# metal-organic papers

Acta Crystallographica Section E Structure Reports Online

ISSN 1600-5368

## **Clifton E. F. Rickard**

Department of Chemistry, University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New Zealand

Correspondence e-mail: c.rickard@auckland.ac.nz

#### Key indicators

Single-crystal X-ray study T = 203 KMean  $\sigma(C-C) = 0.006 \text{ Å}$  R factor = 0.022 wR factor = 0.052 Data-to-parameter ratio = 16.0

For details of how these key indicators were automatically derived from the article, see http://journals.iucr.org/e.

# Dinitratodioxobis(4-picoline N-oxide)uranium(VI)

The title compound,  $[UO_2(NO_3)_2(C_6H_7NO)_2]$ , has a centre of symmetry. This is the first uranyl complex of a simple monodentate *N*-oxide ligand to be structurally characterized.

### Comment

Although aromatic *N*-oxide complexes of uranium(VI) have been known for some time (Ahuja & Singh, 1973, and references therein), few have been structurally characterized. Those that have been structurally characterized invariably have a second donor group attached to the aromatic ring giving bidentate ligands. One such example is (2,2'-bipyridine N,N'-dioxide)dinitratodioxouranium(VI) (Alcock & Roberts, 1987) in which the uranium is eight-coordinate *via* two bidentate nitrate groups, two *N*-oxide O atoms and the two oxo ligands.



The title compound, (I), is eight-coordinate, with a hexagonal bipyramidal geometry. The U atom lies on a centre of symmetry, dictating a *trans* arrangement of the *N*-oxide ligands unlike the 2,2'-bipyridine *N*,*N*'-dioxide complex where a *cis* arrangement is dictated by ligand constraints. The NO<sub>3</sub> groups are bound slightly asymmetrically, with U–O bonds of 2.518 (3) and 2.544 (3) Å. These are significantly longer than the U–O (*N*-oxide) bonds of 2.376 (3) Å. These values are comparable to those found in the 2,2'-bipyridine *N*,*N*'-dioxide complex of 2.513 (18) and 2.378 (14) Å (Alcock & Roberts, 1987). The U=O distance is 1.769 (3) Å, which is typical of values found in uranyl complexes. There are no significant intermolecular interactions.

#### Experimental

. .

The title complex was prepared by mixing solutions of  $UO_2(NO_3)_2$ .6H<sub>2</sub>O and 4-picoline *N*-oxide in ethanol in a 1:2 molar ratio. Crystals of (I) were obtained by recrystalization from ethanol.

Crystal data	
$[UO_2(NO_3)_2(C_6H_7NO)_2]$	$D_x = 2.283 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$
$M_r = 612.30$	Mo $K\alpha$ radiation
Monoclinic, $P2_1/c$	Cell parameters from 6110
$a = 7.9772 (2) \text{ Å}_{1}$	reflections
b = 13.5738(2)Å	$\theta = 2-26^{\circ}$
c = 8.2288 (2)  Å	$\mu = 9.17 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
$\beta = 91.583 \ (2)^{\circ}$	T = 203 (2)  K
$V = 890.68 (3) \text{ Å}^3$	Prism, yellow
Z = 2	$0.32 \times 0.26 \times 0.22 \text{ mm}$

© 2001 International Union of Crystallography Printed in Great Britain – all rights reserved Received 30 August 2001 Accepted 10 September 2001 Online 20 September 2001

#### Data collection

Siemens SMART diffractometer Area-detector  $\omega$  scans Absorption correction: multi-scan (Blessing, 1995)  $T_{\min} = 0.088$ ,  $T_{\max} = 0.133$ 8841 measured reflections 1998 independent reflections

#### Refinement

Refinement on  $F^2$   $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.022$   $wR(F^2) = 0.052$  S = 1.241998 reflections 125 parameters H-atom parameters constrained

#### Table 1

Selected bond lengths (Å).

U O1	1.7(0.(2)	02 N1	1 272 (5)
0-01	1.769 (3)	02-N1	1.272 (5)
U-05	2.376 (3)	O3-N1	1.269 (5)
U-O2	2.518 (3)	O4-N1	1.214 (5)
U-O3	2.544 (3)		

1750 reflections with  $I > 2\sigma(I)$ 

 $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0153P)^2]$ 

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

+ 1.8153P]

 $(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.058$ 

 $\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 0.35 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$ 

 $\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.65 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} R_{\rm int} = 0.020 \\ \theta_{\rm max} = 27.5^\circ \end{array}$ 

 $k = 0 \rightarrow 17$ 

 $l = 0 \rightarrow 10$ 

 $h = -10 \rightarrow 10$ 

The data collection nominally covered over a hemisphere of reciprocal space, by a combination of three sets of exposures; each set had a different  $\varphi$  angle for the crystal and each exposure covered  $0.3^{\circ}$  in  $\omega$ . Crystal decay was monitored by repeating the initial frames at the end of data collection and analyzing the duplicate reflections. H atoms were placed geometrically and refined with a riding model (including free rotation about the methyl C–C bonds), and with  $U_{\rm iso}$  constrained to be 1.2 (1.5 for the methyl group) times  $U_{\rm eq}$  of the carrier atom.

Data collection: *SMART* (Siemens, 1995); cell refinement: *SMART*; data reduction: *SAINT* (Siemens, 1995); program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS*97 (Sheldrick, 1990); program(s) used to



#### Figure 1

The structure of (I) showing 50% probability displacement ellipsoids. H atoms have been omitted.

refine structure: *SHELXL*97 (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: *SHELXTL* (Siemens, 1994); software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXL*97.

### References

Ahuja, I. S. & Singh, R. (1973). J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem. 35, 561-566.

Alcock, N. W. & Roberts, M. M. (1987). Acta Cryst. C43, 476-478.

Blessing, R. H. (1995). Acta Cryst. A51, 33-38.

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

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

Siemens (1994). SHELXTL. Siemens Analytical Instruments X-ray Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.

Siemens (1995). *SMART* and *SAINT*. Siemens Analytical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.