Published in final edited form as:

Inorg Chem. 2010 February 1; 49(3): 879–887. doi:10.1021/ic901464b.

Synthesis and Characterization of Iron(II) Quinaldate Complexes

Dylan T. Houghton, Nicholas W. Gydesen, Navamoney Arulsamy, and Mark P. Mehn

Department of Chemistry, University of Wyoming, 1000 E. University Avenue, Laramie, Wyoming 82071

Abstract

Treatment of iron(II) chloride or iron(II) bromide with two equivalents of sodium quinaldate (qn = quinaldate or $C_{10}H_6NO_2^-$) yields the coordinatively unsaturated mononuclear iron(II) quinaldate complexes $Na[Fe^{II}(qn)_2Cl] \cdot DMF$ and $Na[Fe^{II}(qn)_2Br] \cdot DMF$, respectively. When a similar synthesis is carried out using iron(II) triflate, a solvent derived linear tri-iron(II) complex, $[Fe^{II}_3(qn)_6(DMF)_2]$, with two five-coordinate iron(II) centers and a single six-coordinate iron(II) center is obtained. Each of these species has been characterized using X-ray diffraction. The vibrational features of these complexes are consistent with the observed solid state structures. Each of these compounds exhibits an iron(II)-to-quinaldate(π^*) charge-transfer band between 520–550 nm. These metal-to-ligand charge-transfer bands are sensitive to substitution of the quinaldates as well as alteration of the first coordination sphere ligands. However, the 1H NMR spectra of these paramagnetic high-spin iron(II) complexes are not consistent with retention of the solid state structures in DMF solution. The chemical shifts, longitudinal relaxation times (T_1), relative integrations, and substitution of the quinaldate ligands provide a means to fully assign the 1H NMR spectra of the paramagnetic materials. These spectra are consistent with coordination equilibria between five- and six-coordinate species in DMF solution. Electrochemical studies are reported to place these oxygen-sensitive compounds in a broader context with other iron(II) compounds. Iron complexes of bidentate quinoline-2-carboxylate derived ligands are germane to metabolic pathways, environmental remediation, as well as to catalytic applications.

In the central nervous system, the majority of tryptophan catabolism occurs via the kynurenine pathway.¹ Several of the quinoline and pyridine carboxylic acid metabolites formed are important signaling agents in neuronal pathways which are vital to the onset of certain diseases. For instance, kynurenic acid (4-hydroxyquinoline-2-carboxylic acid) plays a role in glutamate signaling in the brain and is found at elevated levels in people with schizophrenia.² Increases in iron concentrations and picolinic acid have been observed in Alzheimer's disease.^{3,4} The number of quinoline-2-carboxylic acids found in this pathway and their involvement in brain tumor neuropathology led us to examine the iron(II) coordination chemistry of these metabolites.

Since the initial recognition that quinaldic acid (quinoline-2-carboxylic acid, Hqn) can form complexes with iron(II),⁵ the coordination chemistry of quinaldate with iron(II) has received a great deal of attention. Many of the early studies on the determination of binding constants were carried out in water,^{6–8} and provide the foundation for the use of quinaldic acid in quantitative determinations of metal content via gravimetric analysis.^{9–10} Reaction of an iron (II) salt with either quinaldic acid or sodium quinaldate initially yields a red complex, $[Fe(qn)_2]$, which precipitates out of aqueous solution and slowly converts to the dark blue-violet

Supporting Information Available: Table S1 with detailed metrics for all known iron(II) quinaldates; Figures: S1, IR data; S2, electronic spectrum of **4-MeO-1**; S3–S6 variable temperature 1H NMR data, S7 CV data for substituted quinaldate complexes, S8 CV data for **4**; and CIF files. This material is available free of charge via the internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

[Fe(qn)₂(OH₂)₂].^{11,12} Several structures of iron(II)-quinaldate water and alcohol adducts have been reported. The majority of these structures feature a six-coordinate iron(II) geometry with two bidentate quinaldates and two solvent molecules occupying apical positions of a distorted octahedron.¹³⁻¹⁸ There is only one instance of a *cis*-orientation of solvent molecules.¹⁹ Presumably, both *cis*- and *trans*- geometries are accessible in solution.

Despite over a century of experimentation on the coordination chemistry of iron and quinaldate, questions still remain. Reported herein are the syntheses, characterization, and physical properties of a number of iron(II) quinaldate complexes, with the first report of quinaldate supported, anionic, five-coordinate complexes. The single-crystal X-ray diffraction patterns have been solved for the coordinatively unsaturated iron(II) complexes **1**, **2**, and **4**. The electronic, infrared, and ¹H NMR spectra of **1-4** are presented. Our ¹H NMR results demonstrate that the solid state structures do not adequately capture the constitution of these compounds in solution. Electrochemical studies of the iron(II) compounds are presented. These studies provide a basis for ongoing work on the reactivity of each of the iron(II) complexes with a variety of oxidants.

Experimental

Materials

All manipulations were carried out using standard Schlenk or glove box techniques under a dinitrogen atmosphere unless otherwise noted. All reagents and solvents were obtained from commercial vendors and used as received unless otherwise noted. THF, toluene, benzene, and diethyl ether were distilled under nitrogen from Na/benzophenone and subsequently dried over activated alumina. DMF was stirred over CaH₂ overnight, filtered, vacuum distilled, and stored under nitrogen. Acetonitrile was distilled from calcium hydride under nitrogen. Non-halogenated, aprotic solvents were typically tested with a standard purple solution of sodium benzophenone ketyl in tetrahydrofuran to confirm effective oxygen and moisture removal. All chemical reactions were performed at high altitude conditions (~7200 feet or ~2200 m). Fe(OTf)₂·2CH₃CN (OTf = ⁻OSO₂CF₃) was prepared according to literature precedent from TMS(OTf) and FeCl₂.^{20,21} **Caution!** Though we encountered no difficulties, the perchlorate salts of metal complexes with organic ligands are potentially explosive and should be handled with care in small quantities.

The fluorinated quinaldic acids were prepared under aerobic conditions following modifications of literature precedents.^{22,23} **6-Fluoro-quinoline-2-aldehyde.** To a hot solution of 99% SeO₂ (6.66 g, 60 mmol) in 1,4-dioxane (100 mL), was added 97% 6-fluoro-2-methyl-quinoline (1.66 g, 10 mmol). The mixture was refluxed for 3 h, filtered while hot, and concentrated by rotary evaporation. The resultant residue was extracted with hot CHCl₃ and filtered. The filtrate was washed with two portions of water, followed by a brine wash. The organic layer was dried over MgSO₄ and the solvent was removed by rotary evaporation to give the product as a white solid (1.258 g, 72%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 400 MHz) δ (ppm): 10.21 (s, 1H), 8.27 (m, 2H), 8.06 (d, 1H), 7.60 (m, 1H), 7.53 (m, 1H). ¹³C (CDCl₃, 100 MHz) δ (ppm): 193.5 (s), 162.2 (d, ¹J_{CF} = 253 Hz), 152.3 (d, ⁴J_{CF} = 3 Hz), 145.2 (s), 136.9 (d, ⁴J_{CF} = 6 Hz), 133.3 (d, ³J_{CF} = 10 Hz), 131.2 (d, ³J_{CF} = 10 Hz), 121.2 (d, ²J_{CF} = 27 Hz), 118.3 (s), 111.2 (d, ²J_{CF} = 22 Hz).

6-Fluoro-quinoline-2-carboxylic acid (H(6-F-qn))

To a solution of 6-fluoro-quinoline-2-aldehyde (0.876 g, 5 mmol) in *tert*-butyl alcohol (100 mL) and 90% 2-methylbut-2-ene (25 mL) was added a solution of 80% sodium chlorite (4.35 g) and 99% sodium dihydrogen phosphate (4.35 g) in water (43.5 mL) over five minutes. The mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight, after which the organic solvents were

removed by rotary evaporation. Water was added and the residue was extracted with CH_2Cl_2 , dried over MgSO_4 and concentrated by rotary evaporation to give the acid as a white solid (0.8143 g, 85%). ^1H (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz) δ (ppm): 8.39 (d, 1H), 8.31 (d, 1H), 8.20 (m, 1H), 7.64 (m, 1H), 7.58 (m, 1H).

7-Fluoro-quinoline-2-aldehyde

To a hot solution of 99% SeO_2 (6.73 g, 60 mmol) in 1,4-dioxane (100 mL), was added 97% 7-fluoro-2-methyl-quinoline (1.66 g, 10 mmol). The mixture was refluxed for 3 h, filtered while hot, and concentrated by rotary evaporation. The resultant residue was extracted with CH_2Cl_2 and filtered. The filtrate was washed with two portions of water, followed by a brine wash. The organic layer was dried over MgSO_4 and the solvent was removed by rotary evaporation to give the product as a white solid (1.375 g, 78%). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz) δ (ppm): 10.21(s), 8.32 (d), 8.01 (d), 7.91 (m), 7.88 (m), 7.49 (m). ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 100 MHz) δ (ppm): 193.7 (s), 163.7 (d, $^1J_{\text{CF}} = 252$ Hz), 153.5 (s), 149.1 (d, $^3J_{\text{CF}} = 12$ Hz), 137.6 (s), 130.1 (d, $^3J_{\text{CF}} = 10$ Hz), 127.3 (s), 120.0 (d, $^2J_{\text{CF}} = 26$ Hz), 117.0 (s), 114.1 (d, $^2J_{\text{CF}} = 20$ Hz).

7-Fluoro-quinoline-2-carboxylic acid (H(7-F-qn))

To a solution of 7-fluoro-quinoline-2-aldehyde (0.876 g, 5 mmol) in *tert*-butyl alcohol (100 mL) and 90% 2-methylbut-2-ene (25 mL), was added a solution of 80% sodium chlorite (4.35 g) and 99% sodium dihydrogen phosphate (4.35 g), in water (43.5 mL) over five minutes. The mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight, after which the organic solvents were removed by rotary evaporation. Water was added and the residue was extracted with CH_2Cl_2 , dried over MgSO_4 and concentrated by rotary evaporation to give the acid as a white solid (0.7834 g, 82%). ^1H NMR (D_2O , 400 MHz) δ (ppm): 8.60 (m, 1H), 8.04 (t, 1H), 7.99 (d, 1H), 7.74 (d, 1H), 7.54 (t, 1H).

$\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Cl})]\cdot\text{DMF}$ (1)

All of the halide complexes were formed via similar synthetic procedures. Hqn (0.346 g, 2.00 mmol) and NaH (0.0480 g, 2.00 mmol) were added to 10 mL of THF and allowed to stir until gas evolution ceased. FeCl_2 (0.127 g, 1.00 mmol) was added to the suspension and the vial rinsed with an additional 5 mL of THF. After stirring overnight, the resultant purple solution was evaporated to dryness in vacuo and the resultant solids extracted with DMF. The purple solution was filtered and evaporated to dryness. Purple blocks of **1**, suitable for X-ray diffraction, were grown via vapor diffusion of diethyl ether into a dilute DMF solution over 3 days (yield: 0.362 g, 68.0%). Anal. Calcd. for $\text{C}_{23}\text{H}_{19}\text{ClFeN}_3\text{NaO}_5$: C, 51.96; H, 3.60; N, 7.90. Found: C, 52.06; H, 3.97; N, 8.24. IR (KBr, cm^{-1}): 1672 (CO)_{DMF}, 1632 (COO)_{as}, 1395 (COO)_s. ESI/MS (DMF, 200 °C): $m/z = 496$ [$\text{M}-\text{Cl}$]⁺ (i.e., $\text{Na}^+[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2]\cdot\text{DMF}$), 423 [$\text{M}-\text{Cl}-\text{DMF}$]⁺ (i.e., $\text{Na}^+[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2]$).

$\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{4-MeO-qn})_2(\text{Cl})]\cdot\text{DMF}$, (4-MeO-1)

H(4-MeO-qn) (0.2033 g, 1.00 mmol) and NaH (0.0240 g, 1.00 mmol) were added to 5 mL of DMF and allowed to stir until gas evolution ceased. FeCl_2 (0.0638 g, 0.50 mmol) was added to the suspension and the vial rinsed with an additional 5 mL of DMF. After stirring overnight, the resultant dark red/purple solution was filtered and evaporated to dryness. The solid was dissolved in DMF, filtered and dark red crystals of **4-MeO-1** were obtained by vapor diffusion of diethyl ether into the solution (yield: 0.249 g, 84.3%). IR (KBr, cm^{-1}): 1653 (COO)_{as}, 1390 (COO)_s. ESI/MS (DMF, 200 °C): $m/z = 556$ [$\text{M}-\text{Cl}$]⁺ (i.e., $\text{Na}^+[\text{Fe}(\text{4-MeO-qn})_2]\cdot\text{DMF}$), 483 [$\text{M}-\text{Cl}-\text{DMF}$]⁺ (i.e., $\text{Na}^+[\text{Fe}(\text{4-MeO-qn})_2]$).

Na[Fe(6-F-qn)₂(Cl)]·DMF, (6-F-1)

H(6-F-qn) (0.1914 g, 1.00 mmol) and NaH (0.0240 g, 1.00 mmol) were added to 5 ml of DMF and allowed to stir until gas evolution ceased. FeCl₂ (0.0636 g, 0.50 mmol) was added to the suspension and the vial rinsed with an additional 5 ml of DMF. After stirring overnight, the resultant purple solution was filtered and evaporated to dryness. The solid was dissolved in DMF, filtered and purple crystals of **(6-F-1)** were obtained by vapor diffusion of diethyl ether into the solution (yield: 0.258 g, 91.0%) IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 1650 (br, COO)_{as}, 1358 (COO)_s. ESI/MS (DMF, 200 °C): *m/z* = 532 [M-Cl]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(6-F-qn)₂]·DMF), 517 [M-Cl-DMF]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(6-F-qn)₂]).

Na[Fe(7-F-qn)₂(Cl)]·DMF, (7-F-1)

H(7-F-qn) (0.1912 g, 1.00 mmol) and NaH (0.0240 g, 1.00 mmol) were added to 5 ml of DMF and allowed to stir until gas evolution ceased. FeCl₂ (0.0637 g, 0.50 mmol) was added to the suspension and the vial rinsed with an additional 5 ml of DMF. After stirring overnight, the resultant purple solution was filtered and evaporated to dryness. The solid was dissolved in DMF, filtered and purple crystals of **(7-F-1)** were obtained by vapor diffusion of diethyl ether into the solution (yield: 0.262 g, 92.3%) IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 1650 (br, COO)_{as}, 1360 (COO)_s. ESI/MS (DMF, 200 °C): *m/z* = 532 [M-Cl]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(7-F-qn)₂]·DMF), 517 [M-Cl-DMF]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(7-F-qn)₂]).

Na[Fe(qn)₂(Br)]·DMF (2)

(2) was prepared in a similar manner to **(1)** using FeBr₂ (0.216 g, 1.00 mmol). Purple blocks of **2**, suitable for X-ray diffraction, were grown via vapor diffusion of diethyl ether into a dilute DMF solution over 3 days (yield: 0.501 g, 87%). Anal. Calcd. for C₂₃H₁₉BrFeN₃NaO₅: C, 47.95; H, 3.32; N, 7.29. Found: C, 47.91; H, 3.19; N, 7.34. IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 1677 (CO)_{DMF}, 1632 (COO)_{as}, 1393 (COO)_s. ESI/MS (DMF, 200 °C): *m/z* = 496 [M-Br]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(qn)₂]·DMF), 423 [M-Br-DMF]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(qn)₂]).

Fe(qn)₂(DMF) (3)

(3) was prepared in a similar manner to **(1)** using FeI₂ (0.3097 g, 1.00 mmol). A powder of **3**, was obtained via vapor diffusion of diethyl ether into a saturated DMF solution over 3 days (yield: 0.3607 g, 76.2%). Anal. Calcd. for C₂₃H₁₉FeN₃O₅: C, 58.37; H, 4.05; N, 8.88. Found: C, 58.56; H, 4.57; N, 8.80. IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 1657 (CO)_{DMF}, 1612 (COO)_{as}, 1384 (COO)_s. ESI/MS (DMF, 200 °C): *m/z* = 496 [M+Na]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(qn)₂]·DMF), 423 [M-DMF+Na]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(qn)₂]).

[Fe₃(qn)₆(DMF)₂]-4DMF (4)

Hqn (0.346 g, 2.00 mmol) and NaH (0.0480 g, 2.00 mmol) were dissolved in 10 ml of THF and allowed to stir for two minutes (before they were fully dissolved). Fe(OTf)₂·2CH₃CN (0.412 g, 1.00 mmol) was added to the solution and the vial rinsed with an additional 5 ml of THF. After stirring overnight, the resultant deep red solution was filtered and evaporated to dryness in vacuo yielding a deep red powder (IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 1669 (COO)_{as}, 1383 (COO)_s). Purple blocks of **4**, suitable for X-ray diffraction, were grown via vapor diffusion of diethyl ether into a saturated DMF solution of **4** over 5 days (yield: 0.3720 g, 68.1%). Anal. Calcd. for C₇₈H₇₈Fe₃N₁₂O₁₈: C, 57.16; H, 4.80; N, 10.25. Found: C, 57.51; H, 4.86; N, 10.01. IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 1657 (COO)_{DMF}, 1612 (COO)_{as}, 1338 (COO)_s. ESI/MS (DMF, 200 °C): *m/z* = 496 [M+Na]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(qn)₂]·DMF), 423 [M-DMF+Na]⁺ (i.e., Na⁺[Fe(qn)₂]).

trans-[Fe(qn)₂(PrOH)₂]

This compound was prepared according to literature precedent.¹⁵

Physical Methods

Elemental Analyses were performed at Columbia Analytical Services Inc., Tuscon, AZ. ^1H and ^{13}C NMR were collected on a Bruker Avance DRX-400 NMR spectrometer at room temperature unless otherwise noted. For paramagnetic samples, special care was taken to ensure that the delay between pulses was greater than five times the longest proton longitudinal relaxation time (T_1) for proper integration of peaks. UV-vis spectra were recorded on an Agilent 8453 diode-array spectrophotometer at room temperature. A Varian 800 FTIR spectrometer with a resolution of 1 cm^{-1} was used to record IR spectra of the KBr pellets of the samples. Electrochemical measurements were carried out in a drybox under N_2 in DMF solution with 0.1 M $(\text{nBu}_4\text{N})(\text{ClO}_4)$ as the supporting electrolyte using a model CS-1200 computer controlled potentiostat (Cypress Systems). A three-electrode configuration with a glassy carbon working electrode, a Ag/AgNO_3 (0.1 M in CH_3CN) reference electrode, and a platinum wire auxiliary electrode was used. The potential values were referenced to an internal ferrocenium/ferrocene couple which is reported to be $+0.47\text{ V}$ vs SCE in 0.1 M $[\text{nBu}_4\text{N}][\text{ClO}_4]$ in DMF.²⁴ The peak separations are reported with a scan rate of 200 mV/s ($\text{Fc}^{+/0}$ peak separation was 90 mV under these conditions). The electrospray ionization mass spectral data for the compounds were obtained using an LCQ mass spectrometer (Finnigan MAT) on DMF solutions that were directly infused into the spectrometer via a syringe pump. The heated capillary was set at 200°C .

X-ray Diffraction Analysis

$\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Cl})]\cdot\text{DMF}$, (**1**), $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Br})]\cdot\text{DMF}$, (**2**), and $[\text{Fe}_3(\text{qn})_6(\text{DMF})_2]\cdot 4\text{DMF}$ (**4**), were characterized using X-ray diffraction. A purple diamond-shaped crystal of $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Cl})]\cdot\text{DMF}$, (**1**), purple rectangular plate of $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Br})]\cdot\text{DMF}$, (**2**), and a purple rectangular plate of $[\text{Fe}_3(\text{qn})_6(\text{DMF})_2]\cdot 4\text{DMF}$ (**4**) were glued to a MiTeGen micromount using Paratone N oil and mounted on a Bruker Smart Apex II CCD area detector for data collection at either 100 or 150 K using graphite-monochromated $\text{Mo K}\alpha$ ($\lambda = 0.71073\text{ \AA}$) radiation. A summary of the crystallographic details is given in Table 1. All non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically, whereas the H-atoms were placed in ideal positions and refined as riding atoms with relative isotropic displacement parameters. The final full matrix least squares refinement converged to $R1 = 0.0481$ and $wR2 = 0.1290$ for **1**, $R1 = 0.0431$ and $wR2 = 0.1224$ for **2**, and $R1 = 0.0378$ and $wR2 = 0.1134$ for **4**.

Results and Discussion

Mononuclear iron(II) quinaldate complexes were anaerobically synthesized by the addition of two equivalents of sodium quinaldate to a variety of simple iron salts in tetrahydrofuran (Scheme 1). Single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis were grown via slow diffusion of diethyl ether into DMF solutions of $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Cl})]\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**1**) and $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Br})]\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**2**). We have only obtained needles of $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{DMF})]$ (**3**) which proved unsuitable for XRD analysis from the iron(II) iodide synthesis. Interestingly, when similar reaction conditions are employed with $[\text{Fe}(\text{OTf})_2] \cdot 2\text{ CH}_3\text{CN}$, a deep red powder is obtained which we believe to be analogous to the previously reported $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2]$.^{12,17} Though the elemental analysis is convincing,¹² the ambiguous magnetic properties and absence of XRD data of the proposed complex did not provide conclusive evidence for this formulation.¹⁷ Unlike the previously reported red-black species, our complex is not soluble in chloroform or dichloromethane.^{12,17} When dissolved in DMF a color change to dark purple is immediately observed. Prolonged exposure of the purple solution to vacuum yields a dark red powder consistent with a reversible equilibrium. Diffusion of diethyl ether into a saturated DMF solution yields purple crystals of the tri-iron complex $[\text{Fe}_3(\text{qn})_6(\text{DMF})_2]\cdot 4\text{DMF}$ (**4**).

Structures of Iron(II) Quinaldates

All of the previously crystallographically characterized iron(II) quinaldate compounds contain coordinatively-saturated iron centers and are neutral complexes. The crystal structure of **1** reveals a five-coordinate iron(II) center with two quinaldate chelates and a single chloride, to yield the complex anion (Figure 1 top left, Table 2). The iron(II) center is best described as a distorted trigonal bipyramid ($\tau = 0.55$).²⁵ The principle axis through the iron(II) center is defined by the nitrogen atoms of the two quinaldates ($N1-Fe-N2 = 152.70(5)^\circ$), while the more tightly bound carboxylates and the chloride define the trigonal plane. The iron-carboxylate distances are consistent with those observed in other high-spin iron(II) complexes.^{20,26,27} A comparison of geometric parameters in all known Fe^{II} -quinaldates is provided in the Supporting Information (Table S1). The presence of a sodium cation confirms the binding of the quinaldates in the deprotonated state. The crystal structure of quinaldic acid exhibits a greater disparity between the carboxylate bond distances ($1.314(2)$ and $1.221(2)$ Å)¹⁶ which further supports the deprotonation of the carboxylate in this compound. The five-membered chelate rings of the iron-quinaldate complexes are nearly planar exhibiting no torsion angles over 11° . The structure of the bromide **2** is similar to the chloride (Fig. 1 top right). The longer iron-bromide distance is accompanied by shortening of the iron-oxygen bonds in the trigonal plane.

Analysis of the dark purple crystals of **4** reveals a symmetric tri-iron complex containing both five- and six-coordinate iron(II) centers (Fig. 1 bottom, Table 2). Two quinaldate chelates support each iron center; however, the carboxylates from the central iron center also contribute to the coordination sphere of the terminal five-coordinate iron centers. The geometry of these capping iron centers is best described as a distorted trigonal bipyramid ($\tau = 0.60$). As in the chloride complex **1**, the principle axis of the trigonal bipyramid is defined by the two nitrogen donors ($N1-Fe-N2 = 164.74(5)^\circ$) while the carboxylate oxygens reside in the trigonal plane. The slightly distorted octahedral geometry of the central iron center contains two quinaldate chelate rings in the equatorial plane. Two DMF molecules complete the coordination sphere of the central iron. Though the chelate angles do not change significantly ($N3-Fe-O5 \sim 77^\circ$), the bond distances of the iron ligands appreciably lengthen when changing from five- to six-coordinate iron(II) centers. Furthermore, the change in the C-O bond distances supports a fully delocalized carboxylate for the central quinaldates (Table S1).

Properties of Iron(II) Complexes—The IR spectra of the iron(II)-quinaldate complexes were collected as KBr pellets (Table 3, Supporting Information Figure S1). In **1**, three strong features at 1672 , 1632 , and 1395 cm^{-1} can be identified. On the basis of the observed spectra and literature precedents,^{14,15,18,28,29} we tentatively assign the band at 1672 cm^{-1} to cocrystallized DMF retained in the KBr pellets, and the features at 1395 and 1632 cm^{-1} to symmetric and asymmetric carboxylate stretches. As shown in Table 3, the separation between the symmetric and asymmetric bands ranges from 220 cm^{-1} up to 291 cm^{-1} . These values are consistent with the carboxylate coordination modes observed in the solid state.²⁸ Attempts to attain vibrational information for the complexes in solution have been unsuccessful due to intense DMF solvent features. The complexes are insoluble in other solvents.

The iron(II) quinaldate complexes undergo no noticeable change in color upon dissolution of the crystals in DMF. $[Fe(qn)_2(Cl)]^-$ exhibits an intense feature at 546 nm ($18,300\text{ cm}^{-1}$) with a less intense band at 381 nm ($26,250\text{ cm}^{-1}$, Fig. 2A, Table 3). Upon changing the fifth ligand to bromide (Fig 2B), a shift to higher energy is observed for each feature, namely 534 nm ($18,730\text{ cm}^{-1}$) and 375 nm ($26,670\text{ cm}^{-1}$). Furthermore, the substituted quinoline complexes provide additional evidence for an iron(II)-to-quinaldate charge-transfer assignment. While 6-F-qn and 7-F-qn substitutions perturb the spectrum relatively little, $[Fe(4-MeO-qn)_2(Cl)]^-$ exhibits a distinct electronic spectrum (Fig. S2). A clear change in the position of the charge-

transfer band to 530 nm ($18,900\text{ cm}^{-1}$) is observed as well as two high energy features at 370 nm ($27,030\text{ cm}^{-1}$) and 342 nm ($29,240\text{ cm}^{-1}$). When the additional ligand(s) are solvent molecules, a further shift to higher energy is seen. **3**, **4**, and *trans*-[Fe(qn)₂(PrOH)₂] all exhibit bands at ~530 nm ($18,870\text{ cm}^{-1}$) and ~372 nm ($26,881\text{ cm}^{-1}$) in DMF.

The high extinction coefficients and observed shifts are consistent with literature precedent of assigning these features to metal-to-ligand charge-transfer bands.^{14,17} Kral reported three bands in the electronic spectrum of *trans*-[Fe(qn)₂(H₂O)₂] in aqueous acetate buffer at 440 nm ($500\text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$, $\pi \rightarrow e_g$), 513 nm ($500\text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$, $t_{2g} \rightarrow \pi^*$), and 800 nm ($19\text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$, ${}^5T_{2g} \rightarrow {}^5E_g$).^{8,30} Guided by Kral's assignments, we would expect a ligand field band at 670 nm which we do not observe. Even when a 10 cm cell is utilized, no d-d transitions are detected in the near-IR for any of these iron(II) quinaldate complexes (out to 1100 nm or $\sim 9100\text{ cm}^{-1}$). A very weak shoulder is observed at low energy for *trans*-[Fe(qn)₂(PrOH)₂] in DMF.

The ¹H NMR spectra of the paramagnetic high-spin iron(II) complexes have been analyzed in dimethyl formamide-*d*₇ (Fig. 3, Fig. 4, and Table 4). Assignments have been made on the basis of chemical shift, longitudinal relaxation measurements (*T*₁), relative integration, substitution, and variable temperature studies. A rapid inspection of the room temperature ¹H NMR spectrum of freshly dissolved crystals of **1** reveals at least twelve peaks (Fig. 3A) – several more than expected for the quinaldate ligands being in a symmetric environment. Furthermore, the resonances can be grouped into two groups of six with notable differences in relative intensities (1.00:0.16). This is consistent with a major species being in equilibrium with another minor species. Addition of [Me₃PhN]Cl to samples of **1** does not affect the relative intensities of these peaks. Increasing the temperature results in changes in the chemical shift of the peaks and the relaxation times (i.e., the breadth of the peaks) as well as a coalescence of the resonances observed for the two species (Fig. S3-S6). Therefore, we believe the best candidate is an equilibrium between a five-coordinate species and a six-coordinate [Fe(qn)₂(Cl)(DMF)] species.

The assignments for the six major peaks in **1** will be discussed as an example of the process used for the other complexes. In the spectrum of **1**, the very broad peak observed at –58 ppm with the very fast relaxation time (0.8 ms) is assigned to the H₈ position. This is consistent with the average Fe---H_n distances taken from the reported crystallographic data showing H₈ being in closest proximity to the iron(II) center both through space and through bond (Scheme 2). The peak with the largest downfield shift (71 ppm) has an integration of one proton and a short *T*₁ of 3.8 ms. It has been assigned to the 3-position of the quinaldate ring which is also quite near the metal center (Scheme 2). The substituted complexes allow us to watch for systematic absences in the ¹H NMR spectra and allow us to unambiguously assign the remaining resonances. The spectrum of **6-F-1** displays no resonance at 6 ppm (Fig 3B), therefore we assign this peak to H₆. Similarly, **7-F-1** exhibits no peak at –2 ppm (Fig 3C). This leads us to assign the H₇ resonance to the peak at –2 ppm consistent with its shorter *T*₁ value. **4-MeO-1** eliminates the H₄ resonance at 21 ppm in **1** with the appearance of a new methyl group resonance (integrating for three protons) at 4 ppm (Fig 3D). Therefore the best candidate for the H₄ resonance in **1** is the peak at 21 ppm (*T*₁ = 14 ms). This substitution also shifts the H₆ proton resonance from 6 ppm to 14 ppm (integrating for one proton). The single remaining resonance of sufficient integration is the peak at 32 ppm which we assign to H₅. The longer *T*₁ value of H₅ relative to H₄ is also consistent with the increased through space distance to the iron center. It is noteworthy that neither a σ- nor a π-spin delocalization pathway appears to dominate in this aromatic quinoline ring system. The short relaxation times of each of these

resonances gives insufficient time for spin mixing before equilibrium is restored precluding the observation of COSY cross-peaks.

With the major peaks assigned, the assignment of the minor resonances should be addressed. On the basis of the substituted complexes (Fig. 3), we can confidently ascribe the peaks to two sets of quinaldate rings from two complexes in which the respective ligands are in magnetically inequivalent environments. The 4-MeO-qn complex shows an inversion in the intensities of the peaks corresponding to the major and minor species (Eqn. 1). The electron-donating substituent presumably gives rise to a less Lewis acidic metal center.³¹ Therefore, we believe the five-coordinate geometry is the major species in $[\text{Fe}(\text{4-MeO-qn})_2\text{Cl}]^-$ (Fig. 3D), while the six-coordinate $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Cl})(\text{DMF})]$ is the major species in solutions of **1** (Fig. 3A). This is not the sole possibility for the observed equilibria. For instance, a *cis/trans* isomerization, a different coordination equilibrium, or a ligand rearrangement may also result in two sets of quinaldate signals. The relative integrations of the major and minor peaks do not support two inequivalent quinaldates bound to the same metal center. The concentration of the analyte does not noticeably affect the ratio of the peaks, so we do not favor the formation of a coordination polymer (similar to **4**) in DMF solution.

The ^1H NMR spectrum of $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2\text{Br}]\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**2**) (Fig. 4B) was assigned based on its similarity to that of **1**. One notable exception is the peak at 33 ppm, which integrates for two protons. The variable temperature ^1H NMR spectra give rise to two separate peaks of different widths for the H_4 and H_5 resonances providing further support for the assignment of these spectral features (Fig. S5). On the basis of the similarity to **1** and the variable temperature experiments, we assign the feature at 33 ppm in the room temperature spectrum to the H_4 and H_5 protons. Notably, the H_6 resonance is shifted to 4 ppm and broadened in **2**, making it harder to distinguish from the solvent peak; however a T_1 of 21 ms was measured, akin to that observed in **1**. Also, the H_7 resonance is greatly broadened in **2**, prohibiting a T_1 measurement of this peak.

The ^1H NMR spectra of $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{DMF})]$ (**3**), *trans*- $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{PrOH})_2]$, and the tri-iron complex **4** are essentially indistinguishable (Fig. 4C-E, Table 4). The spectrum of the complex formed upon dissolving $\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{DMF})$ (**3**) in DMF exhibits four paramagnetically-shifted peaks for the quinaldate ligands with the remaining two very broad peaks at 4 ppm and 2 ppm (Fig 4C). These assignments are summarized in Table 4.³² Interestingly, a similar set of peaks is observed after dissolving the coordination polymer **4** in DMF. *trans*- $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{PrOH})_2]$ exhibits the same paramagnetically shifted peaks. Additionally, peaks for propanol are observed in the diamagnetic region without paramagnetic broadening. This is consistent with DMF displacing the propanol ligands in solution. The similarity in NMR responses leads us to propose that the same moiety is being formed in each solution. Furthermore, when DMF solutions of **3**, **4**, and/or *trans*- $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{PrOH})_2]$ are mixed no spectral changes are observed in the ^1H NMR spectra.

On the basis of literature precedent and the coordination of the central iron center in the trimer, $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{DMF})_2]$ is a likely candidate for the species formed in solution. DMF solutions of the solvent adducts also give identical positive ion ESI patterns with notable peaks at $m/z = 496$ (i.e., $\text{Na}^+[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2]\cdot\text{DMF}$) and 423 (i.e., $\text{Na}^+[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2]$). Despite our best efforts, we see no evidence for $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{DMF})_2]$ in the gas phase. These results only provide constitution of the ions observed and yield no information on the connectivity of the nuclei within the gas phase.

The ^1H NMR of the solvent adducts also exhibit a second set of quinaldate peaks with significantly lower integration (Fig. 4C-D). The intensity of these peaks is insensitive to the precursor (i.e., **3**, **4**, or propanol adduct) used to generate the sample as well as to the concentration of the complex in DMF. As we hypothesized in the chloride and bromide complexes, the presence of an equilibrium in the solvent adducts cannot be ruled out. On the

basis of the data provided here, we cannot definitively state the species involved in this equilibrium.

The electrochemical properties of the iron(II) precursors have been examined in DMF (Fig. 5 and S7, Table 3). Each of the halide complexes exhibits a quasi-reversible one-electron oxidative wave. The oxidation potentials of the various complexes shift depending upon the identity of the ancillary ligands. Examination of the chloride and bromide complexes shows a positive potential shift of 118 mV for the bromide species (*i.e.*, the chloride is more easily oxidized). Upon changing the fifth ligand from a halide to a solvent molecule(s), a further positive shift is observed. The average of the potentials for the $\text{Fe}^{2+/3+}$ couple for the complexes **3**, **4**, and *trans*- $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{PrOH})_2]$ is -166 mV (vs $\text{Fc}^{+/0}$) - a 168 mV shift in the positive direction from the chloride complex **1**. The voltammograms of **3**, **4**, and *trans*- $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{PrOH})_2]$ in DMF all exhibit behavior consistent with a chemical step after an initial oxidation (Fig. S8). This reduction peak does not grow larger with repeated electrochemical cycles.

Substitution of the quinoline ring also affects the potential of the $\text{Fe}^{2+/3+}$ couple as it appears at -393 mV (vs $\text{Fc}^{+/0}$) for **4-MeO-1**, making it more easily oxidized by 59 mV. The introduction of the methoxy group at the 4-position of the quinoline ring introduces ligand non-innocence within the potential range studied (Fig. S7). The other iron(II) quinaldate complexes do not exhibit this behavior. Of the many $\text{Fe}^{\text{II/III}}$ couples known,^{33,34} these quinaldate species are most similar to FeSOD ³⁵ and iron complexes of tetraazamacrocycles.³⁶

Summary and Implications

The synthesis and physical properties of a series of iron(II) quinaldates are described. The structures of three coordinatively-unsaturated iron(II) quinaldates are reported. Yet, the ^1H NMR spectra of these complexes in DMF (*i.e.*, a coordinating solvent) provide evidence for the formation of six-coordinate DMF adducts in the anionic complexes. Therefore, the results strongly suggest that the solid state structures do not reflect the composition of these samples in solution. At this stage, both geometric isomers (*cis* and *trans*) are possible but the ligands must be in symmetric environments. Based on comparison with **4-MeO-1**, the major species in **1** is the six coordinate DMF adduct. In the solvent adducts, the major species may be either five-coordinate or six-coordinate.

The electronics of the metal center can be tuned via substitution of the aromatic quinaldate ring or the ancillary ligands. The electrochemical potentials and electronic spectra point to cursory descriptions of the electronic structure. Assuming the energy levels of the π^* orbitals of the quinaldate ligands are stationary, the electronic transition of the metal-to-ligand charge-transfer bands are indicative of the energy levels of the metal orbitals. The charge-transfer transition for the chloride occurs at lower energy than that of the bromide. Therefore, a lower oxidation potential of the chloride species is expected, and one is indeed observed. Introduction of the 4-methoxy group in the quinaldate ring, shifts the charge-transfer bands to higher energy than those in the unsubstituted complex **1**. This indicates a widening in the gap between the metal orbitals and the ligand π^* orbitals, either due to a lowering of the energy of the metal orbitals, or an increase in energy of the π^* orbitals (or a combination of the two). The more negative shift for the $\text{Fe}^{2+/3+}$ couple for the **4-MeO-1** complex relative to **1** indicates that the methoxy group causes a destabilization (increase in energy) of the metal orbitals, consistent with a stronger donor. Similar effects have been observed in other pyridine rich ligands.³¹ The DMF adduct has a potential that is less positive than the halides, consistent with its electronic spectrum and its increased air stability.

Quinaldic acid has been utilized as an additive in both Fenton and Gif hydrocarbon oxidation systems.³⁷⁻⁴⁰ While the typical solvent for Fenton chemistry is water, pyridine is characteristically used in Gif systems. Elemental iron reacts with quinaldic acid in pyridine to

yield *trans*-[Fe(qn)₂(pyr)₂].¹⁸ Though iron(II) salts are typically employed as the starting materials in these oxidations, the identity of the species responsible for hydrocarbon oxidation remains elusive. Furthermore, the identity of the active oxidant and the product distributions can be significantly altered by the presence of either a weakly- or strongly-coordinating ligand.⁴¹ This was one of the reasons we are interested in the constitution of iron(II) quinaldates.

In a recent report, a quinaldate supported bis(μ-OH)diiron(III) species reacts with hydrogen peroxide in the presence of a base to yield a mononuclear iron(III) peroxo.⁴² Reaction with carbon dioxide then yields an iron(III) peroxycarbonate adduct which, upon warming, reversibly cleaves the O-O bond.^{42,43} Few examples of first-row transition metal complexes which catalyze O-O bond formation and cleavage are known.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁷ While second and third row transition metal peroxycarbonates have been known for some time,⁴⁸⁻⁵² first row transition metal peroxycarbonates are far more rare.⁵³⁻⁵⁵ Suzuki's peroxycarbonate is the only first row peroxycarbonate adduct that has been structurally characterized. Though peroxycarbonate itself is a potent oxidant for organic substrates,⁵⁶⁻⁵⁸ metal-peroxycarbonate species have been postulated in a number of catalytic schemes,⁵⁹ green oxidations,⁶⁰ and biological process.⁶¹⁻⁶⁴ Early proposals invoked various roles for bicarbonate at the oxygen evolving cluster of photosystem II,^{65,66} however later studies discount the role of bicarbonate in water oxidation.⁶⁷ Our laboratory is exploring alternate routes for first row transition metal-peroxycarbonate generation.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

M.P.M. thanks the University of Wyoming for start-up funds to support this work. Financial support by the NSF (CHE 0619920) for the purchase of the Bruker Apex II Diffractometer is gratefully acknowledged. D.T.H. was supported by an NSF-GK-12 (DGE-0538642) fellowship and a graduate fellowship from NCRR and Wyoming INBRE (P20RR016474) during separate portions of this work. We gratefully thank Teresa Lehmann for assistance with setting up the *T*₁ measurements.

REFERENCES

1. Stone TW. *Pharmacol. Rev* 1993;45:309–379. [PubMed: 8248282]
2. Erhardt S, Schwieler L, Nilsson L, Linderholm K, Engberg G. *Physiol. Behav* 2007;92:203–209. [PubMed: 17573079]
3. Guillemin GJ, Cullen KM, Lim CK, Smythe GA, Garner B, Kapoor V, Takikawa O, Brew BJ. *J. Neurosci* 2007;27:12884–12892. [PubMed: 18032661]
4. Testa U, Louache F, Titeux M, Thomopoulos P, Rochant H. *British Journal of Haematology* 1985;60:491–502. [PubMed: 2990522]
5. Skraup H. *Monatsh. Chem* 1886;7:210–215.
6. Wenger P-E, Monnier D, Epars L. *Helv. Chim. Acta* 1952;35:569–573.
7. Majumdar AK, Bag SP. *Anal. Chim. Acta* 1960;22:549–553.
8. Kral M. *Collect. Czech. Chem. Commun* 1972;37:46–51.
9. Vogel, AI. *Textbook of Quantitative Inorganic Analysis including Elementary Instrumental Analysis*. 4th ed.. Longman; London: 1978.
10. Kolthoff, IM.; Sandell, EB. *Textbook of Quantitative Inorganic Analysis*. 3rd ed.. Macmillan; New York: 1952.
11. Ray P, Bose MK. *Zeitschrift fuer Analytische Chemie* 1933;95:400–415.
12. Bielig H-J, Bayer E. *Naturwissenschaften* 1953;40:340.
13. Okabe N, Makino T. *Acta Cryst C* 1998;54:1279–1280.

14. Osawa K, Furutachi H, Fujinami S, Suzuki M. *Acta Cryst* 2003;E59:m315–m316.
15. Dobrzyńska D, Duczmal M, Jerzykiewicz LB, Warchulska J, Drabent K. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem* 2004;110–117.
16. Dobrzyńska D, Jerzykiewicz LB. *J. Chem. Cryst* 2004;34:51–55.
17. Dobrzyńska D, Jerzykiewicz LB, Duczmal M. *Polyhedron* 2005;24:407–412.
18. Jain SL, Slawin AMZ, Woollins JD, Bhattacharyya P. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem* 2005;721–726.
19. Okabe N, Muranishi Y. *Acta Cryst* E59 2003;m220–m222.
20. Hagadorn JR, Que L Jr. Tolman WB. *Inorg. Chem* 2000;39:6086–6090. [PubMed: 11188526]
21. Hagen KS. *Inorg. Chem* 2000;39:5867–5869. [PubMed: 11151391]
22. Bu X, Deady LW, Finlay GJ, Baguley BC, Denny WA. *J. Med. Chem* 2001;44:2004–2014. [PubMed: 11384245]
23. Contour-Galcéra M-O, Sidbu A, Plas P, Roubert P. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett* 2005;15:3555–3559. [PubMed: 15982879]
24. Connelly NG, Geiger WE. *Chemical Reviews* 1996;96:877–910. [PubMed: 11848774]
25. Addison AW, Rao TN, Reedijk J, van Rijn J, Verschoor GC. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans* 1984:1349–1356.
26. Friese SJ, Kucera BE, Young VG Jr. Que L Jr. Tolman WB. *Inorg. Chem* 2008;47:1324–1331. [PubMed: 18217706]
27. LeCloux DD, Barrios AM, Mizoguchi TJ, Lippard SJ. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1998;120:9001–9014.
28. Deacon GB, Phillips RJ. *Coord. Chem. Rev* 1980;33:227–250.
29. Nakamoto, K. *Infrared and Raman Spectra of Inorganic and Coordination Compounds Part B: Applications in Coordination, Organometallic and Bioinorganic Chemistry*. 5th ed.. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; New York: 1997.
30. Independent synthesis of the iron acetate complex results in a dark blue solution which by NMR and CV is mixture of multiple species. The presence of acetate may confound Kral's assignments.)
31. Xue G, Fiedler AT, Martinho M, Munck E, Que L Jr. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A* 2008;105:20615–20620.
32. Though Jain and coworkers ref.(18) did report NMR spectra for $[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{MeOH})_2]$ in DMF-*d* 7, we believe that the quickly relaxing peaks (60, and –23 ppm) were inadvertently omitted from their spectra. We do not observe peaks at 12, 4.4 or 2.3 ppm. Furthermore, our independent synthesis of the methanol adduct returns a purple complex which turns brown upon oxidation.
33. Groni S, Hureau C, Guillot R, Blondin G, Blain G, Anxolabehere-Mallart E. *Inorg. Chem* 2008;2008:11783–11797. [PubMed: 19007154]
34. Mehn MP, Fujisawa K, Hegg EL, Que L Jr. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2003;125:7828–7842. [PubMed: 12823001]
35. Vance CK, Miller A-F. *Biochemistry* 2001;40:13079–13087. [PubMed: 11669646]
36. Hubin TJ, McCormick JM, Collinson SR, Buchalova M, Perkins CM, Alcock NW, Kahol PK, Raghunathan A, Busch DH. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000;122:2512–2522.
37. Shul'pin GB. *J. Mol. Catal. A: Chemical* 2002;189:39–66.
38. Barton DHR, Hu B, Rojas Wahl RU, Taylor DK. *New J. Chem* 1996;20:121–124.
39. Bianchi D, Bortolo R, Tassinari R, Ricci M, Vignola R. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2000;39:4321–4323.
40. Kiani S, Tapper A, Staples RJ, Stavropoulos P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000;122:7503–7517.
41. Mekmouche Y, Menage S, Toia-Duboc C, Fontecave M, Galey J-B, LeBrun C, Pecaut J. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed* 2001;40:949–952.
42. Hashimoto K, Nagatomo S, Fujinami S, Furutachi H, Ogo S, Suzuki M, Uehara A, Maeda Y, Watanabe Y, Kitagawa T. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed* 2002;41:1202–1205.
43. Furutachi H, Hashimoto K, Nagatomo S, Endo T, Fujinami S, Watanabe Y, Kitagawa T, Suzuki M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2005;127:4550–4551. [PubMed: 15796501]
44. Halfen JA, Mahapatra S, Wilkinson EC, Kaderli S, Young VG Jr. Que L Jr. Zuberbühler AD, Tolman WB. *Science* 1996;271:1397–1400. [PubMed: 8596910]
45. Limburg J, Brudvig GW, Crabtree RH. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1997;119:2761–2762.

46. Mirica LM, Ottenwaelder X, Stack TDP. *Chemical Reviews* 2004;104:1013–1045. [PubMed: 14871148]
47. Hatcher LQ, Karlin KD. *Journal of Biological Inorganic Chemistry* 2004;9:669–683. [PubMed: 15311336]
48. Hayward PJ, Blake DM, Nyman CJ, Wilkinson G. *Chem. Commun* 1969:987–988.
49. Hayward PJ, Blake DM, Wilkinson G, Nyman CJ. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1970;92:5873–5878.
50. Clark HC, Goel AB, Wong CS. *J. Organomet. Chem* 1978;152:C45–C47.
51. Aresta M, Tommasi I, Quaranta E, Fragale C, Mascetti J, Tranquille M, Galan F, Fouassier M. *Inorg. Chem* 1996;35:4254–4260. [PubMed: 11666636]
52. Aresta M, Fragale C, Quaranta E, Tommasi I. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun* 1992:315–317.
53. Aresta M, Nobile CF. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans* 1977:708–711.
54. Schappacher M, Weiss R. *Inorg. Chem* 1987;26:1189.
55. Schappacher M, Weiss R, Montiel-Montoya R, Trautwein A, Tabard A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 1985;107:3736–3738.
56. Bennett DA, Yao H, Richardson DE. *Inorg. Chem* 2001;40:2996–3001. [PubMed: 11399166]
57. Richardson DE, Yao H, Frank KM, Bennett DA. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2000;122:1729–1739.
58. Yao H, Richardson DE. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2003;125:6211–6221. [PubMed: 12785853]
59. Lane BS, Vogt M, DeRose VJ, Burgess K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2002;124:11946–11954. [PubMed: 12358539]
60. Ember E, Rothbart S, Puchta R, van Eldik R. *New J. Chem* 2009;33:34–49.
61. Borowski T, Bassan A, Richards NGJ, Siegbahn PEM. *J. Chem. Theory Comp* 2005;1:686–693.
62. Chang CH, Richards NGJ. *J. Chem. Theory Comp* 2005;1:994–1007.
63. Elam JS, Malek K, Rodriguez JA, Doucette PA, Taylor AB, Hayward LJ, Cabelli DE, Valentine JS, Hart PJ. *J. Biol. Chem* 2003;278:21032–21039. [PubMed: 12649272]
64. Liochev SI, Fridovich I. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci* 2004;101:12485–12490. [PubMed: 15310847]
65. Baranov SV, Ananyev GM, Klimov VV, Dismukes GC. *Biochemistry* 2000;39:6060–6065. [PubMed: 10821678]
66. Baranov SV, Tyryshkin AM, Katz D, Dismukes GC, Ananyev GM, Klimov VV. *Biochemistry* 2004;43:2070–2079. [PubMed: 14967047]
67. Ulas G, Olack G, Brudvig GW. *Biochemistry* 2008;47:3073–30075. [PubMed: 18275153]

Figure 1. ORTEP plot of the anions of **1** and **2** (top) and tri-iron complex **4** (bottom) showing 50% probability thermal ellipsoids and the labeling scheme for selected atoms. Only half of the symmetric trimer has been labeled. Hydrogen atoms, co-crystallized DMF, and the sodium cation from **1** and **2** are omitted for clarity.

Figure 2. Electronic spectra of iron(II) quinaldate complexes recorded at room temperature in DMF. A) $\text{Na[Fe(qn)}_2\text{(Cl)]}\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**1**) (—); B) $\text{Na[Fe(qn)}_2\text{(Br)]}\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**2**) (-•-); C) $\text{Na[Fe(qn)}_2\text{(DMF)]}$ (**3**) (•••); D) $[\text{Fe}_3\text{(qn)}_6\text{(DMF)}_2]\cdot 4\text{DMF}$ (**4**) (-••-); and E) *trans*- $[\text{Fe(qn)}_2\text{(PrOH)}_2]$ (- -).

Figure 3.

^1H NMR spectrum of A) $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Cl})]\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**1**), B) $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{6-F-qn})_2(\text{Cl})]$ (**6-F-1**), C) $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{7-F-qn})_2(\text{Cl})]$ (**7-F-1**), and D) $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{4-MeO-qn})_2(\text{Cl})]$ (**4-MeO-1**) in $\text{DMF-}d_7$ at room temperature. Spectra are referenced to the residual protic solvent peak at 8.03 ppm. Dashed lines identify the peaks associated with DMF resonances.

Figure 4. ^1H NMR spectrum of A) $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Cl})]\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**1**), B) $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Br})]\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**2**), C) $\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{DMF})$ (**3**), D) $\text{trans-}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{PrOH})_2]$, and E) $[\text{Fe}_3(\text{qn})_6(\text{DMF})_2]\cdot 4\text{DMF}$ (**4**) in $\text{DMF-}d_7$ at room temperature. Spectra are referenced to the residual protic solvent peak at 8.03 ppm. Dashed lines identify the peaks associated with DMF resonances.

Figure 5. Cyclic voltammograms of 1 mM $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Cl})]\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**1**) (—) and $\text{Na}[\text{Fe}(\text{qn})_2(\text{Br})]\cdot\text{DMF}$ (**2**) (---) in DMF with 0.1 M $(\text{nBu}_4\text{N})(\text{ClO}_4)$ as supporting electrolyte at a scan rate of 200 mV/s.

Scheme 1.

Scheme 2.
Numbering and Average XRD Fe---H_n Distances

Table 1Summary of Crystallographic Data for **1**, **2**, and **4**

	1	2	4
Chemical Formula	C ₂₃ H ₁₉ ClFeN ₃ NaO ₅	C ₂₃ H ₁₉ BrFeN ₃ NaO ₅	C ₇₈ H ₇₈ Fe ₃ N ₁₂ O ₁₈
Formula Weight (g/mol)	531.70	576.16	1639.07
Space Group	<i>P</i> 2(<i>1</i>)/ <i>n</i>	<i>P</i> 2(<i>1</i>)/ <i>n</i>	<i>P</i> - <i>1</i>
<i>a</i> (Å)	9.9545(2)	9.9868(2)	10.4573(2)
<i>b</i> (Å)	15.2180(3)	15.3065(3)	13.2512(3)
<i>c</i> (Å)	15.1842(3)	15.3134(3)	14.1832(3)
α (°)	90	90	85.557(1)
β (°)	94.6620(10)	94.076(1)	87.301(1)
γ (°)	90	90	73.295(1)
<i>V</i> (Å ³)	2292.61(8)	2334.93(8)	1876.16(7)
<i>Z</i>	4	4	1
<i>D</i> _{calc} (mg/m ³)	1.540	1.639	1.451
Temperature (K)	100(2)	150(2)	150(2)
Absorption (mm ⁻¹)	0.834	2.146	0.652
<i>R</i> [<i>I</i> > 2σ(<i>I</i>)] ^a	0.0481	0.0431	0.0378
<i>wR</i> 2 [<i>I</i> > 2σ(<i>I</i>)] ^b	0.1127	0.1068	0.0948

^a $R I = \Sigma ||F_O| - |F_C|| / \Sigma |F_O|$

^b $wR2 = [\Sigma w(F_O^2 - F_C^2)^2 / \Sigma w(F_O^2)^2]^{1/2}$ where $w = 1/(\sigma^2(F_O^2) + (a*P)^2 + b*P)$.

Table 2Selected Bond Lengths (Å) and Angles (°) for **1**, **2**, and **4**

	1	2	5C – Fe1	4
				6C – Fe2^a
Fe-O1	2.0413(11)	2.030(2)	2.0079(11)	2.1541(11)
Fe-O3	2.0705(11)	2.061(2)	2.0166(11)	
Fe-N1	2.1895(14)	2.197(2)	2.1704(13)	2.2550(12)
Fe-N2	2.1890(13)	2.198(2)	2.1803(12)	
Fe-X	2.2788(5)	2.4309(5)	2.0459(12)	2.0738(11)
O1-Fe-X	125.08(4)	124.86(7)	119.57(5)	92.78(5), 87.22(5)
O1-Fe-N1	77.67(5)	77.74(8)	78.84(5)	74.90(4)
O3-Fe-N2	76.60(4)	76.94(7)	78.18(5)	
O1-Fe-N2	86.60(5)	87.22(8)	97.74(5)	105.10(4)
O1-Fe-O3	115.04(5)	115.61(9)	128.96(5)	180.00(5)
O3-Fe-X	119.77(4)	119.45(6)	111.40(5)	92.78(5)
O3-Fe-N1	89.92(5)	90.77(8)	92.32(5)	105.10(4)
N1-Fe-N2	152.70(5)	154.27(8)	164.74(5)	180.0
N1-Fe-X	104.86(4)	103.86(6)	97.90(5)	96.06(4), 83.94(4)
N2-Fe-X	102.43(4)	101.86(6)	96.70(5)	
τ_{25}	0.55	0.58	0.60	---

^a Comparable distances are compared though the numbering of the individual sites differs.

Table 3

Summary of Physical Properties and Comparisons with Literature Precedents

	Color	$\nu_{\text{sym}}(\text{COO})$ (cm^{-1})	$\nu_{\text{asym}}(\text{COO})$ (cm^{-1})	$\nu_{\text{DMF}}(\text{C=O})$ (cm^{-1})	λ (nm) [$\epsilon(\text{M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1})$]		E (mV) vs $\text{Fc}^{+/0}$	Ref
1	purple	1395	1632	1672	546 [730]	381 [307]	-334 (113)	<i>a</i>
4-MeO-1	dark red	1390	1653(br)		530 [596]	370 [592]; 345 [882]	-393 (96)	<i>a</i>
6-F-1	purple	1358	1650(br)		549 [590]	371 [309]	-288 (84)	<i>a</i>
7-F-1	purple	1360	1650(br)		550 [592]	368 [314]	-300 (75)	<i>a</i>
2	purple	1393	1632	1677	534 [980]	375 [384]	-216 (99)	<i>a</i>
3	purple	1384	1612	1657	527 [775]	368 [274]	-167 (75)	<i>a</i>
Precursor to 4	dark red	1383	1669	---	---	---	---	<i>a</i>
[Fe(qn)₂]	red-black	1377	1652	---	556			17
4	purple	1338	1612	1657	530 [1180]	376 [373]	-170 (88)	<i>a</i>
Na(qn)		1393	1647	---	---			17
<i>trans</i> -[Fe(qn) ₂ (pyr) ₂]	purple	1361	1652		---			18
<i>trans</i> -[Fe(qn) ₂ (H ₂ O) ₂]	deep red	1399	1619	---	539			17
<i>trans</i> -[Fe(qn) ₂ (MeOH) ₂]	brown	1387	1635		---			18
<i>trans</i> -[Fe(qn) ₂ (EtOH) ₂]	red-violet	---	1628	---	527 [800]			14
<i>trans</i> -[Fe(qn) ₂ (PrOH) ₂]	purple	1394	1628	---	528 [1010] (^d)	371 [326] (^d)	-160 (83) (^d)	

^aThis work.

Table 4

Summary of ^1H NMR Parameters^a

	$\text{H}_3\text{-qn}$ δ (ppm)	$\text{H}_4\text{-qn}$ δ (ppm)	$\text{H}_5\text{-qn}$ δ (ppm)	$\text{H}_6\text{-qn}$ δ (ppm)	$\text{H}_7\text{-qn}$ δ (ppm)	$\text{H}_8\text{-qn}$ δ (ppm)
1	71 (3.8)	21 (1.4)	32(24)	6 (28)	-2 (8.3)	-58 (0.3)
4-MeO-1	69	4[OMe]	30	14	-5	-64
6-F-1	74	23	30	--	-2	-56
7-F-1	75	22	30	6	--	-60
2	75 (3.2)	33 (12)	33 (12)	4 (21)	-2	-49 (0.2)
3	61(2)	34 (12)	31 (19)	4	0	-25 (0.2)
<i>trans</i> -[Fe(qn) ₂ (PrOH) ₂]	60 (2.9)	34 (8.9)	31 (15)	4	2	-23 (0.2)
4	59 (2.4)	34 (8.7)	31 (15)	4 (15)	1 (19)	-23 (0.1)

^a All spectra are recorded in DMF-*d*₇. Numbers in parentheses are relaxation times (*T*₁) in milliseconds.