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## 1 Solvent-dependent spectroscopic analysis



Figure S1. Solvent-dependent a) UV/Vis $\left(c=1 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}\right.$ ) and b) fluorescence ( $c=1 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}$, $\lambda_{\text {exc }}=335 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) spectra of OPE3.


Figure S2. Solvent-dependent a) UV/Vis ( $c=1 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}$ ) and b) fluorescence ( $c=1 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}$, $\lambda_{\text {exc }}=345 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) spectra of OPE4.


Figure S3. Solvent-dependent a) UV/Vis ( $c=1 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}$ ) and b) fluorescence ( $c=1 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}$, $\lambda_{\text {exc }}=350 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) spectra of OPE5.


Figure S4. Solvent-dependent a) UV/Vis ( $c=1 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}$ ) and b) fluorescence ( $c=1 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}$, $\lambda_{\text {exc }}=355 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) spectra of OPE6.


Figure S5. Solvent-dependent a) UV/Vis ( $c=1 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}$ ) and b) fluorescence ( $c=1 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}$, $\lambda_{\text {exc }}=365 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) spectra of OPE7.

Table S1. Fluorescence Quantum Yield values for the different OPEs in $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ and MCH . Anthracene in $\mathrm{EtOH}\left(\Phi_{F}: 0.28, \lambda_{\text {exc }}: 340 \mathrm{~nm}\right.$ ) was used as reference for the determination of the $\Phi_{F}$.

|  | OPE3 | OPE4 | OPE5 | OPE6 | OPE7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{C H C l}_{3}$ | 0.47 | 0.44 | 0.40 | 0.52 | 0.46 |
| $\mathbf{M C H}$ | 0.43 | 0.48 | 0.46 | 0.47 | 0.46 |

## 2 Concentration-dependent spectroscopic analysis



Figure S6. a) Concentration-dependent UV-Vis spectra of OPE3 (MCH, 298 K ) and b) photographs of OPE3 solutions in MCH at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (left), $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (middle) and 1 mM (right) under daylight (top) and 365 nm UV light (bottom).


Figure S7. a) Concentration-dependent UV-Vis spectra of OPE4 (MCH, 298 K ) and b) photographs of OPE4 solutions in MCH at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (left), $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (middle) and 1 mM (right) under daylight (top) and 365 nm UV light (bottom).


Figure S8. a) Concentration-dependent UV-Vis spectra of OPE5 (MCH, 298 K ) and b) photographs of OPE5 solutions in MCH at $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (left), $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (middle) and 1 mM (right) under daylight (top) and 365 nm UV light (bottom).



Figure S9. Concentration-dependent a) UV/Vis, b) fluorescence and c) corresponding normalised fluorescence spectra of OPE6 (MCH, $298 \mathrm{~K}, \lambda_{\text {exc. }}=355 \mathrm{~nm}$ ). d) Photographs of OPE6 solutions in MCH at different concentrations from 1 mM (left) to $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (right) under 365 nm UV light (top) and daylight (bottom).


(d)


Figure S10. Concentration-dependent a) UV/Vis, b) fluorescence and c) corresponding normalised fluorescence spectra of OPE7 (MCH, $298 \mathrm{~K}, \lambda_{\text {exc. }}=355 \mathrm{~nm}$ ). d) Photographs of OPE7 solutions in MCH at different concentrations from 1 mM (left) to $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (right) under 365 nm UV light (top) and daylight (bottom).

Comparing the emission properties of OPE6 and OPE7 in the aggregated state in MCH, it can be noticed that the emission band at ca. 530 nm is more significant for OPE6 than it is for OPE7 (see Figures S9 vs. S10). A plausible hypothesis is an increased population of coplanar OPEs for OPE6 compared to OPE7. Experimentally, we also observed a much lower solubility of OPE7 in MCH compared to OPE6, which leads to the formation of cloudy or partially precipitated solutions for OPE7 (such as displayed in Figure S10d) upon increasing concentration. This is not the case for OPE6 (see Figure S9d), where all solutions (even at mM concentration) remain transparent. On this basis, we hypothesize that the interplay between solvation effects and the different population of twisted and co-planar OPEs for OPE6 and OPE7 might account for the differences in photophysical behavior.

## 3 Temperature-dependent spectroscopic analysis



Figure S11. Variable temperature (VT)-UV/Vis spectra of a) OPE3 and b) OPE4 in MCH from 293 K to $263 \mathrm{~K}\left(c=1 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{M}\right.$, cooling rate: $1 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{min}$ )


Figure S12. VT-UV/Vis spectra of OPE5 in MCH from 323 K to 263 K , with a cooling rate of 1 $\mathrm{K} / \mathrm{min}$ at a) 1 mM, b) 2 mM, c) 4 mM and d) 5 mM concentration.

b)




Figure S13. VT- ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}$ spectra of a) OPE3, b) OPE4 and c) OPE5 in MCH- $\mathrm{d}_{14}$ between 313 K and 253 K with a concentration of 5 mM .


Figure S14. VT-UV/Vis spectra of OPE6 in MCH at a) 1 mM , b) 2 mM, c) 3 mM and d) 4 mM with a cooling rate of $1 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{min}$.


Figure S15. VT-UV/Vis spectra of OPE7 in MCH at a) $300 \mu \mathrm{M}$, b) $500 \mu \mathrm{M}$, c) $600 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and d) 800 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ with a cooling rate of $1 \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{min}$.

### 3.1 Nucleation-Elongation Model for Cooperative Supramolecular Polymerizations

The Nucleation-Elongation model describes the equilibrium between the monomeric and the supramolecular species in a cooperative process ${ }^{1}$. The model is used to describe the aggregation of OPE6 and OPE7, which follows a non-sigmoidal cooling curve as shown in the temperaturedependent experiments. The model extends nucleation-elongation based equilibrium models for growth of supramolecular homopolymers to the case of two monomer and aggregate types and can be applied to symmetric supramolecular copolymerizations, as well as to the more general case of nonsymmetric supramolecular copolymerizations. In a cooperative process, the polymerization occurs via a nucleation step followed by a nucleation step. The values $T_{\mathrm{e}}, \Delta H^{\circ}$ nucl, $\Delta H^{\circ}$ and $\Delta S^{\circ}$ can be obtained by a non-linear least-square analysis of the experimental melting curves. The correspondence nucleation, $K_{\text {nucl, }}$, and elongation, $K_{e l}$, equilibrium constants can be calculated with the following equations:

$$
\begin{gathered}
K_{n u c l}=e^{\left[\frac{-\left(\Delta H^{0}-\Delta H_{n u c l}^{0}\right)-T \Delta S^{0}}{R T}\right]} \\
K_{e l}=e^{\left[\frac{-\left(\Delta H^{0}-T \Delta S^{0}\right)}{R T}\right]}
\end{gathered}
$$

And the correspondence cooperativity factor $(\sigma)$ is given by:

$$
\sigma=\frac{K_{n u c l}}{K_{e l}}=e^{\left(\frac{\Delta H_{n u c l}^{0}}{R T}\right)}
$$

### 3.2 Thermodynamic Parameters

Table S2. Thermodynamic parameters for the self-assembly process of OPE6 obtained from the global fitting of the corresponding cooling curves.

| $\begin{gathered} c / \\ \mathrm{mM} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta H^{0} / \\ \mathrm{kJmol}^{-1} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta S^{0} / \\ \mathrm{kJmol}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \Delta H_{N}^{0} / \\ & \mathrm{kJmol}^{-1} \end{aligned}$ | $T_{\text {e }} / \mathrm{K}$ | $\Delta G_{298}^{0} /$ <br> $\mathrm{kJmol}^{-1}$ | $K_{\text {el }}$ | $K_{\text {nucl }}$ | $\sigma$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | -153.63 | -0.49 $\pm$ | -9.80 $\pm$ | 281.00 | -8.62 | $1.43 \times 10^{3}$ | 21.15 | $1.51 \times 10^{-2}$ |
|  | $\pm 2.86$ | 0.01 | 0.54 | $\pm 0.11$ |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | -153.63 | -0.49 $\pm$ | $-9.80 \pm$ | 285.55 | -8.62 | $5.00 \times 10^{2}$ | 8.06 | $1.61 \times 10^{-2}$ |
|  | $\pm 2.87$ | 0.02 | 0.55 | $\pm 0.12$ |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | -153.63 | -0.49 $\pm$ | $-9.80 \pm$ | 287.35 | -8.62 | $3.33 \times 10^{2}$ | 5.51 | $1.65 \times 10^{-2}$ |
|  | $\pm 2.88$ | 0.03 | 0.56 | $\pm 0.13$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | -153.63 | -0.49 $\pm$ | $-9.80 \pm$ | 289.66 | -8.62 | $2.00 \times 10^{2}$ | 3.42 | $1.71 \times 10^{-2}$ |
|  | $\pm 2.89$ | 0.04 | 0.57 | $\pm 0.14$ |  |  |  |  |

Table S3. Thermodynamic parameters for the self-assembly process of OPE7 obtained from the global fitting of the corresponding cooling curves.

| $c / \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $\Delta H^{0} /$ $\mathrm{kJmol}^{-1}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta S^{0} / \\ \text { kJmol }^{-1} \mathbf{K}^{-1} \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta H^{0}{ }_{N} /$ <br> $\mathrm{kJmol}^{-1}$ | $T_{\mathrm{e}} / \mathrm{K}$ | $\Delta G^{0}{ }_{298} /$ <br> $\mathrm{kJmol}^{-1}$ | $K_{\text {el }}$ | $K_{\text {nucl }}$ | $\sigma$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 300 | $\begin{gathered} -109.64 \\ \pm 4.85 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 \pm \\ 0.02 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -10.28 \\ & \pm 0.91 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 286.29 \\ \pm 0.24 \end{gathered}$ | -16.56 | $3.33 \times 10^{3}$ | 44.5 | $1.33 \times 10^{-2}$ |
| 500 | $\begin{gathered} -109.64 \\ \pm 4.86 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 \pm \\ 0.03 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -10.28 \\ & \pm 0.92 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 289.50 \\ \pm 0.25 \end{gathered}$ | -16.56 | $2.00 \times 10^{3}$ | 28.0 | $1.40 \times 10^{-2}$ |
| 600 | $\begin{gathered} -109.64 \\ \pm 4.87 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 \pm \\ 0.04 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -10.28 \\ & \pm 0.93 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 290.66 \\ & \pm 0.26 \end{aligned}$ | -16.56 | $1.67 \times 10^{3}$ | 23.7 | $1.42 \times 10^{-2}$ |
| 800 | $\begin{gathered} -109.64 \\ \pm 4.88 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 \pm \\ 0.05 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -10.28 \\ & \pm 0.94 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 292.52 \\ \pm 0.27 \end{gathered}$ | -16.56 | $1.25 \times 10^{3}$ | 18.3 | $1.42 \times 10^{-2}$ |

## 4 Microscopic analysis of OPE6 and OPE7



Figure S16. AFM images of OPE6 obtained by spin coating a $250 \mu \mathrm{M}$ solution in MCH onto mica surface.


Figure S17. AFM image of OPE7 obtained by spin coating a $250 \mu \mathrm{M}$ solution in MCH onto mica surface.


Figure S18. SEM image of a) OPE6 and b) OPE7 obtained by drop-casting a $250 \mu \mathrm{M}$ solution in MCH onto silicon surface.

## 5 Experimental Part

### 5.1 Materials and Methods

General. All solvents were dried according to standard procedures. Reagents were used as purchased. All air-sensitive reactions were carried out under argon atmosphere. Flash column chromatography was performed using silica gel (Merck Silica 60, particle size 0.04-0.063 nm).

NMR measurements. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker Avance $400\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right.$ : 400 $\mathrm{MHz} ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}: 100.6 \mathrm{MHz}$ ) and on an Agilent DD2 $500\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}: 500 \mathrm{MHz} ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}: 125 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$ ) or an Agilent DD2 600 ( ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}: 600 \mathrm{MHz} ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}: 150 \mathrm{MHz}$ ) at 298 K using deuterated solvents. The recorded spectra were referenced to the remaining resonance signals of the deuterated solvents. Coupling constants ( $J$ ) are denoted in Hz and chemical shifts ( $\delta$ ) in ppm. Multiplicities are denoted as follows: $\mathrm{s}=$ singlet, $\mathrm{d}=$ doublet, $\mathrm{t}=$ triplet, $\mathrm{m}=$ multiplet. Chemical shifts are given in ppm relative to $\mathrm{TMS}\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, 0.0 \mathrm{ppm}\right)$.

Mass Spectroscopy. ESI mass spectra were recorded on a Bruker MicroTof system. The signals are described by their mass/charge ratio ( $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ ) in $u$.

UV-Vis Spectroscopy. UV/Vis absorption spectra were registered using a JASCO-V770/750 spectrophotometer with a spectral bandwidth of 1.0 nm and a scan rate of $400 \mathrm{~nm} / \mathrm{min}$. All experiments were carried out using quartz cuvettes with optical paths of $1,0.1$ or 0.01 cm . For all measurements, spectroscopic grade solvents were used.

Fluorescence Spectroscopy. Fluorescence spectra were recorded on a JASCO Spectrofluorometer FP8500 in quartz cuvettes (SUPRASIL ${ }^{\circledR}$, Hellma) with an optical length of 1 cm .

Atomic Force Microscopy. AFM images were recorded on a Multimode ${ }^{\circledR} 8$ SPM System (AXS Bruker). Silicon cantilevers with a nominal spring constant of $41.0 \mathrm{Nm}^{-1}$ and with resonant frequency of 300 kHz , and a typical tip radius of 7 nm (OMCL-AC160TS, Olympus) were employed. The solutions of OPE-6 and OPE-7 in MCH were spin-coated onto a Mica surface under 4000 rpm .

Scanning Electron Microscopy. SEM images were recorded on a Phenom Pro G6 Desktop SEM using 5 kV acceleration voltage with a secondary electron detector (SED). The solutions of OPE6 and OPE7 in MCH were drop-casted onto a piece of Silicon wafer.

### 5.2 Synthesis and Characterization of OPEs 3-7
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Scheme S1. Synthetic routes for OPEs 3-7.
Compounds $6^{2}, \mathbf{7}^{2}, \mathbf{8}^{3}, 10^{3}$ and $11^{4}$ as well as OPE-3 $(1)^{2}$ and OPE-6 $(4)^{3}$ were synthetized following previously reported procedures and showed identical properties to those reported herein.


In a 100 mL round bottom flask, 1,2,3-tris(dodecyloxy)-5-ethynylbenzene ${ }^{5}$ ( 301 mg ) was dissolved in dry triethylamine ( 8 mL ) and three $\mathrm{Ar} /$ vacuum cycles were flushed alternatively. In a separate flask, 1,4 -diiodobenzene ( 217 mg , 1.5 eq ), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(27.9 \mathrm{mg}, 10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ and $\mathrm{Cul}(3.45 \mathrm{mg}, 5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ were added to 20 mL dry $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and the suspension was subjected to three $\mathrm{Ar} /$ vacuum cycles. The initially prepared $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ solution of $1,2,3$-tris(dodecyloxy)-5-ethynylbenzene was added dropwise to the suspension over a period of $15-20 \mathrm{~min}$. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. After evaporation of the solvent under reduce pressure, the crude was purified by column chromatography (Pentane/DCM 8:2) to obtain compound 9 as a white solid ( $182 \mathrm{mg}, 46 \%$ ).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm})=7.67(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.72(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.97$ $(\mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.83-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.50-1.42(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=14.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 48 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 9 \mathrm{H})$.
${ }^{13}$ C NMR ( $\mathbf{1 2 5} \mathbf{~ M H z}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm})=153.79,153.02,139.32,137.47,132.97,122.89,117.20,110.13$, 110.11, 93.82, 91.20, 87.13, 73.51, 69.26, 69.14, 31.92, 31.90, 31.41, 30.30, 30.28, 30.24, 30.17, 29.73, 29.72, 29.71, 29.68, 29.64, 29.62, 29.60, 29.57, 29.37, 29.34, 29.31, 29.24, 26.07, 26.05, 26.03, 26.01, 22.68, 22.67, 14.08.

HRMS (ESI, Nanospray, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ ): $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{50} \mathrm{H}_{81} \mathrm{IO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}^{+},[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 879.51226$; found 879.51239.


Compound 9 ( $182 \mathrm{mg}, 0.21 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and compound 8 ( $192 \mathrm{mg}, 0.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(4.9 \mathrm{mg}, 2 \% \mathrm{~mol})$ and $\mathrm{Cul}(1.2 \mathrm{mg}, 3 \% \mathrm{~mol})$ were mixed in $\mathrm{dry} \mathrm{NEt}_{3}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the mixture was subjected to three vacuum/argon cycles. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. After evaporation of the solvent under reduce pressure, the crude was purified by column chromatography with Pentane/DCM (from 2:8 to 4:6) as eluent. Compound $\mathbf{2}$ was obtained as a white solid ( $230 \mathrm{mg}, 74 \%$ ).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm})=7.49(\mathrm{~s}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 6.74(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.98(\mathrm{td}, J=6.6,2.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.81(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}$ $=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 1.78-1.69(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{J}=7.8,7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.40-1.19(\mathrm{~m}, 96 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 18 \mathrm{H})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm})=153.79,153.02,139.32,137.47,132.97,122.89,117.20,110.13$, 110.11, 93.82, 91.20, 87.13, 73.51, 69.26, 69.14, 31.92, 31.90, 30.30, 29.73, 29.72, 29.71, 29.68, $29.64,29.62,29.60,29.57,29.37,29.34,29.31,29.24,26.07,26.05,22.67,14.08$.

HRMS (ESI Nanospray, $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ ): $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{102} \mathrm{H}_{163} \mathrm{O}_{6}$, $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$1485.24777; found 1485.24889.

IR (neat) solid: 2955, 2915, 2847, 2150, 1724, 1518, 1501, 1389, 1257, 1235, 1116, 833, 718, 618.


OPE-5 (3)
Compound 8 ( $462 \mathrm{mg}, 0.61 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), diiodobenzene ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(17 \mathrm{mg}, 2 \% \mathrm{~mol})$ and $\mathrm{Cul}(6 \mathrm{mg}, 3 \% \mathrm{~mol})$ were suspended in $8 \mathrm{~mL} \mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ and subjected to five vacuum/argon cycles. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. After $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ was removed under vacuum, column chromatography of the crude was performed using Pentane/DCM (from 8:2 to 1:1) as eluent. Compound 3 ( 429 mg ) was obtained as a yellow solid in $80 \%$ yield.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm})=7.51(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 6.74(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.98(\mathrm{td}, J=6.5,2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $12 \mathrm{H}), 1.85-1.71(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.52-1.41(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.28(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=13.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 96 \mathrm{H}), 0.88(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 18 \mathrm{H})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(150 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm})=153.03,139.34,131.56,131.53,131.46,123.47,123.06,122.60$, $117.30,110.19,91.88,91.13,90.86,87.79,73.55,69.16,31.93,31.92,31.42,30.31,30.18,29.75$, 29.74, 29.72, 29.69, 29.68, 29.65, 29.63, 29.59, 29.39, 29.36, 29.33, 26.09, 26.07, 22.69, 22.68, 14.10 .

HRMS (ESI, Nanospray, $\left.\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}\right): \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{102} \mathrm{H}_{163} \mathrm{O}_{6}{ }^{+},[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$1585.27907; found 1585.28078.

IR (neat): 2951, 2915, 2851, 1576, 1518, 1502, 1465, 1422, 1375, 1357, 1257, 1232, 1116, 991, 826, 718, 624.


OPE-7 (5)

Compound 11 ( $45.2 \mathrm{mg}, 0.14 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) dissolved in THF ( 4.5 mL ) was added dropwise to a mixture containing compound 9 ( $253 \mathrm{mg}, 0.29 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5.91 \mathrm{mg}, 8.42 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$, Cul ( $0.88 \mathrm{mg}, 4.62$ $\mu \mathrm{mol})$ in $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}(8 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. After removing the solvents under reduce pressure, the crude was purified using Pentane to Pentane/DCM $1: 1$ as eluent, affording compound 5 as a yellow solid (70\%).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm})=7.54-7.47(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 6.74(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.00-3.94(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.85-$ $1.70(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.47(\mathrm{td}, \mathrm{J}=8.5,4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.27(\mathrm{~s}, 96 \mathrm{H}), 0.89(\mathrm{~s}, 18 \mathrm{H})$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta(\mathrm{ppm})=153.05,139.36,131.60,131.59,131.55,131.48,123.50,123.14$, $123.07,123.01,122.60,117.31,110.20,91.91,91.18,87.80,73.56,69.18,31.95,31.93,30.33,29.76$, $29.75,29.74,29.71,29.67,29.65,29.60,29.40,29.37,29.34,26.11,26.09,22.70,22.70,14.12$.

HRMS (ESI, Nanospray $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3} / \mathrm{MeOH}$ ): m/z calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{126} \mathrm{H}_{175} \mathrm{O}_{6}{ }^{+},[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$1785.34167; found 1785.33977.

IR (neat): 2980, 2919, 2851, 2355, 1572,1515, 1461, 1414, 1378, 1353, 1253, 1232, 1116, 955, 830, 720.

## $5.3{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR Spectra



Figure S19. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum for compound $9\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 500 \mathrm{MHz}, 298 \mathrm{~K}\right)$.


Figure S20. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum for compound $9\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 125 \mathrm{MHz}, 298 \mathrm{~K}\right)$.


Figure S21. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum for compound $\mathbf{2}$ (OPE4) ( $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}, 298 \mathrm{~K}\right)$.


Figure S22. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum for compound $\mathbf{2}$ (OPE4) (CDCl $3,150 \mathrm{MHz}, 298 \mathrm{~K}$ ).


Figure S23. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum for compound $\mathbf{3}$ (OPE5) ( $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}, 298 \mathrm{~K}\right)$.


Figure S24. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum for compound $\mathbf{3}$ (OPE5) ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}, 298 \mathrm{~K}$ ).


Figure S25. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum for compound 5 (OPE7) ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 500 \mathrm{MHz}, 298 \mathrm{~K}$ ).


Figure S26. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum for compound 5 (OPE7) ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 125 \mathrm{MHz}, 298 \mathrm{~K}$ ).
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