

# Trinuclear Triangular Copper(II) Clusters – Synthesis, Electrochemical Studies and Catalytic Peroxidative Oxidation of Cycloalkanes

Corrado Di Nicola,<sup>[a]</sup> Federica Garau,<sup>[b,c]</sup> Yauhen Y. Karabach,<sup>[c]</sup>  
Luísa M. D. R. S. Martins,<sup>[c,d]</sup> Magda Monari,<sup>[e]</sup> Luciano Pandolfo,<sup>\*,[b]</sup> Claudio Pettinari,<sup>\*,[a]</sup>  
and Armando J. L. Pombeiro<sup>\*,[c]</sup>

**Keywords:** Cluster compounds / Copper / Oxidation / Electrochemistry / Copper(II) trinuclear complexes / Catalytic peroxidative oxidation

The reactions of Cu<sup>II</sup> carboxylates (valerate, 2-methylbutyrate, hexanoate, heptanoate) with pyrazole (Hpz) in EtOH or EtOH/water solutions easily afford the triangular trinuclear copper derivatives [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>(RCOO)<sub>2</sub>(L)<sub>x</sub>] [R = CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>, L = H<sub>2</sub>O, x = 1 for **5**; R = CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CH(CH<sub>3</sub>), L = EtOH, x = 2 for **6**; R = CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>4</sub>, L = EtOH, x = 1 for **7**; R = CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub>, L = EtOH, x = 1 for **8**] as it has been previously found for R = H, L = Hpz, x = 2, (**1**); R = CH<sub>3</sub>, L = Hpz, x = 1, (**2**); R = CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>, L = EtOH, x = 1, (**3**) and [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>-(CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)(H<sub>2</sub>O)], (**4**). The trinuclear structure common to **5–8** has been assigned on the basis of magnetic susceptibility studies, ESI MS, IR and UV/Vis spectroscopy as well as <sup>1</sup>H NMR measurements. The room temp. magnetic susceptibilities of **5–8** almost correspond to the presence of a single unpaired electron for each trinuclear unit. The IR spectra exhibit signals due to the bridging μ<sub>3</sub>-OH in accordance with what was observed in the spectra of **1–4**. Solid-state and MeOH solution UV/Vis spectra show the

same features previously reported for **1–4** and <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra of **1–8** show almost identical low field signals that can be assigned to pz<sup>-</sup> hydrogens. A detailed investigation of the supramolecular structures of **1** and **4** and the single-crystal X-ray study of the polymeric *paddlewheel* Cu(2-methylbutyrate)<sub>2</sub>, **A**, are also reported. Electrochemical experiments show that in **1–8** the Cu<sup>II</sup> ions can be reduced, in distinct steps, to Cu<sup>I</sup> and Cu<sup>0</sup>. All the complexes act as catalysts or catalyst precursors for the efficient peroxidative oxidation, by aqueous hydrogen peroxide in acetonitrile and at room temp., of cycloalkanes RH (cyclohexane and cyclopentane) to the corresponding cyclic alcohols and ketones, with overall yields of up to 34 % and TONs up to 42. Radical pathways involving the formation of alkyl hydroperoxides (ROOH) are involved.

(© Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, 69451 Weinheim, Germany, 2009)

## Introduction

Oligonuclear transition metal complexes have drawn a significant amount of attention due to their magnetic properties, redox characteristics and relevance in numerous catalytic industrial and biological processes.<sup>[1]</sup> The strong interest in di-, tri- and polynuclear copper(II) complexes mainly

stems from the fact that copper has been recognised as a fundamental element in biological systems. As an example, copper species are present in numerous enzymes that selectively catalyse various oxidation reactions,<sup>[1g–l,2]</sup> including those performed by the still poorly characterised particulate methane monooxygenase (pMMO) present in methanotrophs, in which a Cu cluster catalyses alkane hydroxylation and alkene epoxidation.<sup>[2c,f,g]</sup> Moreover, trinuclear arrays of copper(II) have been indicated as the essential functional units in numerous multicopper blue oxidases such as laccase and ascorbate oxidases.<sup>[3]</sup>

In past years we have successfully synthesised di-, tri-, tetra- and polynuclear triethanolamine copper(II) complexes,<sup>[4]</sup> as well as trinuclear triangular copper(II) complexes with carboxylate ligands<sup>[5]</sup> and shown<sup>[4,5c]</sup> that they can act as remarkably active and selective catalysts or catalyst precursors for peroxidative oxidation of cycloalkanes to the corresponding alcohols and ketones.

Continuing our studies on these compounds, we have synthesised and characterised four new trinuclear triangular Cu<sup>II</sup> compounds, [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>(RCOO)<sub>2</sub>L<sub>x</sub>] [pz = pyr-

[a] Dipartimento di Scienze Chimiche, Università di Camerino, Via S. Agostino, 1, 62032 Camerino (MC), Italy  
Fax: +39-0737-637345

E-mail: claudio.pettinari@unicam.it

[b] Dipartimento di Scienze Chimiche, Università di Padova, Via Marzolo, 1, 35131 Padova, Italy  
E-mail: luciano.pandolfo@unipd.it

[c] Centro de Química Estrutural, Complexo I, Instituto Superior Técnico, TU Lisbon, Av. Rovisco Pais, 1049-001 Lisbon, Portugal  
E-mail: pombeiro@ist.utl.pt

[d] Departamento de Engenharia Química, ISEL, R. Conselheiro Emídio Navarro, 1950-062 Lisbon, Portugal


[e] Dipartimento di Chimica “G. Ciamician”, Università di Bologna, Via Selmi, 2, 40126 Bologna, Italy

Supporting information for this article is available on the WWW under <http://www.eurjic.org> or from the author.

azolate; L = EtOH, H<sub>2</sub>O; R = CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub> (valerate), CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CH(CH<sub>3</sub>) (2-methylbutyrate), CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>4</sub> (hexanoate), CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub> (heptanoate)]. For these compounds, as well as for the related previously reported derivatives with R = H (formate),<sup>[5b]</sup> CH<sub>3</sub> (acetate)<sup>[5a]</sup> or CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub> (butyrate),<sup>[5b]</sup> we report the catalytic properties for the peroxidative oxidation of cycloalkanes. Moreover, the electrochemical behaviour of such compounds and of an analogous derivative with R = CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub> (propionate) is presented. Finally, the crystal structure of Cu(2-methylbutyrate)<sub>2</sub> and the supramolecular H-bonding features of trinuclear triangular derivatives [with R = H and CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] are briefly outlined.

## Results and Discussion

Recently, we established a synthetic procedure for obtaining trinuclear triangular copper(II) derivatives simply by treating Cu<sup>II</sup> carboxylates with Hpz in the presence of water, according to the reaction reported in Scheme 1.<sup>[5]</sup>



Scheme 1. General procedure for the synthesis of trinuclear copper complexes [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>(RCOO)<sub>2</sub>L<sub>x</sub>L'<sub>y</sub>].

The single-crystal X-ray diffraction molecular structures of compounds 1–4<sup>[5]</sup> indicated the formation of a trinuclear triangular core [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup>, the three Cu<sup>II</sup> ions also being coordinated by two carboxylate groups, neutral azoles and/or solvent molecules.<sup>[6]</sup>

Moreover, these trinuclear triangular clusters act as secondary building units (SBUs) forming 1D (3) or 2D (1, 2) metal organic frameworks (MOFs) or a hexanuclear cluster (4) through bridging carboxylates. Since a deep examination of other relevant supramolecular interactions, such as H-bonds, was in some cases explicitly omitted,<sup>[5a,5b]</sup> we have hereby taken opportunity to briefly describe these features which are involved in the supramolecular assembly of 1 and 4.<sup>[7]</sup>

In [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>(HCOO)<sub>2</sub>(Hpz)<sub>2</sub>·H<sub>2</sub>O (1), the most relevant supramolecular interactions are due to formate bridges generating a “fishing net” 2D MOF<sup>[5b]</sup> but a relevant role is also played by H-bonds which involve the crystallisation water molecules, the two formate groups and the μ<sub>3</sub>-OH unit (see Figure S1). In particular, each crystallisation water molecule behaves as an H donor in two strong H-bonds, the first one with μ<sub>3</sub>-OH [O(1w)···O(1) 2.710(4) Å, O(1w)···H(1)–O(1) 163(5)°] from the complex in the same asymmetric unit, while the second one is with the

uncoordinated carboxylate oxygen [O(5')] of another trinuclear unit [O(5')···O(1w) 2.780(5) Å, O(5')···H(1w)–O(1w) 130(4)°; symmetry code: (I)  $-x, y - 0.5, -z + 1$ ]. Moreover, compound 1 forms two relatively strong intermolecular H-bonds between: i) the pyrazolic hydrogen bound to N(10) and the coordinated oxygen [O(4')] of the formate group belonging to the adjacent trinuclear unit [O(4')···N(10) 2.828(4) Å, O(4')···H(10N)–N(10) 168°] and ii) the pyrazolic hydrogen H(8N) of the second terminally bound pyrazole and a formate oxygen O(2'') of a third trinuclear unit [O(2'')···N(8) 2.677(4) Å, O(2'')···H(8N)–N(8) 167°; symmetry code: (II)  $x + 1, y, z$ ]. In both cases the 2D MOFs generated through formate bridges are reinforced.

In compound 4 the most striking structural feature is the presence, in contrast to 1, of hexanuclear units located around inversion centres and generated by two monodentate carboxylate bridges (see Scheme S1 in the Supporting Information).<sup>[5b]</sup> Two intramolecular H-bonds can also be detected, those involving the carboxylate oxygen O(3) with the proton of the central μ<sub>3</sub>-OH group [O(3)···O(1) 2.763(4) Å, O(3)···H–O(1) 162(4)°] and two interactions involving the carboxylate O(5) with the hydrogen of coordinated methanol [O(5)···O(6) 2.815(4) Å, O(5)···H(61)–O(6) 171(6)°] (see Figure S2a). O(5) is also engaged in an intermolecular H-bond with the coordinated water of another hexanuclear unit [O(5)···O(7'') 2.694(4) Å, O(5)···H(8w'')–O(7'') 166(5)°; symmetry code: (II)  $-x + 1, -y + 1, -z$ ] thus generating a 1D supramolecular network running along the *ab* diagonal (see Figure S2b). Moreover, the carboxylate oxygens O(3) pertaining to these parallel networks are also involved in another series of intermolecular H-bonds with coordinated water molecules of neighbouring units [O(3)···O(7'') 2.947(4) Å, O(3)···H(7w'')–O(7'') 151(5)°; symmetry code: (III)  $x, y + 1, z$ ] with formation of a 2D supramolecular network (see Figure S3).

Continuing our studies, we examined the reactions of Hpz with other Cu<sup>II</sup> carboxylates, namely valerate, 2-methylbutyrate, hexanoate and heptanoate. Incidentally, in the course of the synthesis of copper(II) 2-methylbutyrate, A, we isolated well formed crystals of this compound. A single-crystal X-ray diffraction study showed that compound A has the typical paddlewheel structure which behaves as a secondary building unit (SBU) to form a 1D MOF in a manner similar to what can be observed in other copper(II) carboxylates.<sup>[8]</sup>

The molecular structure of A,<sup>[9]</sup> which is based on a crystallographic inversion centre located midway along the Cu–Cu vector, is shown in Figure 1. The paddlewheel motif of A is generated by two different types of carboxylate anions almost symmetrically bridging two copper(II) ions. The Cu(1)–O bond lengths are very similar, falling in the range 1.927–1.966(3) Å with the exception of the Cu(1')–O(4) distance which is slightly longer [2.004(3) Å]. In addition, O(4) is also coordinated to the copper Cu(1'') of another paddlewheel unit [O(4)–Cu(1'') 2.216(2) Å] thus generating a 1D MOF running down the crystallographic *a* axis (see Figure S4). Finally, the Cu(1)···Cu(1') separation in the carboxylate bridged complex is 2.5820(8) Å [symmetry code (I):

$-x + 1, -y, -z]$  which is substantially shorter than the inter-paddlewheel distance  $[\text{Cu}(1)\cdots\text{Cu}(1'')] 3.2438(8) \text{ \AA}$ , symmetry code (II):  $-x, -y, -z]$ .




Figure 1. Molecular structure of **A** showing the typical paddlewheel arrangement. Relevant bond lengths [Å]: Cu(1)–O(1) 1.937, Cu(1)–O(2) 1.927, Cu(1)–O(3) 1.966, Cu(1')–O(4) 2.004(3), Cu(1)⋯Cu(1') 2.5820(8).

The reaction of Hpz with  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}$  valerate, 2-methylbutyrate, hexanoate or heptanoate yielded compounds **5–8**, respectively. Unfortunately, we were unable to obtain crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction but we inferred their structures from analytical and spectroscopic data all of which suggest that they have the same trinuclear triangular  $[\text{Cu}_3(\mu_3\text{-OH})(\mu\text{-pz})_3]^{2+}$  core sketched in Scheme 1.

First of all, the formation in each synthesis of the corresponding carboxylic acid (see Experimental Section) indicates that the carboxylates have deprotonated water and Hpz generating  $\text{OH}^-$  and  $\text{pz}^-$  ions which build up the  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}$  trinuclear triangular core.

IR spectra are in accordance with the proposed structure for **5–8**. The IR spectra of **5**, **7** and **8** in fact show two strong bands corresponding to  $\nu_{\text{asym}}(\text{COO})$  (ca  $1570 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) and  $\nu_{\text{s}}(\text{COO})$  ( $1430 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ). The  $\Delta$  values [ $\nu_{\text{asym}}(\text{COO}) - \nu_{\text{s}}(\text{COO})$ ] are in agreement with a nearly symmetric bridging bidentate coordination for the carboxylates, analogous to that found in derivative **4**.<sup>[5b]</sup> On the other hand, the spectrum of **6** is very similar to that of derivative **3**:<sup>[5b]</sup> two sets of absorptions of very different intensities, due to carboxylates, are actually present. Both sets exhibit a  $\Delta$  value of ca.  $120 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and could be assigned to methylbutyrate symmetrically bridging two  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}$  centres in a mono- or bidentate fashion.<sup>[16]</sup> The IR spectra of **5–8** always show a signal at ca.  $750 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  [ $\delta(\text{CH})_{\text{oop}}$ ] which corresponds to bridging pyrazolate ligands.<sup>[17]</sup> No absorption assignable to  $\nu(\text{N-H})$  could be observed. Besides the expected band over  $3000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , due to  $\nu(\text{C-H})$  of the pyrazolate,<sup>[18]</sup> a broad absorption between  $3300\text{--}2800 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , most likely due to hydrogen-bonded OH from alcohol or water, is present. Very small absorptions, sometimes found at ca.  $1715 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , are due to traces of RCOOH formed during the synthesis.

$^1\text{H}$  NMR measurements carried out on  $\text{CD}_3\text{OD}$  solutions of **1–8** show, besides relatively high-field signals due to carboxylate hydrogens, two low-field broad peaks at ca. 37 ppm ( $\delta_1$ ) and ca. 41 ppm ( $\delta_2$ ), integrating in a 2:1 ratio.

These can be assigned to the two equivalent H(3) and H(5) ( $\delta_1$ ) and H(4) ( $\delta_2$ ) pyrazolate hydrogens as already reported for some similar  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}$  trinuclear triangular derivatives.<sup>[19]</sup>

The room temperature magnetic susceptibilities of compounds **5–8** are consistent with the proposed trinuclear arrangement. The observed  $\mu$  values, ranging between 2.45 and 2.73 BM, although a little bit larger than those found for **1–4**,<sup>[5a,5b]</sup> are too low for three independent  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}$  ions, suggesting some kind of exchange coupling in these cases as well.

ESI MS data further support the presence, in **5–8**, of the  $[\text{Cu}_3(\mu_3\text{-OH})(\mu\text{-pz})_3]^{2+}$  core with positive charges balanced by two carboxylate ions. In detail, most relevant signals (Table 1) can be attributed to trinuclear and hexanuclear moieties, analogous to what was previously observed for compounds **1–4**.<sup>[5]</sup> Even though the ESI MS data are not an exhaustive proof of the presence, in the solid-state, of trinuclear or hexanuclear  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}$  clusters,<sup>[20]</sup> they certainly strongly suggest this feature, particularly if we take into account that peaks attributable to mononuclear  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}$  species are generally not observed (see Figures S5–S8).

Table 1. Most relevant signals in the ESI mass spectra of compounds **5–8**.

	Signal <sup>[a]</sup>	Rel. ab. <sup>[b]</sup>	Assignment <sup>[c]</sup>
<b>5</b>	684.8	63	$[\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{pz})_3(\text{RCOO})_2(\text{MeOH})(\text{S})] + \text{H}^+$
	1112.8	100	$[\text{Cu}_6(\text{OH})_4(\text{pz})_6(\text{RCOO})(\text{MeOH})_3]^+$
	1148.8	96	$[\text{Cu}_6(\text{OH})_4(\text{pz})_6(\text{RCOO})(\text{H}_2\text{O})_2(\text{MeOH})_3]^+$
<b>6</b>	752.7	16	$[\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{pz})_3(\text{RCOO})_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})_2(\text{MeOH})_2(\text{S})] + \text{H}^+$
	1112.6	40	$[\text{Cu}_6(\text{OH})_4(\text{pz})_6(\text{RCOO})(\text{MeOH})_3]^+$
	1148.5	100	$[\text{Cu}_6(\text{OH})_4(\text{pz})_6(\text{RCOO})(\text{H}_2\text{O})_2(\text{MeOH})_3]^+$
<b>7</b>	698.8	52	$[\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{pz})_3(\text{RCOO})_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})(\text{S})] + \text{H}^+$
	1154.8	83	$[\text{Cu}_6(\text{OH})_3(\text{pz})_6(\text{RCOO})_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})_3]^+$
	1190.8	100	$[\text{Cu}_6(\text{OH})_3(\text{pz})_6(\text{RCOO})_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})_4]^+$
<b>8</b>	619.9	25	$[\text{Cu}_3(\text{OH})(\text{pz})_3(\text{RCOO})(\text{MeOH})_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})]^+$
	1196.8	35	$[\text{Cu}_6(\text{OH})_3(\text{C}_3\text{H}_3\text{N}_2)_6(\text{RCOO})_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})_4(\text{MeOH})]^+$
	1232.8	100	$[\text{Cu}_6(\text{OH})_3(\text{C}_3\text{H}_3\text{N}_2)_6(\text{RCOO})_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})_6(\text{MeOH})]^+$

[a] Values corresponding to the higher signals of the isotopic clusters. All isotopic clusters fit satisfactorily with calculated ones.<sup>[21]</sup>

[b] Relative abundance of the higher signal of the isotopic cluster. [c] S = MeCN; R =  $\text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_3$ , (**5**),  $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{CH}(\text{CH}_3)$ , (**6**),  $\text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_4$ , (**7**),  $\text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_5$ , (**8**).

Finally, the trinuclear triangular structure of **5–8** is supported by their solid-state reflectance and MeOH solution electronic spectra (400–800 nm) (Figure 2).

The solid-state spectra of **5–8** (Figure 2a) show almost identical patterns. In detail, besides two shoulders around 520 and 720 nm, they display a complex absorption band where two maxima positioned at ca. 610 and 650 nm are evident. These spectroscopic patterns are only slightly different in MeOH solutions (Figure 2b) and the two low energy maxima observed in the solid-state mediate into broad asymmetric signals centred around 620–625 nm. The observed patterns are almost identical to those shown by **1–4**<sup>[5]</sup> and other closely related species with  $\text{Cl}^-$ ,<sup>[22]</sup>  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ,  $\text{ClO}_4^-$ ,  $\text{CF}_3\text{COO}^-$ ,  $\text{CF}_3\text{SO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$  counter anions<sup>[23]</sup> and trinuclear triangular structures ascertained by single-crystal X-ray determinations. Moreover, these patterns differ greatly from the UV/Vis spectra of MeOH solutions of the mononuclear species  $\text{Cu}(\text{Hpz})_4(\text{X})_2$  ( $\text{X} = \text{Cl}^-$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ,




Figure 2. Solid-state reflectance (a) and MeOH solution (b) electronic spectra of **5** (squares), **6** (stars), **7** (solid circles) and **8** (triangles).

$\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4^-$ ,  $\text{ClO}_4^-$ ,  $\text{CF}_3\text{COO}^-$ ,  $\text{CF}_3\text{SO}_3^-$ ;  $\text{X}_2 = \text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ), which exhibit a characteristic broad signal in the range 710–720 nm.<sup>[22,23]</sup>

### Electrochemical Behaviour of 1–8

The redox properties of compounds **1–8** have been investigated by cyclic voltammetry using a Pt electrode in a 0.2 M  $[\text{nBu}_4\text{N}][\text{BF}_4]/\text{DMSO}$  solution at 25 °C. All compounds exhibit similar voltammograms, showing two single-electron (per metal atom) irreversible reduction waves, (Figure 3 shows the voltammogram of **2**) assigned to the  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}} \rightarrow \text{Cu}^{\text{I}}$  (wave I) and  $\text{Cu}^{\text{I}} \rightarrow \text{Cu}^0$  (wave II) reductions, at the reduction peak potential values given in Table 2 ( $^{\text{I}}E_{\text{p}}^{\text{red}}$  in the range from  $-0.38$  to  $-0.45$  V vs. SCE and  $^{\text{II}}E_{\text{p}}^{\text{red}}$  between  $-1.31$  and  $-1.52$  V vs. SCE). In addition, a new irreversible oxidation wave (wave *a*) in the range 0.2–0.5 V vs. SCE (Table 2, Figure 3) can be observed upon scan reversal following the first reduction wave. It corresponds to the oxidation of the  $\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}$  species formed at the first reduction process.

The occurrence of a single-electron reduction per  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}$  (or  $\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}$ ) ion was confirmed by exhaustive controlled potential electrolysis (CPE) at a potential slightly more cathodic to that of the peak potential of wave I (or II). This corresponds to a charge consumption of  $3 \text{ F mol}^{-1}$  of complex. The reduced  $\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}$  compounds appear to be stable in the solvent/electrolyte medium along the CPE and the corresponding  $\text{Cu}^{\text{I/III}}$  oxidation (wave *a*) and  $\text{Cu}^{\text{I/0}}$  reduction (wave II) can be observed at the end of the electrolysis




Figure 3. Cyclic voltammogram of  $[\text{Cu}_3(\mu_3\text{-OH})(\mu\text{-pz})_3(\text{CH}_3\text{COO})_2(\text{Hpz})]$ , **2**, in a 0.2 M  $[\text{nBu}_4\text{N}][\text{BF}_4]/\text{DMSO}$  solution ( $c = 2.41 \text{ mM}$ ), at a Pt disk working electrode ( $d = 0.5 \text{ mm}$ ) at  $200 \text{ mVs}^{-1}$ .

Table 2. Cyclic voltammetric data<sup>[a]</sup> for complexes **1–8**.

Complex	Cathodic waves $^{\text{I}}E_{\text{p}}^{\text{red}}$	$^{\text{II}}E_{\text{p}}^{\text{red}}$	Anodic wave <sup>[b]</sup> $E_{\text{p}}^{\text{ox}}$
<b>1</b>	$-0.40$	$-1.40$	$0.28$
<b>2</b>	$-0.44$	$-1.31$	$0.19$
<b>3</b>	$-0.38$	$-1.42$	$0.35$
<b>4</b>	$-0.38$	$-1.51$	$0.33$
<b>5</b>	$-0.45$	$-1.44$	$0.47$
<b>6</b> <sup>[c]</sup>	$-0.45$	$-1.49$	$0.28$
<b>7</b> <sup>[c]</sup>	$-0.45$	$-1.44$	$0.54$
<b>8</b>	$-0.42$	$-1.52$	$0.39$

[a] Potential values in volts  $\pm 0.02$  vs. SCE in a 0.2 M  $[\text{nBu}_4\text{N}][\text{BF}_4]/\text{DMSO}$  solution with a Pt disk working electrode, determined by using the  $[\text{Fe}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)_2]^{0/+}$  redox couple ( $E_{1/2}^{\text{ox}} = 0.44 \text{ V vs. SCE}$ ) as internal standard and a scan rate of  $200 \text{ mVs}^{-1}$ . [b] Anodic wave (*a*) generated upon scan reversal following the first reduction wave. [c] An oxidation wave at  $E_{\text{p}}^{\text{ox}} = -0.10 \text{ V}$  is generated upon scan reversal following the second reduction wave.

(Table 2). The CPE performed at the second reduction wave leads to the deposition of metallic copper which can be clearly observed by its sharp oxidation (with desorption) wave at  $E_{\text{p}}^{\text{ox}} = -0.11 \text{ V}$ , as shown in Figure 4 for compound **2**.




Figure 4. Cyclic voltammogram after CPE at the reduction wave II of  $[\text{Cu}_3(\mu_3\text{-OH})(\mu\text{-pz})_3(\text{CH}_3\text{COO})_2(\text{Hpz})]$  **2**, in a 0.2 M  $[\text{nBu}_4\text{N}][\text{BF}_4]/\text{DMSO}$  solution with a Pt disk working electrode ( $d = 0.5 \text{ mm}$ ) at  $20 \text{ mVs}^{-1}$ .

No oxidation wave has been detected for any of the complexes by a first anodic sweep without a previous reduction scan, indicating that neither a metal centred nor a ligand centred oxidation occurs. Since any of the cathodic waves involve the reduction of the three metal atoms without differentiation of distinct waves at different potentials, no metal–metal electronic communication was detected. Nevertheless, the occurrence of such an interaction, to a limited extent, cannot be ruled out in view of the considerable broadness of the reduction waves which can result from the overlap of other waves at close but distinct reduction potentials, corresponding to the sequential metal reductions, i.e.  $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}\text{Cu}^{\text{II}} \rightarrow \text{Cu}^{\text{I}}\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}\text{Cu}^{\text{II}} \rightarrow \text{Cu}^{\text{I}}\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}\text{Cu}^{\text{II}} \rightarrow \text{Cu}^{\text{I}}\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}$  for wave I and, similarly, for the further reductions to  $\text{Cu}^0$  at wave II. The values of the reduction potentials of our complexes could reflect the electron-donor character of their ligands but the narrow range and the broadness of the waves prevent reliable comparisons.

All the above indicated characterisations made us fully confident of the trinuclear triangular nature of compounds **5–8**. We therefore tested them (as well as compounds **1**, **2** and **4**) as catalysts for the peroxidative oxidation of cycloalkanes in order to compare their behaviour with that shown by compound **3**.<sup>[5c]</sup>

#### Catalytic Peroxidative Oxidation of Cycloalkanes (Compounds **1**, **2** and **4–8**)

All the new trinuclear triangular copper(II) complexes behave as catalysts or catalyst precursors for the mild peroxidative oxidation of cyclohexane and cyclopentane with aqueous  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ , at room temperature and atmospheric pressure, to the corresponding cyclic alcohols (i.e. cyclohexanol or cyclopentanol) and cyclic ketones (i.e. cyclohexanone or cyclopentanone). The reactions were carried out in a liquid biphasic ( $\text{MeCN}/\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) medium in the presence of nitric acid. The activity and selectivity depend on a variety of factors such as the relative amounts of the reagents and solvent which can be varied for the optimisation of the reaction conditions as we have reported<sup>[4b,24–28]</sup> for other alkane functionalisation catalytic systems. Moreover, the addition of nitric acid to the reaction mixture strongly enhances the activity as reported<sup>[29–31]</sup> for other metal catalysts with N,O ligands, since it can activate the catalyst by promoting unsaturation of the metal centre upon ligand protonation, stabilises peroxo intermediate species<sup>[4a]</sup> and prevents the decomposition of hydrogen peroxide. According to our previous observations,<sup>[5c]</sup> the maximum activity for the trinuclear copper(II) complexes was reached for the acid-to-catalyst and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ -to-catalyst molar ratios of ca. 10:1 and ca. 500–1000, respectively, values that were chosen as typical for the experiments. An increase in the temperature leads to a yield drop (Table 3, entry 18), probably due to the decomposition of hydrogen peroxide.

The use of such catalysts precursors led, in a single batch, to overall yields (based on the cycloalkane) of up to 34% and turnover numbers (TONs) of up to 42 mol of products

per mol of catalyst (see Tables 3, 4, and 5 and Figures 5, 6, and 7). Simple salts of copper(II), such as basic copper(II) carbonate and copper(II) 2-methylbutyrate, exhibit much lower catalytic activities under similar reaction conditions (Tables 3, entries 19, 20 and 5, entries 7, 8). Only traces of cycloalkane oxidation products are obtained in the absence of the copper(II) catalyst.

Table 3. Peroxidative oxidation of cyclohexane to cyclohexanol and cyclohexanone catalysed by compounds **1–8**.<sup>[a]</sup>

Entry	Cat <sup>[b]</sup>	$n(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2)/n(\text{Cat})$	% Yield <sup>[d]</sup> of products			A/K <sup>[e]</sup>	TON <sup>[f]</sup>
			alcohol	ketone	total <sup>[d]</sup>		
1	<b>1</b>	500	26.5	4.9	31.4	5.6	31.4
2	<b>2</b>	500	26.4	4.6	31.0	5.9	31.0
3	<b>3</b> <sup>[g]</sup>	500	23.0	2.6	25.6	9.1	25.6
4	<b>4</b>	500	23.8	4.3	28.1	5.6	28.1
5	<b>5</b>	500	23.3	3.3	26.6	7.1	26.6
6	<b>6</b>	1000	25.2	6.4	31.6	4.0	31.6
7	<b>7</b>	1000	25.2	6.8	32.0	3.7	32.0
8	<b>8</b>	1000	24.1	6.1	30.2	4.0	30.2
9	<b>1</b>	250	23.9	3.1	27.1	7.7	27.1
10	<b>1</b>	750	26.3	7.9	34.2	3.3	34.2
11	<b>1</b>	1000	23.4	9.0	32.4	2.6	32.4
12	<b>4</b>	250	20.2	2.8	23.0	7.1	23.0
13	<b>4</b>	750	25.0	8.2	33.2	7.1	23.0
14	<b>4</b>	1000	19.8	9.7	29.5	2.0	29.5
15	<b>5</b>	250	21.2	3.6	24.8	5.9	24.8
16	<b>5</b>	750	24.7	8.2	32.9	3.0	32.9
17	<b>5</b>	1000	21.2	11.4	32.6	1.9	32.6
18 <sup>[h]</sup>	<b>1</b>	1000	5.5	7.2	12.7	0.8	12.7
19	<sup>[i]</sup>	1000	8.0	8.0	16.0	1.0	16.0
20	<sup>[j]</sup>	1000	–	7.9	7.9	–	7.9

[a] Selected data; reaction conditions:  $\text{C}_6\text{H}_{12}$  (1 mmol), catalyst precursor (10  $\mu\text{mol}$ ),  $\text{MeCN}$  (4 mL),  $\text{HNO}_3$  (0.10 mmol),  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (2.5–10 mmol, added as a 30% aqueous solution), 6 h reaction time, room temperature. [b] Cat = catalyst. [c] Mol of product/100 mol of  $\text{C}_6\text{H}_{12}$ , measured upon reduction of ROOH to the alcohol by  $\text{PPh}_3$ . [d] Cyclohexanol + cyclohexanone. [e] Alcohol (cyclohexanol)/ketone (cyclohexanone) molar ratio, upon reduction of ROOH to the alcohol by  $\text{PPh}_3$ . [f] Overall TON values (mol of products/mol of catalyst). [g] Included<sup>[5c]</sup> for comparative purposes. [h] At 50 °C. [i]  $\text{CuCO}_3 \cdot \text{Cu}(\text{OH})_2$  as catalyst, for comparative purposes. [j]  $\text{Cu}\{\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{CH}(\text{CH}_3)\text{COO}\}_2$  as catalyst, for comparative purposes.

The complexes **1**, **2** and **4**, in the peroxidative oxidation of cyclohexane under the same reaction conditions (Table 3, entries 1–5), exhibit similar catalytic activities which are slightly higher than those of **5** or **3** (the latter has already been investigated<sup>[5c]</sup> and is included for comparative purposes).

An increase in the peroxide-to-catalyst molar ratio results in a yield increase, e.g., for complexes **1**, **4** and **5**, from 24–27 to 33–34% on changing that ratio from 250 to 750 ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  amount increase from 2.5 to 7.5 mmol) whereupon the maximum yields are reached (Figure 5). A further rise of the oxidant amount (up to 10 mmol) does not lead to a better yield.

The relative amounts of the products are also dependent on the hydrogen peroxide amount. In fact, although for the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ /catalyst molar ratio in the 250–500 range the cyclohexanol-to-cyclohexanone molar ratio (A/K) remains grossly invariant (close to 6–8 for catalysts **1**, **4** and **5**)

Table 4. Effect of the catalyst amount in the peroxidative oxidation of cyclohexane catalysed by compound **4**.<sup>[a]</sup>




Entry	Catalyst amount $\mu\text{mol}$	% Yield <sup>[b]</sup> of products			A/K <sup>[d]</sup>	Overall TON <sup>[e]</sup>
		alcohol	ketone	total <sup>[c]</sup>		
1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	—	—
2	0.63	0.9	0.0	0.9	—	14.1
3	1.25	4.5	0.5	5.0	9.1	39.8
4	2.50	9.6	0.9	10.5	11	41.9
5	5.0	16.7	1.7	18.4	10	36.8
6	10.0	23.8	4.3	28.1	5.6	28.1

[a] Selected data; reaction conditions:  $\text{C}_6\text{H}_{12}$  (1 mmol), MeCN 4 mL,  $\text{HNO}_3$  (0.10 mmol),  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (5 mmol, added as a 30% aqueous solution), 6 h reaction time, room temperature. [b] Mol of product/100 mol of  $\text{C}_6\text{H}_{12}$ , measured upon reduction of ROOH to the alcohol by  $\text{PPh}_3$ . [c] Cyclohexanol + cyclohexanone. [d] Alcohol (cyclohexanol)/ketone (cyclohexanone) molar ratio, upon reduction of ROOH to the alcohol by  $\text{PPh}_3$ . [e] Overall TON values (mol of products/mol of catalyst).

Table 5. Peroxidative oxidation of cyclopentane to cyclopentanol and cyclopentanone catalysed by compounds **1–5**.<sup>[a]</sup>

Entry	Cat <sup>[b]</sup>	$n(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2)/n(\text{Cat})$	% Yield <sup>[c]</sup> of products			A/K <sup>[e]</sup>	TON <sup>[f]</sup>
			alcohol	ketone	total <sup>[d]</sup>		
1	—	500	0.0	0.0	—	—	
2	1	500	16.5	9.4	25.9	1.8	
3	2	500	22.2	7.8	30.0	2.9	
4	3 <sup>[g]</sup>	500	22.6	8.4	31.0	2.7	
5	4	500	18.5	11.1	29.6	1.7	
6	5	500	21.6	9.8	31.4	2.2	
7	<sup>[h]</sup>	1000	6.9	8.9	15.8	0.8	
8	<sup>[i]</sup>	1000	3.3	5.1	8.4	0.8	

[a] Selected data; reaction conditions:  $\text{C}_5\text{H}_{10}$  (1 mmol), catalyst precursor (10  $\mu\text{mol}$ ), MeCN 4 mL,  $\text{HNO}_3$  (0.10 mmol),  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (5 or 10 mmol, added as an aqueous 30% solution), 6 h reaction time, room temperature. [b] Cat = Catalyst. [c] Mol of product/100 mol of  $\text{C}_5\text{H}_{10}$ , measured upon reduction of ROOH to the alcohol by  $\text{PPh}_3$ . [d] Cyclopentanol + cyclopentanone. [e] Alcohol (cyclopentanol)/ketone (cyclopentanone) molar ratio, upon reduction of ROOH to the alcohol by  $\text{PPh}_3$ . [f] Overall TON values (mols of products/mol of catalyst). [g] Included<sup>[5c]</sup> for comparative purposes. [h]  $\text{CuCO}_3 \cdot \text{Cu}(\text{OH})_2$  as catalyst, for comparative purposes. [i]  $\text{Cu}\{\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{CH}(\text{CH}_3)\text{COO}\}_2$  as catalyst, for comparative purposes.

Figure 5. Effect of the peroxide-to-catalyst molar ratio on the overall yield of cyclohexanol and cyclohexanone in the cyclohexane oxidation catalysed by **1** (a), **4** (b) or **5** (c).Figure 6. Effect of the peroxide-to-catalyst molar ratio on the cyclohexanol-to-cyclohexanone molar ratio (A/K), in the cyclohexane oxidation catalysed by **1** (a), **4** (b) or **5** (c).Figure 7. Effect of the amount of catalyst **4** on the total yield and turnover number (TON).

(Figure 6), a further increase of the oxidant amount leads to higher yields of cyclohexanone with rough preservation of the cyclohexanol yields (Table 3) [e.g. A/K decreases from 7.1 to 1.9 and K/A increases correspondingly from 0.14 to 0.54 in the case of catalyst **5**, for the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2/\text{catalyst}$  molar ratio change from 500 to 1000]. Hence, the growth of the overall yield with  $n(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2)/n(\text{catalyst})$  (250–750 range) is essentially due to the enhanced formation of cyclohexanone for higher oxidant amounts.

The catalyst amount also plays a role and, as expected, its increase leads to a yield enhancement (Table 4, Figure 7), e.g., from 0.9% to 28% for the respective amounts of 0.63 and 10  $\mu\text{mol}$  of catalyst **4** (which correspond to a substrate/catalyst molar ratio decrease from  $1.59 \times 10^3$  to 100, respectively). On the other hand, a decrease of the catalyst amount below the typical value of 10  $\mu\text{mol}$  results in enhancements of the overall TON from 28 up to 42 and of the A/K ratio from 5.6 up to 11 (Table 4, Figure 7, for catalyst **4**), the maximum TON corresponding to the catalyst amount of 2.5  $\mu\text{mol}$  (substrate/catalyst molar ratio of 400) (entry 4). A further decrease of the amount of catalyst (below ca. 2  $\mu\text{mol}$ , Figure 7) leads to lower TON values.

Our complexes also behave as efficient catalysts or catalyst precursors for the peroxidative oxidation of cyclopentane to cyclopentanol and cyclopentanone, leading to over-

all yields and TONs (Table 5) that are comparable to those observed in the case of cyclohexane oxidation under similar experimental conditions. Typical yields and TONs of ca. 30% and ca. 30, respectively, have been achieved for catalysts 2–5 with 1 being slightly less active. A significant reduction of the relative amount of the alcohol is observed in the cyclopentane oxidation (typical A/K values in the 2–3 range, Table 5) in comparison with the case of cyclohexane (typical A/K values, under identical experimental conditions, within the 6–9 range, Table 3).

The high overall yields (up to 34% in a single batch, in the case of cyclohexane oxidation) achieved with our catalysts (including 3, already studied previously<sup>[5c]</sup>) are comparable with those obtained by other valuable catalysts based on multicopper triethanolamine complexes<sup>[4]</sup> or on iron(III)–chromium(III) hydroxides,<sup>[32]</sup> a bit lower than that (up to 45%) of a heterotrimetallic Fe/Cu/Co complex with a *N,O*-coordination environment<sup>[33a]</sup> and are markedly higher than those with half-sandwich scorpionate tripyrazolymethane complexes of copper, iron or vanadium<sup>[27a]</sup> as well as some pyrazole and trispyrazolymethane rhenium complexes.<sup>[27b]</sup> They are also better than that reported very recently<sup>[27c]</sup> for a dipicolinate-Cu/Na coordination polymer (which, however, has the advantages of being water soluble and operating in the absence of acid) and those shown by other Cu catalytic systems,<sup>[33b–33d]</sup> namely with salen, acetonitrile or phthalocyanine ligands.

Although the detailed mechanisms of the reactions are unknown, we believe they proceed by means of a radical pathway involving both C- and O-centred radicals since, as observed in other cases,<sup>[4b,5c,28a,28c,28d]</sup> the oxidations of the cycloalkanes are essentially suppressed in the presence of radical trapping agents such as bromotrichloromethane, diphenylamine and 2,6-di-*tert*-butyl-4-methylphenol (BHT).

The formation of the ketone does not appear to proceed significantly by oxidation of the alcohol, since by using cyclohexanol as the substrate, instead of the cycloalkane, only very low conversions (2–4%) of cyclohexanol to cyclohexanone were detected (for the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/catalyst molar ratio in the 500–1000 range). Hence, the fall in the A/K ratio for high values of the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/catalyst molar ratio cannot be explained by further oxidation of cyclohexanol (CyOH) to cyclohexanone but may be accounted for by metal-assisted decomposition of cyclohexyl hydroperoxide (CyOOH) to the ketone.<sup>[28c]</sup>

The involvement of CyOOH in the process is indicated by the marked increase of the amount of CyOH (by ca. 70–50%, for the conditions indicated by entries 1 and 11 in Table 3) with the corresponding decrease in the amount of the cycloketone upon treatment of the final reaction solution with an excess of PPh<sub>3</sub> prior to the GC analysis (see Exp. Sect.), following the method reported by Shul'pin.<sup>[34]</sup> Reduction of CyOOH by PPh<sub>3</sub> gives CyOH (with formation of phosphane oxide), thus eliminating the decomposition of CyOOH to both CyOH and the cycloketone in the gas chromatograph. The method<sup>[34]</sup> also allows the estimation of the amount of CyOOH present at the end of the reaction. This organohydroperoxide is then the main product

(e.g. 67% or 47% of the total of all products, for the conditions indicated by entry 1 or 11, respectively, in Table 3).

The reduction in the amount of CyOOH still present at the end of the reaction, upon increasing the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>/catalyst molar ratio, suggests that the higher concentrations of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> favour the decomposition of CyOOH to the products during the reaction.

The formation of the cycloalkyl hydroperoxide (ROOH) can result from the reaction of a metal-peroxo intermediate, e.g. bearing a Cu<sup>II</sup>-OOH type moiety, with the organoradical R<sup>•</sup> to form ROOH (and Cu<sup>I</sup>).<sup>[27a,35,36]</sup> The organohydroperoxide ROOH can undergo metal-assisted homolytic decomposition to alkoxy (RO<sup>•</sup>, upon O–O bond cleavage) and alkylperoxy (ROO<sup>•</sup>, upon O–H bond rupture) radicals from which the final oxygenates can be formed,<sup>[34a,27a,37,38]</sup> i.e. cycloalcohol (ROH) upon H-abstraction from the alkane (RH) by RO<sup>•</sup> or upon decomposition of ROO<sup>•</sup> to both ROH and the cycloketone. In addition, the pyrazole and carboxylate ligands of our catalysts can be involved in proton-transfer steps, e.g., among H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, oxo and/or peroxo species, as suggested<sup>[33c,34a,38b,39]</sup> for some V-catalysts with *N,O*-ligands.

## Conclusions

The reactions of Hpz with some copper(II) carboxylates (namely valerate, 2-methylbutyrate, hexanoate and heptanoate) yield Cu<sup>II</sup> derivatives 5–8 the structures of which, in the absence of XRD data, were inferred on the basis of physico-chemical measurements (magnetic susceptibility, ESI MS, IR and UV/Vis spectroscopy and <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy). In all cases, the triangular trinuclear skeleton [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> is present, analogous to compounds 1–4.<sup>[5]</sup> The compounds 1–8 exhibit, by cyclic voltammetry, irreversible Cu<sup>II</sup> → Cu<sup>I</sup> and Cu<sup>I</sup> → Cu<sup>0</sup> reduction waves which did not clearly reflect any electronic communication between the metals.

All the compounds 1, 2 and 4–8 behave as catalyst precursors for the efficient peroxidative oxidation of cycloalkanes by aqueous hydrogen peroxide, in acetonitrile at room temperature, similar to the previously reported compound 3. Cyclo-alcohols and -ketones are the products of oxidation obtained in markedly high yields, by formation of the corresponding cycloalkyl hydrogen peroxide intermediates (ROOH), following radical mechanisms which were substantiated by radical trap experiments.

## Experimental Section

**Materials and Methods:** All reaction and manipulations were carried out in air. Excluding formate and acetate (Aldrich), copper(II) carboxylates were prepared according to previously reported procedures<sup>[40]</sup> that were slightly modified. Trinuclear triangular Cu<sup>II</sup> derivatives of the type [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>(RCOO)<sub>2</sub>L<sub>x</sub>] with R = H, [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>(HCOO)<sub>2</sub>(Hpz)<sub>2</sub>] (1)<sup>[5b]</sup> R = CH<sub>3</sub>, [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(Hpz)] (2)<sup>[5a]</sup> R = CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>, [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-OH)(μ-pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(EtOH)] (3)<sup>[5b]</sup> and R = CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>, [Cu<sub>3</sub>(μ<sub>3</sub>-

OH)( $\mu$ -pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)(H<sub>2</sub>O)] (**4**)<sup>[5b]</sup> were synthesised as previously reported. All other chemicals were purchased from Aldrich and used without further purification. Elemental analyses (C,H,N) were performed with a Fisons Instruments 1108 CHNS-O Elemental Analyser. IR spectra were recorded from 4000 to 100 cm<sup>-1</sup> with a Perkin–Elmer System 2000 FTIR instrument. Positive electrospray mass spectra were obtained with a Series 1100 MSI detector HP spectrometer by using MeOH as mobile phase. Solutions for electrospray ionisation mass spectrometry (ESI-MS) were prepared using reagent grade methanol and acetonitrile and the obtained data (masses and intensities) were compared with those calculated by using the IsoPro isotopic abundance simulator.<sup>[21]</sup> Peaks containing copper(II) ions were identified as the centres of isotopic clusters. The magnetic susceptibilities were measured at room temperature (20–28 °C) by the Gouy method with a Sherwood Scientific Magnetic Balance MSB-Auto, using HgCo(NCS)<sub>4</sub> as a calibrating agent and data were corrected for diamagnetism with the appropriate Pascal constants. The magnetic moments (in BM) were calculated from the equation  $\mu_{\text{eff}} = 2.84 (X_{\text{m}}^{\text{corr}} T)^{1/2}$ . Reflectance solid-state and MeOH solution UV/Vis spectra were recorded on a Varian Cary 5E spectrophotometer, equipped with a device for reflectance measurements. <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra were obtained with a Bruker Avance 300 instrument. Valeric, 2-methylbutyric, hexanoic and heptanoic acids, formed in the reactions of corresponding copper(II) carboxylates with Hpz, were detected by GC analyses carried out on a Thermo Electron Trace DSQ instrument equipped with a 30 m × 0.25 mm, 0.25 μ Thermo TR 5MS column.

### Syntheses

**Basic Copper(II) Carbonate:** To a water solution (ca. 100 mL) of copper(II) sulfate pentahydrate (10 g) (40 mmol) was added a water solution (75 mL) of K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> (5.54 g, 40 mmol) whilst stirring in 1 mL portions. The resultant light-blue basic copper carbonate [CuCO<sub>3</sub>·Cu(OH)<sub>2</sub>] was filtered off and washed with water until SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup> ions were completely eliminated. Wet CuCO<sub>3</sub>·Cu(OH)<sub>2</sub> was used to prepare some copper(II) carboxylates.

**Copper(II) Valerate:** To a valeric acid (12 mL, 11.27 g, 110 mmol) solution in water (400 mL) was added the freshly prepared wet CuCO<sub>3</sub>·Cu(OH)<sub>2</sub> in small portions, leading to the formation of a green solid. The suspension was stirred for 48 h and the solid filtered off, washed with water and dried under vacuum in the presence of solid KOH. Yield 6.25 g, 24 mmol, 60%, based on starting copper(II) sulfate. C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>18</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> (265.79): calcd. C 45.19, H 6.83; found C 44.61, H 6.85. IR (KBr):  $\tilde{\nu} = 1589$  (s), 1449 (m), 1433 [m v(COO)] cm<sup>-1</sup>.

**Copper(II) 2-Methylbutyrate, A:** The synthesis was carried out as for copper(II) valerate. Yield 60%, based on starting copper(II) sulfate. Recrystallisation from hot EtOH yielded crystals suitable for single crystal XRD determination. C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>18</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> (265.79): calcd. C 45.19, H 6.83; found C 45.19, H 6.85. IR (KBr):  $\tilde{\nu} = 1589$  (s), 1467 (m), 1422 [s v(COO)] cm<sup>-1</sup>.

**Copper(II) Hexanoate:** Commercial basic copper(II) carbonate (1.91 g, 8.5 mmol) was suspended in a little excess of hexanoic acid (5 mL, 4.64 g, 40 mmol). The green suspension was stirred overnight, filtered and washed with cold acetone to remove the excess hexanoic acid. The solid was dried under vacuum and extracted with acetone (Soxlet). The resultant solution was concentrated under vacuum, yielding a green solid that was filtered off, washed with cold acetone and dried under vacuum. Yield 3.0 g, 9.3 mmol, 57%, based on basic copper carbonate. C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>22</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> (293.85): calcd. C 49.05, H 7.55; found C 49.42, H 7.86. IR (KBr):  $\tilde{\nu} = 1590$  (s), 1417 [m v(COO)] cm<sup>-1</sup>.

**Copper(II) Heptanoate:** The synthesis was carried out as for copper(II) hexanoate. Yield 63%, based on basic copper carbonate. C<sub>14</sub>H<sub>26</sub>CuO<sub>4</sub> (321.90): calcd. C 52.24, H 8.14; found C 52.46, H 8.05. IR (KBr):  $\tilde{\nu} = 1596$  (s), 1433 (m), 1417 [m v(COO)] cm<sup>-1</sup>.

**[Cu<sub>3</sub>( $\mu$ -OH)( $\mu$ -pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)] (**5**):** To a solution of copper(II) valerate (500 mg, 1.88 mmol) dissolved in EtOH (50 mL), was added Hpz (140 mg, 2.08 mmol) dissolved in EtOH (10 mL) and H<sub>2</sub>O (1 mL). The solution immediately turned deep blue and was stirred overnight to give a blue solid that was filtered off, washed with ethanol and dried under vacuum. Yield 350 mg, 0.57 mmol, 89%. The presence of valeric acid was ascertained in the mother liquor.

**5:** M.p. above 200 °C. C<sub>19</sub>H<sub>30</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>N<sub>6</sub>O<sub>6</sub> (629.12): calcd. C 36.27, H 4.81, N 13.36; found C 36.87, H 4.13, N 13.22. IR (KBr):  $\tilde{\nu} = 1570$  (s), 1540 [s v(COO)], 1444 (m), 1398 [m v(COO)], 2101 (w) cm<sup>-1</sup>. MS (ESI+, MeOH, MeCN): *m/z* (%) = 684.8 (68) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(OH)(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)(MeCN)]+H<sup>+</sup>; 1076.7 (23) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>4</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)<sub>5</sub>]<sup>+</sup>+Na<sup>+</sup>; 1112.8 (100) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>4</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)<sub>5</sub>]<sup>+</sup> 1148.8 (96) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>4</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)<sub>5</sub>]<sup>+</sup>.  $\mu_{\text{eff}}$  (295 K) = 2.58 BM.  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ /nm (reflectance): 607, 651.  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ /nm (MeOH solution): 626 ( $\epsilon = 191$ ). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CD<sub>3</sub>OD, 298 K):  $\delta = 37.78$  (2 H), 40.88 (1 H) ppm.

**[Cu<sub>3</sub>( $\mu$ -OH)( $\mu$ -pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CH(CH<sub>3</sub>)COO)<sub>2</sub>(EtOH)<sub>2</sub>] (**6**):** To a solution of copper(II) 2-methylbutyrate (550 mg, 2.06 mmol) in EtOH (30 mL) was added Hpz (150 mg, 2.19 mmol) dissolved in EtOH (10 mL). The deep blue solution was stirred overnight and then evaporated to dryness under vacuum. Collected vapours revealed the presence of 2-methylbutyric acid. The deep blue solid was washed with hexane to remove the 2-methylbutyric acid and dried under vacuum. Yield 420 mg, 0.597 mmol, 87%.

**6:** M.p. above 200 °C. C<sub>23</sub>H<sub>40</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>N<sub>6</sub>O<sub>7</sub> (703.24): calcd. C 39.28, H 5.73, N 11.9; found C 38.71, H 5.29, N 11.48. IR (Nujol):  $\tilde{\nu} = 1584$  (s), 1548 [s v(COO)], 1465 (s), 1420 [s v(COO)] cm<sup>-1</sup>. MS (ESI+, MeOH, MeCN): *m/z* (%) = 591.8 (13) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(OH)(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)(MeOH)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)]<sup>+</sup>; 625.8 (20) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)]<sup>+</sup>; 752.7 (16) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(OH)(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)<sub>2</sub>(MeCN)]+H<sup>+</sup>; 1076.6 (10) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>4</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>+Na<sup>+</sup>; 1112.6 (40) Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>4</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)(MeOH)<sub>5</sub>]<sup>+</sup>; 1148.5 (100) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>4</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)<sub>5</sub>]<sup>+</sup>, 1182.4 (19) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>3</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)(MeOH)<sub>4</sub>]<sup>+</sup>.  $\mu_{\text{eff}}$  (295 K) = 2.45 BM.  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ /nm (reflectance): 609, 647, 551 (shoulder).  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ /nm (MeOH solution): 626 ( $\epsilon = 179$ ). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CD<sub>3</sub>OD, 298 K):  $\delta = 37.77$  (2 H), 40.87 (1 H) ppm.

**[Cu<sub>3</sub>( $\mu$ -OH)( $\mu$ -pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>4</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(EtOH)] (**7**):** To a solution of copper(II) hexanoate (530 mg, 1.81 mmol) in EtOH (20 mL) was added Hpz (130 mg, 1.84 mmol) dissolved in EtOH (5 mL). The deep blue solution was stirred overnight and then evaporated to dryness under vacuum. Collected vapours revealed the presence of hexanoic acid. The blue solid obtained was washed with cyclohexane to eliminate hexanoic acid and dried under vacuum. Yield 400 mg, 0.58 mmol, 96%.

**7:** M.p. 195–198 °C (dec., blue colour turns to grey). C<sub>23</sub>H<sub>38</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>N<sub>6</sub>O<sub>6</sub> (685.22): calcd. C 40.31, H 5.59, N 12.26; found C 40.00, H 4.96, N 12.92. IR (Nujol):  $\tilde{\nu} = 1569$  (s), 1542 [s v(COO)], 1430 (m), 1398 [w v(COO)], 2096 (w) cm<sup>-1</sup>. MS (ESI+, MeOH, MeCN): *m/z* (%) = 536 (15) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(OH)<sub>2</sub>(pz)<sub>3</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)(EtOH)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>; 698.8 (52) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(OH)(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>11</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)(MeCN)]+H<sup>+</sup>; 748.8 (14) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(OH)(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>11</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)(MeCN)]+H<sup>+</sup>; 1118.8 (17) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>3</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>11</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>+</sup>; 1154.8 (83) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>3</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>11</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>5</sub>]<sup>+</sup>; 1190.8 (100) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>3</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>11</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>7</sub>]<sup>+</sup>; 1238.8 (10) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>3</sub>(pz)<sub>5</sub>(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>11</sub>COO)<sub>3</sub>



(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>7</sub>)<sup>+</sup>.  $\mu_{\text{eff}}$  (295 K) = 2.73 BM.  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  (reflectance): 611 nm, 645 nm (shoulder).  $\lambda_{\text{max}}/\text{nm}$  (MeOH solution): 621 ( $\epsilon$  = 181). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CD<sub>3</sub>OD, 298 K):  $\delta$  = 37.74 (2 H), 40.89 (1 H) ppm.

**[Cu<sub>3</sub>( $\mu_3$ -OH)( $\mu$ -pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>5</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(EtOH)] (8):** To a solution of copper(II) heptanoate (540 mg, 1.68 mmol) dissolved in EtOH (50 mL) was added Hpz (120 mg, 1.70 mmol) dissolved in EtOH (10 mL). The deep blue solution was stirred for 3 h and then the addition of ca. 80 mL of water produced the precipitation of a clear-blue solid that was filtered off, washed with water and dried under vacuum. Yield 370 mg, 0.52 mmol, 92%. Heptanoic acid was detected in the mother liquor.

**8:** M.p. 190–195 °C (dec., blue colour fades). C<sub>25</sub>H<sub>42</sub>Cu<sub>3</sub>N<sub>6</sub>O<sub>6</sub> (713.28): calcd. C 42.10, H 5.94, N 11.78; found C 42.05, H 5.47, N 11.96. IR (Nujol):  $\tilde{\nu}$  = 1569 (s), 1539 [s  $\nu$ (COO)], 1456 (w), 1430 [m  $\nu$ (COO)], 2095 (w) cm<sup>-1</sup>. MS (ESI+, MeOH, MeCN): *m/z* (%) = 588 (12) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(OH)(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>13</sub>COO)(MeOH)(H<sub>2</sub>O)]<sup>+</sup>; 619.9 (25) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(OH)(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>13</sub>COO)(MeOH)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)]<sup>+</sup>; 650 (10) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>13</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>; 682 (15) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(pz)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>13</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>MeOH]<sup>+</sup>; 712.8 (50) [Cu<sub>3</sub>(OH)(pz)<sub>4</sub>(Hpz)(MeOH)<sub>4</sub>(MeCN)]<sup>+</sup>; 1196.8 (35) Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>3</sub>N<sub>2</sub>)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>13</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>4</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>OH); 1232.8 (100) Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>3</sub>(C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>3</sub>N<sub>2</sub>)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>13</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>6</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>OH); 1294.8 (18) [Cu<sub>6</sub>(OH)<sub>2</sub>(pz)<sub>6</sub>(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>13</sub>COO)<sub>3</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>5</sub>]<sup>+</sup>.  $\mu_{\text{eff}}$  (295 K) = 2.56 BM.  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$  (reflectance): 611 nm, 643 nm.  $\lambda_{\text{max}}/\text{nm}$ (MeOH solution): 626 ( $\epsilon$  = 191). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CD<sub>3</sub>OD, 298 K):  $\delta$  = 37.76 (2 H), 40.83 (1 H) ppm.

#### <sup>1</sup>H NMR Spectroscopic Data of 1–4

<sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra of compounds 1–4 were recorded at 298 K from CD<sub>3</sub>OD solutions.

**[Cu<sub>3</sub>( $\mu_3$ -OH)( $\mu$ -pz)<sub>3</sub>(HCOO)<sub>2</sub>(HPz)<sub>2</sub>] (1):**  $\delta$  = 36.71 (2H), 41.09 (1 H) ppm.

**[Cu<sub>3</sub>( $\mu_3$ -OH)( $\mu$ -pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(HPz)] (2):**  $\delta$  = 37.48 (2H), 40.94 (1 H) ppm.

**[Cu<sub>3</sub>( $\mu_3$ -OH)( $\mu$ -pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(EtOH)] (3):**  $\delta$  = 37.84 (2H), 40.82 (1 H) ppm.

**[Cu<sub>3</sub>( $\mu_3$ -OH)( $\mu$ -pz)<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>COO)<sub>2</sub>(MeOH)(H<sub>2</sub>O)] (4):**  $\delta$  = 37.77 (2H), 40.82 (1 H) ppm.

**Electrochemical Studies:** The electrochemical experiments were performed on an EG&G PAR 273A potentiostat/galvanostat connected to a personal computer through a GPIB interface. Cyclic voltammograms were obtained in 0.2 M [*n*Bu<sub>4</sub>N][BF<sub>4</sub>]/DMSO at a platinum disc working electrode (*d* = 0.5 mm) and at 25 °C. Controlled-potential electrolyses (CPE) were carried out in electrolyte solutions with the above-mentioned composition in a three-electrode H-type cell. The compartments were separated by a sintered glass frit and equipped with platinum gauze working and counter electrodes. For both CV and CPE experiments, a Luggin capillary connected to a silver wire pseudo-reference electrode was used to control the working electrode potential and a Pt wire was employed as the counter-electrode for the CV cell. The CPE experiments were monitored regularly by cyclic voltammetry, thus assuring no significant potential drift occurred along the electrolyses. The redox potentials of the complexes were measured by CV in the presence of ferrocene as the internal standard and their values are quoted relative to the SCE by using the [Fe( $\eta^5$ -C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>0/+</sup> redox couple ( $E_{1/2}^{\text{ox}}$  = 0.44 V vs. SCE<sup>[41]</sup>).

**Catalytic Activity Studies:** The reaction mixtures were prepared as follows: to 0.63–10.0  $\mu\text{mol}$  (typically 10.0  $\mu\text{mol}$ ) of catalyst precursor contained in the reaction flask were added MeCN (4 mL), HNO<sub>3</sub> (0.1 mmol), C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>12</sub> (or C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>10</sub>, 1.0 mmol) and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (30% in H<sub>2</sub>O, 2.5–10.0 mmol), in that order. The reaction mixture was stirred for 6 h at room temperature (ca. 25 °C) and atmospheric

pressure, thereafter cycloheptanone (as internal standard, 90  $\mu\text{L}$ ), diethyl ether (to extract the substrate and the products from the reaction mixture, typically 9.0 mL) and PPh<sub>3</sub> (0.5 g, to reduce the organohydroperoxides, if formed, according to a method developed by Shul'pin<sup>[34]</sup>) were added. The resultant mixture was stirred for 15 min and then a sample taken from the organic phase was analysed by GC using a FISIONS Instruments GC 8000 series gas chromatograph with a DB WAX fused silica capillary column and the Jasco-Borwin v.1.50 software. The GC analyses of the aqueous phase showed the presence of only traces (less than 0.05%) of oxidation products.

**Supporting Information** (see also the footnote on the first page of this article): Structures of 1, 4, copper(II) butyrate; ESI-MS spectra and XRPD patterns for 5, 6, 7, 8.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Italian Programma di Ricerca di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale (PRIN) (fund number 2006038447) and by the Portuguese Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT), and Federación Española de Enfermedades Raras (FEDER), POCI 2010 programme. M. M. wishes to thank the University of Bologna for financial support. F. G. thanks the “Aldo Gini” Foundation (Padova) for a grant to support a research period at Lisbon. The authors are indebted with Mr. Andrea Boaretto for the execution of GM spectra for the identification of carboxylic acids.

- [1] a) G. La Monica, G. A. Ardizzoia, *Prog. Inorg. Chem.* **1997**, *46*, 151–238; b) D. E. Fenton, *Advances in Inorganic and Bioinorganic Mechanisms* (Ed.: A. G. Sykes), Academic Press, London, **1983**, vol. 2; c) S. Ménage, S. E. Vitols, P. Bergerat, E. Codjovi, O. Kahn, J.-J. Girerd, M. Guillot, X. Solans, T. Calvet, *Inorg. Chem.* **1991**, *30*, 2666–2671; d) *Magnetic Molecular Materials* (Eds.: D. Gatteschi, O. Kahn, J. S. Miller, F. Palacio); NATO ASI Series 198; Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, **1991**; e) D. E. Fenton, H. Okawa, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1993**, 1349–1357; f) M. Thomann, O. Kahn, J. Guilhem, F. Varret, *Inorg. Chem.* **1994**, *33*, 6029–6037; g) E. I. Solomon, U. M. Sundaram, T. E. Machonkin, *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, *96*, 2563–2605; h) W. Kaim, J. Rall, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1996**, *35*, 43–60; i) R. H. Holm, P. Kennepohl, E. I. Solomon, *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, *96*, 2239–2314; j) A. P. Sadimenko, S. S. Basson, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1996**, *147*, 247–297; k) O. Kahn, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1997**, *265*, 109; l) O. Roubeau, J. M. A. Gómez, E. Balskus, J. J. A. Kolnar, J. G. Haasnoot, J. Reedijk, *New J. Chem.* **2001**, *25*, 144–150.
- [2] a) J. P. Klinman, *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, *96*, 2541–2562; b) A. P. Cole, D. E. Root, P. Mukherjee, E. I. Solomon, T. D. P. Stack, *Science* **1996**, *273*, 1848–1850; c) S. J. Elliot, M. Zhu, L. Tso, H.-H. T. Nguyen, J. H.-K. Yip, S. I. Chan, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 9949–9955; d) J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva, R. J. P. Williams, *The Biological Chemistry of the Elements*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, **2001**; e) S. Itoh in *Comprehensive Coordination Chemistry*, vol. 8 (Eds.: J. A. McCleverty, T. J. Meyer, L. Que, W. B. Tolman), 2nd ed., Elsevier, Dordrecht, **2003**, chap. 8.15, pp. 369–393; f) D. H. Lee in *Comprehensive Coordination Chemistry*, vol. 8 (Eds.: J. A. McCleverty, T. J. Meyer, L. Que, W. B. Tolman), 2nd ed., Elsevier, Dordrecht, **2003**, chap. 8.17, pp. 437–457; g) M. Ayala, E. Torres, *Appl. Catal. A* **2004**, *272*, 1–13; h) R. L. Lieberman, A. C. Rosenzweig, *Crit. Rev. Biochem. Mol. Biol.* **2004**, *39*, 147–164; i) R. L. Lieberman, A. C. Rosenzweig, *Nature* **2005**, *434*, 177–182; j) J. Yoon, E. I. Solomon, *Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, *44*, 8076–8086.

- [3] R. Huber, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1989**, *28*, 848–869.
- [4] a) A. M. Kirillov, M. N. Kopylovich, M. V. Kirillova, M. Haukka, M. F. C. Guedes da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2005**, *44*, 4345–4349; b) A. M. Kirillov, M. N. Kopylovich, M. V. Kirillova, Y. Y. Karabach, M. Haukka, M. F. C. Guedes da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2006**, *348*, 159–174.
- [5] a) M. Casarin, C. Corvaja, C. Di Nicola, D. Falcomer, L. Franco, M. Monari, L. Pandolfo, C. Pettinari, F. Piccinelli, P. Tagliatesta, *Inorg. Chem.* **2004**, *43*, 5865–5876; b) M. Casarin, C. Corvaja, C. Di Nicola, D. Falcomer, L. Franco, M. Monari, L. Pandolfo, C. Pettinari, F. Piccinelli, *Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, *44*, 6265–6276; c) C. Di Nicola, Y. Y. Karabach, A. M. Kirillov, M. Monari, L. Pandolfo, C. Pettinari, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Inorg. Chem.* **2007**, *46*, 221–230.
- [6] We also obtained the analogous pivalate derivative  $[\text{Cu}_3(\mu_3\text{-OH})(\mu\text{-pz})_3(\text{Me}_3\text{CCOO})_2\{(\text{Me}_3\text{CCOOH})\}]$ , whose synthesis, through a different procedure, as well as its SCXRD crystal structure has been recently reported, see J.-H. Zhou, Z. Liu, Y.-Z. Li, Y. Song, X.-T. Chen, X.-Z. You, *J. Coord. Chem.* **2006**, *59*, 147–153.
- [7] H-bonds concerning data and figures reported in the Supporting Information have been obtained by using the CIF files supplied as Supporting Information in refs. 5b (compounds **1** and **4**) and 5a (compound **2**). To these CIF files are also referred the atom labels used here.
- [8] The Cambridge Structural Database contains 667 crystal structures where the  $[\text{Cu}_2(\text{RCOO})_4]$  paddlewheel moiety is present but only 19 of them refer to polymeric unsubstituted copper(II) carboxylates.
- [9] Crystal data for  $\text{C}_{20}\text{H}_{36}\text{Cu}_2\text{O}_4$ , **A**: triclinic, space group  $P\bar{1}$  (No. 2),  $a = 5.1829(6)$ ,  $b = 11.1982(13)$ ,  $c = 11.8865(14)$  Å,  $\alpha = 65.631(2)^\circ$ ,  $\beta = 88.023(2)^\circ$ ,  $\gamma = 88.948(2)^\circ$ ,  $V = 628.04(13)$  Å<sup>3</sup>,  $Z = 1$ ,  $R$  ( $R_w$ ) [ $I > 2\sigma(I)$ ] = 0.0448 (0.1388). The X-ray intensity data for **A** were recorded on a Bruker SMART Apex II CCD area detector diffractometer [ $\lambda = 0.71073$  Å,  $T = 293(2)$  K]. Cell dimensions and the orientation matrix were initially determined from a least-squares refinement on reflections measured in three sets of 20 exposures, collected in three different  $\omega$  regions and eventually refined against all data. For all crystals, a full sphere of reciprocal space was scanned in  $0.3^\circ$   $\omega$  steps. The software SMART<sup>[10]</sup> was used for collecting frames of data, indexing reflections and determining lattice parameters. The collected frames were then processed for integration by the SAINT program<sup>[10]</sup> and an empirical absorption correction was applied using SADABS.<sup>[11]</sup> The structure was solved by direct methods (SIR 97)<sup>[12]</sup> and subsequent Fourier syntheses and refined by full-matrix least-squares on  $F^2$  (SHELXTL)<sup>[13]</sup> using anisotropic thermal parameters for all non-hydrogen atoms. Some disorder in the carboxylate chains was detected and, in particular, in one of the chains there was a disorder between the methyl and ethyl chains bound at C(3) and a second position for the methyl [bound to C(9) and alternative to C(10)]. Therefore the site occupation factors of the methyls were refined yielding 0.54 for C(10), 0.26 for C(81) and 0.19 for C(91), respectively. All hydrogen atoms were added in calculated positions, included in the final stage of refinement with isotropic thermal parameters,  $U(\text{H}) = 1.2 U_{\text{eq}}(\text{C})$  [ $U(\text{H}) = 1.5 U_{\text{eq}}(\text{C}-\text{Me})$ ] and allowed to ride on their carrier carbons. Molecular graphics were generated using Mercury<sup>[14]</sup> and Schakal<sup>[15]</sup> software. CCDC-697289 contains the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data can be obtained free of charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre via [www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data\\_request/cif](http://www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif).
- [10] SMART & SAINT Software Reference Manuals, version 5.051 (Windows NT Version), Bruker Analytical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, WI, 1998.
- [11] G. M. Sheldrick, SADABS, program for empirical absorption correction, University of Göttingen, Germany, 1996.
- [12] A. Altomare, M. C. Burla, M. Cavalli, G. L. Casciaro, C. Giacovazzo, A. Guagliardi, A. G. G. Moliterni, G. Polidori, R. Spagna, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **1999**, *32*, 115–119.
- [13] G. M. Sheldrick, SHELXTLplus (Windows NT Version) Structure Determination Package, Version 5.1, Bruker Analytical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, WI, USA, 1998.
- [14] Mercury: Visualisation and Analysis of Crystal Structures: C. F. Macrae, P. R. Edgington, P. McCabe, E. Pidcock, G. P. Shields, R. Taylor, M. Towler, J. van de Streek, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* **2006**, *39*, 453–457.
- [15] E. Keller, SCHAKAL A Computer Program for the Graphic Representation of Molecular and Crystallographic Models, Institute for Crystallography of the University of Freiburg, Freiburg (Germany), 1997.
- [16] G. B. Deacon, R. J. Phillips, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1980**, *33*, 227–250.
- [17] E. Pretsch, T. Clerc, J. Seibl, W. Simon, *Tables of Determination of Organic Compounds. <sup>13</sup>C NMR, <sup>1</sup>H NMR, IR, MS, UV/Vis*, Chemical Laboratory Practice, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1989.
- [18] a) J. G. A. Luijten, G. J. M. Van der Kerk, *Recl. Trav. Chim. Pays-Bas* **1963**, *82*, 1181–1188; b) J. G. Vos, W. L. Groeneveld, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **1977**, *24*, 123–126; c) H. Okkersen, W. L. Groeneveld, J. Reedijk, *Recl. Trav. Chim. Pays-Bas* **1973**, *92*, 945–953.
- [19] a) G. Mezei, M. Rivera-Carrillo, R. G. Raptus, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2004**, *357*, 3721–3732; b) P. A. Angaridis, P. Baran, R. Boča, F. Cervantes-Lee, W. Haase, G. Mezei, R. G. Raptis, R. Werner, *Inorg. Chem.* **2002**, *41*, 2219–2228.
- [20] It is well known that in ESI MS conditions aggregation phenomena, leading to oligomeric species, may occur. See, as an example a) M. Fujita, F. Ibukuro, H. Hagihara, K. Ogura, *Nature* **1994**, *367*, 720–723; b) R. Colton, A. D'Agostino, J. C. Traeger, *Mass Spectrom. Rev.* **1995**, *14*, 79–106; c) C. E. C. A. Hop, R. Bakhtiar, *J. Chem. Educ.* **1996**, *73*, A162, A164–169; d) L. S. Bonnington, R. K. Coll, E. J. Gray, J. I. Flett, W. Henderson, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **1999**, *299*, 213–221; e) A. Cingolani, Effendy, M. Pelli, C. Pettinari, C. Santini, B. W. Skelton, A. H. White, *Inorg. Chem.* **2002**, *41*, 6633–6645.
- [21] M. W. Senko, *IsoPro Isotopic Abundance Simulator*, v. 2.1, National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, 1994.
- [22] M. Casarin, A. Cingolani, C. Di Nicola, D. Falcomer, M. Monari, L. Pandolfo, C. Pettinari, *Cryst. Growth Des.* **2007**, *4*, 676–685.
- [23] C. Di Nicola, F. Garau, M. Monari, L. Pandolfo, C. Pettinari, *Proceedings of VIII Congresso Nazionale di Chimica Supramolecolare*, Trieste (Italy), Sept. 19–22, 2007, P53.
- [24] a) M. V. Kirillova, A. M. Kirillov, P. M. Reis, J. A. L. Silva, J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *J. Catal.* **2007**, *248*, 130–136, and references cited therein; b) M. V. Kirillova, M. L. Kuznetsov, P. M. Reis, J. A. L. Silva, J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 10531–10545; c) M. V. Kirillova, M. L. Kuznetsov, J. A. L. Silva, M. F. C. Guedes da Silva, J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2008**, *14*, 1828–1842.
- [25] A. M. Kirillov, M. Haukka, M. F. C. Guedes da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, 2071–2080.
- [26] Y. Y. Karabach, A. M. Kirillov, M. F. C. Guedes da Silva, M. N. Kopylovich, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Cryst. Growth Des.* **2006**, *6*, 2200–2203.
- [27] a) T. F. S. Silva, E. C. B. Alegria, L. R. Martins, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2008**, *350*, 706–716; b) E. C. B. Alegria, M. V. Kirillova, L. R. Martins, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Appl. Catal. A: Gen.* **2007**, *317*, 43–52; c) M. V. Kirillova, A. M. Kirillov, M. F. C. Guedes da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2008**, 3423–3427.
- [28] a) G. S. Mishra, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *J. Mol. Catal. A* **2005**, *239*, 96–102; b) G. S. Mishra, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Appl. Catal. A: Gen.* **2006**, *304*, 185–194; c) G. S. Mishra, J. J. R. Fraú-

- sto da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *J. Mol. Catal. A* **2007**, *265*, 59–69; d) G. S. Mishra, E. C. B. Alegria, L. R. Martins, J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem.* in press.
- [29] P. M. Reis, J. A. L. Silva, J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Chem. Commun.* **2000**, 1845–1846.
- [30] P. M. Reis, J. A. L. Silva, J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *J. Mol. Catal. A* **2004**, *224*, 189–195.
- [31] Y. Y. Karabach, A. M. Kirillov, M. Haukka, M. N. Kopylovich, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *J. Inorg. Biochem.* **2008**, *102*, 1190–1194.
- [32] M. N. Kopylovich, A. M. Kirillov, A. K. Baev, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *J. Mol. Catal. A* **2003**, *206*, 163–178.
- [33] a) D. S. Nesterov, V. N. Kokozay, V. V. Dyakonenco, O. V. Shishkin, J. Jezierska, A. Ozarowski, A. M. Kirillov, M. N. Kopylovich, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Chem. Commun.* **2006**, 4605–4607; b) S. Velusamy, T. Punniyamurthy, *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2003**, *44*, 8955–8957; c) G. B. Shul'pin, J. Gradinaru, Y. N. Kozlov, *Org. Biomol. Chem.* **2003**, *1*, 3611–3617; d) R. Raja, P. Ratnasamy, *Catal. Lett.* **1997**, *48*, 1–10.
- [34] a) G. B. Shul'pin, *J. Mol. Catal. A* **2002**, *189*, 39–66; b) G. B. Shul'pin, *C. R. Chim.* **2003**, *6*, 163–178.
- [35] a) M. Costas, M. P. Mehn, M. P. Jensen, L. Que Jr., *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *104*, 939–986; b) M. Costas, K. Chen, L. Que Jr., *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2000**, *200–20*, 517–544; c) G. Roelfes, M. Lubben, R. Hage, L. Que Jr., B. L. Feringa, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2000**, *6*, 2152–2159.
- [36] T. Hogan, A. Sen, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 2642–2646.
- [37] a) G. B. Shul'pin in *Transition Metals for Organic Synthesis* (Eds.: M. Beller, C. Bolm), 2<sup>nd</sup> edn., vol. 2, Wiley-VCH, New York, **2004**, p. 215; b) G. B. Shul'pin, *Organic Reactions Catalyzed by Metal Complexes*, Nauka, Moscow, **1988**.
- [38] a) G. V. Nizova, B. Krebs, G. Süss-Fink, S. Schindler, L. Westerbeide, L. G. Cuervo, G. B. Shul'pin, *Tetrahedron* **2002**, *58*, 9231–9237; b) G. B. Shul'pin, Y. N. Kozlov, G. V. Nizova, G. Süss-Fink, S. Stanislas, A. Kitaygorodskiy, V. S. Kulikova, *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2* **2001**, *2*, 1351–1371; c) G. Süss-Fink, L. Gonzalez, G. B. Shul'pin, *Appl. Catal. A: Gen.* **2001**, *217*, 111–117; d) G. B. Shul'pin, G. Süss-Fink, *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2* **1995**, *2*, 1459–1463; e) M. Koderer, H. Shimakoshi, K. Kano, *Chem. Commun.* **1996**, 1737–1738; f) H.-J. Schneider, W. Müller, *J. Org. Chem.* **1985**, *50*, 4609–4615; g) G. B. Shul'pin, H. Stoeckli-Evans, D. Mandelli, Y. N. Kozlov, A. T. Vallina, C. B. Woitiski, R. S. Jimenez, W. A. Carvalho, *J. Mol. Catal. A* **2004**, *219*, 255–264.
- [39] P. M. Reis, J. A. L. Silva, A. F. Palavra, J. J. R. Fraústo da Silva, T. Kitamura, Y. Fujiwara, A. J. L. Pombeiro, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2003**, *42*, 821–823.
- [40] R. L. Martin, H. Waterman, *J. Chem. Soc.* **1957**, 2545–2551.
- [41] A. J. L. Pombeiro, M. F. C. Guedes da Silva, M. A. N. D. A. Lemos, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2001**, *219–221*, 53–80.

Received: August 21, 2008

Published Online: January 13, 2009