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Abstract
Three distinctive classes of ancillary chelates, namely: 2-(3-trifluoromethylpyrazol-5-yl)-6-(4-trifluoromethylphenyl)pyridine (L3, H2pzppy), 4-(pyrazol-5-yl)-2-(4-trifluoromethyl)phenylpyrimidine (L5, H2pzppm) and 4-(6-(pyrazol-5-yl)pyridin-2-yl)-2-trifluoromethylpyrimidine (L6, H2pzpypm), which showed identical skeletal topology, but with the more electronegative nitrogen atom replacing the isoelectronic methine group at the selected skeletal position, were obtained to investigate the photophysical and electrochemical properties and hence the associated Ru(II) sensitizers based DSC. To increase the optical absorptivity we also strategically added thiophene (thienyl) or 3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene (EDOT) appendages to L6 for boosting short-circuit photocurrent (Jsc) and overall efficiency (η) of the fabricated DSC devices. Under AM 1.5G illumination the best sensitizer showed performance data of Jsc = 18.22 mA·cm⁻², Voc = 0.66 V, FF = 0.729 and η =
8.72 %, and good cell stability at 60 °C for 1000 hours, being only decreased by ~5% in η value.

Introduction

The future prospect of a low-carbon society requires emerging renewable energy sources, among which the dye-sensitized solar cells (DSCs) are considered to be one competitive candidate. Especially, the low cost TiO₂ photoanode in DSCs can potentially be fabricated using printing technology, providing a viable alternative to conventional photovoltaics. Despite the development of a vast variety of different dyes to optimize the harvested solar photons, up to current stage, the Ru(II) based photosensitizers remain as the key component, because of the higher cell performance, particularly in view of stabilities versus other sensitizers such as organic donor-acceptor dyes and zinc porphyrin/phthalocyanine dyes.¹⁻⁵ Broadly speaking, the Ru(II) sensitizers constitute at least one di- or tri-carboxy substituted poly-pyridine chelate to serve as the anchor to the TiO₂ photoanode, plus an ancillary ligand which would modify both the light absorption capacity, ground state oxidation potential, and relative peak position of the metal-to-ligand charge transfer (MLCT) transition. Among a variety of Ru(II) based photosensitizers the thiocyanate-containing sensitizers N749 (or black dye),⁶⁻⁸ Z907⁹ and N719¹⁰ represent three of the best known examples that have been tested for both fundamentals and commercial applications.

From the viewpoint of device stability, the robust skeletal framework of sensitizers is considered as a major factor governing the lifespan. Thus, studies on the thiocyanate-free Ru(II) sensitizers with either dicarboxy bipyridine or tricarboxy terpyridine anchor are emerged in recent years.¹¹⁻²² The thiocyanate is expected to undergo dissociation from sensitizer in solution due to its latent activity against ligand exchange.²³ To mitigate this problem, a new class of Ru(II) sensitizers were synthesized with the thiocyanates replaced by either electron-deficient cyclometalate²⁴⁻²⁷ or chelating azolate.²⁸⁻³⁰ This approach is stimulated by the general
believes that the chelates should be less labile compared to the uni-dentate bonding of thiocyanate, and the fact that the added electron deficiency is capable to increase the ground state oxidation potential of sensitizers for faster dye regeneration by $\Gamma/\Gamma_3^-$ redox couple.

Recently, our interests have extended to the bis-tridentate Ru(II) sensitizer.$^{31-35}$ We started with a series of multidentate ancillary chelates, namely:

$\text{2,6-bis(3-trifluoromethylpyrazol-5-yl)pyridine} \quad (\text{L1, } H_2pz_2py)$,

$\text{2,6-bis(3-trifluoromethyl-1,2,4-triazol-5-yl)pyridine} \quad (\text{L2, } H_2tz_2py)$,

$\text{2-(3-trifluoromethylpyrazol-5-yl)-6-(4-trifluoromethylphenyl)pyridine} \quad (\text{L3, } H_2pzppy)$

and

$\text{2-(3-trifluoromethyl-1,2,4-triazol-5-yl)-6-(4-trifluoromethylphenyl)pyridine} \quad (\text{L4, } H_2tzppy)$, which are synthesized and employed in construction of relevant Ru(II) sensitizers (see Scheme 1). Their outstanding DSC performances were subsequently validated by showing optimal light harvesting capability down to the near-IR region. Motivated by this finding, we then launched a study on synthesizing new multidentate ancillaries to further fine-tune their electrochemical and spectroscopic properties by insertion of nitrogen atom at specific positions of the backbone, and to explore the associated cell performances.
Scheme 1. Structures of the ancillary chelates in various *bis*-tridentate Ru(II) sensitizers.

In this paper, we present two new classes of ancillary chelates, namely: 4-(pyrazol-5-yl)-2-(4-trifluoromethyl)phenylpyrimidine (L5, H2pzppm) and 4-(6-(pyrazol-5-yl)pyridin-2-yl)-2-trifluoromethylpyrimidine (L6, H2pzpypm). Their structures differ by incorporation of one pyrimidine fragment as opposed to the central pyridine fragment or at the terminal phenyl group in the parent L3 ancillary (Scheme 1). We then probe this subtle structural change versus the critical effect on the DSC performance. Moreover, substituted thiophene (thienyl) or 3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene (EDOT) appendages were also added to the L6 ancillary in an aim to increase optical absorptivity and hence boost short-circuit photocurrent ($J_{SC}$) and overall efficiency ($\eta$) under AM 1.5G illumination.

Results and discussion

First, the demanded dianionic tridentate ancillaries were prepared via the multi-step protocols depicted in Schemes 2 and 3. For the H2pzppm chelate L5, the first step is to replace the 4-chloro substituent of 2,4-dichloropyrimidine with a methoxide protecting group by a simple nucleophilic substitution,$^{36}$ followed by replacement of the unprotected 2-chloro substituent with the $m$-trifluoromethylphenyl group using Suzuki cross-coupling reaction.$^{37}$ The subsequent conversion of 4-methoxy group back to the chloro substituent is achieved using chlorination reagent POCl3.$^{38}$ The resulting chloride compound was subjected to cyanation using KCN,$^{39}$ followed by methylation with Grignard reagent to afford the acetyl group.$^{40}$ Finally, this acetyl group was converted to the pyrazole moiety using Claisen condensation and hydrazine cyclization in sequence.$^{41}$
Scheme 2. Synthetic protocols: (i) NaOMe, MeOH; (ii) 3-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl boronic acid, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$], Na$_2$CO$_3$, THF-H$_2$O; (iii) HCl$_{\text{aq}}$; (iv) POCl$_3$, toluene; (v) KCN, DABCO, DMSO-H$_2$O; (vi) CH$_3$MgBr, THF, HCl$_{\text{aq}}$; (vii) NaOEt, CF$_3$CO$_2$Et, THF; (viii) N$_2$H$_4$, EtOH.

On the other hand, the H$_2$pzpypm chelate L6 and its thienyl and EDOT functionalized derivatives, i.e. L6.1: R = 5-hexyl-2-thienyl and L6.2: R = 7-hexyl-2,3-dihydrothieno[3,4-b]-1,4-dioxin-5-yl, were prepared using another synthetic sequences starting from 2,6-diacetylpyridine and derivatives, see Scheme 3. One acetyl substituent was first protected using stoichiometric amount of ethylene glycol in presence of acid catalyst; the second (unprotected) acetyl group was sequentially reacted with N,N-dimethylformamide dimethyl acetal, trifluoroacetamidine and sodium ethoxide to induce the formation of a CF$_3$-substituted pyrimidine fragment. After then, the dioxolane group was hydrolyzed to release the acetyl group. It was then reacted with ethyl trifluoroacetate under condition for Claisen condensation, followed by hydrazine cyclization to afford the anticipated pyrazole group.
Scheme 3. Synthetic protocols: (i) ethylene glycol; (ii) N,N-dimethylformamide dimethyl acetal; (iii) trifluoroacetamidine, NaOEt, EtOH; (iv) HCl(aq); (v) NaOEt, CF₃CO₂Et, THF; (vi) N₂H₄, EtOH.

With these ancillary chelates in hands, the demanded bis-tridentate Ru(II) sensitizers can be synthesized from coupling of Ru(tectpy)Cl₃ (tectpy = 4,4',4''-triethoxycarboxy-2,2':6',2''-terpyridine) and ancillary chelate in presence of KOAc. Specifically, the designated Ru(II) sensitizers TF-25, 26, 27 and 28 are synthesized using the aforementioned chelates L5, L6, L6.1 and L6.2, respectively. Their molecular structures, together with that of reference sensitizer TF-21, are depicted in Scheme 4.
The UV-Vis absorption spectra of sensitizers TF-25 ~ TF-28 in DMF (dimethylformamide) at conc. of $1 \times 10^{-5}$ M are depicted in Figure 1, together with the spectrum of TF-21 as the reference, while the photophysical and cyclic voltammetric data are listed in Table 1. Generally speaking, TF-21 exhibited two sharp MLCT bands at 404 nm and 521 nm, together with a longer wavelength shoulder that showed a slow decrease in intensity and extended all the way to the near infrared (> 800 nm). In accordance with this pattern, both TF-25 and TF-26 depicted two MLCT absorptions at ~400 and ~520 nm, with extinction coefficient of the lower energy MLCT band ($1.2 \times 10^4$ L·mol$^{-1}$cm$^{-1}$) being slightly lower than that of the higher energy one ($1.5 \times 10^4$ L·mol$^{-1}$cm$^{-1}$), and a much faster decline in intensity for the lower energy MLCT shoulder versus that of TF-21. Furthermore, upon addition of thienyl and EDOT group to TF-26, the resulting sensitizers TF-27 and TF-28 give the lower energy MLCT peak maxima at around 530 and 533 nm, i.e. with a bathochromic shift of at least 13 nm versus that of TF-26, and a substantial gain in absorptivity to $\varepsilon = 2.1 \sim 2.3 \times 10^4$ L·mol$^{-1}$cm$^{-1}$. This could imply a better light
harvesting capability for **TF-27** and **TF-28** over that of the parent **TF-26**, which is consistent with the influence of the attached electron donating and π-conjugating appendage observed in many organic push-pull and Ru(II) based sensitizers.  

**Figure 1.** UV-Vis absorption spectra of Ru(II) sensitizers TF-25 \textasciitilde{} TF-28 and reference TF-21 at 1 \times 10^{-5} M in DMF at RT.

Calculations based on density functional theory (DFT) and time-dependent DFT in DMF were performed for the titled complexes. Figures 2 and 3 depict the simulation of the absorption wavelengths (vertical line) and the relative transition probability (magnitude of vertical line) of **TF-25 \textasciitilde{} TF-28** (please see the result of **TF-21** in reference \textsuperscript{33}). Also depicted in these Figures are the frontier orbitals contributed to the major electronic transition recorded. All numerical data for vertical transition and comprehensive frontier orbital analyses are listed in Tables S1 \textendash{} S4 and Figures S1 \textendash{} S4 of Supporting Information. As a result, the peak wavelength over 500 nm is calculated to be 529, 521, 522, and 525 nm for **TF-25 \textasciitilde{} TF-28**, respectively, for which both value and trend are consistent with the experimental absorption maximum for **TF-25** (523 nm), **TF-26** (517 nm), **TF-27** (530 nm) and **TF-28** (533 nm) in DMF (see Table 1), supporting the validity of computational approaches. Careful examination of the optical transition and its associated frontier orbitals.
indicates that the lower lying singlet transitions over 500 nm are mainly contributed by metal-to-ligand (tricarboxy-terpyridine) charge transfer (MLCT), together with a minor part of ancillary to anchor (terpyridine) charge transfer (LLCT). In the higher lying transition around 400 ~ 550 nm, the unoccupied orbitals of thienyl (TF-27) and EDOT (TF-28) appendages have imposed appreciable contribution (see Figure 3) due to an elongation of π-conjugation, which rationalizes the substantial gain of absorptivity as well as the red shift of peak wavelength observed experimentally for TF-27 and TF-28 in this region.

Table 1. Photophysical and electrochemical data for the studied Ru(II) sensitizers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dye</th>
<th>$\lambda_{abs}$ [nm] ($\varepsilon$ [10$^3$ L·mol$^{-1}$·cm$^{-1}$])$^a$</th>
<th>$E_{ox}'$ (V)$^b$</th>
<th>$E_{0-0}$ (eV)</th>
<th>$E_{ox}^\circ$ (V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF-21</td>
<td>404 (15), 520 (13), 703 (2.2)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-25</td>
<td>405 (15), 523 (12), 555 (10)</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-26</td>
<td>393 (15), 517 (12), 548 (11)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-27</td>
<td>415 (21), 530 (22), 558 (20)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-28</td>
<td>415 (22), 533 (23), 558 (21)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Absorption and emission spectra were measured at 1 × 10$^{-5}$ M in DMF. $^b$ Oxidation potential of dyes was measured in DMF with 0.1 M [TBA][PF$_6$] and a scan rate of 50 mV s$^{-1}$. It was calibrated with Fc/Fc$^+$ as internal standard and converted to NHE by addition of 0.63 V.
Figure 2. The absorption spectra of (a) TF-25 and (b) TF-26 sensitizers. Also depicted are the TD-DFT calculated absorption wavelengths (vertical line) and the relative transition probability (magnitude of vertical line). Inset: the selected frontier orbitals contributed to the major transitions. The occupied and unoccupied orbitals are represented in pink and yellow, respectively.
Figure 3. The absorption spectra of (a) TF-27 and (b) TF-28 sensitizers. Also depicted are the TD-DFT calculated absorption wavelengths (vertical line) and the relative transition probability (magnitude of vertical line). Inset: the selected frontier orbitals contributed to the major transitions. The occupied and unoccupied orbitals are represented in pink and yellow, respectively.

Cyclic voltammetry was conducted to reveal their ground state oxidation potential ($E_{\text{ox}}^{\circ}$). With the $E_{\text{ox}}^{\circ}$ data in hand, the corresponding excited state oxidation potentials ($E^{\circ\ast}$) were estimated using the equation $E^{\circ\ast} = E_{\text{ox}}^{\circ} - E_0$, for
which $E_{0-0}$ stands for the optical energy gap, i.e. at 5% onset of their lowest energy absorption. In general, the absorption onset of TF-25 and TF-26 show a significant hypsochromic shift than that of TF-21, resulting in the higher onset energy by 0.1 eV. However, this increase in $E_{0-0}$ was offset by the more positive $E_{ox}^{\prime\prime}$ of TF-25 and TF-26 recorded (0.93 and 0.96 V), leaving the respective $E_{ox}^{\prime\prime\ast}$ essentially unchanged. Moreover, the TF-27 and TF-28 sensitizers are modified by addition of thienyl and EDOT appendage to TF-26. Although this functionalization red shifts the higher lying MLCT/ππ* absorptions as well as simultaneously increases the extinction coefficient, their $E_{ox}^{\prime\prime}$ values are virtually unaltered versus that of TF-26 (see Table 1). Moreover, as shown in Figure 1, the onset of the absorption, i.e., $E_{0-0}$, is nearly the same among TF-26, TF-27 and TF-28. Support of this also provided by computational results, in which the calculated $S_0 \rightarrow S_1$ transition is virtually identical, being 668, 666 and 671 nm for TF-26, TF-27 and TF-28, respectively (see Tables S2 ~ S4). The result also reconfirms the aforementioned viewpoint that the added thienyl (TF-27) and EDOT (TF-28) appendages only affect the higher lying excited state, while the lowest lying excited state is only dominated by Ru(II)-to-anchor (tricarboxy-terpyridine) MLCT transition. The invariance of $E_{ox}^{\prime\prime}$ and $E_{0-0}$ leads to similar $E_{ox}^{\prime\prime\ast}$ for TF-26 ~ 28. For all these newly developed Ru(II) complexes, evidently, the obtained $E_{ox}^{\prime\prime}$ and $E_{ox}^{\prime\prime\ast}$ are sufficiently more positive and negative than that of the redox potential of I$^-$/I$_3^-$ couple (ca. 0.35 V vs. NHE) as well as the corresponding conduction band edge of the TiO$_2$ electrode (ca. −0.7 V vs. NHE) $^{27, 57}$ respectively, confirming their suitability to serve as the suitable DSC sensitizers.

DSCs were next fabricated using these sensitizers absorbed on the TiO$_2$ photoanode that consists of a 15 µm layer of 20 nm absorbing particles and 7 µm layer of 400 nm light scattering particles, deposited with multiple screen-printing manipulation.$^{33}$ Moreover, the sensitizers were dissolved in mixed EtOH and DMSO ($\nu/\nu$ 4:1) to afford a 0.3 mM solution, together with the addition of 1 mM chenodeoxycholic acid (CDCA) as coadsorbent to reduce the dye aggregation. The
electrolyte solution, coded A, consists of 2.0 M 1,3-dimethylimidazolium iodide (DMII), 0.1 M guanidinium thiocyanate (GuNCS), 0.05 M LiI, 0.03 M I₂, and 0.5 M 4-tert-butylpyridine (tBP) in acetonitrile and valeronitrile (v/v, 85:15). Prior to the measurement, the solar simulator (Sun 3000, ABET Technologies) was calibrated with a certificated c-Si solar cell equipped with a KG-3 filter. Device performances were measured using a metallic shadow mask with a square aperture of 4 × 4 mm². The obtained photovoltaic parameters are listed in Table 2. It is notable that the recorded cell efficiency of TF-21 is similar to the previously reported data, while obviously all the newly developed complexes TF-25 ~ TF-28 have shown improved efficiencies. This appears to be due to the more positive $E_{ox}^{o'}$, i.e., higher oxidation potential versus TF-21, so that faster dye regeneration is expectable, giving better cell efficiency.

Table 2. The performance characteristics of DSCs using electrolyte A and under AM 1.5G illumination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitizers</th>
<th>$J_{SC}$ [mA·cm⁻²]</th>
<th>$V_{OC}$ [V]</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>$\eta$ [%]</th>
<th>dye loading[^a] [× 10⁻⁷ mol·cm⁻²]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF-21</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.42 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-25</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>1.55 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-26</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1.42 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-27</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.88 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-28</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.79 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^a] The value is calculated from the MLCT band ratio for desorbed dye solution versus (0.01 mM) reference solution in mixed MeOH and water (v/v, 1:1) added with 0.1 M of TBAOH.

The device was further improved by adding tetrabutylammonium deoxycholate [TBA][DOC] to the dye solution, and switching to a different electrolyte system. The addition of co-adsorbent [TBA][DOC] is expected to conduct the proton-to-TBA exchange at the sensitizer, which in turn could improve the solubility and shift the $E_{ox}^{o'}$ to a more negative value. In this approach the alternative
electrolyte, now is coded B, consists of 0.6 M 1,2-dimethyl-3-propylimidazolium iodide (DMPII), 0.1 M LiI, 0.05 M I₂, and 0.5 M 4-tert-butylpyridine (tBP) in acetonitrile and valeronitrile (v/v, 85:15). The higher concentration of LiI in electrolyte B is expected to lower the conduction band edge of TiO₂ and lead to faster electron injection and higher \( J_{SC} \) for the DSC devices.\(^{64-67}\)

The resulting photovoltaic parameters are listed in Table 3. For confirming the increase of both solubility and dye loading by the addition of [TBA][DOC], we re-measured the dye loading under this new condition. As expected, the loading of TF-21 is notably increased by 19% and this reference TF-21 device now affords better improved conversion efficiency (\( \eta \)) of 6.44%. In the meantime, DSCs of respective TF-25 and TF-26 under the same condition also demonstrate higher loading and much improved efficiencies; namely: \( \eta \) of 7.86 and 7.85%, \( J_{SC} \) of 16.92 and 17.12 mA·cm\(^{-2}\), \( V_{OC} \) of 0.68 and 0.63 V, and fill factor (FF) of 0.683 and 0.728, as shown in Table 3. The superiority in TF-25 and TF-26 over that of TF-21 is also attributed to the electron withdrawing property of extra nitrogen atoms in the ancillary that shifted the \( E_{ox}^{o} \) to the more positive value for faster dye regeneration (Table 1).\(^{59-61}\)

Moreover, since both TF-25 and TF-26 show nearly identical efficiency, the result implicates that the location of the pyrimidinyl substituent imposes insignificant variation in device efficiency due to the retention of both spatial and electrochemical properties.

Upon further modification of TF-26 by decoration of either thienyl (TF-27) or EDOT (TF-28) substituent, the device efficiency increases to 7.92% for TF-27 and more prominently to 8.72% for TF-28. This improvement is attributed to both better dye loading and light harvesting effect, but the increment is smaller for the thienyl derivative TF-27 than that of the EDOT functionalized TF-28. While the exact cause is unclear, we suspect it could be related to the faster charge recombination,\(^{68}\) which reduced both \( J_{SC} \) and \( V_{OC} \), as shown by the inferior device performance of TF-27 (\( \eta = 5.32 \% \)) vs. that of TF-26 (\( \eta = 7.08 \% \)) and TF-28 (\( \eta = 6.00 \% \)) recorded under lower...
dye loading and with electrolyte A (cf. Table 2).

Table 3. The performance characteristics of DSCs using electrolyte B and under AM 1.5G illumination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitizers</th>
<th>$J_{SC}$ [mA·cm$^{-2}$]</th>
<th>$V_{OC}$ [V]</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>$\eta$ [%]</th>
<th>dye loading [$\times 10^{-7}$ mol·cm$^{-2}$]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF-21</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>$1.69 \pm 0.08$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-25</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>$2.11 \pm 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-26</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>$1.89 \pm 0.07$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-27</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>$1.04 \pm 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-28</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>$1.05 \pm 0.04$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N749</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corresponding J-V characteristics and IPCE action spectra are shown in Figure 4. The IPCE profile of all sensitizers (i.e. TF-25 ~ TF-28) clearly reveals significant improvement over that of TF-21 in the region 400 – 700 nm, and we attribute this to the more positive $E_{ox}^{o'}$ and the higher driving force for dye regeneration with iodide-electrolyte. In Figure 3(b), the TF-28 sensitizer with an EDOT appendage showed the highest $J_{SC}$ of 18.11 mA cm$^{-2}$, which is also in agreement with the higher IPCE (by an deviation of < 10%) over the solar spectral region. Thus, coupled with $V_{OC}$ of 0.66 V and FF of 0.729, TF-28 gave the highest conversion efficiency of 8.72%. On the other hand, TF-27 device did not perform equivalent efficiency despite of showing similar spectrum profile and absorptivity versus that of TF-28.

For showing intimate comparison to pristine sensitizer N749, we also fabricated a reference DSC device using identical cell parameters and electrolyte B (cf. Table 3). This reference device showed an essentially identical value of overall efficiency, but with a slightly lower $J_{SC}$ and higher $V_{OC}$ versus our best sensitizer TF-28 in this study. The variations of $J_{SC}$ and $V_{OC}$ between TF-28 to N749 could be due to the better light harvesting property and faster charge recombination, a result of the introduction of
EDOT appendage at the ancillary chelate of TF-28.

![Figure 4](image.png)

**Figure 4.** IPCE action diagram and $J-V$ characteristics for devices fabricated using the electrolyte B.

To further probe the device performances, measurements of charge extraction (CE) and transient photovoltage (TPV) decay were carried out, for which relevant data are shown in Figure 5(a) and (b). Differences in $V_{OC}$ between cells can generally be explained by shifts in the TiO$_2$ conduction band edge (manifested by the shift of the exponential distribution of experimental data measured by CE) and/or by TiO$_2$ recombination lifetimes (investigated via TPV measurements).$^{69,70}$ As can be seen, except for TF-21 which has a slightly lower $V_{OC}$ at a fixed photo-induced charge
density due to a downward shift of the band edge, all other DSC devices show very similar $V_{OC}$, indicating that the conduction band potentials are similar in cells TF-25 ~ TF-28. In Figure 5(b), transient photovoltage measurements at a fixed charge density indicate that device made by TF-25 has the longest electron lifetime, while TF-27 is the shortest among all others. The trend of electron lifetime of these TF sensitizers seems to be in good agreement with the $V_{OC}$ of the devices (Table 2), suggesting that the conduction band edge of TiO$_2$ is less influential to the observed $V_{OC}$.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 4.** (a) TiO$_2$ electron density versus voltage deduced from charge extraction measurements and (b) electron lifetime versus TiO$_2$ electron density deduced from transient photovoltage measurements for DSC devices containing TF-21 and TF-25 ~ TF-28 dyes. The cell voltage is controlled via tuning the illumination from a halogen lamp.
Then, electrochemical impedance spectroscopy was also utilized to analyze the resistance to charge recombination in these devices. Figure 5 shows the Nyquist plots measured in dark at a forward bias same as the respective \( V_{OC} \) tested under one-sun illumination. The impedance spectra are composed of 2 semicircles, in which the left (smaller cycle) one depicts the electrochemical reaction at the Pt/electrolyte interface, and the right (larger cycle) one represent the impedance characteristics of the charge recombination \( (R_r) \) at the TiO\(_2\)/dye/electrolyte interface.\(^{71-73}\) The radii of the right series of semicircles indicates \( R_r \) to be in the order of \( \text{TF-25} > \text{TF-28} > \text{TF-21} > \text{TF-26} \approx \text{TF-27} \) and, thus, the dark currents \( (J_{dark}) \) appear an inverse trend, which are consistent with the previous TPV results.
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**Figure 5.** Electrochemical impedance spectra of DSC devices tested in dark with an external bias as each corresponding \( V_{OC} \) under one-sun illumination.

To test the stability of Ru(II) sensitizers, the highest efficiency \textbf{TF-28} device was subjected to light soaking test at 60 °C for 1000 h after adopting a low-volatility electrolyte consisting of the composition of 0.6 M PMII, 0.15 M I\(_2\), 0.1 M GuNCS, and 0.5 M NBB (N-butyl-1\( H\)-benzimidazole) in butyronitrile (BN).\(^{74}\) In a duration of 1000 h, the \( J_{SC} \), \( V_{DC} \), FF, and \( \eta \) were steady until 600 h and then decreased. The \( \eta_{max} \) of 7.87%
located around 500 h. The decline of efficiency, defined as \((\eta_{\text{max}} - \eta_{1000h})/\eta_{\text{max}}\), is 5.2% which is close to other data reported by our group.\(^{33}\) This result reconfirms that \textit{bis}-tridentate architecture is stable against the applied thermal stress under simulated solar irradiation.

![Graph showing device performances of TF-28 under one-sun light soaking at 60 °C for 1000 h.](image)

**Figure 6.** Device performances of TF-28 under one-sun light soaking at 60 °C for 1000 h.

**Conclusion**

In summary, two new types of terdentate ancillary ligands, namely: \(H_2pzppm\) (L5) and \(H_2pzpypm\) (L6) and derivatives (L6.1 and L6.2), were synthesized and employed to construct four \textit{bis}-tridentate, thiocyanate-free Ru(II) complexes TF-25 ~ TF-28. The substitution of pyrimidine for pyridinyl and phenyl group in reference TF-21, yielding TF-25 and TF-26, respectively, has successfully increased the ground state oxidation potentials to a level of 0.93 – 0.96 V (vs. NHE). With addition of thienyl and EDOT decorations on \(H_2pzpypm\) ancillary, the resulting TF-27 and TF-28 sensitizers exhibit the expected hyperchromic and bathochromic effects, respectively, on their UV-Vis
absorption spectra. The devices made by TF-25 ~ 28 all have superior performance over that of TF-21. TF-27 showed an improved efficiency up to 7.92%, while TF-28 demonstrates the highest efficiency of 8.72%, with an average IPCE of 80% over 400 – 700 nm and an onset wavelength of 860 nm, confirming their usefulness as a guideline for fine-tuning the functional DSC sensitizers.

**Experimental section**

**General Procedures.** All reactions were performed under nitrogen. Solvents were distilled from appropriate drying agents prior to use. Commercially available reagents were used without further purification. All reactions were monitored by TLC with pre-coated silica gel plates (Merck, 0.20 mm with fluorescent indicator UV254). Compounds were visualized with UV irradiation at 254 or 365 nm. Flash column chromatography was carried out using silica gel obtained from Merck (230 - 400 mesh). Mass spectra were obtained on a JEOL SX-102A instrument operating in electron impact (EI) or fast atom bombardment (FAB) mode. $^1$H and $^{19}$F NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker-400 or INOVA-500 instrument; chemical shifts are quoted with respect to the internal standard tetramethylsilane. Elemental analysis was carried out with a Heraeus CHN-O Rapid Elementary Analyzer. Photophysical data were obtained using an Edinburgh Fluorescence spectrometer FLS928P. Details of the synthetic protocols for the tri-dentate ancillary chelates and the procedures for the DSC cell fabrication and measurement are all given in the electronic supporting information.

**Synthesis of TF-25.** A mixture of 4-(3-(trifluoromethyl)-1H-pyrazol-5-yl)-2-(3-(trifluoromethyl)phenyl) pyrimidine (114 mg, 0.32 mmol), Ru(tectpy)Cl$_3$ (204 mg, 0.32 mmol) and KOAc (156 mg, 1.60 mmol) in 30 mL of xylenes was heated at 140°C under stirring for 15 h. After the removal of solvent, the crude product of TF-25-Et was purified by silica gel column chromatography (ethyl acetate/hexane = 1:2).
then, the resulting solid was dissolved in a mixture of acetone (20 mL) and 1N NaOH solution (1.0 mL). For hydrolysis, the mixture was stirred at room temperature under nitrogen for 5 h. The solvent was removed, and the residue was dissolved in H₂O solution (5 mL). This solution was titrated with 2N HCl(aq) to pH = 3 to afford a brown precipitate. This brown product was washed with acetone and ethyl acetate in sequence, to yield, giving the final product. Yield: 187 mg, 72%. All other Ru(II) derivatives, e.g. TF-26 ~ TF-28, were synthesized from Ru(tectpy)Cl₃ and respective ancillary chelates using identical procedures.

Selected spectral data of TF-25. MS (FAB, ¹⁰²Ru): m/z 824 (823) [M+1]⁺. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, d₆-DMSO,298 K): δ 9.39 (s, 2H), 9.15 (s, 2H), 8.14 ~ 8.16 (m, 2H), 7.60 ~ 7.63 (m, 4H), 7.47 (s, 1H), 6.76 (d, JHH = 7.6 Hz, 1H), 5.68 (d, JHH = 8 Hz, 1H); ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, d₆-DMSO, 298 K): δ -58.54 (s, 3F), -60.64 (s, 3F). Anal. Calcd. for C₃₃H₁₇F₆N₇O₆Ru·2H₂O: C, 46.16; N, 11.42; H, 2.47. Found: C, 46.09; N, 11.31; H, 2.15.

Selected spectral data of TF-26. MS (FAB, ¹⁰²Ru): m/z 825 (M+1)⁺. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, d₆-DMSO, 298 K): δ 9.31 (s, 2H), 9.11 (s, 2H), 8.33 ~ 8.28 (m, 2H), 8.2 (d, JHH = 8 Hz, 1H), 7.64 (dd, JHH = 6 Hz, 2H), 7.59 (d, JHH = 6 Hz, 2H), 7.26 (s, 1H), 7.13 (s, 1H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, d₆-DMSO, 298 K): δ -58.36 (s, 3F), -68.33 (s, 3F). Anal. Calcd. for C₃₂H₁₆F₆N₈O₆Ru·2H₂O: C, 44.71; N, 13.04; H, 2.35. Found: C, 44.79; N, 12.70; H, 2.46.

Selected spectral data of TF-27. MS (FAB, ¹⁰²Ru): m/z 991 (M+1)⁺. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, d₆-DMSO, 298 K): δ 9.32 (s, 2H), 9.12 (s, 2H), 8.64 (s, 1H), 8.27 (s, 1H), 8.02 (d, JHH = 3.6 Hz, 1H), 7.70 (d, JHH = 6 Hz, 2H), 7.63 (d, JHH = 6 Hz, 2H), 7.41 (s, 1H), 7.15 (s, 1H), 7.11 (d, JHH = 3.6 Hz, 1H), 2.95 (t, JHH = 8 Hz, 2H), 1.40 (quin, JHH = 8 Hz, 2H), 1.31 (m, 6H), 0.89 (t, JHH = 8 Hz, 3H). ¹⁹F NMR (376 MHz, d₆-DMSO, 298 K): δ -58.38 (s, 3F), -68.22 (s, 3F). Anal. Calcd. for C₄₂H₃₀F₆N₈O₆Ru·H₂O: C, 50.05; N, 11.12; H, 3.20. Found: C, 50.28; N, 11.01; H, 3.10.

Selected spectral data of TF-28. MS (FAB, ¹⁰²Ru): m/z 1049 (M+1)⁺. ¹H NMR (400 MHz, d₆-DMSO, 298 K): δ 9.31 (s, 2H), 9.12 (s, 2H), 8.49 (s, 1H), 8.39 (s, 1H), 7.68 (d, JHH = 5.6 Hz, 2H), 7.64 (d, JHH = 5.6 Hz, 2H), 7.36 (s, 1H), 7.12 (s, 1H), 4.56 ~ 4.51 (m,
2.76 (t, $J_{HH} = 8$ Hz, 2H), 1.67 (quin, $J_{HH} = 8$ Hz, 2H), 1.45 ~ 1.36 (m, 6H), 1.07 (t, $J_{HH} = 8$ Hz, 3H). Subsequently, the assignment of the 1H NMR of the title complex was performed. The 19F NMR (376 MHz, d$_6$-DMSO, 298 K): $\delta$ -58.33 (s, 3F), -68.24 (s, 3F). Anal. Calcd. for C$_{44}$H$_{32}$F$_{6}$N$_{8}$O$_{8}$RuS·2H$_2$O: C, 48.76; N, 10.34; H, 3.35. Found: C, 48.63; N, 10.02; H, 3.04.
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TOC Illustration:

Systematic changing the ancillary chelate from L3 to L6, together with addition of 3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene (EDOT) appendage, boosts the overall efficiencies of fabricated DSC device.