## Gallane Adducts of Bifunctional Group V Ligands; Crystal Structures of (GaH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(tmen) and (GaH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(dmpe)<sup>†</sup>

## Dermot O'Hare\*<sup>a</sup> John S. Foord,<sup>b</sup> Timothy C. M. Page<sup>a</sup> and Timothy J. Whitaker<sup>a</sup>

*a Inorganic Chemistry Laboratory, South Parks Road, Oxford OX? 3QR, UK b Physical Chemistry Laboratory, South Parks Road, Oxford OX? 3QZ, UK* 

Treatment of GaH<sub>3</sub>NMe<sub>3</sub> with either tmen or dmpe yields (GaH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(tmen) **1** and (GaH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(dmpe) **2**; the X-ray structure of **2 is** the first structure determination of a phosphine adduct of a gallium hydride.

Although the epitaxial growth of semiconductors by metal organic vapour phase epitaxy (MOVPE) or chemical beam epitaxy (CBE) has developed rapidly in recent years, a reduction in the amount of carbon incorporated into the films over current levels achievable still represents an important research target in many instances.<sup>1,2</sup> Al $H_3(NMe_3)$  and

 $GaH_3(NMe_3)$  have recently been reported as excellent sources for the growth of high purity metal films on both silicon and gallium arsenide substrates *via* CBE3-5 and MOVPE.6 Electronic grade samples of  $\text{AlH}_3(\text{NMe}_3)$  are now commercially available and are being used in device fabrication whereas the relatively lower thermal stability of  $GaH_3(NMe_3)$  means that its very favourable surface chemistry may not be commercially exploited. In this paper we report the synthesis, characterisation and X-ray structure determinations of some novel volatile gallane derivatives with relatively high thermal stability.

 $\uparrow$  tmen =  $N, N, N', N'$ -tetramethylethylenediamine; dmpe = 1,2-bis-**(dimethy1phosphino)ethane.** 



**Scheme 1** *Reagents and conditions:* i, tmen, room temp., -NMe3; ii, dmpe, room temp., -NMe<sub>3</sub>; iii, tmen-2HCL, tmen, 0°C, -H<sub>2</sub>,  $-LiC$ : iv, dmpe-2HCl,  $-10\degree$ C,  $-H_2$ ,  $-LiC$ 

Condensation **of** an excess of either tmen or dmpe onto GaH<sub>3</sub>(NMe<sub>3</sub>)<sup>7</sup> at  $-196$ °C followed by warming to room temperature leads to the efficient loss of NMe<sub>3</sub> and formation of  $(GaH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(tmen)$  **1** and  $(GaH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(dmpe)$  **2**, respectively.‡ Alternatively LiGaH4 can be treated with the hydrochloride salts dmpe-2HCl in diethyl ether or tmen-2HCl (Scheme 1). X-Ray-quality crystals of both **1** and **2** were obtained by slow crystallisation from toluene solutions at -20 °C. Compounds 1 and **2** have been characterised by NMR and IR spectroscopy, mass spectrometry, elemental microanalysis and X-ray crystal structure determinations. **9** 

\$ *Synthesis and characterisation:* Method *(i);* in the absence of any solvent, **N,N,N',N'-tetramethylethylenediamine** (tmen) (0.61 cm3, 4.02 mmol) or **1,2-bis(dimethylphosphino)ethane** (dmpe) (0.72 cm3, 3.84 mmol) was condensed *in vacuo* at -196 °C onto GaH<sub>3</sub>(NMe<sub>3</sub>) (0.502 g, 3.8 mmol). The solution was allowed to warm slowly to room temperature. After 0.5 h, excess of ligand was removed *in* vacua at 10°C leaving a white solid which was taken up in toluene. The resulting solution was reduced in volume and cooled very slowly to -20 "C, affording crystals of **1** and **2** (32% yield).

Method *(ii):* tmen (7.5 cm3, 50 mmol) was condensed *in vacuo* at  $-196$  °C onto a solid mixture of LiGaH<sub>4</sub> (1.02 g, 12.6 mmol) and tmen $-2$ HCl (1.64 g, 8.7 mmol). The mixture was warmed slowly to room temeprature, stirred for 0.5 h and filtered. Excess of tmen was removed *in vacuo* at  $-20$  °C leaving a white solid 1 (0.74 g, 44% yield). A solution of  $LiGaH_4$  (0.324 g, 4.0 mmol) in diethyl ether (50 cm3) was added to a stirred suspension of dmpe-2HC1(0.66 g, 2.96 mmol) in diethyl ether (50 cm<sup>3</sup>) during 1 h at  $-30$  °C. After stirring for 1 h at  $-10$  °C the solution was filtered and the solvent removed *in vacuo* forming a white solid **2** (0.22 g, 37% yield).

For 1: <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz,  $CD_3C_6D_5$ ,  $-80\,^{\circ}$ C),  $\delta$  4.93 (6H, s, GaH), 2.45 (4H, s, CH<sub>2</sub>) and 1.68 (12H, s, NMe<sub>2</sub>); IR:  $v_{Ga-H}$ 1804cm-l; *mlz* 187 (M+-GaH2). For **2; 1H** NMR (300MHz, CD3C6D5, -50 "C), 6 4.28 (6H, s, GaH), 1.25 (4H, **s,** CH2) and 0.42 (12H, s, PMe<sub>2</sub>); IR:  $v_{Ga-H}$  1829 cm<sup>-1</sup>; MS:  $m/z$  295 (M<sup>+</sup>) and 223 (M<sup>+</sup> – GaH<sub>3</sub>). Satisfactory elemental analysis results were obtained.

§ Crystal data for 1:  $C_6H_{22}Ga_2N_2$ ,  $M = 261.69$ , monoclinic, space group  $P2_1/n$ ,  $a = 6.724(3)$ ,  $b = 17.067(2)$ ,  $c = 5.893(1)$  Å,  $\beta =$ 114.70(3)°,  $Z = 2$ ,  $D_c = 1.41$  g cm<sup>-3</sup>,  $U = 617.0$  Å<sup>3</sup>,  $\mu$ (Mo-K $\alpha$ ) =  $43.07 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $F(000) = 268$ . Data were collected at room temperature on an Enraf-Nonius CAD4 diffractometer with monochromated Mo-Ka: X-rays. Data were corrected for Lorentz-polarisation and absorption effects. Full-matrix least-squares refinement of 60 parameters gave  $R = 0.041$ ,  $R_w = 0.0465$  for 1075 reflections with  $I >$  $3\sigma(D)$ .

*Crystal data* for 2:  $C_6H_{22}Ga_2P_2$ ,  $M = 295.63$ , monoclinic, space group  $P2_1/a$ ,  $a = 10.262(\overline{2})$ ,  $b = 11.494(3)$ ,  $c = 6.232(2)$  Å,  $\beta =$ 102.20(2)°,  $Z = 2$ ,  $D_c = 1.36$  g cm<sup>-3</sup>,  $U = 718.51$  Å<sup>3</sup>,  $\mu$ (Mo-K $\alpha$ ) =  $43.07 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $F(000) = 300$ . Data were collected at room temperature on an Enraf-Nonius CAD4 diffractometer with monochromated  $Mo-K\alpha$  X-rays. Data were corrected for Lorentz-polarisation and absorption effects. Full-matrix least-squares refinement of 60 parameters gave  $R = 0.0347$ ,  $R_w = 0.0436$  for 885 reflections with  $I >$  $3\sigma(I)$ .

Atomic coordinates, bond lengths and angles, and thermal parameters have been deposited at the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre. See Notice to Authors, Issue No. 1.



**Fig. 1** (a) The structure of  $(GaH_3)_2$ (tmen) 1: selected bond lengths  $(\AA)$ and angles (°): Ga(1)-N(1) 2.085(3), Ga(1)-H(1) 1.54(6), Ga(1)-H(2) 1.32(7), Ga(1)-H(3) 1.45(7), N(1)-C(l) 1.480(5) N(l)-C(2) Ga(1)  $109.7(2)$ ,  $C(2)-N(1)-Ga(1)$   $107.4(2)$ ,  $C(2)-N(1)-C(1)$  $108.4(3)$ , C(3)-N(1)-Ga(1) 113.1(2), C(3)-N(1)-C(1) 111.8(3), C(3) N(1)-C(2) 106.2(3), H(1)-Ga(1)-H(2) 88.1(16), H(1)-Ga(1)-H(3) 99.7(30), H(2)-Ga(1)-H(3) 109.5(30), C(3B)-C(3)-N(1) 112.7(3). *(b)* The structure of  $(GaH_3)_2$ (dmpe) 2: selected bond lengths (Å) and angles ("): Ga(1)-P(l) 2.403(1), Ga(1)-H(l) 1.40(8), Ga(1)-H(2) 1.59(6), Ga(1)-H(3) 1.35(9), P(1)-C(1) 1.798(6), P(1)-C(2) 1.796(6),  $P(1)-C(3)$  1.787(7),  $C(3)-C(3B)$  1.29(1),  $C(1)-P(1)-Ga(1)$  112.9(2),  $C(2)-P(1)-Ga(1)$  115.2(2),  $C(2)-P(1)-C(1)$  104.4(3),  $C(3)-P(1)-C(2)$ Ga(1) 115.0(2), C(3)-P(l)-C(l) 102.9(5), C(3)-P(l)-C(2) 105.2(4),  $H(1)-Ga(1)-H(2)$  102.0(30),  $H(1)-Ga(1)-H(3)$  102.5(24), H(2)-Ga(1)-H(3) 101.7(39), C(3B)-C(3)-P(1) 126.1(9). 1.492(5), N(l)-C(3) 1.498(4), C(3)-C(3B) 1.508(7), C(1)-N(1)-

Compared with their  $NMe<sub>3</sub>$  or  $PMe<sub>3</sub>$  analogues respectively, which decompose over several hours at room temperature, both **1** and **2** appear to be significantly more thermally stable. NMR studies showed that a solid sample of neither complex decomposes significantly after **2** days at room temperature, but over a period of weeks substantial decomposition does occur, However, solutions in toluene decompose completely after standing for 1-2 days at room temperature. Compounds **1** and **2** are less volatile than their NMe<sub>3</sub> or PMe<sub>3</sub> analogues which sublime readily at room temperature; **2** may be sublimed *in vacuo* at  $50^{\circ}$ C (<10<sup>-5</sup> Torr) but decomposes rapidly at 65 °C, whereas 1 sublimes with decomposition at *ca*.  $70 \text{ °C } (<10^{-5} \text{ Torr}).$ 

Results of the X-ray structure determinations for both 1 and **2** are shown in Fig. **1.** The crystal structures are consistent with all the spectroscopic data and show that both didentate ligands bridge between two gallane moieties rather than forming five-coordinate chelate complexes. This contrasts dramatically with  $\text{AlH}_3$ (tmen) which has been shown to have a polymeric chain structure in the solid state.8 In the solid state both **1** and **2** lie on crystallographic twofold axes bisecting the C(3)-C(3B) bond of the tmen and dmpe ligands, respectively. The gallium coordination in both **1** and **2** is as expected pyramidal with Ga-N and Ga-P bond lengths of 2.085(3) and  $2.403(1)$  Å, respectively. The Ga-N bond length is in good agreement with the Ga–N bond length of 1.97(7)  $\AA$  found for  $GaH_3(NMe_3)$ .<sup>9</sup> No phosphine adducts of complexes containing Ga-H bonds have been previously structurally characterized; however,  $(GaMe<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(Ph<sub>2</sub>PCH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>PPh<sub>2</sub>)$  has a Ga-P bond length of  $2.546(4)$  Å.<sup>10</sup> The X-ray diffraction data were of sufficiently high quality to allow the location and refinement of both the positional and isotropic thermal parameters of the gallium hydrides. The mean Ga-H distances were 1.44(7) and  $1.45(7)~\text{\AA}$  for 1 and 2, respectively. These distances are comparable to those found in the electrondiffraction studies on  $[H_2Ga(NMeg_2)]_2$  [Ga-H 1.487(4) Å]<sup>11</sup> and  $Ga(BH_4)_2H$  [Ga-H 1.774(2) Å].<sup>12</sup>

award (T. J. W.). We thank the SERC and Epichem Limited for a CASE

*Received, 20th June 1991; Corn. 1/03066C* 

## **References**

- 1 T. F. Kuech, D. J. Wolford, E. Veuhoff, V. Deline, P. M. Mooney, R. Potemski and J. Bradley, J. Appl Phys., 1987, 62, 632.
- 2 **A.** C. Jones, J. **S.** Roberts, P. **J.** Wright, P. E. Oliver and B. Cockayne, *Chemtronics,* 1988,3, 152.
- 3 **J. S.** Foord, **A.** J. Murrell, D. O'Hare, N. K. Singh, **A.** T. **S.** Wee and T. J. Whitaker, *Chemtronics,* 1989, 4, 262.
- **4 A.** T. **S.** Wee, **A.** J. Murrell, N. K. Singh, D. O'Hare and **J. S.**  Foord, *Vacuum,* 1990,41, 989.
- *5* **A.** T. *S.* Wee, **A.** J. Murrell, N. K. Singh, D. O'Hare and **J. S.**  Foord, J. *Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.,* 1990, **11.**
- 6 **A.** C. Jones and **S. A.** Rushworth, *J. Cryst. Growth,* 1990, **106,**  253.
- 7 D. F. Schriver and **A.** E. Shirk, *Inorg Synth.,* 1963,2,1039; N. N. Greenwood, **A.** Storr and M. G. H. Wallbridge, *Inorg. Synth.,*  1963, **2,** 1036.
- 8 G. J. Palenik, *Acta Crystallogr.,* 1964, **17, 1573.**
- 9 D. F. Shriver and C. E. Nordman, *Inorg Chem.,* 1963, **2,** 1298.
- 10 D. C. Bradley, H. Chudzynska, M. M. Faktor, D. M. Frigo, M. **B.**  Hursthouse, B. Hussain and L. M. Smith, *Polyhedron,* 1988, **7,**  1289.
- 11 P. L. Baxter, **A.** J. Downs, D. W. H. Rankin and H. E. Robertson, *J. Chem. SOC., Dalton Trans.,* 1985, 807.
- 12 M. T. Barlow, C. J. Dain, **A. J.** Downs, G. **S.** Laurenson and D. W. H. Rankin, J. *Chem. SOC., Dalton Trans.,* 1982, 597.