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#### Abstract

A series of cis-[( $\left.\left.\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right] \mathrm{X}_{2}$ complexes ( $\mathrm{G}=9$-ethylguanine, coordinated to Pt through N 7 ) with $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{NO}_{3}{ }^{-}$ (1), $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}(\mathbf{2}),{ }^{1} /{ }_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-}(3), 1 / 2 \mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4}{ }^{2-}(4)$, and $\mathrm{ClO}_{4}{ }^{-}$(5) have been prepared, and the crystal structures of $\mathbf{3}$ and 4 have been determined. cis-[ $\left.\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right] \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (3) crystallizes in the triclinic space group $P \overline{\mathrm{I}}$ with $a=10.727$ (3) $\AA, b=10.769$ (3) $\AA, c=12.976(3) \AA, \alpha=111.52(2)^{\circ}, \beta=90.15(3)^{\circ}, \gamma=109.88(2)^{\circ}, V=1297.47 \AA^{3}, Z=2 . \quad c i s-\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right]-$ $\left[\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4}\right] \cdot 3 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4)$ crystallizes also in the triclinic space group $P \overline{1}$ with $a=12.026$ (2) $\AA, b=12.292$ (3) $\AA, c=10.745$ (2) $\AA, \alpha=110.05(2)^{\circ}, \beta=95.59(2)^{\circ}, \gamma=88.46(2)^{\circ}, V=1484.96 \AA^{3}, Z=2$. The structures were refined to $R=0.069$ (3) and 0.034 (4) and $R_{w}=0.072$ (3) and 0.035 (4) on the basis of 3433 (3) and 3766 (4) independent reflections with $F_{0}$ $\geqslant 2 \sigma F_{0}$. In both compounds, the two 9 -ethylguanine ligands are oriented head-to-head, as is the case with the previously studied Cl salt 2. A comparison of the structures of $\mathbf{2 , 3}$, and $\mathbf{4}$ shows differences in the dihedral angles between the G planes $\left(68-78^{\circ}\right)$ and between G and Pt coordination planes ( $51-131^{\circ}$ ), leading to considerable variations in interbase distances within the complex, e.g., between the O 4 atoms ( $3.4-4.1 \AA$ ) or the $\mathrm{C} 9^{\prime}$ atoms ( $6.3-7.6 \AA$ ). The Raman solid-state spectra can be divided into three classes which, according to the crystal structures of $\mathbf{2 , 3}$, and $\mathbf{4}$, differ in the degree of intramolecular base overlap. Like the Cl salt, 2, 3, and 4 are "real" models for an intrastrand cross-link of cis $-\mathrm{Pt}^{11}$ with two adjacent guanine bases in DNA, which is believed to be the major cross-link. From the geometries of the three closely related complexes, details concerning the expected local distortion of DNA may be deduced


Structural details of bis(guanine) complexes of cis-diammineplatinum(II) residues have evoked considerable interest due to the fact that the antitumor agent cis- $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtCl}_{2}$ has been shown to preferentially form cross-links of this type with adjacent guanine bases. Evidence for this cross-link as the major product in the reaction of cisplatin with nucleic acids comes from studies on the enzymatic digestion of platinated DNA or DNA models, ${ }^{2}$ chemical degradation of platinated DNA, ${ }^{3}$ and an immunological study, ${ }^{4}$ as well as ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR work with small oligonucleotides containing GG sequences flanked by other bases. ${ }^{5}$ In particular, aspects such as the degree of steric distortion of DNA as a consequence of the GG cross-link, ${ }^{6}$ its effect on duplex stability and base pairing, ${ }^{5,6}$ and its stability toward strong nucleophiles such as cyanide ${ }^{7}$ are of interest. Another point of interest relates to findings that cis- $\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{Guo})_{2}\right] \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (Guo $=$ guanosine), despite being a charged complex, shows antitumor activity ${ }^{8}$ and has antiviral properties. ${ }^{9}$

If one reviews the published structures on bis(guanine)-cisdiammineplatinum(II) complexes, ${ }^{10}$ one finds that, with the ex-

[^0]ception of two structures published in 1984 by us, ${ }^{11}$ the two purine bases always are oriented head-to-tail, leading to a $C_{2}$ molecular symmetry. In all cases, Pt coordination is through $\mathrm{N}_{7}$ of the guanine ligand. The head-tail arrangement of the two bases is also observed if the N 7 -platinated guanine ligand becomes deprotonated at N1, e.g., in cis- $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Pt}\left(\mathrm{G}^{-}\right)_{2}$ ( $\mathrm{G}=9$-ethylguanine). ${ }^{12}$ Since a head-tail arrangement of two adjacent guanine bases seems to be rather unlikely in native DNA, the relevance of most bis(guanine) structures as a model for a GG cross-link may be questioned. It has been suggested that the head-tail orientation of two bases may be the thermodynamically most favorable situation ${ }^{13}$ and explain why, unlike in solution, ${ }^{14}$ where rotation about the $\mathrm{Pt}-\mathrm{N} 7$ bond is possible, in the solid state this arrangement appears to be the preferred one. This property is common also to all the other known cis-bis(ligand) complexes of $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Pt}^{11}$ and $\mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{Pt}^{1 \mathrm{I}}$, e.g., with cytosine bases, ${ }^{15} 1$-methyluracil, ${ }^{16} \alpha$-pyridone, ${ }^{17}$ substituted imidazoles, ${ }^{18} 1,3,9$-trimethylxanthine, ${ }^{19} 7,9$-dimethylhypoxanthine, ${ }^{20} 9$-methylhypoxanthine, ${ }^{21}$

[^1]inosine $5^{\prime}$-monophosphate, ${ }^{22}$ and dinucleotide models with bridging $\mathrm{CH}_{2}$ groups. ${ }^{23}$ On the other hand, as has been shown by us in the case of bis(1-methyluracil) complexes, it is possible to force the two nucleobases into a head-head arrangement through coordination of a second metal which links the two bases. ${ }^{24}$

It was the obvious exception of cis- $\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right] \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and cis- $\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right] \mathrm{Cl}_{1.5}\left(\mathrm{HCO}_{3}\right)_{0.5}$ with the unexpected head-head orientation of the two guanine rings ${ }^{11}$ which prompted the work described here. Specifically, we were interested in finding out the effect of the counterion(s) on the mutual orientation of the bases, the degree of flexibility of the system, and in particular the distortion of DNA that might be expected for a G,G intrastrand cross-link.

## Experimental Section

Preparation. cis -[( $\left.\left.\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right]\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2} \cdot \mathbf{2} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (1): Freshly prepared cis- $\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Pt}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}\right]\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2}(2 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{G}(4 \mathrm{mmol})$ were reacted in water (suspension, $0.02 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Pt} ; 2 \mathrm{~h}, 60^{\circ} \mathrm{C} ; 12 \mathrm{~h}, 20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and then filtered, and the precipitate ( 280 mg ) was washed with $2 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ water. On slow evaporation of the filtrate ( pH 3.5 ), 300 mg of 1 was collected. The combined precipitates were recrystallized from water to give colorless, transparent microcubes. Anal. Caled for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{~N}_{14} \mathrm{O}_{10} \mathrm{Pt}$ : C, 22.49; H, 3.78; N, 26.23; Pt, 26.09. Found: C, 22.68; H, 3.76; N, 26.84; Pt, 26.1.
cis $-\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2} \mathrm{CCl}_{2} \cdot \mathbf{3} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ (2) was prepared as previously described ${ }^{11}$ or alternatively in $90 \%$ yield by passing 1 over an anion-exchange column in the $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$form and subsequent slow evaporating the filtrate.
cis $-\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot \mathbf{4} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ (3) was both obtained in a way analogous to 1 (using $\mathrm{Ag}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ instead of $\mathrm{AgNO}_{3}$ to prepare the diaqua species) in $95 \%$ yield and by treating 2 with the calculated a mount of $\mathrm{Ag}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}(40$ h at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), filtrating AgCl , and slow evaporating at $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (yield $85 \%$ ). Crystals suitable for X-ray work were obtained on recrystallization from water. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{~N}_{12} \mathrm{O}_{10}$ SPt: C, 22.25; H, 4.28; $\mathrm{N}, 22.25$; $\mathrm{S}, 4.25 ; \mathrm{Pt}, 25.81$. Found: C, 22.85; H, 4.37; N, 22.63; S, 3.92; Pt, 25.3 (better fit for trihydrate).
cis $-\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\left[\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4}\right] \mathbf{3 H}_{2} \mathbf{O}\right.$ (4) originally was isolated from an aqueous solution of $\mathbf{1}$ or $\mathbf{2}$ to which KCN ( 2 equiv per Pt ) had been added. ${ }^{25}$ Alternatively, 4 was obtained by treating an aqueous solution of $2(0.008 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Pt})$ with 1 equiv of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4} \cdot 3 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. From the filtered, clear solution, crystals of $\mathbf{4}$ formed on slow cooling. After filtration of the first crystalline batch, more material precipitated on slow evaporation of the solution in air: total yield $78 \%$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{Pt}_{2}: \mathrm{C}, 22.98 ; \mathrm{H}, 3.22 ; \mathrm{N}, 23.83 ; \mathrm{Pt}, 41.47$. Found: C , 22.94; H, 3.18; N, 24.32; Pt, 41.4.
cis $-\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right]\left(\mathrm{ClO}_{4}\right)_{2} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{2} \mathbf{O}$ (5) was prepared as previously described. ${ }^{26}$

Spectra. Infrared spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer 580 grating spectrometer from KBr pellets and Nujol mulls (CsJ windows). Raman spectra were taken on a Coderg PH 1 with Krypton laser excitation ( $647.1 \mathrm{~nm}, 100-700-\mathrm{mW}$ power, depending on sample stability in the laser beam). Wavenumber calibration was achieved by means of indene. Spectral slit widths were as indicated; scan rates usually were $10 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} \mathrm{~min}^{-1}$.
Crystallography. X-ray measurements were carried out at room temperature on a Philips-PW 1100 single-crystal diffractometer using graphite monochromated Mo K $\alpha$ radiation $(\lambda=0.71069 \AA)$. The dimensions of the crystals used were $0.3,0.3,0.3 \mathrm{~mm}$ (3) and $0.2,0.2,0.2 \mathrm{~mm}$ (4). Both compounds crystallize in the triclinic space group $P \bar{I}$ with $Z$ =2. Crystal data for 3 are as follows: $a=10.727$ (3) $\AA, b=10.769$ (3) $\AA, c=12.976$ (3) $\AA, \alpha=111.52(2)^{\circ}, \beta=90.15(3)^{\circ}, \gamma=109.88$ (3) ${ }^{\circ}, V=1294.47 \AA^{3}, \rho_{\text {calcd }}=1.931, \rho_{\text {absd }}=1.95 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}$. Crystal data for 4 are as follows: $a=12.026$ (2) $\AA, b=12.292$ (3) $\AA, c=10.745$ (2) $\AA, \alpha=110.05(2)^{\circ}, \beta=95.59(2)^{\circ}, \gamma=88.46(2)^{\circ}, V=1484.96$ $\AA^{3}, \rho_{\text {calcd }}=2.104, \rho_{\text {obsd }}=2.08 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}$. The cell parameters of 3 and of 4 were calculated from 35 reflections ((3) $24^{\circ}<2 \theta<37^{\circ}$; (4) $28^{\circ}<$

[^2]

Figure 1. View of the cis-[ $\left.\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right]^{2+}$ cation of the sulfate salt 3 .
$2 \theta<40^{\circ}$ ) centered on the diffractometer. Intensities were measured by using $\theta-2 \theta$ scans ( $3, \theta_{\text {max }}=23^{\circ} ; 4, \theta_{\max }=25^{\circ}$ ). Of the 3621 reflections measured for 3 and the 4150 reflections measured for 4 , a set of 3433 reflections for 3 and 3766 reflections for 4 with $F_{a}>2 \sigma F_{0}$ was used for the structure determinations. Lp, and in a later stage, empirical absorption corrections ( $3, \mu=53 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1} ; 4, \mu=90.9 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) were applied. The absorption corrections were calculated by using a program written by Walker and Stuart. ${ }^{27}$ The coordinates of the platinum atoms for both structures were obtained by using the XMY program of Debaerdemaeker. ${ }^{28}$ The other non-hydrogen atoms were located in subsequent $\Delta F$ syntheses. H atoms were ignored in all stages. In 3 the Pt and S atoms and in 4 only the Pt atoms were refined with anisotropic temperture factors. The other atoms were refined with isotropic temperature factors: $3, R=0.069, R_{w}=0.072, w^{-1}=\sigma^{2}(F)+0.0006 F^{2} ; 4, R=0.034, R_{w}$ $=0.035, w^{-1}=\sigma^{2}(F)+0.0002 F^{2}$. Atom parameters are listed in Table I. For Pt and S , the equivalent isotrc pic temperature factors are given (calculated from the $U_{i j}$ values by $U_{\text {eq }}=1 / 3 \sum_{i} \sum_{j} U_{i j} a_{i}{ }^{*} a_{j}{ }^{*} a_{i} \cdot a_{j}$ ). The highest peak in the final difference map was $2.9 \mathrm{e}^{-3}$ for $3(1.5 \AA$ away from the platinum atom) and $1.1 \mathrm{e}^{\AA^{-3}}\left(0.72 \AA\right.$ away from $\left.\mathrm{C} 9^{\prime \prime}\right)$ for 4 . Complex scattering factors for neutral atoms were taken from ref 29. For the calculations, the sHELX program package ${ }^{30}$ was used.

## Results and Discussion

Structures of 3 and 4. Interatomic distances and angles of cis- $\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right] \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (3) and cis- $\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right][\mathrm{Pt}-$ $\left.(\mathrm{CN})_{4}\right] \cdot 3 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (4) are listed in Table II; a view of the cation of 3 is given in Figure 1. In both compounds, the neutral $9-$ ethylguanine ligands are coordinated to Pt through N 7 , and the geometry about Pt is normal in both compounds and similar to that observed with the corresponding chloride and the mixed chloride, bicarbonate. ${ }^{11}$ There are no significant differences in bond lengths and angles within the G ligands in $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{4}$, and there aren't any with respect to the neutral, nonplatinated ligand $G^{31}$ and its hemiprotonated ${ }^{32}$ or its fully protonated form. ${ }^{33}$ As in the case of the chloride and the mixed chloride/bicarbonate salts, the two G ligands in 3 and 4 are oriented in a way that the exocyclic oxygens are at the same side of the Pt coordination plane, hence in a head-head arrangement. Bond lengths and angles of the sulfate in $\mathbf{3}$ and the tetracyanoplatinate in $\mathbf{4}$ are normal and compare well with published data. ${ }^{34,35}$

In Table III, possible hydrogen bonding interactions in $\mathbf{3}$ and 4 are listed. As can be seen, only a single intramolecular hydrogen bond is formed between O6 of one guanine ligand and a $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ group ( $2.91 \AA$ in $3,2.97 \AA$ in 4 ), very similar as in 2 . On the other hand, there is extensive intermolecular hydrogen bonding, involving $\mathrm{NH}_{3}$ groups and O 6 of guanine, the oxygens of the
(27) Walker, N.; Stuart, D. Acta Crystallogr., Sect. A: Found. Crystallogr. 1983, A39, 158.
(28) Debardemaeker, T.; Woolfson, M. M. Acta Crystallogr., Sect. A: Found. Crystallogr. 1983, A39, 193.
(29) Cromer, D. T.; Mann, J. B. Acta Crystallogr., Sect. A: Cryst. Phys., Diffr., Theor. Gen. Crystallogr. 1968, A24, 321.
(30) Sheldrick, G. M. "SHELX, Program for Crystal Structure Determination"; University of Göttingen: Göttingen, 1976.
(31) Destro, R.; Kistenmacher, T. J.; Marsh, R. E. Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B 1974, B30, 79.
(32) Mandel, G. S.; Marsh, R. E. Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B 1975, 1975, B3l, 2862.
(33) Purnell, L. G.; Hodgson, D. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1976, 98, 4759.
(34) Sutton, L. E., Ed. Spec. Publ. Chem. Soc. 1965, 18, M 405.
(35) See, e.g.: Peters, C.; Eagen, C. F. Inorg. Chem. 1976, 15, 782.

Table I. Positional Parameters and Temperature Factors $\left(\AA^{2}\right)$ for $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{4}^{a}$

| 3 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| atom | $X$ | $Y$ | $Z$ | $U$ | atom | $X$ | $Y$ | Z | U |
| Pt1 | 0.6776 (1) | -0.0343 (1) | 0.4034 (1) | 0.021 (1) | Pt 1 | 0.0432 (1) | 0.2111 (1) | 0.0665 (1) | 0.026 (1) |
| N10 | 0.7060 (12) | 0.0479 (13) | 0.5683 (10) | 0.025 (3) | N11 | -0.1266 (5) | 0.1935 (6) | 0.0504 (7) | 0.033 (2) |
| N11 | 0.6836 (14) | 0.1532 (15) | 0.3940 (12) | 0.037 (3) | N10 | 0.0452 (6) | 0.2087 (6) | 0.2561 (7) | 0.039 (2) |
| N1a | 0.3898 (13) | -0.1203 (13) | 0.0529 (11) | 0.029 (3) | N1a | 0.1833 (5) | -0.0266 (6) | -0.3800 (7) | 0.034 (2) |
| C2a | 0.4215 (15) | -0.1987 (15) | -0.0455 (12) | 0.027 (3) | C2a | 0.1563 (6) | 0.0155 (7) | -0.4814 (8) | 0.032 (2) |
| N $2 \mathrm{a}^{\prime}$ | 0.3441 (15) | -0.2307 (15) | -0.1412 (12) | 0.042 (4) | N2a' | 0.1942 (6) | -0.0514 (7) | -0.6017 (8) | 0.050 (2) |
| N3a | 0.5213 (14) | -0.2432 (14) | -0.0526 (11) | 0.034 (3) | N3a | 0.0949 (5) | 0.1105 (6) | -0.4669 (7) | 0.036 (2) |
| C4a | 0.5871 (16) | -0.2062 (16) | 0.0486 (13) | 0.031 (4) | C4a | 0.0645 (6) | 0.1639 (7) | -0.3414 (8) | 0.032 (2) |
| C5a | 0.5628 (15) | -0.1367 (15) | 0.1541 (12) | 0.025 (3) | C5a | 0.0878 (6) | 0.1296 (7) | -0.2322 (8) | 0.030 (2) |
| C6a | 0.4601 (16) | -0.0771 (16) | 0.1591 (13) | 0.029 (3) | C6a | 0.1505 (6) | 0.0262 (7) | -0.2493 (8) | 0.032 (2) |
| O6a' | 0.4298 (11) | -0.0014 (11) | 0.2444 (9) | 0.035 (3) | O6a ${ }^{\prime}$ | 0.1773 (5) | -0.0185 (5) | -0.1650 (6) | 0.040 (1) |
| N7a | 0.6526 (12) | -0.1194 (12) | 0.2391 (10) | 0.022 (3) | N7a | 0.0401 (5) | 0.2106 (6) | -0.1222 (7) | 0.031 (2) |
| C8a | 0.7337 (16) | -0.1914 (16) | 0.1788 (13) | 0.031 (4) | C8a | -0.0070 (7) | 0.2899 (7) | -0.1645 (9) | 0.036 (2) |
| N9a | 0.6973 (13) | -0.2439 (13) | 0.0635 (11) | 0.031 (3) | N9a | 0.0045 (5) | 0.2636 (6) | -0.2975 (7) | 0.032 (2) |
| C9a' | 0.7588 (18) | -0.3236 (19) | -0.0223 (15) | 0.043 (4) | C9a' | -0.0383 (8) | 0.3290 (8) | -0.3824 (10) | 0.048 (2) |
| C9a" | 0.6846 (25) | -0.4814 (28) | -0.0608 (22) | 0.075 (7) | C9a" | -0.0908 (10) | 0.4463 (11) | -0.3041 (12) | 0.069 (3) |
| N1b | 0.3645 (13) | -0.5303 (13) | 0.3416 (10) | 0.030 (3) | N1b | 0.3834 (6) | 0.0076 (6) | 0.1617 (7) | 0.039 (2) |
| C 2 b | 0.4230 (15) | -0.6277 (15) | 0.3366 (12) | 0.024 (3) | C 2 b | 0.4848 (7) | 0.0615 (7) | 0.1628 (5) | 0.034 (2) |
| $\mathrm{N} 2 \mathrm{~b}^{\prime}$ | 0.3399 (15) | -0.7646 (16) | 0.3093 (12) | 0.042 (3) | N2 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 0.5779 (6) | 0.0016 (7) | 0.1766 (8) | 0.045 (2) |
| N3b | 0.5560 (12) | -0.5927 (13) | 0.3562 (10) | 0.026 (3) | N3b | 0.4929 (6) | 0.1626 (6) | 0.1497 (7) | 0.037 (2) |
| C4b | 0.6222 (15) | -0.4547 (15) | 0.3783 (12) | 0.026 (3) | C4b | 0.3928 (7) | 0.2064 (7) | 0.1252 (8) | 0.034 (2) |
| C5b | 0.5728 (15) | -0.3474 (16) | 0.3833 (12) | 0.026 (3) | C 5 b | 0.2902 (6) | 0.1573 (7) | 0.1134 (8) | 0.027 (2) |
| C6b | 0.4316 (15) | -0.3887 (15) | 0.3686 (12) | 0.024 (3) | C6b | 0.2806 (6) | 0.0550 (7) | 0.1439 (8) | 0.029 (2) |
| O6b' | 0.3669 (11) | -0.3072 (12) | 0.3759 (9) | 0.037 (3) | O6b ${ }^{\prime}$ | 0.1945 (4) | 0.0066 (5) | 0.1583 (6) | 0.037 (1) |
| N7b | 0.6807 (13) | -0.2170 (13) | 0.4097 (10) | 0.026 (3) | N7b | 0.2095 (5) | 0.2303 (6) | 0.0859 (7) | 0.031 (2) |
| C8b | 0.7896 (15) | -0.2434 (16) | 0.4214 (12) | 0.027 (3) | C8b | 0.2642 (7) | 0.3209 (8) | 0.0840 (9) | 0.040 (2) |
| N9b | 0.7611 (13) | -0.3852 (13) | 0.4041 (11) | 0.030 (3) | N9b | 0.3770 (6) | 0.3107 (6) | 0.1080 (7) | 0.039 (2) |
| C9b' | 0.8571 (18) | -0.4509 (18) | 0.4130 (14) | 0.039 (4) | C9b' | 0.4601 (9) | 0.4010 (9) | 0.1306 (11) | 0.059 (3) |
| C9 ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 0.9966 (23) | -0.3700 (24) | 0.4039 (19) | 0.064 (6) | C9b" | 0.4471 (12) | 0.4911 (13) | 0.2675 (15) | 0.093 (4) |
| S1 | 1.0049 (4) | 0.2152 (5) | 0.2454 (4) | 0.038 (4) | Pt 2 | -0.2586 (1) | 0.5635 (1) | 0.2812 (1) | 0.037 (1) |
| O10 | 1.0172 (28) | 0.1081 (28) | 0.1487 (23) | 0.138 (9) | C 1 | -0.2626 (8) | 0.6523 (9) | 0.4733 (11) | 0.052 (3) |
| O11 | 1.0955 (17) | 0.3531 (17) | 0.2543 (14) | 0.075 (4) | N1 | -0.2646 (9) | 0.7003 (10) | 0.5852 (12) | 0.086 (3) |
| O12 | 0.8716 (20) | 0.2083 (20) | 0.2464 (16) | 0.093 (5) | C2 | -0.3258 (8) | 0.6992 (8) | 0.2425 (10) | 0.046 (2) |
| O13 | $1.0512(24)$ | 0.1878 (24) | 0.3392 (20) | 0.117 (7) | N2 | -0.3681 (8) | 0.7752 (9) | 0.2237 (10) | 0.071 (3) |
| O 20 | 0.8428 (17) | 0.0623 (18) | -0.0445 (14) | 0.078 (5) | C3 | -0.2502 (7) | 0.4693 (8) | 0.0879 (10) | 0.042 (2) |
| O21 | 0.0401 (22) | 0.9313 (24) | 0.3349 (19) | 0.108 (7) | N3 | -0.2486 (7) | 0.4113 (7) | -0.0201 (9) | 0.055 (2) |
| O 22 | 0.9670 (25) | 0.4418 (25) | 0.110 (21) | 0.125 (8) | C4 | -0.2006 (8) | 0.4287 (9) | 0.3239 (10) | 0.049 (2) |
| O 23 | 0.0493 (37) | 0.7305 (38) | 0.1497 (31) | 0.196 (14) | N4 | -0.1714 (8) | 0.3466 (9) | 0.3483 (10) | 0.072 (3) |
|  |  |  |  |  | O10 | 0.3737 (7) | 0.7897 (7) | 0.2064 (8) | 0.074 (2) |
|  |  |  |  |  | O11 | 0.6814 (7) | 0.2222 (8) | 0.4742 (9) | 0.088 (3) |
|  |  |  |  |  | O 12 | 0.4639 (13) | 0.1352 (13) | 0.4832 (16) | 0.184 (6) |

${ }^{a}$ Anisotropic temperature factors for Pt and S are given in the supplementary material.
sulfate, or $\mathbf{N}$ of the tetracyanoplatinate. In addition, the guanine protons at N 1 and at the exocyclic amino group act as proton donors in hydrogen bonds with water oxygens and the cyano groups.

A point of interest in the crystal structures of all four crystallographically studied bis(9-ethylguanine) complexes is the orientations of the ethyl groups of the guanine ligands. In all cases, the ethyl group of one guanine ligand is roughly coplanar with the endocyclic atoms of the ring, while $\mathrm{CH}_{3}$ of the ethyl group of the second guanine is substantially outside the plane of the rest of the ring and either bent toward the second ring $\left(\mathrm{Cl}^{-}, \mathrm{Cl}^{-} /\right.$ $\mathrm{HCO}_{3}^{-}$, and $\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-}$ ) or away from it $\left(\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4}{ }^{2-}\right)$. The differences in the relative orientation of the $\mathrm{C} 9^{\prime \prime}$ groups are responsible for different degrees of base overlap as previously discussed:11 While there is intermolecular base stacking of 3.3-3.4 $\AA$ between rings having C9" either coplanar with the ring or pointing away from each other, the intermolecular base-base distance is much too long for any stacking interaction if the C $9^{\prime \prime}$ groups are pointing toward each other.

Comparison of Structures. In Figure 2, conformational drawings of 2,3 , and 4 are given. The structure of the mixed $\mathrm{Cl}^{-} / \mathrm{HCO}_{3}^{-}$ compound is not included because it is rather similar to 2 . Table IV reports conformational parameters of all three compounds. The dihedral angles listed confer to the convention introduced by Kistenmacher et al. ${ }^{15 a, 36}$ As can be seen from the conformational

[^3]drawings, the cation geometries of $2\left(\mathrm{Cl}^{-}\right)$and $4\left(\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4}{ }^{2-}\right)$ resemble each other more than that of $\mathbf{3}\left(\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-}\right)$. In a simplified representation, the principal difference between the two types is shown in Figure 3. It visualizes the different degrees of intramolecular base overlap, which is larger in 2 and 4 than in 3 . The data listed in Table IV reflect the rather large flexibility of the overall geometry in the bis(base) complexes: even though the dihedral angles between the two rings differ relatively little ( $68-76^{\circ}$ ), the dihedral angles between the rings and the Pt coordination planes are extremely variable ( $51-131^{\circ}$ ), leading to variations in the intramolecular separations of the O 6 sites (3.4-4.1 $\AA$ ) and the $\mathrm{C}^{\prime}$ atoms ( $6.3-7.6 \AA$ ). Since, with nucleotides, the distances between the C9' sites represent the glycoside bond separation (ca. $6.5 \AA 2$ ( B-DNA), the values suggest that an arrangement as observed in $2(6.25 \AA$ ) or $3(6.45 \AA)$ would probably fit better into DNA than that of $4(7.59 \AA)$. Moreover, the deviations of Pt from the guanine planes are variable: while in 4 , the Pt is almost coplanar with both rings, Pt is out of the plane of one of the two guanine rings in $\mathbf{3}$ by $0.36 \AA$, corresponding to a $10^{\circ}$ deviation from coplanarity.

Vibrational Spectra. IR and Raman spectra of solid samples of compounds 1-5 have been recorded and compared. Apart from the expected differences due to different counterions, differences in the positions of a number of bands and in particular in relative intensities are observed. This is to be seen especially well in the Raman spectra. These can be qualitatively divided in three groups: 1 and $2 ; 4 ; 3$ and 5 , with the first two groups having a greater similarity with each other than with the third one. In Figure 4, sections of the Raman solid-state spectra are shown which contain

Table II. Interatomic Distances ( $\AA$ ) and Angles (deg) of cis- $\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right] \mathrm{SO}_{4} \cdot 4 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (3) and


| 3 |  | 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (III) Anions |  |  |  |
| S1-O10 | 1.402 (27) | $\mathrm{Pt} 2-\mathrm{Cl}$ | 1.982 (11) |
| S1-O11 | 1.434 (17) | $\mathrm{Pt} 2-\mathrm{C} 2$ | 1.987 (10) |
| S1-O12 | 1.407 (20) | Pt2-C3 | 2.012 (10) |
| S1-O13 | 1.475 (24) | $\mathrm{Pt} 2-\mathrm{C} 4$ | 1.959 (10) |
|  |  | $\mathrm{C} 1-\mathrm{N} 1$ | 1.146 (13) |
|  |  | $\mathrm{C} 2-\mathrm{N} 2$ | 1.120 (12) |
|  |  | $\mathrm{C} 3-\mathrm{N} 3$ | 1.136 (11) |
|  |  | $\mathrm{C} 4-\mathrm{N} 4$ | 1.164 (12) |

three of the four most intense and at the same time highly characteristic guanine modes ${ }^{37}$ around 1580,1500 , and $1380 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. The high intensity of the latter in the spectra of the $\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-}$ and $\mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}$salts is in marked contrast to the other spectra. We attribute it to the very much reduced intramolecular base overlap between the two rings in the case of the $\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-}$ salt, 3 , as compared to 2
(37) (a) Delabar, J. M.; Majoube, M. Spectrochim. Acta 1978, 34A, 129. (b) Lord, R. L.; Thomas, G. J. Ibid. 1967, 23A, 2551
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Figure 2. Conformational drawings of three cis- $\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right]^{2+}$ cations: (a, top) Ligand $A$ is placed in the paper plane and the $N(7 A)-P t$ vector is leftward. (b, bottom) Determination of dihedral angles between the Pt coordination plane and the G planes by placing one $\mathrm{Pt}-\mathrm{N} 7$ vector perpendicular to the paper plane and the second one pointing to the left.



Figure 3. Simplified representation of the difference between the sulfate salt 3 and chloride and tetracyanoplatinate(II) salts 2 and 4, indicating the differences in base overlap.
and 4, rather than to differences in intermolecular base stacking in the three types of complexes. While intermolecular base stacking causes a Raman hypochromic effect, ${ }^{38}$ leading to a decrease in signal intensity which, with guanine for example, also influences the above-mentioned bands, ${ }^{39}$ intermolecular base stacking in the solid state does not exceed the dimer level. It is hard to imagine that stacking of two bases can cause a hypochromic effect large enough to reduce the intensity of the $1380-$ $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ band in 1, 2, and 4 to $50 \%$ of that in $\mathbf{3}$ and 5 . This interpretation is supported by the similarity between solution spectra $\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} ; \mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}\right)$ (Figure 5) and the solid-state spectra of 2: even though there is stacking between the B rings in solid 2 (3.37 (2) $\AA$ ), yet no stacking in solution (vide infra), the intensity patterns are rather similar.
There are three arguments pointing against any significant intercomplex stacking of $c i s-\left[\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{PtG}_{2}\right]^{2+}$ cations in solution:

[^4]Table III. Possible Hydrogen Bonding Interactions (Distances in $\AA$, Angles in deg) in $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{4}^{a}$

| 3 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (I) Intramolecular |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| O6a'-N11 | 2.91 | $\mathrm{Pt}-\mathrm{N} 11-\mathrm{O6} \mathrm{a}^{\prime}$ | 90 | O6b'-N10 | 2.97 | $\mathrm{Pt} 1-\mathrm{N} 10-\mathrm{O} 6 \mathrm{~b}^{\prime}$ | 108 |
| (II) Intermolecular |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N10-O6b ${ }^{1}$ | 2.99 | $\mathrm{Pt} 1-\mathrm{N} 10-\mathrm{O}^{\text {b }}{ }^{1}$ | 103 | N11-O6a ${ }^{8}$ | 2.92 | Ptl-N11-O6a ${ }^{8}$ | 108 |
| N11-O6b ${ }^{1}$ | 2.99 | $\mathrm{Pt} 1-\mathrm{N} 11-\mathrm{O} 6 \mathrm{~b}^{1}$ | 101 | N11-O66 ${ }^{\text {8 }}$ | 2.78 | $\mathrm{Ptl}-\mathrm{N} 11-\mathrm{O} 6 \mathrm{~b}^{8}$ | 110 |
| $\mathrm{N} 10-\mathrm{O} 21^{2}$ | 2.90 | $\mathrm{Pt1-N10-O212}$ | 113 | N $10-\mathrm{N} 1^{9}$ | 3.02 | $\mathrm{Pt} 1-\mathrm{N} 10-\mathrm{N} 1^{9}$ | 111 |
| N11-O12 | 2.85 | Pt1-N11-O12 | 106 | N10-N4 | 3.12 | Pti-N10-N4 | 101 |
| $\mathrm{N} 1 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{O} 20^{3}$ | 2.78 | $\mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{Nla}-\mathrm{O} 20^{3}$ | 118 | $\mathrm{Nla}-\mathrm{Oll}{ }^{3}$ | 2.81 | C2a-Nla-O113 | 108 |
| Oll-N1b ${ }^{4}$ | 2.77 | S1-O11-N1 ${ }^{4}$ | 125 | $\mathrm{N} 1 \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{O} 10^{10}$ | 2.89 | $\mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{N} 1 \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{O} 10^{10}$ | 122 |
| $\mathrm{O} 13-\mathrm{N} 2 \mathrm{~b}^{\prime 4}$ | 3.01 | $\mathrm{O} 13-\mathrm{N} 2 \mathrm{~b}^{\prime}-\mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~b}^{4}$ | 117 | $\mathrm{N} 2 \mathrm{a}^{\prime}-\mathrm{O} 11^{3}$ | 3.15 | C2a-N2a'-O11 ${ }^{3}$ | 120 |
|  |  |  |  | O6a'-N2 $\mathrm{b}^{3}$ | 2.98 | C6a-O6a'-N $2 \mathrm{~b}^{\prime 3}$ | 95 |
|  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{O} 6 \mathrm{~b}^{\prime}-\mathrm{N} 2 \mathrm{a}^{\prime 11}$ | 2.90 | $\mathrm{C} 6 \mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{O} 6 \mathrm{~b}^{\prime}-\mathrm{N} 2 \mathrm{a}^{\prime 1}$ | 117 |
| O10-O20 | 2.91 | S1-O10-O20 | 110 | $\mathrm{N} 2-\mathrm{O} 10^{12}$ | 3.10 | $\mathrm{C} 2-\mathrm{N} 2-\mathrm{O} 10^{12}$ | 119 |
| O11-O22 | 2.91 | Sl-O11-O22 | 107 | N4-O11 ${ }^{12}$ | 3.06 | $\mathrm{C} 4-\mathrm{N} 4-\mathrm{O} 11^{12}$ | 123 |
| O21-O13 ${ }^{5}$ | 2.70 | O21-O13-S15 | 127 |  |  |  |  |
| O22-O23 ${ }^{6}$ | 3.18 |  |  | O11-O12 | 2.88 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{O} 21-\mathrm{O} 23$ | 2.61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| O22-O23 ${ }^{7}$ | 2.77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{O} 20-\mathrm{O} 23^{6}$ | 2.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table IV. Conformational Parameters of cis-[(NH3) $\left.2 \mathrm{Pt}(9-\mathrm{EtG})_{2}\right] \mathrm{X}_{2}$ Complexes

|  | $2\left(\mathrm{Cl}^{-}\right)^{b}$ | $3\left(\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-}\right)$ | $4\left(\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4}{ }^{2-}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (I) Dihedral Angles (deg) between Planes ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |
| Pt coord plane/G plane a | $104.6{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 51.0 | 116.6 |
| Pt coord plane/G plane b | $130.8{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 80.0 | 118.9 |
| G plane a/G plane b | 68.0 | 75.4 | 78.0 |
| (II) Deviations ( $\AA$ ) of Pt from Guanine Planes |  |  |  |
| from plane a | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.00 |
| from plane $b$ | 0.12 | 0.36 | 0.02 |
| (III) Selected Intracomplex Distances, $\AA$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{N}(7 \mathrm{a})-\mathrm{N}(7 \mathrm{~b})$ | 2.81 | 2.83 | 2.83 |
| $\mathrm{O}\left(6 \mathrm{a}^{\prime}\right)-\mathrm{O}\left(6 \mathrm{~b}^{\prime}\right)$ | 3.76 | 4.10 | 3.37 |
| $\mathrm{C}\left(9 \mathrm{a}^{\prime}\right)-\mathrm{C}\left(9 \mathrm{~b}^{\prime}\right)$ | 6.25 | 6.45 | 7.59 |

[^5]Firstly, the Raman solution spectra in water do not show any changes in relative and absolute intensities of the individual signals between +20 and $+80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Secondly, the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra ( $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) give no indication of any significant intercomplex base stacking. In the concentration range $0.2-0.01 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{G}$, the H8 resonance has no concentration dependency, with a very small shift for $\mathrm{CH}_{3}(0.02 \mathrm{ppm})$ and $\mathrm{CH}_{2}(0.05 \mathrm{ppm})$ only, in agreement with similar results observed with N 7 -platinated 9 -methyladenine. ${ }^{40}$ Thirdly, the similarity between the intensity patterns in the two different solvents, with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in principle favoring stacking and $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}$ preventing stacking, also points against any large effects of intermolecular stacking on the intensities of the Raman modes.

G,G Cross-Link and DNA Distortion. All four structurally characterized bis(9-ethylguanine) complexes have in common the rather large dihedral angle between the two base planes of $72 \pm$ $4^{\circ}$ and the short N7-N7 distance of $2.82 \AA$ (av). While these two alterations-displacement of the two bases from a normally copolanar arrangement to a tilted one and shortening of the N7-N7 distance from $3.9 \AA$ in DNA ${ }^{41}$ by more than $1 \AA$-are dramatic at their own, when combined they actually counterbalance each other in part as far as the effect on DNA is concerned: It explains why the O6-O6 separation within the complex is only moderately altered (see Table IV) as compared to two parallel guanines in a DNA strand, where this distance is estimated to be around $3.5-3.6 \AA$. One might expect that apart from changes

[^6]

Figure 4. Raman solid state spectra between 1300 and $1800 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ of (a) the $\mathrm{Cl}^{-}$salt 2, (b) the $\left[\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4}\right]^{2-}$ salt 4 , and (c) the $\left[\mathrm{SO}_{4}\right]^{2-}$ salt 3 . The $\mathrm{NO}_{3}{ }^{-}$salt 1 has a Raman spectrum virtually identical with that of $\mathbf{2}$ in the range shown; the spectrum of the $\mathrm{ClO}_{4}{ }^{-}$salt 5 looks very similar to that of 3 .
due to electronic reasons, ${ }^{26}$ which could weaken hydrogen bonds with cytosines at the opposite DNA strand, the steric conditions for such a hydrogen-bonding interaction are not as severely disturbed in the G,G complex as it looks at first glance. Indeed, NMR results obtained with a decamer DNA fragment having the two central guanines platinated indicate that at least at low


Figure 5. Raman solution spectra of the $\mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}$salt 5 in $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{SO}(0.2 \mathrm{M}$ Pt , resolution $2 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) (top) and of the sulfate $\mathbf{3}$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(0.07 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Pt}$, resolution $4 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) (bottom). The choice of the anion has no effect on the spectrum in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in the range depicted.
temperatures, base pairing is maintained. ${ }^{5 c}$ Nevertheless, a severe distortion of base stacking in DNA as a consequence of G,G cross-linking is to be expected. In Figure 6, the arrangements are compared between two 9 -ethylguanines placed parallel as two guanines in DNA (A) and the two 9 -ethylguanines cross-linked by cis- $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Pt}^{11}(\mathrm{~B}$ and C$)$. The tilting of the bases, together with their head-head arrangement, results in the solid state in a pseudohelicity with respect to the mutual orientation of the $\mathrm{C}^{\prime}$ atoms of both bases as depicted in Figure 6 for the $\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4}{ }^{2-}(\mathrm{B})$ and the $\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-}$ salts (C). The pseudohelical orientation of the two guanines is the more pronounced, the more the dihedral angle between the G planes and the Pt coordination plane deviates from $90^{\circ}$, a situation given in all G,G complexes studied in this work. Due to the relatively unhindered rotation of the bases about the $\mathrm{Pt}-\mathrm{N}(7)$ bonds, an interconversion of both pseudoenantiomers is expected in solution. Furthermore, it should be noted that within the crystal, both pseudoenantiomers are present in equal amounts. With respect to the handedness of the DNA helix, Figure 6 demonstrates that the model cross-linkes studied might be accommodated both in right- and left-handed DNA. In either case, the helix continuity of this type of cross-link is expected to be




Figure 6. View along an imaginary helix axis of DINA with two parallel guanines rotated by $36^{\circ}(\mathrm{A})$ and with the two guanines cross-linked by cis- $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Pt}^{11}$ as in the $\left[\mathrm{Pt}(\mathrm{CN})_{4}\right]^{2-}$ compound $4(\mathrm{~B})$ and the $\mathrm{SO}_{4}{ }^{2-}$ compound 3 (C).
affected by forcing two adjacent bases (and probably neighboring bases as well) in a strongly tilted orientation.

If one compares our models with a model proposed by den Hartog et al., ${ }^{6}$ which is based on a NMR conformational analysis of a GpG complex of cisplatin in solution, one finds differences which refer in particular to the dihedral angles of the $G$ planes ( $53^{\circ} \mathrm{in} \mathrm{GpG-Pt} \mathrm{vs}. 72^{\circ}$ (av) in our compounds) and the deviations of Pt from coplanarity with guanine (estimated 0.56 and $0.65 \AA$ in GpG-Pt vs. a maximum of $0.36 \AA$ in one out of eight $G$ planes in our compounds). Thus the model based on solution studies assumes a considerably more efficient intracomplex base stacking than the solid-state structures in our models. While this difference is not unrealistic in view of the expected differing effects of Pt on negatively charged guanine nucleotides and neutral 9 -ethylguanine ligands, a definite answer on the validity of these models can be expected only from the successful determination of a crystal structure of a guanine dinucleotide complex of cisplatin. Certainly, our results have shown that in a complex of cis- $\mathrm{Pt}^{11}$, two identical heterocyclic ligands need not invariably be in a head-tail orientation as has been anticipated. ${ }^{13,42}$
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