

Additions and Corrections

Preparation of Triangular Tungsten(IV) Aqua Ion, $W_3S_4^{4+}$, and X-ray Structure of $(bpyH)_3[W_3S_4(NCS)_9] \cdot 3H_2O$ [*J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1986**, *108*, 2757–2758]. TAKASHI SHIBAHARA,* KATSUMI KOHDA, AKIKO OHTSUJI, KOHICHI YASUDA, and HISAO KUROYA

Page 2758; line 10: The peak positions (ϵ values in parentheses), $\lambda_{max, nm}$ ($\epsilon/M^{-1} cm^{-1}$ per trimer), of the $W_3S_4^{4+}$ aqua ion in 2 M HPTS should be 314 (6350) and 557 (446).

The Structure and Barrier to Inversion of Tetrasilabicyclo-[1.1.0]butane. Comparison to Bicyclo[1.1.0]butane [*J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1987**, *109*, 2564]. SCOTT COLLINS,* REMO DUTLER, and ARVI RAUK

Page 2565, Table I: Entry 5.

3	(1A_g)	-1159.423259	146.7
---	-------------	--------------	-------

should read

3	(1A_g)	-1159.040035	-1159.378352	-1159.423259	146.7
---	-------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	-------

In addition, for clarity, I would like to add to Table I footnote *j*.

5	(1A_g)	-154.722809
	(1A_g)	-154.690584 ^j

^jRHF energy of the doubly excited (π^*)² configuration at its gradient optimized geometry.

Asymmetric Hydrogenation of Methyl-(*Z*)- α -acetamidocinnamate Catalyzed by {1,2-Bis((phenyl-*o*-anisoyl)phosphino)ethane}rhodium(I): Kinetics, Mechanism and Origin of Enantioselection [*J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1987**, *109*, 1746–1754]. CLARK R. LANDIS and JACK HALPERN*

(1) As explained in the text, the derivation of eq 23 and 24 from the full steady state rate law (eq 15) invokes the approximation $k_2^{maj}[H_2] \ll k_{-1}^{maj}$. While valid for most of the range of conditions covered by our measurements, this approximation does break down for the highest pressure data (>3 atm of H_2). Omitting the latter data yields values of the rate constants and activation parameters that agree, well within experimental error, with those cited in the paper. No conclusions are affected by this refinement.

(2) The increase in enantiomeric excess with increasing temperature or decreasing H_2 pressure, deduced and confirmed in our studies, clearly is restricted to the temperature and H_2 pressure ranges intermediate between those defined by eq 19 and 22. Outside this range the enantiomeric excess should be H_2 pressure

independent whereas at higher temperatures the usual entropy-dictated inverse dependence of selectivity on temperature must prevail. Accordingly, failure to observe temperature- and H_2 pressure-dependent selectivities similar to those reported in this paper, over limited temperature and H_2 pressure ranges, does not necessarily rule out the mechanism of enantioselection identified in our study. This point warrants emphasis since different H_2 pressure- and temperature-dependent enantioselectivities have recently been reported in related systems. (See, for example: Bakos, J.; Toth, I.; Heil, B.; Marko, L. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1985**, *279*, 23–29. Selke, R.; Pracejus, H. *J. Mol. Catal.* **1986**, *37*, 213. Ulrich, N.; Kinzel, E.; Andrade, J.; Prescher, G. *Chem. Ber.* **1986**, *119*, 3326–3343.) The phrase “quite general” on p 1754, lines 11–12, of the paper should be replaced by “widespread”.

(3) Figure 8 contains several e.e. data points at 0 and 14.8 °C for higher H_2 pressures than are cited in Table V, because kinetic measurements were not performed under these conditions.

We are grateful to Dr. John M. Brown of Oxford University for communicating with us about these points.

Dihydride Transfer. A Bimolecular Mechanism in the Isomerization of *cis*-Dihydridobromo(carbonyl)bis(diphenylphosphino)ethaneiridium, $IrH_2Br(CO)(dippe)$ [*J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1987**, *109*, 2963]. AMANDA J. KUNIN, CURTIS E. JOHNSON, JOHN A. MAGUIRE, WILLIAM D. JONES,* and RICHARD EISENBERG*

Page 2967: An error exists in the above-mentioned paper in the legend for Figure 6. The function plotted as the abscissa (*x*-axis) is $\times 10^5$ M and the ordinate labeled as reduced rate is $\times 10^5$ with units of $M \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$.

Synthesis, Structural Characterization, and Electronic Structures of the $[Fe_6S_6(X)_6(Mo(CO)_3)_2]^{3-}$ Clusters ($X = Cl, Br$) [*J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1987**, *109*, 3807]. D. COUCOUVANIS,* A. SALIFOGLOU, M. G. KANATZIDIS, A. SIMOPOULOS, and A. KOSTIKAS

The structure of $[Et_4N]_3[Fe_6S_6(Cl)_6(Mo(CO)_3)_2]$ was reported (in the abstract and the supplementary material) to crystallize in space group $R\bar{3}$. The correct space group is $R\bar{3}c$ and refinement in the latter space group converged to an *R* value of 0.049. No significant changes (within 1σ) in the bond distances and angles were detected by comparison to the results of the previous refinement.

Page 3808, lines 58–61: The sentence, “The two crystallographically...possess nearly exact D_{3d} symmetry,” should read as follows: “The anion in the structure of **1** possesses crystallographically required $\bar{3}$ symmetry.”