Facile formation of a homoleptic Ce(IV) amide *via* aerobic oxidation†

Peter B. Hitchcock, Michael F. Lappert* and Andrey V. Protchenko*

Received (in Cambridge, UK) 25th May 2006, Accepted 28th June 2006
First published as an Advance Article on the web 20th July 2006
DOI: 10.1039/b607429d

Oxidation of $[Ce(NCy_2)_3(thf)]$ or $[Ce(NCy_2)_4Li(thf)]$ with dry air produced the first homoleptic Ce(IV) amide $[Ce(NCy_2)_4]$.

Cerium is often considered as an analogue of a group 4 metal due to its ability to form compounds in the oxidation state +4. However, homoleptic dialkyl amides, which are common and widely used for Zr and Hf,[1] are unknown for Ce. Related are Ce(IV) bis(trifluoromethanesulfonyl)amide[2] and porphyrinato- or phthalocyaninato-Ce complexes,[3] the latter often being considered as having the Ce atom in an intermediate (between +3 and +4) oxidation state due to the high redox activity of the ligands. Each of the three heteroleptic Ce(IV) amides reported up to date, $[CeI\{N(SiMe_2Bu^t)CH_2CH_2\}_3N]$[4a] and $[Ce\{N(SiMe_3)_2\}_3X]$ (X = Cl or Br),[4b,c] contain silyl substituents on the amido N atoms.

The initial attempts to prepare a Ce(IV) dialkylamido complex using $[Ce(TMP)_3]$ (TMP = 2,2,6,6-tetramethylpiperidinate) failed,[5] apparently due to the high steric demands of the TMP ligand. Thus, dicyclohexylamide (NCy_2) was chosen as a less bulky alternative to TMP for stabilisation of the Ce +4 oxidation state. Here we report the synthesis and characterisation of two new Ce(III) dicyclohexylamides and their oxidation to produce the first homoleptic Ce(IV) amide.

The starting Ce(III) amides $[Ce(NCy_2)_3(thf)]$ (**1**) and $[Ce(NCy_2)_4Li(thf)]$ (**2**) were prepared *via* the salt elimination route (Scheme 1) using 2.7 or 4 equivalents of Li amide, respectively.‡ Both compounds demonstrate paramagnetically shifted ^{1}H NMR signals in C_6D_6 with one set of the Cy group signals for **1** and two sets (terminal and bridging NCy_2 ligands) for **2** (see ESI†). In a coordinating solvent (thf-d_8) complex **2** apparently dissociates into the tetrahedral anion $[Ce(NCy_2)_4]^-$ (which gives only one set of slightly paramagnetically shifted Cy signals) and the $[Li(thf)_x]^+$ cation (which gives a sharp signal in the ^{7}Li NMR spectrum; no such signal was observed in C_6D_6 solvent due to paramagnetic broadening).



Scheme 1

The thf-solvated cerium triamide **1** was stable in solution in hydrocarbon solvents and was thermally robust up to its melting point (*ca.* 235 °C) in contrast to the bulkier analogue $[Ce(TMP)_3(thf)]$,[5] which can be desolvated at room temperature. The lithium tetraamidocerate(III) **2** decomposed slowly in aromatic solvents and much faster in thf, apparently due to thf C–O bond cleavage similar to that observed in the synthesis of $[Ce(TMP)_3]$.[6]

Complexes **1** and **2** were extremely air-sensitive in solution and if the smallest amount of air was accidentally introduced during the work-up, a blue colouration appeared in the solution immediately, later yielding black microcrystals. When a measured amount of dry air was added to toluene or thf solutions of **1** or **2** the diamagnetic Ce(IV) amide $[Ce(NCy_2)_4]$ (**3**)‡ was isolated in a moderate yield (Scheme 1).

Complex **3** was only sparingly soluble in hexane, benzene, toluene or thf, producing deep blue solutions, which were stored in a vacuum-sealed tube without decomposition for several months at room temperature (in contrast to the solution instability of $[Ce\{N(SiMe_3)_2\}_3X]$ [X = Cl, Br][4c]). The solubility increased upon heating to 70 °C thus allowing recrystallisation of **3** without noticeable decomposition even at this temperature.

To confirm the oxidation state of Ce in these complexes the structures of **1**, **2** and **3** were determined by single crystal X-ray diffraction.§ The molecular structures of complexes **1** and **2** are similar to those of their Sm analogues;[7] details are given in ESI†. In the structure of complex **3** there are two independent molecules



Fig. 1 Molecular structure of $[Ce(NCy_2)_4]$ (**3**) (50% probability ellipsoids) showing one of the three independent molecules in the crystal. Symmetry transformations used to generate equivalent atoms: ′ $1-y, x, -z$; ″ $y, 1-x, -z$; ‴ $1-y, 1-x, z$.

The Chemistry Department, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK BN1 9QJ E-mail: m.f.lappert@sussex.ac.uk; a.protchenko@sussex.ac.uk; Fax: 44 1273 677196; Tel: 44 1273 678316
† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: details of synthesis, characterisation and crystallographic data for compounds **1**, **2** and **3**. See DOI: 10.1039/b607429d

Table 1 Ce–N (terminal amido ligand) and Ce–O (thf) bond lengths (Å) in selected Ce(III) and Ce(IV) amides

Compound	Ce–N	Ce–O
$[Ce(NCy_2)_3(thf)]$ (**1**)	2.299(2), 2.317(2), 2.336(2)	2.582(2)
$[Ce(NCy_2)_4Li(thf)]$ (**2**)	2.320(2), 2.330(2)	
$[Ce(TMP)_3]$[6]	2.332(7), 2.346(7), 2.291(7)	
$[Ce(TMP)_3(thf)]$[5]	2.374(2), 2.346(2), 2.363(2)	2.810(2)
$[Ce\{N(SiMe_3)_2\}_3]$[8]	2.320(3)	
$[Ce(NCy_2)_4]$ (**3**)[a]	2.247(6), 2.242(6), 2.238(5), 2.240(5)	
$[CeCl\{N(SiMe_3)_2\}_3]$[4b]	2.217(3)	
$[CeBr\{N(SiMe_3)_2\}_3]$[4c]	2.219(7)	

[a] The four Ce–N bond lengths for **3** are due to the presence of 3 different molecules in the crystal.

lying on $\bar{4}$ inversion centers and one lying on a two-fold rotation axis. Fig. 1 shows a higher-symmetry molecule of **3**, and important bond lengths for these compounds (together with the data for selected Ce(III) and Ce(IV) complexes) are given in Table 1.

Each of **1**, **2** and **3** has the four-coordinate Ce atom in a distorted tetrahedral environment, which facilitates the following bond length comparisons. In complex **1** the three Ce–N distances are very similar to those in $[Ce(TMP)_3]$[6] but slightly shorter than in the overcrowded thf solvate $[Ce(TMP)_3(thf)]$,[5] while the Ce–O distance is much shorter than in the latter (Table 1) paralleling the difference in the thermal stability of these complexes.

In complex **2**, two Ce–N distances to the terminal ligands are close to those in **1** and in the silylamide $[Ce\{N(SiMe_3)_2\}_3]$,[8] while the two bridging Ce–N distances are longer at 2.472(2) and 2.497(2) Å. The Ce^{IV}–N distances in **3** are shorter than the terminal Ce^{III}–N distances in **1** or **2** by *ca.* 0.1 Å, but are slightly longer than the Ce^{IV}–N bonds in the less sterically hindered heteroleptic compounds $[Ce\{N(SiMe_3)_2\}_3X]$ (X = Cl or Br).[4b,c] Thus the structural study (along with the NMR data) confirms the +4 cerium oxidation state in the homoleptic amide **3**.

Possible intermediates along the route to complex **3** may include Ce^{IV} superoxo-, peroxo- and oxo-complexes; the latter would disproportionate into **3** and a polymeric amido-oxo-compound of the type $\{Ce(\mu\text{-}O)(NCy_2)_2\}_x$. While organolanthanides and low-valent Ln compounds with *N*-centred ligands are generally considered as decomposing completely on exposure to air, some examples of oxygen-containing products resulting from aerial oxidation have been reported, including superoxo- $[Sm\{HB(3,5\text{-}Me_2pz)_3\}_2(\eta^2\text{-}O_2)]$,[9] peroxo- $[\{Yb(C_5H_9C_5H_4)_2(thf)\}_2(\mu\text{-}O_2)]$[10] and $[\{Yb(N(SiMe_3)_2)_2(thf)\}_2(\mu\text{-}O_2)]$,[11] and complexes with oxygenated ligands.[12] The present study has demonstrated the suitability of this approach to the synthesis of oxygen-free organoamides of high-valent cerium. This oxidative route to complex **3** parallels that reported for the aerial oxidation of $Ce(\kappa^2\text{-}S_2CNEt_2)_3$ to $[Ce(\kappa^2\text{-}S_2CNEt_2)_4]$.[13]

In conclusion, two new Ce^{III} amides **1** and **2** containing bulky dicyclohexylamido ligand were prepared by the salt metathesis reaction; their oxidation by air provided a route to the remarkably stable homoleptic Ce^{IV} amide $[Ce(NCy_2)_4]$ (**3**).

We thank the EPSRC for continued support.

Notes and references

‡ *Synthesis of* $[Ce(NCy_2)_3(thf)]$ (**1**): $CeCl_3$ (0.453 g, 1.84 mmol) was stirred in thf (15 mL) at room temperature for 2 days to give a copious microcrystalline solvate. To this suspension a solution of $LiNCy_2$ (0.945 g, 5.05 mol) in thf (20 mL) was slowly added at 0 °C producing a yellow solution. The mixture was stirred for 1 h at room temperature and the solvent was removed in a vacuum. The residue was extracted with toluene (2 × 10 mL), filtered, and the filtrate was concentrated to *ca.* 2 mL and covered with hexanes. Storing at −27 °C for 2 days gave 0.811 g (57%) of **1**·PhMe as large yellow crystals; mp 235–240 °C. ^{1}H-NMR (C_6D_6): δ 13.33, 7.00–7.13 (aromatic CH, toluene), 2.47, 2.11 (sharp s, CH_3 toluene), 1.71, 1.49 (and 1.47 sh), 1.19, 1.05, 0.27, −4.07, −7.83.

Synthesis of $[Ce(NCy_2)_4Li(thf)]$ (**2**): $CeCl_3$ (0.383 g, 1.55 mmol) was solvated with thf as described above and a solution of $LiNCy_2$ (1.132 g, 6.05 mol) in thf (20 mL) was slowly added at 0 °C. The mixture was stirred for 1 h at room temperature and the solvent was removed in a vacuum (if it was left as the THF solution overnight, the yield of crystalline products decreased significantly). The residue was extracted with toluene (2 × 10 mL), the combined toluene solution was concentrated to *ca.* 5 mL and covered with hexanes. Storing at 5 °C overnight gave 0.892 g (61%) of **2** as bright pink crystals; mp 146–148 °C (decomp.). ^{1}H-NMR (C_6D_6): δ 12.73, 11.75, 6.05, 5.50, 3.34, 1.50, 0.29, −0.35, −0.87, −1.38, −2.06, −3.44, −4.85, −6.58, −10.52, −29.74.

Synthesis of $[Ce(NCy_2)_4]$ (**3**): A Schlenk tube containing a degassed solution of **1**·PhMe (0.303 g, 0.36 mmol) in toluene (30 mL) was connected *via* a short rubber tubing to an ampoule containing dry air (10 mL, 0.093 mmol of O_2). After stirring for 30 min at 25 °C a dark blue-violet solution was formed; the Schlenk tube was closed and stored at 5 °C overnight yielding a greenish-yellow solution with black crystals and some light brown amorphous precipitate. The crystals were washed by decantation with cold toluene and dried, yielding 0.108 g (35% based on Ce) of **3**. Complex **3** decomposed at 90–100 °C without melting. ^{1}H-NMR (C_6D_6): δ 4.13 (m, 1 H, NCH), 2.04 (d, 2 H), 1.88 (m, 2 H), 1.79 (m, 1 H), 1.70 (m, 2 H), 1.55 (m, 2 H), 1.30 (m, 1 H). ^{13}C-NMR (C_6D_6): δ 57.44 (NCH), 39.60 (CH_2), 27.22 (CH_2), 26.08 (CH).

§ *Crystal data*. For **1**·PhMe (yellow prism 0.25 × 0.20 × 0.20 mm^3): $[C_{40}H_{74}CeN_3O]\cdot(C_7H_8)$, M = 845.28, monoclinic, space group $P2_1/c$, a = 10.3004(2), b = 23.4770(4), c = 19.3077(3) Å, β = 101.189(1), V = 4580.29(14) Å^3, Z = 4, T = 173(2) K, μ = 1.03 mm^{-1}, 8044 independent reflections [R_{int} = 0.060], final $R1$ = 0.032 [for 6438 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$], w$R2$ = 0.069 (all data). For **2** (pink prism 0.25 × 0.25 × 0.20 mm^3): $[C_{52}H_{96}CeLiN_4O]$, M = 940.39, monoclinic, space group $P2_1/n$, a = 15.1681(3), b = 19.1024(4), c = 18.1727(3) Å, β = 96.822(1), V = 5228.21(17) Å^3, Z = 4, T = 173(2) K, μ = 0.91 mm^{-1}, 10277 independent reflections [R_{int} = 0.078], final $R1$ = 0.035 [for 7866 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$], w$R2$ = 0.073 (all data). For **3** (black needle 0.10 × 0.05 × 0.05 mm^3): $[C_{48}H_{88}CeN_4]$, M = 861.34, tetragonal, space group $P\bar{4}$, $a = b$ = 21.1876(5), c = 10.3198(3) Å, V = 4632.7(2) Å^3, Z = 4, T = 173(2) K, μ = 1.02 mm^{-1}, 8991 independent reflections [R_{int} = 0.054], final $R1$ = 0.048 [for 7005 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$], w$R2$ = 0.106 (all data). CCDC numbers: **1**·PhMe 609099, **2** 609100, **3** 609101. For crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format see DOI: 10.1039/b607429d

1 E. Hollink and D. W. Stephan, in *Comprehensive Coordination Chemistry II*, ed. J. A. McCleverty and T. J. Meyer, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2004, vol. 4, p. 105.

2 D. B. Baudry, A. Dormond, F. Duris, J. M. Bernard and J. R. Desmurs, *J. Fluorine Chem.*, 2003, **121**, 233.

3 A. G. Montalban, S. L. J. Michel, S. M. Baum, B. J. Vesper, A. J. P. White, D. J. Williams, A. G. M. Barrett and B. M. Hoffman, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 2001, 3269; Y. Bian, J. Jiang, Y. Tao, M. T. M. Choi, R. Li, A. C. H. Ng, P. Zhu, N. Pan, X. Sun, D. P. Arnold, Z.-Y. Zhou, H.-W. Li, T. C. W. Mak and D. K. P. Ng, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2003, **125**, 12257.

4 (*a*) C. Morton, N. W. Alcock, M. R. Lees, I. J. Munslow, C. J. Sanders and P. Scott, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1999, **121**, 11255; (*b*) O. Eisenstein, P. B. Hitchcock, A. G. Hulkes, M. F. Lappert and L. Maron, *Chem. Commun.*, 2001, 1560; (*c*) P. B. Hitchcock, A. G. Hulkes and M. F. Lappert, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2004, **43**, 1031.

5 P. B. Hitchcock, Q.-G. Huang, M. F. Lappert and X.-H. Wei, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2004, **14**, 3266.

6 S. D. Daniel, J.-S. M. Lehn, J. D. Korp and D. M. Hoffman, *Polyhedron*, 2006, **25**, 205.

7 R. K. Minhas, Y. Ma, J.-I. Song and S. Gambarotta, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1996, **35**, 1866.

8 W. S. Rees, Jr., O. Just and D. S. Van Derveer, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 1999, **9**, 249.

9 X.-W. Zhang, G. R. Loppnow, R. McDonald and J. Takats, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1995, **117**, 7828.
10 D.-M. Cui, T. Tang, J.-H. Cheng, N.-H. Hu, W. Chen and B.-T. Huang, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 2002, **650**, 84.
11 M. Niemeyer, *Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem.*, 2002, **628**, 647.
12 X.-G. Zhou, M. Zhu, L.-B. Zhang, Z.-Y. Zhu, C.-F. Pi, Z. Pang, L.-H. Weng and R.-F. Cai, *Chem. Commun.*, 2005, 2342.
13 P. B. Hitchcock, A. G. Hulkes, M. F. Lappert and Z. Li, *Dalton Trans.*, 2004, 129.

