View Article Online View Journal

Journal of Materials Chemistry C

Accepted Manuscript

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: Z. Jiang, L. Sun, Q. Yang, B. Yin, H. Ke, J. Han, Q. Wei, G. Xie and S. Chen, *J. Mater. Chem. C*, 2018, DOI: 10.1039/C8TC00353J.



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

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

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the **author guidelines**.

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



rsc.li/materials-c

Published on 14 March 2018. Downloaded by University of California - Santa Barbara on 16/03/2018 05:26:09.

YAL SOCIETY CHEMISTRY

Journal Name

ARTICLE

Received 00th January 20xx, Accepted 00th January 20xx

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/

Excess axial electrostatic repulsion as a criterion for pentagonal bipyramidal Dy^{III} single-ion magnets with high U_{eff} and T_B

Zhijie Jiang,[‡] Lin Sun,[‡] Qi Yang, Bing Yin,^{*} Hongshan Ke, Jing Han, Qing Wei, Gang Xie and Sanping Chen^{*}

In this work, the large excess of the electrostatic repulsion, arising from the axial ligands, over that from the equatorial ligands is taken as the designing strategy for high performance pentagonal bipyramidal (PBP) Dy^{III} single-ion magnets (SIMs). Under this strategy, two PBP Dy^{III} -SIMs (1 and 2) [Dy(bbpen-CH₃)X] (X = Cl, 1; Br, 2; H₂bbpen = N,N'-bis(2-hydroxybenzyl)-N,N'-bis(2-methylpyridyl)ethylenediamine) were synthesized and structurally characterized on basis of highly symmetrical ligand H₂bbpen-CH₃ where an electron-donating group (-CH₃) was installed to favor the conformation necessary for the axial oxygen atom coordinating to Dy^{III} . Dynamic magnetic measurement verify the value of our design strategy since complex 2 exhibits high performance with large U_{eff} (above 1000 K) and high magnetic hysteresis temperature (15 K). Ab initio calculations further verified the importance of the high excess of axial interaction which eventually leads to the special electronic structure conceiving desired magnetic properties. The search for excessive axial repulsion is not controversial to the strategy based on local symmetry around the central ion since various high-performance PBP Dy^{III}-SIMs of both clearly distorted and nearly ideal geometries successfully acquire such kind of excess. Apparently this study presents an alternative of designing strategy for promising SIMs.

Introduction

Slow relaxation of magnetization in bistable magnetic molecules, leading to effective magnetization blocking, is widely accepted as the origin of single-molecule magnets (SMMs),¹ which have great application potential in various fields, e.g., quantum computing² spin-based electronics³ and high-density storage of information.⁴ Monometallic SMM, which is also denoted as single-ion magnet (SIM) in which only one central metal ion exists, is a concise target suitable for the studies digging into the fundamental comprehension of the SMM properties.⁵ This is because of not only is the intermolecular interaction is-usually negligible in SIM but also the fact that many recent breakthroughs in this field arise from SIM systems. Thus, the deep comprehension of SIM systems will not only increase knowledge of molecular magnet but also promote the ultimate application of SMM in our real life.

Among this recent progress, Dy^{III}-SIMs of pentagonal bipyramidal (PBP) geometry has their important

[‡] These authors contributed equally to this work.

contributions.^{5c, 5d, 5e, 5f, 5g} The first reports of SIMs that own the barrier for the reversal of magnetization (U_{eff}) over 1000 K^{5c} and the blocking temperatures (T_{B}) around 20 K^{5d} both belong to this group of the complex. Actually, the highest U_{eff} of PBP Dy^{III}-SIMs is 1837 K,^{5e} which still keeps the current record among all the SIMs.

These high-performance PBP Dy^{III}-SIMs are usually deemed to arise from the possible high local symmetry of the Dy^{III} ion since the coordination geometries of some of them are verified to be close to a D_{sh} point group. However, if all the reported PBP Dy^{III}-SIMs are subjected to the detailed continuous shape measurements (CShM), their SMM properties are not monotonously related to their degree of closeness to the perfect PBP (Figure S23). An even larger puzzle indeed exists because the coordination geometries of some high-performance SIMs are actually further away from perfect PBP when compared with those of similar structures but inferior SMM property.⁶

For Dy^{III}-SIMs, the high axiality of all the Kramers doublets (KDs), especially the ground one, and a high degree of the colinearity of the magnetic easy axis of various KDs could effectively suppress the unwanted fast relaxation, e.g., quantum tunneling of magnetization (QTM) and direct process.⁷ Under these circumstances, large crystal field splitting will provide high U_{eff} that eventually leads to long relaxation time and high T_B for SMMs.⁷ The KDs of the Dy^{III}-SIM could be well described as the combinations of the components of the ground ${}^{6}H_{15/2}$ multiplet of Dy^{III}, i.e., |m> where m ranges from -15/2 to +15/2.⁷ Under this

Key Laboratory of Synthetic and Natural Functional Molecule Chemistry of Ministry of Education, College of Chemistry and Materials Science Northwest University Institution, Xi'an 710069 (P.R. China)

^{*}Email: sanpingchen@126.com; rayinyin@nwu.edu.cn

⁽ESI) Electronic supplementary information available: structure, magnetism, ab initio calculation, magnetic interaction analysis, Fig. S1-S32, Table S1-S8, the crystal information files of complexes 1, 2. CCDC 1583475 1583474 for 2. for 1. For ESI and crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format see DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x.

ARTICLE

approximation, the perfect axiality, i.e., the ideal SIM, would be achieved if each KD consists of only one fixed |m> in a manner where the larger the absolute value of m, the lower the energy of the KD.⁸

Under ideal PBP geometry of $D_{\rm 5h}$ symmetry, only axial components of the crystal field Hamiltonian exist and they will make KDs the desired composition. Thus, the ensurence of perfect axiality from high local symmetry should root in its capability of achieving a special composition of the KDs. However, when $D_{\rm 5h}$ symmetry is actually unavailable for distorted PBP Dy^{III} complexes, is there any other driving force toward the special compositions of the KDs?

For Dy^{III} ion, the electron density of the pure $|\pm 15/2\rangle$ components is-of the oblate shape.⁹ Therefore, the stronger the stabilization of this aspherical electron density is, the larger the contribution of $|\pm 15/2\rangle$ component in the ground KD, i.e., stronger axiality, will be. In order to stabilize such oblate electron density, the electrostatic repulsion from the equatorial ligands should be smaller than that of the axial ligands as much as possible. In this way, distorted PBP Dy^{III} complexes, which are although apparently different from $D_{\rm 5h}$ symmetry, could still be expected to have good SIM properties if the large difference between the interactions from axial ligands and those from equatorial ligands exists. That is to say, the key is the consistency between the oblate electron density of Dy^{III} and the electrostatic repulsions from the surrounding ligands.^{6a}

Therefore, for the first time in this current work, the large difference between axial and equatorial electrostatic repulsion is taken as the designing strategy, leading to successful synthesis of two mononuclear Dy^{III} compounds of PBP local geometry. The magnetic properties of them are promising as the highest Ueff exceeds 1000 K and the magnetic hysteresis loop exists up to 15 K.

Experimental

Materials and measurements

All commercial reagents and solvents were purchased from Aldrich, Adamas and TCI. ¹H-NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker AV-400 or AV-100 spectrometer. Chemical shifts (δ) were reported in parts per million (ppm) are referenced relative to the residual solvent peak in the NMR solvent (CDCl₃: δ 7.26 (CHCl₃)). Data are represented as follows: chemical shift, multiplicity (s = singlet, d = doublet, t = triplet, q = quartet, m = multiplet), integration, and coupling constants in Hertz (Hz). The phase purity of the bulk samples was confirmed by powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) measurements executed on a Rigaku RU200 diffractometer at 60 kV, 300 mA, and Cu Ka radiation (I = 1.5406 Å), with a scan speed of 51 min ¹ and a step size of 0.02° in 2ϑ . Magnetic measurements were performed in the temperature range 2.0 K-300 K of 0 Oe, using a Quantum Design MPMS-XL-7 SQUID magnetometer on polycrystalline samples. The diamagnetic corrections for the complexes were estimated using Pascal's constants. Alternating current (ac) susceptibility experiments were

Synthesis



Scheme 1. Synthesis of the ligand H₂bbpen-CH₃.

performed using an oscillating ac field of 0 Oe at ac frequencies ranging from 0.1 or 1.0 to 1000 Hz. The magnetization was measured in the field range 0-70000 Oe.

Synthesis of the ligand H₂bbpen-CH₃:

Ethylenediamine (3.85 g, 64 mmol) was added to a solution of 5-methylsalicylaldehyde (16.3 g, 120 mmol) in ethanol (85 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature until the 5-methylsalicylaldehyde was consumed. The yellow precipitate was filtered off and dried in vacuo to give (1) as a yellow powder (16.7 g, 94% yield).

Sodium borohydride (5.1g, 135 mmol) was added to a stirred suspension of (1) (16.0 g, 54 mmol) in 200 mL ethanol in three batches. The mixture was stirred for 2 hours, and hydrochloric acid (150 mL, 1.0 mol·L⁻¹) was added dropwise. The white precipitate was filtered off and washed with water (3×10mL), ethanol (3×10mL), then dried in vacuo to give (2) as a white power (13.9g, 86% yield).

A suspension of (2) (3.0 g, 10.0 mmol) was treated with NaOH (20 mL, 1.0 mol·L⁻¹) and stirred until producing the mixture changed into a clear solution. 2-(chloromethyl)-pyridine hydrochloride (previously neutralized with NaOH (25 mL, 1.0 mol·L⁻¹)) (4.1g, 25 mmol) was added, the reaction mixture was heated at 85 °C for 3 h. After cooling down the white precipitate was filtered off and washed with water (3×5mL), cold ethanol (3×5mL), then dried in vacuo to give (3) as a white power (1.7g, 35% yield).

¹H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl₃): δ 10.56 (s, 2H), 8.55 (d, *J* = 4.3 Hz, 2H), 7.61 (td, *J* = 7.7, 1.7 Hz, 2H), 7.16 (dd, *J* = 11.1, 6.4 Hz, 4H), 6.94 (dd, *J* = 8.1, 1.5 Hz, 2H), 6.7-6.62 (m, 4H), 3.73 (s, 4H), 3.64 (s, 4H), 2.73 (s, 4H), 2.21 (s, 6H).

Syntheses of [Dy(bbpen-CH₃)Cl] (1):

A suspension of $DyCl_3 GH_2O$ (37 mg, 0.1 mmol) and $H_2bbpen-CH_3$ (48.3 mg, 0.1 mmol) in EtOH (5.0 mL) was treated. After stirring for 15 min, the resulting mixture was immediately filtrated, and the filtrate left to stand at room temperature for slow evaporation. Colourless blocky crystals were gathered after three days in a yield of 68% (based on Dy^{III} salts). Elem anal. calcd: C, 53.10; H, 4.75; N, 8.26. Found: C, 53.01; H, 4.73; N, 8.25.

Syntheses of [Dy(bbpen-CH₃)Br] (2):

2 | J. Name., 2012, **00**, 1-3

Published on 14 March 2018. Downloaded by University of California - Santa Barbara on 16/03/2018 05:26:09

Journal Name

To a solution of $H_2bbpen-CH_3$ (48.3 mg, 0.1 mmol) in acetonitrile (6 mL) was added triethylamine (0.2 mmol). After stirring for half an hour, the anhydrous DyBr₃ (40 mg, 0.1 mmol) solid was added, which was sealed in a 15 mL Teflon-lined stainless container and kept at 75°C for three days, and then cooled to ambient temperature at a rate of 5°C/h. To form colorless block crystals with a yield of 37% (based on Dy^{III} salts). Elem anal. calcd: C, 49.84; H, 4.46; N, 7.75. Found: C, 49.79; H, 4.42; N, 7.71.

X-ray single-crystal diffraction analysis

Single-crystal X-ray data for complexes 1 and 2 were measured at room temperature on a Bruker Smart Apex CCD diffractometer with a graphite-monochromatized MoKa radiation (I=0.71073 Å) by using a ω and ϕ scan mode. Cell determination and data reduction were processed with the SAINT processing program.^{13a} The absorption correction based on multiscan was applied in SADABS.^{13b} By using Olex2,¹⁴ the structures were solved by direct methods with SHELXS and refined by full-matrix least-squares techniques against F2 by using SHELXL-2014 programs.¹⁵ All nonhydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically. All hydrogen atoms were placed in calculated positions and refined isotropically. The crystal data and structural refinement parameters are summarized in Tables S7 and S8, Supporting Information, whereas selected bond lengths and angles for complexes 1 and 2 are listed in Table S9. These data are provided free of charge by the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre.

Computational details

Multi-configurational ab initio calculations, including spin-orbit coupling (SOC), were performed on the experimental structures of complexes 1, 1', 2, 2' (1' = [Dy(bbpen)Cl]), 2' = [Dy(bbpen)Br]),^{2c} and **3** (**3**; $[Dy(O^{t}Bu)_{2}(py)_{5}][BPh_{4}]^{2e}$ possessing the highest U_{eff} among the PBP Dy^{III}-SIM) to explore their magnetic anisotropy. This calculation consists of two steps:^{16a} (1) a set of SOC-free states, that is, spin eigenstates, are obtained by the CASSCF^{17a} method; (2) the low-lying SOC states, that is, Kramers doublets (KD), herein, are obtained by state interaction,^{16a} that is, diagonalizing the SOC matrix in the space spanned by the spin eigenstates from the first step. All calculations were carried out with the MOLCAS 8.0 program.^{17b} In the CASSCF step, the active space consisted of 9 electrons in 7 orbitals and all the spin eigenstates of 21 sextets, 224 quartets, and 490 doublets were included. In the subsequent state interaction, due to hardware limitations, only 21 sextets, 128 quartets and 98 doublet states were mixed by the RASSI-SO module.^{17c} The ANO-RCC basis sets^{17d, 17e} were used. The extraction procedure according to Chibotaru et al. was performed to obtain the g-tensors and transition magnetic moments of low-lying KDs with the SINGLE ANISO module.¹⁸

Results and discussion

Synthetic aspects

The electron-donating group -CH₃, at the 4-position of the phenol rings, is introduced in the H₂bbpen ligand^{2c} to increase the electron density of the axial atoms coordinated to Dy^{III} .

This journal is $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ The Royal Society of Chemistry 20xx

Crystal structures

Both complexes 1 and 2 crystallize in the monoclinic $P2_1/n$ space group without any crystallographic solvent molecules (Figures S3, S4, Table S1). CShM⁷ results indicate that the {DyO₂N₄X} cores of 1 and 2 are closest to PBP among all the ideal seven-coordinate geometries with the distortion of 2 (2.111) larger than that of 1 (1.824) (Table S3). Two negatively charged phenol O atoms coordinate to Dy^{III} ions in the axial direction with the Dy-O distance in 2 (2.141 Å) shorter than that in 1 (2.155 Å). The O-Dy-O angles of 1 (158.070) and 2 (159.400) are close to each other but clearly deviate from 180°. The five equatorial coordination sites are occupied by four N atoms and one Cl for 1 or Br for 2 through the long average Dy-N distances (2.586 Å for 2 and 2.591 Å for 1) and an even longer Dy1-Br1 (Dy1-Cl1) bond length of 2.852 Å in 2 (2.682 Å in 1) (Table S2). The Dy^{III} centers are isolated from each other by the bulky ligands: the closest distances between Dy^{III}...Dy^{III} ions are 8.479 Å for 1 and 8.470 Å for 2 (Figures S5, S6, Table S5). To foster further learning about intermolecular interactions in our system, the two-dimensional (2D)-fingerprint of crystals and the associated Hirshfeld surfaces were employed. Based on the analysis of Hirshfeld surfaces, the weak intermolecular interactions of the neighboring molecules are mainly H···H (1, 63.0%; 2, 62.6%), C···H (19.9%, 10.6%), Cl...H (7.4%, 8.0%), O...H (5.8%, both 1 and 2), C...C (2.1%, both 1 and 2), and N...H (1.5%, 1.4%) (Figures S7, S8).

Magnetic properties

At room temperature, the $\chi_m T$ values for **1** and **2** are 13.85 and 13.82 cm³ K mol⁻¹, respectively, lower than the expectation for a



Figure 1. Molecular structure for complex **2**. The equatorial plane of pentagonal bipyramidal coordination sphere is highlighted.

ARTICLE

Published on 14 March 2018. Downloaded by University of California - Santa Barbara on 16/03/2018 05:26:09.

free Dy^{III} ion (14.17 cm³ K mol⁻¹) due to the splitting of the ${}^{6}H_{15/2}$ ground multiplet (Figure S9). The non-superposition of the *M* versus *H*/*T* data on a single master curve suggests the presence of significant magnetic anisotropy and/or low-lying excited states (Figure S10). The maximum for χ_m " (1000 Hz) appears at 55 K and 62 K for complexes 1 and 2 in zero dc field, respectively, showing the strong frequency and temperature dependence (Figures 2, 3, S11-S14). Compared with Tong' work,^{2c} the maximum peaks appear at higher temperatures with lower ac frequencies (50K/60K with 1488Hz for 1'/2'), implying the improvement of SMM properties of our complexes.

For both complexes, the characteristic relaxation times are extracted using an extended Debye model (Figures S18-S21). The relaxation times τ extracted from the χ_m " peaks for complexes 1 and 2 at selected temperatures under 0 Oe and 2000 Oe. In order to further verify the domination of the Orbach process at high temperature, relaxation time vs temperature is plotted in log-log scale (Figure S22), whose slope indicates the Raman exponent is respectively n = 12 for complex 1 and n = 18 for complex 2. The anomalously large Raman exponents (n \gg 9)^{10, 11} exclude the possibility of the presence of the Raman process in the high-temperature range, suggesting the Orbach one is dominant. The relaxation times for complexes 1 and 2 at high temperatures obey an Arrhenius law ($\tau = \tau_0 \exp(U_{eff}/kT)$) with an effective energy barrier for relaxation $U_{eff}/k = 723$ K (502 cm⁻¹) and $\tau_0 = 1.02 \times 10^{-12}$ s







Figure 3. Temperature dependence of the out-of-phase in zero dc field (up) and magnetic relaxation (down) for complex 2.

for complex 2.

For the relaxation time products under 0 Oe, the direct process can be neglected. In the low-temperature range, the Raman process still plays an important role in the relaxation times. In addition, the $ln(\tau)$ versus 1/T plots for complexes **1** and **2** present some curvature (Figures 2, 3), indicating that the dynamics cannot be properly modeled assuming a simple Orbach mechanism. Therefore, the total relaxation rates mainly remain the Orbach process, Raman process, and QTM process, using the following equation (eqn (1)):

$$\tau^{-1} = \tau_{QTM}^{-1} + CT^{n} + \tau_{0}^{-1} \exp(-U_{eff} / kT) \text{ eqn (1)}$$

Where τ is the inverse of the ac frequency, T is the temperature of the maximum in the ac signal, U_{eff} is the effective energy barrier, k is Boltzmann's constant. τ_{QTM} , C, and τ_0 are the fitting parameters of the different relaxation mechanisms.

In the absence of a static field, the independence of the relaxation time at low temperatures for complex **1** is indicative of a QTM relaxation process. The fit in the temperature range T = 2-54 K for complex **1** by eqn (1) resulted in $\tau_{\text{QTM}} = 0.11$ s, n = 2.97, C = 4.60 × 10⁻³ s⁻¹K^{-2.97}, $\tau_0 = 2.36 \times 10^{-10}$ s, and an effective energy barrier of $U_{\text{eff}}/k = 723$ K (502 cm⁻¹) (see SEI for fitting details). The non-independence of the relaxation

4 | J. Name., 2012, 00, 1-3

This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 20xx

Published on 14 March 2018. Downloaded by University of California - Santa Barbara on 16/03/2018 05:26:09.

Journal Name

time at low temperatures for complex **2** indicates the absence of a QTM relaxation process. The fit in the temperature range T = 11-65 K for complex **1** by eqn (2) resulted in 3.15, C = 5.35 × 10^{-4} s⁻¹K^{-3.15}, $\tau_0 = 1.02 \times 10^{-12}$ s, and an effective energy barrier of $U_{eff} / k = 1162$ K (808 cm⁻¹) (see SEI for fitting details).

$$\tau^{-1} = CT^n + \tau_0^{-1} \exp(-U_{eff} / kT)$$
 eqn (2)

 T_{IRREV} , which is the point where the field-cooled (FC) and zero-field cooled (ZFC) susceptibilities diverge, is found at 12.1 K for complex **2** (Figure 4), which clearly outweighs the value of complex **2**' (9.5 K). Magnetic hysteresis (Figure 4) loops are clearly open at zero field up to 15 K for complex **2** (14 K for complex **2**') at an average sweep rate of 0.02 T s⁻¹ (time for a full cycle). For most SMMs $T_{\rm B}$ and $T_{\rm IRREV}$ are very similar, and observed differences have been assigned to a distribution of relaxation times.¹²

Either from the aspect of U_{eff} or from that of $T_{\rm B}/T_{\rm IRREV}$, the SMM properties of complexes **1** and **2** are clearly shown to be improved when compared with previously reported complexes **1**' and **2**', respectively (Table S8). Thus, the introduction of the



Figure 4. Variable-field magnetization data for complex 2, under field-cooled (FC) and zero-field-cooled (ZFC) conditions with a field of 2000 Oe (up). Magnetic hysteresis loops were measured at a sweep rate of 0.02 T s^{-1} from 2 to 15 K (down).

electron-donating group in the axial ligands should be an effective route to high-performance Dy^{III} -SIM. Furthermore, the U_{eff} and T_B of complex **2** is higher than that of complex **1** by 440 K and 6 K, respectively. These significant improvements may not be related to the local symmetry of the Dy^{III} ion as the distortion of complex **2** from ideal PBP is actually larger than that of complex **1**.

View Article Online DOI: 10.1039/C8TC00353J

ARTICLE

Theoretical analysis

For the sake of obtaining a deep understanding, ab initio calculations were performed for complexes 1, 1', 2, 2' as well as **3** (Table S8). All the g_z values of the ground KDs of the five SIMs are calculated to be approaching the Ising limit of 20 for Dy^{III} ion (Table S6) and thus they indicate the strong magnetic anisotropy of easy-axis type. The $g_{X,Y}/g_Z$ ratio, where g_{XY} is the averaged transversal g values, has been shown to be related to the axiality of a KD as lower ratio represents higher axiality.¹² As shown in Figure 5, the $g_{X,Y}/g_Z$ ratios of the five SIMs are consistent with their SMM properties in the aspects of either $U_{\rm eff}$ or $T_{\rm IRREV}$. The averaged transition magnetic moment within a given KD, μ_{OTM} , could be used to measure the strength of the corresponding QTM.^{10, 2a} The $\mu_{\rm QTM}$ of the ground KDs are also consistent with the SMM properties of the five complexes as smaller μ_{OTM} does relate with higher U_{eff} or T_{IRREV} . Furthermore, theoretical results indicate that the magnetic relaxation of complex 2 occurs via the third excited KD of which the energy



Figure 5. –log (g_{xy}/g_z) vs U_{eff} , TIRREV (up) and –log μ_{QTM} vs U_{eff} , T_{IRREV} (down), for complexes **1**', **1**, **2**', **2** and **3**.

Published on 14 March 2018. Downloaded by University of California - Santa Barbara on 16/03/2018 05:26:09.

Table 1. The results of preliminary ESP (in a.u.) analysis of the complexes 1', 1, 2', 2 and 3.

Complex	1′	1	2'	2	3
ESP(equ)/ESP(ax)	0.843104	0.834454	0.806634	0.788671	0.560832
ESP(equ_N)/ESP(ax)	0.513158	0.503873	0.515078	0.499460	-
ESP(equ_X)/ESP(ax)	0.329950	0.330581	0.2915556	0.2892119	-
ESP(ax)	-0.8286017	-0.8387386	-0.8315977	-0.8473232	-1.0174944
ESP(equ)	-0.6985974	-0.699889	-0.6707952	-0.6682597	-0.5706429
ESP(equ_N)	-0.425204	-0.422618	-0.428338	-0.423204	-
ESP(equ_X)	-0.273394	-0.277271	-0.242457	-0.245056	-

(1179 K) is quite close to the experimental $U_{\rm eff.}$ (1162 K) (Figures 6, S24). Therefore, the *ab initio* results here should be reliable and they demonstrate that the difference in the electronic structures of the five SIMs should be the reason for their different SMM properties.

With the calculated atomic charge, the electrostatic potential (ESP) felt by the central Dy^{III} could be approximated as the sum of contributions from two axial O atoms, ESP(ax), and those from five equatorial atoms, ESP(equ). The lower the ratio ESP(equ)/ESP(ax) is, the larger the excess of axial electrostatic repulsion over that from the equatorial ligands should be. This ration is calculated to be 0.843, 0.834, 0.807, 0.789 and 0.561 for complexes **1**, **1'**, **2**, **2'** and **3**, respectively (Table 1). All these ratios are significantly lower than one, which means the apparent excess of axial repulsion felt by the central Dy^{III} . This is consistent with the fact that all these five complexes are zero-field SIM of high U_{eff} . More importantly, the ESP(equ)/ESP(ax) ratio also accounts for the difference of the SMM properties among these five complexes as clearly



Figure 6. Magnetization blocking barrier in complex **2**. Exchange states are arranged according to the values of their magnetic moments (bold horizontal black lines). Arrows show the transition between the states, while the numbers above the arrows are the corresponding average matrix element of the magnetic moment (μ). Relaxation pathway is outlined by arrows containing the largest μ (blue arrows).

monotonic relation exists between this ration and either $U_{\text{eff}}/T_{\text{IRREV}}$ or *ab initio* parameter (Figures 7, S26-S30). Thus, ESP(equ)/ESP(ax) should be a useful parameter for the prediction of SMM properties of PBP mononuclear Dy^{III} complex.

The decrease of ESP(equ)/ESP(ax) ratio from complex 2' to complex 2 arises from the increase of the magnitude of ESP(ax) (0.83 a.u. for complex 2' vs 0.85 a.u. for complex 2) since the ESP(equ) nearly remains to be 0.67 a.u. Therefore, the ESP results do verify the importance of introducing electron-donating group in the axial ligand. A similar situation also occurs from complex 1' to complex 1. In the comparison between complex 1 and complex 2, the lower ESP(equ)/ESP(ax) ratio of complex 2 could be mainly attributed to the decrease



This journal is $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ The Royal Society of Chemistry 20xx

Figure 7. ESP(equ)/ESP(ax) vs U_{eff} , T_{IRREV} (up) and -log A (down) for complexes 1', 1, 2', 2 and 3.

of the equatorial ESP contributions from Cl (0.28 a.u.) to Br (0.24 a.u.). Although the introduction of equatorial Br instead of Cl will lead to larger deviation from ideal PBP, the longer Dy-Br distance, as well as lower magnitude of the negative charge of Br, will reduce ESP(equ) a lot and then lead to significant increase of the axiality as well as SMM properties of **2**. Above all, the excess of axial electrostatic repulsion over the equatorial one should be a useful guide for the design of high-performance PBP Dy^{III}-SIMs.

It is highly worthy of denoting that, both the *ab initio* parameters and ESP analysis of **3** are consistent with the corresponding experimental observations (Figures 7, S26-S32). That is to say, a high excess of axial electrostatic repulsion is also achieved in **3**. The local geometry of **3**, being clearly different from the other four Dy^{III}-SIMs, is quite close to the ideal PBP geometry of D_{Sh} (Table S4). Thus, the design strategy from the aspect of ESP is not controversial to the strategy based on symmetry and we think these two strategies are actually consistent with each other.

Conclusions

In summary, under the strategy of pursuing high excess of axial electrostatic repulsion, two high-performance PBP Dy^{III} -SIMs were synthesized and characterized. The importance of this strategy is further verified by *ab initio* calculations and ESP analysis. This strategy is effective for both clearly distorted and nearly ideal PBP geometries and it should play an important role in the design of high-performance PBP Dy^{III} -SIMs. Beyond that, in an effort to emulate the favourable SIM properties observed in this system, and encouraged by *ab initio* predictions, various groups (H₂bbpen, containing electron-donating (-OCH₃, -C(CH₃)₃) in the 4-position of the phenol rings) have pursued the use of ligands with even more high-performance PBP Dy^{III} -SIMs is ongoing in our groups.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant nos. 21673180, 21373162, 21673181, 21727805, 21473135 and 21103137).

Notes and references

 (a) R. Sessoli, D. Gatteschi, A. Caneschi and M. A. Novak, Nature, 1993, 365, 141; (b) A. Caneschi, D. Gatteschi, R. Sessoli, A. L. Barra, L. C. Brunel and M. Guillot, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1991, 113, 5873; (c) D. Gateschi, R. Sessoli and J. Villain, Molecular Nanomagnets, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006; (d) S. Thiele, F. Balestro, R. Ballou, S. Klyatskaya, M. Ruben and W. Wernsdorfer, *Science*, 2014, **344**, 1135; (e) M. Atanasov, D. Aravena, E. Suturina, E. Bill, D. Maganas and F. Neese, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2015, **289-290**, 177; (f) J. J. Baldov&, S. Cardona-Serra, A. Gaita-AriÇo and E. Coronado, Adv. *Inorg. Chem.*, 2017, **69**, 213; (g) S. Demir, J. M. Zadrozny and J. R. Long, *Chem. Eur. J.*, 2014, **20**, 9524; (h) K. S. Pedersen, J. Bendix and R. Clérac, *Chem. Commun.*, 2014, **50**, 4396; (i) S. T. Liddle and J. van Slageren, *Chem. Soc Rev.*, 2015, **44**, 6655.

- 2 M. N. Leuenberger and D. Loss, *Nature*, 2001, **410**, 789.
- 3 L. Bogani and W. Wernsdorfer, Nat. Mater., 2008, 7, 179.
- 4 M. Mannini, F. Pineider, P. Sainctavit, C. Danieli, E. Otero, C. Sciancalepore, A. M. Talarico, M.-A. Arrio, A. Cornia, D. Gatteschi and R. Sessoli, *Nat. Mater.*, 2009, 8, 194.
- 5 (a) G. A. Craig and M. Murrie, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2015, 44, 2135; (b) J. M. Frost, K. L. M. Harriman and M. Murugesu, *Chem. Sci.*, 2016, 7, 2470; (c) J. Liu, Y.-C. Chen, J.-L. Liu, V. Vieru, L. Ungur, J.-H. Jia, L. F. Chibotaru, Y. Lan, W. Wernsdorfer, S. Gao, X.-M. Chen and M.-L. Tong, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2016, 138, 5441; (d) Y.-C. Chen, J.-L. Liu, L. Ungur, J. Liu, Q.-W. Li, L.-F. Wang, Z.-P. Ni, L. F. Chibotaru, X.-M. Chen and M.-L. Tong, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2016, 138, 5441; (d) Y.-C. Chen, J.-L. Liu, L. Ungur, J. Liu, Q.-W. Li, L.-F. Wang, Z.-P. Ni, L. F. Chibotaru, X.-M. Chen and M.-L. Tong, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2016, 138, 2829; (e) Y.-S. Ding, N. F. Chilton, R. E. P. Winpenny and Y.-Z. Zheng, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2016, 128, 16305; (f) F.-S. Guo, B. M. Day, Y.-C. Chen, M.-L. Tong, A. Mansikkamäki and R. A. Layfield, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2017, 56, 11445; (g) C. A. P. G oodwin, F. Ortu, D. Reta, N. F. Chilton and D. P. Mills, *Nature*, 2017, 548, 439; (h) S. K. Gupta, T. Rajeshkumar, G. Rajaraman and R. Murugavel, *Chem. Sci.*, 2016, 7, 5181.
- 6 (a) M. Li, H.-P. Wu, Q. Yang, H.-S, Ke, B. Yin, Q. Shi, W.-Y. Wang, Q. Wei, G. Xie and S.-P. Chen, *Chem. Eur. J.*, 2017, 23, 1; (b) M. W. Willer, J. R. Long, C. C. McLauchlan and R. H. Holm, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1998, 37, 328.
- 7 L. Ungur and L. F. Chibotaru, Inorg. Chem., 2016, 55, 10043
- 8 S. G. McAdams, A.-M. Ariciu, A. K. Kostopoulos, J. P. S. Walsh and F. Tuna, *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, 2017, **346**, 216.
- 9 J. D. Rinehart and J. R. Long, *Chem. Sci.*, 2011, **2**, 2078.
- 10 R. Orbach. Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A. 1961, 264, 458.
- 11 K. N. Shrivastava, *Phys. Status Solidi B*, 1983, **117**, 437.
- 12 D. Casanova, M. Llunell, P. Alemany and S. Alvarez, *Chem. Eur. J.*, 2005, **11**, 1479.
- 13 (a) Bruker, SMART, SAINT, and XPREP: Area Detector Control and Data Integration and Reduction Software, Bruker Analy tical X-ray Instruments Inc., Madison, WI, 1995; (b) G. M. Sheldrick, SADABS, Program for Empirical Absorption Correction, University of Göttingen, Göttingen, 1996.
- 14 JG. M. Sheldrick, Acta Crystallogr. Sect. A, 2008, 64, 112.
- 15 O. V. Dolomanov, L. J. Bourhis, R. J. Gildea, J. A. K. Howard and H. Puschmann, J. Appl. Crystallogr., 2009, 42, 339.
- 16 (a) J. Luzon and R. Sessoli, *Dalton Trans.*, 2012, 41, 13556; (b)
 L. F. Chibotaru, *Struct. Bonding*, 2015, 164, 185; (c) A. Abragam and B. Bleaney, Electron Paramagnetic Resonance of Transition Ions, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1970; (d) D. Arav ena and E. Ruiz, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2013, 52, 13770; (e) J. M. Frost, K. L. M. Harriman and M. Murugesu, *Chem. Sci.*, 2016, 7, 2470; (f) Y. F. Deng, T. Han, B. Yin and Y. Z. Zheng, *Inorg. Chem. Front.*, 2017, 4, 1141.
- 17 (a) B. O. Roos, P. R. Tay lor and P. E. M. Siegbahn, *Chem. Phys.*, 1980, 48, 157; (b) F. Aquilante, J. Autschbach, R. K. Carlson, L. F. Chibotaru, M.G.Delcey, L. De Vico, I. F. Galvan, N. Ferre, L. M. Frutos, L. Gagliardi, M.Garavelli, A. Giussani, C. E. Hoyer, G. Li Manni, H. Lischka, D. Ma, P. A. Malmqvist, T. Muller, A. Nenov, M. Olivucci, T. B. Pedersen, D. Peng, F. Plasser, B. Pritchard, M. Reiher, I. Rivalta, I. Schapiro, J. Segarra-Marti, M. Stenrup, D. G. Truhlar, L. Ungur, A. Valentini, S. Vancoillie, V. Veryazov, V. P. Vysotskiy, O. Weingart and F. Zapata, R. Lindh, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 2016, 37, 506; (c) P. A. Malmqv ist, B. O. Roos and B. Schimmelpf ennig,

Journal of Materials Chemistry C Accepted Manuscript

View Article Onlin DOI: 10.1039/C8TC00353J **Journal Name**

Chem.

Phys. Lett., 2002, 357, 230; (d) B. O. Roos, R. Lindh, P. A. Malmqvist, V. Very azov and P. O. Widmark, J. Phys. Chem. A., 2004, 108, 2851; (e) B. O. Roos, R. Lindh, P. A. Malmqvist, V. Veryazov and P. O. Widmark, J. Phys. Chem. A., 2005, 109, 6575.

18 (a) L. F. Chibotaru and L. Ungur, J. Chem. Phys., 2012, 137, 064112; (b) L. F. Chibotaru, Adv. Chem. Phys., 2013, 153, 397.

This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 20xx

Journal of Materials Chemistry C Accepted Manuscript



44x32mm (300 x 300 DPI)