Neutral Ni(II) and Cu(II) complexes of tetraazatetraenemacrocycles
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ABSTRACT: A series of electron donors [neutral Ni(II) and Cu(II) complexes of tetraazatetraenemacrocyclic ligands] differing in metal ion, size of the macrocyclic ligand, and the length of the aliphatic bridges linking the macrocyclic units in dimeric species were synthesized and their redox, structural and spectroscopic properties were studied. The x-ray results for the donors under study show a nearly planar geometry of the monomeric tetraazamacrocyclic complexes and interesting ‘organic-zeolite-like’ structures of the dimers. The dimeric Ni complexes have flexible cavities between the two single ligands linked with aliphatic chains suitable for accommodating some small-sized guests. For the dimeric compounds the metal oxidation [M(II)/M(III)] takes place independently on each centre except one binuclear Ni complex, where the cooperativity of the metal centres was observed. Methyl substituents give rise to irreversibility of the oxidation process of the complexes studied. In the absence of these substituents neither reorganization nor ligand addition/elimination kinetics affect the electrode process. A common scale for the donors under study and some important acceptor compounds (p-benzoquinone, chloranil, tetracyanoethylene and tetracyanoquinodimethane, etc.) was proposed on the basis of their cyclic voltammetric behaviour in the same physicochemical conditions. Copyright © 2000 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
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INTRODUCTION

Metal ion complexes are well recognized as tunable materials owing to the dependence of their redox potential on the electronic/structural properties of ligands. The macrocyclic ligands also offer a versatile molecular scaffolding for the coordinated ions. The scaffolding provides its own structural rigidity/flexibility and may also protect (expose) the structure from (to) the environment. We describe here the synthesis and properties of a number of tetraazatetraenate Ni(II) and Cu(II) metal complexes (Fig. 1). These are either compounds synthesized for the first time (Fig. 1, Mn, where M stands for the metal ion and m = 14, 15, 16 denotes the number of atoms in the macrocyclic ring of the ligand) or described elsewhere [Fig. 1, (MnMe2-n)2, m = 15, 16, n = 4, 6].1

Compared with the compounds reported earlier by Jäger,2 Alcock et al.3 and Busch and co-workers,4,5 the monomeric donors studied in this work contain formyl instead of acetyl groups. Also, the monomers without methyl substituents were synthesized (Fig. 1, R = H). The compounds prepared constitute a logical series of species differing by one, two or three selected structural factors. These factors are the coordinated ion (M = Ni2+ or Cu2+), the size of the macrocyclic monomeric ligand (14-, 15- and 16-membered macrocycles), dimerization of two macrocyclic ligands (a comparison of monomers and dimers) and the length of the links connecting two monomeric moieties.

Our ultimate goal (beyond the scope of this paper) is to use the macrocyclic donors as substrates for larger dimeric/oligomeric units possessing some tailored cavities. Such a supramolecular structure may be held together by covalent, ionic or weak molecular interactions. We are interested not only in the monomeric donors but also in the dimeric ones, the latter with a variable number of the CH2 groups linking both macrocycles. The bridge length changes the cavity size, which is crucial for the future donor–acceptor interaction. Similar donors, lacunar complexes of Co(II) and Fe(II), have been used extensively as dioxygen carriers.6 When cavities and acceptors have appropriate size, hydrophobic/hydrophilic properties and charge distributions, then one may hope that each acceptor molecule would be
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docked between a pair of donors. This may result in a number of novel applications of such complex donor (D)–acceptor (A) systems, e.g. allowing charge transfer in several adjacent DA units or even generating electronic bistability. 6,7

The purpose of this study was to select the most promising DA pairs for such study applications, i.e. pairs with the smallest difference of the redox potentials. Therefore, p-benzoquinone (Q), chloranil (CA), tetracyanoethylene (TCNE) and tetracyanoquinodimethane (TCNQ) were proposed as acceptors and placed on a common redox potential scale. The abbreviations \((\text{Ni16Me}_2-4)_2\) and \((\text{Ni16Me}_2-6)_2\) represent the bismacro cyclic molecular dimers of \(\text{Ni16Me}\) bound by two four- and six-membered methyl units, respectively.

interactions are known as important factors in redox processes.\textsuperscript{8,9} Hence tuning of the redox potential differences is meaningful only when done in the same solvent, for both donors and acceptors. With this in mind we chose acetonitrile (AN), a solvent suitable for both polar and non-polar compounds and convenient for electrochemical studies owing to its high dielectric constant (\(\varepsilon = 36\)).

**EXPERIMENTAL AND COMPUTATIONAL PROCEDURE**

Details of syntheses, \textit{ab initio} calculations, x-ray diffraction crystallographic studies, Raman spectroscopy, UV–VIS, NMR, mass spectrometric and voltammetric measurements are given in the Supplementary Material.

Crystallographic data (excluding structural factors) for the structures reported in this paper have been deposited with the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre and allocated the deposition numbers CCDC 121699, CCDC 121700 and CCDC 121701 for \textit{Cu14}, \textit{Cu16} and \textit{Ni14}, respectively. Copies of the data can be obtained free of charge on application to CCDC (E-mail: deposit@ccdc.cam.ac.uk).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Geometric features**

The monomeric ligands studied in this work are neutral species composed of two strongly delocalized 7\(\pi\)-electron systems separated by aliphatic links and coupled by the bridging metal ion. This situation is often formally depicted as each of the two systems carrying \(-1e\) electric charge compensated by the \(+2e\) charge at the coordinated cation. Structural features of the ligands were studied in the solid state by x-ray crystallography and for the isolated molecules by \textit{ab initio} calculations. According to
our calculations (Restricted Open-Shell Hartree–Fock level, 6–31G* basis set\(^{10}\)) the charge distribution for the isolated moieties resembles only qualitatively the above picture. The Mulliken net charge on the metal atom is +1.48\(e\) and +1.62\(e\) instead of +2\(e\), and on the NC\(_3\)N fragments one has −1.14\(e\) and −1.20\(e\) instead of the formal −le charge for the Ni\(_{14}\) and Cu\(_{14}\), respectively. The calculations show that all the bonds are strongly polar with the largest polarization being at the complex centre, and the most negative net charges are carried by the four nitrogen atoms.

According to the x-ray results, the molecular structures of the monomeric Cu\(_{14}\), Ni\(_{14}\) and Cu\(_{16}\) complexes exhibit different degrees of planarity. Ni\(_{14}\) and Cu\(_{14}\) are almost square planar (Figs 2 and 3, Table 1), whereas Cu\(_{16}\) is significantly distorted from planarity. Some small differences among the Ni—N distances, and also among the Cu—N distances, are within the level of errors. From the crystallographic point of view, only the Ni\(_{14}\) molecule is a symmetric molecule in the crystal lattice with the nickel atom at the symmetry centre (\(C_i\) symmetry group). The \textit{ab initio} Hartree–Fock (6–31G basis set) geometry optimization gives also \(C_i\) symmetry for the isolated Ni\(_{14}\) molecule (for Cu\(_{14}\) the calculations

\[\text{Figure 3.} \] Illustration of the crystal packing and short contacts such as C—H⋯O and Me⋯O interactions (dotted lines) in (a) Cu\(_{14}\), (b) Ni\(_{14}\) and (c) Cu\(_{16}\). Zeolite-like structure of the bismacrocycles: (d) (Ni\(_{15}\)Me\(_2\)-4)\(_2\) with water molecules between the stacked column of the bismacrocycle and (e) (Ni\(_{16}\)Me\(_2\)-4)\(_2\) with disordered toluene molecules in the cavities of the bismacrocycles\(^1\)

give $C_2$ symmetry, with the symmetry axis going through the metal atom, M, and almost orthogonal to the best plane of the MN$_4$ system. The \textit{ab initio} calculations for Ni14 show that the Ni⋯N distances are very close to 1.92 Å and 1.87 Å at the Hartree–Fock and the density functional theory (DFT/B3LYP) levels, respectively. The consecutive N⋯Ni⋯N angles are 85.9, 94.1, 85.9 and 94.1° at the HF level and 86.2, 93.8, 86.2 and 93.8° at the DFT/B3LYP level. The M⋯N distances in Cu14 are slightly longer, 1.96 and 1.93 Å at the HF and DFT/B3LYP levels, respectively. The consecutive N–M–N angles in Cu14 are 85.7, 94.9, 85.7 and 94.9° at the HF level and 85.7, 94.7, 85.7 and 94.6° at the DFT/B3LYP level. The DFT/B3LYP results for the M⋯N distances agree to within 0.01 Å with the experimental values, much better than the Hartree–Fock results. The M⋯N bond lengthening (0.04 and 0.06 Å for HF and DFT/B3LYP, respectively) is consistent and larger than the difference of the Shannon’s ion radii (0.02 Å$^{11}$). The \textit{ab initio} Hartree–Fock geometry optimization for the isolated molecules (starting from the x-ray configuration) gives also the planar fragments, with a very small deviation of an atom represents the distance in Å of the corresponding atom from the best plane based on the nitrogen atoms.

The central MN$_4$ fragment exhibits a higher symmetry (close to $C_{2h}$) than that of the whole molecule. Since the deviation of the central MN$_4$ fragment from the square planar symmetry is fairly small for both Cu14 and Ni14, one may anticipate that the spectroscopic alternative rule will be approximately obeyed for some bands. The calculations give information about $\pi$-conjugation effects for Ni14 and Cu14. The C⋯C bonds in the $\pi$-electron region are almost equal to the characteristic bond length of 1.42 Å. The C⋯N bond lengths are close to about 1.30 Å for all the C$_{ar}$⋯N bonds and to 1.42–1.46 Å for all the C$_{alph}$⋯N bonds. The equality of the C$_{ar}$⋯N bond lengths suggests that the $\pi$-conjugation is extended over the region between the two nitrogen atoms, although the bond length is only slightly larger than that typical for the CN double bond (1.28 Å). In agreement with this, the C$_{alph}$⋯N bond length is close to a typical single C⋯N bond length (1.47 Å). The formyl groups in Ni14, Cu14 and Cu16 participate in the $\pi$-conjugated system. The x-ray diffraction data confirm their near-coplanarity with the central $\pi$-electron part, especially for the 14-membered macrocycles. Indeed, the angles between each of the two formyl group planes and the best four-nitrogen plane are both equal to 90° for Ni14 (centre of symmetry), 14° and 6° for Cu14 and 21 and 24° for Cu16. The intermolecular contacts in Cu14 and Ni14 crystals are different (Fig. 3). The central Cu$^{2+}$ cation has some close contacts (about 3.335 Å) with symmetry [1/2 + x, 1/2 - y, - z] related O(2) atom and about 3.19 Å with H(10a) from the neighbouring [1 - x, -1/2 + y, 1/2 - z] molecule the closest in the crystal lattice. Both the oxygen atoms interact with —CH groups, O(1) with H(2b) [−1 + x, y, z], ca 2.48 Å, and O(2) with H(2b) [−1 + x, y, z], ca 2.32 Å, and H(9a) [x, y, −1 + z], ca 2.38 Å. The arrangement of Ni14 molecules in the crystal lattice is such that some intermolecular dimers are formed via weak C—H⋯O interactions with the H⋯O distance 2.42 Å, with the H⋯O distance 2.42 Å, O(1)⋯H(1b) [1− x, 1− y, 1− z]. Such a weak dimer interacts with another one located more or less perpendicularly in such a manner as to facilitate the M⋯H close contacts of about 3.16 Å to H(1a) [−x, 1/2 + y, 1/2−z] (Fig. 3). In the case of Cu14 the situation is similar with the closest M⋯H contact only slightly longer (3.19 Å). However, in contrast to Cu14, there is no close M⋯O contacts.

The Cu16 molecules also form molecular dimers in the crystal (Fig. 3), interacting with the neighbouring moieties via weak C—H⋯O hydrogen bonds (ca 2.4 Å). These H-bonds are only slightly longer than those in the Ni14 and Cu14 cases, 2.58 and 2.87 Å from O(1) to O(1)⋯H(1).
H(7a) [−x, −y, 2−z] and H(2a) [−1−x, −y, 2−z], respectively. The shortest intermolecular H⋯O contacts for the O(2) atom are even longer and equal to ca 2.9 Å. Also, the shortest M⋯O (4.33 Å) and M⋯H (3.68 Å) contacts for Cu16 are ca 1 Å longer than for the other monomers.

**Spectroscopic results**

Figure 4 shows a section of the electronic absorption spectra and Table 2 presents the wavelengths of several electronic transitions observed in the UV–VIS spectra of the donors in the solution. In the analysis of electronic transitions one has to take into account the d–d, LMCT, MLCT, π−π* and n−π* transitions.

Most of the donors studied have three evident absorption bands in the 300–1100 nm range (the 800–1100 nm region was blank and hence is not shown in Fig. 4). There is a very strong single band at 300–390 nm and a shoulder at about 330–370 nm. This strong single band may be assigned to the ligand-centred π−π* transitions in analogy with the Soret band[12] with a large molar absorption coefficient (ε ≈ 5 × 10^3 l mol^−1 cm^−1). There is no clear tendency of energy decrease of the strong UV band as the structure becomes flatter (Table 2). The strong band at about 320 nm is almost insensitive to the ligand ring distortions [compare the λ values for Ni16Me2 and (Ni16Me2−4)2] and to the ring substituted with methyl groups (compare the λ values for Ni16Me2 and for Ni16). This suggests that the band at about 300 nm originates from a local N,C-centred π−π* transition.

The lowest-energy transition of small intensity is observed for all compounds at about 480–550 nm. This seems to be due to the π−π* electronic transition (HOMO–LUMO, an analogue of a Q porphyrin band[12]) with a strong contribution from the carbonyl groups (thus having a partial n−π* character also).

The IR, Raman and RR spectra all of the donors.
studied here are similar and related to those of the analogous metalloporphyrins. This is the reason why we present only a representative example of the IR, Raman and RR spectra (Figs 5 and 6). The full set of the IR, Raman and RR spectra are included in the Supplementary Material.

An approximate square-planar symmetry of the central part of the Ni14 and Cu14 molecules may explain qualitatively the relative intensities of the Raman and IR spectra. The vibrations localised mainly in the centre should approximately exhibit C2h symmetry. As a consequence, most of the IR-active modes are Raman inactive and vice versa, which is confirmed by the calculated IR intensities. If the symmetry of Cu14 and Ni14 were indeed C2h, their molecular vibrations might be decomposed as \( \Gamma = \text{Raman} \ (31 \ A_g + 14 \ B_g) + \text{IR} \ (32 \ B_u + 16 \ A_u) \). The same small deviations from the C2h symmetry explain why in reality the \( A_g \) modes have negligible IR intensities (typically 0.0–0.2 km mol−1), and the \( B_u \) modes are also practically forbidden in the IR spectra (0.0–2.9 km mol−1). If the molecular symmetry were D2h, which is still close to reality for the central part of the complexes, the \( A_g \) modes would be forbidden in the IR. This seems to be the reason why in the IR the \( A_g \) modes are much weaker (usually 4.8–22.1 km mol−1) than the \( B_u \) modes (typically strong or very strong, up to 239 km mol−1). Of course, the assignment based on C2h symmetry fails for the modes containing strong contribution from the alkyl bridges (element decreasing molecular symmetry).

Electrochemical results

Stronger donor abilities are manifested voltammetrically by a decrease in the formal potential of the Ni(II)–Ni(III) or Cu(II)–Cu(III) systems (Fig. 7 and Table 3). A promising donor would exchange electron reversibly and no chemical reactions should interfere with this process.

Almost reversible electrode behaviour for Ni14, Ni16 and Cu14 was demonstrated by the close to unity ratio of the cathodic to anodic peak currents and the peak potential differences, \( E_{pa} - E_{pc} \), close to 60 mV. The oxidation of Cu14 proceeds at less positive potentials than that of Ni14, indicating better electron donor properties of the former. For the 14-membered monomeric ligands, Cu14 oxidizes more easily than Ni14, whereas the opposite occurs for Cu16 and Ni16. Hence the formal potential of the M(II)–M(III) complex couple is determined by both the electronic and structural factors. The reversibility of the Cu14 system suggests that both the Cu(II) and Cu(III) forms appear in a similar planar configuration, so the electron release does not require larger reorganization of the complex. The planarity, the high redox reversibility and a low value of the formal potential for Cu14 make it one of the most promising of the electron donors under study.

Changes of substituents or of the macrocyclic ligand size affect both the potential at which the complex is oxidized (Fig. 7) and the reversibility of the system. A lower reversibility of the non-planar Cu16 vs the planar Cu14 and Ni14 vs Ni16 indicates larger structural changes accompanying the electron transfer in those cases. Also, the substitution of Ni16 with two additional methyl groups (Jäger-type complexes5) introduces chemical irreversibility.

Influence of dimerization and the double bridge length

Figure 2 shows the molecular structure of the (Ni15Me2-4)2 and (Ni16Me2-4)2 complexes. Both Ni(II) dimers have large cavities formed between the macrocycle moieties joined by two aliphatic chains. The bismacrocyclic (Ni(II)) receptors form unique 3D structures containing parallel channels (Fig. 3)—an ‘organic zeolite.’ The channels can be occupied by some smaller guest molecules (e.g. H2O, CHCl3 or toluene). According to x-ray results, there is an umbrella-like distortion of the monomers of the dimeric ligands especially for (Ni16Me2-4)2, owing to the tension in the too short aliphatic links. These structural changes may result in more facile oxidation of the metal ion in the dimeric species with respect to the monomer (Table 3 and Fig. 7). The anodic peak for the two bismacrocyces is twice as high as those for the single macrocyclic compounds since two redox centres are present in one molecule of the bismacroyclic complexes. However, lack of the cathodic counterparts of these peaks reveals following chemical reactions of the Ni(III) oxidation product.

The appearance of two oxidation signals may be
expected for two identical redox centres when in close proximity. In the case of the \((\text{Ni}16\text{Me}_2\text{-4})_2\) and \((\text{Ni}16\text{Me}_2\text{-6})_2\) complexes, the appearance of a single, but twice as high, oxidation peak means that both centres are separated well enough and do not interact, so voltammetrically they behave as two independent Ni(II) sites. Our x-ray analysis gives for the intermetallic distance 9.3 Å for \((\text{Ni}16\text{Me}_2\text{-4})_2\). Thus, assuming small crystal packing effects, the electrostatic interaction in acetonitrile (AN) seems to be effectively shielded at such distances. In contrast, for \((\text{Ni}15\text{Me}_2\text{-4})_2\) a much shorter intermetallic distance is found from the x-ray measurements (5.22 Å). Therefore, a splitting of the oxidation peak in AN solution is observed (see Table 3 and Fig. 7) which reflects the cooperativity of the metal centres.

The electronic spectrum of \((\text{Ni}16\text{Me}_2\text{-4})_2\) does not show large differences in comparison with \text{Ni16}. Therefore, not only the positively charged metal centres are effectively shielded by the solvent as demonstrated by electrochemistry, but also the interaction of the \(\pi\)-electron systems of the two macrocycles is fairly small. The dimerization influences more strongly the vibra-

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure6.png}
\caption{Raman spectra of \text{Cu14} excited with (a) 647.1 and (b) 488 nm radiation}
\end{figure}
tional spectra of the complexes than does the length of the macrocycles. The wavenumber differences among Ni14, Ni15 and Ni16 are usually smaller than those among the monomeric and dimeric units. As can be seen in Fig. 2, especially the umbrella-like out-of-plane deformation of the aromatic rings is an important structure determining factor of the dimers. The differences between (Ni16Me2-4)2 and (Ni16Me2-6)2 are less important, the compounds have also similar oxidation peak potentials (0.752 and 0.747 V, respectively) and the size of the hydrophobic cavity seems to be the only structurally relevant difference between them.

Figure 7. Redox properties of the tetraazaenemacrocyclic complexes of Cu2+ and Ni2+. CV curves for 0.4 mM Cu14 (a), Cu16 (b), Ni14 (c), Ni15 (d), Ni16 (e), Ni16Me (f), (Ni16Me2-4)2 (g), (Ni16Me2-6)2 (h) and (Ni15Me2-4)2 (i) in 0.1 M a TBAP solution of acetonitrile, scan rate 0.05 V s. The figure shows the oxidation potential dependence on the metal ion [(a) vs (c), (b) vs (e)], of the macrocycle size [(a) vs (b), (c) vs (d) and (e), (g) vs (i)], of the methyl substitution [(e) vs (f)], of the dimerization [(f) vs (g), (e) vs (g), (e) vs (h), (d) vs (i)] and of the bridge length [(g) vs (h)]. (a), (c) and (e) show the reversible oxidation processes. Note the cooperativity of oxidation in case (i)
The goal of this work was to select those donor–acceptor pairs, which exhibit very close redox potentials when measured in the same solvent. In the AN solutions the reduction of all the acceptors under study, quinone, chloranil, tetracyanoquinodimethane and tetracyanoethylene, proceeds in two well resolved 1e redox steps with the formation of a radical and dianion, respectively. Table 4 gives the peak and formal potentials, which show the following sequence of the redox potentials: TCNE > TCNQ > CA > Q, in line with the ab initio calculated electron affinities (Hartree–Fock, 6–31G* basis set, adiabatic approximation, vacuum conditions): TCNQ (2.94 eV), CA (2.85 eV), TCNE (2.76 eV), Q (1.31 eV).

The formal potentials for the acceptors and donors are shown in Fig. 8. They were all measured under the same experimental conditions [obtained from cyclic voltammetry (CV) with the use of a glassy carbon electrode in AN]. For the two donor–acceptor pairs Cu14–TCNQ and Cu14–TCNE, the electric potential differences are the smallest and are as small as 0.430 and 0.373 V, respectively. This suggests that the Cu14–TCNQ and Cu14–TCNE redox pairs can be considered as promising building blocks for bistable molecules and new donor–acceptor materials.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The x-ray results for the donors studied show a nearly planar geometry of the monomeric tetraazamacrocyclic complexes and an ‘organic-zeolite-like’ structures of the dimers. The dimeric Ni complexes have flexible cavities between of the two single ligands linked with aliphatic chains suitable for accommodating some small-sized guests.

For the dimeric compounds the metal oxidation [M(II)–M(III)] takes place independently on each centre except for (Ni15Me2–4)2 where, owing to the short metal–metal distance, an oxidation cooperativity has been observed. Methyl substituents give rise to irreversibility of the oxidation process of the complexes studied. In the absence of these substituents neither reorganization nor ligand addition–elimination kinetics affect the electrode process. This suggests that the Cu14 can be considered as a promising donor for new donor–acceptor complexes.

A common scale for the donors under study and some important acceptor compounds (p-benzoquinone, chloranil, tetracyanoethylene and tetracyanoquinodimethane, Table 3.

### Table 3. Voltammetric characteristics of the donor compounds in AN–0.1 M TBAP solution (see Experimental section, voltammetry), scan rate 0.05 V s⁻¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>(E_{\text{pa}}) M(II)/M(III)</th>
<th>(E_{\text{pc}}) M(III)/M(II)</th>
<th>(E^0) M(II)/M(III)</th>
<th>(E_{\text{pa}} - E_{\text{pc}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cu14</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni14</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni15</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu16</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni16</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni16Me₂</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ni15Me₂–4)₂</td>
<td>0.615 and 0.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ni16Me₂–4)₂</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a The formal potentials are given only for the systems with well developed anodic/cathodic peaks; blanks mean that the cathodic signal is absent owing to chemical reaction consuming the oxidized form of the complex following electron transfer as described in the text. \(E_{\text{pa}}\) and \(E_{\text{pc}}\) denote the oxidation and reduction peak potentials, respectively, and \(E^0\) is the formal potential. All potentials are in volts.

### Table 4. Characteristics of the cyclic voltammograms of acceptor molecules in AN–0.1 M TEAP solution scan rate: 0.05 V s⁻¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>(E_{\text{pc}1})</th>
<th>(E_{\text{pa}1})</th>
<th>(E^0_1)</th>
<th>(E_{\text{pc}2})</th>
<th>(E_{\text{pa}2})</th>
<th>(E^0_2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCNE</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>−0.784</td>
<td>−0.694</td>
<td>−0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCNQ</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>−0.352</td>
<td>−0.278</td>
<td>−0.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>−0.520</td>
<td>−0.450</td>
<td>−0.485</td>
<td>−1.210</td>
<td>−1.130</td>
<td>−1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.0805</td>
<td>−0.732</td>
<td>−0.649</td>
<td>−0.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(E_{\text{pa}1}, E_{\text{pc}1}, E_{\text{pa}2}, E_{\text{pc}2}\) are the peak potentials for the first and second electron transfer, respectively, and \(E^0_1, E^0_2\) are the formal potentials. All potentials in volts.

*b TCNE in 0.1 M TBAP–CH₂Cl₂; scan rate 0.02 V s⁻¹.

Copyright © 2000 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
etc.) was proposed on the basis of their CV behaviour under the same physicochemical conditions. This scale allowed us to select the Cu\textsubscript{14}–TCNQ and Cu\textsubscript{14}–TCNE redox pairs as good candidates for the building blocks of an electronically bistable molecule.
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Figure 8. Positioning of the donors and acceptors under investigation in the common electric redox potential scale (E in volts). The potentials were measured under the same conditions: 0.1 M TBAP in AN, scan rate 0.05 V s. A promising donor–acceptor pair, candidate for the bistability effect (in AN), corresponds to a donor oxidation potential slightly lower than the acceptor reduction potential (e.g. Cu\textsubscript{14}–TCNE or Cu\textsubscript{14}–TCNQ)

\(^3E_0\) instead of \(E\) (see text)