# Molecular Topological Index and Its Application. 4. Relationships with the Diamagnetic Susceptibilities of Alkyl-IVA Group Organometallic Halides

Lin-Feng Li, Yong Zhang, and Xiao-Zeng You\*

Coordination Chemistry Institute and the State Key Laboratory of Coordination Chemistry, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China

Received January 13, 1994<sup>⊗</sup>

On the basis of four-energy-level model proposed previously, a new topological index  $H_1$  was introduced in the paper to investigate the diamagnetic susceptibility of the organometallics for the first time, which is essentially a kind of edge-weighted one in terms of the graph theory. The indices  $H_1$ 's of the alkyl-IVA group organometallic halides, including halogen-substituted methanes and enthanes along with those represented by  $(CH_3)_{4-n}MX_n$  (n=0-4; M=Si, Ge, Sn), were calculated accordingly. Good linear relations were found between the  $H_1$ 's and the corresponding diamagnetic susceptibilities  $\chi_M$ 's for each series of compounds with similar graphic representations. Moreover, estimation of  $\chi_M$ 's was made as to the compounds whose values are not experimentally measured yet.

### INTRODUCTION

Magnetic susceptibilities  $\chi_M$ 's of stable organic species have long been observed to be approximately fit by a sum of atomic contribution, which was so-called Pascal's constants.<sup>1</sup> A subsequent expansion, motivated by the simple quantum chemical treatment, was developed by Hameka<sup>2,3</sup> and later by Flygare and co-workers,<sup>4</sup> which considers, besides atomic contributions, also bond contributions and bond—bond interactions. But a large number of experimental values of  $\chi_M$  are needed in order to obtain that large families of parameters. In some simple cases the theoretical calculation of  $\chi_M$  seems to be attractive, but most of the results thus obtained are quantitatively incomparable with the experimental values.<sup>5</sup> And for the methyl-IVA group organometallic halides, none of the above approaches proved to yield consistent results.<sup>6</sup>

The diamagnetic property of a compound is determined mainly by its molecular structure other than the bulk as a whole.7 Hence, the application of graph theory in this connection may be of some merits, though the structures here are approximately represented by the graphs without taking into account of the geometrical details. In fact, many attempts have been made in this direction, from the Wiener<sup>8</sup> or Randić index<sup>9</sup> for alkanes, through the more sophisticated connectivity indices by Kier and Hall, 10,11 for both alkanes and alaphatic alcohols, to the cluster expansion method, 12,13 proposed more recently. As can be seen, a tendency in the construction of new topological indices (TI's) is followed<sup>14</sup> as the incorporation of more electronic structure information into a graph to get so-called chromograph; therefore the elements other than C, N, O, F, Cl, etc. can be fully described,15-17 and the method can be largely extended to fit the use for the inorganic or organometallic compounds. Practically, there are two strategies to fulfill the aim, which are based on the two kinds of local graph invariants, viz., local vertex invariants associated with vertexes symbolizing atoms and local edge invariants corresponding to edges symbolizing covalent bonds. As we shall see, topological index  $H_1$  falls into the later catalog, and has been proven to

be quite effective in the correlation with the chemical shifts of NMR<sup>16</sup> in  $MoO_nX_{4-n}^{2-}$  (X = S, Se), Mossbauer isomer shifts<sup>15</sup> in  $SnX_nY_{4-n}$  (X, Y = halogens) and the enthalpies of formation for series of compounds.<sup>17</sup> In the present contribution, we will continue to explore its applications to the study of the diamagnetic susceptibilities of group IVA organometallic halides.

#### TOPOLOGICAL INDEX $H_1$

The procedure, which was once taken by Lall<sup>18</sup> and Xin,<sup>19</sup> is adopted here, viz., more information is taken into account as to the edges symbolizing the bonds in a molecule. Following Randić,<sup>9</sup> a new topological index  $H_1$  (eq 1) as proposed previously<sup>15</sup> was introduced as

$$H_1 = (\sum_{i} h_i)^2 = \left(\sum_{i} \frac{1}{(1 + \Delta_i)\sqrt{p_i q_i}}\right)^2 \tag{1}$$

where  $p_i$  and  $q_i$  are the degrees of the vertexes bridging the ith edge,  $h_i$  is the contribution from ith edge.  $\Delta_i$  is a parameter to describe the interaction in an edge (i.e., a bond), the summation goes over all edges in a molecular graph. It's worthwhile to note that the hydrogens in our graph are not suppressed while unusually done. Based on the four-energy-level assumption,  $^{15-17}$   $\Delta_i$  can be expressed as follows:

$$\Delta_i = \alpha [I_i(1) - A_i(2)] + (1 - \alpha)[I_i(2) - A_i(1)] \quad (2)$$

where  $I_i(n)$  and  $A_i(n)$  (n=1,2) are the first ionization potentials and electron affinities of atoms 1 and 2 connected by the *i*th edge (Table 1). As illustrated previously, <sup>15</sup> the first term shows the electron transfer interaction from HOAO of atom 1 to LUAO of atom 2, while the last term represents the feed back interaction from HOAO of atom 2 to LUAO of atom 1, which may be very important in some cases, e.g., the back-donation of the lone pair of fluorine to the vacant p-orbital of boron greatly increases the stability of BF<sub>3</sub>. In order to reflect the difference between the two kinds of interactions, the parameter  $\alpha$  can be adjusted. For simplicity, however,  $\alpha$  is empirically taken to be 0.5 in the following calculation, which means that two kinds of interactions are

<sup>\*</sup> Abstract published in Advance ACS Abstracts, May 1, 1995.

**Table 1.** First Ionization Protentials and Electron Affinities of the Atoms Adopted in the Calculations<sup>20</sup> (KJ mol<sup>-1</sup>)

	F	Cl	Br	I	Н	С	Si	Ge	Sn
I	1681.0	1251.1	1139.9	1008.4	1312.0	1086.4	786.5	762.2	708.6
A	322.0	348.7	324.5	295.0	72.9	122.0	120.0	116.0	121.0

**Table 2.**  $H_1$ 's and  $\chi_M$ 's (Unit:  $10^6$  cgs) of Halogen Substituted Methanes

molecular graph	no.	compd	$H_1 (\times 10^{-6})$	$-\chi_{M}^{exp,21}$	- χ <sup>calcd</sup>
	1	CH <sub>3</sub> Cl	3.592	32.0	38.9
	2	$CH_2Cl_2$	3.909	46.6	50.5
	3	CHCl <sub>3</sub>	4.238	59.3	62.5
	4	CCl₄	4.581	66.6	75.1
	5	CCl <sub>3</sub> Br	4.694	73.1	79.2
_	6	$CCl_2Br_2$	4.808	81.1	83.4
O I	7	$CBr_4$	5.040	93.7	91.9
o-ò-o	8	CBr <sub>3</sub> H	4.567	82.6	74.6
Ĭ	9	$CBr_2H_2$	4.118	65.1	58.2
O	10	CBrH <sub>3</sub>	3.692	42.8	42.6
	11	CBr <sub>2</sub> ClH	4.456	75.1	70.5
	12	CBrCl <sub>2</sub> H	4.347	66.3	66.5
	13	CBrClH <sub>2</sub>	4.013	55.0	54.3
	14	CCl <sub>3</sub> F	4.143	58.7	59.1
	15	$CCl_2F_2$	3.726	52.2	43.8
	16	$CFH_3$	3.205	17.8	24.8
	17	CF <sub>2</sub> ClH	3.417	38.6	32.5
	18	CFCl <sub>2</sub> H	3.817	48.8	47.2
regression equation coeffice	on: — cient:	$\chi_{\rm M} = -89.5$ 0.961; devi	375 + 35.930 > ation max: 8.5	$< 10^6 H_1$ ; av: 4.3	

**Table 3.**  $H_1$ 's and  $\chi_M$ 's (Unit:  $10^6$  cgs) of Halogen Substituted Ethanes

molecular graph	no.	compd	$H_1 (\times 10^{-6})$	$-\chi_{\rm M}^{\rm exp,21}$	$-\chi_{\rm M}^{\rm calcd}$
	1	CHCl <sub>2</sub> CHCl <sub>2</sub>	12,71	89.8	90.7
٩	2	CH <sub>2</sub> ClCH <sub>2</sub> Cl	11.57	59.6	64.6
o-ģ-o	3	CHCl <sub>2</sub> CCl <sub>3</sub>	13.30	99.1	104.2
0-0-0	4	CCl <sub>3</sub> CCl <sub>3</sub>	13.90	112.7	117.9
Ĭ	5	CH <sub>2</sub> BrCH <sub>2</sub> Br	11.93	78.8	72.9
0	6	CBr <sub>3</sub> CBr <sub>3</sub>	15.10	148.0	145.4
	7	CClBrHCClBrH	13.09	108.6	99.4
	8	CBrCl <sub>2</sub> CBrCl <sub>2</sub>	14.29	126.0	126.8
		tion: $-\chi_{\rm M} = -199.5$ ficient: 0.980; devia			

**Table 4.**  $H_1$ 's and  $\chi_M$ 's (Unit:  $10^6$  egs) of  $(CH_3)_3MX$ 

molecular graph	no.	compd	$H_1 (\times 10^{-6})$	$-\chi_{\rm M}^{\rm exp,6}$	$-\chi_{\rm M}^{\rm calcd}$
	1	Me <sub>3</sub> SiCl	31.76	79.0	81.4
Ĭ	2	Me <sub>3</sub> SiBr	22.19	91.3	91.3
0-0-0	3	Me <sub>3</sub> SiI	32.75	104.1	104.7
Ŷ	4	Me <sub>3</sub> GeCl	31.99	90.3	86.7
0-0-0-0	5	Me <sub>3</sub> GeBr	32.42	98.5	97.0
0_1_0	6	Me <sub>3</sub> SnCl	32.67	101.1	102.9
Ĭ	7	Me <sub>3</sub> SnBr	33.15	112.5	114.1
0	8	Me <sub>3</sub> SnI	33.80	130.7	129.4
	9	Me <sub>3</sub> GeI	33.01		110.8
regression equation coefficient					

equally important in the formation of a bond. Though such a postulate does not always hold, the effectiveness has been proven in the previous investigations.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Diamagnetic susceptibilities of various alkanes and alaphatic alcohols have been investigated using the connectivity indices by Kier et al.<sup>11</sup> In most of the cases, up to seven different kinds of indices have been employed for a good

**Table 5.**  $H_1$ 's and  $\chi_M$ 's (Unit:  $10^6$  cgs) of  $(CH_3)_2MX_2$ 

molecular graph	no.	compd	$H_1 (\times 10^{-6})$	$-\chi_{\rm M}^{{ m exp},6}$	$-\chi_{ m M}^{ m caicd}$
0	1	Me <sub>2</sub> SiCl <sub>2</sub>	21.22	81.3	82.8
Ĭ	2	$Me_2SiI_2$	22.85	131.8	125.6
0-0-0	3	$Me_2GeCl_2$	21.44	91.6	88.7
1	4	$Me_2GeBr_2$	22.16	107.0	107.5
0-0-0	5	$Me_2GeI_2$	23.13	138.2	133.0
0-0-0	6	$Me_2SnCl_2$	22.13	102.8	106.8
Ī	7	$Me_2SnBr_2$	22.92	121.3	127.5
0	8	$Me_2SnI_2$	24.00	153.5	155.7
	9	$Me_2SiBr_2$	21.9		101.0
	10	Me <sub>2</sub> SiClBr	21.56		91.8
	11	Me <sub>2</sub> SiBrI	22.38		113.3
	12	Me <sub>2</sub> SiClI	22.03		104.1
	13	$Me_2GeClBr$	21.80		98.1
	14	$Me_2GeClO$	22.28		110.7
	15	$Me_2GeBrI$	22.64		120.1
	16	$Me_2SnClBr$	22.52		117.0
	17	$Me_2SnClI$	23.06		131.1
	18	$Me_2SnBrI$	23.46		141.6
regression equat correlation coeff					

**Table 6.**  $H_1$ 's and  $\chi_M$ 's (Unit:  $10^6$  cgs) of MeMX<sub>3</sub>

molecular graph	no.	compd	$H_1 (\times 10^{-6})$	$-\chi_{\rm M}^{\rm exp.6}$	$-\chi_{\rm M}^{\rm calcd}$
	1	MeSiCl <sub>3</sub>	12.79	87.45	88.71
	2 3	MeSiBr <sub>3</sub>	13.60	115.5	111.2
	3	$MeGeCl_3$	13.00	95.1	94.5
	4	$MeGeBr_3$	13.84	120.5	117.7
	5	$MeGeI_3$	15.00	158.25	150.04
o o	6	MeSnCl <sub>3</sub>	13.64	107.7	112.1
0-0-0	7	$MeSnBr_3$	14.57	129.8	138.0
000	8	$MeSnI_3$	15.88	172.1	174.1
0-0-0	9	MeSiI <sub>3</sub>	14.73		142.4
Ö	10	MeSiCl <sub>2</sub> I	13.42		106.2
	11	MeSiCl <sub>2</sub> Br	13.06		96.2
	12	MeSiClBrI	13.69		113.6
	13	MeSiBr <sub>2</sub> Cl	13.33		103.7
	14	MeSiBr <sub>2</sub> I	13.97		121.4
	15	MeSiClI <sub>2</sub>	14.06		123.9
	16	$MeSiBrI_2$	14.35		131.9
	17	MeGeCl <sub>2</sub> Br	13.27		102.0
	18	MeGeCl <sub>2</sub> I	13.65		112.5
	19	MeGeClBrI	13.93		120.3
	20	MeGeBr <sub>2</sub> Cl	13.55		109.8
	21	MeGeBr <sub>2</sub> I	14.22		128.3
	22	MeGeClI <sub>2</sub>	14.32		131.1
	23	$MeGeBrI_2$	14.61		139.1
	24	MeSnCl <sub>2</sub> Br	13.94		120.6
	25	$MeSnCl_2I$	14.36		132.2
	26	MeSnClBrI	14.68		141.0
	27	MeSnClBr <sub>2</sub>	14.26		129.4
	28	MeSnBr <sub>2</sub> I	15.00		149.9
	29	$MeSnClI_2$	15.11		153.0
	30	$MeSnBrI_2$	15.43		161.82
regression equati correlation coeffi					

linear fitting of the experimental data. But the large families of variables used in the correlation need more experimental  $\chi_M$  values, which may not be the cases in practice. On the other hand, until now, the method is only limited to the organic compounds. As for the organometallics, intrinsic difficulty arises. But on our indices, no confinement is imposed at the point.

**Table 7.**  $H_1$ 's and  $\chi_M$ 's (Unit:  $10^6$  cgs) of MX<sub>4</sub>

$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	87.4 123.3 99.0 129.2 170.9 117.3 148.8 195.6	95.2 119.8 100.6 126.2 162.7 117.3 146.2 187.7 101.2 109.4 107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
3 GeCl <sub>4</sub> 6.655 4 GeBr <sub>4</sub> 7.469 5 GeI <sub>4</sub> 8.630 6 SnCl <sub>4</sub> 7.188 7 SnBr <sub>4</sub> 8.105 8 SnI <sub>4</sub> 9.424 9 SiCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.675 10 SiCl <sub>3</sub> I 6.935 11 SiCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.401 12 SiCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.133 0 13 SiCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.401 14 SiClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.066 15 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.537 16 SiBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.812 17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333 18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBr <sub>1</sub> 3 8.093 20 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039	99.0 129.2 170.9 117.3 148.8	100.6 126.2 162.7 117.3 146.2 187.7 101.2 109.4 107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
4 GeBr <sub>4</sub> 7.469 5 GeI <sub>4</sub> 8.630 6 SnCl <sub>4</sub> 7.188 7 SnBr <sub>4</sub> 8.105 8 SnI <sub>4</sub> 9.424 9 SiCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.675 10 SiCl <sub>3</sub> I 6.935 11 SiCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.401 12 SiCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.133 0 13 SiCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.401 14 SiClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.066 15 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.537 16 SiBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.812 17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333 18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBr <sub>1</sub> S 8.093 20 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039	129.2 170.9 117.3 148.8	126.2 162.7 117.3 146.2 187.7 101.2 109.4 107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	170.9 117.3 148.8	162.7 117.3 146.2 187.7 101.2 109.4 107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	117.3 148.8	117.3 146.2 187.7 101.2 109.4 107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
7 SnBr <sub>4</sub> 8.105 8 SnI <sub>4</sub> 9.424 9 SiCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.675 0 10 SiCl <sub>3</sub> I 6.935 0 11 SiCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 6.869 12 SiCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.133 0 13 SiCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.401 14 SiClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.066 15 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.537 16 SiBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.812 17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333 18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBrI <sub>3</sub> 8.093 20 SiClBr <sub>12</sub> 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 26 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039	148.8	146.2 187.7 101.2 109.4 107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
8 SnI <sub>4</sub> 9.424 9 SiCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.675 0 10 SiCl <sub>3</sub> I 6.935 0 0 11 SiCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 6.869 12 SiCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.133 0 13 SiCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.401 14 SiClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.066 15 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.537 16 SiBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.812 17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333 18 SiCl <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBr <sub>3</sub> 8.093 20 SiClBr <sub>1</sub> 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>I</sub> 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>I</sub> 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		187.7 101.2 109.4 107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
9 SiCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.675  10 SiCl <sub>3</sub> I 6.935  11 SiCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 6.869  12 SiCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.133  13 SiCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.401  14 SiClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.066  15 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.537  16 SiBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.812  17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333  18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882  19 SiBrI <sub>3</sub> 8.093  20 SiClBrI <sub>2</sub> 7.605  21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854  22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124  23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056  24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.331  25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610  26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261  27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752  28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039	195.6	101.2 109.4 107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
0 10 SiCl <sub>3</sub> I 6.935 11 SiCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 6.869 12 SiCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.133 0 13 SiCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.401 14 SiClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.066 15 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.537 16 SiBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.812 17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333 18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBr <sub>3</sub> 8.093 20 SiClBr <sub>1</sub> Z 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 26 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		109.4 107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
0-0-0 11 SiCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 6.869 12 SiCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.133 0 13 SiCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.401 14 SiClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.066 15 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.537 16 SiBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.812 17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333 18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 8.093 20 SiClBr <sub>1</sub> Z 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 26 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		107.3 115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
0-0-0 12 SiCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.133 0 13 SiCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.401 14 SiClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.066 15 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.537 16 SiBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.812 17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333 18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBr <sub>3</sub> 8.093 20 SiClBr <sub>1</sub> Z 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.331 26 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>1</sub> 7.331 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		115.6 124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
13 SiCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.401 14 SiClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.066 15 SiBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.537 16 SiBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.812 17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333 18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBrI <sub>3</sub> 8.093 20 SiClBrI <sub>2</sub> 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 26 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.356 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		124.0 113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		113.5 128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		128.3 137.0 121.9 139.2
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		137.0 121.9 139.2
17 SiClBr <sub>2</sub> I 7.333 18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBrI <sub>3</sub> 8.093 20 SiClBrI <sub>2</sub> 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		121.9 139.2
18 SiClI <sub>3</sub> 7.882 19 SiBrI <sub>3</sub> 8.093 20 SiClBrI <sub>2</sub> 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		139.2
19 SiBrI <sub>3</sub> 8.093 20 SiClBrI <sub>2</sub> 7.605 21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		1450
21 GeCl <sub>3</sub> Br 6.854 22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		145.8
22 GeCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.124 23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		130.5
23 GeCl <sub>2</sub> Br <sub>2</sub> 7.056 24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		106.8
24 GeCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.331 25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		115.3
25 GeCl <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 7.610 26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		113.2
26 GeClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.261 27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		121.8
27 GeBr <sub>3</sub> I 7.752 28 GeBr <sub>2</sub> I <sub>2</sub> 8.039		130.6
28 $GeBr_2I_2$ 8.039		119.6
		135.1
20 C-CID- I 7 540		144.1
29 $GeClBr_2I$ 7.540		128.4
30 $GeC1I_3$ 8.112		146.4
31 GeBrI <sub>3</sub> 8.332		153.4
$32  GeClBrI_2 \qquad 7.823$		137.3
33 SnCl <sub>3</sub> Br 7.412		124.4
34 SnCl <sub>3</sub> I 7.718		134.0
35 $SnCl_2Br_2$ 7.640		131.6
36 SnCl <sub>2</sub> BrI 7.951		141.4
$37 \text{ SnCl}_2 I_2 8.268$		151.3
38 SnClBr <sub>3</sub> 7.571		138.8
39 SnBr <sub>3</sub> I 8.426		156.3
$40  SnBr_2I_2 \qquad 8.752$		166.6
41 SnBr <sub>2</sub> ClI 8.186		148.8
42 SnClI <sub>3</sub> 8.836		169.2
43 SnBrI <sub>3</sub> 8.508		158.9

regression equation:  $-\chi_{\rm M} = -108.965 + 31.484 \times 10^6 H_1$ correlation coefficient: 0.988; deviation max: 8.2; av: 4.3

 $H_1$  and the calculated  $\chi_{\rm M}$ 's of several halogenated methanes are listed in columns 4 and 6, respectively, and good correlation coefficients (r = 0.961) are found. The maximum and average deviation of the calculated  $\chi_{\rm M}$ 's from those observed is  $8.5 \times 10^6$  cgs. As to the halogen substituted ethanes (Table 3), a good linear relation is also held with correlation coefficient r = 0.980, maximum deviation 9.2  $\times$  10<sup>6</sup> cgs. It can be seen that, for the organic halides, our topological index  $H_1$  derives a relationship as good as the others.

Up to date, no quantitative structure property relationship (QSPR) analysis has been made in the sense of topology for the organometallic compounds. The attempts to correlate the diamagnetic susceptibilities of  $(CH_3)_n MX_{4-n}$  (M = Si, Ge,Sn; n = 0-4; X = halogen) with  $H_1$ 's seem to be promising. For each set of compounds, no matter what kinds of central atoms (e.g., Si of Sn) are involved, only one linear relationship is observed for the same graphic representation, as listed in column one of Tables 4-7, with the least square fitting equations, correlation coefficients, calculated  $\chi_{\rm M}$ 's, and the maximum as well as average deviations subsequently. It can be seen that the coefficients are generally larger than 0.98, while the maximum deviations demonstrate that the calcu-

lated  $\chi_{\rm M}$ 's are within the reasonable accuracy compared with the experimental ones, which provides us confidence to the further estimation of the unknown  $\chi_{M}$ 's of various compounds. Accordingly, our estimated diamagnetic susceptibility values of various sets of organometallics are shown in Tables 4-7, which are subject to the future experimental test, especially for the organometallic mixed halides.

The success of the topological index  $H_1$  may not seem too surprising, if one express the eq 1 as follows:

$$H_1 = \sum_i h_i^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} h_i h_j \tag{3}$$

where the first term is the summation over all edges, which may be considered as contributions from each bond, while the last term is the summation over all pairs of edges, which may be considered as contributions from pairs of bonds, i.e., pairwise contributions. Hence, our topological index  $H_1$  has already combined two kinds of contributions together.

#### CONCLUSION

In summary, our topological index  $H_1$  is proved to be quite simple and effective in the correlation with the diamagnetic susceptibility  $\chi_M$ 's of alkyl-group IV organometallic halides. The method is a powerful tool for the estimation of  $\chi_{\rm M}$ 's with reasonable accuracy. Further exploring of its applications are in progress.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The research is supported by the grants for the major research project from the State Science and Technology Commission and the National Natural Science Foundation of China.

## REFERENCES AND NOTES

- (1) Pacault, A.; Hoarau, J.; Marchand, A. New views of Diamagnetism. J. Chem. Soc. 1961, 171-238.
- (2) Hameka, H. F. Theory of the Diamagnetic Susceptibilities of the Alkanes. J. Chem. Phys. 1961, 34, 1996-2000.
- (3) Haley, L. V.; Hameka, H. F. Semiempirical Magnetic Susceptibilities of Nitrogen-Containing Heterocycles. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1974, 96, 2020 - 2024.
- (4) Burnham, A. K.; Lee, J.; Schmalz, T. G.; Beak, P.; Flygare, W. H. Estimation of Local and Nonlocal Magnetic Susceptibilities and A Comparison of Magnetic and Thermodynamic Criteria of Aromaticity for 2-Methoxypyridine and 1-Methyl-2-pyridone. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1971**, 99, 1836.
- (5) Segal, G. A. Semiempirical Methods of Electronic Structure Calculation: Applications. Part B. Modern Theoretical Chemistry; Plenum: New York, 1977; Vol. 8.
- (6) Willemen, H.; Van de Vondel, D. F.; Van Der Kelen, G. P. On the Diamagnetic Susceptibilities of Some Group IVB Organometallic Halides. Inorg. Chim. Acta 1979, 34, 181-186.
- You, X.-Z. Structure and Properties of Coordination Compounds; Science Press: Beijing, China 1992.
- Wiener, H. Structural Determination of Paraffin Boiling Points. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1947, 69, 17-20.
- (9) Randić, M. One Characterization of Molecular Branching. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1975, 97, 6609-6615.
- (10) Kier, L. B.; Hall, L. H. Molecular Connectivity in Chemistry and Drug Research; Academic: New York, 1976.
- (11) Kier, L. B.; Hall, L. H. Molecular Connectivity in Structure-Activity Analysis; Research Studies, Letchworth: England, 1986.
- (12) Klein, D. J. Chemical Graph-Theoretic Cluster Expansions. Int. J. Quant. Chem. 1986, S20, 153-171.
- Schmalz, T. G.; Klein, D. J.; Sandleback, B. L. Chemical Graph-Theoretical Cluster Expansions and Diamagnetic Susceptibilities. J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci. 1992, 32, 54-57.

- (14) Balaban, A. T. Using Real Number as Vertex Invariants for Third-Generation Topological Indexes. J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci. 1992, *32*, 23-28.
- (15) Li, L.-F.; You, X.-Z. Molecular Topological Index and its Application
  1. On the Chemical Shifts of 95Mo NMR and 119Sn Mossbauer Spectroscopy. Chin. Sci. Bull. 1993, 38, 421-425.
- (16) Li, L.-F.; You, X.-Z.; Yao, T.-M. J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. Submitted for publication.
- (17) Li, L.-F.; You, X.-Z. A Topological Index and Its Applications. Part3. Estimations of the Enthalpies of Formation of Mixed Halogen-Substituted Methanes, Silanes and Boron Mixed Halides. Thermochim. Acta 1993, 225, 85-96.
- (18) Lall, R. S.; Srivastava, V. K. Edgeweighted Graphs in Biological
- Systems. MATCH 1982, 13, 325-332.
  Zhang, H.-G.; Xin, H.-W. Bonding Parameter Topological Index and Its Application in correlation with XY, XY<sub>2</sub>, XY<sub>3</sub>, and XY<sub>4</sub> Molecular Properties. Chin. J. Chem. Phys. 1989, 2, 413-419.
- (20) Huheey, J. E. Inorganic Chemistry; 2nd ed.; Harper Row Publishers: New York, 1978, p 40.
- (21) Bernstein, H. J. Bond and Interaction Contributions for Calculating the Heat of Formation, Diamagnetic Susceptibilities, Molar Refraction and Volume, and Thermodynamic Properties of Some Substituted Methanes. J. Phys. Chem. 1965, 69, 1550-1564.

CI9400021