# The Structural and Catalytic Regulation in a Rigid Zr-MOF Through Linker Installation

Jinyi Huang‡<sup>a</sup>, Fugang Li‡<sup>a</sup>, Yuxuan Meng<sup>a</sup>, Xi Lin<sup>a</sup>, Suijun Liu<sup>d</sup>, Liangliang Zhang<sup>\*,a,b,c,d</sup> and Yu Fang<sup>\*,e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Strait Institute of Flexible Electronics (SIFE, Future Technologies), Fujian Normal University and Strait Laboratory of Flexible Electronics (SLoFE), Fuzhou 350017, China

<sup>b</sup> State Key Laboratory of Structural Chemistry, Fujian Institute of Research on the Structure of Matter, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Fuzhou 350002, China

<sup>c</sup> Frontiers Science Center for Flexible Electronics (FSCFE), MIIT Key Laboratory of Flexible Electronics (KLoFE), Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an 710072, China

<sup>d</sup> Jiangxi Provincial Key Laboratory of Functional Crystalline Materials Chemistry, Jiangxi University of Science and Technology, Ganzhou 341000, Jiangxi Province, P.R. China.

<sup>e</sup> State Key Laboratory of Chemo/Bio-Sensing and Chemometrics, College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Hunan University, Changsha, Hunan, 410082, China.

E-mail:ifellzhang@fjnu.edu.cn; yu.fang@hnu.edu.cn

*‡* These authors contributed equally to this work

\* Corresponding author

# **Supplementary Information**

# **Table of Contents**

- 1. Materials and Instrumentation
- 2. <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum and Crystallographic data
- 3. MOFs Characterizations
- 4. Catalytic Reaction

## 5. Additional Tables

#### 1. Materials and Instrumentation

All reagents and solvents utilized in the synthesis studies were commercially available and used without any further purification. <sup>1</sup>H NMR analyses were conducted on a Bruker AVIII-400 instrument. Each MOF sample, weighing 5 mg, was subjected to digestion with 30 µl of deuterated sulfuric acid (D<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>) solution. Following sonication, the solution was further diluted by adding 500 µL of deuterated dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO). Optical images of the crystals were captured using an OLYMPUS CKX53 microscope. Powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) patterns were obtained using a PANalytical B.V. X-ray diffractometer (X'Pert Pro) equipped with Cu  $K\alpha$  ( $\lambda$ =1.5406 Å). N<sub>2</sub> adsorption isotherms were measured at 77 K using an ASAP-2020 instrument. Prior to the nitrogen adsorption/desorption measurements, the synthesized samples were immersed in dichloromethane and then dried under vacuum at 100 °C. Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) was performed under a nitrogen atmosphere using a TA Q50 thermal analyzer with a heating rate of 10 °C min<sup>-1</sup> in the temperature range of 30-700 °C. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) data were recorded by Nexsa. The morphology and elemental distribution of the crystals were examined using field emission scanning electron microscopy by Quanta FEG 250.

### 2. <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum and Crystallographic data



Fig. S1. The synthesis scheme of H<sub>4</sub>TCDB-Me<sub>2</sub>.



**Fig. S2.** The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of 1,2,4,5-tetrakis(4-methoxycarbonylphenyl) -3,6-dimethylbenzene in CDCl<sub>3</sub>.



**Fig. S3.** The <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectrum of 1,2,4,5-tetrakis(4-methoxycarbonylphenyl) -3,6-dimethylbenzene in CDCl<sub>3</sub>.



**Fig. S4.** The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of  $H_4TCDB-Me_2$  in DMSO- $d_6$ .



Fig. S5. The <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectrum of  $H_4TCDB$ -Me<sub>2</sub> in DMSO- $d_6$ .



Fig. S6. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of digested SIFE-1.

Empirical formula	$C_{60}H_{78.5}O_{32}Zr_6$
CCDC number	2353447
Formula weight	1859.04
lemperature/K	150.03(10)
Crystal system	cubic
Space group	Pm-3m
a(Å)	32.2925(4)
b(Å)	32.2925(4)
c(Å)	32.2925(4)
α(°)	90.00
β(°)	90.00
γ(°)	90.00
Volume/(Å <sup>3</sup> )	33674.9(2)
Z	8
$ ho_{calc}g/cm^3$	0.733
$\mu/\text{mm}^{-1}$	3.254
F(000)	7476.0
Radiation	Cu K $\alpha$ ( $\lambda$ = 1.54184)
$2\Theta$ range for data collection/(°)	7.744 to 134.114
Index ranges	$\text{-19} \le h \le 27,  \text{-38} \le k \le 38,  \text{-14} \le \text{1} \le 38$
Reflections collected	29016
Independent reflections	5691 [ $R_{int} = 0.0483$ , $R_{sigma} = 0.0312$ ]
Data/restraints/parameters	5691/104/185
Goodness-of-fit on F <sup>2</sup>	1.070
Final R indexes [I>=2 $\sigma$ (I)]	$R_1 = 0.0460, wR_2 = 0.1229$
Final R indexes [all data]]	$R_1 = 0.056, wR_2 = 0.1294$
Largest diff peak/hole / e Å <sup>-3</sup>	0.79/-0.71

 Table S1. The crystallographic data of SIFE-1.

Empirical formula	C <sub>69</sub> H <sub>51</sub> N <sub>3</sub> O <sub>32</sub> Zr <sub>6</sub>		
CCDC number	2353449		
Formula weight	1981.45		
Temperature/K	150.00(10)		
Crystal system	cubic		
Space group	Pm-3m		
a/Å	32.24423(14)		
b/Å	32.24423(14)		
c/Å	32.24423(14)		
$\alpha/^{\circ}$	90		
β/°	90		
$\gamma^{/\circ}$	90		
Volume/Å3	33524.0(4)		
Z	8		
pcalcg/cm3	0.785		
μ/mm-1	3.300		
F(000)	7856.0		
Radiation	Cu Ka ( $\lambda = 1.54184$ )		
$2\Theta$ range for data collection/°	7.756 to 134.154		
Index ranges	$-28 \le h \le 38, -28 \le k \le 15, -37 \le l \le 36$		
Reflections collected	26337		
Independent reflections	5679 [ $R_{int} = 0.0470, R_{sigma} = 0.0341$ ]		
Data/restraints/parameters	5679/414/189		
Goodness-of-fit on F2	1.078		
Final R indexes [I>=2 $\sigma$ (I)]	$R_1 = 0.0676, wR_2 = 0.1838$		
Final R indexes [all data]	$R_1 = 0.0799, wR_2 = 0.1958$		
Largest diff. peak/hole / e Å <sup>-3</sup>	2.12/-1.48		

**Table S2.** The crystallographic data of SIFE-1-BPYDC.

Empirical formula	$C_{73.5}H_{47}N_{3.5}O_{32}Zr_6$		
CCDC number	2353450		
Formula weight	2038.46		
Temperature/K	296.15		
Crystal system	cubic		
Space group	Pm-3m		
a/Å	32.4218(7)		
b/Å	32.4218(7)		
c/Å	32.4218(7)		
$\alpha/^{\circ}$	90		
β/°	90		
$\gamma/^{\circ}$	90		
Volume/Å3	34081(2)		
Ζ	8		
pcalcg/cm3	0.795		
μ/mm-1	3.257		
F(000)	8068.0		
Radiation	Cu K $\alpha$ ( $\lambda = 1.54178$ )		
$2\Theta$ range for data collection/°	4.72 to 133.214		
Index ranges	$-35 \le h \le 25, -35 \le k \le 30, -21 \le l \le 36$		
Reflections collected	57724		
Independent reflections	5516 [ $R_{int} = 0.0643$ , $R_{sigma} = 0.0329$ ]		
Data/restraints/parameters	5516/318/269		
Goodness-of-fit on F2	1.079		
Final R indexes [I>=2 $\sigma$ (I)]	$R_1 = 0.0457, wR_2 = 0.1493$		
Final R indexes [all data]	$R_1 = 0.0595, wR_2 = 0.1594$		
Largest diff. peak/hole / e Å <sup>-3</sup>	0.82/-0.64		

 Table S3. The crystallographic data of SIFE-1-INA.

Empirical formula	$C_{72}H_{39}Cu_{0.45}N_6O_{32}Zr_6$		
CCDC number	2353448		
Formula weight	2075.88		
Temperature/K	296.15		
Crystal system	cubic		
Space group	Pm-3m		
a/Å	32.2803(17)		
b/Å	32.2803(17)		
c/Å	32.2803(17)		
$\alpha/^{\circ}$	90		
β/°	90		
$\gamma/^{\circ}$	90		
Volume/Å <sup>3</sup>	33637(5)		
Z	8		
$ ho_{cale}g/cm^3$	0.820		
$\mu/mm^{-1}$	0.455		
F(000)	8176.0		
Radiation	Mo Ka ( $\lambda = 0.71073$ )		
$2\Theta$ range for data collection/°	4.55 to 49.986		
Index ranges	$-16 \le h \le 38, -38 \le k \le 33, -33 \le l \le 38$		
Reflections collected	61324		
Independent reflections	5607 [ $R_{int} = 0.1691$ , $R_{sigma} = 0.0784$ ]		
Data/restraints/parameters	5607/378/201		
Goodness-of-fit on F <sup>2</sup>	1.062		
Final R indexes [I>=2 $\sigma$ (I)]	$R_1 = 0.0817, wR_2 = 0.2281$		
Final R indexes [all data]	$R_1 = 0.1150, wR_2 = 0.2555$		
Largest diff. peak/hole / e Å <sup>-3</sup>	1.59/-1.08		

**Table S4.** The crystallographic data of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu).

\_

Empirical formula	$C_{84}H_{51}Cu_{0.56}I_{0.84}N_3O_{32}Zr_6$		
CCDC number	2353451		
Formula weight	2303.46		
Temperature/K	150.01(10)		
Crystal system	cubic		
Space group	Pm-3m		
a/Å	32.43707(14)		
b/Å	32.43707(14)		
c/Å	32.43707(14)		
α/°	90		
β/°	90		
$\gamma^{/\circ}$	90		
Volume/Å <sup>3</sup>	34129.1(4)		
Ζ	8		
$ ho_{cale}g/cm^3$	0.897		
µ/mm <sup>-1</sup>	4.536		
F(000)	9061.0		
Radiation	Cu Ka ( $\lambda = 1.54184$ )		
$2\Theta$ range for data collection/°	7.708 to 134.082		
Index ranges	$-37 \le h \le 29, -36 \le k \le 20, -13 \le l \le 38$		
Reflections collected	27497		
Independent reflections	5777 [ $R_{int} = 0.0454$ , $R_{sigma} = 0.0345$ ]		
Data/restraints/parameters	5777/452/215		
Goodness-of-fit on F <sup>2</sup>	1.076		
Final R indexes [I>=2 $\sigma$ (I)]	$R_1 = 0.0685, wR_2 = 0.1983$		
Final R indexes [all data]	$R_1 = 0.0805, wR_2 = 0.2103$		
Largest diff. peak/hole / e Å <sup>-3</sup>	1.90/-1.48		

 Table S5. The crystallographic data of SIFE-1-INA(Cu)-BDC.

### 3. MOFs Characterizations.



Fig. S7. Optical image of the block single crystals of SIFE-1.



Fig. S8. Optical image of the block single crystals of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu).



Fig. S9. Optical image of the block single crystals of SIFE-1-INA(Cu).



Fig. S10. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of digested SIFE-1-BPYDC.



Fig. S11. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of digested SIFE-1-INA.



Fig. S12. SEM image of SIFE-1.



Fig. S13. SEM image of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu).



Fig. S14. SEM image of SIFE-1-INA(Cu).



Fig. S15. X-ray photoelectron spectrum of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu).



Fig. S16. X-ray photoelectron spectrum of SIFE-1-INA(Cu).



Fig. S17. XPS spectra of Zr 3d of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu)(a) SIFE-1-INA(Cu)(b).



Fig. S18. XPS spectra of N 1s of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu)(a) SIFE-1-INA(Cu)(b).



Fig. S19. XPS spectra of O 1s of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu)(a) SIFE-1-INA(Cu)(b).



Fig. S20. XPS spectra of I 3d of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu)(a) SIFE-1-INA(Cu)(b).



Fig. S21. The  $N_2$  adsorption-desorption isotherms of SIFE-1 at 77 K.



Fig. S22. The  $N_2$  adsorption–desorption isotherms of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu) at 77 K.



Fig. S23. The  $N_2$  adsorption–desorption isotherms of SIFE-1-INA(Cu) at 77 K.



Fig. S24. Pore size distribution of SIFE-1 from  $N_2$  adsorption isotherms using a density functional theory (DFT) model.



Fig. S25. Pore size distribution of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu) from  $N_2$  adsorption isotherms using a density functional theory (DFT) model.



Fig. S26. Pore size distribution of SIFE-1-INA(Cu) from  $N_2$  adsorption isotherms using a density functional theory (DFT) model.



Fig. S27. Experimental PXRD patterns of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu) after catalytic reaction.



Fig. S28. Experimental PXRD patterns of SIFE-1-INA(Cu) after catalytic reaction.

#### 4. Catalytic Reaction

In a classical alcohol-formaldehyde conversion reaction, alcohol (0.5 mmol), TEMPO (0.05 mmol, TEMPO = 2,2,6,6-etramethylpiperidine-N-oxyl), N-methylimidazole (NMI, 0.05 mmol),  $CH_3CN$  (5.0 mL), and catalyst (10 mg, SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu) or SIFE-1-INA(Cu)) were combined in a 20 mL vial. The mixture was stirred in an open-air environment at room temperature for 6 hours to ensure complete exposure to atmospheric oxygen. Following the reaction, the crude reaction mixture was concentrated and subjected to purification using silica column chromatography. The resulting product was analyzed using <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy to determine the conversion rate of the reaction.

To confirm the essential catalytic function of the (bpy)Cu catalysis centers in the aforementioned reaction, SIFE-1, SIFE-1-BPYDC, and SIFE-1-INA were employed as substitutes for the catalytic component in the initial reactants. The reaction was subsequently repeated under identical conditions. The resulting products were analyzed using <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy, revealing minimal formation of the corresponding aldehydes, as outlined in Table S6. These findings unequivocally establish the indispensability of (bpy)Cu in facilitating this reaction.

The recoverability of the SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu) and SIFE-1-INA(Cu) catalysts was evaluated in this study. At the completion of the reaction, the catalysts were easily recovered from the mixture through centrifugation. The resulting solids were washed thoroughly with CH<sub>3</sub>CN and subsequently reused in the subsequent reaction cycles. Benzyl alcohol was employed as the alcohol substrate in the aforementioned reaction, and the reaction underwent cyclic experimental tests while maintaining identical conditions. The yields obtained from three repetitive runs were provided in Table S7. To ensure the integrity of the crystal structure, the powder PXRD patterns of the fresh catalyst and after the third cycle were examined (as

depicted in Fig. S27 and S28). The comparison of these patterns confirmed that the catalytic process did not result in any significant damage to the crystal structure.

### 5. Additional Tables

Entry	Substrate	Catalyst	Time(h)	Conversion(%)
1	Benzyl alcohol	SIFE-1	6	<1
2	1-Naphthalenemethanol	SIFE-1	6	<1
3	9-Anthracenemethanol	SIFE-1	6	<1
4	Benzyl alcohol	SIFE-1-BPYDC	6	<1
5	1-Naphthalenemethanol	SIFE-1-BPYDC	6	<1
6	9-Anthracenemethanol	SIFE-1-BPYDC	6	<1
7	Benzyl alcohol	SIFE-1-INA	6	<1
8	1-Naphthalenemethanol	SIFE-1-INA	6	<1
9	9-Anthracenemethanol	SIFE-1-INA	6	<1

Table S6. Verification of the catalytic function of (bpy)Cu catalytic centers<sup>(a)</sup>.

(a) Reaction condition: alcohol (0.5 mmol), TEMPO (0.05 mmol), N-methylimidazole (NMI, 0.05 mmol), CH<sub>3</sub>CN (5.0 mL), and catalyst (10 mg), room temperature, 6h.

Cycle	Substrate	Catalyst	Time(h)	Conversion(%)
1	Benzyl alcohol	SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu)	6	99
	Benzyl alcohol	SIFE-1-INA(Cu)	6	99
2	Benzyl alcohol	SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu)	6	99
	Benzyl alcohol	SIFE-1-INA(Cu)	6	80
3	Benzyl alcohol	SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu)	6	88
	Benzyl alcohol	SIFE-1-INA(Cu)	6	65

Table S7. Recyclability test of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu) and SIFE-1-INA(Cu)<sup>(a)</sup>.

(a) Reaction condition: Benzyl alcohol (0.5 mmol), TEMPO (0.05 mmol), N-methylimidazole (NMI, 0.05 mmol), CH<sub>3</sub>CN (5.0 mL), and catalyst (10 mg), room temperature, 6h.



Figure S29. Cycle test of SIFE-1-BPYDC(Cu) and SIFE-1-INA(Cu).