Inorganic Chemistry

Dinuclear Spin-Crossover Complexes Based on Tetradentate and Bridging Cyanocarbanion Ligands

Eric Milin,[†] Sabrina Belaïd,^{†,‡} Véronique Patinec,[†] Smail Triki,^{*,†} Guillaume Chastanet,[§] and Mathieu Marchivie[§]

[†]UMR CNRS 6521, Chimie, Electrochimie Moléculaires, Chimie Analytique, Université de Bretagne Occidentale, 6 Avenue V. Le Gorgeu, CS 93837, 29238 Brest Cedex 3, France

[‡]Laboratoire de Physico-Chimie des Matériaux et Catalyse, Université de Béjaia, Béjaia, Algeria

[§]CNRS, Université Bordeaux, ICMCB, 87 Av. Doc. A. Schweitzer, F-33608 Pessac, France

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Spin-crossover (SCO) Fe(II) dinuclear complexes of formula $[Fe_2(tmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2] \cdot 0.8(CH_3OH)$ (**1·MeOH**) and $[Fe_2(andmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2] \cdot 2CH_3OH$ (**2·MeOH**) (tmpa = tris(2-pyridylmethyl)amine, andmpa = bis(2-pyridylmethyl)aminomethyl)aniline, (tcpd)²⁻ = 2-dicyanomethylene-1,1,3,3-tetracyanopropanediide) have been synthesized and characterized by infrared spectroscopy, X-ray diffraction, and magnetic measurements. The crystal structure determinations of the two complexes (**1·MeOH** and **2·MeOH**) and the desolvated complex **1** (from **1·MeOH**) revealed a neutral centrosymmetrical dinuclear structure in which the (tcpd)²⁻ cyanocarbanion acts as a double μ_2 -bridging ligand between two $[FeL]^{2+}$ (L = tmpa (**1**), andmpa (**2**)) units involving two free coordination sites in the *cis* configuration. Examination of the shortest intermolecular contacts in **1·MeOH** and **1** reveals no significant hydrogen bonding between the dinuclear units, while in **2·MeOH** these units are held together by significant hydrogen bonds between one of the uncoordinated nitrile groups and the anilate function, giving rise to 1D



supramolecular structure. The three dinuclear complexes 1, 2·MeOH, and 2 exhibit SCO behaviors which have been evidenced by the thermal evolutions of the $\chi_m T$ product and by the average values of the six Fe–N distances for 1 and 2·MeOH, that reveal a gradual conversion with transition temperatures ($T_{1/2}$) at ca. 352 K (1), 196 K (2), and 180 K (2·MeOH). For the solvated 1· MeOH, the sharp SCO transition observed around 365 K was induced by the desolvatation process above 330 K during the magnetic measurements.

INTRODUCTION

Among the molecular switchable materials, the spin-crossover (SCO) complexes are by far the most studied during the past decade, because of their several potential applications such as in memory display devices and sensing technology.¹⁻³ These complexes can be switched reversibly from a high spin (HS) to a low spin (LS) state by external stimuli such as temperature, pressure, magnetic field, or light irradiation. Although the spin transition can occur in d^4-d^7 transition metal complexes, the most studied examples to date are those based on the Fe(II) (d⁶ configuration) metal ion, for which a paramagneticdiamagnetic transition from HS (S = 2) to LS (S = 0) is observed.^{3,4} The [FeN₆] SCO compounds can be roughly divided into two categories: the cationic complexes in which the six donating nitrogen atoms arise from one or several neutral ligands to generate the $[FeL_n]^{2+}$ complexes, and neutral or anionic complexes for which three or four nitrogen atoms arise from neutral ligands and the octahedral environment of the iron centers is completed by two or three nitrogen atoms arising from monodentate or bridging anionic ligands.³⁻⁵ This last category which can be formulated as $[FeL_nA_m]^{0/-}$ (L =

polydentate neutral ligand, A^- or A^{2-} = terminal or bridging Ndonating anion) presents a richer chemical diversity since the molecular structure of the complex can be designed with a planned dimension or with a desired nuclearity, with only the appropriate choice of the anionic ligand, owing to its chemical structure including its coordination properties.

In this context, we have reported in the past few years the first SCO series based on cyanocarbanion ligands together with abpt chelating neutral ligand (Scheme 1).⁶

In this series, the single charge on the anion induces a terminal coordination mode for the cyanocarbanion unit, resulting in neutral discrete SCO complexes. Afterward, we have shown, in a second report, that the use of the $(tcpd)^{2-}$ cyanocarbanion $((tcpd)^{2-} = 2$ -dicyanomethylene-1,1,3,3-tetra-cyanopropanediide anion) ligand bearing two negative charges induces bridging coordination modes to lead to an original thermo- and photoswitchable SCO chain.⁷ In these reports, we have shown that coordination of the cyanocarbanion in the

Received: June 28, 2016





trans positions is clearly imposed by the planar $[Fe(abpt)_2]^{2+}$ precursor. With the aim to better explore the potential impact of such anionic ligands on the structural features of their complexes, and then on the switching properties (transition temperatures, hysteresis width, abruptness of the transition, photoinduced effects, and so forth), we have extended this work to the use of other polydentate neutral ligands such as the tris(2-pyridylmethyl)amine (Scheme 1). In contrast to the abpt bidentate ligands, such flexible tetradentate molecules should allow free coordination sites in the *cis* positions which are more appropriate for the design of polynuclear complexes.⁸⁻¹¹ For the tmpa ligand (tmpa = tris(2-pyridylmethyl)amine), few SCO systems have been reported.⁸⁻¹⁰ The $[Fe(tmpa)]^{2+}$ entity possesses two free coordination sites in the cis configuration which has been used to allow the coordination of terminal ligands as observed in the polymorphic $[Fe(tmpa)(NCS)_2]$ system,⁸ or the coordination of potentially bridging ligands to design polynuclear SCO derivatives, such as the tetranuclear complex $[Fe(tmpa)(N(CN))_2]_4$ or the diminoquinonoidbridged dinuclear series $[Fe_2(tmpa)_2(\mu_2-^{X}L)]^{2+}(^{X}L^{2-} = double$ deprotonated form of 3,6-disubstituted-2,5-dianilino-1,4-benzoquinone; X = H, Br, Cl, F) in which the authors showed that the slight chemical modifications of the anionic bridging ligand $(^{X}L^{2-})$ affect the transition temperature $(T_{1/2})$ strongly.⁹

We report herein the use of the tetradentate chelating neutral ligands in association with a cyanocarbanion bridging coligand

to form SCO dinuclear complexes. We describe the syntheses and structural characterizations, including thermal variation of the crystallographic data and magnetic properties of the solvated and desolvated Fe(II) dinuclear neutral complexes $[Fe_2(tmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2] \cdot nCH_3OH$ (1-MeOH and 1) and $[Fe_2(andmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2]$ ·2CH₃OH (**2·MeOH** and **2**) (andmpa = (bis(2-pyridylmethyl)aminomethyl)aniline) involving the (tcpd)^{2–} anionic bridges. It should be pointed out that several SCO systems exhibiting dinuclear structure have been reported. Most of them involve neutral bridging ligands such as 2,2'bpyrimidine,¹¹ 4,7-phenanthroline-5,6-diamine,¹² or substituted triazole, pyrazole, and thiadiazole ligands.¹³ To the best of our knowledge, only one SCO dinuclear complex involving bridging anions has been reported.¹⁴ Thus, the present work shows that the use of cyanocarbanion ligands not only leads to the design of polynuclear discrete complexes based on anionic bridges, but also allows the development of new neutral systems without any counterions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Synthesis. The andmpa ligand was synthesized according to a two-step method described by S. Lippard,¹⁵ which was slightly modified. The starting reactant 2-nitrobenzyl bromide was obtained as previously published, by reacting the 2-nitrobenzyl alcohol and PBr₃ in Et₂O as the solvent in the place of CCl₄ (see Figure S1).¹⁶ Reaction of this bromo-derivative with dipicolylamine (dpa) in S_N2 conditions gave rise to the formation of the 2-[bis(2-pyridylmethyl)aminomethyl]nitrobenzene intermediate in 67% yield after purification (see Figures S2–S4). Reduction of the nitro-group into a primary amine function was carried out using hydrazine hydrate in ethanol with activated charcoal¹⁷ instead of hydrogenation in Pd/C catalytic conditions¹⁵ and yielded the andmpa ligand (see Figures S5–S7) with 60% overall yield (Scheme 2).

Both Fe(II) complexes (1·MeOH and 2·MeOH) were synthesized, as single crystals, using a diffusion technique in a fine glass tube (3.0 mm diameter) by carefully layering 2 mL of methanolic solution of K₂tcpd onto a methanolic solution containing Fe(BF₄)₂·6H₂O and the tetradentate neutral ligand in 1:1 ratio (tmpa for 1·MeOH; andmpa for 2·MeOH). In each case, single crystals suitable for X-ray analysis were formed after 3 days. The single crystals of the unsolvated phase 1 [Fe₂(tmpa)₂(μ_2 -tcpd)₂] can be obtained either by heating the sample at 70 °C for 3 h or with time at room temperature since they easily lose their solvent molecules. This "natural"





^a(i) 1.1 equiv PBr₃, Et₂O, 0 °C, 2 h; (ii) K₂CO₃, CH₃CN, reflux, 5 days (67%); (iii) NH₂NH₂-H₂O, EtOH, activated charcoal, 48 h (92%).

	1·MeOH	1	1	2·MeOH	2·MeOH
T/K	296(2)	296(2)	380(2)	100(2)	296(2)
empirical formula ^a	(C ₅₆ H ₃₆ Fe ₂ N ₂₀), 0.8(CH ₃ OH)	$C_{56}H_{36}Fe_2N_{20}$		$(C_{58}H_{40}Fe_2N_{20}), 2$	2(CH ₃ OH)
fw/g mol ⁻¹	1127.49	1100.75		1192.88	
wavelength/Å	0.71073 Å	0.71073 Å		0.71073 Å	
cryst syst	monoclinic	monoclinic		monoclinic	
space group	$P2_{1}/n$	$P2_1/n$		$P2_1/n$	
a/Å	11.7269(5)	11.468(4)	10.894(4)	9.6690(10)	9.6831(12)
b/Å	16.6966(6)	17.0057(9)	18.7523(9)	24.658(2)	25.065(3)
c/Å	13.9317(6)	13.7743(6)	13.7750(6)	11.5670(10)	12.0485(16)
β /deg	104.672(4)	105.098(9)	106.492(9)	102.631(6)	103.711(14)
$V/Å^3$	2638.87(19)	2593.6(10)	2698.3(11)	2691.0(4)	2840.9(7)
Ζ	2	2	2	2	2
$D_{\rm calc}/{\rm g}~{\rm cm}^{-3}$	1.419	1.409	1.355	1.472	1.395
CCDC no.	1413422	1435809	1435810	1413424	1413423

^aThe asymmetric unit contains 0.5 of the chemical formula.

Table 2. Hydrogen Bonds in 1•MeOH and 2•MeOH at 296 K

compd	D-H…A	d(D-A)/Å	$d(D-H\cdots A)/Å$	D-H-A/deg
1·MeOH	(MeOH)O1–H…N10 ^{(a)a} (tcpd)	2.849(8)	2.079(3)	156.4(8)
2·MeOH	(MeOH)O1–H…N9 ^(b) (tcpd)	2.843(7)	2.045(5)	164.7(4)
2·MeOH	(an.)N4–H4b…N8 ^(b) (tcpd)	3.183(6)	2.215(5)	175.1(3)

^{*a*}Equivalent positions: (a) $\frac{3}{2} - x$, $y - \frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{3}{2} - z$; (b) 1 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z. (tcpd) indicates the involved atom belongs to the tcpd anion; (an.) indicates the involved atom belongs to the anilate moiety. (MeOH) indicates the involved atom belongs to the methanol molecule.

Table 3. Shortest Intermolecular Contacts (Å) in 1·MeOH, 1, and 2·MeOH at 296 K

	$\pi-\pi$ -like Intermolecular Contae	cts ^b	
π system ^b	c−c ^c /Å	shift ^d /Å	angle ^e /deg
C20C21C22C23C27N8 ^(a) (1)	3.605(2)	1.088(4)	0.00(2)
C20C21C22C23C27N8 ^(a) (1·MeOH)	3.658(2)	1.303(4)	0.0(3)
C20C21C22C23C29N10 ^(b) (2·MeOH)	3.672(4)	0.488(8)	0.00(3)
	van der Waals Interactions ^f	e 	
	1·MeOH	1	2·MeOH
(tcpd)N8…C20 ^(a) (tcpd) ^a	3.327(5)	3.359(4)	
(tcpd)N8…C21 ^(a) (tcpd)	3.328(4)	3.278(4)	
(tcpd)N8…C25 ^(a) (tcpd)	3.362(4)	3.294(4)	
(tcpd)N10C27 ^(b) (tcpd)			3.388(8)
(tcpd)C25C29 ^(b) (tcpd)			3.590(7)
(an)N4…N8 ^(b) (tcpd)			3.183(6)
(MeOH)O1…N10 ^(c) (tcpd)	2.849(8)		
(MeOH)O1…C6 ^(b) (am.Me)	3.273(9)		
(MeOH)C30····C20(tcpd)	3.388(10)		
(MeOH)C30····C22(tcpd)	3.5366(11)		
(MeOH)C30…C11 ^(d) (py)	3.558(12)		
(MeOH)O1····C4 ^(b) (py)	3.169(9)		
(MeOH)O1…C4 ^(e) (py)			3.265(8)
(MeOH)O1…C10 ^(f) (py)			3.258(7)
(MeOH)C30…N9 ^(b) (tcpd)			3.346(9)
(MeOH)C30…C24 ^(g) (tcpd)			3.557(9)
(MeOH)C30…C25 ^(g) (tcpd)			3.566(9)
(MeOH)C30…C21 ^(g) (tcpd)			3.580(9)
(MeOH)C30…C1 ^(g) (py)			3.581(9)
(MeOH)O1…N9 ^(b) (tcpd)			2.843(7)

^{*a*}Codes of equivalent positions: (a) 2 - x, 1 - y, 2 - z; (b) 1 - x, 1 - y, 1 - z; (c) $\frac{3}{2} - x$, $y - \frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{3}{2} - z$; (d) $\frac{1}{2} - x$, $y - \frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{3}{2} - z$; (e) x, y, 1 + z; (f) $\frac{1}{2} + x$, $\frac{3}{2} - y$, $\frac{1}{2} + z$; (e) -x, 1 - y, 1 - z. (a). ^{*b*}The intermolecular interaction involves the defined π system and its (a) and (b) symmetry equivalent. ^{*c*}Centroid to centroid distance. ^{*d*}Shift distance. ^{*e*}Angle between planes. ^{*f*}(tcpd) = the involved atom belongs to the tcpd anion; (an.) the involved atom belongs to the anilate moiety; (am.Me) the involved atom belongs to the amino-methyl moiety; (py) the involved atom belongs to the pyridine moiety; (MeOH) the involved atom belongs to the methanol molecule.

С

Table 4.	Selected	Bond	Lengths	(A)	and	Distortion	Parameters	of	the (Coord	lination	Spl	here	in 1	l and	2
----------	----------	------	---------	-----	-----	------------	------------	----	-------	-------	----------	-----	------	------	-------	---

		1		2·MeOH					
	1•MeOH 296 K	296 K	380 K	100 K	296 K				
Fe1-Fe1 ^{(a)a}	7.0752(7)	7.1242(8)	7.2688(15)	7.1732(11)	7.3377(16)				
Fe1–N1	1.985(2)	1.991(2)	2.191(4)	2.025(3)	2.232(4)				
Fe1-N2	1.973(2)	1.973(2)	2.131(6)	1.973(3)	2.145(4)				
Fe1-N3	1.966(2)	1.971(2)	2.149(5)	1.972(3)	2.136(4)				
Fe1-N4	1.975(2)	1.973(2)	2.121(5)	2.068(3)	2.200(4)				
Fe1–N5	1.949(3)	1.951(3)	2.118(6)	1.956(3)	2.149(4)				
Fe1–N6 ^(a)	1.939(3)	1.939(2)	2.055(5)	1.955(3)	2.100(4)				
$\langle Fe-N \rangle$	1.965(3)	1.966(3)	2.128(5)	1.992(3)	2.160(4)				
Distortion									
$\Sigma(\text{Fe1})^{b}$ (deg)	51(2)	56(2)	94(3)	48(2)	75(2)				
$\Theta(\text{Fe1})^c \text{ (deg)}$	133(3)	143(3)	248(5)	141(4)	214(4)				

^{*a*}Equals 1 - x, -y, -z + 2 (**1·MeOH** or **1**) or -x, -y + 1, -z + 1 (**2·MeOH**). ^{*b*} Σ is the sum of the deviation from 90° of the 12 *cis* angles of the FeN₆ octahedron.^{23,24} ^{*c*} Θ is the sum of the deviation from 60° of the 24 trigonal angles of the projection of the FeN₆ octahedron onto its trigonal faces.^{24,25}

desolvatation process is confirmed by single crystal X-ray diffraction at room temperature at different times and by elemental analysis since the freshly prepared single crystals of 1. MeOH reveal only a fraction of ca. 0.3CH₃OH (see Experimental Section).¹⁸ In contrast, the two MeOH molecules in compound 2. MeOH are clearly maintained in the crystal packing, even after their long exposition at room temperature, as revealed by the crystal structure at 296 K. Crystals of 2. MeOH were heated up to try to solve the crystal structure of desolvated compound 2. At 330 K the crystal structure reveals no significant difference with the room temperature structure and confirms the presence of the two solvent molecules. Above 350 K the diffraction pattern of 2 changes drastically, highlighting the crystal damage that may be caused by the loss of the solvent molecules. Nevertheless, attempts to solve the crystal structure of 2 failed. This suggests that the solvent molecule should be involved with more and/or shorter intermolecular contacts in the crystal packing of 2·MeOH (see below). TGA measurements performed on a set of single crystals of 2·MeOH show a loss of a fraction of ca. 0.27MeOH (0.7%) at 100 °C (Figure S8). Above this temperature, additional mass loss of ca. 2.0% has been observed, but according to the infrared spectrum of the sample maintained at 100 °C for 6 h (see Experimental Section), this mass loss cannot be attributed to only MeOH molecules (see below). This implies that 2. MeOH may lose the major part of the MeOH molecules (ca. 1.73 molecules) during the preliminary vacuum procedure before the TGA experiment. Compounds 1. MeOH, 1, 2. MeOH, and 2 display similar infrared patterns (see Figures S9 and S10). The infrared spectrum of 2·MeOH displays a broad absorption band around 3468 cm⁻¹. This band which was not observed in the infrared spectra of the warmed samples (see Figure S10) can be attributed to OH stretching of the MeOH molecules in 2. MeOH. As expected, the four complexes (1·MeOH, 1, 2·MeOH, and 2) show absorption bands assigned to the $\nu_{\rm CN}$ stretching vibrations of the cyanocarbanion (2192 and 2165 cm⁻¹ for 1·MeOH; 2192 and 2166 cm⁻¹ for 1; 2186 and 2161 cm⁻¹ for 2·MeOH; 2187 and 2165 cm^{-1} for 2). These absorption bands, distinct from the stretching vibration modes observed for the tetrabutylammonium salt ($[(C_4H_9)_4N]_2(tcpd)$) containing the uncoordinated cyanocarbanion units (2094-2174 cm⁻¹),⁷ can be assigned to the presence of both bridging $(2192-2186 \text{ cm}^{-1})$

and terminal $(2161-2166 \text{ cm}^{-1})$ nitrile groups, in agreement with the single crystal structure determination (see below).

Description of the Crystal Structures. Pertinent crystal data and selected bond distances and bond angles for compounds 1·MeOH, 1, and 2·MeOH are summarized in Tables 1–4 and Table S2. The molecular structures are depicted in Figures 1 and 2. The three compounds crystallize in the monoclinic $P2_1/n$ space group for all the studied temperatures (Table 1 and Table S1).



Figure 1. Molecular structure of the dinuclear iron(II) complex of 1: (a) = 1 - x, -y, -z + 2.

The asymmetric unit of **1·MeOH** is built from one Fe(II) ion, one tmpa neutral ligand, one $(tcpd)^{2-}$ anion, and a methanol solvent molecule with a partial occupation factor of 0.4 at room temperature, all located on general positions. The molecular structure of **1·MeOH** consists of centrosymmetric neutral dinuclear entities of the formula $[Fe_2(tmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2]$ and 0.8 methanol molecule (Figure 1).

Except for the absence of MeOH solvent molecules, the asymmetric unit of 1 is similar to that observed for compound **1·MeOH**, and the two complexes are isostructural with only slight structural differences. In both complexes, the tmpa molecule acts as a tetradentate ligand leading to the $[Fe(tmpa)]^{2+}$ entities which are connected by two $(tcpd)^{2-}$ anions acting as μ_2 -bridging ligands through two nitrile groups of the same $C(CN)_2$ wing. Each iron(II) metal ion presents a distorted FeN₆ octahedral environment assumed by four nitrogen atoms (N1, N2, N3, N4) arising from the tmpa



Figure 2. Molecular structure of the dinuclear iron(II) complex of 2: (a) = -x, -y + 1, -z + 1.

ligand and by two nitrogen atoms of two equivalent $(tcpd)^{2-}$ anions (N5 and N6^(a)).

For compound **2·MeOH**, the crystallographic parameters are different from those observed for compounds **1·MeOH** and **1** (see Table 1). Despite this difference, the structure of **2·MeOH** is built from a similar asymmetrical unit, leading to a dinuclear molecular structure of the formula $[Fe_2(andmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2]$ ·2CH₃OH, similar to that described for **1·MeOH** (Figure 2). Examination of the shortest intermolecular contacts in **1**·

MeOH and 1 reveals no significant hydrogen bonding between the dinuclear units, excepting the hydrogen bonding observed between the dinuclear units and the oxygen of the methanol molecule (Table 2 and Figure 3a) in 1-MeOH. However, as depicted in Figure 3a, the packing cohesion in 1-MeOH and 1 is ensured by the π - π -like contacts between the π -delocalized parts of the tcpd anions of the adjacent dinuclear units (see Table 3, top). In addition to the hydrogen bond mentioned above, the MeOH molecule is also stabilized by several van der Waals interactions involving the carbon atoms of the tcpd anion and the tmpa ligand (Table 3, bottom). Despite the loss of the solvent molecule, the packing cohesion in 1 is very similar to that in 1-MeOH but with a slightly more pronounced $\pi - \pi$ contact between the tcpd anions (Table 3a). In contrast, a different situation is observed in complex 2·MeOH since the dinuclear units are held together by significant hydrogen bonding between the anilate -NH2 group (N4) of the andpma ligand and one of the uncoordinated nitrile groups (N4...N8, 3.183(6) Å), giving rise to 1D supramolecular structure as highlighted in Figure 3b. As in 1, the adjacent $(tcpd)^{2-}$ anions are involved in $\pi - \pi$ -like contacts between π -delocalized parts of tcpd anions, and hydrogen bonding (O1...N9, 2.843(7) Å) occurs between the methanol molecule (O1) and one of the noncoordinated nitrile groups (N9) of the cyanocarbanion (see Tables 2 and 3). According to Table 2, this hydrogen bond is slightly stronger in 2·MeOH than in 1·MeOH as the O-H···N angle is more linear in 2. MeOH. It is worth noting that the



Figure 3. Intermolecular contacts in compounds 1·MeOH (a) and 2·MeOH (b).

MeOH molecule is also involved in van der Waals interactions that are more numerous in **2·MeOH** than in **1·MeOH**. Both observations are consistent with the fact that the MeOH molecules remain in the network of **2·MeOH** at room temperature whereas they slowly go out of the crystal of **1· MeOH** as revealed by variable temperature X-ray data collections and also by elemental analysis.

Magnetic Properties. The thermal dependence of the product of the molar magnetic susceptibility times the temperature ($\chi_m T$) for this dinuclear family has been studied on single crystal samples in the temperature range 10–395 K. Concerning compound **1·MeOH**, it has been inserted at 150 K in the SQUID magnetometer to prevent easy solvent loss. The temperature then has been increased up to 395 K (Figure 4).



Figure 4. Thermal variation of the $\chi_m T$ product of **1·MeOH** (\bullet), **1** (\bigcirc), **2·MeOH** (\blacksquare), and **2** (\square), measured at 1 K/mn in settle mode for **2·MeOH** and **2** and in sweep mode in **1·MeOH** and **1**.

From 150 to 275 K, the $\chi_m T$ value remains close to zero (0.12 $cm^3 K mol^{-1}$), in agreement with a low spin state of the Fe(II) ions. From 275 to 330 K, a slight increase of $\chi_m T$ is observed followed by a sharp increase above 330 K. At 395 K, the $\chi_m T$ value of 5.95 cm³ K mol⁻¹ is reached, which is slightly lower than the expected value for two Fe(II) HS species (between 6 and 7 cm³ \bar{K} mol⁻¹ depending on the g value). This behavior is relevant with a desolvation occurring above 330 K, inducing a spin-crossover. The curve's shape indicates that, even at 395 K, this spin-crossover is not complete and that a small amount of Fe(II) should stay in the LS state. Upon cooling, a new curve is described that presents a gradual decrease of the $\chi_m T$ value down to 0.37 cm³ K mol⁻¹ at 150 K, without any clear steps. This curve appears stable upon further temperature cycling (Figure S11). Regarding the ability of 1. MeOH to lose its solvent, this second SCO complex, characterized by a $T_{1/2}$ of 352 K, could be assigned to compound 1.

Compound **2·MeOH** shows a room temperature $\chi_m T$ value of 6.29 cm³ K mol⁻¹, in agreement with the presence of two isolated HS Fe(II) metal ions with a g value of 2.05. The $\chi_m T$ product for **2·MeOH** smoothly decreases upon cooling down to 0.21 cm³ K mol⁻¹ at 50 K (Figure 4). This HS \leftrightarrow LS SCO conversion is characterized by a $T_{1/2}$ value of 180 K and is reversible upon warming and cooling (Figure S12). After warming at 350 K for half an hour, the thermal behavior of the sample was recorded. A slightly more abrupt curve is observed (Figure 4) that could be related to the spin-crossover of the desolvated compound **2**, with a $T_{1/2}$ value of 196 K. This spincrossover curve is reversible upon cooling and warming (Figure S13).

The solvent dependent magnetic behavior is commonly reported in the SCO literature. In the binuclear case, this is less common. Indeed, apart from the report of new binuclear units, few examples are related to the influence of counteranion and solvent.^{13a,b,14,19} The amount and nature of solvent could strongly affect the magnetic properties, affecting the presence of multistep spin-crossover behavior. Among the more than 30 binuclear systems reported, both one- and two-step spin-crossover behaviors are described.²⁰ To date, there has been no clear understanding of the occurrence or not of steps along the transition. The main theoretical approach provided evidence that a stepped transition could follow from elastic strains within the molecules and/or the network.²¹ However, from the structural point of view this is not always obvious, and this point deserves more attention.²²

Magneto-Structural Relationships. On the basis of the conclusions derived from the magnetic data, the crystal structures of both compounds have been determined at different temperatures (380 K for 1 and 100 K for 2·MeOH), to know more about the two spin states of each dinuclear complex. To know how the crystal structure and the two iron(II) sites are affected by the incomplete SCO transition observed for 1, the temperature dependence of its crystal structure was performed in the temperature range 296–380 K. The corresponding structural parameters are depicted in Table 4 and in Figure 5. These crystallographic data, such as unit cell



Figure 5. Evolution of the unit cell volume (\blacktriangle) and the mean Fe–N distance (\blacksquare) for compound 1 from room temperature to 380 K.

volume, the average Fe–N distances ($\langle \text{Fe}-N \rangle_{\text{LS}} \sim 2.0$ Å; $\langle \text{Fe}-N \rangle_{\text{HS}} \sim 2.2$ Å), and the trigonal distortion parameters Σ and Θ (see Table 4),^{23–25} are known to be highly sensitive to the spin state of the Fe(II) centers, and will thus be used to assign the spin state of Fe(II) sites in each complex.

The iron centers present an octahedral FeN₆ geometry for all compounds. In good agreement with the magnetic data, the mean Fe–N distances observed at 296 K for the solvated phase (**1·MeOH**) and for the unsolvated phase (**1**) (1.965(3) and 1.966(3) Å, respectively) are in the range of those expected for the Fe(II) ion in the LS state.^{6,7} The octahedral geometry appears slightly more distorted for compound **1** than for **1· MeOH** since the trigonal distortion parameter calculated for **1** ($\Theta = 143(3)^{\circ}$) is higher than the corresponding value calculated for **1·MeOH** ($\Theta = 133(3)^{\circ}$). At 380 K, **1·MeOH**

irreversibly loses its methanol molecule, becoming 1. The coordination sphere volume of the metal increases as the mean Fe-N distance rises to 2.128(5) Å, and conjointly the octahedral geometry becomes more distorted (see Table 4 and Table S2), suggesting an LS \rightarrow HS transition. Nevertheless, the mean Fe-N distance (2.128(5) Å) appears significantly smaller than that observed for the HS Fe(II) in compound 2. MeOH (2.160(4) Å) at 296 K) and smaller than those generally observed for other Fe(II) compounds. This can be due to an incomplete spin transition at 380 K for 1, corresponding to a small amount of the remaining LS Fe(II) in the crystal structure. Even if this observation agrees perfectly, the magnetic observations and the crystal data at 380 K did not reveal clearly if, at this temperature, the plateau corresponding to the HS sate is reached. Thus, in order to investigate further this incomplete spin transition, the crystal structure of compound 1 has been solved every 5 K between 296 and 380 K (see Table 1 for 296 and 380 K; and CCDC numbers 1442955-1442970 for the temperature range 300-375 K). These additional structural investigations did not reveal any loss of symmetry over the whole temperature range, suggesting that both iron centers of the dinuclear complex are similarly affected by the spin transition, which is consistent with the observed one-step transition from [LS–LS] to [HS–HS] states. According to Figure 5, that shows the evolution of the unit cell volume and the mean Fe-N bond length between 296 and 380 K, the incomplete spin transition reaches a plateau at 370 K, revealing that about 20% of the complex is trapped in the LS state.

For compound **2·MeOH**, the mean Fe–N distance observed at room temperature ($d_{\text{Fe-N}} = 2.160(4)$ Å) is characteristic of the presence of the iron(II) ion in the HS state. At 100 K, the octahedral geometry of **2·MeOH** becomes more regular, and the mean Fe–N distance decreases drastically to reach 1.992(3) Å. In agreement with the magnetic data, this feature is the signature of the change of the spin state from HS to LS at low temperature.

CONCLUSIONS

Four dinuclear complexes of formula $[Fe_2(L)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2]$. nCH₃OH are obtained from reaction of two tetradentate neutral ligands (L = tmpa (**1·MeOH** and **1**) and L = andmpa(2•MeOH and 2)) and the bridging $(tcpd)^{2-}$ anionic ligand. The complexes display similar molecular structures described as neutral dinuclear units involving similar double μ_2 -tcpd bridges. However, as shown by their crystallographic parameters and confirmed by the intermolecular contacts, the tmpa (1·MeOH and 1) and the andmpa (2·MeOH) complexes display different crystal packing. One of the principle objectives of this study concerns the investigation of the subtle chemical substitution of the tetradentate ligand on the SCO behavior. Complex 1. MeOH based on the tmpa ligand shows the LS state even at room temperature but undergoes an incomplete spin-crossover around 365 K which was probably induced by the desolvation of the sample above 330 K. The crystallographic structural studies confirm clearly the total desolvatation of 1. MeOH at 380 K, leading to compound 1 without drastic structural changes. This desolvated complex (1) reveals a slightly more gradual SCO behavior at ca. 352 K. Complex 2·MeOH involving a slightly different tetradentate ligand (andmpa) shows SCO behavior with a transition temperature of ca. 180 K; after desolvatation, a more abrupt SCO occurs at a slightly higher temperature ($T_{1/2}$ = 196 K). The two desolvatation

process (1·MeOH \rightarrow 1 and 2·MeOH \rightarrow 2) show only slight modification of the SCO behaviors while the strong changes of the transition temperatures have been observed between compounds 1 and 2 ($\Delta(T_{1/2}) > 150$ K). Finally, it is worth noting that this drastic evolution of the transition temeprature cannot be attributed exclusively to the ligand substitution performed on the tmpa initial ligand but also to the solid-state packing which affects significantly the elastic interactions and the SCO behavior as exemplified by several polymorphic systems.^{8,26}

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

General Remarks. Tetracyanoethylene, urea, potassium tertbutoxide (C_4H_9OK) , malononitrile $(CH_2(CN)_2)$, 2-nitrobenzyl alcohol, dipicolyl amine, PBr₃, K₂CO₃, and Fe(BF₄)₂·6H₂O were purchased from commercial sources and used without further purification. Solvents were used and purified by standard procedures. The organic ligands have been prepared under nitrogen. The potassium salt $K_2(tcpd)$ and tmpa ligand (tris(2-pyridylmethyl)amine) were prepared according to published procedures (see Figures S14-\$16).^{27,28} Elemental analyses were performed by the "Service Central d'Analyses du CNRS", Gif-sur-Yvette, France. Infrared spectra were recorded in the range 4000-200 cm⁻¹ on an FT-IR Bruker ATR Vertex 70 spectrometer. Diffraction analyses were performed using an Oxford Diffraction Xcalibur κ-CCD diffractometer. NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker DRX 300 MHz or Bruker Avance 400 and 500 MHz. TGA measurements were performed on Symmetric TGA Setaram TAG2400. The sample was preliminarily put under vacuum and then heated at 3 °C min⁻¹ under an argon atmosphere. Magnetic measurements were performed with a Quantum Design MPMS-XL-5 SQUID magnetometer in the 10-400 K temperature range with an applied magnetic field of 2 T on crushed single crystals of compounds 1·MeOH and 2·MeOH. The susceptibility data were corrected for the sample holders previously measured under the same conditions, and for the diamagnetic contributions as deduced by using Pascal's constant tables ($\chi_{dia} = -547.4 \times 10^{-6}$ and -571.6×10^{-6} emu mol⁻¹ for **1·MeOH** and **2·MeOH**, respectively).²⁹

Crystallographic Data Collection and Refinement. Crystallographic studies of the two derivatives (1 and 2) were performed at 296, 100, and 380 K, using an Oxford Diffraction Xcalibur K-CCD diffractometer equipped with a graphite monochromated Mo K α radiation (λ = 0.71073 Å) or a Bruker APEX-II CCD diffractometer (λ = 0.71073 Å). At 380 K a crystal of 1 was mounted on a glass fiber and glued with high temperature resisting structural glue (DP700 epoxy structural adhesive from 3M Scotch-Weld) and then collected on a Bruker APEX-II CCD diffractometer ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å). The full-sphere data collections were performed using $1.0^{\circ} \omega$ -scans with an exposure time of 200 and 35 s per frame for 1.MeOH and 1, and 60 and 80 s per frame for 2·MeOH at 296 and 100 K, respectively. Data collection and data reduction were done with the CRYSALIS-CCD and CRYSALIS-RED programs or on the Bruker APEX-II program suite on the full set of data.³⁰ The crystal structures were solved by direct methods and successive Fourier difference syntheses, and were refined on F^2 by weighted anisotropic full-matrix least-squares methods.³¹ All non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically, while the hydrogen atoms were calculated and therefore included as isotropic fixed contributors to F_c . All other calculations were performed with standard procedures (WINGX, OLEX2).^{32,33} Pertinent crystal data and structure refinement and collection parameters are listed in Table S1.

Synthesis of Bis(2-pyridyImethyl)aminomethyl)aniline (andmpa). 2-Nitrobenzyl bromide (1.08 g, 5.0 mmol) was added to a solution of bis(2-pyridyImethyl)amine (dmpa) (1.00 g, 5.0 mmol) in distilled CH₃CN (20 mL) with K_2CO_3 (1.38 g, 10.0 mmol). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux with stirring for 5 days. After the solution was cooled and filtered, the solvent was removed by evaporation. Purification of the crude product by column chromatography on neutral alumina (CH₂Cl₂/MeOH from 100/0 to 99/1) produced a brown oil of bis(2-pyridyImethyl)aminomethyl)-

nitrobenzene (1.12 g, 67%). IR data (ν/cm^{-1}): 3060(w), 3008(w), 1588(m), 1569(m), 1523(s), 1432(m), 1358(m), 764(m), 731(m). ¹H NMR δ (300 MHz, CDCl₃): 3.78 (4H, s, CH₂), 4.07 (2H, s, CH₂), 7.12 (2H, dd), 7.33 (1H, t), 7.40 (2H, d), 7.48 (1H, t), 7.63 (2H, t), 7.70 (1H, d), 7.75 (1H, d), 8.49 (d, 2H). ¹³C NMR δ (75 MHz, CDCl₃): 55.7, 60.3 (2C) (CH₂); 121.9 (2C), 123.1 (2C), 124.2, 127.8, 131.2, 132.2 (C_{quat}); 134.2 (2C), 148.8 (2C), 149.8 (C_{quat}), 158.5 (C_{quat}) $(C_{aromatic})$. Oxygen-free hydrazine hydrate (15 mL, excess) (Caution! Harmful and unstable, should be used carefully!) was added to a solution of bis(2-pyridylmethyl)aminomethyl)nitrobenzene (1.00 g, 3.0 mmol) in absolute ethanol (50 mL) with activated carbon (1.0 g). The reaction mixture was heated to reflux with stirring under nitrogen atmosphere for 48 h. After cooling, the solution was filtered through Celite, and the filtrate was evaporated under reduced pressure. The residue was dissolved in CHCl₃ (30 mL) and dried with MgSO₄. After filtration, the solvent was removed to yield a brown solid of bis(2pyridylmethyl)aminomethyl)aniline (andmpa) (840 mg, 92%). IR data (ν/cm^{-1}) : 3401(m), 3312(m), 3201(m), 1633(m), 1589(s), 1492(m), 1432(m), 752(vs). ¹H NMR δ (300 MHz, CDCl₃): 3.66 (2H, s, CH₂), 3.79 (2H, s, CH₂), 6.61–6.64 (2H, m), 7.02–7.05 (2H, m), 7.11–7.15 (m, 2H), 7.36 (d, 2H), 7.62 (t, 2H), 8.53 (d, 2H). $^{13}\mathrm{C}$ NMR δ (75 MHz, CDCl₃): 57.6, 59.9 (2C) (CH₂), 115.2, 116.9, 121.8 (2C), 122.0 (C_{quat}) , 123.2 (2C), 128.2, 130.9, 136.1 (2C), 146.8 (C_{quat}) , 148.8 (2C), 158.9 (C_{quat}) $(C_{aromatic})$.

Complex Syntheses. For $[Fe_2(tmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2] \cdot nCH_3OH$ (1. MeOH), $Fe(BF_4)_2 \cdot 6H_2O$ (6.7 mg, 0.02 mmol) was added to a solution of tmpa (0.02 mmol, 5.8 mg) in methanol (2 mL). The resulting yellow solution was placed in a glass capillary (diameter 0.3 mm). Then a solution of K₂tcpd (5.6 mg, 0.02 mmol) in methanol (2 mL) was carefully added in the capillary. Red crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained after 3 days (yield: 5.0 mg, 44.5%). Anal. Calcd (%) for $[C_{56}H_{36}Fe_2N_{20}](CH_3OH)_n$ for n = 0.3: C, 60.9; H, 3.4; N, 25.2. Found (%): C, 61.3; H, 3.4; N, 25.4. IR data (ν/cm^{-1}) for the freshly filtered sample: 3417(br), 3079(w), 2192(s), 2165(s), 1606(m), 1433(s), 1399(s), 1287(w), 1243(m), 1157(w), 1034(w), 991(m), 759(s), 735(m), 644(w), 503(w), 466(m), 443(m). The unsolvated phase of 1·MeOH $[Fe_2(tmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2]$ (1) has been prepared easily by heating the sample at 70 °C for 3 h. Anal. Calcd (%) for [C₅₆H₃₆Fe₂N₂₀]: C, 61.1; H, 3.3; N, 25.5. Found (%): C, 61.5; H, 3.3; N, 25.8.¹⁸ IR data (ν/cm^{-1}) : 3073(w), 2925(w), 2192(s), 2166(s), 1606(m), 1481(m), 1433(s), 1400(s), 1304(w), 1288(w), 1244(m), 1156(w), 1097(s), 1055(w), 1025(w), 991(m), 761(s), 735(m), 686(w), 644(w), 541(w), 502(w), 467(m), 442(m), 406(m). For $[Fe_2(andmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2] \cdot 2CH_3OH$ (2·MeOH), $Fe(BF_4)_2 \cdot 6H_2O$ (6.7 mg, 0.02 mmol) was added to a solution of andmpa (0.02 mmol, 6.1 mg) in methanol (2 mL). The resulting yellow solution became green after standing overnight, and then was placed in a glass capillary (diameter 0.3 mm). A solution of K2tcpd (5.6 mg, 0.02 mmol) in methanol (2 mL) was carefully added in the capillary. Green crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained after 3 days (yield: 4.2 mg, 35.5%). Anal. Calcd (%) for C₆₀H₄₈Fe₂N₂₀O₂: C, 60.4; H, 4.1; N, 23.5. Found (%): C, 59.9; H, 4.2; N, 23.2. IR data (ν/cm^{-1}): 3468(m), 3268(w), 3213(w), 3134(w), 2922(w), 2854(w), 2186(s), 2161(s), 1442(s), 1390(s), 1294(w), 1241(w), 1035(s), 1020(s), 867(m), 762(s), 736(m), 688(m), 642(w), 619(w), 572(w), 539(m), 509(s), 488(w), 476(w), 424(w). The unsolvated phase of 2·MeOH $[Fe_2(andmpa)_2(\mu_2-tcpd)_2]$ (2) has been prepared by heating the sample at 100 °C for 6 h. Anal. Calcd (%) for [C₅₈H₄₀Fe₂N₂₀]: C, 61.7; H, 3.5; N, 24.8. Found (%): C, 62.1; H, 3.7; N, 24.3. IR data ($\nu/$ cm⁻¹): 3221(w), 3129(w), 2922(w), 2857(w), 2187(s), 2165(s), 1606(m), 1436(s), 1387(s), 1295(w), 1151(w), 1081(m), 1020(m), 867(m), 759(s), 737(m), 688(w), 643(w), 539(m), 508(m), 488(w), 419(w).

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/acs.inorg-chem.6b01542.

Additional characterization data (PDF)

X-ray crystallographic data, CCDC numbers 1413422 (1• MeOH at 296 K), 1413423–1413424 (2•MeOH at 296 and 100 K, respectively), 1435809–1435810 (1 at 296 and 380 K, respectively), and 1442955–1442970 (1 from 300 to 375 K, respectively) (CIF)

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*E-mail: smail.triki@univ-brest.fr.

Author Contributions

The manuscript was written through contributions of all authors.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique), Brest University, the "Agence Nationale de la Recherche" (ANR project BISTA-MAT: ANR-12-BS07-0030-01), and the Aquitaine Region for support of the International Center of Photomagnetisme in Aquitaine. Authors especially thank the "Service Commun" of NMR facilities of the University of Brest and D. Denux for thermal measurements of ICMCB for the TGA analysis.

REFERENCES

(1) See, for example: (a) Gómez, V.; Sáenz de Pipaón, C.; Maldonado-Illescas, P.; Waerenborgh, J.-C.; Martin, E.; Benet-Buchholz, J.; Galán-Mascarós, J.-R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2015, 137, 11924–11927. (b) Chen, M.-Y.; Chen, X.-R.; Ning, W.-H.; Ren, X.-M. RSC Adv. 2014, 4, 39126–39131. (c) Kahn, O.; Martinez, C. J. Science 1998, 279, 44–48. (d) Bousseksou, A.; Molnár, G.; Demont, P.; Menegotto, J. J. Mater. Chem. 2003, 13, 2069–2071. (e) Dugay, J.; Giménez-Marqués, M.; Kozlova, T.; Zandbergen, H. W.; Coronado, E.; van der Zant, H. S. J. Adv. Mater. 2015, 27, 1288–1293.

(2) (a) Bartual-Murgui, C.; Akou, A.; Thibault, C.; Molnár, G.; Vieu, C.; Salmon, L.; Bousseksou, A. J. Mater. Chem. C 2015, 3, 1277–1285.
(b) Jureschi, C. M.; Rusu, I.; Codjovi, E.; Linares, J.; Garcia, Y.; Rotaru, A. Phys. B 2014, 449, 47–51.
(c) Linares, J.; Codjovi, E.; Garcia, Y. Sensors 2012, 12, 4479–4492.
(d) Real, J. A.; Gaspar, A. B.; Niel, V.; Muñoz, M.-C. Coord. Chem. Rev. 2003, 236, 121–141.

(3) (a) Sertphon, D.; Harding, D. J.; Harding, P.; Murray, K. S.; Moubaraki, B.; Adams, H.; Alkas, A.; Telfer, S. G. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* 2016, 2016, 432–438. (b) Shatruk, M.; Phan, H.; Chrisostomo, B. A.; Suleimenova, A. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* 2015, 289–290, 62–73.
(c) Brooker, S. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 2015, 44, 2880–2892. (d) Halcrow, M. A. *Spin-Crossover Materials: Properties and Applications*; John Wiley & Sons, 2013. (e) *Topics in Current Chemistry*; Gütlich, P., Goodwin, H. A., Eds.; 2004; pp 233–235.

(4) See, for example: (a) Gütlich, P.; Gaspar, A.-B.; Garcia, Y. Beilstein J. Org. Chem. 2013, 9, 342–391. (b) Muñoz-Lara, F. J.; Arcís-Castillo, Z.; Muñoz, M.-C.; Rodríguez-Velamazán, J.-A.; Gaspar, A.-B.; Real, J.-A. Inorg. Chem. 2012, 51, 11126–11132. (c) Olguin, J.; Brooker, S. Coord. Chem. Rev. 2011, 255, 203–240. (d) Halcrow, M. A. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2011, 40, 4119–4142. (e) Halcrow, M. A. Coord. Chem. Rev. 2009, 253, 2493–2514. (f) Real, J.-A.; Gaspar, A.-B.; Niel, V.; Muñoz, M. C. Coord. Chem. Rev. 2003, 236, 121–141.

(5) (a) Yamasaki, M.; Ishida, T. Polyhedron 2015, 85, 795–799.
(b) Hirosawa, N.; Oso, Y.; Ishida, T. Chem. Lett. 2012, 41, 716–718.
(6) Dupouy, G.; Marchivie, M.; Triki, S.; Sala-Pala, J.; Salaün, J. Y.; Gómez-García, C. J.; Guionneau, P. Inorg. Chem. 2008, 47, 8921–8931.

(7) (a) Dupouy, G.; Marchivie, M.; Triki, S.; Sala-Pala, J.; Gomez-Garcia, C. J.; Pillet, S.; Lecomte, C.; Létard, J.-F. Chem. Commun.

2009, 3404–3406. (b) Dupouy, G.; Triki, S.; Marchivie, M.; Cosquer, N.; Gómez-García, C. J.; Pillet, S.; Bendeif, E.-E.; Lecomte, C.; Asthana, S.; Létard, J.-F. *Inorg. Chem.* **2010**, *49*, 9358–9368.

(8) (a) Wei, R.-J.; Li, B.; Tao, J.; Huang, R.-B.; Zheng, L.-S.; Zheng, Z. Inorg. Chem. 2011, 50, 1170-1172. (b) Højland, F.; Toftlund, H.; Yde-Anderson, S.; et al. Acta Chem. Scand. 1983, A37, 251-257.
(c) Paulsen, H.; Grünsteudel, H.; Meyer-Klaucke, W.; Gerdan, M.; Grünsteudel, H. F.; Chumakov, A. I.; Rüffer, R.; Winkler, H.; Toftlund, H.; Trautwein, A. X. Eur. Phys. J. B 2001, B23, 463-472. (d) Li, B.; Wei, R.-J.; Tao, J.; Huang, R.-B.; Zheng, L.-S.; Zheng, Z. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2010, 132, 1558-1566.

(9) Wei, R.-J.; Huo, Q.; Tao, J.; Huang, R.-B.; Zheng, L.-S. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 8940–8943.

(10) Park, J. G.; Jeon, I.-R.; Harris, T. D. Inorg. Chem. 2015, 54, 359-369.

(11) (a) Gaspar, A. B.; Ksenofontov, V.; Real, J. A.; Gütlich, P. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2003**, 373, 385–391. (b) Gaspar, A. B.; Ksenofontov, V.; Martinez, V.; Real, J. A.; Gütlich, P.; Munoz, M. C. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2004**, 2004, 4770–4773. (c) Gaspar, A. B.; Muñoz, M.-C.; Real, J. A. *J. Mater. Chem.* **2006**, *16*, 2522–2533.

(12) Ksenofontov, V.; Gaspar, A. B.; Niel, V.; Reiman, S.; Real, J. A.; Gütlich, P. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2004**, *10*, 1291–1298.

(13) (a) Hogue, R. W.; Feltham, H. L. C.; Miller, R. G.; Brooker, S. Inorg. Chem. 2016, 55, 4152-4165. (b) Herold, C. F.; Carrella, L. M.; Rentschler, E. Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. 2015, 2015, 3632-3636. (c) Kulmaczewski, R.; Olguín, J.; Kitchen, J. A.; Feltham, H. L. C.; Jameson, G. N. L.; Tallon, J. L.; Brooker, S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2014, 136, 878-881. (d) Kitchen, J. A.; Ogluín, J.; Kulmaczewski, R.; White, N. G.; Milway, V. A.; Jameson, G. N. L.; Tallon, J. L.; Brooker, S. Inorg. Chem. 2013, 52, 11185-11199. (e) Kitchen, J. A.; White, N. G.; Jameson, G. N. L.; Tallon, J. L.; Brooker, S. Inorg. Chem. 2011, 50, 4586-4597. (f) Grunert, C. M.; Reiman, S.; Spiering, H.; Kitchen, J. A.; Brooker, S.; Gütlich, P. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2008, 47, 2997-2999. (g) Klingele, M. H.; Moubaraki, B.; Murray, K. S.; Brooker, S. Chem. - Eur. J. 2005, 11, 6962-6973. (h) Klingele, M. H.; Moubaraki, B.; Cashion, J. D.; Murray, K. S.; Brooker, S. Chem. Commun. 2005, 987-989. (i) Nakano, K.; Suemura, N.; Yoneda, K.; Kawata, S.; Kaizaki, S. Dalton Trans. 2005, 740-743. (j) Leita, B. A.; Moubaraki, B.; Murray, K. S.; Smith, J. P.; Cashion, J. D. Chem. Commun. 2004, 156-157. (k) Nakano, K.; Kawata, S.; Yoneda, K.; Fuyuhiro, A.; Yagi, T.; Nasu, S.; Morimoto, S.; Kaizaki, S. Chem. Commun. 2004, 2892-2893.

(14) Ortega-Villar, N.; Thompson, A.-L.; Muñoz, M.-C; Ugalde-Saldivar; Goeta, A. E.; Moreno-Esparza, R.; Real, J. A. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2005**, *11*, 5721–5734.

(15) Burdette, S. C.; Frederickson, C. J.; Bu, W.; Lippard, S. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 1778–1787.

(16) Schlager, O.; Wieghardt, K.; Grondey, H.; Rufinska, A.; Nuber, B. *Inorg. Chem.* **1995**, *34*, 6440–6448.

(17) Roger, M.; Patinec, V.; Tripier, R.; Triki, S.; Le Poul, N.; Le Mest, Y. Inorg. Chim. Acta **2014**, 417, 201–207.

(18) Elemental analyses have been performed on single crystals of 1-MeOH and 1 (obtained by heating 1 at 70 °C during three hours). However, the values found for C, H, and N atoms did not show significant difference between the two analyses. The fraction of 0.3MeOH calculated from the elemental analysis of 1-MeOH should be considered as the maximum value. This observation implies that the loss of solvent molecules occurs easily before the analysis.

(19) (a) Darawsheh, M.; Barrios, L. A.; Roubeau, O.; Teat, S. J.; Aromi, G. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2016**, *22*, 8635–8645. (b) Amoore, J. J. M.; Kepert, C. J.; Cashion, J. D.; Moubaraki, B.; Neville, S.; Murray, K. S. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2006**, *12*, 8220–8227. (c) Amoore, J. J. M.; Neville, S. M.; Moubaraki, B.; Iremonger, S. S.; Murray, K. S.; Létard, J.-F.; Kepert, C. J. *Chem. - Eur. J.* **2010**, *16*, 1973–1982. (d) Matouzenko, G. S.; Jeanneau, E.; Verat, A. Y.; de Gaetano, Y. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2012**, *2012*, 969–977.

(20) See, for examples: Olguin, J.; Brooker, S. In *Spin-Crossover Materials: Properties and Applications*; Halcrow, M. A., Ed.; John Wiley & Sons, 2013; pp 77–120.

(21) (a) Bousseksou, A.; Nasser, J.; Linares, J.; Boukheddaden, K.; Varret, F. J. Phys. I 1992, 2, 1381–1403. (b) Bousseksou, A.; Varret, F.; Nasser, J. J. Phys. I 1993, 3, 1463–1473. (c) Boukheddaden, K.; Linares, J.; Codjovi, E.; Varret, F.; Niel, V.; Real, J. A. J. Appl. Phys. 2003, 93, 7103–7105. (d) Nishino, M.; Boukheddaden, K.; Miyashita, S.; Varret, F. Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys. 2003, 68, 224402. (e) Paez-Espejo, M.; Sy, M.; boukheddaden, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2016, 138, 3202–3210.

(22) Kaiba, A.; Shepherd, H. J.; Fedaoui, D.; Rosa, P.; Goeta, A. E.; Rebbani, N.; Létard, J.-F.; Guionneau, P. *Dalton Trans.* **2010**, *39*, 2910–2918.

(23) Deeney, F. A.; Harding, C. J.; Morgan, G. G.; McKee, V.; Nelson, J.; Teat, S. J.; Clegg, W. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans. **1998**, 1837–1844.

(24) Guionneau, P.; Marchivie, M.; Bravic, G.; Létard, J.-F. D.; Chasseau. *Top. Curr. Chem.* **2004**, 234, 97–128.

(25) Marchivie, M.; Guionneau, P.; Létard, J.-F.; Chasseau, D. Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B: Struct. Sci. 2005, B61, 25–28.

(26) Tao, J.; Wei, R-J.; Huang, R.-B.; Zheng, L.-S. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2012, 41, 703-737.

(27) Middleton, W. J.; Little, E. L.; Coffman, D. D.; Engelhardt, V. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1958, 80, 2795–2809.

(28) Britovsek, G. J. P.; England, J.; White, A. J. P. Inorg. Chem. 2005, 44, 8125-8134.

(29) Bain, G. A.; Berry, J. F. J. Chem. Educ. 2008, 85, 532-536.

(30) CRYSALIS-CCD 170, Oxford-Diffraction, 2002; CRYSALIS-RED 170; Oxford-Diffraction, 2002.

(31) Sheldrick, M. SHELX97, Program for Crystal Structure Analysis; University of Gottingen: Gottingen, Germany, 1997.

(32) Farrugia, L. J. J. Appl. Crystallogr. 1999, 32, 837-838.

(33) Dolomanov, O. V.; Bourhis, L. J.; Gildea, R. J.; Howard, J. A. K.;

Puschmann, H. J. Appl. Crystallogr. 2009, 42, 339-341.