

Fe₄ Cluster and a Buckled Macrocyclic Complex from the Reduction of [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe(L)₂] (L = MeCN, ^tBuNC)

Michael J. Rose, Jay R. Winkler, and Harry B. Gray*

Beckman Institute, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, United States

S Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: We report the syntheses, X-ray structures, and reductive electrochemistry of the Fe^{II} complexes [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe(MeCN)₂] (**1**; dmg = dimethylglyoxime, MeCN = acetonitrile) and [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe(^tBuNC)₂] (**2**; ^tBuNC = *tert*-butylisocyanide). The reaction of **1** with Na/Hg amalgam led to isolation and the X-ray structure of [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe(glyIm)] (**3**; glyIm = glyimine), wherein the (dmgBF₂)₂ macrocyclic frame is bent to accommodate the binding of a bidentate apical ligand. We also report the X-ray structure of a rare mixed-valence Fe₄ cluster with supporting dmg-type ligands. In the structure of [(dmg₂BF₂)₃Fe₃(¹/₂dmg)₃Fe(O)₆] (**4**), the (dmgBF₂)₂ macrocycle has been cleaved, eliminating BF₂ groups. Density functional theory calculations and electron paramagnetic resonance data are in accordance with a central Fe^{III} ion surrounded by three formally Fe^{II}dmg₂BF₂ units.

There has been much interest recently in the mechanism of electrocatalytic dihydrogen (H₂) evolution from acidic solutions containing cobalt diglyoximes.^{1–7} Much of this research has been driven by the observation that complexes of the type [(dmgY)₂Co(L)₂] (Y = H, BF₂; dmg = dimethylglyoxime) catalyze the evolution of H₂ under both stoichiometric¹ and electrocatalytic^{2,3} reaction conditions. Chao and Espenson studied the mechanism of H₂ formation from [(dmgH)₂Co(L)] (L = PR₃, py, Cl[–]),¹ and we and others have reported related work on the fluoroborated [(dmgBF₂)₂Co(MeCN)₂] (MeCN = acetonitrile).^{3,4} H₂ generation has also been achieved on catalyst-modified glassy carbon electrodes by Berben and Peters.⁵ Fontecave et al.⁶ and Eisenberg et al.⁷ have utilized cobalt catalysts with photosensitizers, thus enabling the photocatalytic generation of H₂. Recent work by Chang and co-workers reflects the utility of polypyridine ligands in supporting cobalt-based electrocatalysis in aqueous solutions,⁸ and biomimetic iron catalysts have also shown promise as hydrogen-generating electrocatalysts.⁹

We have begun a program to study catalytic reductions involving diglyoximateiron(II) species analogous to those reported by Pang and Styne.^{10–14} The complexes are macrocyclic species bearing two glyoximate ligands linked by difluoroboron (BF₂) or diphenylboron (BPh₂) groups. The Fe^{III/II} reduction potentials depend on the axial ligand, ranging from +0.406 V (L = MeIm; linker = BF₂) to +1.16 V vs SCE (L = *p*-toluenesulfonylmethyl isocyanide, BF₂).¹¹ The electrochemistry of several tetraimine iron systems at negative

potentials has been investigated, as in the cases of Me₆[14]-1,3,8,10-cyclotetradecane-N₄-tetraene (tetraeneN₄) and 2,3,9,10-Me₄-1,4,8,11-N₄-cyclotetradecanetetraene (tim) iron complexes.^{15,16} Indeed, the reduction of [(tim)Fe(MeCN)₂]²⁺ led to isolation of an unexpected Fe^I–Fe^I dimer, [{(tim)Fe}₂], which was structurally characterized.¹⁷ However, no such study has been reported for a glyoxime-based ligand system.

In this work, we have structurally characterized several [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe^{II}(L)₂] species derived from the dmgBF₂ macrocycle [L = MeCN, ^tBuNC (*tert*-butylisocyanide)]. In addition to determining the potentials for these systems, we show that the reduction of [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe(MeCN)₂] with Na leads to the formation of a Fe₄dmg cluster [(dmg₂BF₂)₃Fe₃(¹/₂dmg)₃Fe(O)₆], wherein the ligand frame has been partially reduced. Under slightly different conditions, reduction leads to the formation of a “buckled macrocycle” structure, in which the (dmgBF₂)₂ macrocycle is distorted from the equatorial plane of the Fe^{II} center to accommodate an apical, bidentate glyimine ligand.

The species [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe^{II}(MeCN)₂] (**1**) was synthesized according to a published procedure.^{10,11} Slow evaporation of **1** in CHCl₃/MeCN (5:1) afforded light-orange blocks suitable for X-ray diffraction. The overall structure is octahedral, with the macrocyclic (dmgBF₂)₂ ligand occupying the four equatorial sites, as found in all Fe^{II}dmgBF₂ complexes, with two MeCN ligands in the axial coordination sites. The Fe–N_{dmg} bond distances in **1** [1.8918(5) Å] are similar to those for [(dmgBPh₂)₂Fe^{II}(MeCN)₂] [Fe–N_{dmg} = 1.898(8) Å],²¹ in which the two BF₂ linkers are substituted for BPh₂. The Fe–N_{MeCN} bond distance in **1** [1.9387(4) Å] also is similar to that found in the BPh₂-linked complex mentioned above (Fe–N_{MeCN} = 1.941 Å).¹⁸

The addition of 2 equiv of ^tBuNC in MeCN affords the bis(isocyanide) complex [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe(^tBuNC)₂] (**2**) in good yield. Slow evaporation of MeCN/toluene afforded dark-orange blocks of **2** (structure shown in Figure 1). The Fe–N distances in **2** [Fe–N = 1.8905(7) and 1.8886(7) Å] are similar to those in **1**, while the axial Fe–C bonds [Fe–C = 1.9064(9) Å] are shorter than the Fe–N_{MeCN} distances in **1** [1.9387(4) Å], likely attributable to back-bonding from Fe^{II} to the isocyanides. The isocyanides are farther from the Fe center compared to the carbonyl complex [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe(CO)(py)] [Fe–CO = 1.772(6) Å],¹⁴ consistent with the greater back-bonding ability of CO.

Received: October 19, 2011

Published: February 9, 2012






Figure 1. ORTEP diagrams (50% ellipsoids) of **1** (left) and **2** (right). Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (deg) for **1**: Fe–N_{dmg} = 1.8918(5), Fe–N_{MeCN} = 1.9387(4); N_{MeCN}–Fe–N_{MeCN} = 180.0. For **2**: Fe–N1_{dmg} = 1.8905(7), Fe–N2_{dmg} = 1.886(7), Fe–C = 1.9064(9); C–Fe–C = 180.0.

The cyclic voltammogram (CV) of **1** exhibits a two-electron reductive wave near -1.75 V vs SCE (see Supporting Information, Figure S1). The reduction potential of **1** is much more negative than that of [(dmgBF₂)₂Co(MeCN)₂] (-0.55 V) or [(dmgH)Ni] (-1.05 V). The formation of Fe^{I/0} or ligand-reduced species is equally plausible. Substitution of MeCN (**1**) for ^tBuNC (**2**) results in a small shift of E_{red} to -1.65 V (see the Supporting Information, Figure S2). The negative potentials exhibited by **1** and **2** prompted us to use a strong chemical reductant in an attempt to isolate a reduced species. The reaction of an orange slurry of **1** in MeCN/tetrahydrofuran (THF) (1:1) with 2 equiv of Na/Hg amalgam led to the formation of a dark-red solution. Filtration and crystallization [MeCN–THF/diethyl ether (Et₂O)] under an inert atmosphere afforded small crystals suitable for synchrotron X-ray diffraction. The resulting structure reveals a strained binding motif of the (dmgBF₂)₂ macrocycle (Figure 2, left),




Figure 2. ORTEP diagrams (50% ellipsoids) of **3** (left) and **4** (right). Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (deg): Fe–N1_{dmg} = 1.925(2), Fe–N2_{dmg} = 1.886(2), Fe–N_{N₂H₂} = 1.916(2); N_{N₂H₂}–Fe–N_{N₂H₂} = 78.50(9). For **4**: Fe–N1_{dmgBF₂} = 1.903(4) and 1.876(9), Fe–N2_{dmgBF₂} = 1.912(5) and 1.91(2), Fe–N_{dmgNOH} = 1.923(6) and 1.92(1), Fe–O = 2.005(4).

wherein the ligand no longer occupies the equatorial coordination sites. Overall, we assign the structure as [(dmgBF₂)₂Fe(glyIm)] (**3**; glyIm = glyimine), which, to our knowledge, represents a novel bonding motif for a (dmgBF₂)₂ system (Figure S3).

The imine NH's were identified in the difference map and refined isotropically. The Fe–NH distance [1.916(2) Å] is similar to those observed between the Fe center and glyoximate N donors. Although the (dmgBF₂)₂ macrocycle appears strained, each diglyoxime moiety retains planarity; thus, the bending occurs across the O(BF₂)O unit. However, the B-atom pivot retains an sp³ geometry close to ideal values [103.4(2)–114.6(2)°]; for comparison, the corresponding O(BF₂)O unit

in **1** exhibits a similar range of bond angles [104.86(5)–117.34(5)°].

We performed a similar reduction followed by workup under aerobic conditions, affording instead a *bright-violet* solution. Subsequent filtration and crystallization (MeCN–THF/Et₂O) afforded dark-violet needles suitable for X-ray analysis. The resulting Fe₄dmg cluster [(dmg₂BF₂)₃Fe₃(¹/₂dmg)₃Fe(O)₆] (**4**; Figure 2, right) in trigonal R $\bar{3}$ consists of a central Fe unit, surrounded by three peripheral Fe ions in dmg₂BF₂-type ligation. This results in 3-fold rotational symmetry, although there is no crystallographic symmetry within the cluster itself.

On the periphery of the cluster, each Fe center is coordinated by a “half-broken” (dmg)₂BF₂ half-macrocycle, wherein one fluoroboronyl group and one oximate N–OH unit have been reductively eliminated (presumably forming H₂O). The broken dmg₂BF₂ unit provides one imino N and four oximate N donors to the peripheral octahedral Fe centers. The last two coordination sites of the peripheral Fe atoms are occupied by the two N donors of a “¹/₂dmg” moiety. Indeed, NaBF₄ (ν_{BF} = 1084 cm^{−1}) is observed as a byproduct (precipitates prior to crystallization). Overall, it appears that the cluster with reduced ligand moieties is more stable than an Fe^I intermediate, in contrast to the metal-centered reduction found in [(dmgBF₂)₂Co^I(MeCN)₂][−].^{2,19} The central Fe ion is octahedrally coordinated by oximate O donors from the broken dmg macrocycles. Each oximate O atom is bonded to an oxime N atom that is coordinated to a peripheral Fe atom, forming a tight {Fe_{cent}–O–N–Fe_{periph}} interaction, which links the central and peripheral Fe sites just two atoms apart (Fe–Fe distance = 3.84 Å).

The charge balance of the neutral cluster suggests the presence of three formally Fe^{II} centers and one Fe^{III} center. The three peripheral Fe ions are in dmg₂BF₂-type ligation, which stabilizes the Fe^{II} state to a great extent [$E_{1/2}(\text{Fe}^{\text{III/II}}) \approx +0.850$ V vs SCE], as is also found in other multinuclear complexes, [(N₃)Cr^{III}{ μ -(dmg₃)Fe^{II}}Cr^{III}(N₃)], for example, where magnetic and electrochemical studies confirmed the Fe^{II} oxidation state.²⁰ In contrast, the anionic (O₆)^{6−} donor set at the central Fe site stabilizes an Fe^{III} center. The X-band electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) spectrum of **4** in MeCN/toluene (3:1) frozen glass at 77 K (Figure S5) is indicative of a slightly rhombic, low-spin d⁵ system, consistent with the assignment of a low-spin Fe^{III} center in (O₆)^{6−} coordination at the center of the cluster. Additionally, **4** exhibits $\mu_{\text{eff}} = 1.92 \mu_{\text{B}}$ in the solid state (298 K), in agreement with solution EPR data.

This result is surprising in view of the electronic structures of other octahedral Fe^{III} complexes containing O donors. For example, the {Fe–O₆} fragment of [Fe^{III}(acac)₃]²¹ is structurally similar [Fe–O_{avg} = 1.992(21) Å] to **4** [Fe–O_{avg} = 2.005(4) Å]. However, [Fe^{III}(acac)₃] is high-spin ($S = 5/2$)^{22,23} and displays an EPR spectrum in MeCN/toluene frozen glass at 77 K with features near $g \approx 4$ (see the Supporting Information, Figure S5). Another related complex, [Fe^{III}(ox)₃]^{3−} (ox = oxalate), mimics the (O₆)^{6−} donor set found in **4** more accurately but also exhibits an $S = 5/2$ ground state that gives rise to features in its EPR spectrum near $g \approx 4$ in frozen solutions (H₂O, 77 K).²⁴ We conclude that glyoximate O donor ligand-field splitting in **4** is greater than that associated with carboxylato O ligation in [Fe^{III}(ox)₃]^{3−}, with the result that **4** in frozen solution adopts a low-spin state.

We undertook density functional theory (DFT) calculations (PW91/6-31G*) to investigate localization of the $S = 1/2$ spin (based on EPR results) on the central {Fe–O₆} unit in **4**. The

calculated bond distances are generally in good agreement with the X-ray structure (see Supporting Information, Table S2). The resulting spin density (Figure 4, left) is focused at the




Figure 4. DFT-calculated spin-density plots of **4** optimized at $S = 1/2$ (left) and $S = 5/2$ (right) configurations.

central Fe site (78.1%) versus the peripheral Fe sites (<3.5%). We found that the spin and population densities were largely independent of the chosen basis set or functional (see the Supporting Information, Table S5). This suggests that the central Fe alone exhibits the higher (Fe^{III}) oxidation state.

We now consider the Fe–O bond distances, which are much longer (~ 0.07 Å) in the crystal structure (~ 2.01 Å) than in the $S = 1/2$ calculated values (PW91/6-31G*, 1.93 Å; PW91/TZP, 1.95 Å; see Supporting Information, Table S2), strongly suggesting partial population of a *high-spin* Fe^{III} center in the solid state at 100 K. We performed a DFT calculation assuming an $S = 5/2$ ground state, which more accurately reproduced the crystallographically determined bond distances in the central {Fe–O₆} unit (Fe–O_{calc} = 2.02 Å; Fe–O_{expt} = 2.01 Å). Additionally, we found the geometry-optimized $S = 5/2$ configuration to be ~ 9.1 kcal/mol more stable than the geometry-optimized $S = 1/2$ configuration. In the $S = 5/2$ configuration, the spin density also remained localized at the central $\text{Fe}^{\text{III}}(\text{O}_6)$ moiety (87%), with only $\sim 1\%$ spin density at each peripheral Fe^{II} site (Figure 4, right side). We conclude that there must be a high-spin/low-spin equilibrium, with population of the low-spin complex in glassy solutions at low temperatures. We plan to report a more complete description of this spin-equilibrium system from variable-temperature structural data in combination with the results from Mössbauer and temperature-dependent magnetic susceptibility experiments.

■ ASSOCIATED CONTENT

■ Supporting Information

CIF files for **1–4**, crystal data for **1–4** (Table S1), bond distances and angles for **1–4** (Table S2), DFT parameters (Tables S3 and S4), spin densities of **4** (Table S5), CVs of **1** and **2** (Figures S1 and S2), additional ORTEP views of **3** and **4** (Figures S3 and S4), EPR spectra (Figure S5), and UV/vis absorption spectrum of **4** (Figure S6). This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

■ AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*E-mail: hgray@caltech.edu.

Author Contributions

All authors have given approval to the final version of the manuscript.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Larry Henling and Michael Day for X-ray structures and Angelo Di Bilio for assistance with EPR spectra. We acknowledge Allen Oliver (University of Notre Dame) and Jeannette Krause (University of Cincinnati) for X-ray data collection on **3** via the SCrALS program at Beamline 11.3.1, Advanced Light Source (LBNL), supported by the U.S. DOE, Energy Material Sciences Division. The Bruker KAPPA APEX II was purchased via an NSF CRIF:MU. The authors thank Nicole Fry for obtaining magnetic susceptibility data on **4**. Funding sources: NSF Grant CHE-0802907 (to M.J.R., J.R.W., and H.B.G.); NSF Grant CHE-1042009 (to M.J.R.); Grant DOE-AC02-05CH11231 (synchrotron X-ray structure); NSF Grant CHE-0639094 (Mo $K\alpha$ X-ray structures).

■ REFERENCES

- (1) Chao, T.-H.; Espenson, J. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1978**, *100*, 129–133.
- (2) Hu, X.; Brunschwig, B. S.; Peters, J. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2007**, *129*, 8988–8998.
- (3) Baffert, C.; Artero, V.; Fontecave, M. *Inorg. Chem.* **2007**, *46*, 1817–1824.
- (4) Dempsey, J. R.; Winkler, J. R.; Gray, H. B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 1060–1065.
- (5) Berben, L. A.; Peters, J. C. *Chem. Commun.* **2010**, 398–400.
- (6) Fihri, A.; Artero, V.; Razavet, M.; Baffert, C.; Leibl, W.; Fontecave, M. *Angew. Chem.* **2008**, *47*, 564–567.
- (7) Du, P.; Schneider, J.; Luo, G.; Brennessel, W. W.; Eisenberg, R. *Inorg. Chem.* **2009**, *48*, 4952–4962.
- (8) Sun, Y.; Bigi, J. P.; Piro, N. A.; Tang, M. L.; Long, J. R.; Chang, C. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 9212.
- (9) Tye, J. W.; Lee, J.; Wang, H.-W.; Mejia-Rodriguez, R.; Reibenspies, J. H.; Hall, M. B.; Darensbourg, M. Y. *Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, *44*, 5550–5552.
- (10) Pang, I. W.; Stynes, D. V. *Inorg. Chem.* **1977**, *16*, 590–594.
- (11) Thompson, D. W.; Stynes, D. V. *Inorg. Chem.* **1990**, *29*, 3815–3822.
- (12) Hess, C. R.; Weyhermüller, T.; Bill, E.; Wieghardt, K. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 3703–3706.
- (13) Thompson, D. W.; Stynes, D. V. *Inorg. Chem.* **1991**, *30*, 636–640.
- (14) Harshani de Silva, D. G. A.; Leznoff, D. B.; Impey, G.; Vernik, I.; Jin, Z.; Stynes, D. V. *Inorg. Chem.* **1995**, *34*, 4015–4025.
- (15) Rakowski, M. C.; Busch, D. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1975**, *97*, 2570.
- (16) Norman, J. G. J.; Chen, L. M.; Perkins, C. M.; Rose, N. J. *Inorg. Chem.* **1981**, *20*, 1403.
- (17) Hess, C. R.; Weyhermüller, T.; Bill, E.; Wieghardt, K. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2009**, *48*, 3703–3706.
- (18) Vernik, I.; Stynes, D. V. *Inorg. Chem.* **1996**, *35*, 6210.
- (19) Shi, S.; Daniels, L. M.; Espenson, J. H. *Inorg. Chem.* **1991**, *30*, 3407–3410.
- (20) Burdinski, D.; Birkelbach, F.; Weyhermüller, T.; Flörke, U.; Haupt, H.-J.; Lengen, M.; Trautwein, A. X.; Bill, E.; Wieghardt, K.; Chaudhuri, P. *Inorg. Chem.* **1998**, *37*, 1009–1020.
- (21) Roof, R. B. *Acta Crystallogr.* **1956**, *9*, 781–786.
- (22) Gerloch, M.; Lewis, R. C. *J. Chem. Soc. A* **1969**, 1422–1427.
- (23) Hedewy, S.; Hoffman, S. K. *Phys. Status Solidi A* **1986**, *97*, 129–133.
- (24) Collison, D.; Powell, A. K. *Inorg. Chem.* **1990**, *29*, 4735.