Electronic Supplementary Information

For

Magnetic on-off switching in redox non-innoccent ligand bridged binuclear cobalt complexes

By

Yichen Wang, a# Jing Li, a# Li Zhang, a Chao Chen, a Rui Feng, a Yi-Quan Zhang, B Gengwen Tan*a

You Song *a and Xinping Wang *a

^aState Key Laboratory of Coordination Chemistry, School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Collaborative Innovation Center of Advanced Microstructures, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210023, China

Email: gengwentan@nju.edu.cn; yousong@nju.edu.cn; xpwang@nju.edu.cn

^bJiangsu Key Laboratory for NSLSCS, School of Physical Science and Technology, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210023 (China) Email: zhangyiquan@njnu.edu.cn

These two authors contribute equally to this work.

Content

Experimental part	S1
Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for 1 and 2	S4
The fitting result of <i>M</i> - <i>H</i> with giant spin model of 2	S5
The frequency-dependence out-of-phase (χ'') AC magnetization susceptibility of 2 wi	th different
dc field at 1.8 K	S6
The frequency-dependence in-phase (χ') AC magnetization susceptibility of 2 under 1.0	kOe in the
temperature range of 1.8 – 5.0 K.	S7
Cole-cole plot of 2 under 1.0 kOe in the temperature range of 1.8 – 5.0 K	S8
Ab initio calculations for complexes 1 and 2	
References.	S15

Experimental Part

General considerations: All experiments were carried out under a moisture-free nitrogen or argon atmosphere by using standard Schlenk or glove box techniques. All solvents were dried by standard methods and freshly distilled before used. UV-vis spectra were recorded on Lambda 750 spectrometer. Elemental analyses were performed at Shanghai Institute of Organic Chemistry, the Chinese Academy of Sciences. The temperature-dependent magnetic data for polycrystalline samples was collected on a Quantum Design MPMP-XL7 superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID) magnetometer, while the field-dependent magnetization and alternative-current properties were measured on a MPMS Squid VSM. For the single crystal X-ray structure analyses, the crystals were each mounted on a glass capillary in perfluorinated oil and measured in a cold N_2 flow. The data were collected on Bruker D8 CMOS detectors at 123K. The structures were solved by direct methods and all refined on F² with the SHELX-2014/2018 software package. The positions of the H atoms were calculated and considered isotropically according to a riding model. Commercially available reagents were purchased from Aldrich, Acros or Alfa-Assar, and used upon arrival. $LCo(Tol)^1$ and $[Cp_2Fe][BPh_4]^2$ were synthesized according to the literature method. Synthesis of 1: LCo(Tol) (200 mg, 0.35 mmol) and 2,2'-bipyrimidine (26.5 mg, 0.17 mmol) was placed in a Schlenk flask (100 mL), and toluene (30 mL) was added via cannula. The mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. After filtration, the filtrate was concentrated in vacuo to afford dark brown solid of 1. Yield: 97 mg, 48.5%. X-ray quality crystals were grown by slowly cooling a warm THF solution to room temperature. Elemental analysis for C₆₆H₈₈N₈Co₂(%): Calculated: C 71.33, N 10.08, H 7.98; Found: C 71.64, N 10.32, H 7.97. IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 685.0, 758.6, 794.1, 1021.5, 1086.6, 1100.0, 1141.0, 1176.6, 1261.1, 1316.0, 1390.6, 1435.9, 1462.2, 1519.9, 2866.0, 2925.5, 2961.0, 3056.9. UV-Vis (THF, nm): 331.

Synthesis of 2: LCo(Tol) (200 mg, 0.35 mmol) and 2,2'-bipyrimidine (26.5 mg, 0.17 mmol) was placed in a Schlenk flask (100 mL), and toluene (30 mL) was added *via* cannula. The mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. After removel of solvent in vacuo, $[Cp_2Fe][BPh_4]$ (90 mg, 0.18 mmol) was added, then fluorobenzene (30 mL) was added *via* cannula and stirred at room temperature for 1 day. The solution was filtered and the filtrate was then concentrated. Minimum hexane (2 mL) was added to afford dark brown solid of **2**. Yield: 73 mg, 36.5%. X-ray quality crystals were grown by layering a concentrated THF solution with hexane. IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 669.8, S2

682.3, 713.8, 759.5, 759.1, 838.5, 885.7, 935.2, 1127.7, 1163.3, 1278.2, 1355.1, 1437.7, 1463.7, 1558.5, 2872.6, 2932.3, 2969.7. UV-Vis (THF, nm): 328.

	1	2
formula	$C_{66}H_{88}Co_2N_8$	$C_{94}H_{116}BCo_2N_8O$
formula weight	1111.30	1502.61
crystal system	monoclinic	Triclinic
space group	P21/n	<i>P</i> -1
a/Å	12.577(2)	15.2751(6)
b/Å	16.039(3)	16.3305(6)
c/Å	15.838(2)	20.2692(7)
a/deg		84.7460(10)
β /deg	105.293(4)	76.3530(10)
γ/deg		72.5170(10)
V/Å ³	3081.9(8)	4685.3(3)
Ζ	2	2
$ ho_{ m calcd}/ m g\cdot m cm^{-3}$	1.198	1.065
μ/mm^{-1}	0.583	0.400
F(000)	1188	1606
crystal size/mm ³	0.20 x 0.15 x 0.10	0.27 x 0.25 x 0.19
θ range/deg	2.242-25.00	2.068-25.0009
index ranges	$-24 \le h \le 14$	$-18 \le h \le 16$
	$-18 \le k \le 19$	$-19 \le k \le 14$
	$-18 \le l \le 18$	$-24 \le l \le 24$
collected data	19966	34490
unique data	5405 ($R_{\rm int} = 0.0674$)	$16458 (R_{int} = 0.0299)$
completeness to θ	99.8%	99.6%
data/restraints/parameters	5405 / 0 / 353	16458 / 191 / 1020
GOF on F^2	1.011	1.037
final <i>R</i> indices $[I > 2\sigma(I)]$	$R_1 = 0.0441$	$R_1 = 0.0412$
	$wR_2 = 0.0875$	$wR_2 = 0.1017$
R indices (all data)	$R_1 = 0.0786$	$R_1 = 0.0582$
	$wR_2 = 0.1019$	$wR_2 = 0.1111$
Largest diff peak/hole (e·Å ⁻³)	0.303/-0.239	0.268/-0.302

Table S1. Crystal Data and Structure Refinement for 1 and 2^a

^{*a*} All data were collected at 123(2) K using Mo K_a ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å) radiation. $R_1 = \sum(||F_0| - |F_c||) / \sum |F_0|, wR_2 = \{\sum [w(F_0^2 - F_c^2)^2 / \sum [w(F_0^2)^2]\}^2\}^{1/2}, \text{ GOF} = \{\sum [w(F_0^2 - F_c^2)^2 / (N_0 - N_p)\}^{1/2}.$



Fig. S1 The fitting result of *M*-*H* with giant spin model of 2.



Fig. S2 The frequency-dependence out-of-phase (χ'') AC magnetization susceptibility of 2 with different dc field at 1.8 K.



Fig. S3 The frequency-dependence in-phase (χ') AC magnetization susceptibility of 2 under 1.0 kOe in the temperature range of 1.8 – 5.0 K.



Fig. S4 Cole-cole plot of **2** under 1.0 kOe in the temperature range of 1.8 - 5.0 K.

Ab initio calculations for complexes 1 and 2

Both of binuclear complexes **1** and **2** have an inversion center, thus only one individual Co^{II} fragment was calculated, respectively. Complete-active-space self-consistent field (CASSCF) calculations on individual Co^{II} fragments of the model structures (see Fig. S5 for the calculated model structure of complexes **1** and **2**) extracted from the compounds on the basis of single-crystal X-ray determined geometry have been carried out with MOLCAS 8.2 program package.³ Each individual Co^{II} fragment was calculated keeping the experimentally determined structure of the corresponding compound while replacing the neighboring Co^{II} ion by diamagnetic Zn^{II}. In the calculation of individual Co^{II} fragment of complex **2**, the spin of the central radical was considered as 0.

The basis sets for all atoms are atomic natural orbitals from the MOLCAS ANO-RCC library: ANO-RCC-VTZP for Co^{II} ions; VTZ for close N; VDZ for distant atoms. The calculations employed the second order Douglas-Kroll-Hess Hamiltonian, where scalar relativistic contractions were taken into account in the basis set and the spin-orbit couplings were handled separately in the restricted active space state interaction (RASSI-SO) procedure. For the calculation of Co^{II} fragments, active electrons in 10 active spaces considering the 3*d*-double shell effect (5+5') include all seven 3*d* electrons (CAS(7 in 5+5')), and the mixed spin-free states (all from 10 quadruplets and 20 from 40 doublets). Single_Aniso⁴ program was used to obtain the energy levels, *g* tensors, m_J values, magnetic axes, *et al.*, based on the above CASSCF/RASSI calculations.



Fig. S5 Calculated model structure of individual Co^{II} fragment of complex 1 and 2; H atoms are omitted.

Table S2. Calculated zero-field splitting parameters $D(E)(\text{cm}^{-1})$ and $g(g_x, g_y, g_z)$ tensor of the lowest spin-orbit state of individual Co^{II} fragment of complexes **1** and **2** using CASSCF/RASSI with MOLCAS 8.2.

[1]		[1]+	
$D\left(E ight)$	g	$D\left(E ight)$	g
	2.131	-29.2 (2.8)	2.122
-28.0 (2.7)	2.186		2.177
	2.511		2.526



Fig. S6 Orientations of the local magnetic axes of the ground doublet on Co^{II} ions of complexes 1and2usingCASSCF/RASSIwithMOLCAS8.2.

S10

The calculated *D*, *E* (cm⁻¹) and *g* tensor (*x*, *y*, *z*) of individual Co^{II} fragments of complexes **1** and **2** using CASSCF/RASSI were listed in Table S2 where the calculated *D* values of two complexes are both negative and similar. The calculated orientations of the *g* tensors on Co^{II} ions of complexes **1** and **2** were shown in Fig. S6.

Estimation of the exchange interactions by BS-DFT calculation

To obtain the isotropic exchange coupling constants *J*, Orca 4.0.1 calculations⁵ were performed with the popular hybrid functional B3LYP proposed by Becke⁶⁻⁷ and Lee et al.⁸ Triple- ζ with one polarization function TZVP⁹⁻¹⁰ basis sets were used for all atoms, and scalar relativistic Hamiltonians (ZORA) was used for the scalar relativistic effect in all calculations. For complex **2**, only the nearest neighboring Co^{II}-Radical exchange interactions were considered. The calculated model structure including one radical and two Co^{II} was shown in Fig. S7.



Fig. S7 Calculated model structure of the labeled exchange coupling constants for complex 2; H atoms are omitted.

There is only one type of *J* between Co^{II} and radicals. The large integration grid (grid = 5) was applied to Co^{II} for ZORA calculations. Tight convergence criteria were selected to ensure the results to be well converged with respect to technical parameters. Through calculating the energies of two spin states: the high-spin state ($S_{HS} = S_{Co1} + S_{RadicaI} + S_{Co2}$), the low-spin state (flip the spins on Radical; $S_{LS} = S_{Co1} - S_{RadicaI} + S_{Co2}$), the isotropic Co^{II}-Radical coupling constant J_{Co-Rad} was obtained as eq. 1 using the spin-projected approach¹¹⁻¹³ according to the Heisenberg exchange Hamiltonian: $\hat{H} = -2J_{Co-Rad}(S_{Co1}S_{Rad} + S_{Co2}S_{Rad})$

$$J_{Co-Rad} = \frac{E_{LS} - E_{HS}}{8} \tag{1}$$

The calculated Co^{II}-Radical coupling constant J_{Co-Rad} using eq 1 is -114.5 cm⁻¹, which shows that the antiferromagnetic interactions between Co^{II} and radicals are very strong. Ruiz and coworkers¹⁴ showed that self-interaction error within B3LYP-BS approach could overestimate the exchange coupling constant. And so, they proposed the spin non-projected approach¹⁵ combined with B3LYP-BS method to evaluate *J*. They showed that such approach could give more accurate *J* values compared to the experiments for a lot of transition metal complexes.¹⁴ The isotropic Co^{II}-Radical coupling constant J_{Co-Rad} was obtained as eq. 2 using the non-projected approach.¹⁵

$$J_{Co-Rad} = \frac{E_{LS} - E_{HS}}{12}$$
(2)

The calculated Co^{II}-Radical coupling constant J_{Co-Rad} using eq 2 is -76.3 cm⁻¹.



Fig. S8 Spin density distribution map of complex **2** in the high (left) and low (right)-spin state (blue and green regions indicate positive and negative spin populations, respectively; the isodensity surface represented corresponds to a value of 0.002 e^- bohr⁻³).

References:

- Spitzer, F.; Graßl, C.; Balázs, G.; Mädl, E.; Keilwerth, M.; Zolnhofer, E.M.; Meyer, K.; Scheer, M. Chem. Eur. J., 2017, 23, 2716.
- (2) Piglosiewicz, I. M.; Beckhaus, R.; Wittstock, G.; Saak, W.; Haase, D. *Inorg. Chem.*, 2007, 46, 7610.
- (3) (a) Aquilante, F.; De Vico, L.; Ferré, N.; Ghigo, G.; Malmqvist, P.-Å.; Neogrády, P.; Pedersen, T. B.; Pitonak, M.; Reiher, M.; Roos, B. O.; Serrano-Andrés, L.; Urban, M.; Veryazov, V.; Lindh, R. *J. Comput. Chem.*, 2010, *31*, 224. (b) Veryazov, V.; Widmark, P. O.; Serrano-Andres, L.; Lindh, R.; Roos, B. O. *Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, 2004, *100*, 626. (c) Karlström, G.; Lindh, R.; Malmqvist, P. -Å.; Roos, B. O.; Ryde, U.; Veryazov, V.; Widmark, P. -O.; Cossi, M.; Schimmelpfennig, B.; Neogr'ady, P.; Seijo, L. *Comput. Mater. Sci.*, 2003, *28*, 222.
- (4) (a) Chibotaru, L. F.; Ungur, L.; Soncini, A. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2008, 47, 4126. (b) Ungur, L.; Van den Heuvel, W.; Chibotaru, L. F. New J. Chem., 2009, 33, 1224. (c) Chibotaru, L. F.; Ungur, L.; Aronica, C.; Elmoll, H.; Pilet, G.; Luneau, D. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2008, 130, 12445.
- (5) (a) Neese, F. ORCA-an ab initio, density functional and semiempirical program package, version 4.0.1; Max-Planck institute for bioinorganic chemistry: Mülheim an der Ruhr, Germany, 2017. (b) Neese, F. WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci. 2018, 8: e1327. doi: 10.1002/wcms.1327.
- (6) Becke, A. D. J. Chem. Phys. 1993, 98, 5648.
- (7) Becke, A. D. Phys. Rev. A. 1988, 38, 3098.
- (8) Lee, C.; Yang, W.; Parr, R. G. Phys. Rev. B. 1988, 37, 785.
- (9) Schafer, A.; Horn, H.; Ahlrichs, R. J. Chem. Phys. 1992, 97, 2571.
- (10) Schafer, A.; Huber, C.; Ahlrichs, R. J. Chem. Phys. 1994, 100, 5829.
- (11) Noodleman, L. J. Chem. Phys. 1981, 74, 5737.
- (12) Noodleman, L.; Baerends, E. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984, 106, 2316.
- (13) Noodleman, L.; Case, D. A. Adv. Inorg. Chem. 1992, 38, 423.
- (14) Ruiz, E.; Alvarez, S.; Cano, J.; Polo, V. J. Chem. Phys. 2005, 123, 164110.

(15) Ruiz, E.; Rodriguez-Fortea, A.; Cano, J.; Alvarez, S.; Alemany, P. J. Comput. Chem. 2003, 24, 982.