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Abstract

The room temperature reaction of C₆F₆ or C₆F₅H with [Ru(IEt₂Me₂)₂(PPh₃)₂H₂] (1; IEt₂Me₂ = 1,3-diethyl-4,5-dimethylimidazol-2-ylidene) generated a mixture of the trans-hydride fluoride complex [Ru(IEt₂Me₂)₂(PPh₃)₂HF] (2) and the bis-carbene pentafluorophenyl species [Ru(IEt₂Me₂)₂(PPh₃)(C₆F₅)H] (3). The formation of 3 resulted from C-H activation of C₆F₅H (formed from C₆F₆ via stoichiometric hydrodefluorination), a process which could be reversed by working under 4 atm H₂.

Upon heating 1 with C₆F₅H, the bis-phosphine derivative [Ru(IEt₂Me₂)(PPh₃)₂(C₆F₅)H] (4) was isolated. A more efficient route to 2 involved treatment of 1 with 0.33 eq of TREAT-HF (Et₃N·3HF); excess reagent gave instead the [H₂F₃]⁺ salt (5) of the known cation [Ru(IEt₂Me₂)₂(PPh₃)₂H]⁺. Under catalytic conditions, 1 proved to be an active precursor for hydrodefluorination, converting C₆F₆ to a mixture of tri, di and monofluorobenzenes (TON = 37) at 363 K with 10 mol% 1 and Et₃SiH as the reductant.
Introduction

Recent years have witnessed increasing evidence for the valuable role of N-heterocyclic carbenes (NHCs) and their derivatives in catalytic transformations involving organofluorine substrates.\(^1\) Thus, organocarbene catalysts have been employed for the formation of both C-F and C-CF\(_3\) bonds,\(^2,3\) as well as enantioselective transformations of fluorine containing substrates.\(^4\) Transition metal NHC complexes have also been employed for C-F bond formation through hydrofluorination,\(^5-7\) but have perhaps received more attention in processes in which C-F bonds are broken (Scheme 1), either through cross-coupling\(^8\) or, of particular relevance to the work reported in this manuscript, hydrodefluorination (HDF).\(^9-11\)

![Scheme 1](image)

Prompted by our studies over a number of years on catalytic HDF of fluoroaromatic substrates using ruthenium NHC hydride precursors and the elucidation by DFT calculations of a mechanism involving nucleophilic hydride attack,\(^10-13\) we have set out to investigate the catalytic effectiveness of Ru NHC species containing
increasingly more nucleophilic Ru-H ligands. Very recently, we reported an example of such a species in the form of the mixed carbone-phosphine complex 

\[ \text{[Ru(IEt}_2\text{Me}_2)(\text{PPh}_3)_2\text{H}_2]} \] (I; IEt}_2\text{Me}_2 = 1,3-diethyl-4,5-dimethylimidazol-2-ylidene).\(^{14}\)

The unusual \textit{trans}-arrangement of the two hydride ligands imparts highly nucleophilic character to Ru-H, as evidenced by the formation of methane and 

\[ \text{[Ru(IEt}_2\text{Me}_2)(\text{PPh}_3)_2\text{HI]} \] upon addition of the electrophile MeI. We now report our initial findings on both the stoichiometric and catalytic reactivity of I towards aromatic fluoroarenes. As hoped for, the complex displays high activity for the catalytic HDF of C\(_6\)F\(_6\), undergoing up to five HDF steps in generating fluorobenzene.

\section*{Results and Discussion}

\textbf{Stoichiometric C-F and C-H activation of C\(_6\)F\(_6\) and C\(_6\)F\(_5\)H by I}

Monitoring by \(^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}\) NMR spectroscopy the room temperature reaction of 

\[ \text{[Ru(IEt}_2\text{Me}_2)(\text{PPh}_3)_2\text{H}_2]} \] (I) with 10 eq of either C\(_6\)F\(_6\) or C\(_6\)F\(_5\)H in C\(_6\)H\(_6\) solution\(^{15}\)

showed, over the course of \textit{ca.} 5 h, complete loss of starting material and the appearance of two new product peaks at \(\delta\) 45 and 59. These were assigned to the hydride fluoride complex [Ru(IEt}_2\text{Me}_2)(PPh}_3)_2HF] (2) and the pentafluorophenyl complex 

[\text{[Ru(IEt}_2\text{Me}_2)(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5)\text{H}]} \] (3) respectively (Scheme 2). The formation of the two products, which were present after 5 h in an approximate ratio (by \(^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}\) NMR spectroscopy) of 1:0.2 from C\(_6\)F\(_6\) and 1:0.5 from C\(_6\)F\(_5\)H, arise from competing C-F and C-H activation respectively. C-H activation proved to be reversible. Thus, addition of H\(_2\) (4 atm) to an in-situ generated mixture of 2, 3 and PPh\(_3\) led to the complete disappearance
of 3 over 4 h at room temperature. In a more controlled experiment, addition of 4 atm H₂ to a solution containing an isolated, crystalline sample of 3 (vide infra) and an equivalent of PPh₃ led to the complete conversion of the former to a mixture of 1 and 2 within 4 h at 298 K. Generation of the latter could be rationalised following analysis of the ¹H and ¹⁹F NMR spectra of the volatile materials from the C₆F₆ reaction. This revealed the presence of the hydrodefluorination products C₆F₅H (major species) and both 1,2,3,4- and 1,2,4,5-C₆F₄H₂, indicating that 1 must initially activate the C-F bond in C₆F₆ to give 2 and C₆F₅H, which then proved to be at least as reactive a substrate as C₆F₆, undergoing C-F activation to give the tetrafluorobenzene isomers (and additional 2), as well as C-H activation to produce 3. The competitive nature of C-H activation is clearly shown by the higher ratio of 3:2 formed in the reaction of 1 with C₆F₅H.¹⁶

![Scheme 2](image)

Both 2 and 3 could be isolated from the reaction mixture following removal of the volatile components and recrystallization of the residue. The X-ray structure of 2 (Figure 1) revealed retention of the cis arrangement of the two NHC ligands and two PPh₃ groups
from 1 and, as a result, very little change in either Ru-C/Ru-P distances and angles. Of particular interest was the long Ru-F distance of 2.264(2) Å. This is comparable to the value (2.284(5) Å) in [Ru(dmpe)₂H(FHF)] (dmpe = 1,2-bis(dimethylphosphino)ethane), which is the only other trans H-Ru-F complex we could find that has been structurally verified.¹⁷ Surprisingly, crystallographically characterised examples of Ru(L)₄H(halide) (L = PR₃ or NHC) species with trans H-Ru-halide geometries in general are not that common,¹⁸ despite complexes of this type being known for over 50 years.¹⁹ Elongation in the Ru-F distance in both 2 and [Ru(dmpe)₂H(FHF)] compared to those in cis-[Ru(dppp)₂F₂] (dppp = 1,4-bis(diphenylphosphino)ethane) and trans-[Ru(dppe)₂F₂] (dppe = 1,2-bis(diphenylphosphino)ethane) of 2.056(3)/2.069(3) and 2.1729(18) Å respectively)²⁰ presumably results from the presence of a trans-labilising hydride ligand.

Fig. 1 Molecular structure of 2. Solvent, minor disordered component and hydrogen atoms (with the exception of the hydride ligand) have been omitted for clarity. Ellipsoids
are shown at the 30% probability level. Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°): Ru(1)-C(1) 2.115(2), Ru(1)-C(10) 2.109(2), Ru(1)-P(1) 2.3343(6), Ru(1)-P(2) 2.3493(6), Ru(1)-F(1) 2.264(2), P(1)-Ru(1)-P(2) 98.66(2), C(1)-Ru(1)-P(1) 170.54(6), C(10)-Ru(1)-F(1) 91.64(8).

A very clear low frequency doublet of triplets Ru-H signal was apparent for 2 in the room temperature \(^1\text{H}\) NMR spectrum in toluene-\(d_8\) at \(\delta -21.7\) (with diagnostic \(J_{\text{HF}}\) and \(J_{\text{HP}}\) values of 52.0 and 19.7 Hz respectively). The IEt\(_2\)Me\(_2\) signals were broad and overlapping, but resolved upon cooling to 228 K into eight sets of N-CH\(_2\) and four sets N-CH\(_2\)CH\(_3\) signals respectively. The hydride signal at 228 K now appeared as a doublet of doublet of doublets (\(J_{\text{HF}} = 51.6\) Hz, \(J_{\text{HP}} = 25.6\) Hz, \(J_{\text{HP}} = 14.1\) Hz), indicating that the two PPh\(_3\) ligands became inequivalent at low temperature. In line with this, the \(^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}\) spectrum changed from a broad singlet at room temperature to what is best described as two very broad, overlapping multiplets spread over ca. 1 ppm at 228 K. We were unable to resolve \(J_{\text{PP}}\) or \(J_{\text{PF}}\) splittings even at this low temperature. The \(^{19}\text{F}\) NMR spectrum showed a broad fluoride resonance at \(\delta -354\) in both THF-\(d_8\) and toluene-\(d_8\) at room temperature, although the doublet hydride splitting of ca. 52 Hz was partially resolved in the THF case. Altering the temperature over the range 248-318 K failed to resolve any further couplings, while the addition of CsF also made no effect.\(^{21}\)

The X-ray structure of the second product, the bis-IEt\(_2\)Me\(_2\) pentafluorophenyl complex \([\text{Ru(IEt}_2\text{Me}_2)_2(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5)_\text{H}]\) (3), revealed the anticipated square based pyramidal geometry, with the hydride trans to the vacant site (Figure 2). The two carbenes were now oriented trans to one another, forcing the PPh\(_3\) and fluoroaryl ring
also to be trans. The combination of (i) the nature of the trans ligand and (ii) the coordinative unsaturation of the metal centre impacted upon the Ru-C\_fluoroaryl bond length, which was shorter (2.136(4) Å) than that found in related systems.\textsuperscript{11,12}

**Fig. 2** Molecular structure of 3. All hydrogen atoms, except for Ru-H, are omitted for clarity. Ellipsoids are shown at the 30% probability level. Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°): Ru(1)-C(1) 2.090(3), Ru(1)-C(10) 2.088(3), Ru(1)-C(19) 2.136(4), Ru(1)-P(1) 2.2783(11), C(1)-Ru(1)-C(10) 173.39(15), C(1)-Ru(1)-C(19) 88.43(14).

The positioning of the hydride opposite a vacant site reflected in the solution spectroscopic properties of the compound, in particular, the very low frequency hydride chemical shift of δ -33.0. This appeared as a doublet of triplets, with a typical \textit{cis}-\textsuperscript{31}P
doublet splitting of 30.6 Hz, and a triplet splitting of 7.2 Hz arising from interaction with the two ortho-fluorine atoms of the C₆F₅ ring.

Efforts to accelerate the reaction of 1 with C₆F₅H using higher temperatures resulted instead in the isolation of the bis-phosphine pentafluorophenyl complex [Ru(IEt₂Me₂)(PPh₃)₂(C₆F₅)H] (4, Scheme 2) as the major ruthenium containing product of the reaction following overnight heating at 343 K. It was found that 4 could also be formed at room temperature, although very much as the minor partner alongside 2 and 3 if a sample of 1 and C₆F₆ (10 eq) was left at room temperature for ca. 100 h (ratio 2: 3: 4 = 1:0.4:0.1). Heating an isolated sample of 3 with PPh₃ (2 eq) at 343-363 K in C₆H₆ for 5 h failed to give 4, implying (unsurprisingly)²² that simple substitution of NHC by phosphine does not account for the formation of 4.

Crystals of the red compound 4 suitable for X-ray crystallography were isolated from benzene/hexane and displayed the structure shown in Figure 3. Most noticeable was the distorted octahedral geometry now present that resulted from an agostic interaction involving one of the NHC-Et groups occupying the site opposite the Ru-H. The need for the agostic stabilisation must reflect the instability of the five-coordinate 16e Ru(II) species upon replacing the strongly donating IEt₂Me₂ ligand in 3 for PPh₃ in forming 4. The agostic distances (Ru···C(5), 2.752 Å; Ru···H(5A), 2.052 Å) lie in between those in the related NHC complexes [Ru(l′Pr₂Me₂)₂(l′Pr₂Me₂)Cl] and [Ru(IEt₂Me₂)(PPh₃)₂HCl] previously described by our group²³ and are within the range considered to be strong interactions.²⁴ The Ru-C distance to the pentafluorophenyl ligand was 2.160(2) Å.

Evidence for the agostic interaction being retained in solution was apparent from small, but very clear, doublet ¹⁹F splittings on low frequency resonances for Ru···H-C at δ
0.5 and δ 6.4 in the $^1$H and $^{13}$C{$^1$H} NMR spectra respectively. Use of $^1$H-$^{19}$F HMBC spectroscopy established that the coupling resulted from the ortho-F signal at δ -112 (see ESI). The hydride resonance in 4 (δ -24.7) resonated to higher frequency of that in five-coordinate (non-agostic) 3, and appeared as triplet of doublets, the doublet splitting now arising from coupling to the other ortho-F signal at δ -106 (see ESI). These couplings help to emphasise the restricted rotation of the C$_6$F$_5$ ring suggested by the steric crowding in the crystal structure and proven by the presence of five different $^{19}$F NMR resonances.

**Fig. 3** Molecular structure of 4. All hydrogen atoms, except Ru-H and those in the agostic methyl group, are omitted. Ellipsoids are shown at the 30% probability level.

Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°): Ru(1)-C(1) 2.060(2), Ru(1)-C(10) 2.160(2), Ru(1)-P(1) 2.3452(6), Ru(1)-P(2) 2.3188(6), P(1)-Ru(1)-P(2) 168.093(19), C(10)-Ru(1)-P(1) 91.56(6), C(1)-Ru(1)-P(2) 89.41(6).
Formation of 2 via reaction of 1 with ‘HF’

In an effort to find a higher yielding route to the hydride fluoride complex 2, the reaction of 1 with Et$_3$N·3HF (TREAT-HF) was investigated. This reagent has become quite commonplace for the formation of transition metal bifluoride ([FHF]$^-$) complexes, but has, on occasion, also produced metal fluoride species. As shown in Scheme 3, 2 was formed as the sole Ru containing product upon reaction of 1 with Et$_3$N·3HF in a precise 1:1 ratio (i.e. 0.33 eq TREAT-HF). However, increasing the stoichiometry to 1:3 Ru:HF gave instead the previously reported cation [Ru(IEt$_2$Me$_2$)$_2$(PPh$_3$)$_2$H]$^+$, which was shown crystallographically to be formed as the relatively unusual [H$_2$F$_3$]$^-$ salt, 5 (see ESI).

![Scheme 3](image)

Catalytic HDF using 1

Initial catalytic studies have shown that 1 is far more active for HDF than our previously reported [Ru(NHC)(PPh$_3$)$_2$(CO)H$_2$] system bearing unsaturated or
saturated N-aryl substituted carbenes. As shown in Scheme 4, this reacted via initial phosphine loss to give 16-electron [Ru(NHC)(PPh₃)(CO)H₂], which was converted to the hydride fluoride complex [Ru(NHC)(PPh₃)(CO)HF] following hydrodefluorination. Back reaction with the alkylsilane reductant regenerated the dihydride complex, forming a strong Si-F bond in R₃SiF in the process which provides the driving force for the reaction.

![Scheme 4]

The mixture of C-F and C-H activation products formed in the stoichiometric reaction of 1 and C₆F₆ suggests that the first step of a comparable catalytic cycle with 1 might be more complex, and so the individual stoichiometric reactions of 2, 3 and 4 with Et₃SiH were investigated to establish the viability of the return reduction steps necessary to complete the catalytic cycle. It was found that: (i) Treatment of the hydride fluoride complex 2 with 1 eq Et₃SiH led to the instantaneous reformation of 1, along with Et₃SiF; (ii) There was no reaction between 3 and Et₃SiH (1.5 eq) at room temperature over 6 h, or even upon heating at 343 K for 4 h; (iii) No reaction occurred between the bis-phosphine fluoroaryl complex 4 and silane (1.5 eq) at room temperature overnight, although following addition of IEt₂Me₂ (5 eq), both C₆F₄H₂ and Et₃SiF appeared very quickly in
the $^{19}$F NMR spectrum. Over the course of ca. 2 h, however, the sample began to decompose, shown by the deposition of black solid material.

![Reaction diagram]

**Fig. 4** Product distribution from the catalytic HDF of C$_6$F$_6$ using 10 mol\% 1 with 80 eq Et$_3$SiH in C$_6$H$_6$ at 363 K. Reactions run under (top line) Ar (1 atm) and (bottom line) H$_2$ (4 atm) with percentage of products (average of 3 runs) shown after 72 h and (in parentheses) 144 h. HDF products were assigned by $^{19}$F NMR spectroscopy.

Figure 4 shows the product distribution from the HDF of C$_6$F$_6$ with 10 mol\% 1 carried out with Et$_3$SiH as reductant (80 eq) in C$_6$H$_6$ at 363 K. The elevated temperature was adopted in an effort to both push catalysis through at a reasonable rate and also to try to drive HDF through to lower fluorine containing products, which are typically more stable.
difficult to obtain.\textsuperscript{28} Remarkably, 1 proved capable of bringing about three and four HDF steps to a significant extent, affording 96\% of the reaction mixture as isomers of tri- and difluorobenzenes over 72 h.\textsuperscript{29} Doubling the reaction time increased the amount of 1,2- and 1,4-C\textsubscript{6}F\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} and even generated a small amount of fluorobenzene through completion of five HDF steps, giving an overall turnover number of 37. While an in-depth study of the regioselectivity of HDF remains to be carried out, the presence of both 1,2,4,5- and 1,2,3,4-isomers of C\textsubscript{6}F\textsubscript{4}H\textsubscript{2} after 72 h suggests that the very high \textit{ortho}-regioselectivity found with [Ru(NHC)(PPh\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{2}(CO)H\textsubscript{2}] (which converted C\textsubscript{6}F\textsubscript{5}H overwhelmingly to 1,2,3,4-\textit{C}_{6}F_{4}H_{2}) is less apparent with 1. When HDF of C\textsubscript{6}F\textsubscript{6} was repeated but now under 4 atm H\textsubscript{2}, the amount of difluorobenzene products increased (TON = 38), while the relative ratio of the 1,2:1,3:1,4 difluorobenzene isomers also altered. Interestingly, no turnover of the reaction between C\textsubscript{6}F\textsubscript{6} and 10 mol\% 1 took place under 4 atm H\textsubscript{2}/ excess NEt\textsubscript{3} (80 equivalents)\textsuperscript{30} in the absence of the silane.

**Conclusions**

In conclusion, we have shown that [Ru(I\text{Et}_2\text{Me}_2)\textsubscript{2}(PPh\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}] (1) is a far more active catalyst for the hydrodefluorination of C\textsubscript{6}F\textsubscript{6} than the previously reported [Ru(NHC)(PPh\textsubscript{3})(CO)H\textsubscript{2}] systems, as reflected in the reduction of C\textsubscript{6}F\textsubscript{6} down as far as fluorobenzene. Given the previous mechanistic studies on Ru-H catalysed HDF, this enhanced activity most likely arises from the greater nucleophilicity of the hydride ligands in 1, arising as a result of their \textit{trans} H-Ru-H geometry. A mechanistic study of 1 is ongoing to confirm the role of the Ru-H bond, and also to help rationalise the lower
regioselectivity compared to [Ru(NHC)(PPh₃)(CO)H₂]. Moreover, we hope to be able to explain why 1 is so catalytically competent in spite of appearing, at least on the basis of stoichiometric experiments, to be far more prone than [Ru(NHC)(PPh₃)(CO)H₂] to unfavourable C-H activation reactions with partially fluorinated substrates like C₆F₅H. Given that the catalysis was run under high temperature conditions where C-H activated products like [Ru(IEt₂Me₂)(PPh₃)₂(C₆F₅)H] (4) are observed, one possibility is that such species are not dead-ends, but can be recycled into the catalytic cycle, allowing propagation of HDF to continue. While this may help to explain the bias towards more of the lower fluorine containing products with a moderate pressure of H₂ shown in Figure 4, it fails to explain the change in isomer distribution. We hope to present answers to these questions in the near future.

**Experimental**

**General considerations**

All manipulations were carried out using standard Schlenk, high vacuum and glovebox techniques. Solvents were purified using an MBraun SPS solvent system (hexane, Et₂O) or under a nitrogen atmosphere from sodium benzophenone ketyl (benzene). C₆D₆ and C₆D₅CD₃ were vacuum transferred from potassium. NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker Avance 400/500 and Avance III 500 MHz NMR spectrometers and referenced as follows: 

- $^1$H, δ 7.15 (C₆D₅H), δ 2.09 (C₆D₅CD₂H) and δ 3.58 (THF-$d_7$); $^{13}$C{¹H}, δ 128.0 (C₆D₆) and δ 21.3 (C₆D₅CD₃); $^{31}$P{¹H}, externally to 85% H₃PO₄ (δ 0.0); $^{19}$F, externally to CFCl₃ (δ 0.0). PPh₃ resonances are excluded unless they could be assigned unequivocally. Elemental analyses were performed by Elemental Microanalysis Ltd,
Okehampton, Devon. [Ru(PPh₃)₄H₂]³¹ and IEt₂Me₂ were prepared according to literature methods.

[Ru(IEt₂Me₂)₂(PPh₃)₂H₂] (1). An alternative synthesis of 1 carried out in benzene rather than as previously described¹⁴ in THF is reported here. This new approach afforded 1 in shorter time and in higher yield. [Ru(PPh₃)₄H₂] (500 mg, 0.43 mmol) and IEt₂Me₂ (130 mg, 0.86 mmol) were dissolved in benzene (5 mL) and stirred in an ampoule sealed with a J. Youngs PTFE tap for 5 min at 298 K. The solution was filtered by cannula into a fresh ampoule and the volatiles were removed in vacuo to leave a sticky orange residue. This was washed with hexane (2 x 2 mL) to afford 1 as pale yellow solid. Yield: 279 mg, 70 %. Spectroscopic data matched those in the original report.¹⁴

[Ru(IEt₂Me₂)₂(PPh₃)₂HF] (2). C₆F₆ (50 µL, 0.45 mmol) was added to a benzene (5 mL) solution of 1 (140 mg, 0.15 mmol) in an ampoule fitted with J. Youngs PTFE tap. The reaction mixture was stirred vigorously for 24 h, filtered by cannula and evaporated to dryness to afford an oily red residue. Addition of hexane (1 mL) under the action of vigorous stirring resulted in a formation of a deep orange suspension (of 3), which was filtered by cannula. Leaving the hexane filtrate at room temperature for few days afforded yellow crystals of 2, which were manually separated from red needles of residual 3. Yield of 2: 43 mg, 30 %. A more efficient route to 2 involved treatment of 1 with Et₃N·3HF (TREAT-HF). Thus, TREAT-HF (6.1 µL, 0.037 mmol) was added by syringe to a benzene solution (5 mL) of 1 (100 mg, 0.11 mmol) in an ampoule fitted with a J. Youngs PTFE tap. The reaction mixture was stirred for 30 min, the volatiles then removed under vacuum and the sticky yellow solid washed with hexane (2 mL) to afford 2 as a pale yellow solid. Yield: 75 mg, 72 %. ¹H NMR: δH (C₆D₅CD₃, 400 MHz, 228 K) -21.58
(ddd, 1H, \( J_{HF} = 51.6 \) Hz, \( J_{HP} = 25.0 \) Hz, \( J_{HP} = 14.1 \) Hz, Ru-\( H \)), 0.26 (t, 3H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 0.34 (t, 3H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 1.10 (t, 3H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 1.16 (s, 3H, NCCH\(_3\)), 1.21 (s, 3H, NCCH\(_3\)), 1.39 (t, 3H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 1.49 (s, 3H, NCCH\(_3\)), 1.56 (s, 3H, NCCH\(_3\)), 2.32 (m, 1H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 2.61 (m, 1H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 3.13 (m, 1H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 3.36 (m, 1H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 5.60 (br m, 1H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 5.83 (br m, 1H, \( J_{HH} = 6.8 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 6.45 (br s, 1H, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 6.80 (br s, 1H, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)).

Chemical shift established by \(^1\)H COSY. \(^{31}\)P \(^1\)H NMR: \( \delta_p \) (Cd\(_6\)CD\(_3\), 121.5 MHz, 298 K): 43.1 (br s). \(^{13}\)C \(^1\)H NMR: \( \delta_c \) (Cd\(_6\)CD\(_3\), 100 MHz, 228 K) 8.7 (s, NCCH\(_3\)), 8.8 (s, NCCH\(_3\)), 9.1 (s, NCCH\(_3\)), 9.4 (s, NCCH\(_3\)), 13.6 (s, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 14.2 (s, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 15.0 (s, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 16.2 (s, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 40.5 (d, \( J_{CP} \) or \( J_{CF} = 32.2 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 42.0 (d, \( J_{CP} \) or \( J_{CF} = 16.4 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 43.2 (s, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 122.3 (s, NCCH\(_3\)), 122.9 (s, NCCH\(_3\)), 123.5 (s, NCCH\(_3\)), 124.4 (s, NCCH\(_3\)), 191.4 (m, Ru-C\(_{NHC}\)). \(^{19}\)F NMR (THF-\( d_8 \), 470 MHz, 298 K): \( \delta \) -354.4 (br d, \( J_{FH} = 51.6 \) Hz). Analysis found: C, 68.99; H, 7.15; N, 5.62%.

C\(_{57}\)H\(_{63}\)N\(_4\)FP\(_2\)Ru·0.5C\(_6\)H\(_{14}\) requires: C, 68.93; H, 7.10; N, 5.64%.

\([\text{Ru}(\text{IEt}_2\text{Me}_2)_2(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5)\text{H}] \) (3). C\(_6\)F\(_5\)H (120 \mu L, 1.1 mmol) was syringed into a J. Youngs resealable ampoule containing a hexane suspension (5 mL) of 1 (100 mg, 0.11 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred vigorously at room temperature for 24 h to give a dark orange solid, which was isolated by cannula filtration, washed with hexane (2 x 5 mL) and dried in vacuo. Yield 53 mg, 58 %. \(^1\)H NMR: \( \delta_h \) (Cd\(_6\)D\(_6\), 500 MHz, 298 K) - 32.95 (dt, 1H, \( J_{HP} = 30.6 \) Hz, \( J_{HF} = 7.2 \) Hz, Ru-\( H \)), 0.98 (t, 6H, \( J_{HH} = 7.3 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 1.02 (t, 6H, \( J_{HH} = 7.3 \) Hz, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 1.45 (s, 6H, NCCH\(_3\)), 1.48 (s, 6H, NCCH\(_3\)), 3.05 (m, 2H, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 3.60 (m, 4H, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 4.77 (m, 2H, NCH\(_2\)CH\(_3\)), 6.90-7.05 (br m,
9H, PC₆H₅), 7.43-7.49 (m, 6H, PC₆H₅). ³¹P {¹H} NMR: δ_p (C₆D₆, 121.5 MHz, 298 K) 59.5 (tt, J_PF = 20.7 Hz, J_PF = 9.7 Hz). ¹³C {¹H} NMR: δ_c (C₆D₆, 126 MHz, 298 K) 9.0 (s, NCH₂CH₃), 9.2 (s, NCH₂CH₃), 15.3 (s, NCCH₃), 15.4 (s, NCCH₃), 42.4 (s, NCH₂CH₃), 43.2 (s, NCH₂CH₃), 123.2 (s, NCCH₃), 123.6 (s, NCCH₃), 127.1 (d, J_CP = 7.3 Hz, PC₆H₅), 127.4 (d, J_CP = 11.0 Hz, PC₆H₅), 142.8 (d, J_CP = 26.7 Hz, PC₆H₅), 195.9 (d, J_CP = 12.1 Hz, Ru-C_NHC). ¹⁹F NMR: δ_F (C₆D₆, 470 MHz, 298 K) -166.4 (1F, t, J_FF = 20.3 Hz, p-C₆F₅), -165.6 (2F, m, m-C₆F₅), -111.5 (2F, br s, o-C₆F₅). Analysis found: C, 60.36; H, 5.74; N, 6.72. C₄₂H₄₈N₄F₅PRu requires: C, 60.34; H, 5.79; N, 6.70.

[Ru(IEt₂Me₂)(PPh₃)₂(C₆F₅)H] (4). A J. Young NMR tube containing I (45 mg, 48 µmol) and C₆F₅H (16 µL, 145 µmol) was heated in C₆H₆ (0.5 mL) at 343 K overnight to afford a deep red solution. This was filtered by cannula and the filtrate evaporated to dryness. After washing with hexane (3 x 0.5 mL), the residue was redissolved in a minimal amount of THF and layered with hexane to afford deep red crystals of 4. Yield: 13 mg, 28%. ¹H NMR: δ_H (THF-d₈, 500 MHz, 298 K) -24.66 (1H, td, J_PH = 23.5 Hz, J_HF = 6.9 Hz, Ru-H), 0.34 (3H, t, J_HH = 7.3 Hz, NCH₂CH₃), 0.48 (3H, td, J_HH = 7.3 Hz, J_HF = 1.5 Hz, NCH₂CH₃), 1.92 (3H, s, NCCH₃), 1.96 (3H, s, NCCH₃), 2.90 (2H, q, J_HH = 7.3 Hz, NCH₂CH₃), 3.38 (2H, q, J_HH = 7.3 Hz, NCH₂CH₃), 7.02-7.24 (30H, br m, PC₆H₅). ³¹P {¹H} NMR: δ_p (THF-d₈, 202 MHz, 298 K) 52.3 (s). ¹³C {¹H} NMR: δ_c (THF-d₈, 126 MHz, 298 K) 6.4 (d, J_CF = 7.5 Hz, NCH₂CH₃), 9.4 (s, NCCH₃), 9.8 (s, NCCH₃), 14.5 (s, NCH₂CH₃), 42.5 (s, NCH₂CH₃), 44.0 (s, NCH₂CH₃), 124.7 (s, NCCH₃), 126.2 (s, NCCH₃), 127.9 (virtual triplet (‘vt’), J = 4 Hz, PC₆H₅), 129.0 (s, PC₆H₅), 134.6 (‘vt’, J = 6 Hz, PC₆H₅), 139.0 (‘vt’, J = 17 Hz, PC₆H₅), 194.0 (m, Ru-C_NHC). ¹⁹F NMR: δ_F (THF-d₈, 470 MHz, 298 K) -171.5 (1F, t, J_FF = 20.2 Hz, p-C₆F₅), -170.1 (1F, m, p-C₆F₅), -168.9
(1F, m, m-C6F5), -111.8 (1F, m, o-C6F5), -105.5 (1F, m, o-C6F5). Analysis found: C, 64.89; H, 4.98; N, 3.01. C51H47N2F5P2Ru requires: C, 64.75; H, 5.01; N, 2.96.

[Ru(IEt2Me2)2(PPh3)2H][H2F3] (5). TREAT-HF (17.5 µL, 0.11 mmol) was added to a benzene (5 mL) solution of 1 (100 mg, 0.11 mmol) in a J. Youngs resealable ampoule. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 30 min at 298 K, before the sample was reduced to dryness. The sticky orange/red residue was washed with hexane (2 x 2 mL) and Et2O (2 x 2 mL) and then redissolved in THF (5 mL). Addition of Et2O resulted in the precipitation of 5 as an orange solid, which was washed further with Et2O (2 x 5 mL) and then dried in vacuo. Yield: 76 mg, 69%. Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained upon layering a concentrated THF-d8 solution with hexane. 1H NMR: δH (THF-d8, 500 MHz, 298 K) -29.65 (1H, t, JHP = 24.0 Hz, Ru-H), 0.44 (6H, t, JHH = 7.3 Hz, NCH2CH3), 0.88 (6H, t, JHH = 7.3 Hz, NCH2CH3), 1.81 (6H, s, NCCCH3), 2.01 (6H, s, NCCCH3), 2.75 (4H, q, JHH = 7.3 Hz, NCH2CH3), 3.36 (4H, q, JHH = 7.3 Hz, NCH2CH3), 7.16-7.34 (30H, m, P(C6H5)3), 13.68 (2H, br s, [H2F3]). 31P {1H} NMR: δP (THF-d8, 202 MHz, 298 K) 46.1 (s). 19F NMR: δF (THF-d8, 470 MHz, 298 K) -115.2 (br s). Analysis found: C, 64.38; H, 5.69; N, 4.84.

C54H65N4F3P2Ru·2C4D8O requires C, 64.73; H, 5.70; N, 4.87.

Procedures for Catalytic HDF. A stock solution of 1 was prepared by dissolving 0.0184 g (0.02 mmol) of the complex in 2 mL C6H6 in the glovebox. 0.5 mL aliquots of this solution was syringed into three J. Young’s resealable NMR tubes, and C6F6 (5.8 µL, 0.05 mmol) and Et3SiH (63 µL, 0.4 mmol) added to each tube. These were then placed in a pre-heated oil bath at 363 K and monitored by 19F NMR spectroscopy after 72 and 144 h. For reactions performed under H2, a C6H6 (0.3 mL) sample of 1 (0.0046 g, 0.005
mmol) was placed into a medium-walled NMR tube fitted with a resealable valve and freeze-pump-thaw degassed (3 cycles). A mixture of C₆F₆ (5.8 µL, 0.05 mmol), Et₃SiH (63 µL, 0.4 mmol) and C₆H₆ (0.1 mL) was vacuum transferred into the pressure tube, which was then put under 4 atm H₂ and placed in a pre-heated oil bath at 363 K. The reaction was monitored by ¹⁹F NMR spectroscopy after 72 and 144 h.

**X-ray crystallography.** Data for 2 and 4 were obtained using a Nonius Kappa CCD diffractometer, while those for 3 and 5 (see ESI) were collected using Agilent SuperNova and Agilent Excaliber diffractometers, respectively. Details of the data collections, solutions and refinements are given in Table 1. All diffraction measurements were conducted at 150 K using Mo(Kα) radiation and hydride ligands were uniformly refined subject to being a distance of 1.6 Å from the relevant metal centre. Convergence was straightforward in all cases, and only exceptional details merit note. In particular, the asymmetric unit in 2 was seen to comprise one bis-carbene complex and half of a hexane molecule. The latter is proximate to an inversion centre which serves to generate the remainder. The fluoride and hydride ligands were modelled subject to being disordered with each other in a 53:47 ratio. Fractional occupancy hydride atoms were refined with a common isotropic displacement parameter. In 3, H5A, H5B and H5C were readily located and refined with the single restraint of being at a distance of 0.98 Å from C5. The structures were solved using SHELXS-97 and refined using full-matrix least squares in SHELXL-97. Crystallographic data for compounds have been deposited with the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre as supplementary publications CCDC 1400863-1400866. Copies of the data can be obtained free of charge on application to CCDC, 12
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound reference</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical formula</td>
<td>C₅₇H₇₀N₄FP₂Ru</td>
<td>C₄₂H₄₈N₄F₅PRu</td>
<td>C₅₁H₄₇N₂F₅P₂Ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula Mass</td>
<td>993.18</td>
<td>835.88</td>
<td>945.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system</td>
<td>Monoclinic</td>
<td>Orthorhombic</td>
<td>Triclinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a/Å</td>
<td>16.7400(1)</td>
<td>31.0451(7)</td>
<td>12.6690(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b/Å</td>
<td>16.5550(1)</td>
<td>8.9768(2)</td>
<td>13.1530(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c/Å</td>
<td>19.4760(1)</td>
<td>14.4306(3)</td>
<td>15.5900(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α/°</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>96.300(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β/°</td>
<td>109.727(1)</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>105.626(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ/°</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>116.893(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit cell volume/Å³</td>
<td>5080.63(5)</td>
<td>4021.62(17)</td>
<td>2148.63(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
<td>P2₁/a</td>
<td>Pnna₂₁</td>
<td>P₁̅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of formula units per unit cell, Z</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of reflections measured</td>
<td>94717</td>
<td>22071</td>
<td>40103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of independent reflections</td>
<td>11623</td>
<td>7401</td>
<td>9725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rint</td>
<td>0.0678</td>
<td>0.0684</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R1 values (I &gt; 2σ(I))</td>
<td>0.0370</td>
<td>0.0402</td>
<td>0.0338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final wR(F²) values (I &gt; 2σ(I))</td>
<td>0.0767</td>
<td>0.0877</td>
<td>0.0685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R1 values (all data)</td>
<td>0.0582</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
<td>0.0516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final wR(F²) values (all data)</td>
<td>0.0851</td>
<td>0.0942</td>
<td>0.0746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Crystal data and structure refinement details for compounds 2, 3 and 4.
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Multiple catalytic hydrodefluorination steps take place with the trans-dihydride complex $[\text{Ru}(\text{IEt}_2\text{Me}_2)_2(\text{PPh}_3)_2\text{H}_2]$ (1), taking $\text{C}_6\text{F}_6$ to tri-, di- and mono-fluorobenzenes.