

Supporting Information for

Guest Removal from Ring-Banded Guanidinium Organosulfonate Hydrogen-Bonded Frameworks

Rochelle B. Spencer,^a Anna Yusov,^a Alexandra M. Dillon,^a Akash Tiwari,^a Oriol Arteaga,^b Sophia Sburlati,^a St. John Whittaker,^a Wantong Wu,^a Zoey Chen,^a Alexander G. Shtukenberg,^a Michael D. Ward,^{*a} Bart Kahr^{*a} and Stephanie S. Lee^{*a}

^aMolecular Design Institute, Department of Chemistry, New York University, New York, NY 10003, USA

^bDepartment of Applied Physics, University of Barcelona, 08028 Barcelona, Spain

*mdw3@nyu.edu, bk66@nyu.edu, stephlee@nyu.edu

Video S1. Brightfield video of a (G)₂(1,5-NDS) ⊃ EtOH single crystal undergoing a transition upon heating at 130°C.

Video S2. Frame-by-frame optical micrographs of the recrystallization process upon heating a (G)₂(1,5-NDS) ⊃ EtOH banded spherulite film between crossed polarizers. Time-lapse videos of optical micrographs were created in Fiji and frames were stabilized with the StackReg macro plugin.




Figure S1. Optical micrographs of $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ films grown from ethanol solution between crossed polarizers at various solution concentrations and substrate temperatures. Scale bar = 50 μm .




Figure S2. Color map correlating solution concentration and substrate temperature with $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ film morphologies: (a) coffee rings of small crystalline aggregates (yellow), (b) spherulites (red), (c) needle-like crystals (green), and (d) large crystalline aggregates (blue). Red data points represent banded spherulites.




Figure S3. (a) 2-D XRD pattern of $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})\supset\text{EtOH}$ bulk powder. (b) 1-D line scans extracted from the 2-D diffraction patterns for $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})\supset\text{EtOH}$ twisted crystals and $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})\supset\text{EtOH}$ bulk powder loaded into Kapton capillary tubes. The simulated powder XRD pattern of experimentally determined $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})\supset\text{EtOH}$ are provided for comparison.




Figure S4. Absorbance and emission spectra at different excitation wavelengths for $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ dissolved in ethanol.




Figure S5. (a, b) Optical micrographs of a $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$ single crystal between crossed polarizers before and after ethanol guest removal at 130°C , respectively. The white arrow highlights a thin single crystal exhibiting few domains that transformed with loss of retardance. The red arrow indicates a thick single crystal exhibiting multiple domains that decomposed, became dark because of strong scattering, and lost all phase information upon guest removal.

Table S1. Detailed crystallographic data for $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$ and $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ collected at 100 K

Compound name	$(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$	$(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$
Lab code	23mdw12ay	23mdw35ay
CCDC no.	2419508	-
Formula by X-ray	$C_{14}H_{24}N_6O_7S_2$	$C_{12}H_{18}N_6O_6S_2$
Formula weight	452.51	406.44
Crystal habit	colorless plate	cloudy colorless prism
Crystal size (mm)	0.430 x 0.370 x 0.110	0.886 x 0.471 x 0.190
Crystal system	triclinic	monoclinic
Space group (no.)	$P\bar{1}$	$P2_1/c$
<i>a</i> (Å)	7.2940(3)	11.359(5)
<i>b</i> (Å)	7.2975(3)	9.285(4)
<i>c</i> (Å)	11.5957(5)	9.048(4)
α (°)	100.0921(15)	90
β (°)	95.3125(14)	101.453(12)
γ (°)	118.9930(13)	90
<i>V</i> (Å ³)	520.096	935.276
<i>Z</i>	1	2
<i>D_c</i> (g cm ⁻³)	1.445	1.443
<i>F</i> (000)	238.0	424.0
μ (mm ⁻¹)	0.305	0.326
Total reflections	15215	2443
Unique reflections	2576	640
<i>R</i> _{int}	0.0327	0.0953
<i>R</i> ₁ [<i>I</i> > 2σ(<i>I</i>)]	0.0325	0.1106
<i>wR</i> ₂ (all data)	0.0946	0.2229
GOF (all data)	1.085	1.386




Figure S6. (a) 2-D XRD pattern of guest-free $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ bulk powder. (b) 1-D line scans extracted from the 2-D diffraction patterns of guest-free $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ straight crystals and guest-free $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ bulk powder loaded into Kapton capillary tubes. The simulated powder XRD patterns of experimentally determined guest-free $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ and $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$ are provided for comparison.




Figure S7. Comparison of 1-D line scans extracted from the 2-D diffraction patterns of $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})\supset\text{EtOH}$ bulk powder and guest-free $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ bulk powder with the simulated powder XRD pattern of experimentally determined HOF-GS-10 “unknown solvate”.

Table S2. Comparison of crystallographic data for $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})\supset\text{EtOH}$, $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ and HOF-GS-10.

Compound name	$(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})\supset\text{EtOH}$	$(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$	HOF-GS-10
CCDC no.	2419508	-	1473368
Formula by X-ray	$C_{14}H_{24}N_6O_7S_2$	$C_{12}H_{18}N_6O_6S_2$	$C_{12}H_{18}N_6O_6S_2$
Formula weight	452.51	406.44	406.44
Crystal habit	colorless plate	cloudy colorless prism	colorless rod
Crystal size (mm)	0.430 x 0.370 x 0.110	0.886 x 0.471 x 0.190	0.13 x 0.11 x 0.10
Crystal system	triclinic	monoclinic	triclinic
Space group (no.)	$P\bar{1}$	$P2_1/c$	$P\bar{1}$
<i>a</i> (Å)	7.2940(3)	11.359(5)	7.2631(10)
<i>b</i> (Å)	7.2975(3)	9.285(4)	7.3084(11)
<i>c</i> (Å)	11.5957(5)	9.048(4)	11.6934(17)
α (°)	100.0921(15)	90	74.902(4)
β (°)	95.3125(14)	101.453(12)	84.809(4)
γ (°)	118.9930(13)	90	60.567(4)
<i>V</i> (Å ³)	520.096	935.276	521.41(13)
<i>Z</i>	1	2	1
<i>D_c</i> (g cm ⁻³)	1.445	1.443	1.294




Figure S8. Molecular packing highlighting the distance between adjacent bilayers in (a) $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$ and (b) $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ as 3.074 Å and 2.772 Å, respectively, as measured by the distance between a plane constructed through the closest oxygen atoms in each bilayer. Hydrogen atoms are hidden for clarity.




Figure S9. (a, b) Hydrogen-bonding interactions in GS sheets of $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$ and $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$. Unlike $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$, $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ exhibits a distorted quasi-hexagonal GS sheet. In $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$, G cations and S anions retain the 6 strong hydrogen bonds ($d(\text{N} \cdots \text{O}) = 2.869, 2.889, 2.929, 2.952, 2.968, 3.038 \text{ Å}$), albeit the magnitudes of these hydrogen bonding interactions differ slightly in $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$ ($d(\text{N} \cdots \text{O}) = 2.900, 2.912, 2.927, 2.927, 2.937, 2.948 \text{ Å}$). One pair of G protons on adjacent nitrogen atoms is hydrogen-bonded to a single S oxygen atom. While $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$ has each G cation bound to only 3 S anions, each G cation is bound to 4 S anions in $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$. Hydrogen bonds in $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ are slightly longer on average (2.941 vs. 2.925 Å) than in the $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$ structure, and their geometry appears to be much less favorable: N-H $\cdots$ O angles in $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$ are 167.25°, 145.57°, 147.47°, 145.70°, 156.86°, and 161.66°, compared to N-H $\cdots$ O angles of 163.11°, 165.15°, 174.47°, 160.58°, 159.45°, and 170.42° in the $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS}) \supset \text{EtOH}$ structure.




Figure S10. Visualization of the calculated void spaces (yellow cavities) in (a) $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})\supset\text{EtOH}$ with ethanol computationally removed compared to (b) $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})$. The voids are 19.6% and 9.7% of the unit cell volume, affording void volumes of $101.95 \text{ \AA}^3$ and $90.82 \text{ \AA}^3$, respectively (grid spacing = $0.3 \text{ \AA}$, probe radius = $1.2 \text{ \AA}$).




Figure S11. Linear retardance ($|LR|$) map and angle-dependent linear retardance (LR_{angle}) map measured in degrees counterclockwise from the horizontal direction (a) before and (b) after guest removal from $(G)_2(1,5\text{-NDS})\supset\text{EtOH}$ banded spherulite films. $\lambda = 455 \text{ nm}$.




Figure S12. (a) SEM cross-section of a guest-free (G)₂(1,5-NDS) film, (b) cross-section of the film with pores shaded in red, and (c) tabular summary of measurements obtained from pore analysis conducted using Fiji software.