Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2015 November 04; 137(43): 13949–13956. doi:10.1021/jacs.5b08962.

Meta-Atom Behavior in Clusters Revealing Large Spin Ground States

Rau Hernández Sánchez and Theodore A. Betley*

Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Harvard University, 12 Oxford Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, United States

Abstract

The field of single molecule magnetism remains predicated on super- and double exchange mechanisms to engender large spin ground states. An alternative approach to achieving high-spin architectures involves synthesizing weak-field clusters featuring close M–M interactions to produce a single valence orbital manifold. Population of this orbital manifold in accordance with Hund's rules could potentially yield thermally persistent high-spin ground states under which the valence electrons remain coupled. We now demonstrate this effect with a reduced hexanuclear iron cluster that achieves an $S = 19/2$ ($\chi_{\text{M}}T \approx 53 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ K/mol}$) ground state that persists to 300 K, representing the largest spin ground state persistent to room temperature reported to date. The reduced cluster displays single molecule magnet behavior manifest in both variable-temperature zero-field ^{57}Fe Mössbauer and magnetometry with a spin reversal barrier of $42.5(8) \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and a magnetic blocking temperature of 2.9 K (0.059 K/min).

Graphical abstract

1. INTRODUCTION

To achieve technological viability (operational temperatures approaching 298 K) using single molecule magnets (SMM), new synthetic strategies must be deployed to overcome the thermal limitations with the existing state of the art SMM materials.¹ Two basic requirements for manifesting single molecule magnet behavior with a large spin reversal

*Corresponding Author: betley@chemistry.harvard.edu.

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website at DOI: 10.1021/jacs.5b08962.

X-ray crystal structures, spectra and magnetometry data for complexes **1–3** (crystallographic data CCDC 1412714 and 1412715 can also be obtained free at www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif) (PDF) Crystallographic data (CIF)

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

barrier (U) are (1) a high-spin ground state (S) and (2) large magnetic anisotropy.² To address the former, researchers have approached maximizing the molecular spin ground state by synthesizing large polynuclear assemblies wherein clusters of paramagnetic ions couple their spins via superexchange pathways to achieve extraordinary spin ground states ($S = 7 \rightarrow 83/2$).^{3–23} However, as a result of the superexchange coupling mechanism employed, the maximum high-spin regime for the cited examples only manifests at low temperatures ($T < \sim 30$ K), above which the superexchange interaction is thermally overcome and the metal centers behave as magnetically noninteracting. Stronger electronic alignment of the paramagnetic centers can be engendered by employing radicaloid ligands that facilitate ferrimagnetic spin alignment²⁴ and by spin delocalization in mixed valent clusters where the double exchange mechanism is operative, wherein two metals of different oxidation state come into strong electronic alignment to facilitate internuclear electron exchange.²⁵ Indeed, clusters employing these exchange mechanisms have been shown to exhibit thermally well-isolated ground states that persist even to room temperature and beyond,²⁶ though systematic manipulation of the magnetic anisotropy remains elusive. To improve SMM properties to achieve technical viability, new materials exhibiting facile electronic exchange are necessary to maximize spin ground states while also providing a systematic means for manipulating magnetic anisotropy.²⁷

An alternative approach to achieving strong electronic coupling between paramagnetic centers is through the generation of clusters featuring direct M–M bonding interactions to facilitate direct intracluster valence orbital overlap. In the strong field limit where the M–M overlap is sterically unimpeded, maximal pairing of the valence electrons can occur to yield maximal M–M bond orders ($BO = 1–5$) and covalency is maximized.²⁸ In the weak field limit where energetic separation between valence orbitals is less than the mean electron pairing energy for a transition element, the valence electrons will populate in a parallel alignment to achieve a high-spin configuration in accordance with Hund's rules. Targeting weak field clusters requires management of both metal–ligand (use of weak field ancillary ligands) and metal–metal interactions (sterically preclude strong M–M bond formation). If these conditions are met, the transition-metal valence orbitals will mix according to symmetry, creating a single d-orbital manifold approximating that of a single metal ion.²⁹ Indeed, maximally high-spin complexes for iron have been achieved for dinuclear $S = 4$ $(DPhF)_4Fe_2$,³⁰ $S = 9/2$ $[(Me_3tacn)_2Fe_2(\mu^2-OH)_3]^{2+}$,^{26a,b,e} $S = 9/2$ $[Fe_2(\mu-O_2CAr^{Tol})_4(py)_2]^+$,³¹ and $S = 6$ trinuclear $(^{tbs}L)Fe_3(thf)^{32}$ and $(^{Ph}L)Fe_3(thf)_3^{33}$ dictated by this direct exchange pathway. We now demonstrate that chemical reduction of the intermediate spin hexanuclear cluster $(^HL)_2Fe_6$ (**1**)³⁴ induces an abrupt increase in its electronic configuration to achieve a thermally persistent $S = 19/2$ spin ground state which displays SMM behavior at low temperature.

2. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

2.1. General Considerations

All manipulations involving metal complexes were carried out using standard Schlenk or glovebox techniques under a dinitrogen atmosphere, unless otherwise noted. All glassware was oven-dried for a minimum of 10 h and cooled in an evacuated chamber prior to use in

the drybox. Diethyl ether and tetrahydrofuran (THF) were dried and deoxygenated on a Glass Contour System (SG Water USA, Nashua, NH) and stored over 4 Å molecular sieves (Strem) prior to use. Pyridine (Sure/Seal) and *N,N*-dimethylformamide (Sure/Seal) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and stored over 4 Å sieves prior to use. Nonhalogenated solvents were frequently tested, by a solution of sodium benzophenone ketyl in THF, for effective water and dioxygen removal. Tetrabutylammonium chloride was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich and naphthalene from Alfa Aesar and used without further purification. $(^H\text{L})_2\text{Fe}_6$ (**1**) was prepared according to the methodology previously reported by our laboratory.³⁴

2.1.1. $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}][(^H\text{L})_2\text{Fe}_6(\text{py})_2]$ (2**)**— $(^H\text{L})_2\text{Fe}_6$ (**1**) (100 mg, 0.080 mmol) was suspended in 2 mL of THF and cooled down to -35°C . A freshly prepared solution of sodium naphthalenide (10.3 mg of naphthalene, 0.080 mmol) in 2 mL of THF (-35°C) was added to the suspension of $(^H\text{L})_2\text{Fe}_6$ (**1**) by filtering through Celite. Immediately following combination of the solutions, $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}]\text{Cl}$ (22.4 mg, 0.080 mmol) was added as a solid, and the reaction mixture was stirred for 3 h at room temperature. The dark brown precipitate was collected upon a medium size fritted funnel and washed with 5×2 mL of THF. The solid left behind was extracted into pyridine, and the dark brown solution extracted through the fritted funnel into a diethyl ether vapor diffusion cell. Bulk crystallization provides **2** in 48% yield (average over several batches). Anal. calcd for **2**: $\text{C}_{72}\text{H}_{94}\text{Fe}_6\text{N}_{15}$: C, 57.47; H, 6.30; N, 13.96%. Found: C, 57.28; H, 6.41; N, 13.86%.

2.1.2. $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}][(^H\text{L})_2\text{Fe}_6(\text{dmf})_2]$ (3**)**—The preparation of **3** is identical to that of **2** the only difference is that instead of extracting with pyridine, *N,N*-dimethylformamide (dmf) is used. Similarly, the dark brown solution is extracted through the fritted funnel into a diethyl ether vapor diffusion cell. Bulk crystallization provides **3** in 36% yield. Anal. calcd for **3**: $\text{C}_{68}\text{H}_{98}\text{Fe}_6\text{N}_{15}\text{O}_2$: C, 54.72; H, 6.62; N, 14.08%. Found: C, 54.58; H, 6.65; N, 13.91%.

2.2. X-ray Structure Determinations

Single crystals suitable for X-ray structure analysis were coated with deoxygenated Paratone N-oil and mounted in MiTeGen Kapton loops (polyimide). Data for compound **2** were collected using synchrotron radiation at the Argonne National Laboratory Advance Photon Source, ChemMat-CARS. Data for compound **3** were collected at 100 K on an APEX II DUO single crystal diffractometer. None of the crystals showed significant decay during data collection. Raw data were integrated and corrected for Lorentz and polarization effects using Bruker APEX2 v.2009.1.³⁵ Absorption corrections were applied using SADABS.³⁶ Space group assignments were determined by examination of systematic absences, E-statistics, and successive refinement of the structures. The program PLATON³⁷ was employed to confirm the absence of higher symmetry for any of the crystals. The positions of the heavy atoms were determined using direct methods using the program SHELXTL.³⁸ Successive cycles of least-squares refinement followed by difference Fourier syntheses revealed the positions of the remaining non-hydrogen atoms. Non-hydrogen atoms were refined with anisotropic displacement parameters, and hydrogen atoms were added in idealized positions. Crystallographic data for **2** and **3** are given in Table S1.

2.3. Magnetic Data Measurements

Magnetic data for **1**, **2**, and **3** were collected using a Quantum Design MPMS-XL Evercool SQUID magnetometer. The following is a general procedure for sample preparation: bulk crystals were collected and washed thoroughly with Et₂O. These black block-shaped crystals were crushed in the presence of Et₂O, and the resulting fine suspension was then dried under high vacuum. The sample powder was then immobilized within a gelatin capsule size no. 4 by adding melted eicosane at 50–60 °C. The gelatin capsule was inserted into a plastic straw. Samples were prepared under a dinitrogen atmosphere. Magnetization data at 100 K from 0 to 7 T were used as a test for ferromagnetic impurities (see Figures S11–13). Variable-temperature (VT) direct current (dc) magnetic susceptibility measurements were collected in the temperature range 1.8–300 K under applied fields of 0.1, 0.5, and 1 T. The $\chi_M T$ data were collected multiple times until they were reproduced at least three times (in all three cases the ferromagnetic-impurity test was passed). Variable-temperature, variable-field (VTVH) magnetization data were acquired on heating from 1.8 to 10 K at increasing fields of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 T. Magnetic susceptibility data were corrected for diamagnetism of the sample, estimated using Pascal's constants,³⁹ in addition to contributions from the sample holder and eicosane. The ac magnetic susceptibility data were collected at zero applied dc field and with a 4 Oe oscillating ac field. Magnetization data were collected at 1.8 K on steps and cycling between –7 and +7 T to probe for magnetic hysteresis. Additionally, zero-field-cooled (ZFC) and field-cooled (FC) data were collected between 1.8 and 10 K by measuring with a dc applied field of 0.1 T and at a sweeping rate of 0.059 K/min.

2.4. Fitting the Magnetic Data for 1–3

The VT magnetic susceptibility and the VTVH magnetization data were fit in PHI ⁴⁰ according to the spin Hamiltonians described in the main text. The relaxation dynamics were fit according to a generalized Debye model.⁴¹ Igor Pro Wavemetrics was used to fit χ_M'' and χ_M' vs ν to a distribution of single relaxation processes; similarly, it was also used to fit χ_M'' vs T as described elsewhere.⁴²

2.5. Electrochemical Measurements

Cyclic voltammetry measurements were acquired by a CHI660d potentiostat using a three-electrode cell with a glassy carbon working electrode, platinum wire as a counter electrode, and a Ag/AgNO₃ reference electrode. All potentials were referenced versus the Fc/Fc⁺ couple. Saturated AgNO₃ solutions were prepared fresh before each experiment. A 0.1 M solution of tetrabutylammonium hexafluorophosphate in pyridine was employed as a supporting electrolyte. All measurements were done under a dinitrogen atmosphere.

2.6. Zero-Field ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer Spectroscopy

Data were previously reported for **1** at 90 K only;³⁴ thus the 4.2 K spectrum was recorded (Figure S3). Data for **2** and **3** were acquired at 4.2, 90, and 210 K. Solid samples (ca. 20 mg) were restrained with Paratone-N oil. The data were measured with a constant acceleration spectrometer (SEE Co., Minneapolis, MN). Isomer shifts are given relative to α -Fe metal at 298 K.

2.7. Other Physical Measurements

Elemental analysis was performed by Complete Analysis Laboratories, Inc., Parsippany, New Jersey. Perpendicular mode X-band EPR spectra were collected in 2-methyltetrahydrofuran at several different temperatures from 3.2 to 79 K on a Bruker ElexSys E500 EPR spectrometer. UV–vis–NIR spectra were collected in a 1 cm path length cuvettes on a Varian 5000 UV–vis–NIR spectrophotometer at room temperature. All solutions were prepared in the glovebox, and the cuvettes sealed with a J-Young screw cap. Absorbance values were kept under 1 for all concentrations measured.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Synthesis and Characterization

Reduction of $(^{\text{HL}})_2\text{Fe}_6^{34}$ (**1**) involves adding freshly prepared sodium naphthalenide to a suspension of **1** in THF at $-35\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ (Scheme 1). Immediately after combining the two solutions, 1 equiv of $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}]\text{Cl}$ was added and stirred for 3 h at room temperature during which time a dark brown precipitate forms. Cation metathesis eliminates complications arising from cation desolvation from the previous preparation. The isolated powder was dissolved in pyridine (py) or dimethylformamide (dmf) and set up to crystallize in a vapor diffusion cell containing diethyl ether. Large block-shaped crystals can be obtained at room temperature that affords crystalline $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}]\text{-}[(^{\text{HL}})_2\text{Fe}_6(\text{py})_2]$ (**2**, 48%) or $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}][(^{\text{HL}})_2\text{Fe}_6(\text{dmf})_2]$ (**3**, 36%) as room temperature stable materials under an inert atmosphere (Figure 1a). The constitution of **2** and **3** were confirmed by X-ray crystallography (*vide infra*). The solid- and solution-state properties for **2** and **3** are largely analogous, thus properties for the pyridine complex **2** will be discussed in the text, while the comparable data for **3** are presented in the Supporting Information.

Unlike the unsolvated cluster **1**, the X-ray molecular crystal structures of the anionic clusters **2** and **3** display *trans*-ligation of solvent to make the $[\text{Fe}_6]$ octahedron asymmetric as illustrated in Figure 1a. The molecular crystal structure of **2** reveals that the pyridine-bound ($d_{\text{Fe-py}}$: 2.363(3) Å), five-coordinate Fe sites in **2** extend away from the center of the $[\text{Fe}_6]$ core ($d_{\text{Fe-Fe}}$: 4.001(2) Å), while the remaining pairs of *trans*-disposed iron sites reveal further asymmetry ($d_{\text{Fe-Fe}}$: 3.403(2), 3.838(2) Å). The *trans*-disposed iron sites in **3** reveal a less significant distortion ($d_{\text{Fe-Fe}}$: 3.442(1), 3.846(1), 3.863(1) Å). Elongation of the Fe–N ligand bonds from **1** (Fe–N 2.037(8), Fe–NH 1.998(2) Å)³⁴ occurs upon reduction (Fe–N 2.12(3), Fe–NH 2.07(3) Å in **2** and **3**) (see Table 1).

To assess the stability of the mixed valence cluster **2**, the electrochemical properties of **2** were investigated via cyclic voltammetry. In pyridine **2** displays one reversible oxidation ($E_{1/2} = -1.62\text{ V}$ vs Fc/Fc^+ , $E_p = 91\text{ mV}$) and one reversible reduction ($E_{1/2} = -2.21\text{ V}$ vs Fc/Fc^+ , $E_p = 90\text{ mV}$) as shown in Figure 1b. The reversible reduction at -2.21 V suggests a pyridine-bound, dianionic cluster could be chemically accessible. The calculated comproportionation constant for **2** is 1.3×10^{10} , indicating significant electron delocalization in the mixed-valent cluster **2**.³⁴

3.2. Zero-Field ^{57}Fe Mössbauer Spectroscopy

Our lab has previously reported the species $[\text{Na}(\text{Et}_2\text{O})_2(\text{NCMe})_2][(\text{HL})_2\text{Fe}_6]$ having an asymmetric ^{57}Fe Mössbauer spectrum at 90 K.³⁴ The spectral asymmetry was attributed to a proposed mixture of neutral $(\text{HL})_2\text{Fe}_6$ and reduced $[\text{Na}(\text{Et}_2\text{O})(\text{NCMe})_2][(\text{HL})_2\text{Fe}_6]$ clusters, owing to the presumed instability of the $[\text{Fe}_6]^-$. An alternative reason for the spectral asymmetry could be due to slow magnetic relaxation of the $[\text{Fe}_6]^-$ that is not fully resolved at 90 K.⁴⁴ Thus, samples of polycrystalline **2** were isolated, and their Mössbauer spectra recorded at 4.2 K under a zero-applied external magnetic field.

The spectrum of the pyridine adduct **2** features a well-defined multiline pattern at 4.2 K (Figure 2a). The data were modeled taking into account three crystallographically distinct iron environments. The zero-field spectrum was modeled by employing a nuclear Hamiltonian that only includes the electric quadrupole and the nuclear Zeeman interaction: $\hat{H} = \mathbf{I} \cdot \mathbf{Q} \cdot \mathbf{I} + g_n \beta_n \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{I}$,⁴⁵ where $\mathbf{Q}$ is proportional to the electric field gradient. The only contribution to $\mathbf{H}$ originates from the internal magnetic field ($\mathbf{H}_{\text{int}}$) since $\mathbf{H}_{\text{ext}} = 0$. In this case, the “static” internal field ($\mathbf{H}_{\text{int}}$) results from slow relaxation of the electronic ground state $|S, m_s\rangle$.⁴⁶ The data were fit as described in the Supporting Information. The three sextets that best model the data have the following parameters [δ , $|EQ|$ (mm/s), $\mathbf{H}_{\text{int}}$ (T): 0.55, +0.15, 36.6 (33%, blue trace); 0.65, -0.06, 39.1 (33%, green trace); and 0.80, 0.72, 34.6 (34%, brown trace)] and are shown in Figures 2a and S4. The hyperfine splitting disappears upon warming to 90 K, but relaxation effects are still observed (Figure 2b). In the high-temperature regime the internal field relaxes fast enough to average to zero, and thus the only perturbation that persists is the quadrupole interaction.⁴⁷ Two sharp doublets are observed at 210 K (Figure 2c) with Mössbauer parameters [δ , $|EQ|$ (mm/s): 0.61, 0.97 (59%, blue trace); 0.38, 1.65 (41%, green trace)]. Hence, while the 4.2 K data reflect three distinct iron sites (consistent with the crystallographic data), the four four-coordinate sites become equivalent as temperature increases, distinct only from the pyridine bound five-coordinate iron sites.

3.3. Magnetometry

Variable-temperature (VT) magnetic susceptibility (χ_{MT}) data and VTVH magnetization data were collected for compounds **2** and **3** to assess their spin ground states. The χ_{MT} data for **2** obtained at 0.1 T from 1.8 to 300 K are shown in Figure 3a, which indicates a well-isolated ground state up to room temperature. At 50 K χ_{MT} has a maximum of 55.94 cm³ K/mol ($\chi_{\text{MT}50\text{ K}} = 53.39$ cm³ K/mol for **3**, Figure S15a); which decreases to 52.54 cm³ K/mol at 300 K.⁴⁸ Below 50 K the effect of zero-field splitting is manifest and χ_{MT} drops rapidly until 3 K (46.50 cm³ K/mol), after which it falls precipitously to 2.23 cm³ K/mol at 1.8 K (Figure S14). The susceptibility data for **2** was fit between 5 and 150 K using *PHF*⁴⁹ according to the spin Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = D\hat{S}_z^2 + g_{\text{iso}}\mu_{\text{B}}\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{H}$ for an $S = 19/2$ ground state to give: $g = 2.11$ and $|D| = 0.67$ cm⁻¹. Similarly for **3**: $g = 2.06$ and $|D| = 0.40$ cm⁻¹ for an $S = 19/2$.⁵⁰ These parameters were utilized to extrapolate the fit to 300 K. The susceptibility data for **1** are also shown for means of comparison to the intermediate spin $S = 6$ configuration. The VTVH magnetization data for **2** nearly plateau as the magnetic field is increased, indicating full population of the spin ground state saturating at 16.5 μ_{B} (17.0 μ_{B} for **3**, Figure S18) at 1.8 K and 7 T (Figure 3b). An ideal $S = 19/2$ ($g = 2.0$) would be expected to saturate

at $19 \mu_B$, while deviation from saturation at the $M = gS$ limit can be attributed to the presence of zero-field splitting. The reduced magnetization data of **2** were fit according to the spin Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = D\hat{S}_z^2 + E(\hat{S}_x^2 - \hat{S}_y^2) + g_{\text{iso}}\mu_B\mathbf{S}\cdot\mathbf{H}$ to yield the following parameters for the $S = 19/2$ ground state: $g = 2.10$, $D = -0.60$, and $|E/D| = 0.30$ (Figure 3b). Fitting of **3** as an $S = 19/2$ in an analogous way to **2** we obtain $g = 2.06$, $D = -0.48$, and $|E/D| = 0.24$ (Figure S18). Analysis of the $\chi_M'T$ vs T dependence for **2**, where population of low-lying excited states under large dc fields is suppressed,⁵¹ reveals a plateau of $53 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ K/mol}$ in $\chi_M'T$ for $T > 5 \text{ K}$ (Figure 3c), in agreement with the expected value for an ideal $S = 19/2$ ($g = 2$, $\chi_M'T = 49.875 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ K/mol}$).

The low-temperature slow magnetic relaxation evident from the Mössbauer spectrum of **2** and the precipitous drop in susceptibility led us to examine whether magnetic blocking was operative. Thus, zero-field-cooled (ZFC) and field-cooled (FC) magnetization data were collected at 0.059 K/min for **2**. The ZFC data at 0.1 T display a narrow peak on the magnetization at 2.9 K ; in contrast the FC data display no peak but rather a plateau at $3.07(1) \mu_B$ from 1.8 to 2.5 K , after which the moment decreases superimposing with the ZFC data at $T = 3.0 \text{ K}$ (inset Figure 3c), a signature of magnetic blocking.^{3a}

3.4. Slow Magnetic Relaxation

The relaxation dynamics of **2** were further probed by ac magnetic susceptibility at a 4 Oe oscillating field ($1\text{--}1488 \text{ Hz}$) and in the absence of an external dc magnetic field in the temperature range $1.8\text{--}6.6 \text{ K}$. A maximum in the out-of-phase component (χ_M'' vs ν , Figure 4a) and the concurrent decrease in the in-phase component (χ_M' vs ν , Figure 4c) are hallmark characteristics of slow magnetic relaxation. The maximum in χ_M'' vs ν occurs in a narrow temperature range (3.4 to 6.6 K) and is consistent with the sharp maximum observed in the ZFC data.^{24a} Alternatively, the relaxation behavior can also be observed by a peak maximum in the χ_M'' vs T plot (Figure 4b). Additionally, Cole–Cole plots (χ_M'' vs χ_M') displaying semicircular profiles, as is the case for **2** as illustrated in Figure 4d, indicate that a single relaxation pathway is operative. The relaxation dynamics were fit as described in the Supporting Information to a generalized Debye model.⁴¹ Each panel in Figure 4a–d was fit independently, and the extracted temperature-dependent relaxation times (τ) fit to an Arrhenius temperature law, $\tau = \tau_0 \exp(U_{\text{eff}}/k_B T)$. The average values from all the four methods fit to an effective spin relaxation barrier of $U_{\text{eff}} = 42.5(8) \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and an attempt time of $\tau_0 = 9(2) \times 10^{-9} \text{ s}$ (Figure 4e). Remarkably, parallel analysis of the less structurally distorted dmf-ligated cluster **3** reveals a lower effective spin relaxation barrier of $U_{\text{eff}} = 33.5(1) \text{ cm}^{-1}$ and an attempt time of $\tau_0 = 1.3(1) \times 10^{-8} \text{ s}$ (Figure 4e). The magnetic blocking temperature (T_B) is 2.9 K from examination of the ZFC data (Figure 3c inset). Magnetic hysteresis experiments were conducted on **2** at 1.8 K (Figure 4f) where step-like behavior is observed as the magnetization at $\pm 7 \text{ T}$ reaches $\pm 16.6 \mu_B$ (Figure S22). A remnant magnetization of $8.5 \mu_B$ is observed when cycling from $+7$ to -7 T with a coercive field of $\sim 0.8 \text{ T}$. Step-like hysteresis has been attributed to quantum tunneling of magnetization, one of only a few macroscopic measurements where quantum effects are evident.⁵² The current data suggest that ligation of the pyridine molecules in **2** provides a route to impart magnetic anisotropy via the large axial structural distortion. The effective spin reversal barrier in **2** is $U_{\text{eff}} = 42.5(8) \text{ cm}^{-1}$ which is less than the theoretical value calculated from $U = |D|(S^2 -$

1/4), where $S = 19/2$ and $D = -0.60 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ yielding U of 54 cm^{-1} . Similarly for **3** $U_{\text{eff}} = 33.5(1) \text{ cm}^{-1}$ vs the calculated barrier U of 43.2 cm^{-1} . Inclusion of the rhombic ZFS parameter in the calculation of the spin reversal barrier provides U of 60.8 and 46.8 cm^{-1} for **2** and **3**, respectively (see the Supporting Information). The lower than theoretical U_{eff} observed is typical of systems where the spin reversal does not follow strictly the thermal barrier, but instead tunnels through the barrier at some higher energy m_s levels.^{2,53}

3.5. Electronic Structure Determination

Significant spectroscopic, magnetic, and structural perturbations arise upon reduction of **1** by one electron (*vide supra*). Most remarkably, the spin ground-state changes abruptly from $S = 6$ for the parent all-ferrous cluster **1**, to an $S = 19/2$ for **2** and **3**, for which we sought to account using a delocalized cluster bonding approach.

Previously we proposed a qualitative molecular orbital diagram for **1** to account for the $S = 6$ ground state (Figure 5a).³⁴ The axis system at each iron site was chosen so that the d_{z^2} orbital is oriented normal to the cluster face and the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbital along the Fe–N(H) bonds. The frontier iron 3d orbitals were combined based on symmetry considerations and filled with the available 36 iron valence electrons. To account for the observed $S = 6$, the symmetry-adapted linear combinations (SALCs) of the Fe–N antibonding interactions ($1a_{2g}$, $2e_g$, and $2t_{2u}$) are high enough in energy to remain unpopulated (Figure 5a).

Based on the proposed model for $(^{\text{HL}})_2\text{Fe}_6$, reduction of **1** could result in two potential scenarios: (1) the added electron fills the $1e_g$ orbital set ($1e_g^4$) to yield an $S = 11/2$ configuration (Figure 5b); or (2) the added electron populates the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital ($1a_{2g}^1$) to yield an $S = 13/2$ configuration (Figure 5c). Although neither scenario is observed, the latter may suggest a pathway through which the actual high-spin ground state is attained. Addition of an electron to any of the $1a_{2g}$, $2e_g$, or $2t_{2u}$ antibonding orbitals would weaken the Fe–N(H) bonds and lower their energy as a result. This is indeed the case and is structurally manifested in the longer Fe–N and Fe–NH bond distances observed for **2** and **3** (Table 1). Furthermore, the lower-lying $1a_{2g}$, $2e_g$, and $2t_{2u}$ orbitals are now energetically accessible to be populated and maximize the electron exchange interaction for the cluster. Thus, we might anticipate that the true ground state of the coordinatively unsaturated species would be a maximally high-spin configuration of $S = 23/2$. While this is yet to be verified, we can account for the observed spin state of the pyridine bound **2** by considering how pyridine ligation alters the frontier orbital picture in Figure 5. Akin to the redox directed binding of acetonitrile or dimethylformamide to $[(^{\text{HL}})_2\text{Fe}_6]^+$,^{34,54} two nominally d_{z^2} -based SALCs (originating from $1e_g$ and $2t_{1u}$) are destabilized upon binding of solvent to the $[(^{\text{HL}})_2\text{Fe}_6]^-$ core, leaving two orbitals out of energetic range to be populated. Thus, populating the 37 valence electrons in the remaining 28 orbitals affords a maximum spin ground state of $S = 19/2$ (Figure 5d) consistent with that determined experimentally, and suggesting $E(2t_{2u}-2t_{2g}) = 19150 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ (2.37 eV) the mean spin-pairing energy for a ferrous ion.⁵⁵ Via the strong electron delocalization apparent in these weak field clusters, the electronic structure begins to approximate that of a single transition-metal ion, facilitating the isolation of the observed ground states from lowest-lying electronic excited states.⁵⁴

Consistent with this description, the formally mixed valent **2** does not exhibit intervalence charge-transfer bands in the near-infrared ($12000 > \nu > 5000 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, Figure S23).

4. CONCLUSIONS

The frontier of single molecule magnet design requires strategies to maximize molecular spin while providing a mechanism to generate large magnetic anisotropy. The weak-field cluster approach described herein suggests a mechanism wherein both criteria can be met. The delocalized electronic structure observed for **2** provides a means for generation of well isolated high-spin ground states with the added advantage that postsynthetic cluster solvation can generate the magnetic anisotropy necessary to enable SMM behavior. While the overall magnetic blocking temperatures and spin reversal barriers of **2** and **3** do not exceed other reported SMMs, the findings presented herein highlight how the symmetry reduction imposed on **2** can tune the magnetic properties of these clusters with the possibility of incorporating the $[\text{Fe}_6]^-$ unit into larger assemblies. Further exploration of this design element is currently underway.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by a grant from the NIH (GM 098395), DOE (DE-SC0008313), and Harvard University. R.H.S. gratefully acknowledges Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONACYT) and Fundación México for a doctoral fellowship. T.A.B. is grateful for a George W. Merck Fellowship. R.H.S. Acknowledges Dr. Yu-Sheng Chen for the training provided at the Argonne National Laboratory Advance Photon Source, ChemMatCARS.

References

1. Pedersen KS, Bendix J, Clerac R. *Chem Commun.* 2014; 50:4396.
2. Christou G, Gatteschi D, Hendrickson DN, Sessoli R. *MRS Bull.* 2000; 25:66.
3. S = 7 Sessoli R, Gatteschi D, Caneschi A, Novak MA. *Nature.* 1993; 365:141.
4. S = 9 Miyasaka H, Nakata K, Sugiura K, Yamashita M, Clerac R. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2004; 43:707.
5. S = 19/2 Koizumi S, Nihei M, Shiga T, Nakano M, Nojiri H, Bircher R, Waldmann O, Ochsenbein ST, Güdel HU, Fernandez-Alonso F, Oshio H. *Chem - Eur J.* 2007; 13:8445. [PubMed: 17729217]
6. S = 10 (a) Caneschi A, Gatteschi D, Sessoli R, Barra AL, Brunel LC, Guillot M. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1991; 113:5873. (b) Delfs C, Gatteschi D, Pardi L, Sessoli R, Wieghardt K, Hanke D. *Inorg Chem.* 1993; 32:3099. (c) Barra AL, Debrunner P, Gatteschi D, Schulz CE, Sessoli R. *Europhys Lett.* 1996; 35:133.
7. S = 12 (a) Caneschi A, Gatteschi D, Laugier J, Rey P, Sessoli R, Zanchini C. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1988; 110:2795. (b) Sessoli R, Tsai HL, Schake AR, Wang S, Vincent JB, Foltling K, Gatteschi D, Christou G, Hendrickson DN. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1993; 115:1804. (c) Sessoli R, Gatteschi D, Caneschi A, Novak MA. *Nature.* 1993; 365:141. (d) Friedman JR, Sarachik MP, Tejada J, Ziolo R. *Phys Rev Lett.* 1996; 76:3830. [PubMed: 10061120] (e) Aromi G, Claude JP, Knapp MJ, Huffman JC, Hendrickson DN, Christou G. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1998; 120:2977. (f) Milios CJ, Vinslava A, Wernsdorfer W, Moggach S, Parsons S, Perlepes SP, Christou G, Brechin EK. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2007; 129:2754. [PubMed: 17309264]
8. S = 23/2 Moushi EE, Stamatatos TC, Wernsdorfer W, Nastopoulos V, Christou G, Tasiopoulos AJ. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2006; 45:7722.

9. S = 14(a) Boyd PDW, Li Q, Vincent JB, Folting K, Chang HR, Streib WE, Huffman JC, Christou G, Hendrickson DN. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1988; 110:8537.(b) Goldberg DP, Caneschi A, Lippard SJ. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1993; 115:9299.
10. S = 29/2Wang ZX, van Tol J, Taguchi T, Daniels MR, Christou G, Dalal NS. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:17586. [PubMed: 21981630]
11. S = 16(a) Stamatatos TC, Foguet-Albiol D, Poole KM, Wernsdorfer W, Abboud KA, O'Brien TA, Christou G. *Inorg Chem.* 2009; 48:9831. [PubMed: 19764790] (b) Langley SK, Chilton NF, Moubaraki B, Murray KS. *Dalton Trans.* 2011; 40:12201. [PubMed: 21879081]
12. S = 33/2(a) Powell AK, Heath SL, Gatteschi D, Pardi L, Sessoli R, Spina G, Del Giallo F, Pieralli F. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1995; 117:2491.(b) Goodwin JC, Sessoli R, Gatteschi D, Wernsdorfer W, Powell AK, Heath SL. *J Chem Soc, Dalton Trans.* 2000:1835.
13. S = 39/2Zhong ZJ, Seino H, Mizobe Y, Hidai M, Fujishima A, Ohkoshi S, Hashimoto K. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2000; 122:2952.
14. S = 22(a) Stamatatos TC, Abboud KA, Wernsdorfer W, Christou G. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2006; 45:4134.(b) Manoli M, Johnstone RDL, Parsons S, Maurie M, Affronte M, Evangelisti M, Brechin EK. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2007; 46:4456.(c) Stamatatos TC, Abboud KA, Wernsdorfer W, Christou G. *Polyhedron.* 2007; 26:2042.(d) Stamatatos TC, Poole KM, Abboud KA, Wernsdorfer W, O'Brien TA, Christou G. *Inorg Chem.* 2008; 47:5006. [PubMed: 18454518] (e) Wu G, Huang J, Sun L, Bai J, Li G, Cremades E, Ruiz E, Clérac R, Qiu S. *Inorg Chem.* 2011; 50:8580. [PubMed: 21819050]
15. S = 23Low DM, Jones LF, Bell A, Brechin EK, Mallah T, Rivière E, Teat SJ, McInnes EJJ. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2003; 42:3781.
16. S = 25 (z)Shaw R, Laye RH, Jones LF, Low DM, Talbot-Eckelaers C, Wei Q, Milios CJ, Teat S, Helliwell M, Raftery J, Evangelisti M, Affronte M, Collison D, Brechin EK, McInnes EJJ. *Inorg Chem.* 2007; 46:4968. [PubMed: 17503811]
17. S = 51/2(a) Larionova J, Gross M, Pilkington M, Andres H, Stoeckli-Evans H, Güdel HU, Decurtins S. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2000; 39:1605.(b) Murugesu M, Habrych M, Wernsdorfer W, Abboud KA, Christou G. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2004; 126:4766. [PubMed: 15080666] (c) Murugesu M, Takahashi S, Wilson A, Abboud KA, Wernsdorfer W, Hill S, Christou G. *Inorg Chem.* 2008; 47:9459. [PubMed: 18788733]
18. S = 26Charalambous M, Moushi EE, Papatrianafyllopoulou C, Wernsdorfer W, Nastopoulos V, Christou G, Tasiopoulos AJ. *Chem Commun.* 2012; 48:5410.
19. S = 28Nayak S, Beltran LMC, Lan Y, Clérac R, Hearn NGR, Wernsdorfer W, Anson CE, Powell AK. *Dalton Trans.* 2009:1901.
20. S = 61/2(a) Stamatatos TC, Abboud KA, Wernsdorfer W, Christou G. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2007; 46:884.(b) Stamatatos TC, Abboud KA, Wernsdorfer W, Christou G. *Polyhedron.* 2007; 26:2095.
21. S = 73/2Ge CH, Ni Z-H, Liu C-M, Cui A-L, Zhang D-Q, Kou H-Z. *Inorg Chem Commun.* 2008; 11:675.
22. S = 37Moushi EE, Stamatatos TC, Wernsdorfer W, Nastopoulos V, Christou G, Tasiopoulos AJ. *Inorg Chem.* 2009; 48:5049. [PubMed: 19072669]
23. S = 83/2(a) Ako AM, Hewitt IJ, Mereacre V, Clérac R, Wernsdorfer W, Anson CE, Powell AK. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2006; 45:4926.(b) Cremades E, Ruiz E. *Inorg Chem.* 2010; 49:9641. [PubMed: 20857997] (c) Mameri S, Ako AM, Yesil F, Hibert M, Lan Y, Anson CE, Powell AK. *Eur J Inorg Chem.* 2014; 2014:4326.
24. (a) Rinehart JD, Fang M, Evans WJ, Long JR. *Nat Chem.* 2011; 3:538. [PubMed: 21697874] (b) Rinehart JD, Fang M, Evans WJ, Long JR. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:14236. [PubMed: 21838285] (c) Jeon IR, Park JG, Xiao DJ, Harris TD. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2013; 135:16845. [PubMed: 24164631] (d) Fortier S, Le Roy JJ, Chen CH, Vieru V, Murugesu M, Chibotaru LF, Mindiola DJ, Caulton KG. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2013; 135:14670. [PubMed: 23991708] (e) Fatila EM, Clerac R, Rouzies M, Soldatov DV, Jennings M, Preuss KE. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2013; 135:13298. [PubMed: 23984987] (f) Demir S, Jeon IR, Long JR, Harris TD. *Coord Chem Rev.* 2014; 289:149.(g) Meihaus KR, Corbey JF, Fang M, Ziller JW, Long JR, Evans WJ. *Inorg Chem.* 2014; 53:3099. [PubMed: 24580373] (h) Demir S, Nippe M, Gonzalez MI, Long JR. *Chem Sci.* 2014; 5:4701.

25. Blondin G, Girerd JJ. *Chem Rev.* 1990; 90:1359.
26. (a) Drueke S, Chaudhuri P, Pohl K, Wieghardt K, Ding XQ, Bill E, Sawaryn A, Trautwein AX, Winkler H, Gurman SJ. *J Chem Soc, Chem Commun.* 1989:59.(b) Ding XQ, Bominaar EL, Bill E, Winkler H, Trautwein AX, Drueke S, Chaudhuri P, Wieghardt K. *J Chem Phys.* 1990; 92:178.(c) Cotton FA, Daniels LM, Falvello LR, Murillo CA. *Inorg Chim Acta.* 1994; 219:7.(d) Cotton FA, Daniels LM, Maloney DJ, Murillo CA. *Inorg Chim Acta.* 1996; 249:9.(e) Gamelin DR, Bominaar EL, Kirk ML, Wieghardt K, Solomon EI. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1996; 118:8085.(f) Cotton FA, Daniels LM, Falvello LR, Matonic JH, Murillo CA. *Inorg Chim Acta.* 1997; 256:269.(g) Zall CM, Zhrebetskyy D, Dzubak AL, Bill E, Gagliardi L, Lu CC. *Inorg Chem.* 2012; 51:728. [PubMed: 22148181] (h) Zall CM, Clouston LJ, Young VG, Ding KY, Kim HJ, Zhrebetskyy D, Chen YS, Bill E, Gagliardi L, Lu CC. *Inorg Chem.* 2013; 52:9216. [PubMed: 23902538]
27. (a) Bechlars B, D'Alessandro DM, Jenkins DM, Iavarone AT, Glover SD, Kubiak CP, Long JR. *Nat Chem.* 2010; 2:362. [PubMed: 20414235] (b) Neese F, Pantazis DA. *Faraday Discuss.* 2011; 148:229. [PubMed: 21322486]
28. (a) Cotton FA, Curtis NF, Johnson BFG, Mague JT, Wood JS, Harris CB, Robinson WR, Lippard SJ. *Science.* 1964; 145:1305. [PubMed: 17802015] (b) Cotton, FA., Murillo, CA., Walton, RA. *Multiple Bonds Between Metal Atoms.* Springer; New York: 2005. (c) Nguyen T, Sutton AD, Brynda M, Fettinger JC, Long GJ, Power PP. *Science.* 2005; 310:844. [PubMed: 16179432]
29. (a) Gambardella P, Rusponi S, Veronesse M, Dhesi SS, Grazioli C, Dallmeyer A, Cabria I, Zeller R, Dederichs PH, Kern K, Carbone C, Brune H. *Science.* 2003; 300:1130. [PubMed: 12750516] (b) Miyamachi T, Schuh T, Märkl T, Bresch C, Balashov T, Stöhr A, Karlewski C, André S, Marthaler M, Hoffmann M, Geilhufe M, Ostanin S, Hergert W, Mertig I, Schön G, Ernst A, Wulfhekel W. *Nature.* 2013; 503:242. [PubMed: 24226888] (c) Rau IG, Baumann S, Rusponi S, Donati F, Stepanow S, Gragnaniello L, Dreiser J, Pamonteze C, Nolting F, Gangopadhyay S, Albertini OR, Macfarlane RM, Lutz CP, Jones BA, Gambardella P, Heinrich AJ, Brune H. *Science.* 2014; 344:988. [PubMed: 24812206]
30. Cotton FA, Daniels LM, Matonic JH, Murillo CA. *Inorg Chim Acta.* 1997; 256:277.
31. Lee D, Krebs C, Huynh BH, Hendrich MP, Lippard SJ. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2000; 122:5000.
32. Powers TM, Fout AR, Zheng SL, Betley TA. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:3336. [PubMed: 21332160]
33. Eames EV, Harris TD, Betley TA. *Chem Sci.* 2012; 3:407.
34. Zhao QL, Harris TD, Betley TA. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:8293. [PubMed: 21561083]
35. APEX2, v 2009. Bruker Analytical X-Ray Systems, Inc.: Madison, WI; 2009.
36. Scheldrick, GM. SADABS, version 2.03. Bruker Analytical X-Ray Systems, Inc.: Madison, WI; 2000.
37. Spek, AL. PLATON, A Multipurpose Crystallographic Tool. Utrecht University; Utrecht, The Netherlands: 2010.
38. Sheldrick, GM. SHELXTL, version 6.12. Bruker Analytical, X-Ray Systems, Inc.: Madison, WI; 2000.
39. Bain GA, Berry JF. *J Chem Educ.* 2008; 85:532.
40. Chilton NF, Anderson RP, Turner LD, Soncini A, Murray KS. *J Comput Chem.* 2013; 34:1164. [PubMed: 23386394]
41. Cole KS, Cole RH. *J Chem Phys.* 1941; 9:341.
42. (a) Aubin SMJ, Sun Z, Pardi L, Krzystek J, Folting K, Brunel LC, Rheingold AL, Christou G, Hendrickson DN. *Inorg Chem.* 1999; 38:5329.(b) Yang, P. *The Chemistry of Nanostructured Materials.* World Scientific; Singapore: 2003.
43. Ward MD. *Chem Soc Rev.* 1995; 24:121.
44. (a) Zadrozny JM, Xiao DJ, Long JR, Atanasov M, Neese F, Grandjean F, Long GJ. *Inorg Chem.* 2013; 52:13123. [PubMed: 24175913] (b) Zadrozny JM, Xiao DJ, Atanasov M, Long GJ, Grandjean F, Neese F, Long JR. *Nat Chem.* 2013; 5:577. [PubMed: 23787747]
45. Schulz CE, Hu CJ, Scheidt WR. *Hyperfine Interact.* 2007; 170:55.
46. Hazra S, Sasmal S, Fleck M, Grandjean F, Sougrati MT, Ghosh M, Harris TD, Bonville P, Long GJ, Mohanta S. *J Chem Phys.* 2011; 134:174507. [PubMed: 21548699]

47. Dutta SK, Ensling J, Werner R, Florke U, Haase W, Gutlich P, Nag K. *Angew Chem, Int Ed Engl.* 1997; 36:152.
48. The decrease in the χ_{MT} product as temperature increases from 50 to 300 K is likely the result of population of a very small fraction of the excited state $S = 17/2$.
49. Chilton NF, Anderson RP, Turner LD, Soncini A, Murray KS. *J Comput Chem.* 2013; 34:1164. [PubMed: 23386394]
50. An alternative method of fitting the χ_{MT} data for 2 and 3 is by considering an $S = 17/2$ ground state. This will require an approximate value of g around ~ 2.5 – 2.6 .
51. (a) Stamatatos TC, Poole KM, Abboud KA, Wernsdorfer W, O'Brien TA, Christou G. *Inorg Chem.* 2008; 47:5006. [PubMed: 18454518] (b) Moushi EE, Stamatatos TC, Wernsdorfer W, Nastopoulos V, Christou G, Tasiopoulos AJ. *Inorg Chem.* 2009; 48:5049. [PubMed: 19072669]
52. (a) Thomas L, Lioni F, Ballou R, Gatteschi D, Sessoli R, Barbara B. *Nature.* 1996; 383:145.(b) Friedman JR, Sarachik MP, Tejada J, Ziolo R. *Phys Rev Lett.* 1996; 76:3830. [PubMed: 10061120]
53. Soler M, Wernsdorfer W, Folting K, Pink M, Christou G. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2004; 126:2156. [PubMed: 14971951]
54. Hernández Sánchez R, Zheng S-L, Betley TA. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2015; 137:11126. [PubMed: 26231520]
55. Vanquickenborne LG, Haspeslagh L. *Inorg Chem.* 1982; 21:2448.

Figure 1. Representative molecular crystal structure and electrochemical behavior of [Bu₄N] [(^HL)₂Fe₆(solv)₂]. (a) X-ray structure of the cluster anion in **2**. Thermal ellipsoids are set at 50% probability level. The Fe, C, and N atoms are colored orange, gray, and blue, respectively. (b) Cyclic voltammogram of **2** in pyridine at room temperature. Scan rate: 100 mV/s. A 0.1 M [Bu₄N][PF₆] solution was used as supporting electrolyte.

Figure 2.

Zero-field ^{57}Fe Mössbauer spectra for $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}][(\text{HL})_2\text{Fe}_6(\text{py})_2]$. Spectra collected at: (a) 4.2, (b) 90, and (c) 210 K. The red traces in (a) and (c) correspond to the overall fit. The fit in (a) is composed of three sextets shown by the top blue, green, and brown traces; similarly, the fit in (c) encompasses the two doublets shown in blue and green. The fit parameters are described in the text.

Figure 3.

Magnetic characterization of $(\text{HL})_2\text{Fe}_6$ and $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}][(\text{HL})_2\text{Fe}_6(\text{py})_2]$. (a) VT dc magnetic susceptibility of **1** (1 T, green squares) and **2** (0.1 T, blue circles). (b) VTVH magnetization of **2** at selected fields (1–7 T) measured on increasing temperature from 1.8 to 10 K. Solid red and black lines in (a) and (b) correspond to the fit of the data as described in the text, respectively. (c) Plot of $\chi_M' T$ versus T for **2** at an oscillating field frequency of 1 Hz. The inset displays the ZFC and FC data of **2** collected between 1.8 and 5 K at 0.1 T and at a temperature sweeping rate of 0.059 K/min.

Figure 4.

Slow magnetic relaxation phenomena in $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}][(\text{}^{\text{H}}\text{L})_2\text{Fe}_6(\text{py})_2]$. Out-of-phase (χ_M'' , a) and in-phase (χ_M' , c) components of the ac magnetic susceptibility versus frequency (ν). (b) χ_M'' versus T . (d) Cole–Cole plots. The solid continuous lines in (a–d) represent a fit to the data as described in the text. Data collected under a zero-applied dc field. (e) Relaxation times ($\ln \tau$) extracted from (a–d) versus $1/T$ for **2** (circles) and Figure S21 for **3** (diamonds). (f) Zoomed-in plot of the magnetic hysteresis loop from -7 to $+7$ T. Data collected at rate, range: 0.296 mT/s , $\pm 1 \rightleftharpoons \pm 0.1 \text{ T}$; and 0.041 mT/s , $+0.1 \rightleftharpoons -0.1 \text{ T}$.

Figure 5.

Qualitative molecular orbital diagram derived for hexanuclear iron clusters. Molecular orbital diagram proposed to explain the spin ground state in (a) neutral $(\text{HL})_2\text{Fe}_6^{34}$ and (d) reduced $[(\text{HL})_2\text{Fe}_6(\text{solv})_2]^-$ clusters **2** and **3**.

Scheme 1.

Table 1 Relevant Bond Lengths and Angles for $[(^H\text{L})_2\text{Fe}_6]^n$ Species

(Å;°)	1 ^a	Na[1] ^a	2	3
Fe–Fe	2.597(1)	2.580(6)	2.65(4)	2.63(3)
Fe–N	2.037(8)	2.081(8)	2.12(3)	2.11(3)
Fe–NH	1.998(17)	2.052(15)	2.07(3)	2.07(3)
∠Fe–N–Fe	79.2(2)	77.0(2)	78(3)	78(3)
∠Fe–NH–Fe	81.1(2)	77.5(3)	79(2)	78(2)

^aPreviously reported neutral **1** and reduced clusters Na[1] (where Na[1] = [Na(Et₂O)₂(NCMe)₂][(^H_L)₂Fe₆]).³⁴