Directional control of π -stacked building blocks for crystal engineering: the 1,8-naphthalimide synthon[†]

Daniel L. Reger,* J. Derek Elgin, Radu F. Semeniuc, Perry J. Pellechia and Mark D. Smith

Received (in Columbia, MO, USA) 11th April 2005, Accepted 21st June 2005 First published as an Advance Article on the web 14th July 2005 DOI: 10.1039/b504998a

Incorporating the 1,8-naphthalimide group into bis(pyrazolyl)methane ligands triggers the association of their rhenium(I) complexes into directionally ordered dimers in both solution and solid state, as demonstrated by ES⁺/MS, PGSE–NMR and X-ray diffraction studies.

The understanding and control of intra- and intermolecular forces and of the supramolecular self-assembly process is a prerequisite for the progress of crystal engineering.¹ Hydrogen bonding is a widely used tool in crystal engineering because the directionality and robustness of its associative protocol enable facile and reliable transfer to other systems.² In contrast, π - π stacking has a less predictable directional associative protocol, due to the fact that in the solid state, variable orientations of the moieties involved often occur in order to maximize the electrostatic attraction between the σ framework and the π electron density of the stacked groups.³ Although association of several π species in solution was substantiated in some cases, little is known about their solution structure and their relative orientation.⁴

We wish to report here the design and syntheses of two new bis(pyrazolyl)methane ligands and their rhenium(I) complexes that incorporate a new supramolecular synthon, the 1,8-naphthalimide group. It has long been established that the order of stability in the interaction of two π systems is π -deficient- π -deficient > π -deficient- π -rich > π -rich- π -rich.³ We reasoned that since π - π stacking interactions between π -deficient functionalities are the most favorable, incorporating such groups into our ligands will allow us to exploit their strong π - π stacking interactions within metal complexes. While the photophysical properties of 1,8naphthalimide derivatives were extensively utilized by incorporating this moiety into a large variety of chemosensors and other devices,⁵ its π -deficiency was not exploited to the benefit of crystal engineering. A search of the CSD database (version 5.26, Nov. 2004) identified a surprisingly small number of crystal structures incorporating the 1,8-naphthalimide group, only 19, with 13 of them meeting the requirements for a π - π stacking interaction. Out of these 13 structures, all but one had a common feature: a $\pi - \pi$ stacking interaction with the dipole vectors (which run from the center of the fused aromatic group through the nitrogen atom) of the 1,8-naphthalimide groups oriented at 180°.

Based on these facts, we anticipated that a 1,8-naphthalimide group built into a bidentate, bis(pyrazolyl)methane ligand will let

us exploit the predetermined directional characteristics for intermolecular stacking of the 1,8-naphthalimide group. Furthermore, in our quest for the understanding and application of crystal engineering principles as related to metal complexes of poly-(pyrazolyl)methane ligands, we have recently described a cooperative π - π stacking and C-H··· π interaction found between adjacent bis- or tris(pyrazolyl)methane units, a motif that we named the "quadruple pyrazolyl embrace".⁶ The ubiquitous nature of the quadruple pyrazolyl embrace makes coupling this supramolecular synthon with the π - π stacking of the 1,8-naphthalimide group a potentially powerful combination in crystal engineering.

The new ligands, N-[2,2-bis-(3,5-R-pyrazolyl)ethane]-1,8naphthalimide (R = H, L1; R = Me, L2), were synthesized by the toluenesulfonic acid-catalyzed reaction of the corresponding pyrazole with N-[2,2-(dimethoxy)ethane]-1,8-naphthalimide (Scheme 1), which is easily prepared starting from 1,8-naphthalic anhydride and 2,2-dimethoxyethaneamine. L1 and L2 both react with Re(CO)₅Br to yield L1[Re(CO)₃Br] (1) and L2[Re(CO)₃Br] (2) as white solids.

The molecular structure of $1\ddagger$ consists of an octahedral rhenium center (Fig. 1) formed by three facially positioned carbonyl moieties, two nitrogen atoms from the κ^2 -bonded ligand L1 and a bromide ligand. All bond lengths and angles are within normal parameters found in these types of complexes.

Compound 1 is associated into dimers by the anticipated $\pi-\pi$ stacking interaction of the 1,8-naphthalimide units, with a perpendicular distance of *ca.* 3.5 Å between the aromatic rings; see Fig. 2. The dipole vectors of the stacked 1,8-naphthalimide units are oriented at 180°, placing the bis(pyrazolyl)methane donor sets in opposite directions. The dimers are then organized into stair-like 1-D chains by the pyrazolyl embrace interaction (Fig. 3). Two pyrazolyl rings are involved in offset $\pi-\pi$ stacking with a perpendicular distance between the rings of 3.5 Å. The hydrogen atoms situated on the fourth position of the pyrazolyl rings involved in the $\pi-\pi$ stacking are pointed towards the other two pyrazolyl rings with the following geometrical details: H–centroid distance = 3.0 Å, C–centroid distance = 3.8 Å and the C–H–centroid angle = 142°.



Scheme 1 Synthetic route to L1 and L2: i. 1,8-naphthalic anhydride, EtOH, reflux; ii. 3,5-R₂-Hpz, (pz = pyrazolyl ring, R = H, L1; R = Me, L2), *p*-toluenesulfonic acid (cat.), neat, 220 °C.

University of South Carolina, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, 631 Sumter Street, Columbia, SC 29208, USA. E-mail: Reger@mail.chem.sc.edu; Fax: +1 (803)777-9521; Tel: +1 (803)777-2587

[†] Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: synthetic details and PGSE-NMR data. See http://dx.doi.org/10.1039/b504998a



Fig. 1 Molecular structure of L1[Re(CO)₃Br] (1); color code: carbon, yellow; hydrogen, gray; oxygen, red; nitrogen, blue; bromine, light blue and rhenium, purple.



Fig. 2 Dimeric association of 1 and the relative position of the individual units within the dimer.

The molecular structure of $2\ddagger$ (Fig. 4) is similar to that of 1 with only small differences in bond lengths and angles. The supramolecular association of 2 into dimers is maintained, as can be seen in Fig. 5 and is supported by a similar π - π stacking of the 1,8– naphthalimide units as in 1. The 180° orientation of the dipole vectors of the stacked 1,8-naphthalimide units and the subsequent opposing directional orientation of the bis(pyrazolyl)methane donor sets is maintained. However, the addition of 3- and 5-position methyl groups on the pyrazole rings decreases the dimensionality of the supramolecular structure of **2**, when compared to **1**, because the chain forming pyrazolyl embrace is disrupted by the substitution.⁷

The solution-state supramolecular self-assembly of both 1 and 2 was studied by the means of ES⁺/MS and PGSE-NMR experiments. For 1, the ES⁺/MS spectrum showed peaks that correspond to monomeric {L1[Re(CO)₃]}⁺, {L1[Re(CO)₃] + CH₃CN}⁺ and {L1[Re(CO)₃Br] + NH₄}⁺ species at 628, 669 and 725 *m*/*z* respectively. Dimeric species such as {L1[Re(CO)₃Br]·L1[Re(CO)₃]}⁺ and {2L1[Re(CO)₃Br] + Na}⁺ produced peaks at 1335 and 1437 *m*/*z*. A peak corresponding to the trimetallic {3L1[Re(CO)₃Br] + Na}⁺ species was also identified



Fig. 3 1-D chain of 1 formed by π - π stacking and pyrazolyl embrace interactions; the π - π stacking component of the pyrazolyl embrace is clearly shown in the middle of the top figure.



Fig. 4 Molecular structure of L2[Re(CO)₃Br] (2).



Fig. 5 Dimers formed by π - π stacking with **2**.

at 2144 *m/z*. In the case of **2**, only mono- and dimeric species were observed, in concordance with its solid state structure. Thus, $\{L2[Re(CO)_3]\}^+$, $\{L2[Re(CO)_3Br] + NH_4\}^+$, $\{L2[Re(CO)_3-Br]\cdot L2[Re(CO)_3]\}^+$, $\{2L2[Re(CO)_3Br] + Na\}^+$ were identified at 684, 781, 1447 and 1544 *m/z* respectively.

In order to further test the solution associations of 1 and 2, we performed the pulsed-field gradient spin-echo NMR experiment (PGSE-NMR). Described in detail elsewhere,⁸ the PGSE-NMR technique provides an indirect measure of molecular size by allowing the determination of the diffusion coefficient of a given species in solution. Subsequent application of the Stokes-Einstein relation then yields the hydrodynamic radius, which typically falls within ca. 20% of the crystallographic radius. This technique has been used successfully in a number of different applications,⁹ including establishing the presence or absence of dimeric species in solution.^{9c,d} Table 1 shows the comparison of the experimentally calculated hydrodynamic radii of both complexes along with L2. For complexes 1 and 2, the PGSE-NMR method radii are in accordance with those found from the X-ray data for the dimeric units, indicating that the 1,8-naphthalimide groups are associated in solution and that their dipole vectors are oriented approximately 180° apart, as any significant deviation from linearity would produce smaller radii values in the PGSE-NMR experiment. For comparison, similar experiments with Re(CO)3Br[(pz4-pyrene)2- $CH(^{n}Pr)$] (pz = pyrazolyl ring) that we have reported previously showed the complexes were monomeric in solution even though the solid state structure showed association by π - π stacking of the pyrene groups.^{9c} As expected, the free ligand L2 is also dimeric in solution, with a reasonable difference in its radius due to the lack of a metallic center.

To date, the directionality in multimetallic structures has been mainly controlled by using multibranched ligands because of their increased preorganization.¹⁰ In our earlier work, we used preorganized polytopic ligands such as C₆H_{6-n}CH₂OCH₂C- $(pz)_{3}_{n}$, (n = 2, 3, 4 and 6) and $(CH_{2})_{m}[CH(pz)_{2}]_{2}$, (m = 1-3) to control the outcome of solid state structures.^{6,11} We show here that the strong, directionally oriented π -association of the 1,8naphthalimide group is a valuable synthon in crystal engineering. The directionality is maintained in solution, even in a highly polar solvent like DMSO, as demonstrated by NMR experiments. The naphthalimide group can be easily incorporated into a large variety of compounds that can have other specially designed functionalities (with donor properties or not). From a crystal engineering point of view, the facile transfer of this directional associative protocol from one system to another (as demonstrated by our results and the CSD search), opens the door for the synthesis of new supramolecular (not covalently linked), discrete species or coordination polymers.

Table 1 Comparison of radii from PGSE-NMR calculations and
 X-ray data^a

Compound	Calculated radii/Å	
	PGSE	X-ray
1	8.28^{b}	9.70
L2	8.06^{c}	n/a
2	9.42^{b} , 9.50^{c}	9.96

In summary, we have successfully designed, synthesized, and implemented the use of *directional* π - π stacking in crystal engineering, by building 1,8-naphthalimide moieties into a bis(pyrazolyl)methane ligand system. The 1,8-naphthalimide group leads to association into dimers of metal complexes of the ligands in both solution and solid state, as evidenced by electrospray and pulsed-field gradient spin echo NMR spectrometry techniques and X-ray diffraction experiments. We also demonstrated the use of the quadruple pyrazolyl embrace, an important interaction for bis(pyrazolyl)methane metal complexes, to organize the dimeric units into chains for **1** and these types of chains were intentionally disrupted in **2** by substitution of the pyrazolyl rings.

We acknowledge with thanks the National Science Foundation (CHE-0414239) for support.

Notes and references

‡ Compound 1·(CD₃)₂SO: C₂₅H₁₅BrD₆N₅O₆ReS, M = 791.67, triclinic, a = 8.6135(5), b = 10.6869(6), c = 15.705(1) Å, $\alpha = 73.925(1)^{\circ}$, $\beta = 75.037(1)^{\circ}$, $\gamma = 83.696(1)^{\circ}$, U = 1340.90(14) Å³, T = 150 K, space group $P\bar{1}$ (no. 2), Z = 2, μ (Mo-K α) = 6.149 mm⁻¹, 13416 reflections measured, 5462 unique ($R_{int} = 0.0234$), 352 parameters refined, R1(F) = 0.0236, $wR(F^2) = 0.0559$ (all data). CCDC 268888.

Compound **2**·C₃H₆O: C₃₀H₂₉BrN₅O₆Re, M = 821.69, triclinic, a = 8.8427(5), b = 13.4707(8), c = 13.9727(8) Å, $\alpha = 67.162(1)^\circ$, $\beta = 89.597(1)^\circ$, $\gamma = 82.302(1)^\circ$, U = 1518.27(15) Å³, T = 150 K, space group $P\overline{1}$ (no. 2), Z = 2, μ (Mo-K α) = 5.369 mm⁻¹, 16466 reflections measured, 6199 unique ($R_{int} = 0.0263$), 394 parameters refined, R1(F) = 0.0257, $wR(F^2) = 0.0612$ (all data). CCDC 268889. See http:// dx.doi.org/10.1039/04998a for crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format.

- 1 D. Braga, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 2000, 3705.
- (a) D. Braga, L. Maini, M. Polito, E. Tagliavini and F. Grepioni, Coord. Chem. Rev., 2003, 53, 246; (b) G. R. Desiraju, Acc. Chem. Res., 2002, 35, 565; (c) B. Moulton and M. J. Zaworotko, Chem. Rev., 2001, 101, 1629; (d) G. R. Desiraju, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 2000, 3745; (e) D. Braga and F. Grepioni, Acc. Chem. Res., 2000, 33, 601; (f) A. M. Beatty, Coord. Chem. Rev., 2003, 246, 131; (g) L. Brammer, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2004, 33, 476.
- 3 C. Janiak, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 2000, 3885 and references therein.
- 4 (a) B. Olenik, R. Boese and R. Sustmann, Cryst. Growth Des., 2003, 3, 175; (b) E. V. Garcia-Baez, F. J. Martinez-Martinez, H. Hoepfl and I. I. Padilla-Martinez, Cryst. Growth Des., 2003, 3, 35; (c) J. A. Marsden, J. J. Miller, L. D. Shirtcliff and M. M. Haley, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2005, 127, 2464.
- 5 (a) M. Licchelli, A. O. Biroli, A. Poggi, D. Sacchi, C. Sangermani and M. Zema, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 2003, 4537; (b) T. P. Le, J. E. Rogers and L. A. Kelly, J. Phys. Chem. A, 2000, 104, 6778; (c) J. E. Rogers, S. J. Weiss and L. A. Kelly, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2000, 122, 427.
- 6 D. L. Reger, J. R. Gardinier, R. F. Semeniuc and M. D. Smith, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 2003, 1712.
- 7 The CSD search described by us in ref. 6 revealed that out of 115 hits of a bis- or tris(3,5-dimethyl-pyrazolyl)methane complex, only 6 meet the criteria for a "pyrazolyl embrace" interaction.
- 8 (a) M. Valentni, P. S. Pregosin and H. Rüegger, Organometallics, 2000, 19, 2551; (b) P. Stilbs, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc., 1987, 19, 1.
- 9 (a) W. H. Otto, M. H. Keefe, K. E. Splan, J. T. Hupp and C. K. Larive, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2002, **41**, 6172; (b) N. G. Stahl, C. Zuccaccia, T. R. Jensen and T. J. Marks, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2003, **125**, 5256; (c) D. L. Reger, J. R. Gardinier, P. J. Pellechia, M. D. Smith and K. J. Brown, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2003, **43**, 7635; (d) K. Moon and A. E. Kaifer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2004, **126**, 15016.
- 10 D. L. Caulder and K. N. Raymond, Acc. Chem. Res., 1999, 32, 975.
- (a) D. L. Reger, R. F. Semeniuc, V. Rassolov and M. D. Smith, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2004, **43**, 537; (b) D. L. Reger, R. F. Semeniuc and M. D. Smith, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2003, **42**, 8137; (c) D. L. Reger, R. P. Watson, J. R. Gardinier and M. D. Smith, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2004, **43**, 6609.