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Abstract

Generating sustainable fuel from sunlight plays an important role in meeting the energy demands of the modern age. Here we report the synthesis of new two-coordinate, molecular Cu(I) and Au(I) complexes that were designed to absorb visible photons (ε_{vis} > 10^3 M^{-1}cm^{-1}), maintain long excited state lifetimes (τ~1-0.1μs), and perform stable photo-induced charge transfer to a target substrate with remarkably potent photoreducing capabilities (E^{+/0} up to -2.33 V vs. Fe^{+/0}). The photoredox performance was evaluated in a variety of solvents, and we were able to understand the influence of ligand design and metal center on the photophysical properties. Interestingly, we found that the Cu(I) systems have competitive figures of merit with widely used scarce metal photosensitizers such as Ru(bpy)_3^{2+} and Ir(ppy)_3. This work illuminates two-coordinate coinage metal complexes as promising, abundant metal, solar fuels photosensitizers that offer exceptional tunability and photoredox properties.

Introduction

Solar photocatalysis to generate fuel is a highly active research fields in modern chemistry.\textsuperscript{1,2} Molecular light-driven chemistry requires two primary processes: light absorption and chemical interaction with the substrate of interest. These tasks are often divided between two different molecules. Light absorption occurs at the photosensitizer (PS), which transfers charge onto an electrocatalyst that performs the chemical transformation. Photosensitizers such as Ru(bpy)_3^{2+} and Ir(ppy)_3 are commonly used sensitizers due to their high stability in oxidized and reduced forms, good molar absorptivity (ε ~10^4 M^{-1}cm^{-1}), long-lived excited states, and the ability to efficiently deliver charge to a variety of electrocatalysts or substrates from their excited state.\textsuperscript{3,4} The main drawback of Ru/Ir systems is that they are among the rarest metals on earth, which precludes their use in scalable and sustainable energy technology.\textsuperscript{5}
Chemists have responded to the challenge of developing sustainable solutions by exploring metal complexes of earth abundant metals as viable alternatives. Significant efforts have been put into first row transition metals, among which copper has been a rising candidate to match the performance of scarce metals.\textsuperscript{6-8} The few reported copper photosensitizers have exclusively exhibited a four-coordinate structure. The most prominent classes are Cu(I)(N^N)\textsubscript{2} or Cu(I)(N^N)(P^P) complexes where N^N is a bisimine ligand, such as a phenanthroline or bipyridine derivative, and P^P = is a bisphosphine derivative, which were pioneered by the McMillin group.\textsuperscript{9-11} These systems exhibit a metal to ligand charge-transfer (MLCT) lowest energy excited state, and many of these four-coordinate complexes have low molar absorptivity of visible photons with absorption peak maxes in the UV to blue range with \( \varepsilon > 10^3 \) M\textsuperscript{-1}cm\textsuperscript{-1}, and long excited state lifetimes of \( 10^2-10^5 \) ns. Structures such as Cu(dmp)\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{+} and Cu(dap)(Xantphos) have even been successfully employed in precious metal-free photoredox catalysis.\textsuperscript{8, 10, 12-16} The challenge of controlling the absorption energy of an MLCT excited state is the restricted tunability of the metal center; energetic tuning is predominantly restricted to tuning the ligand.

Two-coordinate Cu(I) complexes have recently been investigated for applications in organic LEDs, but have never been directly investigated for solar photoredox.\textsuperscript{17-27} It is valid to question whether or not two-coordinate complexes would work at all. These molecules are coordinatively unsaturated, which could allow for deleterious non-radiative decay of the excited state via solvent coordination. Solvent coordination and exciplex formation is a well-documented issue, even for the relatively more protected four-coordinate structures, that results in a decrease of excited state lifetime.\textsuperscript{28} In this work, we probe the ground state photophysics and excited state photoredox capabilities in a variety of solvents to thoroughly evaluate these complexes as a new class of Cu(I) photosensitizers. We introduce three new carbene-metal-amide (cMa) complexes equipped with a mono-amido carbene (MAC) and 3,6-disubstituted carbazole (Cz) ligands shown in Figure 1. In this study, we keep the carbene ligand constant which allows us to independently investigate the role of the metal and amide ligand.
Figure 1. Structure of the three photosensitizers investigated in this work: \( M^{\text{MAC}}_{R\text{Cz}} \) \( [M = \text{Cu or Au, } R = \text{ tert-butyl (B) or phenyl (Ph)}] \) \( (\text{iPr} = \text{isopropyl}) \). \( M^{\text{MAC}}_{R\text{Cz}} \) were reported previously and were used for comparison in this study.\(^{21}\)

The lowest energy absorption of cMa complexes is typically an interligand charge transfer (ILCT) with a hole localized on the carbazole, and an electron on the carbene. Thus, the absorption energy is easily tuned by the choice of carbene and amide, which is considerable benefit in comparison to the four-coordinate MLCT systems.\(^{17, 20, 21, 29}\) The MAC carbene and carbazole ligand were chosen for the complexes studied here to ensure visible light absorption with long excited state lifetimes \( (\tau) \). However, carbazole is well documented to undergo irreversible oxidation which leads to oligomerization at the 3,6 - positions.\(^{30}\) We circumvented this issue by installing tert-butyl and phenyl groups in the 3,6 - positions of carbazole. The photophysical and electrochemical properties of the new cMa complexes were evaluated in several common solvents for solar fuels to provide a broad understanding of their properties. Photo-induced electron transfer from the PS to a target molecule involves quenching the excited state PS* with a quenching molecule (Q). Stern-Volmer quenching studies were performed with a variety of quenchers with increasing difficulty of reduction to evaluate the photo-reducing capabilities of each sensitizer. A Rehm-Weller analysis was used to determine the excited state oxidation potential \( (E^{+/*}) \) of each photosensitizer based on the results of the Stern-Volmer experiments. The role of the metal was investigated by comparing Cu(I) and Au(I) in \( M^{\text{MAC}}_{R\text{Cz}} \), and that of the amide was probed by varying the substituent groups in \( M^{\text{MAC}}_{R\text{Cz}} \). Here we report a completely new system for Cu(I) photosensitizers, and the first evaluation of cMa complexes as photosensitizing agents. We find that two-coordinate cMa complexes are a viable new class of photosensitizers for solar photochemistry.
3. Experimental

**Synthesis:** All reactions were performed under a N$_2$ atmosphere using a Schlenk line. Tetrahydrofuran (THF), dichloromethane, and toluene (Tol) were dried over alumina using a solvent purification system by SG Water USA, LLC. Dimethylformamide (DMF) and acetonitrile (MeCN) were purchased as dry solvents from VWR. Precursors 1,3-bis(2,6-diisopropylphenyl)-5,5-dimethyl-4-oxo-3,4,5,6-tetrahydropyrimidin-1-ium-2-ide M(I) chloride (MAC MCl [M = Cu(I) or Au(I)]), were prepared according to literature precedent. The donor precursors 3,6-di-tert-butyl-9H-carbazole and 3,6-di-phenyl-9H-carbazole were purchased from AK Scientific and Tokyo Chemical Industry respectively. Sodium tert-butoxide was purchased from Sigma Aldrich. Reference compounds Cu$^{\text{MAC}}_{Cz}$ and Au$^{\text{MAC}}_{Cz}$ were prepared according to literature procedures. All purchased chemicals were used without further purification.

**Scheme 1.** Synthesis of cMa photosensitizers [R = tert-butyl (B) or phenyl (Ph)].

The general synthesis of all reported compounds involved adding solid CzR$_2$ and NaO'Bu precursors to a freshly dried Schlenk-flask connected to a Schlenk line and a nitrogen atmosphere was established. THF was added against positive N$_2$ pressure and the mixture stirred at room temperature for one hour to generate free carbazolide. After one hour, the MAC MCl [M = Cu or Au] complex was added against positive N$_2$ pressure. The flask was then covered with aluminum foil and allowed to stir at room temperature overnight. All workup was performed in air.

The workup involved filtering the reaction solution through celite and removing the solvent with a rotovap. The crude solid was dissolved in 50/50 MeCN/hexane by volume, and product was extracted into the MeCN phase. The MeCN solution was evaporated on the rotovap to yield a sticky yellow gel. The gel was redissolved in 20/80 CH$_2$Cl$_2$/hexane by volume and the solvent
removed on the rotovap, which converted the gel-like solid to a powder. The process of dissolving in 20/80 CH$_2$Cl$_2$/hexane and solvent removal was repeated three times to yield a fine yellow powder. Lastly, the solid was washed copiously with either methanol or diethyl ether to yield analytically pure samples. The detailed synthesis and analytical data for each cMa sensitizer is given in the Supporting Information (SI).

**Computation:** Density functional theory (DFT) and time dependent DFT (TDDFT) calculations were performed in QChem v5.0 to predict the structural and electronic properties of the cMa photosensitizers in the ground and excited states. Geometry optimizations were performed using the B3LYP method, LACVP basis, and Fit-LACVP effective core potential (ECP). TDDFT calculations were performed using the LACVP basis, fit-LACVP ECP, and the CAM-B3LYP exchange (attenuation parameter = 0.2) with RPA enabled. Orbital composition analysis and wavefunction overlap of the HOMO and LUMO were evaluated using Multiwfn.

**Electrochemistry:** Cyclic voltammetry (CV) and differential pulse voltammetry (DPV) measurements were performed with a VeraSTAT potentiostat using a glassy carbon working electrode, platinum counter electrode, and silver wire as a pseudo-reference electrode. Solutions were prepared in dry, N$_2$ sparged solvents with 0.1M tetrabutylammonium hexafluorophosphate electrolyte concentration. CV and DPV measurements were performed with scan rates of 0.1 Vs$^{-1}$, and 10mVs$^{-1}$, respectively. Measurements were repeated using ferrocene or decamethylferrocene as an internal standard; all measurements were referenced to the Fc$^{+}$/0 couple.

**Photophysical Measurements:** Absorption spectra were recorded using a Hewlett-Packard 4853 diode array spectrometer. Samples were prepared in air using either a quartz or glass cuvette. Photoluminescence (PL) spectra were recorded using a Photon Technology International QuantaMaster spectrofluorimeter. Excited state lifetime measurements were performed using time correlated single photon counting (TCSPC) with an IBH Fluorocube apparatus interfaced to a Horiba FluoroHub+ controller. Quantum yield (QY) measurements were performed using a Hamamatsu C9920 integrating sphere with a xenon lamp excitation source. Samples for PL, TCSPC, and QY measurements were prepared in a custom made long, glass cuvette that allowed the solutions to be sparged with N$_2$ and sealed with a Teflon valve. More information on the cuvette design is available in figure S7.
**Stern-Volmer Quenching:** Quenching of the excited state via photo-induced electron transfer from PS* to Q was measured by TCSPC. Quenching via energy transfer was avoided by choosing Q such that the T_1 energy was lower than the T_1 of the PS. Five solutions were prepared with a constant photosensitizer concentration ~10 μM and increasing quencher concentration. The UV-Vis was measured to ensure that the absorption features of the PS did not change, which could indicate interaction of PS and Q in the ground state. Air-free conditions were established to prevent quenching of PS* by oxygen. Excited state lifetimes (τ) were measured as a function of increasing quenching concentration ([Q]) and compared to the lifetime without quencher (τ_0). The Stern-Volmer equation was used to extract the rate constant k_q corresponding to quenching of the excited state.

\[
\frac{\tau_0}{\tau} = 1 + k_q \tau_0 [Q]
\]

Plots of τ₀/τ vs. [Q] yield a linear line with R² values near unity. For a given Stern-Volmer plot, the slope was divided by τ₀ to yield values for k_q.

4. Results and Discussion

**Synthesis.** The synthetic procedure shown in Scheme 1 was adapted from literature precedent. The copper complexes were isolated with >63% yield, and Au\textsuperscript{MAC}\textsubscript{BCZ} was isolated with 31% yield. The final products are all indefinitely air stable as a solid. The composition was characterized by \textsuperscript{1}H and \textsuperscript{13}C NMR, CHNS elemental analysis (See SI for more details). Crystal structures were achieved through single crystal x-ray diffraction.

---

**Figure 2.** Single crystal structures of all new cMa complexes.
Single crystal structures of Cu_{BCz}^{MAC}, Au_{BCz}^{MAC} and Cu_{PhCz}^{MAC} reveal that the C-M-N atoms are at ~180°. All compounds have nearly coplanar ligands, with the torsion angle between the ligands varies from 6.2° to 19.6°. It has been shown that coplanar ligand orientation is important for achieving appreciable oscillator strength of the S_0 → S_1 transition.\textsuperscript{22, 23, 33} Systems with orthogonal ligands have notably low oscillator strength because the n systems of the ligand become spatially orthogonal. Au_{BCz}^{MAC} crystallized with a disorder of the C=O and the two methyl groups as shown in Figure 2.

\textbf{Computational Results.} The electronic structure of the ground state was examined using DFT calculations for the cMa complexes. All materials have their highest occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) localized on the carbazole, and lowest unoccupied molecular orbital (LUMO) localized on the carbene carbene. Both orbitals have a small contribution from the metal d orbital.

\textbf{Figure 3.} The HOMO and LUMO wavefunctions of Cu_{BCz}^{MAC} displayed with isovalue = 0.1. The 3,6-diisopropylphenyl groups and hydrogen atoms were omitted for clarity. The HOMO/LUMO densities of Cu_{PhCz}^{MAC} and Au_{BCz}^{MAC} are qualitatively the same and are available in Figure S1 in the SI.

Table 1 shows that the HOMO energies are selectively tuned by substitutions on the carbazole ligand, whereas the LUMO energies remain effectively constant. The LUMO energies remain constant because each reported complex has the same carbene ligand. The energy of the HOMO for the Cu analogues is destabilized in the order Cu_{BCz}^{MAC} > Cu_{Cz}^{MAC} > Cu_{PhCz}^{MAC} which is consistent with the electron donating nature of the tBu group, and electron withdrawing nature of the phenyl group. Changing the metal from Cu to Au also stabilizes the HOMO which is ascribed to the higher ionization potential of Au(I) relative to Cu(I).\textsuperscript{34} The choice of metal ion does not
affect the LUMO energies due to the nature of the dative carbene-metal bond compared to the relatively ionic M⁺-Cz⁻ interaction.

Table 1. Computational results of each photosensitizer. Here, \( f \) corresponds to the oscillator strength of the transition, and \( \Lambda_{h+,e} \) is the overlap between the hole and electron wavefunctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HOMO (eV)</th>
<th>LUMO (eV)</th>
<th>( S_0 \rightarrow S_1 ) (eV/f)</th>
<th>( T_1 \rightarrow S_0 ) (eV)</th>
<th>( \Delta E_{ST}^a ) (eV)</th>
<th>% metal (HO/LU)</th>
<th>( \Lambda_{h+,e} ) (( S_1 )) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}} )</td>
<td>-4.08</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>2.41/0.12</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>4.4/7.8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{Cz}} )</td>
<td>-4.17</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>2.48/0.11</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>4.6/7.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{PhCz}} )</td>
<td>-4.23</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>2.51/0.14</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>3.3/7.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Au}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}} )</td>
<td>-4.22</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>2.59/0.19</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>4.1/9.0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Au}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{Cz}} )</td>
<td>-4.32</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>2.66/0.16</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4.3/9.1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the excited states using TDDFT shows that the hole and electron wavefunctions in the \( S_0 \rightarrow S_1 \) transition is well described by the HOMO and LUMO respectively. Consequently, the energy of this interligand charge transfer (ICT) mirrors the trend in HOMO energy, since the energy of the LUMO is relatively invariant in these complexes. The energy of the \( T_1 \) state lies close in energy to the \( S_1 \) state because of the large spatial separation between the hole and electron centers of charge for two-coordinate cMa complexes. Small exchange energies and strong spin orbit coupling are known to promote rapid \( T_1 \rightarrow S_1 \) inter-system crossing and thermally assisted delayed fluorescence (TADF) in two-coordinate complexes with coplanar ligands.\(^{18,35}\) Comparing \( \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}} \) and \( \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{Cz}} \) to their gold analogues shows an increase in oscillator strength for the \( S_0 \rightarrow S_1 \) transition. This is consistent with the HOMO/LUMO overlap trend which suggests the Au(I) metal center induces greater orbital overlap than Cu(I). This is interesting because the metal d orbital contributes a small, albeit important point of overlap between the HOMO and LUMO. To further investigate this feature, the contribution of the metal atom in each orbital was computed using the Hirshfeld method.\(^{32}\) The product of the metal orbital contribution to the HOMO and LUMO (\( \%M_{\text{HOMO}} \times \%M_{\text{LUMO}} \)) is higher for the gold complex (36-39%) with respect to their copper analog (26-36%). This result leads to an increase in oscillator strength for the \( S_0 \rightarrow S_1 \) transition in the Au derivative.
**Electrochemical Results:** Electrochemical measurements were performed to evaluate the ground state redox potentials and reversibility of the cationic and anionic species of the cMa complexes in a variety of solvents that are suitable for solar fuels.\textsuperscript{36-38}

Table 2. Electrochemical potentials of cMa complexes in CH\textsubscript{2}Cl\textsubscript{2}, DMF, THF, and MeCN. The full CV and DPV for all table entries can be found in the SI (Figures S3 – S6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{BCz}</th>
<th>Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{PhCz}</th>
<th>Au\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{BCz}</th>
<th>Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{Cz}</th>
<th>Au\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{Cz}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH\textsubscript{2}Cl\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>0.06 (b)</td>
<td>0.17 (b)</td>
<td>0.13 (b)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.22 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THF</td>
<td>Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{BCz}</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Au\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{BCz}</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{Cz}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeCN</td>
<td>Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{BCz}</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{PhCz}</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Au\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{BCz}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Potentials are in Volts vs. Fc+/0 couple, \textsuperscript{b} Reductions are outside of the solvent window.

The redox potentials are nearly independent of solvent, however the electrochemical reversibility does depend on the solvent. The reduction is reversible for all reported cMa complexes across all solvents. Further, the reduction potentials of all are effectively the same. This is consistent with the LUMO being localized on the carbene ligand because all complexes have the same MAC carbene ligand. The trend in oxidation potentials also follows the computational trends of the HOMO. \(E^{+0}\) of Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{Cz} is greater than that of Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{BCz} and Cu\textsuperscript{MAC} \textsubscript{PhCz}, but less than that of the Au-analog.
Figure 4. Cyclic voltammetry of all complexes in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ (a) and THF (b). The reduction event was outside of the solvent window for CH$_2$Cl$_2$ therefore, only the oxidative sweeps are shown here.

Cu$^{MAC}_{Cz}$ and Au$^{MAC}_{Cz}$ undergo irreversible oxidation in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ and THF as shown in Figure 4. The oxidation is also irreversible in DMF, and MeCN (Figures S4-S5). Irreversible oxidation is to be expected since the HOMO is localized on carbazole; a ligand which irreversibly oxidizes due to oligomerization at the 3,6-positions. The small oxidation features for these cMa complexes at $\sim$ -0.25 V to 0.2 V only appear after the second cycle, and have been assigned to oxidation of the oligomerization products.$^{30}$ These features are not present in any of the cMa complexes with substituents on the 3,6-position of carbazole. Thus, installation of tert-butyl or phenyl groups leads to enhanced oxidative stability in CH$_2$Cl$_2$ and THF on the timescale of seconds. In MeCN (Figure S4), none of the cMa complexes undergo reversible oxidation. In DMF, however, the return wave of the first oxidation diminishes for all reported copper cMa complexes, but Au$^{MAC}_{BCz}$ maintains a return wave. This result suggests that the oxidative stability of Au cMa complexes is greater than the Cu analogs in solution.

Photophysical Properties: The photophysical properties of the cMa complexes were examined in polar and non-polar solvents. All compounds display broad, gaussian-like absorption bands in the visible spectrum which is assigned to the $S_0 \rightarrow S_1$ ICT transition. These bands have reasonable molar absorptivity values for a charge-transfer transitions (Cu$^{MAC}_{BCz}$: $\varepsilon = 4 \times 10^3$ M$^{-1}$cm$^{-1}$ at 435 nm, Cu$^{MAC}_{PhCz}$: $\varepsilon = 6 \times 10^3$ at 425 nm, Au$^{MAC}_{BCz}$: $\varepsilon = 8 \times 10^3$ M$^{-1}$cm$^{-1}$ at 427 nm).$^{39-43}$ The emission is shown in Figure 5b is broad and featureless with a large stokes-shift, which is typical for cMa complexes.
Figure 5. (a) Molar absorptivity and (b) the emission of all compounds in THF. The full spectrum from 250 nm to 550 nm is provided in Figure S6.

The blue shift in the absorption $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ from $\text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}}$ to $\text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{PhCz}}$ and $\text{Au}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}}$ is due to the stabilization of the HOMO in the PhCz and Au complexes, as discussed above. The difference in molar absorptivity between $\text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}}$ and $\text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{PhCz}}$ also stems from the blue shift of the $S_0 \rightarrow S_1$ band which encroaches on the $S_0 \rightarrow S_2$ local excitation of 3,6-diphenylcarbazole, giving $\text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{PhCz}}$ a slightly higher $\varepsilon$ than $\text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}}$. The increased $\varepsilon$ in $\text{Au}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}}$ compared to $\text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}}$ is explained by the increase in oscillator strength of the $S_0 \rightarrow S_1$ absorption in Table 1.
**Figure 6.** Solvent dependent absorption (a) and emission (b) spectra for Cu^{MAC} \text{BCZ}. Spectra for Cu^{MAC} \text{PhCZ} and Au^{MAC} \text{BCZ} are shown in Figures S9 and S10.

Photophysical properties were explored in solvents of varying polarity (toluene, THF, CH₂Cl₂, MeCN, and DMF, Figure 6 (a). With increasing solvent polarity the absorption band for the ICT transition blue shifts, whereas the emission red shifts. This solvatochromism has been previously explained by the large change in dipole between the ground and excited state of these molecules.¹⁹ Here we observe that solvatochromism is markedly more pronounced in the absorption spectrum than the emission spectrum.

An important consideration for a photosensitizer is the lifetime of the excited state, which must persist long enough for the PS* to diffuse to an electrocatalyst and transfer charge. For highly endergonic electron transfer processes, the rate constant of electron transfer (kₚ) typically plateaus at ~1x10¹⁰ M⁻¹s⁻¹.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶ Equation 1 shows that the total quenching rate also depends on the concentration of the quencher ([Q]), which would be the concentration of the electrocatalyst in a solar fuels setup. Electrocatalyst concentrations of 1-10 mM correspond to quenching rates of 1x10⁷ s⁻¹ and 1x10⁸ s⁻¹ respectively. These rates correspond to quenching lifetimes of 100-10ns. The excited state lifetime (τ) and quantum yield (Φ) were measured, and the radiative and non-radiative rate constants (kᵣ and kₙᵣ) were calculated in toluene, THF, CH₂Cl₂, MeCN, and DMF in Table 3.
Table 3. Photophysical parameters in various solvents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Cu&lt;sup&gt;MAC&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sub&gt;BCz&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Cu&lt;sup&gt;MAC&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sub&gt;PhCz&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Au&lt;sup&gt;MAC&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sub&gt;BCz&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>λ&lt;sub&gt;max abs&lt;/sub&gt; (nm)</td>
<td>λ&lt;sub&gt;max em&lt;/sub&gt; (nm)</td>
<td>τ (ns)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THF</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMF</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeCN</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THF</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMF</td>
<td>393*</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeCN</td>
<td>393*</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THF</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;Cl&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMF</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MeCN</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values cannot be accurately determined because the ICT absorption band overlaps with the ligand localized transitions at higher energy.

Notably, the excited state lifetime is longer than intermolecular diffusion in all solvent systems. However, the excited state lifetime drops with solvent polarity for each photosensitizer. This decrease in lifetime is due to an increase in non-radiative decay as a function of solvent polarity (See Figure S11). Toluene yields the longest excited state lifetimes, and the most visible light absorption. The enhanced absorption of visible light due to the red shift of the ICT transition with decreasing solvent polarity. However, non-polar solvents can lead to additional kinetic barriers for intermolecular charge transfer. We opted to perform quenching studies in THF because it is polar enough to facilitate efficient electron transfer and photoredox reactions, and gives the highest
absorptivity of the polar solvents. Furthermore, THF is the only polar solvent that sustains reversible oxidation and reduction for all photosensitizers.

**Photoredox Properties.** Molecules in the excited state are more potent oxidizing and reducing agents than in their ground state. Redox potentials in the excited state are related to the redox potentials in the ground state and the energy gained by absorbing a photon. These potentials are related by Equations 2 and 3.\(^{47}\)

\[
E^{+/-} = E^{+/0} - E_0
\]

\[
E^{*/-} = E^{0/-} + E_0
\]

where \(E_0\) is the energy corresponding to the midpoint between the \(S_0 \rightarrow S_1\) absorption and \(S_1 \rightarrow S_0\) emission. This relationship is shown graphically in Figure 7.

![Latimer diagram](image)

**Figure 7.** Latimer diagram relating the ground state photosensitizer (PS) to the excited state (PS\(^*\)) through ground state and excited state redox couples, and the optical excited state energy \(E_{00}\).

**Table 4.** Ground and excited state redox potentials for the cMa complexes in THF.\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>complex</th>
<th>(E^{+}/0) (V)</th>
<th>(E^{0/-}) (eV)</th>
<th>(E_{00}) (eV)</th>
<th>(E^{+}/*) (V)</th>
<th>(E^{*/-}) (V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_\text{BCz})</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-2.43</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_\text{PhCz})</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{Au}^{\text{MAC}}_\text{BCz})</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Potentials are referenced to internal Fc\(^+/0\).
Equations 2 and 3 predict that the cMa complexes are capable of being potent photo-reducing agents with near equal values of $E^{+/*}$ (-2.4 V vs. Fc$^{+/0}$), whereas they are only mild photo-oxidants. The near degeneracy of $E^{+/*}$ reflects the trend in increasing energy of $E_{00}$ ($\text{Cu}_{BCZ}^{\text{MAC}} \succ \text{Cu}_{PhCz}^{\text{MAC}} \succ \text{Au}_{BCZ}^{\text{MAC}}$) being offset by an increase in oxidation potential for each complex. This behavior is to be expected in a system where the energy of the $S_1$ state is dictated by a transition involving the energy of a spatially separated HOMO and LUMO. Substituents that stabilize/destabilize the oxidation potential will stabilize/destabilize $E_{00}$ accordingly. Thus, the value for $E^{+/*}$ is largely governed by the choice of carbene. Analogously, the value for $E^{+/^r}$ is approximately governed by the choice of metal and amide donor since these moieties determine the energy of the HOMO. Photo-oxidative quenching of the cMa complexes was therefore investigated due to their remarkably high $E^{+/*}$ values.

The thermodynamic driving force of quenching an excited state via electron transfer ($\Delta G$) depends on the values of $E^{+/*}$ of the photosensitizer ($E_{PS}^{+/*}$), $E^{0/-}$ of the quencher ($E_{Q}^{0/-}$), and work terms ($W_s$) associated with coulombic interactions of separating charge in the solvent medium (eq 4).

$$\Delta G = \left( E_{PS}^{+/*} - E_{Q}^{0/-} \right) + W_s \tag{4}$$

As the quenching molecule becomes harder to reduce, the rate of electron transfer is expected to decrease sharply when $\Delta G > 0$. The initial step for electron transfer from the excited photosensitizer ($PS^*$) to a quenching molecule (Q) requires the two species to diffuse together to form an encounter complex [PS*,Q] with rate constant $k_d$ (Scheme 2). This encounter complex can relax through concomitant radiative and non-radiative processes ($k_r$ and $k_{nr}$), or it can be quenched by transferring an electron or energy to the quencher. Here, we focus only on quenching via charge transfer by choosing quenchers that have energies for their $S_1$ and $T_1$ states well above those of the cMa complexes, precluding quenching by energy transfer. Electron transfer occurs with a rate constant $k_{eT}$, and the resultant charge separated pair [PS*,Q'] can either recombine by back electron transfer with rate constant $k_{beT}$, or to form the ground state with rate constant $k_{re}$. The charge separated pair can also diffuse away from each other as individual species ($PS^+ + Q^-$) with rate constant $k_s$. 
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**Scheme 2.** Kinetic scheme for the oxidative quenching of a photosensitizer.

\[
\begin{align*}
PS^* + Q & \underset{k_d}{\xrightarrow{k_{rd}}} PS^*,Q \underset{k_{beT}}{\xrightarrow{k_{eT}}} PS^+,Q^- \underset{k_re}{\xrightarrow{k_{s}}} PS^+ + Q^- \\
& \downarrow k_{r,nr} \downarrow k_{r} \downarrow k_{re} \\
PS + Q & \quad PS + Q
\end{align*}
\]

Rehm and Weller showed that the net quenching rate constant \(k_q\) given by eq 5 must consider the equilibrium which forms the encounter complex (\(k_d/k_{rd} = \Delta V_{1,2}\)), and charge recombination (\(k_{re}\)):

\[
k_q = \frac{k_d}{1 + \left( \frac{k_d}{\Delta V_{12} \times k_{re}} \right) \left( \exp \left( \frac{\Delta G^\ddagger}{RT} \right) + \exp \left( \frac{\Delta G}{RT} \right) \right)}
\]

(5)

where \(R\) is the ideal gas constant, \(T\) is temperature, and \(\Delta G\) is given by equation 3.\(^49\) The free energy term (\(\Delta G^\ddagger\)) accounts for the reorganization energy of (\(PS^*,Q\)) to (\(PS^+,Q^-\)) and the solvent reorganization required for electron transfer (\(\Delta G_r\)).

\[
\Delta G^\ddagger = \left( \frac{\Delta G}{2} \right)^2 + (\Delta G_r)^2 + \frac{\Delta G}{2}
\]

(6)

Rate constants of luminescence quenching for each complex were derived from Stern-Volmer analysis of experiments performed in THF using quenchers with varying reduction potentials: quinoxaline (QNX), N--methylthalimide (NMeP), N,N-dimethyl-4-nitroaniline (DMNA), nitrobenzene (NB), and perinapthenone (PN). The reduction potentials for each quencher is given in Table 5 and plots of Stern-Volmer quenching data are given in the SI (Figures S12 and S13).
Table 5. Stern-Volmer quenching rate constants ($k_q$) for the cMa complexes measured in THF. Reduction potentials of the quenching molecules were measured using differential pulse voltammetry (Figure S2) and are reported vs. Fc$^{+/-}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quencher</th>
<th>$E^{0/-}$ (V)</th>
<th>$k_q$(Au$^{MAC}_{BCz}$) ($10^9$ M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$k_q$(Cu$^{MAC}_{BCz}$) ($10^9$ M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$k_q$(Cu$^{MAC}_{PhCz}$) ($10^9$ M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QNX</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMeP</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMNA</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the Stern-Volmer data for a given quenching molecule shows that rate of $k_q$ is fastest for Cu$^{MAC}_{PhCz}$ and slowest for Au$^{MAC}_{BCz}$ (Table 5). This behavior mirrors the energy of $E^{+/-}$ for the complexes estimated using equation 2. An increase in $k_q$ is apparent as $E^{0/-}$ becomes less negative. This change is due to an increase in the driving force of electron transfer from PS$^*$ to Q ($\Delta G^\ddagger$) as the quenching molecule becomes easier to reduce. When the driving force becomes significantly large, $k_q$ plateaus at $1.1 \times 10^9$ s$^{-1}$, which corresponds to diffusion-limited quenching. In this regime, the slowest step in Scheme 2 is diffusion of PS$^*$ to Q to form the encounter complex (PS$^*$,Q). Thus, the value for $k_d$ in the Rehm-Weller fit was set to $1.1 \times 10^9$ s$^{-1}$. Details for the other parameters used in the fits are given in the SI. Values of $E^{+/-}$ for each complex were determined from fits of the quenching rates to equation 5 (Figure 8). The values for $E^{+/-}$ obtained from fits to the data in Figure 8 are -2.28 V for Cu$^{MAC}_{BCz}$, -2.33 V for Cu$^{MAC}_{PhCz}$, and -2.23 V for Cu$^{MAC}_{BCz}$. Thus, the trend in $k_q$ parallels the same trend in oxidation potential of the complexes (Cu$^{MAC}_{PhCz}$ > Cu$^{MAC}_{BCz}$ > Au$^{MAC}_{BCz}$). This analysis suggests that the small difference in $E^{+/-}$ values found for the three complexes is consistent with the predictions of equation 2, yet 100-170 meV lower than the estimates of -2.4 V. The disparity can be accounted for by considering that $E_{00}$ used in equation 2 is based on the S$_0$ → S$_1$ transition. Intersystem crossing is extremely rapid in the cMa complexes ($k_{ISC} > 10^9$ s$^{-1}$) and they are likely quenched out of the long-lived triplet excited state (T$_1$).21 The energy of the T$_1$ state for Au$^{MAC}_{Cz}$ was reported to be 90 meV lower than the S$_1$ state, which accounts for most of the difference in $E^{+/-}$.17 A similar $\Delta E_{ST}$ value of 90 meV is expected.
for the reported photosensitizers because experimental $\Delta E_{ST}$ values in cMa complexes do not vary significantly between Cu and Au complexes. Since substitutions to the amide ligand do not contribute significantly to the hole NTO, it is reasonable to assume similar $\Delta E_{ST}$ values for the two copper analogs as well.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 8.** Rehm-Weller analysis of the cMa complexes in THF.

Several quenching studies were also performed in toluene, but values of $k_q$ for a given photosensitizer-quencher pair were consistently lower when compared to values found in THF (See Figure S13 and Table S3 in the SI). This effect is likely due to the non-polar nature of toluene which increases the work term ($W_s$ in equation 4) and consequently the energy barrier ($\Delta G_r$ in equation 6) for charge separation. Non-polar media also inhibits physical separation of the charged species in the cage complex ($PS^+, Q^-$), which can allow the rate of $k_{bet}$ to become competitive with $k_{et}$. This effect is expected to lower the overall efficiency of charge transfer, and thus $k_q$. Alternatively, several quenching studies were performed in MeCN (Table S4). Quenching rates for a given photosensitizer-quencher pair are faster in highly polar MeCN than in THF since the work term becomes negligible in MeCN, which yields a larger driving force in $\Delta G$ and a concomitant increase in $k_q$. However, the benefit from the faster quenching rate is offset by the hypsochromic shift for the ICT transition in MeCN, which decreases the amount light absorbed within the visible portion of the solar spectrum, and significantly decreased excited state lifetimes.
5. Conclusion

Photophysical investigations into the excited state redox properties of two-coordinate coinage metal complexes demonstrate that these compounds are a viable new class of photosensitizers for solar fuels applications. Figures of merit were investigated in a variety of different solvents for three new Cu(I) and Au(I) cMa complexes. All reported complexes efficiently absorb visible photons and are potent photo-reducing agents with long-lived excited states. Electrochemical studies show that substituents at the 3,6-position of carbazole stabilizes the cationic species generated upon oxidation. The Au(I) complex has twice the molar absorptivity and greater electrochemical stability compared to Cu(I) analog, with only a minor decrease in excited state reduction potential (~50 meV). The excited state oxidation potential determined using two different methods is found to be $\geq -2.3$ V vs. Fc$^{+/0}$, which is at a stronger potential than the common scarce metal photosensitizers such as Ru(bpy)$_3^{2+}$ ($E^{+/*} = -1.12$ V vs. Fc$^{+/0}$) and Ir(ppy)$_3$ ($E^{+/*} = -2.14$ V vs. Fc$^{+/0}$). Two-coordinate cMa complexes also have excited state reduction potentials greater than Cu(I) bis phenanthroline systems, ($E^{+/*} = -1.8$ V vs. Fc$^{+/0}$).

Importantly, the choice of carbene largely determines the value for $E^{+/*}$, whereas the amide determines the value for $E^{*/-}$. Thus, two-coordinate cMa complexes can be modified to make even more potent photo-reducing agents using carbens with more negative reduction potentials than the carbene used here; however, such a change will shift the lowest energy absorption bands into the near-UV spectrum. These ICT transitions can be shifted back into the visible spectrum by pairing such carbens with amides that are oxidized at lower potentials. Alternatively, carbens with less negative reduction potentials than MAC will redshift the absorption deeper into the visible spectrum but are expected to lower the potential for $E^{+/*}$, making them weaker photoreducing agents. Similarly, amides such as cyano-substituted carbazole ligands can be used to increase the $E^{+/*}$ for photo-oxidative chemistry. Therefore, these cMa complexes can be designed to activate any given electrocatalysts with significant control over the energy of the visible absorption transition, which makes them a promising new class of photosensitizers to produce solar fuels.
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Synthesis and Characterization

Synthesis of 1,3-bis(2,6-diisopropylphenyl)-5,5-dimethyl-4-oxo-3,4,5,6-tetrahydropyrimidin-1-ium-2-ide-Cu(I)-3,6-di-tert-butylcarbazol-9-ide (Cu_{BCz}^{MAC}): Following the general procedure, a 150 mL Schlenk flask was charged with 512 mg 3,6-di-tert-butyl-9-H-carbazole (1.83 mols) and 185 mg sodium tert-butoxide (1.92 mols). The solids were dissolved in 80 mL THF, and 1.0 g (1.83 mols) of MAC CuCl was added. The workup yielded a yellow powder. The powder was washed with methanol which dissolved some product but removed all remaining impurities, yielding 890 mg (64% yield) of Cu_{BCz}^{MAC} as a yellow powder which is bright yellow emissive under 365 nm UV radiation. ^1H NMR (400 MHz, acetone-d6) δ: 7.81-7.72 (m, 4H), 7.58 (d, J = 7.6 Hz, 2H), 7.52 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 6.90 (dd, J = 8.6 Hz, 2.1 Hz, 2H), 5.52 (d, J = 8.8 Hz, 2H), 4.25 (s, 2H), 3.55 (hept, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 3.29 (hept, J = 7.2 Hz, 2H), 1.66 (s, 6H), 1.42 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 6H), 1.32 (s, 18H), 1.28-1.22 (m, 18H). ^13C NMR (100 MHz, acetone-d6) δ: 211.0, 206.3, 206.3, 172.3, 149.5, 147.4, 146.4, 141.5, 138.0, 137.5, 131.3, 130.9, 126.7, 125.8, 124.9, 121.2, 115.3, 115.0, 62.2, 39.0, 35.0, 32.8, 32.5, 30.6, 30.4, 30.2, 30.0, 29.8, 29.8, 29.6, 29.5, 29.4, 25.5, 24.9, 24.7, 24.6, 24.5. CHN (C: 76.61%; H: 8.40%; N: 5.47%; calculated: C: 76.15%; H: 8.44%; N: 5.33%).

Synthesis of 1,3-bis(2,6-diisopropylphenyl)-5,5-dimethyl-4-oxo-3,4,5,6-tetrahydropyrimidin-1-ium-2-ide-Cu(I)-3,6-di-phenylcarbazol-9-ide (Cu_{PhCz}^{MAC}): Following the general procedure, a 250 mL Schlenk flask was charged with 585 mg 3,6-diphenyl-9-H-carbazole (1.83 mols) and 185 mg (1.92 mols) NaO'Bu. The solids were dissolved in 100 mL THF, and 1.0 g (1.83 mols) of MAC CuCl was added to yield a light yellow powder after the general workup. The powder was washed copiously with with diethyl ether to afford 1020 mg (67% yield) of Cu_{PhCz}^{MAC} as a shiny yellow powder which emits intense turquoise under 365 nm UV radiation. (400 MHz, acetone-d6) δ: 8.17 (dd, J = 0.7 Hz, 2.0 Hz, 2H), 7.87-7.80 (m, 2H), 7.67-7.62 (m, 6H), 7.58 (d, J = 7.8 Hz, 2H), 7.41-7.36 (m, 4H), 7.23-7.18 (m, 4H), 5.66 (dd, J = 0.6 Hz, J = 8.3 Hz), 4.30 (s, 2H), 3.59 (hept, J = 6.9 Hz, 2H), 3.33 (hept, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 1.68 (s, 6H), 1.4 (d, J=6.6 Hz, 6H), 1.33-1.24 (m, 18H). ^13C NMR (100 MHz, acetone-d6) δ: 210.7, 206.3, 206.3, 206.3, 172.3, 151.2, 147.5, 146.4, 144.2, 141.5, 137.5, 131.5, 131.1, 129.8, 129.5, 129.4, 127.9, 127.5, 127.3, 126.8, 126.2, 126.1, 125.9, 125.9, 123.5, 119.7, 118.2, 116.1, 62.1, 39.0, 32.4, 30.5, 30.4, 30.3, 30.2, 30.0,
29.8, 29.6, 29.5, 29.4, 29.3, 25.5, 24.9, 24.7, 24.5. CHN (C: 77.70%; H: 6.94%; N: 5.14%; calculated: C: 78.27%; H: 7.06%; N: 5.07%)

Synthesis of 1,3-bis(2,6-diisopropylphenyl)-5,5-dimethyl-4-oxo-3,4,5,6-tetrahydropyrimidin-1-ium-2-ide-Au(I)-3,6-di-tert-butylcarbazol-9-ide (Au$^{\text{MAC\textsubscript{BCZ}}}$): Following the general procedure, a 250 mL Schlenkflask was charged with 411 mg (1.47 mols) 3,6-di-tertbutyl-9-H-carbazole and 142 mg NaO'Bu (1.62 mols). The solids were dissolved in 120 mL THF and 1.0g (1.47 mols) MAC AuCl was added. The general workup afforded 425 mg (31% yield) of Au$^{\text{MAC\textsubscript{BCZ}}}$ as a mustard yellow powder that emits bright yellow under 365 nm radiation.

$^1$H NMR (400 MHz, acetone-d6) δ: 7.83 (d, J = 2 Hz, 2H), 7.78-7.69 (m, 2H), 7.56 (d, J = 7.7 Hz, 2H), 7.50 (d, J = 7.8 Hz, 2H), 7.0 (dd, J = 1.7 Hz, J = 9.0 Hz, 2H), 6.00 (d, J = 8.6 Hz, 2H), 4.25 (s, 2H), 3.50 (hept, J = 6.8 Hz, 2H), 3.25 (hept, J = 6.8 Hz, 2H), 1.68 (s, 6H), 1.41 (d, J = 6.7 Hz, 6H), 1.37 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 6H), 1.34 (d, J = 7.4 Hz, 6H), 1.33 (s, 18H), 1.22 (d, J = 6.8 Hz, 6H). $^{13}$C NMR (100 MHz, acetone-d6) δ 206.3, 206.3, 206.2, 205.7, 173.0, 149.1, 147.4, 146.2, 141.7, 138.8, 137.7, 131.1, 130.8, 126.4, 125.4, 124.7, 121.5, 115.5, 114.4, 62.1, 39.1, 35.0, 35.0, 32.8, 32.6, 30.6, 30.4, 30.4, 30.2, 30.0, 29.8, 29.8, 29.8, 29.6, 29.4, 25.0, 24.7, 24.7, 24.6, 24.3, 14.8. CHN (C: 64.59%; H: 7.10%; N: 4.63%; calculated: C: 65.13%; H: 7.22%; N: 4.56%).

**Crystal Structures**

All crystals were grown by recrystallization. Vappordiffusion of hexanes or pentane into a solution of the compound in DCM or Acetone. A Cryo-Loop was used to mount the sample with Paratone oil.

All single crystal structures were determined at 100K with Rigaku Xta LAB Synergy S, equipped with an HyPix-600HE detector and an Oxford Cryostream 800 low Temperature unit, using Cu Kα PhotonJet-S X-ray source. The frames were integrated using the SAINT algorithm to give the hkl files. Data were corrected for absorption effects using the multi-scan method (SADABS) with Rigaku CrysalisPro. The structures were solved by intrinsic phasing and refined with the SHELXTL Software Package. If necessary, the disordered solvent treatment method BYPASS for co-crystallizing solvent molecules, was implemented and marked in the CCDC entry.
All cif files and report data including atom position, bond lengths and bond angle can be downloaded from the CCDC database, using the database number in the right column of the following table. Furthermore the following table is giving the most important bond lengths, angels and the torsion angle around the metal center. The Conformer ratio represents the ratio of two different disordered conformations of the molecule. All crystalized with one molecule in the asymmetric unit.

Table S1: Selected bond lengths and angles for the(carbene)M(amide) complexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>compound</th>
<th>C-M (Å)</th>
<th>M-N (Å)</th>
<th>C-M-N (°)</th>
<th>Torsion (°)</th>
<th>C-N-C(O) (°)</th>
<th>C-N-C(H₂) (°)</th>
<th>Disorder ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cu&lt;sub&gt;MAC&lt;/sub&gt;_&lt;sub&gt;BCz&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.875(2)</td>
<td>1.849(2)</td>
<td>178.71</td>
<td>19.62</td>
<td>126.41</td>
<td>124.03</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au&lt;sub&gt;MAC&lt;/sub&gt;_&lt;sub&gt;BCz&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.977(4)</td>
<td>1.997(3)</td>
<td>176.23</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>124.76</td>
<td>124.03</td>
<td>60/40 (CH₃) 50/50 (C=O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cu&lt;sub&gt;MAC&lt;/sub&gt;_&lt;sub&gt;PhCz&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.882(2)</td>
<td>1.854(2)</td>
<td>175.11</td>
<td>2.22 6.52</td>
<td>125.89</td>
<td>123.46</td>
<td>-/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2. Crystallographic Parameters for Cu<sup>MAC</sup><sub>BCZ</sub>, Au<sup>MAC</sup><sub>BCZ</sub> and Cu<sup>MAC</sup><sub>PHCZ</sub>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification code</th>
<th>Cu&lt;sup&gt;MAC&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sub&gt;BCZ&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Au&lt;sup&gt;MAC&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sub&gt;BCZ&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Cu&lt;sup&gt;MAC&lt;/sup&gt;&lt;sub&gt;PHCZ&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empirical formula</td>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt;H&lt;sub&gt;66&lt;/sub&gt;CuN&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;O</td>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;50&lt;/sub&gt;H&lt;sub&gt;66&lt;/sub&gt;AuN&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;O</td>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;54&lt;/sub&gt;H&lt;sub&gt;58&lt;/sub&gt;CuN&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formula weight</td>
<td>788.59</td>
<td>921.07</td>
<td>828.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature/K</td>
<td>99.9(3)</td>
<td>100.0(2)</td>
<td>100.0(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal system</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
<td>monoclinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space group</td>
<td>P2&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;/n</td>
<td>P2&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;/n</td>
<td>P2&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;/c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a/Å</td>
<td>12.6232(1)</td>
<td>14.7369(2)</td>
<td>17.0684(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b/Å</td>
<td>15.5893(1)</td>
<td>13.0901(2)</td>
<td>15.5735(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c/Å</td>
<td>23.7886(2)</td>
<td>24.4764(4)</td>
<td>19.4670(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α/°</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β/°</td>
<td>99.598(1)</td>
<td>107.306(2)</td>
<td>114.062(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ/°</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume/Å³</td>
<td>4615.75(6)</td>
<td>4507.93(13)</td>
<td>4725.0(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ&lt;sub&gt;calc&lt;/sub&gt;/g/Å³</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>1.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ/mm⁻¹</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>6.412</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(000)</td>
<td>1696.0</td>
<td>1892.0</td>
<td>1760.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal size/mm³</td>
<td>0.162 × 0.216 × 0.326</td>
<td>0.474 × 0.294 × 0.208</td>
<td>0.141 × 0.089 × 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation</td>
<td>Cu Kα (λ = 1.54184)</td>
<td>Cu Kα (λ = 1.54184)</td>
<td>Cu Kα (λ = 1.54184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Θ range for data coll./°</td>
<td>6.808 to 154.728</td>
<td>7.566 to 154.978</td>
<td>5.67 to 154.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index ranges</td>
<td>-14 ≤ h ≤ 15, -19 ≤ k ≤ 19, -28 ≤ l ≤ 30</td>
<td>-18 ≤ h ≤ 17, -15 ≤ k ≤ 16, -28 ≤ l ≤ 30</td>
<td>-20 ≤ h ≤ 14, -18 ≤ k ≤ 18, -24 ≤ l ≤ 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections collected</td>
<td>85783</td>
<td>46425</td>
<td>33322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent reflections</td>
<td>9360 [R&lt;sub&gt;int&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0466, R&lt;sub&gt;sigma&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0214]</td>
<td>8765 [R&lt;sub&gt;int&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0607, R&lt;sub&gt;sigma&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0378]</td>
<td>8414 [R&lt;sub&gt;int&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0451, R&lt;sub&gt;sigma&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0326]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/restraints/parameters</td>
<td>9360/0/512</td>
<td>8765/0/544</td>
<td>8414/0/543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness-of-fit on F²</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [I&gt;=2σ]</td>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0578, wR&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.1607</td>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0331, wR&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0821</td>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0581, wR&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.1497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final R indexes [all data]</td>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0624, wR&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.1648</td>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0376, wR&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0853</td>
<td>R&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.0658, wR&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; = 0.1547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largest diff. peak/hole/e Å⁻³</td>
<td>2.29/-0.69</td>
<td>0.84/-1.67</td>
<td>0.43/-0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#CCDC</td>
<td>2238026</td>
<td>2237840</td>
<td>2237833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Computation

Figure S1. HOMO and LUMO densities of all reported photosensitizers. The HOMO is displayed in red and blue, and the LUMO is displayed in cyan and cream for Cu$_{PhCz}^{MAC}$, Cu$_{BCz}^{MAC}$, and Au$_{BCz}^{MAC}$ (iso-value = 0.1). A zoomed in panel is shown for each compound to illustrate that the HOMO and LUMO wavefunctions share density at the metal center. The 3,6-diisopropylphenyl substituents, and hydrogen atoms are deleted for clarity.

Several different methods were used to evaluate the atomic orbital contribution to a given molecular orbital including the Mulliken partition method, the Stout-Politzer partition method, the Ros-Schuit partition, and the Hirshfeld method. Computations were performed using Multiwfn.

Table S1. The percent contribution of the gold atom of Au$_{BCz}^{MAC}$ to the HOMO and LUMO by different computational methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAC Au Cz</th>
<th>HOMO (%)</th>
<th>LUMO (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mulliken</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stout-Politzer</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ros-Schuit</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirshfeld</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electrochemistry

Figure S2. Reductive DPV sweep of electron accepting quenchers that were used to determine $E^{\text{aq+}}$ of the cMa complexes.
Figure S3. CV and DPV measurements of all reported compounds in DMF vs. Fc+/0. The CV scans were vertically shifted to be above the DPV scans during post-processing of the data.
Figure S4. CV and DPV measurements of all reported compounds in MeCN vs. Fc\(^{+/0}\). The CV scans were vertically shifted to be above the DPV scans during post-processing of the data.
Figure S5. CV and DPV measurements of all reported compounds in THF vs. Fc$^{+/0}$. The CV scans were vertically shifted to be above the DPV scans during post-processing of the data.
Figure S6. CV measurements of the first oxidation in DCM vs. Fe^{+/0}. The reduction event is outside of the solvent window.
**Photophysics**

Measurements were made in a custom designed glass cuvette equipped with a Teflon valve and side-arm with a small opening. Polyethylene tubing was inserted through the side-arm hole with the schlenk valve open just enough for the tube to pass into the solution and sparge it with N\(_2\). Sparging was performed for ~10 minutes. The tube was raised past the Schlenk valve but not out of the side-arm under high N\(_2\) flow, and the Schlenk valve was sealed to establish a N\(_2\) atmosphere in the samples. Finally, the tube was removed from the side-arm.

**Figure S7.** Custom Schlenk cuvettes were made by purchasing a glass joint with a Teflon valve and 90° side-arm. This was fused to a 1cmx1cm square glass tube with the bottom sealed to form the cuvette shape. The side-arm was sealed and a smaller opening was created to make a smaller inlet for the sparging tubing.
Figure S8. Molar absorptivity spectra in THF for all reported photosensitizers.

Figure S9. Solvent dependent PL of $Au_{BCz}^{MAC}$: (a) absorption, (b) emission.
Figure S10. Solvent dependent PL of $Cu_{PhCz}^{MAC}$. (a) absorption, (b) emission.

Figure S11. The non-radiative rate vs. solvent ET(30) of all reported photosensitizers.\textsuperscript{50}
Figure S12. Stern-Volmer plots measured in THF. The corresponding photosensitizer and electron accepting quencher are displayed on the plots.
Figure S13. Stern-Volmer plots measured in Toluene. The corresponding photosensitizer and electron accepting quencher are displayed on the plots
Figure S14. Stern-Volmer plots measured in MeCN. The corresponding photosensitizer and electron accepting quencher are displayed on the plots.

Table S3. Stern-Volmer results of $k_q$ in Toluene for all cpds against quinoxaline and n-methyl pthalimide. $Au_{MAC}^{BCZ}$ did not yield measurable $k_q$ with quinoxaline or NMeP as an electron accepting quencher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quencher</th>
<th>$V_{red}(V)$</th>
<th>$k_q(Cu_{BCZ}^{MAC})$ (M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$)$10^9$</th>
<th>$k_q(Cu_{PHCZ}^{MAC})$ (M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$)$10^9$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quin</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMeP</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S4. Stern-Volmer results of $k_q$ in MeCN for all cpds against quinoxaline and n-methyl pthalimide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quencher</th>
<th>$V_{red}(V)$</th>
<th>$k_q(Cu_{BCZ}^{MAC})$ (M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$)$10^9$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quin</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMeP</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Rehm-Weller analysis was performed using Equations (4) - (6) in the main text which are reprinted here for reference:
\[ \Delta G = (E_{PS}^{+/-} - E_Q^{0/-}) + W_s \]  

(4)

\[ k_q = \frac{k_d}{1 + \left( \frac{k_d}{k_{re}} \right) \exp \left( \frac{\Delta G^\ddagger}{RT} \right) + \exp \left( \frac{\Delta G}{RT} \right)} \]  

(5)

\[ \Delta G^\ddagger = \left[ \left( \frac{\Delta G}{2} \right)^2 + (\Delta G_r)^2 \right]^{1/2} + \Delta G \]  

(6)

Where \( E_{PS}^{+/-} \) is the excited state oxidation potential of the photosensitizer, \( E_Q^{0/-} \) is the reduction potential of the quenching molecule, \( W_s \) is the work term associated with the solvent, \( R \) is the ideal gas constant, \( T \) is temperature.\(^{49}\) The free energy term \( \Delta G^\ddagger \) accounts for the reorganization energy of \((PS^*,Q)\) to \((PS^+,Q^-)\) and the solvent reorganization required for electron transfer \( \Delta G_r \). The rate constants \( k_d, k_d, \) and \( k_{re} \) are from the kinetic scheme shown in Figure 7 of the main paper. \( \Delta V_{12} \) is the equilibrium constant between \( k_d \) and \( k_{-d} \).

Fitting \( k_q \) vs. \( E_0/^- \) of the quenching molecule provides values of all parameters in equations 4-6 including \( E_0^{+/-}, W_s, k_d, k_{d}, k_{re}, \) and \( \Delta G_r \). The reverse process \( k_{-d} \) is typically near equivalent to \( k_d \), so \( \Delta V_{12} \) was set to unity. This yielded the following parameter values with less than 1% error:

**Table S5.** Parameters from Rehm-Weller fit of \( k_q \) vs. \( E_0^- \) of the quenching molecule.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}} )</th>
<th>( \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{PhCz}} )</th>
<th>( \text{Au}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( E_0^{+/-} ) (V vs. Fe\textsuperscript{3+/2+})</td>
<td>( \Delta G_r ) (eV)</td>
<td>( W_s ) (eV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trend in excited state oxidation potential is consistent with the Stern-Volmer quenching experiments. For a given quenching molecule in a given solvent, the measured \( k_q \) always increases in the order of \( \text{Au}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}} < \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}} < \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{PhCz}} \). The Rehm-Weller analysis suggests that this is due to the difference in reductive potency of the excited state \( E_0^{+/-} \) which follows the same trend: \( \text{Au}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}} < \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}} < \text{Cu}^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{PhCz}} \). The solvent reorganization term \( \Delta G_r \) is within the typical range compared to
other reported systems.\textsuperscript{3,49} The value is consistent for all photosensitizers which can be explained by the similar structural motif of the photosensitizers; they are all two-coordinate carbene-metal amides. The solvent work term of 0.1 eV is reasonable and consistent between all photosensitizers which is to be expected, because \(W_S\) is an intrinsic property of the solvent.\textsuperscript{44} Lastly, \(k_{re}\) is consistent between all photosensitizers and suggests the charge separated pair (PS\textsuperscript{+},Q\textsuperscript{-}) recombines to the ground state (PS,Q) with a time constant of 250\(\mu\)s.
Figure S15. $^1$H and $^{13}$C NMR of Cu$^{\text{MAC}}_{\text{BCz}}$ in acetone-d6. The peaks at 2.05ppm and 2.8ppm in the $^1$H NMR correspond to acetone and water respectively.
Figure S17. $^1$H and $^{13}$C NMR of Cu$_{\text{PhCz}}$MAC in acetone-d6. The peaks at 5.2ppm, 2.8ppm, and 2.05ppm in the $^1$H NMR correspond to DCM, water, and acetone-d6 respectively.
Figure S17. $^1$H and $^{13}$C NMR of Au$_{BCz}^{\text{MAC}}$ in acetone-d6. The peaks at 2.05ppm and 2.8ppm in the $^1$H NMR correspond to acetone and water respectively.