Synthesis, crystal structure, infrared spectrum, and thermal properties of [Ni(1,10-phenanthroline)₃](fumarate)·9H₂O complex with hydrogen bonded supramolecular layers involving fumarate anions

Anna Uhrinová^{a, b}, Juraj Černák^a

^aDepartment of Inorganic Chemistry, Institute of Chemistry, P. J. Šafárik University in Košice, Moyzesova 11, 041 54 Košice, Slovakia ^bDepartment of Chemistry, Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of Veterinary Medicine and Pharmacy in Košice, Komenského 73, 041 81 Košice, Slovakia

juraj.cernak@upjs.sk

Abstract: From the aqueous-ethanolic system $Ni(OH)_2-H_3fum-phen$ (H_3fum = fumaric acid, *phen* = 1,10-phenanthroline), novel complex $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 9H_2O$ (1) was isolated and characterized by chemical analyses and FT-IR spectroscopy. Results of single crystal X-ray structure analysis have shown that the ionic crystal structure of 1 is built of $[Ni(phen)_3]^{2+}$ complex cations, fumarate dianions and nine crystallographically independent water molecules of crystallization. The Ni(II) atom exhibits hexa-coordination by three *phen* ligands with mean Ni-N bond length of 2.090 Å. Water molecules form hydrophilic supramolecular layers with fumarate dianions via extended network of $O-H \cdots O$ type hydrogen bonds with $O \cdots O$ distances from the range of 2.676(2)–2. 916(2) Å; hydrophobic complex cations are embedded between these layers. Thermal study of 1 has shown that endothermic dehydration in the temperature range of 95–195 °C takes at least two steps of the process.

Graphical Abstract: Crystal structure of $[Ni(phen)_3]fum \cdot 9H_2O$ (*phen* = 1,10-phenanthroline; H_2fum = fumaric acid) which is built of supramolecular layers formed by hydrogen bonded water solvate molecules and *fum* dianions and between the supramolecular layers embedded $[Ni(phen)_3]^{2+}$ complex cations is described here.



Keywords: Nickel(II), fumarato ligand, crystal structure, hydrogen bond, thermal analysis

Introduction

Fumarate dianion is a versatile ligand exhibiting, due to four potentially donor oxygen atoms, a large number of bonding possibilities ranging from terminal to various bridging modes of coordination. However, it can also act simply as a counter ion (Oldham, 1987; Zheng et al., 2003; Devereux et al., 2000, Bora and Das, 2012; Téllez-López et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2009). The ability of fumarate dianion to link magnetically active central atoms was used in synthetic design of magnetically interesting low-dimensional complexes (Téllez-López et al., 2015; Neuman et al., 2014; Téllez-López et al., 2014); in order to obtain low-dimensional systems, it is necessary to block some coordination sites of the central atom with suitable blocking ligands, e.g. with aromatic N,Nchelates like *phen* or *bpy* (*phen* = 1,10-phenanthroline;

bpy=2,2'-bipyridine). Previously, using this approach, [Ni(phen)(fum)] (Černák et al., 2009) and $[Ni(H_2O)]$ (*phen*)(*fum*)]_n complexes were isolated from systems Ni(II)-phen-fum (H₂fum = fumaric acid) and characterized (Uhrinová et al., 2012). Surprisingly, to our knowledge, only two complexes from these systems have been structurally characterized up to now, namely $[Ni_2(phen)_4(fum)(H_2O)_2](fum) \cdot 16H_2O$ containing a dinuclear complex cation (Ma et al., 2003) and ionic $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 2H_2 fum \cdot 4H_2O$ with solvate molecules of fumaric acid (Lin and Zheng, 2004). Within a deeper study of low-dimensional Ni(II) complexes (Černák et al., 2009; Čerák et al., 2015; Vráblová et al., 2016), system Ni(II)-phen-fum was added to our research. As the result of our experiments, the title complex **1** was isolated in single crystal form in case of full occupancy of the coordination sites around the Ni(II) central atom by blocking ligand (3x phen)

and its synthesis, IR spectroscopic characterization and crystal structure as well as its thermal properties are reported here.

Experimental

Materials

Nickel(II) hydroxide, Ni(OH)₂, fumaric acid, $C_4H_4O_4$ (H_2fum), 1,10-phenantroline, aqueous ammonia (25 %) and ethanol (96 %) were purchased from commercial sources and used as received.

Synthesis of $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 9H_2O(1)$

Fumaric acid, 232 mg (2 mmol), was dissolved in 15 cm³ of ethanol (96 % vv). To the formed solution, 2 mmol of freshly prepared precipitate of Ni(OH)₂ and 1180 mg (6 mmol) of solid 1,10phenantroline (*phen*) were added under stirring. The resulting red solution was filtered and left aside for crystallization at room temperature. Within a few days, red platelets formed on the surface of the mother liquor, these were collected and dried in air. Yield: 6 %

Anal. Calc. for $C_{40}H_{44}Ni_1N_6O_{13}$ (Mr = 875.51) (%): C, 54.88; H, 5.07; N, 9.60; Ni, 6.70. Found: C, 54.64; H, 4.98; N, 9.55; Ni, 6.69.

IR (cm⁻¹; s = strong, m = medium, w = weak, vs = very strong, sh = shoulder): 3405vs, 3037w, 2990w, 1639w, 1625w, 1578vs, 1516s, 1495wsh, 1425vs, 1397s, 1340wsh, 1306w, 1257vw, 1225m, 1143m, 1104m, 1010m, 955w, 868sh, 846s, 812m, 774w, 725s, 667w, 643w, 576w.

Physical measurements

Elemental analyses (C, H, N) were performed on a CHNS Elemental Analyzer Flash EA 1112 Thermo Finnigan. Nickel content was estimated using the AAS method (Varian Spectr AA-30).

Infrared spectra were recorded on a FT-IR Avatar 330 Thermo-Nicolet instrument using the KBr pellets technique (2 : 200) in the range of 4000-400 cm⁻¹.

Thermal analysis was performed on a NETZSCH STA 409 PC instrument using ceramic crucibles. Measurements were carried out under dynamic conditions (heating rate was 9 deg/min) in air atmosphere in the temperature range of 25–900 °C.

X-ray Crystallography

Single crystal X-ray experiments on 1 were carried out on an IPDS Stoe diffractometer equipped with an imaging plate area detector system with graphite-monochromatized MoK α radiation ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å) at 100 K. Rotation method data acquisition using ω scans was used. Structure was solved by direct methods and further refined using the SHELXS-97 (Sheldrick, 2008) and SHELXL-2014/7 programs (Sheldrick, 2015) incorporated in the WinGX program package (Farrugia, 2012). Hydrogen atoms in the phen ligands and fum dianion were placed in the calculated positions and allowed to ride on the parent atoms with isotropic thermal parameters tied with the thermal motion of the parent atoms (U(H) = 1.2U(CH)). Isotropic thermal parameters of water hydrogen atoms were tied with thermal parameters of the parent oxygen atom (U(H) = 1.5 U(O)), other positional parameters of these hydrogen atoms were allowed to refine freely. Structural figures were drawn using the Diamond software (Brandenburg and Putz, 2008). Crystal data and final parameters of the structure refinement are summarized in Table 1, selected geometric parameters are presented in Table 2 while possible hydrogen bonds are given in Table 3.

Tab. 1. Crystal data and structure refinement for 1.

Empirical formulaC40 H44 N6 Ni O13Formula weight875.52Crystal systemmonoclinicSpace group $P2_1/c$ Unit cell dimensions: $P2_1/c$ $a(Å)$ 10.9212(12) $b(Å)$ 20.6837(17) $c(Å)$ 18.348(2) $\beta(°)$ 96.505(13)Z4 $V(Å^3)$ 4118.0(7) D_{calc} (g·cm ⁻³)1.412T (K)100(2) μ (mm ⁻¹)0.544Index ranges for data collection $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection $2.12-27.00$ Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R_{in}) $8975/0.595$ Observed reflections $[I \ge 2\sigma(I)]$ 6475 Data/restrains/parameters $8975/0.595$ Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices $[I \ge 2\sigma(I)]$ $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$		
Formula weight875.52Crystal systemmonoclinicSpace group $P2_1/c$ Unit cell dimensions: $P2_1/c$ $a(Å)$ 10.9212(12) $b(Å)$ 20.6837(17) $c(Å)$ 8.348(2) $\beta(°)$ 96.505(13)Z4 $V(Å^3)$ 4118.0(7) D_{calc} (g·cm ⁻³)1.412T (K)100(2) μ (mm ⁻¹)0.544Index ranges for data collection $-23 \le k \le 26$ $e^{3} \le k \le 26$ $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection 8975 (0.0341)Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R_{in}) 8975 (0.595Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness0.999Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³)0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	Empirical formula	C40 H44 N6 Ni O13
Crystal system monoclinic Space group $P2_1/c$ Unit cell dimensions: $10.9212(12)$ $a(Å)$ $10.9212(12)$ $b(Å)$ $20.6837(17)$ $c(Å)$ $18.348(2)$ $\beta(°)$ $96.505(13)$ Z 4 $V(Å^3)$ $4118.0(7)$ $D_{calc.}$ (g·cm ⁻³) 1.412 $T(K)$ $100(2)$ μ (mm ⁻¹) 0.544 Index ranges for data collection $-23 \le k \le 26$ μ ange for data collection $2.12-27.00$ Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R_{int}) $8975(0.0341)$ Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] 6475 Data/restrains/parameters $8975/0/595$ Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$	Formula weight	875.52
Space group $P2_1/c$ Unit cell dimensions: a a (Å) $10.9212(12)$ b (Å) $20.6837(17)$ c (Å) $18.348(2)$ β (°) $96.505(13)$ Z 4 V (Å ³) $4118.0(7)$ D_{calc} (g·cm ⁻³) 1.412 T (K) $100(2)$ μ (mm ⁻¹) 0.544 Index ranges for data collection $-23 \le k \le 26$ β range for data collection $2.12-27.00$ Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R _{in}) 8975 (0.0341) Observed reflections $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$ 6475 Data/restrains/parameters $8975/0/595$ Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$ $R_1 = 0.0344$, $wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548$, $wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e, Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$	Crystal system	monoclinic
Unit cell dimensions: a (Å)10.9212(12) b (Å)20.6837(17) c (Å)18.348(2) β (°)96.505(13) Z 4 V (Å ³)4118.0(7) D_{calc} (g·cm ⁻³)1.412 T (K)100(2) μ (mm ⁻¹)0.544Index ranges for data collection $-23 \le h \le 26$ $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collectionReflections collected31894Independent reflections (R_{in})8975 (0.0341)Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$]6475Data/restrains/parameters8975/0/595Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344$, $wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548$, $wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness0.999Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³)0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	Space group	<i>P</i> 2 ₁ /c
a (Å)10.9212(12) b (Å)20.6837(17) c (Å)18.348(2) β (°)96.505(13) Z 4 V (Å ³)4118.0(7) $D_{calc.}$ (g·cm ⁻³)1.412 T (K)100(2) μ (mm ⁻¹)0.544Index ranges for data collection $-13 \le h \le 13$ $-23 \le k \le 26$ $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection2.12–27.00Reflections collected31894Independent reflections (R_{int})8975 (0.0341)Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$]6475Data/restrains/parameters8975/0/595Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344$, $wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548$, $wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness0.999Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³)0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	Unit cell dimensions:	
b (Å) $20.6837(17)$ c (Å) $18.348(2)$ β (°) $96.505(13)$ Z 4 V (Å ³) $4118.0(7)$ D_{calc} (g·cm ⁻³) 1.412 T (K) $100(2)$ μ (mm ⁻¹) 0.544 Index ranges for data collection $-13 \le h \le 13$ $-23 \le k \le 26$ $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection $2.12-27.00$ Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R_{int}) $8975(0.0341)$ Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] 6475 Data/restrains/parameters $8975/0/595$ Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344$, $wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548$, $wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$	$a(\text{\AA})$	10.9212(12)
c (Å)18.348(2) β (°)96.505(13)Z4 V (Å ³)4118.0(7) D_{calc} (g·cm ⁻³)1.412T (K)100(2) μ (mm ⁻¹)0.544Index ranges for data collection $-13 \le h \le 13$ $-23 \le k \le 26$ $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection $2.12-27.00$ Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R_{int}) 8975 (0.0341)Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] 6475 Data/restrains/parameters $8975/0/595$ Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344$, $wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548$, $wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$	b (Å)	20.6837(17)
β (°)96.505(13)Z4 $V(Å^3)$ 4118.0(7) $D_{calc.}$ (g·cm ⁻³)1.412T (K)100(2) μ (mm ⁻¹)0.544Index ranges for data collection $-13 \le h \le 13$ $-23 \le k \le 26$ $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection2.12-27.00Reflections collected31894Independent reflections (R_{int})8975 (0.0341)Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$]6475Data/restrains/parameters8975/0/595Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344$, $wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548$, $wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness0.999Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³)0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	c (Å)	18.348(2)
Z4 $V(Å^3)$ 4118.0(7) D_{calc} (g·cm ⁻³)1.412T (K)100(2) μ (mm ⁻¹)0.544Index ranges for data collection $-13 \le h \le 13$ $-23 \le k \le 26$ $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection2.12-27.00Reflections collected31894Independent reflections (R _{in})8975 (0.0341)Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$]6475Data/restrains/parameters8975/0/595Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness0.999Largest peak and hole (e,Å ⁻³)0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	β (°)	96.505(13)
$V(Å^3)$ 4118.0(7) $D_{calc.} (g \cdot cm^{-3})$ 1.412 $T(K)$ 100(2) μ (mm ⁻¹)0.544Index ranges for data collection $-13 \le h \le 13$ $-23 \le k \le 26$ $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection2.12-27.00Reflections collected31894Independent reflections (R_{int})8975 (0.0341)Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$]6475Data/restrains/parameters8975/0/595Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness0.999Largest peak and hole (e.Å^-3)0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	Z	4
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$V(Å^3)$	4118.0(7)
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	$D_{\text{calc.}} (\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{cm}^{-3})$	1.412
$\begin{array}{lll} \mu \mbox{ (mm^{-1})} & 0.544 \\ 1ndex ranges for data collection & -13 \le h \le 13 \\ -23 \le h \le 26 \\ -23 \le l \le 23 \\ 0 = 23 \le 23 \le l \le 23 \\ 0 = 23 \le 23 \le 23 \le 23 \le 23 \\ 0 = 23 \le 23$	T (K)	100(2)
Index ranges for data collection $-13 \le h \le 13$ $-23 \le k \le 26$ $-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection $2.12-27.00$ Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R_{int}) 8975 (0.0341) Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] 6475 Data/restrains/parameters $8975/0/595$ Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$	$\mu (mm^{-1})$	0.544
$\begin{array}{ll} -23 \leq k \leq 26 \\ -23 \leq l \leq 23 \\ \theta \text{ range for data collection} & 2.12-27.00 \\ \text{Reflections collected} & 31894 \\ \text{Independent reflections (R_{int})} & 8975 (0.0341) \\ \text{Observed reflections } [I > 2\sigma(I)] & 6475 \\ \text{Data/restrains/parameters} & 8975/0/595 \\ \text{Goodness-of-fit on } F^2 & 0.938 \\ \text{Final R indices $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$} & R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782 \\ R$ indices (all data)$} & R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840 \\ \text{Data completeness} & 0.999 \\ \text{Largest peak and hole (e.Å^{-3})} & 0.39(5) \text{ and } -0.39(5) \\ \end{array}$	Index ranges for data collection	$-13 \le h \le 13$
$-23 \le l \le 23$ θ range for data collection $2.12-27.00$ Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R_{int}) $8975 (0.0341)$ Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] 6475 Data/restrains/parameters $8975/0/595$ Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$		$-23 \le k \le 26$
θ range for data collection $2.12-27.00$ Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R_{int}) $8975 (0.0341)$ Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] 6475 Data/restrains/parameters $8975/0/595$ Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$		$-23 \le l \le 23$
Reflections collected 31894 Independent reflections (R_{int}) 8975 (0.0341) Observed reflections [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] 6475 Data/restrains/parameters 8975/0/595 Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices [$I > 2\sigma(I)$] $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) 0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	θ range for data collection	2.12-27.00
Independent reflections (R_{int}) 8975 (0.0341) Observed reflections $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$ 6475 Data/restrains/parameters 8975/0/595 Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$ $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) 0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	Reflections collected	31894
Observed reflections $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$ 6475 Data/restrains/parameters 8975/0/595 Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$ $R_1 = 0.0344$, $wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548$, $wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) 0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	Independent reflections (R _{int})	8975 (0.0341)
Data/restrains/parameters $8975/0/595$ Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$ $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$	Observed reflections $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$	6475
Goodness-of-fit on F^2 0.938 Final R indices $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$ $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) 0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	Data/restrains/parameters	8975/0/595
Final R indices $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$ $R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$ R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å-3) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$	Goodness-of-fit on F^2	0.938
R indices (all data) $R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$ Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) 0.39(5) and -0.39(5)	Final R indices $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$	$R_1 = 0.0344, wR_2 = 0.0782$
Data completeness 0.999 Largest peak and hole (e.Å-3) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$	R indices (all data)	$R_1 = 0.0548, wR_2 = 0.0840$
Largest peak and hole (e.Å ⁻³) $0.39(5)$ and $-0.39(5)$	Data completeness	0.999
	Largest peak and hole (e.Å-3)	0.39(5) and -0.39(5)

Results and Discussion

Synthesis and identification

From the aqueous-ethanolic system Ni^{2+} —*phen*—*fum*, under mild conditions, single crystals of $[Ni(phen)_3]$ $fum \cdot 9H_2O$ (1) were isolated and chemically characterized. Similar experimental conditions were used to prepare $[Ni_2(phen)_4(fum)(H_2O)_2]fum \cdot 16H_2O$ (Ma et al., 2003) and $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 2H_2fum \cdot 4H_2O$ (Lin and Zheng, 2004). The formed mother liquor exhibited a tendency towards jellification, so the formed crystals were separated immediately after their appearance which led to low yield of the product.

Spectroscopic characterization

Characteristic absorption bands in the IR spectrum of 1 (Fig. 1) were observed at 1578 and 1397 cm^{-1} ; these were ascribed to the asymmetric and symmetric carboxylate stretching vibrations ν (COO) according to literature (Nakamoto, 1997). In the IR spectrum of the analogous complex $[Ni(en)_3]$ $(fum) \cdot 3H_2O$ with ionic bonding of the fum²⁻ dianion, the corresponding absorption bands were found at very similar values of 1583 and 1395 cm⁻¹ (Padmanabhan et al., 2008). The calculated value of $\Delta = 181 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ($\Delta = \nu_{as}(\text{COO}) - \nu_s(\text{COO})$) for **1** is in line with the corresponding value of 188 cm⁻¹ found for $[Ni(en)_3](fum) \cdot 3H_2O$ (Padmanabhan et al., 2008), suggesting that the dicarboxylate dianion acts only as a counter ion; this was later corroborated by the results of X-ray structure analyses (see below). The well identifiable shoulder positioned at 3037 cm⁻¹ can be assigned to ν (C_{ar}—H) stretching vibrations due to the presence of aromatic rings. In the analogous complex $[Ni(phen)_2]_2[Ni(mnt)_2]_3 \cdot 2DMF$ (mnt = 1,2-dicyanovinylene-1,2-dithiolato, DMF = N,N-dimethylformamide), the corresponding weak band was observed at 3063 cm⁻¹ (Wang et al., 2004). The broad strong absorption band observed around 3405 cm⁻¹ corresponds well to ν (OH) stretching vibrations for hydrogen bonded solvate water

molecules. The IR spectrum of **1** below 1300 cm⁻¹ is rich mainly due to the presence of *phen* ligands and unambiguous assignment of the observed bands to various types of vibrations is difficult.

Crystal structure of $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 9H_2O$

Ionic crystal structure of $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 9H_2O$ (1) consists of $[Ni(phen)_3]^{2+}$ complex cation, fumarato dianion and nine crystallographically independent molecules of crystal water (Fig. 2). Within the complex cation,

Tab. 2. Selected geometric parameters [Å, °] for $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 9H_2O.$

Nil—N1	2.0822(14)	O4—C40	1.249(2)
Ni1—N2	2.0888(14)	C38—C37	1.499(2)
Nil—N3	2.0965(14)	C38—C39	1.317(2)
Nil—N4	2.0782(14)	C39—C40	1.502(2)
Nil—N5	2.1167(14)	N1—Ni1—N2	80.09(6)
Ni1—N6	2.0802(14)	N3—Ni1—N4	79.78(5)
O1—C37	1.253(2)	N5—Ni1—N6	79.61(5)
O2—C37	1.250(2)	O1—C37—O2	124.66(16)
O3—C40	1.253(2)	O3—C40—O4	125.52(17)

the Ni(II) central atom is hexacoordinated by six nitrogen atoms from three chelate bonded *phen* molecules. Although the complex cation is chiral, both enantiomers are present in the crystal structure due to its centrosymmetric character. The same complex cation was found in analogous complexes $[Ni(phen)_3](succBr_2) \cdot 7H_2O$ $(H_2(succBr_2) = 2,3$ -dibromosuccinic acid) (Li et al., 2005) or $[Ni(phen)_2(phen-dione)][Ni(phen)_3]$



Fig. 1. FT-IR spectrum of $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 9H_2O$.



Fig. 2. Structure of $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 9H_2O$ with atoms numbering scheme. Thermal ellipsoids are drawn at the 30 % probability level. Hydrogen atoms from *phen* ligand are omitted for clarity.

 $(PF_6)_4 \cdot CH_3CN$ (phen-dione = 1,10-phenanthroline-5,6-dione) (Hadadzadeh et al., 2012). The Ni-N bonds in 1 are within the range of 2.0782(14)-2.1167(14) Å (Table 2). Similar ranges for Ni-N bonds, 2.082(4)-2.194(5) Å and 2.081(6)-2.137(7), were reported for the already mentioned $[Ni(phen)_3](succBr_2) \cdot 7H_2O$ (Li et al., 2005) and $[Ni(phen)_2(phen-dione)][Ni(phen)_3](PF_6)_4 \cdot CH_3CN$ (Hadadzadeh et al., 2012), respectively. Fumarate dianion acts as a counter ion and its carboxylate groups are somewhat twisted out of the plane formed by the four carbon atoms C37-C40 as it can be seen from the values of the torsion angles O1-C37-C38-C39 and O3-C40-C39-C38, -172.93(1) and -159.45(1)°, respectively; this deviation from the planarity may reflect the tendency

to maximize the formation of hydrogen bonds (see below). The remaining geometric parameters of **1** correspond well to those observed of $[Ni(phen)_3]$ (*fum*) $\cdot 2H_2fum \cdot 4H_2O$ (Lin and Zheng, 2004).

An outstanding feature of the presented structure **1** is the formation of a 2D supramolecular structure perpendicular to the *a* axis built of O—H···O type hydrogen bonds; fumarate dianions together with nine crystallographically independent solvate water molecules are involved in this structure (Figs. 3 and 4, Table 3). Within the hydrogen bonded layers, ten different hydrogen bonded ring systems can be distinguished and these can be described using the graph-set analysis (Bernstein et al., 1995); descriptors for the respective ring systems are (see also Fig. 3) : *R1*: $R_4^4(13)$, *R2*: $R_5^3(10)$, *R3*: $R_4^3(10)$,



Fig. 3. A part of hydrogen bonded supramolecular layers in **1**. Symmetry codes: i: x, 1/2 - y, z - 1/2; ii: 1 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z; iii: 1 - x, 1 - y, 2 - z; iv: x, 1/2 - y, 1/2 + z; v: 1 - x, y - 1/2, 3/2 - z; vi: 1 - x, y + 1/2, 3/2 - z.



Fig. 4. Approximate crystal structure of 1 along b axis showing the hydrogen bonded hydrophilic host part of the structure (red balls are oxygen atoms, black balls are carbon atoms, brown lines are O—H···O hydrogen bonds) and embedded hydrophobic guest part of the structure formed by [Ni(phen)₃]²⁺ complex cations (light green octahedrons).

R4: $R_5^4(10)$, *R5*: $R_4^4(13)$, *R6*: $R_4^4(10)$, *R7*: $R_4^4(10)$, *R8*: $R_6^5(12)$, *R9*: $R_4^4(8)$, *R10*: $R_4^4(8)$. Similarly hydrogen bonded supramolecular layers with auxiliary anionic species were observed in $[Ni(bpy)_3]Cl_2 \cdot 5.5H_2O$ (bpy=2,2'-bipyridine; chloride anions are involved as anionic species) (Ruiz-Pérez et al., 2002), $[Ni(bpy)_3]$ [Cu(CN)₃] · 4.5H₂O (tricyanidocuprate(2-) anions are the anionic species) (Kočanová et al., 2010) or in $[Ni(phen)_3](HB)_2 \cdot 7H_2O$ (HB⁻ = diphenylglycolate; with HB⁻ anions as anionic species) (Covelo

et al., 2008). As a consequence of the formed supramolecular layers in **1**, the title compound can be viewed as a host-guest (HG) system in which the hydrophilic host part of the structure is built of hydrogen bonded water solvate molecules and fumarate dianions, while hydrophobic $[Ni(phen)_3]^{2+}$ complex cations as guest species are enclosed between the formed layers (Fig. 4). The presented crystal structure thus displays some similarity with the well-know Hofmann-type clathrates in which

$D - H \cdots A$	D—H	$H \cdots A$	$D \cdots A$	$D \!\!-\!\! H \! \cdots \! A$
O5—H51···O12	0.84(4)	1.93(4)	2.747(2)	162(4)
O5—H52···O13	0.84 (4)	1.93(4)	2.771(2)	173(3)
$O6 - H61 \cdots O5^i$	0.83(3)	1.86(3)	2.685(2)	177(3)
$O6-H62\cdots O8^{ii}$	0.87(3)	1.91(3)	2.775(2)	172(3)
$O7$ — $H71 \cdots O10^{iii}$	0.79(3)	2.04(3)	2.824(2)	172(3)
$O7$ — $H72 \cdots O11^{iii}$	0.90(3)	1.79(3)	2.676(2)	168(2)
O8—H81···O1	0.84(3)	1.87(3)	2.710(2)	177(3)
O8—H82···O6	0.79(3)	2.03(3)	2.803(2)	171(3)
O9—H91···O4	0.79(3)	2.04(3)	2.828(2)	175(3)
$O9$ — $H92 \cdots O6^{ii}$	0.90(3)	2.01(4)	2.900(3)	173(3)
O10—H101···O4	0.87(3)	1.87(3)	2.728(2)	170(3)
O10—H102···O7	0.86(3)	1.93(3)	2.776(2)	169(2)
$O11 - H112 \cdots O2^{iv}$	0.79(3)	2.00(3)	2.788(2)	174(3)
O11—H111O3	0.84(3)	1.93(3)	2.766(2)	175(3)
O12—H121O3	0.88(3)	1.87(3)	2.741(2)	177(3)
$O12$ —H122 $\cdots O1^{iv}$	0.78(3)	2.00(3)	2.781(2)	178(3)
O13—H131···O2	0.80(3)	2.01(3)	2.812(2)	177(3)
$O13H132\cdots O10^{v}$	0.84(3)	2.08(3)	2.916(2)	176(3)

Tab. 3. Possible hydrogen bonds in 1 [Å, °].

Symmetry codes: i: x, 1/2 - y, z - 1/2; ii: 1 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z; iii: 1 - x, 1 - y, 2 - z; iv: x, 1/2 - y, 1/2 + z; v: 1 - x, y - 1/2, 3/2 - z.

the aromatic guest molecules are enclosed between the cyanidometallate layers (Iwamoto, 1996). Additional much weaker hydrogen bonding interactions of the C—H···O type (C···O distances are from the range of 3.2040(4)–3.4555(4) Å and C—H···O angles are from the range of 138– 166°) link complex cations with the solvate water molecules.

Thermal analysis

Thermal curves of 1 are shown in Fig. 5. From the TG curve it follows that decomposition starts at 95 °C. The observed weight loss of 17.5 % in the temperature range of 95-195 °C corresponds well to the complete dehydration of 1 (calculated 18.5 % for nine water molecules from the formula unit). The DTA curve suggests that the observed dehydration is formed of three weak endothermic processes. Endothermic dehydration of the analogous complex $[Ni(en)_3](fum) \cdot 3H_2O$ occurred in the similar temperature range of 90-165 °C (Padmanabhan et al., 2008) while [Ni(fum)] · 4H₂O dehydrates at somewhat higher temperature from the range of 130-225 °C (Randhawa and Kaur, 2007). On the TG curve of 1 after its dehydration, a plateau in the temperature range of 195-220 °C can be seen; which is accompanied by a weak exothermic peak on the DTA curve at 210 °C suggesting a possible phase transition. The second mass loss of 21.7 % was observed in the temperature range of 200-290 °C; this weight loss corresponds well to the release of one *phen* ligand from the formula of 1 (calc. 20.6 %).

In the temperature range of 360–650 °C, a strongly exothermic process associated with the mass loss

of 52.4 % can be observed; the experimental mass loss corresponds well to the release (or decomposition) of the remaining organic part of the studied compound (calculated value is 54.2 %). The solid residue after thermal decomposition represents 8.4 % of the initial weight, which is in line with the assumed formation of NiO (calculated value is 8.5 %). The formation of NiO as the solid residue was also reported in case of thermal decomposition of [Ni(phen)(fum)] (Černák et al., 2009), $[Ni(fum)] \cdot 4H_2O$ (Randhawa and Kaur, 2007) and $[Ni(en)_3](fum) \cdot 3H_2O$ (Padmanabhan et al., 2008).

Conclusions

Complex $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 9H_2O$ was synthesized and chemically and spectroscopically characterized. Crystal structure of **1** is ionic and it is formed of $[Ni(phen)_3]^{2+}$ complex cations with a hexacoordinated Ni(II) atom, *fum* counter dianion and nine water molecules of crystallization. Water molecules and fum^{2-} dianions interact *via* hydrogen bonds forming a 2D supramolecular structure with complex cations embedded between the hydrophilic layers, which enables considering the presented crystal structure as a host-guest system built of hydrophilic hydrogen bonded host part and hydrophobic guest complex cations. A study of the thermal properties has shown that dehydration is the first step of thermal decomposition.

Supplementary materials

Crystallographic data for the compound have been deposited with the Cambridge Crystallo-



Fig. 5. Thermal curves for $[Ni(phen)_3](fum) \cdot 9H_2O$.

graphic Data Centre, CCDC 1542632. Copies of the information may be obtained free of charge from The Director, CCDC, 12 Union Road, Cambridge, CB21EZ, UK (fax: +44-1223-336033; e-mail: deposit@ccdc.cam.ac.uk or www: http:// www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Slovak grant agency VEGA (grant No. 1/0063/17). We thank prof. W. Massa from the Philipps-Universität in Marburg (Germany) for his kind permission to use the single crystal diffractometer. Anna Uhrinová thanks DAAD for financial support of her study stay in Marburg.

References

- Bernstein J, Davis RE, Shimoni L, Chang N-L (1995) Angew Chem Int Ed Engl 34: 1555–1573.
- Bora SJ, Das BK (2012) J Solid State Chem 192: 93-101.
- Brandenburg K, Putz H (2008) DIAMOND Crystal Impact (version 3.1f), GbR, Postfach 1251, D-53002 Bonn, Germany.
- Covelo B, Carballo R, Vásquez-López EM, Lago AB (2008) Synthesis and Reactivity in Inorganic, Metal-Organic and Nano-Metal Chemistry 38: 49–54.
- Černák J, Farkašová N, Tomás M, Kavečanský V, Čižmár E, Orendáč M (2015) J Coord Chem 68: 2788–2797.
- Černák J, Pavlová A, Orendáčová A, Kajňaková M, Kuchár J (2009) Polyhedron 28: 2893–2898.
- Devereux M, McCann M, Leon V, Geraghty M, McKee V, Wikaira J (2000) Polyhedron 19: 1205–1211.
- Farrugia LJ (2012) J Appl Crystallogr 45: 849-854.
- Hadadzadeh H, Mansouri G, Rezvani AR, Khavasi HR (2012) Chem Crystallogr 42: 486–493.
- Iwamoto T (1996) J Incl Phenom 24: 61-132.
- Kočanová I, Kuchár J, Orendáč M, Černák J (2010) Polyhedron 29: 3372–3379.
- Li D-X, Xu D-J, Xu Y-Z (2005) Acta Crystallogr E61: m471–m473.

- Lin JL, Zheng YQ (2004) Z Kristallogr–New Cryst Struct 219: 230–232.
- Ma JF, Yang J, Liu JF (2003) Acta Crystallogr E59: m900–m902.
- Nakamoto K (1997) Infrared and Raman Spectra of Inorganic and Coordination Compounds, Part B: Applications in Coordination, Organometallic, and Bioinorganic Chemistry, Wiley, New York.
- Neuman NI, Winkler E, Peña O, Passeggi MCG, Rizzi, AC, Brondino CD (2014) Inorg Chem 53: 2535–2544.
- Oldham C (1987) Carboxylates, Squarates and Related Species. In Wilkinson G, Gillard RD, McCleverty JA, editors. Comprehensive Coordination Chemistry. 1st ed. Pergamon Press, Oxford, UK: 2 (1987). pp. 435–460.
- Padmanabhan M, Joseph JC, Huang X, Li J (2008) J Mol Struct 885: 36–44.
- Randhawa BS, Kaur M (2007) J Therm Anal Calorim 89: 251–255.
- Ruiz-Pérez C, Lorenzo Luis PA, Lloret F, Julve M (2002) Inorg Chim Acta 336: 131–136.
- Sheldrick GM (2008) Acta Crystallogr A64: 112-122.
- Sheldrick GM (2015) Acta Crystallogr C71: 3-8.
- Téllez-López A, Jaramillo-García J, Martínez-Domínguez R, Morales-Luckie RA, Camacho-Lopez MA, Escudero R, Sánchez-Mendieta V (2015) Polyhedron 100: 373–381.
- Téllez-López A, Sánchez-Mendieta V, Jaramillo-García J, Rosales-Vázquez LD, García-Orozco I, Morales-Luckie RA, Escudero R, Morales-Leal F (2016) Trans Met Chem 41: 879–887.
- Uhrinová A, Kuchár J, Černák J (2012) Acta Crystallogr E68: m92–m93.
- Vráblová A, Falvello LR, Campo J, Miklovič J, Boča R, Černák J, Tomás M (2016) Eur J Inorg Chem 928–934.
- Wang CG, Peng ZH, Guo WY, Zhou YH, Cheng GZ (2004) J Mol Struct 702: 1–7.
- Zheng YQ, Lin JL, Chen BY (2003) J Mol Struct 646: 151–159.
- Zhang KL, Zhou F, Wu RT, Yang B, Ng SW (2009) Inorg Chim Acta 362: 4255–4259.