Acta Crystallographica Section C Crystal Structure Communications

ISSN 0108-2701

A ruthenium(II)-porphyrin-carbene complex with a weakly bonded methanol ligand

Masashi Kawai, Hidetaka Yuge and Takeshi Ken Miyamoto*

Department of Chemistry, School of Science, Kitasato University, Kitasato, Sagamihara, Kanagawa 228-8555, Japan Correspondence e-mail: orgnmtl@kitasato-u.ac.jp

Received 17 August 2002 Accepted 23 October 2002 Online 8 November 2002

The title diphenylcarbene porphyrin complex (diphenylcarbenyl- κC)(methanol- κO)(5,10,15,20-tetra-p-tolylporphyrinato- $\kappa^4 N$)ruthenium(II) methanol solvate, [Ru(C₁₃H₁₀)-(C₄₈H₃₆N₄)(CH₄O)]·CH₄O, has a six-coordinate Ru atom with a methanol molecule as the second axial ligand. The carbene fragment is slightly distorted from an ideal sp^2 configuration, with a C(phenyl)–C(carbene)–C(phenyl) angle of 112.2 (3)°. The Ru–C bond length of 1.845 (3) Å is comparable with other carbene complexes. The two phenyl rings of the carbene ligand are perpendicular to the carbene plane. Methanol solvate molecules link the methanol ligands of adjacent porphyrin complexes *via* hydrogen bonds.



Figure 1

The molecular structure of (I), showing displacement ellipsoids at the 30% probability level. H atoms have been omitted for clarity.

Comment

Ruthenium–carbene complexes have attracted much attention in recent years as catalysts of the cyclopropanation of olefins (Trost *et al.*, 2001). Some ruthenium–porphyrin–carbene complexes have been reported as effective catalysts because of their higher stereoselectivity and turnover numbers. However, ruthenium–porphyrin–carbene complexes are so unstable that, since the initial investigation by Collman *et al.* (1985), they have only been characterized using UV–visible or NMR spectroscopy. The first crystal structure of a ruthenium(II)– porphyrin–carbene complex, *viz.* [Ru(tpp){C(CO₂Et)₂}(CH₃-OH)]·H₂O, (II) (H₂tpp is 5,10,15,20-tetraphenylporphyrin),



was determined by Galardon *et al.* (1998). A methanol molecule was bound to the six-coordinate Ru atom *trans* to the carbene ligand and could be replaced by other ligands, such as PPh₃, pyridine or CO, in solution. Che *et al.* (2001) reported that ruthenium(II)–porphyrin diphenyl- or phenyl(allyloxycarbonyl)carbene complexes, recrystallized from CH₂Cl₂/ CH₃CN in air, contained five-coordinate Ru atoms in the crystalline state. Both cases show that carbene complexes without α - and β -H atoms would be stable enough for isolation and crystallization even in air. We have synthesized a simple carbene complex, [Ru(ttp)(CPh₂)(CH₃OH)]·CH₃OH

> (H₂ttp is 5,10,15,20-tetra-*p*-tolylporphyrin) (I), and here we compare its structure with those of some other ruthenium(II)-porphyrin-carbene complexes.

> As shown in Fig. 1, the Ru atom is six-coordinate in (I), similar to (II), while the Ru atoms are squarepyramidally five-coordinate in $[Ru(P^*)(CPh_2)] \cdot 2CH_2Cl_2$, (III), and $[Ru(P^*){C(Ph)CO_2CH_2CH=CH_2}]$ --3CH₂Cl₂, (IV) {H₂P* is 5,10,15,20tetrakis[(1S,4R,5R,8S)-1,2,3,4,5,6,-7,8-octahydro-1,4:5,8-dimethanoanthracen-9-yl]porphyrin} (Che et al., 2001). The Ru-C(carbene) bond length in (I) is similar to that in (II) [1.829 (9) Å], and the Ru-N(porphyrin) bond lengths are also within the range previously reported for ruthenium(II)-porphyrin complexes. A methanol molecule is bonded to the Ru atom trans to the

carbene ligand, and is associated with two other methanol solvate molecules through hydrogen bonding. The Ru-O(methanol) bond length in (I) is significantly longer than that in (II) [2.293 (6) Å], perhaps due to these hydrogen bonds.

The carbene fragment in (I) is distorted from an ideal sp^2 configuration, as the C(phenyl) - C(carbene) - C(phenyl)angle is $112.2 (3)^{\circ}$, similar to that in the diphenylcarbene complex (III) $[112.1 (5)^{\circ}]$. The two phenyl groups are oriented perpendicular to the plane of the carbene fragment, adopting a face-to-face arrangement, as observed in (III). The projection of the phenyl groups on to the porphyrin plane reveals a staggered configuration with regard to the Ru–N bonds; the N2-Ru-C49-C50 and N4-Ru-C49-C56 torsion angles are 27.1 (3) and 26.4 (3) $^{\circ}$, respectively. Because of steric repulsion between the porphyrin group and the phenyl groups of the carbene ligand, the porphyrin system in (I) is slightly distorted into a saddle conformation, whereas those of (III) and (IV) in the square-pyramidal configuration are severely distorted. The largest deviations from the $C_{20}N_4$ least-squares plane in (I) are -0.187 (4) and 0.180 (3) Å for atoms C2 and C7, respectively. The Ru atom is slightly out of this leastsquares plane by 0.1139 (7) Å towards the carbene ligand, close to the value of 0.12 Å in (II), but less than the values of 0.19 and 0.22 Å in (III) and (IV), respectively.

Experimental

The title compound was prepared according to the procedure of Galardon *et al.* (1998). A CH_2Cl_2 solution containing equimolar amounts of [Ru(ttp)(CO)(CH₃OH)] and the diaza compound N₂==CPh₂ was refluxed under N₂ for 3 h. After removal of the solvent *in vacuo*, the residue was purified by column chromatography on silica gel with toluene as eluant. The compound is stable in air at room temperature. Crystals of (I) suitable for X-ray diffraction were prepared by recrystallization from CH₂Cl₂/CH₃OH.

Crystal data

$[Ru(C_{13}H_{10})(C_{48}H_{36}N_4)-$	$D_x = 1.295 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$
(CH ₄ O)]·CH ₄ O	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation
$M_r = 1000.17$	Cell parameters from 25
Monoclinic, $P2_1/c$	reflections
a = 12.4608 (12) Å	$\theta = 14.4 - 15.0^{\circ}$
b = 17.744 (2) Å	$\mu = 0.35 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
c = 23.7491 (13) Å	T = 296 (2) K
$\beta = 102.428 \ (6)^{\circ}$	Prism, dark red
V = 5128.0 (8) Å ³	$0.28 \times 0.14 \times 0.13 \text{ mm}$
Z = 4	

Table 1

Selected geometric parameters (Å, °).

Ru-N1	2.051 (3)	Ru–N4	2.051 (3)
Ru-N2	2.040 (2)	Ru-C49	1.845 (3)
Ru-N3	2.042 (3)	Ru–O1	2.362 (3)
N1-Ru-N2	89.57 (11)	N4-Ru-O1	85.93 (10)
N1-Ru-N3	171.76 (11)	C49-Ru-N1	92.74 (13)
N1-Ru-N4	89.80 (11)	C49-Ru-N2	93.55 (13)
N1-Ru-O1	87.29 (11)	C49-Ru-N3	95.50 (13)
N2-Ru-N3	89.85 (11)	C49-Ru-N4	93.53 (12)
N2-Ru-N4	172.91 (11)	C49-Ru-O1	179.46 (12)
N2-Ru-O1	86.99 (10)	C50-C49-C56	112.2 (3)
N3-Ru-N4	89.76 (11)	Ru-C49-C50	123.5 (2)
N3-Ru-O1	84.47 (11)	Ru-C49-C56	124.2 (2)

Table 2

Hydrogen-bonding geometry (Å, °).

$D - H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	D-H	$H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$	$D \cdots A$	$D - H \cdot \cdot \cdot A$
$O1-H47\cdots O2^{i}$	0.82	1.910	2.704 (5)	163
$O2-H51\cdots O1$	0.82	2.204	2.949 (6)	151

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

Data collection	
Rigaku AFC-7 <i>R</i> diffractometer $\omega/2\theta$ scans 12 304 measured reflections 11 769 independent reflections 5589 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$ $R_{int} = 0.030$ $\theta_{max} = 27.5^{\circ}$	$h = -16 \rightarrow 0$ $k = 0 \rightarrow 23$ $l = -30 \rightarrow 30$ 3 standard reflections every 150 reflections intensity decay: 0.9%
Refinement	
Refinement on F^2 $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.044$ $wR(F^2) = 0.128$ S = 1.02 11 769 reflections 535 parameters H-atom parameters constrained	$\begin{split} &w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0531P)^2 \\ &+ 1.1504P] \\ &where \ P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3 \\ &(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.001 \\ &\Delta\rho_{\rm max} = 0.46 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3} \\ &\Delta\rho_{\rm min} = -0.33 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3} \end{split}$

The positions of the methanol H atoms were refined as rotating methyl and hydroxy groups, with C–H = 0.96 Å and O–H = 0.82 Å, respectively. All remaining H atoms were placed in geometrically idealized positions, with Csp^2 –H = 0.93 Å and Csp^3 –H = 0.96 Å. The isotropic displacement parameters of all the H atoms were constrained to ride on their parent atoms, with $U_{iso}(H) = 1.2U_{eq}(C,O)$.

Data collection: *MSC/AFC Diffractometer Control Software* (Molecular Structure Corporation, 1993); cell refinement: *MSC/AFC Diffractometer Control Software*; data reduction: *CrystalStructure* (Molecular Structure Corporation & Rigaku, 2001); program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS97* (Sheldrick, 1990); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL97* (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: *ORTEP-3 for Windows* (Farrugia, 1997); software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXL97*.

Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: TR1039). Services for accessing these data are described at the back of the journal.

References

- Che, C.-M., Huang, J.-S., Lee, F.-W., Li, Y., Lai, T.-S., Kwong, H.-L., Teng, P.-F., Lee, W.-S., Lo, W.-C., Peng, S.-M. & Zhou, Z.-Y. (2001). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 123, 4119–4129.
- Collman, J. P., Brothers, P. J., McElwee-White, L., Rose, E. & Wright, L. J. (1985). J. Am. Chem. Soc. 107, 4570–4571.
- Farrugia, L. J. (1997). J. Appl. Cryst. 30, 565.
- Galardon, E., Le Maux, P., Toupet, L. & Simonneaux, G. (1998). Organometallics, 17, 565–569.
- Molecular Structure Corporation (1993). MSC/AFC Diffractometer Control Software. Version 5.1.0. MSC, 3200 Research Forest Drive, The Woodlands, TX 77381, USA.

Molecular Structure Corporation & Rigaku (2001). CrystalStructure. Version 2.00. MSC, 9009 New Trails Drive, The Woodlands, TX 77381-5209, USA, and Rigaku Corporation, 3-9-12 Akishima, Tokyo 196-8666, Japan.

Sheldrick, G. M. (1990). Acta Cryst. A46, 467-473.

Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). SHELXL97. University of Göttingen, Germany.

Trost, B. M., Toste, F. D. & Pinkerton, A. B. (2001). Chem. Rev. 101, 2067–2096.