Dalton Transactions

CORRECTION

View Article Online
View Journal | View Issue

Cite this: *Dalton Trans.*, 2019, **48**, 13491

Correction: New light on an old debate: does the RCN–$PtCl_2$ bond include any back-donation? RCN ← $PtCl_2$ backbonding *vs.* the IR $\nu_{C\equiv N}$ blue-shift dichotomy in organonitriles–platinum(II) complexes. A thorough density functional theory – energy decomposition analysis study

Girolamo Casella,*[a,b] Célia Fonseca Guerra,[c,d] Silvia Carlotto,[e] Paolo Sgarbossa,[f] Roberta Bertani[f] and Maurizio Casarin[e]

DOI: 10.1039/c9dt90189b

rsc.li/dalton

Correction for 'New light on an old debate: does the RCN–$PtCl_2$ bond include any back-donation? RCN ← $PtCl_2$ backbonding *vs.* the IR $\nu_{C\equiv N}$ blue-shift dichotomy in organonitriles–platinum(II) complexes. A thorough density functional theory – energy decomposition analysis study' by Girolamo Casella *et al.*, *Dalton Trans.*, 2019, DOI: 10.1039/c9dt02440a.

(i) In the "Abstract" section

Erratum

"…RCN–X (X = **H+, alkaline, Lewis acids**)".

Corrigendum

"…RCN–X (X = **H+, Lewis acids**)".

(ii) In the "Introduction" section

Reference 6b, instead of reference 1, must be cited at the end of this sentence.

Erratum

"The explanation of this behavior based solely on the σ/π donation/backdonation orbital interaction model discussed earlier, would imply the lack of any N ← Pt π back-donation, or at least the occurrence of such interaction which cannot overcome the effect of the N → Pt σ donation".[1]

Corrigendum

"The explanation of this behavior based solely on the σ/π donation/backdonation orbital interaction model discussed earlier, would imply the lack of any N ← Pt π back-donation, or at least the occurrence of such interaction which cannot overcome the effect of the N → Pt σ donation".[6b]

(iii) In the "EDA_NOCV analysis" section

Erratum

"The results are given in Table 4 and indicate that the total N ← Pt π back-donation represents about 30% of the total ΔE_{Orb} term and ranges from 32% to 37% with respect to **the N → Pt σ** interaction which means that the orbital interaction…"

Corrigendum

"The results are given in Table 4 and indicate that the total N ← Pt π back-donation represents about 30% of the total ΔE_{Orb} term and ranges from 32% to 37% with respect to the **total N-Pt σ + π** interactions which means that the orbital interaction…"

[a]*Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra e del Mare, Università degli Studi di Palermo, Via Archirafi, 22, 90123 Palermo, Italy. E-mail: girolamo.casella@unipa.it*
[b]*Consorzio Interuniversitario di Ricerca in Chimica dei Metalli nei Sistemi Biologici (C.I.R.C.M.S.B.) – Piazza Umberto I, 70121 Bari, Italy*
[c]*Department of Theoretical Chemistry and Amsterdam Center for Multiscale Modeling, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1083, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands*
[d]*Leiden Institute of Chemistry, Gorlaeus Laboratories, Leiden University, Einsteinweg 55, 2333 CC Leiden, The Netherlands*
[e]*Dipartimento di Scienze Chimiche, Università degli Studi di Padova, via F. Marzolo 1, 35131 Padova, Italy*
[f]*Dipartimento di Ingegneria Industriale, Università degli Studi di Padova, via F. Marzolo 9, 35131 Padova, Italy*

(iv) In the (a) "Infrared properties of the CN bond" and (b) "Conclusion" sections

Reference 24 in the following sentences should be replaced by ref.19, i.e.:

(a) Erratum

"These results indicate that the νC≡N blue-shift in these complexes is not correlated to the C≡N bond strength, in agreement with what is already reported for some Pt(II,IV)–N systems, including the herein investigated *trans*-1".[24]

Corrigendum

"These results indicate that the νC≡N blue-shift in these complexes is not correlated to the C≡N bond strength, in agreement with what is already reported for some $Pt^{(II,IV)}$–N systems, including the herein investigated *trans*-1".[19]

(b) Erratum

"In this context, EDA-NOCV further confirmed that the νC≡N was not correlated to the C≡N bond strength as already previously found".[24]

Corrigendum

"In this context, EDA-NOCV further confirmed that the νC≡N was not correlated to the C≡N bond strength as already previously found".[19]

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.