# Sulfur Dioxide Insertion Reactions of Alkylruthenium Compounds

M. F. JOSEPH and M. C. BAIRD\*

Department of Chemistry, Queen's University. Kingston, Ont., K7L 3N6, Canada Received May 2, 1984

### Abstract

The compounds CpRuLL'R (L,L' = CO, PPh<sub>3</sub>; R = Me, PhCH<sub>2</sub>) react with SO<sub>2</sub> in chloroform to form the corresponding S-sulfinato complexes. Consistent with the accepted  $S_E 2$  (inversion) mechanism, CpRu(CO)<sub>2</sub>Me, which has a relatively high oxidation potential, is inert under these conditions.

### Introduction

Reactions of the compounds CpFe(CO)LR (L = CO, tertiary phosphine; R = alkyl) with SO<sub>2</sub> to form S-sulfinates, *i.e.* 

$$CpFe(CO)LR + SO_2 \longrightarrow CpFe(CO)L(SO_2R)$$
 (1)

have been long known [1] and are well studied mechanistically [1, 2]. Both kinetic and stereochemical data are consistent with a mechanism involving an  $S_E2$  (inversion) process which is retarded by bulky substitutents on R, but accelerated by ligands L which are good electron donors.

To date, however, relatively little research has been carried out on the analogous ruthenium complexes, the only report being by Jacobson and Wojcicki [3], who found that the compounds CpRu-(CO)<sub>2</sub>R (R = Me, PhCH<sub>2</sub>) react with liquid SO<sub>2</sub> more slowly than do their iron counterparts.

We have been carrying out a survey of the chemistry and electrochemistry of compounds of the type CpRuLL'R (L,L' = CO, PPh<sub>3</sub>; R = Me, PhCH<sub>2</sub>) [4], and thus the opportunity was presented to study the SO<sub>2</sub> insertion reactions as well. In doing so, we have extended the known chemistry of the alkylruthenium compounds, and have made comparisons with the iron analogues.

# Experimental

The compounds  $CpRu(CO)_2Me$  (I), CpRu(CO)-(PPh<sub>3</sub>)R (R = Me (II), PhCH<sub>2</sub> (III)) and  $CpRu(PPh_3)_2$ -R (R = Me (IV), PhCH<sub>2</sub> (V)) were prepared as reported previously [4]. All SO<sub>2</sub> insertion reactions were carried out by bubbling SO<sub>2</sub> through chloroform solutions of the alkyl compounds at room temperature for 15 min. In all cases except I, which showed no reaction (IR) after 1 hr, the yellow solutions turned slightly pale. In each case the solvent and unreacted SO<sub>2</sub> were removed at reduced pressure, and the

TABLE I. Analytical and Spectroscopic Data for the Compounds CpRuL(PPh<sub>3</sub>)SO<sub>2</sub>R.

L	R	Analytical Data <sup>a</sup>		$\nu_{\rm CO} \ ({\rm cm}^{-1})^{\rm b}$	$\nu_{\rm SO} \ ({\rm cm}^{-1})^{\rm c}$	$\delta({}^{1}\mathrm{H})^{d}$	$\delta(^{31}P)^{e}$
		С	Н				
CO	Ме	56.35(56.01)	4.38(4.34)	1980	1175,1040	2.74(s, Me), 5.04 (s, Cp), 7.44(m, Ph)	47.9
CO	PhCH <sub>2</sub>	60.29(60.87)	4.41(4.46)	1980	1175,1041	3.90, 4.30 (AB quartet, $J = 12 Hz$ , $CH_2$ ), 0.56(s, Cp), 7.41(m, Ph)	47.8
PPh3	Me	64.79(65.33)	5.31(4.98) <sup>f</sup>		1160, 1035	2.42(s, Me), 4.53(s, Cp), 7.20(m, Ph)	40.1
PPh3	PhCH <sub>2</sub>	67.36(68.15)	5.56(5.00) <sup>g</sup>		1155, 1030	3.74(s, CH <sub>2</sub> ), 4.62(s, Cp), 7.21(m, Ph)	40.0

<sup>a</sup>Calc'd in parentheses. <sup>b</sup>CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>. <sup>c</sup>Nujol. <sup>d</sup>CDCl<sub>3</sub>, int. TMS ref. <sup>e</sup>CDCl<sub>3</sub>, ext. H<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> ref. <sup>f</sup>S: 3.91(4.16). <sup>g</sup>S:4.30-(3.79).

0020-1693/85/\$3.30

#### © Elsevier Sequoia/Printed in Switzerland

<sup>\*</sup>Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

Compound	Chemical Shifts (J <sub>P-C</sub> ) <sup>a</sup>					
	CH <sub>2</sub>	CO	Ср	Ph		
CpRuCO(PPh3)CH2Ph	4.5(7.5)	207.3(19.7)	88.6	121-137		
CpRuCO(PPh3)SO2CH2Ph	78.5	203.1(17.1)	89.2	127-135		
CpRu(PPh <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> CH <sub>2</sub> Ph	3.9(11)		84.3	120-140		
CpRu(PPh3)SO2CH2Ph	74.5		85.7	126-138		

TABLE II.	<sup>13</sup> C {	<sup>1</sup> H}	NMR	Data
-----------	-------------------	-----------------	-----	------

<sup>a</sup>In CDCl<sub>3</sub>, int. TMS ref.

residue was recrystallized from  $CH_2Cl_2$ -hexane to give pale yellow crystals of the product in about 90% yield. Elemental analyses and spectroscopic data for the new compounds CpRuLL (SO<sub>2</sub>R), are listed in Table I.

IR spectra were run on a Beckman IR 4240 spectrometer, <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra on a Bruker HX 60 spectrometer, <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} and <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR spectra on a Bruker CXP 200 spectrometer. Elemental analyses were carried out by Canadian Microanalytical Services, Vancouver, B.C.

# **Results and Discussion**

The SO<sub>2</sub> insertion reactions of the phosphinecontaining complexes, II-V, proceeded quickly and cleanly to give the S-bonded sulfinato products. The compounds can be readily differentiated from the possible O-sulfinato isomers on the basis of the sulfur-oxygen stretching frequencies [1]. Thus  $\nu_{asym}$  (SO<sub>2</sub>) and  $\nu_{sym}$  (SO<sub>2</sub>) are found in the ranges 1155–1175 cm<sup>-1</sup> and 1030–1040 cm<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, rather than the lower values normally encountered for O-sulfinates. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum provides  $CpRu(PPh_3)_2(SO_2CH_2Ph)$ of further evidence for S-bonding, as the two methylene protons are magnetically equivalent. O-sulfinato compounds contain a chiral sulfur atom, which would lead to magnetic nonequivalence of the benzyl methylene hydrogen atoms [1]. On the other hand, the magnetic nonequivalence observed for the methylene hydrogen atoms of CpRu(CO)(PPh<sub>3</sub>)(SO<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>-Ph) arises because of the chiral metal atom.

We include in Table II <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR data for the benzyl and benzylsulfonyl compounds; to our surprise, few such data appear to exist in the literature [5]. Interestingly the changes on SO<sub>2</sub> insertion appear to parallel those on CO insertion [7, 8] *i.e.* small upfield and downfield shifts of the CO and Cp resonances, respectively, and a large downfield shift (70–75 ppm) for the  $\alpha$ -carbon resonance. As mentioned above, I and  $CpRu(CO)_2CH_2Ph$  are reported to react slowly with liquid  $SO_2$  at low temperatures [3]. We find that I is inert to  $SO_2$ in chloroform solution at room temperature, conditions under which the phosphine-substituted compounds II-V react quickly. The results are entirely consistent with the generally accepted  $S_E2$  mechanism [1, 2], as I, at least, exhibits an oxidation potential in methylene chloride which is about 0.5 V higher than those II and III, about 1.15 V higher than those of IV and V, and about 0.3 V higher than that of  $CpFe(CO)_2Me$  [4]. Thus I must be considerably less electron rich than the other compounds, and thus less susceptible to electrophilic attack.

### Acknowledgements

We thank the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council for financial support, Queen's University for a scholarship to M.F.J., and The International Nickel Company of Canada for a loan of ruthenium trichloride.

### References

- 1 A. Wojcicki, Adv. Organometal. Chem., .12, 31 (1974).
- 2 T. C. Flood, Topics in Inorg. and Organometal. Stereochem., 12, 37 (1981).
- 3 S. E. Jacobson and W. Wojcicki, J. Organometal. Chem., 72, 113 (1974).
- 4 M. F. Joseph, J. A. Page and M. C. Baird, Organometallics, in press.
- 5 None appears for instance, in the collection of data by Mann and Taylor [6].
- 6 B. E. Mann and B. F. Taylor, <sup>13</sup>C NMR Data for Organometallic Compounds', Academic Press, New York (1981).
- 7 L. F. Farnell, E. W. Randall and E. Rosenberg, Chem. Comm., 1078 (1971).
- 8 L. J. Todd, J. R. Wilkinson, J. P. Hickey, D. L. Beach and K. W. Barnett, J. Organometal. Chem., 154, 151 (1978).