

Structure of Some Uranium(IV) Chelates in Solution

By T. H. SIDDALL, TERT.,* and W. E. STEWART

(Savannah River Laboratory, E. I. du Pont de Nemours and Co., Aiken, South Carolina 29801)

Summary N.m.r. data in solution indicate that acetylacetonatouranium(IV) and related compounds have a less symmetrical structure than a D_2 square antiprism or a D_{2d} triangular dodecahedron.

X-RAY data in the *solid state*^{1,2} and various arguments^{3,4} indicate that acetylacetonatouranium(IV) and related compounds might have either the D_2 square antiprism or the D_{2d} triangular dodecahedron as the ground-state

co-ordination polyhedron. We report here ^1H n.m.r. data that indicate a less symmetrical structure for acetylacetonatouranium(IV) and related compounds *in solution*.

The large chemical shifts that arise, because of the paramagnetism of U^{IV} ,^{5,6} provide a sensitive probe for structural variations. While *intramolecular* exchange processes are rapid (on the n.m.r. time scale) in these compounds, *intermolecular* exchange is slow. Mixing two different chelates such as $\text{U}[\text{EtC}(\text{O})\text{CHC}(\text{O})\text{Et}]_4$ and $\text{U}[\text{Bu}^t\text{C}(\text{O})\text{CHC}(\text{O})\text{Bu}^t]_4$ produces separate n.m.r. signals for all five

molecular species including the three mixed chelates. A similar situation has been reported for 8-co-ordinate chelates of other metals.⁷⁻⁹ N.m.r. data are given in the Table for the methide $[-C(O)CHCO-]$ proton of several

Therefore, the shifts for each ligand are not averages from equal populations. (However, separate shifts in a mixed chelate, when averaged together on a weighted basis, are very close to those for the unmixed molecules). The range

N.m.r data for U^{IV} chelates (methide signal) in CDCl₃ at 30°

Chelate	Shift downfield p.p.m. from Me ₄ Si
U[CH ₃ C(O)CHC(O)CH ₃] ₄	12.5
U[EtC(O)CHC(O)Et] ₄	11.7
U[Pr ⁱ C(O)CHC(O)Pr ⁱ] ₄	12.0
U[Bu ^t C(O)CHC(O)Bu ^t] ₄	12.7
U[Bu ^t C(O)CHC(O)Bu ^t] ₃ [EtC(O)CHC(O)Et]	14.1 ^a (Bu ^t), 7.7(Et) ^a
U[Bu ^t C(O)CHC(O)Bu ^t] ₂ [EtC(O)CHC(O)Et] ₂	15.2 ^a (Bu ^t), 8.7(Et) ^a
U[Bu ^t C(O)CH(CO)Bu ^t][EtC(O)CHC(O)Et] ₃	17.1 ^a (Bu ^t), 9.8(Et) ^a

^a Assigned in solutions of mixtures by varying relative concentration. See ref. 7.

chelates. N.m.r. data for other protons in these chelates show the expected large chemical shifts due to U^{IV} paramagnetism and multiplicity consistent with the methide signals, but are not relevant to the discussion and are not given.

The methide proton shifts for unmixed complexes all lie within 1 p.p.m., but for the mixed chelates the shifts are spread out over more than 9 p.p.m. We believe that this observation can be explained only by assuming *two* (or more) nonequivalent sites for chelate rings in all of these molecules, unmixed as well as mixed. Signals from the different sites are not separately observable because the observed shifts reflect the averaged shifts for the sites. Because the internal geometry of the chelate ring is essentially independent of the alkyl substituents, only second-order effects are available to change the shifts of the two sites from molecule to molecule. As a consequence, the observed shifts for unmixed chelates vary little. However, in the mixed chelates, each ligand may occupy one site preferentially.

of shifts for methide protons in mixed chelates might, on this basis, be less for similar ligands and more for dissimilar ligands. This we observe. For mixtures of U[PrⁱC(O)CHC(O)Prⁱ]₄ and U[EtC(O)CHC(O)Et]₄, the range is only 3.2 p.p.m. For mixtures of U[EtC(O)CHC(O)Et]₄, with a variety of U[R¹C(O)CHC(O)R²]₄, where R² is a perfluoro-alkyl group, the range of shifts is at least 25 p.p.m.

On this basis, the ground state polyhedron for these U^{IV} chelates *in solution* cannot be the D₂ square antiprism or the D_{2d} dodecahedron. In both of these polyhedra, all four sites are equivalent and there cannot be two (or more) nonequivalent sites.

We thank Dr. D. G. Karraker for two of the chelates and for advice on preparing others, and Mr. J. E. Conner for valuable experimental assistance. The information contained in this article was developed during the course of work under a contract with the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

(Received, May 5th, 1969; Com. 622.)

¹ D. Grdenić and B. Matković, *Nature*, 1958, **182**, 465.

² D. Grdenić and B. Matković, *Acta Cryst.*, 1959, **12**, 817.

³ J. L. Hoard and J. V. Silverton, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1963, **2**, 235.

⁴ E. L. Muetterties and C. M. Wright, *Quart. Rev.*, 1967, **21**, 109.

⁵ R. von Ammon, B. Kanellakopoulos, and R. D. Fischer, *Chem. Phys. Letters*, 1968, **2**, 513.

⁶ T. H. Siddall, tert., W. E. Stewart, and D. G. Karraker, *Chem. Phys. Letters*, in the press.

⁷ A. C. Adams and E. M. Larsen, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1966, **5**, 228.

⁸ T. J. Pinnavaia and R. C. Fay, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1966, **5**, 233.

⁹ S. J. Lippard, *Progr. Inorg. Chem.*, 1967, **8**, 109.