



HAL
open science

Spin State and Ligand Dissociation in [CpCoL₂] Complexes (L = PH₃, H₂C=CH₂): A Computational Study

Rinaldo Poli, Kevin Smith

► **To cite this version:**

Rinaldo Poli, Kevin Smith. Spin State and Ligand Dissociation in [CpCoL₂] Complexes (L = PH₃, H₂C=CH₂): A Computational Study. *European Journal of Inorganic Chemistry*, 1999, 1999 (5), pp.877-880. 10.1002/(SICI)1099-0682(199905)1999:53.0.CO;2-6 . hal-03304533

HAL Id: hal-03304533

<https://hal.science/hal-03304533v1>

Submitted on 4 Oct 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Spin State and Ligand Dissociation in [CpCoL₂] Complexes (L = PH₃, H₂C=CH₂): a Computational Study

Rinaldo Poli*^[a] and Kevin M. Smith^[a]

^[a] Laboratoire de Synthèse et d'Electrosynthèse Organométalliques, Faculté des Sciences "Gabriel", Université de Bourgogne, 6 Boulevard Gabriel, 21 100 Dijon, France

Fax (+33) 380386098; E-mail: Rinaldo.Poli@u-bourgogne.fr

Keywords: cobalt / density functional calculations / electronic structure / ligand effects / spin state

Abstract: The relative energies of [CpCoL] compounds (L = PH₃, H₂C=CH₂) were calculated at the DFT/B3LYP level of theory. The triplet spin state was found to be favored over the singlet by between 33.0 and 21.0 kcal mol⁻¹ for both fixed and optimized geometries. The basis set size was found to be important for the energy calculations, particularly when the energetics of ligand dissociation was examined. The role of the triplet spin state in facilitating the ligand dissociation process is discussed.

Introduction

The role of spin state changes in the reactivity of $[\text{CpCoL}_2]$ species remains under dispute. Several kinetic, spectroscopic, and theoretical studies have investigated this issue. Bergman *et al.* examined the mechanism of phosphine substitution in $[\text{CpCo}(\text{PPh}_3)_2]$ in order to determine if interconverting between singlet and triplet species resulted in an activation barrier for the dissociative pathway. The first step in the ligand replacement reaction was found to be the rapid, reversible formation of $[\text{CpCo}(\text{PPh}_3)]$.^[1] Extended Hückel molecular orbital theory calculations by Hofmann and Padmanabhan suggested that although linear d^8 $[\text{CpML}]$ compounds are symmetry-required to have a triplet ground spin state, a "bent" geometry for $[\text{CpCo}(\text{PPh}_3)]$ (*i.e.* Cp-Co-P angle $< 180^\circ$) might allow the substitution reaction to proceed via the singlet spin surface, thereby accounting for the observed lack of a "spin flip barrier".^[2] Later studies by Bergman, Moore, and co-workers demonstrated that photogenerated $[\text{CpCo}(\text{CO})]$ and $[\text{Cp}^*\text{Co}(\text{CO})]$ did not form adducts with alkanes or noble gases, although these unsaturated species did react very rapidly with CO.^[3] Using a variety of computational techniques including density functional theory (DFT), Siegbahn calculated that $[\text{CpCo}(\text{CO})]$ possesses a triplet ground spin state, and attributed the difference in reactivity of the 16-electron species with alkanes and CO to the varying ability of the incoming ligand to induce triplet-to-singlet spin crossover.^[4] In contrast, Brookhart *et. al.* have recently reported C-H activation reactions of $[\text{Cp}^*\text{Co}(\eta^2\text{-H}_2\text{C}=\text{CHSiMe}_3)_2]$ that proceed via oxidative addition of benzene or aldehydes to unsaturated $[\text{Cp}^*\text{Co}(\eta^2\text{-H}_2\text{C}=\text{CHSiMe}_3)]$.^[5]

As part of an ongoing investigation of spin state and reactivity,^[6] we have recently used DFT techniques to examine how ligands can affect the relative energy of the singlet and triplet states (ΔE_{S-T}) of 16-electron $[\text{CpM}(\text{NO})]$ -containing complexes of Cr, Mo, and W.^[7] Ultrafast IR studies have implicated triplet $[\text{CpMn}(\text{CO})_2]$ in the photolysis of $[\text{CpMn}(\text{CO})_3]$ in Et_3SiH .^[8] Spin state changes have also been proposed to play a critical role in the reactivity of cytochrome P450.^[9] The computational study described in this paper was performed to address the following questions. (1) What is the ground spin state of *bent* $[\text{CpCoL}]$ species ($L = \text{PH}_3$, $\text{H}_2\text{C}=\text{CH}_2$)? (2) Is ΔE_{S-T} substantially altered for $[\text{CpCoL}]$ species by variation of L? (3) Can the observed C-H bond activation reactivity of $[\text{Cp}^*\text{Co}(\eta^2\text{-H}_2\text{C}=\text{CHSiMe}_3)]$ be attributed to a difference in ground spin state compared to triplet $[\text{CpCo}(\text{CO})]$?

Results and Discussion

Calculated Geometries and Energies

The saturated [CpCoL₂] (L = PH₃, H₂C=CH₂) complexes were studied with DFT using the three-parameter form of the Becke, Lee, Yang, and Parr functional (B3LYP)^[10] and two basis sets, following the methodology recently developed by Siegbahn and co-workers.^[11] The geometries were optimized without constraints (*C*₁ symmetry) using the LanL2DZ basis set;^[12] the structural parameters for both complexes are listed in Table 1. Since energy calculations are more sensitive to basis set size than geometry optimizations,^[13] the energies of the LanL2DZ structures were also calculated using the larger 6-311+G(2d,2p) basis set.

Table 1. Optimized geometries for [CpCo(PH₃)₂] and [CpCo(C₂H₄)₂]^[a]

Parameter ^[b]	[CpCo(PH ₃) ₂]	[CpCo(C ₂ H ₄) ₂]
CNT-Co	1.800	1.837
Co-X	2.231	1.950
	2.235	1.939
CNT-Co-X	131.44	130.45
	130.69	130.26
X-Co-X	97.87	99.28

^[a] Bond lengths in Å and angles in °. ^[b] CNT = center of gravity of the Cp ring, X = P for [CpCo(PH₃)₂] or center of C-C bond for [CpCo(C₂H₄)₂].

The bond lengths obtained for the optimized [CpCoL₂] geometries are marginally longer than those reported for the solid-state molecular structures of [CpCo(PEt₃)₂]^[14b] and [Cp*Co(η²-H₂C=CHSiMe₃)₂].^[5c] For instance, the average calculated Co-C(Cp) bond lengths are 0.09 Å longer than those found experimentally, and the theoretical Co-L(average) distances are 0.015 Å and 0.035 Å longer than those found in the corresponding X-ray molecular structures for the phosphine and alkene complexes, respectively. The alkene orientation of [CpCo(η²-H₂C=CH₂)₂] corresponds to the alignment observed experimentally, namely parallel with the Cp plane.^[5] The calculated alkene C-C bond lengths in [CpCo(η²-H₂C=CH₂)₂] (1.417 and 1.414 Å) are almost identical to those reported for [Cp*Co(η²-H₂C=CHSiMe₃)₂] (1.414 and 1.404 Å). The slight distortions in C-C bond lengths in the Cp ligand also correspond well with those previously discussed for related [CpCoL₂] derivatives.^[14]

As noted in the introduction, Hofmann and Padmanabhan have previously suggested that ligand dissociation from d⁸ [CpML₂] complexes may remain on the singlet spin hypersurface if

the unsaturated [CpML] intermediate adopts a bent geometry.^[2] To test this hypothesis, the energies of bent [CpCoL] compounds were calculated in both singlet and triplet spin states, using the optimized [CpCoL₂] geometries with one L group removed and leaving the other structural parameters unchanged. For both [CpCo(PH₃)] and [CpCo(η^2 -H₂C=CH₂)] in this bent conformation (Cp-Co-L < 132°), the triplet state is greatly favored over the singlet. The value of ΔE_{S-T} decreases only slightly when the larger basis set is employed, from -31.0 to -28.1 kcal mol⁻¹ for the phosphine system and from -25.9 to -23.9 kcal mol⁻¹ for the alkene system. Overall, only a minor difference in ΔE_{S-T} is observed upon changing the L group in [CpCoL].

Analogous results are obtained when the [CpCoL] geometries are optimized using B3LYP/LanL2DZ. Optimized triplet [CpCo(PH₃)] was found to be -33.0 kcal mol⁻¹ more stable using the LanL2DZ basis set, and -27.1 kcal mol⁻¹ more stable at the B3LYP/6-311+G(2p,2d) level. For the alkene system, triplet [CpCo(η^2 -H₂C=CH₂)] was calculated to be -26.5 kcal mol⁻¹ more stable than the singlet at the B3LYP/LanL2DZ level, and -21.0 kcal mol⁻¹ more stable using the larger basis set. By comparison, Siegbahn's B3LYP calculation of [CpCo(CO)] gave a ΔE_{S-T} value of -27.8 kcal mol⁻¹, which falls between the results obtained here for the phosphine and alkene derivatives.^[4] The structural parameters of the B3LYP/LanL2DZ optimized [CpCoL] geometries are listed in Table 2, and the relative energies are illustrated in Figure 1.

Table 2. Optimized geometries for [CpCo(PH₃)] and [CpCo(C₂H₄)]^[a]

Parameter ^[b]	[CpCo(PH ₃)]	[CpCo(C ₂ H ₄)]
CNT-Co	1.782 (1.881)	1.793 (1.958)
Co-X	2.241 (2.325)	1.851 (1.932)
CNT-Co-X	140.92 (140.43)	148.32 (149.09)

^[a] Singlet bond lengths in Å and angles in °, with triplet parameters indicated in parentheses. ^[b] CNT = center of gravity of the Cp ring, X = P for [CpCo(PH₃)] or center of C-C bond for [CpCo(C₂H₄)].

An indication of the energetics of the ligand dissociation process can be attained by comparing the energy of [CpCoL₂] complexes with the sum of the energies of optimized [CpCoL] and the free L ligand, as shown in Table 3. For these relative energies, the difference between the values obtained with the two different basis sets is pronounced. In fact, at the B3LYP/LanL2DZ level, [CpCo(PH₃)₂] is calculated to be 4.3 kcal mol⁻¹ less stable than triplet [CpCo(PH₃)] and free PH₃, contrary to experimental observations. This erroneous result is presumably due to the previously observed correlation between basis set size and bond strength.^[4] Thus, while the relative energies calculated using the small basis set are skewed in

favor of the dissociated species, employing the larger 6-311+G(2d,2p) basis set results in the saturated complex being 7.3 kcal mol⁻¹ more stable, in accord with experimental studies of the [CpCo(PPh₃)₂] system.^[1]




Figure 1. Relative energies of singlet and triplet [CpCo(PH₃)] and [CpCo(C₂H₄)]; ΔE_{S-T} calculated at the B3LYP/6-3111G(2d,2p) level of theory, with B3LYP/LanL2DZ values indicated in parentheses.

Table 3. Relative energies of [CpCoL₂] and [CpCoL] + L^[a]

	[CpCo(PH ₃)]	[CpCo(C ₂ H ₄)]
Singlet	-34.4 (-28.8)	-24.6 (-25.1)
Triplet	-7.3 (+4.3)	-3.6 (+1.4)

^[a] ΔE (in kcal mol⁻¹) calculated at the B3LYP/6-3111G(2d,2p) level of theory, with B3LYP/LanL2DZ values indicated in parentheses.

Implications for Reactivity

It has been previously proposed that the lack of a high activation barrier for ligand exchange reactions in d⁸ [CpML₂] compounds might be due to the bent geometry of unsaturated [CpML] species, allowing the singlet spin state to be maintained throughout the dissociative substitution process.^[15] Although Extended Hückel molecular orbital calculations did not permit the relative energies of the singlet and triplet [CpML] species to be ascertained, Hofmann and co-workers recognized that this possibility was more likely for Rh and Ir than for Co.^[2] Our results at the DFT/B3LYP level indicate that even in the bent conformation, the

triplet spin state is considerably lower in energy for $[\text{CpCo}(\text{PH}_3)]$ and $[\text{CpCo}(\eta^2\text{-H}_2\text{C}=\text{CH}_2)]$ than the corresponding singlet electronic configuration.

It should be observed that the crossover from the singlet to the triplet surface upon phosphine dissociation from $[\text{CpCo}(\text{PPh}_3)_2]$ will in fact lower the enthalpic barrier to the phosphine exchange process if the crossing point is located below the singlet $[\text{CpCo}(\text{PPh}_3)]$ species. A change in spin state would only translate into an entropic contribution to the activation free energy. Thus, the facile phosphine exchange process observed for $[\text{CpCo}(\text{PPh}_3)_2]$ is in fact quite nicely rationalized by the large energetic stabilization of the $[\text{CpCo}(\text{PPh}_3)]$ intermediate upon changing the spin state, accompanied by a low-energy crossing point and lack of a "spin flip barrier".^[16]

Differences in ground spin state between $[\text{CpCo}(\text{CO})]$ and the heavier Rh and Ir congeners were utilized by Siegbahn to explain the experimentally observed differences in alkane binding and C-H bond activation reactivity of these species.^[4] With this precedent, it seemed conceivable that the H/D exchange reactivity with C_6D_6 and the aldehyde C-H activation reactions observed by Brookhart and co-workers might be attributable to a low-lying or ground singlet spin state for $[\text{Cp}^*\text{Co}(\eta^2\text{-H}_2\text{C}=\text{CHSiMe}_3)]$ intermediates.^[5] Although the present study indicates that $\Delta E_{\text{S-T}}$ is slightly more favorable for the singlet alkene species compared to the analogous phosphine system, the triplet state is still the ground state by over 20 kcal mol⁻¹ for $[\text{CpCo}(\eta^2\text{-H}_2\text{C}=\text{CH}_2)]$. However, it has previously been shown that photogenerated $[\text{CpCo}(\text{CO})]$ does form a solvated complex with benzene^[17] and forms alkene adducts at diffusion limited rates.^{[17][18]} Therefore, it is possible that the discrepancy in reactivity between $[\text{Cp}^*\text{Co}(\text{CO})]$ and $[\text{Cp}^*\text{Co}(\eta^2\text{-H}_2\text{C}=\text{CHSiMe}_3)]$ is due to substrate effects; i.e. that the aromatic C_6D_6 solvent or the C=O bond of the aldehyde may help to facilitate the spin state change from triplet to singlet in the 16-electron alkene intermediate, whereas alkanes do not induce this process for $[\text{Cp}^*\text{Co}(\text{CO})]$. MP2 calculations have indicated that a similar difference in the ability of the incoming ligand to induce spin-crossover was responsible for the experimentally-observed variation between the rate of addition of CO and N₂ to triplet $\text{Cp}^*\text{MoCl}(\text{PMe}_3)_2$.^[19]

Conclusion

The triplet spin state is calculated to be much more stable than the singlet state for $[\text{CpCoL}]$ species, even in "bent" structures derived directly from the saturated $[\text{CpCoL}_2]$

precursors. Varying the ligand in [CpCoL] exerts only a minor influence on the energy difference between singlet and triplet species: our present results for the PH₃ and H₂C=CH₂ systems lie on either side of the ΔE_{S-T} value obtained by Siegbahn for the CO complex. The C-H bond activation reactions reported for [Cp*Co(η^2 -H₂C=CHSiMe₃)] may thus be attributable to substrate effects rather than to a difference in ground spin state of the unsaturated intermediate. The comparatively high energy of the singlet [CpCoL] complexes suggest that the ligand dissociation process from [CpCoL₂] may be facilitated by spin crossover to the lower energy triplet species. Although the ΔE_{S-T} values are relatively basis-set independent, the energies of the [CpCoL] species compared to the saturated [CpCoL₂] complexes shows a marked dependence on the size of the basis set used.

Experimental Section

General Remarks: All calculations were performed using GAUSSIAN 94^[20] on an SGI Origin 200 workstation. The geometries of the [CpCoL₂] and [CpCoL] species and the free L ligands were optimized using B3LYP,^[10] a DFT type of calculation, employing the LanL2DZ basis set. The LanL2DZ basis set includes both Dunning and Hay's D95 sets for H and C and the core potential sets of Hay and Wadt for the heavy atoms.^[12] Electrons outside the core were all those for H and C, the 3s and 3p electrons for P, and the 3s, 3p, 3d and 4s electrons for Co. All geometries were optimized at the B3LYP/LanL2DZ level without constraints, with the exception of triplet CpCo(PH₃), which failed to achieve geometric convergence despite several attempts from various initial geometries. At the suggestion of a reviewer, the complex was optimized with imposed C_s symmetry starting from both possible orientations of the Cp ligand. Convergence was attained in both cases, and the configuration with the unique C-H group opposite to the P was found to be slightly less stable than the other conformation, with an energy difference of less than 0.1 kcal mol⁻¹. The fixed, bent [CpCoL] geometries were obtained from the [CpCoL₂] structures by removing one L ligand and keeping all other parameters unchanged. The B3LYP energy calculations were performed separately with both the LanL2DZ basis set and the larger 6-311+G(2d,2p) basis set, which has two sets of polarization functions on all atoms including two f-sets on the Co, and also diffuse functions.^[11]

The mean value of the first-order electronic wavefunction, which is not an exact eigenstate of S^2 for unrestricted calculations on the triplet systems, was considered suitable for unambiguous identification of the spin state. Spin contamination was carefully monitored and the value of

$\langle S^2 \rangle$ for the unrestricted B3LYP (UB3LYP) calculations on the triplet [CpCoL] species using the 6-311+G(2d,2p) basis set (LanL2DZ results shown in parentheses) [L = bent PH₃, 2.0261 (2.0228); optimized PH₃, 2.0234 (2.0205); bent H₂C=CH₂, 2.0499 (2.0463); optimized H₂C=CH₂, 2.0531 (2.0484)] indicated minor spin contamination. The energies shown in the Results and Discussion section correspond to UB3LYP calculations for the triplet [CpCoL] compounds, and to restricted B3LYP calculations for the singlet [CpCoL] and [CpCoL₂] complexes.^[21]

Acknowledgments

R. P. thanks the Région Bourgogne for supporting this research, and K. M. S. thanks the European Commission for a TMR Marie Curie Postdoctoral Fellowship.

References

- [1] A. H. Janowicz, H. E. Bryndza, R. G. Bergman, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1981, 103, 1516–1518.
- [2] P. Hofmann, M. Padamanabhan, *Organometallics* 1983, 2, 1273–1284.
- [3] A. A. Bengali, R. G. Bergman, C. B. Moore, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1995, 117, 3879–3880.
- [4] P. E. M. Siegbahn, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1996, 118, 1487–1496.
- [5] [5a] C. P. Lenges, M. Brookhart, B. E. Grant, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 1997, 528, 199–203. [5b] C. P. Lenges, M. Brookhart, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1997, 119, 3165–3166. [5c] C. P. Lenges, P. S. White, M. Brookhart, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1998, 120, 6965–6979.
- [6] [6a] R. Poli, *Chem. Rev.* 1996, 96, 2135–2204. [6b] R. Poli, *Acc. Chem. Res.* 1997, 30, 494–501.
- [7] [7a] P. Legzdins, W. S. McNeil, K. M. Smith, R. Poli, *Organometallics* 1998, 17, 615–622. [7b] K. M. Smith, R. Poli, P. Legzdins, *Chem. Commun.* 1998, 1903–1904.
- [8] H. Yang, M. C. Asplund, K. T. Kotz, M. J. Wilkens, H. Frei, C. B. Harris, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1998, 120, 10154–10165.

- [9] [9a] S. Shaik, M. Filatov, D. Schröder, H. Schwartz, *Chem. Eur. J.* 1998, 4, 193–199. [9b] P. H. Toy, M. Newcomb, P. F. Hollenberg, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1998, 120, 7719–7729.
- [10] A. D. Becke, *J. Chem. Phys.* 1993, 98, 5648–5652.
- [11] [11a] P. E. M. Siegbahn, R. H. Crabtree, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1997, 119, 3103–3113. [11b] M. R. A. Blomberg, P. E. M. Siegbahn, S. Styring, G. T. Babcock, B. Åkermark, P. Korall, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1997, 119, 8285–8292. [11c] M. Pavlov, P. E. M. Siegbahn, M. R. A. Blomberg, R. H. Crabtree, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1998, 120, 548–555. [11d] P. E. M. Siegbahn, J. Westerberg, M. Svensson, R. H. Crabtree, *J. Chem. Phys. B* 1998, 102, 1615–1625. [11e] M. R. A. Blomberg, P. E. M. Siegbahn, G. T. Babcock, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1998, 120, 8812–8824.
- [12] [12a] P. J. Hay, W. R. Wadt, *J. Chem. Phys.* 1985, 82, 270–283. [12b] W. R. Wadt, P. J. Hay, *J. Chem. Phys.* 1985, 82, 284–298. [12c] P. J. Hay, W. R. Wadt, *J. Chem. Phys.* 1985, 82, 299–310.
- [13] P. E. M. Siegbahn, *Adv. Chem. Phys.* 1996, 93, 333–387.
- [14] [14a] L. R. Byers, L. F. Dahl, *Inorg. Chem.* 1980, 19, 277–284. [14b] R. L. Harlow, R. J. McKinney, J. F. Whitney, *Organometallics* 1983, 2, 1839–1842. [14c] J. W. Chambers, A. J. Baskar, S. G. Bott, J. L. Atwood, M. D. Rausch, *Organometallics* 1986, 5, 1635–1641. [14d] M. Y. Antipin, Y. T. Struchkov, A. N. Chernega, M. F. Meidine, J. F. Nixon, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 1992, 436, 79–82.
- [15] For a detailed analysis of the orbital mixing and energetic changes that accompany variation of the Cp(M(L angle, see reference [2].
- [16] J. L. Detrich, O. M. Reinaud, A. L. Rheingold, K. H. Theopold, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1995, 117, 11745–11748.
- [17] E. P. Wasserman, R. G. Bergman, C. B. Moore, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1988, 110, 6076–6084.
- [18] T. P. Dougherty, E. J. Heilweil, *J. Chem. Phys.* 1994, 100, 4006–4009.
- [19] D. W. Keogh, R. Poli, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1997, 119, 2516–2523.
- [20] M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, P. M. W. Gill, B. G. Johnson, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheesman, T. A. Keith, G. A. Petersson, J. A. Montgomery, K. Raghavarchi, M. A.

Al-Laham, V. G. Zakrzewski, J. V. Ortiz, J. B. Foreman, J. Cioslowski, B. B. Stefanov, A. Nanayakkara, M. Challacombe, C. Y. Peng, P. Y. Ayalla, W. Chen, M. W. Wong, J. L. Andres, E. S. Replogle, R. Gomperts, R. L. Martin, D. J. Fox, J. S. Binkley, D. J. Defrees, J. Baker, J. P. Stewart, M. Head-Gordon, C. Gonzales, J. A. Pople, Gaussian 94, Revision E.1, Gaussian Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, 1995.