Supplementary Information for

Photosensitizing Metal Covalent Organic Framework with Fast Charge Transfer Dynamics for Efficient CO² Photoreduction

Wang-Kang Han,^{#a} Jiayu Li,^{#b} Ruo-Meng Zhu,^a Min Wei,^b Shu-Kun Xia,^a Jia-Xing Fu,^a Jinfang Zhang,^a Huan Pang,^c Ming-De Li^{*b} and Zhi-Guo Gu^{*a}

- [a] Key Laboratory of Synthetic and Biological Colloids, Ministry of Education, School of Chemical and Material Engineering Jiangnan University, Wuxi 214122, China
- [b] College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Key Laboratory for Preparation and Application of Ordered Structural Materials of Guangdong Province Shantou University, Shantou 515063, China
- [c] School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering Yangzhou University, Yangzhou 225002, China

Table of Contents

Section 1. Materials and methods

1.1 Materials

All commercially available starting compounds and solvents were purchased from commercial sources and used without further purification. The organic building units 4',4''',4''''',4'''''''-(ethene-1,1,2,2-tetrayl)tetrakis(([1,1'-biphenyl]-4-amine)) (ETTBA) were synthesized according to the reported procedures.[1]

1.2 General methods

Fourier transform infrared (FT-IR) spectra were collected on a Nicolet 6700 FT-IR spectrophotometer with ATR attachment. Solution ${}^{1}H$ and ${}^{13}C$ nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectra were recorded on AVANCE Ⅲ NMR instrument at 298 K using standard Bruker software. Solid-state ¹³C cross-polarization magic-angle spinning (CP-MAS) NMR experiments were performed on a Bruker Avance III HD spectrometer. Electrospray ionization mass spectrometry (ESI-MS) spectra were recorded using a Waters Quattro Premier XE. Elemental analysis was collected using an Elemantar Vario EL cube under CHN model. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) measurements were carried out on an AXIS Supra by Kratos Analytical Inc. using monochromatized Al Ka radiation (*hv* = 1486.6 eV) as X-ray source. All XPS spectra were calibrated by C1s signal at 284.8 eV. Thermogravimetric analyses (TGA) were carried out using TGA/1100SF thermo grabinetric analyzer. The $N₂$ sorption isotherms and pore-size distribution curves were measured at 77 K using Micromeritics ASAP 2460 equipment. The $CO₂$ isotherms were collected up on a Micromeritics 3Flex equipment at 273 K and 298 K, respectively. The morphology and microstructure of the products were characterized by using scanning electron microscopy (SEM, HitachiS-4800) and HAADF-STEM (FEI Tecnai G2 F20). Inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry (ICP-OES) measurements were carried out by using Agilent 5110. The samples were prepared via digestion by nitrohydrochloric acid, and then diluted using distilled water. Powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) patterns were collected on a D8 Advance X-ray diffractometer (Bruker AXS Germany) with Cu *Kα* radiation at room temperature. The steady-state emission experiments were performed on an Edinburgh FLSP920 spectrometer.

In situ diffuse reflectance infrared Fourier transform spectroscopy (DRIFTS) measurements were performed using a Nicolet iS50 spectrometer (Thermo, USA). Fouriertransform spectrometer equipped with a Harrick diffuse reflectance accessory at the Infrared Spectroscopy. The chamber was sealed with two ZnSe windows. First, the silicon crystal was polished. Briefly, an appropriate amount of 0.5 um alumina polishing powder was poured onto the polishing machine, and an appropriate amount of ultrapure water was added to make it evenly distributed, and rough polishing was performed at a rotational speed of about 300. Then, the above process was repeated and the polishing table was thoroughly cleaned before being polished with 0.05 um silicon oxide polishing powder to achieve a smooth finish. The polished silicon crystal was put into a 50 ml beaker and sequentially sonicated with ultrapure water and ethanol for 5 min and rinsed with ultrapure water to obtain the polished silicon crystal. The sample was prepared as follows: 5 mg of photocatalysts was dispersed in 225 uL of ethanol and 25 μL of Nafion by ultrasonication. Then, 30 uL of the resulting suspension was uniformly added dropwise to the silicon crystal and dried under an infrared lamp. Then, 5 mL of MeCN with 0.2 mL TEOA and 0.02 M of BIH were added. The reaction cell was filled with ultra-pure $CO₂$ gas and connected to the IR instrument. Finally, the light was turned on, and the in-situ DRIFTS data were collected. The spectrum at 0 min in light was recorded as a background.

The single-crystal X-ray data of Ru-bpm was collected on a Bruker APEX-II CCD diffractometer with graphite monochromatic Mo $K\alpha$ radiation ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å). The data was collected at 296 K. Using *Olex2*, [2] the crystal structures were solved with the *ShelXT*[3] structure solution program using Intrinsic Phasing and refined with the *ShelXL*[4] refinement package using Least Squares minimization. All of the non-hydrogen atoms except the anions were refined with anisotropic thermal displacement coefficients. Hydrogen atoms of organic ligands were located geometrically and refined in a riding model.

The fs-TA measurements were performed based on a femtosecond Ti: Sapphire regenerative amplifier laser system (Coherent, Astrella-Tunable-F-1k) and femtosecond transient absorption spectrometer system (Ultrafast Systems, Helios Fire). The laser probe pulse was produced with ~4% of the amplified 800 nm laser pulses to generate a white-light continuum (320-800 nm) in a CaF2 crystal and then this probe beam was split into two parts before traversing the sample. One probe laser beam with spot size $7.9 \times 10-9$ m² goes through the sample, while the other probe laser beam goes to the reference spectrometer to monitor the fluctuations in the probe beam intensity. The instrument response function was determined to be ca. 120 fs. At each temporal delay, data were averaged for 1 s and collected by the acquisition system. For the experiments described in this study, the sample solution was excited by a 350 nm pump beam with a power of 0.5 mW $(63.2 \mu J/cm^2)$ (from TOPAS). The sample solutions were excited in a 2 mm path-length cuvette with a stir bar. The data were stored as three-dimensional (3D) wavelength-time-absorbance matrices that were exported for use with the fitting software. Chirp correction was done for all the data shown here. The kinetics of all fs-TA spectra were fitted by single-wavelength fitting via Surface Xplorer software.

Section 2. General synthetic procedures and characterizations

2.1 Synthesis and characterizations of Ru-bpm

The synthesis of metal complex Ru-bpm was as follow: $Ru(bpy-CHO)_{2}Cl_{2}$ was synthesized according to our previous work.^[5] Typically, in a 50 mL round bottom flask, $Ru(bpy-CHO)_{2}Cl_{2}$ (596.4 mg, 1 mmol) and 2,2'-bipyrimidine (189.79 mg, 1.2 mmol) were suspended in 25 mL of ethylene glycol. The mixture was heated at 160 °C for 72 h with rapid stirring under Ar atmosphere and was then cooled to room temperature. Then, a saturate solution of $NH_4PF_6(aq)$ was added and the orange-red precipitate of the desired compound appeared quickly. The orange-red precipitate was filtered, washed with cold water and diethyl ether, then dried under vacuum. Yield: 68%. The orange-red crystal was obtained by slow diffusion of diethyl ether into the CH₃CN solution of Ru-bpm at room temperature. Notably, during the reaction, the aldehyde groups were protected by the ethylene glycol molecules to form the acetal product. This acetalization may be catalyzed by the ruthenium(III) trichloride.^[6] ¹H NMR (400 MHz, CD₃CN, δ : ppm) 9.14 (m, 2H), 8.57 (q, 4H), 8.20 (m, 4H), 8.05 (q, 2H), 7.84 (d, 2H), 7.63 (m, 4H), 5.72 (d, 4H), 3.96 (m, 16H). ¹³C NMR (101 MHz, CD3CN, δ: ppm) 163.72, 160.47, 158.93, 157.73, 150.90, 150.30, 139.60, 137.10, 125.30, 100.37, 66.03. ESI-MS, m/z Calcd. for C₄₀H₃₈F₁₂N₈O₈P₂Ru [M-PF₆]⁺ 1005.2, found: 1005.2; $[M-2PF₆]²⁺ 430.1, found 430.1.$

Figure S1. ¹H NMR spectrum of Ru-bpm.

Figure S2. ¹³C NMR spectrum of Ru-bpm.

Figure S3. ESI-MS spectrum of Ru-bpm. Insert: the observed and simulated +1 and +2 isotopic peak distributions, respectively.

Figure S4. Thermogravimetric analysis of Ru-bpm.

Figure S5. Powder X-ray diffraction of the as-synthesized sample and single-crystal simulation of Ru-bpm, confirming the phase purity of our sample.

2.2 X-ray single crystal structure of Ru-bpm

Single-crystal X-ray diffraction data reveals that Ru-bpm crystallizes in the triclinic *P*-1 space group. The Ru(II) centre is in a typical octahedral geometry. Each Ru(II) coordinate with two bipyridine derived ligands and one 2,2'-bipyrimidine ligand, forming an octahedral $RuN₆$ coordination geometry. Two PF₆ counter anions balance the charge. The single crystal structure clearly showed that the four aldehyde groups were protected by four ethylene glycol molecules, respectively, to form the acetal product. The remaining N coordination site in 2,2' bipyrimidine ligand can coordinate other metal ions, such as Re(I) in this work. The crystal structure proved that Ru-bpm can be used as a 4-connected building unit for constructing MCOFs. Final crystallographic data for Ru-bpm is listed in Table S1. CCDC: 2323722.

Figure S6. The single crystal X-ray structure for Ru-bpm (ORTEP, 30% ellipsoids). All H atoms and solvent molecules have been removed for clarity (C: Grey; N: blue; Ru: purple; O: red).

	Ru-bpm			
Formula	$C_{40}H_{38}F_{12}N_8O_8P_2Ru$			
Formula Weight	1149.79			
T(K)	296 K			
λ (Å)	0.71073			
Crystal system	triclinic			
Space group	$P-1$			
a(A)	13.1278(11)			
b(A)	13.7431(11)			
c(A)	14.5832(13)			
α (⁰)	86.847(3)			
β (⁰)	75.173(3)			
$\gamma(0)$	69.277(3)			
$V(\AA^3)$	2377.1(4)			
Z	$\overline{2}$			
$D_{\rm calc}\left({\rm g/cm^3}\right)$	1.606			
$M\mu$ (mm ⁻¹)	0.503			
F(000)	1160			
θ (⁰)	1.943 - 27.524			
	$-17 \le h \le 17$			
Index ranges	$-17 \le k \le 17$			
	$-18 \le l \le 13$			
Reflections collected	8288			
GOF (F^2)	1.024			
$R_1^a, wR_2^b(1>2\sigma(I))$	0.0665, 0.1814			
R_1^a ,w R_2^b (all data)	0.0871, 0.1998			
$ F_c \Sigma F_o .$ R_l^a Σ $F_{\rm o}$ $=$	$\left[\Sigma w (F_{o}^{2}$ $wR_2{}^b$ $=$	$- F_c^2^2 \Sigma w (F_o^2)]^{1/2}$		

Table S1 Summary of crystallographic data for Ru-bpm.

2.3 The model reaction

The metal complex building unit Ru-bpm (22.99 mg, 0.02 mmol) and aniline (7.45 mg, 0.08 mmol) were dissolved in a mixed solvent of 0.6 mL *o*-DCB, 0.4 mL *n*-BuOH, and 0.15 mL 6M aqueous acetic acid in a pyrex tube. Then, the pyrex tube was flash frozen in a liquid N² bath and degassed by freeze-pump-thaw technique for three times and sealed under vacuum. Upon warming to room temperature, the tube was placed in an oven and heated at 120 °C for 12 hours. After cooling to room temperature, orange solid was formed on the bottom of the pyrex tube, which was filtered and dissolved in $CH₃CN$ for the analysis of ESI-MS.

The ESI-MS spectrum showed ion peaks at $m/z = 1129.2$ and 492.1, corresponding to $+1$ and +2 ion peaks of the model compound, respectively (Figures S7 and S8). This result clearly confirmed that the Ru-bpm building unit is stable in the above solvothermal condition. Besides, the ESI-MS spectra also showed ion peaks of the corresponding intermediate products which were agreed very well with the simulated isotopic patterns, indicating the in situ sequential deprotection and imine condensation process in the reaction.

Figure S7. The ESI-MS spectra for the isolated product of the model reaction.

Figure S8. The observed and simulated isotopic peak distribution showing the corresponding $+1$ and $+2$ ion peaks.

2.4 Synthesis of MCOFs

The synthesis of MCOF-Ru: The MCOF-Ru was synthesized by solvothermal condensation reaction. In a pyrex tube, Ru-bpm (22.99 mg, 0.02 mmol) and ETTBA (13.94 mg, 0.02 mmol) were dissolved in a mixed solvent of 0.6 mL *o*-DCB, 0.4 mL *n*-BuOH, and 0.15 mL 6M aqueous acetic acid. The above mixture was sonicated for 10 min to get a homogeneous dispersion. Then, the pyrex tube was flash frozen in a liquid N_2 bath and degassed by freeze-pump-thaw technique for three times and sealed under vacuum. Upon warming to room temperature, the tube was placed in an oven and heated at 120 °C for 4 days. The precipitate was collected by filtration, washed with DMF (8×5 mL), extracted by Soxhlet extractor with THF for 24 hours, and finally dried at 90 °C under vacuum overnight to obtain brownish red crystalline powder. Yield: 76%. Elemental analysis of MCOF-Ru: Calcd. for $C_{328}H_{216}N_{48}Ru_4P_8F_{48}$: C, 61.62%; H, 3.41%; N, 10.51%. Found: C, 62.73%; H, 3.56%; N, 10.07%.

Figure S9. Illustration of the synthetic procedure for MCOF-Ru.

The synthesis of MCOF-Ru/Re: The MCOF-Ru/Re was synthesized through the post modification method. MCOF-Ru (100 mg) and $Re(CO)_{5}Cl$ (45 mg) were dispersed in 50 mL toluene, reflux 60 mins while stirring. After cooling to room temperature, the products were filtered and washed with methanol and diethyl ether. And finally dried at 60 °C under vacuum for 6 hours to obtain brownish red crystalline powder. Yield: 96%. The Re content in MCOF-Ru/Re was determined by ICP-OES to be 6.52 wt%, suggesting that about 56% of the reserved coordination sites on 2,2'-bipyrimidine ligands were converted to Re(I) sites.

Figure S10. Illustration of the synthetic procedure for MCOF-Ru/Re

2.5 FT-IR analysis

Figure S11. FT-IR spectra of Ru-bpm, ETTBA and MCOF-Ru.

Figure S12. FT-IR spectra of MCOF-Ru and MCOF-Ru/Re. As for MCOF-Ru/Re, two additional peaks arise at 2019 and 1886 cm⁻¹ can be observed, which can be attributed to the C≡O stretching vibration of the Re(I) moieties.

The as-synthesized materials were characterized by FT-IR. Compared with the building units, the -CH₂- (2890-2960 cm⁻¹) and -C-O-C- (1086 cm⁻¹) from Ru-bpm segment and N-H stretching vibration (3250-3450 cm-1) from ETTBA amine were disappeared for MCOF-Ru. Meanwhile, the characteristic C=N stretching vibration was appeared at around 1643 cm^{-1} . The FT-TR results indicated that the *in situ* deprotection and polymerization occurred with the formation of imine linkages.

2.6 Solid-state ¹³C NMR spectra

Figure S13. ¹³C solid-state NMR spectrum of MCOF-Ru.

Figure S14. ¹³C solid-state NMR spectrum of MCOF-Ru/Re.

The as-synthesized material was characterized by 13 C solid-state NMR spectra. The appearance of characteristic resonance peak of imine carbon (161.8 ppm for MCOF-Ru, 162.7 ppm for MCOF-Ru/Re) suggested the successful formation of imine linkage. Besides, the signals of benzene, bipyridine and bipyrimidine units appeared between 160 and 110 ppm.

2.7 Thermogravimetric analysis

Figure S15. TGA profiles of MCOFs showed that both of the two MCOFs was thermally stable up to about 320 °C.

2.8 N² adsorption-desorption measurement

Figure S16. N₂ adsorption/desorption isotherms with pore size distributions of (a) MCOF-Ru and (b) MCOF-Ru/Re.

The porous structures of the MCOFs were analyzed by N_2 adsorption-desorption measurements. The N_2 Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) surface areas of MCOF-Ru and MCOF-Re were calculated to be 328 and 175 m^2g^{-1} , respectively. The moderate N₂ adsorption is mainly attributed to the blockage of channels by the bulky PF_6 anions. Similar phenomena have been observed in other porous materials that the bulky anions or other guest molecules not only block the pore but also reduce the pore size. The NLDFT pore size distribution analysis showed that the pore size of about 1.82 and 1.46 nm for MCOF-Ru and MCOF-Ru/Re, respectively.

2.9 SEM, TEM and XPS analysis

Figure S17. SEM image of MCOF-Ru.

Figure S18. SEM image of MCOF-Ru/Re.

Figure S19. HRTEM image of MCOF-Ru. Insets: Fourier-filtered image of the selected region. The structural model of MCOF-Ru takes along the [001] direction. All H atoms have been removed for clarity (C: Grey; N: blue; Ru: purple). The HRTEM image with clear lattice fringes demonstrated the crystalline structure of the as-synthesized MCOF-Ru. The *d*-spacing value was 2.48 nm, which was close to the theoretical distance (2.28 nm) between Ru-to-Ru in our proposed structure taking along the [001] direction. The HRTEM result further confirmed the rationality of the simulated structure.

Figure S20. HRTEM image of MCOF-Ru/Re. Unfortunately, no lattice fringe was observed since the material was sensitive to electron beam.

Figure S21. XPS survey spectrum of MCOF-Ru.

Figure S22. The high-resolution XPS spectrum of MCOF-Ru for region Ru 3p.

Figure S23. XPS survey spectrum of MCOF-Ru/Re.

Figure S24. The high-resolution XPS spectrum of MCOF-Ru/Re for region Ru 3p.

Figure S25. The high-resolution XPS spectrum of MCOF-Ru/Re for region Re 4f.

The XPS was performed to explore the metal valence states in MCOFs. For MCOF-Ru, the high-resolution XPS spectrum showed the binding energy of the Ru element for $3p_{1/2}$ and $3p_{3/2}$ are at 484.9 and 462.7 eV, respectively, suggested the presence of Ru(II) species.^[7] Similarly, MCOF-Ru/Re also showed the binding energy at 485.0 and 462.9 eV for Ru $3p_{1/2}$ and Ru $3p_{3/2}$, respectively. Besides, in the XPS spectrum of Re 4f for MCOF-Ru/Re, the peaks at 44.6 and 42.1 eV are assigned to Re $4f_{5/2}$ and $4f_{7/2}$ levels of the coordinated Re(I) species, respectively.[8,9]

Figure S26. The elemental mapping images of MCOF-Ru.

Figure S27. The elemental mapping images of MCOF-Ru/Re.

Section 3. PXRD analysis and structural modeling of the MCOFs

3.1 Comparison of PXRD patterns for MCOFs and their related monomers

Figure S28. The comparison of experimental PXRD patterns for MCOF-Ru and its starting monomers, ETTBA and Ru-bpm. The MCOF-Ru showed distinct reflections with respect to both starting monomers.

3.2 Structural modeling of the MCOFs

Molecular modeling was conducted with the Materials Studio (ver. 8.0) program. Considering the geometry of the precursors and the connection patterns, we constructed models for each of the possible structures (*eg*. 2D **sql** net, and 3D **lvt**, **ssb** nets), and compared their simulated PXRD patterns with the experimental data. The vertex positions were obtained from Reticular Chemistry Structure Resource (RCSR) database for structural modeling.^[10] The structural models were geometrically optimized using MS Forcite molecular dynamics module method. Pawley refinement was carried out using Reflex software package. The Pawley refinements were performed to optimize the lattice parameters iteratively until the R_p and R_{wp} value converges and the overlay of the observed with refined profiles showed good agreement.

Figure S29. Simulated PXRD pattern and structure of MCOF-Ru with 2D **sql** topology. (a) experimental (red) and simulated PXRD patterns for AA (blue) and AB (green) stacking, respectively. The corresponding structure of (b) AA stacking and (c) AB stacking. AA stacking: space group *P*2, $a = 9.47 \text{ Å}$, $b = 35.47 \text{ Å}$, $c = 53.77 \text{ Å}$, $a = 90^{\circ}$, $\beta = 105.34^{\circ}$, $\gamma = 90^{\circ}$. AB stacking: space group *P*2, *a* = 15.66 Å, *b* = 32.98 Å, *c* = 54.94 Å, *α* = 90°, *β* = 107.86°, *γ* $= 90^\circ.$

Figure S30. Simulated PXRD pattern and structure of MCOF-Ru with **ssb** topology. (a) experimental (red) and simulated PXRD patterns (blue). (b) The corresponding structure of ssb net built from Ru(bpm)(PF₆)₂ and ETTBA. Space group *I*222, $a = b = c = 45.35$ Å, $\alpha = \beta$ $= \gamma = 90^{\circ}.$

Figure S31. (a) Experimental (red) and simulated PXRD patterns (blue) of MCOF-Ru with 2 fold interpenetrated **lvt** topology. (b) The corresponding structure. Space group *Pnc*2, *a* = 33.36 Å, *b* = 45.62 Å, *c* = 33.63 Å, *α* = *β* = *γ* =90°.

Section 4. Photocatalysis experiments

4.1 Calculation process of optical band gaps

The optical band gap energy (E_g) can be estimated by assuming direct transitions between valence and conduction bands with the following relation $[11,12]$

$$
(ahv)^2 = C (hv - E_g)
$$

where α is absorption coefficient, $h\nu$ is the incident photo energy, and C is a proportionality constant. Linear behavior exists in a certain range of Tauc plots ((*αhν*) ² versus *hv*), supporting the assumption of direct transitions for the two MCOFs. The optical band gap *E*^g can be obtained by extrapolating the linear portion of the plot relating (*αhν*) ² and *hν* to $(\alpha h v)^2 = 0.$

4.2 Photoelectrochemical measurement

Photoelectrochemical and electrochemical measurements including Mott-Schottky plots, photocurrent-time (I-t) profiles and electrochemical impedance spectra (EIS) were recorded on the CHI660E electrochemical workstation via a three-electrode system with the photocatalyst-coated ITO as the working electrode, Pt plate as the counter electrode and the Ag/AgCl electrode (saturated KCl) as the reference electrode. The working electrodes were prepared as follows: COF powder (5.0 mg) , $10.0 \mu L$ of Nafion (5 wt\%) , dispersed in water) and dry ethanol (0.5 mL) was ultrasonicated for 1 h to form a homogeneous suspension. Then, 200 μL suspension was dropped onto an ITO glass substrate and dried at room temperature. A 0.5 M Na₂SO₄ solution was used as the electrolyte. Irradiation conditions were the same as photocatalytic tests. The applied potentials vs. Ag/AgCl is converted to RHE potentials using the following equation:

 $E_{\text{RHE}} = E_{\text{Ag/AgCl}} + 0.0591 \text{pH} + E^{\theta}_{\text{Ag/AgCl}} (E^{\theta}_{\text{Ag/AgCl}} = 0.199 \text{ V})$

The curves of Mott-Schottky measurements showed positive slopes, corresponding to the n-type semiconductor character of the MCOFs. The flat band potential (E_{fb}) at -0.69 and -0.82 (V vs Ag/AgCl) for MCOF-Ru and MCOF-Ru/Re, respectively, which could be converted to -0.49 and -0.62 (V vs NHE). Accordingly, the conduction band (E_{CB}) of MCOF-Ru and MCOF-Ru/Re were estimated to be -0.59 and -0.72 (V vs NHE), respectively.

Figure S32. Mott-Schottky measurement of MCOF-Ru.

Figure S33. Mott-Schottky measurement of MCOF-Ru/Re.

Figure. S34 The heat of adsorption (Q_{st}) of CO_2 for (a) MCOF-Ru and (b) MCOF-Ru/Re.

4.4 Apparent quantum efficiency measurement

The apparent quantum efficiency (AQE) for photocatalytic $CO₂$ reduction was evaluated using monochromatic lights, where the Xe lamp was equipped with 420 nm band-pass filter. The average intensity of irradiation was measured by using an optical photodiode power meter (ILT 950 Spectroradiometer). The sample was irradiated for 1 hour and the photocatalytic products were collected to analyze the yield. The irradiation area was controlled as 7.06 cm² (3.14 \times 1.25² cm²). The number of incident photons (N_p) is calculated by the following equation:

$$
N_p = \frac{S \times P \times t \times \lambda}{h \times c}
$$

Then, the AQE is calculated by following the equation:

$$
AQE = \frac{2 \times N_e}{N_p} \times 100\% = \frac{2 \times M \times N_A \times h \times c}{S \times P \times t \times \lambda} \times 100\%
$$

Where, N_e is the number of generated electrons, N_p is the number of incident photons, M is the amount of CO (mol), N_A is Avogadro constant (6.022×10²³ mol⁻¹), *h* is the Planck constant (6.626×10⁻³⁴ J·s), *c* is the speed of light (3×10⁸ m s⁻¹), *S* is the irradiation area (cm²), *P* is the intensity of irradiation light (W cm⁻²), *t* is the photoreaction time (s), λ is the wavelength of the incident monochromatic light (m).

4.5 Photocatalytic CO² reduction

The photocatalytic performance was carried out in a 25 mL quartz reaction vessel with sealing components. Typically, 2.0 mg of photocatalyst, 0.4 mL TEOA and 0.02 M of BIH were suspended in 10 mL MeCN with sonication for 20 min to get a uniformly dispersed suspension. Then, the mixture was purged with high purity $CO₂$ for 20 min to remove air, ensuring that the final reactor was filled with $CO₂$. Subsequently, the suspension was irradiated under a 300 W Xe lamp (Perfect Light PLS-SXE 300) with a 420 nm cutoff filter to imitate visible light irradiation (420 nm $\leq \lambda \leq 780$ nm). The mixture was kept stirring during photocatalytic reaction. The temperature was maintained at 25 ºC using a condenser. After a certain period of irradiation, the gas products in the headspace (0.3 mL) of the reactor were detected by a gas chromatographer equipped with thermal conductivity detector (TCD) and flame ionization detector (FID). The carbon source for the isotope-labeling measurements was $13CO₂$ gas instead of $12CO₂$ gas. The gas product was identified by gas chromatography-mass spectrometry. For the blank experiments, control conditions were applied respectively on the basis of the above standard photocatalytic steps. The following control conditions were introduced, (1) Ar instead of CO_2 atmosphere, (2) No photocatalyst, (3) In dark condition, (4) physical mixture of MCOF-Ru and $Re(CO)_{5}Cl$. For the recyclability test, the catalysts were separated from the reaction mixtures by centrifugation and washed with DMF, water, and THF for several times. After dried at 90 °C in a vacuum oven, the catalysts were reused for the next run under the reaction conditions.

Figure S35. (a) The optimization of sacrificial agent within 1 h reaction (1 mg MCOF-Ru/Re in 10 mL MeCN with 0.4 mL of TEOA, 0.02 M of BIH, 0.4 mL of TEOA and 0.02 M of BIH, respectively). (b) The optimization of MCOF-Ru/Re photocatalyst amount within 1 h reaction (varying MCOF-Ru/Re concentrations in 10 mL MeCN with 0.4 mL of TEOA and 0.02 M of BIH).

Figure S36. The comparison of solvent system to the influence on CO selectivity in photocatalytic reaction (2 mg MCOF-Ru/Re in 10 mL solvent with 0.4 mL of TEOA and 0.02 M of BIH in 5 h reaction).

For the evaluation of photocatalytic $CO₂$ performance, the choose of sacrificial electron donor is very important. Specifically, the sacrificial electron donor triethanolamine (TEOA)

and 1,3-dimethyl-2-phenyl-2,3-dihydro-1H-benzo[d]imidazole (BIH) have been widely used in photocatalytic systems for $CO₂$ reduction. And the optimization of sacrificial agent for achieving better photocatalytic performance was carried out. The combination of TEOA and BIH in our catalytic system showed a significant improvement in the efficiency of photocatalyst for CO² reduction. As previously reported (*J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2016, 138, 13818-13821; J. Catal., 2013, 304, 22-28.*), the BIH firstly donated one-electron to the photocatalyst and formed the one-electron oxidized form of BIH⁺⁺. Then, the TEOA functioned as a base for deprotonation of BIH⁺⁺, forming the intermediate state of BI⁺, thereby suppressing the back electron transfer from the photocatalyst to BIH⁺⁺. Furthermore, the BI⁺ intermediate was reported to have strong reducing power and to further donate one-electron to photocatalyst. Therefore, the combination of these two different sacrificial reagents accelerates the photocatalytic $CO₂$ reduction.

Additionally, the optimization of the photocatalyst amount was undertaken. In our system, the most effective concentration for photocatalytic $CO₂$ reduction was determined to be 0.2 mg/mL. Beyond this concentration, an increase in the catalyst amount led to a decline in catalytic performance. One reason for this phenomenon is that a smaller amount of catalysts is usually better dispersed in the solution, leading to a greater affective surface area. Besides, this decrease could also be attributed to the heightened shading effect resulting from an excess of catalyst content.

The photocatalytic experiment in the presence of water was also carried out. Our results revealed that as the content of H_2O in the solvent system increased, the overall CO_2 photocatalytic activity decreased. This decrease can be attributed to the inherent low solubility of CO² in aqueous solution (*Chem. Soc. Rev., 2023, 52, 4343-4380; iScience, 2019, 19, 135-160*.). Besides, the CO selectivity showed a slight decrease from 97.7% (MeCN) to 95.2% (MeCN: $H_2O = 8:2$), further decreasing to 92.6% (MeCN: $H_2O = 2:8$). This decrease is likely due to water competing with $CO₂$ photoreduction.

Figure S37. A representative ¹H NMR spectrum of liquid phase generated from $CO₂$ reduction catalyzed by MCOF-Ru/Re. CD₃CN was used as internal references.

Figure S38. Mass spectrum of ¹³CO produced from the photocatalytic reduction of ¹³CO₂ atmosphere after 10 h photoirradiation.

Figure S39. The recyclability of photocatalytic CO₂RR for MCOF-Ru/Re.

Figure. S40 (a) IR spectra, (b) PXRD patterns and (c-d) SEM images of MCOF-Ru/Re before and after 5 photocatalytic runs.

4.6 Comparison of photocatalytic CO² reduction activity

Entry	Photocatalyst amount	Photosensitizer [Ru(bpy) ₃]Cl ₂ amount	Photocatalyst	Irradiation condition	CO $(umol g-1 h-1)$	Selectivity (%)	(b) CO $(umol g-1 h-1)$	AQE $(\%)$	Ref.
1	10 mg	60 mg	Co-TAPT-COF-2	λ > 420 nm	3500	42.5	500		
$\overline{2}$	10 mg	60 mg	Co-TAPT-COF-1	λ > 420 nm	8390	42.6	1198	0.006	13
\mathfrak{Z}	5 mg	10 mg	Fe SAS/Tr-COF	λ > 420 nm	980.3	96.4	327	$3.17(420 \text{ nm})$	14
4	5 _{mg}	10 mg	Tr-COF	λ > 420 nm	36.5	62.1	12	$0.54(420 \text{ nm})$	
5	1 mg	10 mg	TP-COF	λ > 420 nm	960	74.5	87		
6	1 _{mg}	10 mg	2,3-DHTA-COF	λ > 420 nm	760	76.7	69		15
τ	1 mg	10 mg	Co-2,3-DHTA-COF	λ > 420 nm	18000	95.7	1636	$0.47(450 \text{ nm})$	
8	20 mg	22.5 mg	DQTP COF-Co	λ > 420 nm	1020	90	480	$\sqrt{2}$	16
9(a)	1 mg	14.5 mg	Re-Bpy-sp2c-COF	λ > 420 nm	1400	86	90	$0.5(420 \text{ nm})$	17
10	10 mg	6.5 mg	Ni-TpBpy	λ > 420 nm	966	96	585	$0.3(420 \text{ nm})$	18
11	1 mg	4.3 mg	CoNi-COF-3	λ > 420 nm	2567	92.2	484	$2.95(450)$ nm)	19
12	2 _{mg}	10 mg	CoPor-DPP-COF	λ > 420 nm	10200	82	1700		20
13	2 _{mg}	10 mg	Co-PyPor-COF	λ > 420 nm	9645	96.7	1607.5		21
14	5 _{mg}	19 mg	COF-367-Co NSs	λ > 420 nm	10162	78	2117		22
$15^{(a)}$	$1 \, \text{mg}$	1.12 mg	Co-FPy-CON	λ > 420 nm	1681	76	793	$6.6(420 \text{ nm})$	23

Table S2. Comparison of CO production with that catalyzed by other MCOFs and COFs based photocatalysts.

16	5 mg	30 mg	H-COF-Ni	λ > 420 nm	2847	96	406	$0.9(420 \text{ nm})$	24	
17	5 mg	20 mg	Ni-PCD@TD-COF	λ > 420 nm	478	98	95.6	$0.31(420 \text{ nm})$	25	
18	2 mg	10 mg	ETTA-Bpy-COF-Co	λ > 420 nm	9398.14	92.73	1566	$0.99(420 \text{ nm})$	26	
19	5 mg	7 mg	Ni@TPHH-COF	λ > 420 nm	3250	95	1354	$3.96(420 \text{ nm})$	27	
20	20 mg		C_3N_4 (NH)/COF	λ > 400 nm	562	90	562		28	
21	5 mg		CdS@COF	λ > 420 nm	507	72	507	$0.21(420 \text{ nm})$	29	
22	0.9 mg		Re-COF	λ > 420 nm	750	98	750		30	
23	10 mg		LaNi-Phen/COF-5	λ > 380 nm	608	98.2	608			
24	10 mg		Ni-Phen/COF-5	λ > 380 nm	224.4	91.2	224.4	$\overline{1}$	31	
25	10 mg		La-Phen/COF-5	λ > 380 nm	195.4	95.9	195.4			
26	5 mg		pNJU-319Fe	λ > 420 nm	68.8	90	68.8			
27	5 mg		NJU-319Fe	λ > 420 nm	26.8	83	26.8		32	
28	10 mg		PI-COF-TT	λ >300 nm	483	93	483	$0.55(380 \text{ nm})$	33	
29	3 mg		1D PyTTACOF-Co	λ > 420 nm	125.4	71	125.4	$0.04(420 \text{ nm})$	34	
30	2 mg		MCOF-Ru/Re	λ > 420 nm	1840	97.7	1840	$1.16(420 \text{ nm})$	This	

(a) Ir[dF(CF₃)-ppy]₂(dtbpy))PF₆ was used as photosensitizer. (b) The amounts of photosensitizers were considered for the calculation of catalytic performance (i.e.,

 $g_{total} = g_{catalyst} + g_{photosensitizer}$).

TOF calculations

Turnover frequency (TOF) is defined as moles of produced product per mole of catalyst per h⁻¹. Herein, for the calculation of TOF, the catalyst amount is referred to the amount of Re(I) active site in MCOF-Ru/Re. For MCOF-Ru/Re, each unit cell contains four coordination sites for Re(I) on four 2,2'-bipyrimidine ligands. Taking into account that 56% of the available coordination sites on the 2,2'-bipyrimidine ligands were converted to Re(I) sites, the molecular formula of $[C_{328}H_{216}N_{48}Ru_4P_8F_{48}]$ $[Re(CO)_3Cl]_{2,24}$ was used.

 $TOF(h^{-1}) = \frac{moles\ of\ CO\ evolution}{(moles\ of\ active\ Re(I)\ sites)\times time\ (h)}$

Table S3. The comparison of TOF for CO evolution of the as-synthesized MCOF with other Ru-based and Ir-based system.

The TOF of MCOF-Ru/Re was estimated to be 5.81 h^{-1} . This value is comparable to that of some homogeneous molecular Ru/Re photocatalysts, such as RuBPY/ReDAC (7 h⁻¹), Ru-PSO₂P-Re (1.94 h⁻¹). Besides, our MCOF-Ru/Re showed a higher TOF compared to similar heterogeneous COF-based system, such as Re-Bpy-sp2c-COF (1.07 h^{-1}), $(Ir[dF(CF₃)ppy]₂(dtbpy))PF₆/Co-FPy-CON (4.68 h⁻¹).$

Figure. S41 The time-dependent photocatalytic CO_2 reduction in pure water condition.

Table S4. Comparison of photocatalytic CO₂ reduction in pure water condition with that by other COF-based photocatalysts.

Entry	Photocatalyst	Irradiation condition	CO (umol g^{-1} h ⁻¹)	Selectivity $(\%)$	Ref.	
1	TTCOF-Zn	λ > 420 nm	2.06	100	42	
$\overline{2}$	TAPBB-COF	λ > 200 nm	24.6	95.60	43	
3	CT-COF	λ > 420 nm	102.7	98		
$\overline{4}$	TFPB-COF	320-780	109.8		44	
5	BTE-TBD-COF	320-780	382.03			
6	Mo-COF	λ > 420 nm	6.19	57.10	45	
7	TCOF-MnMo6	λ > 400 nm	37.25	100	46	
8	λ > 420 nm viCOF-bpy-Re		190.6	100	47	
9	$COF-318-TiO2$	380-800	69.67		48	
10	MCOF-Ru/Re	λ > 420 nm	81.7	90.56	This work	

4.7 Charge separation and transfer dynamics

Figure. S42 The transient photocurrents responses for the MCOFs.

Figure. S43 The Nyquist plots for the MCOFs

Figure. S44 Fs-TA spectra of MCOF-Ru in glycol, $\lambda_{ex} = 350$ nm.

Figure. S45 UV-Vis spectra of MCOFs in glycol.

Figure. S46 Fs-TA spectra of MCOF-Ru/Re in glycol, $\lambda_{ex} = 350$ nm.

Figure. S47 Evolution-association dynamics spectra, Temporal concentrations of corresponding species and kinetics fitting of (a-c) MCOF-Ru with four lifetimes 0.34, 6.74, 451, and 3.48×105 ps, and (d-f) MCOF-Ru/Re with four lifetimes 0.47, 10.6, 568, and 1.69×105 ps.

4.8 Density functional theory (DFT) calculations

Density functional theory (DFT) computations was performed to further investigate the mechanism of photocatalytic reaction. Geometry optimizations and frequency calculations were conducted using the hybrid B3LYP exchange-correlation functional. The 6-31G(d) basis set for C, H, O, N and Cl atoms and LANL2DZ basis set for Ru and Re metal atoms were adopted. All calculations were carried out using Gaussian 09 software package.[48] The calculated model was constructed by first cutting a representing part from the simulated MCOFs structure, then the dangling bonds were saturated by hydrogens. The structures were fully optimized, following by the frequency calculation at the same level. The final electronic energies were further improved by single point calculations with an extended $6-31++G(d,p)$ basis set for the nonmetal atoms. Solvation effects were included by using SMD solvation model with acetonitrile as the solvent. Spin density surfaces of T1 states were generated by using Multiwfn and VMD programs.^[49] Additionally, for our MCOF, the reaction center was Re unit. Therefore, in order to accelerate the computations, the Re part was used to study the $CO₂RR$ towards CO , which, generally, was assumed to proceed through the following steps:

Step I: $* + CO_2 \rightarrow *CO_2$ Step II: $^*CO_2 + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow ^*COOH$ Step III: *COOH + H^+ + $e^ \rightarrow$ *CO + H_2O Step IV: $^*CO \rightarrow ^* + CO$, or $^*CO + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow ^*CHO$

Where $*$ represents the possible active site on computational model. The thermodynamic feasibility was evaluated by calculating the Gibbs free energy changes. And the associated free energies of species were calculated by the following expression:

$$
G=E+ZPE-TS
$$

Where *E* represents the total energy from DFT calculations. *ZPE* and *TS* are the correction from zero-point energy and entropic contributions, respectively. Besides, the free energy of $[H^+ + e^-]$ pair is approximately regarded as $1/2H_2$ in the calculation. Finally, the free energy change is described by the following expression:

$$
\Delta G_I = G_{*CO2} - G_{*} - G_{CO2} \qquad \Delta G_{II} = G_{*COOH} - G_{*CO2} - 0.5 G_{H2}
$$
\n
$$
\Delta G_{III} = G_{*CO} + G_{H2O} - G_{*COOH} - 0.5 G_{H2}
$$
\n
$$
\Delta G_{IV} = G_{*} + G_{CO} - G_{*CO}
$$
, or
$$
\Delta G_{IV} = G_{*CHO} - G_{*CO} - 0.5 G_{H2}
$$

Figure S48. The DFT optimized structures for intermediate species.

4.9 Natural sunlight-driven CO² reduction

Figure S49. Experimental device and environment for natural sunlight-driven CO₂ reduction.

The natural sunlight-driven CO_2 reduction was carried out on the basis of the above standard photocatalytic steps. The quartz reaction vessel was placed outdoors of the campus at Jiangnan University. The photocatalytic reaction per day (from 9:00 am to 15:00 pm on Dec. $4th$ to Dec. $8th$ in 2023) was conducted for 5 consecutive days.

Section 5. Unit cell parameters and fractional atomic coordinates

Table S5. Unit cell parameters and fractional atomic coordinates for MCOF-Ru with **lvt** topology.

Table S6. Unit cell parameters and fractional atomic coordinates for MCOF-Ru/Re with **lvt** topology.

 $\overline{}$

Section 6. References

(1) Liu, Y.; Diercks, C. S.; Ma, Y.; Lyu, H.; Zhu, C.; Alshmimri, S. A.; Alshihri, S.; Yaghi, O. M., *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. 2019, **141**, 677-683.

(2) Dolomanov. O. V., Bourhis. L. J., Gildea. R. J., Howard. J. A. K., Puschmann. H., *J. Appl. Cryst*. 2009, **42**, 339-341.

(3) Sheldrick. G. M., 2015, **A71**, 3-8.

(4) Sheldrick. G. M., *Acta Cryst.* 2015, **C71**, 3-8.

(5) Han, W. K.; Liu, Y.; Feng, J. D.; Yan, X.; Pang, H.; Gu, Z. G., *Chem. Sci*. 2023, **14**, 11768-11774.

(6) Qi, J.-Y.; Ji, J.-X.; Yueng, C.-H.; Kwong, H.-L.; Chan, A. S. C., *Tetrahedron Lett*. 2004, **45**, 7719- 7721.

(7) Han, W. K.; Liu, Y.; Yan, X.; Jiang, Y.; Zhang, J.; Gu, Z. G., *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed*. 2022, **61**, e202208791.

(8) Johnson, E. M.; Haiges, R.; Marinescu, S. C., *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces* 2018, **10**, 37919-37927.

(9) Song, D.; Xu, W.; Li, J.; Zhao, J.; Shi, Q.; Li, F.; Sun, X.; Wang, N., *Chinese Journal of Catalysis* 2022, **43**, 2425-2433.

(10) http://rcsr.anu.edu.au/nets.

(11) Tauc, J.; Grigorovici, R.; Vancu, A., *physica status solidi (b)* 1966, **15**, 627-637.

(12) Yang, Y.; Liu, Z.; Ng, W. K.; Zhang, L.; Zhang, H.; Meng, X.; Bai, Y.; Xiao, S.; Zhang, T.; Hu, C.; Wong, K. S.; Yang, S., *Adv. Funct. Mater*. 2018, **29**, 1806506.

(13) Zhou, W.; Wang, X.; Zhao, W.; Lu, N.; Cong, D.; Li, Z.; Han, P.; Ren, G.; Sun, L.; Liu, C.; Deng, W. Q., *Nat. Commun*. 2023, **14**, 6971.

(14) Ran, L.; Li, Z.; Ran, B.; Cao, J.; Zhao, Y.; Shao, T.; Song, Y.; Leung, M. K. H.; Sun, L.; Hou, J., *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. 2022, **144**, 17097-17109.

(15) Zhang, Q.; Gao, S.; Guo, Y.; Wang, H.; Wei, J.; Su, X.; Zhang, H.; Liu, Z.; Wang, J., *Nat. Commun*. 2023, **14**, 1147.

(16) Lu, M.; Li, Q.; Liu, J.; Zhang, F. M.; Zhang, L.; Wang, J. L.; Kang, Z. H.; Lan, Y. Q., *Appl. Catal. B Environ* 2019, **254**, 624-633.

(17) Fu, Z.; Wang, X.; Gardner, A. M.; Wang, X.; Chong, S. Y.; Neri, G.; Cowan, A. J.; Liu, L.; Li, X.; Vogel, A.; Clowes, R.; Bilton, M.; Chen, L.; Sprick, R. S.; Cooper, A. I., *Chem. Sci*. 2020, **11**, 543- 550.

(18) Zhong, W.; Sa, R.; Li, L.; He, Y.; Li, L.; Bi, J.; Zhuang, Z.; Yu, Y.; Zou, Z., *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. 2019, **141**, 7615-7621.

(19) Wang, J.; Zhu, W.; Meng, F.; Bai, G.; Zhang, Q.; Lan, X., *Acs. Catal*. 2023, **13**, 4316-4329.

(20) Wang, X.; Ding, X.; Wang, T.; Wang, K.; Jin, Y.; Han, Y.; Zhang, P.; Li, N.; Wang, H.; Jiang, J., *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces* 2022, **14**, 41122-41130.

(21) Luan, T. X.; Wang, J. R.; Li, K.; Li, H.; Nan, F.; Yu, W. W.; Li, P. Z., *Small* 2023, **19**, 2303324.

(22) Liu, W.; Li, X.; Wang, C.; Pan, H.; Liu, W.; Wang, K.; Zeng, Q.; Wang, R.; Jiang, J., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2019, **141**, 17431-17440.

(23) Wang, X.; Fu, Z.; Zheng, L.; Zhao, C.; Wang, X.; Chong, S. Y.; McBride, F.; Raval, R.; Bilton, M.; Liu, L.; Wu, X.; Chen, L.; Sprick, R. S.; Cooper, A. I., *Chem. Mater*. 2020, **32**, 9107-9114.

(24) Yang, S.; Sa, R.; Zhong, H.; Lv, H.; Yuan, D.; Wang, R., *Adv. Funct. Mater.* 2022, **32**, 2110694.

(25) Zhong, H.; Sa, R.; Lv, H.; Yang, S.; Yuan, D.; Wang, X.; Wang, R., *Adv. Funct. Mater*. 2020, **30**, 2002654.

(26) Wang, Y.; Sun, T.; Zheng, T.; Ding, X.; Zhang, P.; Xu, Q.; Li, T.; Zhang, S.; Wang, K.; Xu, L.; Jiang, J., *ACS Materials Lett*. 2024, **6**, 140-152.

(27) Dong, M.; Zhou, J.; Zhong, J.; Li, H. T.; Sun, C. Y.; Han, Y. D.; Kou, J. N.; Kang, Z. H.; Wang, X. L.; Su, Z. M., *Adv. Funct. Mater*. 2022, **32**, 2110136.

(28) Wang, J.; Yu, Y.; Cui, J.; Li, X.; Zhang, Y.; Wang, C.; Yu, X.; Ye, J., *Appl. Catal. B Environ*. 2022, **301**, 120814.

(29) Zou, L.; Sa, R.; Zhong, H.; Lv, H.; Wang, X.; Wang, R., *Acs. Catal.* 2022, **12**, 3550-3557.

(30) Yang, S.; Hu, W.; Zhang, X.; He, P.; Pattengale, B.; Liu, C.; Cendejas, M.; Hermans, I.; Zhang, X.; Zhang, J.; Huang, J., *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. 2018, **140**, 14614-14618.

(31) Zhou, M.; Wang, Z.; Mei, A.; Yang, Z.; Chen, W.; Ou, S.; Wang, S.; Chen, K.; Reiss, P.; Qi, K.; Ma, J.; Liu, Y., *Nat. Commun*. 2023, **14**, 2473.

(32) Dong, P.; Xu, X.; Luo, R.; Yuan, S.; Zhou, J.; Lei, J., *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2023, **145**, 15473-15481.

(33) Chen, X.; Dang, Q.; Sa, R.; Li, L.; Li, L.; Bi, J.; Zhang, Z.; Long, J.; Yu, Y.; Zou, Z., *Chem. Sci*. 2020, **11**, 6915-6922.

(34) Zou, L.; Chen, Z. A.; Si, D. H.; Yang, S. L.; Gao, W. Q.; Wang, K.; Huang, Y. B.; Cao, R., *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed*. 2023, **62**, e202309820.

(35) K. Kamogawa, A. Santoro, A. M. Cancelliere, Y. Shimoda, K. Miyata, K. Onda, F. Puntoriero, S. Campagna, Y. Tamaki and O. Ishitani, *ACS. Catal*., 2023, **13**, 9025-9032.

(36) D. Saito, Y. Yamazaki, Y. Tamaki and O. Ishitani, *J. Am. Chem. Soc*. 2020, **142**, 19249-19258.

(37) P. L. Cheung, S. C. Kapper, T. Zeng, M. E. Thompson and C. P. Kubiak, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2019, **141**, 14961-14965.

(38) C. M. Brown, T. Auvray, E. E. DeLuca, M. B. Ezhova, G. S. Hanan and M. O. Wolf, *Chem. Commun*., 2020, **56**, 10750-10753.

(39) S. Y. Takizawa, T. Okuyama, S. Yamazaki, K. I. Sato, H. Masai, T. Iwai, S. Murata and J. Terao, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2023, **145**, 15049-15053.

(40) X. Wang, Z. Fu, L. Zheng, C. Zhao, X. Wang, S. Y. Chong, F. McBride, R. Raval, M. Bilton, L. Liu, X. Wu, L. Chen, R. S. Sprick and A. I. Cooper, *Chem. Mater*. 2020, **32**, 9107-9114.

(41) Z. Fu, X. Wang, A. M. Gardner, X. Wang, S. Y. Chong, G. Neri, A. J. Cowan, L. Liu, X. Li, A. Vogel, R. Clowes, M. Bilton, L. Chen, R. S. Sprick and A. I. Cooper, *Chem. Sci*., 2020, **11**, 543-550.

(42) M. Lu, J. Liu, Q. Li, M. Zhang, M. Liu, J. L. Wang, D. Q. Yuan and Y. Q. Lan, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2019, **58**, 12392-12397.

(43) K. Lei, D. Wang, L. Ye, M. Kou, Y. Deng, Z. Ma, L. Wang and Y. Kong, *ChemSusChem*, 2020, **13**, 1725-1729.

(44) L. Yang, W. Yan, N. Yang, G. Wang, Y. Bi, C. Tian, H. Liu and X. Zhu, *Small*, 2023, **19**, e2208118.

(45) M. Kou, W. Liu, Y. Wang, J. Huang, Y. Chen, Y. Zhou, Y. Chen, M. Ma, K. Lei, H. Xie, P. K. Wong and L. Ye, *Appl. Catal. B Environ*., 2021, **291**, 120146.

(46) M. Lu, M. Zhang, J. Liu, T. Y. Yu, J. N. Chang, L. J. Shang, S. L. Li and Y. Q. Lan, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2022, **144**, 1861-1871.

(47) Y. Z. Cheng, W. Ji, P. Y. Hao, X. H. Qi, X. Wu, X. M. Dou, X. Y. Bian, D. Jiang, F. T. Li, X. F. Liu, D. H. Yang, X. Ding and B. H. Han, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed*., 2023, **62**, e202308523.

(48) M. Zhang, M. Lu, Z. L. Lang, J. Liu, M. Liu, J. N. Chang, L. Y. Li, L. J. Shang, M. Wang, S. L. Li and Y. Q. Lan, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2020, **59**, 6500-6506.

(48) Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Scalmani, G.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Petersson, G. A.; Nakatsuji, H.; Caricato, M.; Li, X.; Hratchian, H. P.; Izmaylov, A. F.; Bloino, J.; Zheng, G.; Sonnenberg, J. L.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Vreven, T.; Montgomery, Jr. J. A.; Peralta, J. E.; Ogliaro, F.; Bearpark, M.; Heyd, J. J.; Brothers, E.; Kudin, K. N.; Staroverov, V. N.; Kobayashi, R.; Normand, J.; Raghavachari, K.; Rendell, A.; Burant, J. C.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Cossi, M.; Rega, N.; M. Millam, J.; Klene, M.; Knox, J. E.; Cross, J. B.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, A. J.; Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, J.; Martin, R. L.; Morokuma, K.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, A. D.; Farkas, O.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.; Cioslowski, J. and J. Fox, D.; Gaussian 09 (Revision E.01), *Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford, CT*, 2013.

(49) Lu, T.; and Chen, F. W.; Multiwfn: A Multifunctional Wavefunction Analyzer. *J. Comp. Chem*., 2012, **33**, 580.