### Construction of Multifunctional Cubeoctahedra via Coordination-Driven Self-Assembly

Koushik Ghosh<sup>†</sup>, Jiming Hu<sup> $\dagger,\phi$ </sup>, Henry S. White<sup> $\dagger$ \*</sup>, Peter J. Stang<sup> $\dagger$ \*</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Department of Chemistry, University of Utah, 315 South 1400 East, Room, 2020, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84112 <sup>ф</sup>Department of Chemistry, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China stang@chem.utah.edu

# **Table of Contents**

The Synthesis of Compounds <b>4</b> and <b>5</b>	S2
<sup>1</sup> H and <sup>31</sup> P NMR Spectra of cubeoctahedra <b>4</b> and <b>5</b>	.S3
ESI Mass Spectra of 4	.S9
PGSE experiments	.S11
Electrochemical Measurements	.S12
Computational Procedures and Calculated Models for 5, 6 and 7	S15

#### **General Procedure for the Preparation of Cubeoctahedra 4 and 5:**

To a 0.5 mL acetone- $d_6$  solution triflate (for 1, 5.0 mg, 0.0037 mmol; for 2, 3.95mg, 0.0037 mmol) was added a 0.5 mL CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> solution of the tritopic donor precursor **3** drop by drop with continuous stirring (10 min). The reaction mixture was stirred for 12 hrs at room temperature. The solution was evaporated to dryness, and the product was collected. **4.** Yield: 6.54 mg (orange solid), 95%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, 500 MHz):  $\delta$  = 8.81 (d, 48H, H<sub>a</sub>-Py), 8.08 (s, 24H, Ar-H), 7.96 (s, 48H, Ar*H*), 7.12-6.99 (m, 36H, Ar*H*), 4.96 (s, 24H, H<sub>Fc</sub>), 4.62 (s, 24H, H<sub>Fc</sub>), 4.36 (s, 60H, H<sub>Fc</sub>), 1.96 (m, 288H, PC*H*<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>), 1.25 (m, 432H, PCH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>). <sup>31</sup>P{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, 121.4 MHz):  $\delta$  = 16.9 (s, <sup>1</sup>*J*<sub>Pt-P</sub> = 2311.5 Hz). Anal. Calcd for C<sub>780</sub>H<sub>984</sub>F<sub>72</sub>Fe<sub>12</sub>N<sub>24</sub>O<sub>96</sub>P<sub>48</sub>Pt<sub>24</sub>S<sub>24</sub>: C, 44.17; H, 4.68; N, 1.59. Found: C, 44.20; H, 4.87; N, 1.57.

**5.** Yield: 5.71 mg (white solid), 98%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, 500 MHz):  $\delta$  8.66 (brs, 48H, H<sub>a</sub>-Py), 8.08 (s, 24H, Ar*H*), 7.86 (brs, 48H, H<sub>β</sub>-Py), 7.68 (s, 12H, Ar*H*), 7.1-6.89 (m, 60H, Ar*H*), 4.23-4.08 (m, 96H, α-CH<sub>2</sub>), 3.91-3.85 (m, 96H, β-CH<sub>2</sub>), 3.75 (m, 96H, γ-CH<sub>2</sub>), 1.8 (m, 288H, PCH<sub>2</sub>), 1.23 (m, 432H, PCH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>). <sup>31</sup>P {<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, 121.4 MHz):  $\delta$ =18.1 (s, <sup>1</sup>*J*<sub>Pt-P</sub> = 2729.31 Hz). Anal. Calcd for C<sub>948</sub>H<sub>1248</sub>F<sub>72</sub>N<sub>24</sub>O<sub>192</sub>P<sub>48</sub>Pt<sub>24</sub>S<sub>24</sub>: C, 46.75; H, 5.16; N, 1.38. Found: C, 46.87; H, 5.20; N, 1.41.

Figure S1. A)  ${}^{1}$ H and B)  ${}^{31}$ P NMR Spectra of cubeoctahedra 4 in CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>



B



**Figure S2.** A) <sup>1</sup>H and B) <sup>31</sup>P NMR Spectra of Cubeoctahedra 4 in Acetone- $d_6$ 



B.



**Figure S3.** A) <sup>1</sup>H and B) <sup>31</sup>P NMR Spectra of Cubeoctahedra 4 in  $CD_3NO_2$ 



В.



**Figure S4.** A) <sup>1</sup>H and B) <sup>31</sup>P NMR Spectra of Cubeoctahedra **5** in  $CD_2Cl_2$ 



**Figure S5.** A) <sup>1</sup>H and B) <sup>31</sup>P NMR Spectra of Cubeoctahedra 5 in Acetone- $d_6$ 



**Figure S6.** A) <sup>1</sup>H and B) <sup>31</sup>P NMR Spectra of Cubeoctahedra **5** in CD<sub>3</sub>NO2



Figure S7: ESI Mass Spectrometry of 4:



#### **PGSE Measurement:**

Pulsed gradient spin-echo (PGSE) NMR diffusion measurements were done by pulsesequence developed by Stejskal and Tanner<sup>1</sup>.

$$\ln(I/I_0) = -\gamma_X^2 \delta^2 G^2 (\Delta - \delta/3) D \tag{1}$$

 $\begin{array}{l} \gamma_{\rm X} = {\rm gyromagnetic\ ratio\ of\ the\ X\ nucleus;}\\ \delta = {\rm length\ of\ the\ gradient\ pulse;} \quad G = {\rm gradient\ strength;}\\ \Delta = {\rm delay\ between\ the\ midpoints\ of\ the\ gradients;}\\ D = {\rm diffusion\ coefficient} \end{array}$ 

**Temp:** 298K

Instrument: Inova 500 MHz

**Stokes-Einstein Equation:** The molecular size is obtained from the diffusion coefficient via the Stokes-Einstein equation where  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant, T is the absolute temperature and  $r_H$  is the hydrodynamic radius of the species under investigation.

$$D = \frac{k_B T}{6\pi \eta r}$$

**Gradient Calibration:** The gradient strengths need to be carefully calibrated to obtain accurate D values to fit equation 1. Gradient strengths were calibrated using the width (in Hz) of a sample of known length along the NMR-tube (Z) axis, back-calculation of the coil constant from a diffusion experiment on D<sub>2</sub>O using D =  $1.9 \times 10^{-5} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$  for D<sub>2</sub>O at  $298\text{K}^2$  was used to calculate the gradient strengths of both the probes. **Issue of Viscosity:** The effect of variable viscosity in different batch of same solvents was examined using the D values observed for the residual protons of the solvent resonance.

Pulse sequence: Stejskal-Tanner Pulse sequence



## **Diffusion Coefficients in different solvents:**

_			
	D <sub>acetone</sub> (10 <sup>-6</sup> cm <sup>2</sup> /s)	D <sub>dichloromethane</sub> (10 <sup>-6</sup> cm <sup>2</sup> /s)	D <sub>nitromethane</sub> (10 <sup>-6</sup> cm <sup>2</sup> /s)
4	2.12 ± 0.1	1.59 ± 0.2	1.1 ± 0.1
5	1.82 ± 0.1	1.45 ± 0.1	0.92 ± 0.1

### **Cyclic Voltammetry.**

Cyclic voltammetry (CV) was performed in a Faraday cage using a 3-electrode cell and a potentiostat (Pine Instrument Co., RDE4). The working electrode was a platinum disk embedded in glass with surface area of about 1 mm<sup>2</sup>. A Ag/AgCl (3.0M KCl) electrode was used as reference electrode and a Pt wire as the counter. Voltammetric data were recorded using in-house virtual instrumentation written in LabVIEW 8.0 (National Instrument).

The CV measurements were carried out in a acetone solution containing 0.1 M tetra-*n*-butylammonium hexafluorophosphate (*n*-Bu<sub>4</sub>NPF<sub>6</sub>). The concentration of redox molecule in solution was: (4) cubeoctahedra,  $2.0 \times 10^{-6}$  M, Scan rates are indicated in the figures.



**Figure S8.** Cyclic voltammetric response of  $2.0 \times 10^{-6}$  M cubeoctahedra **4** in acetone containing 0.1M *n*-Bu<sub>4</sub>NPF<sub>6</sub>.

### Steady-State Measurements using Pt microdisk electrodes.

Steady-state voltammetric measurements were made using the same solution, but a two electrode compartment using a 26  $\mu$ m diameter Pt disk with the diameter of as the working and a Ag/AgCl electrode as the counter and reference). A PAR (Princeton Applied Research) model 175 Universal Programmer and Dagan Cornerstone Chem-Clamp Potentiostat were used for potential generation and current measurement, respectively. The size of this micro-Pt disk was determined by steady-state voltammetric measurement using an acetonitrile solution containing 5.0 mM ferrocene and 0.1M TBAPF<sub>6</sub>.

. The limiting current can be calculated from the equation:

$$i_{\rm lim} = 4nFDaC\theta_{\rm sites} \tag{1}$$

where *n* is the number of electrons transferred per ferrocene (=1), F is the Faraday constant C is the bulk concentration,  $\theta_{\text{sites}}$  is the number of reacting ferrocenyl sites per the redox molecule, and *a* is the radius of the electrode.

To determine if the oxidation of the compounds correspond to independent serial electron transfer reactions, the current function  $\log[(i_{lim}-i)/i]$  from the steady-state voltammograms was plotted vs *E*. For this compound, the slope (ca 1mV) corresponded closely to the one-electron value, (59 mV for n = 1) supporting the conclusion that oxidation of the ferrocenyl groups occurs independently of one another.



**Figure S9.** Plot of  $\log[(i_{\text{lim}}-i)/i]$  vs *E* from the steady-state measurements using a Pt microelectrode: Dots are the experimental data and black lines represent best fit lines to the data.

#### **Chronoamperometry Measurements**

Chronoamperometry was performed by stepping the electrode potential from a value where no electron transfer occurred to a value where the oxidation of the redox molecule was diffusion limited. The normalized time-dependent current with respect to the steady-state limiting current ( $i_{lim}$ ) of a microdisk can be expressed as:<sup>3</sup>

$$\frac{i(t)}{i_{\rm lim}} = 1 + (2/\pi^{3/2})a(Dt)^{-1/2}$$

Thus, by plotting  $i(t)/i_{\text{lim}}$  vs  $t^{-1/2}$ , *D* can be evaluated from the slope when *a* is known. Figure S7 shows two examples of  $i(t)/i_{\text{lim}}$  vs  $t^{-1/2}$  plots. The fitted slope value is 0.365 (s<sup>0.5</sup>). D is then calculated from equation (4) as  $2.18 \times 10^{-6} \text{cm}^2$ /s. By using D value,  $\theta_{\text{sites}}$  can be obtained from Eq. (3).



**Figure S10.** Plot of the experimental ratio  $i(t)/i_{\text{lim}} \text{ vs } t^{-1/2}$  for the oxidation of **4** in acetone containing 0.1M *n*-Bu<sub>4</sub>N<sup>+</sup>PF<sub>6</sub><sup>-</sup> using a 13µm microelectrode.

## **Molecular Modeling Procedures:**

The molecular structures of multiferrocene complex **4** and multi-crownether complex **5** were constructed within the input mode of the program Maestro v8.0.110 with the OPLS force-field.<sup>4</sup> and MMFF force field respectively. A 1.0 ns molecular dynamics simulation (0.05 fs timestep) at a simulation temperature of 300 K was used to equilibrate each structure. Following each molecular dynamics simulation a full energy minimization was used to obtain the final optimized structures.



**Figure S11.** Simulated molecular model of multiferrocene **4** optimized with the OPLS force-field. All other hydrogen atoms have been removed for clarity.



**Figure S12.** Simulated molecular model of multicrownether **5** optimized with the MMFF force-field. All other hydrogen atoms have been removed for clarity.

### **References:**

- 1. Stejskal, E. O.; Tanner, J. E. J. Chem. Phys. 1965, 42, 288.
- 2. Longsworth, L. G. J. Phys. Chem. 1960, 64, 1914.
- 3. Denault, G.; Mirkin, M. Bard, A. J.; J. Electroanal. Chem., 1991, 308, 27

4. Mohamadi, F.; Richards, N. G. J.; Guida, W. C.; Liskamp, R.; Lipton, M.; Caufield, C.;

Chang, G.; Hendrickson, T.; Still, W. C. J. Comput. Chem. 1990, 11, 440.

1.