

AD-A130 666


CHARACTERIZATION AND PHOTOCHEMISTRY OF SURFACE-CONFINED
MONONUCLEAR AND T. (U) MASSACHUSETTS INST OF TECH
CAMBRIDGE DEPT OF CHEMISTRY D K LIU ET AL. 15 JUN 83
TR-38-ONR N00014-75-C-0880


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 7/5

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

12

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER ONR-TR-38		2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A130666	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) "Characterization and Photochemistry of Surface-Confined Mononuclear and Trinuclear Phosphine/Carbonyl Complexes of Ruthenium(0)"		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim Technical Report	
7. AUTHOR(s) David K. Liu, Mark S. Wrighton, Dale R. McKay and Gary E. Maciel		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-75-C-0880	
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Chemistry, M.I.T., Rm. 6-335, Cambridge, MA 02139		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT PROJECT TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Department of Chemistry, Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins, CO 80521 NR 051-579	
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research, Department of the Navy, Arlington, Virginia 22215		12. REPORT DATE June 15, 1983	
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 49	
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED	
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; reproduction is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government; distribution unlimited.			
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Distribution of this document is unlimited.			
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared for publication in <u>Inorganic Chemistry</u>.			
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) photochemistry, surfaces, ruthenium, spectroscopy, characterization			
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) See reverse side for Abstract.			

AD A 130666

JUL 26 1983

DTIC FILE COPY

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 68 IS OBSOLETE S/N 0102-014-6601 1

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

83 07 26 081-

The characterization and photochemistry of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is reported where $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$ represents high surface area ($\sim 400 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$) SiO_2 . Synthesis of the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is effected by reaction of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ or $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$ with a hydrocarbon suspension of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$. Solid state ^{13}C , ^{29}Si , and ^{31}P CP/MAS NMR, FTIR, UV-VIS photoacoustic spectroscopy, and elemental analyses establish the nature of the functionalized $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$. Typical coverage of $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ or $\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is 10^{-10} - $10^{-11} \text{ mol}/\text{cm}^2$. Photoexcitation (near-UV) of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ suspended in hydrocarbon media results in chemical reaction consistent with dissociative loss of CO to give a 16-valence electron, surface-confined species that reacts with 2-electron P-donors. The light-induced extrusion of CO can be effected and detected spectroscopically by chemical trapping in rigid media at low temperature ($\sim 90\text{K}$). Near-UV irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ at 298 K exposed to a gas gives chemistry consistent with dissociative loss of CO, also. Complete ($>90\%$) exchange of CO for ^{13}CO can be effected by irradiation under 1 atm ^{13}CO as monitored by FTIR/photoacoustic spectroscopy. The photochemistry of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ involves metal-metal bond rupture; under 1 atm CO in a solid/gas reaction or as a suspension in hydrocarbon solvent saturated with CO the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ yields $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$. The surface-confined mononuclear species formed photochemically from the surface-confined trinuclear species are spectroscopically indistinguishable from the deliberately synthesized $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$. However, irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$ leads to reassembly of the surface cluster, $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$, whereas irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ yields no surface cluster. For small P-donors, L' , irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ yields $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_3\text{L}')_3$, whereas $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ yields $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3\text{L}'$ for large and small L' . Both $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ yield gas phase CO and CO_2 as products when irradiated while exposed to an O_2 -containing atmosphere.

Characterization and Photochemistry of Surface-Confined Mononuclear and
Trinuclear Phosphine/Carbonyl Complexes of Ruthenium(0)

David K. Liu,¹ Mark S. Wrighton,^{1*} Dale R. McKay,² and Gary E. Maciel²

Department of Chemistry
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

and

Department of Chemistry
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521

*Address correspondence to this author.

10 6000 -2- (15) - 29

Abstract

aqueous media

The characterization and photochemistry of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is reported where $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$ represents high surface area ($\sim 400 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$) SiO_2 . Synthesis of the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is effected by reaction of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ or $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$ with a hydrocarbon suspension of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$. Solid state ^{13}C , ^{29}Si , and ^{31}P CP/MAS NMR, FTIR, uv-vis photoacoustic spectroscopy, and elemental analyses establish the nature of the functionalized $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$. Typical coverage of $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ or $\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is $\sim 10^{-10}$ - $10^{-11} \text{ mol}/\text{cm}^2$. Photoexcitation (near-uv) of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ suspended in hydrocarbon media results in chemical reaction consistent with dissociative loss of CO to give a 16-valence electron, surface-confined species that reacts with 2-electron P-donors. The light-induced extrusion of CO can be effected and detected spectroscopically by chemical trapping in rigid media at low temperature ($\sim 90\text{K}$). Near-uv irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ at 298 K exposed to a gas gives chemistry consistent with dissociative loss of CO, also. Complete ($>90\%$) exchange of CO for ^{13}C CO can be effected by irradiation under 1 atm ^{13}C CO as monitored by FTIR/photoacoustic spectroscopy. The photochemistry of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ involves metal-metal bond rupture; under 1 atm CO in a solid/gas reaction or as a suspension in hydrocarbon solvent saturated with CO the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ yields $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$. The surface-confined mononuclear species formed photochemically from the surface-confined trinuclear species are spectroscopically indistinguishable from the deliberately synthesized $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$. However, irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$ leads to reassembly of the surface cluster, $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$, whereas irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ yields no surface cluster. For small P-donors, L', irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ yields $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_3\text{L}')_3$, whereas $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ yields $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3\text{L}'$ for large and small L'. Both $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ yield gas phase CO and CO_2 as products when irradiated while exposed to an O_2 -containing atmosphere.

(13)

Photochemistry at interfaces is of practical importance in several respects including solar energy conversion and imaging. Potentially, photochemistry at interfaces could have practical value in catalytic synthesis, depending on the nature of the photoreactions that can be effected. Fundamentally, study of light-induced chemistry at interfaces can lead to elucidation of reaction mechanisms and to new photoreactions. One of the exciting prospects associated with photochemistry of surface-confined molecules is that "active sites" on a surface can be prepared rationally and characterized with an arsenal of molecular specific probes. Additionally, chemistry not possible in homogeneous solution may be possible for molecular entities attached to a surface.

In this paper, we elaborate results previously communicated³ concerning surface-confined mononuclear and trinuclear ruthenium carbonyl/phosphine complexes. The systems studied are $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ where $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$ represents high surface area SiO_2 and L is a phosphine ligand that covalently links the molecular entities to the SiO_2 . Reaction of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ or $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$ with SiO_2 yields $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ or $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$, respectively. Photoreactions of the solution species $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_3)$ and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_3)_3$ and related complexes involve loss of CO and metal-metal bond cleavage, respectively.⁴ The Ru-P bond is photoinert suggesting that the surface link(s) in $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ should survive irradiation. We now report the complete characterization and photochemical behavior of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$.

Experimental

Instruments. UV-VIS spectra of solution species were recorded using a Cary 17 spectrophotometer. UV-VIS photoacoustic spectra of surface-confined materials were taken with a Princeton Applied Research Model 6001 photoacoustic spectrometer. Solution IR spectra were recorded using a Perkin-Elmer 180 grating or Nicolet 7199 Fourier transform spectrometer. Low-temperature IR spectra were obtained by using a Precision Cell, Inc. Model P/N 21,000 variable-temperature cell with NaCl outer windows, using liquid N₂ as coolant. For surface-confined materials, infrared spectra were obtained as Nujol mulls between CaF₂ plates on the FTIR. NMR spectra of solution species were obtained using a Jeol FX90Q or Bruker 250 MHz Fourier transform spectrometer. FTIR/PAS spectra were obtained by using a Nicolet 7199 spectrometer, equipped with a photoacoustic detector that allows control of the sample environment.⁵ The acoustic coupling gas was either 1 atm of Ar or 1 atm of a 1:4 mixture of O₂:Ar for photolysis experiments. All manipulations of O₂- and H₂O-sensitive materials were carried out in a N₂-filled Vacuum Atmospheres He-43-6 Dri-Lab glovebox with an attached He-493 Dri-Train or under Ar using conventional Schlenk techniques.

Irradiations. Most photochemical reactions were carried out using a Bausch and Lomb SP200 200 W high pressure Hg lamp with a Pyrex water filter, a Hanovia 450 W medium pressure Hg lamp with Corning glass filters to isolate the 366 or 436 nm emission, or a GE Blacklite (355 ± 20 nm). In experiments where the [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉ was to be photochemically converted to [SiO₂]-L(Ru(CO)₄)₃, the Hanovia lamp was filtered to pass only visible light to avoid photoexcitation of the mononuclear species.

Materials. Isooctane, hexane, toluene and CH₂Cl₂ were reagent grade and freshly distilled from CaH₂ under N₂. Methylcyclohexane (99% Aldrich) was washed twice

with H_2SO_4 , then fuming H_2SO_4 , H_2O , dilute NaHCO_3 , saturated NaCl , predried over anhydrous MgSO_4 and then passed through grade #1 alumina (neutral, Woelm). $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_{12}$, PPh_2H , PPh_2Me , $\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3$, $\text{P}(\text{OCH}_2)_3\text{CEt}$ and $\text{P}(\text{t-C}_4\text{H}_9)_3$ were obtained from Strem Chemicals and used as received. PPh_3 (Aldrich) was recrystallized three times from absolute EtOH. 1-Pentene (99.9+%, Phillips) was passed through Al_2O_3 prior to use. Trimethoxyvinylsilane was obtained from Petrarch and used without further purification. High surface area SiO_2 (400 m^2/g , Alfa) was pretreated by heating at $\sim 250^\circ\text{C}$ under vacuum ($\sim 10^{-2}$ torr) for 48 h. ^{13}C (90% ^{13}C) and $^{18}\text{O}_2$ (98% ^{18}O) were obtained from Stohler Isotope Chemicals.

Slight modifications of literature procedures were used to synthesize $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3$ and $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ ($\text{L} = \text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3$).⁶ The preparation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ involves the suspension of ~ 1 g of pretreated SiO_2 in toluene. Addition of excess $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ or $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$ was followed by stirring at 25°C for 24 h under N_2 . The solid was collected by suction filtration and washed repeatedly with toluene, dried under vacuum, and stored under N_2 . $\text{Ru}(^{13}\text{C})_n(^{12}\text{C})_{4-n}(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ ($n = 1-4$) was prepared by near-UV irradiation of a degassed toluene solution containing $\sim 2 \times 10^{-3}$ M $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ under 1 atm ^{13}C at 25°C for 12 h. $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(^{13}\text{C})_n(^{12}\text{C})_{4-n}$ was prepared by the reaction of $\text{Ru}(^{13}\text{C})_n(^{12}\text{C})_{4-n}(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ and high surface area SiO_2 as described above.

$\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OMe})_3$ was synthesized by a method analogous to that reported in the literature.⁷ A 1:1 mixture of PPh_2H and $\text{CH}_2\text{CHSi}(\text{OMe})_3$ together with trace amounts of AIBN, 2,2'-azobis(isobutyronitrile), was heated at 110°C for 6 h under an Ar atmosphere. Vacuum distillation of the resulting solution gave ~ 4.0 g ($\sim 45\%$ yield) of $\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OMe})_3$ (bp $145\text{-}150^\circ\text{C}$, $\sim 10^{-2}$ torr). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3) 7.18 δ (m, 10 H, Ph), 3.48 δ (s, 9H, Me), 2.10 δ (t, 2H, P-CH₂), 0.78 δ (t, 2H, Si-CH₂). 12

$\nu_{C-H(SiOMe)} = 2839 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. $\nu_{p-ph} = 1482 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $\nu_{p-CH_2} = 1438 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. $Ru_3(CO)_9-L_3'$ and $Ru(CO)_4L'$ ($L' = PPh_2CH_2CH_2Si(OMe)_3$) were synthesized according to literature procedures⁶ and $[SiO_2]-L_3'Ru_3(CO)_9$ and $[SiO_2]-L'Ru(CO)_4$ were prepared as discussed above.

CP/MAS NMR. The solid state NMR measurements were taken on Nicolet spectrometers modified for solid-state work. An NT-150, operating at an observe frequency of 37.7 MHz and proton irradiation frequency of 150 MHz, was used for the carbon-13 (C-13) measurements. The silicon-29 (Si-29) measurements were taken on an NT-200 with observe and proton irradiation frequencies of 39.7 MHz and 200 MHz, respectively.

Magic-angle spinning was used to reduce line-broadening due to chemical-shift anisotropy⁸ with spinning rates of about 3 KHz for the Si-29 measurements and about 4 KHz for the C-13 measurements. In both cases, a spinning system employing "bullet" rotors, similar to that of Bartuska and Maciel,⁹ was used. To protect the samples from contamination, nitrogen gas obtained by boiling liquid nitrogen in a pressure vessel was used to drive the rotors.

Cross-polarization and high-power proton decoupling,¹⁰ were used in all of the measurements. As discussed in ref. 10, cross-polarization enhances sensitivity and allows more rapid signal averaging, while high-power decoupling reduces the observed linewidth of the NMR signal.


The cross-polarization contact times used were typically 1 msec for C-13 and 3 msec for Si-29. The optimum repetition rate for signal averaging appeared to be 500 msec, although 1 sec was used in some cases. The proton irradiation field strengths were approximately 10 gauss in the C-13 measurements and 7 gauss in the Si-29 measurements.

Results and Discussion

a. Synthesis of [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄ and [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉. Preparation of the functionalized [SiO₂]- follows well-known chemistry that has been exploited previously in the modification of oxides with organometallic reagents.¹¹ The key is the use of the phosphine ligand PPh₂CH₂CH₂Si(OEt)₃ that has the -Si(OR)₃ functionality that can react with surface-OH groups to covalently anchor functional groups to the surface, equation (1).¹¹ The surface of [SiO₂]- has



been rather well studied and the approach taken here (detailed in the Experimental) to anchor the Ru complexes is unexceptional, (2) and (3). However,



a variety of important issues relating to the nature of the attachment of the molecules have generally not been elucidated and are critical to an understanding of the surface and interfacial chemistry of surface-confined molecules. Treatment of [SiO₂]- with Ru(CO)₄(PPh₂Me) or with Ru₃(CO)₉(PPh₂Me)₃ under the same conditions used to effect reaction according to (2) and (3) results in no detectable color change of the SiO₂ powder. This control experiment establishes that the -Si(OR)₃ group is responsible for the attachment of the Ru complexes. In the section below the characterization of [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄ and [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉ is detailed.

b. Characterization of [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄ and [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉. The white [SiO₂]- is colored by reaction according to (2) and (3); the [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄ is yellow and the [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉ is red. Elemental analysis of the derivatized powder shows the presence of P and Ru in approximately a 1:1 ratio,


and assuming $\sim 400 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$ surface area the coverage of $-\text{LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $-\text{L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is $\sim 10^{-11} \text{ mol}/\text{cm}^2$. Taking $\sim 10^{-10} \text{ mol}/\text{cm}^2$ to be a monolayer, the average coverage of $-\text{LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $-\text{L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is well below a monolayer. If the coverage is uniform the typical mean site-site distance is $\sim 20 \text{ \AA}$. This average was determined as previously described.¹² Since it is known that the $-\text{Si}(\text{OR})_3$ can lead to polymerized (polysiloxane) material in the presence of trace amounts of H_2O ,¹³ uniformity of coverage is not easily proven. However, the low coverage rules out a uniform coating of polymeric material and is consistent with a uniform, submonolayer, coverage. Spectroscopic characterization (*vide infra*) reveals incomplete hydrolysis of the Si-OR bonds and provides some evidence against the formation of polysiloxane incompletely coating the $[\text{SiO}_2]-$.

Cross polarization (CP)¹⁴ and magic angle spinning (MAS)¹⁵ allow high resolution NMR spectra to be recorded for surface-confined molecules. Recent examples include ^{13}C , ^{29}Si , and ^{31}P spectra for species confined to $[\text{SiO}_2]-$.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ We have applied CP/MAS solid state NMR to the characterization of $[\text{SiO}_2]-\text{LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]-\text{L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$. Table I summarizes NMR data for the derivatized solids, for the pure $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$, and $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$, and Figures 1 and 2 show some representative spectra. Data for ^{13}C , ^{29}Si , and ^{31}P are consistent with the attachment of intact $-\text{LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $-\text{L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ entities via the general route represented by (1)-(3). All of the signals for the surface-confined species are significantly broader than for the solution species, but the data are useful. The ^1H NMR spectra were recorded for $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$ and the integration shows the complexes to be pure; in particular, the species have intact $-\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3$ groups.

The information derived from the ^{13}C NMR spectra of the complexes is the richest of the three nuclei studied. A comparison of the spectra for both the solution and surface species shows six different types of carbons and the

resonances are observed in similar, but not identical, positions for the surface and for the solution species. Comparison with other complexes and free ligands allows the assignment of the resonances. The resonance in the vicinity of 200 ppm, attributable to the CO carbons, is not observable for the surface-confined molecule without enrichment in ^{13}C . $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ was enriched for this measurement. In addition to the expected CO carbon revealed at ~200 ppm, the phenyl carbons at ~130 ppm, the carbon adjacent to the P at ~30 ppm, and the carbon adjacent to the Si at ~3.0 ppm, we find signals at ~15 and ~60 ppm for all of the substances. The resonance at ~15 ppm is attributable to the terminal carbon of the -OEt group and the ~60 ppm signal is assigned to the carbon adjacent to the O atom in the -OEt group. The observation of the -OEt carbons rules out complete hydrolysis of the Si-OEt bonds during the synthetic procedure and the relative intensity of the other carbon signals to the -OEt carbons reveals that a large fraction of Si-OEt bonds are intact in the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ samples. Roughly, the relative signal intensities would suggest that ~50% of the -OEt groups are retained in the present case. This number has been confirmed by IR measurements of surfaces derivatized using complexes of $\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OMe})_3$, vide infra. It is possible that -OEt signals are due to surface-OEt groups from reaction with released EtOH. A control experiment shows that surface-OEt is not FTIR-detectable when SiO_2 is treated with 0.1 M EtOH in toluene in the same manner used in derivatization using the Ru complexes. The 0.1 M EtOH represents a ~50-fold excess beyond the EtOH that could be available in the hydrolysis of the ~1 mM concentration of Ru complexes used in derivatization. The line widths of the ^{13}C signals for the solids are too great to observe the individual aromatic carbons or to observe splitting of the ^{13}C resonances by the P, but the positions of the signals for the six different kinds of carbons accord well with the assertion that the surface $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ are intact analogues of the derivatizing reagents.


The ^{31}P spectra are consistent with the attachment of the molecular species, but no interesting conclusions can be drawn from the CP/MAS spectra, especially since the line widths are so large. The ^{29}Si spectra do, however, provide some useful information. The -90 to -110 ppm region of $[\text{SiO}_2]$ - is affected by the derivatization procedure in a manner consistent with reaction of some of the surface Si-OH groups.^{16,17,19} The underivatized $[\text{SiO}_2]$ - shows resonances at -91, -100, and -109 ppm corresponding to silicon moieties of the types $(\text{HO})_2\text{Si}^*(\text{OSi-})_2$, $(\text{HO})\text{Si}^*(\text{OSi-})_3$, and $\text{Si}^*(\text{OSi-})_4$, respectively.^{16,17,19} The interesting features are in the -44 to -62 ppm range. The derivatized $[\text{SiO}_2]$ - shows no signal at -62 ppm attributable to $\text{R}'\text{Si}^*(\text{OSi-})_3$. Rather, the -46 to -53 ppm signals are attributable to structures where there is at least one -OEt group on the Si, as deduced from the ^{13}C spectra. Indeed, the -48 ppm ^{29}Si signal for $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ is most consistent with structure I. The -46/-53 ppm ^{29}Si signals for $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ tend to



support the presence of an approximately 1:1 mixture of structures I and II. The low resolution of the ^{29}Si spectra do not allow quantitative answers, but it would seem that the $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ is present on the surface as a mixture of I and IIa on the basis of the number of -OEt groups, the absence of the -62 ppm ^{29}Si resonance, and the low coverage. The ^{29}Si spectrum of $\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ shows that both I and II are important, but a structure like IIb has greater probability than for $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$, since the surface-bound entities have three Si atoms per unit. We conclude that there are no intact $\text{-Si}(\text{OEt})_3$ groups on $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$, owing to the absence

of a -44 ppm resonance found in the CP/MAS ^{29}Si spectrum of the pure solid $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$. Thus, all three anchoring ligands of the trinuclear Ru species appear to be involved in the covalent attachment. This fact is consistent with photochemical reactions of the surface-bound trinuclear complex, *vide infra*.

Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) has also been used to examine the extent of hydrolysis of the Si-OR bonds upon reaction of the derivatizing reagents with $[\text{SiO}_2]$ -. The spectral features monitored would be those associated with the -OR group compared to those for the remainder of the anchoring ligand. In particular it would seem sensible to monitor the intensity of C-H stretching bands for the -OR group compared to that for the P-CH₂ stretch at $\sim 1430\text{ cm}^{-1}$ that should be unaffected by the attachment of the ligand to the surface. Since the C-H region of the -OEt groups is complex, we have synthesized $\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OMe})_3$, equation (4), to prepare




derivatizing reagents because the C-H region of -OMe shows a sharp band at $\sim 2840\text{ cm}^{-1}$.²⁰ The complexes $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OMe})_3)$ and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OMe})_3)_3$ were prepared and reacted with hydrocarbon suspensions of $[\text{SiO}_2]$ - in the usual manner. A comparison of the absorbance of the symmetric C-H stretch of Si-OMe at 2840 cm^{-1} and the P-CH₂ stretch at 1430 cm^{-1} in the pure complex compared to the features at 2853 cm^{-1} and 1437 cm^{-1} for the derivatized $[\text{SiO}_2]$ - shows that $\sim 50\%$ of the -OMe groups are lost upon reaction of $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OMe})_3)_3$ with the $[\text{SiO}_2]$ - and $\sim 65\%$ of the -OMe groups are lost upon reaction of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OMe})_3)$ with the $[\text{SiO}_2]$ -. These results accord well with those for the CP/MAS NMR spectra.

The NMR data are consistent with the retention of the metal-metal bonds in the surface-bound Ru_3 species, but the optical properties provide positive evidence strongly supporting this fact. The color of both $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ and

$[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ is yellow while the color of both $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is red, though the intensity of the color for the derivatized powders is less. Photoacoustic spectra (PAS)²¹ in the UV-VIS region of the derivatized powders compared to solution absorption properties of mononuclear and trinuclear species reveal that the characteristic visible absorption maximum of Ru_3 species in solution⁴ is present for $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$, Figure 3. The yellow $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{Me})$ show only tail absorption into the visible with a well-defined maximum at 255 nm. The 255 nm absorption is likely attributable to intraligand transitions, while the tail absorption is associated with ligand field transitions that terminate in the population of the $4d_{z^2}$ orbital.⁴ The low energy absorptions of the Ru_3 systems are associated with the orbitals of the metal-metal bond framework,²² and thus the UV-VIS/PAS spectra establish retention of the Ru-Ru framework in $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$.

The FTIR spectra of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ reveal strong absorptions in the CO stretching region, as would be expected. Table II lists band maxima in the CO stretching region for a variety of complexes and for the derivatized surfaces. The IR spectra of metal carbonyls are very sensitive to the electron density and to the geometry. Figure 4 shows a comparison of the IR spectra in the CO stretching region for the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ and the $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$ in solution. As can be seen the IR bands are much broader for the derivatized solids in a Nujol mull compared to the molecular species in homogeneous hydrocarbon solution. Further, there appear to be significant changes in the relative intensities of the bands and a general shift to slightly higher energy for the surface confined systems. These changes in the IR spectra signal subtle changes in geometry and electron density upon attachment of the molecular species onto the surface.

Photochemistry of [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄ Suspended in Hydrocarbon Solvent. The photoexcitation of Ru(CO)₄(P-donor) complexes has been shown to yield loss of CO as the only detectable photoreaction.⁴ We have shown that the [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄ also yields loss of CO upon photoexcitation,³ and here we wish to show that the photoreaction proceeds via dissociative loss of CO with the generation of spectroscopically detectable 16-e⁻ Ru(CO)₃(P-donor) or [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₃. Near-UV irradiation of [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄ suspended in a hydrocarbon solution of a P-donor yields [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₃(P-donor) and no Ru(CO)₄(P-donor) is detectable in the solution for P-donor = PPh₃, P(OCH₂)₃CEt. The formation of [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₃(P-donor) is established by the IR spectral changes accompanying the reaction: the three bands for [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄ in the CO stretching region decline while a single band grows in a region characteristic of trans-Ru(CO)₃(P-donor)₂ complexes. The single CO band for [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₃(PPh₃) is at 1900 cm⁻¹ and that for [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₃(P(OCH₂)₃CEt) is at 1920 cm⁻¹ in accord with the solution analogues, Table II, but with a slight shift to higher energy for the surface species. Thus, the photosubstitution is consistent with dissociative loss of CO from [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄, not loss of Ru(CO)₄ from the surface, equation (5). This



result parallels the solution photochemistry. We now present spectral evidence for the intermediacy of a 16-e⁻ species.

Irradiation of Ru(CO)₄(P-donor) dissolved in a rigid, low temperature hydrocarbon matrix results in IR spectral changes consistent with loss of CO to form the 16-e⁻ Ru(CO)₃(P-donor), Figure 5. Data in Figure 5a are for Ru(CO)₄(PPh₃), but initial spectral changes are quite similar for Ru(CO)₄(P(OCH₂)₃CEt) and


$\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{Me})$ when irradiated under the same conditions, Figures 5b and 5c. Bands for these systems are included in Table II. The peaks associated with the $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-donor})$ disappear while features at 2132 cm^{-1} (free CO) and ~ 2030 and $\sim 1900\text{ cm}^{-1}$ (assigned to $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_3(\text{P-donor})$) grow. The signal intensity due to free CO is consistent with the loss of one CO per $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-donor})$ consumed, based on a comparison with observations in situations where loss of CO is well documented.²³ Warm-up of a low temperature matrix containing PPh_3 and the irradiated $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-donor})$ results in some formation of trans- $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_3(\text{P-donor})$ - (PPh_3) as reflected in the growth of a single CO absorption in the vicinity of 1900 cm^{-1} , characteristic of such compounds, Table II. Warm-up in the absence of an added ligand results in regeneration of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-donor})$. The similarity of the spectral changes for $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_3)$, $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{Me})$, and $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P}(\text{OCH}_2)_3\text{CEt})$ suggests that orthometallation of the aromatic rings and/or β -H interactions for the PPh_2Me are relatively unimportant in these systems. Finally, the UV-VIS spectrum of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_3)$ in a hydrocarbon matrix at $\sim 100\text{K}$ changes markedly upon irradiation, Figure 6, in a manner consistent with formation of a coordinatively unsaturated intermediate. For many mononuclear metal carbonyls loss of a CO leads to a significantly lower first absorption owing to the stabilization of the σ^* LUMO, in this case the $4d_{z^2}$ orbital.^{23,24} All of the data, then, are consistent with loss of CO subsequent to photoexcitation of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-donor})$ to yield a coordinatively unsaturated $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_3(\text{P-donor})$ complex.

The $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{Me})$ differs from the other $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-donor})$ systems investigated in one, potentially significant, way. The primary photoproduct $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_3(\text{PPh}_2\text{Me})$ appears to give rapid secondary photochemistry giving an absorption at 2112 cm^{-1} and additional free CO. This may be associated with chemistry at the methyl group when a second CO is ejected to give


$\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_2(\text{PPh}_2\text{Me})$. This issue is under investigation and will be elaborated elsewhere.

The low temperature photochemistry of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ has also been studied. A suspension of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ in a frozen hydrocarbon solvent can be examined by IR spectroscopy. Irradiation results in the loss of CO as evidenced by the appearance of a feature at 2132 cm^{-1} characteristic of free CO in a hydrocarbon matrix. However, only one band clearly grows in as the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ is consumed, Figure 7a. Even the band that does grow in at 1955 cm^{-1} is near that for one of the absorptions of the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$. Warm-up of an irradiated sample in a matrix containing PPh_3 results in the formation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3(\text{PPh}_3)$, Figure 7b. Accordingly, we conclude that the 1955 cm^{-1} band can be attributed to $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3$, a surface-confined, coordinatively unsaturated species. The $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3$ would be expected to have more than one band in the CO stretching region as we find for solutions of photogenerated $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_3(\text{P-donor})$, Table II. An interesting possibility is that the surface bound species has a different geometry. The $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ does undergo a color change upon irradiation in a frozen matrix, similar to that for $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_3)$, but the spectrum has not been recorded. The unambiguous result from low temperature irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ is that CO is ejected, since a feature is observed at 2132 cm^{-1} in the IR. The remaining surface organometallic species does not appear to have the same structure as do the homogeneous $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_3(\text{P-donor})$ species, but the fragment will readily add ligands such as PPh_3 to give $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3(\text{PPh}_3)$ or the ejected CO to regenerate $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$.

The $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ system differs from the homogeneous $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-donor})$ systems in one key respect: the surface-confined system does not lead to the formation of trinuclear metal-metal bonded complexes as do the homogeneous species, equation (6). At the site-site separations of the $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ entities





the formation of metal-metal bonds is not possible at the coverages used, unless the anchor is labile. The lack of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ formation does not unambiguously rule out labile anchoring; for now we can merely state that reaction according to (6) proceeds cleanly in the homogeneous case. Under the same conditions, we observe loss of all metal carbonyl signals on the surface. Presumably, the coordinatively unsaturated species from loss of CO reacts with O_2 , or other impurities in the solvent, to lead to decomposition of the metal carbonyl. The reaction represented by equation (7) was attempted in order to establish that the surface species could form metal-metal bonds. A small yield of surface cluster was detected, but the formation of $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{Me})_3$ dominated the chemistry. Most of the surface carbonyl decomposed. Distinguishing the surface bound cluster from the solution species is straightforward, since the surface bound material can be isolated by filtration and independently characterized.



The important conclusions then from the photochemistry of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-donor})$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ are that (i) dissociative loss of CO occurs as the exclusive photoreaction; (ii) the reactive $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_3(\text{P-donor})$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3$ can be observed spectroscopically, and (iii) the $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ is inert with respect to metal-metal bond formation, since it is immobilized at site-site separations greater than metal-metal bond distances.


Photochemistry of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ Suspended in Hydrocarbon Solvent. The $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{P-donor})_3$ complexes generally undergo metal-metal bond cleavage reactions upon photoexcitation.⁴ In our earlier communication³ we reported that

[SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉ undergoes metal-metal bond cleavage reactions to give surface-confined, mononuclear derivatives. The two reactions of note are given in equations (8) and (9). Interestingly, the photolysis of [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉ as



a suspension in a hydrocarbon solution containing PPh₃ does not result in the formation of [SiO₂]- (LRu(CO)₃(PPh₃))₃, even though solution Ru₃(CO)₉(P-donor)₃ species do undergo such reaction. Further, [SiO₂]- (LRu(CO)₄)₃ does not yield [SiO₂](LRu(CO)₃(PPh₃))₃ upon irradiation under the same conditions. Note that [SiO₂]-LRu(CO)₄ prepared from [SiO₂]- and Ru(CO)₄(PPh₂CH₂CH₂Si(OEt)₃) does undergo clean photosubstitution with PPh₃, vide supra. The -LRu(CO)₄ from the cluster as in equation (8) is spectroscopically indistinguishable from the same species formed from the reaction of [SiO₂]- with Ru(CO)₄(PPh₂CH₂CH₂Si(OEt)₃). Moreover, the -LRu(CO)₃(P(OCH₂)₃OEt) from either cluster, equation (9), or surface monomer, -LRu(CO)₄, are spectroscopically the same. However, the surface-bound mononuclear complexes formed from the [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉ are geometrically close to one another and immobilized such that fragments from metal-metal bond cleavage do not move away from each other as would be possible in the case of Ru₃(CO)₉(P-donor)₃ complexes in homogeneous solution.

The fact that the fragments from the photolysis of [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉ remain close to one another is established by the fact that the reassembly of the trinuclear cluster can be effected by irradiation of [SiO₂]- (LRu(CO)₄)₃, equation (10). The cycle [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉ $\xrightarrow{3\text{CO}}$ [SiO₂]- (LRu(CO)₄)₃ $\xrightarrow{-3\text{CO}}$ [SiO₂]-L₃Ru₃(CO)₉ can be effected with less than 10% loss of the -L₃Ru₃(CO)₉



system. Moreover, the irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu(CO)}_4)_3$, formed from $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$, in the presence of PPh_3 does not yield $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu(CO)}_3(\text{PPh}_3))_3$. It would appear that the -LRu(CO)_4 generated from the $\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ are too close together to accommodate a large entering group.

Our conclusion is that -LRu(CO)_4 from $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ are sterically demanding while the -LRu(CO)_4 synthesized from the direct reaction of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$ with $\text{Ru(CO)}_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si(OEt)}_3)$ are not sterically demanding with respect to ligand substitution. Consistent with this we find that $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu(CO)}_4$ undergoes clean photosubstitution with the large P-donor $\text{P}(\underline{t}\text{-C}_4\text{H}_9)_3$ (cone angle $\approx 182^\circ$)²⁵ whereas $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu(CO)}_4)_3$ yields only reassembly of the surface-confined cluster. The $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ undergoes no photoreaction with $\text{P}(\underline{t}\text{-C}_4\text{H}_9)_3$ under the same conditions. Thus, the large average site-site separation (~ 20 Å) of the molecular units -LRu(CO)_4 or $\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ from reacting $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$ with $\text{Ru(CO)}_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si(OEt)}_3)$ or $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si(OEt)}_3)$, respectively, accords well with these photoreactivity differences. The photoreaction of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ with CO or the small P-donor $\text{P}(\text{OCH}_2)_3\text{CEt}$ (cone angle $\approx 101^\circ$)²⁵ but not with PPh_3 (cone angle $\approx 145^\circ$)²⁵ is consistent with the conclusion that the -LRu(CO)_4 formed from cluster is sterically demanding.

Unlike the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu(CO)}_4$, the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ is not photolabile in rigid hydrocarbon solution at low temperature. At least on the timescale where the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu(CO)}_4$ gives a large amount of conversion, we find no reaction for the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ when monitoring by FTIR. This result merely rules out dissociative loss of CO as a significant photoprocess. The rupture of Ru-Ru bonds would likely be reversible under such conditions.

The ability to interconvert the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9/[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu(CO)}_4)_3$ systems without significant loss of the surface-confined molecules is consistent with the results for the CP/MAS NMR that showed that each anchoring ligand of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$

$L_3Ru_3(CO)_9$ is bound to the $[SiO_2]-$. The differences in photoreactions of solution vs. anchored $Ru_3(CO)_9(P-donor)_3$ are attributable to the immobilized Ru species. The reaction of $Ru_3(CO)_9(PPh_2CH_2CH_2Si(OEt)_3)_3$ with $[SiO_2]-$ provides a route to densely clustered $-LRu(CO)_4$ that is capable of forming Ru-Ru bonds and is more selective with respect to entering groups in photosubstitution reactions.

Solid/Gas Interfacial Photoreactions of $[SiO_2]-LRu(CO)_4$ and $[SiO_2]-L_3Ru_3(CO)_9$.

We have used an FTIR with a photoacoustic detector to monitor aspects of the photochemistry of $[SiO_2]-LRu(CO)_4$ and $[SiO_2]-L_3Ru_3(CO)_9$ when exposed to a gas. The FTIR/PAS technique has been reported previously from this research group.^{12,26} The value of the technique is that both gas phase and surface reactions can be monitored. For example, we find that irradiation of $[SiO_2]-LRu(CO)_4$ or $[SiO_2]-L_3Ru_3(CO)_9$ as powders under an Ar/O₂ atmosphere leads to the decline of all metal carbonyl material and the formation of gas phase CO and CO₂. The photochemistry of the mononuclear species logically begins with the dissociative loss of CO to form $[SiO_2]-LRu(CO)_3$ that reacts irreversibly with the O₂ to yield oxidative degradation. The irradiation of the $[SiO_2]-LRu(CO)_4$ powder under a ¹³C₁₈O atmosphere yields incorporation of ¹³C₁₈O to eventually form $[SiO_2]-LRu(^{13}C_{18}O)_4$, as revealed by the shift in the FTIR/PAS signals in the CO stretching region, Figure 8. Essentially complete exchange can be brought about without significant loss of integrated metal carbonyl signal. Indeed, irradiation of the $[SiO_2]-LRu(^{13}C_{18}O)_4$ under an atmosphere of natural CO abundance leads to >90% regeneration of the original sample, Figure 8.

Irradiation of a sample of $[SiO_2]-LRu(^{13}C_{18}O)_4$ under an Ar/¹⁸O₂ atmosphere yields FTIR/PAS data consistent with the decomposition of the surface complex and the generation of ¹³C₁₈O and ¹³C₁₈O¹⁸O, Figure 9. This result unambiguously establishes that the CO₂ is formed from added O₂ and the complexed CO. The

$[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ gives a higher CO/CO_2 ratio than $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$, but the ratio of CO/CO_2 is roughly the same per mole of bound CO. Since the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ does not undergo dissociative loss of CO, the reaction with O_2 is presumably with the primary photoproduct that leads to fragmentation. The Ru species on the surface from photoreaction of the surface carbonyls in the presence of O_2 have not been characterized, but presumably the O_2 results in oxidation of the Ru(C).

Irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ under an atmosphere of CO leads to $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$ as in hydrocarbon suspension, Figure 10. Likewise, the irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$ results in the nearly quantitative regeneration of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$. Thus, for both $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ we find that the solid/gas reactions parallel the results found when the powders are suspended in hydrocarbon solutions.

Summary

The photochemistry of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ involves the dissociative loss of CO as the only detectable chemical result of photoexcitation. Extrusion of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4$ via rupture of the Ru-P bond is not a primary photoreaction. Irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ in a rigid, low temperature matrix provides unambiguous evidence for the dissociative loss of CO and the intermediacy of a 16 e^- fragment on the surface, $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3$. Thus, light can be used to activate a surface species to generate a coordinatively unsaturated site that can be observed spectroscopically. Irradiation of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ ($\text{L} = \text{PPh}_3, \text{PPh}_2\text{Me}, \text{P}(\text{OCH}_2)_3\text{CEt}$) in rigid, low temperature matrices parallels the findings for $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$. The $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ on $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$ are effectively isolated from one another (site-site distance of $\sim 20\text{ \AA}$) and do not form trinuclear clusters as do $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ species in solution. The photochemistry of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ does not involve dissociative loss of CO. The chemistry is dominated by Ru-Ru bond cleavage to give mononuclear products in the presence of donors, provided the donor is small enough. Under CO clean formation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$ is effected, consistent with chemistry from $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3$ in solution. The $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ species formed from clusters on the $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$ are spectroscopically indistinguishable from the $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ formed from $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$ derivatized with $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$. However, the $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ formed from the cluster are close to each other and tethered in place. This allows efficient cluster reassembly from photoinduced extrusion of CO from $[\text{SiO}_2](\text{LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$ to form $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$. Further, the fact that the $\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ from cluster are close geometrically results in different steric demands in photosubstitution using P-donors. This fact may be exploited in catalysis and is presently under study. Both $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ undergo very clean chemistry under ^{13}C O or CO to give $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(^{13}\text{C})_4$ and $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$, respectively. Also,

both undergo photoreaction in the presence of O_2 to give gas phase CO_2 , CO and oxidized Ru species. Isotope labelling experiments unambiguously show that a fraction of the bound CO is oxidized by O_2 initially in the gas phase. Presumably, the coordinatively unsaturated intermediates react with O_2 to eventually oxidize the $Ru(0)$ and bound CO .

Acknowledgements. Work at M.I.T. was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research and the National Science Foundation. Work at Colorado State University was done using the Regional NMR Center supported by the National Science Foundation.

References

1. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
2. Colorado State University.
3. Liu, D.K.; Wrighton, M.S. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1982, 104, 898.
4. Graff, J.L.; Sanner, R.D.; Wrighton, M.S. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1979, 101, 273.
5. Kinney, J.B., Ph.D. Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1981.
6. (a) Bruce, M.I.; Shaw, G.; Stone, F.G.A. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1972, 2094; (b) Bruce, M.I.; Shaw, G.; Stone, F.G.A. ibid., 1973, 1667; (c) Johnson, B.F.G.; Lewis, J.; Twigg, M.V. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1976, 1876; (d) Johnson, B.F.G.; Lewis, J.; Twigg, M.V. J. Organomet. Chem., 1974, 67, C75.
7. Uriarte, R.; Mazanec, T.J.; Tau, K.D.; Meek, D.W. Inorg. Chem., 1980, 19, 79.
8. Schaefer, J.; Stejskal, E.O. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1976, 98, 1031.
9. Bartuska, V.; Maciel, G. J. Mag. Res., 1981, 42, 312.
10. Pines, A.; Gibby, M.G.; Waugh, J.S. J. Chem. Phys., 1973, 59, 569.
11. (a) Bailey, D.C.; Langer, S.H. Chem. Rev., 1981, 81, 109; (b) Hartley, F.R.; Verey, P.N. Adv. Organomet. Chem., 1977, 15, 189.
12. Klein, B.; Kazlauskas, R.J.; Wrighton, M.S. Organometallics, 1982, 1, 1338.
13. Arkles, B. Chemtech, 1977, 7, 766.
14. Andrew, E.R. Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spec., 1971, 8, 1.
15. Pine, A.; Gibby, M.G.; Waugh, J.S. J. Chem. Phys., 1972, 56, 1776.
16. Fischer, A.B.; Bruce, J.A.; McKay, D.R.; Maciel, G.E.; Wrighton, M.S. Inorg. Chem., 1982, 21, 1766.
17. (a) Maciel, G.E.; Sindorf, D.W.; Bartuska, V.J. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1980, 102, 7606; (b) Sindorf, D.W.; Maciel, G.E. ibid., 1981, 103, 4263.

18. Bemis, L.; Clark, H.C.; Davies, J.A.; Fyfe, C.A.; Wasylshen, R.E. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1982, 104, 438.
19. (a) Maciel, G.E.; Sindorf, D.W. J. Chromatogr., 1981, 205, 438;
(b) Sindorf, D.W., Ph.D. Dissertation, Colorado State University, 1981.
20. Anderson, D.R. "Infrared Raman and Ultraviolet Spectroscopy", in Smith, A.L., ed., "Analysis of Silicones", John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1974, p. 247.
21. (a) Rosencwaig, A. Anal. Chem., 1975, 47, 592A; (b) Rosencwaig, A.; Gersko, A. J. Appl. Phys., 1976, 47, 64.
22. Tyler, D.R.; Levenson, R.A.; Gray, H.B. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1978, 100, 7888.
23. We have quantitatively measured light-induced CO loss from $M(CO)_6$ ($M = Cr, Mo, W$) in alkane matrices to determine the absorptivity for photoejected CO under the conditions used for the Ru carbonyl species. The $M(CO)_6$ complexes are known to lose CO in rigid media at low temperature: Perutz, B.N.; Turner, J.J. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1975, 97, 4791.
24. Geoffroy, G.L.; Wrighton, M.S. "Organometallic Photochemistry", Academic Press: New York, 1979.
25. Tolman, C.A. Chem. Rev., 1977, 77, 313.
26. Kinney, J.B.; Staley, R.H.; Reichel, C.L.; Wrighton, M.S. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1981, 103, 4273.

Table I. Solution and Solid-State NMR Data for Relevant Compounds^a

Compound	³¹ P	Nucleus ¹³ C	²⁹ Si
Ru(CO) ₄ (PPh ₂ CH ₂ CH ₂ Si(OEt) ₃)	46.4(s)	204.5(s), 132.0(m), 58.6(s) 26.8(d), 18.0(s), 3.0(s)	-54.0
[SiO ₂]-LRu(¹³ CO) ₄ ^b	41.0	198, 130, 60, 30, 15, 0	-48
Ru ₃ (CO) ₉ (PPh ₂ CH ₂ CH ₂ Si(OEt) ₃) ₃	35.0(s)	198.2(s), 131.3(m), 57.3(s) 25.5(d), 17.0(s), 3.0(s)	-54.9 (-44) ^c
[SiO ₂]-L ₃ Ru ₃ (CO) ₉ ^b	34.5	--- ^c , 135, 65, 30, 18, 3	-46, -53

^a³¹P NMR are δ ppm units relative to H₃PO₄ standard; ¹³C and ²⁹Si NMR are ε ppm units relative to (CH₃)₄Si standard; s ≡ singlet, d ≡ doublet, m ≡ multiplet.

^bResonance due to metal-carbonyl not observed unless ¹³C-enriched.

^cMeasured by solid state CP/MAS NMR technique.

Table II. Spectroscopic Data for Relevant Compounds^a

Compound	IR		UV-VIS
	ν_{CO} , cm^{-1} (ϵ or relative o.d.)		λ_{max} , nm (ϵ)
$Ru(CO)_4(PPh_3)$	2060(2.2), 1984(1.0), 1951(3.8)		259(9400)
$Ru(CO)_4(PPh_2Me)$	2060(2710), 1984(1810), 1946(4860)		254(9150)
$Ru(CO)_4(P(OCH_2)_3CEt)$	2075(2.2), 2006(1.0), 1975(3.6)		
$Ru(CO)_3(PPh_3)^b$	2027(1.0), 1908(1.3)		425, 342
$Ru(CO)_3(PPh_2Me)^b$	2024(1.0), 1889(1.6)		
$Ru(CO)_3(P(OCH_2)_3CEt)^b$	2044(1.0), 1924(2.1)		
$Ru(CO)_3(PPh_3)_2^c$	1908		
$[(EtO)_3SiCH_2CH_2PPh_2]Ru(CO)_4$	2058(2800), 1982(1350), 1946(4840)		257(9790)
$[(MeO)_3SiCH_2CH_2PPh_2]Ru(CO)_4$	2056(1.8), 1982(1.0), 1945(3.2)		265
$[(EtO)_3SiCH_2CH_2PPh_2]Ru(CO)_3(P(t-C_4H_9)_3)$	1875		
$[(EtO)_3SiCH_2CH_2PPh_2]Ru(CO)_3(PPh_3)$	1896(5040)		
$[(EtO)_3SiCH_2CH_2PPh_2]Ru(CO)_3(P(OCH_2)_3CEt)$	1917		
$[SiO_2]-LRu(CO)_4^d$	2059(1.7), 1995(1.7), 1952(1.0)		255
$[SiO_2]-L'Ru(CO)_4^d$	2064(1.3), 1996(1.3), 1961(1.0)		
$[SiO_2]-LRu(CO)_3(P(t-C_4H_9)_3)^d$	1876		
$[SiO_2]-LRu(CO)_3(PPh_3)^d$	1900		
$[SiO_2]-LRu(CO)_3(P(OCH_2)_3CEt)^d$	1920		
$Ru_3(CO)_9(PPh_2Me)_3$	2042(320), 1970(2800), 1943(1510)		484(13600), 364(sh)
$[(EtO)_3SiCH_2CH_2PPh_2]_3Ru_3(CO)_9$	2044(240), 1970(2790), 1940(850)		438(13200), 366(sh)
$[(MeO)_3SiCH_2CH_2PPh_2]_3Ru_3(CO)_9$	2038(1.0), 1960(19.2), 1940(5.6)		492, 371(sh)
$[SiO_2]-L_3Ru_3(CO)_9^d$	2056(1.0), 1988(1.3), 1950(sh) 2066(1.0), ^e 2004(1.3), ^e 1965(sh) ^e		490, 370(sh)
$[SiO_2]-L'_3Ru_3(CO)_9^d$	2058(1.0), 1984(1.5), 1980(sh)		

Table II. (continued)

^aAll IR and UV-VIS measurements for solution cluster species were made in toluene solution at 298 K. The IR of mononuclear compounds in solution were for toluene solutions unless noted otherwise. The UV-VIS for mononuclear species was for hexane solutions at 298 K. For surface-supported species infrared spectra were recorded as Nujol mulls by FTIR and UV-VIS spectra were by PAS technique.

^bMeasured in methylcyclohexane matrix at ~100 K, cf. Figure 5.

^cMeasured in methylcyclohexane solution at 298 K.

^d $L = PPh_2CH_2CH_2Si(OEt)_{3-n}$ and $L' = PPh_2CH_2CH_2Si(OMe)_{3-n}$; $n = 1-3$.

^eSpectrum obtained as a KBr pellet.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. ^{13}C NMR for $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ in CD_2Cl_2 and ^{13}C CP/MAS NMR of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$. Peaks marked SSB are spinning side bands. Cf. Table I.

Figure 2. ^{31}P and ^{29}Si CP/MAS NMR of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$. The inset of the top frame is the ^{31}P NMR of $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)_3$ in CDCl_3 . The left inset in the ^{29}Si spectrum is the ^{29}Si NMR of $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_2\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{Si}(\text{OEt})_3)$ in toluene solution and the right inset is the ^{29}Si CP/MAS NMR of the pure solid. Cf. Table I.

Figure 3. Comparison of optical absorption in solution and UV-VIS photoacoustic spectra of powders of mononuclear and trinuclear Ru complexes. Cf. Table II.

Figure 4. Comparison of FTIR absorption spectra for solution species in hydrocarbon media and for derivatized $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-}$ as Nujol mulls.

Figure 5. FTIR absorbance changes accompanying UV irradiation of $\sim 5 \text{ mM}$ $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ ($\text{L} = \text{PPh}_3, \text{PPh}_2\text{Me}, \text{P}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_5)_3\text{CEt}$) in a methylcyclohexane matrix at $\sim 100 \text{ K}$. The negative peaks are associated with disappearance of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ and the positive peak at 2132 cm^{-1} is attributed to free CO. The other two, strong positive peaks are attributed to the $16 \text{ e}^- \text{ Ru}(\text{CO})_3\text{L}$.



Figure 6. Comparison of UV-VIS and IR spectral changes for the same methylcyclohexane solution of $\sim 5 \text{ mM}$ $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4\text{PPh}_3$ upon UV irradiation. The 342, 425 nm features grow in with the 1908, 2027 cm^{-1} features in the IR.


Figure 7. Top: Difference IR spectra upon irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ suspended in a rigid matrix at low temperature. Bottom: Initial spectrum, 1, of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ at 298 K suspended in a methylcyclohexane/0.02 M PPh_3 solution and final spectrum, 2, after warming the irradiated sample from 77 K to 298 K. Spectrum 2 is consistent with complete conversion to $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3(\text{PPh}_3)$ by capturing photogenerated $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_3$ with PPh_3 during warm-up.


Figure 8. FTIR/PAS spectra showing initial $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$, 1; after complete ^{13}C -enrichment by photolysis under ^{13}CO , 2, and after regeneration of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(\text{CO})_4$ by irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(^{13}\text{C})_4$ under CO (natural abundance), 3.


Figure 9. FTIR/PAS spectral changes accompanying irradiation of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-LRu}(^{13}\text{C})_4$ under $^{18}\text{O}_2/\text{Ar}$ (~1/4 at 1 atm total pressure).


Figure 10. FTIR/PAS spectrum of $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$ initially, 1. Irradiation under 1 atm CO yields $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-(LRu}(\text{CO})_4)_3$, 2, which upon irradiation under Ar nearly quantitatively regenerates $[\text{SiO}_2]\text{-L}_3\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9$, 3.



























TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GEN

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>		<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
Office of Naval Research Attn: Code 413 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	2	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Mr. Joe McCartney San Diego, California 92152	1
ONR Pasadena Detachment Attn: Dr. R. J. Marcus 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, California 91106	1	Naval Weapons Center Attn: Dr. A. B. Amster, Chemistry Division China Lake, California 93555	1
Commander, Naval Air Systems Command Attn: Code 310C (H. Rosenwasser) Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20360	1	Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory Attn: Dr. R. W. Drisko Port Hueneme, California 93401	1
Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	12	Dean William Tolles Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
Dr. Fred Saalfeld Chemistry Division, Code 6100 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375	1	Scientific Advisor Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code RD-1) Washington, D.C. 20380	1
U.S. Army Research Office Attn: CRD-AA-IP P. O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709	1	Naval Ship Research and Development Center Attn: Dr. G. Bosmajian, Applied Chemistry Division Annapolis, Maryland 21401	1
Mr. Vincent Schaper DTNSRDC Code 2803 Annapolis, Maryland 21402	1	Mr. John Boyle Materials Branch Naval Ship Engineering Center Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112	1
Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Dr. S. Yamamoto Marine Sciences Division San Diego, California 91232	1	Mr. A. M. Anzalone Administrative Librarian PLASTEC/ARRADCOM Bldg 3401 Dover, New Jersey 07801	1

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 051A

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Dr. M. A. El-Sayed Department of Chemistry University of California, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California 90024	1	Dr. M. Rauhut Chemical Research Division American Cyanamid Company Bound Brook, New Jersey 08805	1
Dr. E. R. Bernstein Department of Chemistry Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado 80521	1	Dr. J. I. Zink Department of Chemistry University of California, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California 90024	1
Dr. C. A. Heller Naval Weapons Code 6059 China Lake, California 93555	1	Dr. D. M. Burland IBM San Jose Research Center 5600 Cottle Road San Jose, California 95143	1
Dr. J. R. MacDonald Chemistry Division Naval Research Laboratory Code 6110 Washington, D.C. 20375	1	Dr. John Cooper Code 6130 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375	1
Dr. G. B. Schuster Chemistry Department University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois 61801	1	Dr. William M Jackson Department of Chemistry Howard University Washington, D.C. 20059	1
Dr. A. Adamson Department of Chemistry University of Southern California Los Angeles, California 90007	1	Dr. George E. Valrafen Department of Chemistry Howard University Washington, D.C. 20059	1
Dr. M. S. Wrighton Department of Chemistry Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	1	Dr. Joe Brandelik AFWAL/AADO-1 Wright Patterson AFB Fairborn, Ohio 45433	1
Dr. A. Paul Schaap Department of Chemistry Wayne State University Detroit, Michigan 49207	1	Dr. Gary Bjorklund IBM 5600 Cottle Road San Jose, California 95143	1
		Dr. Carmen Ortiz Cousejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas Serrano 117 Madrid 6, Spain	1

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>		<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
Dr. Paul Delahay Department of Chemistry New York University New York, New York 10003	1	Dr. P. J. Hendra Department of Chemistry University of Southampton Southampton SO0 5NH United Kingdom	1
Dr. E. Yeager Department of Chemistry Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio 41106	1	Dr. Sam Perone Chemistry & Materials Science Department Laurence Livermore National Lab. Livermore, California 94550	1
Dr. D. N. Bennion Department of Chemical Engineering Brigham Young University Provo, Utah 84602	1	Dr. Royce W. Murray Department of Chemistry University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514	1
Dr. R. A. Marcus Department of Chemistry California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California 91125	1	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Technical Library San Diego, California 92152	1
Dr. J. J. Auburn Bell Laboratories Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974	1	Dr. C. E. Mueller The Electrochemistry Branch Materials Division, Research and Technology Department Naval Surface Weapons Center White Oak Laboratory Silver Spring, Maryland 20910	1
Dr. Adam Heller Bell Laboratories Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974	1	Dr. G. Goodman Johnson Controls 5757 North Green Bay Avenue Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201	1
Dr. T. Katan Lockheed Missiles and Space Co., Inc. P. O. Box 504 Sunnyvale, California 94088	1	Dr. J. Boechler Electrochimica Corporation Attn: Technical Library 2485 Charleston Road Mountain View, California 94040	1
Dr. Joseph Singer, Code 302-1 NASA-Lewis 21000 Brookpark Road Cleveland, Ohio 44135	1	Dr. P. P. Schmidt Department of Chemistry Oakland University Rochester, Michigan 48063	1
Dr. B. Brummer EIC Incorporated 55 Chapel Street Newton, Massachusetts 02158	1		
Library P. R. Mallory and Company, Inc. Northwest Industrial Park Burlington, Massachusetts 01803	1		

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Dr. H. Richtol Chemistry Department Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York 12181	1	Dr. R. P. Van Duyne Department of Chemistry Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1
Dr. A. B. Ellis Chemistry Department University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin 53706	1	Dr. B. Stanley Pons Department of Chemistry University of Alberta Edmonton, Alberta CANADA T6G 2G2	1
Dr. M. Wrighton Chemistry Department Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139		Dr. Michael J. Weaver Department of Chemistry Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48824	1
Larry E. Plew Naval Weapons Support Center Code 30736, Building 2906 Crane, Indiana 47522	1	Dr. R. David Rauh EIC Corporation 55 Chapel Street Newton, Massachusetts 02158	1
S. Ruby DOE (STOR) 600 E Street Providence, Rhode Island 02192	1	Dr. J. David Margerum Research Laboratories Division Hughes Aircraft Company 3011 Malibu Canyon Road Malibu, California 90265	1
Dr. Aaron Wold Brown University Department of Chemistry Providence, Rhode Island 02192	1	Dr. Martin Fleischmann Department of Chemistry University of Southampton Southampton 509 5NH England	1
Dr. R. C. Chudacek McGraw-Edison Company Edison Battery Division Post Office Box 28 Bloomfield, New Jersey 07003	1	Dr. Janet Osteryoung Department of Chemistry State University of New York at Buffalo Buffalo, New York 14214	1
Dr. A. J. Bard University of Texas Department of Chemistry Austin, Texas 78712	1	Dr. R. A. Osteryoung Department of Chemistry State University of New York at Buffalo Buffalo, New York 14214	1
Dr. M. M. Nicholson Electronics Research Center Rockwell International 3370 Miraloma Avenue Anaheim, California	1		

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>		<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
Dr. Donald W. Ernst Naval Surface Weapons Center Code R-33 White Oak Laboratory Silver Spring, Maryland 20910	1	Mr. James R. Moden Naval Underwater Systems Center Code 3632 Newport, Rhode Island 02840	1
Dr. R. Nowak Naval Research Laboratory Code 6130 Washington, D.C. 20375	1	Dr. Bernard Spielvogel U. S. Army Research Office P. O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709	1
Dr. John F. Houlihan Shenango Valley Campus Pennsylvania State University Sharon, Pennsylvania 16146	1	Dr. Denton Elliott Air Force Office of Scientific Research Bolling AFB Washington, D.C. 20332	1
Dr. D. F. Shriver Department of Chemistry Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1	Dr. David Aikens Chemistry Department Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York 12181	1
Dr. D. H. Whitmore Department of Materials Science Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1	Dr. A. P. B. Lever Chemistry Department York University Downsview, Ontario M3J1P3 Canada	1
Dr. Alan Bewick Department of Chemistry The University Southampton, SO9 5NH England		Dr. Stanislaw Szapak Naval Ocean Systems Center Code 6343 San Diego, California 95152	1
Dr. A. Himy NAVSEA-5433 NC #4 2541 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, Virginia 20362		Dr. Gregory Farrington Department of Materials Science and Engineering University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104	
Dr. John Kincaid Department of the Navy Strategic Systems Project Office Room 901 Washington, D.C. 20376		Dr. Bruce Dunn Department of Engineering & Applied Science University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>		<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
M. L. Robertson Manager, Electrochemical and Power Sonics Division Naval Weapons Support Center Crane, Indiana 47522	1	Dr. T. Marks Department of Chemistry Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1
Dr. Elton Cairns Energy & Environment Division Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory University of California Berkeley, California 94720	1	Dr. D. Cipris Allied Corporation P. O. Box 3000R Morristown, New Jersey 07960	1
Dr. Micha Tomkiewicz Department of Physics Brooklyn College Brooklyn, New York 11210	1	Dr. M. Philpot IBM Corporation 5600 Cottle Road San Jose, California 95193	1
Dr. Lesser Blum Department of Physics University of Puerto Rico Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00931	1	Dr. Donald Sandstrom Washington State University Department of Physics Pullman, Washington 99164	1
Dr. Joseph Gordon, II IBM Corporation K33/281 5600 Cottle Road San Jose, California 95193	1	Dr. Carl Kannewurf Northwestern University Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Evanston, Illinois 60201	1
Dr. Robert Somoano Jet Propulsion Laboratory California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California 91103	1	Dr. Edward Fletcher University of Minnesota Department of Mechanical Engineering Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455	1
Dr. Johann A. Joebstl USA Mobility Equipment R&D Command DRDME-EC Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060	1	Dr. John Fontanella U.S. Naval Academy Department of Physics Annapolis, Maryland 21402	1
Dr. Judith H. Ambrus NASA Headquarters M.S. RTS-6 Washington, D.C. 20546	1	Dr. Martha Greenblatt Rutgers University Department of Chemistry New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903	1
Dr. Albert R. Landgrebe U.S. Department of Energy M.S. 6B025 Forrestal Building Washington, D.C. 20595	1	Dr. John Wassib Kings Mountain Specialties P. O. Box 1173 Kings Mountain, North Carolina 28086	1

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
Dr. J. J. Brophy University of Utah Department of Physics Salt Lake City, Utah 84112	1	
Dr. Walter Roth Department of Physics State University of New York Albany, New York 12222	1	
Dr. Thomas Davis National Bureau of Standards Polymer Science and Standards Division Washington, D.C. 20234	1	
Dr. Charles Martin Department of Chemistry Texas A&M University	1	
Dr. Anthony Sammells Institute of Gas Technology 3424 South State Street Chicago, Illinois 60616	1	
Dr. H. Tachikawa Department of Chemistry Jackson State University Jackson, Mississippi 39217	1	
Dr. W. M. Risen Department of Chemistry Brown University Providence, Rhode Island	1	

END

FILMED

9-83

DTIC