Inorganic Chemistry

New Heteroleptic Bis-Phenanthroline Copper(I) Complexes with Dipyridophenazine or Imidazole Fused Phenanthroline Ligands: Spectral, Electrochemical, and Quantum Chemical Studies

Yann Pellegrin,[†] Martina Sandroni,[†] Errol Blart,[†] Aurélien Planchat,[†] Michel Evain,^{*,§} Narayan C. Bera,[‡] Megumi Kayanuma,[‡] Michel Sliwa,^{*,||} Mateusz Rebarz,^{||} Olivier Poizat,^{||} Chantal Daniel,^{*,‡} and Fabrice Odobel^{*,†}

⁺CEISAM, Université de Nantes, CNRS, 2 rue de la Houssinière, 44322 Nantes Cedex 3, France

[‡]Laboratoire de Chimie Quantique, Institut de Chimie, UMR 7177 CNRS-Université de Strasbourg, 4 rue Blaise Pascal, CS 90032, F-67081 Strasbourg Cedex, France

[§]IMN, Université de Nantes, CNRS, 2 rue de la Houssinière, 44322 Nantes Cedex 3, France

^{II}Laboratoire de Spectrochimie Infrarouge et Raman, UMR 8516 CNRS-Université Lille 1 Sciences et Technologies, 59655 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex, France

S Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Two new sterically challenged diimine ligands L_1 (2,9-dimesityl-2-(4'-bromophenyl)imidazo[4,5-f][1,10]phenanthroline) and L_2 (3,6-di-*n*-butyl-11-bromodipyrido[3,2-*a*:2',3'-*c*]phenazine) have been synthesized with the aim to build original heteroleptic copper(I) complexes, following the HETPHEN concept developed by Schmittel and co-workers. The structure of L_1 is based on a phen-imidazole molecular core, derivatized by two highly bulky mesityl groups in positions 2 and 9 of the phenanthroline cavity, preventing the formation of a homoleptic species, while L_2 is a dppz derivative, bearing *n*-butyl chains in



 α positions of the chelating nitrogen atoms. The unambiguous formation of six novel heteroleptic copper(I) complexes based on L₁, L₂, and complementary matching ligands (2,9-R₂-1,10-phenanthroline, with R = H, methyl, *n*-butyl or mesityl) has been evidenced, and the resulting compounds were fully characterized. The electronic absorption spectra of all complexes fits well with DFT calculations allowing the assignment of the main transitions. The characteristics of the emissive excited state were investigated in different solvents using time-resolved single photon counting and transient absorption spectroscopy. The complexes with ligand L₂, bearing a characteristic dppz moiety, exhibit a very low energy excited-state which mainly leads to fast nonradiative relaxation, whereas the emission lifetime is higher for those containing the bulky ligand L₁. For example, a luminescence quantum yield of about 3×10^{-4} is obtained with a decay time of about 50 ns for C2 ([Cu^I(nBu-phen)(L₁)]⁺) with a weak influence of strong coordinating solvent on the luminescence properties. Overall, the spectral features are those expected for a highly constrained coordination cage. Yet, the complexes are stable in solution, partly due to the beneficial π stacking between mesityl groups and vicinal phenanthroline aromatic rings, as evidenced by the X-ray structure of complex C3 ([Cu^I(Mes-phen)(L₂)]⁺). Electrochemistry of the copper(I) complexes revealed reversible anodic behavior, corresponding to a copper(I) to copper(II) transition. The half wave potentials increase with the steric bulk at the level of the copper(I) ion, reaching a value as high as 1 V vs SCE, with the assistance of ligand induced electronic effects. L₁ and L₂ are further end-capped by a bromo functionality. A Suzuki cross-coupling reaction was directly performed on the complexes, in spite of the handicapping lability of copper(I)—phenanthroline complexes.

INTRODUCTION

Copper(I)-diimine complexes ($[Cu^{I}(diimine)_{2}]^{+}$), where the diimine ligand is α -substituted by bulky groups, have attracted much attention since the discovery of their luminescence properties in solution and in the solid state.¹⁻⁵ They share with ruthenium-polypyridine complexes several appealing features for solar energy conversion, in particular the existence of a metal to ligand charge transfer transition (MLCT) around 460 nm, which could be formally described as $[Cu^{II}(imine^{\bullet-})-$ (imine)]^{+,3-6} Importantly, the presence of sterically challenging groups in the α position of the coordinating nitrogen atoms is mandatory to observe photoluminescence, since they prevent the flattening distortion of the complex from the Cu^{I} preferred tetrahedral geometry to the formal Cu^{II} square planar arrangement, leading to a very efficient quenching of the excited state. However, the rather low molar extinction coefficient of the MLCT absorption band and the ligand scrambling around Cu(I), preventing the isolation of a stable $[Cu^{I}(imine^{A})(imine^{B})]^{+}$ heteroleptic complex, has put a dramatic curb on the development of

Received: March 28, 2011 Published: October 21, 2011



Chart 1. Structures of the Ligands and Complexes Described in This Study



copper-based photosystems. Indeed, the formation of a mere dyad (e.g., with imine^A as the electron acceptor and imine^B as the electron donor) was strictly impossible, in contrast with the nearly matchless versatility of ruthenium-polypyridine chemistry. However, the ability to prepare heteroleptic diimine copper(I) complexes would be extremely useful for solar energy conversion applications as it would be easier to accurately tune their photophysical and photoredox properties. This is well demonstrated with the abundant use of heteroleptic ruthenium complexes for dye-sensitized solar cells (DSSCs), in which an anchoring ligand (such as 4,4'-dicarboxy-2,2'-bipyridine) is mixed with electron releasing ligands (such as thiocyananto or a bpy substituted with thienyl or oligophenylenethynylene chains) in order to reach the suitable electronic properties to inject electrons in TiO₂ and to harvest the maximum number of photons in the solar spectrum.⁸ Second, the preparation of heteroleptic diimine copper(I) complexes opens the route to the development of rodlike multicomponent assemblies, which was not conveniently accessible with the octahedral ruthenium trisbipyridine complex. In 1997, Schmittel and co-workers broke through this barrier, with the HETPHEN concept (where HETPHEN stands for HETeroleptic PHENanthroline copper(I) complexes): $^{9-12}$ by grafting very bulky substituents such as mesityl groups (where mesityl stands for 2,4,6trimethylphenyl) at the 2 and 9 positions of the phenanthroline skeleton, the formation of the corresponding homoleptic complex is prohibited. As a result, numerous impressive and carefully designed copper(I)-phenanthroline supramolecular architectures were isolated and fully characterized.¹²⁻¹⁶ A very similar approach has been undertaken using tert-butyl instead of mesityl and proved to be very successful.¹⁷ However, in the HETPHEN concept, the mesityl groups borne by phen^A are involved in a

 $\pi - \pi$ interaction with phen^B, providing further stability to the molecular scaffold.

At the convergence point of the HETPHEN concept and the luminescence properties of sterically hindered copper(I) complexes lies the possibility to design photosensitive dyads, capable of sustaining photoinduced electron transfer, where phen^A behaves as an electron donor and phen^B as an acceptor. In addition to the obvious financial advantage of using copper instead of ruthenium, the tetrahedral arrangement of the $[Cu^{I}(phen^{A})-(phen^{B})]^{+}$ -based arrays is very attractive for the design of linear photosensitive donor—acceptor polyads.

In this work, we describe the synthesis and characterizations of two new, synthetically versatile ligands, L1 (2,9-dimesityl-2-(4'-bromophenyl)imidazo[4,5-f][1,10]phenanthroline) and L₂ (3,6-di-n-butyl-11-bromodipyrido[3,2-a:2',3'-c]phenazine), and their related heteroleptic copper(I) complexes with phen (1,10phenanthroline), Me-phen (2,9-dimethyl-1,10-phenanthroline), *n*Bu-phen (2,9-di-*n*-butyl-1,10-phenanthroline), and Mes-phen (2,9-dimesityl-1,10-phenanthroline) (Chart 1). The molecular structures of L1 and L2 are inspired by well-known phenanthroline derivatives, phen-imidazole and dppz, respectively (where phen-imidazole is 2-phenylimidazo[4,5-f][1,10]phenanthroline and dppz is dipyrido[3,2-a:2',3'-c]phenazine), with well documented electronic properties. In particular, dppz has been extensively used in metal-based photosensitive polyads¹⁸⁻²⁰ and DNA intercalating agents.²¹ On the other hand, phenimidazole derivatives are electron donating in nature and bear a labile proton. With a modest number of new ligands, several original complexes can be synthesized, and the electronic effects of the former on the overall properties of the latter can be explored and constitute the core of this work. Additionally, let us

note that L_1 and L_2 possess a bromo unit, which could be involved in a catalyzed cross-coupling reaction in order to construct larger arrays by chemistry on the complex, a lead that will also be presented in this contribution. The aim of the present work is to provide a detailed analysis of the structural, electrochemical, and spectral properties of the newly synthesized complexes combining experimental and theoretical studies.

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

General. ¹H NMR spectra were recorded on an AMX 400 MHz Bruker spectrometer. Chemical shifts for ¹H NMR spectra are referenced relative to residual protium in the deuterated solvent (CDCl₃ δ = 7.26 ppm). MALDI-TOF analyses were performed on an Applied Biosystems Voyager DE-STR spectrometer in positive linear mode at a 20 kV acceleration voltage with α -cyano 4-hydroxycinnamic acid (CHCA) as the matrix.

Preparative thin-layer chromatography (preparative TLC) was performed with a Merk Kieselgel 60PF₂₅₄. Column chromatography was carried out with a Merk 5735 Kieselgel 60F (0.040–0.063 mm mesh). Air sensitive reactions were carried out under argon in dry solvents and glassware. Chemicals were purchased from Aldrich and used as received. Compounds 2,9-dichloro-1,10-phenanthroline-5,6-dioxolane (2), 2,9di-*n*-butyl-1,10-phenanthroline (*n*Bu-phen), 2,9-di-*n*-butyl-1,10-phenanthroline-5,6-dione, and Mes-phen were synthesized using literature procedures.²²

UV-visible spectra were recorded in analytically pure solvents, with a UV 2501PC Shimadzu spectrophotometer. Luminescence excitation spectra were recorded using a FluoroMax3 (Jobin Yvon Horiba), and emission was corrected for the spectral sensitivity of the instrument. Nanomicrosecond transient absorption experiments were performed using a laser flash photolysis apparatus. Excitation pulses at 460 nm (4 ns, 1 mJ) were provided by a 10-Hz Nd:YAG laser coupled to an OPO (Continuum Panther EX OPO pumped by a Surelite II). The probe light was provided by a pulsed Xe lamp (XBO 150W/CR OFR, OSRAM). Samples were contained in a quartz cell (10 \times 10 mm^2 section) at an adjusted concentration ($\sim 10^{-4}$ mol dm⁻³) to get an OD value of about 1.0 at the pump excitation wavelength. The transmitted light was dispersed by a monochromator (Horiba Jobin-Yvon, iHR320) and analyzed with a photomultiplier (R1477-06, Hamamatsu) coupled to a digital oscilloscope (LeCroy 454, 500 MHz). The experiment was repeated for different wavelengths of the monochromator, and transient spectra were afterward reconstructed. Electrochemistry measurements were performed with an Autolab PGSTAT 302N potentiostat in freshly distilled dichloromethane, with a platinum disk working electrode, a platinum foil counter electrode, and a saturated calomel reference electrode (SCE). Tetra-n-butylammonium hexafluorophosphate in dichloromethane $(0.1 \text{ mol } L^{-1})$ was used as a supporting electrolyte. All potentials are referenced vs SCE.

Computational Chemistry. The geometries of complexes C1 to C6 in the ¹A electronic ground state have been optimized at the density functional theory (DFT) level using the PBE-D functional²³ and TZP basis sets²⁴ for all of the atoms. These calculations are under a C₁ symmetry constraint in a vacuum and have been performed using ADF2010.02 quantum chemistry software.²⁵ Although PBE-D reproduces the π -stacking structure, it is not good at describing the planarity of the floppy system and tends to make L₁ curved. Therefore, we add several constraints to keep L₁ planar. The theoretical absorption spectra of complexes C3 and C6 have been calculated by means of the timedependent DFT (TD-DFT) method²⁶ using the B3LYP functional²⁷ without a solvent effect with the enlarged cc-pVDZ basis sets for the hydrogen, bromide, and second-row atoms²⁸ and the modified Ahlrichs TZV basis set (7s, 6p, 5d) contracted to [6s, 3p, 3d] for the Cu atom.²⁹ TD-DFT calculation has been performed using a modified version of the Gaussian 03 quantum chemistry software. 30

Synthesis. 2,9-Dimesityl-1,10-phenanthroline-5,6-dioxolane (3). In a Schlenk tube fitted with a water condenser, 2 (47 mg, 0.15 mmol), mesitylboronic acid (60 mg, 0.37 mmol), and barium hydroxide (94 mg, 0.55 mmol) were suspended in 5 mL of a 9:1 (v:v) mixture of 1,2dimethoxyethane (DME) and water, respectively. The setup was thoroughly degassed with argon, and palladium tetrakis triphenylphosphine (20 mg, 0.02 mmol) was quickly added. The mixture was heated to 115 °C and stirred for 16 h, under argon. It was then allowed to cool down to room temperature, and water was added. The suspension was extracted four times with dichloromethane. The organic layers were gathered, dried on sodium sulfate, and evaporated under reduced pressure to afford a brown oil. The latter was purified by chromatography on silica gel, prepared in a 1:1 mixture of hexanes and dichloromethane. The second, bright orange ring was collected, and the solvents were removed by rotary evaporation, yielding 3. Yield: 63 mg (88%). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 8.31 (d, 2H, H₄ and H₇), 7.55 (d, 2H, H₃ and H₈), 6.92 (s, 4H, H_{mes}), 2.31 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 2.12 (s, 12H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.92 (s, 6H, CH_{3,dioxolane}) ppm. ES-MS (m/z) 489.2 $[M + H]^+$. Anal. for 3.1/2DME • 1/2CH₂Cl₂. Found (%): C, 74.01; H, 6.38; N, 4.61. Calcd: C, 74.01; H, 6.65; N, 4.86.

2,9-Dimesityl-1,10-phenanthroline-5,6-dione (4). Compound 3 (163 mg, 0.33 mmol) was suspended in distilled water (5 mL). TFA (10 mL) was then added dropwise, at room temperature, and the yellow suspension eventually turned bright red. The mixture was then heated at 60 °C for 5 h. The solvents were evaporated, and the brown residue was dissolved in 10 mL of dichloromethane, on top of which was added 10 mL of aqueous sodium hydrogenocarbonate (1.0 mol L^{-1}). After 2 h of vigorous stirring, the mixture turned into a turbid, green-yellow emulsion. The latter was extracted four times with dichloromethane. The organic layers were gathered, washed with brine, dried on sodium sulfate, and evaporated under reduced pressure. The resulting yellow oil was further dried on a vacuum line at room temperature, until a powder eventually appeared. Yield: 130 mg (87%). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 8.53 (d, 2H, H₄ and H₇), 7.49 (d, 2H, H₃ and H₈), 6.92 (s, 4H, H_{mes}), 2.30 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 2.14 (s, 12H, CH_{3,mes}) ppm. HR-MS (m/z): 893.4067 [2 M + H]⁺.

2,9-Dimesityl-1,10-phenanthroline-[a:b]imidazo-(4'-bromophenyl) (L_1). Compound 4 (50 mg, 0.10 mmol), *p*-bromobenzaldehyde (20 mg, 0.11 mmol), and ammonium acetate (170 mg, 2.2 mmol) were dissolved in glacial acetic acid (5 mL) and the mixture was refluxed overnight. After concentration under reduced pressure, water was added to precipitate a beige solid. The latter was subjected to column chromato graphy on silica, eluting with a gradient of methanol in dichloromethane (0 to 1%). The main yellow ring was collected, and the solvent was removed by rotary evaporation, to afford an off-white powder. Yield: 42 mg (62%). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, [D₆] DMSO, 25 °C): δ 13.81 (s, broad, 1H, H_{imidazole}), 8.97 (d, 2H, H₄ and H₇), 8.27 (d, 2H, H₁₁ and H₁₄), 7.82 (d, 2H, H₁₂ and H₁₃), 7.74 (d, 1H, H₃), 7.68 (d, 1H, H₈), 6.95 (s, 4H, H_{mes}), 2.29 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 2.03 (s, 12H, CH_{3,mes}) ppm. HR-MS (*m*/*z*) 611.1810 [M+H]⁺. Anal. for L₁ · 1/2CH₃COOH. Found (%): C, 71.57; H, 5.31; N, 8.38. Calcd: C, 71.14; H, 5.18; N, 8.73.

2,9-Bis-n-butyl-3'-bromo-dipyrido[3,2-a:2',3'-c]phenazine (**L**₂). Compound **5** (91 mg, 0.28 mmol) and 4-bromo-1,2-diaminobenzene (53 mg, 0.28 mmol) were dissolved in 30 mL of ethanol. The mixture was refluxed overnight. After concentration under reduced pressure, the addition of water yielded a brown powder, which was chromatographed on silica, with dichloromethane as an eluent. Yield: 56 mg (62%). ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 9.50 (m, 2H, H₄ and H₇), 8.53 (d, 1H, H₁₃), 8.20 (d, 1H, H₁₁), 7.95 (dd, 1H, H₁₂), 7.68 (d, 2H, H₃ and H₈), 3.28 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 1.95 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 1.55 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 1.06 (t, 6H, CH_{3,butyl}). HR-MS (*m*/*z*) 473.1351 [M]⁺. Anal. for L₂ + 1/2H₂O. Found (%): C, 64.72; H, 5.38; N, 11.35. Calcd: C, 64.73; H, 5.43; N, 11.61.

General Procedure for the Synthesis of Copper(I) Complexes C1-C6. Cu(CH₃CN)₄PF₆ was dissolved in distilled dichloromethane and thoroughly degassed by a few vacuum/argon cycles. An argon purged solution of mesityl bearing ligand phen^A (L₁ or Mes-phen; 1.0 equivalent) in dichloromethane was then syringed into the former solution, and the mixture was stirred at room temperature. After 5 min, an argon purged solution of ligand phen^B (1.0 equivalent, phen^B = phen, Me-phen, *n*Bu-phen, or L₂) in dichloromethane was syringed into the yellow mixture. The latter immediately turned deep red and was left to stir for half an hour at room temperature. The solvent was then removed by rotary evaporation. The red residue was eventually purified by chromatography on silica gel. Reactions were all performed at least three times, and yields were all comprised between 75 and 85%. In what follows, H nuclei belonging to phen^B (nonmesityl derivatized) are primed.

C1: obtained with phen^A = L_1 , phen^B = Me-phen. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 11.92 (s, 1H, H^{imidazole}), 9.45 (d, 1H, H⁴ or H⁷), 9.36 (d, 1H, H⁷ or H⁴), 8.34 (d, 2H, H¹¹ and H¹⁴), 8.22 (d, 2H, H^{4'} and H^{7'}), 7.82 (d, 2H, H¹² and H¹³), 7.79 (s, 2H, H^{5'} and H^{6'}), 7.72 (d, 2H, H³ and H⁸), 7.49 (d, 2H, H^{3'} and H^{8'}), 6.11 (s, 2H, H^{mes,arom}), 6.02 (s, 2H, H^{mes,arom}), 2.21 (s, 6H, CH_{3,methyl}), 1.76 (s, 3H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.73 (s, 3H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.63 (s, 6H, CH_{3,methyl}), 1.56 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}). HR-MS (*m*/*z*): 881.2021 [M-PF₆]⁺. Anal. for C1·CH₃OH. Found (%): C, 58.73; H, 4.28; N, 7.91. Calcd: C, 58.90; H, 4.47; N, 7.93.

C2: obtained with phen^A = L_1 , phen^B = *n*Bu-phen. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 11.97 (s, 1H, H^{imidazole}), 9.37 (m, 2H, H⁴ and H⁷), 8.31 (d, 2H, H¹¹ and H¹⁴), 8.27 (d, 2H, H^{4'} and H^{7'}), 7.83 (s, 2H, H^{5'} and H^{6'}), 7.78 (d, 2H, H¹² and H¹³), 7.65 (d, 2H, H³ and H⁸), 7.48 (d, 2H, H^{3'} and H^{8'}), 6.22 (s, 2H, H^{mes,arom}), 6.11 (s, 2H, H^{mes,arom}), 2.33 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 1.91 (s, 3H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.85 (s, 3H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.58 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.49 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.18 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.80 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.61 (t, 6H, CH_{3,butyl}). HR-MS (*m*/*z*): 965.2970 [M - PF₆]⁺. Anal. for C2 · 1/2CH₃OH. Found (%): C, 61.21; H, 4.85; N, 7.28. Calcd: C, 61.20; H, 5.09; N, 7.26.

C3: obtained with phen^A = Mes-phen, phen^B = **L**₂. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 9.56 (m, 2H, H^{4'} and H^{7'}), 8.76 (d, 2H, H⁴ and H⁷), 8.60 (d, 1H, H^{13'}), 8.28 (m, 3H, H⁵, H⁶ and H^{11'}), 8.04 (dd, 1H, H^{12'}), 7.79 (d, 2H, H³ and H⁸), 7.71 (m, 2H, H^{3'} and H^{8'}), 6.19 (s, 2H, H^{mes,arom}), 6.17 (s, 2H, H^{mes,arom}), 2.38 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 1.72 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.62 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.60 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.24 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.84 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.70 (m, 6H, CH_{3,butyl}). HR-MS (m/z) 953.2801 [M - PF₆]⁺. Anal. for C3 · CH₃OH. Found (%): C, 60.63; H, 4.86; N, 7.34. Calcd: C, 60.56; H, 5.08; N, 7.43.

C4: obtained with phen^A = L_1 , phen^B = L_2 . ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 9.57 (d, 1H, H⁴ or H⁷), 9.55 (d, 1H, H⁷ or H⁴), 9.45 (d, 2H, H⁴ and H⁷), 8.64 (d, 1H, H¹³), 8.38 (d, 2H, H¹¹ and H¹⁴), 8.31 (d, 1H, H^{11'}), 8.08 (dd, 1H, H^{12'}), 7.82 (d, 2H, H³ and H⁸), 7.74 (d, 2H, H¹² and H¹³), 7.65 (m, 2H, H^{3'} and H^{8'}), 6.17 (s, 2H, H^{mes,arom}), 6.15 (s, 2H, H^{mes,arom}), 2.40 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 1.72 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.62 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.60 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.25 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.84 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.64 (m, 6H, CH_{3,butyl}). HR-MS (m/z): 1145.2266 [M – PF6]⁺. Anal. for C4 · 2CH₃OH. Found (%): C, 57.43; H, 4.56; N, 8.02. Calcd: C, 57.51; H, 4.75; N, 8.25.

C5: obtained with phen^A = L_1 , phen^B = Phen. Data for complex **C5**: ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 9.36 (d, 2H, H⁴ and H⁷), 8.50 (d, 2H, H^{2'} and H^{9'}), 8.39 (d, 2H, H^{4'} and H^{7'}), 8.32 (d, 2H, H¹¹ and H¹⁴), 7.86 (s, 2H, H^{5'} and H^{6'}), 7.82 (d, 2H, H¹² and H¹³), 7.70 (m, 4H, H³, H⁸, H^{3'} and H^{8'}), 5.88 (s, 4H, H^{mes,arom}), 1.70 (s, 12H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.53 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}). HR-MS (*m*/*z*): 853.1721 [M-PF₆]⁺. Anal. for **C5**·CH₃OH. Found (%): C, 58.15; H, 4.17; N, 7.84. Calcd.: C, 58.17; H, 4.20; N, 8.14.

C6: obtained with phen^A = Mes-phen, phen^B = *n*Bu-phen. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 8.70 (d, 2H, H⁴ and H⁷), 8.31 (d, 2H, H⁴ and H^{7'}), 8.24 (s, 2H, H⁵ and H⁶), 7.85 (s, 2H, H^{5'} and H^{6'}), 7.76 (d, 2H,

 $\begin{array}{l} H^{3} \text{ and } H^{8}), \ 7.51 \ (d, \ 2H, \ H^{3'} \ \text{and } H^{8'}), \ 6.20 \ (s, \ 4H, \ H^{\text{mes,arom}}), \ 2.31 \\ (m, \ 4H, \ CH_{2, \text{butyl}}), \ 1.91 \ (s, \ 6H, \ CH_{3, \text{mes}}), \ 1.54 \ (s, \ 12H, \ CH_{3, \text{mes}}), \ 1.16 \\ (m, \ 4H, \ CH_{2, \text{butyl}}), \ 0.81 \ (m, \ 4H, \ CH_{2, \text{butyl}}), \ 0.67 \ (m, \ 6H, \ CH_{3, \text{butyl}}). \\ \text{HR-MS} \ (m/z): \ 771.3489 \ [M - PF_6]^+. \ \text{Anal. for } \mathbf{C6} \cdot \mathbf{CH}_{3} \mathbf{OH} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{2} \mathbf{O}. \\ \text{Found} \ (\%): \ C, \ 63.31; \ H, \ 6.08; \ N, \ 5.44. \ Calcd: \ C, \ 63.31; \ H, \ 6.04; \ N, \ 5.79. \end{array}$

Complex C7. In a Schlenk tube fitted with a water condenser, C2 (27 mg, 0.024 mmol) and *p*-methoxyphenyl boronic acid (19 mg, 0.13) mmol) were dissolved in 4 mL of a 9:1 (v/v) mixture of 1,2-dimethoxyethane (DME) and water, respectively. Barium hydroxide (50 mg, 0.29 mmol) was then added. The setup was thoroughly degassed with argon, and palladium tetrakis triphenylphosphine (3 mg, 0.003 mmol) was quickly added. The mixture was heated to 110 °C and stirred for 16 h, under argon. It was then allowed to cool down to room temperature, and water was added. The orange suspension was extracted three times with dichloromethane. The organic layers were gathered, dried on sodium sulfate, and evaporated under reduced pressure. The product was purified by column chromatography on silica gel and eluted with a gradient of methanol in dichloromethane (from 2% to 10%) to vield a red powder. Yield: 9 mg, 34%. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 15.30 (s broad, 1H, H^{imidazole}), 10.46 (s broad, 1H, H⁴ or H⁷), 9.40 (d, 1H, H⁷ (s bload, 11, 11), 10, 10 (b bload, 11, 14), 7.77 (m, or H^4), 8.88 (d, 2H, H^{11} and H^{14}), 8.22 (d, 2H, H^4 and H^7), 7.77 (m, 6H, $H^{5'}$, $H^{6'}$, H^3 , H^8 , H^{12} and H^{13}), 7.63 (d, 2H, H^{15} and H^{18}), 7.46 (d, 2H, $H^{3'}$ and $H^{8'}$), 7.00 (d, 2H, H^{16} and H^{17}), 6.20 (s, 2H, $H^{\text{mes,arom}}$), 6.11 (s, 2H, $H^{\text{mes,arom}}$), 3.88 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 2.35 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 1.90 (s, 3H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.86 (s, 3H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.57 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.49 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.18 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.82 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.62 (t, 6H, CH_{3,butyl}). HR-MS (m/z): 993.4243 [M - PF₆]⁺.

Complex **C8**. In a Schlenk tube fitted with a water condenser, C3 (25 mg, 0.022 mmol) and *p*-methoxyphenyl boronic acid (18 mg, 0.12 mmol) were dissolved in 2 mL of a 9:1 (v/v) mixture of 1,2-dimethoxyethane (DME) and water, respectively. Barium hydroxide (39 mg, 0.23 mmol) was then added. The setup was thoroughly degassed with argon, and palladium tetrakis triphenylphosphine (5 mg, 0.004 mmol) was quickly added. The mixture was heated to 110 °C and stirred for 16 h, under argon. It was then allowed to cool down to room temperature, and water was added. The organic layers were gathered, dried on sodium sulfate, and evaporated under reduced pressure. The product was purified by column chromatography on silica gel and prepared with CH₂Cl₂/CH₃OH (= 94:6) to yield a red powder.

Yield: 21 mg, 84%. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl₃, 25 °C): δ 9.59 (2d, 2H, H^{4'} and H^{7'}), 8.76(d, 2H, H⁴ and H⁷), 8.55 (d, 1H, H^{13'}), 8.43 (d, 1H, H^{11'}), 8.28 (m, 3H, H⁵, H⁶ and H^{12'}), 7.86 (d, 2H, H^{14'} and H^{17'}), 7.79 (d, 2H, H³ and H⁸), 7.68 (2d, 2H, H^{3'} and H^{8'}), 7.13 (d, 2H, H^{15'} and H^{16'}), 6.19 (s, 4H, H^{mes,arom}), 3.94 (s, 3H, OCH₃), 2.39 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 1.74 (s, 6H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.62 (s, 12H, CH_{3,mes}), 1.25 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.85 (m, 4H, CH_{2,butyl}), 0.70 (m, 6H, CH_{3,butyl}). HR-MS (m/z): 979.4152 [M-PF₆]⁺.

Crystal Structure Data for $C_{56}H_{53}BrCuN_6 \cdot PF_6 \cdot (ClCH_3)_{0.629}$. Structure data are as follows: $M_w = 1130.2$, colorless block, $0.4 \times 0.2 \times 0.15 \text{ mm}^3$, triclinic, $P\overline{1}$, a = 13.6027(6) Å, b = 14.2161(14) Å, c = 15.4400(5) Å, $\alpha = 73.945(6)^\circ$, $\beta = 83.606(6)^\circ$, $\gamma = 85.364(7)^\circ$, V = 2847.5(3) Å³, Z = 2, $D_x = 1.318 \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, $\mu = 1.2 \text{ mm}^{-1}$. A total of 82 229 reflections were measured on a Nonius-Kappa CCD diffractometer (graphite monochromator, $\lambda = 0.71073$ Å) up to a resolution of $(\sin \theta / \lambda)_{max} = 0.66$ Å⁻¹ at 100 K. A total of 13 612 reflections were unique ($R_{int} = 0.10$). The structure was solved using the charge flipping algorithm³¹ implemented in the Superflip program³² and refined with the JANA2006 program³³ against F^2 for all reflections. A disorder in the L₂ moiety, i.e., the superposition of the two regioisomers, was correctly modeled using a rigid body approach. However, the solvent molecules occupying the large void (>200 Å) could not be determined; only two chloromethane solvent molecules with a partial occupancy ratio were identified. Obviously, the solvent molecules are disordered correlatively with the L₂ moiety.

Scheme 1. Synthesis of Ligands L_1 and L_2^a



^{*a*} i: 2-nitropropane, Na₂CO₃, reflux under argon; yield: 91%. ii: dimethylethyleneglycol/H₂O (10/1), Ba(OH)₂, mesityl boronic acid, Pd(PPh₃)₄, reflux under argon; yield: 88%. iii: TFA, H₂O, CH₂Cl₂, R.T.; yield: 87%. iv: 4-bromobenzaldehyde, NH₄OAc (20 eqv.), glacial acetic acid, reflux; yield: 62%. v: 4-bromo-1,2-phenylenediamine, ethanol at reflux; yield: 62%.

Non-hydrogen atoms were refined with anisotropic displacement parameters. All H atoms were introduced in geometrically optimized positions and refined with a riding model, except for methyl group H atoms, the positions of wich were refined under constraints. Altogether, 674 parameters were refined. $R_1/wR_2 [I \ge 2\sigma(I)] = 0.1124/0.2534$. R_1/wR_2 [all reflections] = 0.1625/0.2675, S = 3.25. Residual electron density is rather large (between 4.2 and -4.9 e⁻Å⁻³), due to the disorder and the unsolved solvent void.

CCDC 818959 contains the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data can be obtained free of charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre via www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif.

Synthesis. The syntheses of ligands L1 and L2 require two very similar building blocks: 2,9-dimesityl- and 2,9-di-n-butyl-1,10-phenanthroline-5,6-dione, 4 and 5, respectively (Scheme 1). The synthesis of the latter has been previously reported³⁴ and consists of the classic chemical oxidation of *n*-Bu-phen³⁵ in a mixture of sulphuric and nitric acid with sodium bromide. These rather harsh conditions require a cautious "every second control" of the reaction medium (temperature, stirring velocity, etc.). Under the same conditions, Mes-phen was irremediably damaged, and no traces of 4 were ever detected. We therefore explored a different approach, proposed by Sauvage and co-workers,²² relying on Suzuki's palladium catalyzed cross coupling reaction. Dione 1 was obtained following literature procedures.^{22,36} First of all, 1 was protected in the presence of 2-nitropropane in a basic aqueous medium; the resulting ketal was reacted with mesityl boronic acid, in the presence of barium hydroxide and tetrakis triphenylphosphine palladium(0). The protection step appeared to be mandatory to avoid degradation of the phendione core into a fluorenone derivative, under the Suzuki reaction conditions. The bis-functionalized product 3 was obtained in 88% yield, after purification by chromatography. Subsequent deprotection in TFA afforded dione 4, which was reacted with 4-bromo-benzaldehyde in acetic acid at reflux, in the presence of excess ammonium acetate, yielding ligand L1.37

¹H NMR confirmed the molecular structures of both L₁ and L₂. As regards L1, it is worth noticing the presence of a broad, very unshielded signal at 13.81 ppm, assigned to the slightly acidic proton borne by the imidazole ring. Furthermore, a singlet is observed at 6.95 ppm, characteristic of the four hydrogen nuclei from the two mesityl groups. The signals corresponding to the phenanthroline moiety (H³, H⁴, H⁷, and H⁸) deserve, however, a comment. In Figure S1 (Supporting Information), H³ and H⁸ are not chemically equivalent, being displayed as two separate doublets. The presence of an impurity, like an oxazole derivative, traditionally obtained as a side product in Steck and Day's synthetic protocol,³⁷ can be ruled out since HR-MS and microanalysis are both in agreement with the proposed structure for L1. Such a peculiar behavior could be explained by the asymmetry of the imidazole ring in which one nitrogen is protonated and the other is free. Indeed, in the presence of a strong acid (trifluoroacetic acid) or an organic base (triethylamine), the two doublets actually merge, giving rise to the spectrum of a fully $C_{2\nu}$ symmetric molecule (see Figure S1). H^{imidazole} might somehow induce some asymmetry in the system, resulting in nonequivalent H^3 and H^8 . The effect is milder on H^4 and H^7 , yet the corresponding doublet is slightly broader, with a full width at halfmaximum of 2.9 vs 2.3 Hz for H³ and H⁸. Despite this puzzling feature, the spectra of L1 and L2 fall within the same range of chemical shifts as their nonsubstituted counterparts, 2-(4-bromophenyl)imidazo[4,5-f]-1,10-phenanthroline^{38,39} (see Figure S2, Supporting Information) and 11-bromodipyrido[3,2-a:2',3'-c]phenazine,²⁰ respectively, highlighting the feeble electronic interaction between the phenanthroline core and the bulky groups grafted on positions 2 and 9.

The copper(I) complexes were synthesized in distilled, argon-purged dichloromethane (Scheme 2). In the HETPHEN concept, the idea is to place highly bulky phen^A (Mes-phen or parent L_1) opposite to a less sterically challenged phenanthroline ligand (phen^B) in the presence of copper(I) in solution. The steric bulkiness of mesityl pendant groups prevents the formation of homoleptic species. Tetrakis(acetonitrile)

Scheme 2. Synthesis of Copper(I) Complexes C1-C5



copper(I) hexafluorophosphate [Cu^I(CH₃CN)₄]PF₆⁴⁰ was first dissolved, and one equivalent of ligand L1 or Mes-phen was added, under argon. The solution turned yellow at once, upon formation of the solvato complexes $[Cu^{I}(Mes-phen)(CH_{3}CN)]^{+}$ or $[Cu^{I}(L_{1})(CH_{3}CN)]^{+}$. Once the complementary ligand phen^B (phen^B = phen, Me-phen, *n*Bu-phen, or L_2) was added to the mixture, the color quickly turned deep red, evidencing the formation of a copper complex bearing two phenanthroline ligands. Complexes $[Cu^{I}(L_{1})(phen^{B})](PF_{6})$ (complex C1 if phen^B = Me-phen, complex C2 if phen^B = nBu-phen, complex C4 if phen^{\hat{B}} = L₂ and complex C5 if phen^{\hat{B}} = phen) and [Cu^I(Mes-phen)- $(L_2)](PF_6)$ (complex C3) were chromatographed on silica gel and characterized by ¹H NMR, HR-MS, and elemental analysis, evidencing the unambiguous formation of pure heteroleptic copper(I) complexes. Complex C6 ($[Cu^{l}(Mes-phen)(nBu-phen)](PF_{6})$ was synthesized too, being a convenient and simple model of the coordination cages for C1–C5. ¹H NMR spectra revealed again that some hydrogen nuclei are nonequivalent, all the singlets describing mesityl aromatic and aliphatic protons being for instance split into two signals. In presence of traces of water, the spectrum of a fully symmetrical molecule was obtained, along with the disappearance of the imidazole signal, supporting that H^{imidazole} is playing a crucial role in the symmetry of the complexes C1, C2, and C4. In addition to this, an overall slight downfield shift for most signals was observed, due to the presence of copper in the phenanthroline cavity. On the other hand, $\pi - \pi$ interactions between the mesityl groups of L_1 (or Mes-phen) and the phenanthroline core of each ligand phen⁴ lead to the upfield shift of the aromatic mesityl H signal (see Figure S3, Supporting Information).

RESULTS

X-Ray Structure vs DFT Optimized Structures. Slow diffusion of cyclohexane into a solution of C3 in dichloromethane



Figure 1. Top: ORTEP view of complex C3. Ellipsoids are drawn at the 50% probability level. Bottom: definitions of the rocking and wagging angles.

afforded crystals that were suitable for a structure resolution by X-ray diffraction at 100 K. The ORTEP view is given in Figure 1, and the obtained structure is featured in the Supporting Information (Figure S4, H atoms, two chloromethane solvent molecules, and counterion PF_6^- have been removed for clarity). The hypothesized geometry of the metal center is confirmed, namely, a very distorted tetrahedral symmetry, with a copper(I) ion surrounded by four coordinating nitrogen atoms. Relevant distances and angles are given in Table 1. The structure symmetry is triclinic $P\overline{I}$. Although a rather clear picture of the coordination

Table 1.	Selected Bond	l Lengths (ir	n A) and Bone	l Angles (in d	eg) of Comp	lexes C1 to C6	6 (Numbering of t	he Atoms Ac	cording to
the Struc	tures Depicted	l in Figure 2	$(2)^a$						

geometrical parameters		C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6
Cu-N _{phen^B}	Cu-N ₄	2.003	2.005	2.003	1.999	1.996	2.011
				2.009			
	Cu-N ₃	2.028	2.060	2.075	2.072	2.025	2.075
				2.115			
Cu-N _{phen^A}	Cu-N ₁	2.020	2.014	2.008	1.999	2.006	2.017
				2.004			
	Cu-N ₂	2.031	2.057	2.075	2.068	2.023	2.071
				2.124			
bite angles $N_{phen^B}{-}Cu{-}N_{phen^A}$	N ₃ -Cu-N ₄	83.35	82.65	82.15	82.24	83.27	82.36
				81.45			
bite angles $N_{phen^{\text{A}}}{-}Cu{-}N_{phen^{\text{B}}}$	$N_1 - Cu - N_2$	81.88	82.32	82.26	82.49	82.12	81.96
				81.98			
N_{phen^B} - Cu - N_{phen^A}	N_3-Cu-N_1	131.84	124.87	124.55	124.52	133.08	124.32
				123.38			
	N ₂ -Cu-N ₃	109.10	100.42	97.31	96.75	109.35	98.68
				95.53			
	$N_1 - Cu - N_4$	127.58	142.04	144.47	144.67	123.85	143.09
				147.18			
	N_2-Cu-N_4	127.58	121.34	120.47	120.10	131.24	122.21
				119.68			

^{*a*} Bold cells: experimental corresponding values measured from the X-ray structure of complex C3 shown in Figure 1. Phen^A and Phen^B refer respectively to mesityl and non-mesityl derivatized ligands.

sphere of copper(I) is given by the X-ray structure, the L_2 moiety is subjected to a very disordered environment, as evidenced in Figure 1. Indeed, the bromine atom, which is end-capping the phenazine appendix of L_2 , entails the existence of two regioisomers for C3, C3a and C3b. Unexpectedly though, both molecules crystallize almost the same way, in identical crystallographic positions at the level of the {Cu(Mes-Phen)(nBu-Phen)} moiety; the structures of the isomers start to slightly diverge along the phenazine spacer axis. The complex diffraction pattern could nevertheless be well fitted considering a ratio of 3:7 for C3a/C3b, with a very satisfying R factor, vouching for the accuracy of the structure. This rather peculiar behavior has been previously observed for the complex $[ReCl(CO)_3(dppzBr)]^{2+}$ where dppzBr is same as L_2 but devoid of *n*-butyl chains.²⁰ Indeed, the singly brominated dppz ligand appeared nonetheless symmetrical, as if doubly substituted, in the structure. In our case, we present in Figure 1 the overlay of the structures of both regioisomers, which do not exactly coincide at the level of the brominated end but perfectly match at the level of the copper coordination cage. Let us add that part of the remaining disorder afflicting the structure is due to the fact that solvent molecules for C3a and C3b do not occupy the same crystallographic positions.

To sum up, Cu–N bond lengths are typical of copper(I) phenanthroline complexes, ^{35,38,39,41,42} each ligand being coordinated to copper(I) through two nonequivalent Cu–N bonds (Cu–N₁ = 2.004 Å, Cu–N₂ = 2.124 Å, Cu–N₃ = 2.009 Å, Cu–N₄ = 2.115 Å). N–Cu–N bite angles are very similar (81.98° and 81.45°), owing to the rigidity of both phenanthroline derivatized ligands Mes-phen and L₂. Most importantly, an obvious π stacking is evidenced between just one mesityl susbituent of ligand Mes-phen (label B in Figure 1) and the adjacent L₂ phenanthroline, with a typical distance of ca. 3.45 Å.^{38,39} This



Figure 2. DFT/PBE-D optimized structures of complexes C1 to C6.

entails a strong deviation from the ideal tetrahedral geometry at the copper(I) center toward a heavily distorted trigonal pyramid.² As a consequence, the other mesityl substituent (label A in Figure 1) is unable to interact with L_2 , being too remote from the latter. This explains as well why the dihedral angles between the mesityl groups and the phenanthroline plane of Mes-phen are significantly different (64.11° for the more constrained mesityl group vs 72.97° for the other). Overall, ligand Mes-phen has



Figure 3. Electronic absorption spectra of complexes C1-C6 in dichloromethane. Inset: magnification of the 400–600 nm domain.

Table 2. Spectroscopic and Electrochemical Data for Complexes C1–C6 and Reference $[Cu^{I}(Me-phen)_{2}]^{+a}$

complex	λ_{MLCT}/nm ($\epsilon/L \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$)	$E_{1/2}$ (V) vs SCE ($\Delta E = E_{pa} - E_{pc}, mV$) ^b
C1	468 (6300)	0.87 (95)
C2	463 (5500)	0.94 (105)
C3	465 (6300)	-1.09 (95), 1.06 (85)
C4	467 (5700)	-1.03 (80), 1.05 (140)
C5	476 (7850)	0.71 (95)
C6	458 (4250)	0.99 (140)
$[Cu^{I}(Me-phen)_{2}]^{+}$	455 (7950) ^c	0.83 (110)

^{*a*} All measurements performed in distilled dichloromethane at room temperature. ^{*b*} Recorded in dichloromethane/TBAP 0.1 M with a platinum disk as the working electrode and SCE as a reference. ^{*c*} See ref 47.

"rocked and wagged away" from the ideal D_{2d} symmetry. This is in full agreement with the structures of previously published complexes of the type $[Cu^{I}(Mes-phen)(Phen')]^{+},^{11,13,16,39}$ although in the latter case Phen' did not bear any bulky substituents at the 2 and 9 positions and was not substituted with fused imidazole or phenazine.

The structures of complexes C1-C6 have been scrutinized using DFT/PBE-D/TZP calculations. Selected theoretical bond lengths and bond angles of complexes C1-C6 are reported in Table 1 together with some experimental X-ray data of complex C3 for comparison. The optimized structures are represented in Figure 2.

The optimized geometries compare rather well with the X-ray data reported in Table 1 for complex C3 and with the structures of similar complexes of Cu(I). The four main Cu-N coordination bond distances vary between 2.00 and 2.08 Å, slightly shorter than the experimental values which span between 2.004 and 2.124 Å.

The calculated Cu-heteroleptic ligands' bond angles are very close to the experimental angles of 81.45° and 81.98°. The structures of **C2**, **C3**, **C4**, and **C6**, which have *n*-Bu-phen ligands, are very similar. They have two shorter Cu–N bonds (2.00–2.02 Å) and longer Cu–N bonds (2.06–2.08 Å), and the angles of N_1 –Cu– N_4 are large (142–145°). On the other hand, in **C1** and **C5** complexes, which do not contain *n*-Bu-phen ligands, all four Cu–N bonds are very close (2.00–2.03 Å), and the N_1 –Cu– N_4 angles amount to 128° and 124°, respectively. These differences may be attributed to the steric hindrance of *n*-Bu and π stacking mesityl groups toward one side of the *n*-Bu-phen ligand. Cartesian coordinates of these structures are shown in Table S1 (Supporting Information).

UV–Visible Absorbance Spectroscopy and TD-DFT Absorption Spectra. The electronic absorption spectra of complexes C1–C6 are given in Figure 3, and corresponding data are gathered in Table 2. All complexes displayed a set of intense bands in the UV region that were all assigned to ligand-centered $\pi-\pi^*$ transitions.

In the visible domain, all spectra are dominated by the expected copper(I) to phen MLCT, around 460 nm, which corresponds to the promotion of one electron from the copper-(I) center toward a phen centered π^* orbital, yielding a charge separated state that can be formulated Cu^{II}-(phen^{•-}). With the exception of complex C5, the MLCT energy of complexes C1-C4 and C6 is only slightly dependent on the structure. Nevertheless, the absorption maximum of C1 is slightly but sensibly red-shifted compared to C2, C3, and C4. The reason lies in the steric hindrance within the coordination cage around the copper(I) cation. Indeed, it has been reported that the bulkier the substituents, the more rigid the coordination cage, and the higher the energy of the MLCT.^{42,43} There are exceptions to this simple rule, in particular for $[Cu^{I}(2,9-diphenyl-1,10-phenanthroline)_{2}]^{+}$, since π stacking of the phenyl substituents with the vicinal phenanthroline may entail the $D_{2d} \rightarrow D_2$ transition.² For complexes C1-C4 and C6, alkyl chains are opposed to mesityl groups, creating a rather bulky environment within the coordination sphere of copper(I); the fact that the methyl group is less sterically demanding than the *n*-butyl chain could account for the slight red-shift of the MLCT in C1, compared to C2-C4 and $C6.^{43}$ This is even more blatant in the case of complex C5, where the encumbered 2,9-dimesityl-phenanthroline type ligand L_1 is facing plain phenanthroline. Additionally, the MLCT of C5 exhibits a broad shoulder around 550 nm, which is a diagnostic band for stronger D_2 deformation, likely due to π stacking between phenanthroline and the mesityl groups.^{2,3,41} This transition is nevertheless rather weak when compared to other complexes, especially those built on 2,9-diphenyl phenanthroline (R = phenyl). For L_1 (and Mes-phen), the presence of the mesityl groups greatly increases the steric hindrance of the coordination cage, thus limiting the extent of D_{2d} to D_2 deformation.

Interestingly, the energies of the MLCT in complex C6 and homoleptic $[Cu^{I}(Me-phen)_{2}]^{+}$ are almost identical, being blueshifted by 5 to 10 nm when compared to C1–C4. The coordination spheres of C1–C4 and C6 are very similar (which is supported by DFT calculations), and the rigidity of the copper—phenanthroline core cannot therefore be invoked here to rationalize this experimental fact. On the other hand, the conjugation of L₁ and/or L₂ likely entails a stabilization of the MLCT state; the effect remains however rather weak. Let us add that heteroleptic copper complexes display usually a sensibly lower energy MLCT than their homoleptic counterparts (about



Figure 4. TD-DFT Theoretical Absorption Spectra of Complexes C3 and C6.

10 nm). The existence of a dipole taking its origin in the asymmetry of complexes C1-C5 could as well be held responsible for stabilizing the MLCT, this dipole being of a lesser intensity for C6. Additionally, the $\pi - \pi$ interaction between the mesityl groups and the adjacent phenanthroline might as well account for the observed red shift of the MLCT for C1-C4 (and marginally C6) compared to $[Cu^{1}(nBu-phen)_{2}]^{+}$.

A greater delocalization of the π electrons on conjugated L₂ may explain the slight red-shift of the MLCT of complex C4 compared to C2 confirmed by theory (see Table 2). The energy change here is very small though. Much larger shifts to longer wavelengths have been observed for phenyl- or phenylalkynylsubstituted phenanthrolines.^{2,44} But in the famous case of dppz and complexes thereof, it has been demonstrated that the fused phenazine and bipyridine moieties behave a lot like independent units, from the spectroscopic and electrochemical points of view.45,46 It is therefore not surprising that the MLCT energy is only marginally affected by the presence of the phenazine appendix, just like ruthenium complexes are.

The extinction coefficient of the MLCT depends as well on the structure of the coordination sphere caging the copper(I) cation. Since the latter remains roughly the same all along the series C1–C4 and C6, the values of ε are all held within a narrow frame, ranging from 4250 to 6300 M⁻¹ cm⁻¹, in good agreement with previously published data.^{1,3,4} It is worth mentioning here that poorer ε are not uncommon; values as low as 3000 M^{-1} cm⁻¹ were obtained for complex [Cu^I(2,9-diphenyl-1,10phenanthroline)₂]⁺. This was mainly due to a counterproductive effect of the electron delocalization on the transition dipole.^{2,47} As evoked above, mesityl groups are much more sterically challenging than mere phenyl rings, and the torsion angle between the phenanthroline and the mesityl planes dramatically decreases the eventual interaction of their π systems. This is in agreement with the similar spectral features measured for L_1 and its unsubstituted counterpart 2-(parabromo phenylimidazo)-[4,5-f] [1,10] phenanthroline. Yet, the extinction coefficient of the MLCT is significantly smaller for C6 than for C1-C4. This might be due to feeble delocalization of the electrons on the mesityl rings, lessening the transition dipole. This effect would then be counterbalanced by the strong delocalization of the electrons on the π systems of L₁ or L₂ for C1–C5. Let us finish by saying that the spectra of all complexes remain unaltered in aerated dichloromethane or acetonitrile solutions for several days, and even when exposed to air moisture. The stability of these species could be the result of the favorable $\pi - \pi$ stacking between mesityl aromatic groups and the vicinal phenanthroline ligand phen.

Table 3. TD-DFT Wavelengths (in nm) to the Low-Lying Singlet Excited States of Complexes C3 and C6 and Associated Oscillator Strengths Greater than 0.02^a

con C3 ARTICLE

complex	state	$\Delta E (nm)$	f
C3			
	MLCTphenB	522	0.02
	MLCTphenA	494	0.04
	MLCTphenA	482	0.02
	MLCTphenB	464	0.03
	LLCTphenB/ILphenB	393	0.06
	LLCTphenB/ILphenB	384	0.05
	LLCTphenB	378	0.04
	ILphenB	372	0.02
	LLCTphenB/ILphenB	362	0.04
	ILphenB/LLCTphenB	357	0.10
	MLCTphenA/ILphenB	349	0.02
	ILphenA	338	0.02
	LLCTphenB	335	0.02
	LLCTphenB/ILphenA	333	0.02
	MLCTphenA/LLCTphenB	330	0.04
	LLCTphenB/ILphenA	330	0.02
	LLCTphenB/ILphenB	325	0.02
	ILphenB/LLCTphenB	319	0.02
	ILphenB/LLCTphenB	315	0.03
	LLCTphenB/MLCTphenB	308	0.13
	LLCTphenA/LLCTphenB	305	0.02
	MLCTphenB	303	0.07
	MLCTphenB/LLCTphenB	297	0.44
	LLCTphenB	295	0.03
	MLCTphenB	295	0.22
	MLCTphenB	293	0.04
	ILphenB	285	0.14
	MLCTphenA	275	0.02
	ILphenB/LLCTphenA	273	0.04
	ILphenB/ILphenA	272	0.11
C6			
	MLCTphenB/MLCTphenA	492	0.03
	MLCTphenA	489	0.02
	MLCTphenA/MLCTphenB	466	0.02
	MLCTphenB/LLCTphenB	357	0.02
	MLCTphenA/ILphenA	355	0.08
	MLCTphenA/ILphenA	351	0.02
	MLCTphenA/ILphenA	332	0.07
	MLCTphenA/ILphenA	272	0.11
	MLCTphenA	272	0.03
	LLCTphenB/ILphenB	271	0.07
	ILphenB/LLCTphenB/MLCTphenB	271	0.26
	MLCTphenB	268	0.03
	MLCTphenA/ILphenB/ILphenA	267	0.04
	MLCTphenA/ILphenA	266	0.07
	LLCTphenB/ILphenA	265	0.07
	LLphenB/MLCTphenA/ILphenA	264	0.10
	MLCTphenB/LLCTphenB	262	0.03
	MLCTphenA/ILphenA	259	0.10
	MLCTphenA/ILphenA	256	0.10
	MLCTphenA/ILphenA	255	0.05

Table 3. Continued

	Jonnaea				
complex	state	ΔE (nr	n) <i>f</i>		
	MLCTphenA	254	0.03		
	MLCTphenB/LLCTphenB	253	0.06		
	LLCTphenB	253	0.02		
	MLCTphenB/LLCTphenB	251	0.05		
	MLCTphenB/LLCTphenB	247	0.03		
^{<i>a</i>} Phen ^A and	d Phen ^B refer respectively to	o mesityl and	non-mesityl		
derivatized ligands.					

The TD-DFT/B3LYP absorption spectra of C3 and C6 are presented in Figure 4. These two complexes contain a phenanthroline substituted in 2,9 positions by butyl groups (abbreviated phen^B) and another phenanthroline substituted in 2,9 positions by mesityl groups (abbreviated phen^A). The comparison with the above experimental spectra is not straightforward since the computations are performed in a vacuum for the isolated molecules. The TD-DFT solvent corrected absorption spectra will be presented elsewhere in an article devoted to the theoretical study where the methodological points will be discussed. The transition energies to the low-lying singlet excited states together with the associated oscillator strengths are reported in Table 3 for complexes C3 and C6.

The two complexes are characterized by an intense absorption in the UV centered at 297 nm for complex C3 and at 271 nm for complex C6. As mentioned above, this band corresponds to a mixed MLCT/LLCT state for complex C3, while it is a mixture of LLCT, IL, and MLCT transitions for complex C6. The shoulder around 500 nm corresponds to MLCT states localized on the phen^A and phen^B ligands in both complexes. The theoretical spectra are characterized by a peak around 350 nm, corresponding to the mixture of an IL state localized on the phen^B ligand and an LLCT state for complex C3. In complex C6, this band is less intense, in agreement with experimental spectra, and corresponds to a mixed MLCT/IL state localized on phen^A. From the TD-DFT results, we may observe a very high density of states in this class of molecules, the nature and position of which are very sensitive to the substituents.

The main excitations of some characteristic excited states and related orbitals are shown in Table S2 and Figure S5 (Supporting Information), respectively.

Electrochemistry. All six complexes were studied by cyclic and square wave voltammetry in dry, argon purged dichloromethane. In all cases, a well-defined reversible oxidation wave was monitored and naturally assigned to the removal of one electron from the d orbitals of the copper(I) ion. The half-wave potentials were highly dependent on the extent of the steric hindrance at the $[Cu^{I}(phen^{A})(phen^{B})]^{+}$ core.⁴² Indeed, the latter undergoes a shift from a tetrahedral to a square planar geometry when the oxidation number of the metal ion formally changes from +I to +II, respectively. Since mesityl, n-butyl, or methyl groups at the 2 and 9 positions of the phenanthroline moiety prevent such a deformation of the coordination cage, the oxidized form $[Cu^{II}(phen^{A})(phen^{B})]^{2+}$ (where phen^B = Mephen, nBu-phen or L_2) is destabilized, and the potentials are overall anodically shifted. To summarize, the larger the steric hindrance, the higher the potential of the metal centered oxidation. This is indeed exemplified in our case since $E_{1/2}$ grows from 0.5 V for $[\text{Cu}^{1}(\text{phen})_{2}]^{+}$ to 0.7 V for C5 and finally reaches values between 0.85 and 1.05 V vs SCE for complexes C1, C2, C3, and

C4 where all ligands bear bulky substituents at positions 2 and 9 of the phenanthroline cores. The fact that methyl groups are less sterically demanding than *n*-butyl chains likely accounts for the 100 mV shift toward more positive potentials from C1 to C2. Moreover, complexes C3 and C4 built with ligand L₂ show a further increase in $E_{1/2}$; steric effects cannot be put forward here since the coordination spheres of C2, C3, and C4 are virtually the same. Nevertheless, dppz is a well-known π -acceptor and exerts a strong electron withdrawing power, which could be held responsible for the anodic shift of the potentials for C3 and C4.

The cathodic behavior of our complexes has been investigated within the limits imposed by the solvent used (dichloromethane) under our conditions. For complexes C1, C2, and C5, no reduction wave was observed, meaning that phenanthroline based reductions (or Cu(0) formation) occur at potentials below -1.6 V/SCE, a fact that is corroborated by the literature for similar complexes.^{43,48} Conversely, the cathodic behavior of L₂built complexes C3 and C4 revealed, for both, a well-defined oneelectron, reversible reduction wave at $E_{1/2} = -1.09$ and -1.03 V vs SCE respectively. The shape of the wave, the value of the half wave potentials, and the apparent insensitivity of the latter to the complementary ligand (L1 or Mes-phen) are very reminiscent of those of other metal based dppz complexes, in particular the archetypal $[Ru^{II}(bpy)_2(dppz)]^{2+}$. We therefore assigned these reduction waves to the addition of an extra electron on the phenazine moiety. To further probe this assumption, we performed cathodic spectroelectrochemistry on complex C3. Upon electrolysis, several spectral changes are monitored (Figure 5); in particular, a broad shoulder around 560 nm, extending to 620 nm, is rising while the L₂ centered $\pi - \pi^*$ transition at 275 nm collapses. These features are characteristic of (metalbound) dppz⁴⁻ radical anion formation,⁴⁶ corroborating the initial assumption. Interestingly, the MLCT shows very little change, the intensity of which being only slightly enhanced, probably because of a spectral overlap with the 560 nm transition. This weak electronic coupling between the phenazine moiety and the " $Cu^{1}(phen)_{2}$ " core is once again reminiscent of similar ruthenium complexes, and it seems therefore justified to consider complexes C3 and, by extension, C4 as bichromophoric systems. Additionally, several isosbestic points evidence the formation of only one species during the electrolysis, accounting for the stability of the reduced complex.

Photoluminescence Study. As mentioned in the Introduction, the main challenge to obtaining luminescent copper complexes is to avoid or minimize the flattening distortion of the complex from the Cu^I preferred tetrahedral geometry to the formal Cu^{II} square planar arrangement in the MLCT excited state.^{3,4} In the flattened relaxed excited state, the complex has a smaller gap with the ground state, and the nonradiative decay is faster. Moreover, a very efficient quenching of the excited state by the solvent and exciplex formation can happen. Altogether, these two effects shorten the lifetime and luminescence quantum yield of the MLCT excited state. For example, while [Cu¹(phen)₂]⁺ shows no luminescence at room temperature, thecomplex $[Cu^{1}(Me-phen)_{2}]^{+}$ containing methyl substituents in positions 2 and 9 of the phenanthroline emits at 730 nm and exhibits a luminescence quantum yield of about 4×10^{-4} with a time decay of about 90 ns in dichloromethane at room temperature.¹⁰ The best example of sterically blocked distortion is given by the heteroleptic complex Cu¹(*tert*-butyl-phen)(Mephen)]⁺, in which the *tert*-butyl and methyl groups prevent the flattening and give a significant luminescence quantum yield of



Figure 5. Evolution of the electronic absorption spectra of complex C3 upon cathodic electrolysis (in dichloromethane, with 0.1 M tetran-butylammonium hexafluorophosphate as a supporting electrolyte and a platinum grid as the working electrode).



Figure 6. Emission spectra and excited-state time decay recorded in degassed dichloromethane for complexes C1-C6 (excitation at 460 nm).

Table 4. Luminescence and Time Resolved Data for Complexes $C1-C6^a$

	emission a state lifetime (τ/ns =	nd excited e λ _{MLCT} /nm ±4 ns)	
complex	CH ₂ Cl ₂	CH ₃ CN	absorption maximum of MLCT excited state in CH ₂ Cl ₂ /nm
C1	754 (21)	752 (21)	540
CI	/54 (31)	/53 (21)	540
C2	740 (52)	743 (30)	550
C3	\sim 800 (5)	nd (≤4)	630
C4	> 800 (≤4)	nd (≤4)	620
C5	nd (≤4)	nd (≤4)	550
C6	730 (64)	738 (25)	570

^{*a*} All measurements were performed under degassed conditions. nd = not detected, very weak signal, and hardly distinguishable from the instrumental noise.

1% and a lifetime of 730 ns in dichloromethane.¹⁷ The luminescence spectra and the lifetime of MLCT excited states for C1-C6 are given in Figure 6, and the data are compiled in Table 4. These measurements were recorded in dichloromethane and acetonitrile, because these solvents have very different dielectric constants and coordination abilities. All measurements have been performed under the same conditions (absorbance at the excitation wavelength and instrumental parameters) to enable a straightforward and qualitative comparison of luminescence quantum yields.

A general trend is a slight bathochromic shift of the maximum emission wavelength and a shortening of the emission lifetime as we shift from dichloromethane to acetonitrile (Table 4). This is the consequence of the higher dielectric constant of acetonitrile, which stabilizes the charge transfer state, and its stronger coordinating ability, which increases exciplex quenching by pentacoordination of Cu(II). Heteroleptic complex C6 was prepared to assess the influence of the fused heterocycle moiety capping the back of the phenanthroline. As the substituent size increases, within the series C5, C1, and C2, the emission lifetime of the MLCT naturally increases too, owing to restricted flattening of the excited state. The comparison of complex C2 with reference complex C6 indicates that the fused imidazole ring has little impact on the emission characteristic of the complex. On the other hand, the ligand L_2 bearing the phenazine spacer has a



Figure 7. Suzuki cross-coupling reaction performed on complexes C2 and C3, yielding C7 and C8, respectively.

profound impact on the emission properties of the resulting copper(I) complexes C3 and C4, the latter being barely emissive (Table 4).

Nanosecond transient absorption spectroscopy was used to follow the relaxation of the triplet MLCT excited-state (Figure S6, Supporting Information) for each complex. The transient trace of the MLCT excited state in these complexes is red-shifted relative to that of the other complexes (Figure S6), showing some resemblance with the spectrum of the radical anion of the complex C3 recorded by spectro-electrochemistry (Figure 5). The photophysical properties of [Ru^{II}(bpy)₂dppz]²⁺ were investigated in great detail,^{18,49} and it is well-accepted that the dppz ligand can be considered a weakly coupled dyad in which the pyrido and phenazine units behave quite independently. The emission lifetime of the complex $[Ru^{II}(bpy)_2dppz]^{2+}$ is decreased relative to that of $[Ru^{II}(bpy)_3]^{2+}$ owing to the quenching of the MLCT excited state by electron transfer to the phenazine π -accepting unit. In addition, hydrogen bonding between the dppz and a protic solvent is another cause of the excited-state quenching of the MLCT excited state. With reference to these studies on $[Ru^{II}(bpy)_2dppz]^{2+}$, and with the support of the transient emission and absorption studies, the quenching of the MLCT luminescence in C3 and C4 is likely to due to a photoinduced electron transfer from Cu(I) to phenazine. The charge separated state is however very short-lived, since recombination occurs on the nanosecond time scale. This is nevertheless an encouraging feature, legitimating the possibility of copper(I)-phenanthroline based photochemistry.

Chemistry on the Complex. Thanks to the HETPHEN concept, many intricate supramolecular structures were obtained with minimal synthetic effort.^{9,13,15,39,50,51} It would be therefore particularly appealing to know whether chemical alteration is possible on such assemblies, without degrading the integrity of the latter: copper(I) phenanthroline complexes are indeed wellknown to be kinetically labile, and their stability is at stake when they are in the presence of any other potential ligand, like a mere Lewis base. Encouragingly, a copper catalyzed Glaser homocoupling³⁹ and a Sonogashira cross-coupling⁵⁰ were reported too, although in the latter case a "kinetically locked" copper complex was used.⁵² "Click chemistry" has been performed too on catenanes, 53 assembled via coordination of copper(I) by two phenanthroline cavities. Complexes C1-C4 are nevertheless more sterically challenged and therefore potentially less stable than catenanes, and it is also necessary to test the stability of heteroleptic copper complexes in the presence of a different catalyst than Cu^{n+} (n = 0, 1, or 2). In order

to assess this last point, we involved two of our bromo terminated copper complexes in a palladium catalyzed cross-coupling Suzuki reaction. The latter was chosen with regard to its high impact in modern organic chemistry and great versatility, giving access to a plethora of structures and new functionalities. As a proof of concept, para-methoxy phenyl boronic acid was thus engaged in a Suzuki coupling reaction with complexes C2 and C3 (Figure 7). A classical procedure (catalytic Pd(PPh₃)₄ and Ba(OH)₂ \cdot 8H₂O in a refluxing 4:1 mixture of DME/ H_2O overnight) appeared to be successful, affording complexes C7 and C8 with yields of 34% and 84%, respectively. The higher yield for C8 than C7 can be rationalized by the greater activation of the C-Br bond, given the electron withdrawing character of phenazine. It is important to notice that, however, a small amount of homoleptic complex was formed through the course of the reaction, which could not be removed by chromatography owing to very similar mobilities on the stationary phase, and prevented us from getting satisfactory microanalysis.

Stability Assessment. The small, yet significant amount of homoleptic complex formed during the Suzuki cross coupling reactions unveiled a possible stability issue of our heteroleptic systems. A series of tests was therefore undertaken, with the model complex C6. When the latter is dissolved and heated in dichloromethane (apolar, noncoordinating) or acetonitrile (polar, coordinating), no $[Cu^{I}(nBu-phen)_{2}]^{+}$ was detected by ¹H NMR, even after several hours of heat (and light) stress, which tends to confirm the stability of C6, and by extrapolation of any heteroleptic complex with a related structure. However, in the presence of excess nBuphen, the heteroleptic complex spontaneously dissociates to yield the homoleptic complex $[Cu^{1}(n-Bu-phen)_{2}]^{+}$. A quantitative analysis of the ¹H NMR data revealed that the homoleptic species is approximately 7 times more stable than C6 (Figures S7-S9, Supporting Information). The HETPHEN concept states that heteroleptic copper complexes are stable, thanks to the bulkiness of mesityl groups, but in the presence of an exogenous ligand, capable of yielding homoleptic complexes (typically here, *n*-Bu-phen), a fast ligand exchange occurs, owing to the well-known lability of such species. Eventually, the more thermodynamically stable complex is formed. In our case, the *n*-butyl groups are believed to enhance the σ -donating ability of the phenanthroline chelate and therefore stabilize $[Cu^{l}(nBu-phen)_{2}]^{+}$ vs C6. The higher steric bulk in C6 might account for a lesser stability too, compared to the less sterically stringed homoleptic complex. Comparing the optimized structure of $[Cu^{I}(nBu-phen)_{2}]^{+}$ and C6 using the DFT/ PBE-D method, $[Cu^{I}(nBu-phen)_{2}]^{+}$ has shorter Cu-N bonds (Cu-N₁, 2.021 Å; Cu-N₂, 2.021 Å; Cu-N₃, 2.023 Å; Cu-N₄, 2.023 Å) than those of C6 (Table 1) on average. $[Cu^{I}(n-Bu$ phen)₂]⁺ has an almost symmetric structure (N₁-Cu-N₂, N_3-Cu-N_4 , 82.66°; N_1-Cu-N_3 , 124.23°; 82.87°; N₁-Cu-N₄, 124.34°; N₂-Cu-N₃, 124.34°; N₂-Cu-N₄, 124.23°) and from the viewpoint of coordination, this complex is more stable than the π -stacking C6 complex. In addition to this, when *n*-Bu-phen, Mes-phen, and $[Cu(CH_3CN)_4]PF_6$ are all mixed together in dichloromethane, a mixture of homo- and heteroleptic complexes is obtained. C6 happens to be the major species formed in this rather kinetically controlled experiment, but should polar and coordinating acetonitrile or DME be used as solvents instead of dichloromethane, that the trend would be inverted (Figures S7-S9). It is henceforth of paramount importance to respect the order of introduction of the different reactants, to avoid the formation of the undesired homoleptic complex. Under the Suzuki reaction conditions, DME, H2O, and

 PPh_3 are all potentially coordinating and could be involved in ligand exchange reactions, leading eventually to the formation of the homoleptic species. Nevertheless, only 5% of the latter was formed under rather harsh, nonoptimized conditions (120 $^\circ C$), asserting that a careful choice of reactants and reaction conditions should allow for performing chemistry on the complex.

CONCLUSIONS

This work stands within the frame of unveiling the synthesis of copper(I) phenanthroline complexes and their physicochemical properties. To achieve this goal, two bulky original ligands, L1 and L_{2} , were synthesized. L_1 results from the fusion of a benzimidazole skeleton with the bulky 2,9-dimesityl-1,10-phenanthroline. The structure of L₂ stems from the well-known dppz, bearing two nbutyl chains in α positions of the chelating nitrogen atoms. Both ligands provide a strong steric bulk at the copper center, leading to the obtaining of heteroleptic complexes by combination of L₁ and L_2 with adequate phenanthroline derivatives, thanks to the HET-PHEN concept developed by Schmittel and co-workers. In spite of the lability of phenanthroline ligands coordinated to copper(I), a palladium catalyzed cross-coupling reaction has been successfully performed, directly on the complex, with only marginal damage on the starting molecules. With complex C3, the copper(I) cation is in a distorted tetrahedral arrangement, due to π -stacking between mesityl groups and the neighboring dppz ligand. Additionally, most welcome stability is thus provided to the complex. From one ligand to the other, the arrangement is basically linear, which is a particularly important feature of copper(I)-phenanthroline complexes, paving the way to optimized acceptor-donor photosensitive devices. The new complexes were characterized by electrochemistry, UV-vis absorption spectra, steady state and time-resolved luminescence spectroscopy, and pump-probe transient spectroscopy and fully interpreted with the aid of DFT quantum chemical calculations. The electron attracting character of the phenazine unit in ligand L₂ leads to fast nonradiative quenching of the MLCT excited-state of the corresponding copper(I) complexes, whereas for the mesityl bulky subtituents in ligand L_1 , a luminescence quantum yield of about 3 \times 10⁻⁴ is obtained, with a decay time of about 50 ns for C2 measured. Therefore, the latter complex has a potential use as a sensitizer for the design of molecular arrays for photoinduced charge separation. Work is in progress in our groups toward this goal.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information. ¹H NMR spectra of the ligand L_1 and of complexes C1-C6, X-ray structure of complex C3, the representation and the nature of the orbitals involved in the optical transitions for complexes C3 and C6, the transient absorption spectra of complexes C1-C6, the stability assessment for complex C6, and the Cartesian coordinates of the optimized structures of the complexes C1-C6. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*Tel.: +33 368 851314 (C.D.), +33 251125429 (F.O.). Fax: +33 368851589 (C.D.), +33 251125402 (F.O.). E-mail: michel. evain@univ-nantes.fr, c.daniel@chimie.u-strasbg.fr, Fabrice.Odobel@ univ-nantes.fr.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The "Agence Nationale de la Recherche" (ANR) is gratefully acknowledged for the financial support of this research through the "Programme Blanc" entitled "HeteroCop" referenced ANR-09-BLAN-0183-01. These studies were also supported by the European program COST D35. F.O. warmly thanks Benoit Colasson (Université Paris Descartes) for fruitful and inspiring discussions about the present work. The calculations were carried out in part at the IDRIS and CINES computer centers through a grant of computer time from the Conseil Scientifique.

REFERENCES

 Dietrich-Buchecker, C. O.; Marnot, P. A.; Sauvage, J. P.; Kirchoff, J. R.; McMillin, D. R. Chem. Commun. 1983, 513. Gushurst, A. K. I.; McMillin, D. R.; Dietrich-Buchecker, C. O.; Sauvage, J. P. Inorg. Chem. 1989, 28, 4070. Blasse, G.; Breddels, P. A.; McMillin, D. R. Chem. Phys. Lett. 1984, 109, 24. Blaskie, M. W.; McMillin, D. R. Inorg. Chem. 1980, 19, 3519.McMillin, D. R.; Gamache, R. E., Jr.; Kirchhoff, J. R.; Del, P. A. A. In Photochemical and Photophysical Studies of Copper(I) Complexes; Adenine Press: Schenectady, NY, 1983; p 223. Buckner, M. T.; McMillin, D. R. Chem. Commun. 1978, 759. McMillin, D. R.; Kirchhoff, J. R.; Goodwin, K. V. Coord. Chem. Rev. 1985, 64, 83. Everly, R. M.; Ziessel, R.; Suffert, J.; McMillin, D. R. Inorg. Chem. 1991, 30, 559.

(2) Ichinaga, A. K.; Kirchhoff, J. R.; McMillin, D. R.; Dietrich-Buchecker, C. O.; Marnot, P. A.; Sauvage, J. P. *Inorg. Chem.* **1987**, 26, 4290.

(3) Armaroli, N. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2001, 30, 113.

(4) Armaroli, N.; Accorsi, G.; Cardinali, F.; Listorti, A. Top. Curr. Chem. 2007, 280, 69.

(5) Lavie-Cambot, A.; Cantuel, M.; Leydet, Y.; Jonusauskas, G.; Bassani, D. M.; McClenaghan, N. D. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2008**, *252*, 2572. Horváth, O. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1994**, *135–136*, 303.

(6) McGarvey, J. J.; Bell, S. E. J.; Bechara, J. N. Inorg. Chem. 1986, 25, 4325. McGarvey, J. J.; Bell, S. E. J.; Gordon, K. C. Inorg. Chem. 1988, 27, 4003.

(7) Campagna, S.; Puntoriero, F.; Nastasi, F.; Bergamini, G.; Balzani, V. Top. Curr. Chem. 2007, 280, 117. Sauvage, J. P.; Collin, J. P.; Chambron, J. C.; Guillerez, S.; Coudret, C.; Balzani, V.; Barigelletti, F.; De Cola, L.; Flamigni, L. Chem. Rev. 1994, 94, 993. Medlycott, E. A.; Hanan, G. S. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2005, 34, 133. Abrahamsson, M.; Jager, M.; Kumar Rohan, J.; Osterman, T.; Persson, P.; Becker, H.-C.; Johansson, O.; Hammarström, L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 15533.

(8) Polo, A. S.; Itokazu, M. K.; Murakami Iha, N. Y. Coord. Chem. Rev. 2004, 248, 1343.

(9) Schmittel, M.; Ganz, A. Synlett 1997, 710.

(10) Schmittel, M.; Ganz, A. Chem. Commun. **1997**, 1815. Schmittel, M.; Ganz, A.; Fenske, D.; Herderich, M. Dalton Trans. **2000**, 353.

(11) Schmittel, M.; Michel, C.; Liu, S.-X.; Schildbach, D.; Fenske, D. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2001**, 1155.

(12) De, S.; Mahata, K.; Schmittel, M. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2010, 39, 1555.

(13) Kalsani, V.; Bodenstedt, H.; Fenske, D.; Schmittel, M. Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. 2005, 1841.

(14) Schmittel, M.; Kishore, R. S. K.; Bats, J. W. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2007, 5, 78.

(15) Kalsani, V.; Ammon, H.; Jäckel, F.; Rabe, J. P.; Schmittel, M. Chem.— Eur. J. 2004, 10, 5481.

(16) Schmittel, M.; Ganz, A.; Fenske, D. Org. Lett. 2002, 4, 2289.

(17) Miller, M. T.; Gantzel, P. K.; Karpishin, T. B. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1999, 121, 4292.

(18) Chambron, J. C.; Sauvage, J. P.; Amouyal, E.; Koffi, P. Nouv. J. Chim. **1985**, *9*, 527.

(19) Konduri, R.; Ye, H.; MacDonnell, F. M.; Serroni, S.; Campagna, S.; Rajeshwar, K. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2002, 41, 3185. Chiorboli, C.; Bignozzi, C. A.; Scandola, F.; Ishow, E.; Gourdon, A.; Launay, J.-P. Inorg. Chem. 1999, 38, 2402. Chiorboli, C.; Fracasso, S.; Scandola, F.;

Campagna, S.; Serroni, S.; Konduri, R.; MacDonnell, F. M. *Chem. Commun.* **2003**, 1658. Goze, C.; Leiggener, C.; Liu, S.-X.; Sanguinet, L.; Levillain, E.; Hauser, A.; Decurtins, S. *ChemPhysChem* **2007**, *8*, 1504. Rau, S.; Schaefer, B.; Gleich, D.; Anders, E.; Rudolph, M.; Friedrich, M.; Goerls, H.; Henry, W.; Vos, J. G. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2006**, 45, 6215.

(20) Lundin, N. J.; Walsh, P. J.; Howell, S. L.; McGarvey, J. J.; Blackman, A. G.; Gordon, K. C. *Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, *44*, 3551.

(21) Lim, M. H.; Song, H.; Olmon, E. D.; Dervan, E. E.; Barton, J. K. *Inorg. Chem.* **2009**, *48*, 5392. Rueba, E.; Hart, J. R.; Barton, J. K. *Inorg. Chem.* **2004**, *43*, 4570. Delaney, S.; Pascaly, M.; Bhattacharya, P. K.; Han, K.; Barton, J. K. *Inorg. Chem.* **2002**, *41*, 1966. Jenkins, Y.; Friedman, A. E.; Turro, N. J.; Barton, J. K. *Biochemistry* **1992**, *31*, 10809. Sentagne, C.; Chambron, J.-C.; Sauvage, J.-P.; Paillous, N. J. Photochem. Photobiol, B **1994**, *26*, 165.

(22) Frey, J.; Kraus, T.; Heitz, V.; Sauvage, J.-P. *Chem.—Eur. J.* **200**7, 13, 7584.

(23) Grimme, S. J. Comput. Chem. 2006, 27, 1787.

(24) van Lenthe, E.; J., B. E. J. Comput. Chem. 2003, 24, 1142.

(25) Amsterdam Density Functional program; Theoretical Chemistry, Vrije Universiteit: Amsterdam. http://www.scm.com (accessed October 2011). te Velde, G.; Bickelhaupt, F. M.; Baerends, E. J.; Guerra, C. F.; van Gisbergen, S. J. A.; Snijders, J. G.; Ziegler, T. J. Comput. Chem. **2001**, 22, 931.

(26) Petersilka, M.; Gossmann, U. J.; Gross, E. K. U. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1996, 76, 1212.

(27) Becke, A. D. J. Chem. Phys. **1993**, 98, 5648. Gross, E. K. U.; Kohn, W. Phys. Rev. Lett. **1985**, 55, 2850. Gorling, A.; Heinze, H. H.; Ruzankin, S. P.; Staufer, M.; Rosch, N. J. Chem. Phys. **1999**, 110, 2785.

(28) Dunning, T. H., Jr. J. Chem. Phys. 1989, 90, 1007.

(29) Bera, N. C.; Bhattacharyya, I.; Das, A. K. Spectrochim. Acta, Part A **200**7, 67A, 894.

(30) Frisch, M. J. T. G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Montgomery, J. A., Jr.; Vreven, T.; Kudin, K. N.; Burant, J. C.; Millam, J. M.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Cossi, M.; Scalmani, G.; Rega, N.; Petersson, G. A.; Nakatsuji, H.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Klene, M.; Li, X.; Knox, J. E.; Hratchian, H. P.; Cross, J. B.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, A. J.; Cammi, R. P. C.; Ochterski, J. W.; Ayala, P. Y.; Morokuma, K.; Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, A. D.; Strain, M. C.; Farkas, O.; Malick, D. K.; Rabuck, A. D.; Raghavachari, K.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.; Cui, Q.; Baboul, A. G.; Clifford, S.; Cioslowski, J.; Stefanov, B. B.; Liu, G.; Liashenko, A.; Piskorz, P.; Komaromi, I.; Martin, R. L.; Fox, D. J.; Keith, T.; Al-Laham, M. A.; Peng, C. Y.; Nanayakkara, A.; Challacombe, M.; Gill, P. M. W.; Johnson, B.; Chen, W.; Wong, M. W.; Gonzalez, C.; Pople, J. A. Gaussian, Inc.: Wallingford, CT, 2005.

(31) Oszlanyi, G.; Sueto, A. Acta Crystallogr., Sect. A 2004, A60, 134.

(32) Palatinus, L.; Chapuis, G. J. Appl. Crystallogr. 2007, 40, 786.

(33) Petricek, V.; Dusek, M.; Palatinus, L. *Jana2006*: The crystallographic computing system, Institute of Physics: Praha, Czech Republic, 2006.

(34) Ott, S.; Faust, R. Synthesis 2005, 3135.

(35) Pallenberg, A. J.; Koenig, K. S.; Barnhart, D. M. Inorg. Chem. 1995, 34, 2833.

(36) Yamada, M.; Nakamura, Y.; Kuroda, S.; Shimao, I. *Bull. Chem.* Soc. Jpn. **1990**, 63, 2710. Yamada, M.; Tanaka, Y.; Yoshimoto, Y.;

Kuroda, S.; Shimao, I. Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn. 1992, 65, 1006.

(37) Steck, E. A.; Day, A. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1946, 68, 771.

(38) Miller, M. T.; Gantzel, P. K.; Karpishin, T. B. *Inorg. Chem.* **1998**, 37, 2285.

(39) Schmittel, M.; Kalsani, V.; Bats, J. W. Inorg. Chem. 2005, 44, 4115.
(40) Kubas, G. J. Inorg. Synth. 1979, 19, 90.

(41) Cunningham, C. T.; Moore, J. J.; Cunningham, K. L. H.; Fanwick, P. E.; McMillin, D. R. *Inorg. Chem.* **2000**, *39*, 3638.

(42) Miller, M. T.; Gantzel, P. K.; Karpishin, T. B. Inorg. Chem. 1999, 38, 3414.

ARTICLE

(43) Eggleston, M. K.; McMillin, D. R.; Koenig, K. S.; Pallenberg, A. J. Inorg. Chem. 1997, 36, 172.

(44) Miller, M. T.; Karpishin, T. B. Inorg. Chem. 1999, 38, 5246.

(45) Ackermann, M. N.; Interrante, L. V. Inorg. Chem. 1984, 23, 3904.

(46) Fees, J.; Kaim, W.; Moscherosch, M.; Matheis, W.; Klima, J.; Krejcik, M.; Zalis, S. *Inorg. Chem.* **1993**, *32*, 166.

(47) Phifer, C. C.; McMillin, D. R. Inorg. Chem. 1986, 25, 1329.

(48) Masood, M. A.; Zacharias, P. S. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans. 1991, 111.

(49) Olofsson, J.; Onfelt, B.; Lincoln, P. J. Phys. Chem. A 2004, 108, 4391. Brennaman, M. K.; Alstrum-Acevedo, J. H.; Fleming, C. N.; Jang, P.; Meyer, T. J.; Papanikolas, J. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 15094. Önfelt, B.; Lincoln, P.; Norden, B.; Baskin, J. S.; Zewail, A. H. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A 2000, 97, 5708.

(50) Schmittel, M.; Mahata, K. Chem. Commun. 2008, 2550.

(51) Mahata, K.; Schmittel, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 16544. Schmittel, M.; He, B.; Kalsani, V.; Bats, J. W. Org. Biomol. Chem. 2007, 5, 2395. Schmittel, M.; Mal, P. Chem. Commun. 2008, 960.

(52) Kalsani, V.; Schmittel, M.; Listorti, A.; Accorsi, G.; Armaroli, N. Inorg. Chem. **2006**, 45, 2061.

(53) Durot, S.; Mobian, P.; Collin, J.-P.; Sauvage, J.-P. *Tetrahedron* **2008**, *64*, 8496.