DOI:

Fluoride-Bridged {Gd^{III}₃M^{III}₂} (M = Cr, Fe, Ga) Molecular Coolers**

Kasper S. Pedersen, Giulia Lorusso, Juan José Morales, Thomas Weyhermüller, Stergios Piligkos, Saurabh Kumar Singh, Dennis Larsen, Magnus Schau-Magnussen, Gopalan Rajaraman, Marco Evangelisti, * Jesper Bendix*

Paramagnetic molecules with large spin and negligible magnetic anisotropy have received immense interests in the last few years due to the demonstration of large magneto-caloric effects (MCE).¹ The effect is inherently related to the magnetic entropy increase at low temperatures, which follows an adiabatic demagnetization. Particularly, it is of interest to link the magnetic centers, and shield them magnetically from adjacent molecules, by lightweight ligands to furnish high magnetic density coolers. For an exchange-coupled polynuclear complex, if only the ground spin manifold, S_T, is considered, the magnetic entropy is given by $S_m = R \ln(2S_T + 1)$. The type and strength of the magnetic interactions determine the way in which the entropy is gradually released with decreasing temperature, which occurs more abruptly in the temperature range where the interactions are important.^{1a, 2} Ultimately, on increasing the field change, ΔB , the change of entropy, $-\Delta S_m$, reaches its maximum value, corresponding to the full entropy content of the system, viz., the entropy sum over all single-ion spins, S_i , i.e., $R \sum_i \ln(2S_i + 1)$. Conclusively, it seems promising to combine Gd^{III} ($S_{Gd} = 7/2$) with "magnetically isotropic" transition metal ions as Cr^{III} ($S_{Cr} = 3/2$) or high-spin Fe^{III} ($S_{Fe} = 5/2$), preferably connected by weak *intra*molecular ferromagnetic interactions. Recently, Winpenny and co-

[*] K. S. Pedersen, Dr. S. Piligkos, D. Larsen, M. Schau-Magnussen, Prof. Dr. J. Bendix Department of Chemistry University of Copenhagen Universitetsparken 5, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark Fax: (+45) 35 32 02 14 E-mail: bendix@kiku.dk (J.B.)

Dr. G. Lorusso, J. J. Morales, Dr. M. Evangelisti Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales de Aragón, Departamento de Física de la Materia Condensada, CSIC-Universidad de Zaragoza, 50009 Zaragoza, Spain E-mail: evange@unizar.es (M.E.)

Dr. T. Weyhermüller Max Planck Institute for Chemical Energy Conversion Mülheim an der Ruhr, Germany

S. K. Singh, Dr. G. Rajaraman Department of Chemistry, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Powai, Mumbai, India

[**] K.S.P. and S.P. thank the Danish Ministry of Science Innovation and Higher Education for an EliteForsk travel grant and a Sapere Aude Fellowship (10-081659), respectively. G.L., J.J.M. and M.E. acknowledge financial support by the Spanish MINECO through grant MAT2012-38318-C03-01. G.L. is also grateful to EC for a Marie Curie-IEF (PIEF-GA-2011-299356). G.R would like to thank DST, India (SR/S1/IC-41/2010; SR/NM/NS-1119/2011) for funding and IITB for HPC resources. workers, ³ and we, ⁴ reported the first examples of polynuclear complexes incorporating fluoride-bridged $\{Cr^{III}-F-Ln^{III}\}$ units. These systems owe their existence to the robust character of Cr^{III} (d³) complexes by avoiding precipitation of insoluble LnF₃.⁵ Unfortunately, this fact imposes strong limitations on the chemistry that can be exploited and we herein demonstrate that fluoridebridged 3d-4f polynuclear complexes can indeed also be prepared from labile transition metal fluoride complexes. As we recently communicated, the reaction of fac-[CrF₃(Me₃tacn)]·4H₂O (Me₃tacn = N, N', N''-trimethyl-1,4,7-triazacyclononane) with Nd(NO₃)₃·6H₂O yields a fluoride-bridged {Nd₃Cr₂} trigonal bipyramid (TBP). Performing the same reaction employing Gd(NO₃)₃·5H₂O affords closely related $[{CrF_3(Me_3tacn)}_2Gd_3F_2(NO_3)_7(H_2O)$ the (CH₃CN)]·4CH₃CN (1) which can be considered as a lightweight analog of the [{CrF₃(Me₃tame)}₂Gd₃F₃(hfac)₆]·7CH₃CN (Me₃tame = 1,1,1-tris{(methylamino)methyl}ethane, hfacH = 1,1,1,5,5,5hexafluoro-acetylacetone) TBP-shaped pentanuclear system that exhibits good cooling properties. Although this result is unsurprising, the analogous reaction with novel fac-[FeF3(Me3tacn)]·H2O and fac-[GaF3(Me3tacn)]·4H2O, conveniently synthesized from FeF3 and GaF3·3H2O, respectively, yield isostructural ${MF_3(Me_3tacn)}_2Gd_3F_2(NO_3)_7(H_2O)(CH_3CN)]$. 4CH₃CN (M = Fe (2), Ga (3); cf. Figure 1) without any signs of GdF3 formation. Notably, the presence of any hydroxide bridging can be safely ruled out based on electrospray mass spectra (Figures S4-6).



Figure 1. Structure of **2** shown in perspective (left) and along the Fe…Fe direction (right). Color codes: Gd, purple; Fe, orange; F, green; O, red; N, blue; C, grey. For clarity, CH₃CN molecules and the auxiliary Gd ligand sphere is shown as wireframe.

The capping *fac*-[FeF₃(Me₃tacn)] units (\angle Gd–F–Fe = 137.1(1)°– 143.1(1)°) impose an approximately isosceles {Gd₃} triangle. Herein, two edges consist of η^1 : η^2 : μ_2 -bridging nitrate ions and one edge consists of a μ_2 -fluoride (cf. Figure 1). Additionally, the center furnishes a single μ_3 -fluoride bridge close to the {Gd₃} plane with Gd–(μ_3 -F)–Gd angles of 110.43(11)°, 124.64(12)° and 124.93(11)°. Compounds **2** and **3** add to the tiny family of fourth row/transition element-lanthanide, fluoride-bridged systems which, in addition to the Cr^{III} systems,^{3,4} only encompasses [La{(C₅Me₄Et)₂Ti₂F₇] and $[Ln{(C_5Me_5)_2Ti_2F_7}_3]$ (Ln = Pr, Nd).⁶ These latter systems, however, rely on the pronounced "hard" metal ions Ti^{IV} and Ln^{III}, which compete efficiently for fluoride-abstraction. Neither Fe^{III} nor Ga^{III} are as "hard" as Ti^{IV} or kinetically robust as Cr^{III}, but, surprisingly, exhibit similar reactivity towards Gd^{III}. The lightweight structures and the larger spin possessed by high-spin Fe^{III} over Cr^{III}, fuelled our curiosity whether improved molecular coolers could result. The magnetic data for the isolated fac-[CrF₃(Me₃tacn)]·4H₂O and fac-[FeF3(Me3tacn)]·H2O complexes are shown in the Supporting Information (Figure S7-8). As expected, the magnetic data are largely reminiscent of a Curie behaviour with temperatureindependent χT products approaching the values expected for S_{Cr} = 3/2 and $S_{\rm Fe} = 5/2$, with a g-factor of $g \approx 2$. The temperature dependence of the magnetic susceptibility for 1, 2 and 3 is shown in Figure 2 in the form of χT products. The field dependence of the magnetizations is given in Figure 2 (inset) and Figures S9-11. The high-temperature values of the χT products (1: 27.3 cm³ mol⁻¹ K, 2: 33.3 cm³ mol⁻¹ K and 3: 23.6 cm³ mol⁻¹ K) are in good agreement with the values expected for the spin-only contributions from the uncorrelated ions. On cooling, all χT products increase to reach 36.6, 96.1 and 28.5 cm^3 mol⁻¹ K for 1, 2 and 3, respectively. This behavior suggests the presence of intra-complex ferromagnetic interactions for all compounds. The magnetic data were fitted by use of the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm ⁷ and by numerical diagonalization of the matrix representation of the isotropic spin-Hamiltonian (1):

$$\hat{H} = g\mu_{\rm B} \mathbf{B} \cdot \sum_{i} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i} + J_{ij} \sum_{i,j > i} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{i} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{j}$$
(1)

where the indices *i* and *j* run through the constitutive single-ions of each compound, *g* is the single-ion *g*-factor, fixed to 2.0 for all ions, $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ is a spin-operator and J_{ij} is the isotropic exchange coupling parameter between the *i*th and *j*th centres. For 1 and 2, the χT product and the low temperature variable field magnetization (*M* vs. *H*) data can be fitted using just two parameters, namely: J_{M-Gd} and J_{Gd-Gd} , while fitting the χT data against spin-Hamiltonian (1) results in strongly correlated parameters. The modeling of the magnetic data of 3 affords a good estimation of the Gd–Gd exchange interaction void of complicating, additional interactions. Simultaneous fitting of the χT product and the *M* vs. *H* data yields $J_{Gd-Gd} = -0.028$ cm⁻¹. The best-fit curves are shown as solid lines in Figure 2 and in the SI.



Figure 2. Temperature dependence of the χT product ($\chi \equiv M/H$, H = 1000 Oe) of **1–3**. The solid, red lines are best-fits as described in the text. Insert: Reduced magnetization and best-fits for **1–3** at selected low temperatures.

The data of 1 and 2 were fitted with only J_{M-Gd} as free parameter assuming transferability of J_{Gd-Gd} from 3 to 1 and 2. For 1, this

yielded $J_{\text{Cr-Gd}} = -0.046 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and -0.036 cm^{-1} as obtained from the χT product and magnetization data, respectively. Analogously, for **2**, the best-fit $J_{\text{Fe-Gd}}$ parameter values were -0.25 cm^{-1} (from χT) and -0.26 cm^{-1} (from *M* vs. *H*).

In previous studies,⁸ we have established a magneto-structural correlation of the J_{Cr-Gd} parameter as function of the Cr–F–Gd bridging angle. The average Cr–F–Gd bridging angle of 141.5° in 1, should according to this correlation result in a very small positive J_{Cr-Gd} . This is in reasonable agreement with the vanishing best-fit J_{Cr-Gd} parameter value. To gain insight in the magnitude and sign of the Fe^{III}–F–Gd^{III} interaction, DFT calculations employing the experimental geometry were undertaken. The resulting parameter values are; $J_{Fe-Gd} = -0.35$ cm⁻¹ and $J_{Gd-Gd} = -0.02$ cm⁻¹, also in good agreement with the experimental findings and previous theoretical studies.⁹



Figure 3. DFT-computed spin densities (left) for complex **2** drawn with isosurface value of 0.003 a_0^{-3} (a_0 = Bohr length) and DFT-based magneto-structural correlations (right) developed for the model complex described in the text.

Further, we performed calculations on the dinuclear model $[Fe^{III}F_2(py)_4Gd^{III}(hfac)_4]$ (py = pyridine) to develop a magnetostructural model for the Fe^{III}-F-Gd^{III} unit mimicking our approach for the Cr^{III} analog.⁸ This simple approach is justified by the equality of the average Fe-F (1.91 Å) and Cr-F (1.91 Å) bond distances in 1 and 2. DFT calculations yield a ferromagnetic coupling (J = -1.1)cm⁻¹) for the dinuclear model in contrast to the Cr^{III} analog where an antiferromagnetic coupling was calculated. As discussed by Ruiz and co-workers, the interaction of the 3d orbitals of transition metals with the 5d orbitals of Gd^{III} plays a key role in controlling the sign of the magnetic interaction. ¹⁰ Previously, we established the mechanism of magnetic coupling for generic 3d-Gd^{III} pairs where the crucial role of empty 5d orbitals of Gd^{III} was illustrated.¹¹ Specifically, the occupation of 5d orbitals is linked to the sign of the coupling constant, with larger occupation leading to more ferromagnetic interaction, in structurally related compounds.^{11b} For Cr^{III} , with $(t_{2g})^3$ configuration, interaction with Gd^{III} 5d orbitals is relatively smaller as compared to Fe^{III} where the e_g orbitals promote stronger delocalization and interaction with the Gd^{III} 5d orbitals. The differential occupancy is evident also from the NBO calculations (see SI for details). The overlap between 3d and 4f orbitals, which generally contributes to antiferromagnetic coupling, is also detected to be significantly less for the Fe^{III}-Gd^{III} pair compared to Cr^{III}-Gd^{III} analogues (cf. SI, Table S3). The angular dependence of J_{Fe-Gd} in {Fe^{III}-F-Gd^{III}} (cf. Figure 3 (b)) shows the magnitude of the ferromagnetic $J_{\text{Fe-Gd}}$ to increase with the bridging angle, while for {Cr^{III}-F-Gd^{III}} an opposite trend was established.⁸ As the angle increases, the interaction of the $Fe^{III}\,d_{z^2}$ orbital with Gd^{III} 5d orbitals is expected to be large, leading to stronger ferromagnetic coupling for the Fe^{III}–Gd^{III} pair. For the Cr^{III}–Gd^{III} pair at larger angles, the spin-bearing orbitals of Cr^{III} and the Gd^{III} d-orbitals become orthogonal leading to a decrease in the interaction and less (more) ferromagnetic (antiferromagnetic) coupling. The spin density (cf. Figure 3 (a)) analysis reflects the points discussed where Cr^{III} has gained spin density while there is significant reduction on the Fe^{III} (3.09 vs. 4.28 for Cr^{III} and Fe^{III} respectively). This suggests a spin-polarization mechanism for the Cr^{III}–Gd^{III} unit and both spin-polarization and a delocalization mechanism operational for Fe^{III}–Gd^{III}. This is visually, directly observable in the significant departure from spherical shape of the spin-density distribution around Fe^{III}.



Figure 4. Magnetic entropy changes, $-\Delta S_m$, corresponding to the labeled magnetic field changes, ΔB , for **1** (top) and **2** (bottom), as obtained from specific heat, *C*, and magnetization, *M*, data. Cf. Figure S15 for a zoom of the low-temperature region.

The different magnitude of J_{Cr-Gd} and J_{Fe-Gd} is also evidenced in the experimental specific heat of 1 and 2, respectively, depicted in Figure S12 together with the calculated Schottky anomalies for the paramagnetic ions at the corresponding fields (solid lines). Indeed, while for 1 the intra-molecular magnetic interactions are already decoupled for fields larger than ~1 T, for 2, fields larger than ~7 T are necessary. A prominent feature in 2 is the kink at $T_c = 0.65$ K that we ascribe to a magnetic phase transition, driven by dipolar interactions. We notice that the magnetic entropy at T_c amounts to about $\sim 3.2 k_B$ per molecular spin (Figure S12), which is close to the value corresponding to the highest possible spin per molecule obtained in case of ferromagnetic alignment, i.e., $k_{\rm B} \ln(2S_{\rm T} + 1) =$ 3.47 k_B, where $S_T = 3S_{Gd} + 2S_{Fe} = 31/2$. Thus, we conjecture that the phase transition takes place concomitantly with the establishment of *intra*-molecular alignment of spins. Indeed, T_c is of the same order as the dipolar interaction energy between nearest-neighbor $S_{\rm T} = 31/2$ molecules, i.e., $\mu^2/r^3 \approx 0.3$ K, where $r \approx 12$ Å is the *inter*-molecular distance. Contrary, J_{Cr-Gd} in 1 is not sufficiently strong to compete with thermal fluctuations. Thus, neither an intra-molecular ordering nor a phase transition is observed for 1.

The MCE is evaluated by obtaining the isothermal magnetic entropy changes $-\Delta S_m$ from the entropy data. We also use the magnetization data (Figures S9-12) for the same purpose by means of the Maxwell relation $\Delta S_m(T) = \int [\partial M(T,B)/\partial T]_B \, dB$. From Figure 4, we report that the maximum $-\Delta S_m$ values for the largest ΔB (from

7 T to 0 T) are 38.3 J kg⁻¹ K⁻¹ (T = 2.0 K) and 33.1 J kg⁻¹ K⁻¹ (T = 4.2 K) for **1** and **2**, respectively. The maximum entropy value involved, corresponding to $3S_{Gd}$ and $2S_{Cr}$ (S_{Fe}) is calculated as 43.4 (47.1) J kg⁻¹ K⁻¹ for **1** (**2**). Therefore, for ΔB larger than the field needed to fully overwhelm the magnetic interactions involved, a larger $-\Delta S_m$ should occur in **2** rather than **1**. Otherwise, one would expect a larger $-\Delta S_m$ in the case of weaker magnetic correlations, as experimentally observed for $\Delta B \leq 7$ T. Indeed, a weaker coupling promotes a relatively larger number of low-lying excited spin states, thus favoring a larger field-dependence of the MCE. Finally, we point out that the experimental $-\Delta S_m$ of **1** is extremely large for a 3d-4f complex and comparable to the best magnetic molecular coolers at liquid-helium temperatures.¹²

In summary, a small family of unusual fourth-row metal ionlanthanide complexes with bridging fluoride ions is reported. The combination of lightweight auxiliary ligands and tunable interaction by choice of metal ion makes these systems interesting modules for low-temperature cooling applications.

Keywords: fluoride · magnetic refrigeration · lanthanides · magnetic properties · DFT

¹ a) M. Evangelisti, E. K. Brechin, *Dalton Trans.* **2010**, *39*, 4672; b) J. W. Sharples, D. Collison, *Polyhedron* **2013**, *54*, 91; c) M. Evangelisti in J. Bartolomé, F. Luis and J. F. Fernández (eds.), *Molecular Magnets*, NanoScience and Technology, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 365-387, (2014).

⁵ J. Dreiser, K. S. Pedersen, T. Birk, M. Schau-Magnussen, C. Piamonteze, S. Rusponi, T. Weyhermüller, H. Brune, F. Nolting, J. Bendix, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2012**, *116*, 7842.

⁶ a) F. Perdih, A. Demsar, A. Pevec, S. Petricek, I. Leban, G. Giester, J. Sieler, H. W. Roesky, *Polyhedron* **2001**, *20*, 1967; b) A. Pevec, M. Mrak, A. Demsar, S. Petricek, H. W. Roesky, *Polyhedron* **2003**, *22*, 575.

⁷ W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky W. T. Vetterling, B. P. Flannery, **1992** Numerical Recipes in C: The Art of Scientific Computing, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2nd Ed.

⁸ S. K. Singh, K. S. Pedersen, M. Sigrist, C. Aa. Thuesen, M. Schau-Magnussen, S. Piligkos, H. Mutka, H. Weihe, G. Rajaraman, J. Bendix, *Chem. Commun.* **2013**, 49, 5583.

⁹ T. Rajeshkumar, S. K. Singh, G. Rajaraman, Polyhedron, 2013, 52, 1299.

¹⁰ E. Cremades, S. Gómez-Coca, D. Aravena, S. Alvarez, E. Ruiz, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 10532.

¹¹ a) S. K. Singh, N. K. Tibrewal, G. Rajaraman, *Dalton Trans.* 2011, 40, 10897; b) S. K. Singh, G. Rajaraman, *Dalton Trans.* 2013, 42, 3623; c) G. Rajaraman, F. Totti, A. Bencini, A. Caneschi, R. Sessoli, D. Gatteschi, *Dalton Trans.* 2009, 3153; d) J. Paulovic, F. Cimpoesu, M. Ferbinteanu, K. Hirao, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 3321; e) T. Rajeshkumar and G. Rajaraman, *Chem. Commun.* 2012, 48, 7856.

¹² a) M. Evangelisti, O. Roubeau, E. Palacios, A. Camón, T. N. Hooper, E. K. Brechin, J. J. Alonso, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2011**, *50*, 6606; b) Y.-Z. Zheng, E. M. Pineda, M. Helliwell, R. E. P. Winpenny, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2012**, *18*, 4161; c) Y.-Z. Zheng, M. Evangelisti, F. Tuna, R. E. P. Winpenny, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, 134, 1057; d) S. Langley, N. Chilton, B. Moubaraki, T. Hooper, E. K. Brechin, M. Evangelisti, K. S. Murray, *Chem. Sci.* **2011**, *2*, 1166; e) J. W. Sharples, Y.-Z. Zheng, F. Tuna, E. J. L. McInnes, *Chem.*

² M. Evangelisti, A. Candini, M. Affronte, E. Pasca, L. J. de Jongh, R. T. W. Scott, E. K. Brechin, *Phys. Rev. B* **2009**, *79*, 104414.

³ A. McRobbie, A. R. Sarwar, S. Yeninas, H. Nowell, M. L. Baker, D. Allan, M. Luban, C. A. Muryn, R. G. Pritchard, R. Prozorov, G. Timco, F. Tuna, G. F. S. Whitehead, R. E. P. Winpenny, *Chem. Commun.* **2011**, *47*, 6251.

⁴ a) J. Dreiser, K. S. Pedersen, C. Piamonteze, S. Rusponi, Z. Salman, Md. E. Ali, M. Schau-Magnussen, C. Aa. Thuesen, S. Piligkos, H. Weihe, H. Mutka, O. Waldmann, P. Oppeneer, J. Bendix, F. Nolting, H. Brune, *Chem. Sci.* **2012**, *3*, 1024; b) T. Birk, K. S. Pedersen, C. Aa. Thuesen, T. Weyhermüller, M. Schau-Magnussen, S. Piligkos, H. Weihe, S. Mossin, M. Evangelisti, J. Bendix, *Inorg. Chem.* **2012**, *51*, 5435; c) C. Aa. Thuesen, K. S. Pedersen, M. Schau-Magnussen, M. Evangelisti, J. Vibenholt, S. Piligkos, H. Weihe, J. Bendix, *Dalton Trans.* **2012**, *41*, 11284.

Commun. 2011, 47, 7650; f) J.-B. Peng, Q.-C. Zhang, X.-J. Kong, Y.-P. Ren, L.-S. Long, R.-B. Huang, L.-S. Zheng, Z. Zheng, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 10649; g) J.-B. Peng, Q.-C. Zhang, X.-J. Kong, Y.-Z. Zheng, Y.-P. Ren, L-S. Long, R.-B. Huang, L.-S. Zheng, Z. Zheng, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 3314; h) R. Sibille, T. Mazet, B. Malaman, M. François, Chem. Eur. J. 2012, 18, 12970; i) E. Colacio, J. Ruiz, G. Lorusso, E. K. Brechin, M. Evangelisti, Chem. Commun. 2013, 49, 3845; j) G. Lorusso, J. W. Sharples, E. Palacios, O. Roubeau, E. K. Brechin, R. Sessoli, A. Rossin, F. Tuna, E. J. L. McInnes, D. Collison, M. Evangelisti, Adv. Mater. 2013, doi: 10.1002/adma.201301997.