



Half-sandwich ruthenium(II) complexes containing O, N bidentate azo ligands: Synthesis, structure and their catalytic activity towards one-pot conversion of aldehydes to primary amides and transfer hydrogenation of ketones

Raja Nandhini, Galmari Venkatachalam*

PG & Research Department of Chemistry, Government Arts College, Dharmapuri, 636 705, Tamilnadu, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 23 March 2019
Received in revised form
15 May 2019
Accepted 17 May 2019
Available online 23 May 2019

Keywords:

Biphenylazo ligands
Ruthenium-*p*-Cymene complexes
Structure
Amidation reaction
Beckmann rearrangement
Catalytic transfer hydrogenation

ABSTRACT

The ruthenium(II) complexes of the general formula $[\text{Ru}(\eta^6\text{-}p\text{-cymene})(\text{Cl})(\text{L}_{1-5})]$ ($\text{L} = \text{O}$, N-donors of biphenylazo derivatives), formed by reacting 2-(biphenylazo)phenol (**HL**₁ – **HL**₄) and 1-(biphenylazo)naphthol ligands (**HL**₅) with $[\{\eta^6\text{-}p\text{-cymene}\text{RuCl}\}_2(\mu\text{-Cl})_2]$ have been synthesized. The compositions of the complexes have been established by IR, UV–Vis, ¹H NMR spectral methods and X-ray crystallography. The synthesized complex could act as an efficient, reusable homogeneous catalyst for transformation of aldehydes to the corresponding primary amides in the presence of $\text{NH}_2\text{OH}\cdot\text{HCl}$, thus resulting an expansion of Beckmann rearrangement. The effect of solvent, base, temperature, time, catalyst loading and recyclability was also investigated. They also effectively catalyze the transfer hydrogenation reaction of various ketones with 2-propanol.

© 2019 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Half-sandwich $\eta^6\text{-}p\text{-cymene}$ ruthenium complexes containing various ligands have played an important role in the development of modern organometallic chemistry. They have attracted an enormous interest due to their potential applications in catalytic activity in wide range of organic reactions [1,2] and also display promising anti-cancer activity [3,4]. Current interest in the organometallic chemistry of ruthenium(II) complexes lies in the development of the new catalytic system for different organic transformations such as oxidation [5–7], transfer hydrogenation reactions [8–11], amide conversion [12,13], reduction of nitro compounds [14–16] etc.

The development of efficient methods for the synthesis of amides is very important because of their usefulness in a wide variety of applications in academia as well as in industry, especially as intermediates in organic synthesis, raw materials for engineering plastics, detergents, lubricants and pharmaceuticals. The

conversion of carbonyl compounds, such as aldehydes, ketones, and oximes, is a good candidate for the synthesis of amides [17–20]. Beckmann rearrangement is commonly used to transform oximes into the corresponding amides [21]. This rearrangement is commonly used to transform ketoximes into the corresponding N-substituted amides requiring the use of strong acids [22]. Further, the synthesis of primary amides from aldoximes is very difficult and reactive reagents have to be used in stoichiometric amounts for the transformation to occur. The one-pot synthesis of amide from aldehyde with amines can be a potentially elegant alternative pathway. It has attracted much attention because it (i) eliminates the isolation of unstable intermediates, (ii) reduces hazardous wastage, (iii) more efficient and selective and (iv) no by-product formation is observed [23]. Significant efforts have been developed in recent years to the development of one-pot process enabling the direct formation of primary amides from aldehydes and hydroxylamine derivatives via rearrangement of the in situ formed aldoximes.

The powerful of ruthenium metal compounds to dehydrogenate alcohol and delivered the hydride to a ketone [24,25] or an α , β -unsaturated ketone has made them useful as transfer hydrogenation catalysts [26–30]. The reaction conditions for transfer

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: gvchem@gmail.com (G. Venkatachalam).

hydrogenations are economic, relatively mild and environmentally friendly. Experimental and theoretical studies to improve the new catalysts for transfer hydrogenation is still of substantive importance, in order to find most efficient catalysts.

Ruthenium(II) *p*-cymene complexes showed a piano-stool three legged structure in the ruthenium metal center have a similar octahedral geometry and this structural feature opens the possibility to introducing in the molecules of two type of stereogenic center: (i) the ligand and (ii) the metal. It has been found in the reported literature that the azo phenol ligand is well known to coordinate center metal ions usually with O, N bidentate ligands forming a five and six membered rings. The arylazo groups due to its more acidic nature stabilizes ruthenium metal in lowest oxidation state while phenolate oxygen atom being a hard base stabilized the higher oxidation states of the ruthenium metal ion [31].

We describe here, the synthesis and characterization of new mononuclear ruthenium(II) complexes containing 2-(biphenylazo)phenol and 1-(biphenylazo)naphthol ligands. The molecular structure of the complexes is investigated with the help of the single crystal XRD structure in combination with spectral studies. Further, the catalytic study of the (η^6 -*p*-cymene) ruthenium(II) complexes for both aldehyde to amide conversion and transfer hydrogenation of ketones have been carried out. Density Functional Theory calculations (DFT) also performed to support the experimental findings.

2. Results and discussion


The reaction of 2-(biphenylazo)phenol and 1-(biphenylazo)naphthol ligands with chloro-bridged (η^6 -*p*-cymene) ruthenium precursor complex [$\{\eta^6$ -*p*-cymene)RuCl₂](μ -Cl)₂] in methanol at room temperature in 1:2 molar ratio resulted in the formation of

conformationally rigid new monomeric ruthenium(II) complexes (Scheme 1). The complexes were found to be air stable and are soluble in polar solvents such as dichloromethane and acetone, but insoluble in non-polar solvents such as pentane and hexane. The data obtained from elemental analysis are in good agreement with the compositions proposed for the structure of complexes. It is noted that the present ligand system binds the metal center as five membered chelate rings in complexes 1–4 and six membered chelate rings in complex 5.

2.1. Characterization of the complexes

Infrared spectra of all the ligands displayed strong bands around 1403–1445 and 1257–1270 cm⁻¹ corresponding to ν -N=N- and phenolic ν C–O stretching, respectively. After complexation ν -N=N- appears at 1384–1389 cm⁻¹ and the red shifting is corroborated with N (azo) coordination. FT-IR spectra of complexes 1–5 are given in Figs. S1–S5 (see supporting information). The coordination through phenolic oxygen is confirmed by the increase of C–O at higher frequencies in the region 1305–1323 cm⁻¹ in all the complexes. This is further supported by the disappearance of ν -OH band in the range 3440–3457 cm⁻¹ in all the complexes [32–34].

The UV–Vis spectra of all complexes in chloroform solutions exhibit characteristic absorptions in the region 200–800 nm. The representative UV–Vis spectra of complexes 1–5 are given in Figs. S6–S10 (see supporting information). The absorption at 445–460 nm is probably due to metal-to-ligand charge transfer transitions. The high intensity bands around 340–325 nm and 260–250 nm has been designated as n - π^* and π - π^* transitions respectively for the biphenylazo ligands in these complexes. The obtained electronic spectral pattern of all complexes clearly shows the presence of an octahedral environment around the



Scheme 1. Synthesis of *p*-cymene Ru(II) 2-(biphenylazo)phenolate (1–4) and 1-(biphenylazo)naphtholate complexes (5).

ruthenium(II) ion which is consistent with other reported ruthenium octahedral complexes [35,36,50].

The ^1H NMR spectra of the complexes **1–5** have been recorded in CDCl_3 and were in agreement with their molecular structures. Complexes **1–5** are given in the supporting information (S11–S15). All the complexes show multiplets at δ 6.4–7.9 ppm for the presence of biphenylazo phenol ligands. The methyl protons appear as singlet and isopropyl protons appear as two doublets of the *p*-cymene ligand in the range of δ 2.1–2.2 ppm and δ 0.8–1.4 ppm, respectively. The isopropyl CH protons appear as a septet in the range of δ 2.3–2.8 ppm and the *p*-cymene ring protons are observed in the ranges of δ 4.2–5.8 ppm as either four doublets (4H) or two doublets (2H) and one singlet (2H) for all the complexes. In addition, methyl signals are observed as singlet for complex **1** at δ 2.3 and methoxy signals are observed as singlet for complex **2** at δ 3.7 ppm. A sharp singlet appeared for OH protons of all the ligands (HL₁–HL₅) in the region δ 11.7 ppm was disappeared in all the complexes.

2.2. X-ray crystallographic studies

The structure of the compound (**1**), (**2**) and (**5**) consist of neutral arene ring bonded to the ruthenium along with chloride and O, N-donors of 2-(biphenylazo) phenol ligands. The molecular structure of complexes (**1**), (**2**) and (**5**) with atom labeling scheme is shown in Figs. 1 and 2. The summary of single crystal X-ray structure refinement is given in the supporting information S16. The selected bond parameters are presented in Table 1. In the crystal structure of **1**, the complex crystallized in the triclinic with the $P\bar{1}$ space group whereas the complexes **2** and **5** are recrystallized in monoclinic with the $P2_1/c$ space group. The complexes **1**, **2**, **5** adopt a typical three-legged piano stool conformation with N, O and Cl atoms as the legs. More importantly the isopropyl group of the complex **2** is the successive refinements lead to the permissible R factor values. The position and the bond parameters of the isopropyl group are supported and confirmed from the DFT calculations. Computational methods and experimental findings are being used together nowadays to complete the structural characterization [37].

The 2-(biphenylazo) phenolate ligands bind the metal center at O and N forming the five membered chelate ring with bite angle O(1)–Ru(1)–N(1) 79.10(15), 79.34(9) and bond lengths of Ru(1)–O(1) and Ru(1)–N(1) are 2.059(4), 2.0520(1) and 2.052(2), 2.100(2) in **1** and **2**. The 1-(biphenylazo) naphtholate ligand bind the metal center at O and N forming the six membered chelate ring with bite angle of O(1)–Ru(1)–N(2) 87.49(9) and bond lengths of Ru(1)–O(1)

and Ru(1)–N(2) are 2.005(2) and 2.058(2) in **5** respectively. The Ru–Cl bond length is found to be 2.4215(15), 2.4018(9) and 2.4202(8). As all the complexes display similar spectral properties, the other complexes are assumed to have similar structure to that of complexes **1**, **2** and **5**. In half-sandwich complexes of (η^6 -*p*-cymene) ruthenium with several nitrogen ligands, Ru–N bond lengths have been reported [38,39] generally between 2.060, 2.100(2) and 2.156 Å, which are consistent with the present values.

2.3. Catalytic one-pot conversion of aldehydes to amides

4-nitrobenzaldehyde has been chosen as a model substrate to explore the catalytic activity of the complexes **1–5** under the optimized conditions. Among the tested complexes, complex **1** is highly efficient in the aldehyde to amide with a high conversion of 96%. The result of transformations is given in Table 2. We found that complex **1** showed in high yield than **2**, **3**, **4** and **5** at the same reaction time and at the same temperature. In the results obtained, complex **1** shows good catalytic activity among the other four complexes. Hence, complex **1** was selected as the model catalyst for conversion of 4-nitrobenzaldehyde to 4-nitrobenzamide using $\text{NH}_2\text{OH}\cdot\text{HCl}$ by refluxing in acetonitrile with NaHCO_3 as the base.

In order to optimize the effect of catalyst loading, different catalyst: substrate (C:S) ratios were tested in the one-pot conversion of 4-nitrobenzaldehyde to 4-nitrobenzamide using complex **1** as a catalyst and the results are summarized in Table 3. The reaction proceeds with good isolated yield when the C:S ratio is 1:100. When changing the C:S ratio to 1:200, 1:300, 1:500 and 1:1000, the reaction still proceeds smoothly accompanied by a drop in the isolated yield. Thus, it was concluded that catalyst: substrate ratio of 1:100 is the best compromise between optimal reaction rates in acetonitrile and we obtained 96% yield of amide (entry 1).

The catalytic activity of the ruthenium complex **1** was explored for the one-pot synthesis of amides from various aldehydes with hydroxylamine hydrochloride. For the entire optimization, 4-nitrobenzaldehyde was taken as a test substrate for different conditions. To study the influence of solvents in our catalytic system, we have chosen the reaction between 4-nitrobenzaldehyde (1 mmol), $\text{NH}_2\text{OH}\cdot\text{HCl}$ (1 mmol), complex **1** (1 mol%) as the catalyst precursor in the presence of various solvents and NaHCO_3 (1 mmol) as the base. Xylene, toluene, Benzene, chloroform, dichloromethane and acetonitrile are taken for our solvent variation study. The extent of conversion is solvent-dependent and low conversions were observed in benzene and xylene as solvent even at a higher temperature. Acetonitrile was found to be the solvent of




Fig. 1. ORTEP drawing of complexes **1** and **5** with hydrogen atoms being omitted for clarity.





Fig. 2. (a) ORTEP drawing of complex **2** (with hydrogen atoms being omitted for clarity) and (b) DFT (BP86/TZVP) optimized geometry with isopropyl group.

Table 1
Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°) in complexes **1**, **2** (DFT) and **5**.

Distances/angles	1	2	(DFT)	5
Ru(1)–O(1)	2.059(4)	2.052(2)	(2.047)	2.055(2)
Ru(1)–N(1)	2.103(4)	2.100(2)	(2.101)	2.058(2)
Ru(1)–C(28)	2.173(5)	2.2010(1)	(2.180)	2.182(3)
Ru(1)–Cl(1)	2.4215(15)	2.4018(9)	(2.394)	2.4202(8)
N(2)–N(1)	1.268(6)	1.271(3)	(1.284)	1.251(3)
N(2)–C(8)	1.420(6)	1.4117(1)	(1.401)	1.388(4)
C(1)–O(1)	1.302(7)	1.303(4)	(1.306)	1.272(4)
O(1)–Ru(1)–N(1)	79.10(15)	79.34(9)	(79.47)	87.49(9)
O(1)–Ru(1)–C(28)	129.08(19)	108.56	(107.8)	89.27(10)
O(1)–Ru(1)–Cl(1)	85.52(13)	85.14(7)	(84.94)	84.88(7)
N(1)–Ru(1)–Cl(1)	85.50(11)	84.44(7)	(85.23)	83.94(7)
C(28)–Ru(1)–Cl(1)	144.82(15)	146.09	(145.98)	153.63(9)
N(2)–N(1)–Ru(1)	133.1(3)	132.2(2)	(132.1)	130.5(2)

Table 2
Optimized conditions for the 4-nitrobenzaldehyde to 4-nitrobenzamide conversion using complexes **1–5**^a.



Entry	Complexes	Yield (%) ^b
1	1	96
2	2	82
3	3	79
4	4	70
5	5	62


^a Reaction conditions: aldehyde (1 mmol), NH₂OH·HCl (1 mmol), catalyst (1 mol %) and 2 mL of CH₃CN were refluxed for 5 h.

^b Isolated yield after column chromatography.

choice with excellent isolated yield of amide (96%) at a lower temperature. The choice of the base was chosen, as a next step for the optimization in Table 4. It has been observed that in acetonitrile solvent, NaHCO₃ and KHCO₃ gave excellent isolated yields of 96% (entry 9) and 88% (entry 6) respectively, when compared to a much weaker base like CH₃COONa or Et₃N. Thus, it was concluded that NaHCO₃ as a base in acetonitrile solvent at 78 °C is the optimized condition for this conversion.

To explore the scope of the new catalyst, a range of other substituted aromatic and heterocyclic aldehydes were converted to primary amides using catalyst **1** under the optimized condition. All

Table 3
Effect of catalyst: substrate (C:S) ratio in the one-pot conversion of 4-nitrobenzaldehyde to 4-nitrobenzamide using complex [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₁)] **1**^a.




Entry	Ratio	Yield (%) ^b
1	1:100	96
2	1:200	68
3	1:300	52
4	1:500	41
5	1:1000	35

^a Reaction conditions: Substrate (1 mmol), NH₂OH·HCl (1 mmol) and 2 mL of CH₃CN were refluxed for 5 h.

^b Isolated yield after column chromatography.

the reactions were carried out under identical reaction conditions to allow comparison of results. A broad range of amides were successfully synthesized with good to high isolated yields using the above optimized protocol. The results collected from the catalytic reactions are listed in Table 5. The electron donating groups like –CH₃, –OCH₃ and –OH (entries 2, 3 and 9) on benzaldehyde alters the reactions and the corresponding amides were obtained in good yields of 82%, 76% and 75% respectively and gave slightly lower yields compared with benzaldehyde. On the other hand, electron withdrawing substituents, such as the –Cl, and –NO₂ substituents (entries 5 and 6) offering excellent yields (90%, and 96%) when compared to substrate containing electron donating group. The introduction of electron withdrawing substituents to the *para* position of the aryl ring of the aldehyde decreased the electron density on the C=O bond so that the activity was improved giving rise to easier amidation reaction. The conversion proceeded smoothly even in the presence of heteroatoms such as N and O in the substrates (entries 7 and 8) and a range of heterocyclic aromatic amides were obtained in good isolated yields. Further, we believe that the catalytic transformation proceeds via the oxidative addition of the aldoxime N–OH bond to Ru(II), followed by nucleophilic attack on the coordinated imine, then β-elimination of cyclometalated, and finally reductive elimination to give the amide according to the mechanism proposed by Crabtree [40]. The present Ru(II) catalyst is more efficient in amidation reaction than the reported ruthenium(II) complexes in terms of reaction time, catalyst loading and isolated yields [41–43].

Table 4
Optimization of solvent and base in the one-pot conversion of 4-nitrobenzaldehyde to 4-nitrobenzamide using complex [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₁)] **1**^a.




Entry	Solvent	Base	Temp (°C)	Time (h)	Yield (%) ^b
1	Xylene	NaHCO ₃	140	24	30
2	Toluene	NaHCO ₃	110	24	68
3	Benzene	NaHCO ₃	80	24	28
4	CHCl ₃	NaHCO ₃	61	24	32
5	CH ₂ Cl ₂	NaHCO ₃	40	24	<25
6	CH ₃ CN	KHCO ₃	78	5	88
7	CH ₃ CN	Et ₃ N	78	5	<20
8	CH ₃ CN	CH ₃ COONa	78	5	<20
9	CH ₃ CN	NaHCO ₃	78	5	96

^a Reaction conditions: 4-nitrobenzaldehyde (1 mmol), NH₂OH·HCl (1 mmol), base (1 mmol) and 2 mL of solvent.

^b Isolated yield after column chromatography.

Table 5
One-pot conversion of aldehydes to amides using complex [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₁)] **1**^a.



Entry	Substrate	Product	Yield (%) ^b
1			93
2			82
3			76
4			71
5			90
6			96
7			72
8			67
9			75
10			70

^a Conditions: Catalyst (1 mol%), aldehyde (1 mmol), NH₂OH·HCl (1 mmol), NaHCO₃ (1 mmol) and 2 mL CH₃CN. ^b Isolated yield after column chromatography.

2.4. Catalytic transfer hydrogenation of ketones

Catalytic transfer hydrogenation reaction in which hydrogen is transferred from one organic molecule to another by ruthenium complexes is well known since one can avoid the use of molecular hydrogen and this prompted us to carry out this type of reactions. Representative types of aliphatic alkyl and aryl ketones were chosen to evaluate the performance of catalyst complex [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₁)] **1** in transfer hydrogenation reaction in the presence of iso-propanol and KOH as promoter.


In order to optimize the reaction conditions, different catalyst: substrate ratios were tested and the results are summarized in Table 6. For this initial experiments, acetophenone was selected as a test-substrate and allowed it to react in 2-propanol with catalytic quantities of [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₁)] **1** complex in the presence of KOH. When increasing the C:S ratio to 1:300, 1:600 and 1:900 in 2-propanol, the reaction still proceeds smoothly accompanied by a moderate drop in conversion. Thus, it was concluded that catalyst: substrate ratio of 1:300 is the best compromise between optimal reaction rate and C/S ratio.

The catalyst performed efficiently in the conversion of ketones to alcohols and the results of this organic transformation are presented in Table 7. Both aliphatic and aromatic ketones are converted into their corresponding secondary alcohols with good conversions and turnover. The efficient conversion (upto 95%) was found in the case of acetophenone (entry 2) among the aromatic ketones with all the complex catalysts **1–5**. The complexes **1–5** efficiently catalyzed the reduction of acyclic ketones such as ethyl methyl ketone and isobutyl methyl ketone to their corresponding alcohols with 90% conversion respectively. These ketones took longer time (entry 3 & 7) to react compared to their cyclic counter parts. Moreover, these catalysts show good activity for the transfer hydrogenation of five and six membered cyclic ketones with excellent conversions upto 96%. This trend of higher conversion of cyclic ketones can be attributable to steric hindrance with respect to access to the C=O bond [44]. The complexes of biphenylazo ligands (L_{1–5}) do not differ significantly in catalytic efficiency. The catalytic results obtained are comparable with other ruthenium complexes containing different types of O, N donor ligands [45]. No transfer hydrogenation was observed in the absence of base. In the transfer hydrogenation reaction, the base facilitates the formation of ruthenium alkoxide by abstracting proton from the alcohol and subsequently alkoxide undergoes β-elimination to give ruthenium hydride, which is an active species in this reaction. This is the mechanism proposed by several workers on the studies of ruthenium catalyzed transfer hydrogenation reaction by metal hydride intermediates [46–50].

3. Conclusion


A family of five half-sandwich ruthenium(II) complexes of the

Table 6
Catalytic transfer hydrogenation of acetophenone using complex **1**.



Entry	C/S	Conversion (%)	TON
1	1:900	60	225
2	1:600	75	180
3	1:300	95	285
4	absence of catalyst	product not detected	–

Table 7
Catalytic transfer hydrogenation of ketones by [Ru(η^6 -*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₁₋₅)] **1–5**.



Entry	Substrate	Product	Conversion (%) ^a					TON ^b				
			Complexes									
			1	2	3	4	5					
1			75	70	87	60	70	225	210	261	180	210
2			95	80	90	85	75	285	240	270	255	225
3 ^c			90	82	85	80	60	270	246	255	240	180
4			90	96	92	85	80	270	288	276	255	240
5			82	72	85	80	70	246	270	255	240	210
6			70	73	64	68	75	210	219	192	204	225
7 ^c			90	85	80	75	80	270	255	240	225	240

^a GC analysis.

^b TON = ratio of moles of product obtained the moles of catalyst used.

^c Time 6 h

general formula [Ru(η^6 -*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₁₋₅)] have been synthesized and characterized. The structure of complexes **1**, **2** and **5** were confirmed by single crystal X-ray diffraction, to have the pseudo-octahedral three legged piano stool geometry. These ruthenium complexes exhibit a high activity in an exceptionally short reaction time, effective of solvent, base assisted aldehydes to primary amines. Among the five complexes, the complex **1** is the most active one. The ruthenium complexes also effectively catalyze the transfer hydrogenation of various ketones in presence of *i*-*pr*OH.

4. Experimental procedures

4.1. Materials and physical measurements

Commercial RuCl₃·3H₂O was purchased from Himedia. All the used reagents were chemically pure or analytical reagent grade. Solvents were purified and dried according to standard procedures. The 2-(biphenylazo)phenol and 1-(biphenylazo)naphthol ligands [51] were prepared by diazotization reaction of 2-aminobiphenyl with corresponding *para*-substituted phenols. The metal precursor [(η^6 -*p*-cymene)RuCl₂(μ -Cl)₂] was prepared by standard procedure [52]. The substrates used in the catalytic studies, were purchased from Merck and Aldrich. The IR spectra of the complexes were recorded on an agilent resolution pro model in 4000–400 cm⁻¹ range. Electronic spectra of the complexes were recorded in CHCl₃ solution in a Cary 300 Bio UV–Vis Varian spectrophotometer in the range 800–200 nm. The ¹H NMR spectra were recorded in CDCl₃ with Bruker 300 MHz instrument using TMS as internal reference.

4.2. General method of synthesis of half-sandwich ruthenium complexes (**1–5**)

The RB flask containing ruthenium precursor [RuCl₂(*p*-cymene)]₂ (0.06 g; 0.1 mmol) and 2-(biphenylazo)phenol and 1-(biphenylazo)naphthol ligands (HL₁ – HL₅) (0.0568–0.0640 g; 0.2 mmol) were taken in methanol (20 mL) and the mixture was stirred for 4 h. Then, the solvent was removed through vacuum, the dark red mass obtained was dissolved in chloroform (15 mL) and filtered through short path of silica gel column to remove insoluble materials. The red solution was then concentrated into 2 mL, dark-red product separated out an addition of excess hexane and washed with diethyl ether and dried in vacuum.

4.2.1. [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₁)] (**1**)

Yield: 70%; brown solid; M.p. 196 °C, Anal. Cal. for C₂₉H₂₄N₂OClRu: C, 62.92; H, 4.33; N, 5.06; Found: C, 62.94; H, 4.32; N, 5.10. FT-IR (cm⁻¹): 1384 ν (N=N), 1313 ν (C–O). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ (ppm) = 6.9–7.9 (m, Ar–H), 4.3 (d 1H, cymene Ar–H), 5.8 (d 1H, cymene Ar–H), 0.9–1.3 (dd, 6H, 2CH₃ of *p*-cymene), 2.3 (s, CH₃). UV–Vis (λ_{max} , nm): 450, 340, 250.

4.2.2. [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₂)] (**2**)

Yield: 85%; brownish red solid; M.p. 212 °C, Anal. Cal. For C₂₉H₂₆N₂O₂ClRu: C, 60.94; H, 4.55; N, 4.90; Found: C, 60.92; H, 4.57; N, 4.88. FT-IR (cm⁻¹): 1388 ν (N=N), 1305 ν (C–O). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ (ppm) = 6.7–7.9 (m, Ar–H), 4.15 (d 1H, cymene Ar–H), 5.8 (d 1H, cymene Ar–H), 2.4 (s, 3H, CH₃ of *p*-cymene), 0.8–1.4 (dd, 6H, 2CH₃ of *p*-cymene), 3.7 (s, OCH₃). UV–Vis (λ_{max} , nm): 446, 330, 250.

4.2.3. [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₃)] (3)

Yield: 60%; brown solid; M.p. 206 °C, Anal. Cal. For C₃₂H₃₅N₂OClRu: C, 64.10; H, 5.84; N, 4.67; Found: C, 64.12; H, 5.85; N, 4.61. FT-IR (cm⁻¹): 1389 ν(N=N), 1317 ν(C-O). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ (ppm) = 6.4–7.9 (m, Ar-H), 4.1 (d 1H, cymene Ar-H), 5.3 (d 1H, cymene Ar-H), 2.3 (s, 3H, CH₃ of *p*-cymene), 1.1–1.3 (dd, 6H, 2CH₃ of *p*-cymene), 2.9 (m, (CH₃)₃C). UV-Vis (λ_{max}, nm): 444, 325, 255.

4.2.4. [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₄)] (4)

Yield: 75%; brown solid; M.p. 142 °C, Anal. Cal. For C₂₈H₂₇N₂OCl₂Ru: C, 58.13; H, 4.67; N, 4.84; Found: C, 58.10; H, 4.70; N, 4.82. FT-IR (cm⁻¹): 1388 ν(N=N), 1310 ν(C-O). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ (ppm) = 6.6–7.7 (m, Ar-H), 4.15–5.6 (d 1H, cymene Ar-H), 2.2 (s, 3H, CH₃ of *p*-cymene), 0.9–1.2 (dd, 6H, 2CH₃ of *p*-cymene). UV-Vis (λ_{max}, nm): 455, 330, 260.

4.2.5. [Ru(*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₅)] (5)

Yield: 80%; brown solid; M.p. 240 °C, Anal. Cal. For C₃₂H₂₄N₂OClRu: C, 65.18; H, 4.07; N, 4.75; Found: C, 65.19; H, 4.09; N, 4.76. FT-IR (cm⁻¹): 1384 ν(N=N), 1323 ν(C-O). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃): δ (ppm) = 6.6–7.8 (m, Ar-H), 4.2 (d 1H, cymene Ar-H), 5.8 (d 1H, cymene Ar-H), 2.5–2.8 (s, 3H, CH₃ of *p*-cymene), 0.85–1.3 (dd, 6H, 2CH₃ of *p*-cymene). UV-Vis (λ_{max}, nm): 448, 330, 250.

4.3. Typical procedure for the one-pot conversion of aldehydes to amides

To an oven-dried round-bottom flask equipped with magnetic stirring bar was added complex (1) (1 mol%), the aldehyde (1 mmol), NH₂OH·HCl (1 mmol) and NaHCO₃ (1 mmol) and the mixture was placed under an atmosphere of N₂. Dry and degassed MeCN (2 mL) was added and the reaction mixture was refluxed for the time specified under an N₂ atmosphere. The reaction was cooled to room temperature and the solvent evaporated. The residue was dissolved in CH₂Cl₂, filtered and the solvent removed. The crude product was then purified using silica gel chromatography (CHCl₃/MeOH) giving the amides in high isolated yields. Characterization details for each amide are given in the supporting information S16–S20.

4.4. General procedure for catalytic transfer hydrogenation reaction

A solution of the ketone (3.75 mmol), KOH (0.03 mmol) and the catalyst complexes **1–5** (0.0125 mmol) was heated under reflux (80 °C) in 5 mL of 2-propanol for 2 h. The solvent was removed under vacuum, and an aliquot of the remaining product was extracted with diethylether, filtered through a short column of silica gel. The column was washed with diethylether. The filtrate and washings of the column were mixed and evaporated on a rotary evaporator and analyzed by GC.

4.5. X-ray crystallography

Single crystals of [Ru(η⁶-*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₁)] (**1**), [Ru(η⁶-*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₂)] (**2**) and [Ru(η⁶-*p*-cymene)(Cl)(L₅)] (**5**) were grown by slow evaporation of a chloroform–pentane solution at room temperature. Crystals were mounted on a Stoe Mark II-Image Plate diffractometer using monochromated Mo Kα radiation (λ = 0.71073). Data were collected at 296 K. Structures were solved with direct method using SHELXS [53] and were refined by full-matrix least-squares method [54] on F² with SHELXL. Non hydrogen atoms were refined with anisotropy thermal parameters.

Acknowledgments

The authors express sincere thanks to Single Crystal X-ray Diffraction Facility, SAIF Guwahati University, for providing X-ray data collection.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jorganchem.2019.05.017>.

References

- [1] (a) S. Medici, M. Peana, V.M. Nurchi, J.I. Lachowicz, G. Crisponi, M.A. Zoroddu, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 284 (2015) 329–350; (b) W. Su, Z. Tang, P. Li, *Mini Rev. Med. Chem.* 16 (2016) 787–795; (c) B.S. Murray, M.V. Babak, C.G. Hartinger, P.J. Dyson, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 306 (2016) 86–114; (d) J.M. Stubbs, R.J. Hazlehurst, P.D. Boyle, J.M. Blacquiere, *Organometallics* 36 (2017) 1692–1698; (e) M. Simonetti, G.J.P. Perry, X.C. Cambeiro, F. Julia-Hernandez, J.N. Arokianathar, I. Larrosa, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 138 (2016) 3596–3606; (f) A.O. Ogwenwo, S.O. Ojwach, M.P. Akerman, *Dalton Trans.* 43 (2014) 1228–1237.
- [2] (a) M.J. Clarke, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 236 (2003) 209–233; (b) W.H. Ang, P.J. Dyson, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* (2006) 4003–4018; (c) N. Song, J.J. Concepcion, R. Binstead, J. Rudd, A.K. Vannucci, C.J. Dares, M.K. Coggins, T.J. Meyer, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 112 (2015) 4935–4940; (d) M. Yamamoto, L. Wang, F. Li, T. Fukushima, K. Tanaka, L. Sun, H. Imahori, *Chem. Sci.* (2016) 1–10; (e) D. Zell, S. Warratz, D. Gelman, S.J. Garden, L. Ackermann, *Chem. Eur. J.* 22 (2016) 1248–1252; (f) J. Malineni, H. Keul, M. Moller, *Dalton Trans.* 44 (2015) 17409–17414.
- [3] (a) A.G. Walden, A.J.M. Miller, *Chem. Sci.* 6 (2015) 2405–2410; (b) M.V. Sheridan, B.D. Sherman, Z. Fang, K.R. Wee, M.K. Coggins, T.J. Meyer, *ACS Catal.* 5 (2015) 4404–4409; (c) J.J. Concepcion, M.K. Tsai, J.T. Muckerman, T.J. Meyer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 132 (2010) 1545–1557; (d) F. Sepulveda, M.C. Carrion, A.D. Phillips, F.A. Jalon, P.J. Dyson, B.R. Manzano, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* (2017) 630–638; (e) K.M. Steward, E.C. Gentry, J.S. Johnson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 134 (2012) 7329–7332.
- [4] (a) C.J. Cramer, V.S. Batista, A. Llobet, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 53 (2014) 205–209; (b) L. Tong, Y. Wang, L. Duan, Y. Xu, X. Cheng, A. Fischer, M.S.G. Ahlquist, L. Sun, *Inorg. Chem.* 51 (2012) 3388–3398; (c) L. Tong, A.K. Inge, L. Duan, L. Wang, X. Zou, L. Sun, *Inorg. Chem.* 52 (2013) 2505–2518; (d) R.E. Morris, R.E. Aird, P. Murdoch del, S.H. Chen, J. Cummings, N.D. Hughes, S. Parsons, A. Parkin, G. Boyd, D.I. Jodrell, P.J. Sadler, *J. Med. Chem.* 44 (2001) 3616–3621.
- [5] (a) P. Singh, A.K. Singh, *Organometallics* 29 (2010) 6433–6442; (b) G. Venkatachalam, N. Raja, D. Pandiarajan, R. Ramesh, *Spectrochim. Acta, Part A* 71 (2008) 884–891; (c) S. Kannan, R. Ramesh, *Polyhedron* 25 (2006) 3095–3103; (d) D. Chatterjee, A. Mitra, S. Mukherjee, *J. Mol. Catal. A Chem.* 165 (2001) 295; (e) S. Campestrini, M. Carraro, U. Tonellato, M. Pagliaro, R. Ciriminna, *Tetrahedron Lett.* 45 (2004) 7283.
- [6] (a) N. Sathya, G. Raja, N. Padma Priya, C. Jayabalakrishnan, *Appl. Organomet. Chem.* 24 (2010) 366–373; (b) S.K. Sarkar, M.S. Jana, T.K. Mondal, C. Sinha, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 716 (2012) 129–137; (c) S.J. Bozorghi, H. Esfandiari, H. Saravani, F.R. Charati, B.W. Skelton, M. Makha, *J. Coord. Chem.* 65 (2012) 994–1003; (d) M.U. Raja, N. Gowri, R. Ramesh, *Polyhedron* 29 (2010) 1175–1181.
- [7] (a) M. Sivagamasundari, R. Ramesh, *Spectrochim. Acta, Part A* 66 (2007) 427–433; (b) R.W. Murray, K. Iyanar, J.X. Chen, J. Wearing, *Tetrahedron Lett.* 36 (1995) 6415; (c) V. Kesavan, D.B. Delpont, J.P. Begue, A. Srikanth, S. Chandrasekaran, *Tetrahedron Lett.* 41 (2000) 3327; (d) T. Nishimura, T. Onoue, K. Ohe, S. Uemura, *J. Org. Chem.* 64 (1999) 6750.
- [8] (a) H. Brunner, *Adv. Organomet. Chem.* 18 (1980) 151–206; (b) M.H. Bennett, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 166 (1997) 225; (c) D. Tyagi, C. Binnani, R.K. Rai, A.D. Dwivedi, K. Gupta, P.–Z. Li, Y. Zhao, S.K. Singh, *Inorg. Chem.* 55 (2016) 6332–6343; (d) W.–G. Jia, H. Zhang, T. Zhang, S. Ling, *Inorg. Chem. Commun.* 66 (2016) 15–18; (e) J.H. Rigby, M.A. Kondratenko, *Top. Organomet. Chem.* 7 (2004) 181–204; (f) F. Ding, Y.G. Sun, F. Verpoort, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* (2010) 1536–1543.
- [9] (a) W.Y. Wong, W.T. Wong, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 146 (1995) 307;

- (b) G. Winkhaus, H. Singer, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 7 (1967) 487–491;
(c) G. Pampaloni, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 254 (2010) 402–419.
- [10] (a) M.G. Richard, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 141 (1995) 63;
(b) R. Castarlenas, C. Vovard, C. Fischmeister, P.H. Dixneuf, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 128 (2006) 4079–4089;
(c) F.A. Beckford, G. Leblanc, J. Thessing, M. Shalowski, B.J. Frost, L. Li, N.P. Seeram, *Inorg. Chem. Commun.* 12 (2009) 1094–1098;
(d) A.M. Pizarro, M. Melchart, A. Habtemariam, L. Salassa, F.P.A. Fabbiani, S. Parsons, P.J. Sadler, *Inorg. Chem.* 49 (2010) 3310–3319.
- [11] (a) A. Kanchanadevi, R. Ramesh, D. Semeril, *Inorg. Chem. Commun.* 770 (2014) 21–28;
(b) J.M. Gichumbi, H.B. Friedrich, B. Omondi, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 808 (2016) 87–96;
(c) S. Dayan, N. Kayac, N.O. Kalaycioglu, O. Dayan, E.C. Ozturk, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* 401 (2013) 107–113.
- [12] (a) A. Kanchanadevi, R. Ramesh, D. Semeril, *Inorg. Chem. Commun.* 56 (2015) 116–119;
(b) M. Ramesh, G. Venkatachalam, *ChemistrySelect* 3 (2018) 9056–9061;
(c) N. Raja, B. Therrien, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 765 (2014) 1–7;
(d) R.N. Prabhu, R. Ramesh, *RSC Adv.* 2 (2012) 4515–4524.
- [13] (a) N. Raja, M.U. Raja, R. Ramesh, *Inorg. Chem. Commun.* 19 (2012) 51–54;
(b) L. Perreux, A. Loupy, F. Voltron, *Tetrahedron* 58 (2002) 1215;
(c) C.L. Allen, A.R. Chhatwal, J.M.J. Williams, *Chem. Commun.* 48 (2012) 666–668.
- [14] (a) W.-G. Jia, H. Zhang, T. Zhang, D. Xie, S. Ling, E.-H. Sheng, *Organometallics* 35 (4) (2016) 503–512;
(b) I. Sorribes, G. Wienhöfer, C. Vicent, K. Junge, R. Llusar, M. Beller, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 51 (2012) 7794–7798;
(c) N.S. Sanjini, S. Velmathi, *RSC Adv.* 4 (2014) 15381–15388;
(d) M. Paul, N. Pal, A. Bhaumik, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* (2010) 5129–5134.
- [15] (a) W.-G. Jia, S. Ling, H.-N. Zhang, E.-H. Sheng, R. Lee, *Organometallics* 37 (1) (2018) 40–47;
(b) S.K. Mohapatra, S.U. Sonavane, R.V. Jayaram, P. Selvam, *Tetrahedron Lett.* 43 (2002) 8527–8529;
(c) R.V. Jagadeesh, G. Wienhöfer, F.A. Westerhaus, A.-E. Surkus, H. Junge, K. Junge, *M. Chem. Eur. J.* 17 (2011) 14375–14379;
(d) G. Wienhöfer, I. Sorribes, A. Boddien, F. Westerhaus, K. Junge, H. Junge, R. Llusar, *M. J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 133 (2011) 12875–12879.
- [16] (a) W.-G. Jia, Z.-B. Wang, X.-T. Zhi, J.-Q. Han, Y. Sun, *J. Coord. Chem.* 70 (2017) 848–858;
(b) S. Hohloch, L. Suntrup, B. Sarkar, *Organometallics* 32 (2013) 7376–7385;
(c) S. Gowda, D.C. Gowda, *Tetrahedron* 58 (2002) 2211–2213.
- [17] C.E. Maberger, in: J.I. Kroschwitz (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology*, vol. 1, Wiley, New York, 1991, pp. 251–266.
- [18] D. Lipp, in: J.I. Kroschwitz (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology*, vol. 1, Wiley, New York, 1991, pp. 266–287.
- [19] R. Opsahl, in: J.I. Kroschwitz (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology*, vol. 2, Wiley, New York, 1991, pp. 346–356.
- [20] E.C. Horning, V.L. Stromberg, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 74 (1952) 5151–5152.
- [21] R.E. Gawly, *Org. React.* 35 (1988) 1.
- [22] A. Loupy, S. Regnier, *Tetrahedron Lett.* 40 (1999) 6221–6224.
- [23] (a) D. Gnanamgari, R.H. Crabtree, *Organometallics* 28 (2009) 922–924;
(b) S.T. Chill, R.H. Mebane, *Synth. Commun.* 40 (2010) 2014–2017;
(c) J.W. Faller, J. Parr, *Organometallics* 19 (2000) 1829–1832.
- [24] (a) Y. Miyaki, T. Onishi, H. Kurosawa, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* 300 (2000) 369–377;
(b) D.P. Halbach, C.G. Hamaker, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 691 (2006) 3349–3361;
(c) K. Severin, *Corr. Org. Chem.* 10 (2006) 217–224;
(d) L. Delande, A. Demonceau, A.F. Noels, *Curr. Org. Chem.* 210 (2006) 203;
(e) C.M. Thomas, R. Mafia, B. Thesrian, E. Rusanov, H.S. Evans, G.S. Fink, *Chem. Eur. J.* 8 (2002) 3343–3352;
(f) K. Sui, S.M. Peng, S. Bhattacharya, *Polyhedron* 18 (1999) 631–640;
(g) R. Noyori, H. Akaya, *Acc. Chem. Res.* 23 (1990) 345–350;
(h) P. Dani, T. Karlen, R.A. Gossage, S. Gladiali, G. Van Koten, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 112 (2000) 759–761;
- [30] R.L. Chowdhury, J.E. Backvall, *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* (1991) 1063–1064.
- [31] (a) W. Ferstl, I.K. Sakodinskaya, N.B. Sutter, G.L. Borgne, M. Pfeffer, A.D. Ryabov, *Organometallics* 16 (1997) 411–418;
(b) Y. Miyaki, T. Onishi, S. Ogoshi, H. Kurosawa, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 616 (2000) 135–139;
(c) M. Ramesh, M. Kalidass, M. Jaccob, D. Kaleeswaran, G. Venkatachalam, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 830 (2017) 33–41;
(d) S. Basu, S. Halder, I. Pal, S. Samanta, P. Karmakar, Michael G.B. Drew, S. Bhattacharya, *Polyhedron* 27 (2008) 2943–2951;
(e) P. Gupta, S. Dutta, F. Basuli, S.M. Peng, G.H. Lee, S. Bhattacharya, *Inorg. Chem.* 45 (2006) 460;
(f) P. Byabartta, P.K. Santra, T.K. Misra, C. Sinha, C.H.L. Kennard, *Polyhedron* 20 (2001) 905–913;
(g) S. Goswami, R. Mukerjee, A. Chakravorty, *Inorg. Chem.* 22 (1983) 2825–2832.
- [34] K. Nakamoto, *Infrared and Raman Spectra of Inorganic and Coordination Compounds*, Wiley Interscience, New York, 1971;
(b) A. Ceulemans, L.G. Vanquickenborne, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 103 (1981) 2238–2241.
- [36] A.B.P. Lever, *Inorganic Electronic Spectroscopy*, second ed., Elsevier, New York, 1984.
- [37] (a) A.J. Welch, *Crystals* 7 (2017) 234;
(b) B. S. Krishnamoorthy, A. Thakur, K.K.V. Chakraborty, S.K. Bose, P. Hamon, T. Roisnel, S. Kahlal, S. Ghosh, J.-F. Halet, *Inorg. Chem.* 51 (2012) 10375.
- [38] (a) T. Bugareic, A. Habtemariam, R.J. Deeth, F.P.A. Fabbiani, S. Parsons, P.J. Sadler, *Inorg. Chem.* 48 (2009) 9444–9453;
(b) S. Adhikari, W. Kaminsky, M.R. Kollipara, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 848 (2017) 95–103;
(c) S. Adhikari, O. Hussain, R.M. Phillips, M.R. Kollipara, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 854 (2018) 27–37.
- [39] (a) A. Bacchi, P. Pelagatti, C. Pelizzi, D. Rogolino, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 694 (2009) 3200–3211;
(b) P. Govindaswamy, Y.A. Mozharivskiy, M.R. Kollipara, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 689 (2004) 3265–3274.
- [40] J.F. Hull, S.T. Hilton, R.H. Crabtree, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* 363 (2010) 1243–1245.
- [41] D. Gnanamgari, R.H. Crabtree, *Organometallics* 28 (2009) 922–924.
- [42] (a) Tyagi, R.K. Rai, A.D. Dwivedi, S.M. Mobin, S.K. Singh, *Inorg. Chem. Front.* 2 (2015) 116–124;
(b) S.T. Chill, R.C. Mebane, *Synth. Commun.* 40 (2010) 2014–2017.
- [44] M.D. Bala, M.I. Ikhile, *J. Mol. Catal. A Chem.* 385 (2014) 98–105.
- [45] (a) M. Ramesh, G. Prabusankar, G. Venkatachalam, *Inorg. Chem. Commun.* 79 (2017) 89–94;
(b) S. Kannan, R. Ramesh, Y. Liu, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 692 (2007) 3380–3391;
(c) R.N. Prabhu, R. Ramesh, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 718 (2012) 43–51;
(d) K. Mandal, A.R. Chakravarty, *Polyhedron* 11 (1992) 823–827;
(e) N. Mohan, R. Ramesh, *Appl. Organomet. Chem.* (2016) 1–9.
- [46] J.-E. Backvall, *J. Organomet. Chem.* 652 (2002) 105–111.
- [47] R. Noyori, S. Hashiguchi, *Acc. Chem. Res.* 30 (1997) 97–102.
- [48] H. Doucet, T. Ohkuma, K. Murata, T. Yokozawa, M. Kozawa, E. Katayama, F.A. England, T. Ikariya, R. Noyori, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 37 (1998) 1703–1707.
- [49] E.P. Kelson, P.P. Phengsy, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* (2000) 4023–4024.
- [50] H. Zhang, C.B. Yang, Y.Y. Li, Z.R. Donga, Z.X. Gao, H. Nakamura, K. Murata, K. Ikariya, *Chem. Commun.* (2003) 142–143.
- [51] (a) R. Nandhini, M. Ramesh, G. Venkatachalam, *Inorg. Chem. Commun.* 85 (2017) 84–88;
(b) M. Ramesh, M. Deepan kumar, M. Jaccob, B. Therrien, G. Venkatachalam, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* 477 (2018) 40–50.
- [52] M.A. Bennett, A.K. Smith, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* (1974) 233–241.
- [53] G.M. Sheldrick, *Acta Crystallogr. A* 64 (2008) 112.
- [54] L.J. Farrugia, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* 30 (1997) 565.