
Volume 14 Number 5 7 February 2023 Pages 1029-1330

# Chemical Science



ISSN 2041-6539



#### **EDGE ARTICLE**

# Chemical Science



# **EDGE ARTICLE**

View Article Online
View Journal | View Issue



Cite this: Chem. Sci., 2023, 14, 1065

dll publication charges for this article have been paid for by the Royal Society of Chemistry

Received 31st October 2022 Accepted 29th December 2022

DOI: 10.1039/d2sc06011f

rsc.li/chemical-science

# Germanium hydrides as an efficient hydrogenstorage material operated by an iron catalyst†

Yoshinao Kobayashi<sup>a</sup> and Yusuke Sunada (1)\*\*ab

The use of metal hydrides such as  $NaBH_4$  as hydrogen-storage materials has recently received substantial research attention on account of the worldwide demand for the development of efficient hydrogen-production, -storage, and -transportation systems. Here, we report the quantitative production of  $H_2$  gas from a germanium hydride,  $Ph_2GeH_2$ , mediated by an iron catalyst at room temperature via dehydrogenative coupling, concomitant with the formation of  $(GePh_2)_5$ . Of particular importance is that  $Ph_2GeH_2$  can be facilely recovered from  $(GePh_2)_5$  by contact with 1 atm of  $H_2$  or  $PhICl_2/LiAlH_4$  at 0 °C or 40 °C, respectively. A detailed reaction mechanism for the iron-catalyzed dehydrogenative coupling of  $Ph_2GeH_2$  is proposed based on the isolation of four intermediate iron species.

## Introduction

Economic hydrogen production/storage is the key issue preventing the application of hydrogen as an energy carrier in the context of a global low-carbon strategy to address the everincreasing energy challenges that face humanity. Recently, a number of hydrogen storage materials, such as metal hydrides, liquid organic hydrogen carriers, ammonia and ammonia borane, were applied for the development of effective hydrogen production/storage systems.1 Among them, metal hydrides have attracted great attention recently as potential efficient hydrogen-storage materials. Sodium borohydride (NaBH<sub>4</sub>) is one of the most studied hydrides for this purpose, as it is able to deliver H<sub>2</sub> gas under mild conditions, e.g., at room temperature, via hydrolysis.2 However, one major issue with this approach is that the regeneration of NaBH<sub>4</sub> from the hydrolytic products formed after H2 production generally carries a high energy penalty and thus requires, e.g., high temperatures (400-500 °C). Thus, the development of hydrogen-production/storage systems in which the generation of H<sub>2</sub> can proceed under mild conditions and hydrogen-storage materials that can be regenerated easily is highly desirable.

In this paper, we focus on the use of group-14 hydrides as potentially reusable hydrogen-storage materials. It is well known that group-14 hydrides such as hydrosilanes, hydrogermanes, and hydrostannanes undergo dehydrogenative coupling reactions in the presence of appropriate transition-

metal catalysts to form E-E (E = Si, Ge, Sn) bond(s), concomitant with the generation of H<sub>2</sub>. A pioneering study in this area has been published by Harrod and co-workers, who reported that hydrosilanes such as PhSiH<sub>3</sub> effectively undergo multiple Si-Si-bond-forming reactions in a dehydrogenative manner to afford polysilanes and/or a mixture of oligosilanes.4 This study revealed that hydrosilanes can act as reagents for hydrogenproduction and E-E-bond-formation reactions; however, the regeneration of the starting hydrosilanes is considered to be because high-molecular-weight compounds are obtained as the major products after the production of H2. Although polymeric products have mainly been obtained in catalyst systems based on early transition metals,5 it has been reported that late-transition-metal catalysts often tend to afford relatively short-chain oligomers in the dehydrogenative coupling of group-14 hydrides.6 For instance, Rosenberg et al. have indicated that the dehydrogenative coupling of Ph<sub>2</sub>SiH<sub>2</sub> catalyzed by Rh(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>Cl affords the disilane Ph<sub>2</sub>(H)Si-Si(H)Ph<sub>2</sub> selectively under the optimal reaction conditions; however, no attempts to regenerate Ph<sub>2</sub>SiH<sub>2</sub> from Ph<sub>2</sub>(H)Si-Si(H)Ph<sub>2</sub> have been reported in the same study. Although some examples of the reverse reaction of the dehydrogenative coupling of hydrosilanes, i.e., hydrogenolysis of disilanes to afford hydrosilanes, have been reported for Ni or Pt catalysts,7 reversible and reusable hydrogen-production/storage systems with group-14 hydrides have not been explored so far.

In this work, we developed a catalytic system based on iron for the reversible production/storage of  $H_2$  using germanium hydrides as the potential hydrogen-storage material because iron is the least expensive and least toxic late transition metal (Scheme 1). We found that the combination of the iron precursor  $[Fe(mesityl)_2]_2$  (mesityl = 2,4,6-Me<sub>3</sub>-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>2</sub>) with *N*-heterocyclic carbene (NHC) ligands promotes the effective

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Department of Applied Chemistry, School of Engineering, The University of Tokyo, 4-6-1, Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8505, Japan

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Institute of Industrial Science, The University of Tokyo, 4-6-1, Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8505, Japan. E-mail: sunada@iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp

 $<sup>\</sup>dagger$  Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. CCDC 2204746, 2204747, 2204748 and 2204749. For ESI and crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format see DOI: https://doi.org/10.1039/d2sc06011f

Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> Ph<sub>2</sub>Ge Ge Ph<sub>2</sub>

[Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub> + 4 /PrIMMe

H<sub>2</sub>

LiAlH<sub>4</sub> Ph<sub>2</sub>GeCl<sub>2</sub> 5 Ph|Cl<sub>2</sub>

**Chemical Science** 

Scheme 1 Overall scheme of this work;  $Ph_2GeH_2$  as a reusable hydrogen-storage material in the presence of an iron catalyst.

production of H<sub>2</sub> in the dehydrogenative coupling of R<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> (R = Ph or Et) (hydrogen content: ca. 0.87 wt% for Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> and ca. 1.51 wt% for Et<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub>). The quantitative generation of H<sub>2</sub> at room temperature using Ph2GeH2 as a hydrogen-storage material was confirmed, along with the formation of (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> as the dehydrogenative coupling product. It is noteworthy that the starting Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> can be readily regenerated via the hydrogenation of (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> under 1 atm of H<sub>2</sub> at 0 °C catalyzed by the same iron catalyst system. Alternatively, Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> can also be recovered from (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> by treatment with PhICl<sub>2</sub> followed by LiAlH<sub>4</sub> at 40 °C. These results show the promising potential of germanium hydrides as prospective reusable hydrogenproduction/-storage materials that can evolve H2 at room temperature using an iron catalyst. Moreover, four possible intermediary iron species formed in this catalysis were structurally characterized, based on which, a detailed reaction mechanism is proposed. The present catalyst system is also applicable to the dehydrogenative coupling of other group-14 hydrides, such as hydrosilanes and hydrostannanes R<sub>2</sub>EH<sub>2</sub> (E = Si, Sn).

#### Results and discussion

#### Hydrogen production from secondary germanes

First, the diphenylgermane  $Ph_2GeH_2$  was used as the substrate, and the dinuclear iron(II) complex  $[Fe(mesityl)_2]_2$  (mesityl = 2,4,6-trimethylphenyl) was used as the catalyst precursor, because it has been reported to effectively activate group-14-element-hydrogen bonds.<sup>8</sup> The dehydrogenative coupling of  $Ph_2GeH_2$  proceeded effectively at room temperature in THF under an  $N_2$  atmosphere when a mixture of 2.5 mol% of  $[Fe(mesityl)_2]_2$  (5 mol% based on Fe) and 10 mol% of the *N*-heterocyclic carbene  $^iPrIM^{Me}$  ( $^iPrIM^{Me}$  = 1,3-diisopropyl-4,5-dimethylimidazol-2-ylidene) was used as the catalyst (Scheme

$$R_{2}GeH_{2} \xrightarrow{[Pr]{M^{Me}}} \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} [Fe(mesityl)_{2}]_{2}(2.5 \text{ mol}\%) \\ PrIM^{Me}(10 \text{ mol}\%, \text{ for } R = Ph) \\ \hline EtIM^{Me}(10 \text{ mol}\%, \text{ for } R = Et) \\ \hline THF, r.t., 40 \text{ h (under } N_{2}) \\ \end{array} } \underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} R_{2} \\ Ge \\ Ge \\ R_{2} \\ R_{2} \\ \end{array} }_{quant.} + H_{2} \\ \\ quant. \\ \\ R = Ph: 62\% \text{ isolated yield} \\ R = Et: 52\% \text{ isolated yield} \\ \end{array} }$$

 $\begin{array}{lll} \textbf{Scheme} & \textbf{2} & \textbf{Catalytic} & \textbf{dehydrogenative} & \textbf{coupling} & \textbf{of} & \textbf{Ph}_2\textbf{GeH}_2 & \textbf{or} \\ \textbf{Et}_2\textbf{GeH}_2 & \textbf{catalyzed} & \textbf{by} & \textbf{the} & [\textbf{Fe}(\textbf{mesityl})_2]_2/\textbf{NHC} & \textbf{catalyst} & \textbf{system}. \\ \end{array}$ 

2). This reaction furnished cyclic pentagermane (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> as the sole product in 62% isolated yield after 40 h. The formation of (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> was confirmed based on a comparison of the  $^1\mathrm{H}$  and  $^{13}\mathrm{C}$  NMR spectra of the product with those of an authentic sample. It is noteworthy that the formation of (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> was accompanied by the generation of  $\mathrm{H}_2$  gas, which was confirmed by  $^1\mathrm{H}$  NMR spectroscopy. The quantity of  $\mathrm{H}_2$  gas produced was determined using a gas burette; when the dehydrogenative coupling of 1 mmol of  $\mathrm{Ph}_2\mathrm{GeH}_2$  was performed at room temperature under the catalytic conditions described above, *ca.* 21 mL of gaseous product(s) were obtained in the gas burette. These results indicate that the dehydrogenation of  $\mathrm{Ph}_2\mathrm{GeH}_2$  to afford (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> proceeded effectively at room temperature to give a quantitative amount of  $\mathrm{H}_2$  gas.

It should be emphasized here that this catalysis is highly sensitive to the electronic and/or steric environment of the ligands used. Thus,  ${}^{i}\text{PrIM}^{Me}$  was found to be the only ligand that selectively furnished (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> for a quantitative conversion of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub>, and that other NHC ligands used in this study with different substituents on the nitrogen atoms or the ligand backbone barely generated any (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub>. Although the use of certain NHC ligands led to a high conversion of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub>, the formation of a mixture of oligogermanes other than (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> was suggested by the  ${}^{1}\text{H}$  NMR spectra of the corresponding crude products (for details, see Table S2 in the ESI†). Subsequently, we examined the effect of the solvent on the reaction of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> catalyzed by [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub>/ ${}^{i}\text{PrIM}^{Me}$ , which revealed that the use of ethereal solvents such as Et<sub>2</sub>O and THF afforded (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> in medium to good yield.

Subsequently, the dehydrogenative coupling of Et<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> was performed using [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub>/iPrIM<sup>Me</sup>. Although the conversion of Et<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> reached >99% in THF after 40 h, the <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of the crude product suggested the formation of a complex mixture of oligogermanes, and almost no formation of cyclopentagermane (GeEt<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> was observed. This result stands in stark contrast to the fact that the selective production of (GeEt<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> with >99% conversion (52% isolated yield) of Et<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> was confirmed when EtIMMe was used instead of PrIMMe (Scheme 2). These results indicate that sophisticated control of the steric environment around the iron center on the catalytically active species can be expected to be crucial to achieving the dehydrogenative coupling of secondary germanes in a selective manner to produce the corresponding cyclopentagermanes  $(GeR_2)_5$  (R = Ph, Et) as a single product. It should also be noted here that although cyclooligogermanes are usually generated *via* the Wurtz-type reductive coupling of  $R_2GeX_2$  (R = alkyl, aryl; X = halide) using a stoichiometric amount of alkali or alkaline earth metals,10 the development of alternative synthetic methods would be highly desirable due to the harsh reaction conditions required. The dehydrogenative coupling of secondary germanes could be a potential alternative to such Wurtz-type reductive coupling reactions in terms of the formation of Ge-Ge bonds, although previously reported examples of the catalytic dehydrogenative coupling of secondary germanes only furnished dimers. To the best of our knowledge, the results shown here thus represent the first example of the formation of cyclooligogermanes via the sequential catalytic dehydrogenative

**Edge Article** 

coupling of secondary germanes under the formation of multiple Ge-Ge bonds.

#### Regeneration of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> from (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub>

We discovered that the starting material Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> can be readily regenerated from (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> by treatment with 1 atom of H<sub>2</sub> in the presence of [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub>/iPrIM<sup>Me</sup> in THF at 0 °C for 24 h, *i.e.*, Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> was formed in 51% yield. It was also confirmed that no reaction occurred when (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> was exposed to 1 atm of H<sub>2</sub> in the absence of an iron catalyst. The regeneration of Ph2GeH2 was accompanied by the formation of germoxane (Ph2GeO)3 in 49% yield; this is presumably due to the rapid hydrolysis of the formed Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> induced by <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> and unremovable traces of H<sub>2</sub>O. It should also be noted here that hydrosilanes such as Ph<sub>2</sub>SiH<sub>2</sub> undergo fast hydrolysis in the presence of a catalytic amount of N-heterocyclic carbenes.11 Although the quantitative formation of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> from (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> gas was hampered despite many attempts to remove the aforementioned trace amounts of H2O, we found that Ph2GeH2 could be readily recovered from (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> via an alternative method; (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> can be converted quantitatively into Ph2GeCl2 (64% isolated yield) by treatment with PhICl<sub>2</sub> in THF at 40 °C, before Ph<sub>2</sub>GeCl<sub>2</sub> can be quantitatively transformed into Ph2GeH2 by reaction with LiAlH<sub>4</sub> in THF at room temperature (82% isolated yield) (Scheme 3). Thus, we concluded that the germanium hydride Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> was easily recovered and reused via two independent reaction protocols. These results corroborate the notion that Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> is an effective and reusable hydrogen-storage material that can quantitatively produce H<sub>2</sub> gas at mild operating temperatures and that can be readily regenerated from (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> through hydrogenation under 1 atm of H2 gas or sequential treatment with PhICl2 and LiAlH4.

#### Isolation of four possible intermediary iron species

To obtain insight into the reaction mechanism of the [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub>/<sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup>-catalyzed dehydrogenative coupling of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> to produce (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub>, several investigations were carried out to isolate any potential intermediary iron species. Initially, the reaction of [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub> and 4 equivalents of <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> was carried out in Et<sub>2</sub>O at room temperature for 16 h, which provided mononuclear trans-Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>(<sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup>)<sub>2</sub> (1) in 52% isolated yield (Scheme 4A). A single-crystal X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis revealed that the iron center in 1 adopts a square-planar geometry with two iPrIMMe ligands located at the trans-positions, which is similar to that observed in a previously reported analogous Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>(<sup>i</sup>PmIM<sup>H</sup>)<sub>2</sub> complex.8b Subsequently, isolated complex 1 was treated with 2

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{Ph}_{2} \\ \text{Ge} \\ \text{Ph}_{2} \\ \text{Ge} \\ \text{Ph}_{2} \\ \text{Quant.} \\ \text{(82\% isol. yield)} \\ \end{array}$$

Scheme 3 Regeneration of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> from (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub>

A. 
$$[Fe(mesityl)_{2}]_{2} + 4$$

$$[PrIM^{Me} = L]$$

$$[PriM^{Me}$$

Scheme 4 Synthesis of iron complexes 1-4. (A) Synthesis and isolation of 1. (B) Two reaction schemes for the synthesis of 2. (C) Synthesis and isolation of 3. (D) Synthesis of ca. a 1:1 mixture of iron complexes 3 and 4.

equivalents of Ph2GeH2, which produced a trace amount of orange crystals of trans-Fe(GePh<sub>2</sub>H)<sub>2</sub>(iPrIM<sup>Me</sup>)<sub>2</sub> (2), together with a white powder of (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub>. Although the isolation of pure 2 from this reaction was hampered by the concomitant formation of (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub>, 2 was isolated using an alternative reaction protocol. Namely, the reaction of FeCl2 with in situ-generated LiGe(H)Ph<sub>2</sub> in the presence of 2 equivalents of <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> in THF led to the isolation of 2 in 43% yield (Scheme 4B). The molecular structure of 2 was determined by single-crystal XRD analysis (Fig. 1A). Similar to that in complex 1, the iron center in 2 adopts a square-planar coordination geometry wherein two <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> ligands occupy trans-positions. To the best of our knowledge, complex 2 is the first example of an Fe(II)-germyl complex with a four-coordinate square-planar coordination geometry. The Fe-Ge bond distances of 2.4488(8) Å are longer than those in previously reported iron(II) germyl complexes with octahedral structures (Cp\*Fe(CO)<sub>2</sub>(GeMe<sub>2</sub>SPh): 2.3633(4) Å;<sup>12</sup> CpFe(CO)(pyridine)(GeEt<sub>3</sub>): 2.4055(11)  $\mathring{A}$ ; <sup>13</sup> Cp(CO)<sub>2</sub>[Ge(C<sub>2</sub>F<sub>5</sub>)<sub>3</sub>]: for 2.3232(3) Å;<sup>14</sup>). This is presumably due to the strong transinfluence of the germyl moieties. In the IR spectrum of 2, an absorption band observed at 1848 cm<sup>-1</sup> implied the presence of Ge-H bonds in 2.

Based on the molecular structure of 2, the first H-Ge bond activation mediated by 1 can be assumed to take place through the Fe-mesityl moiety. A similar reaction, i.e., the formation of square-planar trans- $(NHC)_2$ Fe $(Sn^nBu_3)_2$  via the reaction of trans-(NHC)Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub> with <sup>n</sup>Bu<sub>3</sub>SnH, has recently been reported by Radius et al.86 Further treatment of 2 with 1 equivalent of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> and 1 equivalent of Et<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> led to the formation of a Ge-Ge bond on the iron center to afford complex 3, which





Fig. 1 Molecular structures of 2, 3 and 4 with thermal ellipsoids at 50% probability; hydrogen atoms, except for the hydrides in 2, have been omitted for clarity. (A) Molecular structure of 2. (B) Molecular structure of 3. (C) Molecular structure of 4.

contains a metallatrigermacycle skeleton, in 25% isolated yield (Scheme 4C). Although the actual role of Et<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> in this reaction remains unclear so far, Et2GeH2 may contribute to retarding the rate of the reaction between 2 and Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub>, thus leading to the production of complex 3 as the main product. The molecular structure of 3 (Fig. 1B) revealed that the iron center adopts a tetrahedral coordination geometry, which is different from those found in 1 and 2. The Fe-Ge bond distances in 3 (2.5712(6)/2.5557(5) Å) are elongated compared to those in 2 and other previously reported iron(II) germyl complexes,12-14 although they are comparable to that of our previously reported iron(II) digermyl complex with a tetrahedral coordination geometry,  $(THF)_2Fe[Ge(SiMe_3)_3]_2$  (2.5589(8) Å). The iron center and three germanium atoms form a nearly planar metallacyclic skeleton, wherein the deviation of all atoms from the leastsquares plane ranges from 0.116 Å to 0.124 Å. It is worth noting here that the Ge-Ge-bond-forming reaction apparently occurs during the reaction of 2 with Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> to produce 3. In other words, the bond formation involving two Fe-Ge bonds and an incoming molecule of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> to construct a cyclic trigermyl moiety is effectively promoted on the iron center supported by <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> ligands. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of isolated 3 in C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub> at room temperature features broad resonances at  $\delta = 27.2$ , 21.3, 19.8, 15.8, 14.3, 7.5, and −1.2 ppm, indicating that 3 is paramagnetic.

We found that a new iron species 4 is formed together with 3 and  $(GePh_2)_5$  in the reaction between 2 and 2 equivalents of  $Ph_2GeH_2$  (Scheme 4D). Although several attempts to isolate 4 failed, a subsequent recrystallization led to the generation of reddish crystals, whose  $^1H$  NMR spectrum in  $C_6D_6$  indicated that they consist of a ca. 1:1 mixture of 3 and 4. A careful single-crystal XRD analysis revealed the molecular structure of 4,

which consists of a five-membered metallatetragermacycle skeleton composed of four 'GePh<sub>2</sub>' moieties (Fig. 1C). The iron center of 4 adopts a slightly distorted tetrahedral coordination geometry with Fe–Ge bond lengths of 2.5714(10) and 2.5840(9) Å. These structural features are similar to those in 3; however, there are apparent, significant differences in the metallacycle framework. Namely, the four-membered-ring structure in 3 is almost planar, whereas that of 4 exhibits a  $^{\rm Ge(2)}T_{\rm Ge(3)}$ -type twisted structure. The average Ge–Ge bond length (~2.459 Å) in 4 is also comparable to that in 3 (~2.477 Å). Based on the molecular structure of 4, one might consider that the incorporation of one additional 'GePh<sub>2</sub>' unit into 3 led to the generation of 4 *via* Ge–Ge bond propagation.

With the four possible intermediary iron species 1-4 in hand, we would like to propose a reaction mechanism for the dehydrogenative coupling of Ph2GeH2 catalyzed by the [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub>/<sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> catalyst system as shown in Scheme 5. First, [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub> reacts with <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> to generate catalyst precursor 1. Then, Ge-H bond activation of two moles of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> occurs via the Fe-mesityl bonds in 1 to generate the catalytically active species 2. A sequence of Ge-Ge-bondforming and Ge-Ge-bond-propagation reactions occurs on the iron center supported by the two <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> ligands to generate 3 followed by 4, both of which feature metallacyclooligogermane frameworks. Finally, the incorporation of an additional 'GePh<sub>2</sub>' unit proceeds when 4 comes into contact with Ph2GeH2 to produce (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> with concomitant regeneration of 2. In summary, 'GePh<sub>2</sub>' units sequentially assemble on the iron center to realize the selective production of (GePh2)5 via dehydrogenative coupling. It should be noted here that the catalytic activity of the isolated complexes 1, 2 and 3 was examined independently and that both showed good catalytic activity



Scheme 5 Plausible reaction mechanism for the sequential production of  $H_2$  and Ge-Ge bond propagation to afford cyclopentagermane  $(GePh_2)_5$  via the dehydrogenative coupling of  $Ph_2GeH_2$  catalyzed by  $[Fe(mesityl)_2]_2/^iPrIM^{Me}$ .

Edge Article Chemical Science

toward the dehydrogenative coupling of  $Ph_2GeH_2$  to afford  $(GePh_2)_5$  in quantitative yield in THF at room temperature after 40 h (5 mol% of 1, 2 or 3). This result strongly supports the notion that the iron species 2 and 3 play a crucial role in the catalytic dehydrogenative coupling of  $Ph_2GeH_2$ .

#### Dehydrogenative coupling of other group-14 hydrides

As described above, the  $[Fe(mesityl)_2]_2/NHC$  catalyst system is effective for  $H_2$  production via the dehydrogenative coupling of secondary germanes. We found that the dehydrogenative coupling of tertiary and primary germanes can also be achieved by this catalyst system. For instance, the dehydrogenative coupling of  $Ph_3GeH$  proceeded effectively in THF at room temperature mediated by 2.5 mol% of  $[Fe(mesityl)_2]_2$  in the presence of 10 mol% of  $MelM^{Et}$ , which contains sterically less demanding methyl groups on the nitrogen atoms of the NHC ligand, to selectively afford the dimeric product  $(GePh_3)_2$ . Similarly, the reaction with  $^tBuGeH_3$  was briefly examined, and the formation of oligogermanes via the dehydrogenative coupling mediated by a catalytic amount of  $[Fe(mesityl)_2]_2/^iPrIM^{Me}$  was observed using  $^1H$  NMR and FAB-MS.

Tin hydrides such as Ph<sub>2</sub>SnH<sub>2</sub> and <sup>n</sup>Bu<sub>2</sub>SnH<sub>2</sub> were also found to be suitable for this catalytic system (hydrogen content: ca. 0.73 wt% for Ph<sub>2</sub>SnH<sub>2</sub> and ca. 0.85 wt% for <sup>n</sup>Bu<sub>2</sub>SnH<sub>2</sub>). Namely, 1 mmol of Ph2SnH2 was dehydrogenatively coupled in the presence of 1 mol% of [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub> and 4 mol% of <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> to exclusively produce cyclohexastannane (SnPh2)6, which was isolated in 70% yield. The quantity of H2 gas produced in the course of this reaction was determined using a gas burette, from which ca. 15.4 mL of gaseous product(s) were obtained after 2.5 h at room temperature, and then production of ca. 16.7 mL of gaseous product(s) was detected after 19 h. In this reaction, the production of H2 immediately took place once Ph2SnH2 came into contact with [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub>/iPrIM<sup>Me</sup>, and this may cause decrease of the amount of detectable gaseous H2 compared with the theoretical value (ca. 22 mL). In contrast to the reaction with germanium congener Ph2GeH2, the reaction with Ph<sub>2</sub>SnH<sub>2</sub> exclusively afforded cyclohexastannane. <sup>n</sup>Bu<sub>2</sub>-SnH<sub>2</sub> was also found to be suitable for this catalyst system (1 mol% of [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub> and 4 mol% of <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup>) to give a ca. 3:1 mixture of cyclopentastannane  $(Sn^nBu_2)_5$  and cyclohexastannane (Sn<sup>n</sup>Bu<sub>2</sub>)<sub>6</sub> with complete conversion of <sup>n</sup>Bu<sub>2</sub>SnH<sub>2</sub> at room temperature (Scheme 6). In this context, it should also be noted that the formation of a mixture of (Sn<sup>n</sup>Bu<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> and  $(Sn^nBu_2)_6$  has already been reported by Jousseaume et al. in the (PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>PdCl<sub>2</sub>-catalyzed dehydrogenative coupling  $^{n}$ Bu<sub>2</sub>SnH<sub>2</sub>.<sup>17</sup>

$$Ph_{2}SnH_{2} \xrightarrow{iPrIM^{Me} (4 \text{ mol}\%)} Ph_{2}Sn \\ \underbrace{-iPrIM^{Me} (4 \text{ mol}\%)}_{iPrIM^{Me} (4 \text{ mol}\%)} + 1/6 \\ \underbrace{-iPrIM^{Me} (4 \text{ mol}\%)}_{iPl_{2}Sn} + 1/6 \\ \underbrace{-iPh_{2}Sn}_{Sn} SnPh_{2} \\ -iPh_{2}Sn \\ -iPh_{2} \\ -$$

Scheme 6 Catalytic dehydrogenative coupling of  $Ph_2SnH_2$  catalyzed by the  $[Fe(mesityl)_2]_2/NHC$  catalyst system.

The iron-based catalyst system described here was found to be effective under mild reaction conditions for the dehydrogenative coupling of primary, secondary, and tertiary germanes as well as secondary stannanes. Although a relatively high reaction temperature was required, the dehydrogenative coupling of a secondary silane was also achieved by an [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub>/<sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> catalyst system. Neat Ph<sub>2</sub>SiH<sub>2</sub> (hydrogen content: ca. 1.01 wt%) was treated with 2.5 mol% of [Fe(mesityl)<sub>2</sub>]<sub>2</sub> and 10 mol% of <sup>i</sup>PrIM<sup>Me</sup> at 80 °C. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of the crude product indicated 82% conversion of Ph<sub>2</sub>SiH<sub>2</sub> and the generation of the disilane Ph<sub>2</sub>(H)Si-Si(H)Ph<sub>2</sub> and trisilane Ph<sub>2</sub>(H)Si-SiPh<sub>2</sub>-Si(H)Ph<sub>2</sub> in 54% and 8% yield, respectively. In contrast to the reaction systems with secondary germanes and stannanes, no further propagation of the 'SiPh2' units took place in this reaction; instead, the generation of Ph<sub>3</sub>SiH and PhSiH<sub>3</sub> was detected due to concomitant redistribution. It should be mentioned here that Rosenberg et al. have already reported the selective formation of Ph<sub>2</sub>(H)Si-Si(H)Ph<sub>2</sub> via the dehydrogenative coupling of Ph2SiH2 catalyzed by Rh(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>Cl. In their report, the authors mentioned that the chemoselectivity of this reaction strongly depends on the reaction conditions, including the size of the reaction vial relative to the volume of the substrate, as well as the rate and efficacy of stirring, and that trisilanes and other redistribution products are often generated under non-optimized reaction conditions. This precedent might suggest that the chemoselectivity of our reaction with Ph2SiH2 could be improved by the optimization of the reaction conditions. However, unfortunately, neither the conversion of Ph2SiH2 nor the chemoselectivity were improved under either different reaction conditions or the use of catalyst systems that contained different auxiliary ligands.

#### Conclusions

Germanium hydride Ph2GeH2 can act as an efficient and reusable hydrogen-production/-storage material with the aid of iron catalysts. Hydrogen evolution from Ph2GeH2 was effectively realized at room temperature, concomitant with the quantitative formation of (GePh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub>. The regeneration of Ph<sub>2</sub>GeH<sub>2</sub> is very facile, i.e., by simple treatment of  $(GePh_2)_5$  with 1 atm of  $H_2$  at 0 °C, or by treatment with PhICl2 and LiAlH4 at 40 °C. This hydrogen-production/-storage system has some advantages compared to systems based on conventional hydrogen-storage materials such as NaBH4, in which both the hydrogenproduction and -storage processes can be carried out under relatively mild operating conditions, and that they do not require precious-metal catalysts. Furthermore, germanium hydrides are generally sufficiently stable under aerobic conditions, easy-to-handle, and show less toxicity toward living organisms. We expect that the results presented in this paper will help in developing the next generation of chemical hydrogen-storage/-production systems and support efforts to use group-14 hydrides such as germanium hydrides as reusable hydrogen carriers in practical applications, which are currently in progress in our laboratory.

# Data availability

All experimental data are provided in the ESI.†

## **Author contributions**

Y. Kobayashi conducted all experiments. All authors analysed the data. Y. Sunada supervised this study and wrote the manuscript. All authors discussed the results and contributed to the preparation of the final manuscript.

#### Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

# **Acknowledgements**

This work was supported by a project of the Kanagawa Institute of Industrial Science and Technology (KISTEC) as well as by a Grant in Aid for Scientific Research (B) (20H02751) from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), Japan. The synchrotron radiation experiments were performed at the BL02B1 of SPring-8 with the approval of the Japan Synchrotron Radiation Research Institute (JASRI) (Proposal No. 2021A1139).

#### Notes and references

- (a) M. D. Allendorf, V. Stavila, J. L. Snider, M. Witman, M. E. Bowden, K. Brooks and T. Autrey, Nat. Chem., 2022, 14, 1214–1223; (b) T. He, P. Pachfule, H. Wu, Q. Xu and P. Chen, Nat. Rev. Mater., 2016, 1, 1–17; (c) M. R. Usman, Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev., 2022, 167, 112743; (d) A. Kovač, M. Paranos and D. Marciuš, Int. J. Hydrog. Energy, 2021, 46, 10016–10035; (e) T. He, H. Cao and P. Chen, Adv. Mater., 2019, 31, 1902757; (f) A. Schneemann, J. L. White, S. Kang, S. Jeong, L. F. Wan, E. S. Cho and V. Stavila, Chem. Rev., 2018, 118, 10775–10839; (g) M. Paskevicius, L. H. Jepsen, P. Schouwink, R. Černý, D. B. Ravnsbæk, Y. Filinchuk and T. R. Jensen, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2017, 46, 1565–1634; (h) P. Jena, J. Phys. Chem. Lett., 2011, 2, 206–211; (i) J. Yang, A. Sudik, C. Wolverton and D. J. Siegel, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2010, 39, 656–675.
- (a) H. I. Schlesinger, H. C. Brown, A. E. Finholt, J. R. Gilbrbath, H. R. Hoekstra and E. K. Hyde, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1953, 75, 215–219; (b) E. Y. Marrero-Alfonso, A. M. Beaird, T. A. Davis and M. A. Matthews, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res., 2009, 48, 3703–3712; (c) Y. Zhu, L. Ouyang, H. Zhong, J. Liu, H. Wang, H. Shao, Z. Huang and M. Zhu, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2020, 59, 8623–8629; (d) Y. Kojima, Y. Kawai, H. Nakanishi and S. Matsumoto, J. Power Sources, 2004, 135, 36–41; (e) P. Brack, S. E. Dann and K. G. Upul Wijayantha, Energy Sci. Eng., 2015, 3, 174–188; (f) B. H. Liu and Z. P. Li, J. Power Sources, 2009, 187, 527–534; (g) L. Ouyang, M. Liu, K. Chen, J. Liu, H. Wang, M. Zhu and V. Yartys, J. Alloys Compd., 2022, 910, 164831.

- 3 (a) J. Y. Corey, Adv. Organomet. Chem., 2004, 51, 1–52; (b) E. M. Leitao, T. Jurca and I. Manners, Nat. Chem., 2013, 5, 817–829; (c) F. Gauvin, J. F. Harrod and H. G. Woo, Adv. Organomet. Chem., 1988, 42, 363–405; (d) T. D. Tilley, Comments Inorg. Chem., 1990, 10, 37–51; (e) T. D. Tilley, Acc. Chem. Res., 1993, 26, 22–29; (f) R. Waterman, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2013, 42, 5629–5641; (g) T. J. Clark, K. Lee and I. Manners, Chem.-Eur. J., 2006, 12, 8634–8648; (h) H. Yamashita and M. Tanaka, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 1995, 68, 403–419; (i) B. Marciniec, C. Pietraszuk, P. Pawluc and H. Maciejewski, Chem. Rev., 2021, 122, 3996–4090; (j) B. H. Kim, M. S. Cho and H. G. Woo, Synlett, 2004, 0761–0772.
- 4 C. Aitken and J. F. Harrod, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 1985, 279, C11–C13.
- 5 (a) J. F. Harrod, Coord. Chem. Rev., 2000, 206-207, 493-531;
  (b) J. Y. Corey, X. H. Zhu, T. C. Bedard and L. D. Lange, Organometallics, 1991, 10, 924-930; (c) B. J. Grimmond and J. Y. Corey, Organometallics, 2000, 19, 3776-3783; (d) A. D. Sadow and T. D. Tilley, Organometallics, 2003, 22, 3577-3585.
- 6 (a) I. Ojima, S. I. Inaba, T. Kogure and Y. Nagai, J. Organomet. Chem., 1973, 55, C7-C8; (b) L. Rosenberg, C. W. Davis and J. Yao, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2001, 123, 5120-5121; (c) S. M. Jackson, D. M. Chisholm, J. S. McIndoe and L. Rosenberg, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem., 2011, 327-330; (d) K. A. Brown-Wensley, Organometallics, 1987, 6, 1590-1591; (e) L. S. Chang and J. Y. Corey, Organometallics, 1989, 8, 1885–1893; (f) M. D. Fryzuk, L. Rosenberg and S. J. Rettig, Inorg. Chim. Acta, 1994, 222, 345-364; (g) F. G. Fontaine, T. Kadkhodazadeh and D. Zargarian, Chem. Commun., 1998, 1253-1254; (h) E. E. Smith, G. Du, P. E. Fanwick and M. M. Abu-Omar, Organometallics, 2010, 29, 6527-6533; (i) F. G. Fontaine and D. Zargarian, Organometallics, 2002, 21, 401-408; (j) B. P. Chauhan, T. Shimizu and M. Tanaka, Chem. Lett., 1997, 26, 785-786; (k) M. Tanabe, S. Iwase and K. Osakada, Organometallics, 2016, 35, 2557-2562; (1) M. Tanabe, A. Takahashi, T. Fukuta and K. Osakada, Organometallics, 2013, 32, 1037-1043.
- 7 (a) B. Pribanic, M. Trincado, F. Eiler, M. Vogt, A. Comas-Vives and H. Grützmacher, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2020, 59, 15603–15609; Angew. Chem., 2020, 132, 15733–15739; (b)
  S. I. Kalläne, R. Laubenstein, T. Braun and M. Dietrich, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem., 2016, 530–537; (c) D. Schmidt, T. Zell, T. Schaub and U. Radius, Dalton Trans., 2014, 43, 10816–10827; (d) J. Voigt, M. A. Chilleck and T. Braun, Dalton Trans., 2013, 42, 4052–4058.
- 8 (a) N. P. Mankad, M. T. Whited and J. C. Peters, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2007, 46, 5768–5771; Angew. Chem., 2007, 119, 5870–5873; (b) H. Schneider, D. Schmidt, A. Eichhöfer, M. Radius, F. Weigend and U. Radius, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem., 2017, 2600–2616; (c) Y. Sunada, T. Imaoka and H. Nagashima, Organometallics, 2013, 32, 2112–2120; (d) Y. Sunada, T. Imaoka and H. Nagashima, Organometallics, 2010, 29, 6157–6160.
- 9 (a) T. Tsumuraya, Y. Kabe and W. Ando, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 1994, **482**, 131–138; (b) L. Roß and M. Dräger, *Z. Naturforsch.*

**Edge Article** 

B, 1983, **38**, 665–673; (c) W. P. Neumann and K. Kühlein, *Justus Liebigs Ann. Chem.*, 1965, **683**, 1–11.

- 10 (a) R. D. Miller and J. Michl, *Chem. Rev.*, 1989, 89, 1359–1410;
  (b) R. G. Jones and S. J. Holder, *Polym. Int.*, 2006, 55, 711–718;
  (c) R. West, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 1986, 300, 327–346.
- 11 C. Qing and C. Cui, Dalton Trans., 2017, 46, 8746-8750.
- 12 M. Okazaki, H. Kimura, T. Komuro, H. Okada and H. Tobita, *Chem. Lett.*, 2007, **36**, 990–991.
- 13 M. Itazaki, M. Kamitani, K. Ueda and H. Nakazawa, *Organometallics*, 2009, **28**, 3601–3603.
- 14 S. Pelzer, B. Neumann, H. G. Stammler, N. Ignat'ev and B. Hoge, *Chem.–Eur. J.*, 2017, **23**, 12233–12242.
- 15 Y. Kobayashi and Y. Sunada, Catalysts, 2019, 10, 29.
- 16 (a) E. Westhof and M. A. Sundaralingam, J. Am. Chem. Soc.,
  1983, 105, 970–976; (b) C. T. Altona and M. Sundaralingam, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1972, 94, 8205–8212.
- 17 B. Jousseaume, N. Noiret, M. Pereyre, A. Saux and J. M. Frances, *Organometallics*, 1994, 13, 1034–1038.