Acta Crystallographica Section C Crystal Structure Communications

ISSN 0108-2701

The Ni^{II}, Hg^{II} and Cu^{II} complexes of 12-membered-ring mixed-donor macrocycles

Sebastian T. Marcus, Lawrence R. Gahan and Paul V. Bernhardt*

Department of Chemistry, University of Queensland, Brisbane 4072, Australia Correspondence e-mail: bernhardt@chemistry.uq.edu.au

Received 21 February 2000 Accepted 10 March 2000

The structures of diaqua(1,7-dioxa-4-thia-10-azacyclododecane)nickel dinitrate, $[Ni(C_8H_{17}NO_2S)(H_2O)_2](NO_3)_2$, (I), bis(nitrato-O,O')(1,4,7-trioxa-10-azacyclododecane)mercury, $[Hg(NO_3)_2(C_8H_{17}NO_3)]$, (II), and aqua(nitrato-O)(1-oxa-4,7,10-triazacyclododecane)copper nitrate, $[Cu(NO_3)(C_8H_{19}-N_3O)(H_2O)]NO_3$, (III), reveal each macrocycle binding in a tetradentate manner. The conformations of the ligands in (I) and (III) are the same and distinct from that identified for (II). These differences are in agreement with molecular-mechanics predictions of ligand conformation as a function of metal-ion size.

Comment

The coordination chemistry of 12-membered macrocycles has been dominated by the symmetrical N_4 (cyclen) and O_4 (12crown-4) ligands. Mixed-donor macrocycles have been much less extensively studied, due in part to the greater complexity of their syntheses. There are a number of possible combinations of N-, O- and S-donor atoms in a 12-membered macrocyclic ring (substituted at the 1,4,7,10 positions), and it has



been found that judicious replacement of heteroatoms by either harder or softer donors can have a marked effect on the thermodynamic stability, and hence metal-ion selectivity, of the macrocycle (Byriel *et al.*, 1993; Afshar *et al.*, 1999; Marcus *et al.*, 1999). In this paper, we report the crystal structures of the Ni^{II}, Hg^{II} and Cu^{II} complexes of three different mixeddonor macrocycles comprising NO₂S, NO₃ and N₃O donor sets, respectively.

The crystal structure of $[NiL^1(OH_2)_2](NO_3)_2$ ($L^1 = 1,7$ dioxa-4-thia-10-azacyclododecane) (Fig. 1) comprises separate complex cations with neither anion bound to the metal. The Flack (1983) parameter [0.00 (2)] establishes unequivocally that the space group $P6_5$ is correct and not the enantiomorphic $P6_1$ space group. The complex cation is six-coordinate, with the macrocycle adopting a non-planar cis conformation. The two aqua ligands are thus forced to occupy cis coordination sites. The aqua ligands exhibit the shortest coordinate bonds (Table 1), the ether and amine donors display slightly longer bond lengths, while the Ni-S bond is the longest, as expected. There are a number of hydrogen bonds involving both the aqua ligands and the amine-H atoms as donors (Table 2). The macrocycle adopts an asymmetric [2424] conformation (Buschmann, 1987). This conformation has also been observed in the structures of $[NiL^4(OH_2)(ONO_2)]NO_3$ and the dimer $[{CuL^4(OH)}_2](ClO_4)_2$, where L^4 is the N₃S analogue of L^1 (Marcus *et al.*, 1999). The Hg^{II} complex of L^1 (Byriel *et al.*, 1993) finds the ligand in the [3333] conformation, where the four donor atoms are approximately coplanar and the metal ion is displaced well above this plane, in contrast to the present structure.

The crystal structure of $[HgL^2(O_2NO)_2]$ ($L^2 = 1,4,7$ -trioxa-10-azacyclododecane) (Fig. 2) comprises the tetradentate coordinated ligand in the [3333] conformation and two nitrato ligands. In contrast with the structure of $[NiL^{1}(OH_{2})_{2}]^{2+}$, there is a large difference between the macrocyclic Hg-N and Hg-O bond lengths (Table 3), with the former being ca 0.4 Åshorter. This reflects the preference of Hg for amines compared with harder ether donors. Both nitrato ligands coordinate asymmetrically, with unequal Hg-O bond lengths. Moreover, one nitrato ligand is bound more tightly [Hg1-O4 2.166 (5) and Hg1-O5 2.698 (6) Å] than the other [Hg1-O8 2.541 (5) and Hg1-O9 2.906 (6) Å]. The sole hydrogen-bond donor (the amine-H atom) forms an intermolecular hydrogen bond with the non-coordinated O atom of one nitrato ligand (Table 4). The only other report of a crystal structure of L^2 is the complex $[Na(L^2)_2]I$, where both ligands exhibit the [3333]



Figure 1 View of $[NiL^{1}(OH_{2})_{2}]^{2+}$ showing 30% probability ellipsoids.



Figure 2

View of $[HgL^2(ONO_2)_2]$ showing 30% probability ellipsoids.

conformation (White *et al.*, 1987). More common are structural reports of N-functionalized derivatives of L^2 (so-called lariat ethers; Schultz *et al.*, 1985).

The structure of $[CuL^{3}(OH_{2})(ONO_{2})]NO_{3}$ ($L^{3} = 1$ -oxa-4,7,10-triazacyclododecane) (Fig. 3) defines a six-coordinate, distorted octahedral complex cation, comprising one weakly bound nitrato ligand, and one free nitrate anion both on general sites. The macrocycle adopts a folded [2424] conformation as seen in the $[NiL^1(OH_2)_2]^{2+}$ structure. The electronic preference of Cu^{II} for axially elongated five- and six-coordinate geometries is evident from the significantly longer axial Cu-O2 and Cu-O5 bond lengths (Table 5) compared with the equatorial bonds involving the N-donors and aqua ligand. Numerous hydrogen bonds are formed involving the aqua ligands and the amine-H atoms as donors (Table 6). This structure is closely related to $[CuL^3Br]PF_6$ (Felix *et al.*, 1994), where a bromo ligand replaces the aqua ligand in the present structure. The other structural report of an L^3 complex is that of $[MnL^{3}(NCS)_{2}]$ (Zhang *et al.*, 1992).

It has been established that 12-membered macrocycles are too small to encircle a metal ion, and either *cis*-octahedral coordination or square-based pyramidal structures are found. In no case is the metal coplanar with the four donor atoms. We have reported recently a molecular-mechanics analysis of the



Figure 3 View of $[CuL^3(OH_2)(ONO_2)]^+$ showing 30% probability ellipsoids.

conformational preference of the 12-membered N_3S macrocyclic relative of L^1 for metal ions of various sizes (Marcus *et al.*, 1999). The conclusions of this analysis were that the [3333] conformation of ligands of this class will be dominant when the metal-ligand bond lengths are large (>2.25 Å), and the crystal structures observed so far are in agreement with this.

Experimental

The title complexes were crystallized from methanolic solutions containing equimolar amounts of the corresponding metal(II) nitrate and ligand L^1 (Byriel *et al.*, 1993), L^2 (Calverley & Dale, 1981) or L^3 (Thöm *et al.*, 1986).

Compound (I)

Crystal data	
[Ni(C ₈ H ₁₇ NO ₂ S)(H ₂ O) ₂](NO ₃) ₂ $M_r = 410.05$ Hexagonal, $P6_5$ a = 8.7242 (3) Å V = 2445.6 (2) Å ³ Z = 6 $D_x = 1.671$ Mg m ⁻³ Mo K α radiation	Cell parameters from 25 reflections $\theta = 10-14^{\circ}$ $\mu = 1.372 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ T = 295 (2) K Prism, blue $0.40 \times 0.40 \times 0.40 \text{ mm}$
Data collection	
Enraf–Nonius CAD-4 diffract- ometer ω –2 θ scans	$R_{int} = 0.058$ $\theta_{max} = 24.98^{\circ}$ $h = -10 \rightarrow 8$

ω –2 θ scans
Absorption correction: ψ scan
(North et al., 1968)
$T_{\min} = 0.529, \ T_{\max} = 0.578$
4648 measured reflections
1459 independent reflections
1208 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$

Refinement

Refinement on F^2 $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.032$ $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + 0.4947P]$ $wR(F^2) = 0.078$ where $P = (F_o^2) + 0.4947P$ $wR(F^2) = 0.078$ where $P = (F_o^2) + 0.4947P$ S = 1.055 $(\Delta/\sigma)_{max} < 0.001$ 1459 reflections $\Delta\rho_{max} = 0.28 \text{ e}^{2}$ 209 parameters $\Delta\rho_{min} = -0.26 \text{ e}^{2}$ H atoms treated by a mixture of
independent and constrained
refinement(Sheldrick, 19Extinction coefficientExtinction coefficientAbsolute structureSheldrick structure

 $w = 1/[\sigma^{2}(F_{o}^{2}) + (0.0398P)^{2} + 0.4947P]$ where $P = (F_{o}^{2} + 2F_{c}^{2})/3$ $(\Delta/\sigma)_{max} < 0.001$ $\Delta\rho_{max} = 0.28 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$ $\Delta\rho_{min} = -0.26 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$ Extinction correction: *SHELXL97* (Sheldrick, 1997) Extinction coefficient: 0.0010 (4) Absolute structure: Flack (1983) Flack parameter = 0.00 (2)

 $k = 0 \rightarrow 10$

 $l = 0 \rightarrow 44$

3 standard reflections frequency: 120 min

intensity decay: <5%

Table 1 Selected geometric parameters (Å, °) for (I).

Ni1-O4	2.028 (5)	Ni1-N1	2.082 (5)
Ni1-O3	2.029 (5)	Ni1-O1	2.082 (4)
Ni1-O2	2.073 (4)	Ni1-S1	2.4185 (17)
O4-Ni1-O3	91.9 (2)	O2-Ni1-O1	91.66 (17)
O4-Ni1-O2	87.0 (2)	N1-Ni1-O1	80.19 (17)
O3-Ni1-O2	178.8 (2)	O4-Ni1-S1	98.07 (15)
D4-Ni1-N1	99.1 (2)	O3-Ni1-S1	95.33 (15)
D3-Ni1-N1	98.0 (2)	O2-Ni1-S1	84.27 (12)
D2-Ni1-N1	82.75 (18)	N1-Ni1-S1	157.83 (14)
04-Ni1-01	178.5 (2)	O1-Ni1-S1	82.31 (12)
O3-Ni1-O1	89.45 (19)		· · · ·
	(.)		

 $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0622P)^2]$

Extinction correction: SHELXL97

+ 1.3329*P*] where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$

 $(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} < 0.001$ $\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 1.46 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$

Z = 2

 $\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -3.30 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$

(Sheldrick, 1997) Extinction coefficient: 0.0018 (3)

 $D_x = 1.707 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$

Cell parameters from 25

 $0.60 \times 0.60 \times 0.30 \text{ mm}$

Mo $K\alpha$ radiation

reflections

 $\mu = 1.531 \text{ mm}^{-1}$

T = 295 (2) K

 $\theta = 10 - 14^{\circ}$

Prism, blue

 $R_{\rm int} = 0.025$ $\theta_{\rm max} = 24.97^{\circ}$

 $h = 0 \rightarrow 10$

 $k = -11 \rightarrow 11$

 $l=-12\rightarrow 11$

3 standard reflections

frequency: 120 min

intensity decay: <5%

 $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0343P)^2]$

Extinction correction: SHELXL97

+ 0.4836P] where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$

 $(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.001$ $\Delta\rho_{\rm max} = 0.36 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$

 $\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.27 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$

(Sheldrick, 1997) Extinction coefficient: 0.096 (3)

Table 2Hydrogen-bonding geometry (Å, $^{\circ}$) for (I).

$D - H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D-\mathrm{H}$	$H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D \cdots A$	$D - H \cdots A$
			(-)	
$N1 - H1 \cdots O7$	0.91	2.44	3.177 (9)	139
$N1-H1\cdots O8$	0.91	2.56	3.180 (9)	126
O3-H31···O9	0.96	2.02	2.779 (8)	134
O3-H31···O8	0.96	2.65	3.244 (10)	121
$O3-H32\cdots O5^{i}$	0.96	2.00	2.734 (7)	132
$O3-H32\cdots O7^i$	0.96	2.40	3.347 (9)	171
$O3-H32\cdots N2^{i}$	0.96	2.55	3.465 (8)	160
O4-H41O6	0.96	1.99	2.763 (9)	136
O4-H41O7	0.96	2.32	3.174 (10)	149
O4−H41···N2	0.96	2.49	3.380 (8)	154
$O4-H42\cdots O10^{ii}$	0.96	2.14	2.704 (8)	116

 $D_x = 2.381 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$

Cell parameters from 25

Mo $K\alpha$ radiation

reflections

 $\mu = 11.090 \ {\rm mm}^{-1}$

Prism, colourless

 $0.30 \times 0.20 \times 0.20$ mm

T = 275 (2) K

 $R_{\rm int} = 0.024$

 $\theta_{\rm max} = 24.97$

 $h = 0 \rightarrow 9$

 $k = 0 \rightarrow 14$

 $l=-16 \rightarrow 16$

3 standard reflections

frequency: 120 min intensity decay: <5%

 $\theta = 10 - 14^{\circ}$

Symmetry codes: (i) 1 + x - y, x, $z - \frac{1}{6}$; (ii) 1 + x, y, z.

Compound (II)

Crystal data

$[Hg(NO_3)_2(C_8H_{17}NO_3)]$
$M_r = 499.84$
Monoclinic, P_{2_1}/n
a = 8.245 (3) Å
b = 11.927 (2) Å
c = 14.272 (5) Å
$\beta = 96.60 \ (2)^{\circ}$
$V = 1394.2 (7) \text{ Å}^3$
Z = 4

Data collection

Enraf-Nonius CAD-4 diffract-
ometer
ω –2 θ scans
Absorption correction: ψ scan
(North et al., 1968)
$T_{\min} = 0.055, \ T_{\max} = 0.109$
2623 measured reflections
2444 independent reflections
2082 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$

Table 3

Selected geometric parameters (Å, $^{\circ}$) for (II).

Hg1-O4	2.166 (5)	Hg1-O2	2.644 (5)
Hg1-N1	2.184 (5)	Hg1-O3	2.659 (5)
Hg1-O8	2.541 (5)	Hg1-O5	2.698 (6)
Hg1-O1	2.543 (5)	Hg1-O9	2.906 (6)
O4-Hg1-N1	157.7 (2)	O2-Hg1-O3	64.61 (16)
O4-Hg1-O8	108.29 (19)	O4-Hg1-O5	51.21 (18)
N1-Hg1-O8	84.87 (19)	N1-Hg1-O5	151.11 (19)
O4-Hg1-O1	126.29 (17)	O8-Hg1-O5	76.85 (19)
N1-Hg1-O1	73.28 (18)	O1-Hg1-O5	81.04 (17)
O8-Hg1-O1	77.79 (16)	O2-Hg1-O5	73.85 (18)
O4-Hg1-O2	77.63 (18)	O3-Hg1-O5	126.98 (18)
N1-Hg1-O2	105.99 (18)	O4-Hg1-O9	77.50 (17)
O8-Hg1-O2	135.48 (16)	N1-Hg1-O9	101.51 (17)
O1-Hg1-O2	65.19 (15)	O8-Hg1-O9	45.49 (16)
O4-Hg1-O3	87.69 (18)	O1-Hg1-O9	123.06 (15)
N1-Hg1-O3	74.71 (19)	O2-Hg1-O9	152.46 (15)
O8-Hg1-O3	155.73 (18)	O3-Hg1-O9	125.73 (14)
O1-Hg1-O3	107.86 (15)	O5-Hg1-O9	81.42 (18)

Table 4

Hydrogen-bonding geometry (Å, °) for (II).

$D-\mathrm{H}\cdots A$	$D-{\rm H}$	$H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D \cdots A$	$D - \mathbf{H} \cdots A$
$N1-H1\cdots O7^{i}$	0.91	2.10	2.895 (8)	145

Symmetry code: (i) -x, -y, 1 - z.

Refinement

Refinement on F^2 $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.033$ $wR(F^2) = 0.087$ S = 1.0602444 reflections 191 parameters H-atom parameters constrained

Compound (III)

Crystal data

$$\begin{split} & [\mathrm{Cu}(\mathrm{NO}_3)(\mathrm{C_8H_{19}N_3O})(\mathrm{H_2O})]\mathrm{NO}_3 \\ & M_r = 378.84 \\ & \mathrm{Triclinic}, \ & P\overline{1} \\ & a = 8.6167 \ (9) \ & \mathrm{\AA} \\ & b = 9.3975 \ (8) \ & \mathrm{\AA} \\ & c = 10.118 \ (1) \ & \mathrm{\AA} \\ & \alpha = 95.627 \ (8)^{\circ} \\ & \beta = 112.107 \ (9)^{\circ} \\ & \gamma = 99.509 \ (9)^{\circ} \\ & V = 737.05 \ (12) \ & \mathrm{\AA}^3 \end{split}$$

Data collection

Enraf–Nonius CAD-4 diffractometer ω –2 θ scans Absorption correction: ψ scan (North *et al.*, 1968) $T_{min} = 0.401, T_{max} = 0.632$ 2774 measured reflections 2586 independent reflections 2392 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$

Refinement

Refinement on F^2 $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.024$ $wR(F^2) = 0.068$ S = 1.0822586 reflections 200 parameters H-atom parameters constrained

Table 5

Selected geometric parameters (Å, °) for (III).

Cu1-O1	1.9663 (15)	Cu1-N3	2.0393 (18)
Cu1-N2	1.9742 (18)	Cu1-O2	2.3465 (16)
Cu1-N1	2.0312 (18)	Cu1-O5	2.7682 (17)
O1-Cu1-N2	163.92 (7)	N1-Cu1-O2	79.83 (7)
O1-Cu1-N1	96.37 (7)	N3-Cu1-O2	79.07 (7)
N2-Cu1-N1	86.73 (7)	O1-Cu1-O5	81.64 (6)
O1-Cu1-N3	96.54 (7)	N2-Cu1-O5	83.03 (6)
N2-Cu1-N3	86.40 (8)	N1-Cu1-O5	118.63 (6)
N1-Cu1-N3	156.15 (8)	N3-Cu1-O5	83.11 (7)
O1-Cu1-O2	95.29 (6)	O2-Cu1-O5	161.46 (5)
N2-Cu1-O2	100.79(7)		

Table 6

Hydrogen-bonding geometry (Å, °) for (III).

$D - H \cdots A$	D-H	$H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D - H \cdots A$
$N1-H1\cdots O5^{i}$	0.91	2.36	3.153 (3)	145
$N1 - H1 \cdots O8^i$	0.91	2.61	3.234 (3)	127
$N2-H2\cdots O6$	0.91	2.19	2.994 (3)	147
$N2-H2\cdots O7$	0.91	2.56	3.428 (4)	159
$N2-H2\cdots N5$	0.91	2.68	3.582 (3)	174
N3-H3···O3 ⁱⁱ	0.91	2.22	3.000 (3)	143
$N3-H3\cdots O4$	0.91	2.62	3.257 (3)	127
$O1-H21\cdots O4^{ii}$	0.79	2.00	2.788 (2)	172
$O1-H21\cdots O3^{ii}$	0.79	2.57	3.162 (2)	133
$O1-H21\cdots N4^{ii}$	0.79	2.64	3.398 (2)	161
$O1 - H22 \cdots O6^i$	0.73	1.98	2.709 (2)	174

Symmetry codes: (i) 1 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z; (ii) -x, 1 - y, 1 - z.

Ligand-associated H atoms were constrained using a riding model. All water-H atoms were first located from difference maps before being constrained.

For all compounds, data collection: *CAD*-4 *Manual* (Enraf-Nonius, 1988); cell refinement: *SET*4 in *CAD*-4 *Manual*; data reduction: *Xtal*3.2 (Hall *et al.*, 1992); program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS*86 (Sheldrick, 1990); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL*97 (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: *PLATON* (Spek, 1990); software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXL*97.

Financial support from the University of Queensland is gratefully acknowledged.

Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: FG1589). Services for accessing these data are described at the back of the journal.

References

- Afshar, S., Marcus, S. T., Gahan, L. R. & Hambley, T. W. (1999). *Aust. J. Chem.* **52**, 1–6.
- Buschmann, H.-J. (1987). Stereochemistry of Organometallic and Inorganic Compounds, edited by I. Bernal, Vol. 2, ch. 2, pp. 103–185.
- Byriel, K. A., Gahan, L. R., Kennard, C. H. L. & Sunderland, C. J. (1993). J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. pp. 625–629.
- Calverley, M. J. & Dale, J. (1981). J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun. pp. 684–686. Enraf–Nonius (1988). CAD-4 Manual. Version 5.0. Enraf–Nonius, Delft, The Netherlands.
- Felix, V., Delgado, R., Amorim, M. T. S., Chaves, W. S., Galvao, A. M., Duarte, M. T., Carrondo, M. A. A. F. D. T., Mouta, I. & da Silva, J. J. R. F. (1994). J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. pp. 3099–3106.
- Flack, H. D. (1983). Acta Cryst. A39, 876-881.
- Hall, S. R., Flack, H. D. & Stewart, J. M. (1992). Editors. *Xtal3.2 Reference Manual*. Universities of Western Australia, Australia, Geneva, Switzerland, and Maryland, USA.
- Marcus, S. T., Bernhardt, P. V., Grøndahl, L. & Gahan, L. R. (1999). Polyhedron, 18, 3451–3460.
- North, A. C. T., Phillips, D. C. & Mathews, F. S. (1968). Acta Cryst. A24, 351–359.
- Schultz, R. A., White, B. D., Dishong, D. M., Arnold, K. A. & Gokel, G. W. (1985). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 107, 6659–6668.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1990). Acta Cryst. A46, 467-473.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). SHELXL97. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Spek, A. L. (1990). Acta Cryst. A46, C-34.
- Thöm, V. J., Shaikjee, S. & Hancock, R. D. (1986). *Inorg. Chem.* 25, 2992–3000.
 White, B. D., Arnold, K. A., Garrell, R. L., Fronczek, F. R., Gandour, R. D. & Gokel, G. W. (1987). *J. Org. Chem.* 52, 1128–1136.
- Zhang, W.-X., Kong, Q.-C. & Fan, Y.-P. (1992). Chem. Res. Chin. Univ. 8, 332– 336.