Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2018 December 12; 140(49): 17040–17050. doi:10.1021/jacs.8b08520.

Hemilabile Proton Relays and Redox-Activity Lead to {FeNO}^x and Significant Rate Enhancements in NO₂⁻ Reduction.

Pui Man Cheung[†], Kyle T. Burns[†], Yubin M. Kwon[†], Megan Y. Deshayé[†], Kristopher J. Aguayo[†], Victoria F. Oswald[§], Takele Seda[⊥], Lev N. Zakharov[‡], Tim Kowalczyk^{*,†}, John D. Gilbertson^{*,†}

[†]Department of Chemistry, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington 98225, United States

[⊥]Department of Physics, Western Washington University, Bellingham, Washington 98225, United States

[‡]Department of Chemistry, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, United States

[§]Department of Chemistry, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, California 92697, United States

Abstract

Incorporation of the triad of redox-activity, hemilability, and proton responsiveness, into a single ligand scaffold is reported. Due to this triad, the complexes Fe(^{Pyrr}PDI)(CO)₂ (**3**) and Fe(^{Mor}PDI)(CO)₂ (**4**) display 40-fold enhancements in the initial rate of NO₂⁻ reduction, with respect to Fe(^{MeO}PDI)(CO)₂ (**7**). Utilizing the proper sterics and p*K*_a of the pendant base(s) to introduce hemilability into our ligand scaffolds, we report unusual {FeNO}^x mononitrosyl iron complexes (MNICs) as intermediates in the NO₂⁻ reduction reaction. The {FeNO}^x species behave spectroscopically and computationally similar to {FeNO}⁷, an unusual intermediate-spin Fe(III) coupled to triplet NO⁻ and a singly-reduced PDI ligand. These {FeNO}^x MNICs facilitate the enhancements in the initial rate.

Graphical Abstract

*Corresponding Authors john.gilbertson@wwu.edu, tim.kowalczyk@wwu.edu.

Supporting Information

X-ray crystallographic, spectroscopic, kinetic, and computational data. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

INTRODUCTION

In addition to the physiological role in the regulation of nitric oxide (NO) in mammalian blood flow,^{1,2} nitrite (NO_2^-) plays an integral role in the global nitrogen cycle.^{3,4} While NO_3^- composes the majority of species in water runoff, the two proton, one electron reduction of NO_2^- to NO is a vital step in the removal of nitrogen oxides in the treatment of municipal water,⁵ as the overuse of fertilizers rich in nitrogen is responsible for the presence of toxic levels of NO_2^- (and NO_3^-) in water runoff.^{4,6} Biological NO_2^- reduction ($\text{NO}_2^- + 2\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^- \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$) occurs in nitrite reductase (NiR) enzymes³ and also hemoglobin,^{7,8} myoglobin,^{9,10} cytochrome P450, cytochrome c and nitric oxide synthase.^{11,12} Additionally, postulated mechanisms of nitrite reduction by cytochrome *cd*₁ NiRs include the formation of weakly bound $\{\text{FeNO}\}^x$ species.^{2,13–17}

As in the case of NO_2^- reduction, many important biological reactions occur by managing the proton and electron flow at the enzyme active site.^{18–20} To this end, there has been a resurgence into redox-active,^{20,21} hemilabile,^{23–27} and so called proton-responsive ligand scaffolds.^{28–40} However, studies that incorporate the triad of redox-activity, hemilability, and proton responsivity, all in a single ligand scaffold, are exceedingly limited.^{41–47} Our group has been active in developing methodologies that control the movement of both protons and electrons for biologically relevant reactions by utilizing the redox-active pyridinediimine (PDI) scaffold merged with a proton-responsive secondary coordination sphere.^{48–50} Those preliminary studies successfully showed: 1) the PDI scaffold can be tailored to facilitate NO_2^- reduction, and; 2) the NO_2^- reduction is dependent on the protonation state of the secondary coordination sphere (proton-responsivity). Furthermore, given the revelations of the role ligand hemilability plays in biomimicry,^{51–53} we reasoned that the pendant base(s) could be utilized to introduce hemilability into the PDI, yielding ligand scaffolds that increase activity even further. We describe here our efforts towards encompassing the triad, utilizing the proper sterics and $\text{p}K_a$ of the pendant base(s) to introduce hemilability into our ligand scaffolds. Through the isolation of novel mononitrosyl $\{\text{FeNO}\}^x$ species, we demonstrate that ligand hemilability, when integrated with redox-activity and proton responsivity, is responsible for significant enhancements in the initial rate of NO_2^- reduction ($\sim 40\times$) compared to the systems that are not integrated.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Synthesis and Characterization of Fe(PDI) Complexes

The target PDI ligands in this study were the pyrrolidine (PyrPDI) and morpholine (MorPDI) analogs, given their minimal steric bulk and favorable $\text{p}K_a$ range in CH_3CN (free pyrrolidine = 19.6 and free morpholine = 16.6).^{54,55} As shown in eq. 1, The direduced Fe(PDI)(CO)_2 complexes, Fe(PyrPDI)(CO)_2 (**3**) and Fe(MorPDI)(CO)_2 (**4**), were synthesized from the NaHg reduction of the dihalide precursors, Fe(PyrPDI)Br_2 (**1**) and Fe(MorPDI)Br_2 (**2**) in CH_2I_2 under an atmosphere of CO.

(1)

Evaporation of saturated diethyl ether solutions of either **3** or **4** yield green, diamagnetic crystalline solids, which display vco stretches in the ATR-FTIR spectra at 1942 and 1876 cm^{-1} for **3** and 1934 and 1871 cm^{-1} for **4**. The solid state structures of **3** and **4** are shown in Figure 1. The iron center in both complexes is five coordinate with square pyramidal geometry ($\tau = 0.01$ in **3** and 0.05 in **4**).⁵⁶ The $\text{C}_{\text{imine}}\text{-N}_{\text{imine}}$ bond lengths in **3** (1.332(2) and 1.324(2) Å) and **4** (1.332(2) and 1.323(2) Å), coupled with the $\text{C}_{\text{imine}}\text{-C}_{\text{ipso}}$ bond lengths (1.426(2) and 1.438(2) Å in **3** and 1.423(2) and 1.434(2) Å in **4**) are indicative of a doubly reduced PDI ligand bound to an $\text{S}=\text{O}$ Fe(II) center. The room temperature zero-field Mossbauer parameters ($\delta = -0.089(3)$, $E_{\text{Q}} = 1.197(3)$ mm/s in **3** and $\delta = -0.08(1)$, $E_{\text{Q}} = 1.46(2)$ mm/s in **4**) support these assignments.

Similar to the previously reported $\text{Fe}(\text{didpa})(\text{CO})_2$ ($\text{didpa} = [(2,6\text{-}^i\text{PrC}_6\text{H}_3)(\text{N}=\text{CMe})(\text{N}(^1\text{Pr})_2\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)(\text{N}=\text{CMe})\text{C}_5\text{H}_3\text{N}]$) complex,⁵⁰ **3** and **4** both react with two equivalents NO_2^- and four equivalents H^+ (Scheme 1, middle) yielding the representative dinitrosyl iron complexes (DNICs), $[\text{Fe}^{\text{Pyrr}}\text{PDI}(\text{NO})_2]^+$ (**5**) and $[\text{Fe}^{\text{Mor}}\text{PDI}(\text{NO})_2]^+$ (**6**). The solid state structures of **5** and **6** are shown in Figure 2. The iron center in each complex is five coordinate, distorted square pyramidal ($\tau = 0.24$ in **5** and $\tau = 0.32$ in **6**). The PDI backbone is in the neutral form, confirming the ligand-based reduction of NO_2^- , as evidenced by the contracted $\text{C}_{\text{imine}}\text{-N}_{\text{imine}}$ bonds (1.283(2) and 1.285(2) Å in **5**; 1.280(3) and 1.290(3) Å in **6**), and the elongated $\text{C}_{\text{imine}}\text{-C}_{\text{ipso}}$ bonds (1.488(3) and 1.488(3) Å in **5**; 1.486(4) and 1.483(5) Å in **6**). The average Fe-N(O) bond lengths in both **5** and **6** are 1.695 Å, and the average N-O bond lengths are 1.172 Å in **5** and 1.167 Å in **6**. The Fe-N-O units are slightly bent in both complexes in an “attracto” conformation⁵⁷ with average Fe-N-O angles of 161.1° in **5** and 161.5° in **6**. As in our previously reported DNICs on the PDI scaffold, the Enemark-Feltham notation⁵⁸ that best describes both **5** and **6** is $\{\text{Fe}(\text{NO})_2\}^9$. Both complexes exhibit ν_{NO} stretches in the ATR-FTIR spectra at 1785 and 1716 cm^{-1} for **5** and 1783 and 1709 cm^{-1} for **6** (Figs. S4 and S8). These stretches shift to 1752 and 1682 cm^{-1} , and 1749 and 1677 cm^{-1} , respectively, upon isotopic substitution with ^{15}NO . Both **5** and **6** exhibit the characteristic $\text{S} = 1/2$ EPR signal at $g = 2.01$ (Figure S20) observed for $\{\text{Fe}(\text{NO})_2\}^9$ DNICs.⁵⁹

Proton-Responsivity and Kinetics of NO_2^- Reduction

Previously we have shown that the pendant base in $\text{Fe}(\text{PDI})(\text{CO})_2$ complexes play a crucial role in facilitating NO_2^- reduction.^{49,50} In order to probe the role of the pendant base in the NO_2^- reduction reaction in depth, we performed a series of kinetic experiments comparing the initial rates.⁶⁰ All nitrite reductions were run in CH_3CN with TBANO_2 as the source of soluble NO_2^- . We chose $\text{Fe}^{\text{MeO}}\text{PDI}(\text{CO})_2$ (**7**) (where $\text{MeOPDI} = [(2,6\text{-}^i\text{PrC}_6\text{H}_3)\text{N}=\text{CMe})(2\text{-MeO-6-MeC}_6\text{H}_3)\text{N}=\text{CMe})\text{C}_5\text{H}_3\text{N}]$)⁶¹ as the control compound to compare initial rates, as it does not contain a pendant base but is active in NO_2^- reduction.⁶² The pK_{a} of the pendant

pyrrolidine in **3** was measured to be 18.3 (CH₃CN) and the pendant morpholine in **4** was measured to be 17.1 (CH₃CN). These values mirror the values for pyrrolidine (19.6)⁵⁴ and morpholine (16.6).⁵⁵ We also included Fe(didpa)(CO)₂ (**8**) in the kinetic analysis, given its bulkier diisopropylamine pendant base with a similar p*K*_a (19.2)⁴⁸ to **3**.

As shown in the top plot in Figure 3 when [HNEt₃]⁺ (p*K*_a = 18.8 in CH₃CN)⁵⁴ is used as the acid source, the initial rate of 2.11 × 10⁻⁸ M s⁻¹ is observed for the control compound, **7** (Table 1). An increase in initial rate of ~2× (3.97 × 10⁻⁸ M s⁻¹) is observed for **8** and ~3× (7.07 × 10⁻⁸ M s⁻¹) is observed for **3**. However, virtually no increase (2.30 × 10⁻⁸ M s⁻¹) is observed for **4**. These results can be explained, in part, by examination of the p*K*_a of the pendant base, which in the case of both **8** and **3** are both in the range for proton transfer from [HNEt₃]⁺. Compound **4**'s p*K*_a is too low to be protonated by [HNEt₃]⁺ to any appreciable extent, effectively eliminating the proton shuttling capability of the pendant base. As shown in Figure 3 (bottom), when the acid source is changed to [HLut]⁺ (where Lut = 2,6-dimethylpyridine), which has a p*K*_a = 14.1 in CH₃CN,⁵⁴ the rates observed for both **3** and **4** are virtually identical (8.11 × 10⁻⁷ M s⁻¹ and 8.45 × 10⁻⁷ M s⁻¹, respectively), illustrating that [HLut]⁺ is a strong enough acid to protonate the pendant morpholine group in **4** for proton shuttling. Furthermore, that corresponds to ~ **40-fold rate enhancement** for these compounds compared to **7**, whose initial rate is unaffected by utilization of the stronger acid (2.52 × 10⁻⁸ M s⁻¹).

The Role of Hemilability and the Isolation of {FeNO}^x MNICs

This begs the question, why then does **8** not display a similar rate enhancement? As shown in Table 1, NO₂⁻ reduction by **8** with [HLut]⁺ does result in a rate enhancement (as would be expected given the stronger acid source), but only a ten-fold increase in initial rate is observed, significantly less than the ~ 40-fold enhancement exhibited by both **3** and **4**. The answer lies in the fact that the diisopropylamine of **8** is not hemilabile (due to the sterics of the isopropyl groups on the amine). The hemilability of the pendant pyrrolidine and morpholine groups is clearly illustrated by the isolation of the mononitrosyl intermediates [Fe(^{Pyrr}PDI)(NO)]⁺ (**9**) and [Fe(^{Mor}PDI)(NO)]⁺ (**10**), in which the pendant base of each complex is coordinated to the iron center. These mononitrosyl iron complexes (MNICs) can be synthesized independently from either **3** or **4** with only one equivalent of NO₂⁻ and two equivalents H⁺ (eq. 2)

As shown in Figure 4, the iron center in each complex is five coordinate, square pyramidal (τ = 0.09 in **9** and τ = 0.12 in **10**) with the hemilabile pendant group now part of the primary coordination sphere of the iron center. The PDI backbone in both complexes is still in a reduced form, as evidenced by the C_{imine}-N_{imine} bonds (1.315(2) and 1.313(2) Å in **9**; 1.314(1) and 1.313(2) Å in **10**), and the C_{imine}-C_{ipso} bonds (1.453(2) and 1.439(2) Å in **9**; 1.446(2) and 1.440(2) Å in **10**). The Fe-N(O) bond lengths in **9** and **10** are 1.677(2) and 1.679(1) Å, respectively, where the N-O bond length in **9** is 1.182(2) Å and in **10** is 1.183(2) Å. The Fe-N-O angle in **9** is of 150.9(2)° and in **10** is 154.4(1)°. Both complexes are

diamagnetic in the solid state and solution (Evan's method) and exhibit a single ν_{NO} stretch in the ATR-FTIR spectrum at 1667 cm^{-1} for **9** and 1687 cm^{-1} for **10** (Figs. S15 and S19) that shift to 1635 cm^{-1} , and 1654 cm^{-1} , respectively, upon isotopic substitution with ^{15}NO .

The MNIC **9** (and also **10**) is an isolated intermediate along the nitrite reduction reaction coordinate (Figure S26), evidenced by the fact that the DNIC **5** can be produced in quantitative yield from the addition of one equivalent NO_2^- and two equivalents of H^+ to solutions of **9**. Inspection of the solution FTIR spectra (Figure S27) of the reaction mixtures reveals the disappearance of the ν_{NO} band at 1667 cm^{-1} for **9** and the appearance of the ν_{NO} bands at 1785 and 1716 cm^{-1} for **5**. Additionally, the UV-vis spectrum of independently prepared **9** is identical to the spectrum obtained at the inflection point in the global kinetic trace of the reaction of **3** with two equivalents of NO_2^- and four equivalents of H^+ (Figure S21). There are also well anchored isosbestic points at 522 and 650 nm in the stacked UV-vis reaction plots, indicating clean formation of one product (**9**). From these data it is clear that formation of the MNIC intermediate is essential, and that these hemilabile ligands facilitate the propensity of NO_2^- reduction (Scheme 1).

Redox-Activity and the $\{\text{FeNO}\}^x$ Enemark-Feltham Notation

The Enemark-Feltham notation that best describes **9** (and also **10**) is somewhat ambiguous. The PDI ligand in **9** is in a reduced form (see above) and the room temperature zero-field Mossbauer parameters ($\delta = 0.094(3)$, $E_{\text{q}} = 0.489(5)\text{ mm/s}$) in **9** suggest that the iron center in **9** is more oxidized than the Fe(II) center in the DNIC, **5** ($\delta = 0.32(3)$, $E_{\text{q}} = 0.82(9)\text{ mm/s}$).⁶³ Given that **9** is diamagnetic, one could assign the oxidation state(s) as Fe(III), antiferromagnetically coupled to a $\text{NO}\bullet$ radical ligand (confirmed by the Fe-N-O angle of $150.9(2)^\circ$)⁶⁴ and PDI^{2-} . This would result in an Enemark-Feltham notation of $\{\text{FeNO}\}^6$.

If the MNIC **9** (and also **10**) is $\{\text{FeNO}\}^6$ then the bent NO is very unusual. To the best of our knowledge, there are no reported examples of five-coordinate $S = 0$ $\{\text{FeNO}\}^6$ species with a bent NO ligand. Typically, the Fe-N-O linkage found in $\{\text{FeNO}\}^6$ species is linear.^{65,66} Virtually all iron nitrosyls reported to date obey this rule, with the exception of the six-coordinate $\{\text{FeNO}\}^6$ ferric complex $(\text{OEP})\text{Fe}(\text{NO})(p\text{-C}_6\text{H}_4\text{F})$ ⁶⁶ (where OEP = octaethylporphyrinato dianion) which displays an Fe-N-O angle of 157.4° and a ν_{NO} stretch of 1791 cm^{-1} and nitrophorin 4, a salivary protein of the blood-sucking insect *Rhodnius prolixus* (Fe-N-O angle = 156°).⁶⁸

The ν_{NO} stretch of observed for **9** (1667 cm^{-1}) and **10** (1687 cm^{-1}) is also significantly lower than the characteristic range for six and even five-coordinate $\{\text{Fe}(\text{NO})\}^6$ complexes.^{69–72} In addition, the especially low Fe-N-O angles ($150.9(2)^\circ$ in **9** and $154.4(1)^\circ$ in **10**) are closer to the range of the more electron rich $\{\text{Fe}(\text{NO})\}^7$ complexes,⁷³ where either the Fe(II)- $\text{NO}\bullet$ radical or Fe(III)-NO-description would be more appropriate. This description, coupled with the fact that both complexes are diamagnetic, suggests that the PDI ligand is also likely a monoradical (see computations below). As stated above, the PDI ligand in **9** (and **10**) is in the reduced form, but it is difficult to distinguish between PDI^{2-} and/or the $\text{PDI}^\bullet$ (monoradical) state using crystallographic data. For example, the $\text{C}_{\text{imine}}\text{-N}_{\text{imine}}$ bonds in **9** are slightly shorter ($0.017\text{ \AA}$) than **3**, and the $\text{C}_{\text{imine}}\text{-C}_{\text{ipso}}$ bonds are slightly longer

(0.027 Å) suggesting it may be more oxidized (Table 2). If **9** had more Fe(II)-PDI⁻ character, with only one electron withdrawing NO ligand, this could account for both the slight differences in bond lengths and higher isomer shift (0.094(3) for **9** and -0.089(3) for **3**), given the strongly electron withdrawing CO ligands in **3**. However, it should be noted that there are no reported diamagnetic {Fe(NO)}⁷ complexes.

Lastly, given that in some direduced FePDI complexes^{74,75} the PDI ligand can be described as a resonance hybrid between a PDI⁰ and PDI²⁻, an ambiguous electronic structure with contributions from both {FeNO}⁶ and {FeNO}⁸ configurations may be appropriate (see electronic structure calculations below). This would result in some contribution from the Fe(I)-NO• radical nature of the NO ligand in **9**. {FeNO}⁸ complexes are S = 0, but typically possess an NO⁻ ligand with a much lower Fe-N-O bond angle and ν_{NO} stretch than observed in **9** and **10**.⁶⁵

Depending on the {FeNO}^x description, the first NO₂⁻ reduction in Scheme 1 can be described as either a one electron metal-based event yielding {FeNO}⁶ (Scheme 1, bottom), or a ligand-based event yielding {FeNO}⁷ (Scheme 1, top). The second NO₂⁻ reduction in either case is then ligand-based, yielding the {Fe(NO)₂}⁹ DNIC. If the intermediate MNIC is {FeNO}⁶, then the second, ligand-based event would include two electrons from the PDI, one to reduce the iron center and the other to reduce the second NO₂⁻, forming the corresponding Fe(II)PDI⁰ DNIC.⁷⁶ Regardless of the electronic description of **9** and **10**, the hemilabile, proton responsive secondary coordination sphere is absolutely vital for the rate accelerations.

Electronic Structure Calculations

In order to complement experiment, **3**, **5**, and **9** were investigated computationally. Specifically, broken-symmetry density functional theory (BS-DFT) energies and optimized geometries were evaluated. Initial guess wavefunctions for BS calculations were prepared through a spin-flip on iron from a high-spin reference Kohn-Sham (KS) determinant. The notation BS(*m,n*) was adopted to represent a broken-symmetry solution with *m* unpaired electrons on iron antiferromagnetically coupled to *n* unpaired electrons on the ligands. The unpaired spin-down electron density was not forced to localize on the PDI or NO ligand specifically.

The electronic structure of **3** was initially computed, given that previous analyses of the closed-shell frontier orbitals of direduced Fe(PDI)(CO)₂ complexes suggest that they are best represented as a resonance hybrid of a PDI⁰ ligand on a Fe(0) d⁸ center and a PDI²⁻ ligand on a low-spin Fe(II) center.^{74,75} We computed the closed-shell BS(0,0) wavefunction for **3**, and the results are in agreement with the previous studies. The HOMO, shown in Figure S28, is distributed across both the iron center and the PDI ligand, reinforcing the notion that the ground-state electronic structure is a hybrid of Fe(0) and Fe(II) with significant metal-ligand covalent character. We also obtained a BS(2,2) wavefunction for **3** which yielded an electronic energy 1.8 kcal/mol below that of the BS(0,0) solution at the BS(2,2)-optimized geometry. This gap decreases to 0.8 kcal/mol at the BS(0,0)-optimized geometry. The BS(2,2) solution qualitatively resembles an intermediate-spin Fe(II) center

antiferromagnetically coupled to a triplet PDI^{2-} ligand. However, with such a small energy gap, both states are expected to be thermally accessible at room temperature.

The lowest-energy electronic configuration computed for the DNIC, **5**, was the $S=1/2$ configuration; our efforts toward the $S=3/2$ configuration failed to converge. The $S=1/2$ configuration can be considered a resonance hybrid in which each resonance form consists of one formal NO anion and one formal NO radical antiferromagnetically coupled to an intermediate-spin Fe(II) center; the PDI ligand is formally neutral in this configuration.⁷⁷ The frontier orbitals of DNIC in Figure S29 show that none of the highest-occupied MOs have a significant contribution from the PDI ligand, supporting a neutral assignment for PDI in this complex and an overall assignment of $\{\text{Fe}(\text{NO})_2\}^9\text{PDI}^0$. The spin density (Figure S30) is mostly localized to the nitrosyl ligands and iron center. These results are in agreement with previously reported $\{\text{Fe}(\text{NO})_2\}^9$ DNICs.^{78,79}

For **9**, the redox non-innocence of both the NO and PDI ligand results in a range of plausible oxidation and spin states for the complex. Assignments ranging from $\{\text{FeNO}\}^6$ through $\{\text{FeNO}\}^8$ are possible depending on whether the PDI ligand is formally doubly, singly, or not reduced, respectively. Furthermore, the multireference character observed in other Fe-PDI complexes⁸⁰ hints at the possibility that a single electronic configuration may not completely characterize this complex.

From a high-spin initial guess wavefunction, optimized geometries were obtained for two stable solutions: the closed-shell BS(0,0) solution and an open-shell BS(2,2) solution with electronic energy 10.1 kcal/mol below that of BS(0,0). This significant gap indicates that the BS(2,2) solution is likely a closer single-determinant approximation to the electronic structure of this MNIC than the closed-shell solution. The Mulliken spin population on NO (-1.07) in the BS(2,2) solution (Figure 5) is consistent with that observed for triplet NO anion in other FeNO complexes,⁷¹ where the deviation from a formal spin population of -2 arises in part from the metal-ligand covalency which also reduces the spin population assigned to Fe (1.76). Together with the Mulliken spin populations on PDI (-0.65), this calculation suggests $\{\text{FeNO}\}^7$ character with intermediate-spin Fe, a triplet NO-ligand, and a singly reduced PDI ligand, $\text{Fe}(\text{III})(\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow)\text{NO}^- (\downarrow\downarrow)\text{PD}^{\bullet-} (\downarrow)$. We did not locate any BS solution corresponding to a $\{\text{FeNO}\}^6$ complex with a doubly reduced PDI ligand, $\text{Fe}(\text{III})(\uparrow)\text{NO}^{\bullet}(\downarrow)\text{PDI}^{2-}(\uparrow\downarrow)$; however, the calculations presented here cannot rule out the possibility that such a configuration plays a role in the complete description of the complex. The Fe-N-O angle in the BS(2,2)-optimized structure is within the realm typical of NO radical in FeNO complexes at 147.5° (Table 2). This angle is close to the experimentally observed angle of 150.9° . PBE0 predicts a similar Fe-N-O angle for the BS(0,0) structure at 147.3° ; in contrast, the $\omega\text{B97X-D3}$ functional predicts the NO ligand in the BS(0,0)-optimized structure is bent at 143.3° , intermediate between the angles typically observed for the neutral $\text{NO}^\bullet$ radical and NO^- . Given the strong sensitivity of the Fe-N-O angle to the choice of functional for this and other complexes with $\{\text{FeNO}\}^7$ character,⁸¹ we turned to molecular orbital analysis for further insight into the electronic structure.

To further probe the electronic character of the ligands and metal in the BS(2,2) configuration, we performed a corresponding orbital (CO) transformation which rotates the

orbitals into a basis in which their overlap matrix is diagonal. Employed more generally to compute matrix elements between nonorthogonal spin orbitals,^{82,83} the CO transformation is used here to identify COs with $\alpha\beta$ orbital overlaps ($S_{\alpha\beta}$) significantly less than 1. We identified three CO pairs with overlaps significantly less than 1, depicted in the qualitative orbital diagram Figure 6. The three highest-energy occupied β COs are dominated by Fe d character. In contrast, the highest-energy α CO extends significantly onto the PDI ligand, indicating partial radical character on PDI. The other two α COs with $\alpha\beta$ overlap significantly less than 1 have substantial $\pi^*(\text{NO})$ character but are also delocalized over the FeNO system, indicating metal-ligand covalent bonding character and reinforcing the redox non-innocence of the NO unit in **9**. The occupation of two COs with $\pi^*(\text{NO})$ character and a third CO delocalized over the PDI π system supports the assignment of an unusual intermediate-spin Fe(III) coupled to triplet NO^- and a singly-reduced PDI ligand. However, the well-documented challenge of accurately predicting spin densities of FeNO complexes with BS-DFT⁸⁴ suggests that a multireference treatment would be necessary to confirm this assignment.

Optimized PDI bond lengths for the BS(2,2) solutions of MNIC are summarized in Table 2. The imine $\text{C}_{\text{imine}}\text{-N}_{\text{imine}}$ and $\text{C}_{\text{imine}}\text{-C}_{\text{ipso}}$ bond lengths from the BS(2,2) optimization are more consistent with experiment, although the distinction from the BS(0,0) solution is small (Table S1). We conclude from the Fe-N-O angle, PDI bond lengths, and BS-DFT calculations that **9** likely possesses $\{\text{FeNO}\}^7$ character with an unusual intermediate-spin Fe(III) coupled to triplet NO^- and a singly-reduced PDI ligand. Nevertheless, the existence of two BS-DFT solutions with similar energies and different orbital character suggests that a fully multireference electronic structure analysis, which lies beyond the scope of the present work, may be required to fully characterize this complex.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that by utilizing the proper sterics and $\text{p}K_{\text{a}}$ of pendant base(s) located in the secondary coordination sphere we are able to introduce hemilability into redox-active PDI ligand scaffolds. Through the integration of the triad of redox-activity, hemilability, and proton responsivity, into a single ligand scaffold, we have shown that the complexes $\text{Fe}(\text{PyrrPDI})(\text{CO})_2$ (**3**) and $\text{Fe}(\text{MorPDI})(\text{CO})_2$ (**4**) display > 40 fold enhancements in the initial rate of NO_2^- reduction. These significant enhancements in the initial rate are facilitated by the hemilability of the pendant base, as illustrated by the isolation of the MNIC inter-medites $[\text{Fe}(\text{PyrrPDI})(\text{NO})]^+$ (**9**) and $[\text{Fe}(\text{MorPDI})(\text{NO})]^+$ (**10**). **9** and **10** are unusual examples of nonheme MNICs. The Enemark-Feltham notation that best describes **9** and **10** is somewhat ambiguous: spectroscopic and computational studies suggest that **9** and **10** both have $\{\text{FeNO}\}^7$ character, but the non-innocence of both the NO and PDI hints at the possibility that a single electronic configuration may not completely characterize this complex.

EXPERIMENTAL

All reagents were purchased from commercial sources and used as received. The asymmetric ligand $[(\text{ArN}=\text{C}(\text{CH}_3))\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{N}((\text{CH}_3)\text{C}=\text{O})]^{85}$ ($\text{Ar} = 2,6\text{-}^i\text{Pr-C}_6\text{H}_3$), $\text{Fe}(\text{MeOPDI})(\text{CO})_2$ (**7**),⁶⁰

and $\text{Fe}(\text{didpa})(\text{CO})_2$ (**8**)⁴⁸ were synthesized according to literature procedures. $[\text{HNEt}_3][\text{BPh}_4]$ and $[\text{HLut}][\text{BPh}_4]$ were prepared by adding NaBPh_4 in MeOH to an aqueous solution of NEt₃ or Lutidine, where the product precipitated as a white solid and was washed with deionized water and dry under high vacuum before use. Solvents were dried and deoxygenated with a Pure-Solv solvent purification system. Deuterated solvents, chloroform-*d*₁ (D, 99.8%) and methylene chloride-*d*₂ (D, 99.8%), were purchased from Cambridge Isotope Laboratories, Inc. Carbon monoxide (99.3%) was purchased from Airgas, Inc. Unless otherwise noted, air sensitive materials were handled and stored on a Schlenk line or in a glovebox under N₂ atmosphere. Infrared spectra were recorded on a Thermo Scientific Nicolet iS10 FT-IR spectrometer equipped with an ATR accessory. ¹H and ¹³C{¹H} NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker 500 MHz FT-NMR spectrometer. Data are reported in ppm from the solvent resonance as the internal standard unless otherwise noted. UV-Vis absorbance data were acquired using a Jasco UV-Vis/NIR spectrometer equipped with a Peltier controlled 6-cell linear autosampler. All data were obtained at 298 K in 1 cm quartz cuvettes (Starna Cells). Elemental analyses were performed by ALS Environmental in Tuscon, AZ. Mass spectra were collected using an Agilent GC-MS EI system equipped with a HP-5MS column (30 m × 0.25 mm × 0.25 μm). X-band EPR spectra were recorded on a Bruker EMX spectrometer equipped with an Oxford ESR-900 liquid helium cryostat and a dual mode microwave cavity. All the samples were prepared in CH₂Cl₂ and perpendicular mode spectra were collected at 11 K with the following parameters: frequency = 9.64 GHz; attenuator = 35.0 dB; modulation frequency = 100.00 kHz; modulation amplitude = 10.02; time constant = 81.92 msec; conversion time = 40.96 msec; number of scans = 4. *pK_a* values were determined as reported previously.⁴⁸ Solution magnetic susceptibilities were calculated from Evan's method NMR measurements.⁸⁶ Solid-phase magnetic susceptibilities were recorded on a Johnson Matthey MSB-1 magnetic susceptibility balance that was calibrated with HgCo(SCN)₄. Diamagnetic correction factors were calculated from Pascal's constants.⁸⁷

[(2,6-ⁱPr-C₆H₃)N=CMe)(C₄H₈NC₂H₄)N=CMe)C₅H₃N] (P^{Pyrr}pDI).

In a dry 25 mL pressure vial, [(2,6-ⁱPr-C₆H₃)N=CMe)(O=CMe)C₅H₃N] (2.02 g, 5.42 mmol) was added with excess 1-(2-aminoethyl)pyrrolidine (3.00 g, 26.3 mmol) and sealed with a pressure lid. The vial was heated in a silicon-based oil bath at 90°C for 36 hours. Methanol was added to the resulting oil to precipitate the product, yielding 1.609 g (72 %) of a pale yellow powder. FTIR (ATR): 1640 cm⁻¹ (C=N); ¹H NMR (CDCl₃) δ 8.35 (d, 1H), 8.19 (d, 1H), 7.81 (t, 1H), 7.17 – 7.08 (m, 3H), 3.74 (t, 2H), 2.93 (t, 2H), 2.75 (m, 2H), 2.65 (m, 4H), 2.45 (s, 3H), 2.24 (s, 3H), 1.82 (m, 4H), 1.15 (dd, 12H); ¹³C; GC-MS (EI) [M^{•+}] *m/z* calcd for C₂₇H₃₈N₄: 418.31 (100.0%), 419.31 (29.2%), 420.32 (2.7%). Found: 418.300 (100%), 419.300 (30%), 420.300 (3.5%).

Fe(P^{Pyrr}pDI)(CO)₂ (3**).**

In a multistep synthesis, P^{Pyrr}pDI (0.500 g, 1.20 mmol) was first metallated with FeBr₂ (0.270 g, 1.25 mmol) in 10 mL THF overnight. The solvent was removed in vacuo and the resulting purple material was re-dissolved in methanol and filtered through Celite. Et₂O was added to precipitate the product, yielding 0.620 g (82%) of the bluish-purple solid

$\text{Fe}(\text{Py}^\pi\text{PDI})\text{Br}_2$ (**1**) that was directly used without further purification. FTIR (ATR): 1615, 1580 cm^{-1} (C=N).

Under a N_2 atmosphere, **1** (0.6195 g, 0.9767 mmol), NaHg (1.49 g, 5% Na) and 20 mL CH_2Cl_2 was added to an 88 mL Fischer-Porter tube. The tube was sealed with a pressure gauge and charged with 40 psi of CO. The mixture was stirred for 36 hours, resulting in a color change from bluish-purple to dark green. The solvent was removed in vacuo. Under N_2 , the green material was extracted by Et_2O , and the remaining NaHg mixture was removed by filtration through Celite. The filtered Et_2O solution was left to evaporate overnight to yield dark green crystals of $\text{Fe}(\text{Py}^\pi\text{PDI})(\text{CO})_2$ (**3**) (0.2937 g, 57 %). FTIR (ATR): 1942, 1876 cm^{-1} (C=O); ^1H NMR (CD_2O_2) δ 8.05 (d, 1H), 8.01 (d, 1H), 7.49 (t, 1H), 7.29 – 7.20 (m, 3H), 4.37 (m, 2H), 2.85 (m, 2H), 2.68 (s, 3H), 2.59 (br, 4H), 2.47 (m, 2H), 2.32 (s, 3H), 1.75 (br, 4H), 1.22 (d, 6H), 0.99 (d, 6H). $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$ NMR (125 MHz, CD_2O_2) δ 215.24 (C=O), 156.40 ($\text{C}_1=\text{N}_1$), 155.85 ($\text{C}_2=\text{N}_2$), 150.19, 146.03, 144.91, 140.71, 126.50, 123.85, 121.25, 120.49, 117.65, 60.46, 58.64, 54.76, 27.67, 24.79, 24.45, 24.01, 16.74, 14.52. ^{57}Fe Mössbauer: $\delta = -0.089(3)$ mm s^{-1} ; $E = 1.197(3)$ mm s^{-1} . Anal calcd for $\text{C}_{29}\text{H}_{38}\text{FeN}_4\text{O}_2$: C, 65.66; H, 7.22; N, 10.56; Found: C, 65.44; H, 6.98; N, 10.31.

$\text{Fe}(\text{MorPDI})(\text{CO})_2$ (**4**).

In a multistep synthesis, $\text{Fe}(\text{MorPDI})\text{Br}_2$ (**2**) was first synthesized by dissolving the asymmetric ligand $[(\text{ArN}=\text{C}(\text{CH}_3))\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{N}((\text{CH}_3)\text{C}=\text{O})]$ (0.500 g, 1.55 mmol) and FeBr_2 (0.334 g, 1.55 mmol) in approximately 40 mL of ethanol into a 100 mL round bottom Schlenk flask with a stir bar. The solution was heated to 50°C for 20 mins under N_2 gas and stirred. A solution of 4-(2-aminoethyl)morpholine (0.202 g, 1.55 mmol) in 5 mL of ethanol was slowly syringed into the flask and the solution was left to heat at 78°C for 12 hours under N_2 gas. The solvent was removed in vacuo and a dark blue solid was obtained. Inside the glovebox, the solid was redissolved in 40 mL of CH_2Cl_2 and filtered through celite. The solvent was again removed in vacuo. The resulting dark blue solid **2** was used in the next step without further purification.

Under a N_2 atmosphere, **2** (0.200 g, 0.308 mmol), NaHg (0.570 g, 5%Na), a stir bar, and approximately 10 mL of CH_2Cl_2 was added to an 88 mL Fischer-Porter tube. The tube was sealed with a pressure gauge and charged with 40 psi of CO. The mixture was stirred for 36 hours, resulting in a color change from bluish-purple to dark green. The solvent was removed in vacuo. Under N_2 , the green material was extracted by Et_2O , and the remaining NaHg mixture was removed by filtration through Celite. The filtered Et_2O solution was left to evaporate overnight to yield dark green crystals of $\text{Fe}(\text{MorPDI})(\text{CO})_2$ (**4**) (63%). IR (solid): 1934, 1871 cm^{-1} (C=O). ^1H NMR (500 MHz, CD_2Cl_2): δ 8.08 (d, 1H), 8.04 (d, 1H), 7.52 (t, 1H), 7.25 (m, 3H), 3.69 (t, 4H), 2.80 (t, 2H), 2.71 (s, 3H), 2.57 (s, 4H), 2.50 (sept, 2H), 2.36 (s, 3H), 1.26 (d, 6H), 1.03 (d, 6H). $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$ NMR (125 MHz, CD_2Cl_2): δ 214.8 (C=O), 155.9, 155.5, 149.7, 145.5, 144.5, 140.2, 126.1, 123.4, 120.9, 120.1, 117.3, 66.9, 60.9, 58.0, 27.3, 24.4, 24.0, 16.3, 14.2. ^{57}Fe Mössbauer: $\delta = -0.10(1)$ mm s^{-1} ; $E = 1.46(2)$ mm s^{-1} . Anal calcd for $\text{C}_{29}\text{H}_{38}\text{FeN}_4\text{O}_3$: C, 63.74; H, 7.01; N, 10.25; Found: C, 63.34; H, 7.09; N, 10.07.

[Fe(^{Pyrr}PDI)(NO)₂][BPh₄] (5).

To a solution of **3** (0.172 g, 0.325 mmol) in THF, a solution of NaNO₂ (0.0454 g, 0.65 mmol) containing a minimal amount of MeOH was added. The mixture was allowed to equilibrate for about 5 minutes. While stirring, [HNEt₃][BPh₄] (1.3 mmol) was added to the reaction mixture. With continuous stirring, a color change from green to brown was observed within a few hours. The solvents in the brown reaction mixture were removed via vacuum. The crude product was extracted with CHCl₃ and filtered through Celite, which was then layered with Et₂O to yield brown **5** (204 mg, 74%). Vapor diffusion of Et₂O into CHCl₃ solutions of **5** resulted in fine needles for X-ray analysis. The ¹⁵NO analog was synthesized as described above utilizing Na¹⁵NO₂ in the place of NaNO₂. FTIR (ATR): 1785/1716, 1752/1682 cm⁻¹ (¹⁴N=O/¹⁵N=O); 732, 702 cm⁻¹ (BPh₄). ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer: δ = 0.032(3) mm s⁻¹; E = 0.82(9) mm s⁻¹ EPR (X-band, CH₂Cl₂, 11 K): g = 2.01; Anal calcd for C₅₁H₅₈BFeN₆O₂: C, 71.75; H, 6.85; N, 9.84; Found: C, 71.56; H, 6.84; N, 8.99.

[Fe(^{Pyrr}PDI)(NO)₂][BPh₄] (6).

The procedure described above for synthesis of the DNIC **5** was followed, replacing **4** with **3** (32% yield). FTIR (ATR): 1783/1749, 1709/1677 cm⁻¹ (¹⁴N=O/¹⁵N=O); 734, 705 cm⁻¹ (BPh₄). EPR (X-band, CH₂Cl₂, 11 K): g = 2.01; Anal calcd for C₅₁H₅₈BFeN₆O₃: C, 70.43; H, 6.72; N, 9.66; Found: C, 69.97; H, 6.92; N, 9.48.

[Fe(^{Pyrr}PDI)(NO)][BPh₄] (9).

To a suspension of **3** (0.158 g, 0.297 mmol) in THF/MeOH (approximately 1:4 by volume), a MeOH solution of NaNO₂ (2.46 mL, 0.297 mmol) was added. The mixture was allowed to equilibrate for about 5 minutes. While stirring, [HEt₃N][BPh₄] (0.50 g, 1.2 mmol) was added to the reaction mixture, which shortly led to the disappearance of the dark green color and eventually the formation of a blue precipitate. The solvent was then decanted into a Celite filter to isolate the precipitate, followed by treating the dried Celite mixture with CH₂Cl₂ to re-dissolve the blue product. After filtering through a fresh Celite plug, the blue CH₂Cl₂ solution was layered with an equal volume of Et₂O and left undisturbed for 3 days to afford blue crystals of [Fe(^{Pyrr}PDI)(NO)][BPh₄] (**9**) that were suitable for X-ray diffraction (0.1728 g, 71%). The ¹⁵NO analog was synthesized as described above utilizing Na¹⁵NO₂ in the place of NaNO₂. FTIR (ATR): 1666/1635 cm⁻¹ (¹⁴N=O/¹⁵N=O); 729, 702 cm⁻¹ (BPh₄); ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CD₂Cl₂, δ): 7.80 (d, 1H), 7.79 (d, 1H), 7.69 (t, 1H), 7.40 – 7.26 (m, 3H), 7.31 (br, 8H), 6.99 (t, 8H), 6.83 (t, 4H), 3.45 – 3.32 (m, 2H), 2.91 (dd, 1H), 2.84 – 2.81 (m, 2H), 2.55 – 2.46 (m, 2H), 2.42 (s, 3H), 2.39 (s, 3H), 2.13 (dd, 1H), 1.86 – 1.71 (m, 2H), 1.60 (br, 1H), 1.43 (d, 3H), 1.38 (br, 1H), 1.18 (d, 3H), 1.12 (d, 3H), 0.91 (d, 3H). ¹³C{¹H} NMR (125 MHz, CD₂Cl₂): δ 170.99, 165.03, 164.64, 164.25, 163.86, 163.00, 153.21, 152.60, 143.23, 141.19, 139.87, 136.33, 128.76, 126.79, 126.31, 126.02, 125.79, 125.13, 124.80, 122.14, 63.03, 60.27, 51.50, 29.21, 27.83, 25.76, 24.75, 24.67, 22.99, 22.61, 22.17, 18.72, 15.56. ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer: δ = 0.094(3) mm s⁻¹; E = 0.489(5) mm s⁻¹. Anal calcd for C₅₁H₅₈BFeN₅O: C, 74.37; H, 7.10; N, 8.50; Found: C, 73.92; H, 6.96; N, 8.40.

[Fe(^{Mor}PDI)(NO)][BPh₄] (10).

The procedure described above for synthesis of the MNIC **9** was followed, replacing **4** with **3**. The blue green crystalline solid of **10** was isolated (0.0759 g, 35%). Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were grown by vapor diffusion of Et₂O into a THF solution of **10**. The ¹⁵NO analog was synthesized as described above utilizing Na¹⁵NO₂ in the place of NaNO₂. FTIR (ATR): 1686/1654 cm⁻¹ (¹⁴N=O/¹⁵N=O); 734, 705 cm⁻¹ (BPh₄); ¹H NMR (500 MHz, CD₂Cl₂): δ 7.82 (t, 2H), 7.72 (t, 1H), 7.46 – 7.37 (m, 3H), 7.31 (br, 8H), 6.99 (t, 8H), 6.83 (t, 4H), 3.68 (q, 2H), 3.64 – 3.60 (m, 1H), 3.42 – 3.25 (m, 2H), 3.33 (dd, 1H), 3.21 (dd, 1H), 3.08 (td, 1H), 2.78 (d, 1H), 2.57 (d, 1H), 2.57 – 2.46 (m, 2H), 2.41 (s, 3H), 2.40 (s, 3H), 2.34 (dd, 2H), 1.55 (br, 2H), 1.40 (d, 3H), 1.32 (d, 3H), 1.13 (d, 3H), 0.99 (d, 3H). ¹³C{¹H} NMR (125 MHz, CD₂Cl₂): δ 171.65, 165.07, 164.68, 164.28, 163.89, 163.48, 153.12, 152.73, 143.15, 141.42, 139.92, 136.35, 129.04, 126.98, 126.53, 126.07, 125.93, 125.28, 122.18, 61.26, 60.43, 59.63, 50.42, 29.27, 27.81, 25.84, 24.92, 24.79, 22.97, 18.83, 15.69. ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer: δ = 0.095(5) mm s⁻¹; E = 0.415(9) mm s⁻¹. Anal calcd for C₅₁H₅₈BFeN₅O₂: C, 72.95; H, 6.96; N, 8.34; Found: C, 72.95; H, 6.93; N, 8.24.

Mössbauer Spectra.

Mössbauer spectra were recorded at room temperature with a constant acceleration spectrometer (Wissel GMBH, Germany) in a horizontal transmission mode using a 50 mCi ⁵⁷Co source. Approximately 0.200 g of sample was crushed in a Mössbauer sample holder and a drop of Paratone-N was used to cover the sample to prevent oxidation. Data acquisition varied from 2 days to 7 days to get a statistically reasonable spectrum for each sample to analyze. The velocity scale was normalized with respect to metallic iron at room temperature; hence all isomer shifts were recorded relative to metallic iron. The Mössbauer spectra were fitted by assuming Lorentzian line shapes using the NORMOS (Wissel GMBH) least-square fitting program. The isomer shifts and quadrupole splitting parameters were determined from the fitted spectra.

UV-Vis Kinetics.

All samples were prepared under an N₂ atmosphere inside of the glovebox. A typical kinetics experiment was performed by preparing an acetonitrile solution consisting of 225 μM of **2** or **5**, and 550 μM tetrabutylammonium nitrite. 3.0 mL of this solution was added to a quartz cuvette equipped with a stir bar and sealed with a pierceable septa. Into a syringe equipped with a needle, an excess of either a 9 mM [HNEt₃][BPh₄] or a 9 mM [HLut][BPh₄] solution was drawn and the needle was pierced into a scintillation vial equipped with a septa to keep the solution under an N₂ atmosphere. The cuvette and syringe were brought outside of the box where the cuvette was placed into the spectrometer to equilibrate at 25°C for 10 mins before injection of 0.3 mL of the acid solution into the cuvette while starting the spectrometer.

Computational Methods.

The electronic structures were studied through broken-symmetry density functional theory (BS-DFT) calculations. This approach breaks spin-symmetry in the initial guess wavefunction to converge an electronic state with quasi-localized spins on different sites in

the complex.⁸⁸ The resulting spin density is unphysically asymmetric, but the procedure yields a qualitatively correct total electron density and energy for an antiferromagnetically coupled electronic ground state within a single-determinant Kohn-Sham DFT (KS-DFT) framework.⁸⁹ We adopt the notation BS(m,n) to represent a broken-symmetry solution with m unpaired electrons on Fe antiferromagnetically coupled to n unpaired electrons on the ligands. The unpaired spin-down electron density was not forced to localize on the PDI or NO ligand specifically. Following the DFT functional benchmarking procedure described in the Supporting Information, the BP86 functional was selected for analysis of **5**, while the hybrid PBE0 functional was selected for the final electronic structure analysis of **9**. All reported BS-DFT single-point energy evaluations, geometry optimizations, and Mulliken charge/spin analyses were performed with the functionals indicated above and the def2-TZVP(-f) basis set with the RIJCOSX approximation⁹⁰ in ORCA 4.0.1.2.⁹¹

X-Ray Crystallography.

Single crystal X-ray diffraction data for **3** and **10** was collected on a Rigaku Oxford Diffraction XtaLABPRO X-ray diffractometer equipped with a Pilatus P200K hybrid photon counting (HPC) detector. Reflections were collected at 100(2) K using graphite-monochromated Mo K α 1 radiation using a data collection strategy calculated within CrystalClear to ensure maximum data redundancy and percent completeness.⁹² Data processing, including frame integration, Lorentz-polarization corrections and final cell parameter calculations was completed using CrysAlisPro.⁹³ A multi-scan absorption correction was applied using the SCALE3 ABSPACK scaling algorithm integrated into CrysAlisPro.⁹⁴ The crystal structure was solved via intrinsic phasing using ShelXT and refined with least squares minimization with ShelXL in the Olex2 graphical user interface.^{95–97} The space group was unambiguously verified by PLATON.⁹⁸ The final structural refinement included anisotropic temperature factors on all non-hydrogen atoms and hydrogen atoms were attached via the riding model at calculated positions using appropriate HFIX commands. Diffraction intensities for **4**, **5**, **9** and **6** were collected at 150 (**4**) and 173 K on a Bruker Apex2 DUO CCD diffractometer using MoK α (**4**) and CuK α radiation, λ = 0.71073 Å and 1.54178 Å, respectively. Absorption corrections were applied by SADABS.⁹⁹ Space groups were determined based on systematic absences (**4**) and intensity statistics (**5**, **9**, **6**). Structures were solved by direct methods and Fourier techniques and refined on F2 using full matrix least-squares procedures. All non-H atoms were refined with anisotropic thermal parameters. H atoms in **5**, **9** and **6** were refined in calculated positions in a rigid group model. Positions of H atoms in **4** were found on the residual density map and refined with isotropic thermal parameters. All calculations were performed by the Bruker SHELXL-2014/7 package.⁹⁶

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was supported by an award from the National Institute of Health (R15GM123380 to JDG) and NSF MRI awards (CHE-1429164 and CHE-1532269). MYD and TK acknowledge support from NSF award

CHE-1664674. We thank Eric Reinheimer (Rigaku) for assistance with crystallography and an anonymous reviewer for valuable feedback on the electronic structure analysis.

REFERENCES

- 1). Hill BG; Dranka BP; Bailey SM; Lancaster JR Jr.; Darley-USmar VM J. Biol. Chem 2010, 285, 19699–19704. [PubMed: 20410298]
- 2). Cosby K; Partovi KS; Crawford JH; Patel RP; Reiter CD; Martyr S; Yang BK; Wacławski MA; Zalos G; Xu X; Huang KT; Shields H; Kim-Shapiro DB; Schechter AN; Cannon RO III; Gladwin MT Nat. Med 2003, 9, 1498–1505. [PubMed: 14595407]
- 3). Maia LB; Moura JJ G. Chem. Rev 2014, 114, 5273–5357.
- 4). Fields S Environ. Health Perspect 2004, 112, A557–A563.
- 5). Grant SB; Saphores J-D; Feldman DL; Hamilton AJ; Fletcher TD; Cook PLM; Stewardson M; Sanders BF; Levin LA; Ambrose RF; Deletic A; Brown R; Jiang SC; Rosso D; Cooper WJ; Marusic I Science 2012, 337, 681–686. [PubMed: 22879506]
- 6). Ward MH; deKok TM; Levallois P; Brender J; Gulis G; Nolan BT; VanDerslice J Environ. Health Perspect 2005 113, 1607–1614. [PubMed: 16263519]
- 7). Hardison RC Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A 1996, 93, 5675–5679. [PubMed: 8650150]
- 8). Gladwin MT; Kim-Shapiro DB Blood 2008, 112, 2636–2647. [PubMed: 18596228]
- 9). Shiva S; Huang Z; Grubina R; Sun J; Ringwood LA; MacArthur PH; Xu X; Murphy E; Darley-USmar VM; Gladwin MT Circ. Res 2007, 100, 654–661. [PubMed: 17293481]
- 10). Cossins AR; Williams DR; Foulkes NS; Berenbrink M; Kipar AJ Exp. Biol 2009, 212, 627–638.
- 11). Omar SA; Webb AJ J. Mol. Cell. Cardiol 2014, 73, 57–69. [PubMed: 24486197]
- 12). Heinecke J; Ford PC Coord. Chem. Rev 2010, 254, 235–247.
- 13). Williams PA, Fülöp V, Garman EF, Saunders NF, Ferguson SJ, and Hajdu J Nature 1997, 389, 406–412. [PubMed: 9311786]
- 14). Ranghino G; Scorza E; Sjogren T; Williams PA; Ricci M; Hajdu J Biochemistry 2000, 39, 10958–10966. [PubMed: 10998232]
- 15). Huang KT; Keszler A; Patel N; Patel RP; Gladwin MT; Kim-Shapiro DB; Hogg NJ Biol. Chem 2005, 280, 31126–31131.
- 16). Perissinotti LL; Marti MA; Doctorovich F; Luque FJ; Estrin DAA Microscopic Study of the Deoxyhemoglobin-Catalyzed Generation of Nitric Oxide from Nitrite Anion. Biochemistry 2008, 47, 9793–9802. [PubMed: 18717599]
- 17). Silaghi-Dumitrescu R Inorg. Chem 2004, 43, 3715–3718. [PubMed: 15180427]
- 18). Proton-Coupled Electron Transfer Themed Issue, Chem. Rev 2010, 110, 6937–7100. [PubMed: 21141827]
- 19). Dempsey JL; Winkler JR; Gray HB Chem. Rev 2010, 110, 7024–7039. [PubMed: 21082865]
- 20). Warren JJ; Mayer JM Biochemistry, 2015, 54, 1863–1878. [PubMed: 25742166]
- 21). Chirik PJ Preface: Forum on Redox-Active Ligands. Inorg. Chem 2011, 50, 9737–9740. [PubMed: 21894966]
- 22). Berben LA; de Bruin B; Heyduk AF Non-Innocent Ligands. Chem. Commun 2015, 51, 1553–1554.
- 23). Jeffrey JC; Rauchfuss TB Inorg. Chem 1979, 18, 2658–2666.
- 24). Bassetti M Eur. J. Inorg. Chem 2006, 2006, 4473–4482.
- 25). Annibale VT; Song D RSC Adv. 2013, 3, 11432–11449.
- 26). Braunstein P; Naud F Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2001, 40, 680–699.
- 27). Weng Z; Teo S; Hor TS A. Acc. Chem. Res 2007, 40, 676–684. [PubMed: 17461542]
- 28). Borovik AS Acc. Chem. Res 2005, 38, 54–61. [PubMed: 15654737]
- 29). Helm ML; Stewart MP; Bullock RM; DuBois MR; Du-Bois DL Science 2011, 333, 863–866. [PubMed: 21836012]
- 30). Nieto I; Livings MS; Sacci JB; Reuther LE; Zeller M; Papish ET Organometallics 2011, 30, 6339–6342.

- 31). Costentin C; Drouet S; Robert M; Saveant J-M Science 2012, 338, 90–94. [PubMed: 23042890]
- 32). O'Hagan M; Ho M-H; Yang JY; Appel AM; DuBois MR; Raugei S; Shaw WJ; DuBois DL; Bullock RM J. Am. Chem. Soc 2012, 134, 19409–19424. [PubMed: 23072436]
- 33). Geri JB; Szymczak NK J. Am. Chem. Soc 2015, 137, 12808–12814. [PubMed: 26425797]
- 34). Rigsby ML; Wasylenko DJ; Pegis ML; Mayer JM J. Am. Chem. Soc 2015, 137, 4296–4299. [PubMed: 25798713]
- 35). Loewen ND; Thompson EJ; Kagan M; Banales CL; Myers TW; Fettingner JC; Berben LA Chem. Sci 2016, 7, 2728–2735. [PubMed: 28660048]
- 36). Ford CL; Park YJ; Matson EM; Gordon Z; Fout AR Science 2016, 354, 741–743. [PubMed: 27846604]
- 37). Chapovetsky A; Do TH; Haiges R; Takase MK; Marinescu SC J. Am. Chem. Soc 2016, 138, 5765–5768. [PubMed: 27092968]
- 38). Roy S; Sharma B; Pecaut J; Simon P; Fontecave M; Tran PD; Derat E; Artero VJ Am. Chem. Soc 2017, 139, 3685–3696.
- 39). Cioncoloni G; Roger I; Wheatley PS; Wilson C; Morris RE; Sproules S; Symes MD ACS Catal. 2018, 8, 5070–5084.
- 40). Morrow TJ; Christman WE; Williams JZ; Arulsamy N; Goroncy A; Hulley EB Dalton Trans. 2018, 47, 2670–2682. [PubMed: 29410979]
- 41). Chaudhuri P; Hess M; Muller J; Hildenbrand K; Bill E; Weyhermuller T; Wieghardt KJ Am. Chem. Soc 1999, 121, 9599–9610.
- 42). Hubner R; Weber S; Strobel S; Sarkar B; Zalis S; Kaim W Organometallics 2011, 30, 1414–1418.
- 43). Thompson EJ; Berben LA Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2015, 54, 11642–11646.
- 44). Horak KT; Agapie TJ Am. Chem. Soc 2016, 138, 3443–3452.
- 45). Henthorn JT; Agapie T Inorg. Chem 2016, 55, 5337–5342. [PubMed: 27227812]
- 46). Chang M-C; McNeece AJ; Hill EA; Filatov AS; Anderson JS Chem. - Eur. J 2018, 24, 8001–8008. [PubMed: 29572998]
- 47). Rosenkoetter KE; Wojnar MK; Charette BJ; Ziller JW; Heyduk AF Inorg. Chem 2018, 57, 9728–9737. [PubMed: 29969241]
- 48). Delgado M; Sommer SK; Swanson SP; Berger RF; Seda T; Zakharov LN; Gilbertson JD Inorg. Chem 2015, 54, 7239–7248. [PubMed: 26204455]
- 49). Kwon Y; Delgado M; Zakharov L; Seda T; Gilbertson JD Chem. Commun 2016, 52, 11016–11019.
- 50). Delgado M; Gilbertson JD Chem. Commun 2017, 53, 11249–11252.
- 51). Grutzmacher H Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2008, 47, 1814–1818.
- 52). van der Vlugt JI Eur. J. Inorg. Chem 2012, 363–375.
- 53). Askevold B; Roesky HW; Schneider S ChemCatChem, 2012, 4, 307–320.
- 54). Kaljurand I; Kutt A; Soovali L; Rodima T; Maemets V; Leito I; Koppel IA J. Org. Chem 2005, 70, 1019–1028. [PubMed: 15675863]
- 55). Coetzee JF; Padmanabhan GRJ Am.Chem. Soc 1965, 87, 5005–5010.
- 56). A τ value 1 corresponds to an ideal trigonal bipyramidal geometry, whereas a τ value of 0 corresponds to an ideal square pyramidal geometry. See: Addison AW; Rao TN; Reedijk J; van Rijn J; Verschoor GC J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans 1984, 1349.
- 57). Martin RL; Taylor D Inorg. Chem 1976, 15, 2970–2976.
- 58). Enemark JH; Feltham RD Coord. Chem. Rev 1974, 13, 339–406.
- 59). Speelman AL; Zhang B; Silakov A; Skodje KM; Alp EE; Zhao J; Hu MY; Kim E; Krebs C; Lehnert N Inorg. Chem 2016, 55, 5485–5501. [PubMed: 27203448]
- 60). Given the unknown mechanism of NO formation and the potential presence of competitive reactions, the initial rate method was employed. See Casado J; Lopex-Quintela MA; Lorenzo-Barral FM J. Chem. Ed 1986, 63, 450–452.
- 61). Thammavongsy Z; Seda T; Zakharov LN; Kaminsky W; Gilbertson JD Inorg. Chem 2012, 51, 9168–9170. [PubMed: 22906522]

- 62). Burns KT; Marks WR; Cheung PM; Seda T; Zakharov LN; Gilbertson JD *Inorg. Chem* 2018, 57, 9601–9610. [PubMed: 29608297]
- 63). Kupper C; Rees JA; Dechert S; DeBeer S; Meyer FJ *Am. Chem. Soc* 2016, 138, 7888–7898.
- 64). Serres RG; Grapperhaus CA; Bothe E; Bill E; Weyhermuller T; Neese F; Wieghardt KJ *Am. Chem. Soc* 2004, 126, 5138–5153.
- 65). Wyllie GRA; Scheidt WR *Chem. Rev* 2002, 102, 1067–1090. [PubMed: 11942787]
- 66). Roncaroli F; Videla M; Slep LD; Olabe JA *Coord. Chem. Rev* 2007, 251, 1903–1930.
- 67). Richter-Addo GB; Wheeler RA; Hixson CA; Chen L; Khan MA; Ellison MK; Schulz CE; Scheidt WR J. *Am. Chem. Soc* 2001, 123, 6314–6326. [PubMed: 11427056]
- 68). Roberts SA; Weichsel A; Qiu Y; Shelnutt JA; Walker FA; Montfort WR *Biochemistry* 2001, 40, 11327–11337. [PubMed: 11560480]
- 69). Linder DP; Rodgers KR; Banister J; Wyllie GRA; Ellison MK; Scheidt WR J. *Am. Chem. Soc* 2004, 126, 14136–14148. [PubMed: 15506779]
- 70). Lanucara F; Chiavarino B; Crestoni ME; Scuderi D; Sinha RK; Maitre P; Fornarini S *Inorg. Chem* 2011, 50, 4445–4452. [PubMed: 21476565]
- 71). Speelman AL; Zhang B; Krebs C; Lehnert N *Angew. Chem., Int. E d* 2016, 55, 6685–6688.
- 72). Hong S; Yan JJ; Karmalkar DG; Sutherlin KD; Kim J; Lee Y-M; Goo Y; Mascharak PK; Hedman B; Hodgson KO; Karlin KD; Solomon EI; Nam W *Chem. Sci* 2018, 9, 6952–6960. [PubMed: 30210769]
- 73). McCleverty JA *Chem Rev.* 2004, 104, 403–418. [PubMed: 14871130]
- 74). Bart SC; Chlopek K; Bill E; Bouwkamp MW; Lobkovsky E; Neese F; Wieghardt K; Chirik PJ J. *Am. Chem. Soc* 2006, 128, 13901–13912. [PubMed: 17044718]
- 75). Tondreau AM; Milsmann C; Lobkovsky E; Chirik PJ *Inorg. Chem* 2011, 50, 9888–9895. [PubMed: 21667935]
- 76). Given the resonance hybrid between Fe(II)PDI²⁻ and Fe(0)PDI⁰ in 3, one could also envisage the electronic structure of Fe(I)PDI⁰ being valid to describe the electronic structure in 9. Our corresponding orbital analysis suggests contributions from both {FeNO}6 and {FeNO}8 configurations. Regardless, the isomer shift in 9 suggests the iron center is more oxidized than in 5.
- 77). The electronic structure of {Fe(NO)2}9 DNICs can also be qualitatively described as a resonance hybrid of {FeII(NO)(•NO-)}9 and {FeIII(NO-)2}9 electronic states. See Tsai M-L; Tsou C-C; Liaw W-F *Acc. Chem. Res* 2015, 48, 1184–1193. [PubMed: 25837426]
- 78). Ye S; Neese FJ *Am. Chem. Soc* 2010, 132, 3646–3647.
- 79). Pulukkody R; Darensbourg MY *Acc. Chem. Res* 2015, 48, 2049–2058. [PubMed: 26090911]
- 80). Ortuño MA; Cramer CJ J. *Phys. Chem. A* 2017, 121, 5932–5939. [PubMed: 28703600]
- 81). Berto TC; Speelman AL; Zheng S; Lehnert N *Coord. Chem. Rev* 2013, 257, 244–259.
- 82). Yost SR; Kowalczyk T; Van Voorhis TJ *Chem. Phys* 2013, 139, 174104.
- 83). King HF J. *Chem. Phys* 1967, 47, 1936.
- 84). Boguslawski K; Jacob CR; Reiher MJ *Chem. Theory Com-put* 2011, 7, 2740–2752.
- 85). Bianchini C; Mantovani G; Meli A; Migliacci F; Zanolini F; Laschi F; Sommazzi A *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem* 2003, 1620–1631.
- 86). Sur SK J. *Magn. Reson* 1989, 82, 169–173.
- 87). Bain GA; Berry JF J. *Chem. Educ* 2008, 85, 532–536.
- 88). Ciofini I *Coord. Chem. Rev* 2003, 238–239, 187–209.
- 89). Neese F *Coord. Chem. Rev* 2009, 253, 526–563.
- 90). Neese F; Wennmohs F; Hansen A; Becker U *Chem. Phys* 2009, 356, 98–109.
- 91). Neese F *Comput. Mol. Sci* 2018, 8, e1327.
- 92). Pflugrath JW *Acta Cryst.* 1999, D55, 3.
- 93). CrysAlisPro, Rigaku Oxford Diffraction, version 171.39.28e, 2017.
- 94). SCALE3 ABSPACK - A Rigaku Oxford Diffraction program for Absorption Corrections, Rigaku Oxford Diffraction, 2017.

- 95). Sheldrick GM Acta Cryst. 2015, A71, 3.
96). Sheldrick GM Acta Cryst. 2015, C71, 3.
97). Dolomanov OV; Bourhis LJ; Gildea RJ; Howard JAK; Puschmann HJ Appl. Cryst 2009, 42, 339.
98). Spek AL Acta Cryst. 2009, D65, 148.
99).) Sheldrick GM Bruker/Siemens Area Detector Absorption Correction Program, Bruker AXS, Madison, WI, 1998.

Figure 1.

Solid-state structures (30% probability) of $\text{Fe}^{\text{PyTPDI}}(\text{CO})_2$ (**3**, left) and $\text{Fe}^{\text{MorPDI}}(\text{CO})_2$ (**4**, right). The H atoms have been omitted for clarity. Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°) for **1**: Fe(1)-C(28) 1.784(1), Fe(1)-C(29) 1.782(2), Fe(1)-N(1) 1.944(1), Fe(1)-N(2) 1.849(1), Fe(1)-N(3) 1.948(2), C(2)-N(1) 1.332(2), C(8)-N(3) 1.324(2), and C(28)Fe(1)C(29) 95.65(7), N(2)Fe(1)C(28) 153.81(7), N(1)Fe(1)N(3) 154.16(6). Selected bond lengths (Å) and angles (°) for **2**: Fe(1)-C(28) 1.780(2), Fe(1)-C(29) 1.769(2), Fe(1)-N(1) 1.954(1), Fe(1)-N(2) 1.851(1), Fe(1)-N(3) 1.953(1), C(2)-N(1) 1.332(2), C(8)-N(3) 1.332(2), and C(28)Fe(1)C(29) 97.62(9), N(2)Fe(1)C(29) 156.22(7), N(1)Fe(1)N(3) 153.42(5).

Figure 2.

Solid state structures (30% probability) of $[\text{Fe}^{\text{PyrrPDI}}(\text{NO})_2]^+$ (**5**, left) and $[\text{Fe}^{\text{MorPDI}}(\text{NO})_2]^+$ (**6**, right). The H atoms and the BPh_4^- counterion have been omitted for clarity. Selected bond lengths ($\text{\AA}$) and angles ($^\circ$) for **5**: Fe(1)-N(1) 2.216(2), Fe(1)-N(2) 2.080(1), Fe(1)-N(3) 2.138(2), Fe(1)-N(5) 1.693(2), Fe(1)-N(6) 1.696(2), N(1)-C(2) 1.285(2), N(3)-C(8) 1.283(2), and N(5)-Fe(1)-N(6) 108.7(1), N(2)-Fe(1)-N(6) 132.85(8), N(1)-Fe(1)-N(3) 147.38(6). Selected bond lengths ($\text{\AA}$) and angles ($^\circ$) for **6**: Fe(1)-N(1) 2.233(3), Fe(1)-N(2) 2.065(2), Fe(1)-N(3) 2.171(3), Fe(1)-N(4) 1.694(2), Fe(1)-N(5) 1.696(3), N(1)-C(2) 1.280(3), N(3)-C(8) 1.290(3), and N(4)-Fe(1)-N(5) 108.6(1), N(2)-Fe(1)-N(4) 128.9(1), N(1)-Fe(1)-N(3) 148.23(9).

Figure 3. Initial rate plots for the reduction of TBANO₂ by selected Fe(PDI)(CO) species and 4 equiv [HNEt₃]⁺ (top) and [HLut]⁺ (bottom). Black circle = 7, red triangle = 8, blue diamond = 3, and green square = 4.

Figure 4.

Solid state structures (30% probability) of $[\text{Fe}^{\text{PyTPDI}}(\text{NO})]^+$ (**9**, left) and $[\text{Fe}^{\text{MorPDI}}(\text{NO})]^+$ (**10**, right). The H atoms and the BPh_4^- counterion have been omitted for clarity. Selected bond lengths ($\text{\AA}$) and angles ($^\circ$) for **9**: Fe(1)-N(1) 2.031(1), Fe(1)-N(2) 1.830(2), Fe(1)-N(3) 1.894(1), Fe(1)-N(4) 2.066(1), Fe(1)-N(5) 1.677(2), N(1)-C(2) 1.315(2), N(3)-C(8) 1.313(2), and N(5)-Fe(1)-N(4) 104.09(7), N(2)-Fe(1)-N(4) 152.92(7), N(1)-Fe(1)-N(3) 147.66(6). Selected bond lengths ($\text{\AA}$) and angles ($^\circ$) for **10**: Fe(1)-N(1) 2.035(1), Fe(1)-N(2) 1.836(1), Fe(1)-N(3) 1.894(1), Fe(1)-N(4) 2.076(1), Fe(1)-N(5) 1.679(1), N(1)-C(2) 1.314(1), N(3)-C(8) 1.313(2), and N(4)-Fe(1)-N(5) 104.59(5), N(2)-Fe(1)-N(4) 144.87(4), N(1)-Fe(1)-N(3) 151.92(4).

Figure 5.
Mulliken spin populations (left) and spin density (right) of MNIC 9.

Figure 6. Highest-occupied corresponding orbitals (COs) and $\alpha\beta$ overlaps from the BS(2,2) solution for **9**.

Scheme 1.

Reduction of NO_2^- , illustrating the role of the hemila-bile pendant base.

Table 1. Selected initial rates of TBANO₂ reduction.^a

Compound (PK _a)	Rate 1 ^b (x10 ⁻⁸ Ms ⁻¹)	Rate 2 ^c (x10 ⁻⁸ Ms ⁻¹)	Rate ^d Relative to 7
7 (---)	2.11	2.52	1.00 (1.19)
3 (18.3)	7.07	81.1	3.35 (38.42)
4 (17.1)	2.30	84.5	1.09 (40.01)
8 (19.2)	3.97	21.2	1.88 (10.06)

^a 25 °C, 2 equiv. TBANO₂, 4 equiv H⁺, CH₃CN.^b Average [HNEt₃]⁺.^c Average, [HLut]⁺^d Rate 1, (Rate 2).

Table 2. Selected spectroscopic and crystallographic data for Fe(PDI) complexes.^a

	3	9	5	9(2,2)^b
C(2)-N(1)	1.332(2)	1.315(2)	1.285(2)	1.302
C(8)-N(3)	1.32(4)	1.313(2)	1.283(2)	1.314
C(2)-C(3)	1.426(2)	1.453(2)	1.488(3)	1.450
C(7)-C(8)	1.438(2)	1.439(2)	1.488(3)	1.432
Fe(1)-N(1)	1.944(1)	2.031(1)	2.216(2)	2.060
Fe(1)-N(2)	1.849(1)	1.830(2)	2.080(1)	1.839
Fe(1)-N(3)	1.948(2)	1.894(1)	2.138(2)	1.899
Fe(1)-N _{pyrr} (4)		2.066(1)		2.101
Fe(1)-N(5)(O)		1.677(2)	1.693(2)	1.747
Fe(1)-N(6)(O)			1.696(2)	
N(5)-O(1)		1.182(2)	1.170(3)	1.167
N(6)-O(2)			1.173(3)	
Fe-N(5)-O(1)		150.9(2)	161.9(2)	147.5
Fe-N(6)-O(2)			160.4(2)	
$\nu_{\text{No}}(\text{cm}^{-1})$		1667	1785, 1716	
S = δ (mm/s)	0	0	1/2	0
	-0.089(3)	0.094(3)	0.32(3)	
E _Q (mm/s)	1.197(3)	0.489(5)	0.82(9)	

^aBond lengths (Å) and angles (°).^bBS(2,2) solution.