

## ERRATA

ERRATUM TO: SYNTHESIS, CHARACTERIZATION,  
COMPUTATIONAL STUDIES AND SINGLE CRYSTAL  
STRUCTURES OF [Ru(N-P)<sub>2</sub>(O-O)] COMPLEXESM. A. Al-Wahish<sup>1</sup>, F. F. Awwadi<sup>1</sup>, and  
H. A. Hodali<sup>1\*</sup>

DOI: 10.1134/S0022476621090183

In the original article there was a mistake in the Table 1. The correct Table 1 is:

TABLE 1. Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for the Ruthenium Complexes 1, 2 and 3

Parameter	Complex 1	Complex 2	Complex 3
Empirical formula	C <sub>44</sub> H <sub>32</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> P <sub>2</sub> Ru	C <sub>45</sub> H <sub>34</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> P <sub>2</sub> Ru · 2H <sub>2</sub> O	C <sub>48</sub> H <sub>38</sub> N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> P <sub>2</sub> Ru
Formula weight	815.72	865.78	869.81
Temperature, K	293(2)	293(2)	293(2)
Crystal system	Triclinic	Triclinic	Monoclinic
Space group	$P\bar{1}$	$P\bar{1}$	$P2_1/c$
<i>a</i> , <i>b</i> , <i>c</i> , Å	10.7215(11), 11.0719(12), 16.6297(17)	12.5358(5), 12.6559(5), 13.7056(6)	14.4833(4), 11.9329(3), 24.7857(6)
$\alpha$ , $\beta$ , $\gamma$ , deg	71.701(9), 83.791(9), 74.889(9)	90.514(3), 104.870(4), 90.540(3)	90, 97.438(2), 90
<i>V</i> , Å <sup>3</sup>	1808.7(3)	2101.36(15)	4247.60(19)
<i>Z</i>	2	2	4
$\mu$ , mm <sup>-1</sup>	0.570	0.498	0.490
2 $\theta$ range for data collection, deg	6.106 to 52.598	6.44 to 52.596	5.756 to 52.598
Index ranges	-13 ≤ <i>h</i> ≤ 13, -13 ≤ <i>k</i> ≤ 18, -20 ≤ <i>l</i> ≤ 20	-17 ≤ <i>h</i> ≤ 17, -17 ≤ <i>k</i> ≤ 18, -17 ≤ <i>l</i> ≤ 18	-15 ≤ <i>h</i> ≤ 18, -12 ≤ <i>k</i> ≤ 14, -30 ≤ <i>l</i> ≤ 30
Reflections collected / independent	11452 / 6770	17812 / 8510	21333 / 8609
<i>R</i> <sub>int</sub> , <i>R</i> <sub>σ</sub>	0.0333, 0.0776	0.0293, 0.0562	0.0317, 0.0513
Data / restraints / parameters	6770 / 0 / 478	8510 / 1 / 511	8609 / 0 / 524
<i>GOOF</i> on <i>F</i> <sup>2</sup>	1.025	1.049	1.024
Final <i>R</i> indexes ( <i>I</i> ≥ 2σ( <i>I</i> ))	<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> = 0.0456, <i>wR</i> <sub>2</sub> = 0.0939	<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> = 0.0349, <i>wR</i> <sub>2</sub> = 0.0780	<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> = 0.0382, <i>wR</i> <sub>2</sub> = 0.0761
Final <i>R</i> indexes (all data)	<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> = 0.0680, <i>wR</i> <sub>2</sub> = 0.1033	<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> = 0.0468, <i>wR</i> <sub>2</sub> = 0.0825	<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> = 0.0567, <i>wR</i> <sub>2</sub> = 0.0864
Largest diff. peak / hole, e/Å <sup>3</sup>	0.70 / -0.87	0.54 / -0.40	0.44 / -0.37
CCDC number	2033145	2033176	2033175

<sup>1</sup>Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science, The University of Jordan, Amman, Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; \*h-hodali@ju.edu.jo. Original article submitted November 15, 2020; revised December 23, 2020; accepted December 28, 2020.

In the text of the article on the page 1057, instead of “di-(phenylphosphino)methane” should read as “bis(diphenylphosphino)methane”; on the page 1060 instead “were calculated using time” should read as “were calculated using TD-DFT”; on the page 1061 instead “8-(diphenylphosphino)quinolone” should read as “8-(diphenylphosphino)quinoline”.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1134/S002247662107009X>.