inorganic compounds

Acta Crystallographica Section E **Structure Reports** Online

ISSN 1600-5368

Poly[triaguahexa-*u*-cyanido-terbium(III)trisilver(I)1: a 4f-4d bimetallic coordination polymer

Katrina Kalachnikova,^a Zerihun Assefa^b and Richard E. Sykora^a*

^aDepartment of Chemistry, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL 36688-0002, USA, and ^bChemistry Department, North Carolina A&T State University, Greensboro, NC 27411, USA

Correspondence e-mail: rsykora@jaguar1.usouthal.edu

Received 30 May 2007; accepted 13 June 2007

Key indicators: single-crystal X-ray study; T = 290 K; mean $\sigma(N-C) = 0.006$ Å; R factor = 0.019; wR factor = 0.047; data-to-parameter ratio = 10.8.

The title compound, $[Ag_3Tb(CN)_6(H_2O)_3]_n$, consists of hydrated Tb³⁺ cations that are linked with dicyanoargentate anions into a three-dimensional network. The resultant TbN_6O_3 coordination polyhedra have a tricapped trigonal prismatic geometry. Six N atoms from the dicyanoargentate groups form the corners of the trigonal prisms, while the O atoms of three water molecules reside in the capping positions to complete the coordination environment around terbium. Argentophilic interactions give rise to a two-dimensional network of Ag atoms. All of the atoms in the structure are located on special crystallographic positions. Only one unique atom of each type is found in the structure. The site symmetry of each is: Tb ($\overline{6}2m$), Ag (2/m), C (m), N (m), O (m2m) and H (m).

Related literature

The title compound is isostructural with the previously reported gold analog, Tb[Au(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O (Tanner *et al.*, 2005). These compounds adopt the $Eu[Ag(CN)_2]_3 \cdot 3H_2O$ structure type (Assefa et al., 1994, 1995), which has also been reported for several other tris(dicyanoargentate)lanthanide trihydrates or tris(dicyanoaurate)lanthanide trihydrates (Colis, Larochelle et al., 2005). Detailed spectroscopic properties have been reported for the title compound (Rawashdeh-Omary et al., 2000; Tanner et al., 2005). For related literature, see: Ahrland et al. (1985); Colis, Staples et al. (2005).



Experimental

Crystal data

Ag ₃ Tb(CN) ₆ (H ₂ O) ₃]
$M_r = 692.70$
Hexagonal, P63/mcm
$i = 6.6692 (11) \text{\AA}$
c = 18.371 (2) Å
$V = 707.63 (19) \text{ Å}^3$

Data collection

Enraf-Nonius CAD-4	260 independent reflections
diffractometer	226 reflections with $I > 2\sigma($
Absorption correction: analytical	$R_{\rm int} = 0.056$
(XPREP; Bruker, 2000)	3 standard reflections
$T_{\rm min} = 0.320, T_{\rm max} = 0.438$	frequency: 120 min
849 measured reflections	intensity decay: 3%

Z = 2

Mo $K\alpha$ radiation $\mu = 9.04 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ T = 290 (2) K

 $0.29 \times 0.14 \times 0.10 \text{ mm}$

 $2\sigma(I)$

Refinement

$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.019$	24 parameters
$wR(F^2) = 0.047$	H-atom parameters constrained
S = 1.14	$\Delta \rho_{\rm max} = 0.68 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
260 reflections	$\Delta \rho_{\min} = -0.51 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$

Data collection: CAD-4-PC (Enraf-Nonius, 1993); cell refinement: CAD-4-PC; data reduction: XCAD4 (Harms & Wocadlo, 1995); program(s) used to solve structure: SHELXS97 (Sheldrick, 1997); program(s) used to refine structure: SHELXL97 (Sheldrick, 1997); molecular graphics: SHELXTL (Bruker, 1998); software used to prepare material for publication: publCIF (Westrip, 2007).

The authors gladly acknowledge the Department of Energy and Oak Ridge National Laboratory for the loan of an Enraf-Nonius CAD-4 X-ray diffractometer.

Supplementary data and figures for this paper are available from the IUCr electronic archives (Reference: PK2030).

References

- Ahrland, S., Norén, B. & Oskarsson, Å. (1985). Inorg. Chem. 25, 1330-1333. Assefa, Z., Shankle, G., Patterson, H. H. & Reynolds, R. (1994). Inorg. Chem. 33. 2187-2195
- Assefa, Z., Staples, R. J., Fackler, J. P., Patterson, H. H. & Shankle, G. (1995). Acta Cryst. C51, 2527-2529.
- Bruker (1998). SHELXTL. Version 5.1. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Bruker (2000). XPREP. Version 6.10. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Colis, J. C. F., Larochelle, C., Staples, R., Herbst-Irmer, R. & Patterson, H. (2005). Dalton Trans. pp. 675-679.
- Colis, J. C. F., Staples, R., Tripp, C., Labrecque, D. & Patterson, H. (2005). J. Phys. Chem. B, 109, 102-109
- Enraf-Nonius (1993). CAD-4-PC Software. Version 1.2. Enraf-Nonius, Delft, The Netherlands.
- Harms, K. & Wocadlo, S. (1995). XCAD4. University of Marburg, Germany. Rawashdeh-Omary, M. A., Larochelle, C. L. & Patterson, H. H. (2000). Inorg. Chem. 39, 4527-4534.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (1997). SHELXL97 and SHELXS97. University of Göttingen, Germany.
- Tanner, P. A., Zhou, X., Wong, W.-T., Kratzer, C. & Yersin, H. (2005). J. Phys. Chem. B, 109, 13083-13090.

Westrip, S. P. (2007). publCIF. In preparation.

supplementary materials

Acta Cryst. (2007). E63, i162 [doi:10.1107/S1600536807029133]

Poly[triaquahexa-µ-cyanido-terbium(III)trisilver(I)]: a 4f-4d bimetallic coordination polymer

K. Kalachnikova, Z. Assefa and R. E. Sykora

Comment

Compounds containing lanthanide ions and dicyanometallate (*e.g.* dicyanoargentate, dicyanoaurate) anions have been extensively studied in recent years due to the interesting structural and optical properties of these systems (Tanner *et al.*, 2005; Colis & Staples *et al.*, 2005). It has been shown in both Tb[Ag(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O and Tb[Au(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O that donoracceptor energy transfer processes occur. In these systems, exclusive excitation of the donor dicyanoaurate or dicyanoargentate moieties leads to sensitized luminescence from the acceptor Tb(III) (Rawashdeh-Omary *et al.*, 2000; Tanner *et al.*, 2005). The sensitized luminescence is reportedly much stronger in Tb[Ag(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O than in Tb[Au(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O due to a larger spectral overlap between the [Ag(CN)₂⁻] emission and the Tb(III) absorption (Rawashdeh-Omary *et al.*, 2000). However, while the structure of Tb[Au(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O has been previously reported (Tanner *et al.*, 2005), the structure of Tb[Ag(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O has not. For this reason, a structural study of the title compound was undertaken.

Fig. 1 shows the coordination geometry around the terbium atom and the atomic labeling scheme. The environment of the Tb ion consists of six N-bound CN^- groups coordinated approximately end-on, resulting in a trigonal prismatic arrangement. Only the N atoms are shown in Fig. 1, but the overall cyanide coordination is clearly evident in the packing diagram shown in Fig. 2. Three water molecules cap the three rectangular faces of the prism. The result is a tricapped trigonal prismatic coordination geometry around the Tb³⁺ with a D_{3h} site symmetry. The three O atoms of the water molecules are coplanar with the Tb atom, by symmetry. Each silver atom is coordinated to the carbon atoms of two cyanide anions, resulting in nearly linear Ag(CN)₂⁻ units as found in other dicyanoargentates. This arrangement is shown in the packing diagram of Fig. 2. In the structure, the [TbN₆O₃] polyhedra are arranged in layers found in the crystallographic *ab* plane. As shown in Fig. 2, these alternating layers of Ag atoms and Tb polyhedra are bridged with cyanide linkages resulting in an overall three-dimensional framework. The silver atoms form a Kagomé lattice, also found in the *ab* plane, that separates the layers of terbium polyhedra. Every Ag atom has four nearest Ag neighbors, with a uniform Ag··Ag separation of 3.3346 (5) Å. The overall structural features are unchanged in the title compound as compared with the isostructural Tb[Au(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O. The title compound contains a larger cell volume than Tb[Au(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O due largely to the greater Ag···Ag separation as compared to the shorter Au···Au separation of 3.31 (1) Å (Tanner *et al.*, 2005). This is consistent with the well established observation that aurophilic interactions are stronger than argentophilic interactions (Ahrland *et al.*, 1985).

Experimental

Tb(NO₃)₃.xH₂O (99.9%) and KAg(CN)₂ (99.9%) were purchased from Alfa Aesar. An aqueous Tb³⁺ solution (0.13 *M*) was prepared from the Tb(NO₃)₃.xH₂O. The reaction involved placing a sealed quartz tube containing 0.10 ml of the aqueous Tb³⁺ solution and 7.7 mg (39 µmol) of the KAg(CN)₂ into a preheated box oven. The tube was left in the oven at 393 K for 3 d. Colorless single crystals of Tb[Ag(CN)₂]₃·3H₂O in the form of hexagonal plates were isolated as the sole solid product contained in a colorless mother liquor. The observed yield was 51%.

Refinement

The unique H-atom in the structure was located in a Fourier difference map and then fixed at a distance of 0.85 Å from the oxygen atom. The coordinates of the H atom were restrained to ensure a reasonable geometry for the water molecule and $U_{iso}(H)$ was fixed at $1.2U_{eq}(O)$.

Figures



Fig. 1. An illustration of the coordination environment around the terbium and silver atoms. 50% thermal ellipsoids are shown.



Fig. 2. A view of the packing diagram of I viewed perpendicular to the c axis. Hydrogen atoms not shown.

Poly[triaquahexa-µ-cyanido-terbium(III)trisilver(I)]

Crystal data	
[Ag ₃ Tb(CN) ₆ (H ₂ O) ₃]	Z = 2
$M_r = 692.70$	$F_{000} = 628$
Hexagonal, P6 ₃ /mcm	$D_{\rm x} = 3.251 {\rm Mg m}^{-3}$
Hall symbol: -P 6c 2	Mo K α radiation $\lambda = 0.71073$ Å
a = 6.6692 (11) Å	Cell parameters from 25 reflections
b = 6.6692 (11) Å	$\theta = 8.3 - 21.1^{\circ}$
c = 18.371 (2) Å	$\mu = 9.04 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
$\alpha = 90^{\circ}$	T = 290 (2) K
$\beta = 90^{\circ}$	Prism, colorless
$\gamma = 120^{\circ}$	$0.29\times0.14\times0.10~mm$
$V = 707.63 (19) \text{ Å}^3$	

Data collection

Enraf–Nonius CAD-4 diffractometer	$R_{\rm int} = 0.056$
Radiation source: fine-focus sealed tube	$\theta_{max} = 25.3^{\circ}$
Monochromator: graphite	$\theta_{\min} = 2.2^{\circ}$
T = 290(2) K	$h = 0 \rightarrow 6$
$\theta/2\theta$ scans	$k = 0 \rightarrow 6$
Absorption correction: analytical (XPREP; Bruker, 2000)	$l = -22 \rightarrow 22$

$T_{\min} = 0.320, \ T_{\max} = 0.438$	3 standard reflections
849 measured reflections	every 120 min
260 independent reflections	intensity decay: 3%
226 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$	

Refinement

Hydrogen site location: difference Fourier map Refinement on F^2 Least-squares matrix: full H-atom parameters constrained $w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_0^2) + (0.0134P)^2 + 0.104P]$ $R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.019$ where $P = (F_0^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$ $(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} < 0.001$ $wR(F^2) = 0.047$ S = 1.14 $\Delta \rho_{\text{max}} = 0.68 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$ $\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.51 \ {\rm e} \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$ 260 reflections Extinction correction: SHELXL97, 24 parameters $Fc^* = kFc[1+0.001xFc^2\lambda^3/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$

Primary atom site location: structure-invariant direct methods Extinction coefficient: 0.0152 (8)

Secondary atom site location: difference Fourier map

Special details

Geometry. All e.s.d.'s (except the e.s.d. in the dihedral angle between two l.s. planes) are estimated using the full covariance matrix. The cell e.s.d.'s are taken into account individually in the estimation of e.s.d.'s in distances, angles and torsion angles; correlations between e.s.d.'s in cell parameters are only used when they are defined by crystal symmetry. An approximate (isotropic) treatment of cell e.s.d.'s is used for estimating e.s.d.'s involving l.s. planes.

Refinement. Refinement of F^2 against ALL reflections. The weighted *R*-factor *wR* and goodness of fit *S* are based on F^2 , conventional *R*-factors *R* are based on *F*, with *F* set to zero for negative F^2 . The threshold expression of $F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)$ is used only for calculating *R*-factors(gt) *etc*. and is not relevant to the choice of reflections for refinement. *R*-factors based on F^2 are statistically about twice as large as those based on *F*, and *R*- factors based on ALL data will be even larger.

Fractional atomic coordinates and isotropic or equivalent isotropic displacement parameters (A^2)

	x	У	Z	L	$V_{\rm iso}*/U_{\rm eq}$		
Tb1	1.0000	0.0000	0.250	0.00	0.0141 (3)		
Ag1	0.5000	0.0000	0.000	0.00	0.0364 (3)		
N1	0.7414 (6)	0.0000	0.150	02 (2) 0.	.0287 (9)		
C1	0.6558 (8)	0.0000	0.097	70 (2) 0.	.0277 (11)		
01	1.3630 (8)	0.0000	0.250	0 0	.0471 (16)		
H1	1.4199	0.0000	0.208	36 0.	.057*		
Atomic displ	lacement parameter	$rs(\AA^2)$					
	U^{11}	U ²²	U^{33}	U^{12}	U^{13}	U^{23}	
Tb1	0.0161 (3)	0.0161 (3)	0.0101 (3)	0.00803 (15)	0.000	0.000	
Ag1	0.0416 (4)	0.0406 (5)	0.0265 (3)	0.0203 (2)	-0.01559 (18)	0.000	

supplementary materials

N1	0.0273 (16)	0.038 (3)	0.0243 (18)	0.0190 (13)	-0.0030 (15)	0.000
C1	0.0262 (18)	0.033 (3)	0.026 (2)	0.0166 (15)	-0.0024 (18)	0.000
01	0.041 (2)	0.097 (5)	0.022 (2)	0.049 (3)	0.000	0.000
Geometric paran	neters (Å °)					
The second responses of the second se		0.401.(5)				
Ibl—Ol		2.421 (5)	Agl-	–Agl ¹	3	3346 (5)
$A \sigma 1 - C 1$		2.517 (4)	NI— 01—	H1	1.	132 (6) 8500
		120,000 (1)	N1 ^{II}	TL1 N1V	13	9 92 (7)
OI = IDI = OI		120.000 (1)	$NI = 01^{ii}$	Th1 N1 ^{Vi}	69	96 (3)
		120.000 (1)	$01 = 01^{iii}$	-101 NI	13	3 26 (9)
OI = IbI = OI		120.0	01 -	-101 -101	15	96(3)
$OI = IDI = NI^{iii}$		135.20 (9) 60.06 (3)			09 72	.30 (3)
OI = IbI = NI		69.90 (3)	NI -	-101 NI	12	0.02(7)
OI = IDI = NI		69.96 (3)	NI—	TDI-INI TE1 NI ^{VI}	03	<i>4</i> 8 (18)
OI = IDI = NI		69.96 (3)	INI -	-101 -101 -101	13	9.92 (7)
$\begin{array}{ccc} OI & -IDI - NI \\ OI & TbI & NI \end{array}$		133 26 (9)	NI —	-101 N1 ^{Vi}	15	9.92 (7) 81 (14)
NI ^{IV} TH NI		133.20(3)	NI –	-101 -101 -101	12	0.00(12)
NI - IDI - NI		139.92(7)	CI—	Agi—Ci	10	0.00 (12) 4 59 (7)
Ol ⁱⁱⁱ The Ni ⁱⁱⁱ		09.90 (3) 122.26 (0)	CI—	Agl—Agl	75	4.39(7)
Ol TIL NI		(9) (9)	C1	-Ag1-Ag1	75	.41 (7)
OI—IbI—NI ^{III}		69.96 (<i>3</i>)	CI—	Agl—Agl ^{·····}	/3	.41 (/)
NI ^{III} —IbI—NI ^{III}		139.92 (7)	Cl ^{vii} -	-Agl-Agl ^{viii}	10	4.59 (7)
N1—Tb1—N1 ^m		/2.81 (14)	Agl ¹ -	-Agl-Agl ^{vm}	18	0.0
O1 ^{III} —Tb1—N1 ^{III}		133.26 (9)	C1—	Ag1—Ag1 ^{1x}	75	.41 (7)
O1 ^m —Tb1—N1 ⁿ		69.96 (3)	C1 ^{vii} -	-Ag1-Ag1 ^{1x}	10	4.59 (7)
O1—Tb1—N1 ¹¹		69.96 (3)	Ag1 ¹ -	$-Ag1-Ag1^{1X}$	60	.0
N1 ^{1v} —Tb1—N1 ¹¹		93.48 (18)	Ag1 ^v	^{III} —Ag1—Ag1 ^{IX}	12	0.0
N1—Tb1—N1 ⁱⁱ		72.81 (14)	C1—	Ag1—Ag1 ^x	10	4.59 (7)
N1 ⁱⁱⁱ —Tb1—N1 ⁱⁱ		72.81 (14)	C1 ^{vii} -	—Ag1—Ag1 ^x	75	.41 (7)
O1 ⁱⁱ —Tb1—N1 ^v		69.96 (3)	Ag1 ⁱ -	—Ag1—Ag1 ^x	12	0.0
O1 ⁱⁱⁱ —Tb1—N1 ^v		69.96 (3)	Ag1 ^v	iii—Ag1—Ag1 ^x	60	.0
O1—Tb1—N1 ^v		133.26 (9)	Ag1 ^{ix}	–Ag1—Ag1 ^x	18	0.0
$N1^{iv}$ —Tb1— $N1^{v}$		72.81 (14)	C1—	N1—Tb1	16	7.0 (4)
N1—Tb1—N1 ^v		93.48 (18)	N1—	C1—Ag1	18	0.0 (4)
N1 ⁱⁱⁱ —Tb1—N1 ^v		139.92 (7)	Tb1–	-O1H1	11	6.5

Symmetry codes: (i) -y, x-y-1, z; (ii) -x+y+2, -x+1, z; (iii) -y+1, x-y-1, z; (iv) -x+y+2, -x+1, -z+1/2; (v) x, y, -z+1/2; (vi) -y+1, x-y-1, -z+1/2; (vii) -x+1, -y, -z; (viii) -y+1, x-y, z; (ix) -x+y+1, -x, z; (x) -x+y+1, -x+1, z.





