

Activation Volumes for Aquation of a Neutral Ligand from Ionic or Neutral Octahedral Complexes: Urea-pentaamminecobalt(III) Dithionate and Chlorobis(dimethylglyoximate)ureacobalt(III)

GEOFFREY A. LAWRENCE* and SURAPONG SUVACHITTANONT

Department of Inorganic Chemistry, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Vic. 3052, Australia, and Research School of Chemistry, The Australian National University, P.O. Box 4, Canberra, C.T. 2600, Australia

Received September 3, 1979

It has become common practice in both organic and inorganic reactions studied at elevated pressures to divide the experimental activation volume ($\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$) into two components [1, 2]. This separates intrinsic contributions resulting from nuclear displacements at the reaction centre ($\Delta V_{\text{intr}}^\ddagger$) from rearrangement of solvent molecules about the reactants ($\Delta V_{\text{solv}}^\ddagger$) which occur in forming the transition state. When dealing with dissociative reactions of charged ligands in the activation step, $\Delta V_{\text{solv}}^\ddagger$ is dominated by volume changes resulting from changes in electrostriction ($\Delta V_{\text{el}}^\ddagger$).

It has generally been assumed that the $\Delta V_{\text{intr}}^\ddagger$ term is the dominant component of $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ when displacement of neutral ligands is involved. Solvation changes between the ground and transition state should be minor in this case, hence $\Delta V_{\text{solv}}^\ddagger$ will be small. To date, this assumption has not been firmly tested for aquation reactions of octahedral complex ions. We have now approached this problem by determining $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ for aquation of cobalt(III) complexes of different formal charge but with the same unidentate leaving group, and present the results in this report. Results for a neutral leaving group are also contrasted with results for a charged leaving group.

For complex ions with anionic leaving groups, $\Delta V_{\text{el}}^\ddagger$ has been shown to be strongly negative and to dominate $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$. For example, the complexes $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5(\text{SO}_4)^+$, $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5\text{Cl}^{2+}$ and $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5(\text{Me}_2\text{SO})^{3+}$ exhibit $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ values of -18.5 , -10.6 and $-1.7 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1}$ respectively for aquation as the charge on the leaving group falls from 2– to 1– to 0 [3, 4]. A dissociative mechanism applies in each case. The charge separation of, for example, $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5\text{Cl}^{2+}$ into $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5^{3+}$ and Cl^- in the dissociative limit leads to greater electrostriction of the transition state. Since the partial molar volume of bulk solvent

water ($\bar{V} = 18 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1}$) and electrostricted water ($\bar{V} \approx 15 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1}$) differ, increased electrostriction of the transition state demands a strongly negative $\Delta V_{\text{el}}^\ddagger$ when an anionic ligand is dissociated from a cationic complex. A range of reactions involving dissociation of charged ligands in the transition state have $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ which reflect the dominance of $\Delta V_{\text{el}}^\ddagger$ [2, 3, 5].

For complex ions with neutral leaving groups, observed $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ have been assumed to reflect mainly the $\Delta V_{\text{intr}}^\ddagger$ contribution. For example, aquo ligand exchange in $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5(\text{OH}_2)^{3+}$ ($\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger = +1.2 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1}$) [6] and $\text{Cr}(\text{NH}_3)_5(\text{OH}_2)^{3+}$ ($\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger = -5.8 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1}$) [7] can be interpreted in terms of dissociative and associative character arising from partial release or entry of a water molecule respectively in the transition state. While solvation changes in the transition state are assumed to be minor for neutral leaving groups, this has not been explicitly probed. We have chosen for study the strongly solvated 3+ ion $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5(\text{urea})^{3+}$ and the formally neutral molecule $\text{Co}(\text{dmg})_2\text{Cl}(\text{urea})$ ($\text{dmg}^- = \text{dimethylglyoximate}$), both of which aquate spontaneously with loss of neutral O-bound urea and without any stereochemical change. Analytically pure samples of complexes studied were prepared using previously described methods [8–10].

Complex cations of 3+ charge possess several solvation layers of significantly electrostricted water molecules of lower molar volume than bulk water [5], while the relatively insoluble neutral molecule presents a system about which electrostricted solvation layers should be minimal. If $\Delta V_{\text{solv}}^\ddagger$ is not minor in these aquation reactions, the expectation is that the difference in this term and hence in $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ should be marked for these differently solvated complexes.

Determined $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ for the spontaneous aquation of $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5(\text{urea})^{3+}$ and $\text{Co}(\text{dmg})_2\text{Cl}(\text{urea})$ in water (no added electrolyte) at elevated pressures are both small and positive (Table I). The similarity is sufficient to indicate that $\Delta V_{\text{solv}}^\ddagger$ is minor and that $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ hence reflects changes in the intrinsic volume of reactants on forming the transition state. Subsequently, the concept of a positive activation volume indicating a dissociative mechanism and a negative activation volume suggesting an associative mechanism has validity for reactions of complexes with neutral leaving groups. $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ is a more effective mechanistic guide than ΔS^\ddagger in these systems, since the latter varies markedly for the two complexes (Table) even though the expectation is for a dissociative mechanism in each case.

While it is not possible to maintain the same non-leaving groups in the above experiment, we may contrast the above results with $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ for aquation

*To whom correspondence should be addressed at The Australian National University.

TABLE. Activation Volumes and Activation Entropies for Aquation Reactions.

Complex	ΔV^\ddagger ($\text{cm}^3 \text{mol}^{-1}$)	ΔS^\ddagger ($\text{J K}^{-1} \text{mol}^{-1}$)	Reference
$\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5(\text{urea})^{3+}$	+1.3 (± 0.5)	-10 (± 4)	a
$\text{Co}(\text{dmg})_2\text{Cl}(\text{urea})^0$	+3.5 (± 0.3)	-108	a, 9
$\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5\text{Cl}^{2+}$	-10.6	-44	3
$\text{Co}(\text{dtcd})(\text{N}_3)\text{Cl}^+$	+8.3	-51	11

^aThis work.

of an anionic leaving group (Cl^-) from the complexes $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5\text{Cl}^{2+}$ and $\text{Co}(\text{dtcd})(\text{N}_3)\text{Cl}^+$ (dtcd = 5,7-dimethyl-1,4,8,11-tetraazacyclotetradeca-4,11-diene), where again both charge and non-leaving groups have been altered. The previously reported negative $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ for the $\text{Co}(\text{NH}_3)_5\text{Cl}^{2+}$ ion [3] contrasts markedly with the positive value for the macrocyclic $\text{Co}(\text{dtcd})(\text{N}_3)\text{Cl}^+$ ion [11] (Table).

The substantial variation of $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ in the case of aquation of a charged ligand (dominant $\Delta V_{\text{solv}}^\ddagger$) from complexes with different charge and non-leaving groups contrasts sharply with the essentially similar $\Delta V_{\text{exp}}^\ddagger$ when aquation of a neutral ligand (dominant $\Delta V_{\text{intr}}^\ddagger$) is involved. One implication of this study is that activation volume alone may be a less successful indicator of mechanism when dealing with aquation of charged ligands than is the case for aquation of neutral ligands.

References

- 1 T. Asano and W. J. le Noble, *Chem. Rev.*, **78**, 407 (1978).
- 2 D. A. Palmer and H. Kelm, in 'High Pressure Chemistry', ed. H. Kelm, Reidel (Dordrecht) pp. 435-467 (1978).
- 3 G. Guastalla and T. W. Swaddle, *Canad. J. Chem.*, **51**, 821 (1973).
- 4 D. A. Palmer and H. Kelm, *Inorg. Chem.*, **16**, 3139 (1977).
- 5 D. R. Stranks, *Pure Appl. Chem.*, **38**, 303 (1974).
- 6 H. R. Hunt and H. Taube, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **80**, 2642 (1958).
- 7 T. W. Swaddle and D. R. Stranks, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **94**, 8357 (1972).
- 8 R. J. Balahura and R. B. Jordan, *Inorg. Chem.*, **9**, 1567 (1970).
- 9 N. M. Samus', O. N. Danaskina and A. V. Ablov, *Russ. J. Inorg. Chem.*, **16**, 1030 (1971).
- 10 S. Suvachittanont and G. A. Lawrance, *J. Sci. Soc. Thailand*, **4**, 52 (1978).
- 11 G. A. Lawrance and S. Suvachittanont, submitted for publication.