Tetracarbonatodiruthenium Fragments and Lanthanide(III) Ions as Building Blocks to Construct 2D Coordination Polymers

Daniel Gutiérrez-Martín¹, Miguel Cortijo¹, Álvaro Martín-Humanes¹, Rodrigo González-Prieto¹, Patricia Delgado-Martínez², Santiago Herrero^{1,*}, José L. Priego^{1,*}, and Reyes Jiménez-Aparicio^{1,*}

- ¹ Departamento de Química Inorgánica, Facultad de Ciencias Químicas, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Ciudad Universitaria, E-28040 Madrid, Spain.
- ² Centro de Asistencia a la Investigación Difracción de Rayos X, Facultad de Ciencias Químicas, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, E-28040 Madrid, Spain.
- * Correspondence: <u>sherrero@ucm.es</u> (S. H.); <u>bermejo@ucm.es</u> (J.L.P.); <u>reyesja@ucm.es</u> (R.J.-A.); Tel.: +34-913-94-5232 (S. H.); +34-913-94-4344 (J.L.P.); +34-913-94-4334 (R.J.-A.)

Received: date; Accepted: date; Published: date



Figure S1. IR spectrum of Prα.



Figure S2. IR spectra of $Sm\beta$ and $Gd\beta$.



Figure S3. View of the structure of **Sm3D** showing the different coordination environments. Ruthenium: turquoise; samarium: pale green; oxygen: red; carbon: gray; hydrogen: white. Ellipsoids are omitted for clarity.



Figure S4. View along the *b* axis of a 1x1x1 packing of the structure of **Sm3D**.



Figure S5. View along the *c* axis of a 1x1x1 packing of the structure of Sm3D.



Figure S6. Experimental powder X-ray diffraction pattern obtained for **Pr3D** (red) and calculated powder X-ray diffractogram simulated from the single crystal data of **Sm3D** (black).



Figure S7. (Top): Simplification of the 2D net of **Prα**. (Bottom): Simplification of the 3D net of [Ln(OH₂)₄][Ru₂(CO₃)₄(OH₂)]·xH₂O (Ln = Nd, Eu, Gd, Yb), [1] **Pr3D** and **Sm3D**. Turquoise and black: Ru₂⁵⁺ units. Pale green: Ln³⁺·units.



Figure S8: Thermogram of Prα.

[1] Delgado-Martínez, P.; González-Prieto, R.; Herrero, S.; Jiménez-Aparicio, R.; Perles, J.; Priego, J.L.; Torres, M.R.; Sufrate, B. Preparation of Crystalline Phases of 3D Coordination Polymers Based on Tetracarbonatodiruthenium Units and Lanthanide(III) Ions – Magnetic Characterization. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2017**, 3161–3168. DOI:10.1002/ejic.201700281.



Figure S9: Thermogram of Smβ.



Figure S10: Thermogram of **Gdβ**.



Figure S11. Magnetization versus magnetic field between -5 T to 5 T for Smβ.



Figure S12. Magnetization versus magnetic field between -5 T to 5 T for $Gd\beta$.



Figure S13: Temperature dependence of the molar susceptibility χ_M (circles) and $\chi_M T$ (squares) for $Gd\beta$. Solid lines are the best fit to the model indicated in the text.



Figure S14. Temperature dependence of the molar susceptibility χ_M (circles) and $\chi_M T$ (squares) for **Gd\beta**. Solid lines are the fit to the model indicated in the text with a fixed *D* value of 70 cm⁻¹.



Figure S15: Temperature dependence of the molar susceptibility χ_M (circles) and $\chi_M T$ (squares) for Sm β . Solid lines are the best fit to the model indicated in the text.



Figure S16: Temperature dependence of the molar susceptibility χ_M (circles) and $\chi_M T$ (squares) for Pr3D. Solid lines are the best fit to the model indicated in the text.



Figure S17: Temperature dependence of the molar susceptibility χ_M (circles) and $\chi_M T$ (squares) for Pra.Solid lines are the best fit to the model indicated in the text.



Figure S18: Temperature dependence of the molar susceptibility χ_M (circles) and $\chi_M T$ (squares) for Pr3D. Solid lines are the best fit to the model indicated in the text.