## Spectral tuning and emission enhancement through lanthanide coordination in a dual Vis-NIR emissive cyanide-bridged heterometallic Ru(II)-Er(III) complex

Dimitrije Mara, Zhiwang Cai, Silvia Bonabello, Stefano Penna, Rik Van Deun, Paola Deplano, Luciano Marchiò, Luca Pilia\* and Flavia Artizzu\*

## **Supporting Information**



Figure S1. Highlight on the coordination environment of the Er atom in RuEr.



Figure S2. FT-IR spectra of Ru (in blue) and RuEr (in red).

The FT-IR spectra referring to the compounds **RuEr** (in red) and its precursor **Ru** (blue), are both dominated by the peaks attributed to the vibrational modes of the bipy ligand in the region 1550-400 cm<sup>-1</sup>. At about 2060 cm<sup>-1</sup> a peak related to the stretching mode of the cyanide ion is observed. This peak is slightly shifted towards higher wavenumbers in **RuEr**, likely as a consequence of the coordination to the lanthanide ion. In **RuEr** the peak appears asymmetrically split, a feature that may be related to the presence of one coordinated and one uncoordinated CN<sup>-</sup> group.

Around 1630 cm<sup>-1</sup> a moderately broadened band is observed that is the result of the overlap between the peak related to the bending mode of water molecules and that related to the vibrational mode of oxalate, which is present in both the precursor and the final product. Normalizing the spectra to the peak related to the cyanide ion (and therefore to the  $[Ru(bipy)_2(CN)_2]$  moiety), it can be seen that the band assigned to oxalate maintains the same intensity in both the precursor and final product. This confirms the presence of the oxalate ion in both the **Ru** and **RuEr** approximately in the same ratio with respect to the  $[Ru(bipy)_2(CN)_2]$  moiety.

Around 1300 cm<sup>-1</sup> a weak peak is identified, probably related to the stretching of the  $NO_3^-$  group, which is not observed in the precursor.

At around 3400 cm<sup>-1</sup>, the broad band related to the symmetric and antisymmetric stretching of water molecules appears slightly shifted to lower wavenumbers in **RuEr** with respect to **Ru**, likely as a consequence of metal coordination and the establishment of strong hydrogen bondings in the crystalline state.



**Figure S3**. Portion of the crystal packing of RuEr highlighting the  $\pi$ -stacking interactions between bipy ligands as dashed yellow lines.

LUMO+5 LUMO+4 -0.09 -0.15 LUMO+3 LUMO+2 -0.335 -0.57 LUMO+1 LUMO -1.32 -1.25 HOMO HOMO-1 -6.47 -6.73 HOMO-2 HOMO-3 -8.34 -6.80 HOMO-4 HOMO-5 -8.73 -8.72

**Table S1.** DFT calculated molecular orbitals of  $[Ru(bipy)_2CN_2]$  (isovalue plot 0.04) in the gas-phase with corresponding energies (eV).

**Table S2.** DFT calculated molecular orbitals of [Ru(bipy)<sub>2</sub>CN<sub>2</sub>] (isovalue plot 0.04) in CH<sub>3</sub>CN with corresponding energies (eV).

LUMO+5 0.05	LUMO+4 -0.04	
LUMO+3 -0.16	LUMO+2 -0.39	
LUMO+1 -1.15	<b>LUMO</b> -1.21	
HOMO -7.08	HOMO-1 -7.25	
HOMO-2 -7.29	HOMO-3 -8.57	
HOMO-4 -8.62	HOMO-5 -9.53	



**Table S3.** DFT calculated molecular orbitals of **RuEr** (isovalue plot 0.04) in the gas phase with corresponding energies (eV).

Calc. abs. (nm)	$f^{a}$	Major contributions	
436	0.1071	H-2->LUMO (85%), H-1->L+1 (7%)	
302	0.0586	H-1->L+4 (65%), H-1->LUMO+24 (8%), H-1->LUMO+27 (5%)	
259	0.1809	H-6->L+1 (15%), H-5->L+1 (17%), H-4->LUMO (37%), H-3->LUMO (13%)	
256	0.5617	H-6->LUMO (11%), H-5->LUMO (26%), H-4->L+1 (29%), H-3->L+1 (15%)	
252	0.0925	H-8->LUMO (4%), H-6->LUMO (9%), H-4->L+1 (8%), H-3->L+1 (62%)	

**Table S4.** TD-DFT calculated lowest energy transitions for [Ru(bipy)<sub>2</sub>(CN)<sub>2</sub>] in gas-phase, from optimized structures.

<sup>a</sup>Calculated oscillator strength; only the transitions with  $f \ge to 0.04$  have been reported.

Calc.	fa	Major contributions	
abs. (nm)	J	Major contributions	
394	0.2248	$ \begin{array}{l} H-5(A) -> L+1(A) \ (8\%), H-5(A) -> L+2(A) \ (4\%), H-4(A) -> LUMO(A) \ (8\%), H-4(A) -> L+3(A) \ (4\%), H-3(A) -> L+1(A) \ (3\%), H-3(A) -> L+2(A) \ (8\%), H-2(A) -> LUMO(A) \ (3\%), H-2(A) -> L+3(A) \ (8\%), H-5(B) -> L+1(B) \ (8\%), H-4(B) -> LUMO(B) \ (8\%), H-4(B) -> L+3(B) \ (4\%), H-3(B) -> L+1(B) \ (3\%), H-3(B) -> L+2(B) \ (8\%), H-2(B) -> LUMO(B) \ (3\%), H-2(B) -> L+3(B) \ (8\%) \end{array} $	
374	0.0350	$\begin{array}{l} \text{H-5(A)->L+2(A) (17\%), H-4(A)->L+3(A) (16\%), H-5(B)->L+2(B) (17\%), H-4(B)->L+3(B) (17\%) \\  \text{H-5(A)->L+1(A) (6\%), H-4(A)->LUMO(A) (6\%), H-5(B)->L+1(B) (6\%), H-4(B)->LUMO(B) (6\%) \\ \end{array}$	
367	0.0986	$\begin{array}{l} \text{H-3(A)->L+2(A) (11\%), H-2(A)->L+3(A) (11\%), H-3(B)->L+2(B) (11\%), H-2(B)->L+3(B) (11\%) H-5(A)->L+1(A) (6\%), H-4(A)->LUMO(A) (6\%), H-1(A)->L+2(A) (3\%), HOMO(A)->L+3(A) (3\%), H-5(B)->L+1(B) (6\%), H-4(B)->LUMO(B) (6\%), H-1(B)->L+2(B) (3\%), HOMO(B)->L+3(B) (3\%)} \end{array}$	
327	0.0290	H-1(A)->L+4(A) (21%), HOMO(A)->L+5(A) (21%), H-1(B)- >L+4(B) (20%), HOMO(B)->L+5(B) (20%) H-3(A)->L+4(A) (2%), H- 2(A)->L+5(A) (2%), H-3(B)->L+4(B) (2%), H-2(B)->L+5(B) (2%)	
319	0.0151	$\begin{array}{l} H-3(A)->L+4(A) (21\%), H-2(A)->L+5(A) (21\%), H-3(B)->L+4(B) (20\%), H-2(B)->L+5(B) (20\%) \\ \qquad $	
309	0.0569	H-1(A)->L+7(A) (19%), HOMO(A)->L+6(A) (19%), H-1(B)->L+7(B) (20%), HOMO(B)->L+6(B) (20%) H-3(A)->L+7(A) (2%), H-2(A)- >L+6(A) (2%), H-3(B)->L+7(B) (2%), H-2(B)->L+6(B) (2%)	
302	0.0407	H-5(A)->L+4(A) (15%), H-4(A)->L+5(A) (15%), H-5(B)->L+4(B) (15%), H-4(B)->L+5(B) (15%) H-1(A)->L+8(A) (5%), HOMO(A)->L+9(A) (5%), H-1(B)->L+8(B) (5%), HOMO(B)->L+9(B) (5%)	
295	0.0201	$\begin{array}{l} H-5(A) > L+4(A) \ (3\%), H-5(A) > L+7(A) \ (2\%), H-4(A) > L+5(A) \\ (3\%), H-4(A) > L+6(A) \ (2\%), H-3(A) > L+7(A) \ (2\%), H-3(A) > L+8(A) \\ (6\%), H-3(A) > L+60(A) \ (2\%), H-2(A) > L+6(A) \ (2\%), H-2(A) > L+9(A) \\ (6\%), H-2(A) > L+57(A) \ (3\%), H-5(B) > L+4(B) \ (3\%), H-5(B) > L+7(B) \\ (2\%), H-4(B) - > L+5(B) \ (3\%), H-4(B) - > L+6(B) \ (2\%), H-3(B) - > L+7(B) \ (2\%), \\ H-3(B) - > L+8(B) \ (5\%), H-3(B) - > L+66(B) \ (2\%), H-2(B) - > L+6(B) \ (2\%), H-2(B) - > L+6(B) \ (3\%) \\ \end{array}$	
290	0.0118	$\begin{array}{l} H-5(A)->L+7(A)\;(11\%),H-4(A)->L+6(A)\;(11\%),H-5(B)->L+7(B)\\ (11\%),H-4(B)->L+6(B)\;(12\%) & H-4(A)->L+57(A)\;(3\%),H-1(A)-\\ >L+8(A)\;(3\%),HOMO(A)->L+9(A)\;(3\%),H-4(B)->L+63(B)\;(3\%),H-1(B)-\\ >L+8(B)\;(3\%),HOMO(B)->L+9(B)\;(3\%) \end{array}$	
286	0.1492	$ \begin{array}{l} H-3(A) > L+8(A) \ (7\%), \ H-3(A) > L+12(A) \ (2\%), \ H-2(A) > L+9(A) \ (7\%), \ H-2(A) > L+13(A) \ (2\%), \ H-1(A) > L+8(A) \ (6\%), \ HOMO(A) > L+9(A) \ (6\%), \ H-3(B) > L+8(B) \ (7\%), \ H-3(B) > L+12(B) \ (3\%), \ H-2(B) > L+9(B) \ (7\%), \ H-2(B) > L+13(B) \ (2\%), \ H-1(B) > L+8(B) \ (7\%), \ HOMO(B) > L+9(B) \ (7\%) \end{array} $	

## Table S5. TD-DFT calculated lowest energy transitions for RuEr in the gas-phase.

<sup>a</sup>Calculated oscillator strength; only the transitions with  $f \ge to 0.01$  have been reported.



Figure S4. Overlaid normalized DR (dashed line) and PL (solid line) spectra of RuEr in the NIR.



**Figure S5**. Comparison of the Er(III)  ${}^{4}I_{13/2} \rightarrow {}^{4}I_{15/2}$  emission spectra normalized to unity of **RuEr** (red thick line) Er<sub>3</sub>Q<sub>9</sub> (green, Q = 8-quinolinolate), [ErCl(5,7ClQ)<sub>2</sub>(H5,7ClQ)<sub>2</sub>] (blue, H5,7ClQ = 5,7-dichloro-8-hydroxyquinoline) and [Er<sub>2</sub>(ClCNAn)<sub>3</sub>(DMSO)<sub>6</sub>]<sub>n</sub> (grey, ClCNAn = chlorocyananilate).

Compound	Integrated	FWHM	Center	Centroid	Ref.
-	area				
RuEr	58.06728	57.25791	1531	1535.916	This work
Er <sub>3</sub> Q <sub>9</sub>	68.69718	70.13864	1536.5	1534.973	35
[ErCl(5,7ClQ) <sub>2</sub> (H5,7ClQ) <sub>2</sub> ]	76.95706	79.06449	1531.5	1536.218	35
[Er <sub>2</sub> (ClCNAn) <sub>3</sub> (DMSO) <sub>6</sub> ] <sub>n</sub>	78.26956	72.77649	1520	1537.746	36

Table S6. Integration parameters for the normalized Er(III) emission spectra reported in Figure S5.