ChemComm

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the **Information for Authors**.

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard <u>Terms & Conditions</u> and the <u>Ethical guidelines</u> still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



www.rsc.org/chemcomm

Chemical Communications

COMMUNICATION

Cp*Co(IPr): Synthesis and Reactivity of an Unsaturated Co(I) Complex

Received XXth August 2015, Accepted 00th XXXXX 20xx

J. Andjaba,^a J. W. Tye,^b Pony Yu,^c Iraklis Pappas,^c and C. A. Bradley^a

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/

Synthesis of coordinatively unsaturated Cp*Co(IPr) (2), is accomplished by addition of free N-heterocyclic carbene IPr to $[(Cp*Co)_2-\mu-(\eta^4:\eta^4-toluene)]$ (1). Stoichiometric reactivity is consistent with a 16 electron species, as 2 undergoes ligand addition/NHC displacement and reversible reaction with dihydrogen. Cp*Co(IPr) represents an elusive example of a stable Cp*CoL fragment.

Low valent metals are often utilized to break an array of bonds in small molecules, allowing for further elaboration to a range of value added products. Such strategies have proven effective for both the stoichiometric and catalytic functionalisation of carbon dioxide,¹ dinitrogen,² and hydrocarbons.³ In particular, Ir mediated alkane dehydrogenation has permitted access to a variety of potentially useful transformations,⁴ including dehydroaromatisation to produce substituted benzenes⁵ and tandem catalysed alkane metathesis.⁶ Although such Rh and Ir catalysed C-H activations with a range of substrates are now well established,⁷⁻¹⁰ preparation of analogous Co complexes capable of performing similar chemistry has lagged. Recent work provides promise in the area, as examples of intramolecular sp^2 and sp^3 C-H activations with cobalt are now well established.^{11,12} Catalytic sp² C-H activation and functionalisation of aromatic substrates is also an expanding field.¹³ Moreover, reports of cationic Cp*Co(III) mediated catalysis involving sp^2 C-H and C-C bond activation and functionalisation have recently appeared.^{14,15}

The difficult task of activating alkane C-H bonds with first row metals is likely a result of a combination of factors, involving both the propensity for these metals to participate in one electron redox processes and spin state issues not typically encountered with second and third row congeners. Classic studies by Bergman and coworkers illustrate these subtle dynamics and demonstrate that access to unsaturated low valent metals is not the only prerequisive for C-H activation.¹⁶ For example, in the series of Cp*ML (M = Co, Rh, and Ir, L = CO) species, generated at 173 K in liquid Kr matrice, the Rh and Ir intermediates readily react with aliphatic C-H bonc while the corresponding Co version undergoes secondary reactivit rather than binding and cleaving carbon-hydrogen bono Computational studies suggest this difference in reactivity is cause 1 by the predicted triplet nature of the Co intermediate, resulting in 2 high barrier to spin crossover which prevents productive reaction with a singlet C-H bond.^{17,18} Since these seminal studies, others have encountered similar issues while accessing unsaturated Co) species, with lack of reactivity with carbon-hydrogen bonds again being attributed to the triplet nature of the complex.¹⁹

Our groups initial interest in Cp*CoL fragments stemmed from attempts to generate the Cp*Co(η^2 -fumarate) fragment, as a related species was noted as a key intermediate engendering air and water stability to Co catalysed [2+2+2] cycloaddition reaction of alkynes.²⁰ Upon addition of dimethyl fumarate to [(Cp*Co)_{2⁻F} (η^4 : η^4 -toluene)] (1),²¹ sp² C-H activation of the fumarate was observed to form a bridging dicobalt hydride complex.²² As the potential mechanism implied access to a 16 electron fragment prior to C-H activation, this suggested further investigation of analogu s of the Bergman system were in order. Such study could permit the observation or isolation of a Cp*CoL fragment, providing a deep r understanding of the nature of the electronic structure and sm molecule reactivity of these species.

Here we report the isolation, characterisation, and reactivity such a Cp*CoL complex, where L is the N-heterocyclic carber. ligand 1,3-bis(2,6-diisopropylphenyl)imidazole-2-ylidene (IPr).^{23,24} Cp*Co(IPr) (2) has been characterised by numerous meth ds, including X-ray crystallography and mass spectrometry. Computational studies further support the observed triplet groun a state of the molecule. Reactivity of 2 is consistent with ϵ unsaturated Co(I) species, as the complex undergoes ligar addition/carbene displacement as well as reversible reaction wit' dihydrogen. Complex 2 provides a robust entry point into th. chemistry of Cp*CoL fragments, in stark contrast to the fleetin nature of Cp*Co(CO).



^{a.} Department of Science, Mount St. Mary's University, Emmitsburg, MD 21727.

Email: cbradley@msmary.edu; Phone: 301 447 5285; Fax: 301 447 5021.

^b Department of Chemistry, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306.

^{c.} Department of Chemistry, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544.

Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) available: Additional experimental and computational details, selected NMR spectra, and X-ray data for $\bf 2$ and $\bf 3$. See DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

COMMUNICATION



Scheme 1 Synthesis of Cp*Co(IPr) (2).

Stirring **1** with N-heterocyclic carbene ligand IPr in aromatic solvent results in evolution of toluene and formation of the desired 16 electron Cp*Co(IPr) complex **2** (Scheme 1). Monitoring the reaction by ¹H NMR spectroscopy in benzene-*d*₆ reveals that only **2** is formed even in the presence of excess IPr, likely a result of the steric demands of the NHC ligand. Complex **2** displays a broadened paramagnetic ¹H NMR spectrum with wider peak dispersion (~30 ppm) than diamagnetic molecules. This is further corroborated by solution magnetic susceptibility studies (Evans method) performed in benzene-*d*₆,²⁵ with a μ_{eff} = 2.6(1) μ_{B} for **2** at 25 °C. Though this μ_{eff} value is lower than expected for two unpaired electrons, a related bis(indenyl) cobaltate anion gave similar measurements.²⁶ LIFDI mass spectrometry²⁷ further establishes the composition of **2**, with a parent ion observed at m/z = 582.

X-ray quality crystals of **2** were grown from an ether:pentane mixture at -30 °C and supports the formation of Cp*Co(IPr) (Figure 1). Pertinent Co-Cp* metrics in the molecule are within ranges observed in other known Cp*Co(I) complexes.²⁸⁻³⁰ The Co-C_{IPr} distances of 1.943(2) and 1.946(2) Å are slightly elongated relative to comparable bonds found in the related Cp*Co(ⁱPr₂Im)(η^2 -ethylene) complex.³¹ Of note, the Cp*(centroid)-Co-C_{IPr} angle deviates from linearity, by 18° and 20°, in the two molecules in the asymmetric unit. This bent ground state structure is consistent with calculations performed on **2** (*vide infra*). Furthermore, **2** is structurally similar to the Cp*Ni(IPr) analogue recently prepared,³² suggesting the bent structure is an energetic minimum balancing the steric congestion imparted by the Cp* and IPr ligands.

A geometry optimisation was performed on 2, using the coordinates determined from the X-ray structure study. Both singlet and triplet states were computed. In addition, a "linear" version of 2 (with an optimised Cp*(centroid)-Co-C_{IPr} angle of 174°) was also geometry optimised for both the singlet and triplet states. The energies of these structures were calculated using the OLYP functional, to avoid overestimation of triplet energetics.^{33,34} Experimental and calculated metrics for the bent geometry are in reasonable agreement, with a calculated Cp*(centroid)Co-C_{IPr} angle of 159° in the bent triplet. Energetically, there is a strong preference for the triplet state in each geometry, with singlettriplet gaps of >14 kcal/mol in both cases. Comparing the triplet states of each geometry, the bent triplet, experimentally observed, has a slightly lower energy than the corresponding linear triplet. Examining the population analysis of the four structures indicates there is some degree of back donation from ligand to metal, as the α HOMO-11 orbital is composed of 19% C(carbene) and 17% Co d orbital for the bent triplet structure. The other calculated structures also displayed similar parentages for this orbital.

Chemical Communications

Figure 1. Molecular structure of **2** at 30% probability ellipsoids. Hydrogen atoms omitted for clarity (1 of 2 molecules in the asymmetric unit shown). Selected bond distances/ranges (in Å): C Cp* distances: 2.09-2.17, Co-C_{IPr} distances: 1.943(2)/1.946(2).

The small molecule reactivity of 2 is further consistent with 216 electron complex. Addition of excess carbon monoxide to 2 result in immediate reaction, as monitored by ¹H NMR spectroscopy ---provide the mixed ligand complex Cp*Co(IPr)(CO) (3) (Scheme 2). Complex 3, as expected for an 18 electron complex, is diamagnetic displaying a bound CO resonance at 220.48 ppm in the ¹³C NN 3 spectrum recorded in benzene- d_6 . The carbonyl is terminal, based on the observed CO stretch at 1884 cm⁻¹ in the IR spectru n recorded in pentane, in accord with the carbonyl stretches seen in Cp^{Rn}Co(ⁱPr₂Im)(CO).^{35,36} Further establishment of the structure **C** was provided by an X-ray structure determination, performed C crystals grown from ether:pentane at -30 °C (Figure 2). Compour metrics are within standard ranges for known IPr and Cp*Co() complexes.^{11,28-30} Of particular interest is the angle formed betwee Co-C_{IPr}- NHC_{centroid} of 167°. This differs significantly from **2** ar Cp*Co(ⁱPr₂Im)(CO)³¹ which have analogous angles of 175° and 180 respectively. The observed canting of the NHC core in 3 is like necessary to accommodate the additional carbonyl ligand. If suc significant geometric distortion is required to bind two ligands, this may help explain substitution chemistry observed with other n re sterically encumbering small molecules (vide infra).

0 <u>00</u> 2 <u>0</u> -0	9	3 9-9-9 🗲
		3499-4
Bent Geometry	Lin	lear Geometry
Calculated geometry/	Calculated Energy	Relative Er .rgy
spin state of 2	(atomic units, au)	(kcal/m ِ ')
Bent(singlet)	-1694.81465710	14.3
Bent(triplet)	-16954.83750623	0.0
Linear(singlet)	-1694.80562651	20.0
Linear(triplet)	-1694.83418903	2.1

Table 1. Optimised structures (for triplet states only) an calculated total energies for **2**. Computational details: Gaussian 0. OLYP exchange/correlation functional with LANL2TZ+F on Co and 31g(d',p') on all other atoms.

Journal Name

COMMUNICATION



Figure 2. Molecular structure of **3** at 30% probability ellipsoids. Hydrogen atoms omitted for clarity. Selected bond distances/ranges (in Å): Co-Cp* distances: 2.05-2.12, Co-C(2) distance: 1.902(5), Co-C(1) distance: 1.695(4), C(1)-O(1) distance: 1.171(5). Selected bond angles (in °): C(1)-Co-C(2) angle: 88.93, Co-C(1)-O(1) angle: 177.44.



Scheme 2. Addition of carbon monoxide to 2.

Reactivity differences are observed when ${\bf 2}$ is exposed to other σ and π donors (Scheme 3). Weaker σ donors, such as 4-dimethylaminopyridine (DMAP), do not react even with heating. However, addition of excess trimethylphosphine results in reaction at 65 °C to provide $Cp*Co(PMe_3)_2$ (4) and free IPr. This is confirmed by ¹H and ¹³C NMR spectroscopy, and LIFDI mass spectrometry of the reaction mixture when compared to authentic samples of independently prepared 4 and IPr (ESI, Figure S12). Similar carbene displacement is observed, under ambient conditions, upon exposure of **2** to excess ethylene, generating IPr and Cp*Co(η^2 - $H_2C=CH_2)_2$ (5), which can again be confirmed by comparison to the spectroscopy of the known compounds. The observed substitution of a strong σ donor may result from the steric pressure imparted in the potential mixed ligand Cp*Co(IPr)L complexes, resulting in loss of free carbene. Interestingly, the carbene ligand in 3 is not displaced, even in the presence of excess CO at ambient temperature. This dramatic difference in carbene displacement with various L donors is under further investigation in our laboratory.

Besides ligand addition and substitution chemistry, a 16 electron Cp*Co(I) complex would be expected to participate in oxidative addition chemistry, as observed recently in stoichiometric reactivity of PNP Co pincer systems.³⁷ Exposure of **2** to four atm of dihydrogen results in immediate reaction to provide a diamagnetic product we currently identify as the compressed dihydride Cp*Co(IPr)H₂ (**2**-^cH₂) (Scheme 4), a result of oxidative addition of dihydrogen. In particular, an upfield shifted resonance, integrating to two hydrogens per molecule, is observed at -17.78 ppm in the ¹H NMR spectrum recorded in benzene-*d*₆. The peak is absent when **2**-^c**D**₂ is prepared upon addition of D₂ to **2**.



Scheme 3. Reactivity of 2 with σ and π type donors.





In our hands, it has proven difficult to isolate and full, characterise 2- $^{c}H_{2}$. Complete removal of the hydrogen gas and solvent results in immediate regeneration of 2. Efforts to freeze "solution, remove the hydrogen atmosphere in the headspace, and crystalize 2- $^{c}H_{2}$ has resulted only in isolation of 2. Attempts to identify Co-H/Co-D stretches by IR spectroscopy in 2- $^{c}H_{2}$ and 2- $^{c}D_{2}$ have also proven unsuccessful. To further distinguish between a dihydride and dihydrogen complex, 2 was exposed to H-D gas in an attempt to measure the H-D coupling constant of the isotopologu . Due to the broadness of the resonance (~ 40 Hz), the coupling in 2- $^{c}(HD)$ could not be definitively measured, even at Ic v temperature. Fortunately, a T₁(min) value of 91 ms, corresponding to an H-H distance of 1.38 Å, was recorded for the hydride.⁵⁴

Geometry optimisations were performed for singlet dihydride, singlet/triplet compressed dihydride (where the H-H distance was locked at 1.38 Å), and singlet/triplet dihydrogen complex. The lowest energy minima located were a singlet state cobalt(I) i dihydride complex and the singlet compressed dihydride (Table 2 ESI). These two structures were of comparable energy (within 2.5 kcal/mol of one another) and much closer in energy than the corresponding triplet structures, which lie more than 10 kcal/mol above the singlet states. These results are suggestive of the significant dihydride character of $2-{}^{c}H_{2}$ while highlighting the need for experimental data to accurately assign structure.

Thermolysis experiments with **2** were also performed in arom. solvents. Unfortunately, no thermal activation of C-H bonds habeen observed to date. Heating toluene solutions of **2** at 100 °C fr a week results in no discernible change, based on ¹H NM³ spectroscopy. This result is consistent with the large calculater singlet-triplet gap (*vide supra*) and further illustrates how issues spin continue to plague efforts to activate aliphatic C-H bonds wit¹ cobalt. Given the remarkable stability of **2**, we are currently



2-H ₂ (singlet)	 2-(η²-H₂) (triplet) 	
Complex	Calculated Energy (atomic units, au)	Relative Energy (kcal/mol)
2-H₂ (singlet)	-1696.01843440	0.00
2-^cH₂ (singlet) ^a	-1696.01442988	2.50
2-^cH₂ (triplet) ^a	-1695.99297040	16.00
2-(n²-H₂) (triplet) ^b	-1695.97685341	26.10

^aThe H-H distance was frozen at 1.38 Å. ^b A singlet energy minimum for the dihydrogen complex could not be located.

Table 2. Optimised structures (for two of the complexes) and calculated total energies for Cp*Co(IPr)H₂, compressed Cp*Co(IPr)H₂ and Cp*Co(IPr)(η^2 -H₂). Computational details: Gaussian 09, OLYP exchange/correlation functionals with LANL2TZ+F on Co and 6-31g(d',p') on all other atoms.

exploring more forcing thermal and photolytic conditions in an effort to observe intra- or intermolecular oxidative addition of carbon–hydrogen bonds.

In summary, we have demonstrated synthesis of an elusive Cp*CoL fragment. Complex **2** displays the rich chemistry expected of an unsaturated Cp^{Rn}Co(I) center,⁴⁰ participating in ligand addition as well as two electron oxidative processes. Though **2** to date is unreactive with alkanes, we plan to continue to study the stoichiometric activation of other E-H bonds with the molecule, as well as exploring the use of **2** as a precatalyst in transformations involving activated alkene containing substrates, given the lability of the IPr fragment under mild conditions in the presence of ethylene.

The authors gratefully recognize Mount St. Mary's University (CAB, start-up), the National Science Foundation (Grants: 1300508 (RUI) and 1337428 (X-ray)) and the Marion I & Henry J. Knott Foundation (IR spectrometer) for financial support of this research. JWT acknowledges the Centre for Computational Nanoscience at Ball State University for computational time. Tim Funk (Gettysburg College) is thanked for access to a 400 MHz NMR spectrometer for high field studies.

Notes and references

1) Q. Liu, L. Wu, R. Jackstell and M. Beller, *Nature Commun.*, 2014, 6, 5933.

2) P. J. Chirik, Dalton Trans., 2007, 16.

3) J. Choi and A. S. Goldman, *Top. Organomet. Chem.*, 2011, **34**, 139.

4) A. H. R. MacArthur, M. Brookhart and A. S. Goldman, *Chem. Rev.*, 2011, **111**, 1761.

5) R. Ahuja, B. Punji, M. Findlater, C. Supplee, W. Schinski, M. Brookhart and A. S. Goldman, *Nature Chem.*, 2011, **3**, 167.

6) A. S. Goldman, A. H. Roy, Z. Huang, R. Ahuja, W. Schinski and M. Brookhart, *Science*, 2006, **312**, 257.

Chemical Communications

7) J. C. Lewis, R. G. Bergman and J. A. Ellman, Acc. Chem. Res., 200 8) Y-F. Han and G-X. Jin, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2014, 43, 2799. 9) S. R. Klei, J. T. Golden, P. Burger and R. G. Bergman, J. Mol. C to A: Chem., 2002, 189, 79. 10) J. F. Hartwig, Acc. Chem. Res., 2012, 45, 864. 11) Z. Mo, D. Chen, X. Leng and L. Deng, Organometallics, 2012, 31 7040. 12) H. Zhou, H. Sun, S. Zhang, and X. Li, Organometallics 2015, 3 1479. 13) K. Gao and N. Yoshikai, Acc. Chem. Res., 2014, 47, 1208. 14) T. Yoshino, H. Ikemoto, S. Matsunaga and M. Kanai, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2013, 52, 1. 15) J. V. Obligacion, S. P. Semproni and P. J. Chirik, J. Am. Cher Soc., 2014, 136, 4133. 16) A. A. Bengali, R. G. Bergman, and C. B. Moore, J. Am. Chem. So 1995, **117**, 3879. 17) P. E. M. Siegbahn, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1996, 118, 1487. 18) R. Poli and K. M. Smith, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem., 1999, 877. 19) M. J. Ingleson, M. Pink, H. Fan and K. G. Caulton, Inorg. Chem., 2007, 46, 10321. 20) A. Geny, N. Agenet, L. Jannazzo, M. Malacria, C. Aubert and Gandon, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2009, 48, 1810. 21) J. J. Schneider, U. Denninger, O. Heinemann and C. Krüger, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Eng., 1995, 34, 592. 22) F. Hung-Low, J. W. Tye, S. Cheng and C. A. Bradley, Dalton Trans., 2012, 41, 8190. 23) X. Bantreil and S. P. Nolan, Nat. Protoc., 2011, 6, 69. 24) N-Heterocyclic Carbenes in Synthesis, ed. S. P Nolan, Wiley-VC', Darmstadt, DE, 2006. 25) G. A. Bain and J. F. Berry, J. Chem. Educ., 2008, 85, 532. 26) F. Hung-Low and C. A. Bradley, Inorg. Chem., 2013, 52, 2446. 27) J. H. Gross, N. Nieth, B. H. Linden, U. Blumbach, F. J. Richter, N. E. Tauchert, R. Tompers and P. Hofmann, Anal. Bioanal. Chem., 2006, 386, 52. 28) F. Hung-Low, J. P. Krogman, J. W. Tye and C. A. Bradley, Cl. Commun., 2012, 48, 368. 29) C. P. Lenges, P. S. White and M. Brookhart, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1998, 120, 6965. 30) M. Hapke, N. Weding and A. Spannenberg, Organometallics, 2010, 29, 4298. 31) S. Dürr, B. Zarzycki, D. Ertler, I. Ivanović-Burmazović and U. Radius, Organometallics, 2012, 31, 1730. 32) S. Pelties, D. Herrmann, B. de Bruin, F. Hartl and R. Wolf, Chem Commun., 2014, 50, 7014. 33) O. Salomon, M. Reiher and B. A. Hess, J. Chem. Phys., 2002, 11 4729. 34) M. Swart, J. Chem. Theory Comput., 2008, 4, 2057. 35) E. Fooladi, B. Dalhus and M. Tilset, Dalton. Trans. 2004, 3909. 36) C. L. Velez, P. R. Markwick, R. L. Holland, A. G. DiPasquale, A. L. Rheingold and J. M. O'Connor, Organometallics, 2010, 29, 6695. 37) S. P. Semproni, C. C. H. Atienza and P. J. Chirik, Chem. Sci., 2014 1956. 38) D. G. Hamilton and R. H. Crabtree, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1988, 110 4216. 39) R. H. Morris, Coord. Chem. Rev. 2008, 252, 2381. 40) I. Thiel and M. Hapke, Rev. Inorg. Chem., 2014, 34, 217.