

# Green-emitting iridium(III) complexes containing sulfanyl- or sulfone-functionalized cyclometallating 2-phenylpyridine ligands†

Cite this: *Dalton Trans.*, 2014, **43**, 5343

Edwin C. Constable,\* Cathrin D. Ertl, Catherine E. Housecroft\* and Jennifer A. Zampese

A series of  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  complexes in which the cyclometallating ligands contain fluoro, sulfane or sulfone groups is reported. The conjugate acids of the  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}$  ligands in the complexes are 2-(4-fluorophenyl)pyridine (**H1**), 2-(4-methylsulfonylphenyl)pyridine (**H3**), 2-(4-<sup>t</sup>butylsulfanylphenyl)pyridine (**H4**), 2-(4-<sup>i</sup>butylsulfonylphenyl)pyridine (**H5**), 2-(4-<sup>n</sup>dodecylsulfanylphenyl)pyridine (**H6**), 2-(4-<sup>n</sup>dodecylsulfonylphenyl)pyridine (**H7**). The single crystal structures of **H3** and **H5** are described.  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  with  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N} = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{5}$  and **7** were prepared from the appropriate  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  dimer and bpy; the structure of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{3})_4\text{Cl}_2] \cdot 2\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  was determined.  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{6})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  was prepared by nucleophilic substitution starting from  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ . The  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  complexes have been characterized by NMR, IR, absorption and emission spectroscopic and mass spectrometric methods. The single crystal structures of enantiomerically pure  $\Delta$ - $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  and of *rac*-4- $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6] \cdot \text{Et}_2\text{O} \cdot 2\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  are described, and the differences in inter-cation packing in the structures compared.  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ ,  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  and  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{6})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  (fluoro and sulfane substituents) are yellow emitters ( $\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}}$  between 557 and 577 nm), and the room temperature solution emission spectra are broad. The sulfone derivatives  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{3})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ ,  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  and  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{7})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  are green emitters and the emission spectra are structured ( $\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}} = 493$  and 523 to 525 nm). High photoluminescence quantum yields (PLQYs) of 64–74% are observed for the sulfone complexes in degassed solutions. The emission lifetimes for the three complexes containing sulfone substituents are an order of magnitude longer (2.33 to 3.36  $\mu\text{s}$ ) than the remaining complexes (0.224 to 0.528  $\mu\text{s}$ ). Emission spectra of powdered solid samples have also been recorded; the broad emission bands have values of  $\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}}$  in the range 532 to 558 nm, and PLQYs for the powdered compounds are substantially lower ( $\leq 23\%$ ) than in solution. Trends in the redox potentials for the  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  complexes are in accord with the observed emission behaviour.

Received 25th December 2013,  
Accepted 2nd February 2014

DOI: 10.1039/c3dt53626b

www.rsc.org/dalton

## Introduction

Iridium(III)  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{N})]^+$  complexes incorporating cyclometallating ( $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}$ ) and *N,N*-chelating ( $\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{N}$ ) ligands offer an adaptable family of emissive ionic materials for use in light-emitting electrochemical cells (LECs).<sup>1–4</sup> In  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{N})]^+$  cations, the localization of the HOMO and LUMO on the iridium/ $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}$  domain and on the  $\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{N}$  ligands respectively, facilitates manipulation of the HOMO–LUMO separation by judicious choice of ligand substituents. Stabilization of the HOMO has been achieved by introducing electron-withdrawing substituents onto the  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}$  ligands, and 2-(2,4-difluorophenyl)pyridine


(Hdfppy), and to a lesser extent 2-(4-fluorophenyl)pyridine, are regularly employed to achieve blue-shifted emissions in  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{N})]^+$  complexes.<sup>1,5–7</sup> Bolink, Frey and coworkers<sup>8</sup> have shown that the number (one or two) and positions of substitution of fluorine substituents in 2-phenylpyridine (Hppy) have little effect on the photophysical and electrochemical properties of  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(4,4'\text{-}^t\text{Bu}_2\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  complexes (4,4'-<sup>t</sup>Bu<sub>2</sub>bpy = 4,4'-di-*tert*-butyl-2,2'-bipyridine). However, significantly for application in LECs, increasing the number of fluorine atoms results in shorter lived LECs.

Less well explored than the use of fluoro-substituents is the incorporation of SR, SOR and SO<sub>2</sub>R electron-withdrawing substituents, either for functionalization of the  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}^{9–13}$  or  $\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{N}$  ligand.<sup>14</sup> Among these earlier studies is the use of 1-(4-(methylsulfonyl)phenyl)-1H-pyrazole (Hmsppz) as the cyclometallating ligand in a series of green emitting  $[\text{Ir}(\text{msppz})_2(\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{N})][\text{PF}_6]$  complexes which perform efficiently under bias in LECs.<sup>13</sup> The

Department of Chemistry, University of Basel, Spitalstrasse 51, CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland. E-mail: catherine.housecroft@unibas.ch

†CCDC 972690–972694. For crystallographic data in CIF or other electronic format see DOI: 10.1039/c3dt53626b





**Scheme 1** Structures of the conjugate acids of the C<sup>N</sup> ligands with labelling for NMR spectroscopic assignments.

achievement of both high luminances and efficiencies under low driving voltages<sup>13</sup> suggest that sulfone-functionalized cyclometallating ligands may be a viable alternative to the more commonly employed fluoro-substituted C<sup>N</sup> ligands.

We present here a systematic study of the effects of functionalizing the cyclometallating Hppy ligand with increasingly electron-withdrawing substituents in the 4-position of the phenyl ring. Our aim was to apply the series of ligands shown in Scheme 1. Since the influence of fluoro-substituents is rather well understood, ligand H1 was chosen to provide the benchmark complex [Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(N<sup>N</sup>)<sup>+</sup> to which to relate the properties of the sulfane and sulfone derivatized complexes. The increase in electron-withdrawing properties on changing from SMe and SO<sub>2</sub>Me in compounds H2 to H3 (Scheme 1) is reflected in the different Hammett parameters (SMe,  $\sigma_m$  0.15,  $\sigma_p$  0.00; SO<sub>2</sub>Me,  $\sigma_m$  0.60,  $\sigma_p$  0.72),<sup>15–17</sup> and one of us has observed that on going from [Ru(tpy)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> to [Ru(4'-MeO<sub>2</sub>Stpy)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> (tpy = 2,2':6',2''-terpyridine, 4'-MeO<sub>2</sub>Stpy = 4'-methylsulfonyl-2,2':6',2''-terpyridine), the sulfone unit causes a switch from a non-emissive complex in fluid solution to emissive behaviour in MeCN solution.<sup>18</sup> The pairs of ligands H4/H5 and H6/H7 were selected to investigate the added effects of introducing bulky (<sup>t</sup>butyl) and long-chain (dodecyl) thiol and sulfone substituents.

## Experimental

### General

A Biotage Initiator 8 reactor was used for syntheses under microwave conditions.

<sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C spectra were recorded at 295 K on a Bruker Avance III-500 spectrometer; chemical shifts are referenced to residual solvent peaks with  $\delta(\text{TMS}) = 0$  ppm. Solution absorption spectra were recorded on an Agilent 8453 spectrophotometer, and FT-IR spectra on a Perkin Elmer Spectrum Two UATR instrument. Electrospray ionization (ESI) and MALDI-TOF mass spectra were recorded on Bruker esquire 3000<sup>plus</sup> and Bruker Daltronics Microflex mass spectrometers, respectively. LC-ESI-MS employed a combination of Shimadzu (LC) and Bruker AmaZon X instruments. Electrochemical measurements were carried out using cyclic voltammetry and using a CH Instruments 900B potentiostat with glassy carbon working and platinum auxiliary electrodes; a silver wire was used as a pseudo-reference electrode. Solvent was dry, purified MeCN and 0.1 M [<sup>t</sup>Bu<sub>4</sub>N][PF<sub>6</sub>] was used as supporting electrolyte.

Cp<sub>2</sub>Fe was used as internal reference and was added at the end of each experiment.

Solution emission spectra were recorded in MeCN on a Shimadzu 5301PC spectrofluorophotometer. Solution quantum yields were measured using a Hamamatsu absolute PL quantum yield spectrometer C11347 Quantaaurus\_QY. Lifetimes and emission spectra of powdered samples were measured using a Hamamatsu Compact Fluorescence lifetime Spectrometer C11367 Quantaaurus-Tau.

Compound H1 was prepared as reported in the literature<sup>19</sup> and the spectroscopic properties matched those reported.<sup>20,21</sup> [Ir<sub>2</sub>(COD)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>]<sup>22</sup> (COD = cycloocta-1,5-diene) and [Ir<sub>2</sub>(1)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>]<sup>6</sup> were prepared according to literature methods. All solvents were dried before use. Silica and alumina were purchased from Fluka (silica gel 60, 0.040–0.063 mm and activated, neutral aluminium oxide).

**Compound H2.** Compound H2 has been previously reported<sup>23</sup> but the following procedure gives a higher yield. Compound H1 (617 mg, 3.56 mmol) and an excess of NaSMe (1.06 g, 14.3 mmol) were added to *N*-methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP) (18 mL) in a microwave vial. The violet reaction mixture was heated at 80 °C for 1 h in a microwave reactor to give a dark brown suspension. This was poured into a mixture of H<sub>2</sub>O and brine (3 : 1, 100 mL). The resulting yellow precipitate was separated by filtration, dissolved in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> and dried over Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The solvent was removed under reduced pressure to yield H2 as a yellow solid (0.665 g, 3.30 mmol, 92.7%). M.p. 59.5 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 8.67 (ddd,  $J = 4.9, 1.9, 1.0$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 7.93 (m, 2H, H<sup>A2</sup>), 7.76–7.67 (overlapping m, 2H, H<sup>B3+B4</sup>), 7.34 (m, 2H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.21 (ddd,  $J = 7.3, 4.8, 1.4$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 2.53 (s, 3H, H<sup>Me</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 157.0 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 149.8 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 139.9 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 136.9 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 136.2 (C<sup>A1</sup>), 127.3 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 126.5 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 122.1 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 120.2 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 15.7 (C<sup>Me</sup>). IR (solid,  $\nu/\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 3086 (w), 3046 (w), 3002 (w), 2981 (w), 2919 (w), 1982 (w), 1910 (w), 1767 (w), 1661 (w), 1605 (w), 1583 (s), 1569 (s), 1552 (m), 1498 (w), 1458 (s), 1431 (s), 1399 (m), 1322 (w), 1296 (w), 1256 (w), 1227 (w), 1190 (m), 1154 (w), 1121 (w), 1098 (m), 1089 (m), 1057 (w), 1008 (m), 988 (m), 969 (w), 958 (m), 884 (w), 830 (m), 772 (s), 738 (s), 725 (m), 708 (m), 675 (w), 636 (w), 616 (w), 569 (w), 544 (w), 484 (m), 461 (m). ESI-MS  $m/z$  202.0 [M + H]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 202.1). Found C 71.43, H 5.57, N 6.75; C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>11</sub>NS requires C 71.60, H 5.51, N 6.96%.

**Compound H3.** Compound H2 (1.00 g, 4.97 mmol) and sodium tungstate dihydrate (819 mg, 2.48 mmol) were dissolved in MeOH (35 mL). H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (30%, 1.20 mL, 1.36 g) was added and the mixture was stirred overnight at room temperature. The suspension was poured into a mixture of H<sub>2</sub>O and brine (3 : 1, 200 mL) and extracted with CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (3 × 100 mL). The combined organic phases were dried over Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and the solvent was removed under reduced pressure to yield H3 as a white powder (1.14 g, 4.89 mmol, 98.4%). M.p. 134.5 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 8.75 (ddd,  $J = 4.7, 1.8, 1.0$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 8.21 (m, 2H, H<sup>A2</sup>), 8.10–7.99 (m, 2H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.87–7.75 (m, 2H, H<sup>B3+B4</sup>), 7.34 (ddd,  $J = 7.0, 4.8, 1.6$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 3.09 (s, 3H, H<sup>Me</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 155.4 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 150.2 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 144.7 (C<sup>A1</sup>), 140.7 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 137.3 (C<sup>B4</sup>),



128.0 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 127.9 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 123.5 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 121.3 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 44.7 (C<sup>Me</sup>). IR (solid,  $\nu/\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 3000 (w), 2921 (w), 1586 (m), 1563 (w), 1465 (m), 1435 (m), 1392 (w), 1314 (w), 1292 (s), 1185 (w), 1146 (s), 1087 (m), 1030 (w), 1013 (w), 988 (w), 964 (m), 848 (m), 789 (m), 776 (s), 750 (s), 677 (m), 636 (w), 616 (m), 562 (m), 548 (s), 514 (s). ESI-MS  $m/z$  234.0 [M + H]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 234.1). Found: C 62.03, H 4.95, N 6.29; C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>11</sub>NO<sub>2</sub>S requires C 61.78, H 4.75, N 6.00%.

**Compound H4.** NaH (60% suspension in mineral oil, 235 mg, 5.88 mmol) was suspended in DMF (8 mL) under N<sub>2</sub>. 2-Methyl-2-propanethiol (0.660 mL, 5.28 mg, 5.80 mmol) was added leading to gas evolution and a white foam. After the reaction mixture had been stirred for 10 min at room temperature, H1 (501 mg, 2.89 mmol) was added with DMF (2 mL). The mixture was heated at 120 °C for 24 h. The yellow-orange solution was allowed to cool to room temperature and was then poured into water–brine (3 : 1, 50 mL). The resulting suspension was stirred for 5 min. The precipitate was separated by filtration, washed with H<sub>2</sub>O and dried under vacuum. H4 was isolated as a pale brown solid (704 mg, 2.89 mmol, 100%). M.p. 90.7 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  8.70 (ddd,  $J = 4.8, 1.9, 1.1$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 7.95 (m, 2H, H<sup>A2</sup>), 7.82–7.70 (overlapping m, 2H, H<sup>B3+B4</sup>), 7.64 (m, 2H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.26 (m, 1H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 1.32 (s, 9H, H<sup>tBu</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  157.0 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 149.9 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 139.8 (C<sup>A1</sup>), 137.9 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 137.0 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 133.9 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 127.0 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 122.5 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 120.8 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 46.4 (C<sup>tBu</sup>), 31.2 (C<sup>tBu</sup>); IR (solid,  $\nu/\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 1462 (m), 1429 (m), 1391 (w), 1366 (m), 1305 (w), 1289 (w), 1259 (w), 1168 (m), 1152 (m), 1098 (m), 1059 (w), 1031 (w), 1014 (m), 989 (m), 934 (w), 899 (w), 844 (s), 780 (s), 748 (s), 725 (m), 682 (w), 633 (w), 618 (w), 579 (w), 560 (m), 520 (m), 491 (m). ESI-MS  $m/z$  244.0 [M + H]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 244.1). Found C 74.04, H 7.01, N 5.64; required for C<sub>15</sub>H<sub>17</sub>NS C 74.03, H 7.04, N 5.76%.

**Compound H5.** H4 (501 mg, 2.06 mmol) and sodium tungstate dihydrate (352 mg, 1.07 mmol) were dissolved in MeOH (13 mL). H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (30%, 0.500 mL, 5.68 mmol) was added and the suspension was stirred at room temperature for 20 h. CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (100 mL) was then added and the white precipitate was separated by filtration. The filtrate was washed with H<sub>2</sub>O (50 mL), the aqueous layer extracted with CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (100 mL) and the combined organic layers dried over Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. The solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the residue was purified by column chromatography (silica, CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> with 1% MeOH). H5 was isolated as a white powder (473 mg, 1.72 mmol, 83.5%). M.p. 174.4 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  8.75 (ddd,  $J = 4.7, 1.8, 1.1$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 8.17 (m, 2H, H<sup>A2</sup>), 7.98 (m, 2H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.88–7.75 (overlapping m, 2H, H<sup>B3+B4</sup>), 7.33 (ddd,  $J = 6.7, 4.8, 1.7$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 1.37 (s, 9H, H<sup>tBu</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  155.7 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 150.2 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 144.5 (C<sup>A1</sup>), 137.3 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 135.5 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 131.1 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 127.3 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 123.5 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 121.3 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 60.1 (C<sup>tBu</sup>), 23.8 (C<sup>tBu</sup>). IR (solid,  $\nu/\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 2970 (w), 1586 (m), 1561 (w), 1463 (m), 1436 (w), 1395 (w), 1314 (w), 1287 (s), 1192 (w), 1159 (w), 1131 (s), 1113 (m), 1079 (s), 1011 (m), 990 (w), 853 (m), 801 (w), 778 (s), 752 (w), 741 (w), 722 (m), 694 (s), 646 (s), 616 (m), 579 (s), 555 (m), 517 (m), 505 (m). ESI-MS  $m/z$  276.0 [M + H]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 276.1).

Found C 65.41, H 6.31, N 5.14; C<sub>15</sub>H<sub>17</sub>NO<sub>2</sub>S requires C 65.43, H 6.22, N 5.09%.

**Compound H6.** NaH (60% suspension in mineral oil, 187 mg, 4.67 mmol) was suspended in DMF (6 mL) under N<sub>2</sub>. 1-Dodecanethiol (1.14 mL, 956 mg, 4.63 mmol) and then DMF (4 mL) were added and the mixture was stirred for 10 min. H1 (400 mg, 2.31 mmol) was added with DMF (2 mL) and the mixture was heated at 120 °C for 4 h. The yellow mixture was allowed to cool to room temperature and was then poured into water–brine (3 : 1, 50 mL). The resulting suspension was stirred for 5 min and the precipitate was removed by filtration, washed with H<sub>2</sub>O, dried under vacuum and purified by column chromatography (silica, *n*-hexane–EtOAc 6 : 1 by vol. changing to 2 : 1). H6 was isolated as a white solid (542 mg, 1.52 mmol, 65.8%). M.p. 65.3 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  8.67 (ddd,  $J = 4.8, 1.8, 1.0$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 7.91 (m, 2H, H<sup>A2</sup>), 7.78–7.63 (overlapping m, 2H, H<sup>B3+B4</sup>), 7.39 (m, 2H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.21 (ddd,  $J = 7.2, 4.8, 1.4$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 2.97 (m, 2H, H<sup>SCH2</sup>), 1.68 (m, 2H, H<sup>SCH2CH2</sup>), 1.43 (m, 2H, H<sup>SCH2CH2CH2</sup>), 1.35–1.12 (overlapping m, 16H, H<sup>CH2</sup>), 0.88 (t,  $J = 6.9$  Hz, 3H, H<sup>CH3</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  157.0 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 149.8 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 138.7 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 136.9 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 136.7 (C<sup>A1</sup>), 128.6 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 127.3 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 122.1 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 120.3 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 33.3 (C<sup>SCH2</sup>), 32.1 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.8 (2C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.7 (2C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.5 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.3 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.2 (C<sup>SCH2CH2</sup>), 29.0 (C<sup>SCH2CH2CH2</sup>), 22.8 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 14.3 (C<sup>CH3</sup>). IR (solid,  $\nu/\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 3059 (w), 3003 (w), 2954 (m), 2917 (s), 2872 (m), 2850 (s), 1585 (s), 1571 (m), 1554 (w), 1496 (w), 1463 (s), 1432 (s), 1398 (w), 1379 (m), 1297 (m), 1259 (w), 1242 (w), 1191 (w), 1153 (w), 1122 (w), 1100 (m), 1056 (w), 1009 (m), 988 (w), 834 (m), 768 (s), 734 (m), 720 (m), 708 (m), 636 (w), 616 (w), 548 (w), 513 (w), 488 (w), 462 (m). MALDI-TOF MS (no matrix)  $m/z$  355.7 [M]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 355.2). Found C 77.75, H 9.76, N 4.05; C<sub>23</sub>H<sub>33</sub>NS requires C 77.69, H 9.35, N 3.94%.

**Compound H7.** H6 (212 mg, 0.597 mmol) and sodium tungstate dihydrate (98.4 mg, 0.298 mmol) were suspended in MeOH (15 mL). H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (35%, 0.120 mL, 1.36 mmol) was added and the mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight. Water (50 mL) was added and the suspension was stirred for 15 min, after which time the precipitate was separated by filtration. It was washed with H<sub>2</sub>O and dried under vacuum. H7 was isolated as a white solid (207 mg, 0.534 mmol, 89.4%). M.p. 84.4 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  8.74 (ddd,  $J = 5.0, 1.3$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 8.19 (m, 2H, H<sup>A2</sup>), 8.00 (m, 2H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.81 (m, 2H, H<sup>B3+B4</sup>), 7.33 (ddd,  $J = 6.7, 4.7, 1.6$  Hz, 1H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 3.11 (m, 2H, H<sup>SO2CH2</sup>), 1.71 (m, 2H, H<sup>SO2CH2CH2</sup>), 1.35 (m, 2H, H<sup>SO2CH2CH2CH2</sup>), 1.31–1.18 (overlapping m, 16H, H<sup>CH2</sup>), 0.87 (t,  $J = 7.0$  Hz, 3H, H<sup>CH3</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  155.5 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 150.2 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 144.6 (C<sup>A1</sup>), 139.3 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 137.2 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 128.7 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 127.8 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 123.5 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 121.3 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 56.6 (C<sup>SO2CH2</sup>), 32.0 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.72 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.69 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.6 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.5 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.4 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.2 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 28.4 (C<sup>SO2CH2CH2CH2</sup>), 22.9 (C<sup>SO2CH2CH2</sup>), 22.8 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 14.3 (C<sup>CH3</sup>). IR (solid,  $\nu/\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 2915 (m), 2848 (m), 1586 (w), 1562 (w), 1468 (m), 1436 (w), 1399 (w), 1301 (m), 1285 (m), 1271 (m), 1144 (s), 1099 (w), 1086 (m), 1027 (w), 1009 (w), 991 (w), 853 (w), 776 (s), 758 (m), 739 (m), 722 (w), 691 (s),



635 (w), 621 (m), 606 (s), 557 (m), 528 (s), 496 (m). ESI-MS  $m/z$  388.2  $[M + H]^+$  (calc. 388.2). Found C 71.30, H 8.79, N 3.77;  $C_{23}H_{33}NO_2S$  requires C 71.27, H 8.58, N 3.61%.

**[Ir<sub>2</sub>(3)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>].** [Ir<sub>2</sub>(COD)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] (285 mg, 0.424 mmol) and H3 (395 mg, 1.69 mmol) were suspended in degassed 2-ethoxyethanol and the mixture purged with argon. The suspension was heated at reflux overnight and was then allowed to cool to room temperature. The yellow precipitate was separated by filtration, washed with H<sub>2</sub>O and EtOH, and dried under vacuum. [Ir<sub>2</sub>(3)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] was isolated as a yellow powder (516 mg, 0.373 mmol, 88.0% crude) and was used without further purification. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 9.21 (ddd,  $J = 5.8, 1.6, 0.7$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 8.06 (ddd,  $J = 8.4, 1.4, 0.7$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B3</sup>), 7.95 (ddd,  $J = 8.1, 7.5, 1.6$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B4</sup>), 7.68 (d,  $J = 8.2$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.36 (dd,  $J = 8.1, 1.9$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A4</sup>), 7.01 (ddd,  $J = 7.3, 5.7, 1.4$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 6.36 (d,  $J = 1.9$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A6</sup>), 2.75 (s, 12H, H<sup>Me</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 166.5 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 151.8 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 149.2 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 144.8 (C<sup>A1/A5</sup>), 139.8 (C<sup>A1/A5</sup>), 138.0 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 128.1 (C<sup>A6</sup>), 124.4 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 124.3 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 121.0 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 120.6 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 44.3 (C<sup>Me</sup>). ESI-MS  $m/z$  657.1 [Ir(3)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 657.1), 698.2 [Ir(3)<sub>2</sub>(MeCN)]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 698.1).

**[Ir<sub>2</sub>(4)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>].** Compound H4 (401 mg, 1.65 mmol) was dissolved in 2-ethoxyethanol (18 mL) in a vial and the solution purged with N<sub>2</sub>. [Ir<sub>2</sub>(COD)<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] (280 mg, 0.417 mmol) was added and the mixture heated at 110 °C for 1.5 h in a microwave reactor. The yellow precipitate was separated by filtration, washed with H<sub>2</sub>O and EtOH and dried under vacuum to yield [Ir<sub>2</sub>(4)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] as a yellow solid (383 mg, 0.269 mmol, 64.5% crude). The compound was used without further purification. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 9.29 (d,  $J = 5.5$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 7.89 (d,  $J = 8.0$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B3</sup>), 7.76 (*pseudo*-td,  $J = 7.8, 1.6$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B4</sup>), 7.42 (d,  $J = 8.0$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 6.92 (dd,  $J = 7.9, 1.7$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A4</sup>), 6.78 (ddd,  $J = 7.3, 5.7, 1.5$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 5.96 (d,  $J = 1.6$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A6</sup>), 0.98 (s, 36H, H<sup>tBu</sup>). ESI-MS  $m/z$  677.2 [Ir(4)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 677.2), 718.3 [Ir(4)<sub>2</sub>(MeCN)]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 718.2).

**[Ir<sub>2</sub>(5)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>].** Compound H5 (151 mg, 0.548 mmol, 2.0 eq.) was suspended in 2-ethoxyethanol (3 mL) and H<sub>2</sub>O (1 mL) under N<sub>2</sub> atmosphere. IrCl<sub>3</sub>·*n*H<sub>2</sub>O ( $\approx 82\%$  IrCl<sub>3</sub>, 99.2 mg, 1.0 eq.) was added and the suspension was heated at reflux for 21 h. The mixture was allowed to cool to room temperature and then H<sub>2</sub>O was added. The precipitate was removed by filtration and was washed with H<sub>2</sub>O to give [Ir<sub>2</sub>(5)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] as a yellow powder (101 mg, 0.0650 mmol, 48%). This was used without further purification. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 9.30 (ddd,  $J = 5.8, 1.5, 0.6$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 8.03 (ddd,  $J = 8.3, 1.3, 0.6$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B3</sup>), 7.93 (td,  $J = 7.8, 1.5$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B4</sup>), 7.64 (d,  $J = 8.2$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.30 (dd,  $J = 8.1, 1.7$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A4</sup>), 6.98 (ddd,  $J = 7.3, 5.7, 1.5$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 6.21 (d,  $J = 1.8$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A6</sup>), 1.00 (s, 36H, H<sup>tBu</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 166.7 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 151.8 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 148.9 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 143.8 (C<sup>A1/A5</sup>), 137.9 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 134.4 (C<sup>A5/A1</sup>), 131.6 (C<sup>A6</sup>), 124.13 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 124.07 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 123.5 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 120.5 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 59.7 (C<sup>tBu</sup>), 23.5 (C<sup>tBu</sup>). ESI-MS  $m/z$  741.2 [Ir(5)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 741.1), 782.1 [Ir(5)<sub>2</sub>(MeCN)]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 782.2), 823.1 [Ir(5)<sub>2</sub>(MeCN)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 823.2).

**[Ir<sub>2</sub>(7)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>].** IrCl<sub>3</sub>·*n*H<sub>2</sub>O ( $\approx 82\%$  IrCl<sub>3</sub>, 93.5 mg, 0.257 mmol) was added to a suspension of H7 (200 mg, 0.516 mmol) in

2-ethoxyethanol (3 mL) and H<sub>2</sub>O (1 mL) under N<sub>2</sub>. The mixture was heated at reflux for 22 h. After cooling to room temperature, the mixture was poured into H<sub>2</sub>O ( $\approx 50$  mL) and stirred at room temperature for a few min. The resulting suspension was poured into brine ( $\approx 40$  mL) and stirred again at room temperature. The precipitate was removed by filtration, washed with H<sub>2</sub>O, EtOH and Et<sub>2</sub>O and dried under vacuum. [Ir<sub>2</sub>(7)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] was isolated as a yellow powder (216 mg, 0.108 mmol, 84.0% crude) and was used without further purification. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 9.23 (ddd,  $J = 5.7, 1.5, 0.6$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 8.04 (*pseudo*-dt,  $J = 8.4, 1.0$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B3</sup>), 7.94 (*pseudo*-td,  $J = 7.8, 1.6$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B4</sup>), 7.66 (d,  $J = 8.2$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.31 (dd,  $J = 8.1, 1.8$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A4</sup>), 6.99 (ddd,  $J = 7.3, 5.7, 1.5$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 6.30 (d,  $J = 1.8$  Hz, 4H, H<sup>A6</sup>), 2.74 (m, 8H, H<sup>SO<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 1.43 (m, 8H, H<sup>SO<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 1.33–1.05 (overlapping m, 72H, H<sup>Me</sup>), 0.88 ppm (t,  $J = 7.0$  Hz, 12H, H<sup>Me</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>)  $\delta$ /ppm 166.6 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 151.8 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 149.0 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 144.7 (C<sup>A1/A5</sup>), 138.6 (C<sup>A5/A1</sup>), 137.9 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 128.9 (C<sup>A6</sup>), 124.3 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 124.2 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 121.6 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 120.5 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 56.2 (C<sup>SO<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 32.1 (C<sup>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 29.73 (C<sup>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 29.72 (C<sup>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 29.6 (C<sup>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 29.5 (C<sup>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 29.4 (C<sup>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 29.2 (C<sup>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 28.3 (C<sup>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 22.8 (C<sup>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 22.5 (C<sup>SO<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub></sup>), 14.3 (C<sup>Me</sup>). MALDI-TOF MS (no matrix)  $m/z$  965.9 [Ir(7)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 965.4).

**[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>].** [Ir<sub>2</sub>(1)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] (350 mg, 0.306 mmol) and bpy (150 mg, 0.960 mmol) were suspended in MeOH (45 mL). The mixture was heated at reflux overnight and then allowed to cool to room temperature. After filtration, an excess of solid NH<sub>4</sub>PF<sub>6</sub> was added to the filtrate and the mixture was stirred for 1 h at room temperature. The yellow precipitate was separated by filtration, washed with H<sub>2</sub>O and redissolved in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>. The solution was dried over Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and the solvent removed under reduced pressure. The yellow residue was purified by column chromatography (silica, CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> changing to CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>–2% MeOH). [Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] was isolated as a yellow solid (405 mg, 0.483 mmol, 78.9%). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CD<sub>3</sub>CN)  $\delta$ /ppm 8.53 (*pseudo*-dt,  $J = 8.3, 1.0$  Hz, 2H, H<sup>E3</sup>), 8.14 (*pseudo*-td,  $J = 8.0, 1.6$  Hz, 2H, H<sup>E4</sup>), 8.01 (m, 4H, H<sup>B3+E6</sup>), 7.85 (m, 4H, H<sup>A3+B4</sup>), 7.57 (ddd,  $J = 5.8, 1.5, 0.8$  Hz, 2H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 7.51 (ddd,  $J = 7.7, 5.5, 1.2$  Hz, 2H, H<sup>E5</sup>), 7.04 (ddd,  $J = 7.3, 5.8, 1.4$  Hz, 2H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 6.81 (m, 2H, H<sup>A4</sup>), 5.89 (dd,  $J_{HF} = 9.6$  Hz,  $J_{HH} = 2.6$  Hz, 2H, H<sup>A6</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CD<sub>3</sub>CN)  $\delta$ /ppm 167.1 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 164.6 (d,  $J_{CF} = 253$  Hz, C<sup>A5</sup>), 156.6 (C<sup>E2</sup>), 154.3 (d,  $J_{CF} = 5.8$  Hz, C<sup>A1</sup>), 151.8 (C<sup>E6</sup>), 150.1 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 141.4 (d,  $J_{CF} = 2.1$  Hz, C<sup>A2</sup>), 140.5 (C<sup>E4</sup>), 139.8 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 129.4 (C<sup>E5</sup>), 128.1 (d<sub>CF</sub>,  $J = 9.4$  Hz, C<sup>A3</sup>), 125.7 (C<sup>E3</sup>), 124.5 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 121.0 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 118.3 (d<sub>CF</sub>,  $J = 17.7$  Hz, C<sup>A6</sup>), 110.5 (d,  $J = 23.3$  Hz, C<sup>A4</sup>). IR (solid,  $\nu$ /cm<sup>-1</sup>) 1594 (m), 1568 (m), 1555 (m), 1482 (w), 1447 (m), 1434 (m), 1314 (w), 1262 (w), 1245 (w), 1187 (m), 1163 (w), 1032 (w), 833 (s), 766 (s), 733 (m), 675 (w), 576 (m), 556 (s). UV/Vis (MeCN,  $1.1 \times 10^{-5}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>)  $\lambda$ /nm ( $\epsilon$ /dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>) 251 (62 000), 264 (60 000), 295 sh (33 000), 310 sh (2000), 395 sh (4300). Emission (MeCN,  $1.1 \times 10^{-5}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>,  $\lambda_{exc} = 269$  nm)  $\lambda_{em}^{max} = 557$  nm. ESI-MS  $m/z$  693.2  $[M - PF_6]^+$  (calc. 693.1). Found C 45.95, H 2.84, N 6.74; C<sub>32</sub>H<sub>22</sub>F<sub>8</sub>IrN<sub>4</sub>P requires C 45.88, H 2.65, N 6.69%.

**[Ir(3)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>].** [Ir<sub>2</sub>(3)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] (109 mg, 0.0574 mmol) and bpy (26.9 mg, 0.172 mmol) were suspended in MeOH (10 mL)



and the mixture was heated at 120 °C in a microwave reactor for 1 h (15 bar). After cooling, an excess of solid  $\text{NH}_4\text{PF}_6$  was added to the yellow solution and the resulting suspension was stirred for 15 min at room temperature. The yellow precipitate that formed was separated by filtration, was washed with MeOH and redissolved in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ . The solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the product was purified by column chromatography (silica,  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  changing to  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ -4% MeOH). The major fraction was collected and solvent removed under reduced pressure. The residue was suspended in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  and the mixture sonicated and then filtered.  $[\text{Ir}(\text{3})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  was isolated as a yellow solid (92.3 mg, 0.0964 mmol, 84.0%).  $^1\text{H}$  NMR (500 MHz,  $\text{CD}_3\text{CN}$ )  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  8.54 (*pseudo*-dt,  $J = 8.3$ , 1.1 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}3}$ ), 8.23 (*pseudo*-dt,  $J = 8.2$ , 1.1 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}3}$ ), 8.15 (*pseudo*-td,  $J = 8.0$ , 1.6 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}4}$ ), 8.02 (d,  $J = 8.3$  Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{A}3}$ ), 7.98 (ddd,  $J = 8.0$ , 7.7, 1.5 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}4}$ ), 7.95 (ddd,  $J = 5.4$ , 1.6, 0.8 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}6}$ ), 7.72 (ddd,  $J = 5.8$ , 1.5, 0.7 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}6}$ ), 7.58 (dd,  $J = 8.3$ , 1.9 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{A}4}$ ), 7.51 (ddd,  $J = 7.7$ , 5.5, 1.2 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}5}$ ), 7.21 (ddd,  $J = 7.4$ , 5.8, 1.4 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}5}$ ), 6.70 (d,  $J = 1.9$  Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{A}6}$ ), 2.89 (s, 6H,  $\text{H}^{\text{Me}}$ ).  $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$  NMR (126 MHz,  $\text{CD}_3\text{CN}$ )  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  166.2 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}2}$ ), 156.6 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}2}$ ), 152.0 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}6}$ ), 151.2 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}1}$ ), 150.9 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}6}$ ), 150.2 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}2}$ ), 142.3 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}5}$ ), 140.7 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}4}$ ), 140.3 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}4}$ ), 129.6 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}6+\text{E}5}$ ), 126.31 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}3}$ ), 126.29 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}5}$ ), 125.8 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}3}$ ), 122.6 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}4}$ ), 122.6 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}3}$ ), 44.3 ( $\text{C}^{\text{Me}}$ ). IR (solid,  $\nu/\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 2927 (w), 1608 (w), 1575 (w), 1475 (m), 1447 (w), 1430 (w), 1375 (w), 1294 (m), 1267 (w), 1144 (s), 1091 (m), 1062 (m), 1030 (w), 957 (m), 892 (w), 838 (s), 808 (m), 782 (m), 753 (s), 733 (m), 699 (m), 666 (w), 651 (w), 600 (w), 592 (w), 557 (s), 546 (s), 524 (m), 487 (s). UV/Vis (MeCN,  $1.0 \times 10^{-5}$  mol  $\text{dm}^{-3}$ )  $\lambda/\text{nm}$  ( $\epsilon/\text{dm}^3 \text{mol}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 256 (58 000), 300 sh (30 000), 350 sh (7500), 390 (4900), 425 sh (3200). Emission (MeCN,  $1.0 \times 10^{-5}$  mol  $\text{dm}^{-3}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{exc}} = 262$  nm)  $\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}} = 493$ , 525 nm. ESI-MS  $m/z$  813.1  $[\text{M} - \text{PF}_6]^+$  (calc. 813.1). Found C 41.74, H 3.33, N 5.90;  $\text{C}_{34}\text{H}_{28}\text{F}_6\text{IrN}_4\text{O}_4\text{PS}_2 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  requires C 41.84, H 3.10, N 5.74%.

$[\text{Ir}(\text{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ .  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{4})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  (144 mg, 0.101 mmol) and bpy (66.0 mg, 0.423 mmol) were suspended in MeOH (15 mL) and the mixture was heated at reflux for 16 h. The orange solution was allowed to cool to room temperature. An excess of solid  $\text{NH}_4\text{PF}_6$  was added followed by enough  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  to precipitate the product, and the resulting suspension was stirred for 10 min. The yellow precipitate was separated by filtration, washed with  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  and MeOH and then redissolved in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ . The solution was dried over  $\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4$  and the solvent was then removed under reduced pressure. The residue was purified twice by column chromatography (silica,  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  changing to  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  with 1% MeOH; alumina,  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  changing to  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ -5% MeOH). The residue was dissolved in MeOH and an excess of solid  $\text{NH}_4\text{PF}_6$  followed by  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  were added. The resulting suspension was stirred for 5 min, and the yellow precipitate was collected by filtration and redissolved in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ . The solution was dried over  $\text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4$  and the solvent was removed *in vacuo*.  $[\text{Ir}(\text{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  was isolated as a yellow solid (139 mg, 0.142 mmol, 70.3%).  $^1\text{H}$  NMR (500 MHz,  $\text{CD}_3\text{CN}$ ):  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  8.54 (*pseudo*-dt,  $J = 8.2$ , 1.0 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}3}$ ), 8.15 (*pseudo*-td,  $J = 7.9$ , 1.6 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}4}$ ), 8.07 (m, 4H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}3+\text{E}6}$ ), 7.86 (ddd,  $J = 8.2$ , 7.6, 1.5 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}4}$ ), 7.72 (d,  $J = 8.0$  Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{A}3}$ ), 7.61

(*pseudo*-dt,  $J = 5.8$ , 1.2 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}6}$ ), 7.51 (ddd,  $J = 7.5$ , 5.3, 1.2 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}5}$ ), 7.13 (dd,  $J = 8.0$ , 1.7 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{A}4}$ ), 7.05 (ddd,  $J = 7.4$ , 5.8, 1.4 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}5}$ ), 6.30 (d,  $J = 1.7$  Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{A}6}$ ), 1.00 (s, 18H,  $\text{H}^{\text{tBu}}$ ).  $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$  NMR (126 MHz,  $\text{CD}_3\text{CN}$ )  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  167.7 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}2}$ ), 156.7 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}2}$ ), 151.8 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}6}$ ), 150.9 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}5}$ ), 150.3 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}6}$ ), 145.2 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}6}$ ), 140.4 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}2}$ ), 140.3 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}4}$ ), 139.7 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}6}$ ), 136.0 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}4}$ ), 131.6 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}1}$ ), 129.4 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}4}$ ), 125.7 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}3}$ ), 125.5 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}3}$ ), 124.8 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}5}$ ), 121.3 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}3}$ ), 46.8 ( $\text{C}^{\text{CtBu}}$ ), 31.1 ( $\text{C}^{\text{tBu}}$ ). IR (solid,  $\nu/\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 2970 (w), 1607 (m), 1569 (m), 1472 (m), 1447 (m), 1425 (m), 1366 (m), 1313 (w), 1258 (w), 1162 (m), 1099 (w), 1062 (w), 875 (w), 834 (s), 778 (s), 765 (s), 733 (m), 650 (w), 600 (w), 557 (s). UV/Vis (MeCN,  $1.0 \times 10^{-5}$  mol  $\text{dm}^{-3}$ )  $\lambda/\text{nm}$  ( $\epsilon/\text{dm}^3 \text{mol}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 261 (57 000), 305 sh (35 000), 415 sh (4800). Emission (MeCN,  $0.99 \times 10^{-5}$  mol  $\text{dm}^{-3}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{exc}} = 260$  nm):  $\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}} = 568$  nm. ESI-MS  $m/z$  833.5  $[\text{M} - \text{PF}_6]^+$  (calc. 833.2). Found C 48.96, H 4.35, N 5.70;  $\text{C}_{40}\text{H}_{40}\text{F}_6\text{IrN}_4\text{PS}_2$  requires C 49.12, H 4.12, N 5.73%.

$[\text{Ir}(\text{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ .  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{5})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  (101 mg, 0.0650 mmol) and bpy (44.3 mg, 0.284 mmol) were suspended in MeOH (10 mL) and the mixture was heated at reflux for 14 h. The solution was left to cool to room temperature, and an excess of solid  $\text{NH}_4\text{PF}_6$  was then added followed by enough  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  to precipitate the product. The resulting suspension was stirred for 30 min. The yellow precipitate was separated by filtration, washed with  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  and redissolved in  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ . After removal of the solvent under reduced pressure, the residue was purified by column chromatography (silica,  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  changing to  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ -2% MeOH).  $[\text{Ir}(\text{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  was isolated as a yellow solid (119 mg, 0.114 mmol, 87.7%).  $^1\text{H}$  NMR (500 MHz,  $\text{CD}_3\text{CN}$ )  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  8.58 (dd,  $J = 8.2$ , 1.1 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}3}$ ), 8.22 (d,  $J = 8.0$  Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}3}$ ), 8.17 (*pseudo*-td,  $J = 8.0$ , 1.5 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}4}$ ), 8.09 (m, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}6}$ ), 8.02-7.93 (overlapping m, 4H,  $\text{H}^{\text{A}3+\text{B}4}$ ), 7.71 (m, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}6}$ ), 7.51 (ddd,  $J = 6.9$ , 5.5, 1.2 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{E}5}$ ), 7.45 (dd,  $J = 8.2$ , 1.8 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{A}4}$ ), 7.20 (ddd,  $J = 7.4$ , 5.8, 1.4 Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{B}5}$ ), 6.50 (d,  $J = 1.8$  Hz, 2H,  $\text{H}^{\text{A}6}$ ), 0.93 (s, 18H,  $\text{H}^{\text{tBu}}$ ).  $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$  NMR (126 MHz,  $\text{CD}_3\text{CN}$ , 295 K)  $\delta/\text{ppm}$  166.2 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}2}$ ), 156.6 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}2}$ ), 152.3 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}6}$ ), 150.9 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}6}$ ), 150.6 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}1/\text{A}5}$ ), 150.1 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}2}$ ), 140.8 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}4}$ ), 140.4 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}4}$ ), 135.9 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}5/\text{A}1}$ ), 133.2 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}6}$ ), 129.6 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}5}$ ), 126.3 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}5}$ ), 125.9 ( $\text{C}^{\text{E}3}$ ), 125.5 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}4}$ ), 125.4 ( $\text{C}^{\text{A}3}$ ), 122.5 ( $\text{C}^{\text{B}3}$ ), 60.3 ( $\text{C}^{\text{CtBu}}$ ), 23.5 ( $\text{C}^{\text{tBu}}$ ). IR (solid,  $\nu/\text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 2979 (w), 1607 (w), 1575 (w), 1475 (m), 1448 (w), 1430 (w), 1373 (w), 1285 (m), 1193 (w), 1129 (s), 1082 (m), 836 (s), 806 (m), 781 (m), 764 (m), 730 (w), 710 (m), 672 (m), 658 (m), 648 (m), 585 (m), 569 (m), 556 (s), 492 (m). UV/Vis (MeCN,  $0.99 \times 10^{-5}$  mol  $\text{dm}^{-3}$ )  $\lambda/\text{nm}$  ( $\epsilon/\text{dm}^3 \text{mol}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-1}$ ) 257 (59 000), 295 sh (35 000), 391 (4700), 420 sh (3400  $\text{dm}^3 \text{mol}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-1}$ ). Emission (MeCN,  $0.99 \times 10^{-5}$  mol  $\text{dm}^{-3}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{exc}} = 262$  nm)  $\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}} = 493$ , 523 nm. ESI-MS  $m/z$  897.2  $[\text{M} - \text{PF}_6]^+$  (calc. 897.2). Found C 45.51, H 4.05, N 5.56;  $\text{C}_{40}\text{H}_{40}\text{F}_6\text{IrN}_4\text{O}_4\text{PS}_2 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$  requires C 45.32, H 3.99, N 5.29%.

$[\text{Ir}(\text{6})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ . 1-Dodecanethiol (0.060 mL, 50.4 mg, 0.249 mmol) was added to a suspension of NaH (60% in mineral oil, 10.0 mg, 0.250 mmol) in DMF (2 mL) under  $\text{N}_2$ . The mixture was stirred at room temperature for 10 min.  $[\text{Ir}(\text{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  (53.0 mg, 0.0633 mmol) was added to the reaction mixture; this was heated at 120 °C for 1.5 h. The dark brown mixture was allowed to cool to room temperature and was then poured into a mixture of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  and brine (3 : 1 by vol.,



20 mL). The resulting suspension was stirred for 30 min at room temperature. The brown-yellow precipitate was separated by filtration and was washed with H<sub>2</sub>O. The solid was redissolved in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> and the solution dried over Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. Solvent was removed *in vacuo* and the product was purified by column chromatography (silica, CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> changing to CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>-2% MeOH). [Ir(6)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] was isolated as an orange solid (56.1 mg, 0.0467 mmol, 73.8%). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CD<sub>3</sub>CN) δ/ppm 8.54 (*pseudo*-dt, *J* = 8.3, 1.0 Hz, 2H, H<sup>E3</sup>), 8.15 (*pseudo*-td, *J* = 7.9, 1.6 Hz, 2H, H<sup>E4</sup>), 8.06 (m, 2H, H<sup>E6</sup>), 8.00 (*pseudo*-dt, *J* = 8.4, 1.1 Hz, 2H, H<sup>B3</sup>), 7.83 (m, 2H, H<sup>B4</sup>), 7.68 (d, *J* = 8.3 Hz, 2H, H<sup>A3</sup>), 7.58 (*pseudo*-dt, *J* = 5.9, 1.1 Hz, 2H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 7.53 (ddd, *J* = 7.7, 5.4, 1.2 Hz, 2H, H<sup>E5</sup>), 7.00 (ddd, *J* = 7.3, 5.8, 1.4 Hz, 2H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 6.94 (dd, *J* = 8.2, 1.9 Hz, 2H, H<sup>A4</sup>), 6.09 (d, *J* = 1.9 Hz, 2H, H<sup>A6</sup>), 2.63 (m, 4H, H<sup>SCH2</sup>), 1.40 (m, 4H, H<sup>SCH2CH2</sup>), 1.35–1.16 (m, 36H, H<sup>CH2</sup>), 0.89 (t, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 6H, H<sup>CH3</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CD<sub>3</sub>CN) δ/ppm 168.0 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 156.7 (C<sup>E2</sup>), 151.8 (C<sup>A1+E6</sup>), 150.1 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 141.6 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 141.5 (C<sup>A5</sup>), 140.3 (C<sup>E4</sup>), 139.4 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 129.4 (C<sup>E5</sup>), 128.7 (C<sup>A6</sup>), 126.1 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 125.6 (C<sup>E3</sup>), 123.9 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 122.0 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 120.5 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 32.6 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 32.0 (C<sup>SCH2</sup>), 30.3 (2C<sup>CH2</sup>), 30.25 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 30.2 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 30.1 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.9 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.7 (C<sup>SCH2CH2</sup>), 29.4 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 23.4 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 14.4 (S<sup>CH3</sup>). IR (solid, ν/cm<sup>-1</sup>) 2922 (m), 2852 (m), 1606 (m), 1567 (m), 1537 (w), 1472 (m), 1446 (m), 1423 (m), 1373 (w), 1315 (w), 1261 (w), 1244 (w), 1164 (w), 1095 (m), 1062 (w), 1030 (w), 876 (w), 835 (s), 791 (m), 769 (s), 732 (m), 650 (w), 639 (w), 556 (s), 520 (w). UV/Vis (MeCN, 0.99 × 10<sup>-5</sup> mol dm<sup>-3</sup>) λ/nm (ε/dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>) 251 (41 000), 310 (36 000), 400 sh (8200). Emission (MeCN, 0.99 × 10<sup>-5</sup> mol dm<sup>-3</sup>, λ<sub>exc</sub> = 252 nm) λ<sub>em</sub><sup>max</sup> = 577 nm. ESI-MS *m/z* 1058.1 [M - PF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>+</sup> calc. 1057.5. Found C 56.02, H 6.00, N 4.73; C<sub>56</sub>H<sub>72</sub>F<sub>6</sub>IrN<sub>4</sub>PS<sub>2</sub> requires C 55.93, H 6.04, N 4.66%.

[Ir(7)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>]. [Ir(7)<sub>2</sub>(Cl)<sub>2</sub>] (214 mg, 0.107 mmol) and bpy (50.1 mg, 0.321 mmol) were suspended in MeOH (15 mL) and the mixture was heated at reflux for 2 d. After cooling to room temperature, the mixture was filtered. An excess of NH<sub>4</sub>PF<sub>6</sub> followed by H<sub>2</sub>O were added to the orange filtrate and the resulting suspension was stirred for 5 min. The precipitate was collected by filtration, was washed with H<sub>2</sub>O and redissolved in CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>. Solvent was removed *in vacuo* and the residue was purified twice by column chromatography (silica, CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> changing to CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>-1% MeOH; silica, CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>-1% MeOH). [Ir(7)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] was isolated as a yellow solid (81.1 mg, 0.0640 mmol, 30.0%). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, CD<sub>3</sub>CN) δ/ppm 8.56 (*pseudo*-dt, *J* = 8.4, 1.0 Hz, 2H, H<sup>E3</sup>), 8.23 (*pseudo*-dt, *J* = 8.1, 0.9 Hz, 2H, H<sup>B3</sup>), 8.17 (*pseudo*-td, *J* = 7.9, 1.5 Hz, 2H, H<sup>E4</sup>), 8.04–7.96 (overlapping m, 6H, H<sup>A3+B4+E6</sup>), 7.71 (m, 2H, H<sup>B6</sup>), 7.50 (m, 4H, H<sup>A4+E5</sup>), 7.21 (ddd, *J* = 7.5, 5.8, 1.4 Hz, 2H, H<sup>B5</sup>), 6.58 (d, *J* = 1.8 Hz, 2H, H<sup>A6</sup>), 2.87 (m, 4H, H<sup>SO2CH2</sup>), 1.40–1.01 (overlapping m, 40H, H<sup>CH2</sup>), 0.88 (t, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 6H, H<sup>CH3</sup>). <sup>13</sup>C{<sup>1</sup>H} NMR (126 MHz, CD<sub>3</sub>CN) δ/ppm 166.2 (C<sup>B2</sup>), 156.6 (C<sup>E2</sup>), 152.1 (C<sup>E6</sup>), 151.1 (C<sup>A1/A5</sup>), 150.9 (C<sup>B6</sup>), 150.1 (C<sup>A2</sup>), 140.8 (C<sup>E4</sup>), 140.4 (C<sup>B4</sup>), 140.3 (C<sup>A5/A1</sup>), 130.8 (C<sup>A6</sup>), 129.6 (C<sup>E5</sup>), 126.3 (C<sup>B5</sup>), 126.2 (C<sup>A3</sup>), 125.9 (C<sup>E3</sup>), 123.2 (C<sup>A4</sup>), 122.5 (C<sup>B3</sup>), 56.3 (C<sup>SO2CH2</sup>), 32.6 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 30.33 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 30.32 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 30.2 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 30.1 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 30.0 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 29.7 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 28.6 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 23.8 (C<sup>CH2</sup>),

23.4 (C<sup>CH2</sup>), 14.4 (C<sup>CH3</sup>). IR (solid, ν/cm<sup>-1</sup>) 2923 (m), 2853 (w), 1608 (w), 1576 (w), 1476 (m), 1448 (w), 1430 (w), 1375 (w), 1294 (m), 1140 (s), 1090 (m), 1063 (w), 836 (s), 762 (s), 728 (m), 667 (m), 652 (w), 606 (m), 582 (w), 556 (s), 500 (m). UV/Vis (MeCN, 1.0 × 10<sup>-5</sup> mol dm<sup>-3</sup>) λ/nm (ε/dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>) 256 (58 000), 310 sh (25 000), 350 sh (7900), 390 (5000), 420 sh (3700 dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>). Emission (MeCN, 1.0 × 10<sup>-5</sup> mol dm<sup>-3</sup>, λ<sub>exc</sub> = 262 nm) λ<sub>em</sub><sup>max</sup> = 493, 524 nm. ESI-MS *m/z* 1121.6 [M - PF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>+</sup> (calc. 1121.5). Found C 53.38, H 5.57, N 4.72; C<sub>56</sub>H<sub>72</sub>F<sub>6</sub>IrN<sub>4</sub>O<sub>4</sub>PS<sub>2</sub> requires C 53.11, H 5.73, N 4.42%.

### Crystallography

Data were collected on a Bruker-Nonius KappaAPEX diffractometer with data reduction, solution and refinement using the programs APEX2<sup>24</sup> and SHELXL97.<sup>25</sup> ORTEP-type diagrams and structure analysis used Mercury v. 3.0.<sup>26,27</sup> Crystallographic data are given in Table 1.

## Results and discussion

### Ligand synthesis and characterization

The fluoro compound H1 is a convenient precursor to each of H2, H4 and H6. The thiomethyl group in H2 is readily introduced by treatment of H1 with NaSMe in NMP under microwave conditions. The 93% yield of H2 is superior to the 10% obtained using the reported Ullmann coupling of 2-bromopyridine and 4-bromothianisole.<sup>23</sup> The synthesis of H4 was adapted from that reported for the formation of 2-(2'-butylthiophenyl)pyridine,<sup>28</sup> and H6 was prepared in a similar manner. For each, the appropriate thiol was treated with NaH in DMF to generate the corresponding thiolate to displace the fluoro group from H1. Of the oxidation strategies tried for conversion of the thiols to corresponding sulfones, use of Na<sub>2</sub>WO<sub>4</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub><sup>29</sup> proved to be the most efficient.

Compounds H2–H8 were characterized by routine spectroscopic methods, mass spectrometry and elemental analysis. The base peak in the electrospray mass spectrum of H2, H3, H4, H5 and H7 corresponded to the [M + H]<sup>+</sup> with the isotopic distribution matching that calculated in each case. For H6, a parent ion (*m/z* 355.7) was observed in the MALDI-TOF mass spectrum, but no [M + H]<sup>+</sup> ion was detected in the ESI-MS. <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectra were assigned using 2D methods (COSY, HMQC and HMBC) and were consistent with the structures shown in Scheme 1.

Single crystals of H3 were grown by overlaying a CHCl<sub>3</sub> solution with hexanes, and of H5 by overlaying a CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> solution with hexanes. The structures are shown in Fig. 1 and 2. Both compounds crystallize in the monoclinic space group *C2/c*. Detailed analyses of the structures of a range of aryl-alkyl sulfones<sup>30</sup> and diaryl sulfones<sup>30,31</sup> illustrate the formation both intra- and intermolecular CH<sub>aryl</sub>...OS hydrogen bonds. In H3, the O1–S1–C9–C10 and O2–S1–C9–C8 torsion angles are –25.0(1) and 28.2(1)°, respectively, leading to intramolecular O1...H10a and O2...H8a contacts of 2.60 and 2.64 Å. In H5, the corresponding angles (O1–S1–C9–C8 and O2–S1–C9–C10)



Table 1 Crystallographic data

Compound	H3	H5	$[\text{Ir}_2(\text{3})_4\text{Cl}_2]\cdot 2\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$	$\Delta\text{-}[\text{Ir}(\text{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	<i>rac</i> -4 $[\text{Ir}(\text{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]\cdot \text{Et}_2\text{O}\cdot 2\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$
Formula	$\text{C}_{12}\text{H}_{11}\text{NO}_2\text{S}$	$\text{C}_{15}\text{H}_{17}\text{NO}_2\text{S}$	$\text{C}_{50}\text{H}_{44}\text{Cl}_6\text{Ir}_2\text{N}_4\text{O}_8\text{S}_4$	$\text{C}_{32}\text{H}_{22}\text{F}_2\text{IrN}_4\text{P}$	$\text{C}_{134}\text{H}_{102}\text{Cl}_4\text{F}_{32}\text{Ir}_4\text{N}_{16}\text{OP}_4$
Formula weight	233.29	275.37	1554.31	837.73	3594.88
Crystal colour and habit	Colourless block	Colourless block	Yellow plate	Yellow block	Yellow block
Crystal system	Monoclinic	Monoclinic	Orthorhombic	Trigonal	Triclinic
Space group	<i>C2/c</i>	<i>C2/c</i>	<i>Pbca</i>	<i>P3<sub>1</sub>21</i>	<i>P1</i>
<i>a</i> , <i>b</i> , <i>c</i> /Å	23.4437(15)	22.2664(12)	22.0732(12)	13.9523(9)	14.2353(6)
	7.1763(5)	6.1121(4)	21.3598(11)	13.9523(9)	16.2890(7)
	16.5008(11)	22.0876(11)	23.0604(12)	26.0654(17)	17.6451(7)
$\alpha$ , $\beta$ , $\gamma$ /°	90	90	90	90	66.1650(10)
	129.026(3)	110.398(2)	90	90	81.642(2)
	90	90	90	120	67.3900(10)
<i>U</i> /Å <sup>3</sup>	2156.6(2)	2817.5(3)	10 872.5(10)	4394.3(6)	3454.7(3)
<i>D<sub>c</sub></i> /Mg m <sup>-3</sup>	1.437	1.298	1.899	1.899	1.728
<i>Z</i>	8	8	8	6	1
$\mu$ (M-K $\alpha$ )/mm <sup>-1</sup>	0.282 (M = Mo)	2.019 (M = Mo)	13.963 (M = Cu)	10.083 (M = Cu)	9.298 (M = Cu)
<i>T</i> /K	123	296	123	123	296
Refln. collected ( <i>R</i> <sub>int</sub> )	30 251 (0.0269)	7450 (0.0275)	59 052 (0.1107)	67 974 (0.0341)	23 674 (0.0287)
Unique refln.	3021	2523	9726	5359	11 699
Refln. for refinement	2681	2228	6764	5311	10 552
Parameters	146	175	699	415	906
Threshold	<i>I</i> > 2.0 $\sigma$	<i>I</i> > 2.0 $\sigma$	<i>I</i> > 2.0 $\sigma$	<i>I</i> > 2.0 $\sigma$	<i>I</i> > 2.0 $\sigma$
<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> ( <i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> all data)	0.0323 (0.0376)	0.0378 (0.0420)	0.0470 (0.0820)	0.0170 (0.0172)	0.0368 (0.0399)
<i>wR</i> <sub>2</sub> ( <i>wR</i> <sub>2</sub> all data)	0.0913 (0.0962)	0.1024 (0.1068)	0.1111 (0.1295)	0.0436 (0.0437)	0.1120 (0.1168)
Goodness of fit	1.057	1.080	1.008	1.098	1.036
Flack parameter	—	—	—	0.007(2)	—
CCDC deposition	972690	972692	972691	972693	972694




Fig. 1 ORTEP representation of the structure of H3 (ellipsoids plotted at 40% probability level). Selected bond lengths and angles: S1–O2 = 1.4411(9), S1–O1 = 1.4434(10), S1–C12 = 1.7569(14), S1–C9 = 1.7575(11) Å; O2–S1–O1 = 118.19(6), O2–S1–C12 = 108.03(7), O1–S1–C12 = 108.11(6), O2–S1–C9 = 109.20(6), O1–S1–C9 = 108.45(6), C12–S1–C9 = 103.93(6)°.




Fig. 2 ORTEP representation of the structure of H5 (ellipsoids plotted at 40% probability level). Selected bond distances and angles: S1–O2 = 1.4378(12), S1–O1 = 1.4402(12), S1–C12 = 1.8190(16), S1–C9 = 1.7727(15) Å; O2–S1–O1 = 118.85(8), O2–S1–C9 = 107.48(7), O1–S1–C9 = 107.03(7), O2–S1–C12 = 108.05(8), O1–S1–C12 = 107.50(8), C9–S1–C12 = 107.46(7)°.


are  $-23.1(1)$  and  $24.6(1)^\circ$  with O1...H8a and O2...H10a separations of 2.57 and 2.64 Å. The dihedral angles between the phenyl and pyridine rings are  $17.7^\circ$  in H3, and  $37.7^\circ$  in H5. This marked difference is associated with face-to-face  $\pi$ -stacking of phenyl and pyridine rings in H3 (but not in H5). Centrosymmetric pairs of H3 molecules interact through a slipped arrangement of aromatic rings (Fig. 3a) with an intercentroid distance of 3.81 Å. The sulfone group engages in hydrogen-bonded contacts to the methyl groups of two adjacent molecules and the pyridine ring CH of a third molecule. In contrast, a primary packing interaction in H5 involves  $\text{CH}_{\text{phenyl}}\cdots\text{O}_{\text{sulfone}}$  contacts resulting in the formation of ribbons of hydrogen-bonded molecules (Fig. 3b). The <sup>t</sup>butyl groups protrude along one side of the ribbon, and pairs of adjacent ribbons associate through short  $\text{CH}_{\text{butyl}}\cdots\text{N}_{\text{pyridine}}$  contacts (2.73 Å) giving an extended domain of <sup>t</sup>butyl units sandwiched between aromatic domains (Fig. 3c).

### Synthesis and characterization of $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_4\text{Cl}_2]$ dimers


Complexes in the  $[\text{Ir}(\text{ppy})_2(\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{N})]^+$  family are usually synthesized by reaction between the N<sup>^</sup>N ligand and the chlorido-bridged dimer  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{ppy})_4\text{Cl}_2]$ .<sup>32</sup> Typically, this dimer is prepared from the reaction of  $\text{IrCl}_3\cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$  with Hppy.<sup>33,34</sup> Although  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{1})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  (prepared by the latter method) has previously been described,<sup>6</sup> the remaining chlorido-bridged precursors to the target complexes  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})]^+$  with C<sup>^</sup>N = 2 to 7 have not, to the best of our knowledge, been previously reported.

The reaction of  $\text{IrCl}_3\cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$  with sulfones H5 and H7 proceeded smoothly under reflux in a mixture of 2-ethoxyethanol and water (Scheme 2). The compounds  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{5})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  and





**Fig. 3** (a) Face-to-face interactions between centrosymmetric pairs of molecules of H3. (b) Ribbon formation through  $\text{CH}_{\text{phenyl}} \cdots \text{O}_{\text{sulfone}}$  contacts in H5. (c) Sandwiching of 'butyl (space-filling) units between aromatic domains in H5.



**Scheme 2** Routes to the dimers  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  with  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N} = 3, 4, 5$  and  $7$ . Conditions: (i) 2-ethoxyethanol– $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , reflux  $\approx 22$  h; (ii) 2-ethoxyethanol; reflux overnight (for H3), or  $110^\circ\text{C}$ , 1.5 h under microwave conditions (for H4).

$[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{7})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  were isolated as yellow solids. The  $^1\text{H}$  and  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR spectra of the complexes showed negligible impurities and the compounds were used in the next step (see the next section) without purification. The NMR spectra were assigned using routine 2D methods and were in accord with the structures shown in Scheme 2. For a MeOH solution of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{5})_4\text{Cl}_2]$ , the second most intense peak in the electrospray mass spectrum came at  $m/z$  741.2 and as assigned to the  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2]^+$  ion. The base peak at  $m/z$  782.1 and a lower intensity peak at  $m/z$  823.1 arose from  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{MeCN})]^+$  and  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{MeCN})_2]^+$ , respectively; we assume that the MeCN arises from the eluent in the LC column of the LC-ESI-MS. The isotope distributions for each peak matched the calculated patterns. MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry proved more amenable to observing a mass spectrum of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{7})_4\text{Cl}_2]$ , with the base peak at  $m/z$  965.9 corresponding to  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{7})_2]^+$ .

Attempts to prepare the dimers  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  with  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N} = 2, 3$  or  $4$  from reactions of H2, H3 or H4 with  $\text{IrCl}_3 \cdot n\text{H}_2\text{O}$  were unsuccessful. We therefore adopted an alternative strategy which involves the reaction of the conjugate acid of the cyclo-metallating ligand with  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{COD})_2\text{Cl}_2]$ .<sup>35</sup> Unfortunately, reaction of H2 with  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{COD})_2\text{Cl}_2]$  gave an insoluble solid which could not be characterized, and attempts to prepare and isolate  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{2})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  were abandoned. We note that the latter insoluble material reacted with bpy in MeOH to give a mixture of products rather than a salt of the desired  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{2})_4(\text{bpy})]^+$ .

The reaction of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{COD})_2\text{Cl}_2]$  with H3 and H4 (Scheme 2) yielded  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{3})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  and  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{4})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  as yellow powders in good yields. As judged by  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectroscopy, the crude products were pure enough to be used directly in the next step (see the next section). The solution  $^1\text{H}$  and  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR spectra of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{3})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  were assigned by COSY, HMQC and HMBC methods and were in accord with the structures in Scheme 2. In contrast,  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{4})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  is poorly soluble in most common organic solvents. The  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectrum was assigned using a COSY spectrum and by comparison with those of the other dimers, but the 1D  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR spectrum and the 2D HMQC and HMBC spectra were too poorly resolved to permit  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR data to be determined. The electrospray mass spectrum of an MeOH solution of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{3})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  showed peaks at  $m/z$  657.1 and 698.2 assigned to  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{3})_2]^+$  and  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{3})_2(\text{MeCN})]^+$ , respectively; (the origin of the MeCN is explained above). Analogous peaks were observed in the ESI mass spectrum of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{4})_4\text{Cl}_2]$ .

The synthesis of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{6})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  could not be achieved by the reaction of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{COD})_2\text{Cl}_2]$  with H6, and unreacted ligand was recovered from the reaction mixture after 22 hours reflux in 2-ethoxyethanol.

Despite the widespread synthetic use of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  dimers, X-ray diffraction data for this family of complexes in which  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N}$  is (or is derived from) a 2-phenylpyridine ligand remains sparse. A search of the Cambridge Structural Database<sup>36</sup> (CSD, v. 5.34 with November 2012, and February and May 2103 updates) using Conquest v. 1.35<sup>26</sup> generated only nine hits,<sup>37–44</sup> including the structures of the enantiomerically pure  $\Lambda, \Lambda'$ - and  $\Delta, \Delta'$ -forms<sup>42</sup> of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{ppy})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  as well as that of the centrosymmetric  $\Delta, \Lambda'$ -form.<sup>41</sup> In addition, we have recently








Fig. 4 ORTEP representation of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{3})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  in  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{3})_4\text{Cl}_2]\cdot 2\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  (ellipsoids plotted at 30% probability level and H atoms omitted). Important bond parameters: Ir1–C19 = 1.984(8), Ir1–C7 = 1.988(8), Ir1–N1 = 2.050(7), Ir1–N2 = 2.057(7), Ir1–Cl1 = 2.486(2), Ir1–Cl2 = 2.512(2), Ir2–C43 = 1.995(8), Ir2–C31 = 2.015(9), Ir2–N4 = 2.043(7), Ir2–N3 = 2.053(7), Ir2–Cl2 = 2.503(2), Ir2–Cl1 = 2.504(2), S1–O3 = 1.404(9), S1–O4 = 1.441(8), S1–C21 = 1.778(9), S1–C24 = 1.786(10), O1–S2 = 1.422(8), O2–S2 = 1.439(7) Å; Cl1–Ir1–Cl2 = 84.46(7), Cl2–Ir2–Cl1 = 84.30(6), C19–Ir1–N1 = 80.2(3), C7–Ir1–N2 = 80.9(3), C31–Ir2–N3 = 80.7(3), O3–S1–O4 = 117.5(5), O1–S2–O2 = 117.0(5), O6–S3–O5 = 119.7(5), O7–S4–O8 = 117.1(6)°.

reported the structure of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{dfppz})_2(\mu\text{-Cl})_2]\cdot\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  ( $\text{Hdfppz} = 1\text{-}(2,4\text{-difluorophenyl})\text{-}1\text{H-pyrazole}$ ).<sup>45</sup> Single crystals of  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{3})_4\text{Cl}_2]\cdot 2\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  were grown from a  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  solution of the complex overlaid with  $\text{Et}_2\text{O}$ . The structure of the dimer is shown in Fig. 4; each iridium atom is in an octahedral environment. The complex crystallizes in the orthorhombic space group  $Pbca$  and the asymmetric unit contains the  $\Lambda, \Lambda$ -enantiomer with both the  $\Lambda, \Lambda$ - and  $\Delta, \Delta$ -forms present in the lattice. As in other  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  dimers and in mononuclear  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{N}^{\wedge}\text{N})]^+$  cations, the two cyclometallated ligands are arranged with the N-donors *trans* to one another at each iridium centre. Bond parameters (cation to Fig. 4) are unexceptional. The orientations of the four independent sulfone groups with respect to the phenyl ring to which each is attached fall into two categories. Two are twisted in a similar manner to that in the free ligand H3 (see above) with torsion angles of O1–S2–C9–C8 and O2–S2–C9–C10 = 30.9(9) and  $-20.5(9)^\circ$  and O5–S3–C33–C32 and O6–S3–C33–C34 = 31.4(9) and  $-17.4(9)^\circ$ . This arrangement gives rise to short  $\text{CH}_{\text{phenyl}}\cdots\text{O}_{\text{sulfone}}$  contacts of 2.59 and 2.66 Å, and 2.56 and 2.62 Å, respectively (two per sulfone group). In contrast, the sulfone groups containing S1 and S4 are oriented such that the torsion angles are O3–S1–C21–C22 and O4–S1–C21–C20 =  $-58.2(9)$  and  $-3.3(9)$ , and O7–S4–C45–C46 and O8–S4–C45–C44 =  $-53.8(9)$  and  $-1.3(9)^\circ$ . This leads to one  $\text{CH}_{\text{phenyl}}\cdots\text{O}_{\text{sulfone}}$  contact being more effective than the other (separations of 2.49 *versus* 2.99 Å, and 2.47 *versus* 2.96 Å). The  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  solvate molecules sit in pockets between pairs of cyclometallated ligands bound to different iridium centres of the dimer. One  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  molecule


is disordered and has been modelled over two sites of fractional occupancies 0.62 and 0.38.

### Synthesis and characterization of $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ complexes

Synthesis of the  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  complexes was initially approached using the established methodology<sup>32</sup> of treating the appropriate  $[\text{Ir}_2(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  dimer with two equivalents of bpy. This method was successful in five out of six cases (Scheme 3a).  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ ,  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{3})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ ,  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  and  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  were isolated in yields ranging from 70.3 to 87.7%. Purification of  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  required a series of chromatographic and precipitation steps (see Experimental section), but a high yield was still obtained. Purification of  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{7})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  also required two chromatography columns and the final yield was only 30.0%; unreacted dimer was not recovered and the side products were not identified. Since the dimer  $[\text{Ir}_2(\mathbf{6})_4\text{Cl}_2]$  could not be prepared (see above), we adopted a nucleophilic substitution approach to prepare  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{6})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  from  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  (Scheme 3b). The fluoro-derivative was treated with 1-dodecanethiol in the presence of sodium hydride and, after workup,  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{6})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  was obtained in 73.8% yield. We have recently demonstrated that the presence of small amounts of chloride ion can have significant negative impact on the performance of materials in LECs, and all new compounds were shown to exhibit no changes in their  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectra upon the addition of  $[\text{Bu}_4\text{N}][\text{PF}_6]$ .<sup>46</sup>

The base peak in the electrospray mass spectrum of each  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  complex consisted of a peak envelope corresponding to  $[\text{M} - \text{PF}_6]^+$  exhibiting the characteristic isotopic distribution for iridium. The  $^1\text{H}$  and  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR spectra of each complex were consistent with a  $C_2$ -symmetric cation. Fig. 5 shows the  $^1\text{H}$  NMR spectrum of  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  as a representative example. Signals in the  $^1\text{H}$  and  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR spectra were assigned using a combination of COSY, HMQC and HMBC methods. The  $^1\text{H}$  NMR signal for the  $^t$ butyl group in  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  appears at  $\delta$  1.00 ppm and shifts to lower frequency ( $\delta$  0.93 ppm) in the analogous sulfone derivative  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ . The  $^{13}\text{C}$  NMR resonance for the primary carbon atom in the  $^t$ butyl group shifts from  $\delta$  31.1 to 23.5 ppm on going from  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  to  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ , while the S-attached  $^{13}\text{C}$  nucleus resonates at  $\delta$  46.8 and 60.3 ppm, respectively, in the sulfane and sulfone complexes. In  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{6})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  and  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{7})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ , the  $\text{SCH}_2$  unit is characterized by signals at  $\delta(^1\text{H})$  2.63 ppm and  $\delta(^{13}\text{C})$  32.0 ppm in the sulfane and  $\delta(^1\text{H})$  2.87 ppm and  $\delta(^{13}\text{C})$  56.3 ppm in the sulfone. Across the series of  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  complexes, the only bpy-proton signal to be noticeably affected is that assigned to  $\text{H}^{\text{E6}}$  (see Scheme 3) since only this bpy proton is directed towards the substituted phenyl ring. As expected, signals arising from the phenyl-ring protons ( $\text{H}^{\text{A3}}$ ,  $\text{H}^{\text{A4}}$  and  $\text{H}^{\text{A6}}$ ) undergo the most significant changes in chemical shift. For each pair of sulfane and sulfone complexes, signals for  $\text{H}^{\text{A3}}$ ,  $\text{H}^{\text{A4}}$  and  $\text{H}^{\text{A6}}$  all move to higher frequency ( $\Delta\delta$  is in the range 0.20 and 0.56 ppm). Signals for protons  $\text{H}^{\text{A6}}$  and  $\text{H}^{\text{A4}}$







**Scheme 3** Synthetic routes to the  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\text{A}}\text{N})_2(\text{N}^{\text{A}}\text{N})][\text{PF}_6]$  complexes. In route (a), conditions: (i) bpy, MeOH at reflux or in microwave reactor, 120 °C; (ii)  $\text{NH}_4\text{PF}_6$ . In route (b), conditions: (iii)  ${}^n\text{C}_{12}\text{H}_{25}\text{SH}$ , NaH, DMF, 120 °C. Atom labelling for NMR spectroscopic assignments is shown.

undergo the largest shifts to lower frequency in the fluoro-derivative, appearing at  $\delta$  5.89 and 6.81 ppm, respectively.

Single-crystal data were collected for  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  (crystals being grown from MeCN or  $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$  solutions of the complex overlaid with  $\text{Et}_2\text{O}$ , respectively) and fortuitously resulted in the determination of the structures of  $\Delta$ - $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  and *rac*-4- $\{[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]\}$ - $\text{Et}_2\text{O} \cdot 2\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ .




**Fig. 5** 500 MHz  ${}^1\text{H}$  NMR spectrum (295 K,  $\text{CD}_3\text{CN}$ ) of  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ ; see Scheme 3 for proton labelling. Scale:  $\delta$  /ppm.




**Fig. 6** ORTEP representation of the  $\Delta$ - $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})]^+[\text{PF}_6]$  (ellipsoids plotted at 40% probability level and H atoms omitted). Selected bond parameters: Ir1–C17 = 2.008(4), Ir1–C28 = 2.008(4), Ir1–N3 = 2.048(3), Ir1–N4 = 2.054(3), Ir1–N1 = 2.130(3), Ir1–N2 = 2.141(3), C19–F1 = 1.374(5), C30–F2 = 1.370(5) Å; N1–Ir1–N2 = 76.95(12), C17–Ir1–N3 = 80.17(14), C28–Ir1–N4 = 80.77(14), N3–Ir1–N4 = 172.38(12), C17–Ir1–N1 = 170.94(13), C28–Ir1–N2 = 172.58(13)°.

Enantiomerically pure  $\Delta$ - $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  crystallizes in the trigonal space group  $P3_121$  and Fig. 6 shows the structure of the  $\Delta$ - $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})]^+$  cation. The octahedral environment of Ir1 with *trans*-arrangement of the N donors (N3 and N4) of the cyclometallating ligands is as expected, and bond parameters (see Fig. 6 caption) are typical. We note that the packing interactions are predominantly  $\text{CH}\cdots\text{F}$  contacts involving the F atoms of both the  $[\text{PF}_6]^-$  anions and the fluorophenyl rings. There are no  $\pi$ -stacking interactions between arene rings of adjacent cations. This is in contrast to those observed in *rac*- $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  described below.





**Fig. 7** Face-to-face/edge-to-face embrace between the two independent  $\Delta$  and  $\Lambda$ -[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]<sup>+</sup> cations in *rac*-4{[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>}. Et<sub>2</sub>O·2CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>: (a) space-filling, and (b) showing relative orientations of the fluorophenyl and pyridine rings involved in the face-to-face interaction and CH... $\pi$  contacts (red hashed lines).



**Fig. 8** Chain of alternating  $\Delta$ - (red) and  $\Lambda$ - (blue) [Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]<sup>+</sup> cations in *rac*-4{[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>}. Et<sub>2</sub>O·2CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>.


The racemate crystallizes as the solvate *rac*-4{[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>}.Et<sub>2</sub>O·2CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> in the triclinic space group *P* $\bar{1}$ . In terms of bond parameters, the structure of each enantiomer of the [Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]<sup>+</sup> cation is similar to that of the  $\Delta$ -[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]<sup>+</sup> cation described above and we focus only upon the packing interactions. The asymmetric unit in 4{[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>}.Et<sub>2</sub>O·2CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> contains two [Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]<sup>+</sup> cations of opposite handedness which engage in an embrace<sup>47</sup> involving face-to-face and edge-to-face  $\pi$ -interactions (Fig. 7). The face-to-face contact is between a fluorophenyl ring and one pyridine ring of a bpy ligand; the rings are slipped such that the F atom lies partly over the pyridine  $\pi$ -system<sup>48,49</sup> (Fig. 7b) and the interplane angle is 12.4°. The centroid...centroid separation of 4.24 Å lies towards the upper end of the typical range of interactions involving pyridine rings.<sup>50</sup> For the CH... $\pi$  contacts (one CH<sub>fluoroPh</sub>... $\pi$ <sub>py</sub> and one CH<sub>py</sub>... $\pi$ <sub>fluoroPh</sub>), the CH...centroid distances are 2.59 and 3.03 Å. Face-to-face  $\pi$ -interactions between crystallographically independent  $\Delta$ - and  $\Lambda$ -[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]<sup>+</sup> cations extend beyond the single pair in the asymmetric unit to generate chains that run parallel to the *c*-axis (Fig. 8). The [PF<sub>6</sub>]<sup>-</sup> anions are ordered; atoms P2 and P3 reside on inversion centres with half of each respective anion present in

the asymmetric unit. Extensive CH...F contacts contribute to the crystal packing. The CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> solvent molecule is ordered, and the Et<sub>2</sub>O molecule is half occupancy.

### Photophysical properties

The solution electronic absorption spectra of [Ir(C<sup>^</sup>N)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub> (C<sup>^</sup>N = 1, 3–7) are shown in Fig. 9. All are dominated by intense high-energy bands which we assign to ligand-centred (LC), spin-allowed  $\pi^* \leftarrow \pi$  or  $\pi^* \leftarrow n$  transitions. The origin of the lower intensity and broader spectrum of [Ir(6)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub> is not readily interpreted, but reproducibility with different batches of compound was confirmed. All spectra extend into the visible region, consistent with the yellow colour of the compounds [Ir(C<sup>^</sup>N)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub> (C<sup>^</sup>N = 1, 3–5, 7) and orange colour of [Ir(6)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>. Absorptions at wavelengths in the approximate range 350 to 450 nm are attributed to low intensity <sup>1</sup>MLCT and <sup>1</sup>LLCT bands.<sup>1</sup>

Excitation of MeCN solutions of the complexes with  $\lambda_{\text{exc}}$  varying between 269 and 300 for [Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>, and between 252 and 400 nm for the other complexes results in the emission spectra shown in Fig. 10. The spectra are invariant of chosen values of  $\lambda_{\text{exc}}$  in the above ranges with the exception of the appearance of the relevant harmonic band. The complexes [Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>, [Ir(4)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub> and [Ir(6)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub> (*i.e.* fluoro and sulfone substituents on the C<sup>^</sup>N ligands) are yellow emitters and the emission bands are broad and featureless. In contrast, [Ir(3)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>, [Ir(5)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub> and [Ir(7)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub> are green emitters and the emission spectra exhibit vibrational structure. The emitting state of [Ir(C<sup>^</sup>N)<sub>2</sub>(N<sup>^</sup>N)]<sup>+</sup> is the lowest energy triplet state which may contain contributions from <sup>3</sup>MLCT, <sup>3</sup>LC and <sup>3</sup>LLCT states.<sup>1</sup> Significant charge-transfer contributions lead to broad emission bands, but when the CT contributions are small, structured emissions are observed as is the case for the sulfone-containing complexes [Ir(3)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>, [Ir(5)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub> and [Ir(7)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub>. Table 2 summarizes the room temperature solution photophysical properties of the complexes. Compared



**Fig. 9** Absorption spectra of MeCN solutions of [Ir(C<sup>^</sup>N)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]PF<sub>6</sub> for C<sup>^</sup>N = 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. See experimental section for concentrations.






Fig. 10 Solution emission spectra of  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  for  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N} = 1, 3, 4, 5, 6$  and  $7$  (298 K, MeCN). See experimental section for solution concentrations. Excitation wavelengths: 300 nm (with **1**) and 400 nm (with **3, 4, 5, 6** and **7**). \* = Harmonic at 600 nm.

Table 2 Solution photophysical properties of  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  ( $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N} = 1, 3-7$ ). PLQY measured in de-aerated MeCN; lifetimes measured in de-aerated MeCN under argon atmosphere

Complex	$\lambda_{\text{exc}}/\text{nm}$	$\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}}/\text{nm}$	$\tau_{1/2}^a/\mu\text{s}$	PLQY/%
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	269	557	0.224	36
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{3})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	262	493, 525	2.33	74
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	260	568	0.528	24
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	262	493, 523	3.36	64
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{6})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	252	577	0.369	15
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{7})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	262	493, 524	3.21	64

<sup>a</sup>  $\lambda_{\text{exc}} = 280$  nm for complexes with **3, 5** and **7**; 340 nm for complexes with **1, 4** and **6**.

to the parent complex  $[\text{Ir}(\text{ppy})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  which emits at 585 nm (de-aerated MeCN, 298 K),<sup>51</sup>  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  shows an emission at 557 nm, consistent with a lowering of the energy of the HOMO and widening of the HOMO–LUMO gap upon the introduction of the electron-withdrawing fluoro-groups. Replacement of F by <sup>t</sup>BuS on going from  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  to  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  results in an 11 nm red-shift in the emission, and a change from <sup>t</sup>butyl to <sup>n</sup>dodecyl sulfane gives a further 9 nm red-shift. Both sulfane complexes are blue-shifted with respect to  $[\text{Ir}(\text{ppy})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ . The three sulfane complexes exhibit almost identical solution emission spectra (Fig. 10 and Table 2) with  $\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}}$  blue-shifted by 92 nm with respect to  $[\text{Ir}(\text{ppy})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ .

The photoluminescence quantum yields (PLQY) and lifetimes ( $\tau_{1/2}$ ) of the solution-state emissions should be compared with values of 14% and 0.43  $\mu\text{s}$  measured for  $[\text{Ir}(\text{ppy})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  under analogous room temperature conditions.<sup>51</sup> Substantial enhancement of the PLQY is observed for the most electron-withdrawing (F and SO<sub>2</sub>R) substituents (Table 2). The value of 74% for  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{3})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  (SO<sub>2</sub>Me substituents) is particularly high, and it appears that increasing the




Fig. 11 Solid-state emission spectra of  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  for  $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N} = 1$  and **3–7**. Excitation wavelengths: see Table 3.

Table 3 Solid-state photophysical properties of  $[\text{Ir}(\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  ( $\text{C}^{\wedge}\text{N} = 1, 3-7$ )

Complex	$\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}^a}/\text{nm}$	$\lambda_{\text{exc}}$ (for PLQY)/nm	PLQY/%
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	547	269	23
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{3})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	532	262	6.6
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{4})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	553	260	4.9
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	535	262	15
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{6})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	558	252	2.6
$[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{7})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$	537	262	4.2

<sup>a</sup>  $\lambda_{\text{exc}} = 405$  nm.

steric bulk of the alkyl substituent may be detrimental to the PLQY value. We note that if solution samples are not de-aerated, the PLQY values are dramatically reduced to values of between 2.6% for  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{6})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  and 5.5% for  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ , consistent with strong quenching of the phosphorescence by oxygen.

The emission lifetimes for the six complexes in de-aerated MeCN were measured under argon and are given in Table 2. The longest lived emission (3.36  $\mu\text{s}$ ) is for  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ ; in general, the complexes in which the cyclometallated ligand bears a sulfone substituent exhibit lifetimes that are an order of magnitude longer than those containing fluoro or sulfane group.

Fig. 11 illustrates the emission spectra of powdered samples of the complexes and emission maxima and PLQY values are given in Table 3. All emission bands are broad and featureless. For the complexes containing the sulfane- or fluoro-substituted C<sup>^N</sup> ligands (**4, 6** or **1**), a blue shift in the emission is observed on going from solution to the solid state. For  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{3})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ ,  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{5})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  and  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{7})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$ , the solid-state emission maximum is red-shifted to  $\approx 535$  nm. With the exception of  $[\text{Ir}(\mathbf{1})_2(\text{bpy})][\text{PF}_6]$  for which the solid-state PLQY is 23% ( $\lambda_{\text{exc}} = 269$  nm), PLQYs for powdered samples are significantly lower than those obtained in de-aerated solution (compare Tables 2 and 3).



**Table 4** Cyclic voltammetric data with respect to Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup> in MeCN solutions with [tBu<sub>4</sub>N][PF<sub>6</sub>] as supporting electrolyte, and a scan rate of 0.1 V s<sup>-1</sup> (ir = irreversible; qr = quasi-reversible)

Complex	$E_{1/2}^{\text{ox}}/\text{V}$	$E_{1/2}^{\text{red}}/\text{V}$	$\Delta E_{1/2}/\text{V}$
[Ir(1) <sub>2</sub> (bpy)][PF <sub>6</sub> ]	+1.07 <sup>qr</sup>	-1.74, -2.41 <sup>ir</sup> , -2.54	2.81
[Ir(3) <sub>2</sub> (bpy)][PF <sub>6</sub> ]	+1.18	-1.72, -2.16, -2.61 <sup>ir</sup>	2.90
[Ir(4) <sub>2</sub> (bpy)][PF <sub>6</sub> ]	+1.04 <sup>ir</sup>	-1.75, -2.48 <sup>ir</sup> , -2.57 <sup>ir</sup>	2.79
[Ir(5) <sub>2</sub> (bpy)][PF <sub>6</sub> ]	+1.19	-1.73, -2.18, -2.43	2.92
[Ir(6) <sub>2</sub> (bpy)][PF <sub>6</sub> ]	+0.82 <sup>ir</sup>	-1.76, -2.55 <sup>ir</sup>	2.79
[Ir(7) <sub>2</sub> (bpy)][PF <sub>6</sub> ]	+1.25	-1.71, -2.16, -2.39	2.96

## Electrochemistry

Each of the [Ir(C<sup>N</sup>)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] complexes (C<sup>N</sup> = 1, 3–7) is electrochemically active, and cyclic voltammetric data are given in Table 4. Unless stated otherwise, the electrochemical processes are reversible or near-reversible. Each fluoro or sulfone derivative (C<sup>N</sup> = 1, 3, 5, 7) exhibits an iridium-based reversible or quasi-reversible oxidation process at more positive potential than [Ir(ppy)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] ( $E_{1/2}^{\text{ox}} = +0.84$  V *versus* internal Fc/Fc<sup>+</sup>),<sup>51</sup> consistent with the introduction of strongly electron-withdrawing substituents on the cyclometallated ligands. Compounds [Ir(4)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] and [Ir(6)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] also undergo irreversible oxidations at +1.04 and +0.82 V, respectively, which we have not investigated in detail. Two or three ligand-based reductions are observed for each complex, and the  $E_{1/2}^{\text{red}}$  potentials in Table 4 compare with -1.77 and -2.60 V for [Ir(ppy)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>].<sup>51</sup> The LUMO is localized on the bpy ligand,<sup>1</sup> and the values of the reduction potentials are consistent with the processes being bpy-based, being little affected by the electronic changes made to the C<sup>N</sup> ligand across the series of compounds.

The electrochemical band gaps,  $\Delta E_{1/2}$  (Table 4) are all larger than the 2.61 V in [Ir(ppy)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>],<sup>51</sup> consistent with the lowering of the HOMO upon introducing electron-withdrawing substituents into the C<sup>N</sup> domain. As expected, the largest band gaps are observed for the sulfone derivatives (C<sup>N</sup> = 3, 5, 7). The trends in Table 4 parallel those observed in the solution emission spectra (Table 2). The slightly smaller values of  $\Delta E_{1/2}$  on going from fluoro to sulfone derivatives are consistent with the observed red-shift in emission maxima, while the increase in  $\Delta E_{1/2}$  on going to sulfones [Ir(C<sup>N</sup>)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] (C<sup>N</sup> = 3, 5, 7) corresponds to the blue-shift in the emissions compared to those of [Ir(C<sup>N</sup>)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] (C<sup>N</sup> = 1, 4, 6).

## Conclusions

We have prepared a series of [Ir(C<sup>N</sup>)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] complexes in which the cyclometallating ligands contain electron-withdrawing fluoro, sulfone or sulfone groups. The well-established synthetic route of treatment of a [Ir<sub>2</sub>(C<sup>N</sup>)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] dimer with the bpy proved appropriate for the preparation of [Ir(C<sup>N</sup>)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] with C<sup>N</sup> = 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7. However, [Ir(6)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] was prepared by nucleophilic substitution starting from fluoro-

derivative [Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] since attempts to prepare the dimer [Ir<sub>2</sub>(6)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>] were unsuccessful.

The new complexes have been fully characterized by spectroscopic and mass spectrometric methods. The single crystal structures of  $\Delta$ -[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] and of *rac*-4{[Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]-[PF<sub>6</sub>]}·Et<sub>2</sub>O·2CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> have been elucidated, along with the structures of the free ligands H3 and H5, and of the dimer [Ir<sub>2</sub>(3)<sub>4</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>]·2CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>. The solution absorption spectra of the complexes are dominated by ligand-centred transitions, with a tail into the visible arising from low intensity <sup>1</sup>MLCT and <sup>1</sup>LLCT bands. The room temperature, solution emission spectra of [Ir(1)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>], [Ir(4)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] and [Ir(6)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)]-[PF<sub>6</sub>] (fluoro and sulfone substituents) are broad and featureless, consistent with substantial CT contributions to the lowest energy triplet (emitting) state. These complexes are all yellow emitters with  $\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}}$  between 557 and 577 nm. In contrast, incorporation of the sulfone substituents into the cyclometallating ligands results in [Ir(3)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>], [Ir(5)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] and [Ir(7)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] being green emitters which exhibit structured emissions ( $\lambda_{\text{em}}^{\text{max}} = 493$  and 523 to 525 nm), consistent with only minor CT contributions to the lowest energy triplet state. The solution PLQYs of the sulfone complexes are 74% for [Ir(3)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] and 64% for both [Ir(5)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] and [Ir(7)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>], but for powdered solid samples, these are significantly lower ( $\leq 15\%$ ). The emission lifetimes for the complexes containing sulfone substituents in the C<sup>N</sup> ligands (3, 5 and 7) are an order of magnitude longer (2.33 to 3.36  $\mu\text{s}$ ) than the complexes in which the C<sup>N</sup> ligand carries a fluoro or sulfone unit (0.224 to 0.528  $\mu\text{s}$ ). We are currently screening [Ir(3)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>], [Ir(5)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] and [Ir(7)<sub>2</sub>(bpy)][PF<sub>6</sub>] and related complexes in device configuration in LECs.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the Swiss National Science Foundation, the European Research Council (Advanced Grant 267816 LiLo) and the University of Basel for financial support.

## Notes and references

- R. D. Costa, E. Ortí, H. J. Bolink, F. Monti, G. Accorsi and N. Armaroli, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2012, **51**, 8178.
- T. Hu, L. He, L. Duan and Y. Qiu, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2012, **22**, 4206.
- F. Dumar, D. Bertin and D. Gigmes, *Int. J. Nanotechnol.*, 2012, **9**, 377.
- R. D. Costa, in *Molecules at Work*, ed. B. Pignataro, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2012, pp. 339–360.
- N. M. Shavaleev, R. Scopelliti, M. Grätzel and Md. K. Nazeeruddin, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2013, **396**, 17.
- N. M. Shavaleev, F. Monti, R. D. Costa, R. Scopelliti, H. J. Bolink, E. Ortí, G. Accorsi, N. Armaroli, E. Baranoff, M. Grätzel and Md. K. Nazeeruddin, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2012, **51**, 2263.



- 7 T. Kim, H. Kim, K. M. Lee, Y. S. Lee and M. H. Lee, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2012, **52**, 160.
- 8 D. Tordera, J. J. Serrano-Pérez, A. Pertegás, E. Ortí, H. J. Bolink, E. Baranoff, Md. K. Nazeeruddin and J. Frey, *Chem. Mater.*, 2013, **25**, 3391.
- 9 G. Zhou, Q. Wang, C.-L. Ho, W.-Y. Wong, D. Ma, L. Wang and Z. Lin, *Chem.-Asian J.*, 2008, **3**, 1830.
- 10 G. Zhou, C.-L. Ho, W.-Y. Wong, Q. Wang, D. Ma, L. Wang, Z. Lin, T. B. Marder and A. Beeby, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2008, **18**, 499.
- 11 R. Ragni, E. Orselli, G. S. Kottas, O. H. Omar, F. Babudri, A. Pedone, F. Naso, G. M. Farinola and L. De Cola, *Chem.-Eur. J.*, 2009, **15**, 136.
- 12 M. Tavasli, S. Bettington, I. F. Perepichka, A. S. Batsanov, M. R. Bryce, C. Rothe and A. P. Monkman, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.*, 2007, 4808.
- 13 D. Tordera, A. M. Bünzli, A. Pertegás, J. M. Junquera-Hernández, E. C. Constable, J. A. Zampese, C. E. Housecroft, E. Ortí and H. J. Bolink, *Chem.-Eur. J.*, 2013, **19**, 8597.
- 14 I. Bouamaied, E. C. Constable, C. E. Housecroft, M. Neuberger and J. A. Zampese, *Dalton Trans.*, 2012, **41**, 10276.
- 15 C. Hansch, A. Leo and R. W. Taft, *Chem. Rev.*, 1991, **91**, 165.
- 16 J. Chambers, B. Eaves, D. Parker, R. Claxton, P. S. Ray and S. J. Slattery, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2006, **359**, 2400.
- 17 D. H. McDaniel and H. C. Brown, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1958, **23**, 420.
- 18 E. C. Constable, A. M. W. Cargill Thompson, N. Armaroli, V. Balzani and M. Maestri, *Polyhedron*, 1992, **11**, 2707.
- 19 C. Liu, Q. Ni, P. Hu and J. Qiu, *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, 2011, **9**, 1054.
- 20 L. Ackermann, H. K. Potukuchi, A. R. Kapdi and C. Schulzke, *Chem.-Eur. J.*, 2010, **16**, 3300.
- 21 J. Xu, G. Cheng, D. Su, Y. Liu, X. Wang and Y. Hu, *Chem.-Eur. J.*, 2009, **15**, 13105.
- 22 M. Marigo, N. Marsich and E. Farnetti, *J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem.*, 2002, **187**, 169.
- 23 Y. Harrak, G. Casula, J. Basset, G. Rosell, S. Pleascia, D. Raffa, M. G. Cusimano, R. Pouplana and M. D. Pujol, *J. Med. Chem.*, 2010, **53**, 6560.
- 24 APEX2, version 2 User Manual, M86-E01078, Bruker Analytical X-ray Systems, Inc., Madison, WI, 2006.
- 25 G. M. Sheldrick, *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. A: Fundam. Crystallogr.*, 2008, **64**, 112.
- 26 I. J. Bruno, J. C. Cole, P. R. Edgington, M. K. Kessler, C. F. Macrae, P. McCabe, J. Pearson and R. Taylor, *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B: Struct. Sci.*, 2002, **58**, 389.
- 27 C. F. Macrae, I. J. Bruno, J. A. Chisholm, P. R. Edgington, P. McCabe, E. Pidcock, L. Rodriguez-Monge, R. Taylor, J. van de Streek and P. A. Wood, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.*, 2008, **41**, 466.
- 28 S. Clavier, Ø. Rist, S. Hansen, L.-O. Gerlach, T. Högberg and J. Bergman, *Org. Biomol. Chem.*, 2003, **1**, 4248.
- 29 A. B. Charette, C. Berthelette and D. St-Martin, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 2001, **42**, 5149.
- 30 F. A. M. Rudolph, A. L. Fuller, A. M. Z. Slawin, M. Bühl, R. A. Aitken and J. D. Woollins, *J. Chem. Crystallogr.*, 2010, **40**, 253 and references therein.
- 31 C. Glidewell, W. T. A. Harrison, J. N. Low, J. G. Sime and J. L. Wardell, *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B: Struct. Sci.*, 2001, **57**, 190.
- 32 See for example: F. Neve, A. Crispini, S. Campagna and S. Serroni, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1999, **38**, 2250.
- 33 S. Sprouse, K. A. King, P. J. Spellane and R. J. Watts, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1984, **106**, 6647.
- 34 F. O. Garces, K. A. King and R. J. Watts, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1988, **27**, 3464.
- 35 E. Baranoff, B. F. E. Curchod, J. Frey, R. Scopelliti, F. Kessler, I. Tavernelli, U. Rothlisberger, M. Grätzel and Md. K. Nazeeruddin, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2012, **51**, 215.
- 36 F. H. Allen, *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. B: Struct. Sci.*, 2002, **58**, 380.
- 37 E. Andreiadis, D. Imbert, J. Pécaut, A. Calborean, I. Ciofini, C. Adamo, R. Demadrille and M. Mazzanti, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2011, **50**, 8197.
- 38 S. Bettington, M. Tavasli, M. R. Bryce, A. S. Batsanov, A. L. Thompson, H. A. Al Attar, F. B. Dias and A. P. Monkman, *J. Mater. Chem.*, 2006, **16**, 1046.
- 39 S. Bettington, A. L. Thompson, A. Beeby and A. E. Goeta, *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. E: Struct. Rep. Online*, 2004, **60**, m827.
- 40 C. Xu, Z.-Q. Wang, X.-M. Dong, X.-Q. Hao, X.-M. Zhao, B.-M. Ji and M.-P. Song, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 2001, **373**, 306.
- 41 K. A. McGee and K. R. Mann, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2007, **46**, 7800.
- 42 O. Chepelin, J. Ujma, X. Wu, A. M. Z. Slawin, M. B. Pitak, S. J. Coles, J. Michel, A. C. Jones, P. E. Barran and P. J. Lusby, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, **134**, 19334.
- 43 F. O. Garces, K. Dedeian, N. L. Keder and R. J. Watts, *Acta Crystallogr., Sect. C: Cryst. Struct. Commun.*, 1993, **49**, 1117.
- 44 L. Norel, M. Rudolph, N. Vanthuyne, J. A. G. Williams, C. Lescop, C. Roussel, J. Autschbach, J. Crassous and R. Réau, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2010, **49**, 99.
- 45 E. Baranoff, H. J. Bolink, E. C. Constable, M. Delgado, D. Häussinger, C. E. Housecroft, M. K. Nazeeruddin, M. Neuberger, E. Ortí, G. E. Schneider, D. Tordera, R. M. Walliser and J. A. Zampese, *Dalton Trans.*, 2013, **42**, 1073.
- 46 G. E. Schneider, H. J. Bolink, E. C. Constable, C. D. Ertl, C. E. Housecroft, A. Pertegás, J. A. Zampese, A. Kanitz, F. Kessler and S. B. Meier, *Dalton Trans.*, 2014, **43**, 1961.
- 47 I. Dance and M. Scudder, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 1998, 1341.
- 48 A. Forni, S. Pieraccini, S. Rendine, F. Gabas and M. Sironi, *ChemPhysChem*, 2012, **13**, 4224.
- 49 See for example: J. Ganifo, D. Toledo, M. T. Garland and R. Baggio, *J. Fluorine Chem.*, 2010, **131**, 510.
- 50 C. Janiak, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 2000, 3885.
- 51 R. D. Costa, E. Ortí, D. Tordera, A. Pertegás, H. J. Bolink, S. Graber, C. E. Housecroft, L. Sachno, M. Neuberger and E. C. Constable, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2011, **1**, 282.

