## ChemComm

## **COMMUNICATION**

Cite this: *Chem. Commun.*, 2023, 59, 7251

Received 22nd March 2023, Accepted 16th May 2023

DOI: 10.1039/d3cc01411h

[rsc.li/chemcomm](https://rsc.li/chemcomm)

Redox flexibility in a germanium hydride manifold: hydrogen shuttling via oxidative addition and reductive elimination†

Alexa Caise, Jamie Hicks,  $\bullet$  Andreas Heilmann and Simon Aldridge  $\bullet$  \*

We report the synthesis of a trimetallic mixed-valence  $Ge(1)/Ge(1)/$ Ge(III) trihydride, which presents a structural novel motif among systems of the type  $(XMH)_n$  (M = group 14 metal). In terms of reactivity (Ar<sup>NiPr2</sup>)GeGe(Ar<sup>NiPr2</sup>)(H)Ge(Ar<sup>NiPr2</sup>)(H)<sub>2</sub> can act as a source of both the Ge(II) and Ge(IV) hydrides via Ge-H reductive elimination from the central metal centre involving two different regiochemistries.

Subvalent germanium hydrides (*i.e.* hydrides in formal metal oxidation states  $\langle 4 \rangle$  have played a central role in establishing methodologies for bond activation and catalysis by main group compounds.<sup>1</sup> The digermyne  $(Ar^{Dipp}Ge)_2$  reported by Power and co-workers in 2005 (where  $Ar^{Dipp} = 2.6-Dipp_2C_6H_3$  and Dipp =  $2.6$ -<sup>i</sup>Pr<sub>2</sub>C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>) offered the first example of facile main group dihydrogen activation, generating a mixture of hydride products  $(Ar^{Dipp}GeH_3, (Ar^{Dipp}GeH_2)_2$  and  $(Ar^{Dipp}GeH)_2)$  depending on the reaction stoichiometry.2 Orbital comparisons with transition metal complexes offered a rationale for initial  $H_2$  activation occurring at one of the germanium centres in  $(Ar^{Dipp}Ge)_{2}$ ,<sup>3</sup> and structural validation of this type of unsymmetrical  $Ge(i)/Ge(m)$  mixedvalence dihydride was subsequently obtained for  ${Ar^*(Me_3Si)N}Ge$  $Ge(H)<sub>2</sub>{N(SiMe<sub>3</sub>)Ar<sup>*</sup>}$  (where  $Ar<sup>*</sup> = 4-Me-2,6-(Ph<sub>2</sub>CH)<sub>2</sub>C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>2</sub>)<sup>4</sup>$  Twocoordinate  $Ge(n)$  hydride systems can be accessed by employing an even greater degree of steric bulk, as in the case of (for example)  ${Ar^*($ ( $f^Buo$ )<sub>3</sub>Si)N}GeH,<sup>5</sup> and concurrent access to a Ge-H bond and a vacant coordination site is thought to be important in related systems which act as very active catalysts for carbonyl hydroboration.<sup>6</sup>

In the presence of less sterically demanding X ligands, aggregation of [XGeH] monomers is common (Scheme 1); dimerization via Ge $=$ Ge bond formation is prevalent for germanium (type II systems),  $2,4b,7$  while H-bridged structures of the type  $X\text{Sn}(\mu\text{-H})_2\text{Sn}X$  are known for heavier tin congeners.<sup>7a,8,9</sup> Unsymmetrical  $Ge(i)/Ge(m)$  systems (type III) can also *formally* be regarded as a product assembled from two [XGeH] monomers via Ge–H oxidative addition at a  $Ge(\pi)$  centre.

In recent work we have been interested in the use in lowvalent group 14 chemistry of hemi-labile pincer ligands, 2,6-  $(R_2NCH_2)_2C_6H_3$  (R = Et, <sup>i</sup>Pr), and have shown how these can be exploited to control catenation, and to effect reversible E–H bond activation and the reversible uptake of  $CO_2$ .<sup>10</sup> Here we show that these supporting ligands can be used to support a novel mixed-valence variant of  $[XGeH]_n$ , in the form of a trimetallic aggregate of type  $(X)$ Ge-Ge $(X)(H)$ -Ge $(X)(H)_2$ . This system formally contains  $Ge(i)$ ,  $Ge(i)$  and  $Ge(m)$  centres, and, remarkably, can act as a source of both  $Ge(\theta)$  and  $Ge(\theta)$ hydrides by reductive Ge–H elimination from the central metal centre with two different regio-chemistries. As such, it offers a demonstration of unprecedented redox flexibility within a germanium hydride manifold. **COMMUNICATION**<br> **CO** Check for underse **Redox flexibility in a germanium hydride manifoliality**<br> **Redox flexibility in a germanium hydride manifoliality**<br> **CO** Check for unders and the section of the section of the secti

> The reaction of  $Ar^{NiPr2}$ GeCl (1;  $Ar^{NiPr2} = 2.6-(PiPr_2NCH_2)_2$ .  $C_6H_3$ <sup>10a</sup> with K[HBEt<sub>3</sub>] in toluene at room temperature over a period of 3 h gives rise to a single new species, 2 (Scheme 2), characterized by  ${}^{1}H$  and  ${}^{13}C$  NMR spectra indicating a low degree of molecular symmetry. $\ddagger$  The  $^{13}$ C spectrum, for example, features four <sup>i</sup>Pr CH and eight  ${}^{\mathrm{i}}$ Pr CH<sub>3</sub> signals, together with



Scheme 1 Conceptual link between various isomeric forms of (putative) germanium(ii) hydrides.



Inorganic Chemistry Laboratory, Department of Chemistry, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3QR, UK. E-mail: simon.aldridge@chem.ox.ac.uk † Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Full synthetic/characterizing date' representative spectra; CIFs. CCDC 2242325–2242328. For ESI and crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format see DOI: [https://doi.org/10.](https://doi.org/10.1039/d3cc01411h) [1039/d3cc01411h](https://doi.org/10.1039/d3cc01411h)



Scheme 2 Synthesis of trinuclear germanium hydride 2 from either Ge– Cl or Ge–O containing precursors via metathesis with B–H bonds.

four resonances due to the methylene carbons of the  $-CH<sub>2</sub>N$ tethers. By means of comparison, the corresponding  $^{13}$ C spectrum at room temperature for 'simple' mononuclear species (such as 1 itself) $^{10a}$  typically features one  $^{1}$ Pr CH, two  $^{1}$ Pr CH $_{3}$  and one –CH $_{2}$ N signals. In addition, the  ${}^{1}H$  NMR spectrum of the product contains three signals (each integrating to 1H) assigned to germanium-bound hydrogen atoms, namely doublets at  $\delta_{\rm H}$  = 4.70 and 4.88 (with coupling constants of 7.1 and 9.7 Hz, respectively) and a doublet of doublets at  $\delta_{\text{H}}$  = 4.99 (J = 7.1, 9.7 Hz). 2 can also be prepared from precursors containing Ge–O bonds via metathesis reactions with pinacolborane. Thus, reactions of the naphthoxide derivative  $Ar^{NiPr2}Ge(ONaph-1)$  (3) or the formate complex  $Ar^{NiPr2}Ge(OC(O)H)$  (4) with HBpin yield  $(1-NaphO)$ Bpin and HC(O)OBpin, respectively,<sup>11</sup> together with the same  $Ar^{NiPr2}$ Ge-containing species. The identity of the product was definitively established by a combination of elemental microanalysis, IR spectroscopy and X-ray crystallography (Fig. 1). Communication<br>
Published on 16 May 2023. The computer of the commons are at the common and the common state o

The solid-state structure shows 2 to be a trinuclear species,  $(Ar^{NiPr2})GeGe(Ar^{NiPr2})(H)Ge(Ar^{NiPr2})(H)_2$ , featuring a chain of three metal atoms, two of which engage in no short contacts  $(<$  4 Å) with the amine donors of the pendant ligand arms. The third germanium centre,  $Ge(1)$ , is coordinated by a single amine donor, with the associated Ge–N distance  $(2.166(1)$  Å) being similar to those found for the terminal, N-donor 'capped' metal centres in di- or tetra-nuclear Ge(I) chains featuring the same (or related) pincer ligands.<sup>10a</sup> The Ge(1)-Ge(2) separation  $(2.531(1)$  Å) is consistent with a relatively long single bond (cf. 2.5052(3) Å for the corresponding linkage in  $(Ar^{NiPr2}Ge)_4$ and ca. 2.40 Å for the sum of the covalent radii.<sup>10a,12</sup> The lack of coordinated amine arms at either Ge(2) or Ge(3) suggests the presence of metal-bound hydrogen atoms, and notwithstanding the uncertainties in the location of hydrogens by X-ray crystallography, the presence of two H atoms at  $Ge(3)$  and one at  $Ge(2)$ is consistent with (i) peaks located in the difference Fourier map; (ii) the presence of three Ge–H stretching bands (at 1981, 2003 and 2042  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) in the solid-state IR spectrum of 2; and (iii) with the coupling patterns observed for the three germanium bound hydrogens in the <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of 2. A similar pattern of



Fig. 1 Molecular structure of 2 in the solid state as determined by X-ray crystallography. <sup>i</sup>Pr groups shown in wireframe format and most hydrogen atoms omitted for clarity; thermal ellipsoids plotted at the 40% probability level. Key bond lengths (Å): Ge(1)–Ge(2) 2.531(1), Ge(2)–Ge(3) 2.433(1), Ge(1)–N(1) 2.166(1), Ge(1)–C(1) 1.996(1), Ge(2)–C(21) 1.991(2), Ge(3)–C(41) 1.973(1), Ge(2)–H(2) 1.45(2), Ge(3)–H 1.43(2), 1.47(2).

resonances (two doublets and a doublet of doublets) has been reported previously for  $\{(\text{HCDippN})_2B\}Ge(H)_2Ge(H)\{N(SiMe_3)_2\}$  ${B(NDippCH)_2}$ <sup>12</sup> with the larger doublet splitting (9.7 Hz for 2, *cf.* 12.0 Hz) being attributed to the geminal  $^2J_{HH}$  coupling, and the smaller one (7.1 Hz for 2, cf. 2.8 Hz) to the trans  $\beta_{\rm HH}$  coupling. The two compounds feature similar alignments of the Ge–H bonds across the Ge<sub>2</sub> unit in the solid state  $(2: H(2)-Ge(2)-Ge(3)-H(3))$ torsion angles of 166.1, 77.2°, *cf.* 175.6 and 46.7°).<sup>13</sup>

Assignment of formal oxidation states to the metal centres in 2, implies the presence of a central  $Ge(n)$  unit (labelled  $Ge(2)$ ), flanked by  $Ge(i)$  and  $Ge(m)$  centres bearing zero and two hydrogen atoms, respectively (i.e.  $Ge(1)$  and  $Ge(3)$ ). Such as description is also consistent with the shorter Ge(2)–Ge(3) distance  $(2.433(1)$  Å, cf. 2.531(1) Å for Ge(1)–Ge(2)), reflecting the smaller covalent radius associated with  $Ge(m)$  over  $Ge(1)$ .

The structure of 2 represents a novel motif added to the family of known isomeric hydride systems of the type  $(XGEH)_n$  $(X = \text{aryl}, \text{amido etc.})$ . In addition to monomeric and Ge=Ge bonded digermene Ge( $\pi$ ) systems (e.g. I and II, Scheme 1),<sup>2,4b,5,7,9</sup> unsymmetrical Ge(I)/Ge(III) derivatives of the type  $XGeGe(H)_2X$  $(m)$  have been postulated as key intermediates in the activation of  $H_2$  by digermynes,<sup>3</sup> and have been structurally characterized for  $X = N(SiMe<sub>3</sub>)Ar<sup>*</sup><sup>4</sup> Conceptually, type III systems could be$ regarded as dimeric species, (XGeH)<sub>2</sub>, formed via formal oxidative addition of the Ge–H bond of one monomeric hydridogermylene to the germanium centre of another (Scheme 1). By extension, a subsequent Ge–H activation step at the unsaturated metal centre of the resulting (germyl)germylene could then generate a species akin to 2, featuring a linear chain of three Ge centres. With this in mind – and given the reversibility demonstrated recently for E–H oxidative addition at related Sn centres<sup>10b</sup> – we were interested to probe the scope for 2 to act as a source of monomeric germanium hydride species. Given the presence of both  $Ge(i)$  and  $Ge(m)$  centres in the terminal positions in 2, we hypothesized that this system might act as a source of germanium hydride moieties in different formal oxidation states via Ge–H reductive elimination from



Scheme 3 Potential Ge–H reductive elimination processes leading to the cleavage of 2.

the central metal centre occurring via different regio-chemistries (Scheme 3).

In the case of related tin( $\pi$ ) systems, it has been shown that reaction with  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  (to give a tin formate complex) offers a viable route for trapping hydride species of the type  $Ar^{NiPr2}SnH.^{10b}$ With this in mind, we examined the reactivity of 2 towards  $CO<sub>2</sub>$ , aiming to probe the viability of the trinuclear framework to act as a synthon for  $[Ar^{NiPr2}GeH]$ . In the event, this reaction



Scheme 4 Chemically reversible cleavage of 2 into Ge(II) products by the insertion of CO<sub>2</sub> into Ge-H bonds.



Fig. 2 Molecular structure of 4 in the solid state as determined by X-ray crystallography. <sup>i</sup>Pr groups shown in wireframe format and most hydrogen atoms omitted for clarity; thermal ellipsoids plotted at the 40% probability level. Key bond lengths (Å): Ge(1)–C(1) 1.993(2), Ge(1)–O(1) 1.952(1), O(1)– C(21) 1.273(2), C(21)–O(2) 1.223(3), Ge(1)–N 2.341(1), 2.832(1).

proceeds rapidly and quantitatively at room temperature to generate the formate complex  $Ar^{NiPr2}Ge\{OC(O)H\}$  (4; Scheme 4). The same compound can also be generated via the metathesis reaction between  $Ar^{NiPr2}$ GeCl and K[O<sub>2</sub>CH], and its molecular structure (and  $\kappa^1$  coordination mode of the formate ligand) confirmed crystallographically (Fig. 2). Interestingly, while the formation of 4 in this way is consistent with the idea of 2 acting as the synthetic equivalent of three molecules of  $Ar^{NiPr2}$ GeH, it is noteworthy that this reaction is chemically reversible, such that 4 can be re-converted into 2 (and  $HC(O)OBpin)$  by the action of pinacolborane.

Ge–H reductive elimination from 2 in the opposite sense to generate a Ge(IV) hydride species can also be demonstrated (Schemes 3 and 5). Thus, the reaction of 2 with the hydride abstraction agent  $[Ph_3C][B(C_6F_5)_4]$  in 1,2-difluorobenzene leads to precipitation of the insoluble Ge(1) tetramer  $(Ar^{NiPr2}Ge)_4$ ,  $10a$ accompanied by the formation of the cation  $[Ar^{NiPr2}GeH_2]^+$ , as the  $[B(C_6F_5)_4]$ <sup>-</sup> salt (5; Scheme 5). 5 has been characterized by standard spectroscopic methods and its structure in the solid state confirmed by X-ray crystallography (Fig. 3). The presence of two germanium-bound hydrogen atoms within an overall trigonal bipyramidal metal coordination environment is implied by the presence of (i) a single resonance (integrating to 2H) in the  $^1\mathrm{H}$  NMR spectrum at  $\delta_\mathrm{H}$  = 5.92 ppm and (ii) bands due to Ge-H stretching modes at 2162 and 2179  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  in the IR spectrum of solid 5. The bond lengths associated with the germanium centre  $(d(Ge(1)-C(1)) = 1.895(2)$  Å,  $Ge(1)-N$ 2.263(2), 2.272(1) Å) are somewhat shorter than those found in (for example) 1, presumably reflecting the smaller size and greater Lewis acidity of  $Ge(w)$  over  $Ge(u)$ , and the effect of the overall cationic charge.

In conclusion, we report the synthesis of a trimetallic mixedvalence  $Ge(i)/Ge(i)/Ge(m)$  trihydride, the structure of which represents a novel motif among systems of the type  $(XMH)_n$  $(M = \text{group } 14 \text{ metal})$ .  $(Ar^{\text{NiPr2}})GeGe(Ar^{\text{NiPr2}})(H)Ge(Ar^{\text{NiPr2}})(H)_2$ (2) can be viewed conceptually as being formed from monomeric [(Ar<sup>NiPr2</sup>)GeH] units by successive Ge-H oxidative addition processes occurring at  $Ge(n)$ , via the intermediacy of the (germyl)germylene,  $(Ar^{NiPr2})GeGe(Ar^{NiPr2})(H)_2$ . Consistent with this idea, 2 can act as a source of the  $[(Ar^{NiPr2})GeH]$  fragment in reactions with  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  (generating the formate  $Ar^{NiPr2}Ge\{OC(O)H\}$ , 4),



Scheme 5 Cleavage of 2 leading to the formation of a  $Ge(w)$  dihydride cation via reaction with  $[Ph_3C][B(C_6F_5)_4]$ .



Fig. 3 Molecular structure of 5 in the solid state as determined by X-ray crystallography. <sup>i</sup>Pr groups shown in wireframe format and solvent molecule/most hydrogen atoms omitted for clarity; thermal ellipsoids plotted at the 40% probability level. Key bond lengths (Å): Ge(1)–C(1) 1.895(2), Ge(1)– H 1.46(2), 1.49(2), Ge(1)–N 2.263(2), 2.272(1).

and 4 can be re-converted back into 2 via Ge–O/B–H metathesis with pinacolborane. On the other hand, Ge–H reductive elimination from 2 occurring with a different regiochemistry can be used as a source of the Ge(IV) hydride  $(Ar^{NiPr2})$ GeH<sub>3</sub>, which undergoes hydride abstraction with  $[Ph_3C][B(C_6F_5)_4]$  to generate the trigonal bipyramidal cation  $[Ar^{NiPr2}GeH_2]^+$ . The chemically reversible and regiochemically flexible nature of this Ge–H activation chemistry

therefore facilitates unprecedented redox flexibility within a germanium hydride manifold.

AC carried out the synthetic experiments and spectroscopic characterization of new compounds; AH and JH carried out the crystallographic measurements; SA managed the project and wrote the manuscript.

## Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

## Notes and references

‡ Synthetic and characterizing data for new compounds can be found in the ESI.† Crystallographic data for compounds 2, 3, 4 and 5 can be obtained from the CCDC (citing reference numbers 2242325–2242328).

- 1 For a recent review of main group hydride chemistry, see: M. M. D. Roy, A. A. Omaña, A. S. S. Wilson, M. S. Hill, S. Aldridge and E. Rivard, Chem. Rev., 2021, 121, 12784–12965.
- 2 G. H. Spikes, J. C. Fettinger and P. P. Power, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2005, 127, 12232–12233.
- 3 P. P. Power, Nature, 2010, 463, 171–177.
- 4 (a) J. Li, C. Schenk, C. Goedecke, G. Frenking and C. Jones, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2011, 133, 18622–18625. For a related system formed in the presence of a Lewis base, see: (b) A. F. Richards, A. D. Phillips, M. M. Olmstead and P. P. Power, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2003, 125, 3204–3205.
- 5 T. J. Hadlington, B. Schwarze, E. I. Izgorodina and C. Jones, Chem. Commun., 2015, 51, 6854–6857.
- 6 T. J. Hadlington, M. Hermann, G. Frenking and C. Jones, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2014, 136, 3028–3031.
- 7 (a) T. J. Hadlington, M. Hermann, J. Li, G. Frenking and C. Jones, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2013, 52, 10199–10203; (b) J. A. Kelly, M. Juckel, T. J. Hadlington, I. Fernández, G. Frenking and C. Jones, Chem. – Eur. J., 2019, 25, 2773–2785.
- 8 (a) E. Rivard, R. C. Fischer, R. Wolf, Y. Peng, W. A. Merrill, N. D. Schley, Z. Zhu, L. Pu, J. C. Fettinger, S. J. Teat, I. Nowik, R. H. Herber, N. Takagi, S. Nagase and P. P. Power, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2007, 129, 16197–16208; (b) Y. Peng, B. D. Ellis, X. Wang and P. P. Power, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2008, 130, 12268–12269.
- 9 For a more wide-ranging theoretical discussion of  $M(\Pi)$  hydrides of Ge and Sn see: G. Trinquier, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1990, 112, 2130–2137.
- 10 (a) A. Caise, L. P. Griffin, A. Heilmann, C. McManus, J. Campos and S. Aldridge, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2021, 60, 15606–15612; (b) A. Caise, A. E. Crumpton, P. Vasko, J. Hicks, C. McManus, N. H. Rees and S. Aldridge, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2022, 61, e202114926; (c) A. Caise, L. P. Griffin, A. Heilmann, C. McManus, J. Campos and S. Aldridge, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2022, 61, e202117496. For examples of the chemistry of related ligands see: (d) R. Jambor, B. Kašná, K. N. Kirschner, M. Schürmann and K. Jurkschat, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2008, 47, 1650–1653; (e) M. Novák, M. Bouška, L. Dostál, A. Růžička, A. Hoffmann, S. Herres-Pawlis and R. Jambor, Chem. – Eur. J., 2015, 21, 7820-7829; (f) M. Novák, L. Dostál, Z. Růžičková, S. Mebs, J. Beckmann and R. Jambor, Organometallics, 2019, 38, 2403–2407.
- 11 (a) C. Bibal, S. Mazières, H. Gornitzka and C. Couret, Polyhedron, 2002, 21, 2827–2834; (b) E. A. Romero, J. L. Peltier, R. Jazzar and G. Bertrand, Chem. Commun., 2016, 52, 10563–10565.
- 12 B. Cordero, V. Gómez, A. E. Platero-Prats, M. Revés, J. Echeverría, E. Cremades, F. Barragán and S. Alvarez, Dalton Trans., 2008, 2832–2838.
- 13 M. Usher, A. V. Protchenko, A. Rit, J. Campos, E. Kolychev, R. Tirfoin and S. Aldridge, Chem. – Eur. J., 2016, 22, 11685–11698.