Journal of Organometallic Chemistry xxx (2017) 1-13



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Journal of Organometallic Chemistry



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jorganchem

# Synthesis, structural characterization and catalytic activity of indenyl complexes of ruthenium bearing fluorinated phosphine ligands

Matthew J. Stark <sup>a</sup>, Michael J. Shaw <sup>b</sup>, Arghavan Fadamin <sup>b</sup>, Nigam P. Rath <sup>a, c</sup>, Eike B. Bauer <sup>a, \*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> University of Missouri - St. Louis, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, One University Boulevard, St. Louis, MO 63121, USA

<sup>b</sup> Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Department of Chemistry, Edwardsville, IL 62025, USA

<sup>c</sup> Center for Nanoscience, University of Missouri - St. Louis, One University Boulevard, St. Louis, MO 63121, USA

## ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 29 December 2016 Received in revised form 24 March 2017 Accepted 25 March 2017 Available online xxx

Dedicated to Professor John A. Gladysz on the occasion of his 65th birthday.

Keywords: Electronic tuning X-ray Cyclic voltammetry Propargylic alcohols

# ABSTRACT

The synthesis, characterization and catalytic activity of new ruthenium complexes of fluorinated triarylphosphines is described. The new ruthenium complexes  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]$  and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] were synthesized in 57% and 24% isolated yield, respectively, by thermal ligand exchange of [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>], where ind = indenyl ligand  $\eta^5$ -C<sub>9</sub>H $\overline{\gamma}$ . The electronic and steric properties of the new complexes were studied through analysis of the X-ray structures and through cyclic voltammetry. The new complexes [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)  $\{P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3\}$  and the known complex  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_2]$  differed only slightly in their steric properties, as seen from comparison of bond lengths and angles associated with the ruthenium center. As determined by cyclic voltammetry, the redox potentials of  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]$  and  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)[P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3]]$  are +0.173 and + 0.370 V vs.  $Cp_2Fe^{0/+}$ , respectively, which are substantially higher than that of  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_2]$  (-0.023 V). After activation through chloride abstraction, the new complexes are catalytically active in the etherification of propargylic alcohols (8 -24 h at 90 °C in toluene, 1-2 mol% catalyst loading, 29-61% isolated yields). As demonstrated by a comparative study for a test reaction, the three precursor complexes [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P( $p-C_6H_4CF_3$ )<sub>3</sub>]], [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] differed only slightly in catalytic activity. © 2017 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Transition metal complexes of ruthenium are widely utilized in catalysis and other areas of chemical research [1]. A large number of ruthenium complexes have been described in the literature, and they have found applications as catalysts in reactions such as oxidations [2], olefin metathesis [3], and a number of carbon-carbon, carbon-nitrogen and carbon-oxygen bond forming reactions [4]. The quest for sterically and electronically tuned ruthenium complexes is ongoing to satisfy the growing need of such complexes in the area of medicinal chemistry [5] and the development of optical devices [6].

The known [7] ruthenium indenyl complex  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_2]$ (ind =  $\eta^5$ -C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>7</sub>) has previously been utilized as a starting material for organometallic syntheses [8] and other ruthenium indenyl

\* Corresponding author. E-mail address: bauere@umsl.edu (E.B. Bauer).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jorganchem.2017.03.043 0022-328X/© 2017 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved. complexes are frequently applied in synthesis [9] and catalysis [10]. The increased reactivity of indenyl complexes has been ascribed to the so called "indenyl effect" [11]. As part of our long standing research program directed towards the catalytic activation of propargylic alcohols [12], we identified ruthenium indenyl complexes as valuable starting materials not only for the synthesis of ruthenium complexes [12a,c,f], but also as potential catalysts in nucleophilic substitution reactions [12a,c]. However, a serious drawback of these catalyst systems are the high reaction temperatures of 80–90 °C required for transformations. The high reaction temperatures are undesirable because of the energy required and the difficulties of obtaining high enantiomeric excess values under such conditions in addition to rearrangements that often occur as side reactions, lowering the yield of the desired product. We hypothesized that electron-withdrawing groups on the ruthenium center might increase its reactivity, as these groups might facilitate the nucleophilic attack on (potential) carbocation intermediates. Our previous electronic tuning efforts utilizing electronwithdrawing ligands resulted in the synthesis of the tris(*N*-pyrrolyl)phosphine complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(pyr)<sub>3</sub>}] (pyr = *N*-pyrrolyl, see Fig. 1), which catalytically activated propargylic alcohols, albeit still at reaction temperatures around 85 °C [12a].

Fluorinated phosphine ligands have previously been utilized to electronically tune ruthenium complexes, representative examples are shown in Fig. 1 [13]. Ruthenium complexes bearing fluorinated phosphine ligands have been applied in catalysis [14] and also exhibited anticancer activity [15]. Fluorinated phosphines have also been employed in the synthesis of metal complexes to be employed for fluorous biphasic catalysis [16]; for example, Gladysz published fluorous analogs of Grubbs' second-generation catalyst to be employed in ring-opening metathesis polymerization [17]. In context of our own research, we hypothesized that ruthenium indenyl complexes bearing electron-withdrawing, fluorinated phosphine ligands show, due to their increased Lewis acidity, enhanced catalytic activity in the transformation of propargylic alcohols.

Herein, we describe the synthesis and characterization of the ruthenium complexes [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P( $P-C_6H_4CF_3$ )<sub>3</sub>] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5- $C_6H_3(CF_3)_2$ )<sub>3</sub>] where P( $p-C_6H_4CF_3$ )<sub>3</sub> is tris(4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)phosphine and P(3,5- $C_6H_3(CF_3)_2$ )<sub>3</sub> is tris(3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)phosphine. We investigated the steric and electronic properties of the new complexes through X-ray analysis and cyclic voltammetry. The new complexes were demonstrated to be catalyst precursors for the etherification of propargylic alcohols. The catalytic activity of [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P( $p-C_6H_4CF_3$ )<sub>3</sub>], [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P( $3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2$ )] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] were compared and potential catalytically active species in the reaction mixture were investigated.

### 2. Results and discussion

#### 2.1. Ruthenium complex syntheses

The known [7] ruthenium indenyl complex  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_2]$ has previously been utilized as a starting material for organometallic syntheses by us [12,18] and others [8], as one of the PPh<sub>3</sub> ligand can be thermally exchanged by other ligands. Accordingly, when the complex  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_2]$  was refluxed with one equivalent of either  $P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3$  or  $P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3$  in THF for 4 h, the new complexes  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)\{P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3\}]$  and  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)\{P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3\}]$  were isolated chromatographically in 57 and 24% yields, respectively (Scheme 1). The low yields may be due to decomposition reactions that occur during reaction and workup, as little to no starting material was observed



Fig. 1. Representative electronically tuned ruthenium complexes.

by NMR in the crude products.

The new complexes were characterized by multinuclear NMR, MS, IR, elemental analysis and X-ray diffraction. In both complexes, the coordination of one fluorinated phosphine ligand and one PPh<sub>3</sub> ligand is readily indicated by two distinct <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR signals at 50.1 and 44.2 ppm and at 50.1 and 47.8 ppm, respectively. As expected for complexes with two magnetically different phosphorus atoms in the metal coordination sphere, coupling between the two signals was observed. Coupling constants <sup>2</sup>J<sub>PP</sub> of 42 Hz were determined.

In general, the indenyl ligand gives very distinct <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR signals for the three protons and the five carbon atoms of its coordinated five-membered ring [19]. All these carbon and proton atoms of the indenyl ligand in the new complexes gave individual signals in the corresponding <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR spectra.

## 2.2. X-ray structures

In order to unequivocally establish the structure of the new ruthenium complexes, the X-ray structures of  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)$ {P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}] and  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}]$  were determined (Fig. 2). Selected bond lengths and angles are listed in Table 1, and for comparison purposes, the X-ray data for  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_2]$  [20] and for  $[RuCl(Ind)(PPh_3){P(pyr)_3}]$  (Fig. 1) [12a] from the literature are also included. As previously observed by us [12a], it appears that complexes of the general formula  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)L]$  are structurally not significantly different from the "parent" complex  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_2]$ . For the complex  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_3]P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3]$ , a face-to-face aromatic donor-acceptor interaction between one of the fluorinated aryl rings and one of the phenyl rings of PPh<sub>3</sub> was observed (Fig. 2, bottom) [21]. The distance between the two aryl ring systems was calculated to be 3.873 Å.

The P-Ru-P and P-Ru-Cl bond angles around the ruthenium center range from  $91.612(17)^{\circ}$  to  $99.585(19)^{\circ}$ , and are also similar to the bond angles of the other two complexes listed in Table 1. The geometry of the new complexes is, thus, best described as slightly distorted octahedral. The somewhat increased P-Ru-P bond angles for the two new complexes indicates some steric repulsion of the PPh<sub>3</sub> and the fluorinated ligands. It appears that the bulkier phosphine P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub> forms a smaller P-Ru-P angle with PPh<sub>3</sub> compared to the less bulky phosphine P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub> which might be a consequence of the face-to-face interaction in the solid state shown in Fig. 2. For the other two, structurally related complexes in Table 1, increased P-Ru-P bond angles between the phosphine ligands were observed as well.

The Ru-P bond lengths for the two new complexes range from 2.2696(5) to 2.3203(5) Å and are not appreciably different from each other. It appears that the electron-withdrawing character of the fluorinated ligands does not have a profound impact on the Ru-P bond lengths compared to the structurally related complexes [RuCl(ind)(PPh\_3)\_2] and [RuCl(Ind)(PPh\_3){P(pyr)\_3}] (Fig. 1). Also, the distances between the centroids of the C5 ring of the indenyl ligands and the ruthenium centers for both complexes are similar (1.904 and 1.903 Å) and comparable to that for [RuCl(ind)(PPh\_3)\_2] (1.918 Å).

As can be seen from the X-ray structures, the indenyl ligands for both complexes are  $\eta^5$ -coordinated, i.e. all five carbon atoms of the cyclopentadienyl unit are coordinated to the ruthenium center. As analyzed previously by us [12a] and others [11e], not all five carbon atoms have the same Ru–C bond lengths. The bond lengths of the two benzenoid carbons are longer compared to the other three carbon atoms of the cyclopentadienyl ring. This can be quantified by the  $\Delta$  Ru-C value (here 0.197 and 0.137 Å, respectively), which describes the average difference in bond lengths of the two

M.J. Stark et al. / Journal of Organometallic Chemistry xxx (2017) 1-13



Scheme 1. Synthesis of ruthenium complexes bearing fluorinated aryl phosphine ligands.



**Fig. 2.** The molecular structures of [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(*p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] (left) and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] (right and bottom). Hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Crystallographic parameters are given in the experimental, and key bond lengths and angles are listed in Table 1.

benzenoid carbon atoms and the other three carbon atoms of the cyclopentadienyl unit [11e,12a,22]. Related complexes exhibit similar  $\Delta$  Ru-C values around 0.2 Å. The fold angle is the angle between the plane formed by C1-C2-C3 of the C5 ring and by C1-C3-C4-C5 or C1-C3-C4-C9 of two carbon atoms of the C5 ring and the two carbon atoms shared by the C5 ring and the benzenoyl unit; thus, it describes the angle that is formed by the plane of the C5 unit and the benzene unit of the indenyl ligand [11e]. The fold angle

takes the value 0 in an ideal  $\eta^5$ -coordination, and for indenyl complexes, the values typically range below 10°; again, [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(P-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] fall in this range (9.57° and 7.45°, respectively) as do the other two complexes shown in Table 1. An  $\eta^3$ -coordination would be indicated by a fold angle around 60° [11e].

It has been observed before that the ligand with the strongest *trans* influence will take the position *trans* to the benzo unit of the

3

#### M.J. Stark et al. / Journal of Organometallic Chemistry xxx (2017) 1-13

Table 1	l
---------	---

Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°) for complexes of the general formula [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)PR<sub>3</sub>].

	$PR_3 = \{P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3\}]$	$PR_3 = \{P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3\}]$	$PR_3 = P(pyr)_3$ (Fig. 1) [12a]	$PR_3 = PPh_3$ [20]
Bond lengths (Å)				
Ru-P(1)	2.2696(5)	2.2707(9)	2.2323(15)	2.331
	(PPh <sub>3</sub> )	(PPh <sub>3</sub> )	$(P(Pyr)_3)$	(PPh <sub>3</sub> )
Ru-P(2)	2.3203(5)	2.2929(9)	2.2760(14)	2.268
	$P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3$	$P(3,5-P_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3$	(PPh <sub>3</sub> )	(PPh <sub>3</sub> )
Ru-Cl	2.4422(5)	2.4372(8)	2.4362(15)	2.437
Bond angles (°)				
P(1)-Ru-P(2)	99.585(19)	95.59(3)	97.89(5)	99.21
Cl-Ru-P(1)	92.389(18)	93.03(3)	93.51(5)	92.42
Cl-Ru-P(2)	91.612(17)	95.50(3)	91.79(5)	92.19
Other geometrical parameters				
Ru-C5-ring (Å) <sup>a</sup>	1.904	1.903	1.902	1.918
Δ Ru-C	0.197 <sup>b</sup>	0.137 <sup>c</sup>	0.161	0.221
Fold angle	9.57° <sup>d</sup>	7.45° <sup>e</sup>	<b>7.06</b> °	7.07°

<sup>a</sup> Distance between the C5 ring of the indenyl ligand and the ruthenium center.

<sup>b</sup> Average difference between the Ru-C1, Ru-C2 and Ru-C3 bond lengths and the Ru-C4 and Ru-C5 bond lengths.

<sup>c</sup> Average difference between the Ru-C1, Ru-C2 and Ru-C3 bond lengths and the Ru-C4 and Ru-C9 bond lengths.

<sup>d</sup> Angle between the plane formed by C1-C2-C3 and by C1-C3-C4-C5.

<sup>e</sup> Angle between the plane formed by C1-C2-C3 and by C1-C3-C4-C9.

indenyl ligand [11e]. The *trans* influence weakens the bond strength (and enlarges the bond length) of the two Ru-C bonds of the benzo unit coordinated to the ruthenium. Accordingly, the PPh<sub>3</sub> ligand (as opposed to the fluorinated phosphine ligands) takes the position *trans* to the benzoid portion of the indenylid ligand (schematic structure **A** in in Fig. 3). This position provides some evidence that PPh<sub>3</sub> has a larger *trans* influence compared to the fluorinated ligands; however the solid state structures allow only limited conclusions for the situation in solution.

In general, it appears that the placement of electronwithdrawing CF<sub>3</sub> units on the aryl rings in triarylphosphine ligands does not have a profound impact on the Ru-P bond length and other geometric parameters of their respective ruthenium complexes in the solid state when compared to structurally related ones, such as  $[RuCl(Ind)(PPh_3){P(pyr)_3}]$  (Fig. 1) and  $[RuCl(Ind)(PPh_3)_2]$  [7].

#### 2.3. Cyclic voltammetry

Cyclic voltammetry has been used previously to characterize the electronic properties of ruthenium phosphine complexes by us [12a,23] and others [24], and we recorded cyclic voltammograms of [RuCl(ind)(PPh\_3){P( $p-C_6H_4CF_3$ )\_3}] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh\_3){P(3,5-C\_6H\_3(CF\_3)\_2)\_3}]. The traces for a scan rate of 0.2 V/s are compiled in Fig. 4.

The cyclic voltammograms of [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] show a high degree of reversibility at different scan rates in that their  $i_{pd}/i_{pa}$  values are close to a value of 1 at all scan rates. The E°' value for the oxidation is +0.173 V (vs. Cp<sub>2</sub>Fe<sup>0/+</sup>, Cp = cyclopentadienyl) and the peak



**Fig. 3.** Schematic representation of the position of the indenyl ring in the X-ray structures of indenyl complexes determined in this study. **B** and **C** are discussed later in the text.

current ratio  $i_{pc}/i_{pa}$  is 1.0 at a scan rate of 0.2 V/s for [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>) {P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}]. For the complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>], the E°' value is significantly higher (+0.370 V). The oxidation of [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] is also reversible at different scan rates with an  $i_{pc}/i_{pa}$  ratio of 0.98 at 0.2 V/s. It appears that the introduction of CF<sub>3</sub>-substituted tris(aryl)phosphine ligands increases the redox potential of the respective complexes compared to the "parent" complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] (E°' = -0.023 V) [12a], which is in line with the higher  $\pi$ -acidic electron-demand of the fluorinated ligands. Interestingly, as determined before in our laboratory, the related complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(pyr)<sub>3</sub>}] (Fig. 1) exhibited a redox potential of +0.34 V. Thus, it appears that the P(pyr)<sub>3</sub> ligand has a  $\pi$ -acidity comparable to that of P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub> [12a].

## 2.4. Catalytic applications

We then investigated the new complexes for their ability to catalytically activate propargylic alcohols [25], and we chose as a test reaction the etherification of propargylic alcohol **1b** with benzyl alcohol **2b** to obtain the propargylic ether **3c** (Table 2). We performed preliminary screening reactions with the more easily available precursor complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]; reactivity trends established in Table 2 were similar to those observed for the new complexes with the fluorinated ligands. The complexes [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>], [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>]] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] themselves did not show catalytic activity for the reaction. However, after activation by chloride abstraction using NaPF<sub>6</sub>, catalytic activity was observed.

In general, a high-boiling, aliphatic solvent (such as toluene) was required to observe catalytic activity. However, NaPF<sub>6</sub> is minimally soluble in toluene and we determined that the addition of a small amount of CH<sub>3</sub>CN aided the dissolution of NaPF<sub>6</sub>. Accordingly, the best results were obtained, when a 1: 9 ratio of CH<sub>3</sub>CN to toluene in the presence of 4–6 equivalents of NaPF<sub>6</sub> (related to the ruthenium catalyst) was employed for the reaction (Table 2, entry 4; one equivalent of NaPF<sub>6</sub> was insufficient, entry 1). Other chloride abstractors such as KPF<sub>6</sub> and NaClO<sub>4</sub> obviously did not activate the ruthenium precursor complex as no reaction was observed (entries 2 and 3), which might be due to the poor solubility in the solvent mixture. NaPF<sub>6</sub> alone gave no etherification product, but resulted in some elimination (entry 6).

M.J. Stark et al. / Journal of Organometallic Chemistry xxx (2017) 1–13



Fig. 4. Cyclic voltammetry of ruthenium indenyl complexes in 0.1M *n*-Bu<sub>4</sub>PF<sub>6</sub>/CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, 298K, recorded at a scan rate of 0.2 V/s,  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]$  (0.92 mM concentration, solid line) and  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3}]$  (0.73 mM concentration, dotted line ...).

OH 1b	+ COH [Ru <sub>cat</sub> ]				
Entry	Solvent	T-t	Catalyst <sup>a</sup>	Activator <sup>b</sup>	Results/Products
1	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/toluene 1:9	80 °C 8 h	[RuCl(ind)(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> ]	1 equiv. NaPF <sub>6</sub>	no reaction
2	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/toluene 1:9	80 °C 4 h	[RuCl(ind)(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> ]	KPF <sub>6</sub>	no reaction
3	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/toluene 1:9	80 °C 16 h	[RuCl(ind)(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> ]	NaClO <sub>4</sub>	no reaction
4	CH <sub>3</sub> CN/toluene 1:9	80 °C 4 h	[RuCl(ind)(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> ]	6 equiv. NaPF <sub>6</sub>	80% 20%
5	toluene	80 °C 16 h	[Ru(ind)(MeCN)(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> ]PF <sub>6</sub> <sup>c</sup>	none	44 % isolated yield
6	toluene	85 °C 4 h	none	NaPF <sub>6</sub>	incomplete, only elimination
7	toluene	85 °C 4 h	[Ru(ind)(MeCN)(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> ]BAr <sub>F</sub> <sup>d</sup>	none	Trace amounts of ether product

<sup>a</sup> 1–2 mol%.

Table 2

<sup>b</sup> Number of equivalents for the activator given in relation to the ruthenium catalyst.

 $^{\rm c}$  Preformed, chloride-abstracted complex obtained from reaction with NaPF<sub>6</sub>, see text.

<sup>d</sup> Preformed, chloride-abstracted complex obtained from reaction with NaBAr<sub>F</sub>. BAr<sub>F</sub> = Tetrakis(3,5-bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)borate, see text.

Under optimized conditions, the complexes and NaPF<sub>6</sub> were first preheated to 85 °C for 20 min in CH<sub>3</sub>CN/toluene 1: 9, followed by addition of the substrates to the preactivated complex. The activated complexes were employed in a number of etherification reactions to give the known [12d] propargylic ethers 3, and the results are compiled in Scheme 2. All three precursor complexes  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]$  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_2].$ and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}] were employed in catalysis (experimental details are given in the Supplementary data), and the yields given in Scheme 2 are for all three precursor complexes. As can be seen, the isolated yields do not significantly differ for the complexes. The isolated yields are moderate; however, the propargylic alcohol and the alcohol nucleophile were employed in almost equimolar amounts. Excess of the alcohol nucleophile over the propargylic alcohol is not required, as sometimes reported for other catalytic systems [25e]. Also, the catalyst load used of 1-2 mol% is lower than that of many other catalyst systems reported in the literature [25e].

Thus, the activated complexes exhibited catalytic activity, but we could not reach our major goal, i.e. to lower the reaction temperature and to increase the yield of the reactions. In order to improve the catalyst system and to investigate the course of the reaction in greater detail, we performed additional experiments.

#### 2.5. Chloride abstraction products

We first speculated that the chloride abstraction to activate the complexes was inefficient. We, thus, investigated the chloride abstraction by heating the complexes for several hours in presence of NaPF<sub>6</sub> and CH<sub>3</sub>CN but without any substrates, and investigated the result by <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR. The <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR spectra are shown in Fig. 5.

The parent complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] gave a relatively clean (albeit incomplete) reaction to the corresponding acetonitrile complex  $[Ru(ind)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3)_2]^+$ , as indicated by a new <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR peak at 47.7 ppm (Fig. 5, bottom, see also vide infra for the independent synthesis of that complex). For the two other complexes  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]$  and  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)]$  $\{P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3\}$  with fluorinated ligands, the reaction was not as clean (Fig. 5, middle and top) and a number of new peaks appeared in the <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR spectra. For the complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(*p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}], the starting material was consumed (Fig. 5, middle). Besides a couple of unidentified singlets around 48 ppm, the reaction mixture after chloride abstraction revealed a set of relatively small doublets at 49.3 and 47.4 ppm  $(I_{PP} = 35 \text{ Hz})$ , which was, based on the synthesis of an authentic sample (vide infra), attributed to the acetonitrile complex  $[Ru(ind)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3)\{P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3\}]^+$ . The complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}] gave only partial chloride abstraction, as indicated by corresponding peaks for the starting material in the  ${}^{31}P{}^{1}H{}$  NMR spectrum (Fig. 5, top). Only some minor singlets were observed in the spectrum between 47 and 55 ppm. It appears that the more electron-poor complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh\_3){P(3,5-C\_6H\_3(CF\_3)\_2)\_3}] is - compared to the other two complexes - more difficult to ionize.

For all three complexes, peaks between 21 and 30 ppm indicated the presence of the oxidized ligands  $O=PPh_3$  (29 ppm),  $O=P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3$  (25.8 ppm) and  $O=P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3$  (21.8 ppm). The peak assignments for the latter two phosphine oxides were performed based on NMR experiments, where the corresponding phosphine ligands were oxidized with small amounts of  $H_2O_2$  in CDCl<sub>3</sub> and NMR spectra subsequently recorded.

However, we were intrigued by the fact that the chloride abstraction experiments resulted in a resonance around 63 ppm for all three complexes, indicating the formation of a common species (Fig. 5). Furthermore, we observed a peak at -12 ppm in the <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] after chloride abstraction, pointing towards formation of a hydrido complex. Indeed, comparison with literature values showed that the <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR resonances for the known hydrido complex [RuH(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] matches those observed in the reaction mixture after chloride abstraction [7]. Thus, it appeared that the complexes  $[Ru(ind)(PPh_3)]$  $\{P(p-C_{6}H_{4}CF_{3})_{3}\}^{+}$  and  $[Ru(ind)(PPh_{3})\{P(3,5-C_{6}H_{3}(CF_{3})_{2})_{3}\}]^{+}$  undergo ligand metathesis to form [Ru(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>, which then forms the hydrido complex [RuH(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]. It is known that ruthenium complexes can form hydrides in the presence of alcohols or water [26]. In order to determine whether the hydrido complex [RuH(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] is the actual catalytically active species in solution, we synthesized the complex independently following a literature procedure [7] and employed it as catalyst in test reactions under the conditions in Scheme 2. Unfortunately, the complex showed no catalytic activity under these conditions. Thus, the formation of the complex [RuH(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] constitutes a decomposition pathway of the chloro complexes, resulting potentially in catalyst deactivation.

#### 2.6. Syntheses of acetonitrile complexes and their reactivity

It is known that ruthenium forms stable acetonitrile (CH<sub>3</sub>CN) complexes [27]. We next decided to determine whether analytically pure acetonitrile complexes could be employed as catalysts for the title reaction. Accordingly, we synthesized the complex [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] PF<sub>6</sub> according to literature procedures for the corresponding known tetrafluoroborate complex [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>BF<sub>4</sub>, as there was no <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR spectrum published together with its synthesis (Scheme 3) [28]. The tetrafluoroborate complex has previously been characterized by <sup>1</sup>H NMR and X-ray; for comparison purposes in Fig. 5, in addition we



Scheme 2. Catalytic application of new ruthenium complexes.

M.J. Stark et al. / Journal of Organometallic Chemistry xxx (2017) 1-13



**Fig. 5.** <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR spectra of the complexes [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] (top), [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] (middle) and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] (bottom) after treatment with NaPF<sub>6</sub>.



Scheme 3. Synthesis of acetonitrile complexes [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){L}]<sup>+</sup>PF<sub>6</sub>.

analyzed the complex by  ${}^{31}P{}^{1}H$  NMR and IR. Following the same procedure, we also synthesized the new acetonitrile complex [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub>, which was characterized by <sup>1</sup>H and  ${}^{31}P{}^{1}H$  NMR and mass spectrometry (Scheme 3).

The molecular ion  $[Ru(ind)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]^+$  was not observed in the FAB-MS, but only the fragment  $[Ru(ind)(PPh_3)$  ${P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]^+$  which resulted from CH<sub>3</sub>CN loss. The fragmentation pattern for the complex and the <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR shifts differed

Please cite this article in press as: M.J. Stark, et al., Journal of Organometallic Chemistry (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ j.jorganchem.2017.03.043

from those of  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]$ , which provides strong evidence that a new complex had formed. However, we observed a molecular ion for the fragment  $[Ru(ind)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3)$  ${P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]^+$  in the ESI-MS spectrum. Unfortunately, attempts to convert  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3}]$  to the corresponding acetonitrile complex failed, which could be a consequence of the fact that for this complex chloride abstraction with NaPF<sub>6</sub> is more difficult, as was demonstrated in Fig. 5.

The complex [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub> was also characterized structurally (Fig. 6). Selected bond lengths and angles are listed in Table 3. Structural details will be discussed further below. During our characterization efforts for [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub> by NMR, we observed the formation of red crystals precipitating out of the CDCl<sub>3</sub> solution in the NMR tube. X-ray analysis revealed that the red crystals are a peroxo complex  $[Ru(ind)(\eta^2-O_2)(PPh_3)_2]PF_{6}$ , where  $O_2$  is coordinated as  $\eta^2$  side-on to the ruthenium center (Scheme 3). A number of ruthenium complexes with  $\eta^2$ -coordinated O<sub>2</sub> have been structurally characterized [29], and they are typically obtained from a ruthenium precursor complex upon reaction with O<sub>2</sub>. However, attempts to synthesize the complex  $[Ru(ind)(\eta^2-O_2)(PPh_3)_2]PF_6$  in bulk failed. Also, analysis of the crystals of  $[Ru(ind)(\eta^2-O_2)(PPh_3)_2]PF_6$  by FAB and ESI-MS did not give a molecular ion peak as proof of the coordination (or the presence) of  $O_2$  in the sample. The coordination of  $O_2$  might be reversible, as noted previously by others [28], making characterization efforts more difficult. However, the IR spectrum of the complex in the solid state exhibited an intense absorption at 828 cm<sup>-1</sup>; this absorption is in accordance with  $\eta^2$ -coordinated O<sub>2</sub>, which typically shows bands between 800 and 900  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  [30]. The X-ray data of  $[Ru(ind)(\eta^2-O_2)(PPh_3)_2]PF_6$  together with those of its precursor complex [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub> are presented in Fig. 6 and Table 3.

In both complexes the ruthenium centers are slightly distorted octahedra. The acetonitrile complex  $[Ru(ind)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3)_2]PF_6$  is structurally related to the tetrafluoroborate analog previously described in the literature [27]. The bond lengths [2.0436(12) to (2.3913(4) Å)] are comparable to those in the complexes bearing the fluorinated ligands described above despite the fact that the complex is cationic. The bond angles around the ruthenium center in  $[Ru(ind)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3)_2]PF_6$  are also similar except for the P(1)-Ru-P(2) angle, which is larger  $[103.540(12)^\circ]$  compared to those of the complexes in Table 1 (all below 100°). The linear CH<sub>3</sub>CN ligand is obviously less spatially demanding compared to a Cl, allowing for a larger P(1)-Ru-P(2) angle to better accommodate the bulky PPh<sub>3</sub> ligands coordinated to the ruthenium center. The parameters corroborating the  $\eta^5$ -coordination of the indenyl ligand ( $\Delta$  Ru-C and the fold angle) are similar to those in Table 1, which also

#### Table 3

bereeted borna reingenb (11) and angreb (	Selected	bond	lengths	(Å	) and	angles	(°).
-------------------------------------------	----------	------	---------	----	-------	--------	------

	[Ru(ind)(CH <sub>3</sub> CN)(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> ]PF <sub>6</sub>	[Ru(ind)(O <sub>2</sub> )(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> ]PF <sub>6</sub>		
Bond lengths (Å)		_		
Ru-P(1)	2.3913(4)	2.3415(16)		
Ru-P(2)	2.2958(4)	2.3782(17)		
Ru-X	2.0436(12) [X = N(1)]	2.003(5) [X = O(1)]		
Ru-X	-	2.008(5) [X = O(2)]		
O(1)-O(2)	-	1.409(6)		
Bond angles (°)				
P(1)-Ru-P(2)	103.540(12)	96.30(6)		
X-Ru-P(1)	93.56(4) [X = N(1)]	81.78(13) [X = O(1)]		
O(2)-Ru-P(1)	-	105.38(14)		
X-Ru-P(2)	84.87(3) [X = N(1)]	83.86(14) [X = O(2)]		
O(1)-Ru-P(2)	-	119.85(14)		
O(1)-Ru-O(2)	-	41.13(18)		
Other geometrical parameters				
Ru-C5-ring(Å) <sup>a</sup>	1.889	1.952		
$\Delta$ Ru-C	0.132 <sup>b</sup>	0.204 <sup>c</sup>		
Fold angle	6.34 <sup>° d</sup>	5.70° <sup>e</sup>		

<sup>a</sup> Distance between the centroid of the C5 ring of the indenyl ligand and the ruthenium center.

<sup>b</sup> Average difference between the Ru-C2, Ru-C3 and Ru-C4 bond lengths and the Ru-C1 and Ru-C5 bond lengths.

<sup>c</sup> Average difference between the Ru-C1, Ru-C2 and Ru-C3 and the Ru-C4 and Ru-C5 bond lengths, respectively.

<sup>d</sup> Angle between the plane formed by C2-C3-C4 and C1-C2-C4-C5.

<sup>e</sup> Angle between the plane formed by C1-C2-C3 and C1-C3-C4-C5.

holds true for the  $\eta^2$ -O<sub>2</sub> complex. As discussed above for the other complexes, one of the two PPh<sub>3</sub> ligands takes the position *trans* to the benzoid carbon atoms of the cyclopentadienyl unit of the indenylid ligand (**B** in Fig. 3), demonstrating the stronger *trans* influence of PPh<sub>3</sub> compared to CH<sub>3</sub>CN.

However, it seems that for the complex  $[Ru(ind)(\eta^2-O_2)(PPh_3)_2]$ PF<sub>6</sub>, the bond lengths around the ruthenium center are slightly longer compared to the other complexes. The average Ru-P bond length is slightly longer and the Ru-Cp distance between the ruthenium center and the centroid of the  $\eta^5$ -coordinated Cp unit of the indenyl ligand is about 0.06 Å longer. The O(1)-O(2) bond length is 1.409(6) Å and, thus, considerably longer compared to the O-O bond length in O<sub>2</sub> (1.21 Å) [29], as expected for side-on coordinated O<sub>2</sub>. Similar O-O bond length values have been observed before in metal peroxo complexes [28], and they lie in between the bond lengths for superoxide (KO<sub>2</sub>, 1.28 Å) [29] and peroxide (O<sub>2</sub><sup>2-</sup> 1.49 Å) [29]. Most interestingly, the  $\eta^2$ -O<sub>2</sub> ligand is aligned parallel to the indenyl ligand (**C** in Fig. 3). Typically, the indenyl ligand occupies an interstitial site between the two phosphine ligands (**A** and **B** in Fig. 3).

The X-ray structures demonstrate that in the presence of NaPF<sub>6</sub>



Fig. 6. The molecular structures of [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub> (left) and [Ru(ind)(η<sup>2</sup>-O<sub>2</sub>)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub> (middle and right). Hydrogen atoms and PF<sub>6</sub><sup>-</sup> counterions are omitted for clarity. Crystallographic parameters are compiled in the experimental, and key bond lengths and angles are listed in Table 3.

Please cite this article in press as: M.J. Stark, et al., Journal of Organometallic Chemistry (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jorganchem.2017.03.043

and CH<sub>3</sub>CN, for [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] the corresponding acetonitrile complex is obtained. As shown by X-ray and IR, it appears that O<sub>2</sub> from air can replace the CH<sub>3</sub>CN ligand to give the corresponding  $\eta^2$ -O<sub>2</sub> complex. However, when applied as catalysts in the title reaction under the conditions given in Table 3, only small reactivity or yield differences between [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub> and [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){ P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub> and the *in situ* activated complexes were observed (Table 3, entry 5). We, thus, discontinued the investigation of preformed, isolated acetonitrile complex catalysts.

## 2.7. Comparison of catalytic activity

Finally, we speculated whether there were reactivity differences between the three complexes [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>], [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>) {P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>]]. Accordingly, the three precursor complexes were activated by chloride abstraction for a test reaction; product formation was followed over time by NMR. The results are compiled in Fig. 7. Somewhat surprisingly, all three precursor complexes gave comparable activities over time, i.e. product formation was comparable over time for the three complexes. This finding reflects the isolated yields for the catalysis products presented in Scheme 2, which are also fairly similar for the three complexes.

While somewhat speculative, the similarities in reactivity point towards a common catalytically active species for all three catalysts appear to be involved. It is known from the literature that the  $PF_{\overline{6}}$ anion can hydrolyze under aqueous conditions [31]. Thus, it cannot be excluded that hydrolysis products of the  $PF_{\overline{6}}$  counter anion or other, common decomposition products of the precursor complexes contribute to the catalytic activity of the system. It appeared that the chemistry of mixed phosphine complexes of ruthenium of the general formula as in [RuCl(ind)(PPh\_3){P( $p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3$ }] and [RuCl(ind)(PPh\_3){P(3,5- $C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3$ ] is more complex than we originally anticipated (as demonstrated in Fig. 5). Further investigations of the catalytic system and about the catalytically active species are ongoing.

#### 3. Conclusion

In conclusion, two new ruthenium complexes of the general formula [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)L] were synthesized, bearing phosphine ligands L with CF<sub>3</sub>-substituted aryl rings. Structural characterization revealed that the geometry of the new complexes does not differ significantly from related complexes. However, the placement of the fluorinated ligands resulted in increased oxidation potentials compared to the parent complex  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3)_2]$ . The new complexes are, after activation through chloride abstraction, catalytically active in the etherification of propargylic alcohols. As investigated through <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR, the chloride abstracted fragments [Ru(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)L]<sup>+</sup> are not very stable and undergo a decomposition reaction in solution, and formation of the hydrido complex [RuH(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] was observed for the two precursor complexes, indicating ligand metathesis after chloride abstraction. When the catalytic activity of the new complexes [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>) L] was determined for a test reaction and compared to the activity of the parent compound [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>], it appeared that all three complexes exhibited similar reactivities. Investigation of the catalytically active species is ongoing.

# 4. Experimental

## 4.1. General

All reactions were carried out under an inert N<sub>2</sub> atmosphere using standard Schlenk techniques. The ligands tris(4-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)phosphine, P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>, and tris(3,5bis(trifluoromethyl)phenyl)phosphine, P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>, were purchased from Strem Chemicals and used as is. All other chemicals, including NaPF<sub>6</sub>, were used as supplied from Sigma-Aldrich unless otherwise noted and used as received. The complex [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] was synthesized following the literature [7]. THF was distilled from Na/benzophenone under N<sub>2</sub>. Ethyl acetate, hexane, toluene, CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, and ClCH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>Cl were distilled prior to use; solvents used in catalysis were used as is.



**Fig. 7.** Activity comparison for the ruthenium complexes [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(*p*-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>] (dotted line) and [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)] (dashed) after activation by chloride abstraction. The average of three runs for each complex are shown and error bars are given. For comparison, the activity of [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] (solid line) is also included.

Please cite this article in press as: M.J. Stark, et al., Journal of Organometallic Chemistry (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ j.jorganchem.2017.03.043

10

# **ARTICLE IN PRESS**

M.J. Stark et al. / Journal of Organometallic Chemistry xxx (2017) 1–13

## 4.2. Instruments and measurements

NMR spectra for characterization were collected at room temperature on a Varian Unity 300 MHz or Bruker Avance 300 MHz instrument; all chemical shifts ( $\delta$ ) are reported in ppm and are referenced to a residual solvent signal. IR spectra were collected on a Thermo Nicolet 360 FT-IR spectrometer. FAB and exact mass data were collected on a JEOL MStation [JMS-700] Mass Spectrometer. Melting points were determined on a Thomas Hoover uni-melt capillary melting point apparatus and are uncorrected. Elemental analyses were performed by Atlantic Microlab Inc., Norcross, GA, USA.

# 4.3. $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]$

A Schlenk flask containing [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] (0.260 g, 0.335 mmol), P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub> (0.158 g, 0.339 mmol), and THF (5 mL) was refluxed gently for 4 h under nitrogen. The solvent was removed via vacuum. The complex was isolated as a red solid (0.148 g, 0.125 mmol, 57%) by column chromatography, silica gel  $(2 \times 10 \text{ cm})$  using CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> and petroleum ether (1:3) as eluent. The product was recrystallized from CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> layered with hexanes. m. p. 122–124 °C (dec., capillary). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 7.40–7.29 (m, 24H, arom.), 7.20-7.11 (m, 6H, arom.), 6.92-6.81 (m, 2H, arom.), 4.73-4.70 (m, 1H, indenyl), 4.43 (br s, 1H, indenyl), 3.74 (s, 1H, indenyl); <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 140.7 (s), 140.2 (s), 136.6 (s), 136.0 (s), 134.2 (s), 134.1 (s), 133.8 (s), 133.6 (s), 131.6 (s), 131.2 (s), 130.8 (s), 130.3 (s), 129.7 (s), 129.4 (s), 129.0 (s), 128.6 (s), 127.8 (s), 127.7 (s), 125.8 (s), 125.5 (s), 124.7 (m), 123.4 (s), 122.2 (s), 118.6 (s), 112.8 (s), 112.7 (s), 110.6 (br s), 89.6 (s), 70.9 (s), 70.8 (s), 64.8 (s), 53.7 (s, CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>), 31.8 (s, hexanes), 22.9 (s, hexanes), 14.4 (s, hexanes);  ${}^{31}P{}^{1}H{}$  NMR (121 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$  50.1 (d,  $J_{PP} = 42$  Hz), 44.2 (d,  $J_{\rm PP} = 42$  Hz); <sup>19</sup>F{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (282 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$  -62.9. IR (neat, solid): v = 3041 (w), 2956 (w), 2923 (w), 1604 (w), 1479 (w), 1395 (w), 1317 (w), 1162 (w), 1113 (w), 1085 (s), 1055 (s), 1012 (s), 842 (m), 823 (m), 778 (m), 746 (m) cm<sup>-1</sup>. FAB-MS m/z (%) 718 (20) [RuCl(ind)  $\{P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3\}^+$ , 683 (22)  $[Ru(ind)\{P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3\}^+$ , 483 (32)  $[O=P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3]^+$ , 466 (100)  $[P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3]^+$ , 321 (15)  $[P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3]^+$ C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>, 262 (43) [PPh<sub>3</sub>]<sup>+</sup>. C<sub>48</sub>H<sub>34</sub>ClF<sub>9</sub>P<sub>2</sub>Ru (980.24): calcd. C 58.81, H 3.50; found C 59.19, H 3.89.

# 4.4. [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}]

A Schlenk flask containing [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] (0.171 g, 0.219 mmol), P(3,5-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>(CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub> (0.165 g, 0.242 mmol), and THF (5 mL) was refluxed gently for 4 h under nitrogen. The solvent was removed via vacuum. The complex was isolated as a red solid (0.077 g, 0.079 mmol, 24%) by column chromatography, silica gel  $(2 \times 10 \text{ cm})$  using CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> and petroluem ether (1:3/v:v) as eluent. The complex was recrystallized from CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> layered with hexanes, mp 141–143 °C (dec., capillary). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 7.89–7.85 (m, 9H, arom.), 7.39–7.27 (m, 10H, arom.), 7.19–7.14 (m, 6H, arom.), 6.95–6.92 (m, 1H, arom.), 6.59–6.55 (m, 2H, arom.), 5.15 (br s, 1H, indenyl), 4.84 (m, 1H, indenyl), 3.82 (s, 1H, indenyl); <sup>13</sup>C {<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (75 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 138.3 (s), 137.8 (s), 136.5 (s), 135.9 (s), 133.5 (d,  $J_{CP} = 9.7$  Hz), 133.3 (m), 131.8 (d,  $J_{CP} = 9.1$  Hz), 131.4 (d,  $J_{CP} = 9.1$  Hz), 129.9 (s), 129.3 (s), 128.0 (d,  $J_{CP} = 9.7$  Hz), 126.7 (s), 124.8 (s), 123.9 (s), 121.1 (s), 111.0 (s), 109.4 (s), 91.9 (s), 75.9 (s), 75.8 (s), 63.3 (s), 53.7 (s, CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>); <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (121 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 50.1  $(d, J_{PP} = 42 \text{ Hz}), 47.8 (d, J_{PP} = 42 \text{ Hz}); {}^{19}\text{F}{}^{1}\text{H} \text{NMR} (282 \text{ MHz}, \text{CDCl}_3)$  $\delta$  –62.8. IR (neat, solid):  $\tilde{v}$  = 3053 (w), 3022 (w), 2308 (w), 2117 (w), 1888 (w), 1821 (w), 1614 (w), 1478 (w), 1432 (w), 1351 (s), 1275 (s), 1176 (m), 1117 (s), 1088 (s), 893 (m), 843 (m), 816 (m), 748 (m) cm<sup>-1</sup>. HRMS: calcd. for C<sub>51</sub>H<sub>31</sub>F<sub>18</sub>P<sub>2</sub><sup>102</sup>Ru 1149.0657; found 1149.047. C<sub>51</sub>H<sub>31</sub>ClF<sub>18</sub>P<sub>2</sub>Ru (1184.23): calcd. C 51.73, H 2.64; found C 50.72, H

## 2.70.

# 4.5. [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub>

A Schlenk flask containing [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>] (0.311 g, 0.401 mmol), NaPF<sub>6</sub> (0.070 g, 0.417 mmol), CH<sub>3</sub>CN (0.200 mL, 3.829 mmol), and MeOH (15 mL) was refluxed gently for 4 h under nitrogen. An orange precipitate formed. The precipitate was isolated by vacuum filtration and dried under high vacuum to give the product as an orange solid (0.230 g, 0.248 mmol, 62%). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$  7.29–7.21 (m, 20H, arom.), 7.18–7.12 (m, 14H, arom.), 6.88–6.80 (m, 14H, arom.), 4.66 (br s, 1H, indenyl), 4.42 (s, 2H, indenyl), 2.12 (s, 3H, CH<sub>3</sub>CN); <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (121 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$  47.7 (s), -146.0 (septet, *J*<sub>FP</sub> = 712 Hz, PF<sub>6</sub>). IR (neat, solid):  $\tilde{v} = 3637$  (w), 3322 (w), 3049 (w), 2278 (w), 1626 (w), 1582 (w), 1531 (w), 1478 (m), 1431 (m), 1329 (w), 1187 (w), 1156 (w), 1088 (w), 1026 (w), 996 (w), 829 (s), 755 (s), 746 (s) cm<sup>-1</sup>. FAB-MS *m/z* (%) 782 (20) [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>, 741 (100) [Ru(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>.

## 4.6. [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}]PF<sub>6</sub>

A Schlenk flask containing [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}] (0.042 g, 0.043 mmol), NaPF<sub>6</sub> (0.008 g, 0.050 mmol), CH<sub>3</sub>CN (0.200 mL, 3.829 mmol), and MeOH (10 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 1.5 h under nitrogen. The solvent was removed and solids were washed with diethyl ether and dried. The residue was passed through a cotton-filled pipette using chloroform. The residue was dried and the product was isolated as a yellow-orange solid (0.034 g, 0.030 mmol, 69.9%). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 7.29–7.21 (m, 20H, arom.), 7.18–7.12 (m, 14H, arom.), 6.88–6.80 (m, 14H, arom.), 4.66 (br s, 1H, indenyl), 4.42 (s, 2H, indenyl), 2.12 (s, 3H, CH<sub>3</sub>CN);  ${}^{31}P{}^{1}H$  NMR (121 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$  49.5 (d,  $J_{PP} = 35$  Hz), 47.4 (d,  $J_{PP} = 35$  Hz), -141.0 (septet,  $J_{FP} = 712$  Hz,  $PF_6^-$ ). IR (neat, solid):  $\tilde{v} = 3069$  (w), 2930 (w), 2864 (w), 2320 (w), 1604 (w), 1478 (w), 1433 (w), 1394 (w), 1318 (s), 1165 (m), 1120 (s), 1088 (m), 1056 (s), 1012 (m), 824 (s), 745 (m). FAB-MS *m*/*z* (%) 945 (70) [Ru(ind)  $\{P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3\}(PPh_3)\}^+$ , 683 (40)  $[Ru(ind)\{P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3\}]^+$ , 479 (100)  $[Ru(ind)(PPh_3)]^+$ . ESI-MS m/z(%) 986 (25) $[Ru(ind)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]^+$ , 945 (100) [Ru(Indenyl)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)(P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>)]<sup>+</sup>.

# 4.7. $[Ru(ind)(\eta^2-O_2)(PPh_3)_2]PF_6$

A NMR tube containing  $[Ru(ind)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3)_2]PF_6$  in CDCl<sub>3</sub> was allowed to rest on the bench top for 72 h, over which dark solid crystals deposited. IR (neat, solid):  $\tilde{v} = 3056$  (w), 2920 (m), 2850 (w), 2283 (w), 1479 (m), 1432 (m), 1186 (w), 1087 (m), 996 (w), 909 (m), 828 (s,  $\eta^2$ -O<sub>2</sub>), 723 (s) cm<sup>-1</sup>. From X-ray sample (in Nujol): FAB-MS *m/z* (%) 741 (52)  $[Ru(ind)(PPh_3)_2]^+$ , 625 (10)  $[Ru(PPh_3)_2]^+$ , 479 (100)  $[Ru(ind)(PPh_3)]^+$ , 363 (16)  $[Ru(PPh_3)]$ , 279 (64)  $[O=PPh_3]$ . From separate crystal: ESI-MS *m/z* (%) 782  $[Ru(in-d)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3)_2]^+$ , 741  $[Ru(ind)(PPh_3)_2]^+$ .

## 4.8. Catalysis

Unless otherwise indicated, the ruthenium complexes were placed into a screw-capped vial containing 1 mL of acetonitrile in toluene (1 MeCN: 9 Tol), and NaPF<sub>6</sub> (4 molar equivalents with respect to ruthenium), and heated for approximately 20 min. To this solution, the propargyl alcohol and substituent nucleophile were added and allowed to heat for the remainder of the reaction time.

Please cite this article in press as: M.J. Stark, et al., Journal of Organometallic Chemistry (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ j.jorganchem.2017.03.043

#### 4.9. Activity determinations in Fig. 7

The respective precursor complex (0.0061 mmol, 2 mol %) was placed into an NMR tube along with NaPF<sub>6</sub> (0.006 g, 0.036 mmol) and CH<sub>3</sub>CN (0.02 mL). The mixture was heated for 5 min at 85 °C. A solution containing 1-phenyl-2-propyn-1-ol (**1a**, 0.041 g, 0.31 mmol), benzyl alcohol (**2b**, 42 mg, 0.39 mmol) and *p*-dimethoxybenzene (internal standard, 0.002 g) in toluene-d<sub>8</sub> (0.6 mL) was added to each NMR tube. The mixture was heated at 85 °C for 24 h, where <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra were recorded for each reaction mixture over a consistent time period. Integration of the diastereotopic doublets at  $\delta$  4.78 (d, *J*<sub>HH</sub> = 11.7 Hz, *CH*<sub>2</sub>, 2H) for the product in the spectrum were referenced to the aromatic protons of *p*-dimethoxybenzene at  $\delta$  6.71 (4H).

#### 4.10. Cyclic voltammetry

Voltammograms were recorded in a three-electrode BAS electrochemical cell in a Vacuum Atmospheres HE-493 drybox under an atmosphere of argon in 0.1M NBu<sub>4</sub>PF<sub>6</sub>/CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> at 298 K. A 1.6 mm Pt disk electrode was used as the working electrode, a platinum wire was used as the auxiliary electrode, and a silver wire was used a pseudo-reference electrode. Potentials were calibrated against the Cp\*<sub>2</sub>Fe<sup>0/+</sup> couple, which is known to occur at -0.548 V vs the Cp<sub>2</sub>Fe<sup>0/+</sup> couple for this solvent medium [32]. The potentials in this paper can be changed to SCE reference values by addition of 0.56 V. Voltammograms were collected at 0.05–1.6 V/s with an EG&G PAR 263A potentiostat interfaced to a computer operated with EG&G PAR Model 270 software.

#### Table 4

Crystallographic parameters.

# 4.11. X-ray structure determination for [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(p- $C_6H_4CF_3)_3$ ], [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(3,5- $C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3$ ], [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub> and [Ru(ind)( $\eta^2$ -O<sub>2</sub>)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]PF<sub>6</sub>

Crystals of [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>){P(p-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>}], [RuCl(ind)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)  $\{P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3\}$  and  $[Ru(ind)(CH_3CN)(PPh_3)_2)]PF_6$  of appropriate dimension were obtained by diffusion of CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> into hexane solutions of the complexes. Crystals of  $[Ru(ind)(\eta^2-O_2)(PPh_3)_2]PF_6$ obtained by storage of a CDCl<sub>3</sub> solution of were [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub> under aerobic conditions and directly taken from the reaction mixture. Crystals of approximate dimensions were mounted on MiTeGen cryoloops in random orientations. Preliminary examination and data collection were performed using a Bruker X8 Kappa Apex II Charge Coupled Device (CCD) Detector system single crystal X-ray diffractometer equipped with an Oxford Cryostream LT device. All data were collected using graphite monochromated Mo K $\alpha$  radiation ( $\lambda = 0.71073$  Å) from a fine focus sealed tube X-ray source. Preliminary unit cell constants were determined with a set of 36 narrow frame scans. Typical data sets consist of combinations of  $\omega$  and  $\Phi$  scan frames with typical scan width of 0.5° and counting time of 15 s/frame at a crystal to detector distance of 4.0 cm. The collected frames were integrated using an orientation matrix determined from the narrow frame scans. Apex II and SAINT software packages [33] were used for data collection and data integration. Analysis of the integrated data did not show any decay. Final cell constants were determined by global refinement of reflections harvested from the complete data set. Collected data were corrected for systematic errors using SADABS [32] based on the Laue symmetry using equivalent reflections.

Crystal data and intensity data collection parameters are listed in Table 4.Structure solution and refinement were carried out using the SHELXTL- PLUS software package [34]. The structures were

	$[BuC](ind)(PPh_{a})(P(n_{a}))$	$[B_{11}C](ind)(PPb_{a})(P(3.5-$	[Ru(ind)(CH_CN)(PPh_)- 1PF-	$[Bu(ind)(n^2 - \Omega_0)(PPh_0)_0]PF_0$
	$C_6H_4CF_3)_3$ ]	$C_{6}H_{3}(CF_{3})_{2}]_{3}]$	[Ku(IIIu](CII3CN)(FFII3)2]FI'6	[Ku(IIIu](1] -02](FFII3)2]FI'6
Empirical formula	$(C_{48}H_{34}ClF_9P_2Ru)_2(CHCl_3)_3$	$(C_{51}H_{31}ClF_{18}P_2Ru)_2$ Et <sub>2</sub> O	$C_{47}H_{40}F_6NP_3Ru$	C <sub>45</sub> H <sub>37</sub> F <sub>6</sub> O <sub>2</sub> P <sub>3</sub> Ru
Formula weight	2318.52	2456.54	926.78	917.72
Temperature K/Wavelength Å	100(2)/0.71073	100(2)/0.71073	100(2)/0.71073	100(2) K/0.71073
Crystal system	Triclinic	Triclinic	Monoclinic	Triclinic
Space group	P-1	P-1	P21	P-1
Unit cell dimensions	a = 9.5521(3) Å	a = 11.3198(4) Å	a = 10.5101(13) Å	a = 9.8032(5) Å
	b = 11.5438(4)  Å	b = 20.1160(10) Å	b = 17.3270(19) Å	b = 14.8889(8)  Å
	c = 21.3297(8) Å	c = 22.2959(10) Å	c = 11.2487(13)  Å	c = 19.5349(10) Å
	$\alpha = 90.0613(19)^{\circ}$	$\alpha = 101.841(2)^{\circ}$	$lpha=90^\circ$	$\alpha = 72.190(3)^{\circ}$
	$\beta = 90.123(2)^{\circ}$	$\beta = 93.1865(18)^{\circ}$	$\beta = 96.677(7)^{\circ}$	$\beta = 79.428(3)^{\circ}$
	$\gamma = 90.9485(18)^{\circ}$	$\gamma = 94.4486(19)^{\circ}$	$\gamma = 90^{\circ}$	$\gamma = 71.868(3)^{\circ}$
Volume/Z	2351.64(14) Å <sup>3</sup> /1	4940.7(4) Å <sup>3</sup> /2	2034.6(4) Å <sup>3</sup> /2	2567.5(2) Å <sup>3</sup> /2
Density (calculated)	$1.637 \text{ Mg/m}^3$	$1.651 \text{ Mg/m}^3$	$1.531 \text{ Mg/m}^3$	$1.187 \text{ Mg/m}^3$
Absorption coefficient	$0.786 \text{ mm}^{-1}$	$0.545 \text{ mm}^{-1}$	$0.567 \text{ mm}^{-1}$	$0.451 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
F(000)	1162	2456	944	932
Crystal size/mm <sup>3</sup>	0.499 × 0.348 x 0.337	0.406 × 0.337 x 0.189	0.598 × 0.365 x 0.219	$0.384 \times 0.199 \text{ x } 0.107$
Theta range for data collection	1.764-37.238°	0.936–27.799°	1.823-40.516°	1.100-26.492°
Index ranges	$-16 \le h \le 16$ ,	$-14 \le h \le 14$ ,	$-18 \le h \le 19$ ,	$-9 \le h \le 12$ ,
-	$-17 \le k \le 19$ ,	$-26 \le k \le 25$ ,	$-28 \le k \le 30$ ,	$-18 \leq k \leq 18$ ,
	$-36 \le l \le 36$	$0 \le l \le 29$	$-20 \le l \le 19$	$-24 \leq l \leq 24$
Reflections collected	59057	22976	92778	39837
Independent reflections	59057 [R(int) = 0.018]	22976 [R(int) = 0.042]	24235 [R(int) = 0.028]	10242 [R(int) = 0.070]
Absorption correction	Semi-empirical from	Semi-empirical from equivalents	Semi-empirical from	Semi-empirical from
•	equivalents	· ·	equivalents	equivalents
Max. and min. transmission	0.791035 and 0.737117	0.862066 and 0.748420	0.7693 and 0.7103	0.7672 and 0.6547
Data/restraints/parameters	59057/37/624	22976/343/1392	24235/1/523	10242/73/545
Goodness-of-fit on F2	1.058	1.011	1.053	1.044
Final R indices $[I > 2 \text{ sigma}(I)]$	R1 = 0.0497,	R1 = 0.0499,	R1 = 0.0236,	R1 = 0.0788,
R indices (all data)	wR2 = 0.1341	wR2 = 0.1289	wR2 = 0.0530	wR2 = 0.1803
Largest diff. peak and hole/	2.245 and -1.603	1.617 and -0.837	0.763 and -0.551	1.356 and -1.905
e.Å <sup>-3</sup>				

solved and refined successfully in the space groups P21 for [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub> and P-1 for all other complexes. Full matrix least-squares refinements were carried out by minimizing  $\Sigma w (F_0^2 - F_c^2)^2$ . The non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically to convergence. All hydrogen atoms were treated using appropriate riding model (AFIX m3). The final residual values and structure refinement parameters are listed in Table 4.

Absolute structure determination was carried out using Parson's method [35] for [Ru(ind)(CH<sub>3</sub>CN)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub> with Flack x = -0.021(4) from 10263 selected quotients.

For the compound  $[Ru(ind)(\eta^2-O_2)(PPh_3)_2]PF_6$  Platon-Squeeze [36] was used to remove badly disordered solvent molecules  $(3 \times \text{CHCl}_3)$  The counter ion PF<sub>6</sub> is also disordered and the disorder was resolved with partial occupancy F atoms with geometrical restraints.

For the complex  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(p-C_6H_4CF_3)_3}]$ , half a molecule of ethylacetate was found in the lattice. Two CF<sub>3</sub> groups and the CH<sub>3</sub> of the solvent were disordered. The disorder was modeled with partial occupancy atoms and geometrical restraints.

The data for  $[RuCl(ind)(PPh_3){P(3,5-C_6H_3(CF_3)_2)_3}]$  was twinned. A two component twin model was used for refinement with BASF = 0.49.1.5 molecules of  $CHCl_3/Ru$  were found in the lattice. Disordered CF<sub>3</sub> group was refined with partial occupancy F atoms with geometrical restraints.

Tables of calculated and observed structure factors are available in electronic format.

### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the National Science Foundation (NSF CHE-1300818, EBB; CHE-156509, MJS) for financial support. Further funding from the National Science Foundation for the purchase of the NMR spectrometer (CHE-9974801), the ApexII diffractometer (MRI, CHE-0420497), and the mass spectrometer (CHE-9708640) is acknowledged.

### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data related to this article can be found at http:// dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jorganchem.2017.03.043.

## References

- [1] (a) I. Dragutan, V. Dragutan, A. Demonceau, Molecules 20 (2015) 17244-17274
  - (b) P. Kumar, R. Kumar Gupta, D. Shankar Pandey, Chem. Soc. Rev. 43 (2014) 707-733:
  - (c) F. Nicks, Y. Borguet, S. Delfosse, D. Bicchielli, L. Delaude, X. Sauvage, A. Demonceau, Aust. J. Chem. 62 (2009) 184-207;
  - (d) C. Bonaccorsi, A. Mezzetti, Curr. Org. Chem. 10 (2006) 225-240;
  - (e) K. Grela, A. Michrowska, M. Bieniek, Chem. Rec. 6 (2006) 144-156;
- (f) H. Schaffrath, W. Keim, J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem. 168 (2001) 9–14.
- [2] S.-I. Murahashi, D. Zhang, Chem. Soc. Rev. 37 (2008) 1490–1501.
- [3] (a) D.J. Nelson, S. Manzini, C.A. Urbina-Blanco, S.P. Nolan, Chem. Commun. 50 (2014) 10355-10375:
- (b) Y. Vidavsky, A. Anaby, N.G. Lemcoff, Dalton Trans. 41 (2012) 32-43; (c) K. Bieger, J. Díez, M. Pilar Gamasa, J. Gimeno, M. Pavlišta, Y. Rodríguez-Álvarez, S. García-Granda, R. Santiago-García, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. (2002) 1647 - 1656: (d) R.H. Grubbs, Tetrahedron 60 (2004) 7117-7140.
- [4] (a) J. Francos, S.E. García-Garrido, J. García-Álvarez, P. Crochet, J. Gimeno, V. Cadierno, Inorg. Chim. Acta 455 (2017) 398-414;
  - (b) C. Chen, F. Verpoort, Q. Wu, RSC Adv. 6 (2016) 55599-55607;
  - (c) J.M. Sears, W.-C. Lee, B.J. Frost Inorg, Chim. Acta 431 (2015) 248-257;
  - (d) V.S. Thirunavukkarasu, S.I. Kozhushkov, L. Ackermann, Chem. Commun. 50 (2014) 29 - 39;
  - (e) P. Crochet, V. Cadierno, Top. Organomet. Chem. 48 (2014) 81–118, 48;
- (f) J. Moran, M.J. Krische, Pure Appl. Chem. 84 (2012) 1729-1739. [5] (a) A.A. Nazarov, C.G. Hartinger, P.J. Dyson, J. Organomet. Chem. 751 (2014) 251-260;
- (b) M.I. Webb, B. Wu, T. Jang, R.A. Chard, E.W.Y. Wong, M.Q. Wong,

D.T.T. Yapp, C.J. Walsby, Chem. Eur. J. 19 (2013) 17031-17042;

- (c) O. Mazuryk, K. Kurpiewska, K. Lewiński, G. Stochel, M. Brindell, J. Inorg. Biochem. 116 (2012) 11–18;
- (d) N.P.E. Barry, P.J. Sadler, Chem. Soc. Rev. 41 (2012) 3264-3279;
- (e) Y.K. Yan, M. Melchart, A. Habtemariam, P.J. Sadler, Chem. Commun. (2005) 4764-4776.
- [6] (a) J.M. Cole, K.Y.M. Yeung, G. Pace, S.O. Sylvester, D. Mersch, R.H. Friend, CrystEngComm 17 (2015) 5026–5031; (b) A. Breivogel, C. Kreitner, K. Heinze, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. (2014) 5468-5490;
  - (c) S. Fantacci, F. De Angelis, Coord. Chem. Rev. 255 (2011) 2704–2726.
- [7] L.A. Oro, M.A. Ciriano, M. Campo, C. Foces-Foces, F.H.J. Cano, J. Organomet. Chem. 289 (1985) 117–131.
- [8] (a) K.M.E. Burton, D.A. Pantazis, R.G. Belli, R. McDonald, L. Rosenberg, Organometallics 35 (2016) 3970-3980: (b) V. Cadierno, J. Díez, M. Pilar Gamasa, J. Gimeno, E. Lastra, Coord. Chem. Rev.
  - 193-195 (1999) 147-205:
- (c) M. Pilar Gamasa, J. Gimeno, C. Gonzalez-Bernardo, B.M. Martín-Vaca, D. Monti, M. Bassetti, Organometallics 15 (1996) 302–308. [9] Examples: (a) I. García de la Arada, J. Díez, M. Pilar Gamasa, E. Lastra, Or-
- ganometallics 34 (2015) 1345–1353; (b) I. García de la Arada, J. Díez, M.P. Gamasa, E. Lastra, J. Organomet. Chem.
- 797 (2015) 101-109.
- [10] (a) S. Nolan, Acc. Chem. Res. 47 (2014) 3089-3101;

(b) C.A. Mebi, R.P. Nair, B.J. Frost, Organometallics 26 (2007) 429-438; (c) K. Bieger, J. Díez, M. Pilar Gamasa, J. Gimeno, M. Pavlišta, Y. Rodríguez-Álvarez, S. García-Granda, R. Santiago-García, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. (2002) 1647-1656

(d) P. Alvarez, J. Gimeno, E. Lastra, S. García-Granda, J.F. Van der Maelen, M. Bassetti, Organometallics 20 (2001) 3762–3771; (e) E.P. Kündig, C.M. Saudan, V. Alezra, F. Viton, G. Bernardinelli, Angew.

- Chem. Int. Ed. 40 (2001) 4481-4485;
- (f) M. Bassetti, S. Marini, F. Tortorella, V. Cadierno, J. Díez, M. Pilar Gamasa, J. Gimeno, J. Organomet. Chem. 593-594 (2000) 292-298;
- (g) Y. Yamamoto, H. Kitahara, R. Hattori, K. Itoh, Organometallics 17 (1998) 1910-1912.
- [11] (a) M. José Calhorda, L.F. Veiros, Dalton Trans. 40 (2011) 11138-11146; (b) M. José Calhorda, C.C. Romão, L.F. Veiros, Chem. Eur. J. 8 (2002) 868-875; (c) L.F. Veiros, Organometallics 19 (2000) 3127-3136; (d) J.M. O'Connor, C.P. Casey, Chem. Rev. 87 (1987) 307-318;
  - (e) J.W. Faller, R.H. Crabtree, A. Habib, Organometallics 4 (1985) 929–935.
- [12] (a) M.J. Stark, M.J. Shaw, N.P. Rath, E.B. Bauer, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. (2016) 1093-1102;
  - (b) M.J. Queensen, J.M. Rabus, E.B. Bauer, J. Mol. Cat. A Chem. 407 (2015) 221-229;
  - (c) M.J. Queensen, N.P. Rath, E.B. Bauer, Organometallics 33 (2014) 5052-5065
  - (d) D.F. Alkhaleeli, K.J. Baum, J.M. Rabus, E.B. Bauer, Catal. Commun. 47 (2014) 45-48;
  - (e) A.K. Widaman, N.P. Rath, E.B. Bauer, New J. Chem. 35 (2011) 2427-2434; (f) S. Costin, A.K. Widaman, N.P. Rath, E.B. Bauer, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. (2011) 1269-1282;
  - (g) S. Costin, N.P. Rath, E.B. Bauer, Tetrahedron Lett. 50 (2009) 5485-5488;
  - (h) S. Costin, S.L. Sedinkin, E.B. Bauer, Tetrahedron Lett. 50 (2009) 922-925;
  - (i) S. Costin, N.P. Rath, E.B. Bauer, Adv. Synth. Catal. 350 (2008) 2414-2424.
- [13] Representative examples: (a) O. bin Shawkataly, M.A.A. Pankhi, M.G. Alam, C.S. Yeap, H.-K. Fun, Polyhedron 30 (2011) 444-450;
- (b) R. Corrêa da Costa, F. Hampel, J.A. Gladysz, Polyhedron 26 (2007) 581–588. [14] (a) A.C. Marr, M. Nieuwenhuyzen, C.L. Pollock, G.C. Saunders, Organometallics 26 (2007) 2659-2671;
- (b) F. Zhao, Y. Ikushima, M. Chatterjee, O. Sato, M. Arai, J. Supercrit, Fluids 27 (2003) 65-72.
- [15] A.K. Renfrew, R. Scopelliti, P.J. Dyson, Inorg. Chem. 49 (2010) 2239-2246.
- [16] D. Gudmunsen, E.G. Hope, D.R. Paige, A.M. Stuart, J. Fluor. Chem. 130 (2009) 942-950.
- [17] R. Tuba, R. Corrêa da Costa, H.S. Bazzi, J.A. Gladysz, ACS Catal. 2 (2012) 155-162.
- [18] S. Costin, N.P. Rath, E.B. Bauer, Inorg. Chem. Commun. 14 (2011) 478-480.
- [19] E.J. Derrah, J.C. Marlinga, D. Mitra, D.M. Friesen, S.A. Hall, R. McDonald, L. Rosenberg, Organometallics 24 (2005) 5817-5827.
- [20] M. Kamigaito, Y. Watanabe, T. Ando, M. Sawamoto, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 124 (2002) 9994-9995.
- [21] (a) C.R. Martinez, B.L. Iverson, Chem. Sci. 3 (2012) 2191-2201;
- (b) C. Janiak, J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. (2000) 3885–3896. [22] (a) J. Lodinský, J. Vinklárek, L. Dostál, Z. Růžičková, J. Honzíček, RSC Adv. 5 (2015) 27140-27153;
- (b) J. Honzíček, J. Vinklárek, M. Erben, J. Lodinský, L. Dostál, Z. Padělkova, Organometallics 32 (2013) 3502-3511.
- [23] S. Costin, N.P. Rath, E.B. Bauer, Inorg. Chim. Acta 362 (2009) 1935-1942.
- [24] (a) B. Suthar, A. Aldongarov, I.S. Irgibaeva, M. Moazzen, B.T. Donovan-Merkert, J.W. Merkert, T.A. Schmedake, Polyhedron 31 (2012) 754-758; (b) A.P. Shaw, J.R. Norton, D. Buccella, L.A. Sites, S.S. Kleinbach, D.A. Jarem, K.M. Bocage, C. Nataro, Organometallics 28 (2009) 3804-3814; (c) A.R. O'Connor, C. Nataro, A.L. Rheingold, J. Organomet. Chem. 679 (2003) 72-78 (d) S. Santi, L. Broccardo, M. Bassetti, P. Alvarez, Organometallics 22 (2003)

Please cite this article in press as: M.J. Stark, et al., Journal of Organometallic Chemistry (2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/ j.jorganchem.2017.03.043

#### M.J. Stark et al. / Journal of Organometallic Chemistry xxx (2017) 1-13

13

3478-3484.

- [25] General examples and reviews regarding the nucleophilic substitution of propargylic alcohols: (a) K. Nakajima, M. Shibata, Y. Nishibayashi, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 137 (2015) 2472-2475;
  - (b) D.-Y. Zhang, X.-P. Hu, Tetrahedron Lett. 56 (2015) 283-295;
  - (c) B. Wang, C. Liu, H. Guo, RSC Adv. 4 (2014) 53216–53219;
  - (d) F.-Z. Han, F.-L. Zhu, Y.-H. Wang, Y. Zou, X.-H. Hu, S. Chen, X.-P. Hu, Org. Lett. 16 (2014) 588–591;
  - (e) E.B. Bauer, Synthesis 44 (2012) 1131-1151;
  - (f) Y. Nishibayashi, Synthesis 44 (2012) 489–503;
  - (g) R.J. Detz, H. Hiemstra, J.H. van Maarseveen, Eur. J. Org. Chem. (2009) 6263-6276;
- (h) N. Ljungdahl, N. Kann, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 48 (2009) 642–644. [26] (a) B. Schmidt, Eur. J. Org. Chem. (2004) 1865–1880;
- (b) M.B. Dinger, J.C. Mol, Organometallics 22 (2003) 1089-1095.
- (a) A.B.P. Lever, Coord, Chem. Rev. 254 (2010) 1397–1405: [27]
- (b) C. Slugovc, E. Rüba, R. Schmid, K. Kirchner, K. Mereiter, Monatsh. Chem. 131 (2000) 1241-1251.
- [28] S.S. Keisham, Y.A. Mozharivskyj, P.J. Carroll, M.R. Kollipara, J. Organomet. Chem. 689 (2004) 1249-1256.
- [29] Representative examples: (a) S.L. Kuan, W.K. Leong, R.D. Webster, L.Y. Goh, Organometallics 31 (2012) 5159-5168;

(b) A. Yoshinari, A. Tazawa, S. Kuwata, T. Ikariya, Chem. Asian J. 7 (2012) 1417-1425;

(c) W.M. Khairul, M.A. Fox, N.N. Zaitseva, M. Gaudio, D.S. Yufit, B.W. Skelton, A.H. White, J.A.K. Howard, M.I. Bruce, P.J. Low, Dalton Trans. (2009) 610-620; (d) S. Nagao, H. Seino, M. Hidai, Y. Mizobe, Dalton Trans. (2005) 3166-3172; (e) J. Matthes, S. Gründemann, A. Toner, Y. Guari, B. Donnadieu, J. Spandl, S. Sabo-Etienne, E. Clot, H.-H. Limbach, B. Chaudret, Organometallics 23 (2004) 1424-1433.

- [30] J.S. Valentine, Chem. Rev. 73 (1973) 235-245.
- [31] (a) T.T. da Cunha, F. Pointillart, B. Le Guennic, C.L.M. Pereira, S. Golhen, (b) L. Terborg, S. Nowak, S. Passerini, M. Winter, U. Karst, P.R. Haddad, P.N. Nesterenko, Anal. Chim. Acta 714 (2012) 121–126; (c) N.R. Brooks, A.J. Blake, N.R. Champness, J.W. Cunningham, P. Hubberstey, M. Schröder, Cryst. Growth Des. 1 (2001) 395–399;
   (d) M. Di Vaira, M. Peruzzini, S.S. Costantini, P. Stoppioni, J. Organomet. Chem. (d) N. D. Valla, N. F. Cashin, P. C. Barrière, W.E. Geiger, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 128 (2006) 3980–3989.
  [32] F. Barrière, W.E. Geiger, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 128 (2006) 3980–3989.

- [32] F. Balliere, w.E. Gerger, J. Alli, enclin. Soc. 125 (2)
   [33] Madison, WI, Bruker Analytical X-Ray, 2016.
   [34] G.M. Sheldrick, Acta Cryst. A64 (2008) 112–122.
- [35] S. Parsons, H. Flack, Acta Cryst. A60 (2004) s61.
- [36] A.L. Spek, Acta Cryst. A46 (1990) C34.