Tetrairon(II) extended metal atom chains as single-molecule magnets†
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Iron-based extended metal atom chains (EMACs) are potentially high-spin molecules with axial magnetic anisotropy and thus candidate single-molecule magnets (SMMs). We herein compare the tetrairon(II), halide-capped complexes [Fe₄(tpda)₃Cl₂] (1Cl) and [Fe₄(tpda)₃Br₂] (1Br), obtained by reacting iron(II) dihalides with [Fe₂(Mes)₄] and N²,N⁶-di(pyridin-2-yl)pyridine-2,6-diamine (H₂tpda) in toluene, under strictly anhydrous and anaerobic conditions (HMes = mesitylene). Detailed structural, electrochemical and Mössbauer data are presented along with direct-current (DC) and alternating-current (AC) magnetic characterizations. DC measurements revealed similar static magnetic properties for the two derivatives, with 2xMT at room temperature above that for independent spin carriers, but much lower at low temperature. The electronic structure of the iron(II) ions in each derivative was explored by ab initio (CASSCF-NEVPT2-SO) calculations, which showed that the main magnetic axis of all metals is directed close to the axis of the chain. The outer metals, Fe1 and Fe4, have an easy-axis magnetic anisotropy (D = −11 to −19 cm⁻¹, |E/D| = 0.05–0.18), while the internal metals, Fe2 and Fe3, possess weaker hard-axis anisotropy (D = 8–10 cm⁻¹, |E/D| = 0.06–0.21). These single-ion parameters were held constant in the fitting of DC magnetic data, which revealed ferromagnetic Fe1–Fe2 and Fe3–Fe4 interactions and antiferromagnetic Fe2–Fe3 coupling. The competition between super-exchange interactions and the large, noncollinear anisotropies at metal sites results in a weakly magnetic non-Kramers doublet ground state. This explains the SMM behavior displayed by both derivatives in the AC susceptibility data, with slow magnetic relaxation in 1Br being observable even in zero static field.

Introduction

An extended metal atom chain (EMAC) is a 1D array of at least three metal (M) ions supported by polydentate organic ligands, which are often helically wrapped around the metal chain.1–4 They can be homo- or heterometallic, homo- or mixed-valent species,3,5 Oligo-α-pyridylamines or related polydentate ligands, like dipyridin-2-ylamine (Hdpda) and N²,N⁶-di(pyridin-2-yl)pyridine-2,6-diamine (H₂tpda),6,7 are widely used in this research area and are shown in Scheme 1. Their geometry and electronic properties, EMACs have been examined as possible wires in molecular electronics.5,8–11 They also attracted interest as molecular magnetic materials after chromium(III)-based Cr₃ and Cr₅ EMACs,12,13 as well as the Mo₂Cr and W₂Cr heterometallic variants,14,15 showed single-molecule magnet (SMM) properties in their S = 2 ground state. SMMs are molecular compounds displaying directional bistability of the magnetic moment at low temperature16,17 and are being currently investigated for forefront applications in spintronics, quantum
technologies, and data storage. In terms of working temperature, the best-performing SMMs to date are mononuclear complexes of lanthanoids, which can display a memory effect above the boiling temperature of liquid nitrogen (77 K). An alternative to the use of lanthanoids is the stabilization of highly magnetic electronic states in polynuclear transition metal compounds, through M–M bonds or ferromagnetic interactions. Especially in the chemistry of Fe and Co it is not uncommon to find compounds with a giant, thermally persistent magnetic moment as a consequence of the direct interaction between d-orbitals. In this context, iron(II)-based EMACs have arisen as appealing synthetic targets, because of the large magnetic anisotropy and spin value of high-spin (HS) iron(II). Although Fe\textsuperscript{2+} ions were expected to be too large for a metal bond. Nevertheless, the room-temperature effective magnetic moment is not far from the expected value for an S = 6 state, suggesting strongly ferromagnetic interactions. In 2018 we reported the first iron(II)-based EMAC supported by oligo-\textalpha-pyridylamido ligands, [Fe\textsubscript{4}(tpda)\textsubscript{3}Cl\textsubscript{2}] \textsubscript{(tthf)} (1Cl). This chloride-capped complex has idealized three-fold symmetry and a helical structure, and was synthesized by reacting H\textsubscript{2}tpda with [Fe\textsubscript{4}(Mes)\textsubscript{4}] and Fe\textsubscript{4}Cl\textsubscript{8}(thf)\textsubscript{6} in toluene under strictly anhydrous and anaerobic conditions (HMes = mesitylene). It also contains no Fe–Fe bonds but features dominant ferromagnetic interactions at room temperature, although the ground state is only weakly magnetic. In addition, it exhibits SMM behavior only observable in a small static magnetic field (H\textsubscript{dc}). Very recently, using assisted laser desorption/ionization tandem time-of-flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF-MS) measurements were conducted on a 6310A Ion Trap LC-MS(n) instrument (equipped with a SmartBeam laser) using a powdery sample finely milled with a large excess of pure anthrace and working in positive ion mode. Matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization tandem time-of-flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF-MS) measurements were performed at the University of Wisconsin–Madison with a Bruker ULTRAFLEX III instrument (equipped with a SmartBeam laser) using a powdery sample finely milled with a large excess of pure anthrace and working in positive ion mode. The m/z values in the MALDI-TOF-MS spectrum are expressed by setting the isotopic peak of anthrace (C\textsubscript{14}H\textsubscript{10}) at m/z =
178.08. The electronic spectrum in dichloromethane solution was recorded up to 200 nm on a Jasco V-570 double beam UV-Vis-NIR spectrometer, using a quartz cuvette sealed with an airtight Teflon® cap (optical path length \( l = 0.1 \) cm). The \(^1\)H NMR spectrum was recorded at 298 K in CD\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) with a Bruker Avance400 FT-NMR spectrometer (400.13 MHz). The chemical shifts are expressed in ppm downfield from Me\(_4\)Si as external standard, by setting the residual \(^1\)H signal of CD\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) at 5.32 ppm. Spectrum processing and analysis were carried out with TopSpin 4.0.6 software\(^{49}\) (SI = TD, LB = 1.00 Hz).

**Synthesis of \([\text{Fe}_4(\text{tpda})_3\text{Br}_2] \cdot 2.3\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2\cdot\text{Et}_2\text{O}\) (1Br-2.3CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\)-Et\(_2\)O)**

Iron(III)-free FeBr\(_2\)(thf)\(_2\)\(^{50,51}\) was prepared by stirring FeBr\(_2\) (19.6 mg, 0.3578 mmol) in toluene (3 mL). A suspension of H\(_2\)tpda (94.20 mg, 0.3578 mmol) in toluene (3 mL) was then added dropwise under stirring, yielding a light brown suspension. After 5 min, the reaction mixture was gently heated to reflux for 165 min, whereupon it initially turned orange, then gradually darkened to dark orange-brown. After cooling to room temperature, an orange solid was separated from the dark liquid phase by filtration through a fritted glass funnel (porosity G3 or G4) and extracted with CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (2 × 25 mL), to give a red solution (for each extraction, the solid and the solvent were stirred together for 90 min). The solvent was evaporated under vacuum until only ~2 mL remained and an orange precipitate had formed. The suspension was cooled down to ~35 °C and the liquid phase was carefully removed using a narrow bore pipette. The solid was thoroughly dried under vacuum to give 1Br as an orange powder (50 mg, 48%), from which we measured Mössbauer and MALDI-TOF-MS spectra. For all other characterizations the product was crystallized by slow vapour diffusion of Et\(_2\)O (75 mL) into the CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) extract (50 mL). Dark red prisms were obtained and separated easily by flotation from a powdery residue and from minority crystal phases (see ESI Note 1†) and vacuum-dried to remove lattice solvent (30–35% overall yield). Anal. Calc. for 1Br (C\(_{36}\)H\(_{30}\)Fe\(_2\)Br\(_2\)N\(_{12}\)) C: 46.3; H: 2.85; N: 18.0. Found: C, 45.9; H, 2.9; N, 18.4. UV-Vis-NIR (4.3 × 10\(^{-3}\) M): \(\lambda_{\text{max}}(\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2)/\text{nm} = 286 \quad (\varepsilon)/(\text{dm}^3\text{ mol}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-1}) = 3.81 \times 10^4\), 370 (3.38 × 10\(^4\)), 4488. \(^1\)H NMR (CD\(_2\)Cl\(_2\), 400.13 MHz): \(\delta_{\text{H}} = 5.33\) (6H, s), 8.58 (6H, s), 9.80 (3H, s, H\(_z\)), 60.91 (6H, s), 80.50 (6H, s), 119.7 (6H, s). ESI-MS (positive ion mode): \(m/z = 1030.1\) ([Fe\(_3\)(tpda)Br\(_2\)])\(^{+}\), 100%; 986.1 ([Fe\(_4\)(tpda)Cl\(_2\)])\(^{+}\), 25%). MALDI-TOF-MS (positive ion mode): \(m/z = 952.2\) ([Fe\(_3\)(tpda)\(_3\) + H\(^+\)])\(^{+}\), 100%; 1087.3 ([Fe\(_4\)(tpda)Br + H\(^+\)])\(^{+}\), 9); 1031.3 ([Fe\(_4\)(tpda)Br + H\(^+\)])\(^{+}\), 2); 1043.3 ([Fe\(_4\)(tpda)Cl + H\(^+\)])\(^{+}\), 1).

**X-ray crystallography of 1Br-2.3CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\)-Et\(_2\)O**

A prismatic crystal of the compound was removed from the mother liquor under nitrogen, rapidly cooled down in a cold dinitrogen stream, and mounted on a Bruker-Nonius X8APEX diffractometer equipped with Mo-K\(_x\) generator, area detector, and Kryoflex liquid dinitrogen cryostat for data collection at 115(2) K. Acquisition of matrix frames and data collection were carried out using APEX2 software\(^{52}\) while data reduction used SAINT program.\(^{52}\) Multi-scan absorption correction was applied with SADABS.\(^{52}\) Programs SIR92\(^{53}\) and SHELXL-2014/7,\(^{54}\) both implemented in the WINGX v2014.1 suite,\(^{55}\) were used for structure solution and refinement on \(F^2\), respectively. Although the molecule has no crystallographically-imagined symmetry, two tpda\(^{-}\) ligands (those containing N7 and N8) are almost perfectly related by a twofold axis normal to the metal chain. The third tpda\(^{-}\) ligand, the metal ions and the terminal bromido ligands lift such local symmetry and are disordered over two unequally populated positions (0.88 : 0.12) related by a 180° rotation around the above-mentioned dyad. As a consequence of this, the minority component is structurally similar to its majority counterpart. All attempts to model the terminal ligands as mixed Br/CI scatterers with complementary occupancies gave unphysically low (<0.01 Å\(^2\)) displacement parameters for the minority (CI) components. Lattice solvent molecules (CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) and Et\(_2\)O) also show severe positional disorder, with shared occupation of crystallographic sites, which makes their modelling extremely challenging. Non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically, but isotropic displacement parameters had to be used for most disordered portions of the structure. These were refined with further restraints/constraints on geometry and displacement parameters. In particular, similarity restraints were applied to the geometry of CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) molecules, whereas Et\(_2\)O molecules were restrained to the geometry found in CDCC 793759. Hydrogen atoms were treated isotropically and refined using a riding model with \(U(H) = 1.2U_{eq}(C)\) for methyl and \(U(H) = 1.5U_{eq}(C)\) for methyl hydrogens, which were set in a staggered conformation. Crystal data and refinement parameters are gathered in Table S1† while an exhaustive listing of interatomic distances and angles as well as further details on structural analysis are available in Table S2 and in ESI Note 2.†

**Electrochemistry**

Cyclic voltammetry (CV) measurements were carried out using a PARSTAT model 2273 potentiostat-galvanostat. Experiments were performed at different scan rates (0.02–5 V s\(^{-1}\)) using a cell for small volume samples (0.5 mL). A 1 mm diameter glassy carbon (GC) disk, a Pt wire, and an Ag wire were used as working, counter, and quasi-reference (Ag/AgCl or Ag/AgBr) electrodes, respectively. The GC electrode was cleaned following a previously reported procedure.\(^41,56\) For all the experiments, the potential of the quasi-reference electrode was calibrated against the ferrocenium/ferrocene redox couple (in dichloromethane, \(E^0 = 0.460\) V vs. KCl saturated calomel electrode, SCE).\(^57\) All the reported potential values \(E^0\) are referenced to the ferrocenium/ferrocene redox couple. The formal potential value \((E^0)\) corresponding to each electron transfer (ET) process was calculated as the semi-sum of the cathodic and anodic peak potentials, \(E^0 = (E_{pa} + E_{pa})/2\). The dependence of \(\Delta E_p = E_{pa} − E_{pc}\) on scan rate yielded the standard hetero-
geneous ET rate constant \( k_{ET} \),\(^{58}\) which is the ET rate constant measured at the formal potential \( E^o \). Due to the instability of \( 1\text{Cl} \) and \( 1\text{Br} \) in the presence of \( \text{O}_2 \) or \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \), the experiments were performed in the above-described MBraun UniLAB glovebox at temperatures ranging between \(-15 \) and \(+5 \) °C.\(^{51}\) Variable temperature experiments were conducted using an isothermal cell configuration, in which the temperature of the reference and working electrodes was varied. For this experimental configuration, the reduction entropy referenced to the ferrocenium/ferrocene redox couple \( (\Delta S^o_{\text{red}}) \) is given by:

\[
\Delta S^o_{\text{red}} = S^o_{\text{red}} - S^o_{\text{ox}} = nF \frac{\partial E^o}{\partial T} \text{p}
\]

Thus, \( \Delta S^o_{\text{red}} \) can be calculated from the slope of the \( E^o \) vs. \( T \) plot, which is linear under the assumption that \( \Delta S^o_{\text{red}} \) is constant over the limited temperature range investigated. With the same assumption, the enthalpy change (also referenced to the ferrocenium/ferrocene redox couple, \( \Delta H_{\text{red}} \) ) was obtained from the Gibbs–Helmholtz equation, namely as the negative slope of the \( E^o/T \) vs. \( 1/T \) plot. All measurements were made on \(-0.2 \) mM solutions of \( 1\text{Cl} \) and \( 1\text{Br} \) prepared by dissolving vacuum-dried crystals in \( \text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2 \) and using 0.1 M TBACl and TBABr, respectively, as supporting electrolytes. The ohmic drop between the working and the reference electrodes was minimized through a careful feedback correction. The experiments were repeated at least five times; \( E^o \) and \( k_{ET} \) values were found to be reproducible within \( \pm 0.002 \) V and \( \pm 6\% \), respectively.

### Magnetic measurements

Magnetic measurements were made on a Quantum Design PPM cryogenic system with a two-coil susceptometer. A polycrystalline sample of \( 1\text{Br} \cdot 2.3\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2\cdot\text{Et}_2\text{O} \) \((20.41 \text{ mg})\) and a small amount of its mother liquor \((24.08 \text{ mg, CH}_2\text{Cl}_2 :\text{Et}_2\text{O} \text{ 54} : \text{46})\) were introduced into a quartz tube, which was subsequently flame-sealed. The presence of the mother liquor was necessary to prevent field-induced torquing at low temperature. The diamagnetic contributions of the sample and of the mother liquor were evaluated using Pascal’s constants.\(^{59}\) The magnetic response of an identical quartz tube was previously measured to correct for the diamagnetic contributions of the quartz.\(^{41}\) DC measurements were based on the extraction magnetometry technique. Magnetic susceptibility was obtained as \( \chi = M/H \) from magnetization \( M \) measurements in a static magnetic field \( H = 10 \) kOe from 300.0 to 2.0 K. The isothermal field dependence of \( M \) was also measured at 2, 4, and 8 K, scanning the field up to 70 kOe. AC measurements were performed using a small oscillating magnetic field of 10 Oe (for frequencies \( \nu \) between 21 and 1715 Hz) or 5 Oe (for \( \nu \) between 2664 and 9980 Hz) to minimize self-heating of the sample. The influence of \( H_{\text{DC}} \) on the out-of-phase component of the magnetic susceptibility \( (\chi^\prime) \) was explored with preliminary \( \chi^\prime \) vs. \( \nu \) scans at 2 K for \( H_{\text{DC}} \) values ranging from 0 to 2.5 kOe. Afterwards, \( \chi^\prime \) vs. \( \nu \) scans between 2.0 and 8.0 K were carried out for \( H_{\text{DC}} = 0, 1, \) and 2 kOe.

#### Mössbauer spectroscopy

Mössbauer spectra of \( 1\text{Cl} \) and \( 1\text{Br} \) encased in an eicosane matrix were collected at 10 and 77 K with a 1024 channel See Co model W304 resonant gamma-ray spectrometer using \(^{57}\)Co on Rh foil as a gamma-ray source (initial strength = 25 mCi, obtained from Ritverc Isotope Products) at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. The source velocity range used was \( \pm 4 \) mm s\(^{-1} \) and measurements were conducted under vacuum. Cryogenic temperatures were achieved using a Lakeshore model 336 temperature controller in conjunction with a Janis model SHI-850 cryostat. Mössbauer data were fitted with the WMOSS4F software package,\(^{60}\) using an adaptive nonlinear least-squares algorithm developed by Dennis et al. (see ESI Note 3\( ^\dagger \) for further details).\(^{61}\) Refined parameters for each quadrupole doublet were the isomer shift \( (\delta) \), the quadrupole splitting \( (\Delta E_Q) \), and the linewidth, calculated as full-width at half-maximum \( (\text{FWHM}) \). Errors associated with \( \delta, \Delta E_Q, \) and FWHM are estimated to be \( \pm 0.01 \text{ mm s}^{-1} \). All reported isomer shifts are referenced to \( \alpha\text{-Fe} \) foil at room temperature \( (294 \text{ K}) \). At both temperatures the spectra could be satisfactorily fitted using two doublets with fixed 1 : 1 relative areas (sub-spectra 1 and 2). Attempts to fit more quadrupole doublets to the data did not lead to convergence due to overparameterization. Alternative fits to the 77 K spectra are included in the ESI (Fig. S10 and S11\( ^\dagger \)); while numerically sound, these alternative parameter sets are less consistent with those extracted from the 10 K spectra, which could only be modeled with the parameters reported in Table 3.

#### AOM calculations

The electronic structure of the iron(n) centers in \( 1\text{Br} \) was studied using AOM calculations, carried out with the program package AOMX.\(^{62}\) Following the same approach developed for the chloro derivative \( 1\text{Cl} \),\(^{31}\) the X-ray coordinates of Fe1(N1,N2,N3,Br1) and Fe4(N13,N14,N15,Br2) were averaged to \( C_{3v} \) symmetry. As for Fe2(N4,N5,N6,N7,N8) and Fe3(N8,N9,N10,N11, N12), the X-ray coordinates were directly used in the calculations. The ligand field \( (L) \) parameters accounting for \( \sigma \) and \( \pi \) interactions\(^{63}\) were obtained from the values reported for trans-[Fe(py)Br2] and trans-[Fe(py)2(NCS)2] \( (\text{py} = \text{pyridine}) \), assuming an \( r^{-6} \) dependence on metal–ligand distance \( r \) and treating all the N-donor atoms as pyridine-type donors for simplicity.\(^{64–66}\) Racah parameters for the interelectronic repulsion were fixed at \( B = 850 \text{ cm}^{-1} \) and \( C = 3100 \text{ cm}^{-1} \), hence \(~20\% \) lower than the free ion values.\(^{67}\) The effective one-electron spin–orbit \( (SO) \) coupling constant was fixed at \( \zeta_{sd} = 350 \text{ cm}^{-1} \), while the orbital reduction factor \( (\eta) \) was taken as isotropic and unitary.\(^{68}\) Further details can be found in ESI Note 4.\( ^\dagger \)

#### Ab initio calculations

All calculations have been done with the Orca 4.2 package.\(^{68}\) To extract the local anisotropy of the \( i\)-th Fe center, the remaining iron(n) ions were replaced by diamagnetic zinc(n) ions. The zero-field splitting \( (\text{ZFS}) \) \( D_i \) and \( E_i \) parameters were evaluated following the procedure developed in ref. 69. A state- averaged
CASSCF (complete active space self-consistent field) calculation was performed; dynamical correlation was taken into account with the domain-based local pair natural orbital 2nd-order N-electron valence state perturbation theory (DLPNO-NEVPT2) method.\textsuperscript{70\textendash}72 Finally, SO coupling was accounted for by quasi-degenerate perturbation theory with the spin-orbit mean-field (SOMF) Hamiltonian.\textsuperscript{73} The complete active space (CAS) is composed of the five mainly-3d orbitals of the Fe centers and the six associated electrons, i.e. CAS(6,5). Averaging of the molecular orbitals (MOs) was done over all five quintet and 45 triplet spin states generated by the CAS(6,5)SCF optimization. The SO coupling was considered between all $M_S$ components of these spin states, the spin-free energy (diagonal elements of the SO matrix) being evaluated at the DLPNO-NEVPT2 level. In CASSCF, NEVPT2, and SO calculations, the relativistic Karlsruhe basis sets using a Douglas–Kroll–Hess (DKH) Hamiltonian were used (DKH-def2-TZVP for Fe atoms, DKH-def2-TZVP(f) for bonding N, Br and Cl atoms and for first neighbor Zn atoms, and DKH-def2-SVP for H atoms).\textsuperscript{74} The corresponding def2/JK auxiliary basis was used.\textsuperscript{75} Preliminary calculations on various truncated complexes have shown little influence of the truncation on both electronic structure and magnetic properties of the Fe centers. We nevertheless considered the complete structure to avoid any bias.

The principal directions of $\vec{D}_i$ and $\vec{g}_i$ tensors do not in general coincide.\textsuperscript{76} However, the $\vec{D}_i$ tensors of three over four metal centers in both 1Cl and 1Br have their easy, intermediate, and hard principal axes at small angles from the corresponding principal directions of $\vec{g}_i$, i.e. the easy direction of $\vec{D}_i$ is close to the easy direction of $\vec{g}_i$, etc. (Table S11). For Fe1 and Fe2, misalignments in 1Cl (1Br) are in the range 0.58\textendash7.29° (0.38\textendash6.45°). For Fe4 the misalignment is larger, with angles ranging from 4.07 to 20.84° (3.79 to 11.43°). For Fe3, the hard directions of $\vec{D}_i$ and $\vec{g}_i$ are both approximately along the metal chain (Z), but the two remaining principal axes are strongly misaligned, with offsets close to 45°. This behavior is probably related to the very small rhombic anisotropy of Fe3.

### Spin Hamiltonian calculations

The fitting of magnetic data utilized PHI v3.1.5 software.\textsuperscript{77} Since PHI allows only one set of Euler angles to be defined for each spin center, the orientation of the $\vec{g}_i$ tensor was assumed to coincide with that of the $\vec{D}_i$ tensor for $i = 1, 2, 4$, and 4, a reasonable approximation considering the data in Table S11.\textsuperscript{†} The $\vec{g}_3$ tensor is severely misaligned with respect to $\vec{D}_3$ in the XY plane. However, its easy and intermediate components are equal to within 0.025 and were averaged to give an axial $\vec{g}_3$ tensor. When susceptibility and magnetization data were simultaneously fitted, the minimized quantity was the total residual $R$ defined as:

$$R = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} (M_{\exp,\rho} - M_{\text{calc},\rho})^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{m} (\chi_{\exp,\rho} - \chi_{\text{calc},\rho})^2}}$$

(2)

where $n$ and $m$ are the number of magnetization ($M$) and susceptibility ($\chi$) datapoints, respectively, while “exp” and “calc” represent experimental and calculated values, respectively. Refined parameters were isotropic super-exchange coupling constants $J_{ij}$ and a correction for temperature independent paramagnetism (TIP). The TIP correction was introduced to better reproduce high-temperature susceptibility data and compensate for possible systematic errors. For each model, the variable space was surveyed prior to the fit, in order to exclude the presence of additional minima in the $R$ hypersurface. Models with anisotropic super-exchange interactions were also tested but did not improve the fit quality. Although magnetic measurements were performed on uncruushed polycrystalline samples restrained in the frozen mother liquor, the crystals were considered small enough to give rise to a powder average. Therefore, calculated susceptibility and magnetization data were integrated over 377 and 233 different directions, respectively, following the Zaremba–Conroy–Wolfsberg scheme as presented by Levitt (Field Powder 6 and 5 in PHI v3.1.5).\textsuperscript{77,78} Local spin components were computed using in-house developed software based on ZHEEV routine for matrix diagonalization.\textsuperscript{79}

### Results and discussion

#### Synthesis and solution studies

Compound 1Br was synthesized by a procedure similar to that reported for its chloro analogue 1Cl.\textsuperscript{41} Refluxing FeBr2(thf)$_2$, [Fe$_2$(Mes)$_3$], and H$_2$tpda in 1:2:4 molar proportions in toluene under strictly anaerobic and anhydrous conditions gives an orange precipitate. This solid is likely to contain the tetrainorn(ii) EMAC (Scheme 2), which is only sparingly soluble in toluene but highly soluble in CH$_2$Cl$_2$. In fact, extraction of the solid with CH$_2$Cl$_2$ gives a red solution whose ESI-MS spectrum is similar to that recorded on a solution of pure 1Br (vide infra). Concentration and cooling of these CH$_2$Cl$_2$ extracts affords crude 1Br in moderate yield as an orange powder. MALDI-TOF-MS (positive ion mode) shows one strong peak at $m/z = 952.2$ and a much weaker one at $m/z = 1087.3$, whose isotopic envelopes are consistent with [Fe$_2$(tpda)$_2$ + H]$^+$ and [Fe$_4$(tpda)$_3$Br + H]$^+$, respectively (Fig. S1†). In addition, two weak signals are also present at $m/z = 1031.3$ and 1043.3, which are assigned to [Fe$_2$(tpda)$_3$Br + H]$^+$ and [Fe$_4$(tpda)$_3$Cl + H]$^+$, respectively (Fig. S2†). Traces of chloride salts may be present as contaminants in the [Fe$_4$(Mes)$_3$] reactant, but the CH$_2$Cl$_2$ solvent may also represent a source of chloride ions during workup. This crude product can be recrystallized by vapour diffusion of Et$_2$O in a CH$_2$Cl$_2$ solution to give 1Br2.3CH$_2$Cl$_2$-Et$_2$O as large dark red prisms.

These results confirm that iron amides are accessible via [Fe$_2$(Mes)$_3$]$_2$\textsuperscript{80} which performs a dual role in the reaction. It not only acts as a source of iron(ii) ions, but also serves as a strong base for deprotonation of H$_2$tpda, giving an inert hydrocarbon (HMes) as the only by-product. Because of their higher solubility in organic solvents compared to FeX$_2$, the thf adducts of iron(ii) halides are used as additional sources of iron(ii) and of the axial halide ligands. In spite of the favourable molar ratios...
of the reactants, \([\text{Fe}_5(\text{tpda})_4\text{Br}_2]\) was not observed or isolated in these experimental conditions.

The ESI-MS spectrum of \(\text{1Br}\) in CH₂Cl₂ (positive ion mode) shows no molecular parent ion peak (Fig. S3†). Instead, two well resolved signals are present at \(m/z = 1030.1\) (100%) and 986.1 (25%), whose isotopic patterns are consistent with the ionic species \([\text{Fe}_3(\text{tpda})_3\text{Br}]^+\) and \([\text{Fe}_3(\text{tpda})_3\text{Cl}]^+\), respectively. The same peaks are detected in the ESI-MS spectrum of chloro derivative \(\text{1Cl}\), but with reversed relative intensity (13 : 100). While formation of \([\text{Fe}_3(\text{tpda})_3\text{Br}]^+\) in electrosprayed solutions of \(\text{1Cl}\) can only be explained assuming that traces of bromide ions remain from the synthesis of \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{Mes})_4]\), the origin of \([\text{Fe}_3(\text{tpda})_3\text{Cl}]^+\) peak in the spectra of the bromo derivative is less clear. Chloride traces are already present in crude \(\text{1Br}\), as shown by its MALDI-TOF-MS spectra (see above), but might also be generated by chloride abstraction from CH₂Cl₂ under ESI-MS ionization conditions, as found for other chlorinated solvents.81,82

The room-temperature \(^1\text{H}\) NMR spectrum of \(\text{1Br}\) in CD₂Cl₂ is displayed in Fig. 1 along with that of \(\text{1Cl}\) for comparison. In the two compounds, six paramagnetically shifted singlets (labelled from I to VI) are spread over a range of \(\sim 120\) ppm with integrated areas in a 2 : 1 : 2 : 2 : 2 : 2 ratio (peak I in \(\text{1Br}\) partially overlaps with the CH₂ quartet of residual Et₂O). All signals except one (I) undergo downfield shifts compared to the signals of the free ligand in CD₂Cl₂ (Fig. S5†). The three lowest-field signals (IV, V and VI) are approximately in the same position in the two compounds. However, significant differences occur in the high-field portion of the spectrum, since the half-intensity resonance (II) is the second highest-field signal in \(\text{1Cl}\) but the third in \(\text{1Br}\). This is a consequence of the fact that signals I and III are shifted upfield by 2.2 – 2.4 ppm in \(\text{1Br}\) vs. \(\text{1Cl}\). In both compounds, the observed spectra indicate that in solution and over the NMR time scale – the molecules adopt the highest possible symmetry for a helical structure (\(D_3\)), implying three equivalent tpda\(^2–\) ligands with \(C_2\) symmetry and six chemically inequivalent H atoms. A similar behavior is displayed by pentachromium(ii) EMAC \([\text{Cr}_5(\text{tpda})_4\text{Cl}_2]\), which exhibits its maximum possible symmetry (\(D_4\)) in dichloromethane solution over the NMR time scale, while it is much less symmetric in the solid state.83

The half-intensity signal II can be firmly assigned to the \(p\)-H atom of the central pyridine ring (Ha in Scheme 1). Among the remaining signals, the most downfield-shifted one (VI) is presumably due to \(o\)-H atoms (Hf), which lie closest to the terminal iron(ii) ions (Fe⋯Hf = 2.98 – 3.16 Å in \(\text{1Br}\) and 2.97 – 3.13 Å in \(\text{1Cl}\)). Though selective gradient-enhanced 1D-TOCSY on \(\text{1Cl}\) exhibited no signal, a 2D-TOCSY experiment without gradients...
evidenced only a very weak cross peak between singlets I and III, which likely arise from the terminal pyridyl groups (H-c). Isotopic-labelling experiments would be required for a complete assignment of the spectrum.

It is important to note that neither the six peaks of 1Br nor the set of eleven signals expected for a C2-symmetric heterodihalide derivative are detected in the spectrum of 1Cl. Since the intermolecular exchange of axial ligands is likely to be slow over the NMR timescale, 1H NMR data indicate that the species with axial bromido ligands found in the ESI-MS spectra of 1Cl are trace impurities undetectable by NMR. However, the spectrum of 1Br contains an additional set of ten weak singlets with roughly equal intensities, marked with asterisks in Fig. 1. Considering that one signal may be broadened beyond detection or hidden, we tentatively ascribe this feature a shoulder at 448 nm. The electronic spectra of 1Cl and 1Br in CH2Cl2 solution both present two strong π → π* transitions, with a slightly lower molar absorptivity (ε) in the latter (Fig. S6†). The two peaks are red shifted as compared with those of H2tpda and appear at 288 and 374 nm in 1Cl and at 286 and 370 nm in 1Br. In addition, they feature a shoulder at 448 nm. The electronic spectra of 1Cl and 1Br do not vary over time, but admission of air in the cuvette causes an immediate blueshift of the two main peaks and the disappearance of the shoulder at 448 nm, the final spectrum being superimposable to that of H2tpda. Interestingly, the single strong band in the UV-Vis spectra of 4Cl and 4Br also has a lower ε and a higher energy in the bromo derivative.83 This behavior can be explained considering the softer character of the bromido ligands, which promote better donation of electron density from the tpda− molecules and cause a smaller red shift.

X-ray structure

The molecular structure of 1Br, as determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction on 1Br·2.3CH2Cl2·Et2O at 115(2) K, is displayed in Fig. 2. The molecule has no crystallographically imposed symmetry and is partially disordered over two positions with 88:12 occupancies; the disorder is only resolvable on one tpda2− ligand, on the four metals, and on the terminal bromido ligands. We herein discuss only the highest-occupancy portion, whose main geometric features are listed in Table 1.

Complex 1Br is a stringlike species formed by a chain of four metals arranged in a slightly helical zig-zag fashion (Fe⋯Fe⋯Fe = 167.7–172.1°, Fe⋯Fe⋯Fe⋯Fe torsion angle = ...
Table 1: Selected interatomic distances (Å) and angles (°) for 1Br·2.3CH2Cl2·Et2O

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distance/ Angle</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe1-Fe2</td>
<td>2.9747(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe2-Fe3</td>
<td>2.9711(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe3-Fe4</td>
<td>2.9551(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe1-Br1</td>
<td>2.5314(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe4-Br2</td>
<td>2.5100(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe1-N1</td>
<td>2.089(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe1-N2</td>
<td>2.067(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe1-N3</td>
<td>2.096(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe2-N4</td>
<td>2.108(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe2-N5</td>
<td>1.993(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe2-N6</td>
<td>2.011(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe2-N7</td>
<td>2.175(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe2-N8</td>
<td>2.492(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe3-N9</td>
<td>2.500(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe3-N10</td>
<td>2.334(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe3-N11</td>
<td>2.042(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe3-N12</td>
<td>2.036(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe4-N13</td>
<td>2.087(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe4-N14</td>
<td>2.088(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe4-N15</td>
<td>2.071(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br1-Fe1-Fe2</td>
<td>177.01(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe1-Fe2-Fe3</td>
<td>172.08(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe2-Fe3-Fe4</td>
<td>167.67(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe3-Fe4-Br2</td>
<td>178.62(8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

168.1° and wrapped together by three all-syn tpda2− anions (Fig. 2). Each end of the chain is capped by one bromido ligand, without crystallographic evidence for a detectable fraction of terminal chlorides (see Experimental section). 1Br is indeed the first tpda2−-based EMAC with bromido capping ligands.

Charge neutrality considerations and Bond-Valence Sum (BVS) calculations [Table S3†] demonstrate that all four metal centers are HS iron(II), as confirmed by Mössbauer spectra (vide infra). The structure is almost superimposable to that of chloro analogue 1Cl in 1Cl·2.6CH2Cl2·0.84Et2O, as shown in Fig. 3. The main difference is represented by the Fe–X (X = Br, Cl) distances, which are about 6% longer for Br (2.510–2.531 Å) vs. Cl (2.358–2.386 Å). To the best of our knowledge, no other EMACs containing tpda2− and different axial halides are known. However, a comparison can be made with trimetallic chains supported by dpa−, the shorter congener of tpda2− (Scheme 1). The structures of [M3(dpa)4Cl2] and [M3(dpa)4Br2] are reported for M = Cr2+, Co2+ (109–111 K)83,85 and Cu2+ (295 K).86,87 In these complexes the M–X bond distance also increases by 5–8% when replacing Cl with Br.

The Fe⋯Fe distances in 1Br range from 2.955 to 2.975 Å and are hence comparable with those found in 1Cl (2.941 to 2.991 Å). They are far too large for a metal–metal bond, but shorter than in dpa− based diiron(n) complexes, such as [Fe2(dpa)2(Mes)]80 (5; 3.104(2) Å), [Fe2(dpa)2Cl]80 (6; 3.043(1) Å) and [Fe2(dpa)2(hmds)]88 (7; Hhmds = 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexamethyldisilazane; 3.3609(1) Å). Triiron(n) complexes 2 and 3 present considerably shorter Fe⋯Fe distances of 2.782(1)–2.783(1) and 2.4416(5) Å, respectively, consistent with the presence of metal–metal bonds in the latter.40,42

The coordination geometry of the metal centers is highlighted in Fig. 4. The terminal iron centers (Fe1 and Fe4) possess a distorted trigonal-pyramidal coordination environment, afforded by three pyridyl N atoms (Npy) and one terminal bromido ligand (Fe–Npy = 2.067–2.096 Å, Npy–Fe–Npy = 110.8–125.7°, Br–Fe–Npy = 95.1–98.4°). The internal iron centers (Fe2 and Fe3) are pentacoordinated, with a very distorted geometry. Each of them is primarily involved in three short contacts with amido N atoms (N4, N5, N6 and N10, N11, N12, Fe–N = 1.993–2.108 Å). In addition, Fe2 and Fe3 have a slightly longer contact with the central Npy atom of two different tpda2− ligands (N7 and N9, Fe–N = 2.175–2.234 Å). The central Npy atom (N8) of the third tpda2− ligand is involved in a longer coordination bond with both Fe2 and Fe3, thus completing their coordination spheres (Fe–N8 = 2.492–2.500 Å). It is worth noting that only this tpda2− ligand is almost symmetrically bonded to the metal chain (Fe2–N8 ≈ Fe3–N8). The remaining two ligands are asymmetrically positioned, so that in the solid state 1Br does not achieve the maximum possible symmetry for a helical structure (D3h) but approaches twofold symmetry perpendicular to the metal chain. Each tpda2− ligand is helically wrapped around the linear array of metal ions, due to steric interactions between pyridyl β-H atoms (Hb and Hc in Scheme 1). As a result of this twisting, the dihedral angle between neighboring pyridine rings of the same tpda2− ligand ranges from 36° to 53° (Fig. 2, on the right). The molecule is thus chiral, but both enantiomers are found in a 1:1 ratio in the centrosymmetric crystal structure.

For comparison, the other tpda2−-based homometallic EMACs reported in the past (Ni5,89 Cr5,90,91 Co5,92 and Ru5,93) are pentametallic chains wrapped by four ligands and thus contain one more metal center and one more ligand as compared with 1Cl and 1Br. Quite remarkably, a similar situation is encountered in iron(n) complexes of tridentate dpa−. Only two iron(n) centers are incorporated80,88 whereas with different metals the coordination capacity of the ligand is fully exploited to give Ni395,96 Cr3,84 Co3,85 Cu3,86,87 and Ru96 species. This behavior is difficult to understand on purely structural grounds, e.g. on the basis of ionic radii.
Electrochemistry

Extensive, temperature dependent electrochemical measurements were carried out on $^{1}{\text{Cl}}$ and $^{1}{\text{Br}}$ in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ solution. The cyclic voltammogram of $^{1}{\text{Cl}}$ at $-10^\circ$C using 0.1 M TBACl as supporting electrolyte was presented previously in ref. 41 and shows four quasi-reversible signals spanning a potential range of 0.80 V (Fig. 5 and Table 2). $^{1}{\text{Br}}$ behaves similarly: its cyclic voltammogram at $-13^\circ$C (Fig. 5) consists of four consecutive redox signals (hereafter indicated as signals I, II, III, and IV at increasing potential values). The curves are stable and do not change with time using 0.1 M TBABr as supporting electrolyte. As found in $^{1}{\text{Cl}}$, the peak-to-peak separation increases from signal I to IV and with the potential scan rate. The peak currents of all the signals are proportional to the square root of the scan rate (not shown). The electrochemistry of the complex consists of four quasi-reversible and diffusion controlled redox processes spanning a potential window of only 0.75 V, whereby the $^{1}{\text{Br}}$ complex shuttles between five oxidation states (Table 2). These four reversible ET processes will hereafter indicated as ET-I, ET-II, ET-III and ET-IV and correspond to the ETs: $(\text{Fe}^4)_{8}^{+} \leftrightarrow (\text{Fe}^4)_{9}^{+}, (\text{Fe}^4)_{9}^{+} \leftrightarrow (\text{Fe}^4)_{10}^{+}, (\text{Fe}^4)_{10}^{+} \leftrightarrow (\text{Fe}^4)_{11}^{+}, (\text{Fe}^4)_{11}^{+} \leftrightarrow (\text{Fe}^4)_{12}^{+}$. The $E^\circ$ values of corresponding ET steps (from ET-I to ET-IV) are much more negative in $^{1}{\text{Cl}}$ than in $^{1}{\text{Br}}$. The difference amounts to 0.110–0.235 V, depending on the redox step. Thus, from a thermodynamic point of view, chlorido ligands allow an easier oxidation of the Fe$^{2+}$ ions than bromido ligands. This agrees with the higher Fe$^{3+}$-binding affinity of Cl$^{-}$ with respect to Br$^{-}$ and is consistent with experimental evidence gained during the syntheses (i.e., $^{1}{\text{Br}}$ is less air-sensitive).

The $E^\circ$ values of all redox steps in both complexes show a monotonic linear increase with increasing temperature from $-13$ to $+3^\circ$C (Fig. S7 and S8). The calculated values of $\Delta S^\circ_{rc}$ and $\Delta H^\circ_{rc}$ are reported in Table S4.

$E^\circ = $ formal reduction potential (referenced to the ferrocenium/ferrocene redox couple), $\Delta E^\circ = $ separation in $E^\circ$ values of consecutive ET processes, $K_c = $ comproportionation constant, $k_{ET} = $ heterogeneous ET rate constant. The average errors on $E^\circ$, $\Delta E^\circ$, $K_c$ and $k_{ET}$ are ±0.002 V, ±0.004 V, ±12% and ±6%, respectively.
and predominant, and an entropic term which is positive and smaller in magnitude. The enthalpic contribution decreases progressively in magnitude from ET-I to ET-IV, although the $\Delta H_{Kc}^{c}$ values are markedly different in 1Cl and 1Br. The entropic contribution $\Delta S_{Kc}^{c}$ in ET-I is much higher than in the remaining ET steps, which conversely entail very similar entropic contributions. This is probably related to the fact that the reorganization effect of the solvent around the complex is much more extensive in ET-I than in the other ET steps. In fact, the first oxidation (ET-I) transforms a neutral species into a monopositive one, while ET-II to ET-IV increase the charge of an already charged species. Other related iron complexes exhibit similar electrochemical behavior.46,97

In 1Br the observed differences in $E^{\circ}$ values for consecutive ET processes ($\Delta E^{\circ}$) correspond to moderate (ET-I/ET-II) or large (ET-II/ET-III and ET-III/ET-IV) comproportionation constants $K_{c} = \exp[\frac{nF(E_{1}^{\circ} - E_{2}^{\circ})}{RT}]$, whose values are shown in Table 2.98,99 The order of magnitude of $K_{c}$ in 1Br spans the range $10^{3}$ to $10^{6}$ as compared with $10^{4}$ to $10^{6}$ in 1Cl. The data indicate high thermodynamic stability toward disproportionation for the mixed-valence species (Fe4)$^{9+}$ and (Fe4)$^{11+}$ derived from 1Br, which might become synthetically accessible,100 whereas (Fe4)$^{9+}$ is much less stable. Interestingly, replacing Cl with Br affects to the largest extent the stability of the monooxidized (Fe4)$^{9+}$ species, whose $K_{c}$ value undergoes a more than 200-fold decrease from 1Cl to 1Br.

The enthalpic ($\Delta H_{Kc}^{c}$) and entropic ($\Delta S_{Kc}^{c}$) contributions to $K_{c}$ were determined by recording the temperature dependence of $K_{c}$ and applying the van’t Hoff equation (Fig. S9†). The results, presented in Table S5,† reveal that in both 1Br and 1Cl the major contribution to $K_{c}$ is of enthalpic origin, although a significant, albeit minor, entropic contribution is observed for the species (Fe4)$^{9+}$. The other mixed-valence species show negligible entropic contributions to $K_{c}$. The observed difference is due to the very positive value of $\Delta S_{Kc}^{c}$ of ET-I (see above).

The heterogeneous $k_{ET}$ values for signals I and II of 1Br are rather similar, but then progressively decrease from signal II to IV (i.e. with increasing oxidation state and charge of the complex, see Table 2) probably due to a progressive increase in the reorganization energy $\lambda$, as already observed for other mixed-valence complexes.101 A similar behavior is shown by the chloro derivative 1Cl, although the differences in $k_{ET}$ values are much less noticeable. The $k_{ET}$ values of corresponding ET steps are always higher in 1Br than in 1Cl, suggesting different reorganization energies.

Mössbauer spectroscopy

Mössbauer spectra collected on 1Cl and 1Br at 10 and 77 K (Fig. 6 and 7) suggest similar electronic structures in the two complexes. Since all four Fe centers are crystallographically independent in the solid state, it is expected that each of them would exhibit a quadrupole doublet. However, the Mössbauer spectra of 1Cl and 1Br allowed the resolution of only two distinct quadrupole doublets (sub-spectra 1 and 2), with equal intensities and spectral parameters consistent with HS Fe$^{2+}$ (Table 3).102 Hence, the four Fe sites can be partitioned into two chemically distinct pairs, with unresolvable differences in Mössbauer parameters within each pair. The much increased linewidth of sub-spectrum 1 at 10 vs. 77 K may actually hint at enhanced chemical inequivalence within the pair at 10 K. In fact, lowering temperature has been shown to lead to lowersymmetry structures in related Fe-containing chain compounds.34 Such a structural change, or more likely small differences in the second order Doppler effect for these Fe sites may be responsible or contribute to the observed broadness of the sub-spectrum 1 at 10 K. The best-fit parameters to the 10 and 77 K datasets are otherwise similar, suggesting that the Fe centers undergo no gross changes in geometry, oxidation or spin state in the explored temperature range. We propose that sub-spectrum 1 arises from the internal Fe sites (Fe2 and Fe3), whereas the doublet with the higher $\Delta E_{Q}$ (sub-spectrum 2) is due to the terminal Fe sites (Fe1 and Fe4). Our assignment is supported by the Mössbauer behavior of the bimetallic Co$^{2+}$–Fe$^{2+}$ complex [CoFe(py$_{3}$tren)Cl] (8), which features an FeN$_{6}$Cl chromophore and no metal–metal bond (H$_{3}$py$_{3}$tren = N$_{3}$N-tris(2-(2-pyridylamino)ethyl)amine). At 80 K, the HS Fe$^{2+}$ ion in 8 has $\delta = 0.88$ mm s$^{-1}$, $\Delta E_{Q} = 2.62$ mm s$^{-1}$ and FWHM = 0.35 mm s$^{-1}$.103 The quadrupole splitting is thus practically identical to that of sub-spectrum 2 in 1Cl at 77 K (Table 3), although the isomer shift is roughly intermediate between sub-spectra 1 and 2. The diiron(u) complex [Fe$_{2}$py$_{3}$tren]Cl],
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increase up to its maximum value at 100 K (17.3 emu K mol\(^{-1}\)). With further cooling, it drops rapidly to 2.4 emu K mol\(^{-1}\) at 2 K, signaling a weakly magnetic ground state. This is also reflected by isothermal \(M_S \) vs. \(H\) curves recorded at 2, 4, and 8 K (\(M_S\) is molar magnetization). At the highest available field (\(H = 70\) kOe), the average value of \(M_S\) reaches 9.3 \(N_A \mu_B\), which is about 60% of the saturation value of 16.0 \(N_A \mu_B\) expected for four noninteracting \(S = 2\) spins with \(g = 2.00\) (\(N_A\) is Avogadro's constant and \(\mu_B\) is the Bohr magneton). This behavior closely mirrors that found in [Fe4(tpda)3Cl2](Br·2.6CH2Cl2·0.84Et2O) (Fig. 8(b)), which was recently analyzed by us using a local-site model and treating LF effects in a simplified fashion within the AOM. At this level of theory, the approximately \(C_{3x}\) coordination geometry of Fe1 and Fe4 yields an unquenched first-order orbital momentum and a large easy-axis anisotropy roughly parallel to \(Z\). By contrast, Fe2 and Fe3 have a well-isolated \(S = 2\) orbital singlet and an easy-axis anisotropy directed roughly normal to \(Z\). This analysis showed that the measured \(\chi_M T\) vs. \(T\) curve is substantially different from the predicted response of four uncoupled Fe\(^{2+}\) centers and can only be modelled by introducing super-exchange interactions. Using \(\hat{J}_{\parallel}, \hat{J}_{\perp}\) convention for the Heisenberg Hamiltonian, the best model entails (a) ferromagnetic interactions (\(J < 0\)) within the Fe1–Fe2 and Fe3–Fe4 pairs, which dominate around room temperature, and (b) weaker antiferromagnetic coupling (\(J_{\text{eff}} > 0\)) between the two pairs (treated in the mean-field approximation) to reproduce the \(\chi_M T\) drop at low \(T\). For comparison, exactly the same strategy was applied to [Fe4(tpda)3Cl2]·2.3CH2Cl2·Et2O, as detailed in ESI Note 4.† The best-fit parameters so obtained are as follows: \(J = -14.1(3)\) cm\(^{-1}\), \(J_{\text{eff}}/g_{av}^2 = 0.315(4)\) cm\(^{-1}\) and TIP = 3.39(16) \(\times 10^{-3}\) emu mol\(^{-1}\) (\(g_{av}\) is the temperature-independent average \(g\)-factor of the Fe2 unit). The best-fit curve is drawn in Fig. S12.† As compared with [Fe4(tpda)3Cl2]·0.84Et2O \((J = -21.4(4)\) cm\(^{-1}\), \(J_{\text{eff}}/g_{av}^2 = 0.345(7)\) cm\(^{-1}\) and TIP = 2.1(2) \(\times 10^{-3}\) emu mol\(^{-1}\)), the interdimer interaction is similar, while the intradimer ferromagnetic coupling is ∼35% weaker.

**DC magnetic properties and AOM calculations**

The DC magnetic response of a polycrystalline sample of [Fe4(tpda)3Cl2]·2.3CH2Cl2·Et2O is presented in Fig. 8(a). The value of \(\chi_M T\) (\(\chi_M\) = molar magnetic susceptibility) at 300 K is 16.4 emu K mol\(^{-1}\). Because of the absence of metal–metal bonds, it is meaningful to compare this value with the cumulative Curie constant for four localized and noninteracting \(S = 2\) spins, which is significantly lower (12.0 emu K mol\(^{-1}\) with \(g = 2.00\)). On lowering temperature, the \(\chi_M T\) product undergoes a small

**Table 3** Best-fit Mössbauer parameters for 1Cl and 1Br at 77 K (10 K).\(^{\dagger}\) Standard deviations are estimated to be ∼0.01 mm s\(^{-1}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-spectrum</th>
<th>(\delta) (mm s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>(\Delta E_0) (mm s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>FWHM (mm s(^{-1}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Fe4(tpda),Cl2] (1Cl)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.86 (0.87)</td>
<td>2.09 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.93 (0.96)</td>
<td>2.63 (2.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Fe4(tpda),Br2] (1Br)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.87 (0.90)</td>
<td>2.12 (2.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.95 (0.94)</td>
<td>2.54 (2.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{\dagger}\) Reduced \(\chi^2\): 1.677 (0.793) for 1Cl and 0.577 (0.747) for 1Br.
Table 4  Single-ion ZFS parameters and $g$-factors of 1Cl and 1Br from ab initio calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[Fe(tpda)$_3$Cl]$_2$</th>
<th>[Fe(tpda)$_3$Br]$_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$D_i$, $E_i$ (cm$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>$g_{1,i}$, $g_{2,i}$, $g_{3,i}$</td>
<td>$g_{1,i}$, $g_{2,i}$, $g_{3,i}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe1</td>
<td>$-11.32$, $-1.94$</td>
<td>1.998, 2.125, 2.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe2</td>
<td>9.61, 1.95</td>
<td>2.000, 2.101, 2.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe3</td>
<td>7.81, 0.50</td>
<td>2.007, 2.111, 2.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe4</td>
<td>$-18.97$, $-0.92$</td>
<td>1.934, 2.067, 2.425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Axial and rhombic ZFS parameters of Fe. $^b$ Principal values of the $\tilde{g}_i$ tensor of Fe, listed in order of increasing magnitude.
We then wrote a new spin Hamiltonian \( \hat{H} \) as the sum of single-ion spin Hamiltonians \( \hat{H}_i \) (eqn (3)) and of a Heisenberg Hamiltonian, which accounts for super-exchange interaction between the \( i \) and \( j \)-th localized spin centers through isotropic coupling constant \( J_{ij} \) (Scheme 3). Both nearest-neighbor \( (J_{12}, J_{23}, J_{34}) \) and next-nearest-neighbor \( (J_{13}, J_{24}) \) couplings were included, setting \( J_{13} = J_{24} = J' \) for simplicity.

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{4} \hat{H}_i + J_{12} \hat{S}_1 \cdot \hat{S}_2 + J_{34} \hat{S}_3 \cdot \hat{S}_4 + J_{23} \hat{S}_2 \cdot \hat{S}_3 + J' (\hat{S}_1 \cdot \hat{S}_3 + \hat{S}_2 \cdot \hat{S}_4)
\]  

Several models, labelled as \( m1XA \), \( m1XB \), etc. \( (X = Cl, Br) \), were tested for their ability to simultaneously account for \( X_M T \) vs. \( T \) and \( M_M \) vs. \( H \) data. The models differ in the constraints applied to \( J_{ij} \) values as well as in the refinement of a TIP correction. A detailed account of the procedure is available in ESI Note 5, in Tables S12-S14 and in Fig. S13-S17.

We contend that \( m1ClD \) \((J_{12} = -51.4(10), J_{34} = -9.43(5), \text{ and } J_{23} = 4.319(7) \text{ cm}^{-1})\) and \( m1BrD \) \((J_{12} = -26.8(14), J_{34} = -4.61(15), J_{23} = 4.19(3) \text{ cm}^{-1})\) are the most plausible models for the two derivatives, with a \( J_{12} \) constant 5-6 times more ferromagnetic than \( J_{34} \) (Fig. 8). Notice that the average magnitude of the two coupling constants is smaller in \( 1Br \) \((-15.7 \text{ cm}^{-1})\) than in \( 1Cl \) \((-30.4 \text{ cm}^{-1})\), as found in our simplified treatment based on AOM. Furthermore, the two models entail remarkably similar values of \( J_{23} \) (4.2-4.3 cm\(^{-1}\)), again in accordance with the almost superimposable structures of the two derivatives and with AOM-based treatment.

We now analyze in detail the lowest-lying spin levels in the two complexes, as resulting from the parameters \((\mathbf{D}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{g}_i \text{ tensors, and best-fit } J_{ij} \text{ values})\) of models \( m1ClD \) and \( m1BrD \). At \( H = 0 \), the lowest-energy states are closely-spaced non-Kramers doublets (hereafter referred to as pseudo-doublets), which however do not follow the pattern typical of a well-isolated total spin state undergoing predominantly axial ZFS (Fig. S18 and S19†). Each of these pseudo-doublets can be approximated to an \( \hat{S} = 1/2 \) pseudo-spin with an anisotropic...
$g$-tensor (principal components $g_1$, $g_2$, and $g_3$ in order of increasing magnitude). Notice that in non-Kramers systems pseudo-doublets have vanishing values of $g_1$ and $g_2$. The ground doublet in $1\text{Cl}$ ($1\text{Br}$) has $g_3 ≈ 7.6 (6.4)$ in a direction $(z_3)$ at about 29° (44°) from $Z$. This $g_3$ value corresponds to magnetic moment projections of $±3.8μ_B$ ($±3.2μ_B$) and the ground doublet is thus only weakly magnetic. The first-excited doublet lies about 2.5 (4.6) cm$^{-1}$ higher in energy. It has $g_3′ ≈ 9.1 (11.3)$ in a direction $(z_3′)$ that forms an angle of about 26° (17°) with $Z$ and is consequently more magnetic than the ground doublet. Fig. S18 and S19† present the expected Zeeman splittings when a magnetic field up to 10 kOe is applied along $z_3$.

The local spin components in the four lowest-lying states (1 to 4, in order of increasing energy) have been computed for $H = 1$ kOe directed along $z_3$ or $z_3′$. The results for the ground doublet of $1\text{Cl}$ are presented in vectorial form and superimposed to the X-ray molecular structure in Fig. 10. Similar views for the first-excited doublet of $1\text{Cl}$ and for states 1 to 4 of $1\text{Br}$ are available as Fig. S20–S22.†

The states comprised in each doublet have roughly opposite components of the local spins, as expected; furthermore, spin components are substantial and reveal a noncollinear spin arrangement (Table S15†). Looking at state 1 (Fig. 10), the large ferromagnetic coupling between Fe1 and Fe2 and the antiferromagnetic coupling of Fe2 to Fe3 limit noncollinearities between neighboring spins to less than 20°. Moreover, spins at these sites form large angles with the chain axis (Table S15†). This arrangement is understood as a consequence of the fact that the magnetic anisotropies of Fe1 and Fe2 are comparable in magnitude, roughly collinear but opposite in sign. The coupled state of the pair is thus only weakly anisotropic and the spins are torqued away from $Z$ under the influence of hard-axis Fe3 and of the antiferromagnetic $J_{23}$ interaction. Due to the large $|D|$ value of the terminal metal Fe4 and the weak ferromagnetic interaction between Fe3 and Fe4, the spin on Fe4 lies close to its local easy direction and forms a substantial angle with the spin on Fe3 (Fig. 10 and Table S15†). Notice that noncollinearities within the Fe1,Fe2 and Fe3,Fe4 pairs are enhanced in $1\text{Br}$, which features smaller $|J_{12}|$ and $|J_{34}|$ values (Fig. S21 and Table S15†). As a final observation, the spins on Fe1, Fe2, and Fe3 are roughly orthogonal to $z_3$ and contribute only marginally to the magnetic moment in state 1, which is primarily determined by Fe4.

The origin of the weakly magnetic pseudo-doublet ground state is clearly the competition between the large, noncollinear single-ion anisotropies and super-exchange interactions. For dominant super-exchange couplings, the alternating signs of $J_{ij}$ constants across the molecule (Scheme 3) would afford a nonmagnetic ground state with $S = 0$ total spin, irrespective of local anisotropies. In the complexes under study, this strong-exchange regime is not reached and the ground state is magnetic – albeit weakly. To ascertain the role of noncollinear anisotropies, test calculations were performed using the best-fit $J_{ij}$ values of model m1C1D but averaging all $D_i$ and $g_i$ tensors to axial symmetry and aligning their main axes with $Z$. With this operation, the $g_3$ value for the ground pseudo-doublet drastically decreases from 7.6 to 0.62. The new zero-field wavefunctions are predominantly (>50%) constituted by the pairs of product states $|−2,−1,+1,2⟩$, $|+2,+1,−1,−2⟩$ and $|−2,−2,+2,2⟩$, $|+2,+2,−2,−2⟩$, with equal weights within each pair (product states are labelled with the $M_S$ quantum numbers of the four ions). The unequal $g$-factors along $Z$ are the reason for the residual magnetic response of the ground pseudo-doublet, which would otherwise be perfectly nonmagnetic ($g_3 = 0$). The occurrence of a magnetic ground state is consistent with the observation of SMM properties in both derivatives, as presented in the next section.

Fig. 10 Local spin components (orange arrows, drawn on an arbitrary scale) in the ground doublet of $1\text{Cl}$ when a 1 kOe magnetic field (red arrow) is applied along the direction of maximum Zeeman splitting $(z_3)$. The upper and lower panels picture states 1 and 2, respectively. Color code: orange, Fe; blue, N; green, Cl.
**AC magnetic studies**

A crystalline sample of $\text{ICl}_2\cdot2.6\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2\cdot0.84\text{Et}_2\text{O}$, investigated up to $\nu = 1500$ Hz, showed the onset of slow relaxation of the magnetization below 2.8 K when a small static field ($H_{\text{DC}} = 2$ kOe) was applied, but no detectable out-of-phase signal at $H_{\text{DC}} = 0$. AC susceptibility measurements were also performed on a polycrystalline sample of $\text{1Br}_2\cdot2.3\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2\cdot\text{Et}_2\text{O}$ up to $\nu = 9980$ Hz. Preliminary scans at 2.0 K for $H_{\text{DC}}$ values between 0 and 2.5 kOe revealed that the compound features slow relaxation of the magnetization even in zero DC field (Fig. S23†). The frequency dependence of the in-phase ($\chi_{\text{M}}'$) and out-of-phase ($\chi_{\text{M}}''$) components of molar magnetic susceptibility does not change significantly above 2 kOe. Complete sets of frequency-
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**Fig. 11** Frequency dependence of the in-phase ($\chi_{\text{M}}'$, left panels) and out-of-phase ($\chi_{\text{M}}''$, right panels) components of molar magnetic susceptibility for $\text{1Br}_2\cdot2.3\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2\cdot\text{Et}_2\text{O}$ at $T = 2.0, 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 3.0, 3.2, 3.4, 3.6, 3.8, 4.0, 4.4, 4.8, 5.2, 5.6, 6.0, 7.0, and 8.0$ K. Measurements were carried out with a DC field of 0 (top), 1 (middle), and 2 kOe (bottom).
dependent data were then recorded at 0, 1, and 2 kOe for temperatures between 2.0 and 8.0 K. In zero DC field, the onset of slow relaxation of the magnetization was clearly detected below 4.0 K, where each isothermal $\chi_M''(\nu)$ curve is a monotonic increasing function (Fig. 11), with no detectable maximum in our accessible frequency range. Therefore the $\chi_M''$ vs. $\nu$ curves could not be fitted with the generalized Debye model. An alternative method employed also to fit the AC data of 1Cl·2.6CH2Cl2·0.84Et2O,$^{41}$ was used which allows a rough estimate of $U_{eff}/k_B$ and $\tau_0$ by applying eqn (5):

$$\ln(\chi_M''/\chi_M') = \ln(\alpha\tau_0) + E_a/(k_B T)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $\omega = 2\pi\nu$, $E_a \approx U_{eff}$ and $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant. Eqn (5) is valid assuming that only one characteristic Debye relaxabilities, respectively, $\tau_0$ corresponds to a single relaxation process, while $\nu$ determines the width of the distribution of relaxation times (an infinitely wide distribution). Isothermal $\chi_M''$ and $\chi_M'$ vs. $\nu$ curves were simultaneously fitted with eqn (7) and (8), in order to cross-check the two experimental datasets and obtain more reliable results. The best-fit parameters ($\tau$, $\alpha$, $\chi_M''$ and $\chi_M'$) for the two different static fields are reported in Tables S16 and S17.$^\dag$ In both cases, the relaxation times decrease with increasing temperature, presumably due to the progressive enhancement of thermally activated relaxation processes. The use of a 2 kOe static field leads to approximately three times slower relaxation than at $H_{DC} = 1$ kOe. The $\alpha$ parameter does not follow a straightforward trend, but for $H_{DC} = 1$ kOe (2 kOe) it ranges between 0.51–0.63 (0.44–0.51). Its substantial value ($\approx0.5$) highlights a very broad distribution of relaxation times. From Fig. 12 it is evident that the $\ln(\tau)$ vs. $1/T$ plots at 1 and 2 kOe do not follow a linear trend. Therefore, slow relaxation of the magnetization cannot be described solely by a multistep thermally activated relaxation processes (Orbach mechanism), where $\tau$ exponentially increases with decreasing $T$ and follows the expression $\tau = \tau_0 \exp[U_{eff}/(k_B T)]$. The temperature dependence of $\ln(\tau)$ at 1 and 2 kOe were simultaneously fitted to eqn (9), which accounts for Orbach and QTM relaxation mechanisms but disregards Raman relaxation:

$$\tau = \tau_0^{-1} \exp[-U_{eff}/(k_B T)] + \tau_{QTM}^{-1}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

In eqn (9), $\tau_{QTM}$ is the relaxation time associated to QTM mechanism and only $U_{eff}$ is assumed to be independent of $H_{DC}$. The calculated best-fit parameters are: at $H_{DC} = 1$ kOe, $\tau_0 = 1.9(6) \times 10^{-8}$ s, $\tau_{QTM} = 1.44(11) \times 10^{-4}$ s; at $H_{DC} = 2$ kOe, $\tau_0 = 5.2(16) \times 10^{-8}$ s, $\tau_{QTM} = 4.4(4) \times 10^{-4}$ s; $U_{eff}/k_B = 18.9(8)$ K. This value of $U_{eff}$ is ~3.5 times larger than that estimated in zero DC field, and is also larger than found in 1Cl at 2 kOe (10.1 (1.3) K).$^{41}$

**Conclusions**

In this work we have described and compared the solution and solid-state properties of two tetrairon-based EMACs supported by oligo-$\alpha$-pyridylamido ligands and capped by halide ligands: 1Cl and 1Br. The complexes contain exclusively iron (ii) centers, as most directly supported by Mössbauer spectroscopy, and undergo four consecutive quasi-reversible one-electron oxidations in dichloromethane solution. The DC magnetic properties indicate a weakly magnetic ground state in both derivatives. Slow relaxation of the magnetization is never-
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theless detected in AC measurements, with 1Br displaying SMM behavior even in zero static field. To aid the analysis of magnetic data, a local-site model was assumed and the single-ion properties were evaluated by \textit{ab initio} (CASSCF-NEVPT2-SO) methods. The results showed that in these stringlike complexes the terminal metal centers (Fe1 and Fe4) have a negative $D$ parameter whereas the internal ones (Fe2 and Fe3) have a positive $D$, corresponding to predominantly easy- and hard-axis magnetic anisotropies, respectively. Due to the significant deviations from $D_3$ molecular symmetry, however, different anisotropies are predicted for the two terminal metals and, to a lesser extent, for the internal ones; in addition, single-ion magnetic anisotropies display significant rhombic distortions with $|E/D|$ up to 0.2 and noncollinear principal axes. These local anisotropies compete with super-exchange interactions, which turn out to be ferromagnetic within the Fe1,Fe2 and Fe3,Fe4 pairs and antiferromagnetic between Fe2 and Fe3. Since the strong-exchange regime\textsuperscript{16} typical of most polynuclear molecular magnets is not attained, the ground state is a non-Kramers doublet featuring a highly noncollinear spin arrangement.

In conclusion, the large Fe...Fe separations and the super-exchange patterns found in 1Cl and 1Br yield weak-to-moderate ferromagnetic couplings accompanied by antiferromagnetic contributions that severely plague SMM behavior. Additionally, the different coordination pockets available in these EMACs lead to opposite and partially cancelling local anisotropies. Therefore, the formation of metal–metal bonds seems requisite to stabilize well-isolated ground spin states in iron(ii)-based EMACs.\textsuperscript{42} Instilling a negative $D$ parameter in the ground state is a second mandatory task for the design of molecular magnets is not attained, the ground state is a non-Kramers doublet featuring a highly noncollinear spin arrangement.
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