Binding Interactions in Copper, Silver and Gold π-Complexes
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Abstract: The copper(II), silver(II), and gold(II) metals bind π-ligands by σ-bonding and π-back bonding interactions. These interactions were investigated using bidentate ancillary ligands with electron donating and withdrawing substituents. The π-ligands span from ethylene to larger terminal and internal alkenes and alkynes. Results of X-ray crystallography, NMR, and IR spectroscopy and gas phase experiments show that the binding energies increase in the order Ag < Cu < Au and the binding energies are slightly higher for alkynes than for alkenes. Modulation of the electron density at the metal using substituents on the ancillary ligands shows that the π-back bonding interaction plays a dominant role for the binding in the copper and gold complexes.

Introduction

Coinage metals (Cu, Ag, and Au) play critical roles in chemical transformations of small unsaturated hydrocarbons such as olefins and alkynes.[1] For example, copper(I) salts and complexes are often employed as catalysts in azide-alkyne cycloadditions,[2] cyclopropanation of alkenes,[3] and cyclopentanation of alkynes.[4] Copper(I) salts supported by alumina are also involved in the oxycyclorination of ethylene.[5] Silver(I) is used industrially for the epoxidation of ethylene to ethylene oxide,[6] and also has found use in numerous alkynyl transformations.[7] Likewise, gold catalyzes the hydrochlorination of acetylene to give vinyl chloride,[8] another industrially important chemical, and many processes involving various alkenes and alkynes.[9] Recently, Hashmi reported a bimetallic gold/silver catalyzed alkynylation of cyclopropanes.[10]

Polydentate ligands comprised of N-containing heterocycles have had a longstanding use in stabilizing isolable coinage metal complexes of small hydrocarbon molecules.[11] Poly(pyrazolyl)borates are particularly attractive in this regard due to their high degree of steric and electronic tunability through variations of substituents on the pyrazolyl moieties. The tris(pyrazolyl)borate [HB(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] (1) is the first structurally authenticated copper-ethylene complex.[12] The highly fluorinated tris(pyrazolyl)borate ligand analog [HB(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] (M = Cu (2), Ag (3), Au (4)), which represents the first complete series of structurally characterized coinage metal (group 11) ethylene complexes.[13] The silver(I) adduct [HB(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Ag(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] is a rare isolable complex featuring a silver-acetylene bond.[14] [HB(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] (2) has been utilized in ethylene sensing applications,[15] while the bis(pyrazolyl)borate analog [H$_2$B(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu is a very effective material for the separation of ethylene from ethane.[16] Furthermore, bis- and tris(pyrazolyl)borate copper complexes [H$_2$B(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$CuNCMe and [HB(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$CuNCMe are excellent catalysts for the cyclopropanation of alkenes,[17] while [Ph$_2$B(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$ mediates alkene cyclopropanation chemistry.[18] The copper complexes such as [HB(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] with non-fluorinated tris(pyrazolyl)borate ligand (Figure 1) supports are also proven to be good catalysts for the cyclopropanation of alkenes, cyclopropenation of alkynes, and aziridination of alkynes.[19]

In contrast to the anionic, poly(pyrazolyl)borates (e.g. [HB-(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$]), the closely related neutral poly(pyrazolyl)methanes (e.g., HC(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P)$_3$), H$_2$C(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P)$_2$, (6) have been less thoroughly explored.[18,16] To date, very few bis(pyrazolyl)methane supported olefin complexes have been reported, despite having a similar degree of tunability to their anionic counterparts. For example, in 2006, Pampaloni and coworkers prepared the electron rich bis(pyrazolyl)methane (H$_2$C(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P)$_3$) (5) supported copper(I) complexes of cyclooctene, norbornene, and p-vinylisole.[17] The following year the same group prepared electron poor bis(pyrazolyl)methane (H$_2$C(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P)$_2$) and H$_2$C(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P)$_2$ copper(I) and silver(I) complexes of Poly(pyrazolyl)borates are particularly attractive in this regard due to their high degree of steric and electronic tunability through variations of substituents on the pyrazolyl moieties. The tris(pyrazolyl)borate [HB(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] (1) is the first structurally authenticated copper-ethylene complex.[12] The highly fluorinated tris(pyrazolyl)borate ligand analog [HB(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] (M = Cu (2), Ag (3), Au (4)), which represents the first complete series of structurally characterized coinage metal (group 11) ethylene complexes.[13] The silver(I) adduct [HB(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Ag(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] is a rare isolable complex featuring a silver-acetylene bond.[14] [HB(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] (2) has been utilized in ethylene sensing applications,[15] while the bis(pyrazolyl)borate analog [H$_2$B(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu is a very effective material for the separation of ethylene from ethane.[16] Furthermore, bis- and tris(pyrazolyl)borate copper complexes [H$_2$B(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$CuNCMe and [HB(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$CuNCMe are excellent catalysts for the cyclopropanation of alkenes,[17] while [Ph$_2$B(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$ mediates alkene cyclopropanation chemistry.[18] The copper complexes such as [HB(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$Cu(C$_2$H$_4$)$_2$] with non-fluorinated tris(pyrazolyl)borate ligand (Figure 1) supports are also proven to be good catalysts for the cyclopropanation of alkenes, cyclopropenation of alkynes, and aziridination of alkynes.[19]

In contrast to the anionic, poly(pyrazolyl)borates (e.g. [HB-(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P$_2$)$_3$]), the closely related neutral poly(pyrazolyl)methanes (e.g., HC(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P)$_3$), H$_2$C(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P)$_2$, (6) have been less thoroughly explored.[18,16] To date, very few bis(pyrazolyl)methane supported olefin complexes have been reported, despite having a similar degree of tunability to their anionic counterparts. For example, in 2006, Pampaloni and coworkers prepared the electron rich bis(pyrazolyl)methane (H$_2$C(3,5-(CH$_2$)$_2$P)$_3$) (5) supported copper(I) complexes of cyclooctene, norbornene, and p-vinylisole.[17] The following year the same group prepared electron poor bis(pyrazolyl)methane (H$_2$C(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P)$_2$) and H$_2$C(3,5-(CF$_3$)$_2$P)$_2$ copper(I) and silver(I) complexes of
effect the binding energies of the two components. Previously, we have investigated binding energies of unsaturated hydrocarbons to phosphinogold(I) and phosphinosilver(I) ions.\(^{1,2}\) The binding energies to alkenes and alkynes were in the range of 1.8–1.9 eV for \([\text{Au(PMe}_3]_2(\pi\text{-ligand})]^{+}\) and in the range of 1.6–1.8 eV for \([\text{Au(PH}_3]_2(\pi\text{-ligand})]^{+}\).\(^{1,24}\) In general, the binding energies were always about 0.1 eV higher for alkynes than for alkenes. In the silver complexes \([\text{Ag(PH}_3]_2(\pi\text{-ligand})]^{+}\), the binding energies dropped to the 1.3–1.6 eV range.

In this work, we present results from a systematic study on synthesis, structures, and binding energies involving coinage metal ions and alkenes and alkynes supported by bis(pyrazolyl)methanes. This includes the first X-ray structural data and detailed study of isolectric, \([\text{H}_2\text{C}(3,5\text{-}(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{Pz})_2\text{M}-(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]^{+}\) series involving the coinage metals, \(\text{M} = \text{Cu, Ag, Au}\). We also probed the effects of supporting ligand fluorination (and therefore the donor features) on the chemistry of such species. Being a neutral ligand, bis(pyrazolyl)methanes make it an ideal platform for performing mass spectrometric studies to investigate these effects since the complexes of \(\text{M}(\pi\text{-ligand})\) supported by such ligands are cationic species.

### Results

#### Synthesis and spectroscopic data of alkene and alkyne complexes: The first part of this work involves the isolation of \([\text{LM}(\pi\text{-ligand})]^{+}\) complexes where \(\text{L}\) represents bidentate, bis(pyrazolyl)methane ligand scaffolds and \(\text{M}\) was copper, silver, and gold (Figure 2). The properties, spectroscopic, and structural studies of such species were the focus. For this purpose, ethylene complexes \([\text{L}_2\text{Cu(C}_2\text{H}_4)][\text{SbF}_6] (\text{M} = \text{Cu} (7), \text{Ag} (8), \text{Au} (9))\) as well as \([\text{L}_2\text{Ag(C}_2\text{H}_4)][\text{SbF}_6] (10)\) and \([\text{L}_2\text{Ag(C}_2\text{H}_4)][\text{SbF}_6] (11)\) were prepared successfully by first generating the tris(ethylene) copper(I), silver(I), or gold(I) hexafluoroantimonate complex \([\text{M(C}_2\text{H}_4])_3^{+}\)], followed by addition of \(\text{L}_2\) to prevent the homoleptic bis(pyrazolyl)methane ancillary ligand. Special care was taken to slowly add a dichloromethane solution of the ancillary ligand, silver and gold alkenes and alkynes supported by bis(pyrazolyl)methane ligands are quite rare as evident from the above account.

Furthermore, despite the importance of coinage metals in alkene and alkyne chemistry, there is little experimental evidence on how changing the nature of the ancillary ligand on coinage metal ions and substituents on alkenes and alkynes...
complexes 7–11 as colorless crystalline solids. As solids, these compounds are stable under vacuum at room temperature for short periods of time. However, prolonged exposure to reduced pressure will lead to the loss of the coordinated olefins.

The 1-pentene complex \([L_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentene})][\text{SbF}_6]\) (12) was also obtained via a similar route\(^{26}\) using an in situ generated \(\text{Cu}[\text{SbF}_6]\) sample in the presence of excess 1-pentene followed by the addition of \(L_1\) (Scheme 2). The \([L_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentene})][\text{SbF}_6]\) (13) was synthesized by generating the ethylene complex 7 in situ, followed by the addition of excess alkyne (Scheme 2).

The related 2-pentyne complex of copper(I) was prepared via an analogous method to that of 13. Attempts to prepare these copper(I) alkyne complexes using the route utilized for 12 and alkynes instead of alkenes were unsuccessful. The solid products of 12 and 13 were obtained by removing the solvent using a nitrogen stream rather than reduced pressure to prevent π-ligand dissociation.

These complexes were characterized by several analytical techniques including \(^1\)H and \(^{13}\)C NMR spectroscopy. The key NMR spectroscopic features of olefinic and alkyne moieties bound to the coinage metal ions are summarized in Table 1. In comparison to the free ethylene, the \(^1\)H and \(^{13}\)C NMR spectra of copper(I) complex 7 show coordination induced upfield shifts of 0.92 ppm and 35.6 ppm for the ethylene protons and carbons, respectively, while the analogous silver(I) complex 8 shows a 0.18 ppm downfield shift of the ethylene proton signals and a 1.6 ppm upfield shift of the carbon resonance (Table 1). The gold(I) complex 9 displayed a noticeably large upfield shift of the ethylene proton and carbon signals (1.70 ppm (\(^1\)H) and 66.3 ppm (\(^{13}\)C)). The \(N,N\text{-bis}(3,5\text{-dichlorophenyl})\text{-1-naphthyl})\text{butane-2,3-diimine (Nap'}_2\text{Diimine)} ligand supported, cationic coinage metal mono-ethylene adducts, ([\(Nap'}_2\text{Diimine})M(\text{C}_{2}H_{4})][\text{SbF}_6]\) reported by Daugulis and co-workers\(^{27}\) provide a good comparison, and show their ethylene \(^{13}\)C shifts at δ 88.0, 105.4, and 65.4 ppm for \(M=\text{Cu}, \text{Ag} \) and \(\text{Au}\), respectively. The group trends are consistent between 7–9 and ([\(Nap'}_2\text{Diimine})M(\text{C}_{2}H_{4})][\text{SbF}_6]\), as well as with neutral coinage metal ethylene complexes supported by tris(pyrrozyl)borate ligands including the \([\text{PhB(3-(C}_{5}F_{3})Pz)_3M(\text{C}_{2}H_{4})\text{]}\) series (i.e., the gold and silver complexes displaying the highest and lowest upfield ethylene carbon shifts, respectively, as a result of metal ion coordination).\(^{11c,11} 28\)

The relative magnitude of the upfield shifts in ethylene carbons due to coordination reflects the π-acceptor and π-donor abilities of the coinage metal atom (e.g., d\(^{10}\)−d\(^{19}\)\(^1\) electron affinity of Cu(I), Ag(I) and Au(I) ions are −7.72, −7.57 and −9.22 eV, respectively, and d\(^{10}\)−d\(^{19}\)\(^p\) promotional energies of Cu(I), Ag(I) and Au(I) ions are 8.25, 9.94 and 7.83 eV, respectively),\(^{29}\) and the extent of M-ethylene π-back bonding believed to exist in these molecules.\(^{26b,30}\)

Compared to \(L_1\) (\(H_3C(3,5\text{-}(\text{CH}_{3})_2Pz)_3\)), the highly fluorinated \(L_1\) (\(H_3C(3,5\text{-}(\text{CF}_{3})_2Pz)_3\)) is a weaker donor and should make the metal sites supported by this ligand relatively electron poor. The copper(I) and silver(I) ethylene complexes 10 and 11, indeed show relatively smaller upfield shifts of the ethylene \(^{13}\)C signal due to metal ion coordination, suggesting somewhat lower level of metal—ethylene backbonding relatively to the related 7 and 8.\(^{26b,30}\) The olefinic proton and carbon signals in \(^1\)H and \(^{13}\)C NMR spectra of the 1-pentene complex of copper 12 in acetone-\(d_6\) also shows upfield shifts relative to the corresponding signals of the free 1-pentene, indicating the existence of this adduct in solution. In contrast to the \(\text{Molefin)}\) complexes, the 1-pentyne complex 13 displayed large downfield shifts of 2.67 ppm (\(^1\)H) and 13.6, 7.6 ppm (\(^{13}\)C) in its spectra for the \(\text{H=C})\) proton and alkyne carbons. The IR spectrum of 13 displayed bands at 1937 and 3199 cm\(^{-1}\), which can be assigned to the \(\text{C=C})\) and \(\text{C−H})\) stretch. These bands were observed in

---

**Scheme 1.** Synthesis of \([\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentene})][\text{SbF}_6]\) (12) by addition of \(L_1\) to \([\text{Cu}[\text{SbF}_6]\) sample in the presence of excess 1-pentene followed by the addition of \(L_1\). The \([L_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentene})][\text{SbF}_6]\) (13) was synthesized by generating the ethylene complex 7 in situ, followed by the addition of excess alkyne (Scheme 2).

**Scheme 2.** Synthesis of pentene and pentyne complexes of copper(I) supported by ligands \(L_1\) (\(H_3C(3,5\text{-}(\text{CH}_{3})_2Pz)_3\)).
The copper(I)-olefin complexes are moderately air stable, colorless solids, but slowly oxidize to green, presumably ethylene (thus show red shifts of 183 and 108 cm\(^{-1}\)) in CDCl\(_3\), and dissociate and binds ethylene reversibly in solutions when lower temperatures. The silver and gold complexes purged with nitrogen gas or ethylene gas as evident from the data from NMR experiments. Remarkably, the 1-pentyne compound (L\(_1\)) exhibits poor solubility, except in highly polar solvents such as acetone-d\(_6\), CDCl\(_3\), and \(\text{D}_2\text{O}\). In solution, we observed partial loss of ethylene from 9 to produce [L\(_1\)Au\(^+\)] species. It is possible to minimize this ethylene dissociation at lower temperatures. The silver and gold complexes 8 and 9 dissociate and binds ethylene reversibly in solutions when purged with nitrogen gas or ethylene gas as evident from the data from NMR experiments. Remarkably, the 1-pentyne complex 13 was quite shelf stable, even after 6 months of storage.

**X-ray crystallographic study:** The copper, silver, and gold ethylene complexes, [L\(_1\)Cu(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))][n-BuBF\(_4\)] (14), [L\(_2\)Ag(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))][SbF\(_6\)] (8), and [L\(_2\)Au(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))][SbF\(_6\)] (9) were isolated using weakly coordinating hexafluorooximate and n-butyl trifluoroborate anions in order to get a more accurate understanding of the metal-π-ligand interaction between the coinage metal ion and ethylene without significant interference from a coordinating anion. They were characterized by X-ray crystallography and represent a rare, complete series of closely related cationic coinage metal-ethylene complexes with structural data from group trend studies. The coinage metal mono-ethylene adducts, [Nap\(^+\)Diimine]Cu(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))OTf, [Nap\(^+\)Diimine]Ag(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))[BF\(_4\)] and [Nap\(^+\)Diimine]Au(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))[SbF\(_6\)] reported by Daugulis and co-workers\(^{27}\) and the tris-ethylene complexes [M(C\(_3\)H\(_6\))[SbF\(_6\)]\(^{28}\) and [M(C\(_3\)H\(_6\))Al(OCC\(_3\)F\(_3\))]\(^{11}\) (M = Cu, Ag and Au\(^{11}\)) represent the only other complete series of cationic metal-ethylene complexes with X-ray crystallographic data to our knowledge.

Figure 3 depicts the molecular structures of the cationic moieties [L\(_1\)M(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))]\(^{+}\). They are three-coordinate metal complexes with \(\pi^2\)-bound H\(_2\)C(3,5-(CH\(_3\))\(_2\)P\(_2\)) ligands. The ethylene coordinates to metal in a familiar \(\eta^1\)-fashion. The cyclic C\(_3\)N\(_3\)M core adopts a flattened boat conformation. Table 2 summarizes selected structural parameters. The sum of angles about the metal center in 8, 9 and 14 is 360°, indicating the trigonal-planar geometry at the metal site. One of the fluorine atoms of [n-BuBF\(_4\)]\(^-\) in [L\(_1\)Cu(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))][n-BuBF\(_4\)] (14) sits near Cu at 2.5825(10) Å, which is within the van der Waals contact separation of Cu and F atoms (3.84 Å) but this interaction is not significant to distort the planar geometry at copper. Further-

| Table 1. Selected bond lengths and angles of bis(pyrazolyl)methane complexes of Cu, Ag and Au and those of several related complexes for comparisons. |
|---|
| compound | \(\pi\)-ligand | C–M–C [Å] | N–M–N [°] | M–N [Å] | C–M [Å] | \(\Sigma\) angles at M [°] involving N and centroid of C–C |
| [L\(_1\)Cu(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))[n-BuBF\(_4\)] (14)] | 1.361(2) | 39.44(6) | 19.189(11), 19.896(11) | 2.0153(13), 2.0181(13) | 360 |
| [L\(_2\)Ag(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))][SbF\(_6\)] (8) | 1.3505(5) | 34.96(12) | 88.96(9) | 2.223(2), 2.232(2) | 2.243(3), 2.253(3) | 360 |
| [L\(_2\)Au(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))][SbF\(_6\)] (9) | 1.4013(4) | 39.04(10) | 87.57(7) | 2.1720(19), 2.1733(18) | 2.098(2), 2.094(2) | 360 |
| [PPh\(_3\)-(C\(_2\)F\(_4\))\(_2\)P\(_2\)]Ag(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))\(_{2n}\) | 1.3547(7) | 38.96(19) | 93.76(13) | 2.008(3), 2.009(3) | 2.027(4), 2.033(4) | 360 |
| [PPh\(_3\)-(C\(_2\)F\(_4\))\(_2\)P\(_2\)]Au(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))\(_{2n}\) | 1.3115(5) | 33.38(14) | 86.02(7) | 2.279(2), 2.286(2) | 2.286(3), 2.279(3) | 360 |
| [PPh\(_3\)-(C\(_2\)F\(_4\))\(_2\)P\(_2\)]Au(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))\(_{2n}\) | 1.366(2) | 38.03(3) | 84.72(2) | 2.213(6), 2.216(6) | 2.089(6), 2.105(6) | 360 |
| [L\(_2\)Ag(C\(_2\)H\(_4\))][SbF\(_6\)] (11)\(^{28}\) | 1.340(4); | 33.67(11); | 86.44(6); | 2.303(18), 2.323(18); | 2.309(3), 2.319(3); | 359.7, 359.8 |
| [L\(_2\)CuI-pentene][SbF\(_6\)] (12) | 1.340(3); | 33.69(11); | 86.49(6); | 2.330(18), 2.239(18); | 2.313(3), 2.313(3) | 359.0 |
| [L\(_1\)Cu(1-pentene)][SbF\(_6\)] (13) | 1.264(2); | 35.03(11); | 95.69(6); | 1.9816(14), 1.9936(14); | 2.0194(18), 2.0512(17) | 359.9 |
| [L\(_1\)Cu(1-pentene)][SbF\(_6\)] (15) | 1.263(1); | 35.03(11); | 95.69(6); | 1.9816(14), 1.9936(14); | 2.0194(18), 2.0512(17) | 359.9 |
| [L\(_1\)Cu(1-pentene)][SbF\(_6\)] (16) | 1.241(2); | 36.64(11); | 91.93(6); | 1.9787(11), 1.9856(12); | 1.9504(14), 1.9927(14) | 359.9 |

[a] two molecules in the asymmetric unit, [b] triflate counterion excluded in the calculation of sum of angles, [c] C=C length, [d] involving centroid of C=C.
more, Cu(I) complexes of terminal fluoride ligands usually have much shorter Cu–F distances, for example, [(t-Bu)phen]CuF (1.870(8) Å),[32] (PPh₃)₂CuF (2.062(6) Å).[33] The N–M–N and C–M–C planes are nearly coplanar with torsion angles of 1.85°, 5.67°, and 2.12° for [L₃M(C₂H₄)⁺]⁺ (M = Cu, Ag and Au, respectively), with the silver adduct showing the largest twist perhaps suggesting the weakest M–ethylene π-back bonding. The Cu–N < Au–N < Ag–N bond length follows the covalent radii, as silver is bigger than both gold and copper.[34] The M–C bond lengths also follow this trend, and they vary well with the previously reported tris(pyrazolyl)borate ligand supported coinage metal ethylene complexes,[19c,19e,28] and copper and silver dipyridyl amine systems involving larger olefins.[35] The ethylene C–C bond is longest for [L₃Au(C₂H₄)⁺], followed by [L₃Cu(C₂H₄)⁺] and [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)⁺] with bond lengths of 1.401(3), 1.361(2), and 1.350(5) Å, respectively, but the difference in the latter two numbers is not significant at the 3σ limit of estimated standard deviations (for comparison, the C=C bond length for free gaseous ethylene is 1.3305(10) Å while the corresponding distance from X-ray data is 1.313 Å).[36] Apart from the MOF complex MnMoF₃·(Cu(C₂H₄)BF₄)[37] there are no structurally characterized bis(pyrazolyl)methane adducts of Cu, Ag or Au with ethylene to our knowledge. The M–N, M–C, and C–C bond lengths of [L₃M(C₂H₄)⁺] are however, consistent with the structural data on molecules supported by various other supporting ligands, which suggests that gold interacts strongest with ethylene, followed by copper while silver having the weakest interaction with ethylene.[27–29,31]

We have also managed to crystallize and characterize [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] (11) that has a highly fluorinated bis(pyrazolyl)methane supporting ligand, H₂C(3,5-(CF₃)₂Pz)₂ using single crystal X-ray crystallography (Figure 4). Basic structural features are similar between [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] and [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆]. The [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] is also a three-coordinate, trigonal planar metal complex. The Ag–N and Ag–C distances are significantly longer in the [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] compared to those of the [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] pointing to the relatively weakly coordinating nature of H₂C(3,5-(CF₃)₂Pz)₂ in comparison to H₂C(3,5-(CH₂)₂Pz)₂ (Table 2). This observation is in agreement with the NMR data presented above for the two adducts (i.e., [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] and [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] display chemical shifts

![Figure 3](image-url) Molecular structures of [L₃Cu(C₂H₄)][n-BuBF₄] (14), [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] (8), and [L₃Au(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] (9) (clockwise from top to bottom). Anions have been omitted for clarity. L₃ = H₃C(3,5-(CH₂)₂Pz)₂.

![Figure 4](image-url) Molecular structure of [L₃Ag(C₂H₄)][SbF₆] (11). The anion has been omitted for clarity. L₃ = H₃C(3,5-(CF₃)₂Pz)₂.
of 5.56 and 5.78 ppm in their $^1$H spectra and 111.9 and 113.6 ppm in their $^{13}$C spectra for the ethylene moiety). However, the C=C distance is not significantly different between the two complexes, which is not unusual considering typically smaller changes in the distances are often overshadowed by the relatively high estimated standard deviations (esds) associated with the measurement, libration effects and anisotropy of the electron density.

We have also investigated the 1-pentene and 1-pentyne complexes, $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentene})][\text{SbF}_6]$ (12) and $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentyne})][\text{SbF}_6]$ (13) using X-ray crystallography. The molecular structures are illustrated in Figure 5. They are three-coordinate metal complexes with $\eta^2$-bound $\text{H}_2\text{C}(3,5-(\text{CH}_2)_2\text{Pz})_2$ ligands. Pentene and pentyne coordinate to copper in the typical $\eta^2$-fashion. The cyclic $\text{CN}_4\text{Cu}$ core in these molecules adopts a flattened boat conformation. The N–M–N and C–M–C planes are not strictly coplanar with torsion angles of 9.63° and 5.20° for $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentene})][\text{SbF}_6]$ and $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentyne})][\text{SbF}_6]$, respectively.

The C–C bond length of 1.364(3) Å of $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentene})][\text{SbF}_6]$ is similar to the corresponding distance observed in the ethylene complex 14 (1.361(2) Å). The bending back angle between the CuC$_2$ plane and the C$_2$C$_2$ plane of 1-pentene is 9.9° deviated from the idealized 90°, illustrating the effect of the $\pi$-interaction between the copper(I) to 1-pentene in 12. A copper(I)-cyclooctene complex, $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu(coe)}][\text{OTf}]$ (15) supported by $\text{L}_1$ is known, but this molecule features a short TFO–Cu contact leading to a pseudo-tetrahedral copper site (Table 2). The Cu–C and Cu–N distances of 15 are slightly longer than the corresponding distances observed for 12.

The C=C bond length of $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentene})][\text{SbF}_6]$ (1.241(2) Å) is at the upper end of the few reported three-coordinate, terminal copper(I) alkynes of the type $\text{N}_x\text{Cu(alkyne)}$ in the literature.

Table 3. Bond dissociation energies of $\pi$-ligands from $[\text{LM}(\pi\text{-ligand})]^+$. $\text{L}_1=\text{H}_2\text{C}(3,5-(\text{CH}_2)_2\text{Pz})_2$.

| $\pi$-Ligand | $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu}(\pi\text{-ligand})]^+$ | $[\text{L}_1\text{Ag}(\pi\text{-ligand})]^+$ | $[\text{L}_1\text{Au}(\pi\text{-ligand})]^+$ |
|--------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
|              | $\text{BDE}_{\text{exp}}$ (eV) | $\text{BDE}_{\text{theor}}$ (eV) | $\text{BDE}_{\text{exp}}$ (eV) | $\text{BDE}_{\text{theor}}$ (eV) | $\text{BDE}_{\text{exp}}$ (eV) | $\text{BDE}_{\text{theor}}$ (eV) |
| 1-Pentene    | 1.51 ± 0.02 | 1.40 | 1.21 ± 0.01 | 1.16 | 1.94 ± 0.01 | 1.95 |
| 2-Pentene    | 1.46 ± 0.01 | 1.33 | 1.20 ± 0.04 | 1.12 | 1.92 ± 0.04 | 1.90 |
| 1-Pentyne    | 1.63 ± 0.02 | 1.48 | 1.21 ± 0.03 | 1.16 | 2.09 ± 0.04 | 2.02 |
| 2-Pentyne    | 1.65 ± 0.02 | 1.52 | 1.30 ± 0.02 | 1.21 | 2.11 ± 0.04 | 2.09 |
| 3-Hexyne     | 1.73 ± 0.03 | 1.58 | 1.36 ± 0.01 | 1.27 | 1.95 ± 0.01 | 1.97 |
| Styrene      | 1.54 ± 0.01 | 1.51 | 1.24 ± 0.04 | 1.21 | 1.97 ± 0.01 | 1.99 |
| Phenylacetylene | 1.67 ± 0.01 | 1.54 | 1.23 ± 0.01 | 1.22 | 2.09 ± 0.01 | 2.05 |
| 1-Phenylpropyne | 1.66 ± 0.02 | 1.57 | 1.31 ± 0.02 | 1.27 | 2.09 ± 0.01 | 2.05 |

Mass spectroscopic studies: Next, we investigated bond dissociation energies in mass-selected cationic $[\text{LM}(\pi\text{-ligand})]^+$ complexes with $\text{L} = \text{L}_1$, $\text{L}_2$, and $\text{L}_3$ (Tables 3 and 5 and Figure 6). Despite all efforts, it was impossible to generate gaseous complexes with ethylene or acetylene. However, we could prepare a series of $[\text{LM}(\pi\text{-ligand})]^+$ complexes with larger terminal and internal alkenes and alkynes. We were not able to generate all complexes with the more electron-deficient ligands $\text{L}_2$ and $\text{L}_3$, therefore we will discuss the general trends for the complexes with the $\text{L}_1$ ligand first.

Figure 5. Molecular structures of $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentene})][\text{SbF}_6]$ (12, left) and $[\text{L}_1\text{Cu}(1\text{-pentyne})][\text{SbF}_6]$ (13, right). The anions were omitted for clarity. $\text{L}_1=\text{H}_2\text{C}(3,5-(\text{CH}_2)_2\text{Pz})_2$. 
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In the series of the metal complexes, the binding energies to the π ligands increase going from the silver to the copper and finally to the gold complexes (Table 3). This observation is consistent with the data from spectroscopic and structural studies described above. The copper complex binds with a larger energy to the alkenes than to the alkynes (see distribution along x-axis in Figure 6). Silver and gold complexes bind with a similar binding energy to alkynes and terminal alkynes (~1.2 eV in [LAg(π-ligand)]⁺ and ~1.9 eV in [LAu(π-ligand)]⁺), see the color-highlighted stripes in Figure 6). The internal alkynes have about 0.1–0.2 eV larger binding energies in both, silver, and gold complexes (see the point above the color-highlighted stripes in Figure 6). For all the investigated complexes, the symmetrical 3-hexyne has the largest binding energy. Interestingly, Widanhoefer has also observed such unusual binding involving 3-hexyne with phosphine supported gold (I). An easily isolable, isoleptic series [N(C(F$_2$)$_2$)C(4-Dipp)N$_2$]M(EtC$_5$HyC$_5$H) (M = Cu, Ag and Au) is also known with 3-hexyne.

We have further calculated the bond dissociation energies of the π-ligands in the [L,M(π-ligand)]⁺ complexes using DFT theory (B3LYP-D3/def2-TZVPP). In a rough approximation, the experimental data correlate well with the theory (see the solid points in Figure S36). The prediction of the bonding associated with the electron density transfer from the ligands to the metal centers but should have a weaker bonding interaction. The experiments show that the BDEs of different π-ligands correlates well only for the copper complexes except for the BDEs for styrene and 1-phenylpropyne (see Figure S36). The prediction of the BDE trend in the silver (Figure S37) and gold complexes (Figure S38) is less precise.

Next, we have compared the binding energies in complexes with modified ligands L$_1$–L$_3$ (Figure 7, Tables 3–5). The electron deficient ligands could be expected to promote a stronger σ-back bonding associated with the electron density transfer from the π-ligands to the metal centers but should have a weaker π-back bonding interaction. The experiments show that the BDEs of the given π-ligands slightly decreased when the ancillary ligand was more electron deficient (see the y-values of the connected points in Figure 7; for details see Figures S39–S41) pointing to the importance of the π-back bonding. That trend is in agreement with the reported DFT data on three-coordinate, gold tris(pyrazolyl)borate complexes. Note that the formation of the complexes with the electron deficient ligands L$_2$ and L$_3$ was difficult and therefore we couldn’t measure whole series of the complexes. The gold complexes with L$_2$ were not formed at all.

In order to confirm the trend of the binding energies, we have also measured IR photodissociation spectra of selected gaseous complexes. The focus was on complexes with 1-}

---

**Table 4. Bond dissociation energies of π-ligands from [L,M(π-ligand)]⁺.**

| π-Ligand | [L,Cu(π-ligand)]⁺ | BDE$_{exp}$ [eV] | [L,Ag(π-ligand)]⁺ | BDE$_{exp}$ [eV] | [L,Au(π-ligand)]⁺ | BDE$_{exp}$ [eV] |
|---------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1-Pentene | 1.60 | 1.31 ± 0.03 | 1.31 | 1.92 ± 0.01 | 2.20 |
| 2-Pentene | 1.54 | 1.29 ± 0.07 | 1.29 | 1.95 ± 0.01 | 2.17 |
| 1-Pentyne | 1.62 ± 0.01 | 1.35 ± 0.02 | 1.32 | 1.75 ± 0.08 | 2.19 |
| 2-Pentyne | 1.64 ± 0.01 | 1.41 ± 0.02 | 1.39 | 1.97 ± 0.03 | 2.27 |

**Table 5. Bond dissociation energies of π-ligands from [L,M(π-ligand)]⁺.**

| π-Ligand | [L,Cu(π-ligand)]⁺ | BDE$_{exp}$ [eV] | [L,Ag(π-ligand)]⁺ | BDE$_{exp}$ [eV] | [L,Au(π-ligand)]⁺ | BDE$_{exp}$ [eV] |
|---------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1-Pentene | 1.50 | 1.06 | 1.26 ± 0.02 | 1.36 | 1.92 ± 0.01 | 2.20 |
| 2-Pentene | 1.47 | 1.60 | 1.28 ± 0.04 | 1.35 | 1.95 ± 0.01 | 2.17 |
| 1-Pentyne | 1.60 ± 0.02 | 1.71 | 1.30 ± 0.01 | 1.37 | 1.97 ± 0.03 | 2.27 |
| 2-Pentyne | 1.62 ± 0.03 | 1.74 | 1.34 ± 0.04 | 1.43 | 1.97 ± 0.03 | 2.27 |
pentyne as they show a prominent C=C stretching vibration. The spectral shifts of this vibration can also be related to the effect of the metal binding on the C=C bond. The νCC of free 1-pentyne is 2120 cm⁻¹,⁴⁵ We have first compared the C=C stretching vibrations in copper, silver, and gold complexes with the L₁ ligand (Figure 8). In agreement with the predicted trend of binding energies, we observed the smallest red shift for the silver complex (νCC = 2024 cm⁻¹), followed by the copper complex (νCC = 1947 cm⁻¹) and by the gold complex with the largest red shift (νCC = 1862 cm⁻¹). The stretching frequency of the L₁Cu(1-pentyne)⁺ agreed well with the isolated solid complex (νCC = 1937 cm⁻¹ in both the Raman and infrared). The remaining part of the fingerprint spectra nicely correspond to the theoretically predicted bands (see Figures S42–S44).

Next, we investigated series of copper complexes with 1-pentyne and the ligands L₁, L₂, and L₃ (Figure 9). The IR photodissociation spectra clearly show that the red shift of the C=C stretching vibration is slightly smaller for the complexes with electron deficient ligands (L₁: 1947 cm⁻¹, L₂: 1977 cm⁻¹, L₃: 1980 cm⁻¹). Similarly, we could compare the IR spectra of silver complexes with L₁ and L₃ and the trend (L₁: 2024 cm⁻¹, L₃: 2035 cm⁻¹) again clearly showed a weaker interaction of the alkyne with the complex bearing the electron deficient ligand L₃. These spectroscopic data thus fully support the experimental binding energies and show that the more electron deficient ancillary ligands do not support a stronger interaction between the coinage metals and the π-ligands.

Figure 7. The relation between theoretically calculated BDEs of π-ligands in copper, silver, and gold complexes (green, black, and red, respectively) [L,M(π-ligand)]⁺ (solid circles), [L,M(π-ligand)]⁺ (open squares), [L,M(π-ligand)]⁺ (stars) listed in Tables 3–5). The color-coded lines connect points corresponding to the complexes with the same π-ligand, but different L. L₁ = H₂C(3,5-(CH₃)₂Pz)₂, L₂ = H₂C(3-(CF₃)Pz)₂, and L₃ = H₂C(3,5-(CF₃)₂Pz)₂.

Figure 8. Helium tagging photodissociation spectra of [L₁Cu(1-pentyne)]⁺ (top, green), [L₁Ag(1-pentyne)]⁺ (middle, grey), and [L₁Au(1-pentyne)]⁺ (bottom, red). The fingerprint IR spectrum agrees with the theoretically predicted spectra (Figures S42–S44). L₁ = H₂C(3,5-(CH₃)₂Pz)₂.
Discussion

We have reported a series of π-complexes with copper(I), silver(I), and gold(I) having bidentate ancillary ligands. The binding energies of the π-ligands increase in the complexes in the order of Ag < Cu < Au (Table 3). This trend correlates with the increasing C–C bond distances of the π-bonds of the ligands in the corresponding crystal structures (Table 2). In solution, the increasing binding energy correlates with the increasing up-field NMR shifts of the carbon atoms of the coordinated multiple bond as well as with the up-field NMR shifts of the hydrogen atoms attached to those carbon atoms (Table 1). The effect on the NMR shifts is almost negligible for the silver complexes but increases for the copper- and even more for the gold complexes. These results suggest that the binding between the coinage metals Cu⁺ and Au⁺ and the π-ligands leads to an increase of electron density at the π-bond and thus is dominantly mediated by π-back bonding in these complexes. This finding is in agreement with recent computational analysis of three-coordinate coinage metal complexes bearing nitrogen-based supporting ligands.[14,42, 44] Interestingly, the computational data of the coinage metal ethylene and acetylene complexes without supporting ligands predict the presence of more dominant σ-bonding interaction over π-back bonding.[43]

The importance of the π-back bonding for the interactions in the reported complexes is further highlighted by a neutral- or a negative effect of electron-withdrawing substituents at the ancillary ligands on the binding energies between the metals and π-ligands. The electron-withdrawing substitution at the ancillary ligands decreases electron density at the metals. Therefore, it should support σ-bonding interaction between the π-ligands and the metals but should weaken the π-back bonding. The experimental data show that upon the reducing of the electron density at the metal, the binding energies slightly grow for silver complexes, stay about the same for copper complexes and decrease for the gold complexes. The trend suggests that the role of the π-back bonding grows in the series Ag < Cu < Au and is probably the dominating interaction for the gold π-complexes.[42]

Finally, a comparison of the experimental BDE data with non-relativistic DFT calculations presented above (Figure 7) shows that DFT does not correctly describe the effects of electron-withdrawing substituents at the ancillary ligands on metal-π-ligand moiety. This is probably due to an insufficient description of the π-back bonding at the nonrelativistic level.[46a]

Accordingly, the agreement for the gold complexes is the worst. The relativistic effects destabilize the 5d electrons that are therefore high in energy and thus can more efficiently participate in the binding interactions with π ligands.[46b] If this relativistic effect is insufficiently included in the calculations, the participation of the d-electrons in the binding will be underestimated leading to a wrong description of the π-back bonding.
Conclusions

The bis(pyrazolyl)methane ligands enabled a detailed investigation of the coinage metal alkene and alkyne complexes including the solid state structural data on a rare isoleptic series [L,M(C,H)4](M = Cu, Ag, Au). The interaction between these transition metals and π-ligands is a combination of σ bonding and π-back bonding. Consistent with NMR spectroscopic and X-ray structural data, and in agreement with previous studies, this shows that the binding energies of π-ligands in the coinage metal complexes increase in the series Ag<Cu<Au.76 It is often believed that the σ bonding contribution for the d10 coinage metal complexes prevails over the π-back bonding contribution. However, the experimental trend of binding energies and geometry parameters does not support this hypothesis. On contrary, the π-ligand binding energies for copper and gold complexes decrease with the electron-withdrawing substitution on the ancillary ligands. This suggests that the π-back bonding interaction play a significant role in this type of complexes, even though they are cationic, closed-shell d10 metal systems.

Supporting Information Available: Experimental details, synthesis, X-ray crystallographic data (CIF, CCDC deposition numbers 2113041–2113046), NMR and IR/Raman spectroscopic data of metal complexes, additional data obtained by MS experiments, helium tagging photodissociation spectroscopy, and DFT calculations.

Deposition Numbers 2113041 (for 8), 2113043 (for 9), 2113044 (for 11), 2113045 (for 12) and 2113045 (for 13) contain the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data are provided free of charge by the joint Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre and Fachinformationszentrum Karlsruhe Access Structures service.
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