



Fluorinating Reagents | Very Important Paper |

Synthesis of Actinide Fluoride Complexes Using Trimethyltin Fluoride as a Mild and Selective Fluorinating Reagent

Benjamin D. Kagan,^[a,b] Alejandro G. Lichtscheidl,^[a] Karla A. Erickson,^[a] Marisa J. Monreal,^[a] Brian L. Scott,^[c] Andrew T. Nelson,^[d] and Jaqueline L. Kiplinger^{*[a]}

Abstract: Trimethyltin fluoride (Me₃SnF) is a mild and selective reagent for the installation of actinide fluoride bonds as demonstrated by the room temperature synthesis of a variety of organometallic and inorganic thorium(IV), uranium(IV), and uranium(V) fluoride complexes { $(1,2,4-tBu_3C_5H_2)_2ThF_2$, (C₅Me₅)₂-U(F)(O-2,6-*i*Pr₂C₆H₃), U(F)(O-2,6-*t*Bu₂C₆H₃)₃, U(F)[N(SiMe₃)₂]₃,

Introduction

Actinide fluorine chemistry has been studied since the Manhattan project, where volatile separations of uranium isotopes were sought.^[1] As the most volatile uranium compound, UF₆ was selected for isotope separations using the gaseous diffusion method; however, using UF₆ was complicated by its high reactivity and due to problems associated with its handling. Nevertheless, a major consequence of the gaseous diffusion process has been the accumulation of a significant amount of depleted UF₆.^[2] As such, understanding the chemistry of the U–F bond has important implications for evaluating technologies for the storage, disposal, or re-use of depleted UF₆.

Despite the obvious experimental challenges, there is considerable interest in developing methods for the preparation of stable inorganic and organometallic actinide fluoride complexes as these molecules may provide crucial information regarding the poorly understood chemistry of actinide fluorides. In fact, there are only a couple of early accounts that report well-characterized reactivity of UF₆ with MeOH and Me₃SiOMe to give (MeO)UF₅^[3] and U(OMe)₆,^[4] respectively. Even in the presence of trace water, UF₆ reacts to form HF and uranium oxides, making the study of UF₆ and its chemistry challenging.^[5] Over the past decade, this has changed. Techniques for handling and characterizing air- and water-sensitive materials

[a]	Chemistry Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory,
	Mailstop J-514, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA
	E-mail: kiplinger@lanl.gov
n n	

[b] Department of Chemistry, University of Vermont, Discovery Hall, Burlington, Vermont 05405, USA

 [c] Materials Physics and Applications Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Mailstop J-514, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA
 [d] Materials Science and Technology Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory,

- Mailstop E-549, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA
- \blacksquare Supporting information and ORCID(s) from the author(s) for this article are
- **b** available on the WWW under https://doi.org/10.1002/ejic.201701232.

 $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(L)$ (L = O=PMe_3, O=PPh_3, O=PCy_3), and $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)\}$ from their corresponding chloride, bromide, and iodide analogues. From these reactions, the new $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(L)$ (L = O=PPh_3, O=PCy_3) uranium fluoride complexes were isolated and characterized by NMR spectroscopy and X-ray crystallography.

have vastly improved, enabling a variety of new approaches for synthesizing molecular organometallic compounds containing actinide fluoride bonds.

Archetypal methods for synthesizing organometallic uranium fluoride compounds have evolved from redox chemistry with inorganic [AgBF₄,^[6] AgF,^[7] AgPF₆,^[8] CuF₂,^[9] HgF₂,^[10] PF_{3} ^[7,11] (Ph₃P)AuCF₃^[12] and organic (C₆H₅F^[10] Me₃SiCF₃^[13] COF₂,^[7] PhCOF,^[14] Ph₃CF^[7]) fluoride reagents. In the area of thorium chemistry, thorium bipyridyl metallocene complexes react with AgF to give thorium fluoride derivatives.^[15] The reduction of metallocene difluoride complexes has also proved to be a practical method for preparing trivalent fluorides.^[6a,6b,16] Boron trifluoride (BF₃·OEt₂) has been used as a fluoride exchange reagent to yield uranium fluorides upon reactions with metallocene uranium alkoxide,^[17] alkyl,^[17,18] and amide^[17] complexes. Fluoride atom abstraction from aromatic and aliphatic fluorocarbons by $(MeC_5H_4)_3U(tBu)$ has also been shown to give $(MeC_5H_4)_3UF$ in high yields.^[7,19] Similarly, the uranium(III) alkyl Tp*2UCH2Ph activates C-F bonds on a variety of fluorinated substrates to yield Tp_2^*UF and $Tp_2^*UF_2$ [$Tp^* =$ hydrotris(3,5-dimethylpyrazolyl)borate].^[20] Finally, protonolysis chemistry between uranium alkyl compounds using $\mathsf{NEt}_3\mathsf{\cdot}\mathsf{3HF}^{[21]}$ and $\mathsf{NH}_4\mathsf{F}^{[22]}$ has been employed to afford uranium fluoride complexes.

Generally speaking, these existing routes to actinide fluoride complexes are limited and substrate specific. We have been investigating new methods for the synthesis of thorium and uranium fluoride complexes to explore their chemistry and sought to use trimethyltin fluoride (Me₃SnF) as a fluorinating reagent. Roesky and co-workers pioneered the use of Me₃SnF as a reagent for the metathesis of chlorides to the corresponding fluorides.^[23] Although this compound forms a polymeric chain-like structure of tin and fluorine atoms in the solid state,^[24] it has been shown to react with metal chlorides to generate metal fluorides and volatile trimethyltin chloride.^[23b,23c,25] Specifically, Me₃SnF has been used to prepare a variety of alkaline-earth



 $\begin{array}{ll} (Mg, ^{[26]} Ca, ^{[27]} Sr^{[28]}), \ early \ (Sc, ^{[29]} Y, ^{[29]} Ti, ^{[23a, 29, 30]} Zr, ^{[23a, 30h, 31]} \\ Hf, ^{[23a, 31b-31e]} V, ^{[32]} Nb, ^{[33]} Ta^{[34]}), \ mid \ (W^{[30j, 35]}), \ and \ late \ (Fe, ^{[36]} Co, ^{[37]} Zn^{[38]}) \\ Co, ^{[37]} Zn^{[38]}) \ transition-metal, \ main-group \ (Al, ^{[39]} Ga, ^{[39g]} Si, ^{[23c, 40]} Ge, ^{[41]} Sb, ^{[42]} P^{[23b, 43]}) \ and \ lanthanide-metal \ (Sm, ^{[44]} Ho, ^{[29]} Er^{[29]}) \ organometallic \ and \ inorganic \ fluoride \ complexes. \end{array}$

In this contribution, we demonstrate for the first time the use of Me_3SnF in halide exchange reactions with a suite of organometallic and inorganic actinide chloride, bromide, and iodide complexes as a mild route for the synthesis of thorium and uranium fluoride complexes. We further show that this methodology does not seem to be limited by metal (thorium vs. uranium), oxidation state [uranium(IV) vs. uranium(V)] or ligand platform (metallocene vs. non-metallocene).

Results and Discussion

Known uranium(V) imido halide complexes were chosen to initially examine the ability of Me₃SnF to serve as a fluorinating reagent for the preparation of organometallic actinide fluorides. As shown in Equation (1), $(C_5Me_5)_2U(X)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ [X = CI (1), Br (2), I (3)],^[9a,9b] reacts with 2 equiv. of Me₃SnF to afford $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (4).^[12] The resulting Me₃SnX (X = Cl, Br, I) byproduct is easily removed under reduced pressure, and the uranium(V) fluoride (4) is obtained in excellent yields (79–98 %) following work up. If desired, the Me₃SnX (X = Cl, Br, I) can be subsequently converted back into Me₃SnF by reaction with aqueous KF solution.^[24,36,45] When the reactions are monitored by ¹H NMR spectroscopy in [D₆]benzene, resonances corresponding to the uranium(V) imido halide complex (4), in addition to singlets at δ = 0.29, 0.40, and 0.48, are observed for Me_3SnX (X = Cl, Br, and I), respectively, consistent with a halide exchange reaction.^[46] Previously, complex 4 was synthesized by the oxidation of $(C_5Me_5)_2U(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (THF) with excess CuF₂,^[9b] whereas the current procedure is redox-neutral.



Structurally characterized pentavalent uranium fluoride complexes are rare. Brown, crystalline blocks of **4** were grown by slow evaporation of a saturated toluene solution at ambient temperature and analyzed. Single-crystal X-ray diffraction confirmed the existence of the U–F bond in complex **4** (Figure 1). The molecular structure features a typical bent-metallocene framework with the fluoride and imido ligands in the metallocene wedge. The U(1)–F(1) [2.1280(17) Å], U(1)–N(1) [1.981(2) Å], and U–C_{Cent} [2.453(3), 2.453(3) Å, cent = cyclopentadienyl centroid] bond lengths of complex **4** are all comparable to those reported for the structurally related uranium(V) imido fluoride complex (C₅Me₅)₂U(F)(=N-2,4,6-tBu₃C₆H₂) [U–F = 2.122(5) Å, U–N = 1.965(8) Å, U–C_{cent} = 2.453(3), 2.453(3) Å].^[9b] The U(1)–



$$\begin{split} N(1)-C(21) & [170.0(2)^{\circ}], \ F(1)-U(1)-N(1) & [106.60(8)^{\circ}], \ and \ C_{Cent}-U-C_{Cent} & [143.0(1)^{\circ}] \ bond \ angles \ of \ \textbf{4} \ are \ also \ comparable \ to \ those \ observed \ for \ (C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(=N-2,4,6-tBu_3C_6H_2) & [U-N-C_{Ar} = 171.0(7)^{\circ}, \ F-U-N = 97.0(3)^{\circ}, \ and \ C_{Cent}-U-C_{Cent} = 132.1(2)^{\circ}].^{[9b]} \\ These \ values \ are \ also \ in \ agreement \ with \ those \ observed \ for \ the \ chloride, \ bromide, \ and \ iodide \ analogues \ of \ (C_5Me_5)_2U(X)-(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3).^{[9b]} \end{split}$$



Figure 1. Molecular structure of $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (4) with thermal ellipsoids projected at the 50 % probability level. Hydrogen atoms have been omitted for clarity.

To understand the generality of this fluorination method, the reactivity of Me₃SnF with tetravalent uranium metallocene and non-metallocene ligand frameworks was tested. Reaction of Me₃SnF with the uranium(IV) aryloxide–chloride complex, $(C_5Me_5)_2U(CI)(O-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (**5**),^[47] proceeds smoothly at room temperature to afford Me₃SnCl and the corresponding uranium(IV) fluoride complex ($C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(O-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (**6**)^[12] in 93 % yield [Equation (2)]. Likewise, treatment of the uranium(IV) tris(aryloxide) iodide and tris(amide) chloride complexes, $U(I)(O-2,6-tBu_2C_6H_3)_3$ (**7**)^[48] and $U(CI)[N(SiMe_3)_2]_3$ (**9**),^[49] with Me₃SnF forms U(F)(O-2,6-tBu_2C_6H_3)_3 (**8**)^[50] and U(F)[N(SiMe_3)_2]_3 (**10**)^[51] in 53 % and 93 % yields, respectively [Equations (3) and (4)]. Previously, all three complexes, **6**, **8**, and **10**, were prepared by redox or fluoride-atom abstraction oxidative methods.





One interesting observation made during the course of these studies was that the liberated Me₃SnCl and Me₃SnI in reactions 2-4 can react with the uranium aryloxide and amide ancillary linkages in $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(O-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (6), $U(F)(O-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ $tBu_2C_6H_3)_3$ (8) and U(F)[N(SiMe_3)_2]_3 (10) to form the corresponding trimethyltin derivatives Me₃Sn(O-2,6-*i*Pr₂C₆H₃) [$\delta_{[D6]benzene} =$ 0.25 (SnCH₃), 1.27 (iPr-CH₃), 3.38 (iPr-CH), 6.93 (p-Ar-H), 7.12 (m-Ar-H)], Me₃Sn(O-2,6-tBu₂C₆H₃) [$\delta_{ID6]benzene} = 0.32$ (SnCH₃), 1.49 (tBu-CH₃), 6.90 (p-Ar-H), 7.35 (m-Ar-H)], and $Me_3SnN(SiMe_3)_2$ [$\delta_{[D6]benzene} = 0.21$ (SiCH₃), 0.25 (SnCH₃)], respectively, which were identified by monitoring the reactions by ¹H NMR spectroscopy.^[46] We found that this side reaction is circumvented by immediately placing the reactions under reduced pressure after the Me₃SnF is added such that volatile Me_3SnX (X = Cl, Br, I) compounds are removed as they are formed.

Finally, additional studies were carried out to see if the Me₃SnF chemistry could be applied to not only the installation of multiple fluoride bonds, but also as a fluorinating reagent at actinide metal centers other than uranium. Indeed, the metallocene thorium(IV) dichloride complex $(1,2,4-tBu_3C_5H_2)_2ThCl_2$ (11)^[52] reacts cleanly with 2 equiv. of Me₃SnF, yielding $(1,2,4-tBu_3C_5H_2)_2ThF_2$ (12, 90 %)^[15b] [Equation (5)]. Previously, complex 12 was prepared by oxidation of the bipyridyl thorium metallocene complex, $(1,2,4-tBu_3C_5H_2)_2Th(bipy)$ (bipy = 2,2'-bipyridine) using AgF.^[15b]



As shown in Equation (6), similar chemistry was observed for uranium. Reaction of the uranium(IV) dichloride and dibromide complexes $(C_5Me_5)_2UX_2$ [X = Cl (13),^[53] Br (14)^[47]] in the presence of phosphine oxides afforded the monometallic difluoride uranium(IV) complexes $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PR_3)$ [R = CH₃ (15, 97–99%);^[21] R = Ph (16, 70–99%); R = Cy (17, 71–77%)]. Due to the basicity of the fluoride ligand, a characteristic feature of organometallic fluoride complexes is the tendency to form fluoride bridges between two or more metal atoms. However, the added phosphine oxide donor ligands help to sterically saturate the uranium metal center and prevent dimer formation in both the solution and solid state.





Earlier work by our group showed that monometallic uranium difluoride complex **15** could be prepared by protonolysis of $(C_5Me_5)_2UMe_2$ with Et₃N·3HF in the presence of trimethylphosphine oxide.^[21] Halide exchange using Me₃SnF not only offers a higher yielding and more streamlined route to **15**, but also enables access to the triphenylphosphine oxide (**16**) and tricyclohexylphosphine oxide (**17**) derivatives.

Complexes **16** and **17** represent new members to this small but growing class of low-valent uranium fluorides. Similar to complex **15**, ¹⁹F NMR resonances were not visible for the terminal fluoride ligands in either complex **16** or **17**. The ¹H NMR spectrum for $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PPh_3)$ (**16**) in $[D_6]$ benzene is sim-



Figure 2. Molecular structures of $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PMe_3)$ (15), $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PPh_3)$ (16), and $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PCy_3)$ (17) with thermal ellipsoids projected at the 50 % probability level. Hydrogen atoms have been omitted for clarity.

Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. 0000, 0–0 www.eurjic.org





ple and shows a singlet at $\delta = -2.47$ ppm for the C₅Me₅ protons and broad resonances at $\delta = 6.74$ (*m*-Ar–*H*), 4.62 (*p*-Ar–*H*), and 2.60 (o-Ar-H) corresponding to the phenyl groups on the coordinated Ph₃P=O ligand. The ¹H NMR spectrum for $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PCy_3)$ (17) in $[D_6]$ benzene is a bit more complicated with a singlet at $\delta = -1.81$ ppm for the C₅Me₅ protons and several broad resonances corresponding to the protons of inequivalent cyclohexyl groups on the coordinated Cy₃P=O Finally, complexes $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PMe_3)$ ligand. (15). $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PPh_3)$ (16) and $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PCy_3)$ (17) in [D₆]benzene all display signals in their ³¹P{¹H} NMR spectra at $\delta = -34.76, -9.38, \text{ and } 14.87, \text{ respectively.}$

The molecular structures of 15-17 are given in Figure 2. All three complexes display bent metallocene structures with the phosphine oxide coordinated to the uranium(IV) metal center between two fluoride ligands within the wedge. The terminal U-F bond lengths are 2.1285(12) and 2.1292(12) Å for (C₅Me₅)₂UF₂(O=PMe₃) (15), 2.1223(32) and 2.1325(28) Å for (C₅Me₅)₂UF₂(O=PPh₃) (16), and 2.1277(17) and 2.1246(17) Å for $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PCy_3)$ (17). Although these values are similar to that observed in the structurally related $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(py)$ [U-F = 2.146(5) Å],^[21] they are significantly longer than those reported for the other known uranium(IV) terminal fluoride complexes $(1,2,4-tBu_3C_5H_2)_2UF_2$ [U-F = 2.081(5) Å],^[18] $(1,3-tBu_2C_5H_3)_2UF_2$ $[U-F=2.086(5)~{\text{\AA}}^{[17]}],~and~Tp*_{2}UF_{2}~([U-F=2.086(6),~2.090(6)~{\text{\AA}}].$ This observation is consistent with comparatively more electron-rich uranium metal centers in complexes 15-17 due to the additional electron density provided by the phosphine oxide ligands.

Conclusions

We have shown that trimethyltin fluoride (Me₃SnF) serves as a mild and selective reagent for the installation of actinide fluoride bonds. The halide exchange reaction with actinide chloride, bromide, and iodide complexes affords the corresponding fluorides as demonstrated by the synthesis of a variety of organometallic and inorganic thorium and uranium fluoride complexes. As this chemistry does not seem to be limited by actinide metal, oxidation state, or ligand platform, we expect that this protocol will provide a general means for introducing fluoride ligands on actinide metal centers.

Experimental Section

General Considerations: Unless otherwise noted, all reactions and manipulations were performed at 20 °C in a recirculating Vacuum Atmospheres NEXUS model inert atmosphere (Ar or N₂) drybox equipped with a 40CFM Dual Purifier NI-Train. Glassware was dried overnight at 150 °C before use. NMR spectra were obtained using a Bruker Avance 400 MHz spectrometer at ambient temperature. Chemical shifts for ¹H and ¹³C{¹H} NMR spectra were referenced to solvent impurities.^{[54] 31}P{¹H} NMR spectra were referenced to an external 85 % H₃PO₄ solution. IR spectra were obtained using a Thermo Scientific Nicolet iS5 FT–IR spectrometer, using a Golden Gate Diamond ATR (ZnSe lenses) with a reaction anvil (neat solid samples). Melting points were determined with a Hel-Temp II capillary melting point apparatus equipped with a Fluke 50S K/J thermo-

couple using capillary tubes flame-sealed under N₂; values are uncorrected. Elemental Analyses were performed by ALS Environmental (Tucson, AZ) or Atlantic Microlab, Inc. (Norcross, GA).

Materials: Unless otherwise noted, reagents were purchased from commercial suppliers and used without further purification. Celite (Aldrich), alumina (Brockmann I, Aldrich), and 3 Å molecular sieves (Aldrich) were dried under dynamic vacuum at 250 °C for 48 h prior to use. All solvents (Aldrich) were purchased anhydrous, dried with KH for 48 h, passed through a column of activated alumina, and stored over activated 3 Å molecular sieves prior to use. $(C_5Me_5)_2U(X)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (X = Cl, Br, I),^[9a,9b] (C_5Me_5)₂U(Cl)-(O-2,6-*i*Pr_2C_6H_3),^[47] U(I)(O-2,6-*t*Bu₂C₆H₃),^[55] U(Cl)[N(SiMe₃)₂],^[49] (C_5Me_5)₂UCl₂,^[53] (C_5Me_5)₂UBr₂,^[47] (1,2,4-*t*Bu₃C₅H₂)₂ThCl₂,^[52] and Me₃SnF^[36] were prepared according to literature procedures.

Synthesis of $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (4)

Method A: From (C₅Me₅)₂U(Cl)(=N-2,6-iPr₂C₆H₃) (1): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, (C₅Me₅)₂U(CI)(=N-2,6iPr₂C₆H₃) (1, 0.300 g, 0.418 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.153 g, 0.836 mmol), and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred at ambient temperature for 4 h and then the volatiles were removed under reduced pressure. The resulting residue was dissolved in hexane (15 mL) and filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. All volatiles were removed from the brown filtrate to give $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (4) as a brown solid (0.266 g, 0.378 mmol, 90 %). The ¹H NMR spectrum collected in [D₆]benzene was consistent with data previously reported for complex $\mathbf{4}.^{[9b] \ 1} \mathsf{H}$ NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): δ = 69.65 (s, 1 H, CHMe₂), 26.08 (s, 1 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 69 Hz, Ar–H), 16.76 (s, 1 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 28 Hz, Ar–H), 15.39 (s, 6 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 66 Hz, CHMe₂), 3.93 (s, 30 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 107 Hz, C₅Me₅), -10.11 (s, 6 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 48 Hz, CHMe₂), -15.93 (s, 1 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 133 Hz, Ar–H), -34.99 (s, 1 H, CHMe₂) ppm. Method B: From (C₅Me₅)₂U(Br)(=N-2,6*iPr₂C₆H₃) (2)*: A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, (C₅Me₅)₂U(Br)(=N-2,6-*i*Pr₂C₆H₃) (**2**, 0.220 g, 0.289 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.106 g, 0.578 mmol), and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred at ambient temperature for 4 h and then the volatiles were removed under reduced pressure. The resulting residue was dissolved in hexane (15 mL) and filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The brown filtrate was collected and volatiles were removed under reduced pressure to give $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (4) as a brown solid (0.155 g, 0.221 mmol, 76 %). Method C: From (C5Me5)2U(I)(=N-2,6-iPr2C6H3) (3): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, (C₅Me₅)₂U(I)(=N-2,6-*i*Pr₂C₆H₃) (**3**, 0.300 g, 0.371 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.136 g, 0.742 mmol), and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred at ambient temperature for 4 h and then the volatiles were removed under reduced pressure. The resulting residue was dissolved in hexane (15 mL) and filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The brown filtrate was collected and volatiles were removed under reduced pressure to give $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (4) as a brown solid (0.260 g, 0.370 mmol, 99 %). Single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained by slow evaporation of a saturated toluene solution at ambient temperature.

Synthesis of (C_5Me_5)₂U(F)(O-2,6-*i*Pr₂C₆H₃) (6): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, (C_5Me_5)₂U(C)(O-2,6-*i*Pr₂C₆H₃) (5, 0.100 g, 0.139 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.025 g, 0.139 mmol), and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under reduced pressure until dry. The reaction mixture was then charged with a second equivalent of Me₃SnF (0.025 g, 0.139 mmol) in toluene (5 mL), and subsequently placed under reduced pressure until dry. The resulting residue was dissolved in toluene (5 mL) and filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The red filtrate





was collected and the volatiles were removed under reduced pressure to give $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(O-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (**6**) as a red solid (0.091 g, 0.129 mmol, 93 %). The ¹H NMR spectrum collected in [D₆]benzene was consistent with data previously reported for complex **6**.^[12] ¹H NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): $\delta = 6.75$ (d, 1 H, ³J_{H,H} = 8 Hz, *m*-Ar–*H*), 6.30 (t, 1 H, ³J_{H,H} = 8 Hz, *p*-Ar–*H*), 4.13 (d, 1 H, ³J_{H,H} = 8 Hz, *m*-Ar–*H*), 3.19 (s, 30 H, C_5Me_5), –1.71 (s, 6 H, CHMe₂), –10.25 (s, 1 H, CHMe₂), –11.45 (s, 6 H, CHMe₂), –45.33 (s, 1 H, CHMe₂) ppm.

Synthesis of U(F)(O-2,6-tBu₂C₆H₃)₃ (8): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, U(I)(O-2,6-tBu₂C₆H₃)₃ (**7**, 0.084 g, 0.085 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.016 g, 0.085 mmol), and THF (5 mL). The reaction mixture immediately placed under reduced pressure until dry. The resulting residue was triturated with (Me₃Si)₂O (3 mL). Insoluble solids were collected on a coarse-porosity fritted filter, washed with (Me₃Si)₂O (0.5 mL), and dried under reduced pressure to give U(F)(O-2,6-tBu₂C₆H₃)₃ (**8**) as a yellow solid (0.040 g, 0.046 mmol, 54 %). The ¹H NMR spectrum collected in [D₆]benzene was consistent with data previously reported for complex **8**.^{[50] 1}H NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): δ = 15.97 (s, 6 H, $\nu_{1/2}$ = 43 Hz, *m*-Ar-H), 12.43 (s, 3 H, $\nu_{1/2}$ = 28 Hz, *p*-Ar-H), -4.54 (s, 54 H, $\nu_{1/2}$ = 62 Hz, *CMe*₃) ppm.

Synthesis of U(F)[N(SiMe₃)₂]₃ (10): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, U(Cl)[N(SiMe₃)₂]₃ (**9**, 0.100 g, 0.133 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.027 g, 0.146 mmol), and toluene (3 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under reduced pressure until dry. The resulting residue was dissolved in hexane (5 mL) and filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The purple filtrate was collected and volatiles were removed under reduced pressure to give U(F)[N(SiMe₃)₂]₃ (**10**) as a purple solid (0.095 g, 0.129 mmol, 98 %). The ¹H NMR spectrum collected in [D₆]benzene was consistent with data previously reported for complex **10**.^[51] ¹H NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): $\delta = -4.57$ (s, 36 H, $v_{1/2} = 479$ Hz, SiMe₃) ppm.

Synthesis of (1,2,4-tBu₃C₅H₂)ThF₂ (12): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, (1,2,4-tBu₃C₅H₂)₂ThCl₂ (11, 0.085 g, 0.110 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.040 g, 0.220 mmol, 2 equiv.), and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was dissolved in toluene (5 mL) and filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The yellow filtrate was collected and the volatiles were removed under reduced pressure to give (1,2,4-tBu₃C₅H₂)₂ThF₂ (12) as a white solid (0.073 g, 0.100 mmol, 90 %). The ¹H NMR spectrum collected in [D₆]benzene was consistent with data previously reported for complex 12.^(15b) ¹H NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): δ = 6.35 (s, 4 H, CH), 1.55 (s, 36 H, CMe₃), 1.37 (s, 18 H, CMe₃) ppm.

Synthesis of (C₅Me₅)₂UF₂(O=PMe₃) (15)

Method A: From (C_5Me_5)₂UCl₂ (13): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, (C_5Me_5)₂UCl₂ (13, 0.100 g, 0.172 mmol), O= PMe₃ (0.016 g, 0.172 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.063 g, 0.344 mmol) and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was dissolved in toluene (5 mL) and filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The yellow filtrate was collected and volatiles were removed under reduced pressure to give (C_5Me_5)₂UF₂(O=PMe₃) (15) as a yellow solid (0.107 g, 0.167 mmol, 97 %). The ¹H NMR spectrum collected in [D₆]benzene was consistent with data previously reported for complex 15.^[21] ¹H NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): δ = -2.22 (s, 30 H, $\nu_{1/2}$ = 32 Hz, C_5Me_5), -17.31 (d, 9 H, ²J_{P-H} = 10 Hz, O=PMe₃). ³¹P{¹H} NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): δ = -34.76 ppm. IR (ATR-IR, 296 K, neat):

 $\tilde{v} = 2950, 2909, 2856, 1437, 1376, 1311, 1296, 1103, 944, 863, 779, 752, 737, 545 cm⁻¹. M.p. 227–229 °C. Single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained by upon cooling a saturated toluene solution to –30 °C.$ *Method B: From (C₃Me₃)₂UBr₂ (14):* $A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, <math>(C_5Me_5)_2UBr_2$ (14, 0.100 g, 0.150 mmol), O=PMe₃ (0.014 g, 0.150 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.027 g, 0.150 mmol) and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. A second equivalent of Me₃SnF (0.027 g, 0.150 mmol) and toluene (5 mL) were added and the reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was dissolved in toluene (5 mL) and filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The yellow filtrate was collected and the volatiles were removed under reduced pressure to give $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PMe_3)$ (15) as a yellow solid (0.095 g, 0.149 mmol, 99 %).

Synthesis of (C₅Me₅)₂UF₂(O=PPh₃) (16)

Method A: From (C₅Me₅)₂UCl₂ (13): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, $(C_5Me)_2UCl_2$ (13, 0.100 g, 0.172 mmol), O= PPh3 (0.048 g, 0.172 mmol), Me3SnF (0.032 g, 0.172 mmol), and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was charged with Me₃SnF (0.032 g, 0.172 mmol) and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was dissolved in toluene (5 mL), filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The yellow filtrate was collected and the volatiles removed under reduced pressure to give (C₅Me₅)₂-UF₂(O=PPh₃) (**16**) as a yellow solid (0.099 g, 0.120 mmol, 70 %). ¹H NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): $\delta = 6.74$ (s, 6 H, $v_{1/2} = 16$ Hz, m-Ar-H), 4.62 (s, 3 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 19 Hz, p-Ar-H), 2.60 (s, 6 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 37 Hz, o-Ar-H), -2.47 (s, 30 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 32 Hz, C₅Me₅) ppm. ³¹P{¹H} NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): δ = -9.38 ppm. IR (ATR-IR, 296 K, neat): \tilde{v} = 3058, 2901, 2854, 2721, 1486, 1436, 1376, 1147, 1120, 1089, 1072, 1027, 997, 896, 749, 723, 692, 535 cm⁻¹. M.p. 239–240 °C. Elemental analysis could not be obtained due to poor combustibility of the sample. Single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained upon cooling a saturated toluene solution layered with hexane to -30 °C. Method B: From (C₅Me₅)₂UBr₂ (14): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, $(C_5Me)_2UBr_2$ (14, 0.100 g, 0.150 mmol), O= PPh₃ (0.042 g, 0.150 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.027 g, 0.150 mmol), and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was charged with Me₃SnF (0.027 g, 0.150 mmol) and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was dissolved in toluene (5 mL) and filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The yellow filtrate was collected and the volatiles removed under reduced pressure to give (C₅Me₅)₂UF₂(O=PPh₃) (16) as a yellow solid (0.123 g, 0.149 mmol, 99 %).

Synthesis of (C₅Me₅)₂UF₂(O=PCy₃) (17)

Method A: From (C_5Me_5)₂UCl₂ (13): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, (C_5Me_2)₂UCl₂ (13, 0.200 g, 0.344 mmol), O= PCy₃ (0.102 g, 0.344 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.063 g, 0.344 mmol), and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was charged with Me₃SnF (0.063 g, 0.344 mmol) and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was charged with Me₃SnF (0.063 g, 0.344 mmol) and toluene (5 mL). The resulting residue was dissolved in toluene (5 mL), filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The yellow filtrate was collected and the volatiles were removed under reduced pressure to give (C_5Me_5)₂UF₂(O=PCy₃) (17) as a yellow solid (0.224 g, 0.265 mmol, 77 %). ¹H NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): δ = 7.97 (s, 6 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 51 Hz, Cy-H), 2.10–1.88 (m, 3 H, Cy-H), -1.15 (s, 3 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 20 Hz, Cy-H),





-1.81 (s, 30 H, $\nu_{1/2}$ = 34 Hz, C₅Me₅), -3.56 (s, 6 H, $\nu_{1/2}$ = 48 Hz, Cy-H), -6.36 (s, 6 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 33 Hz, Cy-H), -10.74 (s, 6 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 32 Hz, Cy-H), -32.42 (s, 3 H, $v_{1/2}$ = 36 Hz, Cy-H) ppm. ³¹P{¹H} NMR ([D₆]benzene, 298 K): δ = 14.87 ppm. IR (ATR-IR, 296 K, neat): \tilde{v} = 2928, 2850, 2176, 1444, 1343, 1286, 1228, 1130, 1095, 1075, 1049, 1026, 1005, 987, 953, 762, 563 cm⁻¹. M.p. 260.5–262.5 °C. C₃₈H₆₃F₂OPU (842.91): C, 54.15; H, 7.53; found C, 53.13; H, 7.64. Single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained upon cooling a saturated toluene solution to -30 °C. Method B: From (C5Me5)2UBr2 (14): A 20-mL scintillation vial was charged with a stir bar, (C₅Me)₂UBr₂ (**14**, 0.100 g, 0.150 mmol), O=PCy₃ (0.044 g, 0.150 mmol), Me₃SnF (0.027 g, 0.150 mmol), and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture was immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was charged with Me₃SnF (0.027 g, 0.150 mmol) and toluene (5 mL). The reaction mixture immediately placed under vacuum until dry. The resulting residue was dissolved in toluene (5 mL), filtered through a Celite-padded coarse-porosity fritted filter. The yellow filtrate was collected and the volatiles removed under reduced pressure to give $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PCy_3)$ (17) as a yellow solid (0.089 g, 0.106 mmol, 71 %).

X-ray Crystallography

Data for $(C_5Me_5)_2U(F)(=N-2,6-iPr_2C_6H_3)$ (4), $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PMe_3)$ (15), and $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PPh_3)$ (16) were collected on a Bruker Apex II diffractometer, with an APEX II CCD detector. Data for $(C_5Me_5)_2UF_2(O=PCy_3)$ (17) were collected on a Bruker D8 Quest diffractometer, with CMOS detector in shutterless mode. Data for $C_{32}H_{47}FNU$ (**4**): monoclinic, $P2_1/c$, a = 12.927(2) Å, b = 11.4779(18) Å, c = 19.746(3) Å, $\beta = 91.802(2)^\circ$, V = 2928.4(8) Å³, Z = 4, $\rho = 1.594$ g/ cm³, μ = 5.569 Mo- K_{α} , T = 140 K, $2\theta_{max}$ = 57.24°, min/max trans. = 0.2391/0.4022, total reflns = 31885, unique reflns = 6677, parameters = 330, $R_1(wR_2)$ $[l \ge 2\sigma(l)] = 0.0230(0.0607)$. Data for $C_{26.5}H_{43}F_2OPU$ (**15**): monoclinic, $P2_1/c$, a = 15.017(3) Å, b = 10.962(2) Å, c = 16.779(3) Å, $\beta = 90.1060(19)^{\circ}$, V = 2762.1(9) Å³, Z = 4, $\varrho = 1.646$ g/cm³, $\mu = 5.963$ Mo- K_{α} , T = 140 K, $2\theta_{max} = 57.52^{\circ}$, min/max trans. = 0.2513/0.5347, total reflns = 31594, unique refins = 6750, parameters = 398, $R_1(wR_2)$ [$l \ge 2\sigma(l)$] = 0.0165(0.0408). Data for $C_{45}H_{53}F_2OPU$ (**16**): orthorhombic, $P2_12_12_1$, a = 10.9732(8) Å, b = 17.8607(13) Å, c = 20.5456(15) Å, $\beta = 90.00^{\circ}$, V = 4026.7(5) Å³, $Z = 4, \rho = 1.512 \text{ g/cm}^3, \mu = 4.112 \text{ Mo-}K_{\alpha}, T = 140 \text{ K}, 2\theta_{\text{max}} = 53.62^\circ$, min/max trans. = 0.4386/0.4935, total reflns = 40856, unique refins = 9618, parameters = 398, $R_1(wR_2)$ [$l \ge 2\sigma(l)$] = 0.0301(0.0723). Data for C₄₅H₇₁F₂OPU (**17**): monoclinic, $P2_1/n$, a = 10.4620(7) Å, b =17.9494(13) Å, c = 22.8914(16) Å, $\beta = 91.744(2)^{\circ}$, V = 4296.7(5) Å³, $Z = 4, \varrho = 1.445 \text{ g/cm}^3, \mu = 3.855 \text{ Mo-}K_{\alpha}, T = 140 \text{ K}, 2\theta_{\text{max}} = 62.54^\circ$, min/max trans. = 0.4116/0.5128, total reflns = 86771, unique refins = 14049, parameters = 398, $R_1(wR_2)$ $[l \ge 2\sigma(l)] =$ 0.0306(0.0954). The crystals were cooled with a Bruker KRYO-FLEX liquid nitrogen vapor-cooling device (4, 15, 16), or an Oxford Cryostream 700 (17). Hemispheres of data were collected with ω scans. Data collection, initial indexing and cell refinements were handled with APEX II software.^[56] Frame integration, including Lorentz-polarization corrections, and final cell parameter calculations were carried out with Saint+ software.[57] The data were corrected for absorption with the SADABS program.^[58] The structure was solved with direct methods and difference Fourier techniques. Nonhydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically and hydrogen atoms were treated as idealized contributions. Structure solution and refinement were performed with SHELXTL.^[59] CCDC 1572453 (for 16), 1572454 (for 4), 1572455 (for 17), and 1572456 (for 15) contain the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data can be obtained free of charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre.

Acknowledgments

For financial support of this work, we acknowledge the U.S. Department of Energy through the Los Alamos G. T. Seaborg Institute for Transactinium Science (Undergraduate Student Fellowship to B. D. K.; Postdoctoral Fellowships to A. G. L., K. A. E., and M. J. M.), the Los Alamos National Laboratory (Director and Reines PD Fellowships to M. J. M.), the Office of Science, Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS) under the Science Undergraduate Laboratory Internship (SULI) program (Fellowship to B. D. K.), the Advanced Fuels Campaign Fuel Cycle Research & Development Program (A. T. N.), and the LANL LDRD Program. Los Alamos National Laboratory is operated by Los Alamos National Security, LLC, for the National Nuclear Security Administration (contract DE-AC52-06NA25396).

Keywords: Thorium · Uranium · Fluorides · Halides · Trimethyltin fluoride

- R. E. Banks, D. W. A. Sharp, J. C. Tatlow, Fluorine: The First Hundred Years (1886–1986), Elsevier Sequoia, 1986.
- [2] N. R. C. C. o. Decontamination, D. o. U. E. Facilities, Affordable Cleanup?: Opportunities for Cost Reduction in the Decontamination and Decommissioning of the Nation's Uranium Enrichment Facilities, National Academy Press, 1996.
- [3] P. J. Vergamini, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1979, 15, 54–55.
- [4] E. A. Cuellar, T. J. Marks, Inorg. Chem. 1981, 20, 2129-2137.
- [5] a) S.-W. Hu, H. Lin, X.-Y. Wang, T.-W. Chu, J. Mol. Struct. 2014, 1062, 29– 34; b) M. C. Lind, S. L. Garrison, J. M. Becnel, J. Phys. Chem. A 2010, 114, 4641–4646; c) R. Hou, T. Mahmud, N. Prodromidis, K. J. Roberts, R. A. Williams, D. T. Goddard, T. Semeraz, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 2007, 46, 2020– 2033.
- [6] a) P. C. Blake, M. F. Lappert, R. G. Taylor, J. L. Atwood, H. Zhang, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **1987**, *139*, 13–20; b) P. B. Hitchcock, M. F. Lappert, R. G. Taylor, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. **1984**, *20*, 1082–1084; c) S. Kannan, M. A. Moody, C. L. Barnes, P. B. Duval, *Inorg. Chem.* **2006**, *45*, 9206–9212.
- [7] M. Weydert, R. A. Andersen, in *Inorganic Fluorine Chemistry*, American Chemical Society, **1994**, vol. 555, pp. 383–391.
- [8] D. M. King, F. Tuna, E. J. L. McInnes, J. McMaster, W. Lewis, A. J. Blake, S. T. Liddle, *Nat. Chem.* **2013**, *5*, 482–488.
- [9] a) C. R. Graves, B. L. Scott, D. E. Morris, J. L. Kiplinger, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2007, 129, 11914–11915; b) C. R. Graves, P. Yang, S. A. Kozimor, A. E. Vaughn, D. L. Clark, S. D. Conradson, E. J. Schelter, B. L. Scott, J. D. Thompson, P. J. Hay, D. E. Morris, J. L. Kiplinger, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 5272–5285; c) R. K. Thomson, B. L. Scott, D. E. Morris, J. L. Kiplinger, C. R. Chim. 2010, 13, 790–802.
- [10] W. J. Evans, G. W. Nyce, M. A. Johnston, J. W. Ziller, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000, 122, 12019–12020.
- [11] J. G. Brennan, S. D. Stults, R. A. Andersen, A. Zalkin, Organometallics 1988, 7, 1329–1334.
- [12] R. K. Thomson, C. R. Graves, B. L. Scott, J. L. Kiplinger, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* 2009, 1451–1455.
- [13] P. L. Arnold, Z. R. Turner, N. Kaltsoyannis, P. Pelekanaki, R. M. Bellabarba, R. P. Tooze, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2010**, *16*, 9623–9629.
- [14] O. J. Cooper, D. P. Mills, W. Lewis, A. J. Blake, S. T. Liddle, *Dalton Trans.* 2014, 43, 14275–14283.
- [15] a) W. Ren, H. Song, G. Zi, M. D. Walter, *Dalton Trans.* **2012**, *41*, 5965–5973; b) W. Ren, G. Zi, M. D. Walter, *Organometallics* **2012**, *31*, 672–679.
- [16] W. W. Lukens Jr., S. M. Beshouri, A. L. Stuart, R. A. Andersen, Organometallics 1999, 18, 1247–1252.
- [17] W. W. Lukens, S. M. Beshouri, L. L. Blosch, A. L. Stuart, R. A. Andersen, Organometallics 1999, 18, 1235–1246.
- [18] G. Zi, L. Jia, E. L. Werkema, M. D. Walter, J. P. Gottfriedsen, R. A. Andersen, Organometallics 2005, 24, 4251–4264.
- [19] M. Weydert, R. A. Andersen, R. G. Bergman, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1993, 115, 8837–8838.





- [20] C. L. Clark, J. J. Lockhart, P. E. Fanwick, S. C. Bart, Chem. Commun. 2015, 51, 14084–14087.
- [21] R. K. Thomson, C. R. Graves, B. L. Scott, J. L. Kiplinger, Dalton Trans. 2010, 39, 6826–6831.
- [22] E. Dornberger, R. Klenze, B. Kanellakopulos, Inorg. Nucl. Chem. Lett. 1978, 14, 319–324.
- [23] a) A. Herzog, F.-Q. Liu, H. W. Roesky, A. Demsar, K. Keller, M. Noltemeyer, F. Pauer, Organometallics **1994**, *13*, 1251–1256; b) H. W. Roesky, A. Herzog, K. Keller, Z. Naturforsch. B **1994**, *49*, 981–982; c) H. W. Roesky, K. Keller, J. Fluorine Chem. **1998**, *89*, 3–4.
- [24] P. Chaudhary, M. Bieringer, P. Hazendonk, M. Gerken, Dalton Trans. 2015, 44, 19651–19658.
- [25] a) H. Dorn, H. W. Roesky, R. J. Morris, *Inorg. Synth.* 2002, 33, 234–239; b)
 H. W. Roesky in *Efficient Preparations of Fluorine Compounds*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 2012, pp. 270–274.
- [26] a) H. Hao, H. W. Roesky, Y. Ding, C. Cui, M. Schormann, H.-G. Schmidt, M. Noltemeyer, B. Zemva, *J. Fluorine Chem.* **2002**, *115*, 143–147; b) M. Rauch, S. Ruccolo, J. P. Mester, Y. Rong, G. Parkin, *Chem. Sci.* **2016**, *7*, 142–149.
- [27] A. Pevec, A. Demsar, V. Gramlich, S. Petricek, H. W. Roesky, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans. 1997, 26, 2215–2216.
- [28] S. P. Sarish, H. W. Roesky, M. John, A. Ringe, J. Magull, Chem. Commun. 2009, 45, 2390–2392.
- [29] A. M. Neculai, D. Neculai, G. B. Nikiforov, H. W. Roesky, C. Schlicker, R. Herbst-Irmer, J. Magull, M. Noltemeyer, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* 2003, 3120– 3126.
- [30] a) A. Herzog, H. W. Roesky, F. Jaeger, A. Steiner, *Chem. Commun.* **1996**, *32*, 29–30; b) A. Kuenzel, E. Parisini, H. W. Roesky, G. M. Sheldrick, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1997**, *536/537*, 177–180; c) F.-Q. Liu, A. Herzog, H. W. Roesky, I. Uson, *Inorg. Chem.* **1996**, *35*, 741–744; d) A. Pevec, F. Perdih, A. Demsar, Univerza v Mariboru, Fakulteta za Kemijo in Kemijsko Tehnologijo, **2003**, pp. 160–165; e) P. Yu, T. Pape, I. Uson, M. A. Said, H. W. Roesky, M. L. Montero, H.-G. Schmidt, A. Demsar, *Inorg. Chem.* **1998**, *37*, 5117–5124; f) S. Eger, T. A. Immel, J. Claffey, H. Muller-Bunz, M. Tacke, U. Groth, T. Huhn, *Inorg. Chem.* **2010**, *49*, 1292–1294; g) M. Erben, J. Merna, S. Hermanova, I. Cisarova, Z. Padelkova, M. Dusek, *Organometallics* **2007**, *26*, 2735–2741; h) S. K. Mandal, H. W. Roesky, *Adv. Catal.* **2011**, *54*, 1–61; i) G. B. Nikiforov, H. W. Roesky, P. G. Jones, *J. Fluorine Chem.* **2008**, *129*, 376–381; j) K. Köhler, A. Herzog, A. Steiner, H. W. Roesky, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1996**, *35*, 295–297; *Angew. Chem.* **1996**, *108*, 331.
- [31] a) S. L. Benjamin, W. Levason, D. Pugh, G. Reid, W. Zhang, *Dalton Trans.* 2012, *41*, 12548–12557; b) A. Künzel, M. Sokolow, F.-Q. Liu, H. W. Roesky, M. Noltemeyer, H.-G. Schmidt, I. Uson, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* 1996, *25*, 913–919; c) E. F. Murphy, P. Yu, S. Dietrich, H. W. Roesky, E. Parisini, M. Noltemeyer, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* 1996, *25*, 1983–1987; d) S. A. A. Shah, H. Dorn, A. Voigt, H. W. Roesky, E. Parisini, H.-G. Schmidt, M. Noltemeyer, *Organometallics* 1996, *15*, 3176–3181; e) S. A. A. Shah, H. Dorn, H. W. Roesky, E. Parisini, H.-G. Schmidt, M. Noltemeyer, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* 1996, *25*, 4143–4146; f) A. Spannenberg, P. Arndt, W. Baumann, V. V. Burlakov, U. Rosenthal, S. Becke, T. Weiss, *Organometallics* 2004, *23*, 3819–3825.
- [32] M. Billen, G. Hormung, G. Wolmershaeuser, F. Preuss, Z. Naturforsch. B 2003, 58, 237–245.
- [33] a) N. C. Tomson, J. Arnold, R. G. Bergman, *Organometallics* **2010**, *29*, 2926–2942; b) M. Schormann, S. P. Varkey, H. W. Roesky, M. Noltemeyer, J. Organomet. Chem. **2001**, *621*, 310–316.
- [34] a) O. I. Guzyr, M. Schormann, J. Schimkowiak, H. W. Roesky, C. Lehmann, M. G. Walawalkar, R. Murugavel, H.-G. Schmidt, M. Noltemeyer, *Organometallics* **1999**, *18*, 832–836; b) T. Kurogi, B. C. Manor, P. J. Carroll, D. J. Mindiola, *Polyhedron* **2017**, *125*, 80–85.
- [35] a) M. F. Davis, W. Levason, R. Ratnani, G. Reid, T. Rose, M. Webster, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2007**, 306–313; b) A. Dietrich, B. Neumuller, K. Dehnicke, *Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem.* **2000**, *626*, 2443–2445.

- [36] J. Vela, J. M. Smith, Y. Yu, N. A. Ketterer, C. J. Flaschenriem, R. J. Lachicotte, P. L. Holland, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 7857–7870.
- [37] a) K. Ding, T. R. Dugan, W. W. Brennessel, E. Bill, P. L. Holland, *Organome-tallics* **2009**, *28*, 6650–6656; b) T. R. Dugan, J. M. Goldberg, W. W. Brennessel, P. L. Holland, *Organometallics* **2012**, *31*, 1349–1360.
- [38] P. Yu, P. Muller, H. W. Roesky, M. Noltemeyer, A. Demsar, I. Uson, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 1999, 38, 3319–3321; Angew. Chem. 1999, 111, 3518.
- [39] a) J. Chai, V. Jancik, S. Singh, H. Zhu, C. He, H. W. Roesky, H.-G. Schmidt, M. Noltemeyer, N. S. Hosmane, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 7521–7528; b) C. Cui, H. W. Roesky, M. Noltemeyer, M. F. Lappert, H.-G. Schmidt, H. Hao, Organometallics 1999, 18, 2256–2261; c) H. Hatop, H. W. Roesky, T. Labahn, A. Fischer, H.-G. Schmidt, M. Noltemeyer, Organometallics 2000, 19, 937–940; d) M. Schormann, K. S. Klimek, H. Hatop, S. P. Varkey, H. W. Roesky, C. Lehmann, C. Roepken, R. Herbst-Irmer, M. Noltemeyer, J. Solid State Chem. 2001, 162, 225–236; e) H. Hohmeister, H. Wessel, P. Lobinger, H. W. Roesky, P. Muller, I. Uson, H.-G. Schmidt, M. Noltemeyer, J. Magull, J. Fluorine Chem. 2003, 120, 59–64; f) C. Schnitter, K. Klimek, H. W. Roesky, T. Albers, H.-G. Schmidt, C. Roepken, E. Parisini, Organometallics 1998, 17, 2249–2257; g) S. Singh, H.-J. Ahn, A. Stasch, V. Jancik, H. W. Roesky, A. Pal, M. Biadene, R. Herbst-Irmer, M. Noltemeyer, H.-G. Schmidt, Inorg. Chem. 2006, 45, 1853–1860.
- [40] a) C. Ackerhans, P. Boettcher, P. Mueller, H. W. Roesky, I. Uson, H.-G. Schmidt, M. Noltemeyer, *Inorg. Chem.* 2001, *40*, 3766–3773; b) R. Azhakar, R. S. Ghadwal, H. W. Roesky, H. Wolf, D. Stalke, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2012, *134*, 2423–2428; c) J. G. Koch, W. W. Brennessel, B. M. Kraft, *Organometallics* 2017, *36*, 594–604; d) S. S. Sen, H. W. Roesky, D. Stern, J. Henn, D. Stalke, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2010, *132*, 1123–1126.
- [41] Y. Ding, H. Hao, H. W. Roesky, M. Noltemeyer, H.-G. Schmidt, Organometallics 2001, 20, 4806–4811.
- [42] L. Dostál, R. Jambor, A. Růžička, R. Jirásko, I. Císařová, J. Holeček, J. Fluorine Chem. 2008, 129, 167–172.
- [43] T. Lambertsen, R. Schmutzler, Z. Naturforsch. B 1995, 50, 1583-1586.
- [44] H. Schumann, M. R. Keitsch, J. Winterfeld, J. Demtschuk, J. Organomet. Chem. 1996, 525, 279–281.
- [45] E. Krause, Ber. Dtsch. Chem. Ges. 1918, 51, 1447–1456.
- [46] A. G. Lichtscheidl, M. T. Janicke, B. L. Scott, A. T. Nelson, J. L. Kiplinger, Dalton Trans. 2015, 44, 16156–16163.
- [47] A. G. Lichtscheidl, J. P. Pagano, B. L. Scott, A. T. Nelson, J. L. Kiplinger, Inorganics 2016, 4, 1–17.
- [48] M. J. Monreal, R. K. Thomson, T. Cantat, N. E. Travia, B. L. Scott, J. L. Kiplinger, Organometallics 2011, 30, 2031–2038.
- [49] R. K. Thomson, C. R. Graves, B. L. Scott, J. L. Kiplinger, Inorg. Chem. Commun. 2011, 14, 1742–1744.
- [50] L. R. Avens, D. M. Barnhart, C. J. Burns, S. D. McKee, W. H. Smith, *Inorg. Chem.* 1994, 33, 4245–4254.
- [51] J. L. Stewart, "Tris[bis(trimethylsilyl)amido]uranium: Compounds with Tri-, Tetra-, and Pentavalent Uranium" University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, **1988**.
- [52] M. J. Monreal, R. K. Thomson, B. L. Scott, J. L. Kiplinger, *Inorg. Chem. Commun.* 2014, 46, 51–53.
- [53] P. J. Fagan, J. M. Manriquez, E. A. Maatta, A. M. Seyam, T. J. Marks, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1981, 103, 6650–6667.
- [54] G. R. Fulmer, A. J. M. Miller, N. H. Sherden, H. E. Gottlieb, A. Nudelman, B. M. Stoltz, J. E. Bercaw, K. I. Goldberg, *Organometallics* **2010**, *29*, 2176– 2179.
- [55] S. D. McKee, C. J. Burns, L. R. Avens, Inorg. Chem. 1998, 37, 4040-4045.
- [56] APEX2, v. 2014.7–1; Bruker AXS: Madison, WI, 2014.
- [57] SAINT, v. 8.34A; Bruker AXS: Madison, WI, 2013.
- [58] SADABS, v. 2014/3; Bruker AXS: Madison, WI, 2013.
- [59] SHELXTL, v. 2014/7; Bruker AXS: Madison, WI 2000.

Received: October 18, 2017





Fluorinating Reagents
 B. D. Kagan, A. G. Lichtscheidl,
 K. A. Erickson, M. J. Monreal,
 B. L. Scott, A. T. Nelson,
 J. L. Kiplinger* 1–8
 Synthesis of Actinide Fluoride Com-

 plexes Using Trimethyltin Fluoride as a Mild and Selective Fluorinating Reagent



Trimethyltin fluoride (Me₃SnF) is a mild and selective reagent for the installation of actinide fluoride bonds as demonstrated by the room temperature synthesis of a variety of organometallic and inorganic thorium and uranium from their corresponding chloride, bromide, and iodide analogues.

DOI: 10.1002/ejic.201701232