#### MANORAN JAN DAS

*Department of Chemistry, University of Zambia, P.O. Box 32379, Lusaka, Zambia* 

Received March 4,1983

### **Introduction**

The electron impact mass spectra (EIMS) of metal chelates of  $\beta$ -diketones show atom and group migrations from the ligand to the metal. These migrations and highly influenced by the nature of the metals. These impedions  $\mathcal{L}$  many improperty by the hardle of the inetals. Morris and Koob used Hard/Soft/Acid/Base (HSAB) theory to explain some of these reactions [1]. Recently we have started investigating the effect of class  $a$  and class  $b$  metals  $\lceil 2, 3 \rceil$ , and also of the ass a and class  $\theta$  increas  $[2, 3]$ , and also of the  $\frac{1}{2}$  metal  $\frac{1}{2}$  diket so the  $\frac{1}{2}$  metal chelates of  $\frac{1}{2}$  metal chelates of  $\frac{1}{2}$ of metal  $\beta$ -diketonates. The class  $\alpha$  metal chelates of fluorinated  $\beta$ -diketones showed F migration [4, 5] while those of class  $b$  metal showed no such migration  $[6]$ . The presence of  $d$  electrons in the metals on  $[\mathcal{O}]$ . The presence of  $\alpha$  electrons in the metals tuses  $\kappa$  (aryr group) imgration because such imgration involves metal  $\rightarrow$  R  $\pi$  bonding [7]. Thus, R migrations were observed in gallium, indium and palladium complexes of  $\beta$ -diketones [4, 6]. Such reactions were absent in the mass spectra of scandium<br>and yttrium complexes due to the absence of *d* electrons complexes due to the absence of a clec-<br>Land not a EIMS of land no *d* and no *d*  $\cos$  [5]. The ETNS of familiance (class a and no a electrons) chelates of fluorinated  $\beta$ -diketones showed F but no R migrations [8, 9].

We have determined the electron impact mass spectra of urbeiding the circuit inpact mass P-dike of uranity complexes of some nuormated  $\beta$ -diketones. The uranium(VI) belongs to class  $\alpha$  and does not contain  $d$  electrons. No mass spectral studies bes not comain a ciections. Two mass specular studies  $\Omega$ <sup>old</sup>

## **Experimental**

The  $\beta$ -diketones (RCOCH<sub>2</sub>COCF<sub>3</sub>) with R as methyl, phenyl and 2-thienyl were obtained from the commercial sources. Others were prepared by c connicitual sources. Others were prepared by (also it conditionally performance  $R_{\text{C}}$ -COC13), and emyr permuorocarooxylate (K

# *Preparation of the Complexes*

A hot filtered solution of uranyl acetate dihydrate  $(1.5 \text{ g}; 3.53 \text{ mmol in } 25 \text{ ml water})$  was added, dropwisw with stirring, to a solution of  $\beta$ -diketone (7.06) mmol in 25 ml ethanol). The mixture was digested for 10 min and then cooled in an ice-bath. The yellow/orange product was filtered and washed with ice-cooled 50% aqueous alcohol. The uranium in the complexes was determined by decomposing the complexes was determined by decomposing the com- $\frac{1}{2}$  with it w drops of cont.  $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$  and subsequent strong heating to  $U_3O_8$ . Analyses of the complexes are shown in Table I.  $T_{\text{L}}$  mass spectra were obtained on a  $T_{\text{L}}$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$  mass spectra were obtained on an AET MS-12 mass spectrometer at 70 ev and at a source temperature of  $250 \degree$ C.

# **Results and Discussion**

The uranyl complexes were separated as  $UO_2L_2$ .  $C<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>OH$ , except that of trifluoroacetylacetone which

TABLE I. Analytical Data of the Uranyl Complexes of  $\beta$ -Diketones, L = RCOCHCOR'.

Compound	$\mathbf R$	$\mathbf{R}'$	M.p. °C	$%$ Found			% Calculated		
				C	н	U	C	н	U
$UO2L2·H2O$	Methyl	CF <sub>3</sub>	175	20.30	1.71	40.07	20.21	1.70	40.06
$UO2L2 \cdot C2H5OH$	Phenyl	CF <sub>3</sub>	171	35.26	2.49	32.02	35.40	2.43	31.90
$UO2L2 \cdot C2H5OH$	2-Thienyl	CF <sub>3</sub>	175	28.57	1.90	31.52	28.52	1.86	31.39
$UO2L2 \cdot C2H5OH$	$2-Furyl$	CF <sub>3</sub>	160	29.64	2.12	32.52	29.78	1.94	32.79
$UO2L2 \cdot C2H5OH$	Phenyl	$C_2F_5$	162	34.19	2.29	27.80	34.06	2.14	28.12
$UO2L2 \cdot C2H5OH$	2-Thienyl	$C_2F_5$	179	27.89	1.72	27.55	27.98	1.64	27.73
$UO2L2 \cdot C2H5OH$	Phenyl	$C_3F_7$	140	32.99	2.06	25.12	33.01	1.92	25.15
$UO2L2 \cdot C2H5OH$	2-Thienyl	$C_3F_7$	159	27.59	1.51	24.47	27.56	1.47	24.82

0020-1693/83/\$3.00 **Delet Sequoia/Printed in Switzerland** C Elsevier Sequoia/Printed in Switzerland

Ions	$R^1$ $\mathbf R$	CF <sub>3</sub>				$C_2F_5$		$C_3F_7$	
		Methyl	Phenyl	2-Thienyl	2-Furyl	Phenyl	2-Thienyl	Phenyl	2-Thienyl
M	$a^*$	41	100	88.8	89.6	70.7	83.3	100	77.3
$M-R$	b	4							
$M-F$						3.1	3.3	5.8	3.6
$M - CH2CO$		2.8 <sup>a</sup>							
$M-47$		3.6	5.5	7.4	6.2	1.6	$\mathbf{2}$	5.2	3.6
$M-48$		4.9 <sup>a</sup>	5.5	12.6 <sup>a</sup>	10.4 <sup>a</sup>				
M-RCOF		$12^a$							
$M-R1$	$\mathbf c$	37.2	33.3	41.5	47.9 <sup>a</sup>	$51.8^{a}$	63.3 <sup>a</sup>	75 <sup>a</sup>	$72.7^{\rm a}$
$M-R^1-F$						5.9 <sup>a</sup>	$4^a$	4.7	1.7
$M-R^1-2F$			11.5	11.1	2.1	3.4	4.3	$\overline{\mathbf{3}}$	4.5
$M-L$	d	$100^{\rm cb}$	74	$100^{\circ}$	$100^{\rm c}$	$100^{\circ}$	$100^{\circ}$	$90^{\rm c}$	$100^{\text{c}}$
$M-L-CO$		$\overline{4}$	13	10.4	10.4	$\boldsymbol{2}$	$4^{\rm d}$	$\mathbf{2}$	3.6
$M-L-CO-F$		7.4	3.5	-	8.3				
$M-L-CF2$	$\mathbf{e}$	51.3 <sup>d</sup>	40.8	$48.8^{\text{d}}$	$58.3^{\text{d}}$				
$M-L-CF_2-HF$		$6^e$		3.7	4.1				
$M-L-CF_2-CO_2$			7,4	13.3	4.1				
$M-L-C2F4$						$5.6^{\text{d}}$	$5.3^{\rm d}$		
$M-L-CO-C2F4$								1.2	$\mathbf{1}$
$M-L-C_3F_7$								1.5	1.8
UF <sub>5</sub>		0.6	3.6	5.2		$0.8\,$	0.7		
UF <sub>3</sub>		3.8	$\mathbf{1}$	3.3	3.1	0.8	$\mathbf{1}$	$1.5\,$	1.6
UOF <sub>2</sub>		5,4	7.4	11.1	9.3	3.8	3.5	$\overline{\mathbf{3}}$	5.5
$UO_2F$		14	24.1	38.5	31.2	7.7	7.3	7.2	13.6
<b>UOF</b>		$\bf 8$	7.4	12.6	8.3	1.9	$1.7\,$	1.6	2.7
UO <sub>2</sub>		26.9	24.1	51.1	39.9	31.5	35	26.2	45.5

TABLE II. Relative Intensities of Metal Containing Ions in the E1 Mass Spectra of UO<sub>2</sub> (RCOCHCOR<sup>1</sup>)<sub>2</sub>.

\*Identified metastable transitions are indicated by superscripts which relate the daughter to its parent ion.

was separated as monohydrate. Heating the complexes at  $110^{\circ}$ C for 2 hours failed to remove the solvent of crystallization. Some uranyl complexes of non-fluorinated  $\beta$ -diketones were reported by Sacconi and his co-workers [12, 13], and of trifluoro and hexafluoro acetylacetone by Belford et al. [14]. Both groups reported the complexes as hydrates which could be dehydrated only with difficulty. According to these authors the solvent is coordinated to the metal and the coordination number is greater than six. Similar conclusions can be drawn about the present series of complexes of fluorinated ß-diketones. Baskin and Ferraro [15] using aqueous ethanol as solvent prepared solid yellow  $UO_2(TTA)_2 \cdot C_2H_5OH$ , while others [16] separated the complex as  $UO_2(TTA)_2 \cdot 2H_2O$  (TTA = 2-thenoyltrifluoroacetone).

The relative intensities of the metal containing ions in the EI mass spectra of the complexes are shown in Table II. Though uranium is a polyisotopic

element the high (99.27) relative abundance of <sup>238</sup>U contributes some amount of uncertainty in the identification of metal containing ions in the spectra. Some differences in the mass spectra were observed depending on R and  $R^1$ . When R is an alkyl (methyl) group the spectrum shows the presence of M-R and M-RCOF which are absent with R as aryl groups. These differences are perhaps due to delocalisation of  $\pi$  electrons of the aryl groups which makes the bonds stronger. Loss of  $CH<sub>2</sub>CO$  from the molecular ion was observed in many metal complexes with R as a methyl group  $[6, 10]$ .

The complexes of trifluoromethyl- $\beta$ -diketones ( $\mathbb{R}^1$  $= CF_3$ ) showed the presence of M-48 ions and the metastable peaks for their formation from the molecular ions. This elimination of formyl fluoride (HCOF) from the odd-electron molecular ions has not been reported previously in the literature [10]. When  $R^1$  =  $CF_3$  a few other ions, M-L- $CF_2$ , M-L- $CF_2$ -HF and  $M-L-CF_2-CO_2$  are present in most cases. The cor-

TABLE III. High Resolution Mass Measurements on Selected Peaks of  $UO<sub>2</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>COCHCOCF<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>$ .

Ions	Calculated Mass	Determined Mass			
UF <sub>3</sub>	295.0460	295.0479			
UOF <sub>2</sub>	292.0425	292.0445			
UO <sub>2</sub> F	289.0390	289.0393			
UOF	273.0441	273.0437			
UO <sub>2</sub>	270.0406	270.0420			

responding ions are absent when  $R^1 = C_2F_5$  and  $C_3F_7$  except M-L-C<sub>2</sub>F<sub>4</sub> when R<sup>1</sup> is C<sub>2</sub>F<sub>5</sub>. Loss of : $CF<sub>2</sub>$  from M-L ions involves the metal-fluorine bond formation. The mechanism of such reaction was discussed in the literature  $[4, 19]$ . Loss of  $CO<sub>2</sub>$  from  $M-L-CF<sub>2</sub>$  involves organometallic bond formation  $[20]$ .

When  $R^1 = C_2F_5$  and  $C_3F_7$  the complexes showed the presence of a novel ion,  $M-R^1-F$ . Because of the longer chain of the fluorinated alkyl groups perfluoroalkyl groups of two coordinated ligands come closer to each other and thus eliminate  $FR<sup>1</sup>$ . This interligand reaction was confirmed by the presence of metastable peaks for two complexes with  $R^1 = C_2F_5$ . Another interesting reaction is the elimination of tetrafluoroethylene from M-L when  $R^1 = C_2F_5$ . This reaction was confirmed by the presence of a metastable peak. It is not clear whether this reaction involves fluorine migration to metal or to carbonyl carbon. Such reaction was absent in the case of Pd(RCOCHCOC<sub>2</sub>F<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub> complexes [6]. Somehow the central metal atom has great influence in determining the fragmentation pattern of the complexes. When  $R^1 = C_2F_5$ , small unidentified peaks  $(<2)$  were observed at m/e corresponding to M-L-22 and M-L-25.

The fluoride and oxyfluoride of uranium ions show the oxidation state of  $+4$ ,  $+5$  and  $+6$ . Some of these ions are confirmed by high resolution mass spectrometry and are shown in Table III. The replacement of oxygen by fluorine in some of these ions is novel in mass spectrometry.

The migration of R to the metal was not observed due to the absence of any  $d$  electron in uranium-(VI).

#### **References**

- 1 M. L. Morris and R. D. Koob, Znorg. *Chem., 20, 2137*  (1981).
- 2 S. Ahrland, J. Chatt and M. R. Davies, *Quart. Rev., 12,*   $\overline{c}$ *265* (1958).
- *3 S.* Ahrland, *Strut. Bonding, 1, 207 (1966).*
- *4* M. Das, J. *Znorg. Nucl. Chem., 43, 3412* (1981) and references therein.
- 5 M. Das, unpublished results.
- 6 M. Das,Znorg. *Chim. Acta, 76,* Llll (1983). 7 C. Reichert and J. B. Westmore, *Can. J. Chem., 48, 3213*
- $(970)$ *8* M. Das and S. E. Livingstone, *Aust. J. Chem., 28,* 1513
- (1975). 9 R. C. Olivares, J. Gomez-Lara and E. Cortes, J. Znorg.
- N. C. Chrafes, S. Completed. 11 July, Chem, 72, 1990 (1900).<br>0 J. B. Wastmore. 'Mass. Snectrometry' of Motel
- worths, *London (1713)*.<br>1. M. Das, *Inows, Chim. Acta, 48, 33 (*1981). Compounds', Ed. 1, Charalambous, Chap. 9, Butterworths, London (1975).
- 1 m. Das, *Inorg*, Chim. Aciu, 40, 33 (1901).<br>1 I. Secocni and C. Ciannoni, J. Chem. Soc., 2268, 2751.
- 13 L. Sacconi, G. Caroti and P. Paoletti, Z. *Znorg. NucZ.*   $(054)$
- 14 R. L. Belford, A. E. Martell and M. Calvin, J. *Znorg. Chem., 8, 93* (1958).
- 114tt, Chem., 14, 107 (1700).<br>5. V. Bookin and J. B. Ferraro, J. *Inorg. Nual Chem.*, 30, *Nucl. Chem., 14,* 169 (1960).
- 16 K. M. Abubacker and N. S. K. Prasad, J. *Znorg. NucL 241* (1968).
- 17 G. M. Bancroft, C. Reichert, J. B. Westmore and H. D. *Chem., 16, 296* (1961).
- Usssu, *inorg*, Criem, O, 171 (1707).<br>9 W. D. Courrier, W. Forster, C. J. J. Lock and C. Turner, Gesser, *Znorg. Chem., 8, 474* (1969).
- 19 A. L. Clobes, M. L. Morris and R. D. Koob, *Org. Mass*  Can. .Z. *Chem., 50, 8* (1972).
- 20 A. L. Clobes, M. L. Morris and R. D. Koob, Org. *Mass Spectrom., 5, 633* (1971).
- *Spectrom., 3, 1255* (1970).