2011. Том 52, № 4

Июль – август

C. 769 – 775

UDC 541.6:546.47:546.56

SYNTHESIS OF (C₈H₁₁N)₂·Zn(OAc)₂, (C₈H₁₁N)₂·Cu(OAc)₂, AND (C₈H₁₁N)₂·CuCl₂ COMPLEXES AND APPLICATION TO THE HENRY REACTION

© 2011 L. Mei¹*, C. Jie¹, H.B. Yang¹, Z.S. Ming², Y. Hao², T.H. Ming¹

¹*Hefei University of Technology, Department of Chemical Engineering, Hefei, 230009, China* ²*Unversity of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230009, China*

Received August, 5, 2010

 $(C_8H_{11}N)_2 \cdot Zn(OAc)_2$ (1a), $(C_8H_{11}N)_2 \cdot Cu(OAc)_2$ (1b), and $(C_8H_{11}N)_2 \cdot CuCl_2$ (1c) complexes are synthesized by a simple one-pot method. The crystal structures of 1a, 1b, and 1c are determined by X-ray crystallography. The complexes are also characterized by NMR, IR, MS, and elemental analysis and used as the catalysts applied to the Henry reaction; moderate to high yields are obtained at room temperature.

K e y w o r d s: $(C_8H_{11}N)_2 \cdot Zn(OAc)_2$, $(C_8H_{11}N)_2 \cdot Cu(OAc)_2$, and $(C_8H_{11}N)_2 \cdot CuCl_2$ complexes, crystal structures, catalysts, Henry reaction.

Zinc and copper organometallic complexes involving amine ligands are widely used as catalysts in organic reactions and polymerizations [1–26], as evidenced by the numerous reports published in this area. This indiates the importance of these complexes in organic and polymer chemistry, since many groups have developed numerous organometallic polymerization catalysts and achieved satisfasctory results [7–8, 13, 14]. In particular, zinc and copper acetate organometallic complexes have demonstrated good catalytic activity in the Henry reaction [18–26]. Inspired by their work, we synthesized novel $(C_8H_{11}N)_2 \cdot Zn(OAc)_2$ (1a), $(C_8H_{11}N)_2 \cdot Cu(OAc)_2$ (1b), and $(C_8H_{11}N)_2 \cdot CuCl_2$ (1c) complexes via a simple one-pot method. The crystalline forms of 1a, 1b, and 1c were obtained at a low temperature or by slow evaporation at room temperature, and then characterized by NMR, IR, MS, elemental analysis, and X-ray analysis.

EXPERIMENTAL

Preparation of bis(α-ethylphenyl amine) zinc acetate complex (catalyst 1a). Under water- and oxygen-free conditions, 2.7 ml (21.0 mmol) of α-ethylphenyl amine and 2.195 g (10.0 mmol) of Zn(Ac)₂·2H₂O were added in a dry 100-ml Schlenk flask. They were dissolved in 30 ml of dry ethanol and refluxed for 24 h. The solvent was filtrated, and recrystallization with petroleum ether/ethanol gave 1.68 g of white crystals; a yield of 39.4 %. ¹HNMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 27 °C), ¹HNMR (500 MHz, CDCl₃) 7.22 ~ 7.31(m, 10H), 4.06 ~ 4.07 (d, *J* = 6.5 Hz, 1H), 3.06 (br, 1H), 1.94 (s, 6H), 1.40 ~ 1.42 (d, *J* = 6.5 Hz, 6H). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃) 179.70, 144.04, 128.94, 127.92, 125.92, 51.82, 23.94, 23.10. IR (KBr), cm⁻¹: 3130, 1620, 1390, 1170, 702. HRMS (EI) *m/z*, %: Anal calcd for C₂₀H₂₈N₂O₄Zn: 424.1341; found: 424.1354, Elemental analysis, found: N: 6.45 %, C: 56.17 %, H: 6.56 %; Calculated: N: 6.61 %, C: 56.63 %, H: 6.62 %.

Preparation of bis(α -ethylphenyl amine) copper acetate complex (catalyst 1b). Under waterand oxygen-free conditions, 2.7 ml (21.0 mmol) of α -ethylphenyl amine and 1.9965 g (20.0 mmol) of Cu(OAc)₂·H₂O were added in a dry 100-ml Schlenk flask. They were dissolved in 15 ml of dry ace-

^{*} E-mail: luomei@pku.edu.cn



Fig. 1. Synthesis schemes of complexes 1a, 1b, 1c

tonitrile and refluxed for 24 h. The solvent was reduced in vacuum, and recrystalization from a petroleum ether saturated solution gave 1.5 g of dark green crystals; yield 52.5 %. IR (KBr), cm⁻¹: 3220, 2970, 2350, 1560, 1390, 1160, 1090, 760, 702. Elemental analysis: found: N: 6.65 %, C: 56.42 %, H: 6.67 %; Calculated: N: 6.61 %, C: 56.65 %, H: 6.62 %.

Preparation of bis(α-ethylphenyl amine) cupric chloride complex (catalyst 1c). Under waterand oxygen-free conditions, 2.7 ml (21.0 mmol) of α-ethylphenyl amine and 1.7048 g (10.0 mmol) of CuCl₂·2H₂O were added in a dry 100-ml Schlenk flask. They were dissolved in 15 ml of dry ethanol and refluxed for 24 h. The solvent was reduced in vacuun, the precipitation afforded a green solid; slow evaporation of satured ethanol gave 0.88 g of green crystals; yield 51.6 %. IR (KBr), cm⁻¹: 3319, 3232, 3149, 2975, 2928, 1593, 1580, 1496, 1452, 1388., 1375, 1228, 1163, 1195, 1134, 1077, 1027, 1002, 988, 892, 775, 760. HRMS (EI) *m/z*, %: Anal calcd for C₁₆H₂₂N₂Cl₂Cu: 375.0456; found: 375.0458, Elemental analysis, found: N: 7.23 %; C: 50.58 %, H: 5.98 %; Calculated: N: 7.43 %, C: 50.58 %, H: 5.88 %.

2-Nitro-1-phenylethanol. Catalysts **1a**, **1b** or **1c** (0.59 mmol), benzaldehyde (0.20ml, 1.97 mmol), and nitromethane (1.0 ml, 18 mmol) were successively mixed at room temperature. After 72 h, the reaction was quenched. Further purification was performed by silica gel. The title compound was obtained as a colorless liquid. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): 7.28 ~ 7.32 (m, 5H, Ar—H), 5.32 ~ 5.35 (d, J = 9.18 Hz, 1H, —CH), 4.38 ~ 4.56 (m, 2H, —CH₂), 3.89(br, 1H, —OH). ¹³C NMR (75 MHz, CDCl₃): 138.30 128.92(×2), 128.82, 125.98(×2), 81.16, 70.91. HRMS (EI) *m/z*, %: Anal calcd for C₈H₉NO₃: 167.0582; found: 167.0588.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Synthesis of complexes. The α -ethylphenyl amine ligand was treated with Zn(OAc)₂·2H₂O in THF, and the desired complex was obtained after refluxing for 24 h. The crude complex was recrystalized from petroleum ether and ethanol, and a crystal of **1a** was obtained after three days (Fig. 2, *a*).



Fig. 2. Crystal structure of complex 1a, 1b, 1c

By reacting the α -ethylphenyl amine ligand with Cu(OAc)₂·H₂O in THF or ethanol and refluxing for 24 h, complex **1b** was obtained. It was then recrystalized from a saturated petroleum ether solvent (Fig. 2, *b*).

Complex 1c was obtained from the reaction of α -ethylphenyl amine with CuCl₂·2H₂O in THF, and a pale blue solid was obtained after evaporation under vacuum. It easily dissolved in CH₂Cl₂ and

L. MEI, C. JIE, H.B. YANG ET AL.

THF, but was poorly soluble in hexane and ethanol at room temperature. Two methods were attempted to obtain the crystals. The pale solid was separated by method I (recrystalization from petroleum and THF at -30 °C) but a crystal of complex 1c was afforded using method II: slow evaporation from ethanol.

Crystal structure. Structure determination. The structures of **1a**, **1b**, and **1c** were studied by X-ray diffraction (Fig. 2). Tables 1—3 list the selected bond lengths and angles for the three compounds.

A colorless block crystal of title compound **1a** with approximate dimensions of $0.31 \times 0.24 \times 0.16$ mm was selected for the data collection on a BRUKER SMART diffractometer with graphite monochromated Mo K_{α} radiation ($\lambda = 0.7103$ Å). A total of 6428 reflections were collected in the range of $3.39 < \theta < 63.36^{\circ}$ by using "phi and omega" scan techniques at 293(2) K. C₂₀H₂₈N₂O₄Zn, M = 425.81, monclinic, P21, 21, 21, a = 10.662(5), b = 14.912(5), c = 26.991(5) Å, $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 90^{\circ}$, V = 1691 Å³,

Т	а	b	1	e	1
_		-	_	-	

Bond	d	Bond	d	Bond	d
Zn(2) ~O(7)	1.9568(16)	O(8) ~ C(39)	1.224(3)	C(29) ~ C(31)	1.507(3)
$Zn(2) \sim O(5)$	1.9683(16)	N(2) ~C(9)	1.486(3)	$C(29) \sim C(30)$	1.525(3)
$Zn(2) \sim N(4)$	2.0255(18)	$N(3) \sim C(21)$	1.480(3)	C(21) ~ C(23)	1.513(3)
$Zn(2) \sim N(3)$	2.0405(17)	O(4) ~ C(19)	1.220(3)	$C(17) \sim C(18)$	1.508(4)
$Zn(1) \sim O(3)$	1.9492(16)	O(7) ~ C(39)	1.278(3)	$C(37) \sim C(38)$	1.490(4)
$Zn(1) \sim O(1)$	1.9561(17)	$O(1) \sim C(17)$	1.267(3)	$C(9) \sim C(10)$	1.503(3)
$Zn(1) \sim N(2)$	2.0228(16)	$O(2) \sim C(17)$	1.220(3)	$C(19) \sim C(20)$	1.491(4)
$Zn(1) \sim N(1)$	2.0319(19)	$N(1) \sim C(1)$	1.486(3)	$C(1) \sim C(2)$	1.506(3)
$O(3) \sim C(19)$	1.281(3)	$C(39) \sim C(40)$	1.499(3)	$C(1) \sim C(3)$	1.518(4)
$O(5) \sim C(37)$	1.279(3)	$C(29) \sim N(4)$	1.483(3)	$C(11) \sim C(9)$	1.523(3)
O(6) ~ C(37)	1.223(3)				
Angle	ω	Angle	ω	Angle	ω
$O(7) \sim Zn(2) \sim O(5)$	98.61(7)	$C(17) \sim O(1) \sim Zn(1)$	124.19(15)	$O(2) \sim C(17) \sim O(1)$	124.0(2)
$O(7) \sim Zn(2) \sim N(4)$	110.28(8)	$C(1) \sim N(1) \sim Zn(1)$	118.49(15)	O(2)~ C(17) ~C(18)	121.2(2)
$O(5) \sim Zn(2) \sim N(4)$	105.45(7)	O(8) ~ C(39) ~ O(7)	123.4(2)	$O(1) \sim C(17) \sim C(18)$	114.8(2)
$O(7) \sim Zn(2) \sim N(3)$	121.55(7)	$O(8) \sim C(39) \sim C(40)$	121.1(2)	$O(6) \sim C(37) \sim O(5)$	123.8(2)
$O(5) \sim Zn(2) \sim N(3)$	104.22(7)	$O(7) \sim C(39) \sim C(40)$	115.5(2)	$O(6) \sim C(37) \sim C(38)$	121.1(2)
$N(4) \sim Zn(2) \sim N(3)$	113.96(8)	$N(4) \sim C(29) \sim C(31)$	110.8(2)	$O(5) \sim C(37) \sim C(38)$	115.0(2)
$O(3) \sim Zn(1) \sim O(1)$	97.56(7)	$N(4) \sim C(29) \sim C(30)$	108.23(19)	$N(2) \sim C(9) \sim C(10)$	109.3(2)
$O(3) \sim Zn(1) \sim N(2)$	118.06(7)	$C(31) \sim C(29) \sim C(30)$	115.1(2)	$N(2) \sim C(9) \sim C(11)$	111.98(18)
$O(1) \sim Zn(1) \sim N(2)$	110.95(8)	$C(29) \sim N(4) \sim Zn(2)$	121.55(15)	$C(10) \sim C(9) \sim C(11)$	114.8(2)
$O(3) \sim Zn(1) \sim N(1)$	111.36(8)	$C(16) \sim C(11) \sim C(9)$	122.8(3)	$O(4) \sim C(19) \sim O(3)$	123.4(2)
$O(1) \sim Zn(1) \sim N1$	106.25(8)	$C(12) \sim C(11) \sim C(9)$	119.2(2)	$O(4) \sim C(19) \sim C(20)$	121.3(2)
$N(2) \sim Zn(1) \sim N1$	111.29(8)	$C(36) \sim C(31) \sim C(29)$	120.2(2)	$O(3) \sim C(19) \sim C(20)$	115.3(2)
$C(19) \sim O(3) \sim Zn(1)$	120.88(14)	$C(32) \sim C(31) \sim C(29)$	123.9(2)	$N(1) \sim C(1) \sim C(2)$	109.4(2)
$C(37) \sim O(5) \sim Zn(2)$	114.56(15)	$N(3) \sim C(21) \sim C(22)$	108.5(2)	$N(1) \sim C(1) \sim C(3)$	111.1(2)
$C(9) \sim N(2) \sim Zn(1)$	113.92(13)	$N(3) \sim C(21) \sim C(23)$	115.04(19)	$C(2) \sim C(1) \sim C(3)$	112.9(2)
$C(21) \sim N(3) \sim Zn(2)$	112.25(13)	$C(22) \sim C(21) \sim C(23)$ 111.7(2)		$C(3) \sim C(8) \sim C(7)$	121.5(3)
$C(39) \sim O(7) \sim Zn(2)$	118.85(14)				

Selected bond lengths d, Å and bond angles ω , ged. for the N—Zn complex (catalyst **1a**)

Z = 8, $D_x = 1.318$ g/cm³, the final *R* factor was $R_1 = 0.0246$, 6045 for reflections with $I_0 > 2\sigma(I_0)$, $R\omega = 0.0658$ for all data. The structure was solved by full-matrix least-squares on F^2 using the SHELXTL program [26, 27].

A blue block monoclinic crystal of title compound **1b** of approximately $0.38 \times 0.20 \times 0.12$ mm was selected for the data collection on a BRUKER SMART diffractometer with graphite monochromated Mo K_{α} radiation ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å). A total of 17573 reflections were collected in the range of $3.66 < \theta < 29.11^{\circ}$ by using "phi and omega" scan techniques at 293(2) K. C₂₀H₂₈N₂O₄Cu, M = 423.98, orthorhombic, *P*-1, a = 5.472(5), b = 9.225(5), c = 11.094(5) Å, $\alpha = 67.153$, $\beta = 85.263$, $\gamma = 82.016^{\circ}$, V = 510.8 Å³, Z = 1, $D_x = 1.378$ g/cm³, the final *R* factor was $R_1 = 0.0455$, 1784 for reflections with $I_0 > 2\sigma(I_0)$, $R\omega = 0.0917$ for all data; the largest peak and hole were 0.641 and -0.635 eÅ³ respectively. The structure was solved by full-matrix least-squares on F^2 using the the SHELXTL program [27, 28].

Table 2

Bond	d	Bond	d	Bond	d
$Cu(1) \sim O(1)$	1.946(2)	O(2) ~ C(9)	1.223(4)	$C(1) \sim C(2)$	1.375(4)
$Cu(1) \sim O(1)$	1.946(2)	$C(6) \sim C(1)$	1.367(4)	$C(3) \sim C(4)$	1.381(4)
$Cu(1) \sim N(1)$	2.003(2)	$C(6) \sim C(5)$	1.378(4)	$C(3) \sim C(2)$	1.395(4)
$Cu(1) \sim N(1)$	2.003(2)	$C(9) \sim C(10)$	1.502(4)	$C(4) \sim C(7)$	1.531(4)
$O(1) \sim C(9)$	1.258(3)	$\mathrm{C}(5)\sim\mathrm{C}(4)$	1.368(4)	$\mathrm{C}(7) \sim \mathrm{C}(8)$	1.501(4)
$N(1) \sim C(7)$	1.466(4)				
Angle	ω	Angle	ω	Angle	ω
$O(1) \sim Cu(1) \sim O(1)$ $O(1) \sim Cu(1) \sim N(1)$ $O(1) \sim Cu(1) \sim N(1)$ $O(1) \sim Cu(1) \sim N(1)$ $O(1) \sim Cu(1) \sim N(1)$	180.000(1) 90.26(10) 89.74(10) 89.74(10) 90.26(10)	$C(9) \sim O(1) \sim Cu(1)$ $C(7) \sim N(1) \sim Cu(1)$ $O(2) \sim C(9) \sim O(1)$ $O(2) \sim C(9) \sim C(10)$ $O(1) \sim C(9) \sim C(10)$	123.6(2) 123.19(19) 123.9(3) 119.1(3) 116.7(3)	$C(5) \sim C(4) \sim C(7)$ $C(3) \sim C(4) \sim C(7)$ $N(1) \sim C(7) \sim C(8)$ $N(1) \sim C(7) \sim C(4)$ $C(8) \sim C(7) \sim C(4)$	120.0(3) 121.7(3) 110.8(3) 111.5(2) 112.1(2)
$N(1) \sim Cu(1) \sim N(1)$	180.000(1)				

Selected bond lengths d, Å and bond angles ω , ged. for the N—Cu complex (catalyst **1b**)

Table 3

Selected bond lengths d	Å and bond angles ω ,	ged. for the N-C	Cu complex (catalyst 1c)
-------------------------	------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

Bond	d	Bond	d	Bond	d
Cu(1) ~ N(2)	1.990(4)	$Cu(1) \sim Cl(1)$	2.3156(17)	C(4) ~ C(7)	1.500(6)
$Cu(1) \sim N(1)$	1.991(4)	$N(1) \sim C(15)$	1.508(6)	$C(15) \sim C(16)$	1.487(6)
$Cu(1) \sim Cl(2)$	2.3020(17)	$N(2) \sim C(7)$	1.485(6)	$C(7) \sim C(8)$	1.530(6)
Angle	ω	Angle	ω	Angle	ω
$N(2) \sim Cu(1) \sim N(1)$ $N(2) \sim Cu(1) \sim Cl(2)$ $N(1) \sim Cu(1) \sim Cl(2)$ $N(2) \sim Cu(1) \sim Cl(1)$ $N(1) \sim Cu(1) \sim Cl(1)$ $Cl(2) \sim Cu(1) \sim Cl(1)$	164.75(19) 91.47(13) 91.59(11) 89.77(13) 88.65(11) 174.36(8)	$C(7) \sim N(2) \sim Cu(1)$ $C(13) \sim C(12) \sim C(15)$ $C(11) \sim C(12) \sim C(15)$ $C(5) \sim C(4) \sim C(7)$ $C(3) \sim C(4) \sim C(7)$ $C(16) \sim C(15) \sim N(1)$	118.3(3) 122.8(5) 118.8(5) 121.6(6) 118.9(7) 109.8(4)	$N(2) \sim C(7) \sim C(4)$ $N(2) \sim C(7) \sim C(8)$ $C(16) \sim C(15) \sim N(1)$ $C(16) \sim C(15) \sim C(12)$ $N(1) \sim C(15) \sim C(12)$ $C(4) \sim C(7) \sim C(8)$	111.8(4) 112.1(4) 109.8(4) 112.4(4) 113.2(4) 111.5(5)
$C(2) \sim Cu(1) \sim Cl(1)$ $C(15) \sim N(1) \sim Cu(1)$	114.6(3)	$C(10) \sim C(15) \sim N(1)$	109.0(4)	$\ C(4) \sim C(7) \sim C(8)$	111.3(3)

Table 4

Effect of catalysts ^a						
$ \bigcirc \overset{OH}{\longleftarrow} H + CH_3NO_2 \longrightarrow \bigcirc \overset{OH}{\longleftarrow} NO_2 $						
Entry	Catalyst	Time(h)	Conv.(%) ^b			
1	1a	72	>99			
2	1b	72	82			
3	1c	72	63			
4	no	72	<5			

^a Reactions were carried out on 0.2 ml (1 mmol) PhCHO with 1 ml CH₃NO₂ in 4 ml CH₃OH, 72 h, at room temperature (20—30°C).

^b The conv.% was given by ¹H NMR.

A blue block triclinic crystal of title compound 1c of approximately 0.38×0.20×0.12 mm was selected for the data collection on a BRUKER SMART diffractometer with graphite monochromated Mo K_{α} radiation ($\lambda =$ = 0.71073 Å). A total of 5043 reflections were collected in the range of $2.9 < \theta < 28.82^{\circ}$ using "phi and omega" scan techniques at 293(2) K, $C_{32}H_{44}N_4Cl_4Cu_2$, M == 753.59, orthorhombic, *P*-1, a = 6.461(5) Å, $\alpha =$ $= 111.056(5)^{\circ},$ b = 12.017(5), $\beta = 95.542^{\circ}$, c == 12.368(5) Å, $\gamma = 90.559^{\circ}$, V = 890.9(9) Å³, Z = 1, $D_x =$ $= 1.405 \text{ g/cm}^3$, the final R factor was $R_1 = 0.0506$, 1524 for reflections with $I_0 > 2\sigma(I_0)$, $R\omega = 0.0667$ for all data. The structure was solved by full-matrix least-squares on F^2 using the SHELXTL program [27, 28].

Complexes **1a** and **1b** were each composed of two molecules of α -ethylphenyl amine and a Zn(Ac)₂ core, and Cu(Ac)₂ respectively (Fig. 2, *a*, *b*). For complex **1a**, the bond length of N(2) ~ Zn(1) was 2.0228(16) Å,

shorter than that of N(1) ~ Zn(1) of 2.0319(19) Å. The chirality around a zinc ion was N(1), N(2), O(1), and O(3), with these atoms forming a tetrahedron with a zinc ion in the center. The bond angle of N ~ Zn ~ O was nearly 109.5°. Additionally, the presence of hydrogen bonds should be mentioned. Four α -ethylphenyl amine molecules and two Zn(OAc)₂ cores were connected together to construct a hydrogen-bonded dinuclear structure (Fig. 2, *a*). Unlike **1a**, complex **2** is centrosymmetric around the Cu(II) cation having tetragonal geometry and site symmetry $\overline{1}$, coordinated by the two N atoms from the ligating α -ethylphenyl amine and by the two acetate anion.

Complex 1c was composed of four molecules of α -ethylphenyl amine and two CuCl₂ cores (Fig. 2, c). The geometry at the Cu ion contained two Cl⁻ ions and two N atoms from α -ethylphenyl amine, in an approximately tetragonal shape. The four N—Cu—Cl angles were all approximately 90°, and two Cl—Cu bond lengths (2.3020, 2.3156 Å) were longer than two N—Cu bond lengths (1.990, 1.994 Å).

Application to the Henry reaction. Complexes 1a, 1b, and 1c were used as the catalysts in application to the Henry reaction at room temperature. After 72 hours, catalyst 1a showed the best catalytic activity and the conversion rate of almost 100 %, with catalysts 1b and 1c also showing good catalytic effect (Table 4), but no catalytic effect was observed in the absence of catalysts.

The XRD pattern has not showed a significant change after the reaction and the same did the HRMS analysis of catalysts after the reaction. These data further show that the complex is a catalyst involved in the catalytic reaction.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have synthesized N—Zn, N—Cu complexes bearing α -ethylphenyl amine and obtained their crystal structures. The novelty of this methodology can be summarized as follows: (1) synthesis of a series of catalysts by a simple one-step method from inexpensive and readily available raw materials (the ligand: copper acetate, zinc acetate. and cupric chloride), and (2) first reported of novel catalysts of the Henry reaction at room temperature with moderate to high yields. Efforts will be devoted to further improve the conversion rate of benzaldehyde, to study the response of other aldehydes, and will be applied to other organic reactions such as cyanosilylation and aldol reactions, etc.

REFERENCES

- 1. Chaudhuri U.P., Laura R.W., Arunendu M. et al. // Inorgan. Chim. Acta. 2007. 360. P. 3610 3618.
- 2. Knapp S., Keenan T.R., Zhang X.H. et al. // J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 1987. 109, N 6. P. 1882 1883.
- 3. Nakon R., Beadle E.M., Angelici J.R.J. // J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 1974. 96, N 3. P. 719 725.

- 4. Leach B.E., Angelici R.J. // J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 1968. 90, N 10. P. 2504 2508.
- 5. Hopgood D., Angelici R.J. // J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 1968. 90, N 10. P. 2508 2513.
- 6. Nakon R., Angelici R.J. // J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 1974. 96, N 13. P. 4178 4182.
- 7. Huang Y., Tang G.R., Jin G.X. // Organometal. 2008. 27, N 2. P. 259 269.
- 8. Chen F.T., Tang G.R., Jin G.X. // J. Organometal. Chem. 2007. 692, N 16. P. 3435 3442.
- 9. Kim J.A., Park H.Y., Kim J.C. et al. // Inorgan. Chim. Acta. 2008. 361. P. 2087 2093.
- 10. Kleineweischede A., Mattay J. // J. Organometal. Chem. 2006. 691, N 9. P. 1834 1834.
- 11. Mohamed S., Goher B.S., Brigitte B. et al. // Polyhedron. 2008. 27, N 5. P. 1423 1431.
- 12. Sumanta K.P., Rojalin S., Vadivelu M. // Polyhedron. 2008. 27, N 2. P. 805 811.
- 13. Chakraborty D., Chen E.Y.-X. // Organometal. 2003. 22, N 13. P. 769 774.
- 14. Yu K., Jones C.W. // Organometal. 2003. 22, N 4. P. 2571 2580.
- 15. Trost B.M., Yeh V.S.C., Ito H., Bremeyer N. // Org. Lett. 2002. 4, N 16. P. 2621 2623.
- 16. Kudoh T., Ishikawa T., Shimizu Y., Saito S. // Org. Lett. 2003. 5, N 21. P. 3875 3878.
- 17. Paintner F.F., Allmendinger L., Bauschke G., Klemann P. // Org. Lett. 2005. 7, N 7. P. 1423 1426.
- 18. Sasai H., Suzuki T., Itoh N. // J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 1993. 115, N 22. P. 10372 10373.
- 19. Corey E.J., Zhang F.Y. // Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 1999. 38, N 13-14. P. 1931 1934.
- 20. Evans A., Woerpel K.A., Hinman M.M. // J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 1991. 113, N 2. P. 726 728.
- 21. Christensen C., Juhl K., Jorgensen K.A. // Chem. Commun. 2001. P. 2222.
- 22. Knudsen K.R., Risgaard T., Nishiwaki N. // J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 2001. 123, N 24. P. 5843 5844.
- 23. Trost B.M., Yeh V.S.C., Ito H. // Org. Lett. 2002. 4, N 16. P. 2621 2623.
- 24. Trost B.M., Yeh V.S.C. // Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2002. 41, N 5. P. 861 863.
- 25. Misumi Y., Matsumoto K. // Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2002. 41, N 6. P. 1031 1033.
- 26. Colak M., Aral T., Hosgoren H., Demirel N. // Tetrahedron: Asymmetry. 2008. 18, N 9. P. 1129 1133.
- 27. Sheldrick G.M. SHELXS-97, Program for X-ray Crystal Structure Solution. Göttingen University: Germany, 1997; Sheldrick G.M. SHELXL-97, Program for X-ray Crystal Structure Refinement. Göttingen University: Germany, 1997.
- 28. Stout G.H., Jensen L.H. X-Ray Structure Determination: a Practical Guide. New York: MacMillan, 1968.