

View Article Online View Journal

ChemComm

Accepted Manuscript

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: A. K. Powell, N. Leblanc, S. Sproules, C. Pasquier, P. Auban-Senzier and H. Raffy, *Chem. Commun.*, 2015, DOI: 10.1039/C5CC04142B.



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

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

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the **Information for Authors**.

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



www.rsc.org/chemcomm

Published on 18 June 2015. Downloaded by University of Michigan Library on 23/06/2015 11:46:03.

Please do not adjust margins ChemComm

DOI: 10.1039/C5CC04142B



Journal Name

COMMUNICATION

Approaching the limit of Cu''/Cu' mixed valency in a $Cu'Br_2/N$ methylquinoxalinium hybrid compound

Received 00th January 20xx, Accepted 00th January 20xx DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

Nicolas Leblanc,*^a Stephen Sproules,^c Claude Pasquier,*^d Pascale Auban-Senzier,^d Helene Raffy^d and Annie K. Powell,*^{a,b}

www.rsc.org/

A novel 1D hybrid salt (MQ)[CuBr₂]... (MQ= N-methylquinoxalinium) is reported. Structural, spectroscopic and magnetic investigations reveal a minimal Cu" doping of less than 0.1%. However it is not possible to distinguish Cu¹ and Cu¹¹. The unusually close packing of the organic moieties and the dark brown colour of the crystals suggest a defect electronic structure.

The chemistry of copper (I) halides has provided an impressive library of compounds, characterized by their structural diversity,¹ In some case, owing to the oxidative instability of the starting material Cu^IX (X=Cl, Br, I), pure Cu^{II} or mixed valence Cu¹/Cu¹¹ can result.² In the case of mixed valency, depending on how differentiable the two Cu^I and Cu^{II} metal sites are crystallographically, Robin & Day classified them in terms of three different classes. In class I, the sites are fully distinguishable, in class III indistinguishable, and in class II there is an intermediate situation.³

In the field of 1D copper bromide based compounds, only a few examples of mixed valency have been reported,⁴ and of particular interest is the influence that the amount of Cu^{II} present has on the electronic structure.

Here we present a novel 1D copper bromide hybrid compound (MQ)[CuBr₂]_~ (MQ= N-methylquinoxalinium) which has a tiny amount of Cu^{II} (<0.1%), and yet shows properties consistent with a mixed valent electronic structure.

Colourless crystals of the starting material (MQ)[BF₄] were obtained by recrystallization from MeOH at -20°C. Crystals of (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞ were obtained by the slow vapour diffusion method. Dissolution in warm DMSO of a stoichiometric amount

of (MQ)[BF₄] with NaBr and freshly prepared Cu^IBr leads to a brown solution after cooling to room temperature. Upon slow vapour diffusion of MeOH, dark brown crystals formed within a few hours. Phase purity was checked by XRPD (ESI⁺).

The X-ray crystal structure of (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞ was measured at room temperature (293K) and refined in the space group C2/m. The structure has infinite 1D $[CuBr_2]_{\infty}$ chains composed of edge-sharing $[CuBr_4]$ distorted-tetrahedra,^{4b,5} separated by infinite stacks of N-methylquinoxalinium moieties (MQ). These lead to a slightly distorted chessboard packing by virtue of the $\beta \approx 97^{\circ}$ angle, when viewed along the *b* axis (Figure 1a). In the inorganic part, the asymmetric unit contains one half copper lying on the 2-fold axis (0,y,0) and two half bromide lying in the mirror plane (x,0,z) (Figure 1b).



Figure 1: (a) General view of $(MQ)[CuBr_2]_{\infty}$ along the *b* axis. (b) - Partial view perpendicular to the direction (20-1). The close packing within the organic network and the two [CuBr₂]_∞ chains related by the C-centred Bravais lattice are displayed. (c, d) Overlaid view with the projected symmetry elements of the C2/m space group, along the b axis (c) and the a axis (d).

The geometry of the coordination sphere is distorted from ideal tetrahedral symmetry (T_d) to give the D₂d symmetry, as confirmed by the data from Table S1. The values of the interligand dihedral angles average 80° (from 77.7 to 84.4°) rather than the expected 90° for a perfect T_d symmetry. The

^{a.} Institut für Nanotechnologie, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie , Hermann- von-Helmholtz-Platz 1,D-76344 Eggenstein-Leopoldshafen, Germany.

E-mail: nicolas.leblanc@partner.kit.edu; Tel: +49 (0)721-608-28922 ^{b.} Institut für Anorganische Chemie, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, Engesserstraße 15, D-76131, Karlsruhe, Germany. E-mail: annie.powell@kit.edu; Fax: +049 (0)721-608-48142; Tel: +049 (0)721-608-42135

^c University of Glasgow, School of Chemistry, Joseph Black Building A₅-14, University Avenue, Glasgow, G12 8QQ, Scotland.

^d Laboratoire de Physique des Solides, UMR-CNRS 8502, Bat. 510, Université Paris Sud, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France

⁺ Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Tables of crystal and X-Ray crystallographic files in CIF format, XRPD patterns, UV-Vis and IR spectra of $(MQ)[CuBr_2]_{\infty}$ and $(MQ)[BF_4]$, the additional EPR spectra of $(MQ)[CuBr_2]_{\infty}$, and Cyclic Voltammogram of (MQ)[BF4]. CCDC 1400365 and 1400362. For ESI and crystallographic data CIF other electronic format see in or DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

Br1

values of the edge central and face-edge-face angles significantly differ from the ideal T_d values of 109.5° (from 95° to 117°) and 70.53° (from 60.4° to 78.8°) respectively. Significant changes also occur in the Cu-Br bond lengths and Cu-Br-Cu bridging angles (Cu₁-Br₂=2.493 Å, Cu₁-Br₂-Cu₁=73.8° and Cu₁-Br₁=2.535 Å, Cu₁-Br₁-Cu₁=84.7°). This leads to the Cu metal ion being off-centred. This, in turn leads to alternating long-short-long-short Cu-Cu distances of 3.415(1) Å and 2.995(1) Å respectively, and to an increase of the Br₁-Cu₁-Br₂ trans-angle to 117.5°.

Regarding the organic part of this hybrid structure, the corresponding bond distances and angles of the MQ moiety are listed in Table S2 and compared with those measured in some related compounds. According to the Cambridge Structural Database only two other salts based on the MQ unit, $(MQ)[TCNQ]^{b}$ and $(MQ)_{2}{H_{2}-[Fe^{ll}(CN)_{6}]}$, have been reported up to now but only $(MQ)_{2}$ {H₂-[Fe^{II}(CN)₆]} has been characterized by single crystal X-Ray Diffraction. Because of such a lack of comparable structures, the simple starting product (MQ)[BF₄] (ESI⁺) was also characterized by single crystal X-Ray Diffraction, and its structural data added for comparison. In (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞, the MQ moiety is planar. The quinoxaline core is consistent with an aromatic π -conjugated system with bond distances (C_{sp2} - C_{sp2} , C_{sp2} -N) and planar angles, ranging from 1.30 Å to 1.41 Å and 117.1° to 123.3° respectively, which correspond to what has been observed in (MQ)[BF₄], as well as in some other aromatic compounds like naphthalene or pyrazine,⁸ but differ significantly from those measured in $(MQ)_2$ {H₂-[Fe^{II}(CN)₆]}.

In (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞, one half MQ moiety contributes to the organic part of the asymmetric unit and is located in a mirror plane perpendicular to the *b* axis (x,0,z). In the (ac) plane the MQ molecule interacts with its neighbours (X) only through side contacts via hydrogen bonds (X...H-C_{aromatic}) (Figure 2, red dashed lines). These occur between either two MQs related by a symmetry centre (0,0,½) (X=N₂, d_{N2...H8-C}=2.656 (5) Å, Σr_{vdw} (N...H) =2.75 Å) or between MQ and its surrounding bromide anions (X=Br, d_{Br2'...H5-C}=2.962 (1) Å, d_{Br1'...H9-C}=3.036 (1) Å, Σr_{vdw} (Br...H) =3.05 Å). Additional hydrogen bonds are present between the methyl group of MQ and the bromide anions either in the (ac) plane (d_{Br1...H1C-C}=3.054(73) Å) or along the *b* axis (d_{Br1'...H1B-C}=2.808 (50) Å) and contribute to the reinforcement of the packing density.

When viewed perpendicular to the *b* axis, the structure of (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞ shows an infinite stack of antiparallel displaced⁹ MQ molecules related by a symmetry centre $(\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{4},\frac{1}{2})$ - Figure 1c and 1d). The stacking parameters, based on the model of GlÓwka and *al.*¹⁰ lead to an effective stacking surface of about 12% and to an interplanar distance h=b/2 of 3.205 Å (Figure S1). This distance is surprisingly short compared to the average value, $\langle h \rangle = 3.41$ Å $\geq \Sigma_{vdw}$ C...C=3.40 Å, observed in (MQ)₂{H₂- $[Fe^{II}(CN)_6]$ and in some similar cationic π -deficient heterocycles like N-methylphenazinium (NMP), N-methylquinolinium (Q) and N-methylacridinium (N-MeA), which stack in a similar way (Table S3).^{7,11} Although in a cationic N-rich aromatic heterocycle an interplanar distance of 3.0-3.22 Å (at 173K) has been reported,¹² this distance we observe in $(MQ)[CuBr_2]_{\infty}$ is by far the shortest interplanar distance reported for cationic π -deficient heterocycles. Such a distance with d<3.30 Å is usually observed in strongly interacting cation radical or mixed-valence salts.¹³ This raised the question concerning the charge distribution within the (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞ salt, and especially the respective oxidation states of all moieties.

DOI: 10.1039/C5CC04142B

Journal Name



Figure 2: Partial view of $(MQ)[CuBr_2]_{\infty}$ showing the hydrogen bonds (red dashed lines) and the Br-N distance (blue dashed line) between either two MQ or MQ and Br mojeties.

In terms of the synthesis, crystals of $(MQ)[CuBr_2]_{\infty}$ were obtained by heating a solution of Cu¹Br under aerobic conditions, which tends to destabilize Cu¹ to Cu¹¹ (ESI⁺). This is reinforced by the electron acceptor behaviour of the *N*-methylquinoxalinium cation, which can be irreversibly reduced in solution as a neutral radical (E=-0.87 V vs Fc/Fc⁺ - Figure S2). For these reasons, it is reasonable to suggest that both Cu¹¹/Cu¹¹ and MQ¹/MQ[•] species could be stabilized in the crystalline state.

The single crystal X-Ray structure analysis of (MQ)[CuBr₂]. show features that are consistent with the presence of Cu^l and MQ¹ in the crystal. In the inorganic part, the distorted tetrahedral environment around the copper is in line with a four-coordinated Cu^{1,4e,14} while Cu^{II} would prefer a planar square geometry.^{5c,15} In the specific case of mixed valent compounds having the same coordination environment,^{4a-d} the Cu-Br bond distances criterion dominates. Here the average Cu-Br distance of 2.51 Å is consistent with the one found in similar pure Cu^IBr based salts (2.506 Å),^{4e,14} whereas the comparable Cu^{II}Br bond length is shorter with an average value of 2.422 Å.^{5c,15} In the organic part, the structure, IR vibrations (Figure S3) and the redox state of MQ in (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞ are similar to (MQ)[BF₄] (Table S2), where the cationic state MQ¹ is clear. Thus, according to the X-Ray structure analysis, we have a pure (MQ¹)[Cu¹Br₂]_∞ composition.

The X-band EPR spectrum of (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞ shows a broad signal with $g \approx 2.042$ (Figure S4). This g-value is higher than typical for organic-based radical spins and thus reveals the presence of Cu["] in the polycrystalline material. The fluid solution spectrum in DMSO was recorded at 333 K to improve the motional tumbling in this viscous solvent. The complicated sequence of peaks appears to arise from three difference ${\rm Cu}^{^{\rm H}}$ species; only two four-line patterns can be clearly identified (Figure S5). There was no evidence of an organic-based radical signal attributable to MQ[•] or to Br[•] in the spectrum. This signal is consistent with less than 0.4% of the copper ions in the sample based on spin counting. There is insufficient resolution to decipher the chemical environment of the copper. Exposure to the atmosphere sees the growth of a prominent of a signal at $q \simeq 2.17$ that perfectly matches the profile of CuBr₂ dissolved in DMSO solution (Figure S6).

A Bond Valence Sum (BVS) treatment [equation $V_{Cu}=2^*S_{Cu-Br1}+2^*S_{cu-Br2}$; S=exp (R₀-R)/B], using the most recent bond valence parameter table,¹⁶ leads to the oxidation state V_{Cu} =+1.083, which is in line with the suggestion that the copper in this compound is nearly exclusively Cu¹.

The magnetic susceptibility of (MQ)[CuBr_2]_ $_{\infty}$ was measured on a polycrystalline sample (223 mg) from 4.5-300K under an

Published on 18 June 2015. Downloaded by University of Michigan Library on 23/06/2015 11:46:03.

Journal Name

applied field of 0.4T and 1T. As shown in Figure 3a, the susceptibility is negative which confirms the dominant diamagnetic nature of the compound. The fitted molar diamagnetic susceptibilities at 0.4 and 1 T gives an average value χ_m =-173.26 10^{-6} emu.mol^{-1}, which is in line with the approximation \mathbb{B}_m =M(_{MQL})[CuBr]2∞=368.54/2=184.27 10^{-6} emu.mol^{-1} and with the one calculated from the Pascal's Constants^{17} (χ_m =-140.12 10^{-6} emu.mol^{-1}).

In order to determine the amount of Cu^{II} present in the compound a global fitting of the difference plots of χ - χ _{dia} (T) (H=0.4 and 1T) is typical of a paramagnetic species which follows a Curie-Weiss law with weak antiferromagnetic interactions (C=212.766 10⁻⁶ emu.K.mol⁻¹, θ =-2.404 K - Figure 3b+inset). Extraction of the Curie constant gives an estimation of about 0.054% of Cu^{II} present in the compound, when comparing the Curie constant of a corresponding pure Cu^{II} paramagnet (C=0.391 emu.K.mol⁻¹ with S=1/2, g_{eff}=2.042). Thus according to the X-Ray, EPR, BVS, and SQUID measurements, the amount of Cu^{II} within the compound is clearly negligible, and could be explained as arising from some defects at the surface of the crystals, which is a well-known phenomenon in the chemistry of Cu^I.



Figure 3: (a) Plot of the experimental Molar susceptibility versus Temperature of $(MQ)[CuBr_2]_{\sim}$ (223mg, 0.4T and 1T). (b+inset) Plot after diamagnetic correction. The molar paramagnetic susceptibility fits better with a Curie-Weiss law, represented by the red line (global fit parameters: C=212.766 10⁻⁶ emu.K.mol⁻¹, 0=-2.404 K with χ_{dia} (0.4 T)= -171.85 10⁻⁶ emu.mol⁻¹, χ_{dia} (1T)= -174.68 10⁻⁶ emu.mol⁻¹).

However this is not consistent with the homogenous dark brown colour of the crystals (Figure 4) which persists even upon grinding. Furthermore, the electronic spectrum of (MQ)[CuBr₂]. reveals two broad absorption bands, one in the UV-Visible region (200-800 nm), and the other in the near-infrared (600-1200 nm, $\lambda_{max} \approx 900$ nm). This colour cannot arise from the MQ^I cation which displays a unique π - π * transition in the UV region (λ_{max} = 335 nm, Figure 4). Similarly a pure copper (I) bromide species should also give colourless crystals due to the d¹⁰ electronic configuration of Cu¹ and the impossibility of ligand to metal charge transfer.^{5a,18} An electronic transition arising from a charge transfer between the electron donors (Cu¹ or Br⁻) and the acceptor MQ^I, as originally postulated in the study of some paraquat (MV^{2+}) salts 4c,19 is not possible. In the MV^{2+} salts the authors attribute the colour of the crystals to the presence of some Cu^{II} sites and MV^{•+} cation radicals in the solid, resulting from a halide-mediated electron transfer between the Cu['] and

 MV^{2^+} . This is only possible when the orbitals of the halide (X) interact suitably with those of the pyridinium site (N⁺) of the electron acceptor, which is characterized by a short X...N⁺ contact and an almost perpendicular angle between the halide and the pyridinium plane.^{4c,20} In (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞, in addition to the fact that there is no evidence of any MQ[•] from the EPR measurements, such a donor-acceptor interaction is not present, since the bromide anions are 37° shifted from the ideal 90° for a "Br...N⁺" geometry, and the shortest distance (Br₂'...N₁) is much longer than the sum of the Van der Waals radii [d_{Br2'...N1}=4.024 (2) Å; Σr_{vdw} (Br...N) =3.4 Å; Figure 2, blue dashed line]. This leads to the conclusion that a pure MQ¹/Cu¹/Br⁻ composition should give colourless crystals of (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞.





In the case of Cu¹/Cu^{II} mixed valence the d⁹ configuration of Cu^{II} can explain the colours of the compounds.^{4a-d} The absorption bands usually arise from Cu^{II} metal centred transitions and from ligand to metal charge transfer (LMCT) bands, while an additional transition at lower energy can be attributed to an intervalence charge transfer band (IVCT).^{4b} However, dark colours such as green or deep blue are explained when the amount of Cu^{II} is significant in the solid (\geq 50%).^{4a,b} In the case of (pq)[Cu₂Br₄],^{4c} which has only 2% Cu^{II}, the reddishorange colour arises from charge transfer. In our case, with less than 0.1% Cu^{II} and because no charge transfer can occur, we need to find a different explanation for the dark brown colour with such a long absorption range (400-1200 nm).

Our first interpretation of the results postulated itinerant electrons mediated by the crystal packing. Single crystal conductivity measurements were carried out along the *b* axis, since this corresponds to the $[CuBr_2]_{\infty}$ chain and to the π -stacking axis of the MQ moieties directions and is expected to be the preferential conductivity shows an activated behavior, and the conductivity at room temperature is estimated as 3.10^{-9} S/m (Figure 5). The fit of the data to an Arrhenius law with $\sigma = \sigma_0 \exp(-E_a/T)$ gives an activation energy E_a of 7500K *i.e.* an energy gap of $\Delta = 2E_a = 1.3$ eV a little higher than the optical gap.

This value of conductivity is about 300 times smaller than the one reported in $(pq)[Cu_2Br_4]$,^{4c} containing 2% Cu^{II} and acting as mediator of the charge transport. This actually in line with the conductivity value we find giving an estimate of about 0.01% Cu^{II}, acting as a charge carrier in our compound.

DOI: 10.1039/C5CC04142B

Journal Name



Figure 5: Conductivity of single crystal along the *b* axis of $(MQ)[CuBr_2]_{\infty}$ plotted as a function of the inverse temperature. The black line is the fit of the data with an activation law.

As in the case of Scott & Willet $^{\rm 4c}$ we conclude that the observed properties are intrinsic to the system and not due to surface effects.

Acknowledgments

Published on 18 June 2015. Downloaded by University of Michigan Library on 23/06/2015 11:46:03.

The authors thank the financial support provided by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (fellowship to N.L) and Helmholtz POF "STN". We also thank Dr. Lionel Sanguinet for the electrochemistry measurements.

Notes and references

‡ Crystal data of (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞: C₉H₉N₂Cu₁Br₂, M=368.354; monoclinic, C2/m; a=15.373(2) Å, b=6.4099(7) Å, c= 10.9646(18) Å, β=96.692(12)°, V=1073.1(3) Å³; Z=4; T=293K; R₁(F) = 0.029 [1265 unique reflections in the 3.4-27.3° θ range (R_{int} = 0.022), of which 1133 had I > 2σ(I), 92 parameters refined], wR2(F2) = 0.091 (all data), GOF = 1.32; max/min residual electron density 0.390/ -0.582 e.A⁻³. Single crystals X-Ray diffraction data of (MQ)[CuBr₂]_∞ and (MQ)[BF₄] were collected at 293K on a STOE IPDS II Diffractometer equipped with a graphite monochromatized Mo Kα radiation (λ = 0.71073 Å). Structures were solved and refined using the Shelxl2013 package²¹ and molecular diagrams were referied by full-matrix least-squares routines against F², including hydrogens atoms of the methyl group. Hydrogen atoms of the pyrazinium moiety were placed at calculated positions and refined using a riding model.

- 1 R. Peng, M. Li and D. Li, Coord. Chem. Rev., 2010, 254, 1-18.
- (a) H. Feng, X.-P. Zhou, T. Wu, D. Li, Y.-G. Yin and S. W. Ng, *Inorg. Chim.* Acta, 2006, **359**, 4027-4035; (b) Y. Cui, Y. Yue, G. Qian and B. Chen, *Chem. Rev.*, 2011, **112**, 1126-1162.
- 3 (a) M. Robin and P. Day, in Advances in Inorganic Chemistry Volume 10, Elsevier, 1968, vol. 10, pp. 247-422; (b) P. Day, N. S. Hush and R. J. H. Clark, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A, 2008, 366, 5-14.
- 4 (a) R. D. Willett, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1987, 26, 3423-3424; (b) B. Scott, R. Willett, L. Porter and J. Williams, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1992, 31, 2483-2492; (c) B. Scott, R. Willett, A. Saccani, F. Sandrolini and B. L. Ramakrishna, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 1996, 248, 73-80; (d) G. Margraf, M. Bolte, M. Wagner and H.-W. Lerner, *J. Chem. Crystallogr.*, 2007, 37, 503-506; (e) M. Stricker, T. Linder, B. Oelkers and J. Sundermeyer, *Green Chem.*, 2010, 12, 1589-1598.
- 5 (a) R. D. Willett and B. Twamley, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2004, 43, 954-957; (b) J. Sertucha, A. Luque, F. Lloret and P. Román, *Polyhedron*, 1999, 17, 3875-3880; (c) R. Fletcher, J. J. Hansen, J. Livermore and R. D. Willett, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1983, 22, 330-334.
- H. J. Keller, D. Noethe and M. Werner, Can. J. Chem., 1979, 57, 1033-1036.

- 7 S. I. Gorelsky, A. B. Ilyukhin, P. V. Kholin, V. Y. Kotov, B. V. Lokshin and N. V. Sapoletova, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2007, **360**, 2573-2582.
- 8 F. H. Allen, O. Kennard, D. G. Watson, L. Brammer, A. G. Orpen and R. Taylor, J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2, 1987, S1-S19.
- 9 N. Hayashi, H. Higuchi and K. Ninomiya, in *Heterocyclic Supramolecules II*, eds. K. MatsumotoN. Hayashi, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, vol. 18, pp. 103-118.
- M. L. Główka, D. Martynowski and K. Kozłowska, J. Mol. Struct., 1999, 474, 81-89.
- 11 (a) S. Kim, H. Namgung and H. M. Lee, J. Kor. Chem. Soc., 1994, 38, 827-832; (b) P. Kuppusamy, B. L. Ramakrishna and P. T. Manoharan, Inorg. Chem., 1984, 23, 3886-3892; (c) H. Namgung, S.-B. Kim and I.-H. Suh, Acta Cryst. C, 1998, 54, 612-614; (d) C. Mahadevan. M. Seshasayee, P. Kuppusamy and P. T. Manoharan, J. Cryst. Spectrosc ., 1985, 15, 305-316; (e) C. J. Fritchie, Act. Cryst., 1966, 20, 892-898; (f) P. Kuppusamy, P. T. Manoharan, C. Mahadevan and M. Seshasayee, J. Cryst. Spectrosc., 1985, 15, 359-376; (g) K. Ueda, T. Sugimoto and T. Mochida, Acta Cryst. E, 2001, 57, o578-o580; (h) H. Endres, H. J. Keller, W. Moroni and D. Nothe, Acta Cryst. B, 1979, 35, 353-357; (i) J. Y. Niu, J. P. Wang and Z. Y. Zhou, Chin. J. Inorg. Chem., 2000, 647-652; (j) J. P. Wang, J. Y. Niu, D. B. Dang and Y. Bo, Chin. J. App. Chem., 2002, 144-148; (k) T. M. Bockman and J. K. Kochi, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1989, 111, 4669-4683; (I) L. F. Yang, Z. H. Peng, G. Z. Cheng and S. M. Peng, Polyhedron, 2003, 22, 3547-3553; (m) P. Storoniak, K. Krzyminski, P. Dokurno, A. Konitz and J. Blazejowski, Aust. J. Chem., 2000, 53, 627-633.
- 12 R. Centore, M. Causà, S. Fusco and A. Carella, *Cryst. Growth Des.*, 2013, **13**, 3255-3260.
- 13 N. Leblanc, N. Mercier, O. Toma, A. H. Kassiba, L. Zorina, P. Auban-Senzier and C. Pasquier, *Chem. Commun.*, 2013, **49**, 10272-10274.
- (a) J. P. Lang, H. Z. Zhu, X. Q. Xin and M. Q. Chen, *Chem. J. Chin. U.*, 1992, **13**, 18-21; (b) H. Zhao, Z.-R. Qu, Q. Ye, B. F. Abrahams, Y.-P. Wang, Z.-G. Liu, Z. Xue, R.-G. Xiong and X.-Z. You, *Chem. Mater.*, 2003, **15**, 4166-4168; (c) J.-J. Hou, C.-H. Guo and X.-M. Zhang, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2006, **359**, 3991-3995; (d) G. Noshtchenko, V. Kinzhybalo, T. Lis and B. Mykhalitchko, *Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem.*, 2007, **633**, 306-309.
- (a) U. Geiser, R. D. Willett, M. Lindbeck and K. Emerson, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1986, 108, 1173-1179; (b) T. E. Grigereit, B. L. Ramakrishna, H. Place, R. D. Willett, G. C. Pellacani, T. Manfredini, L. Menabue, A. Bonomartini-Corradi and L. P. Battaglia, Inorg. Chem., 1987, 26, 2235-2243; (c) K. Murray and R. D. Willett, Acta Cryst. C, 1991, 47, 2660-2662; (d) M. R. Bond, H. Place, Z. Wang, R. D. Willett, Y. Liu, T. E. Grigereit, J. E. Drumheller and G. F. Tuthill, Inorg. Chem., 1995, 34, 3134-3141; (e) S. Lorenzo, C. Horn, D. Craig, M. Scudder and I. Dance, Inorg. Chem., 2000, 39, 401-405; (f) S. Haddad, F. Awwadi and R. D. Willett, Cryst. Growth Des., 2003, 3, 501-505; (g) A. Kelley, S. Akkina, G. K. Devarapally, S. Nalla, D. Pasam, S. Madhabushi and M. R. Bond, Acta Cryst. C, 2011, 67, m22-m34.
- (a) I. D. Brown and D. Altermatt, Acta Cryst. B, 1985, 41, 244-247; (b) "Bond Valence Parameters", IUCr., 2013.
- (a) G. A. Bain and J. F. Berry, *J. Chem. Edu.*, 2008, **85**, 532; (b) C. J.
 O'Connor, *Progress in Inorganic Chemistry*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2007, pp. 203-283.
- 18 N. Armaroli, G. Accorsi, F. Cardinali and A. Listorti, in *Photochemistry and Photophysics of Coordination Compounds I*, eds. V. Balzani and S. Campagna, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, vol. 280, pp. 69-115.
- 19 A. J. Macfarlane and R. J. P. Williams, J. Chem. Soc. A., 1969, 1517-1520.
- 20 N. Leblanc, M. Allain, N. Mercier and L. Sanguinet, *Cryst. Growth Des.*, 2011, **11**, 2064-2069.
- 21 L. Farrugia, J. Appl. Cryst., 2012, 45, 849-854.
- 22 H. Putz and K. Brandenburg, Diamond Crystal and Molecular Structure Visualization, Kreuzherrenstr. 102, 53227 Bonn, Germany.