## **Electronic Supplementary Information**

# Ditopic binding of perchlorate anion to hexaazamacrocyclic hosts

Musabbir. A. Saeed,<sup>*a*</sup> Jameskia J. Thompson,<sup>*a*</sup> Frank R. Fronczek<sup>*b*</sup> and Md. Alamgir Hossain<sup>*a*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Chemistry, Jackson State University, 1325 J. R. Lynch Street, P.O. Box 17910, Jackson, MS 39212, USA. Fax: 601-979-3674; Tel: 601-979-3748; E-mail: alamgir@chem.jsums.edu

<sup>b</sup> Department of Chemistry, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA, Fax: 225-578-3458; Tel: 225-578-8270; E-mail: ffroncz@lsu.edu

#### Synthesis

L1. Diethylenetriamine (1.00 g, 9.70 mmol) and 2,5-thiophenedicarboxaldehyde (1.35 g, 9.70 mmol) were separately dissolved in CH<sub>3</sub>OH (200 cm<sup>3</sup>). Both solutions were added simultaneously dropwise over 4 h to a stirred CH<sub>3</sub>OH (400 cm<sup>3</sup>) at 0° C. The mixture was kept at room temperature under stirring for another 24 h, after which the solvent was evaporated. The resulting Schiff base was reduced to amine with NaBH<sub>4</sub> (1.73 g, 45.7 mmol) in CH<sub>3</sub>OH (100 cm<sup>3</sup>) at room temperature for 12 h. The solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure and the residue was dissolved in water ((100 cm<sup>3</sup>). The aqueous phase was extracted by CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (3x100 cm<sup>3</sup>). The organic layers were combined and dried with MgSO<sub>4</sub>. The product was purified by column chromatography on neutral Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> using an eluent of CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> containing 2% CH<sub>3</sub>OH to give the hexaazamacrocycle L1 as a white powder. Yield 1.23 g, 65%. Found: C, 56.6; H, 8.2; N, 20.1. C<sub>20</sub>H<sub>34</sub>N<sub>6</sub>S<sub>2</sub> requires C, 56.8; H, 8.1; N, 19.9. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>, TMS):  $\delta$  6.73 (s, 4H, ArH), 3.87 (s, 8H, ArCH<sub>2</sub>), 3.77 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>), 2.72 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>).

 $[H_6L1]^{6+}$ ·6TsO<sup>-</sup>. The tosylate salt of L1 was obtained by titrating the macrocycle L1 (0.05 g, 0.118 mmol) dissolved in CH<sub>3</sub>OH (2 cm<sup>3</sup>) with TsOH. The addition of diethyl

ether (2 cm<sup>3</sup>) yielded a white precipitate that was filtered and dried. Yield 0.135 g, 80%. Found: C, 51.6; H, 5.8; N, 5.7.  $C_{62}H_{82}N_6O_{18}S_8$  requires C, 51.1; H, 5.7; N, 5.8. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, D<sub>2</sub>O, TSP):  $\delta$  7.69 (d, 12H, Ar*H*), 7.38 (d, 12*H*, ArH), 7.22 (s, 4H, ArH), 4.48 (s, 8H, ArCH<sub>2</sub>), 3.51 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>), 2.99 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>), 2.42 (s, 12H, CH<sub>3</sub>).

 $[H_6L1]^{6+} \cdot 6ClO_4^-$ . To a solution of L1 (50 mg, 0.118 mmol) in CH<sub>3</sub>OH (2 cm<sup>3</sup>) was added perchloric acid (*ca.* 0.05 cm<sup>3</sup>). The white precipitate formed immediately was filtered and washed with diethyl ether. Yield 0.05 g, 80%. Found: C, 23.1; H, 4.0; N, 8.1. C<sub>20</sub>H<sub>40</sub>Cl<sub>6</sub>N<sub>6</sub>O<sub>24</sub>S<sub>2</sub> requires C, 23.4; H, 3.9; N, 8.2). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, D<sub>2</sub>O, TSP):  $\delta$  7.23 (s, 4H, ArH), 4.46 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>), 3.32 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>), 2.95 (s, 12H, CH<sub>3</sub>).

L2. This ligand was prepared from the reaction of diethylenetriamine (1.00 g, 9.70 mmol) and terephthalaldehyde (1.30 g, 9.70 mmol) following the similar method as described for L1. Yield 1.20 g, 60%. Found: C, 69.7; H, 9.1; N, 20.7.  $C_{24}H_{38}N_6$  requires C, 70.2; H, 9.3; N, 20.5. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>, TMS):  $\delta$  7.29 (s, 8H, ArH), 3.80 (s, 8H, ArCH<sub>2</sub>), 2.85 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>), 2.83 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>).

 $[H_6L2]^{6+}$ ·6TsO<sup>-</sup>. The salt was prepared from the reaction of L2 (50 mg, 0.122 mmol) with TsOH in CH<sub>3</sub>OH (2 cm<sup>3</sup>). A white precipitate was obtained on the addition of diethyl ether (2 cm<sup>3</sup>). Yield 0.140 g, 80%. Found: C, 54.2; H, 5.8; N, 5.6. C<sub>66</sub>H<sub>86</sub>N<sub>6</sub>O<sub>18</sub>S<sub>6</sub> requires C, 54.9; H, 6.0; N, 5.8. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, D<sub>2</sub>O, TSP):  $\delta$  7.70 (d, 12H, ArH), 7.42 (d, 12H, ArH), 7.26 (s, 8H, ArH), 4.21 (s, 8H, ArCH<sub>2</sub>), 3.27 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>), 3.01 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>), 2.43 (s, 12H, CH<sub>3</sub>).

 $[H_4L2]^{4+} \cdot 4ClO_4^{-}$ . To a solution of L2 (50 mg, 0.122 mmol) in CH<sub>3</sub>OH (2 cm<sup>3</sup>) was added perchloric acid (*ca.* 0.05 cm<sup>3</sup>). The white precipitate formed immediately was filtered and washed with diethyl ether. The white precipitate formed, was filtered and washed with diethyl ether. Yield 0.07 g, 75%. Found: C, 35.8; H, 5.4; N, 10.2. C<sub>24</sub>H<sub>42</sub>Cl<sub>4</sub>N<sub>6</sub>O<sub>16</sub> requires C, 35.5; H, 5.2; N, 10.3. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, D<sub>2</sub>O, TSP):  $\delta$  7.43 (s, 8H, ArCH<sub>2</sub>), 3.30 (t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>), 2.99(t, 8H, CH<sub>2</sub>).

#### NMR titration studies

Binding studies were carried out by <sup>1</sup>H NMR titrations of  $[H_6L1]^{6+}.6TsO^-$  or  $[H_6L2]^{6+}.6TsO^-$  with NaClO<sub>4</sub> in D<sub>2</sub>O at pH 4.0 at room temperature, performed on a 300 MHz Bruker NMR spectrophotometer. Initial concentrations were used as 2 mM and 20 mM for the ligand and anion, respectively, and the pH of the solution was adjusted with a concentrated solution of TsOH and NaOH in D<sub>2</sub>O. Sodium salt of 3-(trimethylsilyl)propionic-2,2,3,3,-*d*<sub>4</sub> acid (TSP) in D<sub>2</sub>O was used as an external reference in a sealed capillary tube. Each titration was performed by 12 measurements in the range of R ([perchlorate]<sub>0</sub>/[ligand]<sub>0</sub>) =0 to 10. The association constant *K* was calculated from the non-linear regression analysis of the NMR shifts of aliphatic protons with a 1:1 association model using Sigma Plot software, from the equations,  $\Delta\delta = ([A]^0 + [L]^0 + 1/K - (([A]_0 + [L]_0 + 1/K)^2 - 4[L]_0[A]_0)^{1/2}) \Delta\delta_{max} / 2[L]_0$  (where L is ligand and A is anion). Error limit in *K* was less that 15%.

#### Job plot

Binding stoichiometry was determined by Job plot analysis of the <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra of  $[H_6L1]^{6+} \cdot 6TsO^-$  or  $[H_6L2]^{6+} \cdot 6TsO^-$  with varying amount of perchlorate anion in D<sub>2</sub>O at pH 4.0 to match what was used in the NMR binding studies described above. Stock solutions (10 mM) of ligands and perchlorate anion were prepared separately in D<sub>2</sub>O and the solution pH was adjusted with a concentrated solution of TsOH and NaOH in D<sub>2</sub>O. Ten NMR samples were prepared with different proportions of the ligand and anion solution so that the final concentration ([L] + [ClO<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup>]) of each sample became 10 mM. Sodium salt of 3-(trimethylsilyl)propionic-2,2,3,3,-*d*<sub>4</sub> acid (TSP) in D<sub>2</sub>O was used as an external reference in a sealed capillary tube. The Job plots were obtained plotting  $\Delta\delta$  ([L]/ ([L] + [ClO<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup>])) with (L]/ ([L] + [ClO<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup>])) as shown in **Figure S1** and **Figure S2**.



Figure S1. Job plot of L1 with NaClO<sub>4</sub> in  $D_2O$  at pH 4.0 showing a maximum at 0.5 mole fraction of L1.



Figure S2. Job plot of L2 with NaClO<sub>4</sub> in  $D_2O$  at pH 4.0 showing a maximum at 0.5 mole fraction of L2.

# **Crystallographic details**

## Crystallographic data for [H<sub>6</sub>L1(ClO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>](ClO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>4</sub>·4H<sub>2</sub>O



Figure S3. The molecular structure of  $[H_6L1(ClO_4)_2](ClO_4)_4$ ·4H<sub>2</sub>O showing the atomnumbering scheme

#### Instrumentation and software

Data collection: Bruker Apex2; cell refinement: Bruker Apex2; data reduction: Bruker Apex2; program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXS97* (Sheldrick, 2008); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL97* (Sheldrick, 2008); molecular graphics: *ORTEP-3 for Windows* (Farrugia, 1997); software used to prepare material for publication: Bruker *SHELXTL*.

## Data collection

Primary atom site location:

structure-invariant direct methods

Bruker Kappa Apex-II CCD area detector	
diffractometer	3690 independent reflections
Radiation source: fine-focus sealed tube	3561 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$
Monochromator: graphite	$R_{\rm int} = 0.030$
T = 90  K	$\theta_{max} = 68.7^{\circ}$
phi and $\omega$ scans	$\theta_{\min} = 3.6^{\circ}$
Absorption correction: multi-scan	
SADABS (Sheldrick, 2002)	$h = -9 \rightarrow 9$
$T_{\min} = 0.314, T_{\max} = 0.605$	$k = -12 \rightarrow 12$
10176 measured reflections	$l = -13 \rightarrow 14$
Refinement	
Refinement on $F^2$	Secondary atom site location: difference Fourier
map	
Least-squares matrix: full	Hydrogen site location: inferred from neighbouring
sites	
$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.032$	H atoms treated by a mixture of
independent and constrained refinement	
$wR(F^2) = 0.087$	$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0406P)^2 + 1.0629P]$
where $P = (F_0^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$	
<i>S</i> = 1.05	$(\Delta/\sigma)_{max} = 0.002$
3690 reflections	$\Delta \rho_{max} = 0.45 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$
345 parameters	$\Delta \rho_{min} = -0.37 \text{ e} \text{ Å}^{-3}$
103 restraints	Extinction correction: SHELXL,
$Fc^* = kFc[1+0.001xFc^2\lambda^3/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$	

Extinction coefficient: 0.0022 (3)



## Crystallographic data for [H<sub>4</sub>L2(ClO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>(H<sub>2</sub>O)](ClO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>:

Figure S4. The molecular structure of  $[H_4L2(ClO_4)_2(H_2O)](ClO_4)_2$ : showing the atomnumbering scheme

#### Instrumentation and software

Data collection: *COLLECT* (Nonius, 2000); cell refinement: *HKL SCALEPACK* (Otwinowski & Minor 1997); data reduction: *HKL DENZO* and *SCALEPACK* (Otwinowski & Minor 1997); program(s) used to solve structure: *SIR97* (Altomare *et al.*, 1999); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL97* (Sheldrick, 2008); molecular graphics: *ORTEP-3 for Windows* (Farrugia, 1997); software used to prepare material for publication: *SHELXL97* (Sheldrick, 2008).

#### Data collection

KappaCCD (with Oxford Cryostream) diffractometer
Radiation source: fine-focus sealed tube

7932 independent reflections 5349 reflections with  $I > 2\sigma(I)$ 

Monochromator: graphite	$R_{\rm int} = 0.097$
T = 90  K	$\theta_{max} = 27.1^{\circ}$
$\omega$ and $\phi$ scans	$\theta_{\min} = 2.6^{\circ}$
Absorption correction: multi-scan	
HKL Scalepack (Otwinowski & Minor 1997)	$h = -15 \rightarrow 15$
$T_{\min} = 0.910, \ T_{\max} = 0.968$	$k = -18 \rightarrow 18$
61377 measured reflections	$l = -26 \rightarrow 26$
Refinement	
Refinement on $F^2$	Hydrogen site location: inferred from neighbouring
sites	
Least-squares matrix: full	H atoms treated by a mixture of
independent and constrained refinement	
$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.051$	$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.042P)^2 + 1.0851P]$
where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$	
$wR(F^2) = 0.105$	$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\rm max} = 0.001$
<i>S</i> = 1.03	$\Delta \rho_{max} = 0.55 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$
7932 reflections	$\Delta \rho_{\rm min} = -0.41 \ e \ {\rm \AA}^{-3}$
474 parameters	Extinction correction: SHELXL,
$Fc^* = kFc[1+0.001xFc^2\lambda^3/sin(2\theta)]^{-1/4}$	
2 restraints	Extinction coefficient: 0.0008 (2)
Primary atom site location: structure-invariant	Absolute structure: Flack (1983)
direct methods	
Secondary atom site location: difference	Flack parameter: 0.28 (5)
Fourier map	

#### **Special details**

*Geometry*. All e.s.d.'s (except the e.s.d. in the dihedral angle between two l.s. planes) are estimated using the full covariance matrix. The cell e.s.d.'s are taken into account individually in the estimation of e.s.d.'s in distances, angles and torsion angles; correlations between e.s.d.'s in cell parameters are only used when they are defined by crystal symmetry. An approximate (isotropic) treatment of cell e.s.d.'s is used for estimating e.s.d.'s involving l.s. planes.

**Refinement**. Refinement of F2 against ALL reflections. The weighted *R*-factor *wR* and goodness of fit *S* are based on *F*2, conventional *R*-factors *R* are based on *F*, with *F* set to

zero for negative *F*2. The threshold expression of  $F2 > \sigma(F2)$  is used only for calculating *R*-factors (gt) *etc.* and is not relevant to the choice of reflections for refinement. *R*-factors based on *F*2 are statistically about twice as large as those based on *F*, and *R*- factors based on ALL data will be even larger.

### **References:**

Altomare, A., Burla, M. C., Camalli, M., Cascarano, G. L., Giacovazzo, C., Guagliardi, A., Moliterni, A. G. G., Polidori, G. & Spagna, R. (1999). *J. Appl. Cryst.* 32, 115–119. Farrugia, L. J. (1997). *J. Appl. Cryst.* 30, 565. Nonius (1999). *COLLECT*. Nonius BV, Delft, The Netherlands.

Otwinowski, Z. & Minor, W. (1997). *Methods in Enzymology*, Vol. 276, *Macromolecular Crystallography*, Part A, edited by C. W. Carter Jr & R. M. Sweet, pp. 307–326. New York: Academic Press.

Sheldrick, G. M. (2008). Acta Cryst. A64, 112-12