

undergo both oxidation and reduction reactions.<sup>25</sup> Thus the behavior of  $^*Ru(bpy)_3^{2+}$  is not without precedent, but the reductive quenching mechanism reported here has not been previously proposed for systems of this kind.

**Acknowledgment.** This research was supported by the U.S. Energy Research and Development Administration.

**Registry No.**  $Ru(bpy)_3^{2+}$ , 15158-62-0;  $Fe(CN)_6^{4-}$ , 13408-63-4;  $Co(phen)_3^{2+}$ , 16788-34-4;  $Ru(NH_3)_6^{2+}$ , 19052-44-9;  $Eu(II)$ , 16910-54-6;  $S_2O_4^{2-}$ , 14844-07-6.

### References and Notes

- (1) H. D. Gafney and A. W. Adamson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **94**, 8238 (1972).
- (2) G. Navon and N. Sutin, *Inorg. Chem.*, **13**, 2159 (1974).
- (3) C. R. Bock, T. J. Meyer, and D. G. Whitten, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **96**, 4710 (1974).
- (4) C. R. Bock, T. J. Meyer, and D. G. Whitten, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **97**, 2909 (1975).
- (5) F. E. Lytle and D. M. Hercules, *Photochem. Photobiol.*, **13**, 123 (1971).
- (6) C.-T. Lin and N. Sutin, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **80**, 97 (1976).
- (7) T. Saji and S. Aoyagui, *J. Electroanal. Chem. Interfacial Electrochem.*, **58**, 401 (1975).
- (8) N. E. Tokel-Takvoryan, R. E. Hemingway, and A. J. Bard, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **95**, 6582 (1973).
- (9) J. H. Baxendale and M. Fiti, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 1995 (1972).
- (10) A. Weller, in "Fast Reactions and Primary Processes in Chemical Kinetics", S. Claesson, Ed., Wiley-Interscience, New York, N.Y., 1967, pp 413-428.
- (11) J. B. Headridge, "Electrochemical Techniques for Inorganic Chemists", Academic Press, New York, N.Y., 1969, p 73.
- (12) J. N. Demas and A. W. Adamson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **95**, 5159 (1973).
- (13) J. R. Pladziewicz, T. J. Meyer, J. A. Broomhead, and H. Taube, *Inorg. Chem.*, **12**, 639 (1973).
- (14) The europium(III) formed in the europium(II) reduction of hexammineruthenium(III) contributes negligibly to the observed quenching as  $k_{sv} = 7.5 \times 10^{-2} M^{-1}$  for europium(III) in this medium.
- (15) C. Creutz and N. Sutin, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, **70**, 1701 (1973).
- (16) V. Balzani, L. Moggi, M. F. Manfrin, F. Bolletta, and G. S. Laurence, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, **15**, 321 (1975).
- (17) D. L. Dexter, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **21**, 836 (1953).
- (18) The energies corresponding to the absorption and emission maxima are, of course, vertical or Franck-Condon energies. These are the important energies in the weak-interaction electron-exchange mechanism considered here. The Franck-Condon energy needs to be distinguished from the energy of the thermally equilibrated excited state. The energy difference between the thermally equilibrated excited and ground states of the donor will generally be larger than the energy corresponding to the donor's emission maximum. Similarly, the energy difference between the thermally equilibrated excited and ground states of the acceptor will generally be less than the energy corresponding to the acceptor's absorption maximum. The energies of the thermally equilibrated states, while not relevant to the electron-exchange interaction mechanism, could be available for certain types of nonvertical energy-transfer processes.<sup>19</sup>
- (19) See, for example, A. Farmilo and F. Wilkinson, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, **34**, 575 (1975), and references cited therein.
- (20) C. Creutz and N. Sutin, *J. Biol. Chem.*, **249**, 6788 (1974).
- (21) T. J. Przystas and N. Sutin, in preparation.
- (22) D. A. Buckingham and A. M. Sargeson, in "Chelating Agents and Metal Chelates", F. P. Dwyer and D. P. Mellor, Ed., Academic Press, New York, N.Y., 1964, p 267.
- (23) B. M. Gordon, L. L. Williams, and N. Sutin, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **83**, 2061 (1961).
- (24) R. Campion, N. Purdie, and N. Sutin, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **85**, 3528 (1963).
- (25) P. A. Carapellucci and D. Mauzerall, "Conference on the Biological Role of Porphyrins and Related Structures", *Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci.*, **244**, 214 (1975).

Department of Chemistry  
Brookhaven National Laboratory  
Upton, New York 11973

Carol Creutz\*  
Norman Sutin\*

Received July 22, 1975

### Stereoselectivity in Electron-Transfer Reactions

AIC506071

Sir:

Despite the vast amount of information available on electron-transfer reactions involving transition metal systems, relatively little is known about possible stereoselectivity in such reactions between pairs of chiral complexes. The use of

optically active reagents has generally been restricted to self-exchange reactions, where racemization serves as a convenient monitor of the redox process.<sup>1,2</sup> For example, racemization accompanies self-exchange in aqueous solution between optically inert (+)-D-[Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> and labile [Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> (phen = 1,10-phenanthroline) and has been implicitly attributed to a lack of stereopreference.<sup>3</sup> Paradoxically (+)-D-[Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> was recently reported by Sutter and Hunt<sup>4</sup> to react with labile [Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> to yield (-)-D-[Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup>. We note that it is possible to rationalize these apparently contradictory results if stereoselectivity is a rather general phenomenon, requiring electron transfer to occur preferentially between reactants of opposite absolute configuration. Although operative, this preference would go undetected in self-exchange reactions—since inversion occurs in both the forward and reverse steps. The model is also consistent with the  $\Delta_C$  and  $\Delta_C$  absolute configurations assigned (+)-D-[Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> and (-)-D-[Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> from circular dichroism studies.<sup>5</sup> However, in a kinetic study of several redox systems involving non-self-exchange situations, Grossman and Wilkins<sup>6</sup> found no evidence for stereopreference. Inspection of the reactions examined suggests that stereoselectivity may require systems containing  $\pi$ -acceptor ligands (e.g., phen) and/or reductants involving strongly reducing metals (e.g., Cr<sup>2+</sup>). This model would not specify a particular isomeric preference, although recent NMR studies by La Mar and co-workers<sup>7,8</sup> suggest electron transfer might then be most facile between reactants with the same chirality.

Our research objectives have been to resolve these anomalies and delineate the extent and nature of redox stereospecificity. The initial experiments involved repeating the work of Sutter and Hunt<sup>4</sup> on the (+)-D-[Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> + [Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> reaction. Despite numerous attempts, following the experimental procedure outlined by the authors, we have been unable to observe any induction of optical activity in the [Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> product. Rotation measurements were recorded at 546 nm immediately after reaction using a Bendix Model 1144 automatic polarimeter with digital readout to  $\pm 0.0002^\circ$ . A small positive rotation was initially observed after reaction, consistent with the slight excess of (+)-D-[Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> employed in each instance. This activity was subsequently lost at a rate consonant with expected [Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup>-[Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> self-exchange. It was verified that [Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> is optically stable in the presence of [Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup>, using a genuine sample of (+)-D-[Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup>.<sup>9</sup> As noted by Sutter and Hunt, the presence of redox stereoselectivity is not a sufficient condition for the experimental observation of the phenomenon. It is also essential that [Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> inversion proceed more rapidly than electron transfer. To enhance the probability of this latter condition being met, the reaction was also followed at substantially lower reagent concentrations than those reported. Even when solutions  $10^{-4}$  M in (+)-D-[Co(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup> and [Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> were mixed, no resultant induction was observed. Assuming the reported formation of 92% (-)-D-[Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3+</sup>, a final rotation of  $-0.067^\circ$  (5-cm cell 546 nm) was anticipated, a value well within the capabilities of the instrument available. Furthermore, the reaction has been repeated without success at elevated temperatures (up to 70 °C) to take advantage of a probable activation enthalpy difference for the redox and racemization processes. Identical runs carried out at room temperature in 50% ethanol and 50% DMSO met with a similar lack of success. We conclude that the previous communication on this system is most probably in error.<sup>10</sup>

We have extended our present investigation to other outer-sphere redox reactions of the type described. The systems examined are collated in Table I. In no instance was a successful optical induction achieved. Reactions 5-7 provide

Table I. Outer-Sphere Redox Systems Surveyed for Induction of Optical Activity<sup>a</sup>

Reaction	Oxidant	Reductant
1	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>3+</sup> <sup>b</sup>	[Cr(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
2	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>3+</sup>	[Cr(bpy) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
3	(-) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(bpy) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>3+</sup> <sup>c</sup>	[Cr(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
4	(-) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(bpy) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>3+</sup>	[Cr(bpy) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
5	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(phen) <sub>2</sub> en] <sup>3+</sup> <sup>d</sup>	[Cr(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
6	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(phen)(en) <sub>2</sub> ] <sup>3+</sup> <sup>e</sup>	[Cr(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
7	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(en) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>3+</sup> <sup>f</sup>	[Cr(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
8	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>3+</sup>	[Cr(en) <sub>2</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup> <sup>h</sup>
9	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>3+</sup>	[Cr(edta)] <sup>2-</sup> <sup>i</sup>
10	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(edta)] <sup>-g</sup>	[Cr(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
11	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(edta)] <sup>-</sup>	[Cr(phen) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
12	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(1-cysu) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>3-</sup> <sup>e</sup>	[Cr(bpy) <sub>3</sub> ] <sup>2+</sup>
13	(+) <sub>D</sub> -[Co(edta)] <sup>-</sup>	[Cr(edta)] <sup>2-</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Equimolar ( $5 \times 10^{-3}$  M) solutions of reactants were mixed at 25 °C with the oxidant in slight excess. <sup>b</sup> Reference 9. <sup>c</sup> J. Ferguson, C. J. Hawkins, N. A. P. Kane-Maguire, and H. Lip, *Inorg. Chem.*, **8**, 771 (1969). <sup>d</sup> L. S. Dollimore and R. D. Gillard, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 369 (1975). <sup>e</sup> L. S. Dollimore and R. D. Gillard, *ibid.*, 933 (1973). <sup>f</sup> J. A. Broomhead, F. P. Dwyer and J. W. Hogarth, *Inorg. Synth.*, **6**, 183 (1960). <sup>g</sup> F. P. Dwyer and F. L. Garvan, *ibid.*, **6**, 192 (1960). <sup>h</sup> J. H. Balthis and J. C. Bailar, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **58**, 1474 (1936). <sup>i</sup> H. Ogino and N. Tanaka, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.*, **41**, 1622 (1968).

a test of the role of  $\pi$ -bonding ligands in the oxidant, while significantly increasing the relative rate of [Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> racemization vs. electron transfer. It is also noteworthy that high-spin [Cr(en)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> as reductant in reaction 8 is

substantially more labile than low-spin [Cr(phen)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> in reaction 1. Stereospecific effects might also be expected to be more pronounced between reagents of opposed charge, a point examined in reactions 10–12. It is our view that the results of the present study, coupled with the earlier findings of Grossman and Wilkins, provide strong evidence for the general absence of stereospecific effects in outer-sphere redox processes.

**Acknowledgment.** We wish to express our appreciation for financial support of this work from Research Corp.'s Cottrell College Science Grant Program and the NSF Undergraduate Research Participation Program. We thank Dr. Alice Fay for valuable discussions during this study.

#### References and Notes

- (1) Y. A. Im and D. H. Busch, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **83**, 3357, 3362 (1961).
- (2) F. P. Dwyer and A. M. Sargeson, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **65**, 1892 (1961).
- (3) R. Farina and R. G. Wilkins, *Inorg. Chem.*, **7**, 514 (1968) (footnote 2).
- (4) J. H. Sutter and J. B. Hunt, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **91**, 3107 (1969).
- (5) S. F. Mason and B. J. Peart, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 949 (1973).
- (6) B. Grossman and R. G. Wilkins, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **89**, 4230 (1967).
- (7) G. N. La Mar, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **94**, 9055 (1972).
- (8) G. N. La Mar and G. R. Van Hecke, *Inorg. Chem.*, **12**, 1769 (1973).
- (9) C. S. Lee, E. M. Gorton, H. M. Neumann, and H. R. Hunt, Jr., *Inorg. Chem.*, **5**, 1397 (1966).
- (10) Recent correspondence with J. B. Hunt<sup>4</sup> supports this observation.

Department of Chemistry  
Furman University  
Greenville, South Carolina 29613

Noel A. P. Kane-Maguire\*  
Ronald M. Tollison  
David E. Richardson

Received August 12, 1975