

# Highly Luminescent Dinuclear Platinum(II) Complexes Incorporating Bis-Cyclometallating Pyrazine-Based Ligands: A Versatile Approach to Efficient Red Phosphors


Stacey Culham,<sup>†</sup> Pierre-Henri Lanoë,<sup>†</sup> Victoria L. Whittle,<sup>‡</sup> Marcus C. Durrant,<sup>†</sup> J. A. Gareth Williams,<sup>\*,‡</sup> and Valery N. Kozhevnikov<sup>\*,†</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Department of Applied Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, United Kingdom

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Chemistry, Durham University, Durham, DH1 3LE, United Kingdom

## Supporting Information

**ABSTRACT:** A series of luminescent dinuclear platinum(II) complexes incorporating diphenylpyrazine-based bridging ligands ( $L^nH_2$ ) has been prepared. Both 2,5-diphenylpyrazine ( $L^2H_2$ ) and 2,3-diphenylpyrazine ( $L^3H_2$ ) are able to undergo cyclometalation of the two phenyl rings, with each metal ion binding to the two nitrogen atoms of the central heterocycle, giving, after treatment with the anion of dipivaloyl methane (dpm), complexes of formula  $\{Pt(dpm)\}_2L^n$ . These compounds are isomers of the analogous complex of 4,6-diphenylpyrimidine ( $L^1H_2$ ). Related complexes of dibenzo(f,h)quinoxaline ( $L^4H_2$ ), 2,3-diphenyl-quinoxaline ( $L^5H_2$ ), and dibenzo[3,2-a:2',3'-c]phenazine ( $L^6H_2$ ) have also been prepared, allowing the effects of strapping together the phenyl rings ( $L^4H_2$  and  $L^6H_2$ ) and/or extension of the conjugation from pyrazine to quinoxaline ( $L^5H_2$  and  $L^6H_2$ ) to be investigated. In all cases, the corresponding mononuclear complexes,  $Pt(dpm)L^nH$ , have been isolated too. All 12 complexes are phosphorescent in solution at ambient temperature. Emission spectra of the dinuclear complexes are consistently red shifted compared to their mononuclear analogues, as are the lowest energy absorption bands. Electrochemical data and TD-DFT calculations suggest that this effect arises primarily from stabilization of the LUMO. Introduction of the second metal ion also has the effect of substantially increasing the molar absorptivity and, in most cases, the radiative rate constants. Meanwhile, extension of conjugation in the heterocycle of  $L^5H_2$  and  $L^6H_2$  and planarization of the aromatic system favored by interannular bond formation in  $L^4H_2$  and  $L^6H_2$  leads to further red shifts of the absorption and emission spectra to wavelengths that are unusually long for cyclometalated platinum(II) complexes. The results may offer a versatile design strategy for tuning and optimizing the optical properties of d-block metal complexes for contemporary applications.



## INTRODUCTION


Phosphorescent red and near-infrared emitters are desired for a variety of applications. For example, in the field of phosphors for organic light-emitting diodes (OLEDs) and light-emitting electrochemical cells (LECs), red emitters are required for full-color displays and white-light systems destined for lighting applications.<sup>1–3</sup> Yet the currently available red-emitting compounds are not able to match the high performance of green emitters.<sup>4</sup> Meanwhile, in the field of luminescent sensors for bioimaging and sensing<sup>5</sup> there is a need for compounds that not only emit in the red or near-infrared (NIR) regions but also absorb at long wavelengths in order to benefit from the window of greater optical transparency of biological tissue and decreased scattering, which favors delivery and collection of light.<sup>6</sup> There is a similar pressing need for red- and NIR-absorbing materials in development of new dyes for dye-sensitized solar cells (DSSCs), where more efficient collection

of light from this region of the solar spectrum is required if efficiencies are to be significantly improved.<sup>7</sup>

One of the most studied classes of phosphorescent materials is Ru(II) complexes of polypyridines, since they often emit in the red region, albeit with modest quantum yields of a few percent, from low-energy <sup>3</sup>MLCT transition states.<sup>8</sup> More recently, cyclometalated complexes of the phenylpyridine type have become increasingly popular, particularly with third-row metals such as iridium(III)<sup>9,10</sup> and platinum(II).<sup>11,12</sup> The combination of (i) a strong  $\sigma$  donor in the C<sup>-</sup>-ligating unit that raises the energy of metal-centered orbitals, thus stabilizing the MLCT states, (ii) a strong ligand field that destabilizes potentially deactivating d–d states, and (iii) efficient spin–orbit coupling (SOC) induced by the heavy metal ion to promote radiative decay of the triplet state<sup>13</sup> renders many such

Received: May 6, 2013

Published: September 25, 2013



**Figure 1.** Structures of the proligands,  $L^nH_2$ , mononuclear platinum(II) complexes,  $PtL^nH$ , and dinuclear platinum(II) complexes,  $Pt_2L^n$ .

complexes very intensely luminescent. Moreover, the emission energy can be quite easily tuned over a wide range by systematic modifications to the ligand, owing to the HOMO and LUMO being localized on mutually different parts of the molecule.<sup>14</sup> In order to shift to the red region of the spectrum, the usual approaches are (i) to lower the LUMO energy through the use of a more electron-deficient heterocycle such as an isoquinoline,<sup>4b,c,e,15</sup> (ii) to raise the energy of the HOMO using a more electron-rich aromatic unit such as a benzothiophene,<sup>16</sup> and (iii) to extend the conjugation within the ligand such that the HOMO–LUMO gap decreases.<sup>17</sup> The problem with these approaches, particularly ii and iii, is that as the ligand-based filled orbitals rise in energy, the amount of metal character in the excited state concomitantly decreases, so that one can expect less efficient SOC, smaller radiative decay constants, and even fluorescence from the ligands due to retarded intersystem crossing.<sup>18</sup> For example, introduction of additional pendent thiophene groups into thienylpyridine complexes of iridium and platinum leads to a switch from efficient phosphorescence to fluorescence accompanied by only very weak, albeit red shifted, phosphorescence.<sup>19</sup>

An emerging alternative approach to achieve red-shifted emission is to introduce two or more metal centers into one molecule by means of a bridging ligand. For example, Zhong and Abruña recently demonstrated that combination of Pt(II) and Ru(II) metal centers, linked through a dipyriddyldiphenylpyrazine bridging ligand, can provide deep red and NIR

emitters, albeit with low quantum yields on the order of  $10^{-3}$  or less.<sup>20</sup> We have been interested in the design of new luminescent materials based on polynuclear assemblies with cyclometalated metal centers. Recently, we reported a versatile strategy to access efficient red emitters based on polynuclear Pt(II) and heterometallic Pt(II)/Ir(III) complexes in which 4,6-di(4-*tert*-butyl-phenyl)pyrimidine was used as the bridging ligand.<sup>21</sup> The general observation was that introduction of a second cyclometalated metal center is accompanied by a significant red shift in absorption and emission, mainly due to stabilization of the LUMO level. Motivated by these results, the present study seeks to extend the methodology to other systems based on related pyrazine rather pyrimidine bridging ligands. Synthesis of five dinuclear platinum(II) complexes based on diphenylpyrazine-based bridging ligands is described, together with their mononuclear analogues. The approach leads to efficient deep red emission, and the influence of isomerism and extended conjugation/rigidification in the bridging ligand is explored.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**1. Synthesis.** The family of mono- and dinuclear complexes investigated is shown in Figure 1, together with the corresponding proligands.  $PtL^1H$  and  $Pt_2L^1$  are derived from 4,6-diphenylpyrimidine and are essentially the same as the complexes we reported previously,<sup>21</sup> except that the phenyl rings do not incorporate *tert*-butyl substituents, and dipivaloyl-

Table 1. UV–Vis Absorption Data and Ground-State Reduction Potentials for the Complexes<sup>a</sup>

complex	$\lambda_{\text{max}}/\text{nm}$ ( $\epsilon/\text{M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$ )	$E_{\text{red}}^0/\text{V}$ [ $\Delta E/\text{mV}$ ]
PtL <sup>1</sup> H	256 (25 200), 301 (31 600), 338sh (10 600), 408 (9 550)	−2.21 [160]
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>1</sup>	257 (47 000), 326 (63 200), 430 (17 100), 481 (24 300), 532sh (19 900)	−1.83 [160]
PtL <sup>2</sup> H	254 (26 800), 299 (25 400), 342 (17 300), 398 (6 430), 435 (5 240)	−2.13 [180]
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>2</sup>	253 (35 300), 296 (26 500), 333 (21 900), 372 (16 600), 453 (15 900), 503 (6 830), 618 (3 46)	−1.79 [100]
PtL <sup>3</sup> H	252 (23 800), 292 (16 900), 340 (11 900), 398 (6 170), 449 (2 170)	−2.14 [150]
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>3</sup>	245 (36 700), 301 (20 300), 319 (20 700), 390 (19 600), 451 (15 200), 572 (3 10)	−1.81 [90]
PtL <sup>4</sup> H	251 (66 000), 278 (42 100), 344 (18 900), 407 (11 800), 463 (3 190)	−2.02 [150]
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>4</sup>	258 (59 300), 295 (25 900), 308 (25 700), 350 (25 800), 428 (10 100), 462 (19 400), 509 (11 500)	−1.70 [120]
PtL <sup>5</sup> H	252 (40 000), 294 (20 000), 373sh (9 380), 388 (10 600), 445 (6 470), 488sh (3 790)	−1.83 [100]
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>5</sup>	251 (42 000), 313 (21 600), 387 (14 200), 428 (8 610), 496 (1 360)	−1.46 [90]
PtL <sup>6</sup> H	251 (52 300), 282 (38 000), 383sh (7 870), 401 (10 300), 463 (7 790), 511 (4 520)	−1.66 [90]
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>6</sup>	266 (29 000), 301sh (13 600), 324sh (11 500), 396 (3 070), 422 (3 890), 476sh (3 350), 519 (7 780), 569 (6 690)	−1.43 [90]

<sup>a</sup>In CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> at 298 ± 3 K. Reduction potentials obtained by cyclic voltammetry using Bu<sub>4</sub>NPF<sub>6</sub> (0.1 M) as the supporting electrolyte. Potentials are given relative to the Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup> couple measured under the same conditions. Peak-to-peak separation is given in parentheses.

methane (dpm) is used as the ancillary ligand in place of acetylacetonate (acac). The change from acac to dpm allows the complexes to retain good solubility without the need for *tert*-butyl groups in the cyclometalating ligands, facilitating comparison with the new compounds. All other complexes are based on a diphenylpyrazine core, cyclometalated either once (mononuclear series, PtL<sup>n</sup>H–PtL<sup>n</sup>H) or twice (dinuclear series, Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>n</sup>–Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>n</sup>). L<sup>4</sup>H<sub>2</sub> is dibenzo(f,h)quinoxaline, L<sup>5</sup>H<sub>2</sub> is 2,3-diphenylquinoxaline, and L<sup>6</sup>H<sub>2</sub> is dibenzo[3,2-a:2',3'-c]-phenazine. Note that the compounds based on L<sup>1</sup>H<sub>2</sub>, L<sup>2</sup>H<sub>2</sub>, and L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub> are isomers of one another, so that a direct comparison can be made of the influence of (i) changing from pyrimidine to pyrazine (L<sup>1</sup>H<sub>2</sub> versus L<sup>2</sup>H<sub>2</sub>/L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub>) and (ii) the substitution pattern in the pyrazine ring (2,5-substitution in L<sup>2</sup>H<sub>2</sub> versus 2,3-substitution in L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub>). Meanwhile, it may be seen that the complexes of ligands L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub>–L<sup>6</sup>H<sub>2</sub> form a series of closely related complexes in which either a C–C bond is introduced between the two pendent phenyl rings (L<sup>4</sup>H<sub>2</sub> versus L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub>) or the pyrazine is replaced by a quinoxaline (L<sup>5</sup>H<sub>2</sub> versus L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub>), while complexes of L<sup>6</sup>H<sub>2</sub> incorporate both these features. It may also be noted that ligands L<sup>2</sup>H<sub>2</sub> and L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub> are related to 2,5-bis(2-pyridyl)pyrazine and 2,3-bis(2-pyridyl)pyrazine, respectively. These ligands, which can act as bridging analogues of 2,2'-bipyridine, have been previously explored by others for preparation of multinuclear ruthenium(II) and osmium(II) complexes in a strategy somewhat similar to that used here.<sup>22</sup>

2,3-Diphenylpyrazine (L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub>) and 2,3-diphenylquinoxaline (L<sup>5</sup>H<sub>2</sub>) are commercially available, while the other proligands were prepared by following established procedures (details and references are given in the Experimental Section). The monometallic Pt(II) complexes, Pt(N<sup>^</sup>C-LH)(dpm) (which will be henceforth be abbreviated as PtL<sup>n</sup>H), were obtained by heating at reflux a mixture of the proligand and 1 equiv of K<sub>2</sub>PtCl<sub>4</sub> in acetic acid for up to 3 days. The resulting dichloro-bridged dinuclear intermediates were then reacted with dipivaloylmethane in the presence of base to give, after purification by column chromatography, the monoplatinum complexes PtL<sup>n</sup>H in low to moderate yield. Formation of a small amount of the corresponding diplatinum complexes was registered in each case.

The dinuclear platinum(II) complexes (which will be referred to as Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>n</sup>) were synthesized either by reaction of PtL<sup>n</sup>H with 1 equiv of K<sub>2</sub>PtCl<sub>4</sub> or by reacting L<sup>n</sup>H<sub>2</sub> with 2 equiv of K<sub>2</sub>PtCl<sub>4</sub>. Under these conditions, it was found that although

the dinuclear complex was the main product, the corresponding monoplatinum complex PtL<sup>n</sup>H was still present in the mixture. In general, it proved to be most convenient to prepare the two complexes simultaneously by reaction of the proligand L<sup>n</sup>H<sub>2</sub> with 1.5 equiv of K<sub>2</sub>PtCl<sub>4</sub>, targeting a statistical 1:1 mixture. After introduction of the dpm ancillary ligand under conventional conditions, the mono- and dinuclear platinum complexes are readily separated by column chromatography (typically on silica gel eluting with dichloromethane) to give both products in one procedure. All products were characterized by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy, mass spectrometry, and elemental analysis.

**2. Electrochemistry.** The electrochemical behavior of the complexes was examined by cyclic voltammetry in dichloromethane solution using Bu<sub>4</sub>NPF<sub>6</sub> as the supporting electrolyte and the ferrocene/ferrocenium couple as the reference. All 12 complexes display one reversible or quasi-reversible reduction wave in the range from −2.2 to −1.4 V versus ferrocene; the reduction potentials are given in Table 1. Four trends emerge upon inspection of the data.


- For any given ligand L<sup>n</sup>, the reduction potential of the dinuclear complex Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>n</sup> is significantly less negative than for the corresponding mononuclear complex PtL<sup>n</sup>H by around 200–400 mV.
- Among the three isomeric complexes PtL<sup>1</sup>H–PtL<sup>3</sup>H, there is little difference between the reduction potentials, all being within 80 mV. Similarly, the three dinuclear complexes of these ligands have reduction potentials that are within 40 mV of one other. Apparently, then, the change from pyrimidine to pyrazine has rather little effect on the reduction, as does the substitution pattern within the pyrazine.
- Strapping together the two phenyl rings in the 2,3-substituted pyrazine system (PtL<sup>4</sup>H versus PtL<sup>3</sup>H, and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>4</sup> versus Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3</sup>) facilitates reduction by around 100 mV, with a qualitatively similar effect in the quinoxaline analogues (L<sup>6</sup> versus L<sup>5</sup>).
- The change from pyrazine to quinoxaline (complexes of L<sup>5</sup> versus L<sup>3</sup> and of L<sup>6</sup> versus L<sup>4</sup>) is accompanied by a more significant anodic shift of the reduction on the order of 300 mV.

Trends i, iii, and iv are consistent with the intuitively reasonable notion that the LUMO in such complexes (which would be expected to be essentially ligand based, according to previous experimental and theoretical work on cyclometalated

Pt(II) complexes<sup>11,12</sup>) will be stabilized by the extension of conjugation that accompanies (i) introduction of the second metal ion, (ii) incorporation of the interannular bond which facilitates a planar conformation, and (iii) change from pyrazine to quinoxaline.


As is typically found for cyclometalated platinum(II) complexes, the first oxidation process observed for each of the complexes studied was irreversible and, in several cases, rather ill defined. Indeed, we found an unsatisfactory level of variation in the peak potential according to the conditions, not only of the scan rate but even from one scan to the next, despite extensive cleaning of the electrode surface between scans. However, the data showed unequivocally that there is significantly less variation in the oxidation potentials with molecular structure than in the reduction potentials: the values were generally around 0.8 V versus Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup>, a value quite typical for cyclometalated platinum complexes with arylpyridine ligands.

**3. Absorption Spectroscopy.** Absorption data for all 12 complexes is compiled in Table 1, and spectra are shown in Figures 2 and 3. In order to facilitate the discussion, we shall



**Figure 2.** UV-vis absorption spectra of PtL<sup>1-3</sup>H (blue, red, and black solid lines, respectively) and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>1-3</sup> (blue, red, and black short-dashed lines, respectively) in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> solution at 298 K. Low-energy region of the spectra of Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>2</sup> and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3</sup> is shown on an arbitrarily expanded scale (red and black long-dashed lines, respectively).

first consider the behavior of the two sets of three isomeric complexes, PtL<sup>1-3</sup>H and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>1-3</sup>, and then examine how elaboration of the L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub> ligand influences the properties on moving to complexes of ligands L<sup>4</sup>H<sub>2</sub>–L<sup>6</sup>H<sub>2</sub>. The mononuclear complexes PtL<sup>1-3</sup>H display absorption spectra that are quite typical of platinum(II) complexes with N<sup>^</sup>C-cyclometallating, aryl-heterocycle ligands, such as Pt(ppy)(acac) and related derivatives.<sup>11,12</sup> There are intense bands in the UV region, <350 nm, with molar absorptivities  $\epsilon$  in the range 10 000–30 000 M<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>, corresponding to  $1\pi-\pi^*$  transitions associated with the ligands (Figure 2, Table 1). Somewhat weaker bands,  $\epsilon < 10\,000$  M<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>, in the visible region (390–500 nm) have no counterparts in the free proligands. On the basis of the conclusions of many previous studies<sup>12</sup> and on the results of time-dependent density functional theory calculations for the present series of complexes (vide infra), at least some of these



**Figure 3.** UV-vis absorption spectra of PtL<sup>3-6</sup>H (black, blue, green, and red solid lines, respectively) and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3-6</sup> (correspondingly colored dashed lines) in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> solution at 298 K.

bands can be attributed to charge-transfer transitions from the aryl–metal unit to the heterocyclic ring, reflecting the predominant localization of the frontier orbitals on these two different parts of the molecule.

The dinuclear complexes Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>1-3</sup> display very different spectra from their corresponding mononuclear analogues PtL<sup>1-3</sup>H (Figure 2, Table 1). For complexes of L<sup>1</sup>H<sub>2</sub> and L<sup>2</sup>H<sub>2</sub>, the set of lower energy bands in the visible region is substantially red shifted in the dinuclear compared to the mononuclear complexes (lowest energy band shifts by around 4000 cm<sup>-1</sup>) and there is a large increase in the molar absorptivity of most of the bands. The visible-region bands in Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3</sup>, on the other hand, are scarcely shifted compared to PtL<sup>3</sup>H, although there is again a very large increase in the molar absorptivities. The red shift in the dinuclear complexes of L<sup>1</sup> and L<sup>2</sup> is likely to be associated with the planarization and extension of conjugation that would be expected to accompany introduction of the second metal ion. In the case of Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3</sup>, on the other hand, it seems likely that attainment of a fully planar structure will be inhibited by steric crowding of the C–H bonds of the pendent phenyl groups, which would account for the lack of red shift in that case.

A further feature of the dinuclear complexes is the appearance of a very weak transition on the low-energy side of the main bands. In Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>1</sup> and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3</sup>, it appears as a shoulder ( $\lambda = 532$  and 572 nm respectively) but for Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>2</sup> as a well-defined narrow band ( $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 618$  nm) (shown on an expanded scale in Figure 2). It is likely that these bands are due to direct excitation to the triplet state ( $S_0 \rightarrow T_1$ ), a formally forbidden process that is facilitated by the spin–orbit coupling associated with the presence of the heavy metal ions.<sup>23</sup>


Absorption spectra of all other complexes, PtL<sup>4-6</sup>H and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>4-6</sup>, are shown in Figure 3, together with those of PtL<sup>3</sup>H and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3</sup> again as a point of comparison. Considering first the mononuclear complexes, it can be seen that all four display spectra that are quite similar to one another in form, but the visible-region bands move progressively further to the red. The displacement is small on going from PtL<sup>3</sup>H to PtL<sup>4</sup>H ( $\sim 700$  cm<sup>-1</sup>), but nevertheless, the trend would be consistent with the planarization of the structure that becomes possible upon formation of the interannular C–C bond and loss of the

sterically unfavorable interaction between the C–H bonds on the two rings mentioned above. A much larger red shift accompanies the change from the pyrazine unit of  $\text{PtL}^3\text{H}$  to the quinoxaline of  $\text{PtL}^5\text{H}$  (around  $1800\text{ cm}^{-1}$  for the lowest energy band and around  $2600\text{ cm}^{-1}$  for the next lowest). This trend is consistent with the trend in reduction potentials, which suggests a significant stabilization of the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital on going from the pyrazine to the quinoxaline and hence, if the filled orbitals are not substantially lowered in energy, an expected red shift in the lowest energy absorption band. Indeed, the energy of the lowest energy absorption maxima for the mononuclear complexes correlates well with the reduction potentials (Figure 4, top, data points represented by blue circles). Notably,  $\text{PtL}^6\text{H}$  and  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^6$ , which feature both the interannular bond and the quinoxaline unit, display the lowest energy absorption bands among the two series of complexes (mononuclear and binuclear, respectively), indicating a qualitatively additive effect.

Again, it is clear that introduction of the second metal ion leads to a red shift in the visible-region bands and to a large increase in the molar absorptivity of these bands. The correlation between the energy of the absorption maxima and the reduction potentials for the set of complexes as a whole, including the binuclear complexes, remains quite clear, albeit with rather more scatter than for the series of mononuclear complexes alone (Figure 4, top, all data points).

**4. Photoluminescence Properties.** All 12 complexes are luminescent in degassed solution at room temperature, most of them intensely so. Emission data for the compounds are compiled in Table 2, and spectra are shown in Figures 5 and 6. The trends in emission maxima are mostly quite similar to those observed in the absorption spectra. In particular, it may be immediately seen that, for a given ligand, the spectrum of the binuclear complex  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^n$  is significantly red shifted compared to that of the corresponding mononuclear complex  $\text{PtL}^n\text{H}$ . The shift is in the range  $1600\text{--}1900\text{ cm}^{-1}$  for the five pairs of pyrazine-based complexes (based on the emission maxima) and a little less,  $1270\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , for the pyrimidine pair ( $\text{PtL}^1\text{H}$  and  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^1$ ). Overall, there is again a quite strong correlation between the emission energy and the reduction potential of the complexes (Figure 4, bottom), suggesting that the structural variations among the complexes predominantly influence the LUMO. The gradient of the best-fit line is very similar to that in the plot for absorption, indicating that the emissive triplet state has similar orbital parentage to the lowest energy singlet state formed upon absorption.

Among the three isomeric complexes  $\text{PtL}^{1-3}\text{H}$ , the pyrimidine complex  $\text{PtL}^1\text{H}$  emits at higher energy ( $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 521\text{ nm}$ ) while the two pyrazine complexes emit in a similar region to one another, with  $\text{PtL}^2\text{H}$  displaying a more structured profile. Meanwhile, the trend among the four complexes  $\text{PtL}^{3-6}\text{H}$  is similar to that in absorption, except that  $\text{PtL}^5\text{H}$  emits at marginally lower energy than  $\text{PtL}^6\text{H}$ , the opposite of the trend in absorption, and its spectrum is markedly broader. If we consider the difference in energy between the lowest energy absorption maximum and the emission band (which we will refer to as  $\Delta E^{\text{A-E}}$ ; note that it is not strictly a Stokes' shift, since the absorption is to the singlet state, whereas the emission occurs from a triplet state), it can be seen that this value is largest for  $\text{PtL}^5\text{H}$  among the mononuclear complexes and particularly compared to  $\text{PtL}^6\text{H}$ , suggesting that there is a more profound excited-state reorganization in this complex prior to emission. We return to this point below.



**Figure 4.** (Top) Plot of the energy of the lowest energy absorption maximum in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  at 298 K (derived from  $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ ) versus the reduction potential (values versus  $\text{Fc}/\text{Fc}^+$ ) obtained by cyclic voltammetry. Data for the mononuclear complexes are shown as blue circles and for the binuclear complexes as red squares. Dashed line represents the best fit of the data for all 12 complexes; gradient =  $6410\text{ cm}^{-1}/\text{V}$ . (Bottom) Corresponding plot for the emission maximum under the same conditions; gradient of best-fit line =  $6460\text{ cm}^{-1}/\text{V}$ .

Two such instances of a reversal in the relative order of emission energies versus absorption energies are observed among the binuclear complexes. Thus,  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^3$  emits at significantly lower energy than  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^1$ , contrary to the absorption being significantly lower in energy for the latter. Indeed, we noted in section 3 that  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^3$  seemed somewhat anomalous in that its lowest energy absorption band was not significantly shifted compared to that of its mononuclear analogue, and we tentatively attributed this to a lack of planarity in the ground state. This complex may undergo a more profound change in geometry toward planarity prior to emission to lead to a lower

Table 2. Emission Data for the Complexes in Degassed CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> at 298 K except Where Stated Otherwise

complex	$\lambda_{\max}/\text{nm}$	$\Phi_{\text{lum}}^a$	$\tau/\text{ns}^b$	$k_{\text{Q}}^{\text{SQ},c}/10^7 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$	$k_{\text{r}}^d/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}$	$\Sigma k_{\text{nr}}^d/10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}$	$k_{\text{Q}}^{\text{O}_2,e}/10^8 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$	$\Delta E^{\text{A-E},f}/\text{cm}^{-1}$	emission at 77 K <sup>g</sup>	
									$\lambda_{\max}/\text{nm}$	$\tau/\mu\text{s}$
PtL <sup>1</sup> H	521	0.25	1600 [460]	87	16	47	7.0	5320	501, 527, 573sh	6.4
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>1</sup>	558, 594	0.36	1100 [670]	<i>h</i>	33	58	2.6	2870	539, 582, 630	4.3
PtL <sup>2</sup> H	565, 608	0.30	8900 [840]	71	3.4	7.9	4.9	5290	554, 603, 654	11
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>2</sup>	628, 685, 753	0.41	3200 [680]	<i>h</i>	13	18	5.3	3960	617, 676, 742	3.4
PtL <sup>3</sup> H	554, 578	0.43	7700 [850]	210	5.6	7.4	4.8	4220	536, 576, 618	11
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>3</sup>	612	0.37	4000 [750]	3.5	9.3	16	4.9	5830	586, 634, 693	6.1
PtL <sup>4</sup> H	568	0.15	2600 [510]	270	5.8	33	7.2	3990	528, 566, 615	11
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>4</sup>	628	0.20	1800 [650]	27	11	44	4.5	3720	601, 654, 716	7.0
PtL <sup>5</sup> H	668	0.14	3700 [700]	15	3.8	23	5.3	5520	625, 677, 747sh	5.7
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>5</sup>	749	0.025 <sup>f</sup>	910 [490]	<i>h</i>	2.7 <sup>f</sup>	110	4.3	6810	694, 760	3.5
PtL <sup>6</sup> H	639, 686	0.13	3800 [700]	180	3.4	23	5.3	3920	617, 676, 746	1.3
Pt <sub>2</sub> L <sup>6</sup>	728, 799	0.027 <sup>f</sup>	2000 [580]	<i>h</i>	1.4 <sup>f</sup>	49	5.6	3840	712, 793	1.5

<sup>a</sup>Measured using [Ru(bpy)<sub>3</sub>]<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> as the standard. <sup>b</sup>Values in air-equilibrated solution in parentheses. <sup>c</sup>Self-quenching rate constant, estimated from a plot of  $\tau^{-1}$  versus concentration. <sup>d</sup> $k_{\text{r}}$  and  $\Sigma k_{\text{nr}}$  are the radiative and nonradiative decay rate constants, estimated from the quantum yield and lifetime assuming that the emissive state is formed with unitary efficiency. <sup>e</sup>Bimolecular rate constant for quenching by O<sub>2</sub>, estimated from the luminescence lifetimes in degassed and air-equilibrated solutions and taking [O<sub>2</sub>] = 2.2 mM in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> at  $p = 1$  atm air and  $T = 298$  K. <sup>f</sup>Difference between the energy of the lowest energy (singlet) absorption band and the emission band using  $\lambda_{\max}$  values. <sup>g</sup>In diethyl ether/isopentane/ethanol (2:2:1 v/v). <sup>h</sup>The change in lifetime with concentration was too small to estimate a self-quenching rate constant, being scarcely larger than the uncertainty on the measurements. <sup>i</sup>Quantum yields of these two complexes will be underestimated owing to a significant part of the emission falling out of the range of detection of our equipment. Radiative rate constants will be underestimated as a result.


energy triplet excited state from which emission occurs. The second instance is the pair of complexes Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>5</sup> and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>6</sup>, where the emission of the former has a slightly longer  $\lambda_{\max}$  despite having an absorption maximum at an unequivocally higher energy. Note that the order is switched round in the more rigid medium of the glass at 77 K (compare Figure 6, top and bottom). Excited-state reorganization at room temperature can be anticipated for Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>5</sup> similar to that proposed for Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3</sup> given the expected sterically unfavorable interannular interactions in the ground state. In line with this explanation, it is notable that  $\Delta E^{\text{A-E}}$  is larger for these two complexes than for any others.

At 77 K, the emission spectra show otherwise similar trends as at room temperature but the spectra become more vibrationally resolved. The observed vibrational spacing is around 1200–1400 cm<sup>-1</sup>, as typically expected for coupling to aromatic ring vibrations. In each case, there is a blue shift in the emission maximum upon cooling, as invariably observed for such cyclometalated complexes in which emission emanates from excited states having appreciable charge-transfer character. Complexes of 2,5-diphenylpyrazine display the smallest shifts between 77 K and room temperature (around 300 cm<sup>-1</sup>), while PtL<sup>4</sup>H and complexes of L<sup>5</sup>H<sub>2</sub> have the largest shifts, a little in excess of 1000 cm<sup>-1</sup>. In the latter case, at least, this may be indicative of a greater degree of excited-state distortion at room temperature, as noted above.

The room-temperature photoluminescence quantum yields,  $\Phi_{\text{lum}}$ , are high for many of the complexes (Table 2) falling off to <0.1 only for the most red-emitting complexes, where much of the emission lies in the near-infrared. Binuclear complexes such as Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>2</sup> and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3</sup> are particularly striking in that they have quantum yields of around 0.40 at a  $\lambda_{\max}$  that matches well with that of the standard red emitters in RGB displays (e.g., Eu<sup>3+</sup> phosphors emit at around 617 nm). Indeed, these complexes are brighter than many of the widely investigated iridium(III) complexes of phenylisoquinoline and benzoethynylpyridine ligands,<sup>4a,b,e</sup> which emit in a similar region, and are competitive with quinoxaline-based iridium(III) complexes.<sup>4c,d</sup>


Luminescence lifetimes are on the order of a few microseconds in degassed solution, and for each pair, the lifetime of the binuclear complex is shorter than that of its mononuclear analogue. By estimating the radiative,  $k_{\text{r}}$ , and nonradiative,  $\Sigma k_{\text{nr}}$ , decay rate constants from the quantum yield and lifetime data (Table 2), it can be seen that introduction of the second metal ion facilitates the radiative decay process by a factor of around 2. Apparently, the emissive transition becomes more allowed in the binuclear complex. Normally, for a given type of excited state in structurally related complexes, a decrease in  $k_{\text{r}}$  with decreasing energy is anticipated, since the oscillator strength of a transition is dependent upon  $\nu^3$  in the Einstein coefficient for spontaneous emission. Comparison with diruthenium complexes of bis-pyridylpyrazine ligands is revealing. For example, based on lifetime and quantum yield data reported by Denti et al., the  $k_{\text{r}}$  value for the dinuclear complex  $[\{\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2\}_2(\mu\text{-}2,3\text{-dpp})]^{4+}$  is approximately  $2 \times 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}$ , compared to a larger value of  $6 \times 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}$  for the mononuclear analogue  $[\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_2(2,3\text{-dpp})]^{2+}$  {2,3-dpp = 2,3-bis(2-pyridyl)pyrazine}.<sup>22c</sup> In that case, the anticipated reduction is observed and the quantum yield for the dinuclear complex is lower.

It may be noted that the molar absorptivities in the present set of Pt(II) complexes are also increased by a comparable factor of around 2-fold in the bimetallic compared to monometallic compounds (Table 1 and Figures 2 and 3), possibly suggesting a similar effect on the oscillator strength of the S<sub>0</sub> → S<sub>1</sub> transition to the T<sub>1</sub> → S<sub>0</sub>. However, such an increase might be anticipated simply on the basis that there are now *two* metallic units contributing to the absorption bands, as observed in the diruthenium(II) systems.<sup>22</sup> Thus, it is possible that the observed increase in  $k_{\text{r}}$  in the dimetallic complexes may reflect the higher degree of spin-orbit coupling expected from the presence of the second heavy metal ion, promoting radiative decay of the triplet state. Nevertheless, facilitation of the transition by other mechanisms, for example, a change in symmetry to a less centrosymmetric environment at the metal, cannot be ruled out.





**Figure 5.** (Top) Normalized emission spectra of  $\text{PtL}^{1-3}\text{H}$  (blue, red, and black solid lines, respectively, legend as in Figure 2) and  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^{1-3}$  (blue, red, and black short-dashed lines, respectively) in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  solution at 298 K. (Bottom) Corresponding spectra in an EPA glass at 77 K (EPA = diethyl ether/isopentane/ethanol, 2:2:1 v/v).

**5. Time-Dependent Density Functional Theory (TD-DFT) Calculations.** Density functional theory calculations have been carried out on all of the compounds shown in Figure 1, but with the dpm ligands truncated to acac in order to facilitate the calculations. It is well established that changing from dpm to acac in  $\text{Pt}(\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{C})(\text{O}^{\wedge}\text{O})$  complexes has very little influence on the photophysical properties,<sup>12b</sup> and indeed, we confirmed this experimentally in the case of  $\text{PtL}^1\text{H}$  and  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^1$ , where the corresponding acac derivatives have also been studied.<sup>21</sup> The advantage of the dpm ligand is in enhancing solubility. All calculations were performed with Gaussian09W<sup>24</sup> using the B3LYP functional<sup>25</sup> and 6-31+G(d) basis set for all atoms except Pt, for which the LanL2DZ basis set was employed.<sup>26</sup> After full geometry optimization, visible spectra were calculated by TD-DFT both in vacuum and in dichloromethane solution using the polarized continuum model for the solvent.<sup>27</sup>



**Figure 6.** (Top) Normalized emission spectra of  $\text{Pt}^{3-6}\text{H}$  (black, blue, green, and red solid lines, respectively) and  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^{3-6}$  (correspondingly colored dashed lines) in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  solution at 298 K. (Bottom) Corresponding spectra in an EPA glass at 77 K.

In addition to spectroscopic analysis, DFT calculations provide a measure of the relative ground-state stabilities of the mononuclear and dinuclear complexes of a given ligand. For each ligand, the energy changes have been calculated for the hypothetical reactions 1 and 2, generating the mono- and dinuclear complexes, respectively




The energy changes ( $\Delta E$ ) associated with these reactions are shown in Table 3. The first notable feature is that introduction of the second Pt center is always more favorable thermodynamically than the first, indicating a synergy in the binding. The trends in complex stabilities for the different ligands can be understood in terms of steric effects: the least sterically hindered ligands  $\text{L}^1\text{H}_2$  and  $\text{L}^2\text{H}_2$  give the most stable

**Table 3.** Calculated Gas-Phase Energy Changes for Reactions 1 and 2 Generating the Mono- or Dinuclear Complex

species $L^n$ , $n =$	reaction 1 $\rightarrow$ Pt(acac) $L^n$ H, $\Delta E/\text{kJ mol}^{-1}$	reaction 2 $\rightarrow$ {Pt(acac)} $_2L^n$ , $\Delta E/\text{kJ mol}^{-1}$
1	-13.4	-42.0
2	-10.3	-46.7
3	-4.2	-32.8
4	-6.5	-33.0
5	+25.8	-12.4
6	+14.9	-23.6

complexes, and the fused ring systems  $L^4H_2$  and  $L^6H_2$  are a little better than their *ortho*-diphenyl analogues  $L^3H_2$  and  $L^5H_2$ , where the complexes show twisting of the ligands to avoid close contacts in the coordinated hydrocarbon rings. Complexes of  $L^5H_2$  and  $L^6H_2$  are the least stable among the two series, which can be explained by the close contacts between the O atoms of the acac ligands and the CH groups of the extra ring (closest CH...O contacts are 1.96–2.04 Å for  $L^5H_2$  and  $L^6H_2$ , compared to 2.35–2.58 Å for  $L^3H_2$  and  $L^4H_2$ ). This is illustrated for  $\{Pt(acac)\}_2L^5$  in Figure 7. This steric congestion is also




**Figure 7.** Calculated structure of  $Pt_2L^5$  showing the steric distortion centered on the pyrazine ring. Dotted lines show the close contacts between the C–H groups and O atoms; distance = 2.00 Å. Atom colors: C, gray; N, blue; O, red; Pt, magenta.

reflected in the calculated Pt–N bond lengths, which are 2.064–2.088 Å for complexes of  $L^5H_2$  and  $L^6H_2$ , significantly longer compared to the range of 2.009–2.027 Å for complexes of the other four ligands; similarly, the Pt–O bonds trans to the metalated carbon are 2.175–2.179 Å for complexes of  $L^5H_2$  and  $L^6H_2$ , compared to 2.142–2.160 Å for the other complexes. The calculated Pt–C bond lengths for all 12 complexes are in the range of 1.970–2.003 Å, while the Pt–O bonds trans to the nitrogen are in the range 2.031–2.043 Å. All of these values are comparable to those obtained in our previous calculations and for experimentally determined structures of related mononuclear complexes.<sup>21</sup>

As expected, the proligands whose rings are linked by rotatable C–C bonds are nonplanar: the dihedral angles between the heterocyclic and phenyl rings vary from 19° for  $L^1H_2$  to 42° for  $L^3H_2$  and  $L^5H_2$ . In the mononuclear complexes of  $L^3H_2$  and  $L^5H_2$  and all complexes of the other ligands, the coordinated rings are essentially coplanar; however, some distortion is observed for the dinuclear complexes of  $L^3H_2$  and  $L^5H_2$ . This is greatest for  $Pt_2L^5$ , as shown in Figure 7; the pyrazine ring is twisted, such that carbons 1 and 2 are displaced

by 0.12 Å above and below the mean plane of the ring, respectively, and the dihedral angle between the two coordinated phenyl rings is 56°. The calculated structure of  $Pt_2L^5$  shows slightly smaller distortions: the corresponding carbons in the pyrazine ring are displaced by 0.09 Å out of the mean plane, and the dihedral angle between the two phenyl rings is 43°. This is very similar to the distortions observed in the X-ray crystal structure of the analogous palladium complex  $\{Pd(acac)\}_2L^3$ , for which the equivalent carbons lie 0.15 Å out of the pyrazine mean plane and the phenyl rings subtend an angle of 46°.<sup>28</sup>

For all complexes, the calculations reveal that the lowest energy singlet transition ( $S_0 \rightarrow S_1$ ) is primarily HOMO  $\rightarrow$  LUMO in nature in each case (Supporting Information). The frontier orbitals for the mono- and dinuclear complexes of  $L^2H_2$ , which are shown in Figure 8, are representative of all six



**Figure 8.** Frontier orbital diagrams for  $PtL_2H$  (left) and  $Pt_2L^2$  (right).

pairs of complexes; frontier orbital plots for all the other complexes are shown in the Supporting Information for reference. For all 12 complexes, the HOMOs are derived mainly from combinations of platinum d orbitals with  $\pi$  orbitals of the surrounding ligands, with only small contributions from the pyrazine and pyrimidine rings, whereas these heterocyclic rings are much more important components of the LUMOs. The frontier orbitals of the dinuclear complexes are all symmetrically distributed over both halves of the molecules, while those of the mononuclear complexes are all qualitatively similar to their dinuclear counterparts but of course limited to the one available metal center; this affects the composition of the occupied frontier orbitals more than the virtual orbitals. Nevertheless, the energies of the HOMOs for all 12 complexes are very similar, varying by only 0.077 eV, whereas the energies of the LUMOs vary by 0.784 eV. This is consistent with the conclusions from the experimental electrochemical measurements described in section 2, which showed little variation in the oxidation potential between the complexes but a greater range in the reduction potential. Moreover, on going from  $PtL^nH$  to  $Pt_2L^n$ , incorporation of the second metal lowers the energy of the LUMO by around 0.3 eV within each pair of complexes (the change is in the range 0.237–0.373 eV; see Supporting Information). This observation also correlates well with the electrochemical data, which showed a less negative reduction potential (by around 0.3 eV) for each dinuclear complex compared to its mononuclear analogue (Table 1; the range is 0.23–0.38 eV).

There is a good correlation between the energy of the LUMO and the energy of the lowest energy singlet transition in the calculated spectra. Calculated absorption spectra are shown in the Supporting Information and are in generally good



agreement with the experimentally measured spectra. Calculations including the triplet excited states for  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^1$ ,  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^2$ , and  $\text{Pt}_2\text{L}^3$  in dichloromethane placed the formally spin-forbidden  $S_0 \rightarrow T_1$  transitions at 538, 622, and 591 nm, respectively, in good agreement with the experimental phosphorescence data discussed in section 4.

## CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

We previously showed how 4,6-diphenylpyrimidine can be used as a bridging ligand to prepare dinuclear cyclometalated platinum(II) complexes.<sup>21</sup> The present study shows that diphenylpyrazines can likewise generate dinuclear platinum(II) complexes through metalation of the two pendent phenyl rings and binding of the metal ions to the two nitrogen atoms of the central heterocycle. Both the 2,3- and the 2,5-substituted isomers of diphenylpyrazine can be employed, along with diphenylquinoxaline and derivatives in which the phenyl rings are interlinked through their ortho positions. Mono- and dinuclear complexes can be isolated from a single reaction by chromatographic separation.

Introduction of the second metal ion leads, for all six ligands investigated, to a significant stabilization of the LUMO of around 0.3 eV, according to both cyclic voltammetry and TD-DFT calculations. In contrast, the HOMO energy seems to be influenced rather little. These contrasting effects are intuitively in line with the typical distribution of frontier orbitals in cyclometalated complexes of aryl-heterocycles, in that the ring to which two metal ions are bound is the heterocycle, on which the LUMO is predominantly localized. The decreased HOMO–LUMO gap that ensues leads to red-shifted absorption and emission spectra for the dinuclear complexes compared to their mononuclear analogues. Meanwhile, the increased conjugation within the heterocycle on going from a pyrazine through quinoxaline to a phenazine unit (as in  $\text{L}^6\text{H}_2$ ) likewise has a much more significant effect on the LUMO, leading to the progressive shift toward the red region observed in the optical spectra.

Of particular interest is the effect of the second metal ion on the radiative rate constant  $k_r$ . For all of the systems in which this parameter can be estimated with confidence, the value increases upon introduction of the second metal ion, despite the red shift. Normally, for a given type of excited state in structurally related complexes, a decrease in  $k_r$  with decreasing energy is anticipated, since the oscillator strength of a transition is dependent upon  $\nu^3$  in the Einstein coefficient for spontaneous emission. It is possible that the observed effect may be due to the higher degree of spin–orbit coupling expected from the presence of the second heavy metal ion.

In summary, dinuclear cyclometalated complexes are shown to offer interesting potential for obtaining phosphorescent materials that both absorb strongly and emit brightly at unusually low energies. Further derivatization of the diarylpyrazine unit can be confidently expected to lead to further new compounds with opportunities for controlling excited states for contemporary applications, such as in imaging, solar energy conversion, and light-emitting displays.

## EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

<sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectra were recorded on JEOL Delta-270 or JEOL ECS-400 spectrometers operating at the frequencies indicated. Chemical shifts ( $\delta$ ) are in ppm, referenced to tetramethylsilane  $\text{Si}(\text{CH}_3)_4$ , and coupling constants are in Hertz. Mass spectra were recorded at the EPSRC National Mass Spectrometry Service Centre

on a Thermo Scientific LTQ Orbitrap XL Mass Spectrometer using low-resolution electrospray (ESI) or high-resolution nano-electrospray (NSI) ionization techniques. Elemental analyses were carried out using a Carlo Erba 1108 Elemental Analyzer controlled with CE Eager 200 software, run in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and samples weighed using a certified Mettler MX5Microbalance. Proligands  $\text{L}^3\text{H}_2$  and  $\text{L}^5\text{H}_2$  were purchased from Aldrich and used without additional purification, while  $\text{L}^4\text{H}_2$  and  $\text{L}^6\text{H}_2$  were prepared following literature procedures.<sup>29,30</sup>

**Photophysical Measurements.** Absorption spectra were measured on a Biotek Instruments XS spectrometer using quartz cuvettes of 1 cm path length. Steady-state luminescence spectra were measured using a Jobin Yvon FluoroMax-2 spectrofluorimeter, fitted with a red-sensitive Hamamatsu R928 photomultiplier tube; spectra shown are corrected for the wavelength dependence of the detector, and quoted emission maxima refer to the values after correction. Samples for emission measurements were contained within quartz cuvettes of 1 cm path length modified with appropriate glassware to allow connection to a high-vacuum line. Degassing was achieved via a minimum of three freeze–pump–thaw cycles while connected to the vacuum manifold; the final vapor pressure at 77 K was  $<5 \times 10^{-2}$  mbar, as monitored using a Pirani gauge. Luminescence quantum yields were determined using  $[\text{Ru}(\text{bpy})_3]\text{Cl}_2$  in degassed aqueous solution as the standard ( $\Phi_{\text{lum}} = 0.042^{31}$ ); estimated uncertainty in  $\Phi_{\text{lum}}$  is  $\pm 20\%$  or better, except where indicated otherwise. The luminescence lifetimes of the complexes were measured by time-correlated single-photon counting, following excitation at 374.0 nm with an EPL-375 pulsed diode laser. The emitted light was detected at 90° using a Peltier-cooled R928 PMT after passage through a monochromator. The estimated uncertainty in the quoted lifetimes is  $\pm 10\%$  or better. Bimolecular rate constants for quenching by molecular oxygen,  $k_{\text{O}_2}$ , were determined from the lifetimes in degassed and air-equilibrated solution, taking the concentration of oxygen in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  at 0.21 atm  $\text{O}_2$  to be 2.2 mmol  $\text{dm}^{-3}$ .<sup>32</sup>

**Electrochemistry.** Cyclic voltammetry was carried out using a  $\mu$ Autolab Type III potentiostat with computer control and data storage via GPES Manager software. Solutions of concentration 1 mM in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  at  $298 \pm 3$  K were used, containing  $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}][\text{PF}_6]$  as the supporting electrolyte. A three-electrode assembly was employed, consisting of a glassy carbon working electrode and platinum wire counter and reference electrodes. Solutions were purged for at least 5 min with solvent-saturated nitrogen gas with stirring, prior to measurements being taken under a nitrogen atmosphere without stirring. Voltammograms were referenced to the ferrocene–ferrocenium couple measured under the same conditions.

**Density Functional Theory Calculations.** All DFT calculations were carried out using Gaussian 09W.<sup>24</sup> The B3LYP hybrid functional was used together with the LanL2DZ basis set for Pt and 6-31+G(d) for all other atom types. Geometries were fully optimized in vacuo. UV–vis absorption spectra were obtained by single-point TD-DFT calculations at the optimized geometries using the same functional and basis sets, either in vacuo or with a PCM solvent correction<sup>27</sup> for dichloromethane. Molecular orbitals and spectra were visualized using GaussView 5.0.34 with Gaussian line shapes and an arbitrary half-width at half-height of 1000  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  for the latter.

**4,6-Diphenylpyrimidine  $\text{L}^1\text{H}_2$ .** Phenylboronic acid (1 g, 8.20 mmol) and 4,6-dichloropyrimidine (469 mg, 3.15 mmol) were dissolved in 1,4-dioxane (25  $\text{cm}^3$ ), and the reaction mixture was then deaerated by bubbling  $\text{N}_2$  through the mixture for 10 min. Aqueous  $\text{K}_2\text{CO}_3$  solution (2 M, 9.4  $\text{cm}^3$ , 18.8 mmol) and tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)palladium(0) (220 mg, 0.19 mmol) were added, and the mixture was deaerated for a further 15 min. The reaction mixture was then stirred at 95 °C under  $\text{N}_2$  for 24 h. Solvents were removed under vacuum, and DCM (35  $\text{cm}^3$ ) was added. The organic layer was separated, washed with water (3  $\times$  35  $\text{cm}^3$ ), dried over  $\text{MgSO}_4$ , filtered, and evaporated to dryness. The product was then purified by column chromatography using silica gel and ethyl acetate/DCM (1:4 ratio) as the eluent; yield 680 mg, 93%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR ( $\text{CDCl}_3$ , 270 MHz)  $\delta$ : 9.31 (1H, d,  $J = 1.2$  Hz), 8.16–8.12 (4H, m), 8.10 (1H, d,  $J = 1.5$  Hz), 7.55–7.50 (6H, m). <sup>13</sup>C NMR ( $\text{CDCl}_3$ , 68 MHz)  $\delta_{\text{C}}$ : 164.8,

159.3, 137.2, 131.0, 129.1, 127.3, 112.9. MS (ESI):  $m/z$  233 [M]<sup>+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>16</sub>H<sub>12</sub>N<sub>2</sub>: C, 82.73; H, 5.21; N, 12.06. Found: C, 82.85; H, 5.33; N, 11.92.

**2,5-Diphenylpyrazine L<sup>2</sup>H<sub>2</sub>.** Phenylboronic acid (1 g, 8.20 mmol) and 2,5-dibromopyrazine (750 mg, 3.15 mmol) were dissolved in 1,4-dioxane (25 cm<sup>3</sup>), and the reaction mixture was then deaerated by bubbling N<sub>2</sub> through the mixture for 10 min. Aqueous K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> solution (2 M, 9.0 cm<sup>3</sup>, 18.8 mmol) and tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)-palladium(0) (6% mol, 220 mg, 0.19 mmol) were added, and the mixture was deaerated for a further 15 min. The reaction mixture was then stirred at 95 °C for 24 h under N<sub>2</sub>. On cooling, water was added and the resulting precipitate was filtered and dried. The residue was then recrystallized from ethanol; yield 238 mg, 33%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 270 MHz) δ<sub>H</sub>: 9.07 (2H, d, *J* = 0.7 Hz), 8.08–8.03 (4H, m), 7.56–7.46 (6H, m). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 100 MHz) δ<sub>C</sub>: 150.8, 141.4, 136.4, 129.9, 129.2, 126.9.

**PtL<sup>1</sup>H and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>1</sup>.** A solution of potassium tetrachloroplatinate (1 g, 2.42 mmol) in water (4 cm<sup>3</sup>) was added to a stirred solution of L<sup>1</sup>H<sub>2</sub> (375 mg, 1.61 mmol) in acetic acid (80 cm<sup>3</sup>). The mixture was heated at reflux under a nitrogen atmosphere for 3 days. The precipitate was filtered off and washed successively with acetic acid (10 cm<sup>3</sup>) and ethanol (10 cm<sup>3</sup>) to give the dichlorobridged intermediate. A mixture of the intermediate (1.07 g, 1.29 mmol), 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-3,5-heptanedione (949 mg, 5.16 mmol), aqueous K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> solution (2 M, 5 cm<sup>3</sup>, 10.32 mmol), and acetone (80 cm<sup>3</sup>) was heated at reflux under N<sub>2</sub> for 24 h. Solvent was removed by rotary evaporation, the residue was treated with DCM and filtered, and the filtrate was evaporated to dryness. The residue was then purified by column chromatography using silica gel and a mixture of dichloromethane/hexane, 1/2, as the eluent to give both the mononuclear and the dinuclear products. **PtL<sup>1</sup>H**, *R<sub>f</sub>* = 0.1, yield 150 mg, 15%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 400 MHz) δ<sub>H</sub>: 9.62 (1H, d, *J* = 0.9 Hz), 8.17–8.14 (2H, m), 7.90 (1H, d, *J* = 0.9 Hz), 7.72 (1H, dd, *J* = 7.6, 0.8 Hz), 7.64 (1H, dd, *J* = 7.6, 1.0 Hz), 7.56–7.54 (3H, m), 7.31 (1H, ddd, *J* = 7.6, 7.6, 1.0 Hz), 7.15 (1H, ddd, *J* = 7.6, 7.6, 0.8 Hz), 5.84 (1H, s), 1.29 (9H, s), 1.28 (9H, s). HRMS (NSI):  $m/z$  609.2003 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Calcd for C<sub>27</sub>H<sub>31</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>Pt: C, 53.20; H, 4.96; N, 4.60. Found: C, 53.31; H, 4.92; N, 4.49. **Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>1</sup>**, *R<sub>f</sub>* = 0.2, yield 29 mg, 2.4%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 400 MHz) δ<sub>H</sub>: 9.68 (1H, s), 7.71 (2H, br. d, *J* = 7.6 Hz), 7.70 (1H, s), 7.62 (2H, br. d, *J* = 7.6 Hz), 7.34 (2H, br. t, *J* = 7.6 Hz), 7.17 (2H, br. t, *J* = 7.6 Hz), 5.84 (2H, s), 1.28 (18H, s) 1.26 (18H, s). HRMS (NSI):  $m/z$  985.2934 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Calcd for C<sub>38</sub>H<sub>48</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>Pt<sub>2</sub>H  $m/z$  985.2941. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>38</sub>H<sub>48</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>Pt<sub>2</sub>: C, 46.24; H, 4.90; N, 2.84. Found: C, 46.30; H, 5.25; N, 2.64.

**PtL<sup>2</sup>H and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>2</sup>.** A solution of potassium tetrachloroplatinate (896 mg, 2.16 mmol) in water (4 cm<sup>3</sup>) was added to a stirred solution of L<sup>2</sup>H<sub>2</sub> (250 mg, 1.08 mmol) in acetic acid (80 cm<sup>3</sup>). The mixture was heated at reflux under N<sub>2</sub> for 3 days. The precipitate was filtered off, washed consecutively with acetic acid (10 cm<sup>3</sup>) and ethanol (10 cm<sup>3</sup>), and dried to give the dichlorobridged dimer. A mixture of the dimer (680 mg, 1.32 mmol), 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-3,5-heptanedione (972 mg, 5.28 mmol), aqueous K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> solution (2M, 5 cm<sup>3</sup>, 10.56 mmol), and acetone (80 cm<sup>3</sup>) was heated at reflux under N<sub>2</sub> for 24 h. Acetone was removed by rotary evaporation, and the residue was then washed with water, filtered, and dried. The solid was purified by column chromatography using silica gel and dichloromethane as an eluent to give both the mononuclear and dinuclear products. For **PtL<sup>2</sup>H**, *R<sub>f</sub>* = 0.6, yield 230 mg, 35%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 400 MHz) δ<sub>H</sub>: 9.54 (1H, d, *J* = 1.2 Hz, <sup>3</sup>*J*<sub>H–Pt</sub> = 46 Hz), 8.95 (1H, d, *J* = 1.2 Hz, <sup>4</sup>*J*<sub>H–Pt</sub> = 13 Hz), 8.06–8.01 (2H, m), 7.70 (1H, dd, *J* = 7.8, 1.6 Hz), 7.60 (1H, dd, *J* = 7.8, 1.6 Hz), 7.58–7.48 (3H, m), 7.29 (1H, ddd, *J* = 7.4, 7.4, 1.2 Hz), 7.17 (1H, ddd, *J* = 7.4, 7.4, 1.2 Hz), 5.86 (1H, s), 1.34 (9H, s), 1.31 (9H, s). HRMS (NSI):  $m/z$  609.2003 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Calcd for C<sub>27</sub>H<sub>31</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>PtH  $m/z$  609.2007. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>27</sub>H<sub>30</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>Pt: C, 53.20; H, 4.96; N, 4.60. Found: C, 52.52; H, 4.47; N, 4.15%. For **Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>2</sup>**, *R<sub>f</sub>* = 0.9, yield 150 mg, 14%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 400 MHz) δ<sub>H</sub>: 9.44 (2H, s), 7.72 (2H, dd, *J* = 6.7, 1.5 Hz), 7.43 (2H, dd, *J* = 6.7, 1.5 Hz), 7.29 (2H, ddd, *J* = 7.7, 7.7, 1.5 Hz), 7.17 (2H, ddd, *J* = 7.7, 7.7, 1.5 Hz), 5.88 (2H, s), 1.37 (18H, s), 1.30 (18H, s). HRMS (NSI):  $m/z$  985.2940 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Calcd for C<sub>38</sub>H<sub>48</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>Pt<sub>2</sub>H  $m/z$  985.2941. Anal.

Calcd for C<sub>38</sub>H<sub>48</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>Pt<sub>2</sub>: C, 46.24; H, 4.90; N, 2.84. Found: C, 46.36; H, 5.27; N, 2.60.

**PtL<sup>3</sup>H.** A solution of potassium tetrachloroplatinate (270 mg, 0.65 mmol) in water (2 cm<sup>3</sup>) was added to a stirred solution of L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub> (150 mg, 0.65 mmol) in acetic acid (60 cm<sup>3</sup>). The mixture was heated at reflux under an argon atmosphere for 19 h. The precipitate was filtered off, washed successively with acetic acid (10 cm<sup>3</sup>) and ethanol (10 cm<sup>3</sup>), and dried to give the dichlorobridged dimer. A mixture of the dimer (150 mg, 0.30 mmol), 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-3,5-heptanedione (166 mg, 0.90 mmol), aqueous K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> solution (2M, 1 cm<sup>3</sup>, 1.8 mmol), and ethoxyethanol (70 cm<sup>3</sup>) was heated at reflux under argon for 15 h. Solvent was evaporated, and the solid was washed in water (70 cm<sup>3</sup>). The solid was then filtered, dried, and purified by column chromatography using silica gel and dichloromethane as the eluent; *R<sub>f</sub>* = 0.4 yield 140 mg, 35%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 400 MHz) δ<sub>H</sub>: 9.10 (1H, d, *J* = 3.4 Hz, <sup>3</sup>*J*<sub>H–Pt</sub> = 47 Hz), 8.33 (1H, d, *J* = 4.5 Hz), 7.69 (1H, dd, *J* = 7.9, 1.4 Hz), 7.57–7.49 (5H, m), 7.13 (1H, ddd, *J* = 7.8, 7.2, 1.8 Hz), 6.75–6.23 (2H, m), 5.84 (1H, s), 1.29 (9H, s), 1.28 (9H, s). MS (ESI):  $m/z$  609 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>27</sub>H<sub>30</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>Pt: C, 53.20; H, 4.96; N, 4.60. Found: C, 53.64; H, 5.18; N, 4.52.

**Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>3</sup>.** A solution of potassium tetrachloroplatinate (540 mg, 1.30 mmol) in water (4 cm<sup>3</sup>) was added to a stirred solution of L<sup>3</sup>H<sub>2</sub> (150 mg, 0.65 mmol) in acetic acid (60 cm<sup>3</sup>). The mixture was heated at reflux under N<sub>2</sub> for 24 h. The precipitate was filtered off, washed successively with acetic acid (10 cm<sup>3</sup>) and ethanol (10 cm<sup>3</sup>), and dried to give the dichlorobridged dimer. A mixture of the dimer (200 mg, 0.26 mmol), 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-3,5-heptanedione (144 mg, 0.78 mmol), aqueous K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> solution (2M, 1 cm<sup>3</sup>, 1.56 mmol), and ethoxyethanol (70 cm<sup>3</sup>) was heated under reflux under nitrogen for 15 h. Solvent was evaporated, and the solid was washed with water (70 cm<sup>3</sup>). The solid was then filtered off and dried. The product was purified by column chromatography using silica gel and dichloromethane as an eluent; *R<sub>f</sub>* = 0.9, yield 60 mg, 9%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 400 MHz) δ<sub>H</sub>: 8.69 (2H, s), 8.03 (2H, dd, *J* = 8.5, 2.0 Hz), 7.73 (2H, dd, *J* = 8.5, 2.0 Hz), 7.31–7.25 (2H, m), 7.00 (2H, ddd, *J* = 7.6, 7.8, 1.8 Hz), 5.86 (2H, s), 1.31 (18H, s), 1.30 (18H, s). MS (ESI):  $m/z$  985 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>38</sub>H<sub>48</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>Pt<sub>2</sub>: C, 46.24; H, 4.90; N, 2.84. Found: C, 46.31; H, 5.05; N, 2.79.

**PtL<sup>4</sup>H and Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>4</sup>.** A solution of potassium tetrachloroplatinate (452 mg, 1.09 mmol) in water (2 cm<sup>3</sup>) was added to a stirred solution of L<sup>4</sup>H<sub>2</sub> (250 mg, 1.09 mmol) in acetic acid (75 cm<sup>3</sup>). The mixture was heated at reflux under N<sub>2</sub> for 24 h. The precipitate was filtered off, washed successively with acetic acid (10 cm<sup>3</sup>) and ethanol (10 cm<sup>3</sup>), and dried to give the dichloro-bridged dimer. A mixture of the dimer (270 mg, 0.55 mmol), 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-3,5-heptanedione (304 mg, 1.65 mmol), aqueous K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> solution (2M, 2 cm<sup>3</sup>, 3.3 mmol), and acetone (70 cm<sup>3</sup>) was heated under reflux under N<sub>2</sub> for 23 h. The mixture was filtered, and water (70 cm<sup>3</sup>) was added to the filtrate. The precipitated solid was filtered off, washed with water, and dried. The product was then purified by column chromatography using silica gel and dichloromethane as the eluent to give both the mononuclear and the dinuclear products. For **PtL<sup>4</sup>H**, *R<sub>f</sub>* = 0.7, yield 100 mg, 15%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 400 MHz) δ<sub>H</sub>: 9.13 (1H, dd, *J* = 7.7, 1.3 Hz), 9.09 (1H, d, *J* = 3.4 Hz), 8.75 (1H, d, *J* = 3.4 Hz), 8.60 (1H, dd, *J* = 8.2, 1.3 Hz), 8.19 (1H, dd, *J* = 8.2, 1.3 Hz), 7.86–7.63 (4H, m), 5.91 (1H, s), 1.18, (18H, s). MS (ESI):  $m/z$  607 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>27</sub>H<sub>28</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>Pt: C, 53.37; H, 4.64; N, 4.61. Found: C, 53.65; H, 4.75; N, 4.48. For **Pt<sub>2</sub>L<sup>4</sup>**, *R<sub>f</sub>* = 0.9, yield 50 mg, 9%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (CDCl<sub>3</sub>, 400 MHz) δ<sub>H</sub>: 8.69 (2H, s), 8.09 (2H, d, *J* = 7.6 Hz), 7.75 (2H, d, *J* = 8.4 Hz), 7.62 (2H, t, *J* = 8.0, 7.6 Hz), 5.91 (2H, s), 1.36 (18H, s), 1.35 (18H, s). MS (ESI):  $m/z$  982 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>38</sub>H<sub>46</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>Pt: C, 46.69; H, 4.95; N, 2.81. Found: C, 46.86; H, 4.87; N, 2.82.

**PtL<sup>5</sup>H.** Under N<sub>2</sub> atmosphere, L<sup>5</sup>H<sub>2</sub> (220 mg, 0.78 mmol) and potassium tetrachloroplatinate (420 mg, 1.01 mmol) were dissolved in acetic acid (50 cm<sup>3</sup>) and the mixture was heated at reflux overnight. The mixture was cooled to room temperature, and the black solid was filtered off, washed with ethanol (20 cm<sup>3</sup>), and air dried. The crude product was added to a solution of 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-3,5-heptanedione (432 mg, 2.34 mmol) in acetone (60 cm<sup>3</sup>), followed

by aqueous  $K_2CO_3$  solution (2M, 5 cm<sup>3</sup>). The mixture was heated at reflux overnight. Acetone was removed under reduced pressure, and the crude product was dissolved in DCM. The organic layer was washed with brine and dried with  $MgSO_4$ . Solvent was removed under vacuum, and the product was then purified by column chromatography using silica gel and  $CHCl_3$ ,  $R_f = 0.4$ , yield 231 mg, 45%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR ( $CDCl_3$ , 400 MHz)  $\delta_H$ : 9.42 (1H, dd,  $J = 8.2$  Hz,  $J = 1.4$  Hz), 8.09 (1H, dd,  $J = 7.6$  Hz,  $J = 1.6$  Hz), 7.83 (1H, d,  $J = 7.8$  Hz), 7.68–7.76 (4H, m), 7.50–7.56 (3H, m), 7.14 (1H, m), 6.71–6.77 (2H, m), 5.93 (1H, s), 1.32 (9H, s), 1.27 (9H, s). MS (ESI):  $m/z$  659 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for  $C_{31}H_{32}N_2O_2Pt$ : C, 56.44; H, 4.89; N, 4.25. Found: C, 56.84; H, 5.12; N, 4.08.

$Pt_2L^5$ . Under  $N_2$  atmosphere,  $PtL^5H$  (200 mg, 0.30 mmol) and potassium tetrachloroplatinate (415 mg, 0.36 mmol) were dissolved in acetic acid (40 cm<sup>3</sup>), and the mixture was heated at reflux 15 h. The mixture was cooled to room temperature, and the black solid was filtered off, washed with ethanol (20 cm<sup>3</sup>), and air dried. The crude product was added to a solution of 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-3,5-heptanedione (74 mg, 0.4 mmol) in acetone (50 cm<sup>3</sup>), followed by aqueous  $K_2CO_3$  solution (2M, 5 cm<sup>3</sup>). The mixture was heated at reflux for 16 h. Acetone was removed under reduced pressure, and the crude product was dissolved in DCM. The organic layer was washed with brine, dried over  $MgSO_4$ , filtered, and evaporated to dryness. The residue was then purified by column chromatography using silica gel and  $CHCl_3$  as the eluent to give the product;  $R_f = 0.8$  yield 102 mg, 33%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR ( $CDCl_3$ , 400 MHz)  $\delta_H$ : 9.49 (2H, m), 8.00 (2H, br d,  $J = 10.0$  Hz), 7.85 (2H, dd,  $J = 12.0$  Hz,  $J = 2.4$  Hz), 7.64 (2H, m), 7.26 (2H, ddd,  $J = 12.0$  Hz,  $J = 11.6$  Hz,  $J = 1.6$  Hz), 7.00 (2H, ddd,  $J = 11.6$  Hz,  $J = 10.4$  Hz,  $J = 2.4$  Hz), 5.96 (2H, s), 1.34 (18H, s), 1.28 (18H, s). MS (ESI):  $m/z$  1035 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for  $C_{42}H_{50}N_2O_4Pt_2$ : C, 48.64; H, 4.86; N, 2.70. Found: C, 48.86; H, 5.38; N, 2.48.

$PtL^6H$  and  $Pt_2L^6$ . A mixture of  $L^6H_2$  (93 mg, 0.33 mmol), potassium tetrachloroplatinate (150 mg, 0.4 mmol), and acetic acid (35 cm<sup>3</sup>) was heated at reflux under nitrogen for 14 h. The mixture was allowed to cool to room temperature, and the black solid was filtered off, washed with ethanol (20 cm<sup>3</sup>), and air dried. The crude product was added to a solution of 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-3,5-heptanedione (431 mg, 2.34 mmol) in acetone (60 cm<sup>3</sup>), followed by aqueous  $K_2CO_3$  solution (2M, 5 cm<sup>3</sup>). The mixture was heated at reflux for 14 h. Acetone was removed under reduced pressure, and DCM (30 cm<sup>3</sup>) and brine (15 cm<sup>3</sup>) were added. The organic layer was dried over  $MgSO_4$  and filtered. Solvent was removed by rotary evaporation, and the residue was then purified by column chromatography using silica gel and  $CHCl_3$ /hexane, 7/3 v/v, as the eluent to give both the mononuclear and the dinuclear products. For  $PtL^6H$ ,  $R_f = 0.7$ , yield 24 mg, 11%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR ( $CDCl_3$ , 400 MHz)  $\delta_H$ : 10.07 (1H, dd,  $J = 8.7$  Hz,  $J = 1.4$  Hz), 9.31 (1H, dd,  $J = 9.2$  Hz,  $J = 1.4$  Hz), 8.50 (1H, d,  $J = 7.8$  Hz), 8.36 (1H, dd,  $J = 8.7$  Hz,  $J = 1.4$  Hz), 8.12 (1H, d,  $J = 7.8$  Hz), 7.99 (1H, d,  $J = 6.9$  Hz), 7.69–7.92 (4H, m), 7.62 (1H, t,  $J = 7.8$  Hz), 5.99 (1H, s), 1.38 (9H, s), 1.37 (9H, s). MS (ESI):  $m/z$  657 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>. Anal. Calcd for  $C_{31}H_{30}N_2O_2Pt$ : C, 56.61; H, 4.60; N, 4.26. Found: C, 56.59; H, 4.63; N, 4.18. For  $Pt_2L^6$ ,  $R_f = 0.8$ , yield 2 mg, 1%. <sup>1</sup>H NMR ( $CDCl_3$ , 400 MHz)  $\delta_H$ : 10.15 (2H, m), 8.06 (2H, d,  $J = 7.8$  Hz), 7.96 (2H, d,  $J = 7.3$  Hz), 7.87 (2H, m), 7.61 (2H, t,  $J = 7.8$  Hz), 5.99 (2H, s), 1.38 (18H, s), 1.37 (18H, s). MS (ESI):  $m/z$  1033 [M + H]<sup>+</sup>.

## ■ ASSOCIATED CONTENT

### Supporting Information

<sup>1</sup>H NMR and mass spectra; data from DFT calculations; frontier orbital plots for all complexes generated by TD-DFT calculations. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

## ■ AUTHOR INFORMATION

### Corresponding Authors

\*E-mail: [j.a.g.williams@durham.ac.uk](mailto:j.a.g.williams@durham.ac.uk).

\*E-mail: [valery.kozhevnikov@northumbria.ac.uk](mailto:valery.kozhevnikov@northumbria.ac.uk).

## Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

## ■ ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank EPSRC for funding (grants EP/I014942/1 and EP/H051902/01) and the EPSRC National Mass Spectrometry Service Centre, Swansea for recording mass spectra.

## ■ REFERENCES

- (1) In *Highly Efficient OLEDs with Phosphorescent materials*; Yersin, H., Ed.; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, Germany, 2008.
- (2) In *Organic light-emitting diodes: Materials, devices and applications*; Buckley, A., Ed.; Woodhead: Cambridge, 2013.
- (3) (a) D'Andrade, B. W.; Forrest, S. R. *Adv. Mater.* **2004**, *16*, 1585. (b) So, F.; Kido, J.; Burrows, P. *MRS Bull.* **2008**, *7*, 663. (c) Sun, Y.; Forrest, S. R. *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **2007**, *91*, 263503.
- (4) (a) Lamansky, S.; Djurovich, P.; Murphy, D.; Abdel-Razzaq, F.; Lee, H. E.; Adachi, C.; Burrows, P. E.; Forrest, S. R.; Thompson, M. E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2001**, *123*, 4304. (b) Tsuboyama, A.; Iwawaki, H.; Furugori, M.; Mukaide, T.; Kamatani, J.; Igawa, S.; Moriyama, T.; Miura, S.; Takiguchi, T.; Okada, S.; Hoshini, M.; Ueno, K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 12971. (c) Su, Y.-J.; Huang, H.-L.; Li, C.-L.; Chien, C.-H.; Tao, Y.-T.; Chou, P.-T.; Datta, S.; Liu, R.-S. *Adv. Mater.* **2003**, *15*, 224. (d) Hwang, F.-M.; Chen, H.-Y.; Chen, P.-S.; Liu, C.-S.; Chi, Y.; Shu, C.-F.; Wu, F.-I.; Chou, P.-T.; Peng, S.-M.; Lee, G.-H. *Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, *44*, 1344. (e) Bronstein, H.; Finlayson, C. E.; Kirov, K. R.; Friend, R. H.; Williams, C. K. *Organometallics* **2008**, *27*, 2980.
- (5) (a) Fernandez-Moreira, V.; Thorp-Greenwood, F. L.; Coogan, M. P. *Chem. Commun.* **2010**, *46*, 186. (b) Lo, K.K.-W.; Li, S.P.-Y.; Zhang, K.-Y. *New J. Chem.* **2011**, *35*, 265. (c) Zhao, Q.; Huang, C.; Li, F. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2011**, *40*, 2508. (d) Baggaley, E.; Weinstein, J. A.; Williams, J. A. G. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2012**, *256*, 1762.
- (6) Wang, L. V.; Wu, H. *Biomedical Optics: Principles and Imaging*; John Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, 2007.
- (7) (a) Ardo, S.; Meyer, G. J. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2009**, *38*, 115. (b) Hagfeldt, A.; Boschloo, G.; Sun, L.; Kloo, L.; Pettersson, H. *Chem. Rev.* **2010**, *110*, 6595. (c) Abbotto, A.; Manfredi, N. *Dalton Trans.* **2011**, *40*, 12421.
- (8) Juris, A.; Balzani, V.; Barigelletti, F.; Campagna, S.; Belser, P.; Von Zelewsky, A. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1988**, *84*, 85.
- (9) For reviews, see: (a) Dixon, I. M.; Collin, J.-P.; Sauvage, J.-P.; Flamigni, L.; Encinas, S.; Barigelletti, F. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2000**, *29*, 385. (b) Lowry, M. S.; Bernhard, S. *Chem.—Eur. J.* **2006**, *12*, 7970. (c) Flamigni, L.; Barbieri, A.; Sabatini, C.; Ventura, B.; Barigelletti, F. *Top. Curr. Chem.* **2007**, *281*, 143. (d) Wong, W.-Y.; Ho, C. L. *J. Mater. Chem.* **2009**, *19*, 4457. (e) Williams, J. A. G.; Wilkinson, A. J.; Whittle, V. L. *Dalton Trans.* **2008**, 2081. (f) Chi, Y.; Chou, P.-T. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2010**, *39*, 638. (g) Liu, Z.; Bian, Z.; Huang, C. *Top. Organomet. Chem.* **2010**, *28*, 113. (h) You, Y.; Nam, W. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2012**, *41*, 7061.
- (10) (a) Baldo, M. A.; O'Brien, D. F.; You, Y.; Shoustikov, A.; Sibley, S.; Thompson, M. E.; Forrest, S. R. *Nature* **1998**, *395*, 151. (b) Grushin, V. V.; Herron, N.; LeCloude, D. D.; Marshall, W. J.; Petrov, V. A.; Wang, Y. *Chem. Commun.* **2001**, *16*, 1494. (c) Tamayo, A. B.; Alleyne, B. D.; Djurovich, P. I.; Lamansky, S.; Tsyba, I.; Ho, N. N.; Bau, R.; Thompson, M. E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 7377. (d) Zhao, Q.; Jiang, C.-Y.; Shi, M.; Li, F.-Y.; Yi, T.; Cao, Y.; Huang, C.-H. *Organometallics* **2006**, *25*, 3631. (e) Xu, M. L.; Wang, G. Y.; Zhou, R.; An, Z. W.; Zhou, Q.; Li, W. L. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2007**, *360*, 3149.
- (11) For reviews, see: (a) Lai, S.-W.; Che, C.-M. *Top. Curr. Chem.* **2004**, *241*, 27. (b) Williams, J. A. G. *Top. Curr. Chem.* **2007**, *281*, 205. (c) Williams, J. A. G.; Develay, S.; Rochester, D. L.; Murphy, L. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2008**, *252*, 2596. (d) Murphy, L.; Williams, J. A. G. *Top. Organomet. Chem.* **2010**, *28*, 75.
- (12) (a) Balashev, K. P.; Puzyk, M. V.; Kotlyar, V. S.; Kulikova, M. V. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1997**, *159*, 109. (b) Brooks, J.; Babayan, Y.; Lamansky, S.; Djurovich, P. I.; Tsyba, I.; Bau, R.; Thompson, M. E. *Inorg. Chem.* **2002**, *41*, 3055. (c) Yin, B. L.; Niemeyer, F.; Williams, J. A. G.; Jiang, J.; Boucekkine, A.; Toupet, L.; Le Bozec, H.; Guerchais, V.

- Inorg. Chem.* **2006**, *45*, 8584. (d) Niedermair, F.; Kwon, O.; Zojer, K.; Kappaun, S.; Trimmel, G.; Mereiter, K.; Slugovc, C. *Dalton Trans.* **2008**, 4006. (e) Ghedini, M.; Pugliese, T.; La Deda, M.; Godbert, N.; Aiello, I.; Amati, M.; Belviso, S.; Lelj, F.; Accorsi, G.; Barigelletti, F. *Dalton Trans.* **2008**, 4303. (f) Chang, S.-Y.; Cheng, Y.-M.; Chi, Y.; Lin, Y.-C.; Jiang, C.-M.; Lee, G.-H.; Chou, P.-T. *Dalton Trans.* **2008**, 6901. (g) Liu, J.; Yang, C.-J.; Cao, Q.-Y.; Xu, M.; Wang, J.; Peng, H.-N.; Tan, W.-F.; Lue, X.-X.; Gao, X.-C. *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **2009**, *362*, 575. (h) Santoro, A.; Whitwood, A. C.; Williams, J. A. G.; Kozhevnikov, V. N.; Bruce, D. W. *Chem. Mater.* **2009**, *21*, 3871. (i) Zhou, G.; Wang, Q.; Ho, C.-L.; Wong, W.-Y.; Ma, D.; Wang, L. *Chem. Commun.* **2009**, 3574. (j) Feng, K.; Zuniga, C.; Zhang, Y.-D.; Kim, D.; Barlow, S.; Marder, S. R.; Brédas, J. L.; Weck, M. *Macromolecules* **2009**, *42*, 6855. (k) Zhou, G. J.; Wang, Q.; Wang, X. Z.; Ho, C. L.; Wong, W. Y.; Ma, D. G.; Wang, L. X.; Lin, Z. Y. *J. Mater. Chem.* **2010**, *20*, 7472. (l) Vezzu, D. A. K.; Deaton, J. C.; Jones, J. S.; Bartolotti, L. C.; Harris, F.; Marchetti, A. P.; Kondakova, M.; Pike, R. D.; Huo, S. *Inorg. Chem.* **2010**, *49*, 5107. (m) Wu, W. H.; Wu, W. T.; Ji, S. M.; Guo, H. M.; Song, P.; Han, K. L.; Chi, L. N.; Shao, J. Y.; Zhao, J. Z. *J. Mater. Chem.* **2010**, *20*, 9775. (n) Chan, J.C.-H.; Lam, W. H.; Wong, H.-L.; Zhu, N. Y.; Wong, W.-T.; Yam, V.W.-W. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 12690.
- (13) (a) Rausch, A. F.; Homeier, H. H. H.; Djurovich, P. I.; Thompson, M. E.; Yersin, Y. *Proc. SPIE* **2007**, *6655*, F6550. (b) Yersin, H.; Rausch, A. F.; Czerwieniec, R.; Hofbeck, T.; Fischer, T. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2011**, *255*, 21.
- (14) Hay, P. J. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2002**, *106*, 1634.
- (15) Okada, S.; Okinaka, K.; Iwawaki, H.; Furugori, M.; Hashimoto, M.; Mukaide, T.; Kamatani, J.; Igawa, S.; Tsuboyama, A.; Takiguchi, T.; Ueno, K. *Dalton Trans.* **2005**, 1583.
- (16) Lamansky, S.; Djurovich, P.; Murphy, D.; Abdel-Razzaq, F.; Kwong, R.; Tsyba, I.; Bortz, M.; Mui, B.; Bau, R.; Thompson, M. E. *Inorg. Chem.* **2001**, *40*, 1704.
- (17) Lepeltier, M.; Le Bozec, H.; Guerchais, V.; Lee, T. K.-M.; Lo, K. K.-W. *Organometallics* **2005**, *24*, 6069.
- (18) (a) Chou, P. T.; Chi, Y.; Chung, M. W.; Lin, C. C. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2011**, *255*, 2653. (b) Chen, Y. L.; Li, S. W.; Chi, Y.; Cheng, Y. M.; Pu, S. C.; Yeh, Y. S.; Chou, P. T. *ChemPhysChem* **2005**, *6*, 2012.
- (19) Kozhevnikov, D. N.; Kozhevnikov, V. N.; Shafikov, M. Z.; Prokhorov, A. M.; Bruce, D. W.; Williams, J. A. G. *Inorg. Chem.* **2011**, *50*, 3804.
- (20) Wu, S. H.; Burkhardt, S. E.; Yao, J.; Zhong, Y. W.; Abruña, H. D. *Inorg. Chem.* **2011**, *50*, 3959.
- (21) Kozhevnikov, V. N.; Durrant, M. C.; Williams, J. A. G. *Inorg. Chem.* **2011**, *50*, 6304.
- (22) (a) Braunstein, C. H.; Baker, A. D.; Streckas, T. C.; Gafney, H. D. *Inorg. Chem.* **1984**, *23*, 857. (b) Cooper, J. B.; MacQueen, D. B.; Petersen, J. D.; Wertz, D. W. *Inorg. Chem.* **1990**, *29*, 3701. (c) Denti, G.; Campagna, S.; Sabatino, L.; Serroni, S.; Ciano, M.; Balzani, V. *Inorg. Chem.* **1990**, *39*, 4750. (d) Serroni, S.; Juris, A.; Campagna, S.; Venturi, M.; Denti, G.; Balzani, V. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 9086. (e) Campagna, S.; Denti, G.; Serroni, S.; Juris, A.; Venturi, M.; Ricevuto, V.; Balzani, V. *Chem.—Eur. J.* **1995**, *1*, 211. (f) Sommovigo, M.; Denti, G.; Serroni, S.; Campagna, S.; Mingazzini, C.; Mariotti, C.; Juris, A. *Inorg. Chem.* **2001**, *40*, 3318.
- (23) (a) Williams, J. A. G.; Beeby, A.; Davies, E. S.; Weinstein, J. A.; Wilson, C. *Inorg. Chem.* **2003**, *42*, 8609. (b) Farley, S. J.; Rochester, D. L.; Thompson, A. L.; Howard, J. A. K.; Williams, J. A. G. *Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, *44*, 9690. (c) Develay, S.; Blackburn, O.; Thompson, A. L.; Williams, J. A. G. *Inorg. Chem.* **2008**, *47*, 11129.
- (24) Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Petersson, G. A.; Nakatsuji, H.; Caricato, M.; Li, X.; Hratchian, H. P.; Izmaylov, A. F.; Bloino, J.; Zheng, G.; Sonnenberg, J. L.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Vreven, T.; Montgomery, Jr., J. A.; Peralta, J. E.; Ogliaro, F.; Bearpark, M.; Heyd, J. J.; Brothers, E.; Kudin, K. N.; Staroverov, V. N.; Kobayashi, R.; Normand, J.; Raghavachari, K.; Rendell, A.; Burant, J. C.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Cossi, M.; Rega, N.; Millam, J. M.; Klene, M.; Knox, J. E.; Cross, J. B.; Bakken, V.;
- Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Zazyev, O.; Austin, A. J.; Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, J. W.; Martin, R. L.; Morokuma, K.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, A. D.; Farkas, Ö.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.; Cioslowski, J.; Fox, D. J. *Gaussian 09W*, Version 7.0; Gaussian, Inc.: Wallingford, CT, 2009.
- (25) Becke, A. *Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 5648.
- (26) Hay, P.; Wadt, W. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1985**, *82*, 270.
- (27) Cossi, K.; Scalmani, G.; Rega, N.; Barone, V. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *117*, 43.
- (28) Steel, P. J.; Caygill, G. B. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1990**, *395*, 359.
- (29) Mason, A. T. *Ber. Dtsch. Chem. Ges.* **1886**, *19*, 112.
- (30) Minsky, A.; Cohen, Y.; Rabinovitz, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1985**, *107*, 1501.
- (31) Van Houten, J.; Watts, R. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1976**, *98*, 4853.
- (32) Murov, S. L.; Carmichael, I.; Hug, G. L. *Handbook of Photochemistry*, 2nd ed.; Marcel Dekker: New York, 1993.