



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

**Thermally Activated Delayed Fluorescence (TADF) and Enhancing Photoluminescence Quantum Yields of [CuI (diimine)(diphosphine)]<sup>+</sup> Complexes—Photophysical, Structural, and Computational Studies**

**Citation for published version:**

Linfoot, CL, Leidl, MJ, Richardson, P, Rausch, AF, Chepelin, O, White, FJ, Yersin, H & Robertson, N 2014, 'Thermally Activated Delayed Fluorescence (TADF) and Enhancing Photoluminescence Quantum Yields of [CuI (diimine)(diphosphine)]<sup>+</sup> Complexes—Photophysical, Structural, and Computational Studies' *Inorganic Chemistry*, vol 53, no. 20, pp. 10854–10861., 10.1021/ic500889s

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.1021/ic500889s](https://doi.org/10.1021/ic500889s)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Peer reviewed version

**Published In:**

*Inorganic Chemistry*

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



This document is the Accepted Manuscript version of a Published Work that appeared in final form in *Inorganic Chemistry*, copyright © American Chemical Society after peer review and technical editing by the publisher. To access the final edited and published work see <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ic500889s>

Cite as:

Linfoot, C. L., Leitl, M. J., Richardson, P., Rausch, A. F., Chepelin, O., White, F. J., Yersin, H., Robertson, N. (2014). Thermally Activated Delayed Fluorescence (TADF) and Enhancing Photoluminescence Quantum Yields of  $[\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}(\text{diimine})(\text{diphosphine})]^+$  Complexes—Photophysical, Structural, and Computational Studies. *Inorganic Chemistry*, 10854–10861.

Manuscript received: 15/04/2014; Article published: 23/07/2014

## Thermally Activated Delayed Fluorescence (TADF) and Enhancing Photoluminescence Quantum Yields of $[\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}(\text{diimine})(\text{diphosphine})]^+$ Complexes – Photophysical, Structural, and Computational Studies\*\*

Charlotte L. Linfoot,<sup>1</sup> Markus J. Leitl,<sup>2</sup> Patricia Richardson,<sup>1</sup> Andreas F. Rausch,<sup>2</sup> Oleg Chepelin,<sup>1</sup> Fraser J. White,<sup>1</sup> Hartmut Yersin,<sup>\*2</sup> and Neil Robertson<sup>\*1</sup>


<sup>[1]</sup>EaStCHEM, School of Chemistry, Joseph Black Building, University of Edinburgh, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3FJ, UK.

<sup>[2]</sup>Institute for Physical und Theoretical Chemistry, University of Regensburg, Universitätsstr. 31, 93053 Regensburg, Germany.

<sup>[\*]</sup>Corresponding authors; N.R.: [neil.robertson@ed.ac.uk](mailto:neil.robertson@ed.ac.uk); fax: +44 131 650 4742; tel: +44 131 650 4755; H.Y.: [hartmut.yersin@ur.de](mailto:hartmut.yersin@ur.de); fax +49 941 943 4488; tel: +49 941 943 4464

<sup>[\*\*]</sup>We thank EPSRC and EaStChem for funding, including the EaStChem Research Computing Facility (<http://www.eastchem.ac.uk/rcf>). This facility is partially supported by the eDIKT initiative (<http://www.edikt.org>). We also gratefully acknowledge funding by the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF).

Graphical abstract:



## Abstract

The complexes  $[\text{Cu(I)(POP)(dmbpy)}][\text{BF}_4]$  (**1**) and  $[\text{Cu(I)(POP)(tmbpy)}][\text{BF}_4]$  (**2**) (dmbpy = 4,4'-dimethyl-2,2'-bipyridyl; tmbpy = 4,4',6,6'-tetramethyl-2,2'-bipyridyl), POP = bis[2-(diphenylphosphino)-phenyl]ether) have been studied in a wide temperature range by steady-state and time-resolved emission spectroscopy in fluid solution, frozen solution, and as solid powders. Emission quantum yields of up to 74 % were observed for **2** in a rigid matrix (powder), substantially higher than for **1** of around 9 % under the same conditions. Importantly, it was found that the emission of **2** at ambient temperature represents a thermally activated delayed fluorescence (TADF) which renders the compound to be a good candidate for singlet harvesting in OLEDs. The role of steric constraints within the complexes, in particular their influences on the emission quantum yields, were investigated by hybrid-DFT calculations for the excited triplet state of **1** and **2** while manipulating the torsion angle between the bipyridyl and POP ligands. Both complexes showed similar flexibility within a  $\pm 10^\circ$  range of the torsion angle, however **2** appeared limited to this range whereas **1** could be further twisted with little energy demand. It is concluded that a restricted flexibility leads to a reduction of non-radiative deactivation and thus an increase of emission quantum yield.

## Introduction

Transition metal complexes are of great interest for electroluminescent devices such as organic light-emitting diodes (OLEDs),<sup>1-6</sup> light-emitting electrochemical cells (LEECs),<sup>7-9</sup> sensors,<sup>10-12</sup> and dye-sensitised solar cells (DSSCs).<sup>13-27</sup> For these applications, heavy metal complexes based on Ru(II),<sup>28-32</sup> Ir(III),<sup>33-37</sup> and Pt(II)<sup>37-42</sup> have been the focus of research due to their high emission quantum yields, short emission decay times, photo-stability, and/or tuneable emission wavelengths through intelligent ligand design. Related research into first-row transition metal complexes has been gaining momentum in the last 30 years thanks to the early work of McMillin.<sup>43-47</sup> In particular, Cu(I) compounds have attracted significant research attention recently as they provide an attractive alternative to expensive, less abundant, and more toxic heavy-metal-containing complexes. Furthermore, copper compounds can exhibit an additional radiative decay channel via thermally activated delayed fluorescence (TADF) which results in high emission quantum yields and short emission decay times.<sup>48-51,37</sup> More importantly, TADF emitters can utilize all injected excitons, singlets *and* triplets, for the generation of light in OLEDs resulting in a singlet state emission. The corresponding mechanism represents the singlet harvesting effect.<sup>37, 48-51</sup> All these factors render Cu(I) compounds attractive for the use in electroluminescent devices making them replacements for heavy metal photo- and electroluminescent complexes.<sup>15,37,48-60</sup>

However, on excitation, Cu(I) compounds can undergo a formal oxidation of Cu(I) to Cu(II) due to the pronounced metal-to-ligand charge transfer (MLCT) character of the transition.<sup>54-65,51,37</sup> As a consequence, the conformational geometry can distort significantly, opening a very effective non-radiative deactivation pathway. Many literature studies have explored coordinating ligands that act to sterically constrain the pseudo-tetrahedral Cu(I) geometry, therefore limiting the extent of the geometrical flattening.<sup>43-52,60-62,66-76</sup>


In this work, we expand understanding of the structural and emissive behaviour of heteroleptic Cu(I) complexes by experimental and computational investigations of bis[2-(diphenylphosphino)-phenyl]ether (POP) containing Cu(I) complexes. Prior research into [Cu(I)(POP)(diimine)]<sup>+</sup> complexes<sup>77-82</sup> has focused on 1,10-phenanthroline diimine ligands with an emission quantum yield of  $\Phi_{\text{PL}} = 69\%$  achieved in PMMA film.<sup>79</sup> Less work has been done to investigate the emission behaviour of the analogous [Cu(I)(POP)(2,2'-bipyridine)]<sup>+</sup> complexes, presumably due to the typically lower quantum yields observed for Cu(I)-bipyridine complexes in comparison with the analogous phenanthrolines.<sup>83,84,53</sup> In a previous report, we qualitatively noted the strikingly different emissive properties of [Cu(I)(POP)(dmbpy)][BF<sub>4</sub>] (**1**) and [Cu(I)(POP)(tmbpy)][BF<sub>4</sub>] (**2**) (dmbpy = 4,4'-dimethyl-2,2'-bipyridyl; tmbpy = 4,4',6,6'-tetramethyl-2,2'-bipyridyl) within a larger body of work on Cu(I) complexes.<sup>85</sup> We now follow this up by quantifying the photoluminescence quantum yields and excited-state lifetimes of **1** and **2** under variation of temperature in different media. The results of the measurements are interpreted through a computational density functional theory (DFT) investigation

that explores in particular the link between structural rigidity and photophysical behaviour. This is also facilitated by the determination of an X-ray structure of **2**. Although a general correlation between rigidity and enhanced quantum yield is well known, investigation of more specific rigidity-property relationships has not been significantly addressed yet and may provide guidelines on the optimisation of future complexes. Furthermore, a detailed analysis of the temperature dependent decay behaviour of compound **2** reveals the occurrence of an efficient TADF process showing that compound **2** exhibits excellent properties for harvesting all singlet and triplet excitons in the lowest excited singlet state in an emitter layer of an OLED (singlet harvesting).<sup>37, 48-51</sup>

## Results and Discussion

In Figure 1, the structure of **2** is displayed as determined from X-ray investigations. The angle between the bipyridyl plane and the P-Cu-P plane of 81.95° shows limited flattening in the ground state away from an ideal 90° and the chelating P-Cu-P angle is close to that of an ideal tetrahedron (Table 1), consistent with other Cu(POP) complexes reported by ourselves,<sup>85</sup> and others.<sup>53, 86-88</sup> The steric blocking that limits the flattening distortion upon excitation can be attributed to a combination of the POP and tmbpy ligands. The PCCOCCP chelating ring of the POP restricts the possible conformations of the phosphine ligands in comparison with two monodentate phosphines, and short interligand contacts are observed of 3.343 Å (C43-O21), 3.522 Å (C51-C10) and 3.300 Å (C40-C42)

(Figure 1). Significantly, the first two of these short contacts involve the 6,6'-methyl groups (Figure 1), demonstrating that these groups play an important role in limiting structural distortions.



**Figure 1** X-ray structure of **2** with probability ellipsoids set to 50% using the programme Mercury.<sup>89</sup>

Left: the tetrahedral coordination geometry around Cu; Right: short atom-to-atom contacts between the POP and the tmbpy ligands. H-atoms are omitted for clarity.

**Table 1** Selected bond lengths (Å) and bond angles (deg) from single crystal X-ray crystallography and solvated (ethanol polarizable-continuum model) DFT calculations for **2** and **1**.

Compound	<b>2</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
	X-ray		DFT	DFT
Cu-(N41)	2.089(3)	Cu-N	2.134	2.103
Cu-(N49)	2.097(3)		2.118	2.090

Cu-P(2)	2.2518(11)	Cu-P	2.477	2.426
Cu-P(28)	2.2901(11)		2.492	2.428
N(41)-Cu-N(49)	79.64(13)	N-Cu-N	79.99	80.01
N(41)-Cu-P(2)	121.85(9)		116.97	110.94
N(49)-Cu-P(2)	117.03(10)	N-Cu-P	114.27	118.69
N(41)-Cu-P(28)	103.50(10)		113.93	115.58
N(49)-Cu-P(28)	114.35(9)		117.98	114.82
P(2)-Cu-P(28)	115.25(4)		110.83	112.84

**Table 2** Emission data for complexes **1** and **2** recorded in ethanol and powder, respectively.

Compound	[Cu(POP)(tmbpy)][BF <sub>4</sub> ] <b>2</b>	[Cu(POP)(dmbpy)][BF <sub>4</sub> ] <b>1</b>
<b>EtOH</b>		
$\lambda_{\max}$ (300 K) [nm]	575	655
$\tau$ (300 K) [ $\mu$ s]	2.5	0.02
$\phi_{\text{PL}}$ (300 K) [%]	6	< 1
$k_r$ (300 K) [ $s^{-1}$ ]	$2.4 \cdot 10^4$	
$k_{nr}$ (300 K) [ $s^{-1}$ ]	$3.8 \cdot 10^5$	
$\lambda_{\max}$ (77 K) [nm]	535	605
$\tau$ (77 K) [ $\mu$ s]	73 <sup>a</sup>	16 <sup>a</sup>
<b>powder</b>		
$\lambda_{\max}$ (300 K) [nm]	555 (555) <sup>b</sup>	575
$\tau$ (300 K) [ $\mu$ s]	11 (13) <sup>b</sup>	-- <sup>c</sup>
$\phi_{\text{PL}}$ (300 K) [%]	55 (74) <sup>b</sup>	9
$k_r$ (300 K) [ $s^{-1}$ ]	$5.0 \cdot 10^4$ ( $5.7 \cdot 10^4$ ) <sup>b</sup>	
$k_{nr}$ (300 K) [ $s^{-1}$ ]	$4.1 \cdot 10^4$ ( $2.0 \cdot 10^4$ ) <sup>b</sup>	
$\lambda_{\max}$ (77 K) [nm]	575	595
$\tau$ (77 K) [ $\mu$ s]	87	-- <sup>c</sup>



$\Phi_{\text{PL}}(77\text{ K}) [\%]$	47
$k_{\text{r}}(77\text{ K}) [\text{s}^{-1}]$	$5.3 \cdot 10^3$
$k_{\text{nr}}(77\text{ K}) [\text{s}^{-1}]$	$6.2 \cdot 10^3$

<sup>a</sup> Slightly deviating from single-exponential decay

<sup>b</sup> Powder of compound **2** was measured as received from the reaction (and also after grinding between two glass plates). For compound **1**, no significant difference between ground and non-ground powder was observed.

<sup>c</sup> Strongly non mono-exponential decay

Firstly, discussion of the photophysical properties will focus on compound **2**. At ambient temperature, the powder as received from the synthesis, exhibits yellow luminescence under excitation with UV light. The corresponding emission spectrum is broad and featureless showing a peak at  $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 555\text{ nm}$  (Figure 2) and the emission decay time amounts to  $\tau = 11\text{ }\mu\text{s}$ . Most notably, the compound's emission quantum yield is observed as  $\Phi_{\text{PL}} = 55\%$ . This places it amongst a relatively small number of highly emissive Cu(I) polypyridyl complexes reported in the literature.<sup>80</sup> Interestingly, the emission quantum yield can be further increased by grinding the substance between two glass plates. After this procedure, a quantum yield of  $\Phi_{\text{PL}} = 74\%$  is obtained for the ground powder. Also, a slight increase of the decay time to  $13\text{ }\mu\text{s}$  is found. A comparison of the radiative  $k_{\text{r}} = \Phi_{\text{PL}} \tau^{-1}$  and non-radiative  $k_{\text{nr}} = (1 - \Phi_{\text{PL}}) \tau^{-1}$  rates before and after grinding shows that the radiative rate is almost not affected by the grinding process, whereas the non-radiative rate is reduced by about a factor of two (Table 2). The

emission spectra are not affected by grinding. The observed enhancement of the quantum yield could be caused by rearrangements in the solid material leading to a more rigid environment for the individual molecules.<sup>84,90</sup>

When compound **2** is dissolved in EtOH, the emission is red-shifted ( $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 575 \text{ nm}$ ) compared to the powder ( $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 555 \text{ nm}$ ). In addition, the quantum yield and the emission decay time decrease significantly in fluid EtOH solution ( $\Phi_{\text{PL}}(\text{powder}) = 55 \%$ ,  $\Phi_{\text{PL}}(\text{EtOH}) = 6 \%$ ,  $\tau(\text{powder}) = 11 \mu\text{s}$ ,  $\tau(\text{EtOH}) = 2.5 \mu\text{s}$ ). Such behaviour has been reported for other Cu(I) compounds in the literature<sup>37, 49-51,54,65</sup> and is attributed to the pronounced metal-to-ligand charge transfer (MLCT) character of the emitting state. In this excited state the tendency of a geometry change towards planarization is strong in non-rigid environments. This leads to an energy stabilization (red-shift) and opens a highly effective non-radiative relaxation channel due to higher Franck-Condon factors of the excited and the ground state.<sup>91</sup> As a result, the quantum yield and emission decay time in fluid solution are drastically reduced. Cooling the solution to  $T = 77 \text{ K}$  leads to a rigid cage around the complex through freezing of the solvent. This prevents distinct geometry changes upon excitation. As a consequence, the emission spectrum is blue shifted and the decay time longer than the fluid situation.

Interestingly, compound **2** exhibits a significantly higher emission quantum yield ( $\Phi_{\text{PL}} = 55 / 74 \%$ ) than compound **1** ( $\Phi_{\text{PL}} = 9 \%$ ). This trend is also displayed in EtOH solution and can be attributed to the 6,6'-methyl groups present on the tmbpy ligand which act to sterically limit the flattening

distortion consistent with the short atom-atom contacts observed (Figure 1). This effect is further discussed in more detail below.

For a more detailed understanding, the emission behaviour of compound **2** (powder) was investigated at different temperatures (Figure 2 and Figure 3). At  $T = 77$  K, the emission decay time amounts to 87  $\mu$ s and is therefore assigned to originate from the triplet state  $T_1$  (while the ground state is a singlet  $S_0$ ). With increasing temperature, the decay time decreases drastically to 11  $\mu$ s at ambient temperature while the quantum yield does not change significantly between liquid nitrogen and ambient temperature ( $\Phi_{PL}(300\text{ K}) = 55\%$ ,  $\Phi_{PL}(77\text{ K}) = 47\%$ ). With this, the radiative rates can be calculated ( $k_r(300\text{ K}) = 5.0 \cdot 10^4\text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $k_r(77\text{ K}) = 5.4 \cdot 10^3\text{ s}^{-1}$ ), i.e. a pronounced increase of the radiative rates by almost a factor of ten is observed on heating. This very strong increase is paralleled by a blue shift of the emission from 575 nm to 555 nm (peak to peak). Both effects, the increase of the radiative rate and the blue shift, can be rationalized by a thermal population of an energetically higher lying singlet state  $S_1$  (Figure 3, inset). Accordingly, compound **2** clearly shows a thermally activated delayed fluorescence (TADF). The energy separation between the first excited singlet and triplet state  $\Delta E(S_1-T_1)$  can be estimated from the shift of the emission spectra from 77 K to 300 K, giving  $\Delta E(S_1-T_1) = 630\text{ cm}^{-1}$  (Figure 2). An alternative approach to determine this energy separation results from the change of emission decay time as function of temperature (Figure 3) according to equation (1).<sup>48,51</sup>

$$\tau(T) = \frac{3 + \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta E(S_1-T_1)}{k_B T}\right]}{\frac{3}{\tau(T_1)} + \frac{1}{\tau(S_1)} \exp\left[-\frac{\Delta E(S_1-T_1)}{k_B T}\right]} \quad (1)$$

In this equation,  $\Delta E(S_1-T_1)$  represents the energy separation between the first excited singlet and triplet state,  $\tau(S_1)$  and  $\tau(T_1)$  are the emission decay times of the respective states, and  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant. From the fitting procedure a value of  $\Delta E(S_1-T_1) = 720 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  results. Within limits of experimental error, this matches well the value obtained from the spectral shift. For the decay time of the first excited singlet state a value of  $\tau(S_1) = 160 \text{ ns}$  was found. Such a value is in agreement with the singlet nature of this state, however, being connected with a relatively-low oscillator strength of the  $S_1 \leftrightarrow S_0$  transition. An emission originating as a prompt fluorescence was not found, presumably due to very fast intersystem crossing between  $S_1$  and  $T_1$ . Moreover, the value found for  $\tau(T_1) = 84 \text{ }\mu\text{s}$  supports our assignment of a triplet state emission. We note that equation (1) can only be applied if the emitting states are in a thermal equilibrium. In the temperature range between 77 K and 300 K this condition is fulfilled.






Figure 2: Emission spectra of compound  $[\text{Cu}(\text{POP})(\text{tmbpy})][\text{BF}_4]$  (**2**) (powder) recorded at temperatures of 300 K and 77 K. The samples were excited at  $\lambda_{\text{exc}} = 350$  nm.



**Figure 3:** Emission decay time of compound **2** (powder) versus temperature. The decay times are closely mono-exponential in the whole temperature range. The solid curve represents a fit according to equation (1). The parameters obtained from the fitting procedure amount to  $\Delta E(S_1-T_1) = 720 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $\tau(T_1) = 84 \text{ } \mu\text{s}$ , and  $\tau(S_1) = 160 \text{ ns}$ .

Although the link between structural rigidity and high quantum yield is qualitatively well established, little detailed analysis has been directed towards more quantitative investigation for Cu(I) complexes.<sup>43-52,60-62,66-76</sup> Accordingly, to deepen our understanding of the effects of structural constraint and to direct future design of Cu(I) electroluminescent complexes, DFT geometry

optimisations for the singlet ground state (Table 1, Fig S1, Fig S2, Table S1, Table S3) and triplet excited states of **1** and **2** were calculated using Gaussian 03<sup>92</sup> with the B3LYP/LANL2DZ<sup>93-96</sup> functional and basis set. This level of theory has been used successfully both in our previous work<sup>85</sup> and in the literature to calculate the structural and electronic properties of a number of coordination complexes.<sup>83,53</sup> The ground state singlet calculations for **1** and **2** were run with induced ethanol solvent effects to explore the ground state of the complex. The TDDFT calculations carried out on the optimised singlet ground state structure reproduce the experimental spectra reasonably well in the UV region, predicting a large number of transitions with significant oscillator strength (Figure 4, Table S2, Table, S4). However, the calculated low-energy absorptions differ by around 2500 cm<sup>-1</sup> from those seen experimentally which is similar to some other literature calculations for charge-transfer transitions and can be attributed to the tendency of TDDFT calculations to underestimate the energies for this transition type.<sup>83,97</sup> The computational results allow insight into the orbital origins showing that the LUMO and LUMO+1 are bpy based and the HOMO to HOMO-3 are all Cu(I) or POP based<sup>85</sup> confirming that the low energy transitions are Cu(I)/POP-to-bpy charge transfer in character.



**Figure 4:** Theoretical UV/Vis absorption spectra compared with experimental absorption spectra for **1** and **2**. Red vertical lines correspond to calculated electronic transitions whereby the height refers to the calculated oscillator strength of the respective transition. Red dotted lines represent calculated spectra, and black solid lines represent the experimental spectra of **1** and **2** recorded in EtOH. The first 70 singlet transitions were calculated.


Triplet excited state calculations have been used to investigate the excited state properties of the lowest triplet of **1** and **2**, both geometrically and electronically, to give insight into the connection between these properties within the systems. Due to computational difficulties it was not possible to calculate an optimised geometry for the triplet states of either complex, hence a minimum energy structure was not obtained in the presence of the solvent effects, and instead a single-point solvent calculation was carried out. This procedure involves taking a computationally optimised structure executed without the presence of solvent, and then applying a polarisable continuum model and re-



calculating the energy of the structure without optimising the geometry. It was felt this method could be applied to these structures as little variation in geometry was observed in the structures as solvents were introduced.

Triplet state computational studies were carried out using ArgusLab<sup>98</sup> input structures of **1** and **2**, and also starting from the crystal structure of **2**. The singlet ground state optimised geometries generated from the different starting structures for **2** revealed little differences between the energy of the structures but there was a difference in the POP orientation, indicating its dependence upon the orientation of the input structure. This suggests the presence of multiple local minima in the energy profiles of these two complexes. Identification of which of these (if any), is the global minimum would require additional computational studies.

To explore the combination of POP and substituted bpys as geometry-constraining (hindering) ligands using DFT methods, we manipulated the geometries of **1** and **2** using the optimised singlet ground state geometries and also the X-ray structure of **2** as the starting point, and calculated new overall complex energies of the optimised singlet and then single-point triplet excited states. This manipulation was carried out while fixing the torsion angle between the bpy and the POP ligands, as highlighted in Figure 5. For the ArgusLab input structures of **1** and **2**, both torsion angles were set to the same value, however, due to a non-symmetrical starting geometry, the crystal structure input structure of **2** had the two torsion angles ① and ② set to different values (Table 3).



**Figure 5** DFT geometry optimised singlet ground state structures of the cationic complexes **1** and **2**.


The blue lines indicate the torsion angles that were manipulated. Using the Argus lab input structures, for both **1** and **2**, the torsion angles ① and ② were set to be equal. Using the crystal input structure for **2**, the torsion angles that correspond to ① and ② were not equal and therefore we manipulated and quote the torsion angle ① C50-N49-Cu1-P28 (Table 3) = 80.63 °. For comparison, the angle ② (C38-N52-Cu1-P54) in the crystal structure = 58.08 °.

**Table 3** Selected torsion angle and relative-energy data from the DFT geometry optimisation of  $[\text{Cu}(\text{POP})(\text{dmbpy})]^+$  (**1**), and  $[\text{Cu}(\text{POP})(\text{tmbpy})]^+$  (**2**) starting from the ArgusLab input structures, and for  $[\text{Cu}(\text{POP})(\text{tmbpy})]^+$  (**2**) starting from the crystal structure. All complexes are in their excited triplet states, without solvent corrections. For geometries labelled with an asterisk(\*), a minimum energy structure was not achieved due to unacceptably short steric clashes. Energies are quoted relative to that of the structure before manipulation of the angle.

compound 1		compound 2		compound 2	
ArgusLab input		ArgusLab input		input from crystal structure	
Torsion	Relative energy /	Torsion	Relative energy /	Torsion	Relative energy /
angle / °	$\text{kJmol}^{-1}$	angle / °	$\text{kJmol}^{-1}$	angle <sup>b</sup> / °	$\text{kJmol}^{-1}$
60	+7.21	55*		65*	
65	+3.77	60	+3.63	70	+3.78
70	+1.31	65	+0.56	75	+0.49


<sup>a</sup>	0	<sup>a</sup>	0	<sup>a</sup>	0
80	+0.43	75	+1.71	85	+0.77
85	+2.98	80	+4.96	90	+3.29
90	+7.19	85*		95*	
<sup>a</sup> no manipulation: Angles ①/②		<sup>a</sup> no manipulation: Angles ①/②		<sup>a</sup> no manipulation: <sup>b</sup> Angle C50-	
= 75.84° / 75.43°		= 69.91° / 68.44°		N49-Cu1-P28 = 80.63°	

The torsion angle was varied by  $\pm 5^\circ$  intervals starting from the optimised singlet geometry and within this constraint, the optimised singlet and single-point triplet energies were then calculated. Figure 6 shows how the relative lowest-triplet energy of complexes **1** and **2** changes with a change of the torsion angle over a  $30^\circ$  range (Table 3). From this level of computational calculation it is not possible to state whether these structures are based around local or global minima. However, it was possible to calculate geometries for the manipulated structure of **1** over this entire  $30^\circ$  range. The curvature of the plots suggest a similarity in the flexibility of the two complexes only within  $\pm 10^\circ$  of the optimised torsion angle, with roughly the same small energy increase with each  $5^\circ$  manipulation of the bpy ligand for both **1** and **2**.



**Figure 6** Plots of DFT calculated relative single-point triplet energies for **1** and **2** against the torsion angle, starting from ArgusLab input structures. Note that y-axes are the same scale and x-axes are the same range and scale, and that the curve is there to act as a guide to the eye. For **2**, the dashed red lines represent the unacceptably high energies calculated at larger angle, due to clashing hydrogen atoms.

Once the torsion angle was increased by  $\pm 15^\circ$  (Table 3), optimisation of **2** led to unacceptably-high energies as these manipulated structures place the 6,6'-methyl groups in too close a proximity to the phenyls of the POP ligand (Figure 7). Triplet geometry calculations starting from the crystal structure of **2** indicate that although the geometries differ from the ArgusLab input structure, they exhibit largely similar overall complex energies and structural behaviour (Table 3, Figure S3).



**Figure 7** DFT geometry optimisation of  $[\text{Cu}(\text{POP})(\text{tmbpy})]^+$  **2** starting from the ArgusLab inputted structures with torsion angles of  $60^\circ$  (upper) and  $55^\circ$  (lower) showing unacceptable steric clashes for the latter in comparison with the former. (Sum of Van der Waals radii  $\text{H}\dots\text{H} = 2.40 \text{ \AA}$ ;  $\text{C}\dots\text{H} = 3.05 \text{ \AA}$ .<sup>99</sup>) Distances are shown in  $\text{\AA}$ . For clarity, a stick model, with irrelevant H-atoms omitted has been used.

## Conclusion

In this contribution, we demonstrate how slight modification of the chemical structure of a  $[\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}(\text{diimine})(\text{diphosphine})]^+$  complex can lead to a substantial increase of the emission quantum

yield. In the case of the  $[\text{Cu}(\text{POP})(\text{dmbpy})]^+$  complex, this is achieved by the increase of the steric demand of the bipyridine ligand through the introduction of two additional methyl groups resulting in the  $[\text{Cu}(\text{POP})(\text{tmbpy})]^+$  complex. In combination with the bulky POP ligand, these groups limit the photo-induced flattening distortion that the compound can undergo on excitation of an MLCT state. As a result, the non-radiative deactivation to the ground state is significantly reduced leading to around a sixfold increase of the emission quantum yield from 9 to 55 % (or even 74% for the sample after grinding).

These observations demonstrate the increased rigidity enforced upon the structure of **2** compared to that present in **1** as a result of the steric demands of the 6,6'-methyl groups on the bipyridyl ligands. The attempt to calculate structures for **2** where the torsion angle between the two ligands has been manipulated to  $55^\circ$  shows the unacceptably short H...H distance of 1.290 Å, (c.f. the sum of the H...H Van der Waal radii of 2.40 Å<sup>99</sup>) between an H-atom on a peripheral ring of the POP and an H-atom on a methyl group in the 6-position of the bipy. This clearly illustrates the inability of the pseudo-tetrahedral structure of **2** to flatten beyond a threshold value of around  $\pm 10^\circ$ . In contrast, compound **1** can further flatten with only an incremental additional energy penalty. Significantly, the flexibility of **1** and **2** seems little different within the limited geometric range  $\pm 10^\circ$  and these observations are reminiscent of the concept of a “steric threshold” introduced in other areas of chemistry,<sup>100</sup> whereby the abrupt onset of steric effects occurs beyond some geometric limit, before which steric effects play a negligible role. Although it is not possible to generalise to all Cu(I)

complexes, our observations suggest a shallow potential well with unconstrained structural flexibility up to a certain range before an abrupt limit to the distortion.

Most interestingly, for the sterically-constrained compound **2**, it was found that at ambient temperature the emission is largely determined by a thermally activated delayed fluorescence (TADF). At ambient temperature, the compound emits almost only from the first excited singlet state  $S_1$  ( $^1\text{MLCT}$ ) which is thermally populated from the  $T_1$  state ( $^3\text{MLCT}$ ). This results in a relatively short emission decay time of 11  $\mu\text{s}$  at ambient temperature as compared to the triplet state decay time of  $\tau(T_1) = 84 \mu\text{s}$ .

Recently, it has been demonstrated that emitters exhibiting a TADF are very attractive for the application in electroluminescent devices, such as OLEDs, as they can make use of the singlet harvesting effect.<sup>37,48-51,101</sup> Cu(I) complexes, such as compound **2** ( $[\text{Cu}(\text{POP})(\text{tmbpy})]^+$ ) are attractive candidates in this regard. However, also purely organic molecules have recently been demonstrated to exhibit an efficient TADF at ambient temperature and might be an interesting alternative to transition-metal compounds.<sup>102, 103</sup> Which of the two concepts will be superior for future applications is not yet clear. The lowest triplet state of organic TADF molecules experiences very weak SOC and thus, intersystem crossing (ISC) is relatively slow. Beside the size of the energy gap  $\Delta E(S_1-T_1)$ , this seems to be a limiting factor for the TADF decay time. Thus, it might become too long and result in saturation effects in OLEDs giving an undesired roll-off of the efficiency with increasing current

density. On the other hand, SOC in Cu(I) complexes is usually high enough to induce fast ISC. As a consequence, the TADF decay time is essentially determined by the energy gap  $\Delta E(S_1-T_1)$  and, slightly less importantly, by the allowedness of the  $S_0 - S_1$  transition.

## Experimental

Complexes **1** and **2** were prepared as reported previously.<sup>85</sup> The steady-state emission spectroscopy was carried out with **1** and **2** dissolved in ethanol at concentrations of about  $10^{-5}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>. Fluid solutions were degassed by at least five pump-freeze-thaw cycles with a final vapour pressure at 77 K of  $\sim 10^{-5}$  mbar, while the powder samples were measured under a nitrogen atmosphere.

The absorption spectra were recorded with a Perkin Elmer Lambda 9 spectrophotometer controlled by the UV/Winlab software. Emission spectra at all temperatures were measured with a steady-state fluorescence spectrometer (Jobin Yvon Fluorolog 3). Luminescence quantum yields at ambient temperature and 77 K were determined with an integrating sphere (Hamamatsu Photonics, C9920-02), which exhibits a highly reflective Spectralon inside coating. The relative error of the measured values is  $\pm 0.10$ . Temperature dependent measurements were carried out in a helium cryostat (Cryovac Konti Cryostat IT) in which helium gas flow and pressure as well as heating were controlled. Excited state decay curves were recorded using a diode laser (Picobrite PB-375L) with a wavelength of 378 nm and a pulse width  $< 100$  ps as excitation source.



Crystals were grown by slow diffusion of hexane into an acetone solution of **2**. Single crystal X-ray diffraction data were collected using Mo-K $\alpha$  radiation ( $\lambda = 0.71073 \text{ \AA}$ ) on a Smart APEX CCD diffractometer equipped with an Oxford Cryosystems low-temperature device operating at 150 K. An absorption correction was applied by the multi-scan procedure SADABS.<sup>104</sup> The structures were solved by direct methods (Shelx)<sup>105</sup> and refined by full-matrix least squares against  $F^2$  using all data (Shelx).<sup>105</sup> The SQUEEZE routine within PLATON was used to treat disorder of the included solvent and counterion, with one molecule of hexane and one  $\text{BF}_4^-$  anion per formula unit removed from the cell.<sup>106</sup> Figures were prepared with the programme Mercury.<sup>89</sup> All non-H atoms were refined with anisotropic displacement parameters. X-ray Crystallography of **2**:  $\text{C}_{50}\text{H}_{44}\text{CuN}_2\text{OP}_2\cdot\text{BF}_4\cdot\text{C}_6\text{H}_{14}$ , MW = 987.39, T/K = 100(2), Triclinic  $P\bar{1}$ ,  $a = 11.35159(16)$ ,  $b = 12.3287(2)$ ,  $c = 17.7320(3) \text{ \AA}$ ,  $\alpha = 70.8270(17)^\circ$ ,  $\beta = 80.0951(13)^\circ$ ,  $\gamma = 77.4948(14)^\circ$ ,  $V = 2274.59(7) \text{ \AA}^3$ ,  $Z = 2$ ,  $D_{\text{calcd}} / \text{Mgm}^{-3} = 1.44$ , Independent reflections = 8960 [Rint=0.049], Data/restraints/Parameters = 8960/0/505, Absorption correction =  $1.845 \text{ mm}^{-1}$ ,  $R_1/wR_2$  (observed data:  $F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)$ ) = 0.0937/0.0810, CCDC 989087.

Density functional theory calculations were performed using the Gaussian 03 program<sup>92</sup> with the starting structures for **1** and **2** input through the builder program Arguslab and/or the crystal structure coordinates where appropriate. All calculations were carried out using the Becke's three parameter exchange functional with the Lee-Yang-Parr for the correlation functional (B3LYP),<sup>96</sup> and the Los Alamos National Laboratory basis sets, known as LANL2DZ (developed by Hay and Wadt),<sup>93-95</sup>

which comprises effective core potential (ECP) + double zeta for copper, and the all-electron valence double zeta basis sets developed by Dunning (D95V) for light atoms.<sup>107</sup> Vibrational frequency calculations were carried out to ensure that optimised geometries were minima on the potential energy surface. Solvent effects were included via the self-consistent reaction field (SCRF) method using the polarised continuum model (PCM),<sup>108</sup> with slight modifications to the default cavity parameters to aid convergence. Time-dependent density functional theory (TDDFT) calculations were performed in an ethanol polarisable continuum model, with the first 70 singlet transitions calculated. Starting structures for the singlet and triplet states of **1** and **2** were input through the builder program ArgusLab.

## Associated Content

**Supporting Information.** Results of DFT and TDDFT calculations. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

## References

1. Yersin, H. (Ed.) *Highly Efficient OLEDs with Phosphorescent Materials*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, Germany, 2008.
2. Brütting, W.; Adachi, C. (Eds.) *Physics of Organic Semiconductors*, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, Germany, 2012.
3. Gao, F. G.; Bard, A. J.; *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **2000**, *122*, 7426-7427.
4. Kim, S. Y.; Baik, J. M.; Yu, H. K.; Lee, J-L. *J. Appl. Phys.*, **2005**, *98*, 093707-093707.
5. Cheng, G.; Chow, P-K.; Kui, S. C. F.; Kwok C-C.; Che, C-M. *Adv. Mater.*, **2013**, *25*, 6765-6770.

6. Xiao, L.; Chen, Z.; Qu, B.; Luo, J.; Kong, S.; Gong G.; Kido, J. *Adv. Mater.* **2011**, *23*, 926-952.
7. Pei, Q.; Yu, G.; Zhang, C.; Yang, Y.; Heeger, A. J. *Science*, **1995**, *269*, 1086-1088.
8. Pei, Q.; Yang, Y.; Yu, G.; Zhang, C.; Heeger, A. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **1996**, *118*, 3922-3929.
9. Slinker, J. D.; DeFranco, J. A.; Jaquith, M. J.; Silveira, W. R.; Zhong, Y-W.; Moran-Mirabal, J. M.; Craighead, H. G.; Abruna, H. D.; Marohn, J. A.; Malliaras, G. G. *Nature Mater.*, **2007**, *6*, 894-899.
10. Wang, X-D.; Wolfbeis, O. S.; Meier, R. J. *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, **2013**, *42*, 7834-7869
11. Karakus, C.; Fischer, L. H.; Schmeding, S.; Hummel, J.; Risch, N.; Schäferling, M.; Holder, E. *Dalton Trans*, **2012**, *41*, 9623
12. Mak, C. S. K.; Pentlechner, D.; Stich, M.; Wolfbeis, O. S.; Chan, W. K.; Yersin, H. *Chem. Mater.* **2009**, *21*, 2173-2175.
13. O'Regan, B.; Grätzel, M. *Nature*, **1991**, *353*, 737-740.
14. Nazeeruddin, M. K. *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, **2004**, *248*, 1161-1164.
15. Robertson, N. *ChemSusChem*, **2008**, *1*, 977-979.
16. Alonso-Vante, N.; Nierengarten, J.-F.; Sauvage, J.-P. *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.*, **1994**, 1649-1654.
17. Sakaki, S.; Kuroki, T.; Hamada, T. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, **2002**, 840-842.
18. Bessho, T.; Constable, E. C.; Graetzel, M.; Redondo, A. H.; Housecroft, C. E.; Kylberg, W.; Nazeeruddin, M. K.; Neuburger, M.; Schaffner, S. *Chem. Commun.*, **2008**, 3717-3719.
19. Constable, E. C.; Redondo, A. H.; Housecroft, C. E.; Neuburger, M.; Schaffner, S. *Dalton Trans.*, **2009**, *39*, 6634-6644.
20. Bozic-Weber, B.; Constable, E. C.; Housecroft, C. E.; Neuburger, M.; Price, J. R. *Dalton Trans.*, **2010**, *39*, 3585-3594.
21. Bozic-Weber, B.; Constable, E. C.; Housecroft, C. E.; Kopecky, P.; Neuburger, M.; Zampese, J. A. *Dalton Trans.*, **2011**, *40*, 12584-12594.
22. Bozic-Weber, B.; Chaurin, V.; Constable, E. C.; Housecroft, C. E.; Meuwly, M.; Neuburger, M.; Rudd, J. A.; Schönhofner, E.; Siegfried, L. *Dalton Trans.*, **2012**, *41*, 14157-14169.
23. Yuan, Y-J.; Yu, Z-T.; Zhang, J-Y.; Zou, Z-G. *Dalton Trans.*, **2012**, *41*, 9594-9597.
24. Bozic-Weber, B.; Brauchli, S. J.; Constable, E. C.; Fürer, S. O.; Housecroft, C. E.; Malzner, F. J.; Wright, I. A.; Zampese, J. A. *Dalton Trans.*, **2013**, *42*, 12293
25. Sandroni, M.; Kayanuma, M.; Planchat, A.; Szuwarski, N.; Blart, E.; Pellegrin, Y.; Daniel, C.; Boujtita, M.; Odobel, F. *Dalton Trans.*, **2013**, *42*, 10818
26. Bozic-Weber, B.; Constable, E. C.; Housecroft, C. E. *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, **2013**, *257*, 3089
27. Hewat, T. E.; Yellowlees, L. J.; Robertson, N. *Dalton Trans.*, **2014**, *43*, 4127
28. Vos, J. G.; Kelly, J. M. *Dalton Trans.*, **2006**, *36*, 4869-4883.
29. Nazeeruddin, M. K.; Kay, A.; Rodicio, I.; Humphry-Baker, R.; Mueller, E.; Liska, P.; Vlachopoulos, N.; Grätzel, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **1993**, *115*, 6382-6390.
30. Meyer, T. *Pure, Appl. Chem.*, **1986**, *58*, 1193-1206.
31. Juris, A.; Balzani, V.; Barigelletti, F.; Campagna, S.; Belser, P.; von Zelewsky, A. *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, **1988**, *84*, 85-277.
32. Yersin H.; Humbs W.; Strasser J. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1997**, *159*, 325
33. Michael, S. L.; Stefan, B. *Chem. Eur. J.*, **2006**, *12*, 7970-7977.
34. Chou, P-T.; Chi, Y. *Chem. Eur. J.*, **2007**, *13*, 380-395.
35. Hofbeck, T.; Yersin, H. *Inorg. Chem.*, **2010**, *49*, 9290-9299.
36. Rausch, A. F.; Thompson, M. E.; Yersin, H. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, **2009**, *113*, 5927-5932.

37. Yersin, H.; Rausch, A. F.; Czerwieniec, R.; Hofbeck, T.; Fischer, T. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2011**, *255*, 2622-2652.
38. Williams, J. A. G. *Topics in Current Chemistry*, **2007**, *281*, 205-268.
39. Che, C-M.; Kwok, C-C.; Lai, S-W.; Rausch, A. F.; Finkenzeller, W. J.; Zhu, N.; Yersin, H. *Chem. Eur. J.*, **2010**, *16*, 233-247.
40. Williams, J. A. G.; Develay, S.; Rochester, D. L.; Murphy, L. *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, **2008**, *252*, 2596-2611.
41. Bossi, A.; Rausch, A. F.; Leitzl, M. J.; Czerwieniec, R.; Whited, M. T.; Djurovich, P. I.; Yersin, H.; Thompson, M. E. *Inorg. Chem.*, **2013**, *52*, 12403-12415.
42. Culham, S.; Lanoë, P-H.; Whittle, V. L.; Durrant, M. C.; Williams, J. A. G.; Kozhevnikov, V. N. *Inorg. Chem.*, **2013**, *52*, 10992-11003.
43. Blaskie, M. W.; McMillin, D. R. *Inorg. Chem.*, **1980**, *19*, 3519-3522.
44. Palmer, C. E. A.; McMillin, D. R. *Inorg. Chem.*, **1987**, *26*, 3837-3840.
45. Kirchhoff, J. R.; McMillin, D. R.; Robinson, W. R.; Powell, D. R.; McKenzie, A. T.; Chen, S. *Inorg. Chem.* **1985**, *24*, 3928-3933.
46. Blasse, G.; McMillin, D. R. *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, **1980**, *70*, 1-3.
47. Gushurst, A. K. I.; McMillin, D. R.; Dietrich-Buchecker, C. O.; Sauvage, J. P. *Inorg. Chem.*, **1989**, *28*, 4070-4072.
48. Leitzl, M. J.; Kühle, F. R.; Mayer, H. A.; Wesemann, L.; Yersin, H. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2013**, *117*, 11823-11836.
49. Czerwieniec, R.; Yu, J.; Yersin, H. *Inorg. Chem.* **2011**, *50*, 8293-8301.
50. Zink, D. M.; Bächle, M.; Baumann, T.; Nieger, M.; Kuhn, M.; Wang, C.; Kloppe, W.; Monkowius, U.; Hofbeck, T.; Yersin, H.; Bräse, S. *Inorg. Chem.* **2013**, *52*, 2292-305.
51. Czerwieniec, R.; Kowalski, K.; Yersin, H. *Dalton Trans.*, **2013**, *42*, 9826.
52. Armaroli, N., *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2001**, *30*, 113-124.
53. Costa, R. D.; Tordera, D.; Orti, E.; Bolink, H. J.; Schönle, J.; Graber, S.; Housecroft, C. E.; Constable, E. C.; Zampese, J. A. *J. Mater. Chem.*, **2011**, *21*, 16108.
54. Tsuboyama, A.; Kuge, K.; Furugori, M.; Okada, S.; Hoshino, M.; Ueno, K. *Inorg. Chem.* **2007**, *46*, 1992-2001.
55. Igawa, S.; Hashimoto, M.; Kawata, I.; Yashima, M.; Hoshino, M.; Osawa, M. *J. Mater. Chem. C* **2013**, *1*, 542-551.
56. Deaton, J. C.; Switalski, S. C.; Kondakov, D. Y.; Young, R. H.; Pawlik, T. D.; Giesen, D. J.; Harkins, S. B.; Miller, A. J. M.; Mickenberg, S. F.; Peters, J. C. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 9499-9508.
57. Osawa, M. *Chem. Commun.*, **2014**, *50*, 1801-1803.
58. Krylova, V. A.; Djurovich, P. I.; Aronson, J. W.; Haiges, R.; Whited, M. T.; Thompson, M. E. *Organometallics* **2012**, *31*, 7983-7993.
59. Krylova, V. A.; Djurovich, P. I.; Whited, M. T.; Thompson, M. E. *Chem. Commun.* **2010**, *46*, 6696-6698.
60. Miller, A. J. M.; Dempsey, J. L.; Peters, J. C. *Inorg. Chem.* **2007**, *46*, 7244-7246.
61. Armaroli, N.; Accorsi, G.; Cardinali, F.; Listorti, A. *Top. Curr. Chem.*, **2007**, *280*, 69-115.
62. Everly, R. M.; McMillin, D. R. *J. Phys. Chem.*, **1991**, *95*, 9071-9075.
63. Vorontsov, I. I.; Graber, T.; Kovalevsky, A. Y.; Novozhilova, I. V.; Gembicky, M.; Chen, Y.-S.; Coppens, P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2009**, *131*, 6566-6573.
64. Coppens, P.; Sokolow, J.; Trzop, E.; Makal, A.; Chen, Y. *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2013**, *4*, 579-582.
65. Yersin, H.; Rausch, A. F.; Czerwieniec, R. in: Ref 2, p. 371.

66. Williams, R. M.; De Cola, L.; Hartl, F.; Lagref, J-F.; Planeix, J-M.; Cian, A. D.; Hosseini, M. W. *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, **2002**, *230*, 253-261.
67. Pallenberg, A. J.; Koenig, K. S.; Barnhart, D. M. *Inorg. Chem.*, **1995**, *34*, 2833-2840.
68. Ruthkosky, M.; Kelly, C. A.; Castellano, F. N.; Meyer, G. J. *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, **1998**, *171*, 309-322.
69. Miller, M. T.; Gantzel, P. K.; Karpishin, T. B. *Inorg. Chem.*, **1998**, *37*, 2285-2290.
70. Miller, M. T.; Gantzel, P. K.; Karpishin, T. B. *Inorg. Chem.*, **1999**, *38*, 3414-3422.
71. Siddique, Z. A.; Yamamoto, Y.; Ohno, T.; Nozaki, K. *Inorg. Chem.*, **2003**, *42*, 6366-6378.
72. Iwamura, M.; Takeuchi, S.; Tahara, T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **2007**, *129*, 5248-5256.
73. Leydet, Y.; Bassani, D. M.; Jonusauskas, G.; McClenaghan, N. D. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **2007**, *129*, 8688-8689.
74. Green, O.; Gandhi, B. A.; Burstyn, J. N. *Inorg. Chem.*, **2009**, *48*, 5704-5714.
75. Che, G.; Su, Z.; Li, W.; Chu, B.; Li, M.; Hu, Z.; Zhang, Z. *Appl. Phys. Lett.*, **2006**, *89*, 103511-103513.
76. Andrés-Tomé, I.; Fyson, J.; Baiao Dias, F.; Monkman, A. P.; Iacobellis, G.; Coppo, P. *Dalton Trans.*, **2012**, *41*, 8669
77. Cuttell, D. G.; Kuang, S-M.; Fanwick, P. E.; McMillin, D. R.; Walton, R. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, **2001**, *124*, 6-7.
78. Kuang, S-M.; Cuttell, D. G.; McMillin, D. R.; Fanwick, P. E.; Walton, R. A. *Inorg. Chem.*, **2002**, *41*, 3313-3322.
79. Zhang, Q.; Zhou, Q.; Cheng, Y.; Wang, L.; Ma, D.; Jing, X.; Wang, F. *Adv. Mater.*, **2004**, *16*, 432-436.
80. Armaroli, N.; Accorsi, G.; Holler, M.; Moudam, O.; Nierengarten, J. F.; Zhou, Z.; Wegh, R. T.; Welter, R. *Adv. Mater.*, **2006**, *18*, 1313-1316.
81. Armaroli, N.; Accorsi, G.; Bergamini, G.; Ceroni, P.; Holler, M.; Moudam, O.; Duhayon, C.; Delavaux-Nicot, B.; Nierengarten, J. F. *Inorg. Chimica Acta*, **2007**, *360*, 1032-1042.
82. Xia, H.; He, L.; Zhang, M.; Zeng, M.; Wang, X.; Lu, D.; Ma, Y. *Optical Materials*, **2007**, *29*, 667-671.
83. Yang, L.; Feng, J-K.; Ren, A-M.; Zhang, M.; Ma, Y-G.; Liu, X-D. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.*, **2005**, 1867-1879.
84. Zhang, L.; Li, B.; Su, Z. *Langmuir*, **2009**, *25*, 2068-2074.
85. Linfoot, C. L.; Richardson, P.; Hewat, T. E.; Moudam, O.; Forde, M. M.; Collins, A.; White, F.; Robertson, N. *Dalton Trans.*, **2010**, *39*, 8945.
86. McCormick, T.; Jia, W-L.; Wang, S. *Inorg. Chem.*, **2005**, *45*, 147-155.
87. Moudam, O.; Kaeser, A.; Delavaux-Nicot, B.; Duhayon, C.; Holler, M.; Accorsi, G.; Armaroli, N.; S'eguy, I.; Navarro, J.; Destruel, P.; Nierengarten, J. F. *Chem. Commun.*, **2007**, 3077
88. Sun, W.; Zhang, Q.; Qin, L.; Cheng, Y.; Xie, Z.; Lu, C.; Wang, L. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.*, **2010**, 4009-4017
89. Macrae, C. F.; Edgington, P. R.; McCabe, P.; Pidcock, E.; Shields, G. P.; Taylor, R.; Towler, M.; van de Streek, J. *J. Appl. Cryst.*, **2006**, *39*, 453-457.
90. Volz, D.; Nieger, M.; Friedrichs, J.; Baumann, T.; Brase, S. *Langmuir* **2013**, *29*, 3034-44.
91. Turro, N. J. *Modern Molecular Chemistry*. Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company, Inc. : Menlo Park, 1978.
92. Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Montgomery, J. A.; Vreven, J. T.; Kudin, K. N.; Burant, J. C.; Millam, J. M.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Cossi, M.;

- Scalmani, G.; Rega, N.; Petersson, G. A.; Nakatsuji, H.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Klene, M.; Li, X.; Knox, J. E.; Hratchian, H. P.; Cross, J. B.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, A. J.; Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, J. W.; Ayala, P. Y.; Morokuma, K.; Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, A. D.; Strain, M. C.; Farkas, O.; Malick, D. K.; Rabuck, A. D.; Raghavachari, K.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.; Cui, Q.; Baboul, A. G.; Clifford, S.; Cioslowski, J.; Stefanov, B. B.; Liu, G.; Liashenko, A.; Piskorz, P.; Komaromi, I.; Martin, R. L.; Fox, D. J.; Keith, T.; Al-Laham, M. A.; Peng, C. Y.; Nanayakkara, A.; Challacombe, M.; Gill, P. M. W.; Johnson, B.; Chen, W.; Wong, M. W.; Gonzalez, C.; Pople, J. A. *Gaussian 03*, Revision E.01; Wallingford CT, 2004.
93. Wadt, W. R.; Hay, P. J. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **1985**, *82*, 284-298.
  94. Wadt, W. R.; Hay, P. J. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **1985**, *82*, 270-283.
  95. Wadt, W. R.; Hay, P. J. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **1985**, *82*, 299-310.
  96. Becke, A. D. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **1993**, *98*, 5648-5652.
  97. McCall, K. L.; Jennings, J. R.; Wang, H.; Morandeira, A.; Peter, L. M.; Durrant, J. R.; Yellowlees, L. J.; Woollins, J. D.; Robertson, N. *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chemistry*, **2009**, *202*, 196-204.
  98. Thompson, M. A. <http://www.arguslab.com>.
  99. *Inorganic Chemistry 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*, C. E. Housecroft, A. G. Sharpe, Pearson Education Limited, England 2012
  100. Brown, T. L.; Lee, K. J. *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, **1993**, *128*, 89
  101. Zink, D. M.; Volz, D.; Baumann, T.; Mydlak, M.; Flügge, H.; Friedrichs, J.; Nieger, M.; Bräse, S. *Chemistry of Materials* **2013**, *25*, 4471-4486
  102. Zhang, Q. S.; Li, B.; Huang, S. P.; Nomura, H.; Tanaka, H.; Adachi, C. *Nature Photonics* **2014**, *8*, 326-332.
  103. Uoyama, H.; Goushi, K.; Shizu, K.; Nomura, H.; Adachi, C. *Nature* **2012**, *492*, 234-238.
  104. Sheldrick, G. M. University of Gottingen, Germany.
  105. Sheldrick, G. *Acta Cryst. A*, **2008**, *64*, 112-122.
  106. Spek, A. *J. Appl. Cryst.* **2003**, *36*, 7-13; van der Sluis, P.; Spek, A. L.; *Acta Cryst.* **1990**, *A46*, 194-201
  107. Dunning, T. H.; Schaefer, H. F.; Hay, P. J. *Modern Theoretical Chemistry, Ed III*, Plenum, New York, 1976.
  108. Vleck Jr, A.; Zális, S. *Coord. Chem. Rev.*, **2007**, *251*, 258-287.