

Dalton Transactions

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

Inducing Magnetic Communication in Caged Dinuclear Co(II) Systems

Judith Caballero-Jiménez,^a Fatemah Habib,^b Daniel Ramírez-Rosales,^c Rafael Grande-Aztatzi,^d Gabriel Merino,^d Ilia Korobkov,^b Mukesh Kumar Singh,^e Gopalan Rajaraman,^e Yasmi Reyes-Ortega^a and Muralee Murugesu.^{b*}

^a Centro de Química, Instituto de Ciencias, Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, A.P. 1613, 72000 Puebla, Pue., México.

^b Department of Chemistry, University of Ottawa, 10 Marie Curie, Ottawa, Canada K1N6N5.

^c Departamento de Física, Escuela Superior de Física y Matemáticas, I.P.N., , Av. Instituto Politécnico Nacional s/n San Pedro Zacatenco, D. F., México, 07738.

^d Departamento de Física Aplicada, Centro de Investigación de Estudios Avanzados Unidad Mérida. km 6 Antigua carretera a Progreso. Apdo. Postal 73, Cordemex, 97310, Mérida, Yuc., México.

^e Department of Chemistry, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai, Powai- 400076, India.

KEYWORDS: *Dinuclear Co(II) complexes, Magnetic interactions, Magneto-structural correlations.*

Supporting Information Placeholder

ABSTRACT: The synthesis, structural, electronic and magnetic characterization of five dinuclear Co(II) azacryptand compounds (1-5) bridged through different ions are reported. The magnetic exchange interactions, $2J$ values, obtained from theoretical computations show that the variation of the intermetallic angles and distances lead to antiferromagnetic behaviours. Magneto-structural correlations show a trend, where the angles Co(II)-bridge-Co(II) closer to 180° favour an increase in the superexchange pathway leading to higher AF interaction values.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the synthesis of compounds containing short ligands with a wide variety of bridging modes to connect metal ions has been the subject of extensive investigation due to their application in many fields including supramolecular chemistry,¹ photoluminescence,² catalysis,³ molecular recognition of important molecules in the biological field,⁴ molecular magnetism⁵ and environmental fields.⁶ From a magnetic point of view, the bridging modes of these ligands can produce a wide range of magnetic behaviours, which range from diamagnetic to moderate or weak antiferromagnetic systems.⁷ Furthermore, in some cases these ligands allow antisymmetric interactions (Dzyaloshinski-Moriya interaction, DM), which play a role in canting the spins and minimizing the energy of the system, thereby allowing weak ferromagnetic behaviour to be observed.⁸⁻¹⁰ In the past, several research groups have established magneto-structural correlations with first row transition metal compounds, especially with Cu(II)¹¹⁻¹³; however, when there is a significant spin orbital con-

tribution, the correlation becomes difficult to establish. For highly anisotropic ions, such as Co(II), some computational studies of the magnetic moment considering axial splitting and spin-orbit coupling are successful yet limited to mainly mononuclear or very few dinuclear systems in O_h symmetries.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ For polynuclear cases, the type and magnitude of the magnetic exchange interaction depends on many factors, such as the metal-metal separation, the metal-bridging ligand bond lengths, the bridge identity, the dihedral angles between the planes containing the metal ions, the metal ion stereochemistry and the bond angles to the bridging atoms.¹⁸⁻¹⁹

Consequently, more experimental and computational work with anisotropic systems is essential to establish magneto-structural correlations in order to understand and control the exchange interactions. For this purpose, we decided to use azacryptands ligands, which are known for the ability to modulate their cavity/cage size in order to contain different hosts.²⁰⁻²² For transition metals, these ligands lead to dinuclear systems where the metal ions are encapsulated and isolated from the neighbouring molecules, minimizing the intermolecular interactions. At the same time, the molecules can be stabilized when the metal ions are linked through a bridging moiety such as an alkyl carbonate bridge formed through a CO_2 fixation process.²³ Mono-, di-, tri-, tetra-, or penta- atomic bridges can be included systematically to replace the alkyl carbonate bridge. This changes the spatial, electronic and magnetic properties of the complex and has been termed "cascade coordination".²⁴ In this work, we report the synthesis and crystallographic analysis of five Co(II) azacryptand complexes. By varying the nature of the bridging ligands we can influence the structural and electronic properties as well as induce

magnetic interactions within each compound as is described in the following sections.

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Materials. All chemicals were obtained from commercial sources and used as received, without further purification. “**Caution!** Perchlorate salts of metal complexes with organic ligands are potentially explosive and should be handled with great care.”

Ligand Synthesis. The ligand 6,16,2,5-tribenzena(1,3)-1,4,8,11,14,18,23,27-octa-azabicyclo[9.9.9]nonacosaphane (**L1**) was synthesized by following a modified procedure from the literature.²⁵ Isophthalaldehyde (15.00 mmol, 2.01 g) and tris(2-aminoethyl)amine (10.00 mmol, 1.46 g) were dissolved in 50 mL of MeOH and refluxed for one hour. A white powder was collected, washed with Et₂O and MeOH and re-dissolved in 200 mL of dried EtOH at reflux, then NaBH₄ (26.40 mmol, 1.00 g) was added slowly in small quantities. The mixture was refluxed for 3 hours and left to stir for 36 hours at RT. After this time, the solvent was removed and the product was mixed with 50 mL of a 1M NaOH solution, extracted with chloroform, washed with water and dried to get a white waxy liquid. Attempts to get the dinuclear Dy(III) compound with **L1** (0.10 mmol, 0.06 g) and DyCl₃·6H₂O (0.20 mmol, 0.07 g) in 10 mL of MeOH for 2 hrs leads to crystallization of **L1** with a protonation of five out of the eight amine groups to ammonium positions with Cl⁻ as counter ions. The solution obtained was filtered and left to slow evaporation. Yield: 70%. ¹H-NMR in CDCl₃: δ(ppm): 8.19(d, 3H), 8.17 (d, 3H), 7.57(s, 6H), 7.52 (t, 3H), 5.32 (s, 3H), 3.77(br, 6H), 2.23 (br, 6H), 2.92 (br, 6H), 2.69 (br, 6H). Selected IR (KBr pellet, cm⁻¹): 2814 (br), 2311 (w), 1452 (m), 1332(s), 1279 (s), 1155 (m), 1051 (m), 745 (vs), 699 (s), 656 (m).

Synthesis of [Co^{II}₂(L1)(OAc)](ClO₄)₃·2MeOH (1**).** The slow addition of Co(ClO₄)₂·6H₂O (0.20 mmol, 0.07 g) and (*n*-Bu)₄NCH₃CO₂ (0.20 mmol, 0.06 g) in 5 mL of CH₃CN to **L1** (0.10 mmol, 0.06 g) in 5 mL of MeOH yielded a bright green solution, which was stirred for three hours then filtered. Green rhombic crystals suitable for X-ray measurements were obtained by slow diffusion of Et₂O.²⁶ Selected IR (KBr pellet, cm⁻¹): 3239 (br), 2876 (br), 1567 (m), 1454 (m), 1068 (vs), 796 (m), 751 (m), 699 (m), 620 (vs). Yield = 40%. UV-Vis (λ in nm / ε in M⁻¹cm⁻¹): 460/230.14, 478/267.47, 602/256.09, 717/86.50.

Synthesis of [Co^{II}₂(L1)(OCN)](ClO₄)₃·2CH₃CN (2**).** The slow addition of Co(ClO₄)₂·6H₂O (0.20 mmol, 0.07 g) in 5 mL of CH₃CN and NaOCN (0.20 mmol, 0.01 g) dissolved in the minimum quantity of H₂O to **L1** (0.10 mmol, 0.06 g) in 5 mL of a MeOH yielded to a bright green solution, which was stirred for three hours then filtered. Green rectangular crystals suitable for single crystal X-ray diffraction analysis were obtained by slow diffusion of Et₂O. Selected IR (KBr pellet, cm⁻¹): 3245 (w), 2879 (w), 2277 (m), 1435 (m), 1057 (vs), 790 (w), 753 (m), 697 (w), 620 (vs), 580 (w). Yield = 36%. UV-Vis (λ in nm / ε in M⁻¹cm⁻¹): 458/228.90, 478/221.42, 602/172.25, 707/59.24.

Synthesis of [Co^{II}₂(L1)(N₃)](N₃)·(ClO₄)₂·H₂O (3**).** The slow addition of Co(ClO₄)₂·6H₂O (0.20 mmol, 0.07 g) in 5 mL of CH₃CN and NaN₃ (0.20 mmol, 0.01 g) dissolved in the minimum quantity of H₂O to **L1** (0.10 mmol, 0.06 g) in 5 mL of MeOH yielded to a green solution, which was stirred for three hours then filtered. Green needles suitable for single crystal X-ray diffraction analysis were obtained by slow diffusion of Et₂O. Selected IR (KBr pellet, cm⁻¹): 3591 (br), 3250 (w), 2882 (w), 2193 (vs), 2024(vs), 1436 (m), 1061 (vs), 794 (m), 755 (m), 700 (vs), 621 (s). Yield = 65%. UV-Vis (λ in nm / ε in M⁻¹cm⁻¹): 461/187.42, 477/177.34, 602/290.19, 696/65.49.

Synthesis of [Co^{II}₂(L1)(Cl)](ClO₄)₃·MeOH (4**).** This complex was obtained following a modified procedure from the literature.²⁷ The slow addition of Co(ClO₄)₂·6H₂O (0.20 mmol,

0.07 g) and (*n*-Bu)₄NCl (0.20 mmol, 0.05 g) in 7 mL of CH₃CN to **L1** (0.10 mmol, 0.06 g) in 2 mL of MeOH yielded a purple solution with purple powder, which was stirred for three hours then filtered. The powder was re-dissolved in CH₃CN and purple rhombic crystals suitable for single crystal X-ray measurements were obtained by slow diffusion of Et₂O. The complex obtained in this work contains different solvent molecules within the lattice than those reported in the literature. Selected IR (KBr pellet, cm⁻¹): 3512 (br), 3264 (w), 2946 (br), 1472 (w), 1438 (w), 1284 (w), 1164 (w), 1052 (vs), 1019 (vs), 923 (m), 889 (m), 809 (m), 763 (m), 708 (w), 621 (vs). Yield = 32%. UV-Vis (λ in nm / ε in M⁻¹cm⁻¹): 510/112.07, 609/161.74, 680/54.12, 796/26.75.

Synthesis of [Co^{II}₂(L1)(Br)](ClO₄)₃·MeOH (5**).** The slow addition of Co(ClO₄)₂·6H₂O (0.20 mmol, 0.07 g) and (*n*-Bu)₄NBr (0.20 mmol, 0.06 g) in 7 mL of CH₃CN to **L1** (0.10 mmol, 0.06 g) in 2 mL of MeOH yielded a purple solution with purple powder, which was stirred for three hours then filtered. The powder was re-dissolved in CH₃CN and purple rhombic crystals suitable for single crystal X-ray measurements were obtained by slow diffusion of Et₂O. Selected IR (KBr pellet, cm⁻¹): 3585 (br), 3248 (br), 2876 (br), 1634 (s), 1453 (m), 1342 (m), 1074 (vs), 801 (s), 756 (s), 700 (s), 621 (s). Yield = 12%. UV-Vis (λ in nm / ε in M⁻¹cm⁻¹): 480/132.56, 606/173.40, 685/126.54, 775/30.13.

Synthesis of [Co^{II}₂(L1)(MeCO₃)](Co^{II}(NCS)₄)ClO₄·CH₃CN (6**).** The slow addition of Co(ClO₄)₂·6H₂O (0.20 mmol, 0.07 g) and (*n*-Bu)₄NCSN (0.20 mmol, 0.06 g) in 5 mL of CH₃CN to **L1** (0.10 mmol, 0.06 g) in 5 mL of MeOH yielded a bright blue solution, which was stirred for three hours then filtered. After 2 days blue rectangular crystals suitable for single crystal X-ray measurements were obtained by slow diffusion of Et₂O. Selected IR (KBr pellet, cm⁻¹): 3192 (br), 2877 (br), 2061 (vs), 1629 (s), 1456 (m), 1343 (m), 1201 (w), 1073 (m), 800 (m), 757 (m), 701 (m), 622(m), 568 (br). Yield = 12%.

Magnetic Measurements. The variable temperature magnetic susceptibility measurements were obtained using a Quantum Design SQUID MPMS-XL7 magnetometer operating between 1.8 and 300 K and applied dc fields of -7 to 7 T. The analyses were performed on polycrystalline samples of 20.0, 21.9, 9.0, 21.5 and 7.8 mg of compounds **1-5**, respectively, wrapped in a polyethylene membrane. Diamagnetic corrections were applied for the sample holder and the core diamagnetism from the sample (estimated with Pascal constants).

X-ray Diffraction. Single yellow needles (**L1**), dark green rectangular (**1-2**), purple rhombic (**3-4**) and blue rectangular (**5-6**) crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction measurements were mounted on a glass fiber. Unit cell measurements and intensity data collections were performed on a Bruker-AXS SMART 1 k CCD diffractometer using graphite monochromatized Mo Kα radiation (λ = 0.71073 Å). The data reduction included a correction for Lorentz and polarization effects, with an applied multi-scan absorption correction (SADABS). The crystal data and refinement parameters for **1-5** are listed in Table 1 and for **L1** and **6** in Table S1. Selected interatomic distances and angles for complexes **1-5** are listed in Table S2. The crystal structures are solved and refined using the SHELXTL package.²⁸ All hydrogen atom positions are calculated geometrically and are riding on their respective atoms.

Computational Details. Magnetic coupling constant calculations for all these five complexes have been performed using Gaussian 09 suit of programmes²⁹ on the X-ray structures. We have employed Noodleman's broken symmetry³⁰ approach along with B3LYP³¹ functional. All the atoms are described by

Table 1. Crystallographic data for complexes 1-5.

	1	2	3	4	5
Formula	C ₄₀ H ₆₅ Cl ₃ Co ₂ N ₈ O ₁₆	C ₃₉ H ₅₆ Cl ₃ Co ₂ N ₁₀ O ₁₃	C ₃₆ H ₅₆ Cl ₂ Co ₂ N ₁₄ O ₉	C ₃₇ H ₅₈ Cl ₄ Co ₂ N ₈ O ₁₃	C ₃₇ H ₅₈ BrCl ₃ Co ₂ N ₈ O ₁₃
Fw	1138.21	1097.15	1017.70	1082.57	1127.02
Crystal System	Triclinic	Monoclinic	Orthorhombic	Orthorhombic	Orthorhombic
Space Group	P-1	C2/c	Pnma	Ama2	Ama2
<i>a</i> /Å	11.8993(4)	39.4302(15)	8.9461(4)	24.1438(5)	24.3318(7)
<i>b</i> /Å	12.1898(5)	9.1554(4)	29.4146(9)	17.6734(3)	17.6327(5)
<i>c</i> /Å	18.1111(6)	30.0283(12)	18.0171(7)	10.6296(2)	10.6002(3)
<i>α</i> /°	101.540(2)	90	90	90	90
<i>β</i> /°	100.071(2)	115.497(2)	90	90	90
<i>γ</i> /°	94.943(2)	90	90	90	90
Vol./ Å ³	2514.19(16)	9784.5(7)	4741.1(3)	4532.68(15)	4547.9(2)
Z	2	8	4	4	4
ρ_{calcd} , g.cm ⁻³	1.503	1.490	1.426	1.585	1.646
μ (Mo, K α), mm ⁻¹	0.893	0.912	0.877	1.038	1.885
F (000)	1188	4552	2120	2248	2320
Measd/indep	26583/10116	66119/9912	31955/4081	34331/5604	36867/5719
R1(I > 2 σ (I))	0.0782	0.0789	0.1132	0.0564	0.0584
wR2 (I > 2 σ (I))	0.1970	0.1862	0.2940	0.1602	0.1638
GOF on F ²	1.039	1.015	1.121	0.886	0.957
CCDC numbers	CCDC 991207	CCDC 991208	CCDC 991209	CCDC 991210	CCDC991211

$$R1 = \frac{\sum ||F_o| - |F_c||}{\sum |F_o|}; wR2 = \left\{ \frac{\sum w[(F_o)^2 - (F_c)^2]^2}{\sum w(F_o)^2} \right\}^{1/2}$$

Ahlrichs-TZV³² basis set, except the Br atom. The Br atom is treated by an ECP SDD³³ basis set.

This methodology has a proven track record of yielding good numerical estimate of exchange constants.³⁴ The *g*-tensors and the zero-field splitting (ZFS) parameters are computed using *ab initio* N-electron valence perturbation theory NEVPT2 method as implemented in ORCA software suit.³⁵ The *ab initio* calculations generally yield superior estimate of anisotropy compared to density functional theory (DFT) approaches as it has been shown recently.³⁶ State-average complete active space self-consistent field methods (CASSCF) calculations were performed for each Co(II) ions individually (the other Co(II) in the dinuclear complex is modelled as a Zn(II) ion) incorporating the five *d*-orbitals and seven electrons in the active space (CAS (7,5) setup). Calculations were carried out with ten quartet and forty doublet excited states in our calculations.^{36f} Here we have employed def2-TZVPP basis set for Co(II) and def2-TZVP basis set for the Zn, Br, O and N. For C and H we have used def2-SVP basis set for the ZFS calculations.³⁷ The calculations utilized the RI approximation with the auxiliary def2-SVP/C and def2-SV/C Coulomb fitting basis sets and the chain-of spheres (RIJCOSX) approximation to exact exchange as implemented in ORCA. The employed methodology has been used earlier to obtain accurate estimations of the ZFS parameters.^{36f, 38} To treat the dynamic correlations, N-electron valence perturbation theory (NEVPT2) calculations³⁹ on SA-CASSCF converged wave functions were performed. Since the NEVPT2 correlated energies are found to be more accurate towards the estimation of ZFS parameters,^{36b, 38a-d, 38g} here we restricted our analysis to NEVPT2 results. The reported *g*-tensors are also computed using the same methodology.

IR, UV-Vis, NMR and EPR Spectroscopy. Infrared analyses were performed using a Nicolet Nexus 6700 FT-IR spectrometer in the 4000-600 cm⁻¹ range. UV-Vis spectra were collected on a Shimadzu UV-3100S spectrophotometer in CH₃CN. NMR analyses were conducted on a Bruker Advance 400 spectrometer equipped with an automatic sample holder and a 5 mm auto tuning broadband probe with Z gradient. EPR measurements were carried out on polycrystalline samples with a JEOL JES-RES 3X equipment at 300 K and in 15 x 10⁻⁴ M CH₃CN solutions at 77 K.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Synthesis. The synthesis of complexes 1-5 requires 50% excess of the corresponding bridging ligand salt in order to obtain adequate crystals for X-ray measurements. For complex 3, this excess leads to two different kinds of azide anions: one acting as a bridge between the metal centres, while the other acts as a counter ion of the azacryptand complex.




Figure 1. Molecular structure of compound 6 highlighting the [Co(NCS)₄]²⁻ complex. Colour code: purple (Co), blue (N), red (O), grey (C), yellow (S). Other counter ions and solvent molecules have been omitted for clarity.

In a similar way, an excess of the thiocyanate salt, leads to the formation of complex **6** shown in Figure 1, which consists of a cationic azacryptand dinuclear Co(II) complex linked by a methylcarbonate bridge and a $[\text{Co}(\text{NCS})_4]^{2-}$ anionic complex. Harding *et al.* have previously reported dinuclear Cu(II) and Ni(II) compounds with a methylcarbonate ion linking the metallic centers and ClO_4^- as counter ions.⁴⁰ It has been proposed that methylcarbonate complexes are obtained in a basic reaction medium by coordination and deprotonation of a water molecule to get a Metal-OH complex, which attacks the electrophilic C atom from an atmospheric CO_2 to form a bicarbonate complex. A subsequent nucleophilic attack from a MeOH solvent molecule and finally a methanolysis reaction leads to the final compound.⁴¹ In compound **6**, the positive charges of the three Co(II) ions are balanced by the methylcarbonate bridge, four SCN^- ions and finally $\text{ClO}_4^-/\text{SCN}^-$ ions in 50/50% occupancy. For the $[\text{Co}(\text{SCN})_4]^{2-}$ complex the Co-N average bond distance is 1.940 Å, the N-Co-N angles vary from 106.12-114.80° and the maximum deviation from linearity in the SCN^- groups is 2.25°, which is indicative of slight distortions from tetrahedral geometry. The $[\text{Co}(\text{NCS})_4]^{2-}$ anionic complex interacts with the cationic azacryptand complex by N-H...S hydrogen bonds at an average distance of 2.82 Å, so the closest intermolecular Co...Co distance is 5.90 Å. Despite adding stoichiometric quantities of the thiocyanate salt and changing the reaction conditions, a complex containing a thiocyanate bridge could not be obtained; however, it is possible to obtain complex **2** by using an isocyanate bridge and **3** by using an azide bridge (Figure 2). This can be explained by the principle of hard and soft acids and bases (HSAB), according to which the borderline acid Co(II) has a tendency to coordinate with hard bases containing highly electronegative O or N donor atoms instead of the soft polarizable bases containing S.⁴² Lu *et al.* have reported similar molecular recognition for halogen bridges in which the azacryptand ligand shows affinity towards Cl^- and Br^- ions, but not F^- and I^- ions because of the size matching in the cavity.²⁷ With these antecedents, the molecular recognition of the azacryptand ligand for transition metals was verified by attempting to use lanthanide ions, which led to the crystallization of the azacryptand as it was described in the synthesis part (Figure S1).

Structural Analysis. The crystallographic and structural refinement data are presented in Table 1 for compounds **1-5** and in the Supporting information for **L1** and **6** (Table S1). Selected bond lengths and bond angles for all compounds are presented in Table S2. Since the structural properties of **6** are different from the other five complexes, a direct comparison cannot be achieved; therefore, structural, electronic and magnetic analyses were done for **1-5** only. Figure 2 shows the X-ray structures of **1-5**, which are dinuclear systems formed by two Co(II) ions coordinated to the N amine atoms of the azacryptand molecule and linked *via* OAc^- (**1**), OCN^- (**2**), N_3^- (**3**), Cl^- (**4**) or Br^- (**5**) ions. Each penta-coordinated Co(II) ion can be described using the parameter τ , which for a perfect square pyramidal geometry (SP) is equal to zero, while for a perfect trigonal-bipyramidal geometry (TBP) it is equal to 1.⁴³ The τ factors for Co(1)/Co(2) are 0.83/0.65 in **1**, 0.94/0.95 in **2**, 0.85 in **3**, 1.00 in **4** and 0.99 in **5**, indicating geometries very close to the perfect TBP for short and rigid bridges such as OCN^- , Cl^- and Br^- . This occurs when the two azacryptand tertiary amines, the bridging ligand and the two Co(II) ions are almost collinear. As shown in Figure 2, the rigidity of the azacryptand leads to unusual bridging modes. In the case of compound **1**, the bridging mode can be described as *anti-anti*, which is rarely observed. Most of the complexes containing acetate bridges display the mode *syn-syn* or, in very few cases, *syn-anti*;⁴⁴ however the linear position of the OAc^- with the metal ions in compound **1** is the first to be observed so far for cobalt compounds.




Figure 2. Molecular structures of complexes **1-5** showing the different bridging ligands. Counter ions, hydrogen atoms and solvent molecules are omitted for clarity. Colour code: purple (Co), blue (N), grey (C), red (O), light green (Cl), dark green (Br).

Linearity can also be found for the triatomic linear bridges in compounds **2** and **3**, which usually present a *syn* bridging mode.⁴⁵⁻⁴⁶ A similar compound to **2** containing ClO_4^- as counter ion instead N_3^- has been reported, the difference in the counter ion changes its properties as is shown below.⁴⁷ Regarding compounds **4** and **5**, a linear geometry of the halogen bridge with the metallic centres occurs more frequently; however magnetic studies on these complexes are very limited.⁴⁸ Careful inspection of the azacryptand conformation in this series of complexes show the ability of the host to optimize the size of the cavity, in order to match the size and shape of the guest ion. The more the guest is sterically demanding and/or has an anisotropic shape, the more the host should allow a large void for accommodating the bridging ion connecting two metal centres. This flexibility is possible because torsion angles around each secondary amine group can be modified through N inversion, affording more or less short arms in each tripodal moiety of the azacryptand. As a consequence, relative benzene planes orientations in the host are related to the nature of the bridging anion. The shortest separation between aromatic rings in symmetry-related molecules is observed at 4.69 Å, with an angle of 54.7° between mean planes of involved rings for. For these interacting rings, the shortest centroid to plane distance is 3.82 Å in **5**, but the same tendency is observed for **4** (Figure S2b). For **1-3** parallel-displaced π - π interactions are favoured with closest centroid-centroid distances of 5.407 Å and centroid-plane distances of 3.36 Å. (Figure S2a).

For all compounds there are significant interactions between the bridging ligands and the phenyl rings with distances that are shorter than the sum of the Van der Waals radii (3.40 Å for C-C, 3.22 Å for C-O and 3.25 Å for C-N, Cl-C 3.45 Å, Br-C 3.55 Å). These interactions are stronger for compounds **4** and **5** with average distances of 3.34 Å for $\text{Cl}^- \cdots \text{C}$ in **4** and $\text{Br}^- \cdots \text{C}$ in **5**. According to our calculations the non-covalent interactions for these molecules can be considered weak; therefore we conclude that bridge- π interactions are responsible of the molecular arrangement. In order to establish some magneto-structural correlations the Co(1)-Co(2)/Co(1') intermetallic distances (R), the Co(1)-X-Co(2)/Co(1') Φ angles (where X = central bridging atom) and the

ratio of the distance from the metal ion to the heteroatom in the bridging ligand (R1) and the Φ angles were obtained (Table 2).

Electronic Structure Analysis. The electronic structure analysis of **1-5** was carried out using IR and UV-Vis spectroscopy. The IR spectra were used to corroborate the formation of the desired compounds through the identification of the characteristic azacryptand, bridging ligands, counter ions and solvents peaks (Figure S3).⁴⁹ Force constants (k) calculations based on a harmonic oscillator approximation were done for **L1** and for compounds **1-5** (Table S3). In general, higher values of k are indicative of stronger bonds,⁵⁰ k values for the $\nu(\text{C-H})_{\text{st}}$ and $\nu(\text{C-H})_{\delta}$ vibration frequencies are higher for compounds **4** and **5** compared to compounds **1-3**. Therefore we conclude that the halogens bridges are acting as electronic density donors as opposed to electron density withdrawing, which is in agreement with the DFT calculations previously reported for azacryptand compounds with halogen bridges.²⁷ UV-Vis spectra in CH_3CN of **1-5** (Figure 3) can be divided into two groups since compounds **4** and **5** exhibit an additional peak (Figure 3, signal i). For high spin Co(II) ions in a TBP field three bands are expected in the visible region around 770 nm, 550 nm and 475 nm for ${}^4\text{A}'_2({}^4\text{F}) \rightarrow {}^4\text{E}'({}^4\text{F})$, ${}^4\text{A}'_2({}^4\text{F}) \rightarrow {}^4\text{E}''({}^4\text{P})$ and ${}^4\text{A}'_2({}^4\text{F}) \rightarrow {}^4\text{A}'_2({}^4\text{P})$ transitions, respectively.⁵¹ These bands are assigned in **4** and **5** to signals f-i and in **1-3** to signals a-d. The transition ${}^4\text{A}'_2({}^4\text{F}) \rightarrow {}^4\text{E}'({}^4\text{F})$ is shifted to higher energies for **2** and disappears for **1** and **3** due their distortions from the TBP geometries, as it is indicated by their τ factors. A Gaussians curve analysis was done for each spectrum and the molar absorption coefficient (ε) was calculated for the components of the spectra (Table S4). The ε values indicate that the signals at the lowest energy (Figure 3, signals e and j) can be assigned to ${}^4\text{A}'_2({}^4\text{F}) \rightarrow {}^2\text{E}''({}^4\text{F})$ spin-forbidden transitions.⁵¹





Figure 3. UV-Vis spectra of **1-3** (left) and **4-5** (right).

The shifting of the bands in **4-5** can be discussed based on the reported spectrochemical series,⁵²⁻⁵³ where the order of the increasing energy of transitions must be as follows



This order is clearly observed in the transition energies for **1-5**. For **1** and **3** the band energies are very similar indicating that the ligand field strengths for OAc^- and N_3^- are very close. The nephelauxetic effect is also observed in the spectra of **4** and **5**, where the increase of the metal-ligand covalent character associated with the soft halogen donors result in the reduction of the inter-electron repulsions and reduction of the gap energy as it is evidenced by the shifting of the transitions to lower energies.⁵³⁻⁵⁵

Magnetic Measurements. The magnetic properties for all five compounds were measured as polycrystalline samples. Direct current (dc) magnetic susceptibility measurements were performed in the 1.8-300 K temperature range under an applied magnetic field of 1000 Oe. The g -tensor and the $2J$ values were computed based on the experimental structures with coordinates directly taken from the X-ray diffraction experiments. Table 2

summarizes the computed and experimental $2J$ and g values, the fitting data and other important structural parameters.

The plots of the temperature dependence of the χT product for all five compounds are shown in Figure 4. Two sets of curves are observed: set I includes triatomic bridge compounds **1-3**, while set II comprises monoatomic bridge compounds **4-5**. For set I the χT product decreases slowly from 300 K to 40 K, then rapidly until 2 K, where the minimum χT values are reached. For set II there is a rapid decreasing of the χT product at higher temperatures indicating antiferromagnetic exchange interactions.⁵⁶ Room temperature χT values for set I are higher than the expected spin only value of $3.76 \text{ cm}^3\text{Kmol}^{-1}$ for two non-interacting high-spin Co(II) (Table 2). Such higher values are often observed in Co(II) systems due to their unquenched first order orbital angular momentum leading to significant spin-orbit coupling contribution.⁵¹




Figure 4. Temperatures dependence of χT product for complexes **1-5**. Solid line represents the fitting for **4-5** (see text).

For set II the χT values at room temperature for **4** and **5** are 3.29 and $3.13 \text{ cm}^3\text{Kmol}^{-1}$, respectively, which are close to the spin only value of $3.76 \text{ cm}^3\text{Kmol}^{-1}$. Sakiyama *et al.*⁵¹ found that under a pure D_{3h} symmetry, the ground ${}^4\text{A}'_2$ term does not have an orbital angular momentum, rendering the spin-only treatment possible. Based on the structural study **4** and **5** have near perfect trigonal-bipyramidal geometry (TBP) (*vide supra*), although all coordinated atoms are not identical which leads to C_{3v} symmetry, however, for simplification of the fitting we assume it has an idealized D_{3h} symmetry for these two complexes. Then the isotropic spin Heisenberg Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = -2J\hat{S}_1\hat{S}_2$ can be used to describe the interaction between the nearest neighbours. The magnetic susceptibility data were fitted for two $S_1 = S_2 = 3/2$ sites (*eq. 1*) and a temperature-independent paramagnetic (TIP) term was included.⁵⁷ To provide accurate D values, computational methods will be employed using the C_{3v} symmetry (*vide infra*)

$$\chi = \left[\frac{N\mu_B^2 g^2 S(S+1)}{3k_B T} \right] \left[\frac{2e^{2J/k_B T} + 10e^{6J/k_B T} + 28e^{12J/k_B T}}{1 + 3e^{2J/k_B T} + 5e^{6J/k_B T} + 7e^{12J/k_B T}} \right] + \text{TIP} \quad (1)$$

For **1-3**, the structures are significantly distorted from the D_{3h} symmetry, then the mixture of the ${}^4\text{E}''$ term may bring the orbital momentum into the ground term.⁵¹ Since the magnetic behaviour is strongly affected by the orbital momentum of a ground term, it is necessary to add the zero field splitting contribution to the Hamiltonian, this will be implemented in the computational study for **1-3** (*vide infra*). Figure 4 shows the fitting for **4-5** as solid lines and the fitting data are shown in Table 2. Experimental

powder measurements at 300 K and 77 K are EPR silent, consistent with an integer spin ground state coming from the interaction of two high-spin Co(II) ions.⁵⁸ However experiments of **1-5** in frozen glass of CH₃CN solutions at 77 K reduce the spin-lattice relaxation times and the spin-spin intermolecular interactions

showing broad signals with average g values (Figure S4), which are in good agreement with the computed values.⁵⁸

Table 2. Magnetic, structural and computed data for complexes **1-5**

Complex	$\chi T_{300\text{K}}$ cm ³ K/mol	$\chi T_{77\text{K}}$ cm ³ K/mol	μ_{eff} μ_{B}	$^a 2J$ cm ⁻¹	$^a g_{zz}$	$^a D$ cm ⁻¹	$^a g_{\text{avg}}$	$^a E/D$ cm ⁻¹	$^b 2J$ cm ⁻¹	$^b g_{zz}$	$^c g_{\text{avg}}$	$^b \text{TIP}$ cm ⁻¹ x 10 ⁻²	R (Å)	Φ (°)	$\Phi/R1$ (°/Å)	J_{SE} cm ⁻¹	$^a J_{\text{Model}}$ cm ⁻¹
1	5.01	0.30	6.33	-5.3	2.26 (2.38, 2.48)	-15.9, -25.3	2.25, 2.29	0.20, 0.32			2.19		6.03	158.31	81.26	-0.34	-0.11
2	4.70	1.58	6.13	-1.9	2.21 (2.26, 2.26)	3.6, 3.6	2.23, 2.08	0.31, 0.31			2.17		6.33	177.25	89.25	-0.10	-0.06
3	4.71	0.33	6.14	-5.8	2.25 (2.28, 2.28)	7.4, 7.4	2.22, 2.22	0.13, 0.13			2.20		6.25	176.93	88.99	-0.36	-0.11
4	3.29	0.04	5.12	-54.2	2.19 (2.77, 2.77)	---	2.19, ---	---	-58.02	2.15	2.41	5.7	4.89	179.65	75.99	-2.57	-2.5
5	3.13	0.03	5.00	-75.8	2.17 (2.24, 2.24)	3.39	2.22, 2.22	0.16	-71.46	2.19	2.23	6.3	4.73	179.06	73.29	-3.22	-3.0

^a Computed Data ^b Fitting Data ^c Experimental Data

Hatfield and Hodgson deduced a linear correlation between the J values and Φ bridging angles for isotropic Cu(II) oxo-bridged systems.⁵⁹ For **1-5** magneto-structural correlations are difficult to establish due to the spin-orbit coupling contribution seen in **1-3**. To find if the magnetic interactions showed some dependence on the structural data the $2J$ computed values obtained from the computational studies were plotted vs. the Co(II)-X-Co(II) Φ angles (X = bridging ligand) and the metal-metal R distances (Figure 5). The $2J$ vs. Φ plot does not show a clear correlation; but the plot of $2J$ vs. R shows an inverse dependence.




Figure 5. Plots of $2J$ vs. Φ angles (left) and $2J$ vs. R distances (right) showing the magneto-structural correlations.

In order to understand the origin of this dependence, theoretical studies were performed showing that the superexchange pathway *via* the bridge is the dominant interaction. Moriya proposed that when spin-orbit coupling effects are included in the superexchange formalism, the anisotropic superexchange can be approximated by $J_{\text{SE}} = J(\Delta g/2)$ (where Δg represents the deviation in the gyromagnetic ratio from the free-electron value of two).⁶⁰ The approximated anisotropic superexchange contribution for **1-5** calculated from the computed J and g values through this formula showed that the superexchange mechanism is less significant as the Φ angles become smaller leading to smaller J_{AF} values (Table 2). Therefore, the J_{AF} contribution is given by the superexchange mechanism and the J_{F} by the direct mechanism. Some other magneto-structural correlations have been established for Cu(II) dinuclear systems compounds by normalizing the Φ angles from the metal-heteroatom distance in the bridging ligand (R1) and plotting the computed $2J$ values vs. the $\Phi/R1$ ratio.⁶¹⁻⁶² This plot for **1-5** is

shown in Figure S5 and exhibits a similar trend as Figure 5 with a maximum value of $\Phi/R1 = 89.25$ for **2**, which shows the smallest antiferromagnetic $2J$ value. Below this ratio the increase of the antiferromagnetic coupling constant follows the decrease of the $\Phi/R1$ ratio.

Magnetization measurements were carried out at 1.8 K and 5 K for all five compounds. The M_{mol} vs. H plots are shown in Figure S6. For **2** and **3** there is a linear behaviour of M_{mol} with respect to H ; while for **1**, **4** and **5** there is a rapid increase followed by a gradual increase towards a near saturation at $H = 7$ T and $T = 1.8$ K can be observed. The saturation values for **1**, **4** and **5** are 5.35, 0.06 and 0.06 $N\beta$ units respectively. These values are much lower than the theoretical limit $M = g_{\text{iso}}S_{\text{max}} = 8.1 N\beta$. Such difference can be attributed to the AF coupling for **4** and **5** and to a combination of AF coupling and population of low lying excited states even at low temperatures in **1**.⁶³ Alternating current (*ac*) susceptibility measurements were carried out under an oscillating field of 3 Oe, in the absence of an applied dc field as well as under an applied field of 1000 Oe, and frequencies ranging from 0.1-1500 Hz in a range of 2-15 K. No signal was observed in the out-of-phase susceptibility *versus* temperature plot. Absence of *ac* signal simply precludes any magnet-like behaviour for these dinuclear complexes.

Theoretical Studies: In order to probe the effect of different bridging groups on the magnetic coupling constants between two Co(II) metallic centres, we have performed computational studies and results are summarized in Table 2. In all five complexes magnetic interaction is found to be antiferromagnetic in nature as expected for the linear Co-L-Co arrangement. The computed $2J$ values for **4** and **5** correlate with the experimental estimates and also reproduce the experimental χT vs. T behaviour (see Figure S7). Weak antiferromagnetic exchange for complexes **1-3** and strong antiferromagnetic exchange for complexes **4-5** are observed and this is due to the fact that the super-exchange interactions are mediated through three linker atoms in complexes **1-3** while in complexes **4** and **5**, they are mediated *via* one linker atom.

In complexes **1-5**, there are three exchange pathways: (i) direct exchange through space (ii) superexchange *via* the ligand moiety (iii) superexchange *via* the anionic linker groups. To understand the origin of the interactions further, calculations were done on

fictitious model complexes by removing the anionic linker atoms (see Table 2). The obtained $2J_{\text{model}}$ values are weak and are anti-ferromagnetic in nature. This clearly suggests that the dominant contributions to J 's arise from the anionic linker atoms.

Our orbital analysis reveals three interactions between two Co(II) centres namely $d_{xy}p_x|d_{xy}$, $d_{x^2-y^2}p_x|d_{x^2-y^2}$ and $d_z^2|p_z|d_z^2$. Among these three interactions, the interaction via the d_z^2 orbital is found to be significant in all complexes and the computed overlap integral correlates with the magnitude of the J values (see Figure 6, Figure S8 and Table S5). As d_{xy} and $d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbitals are perpendicular to the bridging moiety, their contributions to super-exchange mediating through the anion linker are minimal. For complexes 1-3, the frontier molecular orbitals which interact with the magnetic orbitals of Co(II) are π in character and are in fact perpendicular to the d_z^2 orbital leading to weak overlap and very small J values (see Figure S9).




Figure 6. Molecular orbitals showing dominant $d_z^2|p_z|d_z^2$ interactions between the two metallic centers in complex 5.

In complexes 4 and 5 on the other hand the valence s/p_z orbital significantly interacts with the magnetic d_z^2 orbital, leading to stronger interactions (see Figure 6). Between complexes 4 and 5, the larger and more diffuse $5s/4p_z$ orbital of Br overlaps more efficiently than the $4s/3p_z$ orbital of Cl atom leading to larger $2J$ values for complex 5 (see Figure S8 of SI). Stronger delocalization is also evident from the spin density plots, where the following order based on computed spin density on the bridging atoms are found: $5>4>3\sim 1>2$. This order corresponds to that of the $2J$ values revealing a direct correlation between the spin density at the bridging group and the J values (see Figure S9 in SI). We have calculated intermolecular magnetic coupling constant for complex 2 (using B97D/TZV). The interactions were estimated to have a value of -0.07 cm^{-1} (note the π - π stacking distances here are 3.8 \AA). At this stacking distance, we expect the magnetic coupling to be very weak.⁶⁴

Although anisotropy calculations on Co(II) complexes with different coordination spheres have been reported earlier^{36d,36f,65}, most of the reported Co(II) complexes possess either tetrahedral or octahedral structures. We have calculated the zero-field splitting parameters of complexes 1-3 using ORCA software suite.³⁵ Although the magnitudes of the computed D values agree well with the experiments in all three cases, the sign of D differs in complex 1. To further validate the sign of computed D for complex 1, we have analyzed the susceptibility data and our simulations reveal that it can be fit equally well using both positive and negative D values (see Figure S10). This highlights the challenge in obtaining the sign of D from experimental susceptibility data.

The computed ground state electronic configuration for the trigonal bipyramidal Co(II) is found to be $(d_{yz})^2, (d_{xy})^2, (d_{xz})^1, (d_{x^2-y^2})^1$ and $(d_z^2)^1$. The computed orbital energy levels for complexes

1-3 are shown in Figure 7. Ideal TBP Co(II) complexes are expected to have two degenerate sets of orbitals: d_{yz}, d_{xz} and $d_{xy}, d_{x^2-y^2}$, and are predicted to yield positive D values.^{38e} In complexes 1-3, significant distortion from ideal TBP structure is detected and SHAPE analysis⁶⁶ reveals that the deviations are 1.97 for complex 1, 0.54 for complex 2 and 0.82 for complex 3. In all three complexes, the expected orbital degeneracy for the TBP structure is lifted and deviation from ideal TBP structure is correlated to the magnitude of the D values. For complex 1, the possible contributions to D arise from spin-conserved transitions $d_{xy} \rightarrow d_{x^2-y^2}$, $d_{yz} \rightarrow d_{xz}, d_{yz} \rightarrow d_{x^2-y^2}$ and $d_{xy} \rightarrow d_{xz}, d_z^2$. Here, the first two transitions yield to negative contributions to D (transitions between same m_l levels) while the other three transitions contribute positively to D . For complex 1, the largest contribution arises from the $d_{xy} \rightarrow d_{x^2-y^2}$ transition as the orbitals are very close in energy. The energy of the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbital is destabilized in complexes 2 and 3 and significantly reduces the negative D contributions in these complexes leading to overall positive D values (see Table S6 of SI). These transition energies can also be correlated to the experimental absorption spectra discussed earlier. In addition to these complexes, we have also performed calculations on complex 5 where D is expected to be smaller as the structure is very close to perfect TBP. Calculation yield to a D value of 3.39 cm^{-1} which is similar to that computed for complex 2 which is also closer to the TBP structure.




Figure 7. Computed d -orbitals splitting for complexes 1-3.

CONCLUSIONS

Magnetic coupling mediated by a molecular bridge represents one of the fundamental processes that must be considered in the design of new molecular magnetic materials. Thus far, few examples of anisotropic systems allowing the study of the effects of different bridges on the magnetic interactions between metal centres exist. This work shows that structures with geometries very close to perfect TBP have small D values, while the distortion of the C_{3v} symmetry brings significant spin-orbit coupling effects and a significant contribution from the direct exchange mechanism. This difference can be observed in the spatial, electronic and magnetic characterization of the compounds, as well as in computational studies. Plots of computed $2J$ values vs R and vs $\Phi/R1$ showed that $2J$ values for 1-5 depend on the R distances and the ratio $\Phi/R1 = 89.25 \text{ }^\circ/\text{\AA}$ can be established as the limit value for the smallest antiferromagnetic interaction coupling for this series of dinuclear azacryptand compounds. Our theoretical

study provides a clear picture in the nature of the exchange interactions but also provides the origin of the magnetic anisotropy in compounds **1-3**. More experimental and theoretical work is necessary to further our understanding in terms of controlling the exchange interactions in anisotropic systems and efforts are in progress towards that goal.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

Crystallographic data for complexes **L1** and **6** (Table S1), Selected bond distances and bond angles for **1-5** (Table S2), Force constant k calculations for **L1** and complexes **1-5** (Table S3), Wavelengths and molar absorptivities for electronic transitions in **1-5** (Table S4), Overlap integrals calculations for complexes **1-5** (Table S5), Contribution to D from different spin states for **1-3** (Table S6). X-ray structure of Ligand **L1** (Figure S1), Crystal packing of **4** (Figure S2), IR spectra of **L1** and complexes **1-5** (Figure S3), EPR spectra in solution at 77 K for complexes **1-5** (Figure S4), Magneto-Structural Correlations (Figure S5), M vs H plots for **1-6** (Figure S6), DFT fitted χT vs T plots for **1-5** (Figure S7), MOs of **1-3** (Figure S8), Spin density plots for **1-5** (Figure S9), 2-dimensional plots for models **1-5** (Figure S10), X-ray crystallographic information file (CIF) for the structure of ligand **L1** and complexes **1-6** (deposited at the CCDC with deposition numbers CCDC 991207-991213). This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*e-mail: m.murugesu@uottawa.ca Fax: +1(613) 562 5170. Tel: +1(613) 562 5800 ext 2733.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the University of Ottawa, CFI, NSERC DG, Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship, Autonomous University of Puebla projects Y-NAT11-I, Y-NAT12-I, Y-NAT13-I and CONACyT Mexico for financial support. Moshinsky Foundation and Conacyt supported the work in Merida. The CGSTIC (Xiuhcoatil) at Cinvestav is gratefully acknowledged for generous allocation of computational resources. GR would like to thank DST, India for its financial support (DST/INT/AUS/P-47/11) and IITB for computational time. MKS thanks UGC for a fellowship.

REFERENCES

- [1] Delgado, F. S.; Jiménez, C. A.; Lorenzo-Luis, P.; Pasán, J.; Fabelo, O.; Cañadillas-Delgado, L.; Lloret, F.; Julve, M.; Ruiz-Pérez, C. *Cryst. Growth Des.* **2012**, *12*, 599-614.
- [2] Nihei, M.; Okamoto, Y.; Sekine, Y.; Hoshino, N.; Shiga, T.; Po-Chun, I.; Oshio, H. *Angew. Chem.* **2012**, *51*, 6361-6364.
- [3] Nishigaki, J.; Tsunoyama, R.; Tsunoyama, H.; Ichikuni, N.; Yamazoe, S.; Negishi, Y.; Ito, M.; Matsuo, T.; Tamao, K.; Tsukuda, T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 14295-14297.
- [4] a) Francesconi, O.; Ienco, A.; Moneti, G.; Nativi, C.; Roelens, S. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2006**, *45*, 6693-6696; b) Berggren, G.; Adamsaka, A.; Lambert, C.; Simmons, T. R.; Esselborn, J.; Atta, M.; Gambarelli, S.; Mouesca, J. M.; Reijerse, E.; Lubitz, W.; Happe, T.; Artero, V.; Fontecave, M. *Nature* **2013**, *499*, 66-69.
- [5] Aradhya, S. V.; Venkataraman, L. *Nature Nanotech.* **2013**, *8*, 399-410.
- [6] Qiu, J.; Burns P. C. *Chem. Rev.* **2013**, *113*, 1097-1120.
- [7] a) Carlin, R. L. *Magnetochemistry*; Springer-Verlag: Berlin, 1986; b) Anderson, P. W. *Magnetism*; Academic Press: New York, 1963.
- [8] Liu, C.-M.; Gao, S.; Zhang, D.-Q.; Huang, Y.-H.; Xiong, R.-G.; Liu, Z.-L.; Jiang, F.-C.; Zhu, D.-B. *Angew. Chem.* **2004**, *116*, 1008-1012.
- [9] Duan, Z.; Zhang, Y.; Zhang, B.; Zhu, D. *Inorg. Chem.* **2008**, *47*, 9152-9154.
- [10] Duan, Z.; Zhang, Y.; Zhang, B.; Zhu, D. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 6934-6935.
- [11] Kahn, O. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1985**, *24*, 834-850.
- [12] Crawford, W. H.; Richardson, H. W.; Wasson, J. R.; Hodgson, D. J.; Hatfield, W. E. *Inorg. Chem.* **1976**, *15*, 2107-2110.
- [13] Blügel, S.; Bihlmayer, G. *Magnetism of Low-dimensional Systems: Theory. Handbook of Magnetism and Advanced Magnetic Materials*; Wiley: Germany, 2007.
- [14] Gomez-Coca, S.; Cremades, E.; Aliaga-Alcalde, N.; Ruiz, E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 7010-7018.
- [15] Jana, A.; Konar, S.; Das, K.; Ray, S.; Golen, J. A.; Rheingold, A. L.; Carella, L. M.; Rentschler, E.; Modal, T. K.; Kumar, S. K. *Polyhedron* **2012**, *38*, 258-266.
- [16] a) Radon, M.; Srebro, M.; Broclawik, E. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2009**, *5*, 1237; Matsui, T.; b) Kitagawa, Y.; Shigeta, Y.; Okumura, M. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2013**, *9*, 2974-2980.
- [17] a) Lloret, F.; Julve, M.; Cano, J.; Ruiz-García, R.; Pardo, E. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2008**, *361*, 3432-3445; b) Húdká, J.; Boca, R.; Moncol, J.; Titis, J. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2013**, *394*, 401-409; c) Boca, R. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *248*, 757-815.
- [18] McCleverty, J. A.; Ward, M. D. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1998**, *31*, 842-851.
- [19] a) Wang, X.-Y.; Wang, Z.-M.; Gao, S. *Chem. Commun.* **2008**, 281-294; b) Davy, R. D.; Hall, M. B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1989**, *111*, 1268-1275.
- [20] Tozawa, T.; Jones, J.; Swamy, S.; Jiang, S.; Adams, D.; Shakespeare, S.; Clowes, R.; Bradshaw, D.; Hasell, T.; Chong, S.; Tang, C.; Thompson, S.; Parker, J.; Trewin, A.; Bacsá, J.; Slawin, A.; Steiner, A.; Cooper, A. I. *Nature Mater.* **2009**, *8*, 973-978.
- [21] Hasell, T.; James, W.; Jones, T. A.; Bacsá, J.; Steiner, A.; Mitra, T.; Trewin, A.; Adams, D. J.; Cooper, A. I. *Nat. Chem.* **2010**, *2*, 750-755.
- [22] Lu, Q.; Latour, J. M.; Harding, C. J.; Martin, N.; Marrs, D. J.; McKee, V.; Nelson, J. J. *Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1994**, 1471-1478.
- [23] a) Kersting, B. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2001**, *40*, 3987-3990; b) Kitajima, N.; Hikichi, Sh.; Tanaka, M.; Moro-oka, Y. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 5496-5508; c) Rodríguez, M.; Llobet, A.; Corbella, M.; Müller, P.; Usón, M.-A.; Martell, A. E.; Reibenspies, J. J. *Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **2002**, 2900-2901.
- [24] Lehn, J.-M. *Pure Appl. Chem.* **1980**, *52*, 2441-2459.
- [25] a) MacDowell, D.; Nelson, J. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1988**, *3*, 385; b) McKee, V.; Robinson, W. T.; McDowell, D.; Nelson, J. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **1989**, *30*, 7453-7456.
- [26] Dussart, Y.; Harding, Ch.; Dalgaard, P.; McKenzie, Ch.; Kadirvelraj, R.; McKee, V.; Nelson, J. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **2002**, 1704-1713.
- [27] Chen, J. M.; Zhuang, X. M.; Yang, L.-Z.; Jiang, L.; Feng, X. L.; Lu, T.-B. *Inorg. Chem.* **2008**, *47*, 3158-3165.
- [28] Sheldrick, G. M. *Acta Cryst. A* **2008**, *64*, 112-122.
- [29] Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Petersson, G. A.; Nakatsuji, H.; Caricato, M.; Li, X.; Hratchian, H. P.; Izmaylov, A. F.; Bloino, J.; Zheng, G.; Sonnenberg, J. L.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Vreven, T.; Montgomery, J. A.; Peralta, J. E.; Ogliaro, F.; Bearpark, M.; Heyd, J. J.; Brothers, E.; Kudin, K. N.; Staroverov, V. N.; Kobayashi, R.; Normand, J.; Raghavachari, K.; Rendell, A.; Burant, J. C.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Cossi, M.; Rega, N.; Millam, J. M.; Klene, M.; Knox, J. E.; Cross, J. B.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, A.; Cammi, J. R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, J. W.; Martin, R. L.; Morokuma, K.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, A. D.; Farkas, Ö.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.; Cioslowski, J.; Fox, D. J. *Gaussian 09*. 2009.
- [30] Noodleman, L.; Case, D. A.; Aizman, A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1988**, *110* (4), 1001-1005.
- [31] Becke, A. D., *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 5648.

- [32] Schäfer, A.; Horn, H.; Ahlrichs, R., *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *97* (4), 2571-2577.
- [33] Dolg, M.; Wedig, U.; Stoll, H.; Preuss, H., *J. Chem. Phys.* **1987**, *86*, 866.
- [34] (a) McDonald, C.; Sanz, S.; Brechin, E. K.; Singh, M. K.; Rajaraman, G.; Gaynor, D.; Jones, L. F., *RSC Adv.* **2014**, *4* (72), 38182-38191; (b) Berg, N.; Hooper, T. N.; Liu, J.; Beedle, C. C.; Singh, S. K.; Rajaraman, G.; Piligkos, S.; Hill, S.; Brechin, E. K.; Jones, L. F., *Dalton Trans.* **2013**, *42* (1), 207-216; (c) Berg, N.; Rajeshkumar, T.; Taylor, S. M.; Brechin, E. K.; Rajaraman, G.; Jones, L. F., *Chem. Eur. J.* **2012**, *18* (19), 5906-5918; (d) Gass, I. A.; Tewary, S.; Rajaraman, G.; Asadi, M.; Lupton, D. W.; Mobaraki, B.; Chastanet, G.; Létard, J.-F.; Murray, K. S., *Inorg. Chem.* **2014**, *53* (10), 5055-5066; (e) Hazra, S.; Bhattacharya, S.; Singh, M. K.; Carrella, L.; Rentschler, E.; Weyhermueller, T.; Rajaraman, G.; Mohanta, S., *Inorg. Chem.* **2013**, *52* (22), 12881-12892; (f) Piligkos, S.; Weihe, H.; Bill, E.; Neese, F.; El Mkami, H.; Smith, G. M.; Collision, R.; Rajaraman, G.; Timco, G. A.; Winpenny, R. E. P., *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009**, *15* (13), 3152-3167; (g) Upadhyay, A.; Rajpurohit, J.; Kumar Singh, M.; Dubey, R.; Kumar Srivastava, A.; Kumar, A.; Rajaraman, G.; Shanmugam, M., *Chem. Eur. J.* **2014**, *20* (20), 6061-6070; (h) Ruiz, E.; Alvarez, S.; Rodriguez-Fortea, A.; Alemany, P.; Pouillon, Y.; Massobrio, C. In *Magnetism: Molecules to Materials II*; Miller, J. S., Drillon, M., Eds.; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 2001; p 227-280.
- [35] Neese, F., *WIREs Comput. Mol. Sci.* **2012**, *2* (1), 73-78.
- [36] (a) Gatteschi, D.; Sessoli, R.; Villain, J., *Molecular Nanomagnets*. 2006; (b) Atanasov, M.; Comba, P.; Helmle, S.; Müller, D.; Neese, F., *Inorg. Chem.* **2012**, *51* (22), 12324-12335; (c) Singh, S. K.; Rajaraman, G., *Chem. Eur. J.* **2014**, *20* (18), 5214-5218; (d) Vaidya, S.; Upadhyay, A.; Singh, S. K.; Gupta, T.; Tewary, S.; Langley, S. K.; Walsh, J. P. S.; Murray, K. S.; Rajaraman, G.; Shanmugam, M., *Chem. Commun.* **2015** (DOI: 10.1039/C4CC08305A); (e) Petit, S.; Pilet, G.; Luneau, D.; Chibotaru, L.; Ungur, L., *Dalton Trans.* **2007**, 4582; (f) Herchel, R.; Váňovská, L.; Potočník, I.; Trávníček, Z., *Inorg. Chem.* **2014**, *53* (12), 5896-5898; (g) Singh, S. K.; Gupta, T.; Badkur, P.; Rajaraman, G., *Chem. Eur. J.* **2014**, *20* (33), 10305-10313.
- [37] Weigend, F.; Ahlrichs, R., *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2005**, *7*, 3297.
- [38] (a) Cirera, J.; Ruiz, E.; Alvarez, S.; Neese, F.; Kortus, J., *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009**, *15*, 4078-4087; (b) Neese, F., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 10213; (c) Neese, F.; Solomon, E. I., *Inorg. Chem.* **1998**, *37*, 6568; (d) Maganas, D.; Sottini, S.; Kyritsis, P.; Groenen, E. J. J.; Neese, F., *Inorg. Chem.* **2011**, *50*, 8741; (e) Gomez-Coca, S.; Cremades, E.; Aliaga-Alcáde, N.; Ruiz, E., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 7010; (f) Cremades, E.; Ruiz, E., *Inorg. Chem.* **2011**, *50* (9), 4016-4020; (g) Ye, S.; Neese, F., *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2012**, *8* (7), 2344-2351; (h) Maurice, R.; Bastardis, R.; de Graaf, C.; Suaud, N.; Mallah, T.; Guihéry, N., *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2009**, *5*, 2977; (i) Maurice, R.; Graaf, C. d.; Guihéry, N., *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2013**, *15* (43), 18784-18804; (j) Maurice, R.; Vendier, L.; Costes, J.-P., *Inorg. Chem.* **2011**, *50* (21), 11075-11081.
- [39] (a) Angeli, C.; Cimiriaglia, R.; Evangelisti, S.; Leininger, T.; Malrieu, J. P., *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *114*, 10252; (b) Angeli, C.; Cimiriaglia, R.; Malrieu, J. P., *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2001**, *350*, 297; (c) Angeli, C.; Cimiriaglia, R.; Malrieu, J. P., *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *117*, 9138; (d) Angeli, C.; Borini, S.; Cestari, M.; Cimiriaglia, R., *J. Chem. Phys.* **2004**, *121*, 4043.
- [40] Harding, Ch. J.; Lu, Q.; Malone, J. F.; Marrs, D. J.; Martin, N.; McKee, V.; Nelson, J. *J. Chem. Dalton Trans.* **1995**, 1739-1747.
- [41] Kersting, B.; Steinfeld, G. *Inorg. Chem.* **2002**, *41*, 1140-1150.
- [42] a) Pearson, R. G. *J. Chem. Educ.* **1968**, *45*, 581-587; b) Pearson, R. G. *J. Chem. Educ.* **1968**, *45*, 643-648.
- [43] Addison, A. W.; Nageswara, R. *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.* **1984**, 1349-1356.
- [44] a) Kruck, M.; Sauer, D. C.; Enders, M.; Wadepohl, H.; Gade, L. H. *Dalton Trans.* **2011**, *40*, 10406-10415; b) Mishra, V.; Lloret, F.; Mukherjee, R. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2006**, *359*, 4053-4062; c) Langlotz, B. K.; Lloret, J.; Gross, J. H.; Wadepohl, H.; Gade, L. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2008**, *14*, 10267-10279.
- [45] a) Buchler, S.; Meyer, F.; Kaifer, E.; Pritzkow, H. *Inorg. Chimica Acta* **2002**, *337*, 371-386; b) Derossi, S.; Farrell, P. T.; Harding, C. J.; McKee, V.; Nelson, J. *Dalton Trans.* **2007**, 1762-1772; c) Effendy; DiNicola, C.; Fianchini, M.; Pettinari, C.; Skelton, B. W.; Somers, N.; White, A. H. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2005**, *358*, 763-795.
- [46] a) Meyer, F.; Heinze, K.; Nuber, B.; Zsuinai, L. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1998**, 207; b) Fehlhammer, W. P.; Beck, W. Z. *Anorg. Allg. Chem.* **2013**, *639*, 1053.
- [47] Escuer, A.; Harding, Ch. J.; Dussart, Y.; Nelson, J.; McKee, V.; Vicente, R. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1999**, 223-229.
- [48] a) Kember, M. R.; Jutz, F.; Buchard, A.; White, A. J. P.; Williams, C. *Chem. Sci.* **2012**, *3*, 1245-1255; b) Yuan, S.; Bai, S.; Tong, H.; Wei, X.; Liu, D. Sun, W. H. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2011**, *370*, 215-221; c) Meyer, F.; Heinze, K.; Nuber, B.; Zsolnai, L. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1998**, 207-213.
- [49] Nakamoto, K. *Infrared and Raman Spectra of Inorganic and Coordination Compounds*; John Wiley and Sons: New York, 1999.
- [50] Drago, R. *Physical Methods for Chemists*; Saunders College Pub: New York, 1992.
- [51] a) Jamil, Md.; Sakiyama, H. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2002**, *338*, 255-259; b) Sacconi, L.; Ciampolini, M.; Speroni, G. P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1965**, *87*, 3102-3106.
- [52] a) Suh, P. M.; Lee, J.; Han, M. Y.; Yoon, T. S. *Inorg. Chem.* **1997**, *36*, 5651-5654; b) Siluvai, G. S.; Murthy, N. N. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2009**, *362*, 3119-3126.
- [53] Atkins, P. W.; Overton, T. L.; Rourke, J. P.; Weller, M. T.; Armstrong, F. A. *Inorganic Chemistry* Oxford University Press: New York, **2010**.
- [54] Stranger, R.; McMahon, K. L.; Gahan, L. R.; Bruce, J. I.; Hambley, T. W. *Inorg. Chem.* **1997**, *36*, 3466-3475.
- [55] Crawford, W. H.; Richardson, H. W.; Wasson, J. R.; Hodgson, D. J. *Inorg. Chem.* **1976**, *15*, 2107-2110.
- [56] Anderson, P. W. *Magnetism*; Academic Press: New York, 1963.
- [57] Shurtha, E.; Moore, C. E.; Rheingold, A. L.; Miller, J. S. *Inorg. Chem.* **2011**, *50*, 10546-10548.
- [58] Rodriguez, J. H.; Wheeler, D. E.; McCusker, J. K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1998**, *120*, 12051-12068.
- [59] Kahn, O. *Molecular Magnetism*; VCH Publishers Inc.: New York, **1993**.
- [60] Moriya, T. *Phys. Rev.* **1960**, *120*, 91.
- [61] Lalena, J.; Cleary, D. A. *Principles of Inorganic Materials Design*; John Wiley and Sons Inc.: New York, **2010**.
- [62] Willet, R. D. *Magneto-Structural Correlations in Exchanged Coupled Systems*; Reidel Publishing Company.: New York, **1985**.
- [63] Hudak, J.; Boca, R.; Moncol, J.; Titis, J. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2013**, *394*, 401-409.
- [64] Singh, M. K.; Rajaraman, G., *Chem. Eur. J.* **2015**, *21*, 980-983.
- [65] (a) Petit, S.; Pilet, G.; Luneau, D.; Chibotaru, L. F.; Ungur, L., *Dalton Trans.* **2007**, (40), 4582-4588; (b) Zadrozny, J. M.; Long, J. R., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 20732; (c) Jurca, T.; Farghal, A.; Lin, P.-H.; Korobkov, I.; Murugesu, M.; Richeson, D. S., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133* (40), 15814-15817.
- [66] Llunell, M.; Casanova, D.; Cirera, J.; Bofill, J. M.; Alemany, P.; Alvarez, S.; Pinsky, M.; Avnir, D., SHAPE, Universitat de Barcelona and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Barcelona, **2003**.