Supporting Information

for

Solvent Coordination to Palladium Can Invert the Selectivity of Oxidative Addition

Emily K. Elias, Steven M. Rehbein, Sharon R. Neufeldt*

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Montana State University Bozeman, MT 59717, USA

*Correspondence: sharon.neufeldt@montana.edu

Table of Contents

I.	Experimental Details	
	A. General Materials and Methods	S4
	B. Synthesis and Characterization of Substrates and Authentic Samples of Products	S5
	C. Catalytic Suzuki Couplings of 1	Ū
	1. Evaluation of Precatalyst and Water Effect on Selectivity	S9
	2. Benzonitrile Additives (Table 1 and Figure 1)	S11
	3. Mixed THF/Benzonitrile Solvent	S14
	4. Results with Fluoroacetonitrile, Sulfolane (Table 2), and Tetrahydrothiophene	S16
	5. Effect of Temperature (Table 4)	S17
	6. Effect of Additives (Table 6)	S20
	7. Recycling "Decomposed" Catalyst	S21
	D. Reactions with 3a and 3b	
	1. Catalytic Suzuki Couplings	S24
	2. Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition Studies (Table 3)	
	a. 19F NMR Calibrations	S25
	b. ¹⁹ F NMR Chemical Shifts	S25
	c. Oxidative Addition Reactions	S26
	E. Reactions with S15a and S15b	
	1. Catalytic Suzuki Couplings	S32
	2. Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition Studies	
	a. ¹⁹ F NMR Calibrations	S33
	b. ¹⁹ F NMR Chemical Shifts	S33
	c. Oxidative Addition Reactions	S33
	F. Stille Cross-Couplings	
	1. Reactions of 1 (Scheme 3)	S_{35}
	2. Reactions of 8 (Table 5)	S36
	3. Independent Reactions of an Aryl Chloride and an Aryl Triflate	S37
	4. Efforts to Reproduce Literature Results for the Base-Free Stille Coupling of 1	S39
	G. Evaluation of Alternative Hypotheses	
	1. Alternative Hypothesis: Is Solvent Effect Related to KF Solubility?	S41
	2. Alternative Hypothesis: Is Oxidative Addition Reversible (Curtin-Hammett)?	S43
	3. Alternative Hypothesis: "Greasy Tin Hypothesis"	S45
	4. Alternative Hypothesis: Effect of Bu_3SnOTf	S46
	5. Alternative Hypothesis: Autocatalysis in Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition?	S47
	H. Error Analysis	S49
11.	Computational Details	0-1
	A. General Methods B. Desettion Free Press, Discourse Using DMF Calculated with DeLVB, De(D1)	S51
	B. Keaction Free Energy Diagram Using DMF Calculated with B3LYP-D3(BJ)	S52
	U. DET Predictions at 100 °C D. Discussion of DET Charteenings	S53
	D. Discussion of DFT Shortcomings	S53
	E. Energies, Entropies, and Lowest Frequencies of Minimum Energy Structures	856

IV. NMR Spectra

	_	
А.	Compound Characterization	S60
В.	Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition Studies with 3a and 3b	
	1. Experiments from Table 3 and with Deuterated Solvents	S89
	2. Experiments in DMF at 100 and 0 °C	S120
	3. Monitoring the Reaction in DMF over Time	S124
	4. Reactions in the Presence of Additives	S136
C.	Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition Studies with S15a and S15b	S144
D.	Reaction with S11 and NBu₄OTf	S154

I. Experimental Details

A. General Materials and Methods

NMR spectra were recorded at 298 K on Bruker DPX Avance I 300 MHz (300.130 MHz for ¹H, 75.468 MHz for ¹³C, 282.404 MHz for ¹⁹F, 121.495 MHz for ³¹P), Bruker Ascend 400 MHz (400.130 MHz for ¹H NMR, 100.613 for ¹³C, 376.498 for ¹⁹F, 161.967 for ³¹P), Bruker Ascend Avance III 500 MHz (500.130 for ¹H, 125.758 MHz for ¹³C, 470.592 for ¹⁹F, 202.478 MHz for ³¹P), or Bruker Avance III 600 MHz (600.130 MHz for ¹H, 150.903 for ¹³C) NMR spectrometers. ¹H and ¹³C NMR chemical shifts are reported in parts per million (ppm) relative to TMS, with the residual solvent peak used as an internal reference [¹H NMR: CHCl₃ (7.26 ppm); ¹³C NMR: CDCl₃ (77.16 ppm).] ¹⁹F chemical shifts are reported in ppm relative to fluorobenzene (-113.15 ppm). Multiplicities are reported as follows: singlet (s), doublet (d), triplet (t), quartet (q), quartet of triplets (qt), triplet of triplets (tt), triplet of quintets (tqn), triplet of sextets of doublets (tsd), multiplet (m). GC data were collected using a Shimadzu GC-2010 Plus with a flame ionization detector equipped with a SH-Rxi-5ms capillary column (15 m x 0.25 mm ID x 0.25 µm df). GCMS data were collected on a Shimadzu GCMS-QP2020 NX gas chromatograph mass spectrometer. HRMS data were collected on a Bruker MicroTOF II in acetonitrile with NaCl doping. Purifications via flash chromatography were performed using a Biotage Selekt Flash Purification System. "Room temperature" reactions described herein are generally between 23–25 °C as measured by a temperature probe on the reaction stir plates.

Unless otherwise noted, all commercially-obtained chemicals were used as received. Anisonitrile, dioxane, N,Ndimethylformamide, p-cresol, PdCl₂, KF, sulfolane, 4-(dimethylamino)benzonitrile, 4-chlorophenol, and 4chlorotoluene were obtained from Acros Organics. Propylene carbonate was obtained from Aldrich Chemical. Acetonitrile, K₂CO₃, tetrahydrothiophene, P^tBu₃, and 4-methylbiphenyl were obtained from Alfa Aesar. Benzonitrile was obtained from Eastman Chemical. p-Xylene was obtained from Honeywell Fluka Research Chemicals. 4-Chloro-1,1'-biphenyl was obtained from Matrix Scientific. Biphenyl, methyl-4-cyanobenzoate, nitromethane, o-tolyl boronic acid, phenyl boronic acid, tetrabutylammonium bromide, tetrabutylammonium chloride, tetrabutylammonium fluoride hexahydrate, tetrabutylammonium trifluoromethanesulfonate, tetrabutylstannane, trifluoromethanesulfonic anhydride, 1-chloro-2-trifluoromethylbenzene, 1-naphthol, 18-crown-6, 2bromobenzotrifluoride, 2-chlorobenzotrifluoride, 4-(trifluoromethyl)benzonitrile, 4-aminobenzonitrile, 4ethoxybenzonitrile, 4-fluorobenzonitrile, 4-hydroxybenzonitrile, and 4-nitrobenzonitrile were obtained from Oakwood Chemical. The boronic acids were recrystallized from water prior to use. 1-Methylnaphthalene, ^{*n*}Bu₃SnOTf, Me₃SnPh, and α , α , α -trifluorotoluene were obtained from Millipore Sigma. Bis(tri-tbutylphosphine)palladium(0), methanesulfonato(tri-t-butylphosphino)(2'-methylamino-1,1'-biphenyl-2yl)palladium(II) (Buchwald's precatalyst PtBu₃-Pd-G4), and Me₃SnBr were obtained from Strem Chemical. Fluoroacetonitrile, *N*-methyl-2-pyrrolidone, *p*-terphenyl, *p*-tolunitrile, 1-chloronaphthalene, 1,4dimethylnaphthalene, 4-chlorobenzotrifluoride, 4-chloro-1-naphthol, 4-hydroxybenzotrifluoride, and 4-phenyl-1bromonaphthalene were obtained from TCI America. KPF₆ was obtained from Alfa Aesar, Oakwood Chemical, or Millipore Sigma. ⁿBu₃SnPh was obtained from Alfa Aesar Millipore Sigma. or $Tris(dibenzylideneacetone)dipalladium(0) (Pd_2dba_3)$ was obtained from Millipore Sigma or Strem Chemical. Compounds 1,¹ 2a,¹ 2b,¹ 3a,¹ 3b,¹ 4b,² Pd(COD)(CH₂TMS)₂,³ [Pd(PtBu₃)(o-CF₃Ph)(Cl)] (S10),⁴ and PtBu₃•HCl⁵ were synthesized according to literature procedures.

Acetone, acetonitrile, chloroform, dichloromethane, diethyl ether, dimethyl formamide (DMF), dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO), ethanol, ethyl acetate, fluorobenzene, hexanes, isopropanol, methanol, pentane, tetrahydrofuran (THF), and toluene were obtained from Fisher Chemical. Benzene was obtained from TCI America. Solvents were used as received except for those that were used inside the glovebox. In these cases, MeCN, MeOH, DMF, toluene, and fluorobenzene were degassed and dried with a JC Meyer solvent system prior to use. The dried DMF, MeCN, toluene, and methanol were stored over molecular sieves in the glovebox. Deuterated solvents ($CDCl_3$, C_6D_6) were obtained from Cambridge Isotopes and stored over molecular sieves.

B. Synthesis and Characterization of Substrates and Authentic Samples of Products

OTf CF3 *2-(Trifluoromethyl)phenyl triflate (3b):* The title compound was prepared according to a modified literature procedure.⁶ With cooling to 0 °C, a solution of trifluoromethanesulfonic anhydride (4.0 mL, 24.0 mmol, 1.2 equiv) in CH₂Cl₂ (10 mL) was added dropwise to a solution of 2-

hydroxybenzotrifluoride (3.24 g, 20.0 mmol) and pyridine (3.23 mL, 40.0 mmol, 2 equiv) in CH_2Cl_2 (20 mL). The mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred for 1 h, after which the solution was diluted with Et_2O and acidified with aqueous 1 *M* HCl. The layers were separated, and the aqueous layer was washed with Et_2O (3 x 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with saturated NaHCO₃ and brine (aqueous NaCl), dried over MgSO₄, filtered, and concentrated to give a yellow oil that was purified through a short silica plug (100% hexanes) to afford **3b** as a clear, colorless oil (4.40 g, 75 % yield). Spectral data are consistent with those previously reported.⁷



4-PhenyInaphthalen-1-yl triflate (9a). The title compound was prepared according to a modified literature procedure.⁸ Pd-P^{*i*}Bu₃-G4 (7.0 mg, 0.012 mmol, 3 mol %), phenyl boronic acid (49.3 mg, 0.404 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (69.7 mg, 1.20 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, 4-chloronaphthalen-1-yl triflate (**8**, 79

 μ L, 0.40 mmol), deionized water (7.2 μL, 0.40 mmol, 1 equiv), and THF (1.0 mL) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for ~2 min. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred at room temperature for 24 h. The reaction mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate, and the organic extract was filtered over a plug of celite. The filtrate was concentrated and then purified by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) to afford **9a** as a colorless oil (40 mg, 28% yield). ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): 8.17 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 7.95 (d, *J* = 8.5, 1H), 7.69 (t, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 7.51 (multiple overlapping signals, 8H). ¹³C{¹H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): 145.2, 141.3, 139.4, 133.3, 130.1, 128.6, 128.0, 127.8, 127.6, 126.8, 126.7, 126.2, 121.1, 118.9 (q, ¹*J*_{CF} = 320 Hz), 117.4; ¹⁹F (471 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): -73.3. HRMS (ESI/Q-TOF) *m/z*: [M+Na]⁺ Calcd for C₁₇H₁₁F₃NaO₃S⁺ 375.0273. Found 375.0261.

Ph

1-Chloro-4-phenylnaphthalene (9b). $PdCl_2$ (2.1 mg, 0.012 mmol, 3 mol %), phenyl boronic acid (48.8 mg, 0.40 mmol, 1 equiv), and KF (69.7 mg, 1.20 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, 4-chloronaphthalen-1-yl triflate (**8**, 79 μ L, 0.40 mmol), deionized water (7.2 μ L, 0.40 mmol, 1 equiv), and acetonitrile (750 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for ~2 min. The vial was sealed

with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred at room temperature for 22 h. The reaction mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate, and the organic extract was filtered over a plug of celite. The filtrate was concentrated and then purified by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) to afford **9b** as a colorless oil (79 mg, 84% yield). Spectral data are consistent with those previously reported.⁹



4-Methylnaphthalen-1-yl triflate (9c): In a nitrogen-filled glovebox, Pd₂dba₃ (6.9 mg, 0.0075 mmol 1.5 mol %), Pd(P^tBu₃)₂ (7.7 mg, 0.015 mmol, 3.0 mol %), and KPF₆ (276 mg, 1.50 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, 4-chloronaphthalen-1-yl triflate (**8**, 98 μ L, 0.50 mmol), PhSnMe₃ (100 μ L, 0.55 mmol, 1.1 equiv), and DMF (1.0 mL) were added. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the mixture was stirred at

100 °C for 24 h. The reaction mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate, and the organic extract was filtered over a plug of celite. The filtrate was concentrated and then purified by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes, dry-loaded on C18 silica gel) to afford **9c** as a white solid (52 mg, 36% yield).). ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): 8.21-8.01 (two overlapping signals, 2H), 7.68-7.60 (two overlapping signals, 2H), 7.38-7.30 (two overlapping signals 2H), 2.71 (s, 3H); ¹³C{¹H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃ δ): 144.4, 135.6, 133.9, 127.6, 127.3, 126.5, 125.7, 124.7, 122.7, 118.8 (q, ¹*J*_{CF} = 320 Hz), 117.5, 19.4; ¹⁹F (471 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): -73.4. HRMS (ESI/Q-TOF) *m/z*: [M+Na]⁺ Calcd for C₁₂H₉F₃NaO₃S⁺ 313.0117. Found 313.0123.



1-Chloro-4-methylnaphthalene (9d): In a nitrogen-filled glovebox, Pd_2dba_3 (6.9 mg, 0.0075 mmol 1.5 mol %), $Pd(P^tBu_3)_2$ (7.7 mg, 0.015 mmol, 3.0 mol %), and KPF_6 (276 mg, 1.50 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, 4-chloronaphthalen-1-yl triflate (**8**, 98 µL, 0.50 mmol), PhSnMe₃ (100 µL, 0.55 mmol, 1.1 equiv), and DMF (1.0 mL) were added. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the mixture was stirred at

room temperature for 24 h. The reaction mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate, and the organic extract was filtered over a plug of celite. The filtrate was concentrated and then purified by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes, dry-loaded on C18 silica gel) to afford **9d** as a white solid (31 mg, 35% yield). Spectral data are consistent with those previously reported,¹⁰ but higher resolution data are included here. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): 8.30 (dd, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 8.0 (dd, 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.70-7.57 (two overlapping signals, 2H), 7.46 (d, 7.7 Hz, 1H), 7.23 (d, 7.7 Hz, 1H, overlaps with solvent), 2.67 (s, 3H); ¹³C{¹H} NMR (101 MHz, CDCl₃ δ): 133.8, 133.7, 130.8, 130.2, 130.0, 128.5, 126.8 (d, *J* = 7.2 Hz), 126.5, 125.9, 124.1, 124.7, 19.4.



1-Methyl-4-phenylnaphthalene (9f): The title compound was prepared according to a modified literature procedure.⁸ Pd-P^tBu₃-G4 (7.0 mg, 0.012 mmol, 3 mol %), phenyl boronic acid (49.3 mg, 0.404 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (69.7 mg, 1.20 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, 1-bromo-4-methylnaphthalene (63 μ l, 0.40 mmol), deionized water (7.2 μ L, 0.40 mmol, 1 equiv), and THF (1.0 mL) were added to the vial and

the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for ~ 2 min. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred at room temperature for 24 h. The reaction mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate, and the organic extract was filtered over a plug of celite. The filtrate was concentrated and then purified by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) to afford **9f** as a white solid (76 mg, 87% yield). Spectral data are consistent with those previously reported.¹¹



1,4-DiphenyInaphthalene (9g): The title compound was prepared according to a modified literature procedure.⁸ Pd-P^tBu₃-G4 (7.0 mg, 0.012 mmol, 3 mol %), phenyl boronic acid (49.3 mg, 0.404 mmol, 1.01 equiv), KF (69.7 mg, 1.20 mmol, 3 equiv), and 1-bromo-4-phenylnaphthalene (113.3 mg, 0.40 mmol) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, deionized water (7.2 μ L, 0.40 mmol, 1 equiv) and THF (1.0 mL) were added to the vial

and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for ~ 2 min. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred at room temperature for 24 h. The reaction mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate, and the organic extract was filtered over a plug of celite. The filtrate was concentrated and then purified by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) to afford **9g** as a white solid (45 mg, 40% yield). Spectral data are consistent with those previously reported.¹¹

ONF **2-(Trifluoromethyl)phenyl nonaflate (S11).** The title compound was prepared according to a modified literature procedure.¹² To an oven-dried 50 mL round bottom flask was added 2-(trifluoromethyl)phenol (0.68 g, 4.2 mmol, 1 equiv), K₂CO₃ (0.87 g, 6.3 mmol, 1.5 equiv), and acetonitrile (8.3 mL, 0.5 *M*). The resulting slurry was stirred rapidly while perfluorobutanesulfonyl fluoride (1.26 g, 5.0 mmol, 1.2 equiv) was added via Pasteur pipette. The solution was allowed to stir at room temperature for 16 h, after which the slurry was filtered over a pad of silica gel and rinsed thoroughly with hexanes. The filtrate was concentrated under vacuum to yield **S11** as a clear, colorless oil (1.39 g, 75% yield). ¹H NMR (600 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): 7.77 (d, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 7.67 (t, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.53 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 7.50 (t, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 1H). ¹³C{¹H} NMR (151 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): 146.4, 134.2, 128.4, 128.2 (q, *J* = 5.5 Hz), 123.6 (q, *J* = 33.1 Hz), 122.6, 122.2 (q, *J* = 272.7 Hz), 117.5, (qt, *J* = 295.6, 33.1 Hz), 114.7 (tt, *J* = 295.6, 33.1), 110.1 (tqn, *J* = 272.7, 31.8 Hz), 108.7 (tsd, *J* = 272.7, 31.8, 5.5 Hz). ¹⁹F NMR (282 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): -60.9, -80.7, -109.3, -120.9, -125.9. HRMS (EI/Q-TOF) *m/z*: [M]+ Calcd for C₁₁H₄F₁₂O₃S+ 443.9690. Found 443.9686.

Naphthalen-1-yl triflate (S12): The title compound was prepared according to a modified literature procedure.⁶ With cooling to 0 °C, trifluoromethanesulfonic anhydride (1.0 mL, 6.0 mmol, 1.2 equiv) was added dropwise to a solution of 1-naphthol (0.72 g, 5.0 mmol) and pyridine (0.81 mL, 10.0 mmol, 2 equiv) in CH₂Cl₂ (10 mL). The mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred for 1 h, after which the solution was diluted with Et₂O and acidified with aqueous 1 N HCl. The layers were separated, and the aqueous layer was washed with Et₂O (3 x 5 mL). and the combined organics washed with saturated NaHCO₃ and NaCl brine. The combined organic layers were washed with saturated NaHCO₃ and brine (aqueous NaCl), dried over MgSO₄, filtered, and concentrated to give a yellow oil that was purified through a short silica plug (100% hexanes) to afford **S12** as a clear, colorless oil (1.05 g, 76 % yield). Spectral data are consistent with those previously reported.⁷



2-Methyl-2'-(trifluoromethyl)biphenyl (S13). The title compound was prepared according to a modified literature procedure.⁸ Pd-P^tBu₃-G4 (7.0 mg, 0.012 mmol, 3 mol %), *ortho*-tolylboronic acid (54.9 mg, 0.404 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (69.7 mg, 1.20 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, deionized water

(7.2 µL, 0.40 mmol, 1 equiv), 2-chlorobenzotrifluoride (54 µL, 0.40 mmol), and toluene (1.0 mL) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for ~2 min. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred at room temperature for 24 h. The reaction mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate, and the organic extract was filtered over a plug of celite. The filtrate was concentrated and then purified by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) to afford **S13** as a colorless oil (45 mg, 48 % yield).). ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): 7.79 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 1H), 7.59 (dd, *J* = 7.7, 7.7 Hz, 1H), 7.52 (dd, *J* = 7.6, 7.6 Hz, 1H), 7.37-7.23 (multiple signals, 4H, overlaps with solvent), 7.16 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 2.06 (s, 3H). ¹³C{¹H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl₃ δ): 140.8, 139.0, 136.1, 131.7, 131.4, 129.7, 129.6, 128.9 (q, ²*J*_{CF} = 29 Hz), 128.0, 127.4, 126.1 (q, ³*J*_{CF} = 5 Hz), 125.0, 124.1 (q, ¹*J*_{CF} = 276 Hz), 20.2. ¹⁹F (471 MHz, CDCl₃, δ): -59.2. HRMS (ESI/Q-TOF) *m*/*z*: [M+Na]⁺ Calcd for C₁₄H₁₁F₃Na⁺ 259.0705. Found 259.0711.



1-PhenyInaphthalene (S14): The title compound was prepared according to a modified literature procedure.⁸ Pd-P^{*t*}Bu₃-G4 (7.0 mg, 0.012 mmol, 3 mol %), phenyl boronic acid (49.3 mg, 0.404 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (69.7 mg, 1.20 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, deionized water (7.2 μ L, 0.40 mmol, 1 equiv), 1-

chloronaphthalene (55 μ L, 0.40 mmol, 1 equiv), and THF (1.0 mL) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for ~ 2 min.. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred at room temperature for 24 h. The reaction mixture was extracted with ethyl acetate, and the organic extract was filtered over a plug of celite. The filtrate was concentrated and then purified by flash column chromatography (100% hexanes) to afford **S14** as a viscous, colorless oil (6 mg, 7% yield). Spectral data are consistent with those previously reported.¹³

OTf 4-(Trifluoromethyl)phenyl triflate (S15b): The title compound was prepared according to a modified literature procedure.¹⁴ With cooling to 0 °C, a solution of trifluoromethanesulfonic anhydride (4.0 mL, 24.0 mmol, 1.2 equiv) in CH₂Cl₂ (10 mL) was added dropwise to a solution of 4-hydroxybenzotrifluoride (3.24 g, 20.0 mmol) and pyridine (3.25 mL, 40.3 mmol, 2 equiv) in CH₂Cl₂ (20 mL). The mixture was allowed to warm to room temperature and stirred for 1 h, after which the solution was diluted with Et₂O and acidified with aqueous 1 *M* HCl. The layers were separated, and the aqueous layer was washed with Et₂O (3 x 10 mL). The combined organic layers were washed with saturated NaHCO₃ and brine (aqueous NaCl), dried over MgSO₄, filtered, and concentrated to give a yellow oil that was purified through a short silica plug (100% hexanes) to afford S15b as a clear, colorless oil (4.53 g, 77% yield). Spectral data are consistent with those previously reported.¹⁵

C. Catalytic Suzuki Couplings of 1

1. Evaluation of Precatalyst and Water Effect on Selectivity

<u>General Procedure with Precatalyst System A</u>: Without exclusion of air or moisture, P^tBu₃-Pd-G4 (1.5 mg, 0.0026 mmol, 3 mol %), *o*-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, water (0–1.4 μ L, 0–0.08 mmol, 0–1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and solvent (150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at room temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 μ L) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

<u>General Procedure for Precatalyst System B</u>: In a nitrogen filled glovebox, Pd_2dba_3 (0.5 mg, 0.0006 mmol, 0.75 mol %), $Pd(PtBu_3)_2$ (0.6 mg, 0.0012 mmol, 1.5 mol %), *o*-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and removed from the glovebox. Outside of the glovebox, the cap was removed and, in rapid succession, water (0–1.4 µL, 0–0.08 mmol, 0–1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and solvent (150 µL) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum cap was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at room temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 µL) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

Table S1. Effect of Precatalyst and Water on Selectivity^a



precatalyst system **A**: P^tBu₃-Pd-G4 (3 mol %) precatalyst system **B**: Pd₂(dba)₃ (0.75 mol %), Pd(P^tBu₃)₂ (1.5 mol %)

entry	solvent	precatalyst	H₂O (equiv)	trial	1 (%)	2a (%)	2b (%)
1	THF	Α	0	1	25	79	1
2	THF	Α	0	2	21	79	1
3	THF	Α	0	Average	23	79	1
4	THF	Α	1	1	5	63	<1
5	THF	Α	1	2	23	72	<1
6	THF	Α	1	3	26	68	1
7	THF	Α	1	4	25	71	1
8	THF	Α	1	5	27	75	1
9	THF	Α	1	6	24	79	1
10	THF	Α	1	7	20	78	1
11	THF	A	1	. 8	18	79	1
12	THF	A	1	Average	20	74	<1
13	THF	В	1	1	28	72	1
14	THF	В	1	2	19	75	1
15	THF	В	1	Average	24	74	1
16	МеОН	A	1	1	0	68	3
17	MeOH	A	1	2	0	65	2
18	MeOH	A	1	Average	0	67	2
19	МеОН	В	1	1	35	19	2
20	MeOH	B	1	2	36	21	2
21	MeOH	В	1	Average	35	19	2
22	DMF	A	0	1	65	6	30
23	DMF	A	0	2	63	7	31
24	DMF	A	0	Average	64	7	30
25	DMF	A	1	1	16	9	58
26	DMF	Α	1	2	19	9	61
27	DMF	Α	1	3	24	11	59
28	DMF	Α	1	4	26	11	59
29	DMF	Α	1	5	16	12	66
30	DMF	Α	1	6	20	11	62
31	DMF	Α	1	7	18	9	66
32	DMF	Α	1	8	46	7	46
33	DMF	A	- 1	Average	23	10	60
34	DMF	B	1	1	 	7	42
35	DMF	B	1	2	23	10	62
36	DMF	B	1	Average	36	9	52
37	MeCN	Ā	1	1	8	2	75
28	MeCN	A	- 1	2	8	2	78
30	MeCN	A	1	- Average	8	-	, C 77
39	MeCN	P	1	1	16	4	77
40 41	MeCN	В D	1	1	10	4	/2
41	MeCN	B	1	∠ Average	19	4	71
42	propylene carbonato	Δ	1	Average	1/	4	6
43	propyrene carbonate	Л	1	T	9	57	0

44	propylene carbonate	Α	1	2	23	68	6
45	propylene carbonate	Α	1	3	12	75	5
46	propylene carbonate	Α	1	4	19	68	6
47	propylene carbonate	Α	1	Average	16	67	6
48	propylene carbonate	В	1	1	22	52	6
49	propylene carbonate	В	1	2	20	55	5
50	propylene carbonate	В	1	Average	21	53	6

 a GC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard. Diarylated product observed in $\leq 5\%$ yield in all cases.

<u>Discussion</u>: The addition of 1 equiv water does not significantly impact selectivity (compare entries 3 vs 12, and 24 vs 33). Precatalyst systems **A** and **B** provide very similar selectivity in all solvents examined, although in some cases precatalyst **A** affords somewhat higher yields. Precatalyst **A** has the added advantage that it can be handled open to air.

2. Benzonitrile Additives (Table 1 and Figure 1)

<u>General Procedure</u>: Without exclusion of air or moisture, P^tBu₃-Pd-G4 (1.5 mg, 0.0026 mmol, 3 mol %), *o*-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, water (1.4 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), benzonitrile additive (0.04 mmol, 0.5 equiv, if applicable), and solvent (usually THF, 150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at room temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 μ L) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

Table S2. Effect of Benzonitrile Additives on Selectivity^a

	1	OTf + Cl	B(OH)	2 + \bigvee_{X}^{CN} + \bigvee_{X}^{V} (0.5 equiv	P ^t Bu ₃ (3 n H ₂ O (KF (3 ,) THF,	³⁻ Pd-G4 nol %) (1 equiv) 3 equiv) r.t., 24 h	2a o-tol	+ 2b Cl	
entry	Х	$\sigma_{ m p}$	σ_{p^+}	trial	1 (%)	2a (%)	2b (%)	$\log (2a/2b)$	std. dev. ^b
1 ^c				1	5	63	<1	>1.80	
2^c				2	23	72	<1	>1.86	
3^c				3	26	68	1	1.83	
4^c				4	25	71	1	1.85	
5^c				5	27	75	1	1.88	
6 ^c				6	24	79	1	1.90	
7^c				7	20	78	1	1.89	
8^c				8	18	79	1	1.90	
9 ^c				Average	20	74	<1	>1.87	0.03
10	NMe2	-0.83	-1.70	1	46	28	15	0.27	
11	NMe2	-0.83	-1.70	2	47	29	20	0.16	
12	NMe2	-0.83	-1.70	3	37	36	21	0.23	

13	NMe2	-0.83	-1.70	Average	44	31	18	0.24	0.06
14	NH2	-0.66	-1.30	1	29	46	19	0.38	
15	NH2	-0.66	-1.30	2	29	45	20	0.35	
16	NH2	-0.66	-1.30	3	36	43	17	0.40	
17	NH2	-0.66	-1.30	Average	31	45	19	0.37	0.03
18	OH	-0.37	-0.92	1	38	50	16	0.49	
19	OH	-0.37	-0.92	2	28	53	14	0.58	
20	OH	-0.37	-0.92	3	33	46	16	0.46	
21	OH	-0.37	-0.92	Average	33	50	15	0.52	0.06
22	OEt	-0.24	-0.81	1	35	47	10	0.67	
23	OEt	-0.24	-0.81	2	41	45	8	0.75	
24	OEt	-0.24	-0.81	3	48	42	10	0.62	
25	OEt	-0.24	-0.81	Average	42	45	10	0.65	0.06
26	OMe	-0.27	-0.73	1	72	26	3	0.94	
27	OMe	-0.27	-0.73	2	56	18	2	0.95	
28	OMe	-0.27	-0.73	3	62	32	4	0.90	
29	OMe	-0.27	-0.73	Average	63	26	3	0.94	0.03
30	Me	-0.17	-0.31	1	65	35	2	1.24	
31	Me	-0.17	-0.31	2	66	25	2	1.10	
32	Me	-0.17	-0.31	3	69	28	2	1.15	
33	Me	-0.17	-0.31	Average	67	29	2	1.16	0.07
34	F	0.06	-0.07	1	40	51	5	1.01	
35	F	0.06	-0.07	2	71	30	2	1.18	
36	F	0.06	-0.07	3	46	50	5	1.00	
37	F	0.06	-0.07	Average	52	44	4	1.04	0.10
38	Н	0	0	1	37	53	3	1.25	
39	Н	0	0	2	43	53	6	0.95	
40	Н	0	0	3	38	59	3	1.29	
41	Н	0	0	Average	39	55	4	1.14	0.19
42	COOMe	0.45	0.49	1	56	41	3	1.14	
43	COOMe	0.45	0.49	2	55	44	3	1.17	
44	COOMe	0.45	0.49	3	55	41	3	1.14	
45	COOMe	0.45	0.49	Average	55	42	3	1.15	0.02
46	CF3	0.54	0.61	1	44	45	3	1.18	
47	CF3	0.54	0.61	2	46	49	3	1.21	
48	CF3	0.54	0.61	3	49	44	3	1.17	
49	CF3	0.54	0.61	Average	46	46	3	1.19	0.02
50	NO2	0.78	0.79	1	63	32	8	0.60	
51	NO2	0.78	0.79	2	49	38	8	0.68	
52	NO2	0.78	0.79	3	59	35	6	0.77	2
53	NO2	0.78	0.79	Average	57	35	7	0.70	0.08
$54^{d}_{,}$				1	27	7	54	-0.89	
55 ^d				2	26	7	53	-0.88	
56^d				Average	27	7	53	-0.88	0.01

^aGC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard. Diarylated product observed in \leq 5% yield in all cases. Sigma values from reference 16. ^bStandard deviation of the log(**2a/2b**) values. ^bNo benzonitrile derivatives were added. ^cPhCN was used as the reaction solvent (no additional benzonitrile derivatives were added).

<u>Discussion</u>: Table S2 entries 10-49 were used to create Figure 1 in the manuscript, which shows a good correlation between σ_{p}^{+} and log(**2a**/**2b**), with an R² value of 0.8639. The correlation to σ_{p} is not quite as strong (Figure S1). Unusual results were observed with 4-nitrobenzonitrile (entry 53). With this additive, the **2a**/**2b** ratio was much smaller than expected based on the trend with all of the other substituted benzonitriles (Figure S2). This particularly electron-poor nitrile is expected to coordinate to Pd(o) as a π -acceptor, and we speculate that the increased reaction

at OTf may be due to this coordination mode. There is no evidence that nitro groups in isolation promote reaction at triflate. For example, high selectivity for reaction at chloride is observed in the catalytic Suzuki coupling using 3-nitrophenylboronic acid in MeOH and THF,⁸ and running the reaction shown in Table S2 with PhNO₂ as the solvent leads exclusively to product **2a** from reaction at chloride.



Figure S1. Hammett-type plot using σ shows slightly worse correlation than the plot using σ +.



Figure S2. NO₂ is an outlier in the Hammett-type plot correlating benzonitrile donor ability and increased reaction at triflate.

3. Mixed THF/Benzonitrile Solvent

General Procedure: Without exclusion of air or moisture, PtBu₃-Pd-G4 (1.5 mg, 0.0026 mmol, 3 mol %), o-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, water (1.4 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and solvent(s) (total of 150 µL) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at room temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 µL) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

Table S3.	Effect of Mixed PhCN	/THF Solvent on	Selectivitya
-----------	----------------------	-----------------	--------------

	OTf B(ОН) ₂		C	DTf	o-tol	
		P ^t Bu	ı ₃ -Pd-G4 (3 m	ol %)	ے + 1		
			H ₂ O (1 equiv				
	1 (1.01 ed	quiv)	KF (3 equiv) 24 h. r.t.	2a	2b -tol	 Cl	
PhCN (% of total	THF (% of total	trial	1 (%)	2a (%)	2b (%)	total yield	ratio 2a : 2b
solvent volume)	solvent volume)					2a + 2b	
0	100	1	5	63	<1	63	>63:1
0	100	2	23	72	<1	72	>72:1
0	100	3	26	68	1	69	68:1
0	100	4	25	71	1	72	71:1
0	100	5	27	75	1	76	75:1
0	100	6	24	79	1	80	79:1
0	100	7	20	78	1	79	78:1
0	100	8	18	79	1	80	79:1
0	100	average	21	74	1	75	74:1
1	99	1	33	56	2	58	28:1
1	99	2	19	74	2	76	37:1
1	99	average	26	65	2	67	33:1
5	95	1	58	30	6	36	5:1
5	95	2	45	41	9	50	5:1
5	95	average	51	35	7	43	5:1
10	90	1	39	33	17	50	2:1
10	90	2	38	36	19	55	2:1
10	90	average	39	35	18	53	2:1
25	75	1	26	25	38	63	1:2
25	75	2	21	26	38	64	1:2
25	75	average	24	25	38	63	1:2
50	50	1	13	15	48	63	1:3
50	50	2	17	13	52	65	1:4
50	50	average	15	14	50	64	1:4
75	25	1	18	12	56	68	1:5
75	25	2	27	10	44	54	1:4
75	25	average	22	11	50	61	1:5
100	0	1	27	7	54	61	1:8
100	0	2	26	7	53	60	1:8
100	0	average	27	7	53	60	1:8

^aGC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard.

<u>Discussion</u>: The data in Table S3 show that selectivity inverts between 10-25% PhCN, as illustrated in Figure S3. Interestingly, small amounts of PhCN (5% and 10% of total volume) lead to lower conversion than observed in neat THF or with larger amounts of PhCN (\geq 25% of total volume). This phenomenon is illustrated in Figure S4. The unusual shape of the curve in Figure S4 may relate to solvent polarity. Small quantities of PhCN begin to suppress reaction at chloride because Pd is more likely to be bisligated. Reaction at triflate increases with small quantities of PhCN, but it increases even more with larger quantities of PhCN because of increased polarity of the reaction medium. Aryl triflates are known to undergo faster oxidative addition at bisligated palladium in more polar media.¹⁷



Figure S3. Effect of PhCN/THF ratio on product ratio.



Figure S4. Effect of PhCN/THF ratio on the total yield of 2a + 2b.

4. Results with Fluoroacetonitrile, Sulfolane (Table 2), and Tetrahydrothiophene

General Procedure: Without exclusion of air or moisture, PtBu₃-Pd-G4 (1.5 mg, 0.0026 mmol, 3 mol %), o-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, water (1.4 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and solvent (150 µL) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at room temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 µL) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

	OTF B(OH) ₂	P ^t Bu ₃ (3 m	-Pd-G4 nol %)	OTf	Ĵ	tol
	+	so	vent		+	
	1 (1.01 equiv)	H ₂ O (KF (3 equ	1 equiv) iiv), r.t., 24 h	2a o-tol	2b	
entry	solvent	ϵ^b	trial	1 (%)	2a (%)	2b (%)
1	CH ₃ CN	36.6	1	8	2	75
2	CH_3CN	36.6	2	8	2	78
3	CH_3CN	36.6	Average	8	2	77
4	CH ₂ FCN	~36	1	85	4	10
5	CH ₂ FCN	~36	2	88	3	9
6	CH ₂ FCN	~36	Average	86	4	10
7	DMSO	47.2	1	61	1	26
8	DMSO	47.2	2	25	1	64
9	DMSO	47.2	Average	43	1	45
10	sulfolane	42.2	1	41	44	12
11	sulfolane	42.2	2	41	43	10
12	sulfolane	42.2	Average	41	44	11
13	THF	7.5	1	5	63	<1
14	THF	7.5	2	23	72	<1
15	THF	7.5	3	26	68	1
16	THF	7.5	4	25	71	1
17	THF	7.5	5	27	75	1
18	THF	7.5	6	24	79	1
19	THF	7.5	7	20	78	1
20	THF	7.5	8	18	79	1
21	THF	7.5	Average	20	74	<1
22	tetrahydrothiophene	8.6	1	92	0	2
23	tetrahydrothiophene	8.6	2	105	0	1
24	tetrahydrothiophene	8.6	Average	99	0	2

Table S4. Modifying the Coordinating Ability of Common Solvents Leads to Changes in Selectivity^a

OTf

o-tol

OTf

B(OH)

^aGC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard. Results are the average of at least two trials. Diarylated product observed in $\leq 3\%$ yield in all cases. ^bDielectric constants from references 18 and 19.

<u>Discussion</u>: Although reaction in THF provides **2a** as the major product (Table S4, entry **21**), the only product observed in tetrahydrothiophene (THT) is **2b** (entry **24**). This is consistent with THT acting as a coordinating ligand during oxidative addition. However the yield is so low that selectivity cannot be reliably interpreted. The low yield is likely due to the strong coordinating ability of sulfides to palladium, effectively poisoning it as a catalyst. For a discussion of entries **1-12**, see the manuscript.

5. Effect of Temperature (Table 4)

<u>General Procedure with Precatalyst System A</u>: Without exclusion of air or moisture, P^tBu₃-Pd-G4 (1.5 mg, 0.0026 mmol, 3 mol %), *o*-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, water (1.4 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and solvent (150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at the indicated temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 μ L) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

<u>General Procedure for Precatalyst Systems B-E</u>: In a nitrogen filled glovebox, the following reagents were combined with *o*-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv) and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar:

 $\label{eq:2.1} Precatalyst System B: Pd_2dba_3 \, (0.5\,mg, \, 0.0006\,mmol, \, 0.75\,mol\,\%), Pd(PtBu_3)_2 \, (0.6\,mg, \, 0.0012\,mmol, \, 1.5\,mol\,\%)$

 $Precatalyst \ System \ C: \ Pd_2dba_3 \ (1.1 \ mg, \ 0.0012 \ mmol, \ 1.5 \ mol \ \%), \ PtBu_3 \ (0.5 \ mg, \ 0.0024 \ mmol, \ 3.0 \ mol \ \%)$

Precatalyst System D: Pd(OAc)₂ (0.7 mg, 0.0024 mmol, 3.0 mol %), PtBu₃ (0.5 mg, 0.0024 mmol, 3.0 mol %)

Precatalyst System E: Pd(COD)(CH₂TMS)₂ (0.9 mg, 0.0024 mmol, 3.0 mol %), PtBu₃ (0.5 mg, 0.0024 mmol, 3.0 mol %)

The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and removed from the glovebox. Outside of the glovebox, the cap was removed and, in rapid succession, water (1.4 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and solvent (150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at the indicated temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 μ L) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

Table S5. Effect of Reaction Temperature of Suzuki Selectivitya



precatalyst system **A**: P^tBu₃-Pd-G4 (3 mol %)

precatalyst system **B**: $Pd_2(dba)_3$ (0.75 mol %), $Pd(P^tBu_3)_2$ (1.5 mol %) precatalyst system **C**: $Pd_2(dba)_3$ (1.5 mol %), P^tBu_3 (3 mol %) precatalyst system **D**: $Pd(OAc)_2$ (3 mol %), P^tBu_3 (3 mol %)

precatalyst system **E**: $Pd(COD)(CH_2TMS)_2$ (3 mol %), P^tBu_3 (3 mol %)

entry	solvent	precatalyst	temperature	trial	1 (%)	2a (%)	2b (%)	$\Delta\Delta G^{*}$
1	THF	Α	r.t.	1	5	63	<1	>2.4
2	THF	Α	r.t.	2	23	72	<1	>2.5
3	THF	Α	r.t.	3	26	68	1	2.5
4	THF	Α	r.t.	4	25	71	1	2.5
5	THF	Α	r.t.	5	27	75	1	2.6
6	THF	Α	r.t.	6	24	79	1	2.6
7	THF	Α	r.t.	7	20	78	1	2.6
8	THF	Α	r.t.	8	18	79	1	2.6
9	THF	Α	r.t.	Average	20	74	<1	>2.5
10	THF	Α	100 °C	1	9	77	0	>2.6
11	THF	Α	100 °C	2	10	87	1	2.6
12	THF	Α	100 °C	Average	10	82	<1	>2.6
13	THF	В	r.t.	1	17	79	1	2.6
14	THF	В	r.t.	2	16	78	0	2.6
15	THF	В	r.t.	Average	17	79	1	2.6
16	THF	В	100 °C	1	7	75	<1	>2.6
17	THF	В	100 °C	2	5	72	<1	>2.5
18	THF	В	100 °C	Average	6	73	<1	>2.5
19	DMF	Α	r.t.	1	16	9	58	-1.1
20	DMF	Α	r.t.	2	19	9	61	-1.1
21	DMF	Α	r.t.	3	24	11	59	-1.0
22	DMF	Α	r.t.	4	26	11	59	-1.0
23	DMF	Α	r.t.	5	16	12	66	-1.0
24	DMF	Α	r.t.	6	20	11	62	-1.0
25	DMF	Α	r.t.	7	18	9	66	-1.2
26	DMF	Α	r.t.	8	46	7	46	-1.1
27	DMF	Α	r.t.	Average	23	10	60	-1.1
28	DMF	Α	100 °C	1	2	24	29	-0.1
29	DMF	Α	100 °C	2	3	19	31	-0.3
30	DMF	Α	100 °C	Average	2	21	30	-0.2
31	DMF	В	r.t.	1	17	11	67	-1.1
32	DMF	В	r.t.	2	17	11	67	-1.1
33	DMF	В	r.t.	Average	17	11	67	-1.1
34	DMF	В	100 °C	1	6	33	24	0.2
35	DMF	В	100 °C	2	9	34	22	0.3
36	DMF	В	100 °C	Average	7	33	23	0.2
37	DMF	С	r.t.	1	101	0	1	
38	DMF	С	r.t.	2	75	3	23	-1.2

39	DMF	С	r.t.	Average	88	2	12	-1.1
40	DMF	С	100 °C	1	10	38	19	0.4
41	DMF	С	100 °C	2	42	30	19	0.3
42	DMF	С	100 °C	Average	26	34	19	0.3
43	DMF	D	r.t.	1	48	1	42	-2.2
44	DMF	D	r.t.	2	39	7	44	-1.1
45	DMF	D	r.t.	Average	44	4	43	-1.4
46	DMF	D	100 °C	1	12	20	18	0.1
47	DMF	D	100 °C	2	11	8	14	-0.3
48	DMF	D	100 °C	Average	11	14	16	-0.1
49	DMF	Ε	r.t.	1	60	4	33	-1.2
50	DMF	Ε	r.t.	2	39	6	47	-1.2
51	DMF	Ε	r.t.	Average	50	5	40	-1.2
52	DMF	Ε	100 °C	1	9	26	20	0.2
53	DMF	Ε	100 °C	2	9	38	20	0.4
54	DMF	Ε	100 °C	Average	9	32	20	0.3

^{*a*}GC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard. ^{*b*}Calculated difference in activation barriers to forming products $(\mathbf{2b} - \mathbf{2a})$ based on $\Delta\Delta G^{\ddagger} = \text{RTln}(\mathbf{2a}/\mathbf{2b})$.

<u>Discussion</u>: In DMF, more reaction at chloride is observed at 100 °C compared to room temperature. However, the 100 °C product ratios vary somewhat depending on precatalyst source. This difference is most prominent for precatalyst system **A** compared to the other precatalyst systems. As shown in Table S6, the change in $\Delta\Delta G^*$ when going from room temperature to 100 °C is smaller for this system than for the other systems.

precatalyst	$\Delta\Delta G_{(2b-2a)}^*$ at r.t.	$\Delta\Delta G_{(2b-2a)}^{*}$ at 100 °C	change in $\Delta\Delta G^{\ddagger}$ from r.t. to 100 °C
А	-1.1	-0.2	0.9
В	-1.1	+0.2	1.3
С	-1.1	+0.3	1.4
D	-1.4	-0.1	1.3
E	-1.2	+0.3	1.5

Table S6. Effect of Reaction Temperature of Suzuki Selectivitya

^aData are taken from Table S₅.

The difference in selectivity between different precatalyst systems at 100 °C is inconsistent with hypotheses that (a) the temperature effect is solely due to entropy (where higher temperature disfavors a bisligated oxidative addition transition state) or (b) that oxidative addition is reversible at this temperature and selectivity is based on thermodynamics or on the rate of a subsequent step of the catalytic cycle. Instead, these observations are consistent with catalyst decomposition at 100 °C leading to a species that favors chloride activation. Different precatalysts may decompose at different rates. However, further study is needed to generate higher quality data to support or refute this hypothesis. In THF, no significant temperature effect is observed with either precatalyst system, and the reaction is selective for chloride at both temperatures.

6. Effect of Additives (Table 6)

<u>General Procedure</u>: Without exclusion of air or moisture, P^tBu₃-Pd-G4 (1.5 mg, 0.0026 mmol, 3 mol %), *o*-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv), and other additives (0–3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, water (1.4 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and solvent (150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at room temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 μ L) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

OTf	B(C	0H) ₂ P ^t Bu ₃ -Pd-0 (3 mol %	G4 5)	OTf	C	-tol
	+	solvent, add	ditive		+	
1 Cl	(1.1 equ	uiv) H ₂ O (1 eq KF (3 equiv), r	uiv) 2a .t., 24 h	o-tol	2b	:1
entry	solvent	additive	trial	1	2 a	2b
		(equiv)		(%)	(%)	(%)
1	THF		1	5	63	<1
2	THF		2	23	72	<1
3	THF		3	26	68	1
4	THF		4	25	71	1
5	THF		5	27	75	1
6	THF		6	24	79	1
7	THF		7	20	78	1
8	THF		8	18	79	1
9	THF		Average	20	74	<1
10	THF	18-crown-6 (3)	1	0	2	77
11	THF	18-crown-6 (3)	2	0	1	76
12	THF	18-crown-6 (3)	Average	0	1	76
13^{b}	THF	NBu ₄ F (3)	1	<1	<1	17
14 ^b	THF	NBu ₄ F (3)	2	<1	<1	9
15^b	THF	NBu ₄ F (3)	Average	<1	<1	13
16	THF	NBu ₄ Cl (1)	1	20	4	70
17	THF	$NBu_4Cl(1)$	2	21	4	69
18	THF	NBu ₄ Cl (1)	Average	20	4	69
19	THF	$NBu_4Br(1)$	1	1	4	90
20	THF	$NBu_4Br(1)$	2	5	1	91
21	THF	$NBu_4Br(1)$	Average	3	2	91
22	THF	NBu ₄ OTf (1)	1	27	72	3
23	THF	NBu ₄ OTf (1)	2	26	67	3
24	THF	NBu ₄ OTf (1)	Average	26	70	3
25	ⁱ PrOH		1	4	79	1
26	ⁱ PrOH		2	1	95	1
27	ⁱ PrOH		Average	2	87	1
28	ⁱ PrOH	18-crown-6 (3)	1	0	0	5
29	ⁱ PrOH	18-crown-6 (3)	2	0	0	1
30	ⁱ PrOH	18-crown-6 (3)	Average	0	0	3

Table S7.	Additive	Effects ^a
-----------	----------	----------------------

31	PC		1	12	75	5
32	PC		2	19	68	6
33	PC		Average	15	71	5
34	PC	18-crown-6 (3)	1	5	2	14
35	PC	18-crown-6 (3)	2	5	1	8
36	PC	18-crown-6 (3)	Average	5	1	11
37	DMF		1	16	9	58
38	DMF		2	19	9	61
39	DMF		3	24	11	59
40	DMF		4	26	11	59
41	DMF		5	16	12	66
42	DMF		6	20	11	62
43	DMF		7	18	9	66
44	DMF		8	46	7	46
45	DMF		Average	23	10	60
46	DMF	18-crown-6 (3)	1	0	0	45
47	DMF	18-crown-6 (3)	2	0	0	50
48	DMF	18-crown-6 (3)	Average	0	0	47

^{*a*}GC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard. Diarylated product observed in ≤4% yield in all cases except entry 12 (8%). ^{*b*}KF was omitted from the reaction mixture.

7. Recycling "Decomposed" Catalyst

<u>Hypothesis</u>: The results in Tables 3-5 of the manuscript show that heating either the Stille or Suzuki coupling in DMF leads to increased reaction at chloride. One hypothesis is that, upon heating, the catalyst decomposes to a new catalytically active species that preferentially reacts at chloride. If this is the case, then we would expect that the 'decomposed' catalyst would continue to demonstrate chloride-selectivity when it is recycled. To test this hypothesis, we conducted a Suzuki coupling of **1** at 100 °C for 4 h, then added a second substrate (**8**) and a second boronic acid and stirred for an additional 100 °C at either room temperature or 100 °C (Table S9). In order to interpret the results, it was necessary to establish the baseline selectivity of the Suzuki cross-coupling of **8** at both room temperature and 100 °C (Table S8).

<u>General Procedure for Table S8</u>: In a nitrogen filled glovebox, Pd₂dba₃ (0.5 mg, 0.0006 mmol, 0.75 mol %), Pd(Pt-Bu₃)₂ (0.6 mg, 0.0012 mmol, 1.5 mol %), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and removed from the glovebox. Outside of the glovebox, the cap was removed and, in rapid succession, water (1.4 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), phenylboronic acid (9.9 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and DMF (150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes, then resealed with a PTFE-lined cap. The reaction was stirred vigorously at the indicated temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 μ L) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

<u>General Procedure for Table S9</u>: In a nitrogen filled glovebox, Pd₂dba₃ (0.5 mg, 0.0006 mmol, 0.75 mol %), Pd(Pt-Bu₃)₂ (0.6 mg, 0.0012 mmol, 1.5 mol %), *o*-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and removed from the glovebox. Outside of the glovebox, the cap was removed and, in rapid succession, water (1.4 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and DMF (150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes, then resealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction stirred vigorously at 100 °C for 4 h. The reaction was allowed to cool to room temperature, then briefly uncapped (~10 seconds) and phenylboronic acid (9.9 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv) and 4-chloronaphthyl triflate (16 μ L, 0.08 mmol) were quickly added. The reaction mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes through a septum cap. The sparging needle and septum cap were quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at the indicated temperature for an additional 24 h. Undecane (7.5 μ L) and dodecane (8.0 μ L) were added to the reaction mixture as internal standards, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

8) +) +	B(OH) ₂ Pd Pc .01 equiv)	₂ (dba) ₃ (0.75 l(P ^t Bu ₃) ₂ (1.5 r H ₂ O (1 equ KF (3 equiv DMF, 24 h	mol %) mol %) iv) v)	9a P	otf +	Ph 9b Cl
	entry	temperature	trial	8 (%)	9a (%)	9b (%)	
	1	r.t.	1	7	3	52	
	2	r.t.	2	16	4	43	
	3	r.t.	Average	11	4	47	
	4	100 °C	1	0	1	31	
	5	100 °C	2	0	2	30	
	6	100 °C	Average	0	1	30	

Table S8. Effect of Temperature on Selectivity of Suzuki Coupling of Substrate 8^a

^aGC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard.

Table S9. Recycling Thermally Decomposed Catalyst^a



entry	temperature	trial	1 (%)	2a (%)	2b (%)	8 (%)	9a (%)	9b (%)
1	r.t.	1	19	44	22	87	1	7
2	r.t.	2	25	40	21	89	1	4
3	r.t.	Average	22	42	21	88	1	5
4	100 °C	1	17	29	17	24	22	13
5	100 °C	2	17	40	20	25	29	20
6	100 °C	Average	17	35	18	25	26	17

^{*a*}GC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard.

<u>Discussion</u>: As shown in Table S8, substrate **8** does *not* exhibit the same switch in selectivity at 100 °C as seen for substrate **1** in Table 4 of the manuscript. The major product of Suzuki coupling of **8** is **9b**, from reaction at triflate, at both room temperature and at 100 °C. This observation may be rationalized by the higher reactivity of substrate **8**. If Suzuki coupling is fast, then it can outcompete slower decomposition of catalyst. Notably, the mass balance is poor at both temperatures, suggesting that this substrate is prone to decomposition (e.g., by hydrolysis of the triflate).

When the catalyst is recycled, very poor conversion of **8** is observed at room temperature (Table S9, entry 3). Under these conditions, the major product remains the one resulting from triflate activation (**9b**), albeit in only 5% yield. On the other hand, the use of recycled catalyst at 100 °C leads to preferential reaction at chloride, giving **9a** as the major product in 26% yield (entry 6). Critically, this chloride selectivity is different from the triflate-selectivity observed in the high-temperature Suzuki reaction of **8** using fresh catalyst (Table S8, entry 6). A comparison of Table S8, entry 6 and Table S9, entry 6 demonstrates that high temperature alone is *not* sufficient to cause chloride-selective cross-coupling of **8**. Instead, prior heat treatment of the catalyst (hypothesized to cause decomposition) is necessary before chloride-selectivity can be observed.

These results are consistent with the following scenario: Using fresh catalyst, the Suzuki reaction of **8** is fast enough at 100 °C to outcompete catalyst decomposition. Thus, Suzuki coupling of **8** using fresh catalyst favors triflate activation at both room temperature and 100 °C (Table S8). The active catalytic species is expected to be $[Pd(P'Bu_3)(DMF)]$ prior to decomposition. Heating to 100 °C for 4 h in the presence of Suzuki coupling reagents (including **1**) leads to decomposition of most of the catalyst to an unidentified species that exhibits chloride selectivity. When this decomposed catalyst is recycled at room-temperature for the reaction of **8**, poor yield is observed because the decomposed catalyst is not active at low temperature (i.e., the barrier to one or more steps of the catalytic cycle with this catalytic species is too high to be overcome at room temperature). Instead, the small amount of cross-coupling that does occur at room temperature is catalyzed by residual [Pd(P'Bu_3)(DMF)]. However, the decomposed catalyst *is* active at 100 °C, and leads primarily to chloride activation (Table S9, entry 2).

D. Reactions with 3a and 3b

1. Catalytic Suzuki Couplings

General Procedure: Without exclusion of air or moisture, PtBu₃-Pd-G4 (1.5 mg, 0.0026 mmol, 3 mol %), o-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, water (1.4 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 1-chloro-2trifluoromethylbenzene (6.5 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 2-trifluoromethylphenyl triflate (14.8 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and a 5:1 mixture of solvent: benzene (150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at room temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 µL) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

	+	OTf	+ B(OH) ₂ P 	^t Bu ₃ -Pd-G4 (3 mol %) ent /C ₄ H ₄ (5	:1)	
3a	3	3b	(1.01 equ	iv) H KF (3	₂ O (1 equiv) equiv), r.t., 2	A h S	CF ₃
	entry	solvent	trial	3a (%)	3b (%)	S13 (%)	
	1	toluene	1	11	88	91	
	2	toluene	2	13	92	90	
	3	toluene	Average	12	90	91	
	4	THF	1	20	90	86	
	5	THF	2	20	90	84	
	6	THF	Average	20	90	85	
	7	acetone	1	22	82	84	
	8	acetone	2	13	78	92	
	9	acetone	Average	17	80	88	
	10	MeOH	1	3	52	94	
	11	MeOH	2	2	43	88	
	12	MeOH	Average	3	48	91	
	13	MeCN	1	92	18	67	
	14	MeCN	2	93	17	66	
	15	MeCN	Average	92	18	66	
	16	DMF	1	77	11	88	
	17	DMF	2	79	15	81	
	18	DMF	Average	78	13	84	
	19	sulfolane	1	55	61	50	
	20	sulfolane	2	64	58	37	
	21	sulfolane	Average	59	60	43	
	22	PC	1	30	80	75	
	23	PC	2	26	77	84	
-	24	PC	Average	28	78	79	

Table S10. Intermolecular Competition Between **3a** and **3b** in the Catalytic Suzuki Coupling^a

B(OH)₂

^aGC yield calibrated against undecane as an internal standard.

<u>Discussion</u>: The catalytic cross-coupling selectivity shown in Table S10 qualitatively matches the selectivity observed in the stoichiometric oxidative addition studies (Table 3). However, the mass balance is poor in polar solvents. For example, 91% yield of **S13** is observed in MeOH, but 149% of the starting material is consumed (97% of **3a** and 52% of **3b**). The poor mass balance in polar solvents is likely due to hydrolysis of the electron-deficient aryl triflate **3b**.

2. Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition Studies (Table 3) a. 19F NMR Calibrations

<u>Representative Procedure</u>: Inside a nitrogen-filled glovebox, P^tBu₃ (5.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) was measured into a 1-dram scintillation vial. In a separate vial, a solution was prepared of **3a** (3.6 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), **3b** (5.0 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), and C₆H₅F (7.6 μ L, 0.081 mmol, 3 equiv) in C₆D₆ (100 μ L). 500 μ L of the indicated solvent was added to the vial containing P^tBu₃, followed by the entire volume of the substrate solution. The vial was capped and shaken briefly, and then the solution was transferred via Pasteur pipette into an NMR tube. The tube was capped tightly, removed from the glovebox, and the sample was immediately analyzed by ¹⁹F NMR. The observed ratio of substrate to C₆H₅F signals at this "time=0" was used to define the expected ratios for 100% calibrated yield of recovered substrates in the subsequent intermolecular competition reactions run for 6 h. For **3b**, yields were calculated separately based on each of its two fluorine signals and then averaged together.

b. 19F NMR Chemical Shifts

Peaks corresponding to **3a**, **3b**, and 'free' triflate were assigned by comparison to the spectra of authentic samples of **3a**, **3b**, and NBu₄OTf in 600 μ L of a mixture of solvent:C₆D₆ (5:1 v/v). Chemical shifts were referenced to fluorobenzene (set to -113.15 ppm regardless of solvent). The ¹⁹F NMR signals corresponding to **S10** were assigned by comparison to the spectra of an authentic sample prepared by a literature procedure and/or by analogy to the published spectral data for this compound and the spectra in other solvents.⁴ Relevant chemical shifts in the different solvent mixtures are assigned as follows:

	CI CE ₃ 3a	CE ₃	CF ₃ 3b	OTf- anion (NBu₄OTf)	$ \begin{array}{c} tBu \\ tBu - P - Pd \\ tBu \\ $
toluene	-62.9	-61.2	-74.7	-78.4	-55.3^{b}
THF	-62.2	-60.3	-74.0	-78.1	-54.7 ^c
acetone	-61.6	-59.7	-73.5	-77.4	-54.1 ^c
MeOH ^a	-61.9	-60.0	-73.6	-78.0	-54.3^{b}
MeCN	-61.5	-59.5	-73.1	-77.5	-54.1 ^b
DMF	-61.1	-59.4	-73.3	-77.4	-53.9^{b}
sulfolane	-59.8	-61.7	-73.5	-80.0	$n.d.^d$
PC	-59.5	-61.1	-73.1	-77.7	-54.1 ^c

Table S11. 19F Chemical Shifts of Relevant Species by Solvent: ortho-CF3 Substrates

^{*a*}In a control reaction in this solvent in the absence of palladium, a small amount of decomposition of **3b** to form 2-CF₃C₆H₄OH and free OTf was observed. ^{*b*}Chemical shift was identified by analysis of the authentic material, prepared by a literature

procedure,⁴ in the indicated solvent. ^cChemical shift was identified in the oxidative addition reactions by analogy to the chemical shift observed of this compound in other solvents. ^{*a*}n.d. = not determined.

c. Oxidative Addition Reactions

<u>Representative Procedure</u>: Inside a nitrogen-filled glovebox, P^tBu_3 (5.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) and $Pd(COD)(CH_2TMS)_2$ (10.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar. In a separate vial, a solution was prepared of **3a** (3.6 µL, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), **3b** (5.0 µL, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), and C_6H_5F (7.6 µL, 0.081 mmol, 3 equiv) in C_6D_6 (100 µL). 500 µL of the indicated solvent was added to the vial containing P^tBu_3 and $Pd(COD)(CH_2TMS)_2$, followed by the entire volume of the substrate solution. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was allowed to stir for 6 h at room temperature. The reaction mixture was transferred via Pasteur pipette into an NMR tube. The tube was capped tightly, removed from the glovebox, and immediately analyzed by ¹⁹F NMR.

Ja Ja	CI CF ₃ + 3b	Pd(COI OTf (1 P ^I Bu; CF ₃ solven	D)(CH ₂ TMS) ₂ equiv) $_{3}$ (1 equiv) $t/C_{6}D_{6}$ (5:1) :.t., 6 h	reco 3a oxidativ bypr	vered + 3b + e addition roducts
	ashaant	t	recovere	d (%) ^a	reacted
entry	solvent	trial	3a	30	3a : 3D
1	toluene	1	90	≥99	≥10:1
2	toluene	2	89	≥99	$\geq 11:1$
3	toluene	Average	89	≥99	$\geq 11:1$
4^b	toluene	1	64	≥99	\geq 36 : 1
5^b	toluene	2	40	91	7:1
6 ^b	toluene	Average	52	98	24:1
7	THF	1	61	≥99	≥39 : 1
8	THF	2	52	≥99	≥48 : 1
9	THF	3	51	92	6:1
10	THF	Average	55	97	15:1
11	acetone	1	69	91	3:1
12	acetone	2	73	≥99	≥27:1
13	acetone	Average	71	98	15:1
14	MeOH	1	66	≥99	≥36 : 1
15	MeOH	2	74	≥99	$\geq 26:1$
16	MeOH	Average	70	≥99	$\geq 30:1$
17	MeCN	1	94	0	1:16
18	MeCN	2	96	3	1:24
19	MeCN	3	≥99	0	$\leq 1:100$
20	MeCN	4	≥99	0	$\leq 1:100$
21	MeCN	Average	97	1	1:33
22	DMF	1	88	57	1:4
23	DMF	2	87	57	1:3
24	DMF	3	76	33	1:3
25	DMF	4	63	29	1:2
26	DMF	Average	78	44	1:3

Table S12. Stoichiometric oxidative addition reactions of 3a and 3b.

27	sulfolane	1	82	93	3:1
28	sulfolane	2	90	98	5:1
29	sulfolane	Average	86	95	3:1
30	PC^{c}	1	74	93	4:1
31	\mathbf{PC}^{c}	2	79	95	4:1
32	\mathbf{PC}^{c}	3	98	97	1:2
33	\mathbf{PC}^{c}	4	80	92	3:1
34	\mathbf{PC}^{c}	Average	83	94	3:1
35^d	MeCN	1	>99	≥99	
36^d	DMF	1	>99	≥99	
37^e	MeCN	1	n.a.	5	
38^e	MeCN	2	n.a.	3	
39^e	MeCN	3	n.a.	0	
40 ^e	MeCN	Average	n.a.	3	
41^e	DMF	1	n.a.	23	
42^e	DMF	2	n.a.	25	
43^e	DMF	3	n.a.	36	
44^e	DMF	Average	n.a.	28	
45	Toluene- <i>d</i> ₈	1	74	97	9:1
46	Toluene- d_8	2	85	≥99	≥15:1
47	Toluene- <i>d</i> ₈	Average	79	98	11:1
48	$MeCN-d_3$	1	87	0	1:8
49	$MeCN-d_3$	2	87	1	1:8
50	$MeCN-d_3$	Average	87	1	1:8
51	$DMF-d_7$	1	91	40	1:7
52	$DMF-d_7$	2	93	52	1:7
53	$DMF-d_7$	Average	92	46	1:7
54 ^f	DMF	1	36	34	1:1
55^{f}	DMF	2	47	45	1:1
56 ^f	DMF	Average	42	39	1:1
57^g	DMF	1	94	86	1:2
58^{g}	DMF	2	98	83	1:8
59^{g}	DMF	Average	96	83	1:4

^{*a* 19}F NMR yields calibrated against C₆H₅F as an internal standard. ^{*b*}Heated to 80 °C for 2 h. ^{*c*}PC = propylene carbonate. ^{*d*}Pd(COD)(CH₂TMS)₂ was omitted from the reaction mixture. ^{*a*}**3a** was omitted from the reaction mixture (n.a. = not applicable). ^{*f*} Heated at 100°C. ^{*g*}Cooled to 0 °C.

CI	Í	OTf	Pd(COD (1 e P ^t Bu ₃)(CH ₂ TMS) ₂ equiv) (1 equiv)		recovered 3a + 3b
CF ₃	+	CF ₃	DMF/0 r.t., 10	C ₆ D ₆ (5:1) min - 6 h	oxi	+ dative addition byproducts
	entry	time	recovere 3a	ed (%) ^b 3b	reacted 3a : 3b	-
	1	10 min	99	94	1:3	_
	2	20 min	≥99	95	<1:5	
	3	30 min	99	93	1:7	
	4	1 h	98	88	1:6	
	5	3 h	98	82	1:9	
	6	6 h	97	74	1:9	

Table S13. Stoichiometric oxidative addition reactions of 3a and 3b in DMF tracked over time.^a

^{*a*}The reaction setup differed from the Representative Procedure in that the reaction was run in an NMR tube (without stirring) instead of in a vial with a stir bar. ^{*b*} ¹⁹F NMR yields calibrated against C_6H_5F as an internal standard.

Analysis of Variable Temperature and Time Studies for the Reaction in DMF

Three main signals are observed in the ³¹P NMR spectrum of the DMF reaction after 6 h at room temperature: 85 ppm [assigned to Pd(PtBu₃)₂], ~75 ppm, and 53 ppm (assigned to cationic HPtBu₃). At 0 °C, the phosphonium signal is absent, but there is an additional signal at ~64 ppm. Finally, at 100 °C there are around a dozen signals. One small signal corresponds to Pd(PtBu₃)₂, but none of the other signals match those seen at r.t. or 0 °C. Figure S5 illustrates the ³¹P NMR spectra of these reactions, which correspond to entries 26, 56, and 59 in Table S12. The signals at ~74 and ~64 are tentatively assigned as products resulting from oxidative addition of aryl triflate **3b**. The following observations are worth noting:

- The signal at 64 ppm is observable within 10 minutes at room temperature (Table S13 and Figure S6), but is slowly replaced by the signal at 74 ppm. By 3 h reaction time, the 64 ppm signal is gone but the 74 ppm signal remains at 6 h.

- The signal at 64 ppm is detected even at 6 h when the reaction is run at cold temperature (0 °C).

- The signal at 74 ppm is detected even in the absence of **3a**, so it is not derived from **3a**.

Two signals in the ¹⁹F NMR spectra for the time studies in DMF display a pattern of growth and disappearance that matches those of the signals in the ³¹P NMR spectra. These are labeled in Figure S7 with the same labels used in Figure S6.



Figure S5. Stacked ³¹P NMR spectra for the reaction of **3a** and **3b** in DMF at three temperatures.



Figure S6. Stacked ³¹P NMR spectra for the reaction of **3a** and **3b** tracked over time.



Figure S7. Stacked ¹⁹F NMR spectra for the reaction of **3a** and **3b** tracked over time.

See pages S91-S135 for additional representative NMR spectra corresponding to the stoichiometric experiments with **3a** and **3b** (spectra are provided for a single replicate of each experiment, although most experiments were repeated multiple times).

Analysis of Decomposition Products of Oxidative Addition Adducts

The stoichiometric reaction of **3a** and **3b** was repeated in deuterated toluene, acetonitrile, and DMF (i.e., repeats of entries 3, 21, and 26 of Table S12 using deutero instead of protio solvents). The results were analyzed by ¹H NMR as well as by GCMS. The primary compounds detected by GCMS have m/z = 252, which is consistent with Heck coupling products resulting from reaction of Pd(Ar) oxidative addition adducts with COD. Indeed, ¹H NMR reveals the presence of alkene signals that do not correspond to COD itself (see S92, S102, and S107).



GCMS was also used to analyze the reactions of the stoichiometric oxidative additions performed in THF and propylene carbonate (PC). Heck products were detected in THF but not in PC.

E. Reactions with S15a and S15b

1. Catalytic Suzuki Couplings

<u>General Procedure</u>: Without exclusion of air or moisture, P^tBu₃-Pd-G4 (1.5 mg, 0.0026 mmol, 3 mol %), *o*-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, water (1.4 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 1-chloro-4-trifluoromethylbenzene (10.8 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-trifluoromethylphenyl triflate (14.8 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and a 5:1 mixture of solvent:benzene (150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at room temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 μ L) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

Fable S14. Intermolecular	Competition Betwee	en S15a and S15b in	the Catalytic Suzuki	Couplinga
----------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------	-----------

 \sim

	l), A	~	OTf	B(OH) ₂ P ^t Bu	-Pd-G4 (3 mol %)	
F ₃ C	S15a	F ₃ C S15b	+ (1.0	sol KF (3 e 1 equiv)	vent /C ₆ H ₆ (5:1) quiv), H ₂ O (1 equiv) F_3C^2 24 h, r.t.	
entry	trial	solvent	recovered	recovered	total conversion	reacted
			S15a (%)	S15b (%)	S15a + S15b (%)	S15a : S15b
1	1	THF	18	89	92	7.7:1
2	2	THF	2	88	110	8.3 : 1
3	average	THF	10	89	101	8.0:1
4	1	MeCN	68	1	131	1:3.1
5	2	MeCN	53	1	147	1:2.1
6	average	MeCN	60	1	139	1:2.5
7	1	DMF	60	48	92	1:1.3
8	2	DMF	58	52	90	1:1.2
9	average	DMF	59	50	91	1:1.2
10	1	PC	4	61	135	2.4:1
11	2	PC	7	64	129	2.6:1
12	average	PC	6	62	132	2.5:1

^aGC yield calibrated against undecane as an internal standard.

<u>Discussion</u>: The catalytic cross-coupling selectivities shown in Table S14 qualitatively match the selectivity observed in the stoichiometric oxidative additions and catalytic couplings of **3a**/**3b** and **1**. However, it is clear that one or both of the substrates is decomposing in a non-productive pathway based on the >100% conversion observed in some cases. Hydrolysis of the electron-deficient aryl triflate **S15b** is likely taking place.

2. Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition Studies

a.¹⁹F NMR Calibrations

<u>Representative Procedure</u>: Inside a nitrogen-filled glovebox, P^tBu₃ (5.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) was measured into a 1-dram scintillation vial. In a separate vial, a solution was prepared of **S15a** (3.6 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), **S15b** (5.0 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), and C₆H₅F (7.6 μ L, 0.081 mmol, 3 equiv) in C₆D₆ (100 μ L). 500 μ L of the indicated solvent was added to the vial containing P^tBu₃, followed by the entire volume of the substrate solution. The vial was capped and shaken briefly, and then the solution was transferred via Pasteur pipette into an NMR tube. The tube was capped tightly, removed from the glovebox, and the sample was immediately analyzed by ¹⁹F NMR. The observed ratio of substrate to C₆H₅F signals at this "time=0" was used to define the expected ratios for 100% calibrated yield of recovered substrates in the subsequent intermolecular competition reactions run for 6 h. For **S15b**, yields were calculated separately based on each of its two fluorine signals and then averaged together.

b. 19F NMR Chemical Shifts

Peaks corresponding to **S15a**, **S15b**, and unbound triflate were assigned by comparison to the spectra of authentic samples of **S15a**, **S15b**, and NBu₄OTf in 600 μ L of a mixture of solvent:C₆D₆ (5:1 v/v). Chemical shifts were referenced to fluorobenzene (set to -113.15 ppm regardless of solvent). The ¹⁹F NMR signals corresponding to the putative complex **S16** were assigned by comparison to the spectra obtained by reacting **S15a** in the absence of **S15b** in THF. Relevant chemical shifts in the different solvent mixtures are assigned as follows:

	E ₃ C Cl S15a	E ₃ C OTf	F ₃ C S15b	OTf anion (NBu₄OTf)	^t Bu t _{Bu} -P-Pd t _{Bu} S16 CI CI CE ₃
THF	-62.3	-62.3	-73.2	-78.2	-62.8 ^b
MeCN	-61.5	-61.6	-72.2	-77.6	-60.9 ^b
DMF	-61.4	-61.4	-72.6	-77.4	n.d.
PC	-61.4	-61.5	-72.3	-77.7	-60.7 ^b

Table S15. 19F Chemical Shifts of Relevant Species by Solvent: para-CF3 Substrates a

^{*a*}The chemical shifts of the Ar-CF₃ groups of **S15a** and **S15b** are very close. In each of the 4 solvents examined, the ¹⁹F signal for **S15a** is slightly further downfield than **S15b**. n.d. = not determined. ^{*b*}Tentative assignment; the chemical shift of **S16** was assigned by analogy to **S10** and by corroboration with ³¹P NMR.

c. Oxidative Addition Reactions

<u>Representative Procedure</u>: Inside a nitrogen-filled glovebox, P^tBu_3 (5.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) and $Pd(COD)(CH_2TMS)_2$ (10.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar. In a

separate vial, a solution was prepared of **S15a** (3.6 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), **S15b** (5.0 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), and C₆H₅F (7.6 μ L, 0.081 mmol, 3 equiv) in C₆D₆ (100 μ L). 500 μ L of the indicated solvent was added to the vial containing P^tBu₃ and Pd(COD)(CH₂TMS)₂, followed by the entire volume of the substrate solution. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was allowed to stir for 6 h at room temperature. The reaction mixture was transferred via Pasteur pipette into an NMR tube. The tube was capped tightly, removed from the glovebox, and immediately analyzed by ¹⁹F NMR.

		CI	\bigcap	Pd(CO (OTf P ^t Bu	D)(CH ₂ TMS) ₂ 1 equiv) H ₃ (1 equiv) +	ed 15b	
	F ₃ C F ₃ C F ₃ C		\$15b	solve	nt/C_6D_6 (5:1) oxidative a	ddition	
			rocovor	rad(9/)a	total conversion	n reacted	
entrv	trial	solvent	S15a	S15b	$S_{15a} + S_{15b}$ (%)	S15a : S15b	
			~- 0 **	~-0~			
1	1	THF	50	>99	50	> 50 : 1	
2	2	THF	28	99	72	>72:1	
3	Average	THF	39	>99	61	>61:1	
4	1	MeCN	71	7	122	1:3	
5	2	MeCN	51	9	140	1:2	
6	Average	MeCN	61	8	131	1:2	
7	1	DMF	62	14	124	1:2	
8	2	DMF	50	11	139	1:2	
9	Average	DMF	56	13	131	1:2	
10	1	\mathbf{PC}^{b}	52	98	50	24:1	
11	2	PC^b	51	91	60	6:1	
12	Average	\mathbf{PC}^{b}	51	95	54	10:1	
13^c	1	DMF	>99	>99	<1		
14 ^c	1	MeCN	89	>99	11	>11:1	
15^c	2	MeCN	93	95	12	1:1	
16 ^c	Average	MeCN	91	>99	9	> 9:1	
$17^{c,d}$	1	MeCN	97	96	7	1:1	
18 ^{c,d}	2	MeCN	85	97	18	5:1	
19 ^{c,d}	Average	MeCN	91	97	12	3:1	
20^d	1	MeCN	89	35	76	1:6	
21^d	2	MeCN	87	18	95	1:6	
22^d	Average	MeCN	88	27	85	1:6	

Table S16. Solvent effect on selective of stochiometric oxidative addition

^{*a* 19}F NMR yields calibrated against C₆H₅F as an internal standard. ^{*b*}PC = propylene

carbonate. cPd(COD)(CH2TMS)2 was omitted from the reaction mixture. dReaction time

= 1 h.

<u>Discussion</u>: The selectivities shown in Table S16 qualitatively match the selectivity observed in the stoichiometric oxidative additions of **3a/3b** and **1**. However, more reaction of chloride (**S15a**) is observed in MeCN (entry 6) than expected based on the results with **3a/3b** (i.e., the selectivity in MeCN appears much worse for the *p*-CF₃ substrates compared to the *o*-CF₃ substrates). The selectivity is better at shorter reaction time (1 h, entry 22). On closer examination it appears that the substrates, especially **S15a**, undergo a background reaction in the absence of

palladium (see entries 14-19). The ³¹P NMR spectra reveals at least 2 new signals (Figure S8), suggesting that the substrate(s) can react with P^tBu₃, a process that is apparently hindered by *ortho* substituents in **3a** and **3b** (comparable signals are never detected in the reactions of **3a** and **3b**).



Figure S8. ³¹P NMR spectrum of Pd-free control reaction of **S15a** + **S15b** with P^tBu₃ in MeCN.

See pages S144-S153 for the NMR spectra corresponding to the experiments in Table S16.

F. Stille Cross-Couplings

1. Reactions of 1 (Scheme 3)

In a nitrogen filled glovebox, Pd_2dba_3 (0.5 mg, 0.0006 mmol, 0.75 mol %), $Pd(PtBu_3)_2$ (0.6 mg, 0.0012 mmol, 1.5 mol %), and KPF₆ (44.2 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. Trialkylphenyl stannane (0.088 mmol, 1.1 equiv), **1** (14 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and DMF (150 µL) were added. The vial was immediately sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and removed from the glovebox, and the reaction was stirred at the indicated temperature for 24 h. Dodecane (8.0 µL) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography. (Safety Note: Organostannanes and their byproducts are toxic and should be handled in a fumehood or glovebox. For reactions utilizing fluoride bases, quenching crude reaction mixtures via acidification²⁰ prior to disposal is undesirable due to the additional hazard of generating hydrogen fluoride.)

Table S17. Base-Free Stille Coupling of 1^a



S15g was identified based on MS but has not been isolated. **S15e** and **S15f** are hypothetical and were not detected.

entry	Trial	R	temperature	1 (%)	7 a (%)	7 b (%)	e (%)	f (%)	g (%)	7 h (%)
1	1	<i>n-</i> Bu	r.t.	86	5	4	n.d.	n.d.	trace	0
2	2	<i>n-</i> Bu	r.t.	80	4	4	n.d.	n.d.	trace	0
3	Average	<i>n-</i> Bu	r.t.	83	5	4	n.d.	n.d.	trace	0
4	1	<i>n-</i> Bu	100 °C	71	14	2	n.d.	n.d.	trace	0
5	2	<i>n</i> -Bu	100 °C	76	14	2	n.d.	n.d.	trace	0
6	Average	<i>n</i> -Bu	100 °C	74	14	2	n.d.	n.d.	trace	0
7	1	Me	r.t.	87	2	4	2	2	2	0
8	2	Me	r.t.	80	3	4	2	3	2	0
9	Average	Me	r.t.	83	2	4	2	3	2	0
10	1	Me	100 °C	7	42	5	20	4	4	5
11	2	Me	100 °C	1	36	4	21	4	6	7
12	Average	Me	100 °C	4	39	3	20	4	5	6

 a GC yields calibrated against dodecane as an internal standard. Trace = a minor signal with the expected mass for this compound was detected by GCMS, although no authentic material was available for calibration. n.d. = not detected by GCMS.

2. Reactions of 8 (Table 5)

<u>General Procedure</u>: In a nitrogen filled glovebox, Pd_2dba_3 (1.1 mg, 0.0012 mmol, 1.5 mol %), $Pd(P^tBu_3)_2$ (1.2 mg, 0.0024 mmol, 3.0 mol %), and KPF₆ (44.2 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. Trialkylphenyl stannane (0.088 mmol, 1.1 equiv), **8** (16 µL, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and DMF (150 µL) were added. The vial was immediately sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and removed from the glovebox, and the reaction was stirred at the indicated temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 µL) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.
Table S18. Base-Free Stille Coupling of 8^a



S16c and **S16f** were identified based on MS but have not been isolated. **S16d** and **S16e** are hypothetical and were not detected.

entry	trial	R	temperature	8	9a	9b	С	d	е	f (%)	9g	9h	S12
-			_	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	(%)
1	1	<i>n</i> -Bu	r.t.	79	4	5	trace	n.d.	n.d.	trace	1	1	<1
2	2	<i>п</i> -Ви	r.t.	80	4	5	trace	n.d.	n.d.	trace	1	1	<1
3	Average	<i>n</i> -Bu	r.t.	80	4	5	trace	n.d.	n.d.	trace	1	1	<1
4	1	<i>n</i> -Bu	100 °C	15	19	11	trace	n.d.	n.d.	trace	10	1	<1
5	2	<i>n-</i> Bu	100 °C	39	30	8	trace	n.d.	n.d.	trace	4	1	<1
6	Average	<i>n</i> -Bu	100 °C	27	25	10	trace	n.d.	n.d.	trace	7	1	<1
7	1	Me	r.t.	24	1	10	3	39	1	1	1	1	<1
8	2	Me	r.t.	24	1	9	3	37	1	1	1	1	<1
9	Average	Me	r.t.	24	1	9	3	42	1	1	1	1	<1
10	1	Me	100 °C	2	14	5	31	12	2	8	8	1	<1
11	2	Me	100 °C	1	13	4	35	12	1	9	9	1	<1
12	Average	Me	100 °C	1	13	4	33	12	1	8	9	1	<1
13^b	1	Me	r.t.	11	1	12	4	54	12	1	1	8	<1
14^b	2	Me	r.t.	11	2	12	4	50	13	1	1	4	<1
15^b	Average	Me	r.t.	11	1	12	4	52	12	1	1	6	<1

^aGC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard. Average of two runs. Trace = a minor signal with the expected mass for this compound was detected by GCMS, although no authentic material was available for calibration. n.d. = not detected by GCMS. b KPF₆ was omitted from the reaction mixture.

3. Independent Reactions of an Aryl Chloride and an Aryl Triflate

<u>General Procedure</u>: In a nitrogen filled glovebox, Pd_2dba_3 (0.5 mg, 0.0006 mmol, 0.75 mol %), $Pd(P^tBu_3)_2$ (0.6 mg, 0.0012 mmol, 1.5 mol %), and KPF₆ (44.2 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. Trimethylphenyl stannane (16 µL, 0.088 mmol, 1.1 equiv), 1-substituted naphthalene substrate (0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and DMF (150 µL) were added. The vial was immediately sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and removed from the glovebox, and the reaction was stirred at the indicated temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 µL) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

Table S19. Stille Cross-Couplings of 1-Chloronaphthalene and S12 Tracked Over Time^a



entry	Х	temp (°C)	time (h)	A (%)	B (%)	ratio A/B	total product (A+B)
1	Cl	r.t.	2	2	0		2
2	Cl	r.t.	4	2	0		2
3	Cl	r.t.	8	2	1	2.0	3
4	Cl	r.t.	16	3	2	1.5	5
5	Cl	r.t.	24	3	3	1.0	6
6	Cl	100	2	35	31	1.1	66
7	Cl	100	4	42	34	1.2	76
8	Cl	100	8	36	35	1.0	71
9	Cl	100	16	42	31	1.4	73
10	Cl	100	24	45	37	1.2	82
11	OTf	r.t.	2	3	2	1.5	5
12	OTf	r.t.	4	3	3	1.0	6
13	OTf	r.t.	8	5	6	0.8	11
14	OTf	r.t.	16	9	11	0.8	20
15	OTf	r.t.	24	10	11	0.9	21
16	OTf	100	2	44	38	1.2	82
17	OTf	100	4	44	37	1.2	81
18	OTf	100	8	51	40	1.3	91
19	OTf	100	16	50	39	1.3	89
20	OTf	100	24	47	42	1.1	89

^aGC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard. Results of a single trial.

<u>Discussion</u>: The results suggest that an aryl triflate reacts with faster initial rate than an aryl chloride at both room temperature and at 100 °C in the base-free Stille cross-coupling in DMF. There is no clear trend in the ratio of phenylation versus methylation.

4. Efforts to Reproduce Literature²¹ Results for the Base-Free Stille Coupling of 1

For the room-temperature base-free coupling of **1** with PhSnBu₃ catalyzed by $Pd_2(dba)_3/P^tBu_3$, the literature reports a **1:7a:7b** ratio of 45:47:8. We have been unable to reproduce this ratio. In an effort to control for possible variables, we evaluated different sources of most reagents (Table S20). Additionally, six different chemists across three different labs, including our own, set up the reaction using the exact conditions reported (e.g., same scale, same Pd and ligand source, same reaction time; Table S21). As shown below, none of these efforts enabled us to reproduce the literature report.

<u>Procedure for Table S20</u>: In a nitrogen filled glovebox, Pd_2dba_3 (0.5 mg, 0.0006 mmol, 0.75 mol %), $Pd(P^tBu_3)_2$ (0.6 mg, 0.0012 mmol, 1.5 mol %), and KPF₆ (44.2 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. Tributylphenyl stannane (28µL, 0.088 mmol, 1.1 equiv), **1** (14 µL, 0.08 mmol), and DMF (150 µL) were added. The vial was immediately sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and removed from the glovebox, and the reaction was stirred at room temperature for 24 h. Dodecane (8.0 µL) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

<u>Procedure for Table S21</u>: Six chemists in three organometallic chemistry research groups were recruited to attempt to reproduce the literature results of the base-free Stille coupling of **1** by following the procedure described in Table 3, entry 1 of reference 21, on the same scale described in the literature (0.65 mmol of **1**). The only alterations to the reported procedure are as follows: (1) an aqueous workup was not performed for entries 1 and 4-8 in Table S14 below, and (2) dodecane was used as the internal standard for calibrated GC yields instead of mesitylene, the standard reported in the literature. Dodecane was added to the reaction mixture after the 38-hour reaction time. For the table entries without an aqueous workup, the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography. The preparation method for **1** is noted below. The chemists outside of our own laboratory ordered new bottles of all commercial reagents for use in these studies.

Table S20. Varying Material Sources in Stille Cross-Coupling of 1^a



					literature					
	Dd dha	Dd dha	VDE	Du CoDh	procedure	DME				
	Pd_2dba_3	Pd_2dba_3	KPF6	Bu ₃ SnPn	used	DMF	1.1.1			_1
entry	source	purity ^o	source	source	to prepare 1	source	triai	1	<u>7</u> a	7 D
1	Aldrich	31%	Oakwood	Aldrich	ref. 6	solvent system	1	84	4	3
2	Aldrich	31%	Oakwood	Aldrich	ref. 6	solvent system	2	88	3	3
3	Aldrich	31%	Oakwood	Aldrich	ref. 6	solvent system	Average	86	4	3
4	Aldrich	30%	Oakwood	Aldrich	ref. 6	solvent system	1	88	4	3
5	Aldrich	30%	Oakwood	Aldrich	ref. 6	solvent system	2	88	4	4
6	Aldrich	30%	Oakwood	Aldrich	ref. 6	solvent system	Average	88	4	3
7	Aldrich	30 %	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	1	88	3	3
8	Aldrich	30 %	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	2	88	4	3
9	Aldrich	30 %	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	Average	88	3	3
10	Aldrich	69%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	1	87	4	3
11	Aldrich	69%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	2	89	3	3
12	Aldrich	69%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	Average	89	4	3
13	Strem	63%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	1	88	3	3
14	Strem	63%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	2	88	3	3
15	Strem	63%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	Average	88	3	3
16	prepared in-	27%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	1	88	3	3
	house									
	(ref. 22)	0/		A1C A		1	-	00		_
17	prepared in-	27%	Oakwood	Alla Aesar	rei. o	solvent system	2	88	4	3
	(ref op)									
10	(Iel.22)	07%	Onlywood	Alfo Accor	rof 6	colvent evetem	Avorago	00	0	0
10	bouso	2/70	Oakwoou	Alla Aesar	1ei. o	solvent system	Average	00	3	3
	(ref op)									
10	(Iel.22)	0.0%	Aldmiche	Alfo Accor	nof 6	a luont quatam		00	0	0
19	Aldrich	30%	Aldriche	Alla Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	1	92	3	3
20	Aldrich	30%	Aldriche	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	2	00	3	3
21	Aldrich	30%	Aldriche	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	Average	90	3	3
22	Aldrich	30%	Alla Aesar	Alla Aesar	rei. o	solvent system	1	92	3	3
23	Aldrich	30%	Alfa	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	2	89	3	3
			Aesar							
24	Aldrich	30%	Alfa	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	solvent system	Average	90	3	3
	ما جامعة والم	2.20/	Aesar	A16- A	maf (many maple dd	-	0.0		
25	Aldrich	30%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	rei. 6	new, sealed ^a	1	89	4	4
26	Aldrich	30%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	ref. 6	new, sealed ^{a}	2	89	4	4
27	Aldrich	30%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	rei. 6	new, sealed ^{a}	Average	89	4	4
28	Aldrich	30%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	rei. 21	solvent system	1	89	1	2
29	Aldrich	30%	Oakwood	Alfa Aesar	rei. 21	solvent system	2	90	2	2
30	Aldrich	30%	Uakwood	Alta Aesar	ret. 21	solvent system	Average	80	1	2

^{*a*} GC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard. Average of two runs. ^{*b*} Purity was determined by ¹H NMR in CDCl₃ by the method in reference 23. ^{*c*} 99.5 % trace metals basis KPF₆. ^{*d*} Newly-opened bottle of DMF in an AcroSeal bottle from Acros Organics was used.

Table S21. Impact of Chemist and Workup Procedure in Stille Cross-Coupling of 1^a



^aGC yields calibrated against dodecane as an internal standard. Results of a single run. ^bWhen indicated, the aqueous workup was performed after adding internal standard (dodecane) and followed the procedure described in reference 21. ^cMesitylene, which is the internal GCMS standard used in reference 21, was added with the other liquid reagents prior to the start of the reaction.

<u>Discussion</u>: As shown in Table S20, the Pd source and its purity, the KPF₆ source, the Bu₃SnPh source, the DMF source, and the preparation method for **1** did not have a significant effect on the reaction yields in our hands. Furthermore, there was little variation among the different chemists (Table S21). The total yield of products 7a + 7b ranged from 4–16% yield, and the remaining starting material ranged from 77–94% based on calibrated GC.

G. Evaluation of Alternative Hypotheses

1. Alternative Hypothesis: Is Solvent Effect Related to KF Solubility?

<u>Hypothesis</u>: We evaluated an alternative hypothesis for the observed solvent effect wherein better solubility of KF promotes formation of anionic bisligated $[Pd(P^tBu_3)(F)]^-$, which in turn favors reaction at triflate.

<u>General Procedure</u>: Without exclusion of air or moisture, P^tBu₃-Pd-G4 (1.5 mg, 0.0026 mmol, 3 mol %), *o*-tolyl boronic acid (11.0 mg, 0.081 mmol, 1.01 equiv), and KF (13.9 mg, 0.24 mmol, 3 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a magnetic stir bar. In rapid succession, water (1.4 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), 4-chlorophenyl triflate (14 μ L, 0.08 mmol, 1 equiv), and solvent (150 μ L) were added to the vial and the mixture was immediately sparged with nitrogen for two minutes. The sparging needle and septum was quickly replaced with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was stirred vigorously at the indicated temperature for 24 h. Undecane (7.5 μ L) was added to the reaction mixture as an internal standard, and the mixture was diluted with EtOAc. A small aliquot was removed and filtered through celite, and the celite was washed with additional EtOAc. The filtrate was analyzed by gas chromatography.

Table S22. Comparing Selectivity to KF Solubility.^a



entry	solvent	KF solubility (g KF/100 g solvent, 20-25 °C) ^b	reference for solubility data	trial	1 (%)	2a (%)	2b (%)
1	H ₂ O	102	24	1	22	55	0
2	H ₂ O	102	24	2	35	64	0
3	H_2O	102	24	Average	28	59	0
4	THF	0.85	25	1	5	63	<1
5	THF	0.85	25	2	23	72	<1
6	THF	0.85	25	3	26	68	1
7	THF	0.85	25	4	25	71	1
8	THF	0.85	25	5	27	75	1
9	THF	0.85	25	6	24	79	1
10	THF	0.85	25	7	20	78	1
11	THF	0.85	25	8	18	79	1
12	THF	0.85	25	Average	20	74	<1
13	DMF	7.0 X 10 ⁻³	24	1	16	9	58
14	DMF	7.0 X 10 ⁻³	24	2	19	9	61
15	DMF	7.0 X 10 ⁻³	24	3	24	11	59
16	DMF	7.0 X 10 ⁻³	24	4	26	11	59
17	DMF	7.0 X 10 ⁻³	24	5	16	12	66
18	DMF	7.0 X 10 ⁻³	24	6	20	11	62
19	DMF	7.0 X 10 ⁻³	24	Average	23	10	60
20	MeCN	3.6 x 10 ⁻³	24	1	8	2	75
21	MeCN	3.6 x 10 ⁻³	24	2	8	2	78
22	MeCN	3.6 x 10 ⁻³	24	Average	8	2	77
23	acetone	2.2 X 10 ⁻⁵	24	1	16	72	3
24	acetone	2.2 X 10 ⁻⁵	24	2	26	63	4
25	acetone	2.2 X 10 ⁻⁵	24	Average	21	68	4
26	propylene carbonate (PC)	2.0 X 10 ⁻⁷	26	1	9	57	6
27	propylene carbonate (PC)	2.0 X 10 ⁻⁷	26	2	23	68	6
28	propylene carbonate (PC)	2.0 X 10 ⁻⁷	26	3	12	75	5
29	propylene carbonate (PC)	2.0 X 10 ⁻⁷	26	4	19	68	6
30	propylene carbonate (PC)	2.0 X 10 ⁻⁷	26	Average	16	67	6

^aGC yields calibrated against undecane as an internal standard. Diarylated product observed in ≤4% yield in all cases.



Figure S9. No correlation between KF solubility and selectivity is observed in six representative solvents.

<u>Discussion</u>: Solubility data and selectivity were plotted on a linear free energy relationship diagram (Table S22 and Figure S9). For six representative solvents, in which KF solubility is known, there is no trend between solubility and selectivity. As such, it does not appear that fluoride availability is responsible for the observed solvent effects.

2. Alternative Hypothesis: Is Oxidative Addition Reversible (Curtin-Hammett)?

<u>Hypothesis</u>: We considered a scenario in which the previously reported difference between the Suzuki and Stille selectivities²¹ relates to reversible oxidative addition. If transmetallation with organostannane reagents is sufficiently slow, and oxidative addition is reversible, then the Stille reaction kinetics would fall into a Curtin-Hammett regime wherein transmetallation would actually be the selectivity-determining step. For this scenario to serve as an explanation for why chloride-selectivity was reported in the base-free Stille coupling in DMF, despite the observation that stoichiometric oxidative addition occurs preferentially at C–OTf in this solvent, oxidative addition of triflate must be reversible and transmetallation at P^rBu₃Pd(Ar)Cl must be faster than at a putative P^rBu₃Pd(Ar)OTf intermediate. To evaluate this hypothesis, we conducted an experiment using an aryl nonaflate in the presence of triflate anion designed to look for reversible oxidative addition of fluorinated sulfonates. Successful oxidative addition would result in product **3b**. We hypothesized that this process could be tracked by ¹⁹F NMR, since NBu₄OTf (-77.4 ppm) would be consumed and peaks corresponding to product **3b** (diagnostic signal at -73.3 ppm) would appear.



<u>Procedure</u>: Inside a nitrogen-filled glovebox, P^tBu_3 (5.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), $Pd(COD)(CH_2TMS)_2$ (10.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), and NBu_4OTf (10.6 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar. In a separate vial, a solution was prepared of **S11** (0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), C_6H_5F (7.6 µL, 0.081 mmol, 3 equiv) in C_6D_6 (100 µL). DMF (500 µL) was added to the vial containing Pd, followed by the entire volume of the substrate solution. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was allowed to stir for 3-48 h at room temperature. The reaction mixture was transferred via Pasteur pipette into an NMR tube. The tube was capped tightly, removed from the glovebox, and immediately analyzed by ¹⁹F NMR.

<u>Results and Discussion</u>: The NMR spectra from these experiments show evidence of oxidative addition of **S11** based on decrease in the signals corresponding to this compound, but **3b** is not detected after 3 hours, nor after extended reaction time (up to 48 h). We conclude from these results that reductive elimination of C—OTf is unlikely to occur in polar coordinating solvent at room temperature. As such, a Curtin-Hammett scenario involving rapid equilibrium between oxidative addition adducts [Pd(PtBu₃)(Ar)(Cl)] and [Pd(PtBu₃)(Ar)(OTf)] is not feasible. This conclusion is consistent with the dearth of literature examples of $C_{(sp2)}$ —O reductive elimination from Pd(II). Furthermore, DFT calculations suggest that oxidative addition of both C—OTf and C—Cl at [Pd(PtBu₃)] is highly exergonic and unlikely to be reversible based on the calculated free energy barriers for the reverse reaction (see Figure 2 of the manuscript).

See pages S154-S155 for the 19F NMR spectra corresponding to these experiments.

3. Alternative Hypothesis: "Greasy Tin Hypothesis"

<u>Hypothesis</u>: We considered an alternative hypothesis to explain the previously-reported anomalous solvent effects in the Stille coupling. In this hypothesis, we envisioned that the greasy organostannane reagents could modulate the polarity of the reaction medium (for example, oxidative addition could take place within nonpolar micelles rather than within the bulk reaction medium). To test this hypothesis, stoichiometric oxidative addition studies were conducted in DMF at room temperature in the presence of $SnBu_4$ (a reagent that is structurally similar to Bu_3SnPh but is unlikely to undergo transmetallation).

<u>Procedure</u>: Inside a nitrogen-filled glovebox, P^tBu₃ (5.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) and Pd(COD)(CH₂TMS)₂ (10.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar. In a separate vial, a solution was prepared of **3a** (3.6 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), **3b** (5.0 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), C₆H₅F (7.6 μ L, 0.081 mmol, 3 equiv), and SnBu₄ (8.9 μ L – 88.9 μ L, 0.027 – 0.27 mmol, 1-10 equiv) in C₆D₆ (100 μ L). DMF (500 μ L) was added to the vial containing Pd, followed by the entire volume of the substrate solution. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was allowed to stir for 6 h at room temperature. The reaction mixture was transferred via Pasteur pipette into an NMR tube. The tube was capped tightly, removed from the glovebox, and immediately analyzed by ¹⁹F NMR.

Results:

CI	+	OTf ↓ + SnBu₄	Pd(F	COD)(CH ₂ TN (1 equiv) ^{pt} Bu ₃ (1 equiv	IS) ₂)	recovered 3a + 3b
CF ₃ 3a	:	CF ₃ 0 - 10 equiv 3b	D	0MF/C ₆ D ₆ (5: r.t., 6 h	1) o>	+ kidative addition byproducts
	entry	additive (equiv)	recove 3a	ered (%) 3b	reacted 3a : 3b	_
	1	(none)	87	57	1:3	
	2	SnBu4 (1 equiv)	86	26	1:5	
	3	SnBu ₄ (2 equiv)	73	16	1:3	
	4	SnBu4 (10 equiv)	76	23	1:3	

Table S23. Effect of SnBu₄ on Stoichiometric Selectivity^a

<u>Discussion</u>: SnBu₄ did not have a significant effect on the selectivity of oxidative addition, even when used in large excess. C—OTf oxidative addition continues to occur preferentially.

See pages S136-S138 for the ¹⁹F NMR spectra corresponding to these experiments.

4. Alternative Hypothesis: Effect of n-Bu₃SnOTf

<u>Hypothesis</u>: We speculated that the byproduct of transmetallation with organotin reagents might influence the selectivity of oxidative addition in subsequent catalyst turnovers. In a coordinating solvent like DMF, which favors oxidative addition at triflate, the formal byproduct of transmetallation with PhSnR₃ would be R₃SnOTf (R = n Bu or Me). In this compound, tin has Lewis acidic character, and we envisioned that the Lewis acidic tin might activate an Ar—Cl bond toward oxidative addition through interaction with lone pairs on Cl. We evaluated this hypothesis through stoichiometric oxidative addition studies in DMF in the presence of added Bu₃SnOTf.

<u>Procedure</u>: Inside a nitrogen-filled glovebox, P^tBu₃ (5.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) and Pd(COD)(CH₂TMS)₂ (10.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar. In a separate vial, a solution was prepared of **3a** (3.6 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), **3b** (5.0 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), C₆H₅F (7.6 μ L, 0.081 mmol, 3 equiv), and *n*-Bu₃SnOTf (0.027–0.054 mmol, 1-2 equiv) in C₆D₆ (100 μ L). DMF (500 μ L) was added to the vial containing Pd, followed by the entire volume of the substrate solution. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was allowed to stir for 2-6 h at room temperature. The reaction mixture was transferred via Pasteur pipette into an NMR tube. The tube was capped tightly, removed from the glovebox, and immediately analyzed by ¹⁹F NMR.

Results:

CI	+		+ <i>n</i> -Bu ₃ SnC	DTf	Pd(COD)(C (1 eq P ^t Bu ₃ (1	CH ₂ TMS) ₂ uiv) equiv)	recovered 3a + 3b +
3 a		3b	0-2 equiv DMF/C ₆ D ₆ (5:1) r.t., 2-6 h		oxidative addition byproducts		
		entry	Bu₃SnOTf	recov	vered (%)	reacted	
			(equiv)	3a	3b	3a : 3b	
		1	0	87	57	1:3	
		2	1	88	64	1:3	
		3	2	86	65	1:3	

Table S24. Effect of *n*-Bu₃SnOTf on Stoichiometric Selectivity^a

 $^{a\ 19}F$ NMR yields calibrated against $C_{6}H_{5}F$ as an internal standard.

<u>Discussion</u>: The addition of n-Bu₃SnOTf does not influence the observed selectivity. Thus the previously reported difference between Stille and Suzuki selectivity in DMF should not be attributed to the formation of the byproduct n-Bu₃SnOTf.

See pages S139-S140 for the ¹⁹F NMR spectra corresponding to these experiments.

5. Alternative Hypothesis: Autocatalysis in Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition?

<u>Hypothesis</u>: Hartwig has previously observed autocatalytic oxidative addition of PhBr to $Pd(P^tBu_3)_2$ through the proposed mechanism illustrated below in Figure S10.²⁷ In this mechanism, a side product of the initial reaction is $(P^tBu_3)_2Pd(H)(Br)$ (the proton is derived from C–H activation of a phosphine ligand). This complex undergoes reductive elimination to form $[H-P^tBu_3][Pd(P^tBu_3)(Br)]$, which contains anionic Pd(o). The anionic Pd(o) is believed to undergo much more rapid oxidative addition into PhBr than the original neutral Pd(P^tBu_3)_n species.



Figure S10. Previously reported autocatalytic oxidative addition of PhBr mediated by phosphonium salt.²⁷

We considered the possibility that, in our stoichiometric oxidative addition reactions between $[Pd(P^tBu_3)]$ and **3a/3b**, an analogous process could occur that would generate highly reactive $[Pd(P^tBu_3)(Cl)]^-$. This anionic bisligated Pd(o) species would be expected to preferentially react at C—OTf, as proposed by Proutiere and Schoenebeck.²¹ Because the envisioned autocatalytic cycle would be mediated by P^tBu_3 •HCl, by analogy to Figure S4, we evaluated this hypothesis by using P^tBu_3 •HCl as an additive in our stoichiometric studies. If this species promotes a catalytic cycle involving anionic bisligated $[Pd(P^tBu_3)(Cl)]^-$, we would expect to see a change in selectivity toward increased reaction at triflate.

<u>Procedure</u>: Inside a nitrogen-filled glovebox, P^tBu₃ (5.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), Pd(COD)(CH₂TMS)₂ (10.5 mg, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), and P^tBu₃•HCl (0.7 mg, 0.0027 mmol, 0.1 equiv) were combined in a 1-dram vial equipped with a stir bar. In a separate vial, a solution was prepared of **3a** (3.6 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), **3b** (5.0 μ L, 0.027 mmol, 1 equiv), and C₆H₅F (7.6 μ L, 0.081 mmol, 3 equiv) in C₆D₆ (100 μ L). 500 μ L of the indicated solvent was added to the vial containing Pd, followed by the entire volume of the substrate solution. The vial was sealed with a PTFE-lined cap and the reaction was allowed to stir for 6 h at room temperature. The reaction mixture was transferred via Pasteur pipette into an NMR tube. The tube was capped tightly, removed from the glovebox, and immediately analyzed by ¹⁹F NMR.

$\widehat{\Box}$,Cl +	OTf	+ P ^t Bu ₃ ●H	Pd(0	COD)(CH ₂ (1 equiv ^t Bu ₃ (1 eq	TMS) ₂) juiv)	recove 3a + 3	red 3b
3a	°CF ₃	3b	(0.1 equi	v) sol	solvent/C ₆ D ₆ (5:1) r.t., 6 h			addition lucts
				solvent =	= THF, sulf	olane, DMF		
	entry	solvent	P¹Bu₃∙HCl (equiv)	trial	recove 3a	red (%) ^a 3b	reacted 3a : 3b	-
	1	THF	0	1	61	≥99	≥39:1	-
	2	THF	0	2	52	≥99	≥48 : 1	
	3	THF	0	3	51	92	6:1	
	4	THF	0	Average	55	97	15:1	
	5	THF	0.1	1	60	94	7:1	
	6	THF	0.1	2	62	96	10:1	
	7	THF	0.1	Average	61	95	8:1	
	8	sulfolane	0	1	82	93	3:1	
	9	sulfolane	0	2	90	98	5:1	
	10	sulfolane	0	Average	86	95	3:1	
	11	sulfolane	0.1	1	91	96	2:1	
	12	sulfolane	0.1	2	90	94	2:1	
	13	sulfolane	0.1	Average	90	95	2:1	
	14	DMF	0	1	88	57	1:4	
	15	DMF	0	2	87	57	1:3	
	16	DMF	0	3	76	33	1:3	
	17	DMF	0	4	63	29	1:2	
	18	DMF	0	Average	78	44	1:3	
	19	DMF	0.1	1	76	31	1:3	
	20	DMF	0.1	2	81	44	1:3	
	21	DMF	0.1	Average	79	37	1:3	

Table S25. Effect of Phosphonium Chloride on Stoichiometric Selectivity

^{*a* 19}F NMR yields calibrated against C₆H₅F as an internal standard.

<u>Discussion</u>: The addition of 10 mol % of P^tBu₃•HCl led to some selectivity deterioration in THF and sulfolane. However, addition of this quantity of phosphonium salt was insufficient to result in an inversion of selectivity in these solvents. There was no change to the observed selectivity in DMF. These results suggest that, under the standard stoichiometric conditions in the absence of added P^tBu₃•HCl, it is unlikely that bisligated anionic $[Pd(P^tBu_3)(Cl)]^-$ is primarily responsible for the preferential triflate selectivity that is observed in coordinating solvents.

Additionally, there are other observations that contradict the hypothesis that triflate selectivity in DMF/MeCN is due to the involvement of $[Pd(P^tBu_3)(Cl)]^-$ under the stoichiometric conditions. (1) While it makes sense to consider that this anionic species would be better stabilized in polar solvents, preferential reaction at triflate is *not* observed in polar noncoordinating solvents like sulfolane and propylene carbonate (see Table 3 of the manuscript, entries 8-9). (2) Hartwig observed autocatalysis in the oxidative addition of PhBr in the nonpolar solvents toluene and THF, in addition to the polar non-coordinating solvent 2-butanone. If a similar mechanism occurred in our stoichiometric

studies, we would expect to see preferential reaction at triflate (via $[Pd(P^tBu_3)(Cl)]^-$) in toluene, THF, and acetone, but instead we see preferential selectivity for reaction of chloride in these solvents (Table 3, entries 1-4). (3) Control studies show that the presence of a **3a** as a chloride source is not necessary to observe reaction of **3b** in MeCN and DMF (Table 3, entries 12-13).

See pages S141-S143 for the ¹⁹F NMR spectra corresponding to these experiments.

H. Error Analysis

Possible sources of error in GC yields include measurements of reagents and internal standard (typically undecane) and instrument error. To analyze measurement error, substrate **1** and undecane were measured out by volume in the same manner used for reaction set up, and the masses of the measured volumes were weighed by injecting the volume into an empty tared vial. In particular, 7.5 μ L of undecane was measured with a 10 μ L syringe (marked with 0.2 μ L gradations), and 14 μ L of **1** was measured with a 25 μ L syringe (marked with 0.5 μ L gradations). This process was repeated 5x for each compound. The results are summarized in Tables S26 and S27 below. To analyze error in GC analysis, the same reaction sample was analyzed by GC 5x (Table S28).

e S26. Undeca	ane measurement error.	Table S27. Substrate	e 1 measureme
trial	mass	trial	mass
1	5.8 mg	1	21.8 mg
2	5.7 mg	2	21.9 mg
3	5.5 mg	3	21.6 mg
4	5.6 mg	4	21.9 mg
5	5.7 mg	5	21.7 mg
Average	5.66 mg	Average	21.78 mg
Std. dev.	0.11 mg	Std. dev.	0.13 mg
d. dev. as	±1.9%	Std. dev. as	±0.6%
% of avg		% of avg	

Table S28. Instrument error: GC yields based on 5 GC runs of the same sample.

	+ B(OH) ₂ + (1.01 equiv)	P ^t Bu ₃ -Pd-G4 (3 H ₂ O (1 eq KF (3 equ DMF, 24 h	3 mol %) uiv) uiv) 2a , r.t.	OTf + (o-tol	o-to Cl
	trial	1 (%)	2a (%)	2b (%)	_
_	1	21.018	9.039	60.442	
	2	21.151	9.168	60.546	
	3	21.225	9.399	60.106	
	4	20.917	9.390	60.323	
	5	21.449	9.655	60.716	
	Average (%)	21.152	9.330	60.427	
	Std. dev. (%)	0.204	0.237	0.230	

Discussion:

The standard deviation of the measured quantity of undecane is $\pm 1.9\%$ of the average. The standard deviation of the measured quantity of substrate is $\pm 0.6\%$ of the average. The standard deviation of the yields of **2a** and **2b** determined by GC analysis is $\pm 0.2\%$ of the average. As such, measurement error of both substrate and (especially) standard are expected to contribute to the most error in calculated yields. Instrument variation is associated with only a small amount of error. Overall, the estimated error in the total mass balance throughout the manuscript is about $\pm 3\%$ based on the standard deviations of the measurements in this error analysis. Importantly, this error is expected to influence the yields of the two products in the same direction (e.g., under-measuring undecane would increase the yield of both **2a** and **2b**, leading to a relatively minor effect on calculated ratio). Additional variation in yields can be attributed to factors including other measurement errors (e.g., of precatalyst), minor variations in room temperature, heterogeneity of particle size of solid reagents, and variations in the amount of residual O₂ in the reaction vessel.

II. Computational Details

A. General Methods

Calculations were performed with Gaussian 16.28 An ultrafine integration grid and the keyword 5d were used for all calculations. Geometry optimizations of stationary points were carried out in implicit solvent using the CPCM continuum solvation model²⁹ with the indicated functional (B3LYP or MN15L³⁰) and basis sets (either LANL2DZ³¹ or SDD for Pd and 6-31+G(d) for all other atoms). Frequency analyses were carried out at the same level to evaluate the zero-point vibrational energy and thermal corrections at 298.15 K. Unless otherwise indicated, Gibbs free energy values are reported after applying Cramer and Truhlar's quasi-harmonic approximation to vibrational entropy³² and Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximation to vibrational enthalpy³³ to frequencies that are less than 100 cm-1. All thermodynamic quantities were computed with the GoodVibes code.34 The nature of the stationary points was determined in each case according to the appropriate number of negative eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix. Forward and reverse intrinsic reaction coordinate (IRC) calculations were carried out on the optimized transition structures to ensure that the TSs indeed connect the appropriate reactants and products.³⁵ Multiple conformations were considered for all structures, and the lowest energy conformations are reported. It is worth noting that the lowest-energy π -complexes are not necessarily directly connected to the oxidative addition transition structures on the potential energy surfaces (i.e., in some cases the IRC calculations lead to different higher-energy π complexes than the lowest-energy structures reported). This factor is unimportant to the overall energetics, assuming that the barrier to interconverting π -complexes is low (e.g., by palladium ring-walking or by rotation of the triflate group). 3D images of optimized structures were generated with CYLview.³⁶ Where indicated, Grimme's D3(BJ) empirical dispersion correction with Becke-Johnson damping was added to the B3LYP energies using the empirical dispersion=GD3BJ keyword.37

B. Reaction Free Energy Diagram Using DMF Calculated with B3LYP-D3(BJ)



CPCM(DMF)-**B3LYP-D3BJ**/6-31+G(d)/**SDD**(Pd)

free energies are corrected for concentration and reported after applying Truhlar and Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximations to entropy and enthalpy

Figure S11. Reaction free energy diagrams in DMF calculated with B3LYP-D3(BJ).

<u>Discussion</u>: Although the functional B3LYP does not consider London dispersion forces, dispersion corrections can be added. Here we applied Grimme's D3(BJ) empirical dispersion correction with Becke-Johnson damping to the DFT energies using the empirical dispersion=GD3BJ keyword.³⁸ The results are similar to those obtained using MN15L in that **TS5b-dmf** becomes much more favorable than it appears without dispersion. However, this level of theory also predicts that **TS5b** and **TS5a** should be isoenergetic, which contradicts the well-established preference for monoligated Pd to react at chloride.^{1.39,40,41} As such, MN15L appears to perform better than B3LYP-D3BJ for these calculations. This observation is consistent with prior benchmarking studies with transition metals.⁴²

C. DFT Predictions at 100 °C

Applying thermal corrections at 373.15 K to the calculations performed at the CPCM(DMF)-MN15L/6-31+G(d)/SDD(Pd) level of theory predicts lower selectivity for triflate, (Figure S12). This is expected because **TS5bdmf** is less entropically favorable than **TS5a**.



Figure S12. DFT predictions at 100 °C using CPCM(DMF)-MN15L/6-31+G(d)/SDD(Pd).

D. Discussion of DFT Shortcomings

Our DFT calculations, at minimum, suggest that solvent coordination should not be ruled out on the basis of dispersion-free DFT calculations. In particular, they show that the energy of **TS5b-dmf** is similar in energy to **TS5a**. However, even when dispersion is included, the DFT methods used in this work fall short of being able to reproduce the expected coordinating ability trends of different solvents to palladium. For example, the expected order of solvent cordinating ability is MeCN > DMF > THF > benzene, but DFT predicts different trends that vary with method. These results are summarized in Tables S29-S31.

Table S29. Differences in energy between TS5b-dmf and TS5a calculated in implicit DMF^a



	TS5b–dmf – TS5a					
Method	ΔE	ΔH_{qh}	ΔG	ΔG_{qh}		
CPCM(DMF)-B3LYP/6-31+G(d)/LANL2DZ(Pd)	+6.3	+6.3	+16.2	+16.4		
CPCM(DMF)-B3LYP-D3(BJ)/6-31+G(d)/LANL2DZ(Pd)	-9.3	-8.2	+0.9	+0.7		
CPCM(DMF)-B3LYP-D3(BJ)/6-31+G(d)/SDD(Pd)	-10.6	-10.3	-0.1	-0.1		
CPCM(DMF)-MN15L/6-31+G(d)/LANL2DZ(Pd)	-13.0	-12.7	-1.7	-2.4		
CPCM(DMF)-MN15L/6-31+G(d)/SDD(Pd)	-13.7	-12.7	-2.0^{c}	-2.9		

^{*a*}Thermal corrections at 298.15 K. All energies reported in kcal/mol. Free energies are corrected for concentration (ratio of DMF:Pd = 765:1). Enthalpy (ΔH_{qh}) is reported after applying Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximation to vibrational enthalpy. The free energy value labeled with ΔG_{qh} is reported after applying Cramer and Truhlar's and Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximations to vibrational entropy and enthalpy, while the value labeled as ΔG does not include the quasi-harmonic approximations.

Table S30. Differences in energy between TS5b-MeCN and TS5a calculated in implicit MeCN^a



^{*a*}Thermal corrections at 298.15 K. All energies reported in kcal/mol. Free energies are corrected for concentration (ratio of DMF:Pd = 1,118:1). Enthalpy (ΔH_{qh}) is reported after applying Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximation to vibrational enthalpy. The free energy value labeled with ΔG_{qh} is reported after applying Cramer and Truhlar's and Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximations to vibrational entropy and enthalpy, while the value labeled as ΔG does not include the quasi-harmonic approximations.

Table S31. Differences in energy between TS5b-thf and TS5a calculated in implicit THF^a



^{*a*}Thermal corrections at 298.15 K. All energies reported in kcal/mol. Free energies are corrected for concentration (ratio of DMF:Pd = 718:1). Enthalpy (ΔH_{qh}) is reported after applying Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximation to vibrational enthalpy. The free energy value labeled with ΔG_{qh} is reported after applying Cramer and Truhlar's and Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximations to vibrational entropy and enthalpy, while the value labeled as ΔG does not include the quasi-harmonic approximations.

Using CPCM(solvent)-MN15L/6-31+G(d)/LANL2DZ(Pd), we also attempted to evaluate coordinating strength of several different solvents at both Pd(o) and Pd(II) by calculating the energies of the species depicted in Schemes S1 and S2. The free energy values in these schemes are reported after applying a standard state concentration assuming that Pd is 0.017 *M* in solvent, and with quasi-harmonic approximations to vibrational enthalpy and entropy. However, as shown, DFT at this level of theory suggests that the order of coordinating ability to $12 e^-$ Pd(o) should be benzene > MeCN > DMF > THF, which does not match the expected order of MeCN > DMF > THF > benzene. When considering coordination to $14 e^-$ Pd(II), the calculations indicate that solvent coordination is unfavorable in all cases, and the energetics suggest the following order of coordinating ability to Pd(II): benzene > DMF ≈ MeCN > THF. Moreover, in the optimized structures of the solvato complexes with THF and benzene, the solvent molecule is very far away from Pd (≥3.65 Å). The failure of DFT to discriminate between coordinating ability of these solvents indicates that this level of theory is not adequate for describing the strength of weak dative bonds. It is possible that

more useful information may be gleaned using different functionals or larger basis sets; alternatively, molecular dynamics simulations may contribute to a more accurate representation of solvent coordination.

Scheme S1. Calculating favorability of solvent coordination to 12 *e*⁻ Pd(0).



MeCN (σ-type): -9.2 kcal/mol MeCN (π-type): -9.0 kcal/mol DMF: -6.9 kcal/mol THF: -6.2 kcal/mol benzene: -13.1 kcal/mol

Scheme S2. Calculating favorability of solvent coordination to 14 e- Pd(II).



MeCN (σ-type): +3.9 kcal/mol DMF: +4.0 kcal/mol THF: +3.4 kcal/mol benzene: +0.9 kcal/mol

E. Energies, Entropies, and Lowest Frequencies of Minimum Energy Structures

Structure	Eelec	ZPE	Hqh (Hartree)	G ^d	G qh ^e	Imaginary Freq ^f
	(Hartree)	(Hartree)		(Hartree)	(Hartree)	
4	-2594.348615	0.479968	-2593.838126	-2593.939812	-2593.935128	
TS5a	-2594.33273	0.478858	-2593.823409	-2593.925542	-2593.920232	-206.2301
TS5b	-2594.325045	0.47793	-2593.816619	-2593.916959	-2593.913175	-259.9956
6a	-2594.380785	0.481617	-2593.868329	-2593.967968	-2593.965253	
6b	-2594.388147	0.481944	-2593.875515	-2593.97488	-2593.97189	
(4-dmf) ^b	-2842.870244	0.583401	-2842.251221	-2842.367065	-2842.362175	-14.5954
(TS5a-dmf) ^b	-2842.851507	0.583269	-2842.232268	-2842.350003	-2842.34438	-179.6848
TS5b-dmf	-2842.853054	0.582742	-2842.234138	-2842.351143	-2842.345837	-260.8251
6a-dmf	-2842.911073	0.586476	-2842.28799	-2842.404586	-2842.39992	
6b-dmf	-2842.919852	0.586244	-2842.297336	-2842.41364	-2842.409048	
DMF	-248.530317	0.102799	-248.420798	-248.45138	-248.451688	

Table S32. Calculations at the CPCM(DMF)-B3LYP/6-31+G(d)/LANL2DZ(Pd) level of theory.^a

^{*a*1} Hartree = 627.51 kcal mol⁻¹. Thermal corrections at 298.15 K, with concentration = 13 *M* for DMF and 0.017 *M* for all other species. ^{*b*}Optimized with a constrained Pd—O distance; so these are unlikely to represent a true minimum-energy structure at this level of theory. ^{*c*}Enthalpy reported after application of Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximation to vibrational enthalpy. ^{*d*}Solvent-corrected free energy given by $G = E_{elec} + G_{corr}$, where G_{corr} is the thermal correction to Gibbs free energy obtained after applying Cramer and Truhlar's and Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximations. ^{*f*}The single imaginary frequency is reported for the structures that have one (i.e., the transition structures; and **4-dmf** (optimized with constrained Pd-O distance) also has one imaginary frequency).

Structure	Eelec	ZPE	H _{qh} (Hartree) ^b	Gc	$\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{h}}^d$	Imaginary Freq ^e
	(Hartree)	(Hartree)		(Hartree)	(Hartree)	
4	-2593.644346	0.481345	-2593.133222	-2593.228452	-2593.227671	
TS5a	-2593.625463	0.480954	-2593.114724	-2593.210282	-2593.2083	-171.5502
TS5b	-2593.616729	0.478692	-2593.108203	-2593.205818	-2593.202853	-228.3686
6a	-2593.675812	0.483879	-2593.161958	-2593.257676	-2593.255789	
6b	-2593.685169	0.483386	-2593.17171	-2593.266324	-2593.265437	
4-dmf	-2841.934404	0.586643	-2841.312338	-2841.419651	-2841.419805	
TS5a-dmf	-2841.902557	0.585601	-2841.281456	-2841.391212	-2841.389741	-137.2208
TS5b-dmf	-2841.914925	0.585201	-2841.294157	-2841.402029	-2841.401882	-246.0247
6a-dmf	-2841.959897	0.588859	-2841.33526	-2841.446021	-2841.443004	
6b-dmf	-2841.974739	0.588358	-2841.350582	-2841.459279	-2841.45836	
DMF	-248.26759	0.10276	-248.158125	-248.188622	-248.188946	

Table S33. Calculations at the CPCM(DMF)-MN15L/6-31+G(d)/SDD(Pd) level of theory. a

^{*a*}1 Hartree = 627.51 kcal mol⁻¹. Thermal corrections at 298.15 K, with concentration = 13 *M* for DMF and 0.017 *M* for all other species. ^{*b*}Enthalpy reported after application of Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximation to vibrational enthalpy. ^{*c*}Solvent-corrected free energy given by $G = E_{elec} + G_{corr}$, where G_{corr} is the thermal correction to Gibbs free energy. ^{*d*}Solvent-corrected free energy given by $G_{qh} = E_{elec} + G_{corr}$, where G_{corr} is the thermal correction to Gibbs free energy obtained after applying Cramer and Truhlar's and Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximations. ^{*c*}The single imaginary frequency is reported for the structures that have one (i.e., the transition structures).

Structure	Eelec	ZPE	Hqh (Hartree)	Gc	$\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{q}\mathbf{h}^d}$	Imaginary Freq ^e
	(Hartree)	(Hartree)		(Hartree)	(Hartree)	
4	-2595.688612	0.481727	-2595.176572	-2595.276064	-2595.272339	
TS5a	-2595.670641	0.481266	-2595.159196	-2595.257293	-2595.254542	-143.4386
TS5b	-2595.66856	0.479359	-2595.158894	-2595.258514	-2595.254518	-291.4703
6a	-2595.728252	0.48407	-2595.213709	-2595.311295	-2595.309183	
6b	-2595.735645	0.484165	-2595.221073	-2595.318547	-2595.316219	
4-dmf	-2844.243619	0.586633	-2843.621117	-2843.734454	-2843.731391	
TS5a-dmf	-2844.220638	0.586291	-2843.598437	-2843.71181	-2843.708974	-101.0273
TS5b-dmf	-2844.231449	0.585406	-2843.610018	-2843.722351	-2843.720012	-320.8933
6a-dmf	-2844.286863	0.589193	-2843.661374	-2843.775281	-2843.771396	
6b-dmf	-2844.298688	0.588445	-2843.674178	-2843.788233	-2843.784421	
DMF	-248.543978	0.10288	-248.434389	-248.464973	-248.46527	

Table S34. Calculations at the CPCM(DMF)-B3LYP-D3BJ/6-31+G(d)/SDD(Pd) level of theory.^a

^{*a*1} Hartree = 627.51 kcal mol⁻¹. Thermal corrections at 298.15 K, with concentration = 13 *M* for DMF and 0.017 *M* for all other species. ^{*b*}Enthalpy reported after application of Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximation to vibrational enthalpy. ^{*c*}Solvent-corrected free energy given by $G = E_{elec} + G_{corr}$, where G_{corr} is the thermal correction to Gibbs free energy. ^{*d*}Solvent-corrected free energy given by $G_{qh} = E_{elec} + G_{corr^*}$, where G_{corr^*} is the thermal correction to Gibbs free energy obtained after applying Cramer and Truhlar's and Head-Gordon's quasi-harmonic approximations. ^{*e*}The single imaginary frequency is reported for the structures that have one (i.e., the transition structures).

III. References

- 1. Reeves, E. K.; Humke, J. N.; Neufeldt, S. R. J. Org. Chem. 2019, 84, 11789-11812.
- 2. Gill, D.; Hester, A. J.; Lloyd-Jones, G. C. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2004**, *2*, 2547-2548.
- 3. Andersen, T. L.; Kramer, S.; Overgaard, J.; Skrydstrup, T. Organometallics 2017, 36, 2058-2066.
- 4. Barrios-Landeros, F.; Carrow, B. P.; Hartwig, J. F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 8141-8154.
- 5. Morozova, V.; Mayer, P.; Berionni, G. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2015**, *54*, 14508-14512.
- 6. Gooβen, L.J.; Rodríguez, N.; Linder, C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2008**, *130*, 15248-15249.
- 7. Onodera, S.; Kochi, T.; Kakiuchi, F. J. Org. Chem. 2019, 84, 6508-6515
- 8. Reeves, E.K.; Bauman, O.R.; Mitchem, G.B.; Neufeldt, S.R. *Isr. J. Chem.* **2020**, *60*, 406-409.
- 9. Entz, E. D.; Russell, J. E. A.; Hooker, L. V. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2020**, *142*, 15454-15463.
- 10. Bartoli, G.; Bosco, M. Synthesis 1980, 8, 616-617.
- 11. Viswanathan, G.S.; Wang, M.; Li, C.J. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2002, 41, 2138-2141.
- 12. Shekhar, S.; Dunn, T. B.; Kotecki, B. J.; Montavon, D. K.; Cullen, S. C. J. Org. Chem. 2011, 76, 4552-4563.
- 13. Zhang, Z.; Wang, Z. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006, 71, 7485-7487.
- 14. Gooβen, L.J.; Rodríguez, N.; Linder, C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 15248-15249.
- 15. Gill, D.; Hester, A.J.; Lloyd-Jones, G.C. Org. & Biomol. Chem. 2004, 2, 2547-2548.
- 16. Hansch, C.; Leo, A.; Taft, R.W. Chem. Rev. 1991, 91, 165-195.
- 17. Roy, A. H.; Hartwig, J. F. Organometallics **2004**, *23*, 194-202.
- 18. Wohlfarth, C. "Permittivity (Dielectric Constant) of Liquids" in CRC Handbook of Chemistry and Physics, Rumble, Jr., J. R.; Lide, D. R.; Bruno, T. J., eds. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2020.
- 19. Suzuki, K.; Shin-ya, M.; Ono, Y.; Matsumoto, T.; Nanbu, N.; Takehara, M.; Ue, M.; Sasaki, Y. *Electrochemistry* **2007**, *75*, 611-614.
- 20. Salmon, C. J.; Danelon, G. O.; Mascaretti, O. A. J. Org. Chem. 2000, 65, 9220-9222.
- 21. Proutiere, F.; Schoenebeck, F. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 8192-9195.
- 22. Fairlamb, I.J.S.; Kapdi, A.R.; Lee, A.F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 6, 4435-4438,
- 23. Zalesskiy, S.S.; Ananikov, V.P. Organometallics 2012, 13, 2302-2309.
- 24. National Institute of Health PubChem. Potassium fluoride. https://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/compound/522689 (accessed Sep 30, 2020).
- 25. Wynn, D. A.; Roth, M. M.; Pollard, B. D. Talanta **1984**, *31*, 1036-1040.
- 26. Peruzzi, N.; Lo Nostro, P.; Ninham, B. W.; Baglioni, P. J. Solution Chem. 2015, 44, 1224-1239.
- 27. Barrios-Landeros, F.; Carrow, B. P.; Hartwig, J. F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 5842-5843
- 28. Gaussian 16, Revision C.01, Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V.; Petersson, G. A.; Nakatsuji, H.; Li, X.; Caricato, M.; Marenich, A. V.; Bloino, J.; Janesko, B. G.; Gomperts, R.; Mennucci, B.; Hratchian, H. P.; Ortiz, J. V.; Izmaylov, A. F.; Sonnenberg, J. L.; Williams-Young, D.; Ding, F.; Lipparini, F.; Egidi, F.; Goings, J.; Peng, B.; Petrone, A.; Henderson, T.; Ranasinghe, D.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Gao, J.; Rega, N.; Zheng, G.; Liang, W.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Vreven, T.; Throssell, K.; Montgomery, J. A., Jr.; Peralta, J. E.; Ogliaro, F.; Bearpark, M. J.; Heyd, J. J.; Brothers, E. N.; Kudin, K. N.; Staroverov, V. N.; Keith, T. A.; Kobayashi, R.; Normand, J.; Raghavachari, K.; Rendell, A. P.; Burant, J. C.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Cossi, M.; Millam, J. M.; Klene, M.; Adamo, C.; Cammi, R.;

Ochterski, J. W.; Martin, R. L.; Morokuma, K.; Farkas, O.; Foresman, J. B.; Fox, D. J. Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2016

- 29. Cossi, M.; Rega, N.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V. J. Comput. Chem. 2003, 24, 669.
- 30. Yu, H. S.; He, X.; Truhlar, D. G. J. Chem. Theory Comput. 2016, 12, 1280.
- 31. Hay, P. J.; Wadt, W. R. J. Chem. Phys. 1985, 82, 299.
- 32. Ribeiro, R.F.; Marenich, A.V.; Cramer, C.J.; Truhlar, D.G. J. Phys. Chem. B. 2011, 115, 14556.
- 33. Li, Y.-P.; Gomes, J.; Sharada, S. M.; Bell, A.T.; Head-Gordon, M. J. Phys. Chem. C 2015, 119, 1840
- 34. Luchini, G.; Alegre-Requena, J. V.; Funes-Ardoiz, I.; Paton, R. S. GoodVibes: Automated Thermochemistry for Heterogeneous Computational Chemistry Data. *F1000Research*, **2020**, *9*, 291.
- 35. (a) Gonzalez, C.; Schlegel, H. B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1989**, *90*, 2154; (b) Gonzalez, C.; Schlegel, H.B. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1990**, *94*, 5523; (c) Fukui, K. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1981**, *14*, 363.
- 36. CYLview, 1.ob; Legault CY, Université de Sherbrooke, 2009 (http://www.cylview.org)
- (a) Grimme, S.; Antony, J.; Ehrlich, S.; Krieg, H. J. Chem. Phys. 2010, 132, 154104-154119. (b) Grimme, S.;
 Ehrlich, S.; Goerigk, L. J. Comput. Chem. 2011, 32, 1456-1465.
- 38 (a) Grimme, S.; Antony, J.; Ehrlich, S.; Krieg, H. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, 132, 154104-154119. (b) Grimme, S.; Ehrlich, S.; Goerigk, L. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2011**, *32*, 1456-1465.
- 39. Schoenebeck, F.; Houk, K. N. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 2496.
- 40. Niemeyer, Z. L.; Milo, A.; Hickey, D. P.; Sigman, M. S. Nat. Chem. 2016, 8, 610.
- 41. So, C. M.; Yuen, O. Y.; Ng, S. S.; Chen, Z. ACS Catal. 2021, 11, 7820/
- 42. Moltved, K. A.; Kepp, K. P. J. Chem. Theory Comput. **2018**, *14*, 3479.

IV. NMR Spectra A. Compound Characterization





CF ₃										Current Data Parameters NAME 5-SMR-74 EXPNO 21 PROCNO 2 F2 - Acquisition Parameter		
										Date_ Time INSTRUM PROBHD PULPROG TD SOLVENT NS DS SWH FIDRES AQ RG DW DE TE D1 TD0 SF01 NUC1 P1 PLW1	20211009 12.39 h spect 2125869_0055 (zgflqm 130892 CDCl3 16 4 113636.367 Hz 1.736338 Hz 0.5759248 sec 15.61 4.400 usec 18.00 usec 298.0 K 1.0000000 sec 1 470.6394024 MHz 19F 15.00 usec 11.70800018 W	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·						·		·	F2 - Pro SI WDW SSB LB GB PC	cessing parameters 65536 470.6864712 MHz EM 0 0.30 Hz 0 1.00	



63















70




















OTf												BR	UKER
												Current NAME EXPNO PROCNO	Data Parameters EKB-1-184 11 2
512												F2 - Acq Date_ Time INSTRUM PROBHD PULPROG TD SOLVENT NS DS SWH FIDRES AQ RG DW DE TE D1 D11 TD0 SF01 NUC1 P1 PLW1 SF02 NUC2 CPDPRG[1 PLW1 SF02 PLW2 PLW2 PLW2 PLW12 F2 - Pro SI SF	uisition Parameter 20210702 12.13 h Avance Neo Z152088_0031 (zgig 130892 CDC13 16 4 90909.094 Hz 1.389070 Hz 0.7199060 sec 101 5.500 usec 6.50 usec 298.1 K 1.0000000 sec 0.03000000 sec 1 376.4607164 MHz 19F 12.00 usec 31.08900070 W 400.1316005 MHz 1H 2 waltz16 90.00 usec 24.03499985 W 0.18990999 W cessing parameters 65536 376.4983662 MHz
 0	-20	-40	-60	- "	-100	-120	-140	-160	-180	-200	ppm	SSB LB GB PC	0 0.30 Hz 0 1.00





	CF ₃												BR	Data Parameters
Į		H ₃											EXPNO	6-SMR-4 31
	S13												F2 - Acq Date_ Time INSTRUM PROBHD PULPROG TD SOLVENT NS	2 pisition Parameter 20211008 15.39 h spect 2125869_0055 (zgflqn 130892 CDCl3 16
													SWH FIDRES	113636.367 Hz 1.736338 Hz
													AQ RG DW	0.5759248 sec 17.98 4.400 usec
													DE TE	18.00 usec 298.0 K
													D1 TD0	1.00000000 sec 1
													NUC1	470.8394024 MH2 19F
													PI PLW1	11.70800018 W
													F2 - Pro SI	cessing parameters 65536 470 6864712 MHz
													WDW	470.8884712 MH2 EM
													55B LB	0.30 Hz
													GB PC	0 1.00
	0	-20	-40	-60	-80	-100	-120	-140	-160	-180	-200	ppm		







OTf	-64.22	-74.26							BR	UKER
F ₃ C S15b									Current NAME EXPNO PROCNO F2 - Acq Date_ Time INSTRUM PROBHD PULPROG TD SOLVENT NS DS SWH FIDRES AQ BG	Data Parameters 6-SMR-25 12 1 uisition Parameter 20211105 21.32 h Avance Neo Z152088_0031 (2g 131072 CDC13 16 4 90909.094 Hz 1.387163 Hz 0.7208960 sec 101
									DW DE TE D1 TD0 SFO1 NUC1 P1 PLW1 F2 - Pro	5.500 usec 6.50 usec 298.0 K 1.00000000 sec 1 376.4607164 MHz 19F 12.00 usec 31.08900070 W cessing parameters 65536
 020	-40 -60	-80	-100	-120	-140	-160	 -200	DDM	SF WDW SSB LB GB GB PC	376.4989587 MHz EM 0 0.30 Hz 0 1.00

B. Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition Studies with 3a and 3b

1. Experiments from Table 3 and with Deuterated Solvents























	-	ha ⊥ 2h —	Pd(COD)(CH ₂ TMS (1 equiv) P ^t Bu ₃ (1 equiv)	;) ₂		Current NAME EXPNO PROCNO F2 - Acqu	Data Parameters 6-SMR-39-3 11 1 uisition Parameter
	·		THF /C ₆ D ₆ (5:1) C ₆ H ₅ F (3 equiv) r.t., 6 h			Time INSTRUM PROBHD PULPROG TD SOLVENT	15.50 h Avance Neo Z152088_0031 (zgpg30 65536 C6D6
$^{t}Bu_{3}P - Pd - P^{t}Bu_{3}$						NS DS SWH FIDRES AQ RG DW DE TE D1 D11 TD0 SF01 NUC1 P0 P1 PLW1 SF02 NUC2 CPDPRG[2 PLW1 SF02 PLW2 PLW13 F2 - Pr00	32 4 65789.477 Hz 2.007735 Hz 0.4980736 sec 101 7.600 usec 6.50 usec 298.0 K 2.00000000 sec 0.03000000 sec 1 161.9674942 MHz 31P 2.67 usec 8.00 usec 45.86100006 W 400.1316005 MHz 1H 2 waltz16 90.00 usec 24.03499985 W 0.18990999 W 0.09552100 W cessing parameters
100 50	0	-50	-100	-150	-200 F	SF WDW SSB LB	161.9755930 MHz EM 0 1.00 Hz
5.38 5.38						GB PC	0 1.40
























BRUKER	R

		Pd(COD)(CH ₂ TM (1 equiv) P ^t Bu ₃ (1 equiv)	S) ₂	Cu NA EJ PJ	urrent Data Parameters AME 6-SMR-41-11 XPNO 12 ROCNO 1
	3a +	3b DMF- <i>d</i> _{<i>j</i>} /C ₆ D ₆ (5 C ₆ H ₅ F (3 equiv r.t., 6 h))	F2 D3 T1 P1 P1 T1 S(N) S1 S1 F2 B1	2 - Acquisition Parameter ate_ 20211116 ime 16.19 h NSTRUM spect ROBHD Z125869_0055 (ULPROG zgpg30 D 65536 OLVENT DMF S 16 S 4 WH 81521.742 Hz IDRES 2.487846 Hz Q 0.4019541 sec G 190.44
^t Bu ₃ P —Pd—P ^t Bu ₃ + HP ^t Bu				DI DI TI DI DI TI DI DI DI DI DI DI DI DI DI DI DI DI DI	N 6.133 usec E 18.00 usec E 298.0 K 1 2.00000000 sec 11 0.03000000 sec 10 1 PO1 202.4866909 MHz UC1 31P 0 4.00 usec 1 12.00 usec LW1 40.26200104 W FO2 500.2320009 MHz UC2 1H PDPRG[2 waltz16 CPD2 80.00 usec LW2 11.44699955 W LW12 0.25756001 W LW13 0.12955000 W
	na na falikan kalender er k In der er kalender er kalend O	-50 -100	48 - 150 -200	ppm G F S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	2 - Processing parameters I 32768 F 202.4968157 MHz DW EM SB 0 B 1.00 Hz B 0 C 1.40

-85.20 -82.49 -75.28

 \backslash

53.66



					BRUKER
			Pd(COD)(CH ₂ TMS) ₂ (1 equiv) P ^t Bu ₃ (1 equiv)		Current Data Parameters NAME 6-SMR-5-15 EXPNO 11 PROCNO 2
^t Bu ₃ PPdP ^t Bu ₃	$ \begin{array}{c} $	3a + 3b	sulfolane/C ₆ D ₆ (5:1) C ₆ H ₅ F (3 equiv) r.t., 6 h		F2 - Acquisition Parameter Date_ 20210911 Time 20.38 h INSTRUM Avance Neo PROBHD Z152088_0031 (PULPROG zgpg30 TD 65536 SOLVENT C6D6 NS 32 DS 4 SWH 65789.477 Hz FIDRES 2.007735 Hz AQ 0.4980736 sec RG 101 DW 7.600 usec DE 6.50 usec TE 298.0 K D1 2.00000000 sec D1 2.00000000 sec D1 2.00300000 sec D1 2.00300000 sec D1 2.67 usec P1 8.00 usec P1 8.00 usec P1 45.86100006 W SF02 400.1316005 MHz NUC2 1H CPDPRG[2 waltz16 PCPD2 90.00 usec PLW12 0.18990999 W PLW13 0.09552100 W
140 120 100 80	60 40 20	(hill forma dal oddi filmaa haa)) 020	<u>i unhi sa kilin dya kili sa jibi dub<u>a s</u>ilak sekin • • • • • • • • • -40 • -60 -80</u>	-100 -120 ppm	F2 - Processing parameters SI 32768 SF 161.9755930 MHz WDW EM SSB 0 LB 1.00 Hz GB 0 PC 1.40



BRUKE	2

			Pd(COD)(CH ₂ TN (1 equiv)	NS) ₂		C N E P	urrent AME XPNO ROCNO	Data Para 6-SMR-	imeters ·39-15 11 1 Parameter
		3a + 3b	P'Bu ₃ (Tequiv	/)		r D	ate_	202	11115
		3d - 3D	PC /C,D, (5:1)		Т	ime		17.09 h
			C,H _F F (3 equ	iv)		P	ROBHD	Z152088	0031 (
			r.t., 6 h			P	ULPROG	2	.gpg30
			y -			Т	D	e	5536
						N	S		32
						D	S		4
						S	WH	6578	9.477 Hz
						E A	IDRES O	0.491	80736 sec
						R	Ğ		101
						D	W	7	.600 usec
						D T	E	2	6.50 USEC
						D	1	2.000	00000 sec
t	Bu Cl					D	11	0.030	00000 sec
^t Bı	I-P-Pd					S	បប ទីលា	161.96	⊥ 574942 МН₂
t	Bu Bu					Ň	UCI		31P
	<u>E</u> ₃ C					P	0		2.67 usec
	/ \$10					P	1. T.WT	45 861	8.00 usec
/						S	FO2	400.13	316005 MH2
						N	UC2	-	1H
	_					C	PDPRG[2	2 Wa	iltz16
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(+)					P	LW2	24.034	199985 W
	HP'Bu ₃					Р	LW12	0.189	90999 W
						P	LW1 3	0.095	52100 W
անակես ակեստունանում եւ տեղելին հետ հետ	ling and the second			a ana a an table a caa		tan dan F	2 - Pro	cessing p	arameters
tele sur den est de trades a lide à regradition d'a d'unit en dates	ى 1 مارىغا (11 م. ھى ھەرمىز (14 k م. ام مايى 1 مارى 1 م k.	-Label de la tella leville de come a contra de de la co	nailt Brann, 150, 15 anni 191, 201,	al lui anna lanainn ann an	a alfahilin di sa sa wasa a sa ka	S	I		32768
	<u> </u>	• • • • <u> </u> • •		· · · · · ·			Г Гил	161.97	55930 MHz
100	50 0	-50	-100	-150	-200	ppm s	SB	0	1914
11.1.1.1							в		1.00 Hz
						G	B	U	1 40
	5					F	0		1.40
	8								
	1-1								

-84.74 -80.67 -70.72 -55.28

J













2. Experiments in DMF at 100 and 0 °C







—



		3a + 3b	Pd(COD)(CH ₂ TM (1 equiv) P ^t Bu ₃ (1 equiv)	5) ₂		Current D NAME EXPNO PROCNO F2 - Acqui	ata Parameters 6-SMR-42-8 10 1 isition Parameter
			DMF/C ₆ D ₆ (5:1) C ₆ H ₅ F (3 equiv) 0 °C , 6 h)		Date_ Time INSTRUM PROBHD ! PULPROG TD SOLVENT NS DS	20211117 15.37 h spect 2125869_0055 (zgpg30 65536 C6D6 16
^t Bu ₃ P — Pd — P ^t Bu ₃						SWH FIDRES AQ RG DW DE TE D1 D11 TD0 SF01 NUC1 P0 P1 PLW1 SF02 NUC2 CPDPRG[2 PLW2 PLW2 PLW2 PLW12 PLW13	81521.742 Hz 2.487846 Hz 0.4019541 sec 190.44 6.133 usec 273.0 K 2.00000000 sec 0.03000000 sec 1 202.4866909 MHz 31P 4.00 usec 12.00 usec 40.26200104 W 500.2320009 MHz 1H waltz16 80.00 usec 11.44699955 W 0.25756001 W 0.12955000 W
ر خواص المحمد (المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد (المحمد (المحمد (المحمد و المحمد و المحمد و المحمد و الم محمد المحمد (محمد المحمد و محمد و محمد و محمد و المحمد و محمد و المحمد و المحم	al, fry y beer bet below to a finite date for a set of a stranged of the set of a Comparison of the first field and a sector of first and the first first set of the sector of the post first set	randa barran (bi bir tar) aya nya kutik da bir ya bartan tari ya kutika ya kutika 1997 - Antonio Angona nya kutika na kutika ina panya fisi kiyo kutika na mana dapami k	asteri tepateri fi mutu fi kate populari na dina seria tang Mangkan kateri fi mutu fi kate populari na dina seria tang	la zana pipini dan saki da ang kadaladi si kati kati ya Nang nang kati pipini Sing Sing Sing ng Kating ng K	an daa daraan da ahay ang to' yaya daga da daga da	F2 - Proc SI SF	essing parameters 32768 202.4968157 MHz
	50 0 1 8 4	-50	-100	-1'50	- 200 ppm	WUW SSB () LB GB () PC	EM 1.00 Hz 1.40

3. Monitoring the Reaction in DMF over Time



BRUKER

			Pd(CC (P ^t Bu	D)(CH ₂ TMS) ₂ 1 equiv) 4 ₃ (1 equiv)		Current NAME EXPNO PROCNO	Data Parameters 6-SMR-43-5min 11 1
^t Bu ₃ P —Pd—P ^t Bu ₃		3a +	3b DMI C ₆ H r.t reaction	u ₃ (1 equiv) F/C ₆ D ₆ (5:1) ₅ F (3 equiv) , 10 min <i>n in NMR tube</i>		PROCNO F2 - Acqu Date_ Time INSTRUM PROBHD PULPROG TD SOLVENT NS DS SWH FIDRES AQ RG DW DE TE D1 D11 TD0 SF01 NUC1 P0 P1 PLW1 SF02 VUC2	1 1isition Parameter 20211117 9.09 h spect 2125869_0055 (2gpg30 65536 C6D6 16 4 81521.742 Hz 2.487846 Hz 0.4019541 sec 190.44 6.133 usec 18.00 usec 298.0 K 2.0000000 sec 0.03000000 sec 1 202.4866909 MHz 31P 4.00 usec 12.00 usec 12.00 usec 40.26200104 W 500.2320009 MHz
		nter eine mit eine ihre ihre dem andere sticken	ster på men å storet fransen å kritter men att storen skriver att store på det A det storet att storet storet att	naad k Jaan bakker Aurola a Yayak (fa ka Jaana, yak jayan sana k rata	ef mil angeneren de "Mussike af dekke ak yf med ek for yn yn yn.	NUC2 CPDPRG[2 PCPD2 PLW2 PLW12 PLW13 F2 - Pro SI	H Waltz16 80.00 use 11.44699955 W 0.25756001 W 0.12955000 W cessing parameters 32768
100 8	50 50	0 -5	0 -100	-150	-200 ppm	SF WDW SSB LB GB PC	202.4968157 MHz EM 0 1.00 Hz 0 1.40











BRUKER



84.89 75.08 64.40











		3	a + 3b	Pd(COD)(CH ₂ (1 equiv P ^t Bu ₃ (1 eq	2TMS) ₂ () (uiv)		C M E F	urrent I IAME XPNO PROCNO)ata Parameters 6-SMR-43-65 11 1
				DMF/C ₆ D ₆ C ₆ H ₅ F (3 e r.t, 6 H reaction in NM	(5:1) quiv) 1 MR tube		E I J E	2 - Acqu ate_ ime NSTRUM ROBHD	isition Parameter 20211117 15.06 h spect 2125869_0055 (
^t Bu ₃ P —Pd—P ^t Bu ₃							E S N E S E	ULPROG D OLVENT IS S WH IDRES	zgpg30 65536 C6D6 16 4 81521.742 Hz 2.487846 Hz
							A F I I I I I I I I	Q G WW E E 1	0.4019541 sec 190.44 6.133 usec 18.00 usec 298.0 K 2.00000000 sec
							L J S N E E	DO FOI UC1 0	0.03000000 sec 1 202.4866909 MH2 31P 4.00 usec 12.00 usec 40 26200104 W
							S M E E E E	FO2 IUC2 PDPRG[2 PLW2 PLW12 PLW13	500.2320009 MH2 1H waltz16 80.00 use(11.44699955 W 0.25756001 W 0.12955000 W
versent als ut as some statute the second statute of the second st	stand the second s	w saves debut departe ablance ablance saladede, m I	-50	-100		-200	ppm s	2 - Proc I F DW SB	essing parameters 32768 202.4968157 MHz EM 0 1.00 Hz
	43.02						Ē	B C	0 1.40

4. Reactions in the Presence of Additives













¹⁴¹





. 76 98 01 -113.1 61 62 62 62 ĪĪĪĪĪ BR ER Pd(COD)(CH₂TMS)₂ Current Data Parameters (1 equiv) NAME 6-SMR-37-3 P^tBu₃ (1 equiv) 10 EXPNO S15a 2 PROCNO **THF**/C₆D₆ (5:1) F2 - Acquisition Parameter C₄H₅F (3 equiv) .Cl Date_ 20211112 r.t., 6 h 15.41 h Time without S15b INSTRUM Avance Neo PROBHD Z152088_0031 (E₂C S15a PULPROG zgig 130892 TD SOLVENT C6D6 16 NS DS 4 C₆H₅<u>F</u> SWH 90909.094 Hz (standard) FIDRES 1.389070 Hz 0.7199060 sec AQ RG 101 D₩ 5.500 usec DE 6.50 usec 298.1 K TE D1 1.00000000 sec D11 0.03000000 sec TDO 1 SF01 376.4607164 MHz 19F NUC1 12.00 usec P1 PLW1 31.08900070 W ^tBu SFO2 400.1316005 MH2 NUC2 ^tBu-1HCPDPRG[2 waltz16 ^tBu PCPD2 90.00 used **S16** PLW2 24.03499985 W CE₃ 0.18990999 W PLW12 (tentative assignment) F2 - Processing parameters SI 65536 SF 376.4979782 MHz WDW EM SSB 0 Т Т Т \mathbf{LB} 0.30 Hz -65 -115 ppm -55 -60 -70 -75 -80 -85 -90 -95 -100 -105 -110 GB 0 PC 1.00 8

C. Stoichiometric Oxidative Addition Studies with S15a and S15b






















84.90 82.21 78.44 53.32





D. Reaction with S11 and NBu₄OTf



