

*Journal of Organometallic Chemistry*, 421 (1991) C7–C11  
Elsevier Sequoia S.A., Lausanne  
JOM 22342PC

Preliminary communication

---

## Carbon-13 spin–lattice relaxation in organometallic complexes

H. Schumann<sup>1</sup>

*Department of Chemistry, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112 (USA)*

(Received August 22nd, 1991)

### Abstract

The results of inversion recovery spin–lattice relaxation time ( $T_1$ ) measurements on 19 selected organometallic half-sandwich and sandwich complexes of Cr, Mn, Fe and Co are reported together with their  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR data. Large variations of the  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR  $T_1$  values for  $\text{C}_5\text{H}_5$  and CO moieties are observed, depending on field strength, temperature and solvent. The use of high field instruments usually leads to lower  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR  $T_1$  values for these groups, but in certain cases the values for quaternary carbon atoms increase.

---

### Introduction

Solution  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR spin–lattice relaxation ( $T_1$ ) data for organometallic compounds have rarely been obtained in the past [1] owing to the assumed long relaxation times of functional groups such as cyclopentadienyl ( $\text{C}_5\text{R}_5$ ,  $\text{R} = \text{H}$  or  $\text{CH}_3$ ) or CO bonded to metals and the consequently long instrument time needed to obtain the  $T_1$  information. Recently however,  $T_1$  measurements on inorganic [2] and organometallic complexes [3] have proved to be an important tool for obtaining structural information and details of metal–ligand interactions. As part of our program of investigations of the bonding properties of Main Group ligands coordinated to organometallic fragments, we report now the results of  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR  $T_1$  measurements on selected compounds.

During the preparation of this manuscript, two detailed reports on  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR  $T_1$  measurements on iron sandwich compounds, including and confirming some of the results reported here, appeared, together with a detailed account of the theoretical interpretation [4]. Thus, only a limited discussion without a theoretical treatment, is given below. Conclusions about the relaxation mechanism are omitted because the information obtained only further confirms the conclusions presented in reference 4.

---

<sup>1</sup> Present address: Fakultät für Chemie der Universität Bielefeld, Postfach 8640, W-4800 Bielefeld (FRG).

Table 1

<sup>13</sup>C NMR chemical shifts and  $T_1$  values at 75.5 MHz and 298 K for complexes 1–7 in (CD<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>CO

No.	E	$\delta(\text{ECH}_3)$ ( $T_1$ ) (ppm) (s)	$\delta(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)$ ( $T_1$ ) (ppm) (s)	$\delta(\text{CO})$ ( $T_1$ ) (ppm) (s)
<i>[C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(CO)<sub>2</sub>(E(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>)]BF<sub>4</sub> (E = group 15 elements)</i>				
1	N	62.03 (1.1)	88.15 (2.4)	211.69 (3.1)
2	P	19.77 (2.6)	88.21 (5.2)	210.21 (7.2)
3	As	14.86 (4.7)	87.20 (7.6)	210.22 (11.6)
4	Sb	0.57 (6.6)	86.67 (7.4)	212.21 (12.3)
<i>[C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(CO)<sub>2</sub>(E(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>)]BF<sub>4</sub> (E = group 16 elements)</i>				
5	S	27.64 (2.5)	88.28 (5.4)	210.02 (8.3)
6	Se	16.66 (4.4)	87.42 (7.2)	210.25 (11.5)
7	Te	-6.88 (5.5)	86.97 (5.8)	211.40 (16.3)

A report on the MAS <sup>13</sup>C NMR study (MAS ≡ magic angle spinning) of [C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(CO)<sub>2</sub>(E(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>)]BF<sub>4</sub> (E = S, Se and Te) complexes, including solid state <sup>13</sup>C NMR  $T_1$  data, has been submitted for publication [5].

## Results and discussion

The <sup>13</sup>C NMR chemical shifts and their spin–lattice relaxation times ( $T_1$ ) for 19 organometallic complexes are summarized in Tables 1–4.

Measurements on the cationic [C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(CO)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup>BF<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup> fragment (Table 1) indicate that  $T_1$  values increase for the metal-bonded CO groups when the donor element E in ER<sub>n</sub> is varied in the sequence E = N to Sb,  $n = 3$ ; E = S to Te,  $n = 2$ . To a smaller extent, a similar effect is found for the C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub> group. The observed  $T_1$  values decrease in the order N < P < As < Sb for E = Group 15 donor elements and S < Se ≪ Te for E = Group 16 donor elements. This trend seems to indicate

Table 2

Solvent and/or temperature dependency of <sup>13</sup>C NMR  $T_1$  values for complexes 2 and 5

No.	E	Solvent <sup>a</sup>	$T$ (K)	RF <sup>b</sup> (MHz)	ECH <sub>3</sub> $T_1$ (s)	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub> $T_1$ (s)	CO $T_1$ (s)
2	P	A	298	100.6	2.4	3.1	3.8
2	P	A	253	100.6	1.9	2.2	2.4
2	P	A	193	100.6	0.2	0.5	0.4
5	S	A	298	100.6	5.3	10.5	9.8
5	S	A	273	100.6	2.3	6.0	7.4
5	S	A	253	100.6	1.6	4.2	5.3
5	S	A	233	100.6	0.9	2.6	2.8
5	S	A	193	100.6	0.5	1.3	1.3
5	S	A	298	75.5	2.5	5.4	8.3
5	S	B	298	75.5	3.4	8.1	12.0
5	S	C	298	75.5	2.8	7.1	10.7

<sup>a</sup> A = (CD<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>CO; B = CD<sub>3</sub>CN; C = CD<sub>3</sub>NO<sub>2</sub>. <sup>b</sup> RF = resonance frequency for <sup>13</sup>C nucleus.

Table 3

<sup>13</sup>C NMR chemical shifts and  $T_1$  values for neutral  $\pi$ -ligand metal carbonyl complexes 8–11 at 298 K

No.	Solvent <sup>a</sup>	Carbon	$\delta$ (ppm)	$T_1$ (25.2 MHz) (s)	$T_1$ (100.6 MHz) (s)
<i>C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Mn(CO)<sub>3</sub></i>					
<b>8</b>	A	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	83.80	10.8	15.6
		CO	225.84	15.6	9.6
<i>CH<sub>3</sub>C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>4</sub>Mn(CO)<sub>3</sub></i>					
<b>9</b>	A	CH <sub>3</sub>	13.62	7.5	8.4
		C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub> (CH)	82.88	7.4	7.9
		C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub> (CH)	83.29	7.6	7.9
		C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub> (C)	103.62	41.0	35.1
		CO	225.97	12.3	8.3
<i>1,3,5-(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>3</sub>Cr(CO)<sub>3</sub></i>					
<b>10</b>	A	CH <sub>3</sub>	20.61	7.5	7.3
		C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>3</sub> (CH)	93.32	4.7	4.6
		C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>3</sub> (C)	112.76	28.6	100
		CO	235.41	<sup>b</sup>	9.1
<i>cis-1,3-C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>6</sub>Fe(CO)<sub>3</sub> (cis-1,3-C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>6</sub> = 1,3-butadiene)</i>					
<b>11</b>	D	C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>6</sub> (CH <sub>2</sub> )	40.96	4.4	4.1
		C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>6</sub> (CH)	85.86	7.7	5.6
		CO	212.17	20.0	8.9

<sup>a</sup> A = (CD<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>CO, D = CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>. <sup>b</sup> Not observed.

the dominance of steric interactions (covalent radii for E decrease in the same order [6]) rather than bonding contributions between the iron center and the donor element E as discussed in detail elsewhere [7]. As observed in related investigations [8], and shown here for complexes **2** and **5**, the  $T_1$  values are very sensitive to changes in the solvent, temperature, or magnetic field strength (Table 2) [9,10]: At lower temperatures, the  $T_1$  values for all functional groups (ECH<sub>3</sub>, C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub> and CO) fall drastically, while the effects of solvent and magnetic field strength depend strongly on the nature of the compound under investigation (see also Tables 3 and 4).

Organic-group-bearing cyclopentadienyl or aryl moieties coordinated to metals (Tables 3 and 4) show a large splitting of their  $T_1$  values upon substitution of H by CH<sub>3</sub>. The now quaternary carbon atoms in these ligands show long relaxation times, while the remaining unsubstituted carbon atoms relax faster or with nearly identical  $T_1$  values when compared with the unsubstituted ligand system. Measurements at higher magnetic field in general lead to lowering of all relaxation times, but in certain cases (e.g. complexes **10** and **18**), higher  $T_1$  values were observed. The data and their general features are consistent with those observed at lower field strength by Roberts et al. [5] for ferrocenes and [C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(arene)]<sup>+</sup> complexes.

The presented information on <sup>13</sup>C NMR  $T_1$  values for various organometallic compounds should be useful in deciding the choice of instrument and experimental conditions for <sup>13</sup>C NMR measurements, including  $T_1$  determinations for organometallic systems.

Table 4

 $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR chemical shifts and  $T_1$  values for bis( $\pi$ -ligand) metal complexes 12–19

No.	Solvent <sup>a</sup>	Carbon	$\delta$ (ppm)	$T_1$ (25.18 MHz) (s)	$T_1$ (100.6 MHz) (s)
<i>(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub>Fe</i>					
12	A	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	67.94	15.2	11.0
<i>(C<sub>5</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub>Fe</i>					
13	E	C <sub>5</sub> (CH <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>5</sub> (CH <sub>3</sub> )	9.70	6.3	6.5
		C <sub>5</sub> (CH <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>5</sub> (C)	78.44	5.0	9.0
<i>C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>7</sub>)</i>					
14	D	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	72.88	14.3	6.9
		C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>7</sub> (CH <sub>2</sub> )	25.78	5.7	3.5
		C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>7</sub> (CH)	22.16	13.6	4.9
		C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>7</sub> (CH)	79.69	12.4	6.7
		C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>7</sub> (CH)	79.89	14.3	8.0
<i>[(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub>Co]PF<sub>6</sub></i>					
15	A	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	85.67	11.1	8.3
<i>[C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>6</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub></i>					
16	B	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	77.13	11.9	3.8
		C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>6</sub>	88.80	10.6	3.8
<i>[C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>5</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub></i>					
17	B	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	77.47	11.1	<sup>b</sup>
		C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>8</sub> (CH <sub>3</sub> )	20.69	8.5	<sup>b</sup>
		C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>8</sub> ( <i>p</i> -C)	87.02	7.9	<sup>b</sup>
		C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>8</sub> ( <i>m</i> -C)	88.21	7.7	<sup>b</sup>
		C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>8</sub> ( <i>o</i> -C)	89.22	7.8	<sup>b</sup>
		C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>8</sub> (C-1)	104.51	35.4	<sup>b</sup>
<i>[C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(<i>p</i>-(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub></i>					
18	B	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	77.79	4.8	7.8
		C <sub>8</sub> H <sub>10</sub> (CH <sub>3</sub> )	20.17	2.7	6.2
		C <sub>8</sub> H <sub>10</sub> (CH)	88.55	2.5	4.4
		C <sub>8</sub> H <sub>10</sub> (C)	102.61	4.8	11.8
<i>[C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(C<sub>6</sub>(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>6</sub>)]PF<sub>6</sub></i>					
19	B	C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	78.95	0.8	<sup>b</sup>
		C <sub>12</sub> H <sub>18</sub> (CH <sub>3</sub> )	17.79	0.7	<sup>b</sup>
		C <sub>12</sub> H <sub>18</sub> (C)	99.01	0.7	<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> A = (CD<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>CO; B = CD<sub>3</sub>CN; E = C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>. <sup>b</sup> Not measured.

## Experimental

Compounds 1–4 [11], 5–7 [12], 14 [13] and 16–19 [14] were prepared by published methods. The remaining complexes were commercially available.

The  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR spectra were recorded at 25.18 MHz (Bruker AM 100), 75.5 MHz (Varian XL-300) and 100.6 MHz (Bruker AM 400) by the implemented inversion recovery method [10,15] in 5 mm NMR tubes at 298 K using  $^1\text{H}/^{13}\text{C}$  probe heads. All samples were prepared immediately prior to the measurements under nitrogen as ca. 5% solution in the stated solvents and were degassed by repeated freeze/thaw cycles. Control measurements (ferrocene in benzene-*d*<sub>6</sub> and [C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Fe(CO)<sub>2</sub>-

( $\text{S}(\text{CH}_3)_2$ )] $\text{BF}_4$  in acetone- $d_6$ ) indicated a maximum error in  $T_1$  values of  $\pm 5\%$ . Measurements on undegassed samples gave much lower  $T_1$  values.

**Acknowledgements.** The author thanks the Studienstiftung des Deutschen Volkes (Bonn, FRG) for financial support during his stay at the University of Utah (1987–88) and Professors R.W. Parry and T.G. Richmond for their kind support and interest.

## References

- 1 R.F. Jordan and J.R. Norton, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 101 (1979) 4853; G.E. Hawkes, E.W. Randall, S. Aime, D. Osella and J.E. Elliot, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, (1984) 279; S. Aime, M. Botta, R. Gobetto and D. Osella, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, (1988) 791.
- 2 R.T.C. Brownlee, B.P. Shehan and A.G. Wedd, *Inorg. Chem.*, 26 (1987) 2022.
- 3 S. Aime and E. Occhiello, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, (1986) 1863; X.-L. Luo and R.H. Crabtree, *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.*, (1990) 189; A. Gryff-Keller, H. Krawczyk and P. Szczecinski, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 402 (1991) 77; P. Yuan, M.G. Richmond and M. Schwartz, *Inorg. Chem.*, 30 (1991) 588.
- 4 R.M.G. Roberts and J.F. Warmesley, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 405 (1991) 347 and 357.
- 5 A.P.M. Kentgens, H. Karrenbeld, E. de Boer and H. Schumann, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, JOM 22281.
- 6 N.N. Greenwood and A. Earnshaw, *Chemistry of the Elements*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1986.
- 7 H. Schumann, A.M. Arif, A.L. Rheingold, C. Janiak, R. Hoffmann and N. Kuhn, *Inorg. Chem.*, 30 (1991) 1618.
- 8 H.W. Spiess and H. Mahnke, *Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem.*, 76 (1972) 990; S.P. Wang, P. Yuan and M. Schwartz, *Inorg. Chem.*, 29 (1990) 484.
- 9 I. Ando and C.A. Webb, *Theory of NMR Parameters*, Academic Press, London, 1983.
- 10 E. Fukushima and S.B.W. Roeder, *Experimental Pulse NMR*, Addison-Wesley, London, 1981.
- 11 H. Schumann, *Chem.-Ztg.*, 110 (1986) 121; H. Schumann and L. Eguren, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 403 (1991) 183.
- 12 H. Schumann, *J. Organomet. Chem.*, 304 (1986) 341.
- 13 N. Kuhn, H. Schumann, M. Winter and E. Zauder, *Chem. Ber.*, 121 (1988) 111.
- 14 H. Schumann, *Chem.-Ztg.*, 108 (1984) 345.
- 15 D. Shaw, *Fourier Transform NMR Spectroscopy*, 2nd ed., Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1984.