Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2018 June 06; 140(22): 6969–6977. doi:10.1021/jacs.8b02839.

Exploring Applications of Covalent Organic Frameworks: Homogeneous Reticulation of Radicals for Dynamic Nuclear Polarization

Wei Cao[†], Wei David Wang[†], Hai-Sen Xu[†], Ivan V. Sergeyev[‡], Jochem Struppe[‡], Xiaoling Wang[§], Frederic Mentink-Vigier[§], Zhehong Gan[§], Ming-Xing Xiao[†], Lu-Yao Wang[†], Guo-Peng Chen[†], San-Yuan Ding[†], Shi Bai[¶], and Wei Wang^{*,†,||}

[†]State Key Laboratory of Applied Organic Chemistry, College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu 730000, China

[‡]Bruker BioSpin Corporation, 15 Fortune Drive, Billerica, Massachusetts 01821, United States

[§]National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32310, United States

[¶]Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware 19716, United States

^{||}Collaborative Innovation Center of Chemical Science and Engineering, Tianjin 300071, China

Abstract

Rapid progress has been witnessed in the past decade in the fields of covalent organic frameworks (COFs) and dynamic nuclear polarization (DNP). In this contribution, we bridge these two fields by constructing radical-embedded COFs as promising DNP agents. Via polarization transfer from unpaired electrons to nuclei, DNP realizes significant enhancement of NMR signal intensities. One of the crucial issues in DNP is to screen for suitable radicals to act as efficient polarizing agents, the basic criteria for which are homogenous distribution and fixed orientation of unpaired electrons. We therefore envisioned that the crystalline and porous structures of COFs, if evenly embedded with radicals, may work as new “crystalline sponge” for DNP experiments. As a proof of concept, we constructed a series of proxyl radical-embedded COFs (denoted as PR(x)-COFs) and successfully applied them to achieve substantial DNP enhancement. Benefitting from the bottom-up and multivariate synthetic strategies, proxyl radicals have been covalently reticulated, homogeneously distributed, and rigidly embedded into the crystalline and mesoporous frameworks with adjustable concentration (x%). Excellent performance of PR(x)-COFs has been observed for DNP ¹H, ¹³C, and ¹⁵N solid-state NMR enhancements. This contribution not only realizes the direct construction of radical COFs from radical monomers, but also explores the new application

*Corresponding Author: W.W. wang_wei@lzu.edu.cn; ORCID: 0000-0002-9263-7927.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publications website.

Detailed synthetic procedures, FT-IR spectra, PXRD patterns, modeling details and atomic coordinates, N₂ adsorption-desorption isotherms, solid-state NMR spectra, EPR spectra, TGA traces, SEM images, SQUID measurements and DNP NMR experiments.

of COFs as DNP polarizing agents. Given that many radical COFs can therefore be rationally designed and facilely constructed with well-defined composition, distribution, and pore size, we expect that our effort will pave the way for utilizing radical COFs as standard polarizing agents in DNP NMR experiments.

Graphical Abstract

INTRODUCTION

Since the first report in 2005¹, covalent organic frameworks (COFs)² have attracted increasing interest from various research communities. Precise reticulation of organic building blocks via covalent bonding has rendered COFs with high crystallinity and uniformed porosity. These structural characters may further endow COFs with advanced functions. Indeed, potential applications of COFs have been explored in the areas of gas adsorption/separation, catalysis, optoelectricity, sensing, and so on.³ It is therefore expected that crystallinity, porosity, and functionality be facilely integrated, precisely adjusted, and further utilized for *unique* applications. Towards this goal, we realize herein the application of COFs as an efficient agent for dynamic nuclear polarization.⁴

Dynamic nuclear polarization (DNP) at high magnetic fields⁵ proved to be a fascinating technique to overcome the intrinsically low sensitivity of NMR spectroscopy: polarization transfer from unpaired electrons to surrounding nuclei can enable enhancement of NMR signal intensities by 2 to 3 orders of magnitude.^{4m} One of the most critical requirements for DNP is to screen suitable polarizing agents^{4l}, which should possess unpaired electrons and transfer the polarization efficiently. Several organic radicals (Scheme 1) have been found effective⁶ for DNP when physically mixed with the analyte. However, the aggregation of radicals at cryogenic temperatures has hindered^{4g,4m} the practical applications of DNP; as a compromise in most cases, glass formers⁷ (such as glycerol or dimethyl sulfoxide) have to be co-added as indispensable solvents so as to disperse the radicals. A very recent breakthrough to overcome this bottleneck is the exploration of solid polarizing agents.^{8–20} For example, Gajan et al.¹³ developed recently inorganic-organic hybrids in which the TEMPO or bTUrea radicals (Scheme 1) were post-attached to the surface of mesoporous silica. Being free of glass formers, these radical-modified hybrid matrixes proved their efficiency, facility, and recyclability in solid-state DNP NMR experiments. Inspired by these pioneering works, we envisioned to take full advantage of the structural uniqueness of COFs and construct radical-embedded COFs as new polarizing agents for DNP.

To design an efficient polarizing agent, homogenous distribution of radicals and fixed g -tensor orientation of unpaired electrons are key to the improvement of the so-called cross-effect (CE).^{4f,6e,6j} We therefore envisioned that crystalline and porous frameworks such as COFs, if evenly embedded with radicals, would have the following advantages: i) the *ordered* structure ensures homogeneous distribution of radicals throughout the network; ii) the *rigid* structure helps to fix the orientation of the embedded radicals. iii) Being free of glass formers, the *porous* structure acts as “*crystalline sponge*”²¹ to accommodate the analyte of interest.

Taking all these criteria into account, we achieve herein the direct construction of radical-containing²² COFs from radical monomers. As shown in Scheme 2, a series of proxyl radical (PR) embedded COFs (denoted as PR(x)-COFs) have been successfully synthesized, in which the proxyl radicals **1** are homogeneously and rigidly reticulated into the framework via the bottom-up²³ synthetic strategy. In addition, the radical concentration (x%, from 0 to 100%) in the framework can be explicitly controlled in the presence of **2** (the reduced form of **1**) by the multivariate²⁴ approach. These criteria²⁵ are crucial for screening the best experimental conditions for DNP enhancement (the concentration issue, *vide infra*). Indeed, benefitting from their structural uniqueness, PR(x)-COFs have shown excellent performance as new DNP agents. Specifically, the PR(20)-COF reached an enhancement factor ϵ_H of ~ 64 at high magnetic field of 9.4 Tesla. Note that the proxyl radical **1** and its reduced form **2** are new compounds and can be facilely synthesized on a large scale via our method (see SI for synthetic details).²⁶ We therefore expect that radical-containing COFs, such as PR(x)-COFs, may work as the promising polarizing agents for DNP experiments in the near future.

RESULTS

Designed Synthesis and Structural Characterization

As briefly mentioned above, the prerequisite for DNP enhancement is that the radicals should be evenly distributed with a suitable inter-radical distance.^{6a,13,27} Too large a distance will decrease the overall rate of polarization transfer, while too short a distance (i.e., radical aggregation) will lead to fast electron relaxation and dramatically lower the polarization efficiency. This dilemma is solved herein by covalent reticulation of radicals into the COF frameworks. Via the multivariate approach shown in Scheme 2, co-condensation of the proxyl radical **1**, its reduced form **2**, and 1,3,5-triformylbenzene via imine-bond formation resulted in a series of PR(x)-COFs (see SI for details). The radical concentration in PR(x)-COFs has been finely adjusted by varying the proportion of proxyl radical **1** to its reduced form **2** from the beginning. The characterization results confirmed that PR(x)-COFs are highly-crystalline mesoporous materials and the proxyl radicals are homogeneously distributed within the COF frameworks.

The crystalline and porous structure of PR(x)-COFs was verified by powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) analysis, nitrogen adsorption-desorption isotherm, and ¹²⁹Xe NMR spectroscopy. PR(x)-COFs with different radical concentrations showed similar PXRD patterns (Figure S6); the structural simulation suggested that they possess preferentially the eclipsed π - π stacking model (Figure 1a). Derived from nitrogen adsorption-desorption data, large Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) surface areas of 1179 to 1742 m² g⁻¹ and pore

volumes of 0.74 to 2.0 cm³ g⁻¹ were calculated for PR(x)-COFs (Table S2). Moreover, the pore-size-distribution of PR(x)-COFs is centered at 2.5 nm, which agrees with the theoretical data (2.9 nm) of the pore diameter in the proposed stacking model (Figure 1b). ¹²⁹Xe NMR spectrum for ¹²⁹Xe atoms adsorbed into PR(100)-COF showed only one signal which has the narrow full width at half maximum of 975 Hz (Figure 1c). These data indicate that the synthesized PR(x)-COFs are highly crystalline materials with uniform pores. Importantly, the pore size of PR(x)-COFs falls into the mesoporous region, which is large enough to accommodate common analytes.

The covalent connection at atomic level in PR(x)-COFs was further elucidated by FT-IR and solid-state NMR spectroscopy. The FT-IR spectra of PR(x)-COFs showed the same –C=N– stretch at 1626 cm⁻¹ (Figure S3), indicating the successful formation of imine bonds. In addition, the vibration at 1355 cm⁻¹ represents the typical stretching of nitroxyl radicals. Figure 2 shows the ¹³C cross-polarization magic-angle spinning (CP/MAS) NMR spectra of PR(x)-COFs (x = 0, 10, 50, 100; more spectra shown in Figure S40). It is worth mentioning that, due to the paramagnetic broadening, radical-containing polymers could hardly be characterized by solid-state NMR spectroscopy.²⁸ Only very few successful examples^{16,28} have been reported in the literature, and the signals were too broad for unambiguous assignments. Herein, the NMR signals are very narrow and, can be assigned explicitly upon the comparison of NMR data for samples with varied radical concentrations. For example, the signal at 158 ppm is characteristic for the carbon atoms of imine bonds. Meanwhile, the signal at 137 ppm should be assigned to the carbon atoms originating from 1,3,5-triformylbenzene while the signals at 150, 131 and 116 ppm represent the aromatic carbon atoms from monomers **1** and **2**. Note that carbon atoms adjacent to N–O[•] radicals are subject to paramagnetic bleaching and therefore, the signals at 148, 140, 129, 124, 62, and 31 ppm should be assigned to the carbon atoms originating from the neutral monomer **2**. In addition, the successful embedding of proxyl radicals was verified by magnetic measurements via superconducting quantum interference device (SQUID): the results from the M–H (Figure S59) and χ_m –T plots (Figure S60) illustrated the paramagnetic behavior²⁹ of PR(100)-COF.

The homogeneous distribution of radicals in PR(x)-COFs has been verified by EPR spectroscopic analysis. Figure 3 presents typical EPR spectra of PR(x)-COFs recorded at room temperature (more EPR spectra shown in Figure S42). The EPR spectra of PR(x)-COFs with higher radical concentration (x = 50 and 100) possess a single line with a Lorentzian line shape due to large spin-exchange interaction³⁰, while those with lower radical concentration (x = 2–35) possess three lines due to strong hyperfine interaction³¹ with ¹⁴N nuclei. The observation of hyperfine splitting in the EPR spectra implies that radicals are largely separated and evenly distributed in PR(x)-COFs. Moreover, the radical concentration in each sample was derived from the comparison of the double integral of the EPR signal to that of monomer **1**. Note that the radical concentration (C_{rad} , from 0.02 to 1.80 mmol g⁻¹) calculated via this method showed linear correlation with the ingredient proportion (x%, from 2 to 100%) of the radical monomer **1** (Figure S44). This linear correlation also implies the homogeneous reticulation of radicals into the crystalline framework. The overwhelming evidence for the homogeneous distribution of radicals was obtained from the EPR spectra acquired at 110 K for PR(x)-COFs (x = 2–35) samples

impregnated with CHCl_3 (Figure S45).³² The central line-widths, which were least affected by the g -tensor and hyperfine anisotropies, ranged from 10.7 to 13.2 G (Table S3). Note that these line widths are narrower than those of other nitroxide radical materials^{13–16,18} reported, which normally ranged from 12 to 20 G.

PR(x)-COFs for DNP Enhancement

With a series of radical embedded PR(x)-COFs in hand, we set out to screen the best candidate for DNP enhancement. Accordingly, DNP experiments of PR(x)-COFs impregnated with H_2O were performed at 9.4 T and ~100 K and the original spectra have been shown in Figures S65–S76. DNP enhancement was observed for all the measured samples. In the presence of PR(20)-COF, an optimal ^1H DNP enhancement (ϵ_{H}) of ~64 for the protons from H_2O and ^{13}C CP DNP enhancement ($\epsilon_{\text{C CP}}$) of ~39 for the framework carbons were observed (Figure 4). Meanwhile, we found that DNP enhancement increases upon increasing radical concentration from 0.06 to 0.43 mmol g^{-1} ($x = 6\text{--}20$), which comes from the increased overall rate of electron-to-nucleus polarization transfer. However, with radical concentration increased further from 0.43 to 0.61 mmol g^{-1} ($x = 20\text{--}35$), the DNP enhancement decreases most likely due to faster electron spin cross-relaxation via stronger inter-radical interactions.^{27,33} Similar trends were also observed in other systems by Gajan et al¹³ and Besson et al¹⁶.

Figure 5a shows the DNP ^{13}C CP/MAS NMR spectrum of PR(10)-COF impregnated with H_2O with the microwave field on and off, respectively. The spectrum could be recorded with only 16 scans (acquired in 0.04 h) with microwave on. For comparison, with the microwave field off, the corresponding spectrum has to be recorded with 8000 scans (acquired in 3.4 h) to reach reasonable signal-to-noise ratios (see Figure 2). Encouraged by these results, we further collected the ^{15}N CP/MAS NMR spectrum of PR(x)-COF under DNP conditions. This spectrum could not be acquired without DNP. Figure 5b shows the DNP ^{15}N CP/MAS NMR spectrum of PR(10)-COF recorded with 1024 scans only (acquired in 1.1 h). The peaks at 91, 104 and 315 ppm were assigned to the nitrogen atoms of $-\text{N}-\text{H}$, $-\text{NH}_2$ (terminal) and $-\text{N}=\text{C}-$ bonds, respectively. Again, these results indicate that PR(x)-COF is indeed an efficient DNP polarizing agent.

Finally, the efficiency of PR(x)-COFs for polarizing guest molecules was tested by using $[2,3\text{-}^{13}\text{C}]\text{-L-alanine}$ as an analyte. DNP ^{13}C CP/MAS NMR experiment of PR(15)-COF impregnated with 0.1 M H_2O solution of $[2,3\text{-}^{13}\text{C}]\text{-L-alanine}$ was performed at 9.4 T and ~100 K. Figure 6a shows that the ^{13}C resonance of $[2,3\text{-}^{13}\text{C}]\text{-L-alanine}$ can be effectively enhanced by DNP and a ^{13}C CP DNP enhancement factor of ~44 is obtained. The signals at 52 and 18 ppm are due to the labeled carbon atoms originating from $[2,3\text{-}^{13}\text{C}]\text{-L-alanine}$.³⁴ This result indicate that, being absorbed in the pores of PR(x)-COFs, the guest molecules, such as $[2,3\text{-}^{13}\text{C}]\text{-L-alanine}$ can be efficiently polarized by the radicals embedded on the pore walls through proton spin diffusion³⁵ via H_2O . In addition, in order to check whether PR(x)-COFs are efficient polarizing agents at even higher magnetic field, DNP ^{13}C CP/MAS NMR experiment of the same sample was also conducted at 14.1 T and ~105 K. Strikingly, a ^{13}C CP DNP enhancement ($\epsilon_{\text{C CP}}$) of ~32 was given for the carbons from $[2,3\text{-}^{13}\text{C}]\text{-L-}$

alanine (Figure 6b). Note that in most of the reported cases, however, the DNP efficiency dropped^{6f,6i} significantly at higher magnetic fields such as at 14.1 T.

DISCUSSION

The key to exploring advanced applications of new materials is how to utilize their structural uniqueness. This criterion has been exemplified in this contribution by the homogeneous reticulation of radicals into COF structures for DNP enhancement. For this purpose, a series of radical-embedded COFs have been bottom-up synthesized.²² Meeting the demands for an ideal DNP agent, the synthesized COFs, PR(x)-COFs, should have the following structural characteristics: i) The proxyl radicals are covalently reticulated, homogeneously distributed, and rigidly embedded into the highly ordered crystalline framework. Radical aggregation caused by solvent (such as water) crystallization at cryogenic temperatures is therefore avoided, which is crucial³⁶ for efficient polarization transfer in DNP. ii) Benefitting from the multivariate approach shown in Scheme 2, a series of PR(x)-COFs can be facily synthesized with varied radical concentration (x%). This provides an important tool for screening for optimally efficient DNP agents: it has well been acknowledged that the DNP efficiency is indeed sensitive^{13,33,37} to the concentration of radicals. iii) PR(x)-COFs possess well-defined mesopores with the diameter of *ca.* 2.5 nm which not only act as ideal hosts²¹ for analytes but also facilitate¹⁵ the transfer of polarization via spin diffusion.

All these structural features have rendered PR(x)-COFs new and promising polarizing matrixes in DNP applications. i) The EPR data not only verified the homogeneous distribution of proxyl radicals in PR(x)-COFs, but also gave narrow line widths ranging from 10.7 to 13.2 G. These properties have proven important for an efficient DNP agent. ii) DNP ¹H enhancement was observed at 9.4 T and ~100 K for PR(x)-COFs impregnated with H₂O. An optimal ¹H DNP enhancement (ϵ_H) of ~64 for the protons from H₂O was obtained with PR(20)-COF. We therefore conclude that polarization can be efficiently transferred within the straight channels from the unpaired electrons of PR(x)-COFs to the hydrogen nuclei of water. iii) Both ¹³C and ¹⁵N CP DNP enhancements of PR(x)-COFs were observed at 9.4 T and ~100 K. An optimal ¹³C CP DNP enhancement ($\epsilon_{C\ CP}$) of ~39 was observed for the framework carbons of PR(20)-COF. Notably, as shown in Figure 5b, the ¹⁵N CP/MAS NMR spectra could not be acquired without DNP. These results indicate that the polarization can be further transferred from ¹H nuclei to the carbon or nitrogen nuclei within PR(x)-COFs frameworks. iv) The ability of PR(x)-COFs to polarize different guest molecules was demonstrated. With [2,3-¹³C]-*L*-alanine as the analyte, the ¹³C CP DNP enhancement ($\epsilon_{C\ CP}$) of ~44 was observed at 9.4 T and of ~32 was observed at 14.1 T.

The advantages of using radical-containing COFs for DNP enhancement are evident. Given that many strategies have been established in recent years for the covalent construction of COFs, a diverse range of radical-containing COFs can be rationally designed and facily synthesized with well-defined composition, distribution, and pore size. With the availability of these crystalline porous structures, further investigation on the structure-performance relationship is possible, the information from which will certainly shed new light in DNP research. In addition, being structurally robust and totally insoluble in solvents, radical-containing COFs can be easily recycled for repeated use by removal of the analytes.

Therefore, these radical-containing COFs should also be intrinsically suitable for dissolution DNP^{14,20,38} measurements; a solution of analytes can be readily separated from the polarizing agent immediately after polarization.

CONCLUSION

With its ability to dramatically improve the sensitivity of NMR spectroscopy, dynamic nuclear polarization has evolved in recent years into a broadly useful and fascinating technique. By taking advantage of the structural uniqueness of COFs, we explore herein a new application for these agile materials: as efficient DNP agents. For this purpose, a series of proxyl radical embedded COFs, PR(x)-COFs, have been bottom-up constructed with highly-ordered crystalline structures and large BET surface areas. The covalent reticulation, homogenous distribution, and rigid fixation of proxyl radicals with controlled concentration are all advantageous for DNP enhancement. Indeed, DNP ¹H, ¹³C CP, and ¹⁵N CP DNP enhancements of PR(x)-COFs were successfully observed at 9.4 T and even at higher magnetic field of 14.1 T. Given that radical-containing COFs can be facilely and diversely synthesized as two- or three-dimensional crystalline structures, as well as easily scaled-up, we expect that our contribution will boost the unique application of crystalline COFs as glass-former-free agents for DNP experiments.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was mainly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 21425206 and 21632004). A portion of this work was performed at the National High Magnetic Field Laboratory, which is supported by National Science Foundation Cooperative Agreement No. DMR-1157490* and the State of Florida. The 14.1 T DNP system at NHMFL is funded in part by NIH P41 GM122698 and S10 OD018519 (magnet and console), and NSF CHE-1229170 (gyrotron). The international collaboration has also been supported by the 111 project (No. 111-2-17) and the International Joint Research Centre for Green Catalysis and Synthesis, Gansu provincial Sci. & Tech. Department (No. 2016B01017).

References

1. Côté AP, Benin AI, Ockwig NW, O'Keeffe M, Matzger AJ, Yaghi OM. *Science*. 2005; 310:1166. [PubMed: 16293756]
2. For reviews, see: Feng X, Ding X, Jiang D. *Chem Soc Rev*. 2012; 41:6010. [PubMed: 22821129] Ding SY, Wang W. *Chem Soc Rev*. 2013; 42:548. [PubMed: 23060270] Colson JW, Dichtel WR. *Nat Chem*. 2013; 5:453. [PubMed: 23695626] Waller PJ, Gándara F, Yaghi OM. *Acc Chem Res*. 2015; 48:3053. [PubMed: 26580002] Slater AG, Cooper AI. *Science*. 2015; 348:aaa8075. [PubMed: 26023142] Huang N, Wang P, Jiang D. *Nat Rev Mater*. 2016; 1:16068. Segura JL, Mancheno MJ, Zamora F. *Chem Soc Rev*. 2016; 45:5635. [PubMed: 27341661] Jiang J, Zhao Y, Yaghi OM. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2016; 138:3255. [PubMed: 26863450] Diercks CS, Yaghi OM. *Science*. 2017; 355:923. Rogge SMJ, Bavykina A, Hajek J, Garcia H, Olivos-Suarez AI, Sepulveda-Escribano A, Vimont A, Clet G, Bazin P, Kapteijn F, Daturi M, Ramos-Fernandez EV, Llabres i Xamena FX, Van Speybroeck V, Gascon J. *Chem Soc Rev*. 2017; 46:3134. [PubMed: 28338128] Jin Y, Hu Y, Zhang W. *Nat Rev Chem*. 2017; 1:0056. Beuerle F, Gole B. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2018; 57:4850.
3. A more comprehensive list of the references has been presented in SI. For selected examples, see: Han SS, Furukawa H, Yaghi OM, Goddard WA. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2008; 130:11580. [PubMed: 18683924] Ding SY, Gao J, Wang Q, Zhang Y, Song WG, Su CY, Wang W. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2011;

- 133:19816. [PubMed: 22026454] Ding X, Guo J, Feng X, Honsho Y, Guo J, Seki S, Maitarad P, Saeki A, Nagase S, Jiang D. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2011; 50:1289. Yu JT, Chen Z, Sun J, Huang ZT, Zheng QY. *J Mater Chem*. 2012; 22:5369. DeBlase CR, Silberstein KE, Truong TT, Abruña HD, Dichtel WR. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2013; 135:16821. [PubMed: 24147596] Bertrand GHV, Michaelis VK, Ong TC, Griffin RG, Dincă M. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2013; 110:4923. [PubMed: 23479656] Dogru M, Handloser M, Auras F, Kunz T, Medina D, Hartschuh A, Knochel P, Bein T. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2013; 125:2992. Chandra S, Kundu T, Kandambeth S, BabaRao R, Marathe Y, Kunjir SM, Banerjee R. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2014; 136:6570. [PubMed: 24758195] Fang Q, Wang J, Gu S, Kaspar RB, Zhuang Z, Zheng J, Guo H, Qiu S, Yan Y. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2015; 137:8352. [PubMed: 26099722] Wang X, Han X, Zhang J, Wu X, Liu Y, Cui Y. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2016; 138:12332. [PubMed: 27618953] Sun Q, Aguila B, Perman J, Nguyen N, Ma S. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2016; 138:15790. [PubMed: 27934007] Ma H, Liu B, Li B, Zhang L, Li YG, Tan HQ, Zang HY, Zhu G. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2016; 138:5897. [PubMed: 27094048] Yin ZJ, Xu SQ, Zhan TG, Qi QY, Wu ZQ, Zhao X. *Chem Commun*. 2017; 53:7266. Lu S, Hu Y, Wan S, McCaffrey R, Jin Y, Gu H, Zhang W. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2017; 139:17082. [PubMed: 29095604] Banerjee T, Haase F, Savasci G, Gottschling K, Ochsenfeld C, Lotsch BV. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2017; 139:16228. [PubMed: 29022345] Li Z, Li H, Guan X, Tang J, Yusran Y, Li Z, Xue M, Fang Q, Yan Y, Valtchev V, Qiu S. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2017; 139:17771. [PubMed: 29179538]
4. For the earliest reports, see: Overhauser AW. *Phys Review*. 1953; 92:411. Carver TR, Slichter CP. *Phys Rev*. 1953; 92:212. For selected reviews, see: Morley GW, van Tol J, Ardavan A, Porfyrakis K, Zhang J, Briggs GA. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2007; 98:220501. [PubMed: 17677824] Maly T, Debelouchina GT, Bajaj VS, Hu KN, Joo CG, Mak-Jurkauskas ML, Sirigiri JR, van der Wel PC, Herzfeld J, Temkin RJ, Griffin RG. *J Chem Phys*. 2008; 128:052211. [PubMed: 18266416] Griesinger C, Bennati M, Vieth HM, Luchinat C, Parigi G, Hofer P, Engelke F, Glaser SJ, Denysenkov V, Prisner TF. *Prog Nucl Magn Reson Spectrosc*. 2012; 64:4. [PubMed: 22578315] Hovav Y, Feintuch A, Vega S. *J Magn Reson*. 2012; 214:29. [PubMed: 22119645] Rossini AJ, Zagdoun A, Lelli M, Lesage A, Copéret C, Emsley L. *Acc Chem Res*. 2013; 46:1942. [PubMed: 23517009] Franck JM, Pavlova A, Scott JA, Han S. *Prog Nucl Magn Reson Spectrosc*. 2013; 74:33. [PubMed: 24083461] Keshari KR, Wilson DM. *Chem Soc Rev*. 2014; 43:1627. [PubMed: 24363044] Kobayashi T, Perras FA, Slowing II, Sadow AD, Pruski M. *ACS Catal*. 2015; 5:7055. Lee D, Hediger S, De Paëpe G. *Solid State Nucl Magn Reson*. 2015; 66–67:6. Smith AN, Long JR. *Anal Chem*. 2016; 88:122. [PubMed: 26594903] Lilly Thankamony AS, Wittmann JJ, Kaushik M, Corzilius B. *Prog Nucl Magn Reson Spectrosc*. 2017; 102–103:120.
5. A more comprehensive list of the references has been presented in SI. For selected examples, see: Prandolini MJ, Denysenkov VP, Gafurov M, Endeward B, Prisner TF. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2009; 131:6090. [PubMed: 19361195] Salnikov E, Rosay M, Pawsey S, Ouari O, Tordo P, Bechinger B. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2010; 132:5940. [PubMed: 20392100] Corzilius B, Smith AA, Barnes AB, Luchinat C, Bertini I, Griffin RG. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2011; 133:5648. [PubMed: 21446700] Lee D, Takahashi H, Thankamony AS, Dacquin JP, Bardet M, Lafon O, Paepe GD. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2012; 134:18491. [PubMed: 23095121] Blanc F, Sperrin L, Jefferson DA, Pawsey S, Rosay M, Grey CP. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2013; 135:2975. [PubMed: 23379257] Wolf P, Valla M, Rossini AJ, Comas-Vives A, Nunez-Zarur F, Malaman B, Lesage A, Emsley L, Coperet C, Hermans I. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2014; 53:10179. Valla M, Rossini AJ, Caillot M, Chizallet C, Raybaud P, Digne M, Chaumonnot A, Lesage A, Emsley L, van Bokhoven JA, Coperet C. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2015; 137:10710. [PubMed: 26244620] Lilly Thankamony AS, Lion C, Pour-point F, Singh B, Perez Linde AJ, Carnevale D, Bodenhausen G, Vezin H, Lafon O, Polshettiwar V. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2015; 54:2190. Perras FA, Kobayashi T, Pruski M. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2015; 137:8336. [PubMed: 26098846] Mollica G, Dekhil M, Ziarelli F, Thureau P, Viel S. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2015; 54:6028. Mouat AR, George C, Kobayashi T, Pruski M, van Duyne RP, Marks TJ, Stair PC. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2015; 54:13346. Potapov A, Yau WM, Ghirlando R, Thurber KR, Tycko R. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2015; 137:8294. [PubMed: 26068174] Kaplan M, Narasimhan S, de Heus C, Mance D, van Doorn S, Houben K, Popov-Celeketic D, Damman R, Katrukha EA, Jain P, Geerts WJC, Heck AJR, Folkers GE, Kapitein LC, Lemeer S, van Bergen En Henegouwen PMP, Baldus M. *Cell*. 2016; 167:1241. [PubMed: 27839865] Stoppler D, Song C, van Rossum BJ, Geiger MA, Lang C, Mroginski MA, Jagtap AP, Sigurdsson ST, Matysik J, Hughes J, Oschkinat H. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2016; 55:16017. Kaminker I, Shimon D, Hovav Y, Feintuch A, Vega S. *Phys Chem Chem Phys*. 2016; 18:11017. [PubMed: 27047995] Ji X, Bornet A, Vuichoud B, Milani J, Gajan D, Rossini AJ,

- Emsley L, Bodenhausen G, Jannin S. *Nat Commun.* 2017; 8:13975. [PubMed: 28072398] Berruyer P, Lelli M, Conley MP, Silverio DL, Widdifield CM, Siddiqi G, Gajan D, Lesage A, Coperet C, Emsley L. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2017; 139:849. [PubMed: 27997167] Saliba EP, Sesti EL, Scott FJ, Albert BJ, Choi EJ, Alaniva N, Gao C, Barnes AB. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2017; 139:6310. [PubMed: 28429936]
6. (a) Koelsch CF. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1957; 79:4439. (b) Hu K-N, Yu H-h, Swager TM, Griffin RG. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2004; 126:10844. [PubMed: 15339160] (c) Song C, Hu KN, Joo CG, Swager TM, Griffin RG. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2006; 128:11385. [PubMed: 16939261] (d) Hu K-N, Song C, Yu H-h, Swager TM, Griffin RG. *J Chem Phys.* 2008; 128:052302. [PubMed: 18266419] (e) Matsuki Y, Maly T, Ouari O, Karoui H, Le Moigne F, Rizzato E, Lyubanova S, Herzfeld J, Prisner T, Tordo P, Griffin RG. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2009; 121:5096. (f) Sauvée C, Rosay M, Casano G, Aussenac F, Weber RT, Ouari O, Tordo P. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2013; 125:11058. (g) Zagdoun A, Casano G, Ouari O, Schwarzwälder M, Rossini AJ, Aussenac F, Yulikov M, Jeschke G, Copéret C, Lesage A, Tordo P, Emsley L. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2013; 135:12790. [PubMed: 23961876] (h) Liu Y, Villamena FA, Rockenbauer A, Song Y, Zweier JL. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2013; 135:2350. [PubMed: 23320522] (i) Mathies G, Caporini MA, Michaelis VK, Liu Y, Hu KN, Mance D, Zweier JL, Rosay M, Baldus M, Griffin RG. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2015; 54:11770. (j) Kubicki DJ, Casano G, Schwarzwälder M, Abel S, Sauvée C, Ganesan K, Yulikov M, Rossini AJ, Jeschke G, Copéret C, Lesage A, Tordo P, Ouari O, Emsley L. *Chem Sci.* 2016; 7:550. [PubMed: 29896347]
7. Ong TC, Mak-Jurkauskas ML, Walish JJ, Michaelis VK, Corzilius B, Smith AA, Clausen AM, Cheetham JC, Swager TM, Griffin RG. *J Phys Chem B.* 2013; 117:3040. [PubMed: 23421391]
8. Gitti R, Wild C, Tsiao C, Zimmer K, Glass TE, Dorn HC. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1988; 110:2294.
9. McCarney ER, Han S. *J Magn Reson.* 2008; 190:307. [PubMed: 18078772]
10. Dollmann BC, Junk MJN, Drechsler M, Spiess HW, Hinderberger D, Munnemann K. *Phys Chem Chem Phys.* 2010; 12:5879. [PubMed: 20518113]
11. Vitzthum V, Borcard F, Jannin S, Morin M, Miéville P, Caporini MA, Sienkiewicz A, Gerber-Lemaire S, Bodenhausen G. *ChemPhysChem.* 2011; 12:2929. [PubMed: 22028312]
12. Lilly Thankamony AS, Lafon O, Lu X, Aussenac F, Rosay M, Trébosc J, Vezin H, Amoureux J-P. *Appl Magn Reson.* 2012; 43:237.
13. Gajan D, Schwarzwälder M, Conley MP, Grüning WR, Rossini AJ, Zagdoun A, Lelli M, Yulikov M, Jeschke G, Sauvée C, Ouari O, Tordo P, Veyre L, Lesage A, Thieuleux C, Emsley L, Copéret C. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2013; 135:15459. [PubMed: 23978152]
14. Gajan D, Bornet A, Vuichoud B, Milani J, Melzi R, van Kalker HA, Veyre L, Thieuleux C, Conley MP, Grüning WR, Schwarzwälder M, Lesage A, Copéret C, Bodenhausen G, Emsley L, Jannin S. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2014; 111:14693. [PubMed: 25267650]
15. Baudouin D, van Kalker HA, Bornet A, Vuichoud B, Veyre L, Cavaillès M, Schwarzwälder M, Liao WC, Gajan D, Bodenhausen G, Emsley L, Lesage A, Jannin S, Copéret C, Thieuleux C. *Chem Sci.* 2016; 7:6846. [PubMed: 28451127]
16. Besson E, Ziarelli F, Bloch E, Gerbaud G, Queyroy S, Viel S, Gastaldi S. *Chem Commun.* 2016; 52:5531.
17. Cheng T, Mishkovsky M, Junk MJN, Munnemann K, Comment A. *Macromol Rapid Commun.* 2016; 37:1074. [PubMed: 27184565]
18. Grüning WR, Bieringer H, Schwarzwälder M, Gajan D, Bornet A, Vuichoud B, Milani J, Baudouin D, Veyre L, Lesage A, Jannin S, Bodenhausen G, Thieuleux C, Copéret C. *Helv Chim Acta.* 2017; 100:e1600122.
19. Silverio DL, van Kalker HA, Ong T-C, Baudin M, Yulikov M, Veyre L, Berruyer P, Chaudhari S, Gajan D, Baudouin D, Cavaillès M, Vuichoud B, Bornet A, Jeschke G, Bodenhausen G, Lesage A, Emsley L, Jannin S, Thieuleux C, Copéret C. *Helv Chim Acta.* 2017; 100:e1700101.
20. Cavaillès M, Bornet A, Jaurand X, Vuichoud B, Baudouin D, Baudin M, Veyre L, Bodenhausen G, Dumez JN, Jannin S, Coperet C, Thieuleux C. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2018; ASAP. doi: 10.1002/anie.201801009
21. The “crystalline sponge” is initially referred to crystalline and porous hosts which can accommodate organic molecules (analytes), so that the host-guest system becomes observable by conventional X-ray structural analysis. This method plays an important role in the absolute

structure determination of natural products and their derivatives. See for example: Inokuma Y, Arai T, Fujita M. *Nat Chem*. 2010; 2:780. [PubMed: 20729900] Inokuma Y, Yoshioka S, Ariyoshi J, Arai T, Hitora Y, Takada K, Matsunaga S, Rissanen K, Fujita M. *Nature*. 2013; 495:461. [PubMed: 23538828] Vinogradova EV, Muller P, Buchwald SL. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2014; 53:3125. Lee S, Kapustin EA, Yaghi OM. *Science*. 2016; 353:808. [PubMed: 27540171] Öhrström L. *Science*. 2016; 353:754. [PubMed: 27540155] Hoshino M, Khutia A, Xing H, Inokuma Y, Fujita M. *IUCrJ*. 2016; 3:139. Matsuda Y, Mitsuhashi T, Lee S, Hoshino M, Mori T, Okada M, Zhang H, Hayashi F, Fujita M, Abe I. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2016; 55:5785. Easun TL, Moreau F, Yan Y, Yang S, Schroder M. *Chem Soc Rev*. 2017; 46:239. [PubMed: 27896354]

22. Only three reported examples are relevant to the radical-containing COFs, in all of which, however, the post-modification of the neutral COF frameworks with TEMPO radicals or free electrons was applied as the synthetic strategy. See: Xu F, Xu H, Chen X, Wu D, Wu Y, Liu H, Gu C, Fu R, Jiang D. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2015; 54:6814. Hughes BK, Braunecker WA, Bobela DC, Nanayakkara SU, Reid OG, Johnson JC. *J Phys Chem Lett*. 2016; 7:3660. [PubMed: 27583443] Jin E, Asada M, Xu Q, Dalapati S, Addicoat MA, Brady MA, Xu H, Nakamura T, Heine T, Chen Q, Jiang D. *Science*. 2017; 357:673. [PubMed: 28818940]
23. Du X, Sun Y, Tan B, Teng Q, Yao X, Su C, Wang W. *Chem Commun*. 2010; 46:970.
24. (a) Chen X, Addicoat M, Jin E, Zhai L, Xu H, Huang N, Guo Z, Liu L, Irle S, Jiang D. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2015; 137:3241. [PubMed: 25706112] (b) Pang ZF, Xu SQ, Zhou TY, Liang RR, Zhan TG, Zhao X. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2016; 138:4710. [PubMed: 27015785] (c) Crowe JW, Baldwin LA, McGrier PL. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2016; 138:10120. [PubMed: 27490336] (d) Huang N, Zhai L, Coupry DE, Addicoat MA, Okushita K, Nishimura K, Heine T, Jiang D. *Nat Commun*. 2016; 7:12325. [PubMed: 27460607] (e) Zhang J, Han X, Wu X, Liu Y, Cui Y. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2017; 139:8277. [PubMed: 28537721]
25. As previously reported (see ref. 24 as examples), the bottom-up and multivariate approaches guaranteed the homogeneous distribution of monomers in the COF frameworks. Meanwhile, the narrow central line-widths in the EPR spectra (Table S3) are indicative for the homogeneous distribution of radicals, the issue of which has been specifically demonstrated in the literature (see refs 13, 15, and 18). In addition, Figure S58 presented the elemental mapping images which showed the homogeneous distribution of O element (mainly originated from N-O. radicals) as well.
26. Chinese Patent Application, No. 201810074645.8. 2018
27. Mentink-Vigier F, Akbey U, Oschkinat H, Vega S, Feintuch A. *J Magn Reson*. 2015; 258:102. [PubMed: 26232770]
28. Behrends F, Wagner H, Studer A, Niehaus O, Pöttgen R, Eckert H. *Macromolecules*. 2013; 46:2553.
29. Zhang J, Shen H, Song W, Wang G. *Macromolecules*. 2017; 50:2683.
30. Wertz JE, , Bolton JR. *Electron Spin Resonance* Chapman and Hall; New York: 1986
31. Schlick S. *Advanced ESR Methods in Polymer Research* Wiley-Interscience; Hoboken: 2006
32. The reason for measuring EPR spectra at 110 K is that the DNP NMR experiments were conducted at cryogenic temperatures. We also conducted the EPR measurements of PR(15)-COF impregnated with different solvents at 110 K. The results indicated that solvents with similar polarity had ignorable influence on the central line-width (Table S4).
33. (a) Lange S, Linden AH, Akbey Ü, Trent Franks W, Loening NM, Rossum B-Jv, Oschkinat H. *J Magn Reson*. 2012; 216:209. [PubMed: 22285634] (b) Rossini AJ, Zagdoun A, Lelli M, Gajan D, Rascon F, Rosay M, Maas WE, Coperet C, Lesage A, Emsley L. *Chem Sci*. 2012; 3:108. (c) Takahashi H, Fernandez-de-Alba C, Lee D, Maurel V, Gambarelli S, Bardet M, Hediger S, Barra AL, De Paeppe G. *J Magn Reson*. 2014; 239:91. [PubMed: 24480716]
34. Note that these values are identical to the intrinsic chemical shifts of alanine, indicating that the presence of PR(15)-COF as the host does not distort the structural information of the analytes. Meanwhile, making the difference spectrum (Figure S79 as an example) can deduct the NMR signals of PR(x)-COFs in the cases that the analytes coincidentally possess similar ¹³C chemical shifts. In addition, deuteration of PR(x)-COFs should further reduce the background signals and increase the polarizing efficiency.

35. (a) van der Wel PCA, Hu KN, Lewandowski J, Griffin RG. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2006; 128:10840. [PubMed: 16910679] (b) Lafon O, Thankamony ASL, Kobayashi T, Carnevale D, Vitzthum V, Slowing II, Kandel K, Vezin H, Amoureux JP, Bodenhausen G, Pruski M. *J Phys Chem C.* 2013; 117:1375.
36. Le D, Casano G, Phan TNT, Ziarelli F, Ouari O, Aussenac F, Thureau P, Mollica G, Gigmes D, Tordo P, Viel S. *Macromolecules.* 2014; 47:3909.
37. Lesage A, Lelli M, Gajan D, Caporini MA, Vitzthum V, Miéville P, Alauzun J, Roussey A, Thieuleux C, Mehdi A, Bodenhausen G, Coperet C, Emsley L. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2010; 132:15459. [PubMed: 20831165]
38. Bornet A, Jannin S. *J Magn Reson.* 2016; 264:13. [PubMed: 26920826]

Figure 1.

(a) Experimental PXRD pattern (black), Pawley refined pattern (red), difference plot (purple), and simulated pattern (blue) for the eclipsed model of PR(100)-COF. Inset: Extended structure of PR(100)-COF. C, gray; N, blue; O, red; H atoms omitted for clarity. (b) N_2 adsorption (filled symbols) and desorption (empty symbols) isotherms of PR(100)-COF. Inset: pore-size-distribution of PR(100)-COF. (c) ^{129}Xe NMR spectrum of PR(100)-COF; the pressure of xenon adsorbed in PR(100)-COF was controlled as 4.1 bar.

Figure 2.

^{13}C CP/MAS NMR spectra of PR(x)-COFs. Asterisks denote the spinning sidebands.

Assignments of ^{13}C chemical shifts of PR(x)-COFs are indicated in the chemical structure.

Note that the ^{13}C NMR signals in the radical region (146, 134, 76, 68, 31 ppm in Figure S41) are absent.

Figure 3.

CW X band (9.5 GHz) EPR spectra of PR(x)-COFs recorded at 293 K in the solid state. Intensity was corrected for different receiver gain value and power attenuation. Upon the comparison of the double integral of the EPR signal to that of monomer **1**, the derived radical concentration (C_{rad} , from 0.02 to 1.80 mmol g^{-1}) has been listed on the top right corner in each case. The C_{rad} value showed a linear correlation with the ingredient proportion (x%, from 2 to 100%) of the radical monomer **1** (Figure S44).

Figure 4.

DNP ^1H NMR enhancement (ϵ_H , left) and ^{13}C CP NMR enhancement ($\epsilon_{C\ CP}$, right) as a function of the radical concentration (C_{rad}) for PR(x)-COFs. DNP ^1H MAS NMR spectra and ^{13}C CP/MAS NMR spectra of PR(x)-COFs impregnated with H_2O were recorded at 9.4 T and ~ 100 K with the microwave field on and off, respectively. The original spectra have been shown in Figures S65–S76.

Figure 5.

(a) DNP ^{13}C CP/MAS NMR spectrum of PR(10)-COF impregnated with H_2O recorded at 9.4 T and ~ 100 K with the microwave (MW) field on and off, respectively. (b) DNP ^{15}N CP/MAS NMR spectrum of PR(10)-COF impregnated with H_2O recorded at 9.4 T and ~ 100 K with the microwave (MW) field on. Note that this spectrum could not be acquired without DNP. Asterisks denote the spinning sidebands (spinning rate of 8.0 kHz) in each spectrum.

Figure 6. DNP ¹³C CP/MAS NMR spectra of PR(15)-COF impregnated with 0.1 M H₂O solution of [2,3-¹³C]-L-alanine recorded at different magnetic fields of 9.4 T (a) and 14.1 T (b), respectively. The spectra were acquired at ~100 K/~105 K with the microwave (MW) field on and off, respectively. Asterisks denote the spinning sidebands (spinning rates of 8.0 and 8.2 kHz, respectively).

Scheme 1.
Typical organic (bi)radicals for DNP NMR enhancement⁶

Scheme 2.

Bottom-up construction of PR(x)-COFs for DNP NMR enhancement. The radical concentration in the COF framework can be explicitly controlled via the multivariate approach.