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ABSTRACT

Chapter 1

A comprehensive review of diiron modeling in the Lippard group over the past thirty years is presented. This account describes the different strategies employed to prepare biomimetic complexes of non-heme diiron protein active sites, highlighting the accomplishments of the past as well as the challenges for the future. Studies of various model systems have led to a more profound understanding of the fundamental properties of carboxylate-bridged diiron units and their reactivity toward molecular oxygen and organic substrates. The key principles and lessons that have emerged from these studies have been an inspiration for the original work presented in this thesis.

Chapter 2

A series of phenoxy/pyridyl and phenoxy/imine ligands, \( \text{H}_2\text{L}^{R, R'} \) (compounds derived from bis(phenoxy/pyridyl)diethynylbenzene, where \( R = \text{H}, \text{Me}, \) or \( t\)-Bu, and \( R' = \text{H}, \) or Ph) and \( \text{H}_2\text{BIPS}^{\text{Me,Ph}} \) (bis((phenylphenoxy)iminephenyl)sulfone) were synthesized as platforms for no-
heme diiron(II) protein model complexes. UV-vis spectrophotometric studies and preparative-scale reactions of \([L^{R,R'}]^2\) or \([\text{BIPS}^{\text{Me,Ph}}]^2\), where \([L^{R,R'}]^2\) and \([\text{BIPS}^{\text{Me,Ph}}]^2\) are the deprotonated forms of \(H_2L^{R,R'}\) and \(H_2\text{BIPS}^{\text{Me,Ph}}\), respectively, with Fe(II) revealed that the presence of sterically protective ortho phenol substituents is necessary to obtain discrete dinuclear species.

Reaction of \([L^{\text{Me,Ph}}]^2\) with Fe(II) in THF afforded the doubly-bridged compound \([\text{Fe}_2(L^{\text{Me,Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_3]\) (1), which was characterized in the solid state by X-ray crystallography. A large internal cavity in this complex facilitates its rapid reaction with dioxygen, even at −50 °C, to produce the thermodynamically stable \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(L^{\text{Me,Ph}})]\) (2) species. Reaction of \(^{18}\text{O}_2\) instead of \(^{16}\text{O}_2\) with 1 led to a shift in the Fe–O–Fe vibrational frequency from 833 cm\(^{-1}\) to 798 cm\(^{-1}\), confirming the presence of the \(\mu\)-oxodiiron(III) core and molecular oxygen as the source of the bridging oxo group. The \([L^{\text{Me,Ph}}]^2\) ligand is robust toward oxidative decomposition and does not display any reversible redox activity.

**Chapter 3**

A dinucleating macrocycle, \(H_2\text{PIM}\), containing phenoxylimine metal-binding units has been prepared. Reaction of \(H_2\text{PIM}\) with \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{Mes})_4]\) (Mes = 2,4,6-trimethylphenyl) and sterically hindered carboxylic acids, \(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2\text{H}\) or \(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2\text{H}\) (2,6-bis(p-tolyl)benzoic acid), afforded complexes \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{PIM})(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)_2]\) (1) and \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{PIM})(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_2]\) (2), respectively. X-ray diffraction studies revealed that these diiron(II) complexes closely mimic the active site structures of the hydroxylase components of bacterial multi-component monooxygenases (BMMs), particularly the syn disposition of the nitrogen donor atoms and the bridging \(\mu-\eta^1\eta^2\) and \(\mu-\eta^1\eta^1\) modes of the carboxylate ligands at the diiron(II) centers. Cyclic voltammograms of 1 and 2 displayed quasi-reversible redox couples at +16 and +108 mV vs. ferrocene/ferrocenium, respectively, assigned to metal-centered oxidations. Treatment of 2 with silver perchlorate
afforded a silver(I)/diiron(III) heterotrimetallic complex, \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{OH})_2(\text{ClO}_4)_2(\text{PIM})(\text{ArTolCO}_2)\text{Ag}] \) (3), which was structurally and spectroscopically characterized. Complexes 1 and 2 both react rapidly with dioxygen. Oxygenation of 1 afforded a (\(\mu\)-hydroxo)diiron(III) complex \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{PIM})(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)_2] \) (4), a hexa(\(\mu\)-hydroxo)tetrariron(III) complex \([\text{Fe}_4(\mu-\text{OH})_6(\text{PIM})_2(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)_2] \) (5), and an unidentified iron(III) species. Oxygenation of 2 exclusively formed di(carboxylato)diiron(III) products. X-ray crystallographic and \(^{57}\text{Fe}\) Mössbauer spectroscopic investigations indicated that 2 reacts with dioxygen to give a mixture of (\(\mu\)-oxo)diiron(III) \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{PIM})(\text{ArTolCO}_2)_2] \) (6) and di(\(\mu\)-hydroxo)diiron(III) \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{OH})_2(\text{PIM})(\text{ArTolCO}_2)_2] \) (7) complexes in the same crystal lattice. Compounds 6 and 7 spontaneously convert to a tetrariron(III) complex, \([\text{Fe}_4(\mu-\text{OH})_6(\text{PIM})_2(\text{ArTolCO}_2)_2] \) (8), when treated with excess H\(_2\)O. The possible biological implications of these findings are discussed.

Chapter 4

To investigate how protons may be involved in the dioxygen activation pathway of non-heme diiron enzymes, the reaction of H\(^+\) with a synthetic (\(\mu\)-1,2-peroxo)(carboxylato)diiron(III) complex was explored. Addition of an H\(^+\) donor to \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+} \cdot \text{O}_2\), where N-EtHPTB = anion of \(N,N,N^\prime,N^\prime\)-tetrakis(2-benzimidazolylmethyl)-2-hydroxy-1,3-diaminopropane) resulted in protonation of the carboxylate rather than the peroxo ligand. Mössbauer and resonance Raman spectroscopic measurements indicate that the Fe\(_2\)(O\(_2\)) core of the protonated complex \([\text{1} \cdot \text{O}_2]^+ \) is identical to that of \(\text{1} \cdot \text{O}_2\). In contrast, the benzoate ligand of \([\text{1} \cdot \text{O}_2]^+ \) displays significantly different IR and NMR spectral features relative to those of the starting complex. The \([\text{1} \cdot \text{O}_2]^+ \) species can be converted back to \(\text{1} \cdot \text{O}_2\) upon treatment with base, indicating that protonation of the carboxylate is reversible. These findings suggest that in the reaction cycle of soluble methane monooxygenases and related diiron proteins, protons may
induce a carboxylate shift to enable substrate access to the diiron core and/or increase the electrophilicity of the oxygenated complex.

**Chapter 5**

To explore additional methods to interrogate the properties of diiron protein intermediates, studies of the vibrational profiles of (μ-1,2-peroxo)diiron(III) species were pursued using nuclear resonance vibrational spectroscopy (NRVS). Comparison of the NRVS of \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{O}_2)(N-\text{EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}\) (1·O₂) to that of the diiron(II) starting material \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}\) (1) revealed that the oxygenated complex displays new frequencies above 350 cm⁻¹, which are attributed to the Fe–O–O–Fe core vibrations based on $^{18}\text{O}_2/^{16}\text{O}_2$ isotopic labeling studies. The peak at 338 cm⁻¹ has not been previously observed by resonance Raman spectroscopy. Empirical normal mode analysis provides a qualitative description of these isotopic sensitive modes. The NRVS of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O}_2)(\text{HB}(i\text{Pr}pz)_3)_{2}(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)]_2^+(4\cdot\text{O}_2, \text{where HB}(i\text{Pr}pz)_3 = \text{tris}(3,5\text{-diisopropyl-pyrazoyl})\text{hydroborate})\) was also measured and shows several \(\text{Fe}_2(\text{O}_2)\) modes between 350–500 cm⁻¹.

**Appendix A**

Attempts to prepare a diiron(IV) complex described in the literature led to several unexpected discoveries. Reaction of tris((3,5-dimethyl-4-methoxy)pyridyl-2-methyl)amine (R₃TPA) with iron(III) perchlorate decahydrate and sodium hydroxide afforded a (μ-oxo)(μ-hydroxo)diiron(III) \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) complex (1), rather than \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{OH})(\text{H}_2\text{O})-(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) (B) as previously reported. The putative diiron(III) starting material B is formed only at low temperature when excess water is present. Compound 1 hydrolyzes acetonitrile to acetate under ambient conditions. The acetate-bridged diiron compound, \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) (4A), was characterized by X-ray crystallography as well as
various spectroscopic methods and elemental analysis. The identity of the acetate bridged complex was confirmed by comparing the structural and spectroscopic characteristics of $4\text{A}$ to those of an independently prepared sample of $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu\text{-O})(\mu\text{-CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3$.
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Preface

The goal of synthetic modeling is to illuminate the underlying inorganic chemistry adopted by nature to achieve specific and complex transformations. A family of metalloenzymes that catalyzes the regio- and stereoselective oxidation of hydrocarbons using the earth abundant molecule O\(_2\) is the bacterial multi-component monooxygenases (BMMs). The BMMs are sophisticated biological machineries that require several protein components to function, including a hydroxylase that contains a diiron active site, a reductase that shuttles electrons from nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide (NADH) to the hydroxylase, and a regulatory protein that controls electron transfer and substrate oxidation. In addition to studying the biomolecules directly, our laboratory has employed a complementary approach using synthetic modeling to interrogate the structure and reactivity of the carboxylate-bridged diiron unit of the BMM active sites.

To place the work in this thesis into context, a chronological review of diiron modeling in the Lippard laboratory is presented in Chapter 1. This account highlights the various strategies utilized to prepare mimics of non-heme diiron protein active sites, with particular emphasis on rational ligand design. Despite the advances that have been made since the early 1980s, developing a functional protein mimic is still a significant challenge. To obtain a scaffold that can support a diiron core having the same coordination environment/geometry as that in the protein, a series of syn \(N\)-donor ligands were prepared. The diiron complexes assembled using these ligands, however, were too substitutionally labile to be useful as model compounds. Chapter 2 describes our attempt to prepare a more kinetically stabilizing ligand framework; the bis(phenoxylpyridine) and bis(phenoxylimine) ligands are anionic when deprotonated and form six-membered chelate rings upon complexation with iron. These ligands, however, spontaneously form bis(syn \(N\)-donor)diiron units when treated with iron(II) salts. To prevent undesired association of two syn \(N\)-donor ligands in a diiron complex, the two phenyl groups of the bis(phenoxylimine) compound were linked to afford a macrocycle, PIM\(_2\). Chapter 3 reports the synthesis and characterization of di(\(\mu\)-carboxylato)(PIM)diiron(II) complexes that are excellent structural models of the BMM active sites in their reduced state. The [Fe\(_2\)PIM] unit is stable under oxidizing conditions and accommodates changes in the binding mode of the carboxylate moieties upon reaction with O\(_2\). Although further modifications to the aryl groups of PIM\(^2\) are necessary to prevent formation of tetranuclear species, the macrocyclic framework is an important breakthrough in our goal to access more advanced diiron protein models.

To gain insight into the O\(_2\) reaction pathway, another research objective was to examine the characteristics of well-defined diiron complexes that mimic the oxygenated intermediates formed during the BMM catalytic cycle. Extensive biochemical studies revealed that the generation and activation of [Fe\(_2\)O\(_2\)] units in the BMMs occur through proton dependent processes. To interrogate the possible role of protons in the biological O\(_2\) reduction mechanism, the study presented in Chapter 4 explores the effect of H\(^+\) on the stability of a synthetic (\(\mu\)-1,2-peroxo)(carboxylato)diiron(III) model compound. Resonance Raman (RR), infrared (IR), nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR), and Mössbauer spectroscopic studies indicate that the carboxylate is protonated rather than the dioxygen moiety upon treating the synthetic [Fe\(_2\)O\(_2\)] complex with H\(^+\). These results suggest that during O\(_2\) activation in the catalytic cycle of the BMMs, protons might induce a carboxylate shift in the diiron core, possibly increasing the electrophilicity of the [Fe\(_2\)O\(_2\)] unit or facilitating substrate access to the active site.
Inspired by nuclear resonance vibrational spectroscopic (NRVS) studies of mononuclear iron complexes, we initiated a project to evaluate the feasibility of applying this technique to probe the vibrational profile of diiron protein intermediates. As described in Chapter 5, to obtain spectroscopic benchmarks for possible [Fe$_2$(O$_2$)] species that occur during the BMM reaction cycle, the vibrational spectra of two (peroxo)diiron(III) model compounds were recorded using the synchrotron facility at SPring8, Japan. For one of the compounds, $^{16}$O$_2$/$^{18}$O$_2$ studies revealed three isotopic sensitive peaks in the NRVS, one of which was not previously detected by RR spectroscopy. Normal coordinate analyses provide a qualitative description of the modes that involve vibrations of the [Fe$_2$(O$_2$)] core. These results suggest that NRVS may be a useful tool for studying diiron protein samples if an appropriate set of conditions can be met.

As a spectroscopic standard of an [Fe$^{IV}_2$(O)$_2$] unit for the NRVS studies described above, attempts were made to prepare a di($\mu$-oxo)bis(tris(pyridyl-2-methyl)amine)diiron(IV) complex that was reported in the literature. As summarized in Appendix A, our efforts led to several unexpected observations that prompted a re-evaluation of the identity of the diiron(III) precursor. Our data suggest that the ($\mu$-oxo)(hydroxo)(aquo)diiron(III) compound reported is only present in sufficient amounts in wet solvent at low temperature. Furthermore, the diiron(III) complex mediates hydrolysis of acetonitrile to acetate when H$_2$O is present. These findings raise some concerns regarding the purported generation of high-valent diiron(IV) species derived from the mischaracterized diiron(III) starting material.

Diiron modeling has been at the heart of our research program for many years and will continue to be a vital research area for many more. The sophistication of today’s chemical toolbox should enable synthetic chemists to overcome the obstacles that have previously limited significant advances in biomimetic chemistry.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>$\text{[Fe}^{\text{II}}_2(\text{Et}_2\text{BCQEB}^{\text{Et}})(\mu-\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_3]^+$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>$\text{[Fe}^{\text{II}}_2\text{Na}(\text{PIC}_2\text{DET})(\mu-\text{TrpCO}_2)_3]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32  \([\text{Fe}^\text{II}_2(L_{\text{Me,Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_2]\)  
33  \([\text{Fe}^\text{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(L_{\text{Me,Ph}})_2]\)  
34  \([\text{Fe}^\text{II}_2(\mu-\text{Ar}^\text{Tol CO}_2)_2(\text{PIM})]\)  
35  \([\text{Fe}^\text{III}_2(\mu-\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)_2(\text{PIM})]\)  
36  \([\text{Fe}^\text{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{Ar}^\text{Tol CO}_2)_2(\text{PIM})]\)  
37  \([\text{Fe}^\text{III}_2(\mu-\text{OH})_2(\text{Ar}^\text{Tol CO}_2)_2(\text{PIM})]\)  
38  \([\text{Fe}^\text{III}_4(\mu-\text{OH})_6(\text{PIM})_2(\text{Ar}^\text{Tol CO}_2)_2]\)  
39  \([\text{Fe}^\text{II}_2(\mu-\text{RCO}_2)_2(\text{bulk PIM})]\)  
40  \([\text{Fe}^\text{III}_2(\mu-\text{OH})_2(\text{RCO}_2)_2(L)(\text{bulk PIM})]\)  
41  \([\text{Fe}^\text{III}_4(\mu-\text{OH})_6(\text{bulk PIM})_2(\text{RCO}_2)_2]\)

Chapter 2

A  1-Benzylolxy-2-iodobenzene  
B  2-(2-Benzylolxyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine  
C  5-Bromo-2-(2-methoxyphenyl)pyridine  
D  2-Phenylanisole  
E  2-Bromo-6-phenylanisole  
F  5-Bromo-2-(2-methoxybiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine  
G  1-Benzylolxy-2,6-dibromo-4-methylbenzene  
H  1-Benzylolxy-2,6-dibromo-4-tert-butylbenzene  
I  1-Benzylolxy-2-bromo-4-methyl-6-phenylbenzene  
J  1-Benzylolxy-2-bromo-6-phenyl-4-tert-butylbenzene  
K  5-Bromo-2-(2-benzylolxy-5-methylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine  
L  5-Bromo-2-(2-benzylolxy-5-tert-butylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine  
M  2-(5-Methylbiphenyl-2-yloxy)tetrahydro-2\(H\)-pyran  
N  3-Bromo-5-methylbiphenyl-2-ol  
O  1-Benzylolxy-2,6-dibromo-4-methyl-benzene  
P  2-Benzylolxy-3-bromo-5-methylbenzaldehyde  
Q  2-Benzylolxy-5-methyl-3-phenylbenzaldehyde  
R  2-Hydroxy-5-methyl-3-phenylbenzaldehyde  
1  \([\text{Fe}^\text{II}_2(L_{\text{Me,Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_2]\)  
2  \([\text{Fe}^\text{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(L_{\text{Me,Ph}})_2]\)

Chapter 3

A  3,3’-[Oxybis(methylene)]bis(bromobenzene)
Chapter 4

1a \[\text{[Fe}^{II}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{12}\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\]
1b \[\text{[Fe}^{II}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{13}\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\]
1a\_O^2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{12}\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\]
1a\_O^2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{12}\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\]
1b\_O^2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{13}\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\]
1b\_O^2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{13}\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\]
[1a\_O^2]^+ \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{12}\text{CO}_2\text{H})]^3+\]
[1a\_O^2]^+ \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{13}\text{CO}_2\text{H})]^3+\]
[1b\_O^2]^+ \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{13}\text{CO}_2\text{H})]^3+\]
[1b\_O^2]^+ \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{13}\text{CO}_2\text{H})]^3+\]
2 \[\text{[Fe}^{II}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\]
2\_O^2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\]
2\_O^2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\]
[2\_O^2]^+ \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5\text{CO}_2\text{H})]^3+\]
[2\_O^2]^+ \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5\text{CO}_2\text{H})]^3+\]

Chapter 5

1 \[\text{[Fe}^{II}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}\]
1\_O^2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}\]
1\_O^2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}\]
2\_O_2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{OPh}_3)]^{3+}\]
3\_O_2 \[\text{[Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{-}\text{O}_2)(\text{Ph-bimp})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}\]
4-Br $[\text{Fe}^{II}(\text{HB}(i\text{Pr}pz)_3)\text{Br}]$

4 $[\text{Fe}^{II}(\text{HB}(i\text{Pr}pz)_3)(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)]$

$4^\cdot{}^{16}\text{O}_2$ $[\text{Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{16}\text{O}_2)(\text{HB}(i\text{Pr}pz)_3)_2(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)_2]$

$4^\cdot{}^{18}\text{O}_2$ $[\text{Fe}^{III}_2(\mu^{18}\text{O}_2)(\text{HB}(i\text{Pr}pz)_3)_2(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)_2]$

### Appendix A

A $[\text{Fe}^{III}\text{Fe}^{IV}(\mu-\text{O})_2(5\text{-Et-TPA})_2]^{3+}$

B $[\text{Fe}^{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{OH})(\text{H}_2\text{O})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+}$

C $[\text{Fe}^{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{OOH})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+}$

D $[\text{Fe}^{IV}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{OH})(\text{O})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+}$

E $[\text{Fe}^{III}\text{Fe}^{IV}(\mu-\text{O})(\text{OH})(\text{O})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{2+}$

F $[\text{Fe}^{III}\text{Fe}^{IV}(\text{O})_2(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+}$

G $[\text{Fe}^{IV}_2(\text{O})_2(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{4+}$

1 $[\text{Fe}^{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+}$

2 $[\text{Fe}^{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{OH})(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+}$

3 $[\text{Fe}^{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{CH}_3\text{CONH})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+}$

4A $[\text{Fe}^{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\cdot(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_3$

4B $[\text{Fe}^{III}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\cdot(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_2.5(\text{Et}_2\text{O})_{0.5}$
Chapter 1

Rationally Designed Synthetic Mimics of Diiron Protein Active Sites:

A Chronological Perspective
1.1. Introduction

Understanding the role of metal ions in dictating protein structure and function is a central theme in bioinorganic research. In addition to the arsenal of modern physical techniques and instrumentation available for studies of biomolecules, synthetic modeling has been pursued as a complementary tool to interrogate complex biological systems. It provides a convenient simplification of elaborate macromolecules in a real, rather than a virtual (e.g. computational), platform. By reducing a metalloprotein to its functional core, it is possible to gain insight into whether the chemistry that occurs at the metal center is predominantly a result of the inorganic component alone or a consequence of the protein complex as a whole. Synthetic modeling also provides an opportunity to access chemistry that has not yet been achieved artificially using simple biological building blocks under ambient conditions. Some of the most remarkable transformations in nature, such as nitrogen fixation, water splitting, and hydrogen production, are performed by metalloenzymes. Reproducing such chemical reactivity in an efficient manner would not only revolutionize the chemical industry but also provide new sustainable sources of energy. Finally, the synthetic challenges of modeling chemistry will push the limits of current synthetic methodologies. Although natural product synthesis has been largely aided by an understanding of organic chemistry, inorganic synthesis is not governed by the same set of well-defined rules. Controlling the nuclearity and kinetic stability of metal clusters or components using organic ligands is still a significant challenge.

Small-molecule metalloprotein mimics are prepared using one of two design strategies. The biomimetic approach seeks to duplicate the active site structure as faithfully as possible, particularly in matching the identity and geometric arrangement of ligands in the primary coordination sphere. The bio-inspired approach, on the other hand, only requires that the
synthetic model shares some common features with those of the protein core, unrestricted by the type or position of ligands coordinated to the metal center. For modeling studies, the former is preferred over the latter because biomimetic complexes more accurately reproduce the characteristics of the biological center under investigation.

The following is a chronological account of the strategies and tactics employed in the Lippard group to prepare structural and functional mimics of diiron protein active sites. This work will describe the rational basis for ligand design and selection as well as the notable findings that resulted from studies of the various model systems. The reader is referred elsewhere for more general reviews of synthetic diiron modeling.17-22

1.2. Non-Heme Diiron Proteins

Non-heme carboxylate-bridged diiron proteins are involved in essential physiological processes.23,24 Although their roles vary, the first step in their respective reaction mechanisms involves binding and activation of dioxygen. In hemerythrin (Hr),25 the O₂ molecule coordinates to a single iron site and acquires two electrons and a proton to generate a (hydroperoxo)diiron(III) unit (Scheme 1.1, top). This process is reversible and is the basis for O₂ transport in some marine invertebrates. Unlike hemerythrin, ribonucleotide reductase (RNR)26 and bacterial multi-component monooxygenases (BMMs)27 consume dioxygen to perform catalytic reactions (Scheme 1.1, middle and bottom, respectively). Activation of O₂ by these enzymes leads to formation of (peroxo)diiron(III) or di(µ-oxo)diiron(IV) complexes that are capable of oxidizing organic moieties.28-32 The high-valent diiron intermediate in the R2 subunit of RNR generates a tyrosyl radical that initiates the first step in DNA biosynthesis, whereas that in the hydroxylase component of the BMMs is responsible for inserting an oxygen atom into the
C–H bond of hydrocarbon substrates. The most well-studied member of the BMM family is soluble methane monooxygenase (sMMO),\textsuperscript{33} which is unique for its ability to hydroxylate methane to methanol. Recent studies have revealed that other classes of enzymes containing carboxylate-bridged diiron motifs also exist in biology.\textsuperscript{34-36}

\[
\text{Scheme 1.1. Dioxygen reactivity of hemerythrin (Hr, top), ribonucleotide reductase (RNR, middle), and soluble methane monooxygenase hydroxylase (sMMOH, bottom). The active site structures of the proteins in various redox states are depicted.}
\]

These diiron proteins contain two iron atoms that are coordinated by imidazole and carboxylate residues, where at least one of the carboxylate groups bridges the two metal centers.\textsuperscript{23} The structural similarities between the active sites of this protein family indicate that their functional differences are derived from variations in their Asp/Glu/His amino acid combinations and/or careful tuning of their tertiary and quaternary protein structures. Discerning
the factors that contribute to their mechanism of action is an important goal in synthetic model studies.\textsuperscript{19,20}

1.3. Mononucleating $N$-Heterocyclic Ligands

The first successful attempt to prepare a mimic of the Hr core was achieved using tris(pyrazolyl)borate ($\text{TP}^-$) (Table 1.1),\textsuperscript{37,38} a tripodal ligand commonly employed in inorganic coordination chemistry. Reaction of $\text{TP}^-$, iron(III), and acetate led to the spontaneous self-assembly of $\text{[Fe}^{\text{III}}\text{$_2$(µ-O)(µ-CH$_3$CO$_2$)$_2$(TP)$_2$]}$ (1), the structure of which closely matches that of metHr, the inactive form of Hr.\textsuperscript{25} Reaction of 1 with an H$^+$ donor led to formation of $\text{[Fe}^{\text{III}}\text{$_2$(µ-OH)(µ-CH$_3$CO$_2$)$_2$(TP)$_2$]}^+$ (2), a stable protonated analogue of 1.\textsuperscript{39} Spectroscopic and magnetic measurements of the (µ-oxo)di(µ-carboxylato)diiron(III) and (µ-hydroxo)di(µ-carboxylato)diiron(III) compounds provided, for the first time, benchmarks for identifying such units in biology.\textsuperscript{40,41} When 1 was exposed to H$_2^{18}$O, the $^{16}$O bridge was readily exchanged for $^{18}$O, indicating that a lack of exchange with water in the protein is due to inaccessibility of H$_2$O to the diiron core rather than an intrinsic property of the $\text{[Fe}^{\text{III}}$$_2$O] unit. An undesirable feature of 1 and 2 is that the facial capping nature of the $\text{TP}^-$ ligands blocks having open sites for binding of O$_2$. Furthermore, reduction of the diiron(III) species resulted in irreversible dissociation to monoiron complexes.\textsuperscript{38}

To access the asymmetric iron centers in Hr, the denticity of the capping ligand was reduced from three to two, using bis(1-methylimidazol-2-yl)phenylmethoxymethane (BIPhMe) (Table 1.1).\textsuperscript{42,43} Stirring iron(II) formate with BIPhMe in a methanol solution provided $\text{[Fe}^{\text{II}}\text{$_2$(µ-HCO$_2$)$_3$(HCO$_2$)(BIPhMe)$_2$]}$ (3). X-ray crystallography revealed a dinuclear structure with both five- and six-coordinate iron sites, in which each metal ion is bound by a BIPhMe ligand and bridged by three formate groups. A terminal acetate group completes the coordination sphere of
**Table 1.1. Various Ligands Employed to Prepare Diiron Protein Model Complexes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand/ Example of Iron Complex*</th>
<th>Desirable Characteristics</th>
<th>Undesirable Characteristics</th>
<th>Reference No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mononucleating N-Heterocyclic Ligands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP ([\text{TP}^\text{+}])</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/tp.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/tp_complex.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><em>Forms stable tripodal chelate with iron</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>N-donors similar to histidine residues</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Easy to synthesize</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiPhMe ([\text{BiPhMe}]^\text{+})</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/biphme.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/biphme_complex.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><em>Contains biomimetic imidazole groups</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Bidentate chelate allows assembly of asymmetric diiron unit with open sites</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Easy to synthesize</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dicarboxylate Ligands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPDP ([\text{MPDP}]^\text{2-})</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/mpdp.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/mpdp_complex.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><em>Enables assembly of [Fe(^{2+})O] units that could not be accessed using simple carboxylates</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XDK ([\text{XDK}]^\text{2-})</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/xdk.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/xdk_complex.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><em>Supports a diiron core with open sites for substitution with external bases</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Maintains a dinuclear structure upon reaction with dioxygen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph(_3)DBA ([\text{Ph}(_3)DBA]^-)</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/phi3dba.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/phi3dba_complex.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><em>Supports an [Fe(^{2+})(OH)] core with an open metal binding site</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Stabilizes an oxygenated adduct to the diiron center</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDK ([\text{PDK}]^-)</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/pdk.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/pdk_complex.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><em>Provides both a porphyrin and non-porphyrin binding sites</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The donor atoms highlighted in red in the iron complexes (second column) are derived from the donor groups, also shown in red, of the featured ligand (first column).
Table 1.1. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand/ Example of Iron Complex*</th>
<th>Desirable Characteristics</th>
<th>Undesirable Characteristics</th>
<th>Reference No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terphenylcarboxylate Ligands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar$<em>{2}$CO$</em>{2}^-$</td>
<td>Forms diiron complexes in the presence of Fe(II) salts and an appropriate base</td>
<td>The steric encumbrance of the 2,6-ary groups restricts access to the diiron core.</td>
<td>69-72, 74-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Terphenylcarboxylate Ligand" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Fe$<em>2$(Ar$</em>{2}$CO$_{2}$)$_2$(4-BuPy)$_2$]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Terphenylcarboxylate Ligand" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dinucleating Polynitrogen Ligands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPEAN</td>
<td>Contains a “masked carboxylate” to bridge two metal centers</td>
<td>Nitrogen-rich, rather than carboxylate-rich</td>
<td>95-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="BPEAN" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Fe$_2$(OH)(BPEAN)(SO$_3$CF$_3$)$_2$]$^{2+}$</td>
<td>Stabilizes diiron species in multiple oxidation states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="BPEAN" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bdptz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="bdptz" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Fe$<em>2$(OH)(bdptz)(Ar$</em>{2}$CO$_{2}$) (SO$_3$CF$_3$)(CH$_3$CN)]$^{+}$ (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="bdptz" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>syn N-Donor Ligands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Et$_2$BCQEB$^{El}$</td>
<td>Enforces the syn stereochemistry of nitrogen donors relative to the Fe–Fe vector</td>
<td>Neutral oxygen donors, rather than anionic</td>
<td>101, 102-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Et$_2$BCQEB$^{El}$" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Fe$<em>2$(Ar$</em>{2}$CO$_{2}$)$_2$(Et$_2$BCQEB$^{El}$)]$^+$ (30)</td>
<td>Accommodates binding of external carboxylates to the diiron core</td>
<td>Quinoline ester groups do not sufficiently stabilize the iron centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Et$_2$BCQEB$^{El}$" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>Contains a bridging carboxylate unit in addition to two adjacent amine groups</td>
<td>Not sufficiently pre-organized, could not metallate with iron</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="N.A." /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="N.A." /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The donor atoms highlighted in red in the iron complexes (second column) are derived from the donor groups, also shown in red, of the featured ligand (first column).
The donor atoms highlighted in red in the iron complexes (second column) are derived from the donor groups, also shown in red, of the featured ligand (first column).

the octahedral iron atom. Complex 3 reacts instantaneously with dioxygen to give [Fe\textsuperscript{III}2(µ-O)(µ-HCO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}(HCO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}(BIPhMe)\textsubscript{2}] (4), with no detectable intermediates. Manometric measurements indicated that 0.5 equiv of O\textsubscript{2} was consumed per diiron(II) complex, suggesting that 4 is formed through a tetraneuclear dioxygen species. Unfortunately, the behavior of 3 toward dioxygen is markedly different than that of deoxyHr, which binds O\textsubscript{2} reversibly (Scheme 1.1, top).\textsuperscript{25}

### 1.4. Dicarboxylate Ligands

To increase the structural integrity of the model compounds, several dicarboxylate ligands were explored as dinucleating platforms. The first of these is \textit{m}-phenylenedipropionate (MPDP\textsuperscript{2}, Table 1.1),\textsuperscript{44,45} which was selected because the distance between its β-methylene carbon atoms matches the 6 Å separation between the acetate methyl carbons in [Fe\textsuperscript{III}2(µ-O)(µ-CH\textsubscript{3}CO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}(TP)\textsubscript{2}] (1).\textsuperscript{37} The use of MPDP\textsuperscript{2} facilitated synthesis of [Fe\textsuperscript{III}2(µ-O)(MPDP)(bpy)\textsubscript{2}Cl\textsubscript{2}]

---

**Table 1.1. (Continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand/ Example of Iron Complex*</th>
<th>Desirable Characteristics</th>
<th>Undesirable Characteristics</th>
<th>Reference No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macrocyclic Ligands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA\textsuperscript{2+}CO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{2−}</td>
<td>• May help control the nuclearity of the resulting iron complex</td>
<td>• Metallation of this ligand was not successful</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIM\textsuperscript{2−}</td>
<td>• Supports a carboxylate-bridged diiron(II) unit</td>
<td>• Does not prevent formation of tetrairon species</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Fe\textsubscript{2}(Ar\textsubscript{Tol}CO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}(PIM)]\textsubscript{2} (34)</td>
<td>• Maintains a dinuclear core upon reaction with O\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>• Phenolate and imine donors are not biomimetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can be sterically tuned without obstructing access to the metal binding pocket.</td>
<td>[Fe\textsubscript{III}2(µ-O)(µ-HCO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}(HCO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}(BIPhMe)\textsubscript{2}] (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The donor atoms highlighted in red in the iron complexes (second column) are derived from the donor groups, also shown in red, of the featured ligand (first column).
(5) (bpy = 2,2’-bipyridine) and [Fe$^{\text{III}}_2(\mu$-$\text{O})(\text{MPDP})(\text{BIPhMe})_2\text{Cl}_2$] (6, Table 1.1), complexes that could not be obtained from self-assembly with simple monocarboxylate anions. The cyclic voltammogram of [Fe$^{\text{III}}_2(\mu$-$\text{O})(\text{MPDP})(\text{TP})_2$] (7), an analogue of 1, showed that mononuclear [Fe$^{\text{II}}(\text{TP})_2$] and [Fe$^{\text{III}}(\text{TP})_2$]$^+$ species were generated upon electrochemical reduction and oxidation, respectively. These results demonstrated that linking the carboxylate groups using MPDP$^{2-}$ does not impart additional stability to the diiron models.

To obtain a more stable bridging framework, $m$-xylenediamine bis(Kemp’s triacid)imide (H$_2$XDK, Table 1.1), a compound developed from studies of molecular recognition in organic chemistry,$^{46,47}$ was employed. The rigid conformation of the carboxylate units in XDK$^{2-}$ provides a well-defined cleft for assembly of homo- and heterodimetallic complexes.$^{48-51}$ A diiron(III) compound, [Fe$^{\text{III}}_2(\mu$-$\text{O})(\text{XDK})(\text{CH}_3\text{OH})_3(\text{H}_2\text{O})](\text{NO}_3)_2$ (8), was readily prepared from iron(III) nitrate and XDK$^{2-}$. $^{52}$ Kinetic studies of the substitution of 2,2’-bipyridine or $N$-methylimidazole with the coordinated solvents in 8 suggested that anion binding and exchange at the active site of hemerythrin proceed with rates similar to those exhibited by small-molecules; thus, the protein scaffold of Hr does not alter the intrinsic rate of terminal ligand exchange at the diiron center.

Preparation of a series of pseudohalide bound diiron(III) compounds, with the formula [Fe$^{\text{III}}_2(\mu$-$\text{O})(\text{XDK})(\text{bpy})_2(X)_2$] (where X = NCS$^-$, NCSe$^-$, or N$_3^-$), allowed detailed studies of the spectroscopic signatures of molecules with terminal ligation to carboxylate-bridged diiron units. $^{53}$ A notable discovery is that the appearance of only one asymmetric $^{15}$NNN$^-$ stretch is not sufficient to discount the possibility of a terminally coordinated azide group, for isotopically shifted peaks may occur too close to one another in energy to be resolved.

The XDK$^{2-}$ ligand also supports carboxylate-bridged diiron(II) units with the general composition [Fe$^{\text{II}}_2(XDK)(\mu$-$\text{RCO}_2)(\text{RCO}_2)(\text{N-donor})_2$], where R = $t$-Bu- (pivalate), PhCy- (1-
phenylcyclohexylcarboxylate), Ph- (benzoate), iPr- (isobutyrate), or tBuCH$_2$- (1-tert-butylacetate); $N$-donor = py (pyridine), 3-Fpy (3-fluoropyridine), $N$-MeIm ($N$-methylimidazole), or $N$-tBuIm ($N$-tert-butylimidazole).$^{54-56}$ More sterically-protecting XDK$^{2-}$ variants, containing either propyl (PXDK$^{2-}$) or benzyl (BXDK$^{2-}$) substituents in place of the methyl groups on the Kemp’s triacid moiety, were also successfully employed to assemble similar diiron(II) compounds. The asymmetric bridging mode of the ancillary carboxylate to the diiron(II) core is determined by both steric and electronic factors.$^{56}$ X-ray structural studies suggested that greater steric repulsion, between XDK$^{2-}$ and the external carboxylate, and more basic $N$-donors favor a syn,syn-bidentate bridging mode of the ancillary carboxylate rather than a syn,anti-monodentate one. For complexes that have sufficiently bulky groups, such as [Fe$^{II}_2$(XDK)(µ-PhCyCO$_2$)(PhCyCO$_2$)(py)$_2$] (9, Table 1.1), exposure to O$_2$ led to formation of stable peroxo adducts at low temperature.$^{56}$ Although these (peroxo)diiron(III) species could not be crystallized for X-ray diffraction analysis, resonance Raman measurements indicate that the dioxygen molecule is bound in a µ-1,2 fashion. Reactivity studies of the [Fe$^{III}_2$(O$_2$)] units revealed that they are nucleophilic,$^{57}$ rather than electrophilic like the oxygenated intermediates in the BMMs.$^{58,59}$ When warmed above -65°C, the [Fe$^{III}_2$(O$_2$)] species rapidly decayed, initiating a radical chain pathway that oxidized solvents with weak to intermediate C–H bond strengths. Despite having the same ligand stoichiometry as that of the (peroxo)diiron(III) species in sMMOH (H$_{peroxo}$) and related enzymes,$^{33}$ the synthetic analogues do not reproduce the substrate scope, product selectivity, or reaction mechanism of the diiron monooxygenases. It is possible that the doubly-bridging XDK$^{2-}$ ligand is too rigid in the synthetic models to achieve an H$_{peroxo}$-like structure, a prerequisite that may be necessary to attain the high oxidizing power of the oxygenated diiron protein intermediates.
The search for a ligand that is sufficiently pre-organized yet structurally flexible led to examination of other dicarboxylate motifs. One potential candidate was the compound dibenzofuran-4,6-bis(diphenylacetate) (Ph₄DBA²⁻; Table 1.1).⁶⁰,⁶¹ Similar to XDK²⁻, Ph₄DBA²⁻ has two orthogonal carboxylate groups that can support an \{FeIII₂O\}⁴⁺ core. The Ph₄DBA²⁻ ligand, however, has more conformational freedom because the C–C bond between its carboxylate groups and the dibenzofuran linker can rotate freely. The compound [FeII₂(µ-OH)(Ph₄DBA)(TMEDA)₂(CH₃CN)]⁺ (10, Table 1.1), where TMEDA = N,N,N’,N’-tetramethylethylenediamine, was prepared from Ph₄DBA²⁻, triethylamine, TMEDA, and iron(II) triflate. The structure of 10 is unique because it is the first synthetic complex to reproduce the (µ-hydroxo)(µ-carboxylato)diiron(II) core of deoxyHr²⁵ with an open coordination site for binding of a terminal ligand. When 10 was treated with dioxygen at -78 °C in the presence of 3 equiv of N-MeIm in CH₂Cl₂ or in neat EtCN, a red-orange species (11) appeared that decayed after ~10 min. The UV-vis, Mössbauer, resonance Raman, and EXAFS spectra of the transient intermediate closely match those of oxyHr (Scheme 1.1, top), strongly suggesting that 11 contains a (hydroperoxo)(µ-oxo)diiron(III) unit. Unfortunately, oxygenation of 10 is irreversible and led to decomposition to a tetrairon(III) cluster.

A fourth dicarboxylate ligand, α,α-5,15-bis(α-N-(Kemp’s triacid imido)-o-tolyl)-2,8,12,18-tetraethyl-3,7,13,17-tetramethylporphyrin (H₄PDK, Table 1.1), was prepared by replacing the m-xylenediamine linker of XDK²⁻ with a porphyrin unit.⁶² The construct was designed so that activation of O₂ within a trimetallic cavity would offer the possibility of supplying additional electrons to the carboxylate-bridged diiron centers, much like the reductase component of sMMO.³³ A triiron(II) compound, [FeII₃(PDK)(Lut)(Br)₂(HBr)] (12, where Lut = 2,6-lutidine, Table 1.1), was successfully prepared from metallation with iron(II) bromide.⁶³
When iron(II) chloride was used instead of iron(II) bromide in the preparation, a mixed-valent heptairon chloride cluster was isolated.\(^6\) Due to the complicated nature of the iron complexes of PDK\(^{4-}\), no further studies were pursued using this ligand.

The more pre-organized dicarboxylate ligands XDK\(^{2-}\) and Ph\(_4\)DBA\(^{2-}\) impart enhanced stability to their respective diiron complexes and allow detection of O\(_2\) adducts at low temperature. A common problem with the dicarboxylate ligands, however, is that they do not prevent aggregation of the diiron compounds into oligo- and polynuclear clusters,\(^6\) an undesired reaction that is detrimental to the synthesis of accurate models. Furthermore, the conformationally rigid ligand framework may be a liability in terms of accessing oxygenated diiron species that could further react with external substrates.

### 1.5. Terphenylcarboxylate Ligands

To reduce the geometric constraints of the ligand platform, bulky terphenylcarboxylates were employed. Unlike simple benzoates that form polynuclear clusters with iron,\(^6\)\(^6\)\(^6\) the sterically-hindered 2,6-bis(p-tolyl)benzoate (Ar\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2\)^\(^-\), Table 1.1) and 2,6-bis(p-fluorophenyl)benzoate (Ar\(^{4\text{-FPh}}\)CO\(_2\)^\(^-\)) self-assemble into discrete diiron compounds in the presence of iron salts and an appropriate base.\(^6\)\(^9\)\(^\)\(^7\)\(^0\) The first iron complex synthesized in this series is [Fe\(^{\text{II}}\)\(_2\)(μ-Ar\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2\))^\(_2\)(Ar\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2\))^\(_2\)(THF)^\(_2\)] (13), which adopts a windmill structure with two \(\text{syn,syn}\)-bridging carboxylates and two bidentate terminal carboxylates in the solid-state. The coordinated THF molecules in 13 can be readily substituted with \(N\)-donors to afford the corresponding [Fe\(^{\text{II}}\)\(_2\)(Ar\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2\))^\(_4\)(N-donor)^\(_2\)] complex. Use of 4-tert-butylpyridine (4-\(^7\)BuPy) as the ancillary base provided a quadruply-bridged [Fe\(^{\text{II}}\)\(_2\)(Ar\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2\))^\(_4\)(4-\(^7\)BuPy)^\(_2\)] (14A, Table 1.1) paddlewheel compound. Interconversion between the windmill and paddlewheel structures in
solution was demonstrated by variable temperature NMR spectroscopy.\textsuperscript{70} Oxygenation of 14A at -78°C resulted in irreversible formation of a deep green intermediate that decayed to a [Fe\textsuperscript{III}2(μ-OH)2(μ-Ar\textsuperscript{Tol}CO\textsubscript{2})2(Ar\textsuperscript{Tol}CO\textsubscript{2})2(4-t-Bupy)] (17) product.\textsuperscript{71,72} The di(μ-hydroxo)diiron(III) unit of 17 closely resembles that of the oxidized core of sMMOH.\textsuperscript{73} Characterization of the green intermediate revealed two mixed-valent complexes, a diiron(II,III) (15) and a diiron(III,IV) (16) species, that are present in equal amounts. EPR and magnetic Mössbauer measurements indicated that 15 and 16 have spin states of 9/2 and 1/2, respectively. The assignment of 15 as a diiron(II,III) compound was confirmed by comparing its spectroscopic properties to those of a crystallographically characterized [Fe\textsuperscript{II}Fe\textsuperscript{III}(Ar\textsuperscript{Tol}CO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{4}(4-t-Bupy)] complex.\textsuperscript{74,75} As shown in the proposed mechanism in Scheme 1.2, reaction of 14A with dioxygen proceeds through a carboxylate shift, in which either one or two of the bridging Ar\textsuperscript{Tol}CO\textsuperscript{2}– groups rearrange to adopt terminal positions, providing an open site for O\textsubscript{2}. Binding of dioxygen to 14B or 14C affords a (μ-peroxo)diiron(III) or a di(μ-oxo)diiron(IV) intermediate that further reacts with 14A, giving an equal mixture of 15 and 16. This reaction is noteworthy because it is the first synthetic example in which treatment of a diiron(II) precursor with O\textsubscript{2} resulted in formation of an iron(IV) species, a process that parallels the chemistry of several non-heme diiron enzymes.\textsuperscript{23}

Although the steric hindrance provided by the terphenylcarboxylates could suppress undesired reactions involving bond-making processes, it could not eliminate deleterious intermolecular electron transfer (ET) reactions.\textsuperscript{71,72} To prevent the paddlewheel diiron(II) complex from quenching the oxygenated intermediates, bidentate ancillary ligands were used to favor the assembly of windmill rather than paddlewheel species. The doubly-bridged [Fe\textsuperscript{II}2(μ-Ar\textsuperscript{Tol}CO\textsubscript{2})2(Ar\textsuperscript{Tol}CO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}(N,N-Bn\textsubscript{2}en)] (18) complex, where N,N-Bn\textsubscript{2}en = N,N-dibenzylethlenediamine, was successfully prepared to test this strategy.\textsuperscript{76,77} Compound 18
Scheme 1.2. A proposed mechanism for the reaction of \([\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}_2(\mu-\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_4(4^{\text{-Bupy}})_2]\) (14A) with \(\text{O}_2\).\(^{71,72}\)

reacted with dioxygen, but instead of producing a green intermediate, \(N\)-dealkylation occurred affording \([\text{Fe}^{\text{III}}_2(\mu-\text{OH})_2(\mu-\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_3(N\text{-Bnen})(N,N\text{-Bn}_2\text{en})]\) (19) (where \(N\text{-Bnen} = N\text{-benzylethlenediamine}\) and benzaldehyde. Isotopic labeling with \(^{18}\text{O}_2\) demonstrated that the oxygen atom in benzaldehyde was derived from dioxygen. When a non-coordinating \(N,N\text{-Bn}_2\text{en}\) analogue, such as \(N,N\text{-dibenzylpropylamine}\), was treated with \(\text{O}_2\) in the presence of either mononuclear or dinuclear iron(II) complexes, the yield of benzaldehyde was significantly reduced. Detailed mechanistic studies suggested that oxidative \(N\)-dealkylation of 18 involved single electron transfer, proton abstraction, and rearrangement.\(^{78,79}\) The fortuitous discovery that high-valent diiron terphenylcarboxylate complexes could be intercepted by \textit{tethered substrates} enabled studies of the reactivity of oxygenated intermediates toward organic moieties. Attachment of benzyl,\(^{80,81}\) ethyl,\(^{81}\) ethynyl,\(^{82}\) phenoxy,\(^{83}\) phosphido,\(^{80,84}\) or sulfido\(^{84,85}\) units to an amine or pyridine ligand afforded a series of tethered substrates that could be easily incorporated into 13, giving the corresponding diiron(II) compounds. After exposing the substrate/diiron(II)
complex to O$_2$, the reaction products were analyzed by gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS). Chart 1.1 depicts the substrates that were successfully oxidized by this method. When 2-pyridyldiphenylphosphine (2-Ph$_2$Ppy) was employed in excess, catalytic oxidation to 2-pyridyldiphenylphosphine oxide (2-Ph$_2$P(O)py) was observed.\textsuperscript{80,84} Because external non-coordinating substrates cannot be oxidized by [Fe$_2$(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_4$(THF)$_2$]/O$_2$, these results suggest that intramolecular reactions are preferred over intermolecular ones in the terphenylcarboxylate diiron complexes. This behavior is most likely due to reaction of the active diiron oxidant with solvent or adventitious reductants before it can be intercepted by the desired external substrates.

![Chart 1.1](image)

**Chart 1.1.** The tethered substrates that were successfully oxidized with O$_2$ when integrated into a diiron(II) terphenylcarboxylate complex. The starting substrate is depicted on top and the product isolated after oxygenation is shown directly below.

One strategy to prevent premature deactivation of the oxygenated diiron intermediate was to attach dendritic groups to the terphenylcarboxylate ligand that would shield the diiron core from participating in intermolecular ET reactions.\textsuperscript{86} The complex [Fe$^{\text{II}}$_2([G-3]CO$_2$)$_4$(4-CNpy)$_2$] (20) (where [G-3]CO$_2^-$ = third-generation dendrimer-appended terphenylcarboxylate and 4-CNpy = 4-cyanopyridine) was synthesized in a manner analogous to that for the simpler diiron(II) compounds. Treatment of 20 with dioxygen resulted in formation of a diiron(II,III)
intermediate that was postulated to have a superoxo moiety. This colored intermediate is capable of oxidizing dihydroanthracene, albeit in only modest yields.


When a large excess of water was added to 22 complete dissolution occurred, giving the fully aquated [Fe$_{12}$($µ$-H$_2$O)$_2$]$_{2+}$ cation. These observations suggest that the accessibility of water within diiron enzyme active sites may be a control element for achieving different functions using a common structural motif. Furthermore, the presence of excess amounts of water may be destructive to the integrity of the carboxylate-bridged diiron core. Stopped-flow kinetic studies using [Fe$_{12}$($µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-$µ$-

Coordinated of water to 23 most likely induces rearrangement from a paddlewheel to a windmill complex, facilitating more rapid binding of dioxygen to the diiron centers.

The iron chemistry of a variety of other monocarboxylate ligands was evaluated. When the steric bulk of the terphenylcarboxylate was increased using 2,6-bis($p$-(tert-buty1)phenyl)benzoate (Ar$_3$Bu$CO_2$$^-$), reaction with iron(II) salts afforded a tetraciron cluster.$^{91}$ When the steric demand of the carboxylate was reduced using 2-biphenylcarboxylate, an assortment of di-, tri-, and tetraciron species was obtained.$^{92}$ Replacing the
terphenylcarboxylate with 9-triptycene carboxylate resulted in diiron paddlewheel complexes that could not convert to the more reactive windmill structure.\(^9^3\)

Terphenylcarboxylate ligands are a simple alternative to the conformationally restricting dicarboxylate compounds. Diiron complexes derived from \(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2^-\) or \(\text{Ar}^{4\text{-FPh}}\text{CO}_2^-\) can access high valent iron(IV) species from \(\text{O}_2\), which are capable of hydroxylating hydrocarbons, a first for synthetic modeling studies. Although the 2,6-aryl substituents of \(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2^-\) and \(\text{Ar}^{4\text{-FPh}}\text{CO}_2^-\) are effective in shielding against metal cluster assembly, they also contribute to excessive steric crowding at the diiron core that prevent facile entry of external guest molecules.

### 1.6. Dinucleating Polynitrogen Ligands

Polydentate nitrogen donors are commonly utilized as ligands in synthetic modeling studies.\(^1^9\),\(^9^4\) Although these compounds provide a nitrogen-rich, rather than a carboxylate-rich, coordination environment they are well suited for stabilizing kinetically labile first row transition metal ions. Efforts to mimic the \(\text{syn}, \text{syn}\) coordination of the bridging carboxylate in the active site of diiron enzymes led to use of a napthyridine framework as a “masked carboxylate.”\(^9^5\) Several 1,8-substituted napthyridine compounds were prepared and successfully employed to assemble dicopper(II), dizinc(II), dinickel(II), and diiron(II) complexes.\(^9^6\) The most notable of these are \([\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}_2(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{BPEAN})(\text{SO}_3\text{CF}_3)]^{2+}\) (24, where BPEAN = 2,7-bis(bis(2-(5-methyl)pyridyl)ethyl)aminomethyl)-1,8-napthyridine, Table 1.1) and \([\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}_2(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{BEPEAN})-(\text{SO}_3\text{CF}_3)]^{2+}\) (25, where BEPEAN = 2,7-bis(bis(2-(5-ethyl)pyridyl)ethyl)aminomethyl)-1,8-napthyridine).\(^9^7\) Exposing either 24 or 25 to \(\text{O}_2\) at room temperature resulted in rapid decomposition without any detectable intermediates. When the more sterically-hindered 25 was treated with excess hydrogen peroxide at -30 °C a red-brown species (26) appeared, which
decayed upon warming to room temperature. Spectroscopic characterization of 26 suggested that it is a (hydroperoxo)diiron(III) species. The decay of 26 is accompanied by O₂ evolution and formation of a diiron(II) unit, the identity of which is different from that of 25. Although the mechanism of this reaction is uncertain, the release of O₂ from 26 may mimic a process similar to that in hemerythrin.

The stability of the diiron(II) napthyridine compounds afforded an opportunity to investigate how the redox properties of the model complexes vary depending on their composition and structure. Because activation of O₂ in the diiron enzymes invariably results in oxidation of the metal center, knowledge of the redox potential of the diiron(II) models may help explain their dioxygen reactivity. The cyclic voltammogram of [Fe\textsuperscript{II}₂(BPMAN)(μ-PhCyCO₂)₂]\textsuperscript{2+} (27, where BPMAN = 2,7-bis(bis(2-pyridylmethyl)aminomethyl)-1,8-napthyridine) displayed two reversible redox waves at +296 and +681 mV (vs. ferrocene/ferrocenium) that have been attributed to two one-electron oxidation processes, of diiron(II,II) to diiron(II,III) and diiron(II,III) to diiron(III,III), respectively.\textsuperscript{98} The presence of two reversible metal-centered redox couples is unprecedented for diiron(II) compounds having no single atom bridge. Comparing the first oxidation potential of 27 to that of [Fe\textsuperscript{II}₂(Ar\textsuperscript{Tol}CO₂)₄(4-tBupy)] (14A) (E\textsubscript{1/2} = -216 mV) revealed that addition of each anionic carboxylate group lowers the redox potential of the diiron center by ~250 mV. These results also suggested that diiron(II) sites bridged only by Asp and Glu residues in biology could supply up to two electrons without significant change in geometry.

Another polynitrogen donor compound, 1,4-bis(2,2’-dipyridylmethyl)phthalazine (bdptz, Table 1.1) was explored as a potential dinucleating platform.\textsuperscript{99} Reaction of bdptz with iron(II) triflate and Ar\textsuperscript{Tol}CO₂⁻ afforded a stable diiron(II) complex, [Fe\textsuperscript{II}₂(μ-OH)(μ-
Ar^{Tol}CO_2(bdptz)(CH_3CN)(SO_3CF_3)(SO_3CF_3) (28, Table 1.1). Treatment of 28 with dioxygen instantaneously led to formation of a (µ-oxo)diiron(III) product, [Fe^{III}_2(µ-O)(µ-Ar^{Tol}CO_2)(bdptz)(acetone)(SO_3CF_3)](SO_3CF_3)_2 (29) with no detectable intermediates. A bulkier derivative of bdptz was prepared to block the possible formation of tetranuclear species, but no remarkable oxygenation chemistry was observed with the diiron complex of this compound.  

Although the napthryridine and phthalazine bridged diiron model complexes are structurally robust, they do not exhibit the same O_2 reactivity observed in the diiron proteins. Perhaps polydentate ligands with internal bridging units are too rigid to accommodate binding of O_2 to the diiron center.

1.7. Syn N-Donor Ligands

An important structural feature that has been difficult to reproduce in carboxylate-bridged diiron model complexes is the syn coordination of nitrogen donors relative to the iron-iron vector. Despite the different arrangement of carboxylate ligands within the active sites of the BMMs, RNR, and related enzymes, ligation of the two histidine residues always occurs with syn stereochemistry. To enforce the syn arrangement of nitrogen donors within a single ligand framework, two quinoline ester moieties were covalently attached using a diethynylbenzene linker, giving 1,2-bis(3-ethynyl-8-carboxylatequinoline)-4,5-diethynylbenzene ethyl ester (Et_2BCQEB, Table 1.1). Metallation of Et_2BCQEB using iron(II) trilate and Ar^{Tol}CO_2 afforded the compound [Fe^{II}_2(Et_2BCQEB)(µ-Ar^{Tol}CO_2)]^+ (30, Table 1.1). X-ray structural analysis of 30 revealed a diiron complex with three bridging carboxylates and syn binding of the quinoline moieties. Although 30 is a close structural mimic of sMMOH_{red} (Scheme 1.1, bottom), exposing the compound to dioxygen resulted in unidentified iron products. Other
neutral derivatives of Et₂BCQEBEt were synthesized and examined as syn N-donor ligands.¹⁰²
The compound bis(picolinic methyl ester)diethynyltripytene (PIC₂DET) containing pyridine
methyl ester groups afforded a heterometallic [Fe²⁺Na(PIC₂DET)(µ-TrpCO₂)₃] (31) complex that
could exchange sodium for iron; the resulting diiron(II) compound could not be structurally
characterized, however.¹⁰³ Two syn N-donor ligands can also bridge two iron(II) centers, giving
[Fe₁²(syn N-donor)₂] species.¹⁰⁴⁻¹⁰⁶ Several examples are shown in Chart 1.2. Such undesired
[Fe₁²(syn N-donor)₂] species were avoided by the use of ligands bearing polydentate nitrogen-
rich metal binding groups.¹⁰⁷ Only diiron(III) complexes, however, could be prepared from these
ligands.

To obtain a kinetically more stabilizing platform, 2-phenoxypyridine groups were
attached to a 1,2-diethynylbenzene backbone.¹⁰⁸ Reaction of bis(phenyl(p-cresol)pyridyl)-
diethynylbenzene ([LMe,Ph]²⁻, Chart 1.2) with iron(II) in tetrahydrofuran (THF) led to
spontaneous formation of [FeI₂(LMe,Ph)₂(THF)₂] (32). Once again, rotation about the C–C bond
of the ethynyl arms allowed association of two syn N-donor ligands. Unlike complex 30, however,
reaction of 32 with dioxygen resulted in the formation of a (µ-oxo)diiron(III) [Fe₃⁺₂(µ-
O)(LMe,Ph)₂] (33) product. No intermediates were detected during the oxygenation reaction.

Several other ligand designs based on the syn N-donor concept were also explored. An
attempt was made to incorporate both a bridging carboxylate and adjacent amino moieties into a
dinucleating platform using 1,8-bis(dimethylaminomethylethynyl)-3,6-di(tert-butyl)fluorene-9-
yl-acetate (DAFA₂⁻, Table 1.1).¹⁰⁹ Efforts to metallate DAFA₂⁻ with iron(II) were unsuccessful,
possibly due to a lack of pre-organization among the amino and carboxylate donor groups of the
ligand. A two-component system was also proposed as a method to assemble diiron(II) model
Chart 1.2. Examples of crystallographically characterized $[\text{Fe}^{II}_2(\text{syn } N\text{-donor})_2]^{2+}$ species isolated from reaction of iron(II) salts and the corresponding syn $N$-donor ligand. Additional external carboxylate ligands were used in the preparation in some cases. PIC$_2$DET = bis(picolinic methyl ester)diethynyltriptycene;$^{102}$ Im$_2$DET = bis(N-methylimidazole)diethynyltriptycene; $^{102}$ [L$_{\text{Me, Ph}}$)$_2$]$^{2-} = $ bis(phenyl($p$-cresol)pyridyl)diethynylbenzene; $^{108}$ Ar$_{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2^{-} = $ 2,6-($p$-tolyl)benzoate.

complexes. In addition to a syn $N$-donor, a “C-clamp” ligand with two endo-oriented dicarboxylate groups may enforce a doubly-bridging motif and form a hydrophobic pocket around the diiron center.$^{110}$ Complexation reactions with a C-clamp and syn $N$-donor ligands have not yet afforded the desired $[\text{Fe}^{II}_2(\text{syn } N\text{-donor})(C\text{-clamp})]$ unit, however.

Linking two $N$-heterocycles with a 1,2-diethynylarene spacer effectively enforces the syn coordination of nitrogen donors in a diiron complex. Because the compounds do not have an internal bridging group to link the two metal ions like other dinucleating ligands, their terminal metal-binding units must be sufficiently stabilizing to prevent dissociation of the dinuclear core.
Additional ligand modifications are needed to eliminate the possibility of forming $[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}_2(\text{syn } N^{-}\text{donor})_2]$ species.

### 1.8. Macroyclic Ligands

Macroyclic ligands are excellent hosts for transition metal ions, as evident from examples in biology\(^3\)\(^4\) as well as synthetic coordination chemistry.\(^1\)\(^1\)\(^1\)\(^2\) Initial efforts to prepare a dinucleating macrocycle led to synthesis of a bis(terphenylcarboxylate) compound linked by 1,3-bis(aminomethyl)-4,6-diisopropylbenzene (MAr\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2^-\), Table 1.1).\(^1\)\(^3\) The endo-carboxylate groups in MAr\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2^-\) were designed to bridge two iron atoms to form a pre-organized platform for binding of additional external ligands. Failure to complex MAr\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2^-\) with iron, however, was attributed to either the flexibility of the ligand architecture or an improper spacing provided by the phenylene linker.

An improved macrocyclic design was obtained with the compound PIM\(^2^-\) (Table 1.1), which contains two phenoxylimine metal binding units linked by diphenylsulfone and dibenzylether moieties.\(^1\)\(^4\) Reaction of H\(_2\)PIM, the protonated form of PIM\(^2^-\), with $[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}_2(2,4,6\text{-trimethylphenyl})_4]$ and sterically-hindered carboxylic acid afforded di($\mu$-carboxylato)diiron(II) complexes in good yield. Use of terphenylecarboxylic acid and triphenylacetic acid gave $[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}_2(\mu$-$\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_2(\text{PIM})]$ (34, Table 1.1) and $[\text{Fe}^{\text{II}}_2(\mu$-$\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)_2(\text{PIM})]$ (35), respectively. X-ray structural analysis revealed that both compounds accurately mimic the active site structure of sMMOH\(_{\text{red}}\) (Scheme 1.1, bottom),\(^7\)\(^3\) including the asymmetric $\mu$-$\eta^1,\eta^1$ and $\mu$-$\eta^1,\eta^2$ binding mode of carboxylates as well as the syn stereochemistry of nitrogen donors. When 34 was exposed to dioxygen, a mixture of ($\mu$-oxo)diiron(III) $[\text{Fe}^{\text{III}}_2(\mu$-$\text{O})(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_2(\text{PIM})]$ (36) and di($\mu$-hydroxo)diiron(III) $[\text{Fe}^{\text{III}}_2(\mu$-$\text{OH})_2(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_2(\text{PIM})]$ (37) species was isolated. Further treatment
of 36 and 37 with excess water resulted in dimerization of the complexes to form tetranuclear [Fe\textsuperscript{III}\textsubscript{4}(\mu-OH)\textsubscript{6}(PIM)\textsubscript{2}(Ar\textsubscript{Tol}CO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}] (38) species. To eliminate this decomposition pathway, the PIM\textsuperscript{2−} ligand could be modified with sterically more hindering groups at the para position of the phenolate (Scheme 1.3). Having a more bulky platform would also allow smaller carboxylate ligands to be employed, which may facilitate dioxygen binding or substrate access to the diiron center. Unlike other platforms that have been investigated to date, the planar nature of the macrocycle allows for steric tuning of the diiron complex without obstructing access to the dimetallic center.

Scheme 1.3. A cartoon depiction of a diiron(II) model complex (39) containing a more sterically-hindering PIM\textsuperscript{2−} ligand, where the dark wedges represent a bulky organic substituent. Reaction of 39 with dioxygen may lead to a carboxylate shift and formation of a di(\mu-hydroxo)diiron(III) product (40). The steric repulsion between the bulky PIM\textsuperscript{2−} substituents should prevent undesired formation of [Fe\textsuperscript{III}\textsubscript{4}(\mu-OH)\textsubscript{6}(bulky PIM)\textsubscript{2}(RCO\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}] (41) complexes.

1.9. Concluding Remarks

The early years of synthetic modeling in the Lippard group were characterized by use of simple chelating ligands to prepare structural mimics of diiron protein active sites. Efforts to replicate the functional aspects of these proteins, however, required that more elaborately designed ligands be employed. The search for an ideal synthetic platform is complicated by a number of factors, such as constructing ligands that can complex with iron to afford the desired coordination geometry, tuning of ligand steric properties to prevent unproductive decomposition of reactive oxygenated species, and developing short and convenient routes to obtain the target
compounds. Although there is no substitute for direct studies of biomolecules, the work described in this account illustrates that investigations using synthetic mimics can provide insight into metalllobiochemistry in ways that could not be achieved through other means.

Synthetic diiron modeling still offers many unexplored frontiers. One area of interest is understanding the chemical nature as well as the requirements for generating highly oxidizing diiron(IV) units. One strategy to access such chemically reactive species is to prepare diiron complexes that have optimally positioned functional groups to stabilize key transition states along the O₂ reaction pathway. Identifying which transition state structures to target can be aided by the use of quantum mechanical calculations.¹¹⁵,¹¹⁶ This concept has been successfully demonstrated in de novo protein design,¹¹⁷-¹¹⁹ but has not yet been seriously applied to construct small-molecule protein models. Another avenue of research that would help advance diiron modeling chemistry is to establish a clear structure-function relationship between the model compounds and their oxygenation behavior.¹²⁰ For example, although it has been shown that exposing dioxygen to a synthetic diiron(II) complex can lead to formation of a (peroxo)diiron(III) species, this reactivity is not general to all diiron(II) model compounds. In many cases, it is unclear whether the oxygenated diiron units are not observed because they are rapidly quenched by external reactants, do not form under the experimental conditions employed, or the starting complexes are too sterically hindered to bind O₂. To evaluate the various factors that contribute to the dioxygen reactivity in a synthetic model, it is necessary to study the effects of introducing systematic structural and electronic modifications to the complex. Unfortunately, most model systems are not amenable to such investigations because the integrity of the complexes may be comprised upon introducing such changes. Because PIM²⁻ is a remarkably
robust dinucleating platform and has many potential sites for derivatization, it is an excellent framework for such studies.

Although this review has focused exclusively on diiron modeling chemistry in our laboratory, many other research groups have made significant contributions to the development of carboxylate-bridged diiron protein model complexes and the investigation of their chemical and physical characteristics. A large number of synthetic platforms have been devised for the assembly of non-heme diiron model complexes, ranging from simple carboxylate/pyridine donors\textsuperscript{121} to tailored-made dinucleating ligands\textsuperscript{19,122} and synthetic peptides\textsuperscript{123,124}. Although many of the diiron model compounds reported are structurally robust,\textsuperscript{19,122} they do not capture the unique coordination sphere of the bioinorganic unit of interest. Perhaps as a consequence of the incomplete match, the synthetic complexes do not typically exhibit the same reactivity profile as that of the diiron proteins.\textsuperscript{21,125} It is unlikely that every element of a protein active site, including especially the second coordination sphere, can be reproduced in a single model system. But given the extent of the synthetic methodologies available today, it should be possible to overcome many of the obstacles that have impeded the development of more sophisticated diiron protein mimics.\textsuperscript{20}

Extensive reactivity studies utilizing molecular oxygen, hydrogen peroxide, alkyl peroxides, and oxygen atom transfer reagents with diiron model compounds have led to a much improved understanding of the oxidation chemistry that takes place in the active sites of non-heme diiron proteins.\textsuperscript{17,22} For example, characterization of diiron(III,IV) and diiron(IV,IV) species in synthetic models\textsuperscript{126-129} has shed some light on similar high-valent states that are accessible within the diiron protein cores. These achievements help us to formulate possible reaction schemes that reconcile the biochemical data\textsuperscript{23,24} with the proposed biological
mechanisms suggested by theory.\textsuperscript{130-133} Beyond the O\textsubscript{2} activation step, some synthetic systems are even able to perform \textit{catalytic} hydrocarbon oxidation.\textsuperscript{18,134,135} Although these reactions are typically not as efficient as those catalyzed by the bacterial monooxygenases, they represent a good start. The current challenge in diiron model chemistry is to achieve regio- and stereospecific oxidation of external substrates by non-“free radical” reaction pathways. Use of the earth-abundant molecule dioxygen, rather than other more reactive but environmentally less friendly chemical oxidants, to facilitate this chemistry is the ultimate goal. The tasks set forth for future researchers in biomimetic modeling are numerous and complex, but the advances that have been made over the past thirty years promise a future that is full of many exciting discoveries.
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Chapter 2

Kinetic Stabilization of Diiron Complexes Using Phenoxylypyridine and Phenoxylimine Syn N-Donor Ligands

Portions of this chapter have appeared in print:
2.1. Introduction

Our recent synthetic efforts have been largely inspired by the bacterial multi-component monooxygenase (BMM) family of enzymes.\textsuperscript{1-3} These multi-component systems, which include soluble methane monooxygenase (sMMO),\textsuperscript{1} phenol hydroxylase (PH),\textsuperscript{4} and toluene/\textit{o}-xylene monooxygenase (ToMO),\textsuperscript{4,5} perform oxygen-atom transfer reactions in aerobic environments under mild conditions. Although substrate oxidation is believed to occur at the diiron centers of the hydroxylase component, the BMM machinery also requires both reductase and regulatory proteins to function efficiently. Attempts to mimic monooxygenase activity in synthetic systems by our group, as discussed in Chapter 1, as well as others have led to the preparation of a rich assortment of diiron compounds that display structural, spectroscopic, and/or functional features similar to those of the protein active sites.\textsuperscript{6-9} To date, however, no diiron model complexes have been able to match the biological systems in terms of catalytic efficiency, chemoselectivity, and oxygenation ability.\textsuperscript{10-12}

To overcome the shortcomings of existing model designs, our strategy has been to construct diiron compounds with organic ligands that more accurately resemble the primary coordination spheres of the BMM hydroxylase active sites. The structure of each diiron protein core comprises four carboxylate amino acid side chains, two histidine imidazole groups syn to the Fe–Fe vector, and an internal O\textsubscript{2}-binding cavity.\textsuperscript{13-15} A representative view of the reduced form of soluble methane monooxygenase hydroxylase (sMMOH\textsubscript{red}) is provided in Chart 2.1 (left). To achieve such an architecture in a small-molecule host, we have synthesized dinucleating ligands derived from 1,2-diethynylbenzene.\textsuperscript{16,17} Our studies with this class of ligands have resulted in the preparation of several dinuclear compounds, most notably with 8-carboxylquinoline ester\textsuperscript{16} and 2-carboxylpyridyl ester\textsuperscript{18} metal-binding groups. These dimetallic
complexes, however, are substitutionally labile and readily dissociate upon exposure to dioxygen. To obtain a more kinetically stable platform, we introduced 2-phenoxylypyridine moieties into the 1,2-diethynylbenzene backbone. Although the diiron sites in the BMM hydroxylases do not contain phenolate donors, iron-bound tyrosinate ligands occur in the O₂-activating enzymes intradiol dioxygenases\textsuperscript{19,20} and the phosphate ester hydrolyzing proteins mammalian purple acid phosphatases.\textsuperscript{21} Incorporating phenol rings into the ligand design also facilitates synthetic modifications, such as appending bulky moieties for steric protection or introducing electron-donating/or-withdrawing groups for electronic tuning. Our initial synthetic target based on the 2-phenoxylypyridine motif is shown in Chart 2.1 (right). In this design, the exogenous carboxylates are unrestrained so that the diiron complex could accommodate structural rearrangements upon reaction with dioxygen.

\textbf{Chart 2.1.} Active site structure of reduced soluble methane monooxygenase hydroxylase (sMMOH\textsubscript{red}, left) and a proposed synthetic analog with a dinucleating ligand, [L\textsuperscript{H,Ph}]\textsuperscript{2-} (right), containing 2-phenoxylypyridine metal binding groups. Sol = solvent molecule.

In the present chapter, we report a systematic study of the coordination chemistry of phenoxylypyridine- and phenoxylimine-appended ligands with iron(II). The importance of incorporating sterically protecting groups to the ligand periphery and its implication for future ligand designs is discussed. This work led to the synthesis of a diiron(II) complex that reacted
rapidly with dioxygen and demonstrated the ability to perform $O$-atom transfer to phosphines, although it did not yield the target structure in Chart 2.1.

2.2. Experimental

Materials and Methods. Reagents were obtained from Strem, Aldrich Chemical Co., and Alfa Aesar and used as received. The iron(II) starting material $[\text{Fe}_2(\text{Mes})_4]$ (where Mes = 2,4,6-trimethylphenyl) was prepared according to a literature procedure.$^{22}$ Air-sensitive manipulations were performed using standard Schlenk techniques or under a nitrogen atmosphere inside a MBraun drybox. All solvents were saturated with argon and purified by passage through two columns of activated $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$. Labeled dioxygen (~98% $^{18}\text{O}_2$) was obtained from Isotech and used without further purification.

General Physical Methods. NMR spectra were recorded on a 500 MHz Varian Mercury spectrometer and chemical shifts for $^1\text{H}$ and $^{13}\text{C}$ spectra were referenced to residual solvent peaks. IR spectra were recorded on a ThermoNicolet Avatar 360 spectrophotometer with the OMNIC software. Absorption spectra were recorded on a Cary 50 spectrophotometer using 6Q Spectrosil quartz cuvettes (Starna) with 1 cm path lengths. Cyclic voltammetry and differential pulse voltammetry measurements were made using a VersaSTAT3 potentiostat from Princeton Applied Research using the V3 Studio software. Electrospray ionization mass spectra were acquired on an Agilent Technologies 1100 Series LC-MSD Trap. Gas-chromatographic mass spectra were obtained using an Agilent Technologies 6890 N GC system equipped with a 5973N mass selective detector (MSD) unit.
**X-ray Collection and Data Refinement.** Single crystals were mounted in Paratone oil on a cryo-loop and frozen under a 110 K KRYO-FLEX nitrogen cold stream. Data were collected on a Bruker APEX CCD X-ray diffractometer with Mo Kα radiation (λ = 0.71073 Å) controlled by the SMART software package. Empirical absorption corrections were applied using SADABS. The structures were solved by Patterson methods with refinement by full-matrix least squares based on F² using the SHELXTL-97 software package. All non-hydrogen atoms were located and refined anisotropically. Hydrogen atoms were assigned idealized positions based on a riding model. X-ray refinement data for complex 1 is given in Table 2.1

**Fe Mössbauer Spectroscopy.** Mössbauer spectra were recorded on a MSI spectrometer (WEB Research Company) with a ⁵⁷Co source in a Rh matrix maintained at room temperature. Polycrystalline samples were prepared by suspending in Apiezon M grease and placed in a nylon sample holder. Data were acquired at 90 K, and the isomer shift (δ) values are reported with respect to metallic iron that was used for velocity calibration at room temperature. The spectra were fit to Lorentzian lines using the WMOSS plot and fit program (WEB Research, Minneapolis).

**Stopped-flow UV-visible Spectrophotometry.** Ambient-pressure kinetic studies were performed using a Canterbury SF-41 stopped-flow instrument (Hi-Tech) and a fused-silica fiber optics spectrometer (Oriel Corp.). Data were acquired using a KinetAsyst v.3.16 software (TgK Scientific Limited) at a sampling rate of 300 scans in 30 s. To remove moisture and air, the stainless-steel lines were washed with dioxygen-free anhydrous THF before loading the sample syringes. The mixing cell was maintained at 50.0 ± 0.1 ºC. Before mixing, the concentration of complex 1 was 26 µM in THF and that of the dioxygen solution was assumed to be 10 mM.
Synthesis

1-Benzylxy-2,6-dibromo-4-tert-butylbenzene (H). Solid 2,6-dibromo-4-tert-butylphenol (10.0 g, 32.5 mmol), K₂CO₃ (6.7 g, 48.8 mmol), and benzyl bromide (4.7 mL, 39.0 mmol) were combined in 300 mL of CH₃CN and refluxed for 3 h. Water was added to the reaction mixture and the organic phase was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3 x 200 mL). The organic layer was separated, dried over Na₂SO₄, and evaporated to dryness. Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 EtOAc/hexanes) gave a yellow oil (5.54 g, 42%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 7.64 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 7.55 (s, 2H), 7.44 (t, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 7.40 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 1H), 5.03 (s, 2H), 1.32 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 150.55, 150.35, 136.63, 130.14, 128.68, 128.66, 128.54, 118.23, 74.78, 34.84, 31.37. GC-MS = 398 [M]+ (Calcd = 398 [M]+).

3-Bromo-5-methylbiphenyl-2-ol (N). The tetrahydropyran protected 2-(5-methylbiphenyl-2-xyloxy)tetrahydro-2H-pyran (M) (20.0 g, 74.6 mmol) was dissolved in 100 mL of CH₃OH/CH₃CN (1:1). The mixture was treated with conc. HCl (10 mL), refluxed for 1 h, and concentrated by evaporation. About 200 mL of H₂O was added and the product was extracted with CH₂Cl₂ (3x 100 mL). The organic layer was dried over Na₂SO₄, filtered, and evaporated to afford a white solid. The resulting 5-methylbiphenyl-2-ol was re-dissolved in CH₂Cl₂ (100 mL) and cooled to 0 °C. Liquid bromine (3.8 mL, 74.6 mmol) was added dropwise to the reaction flask. The reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h, washed with sat. Na₂SO₂ (aq), dried over Na₂SO₄, and evaporated to yield a pale brown oil (18.8 g, 96%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 7.58 (d, J = 9 Hz, 2H), 7.50 (t, J = 8 Hz, 2H), 7.42 (t, J = 8 Hz, 1H), 7.35 (s, 1H), 7.11 (s, 1H), 5.59 (s, 1H), 2.36 (s, 3H). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 147.10, 137.50, 131.73, 131.29, 130.96, 129.31, 129.26, 128.63, 127.81, 110.78, 20.42. GC-MS = 262 [M]+ (Calcd = 262 [M]+).
1-Benzylxy-2-bromo-4-methyl-6-phenylbenzene (I). Method A: Solid 1-benzylxy-2,6-dibromo-4-methylbenzene (G)\textsuperscript{28} (12.0 g, 33.7 mmol), phenyl boronic acid (4.11 g, 33.7 mmol), and [Pd(PPh\(_3\))\(_4\)] (1.94 g, 1.68 mmol) were combined in 100 mL of THF and 100 mL of 1.0 M aqueous Na\(_2\)CO\(_3\) in a 500 mL Schlenk flask. The mixture was degassed with nitrogen for 30 min and then refluxed for 20 h. The organic phase was then extracted with CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (3 x 150 mL), dried over Na\(_2\)SO\(_4\), and evaporated to dryness. Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 EtOAc/hexanes) gave a colorless oil (10.12 g) that contained a mixture of 1-benzylxy-2,6-dibromo-4-methylbenzene (929 mg, 7%), 1-benzylxy-2,6-diphenyl-4-methylbenzene (1.83 g, 15%) and 1-benzylxy-2-bromo-4-methyl-6-phenylbenzene (7.26 g, 62%). The three compounds could not be separated; therefore, the mixture was used in the next step. GC-MS = 356 [1-benzylxy-2,6-dibromo-4-methylbenzene]\textsuperscript{+} (Calcd = 356 [M]\textsuperscript{+}), 350 [1-benzylxy-2,6-diphenyl-4-methylbenzene]\textsuperscript{+} (Calcd = 350 [M]\textsuperscript{+}), and 352 [1-benzylxy-2-bromo-4-methyl-6-phenylbenzene]\textsuperscript{+} (Calcd = 352 [M]\textsuperscript{+}). Method B: Solid 3-bromo-5-methylbibiphenyl-2-ol (N) (18.8 g, 71.5 mmol) and benzyl bromide (9.3 mL, 78.6 mmol) were dissolved in CH\(_3\)CN (400 mL). The solution was refluxed for 4 h, evaporated to dryness, and the residue was redissolved in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) (300 mL). The organic phase was washed with H\(_2\)O (3 x 100 mL), dried over Na\(_2\)SO\(_4\), filtered, and evaporated to give an oil. The crude material was purified by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 EtOAc/hexanes) and re-crystallized from hot hexanes to give a white solid (16.0 g, 72%). \textsuperscript{1}H NMR (CDCl\(_3\), 125 MHz): \(\delta\) 7.62 (m, 2H), 7.48-7.43 (m, 4H), 7.32 (m 3H), 7.22 (m, 2H), 7.18 (s, 1H), 4.55(s, 2 H), 2.40 (s, 3H). \textsuperscript{13}C NMR (CDCl\(_3\), 500 MHz): \(\delta\) 150.89, 137.99, 137.00, 136.61, 135.57, 132.98, 131.06, 129.46, 128.90, 128.42, 128.39, 128.24, 127.76, 118.29, 74.95, 20.78. GC-MS: m/z = 352 [M]\textsuperscript{+} (Calcd = 352 [M]\textsuperscript{+}). Mp = 64-65 °C.
1-Benzylxy-2-bromo-6-phenyl-4-tert-butylbenzene (J). The same procedure was employed as described for the synthesis of 1-benzylxy-2-bromo-4-methyl-6-phenylbenzene (I) (Method A), except that 1-benzylxy-2,6-dibromo-4-tert-butylbenzene (H) was used in place of 1-benzylxy-2,6-dibromo-4-methylbenzene (G). The reaction was performed with the following reagents: 1-benzylxy-2,6-dibromo-4-tert-butylbenzene (1.0 g, 2.51 mmol), phenyl boronic acid (306 mg, 2.51 mmol), [Pd(PPh₃)₄] (146 mg, 0.126 mmol), and 1.0 M Na₂CO₃ (20 mL, H₂O/THF). 
Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (2:1 hexanes/CH₂Cl₂) gave a colorless oil (997 mg) that contained a mixture of 1-benzylxy-2,6-dibromo-4-tert-butylbenzene (170 mg, 17%), 1-benzylxy-2,6-diphenyl-4-tert-butylbenzene (257 mg, 26%), and 1-benzylxy-2-bromo-6-phenyl-4-tert-butylbenzene (576 mg, 57%). The three compounds could not be separated so the mixture was used in the next step. GC-MS = 398 [1-benzylxy-2,6-dibromo-4-tert-butylbenzene]⁺ (Calcd = 398 [M]⁺), 392 [1-benzylxy-2,6-diphenyl-4-tert-butylbenzene]⁺ (Calcd = 392 [M]⁺), and 394 [1-benzylxy-2-bromo-6-phenyl-4-tert-butylbenzene]⁺ (Calcd = 394 [M]⁺).

2-(2-Benzyloxyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B). The compound 1-benzylxy-2-iodobenzene (1.00 g, 3.22 mmol) was dissolved in 15 mL of dry THF in a 50 mL Schlenk flask and the mixture was cooled to -78 °C. A 1.6 M hexanes solution of n-butyllithium (2.0 mL, 3.22 mmol) was added slowly to the reaction flask. The mixture was stirred at -78 °C for 30 min. Solid anhydrous ZnCl₂ (351 mg, 3.22 mmol) was added and the mixture was stirred at RT for 30 min. The reaction flask was brought inside a drybox and charged with 2,5-dibromopyridine (694 mg, 2.93 mmol) and [Pd(PPh₃)₄] (169 mg, 0.146 mmol). The resulting solution was transferred to a sealed reaction vessel and stirred at 80 °C for 15 h. Water was added to the reaction mixture and the organic phase was extracted with dichloromethane (3x15 mL). The organic layer was
separated, dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, and evaporated to dryness. The crude material was purified by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 EtOAc/hexanes) to afford a white solid (368 mg, 37%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 8.77 (d, $J = 2.00$ Hz, 1H), 7.86 (m, 2H), 7.78 (dd, $J = 11.0$, 2.5 Hz, 1H), 7.40-7.33 (m, 6H), 7.12 (t, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 1H), 7.07 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 1H), 5.15 (s, 2H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 156.19, 154.44, 150.48, 138.34, 136.87, 131.27, 130.55, 128.74, 128.35, 128.09, 127.29, 126.61, 121.72, 119.01, 113.25, 70.77. GC-MS: m/z = 339 [M]$^+$ (Calcd = 339 [M]$^+$). Mp = 69-70 °C.

**5-Bromo-2-(2-methoxyphenyl)pyridine (C).** The same procedure was employed as for the synthesis of 2-(2-benzylxoyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B), except that 2-bromoanisole was used in place of 1-benzyloxy-2-iodobenzene. The reaction was performed with the following reagents: 2-bromoanisole (2.97 g, 15.9 mmol), 1.6 M n-butyllithium in hexanes (10 mL, 15.9 mmol), anhydrous ZnCl$_2$ (1.73 g, 15.9 mmol), [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$] (873 mg, 0.755 mmol), and 2,5-dibromopyridine (3.58 g, 15.1 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 EtOAc/hexanes) gave a light yellow oil (2.29 g, 57%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 8.75 (d, $J = 2.5$ Hz, 1H), 7.81-7.75 (m, 3H), 7.38 (t, $J = 1.0$ Hz, 1H), 7.08 (t, $J = 1.0$ Hz, 1H), 6.99 (d, $J = 10$ Hz, 1H), 3.85 (s, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 156.94, 154.54, 150.40, 138.32, 131.03, 130.46, 127.86, 126.40, 121.19, 118.88, 111.47, 55.65. GC-MS = 263 [M]$^+$ (Calcd = 263 [M]$^+$).

**5-Bromo-2-(2-methoxybiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (F).** The same procedure was employed as for the synthesis of 2-(2-benzylxoyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B), except that 2-bromo-6-phenylanisole (E) was used in place of 1-benzyloxy-2-iodobenzene (A). The reaction was performed with the following reagents: 2-bromo-6-phenylanisole (1.16 g, 4.43 mmol), 1.6 M n-butyllithium in hexanes (2.8 mL, 4.43 mmol), anhydrous ZnCl$_2$ (483 mg, 4.43 mmol),
[Pd(PPh₃)₄] (243 mg, 0.211 mmol), and 2,5-dibromopyridine (1.00 g, 4.22 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 EtOAc/hexanes) gave a white crystalline solid (868 mg, 57%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.80 (s, 1H), 7.87 (s, 2H), 7.74 (dd, J = 9.5, 2.0 Hz, 1H), 7.62 (d, J = 10 Hz, 2H), 7.47-7.42 (m, 3H), 7.39 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.30 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 155.49, 154.91, 150.66, 138.82, 138.44, 136.03, 133.20, 132.26, 130.43, 129.40, 128.44, 127.46, 126.25, 124.79, 119.41, 61.11. GC-MS = 339 [M]+ (Calcd = 339 [M]+). Mp = 88-89 °C.

5-Bromo-2-(2-benzyloxy-5-methylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (K). The same procedure was employed as for the synthesis of 2-(2-benzyloxyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B), except that 1-benzyloxy-2-bromo-4-methyl-6-phenylbenzene (I) was used in place of 1-benzyloxy-2-iodobenzene (A). The reaction was performed with the following reagents: 1-benzyloxy-2-bromo-4-methyl-6-phenylbenzene (~60% purity, 6.00 g, ~10.2 mmol), 1.6 M n-butyllithium in hexanes (10 mL, 16.3 mmol), anhydrous ZnCl₂ (1.78 g, 16.3 mmol), [Pd(PPh₃)₄] (751 mg, 0.65 mmol), and 2,5-dibromopyridine (3.06 g, 12.9 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (10:90 EtOAc/hexanes) gave a white solid (2.47 g, ~60%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.77 (d, J = 2.0 Hz, 1H), 7.85 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 7.78 (dd, J = 12, 2.5 Hz, 1H), 7.65 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 7.56 (d, J = 1.5 Hz, 1H), 7.46 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.41 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.28 (d, J = 2.0 Hz, 1H), 7.20 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 1H), 7.16 (t, J = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 6.75 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 4.24 (s, 2H), 2.44 (s, 3H). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 155.05, 151.72, 138.62, 138.46, 136.48, 136.38, 134.57, 133.50, 132.84, 130.65, 129.76, 128.82, 128.41, 128.27, 128.12, 127.50, 126.86, 119.30, 75.91, 21.08. ESI-MS = 430.3 [M+H]⁺ (Calcd = 430.1 [M+H]⁺). Mp = 93-95 °C.
5-Bromo-2-(2-benzylxy-5-tert-butylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (L). The same procedure was employed as for the synthesis of 2-(2-benzylxyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B), except that 1-benzylxy-2-bromo-6-phenyl-4-tert-butylbenzene (J) was used in place of 1-benzylxy-2-iodobenzene (A). The reaction was performed with the following reagents: 1-benzylxy-2-bromo-6-phenyl-4-tert-butylbenzene (~60% purity, 3.26 g, ~8.25 mmol), 1.6 M n-butyllithium in hexanes (5.9 mL, 9.43 mmol), anhydrous ZnCl₂ (1.03 g, 9.43 mmol), [Pd(PPh₃)₄] (454 mg, 0.393 mmol), and 2,5-dibromopyridine (1.86 g, 7.86 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 EtOAc/hexanes) gave a white solid (909 mg, 39%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.83 (s, 1H), 7.89 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 1H), 7.81 (s, 2H), 7.70 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 7.52-7.44 (m, 4H), 7.24-7.20 (m, 3H), 6.80 (d, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 4.29 (s, 2H), 1.45 (s, 9H). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 155.40, 151.76, 150.58, 147.69, 139.03, 138.39, 136.63, 135.96, 133.05, 129.84, 129.45, 128.70, 128.39, 128.26, 128.06, 127.44, 127.22, 126.87, 119.27, 75.87, 34.82, 31.66. ESI-MS = 472.2 [M+H]⁺ (Calcd = 472.1 [M+H]⁺). Mp = 164-166 °C.

Benz₂LV^{H,H} (5,5'-{(4,5-dimethoxy-1,2-phenylene)bis(ethyne-2,1-diyl)bis(2-(2-(benzylxy) phenyl)-pyridine). Solid 2-(2-benzylxyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B) (600 mg, 1.76 mmol), 4,5-diethynylveratrole (149 mg, 0.802 mmol), [Pd(PPh₃)₄] (93 mg, 80.2 µmol), and triethylamine (0.28 mL, 2.00 mmol) were combined with 20 mL of dry THF in a sealed reaction vessel. The reaction was stirred at 80 °C for 3 d. A 20 mL solution of dichloromethane was added and the mixture was washed with H₂O (2 x 50 mL). The organic layer was separated, dried over Na₂SO₄, and evaporated to dryness. The crude material was purified by silica gel column chromatography (20:80 EtOAc/hexanes) to afford a beige solid (381 mg, 67%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 8.91 (d, J = 1.5 Hz, 2H), 7.96 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.91 (dd, J = 9.0, 1.5 Hz, 2H), 7.80 (dd, J = 10.5, 2.0 Hz, 2H), 7.38-7.31 (m, 8H), 7.25 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.13-7.05 (m, 8H), 5.14 (s, 4H),
3.96 (s, 6H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 156.38, 154.94, 151.82, 149.55, 137.98, 136.96, 131.46, 130.50, 128.93, 128.70, 128.00, 127.21, 124.85, 121.70, 118.57, 118.34, 114.27, 113.32, 91.57, 89.76, 70.79, 56.28. ESI-MS = 705.6 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 705.3 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 51-54 °C.

**Me$_2$L$^{H,H}$ (1,2-bis((6-(2-methoxyphenyl)pyridin-3-yl)ethynyl)benzene).** The same procedure was employed as for the synthesis of Benz$_2$LV$^{H,H}$, except that 5-bromo-2-(2-methoxyphenyl)pyridine (C) was used instead of 2-(2-benzyloxyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B), and 1,2-diethynylbenzene was used instead of 4,5-diethynylveratrole. The reaction was performed with the following reagents: 1,2-diethynylbenzene (331 mg, 2.63 mmol), 5-bromo-2-(2-methoxyphenyl)pyridine (2.00 g, 5.78 mmol), [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$] (304 mg, 0.263 mmol), and triethylamine (0.92 mL, 6.58 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (20:80 EtOAc/hexanes) gave a light yellow solid (341 mg, 26%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 8.91 (d, $J = 3.0$ Hz, 2H), 7.92-7.86 (m, 6H), 7.63 (m, 2H), 7.42-7.37 (m, 4H), 7.11 (t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.02 (2, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2H), 3.89 (s, 6H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 157.32, 155.33, 151.98, 138.42, 132.34, 131.41, 130.67, 128.72, 128.43, 125.57, 124.83, 121.36, 118.26, 111.63, 91.44, 91.08, 55.84. ESI-MS = 493.3 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 493.2 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 150-151 °C.

**Me$_2$L$^{H,Ph}$ (1,2-bis((6-(2-methoxybiphenyl-3-yl)pyridin-3-yl)ethynyl)benzene).** The same procedure was employed as for the synthesis of Benz$_2$LV$^{H,H}$, except that 5-bromo-2-(2-methoxybiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (F) was used instead of 2-(2-benzyloxyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B), and 1,2-diethynylbenzene was used instead of 4,5-diethynylveratrole. The reaction was performed with the following reagents: 1,2-diethynylbenzene (529 mg, 4.20 mmol), 5-bromo-2-(2-methoxybiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (3.0 g, 8.82 mmol), [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$] (486 mg, 0.420 mmol), and triethylamine (1.5 mL, 10.5 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column.
chromatography (CH$_2$Cl$_2$) gave a light yellow solid (1.84 g, 68%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): δ 8.96 (d, $J = 1.0$ Hz, 2H), 8.00 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.92 (dd, $J = 10.5, 1.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.81 (dd, $J = 9.0, 1.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.66-7.62 (m, 6H), 7.47-7.38 (m, 10H), 7.31 (t, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2H), 3.26 (s, 6H).

$^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): δ 155.70, 155.63, 152.08, 138.61, 138.54, 136.02, 133.63, 132.28, 130.65, 129.45, 128.73, 128.42, 127.42, 125.44, 124.76, 118.53, 91.65, 90.84, 61.15. ESI-MS = 645.5 [M+H$^+$] (Calcd = 645.2 [M+H$^+$]). Mp = 128-130 ºC.

**Benz$_2$L$^{Me,Ph}$ (1,2-bis((6-(2-(benzyl oxy)-5-methylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridin-3-yl)ethynyl)benzene).**

**Method A:** The same procedure was employed as for the synthesis of Benz$_2$L$^\text{H,H}$, except that 5-bromo-2-(2-benzyl oxy-5-methylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (K) was used instead of 2-(2-benzyl oxyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B), and 1,2-diethynylbenzene was used instead of 4,5-diethynylveratrole. The reaction was performed with the following reagents: 1,2-diethynylbenzene (345 mg, 2.74 mmol), 5-bromo-2-(2-benzyl oxy-5-methylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (2.47 g, 5.74 mmol), [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$] (317 mg, 0.274 mmol), and triethylamine (1 mL, 6.85 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (10:90 EtOAc/hexanes) gave a light yellow solid (1.26 g, 56%). **Method B:** Solid 1,2-bis((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)benzene (1.31 g, 4.85 mmol) was dissolved in THF (50 mL) and treated with a 1.0 M solution of NBu$_4$F (10.2 mL in THF, 10.2 mmol). The mixture was stirred for 4.5 h and then charged with 5-bromo-2-(2-benzyl oxy-5-methylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (K) (5.21 g, 12.1 mmol), [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$] (560 mg, 0.485 mmol), and NEt$_3$ (2.0 mL, 14.6 mmol). The reaction was stirred at 70 ºC for 2 d. The workup and purification procedure was identical to method A. The product was obtained in 45% yield (1.80 g). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): δ 8.96 (d, $J = 1.5$ Hz, 2H), 8.02 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.86 (dd, $J = 10.5, 2.0$ Hz, 2H), 7.69-7.67 (m, 8H), 7.47 (t, $J = 7.0$ Hz, 4H), 7.42-7.41 (m, 4H), 7.29 (d, $J = 2.0$ Hz, 2H), 7.17-7.14 (m, 6H), 6.78 (dd,
$J = 9.0, 1.5$ Hz, 4H), 4.27 (s, 4H), 2.46 (s, 6H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 155.82, 152.07, 151.99, 138.79, 138.40, 136.58, 136.48, 134.62, 133.93, 132.97, 132.41, 131.03, 129.90, 128.96, 128.87, 128.48, 128.36, 128.20, 127.55, 125.54, 125.20, 118.52, 91.71, 91.05, 76.02, 21.18. ESI-MS = 825.8 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 825.3 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 111-114 °C.

**Benz$_2$L$_{\text{Bu,Ph}}$** (1,2-bis((6-(2-benzylxy)-5-tert-butylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridin-3-yl)ethynyl)-benzene). The same procedure was employed as for the synthesis of Benz$_2$LV$^{H,H}$, except that 5-bromo-2-(2-benzylxy-5-tert-butylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (L) was used instead of 2-(2-benzylxyphenyl)-5-bromopyridine (B), and 1,2-diethynylbenzene was used instead of 4,5-diethynylveratrole. The reaction was performed with the following reagents: 1,2-diethynylbenzene (64 mg, 0.508 mmol), 5-bromo-2-(2-benzylxy-5-tert-butylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridine (576 mg, 1.22 mmol), [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$] (59 mg, 0.051 mmol), and triethylamine (0.2 mL, 1.27 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 to 10:90 EtOAc/hexanes) gave a yellow solid (260 mg, 56%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 8.97 (d, $J = 1.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.99 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2H), 7.86-7.83 (m, 4H), 7.69-7.67 (m, 6H), 7.49-7.46 (m, 6H), 7.43-7.41 (m, 4H), 7.15-7.14 (m, 6H), 6.78-6.76 (m, 4H), 4.26 (s, 4H), 1.42 (s, 18H). ESI-MS = 909.9 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 909.4 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 176-177 °C.

**2-Benzylxy-3-bromo-5-methylbenzaldehyde (P).** Solid 1-benzyloxy-2,6-dibromo-4-methyl-benzene (O) (27.7 g, 77.8 mmol) was dissolved in 500 mL of dry toluene and cooled to -78 °C. A 1.6 M $n$-butyllithium solution in hexanes (58 mL, 93.4 mmol) was added slowly to the reaction mixture and stirred for 1.5 h. The mixture was then treated with anhydrous DMF (9.0 mL, 117 mmol) and continued to stir at -78 °C for 10 h. Once the reaction was complete, formation of a white precipitate was observed. The reaction mixture was washed with H$_2$O (3x200 mL), dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, and evaporated to dryness. The resulting oil was dissolved in
MeOH (200 mL) and cooled to -25 °C to induce crystallization. After 4 h, the material was isolated by filtration to give a white solid (15.5 g, 65%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 10.09 (s, 1H), 7.67 (d, $J = 2.5$ Hz, 1H), 7.57 (d, $J = 2.0$ Hz, 1H), 7.47-7.39 (m, 5H), 5.09 (s, 2H), 2.35 (s, 3H).

$^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 189.18, 156.28, 156.28, 140.06, 136.08, 135.44, 130.96, 128.8, 127.85, 118.08, 77.85, 20.57. GC-MS = 304 [M]$^+$ (Calcd = 304 [M]$^+$). Mp = 53-55 °C.

**2-Benzylxoy-5-methyl-3-phenylbenzaldehyde (Q).** Solid 2-Benzylxoy-3-bromo-5-methyl-benzaldehyde (P) (5.26 g, 17.2 mmol), phenyl boronic acid (3.16 g, 25.9 mmol), Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$ (0.99 g, 0.86 mmol), and NaCO$_3$ (3.65 g, 34.4 mmol) were combined with 100 mL of H$_2$O/THF (1:1) and degassed with N$_2$ for 30 min. The reaction mixture was stirred vigorously and refluxed for 12 h. Dichloromethane (200 mL) was added and the organic phase was separated from the aqueous layer. The organic mixture was dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$ and evaporated to yield an oil. The crude material was purified by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 EtOAc/hexanes) and the desired product was further crystallized from hot hexanes to afford a white solid (3.92 g, 76 %).

$^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 10.32 (s, 1H), 7.64 (m, 3H), 7.50-7.43 (m, 4H), 7.30-7.27 (m, 3H), 7.08-7.06 (m, 2H), 4.53 (s, 2H), 2.42 (s, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 190.22, 157.07, 138.05, 137.30, 136.04, 135.66, 134.27, 129.78, 129.12, 128.73, 128.57, 128.44, 127.80, 127.34, 77.06, 20.71. GC-MS = 302 [M]$^+$ (Calcd = 302 [M]$^+$). Mp = 98-99 °C.

**2-Hydroxy-5-methyl-3-phenylbenzaldehyde (R).** The 2-benzylxoy-5-methyl-3-phenyl-benzaldehyde compound (Q) (3.92 g, 13 mmol) was dissolved in 50 mL of dry CH$_2$Cl$_2$ and cooled to 0 °C. A 1.0 M boron tribromide solution in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (26 mL, 26 mmol) was added slowly to the reaction flask and the solution immediately became a dark red-orange color. The reaction was stirred for 2 h and then quenched with H$_2$O (50 mL). The organic layer was
separated, dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$ and evaporated to dryness. The crude material was purified by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 EtOAc/hexanes) to give the desired product as a yellow oil (3.92 g, 76%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): δ 11.40 (s, 1H), 9.90 (s, 1H), 7.62 (d, $J$ = 8 Hz, 2H), 7.49-7.45 (m, 3 H), 7.39 (m, 1H), 7.34 (s, 1H), 7.40 (s, 3H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): δ 197.56, 157.52, 139.64, 137.17, 133.78, 130.90, 129.99, 129.88, 129.01, 126.33, 121.35, 21.06. GC-MS = 212 [M]+ (Calcd = 212 [M]+).

H$_2$LV$^{HH}$ (2,2'-(5,5'-(4,5-dimethoxy-1,2-phenylene)bis(ethyne-2,1-diyl))bis(pyridine-5,2-diyl)) di-phenol. Solid Benz$_2$LV$^{HH}$ (5,5'-(4,5-dimethoxy-1,2-phenylene)bis(ethyne-2,1-diyl))bis(2-(2-(benzyloxy)phenyl)pyridine) (46.0 mg, 65.3 µmol) and iodonitrile (0.02 mL, 163 µmol) were combined in 2 mL of dry CH$_2$Cl$_2$ in a 10 mL Schlenk flask. The reaction mixture was stirred at RT for 22 h. A diluted solution of HCl(aq) was added and the organic phase was extracted with CH$_2$Cl$_2$. The organic layer was separated, dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, filtered, and evaporated to dryness. The crude material was purified by silica gel column chromatography (CH$_2$Cl$_2$) to afford a yellow solid (10 mg, 29%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): δ 8.70 (s, 2H), 7.95 (d, $J$ = 2.0 Hz, 4H), 7.80 (dd, $J$ = 9.5, 1.5 Hz, 2H), 7.34 (t, $J$ = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 7.08-7.04 (m, 4H). 6.93 (t, $J$ = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 3.98 (s, 6H). ESI-MS = 525.3 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 525.2 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 166-167 ºC.

H$_2$L$^{HH}$ (2,2'-(5,5'-(1,2-phenylenebis(ethyne-2,1-diyl))bis(pyridine-5,2-diyl))diphenol). Solid Me$_2$L$^{HH}$ (1,2-bis((6-(2-methoxyphenyl)pyridin-3-yl)ethynyl)benzene) (340 mg, 0.690 mmol) was dissolved in 15 mL of dry CH$_2$Cl$_2$ and cooled to -78 ºC. A 1.0 M CH$_2$Cl$_2$ solution of BBr$_3$ (3.4 mL, 3.45 mmol) was added slowly to the reaction mixture and stirred for 6 h at 0 ºC. The reaction was quenched with trifluoroacetic acid (2 mL) and washed with K$_2$CO$_3$ (aq). The
organic layer was separated, dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, filtered, and evaporated to dryness. Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (20:80 EtOAc/Hexanes) gave a yellow solid (122 mg, 38%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): δ 11.74 (bs, 2H), 8.73 (s, 2H), 8.10-8.01 (m, 4H), 7.86 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.60 (s, 2H), 7.38 (s, 2H), 7.21 (t, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 6.87-6.81 (m, 4H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): δ 161.47, 158.28, 149.50, 141.05, 133.09, 132.72, 129.84, 127.62, 126.02, 120.01, 119.57, 119.44, 119.39, 118.72, 92.52, 90.93. ESI-MS = 465.3 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 465.2 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 141-145 °C.

H$_2$L$_{H,Ph}$$^{H,Ph}$ (3,3'-(5,5'-(1,2-phenylenebis(ethyne-2,1-diyl))bis(pyridine-5,2-diyl))dibiphenyl-2-ol). The foregoing procedure was employed except that Me$_2$L$_{H,Ph}$$^{H,Ph}$ (1,2-bis((6-(2-methoxybiphenyl-3-yl)pyridin-3-yl)ethynyl)benzene) was used in place of Me$_2$L$_{H,H}$. The reaction was performed using Me$_2$L$_{H,Ph}$$^{H,Ph}$ (1.50 g, 2.32 mmol) and 1.0 M BBr$_3$ in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (12 mL, 12 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (20:80 THF/hexanes) gave a yellow solid (393 mg, 27%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): δ 14.50 (bs, 2H), 8.66 (s, 2H), 8.00-7.95 (m, 4H), 7.82 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.66-7.61 (m, 6H), 7.47-7.34 (m, 10H), 7.00 (t, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): δ 157.60, 157.22, 148.33, 140.07, 138.57, 133.35, 132.34, 131.57, 129.69, 129.03, 128.25, 127.23, 126.06, 125.19, 119.31, 119.06, 118.68, 118.10, 92.33, 90.04. ESI-MS = 617.4 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 617.2 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 104-106 °C.

H$_2$L$_{Me,Ph}$$^{Me,Ph}$ (3,3'-(5,5'-(1,2-phenylenebis(ethyne-2,1-diyl))bis(pyridine-5,2-diyl))bis(5-methyl-biphenyl-2-ol). Method A: Solid Benz$_2$L$_{Me,Ph}$$^{Me,Ph}$ (1,2-bis((6-(2-(benzyloxy)-5-methylbiphenyl-3-yl)pyridin-3-yl)ethynyl)benzene) (1.20 g, 1.45 mmol) and iodosotrimethylsilane (2.1 mL, 14.9 mmol) were combined in 50 mL of dry toluene and stirred in a sealed reaction vessel at 130 °C for 3 d. Dilute HCl (aq) was added to quench the reaction and the organic phase was extracted
into CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (3 x 30 mL). The organic layer was separated, dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, filtered, and evaporated to dryness. Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (50:50 hexanes/CH$_2$Cl$_2$) gave a yellow solid (630 mg, 67%). **Method B:** Solid Benz$_2$L$^{Me,Ph}$ (1.65 g, 2.00 mmol) was dissolved in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (75 mL) and cooled to -78ºC. A 1.0 M BBr$_3$ solution in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (4.40 mL, 4.40 mmol) was added dropwise into the reaction flask. After stirring for 2 h, the mixture was quenched with H$_2$O (100 mL). The organic product was extracted with CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (3 x 50 mL), dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, filtered, and evaporated to afford an oil. About 50 mL of CH$_3$OH was added to the residue and a large amount of yellow solid appeared after 1 h. The product was isolated by filtration and re-crystallized form hot CH$_2$Cl$_2$/CH$_3$OH to give the desired material (0.99 g, 78 %). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 14.38 (bs, 2H), 8.64 (s, 2H), 7.95 (dd, $J$ = 8.5 Hz, 4H), 7.68-7.61 (m, 8H), 7.48-7.35 (m, 8H), 7.35 (s, 2H), 2.40 (d, 6H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 155.31, 148.30, 139.94, 138.65, 134.28, 132.28, 131.23, 129.64, 128.96, 128.21, 127.89, 127.15, 126.20, 125.15, 119.24, 118.30, 117.89, 92.26, 90.09, 20.96. ESI-MS = 645.4 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 645.2 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 137-140 ºC.

**H$_2$L$^{tBu,Ph}$ (3,3'-(5,5'-(1,2-phenylenebis(ethyne-2,1-diyl))bis(pyridine-5,2-diyl))bis(5-tertbutylibiphenyl-2-ol)).** The same procedure was employed as for the synthesis of H$_2$L$^{Me,Ph}$ (Method A), except that Benz$_2$L$^{tBu,Ph}$ (1,2-bis((6-(2-(benzyloxy)-5-tertbutylibiphenyl-3-yl)pyridin-3-yl)ethynyl)benzene) was used instead of Benz$_2$L$^{Me,Ph}$. The reaction was performed with Benz$_2$L$^{tBu,Ph}$ (260 mg, 0.286 mmol) and iodotrimethylsilane (0.4 mL, 2.86 mmol). Purification of the crude material by silica gel column chromatography (50:50 CH$_2$Cl$_2$/Hexanes) gave a yellow solid (43 mg, 21%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 14.39 (bs, 2H), 8.68 (d, 2.5 Hz, 2H), 8.93 (d, $J$ = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 7.97 (dd, $J$ = 10.5, 2.0 Hz, 2H), 7.83 (d, $J$ = 2.5 Hz, 2H), 7.69-7.68 (m, 4H), 7.65-7.63 (m, 2H), 7.50-7.47 (m, 6H), 7.41-7.37 (m, 4H), 1.42 (s, 18H). $^{13}$C NMR
(CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 157.54, 155.28, 148.46, 141.42, 139.93, 139.07, 132.35, 131.08, 130.98, 129.73, 128.98, 128.24, 127.14, 125.14, 122.39, 119.21, 117.86, 117.85, 92.21, 90.12, 34.49, 21.77. ESI-MS = 729.5 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 729.3 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 125-128 °C.

H$_2$BIPS$^{\text{Me,Ph}}$ (3,3$'$(1$E$,1$'E$)-(3,3$'$-sulfonylbis(3,1-phenylene)bis(azan-1-yl-1-ylidene))bis(methan-1-yl-1-ylidene)bis(5-methylbiphenyl-2-ol)). In a 100 mL round-bottom flask, 2-hydroxy-5-methyl-3-phenylbenzaldehyde (R) (2.60 g, 12.3 mmol) and 3,3$'$-diaminodiphenylsulfone (1.38 g, 5.56 mmol) were dissolved in 50 mL of MeOH. The mixture was treated with formic acid (0.46 mL, 12.3 mmol) and stirred at room temperature for 5 h. The resulting bright orange precipitate was isolated by filtration and washed with MeOH. Purification of the reaction product by silica gel column chromatography (CH$_2$Cl$_2$ $\rightarrow$ 15:85 EtOAc/CH$_2$Cl$_2$) gave the desired product (2.1 g, 48 %). A small amount of the starting aldehyde and singly condensed product (< 2 %) were still present in the purified material, presumably due to hydrolysis of H$_2$BIPS$^{\text{Me,Ph}}$. $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 13.19 (s, 2H), 8.59 (s, 2H), 7.88 (m, 2H), 7.61-7.57 (m, 6H), 7.47-7.44 (m, 4H), 7.38-7.24 (m, 6 H), 2.38 (s, 6H). $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 164.97, 156.52, 149.62, 142.86, 142.86, 137.58, 136.23, 132.41, 130.84, 130.18, 129.47, 126.68, 128.37, 127.48, 126.99, 125.88, 119.99, 118.88, 20.61. ESI-MS = 637.2 [M+H]$^+$ (Calcd = 637.2 [M+H]$^+$). Mp = 141-145 °C.

[Fe$_2$(L$^{\text{Me,Ph}}$)$_2$(THF)$_3$] (1). Inside a drybox, solid H$_2$L$^{\text{Me,Ph}}$ (200 mg, 310 µmol) and [Fe$_2$(Mes)$_4$] (91.3 mg, 155 µmol) were dissolved in 10 mL of THF in a 25 mL flask to give a dark red solution. The mixture was stirred at RT for 10 min and the solvent was removed in vacuo. A solution of Et$_2$O (10 mL) was added and the resulting suspension was stirred for 10 min. The solid material was isolated by filtration and crystallized by layering pentane (2 mL) over a solution of the compound in THF (10 mL). The crystals were isolated by filtration and dried
under vacuum to give a red-brown powder (116 mg, 46%). Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction studies were obtained by vapor diffusion of pentane into a solution of the complex in THF. \(^{1}\)H NMR (THF-\(d_8\), 500 MHz): \(\delta = 44.45\) (bs), 42.20 (bs), 38.08 (bs), 36.30 (bs), 34.14 (bs, methyl), 11.01 (bs), 6.84 (bs), 6.25 (bs), 5.61 (bs), 4.61 (bs). IR (KBr): \(\nu = 3442, 2918, 2851, 1595, 1555, 1495, 1453, 1420, 1368, 1292, 1250, 1222, 1045, 840, 821, 757, 698\) cm\(^{-1}\). \(\lambda_{\text{max}} = 395\) (\(\epsilon = 5130\) M\(^{-1}\) cm\(^{-1}\)), 332 (\(\epsilon = 63,300\) M\(^{-1}\) cm\(^{-1}\)), 306 (\(\epsilon = 94100\) M\(^{-1}\) cm\(^{-1}\)), 235 (\(\epsilon = 137000\) M\(^{-1}\) cm\(^{-1}\)) nm. \(^{57}\)Fe Mössbauer (90 K): \(\delta = 1.13\) mm/s, \(\Delta E_Q = 1.88\) mm/s, \(\Gamma_{L/R} = 0.47\) mm/s. Mp > 400 °C. Anal. Calc. for \(\text{I}\), Fe\(_2\)C\(_{104}\)H\(_{84}\)N\(_4\)O\(_7\): C, 77.42; H, 5.25; N, 3.47. Found: C, 76.66, 76.91; H, 4.50, 4.22; N, 4.16, 4.65. Drying of the samples under vacuum at 80 °C and repeated measurements of independently prepared material gave similar results. Deviations between calculated and observed values are ascribed to residual solvent molecules and possibly partial oxidation to form \(\text{II}\) since \(\text{I}\) is quite air-sensitive. Because we have crystal structure information on \(\text{I}\), which has disordered THF and pentane in the crystal lattice, and the crystalline samples looked identical with copious amounts of material, there is no doubt about the composition of \(\text{I}\).

\([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(L^{\text{Me, Ph}})_2]\) \((\text{II})\). **Method A.** The \([\text{Fe}_2(L^{\text{Me, Ph}})_3(\text{THF})_3]\) complex (50 mg, 31 mmol) was dissolved in THF (2 mL) in a 5 mL Schlenk flask under a nitrogen atmosphere. An excess amount of dry \(O_2\) gas was introduced and the reaction was stirred for 5 min. The solvent mixture was evaporated to dryness and the resulting dark red residue was extracted into dry toluene (2 mL). The desired material was crystallized from vapor diffusion of pentane into a solution of the complex in toluene to give a dark red material (35 mg, 80%). **Method B.** The dinucleating ligand \(H_2L^{\text{Me, Ph}}\) (137 mg, 213 \(\mu\)mol) and NaHMDS (82 mg, 447 \(\mu\)mol) were dissolved in THF (3 mL) to give a bright orange solution. A solution of \((\text{NEt}_4)_2[\text{Fe}_2\text{OCl}_6]_2\) \((141\) mg, 234 \(\mu\)mol) in CH\(_3\)CN (0.5 mL) was added and the dark red mixture was stirred for 15 min. The solvent was removed in
and the resulting product was extracted into toluene. Evaporation of the toluene solution gave the desired complex as a red solid (70 mg, 47 %). Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction studies were obtained by vapor diffusion of pentane into a solution of the complex in THF. $^1$H NMR (THF-$d_8$, 500 MHz): $\delta = 16.42$ (bs), 13.90 (bs), 11.75 (bs), 8.56 (bs), 8.25 (bs), 7.59 (bs), 7.52 (bs), 6.96 (bs), 6.60 (bs). IR (KBr): $v = 3431, 3030, 2917, 2851, 1598, 1493, 1418, 1367, 1290, 1250, 1225, 833, 758, 697$ cm$^{-1}$. $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 390$ (sh, $\varepsilon = 37,500$ M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$), 312 ($\varepsilon = 108,000$ M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$) nm. $^{57}$Fe Mössbauer (90K): $\delta = 0.43$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q = 1.35$ mm/s, $\Gamma_{L/R} = 0.42$ mm/s. Mp = 335 °C (decomposition). Anal. Calc. for $2 \cdot$ (THF)$_4$, Fe$_2$C$_{108}$H$_{92}$N$_4$O$_9$: C, 76.96; H, 5.50; N, 3.33. Found: C, 76.23; H, 5.45; N, 3.29. This result is consistent with the four THF molecules found in a low-resolution X-ray crystal structure of 2.

**UV-Vis Spectrophotometric Studies**

*Reaction of Na$_2$L$^{R,R'}$ or Na$_2$BIPS$^{Me,Ph}$ with Fe(II) in THF.* Inside a nitrogen drybox, stock solutions of either Na$_2$L$^{R,R'}$ or Na$_2$BIPS$^{Me,Ph}$ were prepared by dissolving the H$_2$L$^{R,R'}$ or H$_2$BIPS$^{Me,Ph}$ ligand in THF containing two equiv of NaHMDS, giving a concentration of ~20 $\mu$M. A 3.0 mL portion of either the Na$_2$L$^{R,R'}$ or Na$_2$BIPS$^{Me,Ph}$ stock solution was added via a septum to a sealed UV-vis quartz cuvette and brought outside of the drybox. An anaerobic CH$_3$CN solution of Fe(OSO$_2$CF$_3$)$_2$ (~3 mM) was loaded into a 25 $\mu$L gas-tight syringe. Small aliquots (~ 5 $\mu$L, 0.25 equiv relative to Na$_2$L$^{R,R'}$ or Na$_2$BIPS$^{Me,Ph}$) of the Fe(OSO$_2$CF$_3$)$_2$ solution were added to the sample in the cuvette and the absorption spectra were recorded.

*Reaction of 2 Fe(II) and Na$_2$L$^{H,Ph}$ with Ph$_3$CCO$_2$Na in THF.* Inside a nitrogen drybox, a THF solution containing Fe(OSO$_2$CF$_3$)$_2$ (60 $\mu$M) and Na$_2$L$^{H,Ph}$ (30 $\mu$M) was prepared in a 25 mL volumetric flask. A 4.0 mL portion of the iron-ligand mixture was added into a septum-sealed UV-vis quartz cuvette and brought outside of the drybox. A 250 $\mu$L air-tight syringe was loaded
with a degassed THF solution containing Ph$_3$CCO$_2$Na (13 mM). Aliquots of the carboxylate solution (\(\sim 10 \ \mu\text{L}, 1.0 \ \text{equiv relative to } \text{Na}_2\text{L}^{\text{H,Ph}}\)) were added to the UV-vis cell and the absorption spectra were recorded.

\textit{Reaction of }[\text{Fe}_2(\text{L}^{\text{Me, Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_3] \ (\text{I}) \textit{ with }[\text{FeCp}_2](\text{BF}_4) \ (\text{Cp} = \text{cyclopentadiene}) \textit{ in THF.}

Inside a nitrogen drybox, a stock solution of \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{L}^{\text{Me, Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_3]\) (13 \(\mu\text{M}) in THF was prepared using a 25 mL volumetric flask. A 3.0 mL portion of the \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{L}^{\text{Me, Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_3]\) solution was added to a septum-sealed UV-vis quartz cuvette and brought outside of the drybox. Small aliquots of an anaerobic CH$_2$Cl$_2$ solution of \([\text{FeCp}_2](\text{BF}_4)\) (\(\sim 10 \ \mu\text{L}, \) which equals 0.5 equiv relative to \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{L}^{\text{Me, Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_3]\)) were added into the UV-vis cell and the absorption spectra were recorded.

2.3. Results and Discussion

\textbf{Ligand Design and Synthesis.} Controlling the coordination chemistry of kinetically labile iron complexes is a formidable challenge.$^{30,31}$ Reaction of iron salts with simple ligands, such as alkoxides or carboxylates, typically results in formation of oligo- or polymeric metal clusters.$^{31-35}$ In contrast, when the ligands are too sterically hindered, mononuclear iron species are obtained.$^{36,37}$ To construct functional protein models using carboxylate-bridged diiron assemblies, certain design elements must be considered. First, the diiron framework should be sufficiently stable towards changes of the metal oxidation state. Reaction of the reduced diiron(II) form of sMMOH with dioxygen generates transient diiron(III) and diiron(IV) intermediates.$^1,38$ To access such species outside of the protein environment, the ligand must be able to stabilize iron in the +2, +3, and +4 oxidation states. Second, the diiron assembly should be structurally flexible to allow for geometric reorganization. In the biological systems, changes
in ligation of a glutamate side chain to the diiron center occur concomitantly with changes in its redox states. Such carboxylate shifts are believed to be functionally important during dioxygen activation. Third, the ligand scaffold should provide an open site for dioxygen binding between the two iron atoms. To obtain a quadrilateral core, such as the proposed di(µ-oxo)diiron(IV) structure of intermediate Q in sMHOH,39 the diiron unit should be coordinatively unsaturated or have bridging ligands that could be displaced readily. Finally, the ligand framework should be amenable to synthetic modifications. This feature is important because it allows tuning of the geometric and electronic properties of a given construct using the fewest synthetic steps.

Based on the above prerequisites, we designed a series of dinucleating ligands that share a common “V-shaped” architecture (Chart 2.2). These compounds can bind two metal ions, forming stable six-membered ring chelates, and enforce a planar arrangement of O₂N₂ donor atoms. We envisioned that the planar nature of the ligand would allow for axial coordination of external carboxylates, which would match the arrangement of aspartate and glutamate side chains that are bound to the diiron protein active sites (Chart 2.1). The unique “V-shaped” ligand motif also provides an internal pocket for binding of a small molecule, such as dioxygen. Five of these compounds are derived from phenoxylpyridyl binding units tethered to a 1,2-diethynylbenzene linker. The protonated forms of these ligands are designated as H₂L²R,R', where R = H, Me, or t-Bu and R' = H or Ph. The steric constraints of H₂L²R,R' are adjusted by appending alkyl or phenyl moieties to either the ortho or para positions of the phenol ring. A sixth ligand, H₂BIP²Me,Ph, was also synthesized using a different covalent bridge. Replacement of the diethynylbenzene unit in H₂L²R,R' with a bis(iminephenyl)sulfone linker alters the rotational freedom of the ligand framework. The parent bis-(3-(2-hydroxybenzylideneamino)phenyl) sulfone compound was synthesized as a ligand for preparing dinuclear copper complexes.40
Several routes were explored to obtain H$_2$L$^{R,R'}$. The synthetic routes for H$_2$L$^{V,H}$, H$_2$L$^{H,H}$, H$_2$L$^{H,Ph}$, and H$_2$L$^{tBu,Ph}$ are provided in Schemes 2.1 and 2.2. The most efficient synthetic strategy is illustrated for the preparation of H$_2$L$^{Me,Ph}$ in Scheme 2.3. As described previously,$^{27}$ protection of the commercially available 2-bromo-4-methylphenol with tetrahydro-2H-pyran, followed by a Suzuki cross-coupling reaction with phenylboronic acid, gave M as a colorless oil. Deprotection with aqueous HCl, followed by bromination with Br$_2$, afforded N in quantitative yield. Compound N was subjected to a second protection procedure with benzyl bromide and isolated, after purification, as a colorless material. Negishi coupling of I with 2,5-dibromopyridine gave K as a white solid. A Sonogashira procedure was employed to couple K and 1,2-diethynylbenzene. Solid 1,2-diethynylbenzene is susceptible to decomposition upon storage; therefore, it was generated in situ from 1,2-bis((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)benzene$^{41}$ and tetrabutylammonium fluoride before use in the cross-coupling reaction. This procedure afforded the benzyl-protected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R'</th>
<th>R&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$L$^{V,H}$</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OCH$_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$L$^{H,H}$</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$L$^{H,Ph}$</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$L$^{Me,Ph}$</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$L$^{tBu,Ph}$</td>
<td>t-Bu</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ligand Benz$_2$L$_{Me,Ph}$ in moderate yield after purification. Finally, the desired H$_2$L$_{Me,Ph}$ compound was obtained by treatment of Benz$_2$L$_{Me,Ph}$ with boron tribromide in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ and crystallization from CH$_2$Cl$_2$/MeOH. The H$_2$L$_{Me,Ph}$ ligand was isolated as a yellow solid.

**Scheme 2.1.** Part 1: i) $n$-BuLi, THF, -78°C, b. ZnCl$_2$, c. 2,5-dibromopyridine, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$]; ii) 4,5-diethynylveratrole, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$], NEt$_3$, THF, reflux; iii) TMSI, CH$_2$Cl$_2$. Part 2: i) $n$-BuLi, THF, -78°C, b. ZnCl$_2$, c. 2,5-dibromopyridine, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$]; ii) 1,2-diethynylbenzene, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$], NEt$_3$, THF, reflux; iii) a. BBr$_3$, CH$_2$Cl$_2$, b. CF$_3$CO$_2$H.

The sulfone bridged compound H$_2$BIPS$_{Me,Ph}$ was synthesized according to Scheme 2.3. Benzylation of 2,6-dibromo-4-methylphenol with benzyl bromide provided O as a colorless crystalline solid. To introduce an aldehyde functionality, O was treated with $n$-butyllithium and quenched with dimethylformamide to give P. This precursor was coupled to phenylboronic acid to provide Q in good yield. Cleavage of the benzyl protecting group by boron tribromide in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ cleanly gave R as a yellow oil. The final product was obtained by an acid-catalyzed condensation reaction between R and the commercially available 3,3'-diaminodiphenyl sulfone in MeOH. The desired bright orange solid, H$_2$BIP$_{Me,Ph}$, readily precipitated from the reaction mixture and was isolated in moderate yield.
Scheme 2.2. Part 1: i) a. NaH, THF, 0°C, b. CH$_3$I, reflux; ii) a. TMEDA, Et$_2$O, b. Br$_3$; iii) a. n-BuLi, THF, -78°C. b. ZnCl$_2$, c. 2,5-dibromopyridine, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_3$]; iv) 1,2-diethynylbenzene, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_3$], NEt$_3$, THF, reflux; v) BBr$_3$, CH$_2$Cl$_2$, 0°C. Part 2: i) benzyl bromide, K$_2$CO$_3$, CH$_3$CN, reflux; ii) phenylboronic acid, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_3$], Na$_2$CO$_3$(aq), THF, reflux; iii) a. nBuLi, THF, -78°C, b. ZnCl$_2$, c. 2,5-dibromopyridine, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_3$]; iv) 1,2-diethylbenzene, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_3$], NEt$_3$, THF, reflux; v) TMSI, toluene, reflux. Part 3: i) a. HCl (aq), b. Br$_2$, CH$_2$Cl$_2$; ii) benzyl bromide, K$_2$CO$_3$, CH$_3$CN; iii) a. nBuLi, THF, -78°C, b. ZnCl$_2$, c. 2,5-dibromopyridine, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_3$]; iv) 1,2-bis(trimethylsilylacetylene)benzene, NBu$_4$F, THF, b. [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_3$], NEt$_3$; v) BBr$_3$, CH$_2$Cl$_2$.

Scheme 2.3. i) benzyl bromide, K$_2$CO$_3$, CH$_3$CN; ii) a. nBuLi, toluene, -78°C, b. anhydrous DMF; iii) phenylboronic acid, [Pd(PPh$_3$)$_3$], Na$_2$CO$_3$ THF/H$_2$O; iv) BBr$_3$, CH$_2$Cl$_2$; v) 3,3'-bis(aminophenyl)sulfone, CF$_3$CO$_2$H, MeOH
Gram quantities of the final ligands, $\text{H}_2\text{L}^{\text{Me,Ph}}$ and $\text{H}_2\text{BIP}^{\text{Me,Ph}}$, were obtained. These synthetic routes facilitate systematic modification of ligand substituents without significant changes to the overall synthetic strategy.

**UV-Vis Spectrophotometric Studies.** For systems that display strong optical features, a convenient method to examine metal-ligand binding is to conduct UV-vis spectrophotometric titrations. If $[\text{L}^{\text{R,R}'}_2]^{2-}$ or $[\text{BIPS}^{\text{Me,Ph}}_2]^{2-}$ (where $[\text{L}^{\text{R,R}'}_2]^{2-}$ and $[\text{BIPS}^{\text{Me,Ph}}_2]^{2-}$ are the doubly deprotonated forms of $\text{H}_2\text{L}^{\text{R,R}'}$ and $\text{H}_2\text{BIPS}^{\text{Me,Ph}}$, respectively) are capable of serving as dinucleating hosts, addition of iron(II) salts to the apo-ligands should yield a 2:1 metal-to-ligand stoichiometry.

Titration experiments were first performed with the parent $\text{H}_2\text{L}^{\text{H,H}}$ compound (Figure 2.1A). Deprotonation of $\text{H}_2\text{L}^{\text{H,H}}$ with 2.0 equiv of sodium hexamethyldisilazide (NaHMDS) in THF afforded $\text{Na}_2\text{L}^{\text{H,H}}$, which displays an intense absorption at 415 nm (dotted trace). When the $\text{Na}_2\text{L}^{\text{H,H}}$ solution was treated with various aliquots of $\text{Fe(OSO}_2\text{CF}_3)_2$, formation of two sequential isosbestic points were observed, at 392 and 365 nm. This data suggest an $\text{A} \rightarrow \text{B} \rightarrow \text{C}$ reaction scheme, which would be consistent with the binding of a single iron atom followed by binding of a second iron atom to $\text{Na}_2\text{L}^{\text{H,H}}$. A plot of the absorbance change at 350 nm versus equiv of Fe(II) added (relative to $\text{Na}_2\text{L}^{\text{H,H}}$) is shown in Figure 2.2A. A gradual increase in the optical feature at 350 nm upon successive additions of iron(II) indicates that $\text{Na}_2\text{L}^{\text{H,H}}$ is capable of coordinating at least two iron atoms. Saturation behavior was not observed when $\geq 2.0$ equiv of Fe(II) were added.
**Figure 2.1.** Absorption spectra of A) addition of Fe(II) to a solution containing Na₂L²,H,H, B) addition of Fe(II) to a solution containing Na₂L²,H,Ph, C) addition of sodium triphenylacetate to a solution containing Fe(II) and Na₂L²,H,Ph, and D) addition of Na₂L²,H,Ph to a solution containing Fe(II) and sodium triphenylacetate. For A and B, the equiv of Fe(II) added is relative to the amount of the ligand. For C, the equiv of triphenylacetate added is relative to the amount of Na₂L²,H,Ph. For D, the equiv of Na₂L²,H,Ph added is relative to the amount of Fe(II). All experiments were performed in tetrahydrofuran at RT. Panel A: black dotted line = Na₂L²,H,H, solid lines = spectra after addition of up to 2.0 equiv of Fe(II). Panel B: black dotted line = Na₂L²,H,Ph, solid lines = spectra after addition of up to 2.0 equiv of Fe(II). Panel C: blue line = Na₂L²,H,Ph/2 Fe(II), green line = spectrum after addition of 20 equiv of NaO₂CCPh₃. Panel D: black line = Fe(II)/ 20 equiv of NaO₂CCPh₃, colored lines = spectra after addition of up to 2.0 equiv of Na₂L²,H,Ph.

For comparison to Na₂L²,H,H, reaction of the ortho substituted derivative Na₂L²,H,Ph to Fe(II) was examined. Treatment of H₂L²,H,Ph with NaHMDS in THF gave Na₂L²,H,Ph, as indicated by the formation of a prominent absorption band at 424 nm (Figure 2.1B). When aliquots of Fe(OSO₂CF₃)₂ were added to Na₂L²,H,Ph, a hypsochromic shift of the feature at 424 nm to 382 nm occurred. The optical spectra were unchanged after ≥ 1.0 equiv of Fe(II) was introduced (relative
to Na₂L⁻² (Figure 2.2B). This result suggests that in the presence of Fe(II), Na₂L⁻² forms a complex having a 1:1 metal-to-ligand stoichiometry. To test the stability of this new species, increasing amounts of sodium triphenylacetate were added to the Fe²⁺/Na₂L⁻² mixture and the reaction was followed by UV-vis spectroscopy (Figure 2.1C). The absorbance spectrum did not change after the addition of 20 equiv of triphenylacetate (relative to Na₂L⁻²). If coordination of the carboxylate to the iron centers resulted in significant structural rearrangement, such a change would be reflected in the absorption spectrum. Because no optical changes were observed, it was conclude that the 1:1 Fe(II)-to-[L⁻²] species is too stable to be disrupted by triphenylacetate. When the reaction order was reversed, adding Na₂L⁻² to a THF solution containing 1.0 equiv of Fe(II) and 20.0 equiv of triphenylacetate, a band at 382 nm also appeared (Figure 2.1D). Once again, formation of the 1:1 Fe(II) to [L⁻²] species was preferred. We assigned this optical spectrum to the diiron(II) [Fe₂(L⁻²)] complex (vide infra).

To investigate the effect of bulkier ligand substituents on the iron binding of [L⁻²], titration studies were also carried out with Na₂L⁻². We postulated that by appending tert-buty groups to the para position of the phenol ring, the increased steric demand at the ligand periphery would prevent any possible ligand-ligand interactions in the presence of Fe(II). When treated with NaHMDS in THF, H₂L⁻ was converted to Na₂L⁻. The deprotonated ligand displays a characteristic absorption at 437 nm (Figure 2.3A). Upon addition of Fe(OSO₂CF₃)₂ to a solution of Na₂L⁻, the band at 437 nm decreased, concomitant with an absorption increase at 393 nm. Similar to that of Na₂L⁻, the absorbance profile is unchanged after addition of 1.0 equiv of Fe(II) (Figure 2.2C). A 1:1 metal-to-ligand stoichiometry would also be consistent with the formulation [Fe₂(L⁻₂)].
Figure 2.2. Plots of the absorbance change at a single wavelength (nm) from reaction of Fe(II) with a THF solution containing A) Na$_2$L$_{H,H}$, B) Na$_2$L$_{H,Ph}$, C) Na$_2$L$_{IBu,Ph}$, and D) Na$_2$BIPS$_{Me,Ph}$. The wavelengths were chosen to show the maximum change between successive Fe(II) titrations.

Figure 2.3. Absorption spectra from the addition of Fe(II) to a THF solution containing A) Na$_2$L$_{IBu,Ph}$ and B) Na$_2$BIPS$_{Me,Ph}$. Panel A: black dotted line = Na$_2$L$_{IBu,Ph}$, solid lines = spectra after addition of up to 2.0 equiv of Fe(II). Panel B: black dotted line = Na$_2$BIPS$_{Me,Ph}$, solid lines = spectra after addition of up to 2.0 equiv of Fe(II).
The similar results obtained for \([L^{H,Ph}]^{2-}\) and \([L^{iBu,Ph}]^{2-}\) led us to hypothesize that, although \([L^{iBu,Ph}]^{2-}\) is more sterically encumbering, free rotation about the ethynyl arms allows the \([L^{R,R'+}]^{2-}\) ligands to interdigitate. To explore whether we could maintain the “V-shaped” architecture of the \([L^{R,R'+}]^{2-}\) ligand design but restrict rotation of the metal-binding arms, \(H_2BIPS^{Me,Ph}\) (Chart 2.2) was conceived. The bis(iminephenyl)sulfone unit is a promising alternative linker to 1,2-diethynylbenzene because it provides an ideal N–N distance for a dinucleating framework. Deprotonation of \(H_2BIPS^{Me,Ph}\) with NaHMDS in THF gave \(Na_2BIPS^{Me,Ph}\), which has a strong absorbance at 428 nm (Figure 2.3B). When various equiv of Fe(II) were added to \(Na_2BIPS^{Me,Ph}\) the band at 428 nm decreased. By evaluating the absorbance change at 275 nm, it is clear that a saturation point is reached upon addition of 1.0 equiv of Fe(II) (Figure 2.2D). Once again, this experiment indicates that a 1:1 metal-to-ligand complex is formed preferentially in solution.

**Isolation and Characterization of Iron Complexes.** Because the parent \([L^{H,H}]^{2-}\) ligand appeared to accommodate a 2:1 metal-to-ligand ratio, we attempted to prepare a discrete diiron complex in the presence of Fe(II), \(H_2L^{H,H}\), and carboxylates (Chart 2.1, left). When \(H_2L^{H,H}\) (1.0 equiv) and triphenylacetic acid (2.0 equiv) were combined with \([Fe(\text{Mes})_4]^{22}\) (where \(\text{Mes} = 2,4,6\text{-trimethylphenyl}, 1.0\) equiv) in THF, a dark red solid precipitated from the reaction mixture (Scheme 2.4A). This material was insoluble in both polar and non-polar organic solvents. When the reaction was repeated using either benzoate or acetate, instead of triphenylacetate, similar results were obtained. Because phenolate groups are well known to bridge multiple metal ions, it is possible that reaction of the \([L^{H,H}]^{2-}\) ligand with Fe(II) led to the formation of undesired polymetallic species.
Scheme 2.4. Reaction of H$_2$L$^{H,H}$ with Fe(II) (A, top) and H$_2$L$^{Me,Ph}$ with Fe(II) and O$_2$ (B, bottom). Mes = 2,4,6-trimethylphenyl, NaHMDS = sodium hexamethyldisilazide.

The titration experiments with [L$^{R,R'}$]$^{2-}$ and [BIPS$^{Me,Ph}$]$^{2-}$ demonstrated that when the ortho positions of the phenolate rings were substituted with phenyl groups complexes having a 1:1 metal-to-ligand stoichiometry were observed. To determine the identity of these species, we prepared the iron complex of H$_2$L$^{Me,Ph}$. Treatment of H$_2$L$^{Me,Ph}$ (2.0 equiv) with Fe$_2$(Mes)$_4$ (1.0 equiv) in THF led to formation of a homogeneous dark red solution (Scheme 2.4B). Crystallization of the crude material from THF and pentane gave a dark red material in moderate yield. Single crystal X-ray diffraction analysis revealed that the complex has a diiron(II) structure with two bridging [L$^{Me,Ph}$]$^{2-}$ ligands (Figure 2.4). Crystallographic data and refinement details are given in Table 2.1. Coordination of the iron centers by additional THF molecules resulted in the overall molecular formula [Fe$_2$(L$^{Me,Ph}$)$_2$(THF)$_3$] (1). The five-coordinate iron atom, Fe(1), adopts a distorted square pyramidal geometry, with two phenoxy oxygen (Fe–O = ~ 1.94 Å) and two pyridyl nitrogen (Fe–N = ~ 2.12 Å) atoms at the basal sites and a THF oxygen atom (Fe–O = 2.19 Å) at the apical position. The pseudo-octahedral iron center is coordinated by two phenoxy oxygen (Fe–O = ~ 1.97 Å), two pyridyl nitrogen (Fe–N = ~ 2.18 Å), and two THF oxygen (Fe–O = ~ 2.28 Å) atoms, with each set of donors trans to one another. A distance of
7.20 Å separates the two iron centers. The 1:1 Fe(II) to \([L^{R,R'}]^{2-}\) stoichiometry observed from the titration studies is reflected in the \([\text{Fe}_2(L^{\text{Me,Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_3]\) formulation. Thus, it appears that in both the solid and solution states, 1 maintains the same molecular structure. A survey of the literature revealed that only a limited number of Fe(II) complexes with terminal phenolate ligands have been characterized.\(^{48,49}\) Most iron-containing phenolate compounds are found in the Fe(III) state and/or have multiple metals bridged by the phenolate moiety.\(^{50-52}\)

**Table 2.1.** X-ray Crystallographic Data and Refinement for \([\text{Fe}_2(L^{\text{Me,Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_3]\) (1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>1(THF)$<em>{3.5}$pentane)$</em>{0.5}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical formula</td>
<td>Fe$<em>2$C$</em>{120.5}$H$_{118}$N$<em>4$O$</em>{10.5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula weight</td>
<td>1901.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>110 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength</td>
<td>0.71073 Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system, space group</td>
<td>Triclinic, P 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit cell dimensions</td>
<td>(a = 15.624(3)) Å (\alpha = 90.39(3)^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b = 17.712(4)) Å (\beta = 98.51(3)^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c = 18.838(4)) Å (\gamma = 106.33(3)^\circ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>4941.4(17) Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Z,) Calculated density</td>
<td>2.1.278 g/mm$^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theta range for data collection</td>
<td>2.07 – 26.37°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting indices</td>
<td>(-19 \leq h \leq 19, -21 \leq k \leq 22, -23 \leq l \leq 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections collection/ unique</td>
<td>75842/ 20123 [R$_{int}$ = 0.1207]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness to theta</td>
<td>99.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/ restraints/ parameters</td>
<td>20213/ 1390/ 1268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of fit on $F^2$</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R Indices</td>
<td>$R_1 = 0.0854$, $wR_2 = 0.1860$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \(R1 = \frac{\sum |F_o| - |F_c|}{\sum |F_o|};\) \(wR2 = \frac{\sum [w(F_o^2 - F_c^2)^2]}{\sum w(F_o^2)}\)^{1/2}; \(GOF = [\sum w(F_o^2 - F_c^2)]^{1/2}(n-p)\)^{1/2}, where \(n\) is the number of reflections and \(p\) is the total number of parameters refined.
Figure 2.4. Ortep thermal ellipsoid (50%) diagram of the X-ray crystal structure of [Fe$_2$(L$^{\text{Mc,Ph}}$)$_2$(THF)$_3$] (1) with a partial numbering scheme. Hydrogen atoms and solvent molecules are omitted for clarity. The atoms are color coded according to the following: gray, carbon; red, oxygen; blue, nitrogen; orange, iron. Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (deg): Fe(1)–O(1), 1.945(3); Fe(1)–O(2), 1.936(3); Fe(1)–N(3), 2.183(4); Fe(1)–N(4), 2.193(4); Fe(1)–O(100), 2.123(3); Fe(2)–O(3), 1.967(3); Fe(2)–O(4), 1.977(3); Fe(2)–N(1), 2.180(4); Fe(2)–N(2), 2.191(4); Fe(2)–O(200), 2.203(4); Fe(2)–O(300), 2.321(3); O(1)–Fe(1)–N(4), 84.37(14); O(2)–Fe(1)–N(3), 85.98(14); O(3)–Fe(2)–N(2), 85.68(14); O(4)–Fe(2)–N(1), 85.25(14).

The absorption spectrum of 1 shows several intense features, at 235 ($\epsilon = 137,000$ M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$), 306 ($\epsilon = 94,100$ M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$), 332 (sh, $\epsilon = 63,300$ M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$) and 395 ($\epsilon = 5,130$ M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$) nm (Figure 2.5A). This spectrum matches those obtained from the Fe(II)/Na$_2$L$^{R,R'}$ titration studies (vide supra). Due to the limited examples of Fe(II)-phenolate compounds that have been reported in the literature, it is unclear whether any of the absorption bands correspond to a phenolate-to-Fe(II) charge transfer.
Figure 2.5. Electronic spectra of A) complex 1 and B) complex 2 in tetrahydrofuran at RT.

The $^1$H NMR spectrum of 1 in THF-$d_8$ reveals the complex to be paramagnetic in solution (Figure 2.6A). The downfield signals at 44.45, 42.20, 38.08, and 36.30 ppm are most likely due to protons located either on the phenoxy or the pyridyl rings of $[L^{Me,Ph}]^{2-}$ because they are located closest to the paramagnetic iron centers. The peak at 34.14 ppm is attributed to the methyl protons of $[L^{Me,Ph}]^{2-}$ because it has the largest integrated area and is absent in the spectrum of $[Fe_2(L^{H,Ph})_2]$, which does not contain methyl groups (data not shown).

The zero-field $^{57}$Fe Mössbauer spectrum of a polycrystalline sample of 1 was measured at 90 K (Figure 2.7A). The data were fit to a single quadrupole doublet, with $\delta = 1.13$ mm/s and $\Delta E_Q = 1.88$ mm/s. These parameters are typical for high-spin iron(II) centers in pseudo-octahedral environments.\textsuperscript{9,53} Although there are two distinct iron atoms in the solid-state structure of complex 1, the similarities in their coordination environments make the sites indistinguishable in the absence of an applied magnetic field. This effect most likely accounts for the somewhat broadened linewidth of the quadrupole doublet ($\Gamma_{R,L} = 0.46$ mm/s).
Figure 2.6. The 500 MHz $^1$H NMR spectra of complex 1 (A) and 2 (B) recorded in THF-$d_8$. Only the paramagnetically shifted resonances (10-50 ppm) are shown.

Figure 2.7. Zero-field $^{57}$Fe Mössbauer spectra of polycrystalline 1 (A) and 2 (B) recorded at 90 K. Both spectra exhibit a single quadrupole doublet, with parameters $\delta = 1.13$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q = 1.88$ mm/s, and $\Gamma_{R,L} = 0.46$ mm/s for 1 and $\delta = 0.43$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q = 1.35$ mm/s, and $\Gamma_{R,L} = 0.42$ mm/s for 2. Least-square fits (solid lines), assuming Lorentzian lineshapes, are overlaid on the experimental points (black hash marks).
The electrochemical properties of 1 were studied by cyclic voltammetry (CV). When the CV was performed in THF, two sequential quasi-reversible redox processes were observed, at $E_{1/2} = -31$ and -17 mV vs. ferrocene/ferrocenium (Fc/Fc⁺) (Figure 2.8A). A differential pulse voltammetry (DPV) measurement of 1 in THF revealed two oxidation peaks with maximum height at -31 and -17 mV (Figure 2.8C). These events are attributed to oxidation of 1 from Fe(II)Fe(II)$\rightarrow$Fe(II)Fe(III)$\rightarrow$Fe(III)Fe(III). When the CV of 1 was measured in DMF, rather than THF, the complex exhibited one quasi-reversible redox couple at $E_{1/2} = -64$ mV vs. Fc/Fc⁺ (Figure 2.8B). The DPV of 1 in DMF also confirmed that only a single redox event occurs at -64 mV (Figure 2.8D). Presumably, this process corresponds to a two-electron oxidation of 1 from Fe(II)Fe(II)$\rightarrow$Fe(III)Fe(III). Attempts to quantify the number of electrons involved in these electrochemical processes using ferrocene as a standard gave ambiguous results and were not examined further. Nevertheless, these data suggest that electronic delocalization between the two iron centers in complex 1 is solvent dependent. From the electrochemical data, a comproportionation constant ($K_{com}$) of 1 was calculated to be $\sim$100 in THF and $\sim$10⁵ in DMF. According to the Robin-Day classification, 1 behaves as a slightly charge-delocalized Class II species in THF, but becomes a completely charged-localized Class I complex in DMF. Because the UV-vis spectra of 1 in THF and DMF are identical, it is unlikely that the electrochemical differences are due to different speciation in solution. It is more likely that coordination of solvent molecules to the iron centers mediate the degree of electronic communication between the two iron atoms.

Because the CV of 1 shows quasi-reversible behavior, synthesis of the doubly oxidized $[\text{Fe}_2(L^{\text{Me,Ph}})_2(\text{THF})_x]^{2+}$ complex was attempted. Based on the $E_{1/2}$ values of 1 in THF (-31 and -17 mV vs. Fc/Fc⁺), $[\text{FeCp}_2]\text{BF}_4$ (Cp = cyclopentadienyl) should serve as a suitable oxidant.
When aliquots of [FeCp₂]BF₄ in CH₂Cl₂ were added to a THF solution containing 1, clean conversion to a new species occurred, as revealed by the UV-vis spectra (Figure 2.9). This process is accompanied by absorbance decreases at 242 and 395 nm as well as increases at 314 and 626 nm. Efforts to crystallize the iron product for X-ray crystallographic analysis were not successful.

**Figure 2.8.** Cyclic voltammograms of a 0.2 mM solution of complex 1 containing 0.1 M tetra-n-butylammonium hexafluorophosphate in A) THF and B) DMF at a scan rate of 50 mV/s. Differential pulse voltammograms of 1 in C) THF and D) DMF are also shown. The measurements were carried out with a Pt electrode and referenced to the Fc/Fc⁺ redox couple.
Figure 2.9. Absorption spectra from the addition of [FeCp$_2$(BF$_4$)] to a THF solution containing complex 1. Black dotted line = 1, solid lines = spectra after addition of up to 2.0 equiv of ferrocenium.

**Reaction of Complex 1 with Dioxygen.** The > 7 Å separation between the iron(II) sites in complex 1 raises the question, how will it react with dioxygen? If the metal centers are rigidly confined to a fixed position, exposure of 1 to O$_2$ might lead to formation of two dioxygen adducts within the same molecule. Alternatively, if the [L$_{Me,Ph}$]$^{2-}$ framework was rotationally flexible, it is conceivable that O$_2$ might bridge the two iron centers. To determine the final oxygenation product, complex 1 was dissolved in a THF solution and stirred for 5 min in the presence of O$_2$ (Scheme 2.4B). The reaction product was dried *in vacuo* and crystallized from pentane and toluene to afford a red solid in good yield. Single crystals for X-ray diffraction studies were grown by slow diffusion of pentane into a solution of the compound in THF. Because the red crystals were very small (approx. 0.20 x 0.08 x 0.05 mm$^3$) a high-resolution X-ray crystal structure could not be obtained. However, the low-resolution data show that the compound contains a µ-oxodiiron(III) unit having the composition [Fe$_2$(µ-O)(L$_{Me,Ph}$)$_2$] (2, Figure 2.10). The presence of an oxo bridge was also confirmed by several spectroscopic methods (*vide*
The structure showed that rotation of the $[L^\text{Me,Ph}]^2^-$ ethynyl arms led to contraction of the iron-iron distance. Complex 2 was also prepared from a pre-assembled $\mu$-oxodiiron(III) source. Upon deprotonation of $H_2L^\text{Me,Ph}$ with NaHMDS in THF and addition of $(\text{NEt}_4)_2[\text{Fe}_2\text{OCl}_6]^2$ a dark red solution formed (Scheme 2.4B). Evaporation of the solvent and extraction of the residue into toluene gave the desired product in moderate yield.

**Figure 2.10.** A stick figure representation of the low-resolution X-ray crystal structure of $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(L^\text{Me,Ph})_2]$ (2) in two different views. Due to the poor quality of the X-ray data, only the atoms connectivity of the structure could be obtained. The atoms are color coded according to the following: gray, carbon; red, oxygen; blue, nitrogen; orange, iron.

The presence of a $\mu$-oxodiiron(III) center in 2 was further confirmed by both vibrational and $^{57}\text{Fe}$ Mössbauer spectroscopy. When 2 was prepared by reaction of 1 with $^{18}\text{O}_2$, instead of $^{16}\text{O}_2$, its infrared spectrum revealed a single peak shifted from 833 cm$^{-1}$ to 798 cm$^{-1}$. A survey of known $\mu$-oxodiiron(III) complexes revealed that the asymmetric Fe–O–Fe stretch occurs.
between ~700-850 cm\(^{-1}\) and shifts to lower energy by ~30-45 cm\(^{-1}\) when \(^{18}\)O\(_2\) is substituted for \(^{16}\)O\(_2\).\(^{56}\)\(^{57}\) Because 2 exhibits an isotopically shifted peak within this range, the data strongly support the assignment of a \(\mu\)-oxodiiron(III) core. To probe further the oxidation state and coordination environment of 2, its \(^{57}\)Fe Mössbauer spectrum was recorded. A Lorentzian least-squares fit of the Mössbauer data gave a single quadrupole doublet with \(\delta = 0.43\) mm/s and \(\Delta E_Q = 1.35\) mm/s (Figure 2.7B). These parameters are characteristic of high-spin iron centers coordinated by mixed \(O,N\) donors. In addition to overall charge considerations, the IR and Mössbauer data suggest that 2 should be formulated as a \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\text{L}^{\text{Me,Ph}})_2]\) complex.

The electronic absorption spectrum of complex 2 was recorded in THF. An intense band at 312 nm (\(\epsilon = 108,000\) M\(^{-1}\) cm\(^{-1}\)) and a shoulder at ~390 nm (\(\epsilon = 37,500\) M\(^{-1}\) cm\(^{-1}\)) dominate the spectrum (Figure 2.5B). Because the band at ~310 nm also occurs in the spectrum of \(\text{Na}_2\text{L}^{\text{Me,Ph}}\), it is assigned to a \(\pi(\pi) \rightarrow \pi(\pi^*)\) ligand transition. Since the spectrum of 2 shows an increased absorption between 350-390 nm, compared to that of 1, it is possible that this overlapping feature represents one of the phenolate-to-Fe(III) charge-transfer bands.\(^{50,58}\)

A bathochromic shift of the phenolate-to-iron LMCT band is reflected in smaller NMR contact shifts of the phenolate protons due to less mixing between the metal d and ligand orbitals.\(^{58}\) The \(^1\)H NMR spectrum of 2 (Figure 2.6B) contains only three signals outside the diamagnetic region, at 16.42, 13.90, and 11.75 ppm. Compared to the \(^1\)H NMR spectrum of 1, these peaks are less paramagnetically shifted. This result indicates that there is less unpaired spin density on the \([\text{L}^{\text{Me,Ph}}]^2-\) ligand in complex 2 than in 1. Consequently, the phenolate-to-iron charge transfer bands should occur at a higher energy for 2 than for 1.
The electrochemical behavior of 2 was investigated by cyclic voltammetry (Figure 2.11). When recorded in THF, an irreversible reduction wave was observed at -780 mV (vs. Fc/Fc\(^+\)) and an irreversible oxidation wave appeared at +720 mV (vs. Fc/Fc\(^+\)). The absence of any reversible electrochemical processes was unexpected because phenolate complexes are typically redox active due to involvement of phenolate radicals.\(^{59,60}\) A related \(\mu\)-oxodiiron(III) complex containing salen ligands exhibits two reversible redox waves due to generation of ligand-centered monoradical and diradical species.\(^{61}\) Perhaps due to the unique \(\pi\)-conjugation of the \([L^{Me,Ph}]^2\) ligand, the resulting iron complex does not exhibit any ligand-centered redox behavior, at least within the electrochemical window investigated.

![Cyclic voltammogram](image)

**Figure 2.11.** Cyclic voltammogram of a 0.2 mM solution of complex 2 containing 0.1 M tetra-\(n\)-butylammonium hexafluorophosphate in THF at a scan rate of 50 mV/s. The measurement was carried out with a Pt working electrode and referenced to the Fc/Fc\(^+\) redox couple.
Figure 2.12. Single-mixing stopped-flowed spectral data from the reaction of 1 with O₂ in THF. The absorbance spectra from 300-600 nm (A, top) show rapid conversion of 1 to 2, with no observable intermediate species. The kinetic traces at 350 nm (B) and 700 nm (C) were fit to single exponential functions, giving pseudo-first order rate constants of ~0.7 s⁻¹.

The rapid conversion of 1 to 2 in the presence of O₂ was studied by stopped-flow UV-vis spectrophotometry (Scheme 2.4). A single mixing experiment was carried out at -50 °C, in which a 26 μM solution of 1 in THF was combined with a solution saturated with O₂ (~10 mM). Spectral scanning between 300-750 nm revealed that the oxygenation reaction was complete in less than 10 s (Figure 2.12A). The reaction kinetics fit well to a single exponential function (Figure 2.12B and 2.12C), giving a pseudo-first order rate constant of ~0.7 s⁻¹. Even on the stopped-flow timescale, no intermediates were observed for conversion of 1 to 2. Our inability to detect and characterize any transient species prevents us from speculating about the mechanism.
by which 1 converts to 2. Recent work with the ToMO enzyme system has identified an optically-silent diiron(III) oxygenated intermediate that is catalytically competent to hydroxylate arenes. When the oxygenation of 1 was performed in the presence of triphenylphosphine, gas chromatographic mass spectral analysis of the reaction product indicated that triphenylphosphine oxide was formed. The nature of the active oxidizing species and the range of substrates that could be oxidized have not yet been evaluated. It is important to note that during the course of these studies no $[L^{Me,Ph}]^{2-}$ ligand decomposition was observed.

2.4. Conclusion

In our continuing search for novel frameworks to model the active sites of O$_2$-activating diiron proteins, we prepared a new family of dinucleating ligands and provided a streamlined method for easy derivatization. By taking advantage of the chromophoric properties of $[L^{R,R'}]^{2-}$ and $[BIPS^{Me,Ph}]^{2-}$, the coordination chemistry of these ligands with Fe(II) was examined by UV-vis spectrophotometry. Incorporation of sterically demanding groups in the ligand scaffold prevented undesired polymer formation. A diiron(II) $[Fe_2(L^{Me,Ph})_2(THF)_3]$ (1) complex was synthesized having a large separation (7.2 Å) between the two metal centers. Rotation about the ethynyl arms led to a substantial contraction of the diiron distance, the structural flexibility being manifest in the oxygenation product (2) obtained from reaction of 1 with O$_2$. $[^{18}\text{O}]$-Isotopic infrared labeling studies and $^{57}\text{Fe}$ Mössbauer spectroscopy measurements clearly reveal that solutions of 2 retain the $\mu$-oxodiiron(III) core found in the solid state by X-ray crystallography. Formation of $[Fe_2(\mu-O)(L^{Me,Ph})_2]$ most likely involves binding of O$_2$ and concerted reorientation of the $[L^{Me,Ph}]^{2-}$ ligands. Preliminary studies indicate that triphenylphosphine is converted to triphenylphosphine oxide in the presence of 1 and dioxygen, but a comprehensive study of this
chemistry was not undertaken. The \([L^{\text{Me,Ph}}_2]^{2-}\) ligand is chemically stable under these conditions and does not participate in ligand-centered redox reactions, despite the presence of the phenolate group. Although the desired diiron complex containing a single dinucleating \([L^{\text{Me,Ph}}_2]^{2-}\) ligand was not achieved, the structure provides guidance for future modification of the \([L^{R,R'}_2]^{2-}\) framework to preclude formation of \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{syn} \text{N-donor})_2]\) units.

2.5. References


Chapter 3

Redox Behavior and Dioxygen Reactivity of a Macroyclic Carboxylate-Bridged Diiron(II) Mimic of Bacterial Monoxygenase Active Sites
3.1. Introduction

Investigations using synthetic mimics have contributed to our understanding of dioxygen activation at carboxylate-bridged diiron units.\textsuperscript{1-5} Several notable achievements in diiron modeling include the X-ray structural characterization of (µ-1,2-peroxo)diiron(III) species,\textsuperscript{6-8} generation of high-valent diiron(IV) intermediates,\textsuperscript{9,10} and identification of possible protonation sites in oxygenated diiron complexes.\textsuperscript{11} Some synthetic diiron compounds are capable of oxidizing aromatics, alkenes, and saturated hydrocarbons when exposed to dioxygen, hydrogen peroxide, alkyl peroxides, or $O$-atom transfer reagents.\textsuperscript{2,4,12-14} Generally, however, these reactions are unremarkable because the organic substrates have weak C–H bonds or the transformation is not performed using molecular oxygen. One significant difference between the diiron proteins and the model compounds is that most oxygenated synthetic complexes are low-spin due to their nitrogen-rich coordination environment. In contrast, biological diiron centers are high-spin and are carboxylate-rich. Density functional theoretical (DFT) calculations suggest that high-spin oxygenated diiron species are necessary to react with more chemically inert molecules.\textsuperscript{9,15-17}

Scheme 3.1. The diiron(II) complex of soluble methane monoxygenase hydroxylase (sMMOH$\textsubscript{red}$) reacts with dioxygen and saturated hydrocarbons (RH) to give alcohols (ROH) and the resting diiron(III) state of the protein (sMMOH$\textsubscript{ox}$). sMMOH$\textsubscript{ox}$ can be reduced back to sMMOH$\textsubscript{red}$ by acquiring two electrons from a reductase protein (sMMOR). The active site structures of sMMOH$\textsubscript{red}$ and sMMOH$\textsubscript{ox}$ are depicted.
Chart 3.1. Syn N-donor ligands containing mixed N,O metal binding units. Compounds H$_2$L and H$_2$BIPS spontaneously assemble into bis(ligand) diiron complexes in the presence of base and iron(II) salts. The macrocyclic variant H$_2$PIM was designed to have a flexible ether linkage to prevent ligand interdigitation upon metal complexation.

As discussed in the preceding chapters, no synthetic models accurately reproduce the carboxylate-bridged diiron active site structure of the BMMs.$^5$ As shown in Scheme 3.1, the reduced form of soluble methane monoxygenase hydroxylase (sMMOH$_{\text{red}}$) contains a diiron unit coordinated by four carboxylate residues, two bridging and two terminal, as well as two histidine groups syn with respect to the Fe–Fe vector.$^{18-20}$ Although a few model compounds have the same carboxylate and N-heterocyclic donors stoichiometry as the diiron core of sMMOH$_{\text{red}}$, the nitrogen groups are not adjacent to each other.$^{21-23}$ A recent approach in our laboratory to achieve syn N-stereochemistry has been to synthesize compounds that covalently link two N-donors into a single ligand platform. In this manner, complexation of the N-donors and external carboxylates to two iron atoms could afford dinuclear complexes with the same ligand arrangement as sMMOH$_{\text{red}}$ and similar protein active sites. Our early attempts using this strategy were encouraging,$^{24,25}$ but the diiron(II) compounds were too kinetically labile to maintain their dinuclear structure after reaction with O$_2$. To circumvent this problem, we designed ligands containing either phenoxylypyridyl (H$_2$L) or phenoxylimine (H$_2$BIPS) chelating groups that are anionic when deprotonated and form stable six-membered chelate rings when
bound to iron (Chart 3.1).\textsuperscript{26} Unfortunately, as discussed in Chapter 2, these constructs spontaneously assembled into bis(syn N-donor)diiron complexes when treated with iron(II) salts.

In the present study, we prepared and investigated the iron chemistry of a new phenoxylimine ligand (H\textsubscript{2}PIM), which structurally resembles our previous ligand designs but is more preorganized due to its macrocyclic nature (Chart 3.1). We used H\textsubscript{2}PIM and sterically-hindered carboxylates to synthesize the first accurate structural models of the diiron(II) active sites of bacterial multi-component monooxygenases. We also report some novel chemistry of these synthetic units, including their reactions with dioxygen and other chemical oxidants.

3.2. Experimental

**Materials and Methods.** Reagents obtained from Strem, Aldrich Chemical Co., and Alfa Aesar were used as received. The compounds 2,6-bis(\textit{p}-tolyl)benzoic acid\textsuperscript{27} (Ar\textsubscript{Tol}CO\textsubscript{2}H, also referred to as terphenylcarboxylic acid for simplicity) and [Fe\textsubscript{2}(Mes)\textsubscript{4}]\textsuperscript{28} (Mes = 2,4,6-trimethylphenyl) were prepared as reported. All \textsuperscript{57}Fe-enriched compounds were prepared exactly as described for the unenriched analogues, except that [\textsuperscript{57}Fe\textsubscript{2}(Mes)\textsubscript{4}] was used as the starting material. All air-sensitive manipulations were performed using standard Schlenk techniques or under a nitrogen atmosphere inside an MBraun drybox. Solvents were saturated with argon and purified by passage through two columns of activated alumina. Dioxygen gas used in these experiments was obtained from a high-purity gas cylinder (Airgas) and passed through a 10-inch column of activated alumina before use.

**General Physical Methods.** NMR spectra were recorded on 500 MHz Varian Mercury spectrometers and chemical shifts for \textsuperscript{1}H and \textsuperscript{13}C spectra were referenced to residual solvent. \textsuperscript{1}H NMR spectral data of paramagnetic compounds were obtained by widening the sweep window.
(+100 to -30 ppm) and collecting for longer acquisition times (~1024 scans). IR spectra were recorded on a ThermoNicolet Avatar 360 spectrophotometer with the OMNIC software. Absorption spectra were recorded on a Cary 50 spectrophotometer using 6Q Spectrosil quartz cuvettes (Starna) with 1 cm path lengths. X-band EPR spectra were recorded at 5 K on a Bruker EMX spectrometer. Electrochemical measurements were performed with a VersaSTAT3 Princeton Applied Research potentiostat running the V3-Studio electrochemical analysis software. A three-electrode setup was employed comprising a platinum working electrode, a platinum wire auxiliary electrode, and a 0.1 M Ag/AgNO₃ solution in acetonitrile as the reference electrode. Tetra-n-butylammonium hexafluorophosphate (0.1 M) was used as the supporting electrolyte. Electrochemical potentials are referenced externally to the ferrocene/ferroceinum couple at 0.00 V.

**X-ray Data Collection and Refinement.** Single crystals were mounted in Paratone oil using 30 µm aperture MiTeGen MicroMounts (Ithaca, NY) and frozen under a 100 K KRYO-FLEX nitrogen cold stream. Data were collected on a Bruker SMART APEX CCD X-ray diffractometer with Mo Kα radiation (λ = 0.71073 Å) controlled by the APEX 2 (v. 2010.1-2) software package. Data reduction was performed using SAINT and empirical absorption corrections were applied using SADABS.²⁹ The structures were solved by Patterson methods with refinement by full-matrix least squares based on F² using the SHELXTL-97 software package³⁰ and checked for higher symmetry by the PLATON software.³¹ All non-hydrogen atoms were located and refined anisotropically. Hydrogen atoms were fixed to idealized positions unless otherwise noted and given thermal parameters equal to either 1.5 (methyl hydrogen atoms) or 1.2 (non-methyl hydrogen atoms) times the thermal parameters of the atoms to which they are attached.
X-ray diffraction quality crystals were selected out of the crystallization vials and immediately immersed in degassed Partone oil to prevent solvent loss and reaction with air. Complex 1 contains both benzene and pentane molecules in the asymmetric unit. Three of the benzene molecules were refined with full occupancy, whereas one of the benzene rings was substitutionally disordered with pentane. The benzene-to-pentane ratio refined to 55:45. The structure of 2 shows significant thermal motion within the tolyl groups of the terphenylcarboxylate ligands in the solid state, as indicated by the larger anisotropic displacement parameters of their carbon atoms compared to those of the rest of the molecule. Several solvent molecules were located in the crystal structure of 2. In each asymmetric unit there are 1.39 pentane and 0.45 dichloromethane molecules. A pentane that is located on an inversion center shares partial occupancy with a pentane that does not lie on a special position. Another pentane molecule shares partial occupancy with dichloromethane, with a pentane/dichloromethane ratio of 39:45. The silver atom in 3 occupies two positions and is coordinated to O(6) of a bridging hydroxide, O(5) of the PIM²⁻ ligand, and an arene ring of the terphenylcarboxylate ligand. Because the H atoms of the bridging hydroxo groups in 3 could not be located from the difference electron density map, the hydrogen atoms attached to O(6) and O(7) were not included in the structure refinement. Four dichloromethane molecules per diiron complex occur in the structure of 3, three of which are ordered and one is disordered. Complex 4 was unambiguously assigned as a (μ-hydroxo)diiron species because electron density corresponding to the hydrogen atom of O(6) was located from the difference electron density map. The asymmetric unit of 4 also contains two ordered and one disordered benzene molecules. The center of the tetranuclear complex 5 lies on an inversion center; thus, there is only half of the molecule in the asymmetric unit. In addition, there are four benzene molecules per asymmetric
cell. The structure of 6/7 clearly shows two different diiron cores, one containing a single bridging oxygen atom and another containing two bridging oxygen atoms. The occupancy of the one vs. two oxygen bridges was refined to be 76% to 24%, respectively. Each 6/7 unit also contains two ordered and one disordered acetonitrile solvent molecules. Complete X-ray refinement data for complexes 1-3 and 4-7 are shown in Tables 3.1 and 3.4, respectively.

$^{57}$Fe Mössbauer Spectroscopy. Mössbauer spectra were recorded on an MSI spectrometer (WEB Research Company) with a $^{57}$Co source in a Rh matrix maintained at room temperature. Solid samples were prepared by suspension of the complex (~5-40 mg, depending on whether the complex is enriched in $^{57}$Fe) in Apiezon M grease and placed in a nylon sample holder. Solution samples were prepared by freezing 400 µL of the complex (~20 mM) in a nylon sample cup and sealing with a screw cap. Samples containing natural abundance iron were measured over the course of ~5 d, whereas samples that are enriched in $^{57}$Fe were collected over ~12 h. Data were acquired at 80 K, and isomer shift (δ) values are reported with respect to metallic iron that was used for velocity calibration at room temperature. Spectra were fit to Lorentzian lines using the WMOSS plot and fit program.

Synthesis

3,3′-(Oxybis(methylene))bis(bromobenzene) (A). 3-Bromobenzylalcohol (3.72 g, 20 mmol) was dissolved in 50 mL of dry THF and cooled to 0 °C with an ice bath. Solid sodium hydride (0.96 g, 24 mmol, 60% dispersion in mineral oil) was added portionwise to the reaction flask and the mixture was stirred for 1 h. Liquid 3-bromobenzylbromide (5.0 g, 20 mmol) was then added and the solution was stirred at reflux for 12 h. Water was then slowly introduced to quench the reaction and the organic phase was extracted into diethyl ether, dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, filtered, and evaporated to yield a light yellow oil (7.12 g, 99%). This material was determined to be > 98%
pure by NMR spectroscopy and gas chromatography. $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 7.56 (s, 2H), 7.46 (d, $J = 9.0$ Hz, 2H), 7.31 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.25 (t, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2H), 4.53 (s, 4H) ppm. $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 140.38, 130.82, 130.62, 130.16, 126.18, 122.64, 71.82 ppm. GC-MS = 356 [M]$^+$ (Calcd = 355.9 [M]$^+$).

**2,2'-(Oxybis(methylene))bis(5-methyl-(1,1'-biphenyl)-3',2-diyl))bis(oxy)bis(tetrahydro-2H-pyran) (B).** 2-(2-Bromo-4-methylphenoxy)-tetrahydro-2H-pyran$^{32}$ (16.5 g, 61.1 mmol) was dissolved in 250 mL of dry THF and cooled to -78 °C. The solution was treated with $n$-butyllithium (38 mL, 1.6 M in hexanes) and stirred for 2 h, giving a white slurry. A 50 mL solution of zinc chloride (6.66 g, 61.1 mmol) in THF was transferred by cannula to the reaction flask. After 1 h, the solution became nearly homogeneous. The reaction flask was charged with compound A (10.0 g, 28.1 mmol) and Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$ (3.25 g, 2.81 mmol) and refluxed for 2 d. Once the reaction was complete, the solution was evaporated to dryness and the crude material was purified by silica gel column chromatography (5:95 ethyl acetate/hexanes) to afford a colorless oil (5.7 g, 35%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 7.67 (s, 2H), 7.58 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2H), 7.45 (t, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.40 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.24 (s, 2H), 7.20 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.15 (d, $J = 8.5$ Hz, 2H), 5.42 (t, $J = 2.5$ Hz, 2H), 4.71 (s, 4H), 3.84 (m, 2H), 3.59 (m, 2H), 2.39 (s, 6H), 1.89 (m, 2H), 1.76 (m, 4H), 1.67 (m, 2H), 1.54 (m, 4H) ppm. $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 151.80, 138.95, 137.85, 131.46, 131.30, 131.28, 129.22, 129.09, 129.00, 127.93, 126.28, 116.12, 96.89, 72.44, 61.76, 30.35, 25.34, 20.70, 18.54 ppm.

**Bis(3-(2-hydroxy-5-methylphenyl)benzyl)ether (C).** Compound B (0.90 g, 1.56 mmol) and oxalic acid (0.35 g, 3.89 mmol) were dissolved in 10 mL of THF/MeOH (1:1). The mixture was stirred at ~50 °C for 2 h and then evaporated to dryness. Dichloromethane (10 mL) was added and the mixture was washed with water (3 x 10 mL). The organic layer was dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, 
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filtered, and the solvent was removed in vacuo to give an off-white solid. The solid was washed with hot hexanes to remove a colored impurity and the final product was isolated by filtration (0.46 g, 73%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 7.54 (s, 2H), 7.48 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.43 (m, 4H), 7.09 (m, 4H), 6.87 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2H), 5.43 (s, 2H), 4.67 (s, 4H), 2.35 (s, 6H) ppm. $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 151.00, 139.68, 138.43, 131.54, 130.70, 130.33, 129.93, 129.38, 129.21, 128.50, 127.86, 116.56, 73.02, 21.26 ppm. ESI-MS(–) = 409.1 [M–H]$^-$ (Calcd = 409.2 [M–H]$^-$). Mp = 128-130 °C.

Bis(3-(2-hydroxy-5-methylphenyl-3-carbaldehyde)benzyl)ether (D). All reagents and solvents should be rigorously dried before use in this reaction. Compound C (2.44 g, 5.95 mmol), anhydrous magnesium chloride (2.26 g, 23.8 mmol), paraformaldehyde (2.68 g, 89.2 mmol), and triethylamine (5 mL, 35.7 mmol) were combined in 200 mL of dry acetonitrile and refluxed for 3 d. The reaction completeness was determined by the disappearance of starting material as monitored by silica gel thin layer chromatography. The mixture was evaporated to dryness and the residue was dissolved in dichloromethane. The organic phase was washed with aqueous HCl, dried over Na$_2$SO$_4$, filtered, and evaporated to dryness, giving a pale yellow oil. After purification by silica gel column chromatography (10:90 ethyl acetate/hexanes), the desired product was obtained as a light yellow oil (1.7 g, 61%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 11.37 (s, 2H, CHO), 9.91 (s, 2H, OH), 7.62 (s, 2H), 7.56 (d, $J = 7.5$ Hz, 2H), 7.48-7.41 (m, 6H), 7.35 (d, $J = 1.5$ Hz, 2H), 4.69 (s, 4H), 2.39 (s, 6H) ppm. $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): $\delta$ 197.06, 157.84, 139.13, 138.55, 136.01, 133.25, 130.25, 129.39, 128.89, 128.88, 128.60, 127.31, 120.03, 72.38, 20.55 ppm. ESI-MS(–) = 465.3 [M–H]$^-$ (Calcd = 465.2 [M–H]$^-$).

H$_2$PIM. Compound D (1.70 g, 3.65 mmol) was dissolved in 10 mL of dichloromethane and combined with 3,3′-diaminodiphenylsulfone (0.90 g, 3.65 mmol) in 700 mL of dry acetonitrile.
About 1 mL of trifluoroacetic acid was added and the mixture was refluxed for 6 h. Over the course of ~1 h, a large amount of bright yellow-orange material formed. The solid was isolated by filtration and washed with diethyl ether to afford analytically pure product (1.80 g, 72%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): δ 13.16 (s, 2H), 8.63 (s, 2H), 7.89 (d, $J$ = 9.5 Hz, 2H), 7.80 (m, 2H), 7.73 (s, 2H), 7.67 (t, $J$ = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.44 (m, 4H), 7.39 (m, 4H), 7.28 (m, 2H), 7.21 (s, 2H), 4.69 (s, 4H), 2.36 (s, 6H) ppm. $^{13}$C NMR (CDCl$_3$, 125 MHz): δ 164.78, 156.69, 149.82, 143.08, 138.09, 137.72, 136.08, 132.20, 130.72, 130.32, 129.57, 128.69, 128.51, 128.30, 127.06, 125.30, 123.73, 123.59, 118.85, 73.03, 20.61 ppm. IR (KBr): v 2852, 1620, 1579, 1472, 1454, 1427, 1326, 1302, 1211, 1148, 1092, 886, 783, 700, 689, 620, 524 cm$^{-1}$. DART-MS{$^-$} = 677.2121 (Calc = 677.2116 [M–H$^-$]). Mp = 313-315 °C.

$^{[^{57}Fe]_2(Mes)_4}$. A small-scale synthesis of 57-iron enriched $[^{57}Fe]_4(Mes)_4$ was undertaken using a procedure adapted from the literature.$^{28,33,34}$ 57-Iron metal (200 mg, 3.51 mmol, 95% enriched) was suspended in 4.0 mL of concentrated aqueous hydrochloric acid. The mixture was heated to 90 °C for ~4 h without using a stir bar, leading to dissolution of the iron metal and eventual formation of a clear brown solution. The reaction is not complete if the solution is yellow; further air oxidation must occur to convert iron(II) chloride to iron(III) chloride. Once the reaction is complete, aqueous HCl was removed in vacuo (without heating) to give a pale yellow solid. The solid was transferred to a 10 mL Schlenk flask under a nitrogen atmosphere and treated with 3 mL of freshly distilled thionyl chloride to dehydrate the iron(III) chloride. The mixture was heated at 80 °C for 30 min until the solid turned black. Excess thionyl chloride was removed by pumping on the black solid under vacuum for 3 h. About 10 mL of dry chlorobenzene was added to the reaction flask and the slurry was refluxed for 30 min to give a brown suspension, which indicates conversion of anhydrous iron(III) chloride to iron(II)
chloride. The septum-sealed reaction flask was brought inside an anaerobic glovebox for subsequent manipulations. The tan-colored solid was isolated by filtration and washed with toluene. This material was re-suspended in 3 mL of dry THF and stirred for 30 min until the brown solution became a beige color. An off-white solid was isolated by filtration as the desired $^{57}\text{FeCl}_2(\text{THF})_{1.5}$ precursor (571 mg, 53%).

Inside an anaerobic drybox, a mesitylene Grignard reagent was prepared by combining 2-bromomesitylene (1.02 g, 5.12 mmol) and magnesium metal (123 mg, 5.12 mmol) in 2 mL of dry THF. After ~ 5 h, most of the magnesium had dissolved and the solution became a pale light brown color. The Grignard reagent was placed inside a -30 °C freezer and allowed to cool. In a separate vial, solid $^{57}\text{FeCl}_2(\text{THF})_{1.5}$ (571 mg, 2.14 mmol) was suspended in 3 mL of tetrahydrofuran /1,4-dioxane (1:1) that has been cooled to -30 °C. The cold Grignard reagent was added over a 5 min period to the iron solution. The reaction mixture was stirred and allowed to warm slowly to RT. As the reaction progressed, the light brown slurry became a red color. After 2 h, a solid precipitate was removed by filtration and the filtrate was evaporated to dryness. The dried residue was extracted into diethyl ether, filtered, and placed inside a -30 °C freezer to crystallize over the course of ~14 h. A large amount of red crystalline material was isolated by filtration and dried to give $[^{57}\text{Fe}_2(\text{Mes})_4]$ as a red powder (430 mg, 60%). The spectroscopic characteristics of this compound are identical to those reported for $[\text{Fe}_2(\text{Mes})_4]$.

$[\text{Fe}_2(\text{PIM})(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)]_2$ (1). In an anaerobic drybox, solid H$_2$PIM (100 mg, 147 µmol) and triphenylacetic acid (85 mg, 295 µmol) were dissolved in 2.0 mL of tetrahydrofuran. A 1.0 mL solution of tetrahydrofuran containing $[\text{Fe}_2(\text{Mes})_4]$ (86 mg, 147 µmol) was added to the reaction vessel and the mixture was stirred for 1 h. The dark red solution was evaporated to dryness and
the residue was redissolved in benzene. The solution was filtered through a glass wool plug and layered with pentane. After ~12 h, a large amount of red crystals had formed that were suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis. The solid material was isolated by filtration and washed with pentane to give the desired diiron complex (171 mg, 86%). \(^1\)H NMR (C\(_6\)D\(_6\), 500 MHz): \(\delta\) 78.37, 74.97, 48.27, 22.78, 8.20-1.19, -5.32, -6.20, -10.37, -13.49, -21.13 ppm. IR (KBr): \(\nu\) 3056, 3031, 2918, 2850, 1578, 1545, 1490, 1444, 1418, 1378, 1322, 1304, 1284, 1200, 1175, 1152, 1097, 1085, 1036, 985, 790, 745, 699, 673, 547 cm\(^{-1}\). UV-vis (CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\)): \(\lambda_{\text{max}}\) = 290 (36,300 M\(^{-1}\)cm\(^{-1}\)), and 410 (16,000 M\(^{-1}\)cm\(^{-1}\)) nm. Anal. Calcd. for Fe\(_2\)C\(_82\)H\(_62\)N\(_2\)O\(_9\)S·(C\(_4\)H\(_8\)O) (1·THF): C, 71.97; H, 4.92; N, 1.95; Found: C, 71.80; H, 4.94; N, 2.22. Mp (decomp) = 302 °C. Mössbauer (polycrystalline, apiezon M grease): \(\delta_1 = 1.18(2)\) mm/s, \(\Delta E_Q1 = 2.33(2)\) mm/s, \(\Gamma_{(1, L/R)} = 0.38(2)\) mm/s, Site 1 Area = 53%; \(\delta_2 = 0.97(2)\) mm/s, \(\Delta E_Q2 = 2.25(2)\) mm/s, \(\Gamma_{(2, L/R)} = 0.35(2)\) mm/s, Site 2 Area = 47%.

**[Fe\(_2\)(PIM)(Ar\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2\))\(_2\)]** (2). The synthesis of [Fe\(_2\)(PIM)(Ar\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2\))\(_2\)] was performed as described for [Fe\(_2\)(PIM)(Ph\(_3\)CCO\(_2\))\(_2\)] (1), except that Ar\(^{\text{Tol}}\)CO\(_2\)H was used instead of Ph\(_3\)CCO\(_2\)H. The product crystallized upon slow diffusion of pentane into a solution of the complex in dichloromethane and was isolated as a red powder when dried (152 mg, 74%). X-ray diffraction quality crystals were readily obtained by slow diffusion of pentane into a dichloromethane solution of the complex. \(^1\)H NMR (CD\(_2\)Cl\(_2\), 500 MHz): \(\delta\) 76.92, 73.82, 49.00, 24.68, 7.86, 7.31, 6.22, 2.41, 1.37, 0.96, -0.41, -1.81, -5.72, -9.04, -19.60 ppm. IR (KBr): \(\nu\) 3052, 3024, 2918, 2851, 1614, 1577, 1533, 1445, 1413, 1381, 1302, 1286, 1202, 1149, 819, 791, 712, 695, 542 cm\(^{-1}\). UV-vis (CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\)): \(\lambda_{\text{max}}\) = 290 (36,700 M\(^{-1}\)cm\(^{-1}\)), and 418 (14,000 M\(^{-1}\)cm\(^{-1}\)) nm. Anal. Calcd. for Fe\(_2\)C\(_82\)H\(_66\)N\(_2\)O\(_9\)S·(C\(_4\)H\(_8\)O) (2·THF): C, 72.23; H, 5.10; N, 1.91; Found: C, 71.72; H, 4.92; N, 2.17. Mp (decomp) = 240 °C. Mössbauer (polycrystalline, apiezon M grease): \(\delta_1 = \ldots \)
1.10(2) mm/s, ΔE₁ = 2.04(2) mm/s, Γ₁(1,L/R) = 0.38(2) mm/s, Site 1 Area = 63%; δ₂ = 0.95(2) mm/s, ΔE₂ = 2.02(2) mm/s, Γ₂(1,L/R) = 0.32(2) mm/s, Site 2 Area = 37%.

[Fe₂(µ-OH)₂(ClO₄)₂(PIM)(ArTolCO₂)₂Ag] (3). In an anaerobic drybox, [Fe₂(PIM)(ArTolCO₂)₂] (2) (50 mg, 35 µmol) and silver perchlorate (18 mg, 90 µmol) were combined in 2 mL of dichloromethane and stirred for 1 h. The reaction mixture was filtered through a glass wool plug to remove a black precipitate. The solution was concentrated to half its volume and layered with 0.5 mL of pentane. After ~14 h, a dark solid formed on the bottom of the reaction vial. This product was isolated by filtration, yielding a dark crystalline solid (31 mg, 61%). Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction studies were obtained by slow diffusion of pentane into a solution of the complex in dichloromethane. IR (KBr): ν 3432, 2919, 2851, 1579, 1546, 1521, 1472, 1446, 1382, 1337, 1306, 1285, 1200, 1181, 1152, 1122, 1020, 796, 603, 548, 530 cm⁻¹. UV-vis (CH₂Cl₂): λmax = 290 (32,300 M⁻¹cm⁻¹), 375 (11,100 M⁻¹cm⁻¹), 479 (sh, 3,300 M⁻¹cm⁻¹), 600 (2,300 M⁻¹cm⁻¹). Anal. Calcd. for Fe₂C₆₃H₅₁AgCl₂N₂O₁₇S·(CH₂Cl₂) (3·CH₂Cl₂): C, 50.72; H, 3.52; N, 1.85; Cl, 9.36; Found: C, 51.04; H, 3.64; N, 1.77; Cl, 9.23. Mp (decomp) = ~270 °C. Mössbauer (THF): δ = 0.49(2) mm/s, ΔE₀ = 1.38(2) mm/s, Γ(1/L/R) = 0.56(2) mm/s.

[Fe₂(µ-OH)(PIM)(Ph₃CCO₂)₂] (4). In an anaerobic drybox, solid [Fe₂(PIM)(Ph₃CCO₂)₂] (1) (30 mg, 22 µmol), triphenylacetic acid (13 mg, 44 µmol), and triethylamine (6.0 µL) were combined in 2.0 mL of benzene. The reaction vial was sealed with a septum, brought outside of the glovebox, and bubbled with dioxygen for 5 min. When exposed to O₂, the clear red solution quickly turned dark brown. Upon vapor diffusion of pentane into the benzene solution, several large X-ray diffraction quality crystals were obtained. The product was isolated by filtration (8 mg, 22%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 51.28, 44.24, 33.02, 29.70, 23.90, 6.60, -4.52, -7.85 ppm. IR (KBr): ν 3438, 3056, 3032, 2919, 1582, 1544, 1491, 1477, 1446, 1405, 1373, 1331,
UV-vis (CH$_2$Cl$_2$): $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 284$ (108,000 M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$), 372 (38,000 M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$), and 570 (10,300 M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$) nm. Anal. Calcd. for Fe$_2$C$_{102}$H$_{78}$N$_2$O$_{12}$S $\cdot$ (C$_6$H$_6$)(NC$_6$H$_{15}$)$_2$: C, 73.99; H, 5.90; N, 2.88; Found: C, 74.40; H, 5.66; N, 3.22. Mp = 214-217 °C. Mössbauer (polycrystalline, apiezon M grease): $\delta = 0.52(2)$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q = 0.95(2)$ mm/s, $\Gamma_{(L/R)} = 0.38(2)$ mm/s.

[Fe$_4$(µ-OH)$_6$(PIM)$_2$(Ph$_3$CCO$_2$)$_2$] (5). In an anaerobic drybox, solid [Fe$_2$(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO$_2$)$_2$] (1) (40 mg, 29 µmol) was combined with 2.0 mL of benzene in a septum-sealed reaction vessel. Dioxygen was bubbled through the mixture for 5 min. The solution was concentrated to approximately half its volume and then left alone to crystallize over ~1 d by slow evaporation. This method resulted in selective crystallization of the desired tetranuclear [Fe$_4$(µ-OH)$_6$(PIM)$_2$(Ph$_3$CCO$_2$)$_2$] (5) (hexagonal prisms) instead of the dinuclear [Fe$_2$(µ-OH)(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO$_2$)$_3$] (4) (rectangular blocks). Crystals obtained from this method were suitable for X-ray diffraction studies. The desired product was isolated by filtration (10 mg, 32%). $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): $\delta$ 49.97, 43.69, 31.24, 15.60, 8.71, 5.94, 5.31, 4.14, -7.12 ppm. IR (NaCl): $\nu$ 3554, 3445, 3064, 2961, 2921, 2850, 1580, 1542, 1381, 1340, 1260, 1238, 1204, 1151, 1101, 1080, 1017, 984, 800, 789, 747, 738, 705, 692, 671, 633, 528, 416 cm$^{-1}$. UV-vis (CH$_2$Cl$_2$): $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 280$ (84,200 M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$), 370 (25,000 M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$), and 540 (8,060 M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$) nm. Anal. Calcd. for Fe$_4$C$_{124}$H$_{100}$N$_4$O$_{20}$S$_2$: C, 66.09; H, 4.47; N, 2.49; Found: C, 66.09; H, 4.50; N, 2.14. Mp (decomp) = >300 °C. Mössbauer (polycrystalline, apiezon grease): $\delta = 0.51(2)$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q = 1.06(2)$ mm/s, $\Gamma_{(L/R)} = 0.40(2)$ mm/s.

[Fe$_2$(µ-O)(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (6)/ [Fe$_2$(µ-OH)$_2$(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (7). In an anaerobic drybox, [Fe$_2$(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (2) (200 mg, 144 µmol) was dissolved in 2 mL of tetrahydrofuran in a 20 mL vial. The vial was sealed with a rubber septum and brought outside of the drybox. Dioxygen
was bubbled through the reaction vial for 5 min, at which time the red solution became a dark brown. The tetrahydrofuran solvent was removed in vacuo and the resulting brown solid (117 mg, 58%) was isolated and stored inside the drybox to prevent further reaction with ambient moisture. Single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis were obtained by slow diffusion of diethyl ether into a solution of the complex in acetonitrile. $^1$H NMR (CDCl$_3$, 500 MHz): δ 26.30, 24.44, 21.84, 15.92, 14.77, 11.56, 10.08, 9.58, 8.22, 5.44, 4.86, 4.26, 2.16, 1.80, 1.25, 0.88, -7.11 ppm. IR (KBr): ν 3448, 3021, 2918, 2856, 1613, 1582, 1545, 1515, 1473, 1448, 1383, 1336, 1286, 1205, 1152, 818, 791, 766, 700, 546, 531 cm$^{-1}$. UV-vis (CH$_2$Cl$_2$): λ$_{max}$ = 380 (sh), 473, 600 nm. Anal. Calcd. for Fe$_2$C$_{85}$H$_{68}$N$_2$O$_{11}$S·(CH$_3$CN) (6·CH$_3$CN): C, 70.45; H, 4.88; N, 2.87. Anal. Calcd. for Fe$_2$C$_{84}$H$_{66}$N$_2$O$_{10}$S·(CH$_3$CN) (7·CH$_3$CN): C, 71.32; H, 4.80; N, 2.90. Found: C, 69.89; H, 4.76; N, 2.59. As discussed in the text, compounds 6 and 7 exist as a mixture in the solid-state. Mp (decomp) = >300 °C. Mössbauer (polycrystalline, apiezon M grease): δ$_1$ = 0.47(2) mm/s, ΔE$_{Q1}$ = 1.52(2) mm/s, Γ$_{(1,L/R)}$ = 0.36(2) mm/s, Site 1 Area = 21%; δ$_2$ = 0.50(2) mm/s, ΔE$_{Q2}$ = 0.97(2) mm/s, Γ$_{(2,L/R)}$ = 0.48(2) mm/s, Site 2 Area = 79%; [Fe$_4$(µ-OH)$_6$(PIM)$_2$(Ar$_{Tol}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (8). Solid [Fe$_2$(PIM)(Ar$_{Tol}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (2) (200 mg, 144 µmol) was dissolved in 2.0 mL of benzene and stirred under dioxygen for 5 min, giving a dark brown solution. About 10 µL of water was then added to the reaction mixture and the solution was stirred for an additional 10 min, then filtered through a glass wool plug before the filtrate was evaporated to dryness. The remaining solid was isolated as a pale brown material (~120 mg, 73%). $^1$H NMR (DMF-$d_7$, 500 MHz): δ 72.80, 45.00, 26.24, 14.48, 13.26, 10.40, 7.30-0.12, -3.16, -4.65, -11.36 ppm. IR (KBr): ν 3432, 3019, 2919, 2857, 1614, 1584, 1543, 1516, 1473, 1450, 1385, 1324, 1304, 1286, 1206, 1151, 791, 703, 586, 528 cm$^{-1}$. UV-vis (CH$_2$Cl$_2$): λ$_{max}$ = 360 (81,700 M$^{-1}$cm$^{-1}$), 550 (17,100 M$^{-1}$cm$^{-1}$) nm. Anal. Calcd. for Fe$_4$C$_{126}$H$_{104}$N$_4$O$_{20}$S$_2$·(C$_6$H$_6$)$_2$
Ligand Design and Synthesis. A feature of our previous syn N-donor ligands, such as H$_2$L and H$_2$BIPS (Chart 3.1), is that their metal-binding units can rotate in such a manner as to permit spontaneous self-assembly of undesired bis(syn N-donor)diiron(II) complexes following treatment with a base and iron(II) salts.$^{26,35}$ Molecular modeling studies suggested to us that by joining the phenyl rings of H$_2$L or H$_2$BIPS with an appropriate linker to form a macrocycle, it would not be possible to generate [Fe$_2$(syn N-donor)$_2$] species. To test this hypothesis, we designed and synthesized H$_2$PIM (Chart 3.1), using as the linker a three-atom ether moiety.

![Scheme 3.2](image)

**Scheme 3.2.** i. a) NaH, dry THF, b) 3-bromobenzylbromide; ii. a) Aryl zinc reagent: 2-(2-bromo-4-methylphenoxy)-tetrahydro-2H-pyran, $n$-butyllithium, ZnCl$_2$, THF, b) Pd(PPh$_3$)$_4$; iii. oxalic acid, THF/MeOH (1:1), 50 °C; iv. anhydrous MgCl$_2$, paraformaldehyde, NEt$_3$, CH$_3$CN, reflux; v. 3,3ʹ-diaminodiphenylsulfone, trifluoroacetic acid, dry CH$_3$CN.

The H$_2$PIM ligand was prepared as indicated in Scheme 3.2. The dibenzyl ether linker A was obtained by reaction of 3-bromobenzyl alcohol with sodium hydride, followed by refluxing with 3-bromobenzylbromide. To prepare compound B, a palladium catalyzed, Negishi cross-
coupling procedure was employed. After silica gel column chromatography, B was isolated as a colorless oil. Next, the tetrahydropyran protecting group of B was removed by treatment with oxalic acid in tetrahydrofuran/methanol to afford C as a white solid. Orthoformylation of C was achieved by treatment with anhydrous magnesium chloride, paraformaldehyde, and triethylamine to give D as a yellow oil. To prepare H₂PIM, D was condensed with 3,3’-diaminodiphenylsulfone, generating the desired product as a bright yellow-orange solid in good yield. The synthetic route for H₂PIM is amenable to scale-up, and the final ligand has been obtained in multi-gram quantities.

**Assembly of Diiron(II) Complexes.** The phenolate-to-iron charge transfer band is a useful spectroscopic probe for quantitating metal–ligand binding. A previous study demonstrated that the non-macrocyclic syn N-donors L²⁻ and BIPS²⁻, the doubly deprotonated forms of H₂L and H₂BIPS (Chart 3.1), respectively, react with iron in a 1:1 ratio to form [Fe₂(syn N-donor)₂] species. To test whether PIM²⁻, the doubly deprotonated form of H₂PIM, exhibits different metal binding behavior, iron(II) titration experiments were conducted. When H₂PIM was treated with 2 equiv of sodium hexamethyldisilazide (NaHMDS) in tetrahydrofuran, optical bands at 240, 280, and 420 nm appeared, corresponding to formation of PIM²⁻. Addition of iron(II) triflate to the PIM²⁻ solution decreased the intensity of the 240 and 420 nm bands, with concomitant absorption increases at 280 and 375 nm (Figure 3.1A). A plot of the absorbance changes at 375 nm revealed an Fe-to-PIM²⁻ ratio of 2:1 (Figure 3.1B), consistent with binding of two iron atoms by each macrocycle to give [Fe₂(PIM)(SO₃CF₃)₂]. To examine further the nature of this diiron species, titration experiments were conducted using external carboxylates. Addition of sodium triphenylacetate to a solution containing [Fe₂(PIM)(SO₃CF₃)₂] generated new absorption features at 410 and 600 nm (Figure 3.1C). A plot of the absorbance changes at 410
nm indicated that carboxylates readily displace the triflate anions (Figure 3.1D). These results suggested that H₂PIM is a dinucleating ligand that supports a carboxylate-bridged diiron(II) structure.

Figure 3.1. Optical changes upon addition of Fe(SO₃CF₃)₂(CH₃CN)₂ to a 24 µM solution of PIM²⁻ in THF (A). Absorbance change at 375 nm clearly shows a 1:2 macrocycle to iron binding stoichiometry (B). Addition of sodium triphenylacetate to a THF solution containing PIM²⁻/ 2 Fe(SO₃CF₃)₂(CH₃CN)₂ led to absorption increases at ~410 and 600 nm (C). The single wavelength plot at 410 nm (D). Panel A: black line = Na₂PIM, colored lines = spectra after addition of up to 2.50 equiv of Fe(II). Panel C: black line = [Fe₂(PIM)(SO₃CF₃)₂], colored lines = spectra after addition of up to 5.0 equiv of NaO₂CCPh₃.

Preparative scale reactions were performed to metalete H₂PIM by treatment with [Fe₂(Mes)₄] and a sterically-hindered carboxylic acid, triphenylacetic acid or terphenylcarboxylic acid. A diiron(II) complex containing triphenylacetate was crystallized by slow diffusion of
pentane into a solution of the compound in benzene. X-ray diffraction studies revealed a dinuclear complex having the molecular formula \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{PIM})(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)]_2\) (1, Figure 3.2, Table 3.1). The structure indicates that the \text{PIM}^2^- ligand coordinates to two iron atoms that are bridged by two triphenylacetates, one of which is bound in an \(\eta^1,\eta^1\)-1,3 coordination mode and the other in an \(\eta^1,\eta^2\)-1,3 arrangement. The Fe–O(carboxylate) distances range from 2.00 to 2.25 Å. The four- and five-coordinate iron atoms are separated by 3.61 Å, with average Fe–O(phenolate) and Fe–N(imine) distances of 1.88 and 2.04 Å, respectively.

**Figure 3.2.** Ortep thermal ellipsoid (50%) diagram of the X-ray crystal structure of \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{PIM})(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)]_2\) (1, left). An isolated view of the diron core is shown as a stick figure representation on the right. Solvent molecules and hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Color scheme: iron, orange; carbon, gray; nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; sulfur, yellow. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (Deg): Fe(1)–Fe(2) = 3.610; Fe(1)–N(1) = 2.048; Fe(1)–O(2) = 1.877; Fe(1)–O(7) = 1.999; Fe(1)–O(8) = 2.016; Fe(2)–N(2) = 2.039; Fe(2)–O(1) = 1.892; Fe(2)–O(7) = 2.254; Fe(2)–O(6) = 2.153; Fe(2)–O(9) = 2.024; O(2)–Fe(1)–N(1) = 92.5; O(1)–Fe(2)–N(2) = 92.4; O(7)–Fe(1)–O(8) = 103.7; O(7)–Fe(2)–O(9) = 89.1.

When the terphenylcarboxylate anion \(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2^-\) was employed in an analogous synthetic procedure, crystallization by slow diffusion of pentane into a saturated dichloromethane solution of the compound yielded \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{PIM})(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)]_2\) (2, Figure 3.3, Table 3.1). The X-ray structure of this compound revealed a dinuclear core that closely resembles the one in 1. The iron atoms in
2 are bridged by two terphenylcarboxylate ligands, with Fe–O(carboxylate) distances of 2.00 to 2.34 Å. This diiron unit is supported by the syn N-donor macrocycle, resulting in Fe–O(phenolate) and Fe–N(imine) distances of 1.89 and 2.04 Å, respectively. The Fe–Fe distance in 2 is 3.61 Å, the same as in 1. Compounds 1 and 2 have structures with features remarkably close to those at the active sites of sMMOH$_{\text{red}}$, mimicking the syn arrangement of nitrogen donor atoms as well as the asymmetric bridging mode of carboxylates at the diiron(II) center.

**Figure 3.3.** Ortep thermal ellipsoid (50%) diagram of the X-ray crystal structure of [Fe$_2$(PIM)(Ar$_{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (2, left). An isolated view of the diiron core is shown as a stick figure representation on the right. Solvent molecules and hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Color scheme: iron, orange; carbon, gray; nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; sulfur, yellow. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (Deg): Fe(1)–Fe(2) = 3.610; Fe(1)–O(1) = 1.888; Fe(1)–N(1) = 2.037; Fe(1)–O(6) = 1.998; Fe(1)–O(8) = 2.028; Fe(2)–O(2) = 1.894; Fe(2)–N(2) = 2.045; Fe(2)–O(7) = 2.048; Fe(2)–O(8) = 2.092; Fe(2)–O(9) = 2.342; O(1)–Fe(1)–N(1) = 93.1; O(2)–Fe(2)–N(2) = 91.8; O(6)–Fe(1)–O(8) = 102.1; O(7)–Fe(2)–O(8) = 89.5.

Compounds 1 and 2 were further characterized by several spectroscopic methods (Table 3.2). As shown in Figure 3.4, they have strong absorption bands in the UV-visible region, with $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ values of approximately 290 and 410 nm. The higher energy band is attributed to a $\pi$–$\pi^*$ ligand transition, whereas the lower energy band is most likely due to ligand-to-metal charge transfer.$^{36,37}$
Table 3.1. X-ray Data Collection and Refinement Parameters for 1-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical formula</td>
<td>[Fe₂N₂O₄SC₈₂H₆₂] (C₆H₆)₃.₅₅(C₅H₁₂)₂.₄₅</td>
<td>[Fe₂N₂O₄SC₈₄H₆₂] (C₆H₁₀)₂.₉₉(CH₂Cl₂)₂.₄₅</td>
<td>[Fe₂N₂O₄SC₈₄H₹₀Cl₂Ag] (CH₂Cl₂)₃a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula weight</td>
<td>1672.84</td>
<td>1525.91</td>
<td>1768.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (K)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength (Å)</td>
<td>0.71073</td>
<td>0.71073</td>
<td>0.71073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system</td>
<td>Triclinic</td>
<td>Triclinic</td>
<td>Monoclinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
<td>P ̅T</td>
<td>P ̅T</td>
<td>Cc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (Å³)</td>
<td>4253.7(5)</td>
<td>3846.5(8)</td>
<td>7061.7(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated density (g/mm³)</td>
<td>1.306</td>
<td>1.317</td>
<td>1.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption coefficient (mm⁻¹)</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>1.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(000)</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>3576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal size (mm³)</td>
<td>0.33 x 0.10 x 0.05</td>
<td>0.33 x 0.26 x 0.14</td>
<td>0.12 x 0.08 x 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ range for data collection</td>
<td>1.60 to 24.87°</td>
<td>1.31 to 26.49°</td>
<td>1.62 to 25.03°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index ranges</td>
<td>-15 ≤ h ≤ 15</td>
<td>-19 ≤ h ≤ 18</td>
<td>-19 ≤ h ≤ 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections collected</td>
<td>67231</td>
<td>68754</td>
<td>57426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reflections</td>
<td>[R(int) = 0.0743]</td>
<td>[R(int) = 0.0365]</td>
<td>[R(int) = 0.0325]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness to Θ (%)</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption correction</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. and min. transmission</td>
<td>0.9789 and 0.8822</td>
<td>0.9340 and 0.8538</td>
<td>0.9233 and 0.8735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data / restraints / parameters</td>
<td>14670/54/1119</td>
<td>15831/207/1023</td>
<td>12483/45/933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit on F²</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>1.076</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indices [I&gt;2σ(I)]</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0470</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0982</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R indices (all data)</td>
<td>wR2 = 0.0906</td>
<td>wR2 = 0.2493</td>
<td>wR2 = 0.1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest diff. peak and hole (eÅ⁻³)</td>
<td>0.641 and -0.638</td>
<td>1.726 and -1.776</td>
<td>0.907 and -0.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* R1 = Σ ||Fo|−|Fc||/Σ|Fo|; wR2 = [Σ[w(Fo²−Fc²)]²]/Σ[w(Fo²)]²]¹/²; GOF = [Σ[w(Fo²−Fc²)]²/(n−p)]¹/², where n is the number of reflections and p is the total number of parameters refined.
Table 3.2. Spectroscopic Data for 1-8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Optical(^a)</th>
<th>Mössbauer(^b)</th>
<th>X-ray</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\lambda, \text{nm})</td>
<td>(\delta_{\text{Fe}1}, \text{mm/s})</td>
<td>(\Delta E_{Q1}^{\text{Fe}1}, \text{mm/s})</td>
<td>(\Gamma_{\text{Fe}1}, \text{mm/s})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>290 (36,300)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>410 (16,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>290 (36,700)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>418 (14,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>290 (32,300)</td>
<td>0.49(^*)</td>
<td>1.38(^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>375 (11,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>479 (3,300, sh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600 (2,300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>284 (108,000)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>372 (38,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>570 (10,300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>370 (25,000)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>540 (8,060)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>380 (sh)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>473</td>
<td>0.46(^d)</td>
<td>1.59(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.51(^*)</td>
<td>1.24(^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>360 (81,700)</td>
<td>0.49(^*)</td>
<td>0.97(^*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>550 (17,100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Absorption spectra were recorded in dichloromethane. \(^b\) Mössbauer spectra were acquired at 80 K; polycrystalline samples were prepared by mixing with Apiezon M grease and solution samples, which are marked with an asterisk (*), were prepared in tetrahydrofuran. \(^c\) This value corresponds to the Fe–Fe distance between two diiron units. \(^d\) The polycrystalline sample of 6/7 was dried under vacuum at 150 °C for 24 h.

The zero-field Mössbauer spectrum of polycrystalline 1 at 80 K displays two quadrupole doublets, with parameters \(\delta_1 = 1.18(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q1} = 2.33(2) \text{ mm/s}, \delta_2 = 0.97(2) \text{ mm/s}, \text{ and } \Delta E_{Q2} = 2.25(2) \text{ mm/s}\) (Figure 3.5). Each iron site accounts for ~50% of the total iron content in the sample, consistent with the X-ray structure of 1, which shows two geometrically different iron atoms. The Mössbauer spectrum of polycrystalline 2 recorded at 80 K contains two quadrupole doublets, which were fit with parameters \(\delta_1 = 1.10(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q1} = 2.04(2) \text{ mm/s}, \delta_2 = 0.95(2) \text{ mm/s}, \text{ and } \Delta E_{Q2} = 2.02(2) \text{ mm/s}\) (Table 3.2). The isomer shift values of 1 and 2 (>1.0 mm/s) are typical of high-spin iron(II) complexes and the quadrupole splitting parameters are as expected for iron coordinated by \(O,N\)-donors.\(^5,38\) A comparison of the Mössbauer parameters of 1 and 2 to
those reported for sMMOH\textsubscript{red} indicates that, qualitatively, the synthetic compounds are electronically similar to the protein active sites. Although the X-ray structure of sMMOH\textsubscript{red} revealed a diiron core with two different iron environments, the Mössbauer data could be fit to a single quadrupole doublet ($\delta_1 = 1.3 \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q1} = 3.0 \text{ mm/s}$).\textsuperscript{39} The primary difference between 1 and 2 compared to sMMOH\textsubscript{red} is the identity of several donor groups, phenolates in place of carboxylates and imines in place of imidazoles.

**Figure 3.4.** Absorption spectra of 1 (blue) and 2 (red) in dichloromethane. Both compounds exhibit optical bands at ~ 290 and 410 nm.

**Figure 3.5.** Zero-field $^{57}$Fe Mössbauer spectrum of a polycrystalline sample of [Fe$_2$(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO$_2$)] (1) at 80 K. The raw data (black hash lines) were fit to two distinct iron sites (green trace). The single site fits are shown as blue and red traces using the following parameters: $\delta_1 = 1.18(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q1} = 2.33(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Gamma_{L/R(1)} = 0.38(2) \text{ mm/s}; \delta_2 = 0.97(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q2} = 2.25(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Gamma_{L/R(1)} = 0.35(2) \text{ mm/s}.$
EPR spectrum of a frozen solution of [Fe$_2$(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO$_2$)] (1) in 2-methyltetrahydrofuran measured at 5 K. The peaks marked with an asterisk are due to contaminants from the instrument cavity. The broad feature centered at $g \approx 15$ is attributed to 1, whereas the peaks at $g \approx 1.7$ are of unknown origin. Instrument parameters: 9.281 GHz microwave frequency; 2.002 mW microwave power; 1.00 x 10$^4$ receiver gain; 100.0 kHz modulation frequency; 2.00 G modulation amplitude; 2.560 ms time constant.

To evaluate further its electronic structure, an EPR spectrum of 1 in 2-methyltetrahydrofuran was recorded at 5 K (Figure 3.6). The spectrum exhibits a broad signal with $g \approx 15$, similar to that recorded for sMMOH$_{red}$, in which two $S = 2$ iron(II) centers are ferromagnetically coupled. The EPR spectrum of 2 was not measured, but because its UV-visible and Mössbauer spectra are similar to those of 1, complex 2 most likely has the same electronic structure.

The paramagnetism of 1 and 2 was verified by NMR spectroscopy. $^1$H NMR spectra of 1 (Figure 3.7A) and 2 (Figure 3.7B) in dichloromethane-$d_2$ display resonances ranging from approximately 80 to -20 ppm. Although these paramagnetically shifted resonances cannot be assigned without more detailed studies, the peaks at 78.37, 74.97, 48.27, 22.78, 5.32, -10.37, -21.13 ppm for 1 and at 76.92, 73.82, 49.00, 24.68, -5.72, -9.04, -19.60 ppm for 2 are attributed to the PIM$^{2-}$ ligand because their chemical shifts and relative intensities are nearly identical.
Because dichloromethane is a non-coordinating solvent, the solution structures of 1 and 2 in CD₂Cl₂ are probably similar to those in the solid state. When the ¹H NMR spectrum of 2 was recorded in acetonitrile-d₃ (Figure 3.7C), there were significant shifts in the proton peaks compared to the spectrum acquired in dichloromethane-d₂. Most notably, new resonances at 69.33, 55.70, 48.28, 45.03, 42.85, 39.54, 38.55, and 35.55 ppm were observed. Because acetonitrile is coordinating, it is possible that solvent molecules bind to the iron centers and/or displace the carboxylate ligands. These results suggest that the solution structures of 1 and 2 depend on the coordinating abilities of the solvent.

![Figure 3.7](image)

**Figure 3.7.** ¹H NMR spectra (500 MHz) of ~5 mM A) [Fe₂(PIM)(Ph₃CCO₂)] (1) in dichloromethane-d₂ and [Fe₂(PIM)(Ar⁻¹⁺CO₂)] (2) in B) dichloromethane-d₂ and C) acetonitrile-d₃ at room temperature.
Figure 3.8. Cyclic voltammograms of 1.0 mM solutions of 1 (A and B) and 2 (C and D) in dichloromethane. The plots on the left show the full sweep width at a scan rate of 500 mV/s, and the plots on the right display the isolated sweep windows at various scan rates. Tetra-n-butylammonium hexafluorophosphate (0.2 M) was used as the supporting electrolyte. All data were obtained using a platinum working electrode and electrochemical potentials are referenced externally to the ferrocene/ferrocenium couple. Quasi-reversible redox couples at +16 mV and +108 mV were measured for 1 and 2, respectively, at a scan rate of 100 mV/s. Panel B: black line = 100 mV/s, red line = 300 mV/s, blue line = 500 mV/s. Panel D: black line = 50 mV/s, red line = 100 mV/s, blue line = 300 mV/s, green line = 500 mV/s.

**Redox Chemistry.** A characteristic property of carboxylate-bridged diiron proteins is their tendency to undergo single electron transfer reactions.\(^{40}\) For example, treatment of sMOMOH\(_{\text{ox}}\), which contains a diiron(III) unit, with sodium dithionite or gamma radiation from a Co-60 source led to formation of a mixed-valent diiron(II,III) species (H\(_{\text{inv}}\)). Because 1 and 2 are accurate small-molecule models of sMOMOH in its reduced state, their electrochemical behavior is of interest. A cyclic voltammogram (CV) of 1 measured in dichloromethane using a platinum
working electrode and \((n{-}Bu_4N)PF_6\) as supporting electrolyte revealed two electrochemical events (Figures 3.8A and 3.8B). At a scan rate of 100 mV/s, a quasi-reversible redox couple at +16 mV, with a relatively large peak-to-peak separation of +210 mV, and an irreversible oxidation at +840 mV were observed. The CV of 2 was recorded under the same conditions (Figures 3.8C and 3.8D) and displayed a similar voltammogram, showing a quasi-reversible oxidation at +108 mV \((\Delta E_p = +198 \text{ mV})\) and an irreversible oxidation at +600 mV. The quasi-reversible waves are tentatively assigned to metal-centered oxidations, probably conversion of diiron(II,II) to diiron(II,III). Ligand-centered redox chemistry, observed in some phenolate iron complexes,\(^{43-45}\) cannot be ruled out at this time. Unlike that of 1 and 2, the CV of Na\(_2\)PIM does not exhibit any reversible redox events.

The redox chemistry of complex 2 was explored further by using chemical oxidants. Because the Ag\(^+\)/Ag\(^0\) redox couple has an \(E_{1/2}\) value of +650 mV (vs. ferrocene/ferrocenium) in dichloromethane,\(^{46}\) silver(I) reagents were anticipated to be able to oxidize 2 \((E_{1/2} = +108 \text{ mV})\). Treatment of 2 with ~1 equiv of AgClO\(_4\) in dichloromethane gradually converted the initial dark red solution to pale yellow brown. After stirring for about 1 h, a black precipitate formed, presumed to be silver metal. This insoluble material was removed by filtration and the absorption spectrum of the filtrate revealed that a new product had formed having optical bands at 290, 375, 479 (sh), and 600 nm (Figure 3.9A). The filtrate was concentrated and pentane was introduced by diffusion to afford X-ray diffraction quality crystals. Structural analysis of these crystals revealed the product to be \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu\text{-OH})_2(\text{ClO}_4)_2(\text{PIM})(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_2\text{Ag}] \ (3)\), containing a di(\(\mu\)-hydroxo)diiron(III) unit and a silver(I) ion. Because the synthesis of 3 was performed under anhydrous anaerobic conditions, the most likely source of the \(\text{OH}^-\) groups is trace water in the reaction mixture.
Figure 3.9. Absorption spectra of A) \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{OH})_2(\text{ClO}_4)_2(\text{PIM})(\mu-\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)\text{Ag}]\) (3) and the tetranuclear product from the reaction of 2/AgSbF\(_6\). The data were recorded in dichloromethane at RT. Panel A: \(\lambda_{\text{max}} = 290, 375, 475\) (sh), and 600 nm. Panel B: \(\lambda_{\text{max}} = 300, 374, 605\) nm.

The octahedral iron atoms (Fe–Fe = 3.01 Å) in 3 are bridged by two hydroxide ions (Fe–O\(_{\text{ave}}\) = 2.02 Å) and one terphenylcarboxylate ligand (Fe–O\(_{\text{ave}}\) = 2.04 Å) (Figure 3.10). The hydrogen atoms of the hydroxides were not located, but the protonation state could be confidently assigned based on the Fe–O bond distances. Whereas bridging hydroxides afford Fe–O distance of 1.9-2.1 Å, bridging oxides have Fe–O bond lengths in the 1.7-1.8 Å range.\(^{47,48}\) The phenolate (Fe–O\(_{\text{ave}}\) = 1.86 Å) and imine (Fe–N\(_{\text{ave}}\) = 2.12 Å) donors of PIM\(^2\)– and a perchlorate anion (Fe–O\(_{\text{ave}}\) = 2.13 Å) make up the rest of the iron coordination sphere. A Ag(1) ion is encapsulated within the macrocyclic framework, showing strong interactions with a hydroxide ligand (Ag–O(6) = 2.25 Å), the ether oxygen of PIM\(^2\)– (Ag–O(5) = 2.36 Å), and a C=C π bond of the terphenylcarboxylate moiety (Ag–C(60) = 2.49 Å, Ag–C(61) = 2.74 Å). The Ag–C distances are within the 2.36 to 2.77 Å limit reported for other silver(I)-aryl species.\(^{49-51}\) A bond valence sum (BVS),\(^{52,53}\) an empirical quantity used to determine the oxidation state of metal ions in coordination compounds based on crystallographically determined metal-ligand distances, returned values of 3.12 and 3.07 for Fe(1) and Fe(2), respectively (Table 3.3), indicating that the iron centers in 3 are both in the +3 oxidation state.
Table 3.3. Bond Valence Sum Analyses for 3, 6, and 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Bond</th>
<th>Bond Length (Å)</th>
<th>Bond Valence(^a)</th>
<th>Bond Valence Sum (BVS)(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(1)</td>
<td>1.848</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>3.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(6)</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(7)</td>
<td>1.997</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(8)</td>
<td>2.029</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(13)</td>
<td>2.122</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–N(1)</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(2)</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>3.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(6)</td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(7)</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(9)</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(15)</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–N(2)</td>
<td>2.126</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(1)</td>
<td>1.880</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>3.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(6)</td>
<td>1.744</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(7)</td>
<td>2.084</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(8)</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–N(1)</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(2)</td>
<td>1.898</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>3.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(6)</td>
<td>1.753</td>
<td>1.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(9)</td>
<td>2.113</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(10)</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–N(2)</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(1)</td>
<td>1.880</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>2.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(100)</td>
<td>2.110</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(101)</td>
<td>2.090</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(7)</td>
<td>2.084</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–O(8)</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(1)–N(1)</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(2)</td>
<td>1.898</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>2.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(100)</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(101)</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(9)</td>
<td>2.113</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–O(10)</td>
<td>2.092</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe(2)–N(2)</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The bond valence \(s_{ij}\), between cation \(i\) and anion \(j\), was calculated using the equation: \(s_{ij} = \exp \left[\frac{(r_o - r)}{B}\right]\), where \(r_o\) and \(B\) are empirically determined parameters and \(r\) is the observed bond distance. The following values were used in these calculations: \(r_o(\text{Fe}^{3+}–\text{O}) = 1.759\), \(r_o(\text{Fe}^{3+}–\text{N}) = 1.855\), \(B = 0.37\).\(^b\) The bond valence sum (BVS) = \(\sum s_{ij}\).\(^{52,53}\)
Figure 3.10. Ortep thermal ellipsoid (50%) diagram of the X-ray crystal structure of [Fe₂(µ-OH)₂(ClO₄)₂(PIM)(Ar₆Tol₆CO₂)Ag] (3, left). An isolated view of the heterometallic core is shown as a stick figure representation on the right. Solvent molecules and hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Color scheme: iron, orange; carbon, gray; nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; sulfur, yellow; green, chlorine; purple, silver. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (Deg): Fe(1)–Fe(2) = 3.012; Fe(1)–O(1) = 1.848; Fe(1)–N(1) = 2.119; Fe(1)–O(6) = 2.049; Fe(1)–O(7) = 1.997; Fe(1)–O(8) = 2.029; Fe(1)–O(13) = 2.122; Fe(2)–O(2) = 1.865; Fe(2)–N(2) = 2.126; Fe(2)–O(6) = 2.045; Fe(2)–O(7) = 1.976; Fe(2)–O(9) = 2.048; Fe(2)–O(15) = 2.137; Ag(1)–O(6) = 2.261; Ag(1)–O(5) = 2.420; Ag(1)–C(60) = 2.344; Ag(1)–C(61) = 2.588; O(1)–Fe(1)–N(1) = 88.5; O(2)–Fe(2)–N(2) = 88.8; Fe(1)–O(6)–Fe(2) = 94.7; Fe(1)–O(7)–Fe(2) = 98.6; O(5)–Ag(1)–O(6) = 109.1; O(5)–Ag(1)–C(60) = 100.4; O(6)–Ag(1)–C(61) = 117.7.

To provide further evidence for this assignment, the Mössbauer spectrum of a frozen solution of 3 in tetrahydrofuran was recorded at 80 K (Table 3.2). The data could be satisfactorily fit to a single quadrupole doublet, with δ = 0.49(2) mm/s and ΔE_Q = 1.38(2) mm/s, parameters typical of iron(III) complexes having mixed oxygen and nitrogen donor groups. The single quadrupole doublet in the Mössbauer spectrum is consistent with the X-ray crystal structure of 3, which has two chemically equivalent iron centers.

Because chemical oxidation of 2 using AgClO₄ led to metal binding by the perchlorate anion, the oxidation was repeated using the silver salt of a less coordinating anion, AgSbF₆.
Reaction of 2 with 1 equiv of AgSbF₆ in dichloromethane yielded a heterogeneous dark brown solution formed over the course of ~1 h. After removal of a black solid, the UV-vis spectrum of the filtrate revealed bands at 300, 374, and 605 nm (Figure 3.9B), suggesting formation of a new species. Single crystals of the product were grown by slow diffusion of diethyl ether into an acetonitrile solution containing the material. X-ray diffraction studies revealed a tetranuclear complex, [Fe₄(µ-X)₄(µ-Y)₂(PIM)₂(ArTolCO₂)₂], where the identity of atoms X and Y is probably F⁻. We have not been able to fully solve this structure owing to unresolved disorder in the crystal. Based on its optical spectrum, however, we can rule out [Fe₄(µ-OH)₆(PIM)₂(ArTolCO₂)₂] (8) as a possible product (vide infra).

Figure 3.11. Absorption spectra of 1 + O₂ (black, λmax = ~370, 570 nm), 4 (blue, λmax = ~370, 570 nm), and 5 (red, λmax = ~370, 540 nm) in dichloromethane.

Reactivity with O₂. To determine whether 1 and 2 exhibit the same functional activity as the BMM proteins,⁵⁴ their reactivity with dioxygen was investigated. Exposure of a dichloromethane solution of 1 to dioxygen at RT led to an instantaneous color change and the appearance of new optical bands at 370 and 570 nm (Figure 3.11, black trace). Facile reactivity of 1 with O₂ was confirmed by NMR spectroscopy. Injecting O₂ into a septum-sealed NMR tube containing 1 in dichloromethane-d₂ afforded the ¹H NMR spectrum shown in Figure 3.12A. The
numerous proton resonances in the spectrum, ranging from approximately 80 to -15 ppm, suggest the presence of multiple species in the reaction mixture.

![Figure 3.12](image)

**Figure 3.12.** $^1$H NMR spectra (500 MHz) of A) [Fe$_2$(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO)$_2$] (1) + O$_2$; B) [Fe$_2$(µ-OH)(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO)$_2$)$_3$] (4); and C) [Fe$_4$(µ-OH)$_6$(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO)$_2$] (5). Comparison of spectrum A to that of B and C reveals that reaction of 1 with O$_2$ leads to formation of 4 and 5, in addition to at least one other product. All spectra were recorded at room temperature with diiron complex concentrations of ~5 mM. All spectra were acquired in CDCl$_3$. Relative peak heights are not normalized between spectra. Panel A: δ (selected peaks) = 77.39, 65.13, 54.24, 51.17, 50.39, 45.94, 43.64, 31.77, 30.88, 26.75, 22.33, 19.89 ppm. Panel B: δ (selected peaks) = 51.28, 44.24, 33.02, 29.70, 23.90 ppm. Panel C: δ (selected peaks) = 49.97, 43.69, 31.20, 15.80 ppm.

To characterize the reaction product(s), single crystals of the material were grown by slow diffusion of pentane into a benzene solution containing the dark red-brown solid. After several days, a mixture of dark brown rectangular blocks and dark brown hexagonal prisms were obtained in addition to an amorphous solid. X-ray diffraction analysis of the rectangular-shaped crystals showed that the compound has a (µ-hydroxo)diiron(III) core and the molecular formula [Fe$_2$(µ-OH)(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO)$_2$] (4, Figure 3.13, Table 3.4). The distorted-octahedral iron centers
are separated by 3.49 Å, with Fe(1)–O(6) and Fe(2)–O(6) bond lengths of 1.95 and 1.97 Å, respectively. The hydrogen atom on O(6), the bridging hydroxide ion, was located from a difference Fourier map. The diiron core is supported by the PIM\textsuperscript{2} ligand, with average Fe–O(phenoxyl) and Fe–N(imine) distances of 1.31 and 2.12 Å, respectively, and three triphenylacetate groups. Two of the carboxylates coordinate to the iron atoms in a terminal bidentate mode, giving average Fe–O distances of 2.11 Å, and the remaining carboxylate bridges the diiron core, with an average Fe–O distance of 2.02 Å.

**Figure 3.13.** Ortep thermal ellipsoid (50%) diagram of the X-ray crystal structure of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{PIM})(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)_3] (4, left)\). An isolated view of the diiron core is shown as a stick figure representation on the right. Solvent molecules and hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Color scheme: iron, orange; carbon, gray; nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; sulfur, yellow. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (Deg): Fe(1)–Fe(2) = 3.487; Fe(1)–O(1) = 1.890; Fe(1)–N(1) = 2.115; Fe(1)–O(6) = 1.952; Fe(1)–O(10) = 2.063; Fe(1)–O(20) = 2.075; Fe(1)–O(21) = 2.132; Fe(2)–O(2) = 1.872; Fe(2)–N(2) = 2.136; Fe(2)–O(6) = 1.969; Fe(2)–O(11) = 1.979; Fe(2)–O(30) = 2.141; Fe(2)–O(31) = 2.093; O(1)–Fe(1)–N(1) = 87.4; O(2)–Fe(2)–N(2) = 87.5; Fe(1)–O(6)–Fe(2) = 125.6; O(6)–Fe(1)–O(10) = 88.3; O(6)–Fe(2)–O(11) = 88.9.

X-ray diffraction studies of the hexagonal prisms, isolated from the 1/O\textsubscript{2} reaction mixture, revealed a tetranuclear \([\text{Fe}_4(\mu-\text{OH})_6(\text{PIM})_2(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)_2] (5)\), in which two di(\mu-hydroxo)(\mu-triphenylacetato)diiron(III) units are linked by two bridging hydroxide ions (Figure
The tetrairon(III) unit is located on a crystallographic inversion center. The diiron subunit bound by the PIM$^2^-$ ligand has an Fe–Fe distance of 3.06 Å and is bridged by two hydroxide ligands (Fe–O$_{\text{ave}}$ = 2.02 Å). The separation of iron atoms between two Fe$_2$ macrocyclic monomers is 3.78 Å, and the linkages involve only one hydroxo bridge (Fe–O$_{\text{ave}}$ = 1.98 Å). The average Fe–O(phenoxyl) and Fe–N(imine) bond lengths were observed at approx. 1.91 and 2.20 Å, respectively. Finally, two bridging carboxylate groups (Fe–O$_{\text{ave}}$ = 2.06 Å) cap the tetranuclear cluster at opposite ends.

**Figure 3.14.** Ortep thermal ellipsoid (50%) diagram of the asymmetric unit of the X-ray crystal structure of [Fe$_4$(µ-OH)$_6$(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO$_2$)$_2$] (5, left). The center of the complex is located on a crystallographic inversion center. An isolated view of the tetrairon core is depicted as a stick figure representation on the right. Solvent molecules and hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Color scheme: iron, orange; carbon, gray; nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; sulfur, yellow. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (Deg): Fe(1)–Fe(2) = 3.056; Fe(1)–Fe(2A) = 3.780; Fe(1)–O(1) = 1.911; Fe(1)–N(1) = 2.172; Fe(1)–O(6) = 2.042; Fe(1)–O(8) = 2.030; Fe(1)–O(9) = 1.997; Fe(1)–O(10) = 1.978; Fe(2)–O(2) = 1.910; Fe(2)–N(2) = 2.229; Fe(2)–O(7) = 2.072; Fe(2)–O(8) = 2.028; Fe(2)–O(9) = 2.011; N(1)–Fe(1)–O(1) = 83.4; N(2)–Fe(2)–O(2) = 85.4; Fe(1)–O(8)–Fe(2) = 97.7; Fe(1)–O(9)–Fe(2) = 99.4; Fe(1)–O(10)–Fe(2A) = 146.6.
Table 3.4. X-ray Data Collection and Refinement Parameters for 4-7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Fe₂N₂O₁₂Sc₁₀₂H₇₈]</td>
<td>[Fe₄N₄O₂₀Sc₁₂₄H₁₀₀]</td>
<td>[Fe₂N₂O₁₀₂₆Sc₄H₆₃]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical formula</td>
<td>(C₆H₆)₃</td>
<td>(C₆H₆)₈</td>
<td>(C₆H₆)₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula weight</td>
<td>1901.75</td>
<td>2878.46</td>
<td>1531.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (K)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength (Å)</td>
<td>0.71073</td>
<td>0.71073</td>
<td>0.71073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system</td>
<td>Monoclinic</td>
<td>Triclinic</td>
<td>Orthorhombic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
<td>P₂₁/n</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pbca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (Å)</td>
<td>15.2273(15)</td>
<td>14.2464(8)</td>
<td>12.2687(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (Å)</td>
<td>16.6307(16)</td>
<td>15.8784(9)</td>
<td>25.927(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (Å)</td>
<td>37.426(4)</td>
<td>19.3834(11)</td>
<td>48.485(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β (°)</td>
<td>92.975(2)</td>
<td>66.3850(10)</td>
<td>69.7520(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β (°)</td>
<td>92.975(2)</td>
<td>66.3850(10)</td>
<td>69.7520(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ (°)</td>
<td>64.3010(10)</td>
<td>64.3010(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (Å³)</td>
<td>9464.9(16)</td>
<td>3540.4(3)</td>
<td>15423(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated density (g/mm³)</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>1.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption coefficient (mm⁻¹)</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(000)</td>
<td>3976</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>6375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal size (mm³)</td>
<td>0.40 x 0.35 x 0.21</td>
<td>0.14 x 0.08 x 0.07</td>
<td>0.19 x 0.16 x 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ range for data collection</td>
<td>1.47 to 26.43°</td>
<td>1.17 to 25.03°</td>
<td>1.57 to 24.71°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index ranges</td>
<td>-19 ≤ h ≤ 19</td>
<td>-16 ≤ h ≤ 16</td>
<td>-14 ≤ h ≤ 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections collected</td>
<td>133480</td>
<td>50303</td>
<td>227221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reflections</td>
<td>19402</td>
<td>12460</td>
<td>13160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[R(int) = 0.0677]</td>
<td>[R(int) = 0.0677]</td>
<td>[R(int) = 0.1197]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness to Θ (%)</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption correction</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. and min. transmission</td>
<td>0.9214 and 0.8575</td>
<td>0.9656 and 0.9329</td>
<td>0.9547 and 0.9163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data / restraints / parameters</td>
<td>19402/0/1240</td>
<td>12460/49/922</td>
<td>13160/82/998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit on F²</td>
<td>1.040</td>
<td>1.084</td>
<td>1.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indices [I&gt;2σ(I)]</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0472</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0468</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wR2</td>
<td>0.1245</td>
<td>0.1033</td>
<td>0.2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R indices (all data)</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0609</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0718</td>
<td>R1 = 0.1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wR2</td>
<td>0.1334</td>
<td>0.1131</td>
<td>0.2135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest diff. peak and hole (eÅ³)</td>
<td>1.287 and -0.559</td>
<td>1.034 and -0.646</td>
<td>1.516 and -1.390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* R1 = \( \sum ||F_o|| - |F_c|| / \sum |F_o| \); wR2 = \( \sqrt{\sum (w(F_o^2 - F_c^2)^2)/\sum w(F_o^2)} \); GOF = \( \sqrt{\sum (w(F_o^2 - F_c^2)^2)/(n-p)} \), where n is the number of reflections and p is the total number of parameters refined.
Analytically pure samples of 4 and 5 were prepared for spectroscopic characterization. The dinuclear compound 4 was synthesized by combining triphenylacetic acid, triethylamine, and 1 in benzene, followed by exposure to dioxygen. Vapor diffusion of pentane into the benzene reaction solution over the course of ~24 h afforded dark brown crystals. X-ray diffraction analysis of these crystals confirmed the desired (μ-hydroxo)diiron(III) species 4. The UV-visible spectrum of 4 exhibits absorption bands at 370 and 570 nm (Figure 3.11, blue trace). The higher energy band is most likely a ligand π-π* transition, whereas the visible band is most likely a hydroxo-to-iron(III) charge transfer. The 1H NMR spectrum of 4 was recorded in chloroform-d1 (Figure 3.12B). As expected for a paramagnetic compound, the spectrum shows several broad resonances, ranging from approximately 70 to -10 ppm. Assignment of the metal oxidation states in 4 as iron(III) is supported by zero-field Mössbauer spectroscopic measurements. Polycrystalline 57Fe-enriched 4 displays a single quadrupole doublet in the Mössbauer spectrum, with parameters \( \delta = 0.52(2) \text{ mm/s} \) and \( \Delta E_Q = 0.95(2) \text{ mm/s} \) (Figure 3.15A,
Table 3.2). Although the two iron atoms in 4 are not chemically equivalent, similarities in their coordination geometry and donor groups make them indistinguishable by zero-field Mössbauer spectroscopy.

The tetrairon(III) complex 5 was also fully characterized. The compound was isolated as brown crystals by slow evaporation of a benzene solution containing 1 and dioxygen under ambient conditions. To ensure that the bulk product did not contain 4, several representative crystals were analyzed by X-ray crystallography. In all cases, tetrancular 5 was obtained. The absorption spectrum has peaks with $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ at 370 and 540 nm (Figure 3.11, red trace). The visible band, which is blue-shifted by approximately 30 nm from the 570 nm absorption feature in 4, is most likely a ligand-to-metal transition involving the diiron-hydroxo unit. The $^1$H NMR spectrum of 5 in chloroform-$d_1$ exhibits paramagnetically broadened peaks at ~50, 44, 32, 26, and -8 ppm (Figure 3.12C). The simpler $^1$H NMR spectrum of 5, compared to that of 4, is consistent with its higher molecular symmetry (pseudo $C_{2h}$ for 5 versus $C_1$ for 4). The zero-field Mössbauer spectrum of $^{57}$Fe-enriched 5 was fit with parameters that are distinct from those of 4, giving $\delta = 0.51(2)$ mm/s and $\Delta E_Q = 1.06(2)$ mm/s (Figure 3.15B, Table 3.2). Because the four iron sites in 5 are chemically equivalent, a single quadrupole doublet is observed in the Mössbauer spectrum, consistent with its X-ray structure.

Comparison of the $^1$H NMR spectrum of 1/O$_2$ (Figure 3.12A) with those of 4 (Figure 3.12B) and 5 (Figure 3.12C) reveals that not all of the peaks are accounted for, particularly a broad resonance at ~76 ppm and other sharper features between 10 to 40 ppm. To evaluate the number of iron-containing species generated upon reaction of 1 with dioxygen, the crude 1/O$_2$ solid was examined by Mössbauer spectroscopy (Figure 3.16). The Mössbauer data display three overlapping quadrupole doublets, with the following characteristics: $\delta_1 = 0.50(2)$ mm/s, $\Delta E_{Q1} =$
0.78(2) mm/s, Area 1 = 24%; \( \delta_2 = 0.51(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q2} = 1.12(2) \text{ mm/s}, \text{Area 2} = 37\%; \delta_3 = 0.52(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q3} = 1.59(2) \text{ mm/s}, \text{Area 3} = 39\% \). The three sites have nearly identical isomer shift values, but differ in their quadrupole splitting parameters. Based on their similarities to the Mössbauer parameters of the crystallographically characterized species, sites 1 and 2 are ascribed to compounds 4 and 5, respectively. The nature of the third site, which comprises about 39\% of total iron in the \( \text{I/O}_2 \) sample, has not yet been identified.

**Figure 3.16.** Zero-field Mössbauer spectrum (80K) of a frozen benzene-\( d_6 \) solution of \([^{57}\text{Fe}_2(\text{PIM})(\text{Ph}_3\text{CCO}_2)_2])\) \( ^{57}\text{Fe}-\text{I}/\text{O}_2 \) (black lines). The \(^1\text{H} \) NMR spectrum of this sample is shown in Figure 3.12A. Spectral simulations are represented in green and fit residuals in red. Both plots show the same data, but are overlaid with different spectral fits for comparing their overall goodness of fit. Spectrum A was fit to a two-site model, with \( \delta_1 = 0.50(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q1} = 0.95(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Gamma_1 = 0.39(2) \text{ mm/s}, \text{Area 1} = 54\%, \delta_2 = 0.52(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q2} = 1.52(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Gamma_2 = 0.44(2) \text{ mm/s}, \text{and Area 2} = 46\% \). Spectrum B was fit to a three-site model, with \( \delta_1 = 0.50(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q1} = 0.78(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Gamma_1 = 0.30(2) \text{ mm/s}, \text{Area 1} = 24\%, \delta_2 = 0.51(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q2} = 1.12(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Gamma_2 = 0.34(2) \text{ mm/s}, \text{Area 2} = 37\%, \delta_3 = 0.52(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q3} = 1.59(2) \text{ mm/s}, \Gamma_3 = 0.41(2) \text{ mm/s}, \text{and Area 3} = 39\% \). Comparing the fit residuals between A and B clearly demonstrate that the three-site model in B is a better representation of the data.

The dioxygen reactivity of the diiron(II) compound 2, which contains sterically demanding terphenylcarboxylates rather than triphenylacetates, was also examined. Exposing a dichloromethane solution of 2 to \( \text{O}_2 \) led to an immediate color change from bright red to dark brown. The absorption spectrum of dioxygen-treated 2 has features at approximately 380, 473, and 600 nm (Figure 3.17, blue trace). The \(^1\text{H} \) NMR spectrum revealed new resonances between
26 and -8 ppm (Figure 3.18). Unlike the $^1$H NMR spectrum of $1/O_2$ (Figure 3.12A), which shows multiple chemical species in solution, the data suggest that reaction of 2 with $O_2$ forms fewer products.

![Figure 3.17. Absorption spectra of complex 2 + $O_2$ (blue, $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 380, 473, 600$ nm) and complex 2 + $O_2/H_2O$ (red, $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 380, 473, 600$ nm) in dichloromethane. The blue spectrum arises from a mixture of [Fe$_2$(µ-O)(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (6) and [Fe$_2$(µ-OH)$_2$(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (7) species. The red spectrum is assigned to a tetranuclear [Fe$_4$(µ-OH)$_6$(PIM)$_2$(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (8) complex.](image)

![Figure 3.18. $^1$H NMR spectrum (CD$_2$Cl$_2$, 500 MHz) of [Fe$_2$(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (2) after exposure to dioxygen. The spectrum was recorded at room temperature at a diiron complex concentration of ~5.0 mM.](image)
Figure 3.19. Ortep thermal ellipsoid (35%) diagram of the X-ray crystal structure of [Fe$_2$(µ-O)(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (6) and [Fe$_2$(µ-OH)$_2$(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (7) on the left. The two complexes occur in a single crystal and differ only in their (µ-oxo)diiron(III) and di(µ-hydroxo)diiron(III) cores, respectively. Stick figure representations of the diiron core of 6 and 7 are shown on the right. The ratio of 6:7 was determined to be 76:24. Solvent molecules and hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Color scheme: iron, orange; carbon, gray; nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; sulfur, yellow. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (Deg): Fe(1)–Fe(2) = 3.436; Fe(1)–O(1) = 1.880; Fe(1)–N(1) = 2.103; Fe(1)–O(6) = 1.744; Fe(1)–O(7) = 2.084; Fe(1)–O(8) = 2.133; Fe(1)–O(100) = 2.110; Fe(1)–O(101) = 2.090; Fe(2)–O(2) = 1.898; Fe(2)–N(2) = 2.125; Fe(2)–O(6) = 1.753; Fe(2)–O(9) = 2.113; Fe(2)–O(10) = 2.092; Fe(2)–O(100) = 2.103; Fe(2)–O(101) = 2.090; O(1)–Fe(1)–N(1) = 87.2; O(2)–Fe(2)–N(2) = 88.00; Fe(1)–O(6)–Fe(2) = 158.6; Fe(1)–O(100)–Fe(2) = 109.1; Fe(1)–O(101)–Fe(2) = 110.8.

Figure 3.20. Hybrid stick and space-filling diagrams of [Fe$_2$(µ-OH)(PIM)(Ph$_3$CCO$_2$)$_3$] (4, A) and [Fe$_2$(µ-O)(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (6, B). The aromatic rings of the carboxylate ligands are represented as spheres (carbon = green, hydrogen = white) to emphasize their shape and volume. The location of the carboxylate unit, either Ph$_3$CCO$_2^−$ or Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2^−$, is indicated by a white arrow. The PIM$^{2−}$ framework is displayed in stick form (carbon/hydrogen, gray; nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; sulfur, yellow) with the iron atoms shown as orange spheres.
To determine the composition of the \( \text{2/O}_2 \) product, preparative-scale reactions were performed to obtain sufficient material for characterization. Single crystals of oxygenated 2 were grown by slow diffusion of diethyl ether into a solution of the complex in acetonitrile. An X-ray structural investigation revealed that each single crystal contains a mixture of two species, a (\( \mu \)-oxo)diiron(III) \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{PIM})(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_{2}]\) \(6\) compound and a di(\( \mu \)-hydroxo)diiron(III) \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{OH})_2(\text{PIM})(\text{Ar}^{\text{Tol}}\text{CO}_2)_{2}]\) \(7\) compound (Figure 3.19, Table 3.4). This result was verified by analyzing several crystals independently prepared by the same method. The structures of \(6\) and \(7\) are identical except for the nature of their bridging oxygen atoms, which was modeled with positional disorder and partial occupancies assigned to atoms O(6) [in \(6\)] and O(100)/O(101) [in \(7\)]. Data refinement converged with \(6\) having an occupancy of 76% and \(7\) of 24%. The iron atoms in both structures are separated by 3.44 Å. Complex \(6\) is designated as a (\( \mu \)-oxo)diiron(III) species because of its short Fe(1)–O(6) and Fe(2)–O(6) distances of 1.74 and 1.75 Å, respectively.\(^{48}\) In contrast, \(7\) is a di(\( \mu \)-hydroxo)diiron(III) complex with the longer Fe–O(100) and Fe–O(101) bond length of 2.10 Å (averaged), more typical of a dinuclear structure with bridging hydroxide ligands. The iron atoms of \(6\) and \(7\) are coordinated by the PIM\(^2\)-ligand, with average Fe–O(phenoxyl) distances of 1.89 Å and average Fe–N(imine) distances of 2.11 Å. Furthermore, each iron site contains a terminal terphenylcarboxylate (Fe–O\(_{\text{ave}}\) = 2.11 Å). The iron atoms in \(6\) and \(7\) have bond valence sums of 3.0 and 2.8, respectively (Table 3.3), indicating that the iron centers are in the +3 oxidation state. Although three triphenylacetate ligands are accommodated by the PIM\(^2\) platform in \(4\) (Figure 3.20A), only two terphenylcarboxylates could occupy the same space in \(6\) (Figure 3.20B). These observations underscore the importance of considering both shape and size when selecting an appropriate carboxylate for synthetic
modeling studies; a fan-shaped terphenylcarboxylate is preferable over the cone-shaped triphenylacetate for producing dinuclear oxygenated products using the PIM$^2$-ligand framework.

The presence of both (µ-oxo)diiron(III) and di(µ-hydroxo)diiron(III) species in the reaction product of 2 with dioxygen was further supported by zero-field Mössbauer measurements. Polycrystalline 2/O$_2$ gave a Mössbauer spectrum that was best fit to two quadrupole doublets, $\delta_1 = 0.47(2)$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q1 = 1.52(2)$ mm/s, $\delta_2 = 0.50(2)$ mm/s, and $\Delta E_Q2 = 0.97(2)$ mm/s. Sites 1 and 2 were refined with areas of 21% and 79%, respectively. Because (µ-oxo)diiron(III) species typically have larger $\Delta E_Q$ values (>1.0 mm/s) than (µ-hydroxo)diiron(III) complexes (<1.0 mm/s), site 1 is attributed to complex 6 and site 2 to complex 7. When the 2/O$_2$ solid reaction product was further dried under vacuum at 150 °C for 24 h, Mössbauer measurements yielded a 6:7 ratio of 85:15 (Table 3.2), which is similar to the 6:7 ratio of 76:24 determined by X-ray crystallography (Figure 3.19), suggesting that 6 can be obtained from 7 by extrusion of H$_2$O. To examine the 6:7 ratio in solution, an $^{57}$Fe-enriched sample of the 2/O$_2$ solid dissolved in tetrahydrofuran was studied by Mössbauer spectroscopy at 80 K, yielding the following parameters: $\delta_1 = 0.51(2)$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q1 = 1.24(2)$ mm/s, $\delta_2 = 0.49(2)$ mm/s, and $\Delta E_Q2 = 0.78(2)$ mm/s, with sites 1 and 2 having occupancies of 61% and 36%, respectively (Figure 3.21B). Because site 1 has a larger $\Delta E_Q$ value than site 2, the ratio for 6:7 in tetrahydrofuran is 61:36. The varying percentages of 6 and 7, as determined from X-ray crystallographic and Mössbauer spectroscopic measurements, are probably due to the different amounts of H$_2$O present in each 2/O$_2$ sample. Regardless, these Mössbauer results unequivocally show that both 6 and 7 are produced in the reaction of 2 with dioxygen. So far we have been unable to isolate complexes 6 and 7 in pure form.
Figure 3.21. Zero field Mössbauer spectra (80 K) of a 22 mM $^{57}$Fe$_2$(PIM)(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$ (2) solution in tetrahydrofuran (A) that was frozen after exposure to dioxygen (B) or dioxygen/water (C). Spectrum A was best fit to a two-site model, which is consistent with the two different iron environments in 2. The spectrum in B is assigned to two diiron species 6 and 7, whereas the spectrum in C is assigned to a tetrarnuclear complex 8 containing equivalent iron sites. See Table 3.2 for solution Mössbauer parameters for species 2, 6/7, and 8. Raw data are represented in black; spectral fits are shown in green, with unique iron sites displayed as either red or blue lines.

Because 7 differs from 6 by a single water molecule, we explored whether addition of H$_2$O could convert the ($\mu$-oxo)diiron(III) species 6 to the di($\mu$-hydroxo)diiron(III) complex 7. When a 6/7 mixture was treated with 10 µL of H$_2$O, ~15 equiv relative to the diiron complexes, in dichloromethane, the brown solution instantly turned pale red. New optical bands at 360 and 550 nm were observed (Figure 3.17, red trace), which are reminiscent of those displayed by the tetrain complex [Fe$_4$(µ-OH)$_6$(PIM)$_2$(Ph$_3$CCO$_2$)$_2$] (5, Figure 3.11, red trace). To obtain further spectroscopic characterization, a sample containing $^{57}$Fe-enriched 6/7 and 15 equiv of H$_2$O in tetrahydrofuran was studied by Mössbauer spectroscopy at 80 K (Figure 3.21C). The spectrum was fit to a single quadrupole doublet, with $\delta = 0.49(2)$ mm/s and $\Delta E_Q = 0.97(2)$ mm/s. These parameters are nearly identical to those obtained for 5 (Table 3.2). Although we are unable to crystallize this material, the spectroscopic data suggest that the compound has the molecular formula [Fe$_4$(µ-OH)$_6$(PIM)$_2$(Ar$^{\text{Tol}}$CO$_2$)$_2$] (8).
3.4. Discussion

**Macrocyclic Ligands for Constructing Biomimetic Carboxylate-Bridged Diiron Models.** To obtain more accurate structural mimics of carboxylate-bridged diiron protein active sites, we designed and synthesized dinucleating ligands that enforce the syn stereochemistry of nitrogen donor atoms. Early work with 1,2-bis(3-ethynyl-8-carboxylatequinoline)-4,5-diethylbenzene ethyl ester (Et$_2$BCQEB$_{Et}$) led to isolation of a tri($\mu$-carboxylato)(syn N-donor)diiron(II) species that resembles the BMM protein active sites, but this compound produced an intractable mixture when exposed to dioxygen. Other syn N-donor variants primarily afforded bis(ligand)diiron complexes formed through interdigitation of two dinucleating ligands when complexed with iron(II). To prevent such interactions the H$_2$PIM ligand (Chart 3.1), was designed. By linking two phenoxylimine chelates covalently, H$_2$PIM still enforces syn arrangement of the nitrogen donors but has a more pre-organized conformation. This compound was synthesized by the procedure outlined in Scheme 3.2 and could be prepared in multi-gram quantities. The H$_2$PIM ligand is also amenable to electronic and geometric modifications by introduction of various substituents on the aromatic rings.

The H$_2$PIM macrocycle facilitated the preparation of new diiron(II) synthetic analogues of sMMOH$_{red}$ and related enzyme active sites. In the presence of sterically demanding carboxylic acids, treatment of H$_2$PIM with [Fe$_2$(Mes)$_4$] led to spontaneous self-assembly of di($\mu$-carboxylato)(PIM)diiron(II) species (Figure 3.22A). Compounds 1 and 2 reproduce several key features of the sMMOH$_{red}$ active site, including: the bridging $\mu$-$\eta^1\eta^2$ and $\mu$-$\eta^1\eta^1$ modes of carboxylates, syn stereochemistry of nitrogen donors, neutral charge of the complex, $S = 2$ spin state of the irons, and the stoichiometry of the ligands. The main differences are the substitution of carboxylate and imidazole groups with related donors. We used phenolate and imine moieties
because they provide both synthetic and functional advantages. Phenol is a versatile building block. A variety of substituents could be readily appended on the ring, allowing access to different molecular architectures. Although the phenolate anion (pKₐ of phenol = ~12-19 in DMSO) is more basic than a carboxylate (pKₐ of carboxylic acid = ~ 9-13 in DMSO), more electron-rich oxygen donors may stabilize iron in higher oxidation states, such as the diiron(IV) unit of intermediate Q. Alternatively, the basicity of the phenolate groups could be lowered to match better the donor strength of glutamate and aspartate side chains by introducing electron-withdrawing substituents on the PIM²⁻ ligand. An additional advantage of the phenolate ligand is that its iron complexes display visible absorption bands that provide a spectroscopic handle for studying otherwise optically silent species. Finally, imine groups are valuable in the H₂PIM framework because they form through Schiff base condensation reactions that are efficient in producing large macrocyclic structures with syn nitrogen donors.

**Figure 3.22.** Depiction of the X-ray crystal structures of the diiron sites of sMМОH_{red} (top, left) and sMМОH_{ox} (bottom, left). For structural comparison, synthetic complexes that mimic each protein state are shown on its right. Some relevant bond lengths are provided; the distances shown for 1 and 2 are averaged over the two complexes. Color scheme: iron, orange; nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; carbon, gray.
Reactivity of Diiron(II) Mimics and Their Biological Implications. Cyclic voltammograms of compounds 1 and 2 show quasi-reversible redox couples at +16 and +108 mV (vs. ferrocene/ferrocenium), respectively (Figure 3.8). These electrochemical events are assigned to diiron(II,II) to diiron(II,III) metal-centered oxidation processes. To investigate further the redox behavior of compound 2, chemical oxidation with silver perchlorate was attempted. This reaction afforded an organometallic di(µ-hydroxo)(µ-carboxylato)diiron(III)silver(I) (3) species (Scheme 3.3). The bridging hydroxo ions are most likely derived from adventitious water in the reaction mixture. When oxidation of 2 was performed using silver hexafluoroantimonate, which contains the less-coordinating SbF$_6^-$ anion compared to ClO$_4^-$, a tetrairon(III) cluster was isolated. Although the cyclic voltammograms of 1 and 2 suggest that reversible oxidation of these carboxylate-bridge diiron units might be possible, we were unable to isolate the one-electron oxidized forms using chemical methods. One difficulty is that the diiron PIM$^{2-}$ compounds have a propensity to be bridged by small nucleophiles, such as the OH$^-$ ligands in 3, which were not deliberately introduced into the reaction mixture. We cannot determine at this time whether our inability to isolate the oxidized product of 1 or 2 is due to their inherent instability or to our experimental conditions. The structure of 3, however, demonstrates two important features of our model system. Firstly, its di(µ-hydroxo)(µ-carboxylato)diiron(III) core indicates that our macrocyclic framework could support the unusual asymmetric resting state structure of the sMMOH$_{ox}$ active site.$^{18}$ Secondly, the oxophilic character of the diiron(II) complexes may facilitate rapid reaction with dioxygen.

A summary of the dioxygen reactivity of 1 and 2 is shown in Scheme 3.3. Exposure of 1 to O$_2$ generates (µ-hydroxo)diiron(III) (4) and hexa(µ-hydroxo)tetrairon(III) (5) complexes together with a third iron(III) product. Because an additional triphenylacetate ligand is required
to form 4 from 1 and O₂, some of the remaining diiron(III) units might dimerize to generate 5. Comparison of the spectroscopic data for analytically pure samples of 4 and 5 with those of the 1/O₂ reaction product indicates that these compounds do not account for all of the species formed. A Mössbauer spectrum (Figure 3.16) shows that at least one additional iron(III) compound is present in the oxygenated product of 1, the identity of which is currently unknown.

**Scheme 3.3.** Summary of reaction products characterized in this study. Full representation of the PIM²⁻ ligand is omitted for clarity; only its phenolate oxygen and imine nitrogen atoms are depicted. See Chart 3.1 for the structure of H₂PIM, the doubly protonated form of PIM²⁻.

When 2 was treated with dioxygen, a mixture of dinuclear species was generated. X-ray crystallographic studies show that the products are close chemical relatives, (µ-oxo)diiron(III) (6) and di(µ-hydroxo)diiron(III) (7) complexes (Figure 3.19). Unlike 4, which contains three carboxylate ligands per diiron unit, 6 and 7 retain a carboxylate-to-iron ratio of two (Figure 3.20). These results demonstrate that the shape and size of the carboxylate ligands in the diiron(II) complexes are critical for controlling the nature of the oxygenation products. From X-ray crystallographic and solid/solution Mössbauer spectroscopic investigations, we discovered
that the ratio of 6:7 could vary due to uncontrolled amounts of water present during oxygenation of 2. The occurrence of both (μ-oxo)diiron(III) and di(μ-hydroxo)diiron(III) species in a single crystal suggests that the energetic barrier for their interconversion is low. Complex 6 probably forms directly from reaction of 2 with dioxygen and convert to 7 by subsequent reaction with water. Such interconversion between (μ-oxo)dimetallic and di(μ-hydroxo)dimetallic units has previously been observed. Mössbauer spectroscopic studies revealed that drying of a [Fe$_{III}$$_{2}$(μ-OH)$_{2}$] complex resulted in extrusion of water to give a [Fe$_{III}$$_{2}$(μ-O)] species. More recently, crystal-to-crystal conversion of a (μ-oxo)divanadium polynoxometalate cluster to a di(μ-hydroxo)divandium analogue was discovered following exposure of the starting complex to water vapor. These synthetic studies suggest that similar processes occur at the cores of carboxylate-bridged diiron proteins.

The structure of 7 closely mimics that of the oxidized core of sMMOH$_{ox}$, which also contains a di(μ-hydroxo)diiron(III) unit (Figure 3.22B). We attribute the longer Fe–Fe distance in 7 compared to sMMOH$_{ox}$, however, to the lack of a bridging carboxylate. Notably, switching of a bridging Ar$_{Tol}$CO$_{2}$ in 2 to a terminal position in 7 reproduces the redox dependent carboxylate-shift observed in the BMM proteins.

Upon exposure to excess H$_{2}$O, 7 dimerizes to form the tetranuclear species 8 (Scheme 3.3). The tendency for iron complexes to aggregate in this manner is well-documented in the porphyrin as well as the synthetic diiron literature. Unlike the BMMs, which encapsulate diiron cofactors within a protein matrix to avoid unwanted side reactions, small-molecule mimics do not have such exquisite steric protection. By installing more bulky groups around the PIM$_{2}^{2-}$ ligand periphery, however, it should be possible to prevent formation of polynuclear species. Furthermore, having a bulkier ligand platform may allow assembly of diiron(II) models with less
sterically encumbering carboxylate units and facilitate dioxygen binding or improve hydrocarbon substrate access to the diiron core.

3.5. Conclusion

Using ligand design, we constructed more accurate models of the carboxylate-bridged diiron active sites of bacterial multi-component monooxygenases. To do so we developed the new macrocylic ligand H$_2$PIM, which could be readily prepared in multi-gram quantities and in good yields. In the presence of external carboxylates and [Fe$_2$(Mes)$_4$], H$_2$PIM self-assembles to form diiron(II) complexes that reproduce the syn orientation of nitrogen donors as well as the bridging modes of carboxylate ligands in the proteins. Electrochemical studies of the diiron(II) units suggest that isostructural diiron(II,III) species may be isolable, or at least trappable, for characterization. These diiron(II) compounds react rapidly with dioxygen to give a variety of iron-containing species, including (μ-hydroxo)diiron(III), (μ-oxo)diiron(III), di(μ-hydroxo)diiron(III), and hexa(μ-hydroxo)tetrairon(III) complexes. The composition of the oxygenation products is determined in part by the nature of the carboxylate ligand and the presence of water. Because we can now access both the reduced and oxidized forms of the BMMs in a single synthetic platform, detailed studies of the O$_2$ reaction pathway using these models should be able to address some remaining questions concerning the chemistry of carboxylate-bridged diiron proteins.

3.6. References


Chapter 4

Carboxylate as the Protonation Site in

(Peroxo)diiron(III) Model Complexes of Soluble Methane

Monooxygenase and Related Diiron Proteins

Portions of this chapter have appeared in print:
4.1. Introduction

An important subclass of the diiron protein family is the bacterial multi-component monooxygenases (BMMs),\(^1\) which comprises soluble methane monooxygenase (sMMO),\(^2\) toluene/o-xylene monooxygenase (ToMO),\(^3,4\) phenol hydroxylase (PH),\(^5\) and alkene monooxygenase (AMO),\(^6\) among others. All of these enzymes require multiple proteins for efficient chemical catalysis, including a hydroxylase component that contains two identical carboxylate-bridge diiron cofactors, a reductase component that delivers electrons from nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide (NADH) through a [2Fe–2S] cluster to the hydroxylase, and a regulatory component that is postulated to control electron transfer and substrate oxidation. Exposing \(\text{O}_2\) to the diiron(II) form of the hydroxylase leads to formation of (peroxo)diiron(III) intermediates that are capable of hydroxylating and epoxidizing hydrocarbons. In the unique case of soluble methane monooxygenase hydroxylase (sMMOH), one of two natural biological systems known to convert methane to methanol,\(^7\) the (peroxo)diiron(III) (\(\text{H}_{\text{peroxo}}\)) species forms a higher-valent diiron(IV) complex (intermediate Q)\(^8\) before decaying to the resting state of the enzyme (sMMOH\(_{\text{ox}}\)) (Scheme 4.1). Despite many years of research by our group and others on the structural and mechanistic details of the BMM proteins,\(^9-11\) important aspects of their biochemistry are still unknown. Some remaining questions are: What are the structures of the oxygenated intermediates? Does oxygen–atom transfer by (peroxo)diiron(III) species to substrates occur through heterolytic or homolytic O–O bond scission? What features allow sMMOH to generate a diiron(IV) species that is distinct from that of other BMMs?\(^12-15\)
Scheme 4.1. The proposed catalytic cycle of soluble methane monooxygenase hydroxylase (sMMOH). Conversion of $P^*$ to $H_{\text{peroxo}}$ and $H_{\text{peroxo}}$ to $Q$ occur more rapidly under low pH conditions. Intermediates $H_{\text{peroxo}}$ and $Q$ are both capable of oxidizing organic substrates but exhibit different reactivity profiles.\textsuperscript{19}

Chart 4.1. The four (peroxo)diiron(III) model complexes that have been structurally characterized by X-ray diffraction analysis. They are $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(N-\text{EtHPTB})(\text{OPPh}_3)_2]^{3+}$ (top left), $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(\text{Ph-bimp})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}$ (top right), $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(\text{HB}^{(\text{Pr})p}z)_2(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)_2]$ (bottom left), \textsuperscript{22} and $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-O_2)(6\text{Me}_2-\text{BPP})_2]$ (bottom right).\textsuperscript{23}
Re-investigation of the dioxygen activation pathway in sMMOH from *Methylococcus capsulatus* (Bath, *Mc*) revealed that the rates corresponding to P* decay/H$_{\text{peroxo}}$ formation as well as H$_{\text{peroxo}}$ decay/Q formation are significantly slower at high pH (Scheme 4.1).\textsuperscript{24} The pH dependence for these events was taken as evidence that protons are required for further activation of the (peroxo)diiron(III) units, in P* and H$_{\text{peroxo}}$. Similar results have also been reported for studies of sMMOH obtained from *Methylosinus trichosporium* OB3b.\textsuperscript{13,25} Given the complexity of the protein environment, indentifying the sites involved in proton translocation and their effect on the O$_2$ reduction pathway has been difficult to examine directly in the biological system. To shed light on the possible role of protons in the dioxygen activation chemistry at carboxylate-bridged diiron enzyme active sites, several structurally characterized (peroxo)diiron(III) complexes were examined as possible synthetic mimics of P* and H$_{\text{peroxo}}$ (Chart 4.1).\textsuperscript{20-23} Although the structure of the (µ-peroxo)(µ-carboxylato)diiron(III) complex [Fe$_2$(µ-O$_2$)(N-EtHPTB)(µ-PhCO$_2$)]$^{2+}$ (1a•O$_2$) is not known, its spectroscopic features suggest an Fe$_2$O$_2$ core similar to that of the crystallographically determined [Fe$_2$(µ-O$_2$)(N-EtHPTB)(OPPh$_3$)$_2$]$^{3+}$ analogue (Chart 4.1, top left).\textsuperscript{20,26} The dinucleating N-EtHPTB ligand provides kinetic stabilization of the Fe$_2$O$_2$ core and the benzoate group serves as a good mimic of the Asp and Glu carboxylate side chains in the protein diiron centers. We postulated that addition of an H$^+$ donor to 1a•O$_2$ would result in either protonation of the bridging carboxylate ([1a•O$_2$]H$^+$) or the reduced dioxygen moiety ([1a•O$_2$H]$^+$) (Scheme 4.2). Through application of several spectroscopic methods, we show that the reaction of H$^+$ with 1a•O$_2$ results in protonation at the carboxylate unit rather than the peroxo ligand and that the process is reversible. This work provides experimental support for recent theoretical studies suggesting that (hydroperoxo)-
diiron(III) species of non-heme diiron enzymes are too reactive to be isolable protein intermediates.\textsuperscript{27}

**Scheme 4.2.** Reaction of 1a with dioxygen leads to formation of a (\(\mu\)-1,2-peroxo)diiron(III) complex, 1a\(\cdot\)O\(_2\), that is stable at temperatures below -30 °C. Addition of H\(^+\) to 1a\(\cdot\)O\(_2\) was postulated to protonate either the carboxylate group, giving [1a\(\cdot\)O\(_2\)]H\(^+\), or the peroxo moiety, giving [1a\(\cdot\)O\(_2\)H]\(^+\). The spectroscopic data suggest that the carboxylate is the preferred protonation site. Treatment of [1a\(\cdot\)O\(_2\)]H\(^+\) with triethylamine results in conversion back to 1a\(\cdot\)O\(_2\).

### 4.2. Experimental

**Materials and Methods:** Commercial reagents were used as received without further purification. All air-sensitive manipulations were performed using standard Schlenk techniques or under a nitrogen atmosphere inside an MBraun drybox. Solvents were saturated with argon and purified by passage through two columns of activated alumina. The H-N-EtHPTB ligand,\textsuperscript{28} [Fe\(_2\)(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO\(_2\))]\((\text{BF}_4)\)\(_2\) complex,\textsuperscript{26} and [H(\text{OEt}_2)\(_2\)][\(3,5-(\text{CF}_3)\text{C}_6\text{H}_3\)\(_4\)B] (H[\text{BAr}^F]\(_4\))\textsuperscript{29,30} compound were synthesized according to literature procedures. The 40% iron-57 enriched Fe(OSO\(_2\)CF\(_3\))\(_2\)\(\cdot\)2CH\(_3\)CN salt was prepared from \(^{57}\)Fe/\(^{56}\)Fe metal (2:3) and trifluoromethanesulfonic acid.\textsuperscript{31} Benzoic acid 99% enriched with \(^{13}\)C at the carboxylate carbon atom was purchased from Cambridge Isotopes Laboratories, Inc.

**General Physical Methods:** NMR spectra were recorded on 500 MHz Varian Mercury spectrometers. Chemical shifts for \(^1\)H NMR spectra were referenced to residual solvent peaks.
and $^{19}$F NMR spectra were referenced externally to trifluoromethylbenzene ($\delta = -63.72$ ppm). Electrospray ionization mass spectra were obtained using an Agilent Technologies 1100 Series LC-MSD Trap. Absorption spectra were acquired on a Cary 50 spectrophotometer using a custom-made quartz cuvette (path length = 1.74 cm) containing a jacketed dewar. An acetonitrile/dry ice bath was used to maintain the samples at -30 °C. Zero field $^{57}$Fe Mössbauer spectra were recorded at 90 K on an MSI spectrometer (WEB Research Company) with a $^{57}$Co source in a Rh matrix. The isomer shift ($\delta$) values are reported with respect to metallic iron that was used for velocity calibration and the spectra were fit to Lorentzian lines using the WMOSS program. Resonance Raman spectra were measured by Dr. Takahiro Hayashi and Prof. Pierre Moënne-Loccoz at Oregon Health and Science University and were acquired with a custom-built McPherson 2061/207 spectrometer equipped with a Princeton Instrument liquid N$_2$ cooled CCD detector. All samples were obtained with 647 nm laser excitation at 110 K. Solid state and solution FTIR spectra of air-stable compounds were acquired with a ThermoNicolet Avatar 360 spectrophotometer using the OMNIC software. Solid samples were prepared as KBr pellets and solutions were injected into a Specac OMNI liquid IR cell (CaF$_2$ windows, 0.10 mm spacer). Air-sensitive solution IR measurements were collected with a Mettler Toledo ReactIR ic 10 unit equipped with a SiComp K4 conduit probe (ATR). Data were recorded using the ic IR software (v. 4.0) and baseline corrected using the OMNIC program.

**Synthesis**

$[\text{Fe}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)](\text{BPh}_4)_2$ [1a$\cdot$(BPh$_4$)$_2$]. Inside a nitrogen drybox, H-N-EtHPTB (300 mg, 0.417 mmol), benzoic acid (51 mg, 0.417 mmol), sodium tetraphenylborate (571 mg, 1.67 mmol) and triethylamine (0.13 mL, 0.917 mmol) were combined with 5 mL of CH$_3$CN and stirred at RT. Upon addition of FeCl$_2$$\cdot$4H$_2$O (166 mg, 0.833 mmol), the mixture became a light
yellow color. The heterogeneous solution was stirred for 2 h at RT and then filtered to remove the insoluble material. After removal of CH₃CN in vacuo, the resulting solid was extracted into CH₂Cl₂. The remaining solid was removed by filtration and the DCM solution was evaporated to dryness and layered with diethyl ether to afford a light yellow powder upon standing at -30 °C (532 mg, 80 %). ¹H NMR (CD₃CN, 500 MHz): 153.71, 107.44, 78.72, 55.11, 34.12, 22.78, 20.89, 19.21, 14.37, 12.61, 11.46, 8.78, 7.06, 5.57, 4.66, 4.09, 3.10, 0.21, -9.32 ppm. IR (KBr): ν 3055, 2978, 1593, 1578, 1550 (asym. COO⁻ stretch), 1490, 1480, 1453, 1425, 1401 (sym. COO⁻ stretch), 1330, 1294, 1267, 1236, 747, 695 cm⁻¹. UV-vis: λ max (CH₃CN) = 335 nm (1210 cm⁻¹ M⁻¹). Mp = 175-179 °C. ESI-MS(+) = 1273.6 [¹a+BPh₄⁻]⁺. Anal. Calc. for ¹a(BPh₄)₂, Fe₂C₉₂H₄₂B₂N₁₀O₃: C, 73.88; H, 5.95; N, 8.79. Found: C, 73.74; H, 6.00; N, 8.82.

[Fe₂(N-EtHPTB)(Ph¹³CO₂)](BPh₄)₂ [¹b(BPh₄)₂]. The same procedure was used as described for the synthesis of [¹a(BPh₄)₂], except that carbon-13 enriched PhCO₂H was employed instead of natural abundance benzoic acid. IR (KBr): ν 3055, 2978, 1578, 1518 (asym. COO⁻ stretch), 1490, 1485, 1453, 1425, 1375 (sym. COO⁻ stretch), 1330, 1294, 1267, 1236, 747, 695 cm⁻¹. ESI-MS = 1274.9 [¹b + BPh₄⁻]⁺.

[⁵⁷Fe₂(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO₂)](OSO₂CF₃)₂ [⁵⁷Fe-¹a(OSO₂CF₃)₂]. Inside a nitrogen drybox, H-N-EtHPTB (100 mg, 0.139 mmol), benzoic acid (17 mg, 0.139 mmol), ⁵⁷Fe(OSO₂CF₃)₂·2CH₃CN (121 mg, 0.278 mmol), and triethylamine (0.13 mL, 0.917 mmol) were combined with 3 mL of CH₃CN and stirred at RT for 1 h. The resulting solid was isolated by filtration and washed with diethyl ether to afford a light yellow material (110 mg, 63%). ¹H NMR (CD₃CN, 500 MHz): 153.29, 106.58, 78.73, 55.56, 34.58, 22.69, 20.92, 20.60, 13.90, 12.60, 11.42, 8.71, 7.47, 7.36, 4.61, 4.10, 1.56, 0.11, -8.87 ppm. IR (KBr): ν 2981, 2944, 1597, 1554, 1492, 1454, 1400, 1339, 1260, 1224, 1156, 1030, 980, 952, 928, 894, 748, 718, 638, 573, 518 cm⁻¹. UV-vis: λ max
(CH₃CN) = 335 nm (1490 cm⁻¹M⁻¹). Mp = 300 °C (decomp.). ESI-MS(+) = 1103.7 [1a+OSO₂CF₃]⁺. Anal. Calc. for 1a(OSO₂CF₃)₂, Fe₂C₅₂H₅₄F₆N₁₀O₉S₂: C, 49.85; H, 4.34; N, 11.18. Found: C, 49.22; H, 4.40; N, 11.28.

[Fe₂(N-EtHPTB)(C₆F₅CO₂)](OSO₂CF₃)₂ [2·(OSO₂CF₃)₂]. Inside a nitrogen drybox, H-N-EtHPTB (500 mg, 0.694 mmol), pentafluorobenzoic acid (147 mg, 0.694 mmol), Fe(OSO₂CF₃)₂·2CH₃CN (606 mg, 1.39 mmol), and triethylamine (0.22 mL, 1.53 mmol) were combined with 5 mL of CH₃CN and stirred at RT for 1 h. The resulting solid was isolated by filtration and washed with diethyl ether to afford a light yellow material (690 mg, 74%).

1H NMR (CD₃CN, 500 MHz): 151.54, 106.10, 80.99, 56.80, 39.30, 20.76, 18.52, 13.41, 12.42, 11.14, 8.70, 7.75, 7.15, 4.22, 3.86, 2.61, 1.65, 0.16, -6.56 ppm. 19F NMR (CD₃CN, 470 MHz): -77.8 (s, 6F), -113.87 (s, 2F), -135.71 (s, 2F), -148.12 (s, 1F) ppm. IR (KBr): ν 2984, 2942, 1650, 1607, 1530, 1490, 1455, 1380, 1341, 1276, 1262, 1224, 1162, 1030, 1003, 986, 893, 748, 638, 574, 517 cm⁻¹. UV-vis: λ_max (CH₂Cl₂) = 315 nm (sh, 1170 cm⁻¹M⁻¹). Mp = 302 °C (decomp).

ESI-MS(+) = 1193.2 [2+OSO₂CF₃]⁺. Anal. Calc. for 2·(OSO₂CF₃)₂, Fe₂C₅₂H₄₉F₁₁N₁₀O₉S₂: C, 46.51; H, 3.68; N, 10.43. Found: C, 46.49; H, 3.70; N, 10.34.

[¹⁵⁷Fe₂(N-EtHPTB)(C₆F₅CO₂)](OSO₂CF₃)₂ [¹⁵⁷Fe-2·(OSO₂CF₃)₂]. The same procedure was used as described for the synthesis of [2·(OSO₂CF₃)₂], except that 40% iron-57 enriched Fe(OSO₂CF₃)₂·2CH₃CN was employed instead of the natural abundance iron(II) salt.

[Fe₂(N-EtHPTB)(C₆F₅CO₂)](BPh₄)₂ [2·(BPh₄)₂]. The same procedure was used as for the synthesis of [1a·(BPh₄)₂], except that pentafluorobenzoic acid was used instead of benzoic acid. The final product was isolated as a light yellow solid (340 mg, 50%). 1H NMR (CD₃CN, 500 MHz): 151.85, 106.10, 80.99, 56.80, 39.30, 20.76, 18.52, 13.41, 12.27, 11.00, 8.58, 7.60, 7.28, 7.13, 6.99, 6.84, 4.27, 3.77, 2.56, 1.69, -0.20, -6.78 ppm. 19F NMR (CD₃CN, 282 MHz): -117.26 (s,
2F), -140.21 (s, 2F), -148.70 (s, 1F) ppm. IR (KBr): ν 3054, 2983, 1651, 1608, 1580, 1522, 1491, 1481, 1453, 1427, 1397, 1330, 1294, 1269, 1132, 1110, 997, 891, 746, 706, 612 cm⁻¹. UV-vis: λmax (CH₂Cl₂) = 315 nm (sh, 2070 cm⁻¹M⁻¹). Mp = 185-189 °C. ESI-MS(+) = 1363.6 [2+BPh₄⁻]⁺. Anal. Calc. for 2·(BPh₄)₂, Fe₂C₉₈H₈₉F₅B₂N₁₀O₃: C, 69.93; H, 5.33; N, 8.32. Found: C, 69.88; H, 5.18; N, 8.19.

**Spectroscopic Studies**

**UV-Vis Spectroscopy:** Addition of H[BArF₄] to a CH₃CN solution containing either 1a·O₂(BF₄)₂ or 2·O₂(OSO₂CF₃)₂ at -30 °C. Inside a nitrogen glovebox, a 6.0 mL aliquot of a 112 µM CH₃CN solution of 1a·(BF₄)₂ or 2·(OSO₂CF₃)₂ was added to a low temperature UV-vis cell, which was sealed with a septum. The cell was brought outside of the glovebox and cooled to -30 °C with an acetonitrile/dry ice bath. To generate the (peroxo)diiron(III) species, the septum seal was removed and the sample solution was exposed to air and stirred for 15 min. A UV-vis spectrum was recorded. Successive aliquots of a 1.78 mM solution of H[BArF₄] in CH₃CN were added to the (peroxo)diiron(III) solution via syringe and the spectral changes were measured. For the protonated complex of 1a·O₂(BF₄)₂, addition of 2.0 equiv of triethylamine (relative to 1a·(BF₄)₂) led to restoration of the 1a·O₂(BF₄)₂ spectrum. Spectra were corrected for dilution where appropriate.

**57Fe Mössbauer Spectroscopy:** Addition of H[BArF₄] to a CH₃CN solution containing either ⁵⁷Fe-1a·O₂(OSO₂CF₃)₂ or ⁵⁷Fe-2·O₂(OSO₂CF₃)₂. A 8.0 mM CH₃CN solution of either ⁵⁷Fe-1a·(OSO₂CF₃)₂ or ⁵⁷Fe-2·(OSO₂CF₃)₂ was prepared anaerobically and cooled to -30 °C. The diiron(II) compound was exposed to air for 15 min and the resulting mixture was divided into two portions. One portion was frozen in liquid nitrogen in a Nylon Mössbauer sample cup and the other was treated with 1.0 equiv of H[BArF₄], relative to ⁵⁷Fe-1a·O₂ or ⁵⁷Fe-2·O₂, and then
frozen in a second sample cup. The Mössbauer spectra of the samples were recorded over a period of ~12 h. In all cases, the data were best fit to a single quadrupole doublet.

**Resonance Raman Spectroscopy:** Addition of $\text{H}[\text{BAR}^F_4]$ to a CH$_3$CN solution containing either $1\cdot\text{O}_2(\text{BF}_4)_2$ or $2\cdot\text{O}_2(\text{OSO}_2\text{CF}_3)_2$. A 5.9 mM CH$_3$CN solution of either $1\cdot(\text{BF}_4)_2$ or $2\cdot(\text{OSO}_2\text{CF}_3)_2$ was prepared anaerobically and cooled to -30 °C. The diiron(II) compound was exposed to air for 15 min to generate the (peroxo)diiron(III) complex. A 200 µL aliquot of the $1\cdot\text{O}_2$ or $2\cdot\text{O}_2$ solution was quickly transferred to an NMR tube and frozen in liquid nitrogen. To prepare the protonated $1\cdot\text{O}_2$ and $2\cdot\text{O}_2$ samples, 500 µL of the starting (peroxo)diiron(III) solution was combined with the appropriate volume of a 59.3 mM solution of $\text{H}[\text{BAR}^F_4]$ and diluted with cold CH$_3$CN to give a final diiron concentration of ~5.0 mM. Approx. 200 µL of the resulting solutions were added into separate NMR tubes and frozen.

**Solution IR Spectroscopy:** Measurement of diiron(II) complexes in CH$_2$Cl$_2$. Inside a nitrogen glovebox, a 3.0 mL solution of $1\cdot(\text{BPh}_4)_2$, $1\cdot(\text{BPh}_4)_2$, or $2\cdot(\text{BPh}_4)_2$ (15.0 mM) was transferred to a ReactIR Schlenk vessel and sealed with a Teflon screwcap. The flask was brought outside of the glovebox, opened under a stream of nitrogen, and attached to the ReactIR probe. Measurements were made at RT. Solvent peaks were subtracted from all spectral data.

**Addition of $\text{H}[\text{BAR}^F_4]$ to a CH$_2$Cl$_2$ or CD$_3$CN solution containing either $1\cdot\text{O}_2(\text{BPh}_4)_2$ or $1\cdot\text{O}_2(\text{BPh}_4)_2$**. Inside a nitrogen drybox, a ~55 mM solution of $1\cdot\text{O}_2(\text{BPh}_4)_2$ or $1\cdot\text{O}_2(\text{BPh}_4)_2$ was sealed in a scintillation vial. The solution was brought outside of the drybox, cooled to -30 °C, and stirred in air for 5 min to generate the (peroxo)diiron(III) species. An aliquot of the dark blue-green mixture was treated with an appropriate amount of $\text{H}[\text{BAR}^F_4]$ and stirred for an additional 5 min. Approximately 100 µL of each solution was injected into a liquid IR cell that has been pre-cooled over dry ice. IR spectra of the cold samples were recorded over a period of
~30 sec. Identical measurements using the ReactIR system, which maintains a constant low
temperature throughout the experiment, gave the same results, demonstrating that the
(peroxo)diiron(III) species are stable during data acquisition in the liquid IR cell. Spectral data
were subtracted from a nitrogen background and baseline corrected, but not solvent subtracted.

**1H and 19F NMR Spectroscopy:** *Addition of H[BAIF\textsubscript{4}] to a solution containing either
1a\textsuperscript{-}O\textsubscript{2}(BF\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{2} or 2\cdot O\textsubscript{2}(OSO\textsubscript{2}CF\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{2}.* A 8.0 mM solution of 1a\textsuperscript{-}(BF\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{2} or 2\cdot(OSO\textsubscript{2}CF\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{2} was prepared
anaerobically and cooled to -30 ºC. The sample was exposed to air to form the
(peroxo)diiron(III) species and divided into two equal portions. One portion was transferred to an
NMR tube as the 1a\cdot O\textsubscript{2} or 2\cdot O\textsubscript{2} sample. To the other solution, 1.0 equiv of H[BAIF\textsubscript{4}] was added
and then transferred to a second NMR tube. Both the NMR samples and probe were maintained
at -30 ºC to ensure the stability of the (peroxo)diiron(III) species throughout the experiment.

### 4.3. Results and Discussion

To aid spectral interpretation of results obtained during studies of the parent \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}\) complex (1a), two related diiron(II) precursors were synthesized. One is
\([\text{Fe}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{13}\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\) (1b), which contains a \textsuperscript{13}C-enriched carboxylate ligand, and the other is \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5\text{CO}_2)]^{2+}\) (2), in which the benzoate ring is fully fluorinated.

Exposure of 1a to O\textsubscript{2} in CH\textsubscript{3}CN at -30 ºC generated a deep blue-green solution (1a\cdot O\textsubscript{2})
with \(\lambda_{\text{max}}\) at 590 nm.\textsuperscript{26} Addition of an acetonitrile solution of [H(OEt\textsubscript{2})\textsubscript{2}][(3,5-(CF\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{2}C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{3})\textsubscript{4}B]
(H[BAIF\textsubscript{4}]) to 1a\cdot O\textsubscript{2} shifted the peroxo-to-iron(III) charge transfer band to ~600 nm (Figure
4.1A). This absorption was assigned to the formation of a new [1a\cdot O\textsubscript{2}]H\textsuperscript{+} species that maximized
with addition of ~1.5 equiv of H[BAIF\textsubscript{4}]. The spectrum of 1a\cdot O\textsubscript{2} was restored upon addition of
2.0 equiv of NEt\textsubscript{3} (Figure 4.1B), indicating that protonation does not lead to irreversible
decomposition of the 1a·O₂ unit. Reaction of 2 with O₂ afforded [Fe₂(µ-O₂)(N-EtHPTB)(C₆F₅CO₂)]²⁺ (2·O₂), which exhibits a broad absorption feature centered at ~600 nm. When H[BArF₄] was titrated into a solution of 2·O₂, a small bathochromic shift to ~610 nm occurred (Figure 4.2). Unlike 1a·O₂, 2·O₂ required ~3.0 equiv of H[BArF₄] to fully generate the protonated species [2·O₂]H⁺. Given that pentafluorobenzoate, for which the acid has a pKₐ of 1.2, is more electron deficient than benzoate (acid pKₐ = 4.6), the greater amount of H⁺ necessary to produce [2·O₂]H⁺ from 2·O₂ compared to [1a·O₂]H⁺ from 1a·O₂ suggested that either the carboxylate ligand influences the basicity of the protonation site or that it itself is the proton acceptor.

![Image of UV-vis absorption spectra](image.png)

**Figure 4.1.** UV-vis absorption spectra of A) 1a·O₂ (112 µM in CH₃CN, -30 °C) before (dotted trace) and after (blue trace) addition of 2.0 equiv of H[BArF₄] and B) restoration of the initial spectrum (orange trace) upon treatment with 2.0 equiv of triethylamine.

To determine whether a (hydroperoxo)diiron(III) species may form upon addition of H⁺ to 1a·O₂ or 2·O₂, ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer and resonance Raman (RR) spectra were recorded to examine possible changes in the Fe₂O₂ core. In the absence of H⁺, the Mössbauer spectrum of a frozen
Figure 4.2. UV-vis absorption spectra of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5\text{CO}_2)](\text{OSO}_2\text{CF}_3)_2\) (112 \(\mu\text{M}\) in \(\text{CH}_3\text{CN}\), -30\(^\circ\text{C}\)) after addition of up to 4.8 equiv of \(\text{H[BAr}^\text{F}_4\text{]}\), relative to the diiron complex. The (peroxo)diiron(III) species displays a \(\lambda_{\text{max}}\) at \(\sim600\) nm, whereas the protonated complex shows a shifted absorption band centered at \(\sim610\) nm. Black dotted line = compound 2-O\(2\), solid lines = spectra after addition of up to 4.8 equiv of \(\text{H[BAr}^\text{F}_4\text{]}\).

Solution of 1a-O\(2\) in \(\text{CH}_3\text{CN}\) was fit to a single iron site, with \(\delta = 0.53(2)\) mm/s and \(\Delta E_Q = 0.71(2)\) mm/s (Figure 4.3A, Table 4.1). Addition of \(\text{H[BAr}^\text{F}_4\text{]}\) to 1a-O\(2\) gave \([1a\cdot\text{O}_2]^+\) having the same isomer shift (\(\delta = 0.53(2)\) mm/s) and a slightly larger quadrupole splitting parameter (\(\Delta E_Q = 0.80(2)\) mm/s) (Figure 4.3B, Table 4.1). For comparison, the Mössbauer spectra of 2-O\(2\) and \([2\cdot\text{O}_2]^+\) were also recorded. The (peroxo)diiron(III) complex of 2 has parameters \(\delta = 0.53(2)\) mm/s and \(\Delta E_Q = 0.77(2)\) mm/s (Figure 4.3C, Table 4.1), whereas the protonated \([2\cdot\text{O}_2]^+\) form exhibits parameters of \(\delta = 0.54(2)\) mm/s and \(\Delta E_Q = 0.84(2)\) mm/s (Figure 4.3D). The similar isomer shifts obtained for 1a-O\(2\), \([1a\cdot\text{O}_2]^+\), 2-O\(2\), and \([2\cdot\text{O}_2]^+\) are indicative of iron(III) centers and the small increase in \(\Delta E_Q\) values for the protonated forms implies that only minor changes occur in the coordination environment.
Table 4.1. UV-Vis, Mössbauer, RR, and FTIR Data for $1a \cdot O_2$, $[1a \cdot O_2]H^+$, $2 \cdot O_2$, and $[2 \cdot O_2]H^+$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\lambda_{max}$, nm</th>
<th>$\delta$, mm/s</th>
<th>$\Delta E_Q$, mm/s</th>
<th>$\nu$ (Fe–O), cm$^{-1}$ ($\Delta^{18}$O)</th>
<th>$\nu$ (O–O), cm$^{-1}$ ($\Delta^{16}$O)</th>
<th>$\nu_{as}(COO^-)$ cm$^{-1}$ ($\Delta^{13}$C)</th>
<th>$\nu_s(COO^-)$ cm$^{-1}$ ($\Delta^{13}$C)</th>
<th>$\Delta \nu_{as-s}$ cm$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1a \cdot O_2$</td>
<td>590 (3100)</td>
<td>0.53(2)</td>
<td>0.71(2)</td>
<td>466/474 (–18)</td>
<td>897 (–50)</td>
<td>1607/1572 (–22)</td>
<td>1358 (–39)</td>
<td>&gt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[1a \cdot O_2]H^+$</td>
<td>600 (2360)</td>
<td>0.53(2)</td>
<td>0.80(2)</td>
<td>467/478 (–20)</td>
<td>896 (–53)</td>
<td>1553 (–32)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2 \cdot O_2$</td>
<td>600 (3300)</td>
<td>0.53(2)</td>
<td>0.77(2)</td>
<td>466/475 (–18)</td>
<td>897 (–50)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[2 \cdot O_2]H^+$</td>
<td>610 (2700)</td>
<td>0.54(2)</td>
<td>0.84(2)</td>
<td>478 (–19)</td>
<td>897 (–50)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3. Zero-field $^{57}$Fe Mössbauer spectra of frozen CH$_3$CN solutions containing ~8 mM A) $[^{57}\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)](\text{OSO}_2\text{CF}_3)_2$ ($\delta = 0.53(2)$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q = 0.71(2)$ mm/s, $\Gamma = 0.42(2)$ mm/s); B) $[^{57}\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)](\text{OSO}_2\text{CF}_3)_2/\text{H[Bar}^4\text{]}_{1:1}$ ($\delta = 0.53(2)$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q = 0.80(2)$ mm/s, $\Gamma = 0.43(2)$ mm/s); C) $[^{57}\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5\text{CO}_2)]-(\text{OSO}_2\text{CF}_3)_2$ ($\delta = 0.53(2)$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q = 0.77(2)$ mm/s, $\Gamma = 0.34(2)$ mm/s); and D) $[^{57}\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{C}_6\text{F}_5\text{CO}_2)](\text{OSO}_2\text{CF}_3)_2/\text{H[Bar}^4\text{]}_{1:1}$ ($\delta = 0.54(2)$ mm/s, $\Delta E_Q = 0.84(2)$ mm/s, $\Gamma = 0.36(2)$ mm/s). The spectra were acquired at 90 K and the raw data (*) were fit to Lorentzian
least square lineshapes (black trace). The minor peaks in spectra A and B were not included in the data fitting and are attributed to unreacted diiron(II) starting material.

**Figure 4.4.** Resonance Raman spectra of frozen CH$_3$CN solutions of [Fe$_2$(µ-O$_2$)(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO$_2$)](BF$_4$)$_2$ (¹⁶O$_2$: black; ¹⁸O$_2$: red; and ¹⁸O$_2$-sample minus ¹⁶O$_2$-contaminant: blue) with (A, top) and without (B, bottom) addition of 1.0 equiv of H[BARF$_4$], relative to the diiron complex. Each spectrum was normalized based on the solvent bands at 392, 400, and 920 cm$^{-1}$. Top spectra: $\nu = 897$ (847), 532/513 (500), 474/466 (452) cm$^{-1}$. Bottom spectra: $\nu = 896$ (843), 533/514 (501), 478/467 (458) cm$^{-1}$.

**Figure 4.5.** Resonance Raman spectra of 2·¹⁶O$_2$ (black) and 2·¹⁸O$_2$ (red) after addition of 0 (A), 0.5 (B), 1.0 (C), 1.5 (D), and 2.0 (E) equiv of H[BARF$_4$]. Each spectrum was normalized based on the solvent CH$_3$CN bands at 392, 400, and 920 cm$^{-1}$. Before addition of protons: $\nu = 910/897/886$ (847), 532/513 (500), 475/466 (457/449) cm$^{-1}$. After addition of protons: $\nu = 910/897/886$ (847), 532/513 (500), 478/467 (459) cm$^{-1}$. 
To investigate more directly the nature of the peroxo moiety, Fe–O and O–O vibrations were measured by resonance Raman (RR) spectroscopy for species generated with both $^{16}$O$_2$ and $^{18}$O$_2$. As previously reported,$^{26}$ 1a·O$_2$ exhibits Fe–O and O–O stretching vibrations with Fermi splitting (hereafter “/”) centered at 470 and 897 cm$^{-1}$, respectively (Figure 4.4). Also observed are weaker bands at 513/532 cm$^{-1}$ that shifted to 500 cm$^{-1}$ with $^{18}$O$_2$, which we assigned to the asymmetric Fe–O stretch of the Fe$_2$O$_2$ core. Addition of H$^+$ to 1a·O$_2$ only marginally affects its RR spectrum, with small upshift in Fe–O and downshift in O–O vibrations (Figure 4.4, Table 4.1). These shifts in RR frequencies upon H$^+$ addition may reflect subtle changes in Fe–O–O–Fe angles,$^{32}$ but are too small to support the conclusion that a ($\mu$-1,2-peroxo)diiron(III) unit has been converted to a (hydroperoxo)diiron(III) species. The RR spectrum of 2·O$_2$ is practically identical to that of 1a·O$_2$, with symmetric and asymmetric Fe–O modes at 466/475 and 513/532 cm$^{-1}$, respectively, and Fermi-coupled O–O stretches centered at 897 cm$^{-1}$ (Figure 4.5). Addition of up to 2.0 equiv of H[BF$_4$] to generate [2·O$_2$]H$^+$ primarily affects the symmetric Fe–O stretch, which upshifts only a few wavenumbers compared to the spectrum of 2·O$_2$ (Table 4.1). From the RR data and Mössbauer parameters for 1a·O$_2$, [1a·O$_2$]H$^+$, 2·O$_2$, and [2·O$_2$]H$^+$, we conclude that protonation does not lead to formation of a (hydroperoxo)diiron(III) species.

Since the benzimidazole, amine, and propoxy groups of N-EtHPTB are less accessible due to the multidentate nature of the ligand, we assign the carboxylate unit as the site of protonation. To test this hypothesis, we examined the carboxylate stretches of 1a and 1b, and their peroxo complexes by FTIR spectroscopy. The assignment of frequencies in terms of coordination geometry is complicated by mixing of the COO$^-$ symmetric stretch with the O–C–O bend and C–C stretch.$^{33}$ Nevertheless, if the asymmetric and symmetric COO$^-$ stretches could be
Figure 4.6. Infrared spectra of \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)](\text{BPh}_4)_2\) (1a, green) and \([\text{Fe}_2(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{Ph}^{13}\text{CO}_2)](\text{BPh}_4)_2\) (1b, orange) in the solid state (KBr pellet, panel A) and in solution (CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\), panel B). Panel A: \(\nu_{1a} = 1330, 1401, 1425, 1453, 1480, 1490, 1550, 1573, 1593\) cm\(^{-1}\). \(\nu_{1b} = 1330, 1375, 1425, 1453, 1480, 1490, 1518, 1573\) cm\(^{-1}\). Panel B: \(\nu_{1a} = 1332, 1389, 1426, 1457, 1479, 1555, 1580, 1597\) cm\(^{-1}\). \(\nu_{1b} = 1332, 1377, 1426, 1457, 1479, 1493, 1526, 1580\) cm\(^{-1}\). The peaks at 1550 (1555) and 1518 (1526) cm\(^{-1}\) are assigned to asymmetric COO\(^{-}\) stretches (where values in parentheses are for the solution data), and peaks at 1401 (1389) and 1375 (1377) cm\(^{-1}\) are attributed to symmetric COO\(^{-}\) vibration modes.

identified, the binding geometry of the carboxylate ligand could be derived from the difference in the two, \(\Delta \nu_{\text{as-s}}\).\(^{34-36}\) Specifically, \(\Delta \nu_{\text{as-s}}\) should be close to that of the free ionic form for carboxylates bridging two metal ions (150 cm\(^{-1}\) for PhCOO\(^{-}\)), larger in unidentate coordination geometry, and smaller in bidentate mononuclear complexes. As expected, 1a and 1b exhibited \(\Delta \nu_{\text{as-s}}\) values of 149 and 166 cm\(^{-1}\), respectively, consistent with \(\mu-1,3\) bridging carboxylate groups (Figure 4.6). In CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\), 1a\(\cdot\)O\(_2\) displayed \(\nu_\text{as}\) and \(\nu_\text{s}\) stretches at 1572/1607 and 1358 cm\(^{-1}\), respectively, whereas 1b\(\cdot\)O\(_2\) showed peaks at 1550 and 1329 cm\(^{-1}\) (Figure 4.7A). These frequencies give \(\Delta \nu_{\text{as-s}} > 200\) cm\(^{-1}\) and suggest a switch from bridging to unidentate coordination for the carboxylate groups in 1a\(\cdot\)O\(_2\) and 1b\(\cdot\)O\(_2\). Shifting of a phosphinate ligand from a bridging to a terminal position has been reported for the (peroxo)diiron(III) unit supported by N-EtHPTB.\(^{37}\) A bridging benzoate, however, has been observed in the X-ray structure of a
(peroxo)diiron(III) complex containing a related ligand system.\textsuperscript{21} Generation of [\textit{1a-O}_2]H\textsuperscript{+} and [\textit{1b-O}_2]H\textsuperscript{+} was associated with downshift of the \(\nu_{as}\) modes by at least 20 cm\textsuperscript{-1}, whereas \(\nu_s\) modes were not observed, possibly shifting below 1300 cm\textsuperscript{-1} (Figure 4.7B and 4.8D). The FTIR spectra in CH\textsubscript{2}Cl\textsubscript{2} are similar to those in CD\textsubscript{3}CN and do not show evidence for free benzoic acid in the H\textsuperscript{+} treated samples. With the use of the less basic carboxylate C\textsubscript{6}F\textsubscript{5}CO\textsuperscript{2−}, present in \textit{2}, protonation leads to free pentafluorobenzoic acid, but only in the coordinating solvent acetonitrile and not in dichloromethane (Figure 4.8). The peaks at 1529, 1654, and 1739 cm\textsuperscript{-1} are diagnostic of uncoordinated pentafluorobenzoic acid.

**Figure 4.7.** Solution FTIR spectra of \textit{1a-O}_2 (black) and \textit{1b-O}_2 (red) before (A and C) and after (B and D) the addition of 1.5 equiv of H[BAr\textsubscript{4}]. Spectra A and B were acquired in CH\textsubscript{2}Cl\textsubscript{2} whereas spectra C and D were measured in CD\textsubscript{3}CN. The samples were recorded at approx. -30
°C with a diiron concentration of ~55 mM. The intense peaks at 1354/1356 and 1420 cm\(^{-1}\) are due to the \([\text{BAR}^4\text{F}]^-\) anion and solvent, respectively. Panel A: \(v_{1a} = 1358, 1389, 1456, 1481, 1497, 1572, 1607 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). \(v_{1b} = 1329, 1369, 1389, 1456, 1481, 1497, 1550 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). Panel B: \(v_{1a} = 1372, 1456, 1483, 1494, 1553, 1596, 1609 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). \(v_{1b} = 1456, 1483, 1494, 1521, 1596, 1609 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). Panel C: \(v_{1a} = 1356, 1388, 1456, 1481, 1495, 1579, 1616 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). \(v_{1b} = 1326, 1372, 1456, 1481, 1495, 1557, 1579 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). Panel D: \(v_{1a} = 1386, 1455, 1481, 1496, 1554, 1597, 1611 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). \(v_{1b} = 1386, 1455, 1481, 1496, 1518, 1597, 1611 \text{ cm}^{-1}\).

**Figure 4.8.** Solution FTIR spectra of 2⋅O₂ before (purple) and after (green) the addition of 3.0 equiv of H[BAR\(^4\)F]. Spectra in A were acquired in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\) and spectra in B were obtained in CD\(_3\)CN at -30 °C with a diiron concentration of ~55 mM. For A, the intense peaks at 1356 and 1420 cm\(^{-1}\) due to the \([\text{BAR}^4\text{F}]^-\) anion and CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\), respectively. For B, the resonances at 1529, 1654, and 1739 (\(v_{\text{C=O}}\)) are attributed to formation of free pentafluorobenzoic acid. The absence of the 1739 cm\(^{-1}\) absorbance in A is taken as evidence that pentafluorobenzoic acid is not liberated in CH\(_2\)Cl\(_2\). Panel A: \(v_{\text{purple}} = 1370, 1454, 1497, 1525, 1610, 1652 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). \(v_{\text{green}} = 1370, 1382, 1454, 1497, 1525, 1610, 1652 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). Panel B: \(v_{\text{purple}} = 1360, 1456, 1497, 1529, 1635 \text{ cm}^{-1}\). \(v_{\text{green}} = 1385, 1456, 1497, 1529, 1610, 1654, 1739 \text{ cm}^{-1}\).

A comparison of the \(^1\text{H} \text{NMR}\) spectra of the benzoate and pentafluorobenzoate diiron complexes allowed the phenyl ring protons of the former to be identified in 1a⋅O₂ as paramagnetically broadened peaks at 7.01, 8.74, and 11.40 ppm (Figure 4.9A). Upon addition of H[BAR\(^4\)F], these resonances shifted to 7.50, 7.99, and 9.82 ppm (Figure 4.9C), in support of the protonation of the benzoate ligand. This conclusion was confirmed by analysis of the \(^{19}\text{F} \text{NMR}\) spectra of 2⋅O₂ and [2⋅O₂]H⁺. The parent complex 2 displayed resonances at -113.87, -135.71, and -148.12 ppm (Figure 4.10A). Upon oxygenation in dichloromethane, the peaks for 2⋅O₂
appeared more upfield at -134.34, -154.44, and -159.02 ppm (Figure 4.10D) and shifted to -111.30, -142.096, and -154.79 ppm when 3 equiv of H[BarF₄] was introduced (Fig. 4.10E). The paramagnetically broadened resonances in Figure 4.10D and 4.10F, demonstrate that the C₆F₅CO₂H ligand is bound to iron in dichloromethane. Once again, only in the coordinating solvent acetonitrile are resonances for free pentafluorobenzoic acid at -139.47, -150.29, and -161.96 ppm observed (Figure 4.10C).

Figure 4.9. ¹H NMR spectra (CD₃CN, 500 MHz, -30 °C) of A) [Fe₂(µ-O₂)(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO₂)](BF₄)₂, B) [Fe₂(µ-O₂)(N-EtHPTB)(C₆F₅CO₂)](OSO₂CF₃)₂, C) [Fe₂(µ-O₂)(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO₂)](BF₄)₂/H[BarF₄] (1:1), and D) [Fe₂(µ-O₂)(N-EtHPTB)(C₆F₅CO₂)]-(OSO₂CF₃)₂/H[BarF₄] (1:1). Spectral comparison between the benzoate and pentafluorobenzoate diiron analogs (A vs B and C vs. D) reveals proton peaks arising from the aromatic benzoate ring. The peaks at 11.40, 8.74, and 7.01 ppm are assigned to the benzoate protons in [Fe₂(µ-O₂)(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO₂)](BF₄)₂. When H[BarF₄] was added to the (peroxo)diiron(III) solutions, the benzoate protons shifted to 9.82, 7.99, and 7.50 ppm. The aromatic protons of the [BarF₄]⁻
anion appear at 7.7 ppm. Spectrum A: $\delta = 5.41, 5.81, 7.01, 7.39, 8.74, 11.40, 18.08$ ppm. Spectrum B: $\delta = 5.52, 5.92, 7.36, 15.68, 16.94$ ppm. Spectrum C: $\delta = 5.65, 6.08, 7.23, 7.50, 7.99, 9.82, 15.78$ ppm. Spectrum D: $5.66, 6.09, 7.11, 15.67$ ppm.

Figure 4.10. $^{19}$F NMR spectra (470 MHz, -30 °C) of A) compound 2 in CD$_3$CN, B) [2-O$_2$](OSO$_2$CF$_3$)$_2$ in CD$_3$CN, C) [2-O$_2$](OSO$_2$CF$_3$)$_2$/H[BAr$_4$F] (1:3) in CD$_3$CN, D) [2-O$_2$](OSO$_2$CF$_3$)$_2$ in CH$_2$Cl$_2$, and E) [2-O$_2$](OSO$_2$CF$_3$)$_2$/H[BAr$_4$F] (1:3) in CH$_2$Cl$_2$. The signals at approx. -77 and -62 ppm are ascribed to the fluorine atoms of the triflate and [BAr$_4$F] anions, respectively. The narrow peaks in spectrum C are indicative of free pentafluorobenzoic acid. It is uncertain why spectrum E does not display a peak at -77 ppm for the triflate anion. Spectrum A: $\delta = -113.87, -135.71, -148.12$ ppm. Spectrum B: $\delta = -135.16, -154.62, -158.39$ ppm. Spectrum C: $\delta = -139.47, -150.29, -161.96$ ppm. Spectrum D: $\delta = -134.34, -154.44, -159.02$ ppm. Spectrum E: $\delta = -111.30, -142.96, -154.79$ ppm.
4.4. Conclusion

In conclusion, the spectroscopic evidence (Table 4.1) clearly indicate that the carboxylate is preferred over the peroxo ligand as the site of protonation in these (peroxo)diiron(III) model complexes, a possible structure for which is depicted in Scheme 4.2. Our results suggest that, during the O$_2$ activation steps in the catalytic cycle of sMMO and related enzymes, protons might generate and/or transform the (peroxo)diiron(III) core by inducing a carboxylate shift,$^{16,18}$ possibly increasing the electrophilicity of the diiron unit and facilitating substrate access to the active site. Preliminary studies demonstrate, however, that [1a-O$_2$]H$^+$ does not display significantly enhanced reactivity toward external substrates compared to that of 1a-O$_2$ but this oxidation chemistry must be examined in more detail before any conclusions could be drawn.

4.5. References


Chapter 5

Characterization of Synthetic (μ-1,2-Peroxo)diiron(III) Complexes by Nuclear Resonance Vibrational Spectroscopy
5.1. Introduction

To understand the molecular mechanism of O\textsubscript{2} activation by carboxylate-bridged diiron enzymes,\textsuperscript{1,2} it is necessary to determine the kinetic behavior of the oxygenation process as well as the structure of protein intermediates that occur along the reaction pathway. Exposure of dioxygen to the Fe\textsuperscript{II}\textsubscript{2} cores of diiron proteins often generates transient (peroxo)diiron(III) intermediates.\textsuperscript{3-9} Chart 5.1 depicts the possible coordination modes of a bridging O\textsubscript{2} ligand at a dinuclear center.\textsuperscript{1,10} Studies of the peroxide units in the R2 subunit of ribonucleotide reductase (RNR),\textsuperscript{11,12} soluble methane monooxygenase hydroxylase (sMMOH),\textsuperscript{13,14} toluene 4-monooxygenase hydroxylase (T4MoH),\textsuperscript{15} and \(\Delta^9\) desaturase\textsuperscript{16} have suggested that the reduced O\textsubscript{2} molecule is bound to the diiron core in a \(\mu\)-1,2 fashion. Recent theoretical investigations of the T201S mutant of toluene/o-xylene monooxygenase hydroxylase (ToMOH)\textsuperscript{17,18} reveal that both \(\mu\)-1,2- and \(\mu\)-1,1-(peroxo)diiron species form upon reaction with dioxygen; the terminally bridged dioxygen adduct is believed to be protonated and further stabilized by hydrogen-bonding interaction with a nearby threonine residue.\textsuperscript{19} Attempts to characterize the ToMOH intermediates by either resonance Raman spectroscopy or X-ray crystallography have not yet been successful. Although quantum mechanical/ molecular mechanical (QM/MM) studies have provided some insight into the nature of these Fe\textsubscript{2}(O\textsubscript{2}) units,\textsuperscript{20-24} new tools are required to study the protein intermediates directly.

A powerful technique to examine the primary coordination sphere of iron-containing materials is nuclear resonance vibrational spectroscopy (NRVS).\textsuperscript{25-28} In this method, the vibrational spectra of Mössbauer-active nuclei are obtained by tuning the incident photon energy to excite vibrational states that are coincident with nuclear excitations. NRVS is more selective
and comprehensive than Raman or infrared spectroscopy because it reveals all vibrations involving motion of the probe nucleus. NRVS measurements require synchrotron radiation and are limited to nuclei that have favorable properties, such as an excitation energy that is within the range of available monochromators, a sufficiently long nuclear excitation lifetime, a sensitive nuclear response, and a scattering energy that does not exceed the detection limit of an avalanche photodiode detector (APD). NRVS is an invaluable addition to the bioinorganic toolbox.\textsuperscript{29-31} For example, it has been used to assign the vibrational modes of diatomic molecules coordinated to synthetic porphyrins\textsuperscript{27,32,33} and to detect nitrosylated iron-sulfur clusters in proteins.\textsuperscript{34,35} NRVS and density functional theoretical (DFT) studies of mononuclear Fe(III)–OOH\textsuperscript{36} and Fe(IV)=O\textsuperscript{37,38} compounds have provided insight into their unique chemical properties.

To evaluate whether NRVS could be applied to interrogate the binding mode of O\textsubscript{2} at the diiron centers of oxygenated protein intermediates, synchrotron-based vibrational measurements of synthetic (peroxo)diiron(III) compounds were undertaken. Among the various Fe\textsubscript{2}(O\textsubscript{2}) geometries that are shown in Chart 5.1, only the $\text{cis-} \eta', \eta' \cdot 1,2$- and $\text{trans-} \eta', \eta' \cdot 1,2$-dioxygen adducts of Fe\textsubscript{2} units have been crystallographically characterized.\textsuperscript{39-42} The $\eta^2 , \eta^2 - 1,2$, $\eta' , \eta' - 2,1$- and $\eta' , \eta' - 1,1$-dioxygen\textsuperscript{45-47} bridging motifs have been reported for other dinuclear transition metal complexes. In the present NRVS study, the compounds [Fe\textsubscript{2}(\mu-O\textsubscript{2})(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO\textsubscript{2})]\textsuperscript{2+} (1·O\textsubscript{2}, where $N$-EtHPTB = anion of $N,N,N',N'$-tetrakis(2-benzimidazoylmethyl)-2-hydroxy-1,3-
diaminopropane) and \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(\text{HB}(\text{iPr-pz})_2)(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)_2] \ (4\cdot\text{O}_2, \text{where HB}(\text{iPr-pz})_3 = \text{tris}(3,5\text{-diisopropylpyrazoyl})\text{hydroborate})^{40,49}\) were selected as representative examples of cis-\(\eta^1,\eta^1\)-1,2- and trans-\(\eta^1,\eta^1\)-1,2-dioxygen bound diiron species, respectively (Figure 5.2). This chapter describes the first successful characterization of (peroxo)diiron(III) complexes by NRVS and their normal coordinate analysis.

**Chart 5.2.** A depiction of the proposed structure of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)_2]^{2+} \ (1\cdot\text{O}_2, \text{top left})\). The X-ray structures of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{OPPh}_3)_2]^{3+} \ (2\cdot\text{O}_2, \text{top right})^{39} \ [\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(\text{Ph-bimp})(\text{PhCO}_2)_2]^{2+} \ (3\cdot\text{O}_2, \text{bottom left})^{39} \ [\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(\text{HB}(\text{iPr-pz})_2)(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)_2] \ (4\cdot\text{O}_2, \text{bottom right})^{40}\) have been determined. The Cartesian coordinates of the \(\text{Fe}_2\text{N}_6\text{O}(\mu-O_2)(\mu-\text{PhCO}_2)\) core of \(3\cdot\text{O}_2\) was used for normal mode calculations of \(1\cdot\text{O}_2\).

**5.2. Experimental**

**Materials and Methods:** Commercial reagents were used as received without further purification. Air-sensitive manipulations were performed using standard Schlenk techniques or under a nitrogen atmosphere inside an MBraun drybox. Solvents were saturated with argon and purified by passage through two columns of activated alumina. The \(^{57}\text{Fe}_2(N-
EtHPTB)(PhCO₂)(BPh₄)₂ complex,⁵⁰ and K[HB(iPrpz)₃] ligand⁵¹ were synthesized according to literature procedures. The ⁵⁷-iron(II) bromide salt was prepared from ⁵⁷Fe metal (98%) and concentrated hydrobromic acid.⁵² ¹⁸-Dioxygen (99%) was obtained from ICON isotopes and used as received.

**General Physical Methods:** NMR spectra were recorded on 500 MHz Varian Mercury spectrometers. Chemical shifts for ¹H NMR spectra were referenced to residual solvent peaks. Absorption spectra were acquired on a Cary 50 spectrophotometer using a custom-made quartz cuvette (path length = 1.74 cm) containing a jacketed dewar. An acetonitrile/dry ice bath was used to maintain the samples at -30 ºC. Solid-state FTIR spectra were acquired with a ThermoNicolet Avatar 360 spectrophotometer using the OMNIC software.

**Synthesis**

\[[^{57}\text{Fe}](\text{HB(iPrpz)}_{3})\text{Br}]\ (4-\text{Br})\). The following procedure was slightly modified from that reported for unenriched 4-Br.⁴⁰ Solid ⁵⁷FeBr₂ (400 mg, 794 µmol) and K[HB(iPrpz)₃] (172 mg, 794 µmol) were dissolved in 3 mL of THF and stirred for 3 h. The solution was evaporated to dryness and the product was extracted into CH₂Cl₂ (3 mL). The solution was filtered through a glass wool plug and the filtrate was concentrated to half its volume. The CH₂Cl₂ solution was transferred to a small tube and the tube was placed inside a sealed vial containing a solution of toluene. After standing overnight, most of the CH₂Cl₂ solution had diffused out of the tube, leaving a pink crystalline solid. The solid was isolated by filtration and washed with diethyl ether (158 mg, 33%). The IR spectrum of the product matched that previously reported.⁴⁰ ¹H NMR (CD₃CN, 500 MHz, paramagnetically broadened): δ 60.86, 16.19, 3.79, -2.76, -6.25 ppm.

\[[^{57}\text{Fe}](\text{HB(iPrpz)}_{3})(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)]\ (4).\) The following procedure was modified from that reported for unenriched 4.⁴⁰ Solid [⁵⁷Fe(HB(iPrpz)₃)Br] (158 mg, 263 µmol) was dissolved in 1 mL of
CH$_2$Cl$_2$/THF (1:1) and added to a 1 mL solution of thallium triflate (93 mg, 263 µmol) in THF. Upon combining the two solutions, the mixture instantaneously became cloudy and a white precipitate began to form. After stirring for 2 h, the insoluble TlBr was removed by filtration. Sodium phenylacetate (42 mg, 263 µmol) was added to the colorless filtrate and the mixture was stirred for 4 h. The slightly murky solution was filtered through a glass wool plug and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The product was extracted into pentane, filtered, and the filtrate was evaporated to afford a sparkly white solid (155 mg, 90%). The IR spectrum of the product matches that previously reported.\textsuperscript{40} \textsuperscript{1}H NMR (CD$_3$CN, 500 MHz, paramagnetically broadened): $\delta$ 76.60, 60.76, 16.33, 6.38, 6.05, 3.72-1.28, -22.56 ppm.

**Preparation of \textsuperscript{57}Fe$_2$(O$_2$)(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO$_2$)][(BPh$_4$)$_2$ for NRVS.** A 50 mM THF solution (0.5 mL) of \textsuperscript{57}Fe$_2$(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO$_2$)][(BPh$_4$)$_2$ was prepared inside the glovebox and added to a septum-sealed vessel. The flask was brought outside of the glovebox and cooled to -78 °C using a dry ice/acetone cooling bath. For the 1·$^{16}$O$_2$ sample, the diiron(II) solution was injected with 10 mL of $^{16}$O$_2$ using a syringe. For the 1·$^{18}$O$_2$ sample, $^{18}$O$_2$ gas was directly transferred to the diiron(II) solution using a high-vacuum manifold. After stirring for ~10 min, 150 µL of the deep blue solution was transferred via syringe, pre-cooled to ensure that the oxygenated solution does not warm up above -30 °C, to an NRVS cell and immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen.

**Preparation of \textsuperscript{57}Fe$_2$(O$_2$)(HB(iPr)pz)$_2$(PhCH$_2$CO$_2$)$_2$] for NRVS.** A 21 mM pentane/diethyl ether (1:1) solution (0.5 mL) of the mononuclear \textsuperscript{57}Fe(HB(iPr)pz)$_2$(PhCH$_2$CO$_2$)$_2$] complex was prepared inside the glovebox and added to a septum-sealed vessel. The flask was brought outside of the glovebox and cooled to -78 °C using a dry ice/acetone cooling bath. To generate 4·$^{16}$O$_2$ and 4·$^{18}$O$_2$, about 5 mL of $^{16}$O$_2$ or $^{18}$O$_2$, respectively, was injected into the iron(II) solution. After stirring for ~10 min, 150 µL of the deep green solution was transferred via syringe (pre-cooled to
ensure that the oxygenated solution does not warm up above -30 °C) to an NRVS cell and immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen.

**Nuclear Resonance Vibrational Spectroscopy (NRVS)**

**Data Acquisition.** NRVS measurements were performed in collaboration with Dr. Hongxin Wang (UCD), Dr. Christine E. Tinberg (MIT), Dr. Yoshitaka Yoda (SPring-8, Japan), and Prof. Stephen P. Cramer (UCD). Samples were loaded into 3 × 7 × 1 mm³ (interior dimensions) Lucite cuvettes wrapped with Mylar tape. ⁵⁷Fe NRVS spectra were recorded using published procedures at the BL09XU beamline at SPring-8, Japan. Fluxes were on the order of ~2×10⁹ photons/sec in a 1.2 eV bandpass. During NRVS measurements, samples were maintained at low temperatures using a liquid He cryostat (head temperature < 10 K). The real sample temperatures were calculated from the ratio of anti-Stokes to Stokes intensity by the expression

\[ S(-E) = S(E)e^{(-E/kT)} \]

and determined to be at ~35-50 K. Nuclear fluorescence and delayed Fe K fluorescence were recorded with an APD array. Each scan took about 50 min, and all scans were added and normalized to the intensity of the incident beam using the PHOENIX program.⁵³ Spectra were recorded between 0 and 600 cm⁻¹. The number of scans acquired for each sample are as follows: one for 1, five for 1·¹⁶O₂, three for 1·¹⁸O₂, two for 4, five for 4·¹⁶O₂, and three for 4·¹⁸O₂.

**Empirical Force Field Normal Mode Analysis.** Empirical normal mode calculations were performed by Eric Dowty (Shape Software) and conducted using the program VIBRATZ,⁵⁴,⁵⁵ which uses the Urey-Bradley force field. Analysis of 1 utilized only the Cartesian coordinates of the Fe₂N₆O₂(µ-PhCO₂) core to reduce the complexity of the calculations. Since the Fe–N/O modes are “uncoupled” in this virtual model, differences in the calculated peak intensities compared to those observed for 1 are not meaningful because they depend on the precise
stretching force constants and bond angles of all the atoms involved in the vibration. The normal mode calculations for \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}\) (I⋅O_2) employed the Cartesian coordinates of the \(\text{Fe}_2\text{N}_6\text{O}(\mu-O_2)(\mu-\text{PhCO}_2)\) core from the X-ray structure of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(\text{Ph-bimp})(\text{PhCO}_2)_2]^{2+}\) (3⋅O_2, Chart 5.2)\(^{41}\) using a C\(_s\) point group. It was necessary to use 3⋅O_2 as an approximate model for I⋅O_2 because the structure of I⋅O_2 is not available. The calculated results are intended to provide a qualitative description of the modes that involve significant motion of the Fe\(_2\)(O_2) core, rather than a complete description of the full molecule. Because the simulated frequencies do not take into account the complex bonding interactions of the \(N\text{-EtHPTB}\) ligand with the diiron centers, the calculated intensities are not an exact match to those observed in the NRVS of I⋅O_2. Nevertheless, the modes above \(350\ \text{cm}^{-1}\) can be assigned unequivocally to the Fe\(_2\)(O_2) unit because they are well separated from the main Fe–N/O manifold ranging from \(~150\) to \(350\ \text{cm}^{-1}\).

5.3. Results and Discussion

**NRVS of Diiron \(N\text{-EtHPTB}\) Complexes.** To determine the iron-ligand modes that arise from the \(N\text{-EtHPTB}\) and benzoate groups, the parent diiron(II) \([^{57}\text{Fe}_2(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}\) (I)\(^{50}\) complex was studied by NRVS. As shown in Figure 5.1, polycrystalline I exhibits intense features ranging from 150 to 350 \text{cm}^{-1}. Because of the mixed ligand environment of I, this large envelope consists of several overlapping Fe–N and Fe–O vibrations from the benzimidazole, amine, alkoxide, and carboxylate units that are coordinated to the iron atoms. The simulated peak intensities are not an exact match to those observed in the NRVS because knowledge of the precise force constants and bonding angles of all the atoms involved in a given mode is necessary to obtain meaningful simulations of the vibrational intensities.
**Figure 5.1.** $^{57}$Fe partial vibrational density of states (PVDOS) for polycrystalline $[^{57}\text{Fe}_2(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}$ (1) measured by NRVS at ~10 K. Blue spectrum: selected peaks = 182, 224, 240, 298, and 321 cm$^{-1}$. Red spectrum = 192, 146, 195 cm$^{-1}$. Color scheme: raw data in blue, empirical data fit in red, and individual eigenmode frequencies/intensities before broadening in black.

When a solution of 1 in tetrahydrofuran was exposed to dioxygen a deep blue color rapidly developed, indicating generation of the (peroxo)diiron(III) complex $[^{57}\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O_2)(N\text{-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}$ (1·O$_2$). The NRVS of 1·^{16}O$_2$ and 1·^{18}O$_2$ display intense bands between 150-300 cm$^{-1}$ (Figure 5.2A and 5.2B, respectively), assigned to iron-ligand modes based on the spectrum of 1. In addition to these features, higher energy frequencies at 338 and 467/480 cm$^{-1}$ are observed for 1·^{16}O$_2$, which shift upon $^{18}$O-isotopic labeling to 311 and 446/458 cm$^{-1}$, respectively (Figure 5.2C) (the bands separated by “/” are attributed to Fermi splitting). By comparison to the un-oxygenated spectrum of 1, it is clear that these higher energy modes in the NRVS of 1·O$_2$ are due to motions involving the (peroxo)diiron(III) unit. These data are consistent with resonance Raman spectra that were previously reported. Most notably, the RR spectrum of 1·^{16}O$_2$ exhibited bands at 466/474 cm$^{-1}$ that shifted to a single peak at 452 cm$^{-1}$ when $^{18}$O$_2$ was substituted for $^{16}$O$_2$ (Figure 5.3A). The 300-350 cm$^{-1}$ region of the RR spectra does not show any resonance enhanced vibrations (Figure 5.3B). The fact that NRVS revealed a
distinct Fe$_2$(O$_2$) mode not previously observed, at 338 cm$^{-1}$ for 1·$^{16}$O$_2$ and 311 cm$^{-1}$ for 1·$^{18}$O$_2$, illustrates the utility of this new spectroscopic tool.

Figure 5.2. $^{57}$Fe partial vibrational density of states (PVDOS) for frozen THF solutions of $[^{57}$Fe$_2$(µ-$^{16}$O$_2$)(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO$_2$)]$^{2+}$ (1·$^{16}$O$_2$, A) and $[^{57}$Fe$_2$(µ-$^{18}$O$_2$)(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO$_2$)]$^{2+}$ (1·$^{18}$O$_2$, B) measured by NRVS at ~10 K. The 1·$^{18}$O$_2$ minus 1·$^{16}$O$_2$ difference plots for the raw data and the empirical fits are shown in C and D, respectively. Panel A: blue spectrum (selected peaks) = 190, 280, 338, 467, 480 cm$^{-1}$; red spectrum (selected peaks) = 176, 225, 264, 325, 471, 579 cm$^{-1}$. Panel B: blue spectrum (selected peaks) = 186, 241, 281, 311, 446, 458 cm$^{-1}$; red spectrum (selected peaks) = 175, 224, 262, 313, 452, 551 cm$^{-1}$. Color scheme for plots A and B: raw data in blue, empirical data fit in red, and individual eigenmode frequencies/intensities before broadening in black.

NRVS of Iron HB($^{i}$Pr$_3$pz)$_3$ Complexes. The NRVS of the mononuclear [Fe(HB($^{i}$Pr$_3$pz)-(PhCH$_2$CO$_2$))] (4) complex exhibits several Fe–N(pyrazole) and Fe–O(carboxylate) bands below 350 cm$^{-1}$ (Figure 5.4, black). Upon addition of O$_2$ to 4 in pentane/diethyl ether (1:1) a dark green color appeared, indicating formation of the corresponding 4·O$_2$ species.$^{40,49}$ When the NRVS of
Figure 5.3. Resonance Raman spectra of $[^{57}\text{Fe}_2(\mu-^{16}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}$ (1·$^{16}\text{O}_2$, black) and $[^{57}\text{Fe}_2(\mu-^{18}\text{O}_2)(\text{N-EtHPTB})(\text{PhCO}_2)]^{2+}$ (1·$^{18}\text{O}_2$, blue) previously reported.\textsuperscript{50} In panel A ($\nu = 897$ (847), 532/513 (500), 474/466 (452) cm$^{-1}$), the red spectrum represents the 1·$^{18}\text{O}_2$ sample before a 1·$^{16}\text{O}_2$ impurity was subtracted. The lower energy region, in panel B, does not exhibit any clear isotopically shifted resonances.

$^{^{16}}\text{O}_2$ was recorded (Figure 5.4, red) the data suggested that the sample contained mostly starting material because its spectrum was nearly identical to that of 4 (Figure 5.4, black). Furthermore, RR measurements indicate that a new $\nu(\text{Fe–O})$ band should be observed at 415 cm$^{-1}$ for $^{^{16}}\text{O}_2$.\textsuperscript{40} Fortunately, the reaction of 4 with $^{18}\text{O}_2$ generated 4·$^{18}\text{O}_2$ and the product was detected by NRVS. As shown in Figure 5.4 (blue), 4·$^{18}\text{O}_2$ has several higher energy frequencies at 404, 444, and 486 cm$^{-1}$. Because an NRVS of 4·$^{16}\text{O}_2$ is not available for comparison to that of 4·$^{18}\text{O}_2$, it was not possible to identify peaks involving the Fe$_2$(O$_2$) unit. Prior RR studies, however, attributed the frequency at 404 cm$^{-1}$ to the $\nu(\text{Fe–O})$ mode of the iron-peroxo group in 4·$^{18}\text{O}_2$.\textsuperscript{48,50}
Figure 5.4. $^{57}\text{Fe}$ partial vibrational density of states (PVDOS) for $[^{57}\text{Fe}(\text{HB}(^{\text{iPr}}\text{pz}_3))(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)]$ (4, polycrystalline, black), $[^{57}\text{Fe}(\text{HB}(^{\text{iPr}}\text{pz}_3))(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)]/^{16}\text{O}_2$ (4/$^{16}\text{O}_2$, pentane/diethyl ether 1:1, red), and $[^{57}\text{Fe}(\text{HB}(^{\text{iPr}}\text{pz}_3))(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)]/^{18}\text{O}_2$ (4/$^{18}\text{O}_2$, pentane/diethyl ether 1:1, blue) measured by NRVS at ~10 K. The reaction of $[^{57}\text{Fe}(\text{HB}(^{\text{iPr}}\text{pz}_3))(\text{PhCH}_2\text{CO}_2)]$ with $^{16}\text{O}_2$ does not appear to have proceeded to completion, as demonstrated by the similarity of its spectrum (red trace) to that of the starting iron(II) material (black trace). Black spectrum: $\nu = 133, 209, 248, 302, 346 \text{ cm}^{-1}$; red spectrum: $\nu = 141, 209, 298, 313, 338, 357 \text{ cm}^{-1}$; blue spectrum: $\nu = 138, 184, 214, 253, 316, 353, 404, 444, 486 \text{ cm}^{-1}$.

Empirical Normal Coordinate Analysis. To obtain qualitative descriptions of the modes that show significant $^{16}\text{O}_2$/$^{18}\text{O}_2$ isotopic shifts in the NRVS, the data for 1/$^{16}\text{O}_2$ and 1/$^{18}\text{O}_2$ were subjected to normal coordinate calculations by the program VIBRATZ.$^{54,55}$ Although a more quantitative analysis could be obtained using density functional theoretical (DFT) methods,$^{37}$ empirical data fitting is less computationally intensive and adequately models the features of interest. To test the validity of the VIBRATZ analysis, the NRVS of 1 was calculated using the Cartesian coordinates of the iron-bound atoms from its X-ray structure.$^{48}$ As shown by the red trace in Figure 5.1, the calculated spectrum reproduces the experimental one (blue) to a good first approximation. A rigorous assignment of this spectral region is beyond the scope of
this study. Most importantly, the calculated NRVS of 1 does not show any peaks above 350 cm\(^{-1}\).

Because the exact structure of 1\(\cdot\)O\(_2\) is not known, its primary coordination sphere was modeled using the Cartesian coordinates from the X-ray structure of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O}_2)(\text{Ph-bimp})(\text{PhCO}_2)_2]\)\(^{2+}\) (3\(\cdot\)O\(_2\), Chart 5.2, bottom left).\(^{41}\) Although the structure of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O}_2)(N-\text{EtHPTB})(\text{OPPh}_3)_2]\)\(^{3+}\) (2\(\cdot\)O\(_2\), Chart 5.2, top right), an analogue of 1\(\cdot\)O\(_2\), has been determined by X-ray crystallography,\(^{39}\) it has two triphenylphosphine oxide ligands rather than a benzoate group. Using the Fe\(_2\)N\(_6\)O(\(\mu\)-O\(_2\))(\(\mu\)-PhCO\(_2\)) core of 3\(\cdot\)O\(_2\) as a structural model, the NRVS of 1\(\cdot\)\(^{16}\)O\(_2\) and 1\(\cdot\)\(^{18}\)O\(_2\) were simulated (Figure 5.2A and 5.2B, respectively, red traces). The difference spectrum (1\(\cdot\)\(^{18}\)O\(_2\) minus 1\(\cdot\)\(^{16}\)O\(_2\)) shows that \(^{18}\)O\(_2\) substitution afforded three main isotopically shifted peaks in the 0-600 cm\(^{-1}\) region (Figure 5.2D). A fourth isotope sensitive mode was also calculated at 898(-51) cm\(^{-1}\), where the number in parentheses represents the change in wavenumbers upon \(^{18}\)O\(_2\) substitution, outside of the window that was recorded for the 1\(\cdot\)O\(_2\) samples.

The highest energy calculated feature, 898(-51) cm\(^{-1}\), is primarily a symmetric O–O stretching mode (\(\nu_1\), Figure 5.5). Because \(\nu_1\) does not involve significant motion of the iron atoms, it is not likely to be very intense in the NRVS. The experimentally determined value for the symmetric \(\nu\)(O–O) mode of 1\(\cdot\)O\(_2\) is 897(-50) cm\(^{-1}\) (Figure 5.3A),\(^{50}\) in good agreement with the calculated one. The second highest energy mode falls at 579(-28) cm\(^{-1}\) and is essentially the asymmetric O–O stretching/rotation of the peroxo ligand against the iron atoms (\(\nu_2\), Figure 5.5).
Figure 5.5. Normal mode calculations for 1·O₂ using the X-ray coordinates of [Fe₂(µ-O₂)(Phbimp)(PhCO₂)₂]²⁺ (3·O₂), showing the vibrations that involve the Fe₂O₂ unit. The black arrows indicate the direction and relative degree of motion of the atoms to which they are attached. Color scheme: orange, iron; red, oxygen; blue, nitrogen; and gray, carbon.

Although the net stretching of the Fe–O(peroxo) bonds is minimal, v₂ is expected to be observable by NRVS. The spectra of 1·O₂, however, do not show any features in this region. The absence of a clear signal at this frequency may be due to the lower resolution of the NRVS spectrum at higher wavenumbers. It is possible that the weak features at 532/513 cm⁻¹ in the RR of 1·O₂ (Figure 5.3A) may correspond to this v₂ mode. The calculated value at 471(-19) cm⁻¹ (v₃) is attributed to the symmetric Fe–O–O–Fe stretching motion and the frequency is dependent almost entirely on the Fe–OO force constant (Figure 5.5). The theoretical frequency of v₃ (471 cm⁻¹) matches well to those of 1·¹⁶O₂ observed at 467/480 cm⁻¹ in the NRVS (Figure 5.2A) and at 466/474 cm⁻¹ in the RR spectra (Figure 5.3A). Lastly, the isotopically shifted peak that occurs at lowest energy was at 325(-12) cm⁻¹ (v₄, Figure 5.5). In this mode, the O–O group moves as a unit parallel to the Fe–Fe vector and perpendicular to the pseudo-mirror plane that
bisects the Fe$_2$(O$_2$) atoms. It is possible that the $v_4$ mode is absent in the RR spectrum because it is not strongly coupled to the electronic transition induced by the 647 nm excitation wavelength employed in the experiment.

5.4. Conclusion

The vibrational profiles of two synthetic (peroxo)diiron(III) complexes have been revealed by nuclear resonance vibrational spectroscopy. Through $^{16}$O$_2$/$^{18}$O$_2$ isotopic labeling, the frequencies that correspond to motions of the Fe$_2$(O$_2$) unit in [Fe$_2$(μ-O$_2$)(N-EtHPTB)(PhCO$_2$)]$^{2+}$ have been definitively assigned. Most notably, a lower energy mode at ~338 cm$^{-1}$ involving parallel motion between the Fe–Fe and O–O groups has been detected by NRVS, a feature that was not previously observed by resonance Raman spectroscopy. The NRVS of [Fe$_2$(μ-$^{18}$O$_2$)(HB($^{i}$Prpz)$_3$)$_2$(PhCH$_2$CO$_2$)$_2$] displays several distinct modes above 350 cm$^{-1}$ but these frequencies have not been assigned. A more comprehensive study is needed to correlate the vibrational characteristics of a (peroxo)diiron unit to its O$_2$ coordination geometry. Nevertheless, these results demonstrate that synchrotron-based NRVS is a useful tool to investigate the structural and chemical nature of oxygenated diiron protein intermediates and may help to clarify many remaining questions regarding the mechanism of O$_2$ activation in non-heme diiron enzymes.
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Appendix A

Evaluating the Identity of an Electron-Rich Bis(tris(pyridyl-2-methyl)amine)diiron(III) Complex and Its Involvement in the Hydrolysis of Acetonitrile
AI. Introduction

Because of their importance in the chemistry of non-heme diiron enzymes, understanding the chemical and physical characteristics of synthetic diiron(IV) units is of significant interest. Among the various constructs employed to access such species, one convenient platform is based on a tripodal tris(pyridyl-2-methyl)amine (TPA) ligand. Stable dinuclear species can be readily prepared by linking two monomeric [Fe(TPA)] complexes through oxo-, hydroxo-, or carboxylato bridges. A notable achievement in diiron modeling chemistry is the crystallographic characterization of a mixed-valent di(µ-oxo)diiron(III,IV) unit, \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)_2(5\text{-Et}_3\text{-TPA})_2]^{3+}\) (where 5-Et-TPA = tris((5-ethylpyridyl)-2-methyl)amine) (A, Chart A.1). Complex A contains the quadrilateral \(\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_2\) core believed to be present in the diiron(IV) intermediate Q of soluble methane monoxygenase hydroxylase (sMMOH).

![Chart A.1](image)

**Chart A.1.** The \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)_2(5\text{-Et-TPA})_2]^{3+}\) (A) complex was the first di(µ-oxo)diiron(III,IV) species structurally characterized by X-ray crystallography. The \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\text{OH})(\text{H}_2\text{O})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+}\) (B) compound was reported to be a versatile starting material for generating diiron(III,IV) and diiron(IV,IV) species.
Scheme A.1. Reactions of a putative \(\text{[Fe}^{\text{III}}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{OH})(\text{H}_2\text{O})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+}\) species (B) leading to formation of high-valent diiron units. See references for more details.\(^{13-15}\)

The electronic and steric properties of the diiron TPA complexes can be tuned by appending various substituents around the pyridine rings. Recently, studies using an electron-rich tris((3,5-dimethyl-4-methoxy)pyridyl-2-methyl)amine (R\(_3\)TPA) derivative have enabled high-valent diiron units to be prepared.\(^{13-15}\) It was reported that, upon treatment with hydrogen peroxide, the diiron(III) precursor \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{OH})(\text{H}_2\text{O})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) (B, Chart A.1) converts to a di(\(\mu\)-oxo)diiron(III,IV) \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})_2(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) (F) species.\(^{15}\) When F was subjected to controlled bulk electrolysis at an applied potential of +900 mV (vs. ferrocene/ferrocenium) in acetonitrile at -40 °C, a diiron(IV) \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})_2(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{4+}\) (G) species was obtained quantitatively (Scheme A.1). Compound G could also be accessed via chemical methods.\(^{14}\) Reaction of B with hydrogen peroxide and protons rapidly leads to formation of G, through the transient generation of \((\mu\text{-hydroperoxo})\text{diiron(III,III)}\) (C) and \((\mu\text{-oxo})(\text{hydroxo})(\text{oxo})\text{diiron(IV)}\) (D) intermediates (Scheme A.1). Compound G, however, exhibits poor H-atom abstraction ability. When the valence-delocalized diiron(III,IV) F was treated with tetrabutylammonium hydroxide or the diiron(IV) unit D was reduced by ferrocene, a valence-localized species E was obtained.\(^{13}\) Compound E was determined to be a high-spin species,
unlike the low-spin units previously characterized, and displayed a million-fold rate enhancement in H-atom abstraction compared to \( G \).

To obtain spectroscopic standards for the di(\( \mu \)-oxo)diiron(IV) unit, efforts were made to prepare compound \( G \) as described in the literature. During the course of these studies, several inconsistent results were obtained that prompted more detailed investigations. This report clarifies the identity of the diiron(III) staring material and describes its ability to hydrolyze acetonitrile to acetate. Attempts were not made to evaluate the validity of Scheme A.1 in light of these new findings, but a more thorough investigation is necessary to address the concerns enumerated in this report.

A.2. Experimental

**Materials and Methods.** Reagents obtained from commercial suppliers were used as received. The tris((3,5-dimethyl-4-methoxypyridyl)-2-methyl)amine (R\(_3\)TPA) ligand that is deuterated at the benzylic positions was prepared as previously described.\(^{15}\) All manipulations were performed in air using standard laboratory techniques. Solvents were used as received from the commercial suppliers without further purification.

**General Physical Methods.** NMR spectra were recorded on 500 MHz Varian Mercury spectrometers and chemical shifts for \(^1\)H and \(^1^3\)C spectra were referenced to residual solvent. \(^1\)H NMR spectral data of paramagnetic compounds were obtained by widening the sweep window (+100 to -30 ppm) and collecting for longer acquisition times (~1024 scans). IR spectra were recorded on a ThermoNicolet Avatar 360 spectrophotometer with the OMNIC software. Absorption spectra were recorded on a Cary 50 spectrophotometer using 6Q Spectrosil quartz cuvettes (Starna) with 1 cm path lengths. For low temperature UV-vis measurements, a custom-
made quartz cuvette (path length = 1.74 cm) containing a jacketed dewar was employed. An acetonitrile/dry ice bath was used to maintain the samples at -30 °C. Mössbauer spectra were recorded on an MSI spectrometer (WEB Research Company) with a $^{57}$Co source in a Rh matrix maintained at room temperature. Solid samples were prepared by suspension of the complex (~40 mg) in Apiezon M grease and placement in a nylon sample holder. Samples were measured over the course of ~5 d at 80 K. Isomer shift ($\delta$) values are reported with respect to metallic iron that was used for velocity calibration at room temperature. Spectra were fit to Lorentzian lines using the WMOSS plot and fit program.

**X-ray Data Collection and Refinement.** Single crystals were mounted in Paratone oil using 30 µm aperture MiTeGen MicroMounts (Ithaca, NY) and frozen under a 100 K KRYO-FLEX nitrogen cold stream. Data were collected on a Bruker SMART APEX CCD X-ray diffractometer with Mo Kα radiation ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å) controlled by the APEX 2 (v. 2010.1-2) software package. Data reduction was performed using SAINT and empirical absorption corrections were applied using SADABS. The structures were solved by direct methods with refinement by full-matrix least squares based on $F^2$ using the SHELXTL-97 software package and checked for higher symmetry by the PLATON software. All non-hydrogen atoms were located and refined anisotropically. Hydrogen atoms were fixed to idealized positions unless otherwise noted and given thermal parameters equal to either 1.5 (methyl hydrogen atoms) or 1.2 (non-methyl hydrogen atoms) times the thermal parameters of the atoms to which they are attached.

Complex 1 occurs on an inversion center; thus, only half of the molecule is present in the asymmetric unit, along with 1.5 perchlorate anions and two acetonitrile molecules. Both perchlorate groups exhibit positional disorder and were modeled accordingly. One of the $\text{ClO}_4^-$
anions are located on a special position and was refined with 50% occupancy by suppressing generation of special position constraints. Due to charge considerations, the Fe$_2$O$_2$ core of 1 is best described as a ($\mu$-oxo)($\mu$-hydroxo)diiron(III) unit, the overall complex having the empirical formula [Fe$_2$(\(\mu\)-O)(\(\mu\)-OH)(R$_3$TPA)$_2$](ClO$_4$)$_3$. Thus, the observed Fe–O distances must result from a disorder imposed by the symmetry of the unit cell averaged over the Fe–O(oxo) and Fe–O(hydroxo) bond lengths. Although the core structures of 4A and 4B are identical, both containing the cationic [Fe$_2$(\(\mu\)-O)(\(\mu\)-CH$_3$CO$_2$)(R$_3$TPA)$_2$]$^{3+}$ unit, they differ in the number of solvent molecules in their crystal lattices as well as their unit cell dimensions. The asymmetric unit of 4A contains a single [Fe$_2$(\(\mu\)-O)(\(\mu\)-CH$_3$CO$_2$)(R$_3$TPA)$_2$]$^{3+}$ ion, together with three perchlorate anions and three acetonitrile moieties. Two of the ClO$_4^-$ groups were modeled with positional disorder using appropriate similarity restraints and equal anisotropic displacement parameters. In contrast to that in 4A, the asymmetric unit of 4B has two independent molecules of [Fe$_2$(\(\mu\)-O)(\(\mu\)-CH$_3$CO$_2$)(R$_3$TPA)$_2$](ClO$_4$)$_3$, five acetonitrile molecules and one diethyl ether. The diethyl ether unit is severely disordered, as evident by the large anisotropic displacement parameters of its component atoms. Attempts to model this disorder did not give a stable refinement; thus, no attempt was made to do so in the final structure.

**Kinetic Measurements.** The rate of hydrolysis of acetonitrile by 1 was determined by UV-vis spectroscopic measurements. The data were recorded by scanning at 5 min intervals for 900 min. The absorption changes at 550 nm were fit to an A$\rightarrow$B$\rightarrow$C reaction sequence (Eq. 1), with rate constants $k_1$ and $k_2$, respectively. The constants $\varepsilon_A$, $\varepsilon_B$, and $\varepsilon_C$ are the molar absorptivities of species A, B, and C, respectively and [A]$_o$ is the initial concentration of A.

$$\text{Abs}_A(t) = [A]_o e^{-k_1 t} (\varepsilon_A - \varepsilon_C) + \frac{k_1}{k_2 - k_1} [A]_o (e^{-k_1 t} - e^{-k_2 t})(\varepsilon_B - \varepsilon_C) + [A]_o \varepsilon_C$$  (1)
Synthesis

\[ \text{[Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]\text{(ClO}_4\text{)}_3 \] (1). This compound was prepared exactly as described for the purported synthesis of \[ \text{[Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\text{H}_2\text{O})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]\text{(ClO}_4\text{)}_3 \] (B),\textsuperscript{15} except that the final material was extracted into dichloromethane and filtered to remove an insoluble impurity. The organic filtrate was evaporated to dryness to afford a red powder (114 mg, 42%). Red crystals for X-ray crystallographic analysis were obtained by vapor diffusion of diethyl ether into a solution of the compound in acetonitrile. Crystals obtained from dichloromethane/diethyl ether were smaller than those grown from acetonitrile/diethyl ether. Note that hydrolysis of coordinated acetonitrile could occur to give \[ \text{[Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]\text{(ClO}_4\text{)}_3 \]; crystals of the acetate bound diiron complex are yellow rather than red. \textsuperscript{1}H NMR (CD\textsubscript2Cl\textsubscript2, 500 MHz): \( \delta = 4.70, 4.00, 3.89, 3.60, 3.42, 2.79, 2.24, 1.63 \) ppm. UV-vis (CH\textsubscript2Cl\textsubscript2): \( \lambda_{\text{max}} = 370, 550 \) nm. FT-IR (KBr): \( \nu = 2950, 2863, 1599, 1575, 1478, 1456, 1402, 1385, 1292, 1267, 1095, 1080, 997, 875, 800, 623 \) cm\textsuperscript{-1}. \textsuperscript{57}Fe Mössbauer (80 K, apiezon grease): \( \delta = 0.44(2) \) mm/s; \( \Delta E_Q = 1.46(2) \) mm/s; \( \Gamma_{L/R} = 0.47(2) \) mm/s. Mp =190 °C.

\[ \text{[Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]\text{(ClO}_4\text{)}_3 \] (4B). Solid R\textsubscript3TPA (200 mg, 426 µmol), Fe(ClO\textsubscript4)\textsubscript3·10 H\textsubscript2O (230 mg, 426 µmol), sodium acetate (17 mg, 213 µmol), and triethylamine (59 µL, 426 µmol) were dissolved in 2.0 mL of CH\textsubscript3OH and stirred at RT for 3 h. A solid precipitate was isolated by filtration and washed with MeOH to afford a pale yellow material (198 mg, 66%). Single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis were obtained from slow diffusion of diethyl ether into a solution of the compound in either acetonitrile or dichloromethane. \textsuperscript{1}H NMR (CD\textsubscript2Cl\textsubscript2, 500 MHz): \( \delta = 3.91, 3.77, 3.67, 3.28, 2.92, 2.71, 2.44 \) ppm. UV-vis (CH\textsubscript2Cl\textsubscript2): \( \lambda_{\text{max}} = 332 \) (14,500 M\textsuperscript{-1}cm\textsuperscript{-1}), 374 (9,850 M\textsuperscript{-1}cm\textsuperscript{-1}), 454 (1,460 M\textsuperscript{-1}cm\textsuperscript{-1}), 504 (1,390 M\textsuperscript{-1}cm\textsuperscript{-1}), 700 (294 M\textsuperscript{-1}cm\textsuperscript{-1}) nm. FT-IR (KBr): \( \nu = 2960, 1599, 1532, 1478, 1402, 1264, 1092, 994, 875, 801, 764, 623 \) cm\textsuperscript{-1}.
A.3. Results and Discussion

Characterization of Diiron(III) Complexes. Preparation of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\text{OH})(\text{H}_2\text{O})-(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]\)(\text{ClO}_4)_3 (\text{B}) was attempted according to the literature procedure.\textsuperscript{15} Reaction of iron(III) perchlorate decahydrate, \text{R}_3\text{TPA}, and sodium hydroxide in methanol and water afforded a red powder as described, which was reported to be pure \text{B}. This bulk material, however, was determined to be a heterogeneous mixture. Initially, this conclusion was derived from simple solubility tests, in which only some of the red solid could be extracted into common organic solvents, such dichloromethane or acetonitrile. The fact that this crude compound was red, rather than green like other \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\text{OH})(\text{H}_2\text{O})(L)_2]^3^+\) (where \(L = \text{a polynitrogen ligand}\)) compounds reported in the literature,\textsuperscript{7,19,20} was also unexpected. Because the only characterization data reported for “\text{B}” was an elemental analysis and its synthetic yield was not given,\textsuperscript{15} further studies of this material were undertaken.

The zero-field \(^{57}\text{Fe}\) Mössbauer spectrum of the crude red powder was best fit to three quadrupole doublets (Figure A.1A), giving parameters \(\delta_1 = 0.44 \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q1} = 1.16 \text{ mm/s}, \text{Area 1} = 36\%; \delta_2 = 0.44 \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q2} = 1.66 \text{ mm/s}, \text{Area 2} = 28\%; \text{and } \delta_3 = 0.44 \text{ mm/s}, \Delta E_{Q3} = 0.71 \text{ mm/s}, \text{Area 3} = 36\%\) (Table A.1). If the material contained pure \text{B}, a maximum of two quadrupole doublets would be expected if both of its iron atoms had distinct coordination environments. A three-site model suggests that at least two different iron-containing species are present in the sample, perhaps accounting for the organic soluble and organic insoluble fractions.
When the crude powder was extracted into dichloromethane, filtered, and evaporated to dryness, a slightly lighter red solid was obtained, hereafter referred to as compound 1. As shown in Figure A.1B, this product exhibits a single quadrupole doublet, having values of $\delta = 0.44$ mm/s and $\Delta E_Q = 1.46$ mm/s (Table A.1). The Mössbauer parameters of 1 are most similar to those of either site 1 or 2 in the crude material, suggesting that the dichloromethane extraction and filtration steps were necessary purification procedures.

Figure A.1. Zero-field Mössbauer spectra (80 K) of A) the crude material from reaction of $R_3TPA$ and iron(III) perchlorate, B) compound 1, C) compound 4A, and D) compound 4B. Spectrum A was best fit to three quadrupole doublets, whereas those of B, C, and D were adequately fit to single site models. Raw data are in black, simulated fits are in green, and individual sites are in blue, yellow, and red. Mössbauer parameters are given in Table A.1.
For further comparison of the properties of the unpurified material versus compound 1, IR spectroscopy was employed. The IR spectra of the crude solid and 1 are shown in Figure A.2A (black and red traces, respectively). As expected, both solids display intense bands at ~1100 cm\(^{-1}\), indicative of the perchlorate anion. The spectral envelope ranging from 500 to 1700 cm\(^{-1}\) is essentially identical for the two samples (Table A.1), with some slight variations in the weak baseline features. These data suggest that the insoluble fraction either has few IR active features or has a composition similar to that of 1.
Figure A.2. Panel A shows plots of the FTIR spectra (KBr pellets) of the crude material from reaction of R₃TPA with iron(III) perchlorate (black), compound 1 (red), compound 4A (yellow), and compound 4B (blue). The difference spectra of 1/4A (panel B) and 4A/4B (panel C) are depicted to the right. The spectrum of 4A, compared to that of 1, displays two new peaks at 763 and 1540 cm⁻¹. No significant differences were observed in the spectrum of 4A compared to that of 4B. The spectral region from 1000-1200 cm⁻¹ exhibits strong absorption from the perchlorate anion and has been omitted for clarity.

Crystallization of 1 was attempted by slow diffusion of diethyl ether into a solution of the complex in acetonitrile. After several days, two different types of crystals were obtained, some red and others yellow. X-ray diffraction analysis of the red crystals revealed a diiron structure with an Fe₂O₂ core (Figure A.3, Table A.2). The iron atoms are separated by 2.79 Å and have a pseudo-octahedral coordination environment (Table A.3). Each metal center is bound by the tetradeutate R₃TPA ligand, with Fe–N(amine) and Fe–N(pyridyl)\textsubscript{ave} distances of 2.18 and 2.14 Å, respectively. Two oxygen atoms bridge the iron centers, with Fe–O bond lengths of 1.88 and 1.93 Å. Because each diiron unit is associated with three perchlorate anions, charge balance
considerations dictate that the oxygen atom bridges are best described as oxo and hydroxo ligands, giving the molecular formula \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\). Because the molecule is located on an inversion center, the Fe–O distances are an average of the iron-oxo and iron hydroxo bond lengths. The structural parameters of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) fall within the ranges exhibited by two isostructural diiron TPA complexes that differ only in their oxygen protonation states, \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-\text{OH})(6-\text{Me}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\)\(^{21}\) and \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)_2(6-\text{Me}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_2\)\(^{22}\) (where 6-Me\(_3\)TPA = tris((6-methylpyridyl)-2-methyl)amine) (Table A.3). Based on the similar spectroscopic characteristics of the red crystals compared to those of the red powder before crystallization, 1 is assigned as a \((\mu-\text{oxo})(\mu-\text{hydroxo})\)diiron(III) complex, \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) (\textit{vide infra}).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure.png}
\caption{The thermal ellipsoid (50\%) diagram of the X-ray structure of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-\text{OH})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3 \cdot (\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_4\) (1). Hydrogen atoms, solvent molecules, and perchlorate anions are omitted for clarity. Color scheme: iron, orange; oxygen, red; nitrogen, blue; carbon, black. See Table A.2 and Table A.3 for refinement and structural parameters of 1, respectively.}
\end{figure}
Table A.2. X-ray Data Collection and Refinement Parameters for 1, 4A, and 4B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4A</th>
<th>4B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical formula</td>
<td><a href="CH%E2%82%83CN">Fe₂N₀C₆H₃(CIO₄)₂</a>₄</td>
<td><a href="CH%E2%82%83CN">Fe₂N₀C₆H₃(CIO₄)₂</a>₄</td>
<td><a href="CH%E2%82%83CN">Fe₂N₀C₆H₃(CIO₄)₂</a>₄(C₄H₆O₂)₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula weight</td>
<td>1535.46</td>
<td>1537.45</td>
<td>1548.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (K)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength (Å)</td>
<td>0.71073</td>
<td>0.71073</td>
<td>0.71073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system</td>
<td>Monoclinic</td>
<td>Triclinic</td>
<td>Triclinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
<td>C2/c</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit cell dimensions</td>
<td>a = 28.2258(19) Å</td>
<td>a = 13.6256(9) Å</td>
<td>a = 13.6723(12) Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b = 11.7652(8) Å</td>
<td>b = 14.0402(9) Å</td>
<td>b = 22.640(2) Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c = 22.4938(15) Å</td>
<td>c = 20.2928(13) Å</td>
<td>c = 24.640(2) Å</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β = 106.6850(10)°</td>
<td>α = 81.2320(10)°</td>
<td>α = 99.8960(10)°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>γ = 71.0910(10)°</td>
<td>β = 98.875(2)°</td>
<td>γ = 102.9360(10)°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (Å³)</td>
<td>7155.3(8)</td>
<td>3503.6(4)</td>
<td>7135.5(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated density (g/mm³)</td>
<td>1.425</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>1.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption coefficient (mm⁻¹)</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(000)</td>
<td>3212</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal size (mm³)</td>
<td>0.32 x 0.17 x 0.13</td>
<td>0.20 x 0.10 x 0.07</td>
<td>0.20 x 0.16 x 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ range for data collection</td>
<td>1.51 to 26.73°</td>
<td>1.54 to 26.41°</td>
<td>1.14 to 26.77°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index ranges</td>
<td>-35 ≤ h ≤ 35</td>
<td>-16 ≤ h ≤ 17</td>
<td>-17 ≤ h ≤ 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-14 ≤ k ≤ 14</td>
<td>-17 ≤ k ≤ 17</td>
<td>-28 ≤ k ≤ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-20 ≤ l ≤ 20</td>
<td>-25 ≤ l ≤ 25</td>
<td>-30 ≤ l ≤ 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections collected</td>
<td>63728</td>
<td>61129</td>
<td>123942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reflections</td>
<td>7549</td>
<td>14283</td>
<td>30171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness to Θ (%)</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption correction</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>Empirical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. and min. transmission</td>
<td>0.9265 and 0.8321</td>
<td>0.9586 and 0.8878</td>
<td>0.9315 and 0.8895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data / restraints / parameters</td>
<td>7549/85/473</td>
<td>14283/0/952</td>
<td>30171/4/1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit on F²</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indices [I&gt;2σ(I)]</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0652</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0552</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wR2 = 0.1759</td>
<td>wR2 = 0.1259</td>
<td>wR2 = 0.1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R indices (all data)</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0722</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0810</td>
<td>R1 = 0.0967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wR2 = 0.1815</td>
<td>wR2 = 0.1381</td>
<td>wR2 = 0.1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest diff. peak and hole (eA³)</td>
<td>1.828 and -0.693</td>
<td>1.429 and -1.188</td>
<td>2.467 and -1.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* R1 = Σ | |Fo|−|Fc||/|Σ|Fo|; wR2 = [Σ[w(Fo²−Fc²)]²]/[Σ[w(Fo²)]²])¹/²; GOF = [Σ[w(Fo²−Fc²)]²]/(n−p)]¹/², where n is the number of reflections and p is the total number of parameters refined.
Table A.3. Selected Structural Parameters of $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-O\text{H})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3$ (1), $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-O\text{H})(6-\text{Me}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3$, $^{21}$ and $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(6-\text{Me}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_2$. $^{22}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Distances (Å)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>$<a href="%5Ctext%7BClO%7D_4">\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-O\text{H})(6-\text{Me}_3\text{TPA})_2</a>_3$</th>
<th>$<a href="%5Ctext%7BClO%7D_4">\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(6-\text{Me}_3\text{TPA})_2</a>_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)–Fe(1A)</td>
<td>2.7920(9)</td>
<td>2.95(1), 2.94(1)</td>
<td>2.716(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)–O(4)</td>
<td>1.883(3)</td>
<td>1.906(8), 1.91(1)</td>
<td>1.844(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)–O(4A)</td>
<td>1.934(2)</td>
<td>1.981(8), 1.960(9)</td>
<td>1.916(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)–N(1)</td>
<td>2.183(3)</td>
<td>2.174(9), 2.181(1)</td>
<td>2.194(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)–N(2)</td>
<td>2.147(3)</td>
<td>2.239(9), 2.28(1)</td>
<td>2.255(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)–N(3)</td>
<td>2.151(3)</td>
<td>2.194(9), 2.196(9)</td>
<td>2.279(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)–N(4)</td>
<td>2.134(3)</td>
<td>2.188(9), 2.18(1)</td>
<td>2.244(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Angles (deg)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>$<a href="%5Ctext%7BClO%7D_4">\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-O\text{H})(6-\text{Me}_3\text{TPA})_2</a>_3$</th>
<th>$<a href="%5Ctext%7BClO%7D_4">\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(6-\text{Me}_3\text{TPA})_2</a>_2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)–O(4)–Fe(1A)</td>
<td>94.01(11)</td>
<td>98.7(4), 98.7(6)</td>
<td>92.5(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O(4)–Fe(1)–O(1A)</td>
<td>85.99(11)</td>
<td>81.3(4), 81.3(6)</td>
<td>87.5(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(1)–Fe(1)–N(2)</td>
<td>76.24(10)</td>
<td>77.2(3), 76.0(5)</td>
<td>75.7(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(1)–Fe(1)–N(3)</td>
<td>76.24(10)</td>
<td>81.2(4), 81.5(4)</td>
<td>74.7(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(1)–Fe(1)–N(4)</td>
<td>79.74(10)</td>
<td>75.1(3), 75.6(4)</td>
<td>79.0(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(1)–Fe(1)–O(4)</td>
<td>176.66(10)</td>
<td>170.6(4), 168.7(4)</td>
<td>175.1(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(1)–Fe(1)–O(4A)</td>
<td>96.12(10)</td>
<td>89.4(4), 88.0(5)</td>
<td>87.8(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$A generalized numbering scheme, depicted in the above cartoon representation, is used. These atom labels do not necessarily correspond to those assigned in their respective X-ray structures. $^b$Previously reported; see ref. 21. Each asymmetric unit contains two independent diiron units. $^c$Previously reported; see ref. 22.

The yellow crystals obtained from crystallization of 1 in acetonitrile/diethyl ether were also evaluated by X-ray crystallography (Figure A.4, Table A.4). The compound has a dinuclear structure with an Fe–Fe distance of 3.25 Å. Each pseudo-octahedral iron atom is capped by a R$_3$TPA group, with Fe–N(amine)$_{\text{ave}}$ = 2.20 Å and Fe–N(pyridyl)$_{\text{ave}}$ = 2.15 Å, and is linked by two bridging ligands. One of the bridges is an oxo atom, indicated by short Fe–O bond lengths of ~1.80 Å. The difference electron density map reveals that the second bridging ligand contains four non-hydrogen atoms arranged in a trigonal planar geometry. Assigning this group to an
acetate moiety allowed the structure to refine to convergence, the Fe–O distances being 2.04 and 1.96 Å. The presence of an acetate moiety in this structure is surprising because no CH$_3$CO$_2^-$ was used during the preparation of 1 or in the crystallization procedure. Because each diiron unit is associated with three perchlorate anions, the molecular formula of this compound is assigned as [Fe$_2$(μ-O)(μ-CH$_3$CO$_2$)(R$_3$TPA)$_3$](ClO$_4$)$_3$ (4A).

![Figure A.4.](image)

Figure A.4. The thermal ellipsoid (50%) diagram of the cation observed in the X-ray structure of [Fe$_2$(μ-O)(μ-CH$_3$CO$_2$)(R$_3$TPA)$_3$](ClO$_4$)$_3$·(CH$_3$CN)$_3$ (4A). Hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Color scheme: iron, orange; oxygen, red; nitrogen, blue; carbon, black. See Table A.2 and Table A.4 for refinement and structural parameters of 4A, respectively.

As expected, compounds 1 and 4A display distinct optical profiles (Figure A.5). The absorption spectrum of 1 has λ$_{max}$ values at 370 and 550 nm, which are characteristic of (μ-oxo)(μ-hydroxo)diiron(III) rather than di(μ-oxo)diiron(III) species.$^8$ The visible band at 550 nm has been attributed to an oxo-to-iron(III) charge transfer. In contrast, 4A exhibits optical bands at 332, 454, 492, and 700 nm. These features are nearly identical to those reported for other (μ-oxo)(μ-carboxylato)diiron(III) TPA species.$^6$
Table A.4. Selected Structural Parameters of 4A and 4B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Distances (Å)(^a)</th>
<th>4A</th>
<th>4B(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)--Fe(4)</td>
<td>3.252(3)</td>
<td>3.250(3), 3.250(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)--O(1)</td>
<td>2.044(2)</td>
<td>2.042(3), 2.038(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)--O(3)</td>
<td>1.783(2)</td>
<td>1.794(3), 1.788(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)--N(1)</td>
<td>2.212(3)</td>
<td>2.216(3), 2.221(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)--N(2)</td>
<td>2.114(3)</td>
<td>2.137(3), 2.119(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)--N(3)</td>
<td>2.128(3)</td>
<td>2.135(2), 2.131(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)--N(4)</td>
<td>2.146(3)</td>
<td>2.138(3), 2.151(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(2)--O(2)</td>
<td>1.962(2)</td>
<td>1.984(3), 1.966(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(2)--O(3)</td>
<td>1.801(2)</td>
<td>1.808(3), 1.803(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(2)--N(5)</td>
<td>2.182(3)</td>
<td>2.191(3), 2.191(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(2)--N(6)</td>
<td>2.138(3)</td>
<td>2.121(3), 2.134(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(2)--N(7)</td>
<td>2.228(3)</td>
<td>2.228(3), 2.233(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(2)--N(8)</td>
<td>2.128(3)</td>
<td>2.131(3), 2.136(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond Angles (deg)(^a)</th>
<th>4A</th>
<th>4B(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe(1)--O(3)--Fe(2)</td>
<td>130.15(13)</td>
<td>128.98(15), 129.62(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O(3)--Fe(1)--O(1)</td>
<td>98.47(10)</td>
<td>99.63(12), 99.39(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O(3)--Fe(2)--O(2)</td>
<td>102.39(10)</td>
<td>102.14(12), 101.70(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(1)--Fe(1)--N(2)</td>
<td>77.70(10)</td>
<td>75.81(12), 76.58(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(1)--Fe(1)--N(3)</td>
<td>79.20(10)</td>
<td>79.01(13), 78.95(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(1)--Fe(1)--N(4)</td>
<td>75.07(10)</td>
<td>76.18(12), 75.59(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(5)--Fe(2)--N(6)</td>
<td>76.09(10)</td>
<td>78.52(12), 77.11(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(5)--Fe(2)--N(7)</td>
<td>77.98(10)</td>
<td>76.93(12), 77.49(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(5)--Fe(2)--N(8)</td>
<td>76.69(10)</td>
<td>75.89(12), 76.98(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)A generalized numbering scheme, depicted in the above cartoon representation, is used. These atom labels do not necessarily correspond to those assigned in their respective X-ray structures. \(^b\)There are two independent diiron units of 4B in the asymmetric cell; parameters for both cations are provided.
Figure A.5. UV-vis spectra of complexes 1 (red), 4A (yellow), and 4B (blue) recorded in dichloromethane at RT. Red spectrum: $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 370, 550$ nm; yellow spectrum: $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 332, 454, 492$ nm; blue spectrum: $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 332, 454, 492$ nm.

The IR spectra of the red and yellow crystals of 1 and 4A, respectively, were recorded (Figure A.2A). Because of similarities in their molecular composition, 1 and 4A share several prominent features in the spectral range between 500-1700 cm$^{-1}$. In addition to the vibrational modes present in the spectrum of 1, however, compound 4A displays peaks at 763 and 1540 cm$^{-1}$ (Figure A.2B). The former is ascribed to an asymmetric stretching mode of the Fe–O–Fe unit and the latter to an asymmetric C–O–O$^-$ vibration of the bridging acetate. Based on comprehensive analyses of synthetic oxo-bridged diiron(III) compounds,$^{23,24}$ it has been established that the Fe–O stretching frequency of an $\{\text{Fe}_2\text{O}\}^{4+}$ unit is strongly correlated with its Fe–O–Fe angle. Because the Fe–O–Fe angle in 1 (94°) is significantly smaller than that of 4A (130°), the $v_{\text{Fe-O}}$ stretching frequencies of 1 are expected to occur at higher energies than those in 4A. $^{18}$O isotopic labeling experiments are required to definitively assign the $v_{\text{Fe-O}}$ modes.
Nevertheless, the IR data are fully consistent with the formulation of 1 as $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-OH)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3$ and 4A as $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\mu-\text{CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3$.

**Figure A.6.** $^1$H NMR spectra (CD$_2$Cl$_2$, 500 MHz) of A) complex 1, B) complex 4A, and C) complex 4B recorded at RT at concentrations of approx. 5 mM. Spectrum A: $\delta$ = 1.63, 2.24, 2.79, 3.42, 3.60, 3.89, 4.00, 4.70 ppm; spectrum B: $\delta$ = 2.45, 2.94, 3.28, 3.68, 3.92 ppm; spectrum C: $\delta$ = 2.44, 2.93, 3.28, 3.67, 3.91 ppm. Peaks attributed to solvent: $\delta$ (dichloromethane) = 5.2 ppm; $\delta$ (water) = 1.6 ppm; $\delta$ (diethyl ether) = 1.2, 2.0 ppm.

The $^1$H NMR spectra of 1 and 4A are indicative of paramagnetic species at room temperature. The spectrum of 1 shows several significantly broadened peaks at 4.70, 4.00, 3.89, 3.60, 3.42, 2.79, 2.24, and 1.63 ppm (Figure A.6A), whereas those for 4A appear at 3.92, 3.68, 3.28, 2.94, and 2.45 ppm (Figure A.6B). Previous studies of iron TPA complexes have indicated
that the \( \beta \) protons of its pyridine rings are highly sensitive to the electronic properties of the iron centers; no attempts were made to examine this property in the present study.\(^8\)

**Figure A.7.** The thermal ellipsoid (50%) diagram of the X-ray structure of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu\text{-O})(\mu\text{-CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\cdot(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_{2.5}(\text{Et}_2\text{O})_{0.5} \text{ (4B)}\). Two independent molecules of 4B occur in the asymmetric unit; only one of them is shown in the diagram. Hydrogen atoms, solvent molecules, and perchlorate anions are omitted for clarity. Color scheme: iron, orange; oxygen, red; nitrogen, blue; carbon, black. See Table A.2 and Table A.4 for refinement and structural parameters of 4B, respectively.

To confirm the identity of complex 4A, particularly the assignment of acetate as its bridging ligand, efforts were made to prepare \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu\text{-O})(\mu\text{-CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) independently. Reaction of solid R\(_3\)TPA, iron(III) perchlorate decahydrate, sodium acetate, and triethylamine in a 2:2:1:2 ratio in a methanol solution afforded a yellow precipitate that was readily isolated by filtration. Single crystals of the compound were obtained by slow diffusion of diethyl ether into an acetonitrile solution. X-ray diffraction analysis of these yellow blocks showed two molecules of \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu\text{-O})(\mu\text{-CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2]^{3+} \) in the asymmetric unit (Figure A.7), along with six perchlorate anions, five acetonitrile molecules, and one diethyl ether. For
comparison purposes, the $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3$ compound obtained from this preparation will hereafter be referred to as 4B. Table A.4 lists the metrical parameters of the structures of 4A and 4B. The two structures have essentially identical bond distances and angles, with deviations that are no greater than $\sim$0.01 Å or $\sim$1 deg., respectively. The small structural differences between 4A and 4B can be accounted for by crystal packing, for the two unit cells have different dimensions as a result of having different numbers of solvent molecules in their lattices (Table A.2).

To obtain further confirmation that 4A and 4B are indeed the same compound, $^{57}\text{Fe}$ Mössbauer spectra were recorded. The spectra of 4A and 4B both display a single quadrupole doublet. The data for 4A were fit with $\delta = 0.44$ mm/s and $\Delta E_Q = 1.47$ mm/s, whereas those for 4B were fit with $\delta = 0.44$ mm/s and $\Delta E_Q = 1.49$ mm/s (Table A.1). Although the two iron atoms in $[\text{Fe}_2(\mu-\text{O})(\mu-\text{CH}_3\text{CO}_2)(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3$ are not related by molecular symmetry, the similarity in their coordination environments make them indistinguishable by zero-field Mössbauer spectroscopy. These Mössbauer parameters are typical for iron in the +3 oxidation state and compare favorably with those of other $(\mu$-oxo)(\mu-carboxylato)diiron(III) TPA compounds.\textsuperscript{6}

Finally, the UV-vis (Figure A.5, blue) and $^1\text{H}$ NMR spectra of 4B (A.6C) are identical to those of 4A (Figure A.5, yellow and Figure A.6B, respectively), unequivocally showing that the four-atom bridging ligand in 4A is acetate.

**Effect of Solvent, Water, and Temperature on the Stability of 1.** To examine the stability of the $(\mu$-oxo)(\mu-hydroxo)diiron(III) core in solution, the absorption spectrum of 1 was recorded in different solvents at room temperature (Figure A.8). The oxo-to-iron(III) charge transfer band at 550 nm is present when 1 was dissolved in either neat dichloromethane or acetonitrile. Dissolution of 1 in an equal mixture of dichloromethane and methanol, however, led
to complete loss of this optical feature. The disappearance of the 550 nm band indicates that there is a change in the diiron core, perhaps resulting from a loss of one of the bridging ligands, conversion of the hydroxide to a methoxide bridge, or dissociation into mononuclear iron species. Because this behavior was observed when methanol was introduced into dichloromethane, other protic solvents may also affect the structural integrity of 1.

Figure A.8. UV-vis spectra of complex 1 recorded in different solvents. The 370 and 550 nm bands are observed in dichloromethane (green) and acetonitrile (blue) but not in a dichloromethane/methanol (1:1) mixture (red).

The (µ-oxo)(µ-hydroxo)diiron(III) core can convert to a (µ-oxo)(hydroxo)(aqua)-diiron(III) unit through temperature-dependent aquation.\textsuperscript{8,20} When a solution of 1 in acetonitrile was cooled to -30 °C under ambient conditions, the prominent band at 550 nm decreased in intensity (Figure A.9, red trace) and completely diminished upon treatment with ~8000 equiv of H\textsubscript{2}O (green trace). Upon warming the solution to room temperature, the 550 nm band of 1 was partially restored (blue trace). When 1 is cooled to -30 °C, partial aquation may occur to afford [Fe\textsubscript{2}(µ-O)(OH)(H\textsubscript{2}O)(R\textsubscript{3}TPA)\textsubscript{2}](ClO\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{3} (B), resulting in an absorption decrease at 550 nm (Scheme A.2). When water was deliberately added to the solution at -30 °C, all of 1 was
converted to B. This equilibrium shifted back predominantly toward 1 when the solution was warmed to room temperature.

**Figure A.9.** Plot showing the effect of temperature and water on the UV-vis spectra of a 0.7 mM acetonitrile solution of complex 1. At RT, 1 exhibits a prominent band at 550 nm (black dashed line). When cooled to -30°C, this absorption decreases (red) and is completely diminished upon addition of ~8000 equiv of water (green), relative to the diron complex. The band at 550 nm was partially restored upon warming the solution back to RT (blue).

**Scheme A.2.** Proposed pathway for the complete hydrolysis of acetonitrile to acetate mediated by the [Fe₂(μ-O)(μ-OH)(R₃TPA)₂]³⁺ (1) complex.

**Hydrolysis of Acetonitrile to Acetate.** The yellow crystals of 4A isolated from crystallization of 1 in acetonitrile could result either from a contaminant or through a chemical
process that converts 1 to 4A under the conditions employed. Because no sources of acetate were used during the preparation of 1 and the results were verified by multiple independent experiments, the latter hypothesis is more likely. Dimetallic complexes can promote the hydrolysis of organonitriles in the presence of water. As depicted in Scheme A.2, we propose that trace amounts of water in the solvent reacts with 1 to give B. A possible mechanism would be for the coordinated water in B to be displaced by an acetonitrile molecule to generate 2. In the first irreversible step, the hydroxide ligand bound to the other iron atom in 2 attacks the electrophilic nitrile group, affording a (µ-oxo)(µ-acetamido)diiron(III) species 3. For most nitrogen-rich diiron compounds, the hydrolysis of CH₃CN does not proceed beyond the carboxamide. Because 4A, rather than 3, was isolated from the crystallization of 1, hydrolysis of the acetamide in 3 must occur to afford the acetate.

To obtain evidence for the complete hydrolysis of CH₃CN, the absorption spectrum of compound 1 in acetonitrile was recorded over the course of ~900 min. The reaction was performed with wet solvent in air to reproduce the conditions under which 4A was crystallized. Although the reaction is slow, spectral changes were observed between 340-380 nm as well as at 550 nm (Figure A.10A). A kinetic analysis of the data at 553 nm were fit satisfactorily to a two consecutive unimolecular reaction model, yielding rate constants of \( k_1 = 2.04 \pm 0.16 \times 10^{-2} \text{ min}^{-1} \) and \( k_2 = 1.98 \pm 0.06 \times 10^{-3} \text{ min}^{-1} \) (Figure A.10B). These processes are tentatively attributed to conversion of 1 to 3 and of 3 to 4A. A (µ-oxo)(µ-acetamido)diiron(III) complex 3 has not been isolated from the reaction mixture, but is a logical precursor to 4A.
The complete optical profile is shown in panel A. The absorption changes at 553 nm are shown in panel B as black dots. The data were fit to an A→B→C kinetic model (red trace), yielding the parameters: \( k_1 = 2.04 \pm 0.16 \times 10^{-2} \text{ min}^{-1}, k_2 = 1.98 \pm 0.06 \times 10^{-3} \text{ min}^{-1}, \epsilon_A = 610.9 \pm 0.5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}, \epsilon_B = 578.5 \pm 1.4 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}, \epsilon_C = 488.8 \pm 1.0 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}, \chi^2 = 1.72 \times 10^{-6}, \text{ and } R = 0.99977. \) See Eq. 1 in the experimental section for the mathematical expression used.

Validity of the Reported Results. The present study indicates that a more thorough investigation is required to evaluate the reaction scheme proposed in Scheme A.1. Firstly, it is important to determine whether the reaction of hydrogen peroxide with \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)_2(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) (1) proceeds in a manner similar to that with \([\text{Fe}_2(\mu-O)(\text{OH})(\text{H}_2\text{O})(\text{R}_3\text{TPA})_2](\text{ClO}_4)_3\) (4A). To enable such studies, the conditions that favor either 1 or 4A in solution have been delineated. Secondly, diiron(III) R3TPA reactivity studies should be conducted in non-nitrile containing solvents, such as tetrahydrofuran or methanol. Although the hydrolysis of CH3CN is slow in the presence of 1 and trace amounts of water, it is possible that additives such as hydrogen peroxide or acids would enhance the rate of this reaction. If so, there would be an additional competing reaction pathway that may complicate interpretation of the experimental data. It is noteworthy in this context that the reported Mössbauer spectra for the
high-valent diiron R₃TPA compounds showed significant amounts (30-48%) of “iron(III)” that were subtracted from the raw data. It is unclear whether these contributions come from the starting material, the decayed product, or another species generated during the reaction. Because of the complicated nature of the reactions that produce these high-valent species, the Mössbauer data required 15 parameters to be fit during ~1000 simulations.²⁸-³⁰ Perhaps by altering the experimental conditions under which the diiron(IV) units are generated, more homogeneous samples could be obtained to provide cleaner spectra for data analysis.

A.4. Conclusion

The putative diiron(III) starting material, [Fe₂(µ-O)(OH)(H₂O)(R₃TPA)₂](ClO₄)₃, is formed only in solution in the presence of excess amounts of water and at low temperature. The reported synthetic procedure affords the organic solvent soluble [Fe₂(µ-O)(µ-OH)(R₃TPA)₂](ClO₄)₃ compound as well as an intractable iron(III) material. The (µ-oxo)(µ-hydroxo)diiron(III) core opens up in the presence of water to enable binding of acetonitrile. The bound CH₃CN group is fully hydrolyzed to the CH₃COO⁻ anion. Further studies are necessary to clarify the hydrogen peroxide reactivity of the diiron(III) complexes characterized in this report.
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