

Analysis of a hydrodesulfurization process— 2 [1]. The reactions of 2- and 3-methylthiophenes with tris(triethylphosphine)platinum(0)

Juventino J. Garcia,^a Alma Arevalo,^a Santiago Capella,^a Alexander Chehata,^a Maira Hernandez,^a Virginia Montiel,^a Graciela Picazo,^a Federico Del Rio,^b Ruben A. Toscano,^b Harry Adams^c and Peter M. Maitlis^{c*}

^a Facultad de Química, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 04510 México D.F.

^b Instituto de Química, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 04510 México D.F.

^c Department of Chemistry, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield S3 7HF, U.K.

Abstract—The oxidative insertion reactions of 2-methylthiophene (2-MeT) and 3-methylthiopene (3-MeT) with Pt(PEt₃)₃ (1), were examined as models for the first step in a platinum catalysed hydrodesulfurization. 2-MeT gave a single isomer, 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-3-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (2), characterized spectroscopically. 3-MeT gave two isomers (ratio 1:1.6), 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-5-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (3b), identified spectroscopically, and 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-4-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (3a), identified spectroscopically and by an X-ray crystal structure determination. The thiophenes in the thiametallacycles can be displaced by free thiophenes and measurements show that the equilibrium constants decrease in the order [Pt(C,S-3-MeT)(PEt_3)₂] + T[$K_{eqm(3/0)} = 2.30$ (after 7 h)]; [Pt(C,S-3-MeT)(PEt_3)₂] + 2-MeT [$K_{eqm(3/2)} = 2.20$ (after 12 h)]; and [Pt(C,S-2-MeT)(PEt_3)₃] + T [$K_{eqm(2/0)} = 1.45$ (after 20 h)]. The order of stability in the complexes is T > 2-MeT > 3-MeT. Equilibrium is attained more rapidly in the 3-MeT complexes than in those of 2-MeT. Details of the X-ray structure of the previously prepared complex 5, [Pt(PEt_3)₂](C,S-C₁₂H₈S]], derived from dibenzothiophene, are also given and these two structures are compared with that for complex 4, [Pt(PEt_3)₂{C,S-C₈H₆S}], derived from benzothiophene. Complexes 3a, 4 and 5 share the common feature of a six-membered thiaplatinacycle, which is planar in 3a, nearly so in 4, but very severely distorted in 5; however, many of the bond lengths and angles are similar. © 1997 Elsevier Science Ltd

Keywords: thiophenes; platinum; oxidative addition; X-ray structure.

Hydrodesulfurization (HDS) removes undesirable sulfur containing molecules from crude oil. This prevents poisoning of the reforming catalysts and produces sulfur-free fuels and is generally carried out using a sulfided metal catalyst (e.g. CoMoS or NiMoS on alumina) at high temperature and under pressure [2]. However, the highest HDS activity is shown by the noble metals [3], which have therefore been the subject of many model studies [4,5].

Heterocycles such as the thiophenes (T), benzothiophenes (BT) and dibenzothiophenes (DBT), and especially their alkyl derivatives, pose particular problems as they occur in substantial amounts, notably in heavier crudes, and are rather resistant to normal HDS techniques. A widely accepted current mechanistic hypothesis for HDS of such thiophenes over the noble metals is that it takes place in two steps, where the first is the oxidative insertion of the metal into the C—S bond of the thiophene, forming a thiametallacycle, while the extrusion of the sulfur occurs in the second step in the presence of a source of hydrogen or hydride. An alternative view is that one or more rings of the thiophene or annelated thiophene are first hydrogenated and that the hydrogenolysis of the C—S bond occurs subsequently.

It is generally believed that the alkyl-thiophenes and their benzo and dibenzo analogues, where the alkyl

^{*} Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

group is close to the ring sulfur, are inert to conventional HDS procedures because the alkyl offers substantial steric hindrance to the approach of the C—S bond to the CoMoS in the critical oxidative insertion step [6].

Platinum has recently emerged as a viable catalyst for second stage industrial hydrotreating of diesel [7]. While this step has been introduced largely to reduce the proportion of aromatics, it also significantly reduces sulfur from (*ca* 1000 to < 15 ppm); thus, most of the residual sulfur-containing materials that are not removed by the conventional first stage CoMoS or NiMoS catalysts are removed in this second stage. This has allowed the production of the so-called *city diesel* fuel, with very low sulfur (< 5 ppm).

We have shown, in model studies [1], that the platinum(0) complex $[Pt(PEt_3)_3]$ (1) reacts (reversibly) with DBT, BT and T by an oxidative insertion of the Pt(0) into one C—S bond, giving a six-membered heterocyclic Pt—S—C—C—C ring. We have also shown that these thiaplatinacycles extrude S and Pt to give the parent hydrocarbons, thus demonstrating a full HDS sequence mediated by platinum.

As part of our further investigation, we report here on the synthesis and characterization, as well as some equilibrium studies, of the bis-triethylphosphine complexes derived from 2- and 3-methylthiophenes. The object of these investigations is to define more closely the chemistry underlying hydrodesulfurization (HDS), especially with methylated thiophenes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

2-Methylthiophene (2-MeT) and $Pt(PEt_3)_3$ (1) were reacted under reflux (4 h) and then the excess 2-MeT and Et₃P were removed in vacuo to leave an oil, which was triturated with cold hexane to give crystals of the product, 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-3methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (2), which is also written as $[Pt(C,S-2-MeT)(PEt_3)_2]$ [eq. (1)]. The complex was characterized by microanalysis and spectroscopically, which showed quite clearly that the isomer formed was the one where the Pt had inserted into the S-CH rather than the S-CMe bond. This is expected on steric grounds and follows the results found by others for reactions of 2-MeT [8]. The experimental method used was the same as had previously been used for the reaction with thiophene (T) itself and which gave 1bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thiacyclohexa-3,5diene in 89% yield. The low apparent yield (23%) of the thiaplatinacycle derived from 2-MeT was therefore investigated further by following the reaction by ¹H and ³¹P NMR spectroscopy. This showed that only the one complex was formed from 2-MeT and in 89% yield, identical to that for the complex from T itself. We suggest that the very low isolated yield here arises from the greater solubility of the 2-MeT complex in the hexane used for washing the crystals in the workup procedure.

When the reaction of 3-MeT with $Pt(PEt_3)_3$ was carried out under the same conditions, one isomer, shown to be 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-4methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (**3a**), by NMR spectroscopy and an X-ray crystal structure determination, was formed. Again the yield was low (8%) and to check on what was happening, we followed that reaction by NMR spectroscopy as well. In this case *two* complexes were formed, in the ratio of 1.6:1 and in total yield of 56%. The more abundant was complex **3a**, that we had already isolated; the other was characterized spectroscopically as the isomeric 1bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-5methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene, **3b** [eq. (2)]

Structure determination of 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-4-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (3a) and of the platinum adduct derived from dibenzothiophene, 5

A yellow prismatic crystal of complex **3a** was structurally analysed. The data are summarised in Tables 1 and 2 and the structure is illustrated in Fig. 1. In addition, the structure of the corresponding complex (5) derived from DBT, has been redetermined; the data are summarized in Tables 3 and 4 and the structure is illustrated in Fig. 2. Key bond length and bond angle data for **3a** and **5** are summarized in Table 5, where comparisons are drawn with the closely related structure of **4**, derived from BT, which has already been described [1]. In order to make the comparisons easier to follow, a unified labelling scheme has been adopted for the hetero-rings of all the complexes; this is shown in Fig. 3.

The most striking feature of the structural data for the hetero-rings of complexes 3a and 4, derived from 3-MeT and BT, respectively, is their similarity, within the e.s.d.'s estimated. This applies especially to the bond lengths. However, the hetero-ring of complex 5 is quite twisted leading to significantly smaller bond angles, with the exception of C_a —Pt—P_a. The much more twisted shape of complex 5 is clearly seen from an analysis of the dihedral angles of the three molecules, which show those of 5 to be 5-7 times larger than those in complexes 3a and 4 (Table 6). For convenience and to allow comparisons, we have defined four molecular planes, using the numbering convention in Fig. 3. Thus, in the DBT complex 5 the very substantial distortions are reflected in a dihedral angle of 66.3° between planes P_a —Pt—P_b and S—C_c—C_d and of 55.3° between planes P_a —Pt— P_b and C_a — C_b — C_c ; there is also a dihedral angle of 35.3° between planes S— C_c — C_d , and C_a — C_b — C_c and even the "plane" containing the platinum is not quite flat (dihedral angle between planes $P_a - Pt - P_b$ and S—Pt— C_a is 13.7°). By contrast in the BT complex 4, the key dihedral angles are much smaller: only those between planes P_a —Pt— P_b and S— C_c — C_d 11.2°, and between planes P_a —Pt—P_b and C_a — C_b — C_c 9.7°, are



significantly larger than zero. The molecule is thus much more nearly planar.

In the 3-MeT complex 3a four ($C_aC_bC_c$ and Pt) of the six atoms making up the thiaplatinacycle ring are accurately coplanar, with only C_d fractionally below (0.009) and S fractionally above (0.007 Å) that plane. As a consequence the dihedral angles are quite small; the largest angle (of 3.9°) is that between the planes P_a —Pt— P_b and S—Pt— C_a . We can then state that the amount of distortion in the thiaplatinacycles decreases quite sharply in the order 5 > 4 > 3a. It is likely that this order arises from nonbonded interactions between the ethyl hydrogens at the triethylphosphine and the hydrogens on the benzo-rings, as we noted earlier from our NMR studies [1]. These interactions are expected to be largest for the complex with two benzo-rings (i.e. 5), intermediate for the complex 4, which has one benzo-ring, and least (i.e. zero) for complex 3a, which has no benzo-ring.

Combined Fenske-Hall molecular orbital and molecular mechanics calculations very recently carried out by Harris and her collaborators on a series of thiametallacycles have led to the same conclusion, namely that the differences in the thiametallacycle geometry, planar and bent, arise primarily from steric rather than electronic factors [9].

For complex **3a** the question arises whether the planar thiaplatinacyclic ring should be described as delocalized. We have compared our structural data with those for $[C_5Me_5Ir\{C,S-2,5-MeC_4H_2S\}]$, complex **6**, where significant aromatic properties have been claimed [10,11]. As shown in Table 5, the bond lengths of the thiametallacycles **3a** and **6** are very similar, within the precision allowed by the e.s.d.'s. However, Harris has suggested that electron delocalization requires electron deficiency in the metal complex and that our platinum complexes are not deficient in that sense [9]. Further studies will clearly be needed to answer this question.

Relative stabilities of the various 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-4-methylcyclohexa-3,5dienes; equilibrium studies

We have found that on heating one of the thiaplatinacycles with a different monocyclic thiophene, the new thiophene displaces the one in the thiaplatinacycle relatively easily. This has allowed us to establish the relative stabilities of the various thiaplatinacycles by measuring the equilibria in a series of exchange reactions. All the reactions were carried out in toluene- d_8 , in sealed NMR tubes under argon, at 60°C using a metallacycle/thiophene ratio of (1/1.5). The reagents were mixed in the NMR tube and the reaction was monitored by ³¹P and ¹H NMR spectroscopy. No reaction occurred without heating.

The equilibrium constant $K_{eqm(0/2)}$, 0.65, for reaction (0/2; Table 7), between $[Pt(C,S-T)(PEt_3)_2]$ and 2-MeT, was calculated as $[Pt(C,S-2-MeT) (PEt_3)_2][T]/[Pt(C,S-T)(PEt_3)_2][2-MeT]$; equilibrium was achieved after 20 h. For the other reactions the values (Table 7) were obtained similarly; reagents are on the left and products on the right.

The data for the forward and back reactions are reasonably self-consistent; those which take the longest time (20 vs 7 or 12 h) to achieve equilibrium show a little decomposition and some solid is deposited. The reactions using $[Pt(C,S-3-MeT)(PEt_3)_2]$ were made with an enriched mixture of isomers, in a starting ratio of 3.5/1, where the most abundant isomer is **3a** with the methyl in the "far" position from the C—Pt bond. When the complex $[Pt(C,S-3-MeT)(PEt_3)_2]$ is the product, only one isomer is detected, the 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-4-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (**3a**).

The equilibria show that in the thiaplatinacycles, T is favoured over 2-MeT, which in turn is favoured over 3-MeT in the approximate ratio 1:0.65:0.45. This measure of the relative thermodynamic ability

3187

Table 1. X-ray crystal structure determination of complex $3a$, [(Et_3P) ₂ Pt(C,S -3-MeT)]: crystal data, details of data collection,
and of solution and refinement

Empirical formula	$C_{17}H_{36}P_2PtS$
Colour	Yellow
Habit	Prism
Crystal size (mm)	$0.40 \times 0.20 \times 0.16$
Crystal system	Monoclinic
Space group	P2 ₁ /c
Unit-cell dimensions	a = 11.291(2) Å
	b = 12.932(2) Å
	c = 14.988(3) Å
	$\beta = 96.07(2)^{\circ}$
Volume (Å ³)	2176.3(8)
Ζ	4
Formula weight	529.5
Density (calc.) (mg m^{-3})	1.616
Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹)	6.685
F(000)	1048
Data collection	
Diffractometer used	Siemens P4/PC
Radiation	Mo- $K_{\rm c}$ ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å)
Temperature (K)	293
Monochromator	Highly oriented graphite crystal
2θ range (°)	3.0-50.0
Scan type	ω
Scan speed	Variable ; 4.00–60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω
Scan range (ω) (°)	1.40
Background measurement	Stationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each
6	for 25.0% of total scan time
Standard reflections	3 measured every 97 reflections
Index ranges	0 < h < 13,
c	0 < k < 15,
	-17 < l < 17, plus Friedel pairs
Reflections collected	8080
Independent reflections	$3841 \ (R_{\rm int} = 4.71\%)$
Observed reflections	$2251 [F > 4.0\sigma(F)]$
Absorption correction	Face-indexed numerical
Min./Max. transmission	0.3121/0.3701
Solution and refinement	
System used	Siemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)
Solution	Direct methods (SIR92)
Refinement method	Full-matrix least-squares
Ouantity minimized	$\Sigma[w(F_o-F_c)^2]$
Hydrogen atoms	Riding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 \text{ Å}^2$
Weighting Scheme	$w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$
Number of parameters refined	190
Final R indices (obs. data)	R = 5.84%, wR = 6.01%
Goodness-of-fit	1.15
Largest and mean Δ/σ	0.161, 0.010
Data-to-parameter ratio	11.8:1
Largest difference peak (e Å $^{-3}$)	2.13; close to Pt atom
Largest difference hole (e $Å^{-3}$)	-1.03

of methylthiophenes to participate in the oxidative insertion process indicates that there is some destabilizing effect of a methyl on the thiaplatinacycle, but that is small (corresponding to a ΔG° of *ca* 2.5 kJ mol⁻¹ at most). Since the oxidative insertion may be regarded as the attack of the electron rich platinum(0) centre on the thiophene, additional electron density provided by methyl substituents to the thiophene ring would be expected to disfavour the reaction.

We conclude that there is a weak electronic effect, but the fact that the 2-methylthiophene is somewhat favoured over the 3-methyl argues against a single

Pt—P(1)	2.294(4)	C(2)C(3)C(6)	120.6(19)
Pt-P(2)	2.285(5)	C(4) - C(3) - C(6)	115.8(18)
Pt - S(1)	2.285(5)	C(3)—C(4)—C(5)	129.0(18)
Pt-C(5)	2.041(16)	PtC(5)C(4)	134.0(14)
S(1)—C(2)	1.703(17)		
C(2) - C(3)	1.328(28)		
C(3)—C(4)	1.424(30)		
C(3) - C(6)	1.536(26)		
C(4)—C(5)	1.308(23)		
P(1) - Pt - P(2)	98.0(2)		
P(1) - Pt - S(1)	175.0(1)		
P(2) - Pt - S(1)	87.0(2)		
P(1) - Pt - C(5)	85.8(5)		
P(2) - Pt - C(5)	173.9(5)		
S(1)— Pt — $C(5)$	89.2(5)		
Pt - S(1) - C(2)	113.7(7)		
S(1) - C(2) - C(3)	130.3(15)		
C(2) - C(3) - C(4)	123.4(16)		

Table 2. X-ray crystal structure determination of complex 3a, $[(Et_3P)_2Pt(C,S-3-MeT)]$: selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°)



Fig. 1. Illustration of the molecular structure of complex 3a, $[(Et_3P)_2Pt(C,S-3-MeBT)].$

methyl having any major steric influence. A complication is that qualitative measurements indicated that those reactions wherein 2-MeT participated were significantly slower than those of T or 3-MeT. This argues for a steric effect which is kinetic rather than thermodynamic.

We also reacted $Pt(PEt_3)_3$ with 2,5-dimethylthiophene under similar conditions; in this case there was no evidence for the formation of a thiaplatinacycle, only slow decomposition. Bianchini *et al.* [8] also found that T and 2-MeT reacted similarly with [(triphos)RhH] [eq. (7)] and that both reacted more easily than 3-MeT; they also found no reactivity of 2,5-Me₂T. This lack of reactivity contrasts with the results found by Jones and Dong, who were able to oxidatively insert the 16-electron $(C_5Me_5)Rh(PMe_3)$ into the C---S bonds of 2,5-Me₂T as well as of T, 2-MeT and 3-MeT to give the thiarhodiacycle [eq. (6)] in each case [12]. While Jones and Dong [8] found little difference between the rates of reaction of $(C_5Me_5)Rh(PMe_3)$ with thiophene itself and the 2- and 3-Me-Ts; they noted that although 2,5-Me₂T reacted more sluggishly, an almost quantitative yield of the complex derived from it was obtained.

The lack of reactivity of 2,5-dimethylthiophene with $[Pt(PEt_3)_3]$ and [(triphos)RhH] may well imply that the steric congestion around the metal in the $[Pt(PEt_3)_3]$ and in [(triphos)RhH] is much greater than in $(C_5Me_5)Rh(PMe_3)$. This suggests that steric factors can become significant where the sulfur is strongly shielded and oxidative insertion is then inhibited.

One must conclude that the steric and electronic effects on metallacycle formation from the thiophenes are rather unusual. Insufficient data are yet available to allow further discussion of these intriguing effects; one can only speculate whether those operating on the new platinum on zeolite second stage hydrotreating catalysts are different to those that control the activity of the conventional CoMoS or NiMoS catalysts.

CONCLUSION

Pt(PEt₃)₃ oxidatively inserts thiophene (T), 2methylthiophene (2-MeT) and 3-methylthiophene (3-MeT) to give the corresponding thiaplatinacycles. The ring-opened thiophenes can be displaced by the free thiophenes and equilibrium studies show that the ease of formation decreases in the order T > 2-MeT > 3-MeT. For a monomethylthiophene steric effects are very small. 2-MeT gave a single isomer, 1-bis(tri-

Table 3. X-ray crystal structure determination of complex 5, $[(Et_3P)_2Pt(C,S-DBT)]$: crystal data, details of data collection, and of solution and refinement

Empirical formula $C_{s}H_{ss}P_{s}P_{s}S$ ColourYellowHabitPrismCrystal system $0.62 \times 0.48 \times 0.44$ Crystal system $0.62 \times 0.48 \times 0.44$ Space group P_{2} ,Unit-cell dimensions $a = 10.447(2)$ Å $b = 17.178(3)$ Å $c = 14.910(2)$ Å $b = 105.46(2)^{\circ}$ $b = 105.46(2)^{\circ}$ Volume (Å') $2578.9(7)$ Z4Formula weight 615.6 Density (cak.) (mg m ⁻¹)1.586Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹)5.654 $f(000)$ 1224Data collectionDiffractometer usedBiffractometer usedSiemens P4/PCRadiationMo-K ₄ ($i = 0.7017$ Å)Temperature (K)293Zar ange (i)30.60.0Scan speedVariable; 4.00-60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speedVariable; 4.00-60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speedVariable; 4.00-60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speed $0 < k < 14$,Undex ranges $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections3 measured very 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections1750 ($R_m = 2.81\%_0$)Observed reflections1630 ($l^{-} > 4.00r(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission0.08100.1701Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (Structure determination summary	
ColourYellowHabitPrismCrystal size (mm) $0.62 \times 0.48 \times 0.44$ Crystal systemMonoclinicSpace group P_2 ,Unit-cell dimensions $a = 10.447(2)$ Å $b = 17.178(3)$ Å $c = 14.910(2)$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speed $a = 14.910(2)$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speed $a = 14.000(2)$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speed $a = 16.95.00\%$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan ange (ω ($^{\circ}$) 1.10	Empirical formula	C ₂₄ H ₃₈ P ₂ PtS
Habit Crystal size (nm) C, $62 \times 0.48 \times 0.44$ Crystal size (nm) P ₂ , a = 10.47(2) Å b = 17.178(3) Å c = 14.91(02) Å $b = 105.46(2)^{\circ}$ Volume (Å ³) 2578.9(7) Z 4 Formula weight 615.6 Density (calc.) (ng m ⁻¹) 1.586 Absorption coefficient (nm ⁻¹) 5.654 F0000 1224 Data collection Diffactometer used Siemens P4/PC Radiation Mo- K_s ($a = 0.71073$ Å) Temperature (K) 23 Temperature (K) 23 Monochromator Highly-oriented graphite crystal 28 range (c) 30–60.0 Scan speed Variable : 4.00–60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speed Variable : 4.00–60.00° min ⁻¹ in	Colour	Yellow
Crystal size (mm) 0.62 × 0.48 × 0.44 Crystal system Monoclinic Space group P2, Unit-cell dimensions $a = 0.047(2)$ Å b = 10.7178(3) Å c = 14.910(2) Å b = 17.178(3) Å c = 14.910(2) Å b = 17.178(3) Å c = 14.910(2) Å $b = 105.66(2)^{\circ}$ Volume (Å ¹) 2578.9(7) Z 4 A Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹) 1.586 Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹) 5.654 F(000) 1224 Data collection E Diffactometer used Siemens P4/PC Radiation Mo-K ₄ ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å) Temperature (K) 293 Monochromator Highly-oriented graphite crystal 2 θ range (°) 3.0 60.0 Scan type ω Scan type ω Scan speed Variable ; 4.00–60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speed Variable ; 4.00–60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speed Scan time ω Scan speed Variable ; 4.00–60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan range (ω) (°) 1.10 Background measurement each for 50.0% of total scan time Standard reflections 3 measured very 97 reflections Index ranges 0 < A < 14, -20 < l < 20 Reflection scollected 8140 Independent reflections (J15 / 4.0 $r(F)$) Observed reflections (J16 / $F > 4.0r(F))Observed reflections (J16 / F > 4.0r(F))Solution and reflement USystem used Simens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)Solution Direct methods (SIR92)Refinement method Fuil-matrix kast-squaresQuantify minimized Z[w(F_c - F_c)^2]Absolute structure \eta = 0.95(6)Extinction correction \chi = 0.00025(4), where F^* = F[1+0.0022F^3/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}Hydrogen atoms Riding model, fixed istorpic U = 0.08 Å2Weighting scheme w^{-1} = a^2(F) + 0.0003F^3/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}Hydrogen tom \Delta A^rOuton the parameter refined 506Standard fine A middice (Sis, with R = 4.619^*, wR = 5.10\%Goodness-of-fit 1.01Largest difference bale (e_i A-1)2.00$	Habit	Prism
Crystal systemMonoclinicSpace group P_2 ,Unit-cell dimensions $a = 10.447(2)$ Å $b = 17.178(3)$ Å $c = 14.910(2)$ Å $b = 17.178(3)$ Å $c = 14.910(2)$ Å $\beta = 105.64(2)^{\circ}$ Volume (Å ²)2578.9(7)Z4Formula weight615.6Density (calc.) (mg m ⁻¹)5.654 $f(000)$ 1224Data collection1224Diffractometer usedSiemens P4/PCRadiationMo- K_x ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å)Temperature (K)293MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal20 range (°)3.0-60.0Scan speedVariable ($4.00-60.00^{\circ}$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speedVariable ($4.00-60.00^{\circ}$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speedStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard effections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < k < 14$. $-20 < l < 20$ ReflectionsG130 [$F > 4.0r(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-index dummericalMin, Max, transmission0.0810(0.1701Solution and refinementSienens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)System usedSienens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)System usedSienens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (S1R92)Refinement methodFill-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $R = 6.619^{\circ}$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Solution correction $x = 0.00025(4)$, where $f^* = F[1+0.002x F^0sin($	Crystal size (mm)	$0.62 \times 0.48 \times 0.44$
Space group P_2 , Unit-cell dimensions $a = 10.447(2)$ Å b = 17.178(3) Å c = 14.910(2) Å b = 17.178(3) Å c = 14.910(2) Å $f = 105.46(2)^{\circ}$ Volume (Å') 2578.9(7) Z 4 Formula weight 615.6 Density (calc.) (mg m ⁻¹) 1.586 Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹) 5.654 F(000) 1224 Data collection Diffractometer used Siemens P4/PC Radiation $Mo-K_4$ ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å) Temperature (K) 293 Monochromator Highly-oriented graphite crystal 20 range (°) 3.0-60.0 Scan type ω Scan type ω Scan arge (ω) (°) 1.10 Background measurement Stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan time Standard reflections 3 measured every 97 reflections Index ranges $0 < h < 14$, -20 < l < 20 Reflection sollected 1840 Index ranges $0 < h < 14$, -20 < l < 20 Reflections collected station Index range (ω) (γ) Distromeretions ($\beta (P)$) Solution and reflections ($\beta (P)$) Absorption correction ($\beta (P)$) Reflections collected Simens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version) Solution and reflement System used Simens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version) Solution and reflement System used Simens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version) Solution ($\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002yF^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ $\gamma = 0.00025(4)$, where F^*	Crystal system	Monoclinic
Unit-cell dimensions $a = 10.447(2)$ Å $b = 17.178(3)$ Å $c = 14.910(2)$ Å $\beta = 105.46(2)^{\circ}$ Volume (Å ²)2578.9(7)Z4Formula weight615.6Density (calc.) (ng m ⁻¹)5.654 $f(000)$ 1224Data collectionSimens P4/PCRadiationMo-K, $(\lambda = 0.71073$ Å)Temperature (K)293MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal20 range (°)3.0-60.0Scan speedVariable; 4.00-60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speedVariable; 4.00-60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Station and refinementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStat	Space group	$P2_1$
$b = 17.178(3) Å$ $c = 14.910(2) Å$ $\beta = 105.46(2)^{\circ}$ Volume (Å ³) 2578.9(7) Z 4 Formula weight 615.6 Density (calc.) (mg m ⁻¹) 5.654 Formula weight 158.6 Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹) 5.654 F(000) 1224 Data collection Diffractometer used Simens P4/PC Radiation Mo- K_{π} ($\lambda = 0.71073 Å$) Temperature (Å) 293 Monochromator Highly-oriented graphite crystal 20 range (°) 3.0–60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speed Variable ; 4.00–60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan range (ω) (°) 1.10 Background measurement Stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan time Standard reflections Index ranges 0 < $k < 24$, -20 < $l < 20$ Reflections collected Independent reflections 130 ($l > 4.00-60.00^{\circ}$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan range (ω) (°) 1.10 Background measurement Standard reflections 1 ansaured every 97 reflections Index ranges 0 < $k < 24$, -20 < $l < 20$ Reflections collected Independent reflections 130 ($l > 4.00-(l)$) Absorption correction Face-indexed numerical Min./Max. transmission 0.0810(0.170) Solution Direct methods (SIR92) Refinement method Staluty minimized 2 [$w(r_{\omega} - r_{\omega}$] Absorption correction $y = 0.00025(4)$, where $l^* = P[1 + 0.002\chi F^0/sin(2\theta)]^{-1.4}$ Hydrogen atoms Reding mediates $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(r) + 0.0008I^2$ Number of parameters refined Standard for each for 50.0000 $R = 4.006R^3$ Number of parameters refined Standard for each for 50.0000 $R = 4.006R^3$ Number of parameters refined Standard for each for 50.0000 $R = 4.000R^3$ Number of parameters refined Standard for each solo ($R = 4.008R^3$ Number of parameters refined Standard for each for 50.0000R^3 Number of parameters refined Standard for each for 50.000R^3 Number of parameters refined Standard for each for 50.000R^3 Number of parameters refined Standard Standar	Unit-cell dimensions	a = 10.447(2) Å
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		b = 17.178(3) Å
$ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		c = 14.910(2) Å
Volume (Å*)2578.9(7) Z 4Formula weight615.6Density (calc.) (mg m ⁻¹)1.586Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹)5.654 $F(000)$ 1224Data collection1224Data collection1224Diffactometer usedSiemens P4/PCRadiationMo- K_s ($\lambda = 0.71073 Å$)Temperature (K)2920 range (°)3.0-60.0Scan type ω Scan speedVariable; 4.00-60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speedVariable; 4.00-60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan range (ω) (°)1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges0 < $h < 14$, $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < (-20)$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections6130 ($F > 4.0\sigma(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numerical Min/Max. transmissionObserved reflections6130 ($F > 4.0\sigma(F)$]SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\chi = 0.0025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1+0.002\chi F^3)sin(20)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRidigen dode, isotropic $U = 0.08 Å^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008 F^2$ <t< td=""><td></td><td>$\beta = 105.46(2)^{\circ}$</td></t<>		$\beta = 105.46(2)^{\circ}$
Z 4Formula wight615.6Density (catc.) (mg m ⁻¹)5.654 $f(000)$ 1224Data collection1224Data collection1234Diffractometer usedSiemens P4/PCRadiationMo- K_x ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å)Temperature (K)293MonohromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal20 range (°)3.0-60.0Scan speedVariable; 4.00-60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan ange (ω) (°)1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges0 < $k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections(750 ($R_{int} = 2.81\%$)Observed reflections6130 ($F > 4.0\sigma(K$)]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission0.0810(0.1701SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodEllul-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma [w(F - F_s)^2]$ Absorption correction $\chi = 0.0025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1+0.002\chi F^2 isin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Riding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 A^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^*(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodnes-of-fit1.01Largest difference hole ($e A^{-1}$)-2.00	Volume (Å ³)	2578.9(7)
Formula weight615.6Density (calc.) (mg m ⁻¹)1.586Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹)5.654 $F(000)$ 1224Data collection1224Data collection1224RadiationMo- K_c ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å)Temperature (k)293MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal20 range (°)3.0-60.0Scan type ω Scan arge (ω) (°)1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges0 < k < 24, -20 < 1 < 20	Ζ	4
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Formula weight	615.6
Absorption coefficient (mm $^{-1}$)5.654 $P(00)$ 1224Data collection1224Diffractometer usedSiemens P4/PCRadiationMo·K _t ($\lambda = 0.71073 Å$)Temperature (K)293MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal 2θ range (°)3.0–60.0Scan type ω Scan speedVariable; 4.00–60.00° min $^{-1}$ in ω Scan range (ω) (°)1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges0 < $h < 14$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Index range0.0810/0.1701Observed reflections7750 ($R_{att} = 2.81\%$)Observed reflections6130 ($F > 4.0\sigma(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission0.0810/0.1701Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)System usedSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)Solution and refinementFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\chi = 0.90025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1+0.002\chi F^3/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 Å^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0002 K^3/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 Å^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0002 K^3/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 Å^2$	Density (calc.) (mg m^{-3})	1.586
$f(000)$ 1224Data collectionDiffactometer usedBiffactometer usedSiemens P4/PCRadiationMo-K _x ($\lambda = 0.71073 Å$)Temperature (K)293MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal 2θ range (°) $3.0 - 60.0$ Scan type ω Scan speedVariable; $4.00-60.00^{\circ}$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan range (ω) (°) 1.10 Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numerical Min./Max, transmission0.0810/0.1701Solution and refinementSystem usedSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version) Solution and refinementSystem usedSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version) SolutionAbsolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^3 sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atoms $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refinedS06Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $w_R = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fitLargest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})-2.00	Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹)	5.654
Data collectionDiffractometer usedSiemens P4/PCRadiation $M \circ -K_a (\lambda = 0.71073 \text{ Å})$ Temperature (K)293MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal 20 range (°) $3.0-60.0$ Scan type ω Scan speedVariable; $4.00-60.00^\circ$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan range (ω) (°) 1.10 Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections 3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected 8140 Independent reflections $6130 \ [F > 4.0\sigma(F)]$ Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission $0.0810(0.1701)$ Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement method $Full-matrix least-squares$ Quantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absorption correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1+0.002\chi F^3/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 Å^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008 F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Largest difference peak ($e Å^{-1}$) 1.98 Largest difference hole ($e Å^{-3}$) -2.00	F(000)	1224
Diffractometer usedSiemens P4/PCRadiation $Mo - K_x (\lambda = 0.7107 \text{ Å})$ Competature (K)293MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal29 range (°) $3.0-60.0$ Scan type ω Scan speedVariable ; $4.00-60.00^{\circ} \min^{-1}$ in ω Scan range (ω) (°) 1.10 Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections 3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < h < 14$, $0 < h < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected 8140 Independent reflections $7150 (R_{int} = 2.81\%)$ Observed reflections $6130 [F > 4.0\sigma(F)]$ Absorption correctionFace-indexed numerical Min./Max, transmissionSolution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version) SolutionSolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $2[w(F_o - F_o)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2(\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsWeighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference hole (e^{A^{-1})Largest difference hole (e^{A^{-1}) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e^{A^{-1}) 1.98	Data collection	
Radiation $M \circ K_x (\lambda = 0.71073 \text{ Å})$ Temperature (K)293MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal20 range (°)3.0–60.0Scan speed ω Scan speedVariable ; 4.00–60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω Scan range (ω) (°)1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < k < 14$, $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numerical Min./Max. transmissionSolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_0 - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.0025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 \text{ Å}^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^*(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Largest difference peak ($e \text{ Å}^{-1}$)1.98Largest difference hole ($e \text{ Å}^{-1}$)1.98Largest difference hole ($e \text{ Å}^{-1}$)1.98	Diffractometer used	Siemens P4/PC
Temperature (K)293MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal 2θ range (°) $3.0-60.0$ Scan type ω Scan speedVariable; $4.00-60.00^{\circ}$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan arage (ω) (°)1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < h < 14$, $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numerical $0.0810/0.1701$ Obtain definementSitemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\chi[w(F_o-F_c)^2]$ Absorption correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1+0.002\chi F^2/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, face isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å2Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Coodenes-of-fit1.01Largest difference peak (e Å ⁻³)1.98Largest difference hole (e Å ⁻³)-2.00	Radiation	Mo- K_{α} ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å)
MonochromatorHighly-oriented graphite crystal $3.0-60.0$ 20 range (°) $3.0-60.0$ Scan type ω Scan speedVariable; $4.00-60.00^{\circ}$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan range (ω) (°) 1.10 Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections 3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < h < 14$, $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected 8140 Independent reflections 6130 [$F > 4.00(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission $0.0810/0.1701$ SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $Z[w(F_o - F_o)^2]$ Absolut structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^3/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixel isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å^2Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest difference peak (e A^{-1})1.98Largest difference hole (e A^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e A^{-3})1.98	Temperature (K)	293
2θ range (°) $3.0-60.0$ Scan type ω Scan speedVariable; $4.00-60.00^{\circ}$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan speedVariable; $4.00-60.00^{\circ}$ min ⁻¹ in ω Scan range (ω) (°)1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numerical Min./Max. transmission0.0810/0.1701Solution and refinementSystem usedSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version) SolutionSolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squares Quantity minimizedQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_o)^2]$ $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1+0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ ŲWeighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506 StolFinal R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01 Largest difference pake (e Å^{-1})Largest difference pake (e Å^{-1})1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3})Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3})-2.00	Monochromator	Highly-oriented graphite crystal
Scan type ω Scan speedVariable; $4.00-60.00^{\circ} min^{-1}$ in ω Scan speed1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections7750 ($R_{mt} = 2.81\%$)Observed reflections6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F$)]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission0.0810/0.1701SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_i)^2]$ Absorption correction $x = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $x = 0.0022(4)$, where $F^* = F[1+0.002\chi F^2 sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomswiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ ŲWeighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest difference pak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-1})-2.00	2θ range (°)	3.0-60.0
Scan speedVariable ; $4.00-60.00^{\circ} \text{ min}^{-1} \text{ in } \omega$ Scan range (ω) (°)1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < h < 14$, $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F)$]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission0.0810/0.1701Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement method $Full-matrix least-squares$ Quantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_c - F_c)^2]$ Absorption correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atoms $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Sind $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest difference pak (e Å $^{-3}$)1.98Largest difference hole (e Å $^{-1}$)-2.00	Scan type	ω
Scan range (ω) (°)1.10Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections $6130 [F > 4.0\sigma(F)]$ Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission $0.0810/0.1701$ SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement method $Full-matrix least-squares$ Quantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolut structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1+0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3})-2.00	Scan speed	Variable: 4.00–60.00° min ⁻¹ in ω
Background measurementStationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan timeStandard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections $6130 [F > 4.0\sigma(F)]$ Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission $0.0810/0.1701$ Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolut structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3})-2.00	Scan range (ω) (°)	1.10
Standard reflections3 measured every 97 reflectionsIndex ranges $0 < h < 14$, $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections7750 ($R_{int} = 2.81\%$)Observed reflections6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F$)]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max, transmission0.0810/0.1701Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 Å^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-1})-2.00	Background measurement	Stationary crystal and stationary counter at beginning and end of scan, each for 50.0% of total scan time
Index ranges $0 < h < 14$, $0 < k < 24$, $-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected8140Independent reflections7750 ($R_{int} = 2.81\%$)Observed reflections6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F$]]Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission0.0810/0.1701Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRidig model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-1})-2.00	Standard reflections	3 measured every 97 reflections
$0 < k < 24, \\ -20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected 8140 Independent reflections 7750 ($R_{int} = 2.81\%$) Observed reflections 6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F$)] Absorption correction Face-indexed numerical Min./Max. transmission 0.0810/0.1701 Solution and refinement System used Siemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version) Solution Direct methods (SIR92) Refinement method Full-matrix least-squares Quantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_e)^2]$ Absolut structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction Riding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 \text{ Å}^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002 Data-to-parameter ratio 12.1:1 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) . 2.00	Index ranges	0 < h < 14,
$-20 < l < 20$ Reflections collected 8140 Independent reflections 7750 ($R_{int} = 2.81\%$) Observed reflections 6130 [$F > 4.0\sigma(F$)] Absorption correction Face-indexed numerical Min./Max. transmission 0.0810/0.1701 Solution and refinement System used Siemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version) Solution Direct methods (SIR92) Refinement method Full-matrix least-squares Quantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atoms Riding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 \text{ Å}^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002 Data-to-parameter ratio 12.1:1 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) -2.00		0 < k < 24,
Reflections collected 8140 Independent reflections $7750 \ (R_{int} = 2.81\%)$ Observed reflections $6130 \ [F > 4.0\sigma(F)]$ Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission $0.0810/0.1701$ Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 \text{ Å}^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002Data-to-parameter ratio12.1 : 1Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3})-2.00		-20 < l < 20
Independent reflections $7750 (R_{int} = 2.81\%)$ Observed reflections $6130 [F > 4.0\sigma(F)]$ Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission $0.0810/0.1701$ Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)System usedSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 \text{ Å}^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest and mean Δ/σ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3}) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) -2.00	Reflections collected	8140
Observed reflections $6130 [F > 4.0\sigma(F)]$ Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission $0.0810/0.1701$ Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 \text{ Å}^2$ Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002Data-to-parameter ratio12.1 : 1Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3})-2.00	Independent reflections	7750 ($R_{\rm int} = 2.81\%$)
Absorption correctionFace-indexed numericalMin./Max. transmission $0.0810/0.1701$ Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å ⁻³) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å ⁻³) -2.00	Observed reflections	$6130 [F > 4.0\sigma(F)]$
Min./Max. transmission $0.0810/0.1701$ Solution and refinementSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3}) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) -2.00	Absorption correction	Face-indexed numerical
Solution and refinementSystem usedSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002Data-to-parameter ratio12.1 : 1Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3})-2.00	Min./Max. transmission	0.0810/0.1701
System usedSiemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002Data-to-parameter ratio12.1 : 1Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3})-2.00	Solution and refinement	
SolutionDirect methods (SIR92)Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3}) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) -2.00	System used	Siemens SHELXTL PLUS (PC Version)
Refinement methodFull-matrix least-squaresQuantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3}) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) -2.00	Solution	Direct methods (SIR92)
Quantity minimized $\Sigma[w(F_o - F_c)^2]$ Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3}) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) -2.00	Refinement method	Full-matrix least-squares
Absolute structure $\eta = 0.95(6)$ Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å ² Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3}) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) -2.00	Quantity minimized	$\Sigma[w(F_{\rm o}-F_{\rm c})^2]$
Extinction correction $\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$ Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ ŲWeighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined 506 Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%$, $wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3}) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3}) -2.00	Absolute structure	$\eta = 0.95(6)$
Hydrogen atomsRiding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08$ Å2Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002Data-to-parameter ratio12.1 : 1Largest difference peak (e Å^{-3})1.98Largest difference hole (e Å^{-3})-2.00	Extinction correction	$\chi = 0.00025(4)$, where $F^* = F[1 + 0.002\chi F^2/\sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$
Weighting scheme $w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$ Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002Data-to-parameter ratio12.1 : 1Largest difference peak (e Å ⁻³)1.98Largest difference hole (e Å ⁻³)-2.00	Hydrogen atoms	Riding model, fixed isotropic $U = 0.08 \text{ Å}^2$
Number of parameters refined506Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit 1.01 Largest and mean Δ/σ $0.010, 0.002$ Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å ⁻³) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å ⁻³) -2.00	Weighting scheme	$w^{-1} = \sigma^2(F) + 0.0008F^2$
Final R indices (obs. data) $R = 4.61\%, wR = 5.10\%$ Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002Data-to-parameter ratio12.1 : 1Largest difference peak (e Å ⁻³)1.98Largest difference hole (e Å ⁻³)-2.00	Number of parameters refined	506
Goodness-of-fit1.01Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002Data-to-parameter ratio12.1 : 1Largest difference peak (e Å ⁻³)1.98Largest difference hole (e Å ⁻³)-2.00	Final R indices (obs. data)	R = 4.61%, wR = 5.10%
Largest and mean Δ/σ 0.010, 0.002Data-to-parameter ratio12.1 : 1Largest difference peak (e Å ⁻³)1.98Largest difference hole (e Å ⁻³)-2.00	Goodness-of-fit	1.01
Data-to-parameter ratio $12.1:1$ Largest difference peak (e Å $^{-3}$) 1.98 Largest difference hole (e Å $^{-3}$) -2.00	Largest and mean Δ/σ	0.010, 0.002
Largest difference peak (e Å $^{-3}$)1.98Largest difference hole (e Å $^{-3}$)-2.00	Data-to-parameter ratio	12.1 : 1
Largest difference hole (e Å ⁻³) -2.00	Largest difference peak (e Å ⁻³)	1.98
	Largest difference hole (e Å ⁻³)	-2.00

ethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-3-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (2), while 3-MeT gave two (ratio 1:1.6). One was 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-5methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene, while the other was 1bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-4-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (3a). Comparison of the X-ray structure of 3a with that of the previously prepared complexes 5, $[Pt(PEt_3)_2\{C,S-C_{12}H_8S\}]$, derived from dibenzothiophene and 4, $[Pt(PEt_3)_2\{C,S-C_8H_6S\}]$, derived from benzothiophene, shows that all three

Pt(1)—P(1A)	2.261(4)	P(1A) - Pt(1) - P(2A)	99.1(2)
Pt(1) - P(2A)	2.325(5)	P(1A) - Pt(1) - S(5A)	168.5(2)
Pt(1)—S(5A)	2.341(5)	P(2A) - Pt(1) - S(5A)	86.5(2)
Pt(1)—C(13A)	2.052(16)	P(1A) - Pt(1) - C(13A)	92.8(4)
S(5A)C(12A)	1.748(19)	P(2A) - Pt(1) - C(13A)	165.2(5)
C(10A)C(11A)	1.500(21)	S(5A) - Pt(1) - C(13A)	83.4(4)
C(10A)-C(13A)	1.429(23)	Pt(1) - S(5A) - C(12A)	99.8(6)
C(11A)—C(12A)	1.380(28)	C(11A) - C(10A) - C(13A)	120.9(15)
		C(10A)—C(11A)—C(12A)	121.7(16)
		S(5A) - C(12A) - C(11A)	123.6(12)
		Pt(1) - C(13A) - C(10A)	125.1(10)

Table 4. X-ray crystal structure determination of complex 5, $[(Et_3P)_2Pt(C,S-DBT)]$, selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°)



Fig. 2. Illustration of the molecular structure of complex 5, $[(Et_3P)_2Pt(C,S-DBT)].$

complexes contain a six-membered thiaplatinacycle, which is planar in 3a, nearly so in 4, but very severely twisted in 5. However, many of the bond lengths and angles are similar in the three complexes and it is probable that the non-planarity of the hetero-ring arises from non-bonded steric interactions between the triethylphosphines and the benzo-hydrogens.

EXPERIMENTAL

Reactions were carried out using standard Schlenk techniques, under argon or dry nitrogen. NMR spectra were run on either a Varian VXR-300 or on a Varian Unity Plus 500 spectrometer in C_6D_6 , toluened₈, or CDCl₃ solution. Microanalyses were performed by Galbraith Laboratories, USA.

1-Bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-3-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (2)

A solution of tris(triethylphosphine)platinum [13] in hexane (10 cm³ containing 0.072 g, 0.13 mmol cm⁻³) was prepared. A large excess of 2-methylthiophene (3.8 cm³, 39 mmol) was added to the residue, $Pt(PEt_3)_3$ (0.72 g, 1.3 mmol) left from 10 cm³ of this solution after removal of solvent in vacuo and the mixture was refluxed (110°C) with constant stirring (4 h). The methylthiophene was then removed in vacuo, dry hexane (10 cm³) was added to the residue. On addition of further cold hexane (5 cm³) and cooling (ice/acetone bath) this gave a red solid which was filtered; yield, after drying, 0.16 g (23%) of product. Found : C, 38.4; H, 6.8; S, 6.2. Calc. for C₁₇H₃₆P₂PtS : C, 38.5; H, 6.85; S, 6.1%. NMR spectroscopic data: ¹H NMR (in CDCl₃): δ 1.1 (m, 18H, Me), 1.96 (m, 2H, CH₂), 2.38 (m, 3H, Me), 6.54 [d, 1H, H_e $J(H_b-H_c)$, 7 Hz], 7.06 (m, 1H, H_a) and 7.26 (m, 1H, H_b). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃): δ C_d 126.8; C_c 125.1; C_b 122.7; C_a 131.8 [²J(P_b-C_a) 94.5; ²J(P_a-C_a) 9.2 Hz]; CH₂ 28.5; Me, 16.3; Me, 8.0. ³¹P NMR (in toluene d_8 : $\delta P_a + 11.6$; P_b , 1.5; $[^2J(P_a - P_b) 23; {}^1J(Pt - P_b)$ 1660; ¹*J*(Pt—P_a) 3088 Hz].

1-Bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-4-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (**3a**)

1-Bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2-thia-4-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene (**3a**, 0.06 g, 8%) was made in identical fashion from 10 cm³ of the solution of tris(triethylphosphine)platinum in hexane (0.072 g, 0.13 mmol cm⁻³) and 3-methylthiophene (2 cm³, 20.7 mmol). Found: C, 38.6; H, 6.9; S, 6.3. Calc. for C₁₇H₃₆P₂PtS: C, 38.5; H, 6.85; S, 6.1%. NMR spectroscopic data: ¹H NMR δ (CDCl₃): 1.1 (m, 18H, Me), 1.9 (m, 12H, CH₂), 2.0 (s, 3H, Me), 6.8 (m, 2H, H_d and H_b), 7.6 (m, 1H, H_a). ¹³C NMR: δ (CDCl₃) C_d 112.8; C_c 125.9; C_b 130.4; C_a 133.6 [²J(P_b-C_a), 97.2; ²J(P_a-C_a), 9.3 Hz]; Me 25.7; CH₂ 16.5; Me 8.3. ³¹P NMR (in toluene-d₈): δ P_a+11.0; P_b, 0.9;

Bond lengths (Å)	Complex 3a , from 3-MeT	Complex 4, from BT [1]	Complex 5, from DBT	Irdiathiabenzene, 6 [10]
				• [10]
$Pt-P_a$ (<i>trans</i> to S)	2.294(4)	2.301(5)	2.261(4)	
$Pt-P_{b}$ (trans to C)	2.356(5)	2.386(5)	2.325(5)	
Pt—C _a	2.041(16)	2.035(19)	2.052(16)	1.986(6)"
$C_a - C_b$	1.308(23)	1.301(27)	1.429(23)	1.394(9)
$C_b - C_c$	1.424(30)	1.483(29)	1.500(21)	1.41(1)
$C_c - C_d$	1.328(28)	1.403(25)	1.380(28)	1.375(9)
C _d -S	1.703(17)	1.756(18)	1.748(19)	1.713(6)
S—Pt	2.285(5)	2.315(5)	2.341(5)	2.203(2) ^{<i>b</i>}
Bond angles (°)				
$P_a - Pt - P_b$	98.0(2)	97.6(2)	99.1(2)	
C _a PtS	89.2(5)	88.6(6)	83.4(4)	
P _a —Pt—C _a	85.8(5)	86.8(6)	92.8(4)	
P _b PtS	87.0(2)	87.0(2)	86.5(2)	
$Pt - S - C_d$	113.7(7)	114.2(6)	99.8(6)	
$Pt - C_a - C_b$	134.0(14)	137.3(16)	125.1(10)	
$C_a - C_b - C_c$	129.0(18)	128.4(18)	120.9(15)	
$C_b - C_c - C_d$	123.4(16)	121.5(16)	121.7(16)	
$C_c - C_d - S$	130.3(15)	128.7(15)	123.6(12)	
P _a PtS	175.0(1)	175.4(2)	168.5(2)	
P_{b} — Pt — C_{a}	173.9(5)	174.8(6)	165.2(5)	

Table 5. Comparison of bond lengths and angles for complexes 3a, 4, 5 and $[C_5Me_5Ir{C,S-2,5-MeC_4H_2S}]$, 6, (from ref. [10])

^{*a*} Ir—C_a for complex 6.

^b Ir—S for complex 6.





4



5

Fig. 3. Numbering convention used for the comparison of the X-ray structures of complexes 3a, 4 and 5, and for the discussion of NMR data of complexes 2, 3a and 3b; P_a is the triethylphosphine *trans* to S, P_b the one *trans* to C_a .

Analysis of a hydrodesulfurization process-2



Table 6. Dihedral angles comparing 3a (from 3-MeT), 4 (from BT) and 5 (from DBT)

Dihedral angle between planes :	For complex 3a (from 3-MeT)	For complex 4 (from BT)	For complex 5 (from DBT)
$P_a - Pt - P_b / C_c - C_d - S$	7.1	11.2	66.3
$P_a - Pt - P_b / C_a - Pt - S$	3.9	2.9	13.7
$P_a - Pt - P_b / C_a - C_b - C_c$	6.6	9.7	55.3
$C_c - C_d - S/C_a - C_b - C_c$	1.1	5.1	35.5

 Table 7. Equilibrium constants for thiophene/2-methylthiophene/3-methylthiophene

 displacement reactions

$[Pt(C,S-T)(PEt_3)_2] + 2 - MeT \rightleftharpoons [Pt(C,S-2-MeT)(PEt_3)_2] + T$	(0/2)
$[Pt(C,S-2-MeT)(PEt_3)_2] + T \rightleftharpoons [Pt(C,S-T)(PEt_3)_2] + 2-MeT$	(2/0)
$[Pt(C,S)(PEt_3)_2] + 3 - MeT \rightleftharpoons [Pt(C,S-3-MeT)(PEt_3)_2] + T$	(0/3)
$[Pt(C,S-3-MeT)(PEt_3)_2] + T \rightleftharpoons [Pt(C,S-T)(PEt_3)_2] + 3-MeT$	(3/0)
$[Pt(C,S-2-MeT)(PEt_3)_2] + 3-MeT \rightleftharpoons [Pt(C,S-3-MeT)(PEt_3)_2] + 2-MeT$	(2/3)
$[Pt(C,S-3-MeT)(PEt_3)_2] + 2-MeT \rightleftharpoons [Pt(C,S-2-MeT)(PEt_3)_2] + 3-MeT$	(3/2)

Measured equilibrium constants,

 $K_{\text{eqm}(0/2)} = 0.65 \text{ (after 20 h)}; K_{\text{eqm}(2/0)} = 1.45 \text{ (after 20 h)};$

 $K_{\text{eqm}(0/3)} = 0.45 \text{ (after 7 h)}; K_{\text{eqm}(3/0)} = 2.30 \text{ (after 7 h)}; K_{\text{eqm}(2/3)} = 0.46 \text{ (after 7 h)}; K_{\text{eqm}(3/2)} = 2.20 \text{ (after 12 h)}.$

 $[^{2}J(P_{a}-P_{b}) 23; {}^{1}J(Pt-P_{b}) 1690; {}^{1}J(Pt-P_{a}) 3062 Hz].$ The other isomer, 1-bis(triethylphosphine)platina-2thia-5-methylcyclohexa-3,5-diene, showed resonances at ${}^{31}P$ NMR: δP_{a} +11.3; P_{b} , 1.2 $[{}^{2}J(P_{a}-P_{b}) 23;$ ${}^{1}J(Pt-P_{b}) 1673; {}^{1}J(Pt-P_{a}) 3078 Hz].$ The crude product analysed correctly for a mixture of two isomers. Found: C, 38.5; H, 6.95; S, 6.2. Calc. for $C_{17}H_{36}P_2PtS: C, 38.5; H, 6.85; S, 6.1\%$. Although the ¹H NMR spectrum was very complex, peaks due to complex **3b** could be detected at δ 2.2 (s, Me) and 7.2 (m, probably H_c and H_d).

An attempt to carry out the same reaction using 2,5-dimethylthiophene (1.8 cm³, 10 mmol) and tris(triethylphosphine)platinum (0.72 g, 1.3 mmol)

3193



 cm^{-3}), by refluxing for 24 h, was unsuccessful; no product could be isolated.

X-ray crystal structure determination of complex **3a**, [(Et₃P)₂Pt(C,S-3-MeT)

A sample for X-ray crystallography was crystallized from toluene-heptane; crystal data, details of data collection, and of solution and refinement are given in Table 1 and selected bond lengths and angles in Table 2. The X-ray structure analysis clearly shows that one of the ethyl groups on the phosphine ligand (P2) is orientationally disordered and Fig. 1 shows only the main conformer.

X-ray crystal structure determination of complex 5, [(Et₃P)₂Pt(C,S-DBT)]

This was prepared as described, from $[Pt(Et_3P)_3]$ and dibenzothiophene [1]. A crystal for X-ray crystallography was crystallized at 0°C from toluene-hexane; crystal data, details of data collection, and of solution and refinement are given in Table 3; atomic coordinates are in Table 5, and selected bond lengths and angles in Table 4. The structure is illustrated in Fig. 2.

Atomic coordinates for complexes 3a and 5 have been deposited with the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre.

Equilibrium studies. On heating one of the thiaplatinacycles with a different monocyclic thiophene in toluene- d_8 , in sealed NMR tubes under argon, at 60° C using a metallacycle/thiophene ratio of (1/1.5), the new thiophene displaced that in the thiaplatinacycle. The reagents were mixed in the NMR tube and the reaction was usually monitored by ³¹P NMR spectroscopy (45° pulse, 1 s acquisition, 4 s total delay between pulses and decoupling at the end of the sequence to minimize NOE); the integrals were also checked by comparison with mixtures of known compositions.

Acknowledgements—We thank the European Community (Contract CL1*CT94-0062), and CONACYT for support of this work and Dr. Tony Haynes for a helpful discussion.

REFERENCES

- Part 1. Garcia, J. J., Mann, B. E., Adams, H., Bailey, N. A. and Maitlis, P. M., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1995, 117, 2179; see also Garcia, J. J. and Maitlis, P. M., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1993, 115, 12200.
- 2. Weisser, O. and Landa, S., Sulphide Catalysts, their Properties and Applications,. Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1973.
- Pecoraro, T. A. and Chianelli, R. R., J. Catal., 1981, 67, 430; Vissers, J. P. R., Groot, C. K., van Oers, E. M., de Boer, V. H. J. and Prins, R., Bull. Soc. Chim. Belg., 1984, 93, 813.
- 4. Angelici, R. J., Accts Chem. Res., 1988, 21, 387, and refs therein.
- Models for HDS reactions have been reviewed: Sanchez-Delgado, R. A., J. Mol. Catal., 1994, 86, 287; Bianchini, C. and Meli, A., J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1996, 801.
- Isoda, T., Ma, X. and Mochida, I., Abstr. Am. Chem. Soc., Symposium on Advances in Hydrotreating Catalysts, 1994, 208, 584; Ma, X., Sakanishi, K., Isoda, T. and Mochida, I., Abstr. Am. Chem. Soc., Symposium on Advances in Hydrotreating Catalysts, 1994, 208, 622.
- van den Berg, J. P., Lucien, J. P., Germaine, G. and Thielemans, G. L. B., *Fuel Process. Technol.*, 1993, **35**, 119; Cooper, B. H., Stanislaus, A. and Hannerup, P. N., *Hydrocarbon Process.*, June 1993, 83; Maxwell, I. E., Naber, J. E. and de

Jong, K. P., *Appl. Catalysis, A General*, 1994, **113**, 153; Mignard, S., Marchal, N. and Kasztelan, S., *Bull. Soc. Chim. Belg.*, 1995, **104**, 259.

- Jones, W. D. and Dong, L., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1991, 113, 559; Bianchini, C., Jimenez, M. V., Meli, A. and Vizza, F., Organometallics, 1995, 14, 3196.
- 9. Palmer, M., Carter, K. and Harris, S., *Organometallics*, submitted for publication; we thank Professor Harris for a preprint.
- Chen, J., Daniels, L. M. and Angelici, R. J., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1990, 12, 199; see also Chen, J. and Angelici, R. J., Organometallics, 1989, 8, 2277; 1990, 9, 849, 879; Chen, J., Daniels, L. M. and Angelici, R. J., Polyhedron, 1990, 9, 1883;

Chen, J. B., Young, V. G. and Angelici, R. J., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1995, 117, 6362.

- Bianchini, C., Meli, A., Peruzzini, M., Vizza, F., Frediani, P., Herrera, V. and Sanchez-Delgado, R. A., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1993, 115, 2731; Bianchini, C., Meli, A., Peruzzini, M., Vizza, F., Moneti, S., Herrera, V. and Sanchez-Delgado, R. A., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1994, 116, 4370.
- Jones, W. D. and Dong, L., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1992, 114, 151; see also Myers, A. W., Jones, W. D. and McClements, S. M., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1995, 117, 11704; Myers, A. W. and Jones, W. D., Organometallics, 1996, 15, 2905.
- Yoshida, T. and Otsuka, S., *Inorg. Synth.*, 1990, 28, 120.