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## General Procedures

NMR spectra were recorded on Varian Inova 500 or 400 MHz NMR spectrometers with the residual solvent peak ( $\left[\mathrm{D}_{6}\right]$ acetone: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}: \delta=2.05 \mathrm{ppm},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}: \delta=206.68$, 29.92 ppm ; [ $\left.\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}:{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}: \delta=11.65,2.04 \mathrm{ppm},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}: \delta=178.99,20.0 \mathrm{ppm} ;\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}: \delta=1.94$ $\mathrm{ppm},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}: \delta=118.69,1.39 \mathrm{ppm} ;\left[\mathrm{D}_{6}\right]$ benzene: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}: \delta=7.16 \mathrm{ppm},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}: \delta=128.39 \mathrm{ppm} ;$ $\left[\mathrm{D}_{1}\right]$ chloroform: $\left.{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}: \delta=7.24 \mathrm{ppm},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}: \delta=77.23 \mathrm{ppm}\right)$ as the internal reference unless otherwise noted. Chemical shifts are reported in parts per million (ppm) ( $\delta$ ). Multiplicities are reported as follows: br (broad resonance), s (singlet), d (doublet), t (rriplet), q (quartet), $m$ (multiplet). Coupling constants ( $\mathcal{J}$ ) are reported in Hz . Infrared (IR) spectroscopy was performed on a Perkin Elmer FTIR. Peaks are reported in $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ with the following relative intensities: $s$ (strong, 67-100 \%), m (medium, 40-67 \%), w (weak, $20-40 \%$ ), and br (broad). Elemental analyses were performed by Atlantic Microlab, Inc., Norcross, Georgia.

All reactions were conducted without rigorous exclusion of air and moisture unless noted otherwise. $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{1}\right]$ TFA were purchased from Cambridge Isotopes Lab and stored in Schlenk tubes under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$. $\left[\mathrm{D}_{6}\right]$ Acetone, $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $\left[\mathrm{D}_{6}\right]$ benzene and $\left[D_{1}\right]$ chloroform were purchased from Cambridge Isotopes Lab and used as received. Dichloromethane $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)$, diethylether ( $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), methanol $(\mathrm{MeOH})$, pentane, acetonitrile (MeCN), toluene, acetone and ethyl acetate (EtOAc) were obtained from Fisher Scientific or Aldrich and used as purchased. Benzene for H/D exchange and acetoxylation was obtained from Aldrich and stored over 4 Å molecular sieves. Ethanol
(EtOH), 200 proof, was obtained from Deacon Labs, Inc., and used as received. Celite and acetic anhydride were purchased from EM Science. Sodium acetate (anhydrous), $\mathrm{Ag}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}, \mathrm{AgOTf}$, bromobenzene, and 1,2-dimethoxybenzene (veratrol) were purchased from Acros Organics. PhCl, glacial acetic acid (AcOH), $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}, \mathrm{~K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}, \mathrm{Ag}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ and naphthalene were purchased from Fisher Scientific. Deuterium chloride (DCI 35\% in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) was purchased from Cambridge Isotope Laboratories. Chlorobenzene was purchased from Burdick \& Jackson. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene and $\alpha, \alpha, \alpha$-trifluorotoluene were purchased from TCI America. $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ was purchased from Pressure Chemical Company. lodosobenzene diacetate $\left(\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}\right)$ was obtained from Alfa Aesar. AgCl , $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}, \mathrm{AgPF}_{6}, \mathrm{AgNO}_{3}$, silver trifluoroacetate (AgTFA), AgOTs, ethyl benzoate, 2,2'bipyridine (bpy), and 1,1,2-trichloroethane were purchased from Aldrich. (bpym) $\mathrm{PtCl}_{2}$ $1^{[1]}$, (4,4'-di-tert-butylbipyridine) $\mathrm{PtCl}_{2},{ }^{[2]} \quad(\mathrm{DMSO})_{2} \mathrm{PtCl}_{2},{ }^{[3]} \quad$ 2,4,6-tris(4-tertbutylphenyl)pyrilium tetrafluoroborate, ${ }^{[4]}$ 4,4'-diaminobipyridine, ${ }^{[5]}$ (4,4'-di-tertbutylbipyridine) $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}{ }^{[6]}$, (COD) $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}{ }^{[7]}$ and ligand $\mathbf{2 a}{ }^{[8]}$ were prepared according to literature procedures. Stock solutions of silver salts and bpy were prepared using volumetric glassware and all liquid reagents were dispensed by difference using gastight Hamilton syringes.

[^0]H/D exchange data for benzene was measured on a Shimadzu GC-MS Q5000 using a xTi®-5 (serial \# 790776) column obtained from RESTEK. All raw data were deconvoluted using Periana's benzene H/D exchange worksheet with a reported error of $5 \%{ }^{[9]}$ An assumption in the worksheet is that the fragmentation pattern of each isotopolog is identical. To obtain the most accurate analysis, pure samples of each isotopolog must be analyzed to determine the exact coefficients of the polynomial expansion for the given instrument. This treatment confirmed that the calculated percents of each isotopolog were within the reported error of the worksheet.

Gas chromatography was carried out on a Shimadzu 17A instrument using a Restek Rtx-5 (crossbond 5\% diphenyl-95\% dimethyl polysiloxane; $15 \mathrm{~m}, 0.25 \mathrm{~mm}$ i.d., $0.25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ df) column. GC-MS investigations were carried out on a Shimadzu GCMS-QP2010S instrument using a Shimadzu SHRXI-5MS (serial \# 936407; $30 \mathrm{~m}, 0.25 \mathrm{~mm}$ i.d., 0.25 $\mu \mathrm{m} d f)$ column. Retention times were verified using isolated material. Yields were calculated by calibrating isolated material and standard to the response of the instrument.

[^1]
## Preparation of Pt and Pd catalysts

## Synthesis of ligand 2b



A mixture of 2,4,6-tris(4-tert-butylphenyl)pyrilium tetrafluoroborate ( $6.06 \mathrm{~g}, 10.7 \mathrm{mmol}$, 4.00 equiv), 4,4'-diaminobipyridine ( $500 \mathrm{mg}, 2.69 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), and anhydrous sodium acetate ( $3.17 \mathrm{~g}, 38.7 \mathrm{mmol}, 14.4$ equiv) in $\mathrm{EtOH}(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ was heated under reflux for 24 h . The solvent was removed by rotary evaporation, and the resulting residue was stirred in water ( 40 mL ) for 20 min , which produced a light yellow suspension. The solids were collected on a frit and washed with water ( $5 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The solid material was then dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$, this solution was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and the filter plug was rinsed with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (2 x 25 mL ). Pentane (200 mL ) was added to the combined filtrates and the resulting mixture was stirred for 10 min. The formed precipitate was collected by filtration, washed with cold pentane ( $2 \times 25$ mL ) and dried under vacuum, affording ligand $\mathbf{2 b}$ as a white solid ( $2.92 \mathrm{~g}, 85 \%$ ). m.p. $372^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp.); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]\right.$ acetonitrile, $\left.25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right): \delta=8.38\left(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{8}\right), 8.35$ $\left(\mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{6}\right), 8.07\left(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{11}\right), 7.98\left(\mathrm{~d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{3}\right), 7.69$
$\left(\mathrm{m}, 4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{12}\right), 7.36\left(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{18}\right), 7.28\left(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{17}\right), 7.24\left(\mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=5.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=1.7\right.$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{5}$ ), 1.38 (s, 18H; H ${ }^{15}$ ), $1.22 \mathrm{ppm}\left(\mathrm{s}, 36 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{21}\right) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 101 MHz , [ $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ ]acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ): $\delta=158.1,157.9,157.1(2 \times \mathrm{C}), 156.7,155.2,151.3,148.5,131.6$, 130.7, 129.6, 127.9, 126.5, 126.5, 125.2, 121.5, 35.9, 35.6, 31.3, 31.2 ppm; ${ }^{19}$ F NMR ( $377 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right.$ ]acetonitrile, $25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ): $\delta=-151.77\left({ }^{10} \mathrm{BF}_{4}{ }^{-}\right.$), $-151.83 \mathrm{ppm}\left({ }^{11} \mathrm{BF}_{4}{ }^{-}\right.$); IR (KBr): $\tilde{v}=575$ (m), 837 (s), 1065 (br), 1246 (m), 1270 (s), 1365 (s), 1396 (m), 1459 (s), 1510 (s), 1582 (s), 1625 (s), 2963 (s), 3059 (m) cm ${ }^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI): m/z calcd. 1191.7038 $\left[M-\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right]^{+}$, found 1191.7046; elemental analysis calcd. (\%) for $\mathrm{C}_{80} \mathrm{H}_{88} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \cdot 0.8 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{C}$, 74.28; H, 6.98; N, 4.33, found (\%): C, 74.34; H, 6.89; N, 4.31.




Figure 1. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) of ligand $\mathbf{2 b}$


Figure 2. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) of ligand $\mathbf{2 b}$


Figure 3. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $377 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) of ligand $\mathbf{2 b}$


Figure 4. IR (KBr) of ligand 2b


## Synthesis of Pt complex 3a

## 3a

A mixture of ligand 2a ( $530 \mathrm{mg}, 0.562 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.05$ equiv) and (DMSO) ${ }_{2} \mathrm{PtCl}_{2}(225 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.533 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) in $\mathrm{MeOH}(66 \mathrm{~mL})$ was heated under reflux for 10 h . The mixture was cooled to RT, and the solvent was removed under vacuum. The resulting solid residue was recrystallized from a mixture of acetonitrile ( 6 mL ) and toluene (15 mL ) and was then isolated by filtration and dried under vacuum to afford the title complex 3a as a yellow solid (422 mg, 66\%). m.p. $348^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp.); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $\left.25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right): \delta=9.45\left(\mathrm{~d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{6}\right)$, $8.51\left(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{8}\right), 8.18-8.13$ (m, 4H; Ph), $7.94\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{3}\right), 7.77-7.66(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{Ph}), 7.61\left(\mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{4} J(H, H)=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{5}\right), 7.52(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{Ph}), 7.44 \mathrm{ppm}(\mathrm{m}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Ph}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $\left.25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right): \delta=159.4,158.0,156.8,151.6,149.7,134.4,134.3,132.5,132.1$, $131.0, \quad 130.9, \quad 130.2, \quad 129.9, \quad 128.9, \quad 127.1,124.4 \mathrm{ppm} ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR (377 MHz, $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $\left.25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right): \delta=-148.58\left({ }^{10} \mathrm{BF}_{4}{ }^{-}\right),-148.63 \mathrm{ppm}\left({ }^{11} \mathrm{BF}_{4}{ }^{-}\right)$; IR $(\mathrm{KBr}): \tilde{v}=499(\mathrm{w})$, 534 (w), 617 (w), 699 (s), 767 (s), 866 (w), 892 (m), 1060 (br), 1185 (w), 1231 (m), 1360 (m), 1418 (w), 1438 (w), 1460 (m), 1483 (m), 1495 (m), 1546 (s), 1625 (s), 3058 (m) $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; elemental analysis calcd. (\%) for $\mathrm{C}_{56} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{Pt}: \mathrm{C}, 55.65 ; \mathrm{H}, 3.34 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.64$, found (\%): C, 55.94; H, 3.35; N, 4.60.


Figure 5. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]\right.$ acetonitrile, $\left.25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ of complex 3a


Figure 6. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) of complex 3a


Figure 7. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F} \mathrm{NMR}\left(377 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]\right.$ acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) of complex 3a


Figure 8. IR (KBr) of complex 3a

## Synthesis of Pt complex 3b



A mixture of ligand 2b ( $763 \mathrm{mg}, 0.596 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.05$ equiv) and (DMSO) ${ }_{2} \mathrm{PtCl}_{2}(240 \mathrm{mg}$, 0.568 mmol, 1.00 equiv) in $\mathrm{MeOH}(60 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was heated under reflux for 15 h . The mixture was cooled to RT, and the solvent was removed under vacuum. The residue was recrystallized at $8{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ from a mixture of acetonitrile ( 1 mL ) and toluene $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and was then isolated by filtration and dried under vacuum to afford the title complex $\mathbf{3 b}$ as an orange solid (457 mg, 52\%). m.p. $317^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp.); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, [ $\mathrm{D}_{3}$ ]acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ): $\delta=9.32\left(\mathrm{~d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{6}\right)$, $8.39\left(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{8}\right), 8.09(\mathrm{~m}$, $\left.4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{11}\right), 8.03\left(\mathrm{~d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{3}\right), 7.71\left(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{12}\right), 7.51\left(\mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{5}\right), 7.42\left(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{18}\right), 7.34\left(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{17}\right)$, $1.39\left(\mathrm{~s}, 18 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{15}\right), 1.27$ ppm (s, $36 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{21}$ ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 101 MHz , [ $\left.\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ): $\delta=158.7,158.5,158.3$, $156.8,155.4,149.9,131.6,130.8,129.9,129.7$, 128.5, 128.0, 127.1, 126.6, 126.5, 124.6, 35.9, 35.6, 31.4, $31.2 \mathrm{ppm} ;{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( $377 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ): $\delta=-148.40\left({ }^{10} \mathrm{BF}_{4}^{-}\right),-148.46 \mathrm{ppm}\left({ }^{11} \mathrm{BF}_{4}^{-}\right)$; IR (KBr): $\tilde{v}=562(\mathrm{w}), 583(\mathrm{w}), 838(\mathrm{~s}), 1084$ (br), 1203 (w), 1231 (w), 1271 (w), 1364 (m), 1398 (w), 1422 (w), 1442 (w), 1479 (m), 1509 (m), 1543 (m), 1569 (m), 1603 (s), 1624 (s), 2870 (w), 2907 (w), 2964 (s), 3074
(w) $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$; elemental analysis calcd. (\%) for $\mathrm{C}_{80} \mathrm{H}_{88} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{Pt}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 62.18 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.74 ; \mathrm{N}$, 3.63, found (\%): C, 62.39; H, 5.69; N, 3.64.


Figure 9. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]\right.$ acetonitrile, $\left.25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ of complex $\mathbf{3 b}$


Figure 10. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) of complex $\mathbf{3 b}$


Figure 11. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR (377 MHz, $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) of complex $\mathbf{3 b}$


Figure 12. $\mathrm{IR}(\mathrm{KBr})$ of complex 3b


## Synthesis of Pd complex 3c

## 3c

A mixture of ligand 2a ( $900 \mathrm{mg}, 0.955 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) and (COD) $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}$ ( 273 mg , $0.956 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(250 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was stirred at RT for 22 h . The solvent was removed under vacuum. The residue was suspended in acetonitrile ( 5 mL ) and the resulting suspension was filtered. The filter plug was rinsed with acetonitrile ( $2 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). Diffusion of a mixture of pentane and diethyl ether ( $1: 1$ ) into the filtrate over a period of 24 h resulted in formation of a crystalline precipitate, which was collected and dried under vacuum to afford the title complex 3c as a yellow solid ( $902 \mathrm{mg}, 84 \%$ ). m.p. $292^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp.); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ): $\delta=9.01$ ( $\mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=6.2$ $\left.H z, 2 H ; H^{6}\right)$, $8.51\left(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{8}\right)$, 8.17-8.12 (m, $\left.4 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{Ph}\right), 7.89\left(\mathrm{~d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H})=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{H}^{3}\right)$, 7.76-7.65 (m, 6H; Ph), 7.62 (dd, $\left.{ }^{3} J(H, H)=6.2 ~ H z, ~{ }^{4} J(H, H)=2.2 ~ H z, 2 H ; H^{5}\right), 7.56-7.40(m$, $20 \mathrm{H} ; \mathrm{Ph}$ ); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ): $\delta=159.8,157.5,157.3,153.2$, 150.9, 134.8, 134.6, 132.8, 132.5, 131.3, 131.3, 130.5, 130.2, 128.6, 127.4, 124.2 ppm; ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR ( 377 MHz , $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right.$ ]acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ): $\delta=-145.97\left({ }^{10} \mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)$ ), $-146.01 \mathrm{ppm}\left({ }^{11} \mathrm{BF}_{4}{ }^{-}\right)$; IR (KBr): $\tilde{v}=503(\mathrm{w}), 522(\mathrm{w}), 533(\mathrm{~m}), 614(\mathrm{w}), 619(\mathrm{w}), 701(\mathrm{~s}), 765(\mathrm{~s}), 871(\mathrm{w}), 889$ (m), 931 (w), 1083 (br), 1185 (w), 1230 (s), 1282 (w), 1318 (w), 1357 (s), 1414 (s), 1445 (w), 1461 (w), 1494 (s), 1549 (s), 1568 (s), 1621 (s), 3058 (m) cm ${ }^{-1}$; elemental analysis calcd. (\%) for $\mathrm{C}_{56} \mathrm{H}_{40} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{Pd}$ : C, 60.06 ; H, 3.60; N, 5.00, found (\%): C, $59.10 ; \mathrm{H}$, 3.76; N, 4.92.


Figure 13. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $\left.25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ of complex 3c


Figure 14. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (101 MHz, $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) of complex $3 \mathbf{c}$


Figure 15. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\left(377 \mathrm{MHz},\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]\right.$ acetonitrile, $\left.25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ of complex 3 C


Figure 16. IR ( KBr ) of complex 3c

## H/D Exchange Reactions ${ }^{[10]}$

All glassware and stir bars were treated with aqua regia, washed with copious water and acetone, and dried before each use.

## General Procedure For H/D Exchange Reactions Between $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at 2 mol \% Catalyst Loading.

To a 4 mL resealable Schlenk tube was added catalyst ( $5.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) and 0.10 $\mathrm{mL}(10 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 4.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ of a stock solution of $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}(19.5 \mathrm{mg}, 100 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$ in 1.0 mL $\left[D_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$, which had been prepared immediately prior to use. An additional 0.27 mL of $\left[D_{4}\right] A c O H$ was added, and the mixture was stirred for 1 min. Benzene ( $22.3 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 19.5 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.250 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), was added to the reaction vessel, which was subsequently sealed. The vessel was completely submerged in a preheated oil bath. At the end of the reaction, the vessel was cooled to RT. The reaction mixture was then filtered over a plug of Celite to remove any particulates and rinsed with EtOAc ( $1 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) into a 20 mL scintillation vial. A saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\left(9 \mathrm{M}\right.$ in deionized $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 2 \times 1$ mL ) was added to the vial to quench and separate the acid. The organic layer was carefully separated and diluted with additional EtOAc to give a 12.8 mM solution of benzene ( $\sim 1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) for analysis by GC-MS.

The \% deuterium incorporation was defined as the percent of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ bonds converted to $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{D}$ bonds. The background reaction (in the absence of the Pt catalyst) at $150{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ is minimal with $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ and is described in detail in reference [10]. Investigations at 100

[^2] M. Villalobos, M. S. Sanford, Organometallics 2009, 28, 5316-5322.
${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (see Table 1 below) in $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ revealed even lower background activity without platinum catalyst than had been observed at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .{ }^{[11]}$

Turnover numbers (TONs) are calculated as mol deuterium incorporated per mol of catalyst. Reported values have been corrected for the background reaction in the presence of AgCl , which is formed in situ. The reported error is the standard deviation of at least two replicate trials.

Table 1. Turnover numbers for background $H / D$ exchange between benzene and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at $100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ after 2 and 24 h . Conditions: Benzene ( $22.3 \mu \mathrm{l}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), Ag additive ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 4.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), [ $\left.\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(0.37 \mathrm{ml}, 6.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 25$ equiv).

| Additive | TON 2 h | TON 24 h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}$ | $0.19 \pm 0.22$ | $0.01 \pm 0.00$ |
| AgOTf | $0.06 \pm 0.00$ | $0.09 \pm 0.10$ |
| AgCl | $0.04 \pm 0.05$ | $0.03 \pm 0.01$ |

[^3]Table 2. Turnover numbers and turnover frequencies for H/D exchange between benzene and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ catalyzed by 1, 3a, 3b, 3c, dtbpyPtCl ${ }_{2}$ (dtbpy $=4,4^{\prime}-$ di-tert-butylbipyridine) and dtbpyPdCl ${ }_{2}$ after $15 \mathrm{~min}, 2 \mathrm{~h}$ and 24 h . Conditions: $\mathrm{Pt}^{\prime \prime}$ catalyst ( $5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), benzene ( $22.3 \mu \mathrm{l}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}(1.9 \mathrm{mg}$, $10 \mu \mathrm{~mol}),\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(0.37 \mathrm{ml}, 6.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 25$ equiv).

| Catalyst | TON 15 min | TOF 15 min | TON 2 h | TON 24 h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathrm{nd}^{[\mathrm{a}]}$ | $0.01 \mathrm{~s}^{-1[\mathrm{~b}]}$ | $3 \pm 0$ | $94 \pm 13^{[\mathrm{b}]}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 a}$ | $92 \pm 10$ | $0.1024 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ | $217 \pm 6$ | $255 \pm 2$ |
| $\mathbf{3 b}$ | $89 \pm 1$ | $0.0983 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ | $230 \pm 2$ | $249 \pm 0$ |
| 3c | $45 \pm 0$ | $0.0501 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ | $168 \pm 1$ | $249 \pm 1$ |
| dtbpyPtCl $_{2}$ | $3 \pm 1^{[\mathrm{b}]}$ | $0.003 \mathrm{~s}^{-1[\mathrm{~b}]}$ | $17 \pm 1^{[\mathrm{ab}]}$ | $144 \pm 12^{[\mathrm{b}]}$ |
| $\mathrm{dtbpyPdCl}_{2}$ | $2 \pm 0$ | $0.0021 \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ | $13 \pm 0$ | $90 \pm 18$ |

[a] not determined. [b] see ref. [10].

Table 3. Turnover numbers for $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ exchange between benzene and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at 100 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ catalyzed by 1, 3a, 3b, 3c, dtbpyPtCl ${ }_{2}$ and dtbpyPdCl 2 after 2,24 and 48 h. Conditions: catalyst ( $5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), benzene ( $22.3 \mu \mathrm{l}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}$ $(1.9 \mathrm{mg}, 10 \mu \mathrm{~mol}),\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(0.37 \mathrm{ml}, 6.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 25$ equiv).

| Catalyst | TON 2 h | TON 24 h | TON 48 h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $0 \pm 0$ | $0 \pm 0$ | $1 \pm 0$ |
| 3a | $25 \pm 9$ | $136 \pm 14$ | $197 \pm 15$ |
| 3b | $30 \pm 0$ | $167 \pm 8$ | $220 \pm 3$ |
| 3c | $10 \pm 0$ | $57 \pm 8$ | $60 \pm 11$ |
| dtbpyPtCl $_{2}$ | $0 \pm 0$ | $1 \pm 0$ | $2 \pm 0$ |
| dtbpyPdCl $_{2}$ | $0 \pm 0$ | $2 \pm 1$ | $2 \pm 1$ |

## Catalyst Loading Study $3 \mathrm{a}\left(150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$

H/D Exchange Between $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at $1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ Catalyst Loading of 3a.
By analogy to the general procedure for $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ exchange (see above), 3a ( $6.3 \mathrm{mg}, 5.2$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \mathrm{AgBF}_{4}\left(10.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%\right.$ ), $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(0.74 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.83 \mathrm{~g}, 12.9$ mmol, 25 equiv), and benzene ( $46.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 40.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.520 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) were reacted at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a resealable Schlenk tube. Workup and analysis were performed according to the general procedure.

## H/D Exchange Between $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at $0.5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ Catalyst Loading of 3a.

By analogy to the general procedure for H/D exchange (see above), 3a ( $5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 4.1$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}, 0.5 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \mathrm{AgBF}_{4}(8.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%),\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(1.17 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.31 \mathrm{~g}, 20.4 \mathrm{mmol}$, 25 equiv), and benzene ( $73.3 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 64.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.82 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) were reacted at 150 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a resealable Schlenk tube. Workup and analysis were performed according to the general procedure.

## H/D Exchange Between $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at 0.25 mol \% Catalyst Loading of 3a.

By analogy to the general procedure for H/D exchange (see above), 3a ( $2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 2.1$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}, 0.25 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \mathrm{AgBF}_{4}(4.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 0.50 \mathrm{~mol} \%),\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(1.20 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.34 \mathrm{~g}, 21.0$ mmol, 25 equiv), and benzene ( $75.1 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 65.6 \mathrm{mg}, 0.84 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) were reacted at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a resealable Schlenk tube. Workup and analysis were performed according to the general procedure.

## H/D Exchange Between $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at $0.1 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ Catalyst Loading of 3a.

By analogy to the general procedure for H/D exchange (see above), 3a ( $2.5 \mathrm{mg}, 2.1$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}, 0.1 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \mathrm{AgBF}_{4}(4.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 0.2 \mathrm{~mol} \%),\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(3.00 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.36 \mathrm{~g}, 52.4 \mathrm{mmol}$, 25 equiv) and benzene ( $185 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 162 \mathrm{mg}, 2.10 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) were reacted at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a resealable Schlenk tube. Workup and analysis were performed according to the general procedure.

Table 4. Turnover numbers for $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ exchange between benzene and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at 150 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ catalyzed by 3a at different catalyst loadings after 2, 24 and 48 h . Conditions see above.

## Catalyst

Loading 3a $\quad$ TON $_{\text {stat max }}{ }^{[a]} \quad$ TON $2 \mathrm{~h} \quad$ TON $24 \mathrm{~h} \quad$ TON 48 h [mol \%]

| 2.0 | 242 | $217 \pm 6$ | $255 \pm 2^{[b]}$ | nd $^{[c]}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.0 | 484 | $424 \pm 6$ | $513 \pm 1^{[b]}$ | nd $^{[c]}$ |
| 0.50 | 968 | $650 \pm 15$ | $1011 \pm 6^{[b]}$ | nd $^{[c]}$ |
| 0.25 | 1935 | $606 \pm 7$ | $1728 \pm 25$ | nd $^{[c]}$ |
| 0.10 | 4839 | $635 \pm 23$ | $2384 \pm 60$ | $3273 \pm 110$ |

[a] maximum statistical turnover number $\left[\mathrm{TON}_{\text {stat }} \max =\operatorname{TON}_{\max }{ }^{* 25 /(25+6)] .{ }^{[12]}[b] \text { The }}\right.$ TONs under these conditions level off at $\sim 4-6 \%$ above the value for the TON $_{\text {stat max. }}$. This may be due to an isotope effect. [c] Not determined.

[^4]
## Silver Additive Study $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$

By analogy to the general procedure for $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ exchange (see above), 3b ( $4.0 \mathrm{mg}, 2.6$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), Ag additive ${ }^{[13,14]}(5.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 4.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%),\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(0.19 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.21 \mathrm{~g}$, $3.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 25$ equiv), and benzene ( $11.6 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 10.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.130 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) were reacted at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a resealable Schlenk tube.

Table 5. Turnover numbers for $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ exchange between benzene and $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ at 100 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ catalyzed by $\mathbf{3 b}$ after 24 h . Conditions: $\mathbf{3 b}(4.0 \mathrm{mg}, 2.6 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, benzene ( $11.6 \mu \mathrm{l}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), Ag additive ${ }^{[13,14]}\left(5.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 4.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%\right.$ ), $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(0.19$ $\mathrm{ml}, 3.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 25$ equiv)

| Additive | TON 24 h | Additive | TON 24 h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}$ | $167 \pm 8$ | $\mathrm{Ag}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ | $1 \pm 0$ |
| $\mathrm{AgPF}_{6}$ | $79 \pm 9$ | $\mathrm{AgNO}_{3}$ | $0 \pm 0$ |
| AgOTf | $209 \pm 1$ | AgTFA | $17 \pm 8$ |
| AgOTs | $144 \pm 8$ | none | $0 \pm 0$ |
| $\mathrm{Ag}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ | $163 \pm 10$ |  |  |

[^5]
## H/D Exchange Reactions Between Liquid Aromatic Substrates and $\left[D_{4}\right] A c O H$ at 2 mol \% Catalyst Loading.

By analogy to the general procedure for $H / D$ exchange between benzene and $\left[D_{4}\right] A c O H$ (see above), 3a ( $3.0 \mathrm{mg}, 2.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), AgOTf ( $5.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 4.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ ( $0.36 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.40 \mathrm{~g}, 6.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 50$ equiv), and the aromatic substrate ( $0.125 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv; see Figure 13 below) were reacted at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a resealable Schlenk tube. At the end of the reaction, the vessel was cooled to RT and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CICHCl}_{2}(11.6 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 16.7 \mathrm{mg}$, $0.125 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) was added as internal standard for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.

Workup for ethyl benzoate. 0.3 mL of the reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of celite and was rinsed with $\left[\mathrm{D}_{6}\right]$ acetone $(0.6 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.

Workup for bromobenzene. 0.3 mL of the reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of celite and rinsed with $\left[\mathrm{D}_{6}\right]$ benzene $(0.6 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.

Workup for sec-butylbenzene. 0.3 mL of the reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of celite and rinsed with $\left[\mathrm{D}_{3}\right]$ acetonitrile $(0.6 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.

Workup for neopentylbenzene and iso-propylbenzene. 0.3 mL of the reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of celite and rinsed with $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}(0.6 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.

Workup for $\alpha, \alpha, \alpha$-trifluorotoluene and 1,2-dimethoxybenzene (veratrole). The reaction mixture was diluted with $\left[D_{6}\right]$ benzene ( 1 mL ) and extracted with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\left(9 \mathrm{~m}\right.$ in deionized $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 2 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to quench and separate the acid. The organic layer was carefully separated and filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.

Workup for 1,2-dichlorobenzene. The reaction mixture was diluted with $\left[\mathrm{D}_{1}\right]$ chloroform $(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\left(9 \mathrm{~m}\right.$ in deionized $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 2$ $x 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to quench and separate the acid. The organic layer was carefully separated and filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.

## H/D Exchange Reactions Between Naphthalene and $\left[D_{4}\right]$ AcOH.

To a 4 mL resealable Schlenk tube was added catalyst $3 \mathrm{a}(3.0 \mathrm{mg}, 2.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol}$ \%), naphthalene ( $16.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.125 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), and 0.10 mL ( $5.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 4.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) of a stock solution of $\operatorname{AgOTf}(50 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$ in $1.0 \mathrm{~mL}\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$, which had been prepared immediately prior to use. An additional 0.26 mL of $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ was added, and the reaction vessel was subsequently sealed. The vessel was completely submerged in an oil bath preheated to $150{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. At the end of the reaction, the vessel was cooled to RT and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{ClCHCl}_{2}(11.6 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 16.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.125 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) was added as internal
standard. 0.3 mL of the reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of celite and was rinsed with $\left[D_{6}\right]$ acetone $(0.6 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.

In all cases, the \% deuterium incorporation was calculated from the loss of signal intensity in single scan ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra as referenced to integration from a sample containing standard (1,1,2-trichloroethane) and non-deuterated substrate in an equimolar ratio. The reported error is the standard deviation of at least two replicate trials.




$\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{Br}, i \mathrm{Pr}, \mathrm{sBu}$, $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{3}, \mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Et}, \mathrm{CF}_{3}$

Figure 17. Aromatic substrates examined for $H / D$ exchange with $\left[D_{4}\right] A c O H$.

Table 6. Arene $D$ incorporation ${ }^{[\mathrm{ab}}$ after $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ exchange reaction at $150{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ between $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ and monosubstituted aromatic substrates. Conditions: $\mathbf{3 a}(3.0 \mathrm{mg}, 2.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, $2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), substrate ( $0.125 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), AgOTf ( $5.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 4.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ $(0.36 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.40 \mathrm{~g}, 6.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 50$ equiv).

| Substrate | Reaction Time [h] | D incorporation [\%] |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ar-H average | ortho | meta | para |
| $\left(\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{3} \mathrm{CCH}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}^{[a]}$ | 168 | $94 \pm 0$ | $93 \pm 1$ | $95 \pm 1$ | $96 \pm 1$ |
| $s \mathrm{BuPh}{ }^{[a]}$ | 168 | $93 \pm 1$ | $93 \pm 1^{[b]}$ | $93 \pm 1$ | $93 \pm 1^{[b]}$ |
| PrPh ${ }^{\text {a] }}$ | 168 | $95 \pm 1$ | $95 \pm 0$ | $95 \pm 1$ | $96 \pm 1$ |
| BrPh | 48 | $90 \pm 1$ | $93 \pm 0$ | $87 \pm 1$ | $92 \pm 2$ |
| $\mathrm{PhCO}_{2} \mathrm{Et}$ | 168 | $88 \pm 2$ | $85 \pm 2$ | $93 \pm 2$ | $87 \pm 1$ |
| $\mathrm{PhCF}_{3}$ | 168 | $61 \pm 1$ | $55 \pm 2$ | $71 \pm 1$ | $52 \pm 1$ |

[a] See table 8 below for quantification of alkyl D incorporation. [b] Average values, due to overlapping ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR signals.

Table 7. D incorporation after H/D exchange reaction at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ between $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ and monosubstituted aromatic substrates. Conditions: 3 a ( $3.0 \mathrm{mg}, 2.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), substrate ( $0.125 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), AgOTf ( $5.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 4.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), [ $\left.\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(0.36 \mathrm{~mL}$, $0.40 \mathrm{~g}, 6.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 50$ equiv).

| Substrate | Reaction <br> Time [h] | Ar-H average | $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ | $\mathrm{H}^{\beta}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 48 | $91 \pm 1$ | $92 \pm 1$ | $91 \pm 1$ |
| naphthalene |  | $97 \pm 0$ | $97 \pm 0$ | $98 \pm 0$ |
| $1,2-$ | 48 | $49 \pm 1$ | $50 \pm 3$ | $48 \pm 0$ |

## Direct Quantification of D Incorporation in sp ${ }^{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{C - H}$ Bonds of Alkyl Substituted

## Arenes

H/D exchange experiments were performed as described above. The reaction mixture was diluted with chloroform ( 1.5 mL ) and extracted with saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\left(9 \mathrm{~m}\right.$ in deionized $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 3 \times 1 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to quench and separate the acid. The organic layer was carefully separated and filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy (relaxation delay 10 s ). Since the amount of aromatic $D$ incorporation has been calculated from the loss of signal intensity against 1,1,2-trichloroethane as internal standard (see above) in ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra of analogous samples, the \% D incorporation into the alkyl groups can be calculated from the relative integration of alkyl and aryl signals in the ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra.

Table 8. Alkyl D incorporation after H/D exchange reaction between $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ and alkyl substituted aromatic substrates. Conditions: $3 \mathbf{a}(3.0 \mathrm{mg}, 2.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, substrate ( $0.125 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), AgOTf ( $5.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 4.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), [ $\left.\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(0.36 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.40 \mathrm{~g}$, $6.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 50$ equiv), $168 \mathrm{~h}, 150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

| Substrate | D incorporation [\%] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ar-H average | alkyl-H |
| $\left(\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{CCH}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}\right.$ | $94 \pm 0$ | $3\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$ |
| $s \mathrm{BuPh}$ | $93 \pm 1$ | $8\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right), 7\left(\mathrm{CHCH}_{3}\right), 2\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$ |
| $i P r P h$ | $95 \pm 1$ | $7\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)$ |

## Regioselectivity Study - [Pt] catalyzed H/D Exchange

By analogy to the general procedure for $H / D$ exchange between benzene and $\left[D_{4}\right] A c O H$ (see above), catalyst ( $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 0.5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}(5.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%),\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ ( $0.71 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.80 \mathrm{~g}, 12.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 25$ equiv), and the aromatic substrate ( $0.500 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) were reacted at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a resealable Schlenk tube. At the end of the reaction, the vessel was cooled to RT and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{ClCHCl}_{2}(46.3 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 66.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.500 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) was added as internal standard for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. Workup, analysis and calculation of the \% D incorporation for ethylbenzoate and bromobenzene were performed as described above.

Workup for ethylbenzene. At the end of the reaction, the reaction mixture was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{ClCHCl}_{2}(46.3 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 66.7 \mathrm{mg}, 0.500 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) was added as internal standard for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. 0.3 mL of the reaction mixture was filtered through a plug of celite and was rinsed with $\left[\mathrm{D}_{6}\right]$ acetone $(0.6 \mathrm{~mL})$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. Calculation of the \% D incorporation was performed as described above

Table 9. D incorporation after $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ exchange reaction at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ between $\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}$ and $\mathrm{EtPh}, \mathrm{BrPh}$ and $\mathrm{PhCO}_{2} \mathrm{Et}$, respectively. Conditions: catalyst ( $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 0.5 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), substrate ( $0.500 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), $\mathrm{AgBF}_{4}(5.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}),\left[\mathrm{D}_{4}\right] \mathrm{AcOH}(0.71 \mathrm{ml}, 12.4 \mathrm{mmol}$, 25 equiv).

|  | Substrate | Catalyst | Reaction <br> Time |  | D incorporation [\%] |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Ar-H average | ortho | meta | para |  |
| EtPh |  | 10 min | $24 \pm 2$ | $26 \pm 1$ | $20 \pm 4$ | $30 \pm 1$ |  |
| BrPh |  | 4 h | $25 \pm 2$ | $35 \pm 3$ | $14 \pm 2$ | $24 \pm 0$ |  |
| BrPh |  | 141 h | $25 \pm 3$ | $27 \pm 3$ | $19 \pm 3$ | $30 \pm 3$ |  |
| $\mathrm{PhCO}_{2} \mathrm{Et}$ | 3a | 18 h | $26 \pm 2$ | $21 \pm 2$ | $33 \pm 2$ | $22 \pm 1$ |  |

## Regioselectivity Study - D $^{+}$catalyzed H/D Exchange

A mixture of bromobenzene ( $26.3 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 39.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.250 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), $\left[\mathrm{D}_{1}\right]$ TFA ( 0.51 $\mathrm{mL}, 0.719 \mathrm{~g}, 6.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 25.0$ equiv) and 0.05 mL DCl solution in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (35\%) was reacted at $150{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a resealable Schlenk tube. At the end of the reaction, the vessel was cooled to RT and $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{ClCHCl}_{2}(23.1 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 33.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.250 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv) was added as internal standard for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy. The reaction mixture was diluted with $\left[\mathrm{D}_{6}\right]$ benzene $(0.5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(9$ M in deionized $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 2 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to quench and separate the acid. The organic layer was carefully separated and filtered through $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The resulting filtrate was analyzed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectroscopy.

Table 10. D incorporation after $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{D}$ exchange reaction at $150^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ between $\left[\mathrm{D}_{1}\right] \mathrm{TFA}, \mathrm{DCl}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and BrPh . Conditions: $\mathrm{PhBr}\left(26.3 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 39.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.250 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00\right.$ equiv), [ $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ ]TFA ( $0.51 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.719 \mathrm{~g}, 6.25 \mathrm{mmol}, 25.0$ equiv), DCl in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(35 \%, 0.05 \mathrm{~mL})$.

|  | D incorporation [\%] |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Catalyst | Reaction <br> Time |  | Ar-H average | ortho |
| BrPh |  | 38 h | $26 \pm 2$ | $31 \pm 3$ | $5 \pm 2$ | $58 \pm 0$ |

## Pd catalyzed Acetoxylation

$\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ catalyzed Acetoxylation of Benzene - General Procedure ${ }^{[15]}$

To a mixture of $\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}\left(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00\right.$ equiv) and $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 22.4$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) in a pressure resistant vial with a screw cap, glacial acetic acid ( 0.90 mL ) and acetic anhydride ( 0.10 mL ) were added. The suspension was stirred at RT for 1 min , before benzene ( $1.00 \mathrm{~mL}, 875 \mathrm{mg}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv) was added. The vial was sealed and heated to $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using a preheated hotplate. At the end of the reaction, the vessel was cooled to RT and $\mathrm{PhCl}(50 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was added as an internal standard for quantitative GC analysis. The mixture was diluted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and filtered through a plug of celite. The filtrate was extracted with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ (9 $M$ in deionized $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 2 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to quench and separate the acid. The organic layer was carefully separated and diluted with additional $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to a total volume of 20 mL . The resulting solution was analyzed by GC.

## $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ catalyzed Acetoxylation of Benzene - Addition of Bipyridine

By analogy to the general procedure for acetoxylation of benzene (see above), $\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}\left(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00\right.$ equiv), $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, $0.50 \mathrm{~mL}(11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ of a stock solution of bipyridine ( $35.0 \mathrm{mg}, 224 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) in $10 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{AcOH}, \mathrm{AcOH}(0.40 \mathrm{~mL})$, acetic anhydride ( 0.10 mL ) and benzene ( $1.00 \mathrm{~mL}, 875$ $\mathrm{mg}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv) were reacted at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Workup and analysis were performed as described above.

[^6]
## $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ catalyzed Acetoxylation of Benzene - Addition of Dicationic Ligand 2a

By analogy to the general procedure for acetoxylation of benzene (see above),
$\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}\left(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00\right.$ equiv), $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$,
2a ( $10.6 \mathrm{mg}, 11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $\mathrm{AcOH}(0.90 \mathrm{~mL})$, acetic anhydride $(0.10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and benzene ( $1.00 \mathrm{~mL}, 875 \mathrm{mg}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv) were reacted at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Workup and analysis were performed as described above.

Table 11. Calibrated GC yields of phenyl acetate (PhOAc) and biphenyl (PhPh). Conditions: Benzene ( $1.00 \mathrm{~mL}, 875 \mathrm{mg}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv), $\mathrm{AcOH}(0.90 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(0.10 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}\left(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00\right.$ equiv), $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, $2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), ligand ( $11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $100^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} .^{[16]}$

| Reaction Time [h] | Catalyst system |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ |  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathrm{bpy} 2: 1$ |  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathbf{2 a} 2: 1$ |  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathrm{bpym}$ 2:1 |  |
|  | PhOAc | PhPh | PhOAc | PhPh | PhOAc | PhPh | PhOAc | PhPh |
| 2 | $6.2 \pm 0.0$ | $0.0 \pm 0.0$ | $9.1 \pm 0.4$ | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $12.5 \pm 0.1$ | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $1.4 \pm 0.2$ | $0.3 \pm 0.0$ |
| 4 | $12.0 \pm 0.1$ | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $17.6 \pm 0.1$ | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $29.0 \pm 2.0$ | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $1.2 \pm 0.4$ | $0.3 \pm 0.0$ |
| 6 | $17.3 \pm 2.5$ | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $25.4 \pm 0.6$ | $0.8 \pm 0.0$ | $44.1 \pm 3.3$ | $1.0 \pm 0.0$ | $3.4 \pm 0.9$ | $0.3 \pm 0.0$ |
| 8 | $24.2 \pm 3.7$ | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $36.8 \pm 1.1$ | $0.9 \pm 0.0$ | $58.8 \pm 1.9$ | $1.1 \pm 0.0$ | $3.2 \pm 1.2$ | $0.3 \pm 0.0$ |
| 12 | $33.0 \pm 1.8$ | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $47.4 \pm 0.1$ | $0.8 \pm 0.0$ | $66.8 \pm 0.2$ | $1.5 \pm 0.4$ | $3.2 \pm 1.2$ | $0.3 \pm 0.0$ |
| 16 | $50.5 \pm 4.2$ | $0.7 \pm 0.0$ | $62.1 \pm 1.4$ | $0.9 \pm 0.2$ | $68.4 \pm 1.3$ | $2.6 \pm 0.0$ | $3.1 \pm 3.0$ | $0.3 \pm 0.0$ |
| 20 | $57.2 \pm 3.2$ | $1.1 \pm 0.3$ | $70.1 \pm 0.3$ | $1.9 \pm 0.3$ | $68.0 \pm 0.5$ | $2.4 \pm 0.0$ | $5.9 \pm 4.9$ | $0.3 \pm 0.0$ |
| 24 | $66.2 \pm 0.2$ | $1.7 \pm 0.5$ | $70.3 \pm 0.9$ | $1.8 \pm 0.1$ | $68.1 \pm 0.4$ | $2.5 \pm 0.0$ | $13.8 \pm 1.8$ | $0.3 \pm 0.0$ |

[16] The reported error is the standard deviation of at least two replicate trials. The observation that all reactions level off around $70 \%$ yield could be due to the formation of by-products as well as the stability of the oxidant under the reaction conditions. Other than biphenyl, also $\mathrm{IC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{OAc}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ isomers could be identified as by-products using GC-MS analysis. Since the above shown yields are calculated on the amount of oxidant, an excess of $\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ as in directed acetoxylation reactions could not be used.

## $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ catalyzed Acetoxylation of Liquid Arenes ${ }^{[15]}$

By analogy to the general procedure for acetoxylation of benzene, $\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(361 \mathrm{mg}$, $1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$, glacial acetic acid $(0.90 \mathrm{~mL})$, acetic anhydride ( 0.10 mL ) and the arene ( 10.0 equiv) were reacted at 100 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. At the end of the reaction, the vessel was cooled to RT and GC standard ( $20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$; PhCl in the case of trifluoromethylbenzene as substrate, neopentylbenzene in the case of the other substrates) was added. The mixture was diluted with EtOAc ( 2 mL ) and filtered through a plug of celite. The filtrate was extracted with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\left(9 \mathrm{~m}\right.$ in deionized $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, 2 \times 2 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to quench and separate the acid. The organic layer was carefully separated and diluted with additional EtOAc to a total volume of 20 mL . The resulting solution was analyzed by GC or GC-MS.





$$
\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{Br}, \mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{CO}_{2}{\mathrm{Et}, \mathrm{CF}_{3}}^{2}
$$

Figure 18. Aromatic substrates examined for acetoxylation with $\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$.

## $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ catalyzed Acetoxylation of Naphthalene ${ }^{[15]}$

$\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}\left(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00\right.$ equiv), $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ and naphthalene ( $1.44 \mathrm{~g}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv) were suspended in glacial acetic acid $(0.90 \mathrm{~mL})$ and acetic anhydride $(0.10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The vial was sealed and the mixture was reacted at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. At the end of the reaction, the vessel was cooled to RT and $20 \mu \mathrm{~L}$
neopentylbenzene were added as an internal standard for quantitative GC analysis. Workup and analysis were performed as described above.

## $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ catalyzed Acetoxylation of Arenes - Addition of Bipyridine

By analogy to the general procedures for acetoxylation (see above), $\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ (361 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%), 0.50 \mathrm{~mL}(11.2$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ) of a stock solution of bipyridine ( $35.0 \mathrm{mg}, 224 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) in 10 mL AcOH , $\mathrm{AcOH}(0.40 \mathrm{~mL})$, acetic anhydride ( 0.10 mL ) and arene ( 10.0 equiv) were reacted at $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Workup and analysis were performed as described above.

## $\operatorname{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ catalyzed Acetoxylation of Arenes - Addition of Dicationic Ligand 2a

By analogy to the general procedures for acetoxylation (see above), $\mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ (361 $\mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv $), \operatorname{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \mathbf{2 a}(10.6 \mathrm{mg}$, $11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \mathrm{AcOH}(0.90 \mathrm{~mL})$, acetic anhydride ( 0.10 mL ) and arene (10.0 equiv) were reacted at $100{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Workup and analysis were performed as described above.

Table 12. Calibrated combined GC yields and site-selectivity ( $\alpha: \beta$ ) of naphthylacetate regioisomers. Conditions: Naphthalene ( $1.44 \mathrm{~g}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv), AcOH ( 0.90 $\mathrm{mL}), \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.10 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv $), \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}$, $22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), ligand ( $11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reported error is the standard deviation of at least two replicate trials.

| Reaction Time $[\mathrm{h}]$ | Catalyst system |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathrm{bpy} 2: 1$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathbf{2 a} 2: 1$ |
|  | $51.9 \pm 2.5$ | $60.2 \pm 1.8$ | $76.6 \pm 2.6$ |
|  | $(1.46: 1)$ | $(0.97: 1)$ | $(0.89: 1)$ |
| 24 | $73.3 \pm 1.4$ | $78.6 \pm 0.7$ | $79.5 \pm 1.8$ |
|  | $(1.43: 1)$ | $(0.93: 1)$ | $(0.85: 1)$ |
| 48 | $80.4 \pm 1.5$ | $79.8 \pm 0.9$ | $78.2 \pm 0.8$ |
|  | $(1.39: 1)$ | $(0.94: 1)$ | $(0.87: 1)$ |

Table 13. Calibrated combined GC yields and site-selectivity (o:m:p) of $\mathrm{ClC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{OAc}$ regioisomers. Conditions: $\mathrm{PhCl}(1.14 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.26 \mathrm{~g}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv), AcOH ( 0.90 $\mathrm{mL}), \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.10 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv $), \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}$, $22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), ligand ( $11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reported error is the standard deviation of at least two replicate trials.

| Reaction Time $[\mathrm{h}]$ | Catalyst system |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathrm{bpy} 2: 1$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathbf{2 a} 2: 1$ |
|  | $4.0 \pm 0.1$ | $6.4 \pm 0.3$ | $13.0 \pm 0.2$ |
|  | $(0.70: 0.02: 1)$ | $(0.56: 0.17: 1)$ | $(0.91: 0.31: 1)$ |
| 24 | $38.4 \pm 0.2$ | $48.2 \pm 1.3$ | $83.7 \pm 0.5$ |
|  | $(0.82: 0.51: 1)$ | $(0.63: 0.58: 1)$ | $(0.81: 0.72: 1)$ |
| 48 | $57.7 \pm 1.6$ | $78.0 \pm 0.5$ | $89.0 \pm 0.3$ |
|  | $(0.92: 0.69: 1)$ | $(0.67: 0.74: 1)$ | $(0.86: 0.75: 1)$ |

Table 14. Calibrated combined GC yields and site-selectivity (o:m:p) of $\mathrm{BrC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{OAc}$ regioisomers. Conditions: $\mathrm{PhBr}(1.18 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.76 \mathrm{~g}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv), AcOH ( 0.90 $\mathrm{mL}), \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.10 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv $), \mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}$, $22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), ligand ( $11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reported error is the standard deviation of at least two replicate trials.

| Reaction Time $[\mathrm{h}]$ | Catalyst system |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathrm{bpy} 2: 1$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathbf{2 a} 2: 1$ |
|  | $7.9 \pm 0.0$ | $9.9 \pm 0.3$ | $17.0 \pm 0.5$ |
|  | $(1.16: 1.10: 1)$ | $(0.76: 1.00: 1)$ | $(1.06: 1.06: 1)$ |
| 24 | $38.1 \pm 3.5$ | $50.3 \pm 4.6$ | $83.1 \pm 1.1$ |
|  | $(1.19: 1.17: 1)$ | $(0.80: 1.08: 1)$ | $(0.89: 1.12: 1)$ |
| 48 | $41.4 \pm 0.8$ | $55.7 \pm 2.0$ | $84.9 \pm 0.9$ |
|  | $(1.21: 1.15: 1)$ | $(0.77: 1.06: 1)$ | $(0.89: 1.09: 1)$ |

Table 15. Calibrated combined GC yields and site-selectivity (o:m:p) of $\mathrm{EtO}_{2} \mathrm{CC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{OAc}$ regioisomers. Conditions: $\mathrm{PhCO}_{2} \mathrm{Et}(1.60 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.68 \mathrm{~g}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv), AcOH $(0.90 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.10 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}\left(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00\right.$ equiv), $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0$ $\mathrm{mg}, 22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), ligand ( $11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reported error is the standard deviation of at least two replicate trials.

| Reaction Time $[\mathrm{h}]$ | Catalyst system |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathrm{bpy} 2: 1$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathbf{2 a} 2: 1$ |
|  | $2.8 \pm 0.2$ | $5.5 \pm 0.2$ | $8.8 \pm 0.4$ |
|  | $(0.97: 2.13: 1)$ | $(0.62: 3.11: 1)$ | $(0.62: 3.49: 1)$ |
| 24 | $8.6 \pm 0.5$ | $18.9 \pm 0.9$ | $34.2 \pm 1.8$ |
|  | $(0.82: 3.44: 1)$ | $(0.49: 3.83: 1)$ | $(0.59: 3.87: 1)$ |
| 48 | $31.3 \pm 2.4$ | $60.3 \pm 2.4$ | $75.7 \pm 2.6$ |
|  | $(0.71: 3.58: 1)$ | $(0.52: 3.92: 1)$ | $(0.51: 3.84: 1)$ |

Table 16. Calibrated combined GC yields and site-selectivity (o:m:p) of $\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{OAc}$ regioisomers. Conditions: $\mathrm{PhCF}_{3}(1.38 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.64 \mathrm{~g}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv), AcOH ( 0.90 $\mathrm{mL}), \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.10 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}\left(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00\right.$ equiv), $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(5.0 \mathrm{mg}$, $22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), ligand ( $11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reported error is the standard deviation of at least two replicate trials.

| Reaction Time $[\mathrm{h}]$ | Catalyst system |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathrm{bpy} 2: 1$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathbf{2 a} 2: 1$ |
|  | $8.9 \pm 0.3$ | $11.6 \pm 0.3$ | $17.7 \pm 0.6$ |
|  | $(0.65: 3.20: 1)$ | $(0.45: 3.19: 1)$ | $(0.27: 2.67: 1)$ |
| 48 | $12.6 \pm 0.9$ | $21.8 \pm 0.3$ | $43.2 \pm 1.2$ |
|  | $(0.46: 3.03: 1)$ | $(0.29: 3.19: 1)$ | $(0.14: 2.81: 1)$ |
| 72 | $17.2 \pm 0.2$ | $30.6 \pm 2.1$ | $49.3 \pm 1.2$ |
|  | $(0.37: 3.20: 1)$ | $(0.22: 3.25: 1)$ | $(0.14: 2.76: 1)$ |

Table 17. Calibrated combined GC yields and site-selectivity ( $\alpha: \beta$ ) of $\mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{OAc}$ regioisomers. Conditions: 1,2-Dichlorobenzene ( $1.26 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.65 \mathrm{~g}, 11.2 \mathrm{mmol}, 10.0$ equiv), $\mathrm{AcOH}(0.90 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Ac}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.10 \mathrm{~mL}), \mathrm{Phl}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(361 \mathrm{mg}, 1.12 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.00$ equiv), $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAC}) 2\left(5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 22.4 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 2.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%\right.$ ), ligand ( $11.2 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 1.0 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ ), $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reported error is the standard deviation of at least two replicate trials.

| Reaction Time $[\mathrm{h}]$ | Catalyst system |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathrm{bpy} 2: 1$ | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2} / \mathbf{2 a} 2: 1$ |
|  | $10.5 \pm 1.1$ | $23.7 \pm 0.0$ | $32.9 \pm 0.6$ |
|  | $(0.65: 1)$ | $(0.38: 1)$ | $(0.40: 1)$ |
| 48 | $25.9 \pm 0.7$ | $42.5 \pm 3.1$ | $51.7 \pm 0.1$ |
|  | $(0.61: 1)$ | $(0.38: 1)$ | $(0.39: 1)$ |
| 72 | $46.5 \pm 0.2$ | $76.0 \pm 1.0$ | $70.5 \pm 0.6$ |
|  | $(0.62: 1)$ | $(0.37: 1)$ | $(0.36: 1)$ |
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