

Polymeric dihydroxydiphthalato- tricobalt(II)

Shi-Yao Yang,^a La-Sheng Long,^a Rong-Bin Huang,^a
Lan-Sun Zheng^a and Seik Weng Ng^{b*}

^aState Key Laboratory for Physical Chemistry of Solid Surfaces, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361005, People's Republic of China, and ^bDepartment of Chemistry, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Correspondence e-mail: seikweng@um.edu.my

Received 17 June 2003

Accepted 29 September 2003

Online 22 October 2003

In the crystal structure of dihydroxydiphthalatotricobalt(II), $[\text{Co}_3(\text{C}_8\text{H}_4\text{O}_4)_2(\text{OH})_2]_n$, two of the four independent Co atoms lie at special positions of site symmetry 2. The hydroxy groups link three Co atoms to form a pyramidal Co_3O unit, and adjacent Co_3O units are linked through the Co base atoms into a honeycomb layer motif. Each of the phthalate dianions uses the O atoms of one carboxyl group to bind to three Co atoms, the bonding mode giving rise to six-coordinate Co atoms.


Comment

Hydrothermally synthesized cobalt(II) derivatives of benzene polycarboxylic acids exist as hydroxides. The tetracarboxylate compound adopts a framework architecture that constitutes roughly only half the volume of the unit cell (Gutschke *et al.*, 2001a). Cobalt hydroxide benzene-1,4-dicarboxylate, on the other hand, packs in such a manner that the π systems of adjacent carboxylate anions interact magnetically (Huang *et al.*, 2000). Other than a tricarboxylate derivative (Gutschke *et al.*, 2001b), there are no further reports to date of such cobalt hydroxide derivatives of benzene polycarboxylic acids.

Unlike the reaction of cobalt(II) carbonate with phthalic acid in water, which affords hexaaquacobalt hydrogen phthalate (Kariuki & Jones, 1993), the reaction of cobalt(II) nitrate and potassium hydrogen phthalate under hydrothermal conditions yielded the title cobalt(II) hydroxide derivative, (I), and its structure is presented here.

The crystal structure of (I) is built up of a layer motif consisting of corner-sharing pyramidal Co_3O units. These units are linked through the Co corners to form a hexagonal unit, which also shares its Co corners, giving rise to a honeycomb motif (Fig. 1). The layers that make up the structure feature a Co_3O core, and the aromatic groups protrude from the top and bottom of each layer. Where the layers come together,

aromatic–aromatic edge–face interactions exist. The Co_3O unit is also documented in the other compounds mentioned above. For example, in the terephthalate derivative $[\text{Co}_2(\text{C}_8\text{H}_4\text{O}_4)(\text{OH})_2]$, the Co_3O units form layer structures by edge- and corner-sharing (Huang *et al.*, 2000). This layer motif is not adopted by the tri- and tetracarboxylates.



The four independent Co atoms in (I) exist in an octahedral environment (Fig. 2), and each is coordinated by four O atoms from carboxyl groups and two O atoms from hydroxyl groups.





Figure 1

A view of the layer structure of (I), illustrating the honeycomb motif built from Co_3O pyramids.

Each hydroxyl group bridges three Co atoms. For both independent phthalate dianions, each carboxyl $-\text{CO}_2$ group is linked to three Co atoms.

Experimental

Cobalt(II) nitrate hexahydrate (0.17 g, 0.6 mmol) and potassium hydrogen phthalate (0.37 g, 1.8 mmol) were dissolved in water (15 ml). The solution was placed in a Teflon-lined stainless-steel vessel, which was then heated to 473 K for 60 h. The vessel was then allowed to cool to room temperature and needle-shaped crystals of

**Figure 2**

Views of the coordination environments of the four independent Co atoms in (I). Displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 50% probability level and H atoms are shown as small spheres of arbitrary radii. [Symmetry codes: (i) $\frac{1}{2} - x, \frac{1}{2} - y, z$; (ii) $x, \frac{1}{2} - y, z - \frac{1}{2}$; (iii) $\frac{3}{2} - x, y, z - \frac{1}{2}$; (iv) $\frac{3}{2} - x, \frac{1}{2} - y, z$; (v) $x, \frac{1}{2} - y, \frac{1}{2} + z$; (vi) $\frac{1}{2} - x, y, \frac{1}{2} + z$.]

(I) deposited from the solution in about 10% yield. Analysis calculated for $C_{16}H_{10}Co_3O_{10}$: C 35.65, H 1.87%; found: C 35.51, H 1.86%. FT-IR (KBr, ν , cm^{-1}): 3596 (s), 3422 (br), 3070 (w), 2930 (w), 1625 (s), 1599 (vs), 1581 (s), 1568 (s), 1494, 1448, 1425, 1389 (s), 1280 (w), 1156, 1093, 1040, 947 (w), 868, 842, 806, 788, 767, 738, 699, 658, 588 (w), 469, 452.

Crystal data

$[Co_3(C_8H_4O_4)_2(OH)_2]$
 $M_r = 539.03$
 Orthorhombic, $Pccn$
 $a = 12.1121$ (5) Å
 $b = 22.6847$ (9) Å
 $c = 11.8730$ (5) Å
 $V = 3262.2$ (2) Å³
 $Z = 8$
 $D_x = 2.195$ Mg m⁻³

Mo $K\alpha$ radiation
 Cell parameters from 8115 reflections
 $\theta = 1.8$ – 28.3°
 $\mu = 3.08$ mm⁻¹
 $T = 298$ (2) K
 Needle, pink
 $0.45 \times 0.13 \times 0.03$ mm

Data collection

Bruker SMART APEX CCD area-detector diffractometer
 φ and ω scans
 Absorption correction: multi-scan (SADABS; Sheldrick, 1996)
 $T_{min} = 0.692$, $T_{max} = 0.912$
 26 490 measured reflections

3904 independent reflections
 2518 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$
 $R_{int} = 0.057$
 $\theta_{max} = 28.3^\circ$
 $h = -16 \rightarrow 15$
 $k = -30 \rightarrow 30$
 $l = -15 \rightarrow 15$

Refinement

Refinement on F^2
 $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.042$
 $wR(F^2) = 0.104$
 $S = 0.89$
 3904 reflections
 263 parameters

H-atom parameters constrained
 $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0664P)^2]$
 where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$
 $(\Delta/\sigma)_{max} = 0.001$
 $\Delta\rho_{max} = 1.71$ e Å⁻³
 $\Delta\rho_{min} = -0.82$ e Å⁻³

Table 1
Selected geometric parameters (Å, °).

Co1—O2	2.119 (2)	Co2—O7 ^{iv}	2.115 (2)
Co1—O4 ⁱ	2.105 (2)	Co2—O9	2.087 (2)
Co1—O6 ⁱⁱ	2.097 (2)	Co2—O10	2.086 (2)
Co1—O8 ⁱⁱⁱ	2.115 (2)	Co3—O2 ^v	2.340 (2)
Co1—O9	2.094 (2)	Co3—O3	2.063 (2)
Co1—O10 ⁱⁱ	2.089 (2)	Co3—O10	2.018 (2)
Co2—O1	2.108 (2)	Co4—O5	2.056 (2)
Co2—O4 ⁱ	2.116 (2)	Co4—O8 ⁱⁱⁱ	2.379 (2)
Co2—O6	2.110 (2)	Co4—O9	2.010 (2)
O2—Co1—O4 ⁱ	81.7 (1)	O6—Co2—O7 ^{iv}	93.4 (1)
O2—Co1—O6 ⁱⁱ	98.5 (1)	O6—Co2—O9	102.0 (1)
O2—Co1—O8 ⁱⁱⁱ	179.4 (1)	O6—Co2—O10	79.2 (1)
O2—Co1—O9	100.6 (1)	O7 ^{iv} —Co2—O9	93.0 (1)
O2—Co1—O10 ⁱⁱ	78.5 (1)	O7 ^{iv} —Co2—O10	86.6 (1)
O4 ⁱ —Co1—O6 ⁱⁱ	178.8 (1)	O9—Co2—O10	178.8 (1)
O4 ⁱ —Co1—O8 ⁱⁱⁱ	97.8 (1)	O2 ^v —Co3—O2 ^{vi}	99.4 (1)
O4 ⁱ —Co1—O9	78.8 (1)	O2 ^v —Co3—O3	162.9 (1)
O4 ⁱ —Co1—O10 ⁱⁱ	101.8 (1)	O2 ^v —Co3—O3 ⁱ	83.3 (1)
O6 ⁱⁱ —Co1—O8 ⁱⁱⁱ	82.0 (1)	O2 ^v —Co3—O10	74.9 (1)
O6 ⁱⁱ —Co1—O9	100.0 (1)	O2 ^v —Co3—O10 ⁱ	101.5 (1)
O6 ⁱⁱ —Co1—O10 ⁱⁱ	79.4 (1)	O3—Co3—O3 ⁱ	99.1 (1)
O8 ⁱⁱⁱ —Co1—O9	79.5 (1)	O3—Co3—O10	88.0 (1)
O8 ⁱⁱⁱ —Co1—O10 ⁱⁱ	101.4 (1)	O3—Co3—O10 ⁱ	95.5 (1)
O9—Co1—O10 ⁱⁱ	178.8 (1)	O10—Co3—O10 ⁱ	174.6 (1)
O1—Co2—O4 ⁱ	93.7 (1)	O5—Co4—O5 ^{iv}	99.4 (1)
O1—Co2—O6	167.7 (1)	O5—Co4—O8 ⁱⁱⁱ	163.7 (1)
O1—Co2—O7 ^{iv}	95.2 (1)	O5—Co4—O8 ⁱⁱⁱ	82.1 (1)
O1—Co2—O9	86.3 (1)	O5—Co4—O9	96.0 (1)
O1—Co2—O10	92.6 (1)	O5—Co4—O9 ^{iv}	88.5 (1)
O4 ⁱ —Co2—O6	79.3 (1)	O8 ⁱⁱⁱ —Co4—O8 ⁱⁱⁱ	101.0 (1)
O4 ⁱ —Co2—O7 ^{iv}	167.5 (1)	O8 ⁱⁱⁱ —Co4—O9 ^{iv}	75.1 (1)
O4 ⁱ —Co2—O9	78.7 (1)	O8 ⁱⁱⁱ —Co4—O9	100.3 (1)
O4 ⁱ —Co2—O10	101.9 (1)	O9—Co4—O9 ^{iv}	173.0 (1)

Symmetry codes: (i) $\frac{1}{2} - x, \frac{1}{2} - y, z$; (ii) $x, \frac{1}{2} - y, z - \frac{1}{2}$; (iii) $\frac{3}{2} - x, y, z - \frac{1}{2}$; (iv) $\frac{1}{2} - x, \frac{1}{2} - y, z$; (v) $x, \frac{1}{2} - y, \frac{1}{2} + z$; (vi) $\frac{1}{2} - x, y, \frac{1}{2} + z$.

The aromatic and hydroxyl H atoms were generated geometrically (C—H = 0.93 Å and O—H = 0.98 Å) and were allowed to ride on

their parent atoms in riding-model approximations, with $U_{\text{iso}}(\text{H})$ values set at $1.2U_{\text{eq}}(\text{parent})$. The final difference map had peaks of more than $1 \text{ e } \text{Å}^{-3}$ near the four Co atoms.

Data collection: *SMART* (Bruker, 2001); cell refinement: *SAINT* (Bruker, 2001); data reduction: *SAINT*; program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS97* (Sheldrick, 1997); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL97* (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: *ORTEPII* (Johnson, 1976); software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXL97*.

The authors thank the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant No. 20023001), the Innovation Foundation for Young Scientific Talent of Fujian Province, China (grant No. 2002J004), Xiamen University (grant No. Y07015) and the University of Malaya for supporting this work.

Supplementary data for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: TA1414). Services for accessing these data are described at the back of the journal.

References

- Bruker (2001). *SAINT* (Version 6.22) and *SMART* (Version 5.625). Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Gutschke, S. O. H., Price, D. J., Powell, A. K. & Wood, P. T. (2001a). *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* pp. 2739–2741.
- Gutschke, S. O. H., Price, D. J., Powell, A. K. & Wood, P. T. (2001b). *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **40**, 1920–1923.
- Huang, Z. L., Drillon, M., Masciocchi, N., Sironi, A., Zhao, J. T., Rabu, P. & Panissod, P. (2000). *Chem. Mater.* **12**, 2805–2812.
- Johnson, C. K. (1976). *ORTEPII*. Report ORNL-5138. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tennessee, USA.
- Kariuki, B. M. & Jones, W. (1993). *Acta Cryst.* **C49**, 2100–2102.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1996). *SADABS*. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). *SHELXS97* and *SHELXL97*. University of Göttingen, Germany.