



HAL
open science

Evidence of crystal packing effects in stabilizing high or low spin states of iron(II) complexes with functionalized 2,6-bis(pyrazol-1-yl)pyridine ligands

Nathalie Bridonneau, Luca Rigamonti, Giordano Poneti, Dawid Pinkowicz, Alessandra Forni, Andrea Cornia

► To cite this version:

Nathalie Bridonneau, Luca Rigamonti, Giordano Poneti, Dawid Pinkowicz, Alessandra Forni, et al.. Evidence of crystal packing effects in stabilizing high or low spin states of iron(II) complexes with functionalized 2,6-bis(pyrazol-1-yl)pyridine ligands. Dalton Transactions, 2017, 46 (12), pp.4075-4085. 10.1039/c7dt00248c . hal-03357860

HAL Id: hal-03357860

<https://hal.science/hal-03357860>

Submitted on 1 Oct 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Cite this: *Dalton Trans.*, 2017, **46**, 4075

Evidence of crystal packing effects in stabilizing high or low spin states of iron(II) complexes with functionalized 2,6-bis(pyrazol-1-yl)pyridine ligands†

Nathalie Bridonneau,^a Luca Rigamonti,^{*a} Giordano Poneti,^{‡b} Dawid Pinkowicz,^c Alessandra Forni^d and Andrea Cornia^a

The molecular structures and magnetic properties of homoleptic iron(II) compounds [Fe(bpp-COOMe)₂](ClO₄)₂ (**1**) and [Fe(bpp-triolH₃)₂](ClO₄)₂ (**2**) have been investigated to ascertain their spin crossover (SCO) behaviour. In these hexacoordinated complexes, the bpp (2,6-bis(pyrazol-1-yl)pyridine) ligands adopt a *mer-mer* coordination mode and carry COOMe or C(O)NHC(CH₂OH)₃ *para* substituents, respectively, on the central pyridyl ring. In spite of the almost equal donor power of the ligands to the iron(II) centre, the two compounds feature different spin state configurations at room temperature. Compound **1** displays a highly-distorted octahedral environment around the iron(II) centre, which adopts a high spin (HS) state at all temperatures, even under an external applied pressure up to 1.0 GPa. By contrast, **2** is characterized by a more regular octahedral coordination around the metal ion and exhibits a low spin (LS) configuration at or below room temperature. However, it shows a thermally-induced SCO behaviour at $T > 400$ K, along with Light-Induced Excited Spin State Trapping (LIESST) at low temperature, with $T_{\text{LIESST}} = 38$ K. Since DFT (U)M06/6-311+G(d) geometry optimizations *in vacuo* indicate that both complexes should adopt a HS state and a highly-distorted coordination geometry, the stabilization of a LS configuration in **2** is ultimately ascribed to the effect of intermolecular hydrogen bonds, which align the [Fe(bpp-triolH₃)₂]²⁺ cations in 1D chains and impart profound differences in the geometric arrangement of the ligands.

Received 20th January 2017,
Accepted 22nd February 2017

DOI: 10.1039/c7dt00248c

rsc.li/dalton

^aDipartimento di Scienze Chimiche e Geologiche, Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia and INSTM RU of Modena and Reggio Emilia, via G. Campi 103, 41125 Modena, Italy. E-mail: luca.rigamonti@unimore.it

^bLaboratory of Molecular Magnetism (LAMM), Dipartimento di Chimica 'Ugo Schiff', Università degli Studi di Firenze and INSTM RU of Firenze, via della Lastruccia 3-13, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino (FI), Italy

^cFaculty of Chemistry, Jagiellonian University, Ingardena 3, 30-060 Kraków, Poland

^dConsiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR), Istituto di Scienze e Tecnologie Molecolari (ISTM), Università degli Studi di Milano and INSTM RU of Milan, via C. Golgi 19, 20133 Milano, Italy

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Experimental section with the synthesis and characterization of the ligands bpp-COOMe and bpp-triolH₃, crystal packing in **1** (Fig. S1) and 2-MeCN (Fig. S2), hydrogen bonds in **1** (Table S1) and 2-MeCN (Table S2), the temperature dependence of the $\chi_{\text{M}}T$ product and the isothermal field dependence of the magnetization at 1.8 K under different external pressures of **1** (Fig. S3), the isothermal field dependence of the magnetization at 1.8, 2.5 and 4.5 K of **2** (Fig. S4), the time dependence of the $\chi_{\text{M}}T$ product of **2** under 532 nm light irradiation at 10 K (Fig. S5), plots of the (U)M06/6-311+G(d) frontier orbitals mainly localized on the iron(II) centre of the [Fe(bpp-R)₂]²⁺ cations (R = COOMe, triolH₃) in **1** and **2** at both spin states $S = 0$ and $S = 2$ (Fig. S6), Cartesian coordinates, electronic energies and NBO charges of the modelled bpp-R free ligands and [Fe(bpp-R)₂]²⁺ cations (R = COOMe, triolH₃) in **1** and **2** at both spin states $S = 0$ and $S = 2$ (Table S3). CCDC 1522449 and 1522450. For ESI and crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format see DOI: 10.1039/c7dt00248c

‡ Current address: Instituto de Química, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 21941-909 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.


Introduction

Spin crossover (SCO) materials have been extensively investigated in the last few years, since the reversible control of their spin state by external stimuli holds promises for application in information processing and data storage devices or molecular switches.^{1,2} Special interest has been focussed on compounds that show persistent change in magnetization upon light irradiation. The so-called LIESST (Light-Induced Excited Spin State Trapping) effect, first demonstrated by Hauser *et al.*,³ consists of the photo-induced conversion of a low spin (LS) state to a metastable high spin (HS) state at cryogenic temperatures. The LIESST effect has been mostly studied in iron(II) complexes,^{3–8} although iron(III)⁹ or molybdenum(IV)¹⁰ can also exhibit a similar behaviour. Pressure is another important external stimulus used to shift the spin equilibrium: due to the larger size of the HS centre compared to the LS centre, the application of an external pressure favours a LS configuration,^{11,12} additionally increasing the SCO transition temperature.¹³

2,6-Bis(pyrazol-1-yl)pyridine (1-bpp), 2,6-bis(pyrazol-3-yl)pyridine (3-bpp) and their differently-substituted derivatives, hereafter called generically bpp ligands, afford [Fe^{II}(bpp)₂](X)₂ (X⁻ = anion) complexes that can exhibit SCO behaviour

(Scheme 1).^{7,8,14,15} Depending on functionalization and counterions, gradual to abrupt spin conversions are observed, with associated transition temperatures ($T_{1/2}$) ranging from 100 K up to room temperature and above. What is clear is that the SCO ability is primarily governed by the distortion of the coordination sphere as described by the angles ϕ and θ ,⁷ depicted in Scheme 1, together with the clamp angle ψ .¹⁶ Note that the most regular geometry, achieved with $\phi = 180^\circ$ and $\theta = 90^\circ$, still exhibits deviations from perfect octahedral symmetry due to the intrinsic shape of bpp ligands, which imposes a clamp angle $\psi < 180^\circ$. Even though the two distortion angles can occur independently of each other,^{7,8} their combination is probably the key factor determining the existence of SCO behaviour. Previous surveys^{7,8} indicated that derivatives with $\phi \geq 172^\circ$ and $\theta \geq 76^\circ$ (low distortion) in their HS state can easily rearrange to the a more regular geometry typical of the LS state and usually show spin conversion upon cooling. Most of the highly distorted complexes ($\phi < 172^\circ$ and $\theta < 76^\circ$), on the other hand, remain trapped in their HS states at all temperatures in the solid state and therefore do not exhibit SCO behaviour.^{7,8} The two distortion indices Σ (local angular distortions of the octahedral donor set N_6) and Θ (degree of trigonal distortion of the coordination geometry from an octahedron towards a trigonal prism) can also be used as probes of the spin state.¹⁷ They are lower for the LS compounds than for the HS ones, confirming that LS complexes have more regular coordination geometries.⁷ The values of ϕ and θ (and consequently of Σ and Θ) are mainly affected by the Jahn–Teller effect,¹⁸ and in the second place by crystal packing. This is clearly shown by the derivatives $[\text{Fe}(\text{1-bpp})_2](\text{X})_2$, whose coordination distortion varies by changing the counterion X.^{7,18,19} The LIESST effect was also reported for this family of compounds,²⁰ since this type of ligands usually promote adequate iron(II) geometries that lead to long lifetimes of the photo-induced metastable state.²¹

Among all bpp ligands, our attention has been focused on derivatives of 1-bpp, hereafter called bpp-R, in which the R substituent is introduced into the *para* position of the central pyridyl ring, hence approximately along the $\text{N}\{\text{py}\}\text{--Fe}\text{--N}\{\text{py}\}$ bond direction and the distortion angle ϕ . The R groups used



Scheme 1 Molecular scheme of $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-R})_2]^{2+}$ complexes, highlighting the two distortion components (θ and ϕ angles) responsible for SCO behaviour modulation, together with the clamp angle ψ . In this paper, R = COOMe (**1**) and $\text{C}(\text{O})\text{NHC}(\text{CH}_2\text{OH})_3$ or triolH_3 (**2**).

in the past few years range from alkyl,²² halogen^{23,24} alcohol,^{22,25} thioether,^{24,26} pyridine,^{27,28} aldehyde,²⁹ cyano³⁰ and carboxylic acid³¹ to ferrocene,³² guanidine or cytosine,³³ tetrathiafulvalene,³⁴ pyrene,³⁵ $\text{C}\equiv\text{C-R}$ (R = H, SiMe_3 , Br),³⁶ TEMPO³⁷ and *Z-to-E* photoisomerizable $\text{C}\equiv\text{C-Ar}$ ³⁸ fragments. Given this large pool of available derivatives, a unified treatment of the relationship between the electronic nature of R and the SCO properties shown by the iron(II) complexes in solution has been recently proposed.³⁹ The situation is more puzzling when analysing the effect of intermolecular contacts on the magnetic behaviour in the solid state. Weak van der Waals interactions,²² π - π stacking³⁵ or relatively strong hydrogen bonds,^{27,31} together with the steric hindrance of the substituent itself, can in fact come into play and further affect the distortion angles and then the relative stability of the high or low spin state. The most extremely distorted structures are often associated with secondary contacts in the crystal between the complex and the neighboring anions,⁸ but when cations pack into the so-called “terpyridine embrace lattice”,¹⁷ spin transition is still observable.²²

We herein report the structural and magnetic properties of two new compounds belonging to the $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-R})_2](\text{X})_2$ family, namely $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-COOMe})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_2$ (**1**) and $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-triolH}_3)_2](\text{ClO}_4)_2$ (**2**), where the two moieties COOMe and $\text{C}(\text{O})\text{NHC}(\text{CH}_2\text{OH})_3$ (=triolH₃), respectively (Scheme 1), are unable (**1**) or able (**2**) to give relatively strong H bonds in the condensed phase. The two tridentate bpp-R ligands coordinate the iron(II) ion with a meridional-meridional (*mer-mer*) configuration giving an octahedral coordination environment, but with different distortion degrees in **1** and **2**, and consequently different spin states at room temperature. The role of crystal packing and intermolecular contacts is analysed and discussed here with the help of pressure-dependent experiments, photo-magnetic studies and DFT calculations.

Experimental

General information

Unless otherwise stated, all chemicals were of reagent grade and used as received. Diethyl ether (Et_2O) was predried over CaCl_2 overnight and distilled from sodium benzophenone under N_2 before use. Acetonitrile (MeCN) was treated with CaH_2 and then distilled under N_2 . Elemental analyses were recorded using a Carlo Erba EA1110 CHNS-O automatic analyser. IR spectra were recorded with KBr discs using a Jasco FTIR-4700LE spectrophotometer with a 2 cm^{-1} resolution. Further general details and the syntheses of the ligands are reported in the ESI.† **Caution!** Perchlorate salts are explosive in nature and should be handled in small amounts and carefully.

Synthesis of metal complexes

$[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-COOMe})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_2$ (**1**). Solid $\text{Fe}(\text{ClO}_4)_2 \cdot 6\text{H}_2\text{O}$ (24.1 mg, 0.0664 mmol) was added to a suspension of bpp-COOMe (34.8 mg, 0.129 mmol) in MeCN (3 mL) causing the immediate dissolution of the ligand and a colour change to

red-purple upon formation of the desired complex. After stirring for 30 minutes, the solution was filtered to eliminate undissolved materials and subjected to vapour diffusion with Et₂O (5 mL). Diffusion was complete in about one week and the X-ray quality red crystalline product was collected by filtration, quickly washed with Et₂O:MeCN (2:1 v/v) and dried under vacuum. Yield: 35.7 mg (69.6%). Anal (%) calcd for C₂₆H₂₂Cl₂FeN₁₀O₁₂ (793.26): C 39.37, H 2.80, N 17.66. Found: C 39.25, H 2.72, N 17.97. FT-IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 1737s (ν C=O ester), 1631m + 1579s + 1522s + 1404s (ν C=C, ν C=N), 1459s + 1444m (δ C-H), 1095s (ν ClO₄⁻), 1058s (ν C-O).

[Fe(bpp-triolH₃)₂](ClO₄)₂ (2). This compound was prepared and isolated with the same method described for 1, starting from Fe(ClO₄)₂·6H₂O (19.3 mg, 0.0532 mmol) and bpp-triolH₃ (40.0 mg, 0.112 mmol). Once removed from the mother liquor, the crystals (2·MeCN) undergo quick solvent loss. Yield: 21.0 mg (40.6%). Anal (%) calcd for C₃₂H₃₆Cl₂FeN₁₂O₁₆ (971.45): C 39.56, H 3.74, N 17.30. Found: C 39.47, H 4.00, N 17.66. FT-IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 3407br + 3240sh (ν O-H, ν N-H), 1663s (ν C=O amide), 1630m + 1570s + 1525s + 1498s + 1407s (ν C=C, ν C=N), 1471s (δ C-H), 1103s (ν ClO₄⁻), 1056m (ν C-O).

X-ray crystal structure determination

Single-crystal X-ray diffraction studies were carried out on 1 and 2·MeCN with a four-circle Bruker X8-APEX diffractometer equipped with a Mo-K α generator (λ = 0.71073 Å), an area detector and a Kryoflex cryostat, and controlled by using a Bruker-Nonius X8APEX software. The selected individual of 2·MeCN was taken directly from the MeCN/Et₂O mother liquor, rapidly mounted on a glass fiber and cooled in the nitrogen flux of the cryostat. The structures were solved by direct methods using the SIR92⁴⁰ program and refined on F_o^2 by full-matrix least-squares methods using the SHELXL-2014/7⁴¹ software; both programs are implemented in the WINGX⁴² v2014.1 package. The program Mercury 3.8⁴³ was used for graphics. Crystal structure data and refinement parameters for 1 and 2·MeCN are gathered in Table 1. Disorder effects were resolved only in the structure of 2·MeCN, where they affected one OH group *per* ligand (O4A:O4B 0.586(3):0.414(3); O8A:O8B:O8C 0.586(3):0.250(3):0.164(3)), one perchlorate anion (Cl2A:Cl2B 0.531(7):0.469(7)) and the interstitial acetonitrile molecule (0.589(9):0.411(9)). These disordered moieties were refined with restraints on their geometrical and displacement parameters. All non-hydrogen atoms were treated anisotropically, except for the disordered atoms with occupancy <0.25. Perchlorate anions were modelled as variable-metrics tetrahedra, with allowed deviations of 0.01 and 0.02 Å for Cl-O and O...O distances, respectively, and RIGU/ISOR restraints on displacement parameters. The hydrogen atoms of 1 were located in ΔF maps and fully refined with isotropic displacement parameters (IDPs). The hydrogen atoms of 2·MeCN were idealized and treated as riding contributors with IDPs constrained to be 50% (for CH₃) or 20% higher than those of the parent atoms. OH groups were either subjected to torsion angle refinement (AFIX 147) or placed in a staggered conformation so as to afford the best hydrogen bond (AFIX 83). In

Table 1 Crystallographic data and refinement parameters for 1 and 2·MeCN

	1	2·MeCN
Formula	C ₂₆ H ₂₂ Cl ₂ FeN ₁₀ O ₁₂	C ₃₄ H ₃₉ Cl ₂ FeN ₁₃ O ₁₆
Formula weight	793.28	1012.53
Crystal system	Monoclinic	Monoclinic
Space group	C2/c (n. 15)	P2 ₁ /n (n. 14)
<i>T</i> , K	115(2)	140(2)
<i>a</i> , Å	23.476(3)	14.0675(10)
<i>b</i> , Å	10.3734(11)	16.2407(11)
<i>c</i> , Å	15.7959(18)	18.2548(11)
β , °	127.074(2)	101.045(2)
<i>V</i> , Å ³	3069.1(6)	4093.3(5)
<i>Z</i>	4	4
ρ_{calcd} , g cm ⁻³	1.717	1.643
μ , mm ⁻¹	0.749	0.590
Crystal size, mm ³	0.39 × 0.35 × 0.21	0.26 × 0.20 × 0.12
$2\theta_{\text{max}}$, °	64.04	52.99
Collected/indep reflns	21 845/5317	40 776/8447
<i>R</i> _{int}	0.0311	0.0580
Restraints/parameters	0/275	179/679
<i>R</i> ₁ , <i>wR</i> ₂ (<i>I</i> > 2 σ (<i>I</i>))	0.0318, 0.0872	0.0928, 0.2568
<i>R</i> ₁ , <i>wR</i> ₂ (all data)	0.0350, 0.0898	0.1295, 0.2869
Goodness-of-fit	1.031	1.121

2·MeCN, a large (*ca.* 4 e⁻ Å⁻³) residual electron density was found close to the C31-O7 hydroxymethyl group, at 1.36 Å from C31. When this peak was assigned to the minor (*ca.* 15%) component of a disordered C-O group, an unphysically short (2.19 Å) intermolecular contact was produced with C25, belonging to a non-disordered hydroxymethyl group. This suggests that the residual electron density peak might be an artefact related to unresolvable crystal twinning or other so-far unidentified causes. The final *R* indices are consequently high, but the structural model is otherwise satisfactory for the purpose of this study. CCDC 1522449 and 1522450 contain the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper.

Magnetic measurements

Magnetization measurements were carried out on 7.38 and 8.66 mg pelletized polycrystalline samples of 1 and 2, respectively, using a Quantum Design MPMS SQUID magnetometer equipped with a 5 T magnet. The temperature dependence of molar magnetic susceptibility (χ_M) was monitored from 1.8 to 300 (400) K for 1 (2) with an applied field $H_{\text{DC}} = 10$ kOe at $T \geq 35$ K and 1 kOe at $T < 35$ K so as to reduce magnetic saturation effects. The field dependence of molar magnetization (M_M) was also evaluated at 1.8, 2.5 and 4.5 K with an applied field up to 50 kOe. The magnetic data were corrected for the sample holder contribution and for the sample diamagnetism (-421×10^{-6} and -392×10^{-6} emu mol⁻¹ for 1 and 2, respectively, calculated from Pascal's constants⁴⁴).

Magnetic measurements under pressure on 1 were performed using a Quantum Design MPMS3 magnetometer equipped with a 7 T magnet. A polycrystalline sample of 9.1 mg was loaded into the CuBe piston-cylinder type high pressure capsule cell (HMD, Japan). Daphne 7373 oil was used as a pressure-transmitting medium hydrostatic up to 1.2 GPa. The actual pressure (*p*) in the sample chamber at low tempera-

ture was determined with 0.02 GPa accuracy from the linear pressure dependence of the superconducting transition temperature (T_c) of high-purity lead ($dT_c/dp = 0.379 \text{ K GPa}^{-1}$). The residual field of the magnet was cancelled before each measurement using the magnet reset option. The magnetic data were corrected for the background of the pressure cell filled with oil. The temperature dependence of χ_M was monitored from 1.8 to 300 K by applying $H_{DC} = 1 \text{ kOe}$, and the field dependence of M_M was then evaluated at 1.8 K with field dependence up to 70 kOe under different applied pressures up to 1.00 GPa. The magnetic data were corrected with the same diamagnetic sample contribution reported above.

Photo-magnetic measurements were carried out with a pelletized mixture of polycrystalline **2** ($\sim 0.5 \text{ mg}$) and powdered KBr so as to facilitate light penetration (the actual Fe content was evaluated by scaling the magnetic moment on that of the heavier sample of pure **2** used for regular measurements). Irradiation experiments were performed using a 532 nm laser beam with the CW laser diode coupled to an optical fibre inserted in the sample space through a hollow sample rod. The beam was collimated on the sample by means of an aspheric lens, yielding a radiant power on the sample of about 2 mW cm^{-2} . T_{LIESST} measurement consisted of monitoring the temperature featuring a minimum in the $d(\chi_M T)/dT$ curve, after reaching the photostationary limit at 10 K, switching the laser off and warming up the sample at a rate of 0.3 K min^{-1} . Magnetic moments were corrected for the diamagnetic contribution of KBr and the sample holder (independently measured in the same range of field and temperature) as well as for the intrinsic diamagnetism of the sample (see above).

Computational details


In vacuo DFT calculations were performed on the cations $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-R})_2]^{2+}$ of **1** and **2** using Gaussian 09,⁴⁵ at the (U)M06/6-311+G(d) and (U)M06/6-31+G(d) levels of theory. The M06 functional⁴⁶ was adopted owing to its optimal performance in treating organometallic systems.⁴⁶ (U)M06/6-311+G(d) geometry optimizations were performed in both $S = 0$ and $S = 2$ spin states, starting from both the distorted and undistorted geometries around the iron(II) ion as provided by X-ray experiments. For each complex, optimizations with such four starting guesses ended up in only two minima, *i.e.*, the distorted HS and the undistorted LS states, the former being the most

stable one for both **1** and **2**. Frequency calculations at the same level of theory confirmed that the optimized $S = 0$ structures were true minima, while spurious imaginary frequencies were obtained for the optimized structures with $S = 2$. Such negative frequencies were eliminated only by increasing the grid size up to 99 590 (Grid = UltraFine option in Gaussian 09) and reducing the basis set to 6-31+G(d), with no significant change in the optimized parameters. Thermal analysis was then performed at 298 K at the (U)M06/6-31+G(d) level of theory. Natural Bond Orbital (NBO) analysis⁴⁷ was used for evaluating the atomic charges of both bpp-R ligands and (U)M06/6-311+G(d) structurally-optimized complex cations (tables with Cartesian coordinates, electronic energies and NBO charges of the two ligands and of the optimized complexes in the two spin configurations are reported in the ESI†).

Results

Synthesis of ligands and formation of complexes

The synthesis of bpp-triolH_3 was based on a four-step reaction, which started from the commercially available citrazinic acid and involved bpp-COOME as an intermediate (Scheme 2). The detailed synthetic conditions described in the ESI† are based on previous important work by Halcrow *et al.*^{14,48} and, more recently, by Coronado *et al.*,^{31,49} in which the ligands bpp-COOME ²⁷ and bpp-triolH_3 ⁴⁹ were separately reported. Methyl 2,6-dichloroisonicotinate was first synthesized according to the literature procedure^{33,50–53} by reacting citrazinic acid with phosphorous oxychloride in the presence of ammonium chloride and heating the reaction mixture overnight at $140 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$. After cooling down to room temperature, cold methanol was added and the compound was precipitated by the addition of aqueous K_2CO_3 . The acid bpp-COOH was obtained^{27,31} by prolonged heating of methyl 2,6-dichloroisonicotinate with pyrazole and NaH in diglyme, followed by acid workup. The methyl ester bpp-COOME was then prepared by standard methods and reacted with tris(hydroxymethyl)aminomethane in DMSO at room temperature in the presence of K_2CO_3 . After filtration of the excess of the potassium salt and removal of the solvent under vacuum, the treatment of the yellow oily residue with CHCl_3/n -hexane gave bpp-triolH_3 as a white powder in considerably improved yield compared with the available literature



Scheme 2 (a) (i) POCl_3 , $140 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ (overnight) (ii) MeOH (86%); (b) pyrazole, NaH, diglyme, $140 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ (5 days) (83%); (c) SOCl_2 , MeOH (82%); (d) tris(hydroxymethyl)aminomethane, DMSO, K_2CO_3 (78%).

procedure (78 vs. 38%).⁴⁹ All products were achieved in good yields on the gram scale leading to a remarkable overall yield of 46% for the four-step procedure.

The synthesis of the metal complexes **1** and **2** was conveniently carried out by adding the metal perchlorate salt to a suspension of the bpp-R ligands in MeCN, which caused immediate dissolution of the ligand and a concomitant colour change to red-purple. Vapour diffusion of Et₂O in the filtered solution afforded the desired products in reasonable yields as red X-ray quality crystals within a week. The infrared spectrum of **1** shows a slight blue-shift of the ester C=O stretching band from 1732 cm⁻¹ in the free ligand to 1737 cm⁻¹. By contrast, the amide C=O stretching band in **2** undergoes a red-shift from 1671 to 1663 cm⁻¹ upon complexation. ν O–H and ν N–H vibration modes in **2** appear as a broad intense band centred at 3400 cm⁻¹ accompanied by a shoulder at 3240 cm⁻¹ that extends down to 2700 cm⁻¹. This pattern is suggestive of a hydrogen bond network involving O–H and N–H groups in the solid state (see below). The perchlorate stretching is present in both spectra as a broad signal centred at 1100 cm⁻¹, as expected for ClO₄⁻ anions in T_d symmetry.⁵⁴

Crystal and molecular structures

Compound **1** crystallizes in the monoclinic C2/c space group with four formula units per unit cell. The iron(II) ion sits on a twofold crystallographic axis and the asymmetric unit contains a half mononuclear complex and one perchlorate anion. As a consequence, the [Fe(bpp-COOMe)₂]²⁺ cation has crystallographically-imposed twofold symmetry (Fig. 1). Selected geometrical parameters of the coordination sphere at 115(2) K are gathered in Table 2. The clearest aspect in the molecular structure of this hexacoordinated iron(II) complex is the distortion of the octahedral coordination environment, as described by the *trans*-N{py}–Fe–N{py} angle ϕ = 158.77(5)° and by the dihedral (twisting) angle between the two ligands θ = 80.738(12)°. The clamp angle ψ = 146.33(3)° reflects the coordination of the bpp-COOMe ligands with long Fe–N distances (2.14–2.20 Å) that are characteristic of the HS state⁸ (see below). The same conclusion can be drawn by inspecting the distortion index Σ , whose value (155.7°) lies well within the




Fig. 1 Molecular structure and crystal packing of the cation [Fe(bpp-COOMe)₂]²⁺ in **1** with selected atom labels; intermolecular contacts are depicted as light blue dashes (colour code: Fe = dark green, O = red, N = blue, C = grey, H atoms and ClO₄⁻ anions omitted for clarity).

Table 2 Bond distances (Å), angles (°) and distortion indices (°) of **1** from single-crystal X-ray diffraction and computational studies on the cation [Fe(bpp-COOMe)₂]²⁺ in both HS (*S* = 2) and LS (*S* = 0) states

	Experimental	HS (<i>S</i> = 2)	LS (<i>S</i> = 0)
Fe1–N1	2.1643(10)	2.174	1.996
Fe1–N2 (py)	2.1366(9)	2.150	1.914
Fe1–N3	2.1932(10)	2.200	1.996
<i>r</i> _{Fe–N} ^a	2.165	2.175	1.969
N1–Fe1–N2	73.38(3)	73.28	79.93
N2–Fe1–N3	73.27(3)	72.85	79.85
N1–Fe1–N3 (ψ)	146.33(3)	144.87	159.78
N2–Fe1–N2 ^b (ϕ)	158.77(5)	158.44	179.55
θ^c	80.738(12)	77.86	90.00
Σ^d	155.7	160.5	88.0
θ^d	479	500	288

^a Average Fe–N distance. ^b Primed atom is obtained from unprimed atom through twofold rotation. ^c Dihedral angle between the two ligands (the plane of each ligand was defined as the least-squares plane through its sixteen aromatic C/N atoms). ^d See ref. 7 for its definition.

range typically exhibited by HS complexes (140–200°).⁷ The coordination mode is also quite asymmetric, with a difference in the Fe–N bond distances of the two pyrazolyl arms of about 0.03 Å, and a shorter Fe–N bond length with the central pyridyl ring.

The two shortest intermolecular interactions between [Fe(bpp-COOMe)₂]²⁺ cations involve two pyrazolyl C–H groups: one occurs with the carbonyl group (C1(H1)⋯O1 = 3.2704(15) Å, C1–H1⋯O1 = 153.44(15)°) (Fig. 1) and leads to an intermolecular Fe⋯Fe distance of 9.632 Å. The second one involves the pyrazolyl ring of an adjacent molecule (C10(H10)⋯centroid (N1C1C2C3N4) = 3.44 Å, C10–H10⋯centroid(N1C1C2C3N4) = 149°) (Fig. 1) with an intermolecular Fe⋯Fe distance of 8.480 Å. Perchlorate anions are located in the voids between cations and all their oxygen atoms are involved in weak C–H⋯O interactions (ESI, Fig. S1†).

Compound **2**·MeCN crystallizes in the monoclinic P2₁/n space group, with four formula units per unit cell. The asymmetric unit comprises one mononuclear complex, two perchlorate anions and one interstitial MeCN molecule (Fig. 2). The selected coordination parameters at 140(2) K, reported in Table 3, show that the [Fe(bpp-triolH₃)₂]²⁺ cation features a much smaller distortion compared to **1**. Its angular parameters ϕ = 179.30(15)° and θ = 87.414(34)° are indeed very close to the ideal values for a regular octahedron. The clamp angles ψ_1 and ψ_2 of the two crystallographically-independent bpp-triolH₃ ligands are very similar to each other and close to 160°. The Fe–N distances range from 1.89 to 1.97 Å, with the central pyridyl ring still forming the shortest coordination bond. These bond lengths and the low value of the distortion index Σ (85.0°) are characteristic of a LS state.⁸ The two Fe–N bonds with pyrazolyl nitrogen atoms are now of equal length within experimental error and the FeN₆ chromophore thus closely approaches D_{2d} symmetry.

The partially-disordered OH groups of the ligands give rise to a series of intra- and inter-molecular hydrogen bonds (Fig. 2




Fig. 2 Molecular structure and crystal packing of the cation $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-triolH}_3)_2]^{2+}$ in 2-MeCN with selected atom labels; H bonds are depicted as light blue dashes (colour code: Fe = dark green, O = red, N = blue, C = grey; H, ClO_4^- anions and acetonitrile omitted for clarity; only the main components of the disordered OH groups are drawn).

Table 3 Bond distances (Å), angles ($^\circ$) and distortion indices ($^\circ$) of 2-MeCN from single-crystal X-ray diffraction and computational studies on the cation $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-triolH}_3)_2]^{2+}$ in both LS ($S = 0$) and HS ($S = 2$) states

	Experimental	LS ($S = 0$)	HS ($S = 2$)
Fe1–N1	1.973(4)	1.997	2.202
Fe1–N2 (py)	1.894(4)	1.916	2.144
Fe1–N3	1.967(4)	1.997	2.177
Fe1–N4	1.972(3)	— ^a	2.200
Fe1–N5 (py)	1.895(4)	— ^a	2.146
Fe1–N6	1.965(4)	— ^a	2.179
$r_{\text{Fe-N}}^b$	1.944	1.970	2.175
N1–Fe1–N2	80.12(14)	79.74	73.00
N2–Fe1–N3	80.36(14)	79.87	73.33
N1–Fe1–N3 (ψ_1)	160.48(14)	159.61	145.49
N4–Fe1–N5	80.43(14)	— ^a	72.96
N5–Fe1–N6	79.91(14)	— ^a	73.22
N4–Fe1–N6 (ψ_2)	160.34(14)	— ^a	144.97
N2–Fe1–N5 (ϕ)	179.30(15)	178.58	160.11
θ^c	87.414(34)	89.49	79.55
Σ^d	85.0	88.7	157.8
Θ^d	292	290	495

^a Only symmetry-unique parameters are given for the computed structure. ^b Average Fe–N distance. ^c Dihedral angle between the two ligands (the plane of each ligand was defined as the least-squares plane through its sixteen aromatic C/N atoms). ^d See ref. 7 for its definition.

and ESI, Table S2†). One full-occupancy OH group per ligand is intramolecularly H-bonded to the carbonyl oxygen ($\text{O2}\cdots\text{O1} = 2.770(5)$ Å, $\text{O2-H}\cdots\text{O1} = 129.8^\circ$; $\text{O7}\cdots\text{O5} = 2.747(5)$ Å, $\text{O7-H}\cdots\text{O5} = 141.3^\circ$). The major component of a disordered OH group is also involved in an intramolecular H bond within the trimethylol portion of the ligand ($\text{O8A}\cdots\text{O6} = 2.658(8)$ Å, $\text{O8A-H}\cdots\text{O6} = 140.4^\circ$). Intermolecular H bonds link the cations into approximately linear chains ($\text{O4A}\cdots\text{O7} = 2.671(7)$ Å, $\text{O4A-H}\cdots\text{O7} = 163.0^\circ$) and provide interconnections between chains ($\text{N11}\cdots\text{O8A} = 2.846(7)$ Å, $\text{N11-H}\cdots\text{O8A} = 154.2^\circ$). The two remaining OH groups are involved in H bonds with the perchlorate anions ($\text{O3}\cdots\text{O11} = 2.902(10)$ Å, $\text{O3-H}\cdots\text{O11} = 155.4^\circ$; $\text{O6}\cdots\text{O12} = 2.769(7)$ Å, $\text{O6-H}\cdots\text{O12} = 171.1^\circ$). The interstitial acetonitrile molecule is disordered and is only weakly bound to the surrounding cations and anions. It simply fills the voids in the crystal lattice (ESI, Fig. S2†) and is in fact rapidly lost once the crystals are removed from their mother liquor.

Within this crystal packing, the shortest Fe \cdots Fe separation is 8.702 Å, hence very close to that found in 1.

Compound 1 belongs to the small number of HS derivatives with $\phi < 160^\circ$, which in few cases approaches 150° ,^{34,38a} and thus does not fulfil the condition suggested for SCO to be possible ($\phi > 172^\circ$).⁸ Note, however, that the compounds $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-Me})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_2$ ($\phi = 163.7^\circ$, $\theta = 89.5^\circ$)²² and $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-E-C}\equiv\text{C-C}_6\text{H}_5)_2](\text{BF}_4)_2\cdot\text{acetone}$ ($\phi = 161.9^\circ$, $\theta = 73.0^\circ$)^{38c} were both shown to exhibit SCO in spite of their low ϕ values. Since the θ parameter in 1 is definitely more favourable than in $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-E-C}\equiv\text{C-C}_6\text{H}_5)_2](\text{BF}_4)_2\cdot\text{acetone}$ ^{38c} and is well above the threshold value for SCO (76°), 1 gets a chance for showing SCO.

By contrast, 2, with its approximate D_{2d} symmetry, is a perfect candidate for undergoing thermally- and light-induced SCO. In particular, it bears overall structural resemblance and similar distortion parameters to the SCO derivatives $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-pPy})_2\text{H}](\text{ClO}_4)_3$ ($T_{1/2} = 286$ K)²⁷ (bpp-pPy = 2',6'-bis(pyrazol-1-yl)-4,4'-bipyridine) and $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-COOH})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_2$ ($T_{1/2} = 382$ K),³¹ in which complex cations also interact *via* H bonds and form supramolecular chains (see below for more details). In order to ascertain the possible occurrence of SCO, we undertook magnetic and photomagnetic studies on 1 and 2.

Magnetic properties

The temperature dependence of the low-field molar magnetic susceptibility of 1 is reported in Fig. 3 as a $\chi_M T$ vs. T plot along with the isothermal field dependence of the molar magnetization, M_M , up to 5 T at 1.8, 2.5 and 5.0 K. At 300 K the $\chi_M T$ product is 3.74 emu K mol⁻¹, due to the significant orbital contribution to the paramagnetism of HS iron(II) complexes and in line with previous findings on similar derivatives.¹⁹ On cooling, it remains almost unvaried until 60 K, when it starts to decrease slowly and then abruptly below 20 K reaching 0.52 emu K mol⁻¹ at 1.8 K. This behaviour reflects the selective population of the HS ($S = 2$) state, with zero field splitting (zfs) effects being responsible for the $\chi_M T$ drop at low temperature. All data could be satisfactorily fitted with the PHI program⁵⁵ according to the Hamiltonian presented in eqn (1), where g is the Landé factor and D and E are the axial and transverse zfs parameters, respectively. The best-fit parameters so-obtained are: $g = 2.24(1)$, $D = 10.0(3)$ cm⁻¹ and $E = 2.5(2)$ cm⁻¹. These




Fig. 3 Temperature dependence of the $\chi_M T$ product (black circles) for **1**; inset: field dependence of the molar magnetization, M_M , at 1.8, 2.5 and 5.0 K. Solid lines are given by the best-fit parameters (see the text).

values are in line with those previously reported for this class of compounds.¹⁹

$$\hat{H}_S = D\hat{S}_z^2 + E(\hat{S}_x^2 - \hat{S}_y^2) + \mu_B g \hat{B} \cdot \hat{S} \quad (1)$$

It is reported that, in nearly all cases, the HS \rightarrow LS transition is accompanied by a small increase in ϕ but essentially no change in θ .⁷ Since the latter is already above the threshold value for SCO while the former is lower than required, for the first time with this type of ligand we attempted to promote SCO by applying an external pressure, in order to induce a realignment of the two ligands and force ϕ to a value higher than 172° . The magnetic properties of **1** were then investigated under pressure up to 1.00 GPa in 1.8–300 K and 0–7 T temperature and magnetic field ranges, respectively, on a polycrystalline sample loaded into a CuBe piston-cylinder pressure cell. The temperature dependence of the $\chi_M T$ product at $H_{DC} = 0.1$ T and under pressure (ESI, Fig. S3†) is not much different from that observed under ambient pressure in a regular measurement (slight differences are due to small distortions of the raw data by the pressure cell body). The field dependence of the magnetization at 1.8 K (ESI, Fig. S3†) also does not deviate significantly from that measured under ambient pressure in a regular sample holder. This indicates that external pressures as high as 1.00 GPa have little or no influence on the magnetic properties of **1**, which does not undergo pressure-induced thermal SCO. The induction of SCO in **1** by compression would presumably require a profound rearrangement of the two bpp-COOME ligands around the iron(II) centre towards an N{py}–Fe–N{py} angle ϕ closer to 180° , but crystal packing and the position of the perchlorate anions probably hamper such a reorganization.

The temperature dependence of the low-field $\chi_M T$ product of **2** is reported in Fig. 4. Below 300 K, $\chi_M T$ values are close to zero, as expected for a fully populated LS state with a minor fraction of non-converted HS state (about 3%), as confirmed




Fig. 4 Temperature dependence of the $\chi_M T$ product between 1.8 and 400 K of **2** in the dark (black circles), under irradiation with 532 nm light at 10 K (red circles) and upon heating after irradiation (green circles); inset: determination of the T_{LIESST} value.

by isothermal magnetization profiles (ESI, Fig. S4†). Heating the compound above 300 K produces a sharp increase of $\chi_M T$, which reaches $1.11 \text{ emu K mol}^{-1}$ at 400 K. Since complete population of the HS state would lead to a $\chi_M T$ value of $3.1\text{--}3.8 \text{ emu K mol}^{-1}$, approximately one-third of the overall iron(II) content has undergone the spin transition at 400 K. By extrapolation, $T_{1/2}$ is expected to lie above 400 K, as observed in other SCO materials:^{56,57} such a high temperature of spin transition hampers the observation of thermal hysteretic behaviour.

Due to the selective population of the LS state at low temperatures, the photo-magnetic activity of **2** was checked by means of light-dependent magnetization measurements. The compound was irradiated at 10 K with a 532 nm laser beam for approximately 2 h, till photo-stationary was reached with a recorded $\chi_M T$ value of $0.43 \text{ emu K mol}^{-1}$. Taking **1** as a HS reference, this value corresponds to a HS fraction of about 12% (ESI, Fig. S5†). Partial photo-conversion in the SCO systems is usually attributed to light penetration issues in the whole amount of the sample or to fast competing relaxation pathways available even at cryogenic temperatures. The latter may be related to the spectral overlap of the photo-excitation/de-excitation bands, or to strong vibronic coupling between the metastable HS and the ground LS states (adiabatic phonon relaxation), as suggested by the high temperature of SCO interconversion.⁵⁸

After switching the light off, the $\chi_M T$ plot was recorded (Fig. 4, green circles) as the temperature was gradually increased at a rate of 0.3 K min^{-1} , following a standard T_{LIESST} protocol.^{21,25,59} At first, the $\chi_M T$ plot increased due to the zfs of the photo-induced HS iron(II) ion and reached a maximum value of $0.46 \text{ emu K mol}^{-1}$ forming a plateau from 16 to 20 K. Afterwards, a monotonic decrease of the $\chi_M T$ plot was observed upon warming up until the curve reached the values found without irradiation, at around 75 K. A T_{LIESST} value of 38 K was determined from the minimum of the $d\chi_M T/dT$ -vs- T curve (Fig. 4, inset).

Theoretical calculations

Theoretical calculations on this kind of compounds have been reported in recent years,⁶⁰ aiming at describing the ground state,^{61,62} the LIESST phenomenon⁶³ and the impact of crystal packing^{62,64} on the spin state. The HS–LS dualism is investigated here through analysis of the energies and the atomic charges of the optimised structures of both ligands and complexes.

Geometry optimizations were performed on the cations $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-R})_2]^{2+}$ in the gas phase, starting from the geometries experimentally found in the X-ray structures of **1** and **2**·MeCN and imposing the same spin configuration as determined by magnetic measurements (below 300 K for **2**), that is $S = 2$ for **1** and $S = 0$ for **2**. Calculations provided structural parameters in very close agreement with the experimental ones (Tables 2 and 3), confirming that the two compounds occupy in the solid state two stable minima in their respective Potential Energy Surface (PES). In particular, the clear distinction between the distorted and the undistorted octahedral geometries shown by **1** and **2**·MeCN, respectively, has been accurately reproduced.⁶⁵

In the attempt to rationalize the different magnetic behaviour shown by **1** and **2**, and the mutual effect between their spin configuration and structural properties, geometry optimizations were also performed on the complexes in their opposite spin configurations (*i.e.*, $S = 0$ for **1** and $S = 2$ for **2**), starting from the hypothetical undistorted and distorted geometries, respectively. Well defined minima have been obtained, where the geometry of complex **1** was similar to that of **2** at low spin and the geometry of complex **2** was similar to that of **1** at high spin (see last columns of Tables 2 and 3). For both compounds, the HS distorted structure was found to be more stable than the LS undistorted one by 13.2 (**1**) and 13.7 kcal mol⁻¹ (**2**). These results indicate that intermolecular interactions, neglected in the present gas-phase calculations, should be responsible for the unexpected stabilization of the LS structure observed for **2** in the solid state at temperatures below 400 K. In fact, **1** shows only weak C–H...O interactions in its crystal structure and assumes the lowest energy configuration. By contrast, the network of relatively strong intermolecular H bonds in **2**·MeCN can favour the population of the relative minimum on its PES with respect to the absolute one.

Owing to the important role played by enthalpy and entropy contributions in determining the relative stability of the spin states of the complexes,^{62,64} thermal analysis at 298 K was also performed. While the same $\Delta G_{\text{HS} \rightarrow \text{LS}}$ free energy variation from the distorted HS to the undistorted LS state was obtained for **1** and **2** (16.3 kcal mol⁻¹), a slightly larger enthalpy variation was obtained for **2** with respect to **1** ($\Delta H_{\text{HS} \rightarrow \text{LS}} = 13.2$ vs. 11.3 kcal mol⁻¹, respectively), suggesting an even stronger impact of crystal packing in stabilizing the LS state for **2**.

Plots of the frontier Molecular Orbitals (MOs) mainly localized on the iron(II) centre are reported in the ESI, Fig. S6,† together with the corresponding energies and the *d*-orbital contributions. By considering the unoccupied and the doubly

or singly occupied MOs closest in energy, we computed energy gaps equal to 134.97 and 72.28 kcal mol⁻¹ for the LS and the HS states of **1** and 135.04 and 73.94 kcal mol⁻¹ for the corresponding states of **2**. Such quantities can be related to the ligand field strengths at the iron(II) ion, 10Dq, providing 10Dq^{LS}/10Dq^{HS} ratios equal to 1.87 and 1.83 for **1** and **2**, respectively. These results are in agreement with the relationship proposed by Halcrow *et al.*,¹⁸ who connected 10Dq^{LS}/10Dq^{HS} with the sixth power of the average Fe–N bond length ratios in the HS and LS states, $(r_{\text{HS}}/r_{\text{LS}})^6$, equal to 1.82 and 1.81 for **1** and **2**, respectively (Tables 2 and 3). Moreover, such ratios are significantly greater than 1.74, the value typically observed for compounds showing SCO,³ further confirming that at molecular levels both compounds share the same behaviour without any expected SCO transition.

The atomic charges of the four optimized structures and of the free ligands were determined through NBO analysis,⁴⁷ following an approach of demonstrated validity⁶⁶ (ESI, Table S3†). In the two free ligands, the overall charge of the R groups is close to zero, implying that the substituents do not affect the charge distribution in the bpp backbone. As a consequence, the three nitrogen atoms involved in the coordination to the metal have the same negative charges in the two cases, with the pyridyl nitrogen atom being more negative ($-0.42e$) than the pyrazolyl ones (about $-0.26e$). The two ligands are thus expected to exhibit a comparable donor power to the iron(II) centre. Irrespective to the R substituent, the residual charge on the metal is indeed close to zero in the LS state or $+0.91e$ in the HS state. Furthermore, the residual charge of the COOMe and triolH₃ groups in all cases remains low and almost constant (0.10–0.12 e). This analysis indicates a similar effect of ligand electronic character on the coordination geometry.

Discussion

Computational analysis on the gas-phase cations $[\text{Fe}(\text{bpp-R})_2]^{2+}$ of **1** and **2** indicates that in both cases the HS configuration is the most stable one, even including temperature effects. The two bpp-COOMe and bpp-triolH₃ ligands appear to exert comparable electronic influence on the spin state of the iron(II) ion, as evidenced by quite similar computed charges and geometrical parameters when the same spin configuration is considered (compare data of columns HS ($S = 2$) and those of columns LS ($S = 0$) in Tables 2 and 3). It then shows that the different magnetic behaviour of **1** and **2** observed in the solid state should be ascribed to the different patterns of intermolecular interactions in their crystal structures. Taking into account similar anion–cation electrostatic attractions due to the use of perchlorate in both compounds,⁶⁴ H bonds are the main structural motif differentiating the two structures from each other. Relatively strong⁶⁷ O–H...O bonds connect the molecules of **2** on either sides forming linear, infinite chains that develop approximately parallel to the N{py}–Fe–N{py} bond direction. The almost optimal arrangement of H bonds along these chains (O–H...O angle measures 163.0°)

is possible only with a concomitant $N\{py\}-Fe-N\{py\}$ angle ϕ close to 180° , a geometry which promotes the LS configuration of the metal ion. This would suggest that H bonding can be considered as the driving force for the adoption of a LS configuration by **2**, until the entropy-driven stabilization of the HS state sets in at sufficiently high temperatures.

A scenario similar to the one observed in **2** holds in two other members of the $[Fe(bpp-R)_2](X)_2$ family, namely $[Fe(bpp-pPy)_2H](ClO_4)_3$ ²⁷ and $[Fe(bpp-COOH)_2](ClO_4)_2$.³¹ In the former, the complex cations are arranged in supramolecular chains through $(N-H)^+\cdots N$ hydrogen bonds involving the 4-Py substituents ($N\cdots N = 2.654 \text{ \AA}$). Distortion angles are $\phi = 174.9^\circ$ and $\theta = 87.2^\circ$ and the compound displays a 2 K wide thermal hysteresis loop with $T_{1/2\uparrow} = 287 \text{ K}$ and $T_{1/2\downarrow} = 285 \text{ K}$.²⁷ In $[Fe(bpp-COOH)_2](ClO_4)_2$, a chain-like supramolecular structure is also attained *via* a pair of complementary H bond interactions between 4-carboxylic groups ($O\cdots O = 2.671 \text{ \AA}$). In this case, distortion angles ($\phi = 180^\circ$ and $\theta = 87^\circ$) are within 1° from those we found in **2** and the compound also exhibits SCO above room temperature, with $T_{1/2\uparrow} = 384 \text{ K}$, $T_{1/2\downarrow} = 381 \text{ K}$ and $T_{LIESST} = 60 \text{ K}$.³¹ The lower T_{LIESST} observed in **2** (38 K) suggests a decrease in the thermal activation barrier to the relaxation of the metastable HS phase. This finding, along with the lower photo-converted HS fraction at low temperatures and higher $T_{1/2}$, fits into the Inverse Gap Energy Law introduced by Hauser⁵⁸ and points out a high energy difference between the two isomeric spin forms of **2**. Interestingly, the organization of deprotonated $[Fe(bpp-triol)_2]^{4-}$ units into 1D chains with $[MnMo_6O_{18}]^{3+}$ polyoxometallate (POM) fragments was found to further increase $T_{1/2}$, leading to a stable LS configuration up to 400 K, with a similar effect to H bonds.⁴⁹ Unfortunately, no X-ray structural data are available for this hybrid compound.

Compound **1** can also be compared with $[Fe(bpp-COOH)_2](ClO_4)_2$ ³¹ and $[Fe(bpp-Me)_2](ClO_4)$.²² Once the possibility to form H-bonded 1D chains is removed *via* esterification of the carboxylic fragment, the weak $C-H\cdots O/\pi$ intermolecular interactions in the crystal packing of **1** lead to a very distorted cation, which is then stabilised in the HS state at all temperatures. $[Fe(bpp-Me)_2](ClO_4)$ ²² features secondary interactions similar to **1**, but the lower steric hindrance of the methyl group leads to a 'terpyridine embrace packing' of the cations and then thermally-induced HS \leftrightarrow LS conversion.

Conclusions

The present work describes two new members of the $[Fe(bpp-R)_2](X)_2$ family, which reside well in the overall mosaic drawn by Halcrow *et al.* for this class of compounds (see Fig. 5 for a ϕ vs. θ plot based on the available X-ray structural data,^{7,8,22,26,31} including those for **1** and **2**). It also adds important insights into the role of intermolecular contacts in promoting and modulating spin conversion. Although the two ligands display the same donor power to the iron(II) centre, as outlined by NBO charges, **1** ($R = COOMe$) possesses a heavily-distorted octahedral coordination environment ($\phi = 158.77(5)^\circ$ and $\theta =$




Fig. 5 Plot of the values of θ vs. ϕ from the $[Fe(bpp-R)_2](X)_2$ compounds for HS (\blacklozenge) and LS (\blacklozenge) complexes that remain in that spin state at all tested temperatures, and for complexes in their HS (\bullet) or LS (\bullet) state which undergo SCO upon cooling or heating, respectively. When more than one independent molecule is present in the crystal structure, the mean value is reported as a unique point. Compounds that are subject of the present paper are highlighted as filled black diamonds (\blacklozenge).

$80.738(12)^\circ$) that hampers the SCO from its thermodynamic HS state, even under applied pressure. On the other hand, **2** ($R = triolH_3$) features a much more regular coordination sphere ($\phi = 179.30(15)^\circ$ and $\theta = 87.414(34)^\circ$) and a LS state up to 400 K, when a thermally induced SCO sets in; at cryogenic temperatures, **2** displays photomagnetic properties through the LIESST effect with $T_{LIESST} = 38 \text{ K}$.

Since our theoretical studies indicate that both complexes have a thermodynamic HS state in the gas phase, intermolecular interactions must provide the supplementary energy contribution necessary to invert the stability of the spin configurations and afford a LS state in **2** below 400 K. In the solid state, the $[Fe(bpp-triolH_3)_2]^{2+}$ cations are indeed involved in a network of relatively strong H bonds with the formation of infinite chains through $O-H\cdots O$ contacts and the presence of interchain $N-H\cdots O$ linkages. This approach stresses out the idea that SCO behaviour can be actively modulated by the functionalization of the ligands without directly affecting their coordination towards the iron(II) centre, but by simply exploiting their potential to afford specific intermolecular interactions. Furthermore, as a certain aim in our future research, the triolH₃ fragment can act as a tripodal ligand for the well-known propeller-like Fe₄ SMMs⁶⁸ and afford multi-responsive compounds similar to the bimetallic Mn^{III}-Fe^{II} 1D chains comprising alternating POMs and SCO centres recently reported.⁴⁹

Acknowledgements

The research has been supported by the Italian MIUR through the FIRB project no. RBAP117RWN and by the European Research Council through the Advanced Grant MolNanoMaS

no. 267746. D. P. gratefully acknowledges the financial support of the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education within the Iuventus Plus Programme, grant agreement no. 0370/IP3/2015/73. The authors also thank Prof. Roberta Sessoli (Dipartimento di Chimica 'Ugo Schiff', Università degli Studi di Firenze) for helpful discussion.

References

- (a) *Spin-Crossover Materials – Properties and Applications*, ed. M. A. Halcrow, Wiley, Chichester, 2013; (b) J. F. Letard, P. Guionneau and L. Goux-Capes, Spin Crossover in Transition Metal Compounds III, *Top. Curr. Chem.*, 2004, **235**, 221–249; (c) P. Guionneau, M. Marchivie, G. Bravic, J. F. Letard and D. Chasseau, Spin Crossover in Transition Metal Compounds II, *Top. Curr. Chem.*, 2004, **234**, 97–128.
- (a) O. Sato, J. Tao and Y.-Z. Zhang, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2007, **46**, 2152–2187; (b) H. J. Shepherd, G. Molnár, W. Nicolazzi, L. Salmon and A. Bousseksou, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.*, 2013, 653–661.
- (a) P. Gütllich and A. Hauser, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 1990, **97**, 1–22; (b) P. Gütllich, A. Hauser and H. Spiering, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.*, 1994, **33**, 2024–2054.
- M. A. Halcrow, *Chem. Lett.*, 2014, **43**, 1178–1188.
- P. Gütllich, A. B. Gaspar and Y. Garcia, *Beilstein J. Org. Chem.*, 2013, **9**, 342–391.
- P. Gütllich, Y. Garcia and H. A. Goodwin, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2000, **29**, 419–427.
- M. A. Halcrow, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2009, **253**, 2493–2514.
- L. J. Kershaw Cook, R. Mohammed, G. Sherborne, T. D. Roberts, S. Alvarez and M. A. Halcrow, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2015, **289–290**, 2–12.
- S. Hayami, Z. Z. Gu, M. Shiro, Y. Einaga, A. Fujishima and O. Sato, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2000, **122**, 7126–7127.
- N. Bridonneau, J. Long, J. L. Cantin, J. von Bardeleben, S. Pillet, E. E. Bendeif, D. Aravena, E. Ruiz and V. Marvaud, *Chem. Commun.*, 2015, **51**, 8229–8232.
- D. Pinkowicz, M. Rams, M. Misek, K. V. Kamenev, H. Tomkowiak, A. Katrusiak and B. Sieklucka, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2015, **137**, 8795–8802.
- P. Gütllich, V. Ksenofontov and A. B. Gaspar, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2005, **249**, 1811–1829.
- V. Ksenofontov, A. B. Gaspar, J. A. Real and P. Gütllich, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2001, **105**, 12266–12271.
- M. A. Halcrow, *New J. Chem.*, 2014, **38**, 1868–1882.
- J. Olguin and S. Brooker, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2011, **255**, 203–240.
- In ref. 8, Halcrow *et al.* refer to the clamp angle as φ , that is actually the same Greek letter as ϕ ; in order to avoid confusion we preferred to change the symbol to ψ .
- M. A. Halcrow, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2011, **40**, 4119–4142.
- J. M. Holland, J. A. McAllister, C. A. Kilner, M. Thornton-Pett, A. J. Bridgeman and M. A. Halcrow, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 2002, 548–554.
- J. Elhaik, D. J. Evans, C. A. Kilner and M. A. Halcrow, *Dalton Trans.*, 2005, 1693–1700.
- V. A. Money, J. S. Costa, S. Marcen, G. Chastanet, J. Elhaik, M. A. Halcrow, J. A. K. Howard and J. F. Letard, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 2004, **391**, 273–277.
- S. Marcen, L. Lecren, L. Capes, H. A. Goodwin and J. F. Letard, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 2002, **358**, 87–95.
- L. J. Kershaw Cook, F. L. Thorp-Greenwood, T. P. Comyn, O. Cespedes, G. Chastanet and M. A. Halcrow, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2015, **54**, 6319–6330.
- N. T. Nadhu, I. Salistros, F. Schramm, S. Klyatskaya, O. Fuhr and M. Ruben, *C. R. Chimie*, 2008, **11**, 1166–1174.
- L. J. Kershaw Cook, H. J. Shepard, T. P. Comyn, C. Baldé, O. Cespedes, G. Chastanet and M. A. Halcrow, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2015, **21**, 4805–4816.
- (a) C. Carbonera, J. S. Costa, V. A. Money, J. Elhaik, J. A. K. Howard, M. A. Halcrow and J. F. Letard, *Dalton Trans.*, 2006, 3058–3066; (b) V. A. Money, J. Elhaik, M. A. Halcrow and J. A. K. Howard, *Dalton Trans.*, 2004, 1516–1518.
- L. J. Kershaw Cook, R. Kulmaczewski, O. Cespedes and M. A. Halcrow, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2016, **22**, 1789–1799.
- C. Rajadurai, F. Schramm, S. Brink, O. Fuhr, M. Ghafari, R. Kruk and M. Ruben, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2006, **45**, 10019–10021.
- I. Salistros, J. Pavlik, R. Boča, O. Fuhr, C. Rajadurai and M. Ruben, *CrystEngComm*, 2010, **12**, 2361–2368.
- I. Šalistroš, O. Fuhr, R. Kruk, J. Pavlik, L. Pogány, B. Schäfer, M. Tatarko, R. Boča, W. Linert and M. Ruben, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.*, 2013, 1049–1057.
- C. Rajadurai, Z. Qu, O. Fuhr, B. Gopalan, R. Kruk, M. Ghafari and M. Ruben, *Dalton Trans.*, 2007, 3531–3537.
- A. Abhervé, M. Clemente-Leon, E. Coronado, C. J. Gomez-Garcia and M. Lopez-Jorda, *Dalton Trans.*, 2014, **43**, 9406–9409.
- M. Nihei, I. Han, H. Tahira and H. Oshio, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2008, **361**, 3926–3930.
- J. Elhaik, C. M. Pask, C. A. Kilner and M. A. Halcrow, *Tetrahedron*, 2007, **63**, 291–298.
- M. Nihei, N. Takahashi, H. Nishikawa and H. Oshio, *Dalton Trans.*, 2011, **40**, 2154–2156.
- R. González-Prieto, B. Fleury, F. Schramm, G. Zoppellaro, R. Chandrasekar, O. Fuhr, S. Lebedkin, M. Kappes and M. Ruben, *Dalton Trans.*, 2011, **40**, 7564–7570.
- (a) I. Šalistroš, O. Fuhr, A. Eichhöfer, R. Kruk, J. Pavlik, L. Dlháň, R. Boča and M. Ruben, *Dalton Trans.*, 2012, **41**, 5163–5171; (b) I. Šalistroš, L. Pogány, M. Ruben, R. Boča and W. Linert, *Dalton Trans.*, 2014, **43**, 16584–16587; (c) I. Šalistroš, O. Fuhr and M. Ruben, *Materials*, 2016, **9**, 585–594.
- M. Nihei, T. Maeshima, Y. Kose and H. Oshio, *Polyhedron*, 2007, **26**, 1993–1996.
- (a) Y. Hasegawa, K. Takahashi, S. Kume and H. Nishihara, *Chem. Commun.*, 2011, **47**, 6846–6848; (b) K. Takahashi, Y. Hagesawa, R. Sakamoto, M. Nishikawa, S. Kume, E. Nishibori and H. Nishihara, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2012, **51**,

- 5188–5198; (c) Y. Hagesawa, R. Sakamoto, K. Takahashi and H. Nishihara, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2013, **52**, 1658–1665.
- 39 L. J. Kershaw Cook, R. Kulmaczewski, R. Mohammed, S. Dudley, S. A. Barrett, M. A. Little, R. J. Deeth and M. A. Halcrow, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2016, **55**, 4327–4331.
- 40 A. Altomare, G. Cascarano, C. Giacovazzo and A. Guagliardi, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.*, 1993, **26**, 343–350.
- 41 G. M. Sheldrick, *Acta Cryst. Sect. C: Struct. Chem.*, 2015, **71**, 3–8.
- 42 L. J. Farrugia, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.*, 2012, **45**, 849–854.
- 43 C. F. Macrae, I. J. Bruno, J. A. Chisholm, P. R. Edgington, P. McCabe, E. Pidcock, L. Rodriguez-Monge, R. Taylor, J. van de Streek and P. A. Wood, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.*, 2008, **41**, 466–470.
- 44 G. A. Bain and J. F. Berry, *J. Chem. Educ.*, 2008, **85**, 532–536.
- 45 M. J. Frisch, G. W. Trucks, H. B. Schlegel, G. E. Scuseria, M. A. Robb, J. R. Cheeseman, G. Scalmani, V. Barone, B. Mennucci, G. A. Petersson, H. Nakatsuji, M. Caricato, X. Li, H. P. Hratchian, A. F. Izmaylov, J. Bloino, G. Zheng, J. L. Sonnenberg, M. Hada, M. Ehara, K. Toyota, R. Fukuda, J. Hasegawa, M. Ishida, T. Nakajima, Y. Honda, O. Kitao, H. Nakai, T. Vreven, J. A. Montgomery Jr., J. E. Peralta, F. Ogliaro, M. Bearpark, J. J. Heyd, E. Brothers, K. N. Kudin, V. N. Staroverov, R. Kobayashi, J. Normand, K. Raghavachari, A. Rendell, J. C. Burant, S. S. Iyengar, J. Tomasi, M. Cossi, N. Rega, J. M. Millam, M. Klene, J. E. Knox, J. B. Cross, V. Bakken, C. Adamo, J. Jaramillo, R. Gomperts, R. E. Stratmann, O. Yazyev, A. J. Austin, R. Cammi, C. Pomelli, J. W. Ochterski, R. L. Martin, K. Morokuma, V. G. Zakrzewski, G. A. Voth, P. Salvador, J. J. Dannenberg, S. Dapprich, A. D. Daniels, Ö. Farkas, J. B. Foresman, J. V. Ortiz, J. Cioslowski and D. J. Fox, *Gaussian 09, Revision D.01*, Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2013.
- 46 Y. Zhao and D. Truhlar, *Theo. Chem. Accounts*, 2008, **120**, 215.
- 47 (a) A. E. Reed and F. Weinhold, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1985, **83**, 1736–1740; (b) A. E. Reed, L. A. Curtiss and F. Weinhold, *Chem. Rev.*, 1988, **88**, 899–926.
- 48 M. A. Halcrow, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2005, **249**, 2880–2908.
- 49 A. Abhervé, M. Palacios-Corella, J. M. Clemente-Juan, R. Marx, P. Neugebauer, J. van Slageren, M. Clemente-Leon and E. Coronado, *J. Mater. Chem. C*, 2015, **3**, 7936–7945.
- 50 M. Adamczyk, S. R. Akireddy and R. E. Reddy, *Tetrahedron*, 2002, **58**, 6951–6963.
- 51 C. Klein, E. Baranoff, M. Graetzel and M. K. Nazeeruddin, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 2011, **52**, 584–587.
- 52 J. Leblond, H. Gao, A. Petitjean and J.-C. Leroux, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2010, **132**, 8544–8545.
- 53 J. V. Mello and N. S. Finney, *Org. Lett.*, 2001, **3**, 4263–4265.
- 54 L. Rigamonti, A. Cinti, A. Forni, A. Pasini and O. Piovesana, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.*, 2008, 3633–3647.
- 55 N. F. Chilton, R. P. Anderson, L. D. Turner, A. Soncini and K. S. Murray, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 2013, **34**, 1164–1175.
- 56 X. Bao, P.-H. Guo, W. Liu, J. Tucek, W.-X. Zhang, J.-D. Leng, X.-M. Chen, I. Y. Gural'skiy, L. Salmon, A. Bousseksou and M.-L. Tong, *Chem. Sci.*, 2012, **3**, 1629–1633.
- 57 G. S. Matouzenko, S. A. Borshch, E. Jeanneau and M. B. Bushuev, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2009, **15**, 1252–1260.
- 58 A. Hauser, Spin Crossover in Transition Metal Compounds II, *Top. Curr. Chem.*, 2004, **234**, 155–198.
- 59 J. F. Letard, P. Guionneau, O. Nguyen, J. S. Costa, S. Marcen, G. Chastanet, M. Marchivie and L. Goux-Capes, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2005, **11**, 4582–4589.
- 60 S. Vela, M. Fumanal, J. Ribas-Ariño and V. Robert, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 2016, **37**, 947–953.
- 61 N. Suaud, M.-L. Bonnet, C. Boilleau, P. Labèguerie and N. Guihéry, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2009, **131**, 715–722.
- 62 S. Vela, M. Fumanal, J. Ribas-Ariño and V. Robert, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, **17**, 16306–16314.
- 63 A. Droghetti, D. Alfè and S. Sanvito, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter*, 2013, **87**, 205114.
- 64 S. Vela, J. J. Novoa and J. Ribas-Ariño, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2014, **16**, 27012–27024.
- 65 Torsion angles required for the θ definition were calculated by considering the centroids of the triangular faces of the pseudo-octahedron.
- 66 L. Rigamonti, M. Rusconi, A. Forni and A. Pasini, *Dalton Trans.*, 2011, **40**, 10162–10173.
- 67 G. R. Desiraju and T. Steiner, *The Weak Hydrogen Bond*, OUP, Chichester, 1999.
- 68 (a) A. Nava, L. Rigamonti, E. Zangrando, R. Sessoli, W. Wernsdorfer and A. Cornia, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2015, **54**, 8777–8782; (b) L. Rigamonti, C. Cotton, A. Nava, H. Lang, T. Rüffer, M. Perfetti, L. Sorace, A.-L. Barra, Y. Lan, W. Wernsdorfer, R. Sessoli and A. Cornia, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2016, **22**, 13705–13714.