Electronic Structure and Chain-Length Effects in Diplatinum Polyynediyl Complexes trans, trans- $[(X)(R_3P)_2Pt(C \equiv C)_nPt(PR_3)_2(X)]$: A Computational Investigation

Fedor Zhuravlev and John A. Gladysz^{*[a]}

Abstract: Structure and bonding in the title complexes are studied using model compounds trans, trans- $[(C_6H_5)(H_3P)_2 Pt(C \equiv C)_n Pt(PH_3)_2(C_6H_5)$] (PtC_xPt; x = 2n = 4-26) at the B3LYP/LACVP* level of density functional theory. Conformations in which the platinum square planes are parallel are very slightly more stable than those in which they are perpendicular ($\Delta E =$ $0.12 \text{ kcalmol}^{-1}$ for **PtC₈Pt**). As the carbon-chain length increases, progressively longer C=C triple bonds and shorter $\equiv C - C \equiv$ single bonds are found. Whereas the triple bonds in HC_xH become longer (and the single bonds shorter) as the interior of the chain is approached, the $PtC \equiv C$ triple bonds in PtC_xPt are longer than the neighboring triple bond. Also, the Pt-C bonds are shorter at longer chain lengths, but not the H-C bonds. Accordingly, natural bond orbital charge distributions show that the platinum atoms become more

positively charged, and the carbon chain more negatively charged, as the chain is lengthened. Furthermore, the negative charge is localized at the two terminal C=C atoms, elongating this triple bond. Charge decomposition analyses show no significant $d-\pi^*$ backbonding. The HOMOs of PtC_xPt can be viewed as antibonding combinations of the highest occupied π orbital of the sp-carbon chain and filled inplane platinum d orbitals. The platinum character is roughly proportional to the $Pt/C_x/Pt$ composition (e.g., x = 4, 31%; x=20, 6%). The HOMO and LUMO energies monotonically decrease with chain length, the latter somewhat more rapidly so that the HOMO-LUMO

density **Keywords:** functional calculations · electronic structure · natural bond orbital analyses . platinum · polyynes

lar-scale devices.^[16]

gap also decreases. In contrast, the HOMO energies of HC_xH increase with chain length; the origin of this dichotomy is analyzed. The electronic spectra of PtC₄Pt to PtC₁₀Pt are simulated. These consist of two π - π * bands that redshift with increasing chain length and are closely paralleled by real systems. A finite HOMO-LUMO gap is predicted for PtC. The structures of PtC_xPt are not strictly linear (average bond angles 179.7°-178.8°), and the carbon chains give low-frequency fundamental vibrations (x=4,146 cm⁻¹; x = 26, 4 cm⁻¹). When the bond angles in PtC₁₂Pt are constrained to 174° in a bow conformation, similar to a crystal structure, the energy increase is only 2 kcal mol⁻¹. The above conclusions should extrapolate to $(C \equiv C)_n$ systems with other metal endgroups.

Introduction

There has been extensive interest recently in the synthesis and study of compounds comprised of long sp-carbon chains and transition-metal endgroups, $L_{\nu}MC_{x}ML_{\nu}^{-[1-14]}$ These efforts have been motivated by a number of fundamental and

6510

© 2004 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

applied objectives. For example, metal fragments provide dramatic stability enhancements over hydrogen or *n*-alkyl

endgroups, facilitating characterization of basic properties.

At longer chain lengths, models for the polymeric sp-carbon

allotrope "carbyne",^[15] the one-dimensional counterpart of graphite and diamond, are realized. Complexes in which

metals are bridged by unsaturated ligands also exhibit a rich variety of redox and charge or energy transfer phenomena,

and are under active investigation as components in molecu-

plexes can be viewed as the boundary between short- and

long-chained species.^[2-14] As more and more complexes with

longer chains have become available,^[7,8,10-14] all of which to

date are even carbon-chain polyynes or polyynediyl com-

plexes $M(C=C)_nM$, a variety of questions have arisen or

With the present state of synthetic art, $L_{\nu}MC_{8}ML_{\nu}$ com-

[[]a] Dr. F. Zhuravlev, Prof. Dr. J. A. Gladysz Institut für Organische Chemie Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg Henkestraße 42, 91054 Erlangen (Germany) Fax: (+49)9131-852-6865 E-mail: gladysz@organik.uni-erlangen.de

Supporting information for this article (tables of total and zero point energies, bond angles for PtC_rPt , and bond lengths for HC_rH) is available on the WWW under http://www.chemeurj.org/ or from the author.

been brought into sharper focus. There are numerous fundamental issues involving bond lengths and angles, not only with respect to carbyne but also the parent polyynes $H(C=C)_nH$ (HC_xH ; x=2n). For example, how do the metal endgroups affect or regulate charge distribution, and is metal/ligand d- π communication involved? Some of these subjects have been touched upon in previous experimental and computational^[17] investigations of monometallic alkynyl or polyynyl (($C=C)_nR$) complexes. Several computational studies of the polyynes HC_xH have been reported,^[18–21] and provide important reference data for the results below.

In a recent review, we analyzed all crystallographically characterized octatetraynes and higher polyynes.^[22] Many of these are diplatinum complexes of the formula trans, trans- $[(X)(R_3P)_2Pt(C\equiv C)_nPt(PR_3)_2(X)]$, which constitute the most extensively developed type of long-chain L_vMC_xML_v species. Complexes with C_{16} bridges (n=8) have been isolated, and higher homologues will be reported soon.^[10b] In this paper, we describe a detailed computational investigation of model compounds of the formula *trans,trans*- $[(C_6H_5)(H_3P)_2Pt(C \equiv$ $C_nPt(PH_3)(C_6H_5)$ (**PtC_rPt**, Figure 1 below), with x (2n) ranging from 4 to 26. Objectives include the development of 1) a comprehensive model for structure and bonding, 2) rationales for the "chain-length effects" noted for various structural, spectroscopic, and chemical properties, 3) models for the principal electronic transitions, and 4) energy profiles for endgroup rotation and carbon-chain bending-phenomena relevant to several unexpected crystallographic observations.

Other computational studies of structure and bonding in complexes of the type $L_yMC_xML_y$ have been reported.^[3b,23-28] However, only one has involved species with comparable carbon-chain lengths,^[28] and none have examined conformational distortions. While our data were being readied for publication, an important complementary treatment of electronic transitions in the digold complexes $[(R_3P)Au(C \equiv C)_nAu(PR_3)]$ (n = 1-6) appeared.^[25] A theoretical investigation of the electronic structure of a polymeric PtC₆Pt species, *trans,trans*-[(H₃P)₂Pt{(C \equiv C)₃Pt(PH₃)₂-}_∞], has also been described.^[29]

Computational Methods

All calculations were carried out using density functional theory (DFT) as implemented in the Jaguar $5^{[30]}$ and the Gaussian $98^{[31]}$ suite of programs. Geometries were optimized using Jaguar at the B3LYP^[32]/ LACVP* level, which employs the Hay/Wadt^[33] relativistic effective core potential with explicit treatment of the platinum valence electrons (5s,5p,5d,6s,6p) and a standard 6-31G* basis set for other atoms. Optimizations began with Csp-Csp bond angles of 180°, and were constrained to $C_{2\nu}$ symmetry for **PtC_rPt** and $D_{\infty h}$ symmetry for **HC_rH**. Atoms were labeled as exemplified in Figure 1. The optimized structures were characterized as energy minima by vibrational frequency calculations at the B3LYP/LACVP* level. Total energies and zero point energies are given in Table s1 (see the Supporting Information). Natural bond orbital analyses (NBO)^[34] were performed on Jaguar B3LYP/LACVP* Kohn-Sham wave functions. These were also used for the frontier molecular orbital (FMO) and charge decomposition analyses (CDA).^[35] The latter were carried out with the program AOMix-CDA.[36] The lowest excited states of the Jaguar-optimized structures were calculated using time-dependent DFT at the LANL2DZ(d) level as implemented in the Gaussian 98 package.

Results and Discussion

Structures of complexes PtC_xPt : The bond lengths calculated for PtC_xPt are summarized in Table 1. These and all other geometrical features are in good agreement with those found crystallographically for analogues with $(p-tol)(Ar_3P)_2$ -Pt endgroups (x=6, 8, 12).^[10] The experimental data are given in italics (Table 1). The average deviation between theory and experiment is 0.019 Å, with the largest discrepancy being 0.04 Å. This close correspondence provides confidence that the computational methods accurately describe the real systems.

A representative structure is shown in Figure 1. The bond angles about the square-planar platinum atoms are very close to 90° and 180°, and those of the Pt-C_{sp}-C_{sp} and C_{sp} -C_{sp}-C_{sp} segments are very close to 180°; these data are provided in the Supporting Information (Table s2). However, it is important to note that most of the Pt-C_{sp}-C_{sp} and C_{sp} -C_{sp}-C_{sp} angles are in fact slightly less than 180° (range: 178.2–180.0°). This is further analyzed below.

Another key structural feature is the torsional relationship between the platinum square planes. Given that the geometries were optimized with $C_{2\nu}$ symmetry, the relative angles are constrained to 0°. Hence, another series of calculations was conducted with **PtC₈Pt** to define the torsionalenergy profile. The geometry of each additional structure was fully optimized except for the torsion-angle constraint. As shown in Figure 2, the potential surface is quite flat. Although 0° represents the energy minimum, the maximum (90°; C_2) lies only 0.12 kcalmol⁻¹ higher.

One conclusion immediately follows. The crystal structures of seven complexes of the formula *trans,trans*- $[(X)(Ar_3P)_2Pt(C\equiv C)_nPt(PAr_3)_2(X)]$ with $n \ge 4$, or analogues with trialkyl or aryl/alkyl phosphines, have been reported.^[22] In unpublished work, we have structurally characterized several additional examples. In all cases, the torsion angles of the platinum square planes are between 0.0° and 16.6°.^[37] As there is no enthalpic basis for this conformational preference, there must be a broad underlying crystal packing effect that is applicable to many lattice motifs and space groups.

Chain-length effects

Bond lengths: The computational data reveal numerous chain-length effects. The most obvious starting point involves the bond distances in Table 1. All C=C triple bonds lengthen and all $\equiv C-C\equiv$ single bonds contract as the sp chain in **PtC_xPt** is expanded from 4 to 26 carbon atoms (horizontal relationships). The terminal Pt-C1 single bonds also become progressively shorter (2.039 to 2.031 Å, 0.4%). The $\equiv C-C\equiv$ bonds between C2/C3 and C4/C5 exhibit the largest overall changes, -0.02 and -0.01 Å; other differences are less than ± 0.008 Å. It is clear that the C=C and $\equiv C-C\equiv$ bond lengths are approaching distinct asymptotic limits, as opposed to a common asymptotic limit.

One apparent question is how these and other trends compare to the parent compounds HC_xH . The computational data show similar patterns,^[18–21,38] but with two notable ex-

FULL PAPER

Table 1. Bond lengths in *trans,trans*-[(Ar)(R₃P)₂Pt(C=C)_nPt(PR₃)₂(Ar)]: Calculated (Ar/PR₃=Ph/PH₃; PtC_xPt) and *Experimental* (Ar/PR₃/n=p-tol/P(p-tol)₃/3, p-tol/P(p-tol)₃/4, p-tol/P(p-tol)₃/5, p-tol/P(p-tol)₃/6) values (unitalicized/*italicized*).

	Number of sp-carbon atoms (x) in PtC_xPt										
	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	24	26
Pt-C1	2.039	2.035 2.030(3)	2.035 2.011(4)	2.034 1.990(3)	2.033 1.990(3)	2.032	2.031	2.032	2.031	2.031	2.031
C1C2	1.233	1.235 1.193(5)	1.237 1.218(6)	1.238 1.190(5)	1.237 1.233(4)	1.238	1.238	1.239	1.239	1.238	1.239
C2-C3	1.366	1.355 1.388(5)	1.353 1.368(6)	1.349 1.404(4)	1.350 1.358(4)	1.348	1.347	1.347	1.346	1.345	1.345
C3-C4		1.231 1.211(7)	1.233 1.223(6)	1.234 1.215(5)	1.235 1.210(5)	1.235	1.236	1.236	1.236	1.236	1.237
C4–C5			1.346 1.367(9)	1.342 1.342(5)	1.339 1.356(5)	1.337	1.337	1.336	1.337	1.335	1.335
C5-C6				1.236 1.228(7)	1.237 1.211(5)	1.238	1.238	1.239	1.239	1.239	1.240
C6-C7					1.338 1.344(7)	1.336	1.335	1.333	1.333	1.332	1.332
C7-C8 C8-C9 C9-C10 C10-C11 C11-C12 C12-C13						1.238	1.239 1.334	1.240 1.333 1.240	1.240 1.332 1.240 1.332	1.241 1.331 1.242 1.330 1.242	1.241 1.330 1.242 1.330 1.241 1.330
Pt-C(Aryl)	2.103	2.101 2.056(5)	2.100 2.064(4)	2.100 2.078(3)	2.099 2.099(3)	2.099	2.099	2.098	2.098	2.098	2.098
Pt-P1	2.291	2.293 2.295(10)	2.296 2.307(11)	2.296 2.301(8)	2.297 2.297(8)	2.297	2.298	2.299	2.299	2.300	2.300
Pt-P2	2.299	2.300 2.300(10)	2.303 2.300(11)	2.305 2.310(9)	2.306 2.306(8)	2.306	2.307	2.307	2.307	2.308	2.308



Figure 1. Representative computed structure $(\mbox{Pt}C_8\mbox{Pt})$ and atom-labeling scheme.



Figure 2. Energy profile for endgroup rotation in PtC₈Pt.

ceptions: 1) the terminal H–C single bond lengths remain essentially constant (1.066 Å); 2) the C=C triple bonds are

shortest at the termini (C1/C2 1.213 Å in HC_4H or 1.218 Å in $HC_{20}H$), and become progressively longer as the midpoint of the chain is approached. In contrast, the C1/C2 triple bonds in PtC_xPt are always longer than the neighboring C3/C4 triple bonds; subsequent interior triple bonds (e.g., C5/C6) become, as with HC_xH , progressively longer (vertical relationships in Table 1). Although analogous trends are seen in some experimental data, the estimated standard deviation (esd) values are normally too large to permit rigorous conclusions.^[39] In any case, our data suggest an overriding endgroup effect on the C1/C2 distances in PtC_xPt , a subject addressed in detail below.

For both PtC_xPt and HC_xH , the $\equiv C-C\equiv$ single bonds become progressively shorter as the midpoint of the chain is approached. However, single/triple bond alternation is clearly maintained in each molecule, in accord with all previous computational studies of X(C=C)_nX systems.^[17d,18,19,21] The difference in length between the shortest $\equiv C - C \equiv$ single bond and the longest C=C triple bond has been defined as the bond-alternation parameter, δ .^[40] The value for **PtC**₂₀**Pt** (0.097 Å) is smaller than that of $HC_{20}H$ (0.105 Å), and that for $PtC_{26}Pt$ (0.094 Å) is smaller than those of $HC_{26}H$ (1.102 Å) and HC₄₀H (0.097 Å; the longest such species computationally investigated).^[21b,38] This suggests that PtC_rPt has a lower degree of bond alternation than HC_rH , and converges to an asymptotic limit more rapidly. The anionic species $\mathbf{HC}_{\mathbf{x}}^{-}$ exhibits a still lower degree of bond alternation,^[21a,c] implying a correlation with the electronegativity of the endgroup.

In order to interpret the different bond-length patterns involving the HC=C and PtC=C linkages in HC_xH and **PtC_xPt**, the nature of interactions of the platinum endgroups with the sp-carbon chains must be analyzed. To what degree is there communication through the π manifold and how important are the other contributions, such as charge effects? In previous computational studies of metal–alkynyl complexes, it has been noted that the MC=C bond lengths are strong functions of the metal–carbon σ component and the "tightness" of a C=C triple bond.^[17b] We therefore turned to population analysis as a means to separate the σ - and π -bonding contributions.

Population and charge distribution analysis: Natural bond orbital (NBO) analysis has proved to be a powerful tool for describing bonding and charge distribution in terms of localized orbitals.^[41] Table 2 lists the natural electron populations and corresponding cumulative bond orders calculated for PtC_xPt ; the latter were taken as half the difference of the bonding and antibonding electron populations.

The cumulative C=C triple bond orders (Table 2) generally show an inverse relationship to the bond lengths (Table 1), except for the terminal PtC=C moieties. These have the highest bond order of all triple bonds but remain longer than the C3/C4 triple bonds. Upon going from PtC₄Pt to PtC₂₆Pt, the PtC=C bond orders drop from 2.782 to 2.727 (2.00%), in accord with the bond-length trend noted above. Inspection of the natural populations shows that this decrease is due to electron depletion in the π bonding orbitals and increased occupancy of the π^* antibonding orbitals. There is virtually no change in the σ bond order (0.983 to 0.982, 0.1%).

The change in the π populations of the C3/C4 C=C triple bond is even more pronounced. Now the cumulative bond orders decrease from 2.664 to 2.600 (2.4%), again with no change in the σ population. Indeed, all C=C bonds undergo bond-order reduction through the π manifold, although comparisons must be made over narrower ranges (e.g., from **PtC**₁₀**Pt** to **PtC**₂₆**Pt** for C5/C6 C=C). In contrast, the C2/C3 =*C*-*C*= single bond order shows a gradual increase from 0.967 to 0.973 (0.62%).

Thus, while the NBO population analysis describes quite satisfactorily the changes in the internal bond lengths (C2/C3 through C(x-2)/C(x-3)), it cannot adequately account for all features of the PtC=C linkage. One factor often invoked to rationalize metal-carbon bond-length trends is $d-\pi^*$ backbonding. If $d-\pi^*$ backbonding is significant, a corresponding increase in the π^* population of the PtC=C bond would be expected. As it turns out, this population is small (only 0.11 e) and remains the smallest population of all π^* orbitals across the entire PtC_xPt series. Moreover, this trend exactly parallels that observed for HC_xH, for which no backbonding is possible. Additional probes for $d-\pi^*$ interactions will be described below.

Table 3 lists the NBO charge distributions calculated for PtC_xPt . These provide complimentary insight regarding the PtC=C bond lengths. Upon going from PtC_4Pt to $PtC_{26}Pt$, the platinum atoms become more positively charged, whereas the sp-carbon chains become more negatively charged (bottom entry). This is consistent with the bond-length trend as well as the experimental Brønsted acidities of terminal

polyynes.^[42] The latter increase with sp-carbon-chain length, indicating progressively greater negative charge stabilization.

We also find, in agreement with earlier computational studies of metal polyynyl complexes,^[17d] substantial localization of the negative charge on the two terminal C=C atoms at each end. This is particularly pronounced with shorter carbon chains. For example, 89% of the total charge on the chain in **PtC₈Pt** is found at C1/C2. As the chain lengthens, some negative charge flows towards the midpoint. Thus, 77% of the total charge on the chain in **PtC₁₀Pt** is found at C1/C2. Charge alternation patterns also develop. Once **PtC₁₀Pt** is reached, the negatively charged C1/C2 atoms are followed by a positively charged C3 atom. However, regardless of the sign, the total charge on the interior atoms (C3 to C(x-3)) is always much less than those on C1/C2.

The charge distributions provide a clear rationale for the endgroup effect upon bond lengths: The increase in Pt/C1 charge polarizations with chain length leads to stronger electrostatic attraction between the platinum atoms and the carbon chains and shorter bonds, while repulsion between the negatively charged C1 and C2 atoms causes the "anomalous" lengthening of the C1/C2 C=C bond relative to interior C=C bonds. Also, the electrostatic attraction between C2 and C3 increases with chain length, consistent with the greater decrease in bond lengths as compared to other $\equiv C-C\equiv$ bonds.

This model also rationalizes an analogous endgroup effect found in a computational study of LiC_xLi (x=2-8).^[44] For x=6 and 8, the terminal LiC=C triple bonds were similarly longer than the neighboring internal C=C bonds. We therefore predict that comparable trends will be found for all conjugated polyynes with electropositive endgroups.

Orbital analyses: Frontier molecular orbital (FMO) analysis is another valuable approach to rationalizing molecular properties.^[45] Accordingly, the FMOs of PtC_4Pt to $PtC_{26}Pt$ were calculated. The contours and energies of the HOMOs through to $PtC_{20}Pt$ are summarized in Table 4, together with the degree of platinum/sp-carbon-chain character.

The HOMOs can be viewed as antibonding combinations of the highest occupied π orbital of the sp-carbon-chain fragment and the filled in-plane d orbitals of the two platinum fragments. The nodal patterns on the carbon chains are analogous to those that would be expected for simple polyynes and polyenes from the Hückel MO theory. The next highest occupied orbitals (HOMO-1) are essentially out-ofplane counterparts of the HOMOs that utilize orthogonal platinum d and C=C π orbitals. The LUMOs are bonding combinations of the lowest unoccupied π orbital of the carbon-chain fragment and the platinum d orbitals.

The HOMOs are strongly delocalized over the $Pt/C_x/Pt$ framework, with the platinum character roughly proportional to the $Pt/C_x/Pt$ composition. This is significant for the first members of the series (31% in PtC_4Pt , for which 33% of the atoms are platinum), but drops sharply for later members of the series (6% in $PtC_{20}Pt$, for which 9% of the atoms are platinum). Consequently, the HOMOs of the longer-chain compounds are almost exclusively carbon-

Table 2. Natural population and bond order data for PtC_xPt .^[a,b]

4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 24 26 al C1-C2 1914 1.883 1.876 77.768 77.778 77.778 77.778 77.778 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.778 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777 77.777					Nı	umber of sp-	carbon atom	is (x) in PtC .	_x Pt			
Patool 7.774 7.770 7.780 7.786 1.881 <t< th=""><th></th><th>4</th><th>6</th><th>8</th><th>10</th><th>12</th><th>14</th><th>16</th><th>18</th><th>20</th><th>24</th><th>26</th></t<>		4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	24	26
r1 C1C2 1.94 1.89 1.875 1.877 1.867 1.862 1.861 1.875 1.875 r2 C1C2 1.900 1.886 1.877 1.877 1.877 1.877 1.871 1.861 1.819 1.819 1.815 1.815 1.815 r2 C1C2 1.900 1.982 1.983 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 1.881 <td< td=""><td>Pt-total</td><td>77.774</td><td>77.770</td><td>77.770</td><td>77.768</td><td>77.767</td><td>77.766</td><td>77.766</td><td>77.766</td><td>77.765</td><td>77.765</td><td>77.765</td></td<>	Pt-total	77.774	77.770	77.770	77.768	77.767	77.766	77.766	77.766	77.765	77.765	77.765
al C1C.2 ⁺ C1C2 ⁺	π ¹ C1-C2	1.914	1.894	1.883	1.876	1.871	1.867	1.865	1.862	1.861	1.858	1.857
a ² C1 C2 1.900 1.886 1.877 1.877 1.867 1.861 1.899 1.899 1.895 1.854 1.854 a C1 C2 1.905 1.982 1.933 1.973	π^{1} C1-C2*	0.108	0.113	0.114	0.113	0.113	0.113	0.113	0.113	0.113	0.112	0.112
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π^2 C1-C2	1.900	1.886	1.877	1.871	1.867	1.864	1.861	1.859	1.858	1.855	1.854
a C1 C2 1983 1975 1976 1976 1976	$\pi^2 C1-C2^*$	0.106	0.112	0.112	0.112	0.112	0.111	0.111	0.111	0.110	0.110	0.110
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	σ C1-C2	1.982	1.982	1.982	1.982	1.982	1.982	1.982	1.982	1.982	1.982	1.982
	σ C1-C2*	0.017	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018	0.018
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	bond order	2 782	2 760	2 749	2 743	2 738	2 735	2 733	2 731	2 729	2 727	2 727
e (2-C3 1.970 0.973 1.97	bolid order	2.762	2.700	2.749	2.745	2.750	2.155	2.155	2.751	2.12)	2.727	2.727
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	σ C2-C3	1.970	1.973	1.973	1.973	1.973	1.973	1.973	1.973	1.973	1.973	1.974
band arder 0.987 0.972 0.972 0.972 0.972 0.972 0.973 0.973 0.973 0.973 0.973 0.973 0.973 0.973 0.973 1^2 CS-C4 1.866 1.848 1.838 1.832 1.828 1.825 1.823 1.823 1.821 1.818 1.817 1^2 C-C4 0.173 0.185 0.188 0.188 0.182 1.820 1.818 1.818 0.181 1.813 1.829 1.831 1.820 1.976 1.975 0.022 0.022 0.020	σ C2-C3*	0.036	0.029	0.029	0.029	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028	0.028
n ² C3-C4 1866 1.848 1.838 1.832 1.828 1.823 1.821 1.818 1.818 n ² C3-C4 1.81 1.839 1.839 1.831 1.820 1.812 1.823 1.818 1.818 n ² C3-C4 1.81 1.839 1.830 1.810 1.822 1.810 1.818 1.818 n ² C3-C4 1.975 1.976 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.975 1.976 <td>bond order</td> <td>0.967</td> <td>0.972</td> <td>0.972</td> <td>0.972</td> <td>0.972</td> <td>0.972</td> <td>0.972</td> <td>0.973</td> <td>0.973</td> <td>0.973</td> <td>0.973</td>	bond order	0.967	0.972	0.972	0.972	0.972	0.972	0.972	0.973	0.973	0.973	0.973
n ¹ C3-C4* 1072 10.184 0.188 0.180 0.191 0.192 0.192 0.192 0.192 0.192 0.192 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.193 0.194 0.195 0.197 0.19 0.19 0.19 0.19 0.19 0.19 0.19 0.19	π^1 C3-C4		1.866	1.848	1.838	1.832	1.828	1.825	1.823	1.821	1.818	1.817
n ² C3-C4 1.81 1.820 1.820 1.820 1.820 1.810 1.816 1.814 1.813 o C3-C4 1.976 1.975 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976	π^1 C3-C4*		0.172	0.184	0.188	0.190	0.191	0.192	0.192	0.192	0.193	0.193
n ² (C3-C4* 0.173 0.185 0.189 0.191 0.192 0.193 0.193 0.194 0.194 0.194 0.194 0.396 0.236 0.236 0.220 0.221 0.221 0.220 0.220 0.220 0.221 0.221 0.220 0.220 0.220 0.221	π^2 C3-C4		1.851	1.839	1.831	1.826	1.822	1.820	1.818	1.816	1.814	1.813
a C3-C4 band order 1.976 2.664 1.976 2.67 1.976 2.064 1.976 2.021 0.021 0.021 0.021 0.021 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.022 0.022 0.022 0.020 0.022 0.020 0.021 0.021 0.021 0.021 0.021 <td>π^2 C3-C4*</td> <td></td> <td>0.173</td> <td>0.185</td> <td>0.189</td> <td>0.191</td> <td>0.192</td> <td>0.193</td> <td>0.193</td> <td>0.194</td> <td>0.194</td> <td>0.194</td>	π^2 C3-C4*		0.173	0.185	0.189	0.191	0.192	0.193	0.193	0.194	0.194	0.194
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	σ C3-C4		1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976
bend order 2.664 2.637 2.624 2.616 2.611 2.608 2.605 2.603 2.600 2.600 $\sigma C4-C5^{\circ}$ $\sigma C4-C5^{\circ}$ $\sigma C4-C5^{\circ}$ $\sigma C4-C5^{\circ}$ $\sigma C4-C5^{\circ}$ $\tau C5-C6^{\circ}$ $\tau C5-C7^{\circ}$ $\tau C5-C8^{\circ}$ $\tau C5-C7^{\circ}$ $\tau C7-C8^{\circ}$ $\tau C7-C8$	σ C3-C4*		0.021	0.021	0.021	0.021	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020	0.020
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	bond order		2.664	2.637	2.624	2.616	2.611	2.608	2.605	2.603	2.600	2.600
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	σ C4-C5			1.975	1.975	1.975	1.975	1.975	1.975	1.975	1.975	1.975
bond order 0.976 0.976 0.977 0.976 0.218 0.219 0.215 0.256 0.256 0.219 0.215 0.208 0.209 0.215 0.256 0.256 0.200 0.216 0.201 0.020 0.026 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.021 0.020 0.006 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.020 0.021	σ C4-C5*			0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	bond order			0.976	0.976	0.977	0.977	0.977	0.977	0.977	0.977	0.977
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π^1 C5-C6				1 831	1 821	1 820	1 812	1 809	1 807	1 804	1 808
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π^{1} C5-C6*				0.108	0.202	0.213	0.205	0.207	0.208	0.209	0.215
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\pi^2 C5 C6$				1.826	1.817	1 817	1.810	1.807	1.805	1.802	1 806
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$-^{2}C5C6*$				0.109	0.202	0.212	0.205	1.807	1.803	0.200	0.216
$\begin{array}{cccccccc} 0 & 0.5^{-0.6} & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.011 & 0.021 & 0.021 & 0.021 & 0.021 & 0.021 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.011 & 0.021 & 0.021 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.011 & 0.022 & 0.011 & 0.022 & 0.011 & 0.022 & 0.011 & 0.021 & 0.021 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 & 0.022 & 0.021 &$	π CS-C0*				0.198	0.205	0.215	0.205	0.207	0.208	0.209	0.210
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0 CS-C6				1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.976
bond order 2.608 2.59 2.58 2.58 2.58 2.58 2.57 2.57 2.57 2.59 2.59 σ C6-C7 σ 1.975 1.972 1.975 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 1.976 σ C6-C7 σ 0.022 0.022 0.022 0.022 0.020 0.001 σ 0.022 0.022 0.020 0.097 0.977 0.977 0.977 0.977 σ 0.976 π^2 C7-C8 π^2 0.200 0.206 0.220 0.211 0.214 0.207 σ C7-C8 π^2 0.200 0.206 0.220 0.211 0.214 0.207 σ C7-C8 π^2 0.200 0.206 0.220 0.211 0.214 0.207 σ C7-C8 π^2 0.200 0.206 0.220 0.211 0.214 0.207 σ C7-C8 π^2 0.200 0.206 0.220 0.211 0.214 0.207 σ C7-C8 π^2 0.200 0.206 0.220 0.211 0.214 0.207 σ C7-C8 π^2 0.200 0.206 0.220 0.211 0.214 0.207 σ C7-C8 π^2 0.200 0.206 0.220 0.211 0.214 0.210 0.001 σ C7-C8 π^2 0.016 0.019 0.021 0.021 0.002 0.0018 σ C7-C8 π^2 0.017 0.200 0.0022 0.021 0.021 0.0021 0.0021 0.0021 0.0021 0.0021 0.0022 0.0011 σ C7-C8 σ 0.977 0.977 π^2 0.977 σ	σ CS-C6*				0.021	0.021	0.021	0.021	0.021	0.021	0.021	0.021
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	bond order				2.608	2.595	2.583	2.584	2.578	2.576	2.572	2.569
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	σ C6-C7					1.975	1.972	1.975	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.973
bond order 0.977 0.976 0.976 0.977 0.977 0.977 0.977 0.977 0.977 0.977 0.976 π^1 C7-C8 1.789 1.810 1.807 1.801 1.797 1.788 π^1 C7-C8* 0.200 0.206 0.220 0.211 0.214 0.207 π^2 C7-C8* 1.786 1.808 1.806 1.800 1.796 1.776 1.973 c C7-C8* 0.016 0.019 0.021 0.021 0.021 0.021 0.021 c C7-C8* 0.016 0.019 0.021 0.021 0.020 0.018 bond order 2.563 2.580 2.564 2.567 2.561 2.558 o C8-C9* 0.016 0.017 0.020 0.022 0.021 0.022 bond order 2.563 2.580 2.564 2.567 2.561 2.558 o C8-C9* 0.017 0.977	σ C6-C7*					0.022	0.020	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.022	0.020
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	bond order					0.977	0.976	0.976	0.977	0.977	0.977	0.976
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π ¹ C7-C8						1.789	1.810	1.807	1.801	1.797	1.788
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π^1 C7-C8*						0.200	0.206	0.220	0.211	0.214	0.207
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π^2 C7-C8						1.786	1.808	1.806	1.800	1.796	1.787
σ C7-C81.9661.9741.9761.9761.9761.973 σ C7-C8*0.0160.0190.0210.0210.0200.018bond order2.5632.5642.5672.5612.558 σ C8-C91.9651.9731.9751.9761.975 σ C8-C90.0170.0200.0220.0210.022bond order0.9740.9760.9770.977 π^1 C9-C10*1.7761.8001.7941.792 π^2 C9-C10*0.2050.2090.2140.214 σ C9-C10*0.9761.9741.9761.976 π^2 C9-C10*0.2050.2090.2140.214 σ C9-C10*0.9761.9741.9761.976 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021bond order0.2050.2090.2140.214 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021bond order0.9740.9760.9770.977 τ^2 C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021bond order0.9740.9760.9770.977 σ C10-C11*0.0170.0220.0210.021bond order0.9740.9770.9770.977 τ^1 C11-C121.9661.9761.976 τ^1 C11-C12*1.9661.9761.796 τ^2 C11-C121.7961.7961.796 σ C11-C120.2120.2250.211 σ C11-C120.214 <td>$\pi^2 C7-C8^*$</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.200</td> <td>0.206</td> <td>0.220</td> <td>0.211</td> <td>0.214</td> <td>0.207</td>	$\pi^2 C7-C8^*$						0.200	0.206	0.220	0.211	0.214	0.207
σ C7-C8*0.0160.0190.0210.0210.0200.018bond order2.5632.5802.5642.5672.5612.558 σ C8-C91.9651.9731.9751.9761.975 σ C8-C9*0.0170.0200.0220.0210.022bond order0.9740.9760.9770.9770.977 π^1 C9-C101.7771.8011.7951.793 π^1 C9-C10*0.2050.2090.2140.214 π^2 C9-C100.2050.2090.2140.214 σ C9-C10*0.2050.2090.2140.214 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021bond order2.5462.5692.5582.556 σ C10-C11*1.9661.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C11*1.9661.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C11*1.9661.9741.9761.976 σ C10-C11*1.9761.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C11*1.9761.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C11*1.9761.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C12*1.9661.9741.9761.976 π^2 C11-C12*1.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C121.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C12*1.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C141.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C12*1.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C12*1.9761.	σ C7-C8						1.966	1.974	1.976	1.976	1.976	1.973
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	σ C7-C8*						0.016	0.019	0.021	0.021	0.020	0.018
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	bond order						2.563	2.580	2.564	2.567	2.561	2.558
σ C8-C91.9651.9731.9751.9761.975 σ C8-C9*0.0170.0200.0220.0210.022bond order0.9740.9760.9770.977 π^1 C9-C101.7771.8011.7951.793 π^1 C9-C10*0.2050.2090.2140.214 π^2 C9-C100.2050.2090.2140.214 σ C9-C10*0.2050.2090.2140.214 σ C9-C101.9761.9761.976 σ C9-C100.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C100.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C100.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C100.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C100.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021bond order2.5462.5692.5582.556 σ C10-C11*0.0170.0220.021 σ C10-C11*0.0170.0220.021 σ C10-C12*1.9761.7961.796 σ C11-C12*1.7961.7961.795 σ C11-C12*0.2110.2250.2110.225 σ C11-C120.2110.2250.2110.225 σ C11-C120.9741.9761.976												
σ C8-C9*0.0170.0200.0220.0210.022bond order0.9740.9760.9770.9770.977 π^1 C9-C101.7771.8011.7951.793 π^1 C9-C10*0.2050.2090.2140.214 π^2 C9-C101.7761.8001.7941.792 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C101.9661.9741.9761.976 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021 σ C10-C11*0.0160.0170.9220.021bond order1.9661.9761.9761.976 σ C10-C11*0.0170.0220.0210.021 σ C10-C11*0.0170.0220.0210.225 π^1 C11-C12*1.7961.7961.7961.796 π^2 C11-C12*0.2120.2250.2110.225 σ C11-C121.9741.9761.9761.976	σ C8-C9							1.965	1.973	1.975	1.976	1.9/5
bond order 0.974 0.976 0.977 0.977 0.977 0.977 π^1 CP-C10 π^1 CP-C10* 1.777 1.801 1.795 1.793 π^1 CP-C10* 0.205 0.209 0.214 0.214 π^2 CP-C10 1.776 1.800 1.794 1.792 π^2 CP-C10* 0.205 0.209 0.214 0.214 π^2 CP-C10* 0.016 0.019 0.021 0.021 π^2 CP-C10* 0.017 0.022 0.021 π^2 CP-C10* 0.974 0.977 0.977 π^2 C11-C12* π^2 C11-C12* 1.796 1.796 π^2 C11-C12* 1.796 1.795 0.211 0.225 π^2 C11-C12* 1.974 1.976	σ C8-C9*							0.017	0.020	0.022	0.021	0.022
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	bond order							0.974	0.976	0.977	0.977	0.977
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π ¹ C9-C10								1.777	1.801	1.795	1.793
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π ¹ C9-C10*								0.205	0.209	0.214	0.214
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π^2 C9-C10								1.776	1.800	1.794	1.792
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	π^2 C9-C10*								0.205	0.209	0.214	0.214
σ C9-C10*0.0160.0190.0210.021bond order2.5462.5692.5582.556 σ C10-C111.9661.9761.976 σ C10-C11*0.0170.0220.021bond order0.9740.9770.977 π^1 C11-C121.7961.7961.796 π^1 C11-C12*0.2120.2251.796 π^2 C11-C121.7961.7950.211 σ C11-C120.2120.2251.974	σ C9-C10								1.966	1.974	1.976	1.976
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	σ C9-C10*								0.016	0.019	0.021	0.021
$ \begin{array}{c} \sigma \ {\rm C10-C11} & 1.966 & 1.976 & 1.976 \\ \sigma \ {\rm C10-C11^*} & 0.017 & 0.022 & 0.021 \\ 0.074 & 0.977 & 0.977 \\ \end{array} \\ \pi^1 \ {\rm C11-C12} & 1.796 & 1.796 \\ \pi^1 \ {\rm C11-C12^*} & 0.212 & 0.225 \\ \pi^2 \ {\rm C11-C12} & 1.796 & 1.795 \\ \pi^2 \ {\rm C11-C12^*} & 0.211 & 0.225 \\ \sigma \ {\rm C11-C12} & 1.974 & 1.976 \\ \end{array} $	bond order								2.546	2.569	2.558	2.556
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	a C10 C11									1 066	1 076	1 076
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\sigma C10 - C11$									1.900	1.9/0	1.970
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	u CIU-CII*									0.01/	0.022	0.021
$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi^1 \text{C11-C12} & & 1.796 & 1.796 \\ \pi^1 \text{C11-C12}^* & & 0.212 & 0.225 \\ \pi^2 \text{C11-C12} & & 1.796 & 1.795 \\ \pi^2 \text{C11-C12}^* & & 0.211 & 0.225 \\ \sigma \text{C11-C12} & & 1.974 & 1.976 \end{array}$	uona order									0.9/4	0.977	0.977
$ \begin{array}{ccc} \pi^1 {\rm C11-C12}^* & & 0.212 & 0.225 \\ \pi^2 {\rm C11-C12} & & 1.796 & 1.795 \\ \pi^2 {\rm C11-C12}^* & & 0.211 & 0.225 \\ \sigma {\rm C11-C12} & & 1.974 & 1.976 \\ \end{array} $	π ¹ C11-C12										1.796	1.796
$\begin{array}{ccc} \pi^2 \text{C11-C12} & & 1.796 & 1.795 \\ \pi^2 \text{C11-C12}^* & & 0.211 & 0.225 \\ \sigma \text{C11-C12} & & 1.974 & 1.976 \end{array}$	π^{1} C11-C12*										0.212	0.225
π² C11-C12* 0.211 0.225 σ C11-C12 1.974 1.976	π^2 C11-C12										1.796	1.795
σ C11-C12 1.974 1.976	π^2 C11-C12*										0.211	0.225
	σ C11-C12										1.974	1.976

6514 —

© 2004 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim www.chemeurj.org Chem. Eur. J. 2004, 10, 6510–6522

Table 2. (Continued)

	Number of sp-carbon atoms (x) in PtC_xPt										
	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	24	26
σ C11-C12*										0.019	0.021
bond order										2.562	2.548
σ C12-C13										1.966	1.973
σ C12-C13*										0.017	0.020
bond order										0.975	0.976
π ¹ C13-C14											1.767
π ¹ C13-C14*											0.209
π ² C13-C14											1.766
π ² C13-C14*											0.209
σ C13-C14											1.967
σ C13-C14*											0.016
bond order											2.532

[a] Bond orders are calculated as half the difference of the bonding and antibonding electron population as determined by NBO analysis. [b] Unstarred: bonding natural orbitals; starred: antibonding natural orbitals.

Table 3. Natural charge in PtC_xPt .

	Number of sp-carbon atoms (x) in PtC_xPt										
	4	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	24	26
Pt	0.226	0.230	0.230	0.232	0.233	0.234	0.234	0.234	0.235	0.235	0.235
C1	-0.354	-0.316	-0.296	-0.280	-0.269	-0.261	-0.256	-0.251	-0.247	-0.240	-0.239
C2	-0.182	-0.209	-0.215	-0.220	-0.225	-0.227	-0.228	-0.230	-0.231	-0.234	-0.233
C3		-0.033	-0.002	0.015	0.026	0.033	0.039	0.044	0.047	0.054	0.055
C4			-0.060	-0.067	-0.071	-0.073	-0.076	-0.077	-0.078	-0.080	-0.080
C5				-0.030	-0.014	-0.002	0.003	0.008	0.012	0.019	0.025
C6					-0.038	-0.101	-0.042	-0.047	-0.048	-0.051	-0.105
C7						0.037	-0.092	-0.004	-0.001	0.006	0.127
C8							0.052	-0.090	-0.029	-0.035	-0.106
C9								0.042	-0.090	-0.002	0.004
C10									0.059	-0.022	-0.026
C11										-0.089	-0.003
C12										0.063	-0.080
C13											0.049
total C _x	-0.536	-0.558	-0.572	-0.582	-0.590	-0.596	-0.600	-0.604	-0.607	-0.611	-0.613
chain charge											

chain-based. The HOMO-1 orbitals and LUMOs exhibit parallel trends.

As shown in Figure 3, both the HOMO and LUMO energies monotonically decrease upon going from PtC_4Pt to $PtC_{26}Pt$. The former trend is in sharp contrast to that of HC_xH (inset). For the hydrocarbons, the HOMO energies monotonically increase with chain length.^[38] The basis for this rise is the number of nodes per C=C unit, which increases from 1/2 for HC_4H to 1 for $HC_{\infty}H$. For reference, note that the increase in HOMO energies upon going from HC_4H to $HC_{20}H$ (+1.06 eV) is more pronounced than the decrease upon going from PtC_4Pt to $PtC_{20}Pt$ (-0.33 eV). The decrease in LUMO energies in both series of compounds is substantial (HC_4H to $HC_{20}H$, -2.77 eV; PtC_4Pt to $PtC_{20}Pt$, -1.64 eV).

The effect of the platinum endgroup upon the HOMO energies of PtC_xPt can be rationalized as follows. As noted above, the HOMOs are antibonding combinations of the highest occupied π orbital of the carbon-chain fragment and occupied d orbitals on the platinum fragments. This destabilizing interaction, which has no counterpart in $\mathbf{HC}_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{H}$, is reflected in the consistently higher HOMO energies (e.g., -4.69 eV for $\mathbf{PtC}_{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{Pt}$ versus -6.44 eV for $\mathbf{HC}_{\mathbf{s}}\mathbf{H}$). Since the platinum and C_1 coefficients decrease with chain length, the destabilization attenuates. This diminution in energy is apparently larger than the increase associated with the greater number of nodes in the carbon-chain fragment.^[46] This trend has been documented computationally for other $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{C}=\mathbf{C})_n\mathbf{M}$ systems, although over a smaller range of chain lengths $(n \le 4)$, and similarly interpreted.^[3b, 23c]

Importantly, the LUMO energies of PtC_xPt decrease more rapidly than the HOMO energies. Consequently, the HOMO-LUMO gap also decreases, but in progressively smaller increments suggestive of a non-zero value for the infinite chain limit $PtC_{\infty}Pt$. To probe this point, the HOMO-LUMO gap was plotted versus 1/n, the inverse of the number of C=C bonds (1/2x). As illustrated in Figure s1 (see Supporting Information), the relationship was linear $(r^2=0.995)$. The y intercept, corresponding to $n=\infty$, indicated a residual value of 1.49 eV (832 nm). Optical spectra of

Table 4. Selected data for the HOMOs of **PtC**_{*x*}**Pt**.

	Energy [eV]	Symmetry	Pt/sp-chain character [%]	HOMO ^[a]
PtC₄Pt	-4.656	a ₂	31/66	
PtC ₆ Pt	-4.663	b ₁	22/76	-
PtC ₈ Pt	-4.696	a ₂	17/82	
PtC ₁₀ Pt	-4.749	b ₁	14/86	
PtC ₁₂ Pt	-4.801	a ₂	10/90	-X x = = = = = = X X -
PtC ₁₄ Pt	-4.852	b ₁	10/90	-X=====×-X-
PtC ₁₆ Pt	-4.898	a ₂	8/92	-X
PtC ₁₈ Pt	-4.942	b_1	7/93	-X ×=====× X
PtC ₂₀ Pt	-4.983	a ₂	6/94	-☆× ::::::: ×☆

[a] The relative sizes of the orbitals reflect the coefficients at the corresponding atoms.



Figure 3. Energies of frontier molecular orbitals (FMOs) of PtC_xPt as a function of chain length in which \bigcirc =HOMO, +=HOMO-1, \square = LUMO, and \blacklozenge =LUMO+1, and (inset) related data for HC_xH.

all long-chain conjugated polyynes studied to date lead to analogous conclusions, [8, 11, 47] as further elaborated below.

These FMO properties have some important ramifications. First, on the basis of Koopmans' theorem, an increase in ionization potential with chain length would be expected. Accordingly, cyclic voltammograms of the diplatinum complexes trans, trans-[(X)(R₃P)₂Pt(C=C)_nPt(PR₃)₂(X)],^[10-12] as well as related dirhenium species,^[8,9] indicate thermodynamically less favorable oxidations with increasing chain length.^[48] Secondly, other combinations of occupied and unoccupied orbitals mirror the decreasing HOMO-LUMO gap, as illustrated for the LUMO+1 and HOMO-1 energies in Table 5. This should lead to progressively redshifted UV/ visible absorptions, as observed with all families of conjugated polyynes. The HOMO and HOMO-1 energies are nearly degenerate, with a vanishing small difference at longer sp-chain lengths where the chain character becomes very high.

One caveat regarding the ionization potentials deserves emphasis. The above data were obtained using DFT calculations, and Kohn–Sham orbitals were used for the FMO analyses. It is still not clear to what degree Kohn–Sham orbitals can be reliably used in connection with the Koopmans' theorem. However, the recent literature indicates that Kohn– Sham orbitals can be used with confidence at least qualitatively.^[49] Furthermore, a linear relationship between Har-

Table 5. Charge decomposition analysis of PtC_4Pt , with $D = PtC_4^-$ (donor) and $A = Pt^+$ (acceptor). ^[a]							
Orbital	Energy [eV]	Symmetry	$d (\mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{A})$	$b (\mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{D})$	r	Orbital	
HOMO-10	-6.91	b ₂	0.124	-0.012	-0.154	-:: :: ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	*
НОМО-9	-6.84	\mathbf{a}_1	0.11	-0.014	-0.118	-: :::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	-
HOMO-8	-6.72	b_1	0.006	0.018	-0.066	****	Č,
HOMO-7	-6.48	b ₂	0.048	-0.02	-0.128	-;; { }	••
HOMO-6	-6.47	\mathbf{a}_1	0.066	0.012	-0.116	-::(**•
НОМО-5	-6.24	a_2	0	0	0	· = * · · · *	B
HOMO-4	-6.24	b ₁	0	0	0		B
НОМО-3	-5.98	b ₂	0	0	0.002		
НОМО-2	-5.91	\mathbf{a}_1	0	0.002	-0.004	() ;;;;;;	
HOMO-1	-4.74	b ₂	0.022	-0.022	-0.126	•)¤00 #	C.
НОМО	-4.66	a_2	0.046	-0.014	-0.094		Ņ.
total over all MO			0.283	-0.084	-0.521		

[a] d represents the donation from **D** to **A**, and b the back-donation from **A** to **D**; r is the electron repulsion term.

tree–Fock and Kohn–Sham orbital energies has been observed.^[49]

Charge decomposition analysis: As noted above, the NBO population analysis gave no indication of any significant $d-\pi^*$ backbonding (Table 2). In order to further probe this point, a charge decomposition analysis (CDA)^[35] was performed on the first member of the series, **PtC₄Pt**. This technique partitions ligand-metal interactions into donation/back-donation components analogous to those of the Dewar-Chatt-Duncanson model.

Towards this end, the linear combination of Kohn–Sham orbitals of the donor (**D**) fragment PtC_4^- and the acceptor (**A**) fragment Pt^+ were used to describe PtC_4Pt . The results of the charge decomposition are summarized in Table 5. The

quantity *d* represents the donation from **D** to **A**, and *b* the back-donation from **A** to **D**. The electron repulsion term *r* indicates the amount of electron density removed from the bonding area into non-overlapping regions. These quantities can be totaled over all molecular orbitals (final entry). From the resulting absolute values of *d* and *b*, a net flow of electrons from $\mathbf{PtC_4}^-$ to $\mathbf{Pt^+}$ is apparent. The negative sign of *r* indicates a reduced closed-shell repulsion with respect to the superimposed fragments.

Additional insight can be gleaned from the relative contributions of the ten highest occupied molecular orbitals to bond formation. The four orbitals HOMO-2, HOMO-3, HOMO-4, and HOMO-5 have a high degree of phenyl character and make little or no contribution to the CDA analysis. The four orbitals with the largest d values,

FULL PAPER

HOMO-6, HOMO-7, HOMO-9, and HOMO-10, are all of local σ symmetry, indicating the importance of σ donation. The two orbitals with the next largest d values, HOMO and HOMO-1, are of local π symmetry, and contribute to electron donation through the π manifold, that is, ligand-tometal π bonding.

In higher homologues of PtC_4Pt , the PtC_x^- moiety should be a somewhat weaker σ donor and a stronger π acceptor, in accord with the HOMO-LUMO energy trends noted above. Nonetheless, a reversal of the absolute values of dand b would not be expected. We therefore conclude that in polyynyl/Pt^{II} complexes, the polyynyl fragment acts mainly as a $\sigma\!/\!\pi$ donor with essentially no back-donation from the metal. This is in agreement with a combined photoelectron spectroscopy/theoretical study of *trans*-[(PEt₃)₂Pt(C=CH)₂], in which no evidence for π backbonding was found.^[50]

Chain-length effects-electronic transitions: The diplatinum complexes trans, trans- $[(X)(R_3P)_2Pt(C\equiv C)_nPt(PR_3)_2(X)]$ exhibit richly featured electronic spectra.^[10-12] As the spcarbon chain is lengthened, progressively more intense and longer wavelength absorptions are observed. In an effort to better understand the origin of these absorptions, time-dependent DFT calculations were performed for PtC₄Pt through to PtC₁₀Pt. Figure 4 depicts the simulated absorption spectra, each of which features two bands. That with the longer wavelength is termed "band I", and the other "band II". Table 6 lists the corresponding states, energies, and oscillator strengths.

For PtC₄Pt, band I is essentially single configurational and corresponds to a HOMO-LUMO excitation. For the higher homologues, band I becomes increasingly two-configurational, but retains dominant HOMO-LUMO character. At the same time, the oscillator strengths plummet, as reflected by the diminishing peak intensities in Figure 4. In

HOMO-1→LUMO+10

HOMO−1→LUMO+4

 $HOMO \rightarrow LUMO+5$

HOMO→LUMO+19

HOMO−1→LUMO+4

HOMO−1→LUMO+4

HOMO→LUMO

 $HOMO \rightarrow LUMO$

 $HOMO \rightarrow LUMO$

 $HOMO\!\rightarrow\!LUMO$

HOMO→LUMO

 $HOMO \rightarrow LUMO$

 $HOMO\!\rightarrow\!LUMO$

HOMO→LUMO+5

HOMO→LUMO+5

HOMO→LUMO+9

HOMO-1→LUMO+1

HOMO−1→LUMO+1

 $HOMO-3 \rightarrow LUMO+2$

HOMO→LUMO+5

HOMO→LUMO+11

HOMO-1→LUMO+1

HOMO-1→LUMO+1

Contribution

[%]

3

90

85

7

3

16

81

46

9

13

28

33

67

30

18

39

5

41

59

23

21

42

2

 \boldsymbol{E}

[eV]

3.25

4.39

3.05

3.99

2.78

3.68

2.50

3.52

 λ_{\max}

[nm]

382

282

406

310

446

337

496

352

Oscillator

strength

0.353

0.258

0.311

0.824

0.160

1.504

0.071

2.569

Table 6. Calculated singlet excitations for PtC_xPt in gas phase. Orbitals

Band

I

Π

I

Π

I

Π

I

Π

PtC₄Pt

PtC₆Pt

PtC₈Pt

PtC₁₀Pt

6518

© 2004 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim



Figure 4. Simulated absorption spectra for PtCxPt from time-dependent DFT calculations. Color coding: blue=PtC₄Pt, pink=PtC₆Pt, black= PtC_8Pt , and $red = PtC_{10}Pt$.

contrast, the oscillator strengths for band II steadily increase. This absorption is multiconfigurational, but the HOMO-LUMO character gradually rises.

To gain additional insight into the nature of these transitions, the difference electron densities for the ground and excited states corresponding to bands I and II were calculated. As exemplified for PtC_6Pt in Figure 5,^[51] this easily allows both absorptions to be assigned as $\pi - \pi^*$ transitions that originate in the sp-carbon chain. This even holds for PtC₄Pt, where the FMOs have more platinum character.

The simulated spectra in Figure 4 can be contrasted with those of analogous experimental systems. Data for PtC_xPt complexes with (p-tol)(p-tol₃P)₂Pt endgroups are summarized in Table 7.^[10] Those for complexes with $(C_6F_5)(p$ $tol_3P)_2Pt$ and $(C_6F_5)(Et_3P)_2Pt$ endgroups are similar.^[11] These real systems contain additional chromophores, resulting in extra absorptions. When coupled with vibrational fine

> structure, which is often observed,^[11,47a] comparisons become complicated. Nonetheless, several key features are replicated.^[52]

> First, the increasingly intense longest wavelength absorptions of the PtC₁₀Pt, PtC₁₂Pt, PtC₁₆Pt, and PtC₂₀Pt complexes (Table 7) clearly correspond to band II of PtC, Pt. Second, several evenly spaced weaker longer wavelength bands are observed with all PtC₈Pt complexes, followed by a much stronger band at shorter wavelengths (e.g., 359, 387, and 419 nm with ε 17600– $5600 \,\mathrm{M}^{-1} \,\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$, then 337 nm with ε 102000 m⁻¹ cm⁻¹ as given in Table 7). The weaker absorptions likely correspond to vibrational progressions of band I, and the strongest one to band Methyl-capped polyynes II. $Me(C \equiv C)_n Me$ are also charac-

www.chemeurj.org Chem. Eur. J. 2004, 10, 6510-6522



Figure 5. Change of electron density from ground to singlet excited states of PtC_6Pt . Top: band I; bottom: band II. Color coding: ground state blue; excited state white.

Table 7.	UV-visible	data for	trans, trans-	(p-tol	$(p-tol_3)$	P),Pt(C≡C)"P	t(P-p-tol ₃	$_{2}(p-tol)$	[a]
				V	///	- // \		- (- <i>p</i>)	////	

Number of sp-carbon atoms $(x=2n)$	$\lambda_{\max} [nm] [\epsilon (M^{-1} cm^{-1})]$
6	329 [33 600], 351 [25 600], 376 [8800]
8	305 [99 200], 337 [101 600], 359 [17 600], 387 [8800], 419 [5600]
10	281 [74000], 316 [110000], 327 [118000], 350[212000]
12	323 [106 000], 345 [201 000], 371[361 000]
16	309 [50 400], 334 [61 600], 357 [103 000], 383 [219 000], 411 [365 000]
20	296 [71 200], 312 [76 800], 328 [80 000], 347 [78 400], 413 [262 000], 446[368 000]

[a] 1.25×10^{-6} M in CH₂Cl₂.

terized by very weak longer wavelength absorptions that show vibrational subbands.^[53] For the PtC_6Pt complex, the absorption at 329 nm most likely represents band II.^[54]

In order to further evaluate these assignments, the λ_{max} values calculated for band II were plotted versus n (x/2). A linear relationship was obtained ($r^2 = 0.992$), as shown in Figure s2 (see the Supporting Information). The experimental absorptions from Table 7 assigned to band II were similarly plotted, and another linear relationship was obtained ($r^2 = 0.994$). Although a perfect match would not be expected given the structural differences and the limitations of the theory, portions of the lines are roughly coincident and the calculations extrapolate surprisingly well to the transition energies of the real systems.

For the four longest chain complexes in Table 7, the λ_{max} values for band II were plotted versus 1/n (Figure s2, Supporting Information). The resulting line ($r^2 = 0.981$) gives a y intercept of 532 nm, the extrapolated value for **PtC**_{\$\alpha\$}**Pt**. Since endgroup effects will be negligible at infinite chain lengths, this should closely approximate that of the one-dimensional polymeric carbon allotrope carbyne. The value is in quite good agreement with those similarly predicted from

most other $X(C\equiv C)_{\infty}X$ systems (550–569 nm).^[8,47] Pentafluorophenyl-substituted platinum complexes yield slightly lower limits (527–492 nm).^[11] However, the most important point is that these plots experimentally confirm a persistent, non-zero band gap at infinite chain length, complementing the conclusion from Figure 3. This is in

agreement with the single/triple bond alternation maintained in the longer-chain species $PtC_{26}Pt$ and $HC_{40}H$, and the convergence to distinct asymptotic limits for the C=C and =C-C= bond lengths.

sp-Carbon-chain bending: The energy profile for torsional motion of the platinum endgroups was computed above (Figure 2). The conformation of the carbon chain represents yet another structural variable. Of the approximately fifty crystallographically characterized tetraynes and higher polyynes, nearly all exhibit distinct deviations from linearity.^[22] There are only four such compounds in which the average of all X-C_{sp}-C_{sp} and C_{sp}-C_{sp}-C_{sp} bond angles is >178.8°. Both bow- and S-shaped conformations are common, and other motifs also occur. A nonlinearity parameter has been defined.^[22]

Due to the $C_{2\nu}$ symmetry constraint, all of the structures calculated for **PtC_xPt** exhibit symmetrical bow conformations; S-shaped conformations are arbitrarily excluded. The average of all Pt-C_{sp}-C_{sp} and C_{sp}-C_{sp}-C_{sp} bond angles ranges from 179.9° (**PtC₆Pt**) to 179.2° (**PtC₁₂Pt**), as summarized in Table s2 (see the Supporting Information). These structures

show a greater degree of linearity than the real systems, as might intuitively be expected for gas-phase calculations where no crystal packing effects are possible. There is no discernable dependence of the average bond angle or any given bond angle (e.g., C1-C2-C3) upon x.

Two recent computational investigations suggest that spcarbon chains should be intrinsically nonlinear due to lowfrequency vibrational modes of the chain.^[20,28] Indeed, our DFT calculations confirm that the diplatinum compounds feature a number of low-frequency vibrations of the carbon chain, both in- and out-of-plane. The frequency of these vibrations monotonically decreases as the chain lengthens (e.g., 146 cm⁻¹ in **PtC**₄**Pt** to 4 cm⁻¹ in **PtC**₂₆**Pt**), which indicates progressively higher flexibility with longer chains.^[19] However, a detailed investigation and analysis of these effects is outside the scope of the present work.

The shallow nature of the energy surface for chain bending was further supported by a calculation with $PtC_{12}Pt$. The complex *trans*,*trans*-[(C₆F₅)(*p*-tol₃P)₂Pt(C=C)₆Pt(P-*p*-tol₃)₂-(C₆F₅)] crystallizes with the "most bent" carbon chain known to date.^[11,22] The average Pt-C_{sp}-C_{sp}-C_{sp}-C_{sp} bond angle in this bowed structure is 174.6°. When all Pt-C_{sp}-C_{sp} and C_{sp}-C_{sp}-C_{sp} bond angles in **PtC**₁₂**Pt** were constrained to 174° in a bow conformation with $C_{2\nu}$ symmetry, the increase in energy was only 2 kcal mol⁻¹ relative to the unconstrained, nearly linear structure. This quantity is well within the range of crystal packing forces.

Conclusion

Computations using the model sp-carbon-chain complexes PtC_xPt reproduce many structural and electronic features of the real systems *trans,trans-*[(X)(R₃P)₂Pt(C=C)_nPt-(PR₃)₂(X)], and allow a number of chain-length effects to be rationalized. NBO analyses show that as the chains lengthen, the platinum atoms become increasingly positively charged, and the carbon chains increasingly negatively charged. The negative charge is substantially localized on the two terminal C=C atoms.

These data nicely account for the progressively shorter platinum–carbon bonds, and the greater lengths of the PtC=C triple bonds as compared to neighboring C=C linkages. In contrast, the polyynes HC_xH exhibit nearly constant carbon–hydrogen bond lengths, and the C=C bonds lengthen monotonically as the middle of the chain is approached. Otherwise, the bond-length trends in these two classes of compounds are similar. All C-C bonds contract and C=C bonds lengthen with increasing chain length, but marked C-C/C=C bond alternation persists.

Backbonding from platinum could also influence the PtC=C triple bond lengths. However, no evidence for such interactions is found by NBO population or charge decomposition analyses. Rather, the PtC_x^- fragments function as simple σ/π donors. The HOMOs are best viewed as antibonding combinations of the highest occupied π orbital of the sp-carbon-chain fragment and the filled in-plane d orbital of the platinum fragment. They are strongly delocalized over the Pt/C_x/Pt framework, with platinum character rough-

ly proportional to the $Pt/C_x/Pt$ composition (e.g., 31% for PtC_4Pt , 6% for $PtC_{20}Pt$). Hence, the HOMOs are predominantly chain-based at longer chain lengths (91% for $PtC_{20}Pt$).

In sharp contrast to the situation with $\mathbf{HC}_x\mathbf{H}$, the HOMO energies decrease with chain length. This is primarily due to the decrease in platinum and C_1 coefficients, which diminish the repulsive antibonding interactions. Accordingly, oxidations of real systems become thermodynamically more difficult. The LUMO energies decrease somewhat more with chain length, such that the HOMO–LUMO gaps also decrease. However, the increments become progressively smaller, such that a finite gap persists for the macromolecular limit, which corresponds to the one-dimensional polymeric carbon allotrope, carbyne.

Time-dependent DFT calculations reveal two UV-visible absorptions, both of which are π - π * transitions that originate in the carbon chain and redshift with chain length. The higher energy band simultaneously increases in intensity and acquires progressively more HOMO–LUMO character. The lower energy band decreases in intensity and has diminishing HOMO–LUMO character. Both are closely paralleled in real systems, with the former dominating in complexes with C₈ or longer chains. Data for the most related series, *trans,trans-*[(*p*-tol)(*p*-tol₃P)₂Pt(C=C)_nPt(P-p-tol₃)₂(*p*-tol)]

(Table 7), predict a λ_{max} of 532 nm for the macromolecular limit, in accord with the persistent HOMO–LUMO energy gap.

The sp-carbon chains in PtC_xPt deviate slightly from linearity, with average bond angles ranging from 179.9° (PtC_6Pt) to 179.2° ($PtC_{12}Pt$). The calculations identify chain-based low-frequency vibrational modes that range from 146 cm⁻¹ in PtC_4Pt to 4 cm⁻¹ in $PtC_{26}Pt$. The energy surfaces for introducing bow-shaped deformations with average bond angles of 174°, or rotating the endgroups, are very shallow. Hence, conformations are easily influenced by packing forces.

The synthesis and study of sp-carbon-chain complexes of the type $L_yMC_xML_y$ continues to be a very active area, with emphasis shifting from now-quite-common $< C_8$ species to systems with longer bridges.^[7,8,10-14] This paper has attempted to anticipate future developments by providing a comprehensive structural and electronic grammar for complexes with polyynediyl or (C=C)_n linkages of medium to long to infinite lengths. The computational results nicely rationalize the somewhat scant existing data, including phenomena that are at first glance surprising. They can be expected to extrapolate to other metal endgroups, and provide an excellent foundation for the interpretation of future experimental observations.

Acknowledgement

We thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG; SFB 583) for support, the Computer Chemistry Center of the Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg for an internship and consultations, and Mr. Qinglin Zheng for helpful discussions and experimental data.

6520 —

© 2004 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim www.chemeurj.org Chem. Eur. J. 2004, 10, 6510–6522

- [1] Review of C_x complexes: M. I. Bruce, P. J. Low, M. I. Bruce, Adv. Organomet. Chem. **2004**, 50, 179.
- [2] P.J. Kim, H. Masai, K. Sonogashira, N. Hagihara, Inorg. Nucl. Chem. Lett. 1970, 6, 181.
- [3] FeC₈Fe complexes: a) F. Coat, C. Lapinte, *Organometallics* 1996, 15, 477; b) F. Coat, F. Paul, C. Lapinte, L. Toupet, K. Costuas, J.-F. Halet, J. Organomet. Chem. 2003, 683, 368.
- [4] RuC₈Ru, MoC₈Mo, and WC₈W complexes: a) M. I. Bruce, M. Ke, P. J. Low, B. W. Skelton, A. H. White, *Organometallics* **1998**, *17*, 3539; b) M. I. Bruce, B. D. Kelly, B. W. Skelton, A. H. White, J. Organomet. Chem. **2000**, 604, 150.
- [5] RuC₈Ru complexes: a) K.-T. Wong, J.-M. Lehn, S.-M. Peng, G.-H. Lee, *Chem. Commun.* **2000**, 2259; b) G.-L. Xu, G. Zou, Y.-H. Ni, M. C. DeRosa, R. J. Crutchley, T. Ren, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 10057.
- [6] AuC₈Au complexes: W. Lu, H.-F. Xiang, N. Zhu, C.-M. Che, Organometallics 2002, 21, 2343.
- [7] FeC₈Fe and FeC₁₂Fe complexes: a) M. Akita, M.-C. Chung, A. Sakurai, S. Sugimoto, M. Terada, M. Tanaka, Y. Moro-oka, *Organometallics* **1997**, *16*, 4882; b) A. Sakurai, M. Akita, Y. Moro-oka, *Organometallics* **1999**, *18*, 3241; c) M. Akita, A. Sakurai, Y. Moro-oka, *Chem. Commun.* **1999**, 101.
- [8] ReC₈Re, ReC₁₀Re, ReC₁₂Re, ReC₁₆Re, and ReC₂₀Re complexes: R. Dembinski, T. Bartik, B. Bartik, M. Jaeger, J. A. Gladysz, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000, 122, 810.
- [9] ReC₈Re complexes: a) W. E. Meyer, A. J. Amoroso, C. R. Horn, M. Jaeger, J. A. Gladysz, *Organometallics* **2001**, *20*, 1115; b) C. R. Horn, J. M. Martín-Alvarez, J. A. Gladysz, *Organometallics* **2002**, *21*, 5386; c) C. R. Horn, J. A. Gladysz, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2003**, *9*, 2211.
- [10] a) PtC₈Pt and PtC₁₂Pt complexes:T. B. Peters, J. C. Bohling, A. M. Arif, J. A. Gladysz, *Organometallics* **1999**, *18*, 3261; b) The PtC₁₀Pt, PtC₁₆Pt, and PtC₂₀Pt homologues of the complexes in this communication will be reported in future papers: Q. Zheng, J. A. Gladysz, Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, unpublished data.
- [11] PtC₈Pt, PtC₁₂Pt, and PtC₁₆Pt complexes: W. Mohr, J. Stahl, F. Hampel, J. A. Gladysz, *Chem. Eur. J.* 2003, 9, 3324.
- [12] PtC₈Pt and PtC₁₂Pt complexes: J. Stahl, J. C. Bohling, E. B. Bauer, T. B. Peters, W. Mohr, J. M. Martín-Alvarez, F. Hampel, J. A. Gladysz, Angew. Chem. 2002, 114, 1951; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2002, 41, 1871.
- [13] RuC₁₂Ru complexes: S. Rigaut, J. Perruchon, L. Le Pichon, D. Touchard, P. H. Dixneuf, J. Organomet. Chem. 2003, 670, 37.
- [14] RuC₈Ag and RuC₁₄Ru complexes: A. B. Antonova, M. I. Bruce, B. G. Ellis, M. Gaudio, P. A. Humphrey, M. Jevric, G. Melino, B. K. Nicholson, G. J. Perkins, B. W. Skelton, B. Stapleton, A. H. White, N. N. Zaitseva, *Chem. Commun.* **2004**, 960.
- [15] a) R. F. Curl, Angew. Chem. 1997, 109, 1636; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 1997, 36, 1567; b) H. Kroto, Angew. Chem. 1997, 109, 1648; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 1997, 36, 1579; c) R. E. Smalley, Angew. Chem. 1997, 109, 1666; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 1997, 36, 1595.
- [16] a) J. A. McCleverty, M. D. Ward, Acc. Chem. Res. 1998, 31, 842;
 b) J.-P. Launay, C. Coudret in Electron Transfer in Chemistry, Vol. 5 (Ed.: V. Balzani), Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, Germany, 2001, Part 1, Chapter 1; c) L. De Cola, P. Belser in Electron Transfer in Chemistry, Vol. 5 (Ed.: V. Balzani), Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, Germany, 2001, Part 1, Chapter 3; d) F. Scandola, C. Chiorboli, M. T. Indelli, M. A. Rampi in Electron Transfer in Chemistry, Vol. 3 (Ed.: V. Balzani), Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, Germany, 2001, Part 0, Chapter 3; e) R. L. Carrol, C. B. Gorman, Angew. Chem. 2002, 114, 4556; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2002, 41, 4378; f) F. Paul, C. Lapinte in Unusual Structures and Physical Properties in Organometallic Chemistry (Eds.: M. Gielen, R. Willem, B. Wrackmeyer), Wiley, New York, 2002, pp. 220–291.
- [17] a) D. L. Lichtenberger, S. K. Renshaw, Organometallics 1993, 12, 3522; b) J. E. McGrady, T. Lovell, R. Stranger, M. G. Humphrey, Organometallics 1997, 16, 4004; c) K. D. John, T. C. Stoner, M. D. Hopkins, Organometallics 1997, 16, 4948; d) O. F. Koentjoro, R. Rousseau, P. J. Low, Organometallics 2001, 20, 4502.
- [18] L. Horny, N. D. K. Petraco, C. Pak, H. F. Schaefer, III, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 5861.

- [19] A. Scemama, P. Chaquin, M.-C. Gazeau, Y. Bénilan, J. Phys. Chem. A 2002, 106, 3828.
- [20] R. Zahradník, L. Šroubková, Helv. Chim. Acta 2003, 86, 979.
- [21] Additional relevant recent experimental and computational results:
 a) T. Pino, H. Ding, F. Güthe, J. P. Maier, J. Chem. Phys. 2001, 114, 2208;
 b) U. Mölder, P. Burk, I. A. Koppel, Int. J. Quantum Chem. 2001, 82, 73;
 c) D. A. Kirkwood, M. Tulej, M. V. Pachkov, M. Schnaiter, F. Güthe, M. Grutter, M. Wyss, J. P. Maier, G. Fischer, J. Chem. Phys. 1999, 111, 9280;
 d) C. Zhang, Z. Cao, W. Haishun, Q. Zhang, Int. J. Quantum Chem. 2004, 98, 299.
- [22] S. Szafert, J. A. Gladysz, Chem. Rev. 2003, 103, 4175.
- [23] a) M. I. Bruce, P. J. Low, K. Costuas, J.-F. Halet, S. P. Best, G. A. Heath, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000, 122, 1949; b) H. Jiao, K. Costuas, J. A. Gladysz, J.-F. Halet, M. Guillemot, L. Toupet, F. Paul, C. Lapinte, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 9511; c) M. I. Bruce, J.-F. Halet, B. le Guennic, B. W. Skelton, M. E. Smith, A. H. White, Inorg. Chim. Acta 2003, 350, 175.
- [24] a) P. Belanzoni, N. Re, M. Rosi, A. Sgamellotti, C. Floriani, *Organometallics* 1996, 15, 4264; b) P. Belanzoni, N. Re, A. Sgamellotti, C. Floriani, *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.* 1997, 4773; c) P. Belanzoni, N. Re, A. Sgamellotti, C. Floriani, *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.* 1998, 1825; d) P. Belanzoni, A. Sgamellotti, N. Re, C. Floriani, *Inorg. Chem.* 2000, 39, 1147.
- [25] Z. Cao, Q. Zhang, Chem. Eur. J. 2004, 10, 1920.
- [26] See also: B. Bildstein, O. Loza, Y. Chizhov, *Organometallics* 2004, 23, 1825.
- [27] a) H. Jiao, J. A. Gladysz, New J. Chem. 2001, 25, 551; b) P. Belanzoni, N. Re, A. Sgamellotti, J. Organomet. Chem. 2002, 656, 156.
- [28] J. Neugebauer, M. Reiher, J. Phys. Chem. A 2004, 108, 2053.
- [29] M. Springborg, R. C. Albers, Phys. Rev. B 1996, 53, 10626.
- [30] Jaguar 5.0, Schrodinger, LLC, Portland, Oregon, 2002.
- [31] Gaussian 98 (Revision A.11), M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, V. G. Zakrzewski, J. A. Montgomery, Jr., R. E. Stratmann, J. C. Burant, S. Dapprich, J. M. Millam, A. D. Daniels, K. N. Kudin, M. C. Strain, O. Farkas, J. Tomasi, V. Barone, M. Cossi, R. Cammi, B. Mennucci, C. Pomelli, C. Adamo, S. Clifford, J. Ochterski, G. A. Petersson, P. Y. Ayala, Q. Cui, K. Morokuma, D. K. Malick, A. D. Rabuck, K. Raghavachari, J. B. Foresman, J. Cioslowski, J. V. Ortiz, B. B. Stefanov, G. Liu, A. Liashenko, P. Piskorz, I. Komaromi, R. Gomperts, R. L. Martin, D. J. Fox, T. Keith, M. A. Al-Laham, C. Y. Peng, A. Nanayakkara, C. Gonzalez, M. Challacombe, P. M. W. Gill, B. G. Johnson, W. Chen, M. W. Wong, J. L. Andres, M. Head-Gordon, E. S. Replogle, J. A. Pople, Gaussian, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, **1998**.
- [32] a) J. C. Slater, Quantum Theory of Molecules and Solids, Vol. 4: The Self-Consistent Field for Molecules and Solids, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974; b) A. D. Becke, Phys. Rev. A 1988, 38, 3098; c) S. H. Vosko, L. Wilk, M. Nusair, Can. J. Phys. 1980, 58, 1200; d) C. Lee, W. Yang, R. G. Parr, Phys. Rev. B 1988, 37, 785 and implemented as described by B. Miehlich, A. Savin, H. Stoll, H. Preuss, Chem. Phys. Lett. 1989, 157, 200; e) P. J. Stephens, F. J. Devlin, C. F. Chabalowski, M. J. Frisch, J. Phys. Chem. 1994, 98, 11623.
- [33] P. J. Hay, W. R. Wadt, J. Chem. Phys. 1985, 82, 299.
- [34] E. D. Glendening, J. K. Badenhoop, A. E. Reed, J. E. Carpenter, J. A. Bohmann, C. M. Morales, F. Weinhold, (Theoretical Chemistry Institute, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, 2001) NBO 5.0; http://www.chem.wisc.edu/~nbo5.
- [35] a) The CDA methodology is described in S. Dapprich, G. Frenking, J. Phys. Chem. 1995, 99, 9352. Additional applications to transition metal systems can be found in the following references: b) R. K. Szilagyi, G. Frenking, Organometallics 1997, 16, 4807; c) C. Boehme, G. Frenking, Chem. Eur. J. 1999, 5, 2184; d) A. Beste, G. Frenking, Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem. 2000, 626, 381; e) Gudat, D. M. Nieger, K. Schmitz, L. Szarvas, Chem. Commun. 2002, 1820; f) F. R. Sensato, R. Custodio, E. Longo, V. S. Safont, J. Andres, J. Org. Chem. 2003, 68, 5870.
- [36] a) S. I. Gorelsky, A. B. P. Lever, J. Organomet. Chem. 2001, 635, 187;
 b) http://www.stanford.edu/~gorelsky/software/aomix-s/.
- [37] These values are for the least-squares planes $[(P_A-Pt_A-P_A)+Pt_B]$ and $[P_A+(P_B-Pt_B-P_B)]$. The inclusion of a platinum from each terminus minimizes non-idealities arising from chain curvature. When

Chem. Eur. J. 2004, 10, 6510–6522 www.chemeurj.org © 2004 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

FULL PAPER

planes defined by three or four atoms from a single endgroup are used, slightly different torsion angles are usually obtained.

- [38] For the sake of internal consistency we performed our own calculations on $\mathbf{HC}_x\mathbf{H}$ (x=4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26, 40) using the same level of theory as for $\mathbf{PtC}_x\mathbf{Pt}$, as well as one previous computational study of $\mathbf{HC}_x\mathbf{H}$.^[21a] We obtained essentially the same results as found earlier, and selected data are provided in Tables s1 and s3 of the Supporting Information.
- [39] For the complex *trans,trans*- $[(C_6F_5)(p-tol_3P)_2Pt(C \equiv C)_4Pt(P-p-tol_3)_2(C_6F_5)]$,^[11] the C1/C2 triple bond is unambiguously longer than the C3/C4 triple bond (1.252(6) versus 1.209(6) Å).
- [40] E. J. Bylaska, J. H. Weare, R. Kawai, Phys. Rev. B 1998, 58, R7488.
- [41] For recent overview of NBO see: F. Weinhold, C. Landis, *Chem. Educ.: Res. Pract. Eur.* 2001, 2, 91.
- [42] R. Eastmond, T. R. Johnson, D. R. M. Walton, J. Organomet. Chem. 1973, 50, 87.
- [43] A reviewer has suggested the possibility of a relationship between the optimized bond lengths and Pauling bond orders, as exemplified in X. Cao, W. Wu, Q. Zhang, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.* 2003, 94, 144. However, the excellent correlations found for hydrocarbon systems do not extrapolate to the complexes PtC_xPt.
- [44] a) Q. Fan, G. V. Pfeiffer, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1989**, *162*, 479; b) Q. Fan,
 G. V. Pfeiffer, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1989**, *162*, 472.
- [45] I. Fleming, Frontier Orbitals and Organic Chemical Reactions, Wiley, New York, 1976.
- [46] This trend can also be analyzed from the standpoint of interaction diagrams (see ref. [3b] for diagrams of homologous $Fe(C=C)_2Fe$ and $Fe(C=C)_4Fe$ species). The increasing energies of the π HOMOs of the carbon-chain fragments might have been expected to give higher HOMO energies (closer match in energy to the metal fragment HOMO and enhanced filled/filled repulsive interaction). However, the progressive decrease in C1 coefficients more than offsets this effect.

- [47] a) G. Schermann, T. Grösser, F. Hampel, A. Hirsch, *Chem. Eur. J.* **1997**, *3*, 1105; b) T. Gibtner, F. Hampel, J.-P. Gisselbrecht, A. Hirsch, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2002**, *8*, 408.
- [48] Data for the complexes most relevant to this study, *trans,trans-*[(p-tol)(p-tol₃P)₂Pt(C=C)_nPt(P-p-tol₃)₂(p-tol)], are as follows ($E_{p,a}$ [V], CH₂Cl₂):^[11b] n=3, 0.855; n=4, 0.971; n=6, 1.204; n=8, 1.264; n= 10, 1.397.
- [49] a) E. J. Baerends, O. V. Gritsenko, J. Phys. Chem. A 1997, 101, 5383;
 b) R. Stowasser, R. Hoffmann, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1999, 121, 3414;
 c) M. Bendikov, B. Solouki, N. Auner, Y. Apeloig, Organometallics 2002, 21, 1349.
- [50] J. N. Louwen, R. Hengelmolen, D. M. Grove, A. Oskam, R. L. DeKock, *Organometallics* 1984, 3, 908.
- [51] Visualized with the program Molekel: http://www.cscs.ch/molekel/.
- [52] As an additional check, the effect of the CH₂Cl₂ solvent was probed by time-dependent DFT calculations using the Polarizable Continuum Model (PCM) as implemented in the Gaussian 98 suite. No significant changes in the oscillator strengths or configurations were found. These data are summarized in Table s4 of the Supporting Information.
- [53] H. H. Jaffé, M. Orchin, *Theory and Applications of Ultraviolet Spectroscopy*, Wiley, New York, **1962**; Table 11.7 and accompanying discussion.
- [54] Time-dependent DFT calculations on the model compound $[(H_3P)Au(C\equiv C)_nAu(PH_3)]$ also yield transitions with characteristics similar to band II.^[25a] However, in the real systems with n=1-4 prepared to date, the bands are masked for n=1-3.^[6] Time-dependent DFT calculations on **HC_xH** have also been very recently reported.^[21d]

Received: June 25, 2004 Published online: November 10, 2004

6522 —