ChemComm



Optical sensing of aqueous nitrate anion by a platinum(II) triimine salt based solid state material

Journal:	ChemComm
Manuscript ID	CC-COM-08-2022-004732.R1
Article Type:	Communication



Optical sensing of aqueous nitrate anion by a platinum(II) triimine salt based solid state material

Amie E. Norton,^{II,**} Mahmood K. Abdolmaleki,^{IIII} Logan Andriot, ^{II} Christina Cashen,^{II} Jeanette A. Krause, ^{II} William B. Connick^{II} and Sayandev Chatterjee^{II}*

Department of Chemistry, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221, United States of America

[†]Present address: Department of Entomology, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66503, United States of America ^{||}Present address: Department of Biology and Chemistry, Texas A&M International University, Laredo, TX, 78041, United States of America

[#]TerraPower LLC, Bellevue, WA 98008, United States of America *Email: <u>amien@ksu.edu</u>, <u>schatterjee@terrapower.com</u>*

¹This work is dedicated to William B. Connick, who passed away in April 2018

Supporting Information Placeholder

ABSTRACT: Selective and quantitative measurement of aqueous nitrate (NO₃⁻) anion is achieved using solid [Pt(Cl-4-tpy)Cl]ClO₄ salt (Cl-4-tpy = 4-chloro-2,2':6'2"-terpyridine) as is, and as the salt supported on controlled porous glass. This detection method relies on the color change of the Pt(II) complex from yellow to red and intense luminescence response upon ClO₄⁻ exchange with NO₃⁻ due to concomitant enhancement of Pt•••Pt interactions. The spectroscopic response is highly selective for NO₃⁻ over a large range of halides and oxoanions.

The selective and sensitive detection of specific anions for the monitoring and assessment of water quality remains a global environmental and chemical challenge.^{1,2} One such example is the nitrate (NO₃-) anion; it has widespread use in munitions/explosives manufacturing and chemical fertilizer preparation,³⁻⁵ and an abundance of nitrate found in livestock as well as organic wastes⁶ has led to groundwater and food supply contamination and raised public health concerns. Epidemiologic studies have associated continued NO_{3⁻} exposure via ingestion to multiple medical issues that include spontaneous abortions in pregnant women,⁷ birth defects of the central nervous system and intrauterine growth restriction in children,8 and cardiovascular effects9 and gastric cancer in adults.¹⁰ According to recent World Health Organization (WHO) reports, NO3⁻ concentrations in surface waters have increased significantly over the last 30 – 40 years,¹¹ emphasizing a growing need for its rapid in situ detection and prompting the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US-EPA) to set the ambient water quality limit of NO3⁻ at 10 ppm.¹²

Current EPA strategies for aqueous NO₃⁻ detection involve ion selective electrode based potentiometry¹³ or *in-situ* NO₃⁻ reduction followed by NO₂⁻ colorimetry. Alternate methods proposed for *in-situ* NO₃⁻ detection include UV-spectroscopy,¹³ ion chromatography,¹⁴ and capillary electrophoresis.¹⁵ These proposed techniques suffer from limitations including imperfect selectivity, longer processing times, complicated and expensive instrumentation, or need for processing expertise. This impacts rapid testing and impedes water quality assessment particularly in remote corners of the globe where such timely testing can be critical.¹⁶ An

elegant study by Daniel et al. relied on two-step colorimetric sensing of nitrate comprised of (i) an initial enzymatic reduction of NO₃⁻ to NO₂⁻ using nitrate reductase and its cofactors followed by (ii) colorimetric detection of the NO₂⁻ at concentrations \geq 22µm using two sets of Au nanoparticles (NPs), one functionalized with aniline and the other with naphthalene groups. At NO₂⁻ concentrations \geq 22µm, they trigger the formation of a diazo bond between the aniline and the naphthalene units, leading to crosslinking of the Au NPs and consequently their precipitation from solution. This is reflected in the color change of the solution from red to colorless. While this technique offers a selective, sensitive, and robust method for rapid *in-situ* NO₂⁻/NO₃⁻, the need for multiple processing steps makes it less than ideal in terms of operational flexibility for on-site deployment.

We have recently demonstrated a new method of colorimetric aqueous NO_{3⁻} detection, complemented by a second and more sensitive luminescent mode.17 This method utilizes solid-state hybrid materials based on square-planar platinum(II) salts supported on mesoporous silica.¹⁸ The strategy relies on selective recognition of the aqueous NO₃- anion by a square-planar Pt(II) salt, which results in changes in the extended solid-state lattice structure, (i.e., altering the Pt •• Pt interactions) upon anion exchange. Squareplanar, coordinately-unsaturated Pt(II) complexes with sterically permitting ligands demonstrate rich spectroscopic properties that are modulated by changing the Pt•••Pt interactions.^{1,19-21} Incorporation of an anion guest into the crystal lattice that can significantly alter the Pt•••Pt interactions in a desired way, triggers correlated changes in the electronic structure of the Pt(II) compound. This is reflected in vivid changes in their optical spectroscopies.^{1,2,17} Our previous aqueous NO₃⁻ detection method required adjusting the pH of the material to <0, which could negatively impact or render the technique useless for a wider selection of environmental samples. Herein, we present a new Pt(II) salt, [Pt(Cl-4tpy)Cl]ClO₄ ($1 \circ ClO_4$), which shows a unique optical response to aqueous NO₃⁻ anion without the need for pH adjustment. This simplifies the detection process for on-site applications and expands the applicability of the new Pt(II) salt to broader matrices.

 $1 \circ ClO_4$ is a sparingly water-soluble salt that crystallizes as yellow needles. To assess the colorimetric response, yellow microcrystalline powder (~10 mg) or an aqueous suspension (~10 mg/mL) of $1 \circ ClO_4$ were exposed to aqueous NO₃⁻ (1 mL 1 M solution, Scheme 1). Exposure of either the solid or the suspension resulted in a distinct color change from yellow to red within 2-5 minutes.



Scheme 1. Conversion of yellow $[Pt(Cl-4-tpy)Cl]ClO_4$ (1•ClO₄) to red $[Pt(Cl-4-tpy)Cl]NO_3 \bullet xH_2O$ (1•NO₃•xH₂O) upon exposure to aqueous NO₃⁻.

Optical spectroscopy was used to corroborate the visual color changes of 1•ClO₄ from yellow to red (Figure 1). Absorption spectra of microcrystalline powders of 1•ClO₄ dispersed on a glass slide exhibit spin-allowed intra-ligand $(\pi - \pi^*)$ transitions at wavelengths below 365 nm. In addition, a broad low-energy absorption band at wavelengths between 365 and 450 nm is assigned to the $d\pi$ (Pt)– π (Cl-4-tpy) metal-to-ligand charge transfer (MLCT) transition of the Pt(Cl-4-tpy)Cl⁺ chromophore vide-infra.²² Immersion of the glass slide with dispersed 1•ClO₄ microcrystals into a 1.0 mM aqueous NO₃⁻ solution results in the appearance of a new band at longer wavelengths. This new band is nearly identical to that observed for an independently synthesized 1•NO₃•2H₂O sample. Based on comparison with similar Pt(II) salts, this low-energy band is attributed to a metal-metal-to-ligand charge-transfer MMLCT transition $[d\sigma^* (Pt) - \pi^*(Cl-4-tpy)]$ where the $d\sigma^*$ arises from the interaction of the $d_z^2(Pt)$ orbitals of adjacent complexes, which in turn is suggestive of extended Pt•••Pt interactions.^{2,20,22–24}



Figure 1. Optical spectroscopy of $1 \circ ClO_4$ and $1 \circ NO_3 \circ 2H_2O$: (blue lines) spectra of $1 \circ ClO_4$, (red lines) spectra of $1 \circ NO_3 \circ 2H_2O$, (yellow lines) spectra of $1 \circ ClO_4$ post exposure to aqueous NO_3 ; solid lines represent absorption and dashed lines represent emission ($\lambda_{ex} = 436$ nm).

On the other hand, the emission spectrum (λ_{ex} = 436 nm) shows a characteristic asymmetric emission band maximizing near 557 nm (dashed blue line in Figure 1) with a shoulder at 590 nm. The emission for 1•NO₃ is red-shifted showing a new emission maximum at 617 nm (dashed red line in Figured 1). When 1•ClO₄ was exposed to 1.0 mM aqueous NO₃ solution, a similar new band was observed at 608 nm (dashed yellow line in Figure 1). As in the case of the absorption spectra, the new band at lower energy is attributed to a metal-metal-to-ligand charge-transfer MMLCT $[d\sigma^*(Pt)-\pi^* (Cl-4-tpy)]$ transition, further supporting extended Pt•••Pt interactions in both 1•NO₃ and 1•ClO₄ post aqueous NO₃⁻ exposure. We have previously shown that nano-structured platforms with high surface area (e.g. controlled porous glass (CPG) beads of pore sizes 383 Å) respond more rapidly.^{17,18} Aqueous NO₃⁻ exposure of 1•ClO₄ encapsulated in the CPGs (1•ClO₄@CPG-383) produced similar optical changes, albeit with the expected faster response times, which is attributed to the surface area of the sample in the nano-structured environment.



Figure 2. Extended packing arrangements for (a) $1 \cdot ClO_4$ and (b) $1 \cdot NO_3 \cdot 2H_2O$ (ClO_4^- and $NO_3^- \cdot 2H_2O$ units omitted for clarity). Pt $\cdot \cdot \cdot Pt$ stacking distances are shown in Å.

The cumulative observations of the colorimetric and luminescent changes in $1 \cdot \text{ClO}_4$ upon exposure to aqueous NO₃⁻ suggests an alteration of the nearest neighbor Pt•••Pt interactions. One explanation for the observed changes is the incorporation of NO₃⁻ ions within the lattice as ClO₄⁻ is displaced. This anion replacement presumably perturbs stacking in the square planar Pt(II) units, and consequently alters the lowest lying MMLCT [d]*(Pt) \rightarrow [2*(Cl-4tpy)] energy; this is expressed in the color and luminescence changes in the material.^{20,25,26} Structural studies were undertaken to test this hypothesis and gain insight into the Pt•••Pt interactions.

Single crystal X-ray structures were determined for independently synthesized $1 \cdot ClO_4$ and $1 \cdot NO_3 \cdot 2H_2O$ salts (Figure S1, Tables S2-S4). Yellow crystals of $1 \cdot ClO_4$, grown from a 1:1 water:acetone solution, show a lattice devoid of solvent and consisting of equally-spaced [Pt(Cl-4-tpy)Cl]⁺ cations with long Pt $\cdot \cdot Pt$ interaction distances, 4.169(3)Å, and highly-bent Pt $\cdot \cdot Pt$ angles, $106.28(1)^\circ$ (Figure 2).²⁷ In contrast, orange-red crystals of $1 \cdot NO_3 \cdot 2H_2O$, grown from acetone-HNO₃ solution, show incorporation of 2 molecules of water in the lattice. The nearest neighbor Pt $\cdot \cdot Pt$ distances are shortened and alternate between 3.3570(4)Å and 3.4018(4)Å and the Pt $\cdot \cdot Pt$ $\cdot Pt$ angle is essentially linear, $172.66(1)^\circ$ (Figure 2).²⁸

Powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) measurements corroborate identification of the species generated during exposure of $1 \circ ClO_4$ to aqueous NO_3^- for a specified length of time, and therefore provides mechanistic insight. The diffractogram of powdered $1 \circ ClO_4$ measured post exposure to aqueous NO_3^- for 1 hour shows peaks of the starting $1 \circ ClO_4$ complex in addition to a set of new broad peaks. While retention of the parent peaks indicates incomplete conversion, the new peaks match the simulated diffraction pattern from $1 \circ NO_3 \circ 2H_2O$ single crystals (Figure S2). Thus, it can be concluded that exposure of $1 \circ ClO_4$ to aqueous NO_3^- anions leads to the substitution of the ClO_4^- with NO_3^- within the lattice structure.

To determine the structural fate of the complexes upon incorporation within the CPG, diffractograms were recorded on both 1•ClO₄@CPG-383 and 1•NO₃•2H₂O@CPG-383 samples (Figure

S2). Both species are characterized by broad, amorphous silica peaks at $2q = 21^{\circ}$, along with several additional features. For the 1•ClO₄@CPG-383 composite, the additional features match diffraction peaks in the pristine 1•ClO₄ sample. Similarly, the additional features observed for 1•NO₃•2H₂O@ CPG-383 also match the pristine 1•NO₃•2H₂O peaks. This indicates that for both composites, the structural integrity of the starting Pt(II) salts remains preserved even after incorporation into the CPGs. Exposure of 1•ClO₄@CPG-383 to aqueous NO₃⁻ results in ClO₄⁻ \rightarrow NO₃⁻ anion exchange as demonstrated by the PXRD profile showing peaks from both the starting complex as well as the freshly generated 1•NO₃•2H₂O@ CPG-383 species. Scanning electron micrographs on 1•ClO₄@CPG-383 show microcrystalline deposits rich in Pt covering the CPG surface (Figure S4). This is similar to our observations in previous studies.¹⁸ Magnified transmission electron micrographs demonstrate the microcrystals to comprise of hexagonal elongated rods with a seeming tendency to aggregate upon contact with aqueous NO_{3⁻} (Figure **S5**). However, more detailed analysis of this phenomenon is required and is presently underway.



Figure 3. A bar chart comparing the maximum emission intensity of $1 \cdot \text{ClO}_4$ @CPG-383 post exposure to 1.0 M aqueous solutions of different anions for 1 hour compared to 1.0 mM aqueous NO₃⁻ (λ_{ex} = 532 nm). The inset table lists the selectivity factors calculated as the ratio of the maximum emission intensity measured in the presence of interfering anions to that observed in the presence of NO₃⁻.

To qualitatively determine the selectivity for the NO₃⁻ anion over other anionic species, powdered 1•ClO₄ was loaded onto CPG-383 beads (0.2 g, 2 wt% 1•ClO₄ @CPG-383) and separately exposed to a range of 1.0 M aqueous solutions of I⁻, IO₃⁻, BrO₃⁻, Cl⁻ , PO_4^{3-} , SO_4^{2-} , CO_3^{2-} , and F^- for 1 h. These anions were chosen as they are key anions present in environmental water matrices. The emission intensities (λ_{ex} = 532 nm) of the exposed CPGs were compared with CPGs exposed to 10^{-3} M NO₃⁻ for the same time period. Because practical matrices are expected to contain an overwhelming excess of interfering species compared to the target species, the concentrations of the interfering anions were deliberately chosen to be four orders of magnitude greater than aqueous NO3concentrations with the objective of demonstrating the uniqueness of the targeted response of $1 \cdot ClO_4 @ CPG$ to the NO₃⁻ anion. The emission intensity responses of the 1•ClO₄@CPG-383 composite post exposure to various anions is shown in Figure 3. As can be seen, there is an overwhelming response of the composite towards aqueous NO3⁻. The selectivity factor for the interfering anions (calculated as the ratio of the maximum emission intensities observed in the presence of interfering anions to that observed in the presence of NO₃⁻) range from 0.05 for I⁻ to 0.18 for F⁻, confirming the high selectivity of 1•ClO₄ for NO_{3⁻} anion (Figure 3, inset, Figure S4).

As demonstrated in our previous works on anion quantification, luminescence spectroscopy was used for NO₃⁻ quantification.^{1,21} In the test, equal amounts of **1**•ClO₄@CPG-383 were exposed to

aqueous solutions with different NO3⁻ concentrations (1 mL of 10⁻ ⁴ to 1 M). Three independent measurements were conducted for each concentration. Upon excitation at 532 nm, 1•ClO₄@CPG-383 showed a weak asymmetric emission (λ_{max} = 566 nm) with a shoulder at 604 nm, prior to NO₃⁻ exposure. Upon exposure to 10⁻⁴ M aqueous NO₃- for 15 mins, a broader asymmetric band centered at ~610 nm was observed with a ~7-fold increase in emission intensity (Figure 4a). Further addition of aqueous NO₃⁻ (in 0.1 mL aliquots until 0.1 M) resulted in an increase in intensity (Figure 4a), and an emission maximum shifted to higher wavelength until a maximum was reached at 620 nm. The emission band also narrows at higher NO₃- concentrations suggestive of an equilibrium shift to a single platinum species. The logarithm of luminescence intensity of the respective emission maxima was observed to increase linearly with the logarithm of nitrate concentration (Figure 4b).



Figure 4. (a) Luminescence spectra of **1**•ClO₄@CPG-383 upon exposure to varying concentrations of aqueous NO₃⁻ for 1 hour: (—) 0 M, (—) 10⁻⁴ M, (—) 5×10⁻⁴ M, (—) 10⁻³ M, (—) 5×10⁻³ M, (—) 10⁻² M, (—) 5×10⁻² M, (—) 10⁻¹ M (λ_{ex} = 532 nm), (b) logarithmic plot of the maximum emission intensity (λ_{max} = 605 nm) of **1**•ClO₄@CPG-383 versus the concentration of solution NO₃⁻ in solution. The error bars are obtained from standard deviations based on three independent measurements.

The limit of detection (LOD) was calculated from the log-log plot based on the IUPAC recommended Equation 1 reported by Long et al. 29

$$DL = \frac{k \cdot S_b}{m}$$
[1]

Here, DL is the detection limit, k is a numerical constant, m is the slope of the linear region of the plot, and S_b is the standard error for the blank measurements. Per IUPAC recommendations, a k value of 3 was applied, which corresponds to a 99.87% confidence level. Based on this, a detection limit of 0.046±0.005 mM (2.85±0.31 ppm) is obtained, significantly lower than the ambient water quality limit of 0.16 mM (10 ppm) set by US-EPA.

The ability of the $1 \cdot CIO_4 @ CPG-383$ composite to detect aqueous NO₃⁻ from a complex multicomponent matrix was tested using groundwater samples spiked with varying concentrations of NO₃⁻ via standard additions such that the cumulative NO₃⁻ concentrations ranged from 5×10^{-3} to 7.5×10^{-2} M, as determined by independent ion chromatography (IC) measurements. Although the emission profile is observed to be broader as compared to DI water, a proportional rise in emission intensity with increase in NO₃⁻ concentrations was observed (Figure **S5**, left panel). The logarithm of luminescence intensity of the respective emission maxima showed a linear increase with the logarithm of total nitrate concentration (Figure **S5**, right panel), similar to DI water. The slope of the response in the groundwater differs from that of DI water, presumably the groundwater matrix perturbs the electronic structure of the **1**•CIO₄ salt differently. Despite the differences, it is possible to determine the NO₃⁻ concentration from the log-log plot. The NO₃⁻ concentration in groundwater was determined to be 4.4±0.3 mM, consistent with a value of 5.1 mM as determined from independent IC measurements.

Leaching studies performed on both the yellow $1 \cdot ClO_4$ and the red $1 \cdot NO_3 \cdot 2H_2O$ salts @CPG upon prolonged contact with DI water, showed a 4-7% mass loss of the materials over 2 days indicated by optical spectroscopy. While the rate of loss is not significant in the context of rapid sensing applications, efforts are underway to understand and improve the salt retention into the CPG matrix.

This investigation demonstrates the use of a solid-state material for the unambiguous rapid and selective detection of NO₃⁻ in aqueous solution without the requirement of additives, and offers the potential for a new sensor compatible with field deployment. The accumulated evidence establishes that the colorimetric and luminescence response of 1•ClO₄ to aqueous NO₃- is a consequence of a contraction of the intermolecular Pt•••Pt distances exhibiting stronger interactions that results from CIO_4^{-}/NO_3^{-} anion exchange. It is presumable that the energy requirements for the molecular rearrangement in going from 1•ClO₄ to 1•NO₃•2H₂O is compensated by the non-covalent interactions in 1•NO₃•2H₂O. This is presumably due to the steric and electronic complementarity of 1•ClO₄ towards aqueous NO₃⁻ anions makes this salt suitable for NO₃⁻ sensing. Therefore, it is worth acknowledging that in the vast literature on luminescent Pt(II) complexes, there might be additional salts with similar attributes that are also optimally suitable for NO₃⁻ sensing.

This research was supported by (1) the National Science Foundation (CHE-1152853), (2) a US EPA STAR, FP-91765901 to A.E.N., and (3) the Laboratory Directed Research and Development Program at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) (S.C.). PNNL is operated by Battelle for the U.S. DOE under Contract DE-AC05-76RL01830. Single crystal data was collected through SCrALS, Beamline 11.3.1, Advanced Light Source (ALS), Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. ALS is supported by the U.S. DOE, Office of Energy Sciences Materials Sciences Division, under Contract DE-AC02-05CH11231. We thank Dr. Garry Hanon for helping with resources.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Notes and references

- S. Chatterjee, A. E. Norton, M. K. Edwards, J. M. Peterson, S. D. Taylor, S. A. Bryan, A. Andersen, N. Govind, T. E. Albrecht-Schmitt, W. B. Connick and T. G. Levitskaia, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2015, 54, 9914–9923.
- S. D. Taylor, W. Howard, N. Kaval, R. Hart, J. A. Krause and W. B. Connick, *Chem. Commun.*, 2010, **46**, 1070–1072.
- 3 G. A. Blanco, Y. H. Nai, E. F. Hilder, R. A. Shellie, G. W. Dicinoski, P. R. Haddad and M. C. Breadmore, *Anal. Chem.*, 2011, 83, 9068–9075.
- 4 J. J. Brady, P. M. F. Iv, J. J. Perez, E. J. Judge and R. J. Levis, in Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and Explosives (CBRNE) Sensing XIII, SPIE, 2012, vol. 8358, pp. 242–250.
- 5 B. Yellampelle, M. Sluch, S. Asher and B. Lemoff, in *Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and Explosives (CBRNE) Sensing XII*, SPIE, 2011, vol. 8018, pp. 353–359.

- 6 D. Castro-Herrera, K. Prost, Y. Schäfer, D.-G. Kim, F. Yimer, M. Tadesse, M. Gebrehiwot and N. Brüggemann, *J. Environ. Qual.*, 2022, **51**, 19–32.
- F. Raffaelli, L. Nanetti, A. Vignini, L. Mazzanti, S. R. Giannubilo, C. M. Curzi, A. Turi, P. Vitali and A. L. Tranquilli, *Fertil. Steril.*, 2010, 93, 1976–1982.
- 8 M. Rhoades, D. Barnes-Josiah, R. Spalding, L. Howard, C. Steele and C. Beseler, *Child Health Res. Inst. Pediatr. Res. Forum.*
- 9 L. Wang, Z. Fu, J. Zheng, S. Wang, Y. Ping, B. Gao, X. Mo, P. Liang and J. Huang, *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.*, 2022, **230**, 113161.
- 10 R. Picetti, M. Deeney, S. Pastorino, M. R. Miller, A. Shah, D. A. Leon, A. D. Dangour and R. Green, *Environ. Res.*, 2022, 210, 112988.
- 11 M. J. Hill, Nitrates and Nitrites in Food and Water, CRC Press, 1996.
- 12 B. Daniels, N. Mesner, 2010. Nitrate. Utah State University: Water Quality Extension. Utah State University, Logan, Utah.
- 13 J. Ma, F. Meng, Y. Zhou, Y. Wang and P. Shi, *Sensors*, 2018, **18**, 606.
- J. M. Doyle, M. L. Miller, B. R. McCord, D. A. McCollam and G. W. Mushrush, *Anal. Chem.*, 2000, **72**, 2302–2307.
- 15 A. Beutner, B. Scherer and F.-M. Matysik, *Talanta*, 2018, **183**, 33–38.
- 16 W. L. Daniel, M. S. Han, J.-S. Lee and C. A. Mirkin, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2009, 131, 6362–6363.
- 17 A. E. Norton, M. Sharma, C. Cashen, M.-A. Dourges, T. Toupance, J. A. Krause, R. K. Motkuri, W. B. Connick and S. Chatterjee, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, 2021, 13, 16197–16209.
- 18 A. E. Norton, K. P. S. Zanoni, M.-A. Dourges, L. P. Ravaro, M. K. Abdolmaleki, A. S. S. de Camargo, T. Toupance, W. B. Connick and S. Chatterjee, *J. Mater. Chem. C*, 2021, 9, 6193–6207.
- 19 L. J. Grove, A. G. Oliver, J. A. Krause and W. B. Connick, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2008, **47**, 1408–1410.
- 20 J. A. Bailey, M. G. Hill, R. E. Marsh, V. M. Miskowski, W. P. Schaefer and H. B. Gray, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1995, **34**, 4591–4599.
- 21 A. E. Norton, M. Karimi Abdolmaleki, J. Liang, M. Sharma, R. Golsby, A. Zoller, J. A. Krause, W. B. Connick and S. Chatterjee, *Chem. Commun.*, 2020, 56, 10175–10178.
- 22 P. Du, Inorganica Chim. Acta, 2010, **363**, 1355–1358.
- 23 S. D. Taylor, A. E. Norton, R. T. Hart, M. K. Abdolmaleki, J. A. Krause and W. B. Connick, *Chem. Commun.*, 2013, **49**, 9161– 9163.
- 24 A. E. Norton, M. K. Abdolmaleki, J. M. Ringo, V. M. Shingade, C. Cashen, M. Sharma, W. B. Connick and S. Chatterjee, *Sens. Actuators B Chem.*, 2021, **329**, 129207.
- 25 K. Zhang, M. C.-L. Yeung, S. Y.-L. Leung and V. W.-W. Yam, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, 2020, **12**, 8503–8512.
- 26 J. S. Field, J.-A. Gertenbach, R. J. Haines, L. P. Ledwaba, N. T. Mashapa, D. R. McMillin, O. Q. Munro and G. C. Summerton, *Dalton Trans.*, 2003, 0, 1176–1180.
- 27 J. A. Krause, L. Androit, A. E. Norton, W. B. Connick, CCDC-2170160, CSD Communications, 2022, DOI: 10.5517/ccdc.csd.cc2bv75m.
- 28 J. A. Krause, L. Androit, A. E. Norton, W. B. Connick, CCDC-2170168, CSD Communications, 2022, DOI: 10.5517/ccdc.csd.cc2bv7fw.
- 29 G. L. Long and J. D. Winefordner, *Anal. Chem.*, 1983, **55**, 712A-724A.