Solvent-free synthesis of magnesium phosphite-oxalates showing

second-harmonic generation responses

Lisiteng Luo,^{a,b} Xuemei Wen,^a Juan Cheng,^a Jing Li,^{*a} Hongmei Zeng,^a Guohong Zou^a and Zhien Lin^{*a}

^a College of Chemistry, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, P. R. China.

^b Department of Forensic Pathology, West China School of Basic Medical Sciences & Forensic Medicine, Sichuan University, Chengdu, 610041, P. R. China.

* To whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel: +86-28-85412284. E-mail: jingli@scu.edu.cn, zhienlin@scu.edu.cn.

Synthesis

 $Mg(OAc)_2 \cdot 4H_2O$ (99%, Aladdin), ethylenediamine (98%, Aladdin), N,N,N',N'tetramethyl-1,3-propanediamine (97%, Aladdin), H₃PO₃ (99%, MACKLIN), $H_2C_2O_4 \cdot 2H_2O$ (\geq 99.5%, Aladdin) were commercially available and used without further processing.

Synthesis of $C_2H_{10}N_2 \cdot Mg(H_2PO_3)_2(C_2O_4)$ (1): A mixture of $Mg(OAc)_2 \cdot 4H_2O$ (0.428 g), H_3PO_3 (0.410 g), ethylenediamine (200 µL), and $H_2C_2O_4 \cdot 2H_2O$ (0.252 g) was sealed in a 25 mL Teflon-lined steel autoclave and heated at 130 °C for 3 days, and then cooled slowly to room temperature at a rate of 6 °C h⁻¹. The solid products consist of colourless block crystals of compound 1 and some unknown powder. Colourless block crystals of compound 1 were separated from the resulting products by sonication, washed with distilled water, and then dried in air (60% yield based on magnesium).

Synthesis of $C_7H_{20}N_2 \cdot Mg_2(H_2PO_3)_2(C_2O_4)_2 \cdot H_2O$ (2): A mixture of $Mg(OAc)_2 \cdot 4H_2O$ (0.428 g), H_3PO_3 (0.328 g), N,N,N',N'-tetramethyl-1,3-propanediamine (335 µL), and $H_2C_2O_4 \cdot 2H_2O$ (0.504 g) was sealed in a 25 mL Teflon-lined steel autoclave and heated at 150 °C for 7 days, and then cooled slowly to room temperature at a rate of 6 °C h⁻¹. The solid products consist of colourless block crystals of compound **2** and some unknown powder. Colourless block crystals of compound **2** were separated from the resulting products by sonication, washed with distilled water, and then dried in air (41% yield based on magnesium).

Single crystal X-ray diffraction

Single crystal X-ray diffraction data were collected on a on a New Gemini, Dual, Cu at zero, EosS2 diffractometer at room temperature. The structures were refined on F^2 by full-matrix least-squares methods using the *SHELXTL* program package.^{1,2}

Powder X-ray diffraction

Powder X-ray diffraction data were obtained using a Shimazu XRD-6100 diffractometer with Cu-K α radiation ($\lambda = 1.5418$ Å), in the angular range of $2\theta = 5-50^{\circ}$ (step width: 0.02°).

Thermogravimetric analysis

The thermogravimetric analyses of compounds **1** and **2** were performed on a Netzsch STA 409 PC thermal analyzer, with a heating rate of 10 °C /min and in the range of RT-800 °C at N_2 atmosphere.

IR spectroscopy

IR spectra of compounds **1** and **2** were obtained on a Nicolet Impact 410 FTIR spectrometer by using KBr pellets, with transmission mode from 4000 to 400 cm⁻¹.

UV-vis diffuse reflectance spectroscopy

UV-vis diffuse reflectance spectra of compounds **1** and **2** were recorded by using Shimadzu UV-2600 UV-vis spectrophotometer at room temperature. The Kubelka-Munk function is used to calculate the absorption spectrum from the reflection spectrum: $F(R) = \alpha/S = (1-R)^2/2R$, where R is the reflectance, α is the absorption coefficient, and S is the scattering coefficient.^{3, 4}

Second-harmonic generation tests

A Q-switched Nd: YAG lasers was used to measure the SHG signals of compound 1, compound 2, and KDP under 1064 nm radiation based on Kurtz-Perry method.⁵ Crystalline compounds 1 and 2 and KDP were ground and sieved into the following particle size: 25-45, 45-58, 58-75, 75-106, 106-150, and 150-212 μ m owing to that the SHG efficiency mainly depends on the particle size.

Computational descriptions

The first-principles calculations were carried out on compounds 1 and 2 by using the CASTEP.⁶ The gradient-corrected functional (GGA) with Perdew-Burke-Ernzer (PBE) was used for all the calculations.⁷ All the atoms were performed by Norm-conserving pseudopotentials (NCP), with H 1s, C $2s^22p^2$, N $2s^22p^3$, O $2s^22p^4$, P $3s^23p^3$, Mg $3s^2$ treated as valence electrons.⁸ The kinetic energy cutoff of 900 eV and the k-point sampling of $2 \times 1 \times 3$ were chosen for compound 1 and the k-point sampling of $1 \times 1 \times 3$ were chosen for compound 2.⁹ All other parameter settings are CASTEP default values.



Fig. S1 ORTEP plot of the asymmetric unit of compound 1, showing the labeling scheme and the 50% probability displacement ellipsoids.



Fig. S2 ORTEP plot of the asymmetric unit of compound **2**, showing the labeling scheme and the 50% probability displacement ellipsoids.



Fig. S3 Experimental and simulated XRD patterns for compound 1 (a) and compound 2 (b).



Fig. S4 TGA analysis of compound 1 under N₂ atmosphere.



Fig. S5 TGA analysis of compound 2 under N_2 atmosphere.



Fig. S6 The IR spectrum of compound 1.



Fig. S7 The IR spectrum of compound 2.



Fig. S8 SHG intensity versus particle size at 1064 nm for compound 1.



Fig. S9 SHG intensity versus particle size at 1064 nm for compound 2.



Fig. S10 Electron-density difference map of compound 1.



Fig. S11 Electron-density difference map of compound 2.



Fig. S12 Calculated refractive indexes for compound 1.



Fig. S13 Calculated refractive indexes for compound 2.

References

- 1. G. M. Sheldrick, Acta Cryst. 2015, A71, 3.
- 2. G. M. Sheldrick, Acta Cryst. 2015, C71, 3.
- 3. P. Kubelka and F. Z. Munk, Tech. Phys., 1931, 12, 593.
- 4. J. Tauc, Mater. Res. Bull., 1970, 5, 721.
- 5. S. K. Kurtz and T. T. Perry, J. Appl. Phys., 1968, **39**, 3798.
- 6. M. D. Segall, P. J. D. Lindan, M. J. Probert, C. J. Pickard, P. J. Hasnip, S. J. Clark and M. C. Payne, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter.*, 2002, **14**, 2717.
- 7. J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett., 1996, 77, 3865.
- 8. K. Kobayashi, Comput. Mater. Sci., 1999, 14, 72.
- 9. D. Vanderbilt, Phys. Rev. B, 1990, 41, 7892.