# Dalton Transactions

# PAPER

Check for updates

**Cite this:** *Dalton Trans.*, 2021, **50**, 5483

Received 16th February 2021, Accepted 15th March 2021 DOI: 10.1039/d1dt00513h

rsc.li/dalton

# Near-infrared C-term MCD spectroscopy of octahedral uranium(v) complexes<sup>†</sup>

Daniel J. Curran,‡<sup>a</sup> Gaurab Ganguly, <sup>b</sup> ‡§<sup>b</sup> Yonaton N. Heit,<sup>b</sup> Nikki J. Wolford, <sup>b</sup> <sup>a</sup> Stefan G. Minasian, <sup>b</sup> <sup>c</sup> Matthias W. Löble,<sup>d</sup> Samantha K. Cary,<sup>d</sup> Stosh A. Kozimor, <sup>b</sup> <sup>d</sup> Jochen Autschbach <sup>b</sup> \*<sup>b</sup> and Michael L. Neidig <sup>b</sup> \*<sup>a</sup>

*C*-term magnetic circular dichroism (MCD) spectroscopy is a powerful method for probing d–d and f–f transitions in paramagnetic metal complexes. However, this technique remains underdeveloped both experimentally and theoretically for studies of U(v) complexes of  $O_h$  symmetry, which have been of long-standing interest for probing electronic structure, bonding, and covalency in 5f systems. In this study, *C*-term NIR MCD of the Laporte forbidden f–f transitions of [UCl<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> and [UF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> are reported, demonstrating the significant fine structure resolution possible with this technique including for the low energy  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_8$  transitions in [UF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup>. The experimental NIR MCD studies were further extended to [U(OC<sub>6</sub>F<sub>5</sub>)<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup>, [U (CH<sub>2</sub>SiMe<sub>3</sub>)<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup>, and [U(NC(<sup>6</sup>Bu)(Ph))<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> to evaluate the effects of ligand-type on the f–f MCD fine structure features. Theoretical calculations were conducted to determine the Laporte forbidden f–f transitions and their MCD intensity experimentally observed in the NIR spectra of the U(v) hexahalide complexes, *via* the inclusion of vibronic coupling, to better understand the underlying spectral fine structure features for these complexes. These spectra and simulations provide an important platform for the application of MCD spectroscopy to this widely studied class of U(v) complexes and identify areas for continued theoretical development.

# Introduction

Evaluation of electronic structure and bonding in uranium coordination complexes through both spectroscopic and theoretical methods has long been an area of intense research interest, motivated by the need to efficiently handle and separate nuclear waste<sup>1</sup> as well as advancing our understanding of uranium's reactivity towards small molecules.<sup>2–4</sup> To define electronic structure and bonding in uranium chemistry, numerous spectroscopic methods have been employed such as electronic absorbance spectroscopy (EAS),<sup>5–10</sup> X-ray absorption

Buffalo, New York 14260, USA. E-mail: jochena@buffalo.edu

spectroscopy (XAS),<sup>11-21</sup> electronic paramagnetic resonance (EPR) spectroscopy,<sup>21–29</sup> and nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy.<sup>30–32</sup> Computational studies have been widely employed to interrogate electronic structure in uranium chemistry.33-47 EAS is the most widely employed of these methods, due to its broad availability and the insight it can reveal about f-f transitions in the near-infrared (NIR) region, providing a fingerprint of the oxidation states and ligand environments of uranium coordination complexes. While it is extremely useful to probe energy shifts in f-f transitions as a function of ligand perturbation, EAS can suffer from overlapping transitions and vibrational overtone contributions from solvent in the NIR region, resulting in the loss of informationrich fine structure features. While similar challenges exist for NIR EAS studies of transition metal complexes, C-term magnetic circular dichroism (MCD) has been alternatively applied to the study of NIR d-d transitions in paramagnetic complexes, especially to obtain high-resolution insight into electronic structure across systems ranging from bioinorganic chemistry to organometallic catalysis in transition metal chemistry.<sup>48-50</sup> Applying this technique to actinide chemistry, uranium in the case of this study, is important to test theory's ability to treat actinide complexes in addition to better understand the differ-

C ROYAL SOCIETY OF CHEMISTRY

View Article Online

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Department of Chemistry, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627, USA. E-mail: neidig@chem.rochester.edu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Department of Chemistry, University at Buffalo, State University of New York,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup>Chemical Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Chemistry Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, 87544, USA

 $<sup>\</sup>dagger\, Electronic$  supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: 10.1039/ d1dt00513h

<sup>‡</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

<sup>§</sup>Present address: Institute of Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry, Czech Academy of Sciences, 16610 Prague 6, Czech Republic.

ences and similarities between actinides and their transition metal counterparts.

The intensity of an MCD spectrum is proportional to the sum of three contributions which are designated as the *A*-, *B*-, and *C*-terms as shown in eqn (1).

$$\frac{\Delta\varepsilon}{E} \propto \left[ A \left( -\frac{\partial f(E)}{\partial E} \right) + \left( B + \frac{C}{k_{\rm B}T} \right) f(E) \right] \tag{1}$$

Here,  $\Delta \varepsilon$  is the field-dependent difference between the absorption of left-(lcp) and right-circularly polarized (rcp) light, E = hv is the energy of a photon, f(E) is the absorption bandshape, and  $\partial f(E)/\partial E$  is its first derivative. While all three of these mechanisms may contribute to the MCD spectrum for a paramagnetic uranium complex, the C-term is the largest contribution at room temperature already, and it is approximately two orders of magnitude larger than the A- and B-term contributions at cryogenic temperatures, dominating low-temperature measurements of paramagnetic uranium complexes. The C-term mechanism requires a degenerate ground-state (GS) and the presence of an applied magnetic field to remove the degeneracy via the Zeeman effect. This removal of the degeneracy in the GS results in differing intensities in lcp and rcp transitions such that they no longer cancel out, resulting in an absorption band shape as shown in Fig. 1 that is both magnetic field and temperaturedependent.

The application of NIR *C*-term MCD in uranium chemistry to evaluate f–f transitions has largely been limited to several recent studies on U(m) and U(w) complexes.<sup>51–55</sup> Of particular importance is the extension of this method to octahedral ( $O_h$ ) U(v) (f<sup>1</sup>) complexes which have been central to evaluating ligand effects on electronic structure and bonding.<sup>56</sup> However, such an extension is non-trivial due to the role of vibronic



**Fig. 1** The *C*-term MCD mechanism for a J = 1/2 ground state. (A) No *C*-term MCD intensity is observed in the absence of an applied magnetic field, and (B) *C*-term intensity in the presence of an applied magnetic field where the two Zeeman split  $M_J$  levels are unequally populated, resulting in an MCD transition with an absorption band shape.

coupling to overcome the dipole-forbidden nature of the f-f transitions in complexes containing a center of inversion. Compared to our previous studies on f-f transitions in distorted high coordinate U(III) and U(IV) complexes, this provides a considerable challenge in the computation of the resultant *C*-term MCD spectra.<sup>54,55</sup>

The present study focuses on the application of *C*-term MCD spectroscopy to evaluate electronic structure in a series of  $O_h$  U(v) complexes, focusing on f–f transitions in the NIR region to directly probe their ligand field (LF) states involving 5f orbitals. Notably, the ground state (GS), denoted by  $\Gamma_7$ , and transition between its excited states (ESs), referenced as  $\Gamma_8$ ,  $\Gamma_7$ ',  $\Gamma_8$ ', and  $\Gamma_6$ , were investigated.<sup>9</sup> To our knowledge, this is the first attempt to calculate vibronic MCD of a metal complex from first principles. Experimental and theoretical *C*-term MCD studies of [UCl<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> and [UF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> demonstrate the significant resolution of fine structure features in the NIR region that are achievable as well as the information content and associated challenges in MCD simulations of f–f transitions through the incorporation of vibronic coupling.

### Results and discussion

### NIR MCD spectroscopy of [UCl<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup>

Initial studies focused on evaluating the f-f transitions in  $[\text{UCl}_6]^-$  in the NIR region using *C*-term MCD spectroscopy (Fig. 2). The assignments of these transitions are facilitated due to previously reported NIR electronic absorption studies of this complex.<sup>7</sup> Starting at low energy, the first band observed in the 5 K, 7 T NIR MCD spectrum of  $[\text{UCl}_6]^-$  is the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition from 6650 to 7150 cm<sup>-1</sup> (Fig. 2A and C). This transition is comprised of three defining features. The first and most intense grouping includes four defining features with varying negative-to-positive features. The first two features, centered at 6820 cm<sup>-1</sup> are more intense than the final two negative features centered at 6930 and 7100 cm<sup>-1</sup>.

The next transition,  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$ , spans 10050 cm<sup>-1</sup> to 10800 cm<sup>-1</sup>. This transition is comprised of two noticeable fine structure features, with absorption peaks centered at 10180 cm<sup>-1</sup> and 10600 cm<sup>-1</sup>, which are both less intense and broader than the feature observed in the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition. The signal at 10180 cm<sup>-1</sup> has half the intensity of the signal at 6820 cm<sup>-1</sup>, while the 10600 cm<sup>-1</sup> signal is half as intense as the 10180 cm<sup>-1</sup> feature. From low to high energy, these two fine structure features are 350 and 300 cm<sup>-1</sup> wide respectively, and are about seven times wider than either component of the feature. Pure electronic f–f transitions are sharp and intense, providing context to the possible origin of this transition having other mechanisms contributing to the intensity.

The  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_6$  transition is the highest energy f-f transition observed. Spanning 11 400 to 11 875 cm<sup>-1</sup>, this feature is comprised of negative-to-positive bandshapes. These negative to



Fig. 2 The 5 K, 7 T NIR MCD spectrum of (A) [UCl<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> and (B) [UF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup>. Enlarged views of the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_7$  transitions for (C) [UCl<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> and (D) [UF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> and (E)  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_8$  transition of [UF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup>.

positive features are similar to the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$  transition, and relatively weak and broad concerning the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition. The negative fine structure centered at 11575 cm<sup>-1</sup> is 275 cm<sup>-1</sup> wide and has about the same intensity as the lower energy signal in the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$  transition. It is slightly asymmetric, with

the higher energy side of the peak being rather sharp. From 11 675 to 11 875 cm<sup>-1</sup> there is a symmetric positive fine structure that has one-fourth of the intensity of its negative counterpart. Based on the observed fine structure features, the mechanism governing this transition is likely similar to that for the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$  transition.

The high level of resolution of the fine structures of the f-f transitions in the C-term MCD spectrum of  $[UCl_6]^-$  compared to typical electronic absorption studies in the NIR region as described above is immediately apparent, demonstrating the power of this technique. The ability to deconvolute and assign the multitude of fine features of a single transition can provide superior insight into electronic structure and bonding in actinide coordination complexes relative to EAS, particularly when combined with computational studies to calculate and assign these fine structures (vide infra). For example, this approach can provide insight into the underlying mechanisms governing the shape and broadness of the fine structure features. As such, the extension of these studies to additional U(v) complexes with Oh symmetry was pursued to evaluate the effects of ligand type on the f-f transition signals in NIR C-term MCD.

#### NIR MCD spectroscopy of [UF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup>

 $[UF_6]^-$  was selected for *C*-term MCD investigation in the NIR region, as it is known to have larger crystal field (CF) splitting parameters, slightly less 5f-orbital character in its Frontier molecular orbitals (MOs), and less electron density in the 5f-orbitals compared to  $[UCl_6]^{-.9}$  Furthermore, similar high-quality NIR electronic absorption data are available for  $[UF_6]^-$  that facilitate transition assignments and provide a direct comparison to the corresponding NIR *C*-term MCD spectrum.<sup>57</sup>

An immediate difference in the 5 K, 7 T NIR MCD spectrum of  $[UF_6]^-$  is the ability to observe the low energy  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_8$  transition from 5150 to 5850 cm<sup>-1</sup>, which was too low in energy to be observed for  $[UCl_6]^-$  (Fig. 2B and E). This is a direct result of the larger CF splitting present in  $[UF_6]^-$ . For this transition, the first two fine structure features can be observed from 5150 to 5350 cm<sup>-1</sup>; the lower-energy signal centered at 5180 cm<sup>-1</sup> contains a weak negative band and an intense positive band while the higher energy feature at 5325 cm<sup>-1</sup> contains the converse. These sharp, intense features are reminiscent of the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition observed in  $[UCl_6]^-$ . Additionally, compared to the transitions in  $[UCl_6]^-$  the NIR MCD spectrum of  $[UF_6]^$ is extremely complex with numerous signals, inferring highly mixed ESs.

Moving to higher energy, the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition of  $[UF_6]^-$ appears from 7250 to 8050 cm<sup>-1</sup>, slightly blue-shifted compared to the analogous transition in  $[UCl_6]^-$  (Fig. 2D). However, the fine structure of this transition in  $[UF_6]^-$  exhibits multiple differences compared to  $[UCl_6]^-$ . For example, the negative-to-positive feature extending from 7250 cm<sup>-1</sup> to 7430 cm<sup>-1</sup> with its inflection point at 7410 cm<sup>-1</sup> is highly asymmetric, with the negative feature being much more intense than the positive, contrary to what was observed in  $[UCl_6]^-$ ; the low-energy negative transition in  $[UF_6]^-$  is over

eight times as intense as the positive component. At higher energy, there is a positive-to-negative set of features from 7500 to 7600 cm<sup>-1</sup>. This fine structure is significantly different than what was observed in  $[UCl_6]^-$  as it is considerably weaker than the first negative feature and has a derivative shape. The final fine structure feature, from 7850 to 7970 cm<sup>-1</sup>, is another slightly asymmetric negative-to-positive signal centered at 7910 cm<sup>-1</sup>. Note that the fine structure features are both less intense and more complex than for the analogous transitions in  $[UCl_6]^-$ .

The higher energy  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$  and  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_6$  transitions in  $[UF_6]^-$  are shifted to higher energy and weak in intensity compared to the analogous transition in  $[UCl_6]^-$  (see ESI, Fig. S4†). For completeness, they will be briefly described. From 13 500 cm<sup>-1</sup> to 14 250 cm<sup>-1</sup> there is a weak positive-to-negative feature representing the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$  transition. The  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_6$  transition appears from 15 500 cm<sup>-1</sup> to 17 500 cm<sup>-1</sup> as a trio of increasingly weaker positive absorption features. The extreme weakness of the vibronic coupling is an anomaly in this series and is worth considering in future studies.

# Beyond halide ligands: near-infrared MCD spectroscopy of $[U(OC_6F_5)_6]^-, [U(CH_2SiMe_3)_6]^-, and [U(NC(^tBu)(Ph))_6]^-$

While halide complexes are ideal for both experimental and theoretical (vide infra) C-term MCD investigations in U(v) O<sub>h</sub> complexes, it is also of interest to expand the experimental studies to  $U(v) O_h$  systems of other ligand types. This type of study allows for the evaluation of ligand effects on the fine structure of the f-f transition in NIR C-term MCD. Towards this goal, the following complexes, previously reported by Hayton and co-workers were also examined through NIR *C*-term MCD spectroscopy:  $[U(OC_6F_5)_6]^-$ ,  $[U(CH_2SiMe_3)_6]^-$ , and  $[U(NC(^{t}Bu)(Ph))_{6}]^{-}$ .<sup>58-60</sup> While the resulting MCD spectra are too challenging for computational evaluation due to the significant increase in complexity of the ligand environment in these systems compared to simple halide complexes, they provide a useful experimental comparison in terms of the changes in the NIR fine features due to ligand variations beyond the simple halide complexes.

For the 5 K, 7 T MCD spectrum of  $[U(OC_6F_5)_6]^-$  (Fig. 3, top), the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition from 7025 cm<sup>-1</sup> to 7450 cm<sup>-1</sup> contains two sharp fine structure features at 7075 cm<sup>-1</sup> and 7135 cm<sup>-1</sup> of an opposite sign but similar intensity. These negative-to-positive features are followed by a series of lowintensity, higher energy signals which are positively signed. At higher energy of the spectrum, the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$  transition is observed from 10 400  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  to 11 500  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ . There are two clear fine structure peaks present at 10660 cm<sup>-1</sup> and 10730 cm<sup>-1</sup> that are indicative of at least two broad, negatively signed features having overlapping intensity. Also, this transition is relatively intense. This  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_6$  transition from 12 050 cm<sup>-1</sup> to 12 950 cm<sup>-1</sup> is the final transition observed in the NIR region, appearing almost like a standard absorption feature. With the signals being extremely close in energy, it is hard to deconvolute these individual fine structure features. Overall, the aryl oxide ligand complex's electronic transition



Fig. 3 The 5 K, 7 T NIR MCD spectra of top:  $[U(OC_6F_5)_6]^-$ , middle:  $[U(CC_2SiMe_3)_6]^-$  and bottom:  $[U(NC(^{t}Bu)(Ph))_6]^-$  complexes.

is fairly similar to those observed in  $[\mathrm{UCl}_6]^-$  with slight perturbations. Broadly, the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  and  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$  transitions are similar in both complexes, with  $[\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{OC}_6\mathrm{F}_5)_6]^-$  being blueshifted. However, the fine structural features of these transitions in  $[\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{OC}_6\mathrm{F}_5)_6]^-$  are closer in energy than in the previously described complexes. Specifically, in the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition, there are more features present which are predominantly positively signed. Finally, the relative intensities of the transitions are more comparable in  $[\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{OC}_6\mathrm{F}_5)_6]^-$ , while the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  is much stronger relative to the others in  $[\mathrm{UCl}_6]^-$ . With the two higher energy transitions being vibronic (this will be expanded upon in the theoretical section) it appears the ligand exchange has consequential effects on them, while the electronic transition  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  is more resilient to ligand perturbations.

 $[U(CH_2SiMe_3)_6]^-$  was also probed by NIR MCD spectroscopy, as this complex is composed of pure  $\sigma$ -donor ligands.

This provided a system to examine f-f transitions and their fine structures in NIR MCD for a U(v) complex without any ligand  $\pi$ -influence, unlike the three previously described systems. For the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition in the 5 K, 7 T NIR MCD spectrum of  $[U(CH_2Si(Me_3))_6]^-$  (Fig. 3, middle), the asymmetric negative-to-positive feature at 6805 cm<sup>-1</sup> is extremely sharp and intense. It is immediately succeeded by a weaker, positive signal at 6860 cm<sup>-1</sup>. At higher energy, the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$ transition appears from  $10\,600 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  to  $11\,400 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . This transition is both broad and relatively intense. It is comprised of multiple overlapping fine structures that are difficult to resolve, though two noticeable peaks are discernible at 10775 cm<sup>-1</sup> and 11050 cm<sup>-1</sup>. The final transition observed in this region is the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_6$  from 12700 to 13 900 cm<sup>-1</sup>. It is an extremely broad negative transition that is relatively intense with the observed broadness likely resulting from multiple, overlapping fine structure features of the same sign. The  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition appears to be more akin to  $[UF_6]^-$  though it is red-shifted in comparison to  $[UCl_6]^$ and  $[U(OC_6F_5)_6]^-$  demonstrating the two clear regimes of the electronic  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  transition present in the complexes studied herein. As seen in  $[U(OC_6F_5)_6]^-$  there is parity in the relative intensities of the transitions which were not observed in the halide complexes, further reflecting the sensitivity of the vibronic transitions to ligand perturbations.

The 5 K, 7 T NIR MCD spectrum of  $[U(NC(^{t}Bu)(Ph))_{6}]^{-}$  is shown in Fig. 3, bottom. This spectrum has several unique features compared to those previously reported in this study. First, the lowest energy transition starting at  $6180 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , is very weak in intensity compared to the higher energy transitions. Furthermore, there is tremendous complexity and overlap in the higher energy features not observed for the other complexes in this study. These fine structure features can be attributed to the complex's previously reported deviation from ideal O<sub>h</sub> symmetry. From X-ray crystallography, this complex contains an inner sphere cation that interacts with the phenyl component of the ketamide ligands causing them to pucker. Thus, this complex demonstrates the sensitivity of the f-f transitions and fine features observable in NIR C-term MCD to not only ligand type but also geometric perturbations from O<sub>h</sub> symmetry.

### Theoretical C-term MCD spectroscopy of f–f transitions of $O_h$ U(v) complexes

The experimental NIR *C*-term MCD spectra of the  $O_h$  U(v) complexes described above demonstrate the detailed fine structure information that can be extracted in principle. As demonstrated in our previous *C*-term MCD studies of the charge transfer (CT) region of  $[UCl_6]^{-,56}$  this characterization method is most useful when the experimental measurements are coupled with theoretical calculations of the spectra. However, in the NIR region, these calculations are significantly more challenging than calculations of CT bands because the f-f transition intensity in a centrosymmetric environment is largely governed by vibronic coupling. Despite this challenge,

calculations of the NIR MCD spectra of  $[UCl_6]^-$  and  $[UF_6]^-$  were pursued as representative examples of  $O_h U(v)$  complexes to evaluate simulations of these f-f transitions and to gain further insight into the origins of the transitions, fine structure features, and underlying electronic structure of these complexes.

The relevant expressions from Piepho and Schatz<sup>61</sup> can be used to determine the intensity of *C*-terms, where *x* in eqn (2) is either the electric dipole ( $\mu$ ) or magnetic dipole (*m*) moment vector operator:

$$C^{x} = \frac{i}{3|A|} \sum_{\alpha,\alpha',\lambda,j} \langle \Psi_{A\alpha'0}(q;Q)|L + 2S|\Psi_{A\alpha'0}(q;Q)\rangle$$

$$\cdot \langle \Psi_{A\alpha0}(q;Q)|x|\Psi_{J\lambda j}(q;Q)\rangle \times \langle \Psi_{J\lambda j}(q;Q)|x|\Psi_{A\alpha0}(q;Q)\rangle$$

$$(2)$$

In eqn (2),  $\Psi(q;Q)$  represents the wavefunction depending on electronic (q) and nuclear (Q) degrees of freedom:  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$ are components of the GS (A) and the ES (J), subscript '0' indicates that the initial state (GS) A is in the vibrational zero-point level, while the index 'J' characterizes a vibrational sub-state of the excited state (ES) J. Underlying the separation of the vibrational and electronic components of the wavefunctions is the Born–Oppenheimer (BO) approximation, where

$$\Psi_{J\lambda j}(q;Q) = \psi_{J\lambda}(q;Q)\chi_{Jj}(Q) \tag{3}$$

Here,  $\psi_{J\lambda}(q;Q)$  and  $\chi_{Jj}(Q)$  represent the adiabatic electronic and the nuclear vibrational wavefunctions, respectively.

The f-f transitions are magnetic-dipole allowed, while at the same time the vibronic contributions to the MCD via the magnetic transition-dipole moments (TDMs) can be considered negligible compared with the vibronic contributions to the electric TDMs. Therefore, the intensities of the purely electronic transitions were calculated from the magnetic transition-dipole moments according to Piepho and Schatz.61

$$C^{m} = \frac{i}{3|A|} \sum_{\alpha,\alpha',\lambda} \langle \psi_{A\alpha'} | L + 2S | \psi_{A\alpha'} \rangle$$
  
 
$$\cdot \langle \psi_{A\alpha} | m | \psi_{J\lambda} \rangle \times \langle \psi_{J\lambda} | m | \psi_{A\alpha} \rangle$$
(4)

The Herzberg–Teller (HT) vibronic coupling model was used to treat the contributions to the MCD from the electric transition-dipole moments. Accordingly, a Taylor series expansion of TDM in terms of the normal modes was set up:

$$\langle \chi_{A0}(Q) | \mu^{e}_{A\alpha J\lambda}(Q) | \chi_{Jj}(Q) \rangle = \mu^{e}_{A\alpha J\lambda}(Q_{0}) \langle \chi_{A0}(Q) | \chi_{Jj}(Q) \rangle$$

$$+ \sum_{p=1}^{M} \langle \chi_{A0}(Q) | Q_{p} | \chi_{Jj}(Q) \rangle \left( \frac{\partial \mu^{e}_{A\alpha J\lambda}(Q)}{\partial Q_{p}} \right) \Big|_{Q_{0}} + \cdots$$

$$(5)$$

In the previous equation, the electric transition-dipole moment between the electronic states is  $\mu_{A\alpha,J\lambda}^e(Q) = \langle \psi_{A\alpha}(q; Q) | \mu | \psi_{J\lambda}(q;Q) \rangle$ ,  $Q_0$  is the equilibrium position of the *M* nuclei, and  $Q_p$  is one of the M = 3N - 6 vibrational modes for a non-linear molecule.

The TDM derivatives in eqn (5) were calculated *via* a sumover-state (SOS) perturbation theory approach: $^{62,63}$ 

$$\frac{\partial \mu_{A\alpha,J\lambda}^{e}(Q)}{\partial Q_{p}} = \sum_{Kk \neq J\lambda} \langle \psi_{Kk}^{0} | \mu^{e} | \psi_{J\lambda}^{0} \rangle \frac{\langle \psi_{A\alpha}^{0} | \partial H / \partial Q_{p} | \psi_{Kk}^{0} \rangle}{E_{A\alpha}^{0} - E_{Kk}^{0}} + \sum_{Kk \neq A\alpha} \langle \psi_{A\alpha}^{0} | \mu^{e} | \psi_{Kk}^{0} \rangle \frac{\langle \psi_{Kk}^{0} | \partial H / \partial Q_{p} | \psi_{J\lambda}^{0} \rangle}{E_{J\lambda}^{0} - E_{Kk}^{0}}$$
(6)

Here, superscript '0' indicates a state calculated at  $Q = Q_0$ ; k represents the component of electronic state K used in SOS; and H is the molecular Hamiltonian. The Hamiltonian derivatives  $\langle \psi_{Kk}^0 | \partial H / \partial Q_p | \psi_{I\lambda}^0 \rangle$  etc., appearing in eqn (6), are calculated numerically by a central finite difference approach in the form of  $\partial \langle \psi_{Kk}^0 | H / \psi_{l\lambda}^0 \rangle / \partial Q_p$ , as suggested by Orlandi and others,<sup>64</sup> utilizing a "floating" atomic orbital (FAO) basis that moves with the nuclei along  $Q_p$ , while the wavefunction parameters remain those of the equilibrium structure. Matrix elements  $\langle \psi_{Kk}^0 | \mu^e | \psi_{I\lambda}^0 \rangle$  and  $\langle \psi_{A\alpha}^0 | \mu^e | \psi_{Kk}^0 \rangle$  facilitate intensity "borrowing" from state  $\psi_{Kk}^0$  that has the opposite parity of  $\psi_{A\alpha}^0$  and  $\psi_{I\lambda}^0$ . The vibronic TDMs among the spin-orbit (SO)-coupled states are obtained from a posteriori transformation of spin-free (SF)  $\mu^{e}_{A\alpha,I\lambda}$  with the coefficients that mix different spin-states via state interaction. This setup was previously tested in calculations of vibronic f-f absorption spectra and was found to perform reasonably well.

The matrix elements  $\langle \chi_{A0}(Q) | Q_p | \chi_{II}(Q) \rangle$  in eqn (5) are commonly calculated by expanding the vibrational normal modes of one of the states in terms of the normal modes of the other state. Here, we are dealing with the electronic transitions between LF states involving weakly bonding and anti-bonding metal 5f orbitals. Therefore, we assumed the equilibrium structures of the GS and ESs are essentially the same and the vibrational wavefunctions  $|\chi_{A0}\rangle$  and  $|\chi_{Ji}\rangle$  are approximated as products of the same harmonic vibrational modes:  $|\xi_1^a \xi_2^b ... \xi_p^c ... \xi_M^x\rangle$  and  $|\xi_1^k \xi_2^l ... \xi_p^m ... \xi_M^y\rangle$ . Here, the subscripts and the subscripts denote the normal mode index and vibrational quantum number, respectively. From a recursive relation,<sup>66</sup> the value of the integral  $\langle \chi_{A0}(Q) | Q_p | \chi_{II}(Q) \rangle$  is non-zero if the quantum number  $v_p$  in the two states differs by 1, with a value of  $(8\pi^2 c\nu_p/h(v_p + 1))^{-1/2}$  for a change in  $v_p$  of +1, and  $(8\pi^2 c\nu_p/h(v_p + 1))^{-1/2}$  $hv_p$ )<sup>-1/2</sup> for a change of -1. At 5 K, only the +1 transitions are observed because excited vibrational levels are not populated. Vibronic transitions occur at an energy of  $\Delta E_{A\alpha,J\lambda} = \Delta E^{e}_{A\alpha,J\lambda} +$  $hv_p$ , where  $\Delta E^e_{A\alpha,I\lambda}$  is the energy difference between the electronic states involved in the transition, which is accompanied by excitation of the P-th vibrational mode.

*Ab initio* wavefunction calculations were performed using the restricted active space (RAS) self-consistent field method and a developers' version of the [Open]Molcas software.<sup>65,66</sup> For full computational details see section S2 in the ESI.† In the following, RAS-SO indicates RAS wavefunction calculations including spin-orbit (SO) coupling. Calculations labels as PT2-SO also include corrections to the state energies from the dynamic electron correlation *via* 2<sup>nd</sup> order perturbation theory.

### Calculated NIR C-term MCD spectra of [UCl<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> and [UF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup>

Employing the theoretical methods described above, NIR f–f transitions in *C*-term MCD spectra can be simulated. The calculations decipher the origin of the spectral features of these complexes, and the sensitivity of the fine structure features (shape and sign) to ligand identity.

In the SF picture, the GS of  $[UX_6]^-$  (X = F, Cl) is orbitally nondegenerate  ${}^{2}A_{2u}$ , while the lowest-energy LF ESs are the orbitally triply-degenerate  ${}^{2}T_{2u}$  and  ${}^{2}T_{1u}$ .<sup>61,64</sup> In the  $O_{\rm h}$  double-group, the  $^{2}A_{2u}$  transforms as  $\Gamma_{7}$ , the  $^{2}T_{2u}$  splits into  $\Gamma_{8}$  and  $\Gamma_{7'}$ , and  $^{2}T_{1u}$ splits into an  $\Gamma_{8'}$  and  $\Gamma_{6}$  under the SO interaction, and the same symmetry species mix further under the SO interaction such that the GS ( $\Gamma_7 = 60\%^2 A_{2u} + 40\%^2 T_{2u}$ ) acquires orbital degeneracy through mixing with spatially degenerate excited spin-states.57,67 The attained spatial degeneracy of the GS gives rise to a dominant contribution of the C-terms to the MCD spectrum at 5 K. Additionally, along with the ligand identity, it is interesting to observe the change in fine structure features with geometric perturbations (deviations from Oh point group symmetry) and choice of theoretical methods. Experimental structures were used for the H-T expansion and vibrational normal modes obtained from optimized Oh structures were mapped onto experimental structures (for details see section 1.4.3 in the ESI<sup>†</sup>). The corresponding LF spectra for  $[UX_6]^-$  (X = F, Cl) complexes are presented in Fig. S5 and S6 in the ESI<sup>†</sup> and show good agreement with the experiment. Note, as mentioned above, the first LF transition ( $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_8$ ) is out of range of the experimental LF MCD spectra for [UCl<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup>. Therefore, we begin our discussion with the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  LF transition, which is the lowest energy transition observable transition in both complexes that has been calculated to have significant intensity not just from vibronic coupling but also from the purely electronic magnetic-dipole transition.

 $[UCl_6]^-$ . For the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  LF transition in  $[UCl_6]^-$ , the experimental MCD spectrum contains three negative and one positive fine structure features. The lowest-energy sharp negative feature is calculated to be the magnetic-dipole allowed electronic transition, while the higher energy three consecutive weaker features are the vibronic transitions. The calculated RAS-SO and PT2-SO simulated MCD spectra for this LF transition are blue-shifted by ~250 cm<sup>-1</sup> and 300 cm<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, which is well within the error bars of this type of calculation, and fall within the range of  $\sim 6950-7350$  cm<sup>-1</sup>. The calculated broadened spectra along with the experimental spectrum are presented in Fig. 4. Numerical data for the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$ LF transition are collected in Table 1. In the experimental spectrum, there is a shoulder to the first vibronic feature at 23 cm<sup>-1</sup> which does not correspond to any vibrational frequency, therefore, it was not reproduced in the calculations. Hecht et al. showed evidence that this feature could be due to coupling with an unassigned low energy mode,<sup>68</sup> while Ohwada attributed a similar feature to a rotational or translational lattice vibrational mode.<sup>69</sup> The sign, shape, and energy for all the fine structure features are well simulated with RAS-SO. However, with RAS-SO, the magnetic-dipole allowed transitions were less intense than in the experiment, which is





Fig. 4 The f-f LF MCD spectra of  $[UCl_6]^-$ : top: the experimental LF spectrum. Middle: LF MCD spectra (5 K) calculated with RAS-SO using experimental structure for H-T expansion. Bottom: LF MCD spectra (5 K) calculated with PT2-SO using experimental structure for H-T expansion. Calculated  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_7$  transitions were Gaussian-broadened with FWHM = 25 cm<sup>-1</sup>,  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_8$  transitions were Gaussian-broadened with FWHM = 200 cm<sup>-1</sup>, and  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_6$  transitions were Gaussian-broadened with FWHM = 150 cm<sup>-1</sup>. The sharp and intense  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_7$  LF MCD peaks are shown in the inset for clarity. The contributions of electronic and vibronic transitions are denoted with different colors in the underlying "stick spectra".

reflected in the relative intensity between electronic and vibronic transitions. The relative intensity is better reproduced with PT2-SO, although the third fine structure feature in this band is very weak and therefore not visible in the PT2-SO spectrum. The first 'derivative-like' feature is created by two consecutive electronic and vibronic (82 cm<sup>-1</sup>) transitions. It is nicely reproduced with both RAS-SO and PT2-SO, but not when the Oh structure was used for the zeroth-order wavefunction calculation in the H-T expansion (see Fig. S7 in the ESI<sup>†</sup>). The sign of the other vibronic fine structure feature is also opposite to the experiment when Oh structures were used (see Fig. S7 in the ESI<sup>†</sup>). Overall, the LF MCD spectra are sensitive to approximations made in the calculations, including the choice of structure for the HT expansion. This indicates that future vibronic MCD calculations need to be improved and treat Duschinsky rotations and related effects explicitly.

Likewise, the higher energy  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{8'}$  transition turns out to be difficult to simulate. The RAS-SO simulated MCD spectrum for this particular LF transition is blue-shifted by ~400 cm<sup>-1</sup> whereas the PT2-SO simulated spectrum for the same is blue-shifted by ~1100 cm<sup>-1</sup>. Unfortunately, the sign of the band is opposite in the experiment  $\nu$ s the calculations. We tentatively attribute this to the fact that the ES is 4-fold degenerate in  $O_h$  symmetry and may undergo a distortion that we are presently not able to model.

Going to the highest energy  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_6$  transition, the RAS-SO, and PT2-SO MCD features match reasonably well with the experiment. In the simulated MCD spectra using the experimental geometry. Both the RAS-SO and the PT2-SO spectra are blue-shifted by ~750 cm<sup>-1</sup> and ~1700 cm<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, relative to the experiment. However, as pointed out already, such deviations are not untypical in calculations of electronic excitation energies with the methods used.

 $[\mathbf{UF}_6]^-$ . Due to the interest in the  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_{7'}$  LF transition, as it is the only one with significant magnetic dipole character, the MCD spectrum for this transition was calculated for  $[\mathbf{UF}_6]^-$  as well to evaluate the different LF of fluoride. The simulated spectra along with the experimental spectrum are shown in Fig. 5. Numerical data for this transition are collected in

Complex	RAS-SO			PT2-SO		
	$\Delta E_{\text{elec.}}{}^{b}$	$\Delta E_{\rm vib.}{}^b$	$C^{c}$	$\Delta E_{\text{elec.}}$	$\Delta E_{\rm vib.}{}^b$	$C^{c}$
[UCl <sub>6</sub> ] <sup>-</sup>	6988		$-0.476 \times 10^{-4}$	7048		$-0.501 \times 10^{-4}$
		7070	$0.156  imes 10^{-3}$		7130	$0.270  imes 10^{-4}$
		7102	$-0.208  imes 10^{-3}$		7162	$0.100 \times 10^{-6}$
		7289	$-0.190 \times 10^{-3}$		7349	$-0.954 \times 10^{-5}$
$[\mathrm{UF}_6]^-$	7279		$-0.524\times10^{-4}$	7506		$-0.510 imes10^{-4}$
		7413	$0.639 \times 10^{-4}$		7640	$0.399 \times 10^{-4}$
		7453	$0.575\times10^{-4}$		7680	$-0.160 \times 10^{-5}$
		7795	$0.139\times10^{-4}$		8022	$-0.248 \times 10^{-4}$

Table 1 RAS-SO vs. PT2-SO electronic and vibronic absorption energies corresponding to  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_7$  excitation<sup>a</sup> and MCD C-terms for  $[UX_6]^-$  (X = F, Cl) complexes

<sup>*a*</sup> H-T expansion of the zeroth-order wavefunction uses the experimental geometry. <sup>*b*</sup> Electronic ( $\Delta E_{elec.}$ ) and vibronic ( $\Delta E_{vib.}$ ) energies are in photon wavenumbers (cm<sup>-1</sup>). <sup>*c*</sup> MCD terms are in Debye<sup>2</sup>.



Fig. 5 The f-f LF MCD spectra of  $[UF_6]^-$ : top: the experimental LF spectrum. Middle: LF MCD spectra (5 K) calculated with RAS-SO using experimental structure for H-T expansion. Bottom: LF MCD spectra (5 K) calculated with PT2-SO using experimental structure for H-T expansion. Calculated  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_7$  transitions were Gaussian-broadened with FWHM = 25 cm<sup>-1</sup>,  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_8$  transitions were Gaussian-broadened with FWHM = 200 cm<sup>-1</sup>, and  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_6$  transitions were Gaussian-broadened with FWHM = 150 cm<sup>-1</sup>. The sharp and intense  $\Gamma_7 \rightarrow \Gamma_7$  LF MCD peaks are shown in the inset for clarity. The contributions of electronic and vibronic transitions are denoted with different colors in the underlying "stick spectra".

Table 1. The calculated RAS-SO spectrum is slightly red-shifted by ~100 cm<sup>-1</sup> while the PT2-SO spectrum is slightly blueshifted by ~120 cm<sup>-1</sup>, relative to the experiment. Both RAS-SO and PT2-SO predict the first negative peak is due to the magnetic TDM of the electronic transition while the higher energy peaks are vibrionic. Similar to  $[UCl_6]^-$  there is a feature at 33 cm<sup>-1</sup> that does not correspond to any vibrational frequency, therefore, it is not produced in the calculations. Similar explanations<sup>68,69</sup> as for the 23 cm<sup>-1</sup> feature in  $[UCl_6]^-$  apply here as well. The comparison of the calculated and measured spectra likewise show that fine structure details of the MCD can be assigned with the help of the calculations, but in some cases, even the signs of the vibronic peaks are challenging to obtain. For the MCD spectra simulated using  $O_h$  structure see Fig. S8 in the ESI.†

# Conclusion

Insight into the electronic structure of actinide complexes is critical to defining the roles of d- and f-orbitals in bonding and reactivity. Towards this goal, we have focused on the experimental and theoretical development of low-temperature C-term MCD spectroscopy to probe f-f transitions in the NIR region of U(v) O<sub>h</sub> complexes, which have been of longstanding interest for probing electronic structure, bonding, and covalency in 5f systems. C-term MCD spectra of the f-f transitions in  $[UCl_6]^-$  and  $[UF_6]^-$  (and additional non-halide  $O_h$ complexes) demonstrate the high-resolution low energy transitions that can be obtained with these methods, including additional fine structure facilitated by the signed nature of the transitions. In addition, theoretical methods were developed to calculate the experimentally observed spectra of the halide complexes from first principles, providing further insight into the origins of these transitions and their associated fine features. Overall, the spectra and simulations reported herein provide an important platform for the application of MCD spectroscopy to this widely studied class of U(v) complexes and identify areas for continued theoretical development.

# Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

### Acknowledgements

M. L. N. acknowledges support for this work from the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Early Career Research Program under Award DE-SC0016002. J. A. acknowledges support from the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences, Heavy Element Chemistry, grant DE-SC0001136 for the theoretical component of this study. S. G. M. was supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Chemical Sciences, Geosciences, and Biosciences Heavy Element Chemistry Program of the U.S. Department of Energy at LBNL under contract no. DE-AC02-05CH11231. S. A. K. acknowledges support from the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Heavy Element Chemistry program (2020LANLE372). LANL is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer managed by Triad National Security, LLC, for the National Nuclear Security Administration of the U.S. DOE. We thank the Center for Computational Research (CCR) at the University of Buffalo for providing computational resources.

## References

 Q. Sun, B. Aguila, J. Perman, A. S. Ivanov, V. S. Bryantsev, L. D. Earl, C. W. Abney, L. Wojtas and S. Ma, *Nat. Commun.*, 2018, 9, 1644.

- 2 I. Castro-Rodríguez, H. Nakai and K. Meyer, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2006, **45**, 2389–2392.
- 3 S. M. Mansell, N. Kaltsoyannis and P. L. Arnold, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2011, 133, 9036–9051.
- 4 V. Mougel, C. Camp, J. Pécaut, C. Copéret, L. Maron,
  C. E. Kefalidis and M. Mazzanti, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2012, 51, 12280–12284.
- 5 J. J. Kiernicki, M. G. Ferrier, J. S. Lezama Pacheco, H. S. La Pierre, B. W. Stein, M. Zeller, S. A. Kozimor and S. C. Bart, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2016, **138**, 13941–13951.
- 6 V. A. Volkovich, I. May, T. R. Griffiths, J. M. Charnock,
   A. I. Bhatt and B. Lewin, *J. Nucl. Mater.*, 2005, 344, 100–103.
- 7 W. B. Lewis, H. G. Hecht and M. P. Eastman, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1973, **12**, 1634–1639.
- 8 C. R. Graves, P. Yang, S. A. Kozimor, A. E. Vaughn, D. L. Clark, S. D. Conradson, E. J. Schelter, B. L. Scott, J. D. Thompson, P. J. Hay, D. E. Morris and J. L. Kiplinger, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2008, **130**, 5272–5285.
- 9 W. W. Lukens, N. M. Edelstein, N. Magnani, T. W. Hayton, S. Fortier and L. A. Seaman, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2013, 135, 10742–10754.
- 10 J. J. Kiernicki, C. J. Tatebe, M. Zeller and S. C. Bart, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2018, **57**, 1870–1879.
- F. Jollet, T. Petit, S. Gota, N. Thromat, M. Gautier-Soyer and A. Pasturel, *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter*, 1997, 9, 9393–9401.
- 12 S. W. Yu, J. G. Tobin, J. C. Crowhurst, S. Sharma, J. K. Dewhurst, P. Olalde-Velasco, W. L. Yang and W. J. Siekhaus, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 2011, 83, 165102.
- 13 S. M. Butorin, K. O. Kvashnina, D. Prieur, M. Rivenet and P. M. Martin, *Chem. Commun.*, 2017, 53, 115–118.
- 14 J. Su, E. R. Batista, K. S. Boland, S. E. Bone, J. A. Bradley, S. K. Cary, D. L. Clark, S. D. Conradson, A. S. Ditter, N. Kaltsoyannis, J. M. Keith, A. Kerridge, S. A. Kozimor, M. W. Löble, R. L. Martin, S. G. Minasian, V. Mocko, H. S. LaPierre, G. T. Seidler, D. K. Shuh, M. P. Wilkerson, L. E. Wolfsberg and P. Yang, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2018, 140, 17977–17984.
- 15 S. G. Minasian, J. M. Keithm, E. R. Batista, K. S. Boland, D. L. Clark, S. D. Conradson, S. A. Kozimor, R. L. Martin, D. E. Schwarz, D. K. Shuh, G. L. Wagner, M. P. Wilkerson, L. E. Wolfsberg and P. Yang, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, 134, 5586–5597.
- 16 T. Vitova, K. O. Kvashnina, G. Nocton, G. Sukharina, M. A. Denecke, S. M. Butorin, M. Mazzanti, R. Caciuffo, A. Soldatov, T. Behrends and H. Geckeis, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 2010, 82, 235118.
- 17 S. M. Butorin, K. O. Kvashnina, D. Prieur, M. Rivenet and P. M. Martin, *Chem. Commun.*, 2017, 53, 115–118.
- 18 M. A. Denecke, Dalton Trans., 2015, 44, 2606-2612.
- 19 S. M. Butorin, K. O. Kvashnina, J. R. Vegelius, D. Meyer and D. K. Shuh, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2016, **113**, 8093– 8097.
- 20 D. Prieur, F. Lebreton, P. M. Martin, M. Caisso, R. Butzbach, J. Somers and T. Delahaye, *J. Solid State Chem.*, 2015, 230, 8–13.

- 21 C. G. Gianopoulos, V. V. Zhurov, S. G. Minasian, E. R. Batista, C. Jelsch and A. A. Pinkerton, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2017, 56, 1775–1778.
- 22 A.-C. Schmidt, F. W. Heinemann, W. W. Lukens and K. Meyer, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2014, 136, 11980–11993.
- 23 H. S. La Pierre, A. Scheurer, F. W. Heinemann, W. Hieringer and K. Meyer, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2014, **53**, 7158–7162.
- 24 D. M. King, P. A. Cleaves, A. J. Wooles, B. M. Gardner, N. F. Chilton, F. Tuna, W. Lewis, E. J. L. McInnes and S. T. Liddle, *Nat. Commun.*, 2016, 7, 13773.
- 25 A. Formanuik, A.-M. Ariciu, F. Ortu, R. Beekmeyer, A. Kerridge, F. Tuna, E. J. L. McInnes and D. P. Mills, *Nat. Chem.*, 2017, **9**, 578–583.
- 26 K. Herasymchuk, L. Chiang, C. E. Hayes, M. L. Brown, J. S. Ovens, B. O. Patrick, D. B. Leznoff and T. Storr, *Dalton Trans.*, 2016, 45, 12576–12586.
- 27 A. J. Lewis, E. Nakamaru-Ogiso, J. M. Kikkawa, P. J. Carroll and E. J. Schelter, *Chem. Commun.*, 2012, **48**, 4977–4979.
- 28 H. Nakai, X. Hu, L. N. Zakharov, A. L. Rheingold and K. Meyer, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2004, 43, 855–857.
- 29 M. M. Abraham and L. A. Boatner, J. Chem. Phys., 1984, 81, 2528–2534.
- 30 L. K. Aminov, I. N. Kurkin and B. Z. Malkin, *Phys. Solid State*, 2013, 55, 1343–1363.
- 31 C. R. Graves, A. E. Vaughn, E. J. Schelter, B. L. Scott, J. D. Thompson, D. E. Morris and J. L. Kiplinger, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2008, 47, 11879–11891.
- 32 D. E. Smiles, G. Wu, P. Hrobárik and T. W. Hayton, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2016, **138**, 814–825.
- 33 N. H. Anderson, S. O. Odoh, U. J. Williams, A. J. Lewis, G. L. Wagner, J. S. Lezama Pacheco, S. A. Kozimor, L. Gagliardi, E. J. Schelter and S. C. Bart, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2015, 137, 4690–4700.
- 34 H. Ramanantoanina and M. Gruden, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, 2020, **120**, 26081.
- 35 S. Duhović, J. V. Oria, S. O. Odoh, G. Schreckenbach,
  E. R. Batista and P. L. Diaconescu, *Organometallics*, 2013,
  32, 6012–6602.
- 36 S. G. Minasian, J. M. Keith, E. R. Batista, K. S. Boland, D. L. Clark, S. A. Kozimor, R. L. Martin, D. K. Shuh and T. Tyliszczak, *Chem. Sci.*, 2014, 5, 351–359.
- 37 S. Knecht, H. J. A. Jensen and T. Saue, *Nat. Chem.*, 2019, 11, 40–44.
- 38 G. Liu, C. Zhang, S. M. Ciborowski, A. Asthana, L. Cheng and K. H. Bowen, J. Phys. Chem. A, 2020, 124, 6486–6492.
- 39 L. Zhang, B. Fang, G. Zi, W. Ding and M. D. Walter, Organometallics, 2017, 36, 898–910.
- 40 B. E. Bursten, L. F. Rhodes and R. J. Strittmatter, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1989, 111, 2756–2758.
- 41 J. Su, P. D. Dau, H.-T. Liu, D.-L. Huang, F. Wei, W. H. E. Schwarz, J. Li and L.-S. Wang, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, 142, 134308.
- 42 N. Edelstein, D. Brown and B. Whittaker, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1974, 13, 563–567.
- 43 R. Beekmeyer and A. Kerridge, *Inorganics*, 2015, **3**, 482–499.

- 44 N. M. Edelstein and W. W. Lukens, J. Phys. Chem. A, 2020, 124, 4253-4262.
- 45 G. Ganguly, D.-C. Sergentu and J. Autschbach, *Chem. Eur. J.*, 2020, **26**, 1776–1788.
- 46 D.-C. Sergentu, T. J. Duignan and J. Autschbach, J. Phys. Chem. Lett., 2018, 9, 5583–5591.
- 47 D.-C. Sergentu, F. Gendron and J. Autschbach, *Chem. Sci.*, 2018, **9**, 6292–6306.
- 48 B. R. Sook, D. R. Block, S. Sumithran, G. E. Montañez, K. R. Rodgers, J. H. Dawson, Z. Eichenbaum and D. W. Dixon, *Biochemistry*, 2008, 47, 2678–2688.
- 49 S. L. Daifuku, M. H. Al-Afyouni, B. E. R. Snyder, J. L. Kneebone and M. L. Neidig, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2014, 136, 9132–9143.
- 50 S. Hong, K. D. Sutherlin, J. Park, E. Kwon, M. A. Siegler, E. I. Solomon and W. Nam, *Nat. Commun.*, 2014, 5, 5440.
- 51 H.-D. Amberger, H. Reddmann and N. M. Edelstein, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 1987, 139, 339.
- 52 S. De Houwer, K. Servaes and C. Görller-Walrand, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2003, 5, 1164–1168.
- 53 J. T. Coutinho, M. Perfetti, J. J. Baldoví, M. A. Antunes, P. P. Hallmen, H. Bamberger, I. Crassee, M. Orlita, M. Almeida, J. van Slageren and L. C. J. Pereira, *Chem. – Eur. J.*, 2019, 25, 1758–1766.
- 54 N. J. Wolford, D.-C. Sergentu, W. W. Brennessel, J. Autschbach and M. L. Neidig, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2019, 58, 10266–10270.
- 55 N. J. Wolford, X. Yu, S. C. Bart, J. Autschbach and M. L. Neidig, *Dalton Trans.*, 2020, **49**, 14401–14410.
- 56 F. Gendron, V. E. Fleischauer, T. J. Duignan, B. L. Scott, M. W. Löble, S. K. Cary, S. A. Kozimor, H. Bolvin, M. L. Neidig and J. Autschbach, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2017, **19**, 17300–17313.
- 57 M. J. Reisfeld and G. A. Crosby, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1965, 4, 65–70.
- 58 S. Fortier, G. Wu and T. W. Hayton, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2009, 48, 3000–3011.
- 59 S. Fortier, J. R. Walensky, G. Wu and T. W. Hayton, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2011, 133, 11732–11743.
- 60 L. A. Seaman, G. Wu, N. Edelstein, W. W. Lukens, N. Magnani and T. W. Hayton, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, 134, 4931–4940.

- 61 S. B. Piepho and P. N. Schatz, *Group Theory in Spectroscopy with Applications to Magnetic Circular Dichroism*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1983.
- 62 Y. N. Heit, F. Gendron and J. Autschbach, J. Phys. Chem. Lett., 2018, 9, 887–894.
- 63 G. Ganguly, H. D. Ludowieg and J. Autschbach, J. Chem. Theory Comput., 2020, 16, 5189–5202.
- 64 G. Orlandi and W. Siebrand, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1973, **58**, 4513–4523.
- 65 F. Aquilante, J. Autschbach, A. Baiardi, S. Battaglia, V. A. Borin, L. F. Chibotaru, I. Conti, L. D. Vico, M. Delcey, I. F. Galván, N. Ferré, L. Freitag, M. Garavelli, X. Gong, S. Knecht, E. D. Larsson, R. Lindh, M. Lundberg, P. Å. Malmqvist, A. Nenov, J. Norell, M. Odelius, M. Olivucci, T. B. Pedersen, L. Pedraza-González, Q. M. Phung, K. Pierloot, M. Reiher, I. Schapiro, J. Segarra-Martí, F. Segatta, L. Seijo, S. Sen, D.-C. Sergentu, C. J. Stein, L. Ungur, M. Vacher, A. Valentini and V. Veryazov, J. Chem. Phys., 2020, 152, 214117.
- 66 I. F. Galván, M. Vacher, A. Alavi, C. Angeli, F. Aquilante, J. Autschbach, J. J. Bao, S. I. Bokarev, N. A. Bogdanov, R. K. Carlson, L. F. Chibotaru, J. Creutzberg, N. Dattani, M. G. Delcey, S. S. Dong, A. Dreuw, L. Freitag, L. M. Frutos, L. Gagliardi, F. Gendron, A. Giussani, L. González, G. Grell, M. Guo, C. E. Hoyer, M. Johansson, S. Keller, S. Knecht, G. Kovačević, E. Källman, G. Li Manni, M. Lundberg, Y. Ma, S. Mai, J. P. Malhado, P. Å. Malmqvist, P. Marquetand, S. A. Mewes, J. Norell, M. Olivucci, M. Oppel, Q. M. Phung, K. Pierloot, F. Plasser, M. Reiher, A. M. Sand, I. Schapiro, P. Sharma, C. J. Stein, L. K. Sørensen, D. G. Truhlar, M. Ugandi, L. Ungur, A. Valentini, S. Vancoillie, V. Veryazov, O. Weser, T. A. Wesołowski, P.-O. Widmark, S. Wouters, A. Zech, J. P. Zobel and R. Lindh, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2019, 15, 5925–5964.
- 67 S. G. Minasian, J. M. Keith, E. R. Batista, K. S. Boland, D. L. Clark, S. D. Conradson, S. A. Kozimor, R. L. Martin, D. E. Schwarz, D. K. Shuh, G. L. Wagner, M. P. Wilkerson, L. E. Wolfsberg and P. Yang, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, 134, 5586–5597.
- 68 H. G. Hecht, J. G. Malm, J. Foropoulos and W. T. Carnall, J. Chem. Phys., 1986, 84, 3653–3662.
- 69 K. Ohwada, Appl. Spectrosc., 1990, 44, 844-848.