Crystal Engineering of Naphthalenediimide-Based Metal–Organic Frameworks: Structure-Dependent Lithium Storage
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ABSTRACT: Metal–organic frameworks (MOFs) possess great structural diversity because of the flexible design of linker groups and metal nodes. The structure–property correlation has been extensively investigated in areas like chiral catalysis, gas storage and absorption, water purification, energy storage, etc. However, the use of MOFs in lithium storage is hampered by stability issues, and how its porosity helps with battery performance is not well understood. Herein, through anion and thermodynamic control, we design a series of naphthalenediimide-based MOFs 1–4 that can be used for cathode materials in lithium-ion batteries (LIBs). Complexation of the N,N’-di(4-pyridyl)-1,4,5,8-naphthalenediimide (DPNDI) ligand and CdX2 (X = NO3− or ClO4−) produces complexes MOFs 1 and 2 with a one-dimensional (1D) nonporous network and a porous, noninterpenetrated two-dimensional (2D) square-grid structure, respectively. With the DPNDI ligand and Co(NCS)2, a porous 1D MOF 3 as a kinetic product is obtained, while a nonporous, noninterpenetrated 2D square-grid structure MOF 4 as a thermodynamic product is formed. The performance of LIBs is largely affected by the stability and porosity of these MOFs. For instance, the initial charge–discharge curves of MOFs 1 and 2 show a specific capacity of ~47 mA h g−1 with a capacity retention ratio of ~70% during 50 cycles at 100 mA g−1, which is much better than that of MOFs 3 and 4. The better performances are assigned to the higher stability of Cd(II) MOFs compared to that of Co(II) MOFs during the electrochemical process, according to X-ray diffraction analysis. In addition, despite having the same Cd(II) node in the framework, MOF 2 exhibits a lithium-ion diffusion coefficient (DLi) larger than that of MOF 1 because of its higher porosity. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy and Fourier transform infrared analysis indicate that metal nodes in these MOFs remain intact and only the DPNDI ligand undergoes the reversible redox reaction during the lithiation–delithiation process.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The lithium-ion battery (LIB) has established itself as one of the most successful battery technologies because of its high energy density, high rate performance, and long life span.1–8 Transition metal oxides such as layered LiMO2 (M = Co, Ni, Mn, etc.), spinel LiM2O4 (M = Mn, etc.), and olivine LiMPO4 (M = Fe, Mn, Ni, Co, etc.) are conventionally used in LIBs as active cathode materials.9,10,12,23 Recently, as a substitute material for transition metal oxides, organic-based positive electrode materials, in particular organic small molecules or polymers with redox active functional groups, have also been widely investigated because of their high theoretical specific capacities, flexibility, environmental friendliness, and sustainability.11,20–24

Metal–organic frameworks (MOFs) composed of an organic building block and a metal node have attracted extensive attention for their wide applications, including gas storage and separation,13–18 catalysis,19–22 molecule recognition,23–27 and luminescent materials.28,29 For a long time, people believed the MOFs are not suitable for utilization in reversible lithium storage because of their insulating nature and propensity to be structurally deformed during electrochemical cycling. For instance, Li et al. first investigated the usage of “MOF-117” [Zn6O(1,3,5-benzenetribenzoic acid)2] as anodes for lithium...
storage and found that it presented a relatively high irreversible capacity in the first discharge cycle and a much lower reversible charge–discharge capacity in the following cycles because of the decomposition of “MOF-117” in the electrochemical process. Férey and Tarascon reported the first successful example of MOF-based electrode materials for application in LIBs; “Fe-MIL-53” \( \left\{ \left[ \text{M}^{4+}\text{bdc} \right] \left( \text{bdc} = 1,4\text{-benzenedicarboxylate} \right) \right\} \) was used as a positive electrode in LIBs and showed a reversible capacity of 70 mA h g\(^{-1}\) within a voltage window of 1.5–3.5 V (vs Li/Li\(^+\)). Since then, further studies have shown that MOFs have great potential as electrode materials for application in lithium storage or rechargeable LIBs.44

2. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Materials and Methods. The ligand DPNDI (Figure 1) was prepared according to a protocol described in the literature. The reagents and solvents for synthesis are commercially available and were used without further purification. Spectra recorded via Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) were recorded on an OPUS/IR PSIS spectrometer (Bruker) using KBr pellets (4000–4000 cm\(^{-1}\)). Elemental analysis of C, H, and N was performed on an Elementar Vario Micro Cube analyzer.

Synthesis of MOFs 1–4. \( \left\{ \left[ \text{Co(NCS)}_2 \right] \left( \text{DPNDI} \right) \right\} (\text{DMA})_2 (\text{H}_2\text{O})_0.5 \) (MOF 1). A solution of \( \text{Co(NCS)}_2 \) (0.02 mmol, 6.2 mg) in 1 mL of MeOH was mixed with a solution of DPNDI (0.04 mmol, 16.8 mg) in an \( N,N'\)-dimethyl acetamide (DMA)/dichlorobenzene (DCB) mixture [4/1 (v/v), 5 mL] in a glass vial. After that, the diethyl ether was slowly diffused into the resulting mixture at room temperature (rt) for 3 days. The pink rod crystals were collected by filtration and washed with Et\(_2\)O [yield of 31.7% (Table 1)].

\( \left\{ \left[ \text{Cd(NO}_3\right]_2 \left( \text{DPNDI} \right) \right\} (\text{DMA})_3 (\text{H}_2\text{O})_0.5 \) (MOF 2). The synthetic procedure for 2 was similar to that described for MOF 1, except that a solution of \( \text{Cd(NO}_3\right]_2 \cdot (\text{H}_2\text{O})_0.5 \) (0.02 mmol, 8.4 mg) in 0.5 mL of MeOH was used instead of \( \text{Co(NCS)}_2 \cdot (\text{H}_2\text{O})_0.5 \). The pale red crystals were collected by filtration and washed with Et\(_2\)O (yield of 31.7%).

\( \left\{ \left[ \text{Cd(NO}_3\right]_2 \left( \text{DPNDI} \right) \right\} (\text{DMA})_4 (\text{H}_2\text{O})_4 \) (MOF 3). A solution of \( \text{Cd(NO}_3\right]_2 \cdot (\text{H}_2\text{O})_0.5 \) (0.04 mmol, 7.0 mg) in 1 mL of MeOH was added to a solution of DPNDI (0.08 mmol, 33.6 mg) in a DMA/DCB mixture [4/1 (v/v), 5 mL] in a glass vial. After standing at rt for \( \sim \)1 week, the pale red rod crystals were collected by filtration and washed with Et\(_2\)O...
Table 1. Crystal Data and Structural Refinement of Compound MOFs 1–4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOF</th>
<th>crystal system</th>
<th>space group</th>
<th>a (Å)</th>
<th>b (Å)</th>
<th>c (Å)</th>
<th>α (deg)</th>
<th>β (deg)</th>
<th>γ (deg)</th>
<th>V (Å³)</th>
<th>D_crist (g cm⁻³)</th>
<th>μ (mm⁻¹)</th>
<th>P(000)</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>R[Fo&gt;4σ(Fo)]%</th>
<th>R[Fo&lt;σ(Fo)]%</th>
<th>GoF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOF 1</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
<td>C2/c</td>
<td>12.3944(4)</td>
<td>18.6312(5)</td>
<td>7.912(4)</td>
<td>10.5940(5)</td>
<td>9.7748(12)</td>
<td>10.2417(7)</td>
<td>3.4000(12)</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>0.0411</td>
<td>0.0410</td>
<td>0.0413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOF 2</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
<td>C2/c</td>
<td>17.5823(5)</td>
<td>27.1732(7)</td>
<td>14.2019(6)</td>
<td>9.6488(2)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2081 (s, SCN), 1717 (s, C≡N), 1678 (s), 1607 (m), 1582 (s), 1508 (m), 1445 (m), 1421 (m), 1349 (s), 1251 (s), 1196 (m), 1149 (s), 1067 (m), 1015 (m), 985 (s), 869 (m), 766 (m) cm⁻¹. Elemental analysis. Calculated for [(C₆H₆N₂O₃)Co(NCS)₂]·(C₄H₉NO)·(H₂O)]; C, 54.36; H, 3.63; N, 12.91. Found: C, 54.18; H, 3.72; N, 12.89. GoF = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/∑(Fo²)²/2. GoF = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/σ(Fo²)²/2. GoF = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/2(n − p)²/2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOF 3</td>
<td>triclinic</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14.449</td>
<td>24.288</td>
<td>8.610</td>
<td>95.387</td>
<td>89.601</td>
<td>87.247</td>
<td>36.375</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>0.0503</td>
<td>0.0515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOF 4</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
<td>C2/m</td>
<td>16.1619(5)</td>
<td>17.6234(8)</td>
<td>14.2019(6)</td>
<td>9.6488(2)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1478 (s), 1445 (s), 1421 (m), 1349 (s), 1251 (s), 1196 (m), 1149 (s), 1067 (m), 1015 (m), 985 (s), 869 (m), 766 (m) cm⁻¹. Elemental analysis. Calculated for [(C₆H₆N₂O₃)Co(NCS)₂]·(C₄H₉NO)·(H₂O)]; C, 54.36; H, 3.63; N, 12.91. Found: C, 54.18; H, 3.72; N, 12.89. GoF = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/∑(Fo²)²/2. GoF = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/σ(Fo²)²/2. GoF = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/2(n − p)²/2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] R = ∑|Fo| − |Fe|/∑Fo.  
[b] R = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/∑Fo²).  
[c] GoF = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/2(n − p)²/2.  
[d] GoF = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/σ(Fo²)²/2.  
[e] GoF = ∑(Fo² − Fe²)²/2(n − p)²/2.  

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Crystal Structures of MOFs 1 and 2. Single-crystal analysis reveals that (Figure 2a,b) the nonporous coordination polymer MOF 1 is crystallized in the monoclinic space group P2₁/c and distorted pentagonal bipyramidal Cd(II) ions are linked by PDNP1 ligands. Via the O atoms of a DMA molecule, two bidentate NO₃⁻ ions satisfied the remaining five open sites of the Cd(II) ion. Both bidentate NO₃⁻ ions take part in anion–π interactions with the imide rings of PDNP1 ligands (centroid distances of 3.00 and 2.80 Å, respectively) of neighboring 1D chain frameworks (Figure 2 and Figure S1). In contrast, the ClO₄⁻ ion in MOF 2, unlike the NO₃⁻ ion in...
MOF 1, does not coordinate to the Cd(II) ion because of the weak coordination ability of the ClO$_4^-$ ion. MOF 2 possesses large noninterpenetrated square cavities ($20 \times 20 \ \text{Å}$), and each cavity is filled with two ClO$_4^-$ ions and DMA solvent molecules, which occupy 27% of the volume of MOF 2 (Figure 3a,b). Four equatorial DPNDI ligands via the pyridyl N atom and two axial DMA molecules through the O atom are linked by octahedral Cd(II) ions, giving an array of distorted square cavities with $\angle \text{Cd}–\text{Cd}–\text{Cd}$ values of 94.62$^\circ$ and 85.38$^\circ$, respectively, in slipped square-grid frameworks. Importantly, the ClO$_4^-$ ions play crucial roles in prohibiting interpenetration of frameworks by partially occupying the pores; they also facilitate parallel stacking of the sheets by providing multisite CH–anion hydrogen bonding interactions ($d_{\text{CH-O}}$ values of 2.77 and 2.62 Å) with the aromatic hydrogen in the DPNDI ligands (Figure S3). In addition, the dihedral angle between pyridyl groups and the DPNDI core is $\sim 82^\circ$, resulting in the pyridyl groups’ hydrogen (Py-Hs) being nearly perpendicular to the 2D network plane. Such an orientation allows the formation of additional CH–anion interactions ($d_{\text{CH-O}}$ values of 2.52, 2.81, 2.96, and 3.02 Å) between ClO$_4^-$ anions and Py-Hs (Figure S3). Therefore, ClO$_4^-$ ions not only occupy 1D channels but also align planar grids parallel to each other, thereby prohibiting interpenetration of frameworks.

Crystal Structures of MOFs 3 and 4. When the DPNDI ligand is reacted with Co(NCS)$_2$, instantly, we obtain MOF 3 as a kinetic product with a 1D chain structure similar to that of MOF 1. Analysis of crystal structures shows that MOF 3 crystallized in the triclinic space group $P\bar{1}$ and the octahedral Co(II) ions are linked by two DPNDI ligands, two DMA molecules, and two NCS$^-$ ions. It is noteworthy that the linear NCS$^-$ ions assist the formation of square cavities (7 Å × 3 Å) through the CH–anion hydrogen bonding interactions ($d_{\text{CH-O}}$ values of 2.94 and 3.10 Å) with aromatic hydrogen in the DPNDI ligands of neighboring 1D chain frameworks (Figure 2c,d). The square cavities are filled with DMA molecules, which occupied 9.3% of the volume of MOF 3.

Surprisingly, when the methanolic solution of Co(NCS)$_2$ is slowly mixed with the DPNDI ligand, MOF 4, which is isostructural to MOF 2, is obtained as a thermodynamic product. A 2D noninterpenetrated square-grid structure with dimensions of 19 Å × 19 Å is observed from the single crystallographic analysis. These 2D layers stack on each other to form small irregular channels (8.0% of the volume of MOF 4), which are filled with DMA solvent molecules (Figure 3c,d). The octahedral Co(II) ions are coordinated to four equatorial DPNDI ligands and two axial NCS$^-$ ions, which insert into the neighboring square cavities and interacted with the aromatic hydrogen in DPNDI ligands (Figure S6). In addition, the linear NCS$^-$ ions prevent the formation of interpenetrated structure through the anion–π interactions with the imide rings in the DPNDI ligands (centroid distance of 3.19 Å) of separated 2D sheet frameworks (Figure S6). All the factors mentioned above contribute to the prevention of network interpenetration.

Electrochemical Behavior of MOFs 1–4. The discharge–charge voltage profiles of Cd(II) MOFs (MOFs 1 and 2), Co(II) MOFs (MOFs 3 and 4), and the DPNDI ligand at 100 mA g$^{-1}$ in the potential range of 1.8–3.4 V (vs Li/Li$^+$) (Figure 4a–e, respectively) present the electrochemical properties of the MOFs as cathodes in LIBs. The initial discharge–charge profiles of the Co(II) MOFs (MOFs 1 and 2) show a similar specific capacity of $\sim 45$ mA h g$^{-1}$. A sloping plateau is observed in the charge–discharge profiles of MOF 1 within the potential range of 2.8–2.0 V, with an output gravimetric capacity of $\sim 40$ mA h g$^{-1}$, while for MOF 2, a flatter plateau is
Figure 4. First, second, third, tenth, and fiftieth discharge–charge curves of Cd(II) MOFs [MOFs 1 (a) and 2 (b)], Co(II) MOFs [MOFs 3 (c) and 4 (d)], and the DPNDI ligand (e) at a current rate of 100 mA g\(^{-1}\) in the potential range of 1.8–3.4 V. (f) Cycling performance of MOFs 1–4 and the DPNDI ligand.

Figure 5. First, second, and third CV curves of Cd(II) MOFs [MOFs 1 (a) and 2 (b)]. The scan rate was 0.1 mV s\(^{-1}\), and the potential range was 1.8–3.4 V.
observed in the potential range of 2.6–2.3 V but also delivers a plateau capacity of ∼40 mA h g⁻¹. The two Cd(II) MOFs present specific capacities of 42.1 and 46.8 mA h g⁻¹ during the initial discharge with capacity retention ratios of 77.2 and 78.4%, respectively, even after 50 cycles (Figure 4a,b,f). However, although the Co(II) MOFs (MOFs 3 and 4) provide higher initial experimental specific capacities (45.9 and 62.7 mA h g⁻¹, respectively), they all give poor cycling performances because of their unstable structure during the electrochemical process compared with that of Cd(II) MOFs, as confirmed by XRD results depicted in Figure S18.

The cyclic voltammograms (CVs) of the four MOFs and DPNDI ligand (Figure 5 and Figure S15) are consistent with the galvanostatic discharge–charge results. The CVs of MOF 1 (Figure 5a) show one pair of broad redox peaks due to the poor kinetic properties of the 1D chain structure. However, in the case of MOF 2, which is constructed from the same Cd(II) node, two sharp cathodic peaks around 2.41 and 2.34 V are observed, corresponding to the two-step lithiation process of MOF 2. In the first delithiation process, three sharp anodic peaks (located at 2.37, 2.46, and 2.80 V) and one broad anodic peak (centered at 2.63 V) are observed, indicating four electrochemical active sites participated in this oxidation process. However, from the CV data (integration of anodic parts, 147 C g⁻¹ and charge capacity (47.5 mA h g⁻¹) of the electrodes, only two electrons (and two Li⁺ ions) per molecule unit are extracted from the lithiated electrode during the delithiation process. This result is consistent with previous work on NDI, whereby a two-electron reaction occurs, although it has four active sites for one molecule unit. 48

However, after the first CV, the peak at 2.80 V disappears because of the irreversible process of the electrode in this potential range. Similar irreversible reaction was also observed in Co(II) MOFs (MOFs 3 and 4) and the DPNDI ligand as shown in the CV plots (Figure S15).

To understand the electronic and ionic transport kinetics that determine the electrochemical performance, the electrochemical impedance spectra of the Cd(II) MOF (MOFs 1 and 2) electrodes at the stages of open circuit potential (OCP), discharge, and charge in the first lithiation–delithiation cycle are studied as shown in Figure 6. From the EIS curves of MOF 1 and 2 electrodes at OCP (Figure 6a), a smaller semicircle of the MOF 2 cell demonstrates that 2D MOF 2 has an electrode conductivity better than that of 1D MOF 1. 51 Moreover, the semicircle of the MOF 2 electrode increased with further discharge–charge cycling (Figure S16), demonstrating that the charge transfer resistance of the MOF 2 cell increases continuously during the electrochemical cycling process.

To obtain the diffusion coefficient for diffusion of lithium ions (D_Li) into the MOF electrodes, the low-frequency region related to Warburg impedance (Z_W) was selected for analysis. The D_Li can be deduced from the Z_W, as follows:

\[
Z_W = \sigma_W (1 - j) \omega^{-1/2}
\]

where \(\omega\) is the radial frequency and \(\sigma_W\) is the Warburg impedance coefficient, which is determined from the real impedance (Z’) plotted versus the radial frequency (\(\omega^{-1/2}\)), as shown in Figure 6d. The D_Li is then given by:

\[
D_Li = 0.5 \left( \frac{RT}{AF \sigma W^*} \right)^2 = 4.52 \times 10^{-13} \left( \frac{1}{\sigma W^*} \right)^2
\]
where $T$ is the absolute temperature, $R$ is the gas constant, $C$ is the molar concentration of Li$^+$ ions (moles per cubic centimeter), $A$ is the geometric electrode area (1.54 cm$^2$), and $F$ is the Faraday constant. Equation 2 is valid only when semi-infinite diffusion conditions are fulfilled. The values of $\sigma_{\mathrm{MOF}}$, $C$, and $D_{\mathrm{fl}}$ at various potentials are listed in Table S1. At the discharged state (1.8 V), MOF 2 shows a lithium-ion diffusion coefficient ($D_{\mathrm{fl}} = 4.21 \times 10^{-14}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$) 5-fold larger than that for MOF 1 ($8.80 \times 10^{-15}$ cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$), indicating superior kinetic properties of 2D porous Cd(II) MOFs compared to those of 1D nonporous Cd(II) MOFs in LIBs.

The redox mechanism of the various synthesized MOFs with lithium ion is studied using FTIR and XPS analysis during the lithiation–delithiation process (Figure 7 and Figures S19–S21). The MOF cells were disassembled in a glovebox at the discharged (1.8 V) and recharged (3.4 V) states to prepare test samples. Pristine MOF 2 displays absorbance signals at 1684 and 1717 cm$^{-1}$ that can be assigned to redox active C–O bonds, which show the variation in intensity during the charge–discharge process. The signal intensity of C–O bonds decreases during discharge and increases during recharge, suggesting partial lithiation of carbonyl groups. The absorbance signal assigned to vibration of C–C bonds shifts from 1578 to 1607 cm$^{-1}$, indicating the formation of new C–C bonds in the discharged state. After recharge to 3.4 V, the peak at 1607 cm$^{-1}$ returns to 1580 cm$^{-1}$, which is close to that of the original MOF 2, implying a reversible lithiation and delithiation process. The reversible changes in the C–O and C–C bond vibrational modes coincide with the lithiation and delithiation of MOF 2 on the organic linkers (DPNDI), which confirms the participation of C–O bonds in the electrochemical redox reaction. The XPS Cd 3d core levels of the MOF 2 electrodes did not change their peak position or profile throughout the stages of discharged (1.8 V) and recharged (3.4 V) states, indicating that the metal centers (Cd$^{2+}$) did not undergo redox reactions during the electrochemical process. XPS analysis also confirms the Co(II) ion remains intact in MOF 4 electrodes during the lithiation–delithiation process (Figure S21). These results prove that only the organic linkers DPNDI take part in the electrochemical process instead of metal ions, which is quite unusual compared to the previously reported case for MOF electrodes for LIBs.$^{43,45,47}$

4. CONCLUSIONS
In conclusion, two pairs of isostructural naphthalenediimide-based MOFs with different linkers are synthesized via anion and thermodynamic control. These MOFs are employed as cathode materials for lithium-ion batteries. Their structure-dependent electrochemical performances are investigated. The electrochemical stability and reversibility of the MOF electrodes are strongly influenced by metal nodes in the MOFs. As shown here, the Cd(II) MOFs (MOFs 1 and 2) exhibit a capacity higher than and a cycling stability better than those of Co(II) MOFs (MOFs 3 and 4). Besides the metal nodes, the electrochemical properties are also influenced by porosity. Because of the large porosity of 2D MOF 2, it allows a lithium-ion diffusion coefficient ($D_{\mathrm{fl}}$) that is much higher than that of 1D nonporous MOF 1. Although the gravimetric specific capacity of these MOFs is not very high (only 47 mA h g$^{-1}$), because of the high molecular weight and limited number of inserted Li atoms per formula unit, our work indicates that the proper design of functionalities will improve the ion storage capacity of these materials.
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