

# **M.Sc Chemistry**



# **Inorganic Special Paper Semester IV**

# **Course – 4101 B**

# **Course Title – Spectral Techniques in Inorganic Chemistry**

By – Dr. Vartika Tomar

# Paramagnetic NMR

- Paramagnetic nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy refers to nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy of paramagnetic compounds.
- Although most NMR measurements are conducted on diamagnetic compounds, paramagnetic samples are also amenable to analysis and give rise to special effects indicated by a wide chemical shift range and broadened signals.
- > Paramagnetism diminishes the resolution of an NMR spectrum to the extent that coupling is rarely resolved.
- Nonetheless spectra of paramagnetic compounds provide insight into the bonding and structure of the sample.
- For example, the broadening of signals is compensated in part by the wide chemical shift range (often 200 ppm). Since paramagnetism leads to shorter relaxation times (T<sub>1</sub>), the rate of spectral acquisition can be high.

# Paramagnetic <sup>1</sup>H NMR

> Was initially ignored because people thought the signals would be so broad as to be useless.

### "They" were wrong

- > Sometimes we do see Broader lines. But the range of  $\delta$  increases hugely.
- > Broadening from fast Spin-Lattice Relaxation  $(T_{1N})$ .
- ➢ If lines are too broad, will often give useful EPR.
- > If e- relaxation times are fast enough,  $T_{1N}$  is unaffected.
- ➢ Many paramagnetic compounds have paramagnetic <sup>1</sup>H NMR & EPR.

# Paramagnetic <sup>1</sup>H NMR

The presence of a paramagnetic metal ion causes line broadening of all NMR signals from nuclei close to the metal ion: too close, too broad to be seen!

The radius of the "blind" sphere depends on the metal ion.

The size of the blind sphere changes with the nuclear type, being smaller for <sup>13</sup>C than for <sup>1</sup>H.

The effect decreases rapidly with increasing distances from metal ion, so that it is negligible outside of an outer "paramagnetic effects" sphere.



# Where is Paramagnetic NMR Useful?

- ✤ Inorganic any metal that has unpaired e<sup>-</sup> will cause chemical shift range to be extremely large
- Proteins many proteins contain paramagnetic ions (often Fe<sup>+3</sup>) in their active site. But one can also substitute paramagnetics (e.g., Co<sup>+2</sup> for Zn<sup>+2</sup>) into the protein to spread out the chemical shifts near the active site

## **Applications:**

- Electronic Structure & Spin Distribution
- Stereochem and Structure
- Equilibrium Dynamics & Solvation
- Lanthanide Shift Reagents
- Bioinorganic Applications
- Contrast agents for MRI

# Isotropic Shift

The difference between the chemical shift of a given nucleus in a diamagnetic vs paramagnetic environments is called the isotropic shift.

The isotropic shift contains contributions from the pseudocontact (called dipolar) and contact (also called scalar) terms.

Components of Paramagnetic Shifts

- Scalar/Contact
- Dipolar/Pseudocontact

This division is really an artifact of viewing molecules through LCAO-MOT:

Both Shifts are due to the same coupling phenomenon of electron mag moment coupling to nuclear mag moment.

# **Contact vs pseudocontact shifts**

Isotropic shifts result from two mechanisms, contact shifts and pseudocontact shifts. Both effects operate simultaneously but one or the other term can be dominant. Contact shifts result from spin polarization conveyed through the molecular orbitals of the molecule. Pseudocontact shifts result from the magnetic field emanating from the paramagnetic center. Pseudocontact shifts follow an 1/r<sup>3</sup> dependence and tend to be smaller, often within the normal 1-10 ppm range for <sup>1</sup>H NMR. NMR shift reagents such as EuFOD exploit this effect.

The effect of the contact term arises from transfer of spin polarization to the observed nucleus. Spin polarization is a consequence of the very strong electron-nuclear (NMR detected) interaction. This coupling, also known by EPR spectroscopists as hyperfine coupling, is on the order of MHz, vs the usual internuclear (J) coupling observed in conventional NMR spectra, which are on the order of a few Hz. This difference reflects the large magnetic moment of an electron ( $-1.00 \mu$ B), which is much greater than any nuclear magnetic moment (e.g. for <sup>1</sup>H:  $1.52 \times 10^{-3} \mu$ B). Owing to rapid spin relaxation, the electron-nuclear coupling is not observed in the NMR spectrum, so the affected nuclear resonance appears at the average of the two coupled energy states, *weighted according to their spin populations*. Given the magnitude of the coupling, the Boltzmann population of these spin state are not close to 1:1, leading to net spin polarization on the affected NMR nucleus, hence a relatively large contact shifts.

The effect of the pseudocontact term arises magnetic anisotropy of the paramagnetic center (reflected in ganisotropy in the EPR spectrum). This anisotropy creates a magnetic field which supplements that of the instrument's magnet. The magnetic field exerts its effect with both angular and a 1/r<sup>3</sup> geometric dependences. **Contact Shift** – Consider the Electron and Nucleus as simply a coupled doublet,

But with a  $J \sim 1 \times 106 \text{ Hz}$  !

Not an equal coupling, so intensities are not equal, and the weighted mean position is not at midpoint. Under fast relaxation, doublet collapses into a singlet far away from the original nuclear chemical shift.

**Dipolar Shift** – through space interaction between electron & nucleus, also called pseudocontact shift, often small in magnitude.

## NMR of Paramagnetic Complexes – Contact Shifts

As mentioned earlier, the NMR spectrum of many paramagnetic compounds cannot be obtained because the unpaired electron broadens the spectrum by both dipolar and electron spin-nuclear spin coupling mechanisms.

Since the magnetic moment of an electron is ~  $10^3$  times larger than the nuclear magnetic moment, tumbling of paramagnetic ions produces large magnetic fields which are very effective in causing dipolar spin-lattice relaxation i.e., T<sub>1</sub> is decreased.

If the wave function for the unpaired electron has a finite value at the nucleus, electron spin-nuclear spin coupling occurs. This can also give rise to a fluctuating magnetic field at the nucleus, which shortens  $T_1$ .

If the electron relaxation is very slow, the lifetime of an ion is a given spin state will be long, and two resonances,

corresponding to  $S = \pm \frac{1}{2}$ , will be observed. This case if not very common.

When the paramagnetic state has a very short lifetime, the magnetic nucleus sense only the time-averaged magnetic field of the two spin states of the electron and a single peak is observed.

Often electron spin relaxation is of such a rate as to be intermediate between these two extremes, in effect shortening  $T_2$  and causing severe broadening.

When electron relaxation is very rapid, broadening is minimized, and the major effect on the spectrum from the presence of unpaired electrons is to change the magnetic field experienced by the magnetic nucleus. This causes a very large chemical shift (sometimes 3000 to 5000 cps) of the resonance in the NMR spectrum. This shift is referred to as a contact NMR shift.

The following relationship can be derived between the contact shift and the electron spin-nuclear spin coupling constant, A<sub>N</sub>

...(1)

...(2)

$$\frac{\Delta H}{H} = \frac{\Delta \nu}{\nu} = -2A_N \frac{\gamma_e}{\gamma_N} \frac{g\beta I(I+1)S(S+1)}{9kT}$$
$$\frac{\Delta H}{H} = \frac{\Delta \nu}{\nu} = -\frac{1}{6}A_N \frac{\gamma_e}{\gamma_N} \frac{g\beta S(S+1)}{kT}$$

This equation (2) is for specific case of proton magnetic resonance

Where,  $\gamma_e =$  magnetogyric ratio for the electron  $\gamma_N =$  magnetogyric ratio for the magnetic nucleus I = nuclear spin S = electron spin multiplicity  $\Delta H = H_{complex} - H_{ligand}$  $\Delta v = v_{complex} - v_{ligand}$ 

g = ratio of magnetic moment to the total angular momentum of the electron

Since the contact shift is to lower fields when  $A_N$  is positive and to higher fields when  $A_N$  is negative, the sign of the electron spin-nuclear spin coupling constant can be obtained from NMR. Often all terms in equation (2) can be evaluated for a complex ion, so  $A_N$  can be calculated from the measured contact shift.

The conditions requisite to observing a contact shift in NMR are that either of the following inequalities can be satisfied:

 $\frac{1}{\tau_s} \gg A_N$  or  $\frac{1}{\tau_e} \gg A_N$ 

- Where,  $\tau_S$  is the electronic relaxation time
- $\tau_{\rm e}$  is the chemical exchange time

A<sub>s</sub> is the contact interaction constant (electron spin-nuclear spin coupling constant)

Fortunately, most of the paramagnetic metal ions of the first transition series have sufficiently short electron spin lifetimes or sufficiently fast ligand exchange rates to allow NMR studies to be made on their complexes.

Much information can be obtained from the electron spin-nuclear spin coupling constants ( $A_N$ ), often called the contact interaction constant. The magnitude of this quality Is related to the unpaired spin densities in  $\pi$  orbitals of sp<sup>2</sup> carbons by equation

$$A_N = Q\rho_N$$

Where  $\rho_N$  is the spin density at carbon, Q is the proportionality constant (-22.5 gauss for an aromatic C-H fragment and +27 gauss for C-CH<sub>3</sub> fragment).



- Spin Density (ρ<sub>N</sub>) is defined as that fraction of an unpaired electron which appears to be localized at site N.
- > Spin densities may be either positive or negative.
- A negative sign density results when the electron spin at the site N is antiparallel to the net spin of the paramagnetic species as whole and the opposite is true for positive spin density.
- > Negative spin density is a concept foreign to Huckel molecular orbital theory.
- > Molecular orbit theory must be modified by addition of  $\pi$ - $\pi$  exchange interaction in order to account for negative spin densities.
- Exchange interaction is the unpairing of electron spins so as to reduce the energy of the system through exchange interaction of electrons having the same spin.

#### Demonstration of the affects of exchange interaction on the spin densities of conjugated radicals

**Allyl Free Radical** 



The combination of Carbon Atomic Orbitals  $\psi_1$ ,  $\psi_2$ ,  $\psi_3$ . Constituting the Molecular Orbitals of Allene. The subscripts on carbon in the structural formula correspond to atomic orbitals  $\psi_1$ ,  $\psi_2$  and  $\psi_3$ .

The odd electron in  $\psi^*$  gives rise to positive sign ( $\alpha$ ) densities at carbon 1 and 3. Exchange interactions between the odd electron in  $\psi^*$  of spin  $\alpha$  and the paired electron  $\psi$  of spin  $\alpha$  enhances the positive spin density at C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>3</sub> and leaves a net spin  $\beta$  (negative spin density) at C<sub>2</sub>. Valence bind theory accommodates negative spin densities quite naturally. The valence bond wave function for the allyl radical (CH<sub>2</sub>=CH-CH<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>  $\leftrightarrow$  'CH<sub>2</sub>-CH=CH<sub>2</sub>) predicts the same electron spin at atoms 1 and 3 and antiparallel spin at position 2 because of exchange interactions. A simple rule for predicting the signs of spin densities comes from valence bond theory. All positions at which a major contributing resonance form places the unpaired electron have positive spin density. Any position where no important resonance form places the odd electron has negative spin density. For example, the allyl radical has positive spin density at positions 1 and 3 and negative spin density at position 2. In paramagnetic complexes the effects of unpaired electrons in the metal ion are transferred to the ligand through the formation of covalent bonds. Charge transfer mechanisms offer a convenient way to look at the transfer of the effects of unpaired electrons from the metal to the ligand. For the purpose of predicting how the unpaired electron density on the ligand will distribute itself, the ligand can be treated as a free radical.

#### Nickel (II) aminotroponeimineate



Figure: The structure of Nickel (II) aminotroponeimineate (a) including Resonance Forms (b) and (c) which place odd electron density on the ligand

In valence bond structures (b) and (c) in figure, an electron is added to the d orbital of nickel and the odd electron on the ligand is delocalized on the ring in the  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  positions. There is another structure similar to (b) which places the odd electron on the other  $\alpha$  position but this is not indicated. This complex is tetrahedral and the valence bond structures (b) and (c) out two electrons in the particular nickel orbital which contributes to the  $\pi$  system of the overall molecule (d<sub>xz</sub>, d<sub>xy</sub> or d<sub>yz</sub>), In effect, the nickel is reduced in these resonance forms. The spin magnetic moment of the electron on nickel in the ground state is aligned with the field. Because the d orbitals of Ni<sup>2+</sup> are more than half filled, the electron transferred from the ligand into the d orbitals must pair up with the d electrons (which are aligned with the field) and so must have opposite spin. As a result, the odd electron remaining on the ligand will have its spin moment aligned with the field. Valence bond structures place the unpaired electron at the  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  positions of the seven membered ring.

No structure placing the odd electrons at the  $\beta$  position can be written without recourse to long bonds. The ligand as a whole has spin parallel to the nickel ion. Positive sign densities are thus predicted for the  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  electrons and a negative spin density is expected for the  $\beta$  carbon. Since the spin density at the proton is antiparallel to that on the carbon, the  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  protons are expected to be shielded while the  $\beta$  protons should be deshielded.

These considerations lead to the NMR assignment in figure. Confirmation of these assignments has been made by other independent means.



Proton Magnetic Resonance Spectra of Ni<sup>2+</sup> N,N' diethyl aminotroponeimineate Substitution of phenyl for ethyl on the nitrogens of the previous compound extends the  $\pi$  system over which the unpaired spin is distributed. As expected from simple valence bond considerations (figure), positive spin densities occur at the ortho and para positions of the phenyl ring and a negative spin density is found at the meta position.



Valence Bond Structure for the Phenyl group in the Phenyl substituted Aminoytoponeimineate Complex

Valence bind calculations of spin densities have been useful for predicting spin densities at atoms not readily observable in the NMR. The calculations are made assuming the ligand to be a free radical. The values obtained are then scaled down to correspond to the transfer of that fraction of an electron which best agrees with the observes spin densities,

Results presented for the N, N'-dimethylaminoytoponeimineate system, assuming transfer of 0.10 electrons in the complex, are in extremely good agreement with spin densities experimentally determined from the contact shift.



Calculated and experimental spin densities (a) Spin densities calculated for transfer of 0.10 electrons. (b) Experimental spin densities

- Contact interactions have been observed in a large number of systems. By virtue of the fact that the sign of the spin density can be determined, one can obtain information regarding the mechanism of electron delocalization onto the ligand.
- For example, in some octahedral Ni<sup>2+</sup> complexes of benzonitrile, it was shown that the principal mechanism involved back bonding from the metal with the ligand  $\pi$  system. In the case of the octahedral complex of nickel (II) with CH<sub>3</sub>CON(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>, the principal mechanism involved charge transfer in the nickel-oxygen  $\sigma$  bond, Also, by comparing the magnitude of the contact shift for a series of different transition metal ions with the same ligand, the amount of charge transfer (i.e., covalence) in the metal-ligand bond can be estimated.
- The O<sup>17</sup> NMR spectra or aqueous solution of rare earth perchlorates have been reported. The observed magnitude and variation of the O<sup>17</sup> contact shifts with the number of 4f electrons was interpreted as evidence for very weak covalent boding of O<sup>17</sup> 2s and 2p orbitals with the rare earth 6s orbitals, The 4f, 5d and 6p orbitals play at most a minor role in the bonding.
- It is apparent that NMR spin density determinations provide a promising new approach to the study of conjugation in molecules containing extended π electron systems. The ability of NH, O. S and SO<sub>2</sub> groups in transfer electronic effects has been studied directly using this technique. The importance of double bonding between fluorine and π systems has also been assessed.

## **Structural Uses of Paramagnetic NMR**

#### **Paramagnetic NMR Constraints**

Nuclear relaxation provides metal-nucleus distances.

Pseudocontact shifts provide the angular coordinates of the metal ion and new structural constraints.

Contact shifts may provide dihedral angle constraints.

### **Diamagnetic Reference**

Paramagnetic effects are measured as differences in NMR spectra recorded from the target molecule in the paramagnetic and diamagnetic states.

Data measured with a paramagnetic ion must be compared with corresponding data obtained with a chemically similar but diamagnetic metal ion.

# Lanthanide Shift Reagents (S.R.)

- S.R.s are paramagnetic Lewis Acids that bind to functional groups of organics w/ complex NMR.
- Subsequent paramagnetic shift reduces complexity and increases ease of assignments.
- Amount of shift can be used (under certain conditions) to calculate structures of the organic as bound to the S.R.
- Less useful these days with large field NMRs and multi-dimensional NMR.
- But S.R. became reborn as MRI contrast agents due to increased relaxation rates of interacting waters!

# MRI Contrast Reagents

- Chemical agents influencing the contrast behavior of magnetic resonance images and spectra. Commonly used agents include paramagnetic and superparamagnetic media.
- Contrary to x-ray contrast agents which are directly visible, magnetic resonance imaging contrast agents influence the behavior of the surrounding tissue; thus they are indirect contrast agents
- Traditional shift and contrast agents are largely based on high relaxivity Gd(III) complexes.
- (1) Fe(III) is substantially less toxic than Gd(III) and therefore holds promise for eventual in vivo applications.

(2) The high relaxivity of Gd(III) complexes arises fundamentally from fast ligand exchange rates but comparatively weak f orbital based binding.

# **Reference PDFs for Detailed Study**

#### NMR Spectroscopy of Paramagnetic Complexes

#### By Karl E. Schwarzhans<sup>[\*]</sup>

Serviceable NMR spectra can, with a few exceptions <sup>[1,6]</sup>, be recorded for paramagnetic complexes in solution. These spectra provide information about the structure of the complexes and the distribution of the unpaired electrons, and hence also about reactive centers in the molecule. The elucidation of intermolecular and intramolecular exchange phenomena, e.g. the determination of ligand exchange rate constants, the determination of rotation barriers, and the detection of contact complexes in solution, or even of occupation equilibria of the electrons, is possible in this way. It can be seen, therefore, that NMR studies on paramagnetic complexes can be a rich source of information.

#### 1. Introduction

The investigation of paramagnetic compounds with the aid of nuclear magnetic resonance was ignored during the first decade of the application of this spectroscopic method to chemical problems. It is now known that NMR spectra can be recorded for nearly all paramagnetic complexes [1]; exceptions are rare. In general, however, the spectra of paramagnetic metal complexes are not so well resolved as those of corresponding diamagnetic compounds; nucleusnucleus coupling is rarely observed is such spectra<sup>[2, 3]</sup>. The half-widths of the NMR signals are between 1 Hz and several thousand Hz for dissolved paramagnetic species. Like the half-widths, the shifts of the signals also extend in part over a range that is several orders of magnitude greater than for the analogous diamagnetic compounds [4]. Roughly speaking, the shifts behave in the same manner as the susceptibilities of these compounds.

The first report of an investigation on the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectra of (dissolved) paramagnetic complexes was published in 1958 <sup>(51)</sup>. Since then, the number of publications on this subject has increased to about 400. The theoretical principles of the application of NMR spectroscopy to the study of paramagnetic substances have been described by various authors (cf. e.g. <sup>16-101</sup>).

[1] H. J. Keller: NMR-Basic Principles and Progress. Springer, Berlin 1970.

- [3] E. W. Randali and D. Shaw, J. Chem. Soc. A 1969, 2867.
  [4] D. R. Eaton: Physical Methods in Advanced Inorganic
- Chemistry, Interscience New York 1968.
- [5] H. M. McConnell and C. H. Holm, J. Chem. Phys. 28, 749 (1958).
- [6] H. J. Keller and K. E. Schwarzhans, Angew. Chem. 82, 227 (1970); Angew. Chem. internat. Edit. 9, 196 (1970).
- [7] H. M. McConnell et al., J. Chem. Phys. 27, 314 (1957); 28, 107 (1958); 29, 1361 (1958); 34, 696 (1961).
- [8] E. DeBoer and H. van Willigen, Progr. Nucl. Magn. Resonance Spectrosc. 2, 111 (1967).
- [9] M. Bose, Progr. Nucl. Magn. Resonance Spectrosc. 4, 335 (1969).

Several mechanisms have been detected by which the nuclei examined by NMR spectroscopy in metal complexes can be influenced by unpaired electrons. The effects can be roughly divided into two groups, i.e. signal shifts due to Fermi contact interactions and those due to pseudo-contact interactions. Since it is only possible occasionally to distinguish between the contributions of the various mechanisms to the total shift of a given NMR signal, it has recently been suggested<sup>[3]</sup> that signal shifts in the NMR spectra of paramagnetic compounds should be referred to generally as "Knight shifts" (11). This name has the advantage that it does not specify any mechanism that contributes to or is alone responsible for the shift, as is the case in the terms "contact shift" and "pseudo-contact shift". The Knight shift is thus defined as the difference in shift between the signals of the paramagnetic complex and the corresponding diamagnetic model compound. This definition naturally excludes any effect of ligand exchange on the shift of the signal.

The mechanisms of electron-nucleus interaction that may be regarded as established for paramagnetic metal complexes will be outlined below.

#### 1.1. Fermi Contact Interaction

The Fermi contact interaction is defined as the interaction of the nucleus in question with the density of unpaired electrons on the nucleus.

If this Fermi contact interaction essentially causes shielding of the nucleus in question, and hence a shift of its signal, "unpaired electron density" (also known as spin density) could conceivably reach the position of the resonating nucleus, or could in general reach the ligands of a paramagnetic metal complex, in the following ways:

(a) Unpaired d electrons of the metal fill unoccupied antibonding orbitals of the ligands that have  $\sigma_{\mu}$  or  $\pi$ character. This mechanism is involved in particular

<sup>[\*]</sup> Doz. Dr. K. E. Schwarzhans

Anorganisch-chemisches Laboratorium

der Technischen Universität 8 München 2, Arcisstrasse 21 (Germany)

o multiclicit 2, melostrasse 21 (Germany)

<sup>[2]</sup> D. R. Eaton and W. D. Phillips, Advan. Magn. Resonance 1, 103 (1965).

<sup>[10]</sup> J. W. Emsley, J. Feeney, and L. H. Sutcliffe, High Resolution Nucl. Magn. Resonance Spectrosc. 1, 115 (1965); 2, 826 (1966).

<sup>[11]</sup> W. D. Knight, Phys. Rev. 76, 1259 (1949).

in the signal shifts in the NMR spectra of titanium(III) and vanadium(III) complexes <sup>(12]</sup>. Typical features pointing to an important contribution from this electron delocalization mechanism can also be found in the spectra of pyridine, pyridine *N*-oxide, and picoline adduct complexes of many 3d metals <sup>(13-15]</sup>. A particularly good example of the delocalization of spin density into the  $\pi$  system of the ligand is provided by the bis(2-amino-2,4,6-cycloheptatrieniminato)nickel(II) complexes <sup>(16)</sup> (cf. Fig. 1).



Fig. 1. 1H-NMR spectrum of a bis(2-amino-2,4,6-cycloheptatrieniminato)nickel(II) complex in CDCl<sub>3</sub> (40 MHz).

These complexes are characterized by a very fast configuration change in solution between a squareplanar diamagnetic form and a tetrahedral paramagnetic form. All the following mechanisms that can contribute to the Knight shift are averaged out by this process. The electrons of the C-H bonds are polarized by the free spin density [\*] in the  $\pi$  system of the ligand in such a way that the spin density on the proton of the aromatic ligand is negative (shift to higherfields) for even numbers and alternately negative and positive (shift to lower fields) for odd numbers.

(b) Electrons in the highest occupied orbitals of the ligand or ligands are partly transferred into unoccupied or unfilled d orbitals of the metal. This transfer mechanism is possible in particular for the more highly charged ions of the 3d metals. A positive spin density also remains in the ligand orbitals, so that it is often practically impossible to distinguish between mechanisms (a) and (b).

(c) Partly occupied d orbitals of the metal overlap with occupied orbitals of ligand atoms having a

Angew. Chem. internat. Edit. | Vol. 9 (1970) | No. 12

sterically favorable arrangement, but which are not bonded directly (in the conventional sense of a chemical bond) to the metal atom or ion. This "direct interaction" is probably responsible e.g. for the strong negative shifts of the signals in the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectra of substituted and unsubstituted bis(cyclopentadienyl) complexes of vanadium(II) and chromium(11)<sup>(17)</sup>. In these compounds, positive spin density is transferred directly from the transition metal ion to the protons of the cyclopentadienyl rings, with the result that the signals of these protons are displaced by up to 360 ppm toward lower fields. Another very instructive example of the occurrence of a "direct interaction" is found in the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectra of iminodi(trimethyleniminomethyl-o-phenolato)cobalt(11) (Fig. 2) and of the corresponding nickel(11) complex. Geminal protons in the alkyl chains of these compounds exhibit differences of up to 86 ppm in their shifts [18, 19].



Fig. 2. Structural formula of iminodi(trimethyleniminomethyl-ophenolato)cobalt(II).

Several reports dealing with the separation of the contributions of the types (a) to (c) to the Fermi contact shift for certain classes of complexes have been published during the past few years<sup>[12,20-26]</sup>. The clarification of this problem would enable information about the metal-ligand bond to be gained from the signal shifts of certain ligand nuclei.

#### 1.2. Pseudo-Contact Interaction

The investigation of the NMR spectra of paramagnetic compounds is frequently made difficult by the fact that intramolecular (and also intermolecular in studies on solids) dipole-dipole interactions influence

<sup>[12]</sup> D. R. Eaton, W. R. McClellan, and J. F. Weiher, Inorg. Chem. 7, 2040 (1968).

<sup>[13]</sup> J. A. Happe and R. L. Ward, J. Chem. Phys. 39, 1211 (1963).

<sup>[14]</sup> R. H. Holm, G. W. Everett jr., and W. De W. Horrocks jr., J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 88, 1071 (1966).

<sup>[15]</sup> G. N. LaMar and G. R. van Hecke, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 91, 3442 (1969).

<sup>[16]</sup> D. R. Eaton, A. D. Josey, W. D. Phillips, and R. E. Benson, J. Chem. Phys. 37, 347 (1962).

<sup>[\*]</sup> The absolute probability of finding an unpaired electron at a given point is known in general as the "free spin density".

<sup>[17]</sup> H. P. Fritz, H. J. Keller, and K. E. Schwarzhans, J. Organometal. Chem. 7, 105 (1967).

<sup>[18]</sup> G. N. LaMar and L. Sacconi, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 89, 2282 (1967).

<sup>[19]</sup> W. Greiner, Dissertation, Technische Hochschule München 1969.

<sup>[20]</sup> M. R. Rettig and R. S. Drago, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 91, 1361, 3432 (1969).

<sup>[21]</sup> K. E. Schwarzhans, Habilitationsschrift, Technische Hochschule München 1968.

<sup>[22]</sup> H. P. Fritz, H. J. Keller, and K. E. Schwarzhans, Z. Naturforsch. 23b, 298 (1968).

<sup>[23]</sup> G. N. LaMar and L. Sacconi, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 90, 7216 (1968).

<sup>[24]</sup> J. R. Hutchison, G. N. LaMar, and W. De W. Horrocks jr., Inorg. Chem. 8, 126 (1969).

<sup>[25]</sup> F. Röhrscheid, R. E. Ernst, and R. H. Holm, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 89, 6472 (1967).

<sup>[26]</sup> H. P. Fritz, W. C. Greiner, H. J. Keiler, and K. E. Schwarzhans, Z. Naturforsch. 23b, 906 (1968),

the magnitude and sign of the shifts of the resonance signals in an extremely complicated manner that can only be determined in particularly simple cases. In complexes with extensive delocalization of electrons, the pseudo-contact contribution to the total shift of the resonance signals should be small, since the pseudo-contact model<sup>[271]</sup> is based on the assumption of a point charge localized on the central metal ion. It is not yet known, however, how much zero-field splitting, which is a property of all complexes with more than one unpaired electron, contributes to the pseudo-contact component of the shift. Information on this point should be obtainable from ESR experiments at very low temperatures<sup>[28]</sup>.

#### 2. Application and Results

Hetero-NMR measurements on paramagnetic complexes in solution have so far been confined to a few investigations on simple systems. For example, <sup>17</sup>Oand <sup>14</sup>N-NMR spectra of hexaaquo and hexaammine complexes respectively have been recorded for the determination of ligand exchange rates in these compounds <sup>(29, 30)</sup>. NMR experiments in which different types of atoms in a paramagnetic molecule are detected are therefore particularly interesting.

2.1. Investigations on Pyridine and Picoline Adducts of Bis(salicylaldehydato)iron(II), -cobalt(II), and -nickel(II)

Pyridine and simple methyl derivatives of pyridine form 2:1 adducts with paramagnetic bis(salicylaldehydato)metal(II) complexes, and these adducts are particularly suitable for NMR studies. They have a simple ligand system in a pseudo-octahedral arrangement, and are very readily soluble in organic solvents. The pyridine and picoline ligands readily undergo exchange with excess ligands, and this greatly facilitates the assignment of the resonance signals. Kinetic data for this exchange can also be determined from NMR studies.

#### 2.1.1. <sup>1</sup>H-NMR Spectra

The data from the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectra of such adducts (Fig. 3) are presented in Tables 1 to 3. The assignment for the pyridine protons was possible on the basis of the signal intensities, by comparison of the spectra of the pyridine adducts with those of the  $\beta$ -picoline and  $\gamma$ -picoline adducts, and finally on the basis of the changes produced in the spectra by an

exchange process on addition of small quantities of pyridine or picoline in excess. If the exchange frequency is very much greater than the difference in shift in Hz between the signals of the protons of the pyridine ligand in the paramagnetic complex and of free pyridine, an averaged signal appears in the NMR spectrum<sup>[31]</sup> at a position that depends on the ratio of the concentrations of the free ligand and of the complex. The ring protons of the salicylaldehyde ligands were assigned by comparison with the spectra of the derivatives with methyl substituents in position 3, 4, 5, or 6 of the ring<sup>[19]</sup>. The assumption that the symmetry of the complex changes only slightly on substitution appears to be confirmed by the invariance of the signal shifts of the pyridine and phenylene protons in the substituted and unsubstituted complexes.



Fig. 3. H-NMR spectra of bis(salicylaldehydato)bis(pyridine)metal(II) complexes in CDCl<sub>3</sub> (100 MHz).

The large shifts of the aldehydic protons, which change only slightly on substitution in the aromatic ring of the salicylaldehyde ligand are a characteristic feature of all the spectra.

Except in the case of complexes substituted in position 6 of the salicylaldehyde ligand (Fig. 4), the equivalent protons of the ligands generally give only one NMR signal. Methylation in position 6 evidently leads to moderate distortion of the complex. Separate resonance signals are found both for the two CH<sub>3</sub> groups and for the two aldehydic protons. A much greater distortion of the complex should be observed on replacement of the pyridine ligand by  $\alpha$ -picoline.

<sup>[27]</sup> N. Bloembergen and W. C. Dickinson, Phys. Rev. 79, 179 (1950).

<sup>[28]</sup> J. P. Jesson, J. Chem. Phys. 47, 579, 582 (1967).

<sup>[29]</sup> H. H. Glaeser, H. W. Dodgen, and J. P. Hunt, Inorg. Chem. 4, 1061 (1965).

<sup>[30]</sup> H. H. Glaeser, G. A. Lo, H. W. Dodgen, and J. P. Hunt, Inorg. Chem. 4, 206 (1965).

<sup>[31]</sup> J. A. Pople, W. G. Schneider, and H. J. Bernstein: Highresolution Nuclear Magnetic Resonance. McGraw-Hill, New York 1959, p. 218.

Table 1. TH-NMR data for paramagnetic pyrigine and picoline adducts of bis(salicylaldehydato)iron(1) complexes. Shifts in Hz against internal TMS at 100 MHz. Saturated solutions in CDCI<sub>3</sub> at 32 °C.

	Fe(sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Fe(3-sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Fe(4-sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Fe(5-sai) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Fe(6-sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Fe(sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2β-pic	Fe(sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 γ-pic
α.	-9160	-9330	-8600	-8900	-9070	-7800	-7130
β	-3230	-3121	-3080	-3140	-3 300	-3200	-3050
β-CH₃						-1130	-
Y	-1460	-1920	-1458	-1 340	-1602	-1750	
ү-СН3							+50
С?-н	+1 300			+1290	+1100	+ 720	+ 720
C <sup>3</sup> -CH <sub>3</sub>		~1740	1				
C⁴−H	-4810	4460	1	-4950	- 5 6 4 6	-5440	5 390
C⁴ <b>−CH</b> ₃			+1560			[	Í
C <sup>5</sup> -H	·I-956	+ 986	+ 862		+ 750	+ 310	+ 350
C⁵−CH3	ĺ		ĺ	-2745			
C6-H	3 270	-2860	-3241	-3360			-3950
C6-CH3			1		+ 340		
					+1430		
Ald-H	-46700	-43400	-45150	-47 300	-48100 -45300	-46 600	-48200

3-sal = 3-methylsalicylaldehydate, py = pyridine, pic = picoline.

Table 2. <sup>1</sup>H-NMR data for paramagnetic pyridine and picoline adducts of bis(salicylaldehydato)cobalt(II) complexes. Shifts in Hz against internal TMS at 100 MHz, Saturated solutions in CDCl<sub>3</sub> at 32 °C.

	Co(sai) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Co(3-sel) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Co(4-sal) <sub>2</sub> - 2 py	Co(5-sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Co(6-sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Co(sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 (3-pic	Co(sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 γ-pic
α.	-8300	-11200	-8 300	-8750	-9330	-7700	-8150
β β-CH 1	-1 540	-1 770	-1940	-1150	-1720	-1620 +170	— I 460
ү ү-СН3	+474	+ 570	-+ 384	+ 1 060	+ 510	+ 464	+1634
С <sup>3</sup> Н С <sup>3</sup> СН <sub>3</sub>	-8200	-8360		-8940	-8460	-7700	
С4-Н С4-СН	- 5 580	-6670	2050	-5530	-6450	-5720	-5480
С <sup>3</sup> Н С <sup>3</sup> СН	-1150	-1350	-1610	-1 520	-1250		-1060
С6—Н С6—СН3	790	- 1 30		-700	-1720	704	-760
Ald-H	-36520	-35700	-36200	-36900	43100	-33800	-34120

Table 3. <sup>1</sup>H-NMR data for paramagnetic pyridine and picoline adducts of bis(salicylaldehydato)nickel(11) complexes. Shifts in Hz against internal TMS at 100 MHz. Saturated solutions in CDCl<sub>3</sub> at 32 °C. The absorptions marked ? could not be assigned because of excess line width or overlap.

	$Ni(sal)_2 + 2 py$	Ni(3-sai) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Ni(4-sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Ni(5-sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	Ni(6-sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 py	$Ni(sal)_2 \cdot 2\beta$ -pic	Ni(sal) <sub>2</sub> · 2 γ-pic
α.	-8650	?	-9130	-10450	9730	-9350	-10700
β β-CH3	-3 370	7	-3 (80	-3440	-3230	-3350 -682	3640
Υ γ-CH3	-1440	?	— I 360	-1470	-1 330	-1250	+ 703
С <sup>3</sup> —Н С <sup>3</sup> —СН <sub>3</sub>	-647	-840	- 590	-650	-560	-632	-674
С⁴ <b>Н</b> С⁴СҢ <sub>3</sub>	-2630	-3080	-50	-2610	-2760	-2460	-2700
С <sup>5</sup> —Н С <sup>5</sup> —СН,	-805	?	-690	-100	-690	-746	-810
С%—н С%—сн₃	-97	?	-120	-180	-360	84	-81
AId-H		?	-36100		-39400	?	?

However, no 2:1 adduct of  $\alpha$ -picoline with any of the bis(salicylaldehydato)metal(11) complexes has yet been obtained. Axial entry of the  $\alpha$ -picoline is presumably impossible in these compounds on steric grounds. If, however, measurements are carried out on an exchange system with  $\alpha$ -picoline in solution together with bis(salicylaldehydato)bis(pyridine)cobalt(11), all the proton resonance signals of the salicylaldehyde ligands split into doublets. The two aldehyde ligands in the complex are thus no longer magnetically equivalent, *i.e.* the symmetry of the dissolved complex is reduced. NMR studies on paramagnetic compounds can thus also serve as a sensitive test for changes in the geometry of the arrangement of the ligands, since the Knight shifts of the resonance signals, as was mentioned earlier, are strongly dependent on the arrangement of the ligands with respect to the central metal ion.



Fig. 4. Scheme of the structure of bis(salicytaldehydato)bis(pyridine) metal(II) complexes.

In a purely qualitative consideration of the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR shifts of this type of complex, the highest spin density is to be expected on the aldehyde grouping of the salicylaldehyde ligand. This position in the molecule should be particularly suitable for a free-radical reaction. The complexed salicylaldehyde is in fact oxidized by air to salicylic acid <sup>1321</sup>.

#### 2.1.2. <sup>14</sup>N-NMR Spectra

The 14N-NMR spectra of the bis(salicylaldehydato)bis(pyridine)metal(II) complexes of iron, cobalt, and nickel could not be recorded with the pure compounds in solution. An important reason for this is the fact that the spectral sensitivity of the <sup>14</sup>N nucleus is lower by a factor of 103 than that of the proton. The complexes contain only a little nitrogen (about 6.1 %), so that even concentrated samples contain only a few <sup>14</sup>N nuclei. Moreover, because of the undoubtedly high spin density on the nitrogen atoms to be considered, the <sup>14</sup>N resonance signal is expected to be very broad [19]. It was possible to avoid both of these difficulties by measurements on the complex under the conditions of the exchange with excess pyridine. If the <sup>14</sup>N-NMR spectrum of pyridine is recorded with the addition of various quantities of the bis(salicylaldehydato)bis(pyridine)metal(II) complex, the shift of the <sup>14</sup>N signal varies linearly with the concentration of the complex in the case of the iron and cobalt compounds; for the analogous nickel compound, on the other hand, the ligand exchange rate constant must be much smaller. A Knight shift of -7800 ppm can be extrapolated for the FeII complex, and -5400 ppm for the Co<sup>II</sup> complex, from the concentration dependence of the <sup>14</sup>N signals.

The ligand exchange rate constants found from these spectra, which merely indicate a lower limit for the exchange rate <sup>[33]</sup>, differ only slightly for the two complexes ( $k_{\rm FeII} = 2.0 \times 10^5$ ,  $k_{\rm CoII} = 1.8 \times 10^5$ 

Hz) <sup>(19)</sup>. The fall in rate constant from iron to nickel for exchange reactions on pseudo-octahedral complexes is a well-known phenomenon, and is associated with the ligand field stabilization energy in the trigonal-bipyramidal transition state <sup>[19, 34]</sup>.

2.2. <sup>1</sup>H-NMR Studies on a Dimethylacetamide Adduct of Uranium Tetrabromide

Dimethylacetamide forms a 4:1 adduct with uranium tetrabromide. It was uncertain at first whether the bonding to the central metal ion occurs via the nitrogen or the oxygen atom of the ligand. Rotation about the C-N bond in free dimethylacetamide is hindered at room temperature; the two methyl groups on the nitrogen give different <sup>1</sup>H-NMR signals, showing that their chemical environments are different. If the spectrum is recorded at various temperatures the two signals of the N-CH<sub>3</sub> groups fuse at 49.8 °C, from which the height of the rotation barrier is found to be  $12 \pm 2 \text{ kcal}^{135}$ .

Exactly the same behavior is found in the spectrum of the adduct. The two <sup>1</sup>H-NMR signals of the  $N-CH_3$  groups, which are separated at lower temperatures, unite at 50 °C (Fig. 5). The height of the



Fig. 5. Temperature dependence of the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR signal shifts of the N-CH<sub>3</sub> groups of dimethylacetamide in  $(C_4H_9ON)_4UBr_4$  (dissolved in CH<sub>2</sub>Br<sub>2</sub>; 100 MHz).

rotation barrier is therefore unchanged by the complex formation, and it follows that the dimethylacetamide cannot be bonded to the uranium ion via the nitrogen atom  $^{[36]}$ .

<sup>[32]</sup> H. G. Biedermann and K. E. Schwarzhans, Angew. Chem. 82, 640 (1970); Angew. Chem. internat. Edit. 9, 640 (1970).
[33] T. J. Swift and R. E. Connik, J. Chem. Phys. 37, 307 (1962).

<sup>[34]</sup> F. Basolo and R. G. Pearson: Mechanisms of Inorganic Reactions. Wiley, New York 1967.

<sup>[35]</sup> H. S. Gutowsky and C. H. Holm, J. Chem. Phys. 25, 1228 (1956).

<sup>[36]</sup> F. Lux, G. Wirth, K. W. Bagnall, and D. Brown, Z. Naturforsch. 24b, 214 (1969).

Because of the greater signal shifts in the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectra of the diamagnetic tetrabutylammonium and tetraphenylarsonium cations in solutions containing paramagnetic complex anions, such as hexacyano-ferrate(11) or tetrachloroniccolate(11), a number of authors  $^{137-421}$  postulated the presence of "ion pairs". The unusual signal shifts were attributed to pseudo-contact interaction, which depends on the g-factor anisotropy of the unpaired electrons and on the distance and the fixed steric relation between the ions <sup>161</sup>.

However, there are three serious objections to such an interpretation of the  ${}^{1}$ H-NMR spectra on the basis of ion associates of this nature:

(a) All the paramagnetic anions and diamagnetic cations investigated have approximately spherical symmetry. There is therefore no reason to insist on a preferred steric arrangement for the ions in solution over a long measuring period, which would be fundamentally necessary in order to be able to observe pseudo-contact shifts. Without a sufficiently longlasting, definite relation between the paramagnetic ion and the nucleus that is interacting magnetically with it, the dipole-dipole contribution to the signal shift is averaged out. It is clear from the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectra of the ion associates, however, that a very much faster ion exchange takes place in the solution when the diamagnetic cation is present in excess.

(b) The octahedral and tetrahedral symmetries of the hexacyanoferrate(III), hexacyanochromate(III), and tetrachloroniccolate(II) anions <sup>[43]</sup> do not allow any anisotropy of the g factor, which is also an assumption for pseudo-contact interaction.

(c) In complexes with strong delocalization of electrons, as was mentioned in Section 1.2, the pseudocontact contribution to the signal shift should be small or zero (27). At least for the complex anions triiodotriphenylphosphanecobaltate(II) and triiodotriphenylphosphaneniccolate(II), however, the large shifts of the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR signals of the aromatic protons of the triphenylphosphane ligands point to strong delocalization of electrons in these compounds.

#### 2.3.1. <sup>1</sup>H-, <sup>14</sup>N-, and <sup>31</sup>P-NMR Spectra

The <sup>1</sup>H-NMR spectra recorded for the diamagnetic cations of the ion associates (given in Table 4 for the tetrabutylammonium salt of triiodotriphenylphos-

- [41] G. N. LaMar, J. Chem. Phys. 43, 235 (1965).
- [42] R. H. Fischer and W. De W. Horrocks jr., Inorg. Chem. 7, 2659 (1968).
- [43] I. M. Walker and R. S. Drago, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 90, 6951 (1968).

phanecobaltate( $\pi$ ) at various concentrations) can be satisfactorily explained only if one postulates a direct transfer of spin density from the central metal ion of the anionic complex *e.g.* to the ammonium nitrogen atom.

Table 4. <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>14</sup>N Knight shifts (in ppm) of  $(C_4H_9)_4N^+$  in  $[(C_4H_9)_4N][CoI_3(C_6H_5)_5P]$  (dissolved in CDCI<sub>3</sub>; 100 and 7.22 MHz).

c (mote/l)	Н∝	нβ	нγ	нδ	14N
1.07	4	1.4	1.4	0.4	-14.4
0.88	4	1.4	1.4	0.4	-13.5
0,71	4.2	1.4	1.4	0.5	-12.8
0.53	4.4	1.6	1.5	0.4	-13,0
0.26	5.0	2.0	1.7	0.5	-10.2
0.15	5.5	2.5	1.8	0.6	- 7.8
0.075	6.0	3.0	2.0	0.7	- 5.7
0.034	7.3	3.7	2.3	0.8	_
0.010	8.1	4.3	2.7	0.9	-
0.005	8.5	4.5	2.8	0.9	
0.002	8.4	4.5	2.8	0.9	! _
0.001	8.0	4.3	2.6	0.9	1 -

The monotonic decrease in the spin density transmitted along the  $\sigma$  bond skeleton of the carbon chain from the  $\alpha$ - to the  $\omega$ -C atom is typical of alkyl chains in paramagnetic transition metal complexes [44]. In  $(C_4H_9)_4N^+$ , the highest density of unpaired electrons should be localized on the nitrogen. On correct application of the pseudo-contact model [5, 27], a signal shift toward higher fields is to be expected for the nitrogen of the diamagnetic tetrabutylammonium ion [37]. In the case of a direct transfer of unpaired electrons from the central metal ion to the nitrogen atom, however, the <sup>14</sup>N resonance signal must be displaced to lower fields (negative sign)<sup>[42]</sup>. The positive spin density on the nitrogen atom would then pass over to the adjacent  $\alpha$ -CH<sub>2</sub> group by configuration interaction <sup>[6]</sup>.

Only shifts with negative signs were found for the <sup>14</sup>N and <sup>31</sup>P signals in the spectra of the ion associates with ammonium and phosphonium cations (Table 5).

Table 5. <sup>14</sup>N and <sup>31</sup>P Knight shifts of the diamagnetic cation in the ion associate (dissolved in CDCl<sub>3</sub>; 7.22 and 40.5 MH2).

Compound	c (mole/l)	Shift (ppm)	
		14N	згр
[(C4H9)4N] [CoJ3(C6H5)3P]	0.53	-13	_
[(C4H9)4N] [Nif3(C6H5)3P]	0.52	- 7,1	-
[(C4H9)4P] [C0I3(C6H5)3P]	0.6	-	-3.5
[(C4H9)4P] [NiI3(C6H5)3P]	0.61	-	5.1
[(C4H9)4N]3 [Fe(CN)6]	0.7	-10.8	

#### 2.3.2. Discussion

The negative signal shifts that are always found in the  $^{14}N$ - and  $^{31}P$ -NMR spectra of the cations (Table 5) clearly show the transfer of positive spin density from the central metal ion of the anionic complex to the nitrogen or phosphorus atom. It can also be seen from Table 4 that the position of the  $^{1}H$ -NMR signals of the cation is strongly dependent on the concentration, whereas the Knight shifts of the anion remain

<sup>[37]</sup> G. N. LaMar, J. Chem. Phys. 41, 2992 (1964).

<sup>[38]</sup> R. J. Fitzgerald and R. S. Drago, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 90, 2523 (1968).

<sup>[39]</sup> D. W. Larsen and A. C. Wahl, Inorg. Chem. 4, 1281 (1965),
[40] W. De W. Horrocks jr., R. H. Fischer, J. R. Hutchison, and G. N. LaMar, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 88, 2436 (1966).

<sup>[44]</sup> H. P. Fritz, H. J. Keller, and K. E. Schwarzhans, J. Organometal. Chem. 6, 652 (1966).

constant over the entire concentration range investigated. This is true of all the ion associates studied. In Figure 6, there are three easily recognizable regions at concentrations below 0.2 mole/l, in which the ratio of the change in shift to the change in concentration assumes different values.



Fig. 6. Concentration dependence of the Knight shifts of the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  protons of the tetrabutylammonium ion in  $[C_4H_0)_4N][Col_3(C_6H_5)_3P]$  (dissolved in CDCl<sub>3</sub>).

This observation points to the presence of higher aggregates (associates), and is not compatible with the existence of "ion pairs" in solution. Such associates may be expected in solvents having low dielectric constants at relatively high salt concentrations<sup>[45]</sup>. There appear to be several definite aggregates, which evidently differ in their stability, and each of which is stable in a given concentration range.

# 2.4. <sup>1</sup>H-NMR Studies on the Occupation Equilibrium of the Electrons in Bis[4-(2-pyridy])-2-(2-pyridylamino)-thiazolato]iron(II)

Complexes in which a temperature-dependent occupation equilibrium exists between the electronic ground state and nearby excited states are of interest in biochemistry. Examples of compounds belonging to this class are in the iron-porphyrin complexes, whose term diagrams show a change in the ground state with the nature of the other ligands as a result of crossover of two terms. The NMR-spectroscopic investigation of the anomalous magnetic behavior of such complexes is frequently found to be very difficult because of their extremely low solubility.

This anomalous magnetic behavior has been observed and studied by NMR spectroscopy for the electron configuration  $d^5$  in dithiocarbamatoiron(III) complexes <sup>[46]</sup> and for the configuration  $d^7$  in some chelate complexes of cobalt(II) iodide <sup>[47]</sup>. No example of such an anomaly is known as yet for the electron configuration  $d^4$ , while an iron(11) complex will be described here as a typical and confirmed example with the configuration  $d^6$ .

Though the anomalous magnetic properties of several bis(o-phenanthroline)iron(11) complexes <sup>[48]</sup> have been interpreted as a temperature-dependent quintet-singlet occupation equilibrium, the sudden change in the effective magnetic moment of these compounds at a certain temperature is definitely due to a phase change, *i.e.* to an intermolecular effect.

The complex bis[4-(2-pyridyl)-2-(2-pyridylamino)thiazolato]iron(II) exhibits a characteristic decrease in its effective magnetic moment with falling temperature <sup>[49]</sup>.  $\mu_{eff}$  is 4.96  $\mu_B$  at room temperature and 1.55  $\mu_B$  at -170 °C, and decreases steadily in the intervening range. If this behavior is due to an intramolecular effect, it can only be explained by the existence of a singlet-quintet occupation equilibrium, naturally with participation of interjacent triplet states in accordance with their energy levels. On the basis of the IR spectra recorded at various temperatures, it was possible to show that the magnetic anomalies of bis-[4-(2-pyridyl)-2-(2-pyridylamino)thiazolato]iron(II) are not due to any intermolecular effect [50]. Where a temperature-dependent occupation equilibrium exists between the singlet ground state and the lowest quintet state, the NMR spectra of the compound must show characteristic changes with temperature. The Knight shifts of the resonance signals of a paramagnetic compound are directly proportional to the density of the unpaired electrons on the nucleus in question, and inversely proportional to the absolute temperature [6-10]. Thus the signal shifts in the NMR spectra of paramagnetic substances normally increase with falling temperature. In our example, the effective magnetic moment decreases slowly with falling temperature, i.e. the singlet state becomes more highly populated and the free spin density in the molecule as a whole decreases. Two opposing effects are therefore operative in the spectrum of such a complex. In bis[4-(2-pyridyl)-2-(2-pyridylamino)thiazolato]iron(II) at room temperature, the quintet state is predominantly populated ( $\mu_{eff} = 4.96 \ \mu_B$ ). The Knight shifts of the resonance signals will therefore initially become larger with falling temperature, as is to be expected for any magnetically normal paramagnetic complex. Ultimately, however, the occupation of the singlet ground state becomes so high that the direction of the signal shift in the NMR spectrum is reversed; the Knight shifts thus pass through a maximum on cooling. The shifts then decrease rapidly with further population of the singlet ground state. This effect is shown in Table 6 for seven <sup>1</sup>H-NMR signals of the complex in question in the temperature range between +30 and -60 °C.

<sup>[45]</sup> C. W. Davies: Ion Association. Butterworth, London 1962.

<sup>[46]</sup> R. M. Golding, W. C. Tennant, C. R. Kanekar, R. L. Martin, and A. H. White, J. Chem. Phys. 45, 2688 (1966).

<sup>[47]</sup> R. C. Stoufer, D. H. Busch, and W. B. Hadley, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 83, 3732 (1961).

<sup>[48]</sup> E. König and K. Madeja, J. Amer. Chem. Soc. 88, 4528 (1966); Inorg. Chem. 6, 48 (1967).

<sup>[49]</sup> R. N. Sylva and H. A. Goodwin, Australian J. Chem. 21, 1081 (1968).

<sup>[50]</sup> H. J. Keller, K. E. Schwarzhans, H. A. Goodwin, and R. N. Sylva, Z. Naturforsch. 24b, 1058 (1969)

Table 6. Shifts of the <sup>1</sup>H-NMR signals 1 to 7 of bis[4-(2-pyridyl)-2-(2-pyridylamino)thiazolato]iron( $\pi$ ) in relation to TMS (internal) toward lower fields with falling temperature (100 MHz).

T	Knight shift (Hz)					
•	l I	2	3	4	5/6	7
30	4630	4410	2810	2580	2210	865
20	4980	4700	2930	2695	2280	860
10	5120	4800	3020	2740	2380	915
0	5150	4850	3040	2780	2405	915
-10	5220	4880	3050	2820	2450	(960?)
20	5245	4900	3050	2840	2450	915
- 30	5120	4815	3000	2790	2410	905
-40	4970	4700	2920	2780	2405	875
50	4600	4300	2645	2565	2210	750
60	4200	4200	2350	2350	2020	660

The signal shifts of the protons, which are not assigned, are measured in Hz. All the resonance signals pass through a maximum at -20 °C. The variation of the shifts (measured in solution) with falling temperature is directly parallel to the molar susceptibility

COMMUNICATIONS

#### Photoelectron Spectrum of Cyclobucane<sup>(1)</sup>

#### By Peter Bischof, Edwin Haselbach, and Edgar Heilbronner<sup>[\*]</sup>

The vertical ionization potentials  $I_v$  of cyclobutane C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>8</sub>, as determined from the photoelectron spectrum<sup>[2]</sup>, are listed in Table 1. An assignment to orbitals of particular symmetry can be performed, assuming the validity of Koopmans' theorem<sup>[3]</sup>, on the basis of the orbital energies  $\varepsilon = -I_v$  obtained for cyclobutane by a SCF *ab initio* technique<sup>[4]</sup>, by the MINDO/2 method<sup>[5]</sup>, or by the extended Hückel theory (EHT)<sup>[6]</sup> (see Table 1).

The *ab initio* and EHT results, which were made available to us by *L. Salem* and *J. S. Wright* (cf. ref. <sup>[7]</sup>), are based on the following structural parameters: Symmetry  $D_{4h}$ ; C--C = 1.556 Å; C--H = 1.095 Å,  $\leq$  HCH = 116°<sup>[6]</sup>. In the MINDO/2 method the total energy of the cyclobutane molecule was minimized without any restriction of the topography except for C-·H = 1.093 Å and HCH = 120°. In this case, the calculation yields a  $D_{4h}$  structure with C--C = 1.534 Å within the convergence criteria of the minimization process. It should be noted that a  $D_{2d}$  structure is found experimentally for cyclobutane<sup>[9]</sup>. For this reason the classification of the orbitals according to  $D_{2d}$  symmetry is also included in Table 1.

Table J. Vertical ionization potentials and orbital energies of cyclobutane.

Orbita	đ	Ju (eV)	Calculate	d orbital ene	rgies (eV)	Orbital
D₄h	D <sub>2d</sub>	±0.1 eV	ab initio [a]	MINDO/2	EHT [a]	character
3eu	4e	10.7 [b]; (1.3 (JT) [c]	-10.50	- 9.88	12.83	mixed; Walsh type
tbru	4a,	11.7	-11.82	-10.35	-13.92	CH <sub>2</sub> (π)
161g	1b1	12.5	-12,47	-11.93	-14.09	CC (0)
leg	Зе	13.4; 13.6 (JT) [c]	-14,38	-13,17	-15.36	CH <sub>2</sub> (π)
3a <sub>1g</sub>	3atı	15.9	-16.05	15.23	-15.68	CH <sub>2</sub> (σ)+CC(σ)
3a <sub>20</sub>	3 <b>b</b> 2	18,2	17.53	-17.94	16.81	CH <sub>2</sub> (π)

[a] See ref. [4]. [b] Electron impact value: 10.58 eV, cf. [13].
[c] Jahn-Teller splitting.

Angew. Chem. internat. Edit. / Vol. 9 (1970) / No. 12

(measured in the solid state<sup>[49]</sup>). These experimentally observed anomalies of bis[4-(2-pyridy])-2-(2-pyridy]amino)thiazolato]iron(11) are thus not due to an intermolecular effect, but they can be plausibly explained by a temperature-dependent occupation equilibrium of the electrons between the <sup>1</sup>A<sub>1</sub> ground state and the energetically nearby excited <sup>5</sup>T<sub>2</sub> state, *i.e.* by an intramolecular effect.

I am grateful to Dr. W. Gretner for his assistance with the work carried out by our own research group. I thank Dr. H. J. Keller for many valuable discussions, and the Principals of the Inorganic Chemistry Laboratories of the Technische Universität München, Professor H. P. Fritz and Professor E. O. Fischer, for the opportunity to use the NMR spectrometer. Thanks are due to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for financial support.

> Received: February 4, 1970 [A 797 1E] German version: Angew. Chem. 82, 975 (1970) Translated by Express Translation Service, London



Fig. 1. Comparison of the calculated SCF orbital energies  $\varepsilon$  with the vertical ionization potential  $I_y = -s$  of cyclobutane.

As shown by the correlation diagram (Fig. 1), the experimental values are in excellent agreement with the calculated ab initio and MINDO/2 data. The reasonable results obtained from the EHT model are probably due to the high degree of symmetry of the molecule. As predicted, the first band in the PE spectrum (at 11 eV) is split into two partial bands separated by about 0.6 eV. Since the photoelectron vacates a degenerate orbital (3e<sub>0</sub> or 4e), the radical cation  $C_4H_8^\ast$  must be subject to a Jahn-Teller distortion in its electronic ground state, which leads to the observed splitting. (Compare the analogous behavior of cyclopropane<sup>[10]</sup>.) Similarly, the form of the band at 13.5 eV seems to indicate a small splitting of 0.2 eV, which would agree with the theoretical prediction that in this case the photoelectron is ejected from the  $1e_g$  (or 3e) orbital. It should be noted that the PE spectroscopic findings confirm the prediction [7] that, by analogy to the situation prevailing in cyclopropane<sup>[10,11]</sup>, the highest occupied orbital in cyclobutane is also degenerate and can consequently be regarded as a kind of Walsh orbital.

The structure of the radical cation  $C_4H_8^*$  (in the electronic ground state) has been studied in the course of an investi-

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect



Progress in Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/pnmrs

#### Paramagnetic NMR in solution and the solid state

#### Andrew J. Pell<sup>a,\*</sup>, Guido Pintacuda<sup>b</sup>, Clare P. Grey<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Materials and Environmental Chemistry, Arrhenius Laboratory, Stockholm University, Svante Arrhenius väg 16 C, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden <sup>b</sup> Institut des Sciences Analytiques (CNRS UMR 5280, ENS de Lyon, UCB Lyon 1), Université de Lyon, 5 rue de la Doua, 69100 Villeurbanne, France <sup>c</sup> Department of Chemistry, University of Cambridge, Lensfield Road, Cambridge CB2 1EW, UK

Edited by Gareth Morris and Geoffrey Bodenhausen

#### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 22 September 2017 Accepted 12 May 2018 Available online 24 May 2018

#### ABSTRACT

The field of paramagnetic NMR has expanded considerably in recent years. This review addresses both the theoretical description of paramagnetic NMR, and the way in which it is currently practised. We provide a review of the theory of the NMR parameters of systems in both solution and the solid state. Here we unify the different languages used by the NMR, EPR, quantum chemistry/DFT, and magnetism communities to provide a comprehensive and coherent theoretical description. We cover the theory of the paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy in solution both in the traditional formalism in terms of the magnetic susceptibility tensor, and using a more modern formalism employing the relevant EPR parameters, such as are used in first-principles calculations. In addition we examine the theory first in the simple nonrelativistic picture, and then in the presence of spin-orbit coupling. These ideas are then extended to a description of the paramagnetic shift in periodic solids, where it is necessary to include the bulk magnetic properties, such as magnetic ordering at low temperatures. The description of the paramagnetic shift is completed by describing the current understanding of such shifts due to lanthanide and actinide ions. We then examine the paramagnetic relaxation enhancement, using a simple model employing a phenomenological picture of the electronic relaxation, and again using a more complex state-of-the-art theory which incorporates electronic relaxation explicitly. An additional important consideration in the solid state is the impact of bulk magnetic susceptibility effects on the form of the spectrum, where we include some ideas from the field of classical electrodynamics. We then continue by describing in detail the solution and solid-state NMR methods that have been deployed in the study of paramagnetic systems in chemistry, biology, and the materials sciences. Finally we describe a number of case studies in paramagnetic NMR that have been specifically chosen to highlight how the theory in part one, and the methods in part two, can be used in practice. The systems chosen include small organometallic complexes in solution, solid battery electrode materials, metalloproteins in both solution and the solid state, systems containing lanthanide ions, and multi-component materials used in pharmaceutical controlled-release formulations that have been doped with paramagnetic species to measure the component domain sizes. © 2018 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

#### Contents

Chapter	1: Introduction	. 7
1.1.	Paramagnetic NMR	. 7
1.2.	New techniques for solid-state paramagnetic NMR	. 7
1.3.	The paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy	. 7
1.4.	The paramagnetic relaxation enhancement	. 8
1.5.	Bulk magnetic susceptibility effects	. 9
1.6.	Paramagnetic NMR and dynamic nuclear polarization	. 9
1.7.	What this review contains	10
Chapter	2: Introduction to nuclear and electronic magnetism	11

\* Corresponding author. E-mail address: andrew.pell@mmk.su.se (A.J. Pell).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnmrs.2018.05.001

0079-6565/© 2018 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V.

This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

2.1.	Nuclear and electronic magnetic moments	11
2.2.	Magnetic field, magnetization, and the magnetic susceptibility	12
2.3.	The electronic and magnetic properties of periodic solids	12
	2.3.1. Electronic energy levels and the density of states	12
	2.3.2. Band structures of insulators, semiconductors, and metals	14
	2.3.3 The free-electron model of metals	14
24	The nuclear and electronic Zeeman interactions	15
2.4.	Includible spherical topsors and topsors operators	16
2.5.	Includible splicitical tensors and tensor operators	10
	2.5.1. Cartesian tensor representation of the spin Hamiltonian	10
	2.5.2. Irreducible spherical tensor representation of the spin Hamiltonian	16
2.6.	Chemical shielding and chemical shift.	18
	2.6.1. The high-field approximation	18
	2.6.2. The chemical shift	21
2.7.	The spin interactions of quadrupolar nuclei	21
	2.7.1. The nuclear guadrupole Hamiltonian	22
2.8.	The hyperfine interaction	23
	28.1 Interaction with a single delocalised electron	23
	2.8.2. Interaction with a single localized electron	24
	2.0.2. Interaction with a single totalistic electron multiple delection delectrons	24
	2.6.5. Interaction with a paramagnetic centre of multiple depotatised electrons.	24
	2.8.4. Interaction with a paramagnetic centre of multiple localised electrons	25
	2.8.5. The hyperfine coupling constant	25
	2.8.6. The hyperfine interaction in solid insulators	26
	2.8.7. The hyperfine interaction in solid metals	26
	2.8.8. Finite nucleus effects	26
2.9.	Key concepts	26
Chapter	3: The paramagnetic shift in electron spin-only systems	27
3.1.	The origin of the paramagnetic shift	27
	3.1.1 Two-spin system comprising two spin-1/2 heteronuclei	27
	1.2 Two-enin system comprising one spin-1/2 nucleus and a free electron	20
27	The thermal average of the electron magnetic moment: the Brillouin function and the Curie coin	20
J.2.	The definition and the possible reliance in the first and the first and the cure spin-	20
<b>.</b>	5.2.1. The manifoldina and the pseudo spin	20
3.3.	Ine magnetic susceptibility	33
	3.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk	33
	3.3.2. The susceptibility in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters	33
	3.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility	33
3.4.	The scaling factor	35
3.5.	Key concepts	35
Chapter	4: The paramagnetic shift due to <i>d</i> -block transition-metals with spin-orbit coupling	35
4.1	The EPR effective spin Hamiltonian	36
	4.11 Derivation	36
	11.2 The NMD and EDD targers	20
4.2	The EDB formalism of the anamagnetic childing	50
4.2.		20
		39
	4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor	39 39
	4.2.1.General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor4.2.2.The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i> -block transition-metal systems	39 39 42
	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	39 39 42 42
4.3.	4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor         4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i> -block transition-metal systems         4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits         The magnetic susceptibility tensor.	39 39 42 42 45
4.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	39 39 42 42 45 45
4.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> </ol>
4.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>46</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>48</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5.	4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor         4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i> -block transition-metal systems         4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits         The magnetic susceptibility tensor.         4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk         4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism         4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor.         The scaling factor revisited         4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy         The Kurland-McGarvey formalism.	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>48</li> <li>40</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>49</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter	4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor         4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i> -block transition-metal systems         4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits         The magnetic susceptibility tensor.         4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk         4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism         4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor.         The scaling factor revisited.         4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy         The Kurland-McGarvey formalism.         Key concepts         5: The interpretation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor of <i>d</i> -block transition-metal ions	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>49</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1.	4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor         4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i> -block transition-metal systems         4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits         The magnetic susceptibility tensor.         4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk         4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism         4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor.         The scaling factor revisited.         4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy         The Kurland-McGarvey formalism.         Key concepts         5: The interpretation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor of <i>d</i> -block transition-metal ions.         Correspondence between the EPR and susceptibility formalisms of the paramagnetic shielding tensor .	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ul> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>49</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> </ul>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ul> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> </ul>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ul> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> <li>51</li> </ul>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ul> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> <li>51</li> </ul>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> <li>51</li> <li>53</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> <li>51</li> <li>53</li> <li>53</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li></ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> <li>51</li> <li>53</li> <li>53</li> <li>53</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i>-block transition-metal systems</li> <li>4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits</li> <li>The magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk.</li> <li>4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism</li> <li>4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>The scaling factor revisited.</li> <li>4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy.</li> <li>The Kurland–McGarvey formalism.</li> <li>Key concepts</li> <li>S: The interpretation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor of <i>d</i>-block transition-metal ions.</li> <li>Correspondence between the EPR and susceptibility formalisms of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>Summary of the relevant tensor parameters.</li> <li>5.2.0.1. The magnetic coupling tensor</li> <li>5.2.0.3. The <i>g</i>-tensor.</li> <li>5.2.0.4. The zero-field splitting and <i>Z</i> tensors</li> <li>The paramagnetic shift in the susceptibility formalism.</li> <li>5.3.1. The contact shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.2. The spin-dipolar shift and shift anisotropy.</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 39\\ 39\\ 42\\ 45\\ 46\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 51\\ 51\\ 51\\ 53\\ 53\\ 53\\ 56\end{array}$
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i>-block transition-metal systems</li> <li>4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits</li> <li>The magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk.</li> <li>4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism</li> <li>4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy</li> <li>The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy.</li> <li>The interpretation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor of <i>d</i>-block transition-metal ions.</li> <li>Correspondence between the EPR and susceptibility formalisms of the paramagnetic shielding tensor .</li> <li>S.2.0.1. The magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>S.2.0.2. The hyperfine coupling tensor</li> <li>S.2.0.3. The <i>g</i>-tensor.</li> <li>S.2.0.4. The zero-field splitting and <i>Z</i> tensors</li> <li>The contact shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>S.3.4. The contact shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>S.3.4. The summetric hyperfine shift anisotropy.</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 39\\ 39\\ 42\\ 45\\ 45\\ 46\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 51\\ 51\\ 53\\ 53\\ 53\\ 56\\ 56\end{array}$
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i>-block transition-metal systems</li> <li>4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits</li> <li>4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk</li> <li>4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism</li> <li>4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility tensor</li> <li>4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility tensor</li> <li>4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy</li> <li>The Kurland–McGarvey formalism.</li> <li>Key concepts</li> <li>5: The interpretation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor of <i>d</i>-block transition-metal ions.</li> <li>Correspondence between the EPR and susceptibility formalisms of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>Summary of the relevant tensor parameters.</li> <li>5.2.0.1. The magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>5.2.0.3. The g-tensor.</li> <li>5.2.0.4. The zero-field splitting and <b>Z</b> tensors</li> <li>The paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.2. The spin-dipolar shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.3. The antisymmetric hyperfine shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.4. Summary.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>39</li> <li>39</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>50</li> <li>50</li> <li>51</li> <li>53</li> <li>56</li> <li>57</li> </ol>
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i>-block transition-metal systems</li> <li>4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits</li> <li>4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk.</li> <li>4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism</li> <li>4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>The kurland-McGarvey formalism.</li> <li>Key concepts</li> <li>5: The interpretation of the parameters.</li> <li>5.2.0.1. The magnetic susceptibility formalisms of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>5.2.0.2. The hyperfine coupling tensor</li> <li>5.2.0.4. The zeno-field splitting and Z tensors</li> <li>The paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.1. The contact shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.3. The antisymmetric hyperfine shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.4. Summary.</li> <li>The wave fine the methematic shift calcular/atomic-level EPR parameters.</li> <li>5.3.4. Summary.</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 39\\ 39\\ 42\\ 45\\ 45\\ 46\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 50\\ 51\\ 51\\ 53\\ 53\\ 53\\ 56\\ 56\\ 57\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77$
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to 4-block transition-metal systems</li> <li>4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits</li> <li>4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits</li> <li>4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk.</li> <li>4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism</li> <li>4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy</li> <li>The Kurland-McGarvey formalism.</li> <li>Key concepts</li> <li>S: The interpretation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor of d-block transition-metal ions.</li> <li>Correspondence between the EPR and susceptibility formalisms of the paramagnetic shielding tensor.</li> <li>S.2.0.1. The magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>5.2.0.2. The hyperfine coupling tensor</li> <li>5.2.0.3. The g-tensor.</li> <li>5.2.0.4. The zero-field splitting and Z tensors</li> <li>The paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.1. The contact shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.3. The antisymmetric hyperfine shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.4. Summary.</li> <li>The paramagnetic shift in terms of the molecular/atomic-level EPR parameters.</li> <li>5.4.1. Magnetically isotropic transition-metal ions in the absence of spin-orbit coupling .</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 39\\ 39\\ 42\\ 45\\ 46\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 50\\ 51\\ 51\\ 53\\ 53\\ 56\\ 56\\ 57\\ 57\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77\\ 77$
4.3. 4.4. 4.5. 4.6. Chapter 5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	<ul> <li>4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to <i>d</i>-block transition-metal systems</li> <li>4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits</li> <li>4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits</li> <li>4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk</li> <li>4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism</li> <li>4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy</li> <li>The Kurland-McGarvey formalism.</li> <li>Key concepts</li> <li>S. The interpretation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor of <i>d</i>-block transition-metal ions.</li> <li>Correspondence between the EPR and susceptibility formalisms of the paramagnetic shielding tensor</li> <li>5.2.0.1. The magnetic susceptibility tensor.</li> <li>5.2.0.2. The hyperfine coupling tensor</li> <li>5.2.0.3. The <i>g</i>-tensor.</li> <li>5.2.0.4. The zero-field splitting and <i>Z</i> tensors</li> <li>The paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.2. The spin-dipolar shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.3. The antisymmetric hyperfine shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.3.4. Summary.</li> <li>The paramagnetic shift in the molecular/atomic-level EPR parameters.</li> <li>5.4.1. Magnetically isotropic transition-metal ions in the absence of spin-orbit coupling.</li> <li>5.4.2. The contact shift and shift anisotropy.</li> <li>5.4.1. Magnetically isotropic transitor.</li> </ul>	$\begin{array}{c} 39\\ 39\\ 42\\ 45\\ 46\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 49\\ 50\\ 50\\ 50\\ 51\\ 51\\ 53\\ 53\\ 56\\ 56\\ 57\\ 57\\ 57\\ 57\\ 57\\ 57\\ 57\\ 57\\ 57\\ 57$

	5.4.4.	The antisymmetric hyperfine shift anisotropy	60
	545	Summary	60
5 5	Key con	cants	61
Chantar	C. The	cepto	01
Chapter	r 6: The j	paramagnetic shift due metal ions with arbitrary spin-multiplicity and spin-orbit coupling strength: application to <i>a</i> -transiti	on
metals,	, lanthani	des, and actinides	61
6.1.	The crys	stal-field interaction and the effective spin	61
	6.1.1.	The effective spin	62
	612	The crystal-field interaction	62
	612	First field us zone field splitting	62
6.0	0.1.5.	Crystar-netu vs zero-netu spitting	02
6.2.	The gen	eralized EPR spin Hamiltonian and paramagnetic shielding tensor	63
	6.2.1.	The electronic Zeeman interaction	63
	6.2.2.	The hyperfine interaction	63
	6.2.3.	The ZFS interaction.	64
	624	The EDP formalism of the paramagnetic chielding tensor	64
6.2	0.2.4. The new	The Li K formatism of the paramagnetic sine during tensor	04
0.3.	The para	anaghetic shielding and magnetic susceptionity tensors due to a transition-metal ion with arbitrary spin multiplicity	65
	6.3.1.	The Bleaney expression for <i>d</i> -block metal ions revisited	65
	6.3.2.	The EPR formalism of the magnetic susceptibility tensor	66
6.4.	Electron	ic properties of the lanthanide ions	67
	641	The free lanthanide ions	67
	642	The entrational field interaction	60
6 <b>F</b>	0.4.2.	The clystal-neu interaction.	00
6.5.	The Blea	aney theory of the paramagnetic shielding tensor due to lanthanide ions	68
	6.5.1.	The paramagnetic chemical shielding in terms of the magnetic susceptibility tensor	69
	6.5.2.	Contact shift contributions from excited states of different /	70
	653	Pseudo-contact shift contributions from excited states of different I	71
	654	The shortcomings of the Blaney theory	72
6.6	0.5.4.	The shortcomings of the bleaney theory.	72
6.6.	ine para	anagnetic sineiding due to actinides	12
	6.6.1.	Electronic structure of actinide ions	72
	6.6.2.	The EPR formalism for the paramagnetic shielding tensor	72
6.7	Key con	cents.	72
Chapter	r 7. The n	promotion shift in multi-metal ion systems, and solid materials	72
Chapter			75
7.1.	The para	amagnetic shift due to multiple non-interacting metal ions	/3
7.2.	The Hei	senberg exchange Hamiltonian	73
	7.2.1.	The exchange interaction between two electronic spins 1/2	73
	7.2.2.	The exchange interaction between two arbitrary electronic spins	74
73	The par	amagnetic shift due to a coupled electronic spin system	75
7.5.	The gen	anaginetic sinit due to a coupled electronic spin system	75
7.4.	The gen	eral exchange Hamiltonian for transition metal ions subject to spin-orbit coupling	76
7.5.	The para	amagnetic shift due to a coupled electronic spin system subject to spin-orbit coupling	77
	7.5.1.	The EPR formalism	77
	7.5.2.	Example: two coupled electronic spins-1/2	78
76	Ferroma	gnetic and antiferromagnetic interactions in solid insulators: the Curie-Weiss law	79
7.0.	761	The Weise model of foremagneticm	70
	7.0.1.	The weiss model of ferromagnetism.	79
	7.6.2.	The Weiss model of antiferromagnetism	80
	7.6.3.	The magnetic susceptibility	81
	7.6.4.	The Néel temperature and Weiss constant in antiferromagnetic materials	82
	7.6.5	The magnetic susceptibility in terms of the isotropic exchange coupling	82
77	The par	magnetic shielding tapeor in solid insulator materials	Q2
7.7.		anagictic shielding tensor in Sond insulator materials.	0.1
	7.7.1.	The Curle–webs expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor	84
	7.7.2.	The scaling factor	84
	7.7.3.	A word of caution	85
	7.7.4.	The magnetic susceptibility and paramagnetic shielding tensors in solid materials with more than one species of paramagne	tic
metal ion			85
7 0	Typec of	f isotropic exchange interaction	86
7.8.			00
	1.8.1.	Direct exchange	86
	7.8.2.	Superexchange	86
	7.8.3.	Double exchange	86
	784	Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuva-Yosida exchange	87
70	Drodicti	as the Formi contact chift with the Condenough Kanamori rules	87
7.5.	The	ig the refine contact sint with the Goodenough-Kananon rules	07
7.10.	The ma	agnetic susceptibility and paramagnetic snielding tensors in solid materials due to metal lons with SO coupling	89
	7.10.0.1.	The magnetic susceptibility tensor	89
	7.10.0.2.	The paramagnetic shielding tensor	90
7.11.	Exchar	ge interactions between transition-metal ions and lanthanides	90
7 12	The na	ramagnetic shift in metals	90
7.12.	7 1 D 1	The Veight child	00
	7.12.1.	The Neight shift.	30
	7.12.2.	The Pauli magnetic susceptibility	92
	7.12.3.	Comparison between the paramagnetic shifts in metals and insulators.	93
7.13.	Key co	ncepts	93
Chanter	r 8: Relax	ation in paramagnetic systems under fast-motional and high-field conditions	94
Q 1	Overvio	of the models of electronic and nuclear relaxation	٥ <u>/</u>
0.1.	The D	w of the models of electronic and nuclear relaxation	04
8.2.	The Red	lieu uleory of relaxation	94
	8.2.1.	The equation of motion	94
	8.2.2.	Relaxation by spatial reorientation of the interaction tensor	97
	8.2.3.	Relaxation by fast chemical exchange	98

	8.2.4. The spin-dependent part	. 98
	8.2.5. The nuclear relaxation superoperator	. 98
8.3.	The correlation function and spectral density	99
	8.3.1. A note on terminology for motional regimes	. 99
8.4.	Electronic relaxation	. 100
	8.4.1. Relaxation due to the transient ZFS	. 101
	8.4.2. Relaxation due to the static ZFS	. 101
	8.4.3. Beyond the simple Redfield approximation	. 102
	8.4.4. Other electronic relaxation mechanisms involving spin-orbit coupling	. 102
8.5.	Nuclear relaxation	. 102
8.6.	The Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory of paramagnetic nuclear relaxation	. 104
	8.6.1. Relaxation due to the spin-dipolar interaction with delocalized electrons.	. 105
	8.6.2. Relaxation due to the spin-dipolar interaction with localised electrons (the Solomon mechanism)	. 105
	8.6.3. Relaxation due to the Fermi-contact interaction (the Bloembergen mechanism)	. 105
	8.6.4. The Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations	. 106
	8.6.5. Shortcomings of the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory	. 106
8.7.	Curie-spin relaxation	. 106
	8.7.1. Relaxation due to the spin-dipolar interaction with delocalized electrons.	. 107
	8.7.2. Relaxation due to the spin-dipolar interaction with localised electrons.	. 107
	8.7.3. Relaxation due to the Fermi-contact interaction	. 108
	8.7.4. Comparison of the Curie terms with the relaxation rate constants due to stochastic fluctuation of the paramagnetic ch	emical
	shielding interaction	108
	875 The importance of the Curie term	109
88	Cross-correlation between the paramagnetic and diamagnetic relaxation mechanisms in solution	110
0.0.	88.1 Nuclear-nuclear dipolar-coupling relaxation and cross-correlation with the Curie mechanism	110
	8.8.2 Inopitudinal relaxion	111
	883 Transverse relayation	111
80	Decomparity relaxation analyzements in non-dynamic solid insulators	114
0. <i>3</i> . 8 10	Paramagnetic relavation emaneted in non-uplante solid insulators.	115
0.10. Q 11	Palazitan properties of specific personantic metic into antinanue fois	. 115
0.11.	Relaxation properties of specific parameteric metal ions	. 115
	0.11.1. The builds that and the second	110
0 1 2		110
8.12. Chantar	Reg concepts	. 118
Chapter	9: Relaxation in paramagnetic systems under general conditions.	. 119
9.1.	Introduction to the slow-motion theory of relaxation	. 119
	9.1.1. The different approaches for slow relaxation dynamics	. 119
	9.1.2. The Swedish slow-motion theory	. 120
9.2.	The stochastic Liouville formalism.	. 121
	9.2.1. The Hamiltonian and Liouvillian	. 121
	9.2.2. The density operator	. 122
9.3.	Derivation of the stochastic Liouville equation	. 122
	9.3.1. The relaxation superoperator.	. 122
	9.3.2. The longitudinal and transverse relaxation times	. 124
	9.3.3. Summary of the formalism	. 125
9.4.	Electronic relaxation in the Redfield limit	. 125
	9.4.1. The spin system, lattice, and spin–lattice coupling	. 125
	9.4.2. The electronic spin relaxation superoperator	. 126
9.5.	The Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory revisited	. 126
	9.5.1. The lattice	. 126
	9.5.2. The spectral densities	. 127
	9.5.3. The Solomon-Morgan-Bloembergen equations	. 127
9.6.	Low-field theory of the PRE in low-symmetry complexes in solution.	. 128
	9.6.1. Introduction	. 128
	9.6.2. The lattice	. 128
	9.6.3. The spectral densities	. 129
	9.6.4. Electronic relaxation.	. 130
	9.6.5. Nuclear relaxation	. 131
9.7.	The PRE under fast-rotation conditions in solution	. 132
	971 Introduction	132
	9.7.2. A simple model of inner- and outer-sphere relaxation .	. 132
	7.3 Inner-sphere relaxation at high field	133
	974 Outer-sphere relaxation at high field	134
	975 Inner- and outer-sphere relaxation at low field	125
9.8	The effect of vibrational motion on the PRF	135
5.6.	Reference of violational induction of the risk	126
	0.8.2 The vibrational subsystem	120
	0.8.2 Electronic relayation	100
		13/
0.0	J.0.4. THE LIKE	1.10
9.9.		. 140
	3.5.1. Introduction	140
	9.9.2. Longitudinal relaxation due to transitions between energy levels	. 140

	9.9.5.		140
	9.9.4.	The Korringa relation	142
	9.9.5.	Comparison of the longitudinal PRE in solid insulators and metals	142
9.10.	Key co	ncepts	143
Chapter	10: Inho	mogeneous broadening due to the bulk paramagnetic susceptibility	143
10.1.	The BN	Is shift in a single crystal	143
	10.1.1.	The demagnetising field in a single crystal.	143
	10.1.2.	The BMS shift of a spherical crystallite.	145
	10.1.3.	The IBMS and ABMS contributions to the paramagnetic shielding tensor	145
10.2.	The BN	IS shift in a polycrystalline powder	146
	10.2.1.	The IBMS and ABMS contributions to the paramagnetic shielding	146
	10.2.2.	BMS inhomogeneous broadening	148
10.3.	Key co	ncepts	148
Chapter	11: The	NMR spectrum for non-interacting spins	148
11.1.	The qu	antum mechanics of NMR	149
	11.1.1.	The Hamiltonian, propagator, and density operator	149
	11.1.2.	Radiofrequency pulses and sequences	149
	11.1.3.	The spin interactions	150
	11.1.4.	Basis operators	151
	11.1.5.	NMR frequencies and spin order	151
	11.1.6.	Solution NMR	152
	11.1.7.	Solid-state NMR of static powders	153
	11.1.8.	Solid-state NMR of spinning powders	153
11.2.	The shi	ft and shift anisotropy in paramagnetic NMR	155
	11.2.1.	The chemical shielding frequencies	155
	11.2.2.	Solution NMR	155
	11.2.3.	Solid-state NMR of static powders	156
	11.2.4.	Solid-state NMR of spinning powders	158
11.3.	Parama	gnetic NMR of integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei	159
	11.3.1.	Static solid powders	159
	11.3.2.	Solid powders under MAS	160
	11.3.3.	First-order guadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	160
11.4	Parama	metic NMR of half-integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei	160
	11.4.1	First-order guadrupolar interaction	160
	1142	Second-order analytimolar interaction	161
	1 1. 1.2.	become of der quadrupolar interaction	101
	1143	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162
11.5	11.4.3. Key co	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163
11.5. Chapter	11.4.3. Key con 12 <sup>.</sup> A su	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164
11.5. Chapter 12.1	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 166
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 166 172
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 166 172 174
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 166 172 174 176
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3.	11.4.3. Key con 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measur 12.4.1. 12.4.2.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 182
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 182 183 184
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 182 182 183 184
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 182 183 184 184
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.3.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 182 183 184 184 184
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.3. 12.5.4.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 183 184 184 186 192
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.3. 12.5.4. 12.5.5.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 183 184 184 186 192 193 193
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measui 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.3. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.6.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 183 184 184 186 192 193 193
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measui 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.3. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.5.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 183 184 184 186 192 193 193 193
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measui 12.4.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.3. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 183 184 184 184 184 184 192 193 195 201 207
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key cou 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measu 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.3. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions. nepts . rvey of NMR methods for paramagnetic systems . ulse sequences . n NMR methods for paramagnetic systems . The general strategy. Small molecules . n NMR of paramagnetic proteins . General strategy for resonance assignment and structural restraints. Paramagnetic NMR methods . Paramagnetic Structural restraints . Solvent PREs for measuring protein–solvent interactions . ing chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (CEST). Paramagnetic shift reagents in chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (PARACEST). ate NMR methods for paramagnetic systems . The general strategy . One-dimensional NMR. Homonuclear through-space correlations . Heteronuclear through-space correlations . Heteronuclear through-space correlations . Broadband NMR methods for spin–1/2 nuclei . Separation of shift anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions . ate NMR of paramagnetic proteins . Separation of shift anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions . ate NMR of paramagnetic proteins . Comediate exchange correlations . Heteronuclear through-space proteins . Separation of shift anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions . The general strategy . Separation of shift anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions . Separation of shift-anisotropy and quadrupolar int	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 183 184 184 184 184 193 193 195 201 207 211
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measui 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.3. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.1.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 183 184 186 192 193 195 201 207 211 207
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measur 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.1. 12.6.2.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 183 184 184 184 184 193 193 201 207 211 207 211
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measui 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.3. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.1. 12.6.2. 12.6.3.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions. treepts treey of NMR methods for paramagnetic systems Ilse sequences n NMR methods for paramagnetic systems. The general strategy. Small molecules n NMR of paramagnetic proteins General strategy for resonance assignment and structural restraints. Paramagnetic NMR methods Paramagnetic structural restraints Solvent PREs for measuring protein-solvent interactions ing chemical exchange in solution NMR and MRI Chemical exchange in solution NMR and MRI Chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (CEST). Paramagnetic shift reagents in chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (PARACEST). tate NMR methods for paramagnetic systems The general strategy. One-dimensional NMR. Homonuclear through-space correlations. Heteronuclear through-space correlations Separation of shift anisotropy interactions Broadband NMR methods for spin-1/2 nuclei Separation of shift anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions General strategy. <sup>11</sup> B-detection. <sup>1</sup> H-detection.	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 183 184 184 184 184 193 193 193 201 207 211 211 211 212
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5. 12.6.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.2. 12.6.3. 12.6.3. 12.6.4. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.3. 12.6.4. Solid-si 12.6.3. 12.6.4. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.3. 12.6.4. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.3. 12.6.4. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.3. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.3. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.3. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.4. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.5.5. Solid-si 13.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions. neepts neepts nown MR methods for paramagnetic systems The general strategy. Small molecules n NMR of paramagnetic proteins General strategy for resonance assignment and structural restraints. Paramagnetic NRR methods Paramagnetic structural restraints Solvent PREs for measuring protein–solvent interactions ing chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (CEST). Paramagnetic shift reagents in chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (PARACEST). The general strategy. One-dimensional NMR. Homonuclear through-space correlations. Hotomonuclear through-space correlations. Separation of shift and shift anisotropy interactions Separation of shift anisotropy interactions Augustantic strategy. <sup>13</sup> C-detection. <sup>13</sup> C-detection. Paramagnetic restraints.	162 163 164 164 164 164 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 183 184 184 184 184 193 193 195 201 207 211 211 211 212
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5. 12.6.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.9. Solid-si 12.5.9. Solid-si 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.9. Solid-si 13.5.9. Solid-si 13.5.5. Solid-si 13.5.5.5.5. Solid-si 13.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions. reepts reey of NMR methods for paramagnetic systems In MR methods for paramagnetic systems The general strategy. Small molecules n NMR of paramagnetic proteins General strategy for resonance assignment and structural restraints. Paramagnetic NMR methods Paramagnetic structural restraints Solvent PREs for measuring protein–solvent interactions ing chemical exchange in solution NMR and MRI Chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (CEST). Paramagnetic shift reagents in chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (PARACEST) ate NMR methods for paramagnetic systems. The general strategy. One-dimensional NMR. Homonuclear through-space correlations. Heteronuclear through-space correlations Separation of shift and shift anisotropy interactions Broadband NMR methods for spin-1/2 nuclei Separation of shift-anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions General strategy. Indetending in the spin-1/2 nuclei Separation of shift-anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions General strategy. Indetending in the spin-1/2 nuclei Separation of shift-anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions Area Magnetic proteins. General strategy. Indetection. Inde	162 163 164 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 183 184 184 184 184 192 193 195 201 207 211 211 212 212
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5. 12.6. 12.6.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.1. 12.6.2. 12.6.3. 12.6.4. Key coi 13: Case	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions. neepts neepts neepts nNR methods for paramagnetic systems n NR methods for paramagnetic systems The general strategy. Small molecules n NR of paramagnetic proteins General strategy for resonance assignment and structural restraints. Paramagnetic NMR methods Paramagnetic structural restraints Solvent PREs for measuring protein–solvent interactions ing chemical exchange in solution NMR and MRI. Chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (CEST). Paramagnetic shift reagents in chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (PARACEST). atte NMR methods for paramagnetic systems. The general strategy. One-dimensional NMR. Homonuclear through-space correlations. Heteronuclear through-space correlations. Heteronuclear through-space correlations. Broadband NMR methods for spin-1/2 nuclei. Separation of shift-anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions atte NMR of paramagnetic proteins. Heteronuclear through-space correlations. Heteronuclear strategy. <sup>13</sup> C-detection. <sup>14</sup> -detection. <sup>14</sup> -detection. <sup>15</sup> C-detection. <sup>16</sup> C-detection. <sup>17</sup> C-detection. <sup>17</sup> C-detection. <sup>17</sup> C	162 163 164 164 164 164 172 172 172 182 182 183 184 184 186 192 193 193 193 201 207 201 207 201 211 211 212 212 213 213
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5. 12.6. 12.6. 12.7. Chapter 13.1.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.5. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 13.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 14.5.8. Solid-si 14.5.8. Solid-si 14.5.8. Solid-si 14.5.8. Solid-si 14.5.8. Solid-si 15.5.5.8. Solid-si 15.5.5.8. Solid-si 15.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions. neepts	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 172 182 182 182 182 183 184 184 184 186 192 193 193 195 201 207 211 217 211 212 213 213 213 213
11.5. Chapter 12.1. 12.2. 12.3. 12.4. 12.5. 12.6. 12.6. 12.7. Chapter 13.1. 13.2.	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.3. 12.5.4. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.7. 13.5.8. Solid-si 13.5.8. Solid-si 14.5.8. Solid-si 14.5.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 14.5.8. Solid-si 14.5.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 15.6.8. Solid-si 16.7.8. Solid-si 16.7.8. Solid-si 16.7.8. Solid-si 16.7.8. Solid-si 16.7.8. Solid-si 16.7.8. Solid-si 16.7.8. Solid-si 16.7.8.5.8. Solid-si 16.7.8.5.8.5.8.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5.5	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions. neepts	162 163 164 164 164 164 172 172 172 182 182 183 184 184 186 192 193 193 195 201 207 211 211 212 213 213 213 213 213
<ul> <li>11.5.</li> <li>Chapter</li> <li>12.1.</li> <li>12.2.</li> <li>12.3.</li> <li>12.4.</li> <li>12.5.</li> <li>12.5.</li> <li>12.6.</li> <li>12.6.</li> <li>12.7.</li> <li>Chapter</li> <li>13.1.</li> <li>13.2.</li> </ul>	11.4.3. Key coi 12: A su NMR p Solutio 12.2.1. 12.2.2. Solutio 12.3.1. 12.3.2. 12.3.3. 12.3.4. Measun 12.4.1. 12.4.2. Solid-si 12.5.1. 12.5.2. 12.5.4. 12.5.5. 12.5.6. 12.5.7. 12.5.8. Solid-si 12.6.1. 12.6.2. 12.6.3. 12.6.4. Key con 13. Case Introdu Transit	Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions. neepts	162 163 164 164 164 166 172 174 176 179 182 182 182 183 184 184 186 192 193 193 195 201 207 211 217 217 211 212 213 213 213 213 214 214 214
	13.2.3.	Interpretation	216
------------	--------------------	---	-------
	13.2.4.	The delocalization error	217
13.3.	Co(II) p	yrazolylborate complexes in solution	. 218
	13.3.1.	Background	218
	13.3.2.	The EPR tensor parameters	218
	13.3.3.	Paramagnetic shifts	218
13.4.	Layered	l transition-metal oxides LiMO <sub>2</sub>	. 219
	13.4.1.	Background	219
	13.4.2.	Spin-transfer pathways in LiM <sub>v</sub> Co <sub>1-v</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	220
	13.4.3.	<sup>7</sup> Li contact shifts in LiM <sub>v</sub> Co <sub>1-v</sub> $O_2$ .	223
13.5.	Prussia	n blue analogue materials $A_n M'_x [M(CN)_6]_y \cdot z H_2 O \dots$	. 223
	13.5.1.	Background	223
	13.5.2.	Solid-state NMR spectra	225
	13.5.3.	Interpretation of the contact shifts	226
13.6.	Olivine	-type lithium transition-metal phosphate cathode materials LiMPO $_4$	226
	13.6.1.	Background	226
	13.6.2.	<sup>6/7</sup> Li NMR shifts and relaxation properties	227
	13.6.3.	<sup>31</sup> P NMR shifts and relaxation properties	229
	13.6.4.	Shifts and shift anisotropies in the EPR formalism	230
	13.6.5.	Experiments and calculations on LiFe <sub>2</sub> Mn <sub>1-x</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>	231
13.7.	Contact	shifts in ferredoxins due to coupled $Fe_{aS_{4}}$ clusters	233
	13.7.1.	Background	233
	13.7.2	NMR spectroscopy and assignment	233
	1373	Temperature dependence of the contact shifts	235
	1374	Angular dependence of the contact shifts	236
13.8	Parama	metic distance restraints in the metallonrotein superovide dismutase (SOD)	236
15.0.	13.8.1	Background	236
	13.0.1.	Deconjunct and structure calculation using non paramagnetic <sup>1</sup> H <sup>-1</sup> H distance restraints	230
	12.0.2.	Resonance assignment and structure calculation using non-paramagnetic file in distance restraints.	237
	12.0.2.	Failingheite felazation einiantenient as structural restraints.	237
12.0	IJ.0.4.	I sedue-contract since as structural resumins.	200
15.9.	1201		239
	13.9.1.	Background	239
	13.9.2.	rataling neurosities sints	240
12.10	13.9.3. The im	The $Y_{2-x}Lh_{s}Sh_{2}O_{r}$ indefinition and the distribution in solution is solution. (Croc) [17(DD)]	241
13.10	12 10 1		241
	13.10.1.	Background	241
10 1 1	13.10.2. Domoni	Pseudo-contact simils	241
13.11	. Param	Lagnetic effects of lanthanide ions in the dicalcium protein caldingin $D_{9k}$	. 242
	13.11.1.	Background	242
	13.11.2.	Pseudo-contact shifts	243
40.40	13.11.3.	Extracting the crystal-field splitting parameters	243
13.12	. Actiny	1 tris-carbonate complexes in solution	. 244
	13.12.1.	Background	244
	13.12.2.	Paramagnetic shifts	244
	13.12.3.	Interpretation	246
13.13	. Solid a	actinide oxides	. 246
	13.13.1.	Background	246
	13.13.2.	Paramagnetic shifts	246
13.14	. Probir	g the nanostructure of composite materials using relayed paramagnetic relaxation enhancement	. 248
	13.14.1.	Background	248
	13.14.2.	The relay of the paramagnetic relaxation enhancement by spin diffusion.	248
	13.14.3.	Measurement of domain sizes in ethyl cellulose/hydroxypropyl cellulose film coatings in pharmaceutical controlled-re-	lease
		formulations	249
13.15	. Key co	ncepts	. 249
Chapter	r 14: Conc	luding remarks and the future of paramagnetic NMR	250
Ackno	owledgem	ents	251
Appendix A	A. The V	Nigner–Eckart theorem.	251
A.1.	The proj	ection theorem	252
	A.1.1.	Magnetic moments due to ions subject to Russell–Saunders spin–orbit coupling	252
Appendix I	B. Relat	ivistic corrections to the hyperfine coupling tensor	252
B.1.	The vect	or potential	. 252
B.2.	The non-	-relativistic hyperfine interaction	. 252
B.3.	The spin	-orbit-coupling correction to the hyperfine interaction	253
Appendix (	C. The F	Pennanen–Vaara formalism for the paramagnetic shift	253
C.1.	The term	ns in the paramagnetic shift tensor	. 255
Appendix I	D. Deriv	vation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor for arbitrary spin multiplicity to second order	255
A		estion of the neuroperatio chiefding tensor for a system containing multiple coupled neuroperatic contacts of arbitrary	cnin
мррепаіх	E. Deriv	ation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor for a system containing multiple, coupled paramagnetic centres of arbitrary	spin

Appendix	F. Simplification of the relaxation superoperator and spectral densities in the stochastic Liouville formalism	259
F.1.	The relaxation superopertor	. 259
F.2.	Symmetry properties of the spectral density	. 260
Refer	ences	. 261

# **Chapter 1: Introduction**

# 1.1. Paramagnetic NMR

Nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectroscopy has become established as an essential method for structural characterisation in chemistry, biology, and the materials sciences [1,2]. One area that has seen increased activity in recent years is the study of the structural and electronic properties of paramagnetic systems in both solution and the solid state [3-13]. Paramagnetic systems are defined as molecules or materials that contain one or more 'paramagnetic centres', which are atoms or ions possessing at least one unpaired electron. From the point of view of NMR spectroscopy the important property of these systems is that there is a hyperfine interaction between the unpaired electrons and the observed nucleus, which is the origin of the paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy (SA), the paramagnetic relaxation enhancement (PRE), and additional sources of substantial broadening due to bulk magnetic susceptibility effects. These interactions potentially yield important information about the system, including the bonding between the atoms and ions and their spatial arrangement, the delocalisation of the unpaired electrons onto the coordinating atoms and ligands, the dynamics of the system, and, particularly relevant in the case of lanthanide ions, details about the crystal-field splitting and consequent optical properties [14–18]. However the paramagnetism can also cause problems when attempting to both acquire and interpret the NMR data. The problem of acquisition arises because the paramagnetic shifts and SAs are often very large, with the result that excitation of the nuclei with practicable radio-frequency (RF) powers can be both inefficient and not sufficiently broadbanded, and the large PREs cause the coherences to decay rapidly once they have been excited. The interpretation of the NMR data is not always intuitive, and usually requires the availability of reliable theoretical models. The research in the field of method development has therefore. focused on two areas: the development of new and improved experimental NMR techniques for acquiring usable data, and the development of new theoretical techniques for calculating and interpreting the spectra.

### 1.2. New techniques for solid-state paramagnetic NMR

The development of new NMR techniques has focused on new methods for solid samples under magic-angle spinning (MAS). The motivation for this development arises from the observation that many conventional techniques that are standard for diamagnetic systems perform very poorly when applied to paramagnetic systems. In particular those techniques that require long periods of RF irradiation, such as cross-polarization (CP) [19] and heteronuclear decoupling [20] are found to be inefficient, due to RF field power not dominating the paramagnetic shift and SA interactions; in the worst cases this has a deleterious effect on the spectrum. The most successful techniques applied to paramagnetic solid-state NMR are generally those that employ short, high-power RF pulses, such as the spin-echo [21] and transferred-echo double-resonance (TEDOR) [22] sequences.

Clayton et al. showed that under slow-to-moderate MAS the linewidths in the <sup>13</sup>C spectra of paramagnetic complexes have a significant contribution due to the <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>13</sup>C dipolar couplings, and that attempts at conventional <sup>1</sup>H decoupling lead to no improve-

ment [23]. However the problem can be alleviated by chemical substitution of <sup>2</sup>H for <sup>1</sup>H, which results in narrower lines due to the smaller heteronuclear dipolar interactions. These observations were later confirmed by Liu et al., who also showed that detection of <sup>2</sup>H leads to narrower lines than detection of <sup>1</sup>H, allowing the characterization of hydrogen environments closer to the metal ion [24]. One spectroscopic solution to the problem would be to design a new, more broadband, decoupling sequence, such as that proposed by Raleigh et al. [25]. Their solution was to split the irradiation over multiple frequencies so that the RF power is distributed more evenly over the <sup>1</sup>H resonances. However this early method has not achieved widespread usage. Ishii et al. suggested a different approach using very fast MAS, under which conditions the dipolar-coupling contribution to the linewidths is sufficiently narrowed that the decoupling can be dispensed with [26,6]. This approach has the advantage that the recycle delay can be shortened considerably, in the absence of a duty cycle limit, in order to exploit the PRE of the longitudinal relaxation. Hence both the resolution and sensitivity are considerably enhanced. Very fast MAS is the foundation upon which all subsequent paramagnetic NMR methods have been based.

Further improvements in resolution and sensitivity have been made by using two-dimensional heteronuclear correlation experiments based on the TEDOR [7], dipolar insensitive nucleus enhanced by polarization transfer (DINEPT) [27], and dipolar heteronuclear single-quantum correlation (DHSQC) [28] experiments. These pulse sequences employ short, high-power pulses and have been shown to give superior results compared to the CP-based heteronuclear correlation (HETCOR) sequences. The use of such techniques is crucial if solid-state NMR is to yield unambiguous data for paramagnetic systems.

An additional avenue of enquiry is the development of new RF pulse schemes that are capable of delivering more broadband excitation, therefore making NMR applicable to more demanding paramagnetic systems experiencing larger interactions. The most promising schemes to have been proposed to date are those which employ adiabatic pulses, the most successful example of which is the family of short high-power adiabatic pulses (SHAP) [29]. It has been shown that the SHAPs are particularly versatile, and they have been incorporated into more sophisticated experiments to enhance sensitivity, such as the SHAP-CPMG sequence [30], and resolution, such as the adiabatic magic-angle turning (aMAT) experiment [31]. A second class of adiabatic scheme that has been proposed is the low-power single-sideband-selective adiabatic pulse (S<sup>3</sup>AP) [32–34]. These pulses have been shown to achieve a broadband NMR response over a frequency range that is an order of magnitude larger than the applied RF field amplitude, and generally exhibit optimal performances at higher spinning frequencies. This field has been recently reviewed [35].

### 1.3. The paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy

The interpretation of the paramagnetic shift and SA is aided by a number of different theories and formalisms that have been proposed over the years. Work in this area has been performed by theoretical physicists, researchers in quantum chemistry and densityfunctional theory (DFT), chemists, and biologists. As a result the different formalisms take different approaches, and often use different scientific language. It is one main purpose of this review to unify these different approaches, to identify the common ground, and to explain any differences. In brief the different approaches can be categorised into the groups described below, between which there is some overlap. For example some theories are designed for *d*-block transition-metal ions, whilst others are specifically for lanthanide ions. There are also different ways of modelling the magnetic properties of the metal ions. In some cases the ions are described by their molecular/atomic-level electronic paramagnetic resonance (EPR) parameters, such as the *g*-tensor and zero-field splitting (ZFS), whilst in others the ions are described by their bulk magnetic susceptibility. Finally another important distinction that arises is whether the system being described contains non-interacting metal ions, such as complexes in solution, or an extended network of interacting metal ions, such as in periodic solid materials. The link between these cases is not always obvious.

The first contributions to understanding the paramagnetic shifts from *d*-block metal ions are due to McConnell in 1958. who identified two important contributions to the isotropic shift. These are the contact shift, which is due to through-bond transfer of the unpaired electron spin onto the nucleus [36], and the pseudo-contact shift (PCS), which arises from the through-space spin-dipolar coupling between the unpaired electrons and the nucleus [37]. Kurland and McGarvey generalized this formalism to include *d*-block metal ions with a more complex description of the magnetic properties [38]. More recently Moon and Patchkovskii have rejuvenated interest in this area by publishing a modern formalism describing the whole shift tensor, including the SA, for metal ions with a single unpaired electron [39]. This has since been extended to *d*-block metal ions with arbitrary electronic spin, and a small spin-orbit coupling parameter, by Pennanen, Vaara, et al., where the shift tensor is described in terms of the g-tensor, hyperfine tensor, and the ZFS [40,41]. This formalism and its application in quantum chemistry and DFT calculations have been recently reviewed by Kaupp and Koehler [42].

An alternative description of the paramagnetic shift and SA due to *d*-block transition-metal ions has been given in terms of the bulk magnetic properties of an ensemble of such ions. Here the paramagnetic shift tensor is calculated from the magnetic susceptibility tensor and the hyperfine tensor [43,15,16]. This approach has been applied extensively to paramagnetic metalloproteins in both solution [44] and the solid state [45,46], where the observed paramagnetic shifts are given entirely by the PCS. As a consequence of its origin from the through-space spin-dipolar interaction, the PCS has a very well-defined geometrical dependence that can be exploited to provide information on the position of the observed nuclei relative to the metal ion, and thence structural restraints [15]. The advantage of this susceptibility formalism is that it can be used to describe the paramagnetic shifts in materials with different magnetic properties by changing the form of the magnetic susceptibility accordingly. For example it has been used to describe the shift due to a small cluster of paramagnetic *d*-block metal ions that are coupled together by exchange interactions [47,48]. In addition this formalism has been used extensively to rationalize the paramagnetic shifts in periodic paramagnetic battery materials [49], glasses, and minerals [50–53]. For these systems it has been shown that the isotropic shifts are dominated by contact interactions, and the SAs are dominated by spin-dipolar interactions. One important observation is that the contact shifts can be broken down into a sum of contributions from the metal ions that transfer unpaired electronic spin density onto the nucleus, known as 'pathway contributions' [5]. This idea has been instrumental in allowing the analysis of the contact shifts of very complex battery materials which contain more than one type of metal ion [31,54–60].

In parallel to these developments there has been some work, albeit less extensive, in rationalizing the form of the paramagnetic shift due to lanthanide ions. The first, and still principal, contributions to this were the Golding and Halton [61] and Bleaney [62] theories, which gives expressions for the contact shift and PCS respectively. For the latter the Bleaney theory links the PCS to the crystal-field splitting parameters of the metal ion [62]. These theories are considerably simpler than the formalisms for *d*-block metal ions described above, and depend on the assumption, which may not be universally valid [63], that the spin-orbit (SO) coupling interaction completely dominates the crystal-field splitting. Nevertheless they have been remarkably successful in rationalizing the observed shifts in both solid-state samples and in solution, and in pushing the field forward. An extension has been given by McGarvey, however the improvements are relatively modest and the theory is still subject to the same basic assumptions [64]. The basic forms of the Golding and Halton, and Bleaney theories have been instrumental in the rationalization of the shifts observed in lanthanide pyrochlores [65,66], and more recently for the solidstate lighting materials, lanthanide-doped vttrium aluminium garnet [66,68]. The Bleaney theory also allows the paramagnetic shift and SA due to lanthanides to be described in terms of the magnetic susceptibility [62]. This is an extension of the susceptibility formalism described above, and has been employed for materials in the solid state [69-71,67,73], small molecules in solution [63,74], and more extensively for proteins in solution including calciumbinding metalloproteins such as calbindin  $D_{9k}$  [75] and calmodulin [76,77], and for many other proteins where the lanthanide ions have been introduced as attached tags [78–86].

Recently van den Heuvel and Soncini have introduced a formalism which describes the paramagnetic shift for any system with arbitrary SO coupling strength [87-89]. For *d* metal ions, lanthanides, and actinides the shift and SA can either be calculated directly from the electronic energy levels, or else via an intermediate step where the EPR parameters are first determined. This is straightforward for 3*d* metals, but the equivalent description of lanthanides and actinides is more complicated due to the more complex electronic structure of these ions. This formalism has been explored for isolated *d*-block metal ions [88,90,91] and actinide ions [92,93]. In the future it seems likely that this formalism will become more widely used.

### 1.4. The paramagnetic relaxation enhancement

The development of formalisms to describe the PRE, and their applications, have also been researched actively [94-96]. The earliest and most widely-used formalism is the Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan theory, which describes the nuclear relaxation as the effect of stochastic fluctuations in the hyperfine interaction as a consequence of a combination of molecular dynamics, fast chemical exchange, and electronic relaxation [95–99]. This formalism is limited to applications in high external magnetic fields, and with fast molecular dynamics. Additionally, the electronic relaxation is only treated approximately, using phenomenological parameters. The theory has been extended to describe systems with molecular dynamics that are much slower than electronic relaxation, such as large biomolecules, adding an extra term known as the Curie relaxation rate [100,101]. The Curie PRE is calculated by separating the slow molecular dynamics from the faster electronic relaxation, and treating the relaxation process as a hyperfine coupling to the average electronic magnetic moment. The Curie contribution has been shown to dominate the linewidths of nuclear spins in proteins in solution for paramagnetic metals with electron relaxation times much shorter than the reorientation times [15]. These formalisms have been widely used to interpret PREs as structural restraints, particularly for proteins [17,102,11].

Further developments have focussed on formalisms that treat the electronic relaxation explicitly, both in the fast- and slowelectronic dynamics regimes, and which are also applicable in low external magnetic fields. These formalisms have been developed mainly by research groups in Sweden, Grenoble, and Ann Arbor, and are consequently referred to as the Swedish slowmotion [94,103-110], Grenoble [111,112], and Ann Arbor [113-115] theories respectively. These theories are more complicated than the Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan theory and Curie formalisms, but have also been shown to be more generally applicable. Explicit calculations of electronic relaxation have been incorporated, including mechanisms such as distortion of the metal-site geometry due to solvent collisions in solution samples [116,117], and molecular vibrations in solutions and solids [118-120]. The slow-motion theory has been used to describe the relaxation of solvent molecules in a solution of paramagnetic metal ions by the mechanisms of inner- and outer-sphere relaxation [121]. The former mechanism describes the relaxation of molecules in the solvation sphere of the metal ion that are in exchange with the bulk solvent, and the latter mechanism describes the PRE of solvent molecules that never coordinate to the metal ion. The theory that describes these effects, and the calculations it facilitates [122–125], are of importance to understanding and developing contrast agents in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) [126-134]. In addition the studies of the PRE under low-field conditions enable the calculation of NMR dispersion (NMRD) profiles, which show how relaxation rates vary with field [135-145]. Such NMRD profiles are useful for studying dynamic processes such as protein folding [146,147].

### 1.5. Bulk magnetic susceptibility effects

The final paramagnetic effects that are considered here are the bulk magnetic susceptibility (BMS) and anisotropic bulk magnetic susceptibility (ABMS). These are of particular importance in the solid-state NMR of paramagnetic single-crystal samples, powders, and complex and heterogeneous samples such as battery cells. The BMS effect involves the change in the bulk susceptibility at the surface of a crystal and in the surrounding medium, which gives rise to a demagnetizing field within the crystal leading in turn to changes in the measured paramagnetic shift and to inhomogeneous line broadening. For paramagnetic polycrystalline powder samples with an ABMS, the close packing results in each crystallite experiencing a demagnetizing field due to the neighbouring crystallites, which is also a source of inhomogeneous broadening. Importantly this ABMS broadening is not removed by MAS and can dominate the lineshapes and linewidths of spinning paramagnetic solids, and perturb the intensities of the spinning sidebands so that they can no longer be analysed in terms of a simple second-rank tensor. What this means in practice is that the BMS leads to NMR spectra with low resolution, which hinders the basic assignment, and also impedes the obtaining of accurate distance information from the analysis of sideband manifolds.

The BMS and ABMS broadening effects were first described by VanderHart [148], and Alla and Lippmaa [149]. The effects of the BMS on the linewidth and spinning sideband intensities were demonstrated on paramagnetic lanthanide stannates by Grey et al. [150], who also showed that it is possible to remove the perturbing effects on the spinning sidebands in materials with isotropic susceptibilities by immersing the crystals in a medium with a matching magnetic susceptibility, thus removing the effects that are responsible for the BMS. A more complete theory of the BMS and ABMS broadening was proposed by Schwerk et al. [151], and extended by Kubo et al. [152]. More recently a practical method for calculating the broadening has been proposed by Dickinson et al., [153], who use ideas from classical electrostatics to calculate the demagnetizing fields due to a large bulk sample.

The BMS effect has been shown to be very important in the study of whole battery cells containing a paramagnetic material.

In this case the linewidth and shift varies with the orientation of the sample within the magnetic field, and so it is crucial that this be optimized in order to obtain the optimum data [154,155].

### 1.6. Paramagnetic NMR and dynamic nuclear polarization

One area of magnetic resonance that is very closely related to paramagnetic NMR is dynamic nuclear polarization (DNP). The object of this method is to increase, or enhance, the nuclear polarization of a system that also contains unpaired electrons. The electrons have a larger gyromagnetic ratio than any nuclei and so the electrons also have a larger spin polarization. For example the electronic gyromagnetic ratio, and therefore the polarization in a magnetic field, is larger than that of the proton by a factor of 658. The DNP methods transfer this polarization to the nuclei via a number of mechanisms involving the coupling between the electronic and nuclear magnetic moments, by irradiating the electronic spin transitions with microwave radiation while acquiring the NMR spectrum.

Dynamic nuclear polarization was first proposed as an enhancement method for metals by Overhauser [156], and was demonstrated experimentally by Carver and Slichter shortly afterwards [157,158]. In recent years, the field has been revolutionized by the development of polarization methods for frozen suspensions at high magnetic fields [159,160], and application to solids under MAS [161–163]. The best enhancements have generally been obtained on diamagnetic samples that have been impregnated with paramagnetic species based on organic nitroxide-based radicals, and frozen at low temperatures of around 100 K [164-171]. These radicals and conditions are chosen because the polarization transfer mechanisms are generally more efficient if the electrons have longer relaxation times, typically of the order of milliseconds. This approach has been shown to be very successful in NMR applications in both biology [163,172-177] and materials science [178–180]. However it has also been demonstrated that DNP enhancements can be obtained on paramagnetic samples containing high-spin transition metal ions, such as Mn<sup>2+</sup> and Gd<sup>3+</sup> which also have comparatively slow electronic spin relaxation since these ions have no orbital angular momentum [181,182].

The field of DNP has much in common with that of paramagnetic NMR. The obvious similarity is that both fields are applicable to samples containing sources of unpaired electrons, and an understanding of both fields requires an appreciation of "paramagnetic NMR concepts" such as the hyperfine interaction, electronic relaxation, PRE, and BMS. Specifically to explain DNP fully, we need to understand these paramagnetic effects in samples that have been impregnated with many paramagnetic radical molecules. For example two paramagnetic effects that have consequences for DNP are quenching, and nuclear depolarization. The quenching effect is important for nuclei that are close to the radicals, and experience a large PRE or hyperfine coupling that renders them "invisible" in conventional NMR experiments. This effectively reduces the number of nuclei that contribute to the NMR signals, and acts to reduce the size of the DNP enhancement. The depolarization effect, described by Thurber and Tycko, is an interesting phenomenon where the impregnation of the sample with the radical has the effect of reducing the initial nuclear polarization in the absence of microwave irradiation [183]. With microwave irradiation depolarization is expected to reduce the enhancement. Thurber and Tycko showed that depolarization is more effective when the unpaired electrons have long electronic relaxation times, meaning that the effect is important for organic radicals at low temperature, and is increased at higher fields [183]. It was also shown that spinning samples experience larger depolarization than static samples, provided the electronic spin relaxation times are longer than the rotation period. Thurber and Tycko ascribed depolarization to the cross effect, which becomes more pronounced in spinning samples due to time-dependent spin-level crossings that occur in organic biradicals with spatially anisotropic electronic Zeeman interactions. It is currently unclear whether this effect is also important for paramagnetic samples containing metal ions at room temperature, although the indications so far are that depolarization is negligible for such samples under these conditions, as the metal ions generally have much shorter electronic relaxation times.

Both the fields of paramagnetic NMR and DNP have their origin in early contributions made from the 1950s onwards, but have only experienced an expansion into the mainstream relatively recently with advances in instrumentation and methodology. However there are also some subtle differences between the two fields. Firstly, most applications of DNP are to diamagnetic systems that have been impregnated with paramagnetic radicals specifically for the purpose of using the unpaired electrons to obtain the enhancement. For the subsequent DNP study to be valid, it is clearly necessary to avoid any structural changes to the system on adding the radical, and so the impregnation is carried out in such a way that the part of the system of interest is sufficiently far from the unpaired electrons not to experience any direct paramagnetic NMR effects. Beyond experiencing an enhancement and any relayed paramagnetic effects transferred by spin diffusion, this part of the system is assumed to be unperturbed by the radical. The "paramagnetic" part of the sample that is close to the radical is usually not studied and, as has already been remarked, is often invisible under the experimental conditions. This is in contrast to the practice of paramagnetic NMR, where the unpaired electrons play a key role in the properties of the system, and it is of immense interest to probe the nuclei that are as close to the paramagnetic centre as possible. Secondly, the DNP radicals are designed so that the unpaired electrons have long electronic spin relaxation times, on the order of milliseconds at low temperature. By contrast paramagnetic NMR is applied to paramagnetic species with a broader range of electronic relaxation times, usually ranging from picoseconds to milliseconds, but most studies are performed on species with faster electronic relaxation than DNP. Thirdly, in paramagnetic NMR we usually model the shift and shift anisotropy by noting that the nuclear spin dynamics occur on a timescale that is much longer than the electronic relaxation times, meaning that the nuclear spin effectively interacts with the average electronic magnetic moment. This model is at the root of all the theories of the paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy. We only model the electronic spin levels explicitly when we need to consider a process that occurs on a faster timescale, such as the processes leading to nuclear relaxation. In DNP, on the other hand, the polarization transfer mechanisms can only be understood from a full consideration of the electronic spin levels at all times. This difference from paramagnetic NMR is due both to the longer electronic relaxation times of DNP radicals, and to the fact that the microwave irradiation of the electronic spin transitions has a timescale that is shorter than, or comparable to, the electronic spin relaxation times.

The field of DNP is currently evolving very rapidly, and there are many details to be worked out and controversies to be resolved. Therefore a comprehensive review of the theory and applications of DNP is at the time of writing extremely difficult, and beyond the scope of the current review.

### 1.7. What this review contains

The purpose of this review is to unify the descriptions of paramagnetic effects in the literature, and set them out in the context of the most recent work, particularly the theoretical descriptions of the paramagnetic shift and SA, which have hitherto not been described in detail for the NMR community. In addition greater emphasis is placed on the form of the shifts obtained in solid materials, which has been somewhat neglected in comparison to paramagnetic molecules in solution. In all cases we pull out the key equations that are generally used to interpret the spectra so that the reader does not have to follow all of the derivations, which we hope makes the chapters more practically useful. We do not intend this to be comprehensive in terms of a review of the literature, but simply to review the different approaches and strategies, and their strengths and weaknesses.

This review is divided into six parts. Part I is the single Chapter 2, which describes the basic concepts that are necessary for understanding paramagnetic effects on NMR. Part II comprises Chapters 3-7, and contains a description of all the formalisms for the paramagnetic shift and SA under different conditions and in different systems. This part also attempts to provide a unified description of the different formalisms. Part III contains Chapters 8 and 9. and describes the PRE in different regimes. Again a unifying description is provided. Part IV concerns the BMS and ABMS effects in single-crystal and powder samples, and is formed of the single Chapter 10. Part V is Chapter 11, and describes the quantum mechanics of the NMR experiment. It is shown how the different NMR interactions in paramagnetic systems change the observed spectral features in both solution and solid-state NMR. The final part VI, formed from Chapters 12-14, is a practical guide to the NMR experiments that can be used on different paramagnetic systems in solution and the solid state, and includes a series of case studies of different systems.

Chapter 2 describes some basic concepts that are essential for understanding paramagnetic NMR. These include the basic theory of magnetism, the chemical shift, and the hyperfine interaction. This material forms the foundations of NMR [184] and EPR [185,186] spectroscopy, and it will be seen that an understanding of paramagnetic effects in NMR can only be obtained through an understanding of EPR.

Chapter 3 describes the origin of the paramagnetic shift and SA for the simplest possible example of a spin-only transition-metal complex. The shift is described both in terms of the EPR parameters, and the bulk magnetic susceptibility, and the two formalisms are unified. The effects of SO coupling on the paramagnetic shift and SA due to a *d*-block transition-metal ion are described in Chapter 4 in terms of the EPR formalism of van den Heuvel and Soncini [87,89]. The effect of SO coupling on the magnetic susceptibility and the susceptibility formalism, are given. This chapter concludes with the first description of a unification of the two formalisms. The interpretation of the various contributions to the shift and SA arising from these EPR and susceptibility formalisms is detailed in Chapter 5. This chapter describes under which conditions the various contributions become important, and the different types of structural and electronic information that each can provide. The following Chapter 6 provides an advanced description of the EPR formalism of van den Heuvel and Soncini [87,89], and in particular the role of higher-order effects that may be present in the EPR description of the metal ion, and with arbitrary spin-orbit coupling strength. This description is first applied to *d*-block metal ions, and then extended to the shift and SA due to lanthanide ions in the Bleaney formalism [62]. The effect of interactions between neighbouring metal ions in transition-metal clusters and extended solids is described in Chapter 7. It describes the role of lowtemperature magnetic ordering, such as ferro- and antiferromagnetic ordering, in determining the sizes of the shifts and SAs. We also link the solid-state shift formalism described by Kim et al. [54] to the EPR formalism.

In Chapter 8 we turn our attention to the PRE and the form that the relaxation rate constants take in different motional regimes, including rapidly-tumbling molecules in solution, large biomolecules, and rigid solids. This chapter presents the Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan and Curie relaxation theories, which are used to interpret the PRE of small molecules and large biomolecules under conditions of high field, and with a phenomenological description of electronic relaxation. Chapter 9 extends the relaxation discussion to include explicitly the relevant mechanisms of electronic relaxation. The Swedish slow-motion formalism is used to describe the effects of slow electron dynamics, low field, and inner- and outer-sphere PREs [103–105,108–110].

A feature of paramagnetic solid-state NMR that has hitherto been neglected by reviews is the presence of BMS effects in single-crystal and powder samples. However it is a very important effect as it leads to changes in the measured shift, and to broadening of the resonances which limits the available resolution. The BMS effects are described in Chapter 10 in terms of the theory of classical electrodynamics [187].

The remainder of the review concentrates on how different paramagnetic effects appear in the NMR spectra of solutions, static, and spinning solids containing different metal ions. Chapter 11 describes the basic quantum mechanics of NMR. We examine how the appearance of the NMR spectrum varies with different interactions due to paramagnetic metal ions, and how these effects combine with other interactions, such as the nuclear quadrupolar interaction, to give distinctive spectral features. Chapter 12 is a practical guide to the NMR pulse sequences that can be applied to paramagnetic systems. The survey has a wide scope, and encompasses small molecules in solution, solid materials, and proteins both in solution and the solid state. This chapter aims to find the general principles that govern the success or failure of particular NMR methods when applied to paramagnetic systems. This links to Chapter 13, which presents a series of case studies in paramagnetic NMR. The examples that are presented include small molecules, biomolecules, and solid materials incorporating a wide range of unpaired electron species including 3d metal ions, lanthanides, and organic radicals. Finally we provide some concluding remarks, and offer a perspective on the future of paramagnetic NMR in Chapter 14.

Each chapter ends with a summary of the salient points.

# Chapter 2: Introduction to nuclear and electronic magnetism

This chapter introduces the basic concepts describing the magnetic properties of nuclei and electrons. Bulk properties, such as the magnetization and magnetic susceptibility, and molecular/ atomic-level properties, such as magnetic moments, are presented. We employ Cartesian and spherical tensor formalisms for describing the spin Hamiltonians of the basic interactions that are relevant for the NMR of paramagnetic systems, namely the nuclear and electronic Zeeman interactions, the chemical shielding and shift, and the hyperfine interaction.

# 2.1. Nuclear and electronic magnetic moments

In quantum mechanics the magnetic dipole moment of a nucleus  $\mu_i$  is proportional to the dimensionless nuclear spin angular momentum I,

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{I} = \hbar \gamma_{I} \boldsymbol{I}, \tag{2.1}$$

where the constant of proportionality is the product of Planck's constant divided by  $2\pi$  ( $\hbar$ ), and the nuclear gyromagnetic ratio  $\gamma_l$ . Planck's constant is a fundamental physical constant, whereas  $\gamma_l$ takes different values depending on the nuclear species. It is important to note that  $\gamma_l$  is a signed quantity, i.e. it can take either positive or negative values. For example both <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C have positive gyromagnetic ratios, whereas <sup>15</sup>N has a negative value. Fig. 2.1 illustrates the relationship between the spin and magnetic moment vectors. The cases of positive and negative  $\gamma_l$  are shown in (a) and (b) respectively.

In describing the electronic magnetic moment we encounter a difference in the nomenclature used by the NMR and EPR communities. The definition of the nuclear magnetic moment in Eq. (2.1), given in terms of  $\hbar$  and  $\gamma_i$ , is that most commonly employed by the NMR community. The EPR community, however, predominantly uses the alternative expression

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{l} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{N} \boldsymbol{g}_{l} \boldsymbol{I}, \tag{2.2}$$

where  $\mu_N$  is the nuclear magneton, and  $g_I$  is the dimensionless nuclear *g*-factor. Like  $\hbar$ ,  $\mu_N$  is a physical constant; it can be related to other physical constants via the expression

$$\mu_{\rm N} = \frac{e\hbar}{2m_{\rm p}},\tag{2.3}$$

where e is the elementary charge, and  $m_p$  is the rest mass of the proton. In this nomenclature, different nuclear species have different values of  $g_l$ . The equivalence between the two sets of parameters describing the magnetic moment is concisely expressed as

$$\hbar \gamma_I = \mu_N g_I. \tag{2.4}$$

We note that  $g_i$  is also a signed quantity, and takes the same sign as  $\gamma_i$ .

In an analogous way the electron magnetic moment  $\mu_s$  is proportional to the electron spin *S*, and can also be written using two related constants of proportionality as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{S}} = \hbar \gamma_{\mathrm{S}} \mathbf{S} \tag{2.5}$$

$$= -\mu_{\rm B} g_e S, \tag{2.6}$$

where  $\gamma_s$  is the electron gyromagnetic ratio,  $g_e$  is the free-electron *g*-factor, and  $\mu_B$  is a physical constant known as the Bohr magneton which can be calculated from the elementary charge and the rest mass of the electron  $m_e$ :

$$\mu_{\rm B} = \frac{e\hbar}{2m_{\rm e}}.\tag{2.7}$$

The relationship between the two sets of constants in the expression for the electronic magnetic moment is related in a similar way to Eq. (2.4), but with an additional minus sign:

$$\hbar\gamma_{\rm S} = -\mu_{\rm B}g_e. \tag{2.8}$$

This awkward minus sign arises because the electron gyromagnetic ratio is actually negative, but it remains conventional to define  $g_e$  as a positive number with approximate value 2.0023. The relationship between the electronic spin and magnetic moment is illustrated in Fig. 2.1(c). In this review we adopt the convention that the angular



**Fig. 2.1.** Illustration of the relationship between the spin and the magnetic dipole moment for nuclear and electronic spins. In (a) it is shown that a nuclear spin *I* with a positive gyromagnetic ratio  $\gamma_I$  possesses a magnetic moment  $\mu_I$  that is parallel to the spin *I*. If instead the nuclear gyromagnetic ratio is negative, the spin and magnetic moment are antiparallel, as shown in (b). The free electron has a negative gyromagnetic ratio  $\gamma_S$ , and so the electronic magnetic moment  $\mu_S$  is antiparallel to the electronic spin *S*.



**Fig. 2.2.** Illustration of the effect of applying a magnetic field to a magnetic material. The external magnetic field H induces a response from the material in the form of a bulk magnetization M. The vector sum of H and M is the total magnetic flux density B. In general these three vector quantities are not parallel to each other, as shown in (a). The special case of a linear material with an isotropic volume magnetic susceptibility  $\chi_V$  is shown in (b). Here M is parallel to H, and so both are parallel to B.

momenta **I** and **S** refer to nuclear spins and electronic spins respectively.

### 2.2. Magnetic field, magnetization, and the magnetic susceptibility

In the literature one commonly encounters two definitions of the magnetic field, namely the magnetic field strength H, and the magnetic induction, also known as the magnetic flux density, B. When we are describing the application of a magnetic field to a material containing a large number of magnetic moments, the relationship between H and B is, in general, rather complicated. The field induces a net bulk magnetization M which is the total induced magnetic moment per unit volume. The relationship between B and H is then [188]

$$\boldsymbol{B} = \mu_{0}(\boldsymbol{H} + \boldsymbol{M}), \tag{2.9}$$

where  $\mu_0$  is the permeability of free space. The magnetic field, magnetization, and flux density are not always parallel to each other, as illustrated in Fig. 2.2(a). Here we are concerned with *linear materials*, which are those materials for which the magnetization is proportional to the field strength [188]

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \chi_{\boldsymbol{V}} \boldsymbol{H},\tag{2.10}$$

where  $\chi_V$  is a dimensionless scalar quantity called the volume magnetic susceptibility. Hence the flux density is given by

$$\boldsymbol{B} = \mu_0 (1 + \chi_V) \boldsymbol{H}. \tag{2.11}$$

In this case the flux density *is* parallel to the field, as shown in Fig. 2.2(b). The scope of this review is restricted to paramagnetic systems which are linear, and for which the volume susceptibility is small,  $|\chi_V| \ll 1$ , and so the magnetic flux density and field strength are related by the simple relation

$$\boldsymbol{B} \approx \mu_0 \boldsymbol{H}. \tag{2.12}$$

Henceforth we use **B** for the applied field, and refer to it simply as the 'magnetic field'.

This review will focus on how the interaction between the nuclear and electronic spins in the presence of a magnetic field can be related to both the macroscopic and the molecular/atomic-level properties of the system. This link can be made by employing classical and statistical thermodynamics, and will be summarised here to facilitate the discussion. The first law of thermodynamics relates the infinitesimal change in the internal energy *U* of a system to the energy supplied as heat and the work done by the system:

$$dU = TdS - pdV - VM \cdot dB.$$
(2.13)

The heat is equal to *TdS*, where *T* is the absolute temperature and *S* is the entropy of the system, and the work done *by* the system is  $pdV + V\boldsymbol{M} \cdot d\boldsymbol{B}$  where *p* and *V* are the pressure and volume of the system. We define the Helmholtz free energy *F* as

$$F = U - TS. \tag{2.14}$$

The infinitesimal change in F that accompanies the infinitesimal change in U is

$$\mathrm{d}F = \mathrm{d}U - \mathrm{S}\mathrm{d}T - T\mathrm{d}S \tag{2.15}$$

$$= -SdT - pdV - V\boldsymbol{M} \cdot d\boldsymbol{B}, \qquad (2.16)$$

from which the components of the magnetisation are given by

$$M_i = -\frac{1}{V} \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial B_i}\right)_{T,V},\tag{2.17}$$

where the subscripts T and V indicate that the partial derivative is calculated at constant temperature and volume. This establishes the link between the bulk magnetization and the bulk thermodynamic properties of the system via the Helmholtz energy. It is also possible to establish a link to the molecular/atomic-level properties via statistical thermodynamics, from which it can be shown that F is given by

$$F = -NkT\ln Q, \qquad (2.18)$$

where *N* is the number of particles, *k* is the Boltzmann constant, and *Q* is the partition function. This latter quantity is a sum over the molecular/atomic-level states  $|n\rangle$  with energies  $E_n$ :

$$Q = \sum_{n} \exp(-E_n/kT).$$
(2.19)

Hence the expression for magnetization in terms of the molecular/ atomic-level states is

$$M_i = \frac{NkT}{V} \left(\frac{\partial \ln Q}{\partial B_i}\right)_{T,V}.$$
(2.20)

This important link is used later to establish the forms of the chemical shielding and magnetic susceptibility tensors.

# 2.3. The electronic and magnetic properties of periodic solids

In Chapter 7 we derive and discuss the form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor in periodic solid materials. In order to do so we must make a distinction between electronic insulators and metals, which have distinct electronic properties, and for which the contributions of the unpaired electrons to the NMR properties are very different. We therefore summarize the electronic properties of periodic solids here.

### 2.3.1. Electronic energy levels and the density of states

In finite systems, such as isolated molecules, the electronic energy levels form a discrete ladder with well-defined energies, and the wavefunctions may either be localized to certain atoms or delocalized to a limited extent across the molecule. However in an infinite periodic solid the energy spacing between levels is so small that the levels broaden into continuous bands [189]. The corresponding wavefunctions are delocalized across the entire material. In the absence of interactions between the electrons, the overall wavefunction can be approximated by a product of one-electron wavefunctions  $\phi(\mathbf{r})$  with energies *E* that are the solutions of the following Schrödinger equation:

$$\left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_e}\nabla^2 + U(\boldsymbol{r})\right)\phi(\boldsymbol{r}) = E\phi(\boldsymbol{r}), \qquad (2.21)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}$  is the position of the electron. The potential  $U(\mathbf{r})$  is due to the electrostatic attraction between the electron and all the nuclei distributed throughout the solid lattice. The potential is periodic over the lattice, and so satisfies the relation

$$U(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{R}) = U(\mathbf{r}), \tag{2.22}$$

where the position vector  $\mathbf{R}$  is a linear combination of the three primitive vectors  $\mathbf{a}_i$  that span the lattice,

$$\boldsymbol{R} = n_1 \boldsymbol{a}_1 + n_2 \boldsymbol{a}_2 + n_3 \boldsymbol{a}_3, \qquad (2.23)$$

and the  $n_i$  are integers. The energy levels  $E_n(\mathbf{k})$  found by solving the Schrödinger equation can be characterized by a band index n, which is an integer defining the electronic band, and a wavevector  $\mathbf{k}$ , which labels the levels within a particular band. Each corresponding one-electron wavefunction  $\phi_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$  is given by the product of a plane wave that depends on  $\mathbf{k}$  and is normalized over the sample volume V, and a normalized function  $u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$  that depends on both n and  $\mathbf{k}$ :

$$\phi_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{V}} \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}) u_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}).$$
(2.24)

The functions  $u_{nk}(\mathbf{r})$  have the same periodicity as the lattice, i.e.  $u_{nk}(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{R}) = u_{nk}(\mathbf{r})$ , and the allowed values of  $\mathbf{k}$  satisfy

$$\exp(\mathbf{i}\boldsymbol{k}\cdot\boldsymbol{R}) = 1. \tag{2.25}$$

If the electron-electron interactions are weak or absent we can write the normalized multi-electron wavefunction  $\psi(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, ..., \mathbf{r}_N)$  describing *N* electrons as the product of the *N* one-electron wavefunctions that have been properly symmetrized to satisfy the Pauli principle:

$$\psi(\mathbf{r}_{1},\mathbf{r}_{2},\ldots,\mathbf{r}_{N}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N!}} \sum_{p} (-1)^{p} P \phi_{n_{1}\mathbf{k}_{1}}(\mathbf{r}_{1}) \phi_{n_{2}\mathbf{k}_{2}}(\mathbf{r}_{2}) \ldots \phi_{n_{N}\mathbf{k}_{N}}(\mathbf{r}_{N}).$$
(2.26)

The operator *P* permutes the electron labels, the factor  $(-1)^{P}$  is a plus or minus depending on whether an even or odd number of permutations is involved, and  $\mathbf{r}_{i}$  is the position of the *i*th electron.

It is frequently the case that we need to calculate certain general quantities that are the sum of contributions from the different electronic levels. For instance we may write a general quantity Q as the following sum of contributions  $Q_n(\mathbf{k})$ 

$$Q = \sum_{n,k} Q_n(k), \qquad (2.27)$$

where  $Q_n(\mathbf{k})$  is the contribution from the level with wavevector  $\mathbf{k}$  in band n, and the sum runs over all bands n and the allowed values of  $\mathbf{k}$  with in each band. In the limit where the volume of the system V becomes very large, the allowed values of  $\mathbf{k}$  become more closely spaced, and we can replace the sum over  $\mathbf{k}$  in Eq. (2.27) with an integral. This allows us to calculate the value of the general quantity Q per unit volume, q, as

$$q = \lim_{V \to \infty} \frac{Q}{V}$$
(2.28)

$$=\frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{n} \int Q_n(\mathbf{k}) d\mathbf{k}.$$
 (2.29)

This expression is awkward to evaluate in practice, and so we replace it with an integral over the energies *E*. To do this we firstly calculate the average value of  $Q_n(\mathbf{k})$  at constant energy *E* over all values of  $\mathbf{k}$  corresponding to that energy, denoted  $\langle Q(\mathbf{k}) \rangle_E$ . The value of *q* is then given by the following integral

$$q = \int \langle \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{k}) \rangle_{E} g(E) \mathrm{d}E.$$
(2.30)

The function g(E) is the density of states, which is given by the derivative of the number of electrons per unit volume (number density) n = N/V with respect to the energy:

$$g(E) = \frac{\mathrm{d}n}{\mathrm{d}E}.$$
 (2.31)

.1...

Using this definition the number of electrons per unit volume with energies between *E* and *E* + d*E* is g(E)dE. In the special case where  $Q_n(\mathbf{k})$  depends on *n* and **k** only through the energy  $E_n(\mathbf{k})$ , we can write Eq. (2.30) as

$$q = \int Q(E)g(E)dE. \tag{2.32}$$

In the discussion so far we have focussed solely on the spatial properties of the electrons, and have made no reference to the spin. We account for the spin by multiplying the many-electron spatial wavefunction in Eq. (2.26) with a properly symmetrized spin wavefunction. In addition we define separate density-of-state functions  $g_{\alpha}(E)$  and  $g_{\beta}(E)$  describing the electronic states of electrons in the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  spin states. In the absence of an external magnetic field these functions are simply

$$g_{\alpha}(E) = g_{\beta}(E) = \frac{1}{2}g(E),$$
 (2.33)

i.e. each is exactly half of the total density of states.

The density of states gives us the energies of the levels, but does not give us their populations. The average occupancy of a level in band *n* with wavevector **k** is given by the Fermi–Dirac distribution function  $f_n(\mathbf{k})$ . This distribution function is usually given in terms of the energy to give the following function f(E),

$$f(E) = \frac{1}{\exp\left[(E - \mu)/kT\right] + 1},$$
(2.34)

where  $\mu$  is the chemical potential of the system. At zero temperature the Fermi–Dirac distribution function is a Heaviside step function [190], which is given by

$$f(E) = \begin{cases} 1, & E < \mu, \\ 0, & E > \mu, \end{cases}$$
(2.35)

i.e. the states with energies below the chemical potential are completely filled, and those with energies above the chemical potential are completely unfilled. Hence we see that at zero temperature the chemical potential is equal to the energy of the highest-energy occupied electronic level, which is referred to as the Fermi energy  $E_{\rm F}$ , i.e.  $\lim_{T\to 0}(\mu) = E_{\rm F}$ . The corresponding level is the Fermi level. At temperatures above zero the chemical potential deviates from the Fermi energy according to

$$\mu = E_{\rm F} \left[ 1 - \frac{\pi^2}{12} \left( \frac{T}{T_{\rm F}} \right)^2 + \mathcal{O} \left( \left( \frac{T}{T_{\rm F}} \right)^4 \right) \right],\tag{2.36}$$

where  $T_F$  is the Fermi temperature which is defined via the relation  $E_F = kT_F$ . However the temperature-dependent correction can usually be neglected at typical temperatures from 100 to 1000 K, for example in the case of metals where  $T_F$  is of the order  $10^4-10^5$  K [184], and so we simply equate the chemical potential with the Fermi energy  $\mu \approx E_F$ . The Fermi–Dirac distribution function is plotted for different temperatures in Fig. 2.3. It can be seen that the distribution is a step function at T = 0, with the discontinuity at  $E = E_F$ . However as the temperature increases we can clearly see the progressive population of states just above the Fermi level at the



**Fig. 2.3.** Plots of the Fermi–Dirac distribution function versus energy at different temperatures. At T = 0 (light grey curve) the distribution is a Heaviside step function with the discontinuity at  $E_{\rm F}$ . As *T* increases (dark grey and black curves) the discontinuity is smoothed, and the states with energies just above  $E_{\rm F}$  are populated at the expense of those with energies just below.



**Fig. 2.4.** Schematic band structures of solid materials. The bands are shown for (a) an insulator with band gap  $E_g \gg kT$ , and (b) a metal. Intrinsic semi-conductors are also represented by (a), but now with  $E_g \approx kT$ .

expense of those just below the Fermi level. The total number density of the electrons n is given by the integral expression in Eq. (2.32), where the quantity Q(E) is substituted for f(E):

$$n = \int f(E)g(E)dE. \tag{2.37}$$

There are also analogous expressions for the separate number densities of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  electrons.

# 2.3.2. Band structures of insulators, semiconductors, and metals

We are now in a position to distinguish between the different types of periodic solids, namely insulators, semiconductors, and metals. The definitions of these materials are illustrated by the schematics of their band structures shown in Fig. 2.4.

2.3.2.1. Insulators. We discuss the case of insulators first as this is the class of solid materials to which we devote the most time in this review. The band structure is shown in Fig. 2.4(a). The highest occupied band, called the valence band, is completely filled with electrons, and the next-highest, called the conduction band, is completely empty. There is an energy gap between the top of the valence band and the bottom of the conduction band called the band gap  $E_g$ , in the middle of which is the Fermi energy. This gives us our definition of a non-metallic system, which is a system for which the Fermi level lies in a band gap. Solid insulators have a band gap that is large compared to the thermal energy  $E_g \gg kT$ , so that the conduction band remains unpopulated. We note that such systems do not necessarily have equal numbers of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ electrons, and that such systems behave as paramagnets. There is no mobility of electronic charge, and we can regard any unpaired metal electrons as being mainly localised on, for example, the metal ion. The paramagnetic NMR properties of these systems are discussed in Section 7.7.

2.3.2.2. Semiconductors. Intrinsic semi-conductors are also described by the band structure in Fig. 2.4(a), with the Fermi level being located in a band gap. However the difference here is that the band gap is comparable to kT at room temperature, and not much greater, i.e.  $E_g \approx kT$ . Therefore there is some thermal population of the conduction band and the conduction electrons are delocalized over the whole lattice, rather than being localized to the paramagnetic centres. Hence the NMR properties are different to those of paramagnetic insulators, as discussed in Section 7.12.

2.3.2.3. *Metals.* The final example we consider is the case of solid metals, the band structure of which is shown in Fig. 2.4(b). Here the highest-occupied band is only partly filled, and the Fermi level coincides with the highest-energy occupied level. Therefore at non-zero temperatures the levels just above the Fermi level become partly occupied and the material exhibits conductive behaviour. This has profound consequences for the NMR properties of nuclei in such materials as the unpaired electrons, rather than being largely localised to the paramagnetic centres, are now delocalized across the whole lattice. These effects are discussed in Section 7.12.

### 2.3.3. The free-electron model of metals

In order to facilitate a later discussion in Section 7.12 comparing the NMR shifts observed in paramagnetic insulators and metals, we will use a simple model for the electronic structure of a metal referred to as a free-electron model. This model is summarized here.

The definition of a free-electron metal is a solid in which there is no attractive potential between the nuclei and the electrons, so that  $U(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ . The solid is also periodic in x, y, and z over a length L. Then the electronic levels are contained in a single band n = 1, and the one-electron wavefunctions  $\phi_k(\mathbf{r})$  are simply the normalized plane wave functions

$$\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{V}} \exp(i\boldsymbol{k} \cdot \boldsymbol{r}), \qquad (2.38)$$

i.e.  $u_k(\mathbf{r}) = 1$ . The allowed values of the wavevectors are  $\mathbf{k} = (2\pi/L)(n_1, n_2, n_3)$ . The corresponding energies E(k) depend only on the magnitude of the wavevector k, and are given by

$$E(k) = \frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m_e}.$$
 (2.39)

The number density of electrons with wavevector magnitudes between k and k + dk is given by the density of states g(E(k))dkon the one hand. On the other the number density is equal to the volume of a spherical shell in wavevector space at radius k and thickness dk divided by the average volume per electron  $(2\pi/L)^3$ . Equating these two expressions we obtain

$$g(E(k))dk = \frac{2}{V} \left(\frac{L}{2\pi}\right)^3 4\pi k^2 dk$$

$$= \frac{k^2}{\pi^2} dk,$$
(2.40)
(2.41)

where the extra factor of two accounts for double occupancy by electrons with paired spins. The number density of electrons n(k, 0) with wavevector magnitudes between 0 and k is given by the integral

$$n(k,0) = \int_0^k g(E(k')) dk'$$
(2.42)

$$=\frac{k^3}{3\pi^2}.$$
 (2.43)

From this we can calculate an expression for the density of states as a function of energy:

$$g(E) = \frac{\mathrm{d}n(k,0)}{\mathrm{d}k} \frac{\mathrm{d}k}{\mathrm{d}E}$$
(2.44)

$$=\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \left(\frac{2m_e}{\hbar^2}\right)^{3/2} E^{1/2}.$$
 (2.45)

We associate the Fermi level with a Fermi wavevector  $k_{\rm F}$ , giving a Fermi energy of

$$E_{\rm F} \equiv E(k_{\rm F}) \tag{2.46}$$

$$=\frac{\hbar^2 k_{\rm F}^2}{2m_e}.\tag{2.47}$$

Combining Eqs. (2.45) and (2.47), we obtain the following simple expression for the density of states at the Fermi level:

$$g(E_{\rm F}) = \frac{3n}{2E_{\rm F}}.$$
 (2.48)

This expression will prove very useful when comparing the shifts in metals and paramagnetic insulators.

### 2.4. The nuclear and electronic Zeeman interactions

The energy of interaction *E* between a magnetic moment  $\mu$  and a magnetic field **B** is given by the scalar product

$$E = -\mathbf{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu},\tag{2.49}$$

where the magnetic field can either be applied externally or be due to a second magnetic moment. Fig. 2.5(a) shows the variation of the interaction energy with the relative orientation of the magnetic moment with respect to the magnetic field. The corresponding Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  is given by the same expression with  $\mu$  replaced with the equivalent operator  $\hat{\mu}$ :

$$\widehat{H} = -\mathbf{B} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}.\tag{2.50}$$

The interaction of the nuclear magnetic moment with an external magnetic field **B**<sub>0</sub> gives the nuclear Zeeman Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{IZ}$ 

$$\widehat{H}_{IZ} = -\boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_I \tag{2.51}$$

$$= -\hbar \gamma_I \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{I}, \qquad (2.52)$$

where  $\hat{I}$  is the nuclear spin operator. By convention the laboratory axis system is defined so that the external field is parallel to *z*. The nuclear Zeeman interaction is therefore given by

$$\widehat{H}_{IZ} = -\hbar\gamma_I B_0 \widehat{I}_z \tag{2.53}$$

$$=\hbar\omega_0 \widehat{I}_z,\tag{2.54}$$

where  $\hat{I}_a$  is the operator representing the component of the spin along axis a, and  $\omega_0 = -\gamma_I B_0$  is the nuclear Larmor frequency. Since  $\gamma_I$  is a signed quantity, so is  $\omega_0$ . For example we note that both <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C have positive gyromagnetic ratios and negative Larmor frequencies, whereas <sup>15</sup>N has a negative gyromagnetic ratio and positive Larmor frequency. A nucleus of spin quantum number *I* has 2I + 1 states  $|IM_I\rangle$  which are labelled by the magnetic quantum number  $M_I$  which takes values from -I to +I in integer steps. Whilst this 'complete notation' is the one that is mainly used throughout this review, in some cases we also employ the more compact, and less crowded, notation  $|M_I\rangle$  where the spin quantum number *I* is well defined. These states are the eigenstates of the Zeeman Hamiltonian, with the following energies  $E(M_I)$ :

$$E(M_I) = M_I \hbar \omega_0. \tag{2.55}$$

Fig. 2.5(b) illustrates the relationship between the nuclear spin vector, the external field, and the Zeeman energy of interaction. Note that for a nucleus with positive  $\gamma_I$  (and therefore negative  $\omega_0$ ), the lowest-lying state is  $|I + I\rangle$ , with energy  $I\hbar\omega_0$ , and the state with the highest energy is  $|I - I\rangle$ . Allowed transitions obey the selection rule  $\Delta M_I = \pm 1$ , and so the observed frequency of absorption is  $-\omega_0$ , as shown in Fig. 2.6(a). For nuclei with negative  $\gamma_I$  the energy order of the states is reversed with the lowest-lying state now being  $|I - I\rangle$ , with energy  $-I\hbar\omega_0$ , as shown in Fig. 2.6(b). The observed frequency of absorption for transitions obeying the selection rule  $\Delta M_I = \pm 1$  is now  $+\omega_0$ . A nucleus with spin I = 1/2 possesses two states, which are conventionally labelled  $|\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\rangle \equiv |\alpha\rangle$  and  $|\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\rangle \equiv |\beta\rangle$ .

The electron Zeeman interaction is described by the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{SZ}$  which is given by

$$\widehat{H}_{SZ} = -\boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \tag{2.56}$$

$$=\mu_{\mathsf{R}}g_{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\boldsymbol{B}_{0}\cdot\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}},\tag{2.57}$$

where  $\hat{\mu}_s$  and  $\hat{s}$  are the operators representing the electronic magnetic moment and spin respectively. When the applied magnetic field is along *z* the Hamiltonian becomes

$$\widehat{H}_{SZ} = \mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0 \widehat{S}_z, \tag{2.58}$$

where  $\hat{S}_a$  is the operator representing the component of  $\hat{S}$  along axis a. The electronic spin states are now labelled  $|SM_S\rangle$ . A free electron has spin S = 1/2, and therefore two states with energies



**Fig. 2.5.** Illustration of the relationship between the spin, magnetic moment, external magnetic field, and Zeeman energy of interaction for nuclear and electronic spins. The classical description is illustrated in (a), with the energy of interaction between the magnetic moment and external field depending on the angle  $\theta$  between the two vectors. The corresponding quantum-mechanical relationships are shown for the nuclear and electronic spins in (b) and (c), assuming that the external field is along z.



**Fig. 2.6.** The ladder of energy levels due to the Zeeman interaction. The energy levels are shown for a general nuclear spin *I* with (a) a positive gyromagnetic ratio, and (b) a negative gyromagnetic ratio. The energy levels for an arbitrary electronic spin S are shown in (c). Note that the gyromagnetic ratio of the electron is negative. We employ the compact notation for the spin states,  $|M_l\rangle$  or  $|M_s\rangle$ , rather than the complete notation. In each case the energies of the allowed transitions are shown.

T-1-1- 0 4

 $E_{\beta} = -\frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0$  and  $E_{\alpha} = +\frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0$ . The relationship between the electronic spin, external magnetic field, and Zeeman energy of interaction is illustrated in Fig. 2.5(c). Note that as the electron has a negative gyromagnetic ratio, it is the  $|\beta\rangle$  state that has the lower energy. Fig. 2.6(c) shows the ladder of Zeeman energy levels and energy of transition of an arbitrary electronic spin *S*.

### 2.5. Irreducible spherical tensors and tensor operators

### 2.5.1. Cartesian tensor representation of the spin Hamiltonian

This review makes extensive use of the various types of spin interactions that are present in both NMR and EPR spectroscopy, the basic ideas behind which are summarised here. All NMR and EPR interactions can be described as a coupling between two vectors, such as two spin vectors either belonging to two different spins or to the same spin, or a spin coupling to an external magnetic field, via a rank-two Cartesian tensor that contains all the information about the relevant spatial properties of the interaction. For example the nuclear Zeeman and chemical shielding interactions can be described by a Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{BI}$  of the form

$$\hat{H}_{RI} = \mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{K} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}.$$
(2.59)

The form of this Hamiltonian is instantly recognisable as a generalised scalar product of the external magnetic field vector **B** with the spin vector  $\hat{I}$  via the real spatial tensor **K**. As stated earlier in Chapter 2, *I* refers to nuclear spins and *S* to electronic spins. Hence Eq. (2.59) describes either a nuclear Zeeman or chemical shielding interaction, and the electronic Zeeman interaction can be obtained simply by replacing  $\hat{I}$  with  $\hat{S}$ . Note that the information about the field, spatial orientation, and spin is neatly separated into the different parts of  $\hat{H}_{BI}$ , being represented by **B**, **K**, and  $\hat{I}$  respectively. Likewise a coupling between two spins *S* and *I* has the general Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{SI}$ 

$$\widehat{H}_{SI} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{K} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}.$$
(2.60)

Finally the nuclear quadrupole interaction Hamiltonian is  $\hat{H}_{ll}$ ,

 $\widehat{H}_{II} = \widehat{I} \cdot K \cdot \widehat{I}, \qquad (2.61)$ 

which mathematically appears to be the coupling of the spin vector of *I* with itself.

Table 2.1
Irreducible spherical tensor components of a vector V in terms o
the Cartesian components $V_i$ , with $V_{\pm} = V_x \pm i V_y$ .

<i>V</i> <sub>10</sub>	$V_{1\pm 1}$
Vz	$\mp \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}V_{\pm}$

# 2.5.2. Irreducible spherical tensor representation of the spin Hamiltonian

In addition to the Cartesian representation of the interaction Hamiltonian, it sometimes proves convenient to adopt an irreducible spherical tensor representation of the field, spin, and spatial parts. A general irreducible spherical tensor is represented as  $P_{lm}$ , with *l* and *m* indicating the rank and order respectively. The order *m* takes values from -l to +l in integer steps. In the spherical tensor basis we write Cartesian vectors V, such as the field and spin, as irreducible spherical tensors of rank 1. They have three components  $V_{10}$ , and  $V_{1\pm 1}$ , which are given in terms of the Cartesian components by the expressions in Table 2.1. It is usual to couple together the two vectors in the Hamiltonian to form either a mixed field-spin tensor operator, in the case of coupling the field to a spin operator, or a spin-spin tensor operator, in the case of coupling two spin operators. The coupling of two rank-one tensors  $\hat{U}_{1m'}$  and  $\hat{V}_{1m''}$ , both of which are in general operators, yields the coupled tensor operator  $\hat{T}_{lm}$  via the expression [191]

$$\widehat{T}_{lm} = \sum_{m'=-1}^{+1} \sum_{m''=-1}^{+1} \langle 11m'm'' | lm \rangle \widehat{U}_{1m'} \widehat{V}_{1m''}, \qquad (2.62)$$

where  $\langle 11m'm''|lm \rangle$  is a Clebsch–Gordan coefficient, *l* takes the values 2, 1, and 0 according to the Clebsch–Gordan series, and m = m' + m''. Table 2.2 shows the tensor operators  $\hat{T}_{lm}$  formed by coupling two rank-one spin tensors for interactions that are commonly encountered in NMR spectroscopy.

The real Cartesian spatial tensor K can be broken down into an isotropic part  $K^{iso}$ , an anisotropic antisymmetric part  $K^{asym}$ , and a traceless anisotropic symmetric part  $K^{sym}$ :

$$\boldsymbol{K} = \boldsymbol{K}^{\text{iso}} \boldsymbol{1} + \boldsymbol{K}^{\text{asym}} + \boldsymbol{K}^{\text{sym}}, \qquad (2.63)$$

where **1** is the  $3 \times 3$  identity matrix. These three parts are given by

Table 2.2

Rank-two tensors formed by coupling two rank-one spin tensors, or a rank-one spin tensor to a rank-one magnetic field tensor for different internal spin interactions. The names of both the NMR interactions and their EPR equivalents (in parentheses) are given. The identity operator for the spin is written 1.

Interaction	$\hat{T}_{00}$	$\hat{T}_{10}$	$\widehat{T}_{1\pm 1}$	$\widehat{T}_{20}$	$\widehat{T}_{2\pm 1}$	$\widehat{T}_{2\pm 2}$
Nuclear shielding (electronic Zeeman)	$-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}B_0\widehat{I}_z$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}B_0\widehat{I}_{\pm}$	$\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}B_0\widehat{I}_z$	$\mp \frac{1}{2} B_0 \hat{I}_{\pm}$	0
Dipolar coupling (spin-dipolar hyperfine)	0	0	0	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \left( 3\hat{I}_{z}\hat{S}_{z} - \hat{\mathbf{I}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}} \right)$	$\pm \frac{1}{2} \left( \widehat{I}_z \widehat{S}_{\pm} + \widehat{I}_{\pm} \widehat{S}_z \right)$	$\frac{1}{2}\widehat{I}_{\pm}\widehat{S}_{\pm}$
J-coupling (Fermi-contact hyperfine)	$-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\hat{\mathbf{I}}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{S}}$	$-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\left(\widehat{I}_{+}\widehat{S}_{-}-\widehat{I}_{-}\widehat{S}_{+}\right)$	$\frac{1}{2} \left( \widehat{I}_z \widehat{S}_{\pm} - \widehat{I}_{\pm} \widehat{S}_z \right)$	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \left( 3\hat{I}_z \hat{S}_z - \hat{\mathbf{I}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}} \right)$	$\pm \frac{1}{2} \left( \widehat{I}_z \widehat{S}_{\pm} + \widehat{I}_{\pm} \widehat{S}_z \right)$	$\frac{1}{2}\widehat{I}_{\pm}\widehat{S}_{\pm}$
Quadrupolar coupling (zero-field splitting)	0	0	0	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \left( 3\hat{I}_z^2 - I(I+1)\hat{1} \right)$	$\pm \frac{1}{2} \left( \widehat{I}_z \widehat{I}_{\pm} + \widehat{I}_{\pm} \widehat{I}_z \right)$	$rac{1}{2}\widehat{I}_{\pm}^2$

$$K^{\rm iso} = \frac{1}{3} {\rm Tr}(\boldsymbol{K}), \tag{2.64}$$

$$\boldsymbol{K}^{\text{asym}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \boldsymbol{K} - \boldsymbol{K}^{\text{T}} \right), \tag{2.65}$$

$$\boldsymbol{K}^{\text{sym}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \boldsymbol{K} + \boldsymbol{K}^{\text{T}} \right) - \frac{1}{3} \text{Tr}(\boldsymbol{K}) \mathbf{1}.$$
(2.66)

We see that the nine independent components of **K** are separated into these three parts as follows. The isotropic part  $K^{iso}$  contains a single component which corresponds to the orientationindependent part of **K**. The anisotropic and antisymmetric part  $K^{asym}$  contains three independent components, and is therefore equivalent to a so-called pseudo vector. The final part  $K^{sym}$ , which is wholly anisotropic (i.e. traceless) and symmetric, contains five independent components. These five parts can be written in terms of the irreducible spherical tensors of ranks 0, 1, and 2 respectively as summarised in Table 2.3. The Hamiltonian written in the irreducible spherical tensor basis is

$$\widehat{H} = \sum_{l=0}^{2} \sum_{m=-l}^{+l} (-1)^m K_{lm} \widehat{T}_{l-m}, \qquad (2.67)$$

which is the form of the generalised scalar product [191].

It is conventional to parameterise the anisotropic parts of the spatial tensor according to their anisotropy parameters in their respective principal axis frames (PAFs). The PAF of the antisymmetric rank-one tensor is defined as the coordinate system in which the irreducible spherical tensor components are given by

$$\overline{K}_{10} = -i\sqrt{2\zeta},\tag{2.68}$$

$$\overline{K}_{1\pm 1} = 0, \tag{2.69}$$

where the overbar indicates that the tensor components are evaluated in the PAF of the antisymmetric part of the tensor. The antisymmetric anisotropy parameter  $\zeta$  is defined as

$$\zeta = \sqrt{\left(K_{xy}^{\text{asym}}\right)^2 + \left(K_{yz}^{\text{asym}}\right)^2 + \left(K_{xz}^{\text{asym}}\right)^2} \tag{2.70}$$

$$=\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\left(K_{xy}-K_{yx}\right)^{2}+\left(K_{yz}-K_{zy}\right)^{2}+\left(K_{xz}-K_{zx}\right)^{2}}.$$
 (2.71)

The PAF of the symmetric part of the tensor is defined as the frame in which  $\mathbf{K}^{\text{sym}}$  is diagonal. Note that this frame does not, in general, coincide with the PAF of the antisymmetric part of  $\mathbf{K}$ . In the PAF of  $\mathbf{K}^{\text{sym}}$  the diagonal elements are ordered according to the Haeberlen convention so that  $|K_{zz}^{\text{sym}}| \ge |K_{xx}^{\text{sym}}| \ge |K_{yy}^{\text{sym}}|$ . The rank-two irreducible spherical tensor components are given by

$$\widetilde{K}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\Delta K, \qquad (2.72)$$

$$\widetilde{K}_{2\pm 1} = \mathbf{0},\tag{2.73}$$

$$\widetilde{K}_{2\pm 2} = -\frac{1}{2}\eta\Delta K, \qquad (2.74)$$

where the tilde indicates that the tensor components are evaluated in the PAF of the symmetric part of **K**. The symmetric anisotropy  $\Delta K$ and asymmetry parameter  $\eta$  are given by

$$\Delta K = \widetilde{K}_{zz}^{\text{sym}},\tag{2.75}$$

$$\eta = \frac{\tilde{K}_{yy}^{\text{sym}} - \tilde{K}_{xx}^{\text{sym}}}{\Delta K}.$$
(2.76)

Before leaving this section we note that there are numerous examples of spatial interaction tensors X, such as the nuclear quadrupolar interaction, zero-field splitting, and magnetic susceptibility tensors, which have an antisymmetric part of zero, i.e.  $X_{10} = X_{1\pm 1} = 0$ . In this case it is possible to define the rank-zero and rank-two tensors in terms of the components  $X_{ij}$  of the complete tensor:

$$X_{00} = -\sqrt{3}X^{iso},$$
 (2.77)

$$\widetilde{X}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\Delta X, \tag{2.78}$$

$$\widetilde{X}_{2\pm 1} = \mathbf{0},\tag{2.79}$$

$$\widetilde{X}_{2\pm 2} = -\frac{1}{2}\eta\Delta X, \qquad (2.80)$$

where the anisotropy  $\Delta X$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta$  have modified expressions:

Table 2.3

Irreducible spherical tensor components of a matrix K describing the spatial part of an interaction in terms of the Cartesian components K<sub>ij</sub>. The isotropic part of the tensor is K<sub>iso</sub>.

Rank	Expression in terms of $K_{ij}$	Expression in terms of $K^{\rm iso}, K^{\rm asym}_{ij}$ , and $K^{\rm sym}_{ij}$
0	$K_{00} = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}(K_{xx} + K_{yy} + K_{zz})$	$-\sqrt{3}K^{iso}$
1	$K_{10} = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} (K_{xy} - K_{yx})$ $K_{1\pm 1} = -\frac{1}{2} [K_{zx} - K_{xz} \pm i (K_{zy} - K_{yz})]$	$-\mathrm{i}\sqrt{2}K^{\mathrm{asym}}_{xy} \ - \left[K^{\mathrm{asym}}_{zx}\pm\mathrm{i}K^{\mathrm{asym}}_{zy} ight]$
2	$\begin{split} K_{20} &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} [3K_{zz} - (K_{xx} + K_{yy} + K_{zz})] \\ K_{2\pm 1} &= \pm \frac{1}{2} [K_{xz} + K_{zx} \pm i(K_{yz} + K_{zy})] \\ K_{2\pm 2} &= \frac{1}{2} [K_{xx} - K_{yy} \pm i(K_{xy} + K_{yx})] \end{split}$	$ \begin{array}{c} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}K_{zz}^{\text{sym}} \\ \mp \left[K_{zx}^{\text{sym}} \pm iK_{zy}^{\text{sym}}\right] \\ \frac{1}{2} \left[K_{xx}^{\text{sym}} - K_{yy}^{\text{sym}} \pm 2iK_{xy}^{\text{sym}}\right] \end{array} $

$$\Delta X = \widetilde{X}_{zz} - X^{\text{iso}},\tag{2.81}$$

$$\eta = \frac{\widetilde{X}_{yy} - \widetilde{X}_{xx}}{\Delta X}.$$
(2.82)

These definitions are completely equivalent to those in Eqs. (2.75) and (2.76).

### 2.6. Chemical shielding and chemical shift

The nuclear Zeeman Hamiltonian correctly describes the effect of an external magnetic field applied to an isolated nucleus. However when the nucleus is part of an atom, ion, or molecule, the Zeeman Hamiltonian no longer provides an adequate description, and we must account for the effect of the surrounding electrons. The external magnetic field causes the electrons to move in such a way that they produce their own induced magnetic fields that modify the actual field experienced by the nucleus. In diamagnetic systems the electronic magnetic fields usually oppose the external field, thus *shielding* the nucleus from the external field. This effect is described by a chemical shielding tensor  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$  which can be included in the nuclear Zeeman Hamiltonian to give the correct overall description of the system:

$$\widehat{H}_{I} = \widehat{H}_{IZ} + \widehat{H}_{IC} \tag{2.83}$$

$$= -\hbar \gamma_{I} \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot (\mathbf{1} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{I}}, \qquad (2.84)$$

where  $\hat{H}_{IC} = \hbar \gamma_I B_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{l}}$  is the term in the Hamiltonian describing the chemical shielding, and **1** is the identity tensor.

The shielding tensor  $\sigma$ , which was first described theoretically by Ramsey [192], comprises isotropic, antisymmetric, and symmetric anisotropic parts. Ramsey showed that for diamagnetic systems the chemical shielding can be written as the sum of a "diamagnetic component"  $\sigma^{\text{dia}}$  and a "paramagnetic component"  $\sigma^{\text{para}}$ :

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{dia}} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{para}}.$$
 (2.85)

Here we face our first difficulty with the terminology. The terms "diamagnetic" and "paramagnetic" do not refer to whether the *system* itself is dia- or paramagnetic, i.e. whether or not it has unpaired electrons. Rather, the former is the contribution to the shielding from the electronic ground state of the system, and the latter is due to the mixing of excited states with the ground state. Both contributions are present in both dia- and paramagnetic systems [89]. Pennanen and Vaara refer to the sum of these two terms as the *orbital* contribution to the shielding  $\sigma^{\text{orb}}$  [40]. In true paramagnetic systems we must add to the orbital contribution a second term that is due solely to the unpaired electrons  $\sigma^{s}$  to give the total shielding tensor:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{orb}} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{S}}. \tag{2.86}$$

It is  $\sigma^{s}$  that gives rise to the "paramagnetic shift", and it is this that forms a central subject of this review.

The isotropic, antisymmetric, and symmetric parts of  $\sigma$  can be separated by rewriting  $\hat{H}_{IC}$  as the generalised scalar product of irreducible spherical tensors. This gives

$$\widehat{H}_{IC} = \hbar \gamma_I \sum_{l=0}^{+2} \sum_{m=-l}^{+l} (-1)^m \sigma_{lm} \widehat{T}_{l-m}, \qquad (2.87)$$

where  $\sigma_{lm}$  is the component of the chemical shielding tensor with spherical rank *l* and order *m*, and contains the spatial dependence of the interaction. The rank *l* can take values of 0 (corresponding to the isotropic part of the tensor), 1 (antisymmetric anisotropic part), and 2 (symmetric anisotropic part), and *m* takes values from -l to +l in integer steps. The irreducible spherical components of  $\sigma$  are taken from Table 2.3. The irreducible spherical tensor operators

 $\hat{T}_{lm}$  are formed by coupling the components of the rank-one tensor representing the external magnetic field vector  $B_{1n}$ , and the rank-one tensor operator containing the components of the nuclear spin vector  $\hat{I}_{1n}$  where the order *n* takes the values -1, 0, and +1. These rank-one irreducible spherical tensor components are given in Table 2.1. The components of  $\hat{T}_{lm}$  that are formed by coupling the field and spin tensors are calculated from the formula [191]

$$\widehat{T}_{lm} = \sum_{n} B_{1n} \widehat{I}_{1,m-n} \langle 11n, m-n | lm \rangle$$
(2.88)

$$= \langle 110m|lm\rangle B_0 \hat{I}_{1m}, \qquad (2.89)$$

where the  $\langle l_1 l_2 m_1 m_2 | LM \rangle$  are the Clebsch–Gordan coefficients, which are non-zero for values of *L* equal to  $l_1 + l_2, l_1 + l_2 - 1, \dots, |l_1 - l_2|$ , and for  $M = m_1 + m_2$ . To go to the last line we used the convention that the magnetic field is applied along *z*. The mixed field-spin second-rank tensor components formed by coupling the field and spin tensors in this manner are given in Table 2.2.

### 2.6.1. The high-field approximation

Conventional NMR experiments are performed in the high-field limit, where the Zeeman interaction of the spin with the external field dominates all internal interactions, including couplings between spins, and the interaction of the spin with the external field via the chemical shielding. In this limit we can simplify the form of the Hamiltonians describing these internal interactions by treating them as a perturbation to the Zeeman Hamiltonian. The perturbation expansion can be calculated by first transforming the Hamiltonian representing the interaction into the reference frame rotating at the Larmor frequency (simply referred to as the *rotating frame*) [184], and then computing the average Hamiltonian  $\overline{H}$  over one period of Larmor precession according to the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff expansion, which can be written as  $\overline{H} = \overline{H^{(1)}} + \overline{H^{(2)}} + \overline{H^{(3)}} + \cdots$  where  $\overline{H^{(i)}}$  is the *i*th-order term [193,194].

The transformation of the chemical shielding Hamiltonian in Eq. (2.87) into the rotating frame gives a time-dependent Hamiltonian  $\tilde{H}_{IC}(t)$  which is equal to

$$\widetilde{H}_{IC}(t) = \hbar \gamma_I \sum_{l=0}^{+2} \sum_{m=-l}^{+l} (-1)^m \sigma_{lm} \widehat{T}_{l-m} \exp\left(-im\omega_0 t\right)$$

$$= \hbar \gamma_I R_0 \sum_{m=-l} \sum_{m=-l} (-1)^m (-1)^m$$

$$=\hbar\gamma_{I}B_{0}\sum_{l}\sum_{m}(-1)^{m}\langle 110-m|l-m\rangle\sigma_{lm}I_{1-m}\exp\left(-im\omega_{0}t\right).$$
 (2.91)

The first-order average Hamiltonian  $\overline{H^{(1)}}$  is given by the timeaverage over one period of Larmor precession  $\tau_0 = 2\pi/|\omega_0|$ :

$$\overline{H^{(1)}} = \frac{1}{\tau_0} \int_0^{\tau_0} dt_1 \widetilde{H}_{IC}(t_1)$$
(2.92)

$$=\hbar\gamma_{l}\sum_{l=0}^{+2}\sigma_{l0}\hat{T}_{l0},$$
(2.93)

where we recall that only those terms with m = 0 contribute. For the chemical shielding interaction, and indeed all interactions apart from the coupling of the nuclear quadrupolar moment to the electric-field gradient, it is sufficient to truncate the average Hamiltonian series at the first-order term. We can now substitute in the expressions for the  $\hat{T}_{l0}$  in Table 2.2, noting that  $\hat{T}_{10} = 0$  and that both  $\hat{T}_{00}$  and  $\hat{T}_{20}$  are proportional to  $B_0 \hat{I}_2$ . The result is

$$\overline{H^{(1)}} = -\hbar\omega_0 \left( -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_{00} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_{20} \right) \widehat{I}_z.$$
(2.94)

We can rewrite Eq. (2.94) in terms of a high-field chemical shielding  $\sigma^{(1)}$  as follows:

$$\overline{H^{(1)}} = -\hbar\omega_0 \sigma^{(1)} \widehat{I}_z, \qquad (2.95)$$

$$\sigma^{(1)} = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_{00} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_{20}.$$
(2.96)

We see that, in this high-field regime, the chemical shielding tensor contains only terms of spherical ranks zero and two, i.e. we only observe the symmetric part of the tensor. The isotropic term can be simplified easily by noting, with reference to Table 2.3, that  $\sigma_{00} = -\sqrt{3}\sigma_{iso}$ . The rank-two term is more complex to write out, as  $\sigma_{20}$ , by definition, varies with the orientation of the system. However we can separate the size of the anisotropy and the orientation dependence in the PAF. According to the Haeberlen convention the diagonal elements  $\tilde{\sigma}_{ii}$  are ordered as follows:  $|\tilde{\sigma}_{zz} - \sigma_{iso}| \ge |\tilde{\sigma}_{xx} - \sigma_{iso}| \ge |\tilde{\sigma}_{yy} - \sigma_{iso}|$ . The irreducible spherical tensor components of the chemical shielding tensor in the laboratory frame  $\sigma_{2m}$  can now be written in terms of the components in the PAF  $\tilde{\sigma}_{2m}$  using the following relationship:

$$\sigma_{2m} = \sum_{m'=-2}^{+2} \tilde{\sigma}_{2m'} D_{m'm}^{(2)}(\alpha_{\text{PL}}, \beta_{\text{PL}}, \gamma_{\text{PL}}), \qquad (2.97)$$

where the  $D_{m'm}^{(l)}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$  are the Wigner rotation matrix elements of rank *l*, and the Euler angles  $(\alpha_{\text{PL}}, \beta_{\text{PL}}, \gamma_{\text{PL}})$  give the orientation of the PAF in the laboratory frame. The Wigner rotation matrix elements can be written in terms of the reduced matrix elements  $d_{m'm}^{(l)}(\beta)$  by separating the dependence on each Euler angle into three separate factors:

$$D_{m'm}^{(l)}(\alpha,\beta,\gamma) = \exp(-im'\alpha) d_{m'm}^{(l)}(\beta) \exp(-im\gamma).$$
(2.98)

The complete set of reduced Wigner rotation matrix elements are tabulated up to rank l = 2 in Table 2.4, along with the single fourth-rank element  $d_{00}^{(4)}(\beta)$ . Substituting the matrix elements into Eq. (2.94) we obtain

$$\overline{H^{(1)}} = -\hbar\omega_0 \left(\sigma_{\rm iso} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} \tilde{\sigma}_{2m} \exp(-im\alpha_{\rm PL}) d_{m0}^{(2)}(\beta_{\rm PL}) \right) \widehat{I}_z.$$
(2.99)

Note that the anisotropic part of the chemical shielding interaction only depends on two Euler angles. This is because the application of the large magnetic field means that only the shielding spherical tensor components with m = 0 in the laboratory frame are retained in the Hamiltonian, as seen in Eq. (2.93). Therefore the orientation dependence is described purely by the Wigner matrix elements  $D_{m0}^{(2)}(\alpha_{\text{PL}}, \beta_{\text{PL}}, \gamma_{\text{PL}})$  in which the second index is zero, and so the dependence  $\gamma_{\text{PL}}$  is removed. The symmetric part of the chemical shielding tensor is conventionally represented as a chemical-shielding tensor is plotted as  $1/\sqrt{\sigma}$  as a function of orientation in a Cartesian coordinate system. The tensor has the shape of an ellipsoid when plotted as  $1/\sqrt{\sigma}$ . By convention the *ii* principal component is located along the *i*-axis, and is plotted as  $1/\sqrt{\tilde{\sigma}}_{ij}$ .

We can now use Table 2.3 to write down expressions for the rank-two chemical shielding terms in the PAF of the symmetric part of the shielding tensor, and substitute these into the Hamiltonian to give it an explicit form. Remembering that the off-diagonal elements are zero in the PAF, the  $\tilde{\sigma}_{2m}$  are [195]:

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \Delta \sigma, \qquad (2.100)$$

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{2\pm 1} = \mathbf{0},\tag{2.101}$$

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{2\pm 2} = -\frac{1}{2}\eta\Delta\sigma,\tag{2.102}$$

#### Table 2.4

Expressions for the set of unique reduced Wigner rotation matrix elements  $d_{m'm}^{(l)}(\beta)$  for ranks l = 1/2, 1, 3/2, and 2, and the single fourth-rank element  $d_{00}^{(l)}(\beta)$ . Additional elements are generated using the symmetry relations  $d_{mm'}^{(l)}(\beta) = (-1)^{m-m'} d_{m'm}^{(l)}(\beta)$  and  $d_{mm'}^{(l)}(\beta) = (-1)^{m-m'} d_{m'm}^{(l)}(\beta)$ .

l = 1/2	Expression
$d^{(1/2)}_{+1/2,+1/2}(eta)$	$\cos(\beta/2)$
$d^{(1/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(eta)$	$\sin(\beta/2)$
l = 1	Expression
$d^{(1)}_{+1+1}(\beta)$	$\cos^2(\beta/2)$
$d^{(1)}_{-1,+1}(\beta)$	$\sin^2(\beta/2)$
$d_{0,+1}^{(1)}(eta)$	$\sin(\beta)/\sqrt{2}$
$d^{(1)}_{0,0}(eta)$	$\cos(\beta)$
l = 3/2	Expression
$d^{(3/2)}_{+3/2}{}_{+3/2}(eta)$	$\cos^3(\beta/2)$
$d^{(3/2)}_{+1/2,+3/2}(\beta)$	$\sqrt{3}\cos^2(\beta/2)\sin(\beta/2)$
$d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+3/2}(eta)$	$\sqrt{3}\cos(\beta/2)\sin^2(\beta/2)$
$d^{(3/2)}_{-3/2,+3/2}(eta)$	$\sin^3(\beta/2)$
$d^{(3/2)}_{\pm 1/2,\pm 1/2}(\beta)$	$\cos(\beta/2)(3\cos^2(\beta/2)-2)$
$d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(eta)$	$-\sin(\beta/2)\Big(3\sin^2(\beta/2)-2\Big)$
$d_{-1/2,+1/2}^{(3/2)}(\beta)$ $l = 2$	$-\sin(\beta/2)(3\sin^2(\beta/2)-2)$ Expression
$d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(\beta)$ $l = 2$ $d^{(2)}_{+2,+2}(\beta)$	$-\sin(\beta/2) \left(3\sin^2(\beta/2) - 2\right)$ Expression $\cos^4(\beta/2)$
$d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(\beta)$ $l = 2$ $d^{(2)}_{+2,+2}(\beta)$ $d^{(2)}_{+1,+2}(\beta)$	$-\sin(\beta/2) \left(3\sin^2(\beta/2) - 2\right)$ Expression $\cos^4(\beta/2)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$
$\begin{aligned} d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(\beta) \\ l &= 2 \\ d^{(2)}_{+2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{+1,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \end{aligned}$	$-\sin(\beta/2) \left(3\sin^2(\beta/2) - 2\right)$ Expression $\cos^4(\beta/2)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}\sin^2(\beta)$
$d_{-1/2,+1/2}^{(3/2)}(\beta)$ $l = 2$ $d_{+2,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{+1,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{0,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{-1,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$	$-\sin(\beta/2) \left(3\sin^2(\beta/2) - 2\right)$ Expression $\cos^4(\beta/2)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sqrt{\frac{5}{8}}\sin^2(\beta)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2$
$\begin{aligned} d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(\beta) \\ l &= 2 \\ d^{(2)}_{+2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-1,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-2,+2}(\beta) \end{aligned}$	$-\sin(\beta/2) \left(3\sin^2(\beta/2) - 2\right)$ Expression $\cos^4(\beta/2)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sqrt{\frac{2}{8}}\sin^2(\beta)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sin^4(\beta/2)$
$\begin{aligned} d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(\beta) \\ \hline l &= 2 \\ d^{(2)}_{+2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{+1,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-1,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{+1,+1}(\beta) \end{aligned}$	$-\sin(\beta/2) \left(3 \sin^2(\beta/2) - 2\right)$ Expression $\cos^4(\beta/2)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} \sin^2(\beta)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sin^4(\beta/2)$ $(2\cos(\beta) - 1)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$
$\begin{aligned} d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(\beta) \\ l &= 2 \\ d^{(2)}_{+2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{+1,+1}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+1}(\beta) \end{aligned}$	$-\sin(\beta/2) \left(3\sin^2(\beta/2) - 2\right)$ Expression $\cos^4(\beta/2)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sqrt{\frac{3}{8}}\sin^2(\beta)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sin^4(\beta/2)$ $(2\cos(\beta) - 1)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\sin(\beta)\cos(\beta)$
$d_{-1/2,+1/2}^{(3/2)}(\beta)$ $l = 2$ $d_{+2,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{+1,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{0,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{-1,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{-2,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{-2,+2}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{-1,+1}^{(2)}(\beta)$ $d_{0,+1}^{(2)}(\beta)$	$\begin{split} &-\sin(\beta/2) \left( 3\sin^2(\beta/2) - 2 \right) \\ \hline & Expression \\ & \cos^4(\beta/2) \\ & \sin(\beta)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2 \\ & \sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} \sin^2(\beta) \\ & \sin(\beta)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2 \\ & \sin^4(\beta/2) \\ & (2\cos(\beta) - 1)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2 \\ & \sqrt{\frac{5}{2}} \sin(\beta)\cos(\beta) \\ & (2\cos(\beta) + 1)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2 \end{split}$
$\begin{aligned} d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(\beta) \\ \hline l &= 2 \\ d^{(2)}_{+2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-1,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-1,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-1,+1}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+1}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,0}(\beta) \end{aligned}$	$\begin{split} &-\sin(\beta/2) \left( 3\sin^2(\beta/2) - 2 \right) \\ \hline & Expression \\ & \cos^4(\beta/2) \\ & \sin(\beta)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2 \\ & \sqrt{\frac{2}{8}} \sin^2(\beta) \\ & \sin(\beta)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2 \\ & \sin^4(\beta/2) \\ & (2\cos(\beta) - 1)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2 \\ & \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \sin(\beta)\cos(\beta) \\ & (2\cos(\beta) + 1)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2 \\ & (3\cos^2(\beta) - 1)/2 \end{split}$
$\begin{aligned} d^{(3/2)}_{-1/2,+1/2}(\beta) \\ l &= 2 \\ d^{(2)}_{+2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{+1,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-1,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-2,+2}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{-1,+1}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,+1}(\beta) \\ d^{(2)}_{0,0}(\beta) \\ l &= 4 \end{aligned}$	$-\sin(\beta/2) (3 \sin^{2}(\beta/2) - 2)$ Expression $\cos^{4}(\beta/2)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sqrt{\frac{3}{8}} \sin^{2}(\beta)$ $\sin(\beta)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sin^{4}(\beta/2)$ $(2 \cos(\beta) - 1)(1 + \cos(\beta))/2$ $\sqrt{\frac{5}{2}} \sin(\beta) \cos(\beta)$ $(2 \cos(\beta) + 1)(1 - \cos(\beta))/2$ $(3 \cos^{2}(\beta) - 1)/2$ Expression



**Fig. 2.7.** The chemical-shielding ellipsoid. The symmetric part of the chemical shielding tensor is plotted on three-dimensional Cartesian axes as  $1/\sqrt{\sigma}$ , with the three *ii* principal components plotted as  $1/\sqrt{\sigma_{ii}}$  along the *i*-axes.

where  $\Delta \sigma$  and  $\eta$  are the chemical shielding anisotropy and asymmetry parameter respectively. They are defined according to the Haeberlen convention as

$$\Delta \sigma = \tilde{\sigma}_{zz} - \sigma_{\rm iso}, \tag{2.103}$$

$$\eta = \frac{\dot{\sigma}_{yy} - \dot{\sigma}_{xx}}{\Delta \sigma}.$$
(2.104)

For completeness we can also give explicit expressions for the unobservable antisymmetric part of the shielding tensor. The PAF of the antisymmetric tensor is the reference frame in which

$$\overline{\sigma}_{10} = -i\sqrt{2}\zeta, \tag{2.105}$$

$$\overline{\sigma}_{1\pm 1} = 0, \tag{2.106}$$

where the antisymmetric anisotropy parameter  $\zeta$  is

$$\zeta = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\sigma_{xy} - \sigma_{yx})^{2} + (\sigma_{yz} - \sigma_{zy})^{2} + (\sigma_{xz} - \sigma_{zx})^{2}}.$$
 (2.107)

The  $\sigma_{ij}$  in Eq. (2.107) are those in the laboratory frame. We recall that the PAF of the antisymmetric part *does not* in general coincide with that of the symmetric part, and that tensor components in the former are represented with a tilde, whereas those in the latter are shown with an overbar. In terms of these parameters the Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{split} \overline{H^{(1)}} &= -\hbar\omega_0 \bigg[ \sigma_{iso} + \Delta\sigma \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \bigg\{ \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} d_{00}^{(2)}(\beta_{\text{PL}})) \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \eta \Big( \exp(2i\alpha_{\text{PL}}) d_{-20}^{(2)}(\beta_{\text{PL}}) + \exp(-2i\alpha_{\text{PL}}) d_{+20}^{(2)}(\beta_{\text{PL}}) \Big) \bigg\} \bigg] \widehat{I}_z \\ &= -\hbar\omega_0 \bigg[ \sigma_{iso} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta\sigma \Big\{ 3\cos^2(\beta_{\text{PL}}) - 1 - \eta\cos(2\alpha_{\text{PL}}) \sin^2(\beta_{\text{PL}}) \Big\} \bigg] \widehat{I}_z. \\ &(2.109) \end{split}$$

A nuclear spin with positive gyromagnetic ratio in a crystallite of a well-defined orientation  $(\alpha_{PL}, \beta_{PL})$  will therefore resonate in the rotating frame at a single well-defined frequency  $\Omega(\alpha_{PL}, \beta_{PL})$  which is given by

$$\Omega(\alpha_{\text{PL}}, \beta_{\text{PL}}) = \omega_0 \left[ \sigma_{\text{iso}} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \sigma \Big\{ 3 \cos^2(\beta_{\text{PL}}) - 1 - \eta \cos(2\alpha_{\text{PL}}) \sin^2(\beta_{\text{PL}}) \Big\} \right].$$
(2.110)

In a polycrystalline powder, in which crystallites of all orientations are present with a random statistical distribution, each crystallite is represented by a sharp peak at a particular frequency. These peaks combine to give a broad resonance referred to as a powder pattern, an example of which is shown in Fig. 2.8. Superimposed upon this powder pattern are the positions of five single-crystallite spectra (a)–(e) of representative orientations. The lineshape has two discontinuities, which are located at frequencies  $\omega_0 \tilde{\sigma}_{zz}$  and  $\omega_0 \tilde{\sigma}_{xx}$ , with the former frequency defined as being the one that is further from the isotropic frequency  $\omega_0 \sigma_{iso}$ . In addition there is a cusp at frequency  $\omega_0 \tilde{\sigma}_{yy}$ . In principle, measuring these three positions is sufficient to obtain the three principal values of the symmetric part of the CSA tensor.

2.6.1.1. Second-order effects in the high-field approximation. In the majority of known cases the first-order approximation as presented in the previous section is sufficient for the description of the chemical shielding under high-field conditions. However for very large shifts and shift anisotropies, such as those that may be encountered in superparamagnetic systems [196–198], it may be necessary to include higher-order terms. We will calculate the second-order term here as an example, following the protocol of Ashbrook et al. [194].

We proceed by calculating the second-order average Hamiltonian term in the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff expansion, given by

$$\overline{H^{(2)}} = -\frac{i}{2\hbar\tau_0} \int_0^{\tau_0} dt_2 \int_0^{t_2} dt_1 \Big[ \overline{H_I(t_2), H_I(t_1)} \Big],$$
(2.111)

and extracting the secular terms. Substituting Eq. (2.91) into the commutator we obtain

$$\begin{split} \left[\widetilde{H}_{I}(t_{2}),\widetilde{H}_{I}(t_{1})\right] &= \hbar^{2} \gamma_{I}^{2} B_{0}^{2} \sum_{l_{1},l_{2}} \sum_{m} \langle 110 - m|l_{1} - m\rangle \langle 110m|l_{2}m\rangle \sigma_{l_{1}m} \sigma_{l_{2}-m} \\ &\times \left[\widehat{I}_{1m},\widehat{I}_{1-m}\right] \exp\left(-im\omega_{0}(t_{1} - t_{2})\right), \end{split}$$

$$(2.112)$$



**Fig. 2.8.** Simulated NMR 'powder pattern' spectrum of a static polycrystalline powder of a system containing a single spin-1/2, with positive gyromagnetic ratio, which experiences a CSA interaction. The three principal components of the CSA tensor are labelled, and correspond to the high- and low-frequency discontinuities, and the cusp in the powder pattern. Superimposed are the five spectra (a)–(e) corresponding to five representative crystallites of well-defined orientations. The chemical shielding isotropic and anisotropy parameters used are  $\omega_0 \sigma_{iso}/2\pi = 0$ ,  $\omega_0 \Delta \sigma/2\pi = 500$  kHz, and  $\eta = 0.3$ , which correspond to principal components of  $\omega_0 \bar{\sigma}_{xx}/2\pi = -325$  kHz,  $\omega_0 \bar{\sigma}_{yy}/2\pi = -175$  kHz, and  $\omega_0 \bar{\sigma}_{zz}/2\pi = 500$  kHz. The single-crystallite spectra have orientations ( $\alpha_{PL}, \beta_{PL}$ ) equal to (a) (0°, 90°), (b) (0°, 64.74°), (c) (45°, 54.74°), (d) (0°, 36°), (e) (0°, 0°), and resonance frequencies  $\Omega(\alpha_{PL}, \beta_{PL})/2\pi$  of (a) -325 kHz, (b) -175 kHz, (c) 0 kHz, (d) 215 kHz, and (e) 500 kHz.

where we have retained only the secular terms with  $m_1 = -m_2 = m$ . Inserting this expression into Eq. (2.111) and computing the integral yields the second-order average Hamiltonian:

$$\overline{H^{(2)}} = \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega_0 \sum_{l_1, l_2} \sum_{m \neq 0} \frac{1}{m} \langle 110 - m | l_1 - m \rangle \\
\times \langle 110m | l_2m \rangle \sigma_{l_1m} \sigma_{l_2 - m} [\widehat{I}_{1m}, \widehat{I}_{1 - m}].$$
(2.113)

The commutator of rank-one irreducible spherical tensor operators can be simplified after some tedious algebra by using the mathematical tools of quantum angular momentum, giving

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{I}_{1m}, \hat{I}_{1-m} \end{bmatrix} = 2\sqrt{3}(-1)^{2l+1}\sqrt{I(l+1)(2l+1)}\langle 11m - m|10\rangle \begin{cases} 1 & 1 & 1\\ I & I & I \end{cases} \hat{I}_{z} \quad (2.114)$$

$$=(-1)^m m \hat{I}_z,$$
 (2.115)

where the array in braces is a Wigner 6*j* symbol [191]. Finally we use the explicit expressions for the Clebsch–Gordan coefficients to give the following second-order chemical shielding Hamiltonian:

$$\overline{H^{(2)}} = \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega_0 \sum_{l_1, l_2 \ m \neq 0} (-1)^m \langle 110 - m | l_1 - m \rangle \langle 110m | l_2m \rangle \sigma_{l_1m} \sigma_{l_2-m} \widehat{l}_z \quad (2.116) 
= \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega_0 [\sigma_{l_1-l_1} \sigma_{l_1+l_1} - \sigma_{l_2-l_1} \sigma_{l_2+l_1} + \sigma_{l_2-l_2} \sigma_{l_2+l_1} - \sigma_{l_2-l_2} \sigma_{l_1+l_1}] \widehat{l}_z. \quad (2.117)$$

In analogy to the first-order interaction, we can reformulate Eq. (2.117) in terms of the second-order chemical shielding:

$$\overline{H}^{(2)} = -\hbar\omega_0 \sigma^{(2)} \widehat{I}_z, \qquad (2.118)$$

$$\sigma^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2}[\sigma_{1-1}\sigma_{1+1} - \sigma_{2-1}\sigma_{2+1} + \sigma_{1-1}\sigma_{2+1} - \sigma_{2-1}\sigma_{1+1}].$$
(2.119)

The spin part of this Hamiltonian is simply  $\hat{I}_z$ , which is the same as for the first-order high-field chemical shielding interaction. The second-order term therefore indicates that the resonance frequency experienced by a nuclear spin is simply shifted from the frequency in Eq. (2.94) by the correction term in Eq. (2.117). This correction term is also proportional to the external magnetic field  $B_0$ , and therefore the Larmor frequency  $\omega_0$ . The spatial dependence of this correction term is complicated as it is the sum of four terms, each of which is a product of two irreducible spherical tensor components,  $\sigma_{l_1-1}\sigma_{l_2+1}$ . It should be noted that only the antisymmetric and symmetric anisotropic parts of the shielding tensor contribute to the second-order interaction; no contribution is made by the isotropic shielding. The spatial dependence is more easily understood by writing the products  $\sigma_{l_1m}\sigma_{l_2-m}$  in terms of the coupled spatial tensors  $W_{l_0}^{(Cl_1Cl_2)}$  as follows:

$$W_{L0}^{(Cl_1,Cl_2)} = \sum_m \langle l_1 l_2 m - m | L0 \rangle \sigma_{l_1 m} \sigma_{l_2 - m}.$$
(2.120)

The tensor  $W_{L0}^{(l_1 l_2)}$  is of rank *L*, which takes values according to the Clebsch-Gordan series from  $l_1 + l_2$  down to  $|l_1 - l_2|$  in integer steps. We will see that the only coupled tensors we need to consider are those of ranks 0, 2, and 4. The rank-zero tensors correspond to spatially isotropic shielding components, the rank-two tensors to the symmetric shielding anisotropy, and the rank-four tensors to an additional shielding anisotropy with a different angular dependence. The coupled tensor components have the following symmetry with regard to the order in which the  $\sigma_{l_1m}$  are coupled:

$$W_{L0}^{(Cl_1,Cl_2)} = (-1)^{L-l_1-l_2} W_{L0}^{(Cl_2,Cl_1)}.$$
(2.121)

In order to write the second-order shielding Hamiltonian in terms of the  $W_{L0}^{(l_1l_2)}$  tensors, we invert Eq. (2.120) to give an expression for  $\sigma_{l_1m}\sigma_{l_2-m}$ :

$$\sigma_{l_1m}\sigma_{l_2-m} = \sum_{L=|l_1-l_2|}^{l_1+l_2} \langle l_1 l_2 m - m | L0 \rangle W_{L0}^{(Cl_1,Cl_2)}, \qquad (2.122)$$

which we substitute into Eq. (2.117). The final expression is

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{H^{(2)}} &= \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega_0 \left[ \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} W_{00}^{(C1,C1)} + \sqrt{\frac{1}{5}} W_{00}^{(C2,C2)} \right] \hat{I}_z \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega_0 \left[ \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} W_{20}^{(C1,C1)} - \sqrt{2} W_{20}^{(C1,C2)} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{14}} W_{20}^{(C2,C2)} \right] \hat{I}_z \\ &- \sqrt{\frac{2}{35}} \hbar \omega_0 W_{40}^{(C2,C2)} \hat{I}_z. \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.123)$$

The Hamiltonian in Eq. (2.123) comprises three terms. The first is spatially isotropic, as it depends on  $W_{00}^{(C1,C1)}$  and  $W_{00}^{(C2,C2)}$  which are formed by coupling two antisymmetric and two symmetric shielding tensor components respectively. It will therefore manifest itself as a change in the measured isotropic chemical shielding. The second term contains coupled tensors of rank 2, formed from coupling two antisymmetric, one symmetric and one antisymmetric, or two symmetric shielding components, and therefore contributes to the symmetric shielding anisotropy in the same way as the rank-two tensor in Eq. (2.94). One intriguing aspect of these two terms is that both depend on the antisymmetric part of the shielding tensor, which is not observable in the conventional high-field (first-order) limit. The final term is new: it has a rank-four spatial dependence through  $W_{40}^{(C2,C2)}$ , which is due to the coupling of two symmetric shielding tensor components. It is spatially anisotropic, but with a different angular dependence to the 'conventional' shielding anisotropy. Such rank-four spatial terms are well known from the NMR of quadrupolar nuclei, where they are formed from the coupling together of two spatial components from the quadrupolar coupling Hamiltonian or the quadrupolar Hamiltonian with the CSA Hamiltonian [194], and are known to lead to broadening of the resonance [199] as well as being sources of information about the tensor parameters.

### 2.6.2. The chemical shift

So far we have formulated the discussion in terms of the chemical shielding. We now introduce the chemical shift convention, limiting ourselves to the high-field limit where only the firstorder interaction is retained. In experimental NMR we actually measure the *chemical shift tensor*  $\delta$ , the isotropic value of which is equal to the difference between the isotropic shielding of a reference system  $\sigma_{iso}^{ref}$  and the system of interest:

$$\delta_{\rm iso} = \sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm ref} - \sigma_{\rm iso}. \tag{2.124}$$

Using the shift convention we define the diagonal components (or principal values) of the symmetric part of the tensor in the PAF as  $\tilde{\delta}_{ii}$ , and write the chemical shift anisotropy (CSA)  $\Delta \delta$ , and asymmetry parameter  $\eta$  as:

$$\Delta \delta = \tilde{\delta}_{zz} - \delta_{\rm iso}, \qquad (2.125)$$

$$\eta = \frac{\delta_{yy} - \delta_{xx}}{\Delta \delta},\tag{2.126}$$

where we have used the Haeberlen convention to order the principal values:  $|\tilde{\delta}_{zz} - \delta_{iso}| \ge |\tilde{\delta}_{xx} - \delta_{iso}| \ge |\tilde{\delta}_{yy} - \delta_{iso}|$ . To obtain the isotropic chemical shift and the CSA in frequency units, we multiple  $\delta_{iso}$  and  $\Delta\delta$  by the Larmor frequency  $\omega_0$ . Note that for nuclei with a positive gyromagnetic ratio, and therefore a negative Larmor frequency, a positive value of either  $\delta_{iso}$  or  $\Delta\delta$  implies a negative frequency.

Finally, when we discuss the paramagnetic contribution to the chemical shielding  $\sigma^s$ , we can also define a paramagnetic shift tensor. If our reference system is diamagnetic the total isotropic chemical shift is

$$\delta_{iso} = \sigma_{iso}^{\text{ref,orb}} - \sigma_{iso}^{\text{orb}} - \sigma_{iso}^{\text{S}}, \qquad (2.127)$$

where  $\sigma_{iso}^{\text{ref,orb}}$  is the orbital contribution to the isotropic shielding of the reference compound. The total chemical shift is therefore the sum of the orbital contribution  $\delta_{iso}^{\text{orb}}$  and the paramagnetic shift  $\delta_{iso}^{S}$ :

$$\delta_{\rm iso} = \delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm orb} + \delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm S}, \tag{2.128}$$

where

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm orb} = \sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm orb, ref} - \sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm orb}, \tag{2.129}$$

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm S} = -\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm S}.\tag{2.130}$$

This implies that the paramagnetic part of the isotropic shift is simply given by minus the isotropic part of the paramagnetic shielding tensor.

### 2.7. The spin interactions of quadrupolar nuclei

We now extend the previous discussion of nuclear spin interactions to quadrupolar nuclei, which are defined as nuclei with spin I > 1/2. Quadrupolar nuclei also experience nuclear Zeeman  $\hat{H}_{IZ}$  and chemical shielding  $\hat{H}_{IC}$  interactions, which have the same form as for spin-1/2 nuclei. However there is an additional term in the Hamiltonian, known as the nuclear quadrupolar interaction  $\hat{H}_{IQ}$ , which describes the interaction of the nuclear quadrupole moment with the gradient of the electric field due to the electrons. The total nuclear spin Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{I}$  is therefore

$$\widehat{H}_I = \widehat{H}_{IZ} + \widehat{H}_{IQ} + \widehat{H}_{IC}. \tag{2.131}$$

Under high-field conditions the magnitudes of the three interactions are generally ordered as follows:  $|\hat{H}_{IZ}| \gg |\hat{H}_{IQ}| > |\hat{H}_{IC}|$ , i.e. the nuclear Zeeman interaction dominates the chemical shielding and quadrupolar interactions. In come cases the magnitudes of the shielding and quadrupolar interactions may be opposite, for

example for nuclei with small quadrupolar moments such as  $^{6/7}$ Li and nuclei in a cubic environment. The dominance of the Zeeman interaction means that the internal spin interactions may be treated as perturbations, as we have already seen for the chemical shielding interaction. Hence we can write down a high-field internal spin interaction  $\overline{H}_{1}^{(2)}$  with the following form:

$$\overline{H}_{I}^{(2)} = \overline{H}_{IQ}^{(1)} + \overline{H}_{IC}^{(1)} + \overline{H}_{I,Q\times Q}^{(2)} + \overline{H}_{I,Q\times C}^{(2)} + \overline{H}_{I,C\times C}^{(2)}.$$
(2.132)

In order of decreasing magnitude the interactions in Eq. (2.132) are the first-order quadrupolar interaction  $\overline{H}_{IQ}^{(1)}$ , the first-order chemical shielding interaction  $\overline{H}_{IC}^{(1)}$ , and the second-order interactions due to the nuclear quadrupole  $\overline{H}_{I,Q\times Q}^{(2)}$ , the cross-terms between the quadrupole and chemical shielding  $\overline{H}_{I,Q\times C}^{(2)}$ , and the chemical shielding  $\overline{H}_{I,C\times C}^{(2)}$ . The two Hamiltonians for the chemical shielding  $\overline{H}_{IC}^{(1)}$  and  $\overline{H}_{I,C\times C}^{(2)}$  have already been determined for spin-1/2 nuclei in Eqs. (2.109) and (2.123), and have exactly the same form for a quadrupolar nucleus. However for a quadrupolar nucleus there is the additional complication in that there are 2I + 1 spin states, between which there are I(2I + 1) transitions in which the magnetic quantum increases. Each transition has an associated frequency for each interaction. For example the first-order chemical shielding transition frequency for a transition from state  $|IM_1\rangle$  to  $|IM_2\rangle$  is

$$\Omega_{\rm IC}^{(M_1 \to M_2)}(\alpha_{\rm PL}, \beta_{\rm PL}) = -\omega_0 \bigg[ \sigma_{\rm iso} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta \sigma \big\{ 3 \cos^2(\beta_{\rm PL}) - 1 \\ -\eta \cos(2\alpha_{\rm PL}) \sin^2(\beta_{\rm PL}) \Big\} \bigg] (M_2 - M_1).$$
(2.133)

We have already fully examined the chemical shielding interaction. The remainder of this section is devoted to the quadrupolar interaction under high-field conditions.

### 2.7.1. The nuclear quadrupole Hamiltonian

The nuclear quadrupolar Hamiltonian describes the interaction between the quadrupolar moment of the nucleus and the electricfield gradient (EFG) due to the surrounding electrons. The EFG is calculated from the electric scalar potential of the electrons *V* by taking the second derivative with respect to the position coordinates  $x_i$ . There are therefore nine components of the EFG, which takes the form of a symmetric and traceless tensor (rank two) with components  $V_{ij} = \partial^2 V / \partial x_i \partial x_j$ . We define the PAF of the EFG tensor as the reference frame in which the tensor is diagonal with principal components  $\tilde{V}_{ii}$ . These components are ordered as  $|\tilde{V}_{zz}| \ge |\tilde{V}_{yy}| \ge |\tilde{V}_{xx}|$ , and are written in terms of the EFG anisotropy *eq* and asymmetry  $\eta^{Q}$  parameters as follows:

$$\widetilde{V}_{zz} = eq, \qquad \eta^{Q} = \frac{\widetilde{V}_{xx} - \widetilde{V}_{yy}}{\widetilde{V}_{zz}}.$$
 (2.134)

The Euler angles giving the orientation of the PAF relative to the laboratory frame are  $\Omega_{QL} = (\alpha_{QL}, \beta_{QL}, \gamma_{OL})$ .

The nuclear quadrupolar Hamiltonian is given by

$$\widehat{H}_{IQ} = \frac{eQ}{2I(2I-1)}\widehat{I} \cdot V \cdot \widehat{I}, \qquad (2.135)$$

where eQ is the nuclear quadrupole moment. Note that although  $\hat{H}_{IQ}$  appears to have the form of an interaction of the nuclear spin with itself, this is not the correct physical interpretation. As we have stated, the interaction is between the nuclear quadrupolar moment and the EFG. By convention we define the quadrupolar coupling constant  $C_Q$  (in Hz) and quadrupolar splitting frequency  $\omega_Q$  (in rad s<sup>-1</sup>) as

$$C_{\rm Q} = \frac{e^2 q {\rm Q}}{h}, \qquad \omega_{\rm Q} = \frac{3\pi C_{\rm Q}}{2I(2I-1)}.$$
 (2.136)

In terms of these quantities we can rewrite  $\hat{H}_{IQ}$  as

$$\widehat{H}_{IQ} = \frac{2\hbar\omega_Q}{3eq}\widehat{\mathbf{i}} \cdot \mathbf{V} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{i}}$$
(2.137)

$$=\frac{2}{3}\hbar\omega_{\rm Q}\hat{\mathbf{I}}\cdot\boldsymbol{v}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{I}},\tag{2.138}$$

where we have defined the reduced EFG tensor as  $\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{V}/(eq)$ . We see that the strength of the interaction is proportional to the quadrupolar splitting frequency. This Hamiltonian contains the generalized Cartesian scalar product  $\hat{\boldsymbol{I}} \cdot \boldsymbol{v} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{I}}$ . To facilitate the following discussion, this quantity is more conveniently written in terms of irreducible spherical tensors, which gives the following equivalent form of the Hamiltonian:

$$\widehat{H}_{IQ} = \frac{2}{3} \hbar \omega_Q \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} (-1)^m v_{2m} \widehat{I}_{2-m}.$$
(2.139)

We now proceed to calculate the resulting first- and second-order terms in Eq. (2.132).

2.7.1.1. The first-order nuclear quadrupole interaction. The first-order quadrupolar interaction Hamiltonian  $\overline{H}_{IQ}^{(1)}$  is calculated according to the protocol in Section 2.6.1. The Hamiltonian has a simple form in which only the term in  $\hat{I}_{20}$  is retained from Eq. (2.139):

$$\overline{H}_{IQ}^{(1)} = \frac{2}{3} \hbar \omega_Q \, \nu_{20} \widehat{I}_{20} \tag{2.140}$$

$$=\frac{2}{3}\hbar\omega_{Q}\widehat{I}_{20}\sum_{m=-2}^{+2}\tilde{\nu}_{2m}D_{m0}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\rm QL}), \qquad (2.141)$$

which we see is proportional to  $\omega_{Q}$ . On the second line we have written  $v_{20}$  in terms of the irreducible spherical tensor components in the PAF  $\tilde{v}_{2m}$ , which are given by:

$$\tilde{v}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}},$$
 (2.142)

$$\tilde{\nu}_{2\pm 1} = 0,$$
 (2.143)

$$\tilde{\nu}_{2\pm 2} = \frac{1}{2}\eta^Q. \tag{2.144}$$

Substituting these into Eq. (2.141) gives the following explicit expression for  $\overline{H}_{IO}^{(1)}$ :

$$\overline{H}_{IQ}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{Q} \Big[ 3\cos^{2}(\beta_{QL}) - 1 + \eta^{Q}\sin^{2}(\beta_{QL})\cos(2\alpha_{QL}) \Big] \Big[ \hat{I}_{z}^{2} - \frac{1}{3}I(I+1)\hat{1} \Big].$$
(2.145)

The corresponding frequency of transition from state  $|IM_1\rangle$  to state  $|IM_2\rangle$  is therefore:

$$\Omega_{IQ}^{(M_1 \to M_2)}(\alpha_{QL}, \beta_{QL}) = \frac{1}{2} \omega_Q \Big[ 3\cos^2(\beta_{QL}) - 1 + \eta^Q \sin^2(\beta_{QL}) \cos(2\alpha_{QL}) \Big] \\ \times \Big[ M_2^2 - M_1^2 \Big].$$
(2.146)

We see that, in contrast to the chemical shielding interaction, the transition frequency depends on the difference in the squares of the two magnetic quantum numbers. An important consequence of this is that any symmetric transition with  $M_2 = -M_1$  has no contribution from the quadrupolar interaction. This point is explored in more detail in Chapter 11.

2.7.1.2. The second-order nuclear quadrupole interaction. There are two second-order terms in the Hamiltonian in Eq. (2.141) which are due to the quadrupolar interaction. The larger and more

important of these is  $\overline{H}_{I,Q\times Q}^{(2)}$ , which is due solely to the nuclear quadrupole. It is calculated using the same protocol given for the second-order chemical shielding term as described in Section 2.6.1.1. The Hamiltonian is given by the time-integral of the commutator  $\left[\widetilde{H}_{IQ}(t_2), \widetilde{H}_{IQ}(t_1)\right]$  in the second-order average Hamiltonian. Evaluating this gives the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{H}_{I,Q\times Q}^{(2)} &= -\frac{2\hbar\omega_Q^2}{45\omega_0} \Big[ 2(4\nu_{2-1}\nu_{2+1} + \nu_{2-2}\nu_{2+2}) \Big( 5\widehat{I}_z^3 - (3I(I+1)-1)\widehat{I}_z \Big) \\ &+ (\nu_{2-1}\nu_{2+1} - \nu_{2-2}\nu_{2+2}) (4I(I+1)-3)\widehat{I}_z \Big], \end{aligned} \tag{2.147}$$

which has a magnitude that is proportional to  $\omega_Q^2/\omega_0$ . This indicates that this second-order interaction decreases in size as we increase the external magnetic field  $B_0$ .

The spatial properties of the interaction are elucidated by writing the products  $v_{2-m}v_{2m}$  in terms of the following irreducible spherical tensor components  $W_{L0}^{(Q,Q)}$  in the coupled representation:

$$W_{L0}^{(Q,Q)} = \sum_{m} \langle 22m - m | L0 \rangle \, \nu_{2m} \, \nu_{2-m}.$$
(2.148)

In this representation the Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{split} \overline{H}_{l,Q\times Q}^{(2)} &= \frac{4\hbar\omega_Q^2}{9\omega_0}W_{00}^{(Q,Q)} \left[\frac{3}{5\sqrt{5}} \left(5\hat{I}_z^3 - (3l(l+1)-1)\hat{I}_z\right) + \frac{4l(l+1)-3}{5\sqrt{5}}\hat{I}_z\right] \\ &+ \frac{4\hbar\omega_Q^2}{9\omega_0}W_{20}^{(Q,Q)} \left[-\frac{3}{5}\sqrt{\frac{2}{7}} \left(5\hat{I}_z^3 - (3l(l+1)-1)\hat{I}_z\right) + \frac{4l(l+1)-3}{10\sqrt{14}}\hat{I}_z\right] \\ &+ \frac{4\hbar\omega_Q^2}{9\omega_0}W_{40}^{(Q,Q)} \left[-\frac{51}{15}\sqrt{\frac{1}{70}} \left(5\hat{I}_z^3 - (3l(l+1)-1)\hat{I}_z\right) - \frac{3}{10\sqrt{70}} (4l(l+1)-3)\hat{I}_z\right]. \end{split}$$

$$(2.149)$$

We see that the interaction contains a part that depends on the rank-zero tensor  $W_{00}^{(Q,Q)}$ , and is therefore spatially isotropic. The anisotropic parts are of ranks two and four. Finally we note that the transition frequencies depend on  $M_2 - M_1$  and  $M_2^3 - M_1^3$ , and so symmetric transitions are affected by the quadrupolar interaction to second order.

2.7.1.3. The second-order quadrupole–SA cross term. The final second-order interaction Hamiltonian  $\overline{H}_{I,Q\times C}^{(2)}$  is due to the combination of the quadrupolar and chemical shielding interactions. In the second-order average Hamiltonian treatment, the Hamiltonian is given by the integral of  $\left[\widetilde{H}_{IQ}(t_2), \widetilde{H}_{IC}(t_1)\right] + \left[\widetilde{H}_{IC}(t_2), \widetilde{H}_{IQ}(t_1)\right]$ , which is the sum of the two cross terms between these two interactions [194]. The resulting expression for  $\overline{H}_{IQ\times C}^{(2)}$  is:

$$\overline{H}_{I,Q\times C}^{(2)} = \hbar \omega_{Q} [(\sigma_{1+1} + \sigma_{2+1}) v_{2-1} - (\sigma_{1-1} - \sigma_{2-1}) v_{2+1}] \Big[ \hat{I}_{z}^{2} - \frac{1}{3} I(I+1) \hat{1} \Big],$$
(2.150)

which we see is proportional to the product of the quadrupolar splitting frequency  $\omega_{\rm Q}$  and the components of the symmetric and antisymmetic anisotropic parts of the chemical shielding tensor  $\sigma_{2m}$  and  $\sigma_{1m}$ . As before, we can deduce the spatial properties by writing the tensor products in terms of the coupled tensor components  $W_{10}^{(Cl,Q)}$ 

$$W_{L0}^{(Cl,Q)} = \sum_{m} \langle l2m - m | L0 \rangle \sigma_{lm} v_{2-m}, \qquad (2.151)$$

which gives

$$\overline{H}_{l,Q\times C}^{(2)} = \hbar \omega_{Q} \left[ -\frac{2}{\sqrt{5}} W_{00}^{(C2,Q)} + \sqrt{2} W_{20}^{(C1,Q)} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{7}} W_{20}^{(C2,Q)} + 4 \sqrt{\frac{2}{35}} W_{40}^{(C2,Q)} \right] \\ \times \left[ \hat{I}_{z}^{2} - \frac{1}{3} I(I+1)\hat{1} \right].$$
(2.152)

As for the other second-order terms, this contribution also has parts of spatial ranks zero, two, and four. We also note that, as for the first-order quadrupolar interaction, the transition frequencies are proportional to  $M_2^2 - M_1^2$ , and so this interaction does not affect symmetric transitions.

# 2.8. The hyperfine interaction

The coupling interaction between the nucleus and the unpaired electrons is of central importance when discussing the effect of the latter on the NMR of paramagnetic systems. This coupling is referred to as the hyperfine interaction as it results in a "hyperfine" splitting structure in the EPR resonance. As we will see the hyperfine coupling constant, which describes the dependence of the interaction on the spatial orientation, contains both an isotropic contact term, which is analogous to the *J*-coupling interaction between nuclei, and a symmetric anisotropic dipolar coupling term.

In deriving the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{\rm SI}$  describing the hyperfine interaction, we can choose to view it either as the interaction of the nuclear magnetic moment  $\hat{\mu}_l$  with a magnetic field due to the electron, or equivalently as the interaction of the electronic magnetic moment  $\hat{\mu}_{\rm S}$  with a magnetic field due to the nucleus. A detailed derivation can be found in Abragam and Bleaney [185], who show that  $\hat{H}_{\rm SI}$  is equal to

$$\widehat{H}_{\text{SI}} = -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \Big[ (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\text{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}) (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\text{I}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}) - (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\text{S}} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\text{I}}) \boldsymbol{\nabla}^2 \Big] \frac{1}{r}, \qquad (2.153)$$

where  $\nabla$  is the vector derivative operator del, which is given by

$$\mathbf{\nabla} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{x}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{y}}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z}\right). \tag{2.154}$$

The coordinates (x, y, z) describe the position of a point relative to the nucleus, and  $r = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2 + z^2}$  is the distance from the nucleus. As will become apparent shortly, it is convenient to separate the Hamiltonian into two parts as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H}_{\text{SI}} &= -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \left[ (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\text{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla}) - \frac{1}{3} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\text{S}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l) \boldsymbol{\nabla}^2 \right] \frac{1}{r} \\ &+ \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{2}{3} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\text{S}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l) \boldsymbol{\nabla}^2 \right] \frac{1}{r}. \end{aligned}$$
(2.155)

The two terms in Eq. (2.155) are the spin-dipolar and contact parts of the hyperfine interaction respectively, which we now explore in detail.

### 2.8.1. Interaction with a single delocalised electron

We assume that the electron is spatially delocalized, and the nucleus is localised at the single point  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$ . This description is appropriate when for example considering 3*d* electrons of firstrow *d*-block transition-metal ions that are delocalized into ligand orbitals. The full magnetic interaction is calculated by multiplying  $\hat{H}_{sl}$  with the electron density  $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ , which is given by the square of the electron wavefunction  $\psi(\mathbf{r})$ , i.e.  $\rho(\mathbf{r}) = |\psi(\mathbf{r})|^2$ , and then integrating over all space. We consider two cases, firstly when the electron and nucleus are well separated, and secondly when the electron is within the immediate vicinity of the nucleus. In the first case we set  $r \neq 0$ , which for instance would be the case when the electron occupies an orbital other than an *s*-orbital. The second term in Eq. (2.155) then integrates to zero, and the first term  $\hat{H}_{s1}^{\varphi_0}$  becomes [185]

$$\widehat{H}_{SI}^{r\neq0} = -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \int \frac{3(\hat{\mu}_S \cdot \boldsymbol{r})(\hat{\mu}_I \cdot \boldsymbol{r}) - (\hat{\mu}_S \cdot \hat{\mu}_I)r^2}{r^5} |\psi(\boldsymbol{r})|^2 d^3r \qquad (2.156)$$

$$= -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \int \left[ 3(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\boldsymbol{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\boldsymbol{e}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\boldsymbol{I}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\boldsymbol{e}}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\boldsymbol{S}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\boldsymbol{I}} \right] \frac{\left| \psi(\boldsymbol{r}) \right|^2}{r^3} \mathrm{d}^3 r, \qquad (2.157)$$

where **r** is the vector displacement of the electron with respect to the nucleus, **e** is the corresponding unit vector, and  $\psi(\mathbf{r})$  is the electron wavefunction. The square of the magnitude of the wavefunction,  $|\psi(\mathbf{r})|^2$ , gives the electron density at position **r**. This interaction term is referred to as the *spin-dipolar interaction*.

The situation where the electron is in the immediate vicinity of the nucleus corresponds to setting r = 0. Physically we would encounter this situation when the electron resides in an *s*-orbital centred at the nucleus. It can be shown that, in this case, the dipolar coupling term of the hyperfine interaction is equal to zero, and we are then left with the second term of Eq. (2.155) which integrates to give  $\hat{H}_{S1}^{r=0}$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm SI}^{r=0} = -\frac{2}{3}\mu_0(\hat{\mu}_{\rm S}\cdot\hat{\mu}_{\rm I})|\psi(\mathbf{0})|^2. \tag{2.158}$$

This term, which is referred to as the *Fermi-contact interaction*, is purely isotropic and arises due to the delocalisation of the electron onto the nucleus [185], which is reflected by the dependence of the size of the interaction on  $|\psi(\mathbf{0})|^2$ , which is the electron density at the nucleus, where  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$ . Summing  $\hat{H}_{SI}^{r\neq0}$  and  $\hat{H}_{SI}^{r=0}$  yields the full hyperfine Hamiltonian,

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm SI} = -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \left[ \int \frac{3(\hat{\mu}_{\rm S} \cdot \mathbf{r})(\hat{\mu}_l \cdot \mathbf{r}) - (\hat{\mu}_{\rm S} \cdot \hat{\mu}_l)r^2}{r^5} |\psi(\mathbf{r})|^2 \mathrm{d}^3 r + \frac{8\pi}{3} (\hat{\mu}_{\rm S} \cdot \hat{\mu}_l) |\psi(\mathbf{0})|^2 \right].$$
(2.159)

The Fermi-contact and spin-dipolar interactions with a delocalised electron are illustrated in Fig. 2.9(a) and (b).

### 2.8.2. Interaction with a single localised electron

In cases where we can model the electron as being completely localised on the paramagnetic centre, we treat the electron as a point charge and point dipole. In this case we replace the electron density  $|\psi(\mathbf{r})|^2$  in Eq. (2.159) with the three-dimensional Dirac delta function  $\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R})$  [190], where  $\mathbf{R}$  is the position of the electron relative to the nucleus, and the integral simplifies to

$$\int \frac{3(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S} \cdot \boldsymbol{r})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l} \cdot \boldsymbol{r}) - (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l})r^{2}}{r^{5}} |\psi(\boldsymbol{r})|^{2} d^{3}r$$

$$= \int \frac{3(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S} \cdot \boldsymbol{r})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l} \cdot \boldsymbol{r}) - (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l})r^{2}}{r^{5}} \delta(\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{R}) d^{3}r \qquad (2.160)$$

$$=\frac{3(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S}\cdot\boldsymbol{e})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l}\cdot\boldsymbol{e})-\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l}}{R^{3}}$$
(2.161)

where R is the distance of the electron from the nucleus. We note here that, formally, R is the position of the *unpaired electron* relative to the nucleus of interest. However in situations where this nucleus of interest is different to the paramagnetic centre, R is effectively the position of the *nucleus of the paramagnetic centre* relative to the nucleus of interest, i.e. the positions of the nucleus and electron of the paramagnetic centre are essentially indistinguishable. If the errors introduced by this approximation are non-negligible, then we are automatically *not* in the point-dipole regime, which is the situation described by Walder et al. [200]. Assuming that the point-dipole approximation holds, the total hyperfine Hamiltonian is

$$\widehat{H}_{SI} = -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{3(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \cdot \boldsymbol{e})(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_I \cdot \boldsymbol{e}) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_I}{R^3} + \frac{8\pi}{3} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_I) \delta(\boldsymbol{R}) \right], \quad (2.162)$$

The first term is the well-known interaction between point dipoles [195], and the second term is the Fermi-contact interaction which is equal to zero unless the nucleus is actually located at the exact position of the electron, i.e.  $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{0}$ . This is illustrated in Fig. 2.9(c).

In order to simplify the calculation of the hyperfine interaction it is frequently assumed that we can apply the point-dipole approximation to determine the spin-dipolar part, and need only use electron delocalization for the Fermi-contact part. The errors in the former approximation are not great at large distances from the paramagnetic centre, i.e. typically when R > 4 Å, but can lead to inaccuracies for nuclei that are closer. This comparison has been discussed in some detail by Autschbach et al. [201]. The pointdipole approximation for the spin-dipolar interaction has been widely used for both paramagnetic proteins, and solid materials [45,46,102,11,17,66,67].

# 2.8.3. Interaction with a paramagnetic centre of multiple delocalised electrons

The expression for the hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian given above describes a hyperfine coupling to a single electron. For a system containing an ion with multiple unpaired electrons i with total electronic spin *S*, the Hamiltonian in Eq. (2.159) is modified so that we sum over all the electrons [185]:

$$\hat{H}_{\rm SI} = -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \sum_i \left[ \int \frac{3(\hat{\mu}_{s,i} \cdot \boldsymbol{r}_i)(\hat{\mu}_l \cdot \boldsymbol{r}_i) - (\hat{\mu}_{s,i} \cdot \hat{\mu}_l)r_i^2}{r_i^5} |\psi_i(\boldsymbol{r}_i)|^2 \mathrm{d}^3 r_i + \frac{8\pi}{3} (\hat{\mu}_{s,i} \cdot \hat{\mu}_l) |\psi_i(\boldsymbol{0})|^2 \right],$$
(2.163)

where  $\hat{\mu}_{s,i}$  and  $\psi_i(\mathbf{r}_i)$  are the magnetic moment and wavefunction of electron *i* at position  $\mathbf{r}_i$ . We can simplify the Hamiltonian by writing the sum over the electrons *i* in terms of the average spin density per electron  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r})/(2S)$ , where  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r})$  is the *total* spin-unpaired electron density at position  $\mathbf{r}$ , and 2S is the number of unpaired electrons. The Fermi-contact term can then be written as

$$-\frac{2\mu_0}{3}\sum_{i} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s,i} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l}) |\psi_i(\mathbf{0})|^2 = -\frac{2\mu_0}{3} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l}) \frac{1}{2S} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}), \qquad (2.164)$$

where  $\hat{\mu}_{S} = \sum_{i} \hat{\mu}_{s,i}$  is the magnetic moment operator for the total electron spin  $\hat{S}$ . Likewise the spin-dipolar term can be written as



**Fig. 2.9.** Illustration of the hyperfine interaction between a nucleus and unpaired electron. In (a) is shown the contact interaction. The nucleus n interacts with a delocalised electron, the electron density of which here takes the shape of a 3*d*-orbital centred on a different nucleus. The size of the interaction is proportional to the electron density located at the nuclear position  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$  (Eq. (2.158)). In (b) the same unpaired electron interacts with a more remote nuclear spin via the spin-dipolar interaction. The size of the interaction is given by the integral over all positions  $\mathbf{r}$  relative to the nucleus in Eq. (2.157). When the electron is approximated as a point electronic dipolar moment e in (c), the hyperfine interaction is given by Eq. (2.162), and depends on the distance *R* between the nucleus and electron. Now if  $R \neq 0$  the Fermi-contact interaction is zero, and the hyperfine interaction is purely spin-dipolar in nature.

$$-\frac{\mu_{0}}{4\pi}\sum_{i}\int \frac{3(\hat{\mu}_{s,i}\cdot\boldsymbol{r}_{i})(\hat{\mu}_{l}\cdot\boldsymbol{r}_{i}) - (\hat{\mu}_{s,i}\cdot\hat{\mu}_{l})r_{i}^{2}}{r_{i}^{5}}|\psi_{i}(\boldsymbol{r}_{i})|^{2}d^{3}r_{i}$$

$$= -\frac{\mu_{0}}{4\pi}\int \frac{3(\hat{\mu}_{s}\cdot\boldsymbol{r})(\hat{\mu}_{l}\cdot\boldsymbol{r}) - (\hat{\mu}_{s}\cdot\hat{\mu}_{l})r^{2}}{r^{5}}\frac{\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\boldsymbol{r})}{2S}d^{3}r.$$
(2.165)

The total hyperfine Hamiltonian is therefore

$$\widehat{H}_{SI} = -\frac{\mu_0}{8\pi S} \left[ \int \frac{3(\hat{\mu}_S \cdot \boldsymbol{r})(\hat{\mu}_I \cdot \boldsymbol{r}) - (\hat{\mu}_S \cdot \hat{\mu}_I)r^2}{r^5} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\boldsymbol{r}) d^3r + \frac{8\pi}{3} (\hat{\mu}_S \cdot \hat{\mu}_I) \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\boldsymbol{0}) \right].$$
(2.166)

# 2.8.4. Interaction with a paramagnetic centre of multiple localised electrons

Finally we consider the case where all the electrons are localised at the same position *R*, which we refer to as the position of the paramagnetic centre. The densities of each of the electrons *i* can now be replaced with the same Dirac delta function  $|\psi_i(\mathbf{r})|^2 = \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R})$ , and we can write the hyperfine Hamiltonian in terms of the effective spin electronic magnetic moment  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_s$  as follows:

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm SI} = -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \sum_i \left[ \frac{3(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s,i} \cdot \boldsymbol{e})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l \cdot \boldsymbol{e}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s,i} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l}{R^3} + \frac{8\pi}{3} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{s,i} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l) \delta(\boldsymbol{R}) \right] \quad (2.167)$$

$$=-\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi}\left[\frac{3(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S}\cdot\boldsymbol{\boldsymbol{e}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l}\cdot\boldsymbol{\boldsymbol{e}})-\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l}}{R^3}+\frac{8\pi}{3}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{l})\delta(\boldsymbol{R})\right],$$
(2.168)

which is the same as Eq. (2.162). Note in particular that, for localised electrons, there is no scaling of the hyperfine Hamiltonian by the factor 1/(2S).

### 2.8.5. The hyperfine coupling constant

For all the situations we have described above, we can write the hyperfine Hamiltonian in terms of the spin operators. Substituting in the corresponding expressions for the nuclear and electronic magnetic moments, namely  $\hat{\mu}_l = \hbar \gamma_l \hat{I}$  and  $\hat{\mu}_S = -\mu_B g_e \hat{S}$ , we obtain an expression of the form

$$H_{\rm SI} = \boldsymbol{S} \cdot \boldsymbol{A} \cdot \boldsymbol{I}, \tag{2.169}$$

where **A** is the hyperfine coupling tensor, which we have seen can be divided into the isotropic Fermi-contact coupling constant  $A^{FC}$ and the traceless and symmetric spin-dipolar tensor  $A^{SD}$ :

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{FC}} \boldsymbol{1} + \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}}.$$
 (2.170)

If the electrons are delocalised onto the ligands, the Fermi-contact coupling constant and the Cartesian components of the spindipolar tensor are given by [185,202]

$$A^{\rm FC} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I}{3S} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{0}), \qquad (2.171)$$

$$A_{ij}^{\rm SD} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I}{8\pi S} \int \frac{3r_i r_j - \delta_{ij} r^2}{r^5} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{r}) {\rm d}^3 r, \qquad (2.172)$$

where *i* and *j* are equal to *x*, *y*, or *z*, *e<sub>i</sub>* is the unit vector along axis *i*, and  $\delta_{ij}$  is the Kronecker delta. The coupling constant describing the hyperfine interaction to a multi-electron paramagnetic centre has a complicated interpretation. The Fermi-contact coupling constant is proportional to the total unpaired electron spin density transferred to the nucleus, i.e. the sum of the contributions from the individual electrons. But since each unpaired electron resides in a different orbital with a different spatial distribution of electron density, the contribution to the hyperfine interaction from each electron is different. For example, imagine a diatomic system comprising a *d*-transition-metal centre whose  $d_{z^2}$  orbital is coordinated to an *s*-orbital of the atom containing the nucleus of interest. We would expect the contribution to the Fermi-contact term from the  $d_{z^2}$ 

orbital to be non-zero. However an electron in the  $d_{xy}$  orbital may not be delocalized at all into the *s*-orbital due to the different symmetry, and so would have a Fermi-contact contribution of zero. In order to make the Fermi-contact contributions from different metal ions in different systems comparable we divide the coupling constant by the number of unpaired electrons, which is equal to 2*S* so as to give a "Fermi-contact coupling constant per electron", which is also known as the many-electron Fermi-contact coupling constant. The same considerations also apply to the spin-dipolar interaction.

If, on the other hand, the electrons can be treated as a point dipole with spin *S*, the hyperfine coupling tensor parameters are

$$A^{\rm FC} = \frac{2\mu_0\mu_{\rm B}g_e\hbar\gamma_I}{3}\delta(\mathbf{R}),\tag{2.173}$$

$$A_{ij}^{\rm SD} = b_{SI} [3e_i e_j - \delta_{ij}], \qquad (2.174)$$

where the point-dipole coupling constant  $b_{SI}$  is

$$b_{SI} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B g_e \hbar \gamma_I}{4\pi R^3}.$$
(2.175)

Here the scaling by the number of electrons has already been implicitly included. Since the electrons are point dipoles, the different spatial variation of the individual orbitals is suppressed, and each electron makes exactly the same contribution to the interaction. Hence the factor of 2*S* is not present.

We can also write Eq. (2.169) in terms of irreducible spherical tensors as follows

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm SI} = \sum_{l=0,2m=-l}^{s+l} (-1)^m A_{lm} \widehat{T}_{l-m}.$$
(2.176)

In the high-field limit, only the terms with m = 0 are retained and the Hamiltonian reduces to

$$\hat{H}_{\rm SI} = A_{00}\hat{T}_{00} + A_{20}\hat{T}_{20}. \tag{2.177}$$

The spin tensors  $\hat{T}_{l0}$  can be written down after referring to Table 2.2, with one important difference. Because the energy corresponding to the difference between the electron and nuclear Larmor frequencies is several orders of magnitude greater than the hyperfine coupling constant, the scalar product  $\hat{I} \cdot \hat{S}$  can be simplified as the flip-flop term  $\hat{I}_x \hat{S}_x + \hat{I}_y \hat{S}_y$  is averaged to zero in the calculation of the first-order average Hamiltonian, and only the longitudinal term  $\hat{I}_z \hat{S}_z$  remains [1]. Therefore the spin tensors are

$$\widehat{T}_{00} = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\widehat{I}_z\widehat{S}_z \tag{2.178}$$

$$\hat{T}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \hat{I}_z \hat{S}_z.$$
(2.179)

The spatial tensor components  $A_{I0}$  can be written down after referring to Table 2.3. Using this information we can write the spatial tensor components for delocalised electrons as

$$A_{00} = -\sqrt{3}A^{\rm FC}, \tag{2.180}$$

$$\widetilde{A}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \left( \widetilde{A}_{zz} - A^{\text{FC}} \right) \tag{2.181}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I}{8\pi S} \int \frac{3 z_{\rm PAF}^2 - r_{\rm PAF}^2}{r_{\rm PAF}^5} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r}_{\rm PAF}) \, \mathrm{d}^3 r_{\rm PAF}, \tag{2.182}$$

$$\widetilde{A}_{2\pm 1} = 0, \tag{2.183}$$

$$\widetilde{A}_{2\pm 2} = -\frac{1}{2}\eta^{\text{SD}} \left( \widetilde{A}_{zz} - A^{\text{FC}} \right), \qquad (2.184)$$

where  $\eta^{\text{SD}}$  is the asymmetry parameter, and  $r_{i,\text{PAF}}$  is a position coordinate measured in the PAF of the spin-dipolar tensor. Note that the spin-dipolar interaction is not necessarily axially symmetric. For localised electrons, the spatial tensor components are:

$$A_{00} = -\sqrt{3}A^{\text{FC}},\tag{2.185}$$

$$A_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{2}} \left( A_{zz} - A^{\rm PC} \right) \tag{2.186}$$

$$= \sqrt{6b_{SI}}, \qquad (2.187)$$
  
 $\widetilde{A}_{2+1} = 0 \qquad (2.188)$ 

$$\widetilde{A}_{2\pm 2} = 0,$$
 (2.189)  
 $\widetilde{A}_{2\pm 2} = 0,$  (2.189)

where  $\tilde{A}_{zz} - A^{FC} = 2b_{SI}$ . The spin-dipolar interaction between two point magnetic dipoles is always axially symmetric, and so  $\eta^{SD}$  and  $\tilde{A}_{2\pm 2}$  are therefore zero.

### 2.8.6. The hyperfine interaction in solid insulators

We now consider the form of the hyperfine interaction in solids. As discussed in Section 2.3.2, insulating materials exhibit no charge conductivity, and so we can treat the unpaired electrons as being largely localized on the paramagnetic centres. In this case we can write the hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian as a sum of terms of the type given in Section 2.8.5, to give

$$\widehat{H}_{IS} = \sum_{A} \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}.$$
(2.190)

Here  $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(A)}$  and  $\mathbf{A}^{(A)}$  are the electronic spin operator and the hyperfine coupling tensor due to the unpaired electrons on paramagnetic centre *A*.

# 2.8.7. The hyperfine interaction in solid metals

The hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian in metallic materials has a similar form to the Hamiltonian describing an isolated paramagnetic centre, but with some notable differences. Firstly we note that we cannot necessarily write the interaction in terms of a total electronic spin operator  $\hat{S}$ . We therefore write the Hamiltonian as a sum over the *N* electrons:

$$\widehat{H}_{lS} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_l}{4\pi} \widehat{\mathbf{I}} \cdot \sum_l \left[ \frac{3(\mathbf{r}_l \cdot \hat{\mathbf{s}}_l) \mathbf{r}_l - r_l^2 \hat{\mathbf{s}}_l}{r_l^5} + \frac{8\pi}{3} \delta(\mathbf{r}_l) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_l \right].$$
(2.191)

Secondly, in the sum over the electrons l, only electrons in states close to the Fermi level contribute to the hyperfine coupling. The other electrons are spin paired, and so do not contribute. Eq. (2.191) assumes that the electrons can be approximated as free electrons, with g-factor  $g_e$ .

We proceed as before and calculate the expectation value of  $\hat{H}_{IS}$  with respect to the electronic spatial degrees of freedom in a spatial state described by the many-electron wavefunction of Eq. (2.26). The result is a sum of hyperfine interactions with the individual electronic spins:

$$\widehat{H}_{lS} = \sum_{l} \widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}_{l} \cdot \boldsymbol{a}_{l} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{l}}, \qquad (2.192)$$

where  $a_l$  is the hyperfine coupling tensor describing the interaction with electron l, which is given by

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{l} = \frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}g_{e}\hbar\gamma_{l}}{4\pi}\int\psi(\boldsymbol{r}_{1},\boldsymbol{r}_{2},\ldots,\boldsymbol{r}_{N})^{*}\left[\frac{3r_{l}r_{l}-r_{l}^{2}\boldsymbol{1}}{r_{l}^{5}}+\frac{8\pi}{3}\delta(\boldsymbol{r}_{l})\boldsymbol{1}\right] \times\psi(\boldsymbol{r}_{1},\boldsymbol{r}_{2},\ldots,\boldsymbol{r}_{N})d^{3}r_{1}d^{3}r_{2}\ldots d^{3}r_{N}.$$
(2.193)

The NMR properties that result from this interaction are explored in Section 7.12.

### 2.8.8. Finite nucleus effects

The treatment of the hyperfine interaction in this section has so far assumed that the nucleus can be accurately modelled as a point charge *eZ*, with a distribution of infinitesimal width given by  $\rho(\mathbf{r}_l) = eZ\delta(\mathbf{r}_l)$ , where  $\mathbf{r}_l$  is the nuclear position coordinate. Assuming this model, we obtain a hyperfine Hamiltonian of the form of Eq. (2.159), from which follow all the remaining formulae up to the end of Section 2.8.7. However it has been shown that finite nucleus effects, where the nuclear charge has a finite volume, can have a non-negligible effect on the hyperfine interaction, particularly for heavy nuclei [203–206]. A finite nucleus has two effects on the hyperfine interaction, namely the change in electronic structure due to the non-zero nuclear volume and the change to the relevant operators due to the spread of nuclear charge [205].

The effect of a finite nucleus is modelled by replacing the point nuclear charge with a charge distribution  $\rho(\mathbf{r}_l)$  of finite width. This distribution can be modelled with any suitable function, but a radial Gaussian  $G_{\xi}(\mathbf{r}_l)$  is commonly used [203–206]:

$$\rho(\mathbf{r}_{I}) = eZG_{\xi}(\mathbf{r}_{I}), \qquad (2.194)$$

$$G_{\xi}(\mathbf{r}_{I}) = \left(\frac{\xi}{\pi}\right)^{3/2} \exp\left(-\xi r_{I}^{2}\right), \qquad (2.195)$$

where  $\xi$  is a parameter that is inversely proportional to the meansquare width of the distribution  $\langle r_i^2 \rangle$ :

$$\xi = \frac{3}{2\langle r_l^2 \rangle},$$
(2.196)

and the distribution is centred at  $\mathbf{r}_{l} = \mathbf{0}$ . The electron-nucleus potential  $V_{Sl}(\mathbf{r})$  is then given by

$$V_{SI}(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{Ze}{r} P(1/2, \xi r^2), \qquad (2.197)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}$  is the position of the electron relative to the centre of the nuclear charge distribution. The function P(a, x) is defined as

$$P(a,x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(a)} \int_0^x t^{a-1} \exp(-t) dt,$$
(2.198)

where  $\Gamma(a)$  is the gamma function, and a > 0.

The hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian can now be modified to include the finite nucleus effect. If we consider the hyperfine interaction with a single unpaired electron, we simply modify Eq. (2.159) to include the nuclear distribution. The modified hyperfine Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H}_{\text{SI}} &= -\frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \left[ \int P(5/2,\xi r^2) \frac{3(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \cdot \boldsymbol{r})(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l \cdot \boldsymbol{r}) - (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l)r^2}{r^5} |\psi(\boldsymbol{r})|^2 d^3 r \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{8\pi}{3} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l) \int G_{\xi}(\boldsymbol{r}) |\psi(\boldsymbol{r})|^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.199)$$

The first term is due to the spin-dipolar interaction with a nucleus of finite charge distribution, and the second term is the corresponding Femi-contact distribution. For the remainder of this review, we do not consider finite nucleus effects further. However we should remember that these effects become important for heavy elements [203–206].

### 2.9. Key concepts

- Nuclei and unpaired electrons possess magnetic moments, due to their spin, which define their molecular/atomic-level magnetic properties.
- The magnetization and magnetic susceptibility define the bulk magnetic properties of ensembles of nuclei and electrons.
- Solid materials with unpaired electrons can be characterized as insulators, semi-conductors, or metals according to their electronic structure.

- The molecular/atomic-level magnetic moments of nuclei and unpaired electrons couple with an external magnetic field, giving the Zeeman interaction, which is responsible for both the NMR and EPR spectra.
- The nuclear Zeeman resonance frequency depends on the local environment of the nucleus, with nuclei in different chemical sites having different resonance frequencies. This is the origin of the chemical shielding and chemical shift.
- The chemical shielding, in general, depends on the orientation of the chemical environment with respect to the external magnetic field. The orientationally-dependent part of the shielding is known as the CSA, and is described by a rank-two spherical tensor.
- The nuclear and electronic magnetic moments couple to each other resulting in the hyperfine interaction.
- The hyperfine interaction in isolated molecules, solid insulators, and metals is described by a hyperfine coupling constant, which comprises a 'through-bond' isotropic Fermi-contact term, and a 'through-space' anisotropic spin-dipolar term.
- For heavy nuclei, finite nuclear effects modify the hyperfine interaction. Here the nuclear charge distribution is modelled by a function of non-zero spatial width.

# Chapter 3: The paramagnetic shift in electron spin-only systems

In this chapter we describe the origin of the paramagnetic shifts of nuclei that are coupled to the unpaired electrons of paramagnetic systems such as organic radicals or transition-metal ions. The discussion is initially limited to spin-only paramagnets, where the electrons occupy a non-degenerate orbital state, with the more complicated effects due to orbital angular momentum, spin-orbit coupling, and the crystal field being dealt with in the following chapters.

The first question that is answered is why the hyperfine interaction, which takes exactly the same form as a heteronuclear coupling interaction, causes a shift in the nuclear resonance frequency and *not* a splitting of the NMR resonance. The reason for this is that the unpaired electrons relax on a timescale that is several orders of magnitude shorter than the timescales of both nuclear relaxation and the NMR experiment. Values of electron relaxation times for a range of metal ions have been tabulated [15], and are generally between  $10^{-14}$  and  $10^{-8}$  s, which are considerably shorter than typical nuclear longitudinal relaxation times of between 1 ms and several minutes. As a result the nucleus in effect does not interact with an electronic magnetic moment, but rather with its average value. This interaction has the same form as a chemical shift.

Three different, but essentially equivalent, explanations of why the paramagnetic shift occurs are proposed. Firstly we calculate the form of the NMR spectrum of a nucleus coupled to a free electron, and show that the effect of the fast electron relaxation is to average the two components of the resonance splitting to a single line that is shifted with respect to the nominal nuclear Larmor frequency. Secondly we show that we can also explain the shift as a result of the nucleus coupling to an average electronic magnetic moment that can be calculated from an average over the thermally-accessible electron energy levels. Thirdly we show that the thermal average of the electron magnetic moment is related to the bulk magnetic properties of the material via the magnetic susceptibility, and that we can therefore relate the paramagnetic shift to these bulk properties.

### 3.1. The origin of the paramagnetic shift

We begin by deriving the form of the spectrum of a heteronuclear spin system comprising two spins-1/2, which is already familiar to an NMR audience. Following this we will then substitute a single free electron for the second nucleus, and derive the corresponding paramagnetic shift.

### 3.1.1. Two-spin system comprising two spin-1/2 heteronuclei

We initially consider a spin system comprising two nuclear spins-1/2 *I* and *S* of different species that interact via an isotropic *J*-coupling. Note however that the argument that follows also applies to a dipolar coupling in a static single crystal, and can be extended in a straightforward manner to powder samples, and to include the effects of sample rotation. We also assume that the gyromagnetic ratios of *I* and *S* are positive and negative respectively, and that  $|\omega_{0,S}| > |\omega_{0,I}| \gg |J|$ , where  $\omega_{0,S}$  and  $\omega_{0,J}$  are the *I*-spin and *S*-spin Larmor frequencies respectively, and *J* is the heteronuclear *J*-coupling constant in rad s<sup>-1</sup>, which is here taken to be positive. This choice allows us to change the *S*-spin into an electron later on, without having to change the signs in all of the derived expressions.

The high-field Hamiltonian is

$$\widehat{H} = \hbar \omega_{0,l} \widehat{I}_z + \hbar \omega_{0,S} \widehat{S}_z + \hbar J \widehat{I}_z \widehat{S}_z, \qquad (3.1)$$

where the first and second terms represent *I*-spin and *S*-spin Zeeman interactions respectively, and the third term is the heteronuclear *J*-coupling interaction. The eigenstates of  $\hat{H}$  are the functions  $|IM_I, SM_S\rangle$ , which depend on the four quantum numbers I = 1/2, S = 1/2,  $M_I$ , and  $M_S$ . Here we omit *I* and *S*, and use the labels  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  to represent the allowed values of both  $M_I$  and  $M_S$ . In addition it proves useful to emphasize the energy order of the four spin states, and so we also label them as  $|1\rangle$ ,  $|2\rangle$ ,  $|3\rangle$ , and  $|4\rangle$  in order of increasing energy as follows:

$$|1\rangle = |\alpha\beta\rangle, \tag{3.2}$$

$$2\rangle = |\beta\beta\rangle, \tag{3.3}$$

$$3\rangle = |\alpha\alpha\rangle, \tag{3.4}$$

$$|4\rangle = |\beta\alpha\rangle. \tag{3.5}$$

The corresponding energies  $E_n$  are

$$E_1 = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,I} - \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,S} - \frac{1}{4}\hbar J$$
(3.6)

$$E_2 = -\frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,I} - \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,S} + \frac{1}{4}\hbar J,$$
(3.7)

$$E_{3} = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,I} + \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,S} + \frac{1}{4}\hbar J, \qquad (3.8)$$

$$E_4 = -\frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,I} + \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,S} - \frac{1}{4}\hbar J.$$
(3.9)

Note that the order of the energies is correct as  $\omega_{0,I} < 0$  and  $\omega_{0,S} > 0$ . A schematic of the energy levels is shown in Fig. 3.1(a).

We are interested in the transitions which give resonances in the NMR spectrum of the *I*-spin. These are the two single quantum transitions  $|1\rangle \rightarrow |2\rangle$  and  $|3\rangle \rightarrow |4\rangle$ , which have the transition frequencies  $\Delta \omega_{1\rightarrow 2}$  and  $\Delta \omega_{3\rightarrow 4}$  given by:

$$\Delta \omega_{1 \to 2} = \frac{E_2 - E_1}{\hbar} \tag{3.10}$$

$$= -\omega_{0,I} + \frac{1}{2}J, \tag{3.11}$$

$$\Delta\omega_{3\to4} = \frac{E_4 - E_3}{\hbar} \tag{3.12}$$

$$= -\omega_{0,I} - \frac{1}{2}J. \tag{3.13}$$

The two resonances are split by the coupling constant *J* and centred on  $-\omega_{0,I}$ , and so can be interpreted as the two components of the *I*-spin doublet, with the component due to the  $|1\rangle \rightarrow |2\rangle$  transition representing the *I*-spin single-quantum transition when the *S*-spin



**Fig. 3.1.** Illustration of the spin energy levels and NMR spectrum of a two-spin-1/2 system *I*-*S*, showing the differences between a system of two coupled nuclear spins-1/2 of different species, and a spin-1/2 coupled to an electron. In (a) is shown the array of four energy levels, 1–4, assuming that  $|\omega_{0,S}| > |\omega_{0,I}| > |J|$ ,  $\omega_{0,S} > 0$ ,  $\omega_{0,J} < 0$ , and J > 0. The two *I*-spin transitions are shown with a red and blue arrow, and are labelled with their frequencies  $\Delta \omega_{1-2}$  and  $\Delta \omega_{3-4}$ . The corresponding schematic of the *I*-spin NMR spectrum is shown in (b) for the case where *S* is a second nuclear spin. The spectrum contains two components of a doublet with the same intensity, centred on  $-\omega_{0,I}$ , and separated by the coupling constant *J*. Decoupling of the *S*-spin, or other fast exchange of the two *S*-spin spin states leads to a singlet at  $-\omega_{0,I}$  as shown in (c). The energy level diagram in (a) also applies to a nuclear spin *I* coupled to an electron *S* if we substitute *J* for *A*/h. The corresponding nuclear *I*-spin spectrum is shown in (d), and exhibits the same features as the spectrum in (b) with the exception that the two components of the doublet now have different intensities because the larger energy separation between the pairs of *I*-spin energy levels in the two transitions leads, via the Boltzmann distribution, to different equilibrium spin state population differences. The rapid electronic relaxation of *S* 'decouples' the *I* spin spectrum to give a singlet which is positioned at the centre of mass of the two doublet components as shown in (e). The singlet is thus offset frequency  $-\omega_{0,I}\delta_{\text{sp}}^{\text{sp}}$ , where  $\delta_{\text{iso}}^{\text{sp}}$  is the 'paramagnetic shift' due to the electron *S*.

is in the  $|\beta\rangle$  state, and the  $|3\rangle \rightarrow |4\rangle$  transition occurring with the S-spin in the  $|\alpha\rangle$  state.

The intensity of each peak is proportional to the population difference of the two states. For example the intensity  $I_{n\to p}$  of the transition  $|n\rangle \to |p\rangle$  varies as

$$I_{n \to p} \propto P_n - P_p. \tag{3.14}$$

The population of the state  $|n\rangle$ ,  $P_n$  is given by the Boltzmann distribution,

$$P_n = \frac{\exp(-\beta E_n)}{Q},\tag{3.15}$$

where  $\beta = 1/kT$ , *k* is the Boltzmann constant, *T* is the absolute temperature, and *Q* is the partition function

$$Q = \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_n). \tag{3.16}$$

Using these expressions we can write down the fraction  $f_{n\rightarrow p}$  of the total spectral intensity that is contained in the peak due to the transition  $|n\rangle \rightarrow |p\rangle$ . For the two *I*-spin transitions these fractional intensities are:

$$f_{1\to 2} = \frac{I_{1\to 2}}{I_{1\to 2} + I_{3\to 4}}$$
(3.17)

$$=\frac{P_1 - P_2}{P_1 - P_2 + P_3 - P_4},\tag{3.18}$$

$$f_{3\to4} = \frac{I_{3\to4}}{I_{1\to2} + I_{3\to4}}$$
(3.19)

$$=\frac{P_3 - P_4}{P_1 - P_2 + P_3 - P_4}.$$
(3.20)

Note that, according to these definitions,  $f_{1 \rightarrow 2} + f_{3 \rightarrow 4} = 1$ .

We can simplify these expressions somewhat by noting that the thermal energy kT greatly exceeds the energy separation of the four energy levels, which allows us to expand the exponential in the expression for the population of the state  $|n\rangle$  as a Taylor series in  $\beta$ , and to truncate it at the first-order term:

$$\exp(-\beta E_n) = 1 - \beta E_n + \mathcal{O}(\beta^2). \tag{3.21}$$

Substituting this into the expressions in Eqs. (3.18) and (3.20) we obtain, to zeroth order in  $\beta$ ,

$$f_{1\to2} = \frac{E_2 - E_1}{E_4 - E_3 + E_2 - E_1} + \mathcal{O}(\beta)$$
(3.22)

$$=\frac{\Delta\omega_{1\to 2}}{\Delta\omega_{3\to 4}+\Delta\omega_{1\to 2}}+\mathcal{O}(\beta),$$
(3.23)

$$f_{3\to4} = \frac{E_4 - E_3}{E_4 - E_3 + E_2 - E_1} + \mathcal{O}(\beta)$$
(3.24)

$$= \frac{\Delta\omega_{3\to4}}{\Delta\omega_{3\to4} + \Delta\omega_{1\to2}} + \mathcal{O}(\beta), \qquad (3.25)$$

and hence

$$f_{1\to 2} = \frac{-\omega_{0,I} + \frac{1}{2}J}{-2\omega_{0,I}},\tag{3.26}$$

$$f_{3\to4} = \frac{-\omega_{0,I} - \frac{1}{2}J}{-2\omega_{0,I}}.$$
(3.27)

Remembering that  $|J| \ll |\omega_{0,J}|$ , we see that both transitions, and therefore both components of the doublet, have the same fractional intensity of 1/2. A schematic of the corresponding *I*-spin spectrum is shown in Fig. 3.1(b).

Now let us imagine that the spectrum is acquired whilst the  $|\alpha\rangle$  and  $|\beta\rangle$  spin states of the *S*-spin are rapidly interconverted. Such a situation may arise either because we are applying decoupling irradiation to *S*, or because *S* is relaxing on a timescale that is fast compared to the *I*-spin relaxation. Under these circumstances the two components of the *I*-spin doublet collapse to a singlet, the spectral position of which  $\overline{\omega}$  is given by the average of the two spectral frequencies:

$$\overline{\omega} = f_{1 \to 2} \Delta \omega_{1 \to 2} + f_{3 \to 4} \Delta \omega_{3 \to 4} \tag{3.28}$$

$$=\frac{1}{2}\left(-\omega_{0,I}+\frac{1}{2}J\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(-\omega_{0,I}-\frac{1}{2}J\right)$$
(3.29)

$$= -\omega_{0,I},\tag{3.30}$$

i.e. the peak appears at minus the *I*-spin Larmor frequency, as shown in Fig. 3.1(c).

# 3.1.2. Two-spin system comprising one spin-1/2 nucleus and a free electron

A spin system comprising a single spin-1/2 nucleus *I* coupled to a free electron *S* can be treated in an analogous way. The high-field Hamiltonian is the same as in Eq. (3.1), with the exception that we write the electron Zeeman interaction in terms of  $\mu_B g_e$ , and we replace the coupling  $\hbar J$  with a hyperfine coupling constant A (which is in units of energy, rather than frequency):

$$H = \hbar \omega_{0,I} I_z + \mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0 S_z + A I_z S_z. \tag{3.31}$$

.

<u>^</u>

The eigenstates are the same as those in Eqs. (3.2)–(3.5), and have the corresponding energies:

$$E_1 = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,l} - \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0 - \frac{1}{4}A, \qquad (3.32)$$

$$E_2 = -\frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,I} - \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0 + \frac{1}{4}A, \qquad (3.33)$$

$$E_{3} = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,l} + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_{e}B_{0} + \frac{1}{4}A, \qquad (3.34)$$

$$E_4 = -\frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_{0,l} + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0 - \frac{1}{4}A.$$
(3.35)

The two nuclear-spin transitions have the following frequencies:

$$\Delta\omega_{1\to 2} = \frac{E_2 - E_1}{\hbar} \tag{3.36}$$

$$= -\omega_{0,l} + \frac{1}{2}\hbar^{-1}A, \qquad (3.37)$$

$$\Delta \omega_{3 \to 4} = \frac{E_4 - E_3}{\hbar} \tag{3.38}$$

$$= -\omega_{0,I} - \frac{1}{2}\hbar^{-1}A.$$
 (3.39)

Here we encounter the key difference between the energy levels of the heteronuclear two-spin system, and the nucleus-electron two-spin system, which is that the electron Zeeman interaction is much larger than the nuclear Zeeman interaction. This is reflected in the values of the gyromagnetic ratios for <sup>1</sup>H and the free electron which are  $2.675 \times 10^8$  rad s<sup>-1</sup> and  $-1.761 \times 10^{11}$  rad s<sup>-1</sup> respectively (ratio  $|\gamma_S/\gamma_I| = 658$ ), and the Larmor frequencies of -500 MHz and +329 GHz at a magnetic field of 11.74 T.

Therefore when we calculate the intensities of the spectral peaks using Eqs. (3.18) and (3.20) we have to bear in mind that the larger ratio of  $\mu_B g_e/(kT)$  means we can no longer truncate the exponential factors in the Boltzmann distribution at first order in  $\beta$ , and must include terms of order  $\beta^2$ :

$$\exp(-\beta E_n) = 1 - \beta E_n + \frac{1}{2}\beta^2 E_n^2 + \mathcal{O}(\beta^3).$$
(3.40)

If we again assume that the coupling constant has a negligible effect on the populations of the states the intensities of the two nuclear transitions are, to first order in  $\beta$ :

$$f_{1\to 2} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} \mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0 \beta, \tag{3.41}$$

$$f_{3\to4} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{4} \mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0 \beta. \tag{3.42}$$

We see that the transition between the two lower states,  $|1\rangle$  and  $|2\rangle$ , has a greater intensity than the transition between the two higher states,  $|3\rangle$  and  $|4\rangle$ . The corresponding NMR spectrum is illustrated in Fig. 3.1(d). In a magnetic field of 11.74 T at a temperature of 298 K, the difference in peak intensities is approximately 0.03, or 3%. At first sight this appears to be very small, but as we will see it is enough to exert a decisive effect on the NMR spectrum.

The rapid electron relaxation effectively "decouples" the NMR spectrum, resulting in a singlet appearing at a frequency  $\overline{\omega}$  that is the weighted average of the two peaks. This frequency is

$$\overline{\omega} = f_{1 \to 2} \Delta \omega_{1 \to 2} + f_{3 \to 4} \Delta \omega_{3 \to 4} \tag{3.43}$$

$$= -\omega_{0,I} + \frac{\mu_{\mathsf{B}} g_{\mathsf{e}}^{\mathsf{A}} B_{0}}{4\hbar kT}.$$
(3.44)

The corresponding spectrum is shown in Fig. 3.1(e). We see immediately that the resonance is offset from  $-\omega_{0,I}$  by an amount  $\mu_{\rm B}g_eAB_0/(4\hbar kT)$  that is proportional to the magnetic field  $B_0$ . It is therefore equivalent to an isotropic chemical shift which, from Eqs. (2.109) and (2.130), has a Hamiltonian  $\hat{H} = \hbar\omega_{0,I}(1 + \delta_{\rm iso}^S)$  from which we can calculate a transition frequency

$$\overline{\omega} = -\omega_{0,l} (1 + \delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm S}). \tag{3.45}$$

Comparing Eqs. (3.44) and (3.45) we deduce that the shift is equal to

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm S} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e A}{4 \hbar \gamma_i k T}.$$
(3.46)

We have identified this contribution as the paramagnetic shift, as it is due solely to the interaction between the nucleus and the unpaired electron. The paramagnetic shift scales as A/(kT), which can be understood as follows. Increasing the temperature results in a smaller shift, simply because the higher-energy states become more populated relative to the lower-energy states, and the difference between the intensities of the two transitions is reduced. Eventually we approach the limit encountered in the case of the heteronuclear two-spin system, with the paramagnetic shift tending to zero. This inverse proportionality is a form of the Curie Law, which we will see again in the discussion of the magnetic susceptibility. On the other hand as we increase the hyperfine coupling constant the shift also increases as we are averaging over a larger separation of the peaks.

These observations all point to the idea that the hyperfine interaction has been scaled down by a temperature-dependent factor to give the paramagnetic shift. This is an idea we will return to later, and quantify more formally, when we discuss the role of the magnetic susceptibility.

# 3.2. The thermal average of the electron magnetic moment: the Brillouin function and the Curie spin

The ideas developed in the previous section act as a visual explanation of why we observe a paramagnetic shift in the presence of unpaired electrons. However this is not the most convenient way to calculate the shift, especially for more complex systems with multiple electrons and orbital angular momentum. A better method turns out to be to calculate the average electronic magnetic moment first, and then to couple that to the nucleus via the hyperfine interaction.

3.2.1. The Hamiltonian and the pseudo spin

The Hamiltonian we use in this section is

$$H = \hbar \omega_{0,I} I_z + \mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0 S_z + \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{A} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{I}}, \qquad (3.47)$$

where the first term is the nuclear Zeeman interaction, which ignores the effects of the orbital contribution to the chemical shielding, the second term is the electron Zeeman interaction, and the third term is the hyperfine coupling.

For the electron Zeeman interaction we assume that the interaction is spatially isotropic, with a *g*-factor equal to  $g_e$ . However we no longer restrict the discussion to a single free electron, but to a *paramagnetic centre* containing *N* unpaired electrons with total spin *S*. Such a situation is appropriate, for instance, for describing spin-only transition-metal ions in a perfectly cubic ligand-field environment. Here we introduce the concept of *pseudo spin*, where we model the energy levels of the electrons as being due to a single effective spin  $\tilde{S}$  which has the same multiplicity  $2\tilde{S} + 1$  as the true states [185]. For the first-row *d*-block transition metals the pseudo spin is the same as the true spin *S*, so we drop the tilde.

The form of the hyperfine interaction we use here does not make use of the high-field approximation. This allows us to treat coupling constants that are not small compared to the Zeeman interactions in the most general way possible. At this point we remind ourselves that the hyperfine coupling tensor is the sum of an isotropic Fermi-contact term, and a symmetric spin-dipolar tensor.

We saw in the previous section that the paramagnetic shift is due to electronic relaxation, which occurs on a timescale that is orders of magnitude shorter than nuclear relaxation, so that during the observation of the nuclear-spin transitions the electronic spins are effectively sampling all the electronic energy levels according to their equilibrium configuration. This means that, in effect, the hyperfine interaction  $\hat{H}_{SI}$  does not really couple the nuclear magnetic moment to the electronic magnetic moment, but rather to the average of the electronic magnetic moment. Before continuing, we note that whilst this model is sufficient for understanding the paramagnetic shift, it does not give a correct explanation of nuclear relaxation in paramagnetic systems. This is because the random processes that cause nuclear relaxation occur on timescales that are several orders of magnitude shorter than those of nuclear relaxation itself, and so we must consider the full interaction between the nuclear and electronic dipole moments. This is discussed in more detail in Chapters 8 and 9. For now we confine our discussion to the shift, and are therefore able to write the hyperfine Hamiltonian as

$$\widehat{H}_{SI} = \langle \widehat{\mathbf{S}} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{I}}, \tag{3.48}$$

where  $\langle \hat{S} \rangle$  is the expectation value of the electronic spin vector. This expectation value represents the time average of the electron spin, which we will assume to be equivalent to the average over the entire ensemble of paramagnetic centres. The latter is equal to the Boltzmann average of the components  $\hat{S}_i$  of the spin:

$$\langle \widehat{S}_i \rangle = \frac{\sum_n \langle n | \widehat{S}_i | n \rangle \exp(-\beta E_n)}{\sum_n \exp(-\beta E_n)},$$
(3.49)

where the  $|n\rangle$  and the  $E_n$  are the eigenstates and energies of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (3.47). To proceed we simplify matters by noting that the dominant term in the Hamiltonian is the electronic Zeeman interaction, and that the other terms have a negligible effect on the electronic spin energy levels. Therefore we take the eigenstates and energies simply to be those of the Zeeman interaction, namely

$$|n\rangle = |SM_S\rangle, \qquad E_n \equiv E(S, M_S) = \mu_B g_e B_0 M_S.$$
 (3.50)

We note that the lowest-energy state is  $|S - S\rangle$ , which is consequence of the negative gyromagnetic ratio of the electron.

We see immediately that the transverse components of the expectation value of the spin are zero:

$$\langle \widehat{S}_{x} \rangle = \langle \widehat{S}_{y} \rangle = 0. \tag{3.51}$$

This is because these components are perpendicular to the applied field, and so there is no driving force for inducing a net magnetic moment in these directions. However there is such a driving force parallel to the field, resulting in the longitudinal component  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle$  being non-zero:

$$\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle = \frac{\sum_{M_s=-S}^{+S} \langle SM_s | \widehat{S}_z | SM_s \rangle \exp(-\beta E(S, M_s))}{\sum_{M_s=-S}^{+S} \exp(-\beta E(S, M_s))}$$
(3.52)

$$=\frac{\sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S}M_{S}\exp(-\beta\mu_{B}g_{e}B_{0}M_{S})}{\sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S}\exp(-\beta\mu_{B}g_{e}B_{0}M_{S})}.$$
(3.53)

Defining  $x = -\beta \mu_B g_e B_0$  we can write Eq. (3.53) as

$$\langle \hat{S}_{z} \rangle = \frac{\sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S} M_{S} \exp(M_{S} x)}{\sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S} \exp(M_{S} x)}$$
(3.54)

$$=\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\ln\left[\sum_{M_{\mathrm{S}}=-\mathrm{S}}^{+\mathrm{S}}\exp(M_{\mathrm{S}}x)\right],\tag{3.55}$$

where the move to the last line can be verified by calculating the derivative. The sum is a simple geometric progression, which can be written in the following closed form:

$$\sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S} \exp(M_{S}x) = \frac{\sinh\left[(S+\frac{1}{2})x\right]}{\sinh\left[\frac{1}{2}x\right]}.$$
(3.56)

Calculating the derivative now gives, after some algebra:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}\ln\left[\frac{\sinh\left[\left(S+\frac{1}{2}\right)x\right]}{\sinh\left[\frac{1}{2}x\right]}\right] = \left(S+\frac{1}{2}\right)\coth\left[\left(S+\frac{1}{2}\right)x\right] - \frac{1}{2}\coth\left[\frac{1}{2}x\right].$$
(3.57)

The expectation value of the *z*-component of the spin is now

$$\langle S_z \rangle = -SB_S(y), \tag{3.58}$$

where the Brillouin function  $B_S(y)$  is defined as

$$B_{S}(y) = \frac{2S+1}{2S} \operatorname{coth}\left[\left(\frac{2S+1}{2S}\right)y\right] - \frac{1}{2S} \operatorname{coth}\left(\frac{y}{2S}\right), \quad (3.59)$$

and  $y = \beta \mu_B g_e B_0 S = -Sx$ .

Eq. (3.58) is a general expression for the value of the expectation value of  $\hat{S}_z$  for *any* temperature and magnetic field. Representative curves are plotted in Fig. 3.2(a) for a range of magnetic fields and temperatures. However for typical values of the field and temperature in high-resolution NMR, including the current maximum available field of 28.18 T and the lowest readily-available temperature of 90 K, we are in the high-temperature limit  $\mu_B g_e B_0 / kT \ll 1$ ,



**Fig. 3.2.** The Brillouin function in Eq. (3.59) for an electronic spin S = 1/2 plotted as a function of the applied magnetic field for a range of experimentally-available temperatures. The plots in (a) show the Brillouin function  $B_5(y)$  for values of the external field up to 2000 T for temperatures of 100, 200, and 300 K. Saturation is reached at values of  $B_0$  between approximately 300 T (at 100 K) and 1500 T (300 K). Part (b) shows an expansion of the plots in (a) up to the commercially-available magnetic field of 28 T (black curves), along with the linear approximation of Eq. (3.61) (grey curves). For each temperature the two curves are indistinguishable, except for the lowest temperature of 100 K where there is a small departure of  $B_5(y)$  from linear behaviour.

and the general form of the Brillouin function is not needed. We can therefore expand the coth function as a Laurent series [190],

$$\operatorname{coth}(z) = \frac{1}{z} + \frac{1}{3}z - \frac{1}{45}z^3 + \frac{2}{945}z^5 + \mathcal{O}(z^7), \tag{3.60}$$

and truncate at the lowest order in *y* to give the following approximation to the Brillouin function:

$$B_{S}(y) = \frac{S+1}{3S}y + \mathcal{O}(y^{3}).$$
(3.61)

The expectation value of  $\hat{S}_z$  is therefore

$$\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1) B_0}{3kT}.$$
(3.62)

The  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle$  above is referred to as the *Curie spin*, as it exhibits a Curie temperature dependence of 1/T. The Brillouin function is an odd function in  $\beta$ , and so the next-lowest-order term in the expansion varies as  $1/T^3$ , i.e. there is no term in  $1/T^2$  for an isotropic spin system. Comparisons of the full Brillouin function and the high-temperature approximation are shown in Fig. 3.2(b).

We see immediately that the Curie spin is negative, which we rationalise by noting that, at finite temperature, the states with the more negative values of  $M_S$  are more populated, as we see in Fig. 3.3(a). In addition we see that the magnitude of the Curie spin is proportional to the electron Zeeman energy  $\mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0$ . If we increase this energy, for example by raising the magnetic field, the separation between the energy levels increases and the lower-energy states with negative  $M_{\rm S}$  become more populated relative to the higher energy states, as seen in Fig. 3.3(b). A similar argument also explains the Curie temperature dependence, namely that a lower thermal energy kT increases the populations of the lower-energy states relative to the higher-energy states, as we see in Fig. 3.3(c). In both cases the magnitude of the Curie spin increases. The components of the expectation value of the electronic magnetic moment are proportional to those of the Curie spin, i.e.  $\langle \hat{\mu}_i \rangle = -\mu_{\rm B} g_e \langle \widehat{S}_i \rangle$ , and are given by the following expressions:

$$\langle \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle = \langle \hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{y}} \rangle = \mathbf{0}, \tag{3.63}$$

$$\langle \hat{\mu}_{z} \rangle = \frac{\mu_{B}^{2} g_{e}^{2} S(S+1) B_{0}}{3kT}.$$
 (3.64)



**Fig. 3.3.** Illustration of the factors affecting the populations of the electronic spin states according to the Boltzmann distribution, and the resulting Curie spin. The population distribution of the electronic spin states  $|SM_S\rangle$  is shown for an electronic spin S = 3/2 in (a). The states with more negative  $M_S$  lie lower in energy and are more populated relative to the higher-energy states, hence the Curie spin is negative. The populations of the lower-energy states can be increased relative to those of the higher-energy states either by increasing the size of the external magnetic field  $B_0$  (b), or decreasing the temperature T (c). When the field is increased, or the temperature is lowered, sufficiently that  $\mu_{B}g_{e}B_{0}/kT \rightarrow \infty$  only the lowest-energy state with  $M_{S} = -S$  is populated, and the electronic spins are saturated, as shown in (d).

We note that  $\langle \hat{\mu}_z \rangle$  is proportional to the square of the magnitude of the total electronic magnetic moment  $\mu_{\text{eff}} = \mu_{\text{B}} g_e \sqrt{S(S+1)}$ .

Another regime of interest is the saturation regime, where either the field is sufficiently high or the temperature is sufficiently low that  $\mu_{B}g_{e}B_{0}/kT \rightarrow \infty$ . In this case both the coth function and  $B_{S}(y)$  tend to unity, and the expectation value of  $\hat{S}_{z}$ ,  $\langle \hat{S}_{z} \rangle_{sat}$ , is

$$\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}} = -S. \tag{3.65}$$

At saturation only the lowest-energy state with  $M_s = -S$  is populated, with all the paramagnetic centres having this same  $M_s$ . This situation is shown in Fig. 3.3(d).

Returning to the high-temperature regime we see that the Curie spin is linear in  $B_0$ , so is the corresponding hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian  $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}$ . It has exactly the same form as the nuclear shielding interaction Hamiltonian in Eq. (2.84), and we can equate the two to determine the corresponding paramagnetic shielding tensor:

$$\hbar \gamma_{I} \mathbf{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}} = \langle \hat{\mathbf{S}} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}, \qquad (3.66)$$

from which we obtain:

$$\hbar \gamma_I \mathbf{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = \langle \hat{\mathbf{S}} \rangle \cdot \mathbf{A}. \tag{3.67}$$

Our calculation of the Curie spin assumes a magnetic field  $B_0$  along z, and so the only components of the paramagnetic shielding we obtain are the  $\sigma_{zj}$ , where j is x, y, or z:

$$\sigma_{zj} = \frac{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle A_{zj}}{\hbar \gamma_l B_0}.$$
(3.68)

We can repeat the calculation with the field along *x* or *y*, with a Zeeman interaction of  $\mu_B g_e B_0 \hat{S}_x$  or  $\mu_B g_e B_0 \hat{S}_y$  respectively, and obtain the corresponding *x*- and *y*-components of the Curie spin, which are the same as the *z*-component above, i.e.:

$$\langle \widehat{S}_{x} \rangle = \langle \widehat{S}_{y} \rangle = \langle \widehat{S}_{z} \rangle = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1) B_0}{3kT}.$$
(3.69)

Note that, for each calculation, the components of the Curie spin that are perpendicular to the applied field are zero, and so in order to obtain the full paramagnetic shielding tensor we must apply the field along each of the three axes in turn. This is because only three of the nine components of the shielding tensor dictate the response of the system to a field applied in a single direction. The full form of the shielding tensor is therefore

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}} \mathsf{g}_{e} S(\mathrm{S}+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_{l} k T} \boldsymbol{A}. \tag{3.70}$$

The Curie spin is, of course, proportional to the thermal average of the magnetic moment of the total spin *S*, and multiplying the hyperfine coupling constant in Eqs. (2.171) and (2.172) by the Curie spin gives the total paramagnetic shift due to all the unpaired electrons.

Note that although the hyperfine tensor **A** depends on the nuclear species, the ratio  $\mathbf{A}/(\hbar\gamma_l)$ , which appears in the expression for the paramagnetic shielding in Eq. (3.70) does not, as it is independent of  $\gamma_l$ . This independence from the nuclear species is a general property of all chemical shielding tensors.

We can write the paramagnetic shielding tensor in terms of the irreducible spherical tensor components  $\sigma_{lm}^{S}$ , and apply the high-field approximation. We saw in Section 2.6 that the only components that are significant at high field are  $\sigma_{00}^{S}$  and  $\sigma_{20}^{S}$ . Note that, although the high-field approximation may not be valid for the hyperfine interaction, it can be more safely applied to the paramagnetic shielding interaction as the size of the hyperfine coupling constant is scaled down by the Curie spin. The irreducible spherical tensor components are therefore

$$\sigma_{00}^{\rm S} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_l k T} A_{00}, \qquad (3.71)$$

$$\sigma_{20}^{\rm S} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_I kT} A_{20}.$$
(3.72)

The orientation dependence of the rank-two part of  $\sigma$  is exactly the same as the orientation dependence of the rank-two part of A, and both share the same PAF.

The isotropic part of the paramagnetic shielding tensor  $\sigma_{
m iso}^{
m S}$  is

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm S} = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_{00}^{\rm S} \tag{3.73}$$

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\mathsf{B}}g_{e}S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_{I}kT} \left(-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}A_{00}\right)$$
(3.74)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\mathsf{B}} \mathsf{g}_{e} S(S+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_{l} kT} A^{\mathsf{FC}}.$$
(3.75)

We see that the Fermi-contact interaction gives a paramagnetic shielding that is entirely isotropic. Substituting in the expression in Eq. (2.171) we obtain

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm S} = -\frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 (S+1)}{9kT} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}). \tag{3.76}$$

By contrast we expect the spin-dipolar contribution to the paramagnetic shielding to be wholly anisotropic and symmetric, and therefore contribute only to the anisotropy and asymmetry of the interaction. If we compare the spherical components of the ranktwo part of the shielding and hyperfine tensors in their common PAF:

$$\begin{split} \tilde{\sigma}_{20}^{S} &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \Delta \sigma^{S}, \\ \tilde{A}_{20} &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \left( \tilde{A}_{zz} - A^{\text{FC}} \right) \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\mu_{0} \mu_{B} g_{e} \hbar \gamma_{I}}{8 \pi S} \int \frac{3 z_{\text{PAF}}^{2} - r_{\text{PAF}}^{2}}{r_{\text{PAF}}^{5}} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{r}_{\text{PAF}}) \, \mathrm{d}^{3} r_{\text{PAF}}, \end{split}$$
(3.77)

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{2\pm 1}^{S} = 0, \qquad \tilde{A}_{2\pm 1} = 0,$$
(3.78)

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{2\pm2}^{\rm S} = -\frac{1}{2}\eta^{\rm S}\Delta\sigma^{\rm S}, \qquad \tilde{A}_{2\pm2} = -\frac{1}{2}\eta^{\rm SD}\left(\tilde{A}_{zz} - A^{\rm FC}\right), \tag{3.79}$$

we can deduce that the shielding anisotropy  $\Delta \sigma^{\rm S}$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{\rm S}$  are:

$$\Delta\sigma^{\rm S} = -\frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 (S+1)}{24\pi kT} \int \frac{3 z_{\rm PAF}^2 - r_{\rm PAF}^2}{r_{\rm PAF}^5} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r}_{\rm PAF}) \, \mathrm{d}^3 r_{\rm PAF}, \tag{3.80}$$

$$\eta^{\rm S} = \eta^{\rm SD}.\tag{3.81}$$

In terms of the shift convention, these expressions become

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm S} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 (S+1)}{9kT} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}), \tag{3.82}$$

$$\Delta\delta^{S} = \frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}^{2}g_{e}^{2}(S+1)}{24\pi kT} \int \frac{3z_{PAF}^{2} - r_{PAF}^{2}}{r_{PAF}^{5}} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\boldsymbol{r}_{PAF}) d^{3}r_{PAF}, \qquad (3.83)$$

$$\eta^{\rm S} = \eta^{\rm SD}. \tag{3.84}$$

The interaction of a nucleus with a single paramagnetic centre therefore results in an isotropic paramagnetic shift  $\delta_{iso}^{S}$  due to the Fermi-contact interaction, usually referred to as the Fermi-contact shift and first described by McConnell and Chesnut [36], and a shielding anisotropy  $\Delta \delta^{S}$  due to the spin-dipolar interaction, and hence referred to as the dipolar shift anisotropy.

Finally we note that if we set S = 1/2 in Eq. (3.82) we obtain the same value for the isotropic shift in Eq. (3.46) that we derived by averaging the position of the two components of the doublet in the NMR spectrum.

#### 3.3. The magnetic susceptibility

As discussed in the previous section, the effect of applying a magnetic field to an electronic spin system is to lift the degeneracy of the manifold of states, giving the net magnetic moment in Eq. (3.64) that is parallel to the direction of the applied field, and whose magnitude is proportional to the Curie spin. To complement the quantum mechanical treatment we have already seen, we can also determine the average effect of the magnetic field on the *bulk* material via the magnetic susceptibility  $\chi$ , which is of interest as this property can be measured independently. Following the description by Bertini et al. [16], we describe the susceptibility and relate it to the paramagnetic shift tensor.

### 3.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk

The application of an external magnetic field  $H_0$  to an ensemble of spins induces a bulk magnetization M (the total induced magnetic moment  $\mu_{ind}$  per unit volume V), which is proportional to  $H_0$ , as seen from Eq. (2.10):

$$M = \chi_V H_0, \tag{3.85}$$

where the dimensionless constant of proportionality  $\chi_V$  is the magnetic susceptibility per unit volume. As seen in Section 2.2 we can, for a linear and paramagnetic material, relate the magnetic field  $H_0$  to the induction  $B_0$  via the expression

$$B_0 \approx \mu_0 H_0, \tag{3.86}$$

and so the magnetisation is given by [188]:

$$M = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \chi_V B_0.$$
(3.87)

In addition to  $\chi_V$  there are other definitions of the susceptibility. For example the molar susceptibility  $\chi_M$  (units m<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup>) relates the size of the induced magnetic moment per mole to the external field. The molar susceptibility is given by  $\chi_M = V_M \chi_V$ , where  $V_M$  is the volume that contains one mole of the paramagnetic system, and so

$$MV_M = \mu_{\rm ind} \frac{V_M}{V} = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \chi_M B_0,$$
 (3.88)

where we identify  $\mu_{ind}V_M/V$  as the total induced magnetic moment per mole. For a large ensemble of spins, we can write this quantity as  $\langle \mu \rangle N_A$ , where  $\langle \mu \rangle$  is the ensemble average of the induced magnetic moment, and  $N_A$  is Avogadro's number. This leads us to another definition of the susceptibility, which is the magnetic susceptibility per molecule  $\chi = \chi_M/N_A$  (units m<sup>3</sup>), which relates  $\langle \mu \rangle$  to the external field as follows:

$$\langle \mu \rangle = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \, \chi B_0. \tag{3.89}$$

Throughout the rest of this review this definition is the one we utilise, and we refer to  $\chi$  simply as the "magnetic susceptibility". In a solid paramagnetic material containing a single species of metal ion, and in which there are no clear molecular units,  $\chi$  is more properly identified as the magnetic susceptibility per metal ion.

Eq. (3.89) gives the average magnetic moment per molecule induced by a magnetic field  $B_0$ , which is in turn a result of the Zeeman interaction of the individual magnetic moments of the spins i,  $\mu^{(i)} = -\mu_{\rm B}g_eS_z^{(i)}$ , where  $S_z^{(i)}$  is the z-component of the spin *i*. We are therefore able to draw a parallel between the bulk susceptibility  $\chi$  and the g-factor  $g_e$ , and identify the former as a 'bulk representation' of the latter. This correspondence will be presented more formally in the following section.

# 3.3.2. The susceptibility in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters

We can immediately relate the average induced magnetic moment  $\langle \mu \rangle$  in Eq. (3.89) to the expectation value of  $\hat{\mu}_z$ . We have already calculated this in the high-temperature limit, with the result shown in Eq. (3.64), and reproduced below:

$$\langle \hat{\mu}_z \rangle = \frac{\mu_B^2 g_e^2 S(S+1) B_0}{3kT}.$$
(3.90)

Comparing this with Eq. (3.89) gives us the expression for the magnetic susceptibility [16]:

$$\chi = \frac{\mu_0}{B_0} \langle \hat{\mu}_z \rangle \tag{3.91}$$

$$=\frac{\mu_0\mu_B^2g_e^2S(S+1)}{3kT}.$$
(3.92)

The susceptibility has a Curie temperature dependence, and is proportional to the square of the magnitude of the electronic magnetic moment  $\mu_{\rm eff}$ .

#### 3.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility

We now derive the expression for the paramagnetic shift tensor in terms of the magnetic susceptibility. As before we begin with the Hamiltonian describing the hyperfine interaction, this time using the form in Eq. (2.166) which is in terms of the electronic and nuclear magnetic moments. However, as before, we must remember that the nuclear magnetic moment couples to the expectation value of the electronic magnetic moment  $\langle \hat{\mu}_s \rangle$ , and so we must modify Eq. (2.166) accordingly to give the paramagnetic shielding Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H} &= -\frac{\mu_0}{8\pi S} \left[ \int \frac{3(\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \rangle \cdot \boldsymbol{r})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l \cdot \boldsymbol{r}) - (\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \rangle \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l)r^2}{r^5} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\boldsymbol{r}) \mathrm{d}^3 r \right. \\ &+ \frac{8\pi}{3} (\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \rangle \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_l) \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\boldsymbol{0}) \right], \end{aligned} \tag{3.93}$$

where we have assumed that the electrons are delocalised. The above Hamiltonian can easily be modified for localised electrons as described previously. The expectation value of the electronic magnetic moment in terms of the susceptibility is the operator equivalent of Eq. (3.89) which, for an arbitrary direction of the external magnetic field **B**<sub>0</sub> is

$$\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\rm S} \rangle = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \, \chi \boldsymbol{B}_0. \tag{3.94}$$

Using this expression, and the expression for the nuclear magnetic moment in terms of the nuclear spin,  $\hat{\mu}_l = \hbar \gamma_l \hat{l}$ , gives the following Hamiltonian:

$$\begin{split} \widehat{H} &= -\frac{\hbar \gamma_{I} \chi}{8\pi S} \left[ \int \frac{3(\boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \boldsymbol{r}) \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{l}} \cdot \boldsymbol{r} \right) - \left( \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{l}} \right) r^{2}}{r^{5}} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\boldsymbol{r}) d^{3}r \right. \\ &+ \frac{8\pi}{3} \left( \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{l}} \right) \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\boldsymbol{0}) \right]. \end{split}$$
(3.95)

This Hamiltonian is linear in both the magnetic field and the nuclear spin, and so can be written in terms of a chemical shielding tensor  $\sigma^{\chi}$ , with isotropic and anisotropic parts  $\sigma_{iso}^{\chi}$  and  $\sigma_{aniso}^{\chi}$  as follows:

$$\widehat{H} = \hbar \gamma_I \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\chi} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}, \qquad (3.96)$$

$$=\hbar\gamma_I \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\rm iso}^{\chi} \mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\rm aniso}^{\chi}\right) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{I}}.$$
(3.97)

Comparing Eq. (3.95) with Eq. (3.97) we identify the isotropic and anisotropic parts of the shielding tensor as

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\chi} = -\frac{\chi}{3S} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}), \tag{3.98}$$

$$\sigma_{\text{aniso},ij}^{\chi} = -\frac{\chi}{8\pi S} \int \frac{3r_i r_j - r^2 \delta_{ij}}{r^5} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r}) d^3 r, \qquad (3.99)$$

where we see that the former is due to the Fermi-contact interaction, and the latter is due to the spin-dipolar interaction. We note that this expression for the paramagnetic shielding is symmetric, as is the expression in terms of the Curie spin  $\sigma^{s}$ .

We can also write the shielding tensor as the product of the susceptibility and a reduced coupling tensor *C*:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\chi} = -\chi \boldsymbol{C},\tag{3.100}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{C} = \frac{1}{\mu_0 \mu_{\mathsf{B}} \boldsymbol{g}_e \hbar \gamma_I} \boldsymbol{A}.$$
(3.101)

This tensor C is the sum of an isotropic Fermi-contact part  $C^{FC}$  and anisotropic spin-dipolar part  $C^{SD}$ :

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}^{\mathrm{FC}} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{C}^{\mathrm{SD}},\tag{3.102}$$

where

$$C^{\rm FC} = \frac{\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})}{3S} \tag{3.103}$$

$$C_{ij}^{\rm SD} = \frac{1}{8\pi S} \int \frac{3r_i r_j - r^2 \delta_{ij}}{r^5} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{r}) d^3 r.$$
(3.104)

This way of writing down the shielding tensor emphasises that it can be separated into two factors which describe different parts of the shielding interaction. The magnetic susceptibility is a bulk quantity that describes the unpaired electrons in that it quantifies the size of the average electronic magnetic moment per unit field, or equivalently the Curie spin per unit field, that we can expect from our paramagnetic centre at a certain temperature. It is important to draw the distinction that  $\gamma$  represents an average over the whole system, whereas the paramagnetic shielding tensor describes local structural and electronic effects. Therefore the susceptibility description of the shielding may not capture more local phenomena, such as we may encounter in a heterogeneous solid material. The coupling tensor describes the relationship of the nucleus of interest with respect to the paramagnetic centre, with  $C^{FC}$  giving the unpaired spin density per electron that is delocalized onto the nucleus, and  $\mathbf{C}^{SD}$  giving the geometrical position of the nucleus with respect to the paramagnetic centre. These are molecular/atomiclevel properties that depend on the geometry and bonding in the paramagnetic material. Note that neither the susceptibility nor the reduced coupling tensor depends on the nuclear species, as is usual for shielding tensors, which are independent of  $\gamma_{I}$ .

Using this description we can write down the irreducible spherical tensor components of the paramagnetic shielding  $\sigma_{lm}^{\chi}$  in terms of the corresponding components of the reduced hyperfine coupling tensor  $C_{lm}$ :

$$\sigma_{lm}^{\chi} = -\chi C_{lm}. \tag{3.105}$$

In the high-field regime, only the components  $\sigma_{00}^{\chi}$  and  $\sigma_{20}^{\chi}$  are retained. The isotropic part is proportional to  $C_{00}$ , which is given by:

$$C_{00} = -\frac{\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})}{\sqrt{3}S}.$$
(3.106)

The isotropic shielding  $\sigma_{iso}^{\chi}$  is:

$$\sigma_{iso}^{\chi} = -\chi C^{FC}$$

$$= -\chi \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$$
(3.107)
(3.108)

$$= -\frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 g_e^2 (S+1)}{9kT} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}), \qquad (3.109)$$

which is exactly the same as the expression derived in Eq. (3.76). The anisotropy parameters can be determined from  $\sigma_{20}^{\chi}$ , which is proportional to  $C_{20}$ . In the PAF of the reduced coupling tensor, the spherical components  $\tilde{C}_{2m}$  are:

$$\widetilde{C}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \left( \widetilde{C}_{zz} - C_{iso} \right)$$
(3.110)

$$=\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{1}{8\pi S}\int\frac{3z_{PAF}^{2}-r_{PAF}^{2}}{r_{PAF}^{5}}\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\boldsymbol{r}_{PAF})d^{3}r_{PAF},$$
(3.111)

$$\tilde{C}_{2\pm 1} = 0,$$
 (3.112)

$$\widetilde{C}_{2\pm 2} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \widetilde{C}_{xx} - \widetilde{C}_{yy} \right) \tag{3.113}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2}\eta^{\text{SD}}\left(\widetilde{C}_{zz} - C_{\text{iso}}\right). \tag{3.114}$$

If the electrons are localised at the paramagnetic centre, we can write the unpaired electron density as  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r}) = 2S\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{R})$ , where  $\mathbf{R}$  is the position of the electrons relative to the nucleus. The Cartesian components of the reduced hyperfine coupling tensor are then

$$C_{ij} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{3R_i R_j - R^2 \delta_{ij}}{R^5} + \frac{8\pi}{3} \delta(\mathbf{R}) \delta_{ij} \right],$$
(3.115)

and the spherical-tensor components in the PAF become

$$C_{00} = -\frac{2\delta(\mathbf{R})}{\sqrt{3}},\tag{3.116}$$

$$\widetilde{C}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2} \frac{1}{2\pi R^3}},$$
(3.117)

$$C_{2\pm 1} = 0,$$
 (3.118)

$$C_{2\pm 2} = 0. (3.119)$$

In the general case the spherical components of the shielding tensor are:

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{20}^{\chi} = -\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\chi}{8\pi S} \int \frac{3z_{PAF}^2 - r_{PAF}^2}{r_{PAF}^5} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r}_{PAF}) d^3 r_{PAF}, \qquad (3.120)$$

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{2\pm 1}^{\chi} = \mathbf{0},\tag{3.121}$$

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{2\pm2}^{\chi} = \frac{\eta^{\text{SD}}\chi}{16\pi S} \int \frac{3z_{\text{PAF}}^2 - r_{\text{PAF}}^2}{r_{\text{PAF}}^5} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\boldsymbol{r}_{\text{PAF}}) d^3 r_{\text{PAF}}, \qquad (3.122)$$

and hence the following shielding anisotropy  $\Delta \sigma^{\chi}$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{\chi}$  have the forms:

$$\Delta \sigma^{\chi} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sigma_{20}^{\chi} \tag{3.123}$$

$$= -\frac{\chi}{8\pi S} \int \frac{3z_{PAF}^2 - r_{PAF}^2}{r_{PAF}^5} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r}_{PAF}) d^3 r_{PAF}$$
(3.124)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}^{2}g_{e}^{2}(S+1)}{24\pi kT}\int \frac{3z_{PAF}^{2} - r_{PAF}^{2}}{r_{PAF}^{5}}\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r}_{PAF})d^{3}r_{PAF}, \qquad (3.125)$$

$$\eta^{\chi} = \eta^{\text{SD}}.\tag{3.126}$$

We see that these are exactly the same expressions in Eqs. (3.80) and (3.81) that we derived using the Curie spin, thus demonstrating the equivalence of the two approaches.

Finally in terms of the chemical shift convention, the isotropic paramagnetic shift  $\delta_{iso}^{\chi}$ , paramagnetic SA  $\Delta \delta^{\chi}$ , and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{\chi}$  are

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\chi} = \chi \frac{\rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{0})}{3S} \tag{3.127}$$

$$=\frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}^{2}g_{e}^{2}(S+1)}{9kT}\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}),$$
(3.128)

$$\Delta\delta^{\chi} = \frac{\chi}{8\pi S} \int \frac{3z_{\text{PAF}}^2 - r_{\text{PAF}}^2}{r_{\text{PAF}}^5} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\boldsymbol{r}_{\text{PAF}}) d^3 r_{\text{PAF}}$$
(3.129)

$$=\frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}^{2}g_{e}^{2}(S+1)}{24\pi kT}\int\frac{3z_{PAF}^{2}-r_{PAF}^{2}}{r_{PAF}^{5}}\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\boldsymbol{r}_{PAF})d^{3}r_{PAF},$$
(3.130)

$$\eta^{\chi} = \eta^{\text{SD}}.\tag{3.131}$$

### 3.4. The scaling factor

In the previous sections we commented that the paramagnetic shielding tensor, which has the form shown in Eq. (3.70), is essentially proportional to the hyperfine tensor, with the proportionality constant equal to a factor that scales down the size of the interaction. So far we have avoided giving a precise description of the exact quantity that is scaled down, and what the scaling factor represents. A full discussion will be presented in this section, following the description of Kim et al. [54], who use the idea of scaling the hyperfine interaction calculated from first principles to determine a paramagnetic shift.

The calculation is performed on a system in which all the effective electron spins are aligned parallel in a ferromagnetic configuration. Note that the ferromagnetic alignment is not necessarily the lowest-energy configuration, but reflects the system in the saturation regime at a temperature of 0 K that we have discussed previously. It turns out that this arrangement is convenient for performing the calculation. So far, we have not included any interactions between the paramagnetic centres, which we still assume to be independent of each other, and so there is no energetic driving force for preferential alignment of the electronic spins. The calculation provides the *total* unpaired-spin density  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{r})$ , whence is determined the total hyperfine tensor  $\mathcal{A}$ , which is the sum of Fermi-contact  $\mathcal{A}^{FC}\mathbf{1}$  and spin-dipolar  $\mathcal{A}^{SD}$  parts as before. The hyperfine Hamiltonian takes the usual form:

$$\hat{H}_{SI} = \hat{S} \cdot \mathcal{A} \cdot \hat{I},$$
 (3.132)

in which the calculated Fermi-contact and spin-dipolar contributions are

$$\mathcal{A}^{\rm FC} = \frac{2}{3} \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{0}), \qquad (3.133)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{\rm SD} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I}{4\pi} \int \frac{3r_i r_j - r^2 \delta_{ij}}{r^5} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{d}^3 r.$$
(3.134)

We note that this definition of the hyperfine tensor, involving the full unpaired electron spin density, has *not* been normalised by dividing by the number of electrons. The spin-dipolar tensor is usually written in a form in which the total electronic wavefunction  $|\psi(\mathbf{r})\rangle$  of the unpaired electrons is expressed as a superposition of basis functions, for example molecular orbitals,  $|\epsilon\rangle$ , combined with the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  spin functions as follows

$$|\psi(\mathbf{r})\rangle = \sum_{\epsilon} c_{\epsilon}^{\alpha} |\epsilon\rangle |\alpha\rangle + c_{\epsilon}^{\beta} |\epsilon\rangle |\beta\rangle$$
(3.135)

where the  $c_{\epsilon}^{\alpha}$  and  $c_{\epsilon}^{\beta}$  are coefficients relating to electrons of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  spin in molecular orbital  $|\epsilon\rangle$ . The expansion can, in principle, include contributions from several unit cells. The resulting tensors are

$$\mathcal{A}^{\rm FC} = \frac{2}{3} \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I \sum_{\epsilon \tau} P^{\alpha - \beta}_{\epsilon \tau} \langle \epsilon | \delta(\mathbf{r}) | \tau \rangle, \qquad (3.136)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{ij}^{\rm SD} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_l}{4\pi} \sum_{\epsilon \tau} P_{\epsilon \tau}^{\alpha - \beta} \left\langle \epsilon \right| \frac{3 r_i r_j - r^2 \delta_{ij}}{r^5} \left| \tau \right\rangle, \tag{3.137}$$

where  $P_{\epsilon\tau}^{\alpha-\beta} = \overline{c_{\epsilon}}^{\alpha} c_{\tau}^{\alpha} - \overline{c_{\epsilon}}^{\beta} c_{\tau}^{\beta}$  is the spin density matrix, and the overbar represents the complex conjugate.

The size of the hyperfine splitting expressed as a chemical shielding is proportional to the hyperfine coupling constant divided by the nuclear Zeeman energy:

$$-\frac{\mathcal{A}}{2\hbar\gamma_{I}B_{0}},$$
(3.138)

where the factor of 1/2 is included because, in the high-field regime, the hyperfine interaction splits the nuclear resonance into two peaks which appear at frequencies located at  $\pm A_{zz}/2$  either side

of the nuclear Larmor frequency. This chemical shielding is the value that would be observed when all the effective electron spins are aligned, which occurs at saturation. The expectation value of  $\hat{S}_z$  is, under these circumstances, given by Eq. (3.65),

$$\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}} = -S. \tag{3.139}$$

Experimentally we observe the system in the weaker paramagnetic regime, in which  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle$  has been scaled down by the Brillouin function. Therefore in order to obtain the shielding tensor of the paramagnetic system, we must scale the expression in Eq. (3.138) by

$$\frac{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{para}}}{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = B_S \left( \frac{\mu_B g_e B_0 S}{kT} \right)$$
(3.140)

$$\approx \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e(S+1) B_0}{3kT}.\tag{3.141}$$

In terms of the susceptibility the scaling factor is

$$\frac{\langle S_z \rangle_{\text{para}}}{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = \frac{\chi B_0}{\mu_0 \mu_{\text{B}} g_e S}.$$
(3.142)

The paramagnetic shielding tensor thus obtained is

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S} = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}}{2\hbar\gamma_{I}B_{0}} \frac{\langle S_{z}\rangle_{\text{para}}}{\langle \widehat{S}_{z}\rangle_{\text{sat}}}$$
(3.143)

$$= -\frac{\chi}{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I} \frac{\mathcal{A}}{2S}$$
(3.144)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_e S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_l kT} \frac{\mathcal{A}}{2S},\tag{3.145}$$

which, when we note that  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}/(2S)$ , is the same expression as the one obtained in Eq. (3.70).

# 3.5. Key concepts

- In a system of two coupled spin-1/2 nuclei *I* and *S*, the *I*-spin NMR spectrum contains a resonance that is centred on the *I*-spin Larmor frequency, and split into two peaks separated by the coupling constant.
- In a system of a nuclear spin-1/2 *I* coupled to an electron *S*, the NMR spectrum contains a single peak offset from the *I*-spin Larmor frequency by the "paramagnetic shift".
- The paramagnetic shift is the result of the electron relaxation between its Zeeman spin states occurring on a timescale that is orders of magnitude faster than the corresponding nuclear dynamics.
- The paramagnetic shift can be calculated from the hyperfine coupling between the nucleus and the electronic pseudo-spin with a thermally averaged magnetic moment (the Curie spin).
- The Curie spin, and therefore the paramagnetic shift, both have a Curie temperature dependence of 1/(kT).
- We can also calculate the paramagnetic shift from the bulk magnetic susceptibility.
- The role of the magnetic susceptibility in determining the paramagnetic shift is to scale down the hyperfine coupling constant between the nuclear and electronic spins, from the saturation regime to the high-temperature paramagnetic regime.

# Chapter 4: The paramagnetic shift due to *d*-block transitionmetals with spin-orbit coupling

The EPR parameters in many d-block transition-metal systems are strongly influenced by the effects of spin-orbit (SO) coupling. In turn these changes to the EPR properties strongly influence the form of the paramagnetic shift and SA. The formalism presented in the previous chapter ignored the effects of SO coupling, and so is only valid when the metal ion behaves strictly as a spinonly ion. Whilst this formalism could be applied successfully to more complex systems where the paramagnetic shifts are dominated by non-SO effects, such as the Fermi-contact interaction [54], it is often inadequate for describing the shift when such non-SO effects are small [15]. Kurland and McGarvey were the first to derive a general equation for the isotropic shift that includes these additional effects, but this did not describe the effects leading to the SA [38]. More recently Moon and Patchkovskii proposed a formula for the entire shift tensor due to a paramagnetic centre with spin S = 1/2 in terms of the EPR parameters; this remains the benchmark for all theoretical work that has been proposed since [39]. Following this milestone Pennanen and Vaara extended the theory to describe the paramagnetic shifts at high temperature of first-row (3*d*) transition-metal ions with spin S > 1/2, which are subject to a SO coupling that is smaller than the ligand-field interaction [40]. More recently van den Heuvel and Soncini proposed a different formalism which extends the theory to low temperatures, and larger SO coupling interactions [87,89]. This generalised treatment gives the paramagnetic shift in terms of the effective spin EPR parameters for electronic spins greater than S = 1/2.

We begin this chapter by deriving the form of the EPR effective spin Hamiltonian, the parameters in which are used to calculate the paramagnetic shift. The discussion here will be limited to *d*transition-metal ions with spin-orbit coupling that is weak compared to the ligand-field interaction, and which is described by the Russell-Saunders (*LS*) coupling scheme. We then outline an EPR theory of the paramagnetic shielding tensor and highlight the new features that are introduced as a result of SO coupling. Finally we show that the magnetic susceptibility of such systems becomes anisotropic [16], and we show how this tensor can be related to the paramagnetic shielding tensor.

### 4.1. The EPR effective spin Hamiltonian

#### 4.1.1. Derivation

For a spin-only *d*-block transition-metal ion we have seen that the electronic magnetic moment is proportional to the effective spin, i.e.  $\hat{\mu}_S = -\mu_B g_e \hat{S}$ . Transition-metal ions with non-zero orbital angular momentum L, on the other hand, have an orbital contribution to the magnetic moment  $\hat{\mu}_L = -\mu_B \hat{L}$ , where  $\hat{L}$  is the operator representing the total orbital angular momentum, that is orientation-dependent. In the limit of *LS* coupling we can define the total angular momentum operator  $\hat{J}$  as the sum of  $\hat{L}$  and  $\hat{S}$ , i.e.  $\hat{J} = \hat{L} + \hat{S}$ , and the total magnetic moment operator  $\hat{m}$  as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{m}} = -\mu_{\rm B} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{L}} + g_e \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \right). \tag{4.1}$$

We note that the vectors representing the total angular momentum and total magnetic moment, shown in Fig. 4.1(a) and (b) respectively, are not parallel because  $g_e$  is not equal to unity. The orbital angular momentum is quantized and represented by the quantum number *L* which takes integer values. Each level *L* comprises a manifold of 2L + 1 states that are labelled by the orbital magnetic quantum number  $M_L$  which takes integer values from -L to +L.

The Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  describing the electronic spin system of a *d*-block transition-metal ion in a ligand field is given by

$$H = H_{\rm LF} + H_1, \tag{4.2}$$

where  $\hat{H}_{LF}$  is the interaction of the ion with the ligand field, and  $\hat{H}_1$  encompasses the other interactions. The ligand-field interaction is the largest contribution to  $\hat{H}$ , giving rise to a splitting in the energy levels of the order of  $10^4$  cm<sup>-1</sup>. The smaller contribution  $\hat{H}_1$  can be broken down into a sum of the following terms:

$$\widehat{H}_1 = \widehat{H}_{SO} + \widehat{H}_{SS} + \widehat{H}_{HF} + \widehat{H}_Z.$$
(4.3)

The first term  $\hat{H}_{SO}$  is the Hamiltonian representing the SO coupling interaction which, for *LS* coupling and assuming Hund's rules are obeyed, is

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm SO} = \lambda \widehat{\boldsymbol{L}} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}},\tag{4.4}$$

$$\lambda = \pm \zeta/2S. \tag{4.5}$$

The many-electron SO coupling parameter  $\lambda$  is given above in terms of the single-electron SO coupling parameter  $\zeta$ , where for the free ion the + sign is required for a shell that is less than half filled, and the – sign for a shell that is more than half filled. Values of  $\zeta$  have been tabulated by Abragam and Bleaney [185], and take values between  $10^2$  and  $10^3$  cm<sup>-1</sup> for 3*d* metal ions. The SO coupling is therefore the largest interaction after the ligand-field splitting. The second term  $\hat{H}_{SS}$  is the spin-spin interaction which represents the magnetic coupling between the individual electrons. In the *LS* coupling regime it is given by [185]

$$\widehat{H}_{SS} = -\rho \left[ \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{L}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{L}} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \right) - \frac{1}{3} L(L+1)S(S+1)\hat{1} \right],$$
(4.6)

where  $\rho$  is an energy coefficient that, for 3*d* metal ions, takes values up to 1 cm<sup>-1</sup>. We can also write the spin-spin interaction Hamiltonian as

$$\widehat{H}_{SS} = -\rho \sum_{ij} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \widehat{L}_i \widehat{L}_j + \widehat{L}_j \widehat{L}_i \right) - \frac{1}{3} L(L+1) \delta_{ij} \right] \widehat{S}_i \widehat{S}_j.$$

$$(4.7)$$

The third term  $\hat{H}_{\text{HF}}$  is the hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian which, for spin-only systems, was derived in Section 2.8. For systems with non-zero orbital angular momentum  $\hat{H}_{\text{HF}}$  can be generalised to [185]

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm HF} = \mathcal{P}\bigg[\{\xi L(L+1) - \kappa\} \left(\hat{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}\right) - \frac{3}{2}\xi \{\left(\hat{\mathbf{L}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}\right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{L}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}\right) + \left(\hat{\mathbf{L}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}\right) \left(\hat{\mathbf{L}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}\right)\} + \hat{\mathbf{L}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}\bigg],$$

$$(4.8)$$

$$\mathcal{P} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_c \hbar \gamma_l}{4\pi} \left\langle \frac{1}{r^3} \right\rangle,\tag{4.9}$$

$$\xi = \frac{2l+1-4S}{S(2l-1)(2l+3)(2L-1)},$$
(4.10)



**Fig. 4.1.** The angular momentum properties of a metal ion subject to Russell–Saunders spin–orbit coupling. The total angular momentum J, which is the vector sum of the spin S and orbital angular momentum L, is shown in (a). The total magnetic moment m, which is the sum of the spin and orbital magnetic moments  $\mu_s$  and  $\mu_L$  is shown in (b). We note that m is not parallel to J.

where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the dipolar coupling constant,  $\xi$  is a coefficient that depends on the total spin and orbital quantum numbers *S* and *L* and the one-electron orbital quantum number *l*, and  $\kappa$  is a dimensionless number that accounts for the Fermi-contact term. Finally we have the electronic Zeeman interaction  $\hat{H}_Z$  which is the sum of the orbital Zeeman  $\mu_{\rm B} \mathbf{B}_0 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{L}}$  and spin Zeeman  $\mu_{\rm B} \mathbf{g}_e \mathbf{B}_0 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}$  terms:

$$\widehat{H}_{Z} = \mu_{\rm B} \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{L}} + g_e \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \right). \tag{4.11}$$

The Zeeman splitting varies with the applied magnetic field  $B_0$ , with  $\mu_B B_0$  taking a maximum value of 13 cm<sup>-1</sup> at the maximum field of 28.18 T that is currently commercially available ( $\mu_B g_e B_0 = 26 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ). The typical ranges of the magnitudes of the ligand-field interaction and the additional four perturbation interactions are plotted in Fig. 4.2. For now we neglect the nuclear Zeeman interaction and the orbital contribution to the chemical shielding as they are both much smaller than the interactions above.

Clearly the perturbation Hamiltonian depends on both the spin- and spatially-dependent orbital angular momentum operators. It is our task to convert this to a Hamiltonian that contains only spin operators, and which can therefore be used in the interpretation of both EPR and paramagnetic NMR experiments. We do this by applying time-independent perturbation theory [207] to the eigenstates  $|n\rangle$  of the ligand-field Hamiltonian, which have energies  $E_n$ , i.e.

$$H_{\rm LF}|n\rangle = E_n|n\rangle. \tag{4.12}$$

The  $|n\rangle$  are orbital states, and so have no dependence on the spin.

We apply perturbation theory to the orbital ground state  $|0\rangle$ , which for ease of derivation we assume to be a singlet. Orbital ground states of larger degeneracy are more difficult to treat, and so we do not discuss them further. The consequence of assuming a singlet ground state is that the expectation values of the components of the orbital angular momentum operator  $\hat{L}_i$  in the ground state are zero:

$$\langle \mathbf{0}|\hat{L}_i|\mathbf{0}\rangle = \mathbf{0}. \tag{4.13}$$

The first-order perturbation Hamiltonian  $\widehat{H}_1^{(1)}$  is given by

$$H_1^{(1)} = \langle 0|H_1|0\rangle.$$
 (4.14)

Inserting the expression for  $\hat{H}_1$  in Eq. (4.3) we obtain

~ ~



**Fig. 4.2.** Typical ranges of the magnitudes of electronic-spin interactions that are relevant to the EPR properties of the metal ion. The largest interaction is the ligand field (LF). The four relevant perturbations are the spin-orbit (SO) coupling, electronic Zeeman (Z), hyperfine (HF), and the electronic spin-spin (SS) interactions.

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H}_{1}^{(1)} &= \langle 0|\widehat{H}_{SO}|0\rangle + \langle 0|\widehat{H}_{SS}|0\rangle + \langle 0|\widehat{H}_{HF}|0\rangle + \langle 0|\widehat{H}_{Z}|0\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{4.15} \\ &= \lambda \sum_{i} \langle 0|\widehat{L}_{i}|0\rangle \widehat{S}_{i} - \rho \sum_{ij} \langle 0| \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\widehat{L}_{i}\widehat{L}_{j} + \widehat{L}_{j}\widehat{L}_{i}\right) - \frac{1}{3}L(L+1)\delta_{ij}\right] |0\rangle \widehat{S}_{i}\widehat{S}_{j} \\ &+ \mathcal{P} \sum_{ij} \left[ \langle 0| \{\xi L(L+1) - \kappa\} |0\rangle \delta_{ij}\widehat{S}_{i}\widehat{I}_{j} - \langle 0| \frac{3}{2}\xi \left\{\widehat{L}_{i}\widehat{L}_{j} + \widehat{L}_{j}\widehat{L}_{i}\right\} |0\rangle \widehat{S}_{i}\widehat{I}_{j} + \delta_{ij} \langle 0|\widehat{L}_{i}|0\rangle \widehat{I}_{j}\right] \end{aligned}$$

$$+\mu_{\rm B}\sum_{i}B_{0,i}\Big(\langle 0|\hat{L}_{i}|0\rangle+\langle 0|0\rangle g_{e}\widehat{S}_{i}\Big)$$

$$(4.16)$$

$$= -\rho \sum_{ij} \widehat{S}_i l_{ij} \widehat{S}_j - \mathcal{P} \sum_{ij} \widehat{S}_i \left( \kappa \delta_{ij} + 3\xi l_{ij} \right) \widehat{I}_j + \mu_{\rm B} g_e \sum_i B_{0,i} \widehat{S}_i.$$
(4.17)

This is an example of an effective spin Hamiltonian, which comprises three terms. The first is referred to either as the zero-field splitting (ZFS) or the electric quadrupole interaction [208]. The latter name emphasises the fact that the Hamiltonian is formally equivalent to that of a nuclear quadrupole interaction  $\hat{I} \cdot Q \cdot \hat{I}$ , where Q is the tensor describing the orientation dependence of the quadrupolar coupling. To first order the ZFS is due to the spinspin interaction, and has a spatial dependence given by the tensor  $l_{ii}$  whose components are given by

$$I_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \langle 0|\hat{L}_i \hat{L}_j + \hat{L}_j \hat{L}_i |0\rangle - \frac{1}{3} L(L+1)\delta_{ij}.$$

$$(4.18)$$

In common with the quadrupolar coupling interaction the ZFS tensor is symmetric, and is equal to zero for S < 1 or for an environment of perfectly cubic symmetry.

The second term is the hyperfine interaction comprising both the isotropic Fermi-contact  $-\mathcal{P}\kappa$  and anisotropic spin-dipolar  $-3\mathcal{P}\xi l_{ij}$  parts. The third term is the electron Zeeman interaction. The Hamiltonian in Eq. (4.17) is often referred to as nonrelativistic (NR) as it does not depend on the SO coupling [202]. In fact this Hamiltonian is *only* valid in the absence of SO coupling effects, for example for spin-only metal ions. When SO coupling is present we must continue the perturbation theory calculation to at least second order, remembering that as the SO interaction is the largest term in  $\hat{H}_1$ , some of the second-order terms may be larger than the first order terms in the NR Hamiltonian.

The second-order perturbation Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_1^{(2)}$  is given by [207]

$$\widehat{H}_{1}^{(2)} = -\sum_{n \neq 0} \frac{\langle 0|\widehat{H}_{1}|n\rangle\langle n|\widehat{H}_{1}|0\rangle}{E_{n} - E_{0}}$$

$$\tag{4.19}$$

$$= \langle \mathbf{0} | \widehat{H}_1 \hat{\Sigma} \widehat{H}_1 | \mathbf{0} \rangle, \tag{4.20}$$

where  $\hat{\Sigma}$  is a sum of the projection operators of the excited orbital states  $|n\rangle\langle n|$  where each term is weighted by the reciprocal of the difference in the energy of the state from the ground state  $E_0$ :

$$\hat{\Sigma} = -\sum_{n \neq 0} \frac{|n\rangle \langle n|}{E_n - E_0}.$$
(4.21)

The expression in Eq. (4.20) contains products between all the various terms in  $\hat{H}_1$ , the largest of which is expected to be the self term involving  $\hat{H}_{SO}$  SO–SO, which is

$$\langle \mathbf{0}|\widehat{H}_{SO}\widehat{\Sigma}\widehat{H}_{SO}|\mathbf{0}\rangle = \lambda^2 \sum_{ij} \langle \mathbf{0}|\widehat{L}_i\widehat{\Sigma}\widehat{L}_j|\mathbf{0}\rangle\widehat{S}_i\widehat{S}_j$$
(4.22)

$$= -\lambda^2 \sum_{ij} \hat{S}_i \Lambda_{ij} \hat{S}_j, \qquad (4.23)$$

where

$$\Lambda_{ij} = \sum_{n \neq 0} \frac{\langle \mathbf{0} | \widehat{L}_i | n \rangle \langle n | \widehat{L}_j | \mathbf{0} \rangle}{E_n - E_0}.$$
(4.24)

We see that this term varies as the square of the SO coupling energy coefficient  $\lambda^2$ , and is bilinear in the components of  $\hat{S}$ , and so it

contributes to the ZFS in the effective spin Hamiltonian. The spatial tensor  $\Lambda_{ii}$  is real and symmetric.

Whilst the SO–SO self term is the largest of the second-order contributions, we also expect there to be significant contributions from the cross terms between  $\hat{H}_{SO}$  and the other parts of  $\hat{H}_1$ . These are the only remaining terms we consider here, and we ignore the smaller contributions such as the cross terms between the spin-spin and hyperfine interactions. The cross term between the spin-spin and SO interactions SS–SO is given by

$$\langle 0|\hat{H}_{S0}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{H}_{SS} + \hat{H}_{SS}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{H}_{S0}|0\rangle = -\frac{1}{2}\lambda\rho \sum_{ijk} \langle 0|\hat{L}_{i}\hat{\Sigma}(\hat{L}_{j}\hat{L}_{k} + \hat{L}_{k}\hat{L}_{j})|0\rangle\hat{S}_{i}\hat{S}_{j}\hat{S}_{k}$$
$$-\frac{1}{2}\lambda\rho \sum_{ijk} \langle 0|(\hat{L}_{j}\hat{L}_{k} + \hat{L}_{k}\hat{L}_{j})\hat{\Sigma}\hat{L}_{i}|0\rangle\hat{S}_{i}\hat{S}_{j}\hat{S}_{k} \quad (4.25)$$
$$=\lambda\rho \sum \hat{S}_{i}(\Lambda'_{ii} + \Lambda'_{ii})\hat{S}_{i}, \qquad (4.26)$$

$$=\lambda
ho{\displaystyle\sum_{ij}\widehat{S}_{i}\Big(\Lambda_{ij}^{\prime}+\Lambda_{ji}^{\prime}\Big)\widehat{S}_{j}},$$

where the tensor  $\Lambda'_{ii}$  is given by

$$\Lambda_{ij}' = -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{kl} \varepsilon_{ikl} \sum_{n \neq 0} \frac{\langle 0|\hat{L}_l|n\rangle \langle n|\hat{L}_j\hat{L}_k + \hat{L}_k\hat{L}_j|0\rangle}{E_n - E_0}, \qquad (4.27)$$

and  $\varepsilon_{ijk}$  is the Levi-Civita tensor. Note that  $\Lambda'_{ij}$  is not necessarily symmetric. This term is again a contribution to the ZFS which is proportional to the product of the spin-spin and SO interaction energies, and so we expect it to be smaller than the SO–SO term. It is also spatially symmetric, even though  $\Lambda'_{ij}$  may not be. The cross term between the SO and hyperfine Hamiltonians SO–HF gives a contribution to the hyperfine part of the effective spin Hamiltonian:

$$\langle 0|\widehat{H}_{SO}\widehat{\Sigma}\widehat{H}_{HF} + \widehat{H}_{HF}\widehat{\Sigma}\widehat{H}_{SO}|0\rangle = -2\lambda \mathcal{P}\sum_{ij}\widehat{S}_i\Lambda_{ij}\widehat{I}_j + 3\xi\lambda \mathcal{P}\sum_{ij}\widehat{S}_i\Lambda_{ij}'\widehat{I}_j,$$
(4.28)

where the first term is symmetric and the second, in general, is not. The final cross term we will consider is that between the SO and Zeeman Hamiltonians SO–Z, which gives us a contribution to the electronic Zeeman Hamiltonian:

$$\langle 0|\hat{H}_{\rm SO}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{H}_{\rm Z} + \hat{H}_{\rm Z}\hat{\Sigma}\hat{H}_{\rm SO}|0\rangle = \mu_{\rm B}\lambda \sum_{ij} B_{0,i} \langle 0|\hat{L}_i\hat{\Sigma}\hat{L}_j + \hat{L}_j\hat{\Sigma}\hat{L}_i|0\rangle\hat{S}_j \quad (4.29)$$

$$= -2\mu_{\rm B}\lambda \sum_{ij} B_{0,i}\Lambda_{ij}\widehat{S}_j. \tag{4.30}$$

More specifically, this is the cross term between the SO and orbital Zeeman interactions, as the cross term with the spin Zeeman interaction is zero. We note that the tensor coupling the electronic spin to the magnetic field is now spatially anisotropic, and is proportional to  $\mu_{\rm B}\lambda$ . All these second-order terms sum to give us an SO, or relativistic, contribution to the effective spin Hamiltonian.

We collect all of the above first- and second-order contributions to give the total EPR effective spin Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{EPR}$ :

$$\hat{H}_{\rm EPR} = \mu_{\rm B} \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{A} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{I}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{S}}, \qquad (4.31)$$

which comprises three terms. The first term is the electronic Zeeman interaction describing the interaction of the magnetic moment of the electrons with the external magnetic field. We see that this interaction is now spatially anisotropic, and is described by a g-tensor g which is given by:

$$g_{ij} = g_e \delta_{ij} - 2\lambda \Lambda_{ij}. \tag{4.32}$$

This is the sum of the free-electron g-factor and the g-shift term  $-2\lambda\Lambda_{ij}$  which arises because of SO coupling. This g-shift plays the role of a "chemical shielding" for the electron as it modifies the reference resonance frequency that is due to  $g_e$ , in the same way that

the chemical shielding of the nucleus gives a deviation of the nuclear resonance frequency from the Larmor frequency. We note that the *g*-shift contribution above is symmetric. However we must bear in mind that this is not a general feature and that, on including other cross terms and higher-order perturbations, the *g*-tensor is not necessarily symmetric [209,210]. We can see that, from this form of the Zeeman interaction, we can write down an expression for the electronic magnetic moment operator  $\hat{m}$  in terms of the *g*-tensor:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{m}} = -\mu_{\rm B} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{S}}.\tag{4.33}$$

This expression is apparently different to that in Eq. (4.1) which contains both the orbital and electronic contributions to  $\hat{m}$ . The difference can be understood by noting that the expression in Eq. (4.1) contains  $\hat{L}$ , thus giving the magnetic moment an intrinsic spatial dependence. On calculating the effective spin Hamiltonian we remove the explicit dependence on  $\hat{L}$  and, by definition, retain only the spin operators. However the spatial dependence is retained and is encoded in the *g*-tensor anisotropy, the leading contribution to which is the cross term between the SO coupling and orbital Zeeman interaction Hamiltonians. As we will see, this definition of the electronic magnetic moment operator corresponds to that used by van den Heuvel and Soncini in their description of the EPR formalism of the paramagnetic shielding tensor [87,89].

The second term is the hyperfine interaction from which we can write down a hyperfine coupling tensor **A** as follows:

$$A_{ij} = -\mathcal{P}\Big(\kappa \delta_{ij} + 3\xi l_{ij} + 2\lambda \Lambda_{ij} - 3\xi \lambda \Lambda'_{ij}\Big).$$
(4.34)

The first two terms of **A** are due to the NR Fermi-contact and spindipolar interactions, and the second two terms are due to SO coupling. Both of the SO terms contribute to the anisotropy of **A**, which is now not necessarily symmetric due to the presence of the last term which is proportional to  $\Lambda'_{ij}$ . The final interaction is the ZFS, which is mediated by a tensor **D**, the Cartesian components of which are given by

$$D_{ij} = -\lambda^2 \Lambda_{ij} - \rho l_{ij} + \lambda \rho \left( \Lambda'_{ij} + \Lambda'_{ji} \right).$$
(4.35)

This interaction is only non-zero for effective spins S > 1/2, in complete analogy with the nuclear quadrupole interaction which is only non-zero for I > 1/2. The first term  $-\lambda^2 \Lambda_{ij}$  is dominant for 3d metal ions due to the relative sizes of the SO and spin-spin splitting parameters  $\lambda$  and  $\rho$ . The ZFS tensor **D** is always symmetric due to the symmetric form of the ZFS Hamiltonian. We also note that, whilst **D** is not necessarily traceless, we can ignore the isotropic contribution as it shifts all the spin energy levels by the same amount in the same direction, and so does not affect the frequencies of the transitions between these levels. Henceforth we refer to the ZFS as a traceless and symmetric interaction.

### 4.1.2. The NMR and EPR tensors

If we now include the nuclear Zeeman and chemical shielding interactions the EPR Hamiltonian becomes

$$\hat{H}_{\rm EPR} = -\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}\boldsymbol{B}_0\cdot\left(\boldsymbol{1}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\rm orb}\right)\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{I}} + \mu_{\rm B}\boldsymbol{B}_0\cdot\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{S}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{S}}\cdot\boldsymbol{A}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{I}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{S}}\cdot\boldsymbol{D}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{S}}.$$
(4.36)

As we have already discussed in Section 2.6.1 it is common practice in NMR to employ high-field conditions, in which we retain only those terms in the Hamiltonian that commute with the unmodified Zeeman interaction, which in this case is  $\hbar \omega_0 \hat{I}_z + \mu_B g_e B_0 \hat{S}_z$ . Such an approximation is only valid if the Zeeman interaction is several orders of magnitude larger than the other interactions. However this is not necessarily the case for  $\hat{H}_{EPR}$  as the dominant interaction may be the ZFS, and so the high-field approximation does not apply. We can expand the EPR tensors as Taylor series in the fine structure constant  $\alpha$  which takes the value 1/137.036 [202]. For instance the *g*-tensor can be written as the sum of the NR and SO terms

$$\boldsymbol{g} = \boldsymbol{g}_{NR} + \boldsymbol{g}_{SO}, \tag{4.37}$$

where the NR term  $g_{NR}$  is of order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^0)$  and the SO term  $g_{SO}$  is  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$ . These two terms can further be written as [210]

$$\mathbf{g}_{\rm NR} = \mathbf{g}_e \mathbf{1}, \qquad \mathcal{O}(\alpha^0), \tag{4.38}$$

$$\mathbf{g}_{\mathrm{SO}} = \Delta g_{\mathrm{iso}} \mathbf{1} + \Delta \mathbf{g}, \qquad \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2). \tag{4.39}$$

Thus, as indicated by the previous perturbation theory calculation, the NR contribution is simply the isotropic free-electron g-factor, and the SO contribution can be separated into an isotropic part  $\Delta g_{\rm iso}$  and a traceless anisotropic part  $\Delta g$  that is not necessarily symmetric.

In the same way we can expand the hyperfine coupling constant as a Taylor series in  $\alpha$  [211]:

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{A}_{\rm NR} + \boldsymbol{A}_{\rm SO}, \tag{4.40}$$

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{\rm NR} = \boldsymbol{A}^{\rm FC} \boldsymbol{1} + \boldsymbol{A}^{\rm SD}, \qquad \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2), \tag{4.41}$$

$$A_{\rm SO} = A^{\rm FC,2} \mathbf{1} + A^{\rm SD,2} + A^{\rm as}, \qquad \mathcal{O}(\alpha^4). \tag{4.42}$$

The NR contribution is the sum of the isotropic Fermi-contact term and the symmetric and anisotropic spin-dipolar part that we have already encountered. The SO contribution contains an isotropic part  $A^{\text{FC},2}$  which has been referred to as a 'pseudo-contact' term [211], but since this leads to confusion with the established NMR term 'pseudo-contact shift' we will simply refer to it as a second-order Fermi-contact coupling constant. The SO hyperfine constant also comprises a symmetric and anisotropic component  $A^{SD,2}$  which is labelled as a second-order spin-dipolar interaction, but is actually an interaction of shorter range than the NR spin-dipolar term. Nevertheless we include it with  $A^{SD}$  as it is also a rank-two tensor. We note that this is similar to diamagnetic NMR where the anisotropic J-coupling is often absorbed into the larger dipolar coupling. Finally there is also an antisymmetric anisotropic contribution to the hyperfine tensor  $A^{as}$ . Explicit expressions for the SO coupling contribution to the hyperfine tensors are given in Appendix B.

The ZFS tensor is given by [212]

$$\boldsymbol{D} = \boldsymbol{D}_{\rm NR} + \boldsymbol{D}_{\rm SO},\tag{4.43}$$

where the NR part  $D_{NR}$  is due to the electron spin-spin interaction, and is usually dominated by the SO term  $D_{SO}$ . We recall that D is symmetric and traceless, and is equal to zero either for electronic spins S < 1 or for transition metals in perfectly cubic environments.

We expect the NR terms of all three tensors to be the only contributions to spin-only 3*d* metal ions, with the SO terms only being observed in the presence of SO coupling. We recall that we have already encountered the NR contributions to both *g* and *A* in Chapter 3 when we calculated the paramagnetic shift tensors in spin-only systems. That theoretical treatment ignored the NR spin-spin contribution to the ZFS, and so is only an approximation for S > 1/2.

We can write all the terms in the EPR Hamiltonian in terms of irreducible spherical tensor operators, according to Eq. (2.67). The expressions for the spin-spin spherical tensors used in the hyperfine and ZFS interactions, and the spin-field tensor used in the electronic Zeeman interaction are given in Table 2.2. The spherical spatial tensors are given in Table 2.3, and can in turn be written in terms of the isotropic value, antisymmetric anisotropy, symmetric anisotropy, and asymmetry parameter. We return to this topic in Chapter 5. For now we give the single example of

the ZFS. The spatial tensor is symmetric and traceless, and so contains only rank two components. The Hamiltonian is therefore

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} = \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} (-1)^m D_{2m} \widehat{T}_{2-m} (SS)$$
(4.44)

$$=\sum_{m=-2}^{+2} (-1)^m \hat{T}_{2-m}(SS) \sum_{m'=-2}^{+2} \widetilde{D}_{2m'} D_{m'm}^{(2)}(\alpha_{\text{DL}}, \beta_{\text{DL}}, \gamma_{\text{DL}}), \quad (4.45)$$

where  $(\alpha_{DL}, \beta_{DL}, \gamma_{DL})$  are the Euler angles that give the orientation of the ZFS PAF in the laboratory frame. The spin operators  $\hat{T}_{2m}(SS)$  are equivalent to the spin operators describing the nuclear quadrupole interaction:

$$\widehat{T}_{20}(SS) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \Big( 3\widehat{S}_z^2 - S(S+1)\widehat{1} \Big), \tag{4.46}$$

$$\widehat{T}_{2\pm 1}(SS) = \mp \frac{1}{2} \left( \widehat{S}_z \widehat{S}_{\pm} + \widehat{S}_{\pm} \widehat{S}_z \right), \tag{4.47}$$

$$\widehat{T}_{2\pm 2}(SS) = \frac{1}{2}\widehat{S}_{\pm}^2.$$
(4.48)

The spatial irreducible spherical tensors  $D_{2m}$  in the PAF are given by

$$\widetilde{D}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}D, \tag{4.49}$$

$$\widetilde{D}_{2\pm 1} = 0,$$
 (4.50)

$$D_{2\pm 2} = E, (4.51)$$

where D and E are the established symbols for the axial and rhombic anisotropies:

$$D = \widetilde{D}_{zz} - \frac{1}{2} (\widetilde{D}_{xx} + \widetilde{D}_{yy}), \qquad (4.52)$$

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \left( \widetilde{D}_{xx} - \widetilde{D}_{yy} \right). \tag{4.53}$$

Note that for the ZFS it is conventional to define the interaction in terms of *D* and *E*, rather than the anisotropy  $\Delta D$  and asymmetry  $\eta$ .

### 4.2. The EPR formalism of the paramagnetic shielding

In Chapter 3 we saw that the hyperfine interaction between the nucleus and unpaired electrons results in a "paramagnetic shift" of the nuclear resonance frequency, rather than a splitting, and that the shielding tensor depends on the electronic *g*-factor and hyperfine coupling tensor. We have a similar situation when the metal ion is subject to SO coupling, but the details of the theory are more complicated. In the following we relate the EPR tensor parameters to the paramagnetic shielding tensor.

## 4.2.1. General derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor

The description of the chemical shielding interaction in paramagnetic systems follows that of van den Heuvel and Soncini. Although the remainder of this chapter is concerned with 3*d* metal ions, it should be noted that the derivation of van den Heuvel and Soncini is more general, since there are no assumptions made about whether or not the theory is at the relativistic level, or about the SO coupling strength. Therefore the expression we derive here is one we will return to later in Chapter 6 when considering more complex metal ions, such as lanthanides and actinides. There is a short review of this formalism by Autschbach, which summarizes its theory and practice in quantum chemistry [213].

We equate the chemical shielding interaction to the terms in the effective temperature-dependent Hamiltonian that are linear in both the external magnetic field and the nuclear magnetic moment. This effective Hamiltonian is given by the singleparticle Helmholtz free energy  $\overline{F}$ , to which we apply RayleighSchrödinger perturbation theory to find the chemical shielding tensor, the components of which are [89]

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar \gamma_I} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \overline{F}}{\partial B_{0,i} \partial \widehat{I}_j} \right)_{B_0 = 0, \hat{I} = \hat{0}}.$$
(4.54)

The electronic Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}(\boldsymbol{B}_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{I}})$  is written as the sum of  $\hat{H}_0$ , which describes the electrons in the absence of the external field and the nuclear magnetic moments, and a perturbative term  $\hat{V}(\boldsymbol{B}_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{I}})$  which includes these latter effects:

$$\widehat{H}(\boldsymbol{B}_{0},\hat{\boldsymbol{I}}) = \widehat{H}_{0} + \widehat{V}(\boldsymbol{B}_{0},\hat{\boldsymbol{I}}).$$
(4.55)

The term  $\hat{H}_0$  is the dominant part of the Hamiltonian and includes parts such as the Born-Oppenheimer Hamiltonian, the crystal-field interaction, and the ZFS interaction. The smaller term  $\hat{V}$  is written as the sum of three parts that are linear in either  $B_0$ ,  $\hat{I}$ , or both:

$$\widehat{V} = \widehat{H}_{Z} + \widehat{H}_{HF} + \widehat{H}_{D}, \qquad (4.56)$$

$$\widehat{H}_{\mathsf{Z}} = -\mathbf{B}_0 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{m}},\tag{4.57}$$

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm HF} = \widehat{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{I}},\tag{4.58}$$

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm D} = \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}. \tag{4.59}$$

The Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_z$  is the electronic Zeeman interaction between the electronic magnetic moment operator  $\hat{m} = -\mu_B(\hat{L} + g_e\hat{S})$  and the external field,  $\hat{H}_{\rm HF}$  is the hyperfine interaction between the hyperfine field operator  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  and the nuclear magnetic moment operator, and  $\hat{H}_D$  represents the diamagnetic nuclear-electron field coupling via the spatial tensor  $\mathcal{D}$ . There are additional terms of higher degree in  $B_0$  and  $\hat{I}$ , but these do not contribute to the shielding tensor, and so are not considered here. It proves convenient to partition the Hamiltonian as follows

$$\widehat{H} = \widehat{H}_0 + \lambda \widehat{H}_1 + \lambda^2 \widehat{H}_2, \tag{4.60}$$

where  $\lambda$  is a perturbation parameter that represents the combined order of **B**<sub>0</sub> and  $\hat{I}$ , and  $\hat{H}_1$  and  $\hat{H}_2$  are

$$\widehat{H}_1 = \widehat{H}_{\mathsf{Z}} + \widehat{H}_{\mathsf{HF}},\tag{4.61}$$

$$\widehat{H}_2 = \widehat{H}_{\mathsf{D}}.\tag{4.62}$$

The Helmholtz free energy is given by Eq. (2.18) as

$$\overline{F} = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln Q, \qquad (4.63)$$

where *Q* is the partition function. We write *Q* as the sum of the diagonal elements of the matrix representation of the density operator  $\hat{\rho}$ , that has been computed in the basis operators of the electronic spin:

$$\mathbf{Q} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}). \tag{4.64}$$

The notation  $Tr_s$  indicates that the sum is over the matrix elements of a *spin* operator, and not a sum of the diagonal elements of a *spatial* tensor. The equilibrium density operator is defined as

$$\hat{\rho} = \exp\left(-\beta \widehat{H}\right). \tag{4.65}$$

We can expand both  $\hat{\rho}$  and Q as Taylor series in  $\lambda$ :

$$\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}_0 + \lambda \hat{\rho}_1 + \lambda^2 \hat{\rho}_2 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3), \qquad (4.66)$$

$$\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q}_0 + \lambda \mathbf{Q}_1 + \lambda^2 \mathbf{Q}_2 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3), \tag{4.67}$$

where  $\hat{\rho}_0 = \exp(-\beta \hat{H}_0), \hat{\rho}_n$  is the *n*th-order correction to  $\hat{\rho}$ , and  $Q_n = \operatorname{Tr}_{S}(\hat{\rho}_n)$  is the *n*th-order correction to *Q*. We are now in a position to expand  $\overline{F}$  as a power series in  $\lambda$ :

$$\overline{F} = -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left[ Q_0 + \lambda Q_1 + \lambda^2 Q_2 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) \right]$$
(4.68)

$$= -\frac{1}{\beta} \ln Q_0 - \frac{1}{\beta} \ln \left[ 1 + \lambda \frac{Q_1}{Q_0} + \lambda^2 \frac{Q_2}{Q_0} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^3) \right]$$
(4.69)

$$=\overline{F}_{0} - \frac{\lambda}{\beta} \frac{Q_{1}}{Q_{0}} + \frac{\lambda^{2}}{\beta} \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{Q_{1}}{Q_{0}} \right)^{2} - \frac{Q_{2}}{Q_{0}} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{3}), \qquad (4.70)$$

where  $\overline{F}_0 = -\beta^{-1} \ln Q_0$  is the Helmholtz free energy in the absence of the external magnetic field and nuclear magnetic moment. The principle of time-reversal symmetry [191] states that the free energy must be time-even, and therefore an even function of the time-odd parameters  $B_0$  and  $\hat{I}$ . Hence it must only contain even powers of  $\lambda$ , from which we deduce that  $Q_1$  must be zero. The free energy is therefore

$$\overline{F} = \overline{F}_0 - \frac{\lambda^2}{\beta} \frac{Q_2}{Q_0} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4).$$
(4.71)

We now need an expression for the partition function  $Q_2$ . We note that  $\hat{\rho}$  satisfies a form of the Schrödinger equation:

$$\frac{\partial \hat{\rho}}{\partial \beta} = -\hat{H}\hat{\rho}.\tag{4.72}$$

On substituting Eqs. (4.60) and (4.66) for  $\hat{H}$  and  $\hat{\rho}$  into the Schrödinger equation, and collecting terms of equal order in  $\lambda$ , we obtain the following differential equations for  $\hat{\rho}_1$  and  $\hat{\rho}_2$ :

$$\frac{\partial \hat{\rho}_1}{\partial \beta} = -\hat{H}_0 \hat{\rho}_1 - \hat{H}_1 \hat{\rho}_0, \tag{4.73}$$

$$\frac{\partial \hat{\rho}_2}{\partial \beta} = -\hat{H}_0 \hat{\rho}_2 - \hat{H}_1 \hat{\rho}_1 - \hat{H}_2 \hat{\rho}_0.$$
(4.74)

The solutions to these equations can be found using standard techniques [190], which give:

$$\hat{\rho}_{1} = -\int_{0}^{\beta} dw \exp\left((w - \beta)\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1} \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right), \qquad (4.75)$$

$$\hat{\rho}_{2} = -\int_{0}^{\beta} dw \exp\left((w - \beta)\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{2} \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)$$

$$+\int_{0}^{\beta} dw \int_{0}^{w} dw' \exp\left((w - \beta)\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1}$$

$$\times \exp\left((w' - w)\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1} \exp\left(-w'\widehat{H}_{0}\right). \qquad (4.76)$$

Alternatively one can substitute Eqs. (4.75) and (4.76) into Eqs. (4.73) and (4.74) to verify that the former are solutions of the latter. The partition function  $Q_2$  is given by the trace of  $\hat{\rho}_2$ . Taking the trace of the first term gives

$$Tr_{S}\left[-\int_{0}^{\beta} dw \exp\left((w-\beta)\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{2} \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\right]$$
  
$$=-\int_{0}^{\beta} dwTr_{S}\left[\exp\left((w-\beta)\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{2} \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\right]$$
  
$$=-\int_{0}^{\beta} dwTr_{S}\left[\exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\exp\left((w-\beta)\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{2}\right]$$
  
$$=-\int_{0}^{\beta} dwTr_{S}\left[\exp\left(-\beta\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{2}\right] =-\beta Tr_{S}\left[\hat{\rho}_{0}\widehat{H}_{2}\right], \qquad (4.77)$$

where to go to the third line, we have used the identity  $\operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{A}\widehat{B}\widehat{C}) = \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{C}\widehat{A}\widehat{B}) = \operatorname{Tr}(\widehat{B}\widehat{C}\widehat{A})$ , and then to go to the final line, we have evaluated the integral. The Boltzmann average  $\langle \widehat{U} \rangle_0$  of an operator  $\widehat{U}$  over the energy levels of  $\widehat{H}_0$  is equal to

$$\langle \widehat{U} \rangle_0 = \frac{\text{Tr}_s(\hat{\rho}_0 \widehat{U})}{Q_0}, \qquad (4.78)$$

and so Eq. (4.77) can be written in its final form as

$$-\beta \langle \hat{H}_2 \rangle_0 Q_0, \tag{4.79}$$

i.e. this part of  $\hat{\rho}_2$  is proportional to the thermal average of  $\hat{H}_2$  over the energy levels of  $\hat{H}_0$ .

The trace of the second term in Eq. (4.76) is more complex to compute. We start by noting that

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left[\int_{0}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}w \int_{0}^{w} \mathrm{d}w' \exp\left((w-\beta)\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1}\exp\left((w'-w)\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1}\exp\left(-w'\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\right]$$
$$=\int_{0}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}w \int_{0}^{w} \mathrm{d}w' \operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left[\widehat{\rho}_{0}\exp\left((w-w')\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1}\exp\left(-(w-w')\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1}\right] \quad (4.80)$$
$$=\int_{0}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}u \int_{0}^{u} \mathrm{d}v \operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left[\widehat{\rho}_{0}\exp\left(v\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1}\exp\left(-v\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1}\right], \quad (4.81)$$

where to go to the last line we have performed a change in the dummy integration variables 
$$u = w$$
 and  $v = w - w'$ . This integral is still rather tricky to evaluate in its present form, but fortunately it can be simplified after some straightforward algebra. Firstly we apply the change of variable  $v' = v - \beta$  to the first integral, which

gives  

$$\int_{0}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}u \int_{-\beta}^{u-\beta} \mathrm{d}v' \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \Big[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp\left(-v' \hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \exp\left(v' \hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \Big], \qquad (4.82)$$

followed by a second change of variable v = -v', which yields

$$\int_{0}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}u \int_{\beta-u}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}\nu \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{S}} \Big[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp\left(\nu \widehat{H}_{0}\right) \widehat{H}_{1} \exp\left(-\nu \widehat{H}_{0}\right) \widehat{H}_{1} \Big].$$
(4.83)

Secondly we apply a similar change of variables to u in the second integral, namely  $u' = u - \beta$  which gives

$$\int_{-\beta}^{0} \mathrm{d}u' \int_{-u'}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}v \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{S}} \Big[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp\left(v \hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \exp\left(-v \hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \Big], \qquad (4.84)$$

followed by u = -u' after which the double integral becomes

$$\int_{0}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}u \int_{u}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}v \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{S}} \Big[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp\left(v \hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \exp\left(-v \hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \Big].$$
(4.85)

The integrals in Eqs. (4.81) and (4.85) sum to give

$$\int_{0}^{\beta} du \int_{0}^{u} dv \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp \left( v \hat{H}_{0} \right) \hat{H}_{1} \exp \left( - v \hat{H}_{0} \right) \hat{H}_{1} \right] + \int_{0}^{\beta} du \int_{u}^{\beta} dv \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp \left( v \hat{H}_{0} \right) \hat{H}_{1} \exp \left( - v \hat{H}_{0} \right) \hat{H}_{1} \right] = \int_{0}^{\beta} du \int_{0}^{\beta} dv \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp \left( v \hat{H}_{0} \right) \hat{H}_{1} \exp \left( - v \hat{H}_{0} \right) \hat{H}_{1} \right].$$
(4.86)

However the integrals on the first line are equal, and so we can finally write Eq. (4.81) in a form that is more straightforward to evaluate:

$$\int_{0}^{\beta} du \int_{0}^{u} dv \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp\left(v\hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \exp\left(-v\hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \right]$$
  
=  $\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\beta} du \int_{0}^{\beta} dv \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp\left(v\hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \exp\left(-v\hat{H}_{0}\right) \hat{H}_{1} \right]$  (4.87)

$$= \frac{\beta}{2} \int_{0}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}\nu \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \Big[ \hat{\rho}_{0} \exp\left(\nu \widehat{H}_{0}\right) \widehat{H}_{1} \exp\left(-\nu \widehat{H}_{0}\right) \widehat{H}_{1} \Big]$$
(4.88)

$$=\frac{\beta}{2}\left\langle \int_{0}^{\beta} \mathrm{d}w \exp\left(w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1} \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{H}_{1}\right\rangle_{0} Q_{0}, \qquad (4.89)$$

i.e. it is proportional to the Boltzmann average of the integral of  $\exp\left(w\widehat{H}_0\right)\widehat{H}_1\exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_0\right)\widehat{H}_1$  over *w*. Combining Eqs. (4.71), (4.79), and (4.89) we arrive at the final expression for the Helmholtz free energy

$$\overline{F} = \overline{F}_0 + \langle \widehat{H}_2 \rangle_0 - \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \int_0^\beta \mathrm{d}w \exp\left(w\widehat{H}_0\right) \widehat{H}_1 \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_0\right) \widehat{H}_1 \right\rangle_0 + \dots,$$
(4.90)

where we have set  $\lambda = 1$ , as it has served its purpose as an expansion parameter and is no longer needed. Substituting in the expressions for  $\hat{H}_1$  and  $\hat{H}_2$  and performing the double differentiation gives us the expression for the chemical shielding:

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar\gamma_I} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \overline{F}}{\partial B_{0,i} \partial \widehat{I}_j} \right)_{B_0 = 0, \overline{I} = 0}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\hbar\gamma_I} \langle \mathcal{D}_{ij} \rangle_0 + \frac{1}{2\hbar\gamma_I} \left\langle \int_0^\beta dw \exp\left(w\widehat{H}_0\right) \hat{m}_i \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_0\right) \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j \right\rangle_0$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\hbar\gamma_I} \left\langle \int_0^\beta dw \exp\left(w\widehat{H}_0\right) \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_0\right) \hat{m}_i \right\rangle_0.$$
(4.91)
(4.91)

The second integral can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{2\hbar\gamma_{I}}\left\langle\int_{0}^{\beta}\mathrm{d}w\exp\left(w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{j}\exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{m}_{i}\right\rangle_{0} \\
=\frac{1}{2\hbar\gamma_{I}Q_{0}}\int_{0}^{\beta}\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{Tr}_{S}\left[\exp\left(-\beta\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\exp\left(w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{j}\exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{m}_{i}\right] \quad (4.93) \\
=\frac{1}{2\hbar\gamma_{I}Q_{0}}\int_{0}^{\beta}\mathrm{d}w\mathrm{Tr}_{S}\left[\exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{m}_{i}\exp\left(-\beta\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\exp\left(w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{j}\right]. \quad (4.94) \\$$

Making a change of variable  $u = \beta - w$  we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2\hbar\gamma_{I}Q_{0}}\int_{0}^{\beta}du\mathrm{Tr}_{S}\left[\exp\left(-\beta\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\exp\left(u\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{m}_{i}\exp\left(-u\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{j}\right]$$
$$=\frac{1}{2\hbar\gamma_{I}}\left\langle\int_{0}^{\beta}du\exp\left(u\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{m}_{i}\exp\left(-u\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{j}\right\rangle_{0},$$
(4.95)

which is equal to the first integral in Eq. (4.92). The expression for the shielding tensor is therefore

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar \gamma_I} \langle \mathcal{D}_{ij} \rangle_0 + \frac{1}{\hbar \gamma_I} \left\langle \int_0^\beta \mathrm{d}w \exp\left(w\widehat{H}_0\right) \hat{m}_i \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_0\right) \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j \right\rangle_0.$$
(4.96)

To evaluate the integral we need to write the Boltzmann averages in terms of the energy levels and states of the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_0$ . We will denote the eigenstates as  $|nv\rangle$  where v denotes the states with the same energy  $E_n$ , i.e.

$$\widehat{H}_0|n\nu\rangle = E_n|n\nu\rangle. \tag{4.97}$$

Using this we write Eq. (4.96) as

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar \gamma_I Q_0} \sum_{n\nu} \exp(-\beta E_n) \langle n\nu | \mathcal{D}_{ij} | n\nu \rangle + \frac{1}{\hbar \gamma_I Q_0} \sum_{n\nu, m\mu} \exp(-\beta E_n) \langle n\nu | \hat{m}_i | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j | n\nu \rangle \times \int_0^\beta dw \exp(w(E_n - E_m)).$$
(4.98)

This integral is now easy to evaluate, and we obtain as the final result for the chemical shielding tensor

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{h\gamma_{i}} \left[ \frac{1}{Q_{0}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_{n}) \sum_{\nu} \langle n\nu | \mathcal{D}_{ij} | n\nu \rangle \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{Q_{0}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_{n}) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu, \mu'} \frac{\langle n\nu | \hat{m}_{i} | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j} | n\nu \rangle + \text{c.c.}}{E_{m} - E_{n}} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\beta}{Q_{0}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_{n}) \sum_{\nu, \nu'} \langle n\nu | \hat{m}_{i} | n\nu' \rangle \langle n\nu' | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j} | n\nu \rangle \right],$$
(4.99)

where c.c. is the complex conjugate of  $\langle nv | \hat{m}_i | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j | nv \rangle$ .
This apparently complicated expression comprises three terms. The first two are the 'diamagnetic'  $\sigma_{ij}^{\text{plara}}$  and 'paramagnetic'  $\sigma_{ij}^{\text{para}}$  contributions to the chemical shielding that Ramsey calculated for a non-degenerate, singlet ground state [192], and which van den Heuvel and Soncini generalised to an open-shell electronic configuration with thermally accessible electronic excited states [87,89]:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\text{dia}} = \frac{1}{\hbar \gamma_I Q_0} \sum_n \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{\nu} \langle n\nu | \mathcal{D}_{ij} | n\nu \rangle, \qquad (4.100)$$

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\text{para}} = \frac{1}{\hbar \gamma_i Q_0} \sum_n \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu, \mu} \frac{\langle n\nu | \hat{m}_i | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j | n\nu \rangle + \text{c.c.}}{E_m - E_n}.$$
 (4.101)

We again note that Ramsey's use of the term 'paramagnetic' is different to the one employed here. Pennanen and Vaara gathered the diamagnetic term and the spin-independent part of the paramagnetic term together into the 'orbital' component of their chemical shielding tensor  $\sigma_{ij}^{\text{orb}}$ . However we must bear in mind that, for open-shell configurations exhibiting appreciable SO coupling, the 'paramagnetic' term includes the spin-dependent terms in both  $\hat{m}$ and  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ , and so  $\sigma^{\text{para}}$  is not a pure orbital term. The third term in Eq. (4.99) exhibits a leading Curie temperature dependence of 1/(kT), which is familiar from our earlier discussions. One interesting feature of this term is that it receives a zero contribution from any levels *n* that are non-degenerate. Hence if we have an isolated non-degenerate ground state n = 0 we obtain

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar \gamma_I} \langle 0 | \mathcal{D}_{ij} | 0 \rangle + \frac{1}{\hbar \gamma_I} \sum_{m \neq 0} \sum_{\mu} \frac{\langle 0 | \hat{m}_i | m \mu \rangle \langle m \mu | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j | 0 \rangle + \text{c.c.}}{E_m - E_0}, \quad (4.102)$$

which is the Ramsey expression [192].

In our discussion of paramagnetic shifts, we retain both the Curie term and the spin-dependent part of the 'paramagnetic' term and combine both in our paramagnetic shielding  $\sigma_{ii}^{s}$ :

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S} = \frac{2}{\hbar \gamma_{I} Q_{0}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_{n}) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu, \mu} \frac{\langle n\nu | \hat{m}_{i} | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j} | n\nu \rangle}{E_{m} - E_{n}} + \frac{\beta}{\hbar \gamma_{I} Q_{0}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_{n}) \sum_{\nu, \nu'} \langle n\nu | \hat{m}_{i} | n\nu' \rangle \langle n\nu' | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j} | n\nu \rangle.$$
(4.103)

Note that  $\langle nv|\hat{m}_i|m\mu\rangle\langle m\mu|\hat{\mathcal{F}}_j|nv\rangle$  in the first term is always real, and so we have removed the c.c. and replaced it with a factor of 2 in front of the sum. Henceforth we only consider  $\sigma_{ii}^{s}$  in our discussion.

4.2.2. The EPR formalism applied to d-block transition-metal systems

Eq. (4.103) is a correct, if opaque, form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor. However for *d*-block transition-metal ions we can convert it to an intuitively more useful form by using the explicit EPR Hamiltonian in Eq. (4.36), from which we can write down  $\hat{H}_0$  and  $\hat{H}_1$  as

$$\widehat{H}_0 = \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}, \tag{4.104}$$

$$\widehat{H}_1 = \mu_{\mathsf{B}} \mathbf{B}_0 \cdot \mathbf{g} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}} + \hat{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}, \qquad (4.105)$$

where we see that the ZFS interaction is the Hamiltonian in the absence of the external field and nuclear magnetic moments. We can deduce the expressions for both the magnetic moment  $\hat{m}_i$  and the hyperfine field  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$  operators to be

$$\hat{m}_i = -\mu_{\rm B} \sum_k g_{ik} \hat{S}_k, \tag{4.106}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_j = \sum_l \hat{S}_l A_{lj}. \tag{4.107}$$

Substituting these into the EPR expression for the paramagnetic shielding in Eq. (4.103) we obtain

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S} = -\frac{2\mu_{B}}{\hbar\gamma_{l}}\sum_{kl}g_{ik}A_{lj}\frac{1}{Q_{0}}\sum_{n}\exp(-\beta E_{n})\sum_{m\neq n}\sum_{\nu,\mu}\frac{\langle n\nu|S_{k}|m\mu\rangle\langle m\mu|S_{l}|n\nu\rangle}{E_{m}-E_{n}}$$
$$-\frac{\mu_{B}}{\hbar\gamma_{l}kT}\sum_{kl}g_{ik}A_{lj}\frac{1}{Q_{0}}\sum_{n}\exp(-\beta E_{n})\sum_{\nu,\nu'}\langle n\nu|\widehat{S}_{k}|n\nu'\rangle\langle n\nu'|\widehat{S}_{l}|n\nu\rangle,$$
(4.108)

where the  $|nv\rangle$  and  $E_n$  are the eigenstates and eigenvalues of the ZFS interaction Hamiltonian. This is simplified to give

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\rm S} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_l} \sum_{kl} g_{ik} Z_{kl} A_{lj}, \qquad (4.109)$$

or alternatively

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}}{\hbar\gamma_{\mathrm{I}}}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{Z}\cdot\boldsymbol{A}.$$
(4.110)

The tensor  $Z_{kl}$  contains all the information pertaining to the ZFS, and the form of the temperature dependence of the whole shielding tensor. It takes the form

$$Z_{kl} = \left\langle \int_{0}^{\beta} dw \exp\left(w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{S}_{k} \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{S}_{l} \right\rangle_{0}$$

$$= \frac{1}{Q_{0}} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left\{ \exp\left(-\beta\widehat{H}_{0}\right) \int_{0}^{\beta} dw \exp\left(w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{S}_{k} \exp\left(-w\widehat{H}_{0}\right)\widehat{S}_{l} \right\}$$

$$(4.112)$$

$$= \frac{2}{Q_0} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu, \mu} \frac{\langle n\nu | S_k | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | S_l | n\nu \rangle}{E_m - E_n} + \frac{\beta}{Q_0} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{\nu, \nu'} \langle n\nu | \widehat{S}_k | n\nu' \rangle \langle n\nu' | \widehat{S}_l | n\nu \rangle.$$
(4.113)

In the absence of a ZFS interaction D = 0 and there is a single degenerate level n = 0 with energy  $E_0 = 0$ . In this case Eq. (4.108) reduces to a simple expression with a Curie temperature dependence:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S} = -\frac{\mu_{B}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}kT} \sum_{kl} g_{ik} A_{lj} \sum_{\nu,\nu'} \frac{\langle 0\nu | \hat{S}_{k} | 0\nu' \rangle \langle 0\nu' | \hat{S}_{l} | 0\nu \rangle}{2S+1}$$
(4.114)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_l kT} \sum_{kl} g_{ik} A_{lj} \frac{{\rm Tr}_{\rm S} \left(S_k S_l\right)}{2S+1}$$
(4.115)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_l kT} \sum_{kl} g_{ik} A_{lj} \frac{1}{3} S(S+1) \delta_{kl} \tag{4.116}$$

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_I kT} \sum_k g_{ik} A_{kj}, \qquad (4.117)$$

which can also be written

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_{\mathrm{I}} k T} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}. \tag{4.118}$$

In fact this is the same expression that was derived by Moon and Patchkovskii [39]. We note the following features. Firstly this expression is reminiscent of that for the spin-only ion in Eq. (3.70), with the main difference that the *g*-factor  $g_e$  has been replaced by the full *g*-tensor *g*. The tensors *g* and *A* couple together via conventional matrix multiplication. Secondly, as in Eq. (3.70), the temperature dependence varies according to the 1/kT Curie law. We see in the next section that this is not the case when there is a non-zero ZFS.

### 4.2.3. The EPR formalism in different temperature limits

It is instructive to explore the form of the EPR expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor in different temperature regimes. This has been investigated in some detail by Martin and Autschbach, who considered expansions of the EPR expression for the shielding tensor up to  $1/(kT)^3$  for metal ions with the full range of spins appropriate for the *d*-block, which range from 1/2 to 5/2[90,91]. It is particularly informative to consider the case of high temperatures, where the expression is considerably simplified. The term 'high temperature' refers to the size of kT with respect to the ZFS parameters D and E, and is therefore quantified by the ratios |D|/kT and |E|/kT, with smaller ratios indicating a better agreement with the high-temperature limit. We examine two related facets of this limit in order to illustrate the connection between the two formalisms. Firstly we note that the integral in Eq. (4.112) is over values of w from 0 to  $\beta$ , which corresponds to temperatures from infinity down to the experimental temperature T. If we assume that this range of temperatures is 'high', such that we can approximate the operators  $\exp(\pm w \hat{H}_0)$  by the identity operator, then  $Z_{kl}$  reduces to the expression calculated by Pennanen and Vaara  $Z_{kl}^{PV}$  [40]:

$$Z_{kl} = \frac{1}{Q_0} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left\{ \exp\left(-\beta \widehat{H}_0\right) \int_0^\beta \mathrm{d}w \exp\left(w \widehat{H}_0\right) \widehat{S}_k \exp\left(-w \widehat{H}_0\right) \widehat{S}_l \right\}$$
(4.119)

$$\approx \frac{1}{Q_0} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left\{ \exp\left(-\beta \widehat{H}_0\right) \int_0^p \mathrm{d}w \widehat{S}_k \widehat{S}_l \right\}$$

$$(4.120)$$

$$=\beta \frac{\Pi_{S} \left\{ \exp\left(-\beta H_{0}\right) S_{k} S_{l} \right\}}{Q_{0}}$$
(4.121)

$$=Z_{kl}^{\rm PV}.$$
(4.122)

The Pennenan-Vaara expression is therefore a high-temperature approximation of the EPR expression [41]. Note that we have not explicitly assumed that  $\exp(-\beta \hat{H}_0)$  is also approximated by the identity; this approximation has only been applied to temperatures higher than *T*.

Even higher temperatures can be examined further by expanding both  $Z_{kl}^{PV}$  and  $Z_{kl}$  as Taylor series in  $\beta$ . The expansion of the former is straightforward:

$$Z_{kl}^{PV} = \beta \frac{\text{Tr}_{S}(\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l})}{Q_{0}} - \beta^{2} \frac{\text{Tr}_{S}(\widehat{H}_{0}\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l})}{Q_{0}} + \frac{\beta^{3}}{2} \frac{\text{Tr}_{S}(\widehat{H}_{0}^{2}\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l})}{Q_{0}} + \mathcal{O}(\beta^{4}).$$

$$(4.123)$$

The expansion of the EPR expression  $Z_{kl}$  requires more tedious algebra, which gives the following

The first term of order  $\beta^2$  is proportional to the trace of  $\hat{H}_0[\hat{S}_k, \hat{S}_l]$ , which is equal to zero:

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left\{\widehat{H}_{0}\left[\widehat{S}_{k},\widehat{S}_{l}\right]\right\} = \sum_{m,n,p,\mu,\nu,\pi} \sum_{\langle m\mu | \widehat{H}_{0} | n\nu \rangle} \left[ \langle n\nu | \widehat{S}_{k} | p\pi \rangle \langle p\pi | \widehat{S}_{l} | m\mu \rangle - \langle n\nu | \widehat{S}_{l} | p\pi \rangle \langle p\pi | \widehat{S}_{k} | m\mu \rangle \right] \quad (4.127)$$

$$=\sum_{n,p}\sum_{\nu,\pi} E_n \left[ \langle n\nu | \hat{S}_k | p\pi \rangle \langle p\pi | \hat{S}_l | n\nu \rangle - \langle n\nu | \hat{S}_l | p\pi \rangle \langle p\pi | \hat{S}_k | n\nu \rangle \right]$$
(4.128)

where to go to the last line we use the argument set out in Appendix D. We therefore see that  $Z_{kl}^{PV}$  and  $Z_{kl}$  are identical out to and including the terms in  $1/(kT)^2$ , and differ only in the third-order terms and above. Both formalisms therefore give the same second-order expression:

$$Z_{kl} = \beta \frac{\operatorname{Tr}_{s}\left(\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l}\right)}{Q_{0}} - \beta^{2} \frac{\operatorname{Tr}_{s}\left(\widehat{H}_{0}\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l}\right)}{Q_{0}}$$
(4.130)

$$=\frac{\beta}{3}S(S+1)\delta_{kl}-\frac{\beta^2}{30}S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)D_{kl},$$
(4.131)

where we have replaced  $\hat{H}_0$  with the ZFS interaction Hamiltonian. The calculation is described in detail in Appendix D. This form of  $Z_{kl}$  results in a high-temperature expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor that was first derived by Bleaney [62]:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} \approx -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}} \mathcal{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)}{3 \, \hbar \gamma k T} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A} + \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}} \mathcal{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)(2\mathrm{S}-1)(2\mathrm{S}+3)}{30 \, \hbar \gamma_{l} (kT)^{2}} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}.$$
(4.132)

The conclusion is that if kT is sufficiently large that the Boltzmann average over the ZFS energy levels can be well-approximated to  $1/(kT)^2$  in the Taylor expansion, both the Pennanen-Vaara and van den Heuvel-Soncini EPR formalisms give the same result.

4.2.3.1. An example of the temperature dependence of the paramagnetic shielding tensor. The deviation of both the Bleaney and Pennanen–Vaara theories from the EPR shielding formalism becomes important at low temperature, and for very large values of the ZFS. To investigate this we employ a discussion along the lines of van den Heuvel and Soncini [88], upon which we expand, and calculate the form of the shielding tensor due to a paramagnetic centre with spin S = 1. Initially we assume that the ZFS interaction is axially symmetric and traceless. In the PAF of the

$$Z_{kl} = \frac{1}{Q_0} \operatorname{Tr}_S \left\{ \left( \hat{1} - \beta \hat{H}_0 + \frac{1}{2} \beta^2 \hat{H}_0^2 - \frac{1}{6} \beta^3 \hat{H}_0^3 + \mathcal{O}(\beta^4) \right) \\ \times \int_0^\beta dw \left( \hat{1} + w \hat{H}_0 + \frac{1}{2} w^2 \hat{H}_0^2 + \mathcal{O}(w^3) \right) \hat{S}_k \left( \hat{1} - w \hat{H}_0 + \frac{1}{2} w^2 \hat{H}_0^2 + \mathcal{O}(w^3) \right) \hat{S}_l \right\}$$

$$= \frac{1}{Q_0} \operatorname{Tr}_S \left\{ \left( \hat{1} - \beta \hat{H}_0 + \frac{1}{2} \beta^2 \hat{H}_0^2 - \frac{1}{6} \beta^3 \hat{H}_0^3 + \mathcal{O}(\beta^4) \right) \right\}$$

$$(4.124)$$

$$\times \left(\beta \widehat{S}_k \widehat{S}_l + \frac{1}{2} \beta^2 \widehat{H}_0 \widehat{S}_k \widehat{S}_l - \frac{1}{2} \beta^2 \widehat{S}_k \widehat{H}_0 \widehat{S}_l + \frac{1}{6} \beta^3 \widehat{H}_0^2 \widehat{S}_k \widehat{S}_l - \frac{1}{3} \beta^3 \widehat{H}_0 \widehat{S}_k \widehat{H}_0 \widehat{S}_l + \frac{1}{6} \beta^3 \widehat{S}_k \widehat{H}_0^2 \widehat{S}_l + \mathcal{O}(\beta^4)\right) \right\}$$

$$(4.125)$$

$$=\beta\frac{\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l}\right)}{Q_{0}}+\beta^{2}\left[\frac{\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{H}_{0}\left(\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l}-\widehat{S}_{l}\widehat{S}_{k}\right)\right)}{2Q_{0}}-\frac{\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{H}_{0}\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l}\right)}{Q_{0}}\right]+\beta^{3}\left[\frac{\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left\{\widehat{H}_{0}^{2}\left(\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l}+\widehat{S}_{l}\widehat{S}_{k}\right)+\widehat{H}_{0}\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{H}_{0}\widehat{S}_{l}\right\}}{6Q_{0}}\right]+\mathcal{O}(\alpha^{4}).$$

$$(4.126)$$

ZFS the Hamiltonian  $\tilde{H}$  is given by

$$\hat{\widetilde{H}} = \widetilde{D}_{20} \widehat{T}_{20} \tag{4.133}$$

$$= D\left(\widehat{S}_{z}^{2} - \frac{1}{3}S(S+1)\widehat{1}\right), \tag{4.134}$$

and has the following eigenstates and energies:

$$|1\rangle = |+1\rangle, \qquad E_1 = \frac{1}{3}D,$$
 (4.135)

$$|2\rangle = |0\rangle, \qquad E_2 = -\frac{2}{3}D, \qquad (4.136)$$

$$|3\rangle = |-1\rangle, \qquad E_3 = \frac{1}{3}D,$$
 (4.137)

where we see that states  $|1\rangle$  and  $|3\rangle$  are degenerate and form a doublet state, and  $|2\rangle$  is a non-degenerate singlet state. The energy levels are shown in Fig. 4.3 and the matrix representations of the spin operators  $\hat{S}_i$  are given in Table 4.1. It should be noted that these energy levels are of the same form as those that describe nuclear quadrupolar resonance (NQR) spectra of nuclei with spin I = 1.

We obtain the components of the tensor  $Z_{kl}$  by taking all possible products of the matrix elements of two spin operators. In the full EPR formalism we obtain the following diagonal components:

$$\widetilde{Z}_{xx} = \widetilde{Z}_{yy} = \frac{2}{D} \frac{e^{2\beta D/3} - e^{-\beta D/3}}{2e^{-\beta D/3} + e^{2\beta D/3}},$$
(4.138)

$$\widetilde{Z}_{zz} = 2\beta \frac{e^{-\rho D/3}}{2e^{-\beta D/3} + e^{2\beta D/3}}.$$
(4.139)

The off-diagonal elements are zero, as a result of our working in the PAF of the ZFS tensor. The implication is that the both the *Z*- and ZFS tensors share the same PAF. Furthermore we see that  $\tilde{Z}_{xx} = \tilde{Z}_{yy}$ , and so the *Z*-tensor is axially symmetric, like the ZFS. In the Pennanen–Vaara formalism we calculate  $\tilde{Z}_{kl}^{PV}$  in a similar way to obtain the following diagonal elements:



**Fig. 4.3.** Energy levels of an electronic spin S = 1 subject to a ZFS in its PAF. The levels are shown in coordination environments of axial and rhombic symmetry. The dotted line represents the barycentre at zero energy.

$$\widetilde{Z}_{xx}^{PV} = \widetilde{Z}_{yy}^{PV} = \beta \frac{e^{-\beta D/3} + e^{2\beta D/3}}{2e^{-\beta D/3} + e^{2\beta D/3}},$$
(4.140)

$$\widetilde{Z}_{zz}^{PV} = 2\beta \frac{e^{-\beta D/3}}{2e^{-\beta D/3} + e^{2\beta D/3}}.$$
(4.141)

We can see immediately that the two formalisms give different results for the  $\tilde{Z}_{xx}$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{yy}$ , but the same value for  $\tilde{Z}_{zz}$ . However, as seen above, if we expand both  $\tilde{Z}_{xx}^{PV}$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{xx}$  as Taylor series

$$\widetilde{Z}_{xx}^{PV} = \frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{1}{9}D\beta^2 + \frac{1}{54}D^2\beta^3 + \mathcal{O}(\beta^4), \qquad (4.142)$$

$$\widetilde{Z}_{xx} = \frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{1}{9}D\beta^2 - \frac{1}{27}D^2\beta^3 + \mathcal{O}(\beta^4), \qquad (4.143)$$

we see that the deviation only appears in the terms of order  $\beta^3$  and higher. Finally we use the Taylor expansions to obtain the Bleaney expressions for the *Z*-tensor  $\tilde{Z}_{kl}^{B}$ , which are:

$$\widetilde{Z}_{xx}^{B} = \widetilde{Z}_{yy}^{B} = \frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{1}{9}D\beta^{2}, \qquad (4.144)$$

$$\widetilde{Z}_{zz}^{B} = \frac{2}{3}\beta - \frac{2}{9}D\beta^{2}.$$
(4.145)

We need an idea of the size of the discrepancies between the three theories under standard conditions for high-resolution NMR. Fig. 4.4 shows plots of the three diagonal components of the Z-tensor as a function of temperature in the EPR, Pennanen-Vaara, and Bleaney formalisms. Parts (a) and (b) compare the temperature variation of  $\tilde{Z}_{xx,yy}$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{zz}$  respectively for each formalism from 0 K to 400 K for a large axial ZFS of  $D = 50 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The non-Curie behaviour of all four curves is immediately seen, and for the xx and yy components we see that the differences between the three curves are only apparent below approximately 100 K. with both the Pennanen-Vaara and Bleaney curves tending to infinity at 0 K, whilst the EPR curve shows better behaviour by tending to a constant, finite value of 2/D. The EPR and Pennanen–Vaara curves of the zz component are coincident, as we have shown with the calculations above, and both tend to zero at zero temperature. The Bleaney curve is not well-behaved at very low temperatures (here below 50 K), as it tends to minus infinity. Nevertheless the Bleaney curve matches extremely well with the others at higher temperatures.

The discrepancies between the curves appear at higher temperatures if the system possesses a larger ZFS. Interestingly we note that the Bleaney theory, although considerably simpler than the other two, performs remarkably well down to temperatures of 100 K, and in particular has very good agreement with the more complicated Pennanen–Vaara theory. However out of the these three formulae we would expect the full EPR formula to be more likely to be correct at low temperatures simply because at very low temperatures only the lowest-energy state  $|2\rangle \equiv |0\rangle$  is populated, and so the shielding tensor should be temperature independent and not tend to infinity [88].

We can repeat the calculation for a ZFS of rhombic symmetry with the Hamiltonian

### Table 4.1

Matrix representations of the spin operators  $\hat{S}_i$  in the basis of a spin S = 1 subject to a ZFS interaction of axial or rhombic symmetry.

Symmetry	$\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{x}}$	$\widehat{S}_{y}$	$\widehat{S}_z$
Axial	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1/\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 1/\sqrt{2} & 0 & 1/\sqrt{2} \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i/\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ i/\sqrt{2} & 0 & -i/\sqrt{2} \\ 0 & i/\sqrt{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$
Rhombic	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$



**Fig. 4.4.** Comparison between the expressions of the paramagnetic chemical shielding *Z*-tensor as a function of temperature as derived using the EPR formalism of van den Heuvel and Soncini [87,89], and the Pennanen–Vaara [40], and Bleaney [62] theories for a spin S = 1 subject to the ZFS interaction. In each plot the EPR curve is in black, the Pennanen–Vaara curve is in red, and the Bleaney curve is in grey. Shown in (a) and (b) are the  $Z_{xx}/Z_{yy}$  and  $Z_{zz}$  curves due to an axially symmetric ZFS with  $D = 50 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . In (b) the black and red curves are exactly coincident. The temperature variations of  $Z_{xx}$ ,  $Z_{yy}$ , and  $Z_{zz}$  are shown in (c), (d), and (e) for a rhombic ZFS interaction with  $D = 50 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $E = 20 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .

$$\hat{\vec{H}} = \tilde{D}_{20}\hat{T}_{20} + \tilde{D}_{2-2}\hat{T}_{2+2} + \tilde{D}_{2+2}\hat{T}_{2-2}$$
(4.146)

$$= D\left(\widehat{S}_{z}^{2} - \frac{1}{3}S(S+1)\widehat{1}\right) + E\left(\widehat{S}_{x}^{2} - \widehat{S}_{y}^{2}\right),$$
(4.147)

where we are once again working within the PAF of the ZFS tensor. The eigenstates and energies are:

$$|1'\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}(|+1\rangle + |-1\rangle), \qquad E'_1 = \frac{1}{3}D + E,$$
 (4.148)

$$|2'\rangle = |0\rangle, \qquad E'_2 = -\frac{2}{3}D,$$
 (4.149)

$$|3'\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}(-|+1\rangle + |-1\rangle), \qquad E'_3 = \frac{1}{3}D - E.$$
 (4.150)

The rhombic terms  $\hat{T}_{2\pm 2}$  are double-quantum operators, being proportional to  $\hat{S}_{\pm}^2$ , and so mix together the states  $|\pm 1\rangle$ , which are no longer degenerate but are split by 2*E*, and leave  $|0\rangle$  unperturbed. The energy levels under rhombic symmetry are shown in Fig. 4.3. We need the matrix elements of  $\hat{S}_i$  in the new basis, the representations within which are given in Table 4.1.

The EPR formula gives the following non-zero diagonal values of  $\widetilde{Z}_{kl}$ :

$$\widetilde{Z}_{xx} = \frac{2}{D+E} \frac{e^{2\beta D/3} - e^{-\beta (D/3+E)}}{e^{-\beta (D/3+E)} + e^{2\beta D/3} + e^{-\beta (D/3-E)}},$$
(4.151)

$$\widetilde{Z}_{yy} = \frac{2}{D-E} \frac{e^{2\beta D/3} - e^{-\beta (D/3-E)}}{e^{-\beta (D/3+E)} + e^{2\beta D/3} + e^{-\beta (D/3-E)}},$$
(4.152)

$$\widetilde{Z}_{ZZ} = \frac{1}{E} \frac{e^{-\rho(D/3-E)} - e^{-\rho(D/3-E)}}{e^{-\beta(D/3+E)} + e^{2\beta D/3} + e^{-\beta(D/3-E)}}.$$
(4.153)

We note that the *Z*-tensor is still diagonal, but no longer axially symmetric due to the introduction of the rhombic anisotropy *E*. The Pennanen–Vaara formula gives the following non-zero values of  $\widetilde{Z}_{kl}^{PV}$ :

$$\widetilde{Z}_{xx}^{PV} = \beta \frac{e^{-\beta(D/3+E)} + e^{2\beta D/3}}{e^{-\beta(D/3+E)} + e^{2\beta D/3} + e^{-\beta(D/3-E)}},$$
(4.154)

$$\widetilde{Z}_{yy}^{PV} = \beta \frac{e^{-\beta(D/3+E)} + e^{-\beta(D/3-E)}}{e^{-\beta(D/3+E)} + e^{-\beta(D/3-E)}},$$
(4.155)

$$\widetilde{Z}_{zz}^{PV} = \beta \frac{e^{-\beta(D/3+E)} + e^{-\beta(D/3-E)}}{e^{-\beta(D/3+E)} + e^{2\beta D/3} + e^{-\beta(D/3-E)}}.$$
(4.156)

We see that the expressions for the *zz* components are no longer the same, which is a result of the lifting of the axial symmetry. However the Taylor series of the expressions up to  $\beta^2$  are once again identical, and are equal to the expressions obtained from the Bleaney theory:

$$\widetilde{Z}_{xx}^{B} = \frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{1}{9}(D - 3E)\beta^{2}, \qquad (4.157)$$

$$\widetilde{Z}_{yy}^{\mathsf{B}} = \frac{2}{3}\beta + \frac{1}{9}(D+3E)\beta^2, \qquad (4.158)$$

$$\widetilde{Z}_{zz}^{\rm B} = \frac{2}{3}\beta - \frac{2}{9}D\beta^2.$$
(4.159)

All these expressions for  $\tilde{Z}_{xx}, \tilde{Z}_{yy}$ , and  $\tilde{Z}_{zz}$  are plotted in Fig. 4.4(c)–(e) for ZFS anisotropies of  $D = 50 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $E = 20 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Once again the discrepancies from the EPR curves are only apparent at low temperatures, here below 100 K for these specific values of D and E, with the EPR curves for  $\tilde{Z}_{xx}$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{yy}$  tending to constant values of 2/(D + E) and 2/(D - E) respectively at 0 K. It is once again striking how well the Bleaney theory performs at higher temperatures.

Therefore the conclusion is that the general EPR formalism, due to van den Heuvel and Soncini, presented in this chapter gives an exact description of the paramagnetic shielding tensor at all temperatures. However the simpler Pennanen–Vaara or Bleaney forms can be used if the temperature is sufficiently high that the shielding expression can be truncated at  $1/(kT)^2$ . In practice, this means that for first-row transition-metal ions for which *D* has a maximum of approximately 50 cm<sup>-1</sup> at temperatures above 100 K we can safely use either the Pennanen–Vaara or Bleaney formula.

### 4.3. The magnetic susceptibility tensor

### 4.3.1. Magnetism of the bulk

We saw that for a linear material containing an ensemble of spin-only transition metal centres, an applied magnetic field induces a bulk magnetisation that is proportional in size and parallel in direction to the field, with the constant of proportionality equal to the volume magnetic susceptibility, as shown in Eq. (3.87). In particular we noted that the magnetization is independent of the relative orientation of the field to the material. Such a bulk material is said to be magnetically isotropic. This situation is shown in Fig. 4.5(a). For spin systems subject to SO coupling



**Fig. 4.5.** Illustration of the induced magnetic moment per paramagnetic ion due to magnetically isotropic and anisotropic materials. A magnetically isotropic material is shown in (a). The size of the induced magnetic moment per paramagnetic ion is proportional to the size of the external field, and does not vary with the field direction. However the induced magnetic moment always remains parallel to the field. In a magnetically anisotropic material, shown in (b), the induced magnetic moment per paramagnetic ion is in general not parallel to the external field, and changes in size and direction as the material is rotated within the field.

we can apply the same reasoning to determine the induced magnetization, with one important difference. Because the magnetic moments of the paramagnetic centres are now spatially anisotropic, via either  $\hat{L}$  or g depending on how we choose to define the spin Hamiltonian, we also expect the induced magnetization vector M to vary as the direction of the applied field is changed. The bulk material is therefore anisotropic, and Eq. (3.87) should be modified to account for this:

$$\boldsymbol{M} = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \boldsymbol{\chi}_V \cdot \boldsymbol{B}_0. \tag{4.160}$$

The constant of proportionality is replaced by the volume magnetic susceptibility tensor  $\chi_V$ , in which is encoded the anisotropic response of the material to the field. The effect of the anisotropic susceptibility tensor is that in general the magnetisation vector is no longer parallel to the field, as shown in Fig. 4.5(b). From here we can also generalise Eq. (3.89) to give an expression for the average induced magnetic moment per paramagnetic centre  $\langle \hat{\mu}_S \rangle$  of such spin systems:

$$\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{S} \rangle = \frac{1}{\mu_{0}} \boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \boldsymbol{B}_{0}, \qquad (4.161)$$

where  $\chi$  is the molecular magnetic susceptibility tensor.

To calculate the average energy *E* per paramagnetic centre that results from the interaction of the average moment with the field we recall Eq. (2.13), which gives the infinitesimal change in internal energy of the whole sample due to a change in magnetic field at constant entropy and constant volume as  $-V\mathbf{M} \cdot d\mathbf{B}$ . From this we express the infinitesimal change in the average energy per paramagnetic centre as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}E}{\mathrm{d}B_0} = -\langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \rangle \tag{4.162}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\mu_0} \boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \boldsymbol{B}_0. \tag{4.163}$$

Integrating this expression we obtain

$$E = -\frac{1}{2\mu_0} \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \boldsymbol{B}_0, \qquad (4.164)$$

from which we see that the  $\chi$  tensor must be symmetric. It therefore just contains zeroth- and second-rank irreducible spherical tensor components  $\chi_{00}$  and  $\chi_{2m}$ . Writing the latter in the PAF these components are

$$\chi_{00} = -\sqrt{3}\chi_{iso}, \tag{4.165}$$

$$\widetilde{\chi}_{20} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{2}} \Delta \chi_{ax}, \qquad (4.166)$$

$$\widetilde{\chi}_{2\pm 1} = 0, \tag{4.167}$$

$$\widetilde{\chi}_{2\pm 2} = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \chi_{\rm rh}, \tag{4.168}$$

where  $\chi_{iso}$  is the isotropic susceptibility, and  $\Delta \chi_{ax}$  and  $\Delta \chi_{rh}$  are the axial and rhombic susceptibility anisotropies which are defined as

$$\Delta \chi_{ax} = \tilde{\chi}_{zz} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \tilde{\chi}_{xx} + \tilde{\chi}_{yy} \right)$$
(4.169)

$$\Delta \chi_{\rm rh} = \chi_{\rm xx} - \chi_{\rm yy}. \tag{4.170}$$

Note that in this convention we order the principal components of the tensor as  $\tilde{\chi}_{zz} > \tilde{\chi}_{yy} > \tilde{\chi}_{xx}$ .

4.3.2. The susceptibility tensor in terms of the molecular/atomic-level parameters according to the EPR formalism

The EPR formalism for the paramagnetic shielding tensor can be adapted to calculate the magnetic susceptibility tensor [89]. Here, following the computation of the Helmholtz free energy we look for terms that are bilinear in the external magnetic field, which is done by calculating the following derivative:

$$\chi_{ij} = -\mu_0 \left( \frac{\partial^2 \overline{F}}{\partial B_{0,i} \partial B_{0,j}} \right)_{B_0 = \mathbf{0}}.$$
(4.171)

The paramagnetic susceptibility tensor can written down from Eq. (4.103) on substituting  $\hat{m}_i$  for  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ . The expression is

$$\chi_{ij} = \frac{2\mu_0}{Q_0} \sum_n \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu,\mu} \frac{\langle n\nu | \hat{m}_i | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | \hat{m}_j | n\nu \rangle}{E_m - E_n} + \frac{\mu_0}{kT} \frac{1}{Q_0} \sum_n \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{\nu,\nu'} \langle n\nu | \hat{m}_i | n\nu' \rangle \langle n\nu' | \hat{m}_j | n\nu \rangle, \qquad (4.172)$$

which is a form of the van Vleck equation [214]. This is the general expression for the paramagnetic susceptibility tensor.

In the specific case of an ensemble of *d*-block transition-metal ions, we once again write the electronic magnetic moment operator as  $\hat{m}_i = -\mu_B \sum_k g_{ik} \hat{S}_k$ , and we obtain Eq. (4.173):

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} = \mu_0 \mu_B^2 \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T, \qquad (4.173)$$

where the matrix **Z** is the same as that encountered earlier in Eq. (4.113). If the EPR expression for **Z** is used, this expression gives the susceptibility tensor at arbitrary temperature. The expression for the susceptibility tensor reduces to the Pennanen–Vaara expression if we use  $Z^{PV}$  for **Z**. In addition, as for the paramagnetic shielding tensor, we can also approximate  $\chi$  to second order in 1/(kT). Once again the expression for **Z** approximates to the same expression  $Z^{B}$  regardless of which formalism we employ, and we obtain the Bleaney expression for  $\chi$ :

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} \approx \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)}{3kT} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T - \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30(kT)^2} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T. \quad (4.174)$$

This describes the susceptibility tensor in the high-temperature limit, such that |D|,  $|E| \ll kT$ .

# 4.3.3. Relating the paramagnetic shift to the magnetic susceptibility tensor

We can now derive the connection between the paramagnetic shielding and the magnetic susceptibility tensors. We start by writing down the Hamiltonian describing the hyperfine interaction between the nuclear spin and the average electronic magnetic moment. The general widely-used expression is [215,216]

$$\hat{H}_{SI} = -\mu_0 \langle \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \rangle \cdot \boldsymbol{C} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_I, \tag{4.175}$$

where we write the reduced hyperfine coupling tensor in a completely general way as the sum of isotropic  $C^{con}$ , antisymmetric  $C^{as}$ , and traceless symmetric  $C^{dip}$  parts:

$$\mathbf{C} = C^{\rm con} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{C}^{\rm as} + \mathbf{C}^{\rm dip}. \tag{4.176}$$

We will see shortly that the isotropic and symmetric anisotropic parts  $C^{con}$  and  $C^{dip}$  are not strictly equal to the NR Fermi-contact

and spin-dipolar parts  $C^{FC}$  and  $C^{SD}$  respectively. Nevertheless this approximation is frequently made, in which case the expressions for  $C^{con}$  and  $C^{dip}$  are the same as those for  $C^{FC}$  and  $C^{SD}$  given in Eqs. (3.103) and (3.104), and the corresponding irreducible spherical tensor components are those given in Eqs. (3.106) and (3.110)–(3.114). This equivalence (or lack thereof) is a subtle point that is discussed further in Sections 4.4 and 4.5. The antisymmetric hyperfine term  $C^{as}$  is characterised by the antisymmetric anisotropy  $\zeta^{C}$ , which is given by

$$\zeta^{C} = \sqrt{\left(C_{xy}^{as}\right)^{2} + \left(C_{yz}^{as}\right)^{2} + \left(C_{xz}^{as}\right)^{2}}.$$
(4.177)

In the PAF of  $C^{as}$ , the three rank-one irreducible spherical tensor components are

$$\overline{C}_{10} = -i\sqrt{2}\zeta^C, \qquad (4.178)$$

$$\overline{C}_{1\pm 1} = 0.$$
 (4.179)

Substituting the expressions for the average electronic magnetic moment in Eq. (4.161) and the nuclear magnetic moment operator into Eq. (4.175), we obtain

$$\hat{H}_{SI} = -\boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \boldsymbol{C} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_I \tag{4.180}$$

$$= -\hbar \gamma_I \mathbf{B}_0 \cdot \mathbf{\chi} \cdot \mathbf{C} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}. \tag{4.181}$$

This Hamiltonian represents an interaction that is linear in the components of both the magnetic field and the nuclear spin, i.e. a chemical shielding. We can therefore write the interaction in the form  $\hbar \gamma_1 \mathbf{B}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\chi} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}$ , where the shielding due to the susceptibility tensor  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\chi}$  is

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\boldsymbol{\chi}} = -\boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathsf{C}}.\tag{4.182}$$

This is the generalised form of Eq. (3.100) which we derived for spin-only paramagnetic centres. Note that Eq. (4.182) has been derived without making any specific assumptions about the form of the susceptibility tensor, other than it being field-independent. We now provide the last link in the connection between the EPR and susceptibility formalisms. We start from the Hamiltonian of the hyperfine interaction

$$\hat{H}_{SI} = -\mu_0 \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_S \cdot \boldsymbol{C} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_I, \tag{4.183}$$

and we substitute in the expressions for the magnetic moment operators  $\hat{\mu}_l = \hbar \gamma_l \hat{I}$  and  $\hat{\mu}_s = -\mu_B g \cdot \hat{S}$ . This expression for the electronic magnetic moment encodes both the orbital and spin components of the magnetic moment. The hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian becomes

$$\widehat{H}_{SI} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} \hbar \gamma_l \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T \cdot \boldsymbol{C} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}$$
(4.184)

$$=\hat{\mathbf{S}}\cdot\mathbf{A}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{I}},\tag{4.185}$$

where the hyperfine coupling constant is given by

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} \hbar \gamma_I \boldsymbol{g}^T \cdot \boldsymbol{C}. \tag{4.186}$$

We have written it as the matrix product of the transpose of the *g*-matrix and the reduced hyperfine coupling matrix  $g^T \cdot C$ . We note that writing the hyperfine tensor in this form means that the magnitude and sign of the interaction change as the spatially-anisotropic electronic magnetic moment changes orientation due to the presence of  $g^T$ . This property is missing in the EPR expression for the hyperfine tensor, which is dominated by the NR terms  $A^{FC}$  and  $A^{SD}$ , which only contain information about the NR part of the electronic magnetic moment via  $g_e$ . We note that it is exactly this inclusion of the *g*-tensor in Eq. (4.186), and in particular the anisotropic part of the *g*-tensor, which means that  $C^{con}$  and  $C^{dip}$  are not

strictly equivalent to  $C^{FC}$  and  $C^{SD}$ . Rather,  $C^{con}$  contains contributions from both  $A^{FC}$  and  $A^{SD}$ . We also note that this discrepancy is not addressed by including the SO coupling terms from Eq. (4.42) in the EPR expression. Firstly these terms usually have a negligible impact on the shift when compared to other SO coupling effects, such as the *g*-shift and ZFS. Secondly the second-order contribution to the hyperfine tensor  $A^{SD,2}$  is only referred to as a "dipolar coupling" as it is symmetric like the NR contribution  $A^{SD}$ , but does not have the same long-range dependence on distance. This is due to it being a cross term in the perturbation expansion of the effective-spin Hamiltonian, and therefore representing a shorterrange effect. Combining the expression in Eq. (4.186) with the EPR formula for the paramagnetic shielding in Eq. (4.109) gives

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}}{\hbar\gamma_{\mathrm{I}}} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}$$
(4.187)

$$= -\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^{\rm T} \cdot \boldsymbol{C}$$
(4.188)

$$= -\boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \boldsymbol{C}. \tag{4.189}$$

Eqs. (4.182) and (4.189) are the same, thus establishing the selfconsistency of the derived expressions. This provides the foundation for showing that the EPR and susceptibility expressions  $\sigma^{S}$ and  $\sigma^{\chi}$  for the paramagnetic shielding tensor are indeed equivalent. A previous attempt at providing a similar argument was made by Benda et al., which covered a lot of ground on unifying the description of the PCS in both formalisms [217]. However there are still some subtleties that remain in the argument, which mainly originate from the interpretation of the hyperfine tensors *A* and *C*. These points are addressed in the following sections on the scaling-factor model of Kim et al. (Section 4.4) [54], and on the Kurland–McGarvey formalism (Section 4.5) [38]. We begin by writing the susceptibility tensor as the sum of the isotropic  $\chi^{iso}$  and anisotropic  $\Delta \chi$  parts, i.e.  $\chi = \chi^{iso} \mathbf{1} + \Delta \chi$ , and the expression for  $\sigma^{\chi}$  becomes

$$\sigma^{\chi} = -\chi^{iso} C^{con} \mathbf{1} - \Delta \chi C^{con} - \chi^{iso} \mathbf{C}^{as} - \Delta \chi \cdot \mathbf{C}^{as} - \chi^{iso} \mathbf{C}^{dip} - \Delta \chi \cdot \mathbf{C}^{dip}.$$
(4.190)

This establishes that  $\sigma^{\chi}$  is the sum of different terms that originate from different parts of the hyperfine interaction, and contribute differently to the isotropic shift and SA. If the different contributions to the hyperfine tensor are interpreted correctly, the susceptibility expression for the paramagnetic shielding is exactly equivalent to the EPR formalism. However if we make the approximation  $C^{\text{con}} = C^{\text{FC}}$  and  $C^{\text{dip}} = C^{\text{SD}}$  differences do arise between the formalisms.

We examine these points in more detail in the next Sections 4.4 and 4.5, and later in Chapter 5.

### 4.4. The scaling factor revisited

It was shown in Section 3.4 that the paramagnetic shielding tensor for spin-only transition-metal ions can be viewed as the ratio of the hyperfine coupling tensor to the nuclear Zeeman energy, given by  $-\mathcal{A}/(2\hbar\gamma_I B_0)$ , that is calculated in the saturation regime, and then scaled into the high-temperature paramagnetic regime by multiplication with a scaling factor that depends on both temperature, and the electronic magnetic moment. This scaling factor is proportional to the magnetic susceptibility, and so can be determined from measurements of the bulk magnetism. When we include the effects of SO coupling this picture becomes more complicated. We have seen that the magnetic susceptibility becomes a spatially-anisotropic tensor, and so we would expect the scaling factor to also be anisotropic. However if we restrict the discussion to an NR hyperfine tensor, and only account for the SO coupling effects in the electronic magnetic moment, we can apply a modified form of the scaling-factor idea of Kim et al. [54], which has been employed by Clément et al. to first-row *d*-block ions [31].

The idea is to scale down the same NR hyperfine tensor expression  $-\mathcal{A}/(2\hbar\gamma_I B_0)$ , comprising the NR Fermi-contact and spindipolar parts, as shown in Section 3.4, but with a scaling factor that includes SO coupling effects. This scaling factor is the ratio of the paramagnetic electronic magnetic moment to the saturated magnetic moment. The electronic angular momentum properties are described in full in Section 6.4.1. However for present purposes we simply note that the paramagnetic centre is described by a total angular momentum J, and has a magnetic moment operator given by  $\hat{m} = -\mu_B g_j \hat{J}$ , where  $g_J$  is the isotropic Born–Landé g-factor. We note here that we do not account for the spatial anisotropy of the g-tensor. Following the discussion in Section 3.2, the z-component of the average electronic magnetic moment  $\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{para}$  is given by

$$\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{\text{para}} = \mu_{\text{B}} g_I J B_I(y), \qquad (4.191)$$

where  $B_J(y)$  is a form of the Brillouin function that depends on the total angular momentum quantum number *J*:

$$B_{J}(y) = \frac{2J+1}{2J} \operatorname{coth}\left[\left(\frac{2J+1}{2J}\right)y\right] - \frac{1}{2J} \operatorname{coth}\left[\frac{y}{2J}\right], \quad (4.192)$$

and  $y = \beta \mu_B g_J B_0 J$ . In the high-temperature limit the Brillouin function is approximated by  $B_J(y) \approx y(J+1)/(3J)$ , and  $\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{\text{para}}$  is given by

$$\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{\text{para}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{eff}}^2 B_0}{3kT}.$$
(4.193)

In Eq. (4.193) we have defined the magnitude of the effective electronic magnetic moment as  $\mu_{\rm eff} = \mu_{\rm B}g_J\sqrt{J(J+1)}$ . However in practice we treat  $\mu_{\rm eff}$  as an empirical parameter that can be determined from measurements of the magnetic susceptibility, which is given by

$$\chi^{\rm iso} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm eff}^2}{3kT}.\tag{4.194}$$

The treatment of  $\mu_{\text{eff}}$  in this way avoids the need for any explicit calculation of the SO coupling effects. The average electronic magnetic moment in the saturation regime  $\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}$  is formally given by  $\mu_{\text{B}}g_j J$ . However, as we do not include SO coupling effects in the calculation of either the electronic magnetic moment or the hyperfine tensor, we instead use the NR expression derived in Section 3.2, where  $J \rightarrow S$  and  $g_l \rightarrow g_e$ :

$$\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{\rm sat} = \mu_{\rm B} g_e S. \tag{4.195}$$

The scaling factor is therefore

$$\frac{\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{\text{para}}}{\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = \frac{\chi^{\text{iso}} B_0}{\mu_0 \mu_{\text{B}} g_e S} \tag{4.196}$$

$$=\frac{\mu_{\text{eff}}^2 B_0}{3\mu_{\text{B}} g_e S k T}.$$
(4.197)

The expression in terms of the magnetic susceptibility is the same as for spin-only paramagnetic centres. However in the present case we note that the magnetic susceptibility here includes the SO coupling contributions to the electron magnetic moments, and does not have the same expression as in the spin-only case. Finally, in this formalism, the paramagnetic shielding tensor is

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\langle \hat{m}_{z} \rangle_{\mathrm{para}}}{\langle \hat{m}_{z} \rangle_{\mathrm{sat}}} \frac{\mathcal{A}}{2\hbar\gamma_{I}B_{0}} \tag{4.198}$$

$$= -\frac{\chi^{\rm iso}}{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I} \frac{\mathcal{A}}{2S}$$
(4.199)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm eff}^2}{3\mu_{\rm B}g_e\hbar\gamma_l kT}\frac{A}{2S}$$
(4.200)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm eff}^2}{3\mu_{\rm B}g_e\hbar\gamma_l kT}\boldsymbol{A},\tag{4.201}$$

where have written  $\mathbf{A} = \mathcal{A}/(2S)$  as the hyperfine tensor per electron. As mentioned earlier the effective electronic magnetic moment in Eq. (4.201) can be treated as an empirical parameter which hides all the SO coupling effects, such as the *g*-shift. The hyperfine tensor  $\mathbf{A}$  is calculated in the NR regime, and so if we make the approximations  $C^{\text{con}} = C^{\text{FC}}$  and  $\mathbf{C}^{\text{dip}} = \mathbf{C}^{\text{SD}}$ , the shielding tensor in this formalism is equivalent to the part  $-\chi^{\text{iso}}C^{\text{con}}\mathbf{1} - \chi^{\text{iso}}\mathbf{C}^{\text{dip}}$  in Eq. (4.190). This model of the paramagnetic shielding tensor is therefore an approximation, as it neglects SO coupling effects in the hyperfine tensor and does not account for magnetic anisotropy, which gives rise to the PCS. Nevertheless it has been shown to be very effective for calculating the contact shifts of solid paramagnetic battery materials [31,55–57].

# 4.4.1. The scaling tensor in the presence of magnetic susceptibility anisotropy

The scaling factor picture can be modified in a straightforward manner to also account for the effects of the susceptibility anisotropy due to both the *g*-anisotropy and ZFS. We note that when the susceptibility anisotropy is taken into account, rather than the scaling factor being a scalar quantity that is proportional to the isotropic magnetic susceptibility, the scaling factor becomes a tensor with the same spatial properties as the susceptibility tensor. We can back-calculate the scaling factor from the shielding tensor in the susceptibility formalism in Eq. (4.182). If we assume that the hyperfine tensor is still well approximated in the NR regime, Eq. (4.186) gives is the following expression for the total hyperfine tensor:

$$\mathcal{A} = 2S\mu_0\mu_B g_e \hbar \gamma_I \mathbf{C}. \tag{4.202}$$

Rearranging Eq. (4.182) gives us

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\chi} = -\frac{B_0 \boldsymbol{\chi}}{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e S} \cdot \frac{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}}{2\hbar \gamma_{\rm I} B_0}. \tag{4.203}$$

From here we can define the scaling tensor as

$$\frac{B_0}{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e S} \chi. \tag{4.204}$$

The physical explanation for this expression comes from the fact that the electronic magnetic moments that contribute to the magnetic susceptibility tensor are orientation-dependent, and so the required scaling of the hyperfine interaction into the paramagnetic regime is also orientation-dependent. When we compare this expression for the shielding with Eq. (4.190) we see that it contains the following terms:  $-\chi^{iso}C^{con}\mathbf{1} - \Delta\chi C^{con} - \chi^{iso}C^{dip} - \Delta\chi \cdot C^{dip}$ , i.e. all the cross terms between the isotropic and anisotropic parts of the susceptibility tensor and the contact and spin-dipolar parts of the hyperfine tensor, with only contributions from the antisymmetric hyperfine tensor missing. Therefore the model of the paramagnetic shielding in terms of a scaling tensor accounts for both the contact shift [54] and PCS [16].

### 4.5. The Kurland–McGarvey formalism

We complete our survey of the different formalisms for the paramagnetic shielding tensor by examining the classic general treatment by Kurland and McGarvey [38]. The expression for the PCS in the Kurland–McGarvey formalism exactly matches that in the susceptibility formalism introduced in Eq. (4.190), namely  $-\Delta \chi \cdot C^{dip}$ , but there is a discrepancy in the expressions for the contact shielding, which in the susceptibility and scaling-factor formalisms is given by  $-\chi^{iso}C^{con}$ **1**. This reason for this discrepancy can be understood by noting that in the susceptibility formalism, we neglect the effect of the *g*-shift in the expression linking the

two hyperfine interactions in the definition in Eq. (4.186), where we choose to write:

$$A^{\rm FC} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I C^{\rm con}, \qquad (4.205)$$

$$\boldsymbol{A}^{\rm SD} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} \boldsymbol{g}_e \hbar \gamma_I \boldsymbol{C}^{\rm dip}. \tag{4.206}$$

This is the approach taken in the exposition of the scaling-factor models in Section 4.4. However there may be cases in which the g-shift in Eq. (4.186) cannot be neglected. The correct expression for **C** to use in the susceptibility formalism is given by inverting Eq. (4.186) to give [201]:

$$\mathbf{C} = \frac{1}{\mu_0 \mu_{\mathrm{B}} \hbar \gamma_I} \left[ \mathbf{g}^{\mathrm{T}} \right]^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{A}.$$
(4.207)

This, in turn, gives us the following expression for the paramagnetic shielding in the susceptibility formalism:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\chi} = -\frac{1}{\mu_0 \mu_{\mathsf{B}} \hbar \gamma_I} \boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \left[ \boldsymbol{g}^{\mathsf{T}} \right]^{-1} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}. \tag{4.208}$$

We now write the hyperfine tensor as the sum of the NR Fermicontact and spin-dipolar parts, which results in a shielding tensor which is the sum of two terms:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\chi} = -\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\mu_0 \mu_{\text{B}} \hbar \gamma_I} \boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \left[\boldsymbol{g}^{\text{T}}\right]^{-1} - \frac{1}{\mu_0 \mu_{\text{B}} \hbar \gamma_I} \boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \left[\boldsymbol{g}^{\text{T}}\right]^{-1} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}}.$$
(4.209)

The first term gives us the Fermi-contact shift and associated SA, whilst the second gives us the PCS and the SA due to the spindipolar interaction.

The isotropic contact shielding is given by

$$\sigma^{\rm FC} = -\frac{A^{\rm FC}}{3\mu_0\mu_{\rm B}\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}} {\rm Tr}\Big[\boldsymbol{\chi}\cdot\big[\boldsymbol{g}^{\rm T}\big]^{-1}\Big]$$
(4.210)

The trace can, of course, be computed in any spatial reference frame. For convenience, we choose the common PAF of both the susceptibility and symmetric part of the g-tensor. Evaluating the trace then gives us the Kurland–McGarvey expression for the contact shielding [38]:

$$\sigma^{\rm FC} = -\frac{A^{\rm FC}}{3\mu_0\mu_B\hbar\gamma_l} \left[\frac{\widetilde{\chi}_{xx}}{\widetilde{g}_{xx}} + \frac{\widetilde{\chi}_{yy}}{\widetilde{g}_{yy}} + \frac{\widetilde{\chi}_{zz}}{\widetilde{g}_{zz}}\right]. \tag{4.211}$$

On comparing this expression with that from the scaling-factor model in Eq. (4.199), we see that the two are only equal when the g-tensor is equal to the free-electron g-factor, which is one of the initial assumptions of the scaling-factor model [54]. The Kurland-McGarvey expression for the contact shielding in Eq. (4.211) can therefore be regarded as a generalization of the contact shielding calculated using the scaling-factor approach in the susceptibility formalism. In commenting on the difference between the two expressions, we note that to use the Kurland-McGarvey expression we need to know the principal values of the susceptibility tensor, which cannot be independently measured for molecules in solution, or for solid powders, and may also be difficult to determine for single crystals, as discussed in Chapter 7. The scaling-factor expression, on the other hand, only requires knowledge of the isotropic susceptibility, which can be readily obtained for all these samples. Therefore the scaling-factor model is almost always more convenient to use than the Kurland-McGarvey formula.

The pseudo-contact shielding is given by the expression

$$\sigma^{\text{PCS}} = -\frac{1}{3\mu_0\mu_B\hbar\gamma_I}\text{Tr}\Big[\boldsymbol{\chi}\cdot\big[\boldsymbol{g}^{\text{T}}\big]^{-1}\cdot\boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}}\Big].$$
(4.212)

If we write  $A^{SD}$  in terms of  $C^{SD}$  via Eq. (3.102) we obtain

$$\sigma^{\text{PCS}} = -\frac{1}{3} \text{Tr} \Big[ \boldsymbol{\chi}' \cdot \boldsymbol{C}^{\text{SD}} \Big], \qquad (4.213)$$

where  $\chi' = \chi \cdot [\mathbf{g}^T]^{-1}g_e$  is the pseudo-susceptibility tensor defined by Benda et al. in their description of the PCS obtained following a first-principles calculation of  $\chi$  via the *g*- and ZFS tensors [217]. As for the contact shielding, there is a discrepancy between this expression for the pseudo-contact shielding and that from the susceptibility formalism,  $-\Delta \chi \cdot \mathbf{C}^{dip}$ . The reason for this discrepancy can be traced back to the difference between the NR hyperfine spindipolar tensor  $\mathbf{C}^{SD}$  and the traceless symmetric tensor in the presence of SO coupling  $\mathbf{C}^{dip}$ . The former is a 'true' dipolar coupling, and may be represented as a point-dipolar interaction where appropriate, whereas the latter is the second-rank component of  $\mathbf{C}$  that is proportional to  $[\mathbf{g}^T]^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{A}$  and is not a pure spin-dipolar contribution, as there is a contribution from the *g*-anisotropy. Care is needed in differentiating between these two cases.

### 4.6. Key concepts

- The coupling between the electronic spin and orbital angular momentum changes the form of the EPR parameters, resulting in the Hamiltonian of Eq. (4.36).
- The free-electron *g*-factor is modified so that it becomes a spatially anisotropic *g*-tensor.
- The hyperfine tensor gains additional contributions to the isotropic and symmetric parts, as well as an antisymmetric part.
- For electronic spins greater than 1/2 there is also a zero-field splitting interaction.
- The SO-induced changes to the EPR parameters also change the form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor, as given in the EPR formalism (Eq. (4.109)).
- The SO coupling also introduces anisotropy to the bulk magnetic properties, with the magnetic susceptibility becoming a spatially anisotropic tensor (Eq. (4.173)).
- The paramagnetic shielding can also be calculated in terms of the susceptibility tensor, as in Eq. (4.189).
- The paramagnetic shielding due to SO coupling can also be approximated by a scaling of the NR hyperfine tensor. The scaling factor contains an empirical effective electronic magnetic moment that can be calculated, or measured, separately (Eq. (4.201)).
- The susceptibility formalism also provides the Kurland–McGarvey expressions for the contact and pseudo-contact shieldings (Eqs. (4.211) and (4.213)). These expressions may be regarded as generalizations of those obtained from the scaling-factor formalism.

# Chapter 5: The interpretation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor of *d*-block transition-metal ions

This chapter contains a full discussion of the various terms that arise from the expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor presented in Chapter 4, and how they may be interpreted in terms of the structural and electronic properties of the system under study. We explore the form of the shielding tensor in two different formalisms: the EPR formalism, in terms of the molecular/atomiclevel EPR tensor parameters, and the susceptibility formalism, in terms of the bulk magnetic susceptibility tensor. In each formalism the shielding tensor is broken down into a number of contributions that can be grouped according to the different parts of the hyperfine interaction. There are three such groups of terms, corresponding to the isotropic contact interaction, the symmetric anisotropic spin-dipolar interaction, and the antisymmetric hyperfine interaction. We derive explicit formulae for all these contributions using both formalisms, and link both approaches together. It is particularly important to link the two formalisms, so that we can compare the forms of the paramagnetic shielding tensor we obtain from each, and to be able to judge whether the differences we observe are merely superficial, or due to the fundamental differences between the two pictures.

# 5.1. Correspondence between the EPR and susceptibility formalisms of the paramagnetic shielding tensor

The terms in both the EPR and susceptibility formalisms are listed in Table 5.1 and ordered into three groups: terms giving rise to the contact shift (con), the dipolar shift (dip), and the shift from the antisymmetric part of the hyperfine tensor (as). We recall that  $A^{SD,2}$  is not a long-range interaction term, unlike  $A^{SD}$ , and that the notation 'SD,2' is somewhat misleading. Nevertheless we include it with the other dipolar terms, since it is also a rank-two tensor and shares the same angular properties. A similar argument is made for including the SO contribution to the isotropic hyperfine tensor  $A^{FC,2}$  with the contact terms.

We see that the correspondence between the formalisms is not perfect, as for example in the lack of rank-one contact shielding terms in the susceptibility formalism. This reason for this discrepancy is that in the EPR formalism the magnetic anisotropy of the metal ion is accounted for by the local SO coupling effects which give rise to the g-anisotropy and ZFS, whereas in the susceptibility formalism the magnetic anisotropy is described wholly as a bulk effect in the magnetic susceptibility tensor. So for instance we see that the rank-one contact shielding tensor components are due to the antisymmetric part of the g-tensor in the EPR formalism. In the susceptibility formalism, on the other hand, the antisymmetric part of the g-tensor is 'hidden' in the susceptibility tensor, which itself is symmetric and so does not produce any rank-one terms in the contact shielding. For the spin-dipolar interaction the antisymmetric shielding terms are present, but we will see that these are due to the coupling of the symmetric susceptibility anisotropy tensor with the dipolar coupling tensor. However we do not dwell on this specific point, since the rank-one shielding terms are unobservable under high-field conditions. A second reason for any possible discrepancy is that the terms present in the EPR formalism form a series expansion in the fine structure constant  $\alpha$ , with only terms of order up to and including  $\alpha^4$  being retained.

Throughout this chapter we assume that the chemical shielding interaction is in the high-field approximation. Even though this approximation may not be valid for the ZFS and electron Zeeman interactions in the EPR Hamiltonian, it can be applied more safely to the paramagnetic shielding interaction as the latter is obtained by scaling down the hyperfine tensor, as we have seen previously [54]. In the high-field approximation the paramagnetic shielding in terms of irreducible spherical tensors is given by Eq. (2.96):

$$\sigma^{(1)} = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_{00}^{S} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_{20}^{S} \tag{5.1}$$

$$=\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm S} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} \widetilde{\sigma}_{2m}^{\rm S} \exp(-im\alpha_{\rm PL}) d_{m0}^{(2)}(\beta_{\rm PL}), \qquad (5.2)$$

from which we see that we are only able to observe the isotropic and symmetric parts of the shielding tensor. Hence we do not concern ourselves with the rank-one parts of the shielding tensor. In Cartesian tensor components the high-field paramagnetic shielding adopts the simple form

$$\sigma^{(1)} = \sigma_{zz}^{\mathsf{S}}.\tag{5.3}$$

The same interaction can also be written in terms of the susceptibility expression for the paramagnetic shielding as follows:

$$\sigma^{(1)} = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_{00}^{\chi} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_{20}^{\chi}$$
(5.4)

$$=\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\chi} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} \widetilde{\sigma}_{2m}^{\chi} \exp(-im\alpha_{\rm PL}) d_{m0}^{(2)}(\beta_{\rm PL}), \tag{5.5}$$

$$=\sigma_{ZZ}^{\chi}.$$
 (5.6)

We now proceed to analyse the terms in Table 5.1 in both formalisms, and examine in detail the contributions from the contact, spin-dipolar, and antisymmetric hyperfine interactions.

### 5.2. Summary of the relevant tensor parameters

The interpretation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor using either the susceptibility or EPR formalisms requires the definition of a number of spatial tensors.

### 5.2.0.1. The magnetic susceptibility tensor

The magnetic susceptibility tensor  $\chi$  is symmetric, and can be decomposed into two components as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} = \boldsymbol{\chi}^{\text{iso}} \mathbf{1} + \Delta \boldsymbol{\chi}, \tag{5.7}$$

where  $\chi^{iso}$  is the isotropic part, and  $\Delta \chi$  is the traceless and symmetric susceptibility anisotropy. The susceptibility anisotropy is parameterised according to one of two conventions. The first is in terms of the axial and rhombic anisotropies  $\Delta \chi_{ax}$  and  $\Delta \chi_{rh}$ , which are defined in terms of the PAF components  $\tilde{\chi}_{ii}$  as

### Table 5.1

Comparison of the terms contributing to the paramagnetic shielding tensor arising from the EPR formalism [87,89] with those arising from the susceptibility formalism. The different terms are separated into groups arising from the contact interaction (con), spin-dipolar interaction (dip), and the antisymmetric hyperfine interaction (as). The spatial irreducible spherical tensor ranks have been included for situations in which the ZFS is both present and absent.

Туре		$\sigma^{\rm s}$						
	Term	Order	With Z	FS	Without	ZFS	Expression	Rank
			Expression <sup>a</sup>	Rank	Expression <sup>b</sup>	Rank		
con	1	α <sup>2</sup>	$g_{e}A^{FC}Z$	0, 2	g_A <sup>FC</sup>	0	$-\chi^{iso}C^{con}$	0
	3	$\alpha^4$	$g_e A^{FC,2} \mathbf{Z}$	0, 2	$g_e A^{FC,2}$	0	$-\Delta \chi C^{con}$	2
	6	$\alpha^4$	$\Delta g_{iso} A^{FC} Z$	0, 2	$\Delta g_{iso} A^{FC}$	0		
	8	$\alpha^4$	$A^{FC}\Delta g \cdot Z$	0, 1, 2	$A^{FC}\Delta g$	1, 2		
dip	2	α <sup>2</sup>	$g_{e} \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{SD}$	0, 1, 2	g <sub>e</sub> A <sup>SD</sup>	2	$-\chi^{iso} C^{dip}$	2
	4	$\alpha^4$	$g_{e} \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{SD,2}$	0, 1, 2	$g_{e}A^{SD,2}$	2	$-\Delta \boldsymbol{\gamma} \cdot \boldsymbol{C}^{dip}$	0, 1, 2
	7	$\alpha^4$	$\Delta g_{iso} \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{SD}$	0, 1, 2	$\Delta g_{iso} A^{SD}$	2		
	9	$\alpha^4$	$\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0, 1, 2	$\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0, 1, 2		
as	5	$\alpha^4$	$g_e \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{as}$	1, 2	$g_e A^{as}$	1	$-\chi^{iso} \mathcal{C}^{as} \ -\Delta \chi \cdot \mathcal{C}^{as}$	1 1, 2

 $^{\rm a}~$  Multiply by  $-\mu_{\rm B}/({\rm h}\gamma_{\rm I})$  to obtain full shielding expression.

<sup>b</sup> Multiply by  $-\mu_{\rm B}S(S+1)/(3\hbar\gamma_I kT)$  to obtain full shielding expression.

$$\Delta \chi_{ax} = \tilde{\chi}_{zz} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \tilde{\chi}_{xx} + \tilde{\chi}_{yy} \right), \tag{5.8}$$

$$\Delta \chi_{\rm rh} = \widetilde{\chi}_{\rm xx} - \widetilde{\chi}_{\rm yy}. \tag{5.9}$$

The PAF components are defined so that  $\tilde{\chi}_{zz} \ge \tilde{\chi}_{yy} \ge \tilde{\chi}_{xx}$ . Alternatively we can define the PAF components to satisfy  $|\tilde{\chi}_{zz} - \chi^{iso}| \ge |\tilde{\chi}_{xx} - \chi^{iso}| \ge |\tilde{\chi}_{yy} - \chi^{iso}|$ , and define the anisotropy  $\Delta \chi$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{\chi}$  as

$$\Delta \chi = \widetilde{\chi}_{zz} - \chi^{iso}, \tag{5.10}$$

$$\eta^{\chi} = \frac{\widetilde{\chi}_{yy} - \widetilde{\chi}_{xx}}{\Delta \chi}.$$
(5.11)

The orientation of the PAF of  $\Delta \chi$  is specified by the Euler angles  $\Omega_{XL} = (\alpha_{XL}, \beta_{XL}, \gamma_{XL}).$ 

The susceptibility tensor is given in terms of the EPR parameters by the following expression

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^{\rm T}. \tag{5.12}$$

The expressions for both the isotropic and anisotropic parts of the susceptibility contain the *g*-shift and ZFS tensors, which are both due to SO coupling.

### 5.2.0.2. The hyperfine coupling tensor

The hyperfine coupling tensor **A** takes the following form

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \left(\boldsymbol{A}^{\text{FC}} + \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{FC},2}\right)\boldsymbol{1} + \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{as}} + \left(\boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} + \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD},2}\right).$$
(5.13)

The isotropic part  $A^{iso}$  is due to the NR Fermi-contact and the SO second-order contact interactions:

$$A^{\rm iso} = A^{\rm FC} + A^{\rm FC,2}.$$
 (5.14)

The antisymmetric part is due entirely to the SO-coupling term  $A^{as}$  and is characterised by the antisymmetric anisotropy  $\zeta^A$  which is given by

$$\zeta^{A} = \sqrt{\left(A_{xy}^{as}\right)^{2} + \left(A_{yz}^{as}\right)^{2} + \left(A_{xz}^{as}\right)^{2}}.$$
(5.15)

The orientation of the PAF of  $A^{as}$  is specified by the Euler angles  $\Omega_{AAL} = (\alpha_{AAL}, \beta_{AAL}, \gamma_{AAL})$ . The symmetric part is due to the NR and SO spin-dipolar terms  $A^{SD}$  and  $A^{SD,2}$ . The symmetric anisotropy  $\Delta A$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^A$  are therefore given by

$$\Delta A = \widetilde{A}_{zz}^{SD} + \widetilde{A}_{zz}^{SD,2}, \qquad (5.16)$$

$$\eta^{A} = \frac{A_{yy}^{\text{SD}} + A_{yy}^{\text{SD},2} - A_{xx}^{\text{SD}} - A_{xx}^{\text{SD},2}}{\Delta A}.$$
(5.17)

The tilde denotes that the matrix elements are evaluated in the PAF of the symmetric part of the *whole* hyperfine tensor, i.e.  $A^{SD} + A^{SD,2}$ . The orientation of this PAF is specified by the Euler angles  $\Omega_{ASL} = (\alpha_{ASL}, \beta_{ASL}, \gamma_{ASL})$ . Note that in the point-dipole approximation, the interaction is given by the long-range NR term, and the anisotropy and asymmetry parameter are

$$\Delta A = 2b_{\rm SI},\tag{5.18}$$

$$\eta^A = \mathbf{0},\tag{5.19}$$

where  $b_{SI}$  is the dipolar coupling constant.

In the susceptibility formalism we make use of the reduced hyperfine coupling tensor C, which comprises an isotropic contact term  $C^{\text{con}}$ , antisymmetric term  $C^{\text{as}}$ , and a symmetric spin-dipolar term  $C^{\text{dip}}$ . If we approximate the isotropic contact term as the NR Fermi-contact coupling constant, as in Sections 4.3.3 and 4.4, it is equal to

$$C^{\rm con} = \frac{1}{35} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}), \tag{5.20}$$

i.e. it is proportional to the unpaired electron spin density at the nucleus  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$ . The antisymmetric hyperfine term  $\mathbf{C}^{as}$  is characterised by the antisymmetric anisotropy  $\zeta^{C}$ , which is given by

$$\zeta^{C} = \sqrt{\left(C_{xy}^{as}\right)^{2} + \left(C_{yz}^{as}\right)^{2} + \left(C_{xz}^{as}\right)^{2}}.$$
(5.21)

If we approximate the rank-two hyperfine tensor as the NR spindipolar coupling, the symmetric anisotropy  $\Delta C$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{c}$  are given by

$$\Delta C = \widetilde{C}_{zz}^{dip},\tag{5.22}$$

$$\eta^{C} = \frac{\widetilde{C}_{yy}^{dip} - \widetilde{C}_{xx}^{dip}}{\Delta C}.$$
(5.23)

We will see that the corresponding expressions in the point-dipole approximation are of interest; these are derived from Eqs. (3.115)–(3.119) to give:

$$\Delta C = \frac{1}{2\pi R^3},\tag{5.24}$$

$$\eta^{\rm C} = \mathbf{0}.\tag{5.25}$$

The orientations of the PAFs of the antisymmetric and symmetric parts of **C** are specified by the Euler angles  $\Omega_{CAL} = (\alpha_{CAL}, \beta_{CAL}, \gamma_{CAL})$  and  $\Omega_{CSL} = (\alpha_{CSL}, \beta_{CSL}, \gamma_{CSL})$  respectively. We recall that if we employ the Kurland–McGarvey formalism described in Section 4.5, the interpretation of the parts of **C** with ranks zero, one, and two are more complicated than that given here (c.f. Eq. 4.186), and in fact we recover the expressions for the shielding tensor from the EPR formalism.

### 5.2.0.3. The g-tensor

The *g*-tensor has the following generic form:

$$\mathbf{g} = (g_e + \Delta g_{\rm iso})\mathbf{1} + \Delta \mathbf{g},\tag{5.26}$$

where the isotropic free-electron *g*-factor *g*<sub>e</sub> is the NR contribution. The effect of SO coupling manifests itself in the *g*-shift part of the tensor, which comprises an isotropic part  $\Delta g_{iso}$  and an anisotropic part  $\Delta g$  which, in general, contains both symmetric and antisymmetric contributions.

The isotropic g-tensor is simply

$$g^{\rm iso} = g_e + \Delta g_{\rm iso}. \tag{5.27}$$

The anisotropic g-tensor is defined by both the antisymmetric and symmetric anisotropy parameters. The antisymmetric g-anisotropy  $\zeta^g$  is given by

$$\zeta^{g} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left(\Delta g_{xy} - \Delta g_{yx}\right)^{2} + \left(\Delta g_{yz} - \Delta g_{zy}\right)^{2} + \left(\Delta g_{xz} - \Delta g_{zx}\right)^{2}}, \quad (5.28)$$

and the symmetric *g*-anisotropy  $\Delta g$  and asymmetry  $\eta^{g}$  are:

$$\Delta g = \widetilde{\Delta g}_{zz},\tag{5.29}$$

$$\eta^{g} = \frac{\Delta g_{yy} - \Delta g_{xx}}{\Delta g}, \tag{5.30}$$

where the  $\Delta g_{ii}$  are the principal components of the symmetric part of  $\Delta g$  in its PAF. The orientations of the PAFs of the antisymmetric and symmetric parts of g are specified by the Euler angles  $\Omega_{GAL} = (\alpha_{GAL}, \beta_{GAL}, \gamma_{GAL})$  and  $\Omega_{GSL} = (\alpha_{GSL}, \beta_{GSL}, \gamma_{GSL})$  respectively.

### 5.2.0.4. The zero-field splitting and Z tensors

The final interaction of interest for single transition-metal ions is the ZFS, which is characterised by a traceless and symmetric spatial tensor **D**. This tensor is described by the axial and rhombic anisotropy parameters *D* and *E* which are conventionally defined in terms of the principal values  $\tilde{D}_{ii}$  as follows:

$$D = \widetilde{D}_{zz} - \frac{1}{2} \left( \widetilde{D}_{xx} + \widetilde{D}_{yy} \right), \tag{5.31}$$

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \left( \widetilde{D}_{xx} - \widetilde{D}_{yy} \right). \tag{5.32}$$

Note that the definition of the rhombic anisotropy *E* differs from the rhombic susceptibility  $\Delta \chi_{rh}$  by a factor of 1/2 included in the former. Alternatively we can adopt an alternative convention and specify the ZFS anisotropy  $\Delta D$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^D$  as follows:

$$\Delta D = \widetilde{D}_{zz},\tag{5.33}$$

$$\eta^{D} = \frac{D_{yy} - D_{xx}}{\Delta D},\tag{5.34}$$

where we use the following convention for the ordering of the principal values:  $|\tilde{D}_{zz}| \ge |\tilde{D}_{xx}| \ge |\tilde{D}_{yy}|$ . The orientation of the PAF of *D* is specified by the Euler angles  $\Omega_{DL} = (\alpha_{DL}, \beta_{DL}, \gamma_{DL})$ .

The ZFS tensor does not usually enter the expression for the paramagnetic shielding directly, but rather does so within the tensor Z, which is an average of a product of electronic spin operators over the ZFS energy levels. The tensor can be written as the sum of an isotropic part  $Z^{iso}$  and a symmetric anisotropic part  $\Delta Z$ :

$$\mathbf{Z} = Z^{\text{iso}} \mathbf{1} + \Delta \mathbf{Z}. \tag{5.35}$$

We recall that a general expression for **Z** is given by the van den Heuvel–Soncini theory in Eq. (4.113), of which the Pennanen–Vaara theory (Eq. (4.121)) is a high-temperature approximation. As for the other symmetric anisotropic tensors, we can define the anisotropy  $\Delta Z$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{Z}$  according to

$$\Delta Z = \widetilde{Z}_{77} - Z^{\text{iso}}.$$
(5.36)

$$\eta^{Z} = \frac{Z_{yy} - Z_{xx}}{\Delta Z}, \tag{5.37}$$

where the  $\widetilde{Z}_{ii}$  are the principal components of the whole Z tensor which have been ordered according to:  $|\widetilde{Z}_{zz} - Z^{iso}| \ge |\widetilde{Z}_{xx} - Z^{iso}| \ge |\widetilde{Z}_{yy} - Z^{iso}|$ . The PAF of Z coincides with that of D, and therefore has an orientation specified by the Euler angles  $\Omega_{ZL} = \Omega_{DL}$ .

In general the expressions for  $Z^{iso}$ ,  $\Delta Z$ , and  $\eta^Z$  are complicated. However, as has been shown in the previous chapter, when we apply the high-temperature limit up to second order in 1/(kT), as shown in Eq. (4.131), they simplify to the expressions derived by Bleaney [62]:

$$Z^{\rm iso} \approx \frac{S(S+1)}{3kT},\tag{5.38}$$

$$\Delta \mathbf{Z} \approx -\frac{S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30(kT)^2}\mathbf{D}.$$
(5.39)

(a)

Z<sup>iso</sup> / cm

In this high-temperature limit the first-order term is wholly isotropic, and the second-order term is wholly anisotropic. We subsequently see that, in this regime, the anisotropy and asymmetry of Z are proportional to those of D:

$$\Delta Z = -\frac{S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30(kT)^2} \Delta D,$$
(5.40)

$$\eta^Z = \eta^D. \tag{5.41}$$

It is worth examining the temperature dependence of  $Z^{iso}$ ,  $\Delta Z$ , and  $\eta^{Z}$  more closely through an example. In Section 4.2.3 we calculated the **Z**-matrix of an electronic spin S = 1 subject to a ZFS interaction with rhombic symmetry. The principal values of **Z** were given in Eqs. (4.151)–(4.153). They are reproduced below for convenience, having been reordered according to the Haeberlen convention assuming D = 5E/2 > 0:

$$\widetilde{Z}_{xx} = \frac{1}{E} \frac{e^{-\beta(D/3-E)} - e^{-\beta(D/3+E)}}{e^{-\beta(D/3+E)} + e^{2\beta D/3} + e^{-\beta(D/3-E)}},$$
(5.42)

$$\widetilde{Z}_{yy} = \frac{2}{D+E} \frac{e^{2\beta D/3} - e^{-\beta(D/3+E)}}{e^{-\beta(D/3+E)} + e^{2\beta D/3} + e^{-\beta(D/3-E)}},$$
(5.43)

$$\widetilde{Z}_{ZZ} = \frac{2}{D-E} \frac{e^{2\rho D/3} - e^{-\rho (D/3-E)}}{e^{-\rho (D/3+E)} + e^{2\rho D/3} + e^{-\beta (D/3-E)}}.$$
(5.44)

The previous example focussed on the case where the axial and rhombic anisotropies are  $D = 50 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $E = 20 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  respectively, giving ordered principal values of **D** of  $\tilde{D}_{xx} = 33.33 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ,  $\tilde{D}_{yy} = 3.33 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , and  $\tilde{D}_{zz} = -36.67 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Fig. 5.1 shows plots of the isotropic value and anisotropy of **Z** as a function of temperature. Part (a) compares the isotropic values of **Z** calculated from Eqs. (5.42)–(5.44) with the high-temperature Bleaney expression in Eq. (5.38). The comparison of the values of  $\Delta Z$  calculated from Eqs. (5.42)–(5.44) with the high-temperature Bleaney expression in Eq. (5.40) is shown in (b). Interestingly, we note that the asymmetry parameter  $\eta^Z$  is temperature-independent, and is always equal to the ZFS asymmetry parameter  $\eta^D$ , taking in this case the value  $\eta^Z = 9/11$ .

We note that, as seen previously in Section 4.2.3, the curves calculated from the high-temperature approximation match the exact curves very well down to a temperature of 100 K. The general value of this high-temperature 'cut-off' threshold depends on the values of D/(kT) and E/(kT). We also see that the anisotropy of **Z** tends to zero at higher temperatures more quickly than the isotropic part, on account of the latter varying as 1/(kT), and the former being due to a second-order effect with a temperature dependence of  $1/(kT)^2$ .



**Fig. 5.1.** Example plots of the isotropic value  $Z^{iso}$  and anisotropy  $\Delta Z$  of the **Z**-tensor as a function of temperature. The isotropic part is plotted in (a), and the anisotropy is plotted in (b). The asymmetry parameter is temperature-independent. For both plots the curves in black are calculated from the general EPR expressions in Eqs. (5.42)–(5.44). The red curves are plotted from the high-temperature Bleaney expressions in Eqs. (5.38) and (5.40). The electronic spin is S = 1, and the ZFS parameters are D = 50 cm<sup>-1</sup> and E = 20 cm<sup>-1</sup>, giving properly-ordered principal values of  $D_{xx} = 33.33$  cm<sup>-1</sup>,  $D_{yy} = 3.33$  cm<sup>-1</sup>,  $D_{zz} = -36.67$  cm<sup>-1</sup>, and an anisotropy and asymmetry of  $\Delta D = -36.67$  cm<sup>-1</sup>, and  $\eta^D = 9/11$ .

### 5.3. The paramagnetic shift in the susceptibility formalism

We now examine in detail the terms contributing to the paramagnetic shielding tensor according to the susceptibility formalism, as listed in Table 5.1. In this section we treat the susceptibility tensor as an empirical quantity that can be either measured experimentally or calculated using Eq. (5.12). However we remember that  $\gamma^{iso}$  depends on both NR and SO coupling effects, and that  $\Delta \chi$  is due entirely to SO coupling, and so the simple expressions obtained in this section actually hide a high level of complexity. At this stage we do not make the explicit link between the various terms and the EPR parameters, the discussion of which we defer until Section 5.4. We separate the terms into three groups, which are (1) terms due to a contact interaction (contact shielding), (2) terms due to a spin-dipolar interaction (dipolar shielding), and (3) terms due to the antisymmetric hyperfine interaction (antisymmetric hyperfine shielding). Within each group we examine the isotropic and symmetric anisotropic contributions to the shielding tensor. Note that as the antisymmetric shielding is not observable under high-field conditions we neglect it.

### 5.3.1. The contact shift and shift anisotropy

The contact shielding contains two terms, namely  $-\chi^{iso}C^{con}$  and  $-C^{con}\Delta\chi$ , which are of spherical-tensor ranks 0 and 2. They contribute to the isotropic shift and shift anisotropy respectively.

5.3.1.1. The contact shift. In the approximation described in Section 4.4, the isotropic contact shielding  $\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm con,\chi}$  is proportional to both the isotropic susceptibility and the contact coupling constant:

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm con,\chi} = -\chi^{\rm iso} C^{\rm con}. \tag{5.45}$$

The contact coupling constant is proportional to the unpaired electron density at the nucleus, and so  $\sigma_{iso}^{con,\chi}$  can be written as

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm con,\chi} = -\frac{\chi^{\rm iso}}{3S}\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}). \tag{5.46}$$

Using the chemical shift convention we can also define the contact shift as  $\delta_{iso}^{con,\chi} = -\sigma_{iso}^{con,\chi}$ , which then has the form given by McConnell and Chesnut [36]

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm con,\chi} = \chi^{\rm iso} C^{\rm con} \tag{5.47}$$

$$=\frac{\lambda}{3S}\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}). \tag{5.48}$$

There are three things to note about the contact shift. Firstly it is proportional to the isotropic magnetic susceptibility, indicating that paramagnetic metal ions that exhibit a stronger tendency for their electronic magnetic moments to align with the external magnetic field also give larger contact shifts. Secondly the contact shift is also proportional to the magnitude of the unpaired electron density that is present at the nuclear site. This indicates that larger shifts result from the more extensive overlap between the orbitals of the metal ion and the orbitals of the nucleus via the orbitals of any bridging atoms. Finally the sign of the contact shift is the same as that of the unpaired electron density at the nucleus. Therefore the contact shift can be used as a tool to determine whether the unpaired electrons are delocalised onto the nucleus, giving a positive shift, or whether the unpaired electrons polarise a negative spin density at the nucleus, which gives a negative shift [218].

5.3.1.2. The contact shift anisotropy. The term  $-C^{\text{con}}\Delta\chi$  gives rise to a purely anisotropic paramagnetic chemical shielding which is parameterised by the anisotropy  $\Delta\sigma^{\text{con},\chi}$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{\text{con},\chi}$ . The form of these anisotropy parameters is easily deduced by noting that this contribution to the shielding tensor has exactly the same symmetry as  $\Delta\chi$ , and therefore the same PAF. The value of  $\Delta\sigma^{\text{con},\chi}$  is then simply proportional to  $\Delta\chi$ , and the  $\eta^{\text{con},\chi}$  is exactly equal to  $\eta^{\chi}$ :

$$\Delta \sigma^{\rm con,\chi} = -C^{\rm con} \Delta \chi \tag{5.49}$$

$$= -\frac{\Delta\chi}{3S}\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}),\tag{5.50}$$

$$\eta^{\operatorname{con},\chi} = \eta^{\chi}.\tag{5.51}$$

This form of the contact shielding anisotropy has obvious similarities to that of the isotropic contact shift. The size and sign of  $\Delta\sigma^{\text{con},\chi}$  both depend on the size and sign of the unpaired electron density transferred to the nuclear site. However the anisotropy is proportional to  $\Delta\chi$ , rather than  $\chi^{\text{iso}}$ , indicating that metals which exhibit a greater degree of spatial anisotropy in the tendency for their electronic magnetic moments to align with the external field also give larger contact shielding anisotropies. In addition the shape of the shielding tensor, as described by the ellipsoid in Fig. 2.7, exactly matches the shape of the susceptibility tensor.

### 5.3.2. The spin-dipolar shift and shift anisotropy

The spin-dipolar shielding contribution to the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor has two terms, namely  $-\chi^{iso}C^{dip}$  and  $-\Delta \chi \cdot C^{dip}$ . The former has a simple form and is purely anisotropic with spherical-tensor rank 2. However the latter is more complicated as it couples together the two rank-two tensors  $\Delta \chi$  and  $C^{dip}$  and therefore requires special consideration.

The secular part  $\sigma^{(1)}$  of  $-\Delta\chi\cdot \textbf{C}^{dip}$  is, in terms of the Cartesian tensor components:

$$\sigma^{(1)} = -\Delta \chi_{zx} C_{xz}^{dip} - \Delta \chi_{zy} C_{yz}^{dip} - \Delta \chi_{zz} C_{zz}^{dip}.$$
(5.52)

It proves convenient to rewrite this expression in terms of the irreducible spherical tensor components  $\Delta \chi_{2m}$  and  $C_{2m}^{dip}$ :

$$\sigma^{(1)} = -\frac{2}{3}\Delta\chi_{20}C_{20}^{\rm dip} + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\chi_{2-1}C_{2+1}^{\rm dip} + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\chi_{2+1}C_{2-1}^{\rm dip}.$$
(5.53)

The spatial dependence of  $\sigma^{(1)}$  can now be deduced by writing the products  $\Delta \chi_{2m} C_{2-m}^{dip}$  in terms of the coupled irreducible spherical tensor components  $W_{L0}(22)$ , which are defined as

$$W_{L0}(22) = \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} \langle 22m - m | L0 \rangle \Delta \chi_{2m} C_{2-m}^{dip}, \qquad (5.54)$$

where the rank *L* can take values between 0 and 4 in integer steps. The inverse of Eq. (5.54) is

$$\Delta \chi_{2m} C_{2-m}^{\rm dip} = \sum_{L=0}^{4} \langle 22m - m | L0 \rangle W_{L0}(22).$$
 (5.55)

Substituting Eq. (5.55) into Eq. (5.53) we obtain the following expression for the secular shielding in terms of the coupled tensor components:

$$\sigma^{(1)} = \sum_{L=0}^{4} a_L W_{L0}(22), \tag{5.56}$$

where the coefficients  $a_L$  are given by

$$a_{L} = -\frac{2}{3} \langle 2200|L0 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle 22 - 1 + 1|L0 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle 22 + 1 - 1|L0 \rangle \quad (5.57)$$
  
=  $-\frac{2}{3} \langle 2200|L0 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} (1 + (-1)^{L}) \langle 22 - 1 + 1|L0 \rangle. \quad (5.58)$ 

The Clebsch-Gordan coefficients are easily evaluated to obtain

$$a_0 = -\frac{\sqrt{5}}{3},\tag{5.59}$$

$$a_1 = 0,$$
 (5.60)

$$a_2 = \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{7}{2}},\tag{5.61}$$

$$a_3 = 0, \tag{5.62}$$

$$a_4 = 0.$$
 (5.63)

The terms with odd L are zero due to the symmetry properties of the Clebsch–Gordan coefficients. Furthermore we see that there are no terms of rank L = 4. This is because the coupling of the two tensors is a standard matrix multiplication. The only terms that contribute to the secular shielding tensor are therefore of ranks 0 and 2, which correspond to the isotropic and symmetric anisotropic parts of the interaction. The shielding is therefore given by

$$\sigma^{(1)} = \frac{1}{3} \left( -\sqrt{5}W_{00}(22) + \sqrt{\frac{7}{2}}W_{20}(22) \right).$$
(5.64)

The  $W_{00}(22)$  term is the only isotropic component of the shielding tensor that originates from the spin-dipolar interaction, and results in the so-called 'pseudo-contact shift' (PCS). The shift anisotropy term resulting from  $W_{20}(22)$  is present in addition to the shift anisotropy due to the  $-\chi^{iso}C^{dip}$  term. Both contributions are referred to as spin-dipolar anisotropy. The three contributions are now discussed.

5.3.2.1. The pseudo-contact shift. The sole isotropic term in the paramagnetic shielding is due to the  $W_{00}(22)$  term in Eq. (5.64). On comparing this expression with Eq. (5.4) we see that the isotropic pseudo-contact shielding  $\sigma_{iso}^{pcs,\chi}$  is given by

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs,\chi} = -\frac{\sqrt{5}}{3} W_{00}(22). \tag{5.65}$$

The isotropic tensor  $W_{00}(22)$  is given in terms of  $\Delta \chi_{2m}$  and  $C_{2m}^{dip}$  by Eq. (5.54), which gives the following

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs,\chi} = -\frac{\sqrt{5}}{3} \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} \langle 22m - m | 00 \rangle \Delta \chi_{2m} C_{2-m}^{\rm dip}$$
(5.66)

$$= -\frac{1}{3}\sum_{m=-2}^{+2}(-1)^{m}\Delta\chi_{2m}C_{2-m}^{dip}, \tag{5.67}$$

where to go to the second line we have used the identity  $\langle 22m - m|00\rangle = (-1)^m/\sqrt{5}$ . The sum in Eq. (5.67) is recognisable as the generalised scalar product of the tensors  $\Delta \chi$  and  $C^{dip}$  written in the irreducible spherical tensor basis [191]. Further progress is made by writing  $\Delta \chi_{2m}$  and  $C^{dip}_{2-m}$  in terms of their PAF values:

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs,\chi} = -\frac{1}{3} \sum_{m'} \widetilde{\Delta\chi}_{2m'} \sum_{m''} \widetilde{C}_{2m'}^{\rm dip} \sum_{m} (-1)^m D_{m'm}^{(2)}(\alpha_{\rm XL}, \beta_{\rm XL}, \gamma_{\rm XL}) \times D_{m''-m}^{(2)}(\alpha_{\rm CS,L}, \beta_{\rm CS,L}, \gamma_{\rm CS,L}).$$
(5.68)

The second Wigner rotation matrix element can be rewritten as

$$D_{m''-m}^{(2)}(\alpha_{CS,L},\beta_{CS,L},\gamma_{CS,L}) = (-1)^{m''-m} D_{m-m''}^{(2)}(-\gamma_{CS,L},-\beta_{CS,L},-\alpha_{CS,L}),$$
(5.69)

where  $(-\gamma_{CS,L}, -\beta_{CS,L}, -\alpha_{CS,L})$  are the Euler angles representing the inverse rotation to  $(\alpha_{CS,L}, \beta_{CS,L}, \gamma_{CS,L})$ . The pseudo-contact shielding then simplifies to

$$\begin{split} \sigma_{iso}^{pcs,\chi} &= -\frac{1}{3} \sum_{m'} \widetilde{\Delta \chi}_{2m'} \sum_{m''} \widetilde{C}_{2m''}^{dip} \sum_{m} (-1)^{m''} \\ &\times D_{m'm}^{(2)} (\alpha_{XL}, \beta_{XL}, \gamma_{XL}) D_{m-m''}^{(2)} (-\gamma_{CS,L}, -\beta_{CS,L}, -\alpha_{CS,L}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{3} \sum_{m'} \widetilde{\Delta \chi}_{2m'} \sum_{m''} \widetilde{C}_{2m''}^{dip} \sum_{m} D_{m'm}^{(2)} (\alpha_{XL}, \beta_{XL}, \gamma_{XL}) \\ &\times D_{m-m''}^{(2)} (-\gamma_{CS,L}, -\beta_{CS,L}, -\alpha_{CS,L}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{3} \sum_{m'} \widetilde{\Delta \chi}_{2m'} \sum_{m''} \widetilde{C}_{2m''}^{dip} D_{m'-m''}^{(2)} (\alpha_{X,CS}, \beta_{X,CS}, \gamma_{X,CS}), \end{split}$$
(5.70)

where  $(\alpha_{X,CS}, \beta_{X,CS}, \gamma_{X,CS})$  are the Euler angles that specify the orientation of the PAF of the susceptibility tensor relative to the PAF of

the spin-dipolar tensor. To go to the second line, we have used the fact that  $\tilde{C}_{2\pm 1}^{\text{dip}} = 0$  and therefore m'' is always even, and to go to the last line we have used the following closure identity for the Wigner rotation matrix elements [191]:

$$\sum_{m''} D_{mm''}^{(l)}(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1) D_{m''m'}^{(l)}(\alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2) = D_{mm'}^{(l)}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma),$$
(5.72)

where  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$  represents the rotation resulting from applying  $(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1)$  followed by  $(\alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2)$ . Now we can substitute the explicit expressions for the  $\widetilde{\Delta\chi}_{2m}$  and the  $\widetilde{C}_{2m}^{dip}$  in terms of the relevant anisotropy and asymmetry parameters, which are given in Eqs. (5.8), (5.9) and (5.22)–(5.25) respectively, to give the final form of the pseudo-contact shielding:

$$\begin{split} \sigma_{iso}^{pcs,\chi} &= -\frac{1}{6} \Delta C \left[ \Delta \chi_{ax} \left( 3\cos^2\left(\beta_{X,CS}\right) - 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{rh} \sin^2\left(\beta_{X,CS}\right) \cos\left(2\alpha_{X,CS}\right) \\ &- \eta^c \left\{ \Delta \chi_{ax} \sin^2\left(\beta_{X,CS}\right) \cos\left(2\gamma_{X,CS}\right) + \Delta \chi_{rh} \cos^4\left(\beta_{X,CS}/2\right) \cos(2\left(\alpha_{X,CS} + \gamma_{X,CS}\right)) \right. \\ &+ \Delta \chi_{rh} \sin^4\left(\beta_{X,CS}/2\right) \cos(2\left(\alpha_{X,CS} - \gamma_{X,CS}\right)) \right\} \right]. \end{split}$$

$$(5.73)$$

Using the chemical shift convention we obtain the pseudo-contact shift  $\delta_{iso}^{pcs,\chi}$ :

$$\begin{split} \delta_{iso}^{pcs,\chi} &= \frac{1}{6} \Delta C \bigg[ \Delta \chi_{ax} \big( 3\cos^2(\beta_{X,CS}) - 1 \big) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{rh} \sin^2(\beta_{X,CS}) \cos(2\alpha_{X,CS}) \\ &- \eta^C \Big\{ \Delta \chi_{ax} \sin^2(\beta_{X,CS}) \cos(2\gamma_{X,CS}) \\ &+ \Delta \chi_{rh} \cos^4(\beta_{X,CS}/2) \cos(2(\alpha_{X,CS} + \gamma_{X,CS})) \\ &+ \Delta \chi_{rh} \sin^4(\beta_{X,CS}/2) \cos(2(\alpha_{X,CS} - \gamma_{X,CS})) \Big\} \bigg]. \end{split}$$

The Euler angles ( $\alpha_{X,CS}$ ,  $\beta_{X,CS}$ ,  $\gamma_{X,CS}$ ) depend only on the internal geometry of the system, and so are independent of crystallite orientation as required for an isotropic shift. We can also specify the orientation between the two PAFs in terms of the Euler angles ( $\alpha_{CS,X}$ ,  $\beta_{CS,X}$ ,  $\gamma_{CS,X}$ ), which give the orientation of the PAF of the dipolar coupling tensor relative to the PAF of the susceptibility. In this case Eq. (5.71) becomes

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs,\chi} = -\frac{1}{3} \sum_{m'} \widetilde{\Delta\chi}_{2m'} \sum_{m''} \widetilde{C}_{2m''}^{\rm dip} D_{m''-m'}^{(2)}(\alpha_{\rm CS,X}, \beta_{\rm CS,X}, \gamma_{\rm CS,X}), \tag{5.75}$$

and the final expression for the PCS is

$$\begin{split} \delta_{iso}^{pcs,\chi} &= \frac{1}{6} \Delta C \bigg[ \Delta \chi_{ax} \big( 3\cos^2(\beta_{CS,X}) - 1 \big) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{rh} \sin^2(\beta_{CS,X}) \cos(2\gamma_{CS,X}) \\ &- \eta^C \Big\{ \Delta \chi_{ax} \sin^2(\beta_{CS,X}) \cos(2\alpha_{CS,X}) \\ &+ \Delta \chi_{rh} \cos^4(\beta_{CS,X}/2) \cos(2(\alpha_{CS,X} + \gamma_{CS,X})) \\ &+ \Delta \chi_{rh} \sin^4(\beta_{CS,X}/2) \cos(2(\alpha_{CS,X} - \gamma_{CS,X})) \Big\} \bigg]. \end{split}$$

The PCS is a shift that originates from the through-space spindipolar interaction, and so has a form that is very different to that of the contact shift. Both depend on the interaction with the unpaired electron spin density, but whereas the contact shift results from the spin density at the nuclear site, the PCS is a longer-range effect that depends on the spatial position of the nucleus with respect to the paramagnetic ion. This form of the PCS emphasises that it depends only on the susceptibility anisotropy, through the axial and rhombic anisotropy parameters, and not on the isotropic susceptibility. Therefore the PCS only arises for metal ions with electronic configurations that are subject to SO coupling. At ion-nucleus separations that are sufficiently large, typically more than 4 Å, we can employ the point-dipole approximation for the unpaired electrons. The PCS then takes on the wellknown form that was first derived by McConnell and Robertson [37]:

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs,\chi} = \frac{1}{12\pi R^3} \left[ \Delta \chi_{\rm ax} \left( 3\cos^2(\theta) - 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{\rm rh} \sin^2(\theta) \cos(2\phi) \right].$$
(5.77)

The angles  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are the polar and azimuthal angles that are defined through  $\beta_{X,CS} = \theta$  and  $\alpha_{X,CS} = \phi$ , or equivalently  $\beta_{CS,X} = \theta$  and  $\gamma_{CS,X} = \phi$ . Hence  $(\theta, \phi)$  can be interpreted either as the angles relating the PAF of the susceptibility tensor relative to the metal ion-nucleus vector, or vice versa. The point-dipole PCS therefore depends on five parameters: the spherical polar coordinates  $(R, \theta, \phi)$  of the nucleus relative to the PAF of the susceptibility tensor of the susceptibility. Two examples of the position-dependence of the PCS are shown in Fig. 5.2, for an axially-symmetric susceptibility tensor (a), and a susceptibility tensor with a rhombic component (b). The former plot has the appearance of a  $3d_{z^2}$  orbital, which is due to the polar-angle dependence of  $(3\cos^2(\theta) - 1)$  in Eq. (5.77). The inclusion of the rhombic term has the effect of splitting the 'doughnut' ring into two distinct lobes.

Equivalent expressions for the PCS in different coordinate systems can be formulated; an extensive list of these has been provided by Bertini et al. for the point-dipole regime [16]. Here we give two expressions in Cartesian coordinates for the case where the point-dipole model applies. We write the PCS as

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs} = \frac{1}{3} {\rm Tr}\Big( \Delta \boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \boldsymbol{C}^{\rm dip} \Big). \tag{5.78}$$

Starting from Eq. (3.104) we write the Cartesian components of  $C^{dip}$  as

$$C_{ij}^{\rm dip} = \frac{3R_i R_j - R^2 \delta_{ij}}{4\pi R^5}.$$
 (5.79)

Because the PCS is isotropic, we obtain the same result independent of which reference frame we use. Therefore for convenience we adopt the PAF of the susceptibility tensor, so that  $\Delta \chi_{ij} = \widetilde{\Delta \chi_{ii}} \delta_{ij}$ . In this frame the Cartesian coordinates (x, y, z) give the position of the nucleus in the PAF of the susceptibility tensor. The PCS can now be evaluated easily:

$$\delta_{iso}^{pcs} = \frac{1}{12\pi R^5} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\Delta\chi}_{xx} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \widetilde{\Delta\chi}_{yy} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \widetilde{\Delta\chi}_{zz} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 3x^2 - R^2 & 3xy & 3xz \\ 3xy & 3y^2 - R^2 & 3yz \\ 3xz & 3yz & 3z^2 - R^2 \end{pmatrix} \right] \\ = \frac{1}{12\pi R^5} \left[ \widetilde{\Delta\chi}_{xx} \left( 3x^2 - R^2 \right) + \widetilde{\Delta\chi}_{yy} \left( 3y^2 - R^2 \right) + \widetilde{\Delta\chi}_{zz} \left( 3z^2 - R^2 \right) \right].$$
(5.80)

In terms of the axial and rhombic susceptibility anisotropy parameters Eq. (5.80) becomes

$$\delta_{iso}^{pcs} = \frac{1}{12\pi R^5} \left[ \Delta \chi_{ax} (2z^2 - x^2 - y^2) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{rh} (x^2 - y^2) \right].$$
(5.81)

This form of the PCS again emphasises that the shift depends only on the susceptibility anisotropy, and not on the isotropic susceptibility.

5.3.2.2. The spin-dipolar shift anisotropy. There are two contributions to the spin-dipolar shift anisotropy, namely the anisotropic shielding term  $-\chi^{iso}\mathbf{C}^{dip}$ , and the anisotropic component of  $-\Delta \boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \mathbf{C}^{dip}$  as given in Eq. (5.64). The symmetry of the former shielding tensor exactly matches the symmetry of the dipolar coupling tensor, and so they both share the same PAF, the same anisotropy to within a multiplicative constant of proportionality, and the same asymmetry parameter. The shielding anisotropy  $\Delta \sigma^{\text{dip},\chi,1}$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{\text{dip},\chi,1}$  are therefore

$$\Delta \sigma^{\text{dip},\chi,1} = -\chi^{\text{iso}} \Delta C, \tag{5.82}$$

$$\eta^{\mathrm{dip},\chi,1} = \eta^{\mathcal{C}}.\tag{5.83}$$

The former is proportional to the isotropic magnetic susceptibility. In the point-dipole approximation the anisotropy  $\Delta C$  is equal to twice the reduced dipolar coupling constant  $1/(4\pi R^3)$ , and the asymmetry parameter  $\eta^c$  is zero. The anisotropic shielding parameters are therefore

$$\Delta\sigma^{\mathrm{dip},\chi,1} = -\frac{\chi^{\mathrm{iso}}}{2\pi R^3},\tag{5.84}$$

$$\eta^{\text{dip},\chi,1} = 0. \tag{5.85}$$



**Fig. 5.2.** Representative surfaces plots of the PCS as a function of the position (x, y, z) of the NMR-active nucleus relative to an anisotropic paramagnetic centre. The PCS due to two examples of the magnetic susceptibility are shown with the susceptibility in (a) being axially symmetric, and that in (b) having a non-zero rhombic component. The susceptibility anisotropy parameters are:  $\Delta \chi_{ax} = 10^{-32}$  m<sup>3</sup> in both cases, and  $\Delta \chi_{rh} = 0$  for (a) and  $\Delta \chi_{rh} = 0.9 \times 10^{-32}$  m<sup>3</sup> for (b). The surfaces show the position at which we see a positive PCS of 1 ppm (in red), and a negative PCS of -1 ppm (in blue).

We expect this contribution to the spin-dipolar shielding anisotropy to be the most dominant of the two.

The second shift anisotropy contribution from Eq. (5.64) gives a rank-2 shielding  $\sigma_{20}^{\text{dip},\chi,2}$  equal to

$$\sigma_{20}^{\text{dip},\chi,2} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{7}{3}} W_{20}(22). \tag{5.86}$$

The anisotropy  $\Delta \sigma^{\text{dip},\chi,2}$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{\text{dip},\chi,2}$  of this contribution to the shielding match those of the coupled tensor  $W_{20}(22)$ , which we denote as  $\Delta W(22)$  and  $\eta^{W(22)}$  respectively:

$$\Delta\sigma^{\rm dip,\chi,2} = \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{7}{2}}\Delta W(22), \tag{5.87}$$

$$\eta^{\rm dip,\chi,2} = \eta^{\rm W(22)}.$$
 (5.88)

These parameters contain information on the anisotropic properties of both the susceptibility and dipolar coupling tensors.

### 5.3.3. The antisymmetric hyperfine shift anisotropy

The final contribution to consider is that due to the antisymmetric hyperfine interaction  $C^{as}$ . The only contribution to the shielding that is observable under high-field conditions is the symmetric anisotropic part of  $-\Delta \chi \cdot C^{as}$ , which contributes to the shift anisotropy. This term is calculated from the secular part of  $-\Delta \chi \cdot C^{as}$ , which is given by

$$\sigma^{(1)} = -\Delta \chi_{zx} C_{xz}^{as} - \Delta \chi_{zy} C_{yz}^{as}, \qquad (5.89)$$

where we have acknowledged that  $C_{zz}^{as}$  is zero by definition. Applying the same treatment as for the coupled spin-dipolar contribution to the shielding, we rewrite Eq. (5.89) in terms of the irreducible spherical tensor basis to obtain

$$\sigma^{(1)} = -\frac{1}{2}\Delta\chi_{2-1}C_{1+1}^{as} + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\chi_{2+1}C_{1-1}^{as}.$$
(5.90)

We can now express the tensor products  $\Delta \chi_{2m} C_{1-m}^{as}$  in terms of the coupled tensor components  $W_{L0}(21)$  which are defined through the relations

$$W_{L0}(21) = \sum_{m=-1}^{+1} \langle 21m - m | L0 \rangle \Delta \chi_{2m} C_{1-m}^{as}, \qquad (5.91)$$

$$\Delta \chi_{2m} C_{1-m}^{\rm as} = \sum_{L=1}^{3} \langle 21m - m | L0 \rangle W_{L0}(21), \qquad (5.92)$$

where the rank *L* runs from 1 to 3. In terms of the  $W_{L0}(21)$  the secular shielding is

$$\sigma^{(1)} = \sum_{L=1}^{3} b_L W_{L0}(21), \tag{5.93}$$

where the coefficients  $b_L$  are given by

$$b_{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \langle 21 - 1 + 1 | L0 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle 21 + 1 - 1 | L0 \rangle$$
(5.94)

$$= -\frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + (-1)^{L} \right) \langle 21 - 1 + 1 | L0 \rangle.$$
(5.95)

We see immediately that the coefficients are zero if *L* is odd, and therefore the only contribution is from the rank-2 part  $W_{20}(21)$ :

$$b_1 = 0,$$
 (5.96)

$$b_2 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}},\tag{5.97}$$

$$b_3 = 0.$$
 (5.98)

The secular shielding is therefore

$$\sigma^{(1)} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} W_{20}(21). \tag{5.99}$$

The corresponding shielding anisotropy  $\Delta\sigma^{as,\chi}$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{as,\chi}$  are given in terms of the corresponding anisotropy and asymmetry of  $W_{20}(21)$ , which we denote as  $\Delta W(21)$  and  $\eta^{W(21)}$  respectively:

$$\Delta\sigma^{\mathrm{as},\chi} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W(21), \qquad (5.100)$$

$$\eta^{\text{as},\chi} = \eta^{W(21)}.$$
 (5.101)

### 5.3.4. Summary

The various terms in the susceptibility formalism of the paramagnetic shielding, and their contributions to the isotropic paramagnetic shift, shift anisotropy, and asymmetry are summarised in Table 5.2. The questions that now arise are what is the relative importance of these various terms, and can the interpretation of the observed shifts and shift anisotropies in the NMR spectrum be simplified by considering only a subset of them.

5.3.4.1. Magnetically isotropic transition-metal ions. The first case to consider is that of transition metal ions with an isotropic magnetic susceptibility. This includes metal ions that are not subject to SO coupling, such as those with a half-full high-spin d-shell configuration, for example Mn<sup>2+</sup>, and metal ions which may exhibit SO coupling effects, but in a perfectly cubic coordination environment. In this case the only contributions to the shielding tensor are terms A and C. Hence the isotropic paramagnetic shift is due entirely to the contact interaction, and the shift anisotropy is due entirely to the spin-dipolar interaction. In such systems the interpretation of the NMR spectrum is relatively straightforward, with the isotropic and anisotropic shifts providing information on the spin-transfer pathways from the unpaired electrons to the nucleus, and the spatial geometry of the system, respectively. One important observation is that the shift anisotropy has a distance dependence of  $1/R^3$ , and so is considerably longer range than the spin-transfer

#### Table 5.2

Summary of the various terms in the paramagnetic shielding tensor in the susceptibility formalism, and their respective contributions to the isotropic paramagnetic shift, shielding anisotropy, and asymmetry parameter.

Туре	Term	σχ	$\delta_{\rm iso}$	$\Delta\sigma$	η	Present in magnetically isotropic transition-metal systems?
con	А	$-\chi^{iso}C^{con}$	$\chi^{iso}C^{con}$	0	_	Yes
	В	$-\Delta\chi C^{con}$	0	$-\Delta \chi C^{con}$	$\eta^{\chi}$	No
dip	С	$-\chi^{iso} C^{dip}$	0	$-\chi^{iso}\Delta C$	$\eta^{c}$	Yes
	D	$-\Delta \chi \cdot C^{dip}$	$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs}$	$\frac{1}{3}\sqrt{\frac{7}{2}}\Delta W(22)$	$\eta^{W(22)}$	No
as	E	$-\chi^{iso}C^{as}$	0	0	_	No
	F	$-\Delta \chi \cdot \boldsymbol{C}^{as}$	0	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}\Delta W(21)$	$\eta^{W(21)}$	No

that gives the isotropic shift. Therefore nuclei that are outside the coordination environment of the metal ion, and hence exhibit no contact shift, are still expected to have a significant shift anisotropy due to the spin-dipolar interaction.

5.3.4.2. The effect of magnetic anisotropy. Metal ions that are subject to SO coupling effects, and in coordination environments of noncubic symmetry, possess a susceptibility anisotropy which results in a more complicated form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor, as can be seen from Table 5.2. In such systems the isotropic paramagnetic shift is a combination of the contact (term A) and pseudo-contact (term D) interactions. These give complementary information on the through-bond and through-space interactions with the unpaired electrons. Whether one or the other is dominant is a complex issue, and depends on the precise nature of the system. In situations where the s-orbitals of the relevant nucleus receive appreciable transfer of electronic spin density due to, for example, favourable orbital overlap, the contact shift is likely to dominate the overall isotropic shift and the PCS can safely be neglected. However in situations where the orbital overlap is less favourable, or where the nucleus is outside the immediate coordination environment of the metal ion, the contact shift is small, and the PCS becomes more important. In structural studies of proteins with a paramagnetic centre, the PCS is observed for nuclei up to a range of approximately 50 Å, at which distance the contact shift is zero. Because of the long-range nature of the PCS, and its dependence on the position of the nucleus with respect to the susceptibility tensor of the metal ion, the PCS is an extremely useful tool here, as will be seen in Chapters 12 and 13.

The form of the overall shielding anisotropy is more complicated, having four contributions that are due to the anisotropy of the hyperfine tensor, the susceptibility tensor, and the coupling of the two. The anisotropy due to term B is due to the susceptibility anisotropy and the contact interaction, and is therefore only expected to be important for nuclei that are within the coordination environment of a metal ion with large magnetic anisotropy. Terms C and D are longer-range effects, being due to the spindipolar interaction. Term C is proportional to the isotropic susceptibility whereas term D depends on the susceptibility anisotropy, and so the former is expected to be the more important contribution of the two, especially for metal ions with a small magnetic anisotropy. In addition both C and D contain the product of an NR term with a SO coupling term, and so both are expected to be larger than term F, which is formed by coupling together two tensors due entirely to SO coupling, namely  $\Delta \gamma$  and  $C^{as}$ .

# 5.4. The paramagnetic shift in terms of the molecular/atomic-level EPR parameters

We now begin the more complex task of interpreting the form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor in terms of the EPR tensor parameters, and elucidating more thoroughly the links between this formalism and the susceptibility formalism. This link can be summarised by the expression for the magnetic susceptibility tensor in Eq. (5.12). If we expand this expression by using the full forms of **g** and **Z** we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 (g_e \mathbf{1} + \Delta g_{\rm iso} \mathbf{1} + \Delta g) \cdot \left( \boldsymbol{Z}^{\rm iso} \mathbf{1} + \Delta \boldsymbol{Z} \right) \\ \cdot \left( g_e \mathbf{1} + \Delta g_{\rm iso} \mathbf{1} + \Delta g^T \right).$$
(5.102)

We see that both the isotropic and anisotropic parts of  $\chi$  contain contributions due to the SO coupling. In the absence of SO coupling however both Z and the susceptibility are wholly isotropic, and  $\chi$  reduces to the NR form we have seen previously:

$$\chi^{\rm iso} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 Z^{\rm iso} \tag{5.103}$$

$$=\frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 S(S+1)}{3kT},$$
(5.104)

where we have used the NR expression for Z. We begin by re-examining the NR case, and then include the SO coupling terms. The contributions are separated into contact, spin-dipolar, and antisymmetric hyperfine terms in the same way as for the susceptibility formalism.

5.4.1. Magnetically isotropic transition-metal ions in the absence of spin-orbit coupling

In the absence of SO coupling the only terms in Table 5.1 that remain are the Fermi-contact term (1), and the NR spin-dipolar term (2). These give rise to the isotropic paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy respectively. The expressions given in this section are the same as those presented in Chapter 3.

*5.4.1.1. The Fermi-contact shift.* The isotropic Fermi-contact paramagnetic shielding  $\sigma_{iso}^{FC,S}$  is given by

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm FC.S} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_I kT} A^{\rm FC}.$$
(5.105)

We can also define the corresponding Fermi-contact shift  $\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm FC,S}$  as

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm FC,S} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_l k T} A^{\rm FC}.$$
(5.106)

This expression is exactly equal to the corresponding contact shift in the susceptibility formalism  $\delta_{iso}^{con,\chi} = \chi^{iso}C^{con}$  when we note that both  $\chi^{iso}$  and  $C^{con}$  take their respective NR forms:

$$\delta_{iso}^{\text{con},\chi} = \chi^{iso} C^{\text{con}}$$
(5.107)

$$= \left[\frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 g_e^2 S(S+1)}{3kT}\right] \left[\frac{\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})}{3S}\right]$$
(5.108)

$$= \left[\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_e S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_l kT}\right] \left[\frac{1}{3S}\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}g_e \hbar\gamma_l \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})\right]$$
(5.109)

$$=\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_e S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_l kT}A^{\rm FC},\tag{5.110}$$

where to go to the third line we have multiplied the numerator and denominator by  $\hbar \gamma_l$ . The final expression is exactly the one given in Eq. (5.106).

5.4.1.2. The spin-dipolar shift anisotropy. The shielding anisotropy due to the spin-dipolar term SD is parameterised in terms of the shielding anisotropy and asymmetry, which are given by:

$$\Delta \sigma^{\text{SD},\text{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\text{B}} g_e S(\text{S}+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_l kT} \Delta A^{\text{SD}}, \qquad (5.111)$$

$$\eta^{\text{SD},\text{S}} = \eta^{\text{SD}},\tag{5.112}$$

where  $\Delta A^{\rm SD}$  and  $\eta^{\rm SD}$  are the anisotropy and asymmetry parameter of the NR spin-dipolar interaction. The overall shielding tensor therefore has the same PAF and anisotropic properties as the NR spindipolar coupling tensor. By following the same line of reasoning as with the Fermi-contact shift in Eqs. (5.107)–(5.110), we can show that this value of  $\Delta \sigma^{\rm SD,S}$  is exactly equivalent to the corresponding NR expression given by the susceptibility formalism  $\Delta \sigma^{\rm dip,\chi.1} = -\chi^{\rm iso}\Delta C$  when we note that  $\Delta A^{\rm SD} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e h \gamma_1 \Delta C$ .

### 5.4.2. The contact shift and shift anisotropy

We now examine the contact contribution to the shielding tensor in the presence of SO coupling. The relevant terms from Table 5.1 are (1), (3), (6), and (8). Terms (1), (6), and (8) are due to the NR Fermi-contact interaction with coupling constant  $A^{FC}$ , whilst term (3) originates from the SO contact term with coupling constant  $A^{FC,2}$ . The link can be made to the susceptibility formalism when we note that  $C^{con}$  contains contributions from both  $A^{FC}$  and  $A^{FC,2}$ .

5.4.2.1. The contact shift. All four terms have an isotropic part, the sum of which gives the overall isotropic contact shielding  $\sigma_{iso}^{con,S}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm con,S} &= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_I} Z^{\rm iso} \Big[ g_e A^{\rm FC} + g_e A^{\rm FC,2} + \Delta g_{\rm iso} A^{\rm FC} \Big] \\ &- \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{3\hbar\gamma_I} {\rm Tr} [\Delta g \cdot \Delta Z] A^{\rm FC}. \end{aligned}$$
(5.113)

The first three terms (1, 3, and 6) in Eq. (5.113) depend on the isotropic part of the *g*-tensor, and the isotropic part of **Z**. Therefore the leading temperature dependence of these terms matches that of  $Z^{iso}$ , which is first order in 1/(kT). On the other hand the final isotropic term (8) is formed from coupling together the anisotropic part of **Z** and the anisotropic and symmetric part of **g**. The temperature dependence of this term is that of  $\Delta Z$ , which is  $1/(kT)^2$ , i.e. second order. This is also observed in the corresponding isotropic shielding in the susceptibility formalism where, in the presence of SO coupling,  $\chi^{iso}$  contains contributions from  $\Delta Z$  and  $\Delta g$  in addition to  $Z^{iso}$  and  $g_e + \Delta g_{iso}$ . The overall isotropic contact shift is given by

$$\begin{split} \delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm con,S} &= \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}} Z^{\rm iso} \Big[ g_e A^{\rm FC} + g_e A^{\rm FC,2} + \Delta g_{\rm iso} A^{\rm FC} \Big] \\ &+ \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{3\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}} {\rm Tr} [\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \Delta \boldsymbol{Z}] A^{\rm FC}. \end{split}$$
(5.114)

This expression is completely general for transition-metal ions subject to SO coupling.

In the high-temperature limit we can approximate the contact shift to  $1/(kT)^2$ , which gives the Bleaney expression:

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm con,S} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} S(S+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_l kT} \Big[ g_e A^{\rm FC} + g_e A^{\rm FC,2} + \Delta g_{\rm iso} A^{\rm FC} \Big] - \frac{\mu_{\rm B} S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{90\hbar \gamma_l (kT)^2} {\rm Tr}[\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D}] A^{\rm FC}.$$
(5.115)

This form of the contact shift emphasises that both the isotropic *g*-factor, including the SO coupling contribution, and the SO coupling contribution to the Fermi-contact interaction appear to first order in 1/(kT). The *g*-anisotropy and ZFS, on the other hand, only appear to second order in 1/(kT). In the absence of the ZFS the fourth term is zero and we are left with

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm con,S} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B}S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_l kT} \Big[ g_e A^{\rm FC} + g_e A^{\rm FC,2} + \Delta g_{\rm iso} A^{\rm FC} \Big], \tag{5.116}$$

which is a simple modification of the NR expression that accounts for the SO-coupling-induced changes to both the isotropic *g*-factor and contact coupling interaction.

5.4.2.2. The contact shift anisotropy. The anisotropy associated with the contact shielding is represented by the symmetric anisotropic part of the contact shielding, which we denote  $\sigma^{\text{con,sym,S}}$ . The full expression is

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{con,sym,S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{h\gamma_{I}} \Big[ g_{e} A^{\text{FC}} + g_{e} A^{\text{FC},2} + \Delta g_{\text{iso}} A^{\text{FC}} \Big] \Delta \boldsymbol{Z} \\ -\frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{h\gamma_{I}} A^{\text{FC}} Z^{\text{iso}} \Delta \boldsymbol{g}^{\text{sym}} - \frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{h\gamma_{I}} A^{\text{FC}} \{ \Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \Delta \boldsymbol{Z} \}^{\text{sym}},$$
(5.117)

where the notation  $A^{\text{sym}}$  indicates the symmetric anisotropic part of A, and  $\{A \cdot B\}^{\text{sym}}$  represents the symmetric anisotropic part of the

matrix product of **A** and **B**. Hence  $\Delta g^{\text{sym}}$  and  $\{\Delta g \cdot \Delta Z\}^{\text{sym}}$  are the symmetric anisotropic parts of those tensors, which are given by

$$\Delta \boldsymbol{g}^{\text{sym}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \Delta \boldsymbol{g} + \Delta \boldsymbol{g}^T \right), \tag{5.118}$$

$$\{\Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{Z}\}^{\text{sym}} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{Z} + \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{g}^T \right) - \frac{1}{3} \text{Tr}(\Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{Z}) \mathbf{1}.$$
(5.119)

All of these terms correspond to the single term in the susceptibility formalism  $-\Delta \chi C^{\text{con}}$ . Thus the shielding anisotropy is the sum of three terms  $\sigma^{\text{con,sym,A,S}}$ ,  $\sigma^{\text{con,sym,B,S}}$ , and  $\sigma^{\text{con,sym,C,S}}$ , to each of which can be ascribed an anisotropy  $\Delta \sigma^{\text{con,X,S}}$  and asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{\text{con,X,S}}$ , X = A, B, C. These are given by:

$$\Delta \sigma^{\text{con,A,S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{\hbar \gamma_{I}} \left[ g_{e} A^{\text{FC}} + g_{e} A^{\text{FC,2}} + \Delta g_{\text{iso}} A^{\text{FC}} \right] \Delta Z, \qquad (5.120)$$

$$\eta^{\text{con,A,S}} = \eta^Z, \tag{5.121}$$

$$\Delta \sigma^{\text{con,B,S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{\hbar \gamma_{I}} A^{\text{FC}} Z^{\text{iso}} \Delta g, \qquad (5.122)$$

$$\eta^{\text{con,B,S}} = \eta^g, \tag{5.123}$$

$$\Delta\sigma^{\text{con,C,S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}}A^{\text{FC}}\Delta\{\Delta \mathbf{g}\cdot\Delta \mathbf{Z}\},\tag{5.124}$$

$$\eta^{\operatorname{con},\mathsf{C},\mathsf{S}} = \eta^{\{\Delta \mathbf{g}:\Delta \mathbf{Z}\}},\tag{5.125}$$

where  $\Delta{\{\Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{Z}\}}$  and  $\eta^{\{\Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{Z}\}}$  are shorthand notation for the anisotropy and asymmetry parameter respectively of the matrix product  $\{\Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{Z}\}$ . In general each term has its own PAF which does not necessarily coincide with the other two, and therefore the overall contact shift anisotropy and asymmetry parameter are not simple combinations of the contributions given above, but are rather calculated by diagonalising the total symmetric anisotropic contact shielding  $\sigma^{\text{con,sym,S}}$ . Nevertheless it is instructive to analyse the three terms separately to understand better the anisotropic properties of the contact shielding. Term A depends on the ZFS tensor, with the anisotropy and asymmetry parameter being proportional to  $\Delta Z$ and  $\eta^{Z}$  respectively, and the PAF being coincident with that of the ZFS. Term B depends only on the anisotropic g-tensor, with an anisotropy proportional to  $\Delta g$ , an asymmetry parameter equal to  $\eta^g$ , and the same PAF as the symmetric g-tensor. Term C is more complicated, with an anisotropy, asymmetry parameter, and PAF that depend on the product of the anisotropic parts of **Z**, and **g**.

In the high-temperature limit the anisotropic contact shielding is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{con,sym,S}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{B}} S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30 \hbar \gamma_{l} (kT)^{2}} \Big[ g_{e} A^{\text{FC}} + g_{e} A^{\text{FC,2}} + \Delta g_{\text{iso}} A^{\text{FC}} \Big] \boldsymbol{D} - \frac{\mu_{\text{B}} S(S+1)}{3 \hbar \gamma_{l} kT} A^{\text{FC}} \Delta \boldsymbol{g}^{\text{sym}} + \frac{\mu_{\text{B}} S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30 \hbar \gamma_{l} (kT)^{2}} A^{\text{FC}} \{ \Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \}^{\text{sym}}.$$
(5.126)

The three contributions to the contact shielding anisotropy and asymmetry parameter are now

$$\Delta \sigma^{\text{con,A,S}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{B}} S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30\hbar \gamma_{I} (kT)^{2}} \Big[ g_{e} A^{\text{FC}} + g_{e} A^{\text{FC},2} + \Delta g_{\text{iso}} A^{\text{FC}} \Big] \Delta D,$$
(5.127)

$$\eta^{\mathrm{con},\mathrm{A},\mathrm{S}} = \eta^D \tag{5.128}$$

$$\Delta\sigma^{\mathrm{con},\mathrm{B},\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}S(\mathrm{S}+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_{*}kT}A^{\mathrm{FC}}\Delta g,\qquad(5.129)$$

$$\eta^{\text{con,B,S}} = \eta^g, \tag{5.130}$$

$$\Delta\sigma^{\text{con,C,S}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{B}}S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30\hbar\gamma_{l}(kT)^{2}}A^{\text{FC}}\Delta\{\Delta\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{D}\},$$
(5.131)

$$\eta^{\operatorname{con},\mathsf{C},\mathsf{S}} = \eta^{\{\Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{D}\}}.$$
(5.132)

We see that the ZFS only contributes to second order in 1/(kT), whereas the *g*-anisotropy contributes to first order. Finally in the absence of the ZFS interaction we obtain the following simple expression for the contact shielding anisotropy:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{con,sym,S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\text{B}}S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_{l}kT}\boldsymbol{A}^{\text{FC}}\Delta\boldsymbol{g}^{\text{sym}}.$$
(5.133)

Only term B is present, and so the total shielding anisotropy and asymmetry parameter are wholly given by the anisotropic properties of the symmetric part of the *g*-tensor:

$$\Delta\sigma^{\rm con,B,S} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}kT}A^{\rm FC}\Delta g, \qquad (5.134)$$

$$\eta^{\text{con,B,S}} = \eta^g. \tag{5.135}$$

### 5.4.3. The spin-dipolar shift and shift anisotropy

The spin-dipolar contribution to the shielding tensor comprises four terms from Table 5.1, namely (2), (4), (7), and (9). Three of these terms (2, 7, and 9) are due to the NR spin-dipolar interaction with coupling tensor  $A^{SD}$ , and the fourth term (4) is due to the SO coupling contribution  $A^{SD,2}$ . As for the contact shielding, the link to the susceptibility formalism can be made when we note that  $C^{dip}$ includes both the NR and SO parts of the dipolar coupling tensor.

5.4.3.1. The pseudo-contact shift. In order to obtain an isotropic chemical shielding from the spin-dipolar interaction in the EPR formalism we need the terms that contain a matrix product of the spin-dipolar tensor with at least one other anisotropic and symmetric tensor. Writing down these terms and taking the trace we obtain the pseudo-contact shielding  $\sigma_{ics}^{ics}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs,S} &= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{3\hbar\gamma_I} \Big[ g_e {\rm Tr} \Big( \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD} \Big) + g_e {\rm Tr} \Big( \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD,2} \Big) + \Delta g_{\rm iso} {\rm Tr} \Big( \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD} \Big) \Big] \\ &- \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{3\hbar\gamma_I} \Big[ Z^{\rm iso} {\rm Tr} \Big( \Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD} \Big) + {\rm Tr} \Big( \Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD} \Big) \Big]. \end{aligned}$$
(5.136)

From this we can write down the expression for the PCS  $\delta_{iso}^{pcs,S}$ :

$$\begin{split} \delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs,S} &= \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{3\hbar\gamma_I} \left[ g_e {\rm Tr} \left( \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD} \right) + g_e {\rm Tr} \left( \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD,2} \right) + \Delta g_{\rm iso} {\rm Tr} \left( \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD} \right) \right] \\ &+ \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{3\hbar\gamma_I} \left[ Z^{\rm iso} {\rm Tr} \left( \Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD} \right) + {\rm Tr} \left( \Delta \mathbf{g} \cdot \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{\rm SD} \right) \right]. \end{split}$$

$$(5.137)$$

The first three terms (2, 4, and 7) of both Eqs. (5.136) and (5.137) contain the product of the symmetric part of the *Z*-tensor with a spin-dipolar coupling tensor, the fourth term (9) contains the product of the *g*-anisotropy tensor with the NR spin-dipolar coupling tensor, with only the symmetric part of  $\Delta g$  contributing to the PCS, and the fifth (also 9) contains the triple product  $\Delta g \cdot \Delta Z \cdot A^{SD}$ . The term containing the SO spin-dipolar term is of shorter range than the other four, and so has a negligible contribution to  $\sigma_{iso}^{pcs.S}$  at longer distances from the metal. However it may be important at shorter distances. In analogy with the PCS in the susceptibility formalism we can deduce the following about this form of the PCS.

The first and third terms depend on the Euler angles  $\Omega_{A^{SD}D}$  which specify the orientation of the PAF of the NR spin-dipolar tensor relative to the PAF of the ZFS tensor. The second term is similar, with the difference that the relevant Euler angles  $\Omega_{A^{SD,2}D}$  are those that now specify the orientation of the PAF of the SO coupling spin-dipolar tensor relative to the PAF of the ZFS tensor. Both terms have a leading temperature dependence of  $1/(kT)^2$ . The fourth term, which has a leading temperature dependence of 1/(kT), depends on the Euler angles  $\Omega_{A^{SD},GS}$ , which give the orientation of

the PAF of the NR spin-dipolar tensor relative to the PAF of the symmetric part of the *g*-tensor. The fifth term is more complicated, and depends on the orientation of the NR spin-dipolar tensor PAF relative to the PAF of the symmetric part of the product  $\Delta g \cdot \Delta Z$ . It has a leading temperature dependence of  $1/(kT)^2$ .

In the high-temperature limit we obtain the following PCS

$$\begin{split} \delta_{iso}^{pcs,S} &= \frac{\mu_{B}S(S+1)}{9\hbar\gamma_{I}kT} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{SD}\right) \\ &- \frac{\mu_{B}S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{90\hbar\gamma_{I}(kT)^{2}} \left[ \boldsymbol{g}_{e}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{SD}\right) \right. \\ &+ \boldsymbol{g}_{e}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{SD,2}\right) + \Delta \boldsymbol{g}_{iso}\mathrm{Tr}\left(\boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{SD}\right) \right] \\ &- \frac{\mu_{B}S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{90\hbar\gamma_{I}(kT)^{2}} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{SD}\right). \end{split}$$
(5.138)

The *g*-anisotropy appears in terms with both a first- and secondorder temperature dependence, whilst the ZFS only affects the PCS to second order. In the absence of the ZFS all the terms bar the first are zero, and we are left with a very simple form of the PCS

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs,S} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} S(S+1)}{9\hbar \gamma_{\rm I} kT} {\rm Tr} \left( \Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\rm SD} \right). \tag{5.139}$$

The PCS now depends only on the *g*-anisotropy, and the orientation of the PAF of the NR dipolar coupling tensor with respect to the PAF of the symmetric part of the *g*-tensor.

The question that now arises is how different are the two expressions for the PCS that are given in Eqs. (5.76) and (5.137)? This point was explored in Section 4.5. There it was shown that if we attempt to interpret the rank-two part of the reduced hyperfine tensor as a pure spin-dipolar interaction, we recover an expression for the PCS where the true susceptibility tensor is substituted by a modified (non-symmetric) tensor  $\chi'$ . Therefore we recover an equation of the form of Eq. (5.76), but containing the tensor components of the rank-two part of  $\chi'$ . If this substitution is made, Eqs. (5.76) and (5.137) become exactly equivalent [217].

*5.4.3.2.* The spin-dipolar shift anisotropy. The anisotropic shielding  $\sigma^{\text{dip,sym,S}}$  that arises from the spin-dipolar interaction is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{dip,sym,S}} &= -\frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}} \boldsymbol{Z}^{\text{iso}} \Big[ \boldsymbol{g}_{e} \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} + \boldsymbol{g}_{e} \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD,2}} + \Delta \boldsymbol{g}_{\text{iso}} \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} \Big] \\ &- \frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}} \boldsymbol{Z}^{\text{iso}} \Big\{ \Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} \Big\}^{\text{sym}} - \frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}} \Big[ \boldsymbol{g}_{e} \Big\{ \Delta \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} \Big\}^{\text{sym}} \\ &+ \boldsymbol{g}_{e} \Big\{ \Delta \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD,2}} \Big\}^{\text{sym}} + \Delta \boldsymbol{g}_{\text{iso}} \Big\{ \Delta \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} \Big\}^{\text{sym}} \Big] \\ &- \frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}} \Big\{ \Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \Delta \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} \Big\}^{\text{sym}} \tag{5.140} \end{aligned}$$

The first three terms correspond to an anisotropy that depends wholly on the NR and SO-coupling dipolar part of the hyperfine tensor, and corresponds to the term in the susceptibility formalism  $-\chi^{iso}C^{dip}$ . The remaining terms contain one or both of the anisotropic part of the *g*-tensor and of the ZFS tensor, as part of  $\Delta Z$ , and therefore correspond to the anisotropic symmetric part of  $-\Delta \chi \cdot C^{dip}$ .

In the high-temperature approximation the expression for  $\sigma^{\mathrm{dip},\mathrm{sym},S}$  becomes

$$\begin{split} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{dip,sym,S}} &= -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)}{3h\gamma_{l}kT} \left[ \boldsymbol{g}_{e}\boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}} + \boldsymbol{g}_{e}\boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD,2}} + \Delta \boldsymbol{g}_{\mathrm{iso}}\boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}} \right] - \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)}{3h\gamma_{l}kT} \left\{ \Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}} \right\}^{\mathrm{sym}} \\ &+ \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)(2\mathrm{S}-1)(2\mathrm{S}+3)}{30h\gamma_{l}(kT)^{2}} \left[ \boldsymbol{g}_{e} \left\{ \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}} \right\}^{\mathrm{sym}} + \boldsymbol{g}_{e} \left\{ \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD,2}} \right\}^{\mathrm{sym}} \\ &+ \Delta \boldsymbol{g}_{\mathrm{iso}} \left\{ \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}} \right\}^{\mathrm{sym}} \right] + \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)(2\mathrm{S}-1)(2\mathrm{S}+3)}{30h\gamma_{l}(kT)^{2}} \left\{ \Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}} \right\}^{\mathrm{sym}}. \end{split}$$

$$(5.141)$$

The first four terms, which depend only on the dipolar coupling tensors and *g*-anisotropy, have a leading temperature dependence of 1/(kT). The other terms, which also depend on the ZFS tensor, have a leading temperature dependence of  $1/(kT)^2$  as we have seen with the other contributions to the shielding tensor. In the absence of the ZFS interaction the anisotropic shielding is

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{dip,sym,S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\text{B}} S(S+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_{\text{I}} k T} \Big[ g_{e} \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} + g_{e} \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD,2}} + \Delta g_{\text{iso}} \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} \Big] \\ - \frac{\mu_{\text{B}} S(S+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_{\text{I}} k T} \Big\{ \Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}} \Big\}^{\text{sym}},$$
(5.142)

which contains contributions due to  $A^{SD}$ ,  $A^{SD,2}$ ,  $\Delta g_{iso}$ , and  $\Delta g$ . In all these cases we note again that  $A^{SD,2}$  represents a shorter-range interaction than  $A^{SD}$ , and so is only important at shorter distances from the metal ion.

### 5.4.4. The antisymmetric hyperfine shift anisotropy

The final term to consider is the paramagnetic chemical shielding due to the antisymmetric hyperfine interaction, as given by term (5) in Table 5.1. This contribution corresponds to the susceptibility formalism contribution  $-\Delta \chi \cdot C^{as}$ . As in the susceptibility formalism the anisotropic hyperfine interaction does not contribute to the isotropic paramagnetic shift, but does contribute to the shielding anisotropy through the term

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{as,sym,S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}}{\hbar\gamma_{l}} g_{e} \left\{ \Delta \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{as}} \right\}^{\mathrm{sym}}. \tag{5.143}$$

The anisotropic properties therefore depend on those of the matrix product  $\Delta Z \cdot A^{as}$ . The g-anisotropy does not play a role here, but the dependence on  $\Delta Z$  indicates that the shielding anisotropy and asymmetry do depend on the ZFS. In the high-temperature limit Eq. (5.143) becomes

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{as,sym,S}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{B}} S(S+1) (2S-1) (2S+3)}{30 \hbar \gamma_{l} (kT)^{2}} g_{e} \{ \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{as}} \}^{\text{sym}}.$$
 (5.144)

The leading temperature dependence is therefore  $1/(kT)^2$ . In the absence of the ZFS this term disappears altogether.

### 5.4.5. Summary

As has been seen in this chapter, the form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor in terms of the EPR parameters is rather complex. Therefore to finish this discussion we outline the salient points, which are the roles that the various EPR parameters play in the forms of the isotropic shift and shift anisotropy, the temperature dependences of the various contributions, and which are the most important for different systems. This last point closely follows the corresponding discussion of the susceptibility formalism in Section 5.3.4. The different terms are summarised in Table 5.3, where it is shown whether each term contributes to the shift and/or shift anisotropy, and also the leading temperature dependence of each contribution.

5.4.5.1. In the absence of spin-orbit coupling. As has been shown, the only terms to contribute to metal ions which do not exhibit SO coupling are (1a) and (2a), which contribute to the isotropic shift and shift anisotropy respectively. The shielding tensor therefore has a simple form, with a temperature dependence of 1/kT. Such paramagnetic systems only show an isotropic paramagnetic shift if the nucleus is within the coordination environment of the metal ion and receives unpaired electron density within its *s*-orbital. Nuclei outside the coordination site therefore have zero isotropic paramagnetic shift. The shift anisotropy is longer range, as it depends on the spin-dipolar interaction, and so nuclei exhibit a shift anisotropy even when several 10 s of Å from the metal ion.

5.4.5.2. The effect of spin-orbit coupling. The simple picture described above is complicated significantly when SO coupling is present, with the extra contributions to the hyperfine, *g*- and ZFS tensors adding several more terms to the paramagnetic shielding tensor. The ZFS tensor is responsible for a more complicated temperature dependence, through the tensor  $\mathbf{Z}$ . In the high-temperature limit, such that  $\mathbf{Z}$  can be truncated at second order in  $1/(kT)^2$ , the ZFS tensor only appears in the shielding with a leading temperature dependence of  $1/(kT)^2$ . For metal ions where the ZFS is small its contribution to the shielding can be neglected,

#### Table 5.3

Summary of the terms appearing in the EPR formalism of the paramagnetic shielding tensor, including the leading temperature dependence of the isotropic and anisotropic parts. A tick shows that the shielding contribution gives an isotropic shift or shift anisotropy of the indicated leading temperature dependence. The different terms are separated into groups arising from the contact interaction (con), spin-dipolar interaction (dip), and the antisymmetric hyperfine interaction (as). The term numbering 1, 2, ... corresponds to that in Table 5.1, with the appended letter a and b representing a term containing  $Z^{iso}$  and  $\Delta Z$  respectively.

Туре	Term	Shielding expression <sup>a</sup>	Leading temp dependence 1/kT		Leading temp de	ependence $1/(kT)^2$
			Isotropic shift	Shift anisotropy	Isotropic shift	Shift anisotropy
con	1a	$g_e Z^{iso} A^{FC}$	100			
	3a	$g_e Z^{iso} A^{FC,2}$				
	6a	$\Delta g_{iso} Z^{iso} A^{FC}$				
	8a	$Z^{iso}A^{FC}\Delta g$				
	1b	$g_e A^{FC} \Delta Z$				
	3b	$g_e A^{FC,2} \Delta Z$				
	6b	$\Delta g_{iso} A^{FC} \Delta Z$				
	8b	$A^{FC}\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \Delta \boldsymbol{Z}$			1	1
dip	2a	$g_e Z^{iso} A^{SD}$		100		
	4a	$g_{e}Z^{iso}A^{SD,2}$		1		
	7a	$\Delta g_{iso} Z^{iso} A^{SD}$		1		
	9a	$Z^{iso}\Delta g \cdot A^{SD}$		1		
	2b	$g_e \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{SD}$				1
	4b	$g_e \Delta Z \cdot A^{SD,2}$				1
	7b	$\Delta g_{iso} \Delta Z \cdot A^{SD}$				
	9b	$\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \Delta \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD}}$			~	1
as	5a	$g_{a}Z^{iso}A^{as}$				
	5b	$g_e \Delta \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{as}$				~

<sup>a</sup> Multiply by  $-\mu_{\rm B}/(\hbar\gamma_l)$  to obtain full shielding expression.

and the temperature dependence is simply 1/kT. Under these circumstances the contact shift is given by the sum of terms (1a), (3a), and (6a) with the NR term (1a) dominating. In addition the PCS is due entirely to the coupling of the *g*-anisotropy to the NR dipolar coupling tensor in term (9a). The total shift anisotropy contains a contact contribution from the *g*-anisotropy, in term (8a), and four terms due to the spin-dipolar interaction (2a), (4a), (7a), and (9a). The dominant spin-dipolar term is expected to be the NR contribution (2a). The contact anisotropy is only significant if the nucleus is within the coordination environment of the metal ion, so that the Fermi-contact interaction.

For metal ions with a larger ZFS anisotropy, the terms in  $1/(kT)^2$  become important. The isotropic contact shift now includes a contribution in  $1/(kT)^2$ , term (8b), and the contact shift anisotropy includes four extra terms (1b), (3b), (6b), and (8b). The ZFS contribution to the PCS comprises four terms (2b), (4b), (7b), and (9b), of which (2b) is expected to be the most important as it depends on the product of the NR freeelectron g-factor ge and the NR spin-dipolar coupling constant, whereas in the other terms either the g-tensor or hyperfine tensor is an SO coupling contribution. The relative importance of the ZFS contribution (2b) and the g-anisotropy contribution (9a) depends on the relative sizes of the g- and ZFS anisotropies. There are also four additional contributions to the spin-dipolar anisotropy, which are terms (2b), (4b), (7b), and (9b). Finally there is one more contribution to the shift anisotropy (5b) which comes from the antisymmetric hyperfine interaction, which can usually be neglected.

As discussed in Section 5.3.4 the isotropic shift is dominated by the contact shift (1a) when nucleus is in the coordination site of the metal ion, and the transfer of unpaired electronic spin density is large. In situations where the orbital overlap is poor and the spin transfer is relatively low, or where the nucleus is outside the coordination environment of the metal the PCS terms begin to dominate. For nuclei outside the coordination environment of the metal ion the dominant contribution to the shift anisotropy is the spin-dipolar term (2a). The contact anisotropy terms become more important for nuclei within the coordination environment.

### 5.5. Key concepts

- The paramagnetic shielding tensor can be expressed either in terms of the EPR parameters, or the bulk magnetic susceptibility tensor. The correspondence between the two formalisms is given in Table 5.1.
- In both formalisms we can separate the shift into contributions from the contact, spin-dipolar, and antisymmetric hyperfine interactions.
- The contact interaction gives an isotropic contact shift that is proportional to the isotropic susceptibility, and a shift anisotropy that is proportional to the susceptibility anisotropy. Both contributions are also proportional to the unpaired electron spin density at the nuclear site.
- The spin-dipolar interaction produces an isotropic pseudocontact shift, that depends on the susceptibility anisotropy and the spatial position of the nucleus with respect to the PAF of the susceptibility tensor, and a shift anisotropy that is dominated by the product of the isotropic susceptibility and spindipolar coupling tensor.
- The terms in the EPR formalism of the paramagnetic shielding tensor are summarised in Table 5.3.

# Chapter 6: The paramagnetic shift due metal ions with arbitrary spin-multiplicity and spin-orbit coupling strength: application to *d*-transition metals, lanthanides, and actinides

Chapters 4 and 5 provide a practicable formalism for the paramagnetic shielding tensor in terms of the g-, hyperfine, and ZFS tensors due to a *d*-block transition-metal ion. The initial part of the derivation gives an exact expression for the chemical shielding that is valid for an arbitrary electronic spin S, and makes no assumptions about the relative orientations of the tensors in the EPR Hamiltonian. Following the derivation of the general expression, a number of assumptions are applied in order to make further progress. These assumptions are that (i) the effective electronic spin S is equal to the real spin of the ion, (ii) the SO coupling is weak in comparison to the ligand-field interaction, (iii) the spin system can be described by the EPR Hamiltonian in Eq. (4.36), and (iv) we need only consider contributions from the ground state spin manifold, i.e. there are no thermally-accessible excited states. Assumption (iii) effectively means that the final expression is only exact for electronic spins up to S = 1 and is only an approximation for larger spins, and all three assumptions limit the theory to the application of *d* metal ions.

We now extend the description to paramagnetic ions with arbitrary SO coupling strength and arbitrary spin, such as the lanthanides and actinides. In systems with lanthanide ions the crystal-field interaction is much weaker than the SO coupling, whilst for actinides both interactions are large, and of comparable magnitude. In both cases the EPR Hamiltonian is more complex than the perturbation expression derived in Chapter 4, and in particular higher-order terms in the EPR Hamiltonian need to be considered to provide a proper description.

We first describe the crystal-field interaction explicitly, and extend the concept of "effective electronic spin". We then generalise the EPR Hamiltonian and use this to derive an expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor and the magnetic susceptibility of a paramagnetic system of arbitrary SO coupling strength and spin. This is first applied to *d*-block transition-metal ions, and spin-only *f*-block ions with an  $f^7$  electronic configuration which exhibit equivalent behaviour. Then we indicate how the EPR formalism may be applied to lanthanides and actinides generally, and we link the EPR formalism to the Bleaney theory of paramagnetic shifts due to lanthanides.

The Bleaney formalism assumes that the magnetic properties of the coordinated lanthanide ions can be approximated by those of the free ion, and that the crystal-field interaction is sufficiently small that all levels are equally thermally populated. Therefore this part of the discussion begins with a description of the electronic properties of the free lanthanide ions in terms of the total angular momentum J, and the Landé *g*-factor  $g_I$ .

Finally we include a short discussion about the paramagnetic shieldings in paramagnetic actinide complexes.

### 6.1. The crystal-field interaction and the effective spin

In Chapter 4 we introduced the concept of the crystal- or ligand-field, as the interaction between the metal ion and the ligands following the immersion of a free metal ion into a coordination complex. For the *d*-block transition-metal ions to which we have hitherto restricted the discussion the crystal-field interaction is sufficiently large that (1) only the ground state is thermally populated at relevant experimental temperatures and (2) it dominates the other interactions relevant to the EPR properties, such as the SO coupling. This results in an EPR Hamiltonian that is charac-

terised by a spin quantum number that is equal to the true spin of the metal ion. This description is not valid for metal ions such as lanthanides and actinides where the larger SO coupling and greater complexity of the electronic structure result in a more complicated form of the shielding tensor. In lanthanides the contracted nature of the 4*f*-orbitals containing the unpaired electrons results in a weaker crystal-field interaction, which is now dominated by the SO coupling, whereas for lanthanides the 5*f* electrons participate directly in bonding to the ligand, and so the crystal-field and SO interactions are both large, and of comparable magnitude. In these cases we need to describe the crystal-field interaction explicitly.

### 6.1.1. The effective spin

For a free ion subject to SO coupling the electron configuration gives rise to a series of energy levels each of which is, in general, degenerate. Each level can be represented as an effective spin  $\tilde{S}$  whose multiplicity  $2\tilde{S} + 1$  matches the degeneracy of the level. In general  $\tilde{S}$  is not equal to the true spin S. In addition the different levels will, in general, have different effective spins. If we immerse the free ion into a complex the effect of the crystal field is to separate the energies of the states of each level, thus reducing their degeneracy. This results in the formation of a number of sub-levels from each level, each of which has lower degeneracy compared to the original level. Each sub-level can therefore be represented by a new effective spin, again whose multiplicity matches the degeneracy of that sub-level.

In order to interpret the EPR and NMR data of paramagnetic systems with an arbitrary SO coupling strength we apply the following logic. Firstly the combination of the SO coupling and crystal-field interactions creates a ladder of (degenerate) energy sub-levels *n*, to each of which can be assigned an effective spin  $\widetilde{S}_n$ , whose multiplicity matches the degeneracy of the corresponding sub-level. These energy levels are properties of the metal ion and the surrounding crystal-field environment and, of course, are independent of the external magnetic field and nuclear magnetic moments. Secondly we introduce the effects of the external magnetic field and nuclear magnetic moments as 'external' perturbations, which allows us to define an electronic Zeeman interaction, a hyperfine interaction, and a ZFS for each level n which are dependent on the effective spin  $\tilde{S}_n$  of that level. Since the corresponding EPR tensor parameters depend on the effective spin, rather than the true spin, they are different in the different sublevels. This idea is explored further in this chapter.

### 6.1.2. The crystal-field interaction

The crystal field can be modelled as the interaction of the unpaired electrons of the metal ion with a potential  $V(\mathbf{r})$  due to the ligands of the coordination site. The potential is given by

$$V(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{e}{4\pi\varepsilon_0} \sum_{l} \frac{Z_l}{|\mathbf{R}_l - \mathbf{r}|},\tag{6.1}$$

where  $\varepsilon_0$  is the permittivity of free space, and the sum is over all the ligands *l*, each one of which is modelled as a point charge  $-Z_l e$  at position  $\mathbf{R}_l$  [219]. We define the positions of the ligand charges with the spherical polar coordinates  $(a_l, \theta_l, \phi_l)$ , and place the unpaired electron at  $(r, \theta, \phi)$ . If we assume that the electron is closer to the paramagnetic centre than to the ligands, so that  $a_l > r$ , we can expand the factor  $|\mathbf{R}_l - \mathbf{r}|^{-1}$  as a sum of products of spherical harmonic functions  $Y_{kq}(\theta, \phi)$  to give

$$V(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{e}{4\pi\varepsilon_0} \sum_{l} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} \frac{4\pi}{2k+1} \frac{Z_l}{a_l^{k+1}} r^k Y_{kq}(\theta,\phi)^* Y_{kq}(\theta_l,\phi_l), \quad (6.2)$$

where k and q are the spherical harmonic rank and order. The crystal-field Hamiltonian  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{CF}$  is given by the sum of the interactions of the unpaired electrons i with the potential:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{CF} = -e \sum_{i} V(\mathbf{r}_{i})$$
(6.3)

$$= \frac{e^2}{4\pi\varepsilon_0} \sum_{i} \sum_{l} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} \frac{4\pi}{2k+1} \frac{Z_l}{a_l^{k+1}} r_i^k Y_{kq}(\theta_i, \phi_i)^* Y_{kq}(\theta_l, \phi_l), \quad (6.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}_i = (r_i, \theta_i, \phi_i)$  is the position of the *i*th electron.

It was shown by Stevens that this Hamiltonian can be transformed into a different form  $\hat{H}_{CF}$  by replacing each term in the sum over k and q with an *operator equivalent* [220]. The most convenient choice of operator basis comprises the irreducible spherical tensors operators  $\hat{O}_{kq}$  of rank k and order q, which represent either the orbital or total angular momentum according to the particular situation. These operator equivalents  $\hat{O}_{1q}$  of rank 1 with those components  $\hat{O}_{k-1,q}$  of rank k-1 using the expression

$$\widehat{O}_{kq} = \sum_{q_1, q_2} \widehat{O}_{k-1, q_1} \widehat{O}_{1q_2} \langle k - 11q_1q_2 | kq \rangle.$$
(6.5)

The expressions for these irreducible spherical tensor operators have been tabulated extensively by Buckmaster et al. [221]. This gives the following Hamiltonian:

$$\widehat{H}_{CF} = \sum_{k} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^{q} B_{kq} \widehat{O}_{k-q},$$
(6.6)

where the  $B_{kq}$  are components of the crystal-field spatial tensor in the irreducible spherical tensor basis, which satisfy

$$B_{kq}^* = (-1)^q B_{k-q}.$$
(6.7)

Not all the components in Eq. (6.6) are retained, and it can be shown that only those components of even rank, up to a maximum of k = 6, are non zero.[219]. In addition the rank-zero component has the effect of simply shifting all the energy levels by the same amount, resulting in no effect on the transition frequencies, and so is also dropped. Therefore the remaining spherical tensor components in the crystal-field Hamiltonian have ranks 2 and 4, for *d*-block transition-metal ions, and ranks 2, 4, and 6 for *f*-block transition-metal ions [219].

### 6.1.3. Crystal-field vs zero-field splitting

The crystal-field terms with k = 2 have the same mathematical form as the ZFS interaction, which we have already encountered in the discussion of the first-row transition metal ions. However great care must be taken in correctly interpreting the crystal-field and ZFS interaction Hamiltonians [222]. In summary the crystal-field interaction is a physical property of the metal ion and its coordination environment, and therefore depends on the orbital and total angular momenta of the system. This interaction lifts the degeneracy of the electron configuration in zero external magnetic field, and creates a number of distinct sub-levels. To each sub-level can be assigned an effective spin  $\tilde{S}$ , the multiplicity  $2\tilde{S} + 1$  of which matches the degeneracy of the sub-level. Each sub-level is associated with a set of effective EPR Hamiltonians including the electronic Zeeman, hyperfine, and ZFS interactions, each of which acts only within the designated sub-space that is defined by  $\tilde{S}$ . Hence the effective spin Hamiltonians are properties of the effective spin only. One consequence is that for a particular metal ion the tensor parameters change according to the sub-level under consideration [222]. We can see from this that the crystal-field and ZFS interactions are completely different, and should not be confused with each other.

### 6.2. The generalized EPR spin Hamiltonian and paramagnetic shielding tensor

At arbitrary SO coupling strength we can no longer treat the SO coupling interaction as a perturbation to the ligand, or crystal, field interaction, and in fact the former may be larger than the latter. Nevertheless we can still write down the EPR Hamiltonian within each sub-level n in terms of an *effective* electronic spin operator

 $\tilde{S}$  which represents the effective spin quantum number  $\tilde{S}$  which we have seen may or may not be equal to the true spin quantum number. The general Hamiltonian is equal to a sum of terms of the form  $KB^r \tilde{S}^s I^t$ , where  $B^r$  is a product of the components of the external magnetic field with degree r, and  $\tilde{S}^{s}$  and  $I^{t}$  respectively are products of *s* and *t* components of the electronic and nuclear spin operators respectively [223]. The size and spatial dependence of the interaction is given by K, which is a component of the relevant tensor. The EPR Hamiltonian in Eq. (4.36) contains terms with r = t = 1 and s = 0 (the orbital chemical shielding interaction), r = s = 1 and t = 0 (the electronic Zeeman interaction), s = t = 1and r = 0 (the hyperfine interaction), and finally s = 2 and r = t = 0 (the ZFS interaction). However these are not the only terms that are present in the Hamiltonian, as we could in principle include terms with larger values of *r*, *s*, and *t*. There are three conditions that we must impose on the form of the terms, the first being that r + s + t must be even in order to ensure that the Hamiltonian is even with respect to time reversal [191], since the field and spin angular momenta are each time-odd. Secondly the maximum value that *s* can take is  $2\tilde{S}$ , i.e. twice the effective electronic spin, and the third condition is that the maximum value of t is 2I [223]. The electronic configurations of *d*-block transition metals result in a maximum possible spin of S = 5/2 and so, for systems containing these ions, we need only consider terms containing

products of  $\tilde{S}$  with  $s \le 5$ . Likewise for *f*-block metal ions, the maximum spin is S = 7/2, and so the maximum value of *s* we need consider is 7.

The dominant terms in the nuclear chemical shielding interaction are linear in both the external field and nuclear spin with higher-order terms being negligible. We therefore ignore any terms with r > 1 and t > 1 as these will not give us the required chemical shielding tensor. Nevertheless we retain any terms with s > 1 as these can contribute important effects to the electronic Zeeman, hyperfine, and ZFS interactions. The term with t = 2 and r = s = 0 is due to the nuclear quadrupole interaction which is present for quadrupolar nuclei with spin I > 1/2 [199]. This is a very important interaction in the NMR of such nuclear spins, but since it does not directly impact on our discussion of paramagnetic shifts we do not consider it further. We can therefore write the generalized EPR Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{EPR}$  as

$$\hat{H}_{\text{EPR}} = -\hbar \gamma_I \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \left( \mathbf{1} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{orb}} \right) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{I}} + \hat{H}_{\text{Z}} + \hat{H}_{\text{HF}} + \hat{H}_{\text{ZFS}}, \tag{6.8}$$

where  $\hat{H}_{z}$ ,  $\hat{H}_{\text{HF}}$ , and  $\hat{H}_{\text{ZFS}}$  are the Hamiltonians representing the electronic Zeeman, hyperfine, and ZFS interactions as described below. Henceforth, in the interests of simplifying the notation, we denote the effective spin operator as  $\hat{S}$  rather than  $\hat{S}$ , i.e. we omit the tilde.

### 6.2.1. The electronic Zeeman interaction

We can write the general electronic Zeeman interaction Hamiltonian as

$$\widehat{H}_{Z} = -\sum_{i} B_{0,i} \widehat{m}_{i}, \tag{6.9}$$

where, in an electronic state with effective spin *S*, the general magnetic moment vector operator  $\hat{m}_i$  is [223]

$$\hat{m}_{i} = -\mu_{\rm B} \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^{q} \widehat{S}_{k-q} g_{kq,i}, \tag{6.10}$$

and the  $g_{kq,i}$  are the components of a complex *g*-tensor of rank *k* and order *q*. The complex conjugate of  $g_{ka,i}$  is

$$g_{kq,i}^* = (-1)^q g_{k-q,i}, \tag{6.11}$$

which ensures that  $\hat{H}_z$  is Hermitian. We note that, because  $\hat{H}_z$  is linear in  $B_{0,i}$  the sum in Eq. (6.10) only contains terms of odd rank k. Explicitly this means that the terms of ranks 1, 3, and 5 are relevant for *d*-block metal ions, whereas terms of ranks 1, 3, 5, and 7 are needed for *f*-block metal ions. We have already encountered the terms of rank one in Chapter 4.

As an example, we consider the generalized Zeeman interaction of Gd<sup>3+</sup>, which has spin S = 7/2. The relevant *g*-tensors are approximately isotropic as the 4*f* subshell is half filled, giving an electronic ground state with term  ${}^{8}S_{7/2}$ . We can therefore write the Zeeman Hamiltonian as [224]

$$\widehat{H}_{Z} = \mu_{B}gB_{0}\widehat{S}_{z} + \mu_{B}g'B_{0}\widehat{S}_{z}^{3} + \mu_{B}g''B_{0}\widehat{S}_{z}^{5} + \mu_{B}g'''B_{0}\widehat{S}_{z}^{7},$$
(6.12)

where g, g', g'', and g''' are the g-factors associated with the Zeeman interactions of increasing order, consistent with measurements of the g-factors of Gd<sup>3+</sup> defects within diamagnetic host crystalline lattices of different symmetries. Early measurements of the first-order factors g have been reviewed by Buckmaster and Shing, and are found to be slightly smaller than  $g_e$ , taking typical values of 1.985–1.992. The higher-order g-factors have also been examined separately by Marshall and Tilton [225], and Buckmaster et al. [226]. Marshall and Tilton acquired EPR spectra of Gd<sup>3+</sup> in ThO<sub>2</sub>, and measured an upper bound of g' of  $2 \times 10^{-7}$ , with the higherorder g-factors expected to have progressively smaller values [225]. Buckmaster et al. measured the g-factors of  $Gd^{3+}$  in La(C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>- $SO_4$ <sub>3</sub>·H<sub>2</sub>O, and found that g' has an upper bound of  $2 \times 10^{-6}$  [226]. This indicates that, although measurable, the higher-order Zeeman interactions in these systems are much weaker than the first-order Zeeman interaction, and consequently less important to the EPR/ NMR properties.

### 6.2.2. The hyperfine interaction

The general hyperfine interaction can be written as a scalar product between the nuclear spin operator and the hyperfine field vector operator  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ ,

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm HF} = \sum_{i} \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{i} \widehat{l}_{i}. \tag{6.13}$$

The hyperfine field operator in an electronic state with effective spin *S* has a form that is similar to the magnetic moment vector operator in Eq. (6.10) in that it is written in terms of the irreducible spherical tensor operators  $\hat{S}_{kq}$  [223]:

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{i} = \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^{q} \widehat{S}_{k-q} A_{kq,i}.$$
(6.14)

The  $A_{kq,i}$  are the components of a complex hyperfine tensor of rank k and order q which, like the  $g_{kq,i}$  components, obey the following relation:

$$A_{kq,i}^* = (-1)^q A_{k-q,i}.$$
(6.15)

We note that, as for the electronic Zeeman interaction, the hyperfine field vector operator contains only terms of odd rank k to ensure the time-even nature of the hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian, i.e. k = 1, 3, and 5 for *d*-block metal ions, and k = 1, 3, 5, and 7 for *f*-block metal ions. We have already encountered the terms of rank one in Chapter 4.

### 6.2.3. The ZFS interaction

The general ZFS interaction Hamiltonian is

$$\widehat{H}_{ZFS} = \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^q D_{kq} \widehat{S}_{k-q},$$
(6.16)

where the ZFS irreducible spherical spatial tensor components  $D_{kq}$  have rank k and order q, and satisfy the relation:

$$D_{kq}^* = (-1)^q D_{k-q}. ag{6.17}$$

In contrast to the Zeeman and hyperfine interactions, the ZFS retains non-zero terms with even k, i.e. k = 2, and 4 for d-block metal ions, and k = 2, 4, and 6 for f-block metal ions. We have already encountered the terms of rank two in Chapter 4. The principal values of the generalized ZFS tensor of rank k and order q are conventionally written in terms of the energy parameters  $b_k^{[q]}$ . In cubic systems we define the three principal axes to be along the three fourfold (proper or improper) rotation axes, whereas in tetragonal, hexagonal, and trigonal systems the principal *z*-axis is defined to be parallel to the highest-order rotation axis. In orthorhombic groups the principal axes are defined according to the twofold rotation axes. Adopting these conventions we obtain the principal values of the ZFS tensors described by Buckmaster and Shing, which are tabulated in Table 6.1.

The rank-four ZFS parameters have been measured for  $Mn^{2+}$  and Fe<sup>3+</sup> (both S = 5/2) [208], and the rank-four and rank-six parameters have been measured extensively for Gd<sup>3+</sup> in diamagnetic host lattices of various symmetry groups [224]. The maximum values of the ZFS parameters for Gd<sup>3+</sup> are generally found to be  $b_2^0 \sim 1$  GHz,  $b_4^0 \sim 100$  MHz, and  $b_6^0 \sim 10$  MHz. In non-cubic

systems the rank-two ZFS is generally expected to dominate the other ZFS terms. However in cubic systems with either a small or no rank-two ZFS, the higher-order ZFS interactions may become important.

### 6.2.4. The EPR formalism of the paramagnetic shielding tensor

The form of the generalized EPR Hamiltonian has a profound effect on the form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor, which is given by the EPR formula in Eq. (4.103) and reproduced below for convenience:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S} = \frac{2}{\hbar \gamma_{I} Q_{0}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_{n}) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu, \mu} \frac{\langle n\nu | \hat{m}_{i} | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j} | n\nu \rangle}{E_{m} - E_{n}} + \frac{\beta}{\hbar \gamma_{I} Q_{0}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_{n}) \sum_{\nu, \nu'} \langle n\nu | \hat{m}_{i} | n\nu' \rangle \langle n\nu' | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j} | n\nu \rangle.$$
(6.18)

The EPR expression in Eq. (6.18) is a completely general formula for the paramagnetic shielding tensor due to a paramagnetic centre of any spin multiplicity and SO coupling strength. As we mentioned in Section 4.2.1, this formalism makes no assumptions about the level of theory, i.e. relativistic or not, the SO coupling strength, or the multiplicity of the electronic energy levels. Therefore this formalism has a much wider scope than the 3*d* metal ions we have so far discussed, and can be applied to more complex ions such as lanthanides and actinides. The general, and unspecified, forms of the electronic magnetic moment  $\hat{m}$  and hyperfine  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  operators in Eq. (6.18) are valid for situations where several energy levels of the crystal-field interaction are thermally populated. However this formula suffers from the disadvantage of being rather unwieldy. The remainder of this chapter is orientated towards examining the situations in which we may simplify the formalism.

6.2.4.1. Paramagnetic chemical shielding of a thermally-isolated degenerate ground state. Van den Heuvel proposed a simplification of Eq. (6.18) that can be employed when only the ground state submanifold due to the crystal-field splitting is thermally occupied [89]. In practice this would occur when the energy separation

### Table 6.1

The principal values of the spatial parts of the generalized ZFS interaction up to rank six. The second-rank parameters are related to the axial and rhombic ZFS anisotropies by  $b_2^0 = D$  and  $b_2^2 = 3E$ . The point groups corresponding to each symmetry class are:  $O_h$ , O,  $T_d$ , and T (cubic);  $C_4$ ,  $C_{4\nu}$ ,  $C_{4h}$ ,  $D_4$ ,  $D_{4h}$ , and  $D_{2d}$  (tetragonal);  $C_6$ ,  $C_{6\nu}$ ,  $C_{6h}$ ,  $C_{3h}$ ,  $D_6$ ,  $D_{6h}$ , and  $D_{3h}$  (hexagonal);  $C_3$ ,  $S_6$ ,  $C_{3\nu}$ ,  $D_3$ , and  $D_{3d}$  (trigonal);  $C_{2\nu}$ ,  $D_2$ , and  $D_{2h}$  (orthorhombic). In the cubic groups the principal axes of the PAF are along the three fourfold rotation axes. In the tetragonal, hexagonal, and trigonal groups the PAF is defined so that the z-axis is aligned with the highest-order rotation axis. In the orthorhombic groups, the three principal axes coincide with the three twofold rotation axes.

Rank k	Order q	$D_{kq}$ for different symmetries						
		Cubic	Tetragonal	Hexagonal	Trigonal	Orthorhombic		
2	0	0	$\left(\sqrt{2/3}\right)b_2^0$	$\left(\sqrt{2/3}\right)b_2^0$	$\left(\sqrt{2/3}\right)b_2^0$	$\left(\sqrt{2/3}\right)b_2^0$		
	±1	0	0	0	0	0		
	$\pm 2$	0	0	0	0	$(1/3)b_2^2$		
4	0	$\left(\sqrt{70}/30 ight)b_4^0$	$\left(\sqrt{70}/30\right)b_4^0$	$\left(\sqrt{70}/30\right)b_4^0$	$\left(\sqrt{70}/30\right)b_4^0$	$\left(\sqrt{70}/30\right)b_4^0$		
	$\pm 1$	0	0	0	0	0		
	$\pm 2$	0	0	0	0	$\left(\sqrt{7}/60\right)b_4^2$		
	±3	0	0	0	$\pm \left(\sqrt{2}/6\right) b_4^3$	0		
	$\pm 4$	$(1/6)b_4^0$	$(1/30)b_4^4$	0	0	$(1/30)b_4^4$		
6	0	$\left(\sqrt{231}/315\right)b_{6}^{0}$	$\left(\sqrt{231}/315\right)b_{6}^{0}$	$\left(\sqrt{231}/315\right)b_6^0$	$\left(\sqrt{231}/315\right)b_6^0$	$\left(\sqrt{231}/315\right)b_6^0$		
	$\pm 1$	0	0	0	0	0		
	$\pm 2$	0	0	0	0	$((\sqrt{11/5})/315)b_6^2$		
	±3	0	0	0	$\pm \left(\left(\sqrt{11/5}\right)/18\right)b_6^3$	0		
	$\pm 4$	$-((\sqrt{11/6})/15)b_6^0$	$\left(\left(\sqrt{11/6}\right)/315\right)b_6^4$	0	0	$\left(\left(\sqrt{11/6}\right)/315\right)b_6^4$		
	$\pm 5$	0	0	0	0	0		
	$\pm 6$	0	0	$(1/315)b_6^6$	$(1/315)b_6^6$	$(1/315)b_6^6$		

between the ground sub-manifold n = 0 and the lowest-lying excited sub-manifold is much greater than kT. In this case Eq. (6.18) can be simplified to give

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\widetilde{S}} = \frac{\beta}{\hbar\gamma_l} \frac{1}{2\widetilde{S} + 1} \sum_{\nu,\nu'} \langle 0\nu | \hat{m}_i^{(0)} | 0\nu' \rangle \langle 0\nu' | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j^{(0)} | 0\nu \rangle$$
(6.19)

$$=\frac{\beta}{\hbar\gamma_{I}}\frac{1}{2\widetilde{S}+1}\mathrm{Tr}_{\widetilde{S}}\left[\hat{m}_{i}^{(0)}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j}^{(0)}\right]$$
(6.20)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}\beta}{\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}} \frac{1}{2\widetilde{S}+1} \sum_{k,k'} \sum_{q,q'} (-1)^{q+q'} g^{(0)}_{kq,i} A^{(0)}_{k'q'\,j} {\rm Tr}_{\widetilde{S}} \Big[ \widehat{S}_{k-q} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \Big], \quad (6.21)$$

where we have added a superscript (0) to the *g*- and hyperfine tensor parameters to reflect the fact that they are properties of the n = 0 sub-manifold. The trace can be further simplified following the discussion in Appendix D to give

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\widetilde{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}kT} \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \frac{\langle \widetilde{S} \| \widehat{S}_k \| \widetilde{S} \rangle^2}{2k+1} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^q g_{kq,i}^{(0)} A_{k-q,j}^{(0)}, \tag{6.22}$$

where only the terms with k' = k and q' = q remain. The  $\langle S \| \hat{S}_k \| S' \rangle$  are the reduced matrix elements of the tensor  $\hat{S}_k$  [191] which, for tensors  $\hat{S}_k$  that are formed according to Eq. (6.5) with  $\hat{O}_{kq} = \hat{S}_{kq}$ , can be calculated from the formula of Buckmaster et al. [221]:

$$\langle S \| \widehat{S}_k \| S' \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{k!k!(2S+k+1)!}{2^k (2k)!(2S-k)!(2S+1)}} \delta_{SS'}.$$
(6.23)

The paramagnetic shielding in this expression has a Curie temperature dependence, which is because the electronic spin system behaves analogously to the spin system with an anisotropic *g*-tensor and no ZFS discussed by Moon and Patchkovskii [39]. In fact we may regard Eq. (6.22) as the generalization of the Moon–Patchkovskii equation (4.118) resulting from considering the EPR interaction terms with ranks *k* greater than one. If we retain only those terms with k = 1, then Eq. (6.22) reduces to Eq. (4.118).

## 6.3. The paramagnetic shielding and magnetic susceptibility tensors due to a transition-metal ion with arbitrary spin multiplicity

In this section we return to the case of a *d*-block transition-metal ion in a thermally-isolated ground state n = 0 of the crystal-field splitting interaction Hamiltonian, in which the effective spin is the same as the formal true spin. The generalized EPR Hamiltonian in Section 6.2 describes the electronic spin properties of this ground state, and dictates the form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor. We use the forms of the operators  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  that are given in terms of  $\hat{S}_{kq}$ , and set the energy levels of the Boltzmann averages so that they correspond to the eigenvalues of the generalized ZFS Hamiltonian. Note that this situation is different to that which resulted in Eq. (6.22), since in that case it is also assumed that the electronic spin system is thermally isolated in the ZFS ground state in addition to the crystal field splitting ground state. In the present case the paramagnetic shielding tensor then takes the form:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\rm S} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_I} \sum_{k=0}^{2{\rm S}} \sum_{k'=0}^{2{\rm S}} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} \sum_{q'=-k'}^{+k'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{kq,i} Z_{kk'qq'} A_{k'q',j}, \tag{6.24}$$

where the dependence on both the temperature and the zero-field Hamiltonian is encoded in  $Z_{kk'qq'}$ , which is given by

$$Z_{kk'qq'} = \frac{2}{Q_0} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu,\mu'} \frac{\langle n\nu | S_{k-q} | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | S_{k'-q'} | n\nu \rangle}{E_m - E_n} + \frac{\beta}{Q_0} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{\nu,\nu'} \langle n\nu | \widehat{S}_{k-q} | n\nu' \rangle \langle n\nu' | \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} | n\nu \rangle.$$
(6.25)

To second order in 1/(kT) the paramagnetic shielding tensor is given by

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S} = -\frac{\mu_{B}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}} \left[ \frac{\beta}{2S+1} \sum_{kk'qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{kq,i} A_{k'q',j} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left( \widehat{S}_{k-q} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \right) \right. \\ \left. - \frac{\beta^{2}}{2S+1} \sum_{kk'k''qq'q''} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g_{kq,i} A_{k'q',j} D_{k''q''} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left( \widehat{S}_{k-q} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \widehat{S}_{k''-q''} \right) \right] \\ \left. + \mathcal{O}(\beta^{3}).$$
(6.26)

The details of the calculation are given in Appendix D. This expression can be simplified by calculating the traces (also see Appendix D). The term that is first-order in 1/(kT),  $\sigma_{ii}^{S,1}$ , is then given by [89]:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S,1} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_i kT} \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \frac{\langle S \| \widehat{S}_k \| S \rangle^2}{2k+1} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^q g_{kq,i} A_{k-q,j}, \tag{6.27}$$

where we notice that the only contributing terms from the sum are those with k = k' and q = -q'. This is an analogous expression to that in Eq. (6.22). However we recall that here the electronic spin is not thermally isolated in the ground state of the ZFS. The second-order term  $\sigma_{ij}^{S,2}$  is given by

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S,2} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar \gamma_{I} (kT)^{2}} (-1)^{2S} (2S+1)^{1/2} \sum_{kk'k''} \langle S \| \widehat{S}_{k} \| S \rangle \langle S \| \widehat{S}_{k'} \| S \rangle \\ \times \left\{ \begin{matrix} k' & k'' & k \\ S & S & S \end{matrix} \right\} \times \sum_{qq'q''} g_{kq,i} A_{k'q',j} D_{k''q''} \begin{pmatrix} k' & k'' & k \\ -q' & -q'' & -q \end{pmatrix},$$
(6.28)

where the arrays contained in parentheses and braces are Wigner 3*j* and Wigner 6*j* symbols respectively.

It is important to note that the symmetry properties of the Wigner 3*j* and Wigner 6*j* symbols impose restrictions on both the ranks and orders of the irreducible spherical tensors that can contribute to the second-order paramagnetic chemical shielding. Firstly the symmetry of the 6*j* symbol dictates that the triplets (k, S, S), (k', S, S), and (k'', S, S) must satisfy the triangle condition *k*, k',  $k'' \leq 2S$ . This is simply a reinforcement of the restriction on the ranks of the interaction tensors that we stated earlier. Secondly, both the 3*j* and 6*j* symbols require (k, k', k'') to also satisfy the triangle condition that any one of the three ranks must be less than or equal to the sum of the other two. This has important consequences for the shielding tensor to second order, as we will see later. Finally, from the 3*j* symbol, the sum of the three orders must be zero, q + q' + q'' = 0.

As we have also noted in Chapter 4, the *g*-tensor is responsible for introducing a term into the paramagnetic shielding tensor with a leading temperature dependence of 1/(kT), and the ZFS gives a term with a leading temperature dependence of  $1/(kT)^2$ . This feature is also present in the Bleaney expression in Eq. (4.132). However the present situation is more general, as we have explicitly considered the higher-order irreducible spherical tensor components of the EPR parameters. Hence Eqs. (6.27) and (6.28) are generalized forms of the Bleaney expression in Eq. (4.132).

### 6.3.1. The Bleaney expression for d-block metal ions revisited

We now calculate the paramagnetic shielding tensor up to  $\mathcal{O}(1/(kT)^2)$  for a Hamiltonian comprising an electronic Zeeman term and a hyperfine term that are both linear in  $\hat{S}$ , and a ZFS term with terms of ranks 2, 4, and 6:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H} &= \mu_{\mathsf{B}} \mathbf{B}_{0} \cdot \mathbf{g} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{S}} + \widehat{\mathbf{S}} \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{I}} + \sum_{k=2,4,6} \sum_{q=-k}^{+\kappa} (-1)^{q} D_{kq} \widehat{S}_{k-q} \end{aligned} \tag{6.29} \\ &= \mu_{\mathsf{B}} \sum_{i} B_{0,i} \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} (-1)^{q} \widehat{S}_{1-q} g_{1q,i} + \sum_{i} \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} (-1)^{q} \widehat{S}_{1-q} A_{1q,i} \widehat{l}_{i} \\ &+ \sum_{k=2,4,6} \sum_{q=-k}^{+\kappa} (-1)^{q} D_{kq} \widehat{S}_{k-q}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.30}$$

In the ZFS term, we encounter the terms of rank 4 for transition metal ions with  $S \ge 2$ , and the rank-6 terms for the lanthanide ions [185]. Henceforth we concentrate on the transition-metal ions of the *d* block and those of the *f* block with an  $f^7$  configuration, such as Gd<sup>3+</sup>, with the aim being to reproduce the Bleaney expression in Eq. (4.132). We can write down the first- and second-order parts of the shielding tensor from Eqs. (6.27) and (6.28):

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S,1} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_i kT} \frac{\langle S \| \widehat{S}_1 \| S \rangle^2}{3} \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} (-1)^q g_{1q,i} A_{1-q,j}, \tag{6.31}$$

$$\sigma_{ij}^{5,2} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_{l}(kT)^{2}} (-1)^{2S} (2S+1)^{1/2} \langle S \| \widehat{S}_{1} \| S \rangle^{2} \sum_{k''=2,4,6} \langle S \| \widehat{S}_{k''} \| S \rangle \begin{cases} 1 & k'' & 1\\ S & S & S \end{cases}$$
$$\times \sum_{qq'q''} g_{1q,i} A_{1q',j} D_{k''q''} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & k'' & 1\\ -q' & -q'' & -q \end{pmatrix}.$$
(6.32)

As we have come to expect, the first-order term is proportional to the product of the *g*- and hyperfine tensors, and is independent of the ZFS tensor. In the second-order term we have hitherto retained terms in the ZFS tensor of all possible ranks, but we can see that a simplification is possible. Since *k*, *k'*, and *k''* must satisfy the triangle condition, the only ZFS tensor components that contribute to the second-order shielding tensor are of rank k'' = 2, as was previously noted by Bleaney [62], and McGarvey and Kurland [38].

We can now proceed with the calculation by writing down the analytical expressions of all the factors involved. The reduced matrix elements of the first- and second-rank spin tensors are given by Eq. (6.23), and have the following explicit expressions:

$$\langle S \| \widehat{S}_1 \| S \rangle = \sqrt{S(S+1)},\tag{6.33}$$

$$\langle S \| \widehat{S}_2 \| S \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{6}}.$$
(6.34)

The exact expression for the Wigner 6*j* symbol with k'' = 2 has been derived by Edmonds [227], and is

$$\begin{cases} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ S & S & S \end{cases} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{2S} \sqrt{\frac{(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30S(S+1)(2S+1)}}, & S \ge 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(6.35)

It can also be shown that the exact expression for the Wigner 3*j* symbol is [191]

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ -q' & -q'' & -q \end{pmatrix} = (-1)^{-q'-q} \\ \times \sqrt{\frac{(1+q')!(2-q'')!(2+q'')!(1-q)!}{30(1-q')!((1+q'+q'')!)^2((1-q''-q)!)^2(1+q)!}},$$
(6.36)

for q + q' + q'' = 0 and zero otherwise. Finally the components of the *g*- and hyperfine tensors  $g_{1q,i}$  and  $A_{1q,i}$  can be calculated from the Cartesian components. The *g*-tensor comprises three vectors  $g_{1q}$ , one for each value of *q*, which are equal to:

$$\boldsymbol{g}_{1\pm1} = \mp \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{g}_{xx} \pm i \boldsymbol{g}_{xy} \\ \boldsymbol{g}_{yx} \pm i \boldsymbol{g}_{yy} \\ \boldsymbol{g}_{zx} \pm i \boldsymbol{g}_{zy} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \boldsymbol{g}_{10} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{g}_{xz} \\ \boldsymbol{g}_{yz} \\ \boldsymbol{g}_{zz} \end{pmatrix}.$$
(6.37)

Likewise the three vectors comprising the hyperfine tensor  $A_{1q}$  are:

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{1\pm 1} = \mp \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} A_{xx} \pm iA_{yx} \\ A_{xy} \pm iA_{yy} \\ A_{xz} \pm iA_{yz} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \boldsymbol{A}_{10} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{zx} \\ A_{zy} \\ A_{zz} \end{pmatrix}.$$
(6.38)

Combining all these expressions results in the final expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor to second order in 1/(kT):

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)}{3\hbar\gamma kT}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{A} + \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)(2\mathrm{S}-1)(2\mathrm{S}+3)}{30\hbar\gamma (kT)^{2}}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{D}\cdot\boldsymbol{A},$$
(6.39)

where **D** is the second-rank part of the ZFS interaction tensor. This expression is identical to that derived earlier in Eq. (4.132), but is in fact more general. The former expression was calculated assuming that the zero-field Hamiltonian was described entirely by the second-rank ZFS tensor, whereas the present derivation has shown that the fourth- and sixth-rank parts do not contribute to the shielding tensor to second order in 1/(kT). However these higher-order components are present in the terms of third order and higher in 1/(kT) [38]. We recall that if the higher-order ZFS terms are zero or negligible, the shielding tensor has the form of Eq. (4.109).

### 6.3.2. The EPR formalism of the magnetic susceptibility tensor

The EPR formalism can also be used to calculate the magnetic susceptibility tensor [89]. Following the discussion leading to the paramagnetic shielding tensor in Eq. (6.24), and substituting the hyperfine field operator for the electronic magnetic moment operator, we obtain a susceptibility tensor of a similar form:

$$\chi_{ij} = \mu_0 \mu_B^2 \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \sum_{k'=0}^{2S} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} \sum_{q'=-k'}^{+k'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{kq,i} Z_{kk'qq'} g_{k'q',j}.$$
(6.40)

We can write down the first- and second-order terms in 1/(kT) in the susceptibility tensor following the same procedure as for the paramagnetic shielding tensor. The first-order term  $\chi_{ii}^{(1)}$  is

$$\chi_{ij}^{(1)} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2}{kT} \sum_{k=0}^{2S} \frac{\langle S \| \widehat{S}_k \| S \rangle^2}{2k+1} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^q g_{kq,i} g_{k-q,j},$$
(6.41)

and the second-order term  $\chi_{ij}^{(2)}$  is

$$\begin{split} \chi_{ij}^{(2)} &= -\frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2}{(kT)^2} (-1)^{2S} (2S+1)^{1/2} \sum_{kk'k''} \langle S \| \widehat{S}_k \| S \rangle \langle S \| \widehat{S}_{k'} \| S \rangle \\ & \times \begin{cases} k' & k'' & k \\ S & S & S \end{cases} \times \sum_{qq'q''} g_{kq,i} g_{k'q',j} D_{k''q''} \begin{pmatrix} k' & k'' & k \\ -q' & -q'' & -q \end{pmatrix}. \end{split}$$

$$(6.42)$$

We immediately notice the similarity between these expressions and the corresponding expressions for the shielding tensor in Eqs. (6.27) and (6.28).

If we further assume that the system can be described with the EPR Hamiltonian in Eq. (6.30) we obtain Eq. (4.174), which is reproduced below

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} \approx \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)}{3kT} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T - \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30(kT)^2} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T.$$
(6.43)

Once again, as noted by Bleaney [62] and Kurland and McGarvey [38], the only terms of the ZFS Hamiltonian that contribute to the susceptibility tensor to second order are those of spatial rank two. We recall at this point that higher-order ZFS terms do contribute to shielding terms of order higher than  $1/(kT)^2$ . However when the fourth- and sixth-rank ZFS terms are either zero or negligible

we can write down a general form of the susceptibility tensor as follows

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^{\rm T}, \tag{6.44}$$

which is the same expression as given in Eq. (4.173).

### 6.4. Electronic properties of the lanthanide ions

We now turn our attention to the lanthanide ions, focussing on the formalism for the paramagnetic shielding and magnetic susceptibility tensors proposed by Bleaney [62]. This approach assumes that the coordinated lanthanides can be modelled as free metal ions with the crystal-field due to the ligands added as a perturbation. We therefore begin by summarizing the free-ion properties, and then introduce the crystal-field interaction.

### 6.4.1. The free lanthanide ions

The lanthanide ions are predominantly, but not exclusively, trivalent with the unpaired electrons residing in the 4*f* orbitals. Unlike the 3*d* shell of the first-row transition-metal ions, the 4*f* orbitals of the lanthanides are not valence orbitals and so participate in the metal-ligand bonding to a lesser extent. In addition the SO coupling strength of the lanthanides is much larger than for the 3*d* metal ions. This places the lanthanide ions in the 'weak crystal-field limit', where the SO coupling is much stronger than the crystal-field interaction, and so cannot be treated as a perturbation as in Chapter 4. We therefore use the approach of Bleaney [62], which is to assume that the 4*f* orbitals are sufficiently radially contracted for the properties of the coordinated metal ions to be adequately described by the free ions, with the crystal-field interaction.

The magnetic properties of the free lanthanides are described in terms of the total angular momentum J which, in the limit of *LS* coupling, is written as the sum of the total orbital L and spin S angular momenta of the electronic configuration, according to the *LS* coupling scheme:

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{S}.\tag{6.45}$$

The total angular momentum is quantized, and labelled with the total angular momentum quantum number *J* which takes values according to the Clebsch–Gordan series, i.e.  $L + S, L + S - 1, \ldots, |L - S|$ . The electronic levels corresponding to the configuration of the free ion can therefore be labelled by these three quantum num-

bers and are usually represented by term symbols  $^{25+1}L_J$ . The ground level is given by Hund's rules [207], and is generally the only level that is thermally occupied at room temperature and is therefore the only state we need consider. The exceptions to this assertion are the ions with configurations  $4f^5$  and  $4f^6$ , namely Sm<sup>3+</sup> and Eu<sup>3+</sup>, where we also have to consider the lowest-lying excited states. The freeion properties of the trivalent lanthanides Ln<sup>3+</sup> with between 1 and 13 4f electrons, and the one-electron and many-electron SO coupling constants  $\zeta$  and  $\lambda$  [186], are given in Table 6.2.

Each electronic level  ${}^{2S+1}L_J$  comprises 2J + 1 electronic states that are labelled with the azimuthal quantum number  $M_J$ , which takes values from +J to -J in integer steps. In the absence of other interactions the states of a particular level are degenerate, and may therefore be described as corresponding to an effective spin  $\tilde{S} = J$  whose multiplicity  $2\tilde{S} + 1$  matches the true degeneracy. Clearly levels with different *J* therefore correspond to different effective spins.

The effective spin EPR Hamiltonian can therefore be written in terms of the operator for the total angular momentum  $\hat{J}$ . For the free ion the ZFS is zero by symmetry, and so we need only consider the electronic Zeeman interaction, and the hyperfine coupling between the unpaired electrons and the lanthanide nucleus. We have seen that the total magnetic moment  $\mu_j$  is not parallel to the total angular momentum J, as illustrated in Fig. 4.1. However, from the projection theorem outlined in Appendix A.1, the matrix elements of the operator  $\hat{\mu}_j$  are proportional to those of  $\hat{J}$ , and so the component of the magnetic moment that appears in the Zeeman interaction Hamiltonian is that which commutes with  $\hat{J}$ , i.e.  $-\mu_{\rm B}g_j\hat{J}$ , as shown in Fig. 6.1. The Zeeman interaction Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_Z = \mu_{\rm B}B_0 \cdot (\hat{L} + g_e\hat{S})$  can therefore be written in terms of  $\hat{J}$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{\mathsf{Z}} = \mu_{\mathsf{B}} g_{\mathsf{I}} \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{J}}. \tag{6.46}$$

The number  $g_i$  is the isotropic Landé g-factor which is given by

$$g_J = \frac{g_S + g_L}{2} + (g_L - g_S) \frac{L(L+1) - S(S+1)}{2J(J+1)},$$
(6.47)

where  $g_L$  and  $g_S$  are the orbital and electronic g-factors. Writing  $g_L = 1$  and approximating  $g_S$  as 2 gives us the familiar expression

$$g_J = \frac{3}{2} + \frac{S(S+1) - L(L+1)}{2J(J+1)}.$$
(6.48)

Table 6.2

List of the trivalent lanthanide ions, and the parameters defining the electronic ground states of the free ions assuming *LS*-coupling. The *f*-electron configurations are given, along with the total spin *S*, orbital *L*, and total *J* angular momenta. The ground state is given by Hund's rules, and is represented by the term symbol. The one-electron  $\zeta$  and many-electron  $\lambda$  SO coupling parameters are also given, except for Pm<sup>3+</sup>, which is radioactive, and Gd<sup>3+</sup>, which has a half-filled 4*f* shell and therefore an SO interaction of zero.

Ion	Configuration	S	L	J	Term	$\zeta/cm^{-1a}$	$\lambda/cm^{-1b}$
Ce <sup>3+</sup>	$f^1$	1/2	3	5/2	${}^{2}F_{5/2}$	640	640
Pr <sup>3+</sup>	$f^2$	1	5	4	${}^{3}H_{4}$	750	375
Nd <sup>3+</sup>	$f^3$	3/2	6	9/2	$^{4}I_{9/2}$	900	300
Pm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^4$	2	6	4	<sup>5</sup> I <sub>4</sub>	-	-
Sm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^5$	5/2	5	5/2	${}^{6}H_{5/2}$	1180	236
Eu <sup>3+</sup>	$f^6$	3	3	0	<sup>7</sup> <i>F</i> <sub>0</sub>	1360	227
Gd <sup>3+</sup>	$f^7$	7/2	0	7/2	<sup>8</sup> S <sub>7/2</sub>	-	-
Tb <sup>3+</sup>	$f^8$	3	3	6	${}^{7}F_{6}$	1620	-270
Dy <sup>3+</sup>	$f^9$	5/2	5	15/2	${}^{6}H_{15/2}$	1820	-364
Ho <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{10}$	2	6	8	<sup>5</sup> I <sub>8</sub>	2080	-520
Er <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{11}$	3/2	6	15/2	${}^{4}I_{15/2}$	2470	-823
Tm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{12}$	1	5	6	${}^{3}H_{6}$	2750	-1375
Yb <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{13}$	1/2	3	7/2	<sup>2</sup> F <sub>7/2</sub>	2950	-2950

<sup>a</sup> Values taken from Weil and Bolton [186].

<sup>b</sup> Calculated using  $\lambda = \pm \zeta/(2S)$  with the plus sign for *f*-shells that are less than half full, and the minus sign for shells that are more than half full. When the shell is exactly half full, the SO coupling is essentially zero.



**Fig. 6.1.** Illustration of the relationship between the total angular momentum **J** and the total magnetic moment  $\mu_j$  under the Russell–Saunders coupling scheme. In general  $\mu_j$  is not parallel to **J**. However the electronic Zeeman interaction depends only on the component of the magnetic moment that is parallel to **J**, namely  $-\mu_{\rm B}g_J$ .

This expression for  $g_J$  can be derived by calculating the projection of the total magnetic moment  $\mu_J$  onto the total angular momentum J, as shown in Appendix A.1. The Zeeman interaction lifts the degeneracy of the each level J and, for an external magnetic field along z, the Zeeman energy of each state is  $M_J \mu_B g_J B_0$ . One important property of the Landé g-factor is that it varies with J, and so we would expect a different g-factor, and therefore a different Zeeman splitting, for each level. This may appear trivial, but does in fact have important consequences for the EPR and NMR spectra of lanthanide compounds subject to a large crystal-field splitting of the electronic energy levels.

We can write the hyperfine coupling Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{HF}$  as

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm HF} = A_J \,\widehat{\boldsymbol{J}} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}},\tag{6.49}$$

where  $A_j$  is an isotropic contact hyperfine coupling constant. Here  $\hat{H}_{HF}$  describes the interaction between the unpaired 4f electrons and the lanthanide nuclear spin.

### 6.4.2. The crystal-field interaction

The crystal-field interaction Hamiltonian can be described by Eq. (6.6), but in terms of the total angular momentum. The expression is here given explicitly:

$$\widehat{H}_{CF} = \sum_{k=2,4,6} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^q B_{kq} \widehat{J}_{k-q},$$
(6.50)

where the  $\hat{J}_{kq}$  are irreducible spherical tensor operators of the total angular momentum of rank k and order q. In the absence of an external magnetic field and nuclear magnetic moments, this Hamiltonian has the effect of lifting the degeneracy of the manifold of states of level J, creating a set of sub-manifolds each with a multiplicity lower than 2J + 1.

It is common to write the crystal-field splitting Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{CF}$  using the following alternative form, rather than in terms of the irreducible spherical tensor operators:

$$\widehat{H}_{CF} = \sum_{k=2,4,6} \sum_{q=0}^{+\kappa} A_k^q \langle r^k \rangle \langle J \| k \| J \rangle \widehat{O}_k^q.$$
(6.51)

In Eq. (6.51) the spin part of the interaction is represented by the Stevens operator equivalents  $\hat{O}_k^q$  of rank k, and an order q that takes values from 0 to +k [220]. These operators should not be confused with the irreducible spherical tensor operators  $\hat{O}_{kq}$  introduced earlier. For example the operators  $\hat{O}_2^0$  and  $\hat{O}_2^2$  are given by

$$\widehat{O}_2^0 = 3\widehat{J}_z^2 - J(J+1)\widehat{1}, \tag{6.52}$$

$$\widehat{O}_{2}^{2} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \widehat{J}_{+}^{2} + \widehat{J}_{-}^{2} \right), \tag{6.53}$$

and the additional relevant expressions for  $k \ge 2$  can be found in Abragam and Bleaney [185]. The spatial part of the interaction is represented by the *A*-energy coefficients  $A_k^q$  of rank *k* and order *q*.

The reduced matrix elements  $\langle J || k || J \rangle$  are numerical coefficients that depend only on *J*. It is common to use the notation  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $\gamma$  for k = 2, 4, and 6 so that, for example,  $\langle J || \alpha || J \rangle \equiv \langle J || 2 || J \rangle$ . However we do not use that convention here. The remaining factor  $\langle r^k \rangle$  is the mean *k*th power of the electronic radius of the 4*f* orbitals. The principal values of the rank-two part of the **B**-tensor,  $\tilde{B}_{ii}$ , are related to  $A_2^0$  and  $A_2^2$  as follows [62]:

$$\widetilde{B}_{xx} = \langle r^2 \rangle \langle J \| 2 \| J \rangle \Big( A_2^2 - A_2^0 \Big), \tag{6.54}$$

$$\widetilde{B}_{yy} = \langle r^2 \rangle \langle J \| 2 \| J \rangle \Big( -A_2^2 - A_2^0 \Big), \tag{6.55}$$

$$\widetilde{B}_{zz} = \langle r^2 \rangle \langle J \| 2 \| J \rangle 2A_2^0, \tag{6.56}$$

from which we can define the axial and rhombic anisotropies of  $B_{,\Delta}B_{ax}$  and  $\Delta B_{rh}$ , as

$$\Delta B_{\rm ax} = \langle r^2 \rangle \langle J \| 2 \| J \rangle 3A_2^0, \tag{6.57}$$

$$\Delta B_{\rm rh} = \langle r^2 \rangle \langle J \| 2 \| J \rangle 2A_2^2. \tag{6.58}$$

These crystal-field splitting parameters can be calculated from first principles as demonstrated by, for example, Vonci et al. [74].

Each sub-manifold can therefore be described by an effective spin  $\tilde{S}$  chosen so that the degeneracy is equal to  $2\tilde{S} + 1$ . We can now write down the EPR Hamiltonian of the lanthanide within a particular sub-manifold n as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H}^{(n)} &= \mu_{\rm B} \sum_{i} B_{0,i} \sum_{k=0}^{2\widetilde{S}} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^{q} \widehat{S}_{k-q} g_{kq,i}^{(n)} \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{2\widetilde{S}} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^{q} \widehat{S}_{k-q} \sum_{i} A_{kq,i}^{(n)} \widehat{I}_{i} + \sum_{k=0}^{2\widetilde{S}} \sum_{q=-k}^{+q} (-1)^{q} D_{kq}^{(n)} \widehat{S}_{k-q}, \quad (6.59) \end{aligned}$$

where the superscript (n) denotes the EPR tensor parameters in the nth sub-level. We note that the g-tensor in each sub-level is no longer isotropic due to the lowering of the symmetry of the metal environment, and that the hyperfine interaction can now refer to the coupling between the unpaired electrons and a nucleus in the ligand. These tensor parameters are actually different for the different submanifolds that are present as a result of the crystal field splitting [185]. To take an example, the four states of the J = 3/2 level of a free lanthanide ion will, when subjected to an axially-symmetric crystalfield of spatial rank two, split into two doubly-degenerate sub-manifolds, each corresponding to an effective spin S = 1/2. The PAF components of the rank-one g-tensor are  $\tilde{g}_{zz} = 3g_l$  and  $\widetilde{g}_{xx} = \widetilde{g}_{yy} = 0$  for one sub-manifold, and  $\widetilde{g}_{zz} = g_I$  and  $\widetilde{g}_{xx} = \widetilde{g}_{yy} = 2g_I$ for the other. In practice this means that the effective g- and hyperfine tensors that we measure during an EPR experiment depend on the relative populations of the sub-manifolds at the given temperature.

# 6.5. The Bleaney theory of the paramagnetic shielding tensor due to lanthanide ions

Bleaney derived a form of the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor for lanthanide ions using a method that is distinct from the EPR formalism [62]. He assumed that (i) only the ground-state *J* manifold is thermally occupied, and that (ii) the 2J + 1 states are split by the crystal field by an overall amount that does not exceed *kT*. Condition (i) is a good assumption for the lanthanide ions, with the exception of those metal ions with either a  $4f^5$  or  $4f^6$  configuration. However Bleaney calculated corrections involving the excited states for these cases. Condition (ii) is reasonable for many lanthanide compounds. This latter assumption also allows us to make a simplification to the form of the electron Zeeman interaction. We have seen that the different sub-manifolds of the level *J* under the crystal-field splitting have *g*-tensors with different anisotropies, and whose PAFs have different orientations. Kurland and McGarvey pointed out that, when all the sub-manifolds have a substantial thermal population, the *g*-anisotropies from the different sub-manifolds cancel to a first approximation, and we are left with an overall *g*-tensor that is isotropic, and equal to the Landé factor  $g_j$ . We can therefore write down a Hamiltonian that comprises this Zeeman interaction, and terms for the hyperfine and crystal-field interactions as:

$$\widehat{H}_{J} = \mu_{\mathrm{B}} g_{J} \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{J}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{J}} \cdot \boldsymbol{A} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}} + \sum_{k=2,4,6} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^{q} B_{kq} \widehat{\boldsymbol{J}}_{k-q}.$$
(6.60)

Note that, in contrast to the effective-spin Hamiltonians we have so far encountered, the Hamiltonian in Eq. (6.60) is a property of the total angular momentum of the physical system, rather than of the effective spin of a particular sub-level. This is why there is a term for the crystal-field interaction, rather than a ZFS. We can use this Hamiltonian to derive an expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor in terms of the total angular momentum. We begin by deriving the following electronic magnetic moment and hyperfine field operators:

$$\hat{m}_i = -\mu_{\rm B} \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} (-1)^q \widehat{J}_{1-q} g_{1q,i}, \tag{6.61}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i = \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} (-1)^q \widehat{J}_{1-q} A_{1q,i}, \tag{6.62}$$

where

.

$$\boldsymbol{g}_{1\pm 1} = \mp \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} g_J \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pm i \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \boldsymbol{g}_{10} = g_J \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad (6.63)$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{1\pm1} = \mp \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \begin{pmatrix} A_{xx} \pm iA_{yx} \\ A_{xy} \pm iA_{yy} \\ A_{xz} \pm iA_{yz} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \boldsymbol{A}_{10} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{zx} \\ A_{zy} \\ A_{zz} \end{pmatrix}.$$
(6.64)

The hyperfine coupling constant can be written as  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^{\text{con}}\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{A}^{\text{dip}}$ , i.e. as the sum of an isotropic contact term and an anisotropic dipolar term.

We can now derive the Bleaney expression for the shielding tensor  $\sigma_{ij}^I$  by expanding the expression from the EPR formalism to second order in 1/(kT), which gives us (from Appendix D),

$$\begin{split} \sigma_{ij}^{J} &= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_{l}} \left[ \frac{\beta}{2J+1} \sum_{qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{1q,i} A_{1q',j} {\rm Tr}_{J} \Big( \widehat{J}_{1-q} \widehat{J}_{1-q'} \Big) \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{\beta^{2}}{2J+1} \sum_{k'' qq'q''} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g_{1q,i} A_{1q',j} B_{k''q''} {\rm Tr}_{J} \Big( \widehat{J}_{1-q} \widehat{J}_{1-q'} \widehat{J}_{k''-q''} \Big) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\beta^{3}), \end{split}$$

$$(6.65)$$

where we have replaced *S* with *J*, and Tr<sub>J</sub> refers to a summation over the 2J + 1 states of the level *J*. As previously we can simplify the traces to obtain (see Appendix D) the first-order and second-order contributions to the shift  $\sigma_{ii}^{J,1}$  and  $\sigma_{ii}^{J,2}$ :

$$\sigma_{ij}^{J,1} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_l kT} \frac{\langle J || \hat{J}_1 || J \rangle^2}{3} \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} (-1)^q g_{1q,i} A_{1-q,j}, \tag{6.66}$$

$$\sigma_{ij}^{J,2} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}(kT)^{2}} (-1)^{2J} (2J+1)^{1/2} \langle J || \widehat{J}_{1} || J \rangle^{2} \sum_{k''=2,4,6} \langle J || \widehat{J}_{k''} || J \rangle \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} 1 & k'' & 1 \\ J & J & J \end{array} \right\}$$
$$\times \sum_{qq'q''} g_{1q,i} A_{1q',j} B_{k''q''} \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & k'' & 1 \\ -q' & -q'' & -q \end{array} \right).$$
(6.67)

Substituting in the values for the spatial tensor parameters, and the 3*j* and 6*j* symbols, we obtain the Bleaney expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{J} \approx -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_{J} J(J+1)}{3\hbar\gamma kT} \boldsymbol{A} + \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_{J} J(J+1)(2J-1)(2J+3)}{30\hbar\gamma (kT)^{2}} \boldsymbol{B} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}, \qquad (6.68)$$

where we note that only the rank-two terms in the crystal-field Hamiltonian contribute to the shielding tensor to second order.

# 6.5.1. The paramagnetic chemical shielding in terms of the magnetic susceptibility tensor

We can also use the EPR formula to derive the paramagnetic susceptibility tensor, in terms of *J*, of a system containing an ensemble of lanthanide ions. To second order in  $1/(kT)^2$ , the susceptibility tensor is

$$\chi \approx \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 g_j^2 J(J+1)}{3kT} \mathbf{1} - \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 g_j^2 J(J+1)(2J-1)(2J+3)}{30(kT)^2} \mathbf{B}.$$
 (6.69)

This expression exhibits a complete separation of the isotropic and anisotropic contributions of the susceptibility according to their temperature dependence, which is a direct result of treating the *g*-tensor of the lanthanide ions as isotropic. The term that varies as 1/(kT) is purely isotropic whereas the  $1/(kT)^2$  term is purely anisotropic, with an anisotropy that is proportional to that of, and with the same orientation as, the second-rank part of the spatial tensor of the crystal-field interaction Hamiltonian.

As for the first-row transition metals, we can write the hyperfine coupling constant in terms of the reduced coupling constant  $\boldsymbol{C}$  as

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_I \hbar \gamma_I \boldsymbol{C}, \tag{6.70}$$

where **C** is the sum of an isotropic contact part  $C^{\text{con}}\mathbf{1}$  and an anisotropic dipolar part  $C^{\text{dip}}$ . The paramagnetic shielding tensor  $\sigma^{\chi}$  in terms of the susceptibility tensor now takes on a form that we have seen before:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\boldsymbol{\chi}} = -\boldsymbol{\chi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\mathsf{C}}. \tag{6.71}$$

We are now in a position to write down all the terms in the expression for the shielding tensor that are formed from the cross-terms between the coupling constant and the susceptibility tensor. They are summarised in Table 6.3, where we have written the firstand second-order terms in the susceptibility as  $\chi^{(1)}$  and  $\chi^{(2)}$  respectively. The contact interaction produces two terms in the shielding tensor, both of which are due to the unpaired electron spin density that is present at the nucleus. Term 1 is purely isotropic, and exhibits a temperature dependence of 1/(kT) whilst term 2 is purely anisotropic, with a temperature dependence of  $1/(kT)^2$  and anisotropy parameters that are proportional to those of the secondrank crystal-field splitting tensor. The two terms 3 and 4 are a result of the long-range spin-dipolar interaction between the nucleus and metal ion. Term 3 is purely anisotropic, with tensor parameters that are proportional to those of the dipolar coupling tensor, and exhibits a temperature dependence of 1/(kT). Term 4 is more complex because it is given by the matrix product of the crystal-field splitting tensor with the dipolar coupling tensor, and so contains isotropic, antisymmetric, and symmetric anisotropic parts. Like term 2, it also has a  $1/(kT)^2$  temperature dependence. The isotropic part of term 4 is a psuedo-contact shielding, as it is given by the product of the anisotropic part of the susceptibility tensor with the dipolar coupling tensor. Assuming that the 4f electrons can be modelled as point-dipole moments, the pseudo-contact shielding is given by Eq. (5.77) as

Table 6.3

The terms present in the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor in a lanthanide system, expressed in terms of both the molecular/atomic-level parameters  $\sigma^{J}$ , and the bulk magnetic susceptibility tensor  $\sigma^{\chi}$ .

Туре	Term	$\sigma^{J}$	σχ	Rank
Contact	1	$-\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_J J(J+1)}{3\hbar\nu kT}A^{\rm con}$	$-\chi^{(1)}C^{\text{con}}$	0
	2	$\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_{J}J(J+1)(2J-1)(2J+3)}{30h\gamma(kT)^{2}}B\!A^{\rm con}$	$-\chi^{(2)}C^{con}$	2
Dipolar	3	$-\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_J J(J+1)}{3\hbar \nu kT} \boldsymbol{A}^{\rm dip}$	$-\chi^{(1)} \boldsymbol{C}^{dip}$	2
	4	$\frac{\mu_{B}g_{J}J(J+1)(2J-1)(2J+3)}{30h\gamma(kT)^{2}}\boldsymbol{B}\cdot\boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{dip}}$	$-\pmb{\chi}^{(2)}\cdot\pmb{C}^{dip}$	0, 1, 2

$$\sigma_{iso}^{pcs} = -\frac{1}{12\pi R^3} \left[ \Delta \chi_{ax} \left( 3\cos^2(\theta) - 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{rh} \sin^2(\theta) \cos(2\phi) \right], \quad (6.72)$$

where  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are the polar and azimuthal angles describing the orientation of the susceptibility tensor to the dipolar coupling tensor. In terms of the axial and rhombic crystal-field splitting tensor parameters  $\Delta B_{\rm ax}$  and  $\Delta B_{\rm rh}$ , the pseudo-contact shielding is equal to

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm pcs} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_j^2 J(J+1)(2J-1)(2J+3)}{360 \pi (kT)^2 R^3} \times \left[ \Delta B_{\rm ax} (3\cos^2(\theta) - 1) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta B_{\rm rh} \sin^2(\theta) \cos(2\phi) \right].$$
(6.73)

This is the main result of Bleaney's theory.

6.5.1.1. Trends in the contact and pseudo-contact shielding, and shielding anisotropy. We are now in a position to decompose the terms in the paramagnetic shielding tensor in Eq. (6.68) into products of two contributions, the first of which depends on the electronic properties of the free lanthanide ion, and the second of which depends on the coordination environment. For example the first term in Eq. (6.68), which is proportional to the hyperfine tensor **A**, can be decomposed as follows. The free-ion part of the dominant contribution to the SA, that depends on the lanthanide ion being studied, is a function of  $g_1$  and J, and is equal to

$$C_I^{SA} = g_I^2 J(J+1). \tag{6.74}$$

We recall that the hyperfine tensor is proportional to  $g_j$ , hence the above factor contains  $g_j^2$ . The coordination environment is due to the unpaired electron density present in the *s*-orbital of the observed nuclear spin, and the distance of this nucleus from the lanthanide ion, both of which are contained within the hyperfine tensor. These factors dictate the size of the dominant part of the SA. Therefore the factor  $C_j^{SA}$  indicates the sign and magnitude of the dominant part of the SA. The form of the contact shielding is actually more complicated than predicted by the simple Bleaney theory, and requires special treatment, as first proposed by Golding and Halton [61]. This is discussed below.

The second term of Eq. (6.69) gives rise to the PCS, and a secondary contribution to the SA. The lanthanide-ion-dependent part is

$$C_J^{\text{pcs}} = g_J^2 J (J+1)(2J-1)(2J+3) \langle J \| 2 \| J \rangle, \tag{6.75}$$

and the coordination-environment-dependent part is due to the crystal-field splitting factors  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^0$  and  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^2$ .

The form of the contact contribution to the isotropic shielding is more complicated than suggested by the Bleaney theory. The reason for this is that the contact interaction requires the throughbond transfer of the unpaired electronic spin density, and so we cannot separate the shielding into parts that depend solely on the properties of the free ion and coordination environment. One way of treating the contact shielding has been proposed by Golding and Halton [61]. The idea is to essentially treat the electronic configuration of the lanthanide as a free ion, but include a modification to account for the bonding to the ligands. This modification is the inclusion of an orbital reduction parameter  $\gamma$  that takes values close to unity. The factor  $C_J^{con}$  which gives the sign and magnitude of the contact shielding when the ion is in an SO coupling level *J* can be shown to be

$$C_J^{\text{con}} = \frac{(g_J - \gamma)g_J J(J+1)}{2 - \gamma} + \left(\frac{2kT}{\lambda}\right) \frac{(g_J - \gamma)(g_J - 2)}{2 - \gamma}.$$
 (6.76)

The first term has a similar form to  $C_J^{SA}$ , with the inclusion of the  $\gamma$  factor. The second term accounts for the effect of the SO coupling strength  $\lambda$ .

Numerical values of the ion-dependent contributions for all these terms in the paramagnetic shielding are given in Table 6.4. These values depend only on the nature of the ion, and so can be used to compare the size of the expected shifts and SAs for a series of lanthanide ions in the same coordination site, assuming that both the coordination geometry and the factors  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^q$  are unchanged. Note also that, whilst these numerical factors can be used to compare, for example, the expected pseudo-contact shifts for a series of ions, they cannot be used to compare the sizes of the contact shifts versus the pseudo-contact shifts as this comparison also requires knowledge of the Fermi-contact and spin-dipolar components of the hyperfine tensor. For instance we would expect both Ce<sup>3+</sup> and Pm<sup>3+</sup> to give relatively small SAs, with the relative factors being 6.4 and 7.2 respectively, whereas we would expect the corresponding values for  $\text{Dy}^{3+}$  and  $\text{Ho}^{3+}$  to be approximately 16 times larger. We see a different trend for the sizes of the PCSs with Ce<sup>3+</sup> and Pm<sup>3+</sup> giving values that differ more in magnitude than their contact/SA contributions, and which are also of opposite sign. In addition we expect Gd<sup>3+</sup> and Tb<sup>3+</sup> to give the largest contact shifts, but Dy<sup>3+</sup> to give the largest pseudo-contact shifts.

### 6.5.2. Contact shift contributions from excited states of different J

The theory presented above assumes that only the lowestenergy *J* level, with  $J = J_0$ , contributes to the electronic properties of the lanthanide, and therefore to the paramagnetic shift. If the

Table 6.4

Parameters pertaining to the size of the contact [61] and pseudo-contact [62] shifts, and the SA of the different lanthanides. The contact shift is proportional to  $C_J^{\text{con}}$ , the pseudo-contact shift to  $C_J^{\text{pcs}}$ , and the SA is proportional to  $C_J^{\text{SA}}$ . The contact-shift terms are evaluated with  $\gamma = 1$ , and at 300 K.

lon	Configuration	J	gj	$\langle J \  2 \  J \rangle^{a}$	$C_J^{SA}$	$C_J^{\operatorname{conb}}$	$C_J^{pcsc}$
Ce <sup>3+</sup>	$f^1$	5/2	6/7	-0.0571	6.4	-0.98	-11.8
Pr <sup>3+</sup>	$f^2$	4	4/5	-0.0210	12.8	-2.9	-20.7
Nd <sup>3+</sup>	$f^3$	9/2	8/11	-0.00643	13.1	-4.4	-8.08
Pm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^4$	4	3/5	0.00771	7.2	-	4.28
Sm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^5$	5/2	2/7	0.0413	0.7	0.3	0.943
Eu <sup>3+</sup>	$f^6$	0	-	-	-	-	-
	, ,	1	3/2	-0.200	4.5	1.0	-4.5
		2	3/2	-0.0349	13.5	4.0	-9.9
Gd <sup>3+</sup>	$f^7$	7/2	2	0	63.0	31.5	0
Tb <sup>3+</sup>	$f^8$	6	3/2	-0.0101	94.5	31.9	-157.5
Dy <sup>3+</sup>	$f^9$	15/2	4/3	-0.00635	113.3	28.6	-181
Ho <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{10}$	8	5/4	-0.00222	112.5	22.6	-71.3
Er <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{11}$	15/2	6/5	0.00254	91.8	15.4	58.8
Tm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{12}$	6	7/6	0.0101	57.2	8.2	95.3
Yb <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{13}$	7/2	8/7	0.0317	20.6	2.6	39.2

<sup>a</sup> Values taken from Abragam and Bleaney [185], and Bleaney [62].

<sup>b</sup> Values taken from Golding and Halton [61].

<sup>c</sup> Values taken from Bleaney [62].

4*f* shell is less than half full the lowest excited state is  $J_0 + 1$ , whilst for 4*f* shells that are more than half full it is  $J_0 - 1$ . In general, in the free ion, the lowest-lying excited *J* levels are 2000 cm<sup>-1</sup> or more above the ground level, and we do not need to consider them. However there are two exceptions amongst the trivalent ions, which are Sm<sup>3+</sup> (4*f*<sup>5</sup>; ground term <sup>6</sup>H<sub>5/2</sub>), and Eu<sup>3+</sup> (4*f*<sup>6</sup>; ground term <sup>7</sup>F<sub>0</sub>). The lowest-lying excited level of Sm<sup>3+</sup> is J = 7/2 which lies at 1000 cm<sup>-1</sup> above the ground level, and for Eu<sup>3+</sup> it is J = 1which lies at 400 cm<sup>-1</sup> above the ground level. In order to describe the paramagnetic chemical shielding due to these lanthanides we must account for these low-lying ground states, and must include them in the sum over states in the EPR formula in Eq. (4.103). The states  $|nv\rangle$  now contain information about the different *J* levels that result from SO coupling as well as the crystal-field splitting of each *J* level.

The effect of thermal population of the excited states on the total isotropic contact shielding parameter  $C^{con}$  can be calculated from the following Boltzmann average over the excited *J* levels:

$$C^{\rm con} = \frac{\sum_J C_J^{\rm con}(2J+1)\exp(-E_J/kT)}{\sum_I (2J+1)\exp(-E_J/kT)},$$
(6.77)

where the energies  $E_l$  are due to the SO coupling, and are given by

$$E_J = \frac{\lambda}{2} [J(J+1) - L(L+1) - S(S+1)].$$
(6.78)

The values at 300 K, taken from Golding and Halton, are tabulated in Table 6.5 [61]. If we compare the values of  $C^{\rm con}$  with those calculated from the ground level only in Table 6.4 we see the inclusion of thermal population of the excited levels has a negligible effect on the contact coupling, with the exception of Sm<sup>3+</sup> and Eu<sup>3+</sup>. In the former case the excited states reduce the magnitude of the (already small) contact shielding by almost an order of magnitude. However the most substantial effect is seen for Eu<sup>3+</sup>, where the inclusion of the excited states increases the contact shielding from zero to a substantially larger value.

# 6.5.3. Pseudo-contact shift contributions from excited states of different J

The excited states also play an important role for the pseudocontact shift in the Bleaney formalism. Here we examine the cases of  $\text{Sm}^{3+}$  and  $\text{Eu}^{3+}$ , and also comment on  $\text{Gd}^{3+}$ .

6.5.3.1. The  $Sm^{3+}$  ion:  $4f^5$ ,  ${}^{6}H_{5/2}$ . To calculate the correction to the PCS for all the trivalent lanthanide ions with the exception of

### Table 6.5

The parameters  $C^{\text{con}}$  dictating the sign and size of the contact shift for the full series of trivalent lanthanide ions calculated by considering the excited SO coupling states; the values given here are taken from Golding and Halton [61].  $\gamma = 1$ , and the temperature is 300 K.

Ion	Configuration	C <sup>con</sup>
Ce <sup>3+</sup>	$f^1$	-0.98
Pr <sup>3+</sup>	$f^2$	-3.0
Nd <sup>3+</sup>	$f^3$	-4.5
Pm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^4$	-4.0
Sm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^5$	0.063
Eu <sup>3+</sup>	$f^6$	10.7
Gd <sup>3+</sup>	$f^7$	31.5
Tb <sup>3+</sup>	$f^8$	31.8
Dy <sup>3+</sup>	f <sup>9</sup>	28.5
Ho <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{10}$	22.6
Er <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{11}$	15.4
Tm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{12}$	8.2
Yb <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{13}$	2.6

 $Eu^{3+}$ , we need only consider the effects of mixing the excited states into the ground state, which results in the PCS in Eq. (6.73) being multiplied by the following correction factor [62]:

$$1 + a\left(\frac{kT}{\Delta E}\right) + b\left(\frac{kT}{\Delta E}\right)^{2} + c\left(\frac{\left(kT\right)^{2}}{\Delta E \Delta E'}\right).$$
(6.79)

In Eq. (6.79) *a*, *b*, and *c* are coefficients,  $\Delta E$  is the energy of the lowest-lying excited state relative to the ground state, and  $\Delta E'$  is the energy of the lowest-lying excited state resulting from different values of *S* and *L* to those of the ground state. The coefficients *a* and *b* and the ratio  $kT/\Delta E$  have been calculated by Bleaney, and are reproduced in Table 6.6 [62]. These correction terms are negligible for all the ions apart from Sm<sup>3+</sup>, which has values  $a(kT/\Delta E) = -2.25$ ,  $b/(kT/\Delta E)^2 = -0.12$ , and also  $c(kT)^2/(\Delta E\Delta E') = +0.14$  at 300 K [62]. The overall multiplicative factor is then -1.23, which results in a change in sign of the PCS predicted from the ground state only. The lowest-lying excited *J* level J = 7/2 is sufficiently high for its thermal population to be negligibly small, and we need only consider the effects of mixing of the excited states into the ground state.

6.5.3.2. The Eu<sup>3+</sup> ion:  $4f^{6}$ , <sup>7</sup>F<sub>0</sub>. For the Eu<sup>3+</sup> ion the situation is more complex. The ground level of J = 0 is diamagnetic, but the mixing of the excited states into the ground state gives rise to a temperature-independent paramagnetic shift. In addition to the J = 1 excited level at 400 cm<sup>-1</sup> above the ground level, we must also consider the second excited level J = 2 at 1200 cm<sup>-1</sup>, and possibly the third J = 3. We may also see contributions to the paramagnetic shift from the thermal population of these same excited states, which gives temperature-dependent contributions to the PCS [62]. The energies quoted here are those in the free ion and so we must bear in mind that the excited levels may be lowerlying in a bound ion [185].

6.5.3.3. The  $Gd^{3+}$  ion:  $4f^7$ ,  ${}^8S_{7/2}$ . The  $Gd^{3+}$  ion represents a special case amongst the trivalent lanthanides as it possesses a half-full 4f shell, and is therefore an S term. The SO coupling is effectively zero, and so the ion exhibits behaviour more akin to a first-row transition-metal ion with S = 7/2 than to the other lanthanides. One important property is that the reduced matrix element  $\langle J||2||J\rangle$  is zero, and so the PCS is zero. The zero PCS is a property that  $Gd^{3+}$  shares with transition-metal ions with half-filled d shells, such as high-spin Mn<sup>2+</sup> and Fe<sup>3+</sup>. It should also be noted that, because there is no SO coupling, there are no low-lying *J*-levels that mix with the ground level J = 7/2.

Table 6.6

The values of the coefficients *a* and *b*, and the factor  $kT/\Delta E$  at 300 K used in the correction factor for the pseudo-contact shift resulting from the mixing of excited states into the ground state. Values for the trivalent lanthanides (excluding Eu<sup>3+</sup> and Gd<sup>3+</sup>) are taken from Bleaney [62].

Ion	а	b	$kT/\Delta E$ at 300 K	$a(kT/\Delta E)$	$b(kT/\Delta E)^2$
Ce <sup>3+</sup>	-0.555	-0.0833	0.09	-0.050	-0.00067
Pr <sup>3+</sup>	-0.497	-0.0535	0.095	-0.047	-0.00048
Nd <sup>3+</sup>	-0.673	-0.0678	0.105	-0.071	-0.00075
Pm <sup>3+</sup>	-1.426	-0.178	0.125	-0.18	-0.0028
Sm <sup>3+</sup>	-11.25	-3	0.20	-2.25	-0.12
Tb <sup>3+</sup>	-0.287	+0.0139	0.10	-0.029	0.00014
Dy <sup>3+</sup>	-0.185	+0.0081	0.07	-0.013	0.000040
Ho <sup>3+</sup>	-0.142	+0.0062	0.05	-0.0071	0.000016
Er <sup>3+</sup>	-0.127	+0.0061	0.03	-0.0038	0.0000055
Tm <sup>3+</sup>	-0.133	+0.0081	0.025	-0.0033	0.0000051
Yb <sup>3+</sup>	-0.181	+0.0188	0.02	-0.0036	0.0000075

### 6.5.4. The shortcomings of the Bleaney theory

The Bleaney theory is currently the only theory of paramagnetic shifts due to lanthanides that has been applied with any regularity to the interpretation of the NMR data of systems containing rare earths [69,75,67]. However the theory has a number of shortcomings which mean that it is not generally applicable to all systems. Some of these have already been mentioned in this chapter, and these and other shortcomings have been enumerated in more detail by Funk et al. [63]. There are two minor and two more important points to be addressed, which are detailed and expanded upon here.

Firstly Funk et al. point out that it is often assumed that the PAF of the second-rank crystal-field splitting tensor is invariant when comparing lanthanide ions in an isostructural series of materials. This assumption does not hold in general, as the differences in ion size and electronic properties can result in differences in the coordination geometry for different ions. However, contrary to the claim of Funk et al. this is not a deficiency in the Bleaney theory per se, but is rather a cautionary note that the differences in the PAF orientation must be accounted for when comparing the effects of different lanthanide ions in isostructural systems. For example Bertini et al. performed a study in which the full series of lanthanide ions, with the exceptions of Pm<sup>3+</sup> and Gd<sup>3+</sup>, were incorporated into the C-terminal calcium binding site of the dicalcium protein calbindin  $D_{9k}$  [75]. The measured PCSs enabled the determination of the anisotropic components of the magnetic susceptibility tensor and the orientation of the PAF for each lanthanide. The axes of the largest anisotropy were found to vary by up to 20° across the series.

Secondly the simplest implementation of the Bleaney theory assumes a point-dipole model for the unpaired electron density in the 4f orbitals. The justification for this is that the f-orbitals are relatively contracted, and so the electron density is confined to a relatively small space. In the study of Bertini et al. the observed nuclei were separated from the lanthanide ion by more than 8 Å, where the point-dipole model is a good approximation [75]. However the point-dipole approximation begins to break down when the nucleus is closer to the metal ion, and the spread of electron density must be taken into account. For first-row transitionmetal ions the cutoff separation below which the point-dipole model begins to break down is approximately 4 Å, but this value may be smaller for lanthanides due to the more contracted nature of the 4*f* orbitals relative to the 3*d* orbitals, where the electron density is delocalised to a greater extent onto the ligands. However the lifting of the point-dipole restriction is relatively straightforward and, whilst the Bleaney formula itself is no longer valid, the expressions given in Section 5.3.2.1 are still applicable.

This brings us to the more serious deficiencies in the Bleaney theory. The third point is the central assumption that the crystalfield splitting parameters  $B_{lm}$  are much smaller in magnitude than kT. This is generally not true, as  $B_{20}$  can take values up to 1500 cm<sup>-1</sup> in some cases [228], compared to  $kT = 205 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  at 298 K. Since this assumption lies at the heart of the Bleaney theory, there is no easy fix to this problem. A related issue is that the Bleaney formula is calculated from a series expansion up to  $1/(kT)^2$ , to which the higher-rank crystal-field terms do not contribute. However since the crystal-field splittings may be comparable to or greater than kT the second-order term may not be sufficient to account for the paramagnetic shielding, and the higher-rank crystal-field terms may become important. The fourth shortcoming is that it is assumed that the SO coupling is adequately described by the Russell-Saunders coupling scheme, and that I is a good quantum number. However this may not be the case for the heavy lanthanide ions with larger SO coupling constants. Both of these points are not easily fixed in the Bleaney formalism, and a different

approach is needed. In cases where the deficiencies in the Bleaney theory are too important to be neglected it will be necessary to adopt a more general EPR formalism, as summarised by the expression of the paramagnetic shielding tensor in Eq. (6.18). Nevertheless it should be pointed out that the Bleaney theory has been remarkably successful in driving the field of paramagnetic NMR of lanthanide ions forward.

### 6.6. The paramagnetic shielding due to actinides

A comparatively small number of paramagnetic NMR studies have been performed on systems containing actinide ions, including small molecules in solution [229–231] and solid oxides [13]. However only relatively recently have first-principles calculations of the paramagnetic shifts been performed [213].

### 6.6.1. Electronic structure of actinide ions

The magnetic properties of the actinide ions are defined by the 5f electrons. Whilst one might expect these properties to mirror those of the lanthanide ions, there are some important differences. Firstly, in contrast to the lanthanide ions, actinides exhibit a greater range of oxidation states. For example, uranium exhibits oxidation states up to its diamagnetic ( $5f^0$ ) state of +6. Secondly the SO coupling is not the dominant interaction. Rather, both the crystal-field and SO interactions are large, and comparable in magnitude. In addition we expect there to be greater deviation from the Russell–Saunders coupling scheme than for lanthanide ions. Thirdly, the partially-occupied 5f orbitals are more directly involved in bonding interactions with the metal coordination site.

### 6.6.2. The EPR formalism for the paramagnetic shielding tensor

The paramagnetic shielding tensor due to an actinide ion is given by the general formula of van den Heuvel and Soncini in Eq. (6.18). When the electronic energy levels are parameterized in terms of the EPR effective-spin parameters, we obtain separate shielding tensors for each of the electronic levels, each of which has the form of Eq. (6.22) if we neglect the ZFS. Otherwise, if we include the ZFS we obtain a similar sum of terms, with each now having the form of Eq. (6.24). We recall that each level has a distinct set of EPR parameters.

First-principles calculations of the paramagnetic shielding tensor have recently been carried out by Gendron et al. where they investigated the  $5f^1$  complexes  $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{5-}$  and  $NpO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$ , and the  $5f^2$  complexes  $PuO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$  and  $(C_3H_5)_3UCH_3$  [92,93]. Here they showed that the main contributions are due to the Fermicontact and spin-dipolar interactions, giving the contact shift and PCS respectively, and a third term known as the paramagnetic spin-orbital interaction (PSO), which is a coupling between the nuclear spin and the electron orbital angular momentum.

Research in this area is still relatively new, but progressing rapidly, and it is expected that both experiments and calculations in actinide complexes, in addition to solid systems, will become more widespread.

### 6.7. Key concepts

- In a free ion subject to spin-orbit coupling each electronic energy level can be represented as an effective spin  $\tilde{S}$  with multiplicity  $2\tilde{S} + 1$  that matches the actual degeneracy of the level.
- The immersion of a metal ion in a complex results in a crystal- or ligand-field interaction which partially lifts the degeneracy of the electron energy levels creating a number of sub-levels to each of which is assigned an (different) effective spin  $\tilde{S}$ .

- Each sub-level is associated with a different set of EPR parameters.
- The EPR Hamiltonian in a level with effective spin  $\tilde{S}$  contains terms with powers of  $\hat{S}$  up to  $2\tilde{S}$ .
- Lanthanide ions form complexes with crystal-field interactions that are much weaker than the SO coupling.
- Actinde ions form complexes in which the crystal-field interactions and SO coupling are both large, and of comparable magnitude.
- The paramagnetic shielding tensor can also be parameterised in terms of the EPR parameters associated with all the thermally accessible crystal-field energy levels (Eq. (6.24)).
- The magnetic properties of the free lanthanide ions are characterised by the total angular momentum *J*.
- The paramagnetic shielding tensor due to lanthanide ions is given by the general EPR expression in Eq. (6.18).
- A simplified form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor for lanthanides is given by the Bleaney formula in Eq. (6.68).
- The Bleaney theory is an approximate description of the shielding tensor, and assumes that the lanthanide can be treated as a free ion, subject to a crystal-field interaction that is sufficiently small so that all the energy levels are equally populated at the relevant temperature.
- The paramagnetic shielding tensor due to actinide ions can be calculated from the general expression of van den Heuvel and Soncini (Eq. (6.18)), which can, in turn, be expressed in terms of the EPR parameters of each electronic level, giving a sum of terms of the form of Eq. (6.22) (neglecting ZFS) or Eq. (6.24) (including ZFS).

# Chapter 7: The paramagnetic shift in multi-metal-ion systems, and solid materials

Our discussion of the paramagnetic shift has so far only considered systems containing a single paramagnetic metal ion. This is sufficient for describing monometallic complexes in solution, but is obviously inadequate for molecular systems containing metal clusters, crystallised molecular complexes, and solid materials. In these systems we must account for the contributions to the paramagnetic shift from multiple metal ions, and the effects of magnetic exchange interactions between the unpaired electrons of different metal ions. In general these interactions can lead to either ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic alignment of the paramagnetic centres at low temperature. In this review we are not interested in this regime per se, but rather in the high-temperature paramagnetic behaviour of these materials.

We begin by exploring how the exchange coupling interactions influence the form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor due to small clusters of metal ions. These principles can also be applied to solid materials containing an extended network of coupled metal ions. We also provide a simplified description of these solid materials using a mean-field expression of the magnetic properties, leading to the Curie–Weiss model of the magnetic susceptibility [188] and the paramagnetic shielding tensor. The discussion in this chapter focuses exclusively on the first-row *d*-transition-metal ions.

### 7.1. The paramagnetic shift due to multiple non-interacting metal ions

Initially we consider the relatively simple case of the paramagnetic shift of a nucleus that is hyperfine-coupled to multiple noninteracting metal ions. The EPR Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{EPR}$  can then be written as a sum of Hamiltonians  $\hat{H}_{EPR}^{(A)}$ , each containing the interactions pertaining to an individual metal ion A:

$$\widehat{H}_{EPR} = -\hbar \gamma_I \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \left( \mathbf{1} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{orb}} \right) \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}} + \sum_A \widehat{H}_{EPR}^{(A)}.$$
(7.1)

The individual Hamiltonians  $\hat{H}_{EPR}^{(A)}$  are given by

$$\widehat{H}_{EPR}^{(A)} = \mu_{B} \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{D}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)},$$
(7.2)

where each symbol has its usual meaning, and the superscript (A) indicates that the relevant tensor or spin operator refers to the metal ion A.

In such a system the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor is simply the sum of contributions from each metal ion, with the expression for each contribution being given by Eq. (4.109):

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S} = -\frac{\mu_{B}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}} \sum_{A} \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{Z}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)}, \qquad (7.3)$$

where the tensor  $\mathbf{Z}^{(A)}$  contains both the temperature dependence of the shielding, and the information of the ZFS tensor of metal ion *A*. The EPR formalism gives the following expression for  $Z_{kl}^{(A)}$ :

$$Z_{kl}^{(A)} = \frac{2}{Q_0^{(A)}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_n^{(A)}) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu,\mu} \frac{\langle n\nu | \hat{S}_k^{(A)} | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | \hat{S}_l^{(A)} | n\nu \rangle}{E_m^{(A)} - E_n^{(A)}} + \frac{\beta}{Q_0^{(A)}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_n^{(A)}) \sum_{\nu,\nu'} \langle n\nu | \hat{S}_k^{(A)} | n\nu' \rangle \langle n\nu' | \hat{S}_l^{(A)} | n\nu \rangle.$$
(7.4)

We note here that the expression for the shielding tensor does not contain any 'cross terms' involving two or more metal ions. This is because there are no interactions between the metal ions, with the result that they are independent. This observation is no longer true once we introduce the interactions between the spins, when the cross terms become extremely important.

### 7.2. The Heisenberg exchange Hamiltonian

In this section we describe the simplest coupling interaction between the unpaired electron clouds of two paramagnetic metal ions, referred to as the Heisenberg exchange interaction. The Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{ex}$  describing the interaction between two electronic spins  $S^{(1)}$  and  $S^{(2)}$  is given by [188]

$$\widehat{H}_{\text{ex}} = -2\mathcal{J}^{(12)}\widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(1)} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(2)},\tag{7.5}$$

where  $\mathcal{J}^{(12)}$  is the spatially-isotropic Heisenberg exchange coupling constant, and the factor of two is present by convention. The exchange constant  $\mathcal{J}^{(12)}$  is a signed quantity, with the sign having a profound effect on the behaviour of the spin system, as we will see shortly. This Hamiltonian bears an obvious resemblance to the Hamiltonian describing a homonuclear *J*-coupling interaction between two nuclei [195], and much of the theory of nuclear spin systems subject to *J*-couplings is applicable to exchange interactions and vice versa.

### 7.2.1. The exchange interaction between two electronic spins 1/2

Many of the important properties of the exchange interaction are illustrated by considering a metal dimer containing two electronic spins 1/2. An example of this in practice might be a system containing two Cu<sup>2+</sup> ions, each of which has a  $3d^9$  electronic configuration.

Each spin can be described using a basis comprising the functions  $|\alpha\rangle$  and  $|\beta\rangle$ , which describe the spin states referred to as 'spin up' and 'spin down' respectively, and we write down the spin 1 and spin 2 bases as  $\{|\alpha_1\rangle, |\beta_1\rangle\}$  and  $\{|\alpha_2\rangle, |\beta_2\rangle\}$ . However these bases are not sufficient for describing the interacting spin system, and we need to construct a new basis by taking the direct product of the two one-spin bases. The two-spin basis functions are therefore

$$\{|\alpha_1\rangle, |\beta_1\rangle\} \otimes \{|\alpha_2\rangle, |\beta_2\rangle\} = \{|\alpha_1\alpha_2\rangle, |\alpha_1\beta_2\rangle, |\beta_1\alpha_2\rangle, |\beta_1\beta_2\rangle\}$$
(7.6)

$$\equiv \{ |\alpha\alpha\rangle, |\alpha\beta\rangle, |\beta\alpha\rangle, |\beta\beta\rangle \}.$$
(7.7)

The exchange Hamiltonian has four eigenfunctions, denoted  $|SM_S\rangle$ , which are linear combinations of the basis functions. The notation  $|SM_S\rangle$  emphasises that each eigenstate represents the spin system as an object with total spin  $S = S_1 + S_2$ , the spin quantum number *S* of which is given by a value of the Clebsch–Gordan series  $S_1 + S_2, S_1 + S_2 - 1, \ldots, |S_1 - S_2|$ . The corresponding total magnetic quantum number  $M_S$  takes values from +S to -S in integer steps as usual. For  $S_1 = S_2 = 1/2$  the allowed values of *S* are 1 and 0, and so we can separate the four eigenstates into the S = 1 triplet and the S = 0 singlet states. All the states with the same total spin quantum number *S* are degenerate, and have energy  $E_S$ . The energies and eigenstates are:

$$E_1 = -\mathcal{J}^{(12)}/2, \quad |1+1\rangle = |\alpha\alpha\rangle \tag{7.8}$$

$$|10\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}(|\alpha\beta\rangle + \beta\alpha\rangle) \tag{7.9}$$

$$|1-1\rangle = |\beta\beta\rangle, \tag{7.10}$$

$$E_0 = +3\mathcal{J}^{(12)}/2, \quad |00\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}(|\alpha\beta\rangle - \beta\alpha\rangle). \tag{7.11}$$

The three triplet states  $|1M_s\rangle$  correspond to the two spins being aligned co-parallel, which is referred to as ferromagnetic alignment. By contrast the singlet state  $|00\rangle$  is formed by summing the two spin angular momenta when they are aligned antiparallel to each other, which represents antiferromagnetic alignment. The question as to which level is the ground level, and therefore the nature of the alignment at low temperature when only this level is occupied, depends on the sign of  $\mathcal{J}^{(12)}$ . If  $\mathcal{J}^{(12)} > 0$ , the triplet is lowest in energy, and therefore the spins are aligned ferromagnetically at low temperature. On the other hand if  $\mathcal{J}^{(12)} < 0$  the low-temperature alignment is antiferromagnetic. The energy levels for the two cases are shown in Fig. 7.1(a) and (b). At high temperatures, such that all the states are substantially occupied, there is no strong preference for either ferro- or antiferromagnetic alignment of the two spins i.e. the thermal fluctuations disrupt the tendency for the spins to align, and the two spins begin to act as if they are independent and exhibit paramagnetic behaviour. The temperature at which we can expect to observe this ferro/antiferromag netic-to-paramagnetic transition is a topic we will return to later.

### 7.2.2. The exchange interaction between two arbitrary electronic spins

We now turn our attention to the exchange interaction between two arbitrary spins. The basis set of the two-spin system is formed by the direct product of the two one-spin bases  $|S_1M_1\rangle$  and  $|S_2M_2\rangle$ , and comprises  $(2S_1 + 1)(2S_2 + 1)$  functions  $|S_1S_2M_1M_2\rangle$ . We can take linear combinations of the direct-product basis functions to give the eigenfunctions  $|S_1S_2SM_5\rangle$  of the exchange Hamiltonian, which are characterised by *S* and *M*<sub>5</sub>. The eigenfunctions are given by

$$\begin{split} |S_1 S_2 S M_S\rangle &= \sum_{M_1, M_2} |S_1 S_2 M_1 M_2\rangle \langle S_1 S_2 M_1 M_2 | S M_S\rangle \\ &= (-1)^{S_1 - S_2 + M_S} \sqrt{2S + 1} \sum_{M_1, M_2} |S_1 S_2 M_1 M_2\rangle \begin{pmatrix} S_1 & S_2 & S\\ M_1 & M_2 & -M_S \end{pmatrix}, \end{split}$$
(7.12)

where  $S = S_1 + S_2, S_1 + S_2 - 1, \dots, |S_1 - S_2|$ , and  $M_S = M_1 + M_2$ .

We can calculate the corresponding energies by rewriting the exchange Hamiltonian in terms of the total spin. First we note that  $(2 - 2)^2 = (2 - 2)^2$ 

 $\widehat{S}^2 = \left(\widehat{S}_1 + \widehat{S}_2\right)^2 = \widehat{S}_1^2 + \widehat{S}_2^2 + 2\widehat{S}_1 \cdot \widehat{S}_2$ , and therefore

$$\hat{H}_{\text{ex}} = -2\mathcal{J}^{(12)}\hat{\mathbf{S}}^{(1)} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{S}}^{(2)}$$
(7.14)

$$= -\mathcal{J}^{(12)} \left[ \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_1^2 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}_2^2 \right]$$
(7.15)

$$= -\mathcal{J}^{(12)}[S(S+1) - S_1(S_1+1) - S_2(S_2+1)]\hat{1}.$$
(7.16)

The exchange Hamiltonian therefore depends only on  $\mathcal{J}^{(12)}, S_1, S_2$ , and *S*, and splits the  $(2S_1 + 1)(2S_2 + 1)$  states into a series of manifolds  $|S_1S_2SM_S\rangle$ , each of which is labelled with the total spin quantum number *S* and is (2S + 1)-fold degenerate. The energies  $E(S, S_1, S_2)$  of the states within each manifold *S* are given by [48]

$$E(S, S_1, S_2) = -\mathcal{J}^{(12)}[S(S+1) - S_1(S_1+1) - S_2(S_2+1)].$$
(7.17)

As with the case of the two coupled spins 1/2 we see that a positive exchange coupling constant results in the states with the maximum *S* lying lowest in energy, and therefore favours ferromagnetic alignment at low temperature. In addition, a negative exchange coupling constant results in the lowest-energy manifold having the minimum value of *S*, which favours antiferromagnetic alignment at low temperature. Levels that are adjacent in energy have values of *S* that differ by one, e.g. *S* and *S* – 1. The energy separation between such adjacent levels is given by an interval rule, and is equal to  $2|\mathcal{J}^{(12)}|_{S_>}$  where,  $S_>$  is the larger of the two values of *S*.



**Fig. 7.1.** The energy levels resulting from the exchange coupling of two electronic spins 1/2. The energy levels, energies, and effective spins are shown for (a) ferromagnetic coupling with a positive exchange coupling constant  $J^{(12)}$ , and (b) antiferromagnetic coupling with a negative exchange coupling constant  $J^{(12)}$ .

### 7.3. The paramagnetic shift due to a coupled electronic spin system

The exchange-coupled electronic spin system induces a paramagnetic contribution to the chemical shielding tensor in a similar way to a single transition-metal ion. On the application of an external magnetic field  $B_0$  each individual electronic manifold  $|S_1S_2SM_S\rangle$ is split by the Zeeman interaction. The resulting total energies  $E(S, S_1, S_2, M_S)$  are

$$\begin{split} E(S,S_1,S_2,M_S) = & E(S,S_1,S_2) + \mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0 M_S \\ &= -\mathcal{J}^{(12)} [S(S+1) - S_1(S_1+1) - S_2(S_2+1)] + \mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0 M_S, \end{split} \tag{7.18}$$

where we have ignored the spin-spin contribution to the ZFS tensor. Examples of the ladders of the spin energy levels are shown in Fig. 7.2 for both ferro- and antiferromagnetic coupling and in the absence and presence of an external magnetic field  $B_0$ . The example spin systems are two coupled electronic spins 1/2 in (a) and (b), a spin 1/2 coupled to a spin 1 in (c) and (d), and two coupled spins 1 in (e) and (f).

The average electronic magnetic moments are characterised both by the individual Curie spins  $\langle \widehat{S}_{iz} \rangle$ , where i = 1, 2, and the total Curie spin  $\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle$  of the coupled spin system. This latter quantity is the Boltzmann average over the states with energies  $E(S, S_1, S_2, M_S)$ :

$$\langle \widehat{S}_{z} \rangle = \frac{\sum_{S=|S_{1}-S_{2}|}^{S_{1}+S_{2}} \sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{H_{S}} M_{S} \exp\left(-E(S, S_{1}, S_{2}, M_{S})/kT\right)}{\sum_{S=|S_{1}-S_{2}|}^{S_{1}+S_{2}} \sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{H_{S}} \exp\left(-E(S, S_{1}, S_{2}, M_{S})/kT\right)},$$
(7.20)

where we have explicitly separated the sums over the Zeeman states in each manifold *S* from the sum over the manifolds themselves.

Initially we consider the case where only the ground manifold is occupied so that  $|\mathcal{J}^{(12)}| \gg kT$ , and the spin system behaves as a single electronic spin *S*. The Curie spin then takes exactly the same value as we calculated for a single metal ion in Eq. (3.62):

$$\langle \hat{S}_{z} \rangle = \frac{\sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S} M_{S} \exp\left(-\left(E(S, S_{1}, S_{2}) + \mu_{B} g_{e} B_{0} M_{S}\right)/kT\right)}{\sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S} \exp\left(-\left(E(S, S_{1}, S_{2}) + \mu_{B} g_{e} B_{0} M_{S}\right)/kT\right)}$$
(7.21)

$$=\frac{\sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S}M_{S}\exp\left(-\mu_{B}g_{e}B_{0}M_{S}/kT\right)}{\sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S}\exp\left(-\mu_{B}g_{e}B_{0}M_{S}/kT\right)},$$
(7.22)

The interpretation of this situation is that we have an ensemble of spin pairs with no interactions *between* the pairs, and so we can view the system as comprising an ensemble of paramagnetic ions with spin *S*. We employ the high-temperature approximation for the thermal populations of the Zeeman energy levels, and we obtain the familiar expression for the spin-only Curie spin:

$$\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1) B_0}{3kT}.$$
(7.23)

The corresponding paramagnetic shielding tensor is

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}} \mathbf{g}_{\mathrm{e}} \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{S}+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_{\mathrm{I}} k T} \boldsymbol{A},\tag{7.24}$$

where the hyperfine tensor is calculated from the total unpaired electron density of the combined spin system. Now let us consider the simplest example of a coupled spin system we introduced above, namely with  $S_1 = S_2 = 1/2$ . If  $\mathcal{J}^{(12)}$  is positive and the spins are ferromagnetically aligned, the lowest-energy manifold is the triplet with S = 1, and both the EPR and NMR parameters we measure reflect those of a fictitious ion with that spin. If, on the other hand,  $\mathcal{J}^{(12)}$  is negative it is the singlet S = 0 that is lowest in energy. The system is effectively diamagnetic and therefore exhibits no EPR signal. Therefore we observe no paramagnetic contribution to the



**Fig. 7.2.** Energy levels due to the ferro- and antiferromagnetic exchange coupling between two electronic spins in the absence and presence of an external magnetic field. The energy levels are shown for (a) and (b) two coupled electronic spins 1/2, (c) and (d) a spin 1/2 coupled to a spin 1, and (e) and (f) two coupled spins 1. The energy levels due to ferromagnetic coupling are shown in (a), (c), and (e), and those due to antiferromagnetic coupling are shown in (b), (d), and (f).

shielding tensor of the nuclei. More generally we can extend the above discussion to include systems of more than two interacting spins. For instance this has been done by Bertini et al. who considered the case of a cluster containing four iron ions in an iron-sulphide protein [47].

Now we consider the other extreme situation where the thermal energy dominates the exchange coupling, i.e.  $|\mathcal{J}^{(12)}| \ll kT$ . The exponential factors in Eq. (7.20) can now be expanded to first order in  $\mathcal{J}^{(12)}/kT$ , in addition to first order in  $\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0M_S/kT$ :

$$\langle \hat{S}_{z} \rangle \approx \frac{\sum_{S=|S_{1}-S_{2}|}^{S_{1}+S_{2}} \sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S} M_{S} \left(1 - \frac{E(S,S_{1},S_{2})}{kT} - \frac{\mu_{B}g_{e}B_{0}M_{S}}{kT}\right)}{\sum_{S=|S_{1}-S_{2}|}^{S_{1}+S_{2}} \sum_{M_{S}=-S}^{+S} \left(1 - \frac{E(S,S_{1},S_{2})}{kT} - \frac{\mu_{B}g_{e}B_{0}M_{S}}{kT}\right)}$$
(7.25)

We now obtain a Curie spin that is simply the sum of the two independent Curie spins:

$$\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e [S_1(S_1+1) + S_2(S_2+1)] B_0}{3kT}$$
(7.26)

$$=\langle \widehat{S}_{1z} \rangle + \langle \widehat{S}_{2z} \rangle. \tag{7.27}$$

Since both electronic spins are independent, we can write the total paramagnetic shielding tensor as the sum of two independent contributions

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\rm S} = -\frac{\mu_0 g_e S_1(S_1+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_l k T} \boldsymbol{A}^{(1)} - \frac{\mu_0 g_e S_2(S_2+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_l k T} \boldsymbol{A}^{(2)}, \tag{7.28}$$

where  $A^{(A)}$  is the hyperfine coupling tensor due to ion *A*. The two metal ions are now effectively non-interacting, and the system is reduced to the paramagnetic ensemble, which we have seen previously in Section 7.1.

In each individual regime the paramagnetic shielding tensor has a Curie temperature dependence of 1/(kT). However we should note that the dependence over the full range of temperatures is more complicated, since the expression for the shielding changes on moving from one regime to another via an intermediate regime where  $|\mathcal{J}^{(12)}| \approx kT$  that we have not explicitly examined. This is an example of the exchange interactions introducing a deviation from the Curie behaviour.

# 7.4. The general exchange Hamiltonian for transition metal ions subject to spin-orbit coupling

The previous section described the behaviour of an electronic spin system and the corresponding paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor of two spin-only transition-metal ions that interact via an isotropic exchange interaction in both the low-temperature ordered and high-temperature paramagnetic regimes. The results above can easily be generalised to a finite cluster of metal ions. The case where the metal ions are subject to SO coupling is a little more complex, as there are several other terms that must be included in the exchange coupling Hamiltonian, which is where we turn our attention now.

The general spin Hamiltonian  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0$  describing the exchange interactions between the transition-metal ions is

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0 = \hat{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\text{NR}} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_0^{\text{SO}},\tag{7.29}$$

where  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0^{NR}$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0^{SO}$  are the NR and SO contributions respectively. The NR contribution can be written as [232]

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{0}^{\mathsf{NR}} = -2\sum_{A>B} \mathcal{J}^{(AB)} \hat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(B)} + \sum_{A>B} \hat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{D}^{(AB)} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(B)},$$
(7.30)

where the sums are over pairs of coupled metal ions (*A*, *B*). The first term is the isotropic Heisenberg exchange Hamiltonian with isotropic exchange coupling constant  $\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}$ , and the second term is the anisotropic dipolar coupling interaction and  $\mathbf{D}^{(AB)}$  is the symmetric dipolar coupling constant [233]. This latter interaction is weaker than the former, but can be important in establishing either long-range ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic ordering in three dimensions. The presence of SO coupling adds two important terms that are contained in  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{0}^{SO}$ , which is given by [232]

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{0}^{SO} = \sum_{A} \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{D}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} + \sum_{A > B} \boldsymbol{d}^{(AB)} \cdot \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \times \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(B)}\right).$$
(7.31)

The first term represents the ZFS interactions of the ions, with which we are already familiar, and which are sometimes referred to as the single-ion anisotropy interactions [234]. The symmetric and traceless ZFS tensor for ion *A* is denoted  $D^{(A)}$ . The second term is referred to as the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya (DM) interaction

[235,236,234]. The spatial dependence is encoded in the vector  $d^{(AB)}$ , the three components of which can also be described by an antisymmetric (i.e. rank-one) tensor, and so this interaction is entirely anisotropic. The DM interaction depends on the vector product between  $\hat{S}^{(A)}$  and  $\hat{S}^{(B)}$ , and is therefore zero if the two spins are exactly collinear, which we have seen is the preferred alignment for both ferro- and antiferromagnetic interactions. The effect of the DM term is therefore to perturb the spin orientations away from the perfect ferro- or antiferromagnetic collinear alignment, a process which is referred to as spin canting. We have neglected any SO contribution to the dipolar coupling interaction, which we absorb into the NR dipolar coupling term.

For convenience we recast the Hamiltonians in Eqs. (7.29)-(7.31) into the following form

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{0} = \sum_{A} \sum_{q=-2}^{+2} (-1)^{q} D_{2q}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{2-q}^{(A)} + \sum_{A>B} \sum_{k=0}^{2} \sum_{q=-k}^{+k} (-1)^{q} J_{kq}^{(AB)} \widehat{T}_{k-q}^{(AB)},$$
(7.32)

which is written in terms of irreducible spherical tensors. The first sum represents the rank-two ZFS interactions experienced by all the metal ions, the spatial and spin parts of which are given by the usual expressions. The second sum contains all the two-spin interaction terms, including the isotropic Heisenberg exchange, dipolar interaction, and DM parts. The spin tensor  $\hat{T}_{k-q}^{(AB)}$  is a direct tensor product of the rank-one spin operators:

$$\widehat{T}_{k-q}^{(AB)} = \sum_{q_1,q_2} \widehat{S}_{1q_1}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{1q_2}^{(B)} \langle 11q_1q_2|k-q \rangle$$
(7.33)

$$= (-1)^{q} \sqrt{2k+1} \sum_{q_{1},q_{2}} \widehat{S}_{1q_{1}}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{1q_{2}}^{(B)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & k \\ q_{1} & q_{2} & q \end{pmatrix},$$
(7.34)

and the components of the spatial tensor  $J_{kq}^{(AB)}$  can be written down with reference to Table 2.3. The rank-zero part of the interaction is purely isotropic, and so represents the isotropic Heisenberg interaction. The spatial component  $J_{00}^{(AB)}$  is therefore given by

$$J_{00}^{(AB)} = 2\sqrt{3}\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}.$$
(7.35)

The rank-one part is anisotropic and antisymmetric, and so represents the DM interaction. In terms of the Cartesian components of the DM interaction vector  $d^{(AB)}$  the irreducible spherical tensor components  $J_{1a}^{(AB)}$  are:

$$J_{10}^{(AB)} = -i\sqrt{2}d_z^{(AB)},\tag{7.36}$$

$$I_{1\pm1}^{(AB)} = -\left(d_y^{(AB)} \pm i d_x^{(AB)}\right).$$
(7.37)

Finally we have the rank-two components of the two-ion interaction, which are symmetric and therefore represent the ion-ion dipolar coupling interaction. In terms of the Cartesian tensor  $\boldsymbol{D}^{(AB)}$  the irreducible spherical tensor components  $J_{ka}^{(AB)}$  are given by:

$$J_{20}^{(AB)} = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} D_{zz}^{(AB)}, \tag{7.38}$$

$$J_{2\pm1}^{(AB)} = \mp \left( D_{xz}^{(AB)} \pm i D_{yz}^{(AB)} \right), \tag{7.39}$$

$$J_{2\pm2}^{(AB)} = \frac{1}{2} \left( D_{xx}^{(AB)} - D_{yy}^{(AB)} \pm 2i D_{xy}^{(AB)} \right).$$
(7.40)

From Eq. (7.34) the irreducible spherical spin components satisfy the following identity when the ion labels *A* and *B* are swapped:

$$\widehat{T}_{kq}^{(AB)} = (-1)^k \widehat{T}_{kq}^{(BA)}.$$
(7.41)

Hence, in order for the Hamiltonian to remain invariant under such a label change, the irreducible spherical spatial components of the exchange coupling tensor must also satisfy

$$J_{kq}^{(AB)} = (-1)^k J_{kq}^{(BA)}.$$
(7.42)

This indicates that the isotropic coupling constant and dipolarcoupling tensor do not change sign when the ions are coupled in the opposite order, whereas the DM tensor undergoes a sign change.

7.5. The paramagnetic shift due to a coupled electronic spin system subject to spin-orbit coupling

### 7.5.1. The EPR formalism

In this section we calculate the form of the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor due to a cluster of coupled transition-metal ions. We firstly consider the case where the exchange coupling constants are sufficiently large that only the ground manifold is thermally populated, and secondly spend more time deriving the form of the shielding tensor in the high-temperature paramagnetic regime to second order in  $1/(kT)^2$ .

In the former case where only the ground manifold is thermally populated, we can describe the metal cluster as a single effective spin *S*, which possesses a single g-, hyperfine, and ZFS tensor. The EPR Hamiltonian is therefore of the form that we have already seen for a single metal ion in Eq. (4.36), and we can immediately write down the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S} = -\frac{\mu_{B}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{Z}\cdot\boldsymbol{A}.$$
(7.43)

This has the same form as the shielding due to a single transitionmetal ion.

We have seen that in the high-temperature paramagnetic regime, where *kT* dominates the exchange coupling constants, the metal ions are independent. One important consequence of this is that we are able to assign to each ion its own *g*-, hyperfine, and ZFS interaction tensor. The exchange Hamiltonian  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{0}$  introduced above can be included in the EPR Hamiltonian  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{EPR}$  with the electronic Zeeman and hyperfine interaction Hamiltonians. We consider a system containing a single spin-1/2 nucleus *I* that is coupled to several paramagnetic centres. The following Hamiltonian represents the starting point for our calculation of the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor:

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}_{EPR} = \mu_{B} \sum_{A} \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} + \sum_{A} \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{I}} + \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{0}$$
(7.44)

$$= \mu_{\mathrm{B}} \sum_{A} \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} + \sum_{A} \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}} + \sum_{A} \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{D}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} + \sum_{A > R} \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{J}^{(AB)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(B)}.$$
(7.45)

The first and second terms represent the electronic Zeeman interactions of all the metal ions, and the hyperfine couplings between these ions and the single nucleus. As before these interactions are the origin of the electronic magnetic moment and hyperfine field operators  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ , the cross terms between which give us the chemical shielding tensor according to the EPR formalism. The terms contained in  $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0$ , namely the ZFS and two-spin exchange interactions, are independent of both the external magnetic field and the nuclear magnetic moment, so their eigenfunctions and energies are used to calculate the Boltzmann average in the expressions for the shielding tensor.

The details of the calculation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor are somewhat complicated, and are contained in Appendix E, with only the results given here. We can write the paramagnetic shielding as the sum of three terms up to  $O(\beta^2)$ :

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\rm S} = \sigma_{ij}^{\rm S,1} + \sigma_{ij}^{\rm S,2B} + \sigma_{ij}^{\rm S,2B} + \mathcal{O}(\beta^3). \tag{7.46}$$

The first term  $\sigma_{ij}^{S,1}$  is of order 1/(kT), and there are two terms of order  $1/(kT)^2$  which we have labelled  $\sigma_{ij}^{S,2A}$  and  $\sigma_{ij}^{S,2B}$ .

The first term is calculated to be

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S,1} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{3h\gamma_{\rm I}kT} \sum_{A} \langle S^{(A)} \| \widehat{S}_{1}^{(A)} \| S^{(A)} \rangle^{2} \sum_{q} (-1)^{q} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} A_{1-q,j}^{(A)},$$
(7.47)

which is a sum of terms each of which has the same form as the expression we have already encountered in Eq. (6.27). Substituting in the expression for the reduced matrix element and simplifying the sum over q as before, we obtain a familiar expression for the first-order shielding:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S,1} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{3\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}kT} \sum_{A} S^{(A)} \left( S^{(A)} + 1 \right) \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)}.$$
(7.48)

We note that this contribution depends only on the *g*- and hyperfine tensors of the individual spins and is independent of the ZFS, as before, and of the two-spin exchange tensors. Hence this term is a simple sum of contributions from each paramagnetic centre, as it contains no information on how the ions interact with each other.

The second term, which is of order  $1/(kT)^2$ , is also familiar to us, being a sum of expressions which have the same form as Eq. (6.28):

$$\begin{split} \sigma_{ij}^{S,2A} &= \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{\hbar\gamma_{l}(kT)^{2}} \sum_{A} (-1)^{2S^{(A)}} (2S^{(A)} + 1)^{1/2} \langle S^{(A)} \| \hat{S}_{1}^{(A)} \| S^{(A)} \rangle^{2} \langle S^{(A)} \| \hat{S}_{2}^{(A)} \| S^{(A)} \rangle \\ & \times \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ S^{(A)} & S^{(A)} & S^{(A)} \end{array} \right\} \sum_{qq'q''} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} A_{1q'j}^{(A)} D_{2q''}^{(A)} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 1 \\ -q' & -q'' & -q \end{array} \right). \end{split}$$
(7.49)

This term can also be simplified using the same method as before to give

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S,2A} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{30\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}(kT)^2} \sum_{A} S^{(A)} \left( S^{(A)} + 1 \right) \left( 2S^{(A)} - 1 \right) \left( 2S^{(A)} + 3 \right) \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{D}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)},$$
(7.50)

which depends on the ZFS tensors in addition to the *g*- and hyperfine tensors. Once again it is a simple sum of contributions from each paramagnetic ion, which is again a result of it containing no information about the couplings between the paramagnetic centres.

The third term, also of order  $1/(kT)^2$  is given by

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S,2B} = \frac{\mu_{B}}{9\hbar\gamma_{I}(kT)^{2}} \sum_{A,B\neq A} \langle S^{(A)} \| \widehat{S}_{1}^{(A)} \| S^{(A)} \rangle^{2} \langle S^{(B)} \| \widehat{S}_{1}^{(B)} \| S^{(B)} \rangle^{2} \\ \times \sum_{k''qq'q''} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} A_{1q',j}^{(B)} J_{k''q''}^{(AB)} \sqrt{2k'' + 1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & k'' \\ q & q' & q'' \end{pmatrix}.$$
(7.51)

This is an expression we have not encountered before, as it results from the exchange couplings between the paramagnetic centres. On simplifying we obtain the concise expression

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S,2B} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{9\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}(kT)^2} \sum_{A,B\neq A} S^{(A)} \left( S^{(A)} + 1 \right) S^{(B)} \left( S^{(B)} + 1 \right) \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{J}^{(AB)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(B)},$$
(7.52)

which is now a sum of contributions from pairs of metal ions that have a non-zero coupling between them. Each contribution is a cross term containing the *g*-tensor of one metal ion and the hyperfine tensor of another. Note that if the exchange coupling constant between any two ions is zero, that pair of ions will not give a joint contribution to the overall paramagnetic shielding tensor. To summarise, the final expression for the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor is
$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S} &= -\frac{\mu_{B}}{3\hbar\gamma_{I}kT} \sum_{A} S^{(A)} \Big( S^{(A)} + 1 \Big) \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} \\ &+ \frac{\mu_{B}}{30\hbar\gamma_{I}(kT)^{2}} \sum_{A} S^{(A)} \Big( S^{(A)} + 1 \Big) \Big( 2S^{(A)} - 1 \Big) \Big( 2S^{(A)} + 3 \Big) \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{D}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} \\ &+ \frac{\mu_{B}}{9\hbar\gamma_{I}(kT)^{2}} \sum_{A,B \neq A} S^{(A)} \Big( S^{(A)} + 1 \Big) S^{(B)} \Big( S^{(B)} + 1 \Big) \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{J}^{(AB)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(B)}. \end{aligned}$$

$$(7.53)$$

The third term adds both isotropic and anisotropic contributions to both the contact and pseudo-contact shifts.

In this high-temperature regime, we may also write the paramagnetic shielding tensor in terms of *Z*-tensors, as for noninteracting ions. In the present case, however, the expression is more complicated:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S} = -\frac{\mu_{B}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}} \sum_{A} \boldsymbol{g}^{(A)} \cdot \left[ \boldsymbol{Z}^{(A)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} + \sum_{B \neq A} \boldsymbol{Z}^{(AB)} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{(B)} \right].$$
(7.54)

The tensor  $\mathbf{Z}^{(A)}$  is the one-ion Z-tensor, and takes the form that we have seen before:

$$\boldsymbol{Z}^{(A)} = \frac{S^{(A)} \left(S^{(A)} + 1\right)}{3kT} \mathbf{1} - \frac{S^{(A)} \left(S^{(A)} + 1\right) \left(2S^{(A)} - 1\right) \left(2S^{(A)} + 3\right)}{30(kT)^2} \boldsymbol{D}^{(A)},$$
(7.55)

which depends on the single-ion g- and ZFS tensors. The tensor  $Z^{(AB)}$  is the two-ion Z-tensor, which is given by

$$\boldsymbol{Z}^{(AB)} = -\frac{S^{(A)} \left(S^{(A)} + 1\right) S^{(B)} \left(S^{(B)} + 1\right)}{9 \left(kT\right)^2} \boldsymbol{J}^{(AB)},$$
(7.56)

and contains all the information about the exchange coupling tensors.

#### 7.5.2. Example: two coupled electronic spins-1/2

We complete this section with the illustration of a practical example of the paramagnetic shielding tensor due to a cluster of coupled paramagnetic ions, with a particular emphasis on the temperature dependence of the shielding. The example we choose is that of electronic spins-1/2 *A* and *B* with different isotropic *g*-factors *g*<sup>(A)</sup> and *g*<sup>(B)</sup>, which interact via an isotropic exchange interaction with coupling constant  $\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}$ . We focus on the paramagnetic shielding of a nuclear spin *I* which interacts with both paramagnetic centres via different Fermi-contact coupling constants  $A^{\text{FC},(A)}$  and  $A^{\text{FC},(B)}$ . This choice of isotropic interaction parameters results in a paramagnetic shielding that is also wholly isotropic. Since we are mainly interested in the temperature dependence of the

shielding this choice is sufficient, but we note here that the extension to anisotropic spatial tensors is straightforward.

We begin by deriving the general paramagnetic shielding tensor from the EPR formula in Eq. (4.103), where the energy levels  $E_n$  are the eigenvalues of the singlet and triplet states of the exchange Hamiltonian given in Eqs. (7.8)–(7.11), and the hyperfine and electronic magnetic moment operators are each the sum of the operators for each paramagnetic centre. The general shielding tensor is isotropic and is given by

$$\sigma_{\text{gen}}^{\text{S}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{B}} \Delta g \Delta A - \mu_{\text{B}} \exp(2\beta \mathcal{J}^{(AB)}) \left[ \Delta g \Delta A + 2\beta \Sigma g \Sigma A \mathcal{J}^{(AB)} \right]}{4\hbar \gamma_{I} \mathcal{J}^{(AB)} \left[ 1 + 3 \exp(2\beta \mathcal{J}^{(AB)}) \right]},$$
(7.57)

where  $\Delta g = g^{(A)} - g^{(B)}$ ,  $\Delta A = A^{\text{FC},(A)} - A^{\text{FC},(B)}$ ,  $\Sigma g = g^{(A)} + g^{(B)}$ , and  $\Sigma A = A^{\text{FC},(A)} + A^{\text{FC},(B)}$  are the sums and differences of the *g*-factors and Fermi-contact coupling constants. For comparison we can also calculate the shielding tensor to second-order in  $\beta \sigma_{2nd}^{S}$  using the expressions in Eqs. (7.54)–(7.56) to give

$$\sigma_{2nd}^{S} = -\frac{\mu_{B}}{4\hbar\gamma_{I}kT} \left( g^{(A)}A^{FC,(A)} + g^{(B)}A^{FC,(B)} \right) -\frac{\mu_{B}\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}}{8\hbar\gamma_{I}(kT)^{2}} \left( g^{(A)}A^{FC,(B)} + g^{(B)}A^{FC,(A)} \right).$$
(7.58)

The general and second-order shielding tensors are plotted as a function of temperature in Fig. 7.3 with both positive and negative exchange coupling constants. In both plots the expressions are  $g^{(A)} = g^{(B)} \equiv g$ simplified by assuming that and  $A^{\text{FC},(A)} = A^{\text{FC},(B)} \equiv A^{\text{FC}}$ . The temperature plot of the paramagnetic shielding for a positive exchange coupling constant of  $\mathcal{J}^{(AB)} = +100 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  is shown in Fig. 7.3(a). Here ferromagnetic alignment at low temperature results in a triplet electronic spin ground state with S = 1. The shielding decreases as the temperature increases from 0 K, due to two factors. At temperatures below  $\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}/k$  = 144 K the decrease in the shielding is primarily due to the thermal population of the excited Zeeman energy levels of the triplet manifold, which reduces the Curie spin of this state; this temperature variation can therefore be modelled with a Curie law with S = 1. As the temperature increases above 144 K the diamagnetic singlet excited state with S = 0 begins to be substantially populated. At still higher temperatures where kT dominates the exchange coupling interaction the two spins-1/2 behave as independent spins, each with its own separate contribution to the shielding. The total shielding is then equal to the sum of the two independent contributions, as given by the first-order term in Eq. (7.58), which follows a Curie temperature law.



**Fig. 7.3.** Plots of the temperature dependence of the isotropic paramagnetic shielding due to two coupled electronic spins-1/2. The plot in (a) is for a positive exchange coupling constant of  $\mathcal{J}^{(AB)} = +100 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , and the plot in (b) corresponds to a negative exchange constant of  $\mathcal{J}^{(AB)} = -100 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . In both cases the temperature curves calculated from both the general EPR expression and the high-temperature second-order approximation are included.

In Fig. 7.3(b) is shown the corresponding temperature plot of the shielding with a negative exchange coupling of  $\mathcal{J}^{(AB)} = -100 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . This interaction gives a diamagnetic singlet ground state with S = 0. The temperature dependence is markedly different from the ferromagnetic case as the shielding first increases with increasing temperature, before reaching a maximum at  $|\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}|/k = 144$  K and then decreasing. Initially, at temperatures below 40 K, only the singlet state is thermally occupied, and so there is no contribution to the paramagnetic shielding tensor. The increase in the shielding above 40 K is due to the increasing thermal population of the triplet state. This trend persists up to 144 K, above which both the singlet and triplet states are substantially populated and the two spins-1/2 start to behave as independent Curie spins. The subsequent decrease in the shielding with increasing temperature is then due to each Curie spin following a Curie law.

One interesting aspect of these plots is that they suggest that NMR can be used to determine the exchange coupling constants of a cluster of coupled electronic spins by measuring the paramagnetic shielding tensors at multiple temperatures.

## 7.6. Ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic interactions in solid insulators: the Curie–Weiss law

We now extend the previous discussion on magnetic exchange coupling interactions to solid insulator materials containing an ensemble of metal ions which possess unpaired electrons. The interactions between the unpaired electrons result in ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic ordering of the bulk material, and we will see how this ordering affects the magnetic susceptibility and the paramagnetic shielding tensor of the nuclei. Whereas in isolated metal-ion clusters the electronic energy levels form a discrete ladder, the case of solid materials is considerably more complicated as the extremely large number of interactions results in a continuum of energy levels. This means that whilst for isolated clusters we are able to define EPR parameters, such as the gtensor, which are properties of the entire coupled spin system with total spin S, it becomes much less clear how to define such parameters for an infinite lattice of coupled electronic spins. Therefore we use the simplest successful model for extended systems of coupled electronic spins, namely mean-field theory and the Weiss model, which we apply to spin-only transition-metal ions.

### 7.6.1. The Weiss model of ferromagnetism

We describe the material with the simplest Hamiltonian that can be used to describe magnetic ordering, which contains the electronic Zeeman and isotropic Heisenberg exchange terms:

$$\widehat{H} = \mu_{B} g_{e} \sum_{A} \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} - 2 \sum_{A > B} \mathcal{J}^{(AB)} \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(B)}, \qquad (7.59)$$

where the sum is over the metal ions *A* and *B*. We assume that the ions are spin only, and therefore exhibit no SO coupling. As is the case for the two-spin system of Section 7.2, the exchange coupling constants  $\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}$  between the nearest neighbours are positive for ferromagnetic alignment, and negative for antiferromagnetic alignment.

In the Weiss model we approximate the above Hamiltonian with a *mean field* term which describes the interaction of spin A with a mean molecular field  $B_{mf}$  that is due to the other spins. Furthermore we restrict our discussion to an ensemble of metal ions of the same type, and consider only nearest-neighbour interactions. The molecular magnetic field experienced by ion A is given by

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\mathrm{mf}} = -\frac{1}{\mu_{\mathrm{B}} g_{e}} \sum_{B \neq A} \mathcal{J}^{(AB)} \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(B)}, \qquad (7.60)$$

and is assumed to be the same for *all* the metal ions in the solid. Here the factor of 2 has been removed from the prefactor to prevent double counting. The total effective mean-field Hamiltonian, which replaces Eq. (7.59), is then

$$\widehat{H} = \mu_{\rm B} g_e \sum_{A} (\boldsymbol{B}_0 + \boldsymbol{B}_{\rm mf}) \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)}.$$
(7.61)

This expression has the form of the Hamiltonian of an ensemble of spin-only paramagnetic ions in a magnetic field  $B_0 + B_{mf}$ . The mean molecular field is responsible for the ordering of the system at low temperature, and so we assume that it is proportional to the bulk magnetization of the system:

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\rm mf} = \Lambda \boldsymbol{M},\tag{7.62}$$

where  $\Lambda$  is the constant of proportionality that characterises the strength of the molecular field as a function of the magnetization. We find it useful to employ an alternative expression for the mean molecular field in terms of the Curie spin:

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\rm mf} = -\lambda \langle \boldsymbol{\tilde{S}} \rangle, \tag{7.63}$$

where the minus sign is present because **M** and  $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}} \rangle$  have opposite sign. Note that we have dropped the superscript (*A*) from the Curie spin, as a result of the assumption that all ions experience the same molecular field. With these conventions, both  $\Lambda$  and  $\lambda$  are positive for a ferromagnet.

The form of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (7.61) implies that magnetic ordering of the electronic spins can be achieved with the mean molecular field, even in the absence of an external field. At low temperatures this leads to the formation of a spontaneous magnetization in a ferromagnet. As the temperature is raised, the higher-energy states become occupied, and the magnetic ordering is disrupted, with all order being destroyed above a transition temperature. At temperatures above the transition temperature, the material behaves as a paramagnet. This is the Weiss model of ferromagnetism.

In order to elucidate the magnetic behaviour of a ferromagnetic material, and to derive the expression for the transition temperature above which we observe paramagnetic behaviour, we apply a modified form of the general expression for the Curie spin in Eq. (3.58):

$$\frac{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle}{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = B_S(y), \tag{7.64}$$

where the Brillouin function  $B_S(y)$  is given in Eq. (3.59). The quantity y has a similar expression to that in Eq. (3.59), but we have added the term  $-\lambda \langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle$  to account for the mean molecular field:

$$y = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S \left( B_0 - \lambda \langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle \right)}{kT}.$$
(7.65)

Note that we assume that  $B_0$ , the Curie spin, and therefore the mean molecular field are all along *z*. We obtain the conditions for spontaneous ferromagnetic alignment of the spins in the absence of an external field as follows. We set  $B_0 = 0$ , and rearrange Eq. (7.65) in terms of  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle / \langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{sat}$  (where  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{sat} = -S$ ). In combination with Eq. (7.64) we now have two simultaneous equations that we must solve to obtain the alignment conditions:

$$\frac{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle}{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = B_S(y), \tag{7.66}$$

$$\frac{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle}{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = \frac{kTy}{\mu_{\text{B}}g_e s^2 \lambda}.$$
(7.67)

The second equation depends on the temperature, and so the solutions can be found by identifying the temperature, referred to as the *Curie temperature*  $T_{\rm C}$ , below which we obtain solutions consistent with spontaneous ferromagnetism. The solutions are illustrated graphically in Fig. 7.4(a), which shows as a function of y a plot of both the Brillouin function, and the linear relation  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle / \langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{sat} = kTy/(\mu_B g_e S^2 \lambda)$ , at three different temperatures. When the temperature is higher than  $T_{\rm C}$  there is only one solution to the two simultaneous equations,  $\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle / \langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{sat} = y = 0$ , indicating that there is no spontaneous magnetization in the absence of the external field. At temperatures below  $T_{\rm C}$  we see that there are two solutions in addition to the one at y = 0. These two further solutions, with non-zero values of  $\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle / \langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{sat}$ , with equal magnitudes and opposite signs, indicate the presence of a spontaneous magnetization, and therefore ferromagnetic behaviour. The transition between the paramagnetic and ferromagnetic behaviour occurs at  $T = T_{\rm C}$ , which is the temperature at which the gradient of the linear relation in Eq. (7.67) is exactly equal to the gradient of the Brillouin function at y = 0. Equating the two gradients, we obtain an expression for the Curie temperature in terms of the mean-field parameter:

$$\frac{S+1}{3S} = \frac{kT_c}{\mu \sigma S^2 \lambda} \tag{7.68}$$

$$T_{\rm C} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1)\lambda}{3k}.$$
(7.69)

The application of an external magnetic field  $B_0$  results in a nonzero magnetization at all temperatures. This can be deduced from Eqs. (7.64) and (7.65), by rearranging the latter as before, but this time retaining a non-zero  $B_0$ . The result is the following pair of simultaneous equations:

$$\frac{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle}{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = B_S(y), \tag{7.70}$$

$$\frac{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle}{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = -\frac{B_0}{\lambda S} + \frac{kTy}{\mu_{\text{B}}g_e S^2 \lambda}.$$
(7.71)

Eq. (7.71) differs from Eq. (7.67) by the additive factor  $-B_0/(\lambda S)$ . The effect of this factor is to shift the straight line parallel to the *y*-axis so that it crosses  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle / \langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{sat} = 0$  at  $y = \mu_B g_e S B_0 / kT$ , rather than y = 0, with the result that the line always intersects the Brillouin function at a non-zero value of the Curie spin for all temperatures. Hence, for all temperatures above and below the Curie temperature, there is a non-zero net magnetization, as shown in Fig. 7.4(b). The

implication is that there is always an energetic advantage for the magnetic moments of a ferromagnet to line up with the external field. We return to this topic in Section 7.6.3, when we discuss the magnetic susceptibility of magnetically ordered systems.

## 7.6.2. The Weiss model of antiferromagnetism

In the Weiss model of antiferromagnetism we apply the same basic assumptions as for ferromagnetism, namely that the ions are of the same species, that we only consider nearest-neighbour interactions, and that we can replace the terms in the exchange Hamiltonian with a mean molecular field term. However we have to modify the phenomenological form of the molecular field in Eq. (7.63) in the following way. The negative exchange coupling constants result in the magnetic moments of the nearest-neighbour ions lying antiparallel to one another. Hence, from a conceptual point of view, we can divide the ions into two interpenetrating sub-lattices, where within each sub-lattice the magnetic moments at low temperature are aligned the same way. In one sub-lattice all the magnetic moments point 'up', and in the other they point 'down'. In the simple cubic oxides MO, such as NiO and MnO, which adopt the rock-salt structure, all the nearest neighbours of a particular M<sup>2+</sup> ion on one sub-lattice must belong entirely to the other sub-lattice. In addition the simplest implementation of mean-field theory assumes that the exchange interactions only occur between nearest neighbours, so that a particular spin interacts only with spins on the other sub-lattice. The result is that the mean molecular field on the former must be proportional to the magnetization of the latter. Whilst this represents a clear simplification of the physics of antiferromagnetism, it is nevertheless sufficient to introduce most of the important features of the magnetic ordering. However we note that in real materials nextnearest-neighbour interactions are not negligible. This situation requires a modification of the model discussed here, which is presented in Section 7.6.4.

Therefore, according to the Weiss model, the molecular fields on the 'up' and 'down' sub-lattices  $B_{mf}^+$  and  $B_{mf}^-$  are given by

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\rm mf}^{+} = -\lambda \langle \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle^{-} \tag{7.72}$$

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\mathrm{mf}}^{-} = -\lambda \langle \boldsymbol{\hat{S}} \rangle^{+}, \qquad (7.73)$$

where  $\langle \hat{\mathbf{S}} \rangle^{\pm}$  are the Curie spins of the two sub-lattices, which we label + and -, and the mean-field constant  $\lambda$  is negative for antiferromagnetic ordering. The Curie spin of each sub-lattice, and therefore the conditions for spontaneous magnetization in each of the





**Fig. 7.4.** Plot illustrating the conditions for spontaneous ferromagnetism in the absence of an external field, and the effect of a subsequently applied field. In (a) are shown plots of Eq. (7.66) (in red) and Eq. (7.67) (black), with the second equation plotted at three different temperatures. Simultaneous solutions are found at the points where the two curves intersect, and indicate the conditions under which the sample is spontaneously magnetised. These plots indicate that the sample must be below a certain critical temperature  $T_c$  for spontaneous ferromagnetism to occur. The graph in (b) shows plots of Eqs. (7.70) and (7.71), which illustrate the conditions for non-zero magnetisation in a ferromagnet in an externally applied magnetic field. The effect of the field is to magnetise the sample irrespective of the temperature.

two sub-lattices can be found in a similar way as for the ferromagnetic systems in the previous section. In the absence of an external field, the  $\langle \hat{S} \rangle^{\pm}$  are given by

$$\frac{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle^{\pm}}{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = B_S(y^{\pm}), \tag{7.74}$$

where

$$y^{\pm} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S \lambda \langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle^{\mp}}{kT}, \qquad (7.75)$$

and we have assumed that the Curie spins are aligned along  $\pm z$ . The two sub-lattices are equivalent, and differ only in the opposite directions of their spontaneous magnetization vectors. Therefore

$$\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle^+ = -\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle^- = \langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle, \tag{7.76}$$

where  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle$  is the magnitude of the Curie spin of each sub-lattice, which is now given by

$$\frac{\langle S_z \rangle}{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = B_S(y), \tag{7.77}$$

$$y = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S \lambda \langle \hat{S}_z \rangle}{kT}.$$
(7.78)

The situation is now exactly the same as for the ferromagnetic system in Section 7.6.1. We rearrange Eq. (7.78) to obtain a pair of simultaneous equations that can be solved in the same way:

$$\frac{\langle S_z \rangle}{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = B_S(y), \tag{7.79}$$

$$\frac{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle}{\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{spt}}} = -\frac{kTy}{\mu_{\text{B}}g_e S^2 \lambda}.$$
(7.80)

These two equations can be solved using Fig. 7.4 as an aid, which shows that for temperatures below a certain transition temperature we obtain a spontaneous magnetization in each sub-lattice, which disappears above the transition temperature. This transition temperature is referred to as the *Néel temperature*  $T_N$ , and can be shown to have an expression in terms of the mean-field parameter that is similar to the Curie temperature:

$$T_{\rm N} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1)\lambda}{3k}.\tag{7.81}$$

We note that there is an additional sign compared to the expression for  $T_c$ . This is because for antiferromagnetic alignment  $\lambda$  is negative, and the minus sign ensures that  $T_N$  is positive.

At this point we also note that, although each sub-lattice exhibits spontaneous magnetization below  $T_N$ , the magnetization vectors of the two sub-lattices are equal in magnitude and opposite in direction. This means that the material as a whole has zero magnetization in the absence of an external magnetic field. This magnetic transition may also be accompanied by a change in structure. For example MnO undergoes a rhombohedral distortion from the high-temperature cubic structure on cooling below the Néel temperature.

#### 7.6.3. The magnetic susceptibility

We have derived expressions for the Curie and Néel temperatures, below which a solid material shows ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic behaviour respectively in the absence of an external magnetic field. Now we must move further and consider the effect of an external magnetic field when applied to these materials, as it is under these conditions we observe the NMR spectrum. At this point we assume that, under the experimental conditions, we are operating in a temperature regime where  $T > T_c$  or  $T > T_N$ , and the material behaves as a paramagnet. Before we calculate the magnetic susceptibility we note that, so far, we have treated the ferromagnetic and antiferromagnetic systems differently in order to acknowledge the differences between the two models. However, since we have now shown that both systems behave in the same way above their respective transition temperatures we can unify the descriptions. In doing so, we note that the expressions for  $T_{\rm C}$  and  $T_{\rm N}$  differ only in their signs. Therefore we can define a single parameter, called the Weiss constant  $\Theta$ , which is given by

$$\Theta = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1)\lambda}{3k}.$$
(7.82)

When we are referring to a ferromagnetic material the mean-field parameter  $\lambda$  is positive, and so  $\Theta$  is positive and is equal to the Curie temperature,  $\Theta = T_{\rm C}$  within the mean-field approach. On the other hand antiferromagnetic materials have negative  $\lambda$ , and so  $\Theta$  is negative and given by  $\Theta = -T_{\rm N}$ .

In the presence of an external magnetic field  $B_0$  of the strength used in high-resolution NMR we can truncate the Brillouin function at the first-order term in *y*. For a ferromagnetic material we take the expressions for the Curie spin and the quantity *y* in Eqs. (7.64) and (7.65) and obtain:

$$\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = -SB_S(y) \tag{7.83}$$

$$\approx -\frac{S+1}{3}y \tag{7.84}$$

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_{\rm e}S(S+1)}{3k} \left(\frac{B_0 - \lambda\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle}{T}\right)$$
(7.85)

$$= -\frac{\Theta}{\lambda} \left( \frac{B_0 - \lambda \langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle}{T} \right).$$
(7.86)

For an antiferromagnetic material the treatment is similar with an additional step. We take the expressions for the Curie spins of the two sub-lattices in Eq. (7.74) and the quantities  $y^{\pm}$  in Eq. (7.78), and modify the latter to include  $B_0$ . The effect of the external field is to make both Curie spins more negative, so that they are no longer equal and opposite. We average them to obtain the total Curie spin  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = \left( \langle \hat{S}_z \rangle^+ + \langle \hat{S}_z \rangle^- \right) / 2$ , for which we obtain the same expression as for the ferromagnetic case in Eq. (7.86). Henceforth we can treat both cases using this same expression for the Curie spin, which rearranges to give

$$\langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle = -\frac{\Theta B_0}{\lambda (T - \Theta)}.$$
(7.87)

The *z* component of the average electronic magnetic moment operator is then

$$\langle \hat{\mu}_z \rangle = -\mu_{\rm B} g_e \langle \widehat{S}_z \rangle \tag{7.88}$$

$$=\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_e\Theta B_0}{\lambda(T-\Theta)}.\tag{7.89}$$

Finally, substituting this last expression in Eq. (3.89) gives the magnetic susceptibility

$$\chi = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 g_e^2 S(S+1)}{3k(T-\Theta)}.$$
(7.90)

This expression has the same form as the susceptibility of an ensemble of non-interacting paramagnetic spins, with the exception that the 1/T Curie temperature dependence has been replaced by a  $1/(T - \Theta)$  dependence. The temperature dependence of the susceptibility in Eq. (7.90) is an example of the Curie–Weiss law.

## 7.6.4. The Néel temperature and Weiss constant in antiferromagnetic materials

The mean-field theory of antiferromagnetism that we have presented so far indicates that the Néel temperature and the Weiss constant have the same value within a sign, i.e.  $\Theta = -T_N$ . However we should bear in mind that the two quantities are physically distinct, with the Néel temperature being the temperature below which we observe antiferromagnetic ordering, and the Weiss constant being a parameter that characterises the magnetic susceptibility in the paramagnetic regime. The two parameters are therefore measured in different temperature regimes, and may in fact take very different values for some antiferromagnetic materials. For example in materials such as MnO, FeO, and CoO the measured Weiss constants have greater magnitude than the Néel temperature,  $|\Theta| > T_N$ ; in the case of MnO  $T_N$  and  $\Theta$  are 116 K and -510 K respectively [188]. The discrepancy can be explained when we note that in the mean-field theory of Section 7.6.2 it was assumed that exchange interactions occur only between nearest neighbouring spins on different sub-lattices, so that the mean field experienced by one sub-lattice is due entirely to the other sub-lattice. However this is generally not true, and we may have to account for next-nearest-neighbour interactions between spins on the same sub-lattice, which introduces an additional meanfield term.

We can write down the two mean fields experienced by the + and - sub-lattices,  $B_{mf}^+$  and  $B_{mf}^-$ , as

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\mathrm{mf}}^{+} = \xi \langle \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle^{+} - \lambda \langle \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle^{-} \tag{7.91}$$

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\mathrm{mf}}^{-} = \boldsymbol{\xi} \langle \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle^{-} - \lambda \langle \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle^{+}, \qquad (7.92)$$

where the quantity  $\xi$  parameterises the strength of the mean field from the same sub-lattice. If we now repeat the derivation of the Néel temperature in Section 7.6.2, we now obtain the following expression:

$$T_{\rm N} = -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1)(\lambda+\xi)}{3k}.$$
(7.93)

If the field parameter  $\xi$  is positive the Néel temperature is lower than predicted by the previous expression in Eq. (7.81). If the recalculate the magnetic susceptibility in the paramagnetic regime according to Section 7.6.3, we obtain the Curie–Weiss expression in Eq. (7.90), but with a different expression for the Weiss constant:

$$\Theta = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e S(S+1)(\lambda-\xi)}{3k},\tag{7.94}$$

which for positive  $\xi$  has a lower value that than predicted by Eq. (7.82). Therefore this formulation of the mean-field theory predicts that  $|\Theta| \ge T_N$ , with the equality only being observed when  $\xi = 0$ .

We emphasize again that the Néel temperature and Weiss constant are distinct quantities that measure fundamentally different aspects of the bulk magnetic properties of the material. The former is measured from the experimental magnetic susceptibility data at temperatures in the vicinity of which we observe the onset of magnetic ordering. Therefore  $T_N$  is the temperature below which we see antiferromagnetic behaviour, and above which we are in the paramagnetic regime. On the other land the Weiss constant parameterizes the magnetic susceptibility in the paramagnetic regime at temperatures above  $T_N$ , and so in principle is independent of the lower-temperature regime where we observe magnetic ordering. As we will see in Section 7.7, the paramagnetic shielding tensor is also parameterized by the Weiss constant.

In materials such as the metal oxides where  $|\Theta| \ge T_N$  the temperature at which we acquire NMR data may be larger than the Néel temperature, but lower than the magnitude of the Weiss constant, i.e.  $T_N < T < |\Theta|$ . For example this is the case for FeO where

 $T_{\rm N} = 116$  K and  $\Theta = -610$  K, and thus considerable residual (antiferromagnetic) interactions persist at typical operating temperatures of around 300 K [188]. In this case the material is in the paramagnetic regime as we are above the Néel temperature and there is no magnetic ordering. A classic example where  $|\Theta| \gg T_{\rm N}$  occurs is in frustrated magnets. In the conceptually simplest example of these materials, the triangular lattice, three sublattices are coupled antiferromagnetically, and thus no simple ordering scheme exists. The extent of residual magnetic couplings at room temperature is determined by the strength of the antiferromagnetic couplings, but long range magnetic ordering may not occur until temperatures much below  $|\Theta|$ , if at all in the case of spin-glasses.

For completeness, we note that ferrimagnets are materials with two or more magnetic sublattices that are coupled antiferromagnetically (i.e.,  $\Theta$  is negative) but because the magnetic moments of the two sublattices are not equal, ferromagnetism is observed below  $T_{\rm N}$ .

## 7.6.5. The magnetic susceptibility in terms of the isotropic exchange coupling

So far we have examined the magnetic properties of paramagnetic solid insulator materials by employing a phenomenological approach using mean-field theory. We now round off this section by linking this model to the explicit exchange interactions between the magnetic ions and deriving the expression linking the Weiss constant to the exchange coupling constants for transition-metal ions. We focus on the isotropic exchange interactions as these dominate the effects of anisotropic exchange in determining the magnetic properties of these materials.

We start by writing the total Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  in Eq. (7.59) with the isotropic exchange interaction terms written with irreducible spherical tensors:

$$\widehat{H} = \mu_{B} g_{e} \sum_{A} \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{S}}^{(A)} + \sum_{A > B} J_{00}^{(AB)}(11) \widehat{T}_{00}^{(AB)}(11).$$
(7.95)

The second term describes all the exchange interactions, and comprises a sum of terms, each of which is the product of an electronic spin part  $\hat{T}_{00}^{(AB)}(11)$  and a spatial part  $J_{00}^{(AB)}(11)$ . The former is the direct-product irreducible spherical tensor operator of two one-spin operators  $\hat{S}_{1q_1}^{(A)}$  and  $\hat{S}_{1q_2}^{(B)}$ , and is written as

$$\widehat{T}_{00}^{(AB)}(11) = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\widehat{S}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{S}^{(B)}.$$
(7.96)

The rank-zero spatial tensor of the exchange interaction is written in terms of the isotropic exchange coupling constant  $-2\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}$  as follows

$$J_{00}^{(AB)}(11) = 2\sqrt{3}\mathcal{J}^{(AB)},\tag{7.97}$$

where we have retained the factor of two as before. Note that we are restricting the discussion to the isotropic exchange interaction. A central assumption of mean-field theory is that each ion experiences exactly the same mean molecular magnetic field. The same assumption is made here, and is equivalent to assuming that all the ions are of the same species, and that the network of exchange interactions experienced by a particular ion *A* is the same for all the other ions in the lattice (or sub-lattice in the case of antiferromagnetic materials). Therefore the magnetic susceptibility tensor calculated for ion *A*,  $\chi_{ij}$ , corresponds to the total susceptibility tensor per metal ion for the whole material.

The magnetic susceptibility tensor per ion can be calculated to second order in 1/(kT) from the EPR formalism. Following a similar

calculation in Appendix E, and after much algebraic manipulation, the expression is

$$\begin{split} \chi_{ij} &= \mu_0 \mu_B^2 \left[ \frac{\beta}{\omega} \sum_B \sum_{qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} \\ &\times \mathrm{Tr}_S \Big( \hat{S}_{1-q}^{(A)} \hat{S}_{1-q'}^{(B)} \Big) - \frac{\beta^2}{\omega} \sum_B \sum_{\Gamma > \Delta} \sum_{qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} J_{00}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}(11) \\ &\times \mathrm{Tr}_S \Big( \hat{S}_{1-q'}^{(A)} \hat{S}_{1-q'}^{(B)} \hat{T}_{00}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}(11) \Big) \right], \end{split}$$
(7.98)

where we have only retained the Zeeman terms with a rank one spin operator, we have written the *g*-tensor components of ion A  $g_{1q,i}^{(A)}$  in their most general form, and  $\omega$  is the total number of electronic spin states. The trace Tr<sub>s</sub> is a sum over all the states of the entire extended spin system. This expression can be simplified after the tedious task of computing the two traces, following the calculations presented in Appendix E. The first-order term in the susceptibility  $\chi_{ij}^{(1)}$  is given by:

$$\chi_{ij}^{(1)} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2}{kT} \frac{1}{\omega} \sum_{B} \sum_{qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{1q,j}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} \mathrm{Tr}_s \left( \widehat{S}_{1-q}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{1-q'}^{(B)} \right)$$
(7.99)

$$=\frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}^{2}}{3kT}\sum_{B}\sum_{qq'}(-1)^{q'}g_{1q,i}^{(A)}g_{1q',j}^{(B)}\langle S^{(A)}\|\widehat{S}_{1}^{(A)}\|S^{(A)}\rangle^{2}\delta_{q-q'}\delta_{AB}$$
(7.100)

$$=\frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}^{2}}{3kT}\sum_{q}(-1)^{q}g_{1q,i}^{(A)}g_{1-q,j}^{(A)}\langle S^{(A)}\|\widehat{S}_{1}^{(A)}\|S^{(A)}\rangle^{2},$$
(7.101)

where the reduced matrix element of  $\widehat{S}_{1}^{(A)}$  is evaluated in the basis functions of ion *A*. As a result of the mean-field approximation, all the ions are of the same type and therefore have the same spin *S*, and all the reduced matrix elements are equal to  $\sqrt{S(S+1)}$ . The second-order susceptibility term  $\chi_{ij}^{(2)}$  is more complicated, and is equal to

$$\begin{split} \chi_{ij}^{(2)} &= -\frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2}{(kT)^2} \frac{1}{\omega} \sum_{B} \sum_{\Gamma > \Delta} \sum_{qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} J_{00}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}(11) \\ &\times \operatorname{Tr}_S \Big( \widehat{S}_{1-q'}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{1-q'}^{(D)} \widehat{T}_{00}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}(11) \Big) \\ &= -\frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2}{9(kT)^2} \sum_{B \neq A} \sum_{\Gamma > \Delta} \sum_{qq'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} J_{00}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}(11) \\ &\times \langle S^{(A)} || \widehat{S}_1^{(A)} || S^{(A)} \rangle^2 \langle S^{(B)} || \widehat{S}_1^{(B)} || S^{(B)} \rangle^2 \times \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ q & q' & 0 \end{pmatrix} \delta_{\Gamma A} \delta_{\Delta B} (7.103) \\ & \mu_{A} \mu_{A}^2 \Big) \Big( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{B \neq A} \sum_{\Gamma > \Delta} \sum_{qq'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} J_{00}^{(A)}(11) \Big) \\ &\times \langle S^{(A)} || \widehat{S}_1^{(A)} || S^{(A)} \rangle^2 \langle S^{(B)} || \widehat{S}_1^{(B)} || S^{(B)} \rangle^2 \times \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ q & q' & 0 \end{pmatrix} \delta_{\Gamma A} \delta_{\Delta B} (7.103) \end{split}$$

$$= -\frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}}{9(kT)^{2}} \sum_{B \neq A} \sum_{qq'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} J_{00}^{(AB)}(11) \\ \times \langle S^{(A)} || \widehat{S}_{1}^{(A)} || S^{(A)} \rangle^{2} \langle S^{(B)} || \widehat{S}_{1}^{(B)} || S^{(B)} \rangle^{2} \times \frac{(-1)^{1-q} \delta_{q-q'}}{\sqrt{3}}$$

$$= \frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}^{2}}{\sqrt{3}} \langle S^{(A)} || \widehat{S}^{(A)} || S^{(A)} \rangle^{2} \sum_{q \neq 0} \langle S^{(B)} || \widehat{S}^{(B)} || S^{(B)} || S^{(B)} \rangle^{2} I_{con}^{(AB)}(11)$$
(7.104)

$$9\sqrt{3}(kT)^{2} \bigvee_{B \neq A} (1)^{q} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1-q,j}^{(B)}.$$
(7.105)

We now acknowledge that we are assuming that the transitionmetal ions have a spin-only ground state, and write the *g*-factors for each ion  $g_{1q,i}^{(A)}$  in terms of  $g_e$ :

$$\mathbf{g}_{1\pm1}^{(A)} = \mp \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{g}_{e} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \pm \mathbf{i} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathbf{g}_{10}^{(A)} = \mathbf{g}_{e} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
(7.106)

The sum of the product of *g*-factors that occurs in the expressions for both the first- and second-order susceptibility tensors then takes the simple form:

$$\sum_{q} (-1)^{q} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1-q,j}^{(B)} = g_{e}^{2} \delta_{ij}.$$
(7.107)

We note that, as a consequence of both the Zeeman and exchange interactions being spatially isotropic, the susceptibility  $\chi$  is also isotropic. The final expression is

$$\chi = \chi^{(1)} + \chi^{(2)} \tag{7.108}$$

$$=\frac{\mu_{0}\mu_{B}^{2}g_{e}^{2}S(S+1)}{3kT}+\frac{2\mu_{0}\mu_{B}^{2}g_{e}^{2}S^{2}(S+1)^{2}}{9(kT)^{2}}\sum_{B\neq A}\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}.$$
(7.109)

The first-order term is independent of the exchange coupling constants, and is equal to the expression we derived previously for a system of non-interacting transition-metal ions. The exchange interactions only contribute to the susceptibility to second order, with this term being proportional to the sum of the exchange coupling constants describing the couplings to a particular ion [185]. For ferromagnetic ordering all the coupling constants are positive, and the second-order susceptibility is positive. On the other hand, if we assume that the nearest-neighbour exchange couplings are dominant, then antiferromagnetic ordering results in a sum of coupling constants that is negative, and the second-order susceptibility is also negative. If there are no exchange couplings this term is zero, as we have also seen previously for non-interacting metal ions.

Now we need to establish the connection between Eq. (7.109) and the susceptibility from the mean-field model in Eq. (7.90). The former is written as a Taylor series in 1/(kT), so to facilitate the comparison we also expand the latter as a Taylor series giving

$$\chi = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 g_e^2 S(S+1)}{3kT} + \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 g_e^2 S(S+1)}{3kT^2} \Theta.$$
(7.110)

The first term in Eq. (7.110) is equal to the susceptibility from an ensemble of non-interacting metal ions, as for Eq. (7.109). The second term depends on the Weiss constant, which contains all the information about the exchange interactions, in the same way that only the second term of Eq. (7.109) depends on the exchange coupling constants. If we equate the two we obtain an expression for the Weiss constant in terms of the sum of exchange coupling constants [185]:

$$\Theta = \frac{2S(S+1)}{3k} \sum_{B \neq A} \mathcal{J}^{()}.$$
(7.111)

Considering only the nearest-neighbour interactions, we can make a similar observation to before: ferromagnetic order is characterised by positive nearest-neighbour exchange constants, and therefore a positive Weiss constant, whilst antiferromagnetic ordering is characterised by negative exchange coupling constants, and therefore a negative Weiss constant.

#### 7.7. The paramagnetic shielding tensor in solid insulator materials

Eq. (7.53) is a general expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor in either a system containing a cluster of transition-metal ions, or a solid insulator, and includes the effects of anisotropic exchange, *g*-anisotropy, and the ZFS interaction. Many solid systems, such as battery materials, can be approximated by a simpler formula which neglects SO coupling, and in which the dependence on the isotropic exchange coupling constants is replaced by a Curie–Weiss temperature dependence [5,54,55]. The link between this model and Eq. (7.53) is now examined in detail. As for the magnetic susceptibility the isotropic exchange interactions, rather than anisotropic exchange, dominate the form of the paramagnetic shielding tensor, and so we focus exclusively on the former interactions.

## 7.7.1. The Curie–Weiss expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor

In the spin-only limit we replace the *g*-tensor with the freeelectron *g*-factor, and remove both any SO coupling contributions to the ZFS tensor, and the DM part of the exchange coupling constants. In addition we will also ignore the NR parts of the ZFS and the anisotropic exchange interaction, which are due to dipolar couplings between the electrons and are expected to be small. The paramagnetic shielding tensor in a solid insulator containing only spin-only transition-metal ions of the same species is now given by a simplified form of Eq. (7.53):

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S} = -\frac{\mu_{B}g_{e}S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_{I}kT}\sum_{A}\boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} -\frac{2\mu_{B}g_{e}S^{2}(S+1)^{2}}{9\hbar\gamma_{I}(kT)^{2}}\sum_{A}\sum_{B\neq A}\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}\boldsymbol{A}^{(B)}.$$
(7.112)

So far we have made no assumptions about the exchange coupling constants. However in order to make the link with the Curie–Weiss law we need to introduce a mean-field approximation. As we have already seen this equates to stating that the network of exchange couplings experienced by any one metal ion is the same as for all metal ions. This means that in the second term of Eq. (7.112), the sum over the exchange coupling constants is independent of one of the indices, and we can partition the double sum as follows:

$$\sum_{A} \sum_{B \neq A} \mathcal{J}^{(AB)} \boldsymbol{A}^{(B)} = \sum_{B \neq A} \mathcal{J}^{(AB)} \sum_{\Gamma} \boldsymbol{A}^{(\Gamma)}, \qquad (7.113)$$

where we have labelled the index in the sum of the hyperfine coupling constants as  $\Gamma$  to emphasise the separation from the sum over *B*. We can also simplify the sum over the hyperfine coupling tensors further. We have already seen that for each metal ion the hyperfine coupling tensor  $A^{(A)}$  that we include in the expression for the paramagnetic shielding as derived from the EPR formalism represents the coupling per electron. This is because the different electrons reside in different orbitals, each of which may couple differently to the nuclear spin. However, at this point, it proves convenient to write the shielding tensor in terms of the total hyperfine coupling constant A, due to *all* the electrons in *all* the metal ions that couple to the nucleus:

$$\mathcal{A} = 2S \sum_{A} A^{(A)}. \tag{7.114}$$

With these two simplifications the paramagnetic shielding tensor is now

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}} g_{e}(\mathrm{S}+1)}{6\hbar\gamma_{I} kT} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} - \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}} g_{e} S(\mathrm{S}+1)^{2}}{9\hbar\gamma_{I} (kT)^{2}} \sum_{B \neq A} \mathcal{J}^{(AB)} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}.$$
 (7.115)

We can also write down a phenomenological form of the shielding tensor. We have seen that the magnetic susceptibility per metal ion of an ensemble of spin-only transition-metal ions, as given in Eq. (7.90), has a Curie–Weiss temperature dependence, and since the shielding is proportional to the susceptibility, we expect the shielding tensor to have the form

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}} g_{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_{\mathrm{I}} k(T-\Theta)} \sum_{\mathrm{A}} \boldsymbol{A}^{(\mathrm{A})}$$
(7.116)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_e(S+1)}{6\hbar\gamma_I k(T-\Theta)}\mathcal{A}.$$
(7.117)

Expanding Eq. (7.117) as a Taylor series in 1/(kT), and equating terms of order  $1/(kT)^2$  as we did for the magnetic susceptibility, we obtain the same expression for the Weiss constant as we calculated in Eq. (7.111). This establishes the Curie–Weiss temperature

dependence of the paramagnetic shift at temperatures above  $|\Theta|$  that is often assumed in the calculation and interpretation of the paramagnetic shifts of solid insulating materials [54,237].

#### 7.7.2. The scaling factor

In Section 3.4 we introduced the idea of Kim et al. [54] that the paramagnetic shielding tensor can be thought of as a quantity that is calculated with all the effective electronic spins aligned with ferromagnetic ordering, and then scaled down into the paramagnetic regime by a factor that accounts for the thermal occupation of the excited electronic spin states. The quantity that is averaged is

$$-\frac{\mathcal{A}}{2\hbar\gamma_{l}B_{0}},$$
(7.118)

where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the total hyperfine coupling tensor calculated in the ferromagnetic regime from the electron density of *all* the unpaired electrons from *all* the paramagnetic centres coupled to the nucleus. This expression is the same as the one quoted in Section 3.4 for noninteracting metal ions, and we again note that the ferromagnetic phase of the material in which the calculation of  $\mathcal{A}$  is performed need not necessarily represent the ground state.

The factor which scales this quantity to give the paramagnetic shielding tensor is the ratio of the Curie spins in the paramagnetic and saturated (i.e. spin-aligned) regimes. The saturated Curie spin  $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{sat}$  is simply -S, as before, and the paramagnetic Curie spin is given by Eq. (7.87), and contains the Curie–Weiss temperature dependence. The scaling factor is therefore

$$\frac{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{para}}}{\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle_{\text{sot}}} = \frac{\Theta B_0}{S\lambda(T - \Theta)}$$
(7.119)

$$=\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_e(S+1)B_0}{3k(T-\Theta)}$$
(7.120)

$$=\frac{\chi B_0}{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e S},\tag{7.121}$$

and has been written in terms of both the local parameters, and the bulk magnetic susceptibility. To go to the second line we have used the expression for the Weiss constant in terms of the mean-field parameter  $\lambda$  as given in Eq. (7.82). The scaled paramagnetic shield-ing tensor is therefore

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mathcal{A}}{2\hbar\gamma_{\mathrm{I}}B_{\mathrm{0}}} \frac{\langle \hat{S}_{z} \rangle_{\mathrm{para}}}{\langle \hat{S}_{z} \rangle_{\mathrm{sat}}}$$
(7.122)

$$= -\frac{\chi}{2\mu_0\mu_{\rm B}g_e\hbar\gamma_I S}\mathcal{A}$$
(7.123)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\mathsf{B}}g_{\mathsf{e}}(\mathsf{S}+1)}{6\hbar\gamma_{\mathsf{I}}k(T-\Theta)}\mathcal{A}.$$
(7.124)

These expressions open up two possibilities for calculating paramagnetic shifts in the solid state. In both cases the hyperfine coupling tensor can be calculated using either quantum chemistry or DFT methods [238,211,54]. The scaling factor can then be calculated either from (1) the experimental magnetic susceptibility or the experimental Weiss constant [54], which have been determined independently from the NMR measurement, or (2) the computed values of the exchange couplings from which a Weiss constant can be calculated.

If SO coupling effects need to be considered, we can employ an alternative form of the scaling factor, as shown in the absence of magnetic ordering in Section 4.4. Here the scaling factor is given by the ratio of the paramagnetic and saturation electronic magnetic moments, in terms of an empirical effective magnetic moment  $\mu_{\rm eff}$ :

$$\frac{\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{\text{para}}}{\langle \hat{m}_z \rangle_{\text{sat}}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{eff}}^2 B_0}{3\mu_{\text{B}} g_e S k (T - \Theta)}.$$
(7.125)

The paramagnetic shielding tensor is then:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{eff}}^{2}}{3\mu_{\mathrm{B}}\mathbf{g}_{e}\hbar\gamma_{I}k(T-\Theta)}\boldsymbol{A}.$$
(7.126)

This is the same as Eq. (4.201), except with the inclusion of the Weiss constant. As discussed in Section 4.4 this form of the shielding tensor is approximate, as it neglects SO coupling effects in the hyperfine tensor and does not account for magnetic anisotropy, which gives rise to the PCS. However it has been successfully used to calculate contact shifts due to first-row *d*-block ions for a range of solid battery electrode materials [31,54–57].

## 7.7.3. A word of caution

In the light of the discussion in Section 7.7.2, and the Curie– Weiss temperature dependence of the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor, there is the very attractive prospect of determining the Weiss constant experimentally from the measured temperature dependence of either the isotropic shift or the SA. For example, at temperatures above  $|\Theta|$ , the isotropic paramagnetic shift  $\delta_{iso}^{s}$  has the dependence

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm S} = \frac{\kappa}{T - \Theta},\tag{7.127}$$

where the constant  $\kappa$  is equal to

$$\kappa = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e(S+1)}{6\hbar\gamma_l k} \mathcal{A}^{\rm FC},\tag{7.128}$$

and  $\mathcal{A}^{FC}$  is the total Fermi-contact coupling constant. Eq. (7.127) can be rearranged to give

$$\frac{1}{\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm S}} = \frac{T}{\kappa} - \frac{\Theta}{\kappa},\tag{7.129}$$

from which one would plot  $1/\delta_{iso}^{S}$  versus *T* to obtain  $\Theta$  from the *y*-intercept, and then relate this to the exchange coupling constants. However there are a number of problems with this approach. The first is that the temperature range over which NMR data can be acquired is generally limited either by the available hardware, or the nature of the material, which may undergo a structural phase transition above or below a certain temperature, or decompose. In such cases there will be a significant error introduced when extrapolating the line in Eq. (7.129) back to T = 0 K to obtain the intercept, and in some cases the errors will be sufficiently large that even the sign of  $\Theta$  cannot be obtained. This problem is exacerbated for large Weiss constants when we note that Eq. (7.129) is only valid at temperatures above  $|\Theta|$ . In practice, this problem can be overcome by taking the susceptibility measured at the temperature of the NMR experiment and using this to calculate the scaling factor.

The second, and more fundamental, problem is that Eq. (7.127) is only valid for spin-only transition-metal ions. For metal ions with SO coupling, the resulting *g*-anisotropy and ZFS splitting tensor combine to give a contribution that varies as  $1/(kT)^2$  in addition to the contribution from the exchange couplings, as seen in Eq. (7.53). The measured Weiss constant is then a function not only of the exchange coupling constants, but also of the *g*- and ZFS tensors, and the different contributions cannot be separated without further experimental or computational data.

## 7.7.4. The magnetic susceptibility and paramagnetic shielding tensors in solid materials with more than one species of paramagnetic metal ion

The previous discussion in Sections 7.6.3 and 7.7.1–7.7.3 focussed on solid materials with only one species of transitionmetal ion, and neglected the effects of SO coupling. We remove the first assumption here, and delay the discussion of SO coupling effects to Section 7.10.

The presence of only one species of transition-metal ion in the material allows us to relate the bulk magnetic properties, such as the magnetic susceptibility and Weiss constant, to the local paramagnetic shielding in a straightforward manner. This is because each metal ion has the same local magnetic properties, which are equal to the average of those of the ensemble. If the material contains more than one species of transition-metal ion this assertion is no longer true, as the average of the bulk properties fails to distinguish the differences between the ions. It therefore appears that we can no longer use the bulk magnetic properties to calculate the shielding tensor. However we show here that a simple modification of the discussion of the scaling factor does indeed allow us to do this with no significant difficulty.

The trick is to break the material up into interpenetrating sublattices, each one of which contains a single species of metal ion. For example a material containing two species of metal ion 1 and 2 can be separated into two sub-lattices, which contain exclusively ions of type 1 and type 2 respectively. We note that this treatment is analogous to that used in the Weiss model of antiferromagnetism, where the two sub-lattices contained metal ions with spin-up and spin-down electron spins. In the present case we can associate a magnetic susceptibility per ion  $\chi^{(A)}$  with the sublattice with metal ions *A*. The sum of these sub-lattice susceptibilities gives the *total* magnetic susceptibility per ion  $\chi$ :

$$\chi = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{A} \chi^{(A)}, \tag{7.130}$$

where *N* is the number of distinct species of metal ion in the material. Each metal ion species has electronic spin  $S^{(A)}$ , and can also be associated with its own Weiss constant  $\Theta^{(A)}$ , which describes the exchange interactions associated with ion *A*, which are assumed to be the same as for all ions of species *A*. In the spin-only approximation this allows us to write  $\chi^{(A)}$  as

$$\chi^{(A)} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 g_e^2 S^{(A)} (S^{(A)} + 1)}{3k(T - \Theta^{(A)})},$$
(7.131)

where the corresponding Weiss constant is

$$\Theta^{(A)} = \frac{2S^{(A)}\left(S^{(A)}+1\right)}{3k} \sum_{B \neq A} \mathcal{J}^{(AB)}.$$
(7.132)

The exchange coupling constants in the expression for the Weiss constant of ion A in Eq. (7.132) describe both the couplings within the sub-lattice A, and also between each ion A and the metal ions in the other sub-lattices.

The total paramagnetic shielding tensor of a particular nuclear spin  $\sigma^{s}$  can be written as the sum of the contributions  $\sigma^{S,(A)}$  from the metal ions from all the sub-lattices:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = \sum_{A} \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S},(A)}. \tag{7.133}$$

In general each contribution  $\sigma^{S,(A)}$  from a sub-lattice *A* contains the hyperfine interactions from all the ions in that sub-lattice. We now see that relating the bulk magnetic properties to the shielding tensor is actually straightforward. We simply scale the hyperfine tensors  $\mathcal{A}^{(A)}$  from each sub-lattice separately according to either Eq. (7.120) or 7.121, using the susceptibility and Weiss constants pertaining to the relevant sub-lattice. The sub-lattice contributions to the shielding tensor  $\sigma^{S,(A)}$  are then given by:



**Fig. 7.5.** Illustration of the direct isotropic exchange interaction between two paramagnetic metal ions at low temperature. One example is given, which shows the exchange that results from  $\sigma$ -overlap between two  $e_g$  orbitals of metal ions  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , each one of which contains an unpaired electron, as is shown in (a). The overlap between both atomic orbitals gives a bonding molecular orbital 1 $\sigma$ , and an anti-bonding molecular orbital  $2\sigma$ , as shown in (b). It can be seen that the two electrons are paired in the  $1\sigma$  orbital, leaving the  $2\sigma$  vacant. The electron pairing results in an overall spin of S = 0, and hence antiferromagnetic alignment.

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathcal{S},(A)} = -\frac{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^{(A)}}{2\hbar\gamma_I B_0} \frac{\langle \widehat{S}_z^{(A)} \rangle_{\text{para}}}{\langle \widehat{S}_z^{(A)} \rangle_{\text{sat}}}$$
(7.134)

$$=-\frac{\chi^{(A)}}{2\mu_0\mu_B g_e \hbar \gamma_I S^{(A)}} \mathcal{A}^{(A)}$$
(7.135)

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e(S^{(A)} + 1)}{6\hbar \gamma_l k (T - \Theta^{(A)})} \mathcal{A}^{(A)}.$$
(7.136)

This process is of particular importance for studying mixed transition-metal ion materials, or materials containing metal ions of mixed valency.

### 7.8. Types of isotropic exchange interaction

In the discussion of the magnetic exchange interactions and their effect on the susceptibility and paramagnetic shielding tensors we have hitherto avoided a detailed discussion of the physical nature of the interactions. We turn to this topic now.

### 7.8.1. Direct exchange

The first mechanism involves the direct interaction between unpaired electrons of neighbouring metal ions, and is known as direct exchange. The interaction is due to the overlap of the atomic orbitals of the two ions, an example of which is shown in Fig. 7.5 (a). Here the two metal ions  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  each possess a halfoccupied orbital of  $e_r$  symmetry, which overlap to form molecular orbitals of  $\sigma$  symmetry. The resulting alignment of the two unpaired electrons at low temperature, i.e. below the magnetic ordering temperature  $T_{\rm C}$  or  $T_{\rm N}$ , can be understood by employing the linear combination of atomic orbitals (LCAO) model. This is the foundation of the Goodenough-Kanamori rules, which allow the prediction of the sign of the exchange coupling constant [239–241]. In this case the LCAO model predicts the formation of two molecular orbitals, which are the  $1\sigma$  bonding and  $2\sigma$  antibonding orbitals. As shown in Fig. 7.5(b) the energy of the  $1\sigma$  lies below that of the two  $e_g$  atomic orbitals, while the energy of the  $2\sigma$  lies above. Therefore the two unpaired electrons both occupy the lower-energy  $1\sigma$  orbital, with configuration  $1\sigma^2$ , and must do so with paired spins to satisfy the Pauli principle. This results in the S = 0 spin state having the lower energy, and the electrons are aligned antiferromagnetically. We note that the S = 1 spin state can only be reached with the higher-energy electronic configuration of  $1\sigma^1 2\sigma^1$ , where occupancy of the anti-bonding orbital causes no net bonding.

Although the direct interaction is the most obvious exchange mechanism, it is not the most prevalent, due to the difficulty of obtaining sufficient overlap between the metal orbitals. For example direct exchange is unlikely to be effective between lanthanide ions, since the contracted nature of the 4*f* orbitals means that there

is negligible overlap over typical atomic spacings. For *d*-transition metals the *d*-orbitals extend further from the nucleus, and so direct overlap is more common particularly for the less radially-contracted 3*d* ions on the left-hand side of the 3*d* series, and the larger 4*d* and 5*d* ions. However other exchange mechanisms are generally more important in determining the magnetic properties of *d*-transition-metal materials.

#### 7.8.2. Superexchange

Many ionic solid materials, such as metal oxides, exhibit magnetic ordering at low temperatures even though there is no direct overlap between the metal-ion orbitals. In these cases the exchange interaction is indirect, and occurs via an intermediate bridging anion, such as  $O^{2-}$ . This mechanism, which is clearly longer range than direct exchange, is referred to as superexchange. The superexchange mechanism is dominated by the overlap of the two metal orbitals with the orbitals of the bridging anion, and may be ferro- or antiferromagnetic depending on the exact nature of the overlap. An example of each is shown in Fig. 7.6. In Fig. 7.6(a) is shown the orbital overlap that occurs when the metal ions M<sub>1</sub> and  $M_2$  and  $O^{2-}$  ion are arranged as  $M_1$ –O– $M_2$  with a bridging angle of 180°. The two half-filled metal  $e_g$  orbitals both overlap with the filled oxygen  $2p_{\sigma}$  orbital to give three molecular orbitals of  $\sigma$  symmetry, labelled  $1\sigma$ ,  $2\sigma$ , and  $3\sigma$ , as shown in Fig. 7.6(b). The four electrons fill the  $1\sigma$  and  $2\sigma$  orbitals as two pairs, giving a configuration of  $1\sigma^2 2\sigma^2$  with S = 0. This superexchange interaction is therefore antiferromagnetic.

A different result arises in the situation shown in Fig. 7.6(c)where the M<sub>1</sub>–O–M<sub>2</sub> bridging angle is 90°. In this case an unfilled  $t_{2g}$  orbital of each metal ions overlaps with a different filled oxygen  $2p_{\pi}$  orbital. Therefore the orbitals formed by M<sub>1</sub>–O overlap are orthogonal to those formed by M2-O overlap. The resulting molecular orbitals are shown in Fig. 7.6(d), and comprise a doublydegenerate  $1\pi$  bonding level, and a doubly-degenerate  $2\pi$  antibonding level. The low-temperature electronic configuration of the six electrons is  $1\pi^4 2\pi^2$ , i.e. the two  $1\pi$  orbitals are filled with two pairs of electrons, with the remaining two electrons in the  $2\pi$ orbitals. The lowest-energy arrangement of these latter two electrons is that they occupy different  $2\pi$  orbitals with parallel spins, according to Hund's first rule. The lowest-energy spin state is therefore S = 1 and the alignment is ferromagnetic. It is generally observed that the ferromagnetic superexchange interaction is weaker than antiferromagnetic superexchange. It is also worth noting that, in the second example in Fig. 7.6(c) and (d), direct overlap between the two metal  $t_{2g}$  orbitals may occur if the distance is sufficiently short, resulting in an antiferromagnetic direct exchange interaction in addition to the ferromagnetic superexchange interaction. This has been suggested to happen in Li<sub>2</sub>MnO<sub>3</sub>, with direct exchange between the two Mn<sup>4+</sup> ions proving to be the dominant interaction, resulting in antiferromagnetic alignment [242].

#### 7.8.3. Double exchange

Some metal oxide materials contain metal ions which are present in more than one oxidation state and exhibit a ferromagnetic exchange interaction. This is due to the double exchange mechanism, which is illustrated in Fig. 7.7 for an interaction between  $Mn^{3+}$  and  $Mn^{4+}$ , which have free-ion electronic configurations of  $3d^4$  and  $3d^3$ . In an octahedral ligand field the electronic configurations are  $t^3_{2g}e^1_g$  and  $t^3_{2g}$ , and have effective spins of S = 2 and S = 3/2due to Hund's first rule. In the double-exchange mechanism the  $e_g$ electron of the  $Mn^{3+}$  ion can hop into a vacant  $e_g$  orbital of the  $Mn^{4+}$ ion on a neighbouring site. This hopping electron does not undergo a change in spin polarization, and so this process is only energetically favourable if the polarization of this electron matches that of the  $t_{2g}$  electrons in the destination ion. This means that the  $Mn^{4+}$ 



**Fig. 7.6.** Illustration of the indirect isotropic superexchange interaction between two paramagnetic metal ions via a bridging anion at low temperature. Two examples are given which show the superexchange that results from the overlap between the atomic orbitals of two metal ions  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , each one of which contains an unpaired electron, and the filled 2p orbitals of a bridging  $O^{2-}$  anion. In the first example, shown in (a) two metal  $e_g$  orbitals interact with one filled oxygen  $2p_\sigma$  orbital with a 180° bridging angle to give molecular orbitals of  $\sigma$  symmetry. Three such orbitals are formed, labelled  $1\sigma$ ,  $2\sigma$ , and  $3\sigma$ , as shown in (b). The four electrons occupy the bonding  $1\sigma$  and  $2\sigma$  orbitals in pairs, leaving the anti-bonding  $3\sigma$  orbital vacant. The total spin is S = 0, and hence the interaction is antiferromagnetic. A different example is shown in (c) and (d), in which the bridging angle is 90°, and involving two orthogonal atomic orbitals of the bridging oxygen. The  $t_{2g}$  orbitals of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  each overlap with a different oxygen  $2p_{\pi}$  orbital, resulting in two separate  $\pi$  interactions as shown in (c). The energy levels are shown in (d), from which can be seen that a pair of degenerate  $1\pi$  bonding orbitals are formed. Four of the six electrons fill the two  $1\pi$  as two pairs, with the remaining two occupying the  $2\pi$  orbitals. According to Hund's first rule these latter two electrons occupy different  $2\pi$  orbitals with parallel spins, thus giving ferromagnetic alignment with S = 1.

 $t_{2g}$  electrons must have the same polarization as the Mn<sup>3+</sup>  $t_{2g}$  electrons, which in turn requires ferromagnetic alignment of the two metal ions.

Double exchange is also an important exchange mechanism in iron materials of mixed valency, i.e. containing  $Fe^{2+}$  ( $3d^{6}$ ) and  $Fe^{3+}$  ( $3d^{5}$ ).

#### 7.8.4. Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuya-Yosida exchange

The final mechanism we consider here is Ruderman–Kittel–Ka suya–Yosida (RKKY) exchange, which is observed in metals. The interaction occurs between two localized effective electronic spins via the conduction electrons, hence it is an indirect exchange mechanism and may occur over long distances. It can be shown that the exchange constant varies with distance *r* as

$$\mathcal{J}^{(AB)} \propto \frac{\cos(2k_{\rm F}r)}{r^3},\tag{7.137}$$

(where  $k_F$  is defined in Section 2.3.3) i.e. the sign oscillates with distance, and so the interaction may be either ferro- or antiferromagnetic [188].

#### 7.9. Predicting the Fermi-contact shift with the Goodenough-Kanamori rules

In solid-oxide materials the isotropic paramagnetic shift is usually dominated by electron transfer processes, and is therefore given by the Fermi-contact shift. Therefore we now examine the problem of interpreting and rationalizing the Fermi-contact shifts obtained in such materials. It turns out that we can use the Goodenough–Kanamori rules [239–241] to make simple predictions about the Fermi-contact shift which have proved to represent a practical and intuitive method with which to interpret the NMR spectra of, for example, a series of paramagnetic battery materials [5]. The concepts introduced in this section are therefore closely related to those for predicting the sign of the isotropic exchange coupling constants introduced in Section 7.8.

The isotropic Fermi-contact shift can be determined from Eq. (7.124) to be

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm FC} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B} g_e(S+1)}{6\hbar\gamma_I k(T-\Theta)} \mathcal{A}^{\rm FC},\tag{7.138}$$

where we have focussed on a single sub-lattice containing a single species of metal ion. However the ideas discussed here are easily generalized to materials containing more than one metal-ion species, and also to systems with no magnetic ordering, such as paramagnetic molecules in solution. The Fermi-contact shift is proportional to the Fermi-contact coupling constant, which is given by Eq. (2.171) and reproduced below for convenience:

$$\mathcal{A}^{\text{FC}} = \frac{2\mu_0 \mu_B g_e \hbar \gamma_I}{3} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{0}).$$
(7.139)

Thus the Fermi-contact shift is proportional to, and has the same sign as, the unpaired electron density  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$  that is within the *s*-orbital of the nucleus. In general accurate values of  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$  require either quantum-chemical or DFT calculations. However it may be possible to determine and/or rationalise the sign of  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$ , and hence the sign of the Fermi-contact shift, more simply by using the Goodenough-Kanamori rules [239–241]. The rules stem from the fact that, on the formation of a bonding interaction between two atoms, the atomic orbitals of compatible symmetry of the two atoms combine to form a molecule orbital, or 'bond'. The electrons present in both atomic orbitals are now shared between the



**Fig. 7.7.** Illustration of the indirect isotropic double-exchange interaction between two paramagnetic metal ions of different valency. The two interacting ions are the  $Mn^{3+}$  and  $Mn^{4+}$  cations in octahedral coordination environments, and with electronic configurations of  $t_{2g}^3 e_g^1$  and  $t_{2g}^3$  respectively. The single  $e_g$  electron on the  $Mn^{3+}$  ion undergoes hopping to a vacant  $e_g$  orbital of  $Mn^{4+}$  as shown by the red arrow. This hopping occurs without a change in electron polarization, and so is energetically most favourable when the electrons of  $Mn^{3+}$  are spin-aligned so they are parallel to those of  $Mn^{4+}$ , according to Hund's first rule. The double-exchange interaction is therefore ferromagnetic.

two atoms. In particular any unpaired electrons present on one atom become delocalised, or partially transferred, into the atomic orbitals of the second, and if the second orbital is an *s*-orbital this *delocalisation mechanism* results in a Fermi-contact shift. Alternatively the *s*-orbital may form a bond with an unoccupied metal orbital. If this metal orbital receives electron density as a result this density must be spin-aligned to any other unpaired electrons in other metal orbitals. This results in unpaired electron density with a well-defined polarization being transferred to the *s*-orbital. This *polarization mechanism* also results in a Fermi-contact shift. The essence of the Goodenough–Kanamori rules is that this electronic spin transfer occurs so that the total electronic spin angular momentum of the system is conserved.

An illustration of the use of the Goodenough-Kanamori rules to predict the sign of the Fermi-contact shift is given by three examples in Fig. 7.8. Part (a) shows the simplest case, where a half-filled atomic orbital of a metal ion M overlaps with a vacant s-orbital on the atom X with the NMR-active nucleus. The single unpaired spinup electron on M is shared between the two atoms with a certain proportion being delocalised into the vacant orbital of X. The transferred electron density must have the same spin polarisation as the original electron, and so is also spin up. The result is that the net spin density  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$  is positive, and hence the Fermi-contact shift is also positive. The second example, shown in (b), is the case where the half-filled M-orbital overlaps with the vacant s-orbital on X via a filled atomic orbital of a bridging atom, say oxygen O. In this case the delocalisation is a transfer of two electrons from the O atom, one to each of the other two atoms M and X. Since the unpaired electron already present on M is spin up, any additional electronic spin partially transferred from O must be of the opposite polarisation so as to satisfy the Pauli exclusion principle. The remaining spin-up electron on O is then partially transferred into the s-orbital of X, thus giving a net positive spin density at the nucleus and a positive Fermi-contact shift. In the final example (c) the M-orbital involved in the overlap with O and X is vacant, and the only electrons present in the molecular orbitals are the pair on O. The M-orbital that contains the spin-up unpaired electron, shown as having lower energy in (c), does not have compatible symmetry with either the O- or X-orbitals, and so does not participate directly in any covalent bonding. The unpaired electron density that is now transferred from O to the vacant M-orbital must have the same polarisation as the unpaired electron in the second M-orbital, i.e. spin-up, so as to satisfy the requirements of Hund's first rule, and therefore the electronic spin density transferred from O to X is spin down. This polarization mechanism results in a net negative spin density at the X nucleus, and therefore a negative Fermi-contact shift.



Fig. 7.8. Schematic illustrating the transfer of unpaired-electron spin density between the orbitals of a transition-metal ion M and the vacant s-orbital of the NMR-active nucleus X, possibly via the filled orbital of a bridging atom O. The unpaired electrons formally present in each orbital are illustrated with black arrows. The transfer of polarisation is indicated with a curved red arrow, and the transferred spin is shown with a small red arrow. In (a) is shown the direct delocalisation of an unpaired electron on M to the vacant orbital on X. Both the unpaired electron and the transferred polarisation have the same 'up' polarisation, giving a positive spin density  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$  at X, and therefore a positive Fermi-contact shift. In (b) is shown the spin transfer that occurs when the M orbital, which contains a single spin-up electron, interacts with a vacant X-orbital via the filled orbital of the bridging atom O. Transferred polarisation from the O-orbital of both the 'up' and 'down' electrons occurs, with the latter being transferred to the Morbital to satisfy the Pauli principle, and the former being transferred to X to give both a positive spin density and Fermi-contact shift. The situation in (c) is similar with the exception that the M-orbital that interacts with the filled O-orbital is unoccupied. The result is that the 'up' electron is transferred to the vacant M-orbital so as to satisfy Hund's first rule and be spin-aligned with the unpaired electron in the lower-energy half-filled M-orbital. The 'down' electron is therefore transferred to X, giving a negative spin density at X, which results in a negative Fermi-contact shift. The situations in (a) and (b) are examples of unpaired-electron delocalization, and the situation in (c) is an example of unpaired-electron polarization.

Fig. 7.9 shows how the Goodenough-Kanamori rules are applied in practice using the solid lithium manganates as examples [5]. In these materials M =  $Mn^{4+}$  has a  $3d^3$  electronic configuration, which becomes  $t_{2g}^3$  in octahedral coordination sites, i.e. the  $t_{2g}$  orbitals are each half filled, and the  $e_g$  are vacant. The O atom forms the bridge via the filled 2p orbitals, and X is the Li<sup>+</sup> ion which possesses a vacant 2s orbital into which the unpaired electron density is transferred. The metal-lithium interactions are formed by sets of Mn<sup>4+</sup>-O<sup>2-</sup>--Li<sup>+</sup> bonds, which are characterised by the angle subtended at the O atom. The signs of the Fermi-contact shifts can be rationalised easily in two special cases of bond geometry, namely when the bond angle is either close to, or equal to, 90° or 180°. Fig. 7.9(a) shows the overlap of the orbitals for a 90° bond angle. A half-filled  $t_{2g}$  orbital of  $Mn^{4+}$  is of the correct symmetry to overlap with one of the filled  $2p_{\pi}$ orbitals of O to give a  $\pi$ -bond, which in turn overlaps with the vacant Li<sup>+</sup> 2s orbital. As discussed above and shown in Fig. 7.8(b), this form of overlap gives a positive Fermi-contact shift for both <sup>6</sup>Li and <sup>7</sup>Li. In addition, direct overlap between the  $t_{2g}$  and 2s orbitals is possible, which also results in a positive shift as shown in Fig. 7.8(a). In this bonding geometry the vacant  $e_g$  orbitals make no contribution as their symmetry properties result in there being no net overlap between them and the Li<sup>+</sup> 2s, either directly or through any bridging O 2p orbital. By contrast a 180° bonding angle gives the overlap of orbitals shown in Fig. 7.9(b). In this case the  $t_{2g}$ -2 $p_{\pi}$   $\pi$ -bond has symmetry that is incompatible with that of the Li<sup>+</sup> 2s orbital, and



**Fig. 7.9.** Illustration of the orbital overlap and electron spin transfer in an  $Mn^{4+}$ –O–Li arrangement of ions in the solid lithium manganates, for 90° and 180° angles subtended at O [5]. The unpaired electrons formally present in each orbital are illustrated with black arrows. The transfer of polarisation is indicated with a curved red arrow, and the transferred spin is shown with a small red arrow. In (a) is shown the orbital overlap that occurs in a  $Mn^{4+}$ –O–Li link with a 90° angle. Both direct overlap between the M  $t_{2g}$  and the Li<sup>+</sup> 2s orbitals, indicated by the dashed line, and overlap via the filled bridging O 2*p* orbitals are possible, both of which result in a positive Fermi-contact shift via electron delocalization as shown in Fig. 7.8(a) and (b). In (b) is shown the orbital overlap that occurs spin density being transferred to the 2*s* orbital via polarization, and hence a negative Fermi-contact shift as shown in Fig. 7.8(c).

so does not contribute directly. However the  $\sigma$ -overlap between a vacant  $e_g$  orbital and a filled O  $2p_{\sigma}$  gives a  $\sigma$ -bond which does have a net overlap with the Li<sup>+</sup> 2s orbital. The electronic spin transferred to the  $e_g$  must be spin up, so as to be aligned with the unpaired electrons in the  $t_{2g}$  orbital which, as shown in Fig. 7.8(c), results in both a negative electronic spin density transferred to the Li<sup>+</sup> 2s, and a negative Fermi-contact shift for <sup>6</sup>Li and <sup>7</sup>Li.

## 7.10. The magnetic susceptibility and paramagnetic shielding tensors in solid materials due to metal ions with SO coupling

We now extend the Curie–Weiss description of the paramagnetic shielding tensor in solid insulator materials by including the effects of SO coupling. In particular we once again provide a link between the bulk magnetic properties, namely the magnetic susceptibility tensor and the Weiss constant, and the local paramagnetic shielding tensor. Whilst we include the effects of SO coupling on the *g*- and ZFS tensors, we continue to neglect the SO contributions to the exchange interactions, namely the DM interaction, as well as the NR dipolar coupling. The justification for this is that isotropic exchange is the most important contribution to the interactions between the metal ions.

In the following discussion we assume for simplicity that only one species of transition-metal ion is present. However we note that the extension to more than one species is easily made by using the sub-lattice model of Section 7.7.4. The assumption of one species of metal ion is not as trivial a point as it first appears. The reason is that it restricts all the metal ions to have the same *g*- and ZFS tensors. Importantly this means that not only must, for example, the *g*-tensors have the same principal components, but they must also have PAFs with the same orientation. Even if the unit cell contains only one metal ion, the solid may not satisfy the singlespecies condition. For example consider the battery cathode material LiFePO<sub>4</sub>, the unit cell of which contains one Fe<sup>2+</sup> site. However closer inspection reveals that there are actually four Fe<sup>2+</sup> sites that are related to each other by rotational symmetry operations. This means that, whilst the four Fe<sup>2+</sup> ions have the same principal values for the *g*- and ZFS tensors, their PAFs have different orientations which are related to each other by the same rotational symmetry operations. Therefore in order to describe this system we would require four separate sub-lattices.

### 7.10.0.1. The magnetic susceptibility tensor

Assuming only one species of transition-metal ion we can write down the magnetic susceptibility tensor per metal ion  $\chi_{ij}$  to second order in 1/(kT) as an extension of Eq. (7.98):

$$\begin{split} \chi_{ij} &= \mu_0 \mu_B^2 \Bigg[ \frac{\beta}{\omega} \sum_{B} \sum_{qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} \mathrm{Tr}_S \Big( \hat{S}_{1-q}^{(A)} \hat{S}_{1-q'}^{(B)} \Big) \\ &- \frac{\beta^2}{\omega} \sum_{B,\Gamma} \sum_{qq'q''} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} D_{2q''}^{(\Gamma)} \mathrm{Tr}_S \Big( \hat{S}_{1-q}^{(A)} \hat{S}_{1-q'}^{(B)} \hat{S}_{1-q''}^{(\Gamma)} \Big) \\ &- \frac{\beta^2}{\omega} \sum_{B} \sum_{\Gamma > \Delta} \sum_{qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} g_{1q',j}^{(B)} J_{00}^{(\Gamma\Delta)} (11) \mathrm{Tr}_S \Big( \hat{S}_{1-q}^{(A)} \hat{S}_{1-q'}^{(B)} \hat{T}_{00}^{(\Gamma\Delta)} (11) \Big) \Bigg], \end{split}$$

$$(7.140)$$

where we have included the second-order contribution from the ZFS tensor. As for Eq. (7.98), and with reference to Appendix E, we simplify the expressions for the traces to obtain:

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)}{3kT} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T - \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30(kT)^2} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T + \frac{2\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S^2(S+1)^2}{9(kT)^2} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T \sum_{B \neq A} \mathcal{J}^{(AB)}.$$
(7.141)

We have seen the first two terms before, which are simply the firstand second-order contributions that also occur in systems with no magnetic ordering, and which depend on the matrix products  $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{g}^T$ and  $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{g}^T$  respectively. The third term, which depends on the exchange coupling constants, is analogous to the second term in Eq. (7.109), with the factor  $g_e^2$  replaced with  $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{g}^T$ . Note that the form of this susceptibility tensor requires the metal ions to have the same *g*-tensor **g** and ZFS tensor **D**.

In order to link the susceptibility Eq. (7.141) Weiss constant we require a phenomenological expression for  $\chi$  that depends on  $\Theta$ . For this we propose the following modified version of Eq. (7.90), into which we have introduced the *g*- and ZFS tensors:

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)}{3k(T-\Theta)} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T - \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30k^2(T-\Theta)^2} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T.$$
(7.142)

In order to link this expression to Eq. (7.141) we expand the former as a Taylor series in 1/(kT) to second order, which gives us

$$\boldsymbol{\chi} \approx \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)}{3kT} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T - \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30(kT)^2} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{D} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T + \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B^2 S(S+1)}{3kT^2} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}^T \boldsymbol{\Theta}.$$
(7.143)

On comparing terms in this expression and Eq. (7.141) with the same temperature dependence we obtain the same expression for the Weiss constant as calculated previously in Eq. (7.111).

#### 7.10.0.2. The paramagnetic shielding tensor

We now calculate the SO coupling expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor, where we include the SO coupling contributions to the g-, ZFS, and hyperfine tensors, but only consider the isotropic exchange coupling constants. From the discussion in Appendix E we obtain the following expression for the shielding tensor:

$$\begin{split} \sigma_{ij}^{S} &= -\frac{\mu_{B}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}} \left[ \frac{\beta}{\omega} \sum_{A,B} \sum_{qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} A_{1q',j}^{(B)} \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \left( \hat{S}_{1-q}^{(A)} \hat{S}_{1-q'}^{(B)} \right) \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{\beta^{2}}{\omega} \sum_{A,B,\Gamma} \sum_{qq'q''} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} A_{1q',j}^{(B)} D_{2q''}^{(\Gamma)} \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \left( \hat{S}_{1-q}^{(A)} \hat{S}_{1-q'}^{(B)} \hat{S}_{2-q''}^{(\Gamma)} \right) \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{\beta^{2}}{\omega} \sum_{A,B} \sum_{\Gamma > \Delta} \sum_{qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{1q,i}^{(A)} A_{1q',j}^{(B)} J_{00}^{(\Gamma\Delta)} (11) \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \left( \hat{S}_{1-q}^{(A)} \hat{S}_{1-q'}^{(B)} \hat{T}_{00}^{(\Gamma\Delta)} (11) \right) \right. \end{split}$$

Following the calculation of the expressions for the traces we obtain the following expression:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S} = -\frac{\mu_{B}S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma_{I}kT}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\sum_{A}\boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} + \frac{\mu_{B}S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30(kT)^{2}}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{D}\cdot\sum_{A}\boldsymbol{A}^{(A)} - \frac{2\mu_{B}g_{e}S^{2}(S+1)^{2}}{9\hbar\gamma_{I}(kT)^{2}}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\sum_{A}\sum_{B\neq A}\mathcal{J}^{(AB)}\boldsymbol{A}^{(B)},$$
(7.145)

where the first term is the first-order contribution that depends only on the *g*-tensor, the second term is a second-order contribution that depends on the *g*- and ZFS tensors, and the third term contains all the information about the exchange couplings. The first step in linking this expression with the Weiss constant is to write the many-electron hyperfine tensors  $A^{(A)}$  in terms of the total hyperfine tensors A using Eqs. (7.113) and (7.114):

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{S}+1)}{6\hbar\gamma_{\mathrm{I}}kT}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} + \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{S}+1)(2\mathrm{S}-1)(2\mathrm{S}+3)}{60(kT)^{2}}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} - \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{S}+1)^{2}}{9\hbar\gamma_{\mathrm{I}}(kT)^{2}}\sum_{\boldsymbol{R}\neq\boldsymbol{A}}\mathcal{J}^{(\mathrm{AB})}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}.$$
(7.146)

The phenomenological expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor is given by an expression that is analogous to the magnetic susceptibility tensor in Eq. (7.142):

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{S}+1)}{6\hbar\gamma_{\mathrm{I}}k(T-\Theta)}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}} + \frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}(\mathrm{S}+1)(2\mathrm{S}-1)(2\mathrm{S}+3)}{60k^{2}(T-\Theta)^{2}}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mathcal{D}}\cdot\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}$$
(7.147)

Expanding this as a Taylor series in 1/(kT) and comparing the secondorder terms, we once again obtain the expression for the Weiss constant in Eq. (7.111). Eq. (7.147) is therefore a practical expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor in a solid exhibiting magnetic ordering. If the solid contains more than one species of metal ion, we may repeat the analysis of Section 7.7.4, and treat Eq. (7.147) as the contribution to the shielding tensor from a single sub-lattice containing one species of metal ion. For the example of LiFePO<sub>4</sub> introduced above, this would require the specification of four sub-lattices, each corresponding to a Fe<sup>2+</sup> ion with a different PAF orientation.

# 7.11. Exchange interactions between transition-metal ions and lanthanides

Throughout this chapter we have focussed exclusively on the exchange interactions between transition-metal ions, and the consequences for the paramagnetic shift. Before we leave this topic we very briefly note the additional effects that we may expect from an exchange interaction between a transition-metal ion and a lanthanide ion. For such a spin system it has been shown that the exchange Hamiltonian is given by the expressions in Eqs. (7.29)– (7.31) to which have been added terms of higher degree in the electronic spin operators [232]. The most important of these is the biquadratic exchange, which takes the form [243]

$$\sum_{A>B} K^{(AB)} \left( \widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(A)} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{S}}^{(B)} \right)^2, \tag{7.148}$$

where the sum is restricted to only include interactions between one transition-metal ion and one lanthanide ion, and  $K^{(AB)}$  is the biquadratic exchange coupling constant. These terms can be included in the irreducible spherical tensor form of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (7.32) by adding terms of spatial and spin ranks greater than two to give a new Hamiltonian of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{H}}_{0} &= \sum_{A} \sum_{kq} (-1)^{q} D_{kq}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)} \\ &+ \sum_{A > B} \sum_{kq} (-1)^{q} J_{kq}^{(AB)}(k_{1}k_{2}) \widehat{T}_{k-q}^{(AB)}(k_{1}k_{2}). \end{aligned}$$
(7.149)

This Hamiltonian can be used in conjunction with the EPR formalism to derive a general form of the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor, using the method in Appendix E.

### 7.12. The paramagnetic shift in metals

We now turn to the final topic of this chapter, which is the paramagnetic shift in metals. This shift was first described by Townes and Knight, and is referred to as the Knight shift [244]. It is interesting to compare the form of the Knight shift in metals with the corresponding paramagnetic shifts in insulators. We will see that there are striking similarities, as well as important differences. The latter are due to the differences in the paramagnetism in the two materials. We have seen that in insulators, the unpaired electrons are largely localized on the paramagnetic centres, which act as effective electronic spins S. In the paramagnetic regime, above the ordering temperature, these effective spins act independently of each other, which can result in large magnetic susceptibilities and induced magnetic moments. On the other hand, in metals at zero temperature the electrons occupy orbitals that are delocalized across the entire lattice with energies up to the Fermi energy. The electrons are paired, and so the material is diamagnetic. On increasing the temperature the orbitals just above the Fermi level are partially populated at the expense of those just below and the material exhibits paramagnetism. The key difference to insulators is that in metals only the electrons close to the Fermi level contribute to the paramagnetism, and these are delocalized across the entire lattice. The resulting magnetic susceptibilities are therefore much smaller than in insulators and, as will be discussed later, essentially temperature independent above 0 K. We should note that the form of the Knight shift is also valid for the paramagnetic shifts of semiconductors [245]. We derive the form of the Knight shift here, following the protocols of Slichter [246] and Abragam [184].

### 7.12.1. The Knight shift

Like all paramagnetic shifts, the Knight shift of a nuclear spin is due to the hyperfine interaction with the unpaired electrons. For metals the correct form of the hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian is given in Eq. (2.191). We note that, as for other paramagnetic systems, the electronic relaxation dynamics are several orders of magnitude faster than the nuclear spin dynamics. This means that, in effect, the nuclear spins actually interact with the average electronic magnetic moments. We account for this by modifying the hyperfine coupling Hamiltonian in Eq. (2.191) by computing its expectation value with the wavefunction that is the product of the spatial ground state of Eq. (2.26), and a spin wavefunction which is the correctly symmetrized product of the one-electron functions  $|m\rangle$ . We make the assumption that the metal has cubic symmetry, and that therefore we only need to consider the contact interaction, and furthermore we do not consider SO coupling effects. The resulting Knight shift is therefore purely spatially isotropic, and takes the form of a Fermi-contact shift. The role of the spin-dipolar interaction and the susceptibility anisotropy would be to introduce an SA, which for metals is generally smaller than the isotropic shift [184].

Following these assertions and assumptions the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  describing the nuclear spin interaction with the average electronic magnetic moments is given by the contact part of Eq. (2.191) following the calculation of the expectation value in the manyelectron space-spin wavefunction. Since  $\delta(\mathbf{r}_l)$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_l$  are oneelectron space and spin operators and the one-electron wavefunctions are orthogonal, the only terms of the wavefunction in Eq. (2.26) that contribute are those with no permutations of the electron labels. The Hamiltonian is therefore

$$\widehat{H} = \frac{2}{3} \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I \sum_l \langle \phi_{\mathbf{k}_l}(\mathbf{r}_l) | \delta(\mathbf{r}_l) | \phi_{\mathbf{k}_l}(\mathbf{r}_l) \rangle \langle m_l | \hat{\mathbf{s}}_l | m_l \rangle \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}, \qquad (7.150)$$

where we have placed the nucleus at the origin  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$ . Whilst the sum is over all the electrons *l* in the metal, we note that only those electrons present in partially filled orbitals actually make a net contribution to both the hyperfine interaction and  $\hat{H}$ . As discussed before these electrons occupy states that lie close to the Fermi level. To simply this Hamiltonian we replace the sum over *l* with a double sum over the wavevectors  $\mathbf{k}$  in the partially occupied band, as the other filled bands make no net contribution, and the electronic spin states *m*. We also note that, as the external magnetic field is applied along *z*, the nuclear spin system is quantised along *z* and we retain only the component  $\hat{I}_z$  in the scalar product. The result is

$$\widehat{H} = \frac{2}{3} \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I \widehat{I}_z \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},m} |\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^2 m f_m(\boldsymbol{k})$$
(7.151)

$$=\frac{2}{3}\mu_0\mu_B g_e h\gamma_1 \widehat{I}_z \sum_{\boldsymbol{k},\boldsymbol{m}} \frac{1}{V} |\boldsymbol{u}_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{0})|^2 m f_m(\boldsymbol{k}), \qquad (7.152)$$

where we have included the Fermi–Dirac distribution function  $f_m(\mathbf{k})$  for electrons in spin state m. This function provides the necessary weighting to the state populations as a result of the non-zero temperature, and replaces the Boltzmann distribution function used for insulators.

At this point we are able to make the connection between this interaction and the bulk magnetic properties of the metal. When an external magnetic field is applied to the metal, the electrons with wavevector **k** are partially aligned with the field, and can be described by an average magnetic moment per electron  $\langle \hat{\mu}_{k,z} \rangle$ . This is given by

$$\langle \hat{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{k},z} \rangle = -\mu_{\rm B} g_e \sum_m m f_m(\boldsymbol{k}) \tag{7.153}$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_e \big[f_{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{k}) - f_{\beta}(\boldsymbol{k})\big], \qquad (7.154)$$

which is proportional to the difference in populations of electrons with different polarizations in the state k. Written in terms of the average electronic magnetic moments the Hamiltonian becomes

$$\widehat{H} = -\frac{2}{3}\mu_0 \hbar \gamma_I \widehat{I}_z \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}} |\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{0})|^2 \langle \hat{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{k},z} \rangle.$$
(7.155)

This form of the expression emphasises that electrons far from the Fermi level, for which  $f_{\alpha}(\mathbf{k}) \approx f_{\beta}(\mathbf{k})$ , have zero net magnetic moment as indicated by Eq. (7.154), and do not contribute. In com-

plete analogy with paramagnetic molecules in solution, or paramagnetic insulators, the average electronic magnetic moment due to wavevector  $\mathbf{k}$  is proportional to  $B_0$ :

$$\langle \hat{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{k},z} \rangle = \frac{1}{\mu_0} \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}} B_0, \qquad (7.156)$$

where the  $\chi_{\mathbf{k}}$  is the magnetic susceptibility per electron with wavevector  $\mathbf{k}$ . The sum of these susceptibilities divided by the volume of the system is the total magnetic susceptibility per unit volume, which for metals is called the Pauli susceptibility  $\chi_{\rm P}$ :

$$\chi_{\rm P} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}} \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}.$$
(7.157)

In terms of the individual magnetic susceptibilities the Hamiltonian is

$$\widehat{H} = -\frac{2}{3}\hbar\gamma_I B_0 \widehat{I}_z \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^2 \chi_{\mathbf{k}}.$$
(7.158)

This clearly has the form of a chemical shielding Hamiltonian:

$$H = \hbar \gamma_I \sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm K} B_0 I_z, \tag{7.159}$$

with an isotropic shielding  $\sigma_{iso}^{K}$ . In the shift convention we write the Knight shift  $K = -\sigma_{iso}^{K}$  as

$$K = \frac{2}{3} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}} |\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{0})|^2 \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}}.$$
(7.160)

We can see that this form of the Knight shift is a sum of terms due to each electron, with each term proportional to the product of the density of that electron at the nucleus  $|\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2$ , and its isotropic magnetic susceptibility  $\chi_k$ . Therefore each term is equivalent in form to a Fermi-contact shift from one electron, but with two differences. Firstly the magnetic susceptibility per electron has a different form to that for independent electrons, as discussed in Section 7.12.2. Secondly we note that the Knight shift is written as a sum over electronic spatial states that appear to be independent, whereas for a paramagnetic centre in an insulator we combine the electrons into a single effective spin with a total unpaired spin density. This appears to be a significant difference, but we now show that we can rewrite the expression for the Knight shift in terms of a single contribution that has a form closer to that of the Fermi-contact shift.

We can simplify the sum over k by recalling that as the volume of the system becomes infinitely large, the spacing between the allowed values of k decreases until the wavevector space becomes a continuum, and we can replace the sum with an integral over energy as in Eq. (2.30):

$$\lim_{V \to \infty} \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\boldsymbol{k}} |\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{0})|^2 \chi_{\boldsymbol{k}} = \int \langle |\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \chi(E_{\boldsymbol{k}}) g(E_{\boldsymbol{k}}) dE_{\boldsymbol{k}}.$$
(7.161)

Here we have acknowledged that the magnetic susceptibilities  $\chi_k$  only depend on k via the energies  $E_k$ , and so the susceptibilities are written as  $\chi(E_k)$ . However the electron spin densities  $|\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2$  have a more complicated dependence on k, and so must be averaged over all values of k that have the same energy  $E_k$  before we compute the integral. We recall that the only electrons that contribute to the Knight shift are those that are close to, i.e. within a range kT of, the Fermi level. We also assume that the variation of the average of the spin density  $\langle |\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_k}$  over this range of energies is small, and so we can replace the average at energy  $E_k$  with the average over the Fermi energy. This allows us to bring the factor of  $\langle |\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_k}$  outside the integral to give

$$\lim_{V \to \infty} \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^2 \chi_{\mathbf{k}} = \langle |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_{\mathrm{F}}} \int \chi(E_{\mathbf{k}}) g(E_{\mathbf{k}}) \mathrm{d}E_{\mathbf{k}}$$
(7.162)

$$= \langle |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_{\mathrm{F}}} \chi_{\mathrm{P}}, \qquad (7.163)$$

where to go to the last line we have written the total Pauli susceptibility as the integral

$$\chi_{\rm P} = \int \chi(E_k) g(E_k) dE_k. \tag{7.164}$$

The Knight shift now takes the simple form

$$K = \frac{2}{3} \langle |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_{\rm F}} \chi_{\rm P} V.$$
(7.165)

This expression is a contact shift proportional to the total susceptibility of the metal  $\chi_P V$ , and the average one-electron spin density at the Fermi level  $\langle |\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_F}$ . To further investigate the form of the Knight shift, we need an expression for the Pauli susceptibility.

### 7.12.2. The Pauli magnetic susceptibility

The origin of the paramagnetic magnetic moment in a metal induced by an external magnetic field  $B_0$  can be understood from Fig. 7.10. In the absence of the external field the electrons are divided into two bands with spin polarization  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , referred to as the spin-up and spin-down bands respectively. Both bands have the same density of states at all energies, given by Eq. (2.33), and both bands are equally populated as shown in Fig. 7.10(a). When we apply the magnetic field the electrons acquire an additional Zeeman energy term  $\mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0 m$ , where *m* is the magnetic-quantum number for a single electron. Hence the spin-up band is shifted up in energy by  $\mu_{\rm B}g_e B_0/2$ , and the spindown band is shifted down by the same amount, as shown in Fig. 7.10(b). In order to maintain the lowest-energy electronic configuration, electrons move from the spin-up band to the spin-down band, resulting in a greater population of the latter and hence a net non-zero electronic magnetic moment. The expressions for the density of states for the two bands  $g_{\alpha}(E)$  and  $g_{\beta}(E)$  are modified from those in Eq. (2.33) to account for the field, and are given by:

$$g_{\alpha}(E) = \frac{1}{2}g\left(E - \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_{e}B_{0}\right),$$
 (7.166)

$$g_{\beta}(E) = \frac{1}{2}g\left(E + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0\right). \tag{7.167}$$

The numbers of electrons per unit volume in the spin-up and spindown bands  $n_{\alpha}$  and  $n_{\beta}$  are then given by the integral expressions:

$$n_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} g\left(E - \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_{e}B_{0}\right) f(E) dE, \qquad (7.168)$$

$$n_{\beta} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty g\left(E + \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_e B_0\right) f(E) dE.$$
(7.169)

We recall that the Zeeman energy is much smaller than the thermal energy  $\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0\ll kT$ , and so we can expand the expressions for the density of states as Taylor series,

$$g\left(E \pm \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0\right) = g(E) \pm \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0g'(E) + \mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_eB_0\right)^2\right),$$
(7.170)

from which we can clearly see that the spin-down band has a greater population than the spin-up band.

The magnetization, i.e. the net magnetic moment per unit volume, is proportional to the difference in spin populations:

$$M = \frac{1}{2}\mu_{\rm B}g_e(n_\beta - n_\alpha).$$
(7.171)

Expanding the density of states functions as Taylor series we obtain the following expression for *M*:

$$M = \frac{1}{4}\mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 B_0 \int_0^\infty g'(E) f(E) dE$$
(7.172)

$$= \frac{1}{4} \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 B_0 \left\{ \left[ g(E) f(E) \right]_0^\infty - \int_0^\infty g(E) f'(E) dE \right\}$$
(7.173)

$$= -\frac{1}{4} \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 B_0 \int_0^\infty g(E) f'(E) dE, \qquad (7.174)$$



**Fig. 7.10.** Illustration of the effect of an external magnetic field on the band structure of a metal. In the absence of the field the spin-up ( $\alpha$ ) and spin-down ( $\beta$ ) electrons have the same band structure and are equally populated, as shown by the left- and right-hand density-of-states plots in (a). When the field is applied the spin-up band is shifted to higher energy by an amount  $\mu_{B}g_{e}B_{0}/2$ , and the spin-down band is shifted down by the same amount, as shown in (b). The populations of the levels change so as to maintain the same average Fermi level, with the result that electrons transfer from the spin-up band to the spin-down band.

where to go to the second line we have employed integration by parts, and to go to the last line we have removed the first term by noting that g(0) = 0 and  $f(E) \rightarrow 0$  as  $E \rightarrow \infty$ . To proceed we need to evaluate the derivative for the Fermi–Dirac distribution function with respect to energy. We recall that, at zero temperature, f(E) is proportional to the Heaviside step function with the discontinuity at  $E = E_F$ , and that at higher temperatures the discontinuity is smoothed out. Nevertheless at practicable experimental temperatures the Fermi–Dirac function is still well-approximated by the Heaviside step function, and so we can write its derivative as [190]

$$f'(E) = -\delta(E - E_{\rm F}).$$
 (7.175)

Substituting this into Eq. (7.174) we obtain the final expression for the magnetization:

$$M = \frac{1}{4} \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 B_0 g(E_{\rm F}).$$
(7.176)

The Pauli susceptibility per unit volume is therefore

$$\chi_{\rm P} = \frac{\mu_0 M}{B_0} \tag{7.177}$$

$$= \frac{1}{4} \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 g(E_{\rm F}). \tag{7.178}$$

We see that the Pauli susceptibility is proportional to the density of states at the Fermi level. This is because the Zeeman interaction is very small, and so the unpaired electrons resulting from the application of the field are located in the vicinity of the Fermi level. A greater number of states in this range of energies, which is given by  $g(E_F)$ , results in a greater number of unpaired electrons, and hence a greater magnetization and susceptibility. It is notable that the Pauli susceptibility, in contrast to the Curie expression for isolated electrons, is temperature independent. This is because in this derivation we have assumed the zero-temperature form of the Fermi–Dirac function, and hence we have ignored the effects of thermal population. Nevertheless the inclusion of temperature results in only a small correction, because the electron populations follow the Fermi–Dirac distribution rather than the Boltzmann distribution.

# 7.12.3. Comparison between the paramagnetic shifts in metals and insulators

We are now in a position to compare the Knight shift of a metal with the Fermi-contact shift obtained from an insulator. In order to make a fair comparison we compare two solids with the same number of electrons in the same volume. In the case of the metal these *N* electrons occupy the delocalized orbitals with energies determined by the density of states and populations by the Fermi–Dirac distribution, whilst in the insulator the *N* electrons are each localized to *N* paramagnetic centres of spin S = 1/2. The expression for the Knight shift is taken from Eq. (7.165), and the Fermi-contact shift for the insulator is adapted from Eq. (3.108). These expressions are reproduced here for convenience:

$$K = \frac{2}{3} \langle |\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_{\mathrm{F}}} \chi_{\mathrm{P}} V$$
(7.179)

$$\delta^{\rm FC} = \frac{2}{3} \rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0}) \chi_{\rm V} V \frac{N_A}{N}, \qquad (7.180)$$

where  $N_A$  is the number of equivalent paramagnetic centres that contribute to the Fermi-contact shift of the insulator. We note that we have written the Fermi-contact shift in terms of the volume susceptibility, which is related to the susceptibility per paramagnetic centre by  $\chi_V = \chi(N/V)$ . The two expressions are similar except for the additional factor of  $N_A/N$  in the latter. This reflects the fundamental differences in the two cases between the small number of electrons that contribute to the shift. For a simple metal (with *s*- or *p*-conduction bands) all *N* electrons are delocalized over the entire lattice, and hence they all contribute spin density to the *s*-orbital of the observed nucleus. In more complicated metallic systems, such as alloys, there may be very different contributions from different electrons, and in transition-metal or lanthanide oxides, there may be both localized and delocalized spins. The fact that only the fraction at the Fermi level make a *net* contribution is addressed by the Pauli susceptibility. However for the insulator the *N* electrons are localized at their paramagnetic centres and only a small number  $N_A$ , which are located in the bonding environment of the nucleus, actually contribute to the shift. The other electrons are not delocalized at all into the *s*-orbital.

In both cases the shift is proportional to the size of the average unpaired electron density per electron that is present in the *s*-orbital of the nucleus. For the metal this is given by  $\langle |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_F}$ , which is the average of the one-electron spin density over the electrons located at the Fermi level. For the insulator the one-electron density in the expression for the Fermi-contact shift is  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$ , and is due to the single electron on the paramagnetic ion. We have seen that  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$ , and therefore the Fermi-contact shift, can either be positive or negative depending whether the electron transfer occurs via a delocalization or polarization mechanism. The same principles also apply to  $\langle |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_F}$ , and so the Knight shift may also be positive or negative depending on the nature of the electron transfer. Furthermore if the effective spin of the paramagnetic centres is greater than S = 1/2, this electron density is divided by 2S to give the unpaired electron density per unpaired electron.

In order to compare the sizes of the two shifts we compare the two magnetic susceptibilities. For the insulator we take the expression from Eq. (3.92), set S = 1/2, and multiply by n to obtain the volume susceptibility  $\chi_V$ . For the metal the comparison with the Pauli susceptibility  $\chi_P$  is difficult unless we specify the form of the density of states. Therefore we apply the simplified free-electron model, for which the density of states at the Fermi level is given by Eq. (2.48). The two volume susceptibilities are given below:

$$\chi_{\rm P} = \frac{3\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 n}{8kT_{\rm F}} \tag{7.181}$$

$$\chi_{\rm V} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 n}{4kT}.$$
(7.182)

The two expressions appear to be remarkably similar, but with one crucial difference. The expression for the insulator has a Curie temperature difference, and therefore  $\chi_{v}$  and the Fermi-contact shift increase with decreasing temperature. The Pauli susceptibility, however, is temperature independent. The temperature that does appear in the denominator of  $\chi_{p}$  is the constant Fermi temperature  $T_{F}$ . For metals  $T_{F}$  generally takes values from 10<sup>4</sup> to 10<sup>5</sup> K, and so the Pauli susceptibility is between two and three orders of magnitude lower than the corresponding Curie susceptibility at all practicable temperatures. Therefore Fermi-contact shifts are generally much larger than Knight shifts.

#### 7.13. Key concepts

- The paramagnetic shielding tensor due to multiple noninteracting metal ions is simply the sum of the individual independent contributions from each ion.
- Neighbouring metal ions often interact with each other via an exchange coupling, which gives either ferromagnetic or antiferromagnetic alignment of the effective spins.
- The exchange interaction comprises an isotropic exchange term, antisymmetric Dzyaloshinskii–Moriya term, and a symmetric dipolar term.
- In the high-temperature regime the paramagnetic shielding tensor due to clusters of interacting metal ions is modified by the exchange coupling, which gives an additional term in  $1/(kT)^2$  (Eq. (7.53)).

- The magnetic properties of extended networks of interacting metal ions in solid insulator materials can be approximated by mean-field theory.
- The magnetic susceptibility (Eq. (7.90)) and paramagnetic shielding tensor (Eq. (7.117)) of solid insulator materials generally exhibit a Curie–Weiss temperature dependence.
- In systems either with large Weiss constants, or with magnetic ordering temperatures close to room temperature, it is not appropriate, even in the paramagnetic state, to use the spin-only values to estimate the magnetic susceptibility.
- Under certain circumstances the signs of both the isotropic exchange coupling constants and the Fermi-contact shift can be predicted using the Goodenough-Kanamori rules. This approach often provides a relatively simple and intuitive method for understanding and predicting shifts, particularly in materials that adopt undistorted/simple structures, such as those derived from rocksalt (NaCl).
- The paramagnetic shift in a metal or semiconductor is referred to as the Knight shift (Eq. (7.165)), and depends on the Pauli susceptibility of the material (Eq. (7.178)).
- Both the Pauli susceptibility and Knight shift are 100–1000 smaller than their equivalents in solid insulators, and are essentially temperature-independent above 0 K.

### Chapter 8: Relaxation in paramagnetic systems under fastmotional and high-field conditions

We now turn our attention to a feature of paramagnetic NMR that we have rather neglected up until now, but which is nevertheless extremely important, and that is the relaxation behaviour of paramagnetic systems. The relaxation rates of the nuclear spins contain contributions from effects that are present in both diamagnetic and paramagnetic systems, such as nuclear-nuclear dipolar couplings and the quadrupole interaction, and effects that are present only in paramagnetic systems, namely the hyperfine couplings to unpaired electrons. For many systems the paramagnetic effects dominate the relaxation properties, with very large contributions to the rate constants that are often referred to as *paramagnetic relax*ation enhancements (PREs). Here we provide a basic description of the PRE under the high-field conditions of high-resolution NMR, and the conditions of fast electron dynamics. A more complete treatment for arbitrary field and electron dynamics is deferred until Chapter 9.

We begin with a brief account of the Redfield theory of relaxation, and then document the applications to the calculation of electronic relaxation rates and the PRE of the nuclei. We discuss the main mechanisms responsible for electron relaxation in both complexes in solution, and solid insulators. The relaxation properties of the unpaired electrons are directly responsible for the PRE. However electronic relaxation is more complicated than nuclear relaxation as Redfield theory does not usually provide a valid description [96]. Therefore for the remainder of this chapter we model the effect of the electronic relaxation on the PRE phenomenologically.

We then describe the PRE using semi-classical Redfield theory [247], which in this specific case is known as the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory. The treatment of relaxation given here is valid for systems with fast motional dynamics, such as those encountered in the rotational diffusion of small and large molecules in solution, and under high-field conditions, which are defined as those where the electronic Zeeman interaction dominates the ZFS interaction.

We derive the expressions for the contributions to the relaxation rate constants originating from the different parts of the hyperfine interaction, and in different motional regimes including small complexes in solution, large biomolecules in solution, and solid insulators with no rotational dynamics. The discussion in this chapter is limited to the non-relativistic description of the hyperfine interaction, and we ignore SO coupling effects on the PRE, although we acknowledge that SO coupling is important for electronic relaxation, via the ZFS and the *g*-anisotropy.

Further reading on the subject of relaxation in solution can be found in the contributions from Kowalewski and Mäler [96], Bertini et al. [248,15], and Kruk [249,250]. The specific topic of paramagnetic relaxation in solution has recently been reviewed by Kowalewski and Kruk [251].

#### 8.1. Overview of the models of electronic and nuclear relaxation

Both this chapter and the next present the different models of electronic and nuclear relaxation in paramagnetic systems, for different experimental conditions and within different approximations. Whilst this plethora of different models and approaches may initially seem confusing, they are in fact related to each other in a straightforward way, as shown by the two flow charts in Figs. 8.1 and 8.2.

Fig. 8.1 shows how the models of electronic relaxation at different levels of theory (quantum vs semi-classical treatment of the lattice), timescales of motion (fast vs slow), size of the external magnetic field (high vs low), and the electronic spin (S = 1/2, S = 1, S > 1) are related to each other. Fig. 8.2 presents the same relationship for nuclear relaxation, this time for different levels of theory (quantum vs semi-classical treatment of the lattice), timescales of motion (fast vs slow), size of the external magnetic field (high vs low), and timescale of rotation (fast vs slow). Full definitions of these terms are provided at later points in Chapters 8 and 9.

These flow charts are intended to act as visual aids to help place the various relaxation models in their proper context. In particular, there are a number of cases in Chapter 9 where a more advanced theory of relaxation is subjected to a set of assumptions that result in a description that is equivalent to one obtained with a simpler theory. Figs. 8.1 and 8.2 will help to illuminate these cases more clearly.

The expressions for the relaxation rate constants derived in these two chapters were verified using SpinDynamica, which is a set of packages for spin dynamics calculations in Mathematica. Details about numerical implementations of relaxation calculations are given in Belorizky et al. [252].

### 8.2. The Redfield theory of relaxation

In this section we summarize the main features of semiclassical Redfield theory, and establish the conventions and notation that we continue to use later. Readers interested in complete and accessible descriptions of Redfield theory are referred to the contributions by Redfield [247], Goldman [253,254], and Kowalewski and Mäler [96].

#### 8.2.1. The equation of motion

We separate the system into two parts: the combined electronic-nuclear spin system, and the lattice which comprises everything else, such as the molecular framework. In the semi-classical formulation of Redfield theory we treat the combined electronic-nuclear spin system using quantum mechanics, and model the lattice classically. We therefore describe the time-evolution of the spin system with the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}(t)$ , which is the sum of a dominant part  $\hat{H}_0$ , containing coherent terms such as the Zeeman interactions, and a perturbation  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  with a random time dependence and zero time-average, which describes incoherent effects such as relaxation and chemical exchange:

$$H(t) = H_0 + H_1(t).$$
(8.1)

The dominant part  $H_0$  essentially describes both the experimental conditions we impose upon the spin system, for example the size



**Fig. 8.1.** Flow chart showing the relationship between the different models describing electronic relaxation. The chart differentiates between the full-quantum and semiclassical treatment of the lattice, fast (Redfield) and slow (non-Redfield) motions and, within Redfield theory, between high and low field, and between different electronic spins. Definitions: fast motion  $\Omega \tau_c \ll 1$ , slow motion  $\Omega \tau_c \gg 1$ , high field  $|D| \ll \mu_B g_e B_0$ , low field  $|D| \gg \mu_B g_e B_0$ .  $\Omega$  is the strength of the fluctuating spin interaction,  $\tau_c$  is the correlation time, D is the axial ZFS anisotropy,  $B_0$  is the applied magnetic field.

of the external magnetic field via the Zeeman interaction, or else the effects of radiofrequency (RF) irradiation during the pulse sequence, in addition to any coherent internal spin interactions. We therefore note that  $\hat{H}_0$  may also be time-dependent if it includes, for example, terms describing a time-dependent radiofrequency (RF) irradiation, or the periodic modulation of spatially anisotropic interactions due to sample spinning. However when describing the spin-lattice and spin-spin relaxation of molecules in solution  $\hat{H}_0$  generally contains only isotropic interactions. We also add RF terms when describing relaxation during extended spin-lock pulses or pulse sequences, which may be time-dependent. However, here we mainly consider the case of relaxation in solution with no RF irradiation where  $\hat{H}_0$  is time-independent, as written here. However we should note that, since introducing RF irradiation or sample rotation changes the form of  $\hat{H}_0$ , we expect these effects to also change the measured relaxation properties. The behaviour of the ensemble of spin systems in the sample under the action of  $\hat{H}(t)$  is determined by calculating the time evolution of the density operator  $\hat{\rho}(t)$  with the Liouville-von Neumann equation:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar} \Big[ \widehat{H}_0 + \widehat{H}_1(t), \hat{\rho}(t) \Big]. \tag{8.2}$$

The random time dependence of the part  $\left[\hat{H}_1(t), \hat{\rho}(t)\right]$  makes the equation in this form insoluble. However we are able to proceed by factoring out the 'motion' of the density operator due to the static Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_0$ , which we do by transforming both  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  and

 $\hat{\rho}(t)$  into the interaction representation of  $\hat{H}_0$ . The reference frame of the interaction representation changes orientation so that it follows the time evolution due to  $\hat{H}_0$  in the laboratory frame. Both the random Hamiltonian and density operator in the interaction representation of  $\hat{H}_0$  can be calculated from their laboratory frame counterparts at any time *t* using the following expressions:

$$\widehat{H}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = \exp\left(i\widehat{H}_{0}t/\hbar\right)\widehat{H}_{1}(t)\exp\left(-i\widehat{H}_{0}t/\hbar\right),\tag{8.3}$$

$$\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = \exp\left(i\hat{H}_{0}t/\hbar\right)\hat{\rho}(t)\exp\left(-i\hat{H}_{0}t/\hbar\right),\tag{8.4}$$

where the superscript T denotes an operator in the interaction representation.

The evolution of  $\hat{\rho}^{T}(t)$  under the action of  $\hat{H}_{1}^{T}(t)$  can be solved to second order in a perturbation expansion to give the Redfield master equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \overline{\left[\widehat{H}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}}(t), \left[\widehat{H}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau), \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right]} \mathrm{d}\tau, \qquad (8.5)$$

where the overbar denotes an average over the spin systems in the ensemble, and  $\hat{\rho}_0$  is the equilibrium density operator, which commutes with  $\hat{H}_0$  and is therefore unchanged by the transformation into the interaction representation. Eq. (8.5) depends on a series of approximations. Firstly we assume that the motions of the lattice are characterised by a correlation time  $\tau_c$  which is sufficiently short that its product with the r.m.s. size  $\Omega$  of the interaction represented by  $\hat{H}_1(t)$ , in frequency units, is much less than unity:



**Fig. 8.2.** Flow chart showing the relationship between the different models describing nuclear relaxation in paramagnetic systems. The chart differentiates between the fullquantum and semi-classical treatment of the lattice, fast (Redfield) and slow (non-Redfield) motions and, within Redfield theory, between high and low field, and between fast and slow rotations. Definitions: fast motion  $\Omega \tau_c \ll 1$ , slow motion  $\Omega \tau_c \gg 1$ , high field  $|\omega_Q| \ll |\omega_0|$ , low field  $|\omega_Q| \gg |\omega_0|$ , fast rotation  $\tau_r \ll T_{1e}, T_{2e}$ , slow rotation  $\tau_r \gg T_{1e}, T_{2e}, \Omega$  is the strength of the fluctuating spin interaction,  $\tau_c$  is the correlation time,  $\tau_r$  is the rotational correlation time,  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  are the electronic spin-lattice and spin-spin relaxation times,  $\omega_Q$  is the quadrupolar splitting,  $\omega_0$  is the nuclear Larmor frequency.

$$\Omega \tau_c \ll 1,$$
 (8.6)

where  $\hbar\Omega = |\hat{H}_1(t)^2|^{1/2}$ . This is the motional narrowing regime, in which the fluctuations of the interactions in  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  due to stochastic motion lead to a narrowing of the spectroscopic peak in comparison to the lineshape that would be obtained due to the spread of frequencies if the spin systems were static. Secondly, in order to be able to stop the perturbation expansion at second order, we assume that the time *t* during which we observe the system satisfies the inequalities

$$\tau_{\rm c} \ll t \ll \frac{1}{\Omega}.\tag{8.7}$$

The upper-bound inequality,  $t \ll \Omega^{-1}$ , is potentially problematic as the inverse frequency  $\Omega^{-1}$  is often much shorter than typical NMR observation times of between milliseconds and seconds. For example an interaction frequency of  $\Omega/(2\pi) = 100$  kHz would give an inverse frequency of 1.6 µs, which is much shorter than our NMR acquisition time! However this problem can be circumvented by noting that we can divide our observation time *t* into discrete chunks, each one of which satisfies Eq. (8.7), and which we can safely assume is independent of the others due to the random nature of the perturbation. This leaves the lower-bound inequality of Eq. (8.7), which amounts to the relaxation times always being longer than the correlation time.

The next step is to write the random perturbation Hamiltonian  $\widehat{H}_1(t)$  in terms of the irreducible spherical tensor operators as follows:

$$\widehat{H}_{1}(t) = \sum_{\Lambda} \sum_{l} \sum_{m=-l}^{+l} (-1)^{m} K_{lm}^{(\Lambda)}(t) \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$$
(8.8)

$$=\sum_{\Lambda}\sum_{l}\sum_{m=-l}^{+l}(-1)^{m}K_{lm}^{(\Lambda)}(t)^{*}\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(\Lambda)}(t)^{\dagger}.$$
(8.9)

We have written the total perturbation as a sum of terms from different interactions  $\Lambda$ , with each interaction having a distinct set of spatial tensors  $K_{lm}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$  and spin tensors  $\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$ . This form of the Hamiltonian separates the lattice variables and the spin variables into the spatial tensors and spin tensors respectively. We have included the time-dependence explicitly in both the  $K_{lm}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$ , and the  $\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$  to account for all the possible causes of the random fluctuations in  $\widehat{H}_1(t)$ , a subject we return to in more detail later. In the following discussion we consider the effect of just a single interaction (which for nuclear relaxation we will later take to be the hyperfine interaction, and for electronic relaxation the ZFS) and so we drop both the sum over  $\Lambda$  and the superscript. We return to the case of the combined effects of more than one interaction on nuclear relaxation in Chapter 8.8. We can write the spatial tensors in terms of their components in the PAF as follows

$$K_{lm}(t) = \sum_{\mu=-l}^{+l} D_{\mu m}^{(l)}(\alpha_l(t), \beta_l(t), \gamma_l(t)) \widetilde{K}_{l\mu}(t),$$
(8.10)

where we have acknowledged that the random lattice fluctuations can result in a fluctuation of either the PAF components  $\tilde{K}_{l\mu}(t)$ , or the orientation of the PAF in the laboratory frame, due to changes in the Euler angles ( $\alpha_l(t), \beta_l(t), \gamma_l(t)$ ). These Euler angles describe a pair of rotations, the first of which gives the orientation of the PAF in a frame fixed relative to the molecular geometry, and the second of which gives the orientation of this molecular frame in the laboratory frame. Each interaction clearly has a different set of Euler angles. However for a single interaction, each part of different rank may have also have a different set of Euler angles, since the PAFs may not be coincident. For example we generally expect the rank-one and rank-two parts of the hyperfine tensor to have different PAFs. This is why we have written the Euler angles as having a dependence on *l*.

Before inserting the operator expression into the master equation, we first need to transform the spin tensors into the interaction representation of  $\hat{H}_0$ . At this point we assume high-field conditions such that  $\hat{H}_0$  is dominated by the electronic and nuclear Zeeman interactions, and that the electronic *g*-tensor is isotropic and equal to  $g_e$ . Therefore the transformation into the interaction representation is a rotation about the *z*-axes of the *I*- and *S*-spin operators. We recall, from the rotation properties of irreducible spherical tensor operators, that rotations about *z* depend only on the order *m* of the operators  $\hat{T}_{lm}$  and not on the rank *l*, and that the effect of such a rotation is to impart a phase factor that depends only on *m*. Therefore  $\hat{T}_{l-m}^T(t)$  is equal to

$$\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\widehat{H}_{0}t/\hbar\right)\widehat{T}_{l-m}(t)\exp\left(-\mathrm{i}\widehat{H}_{0}t/\hbar\right) \tag{8.11}$$

$$=\sum_{n}\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t)\exp\left(\mathrm{i}\omega_{-m}^{(n)}t\right),\tag{8.12}$$

where we have split each spin tensor operator  $\hat{T}_{l-m}(t)$  into a sum of operators  $\hat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t)$ , labelled by a superscript (n), each of which evolves at frequency  $\omega_{-m}^{(n)}$  in the interaction representation. We note that the inclusion of this superscript is necessary when the two spins have different Larmor frequencies, as is the case for a system comprising a nuclear spin *I* coupled to an electronic spin *S*. The Hermitian conjugate of  $\hat{T}_{l-m}^{T}(t)$  is simply given by

$$\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)^{\dagger} = \sum_{n} \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t)^{\dagger} \exp\left(-\mathrm{i}\omega_{-m}^{(n)}t\right).$$
(8.13)

Inserting the operator expression into the master equation in Eq. (8.5), we now obtain the Redfield operator equation:

$$\begin{split} \frac{d\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{dt} &= -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{ll'} \sum_{mm'nn'} (-1)^{m+m'} \exp\left[i\left(\omega_{-m}^{(n)} - \omega_{-m'}^{(n')}\right)t\right] \\ &\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \overline{\left[\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t), \left[\widehat{T}_{l'-m'}^{(n')}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right]} K_{lm}(t) K_{l'm'}(t-\tau)^{*} \exp\left(i\omega_{-m'}^{(n')}\tau\right) \mathrm{d}\tau. \end{split}$$

$$(8.14)$$

We have included the simultaneous ensemble average over all the spatial and spin-dependent parts of the expression, which is a formal requirement. However we can simplify things by assuming that the different stochastic processes are independent to each other, which enables us to perform the ensemble averages for each process independently. This is the decomposition approximation, in which we can write:

$$\begin{split} \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t), \left[\widehat{T}_{l-m'}^{(n')}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right] K_{lm}(t) K_{lm'}(t-\tau)^{*} \\ &= \overline{\left[\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t), \left[\widehat{T}_{l-m'}^{(n')}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right]} \\ &\times \sum_{\mu\mu'} \overline{D}_{\mu m}^{(l)}(\alpha_{l}(t), \beta_{l}(t), \gamma_{l}(t)) D_{\mu'm'}^{(l')}(\alpha_{l'}(t-\tau), \beta_{l'}(t-\tau), \gamma_{l'}(t-\tau))^{*}} \\ &\times \overline{\widetilde{K}_{l\mu}(t)} \widetilde{K}_{l'\mu'}(t-\tau)^{*}. \end{split}$$

$$(8.15)$$

In situations where the two spins relax on timescales that differ by several orders of magnitude, the faster-relaxing spin acts as a source of a rapidly fluctuating magnetic field that influences the slower-relaxing spin via the coupling between them. This effect is accounted for by the ensemble average over the double commutator of spin operators. For example electronic relaxation occurs on a timescale, typically between 0.1 ps and 10 ns for metal ions, that is generally several orders of magnitude shorter than the timescale of nuclear relaxation, which is typically between 1 ms and several hours or longer. Therefore this factor describes the effect of the rapid electronic relaxation on the PRE of the nucleus. On the other hand, when describing electronic relaxation this part of the ensemble average can be dispensed with. The ensemble average over the product of Wigner matrix elements accounts for the fluctuations due to random spatial reorientation of the anisotropic interaction tensor, a process known as rotational diffusion. It only affects elements of tensor rank l > 0. The final factor is the ensemble average of the product of the PAF tensor components, and accounts for the instantaneous changes that may occur in these components either through distortion of the molecular geometry of the system, or chemical exchange of the nucleus or electron between different sites. We now examine these three mechanisms in detail.

#### 8.2.2. Relaxation by spatial reorientation of the interaction tensor

We begin by examining the effect of the random rotational diffusion of the spatial tensor. Specifically we consider the case of paramagnetic molecules in solution that experience unrestricted isotropic tumbling. The local magnetic field experienced by the spin fluctuates in both size and direction as a result of the random time dependence. The ensemble average of the product of the spatial tensor components can be written in the decomposition approximation as

$$\overline{K_{lm}(t)K_{l'm'}(t-\tau)^{*}} = \sum_{\mu\mu'} \overline{D_{\mu m}^{(l)}(\alpha_{l}(t),\beta_{l}(t),\gamma_{l}(t))D_{\mu'm'}^{(l')}(\alpha_{l'}(t-\tau),\beta_{l'}(t-\tau),\gamma_{l'}(t-\tau))^{*}}} \times \overline{\widetilde{K}_{l\mu}(t)\widetilde{K}_{l'\mu'}(t-\tau)^{*}}.$$
(8.16)

Our first step is to assume that the random fluctuations that modulate the different interactions are uncorrelated. For the PRE, this means that the fluctuations of the Fermi-contact interaction are independent of those of the spin-dipolar interaction, and that both fluctuate independently of any other relevant interactions that cause relaxation. For electronic relaxation we assume that the fluctuations of the ZFS, Zeeman, and hyperfine interactions are all independent of each other. In practice the result is that we consider only those terms in the double-commutator where the two Hamiltonians are of the same interaction, e.g. both Fermi contact, or both spin dipolar, and neglect the cross-terms due to cross correlation between different interactions (to which we will return later). Hence we set l = l'. The average product  $\overline{K_{lm}(t)K_{lm'}(t-\tau)^*}$  depends only on the *difference*  $\tau$  between the times at which we evaluate each element in the product, and not on *t* itself. We can therefore simplify the average of the product of the Wigner rotation matrix elements as follows:

$$\begin{split} D^{(l)}_{\mu m}(\alpha_{l}(t),\beta_{l}(t),\gamma_{l}(t))D^{(l)}_{\mu'm'}(\alpha_{l}(t-\tau),\beta_{l}(t-\tau),\gamma_{l}(t-\tau))^{*} \\ &= \bigg[\frac{1}{8\pi^{2}}\int_{0}^{2\pi}d\alpha_{l}\int_{0}^{\pi}\sin(\beta_{l})d\beta_{l}\int_{0}^{2\pi}d\gamma_{l}D^{(l)}_{\mu m}(\alpha_{l},\beta_{l},\gamma_{l})D^{(l)}_{\mu'm'}(\alpha_{l},\beta_{l},\gamma_{l})^{*}\bigg]g^{R}_{l}(\tau) \quad (8.17) \\ &= \frac{1}{2l+1}\delta_{mm'}\delta_{\mu\mu'}g^{R}_{l}(\tau), \quad (8.18) \end{split}$$

where to go to the second line we have factored out the  $\tau$ dependence into a function  $g_l^R(\tau)$  which is the reduced rotational correlation function describing the random reorientation of the spatial tensors, we have used the fact that, for isotropic tumbling, the average product of the Wigner matrix elements at  $\tau = 0$  is given by the integral over *all the Euler angles*, and we have assumed that all orientations are equally probable at  $\tau = 0$ . To go to the last line we have used the well-known orthogonality relations of the Wigner elements [191].

We do not specify the form of the reduced correlation function at this point other than to say that, by definition,  $g_I^R(0) = 1$ , and that at times longer than the associated correlation time  $g_I^R(\tau)$ decays to zero. The reduced correlation function also, in principle, depends on the spatial rank *l*, which allows us to differentiate between second-rank interactions, which are affected by spatial reorientation, and zeroth-rank interactions which are invariant. The average product  $\overline{K_{lm}(t)K_{lm'}(t-\tau)^*}$  can now be written in the following simplified form:

$$\overline{K_{lm}(t)K_{l'm'}(t-\tau)^*} = \frac{1}{2l+1}\delta_{ll'}\delta_{mm'}g_l^{\mathsf{R}}(\tau)\sum_{\mu}\widetilde{K}_{l\mu}(t)\widetilde{K}_{l\mu}(t-\tau)^*.$$
(8.19)

The next step is to evaluate the sum over  $\mu$ .

#### 8.2.3. Relaxation by fast chemical exchange

The sizes of the tensor components in the PAF are modulated by fast chemical exchange, or distortions in the molecular geometry surrounding the site of the spin. A simple example is a nuclear spin, fixed in a chemical site, that is coupled to a second spin which undergoes rapid exchange. The size of the coupling interaction fluctuates in both sign and magnitude when the second spin is exchanged for another with a different magnetic quantum number  $m_S$ , and thus acts as a relaxation mechanism for the first spin. This mechanism is responsible for the time dependence and ensemble average contained in the sum over  $\mu$  in Eq. (8.19). The  $\tau$ -dependence can be factored out of this sum to give

$$\sum_{\mu} \overline{\widetilde{K}_{l\mu}(t)} \widetilde{K}_{l\mu}(t-\tau)^* = \sum_{\mu} |\widetilde{K}_{l\mu}|^2 g_l^{\rm M}(\tau), \qquad (8.20)$$

where  $g_l^{\rm M}(\tau)$  is the reduced exchange correlation function. In contrast to rotational diffusion this mechanism is also active for scalar interactions, as chemical exchange modulates the size of the interaction. If the interaction under consideration is indeed of rank zero, then the chemical exchange mechanism described here is an example of *scalar relaxation of the first kind* [184].

#### 8.2.4. The spin-dependent part

The final source of relaxation we consider here is a rapidlyfluctuating local magnetic field experienced by one spin due to the rapid relaxation of a second spin to which the former is coupled. This situation is very important in paramagnetic systems, as the unpaired electrons relax on a timescale that is orders of magnitude shorter than typical nuclear relaxation times. The rapidly-relaxing unpaired electrons induce a fluctuating local field at the nucleus via both the isotropic and anisotropic hyperfine interactions. We can therefore rewrite the ensemble average of the double commutator of spin operators as follows.

For computing electronic relaxation, we note that the relaxation of the nucleus has no effect on the relaxation of the electrons, and so we rewrite the double commutator by removing both the time dependence from  $\hat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}$ , and the ensemble average to give:

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t), \left[\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n')}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right] \\
= \left[\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}, \left[\left(\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n')}\right)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right] \end{bmatrix}.$$
(8.21)

Electronic relaxation is discussed in Section 8.4. The situation for nuclear relaxation is more complicated. Here both the  $\tau$ -dependence and ensemble average are factored out into the reduced electronic relaxation correlation function  $g_{l-mnn'}^{S}(\tau)$ , and the double commutator is rewritten as

$$\begin{split} & \left[ \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t), \left[ \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n')}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0} \right] \right] \\ & = \left[ \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}, \left[ \left( \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n')} \right)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0} \right] \right] g_{l-mnn'}^{\mathsf{S}}(\tau). \end{split}$$
(8.22)

We have acknowledged that  $g_{l-mnn'}^{S}(\tau)$ , in general, depends on the rank l, order -m, and the indices n and n', as the associated electronic spin operators relax at different rates depending on whether they represent coherences ( $\hat{S}_{\pm}$  or equivalently  $\hat{S}_{1\pm 1}$ ), or populations ( $\hat{S}_z$  or equivalently  $\hat{S}_{10}$ ). This in turn affects the correlation function. As is the case for chemical exchange, electronic relaxation is able to induce nuclear relaxation via the isotropic hyperfine interaction as well as the anisotropic interaction. Relaxation via the isotropic part is referred to as *scalar relaxation of the second kind* [184].

## *8.2.5. The nuclear relaxation superoperator*

Now that we have defined the reduced correlation functions above we can write the Redfield differential equation for the nuclear PRE from Eq. (8.14) as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}\left(\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right),\tag{8.23}$$

where  $\hat{\Gamma}$  is the relaxation superoperator which takes the form

$$\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}} \, \widehat{O} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \sum_{lmnn'} \frac{1}{2l+1} \\ \times \exp\left[i\left(\omega_{-m}^{(n)} - \omega_{-m}^{(n')}\right)t\right] \left[\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}, \left[\left(\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n')}\right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{O}\right]\right] \\ \times \int_0^\infty g_l^{\mathsf{M}}(\tau) g_l^{\mathsf{R}}(\tau) g_{l-mnn'}^{\mathsf{S}}(\tau) \exp\left(i\omega_{-m}^{(n')}\tau\right) d\tau \sum_{\mu} |\widetilde{K}_{l\mu}|^2. \quad (8.24)$$

This expression emphasizes that the relaxation superoperator acts

on an operator  $\hat{O}$  to produce a new operator  $\hat{\Gamma} \hat{O}$ . The integral over  $\tau$  contains only the product of the reduced correlation functions as only these are functions of  $\tau$ . The integral is complex, but is dominated by the real and even part which contributes to the relaxation rate. The smaller imaginary and odd part is responsible for a relaxation-induced shift in the resonance frequency [96], which is not considered further here. We therefore change the lower limit of integration from 0 to  $-\infty$  and introduce a factor of 1/2.

Eq. (8.24) contains a number of terms that oscillate during *t* at frequency  $\omega_{-m}^{(n)} - \omega_{-m}^{(n')}$ . The terms where this frequency is non-zero are non-secular and are expected to not contribute significantly to the relaxation rate if the oscillation is on a timescale that is much shorter than the relaxation times, as the net contribution averages

to zero. We therefore choose to retain only the secular terms, for which  $\omega_{-m}^{(n)} = \omega_{-m}^{(n')}$ . For spin systems in which all the spins have widely separated Larmor frequencies, such as an effective electronic spin coupled to a single nucleus, the secular approximation is made by setting n' = n. The secular relaxation superoperator is therefore

$$\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}\,\widehat{O} = \frac{1}{2\hbar^2} \sum_{lmn} \frac{1}{2l+1} \left[ \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}, \left[ \left( \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{O} \right] \right] j_{l-mn} \left( -\omega_{-m}^{(n)} \right) \sum_{\mu} |\widetilde{K}_{l\mu}|^2.$$
(8.25)

In Eq. (8.25) we have defined the reduced spectral density  $j_{l-mn}(\omega)$  as

$$j_{l-mn}(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g_{l-mn}(\tau) \exp\left(-i\omega\tau\right) d\tau, \qquad (8.26)$$

i.e. the Fourier transform of the overall reduced correlation function  $g_{l-mn}(\tau)$  which is the product of the three reduced correlation functions defined above:

$$g_{l-mn}(\tau) = g_l^{\rm M}(\tau) g_l^{\rm R}(\tau) g_{l-mn}^{\rm S}(\tau).$$
(8.27)

We note that both  $g_{l-mn}(\tau)$  and  $j_{l-mn}(\omega)$  depend on l, m, and n for the reasons given above, and that we have dropped the dependence on n' following the application of the secular approximation.

### 8.3. The correlation function and spectral density

We are now in a position to calculate nuclear relaxation rates using the superoperator in Eq. (8.25), which is the final result of the Redfield theory. Once we have decided on the mechanism, and the associated Hamiltonian, that we wish to study all that remains is to decide on the form of the reduced correlation function, which contains all the information about the dynamics, chemical exchange, and electronic relaxation properties. There are a number of correlation functions  $g(\tau_c; \tau)$  that can be applied depending on the details of the dynamics of the system [96]. However we use the simplest, which is an exponential decay

$$g(\tau_{\rm c};\tau) = \exp\left(-|\tau|/\tau_{\rm c}\right),\tag{8.28}$$

where  $\tau_c$  is the correlation time. This form of the reduced correlation function can be rationalised for unrestricted rotational motion of the system by using the principles of rotational diffusion as described by Fick's law [96], and has been used to describe the relaxation due to overall tumbling of small- to large-sized molecules in an isotropic solution. We also assume that the correlation functions describing the effects of chemical exchange and electron relaxation have the form of an exponential decay, but with different correlation times.

The reduced spectral density  $j(\tau_c; \omega)$  is the Fourier transform of  $g(\tau_c; \tau)$ :

$$j(\tau_{\rm c};\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(\tau_{\rm c};\tau) \exp\left(-i\omega\tau\right) d\tau$$
(8.29)

$$=\frac{2\tau_c}{1+\omega^2\tau_c^2}.$$
(8.30)

This is a Lorentzian function, examples of which are plotted as a function of the correlation time, and for particular frequencies, in Fig. 8.3(a). The spectral density, and hence its contribution to the relaxation rate, is at a maximum when  $|\omega \tau_c| = 1$ , where  $j(\tau_c; \omega)$  takes the value  $|1/\omega|$ .

One regime of particular interest is the *extreme-narrowing limit* where the correlation time is sufficiently short that  $|\omega \tau_c| \ll 1$ . This situation is encountered, for example, in the unrestricted tumbling of small molecules in solution. In this limit the spectral density is equal to

$$j(\tau_{\rm c};\omega) \approx 2\tau_{\rm c},$$
 (8.31)

and is independent of the frequency  $\omega$ . This is shown in Fig. 8.3(b), where the reduced spectral density is plotted against frequency for five particular correlation times. For correlation times up to 10 ps we are in the extreme-narrowing limit, and so we see no variation of the reduced spectral density with frequencies of up to 1 GHz, as expected.

Another regime of interest is the *spin-diffusion limit* in which the correlation time is sufficiently long so that  $|\omega \tau_c| \gg 1$ . In this limit the spectral density has the approximate expression

$$j(\tau_{\rm c};\omega) \approx \frac{2}{\omega^2 \tau_{\rm c}},$$
(8.32)

which decreases to zero at longer correlation times and larger frequencies. This is shown in Fig. 8.3(b) for correlation times of 1 ns and above, where we see a decrease in the reduced spectral density with increasing frequency.

#### 8.3.1. A note on terminology for motional regimes

We have hitherto encountered three different regimes within which we have defined the timescale of dynamic processes as corresponding to either "fast" or "slow" dynamics. Before we continue further, it is worth taking the time to properly define what these terms actually mean. Of course, the terms "fast" and "slow" are only meaningful if they are quoted relative to something, usually the size of an interaction, or another timescale.



**Fig. 8.3.** Plots of reduced spectral densities  $j(\tau_c; \omega)$  as a function of (a) the correlation time  $\tau_c$ , and (b) the frequency  $\omega$ . The expression for the reduced spectral density is given by Eq. (8.30). In (a) three plots are shown for the frequencies of 200, 300, and 400 MHz. In each case the maximum value of  $j(\tau_c; \omega)$  occurs when  $|\omega\tau_c| = 1$  and is equal to  $|1/\omega|$ . In (b) the plots are for the five values of  $\tau_c$  of  $10^{-12}$ ,  $10^{-11}$ ,  $10^{-19}$ , and  $10^{-8}$  s.

The first use of these terms we encountered was in the discussion on the validity of the Redfield theory. Here we defined the motional narrowing limit in Eq. (8.6), where  $\Omega \tau_c \ll 1$ . This limit is also known as the *fast-motion limit*, where "fast" means that the correlation time must be much shorter than the inverse of the strength of the fluctuating interaction. If this condition is met, the Redfield theory is valid. The other regime  $\Omega \tau_c \gg 1$  is known as the *slow-motion limit*, which is explored in more detail in Chapter 9. The electronic spin interactions are usually much larger than nuclear spin interactions, and so the absolute timescales associated with "fast" and "slow" motions are different for electronic and nuclear relaxation, with the motional-narrowing limit usually violated at shorter correlation times for electronic relaxation than for nuclear relaxation.

The second use of "fast" and "slow" pertains only to nuclear relaxation, as it refers to the timescale of the rotational diffusion processes that modulate the spin-dipolar hyperfine interaction compared to the electronic relaxation time constants. Here we define the *fast-rotation limit* as  $\tau_r \ll T_{1e}$ ,  $T_{2e}$ , where rotational diffusion is faster than electronic relaxation, and the *slow-rotation limit* where  $\tau_r \gg T_{1e}$ ,  $T_{2e}$ . Both cases correspond to situations where nuclear relaxation is described within the Redfield limit. This distinction is important as, under high-field conditions, it defines which description of nuclear relaxation is appropriate. We will see that, in the fast-rotation limit, the correct description is that in Section 8.6, leading to the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations. In the slow-rotation limit, however, we need to employ the Curie mechanism in Section 8.7.

The final classification of motional regimes is described earlier in this section, and refers to the size of the correlation time compared to the inverse of the frequency  $\omega$  that appears in the spectral density. The *extreme-narrowing limit* is defined as  $|\omega|\tau_c \ll 1$ , where the correlation time is much shorter than the period of Larmor precession. By contrast, the *spin-diffusion limit* is defined for longer correlation times such that  $|\omega|\tau_c \gg 1$ . This distinction is important as it allows us to simplify the spectral densities in these regimes. We note that the frequency  $\omega$  describes the size of the dominant coherent term  $\hat{H}_0$  in the total Hamiltonian, and so is much larger than the frequency describing the strength of the perturbing interaction  $\hat{H}_1(t)$ , i.e.  $|\omega| \gg |\Omega|$ . This implies that the extremenarrowing limit always falls in the motional-narrowing regime, and that the spin-diffusion limit may do too.

#### 8.4. Electronic relaxation

We now discuss electronic relaxation very briefly. One point that must be made very clear at the outset is that Redfield theory does not provide an adequate description of the relaxation of electrons in the majority of systems due to the larger magnitude of the interactions involved compared to nuclear relaxation, which means that the motional-narrowing condition in Eq. (8.6) is violated at shorter correlation times [96]. Nevertheless there are some systems for which Redfield theory is applicable, such as highly-symmetric metal environments in which the anisotropic interactions are somewhat smaller. We therefore describe how Redfield theory may be applied in these cases.

The Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  that gives rise to electron relaxation may be written as

$$\hat{H}_{1}(t) = \mu_{\rm B} \boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \boldsymbol{g}(t) \cdot \boldsymbol{\hat{S}} + \boldsymbol{\hat{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}(t) \cdot \boldsymbol{\hat{I}} + \boldsymbol{\hat{S}} \cdot \boldsymbol{D}(t) \cdot \boldsymbol{\hat{S}}, \tag{8.33}$$

which we recognise as a standard EPR Hamiltonian in which the time dependence has been explicitly indicated in the g-tensor g(t), hyperfine tensor A(t), and ZFS tensor D(t). The time dependence is due to stochastic changes in the orientations of the tensors, in addition to changes in the sizes of the PAF components due to

chemical exchange and other random processes. The dominant relaxation source for metal ions with S = 1/2 in high external fields is the *g*-tensor, with an important example being the Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion. The majority of ions are of spin S > 1/2, and for these relaxation is predominantly due to the ZFS interaction, which is the case we focus on here. From Eq. (8.25) the Redfield relaxation superoperator  $\hat{\Gamma}_{S}$ 

on here. From Eq. (8.25) the Redfield relaxation superoperator  $\Gamma_s$  is equal to

$$\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{S}\widehat{O} = \frac{1}{10\hbar^{2}} \sum_{mn} \left[ \widehat{S}_{2-m}^{(n)}, \left[ \left( \widehat{S}_{2-m}^{(n)} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{O} \right] \right] j(-\omega_{-m}^{(n)}) \sum_{\mu} |\widetilde{D}_{2\mu}|^{2}, \quad (8.34)$$

for which the relevant spin operators  $\widehat{S}_{2m}^{(n)}$  and frequencies  $\omega_m^{(n)}$  are given in Table 8.1. The spectral density function  $j(\omega)$  is independent of *m*.

It was shown by Bloembergen and Morgan [99] that, for hydrated first-row transition-metal ions with S = 1 at high magnetic field, the Redfield master equation for longitudinal (spin–lattice) relaxation can be written in the following form:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}S_z(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{T_{1e}}(S_z(t) - S_{z,0}),\tag{8.35}$$

where  $S_z(t)$  is the ensemble average of the expectation value of  $\hat{S}_z$  at time t (note the lack of the 'hat' in the former),  $S_{z,0}$  is the corresponding equilibrium value, and  $T_{1e}$  is the electron longitudinal (spin–lattice) relaxation time constant. This equation can be solved to give a mono-exponential expression for  $S_z(t)$ :

$$S_z(t) = (S_z(0) - S_{z,0}) \exp(-t/T_{1e}) + S_{z,0}, \qquad (8.36)$$

where  $T_{1e}$  is calculated from the expectation value of  $\hat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{S}$  in the state  $|\widehat{S}_{z}\rangle$  of Liouville space:

$$\frac{1}{T_{1e}} = \frac{\left(\widehat{S}_z | \widehat{\Gamma}_S | \widehat{S}_z\right)}{\left(\widehat{S}_z | \widehat{S}_z\right)}$$
(8.37)

$$=\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{z}\,\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{S}\,\widehat{S}_{z}\right)}{\mathrm{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{z}^{2}\right)}.$$
(8.38)

The notation  $(\hat{A}|\hat{\Gamma}_{S}|\hat{B})$  represents the inner product in Liouville space, which takes the explicit form  $\operatorname{Tr}_{S}(\hat{A}^{\dagger}\hat{\Gamma}_{S}\hat{B})$ , where  $\operatorname{Tr}_{S}$  refers to a trace taken over the states of the *S*-spin manifold.

The transverse (spin-spin) relaxation time constant  $T_{2e}$  of the electron can be calculated in a similar way. The ensemble average of the expectation value of the operators  $\hat{S}_{\pm}$ , which represent coherences, denoted  $S_{\pm}(t)$ , satisfy the following differential equations:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}S_{\pm}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{T_{2e}}S_{\pm}(t),\tag{8.39}$$

which have solutions

. . .

$$S_{\pm}(t) = S_{\pm}(0) \exp(-t/T_{2e}).$$
 (8.40)

Table 8.1

The spin operators  $\widehat{S}_{2m}^{(m)}$  and frequencies  $\omega_m^{(m)}$  for the ZFS interaction used in the calculation of the electron relaxation rates.

m	$\widehat{S}_{2m}^{(n)}$	$\omega_m^{(n)}$
m	n = 1	n = 1
0	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \Big( 3\hat{S}_z^2 - S(S+1)\hat{1} \Big)$	0
$\pm 1$	$\mp rac{1}{2} \left( \widehat{S}_z \widehat{S}_{\pm} + \widehat{S}_{\pm} \widehat{S}_z  ight)$	$\pm\omega_{s}$
±2	$\frac{1}{2}\widehat{S}_{\pm}^2$	$\pm 2\omega_{ m S}$

The time constant  $T_{2e}$  is given by the following expectation value of  $\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{s}$ :

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}} = \frac{\left(\hat{S}_{+} | \hat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{S} | \hat{S}_{+}\right)}{\left(\hat{S}_{-} | \hat{S}_{-}\right)}$$
(8.41)

$$=\frac{\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{-}\widehat{\Gamma}_{S}\widehat{S}_{+}\right)}{\left(\widehat{S}_{-}\widehat{\Gamma}_{-}\widehat{S}_{+}\right)}.$$
(8.42)

$$= \frac{1}{\operatorname{Tr}_{S}(\widehat{S}_{-}\widehat{S}_{+})}.$$
(8.42)

As well as referring to the relaxation time constants  $T_{ie}$ , it is also common to refer to the relaxation rates  $R_{ie}$  which are simply the reciprocals of the former. Hence the electronic longitudinal and transverse rate constants are  $R_{1e} = 1/T_{1e}$  and  $R_{2e} = 1/T_{2e}$  respectively.

The relaxation by the ZFS interaction can be divided into two separate mechanisms. The first concerns metal ions in a cubic coordination environment, for which the ZFS tensor is zero by symmetry. However, random, time-dependent distortions of the coordination sphere can lead to instantaneous deviations from cubic symmetry, which in turn give rise to a *transient* ZFS. The second mechanism applies to metal ions in environments of symmetry lower than cubic for which there is a permanent, non-zero *static* ZFS tensor. These are considered in turn.

#### 8.4.1. Relaxation due to the transient ZFS

The transient ZFS is characterised by quantity  $\Delta_t^2$ , which is the trace of the mean square of the interaction tensor

$$\Delta_t^2 = \widetilde{D}_{xx}^2 + \widetilde{D}_{yy}^2 + \widetilde{D}_{zz}^2 \tag{8.43}$$

$$=\frac{2}{3}D^2+2E^2,$$
 (8.44)

where D and E are the axial and rhombic anisotropies of the transient ZFS. This expression is also equal to the sum of the square moduli of the PAF components in the expression for the Redfield superoperator

$$\sum_{\mu=-2}^{+2} |\widetilde{D}_{2\mu}|^2 = \Delta_{\rm t}^2. \tag{8.45}$$

The process by which the coordination shell is distorted is responsible for the modulation of the transient ZFS. We can model this process as a rapid reorientation of the PAF of the transient ZFS tensor relative to a frame fixed relative to the molecule, with the magnitudes of the anisotropies *D* and *E* remaining constant. This is the pseudo-rotation model proposed by Rubinstein et al. [116]. This stochastic process is therefore characterised by a reduced correlation function  $g_2(\tau)$  which is analogous to that which describes unrestricted rotational motion  $g_R^P(\tau)$ :

$$g_{2}(\tau) = g_{2}^{R}(\tau)$$
(8.46)  
= exp(-|\tau|/\tau\_{v}), (8.47)

where  $\tau_v$  is the distortional, or pseudo-rotational, correlation time. The analogy between this stochastic distortion and the stochastic rotation of the system is the origin of the term 'pseudo-rotation'. It has been shown that this model generates correlation times  $\tau_v$ of the order of 1–10 ps [110,124,124], which are values consistent with efficient electronic relaxation: at 11.74 T the electronic Larmor frequency is 329 GHz, which corresponds to an optimum correlation time of  $1/|\omega_s|$  of 0.5 ps.

Combining these expressions with the double commutators calculated from the operators in Table 8.1 we obtain the following expressions for  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$ :

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma_{1e}} = \Delta_{t}^{2} \left[ \frac{1}{10} j^{R}(\omega_{S}) + \frac{2}{5} j^{R}(2\omega_{S}) \right]$$
(8.48)

$$=\frac{\Delta_{t}^{2}}{5}\left[\frac{\tau_{\nu}}{1+\omega_{s}^{2}\tau_{\nu}^{2}}+\frac{4\tau_{\nu}}{1+4\omega_{s}^{2}\tau_{\nu}^{2}}\right],$$
(8.49)

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}} = \Delta_t^2 \left[ \frac{3}{20} j^R(0) + \frac{1}{4} j^R(\omega_S) + \frac{1}{10} j^R(2\omega_S) \right]$$
(8.50)

$$= \frac{\Delta_t^2}{10} \left[ 3\tau_v + \frac{5\tau_v}{1 + \omega_s^2 \tau_v^2} + \frac{2\tau_v}{1 + 4\omega_s^2 \tau_v^2} \right], \tag{8.51}$$

where  $j^{\rm R}(\omega)$  is the spectral density at frequency  $\omega$  that describes the distortion process.

It must be remembered that Eqs. (8.48)–(8.51) are valid only for an electronic spin S = 1 in the motional-narrowing limit  $\Delta_t \tau_v \ll 1$ . For hydrated transition-metal complexes in solution  $\tau_v$  is of the order of  $10^{-12}$  s, and so we are within the motional-narrowing limit for values of  $\Delta_t$  to up approximately 0.5 cm<sup>-1</sup>.

We note that  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  are not necessarily the same, which is an observation of electron relaxation that holds in more general cases. In the present case the two time constants only take the same value when we are in the extreme-narrowing limit  $|\omega_S \tau_v| \ll 1$ , where the expressions for  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  reduce to:

$$\frac{1}{T_{1e}} = \frac{1}{T_{2e}} = \Delta_t^2 \tau_v.$$
(8.52)

In this regime both  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  are independent of field, and decrease with increasing  $\tau_{v}$ , i.e. the relaxation rates increase as the timescale of distortion becomes longer.

#### 8.4.2. Relaxation due to the static ZFS

The Redfield expressions for the relaxation time constants due to the static ZFS interaction are analogous to those calculated in Eqs. (8.48)–(8.51) for the transient ZFS, with two important differences. Firstly we replace  $\Delta_t$  with the trace of the square of the permanent ZFS interaction tensor  $\Delta_s$ , which has the form

$$\Delta_{\rm s}^2 = \frac{2}{3}D^2 + 2E^2. \tag{8.53}$$

Secondly we ascribe the modulation of the static ZFS to actual random reorientation of the tensor, a process which is described by the correlation function  $g_2^R(\tau)$ , so that  $g_2(\tau)$  is given by

$$\mathbf{g}_2(\tau) = \mathbf{g}_2^{\mathrm{R}}(\tau) \tag{8.54}$$

$$=\exp\left(-|\tau|/\tau_{\rm R}\right),\tag{8.55}$$

and  $\tau_R$  is the corresponding dynamic correlation time. The time constants  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  are now

$$\frac{1}{T_{1e}} = \Delta_s^2 \left[ \frac{1}{10} j^{\rm R}(\omega_{\rm S}) + \frac{2}{5} j^{\rm R}(2\omega_{\rm S}) \right]$$
(8.56)

$$=\frac{\Delta_{s}^{2}}{5}\left[\frac{\tau_{R}}{1+\omega_{s}^{2}\tau_{R}^{2}}+\frac{4\tau_{R}}{1+4\omega_{s}^{2}\tau_{R}^{2}}\right],$$
(8.57)

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}} = \Delta_{\rm s}^2 \left[ \frac{3}{20} j^{\rm R}(0) + \frac{1}{4} j^{\rm R}(\omega_{\rm S}) + \frac{1}{10} j^{\rm R}(2\omega_{\rm S}) \right]$$
(8.58)

$$= \frac{\Delta_{s}^{2}}{10} \left[ 3\tau_{R} + \frac{5\tau_{R}}{1 + \omega_{s}^{2}\tau_{R}^{2}} + \frac{2\tau_{R}}{1 + 4\omega_{s}^{2}\tau_{R}^{2}} \right].$$
(8.59)

Once again Eqs. (8.56)–(8.59) are only valid in the motionalnarrowing limit. However this condition is much more difficult to fulfil than for the transient ZFS, as the dynamic correlation time is usually orders of magnitude longer than  $10^{-12}$  s, and so the theory is only valid for metal ions such as  $Mn^{2+}$ , which has a symmetrical electron configuration of  $3d^5$  and therefore a small ZFS.

#### 8.4.3. Beyond the simple Redfield approximation

The theory of Bloembergen and Morgan for describing electron relaxation has two important shortcomings, which are that the resulting relaxation time constants are valid only for S = 1 and in the Redfield limit. The first limitation is important because, as shown by Rubinstein et al., electronic relaxation is multiexponential for spins  $S \ge 3/2$  even within the Redfield limit, provided we are not inside the extreme-narrowing regime [116]. In such cases the multi-exponential form of the relaxation curves must be accounted for when considering both electronic relaxation and the form of the correlation function when calculating the PRE. However, for the latter, we may be able to approximate the correlation function with a mono-exponential decay containing a correlation time  $\tau_s$  that represents the best fit to the true multiexponential electronic relaxation curve. The regime outside which Redfield theory does not apply is referred to as the slow-motion regime. An improved model of electronic relaxation for  $S \ge 1$ . comprising the effects of slow and fast motion, and higher-order ZFS effects has been proposed by Rast et al. and applied to Gd<sup>3+</sup> complexes in solution [117]. Some of these features are discussed in more detail in Chapter 9.

# 8.4.4. Other electronic relaxation mechanisms involving spin-orbit coupling

The preceding discussion has focussed both on the motional modulation of the anisotropic electronic spin interactions, such as the *g*-anisotropy and particularly the static ZFS, and the collisional distortion of the coordination geometry, leading to the transient ZFS. Both the ZFS and *g*-anisotropy are dominated by SO coupling effects, with the result that both interactions increase in size with the strength of SO coupling. Therefore we would expect both of the electronic relaxation mechanisms to become more efficient with increasing size of the SO interaction. This is borne out in the observation that, for first-row transition metal ions subject to a small SO coupling interaction, typical  $T_{1e}$  values are of the order  $10^{-12}-10^{-8}$  s, whilst lanthanide ions with significantly larger SO coupling experience shorter  $T_{1e}$  values of  $10^{-14}-10^{-12}$  s, the exception being Gd<sup>3+</sup> which has a spatially non-degenerate electronic state.

In the solid state, where the system lattice experiences little, or possibly no, rotational motion, we need another mechanism to account for electronic relaxation. One mechanism that has been proposed is the transition between vibrational energy levels, often referred to as phonons. Phonons occur on timescales that are orders of magnitude shorter than rotational diffusion, and which are too short to contribute directly to nuclear relaxation in an efficient manner [255]. However they are more efficient at inducing electronic relaxation [120], where the relaxation rates are highest when the correlation time is of the order of  $|1/\omega_s|$ .

For metal ions with non-zero orbital angular momentum, there is an interaction between the orbital angular momentum and the lattice which is modulated by the phonons. This requires phonons with energies that match the transition energies between the electronic spin levels, and can occur via three principal mechanisms [15]. The first is the direct transition between electronic spin states of the ground electronic manifold [256], and occurs only when the phonon energy matches the electronic Zeeman energy, as shown in Fig. 8.4(a). It is the least important mechanism at high temperature, where the phonon energies are generally too large for the required electronic spin transition, and this process only becomes significant at temperatures of the order of 10 K. The second process is due to the Raman effect [256,257], where two phonons simultaneously interact with the spin system, both of which are of energy that is too large for the spin transition. However their energy difference is equal to the spin transition energy, thus allowing the spin transition to take place. This is shown in Fig. 8.4(b). The final mechanism is due to the Orbach process where the electronic spin has low-lying excited states [257]. This process allows the coupling of the electronic spin to a higher-energy phonon, which causes a transition from an electronic state in the ground manifold to a state in a higher-energy manifold, as shown in Fig. 8.4(c). This is usually the fastest mechanism for electronic transitions in the hightemperature limit.

#### 8.5. Nuclear relaxation

Having outlined some of the difficulties associated with electronic relaxation, we now move onto the main topic of this chapter, which is the Redfield description of the PRE. The source of the PRE is the hyperfine interaction with the unpaired electrons, and so we can write down the incoherent time-dependent Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  as

$$\widehat{H}_1(t) = \widehat{S}(t) \cdot A(t) \cdot \widehat{I}, \qquad (8.60)$$



**Fig. 8.4.** The mechanisms of electronic spin transitions induced by energy exchange between the spin and the lattice vibrational states. The direct process is illustrated in (a) in which the transition from the lower energy spin state to a higher spin state in the ground electronic manifold n = 0 occurs with absorption of energy that is emitted from an excited lattice vibrational state v = 1 to a lower state, here the ground state v = 0. The separation of this phonon must equal the electronic spin transition energy. The Raman process is shown in (b). Here two lattice phonons simultaneously interact with the electronic spin. The difference in the energies of these phonons is exactly equal to the energy required for the electronic spin transition. In (c) is illustrated the Orbach process. The excited electronic manifold n = 1 is relatively low-lying, so that the transition energy between the lattice states v = 0 and v = 1 is equal to the separation between the spin state  $M_5 = -1/2$  in the ground manifold n = 0, and the spin state  $M_5 = +1/2$  in the low-lying excited manifold n = 1. The latter transition is therefore caused by interaction with the corresponding lattice phonon. The energy parameter  $\Delta$  is the separation between the ground n = 0 and first-excited n = 1 spin manifolds, and the lattice vibrational states are labelled with the vibrational quantum number v.

where we have acknowledged that the time dependence is due to both modulation of the hyperfine coupling tensor  $\mathbf{A}(t)$  and the variation of the electronic spin operator  $\hat{\mathbf{S}}(t)$  due to electronic relaxation. The spin operators  $\hat{T}_{l-m}$  used to describe the interaction are formed by the direct product of the *I*-spin and *S*-spin operators and are given by

$$\widehat{T}_{l-m} = \sum_{q_1, q_2} \langle 11q_1q_2 | l-m \rangle \widehat{I}_{1q_1} \widehat{S}_{1q_2}, \qquad (8.61)$$

where each term is only non-zero if  $q_1 + q_2 = -m$ . The expression for the Redfield relaxation superoperator partitions these basis operators into operators  $\hat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}$  that are labelled with an index n, and which evolve under different frequencies on transformation into the interaction representation of  $\hat{H}_0$ . In terms of the direct product notation, for each order m the index n refers to a unique pair of one-spin orders  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ , i.e.  $n \equiv n(q_1, q_2)$ , and so we are able to write  $\hat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}$  as

$$\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)} = \langle 11q_1q_2 | l-m \rangle \widehat{I}_{1q_1} \widehat{S}_{1q_2}.$$
(8.62)

The Hermitian conjugate of  $\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}$  is given by

$$\left(\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}\right)^{\dagger} = \langle 11q_1q_2 | l-m \rangle \widehat{I}_{1q_1}^{\dagger} \widehat{S}_{1q_2}^{\dagger}$$
(8.63)

$$= (-1)^{m} \langle 11q_{1}q_{2}|l-m\rangle I_{1-q_{1}}S_{1-q_{2}}.$$
(8.64)

We consider only the non-relativistic spin-dipolar and Fermicontact interactions, the operators  $\hat{T}_{lm}^{(n)}$  corresponding to which are given in Tables 8.2 and 8.3. Also given are the characteristic evolution frequencies in the interaction representation, and the electron correlation times used in the electron correlation functions.

Using Eqs. (8.62) and (8.63) we can write the double commutator in the Redfield superoperator as

$$\begin{split} & \left[\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t), \left[\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right] = (-1)^{m} \langle 11q_{1}q_{2}|l-m\rangle^{2} \\ & \times \overline{\left[\widehat{I}_{1q_{1}}\widehat{S}_{1q_{2}}(t), \left[\widehat{I}_{1-q_{1}}\widehat{S}_{1-q_{2}}(t-\tau), \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right]} \\ = (-1)^{m} \langle 11q_{1}q_{2}|l-m\rangle^{2} \left\{\widehat{I}_{1q_{1}}\left[\widehat{I}_{1-q_{1}}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right] \overline{\left[\widehat{S}_{1q_{2}}(t), \widehat{S}_{1-q_{2}}(t-\tau)\right]} \end{split}$$
(8.65)

$$+\left[\widehat{I}_{1q_1},\left[\widehat{I}_{1-q_1},\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)-\hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right]\overline{\widehat{S}_{1-q_2}(t-\tau)\widehat{S}_{1q_2}(t)}\Big\},$$
(8.66)

where to go to the last line we have used the fact that the rapid electronic relaxation means that only the electronic spin operators are time-dependent on the timescale we are interested in, and so

Table 8.3

the ensemble average is only over these operators. As before, we can factor out the  $\tau$ -dependence and rewrite the ensemble averages of the products of the electronic spin operators as

$$\widehat{S}_{1\pm1}(t)\widehat{S}_{1\mp1}(t-\tau) = \widehat{S}_{1\pm1}(t-\tau)\widehat{S}_{1\mp1}(t) = \widehat{S}_{1\pm1}\widehat{S}_{1\mp1}g_{\pm1}^{S}(\tau)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2}\widehat{S}_{\pm}\widehat{S}_{\mp}g_{\pm1}^{S}(\tau),$$
(8.67)
(8.68)

$$\overline{\hat{S}_{10}(t)\hat{S}_{10}(t-\tau)} = \hat{S}_{10}^2 g_0^S(\tau)$$
(8.69)

$$= \hat{S}_z^2 g_0^S(\tau). \tag{8.70}$$

Here we have used the fact that operators representing electronic coherences such as  $\hat{S}_{1\pm 1}$ , or equivalently  $\hat{S}_{\pm}$ , relax according to the electronic transverse relaxation time constant, and that this is represented by a reduced electronic correlation function  $g_{\pm 1}^{S}(\tau)$ . Likewise the longitudinal electronic spin operator  $\hat{S}_{10}$ , or equivalently  $\hat{S}_z$ , relaxes according to the electronic longitudinal relaxation time constant, and we represent this by a reduced electronic correlation function  $g_0^S(\tau)$ . The double commutator is therefore

$$\begin{split} & \left[\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t), \left[\widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right] \\ &= (-1)^{m} \langle 11q_{1}q_{2} | l-m \rangle^{2} \Big\{ \widehat{I}_{1q_{1}} \Big[ \widehat{I}_{1-q_{1}}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0} \Big] \Big[ \widehat{S}_{1q_{2}}, \widehat{S}_{1-q_{2}} \Big] \\ &\quad + \Big[ \widehat{I}_{1q_{1}}, \Big[ \widehat{I}_{1-q_{1}}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0} \Big] \Big] \widehat{S}_{1-q_{2}} \widehat{S}_{1q_{2}} \Big\} g_{q_{2}}^{\mathrm{s}}(\tau), \end{split}$$
(8.71)

where we have labelled the reduced electronic correlation function with the index  $q_2$  which indicates the order of the rank-one *S*-spin spherical tensor operator.

The overall reduced correlation function  $g_{lq_2}(\tau)$ , which combines all the sources of fluctuating fields experienced by the nucleus, is labelled by two indices *l* and *q*, and is given by the product of three correlation functions:

$$g_{lq}(\tau) = g^{\mathrm{M}}(\tau)g_{l}^{\mathrm{R}}(\tau)g_{q}^{\mathrm{S}}(\tau).$$

$$(8.72)$$

The first function  $g^{M}(\tau)$  in the product is the reduced correlation function that encodes the effects of chemical exchange, and takes the simple exponential form:

$$\mathbf{g}^{\mathsf{M}}(\tau) = \exp\left(-|\tau|/\tau_{\mathsf{M}}\right),\tag{8.73}$$

where  $\tau_{\rm M}$  is the chemical exchange correlation time. The second factor  $g_l^{\rm R}(\tau)$  is the reduced dynamic, or rotational, correlation function. It depends on the spatial rank of the interaction tensor *l* and takes the following form:

Table 8.2

Th	e spin	operators $T_{2m}^{(n)}$	, frequencies $\omega_m^{(n)}$	, and electron	correlation t	times $\tau_s$ for	the spin-dipolar	<sup>·</sup> interaction	used in the	calculation (	of the PRE.
		1 2111		·		5	1 1				

		$\widehat{T}_{2m}^{(n)}$			$\omega_m^{(n)}$			$ au_S$	
т	n = 1	n = 2	<i>n</i> = 3	n = 1	n = 2	<i>n</i> = 3	n = 1	<i>n</i> = 2	<i>n</i> = 3
0	$\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\widehat{I}_z\widehat{S}_z$	$-rac{1}{2}\sqrt{rac{1}{6}\widehat{I}_{+}\widehat{S}_{-}}$	$-rac{1}{2}\sqrt{rac{1}{6}}\widehat{I}_{-}\widehat{S}_{+}$	0	$\omega_{\rm I}-\omega_{\rm S}$	$-\omega_{\rm I}+\omega_{\rm S}$	$T_{1e}$	$T_{2e}$	$T_{2e}$
$\pm 1$	$\mp \frac{1}{2} \widehat{I}_{\pm} \widehat{S}_z$	$\mp \frac{1}{2} \widehat{I}_z \widehat{S}_{\pm}$	-	$\pm \omega_l$	$\pm\omega_{s}$	-	$T_{1e}$	$T_{2e}$	-
$\pm 2$	$\frac{1}{2}\widehat{I}_{\pm}\widehat{S}_{\pm}$	_	-	$\pm(\omega_I+\omega_S)$	-	-	$T_{2e}$	-	-

$\mathbf{T}[\mathbf{r}_{1}, \mathbf{r}_{2}] = \mathbf{T}[\mathbf{r}_{1}] + \mathbf{T}[\mathbf{r}_{2}] + \mathbf{T}[\mathbf{r}_{$	
The spin operators $T \ge $ treduencies $m \ge$ and electron correlation times $t_e$ for the Permi-contact interaction used in the calculation of th	• PKF
the spin operators r <sub>m</sub> , nequencies $m_1$ , and electron correlation times $m_1$ for the remni contact interaction used in the calculation of th	

	$\widehat{T}_{00}^{(n)}$			$\omega_0^{(n)}$			$ au_{ m S}$		
т	n = 1	<i>n</i> = 2	<i>n</i> = 3	n = 1	n = 2	<i>n</i> = 3	n = 1	<i>n</i> = 2	<i>n</i> = 3
0	$-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\widehat{I}_{z}\widehat{S}_{z}$	$-rac{1}{2}\sqrt{rac{1}{3}}\widehat{I}_+\widehat{S}$	$-rac{1}{2}\sqrt{rac{1}{3}}\widehat{I}_{-}\widehat{S}_{+}$	0	$\omega_I - \omega_S$	$-\omega_I + \omega_S$	T <sub>1e</sub>	T <sub>2e</sub>	$T_{2e}$

$$g_l^{\rm R}(\tau) = \begin{cases} \exp\left(-|\tau|/\tau_{\rm R}\right), & l = 2, \\ 1, & l = 0. \end{cases}$$
(8.74)

For spatial ranks l = 2 the correlation function is a simple exponential decay with rotational correlation time  $\tau_{\rm R}$ . By contrast spatially isotropic interactions with l = 0 are invariant to rotational diffusion, and so the corresponding correlation function is simply unity. The third factor in the overall reduced correlation function  $g_q^S(\tau)$  is due to electronic relaxation. The index q takes values of 0 or  $\pm 1$ in order to distinguish between the longitudinal and transverse relaxation of the unpaired electrons respectively, with the correlation functions being given by:

$$g_0^{\rm S}(\tau) = \exp\left(-|\tau|/T_{1e}\right),$$
 (8.75)

$$g_{+1}^{S}(\tau) = \exp\left(-|\tau|/T_{2e}\right). \tag{8.76}$$

We see that  $g_0^{\rm S}(\tau)$  decays according to  $T_{1e}$ , and  $g_{\pm 1}^{\rm S}(\tau)$  decays according to  $T_{2e}$ .

The overall reduced correlation function  $g_{lq}(\tau)$  and spectral density  $j_{lq}(\omega)$  take two distinct forms depending on whether the interaction in question is spatially isotropic or not. For spatially isotropic interactions, these are

$$g_{0q}(\tau) = \exp\left(-|\tau|/\tau_{\mathrm{E},q}\right),\tag{8.77}$$

$$j_{0q}(\omega) = \frac{2\tau_{E,q}}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_{E,q}^2},$$
(8.78)

where the effective correlation times  $\tau_{E,q}$  are equal to

$$\tau_{\mathrm{E},q}^{-1} = \tau_{\mathrm{M}}^{-1} + T_{qe}^{-1}, \qquad q = 1,2 \tag{8.79}$$

and the index *q* distinguishes between electronic longitudinal and electronic transverse relaxation. We note that both the chemical exchange and electronic relaxation time constants contribute to  $\tau_{\text{E},q}$ , but that the rotational correlation time does not. By contrast interactions that are spatially anisotropic with spatial rank l = 2 have the following reduced correlation time and reduced spectral density:

$$g_{2q}(\tau) = \exp\left(-|\tau|/\tau_{c,q}\right),\tag{8.80}$$

$$j_{2q}(\omega) = \frac{2\tau_{c,q}}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_{c,q}^2}.$$
(8.81)

The correlation times  $\tau_{c,q}$  are still labelled by q, but now also contain contributions from  $\tau_R$  as the interaction tensors are modulated by rotations of the system:

$$\tau_{c,q}^{-1} = \tau_{M}^{-1} + \tau_{R}^{-1} + T_{qe}^{-1}, \qquad q = 1, 2.$$
(8.82)

Typical ranges of the correlation times  $T_{qe}$ ,  $\tau_R$ , and  $\tau_M$  are shown in Fig. 8.5. There is significant overlap of the timescales of the three processes, especially when we have both fast rotational diffusion and chemical exchange, but the mean values of the ranges can be ordered as  $T_{qe} < \tau_R < \tau_M$  [15].



**Fig. 8.5.** Typical timescales of the electronic relaxation times  $T_{qe}$  (q = 1, 2), the rotational correlation time  $\tau_{R}$ , and the chemical exchange correlation time  $\tau_{M}$ . Note that  $\tau_{M}$  can extend to longer values than are shown on the scale, which are not considered here.

The nuclear longitudinal relaxation time constant  $T_1$  is given by the following expectation value of the relaxation superoperator in Liouville space:

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{\left(\widehat{I}_z | \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}} | \widehat{I}_z\right)}{\left(\widehat{I}_z | \widehat{I}_z\right)}$$
(8.83)

$$=\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{IS}\left(\widehat{I}_{z}\,\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}\,\widehat{I}_{z}\right)}{\mathrm{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{z}^{2}\right)\mathrm{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{1}_{S}\right)}$$
(8.84)

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{IS}\left(\widehat{I}_{z}\,\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}\,\widehat{I}_{z}\right) \tag{8.95}$$

$$=\frac{1}{\mathrm{Tr}_{I}\left(\hat{I}_{z}^{2}\right)(2S+1)},$$
(8.85)

where  $\text{Tr}_I$  and  $\text{Tr}_S$  indicate traces taken over the manifold of states of the *I*-spin and *S*-spin respectively, and  $\text{Tr}_{IS}$  is a trace taken over the entire direct-product manifold of states of the combined *I*-*S* spin system. On moving from Eq. (8.83) to Eq. (8.84) we see that the trace of the *S*-spin identity operator  $\hat{1}_S$  appears in the denominator. This is because the inner products appearing in the former equation are defined as sums over the direct-product manifold of states of the combined spin system. However when the operator in the inner product is a simple direct product of an *I*-spin operator with an *S*-spin operator, the trace of the product is equal to the product of the traces of the two individual operators over the two separate manifolds of *I*-spin and *S*-spin states. Since here  $\hat{I}_z^2$  implies  $\hat{I}_z^0 \otimes \hat{1}_s$ , the *S*-spin trace is over the identity, and is equal to  $\text{Tr}_S(\hat{1}_S) = 2S + 1$ . Similarly the nuclear transverse relaxation time constant  $T_2$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{\left(\hat{I}_+ | \hat{\widehat{\Gamma}} | \hat{I}_+\right)}{\left(\hat{I}_+ | \hat{I}_+\right)} \tag{8.86}$$

$$=\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{IS}\left(\widehat{I}_{-}\widehat{\Gamma}\widehat{I}_{+}\right)}{\mathrm{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{-}\widehat{I}_{+}\right)(2S+1)}.$$
(8.87)

As for electronic relaxation we can also define rate constants for longitudinal and transverse nuclear relaxation, which are equal to  $R_1 = 1/T_1$  and  $R_2 = 1/T_2$  respectively.

The traces in the numerators of Eqs. (8.85) and (8.87) are calculated from the trace of the operator in Eq. (8.71), which is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_{lS} &\left\{ \left[ \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t), \left[ \widehat{T}_{l-m}^{(n)}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}, \widehat{I}_{a} \right] \right] \right\} \\ &= (-1)^{m} \langle 11q_{1}q_{2} | l-m \rangle^{2} \operatorname{Tr}_{l} \left\{ \left[ \widehat{I}_{1q_{1}}, \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-q_{1}}, \widehat{I}_{a} \right] \right] \right\} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left\{ \widehat{S}_{1-q_{2}} \widehat{S}_{1q_{2}} \right\} g_{q_{2}}^{S}(\tau), \end{aligned}$$

$$(8.88)$$

where a = z or  $\pm$ . We have used the fact that  $\text{Tr}_{S}[\widehat{S}_{1q_{2}}, \widehat{S}_{1-q_{2}}]$  is always zero for any value of  $q_{2}$ . We can therefore proceed with the calculation by using the following expressions for the traces of the products of the *S*-spin operators:

$$Tr_{S}\left\{\widehat{S}_{10}^{2}\right\}/(2S+1) = S(S+1)/3, \tag{8.89}$$

$$Tr_{S}\left\{\widehat{S}_{1\pm 1}\widehat{S}_{1\mp 1}\right\}/(2S+1) = -S(S+1)/3. \tag{8.90}$$

We now examine some specific models for the PRE.

# 8.6. The Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory of paramagnetic nuclear relaxation

The simplest and most commonly-used model for the PRE is Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory. It is a non-relativistic theory, meaning that the parts of the hyperfine tensor we use in the calculation of the relaxation time constants are limited to the first-order Fermi-contact and spin-dipolar parts. In calculating the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations for  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  we consider the two parts of the hyperfine tensor separately, firstly focusing on the spin-dipolar part for both localised and delocalised electrons, and then on the Fermi-contact part.

# 8.6.1. Relaxation due to the spin-dipolar interaction with delocalized electrons

For a metal ion possessing unpaired electrons that are spatially delocalised we must calculate the sum of the squares of the PAF tensor components using the expressions in Eq. (2.172). Thus the tensor can be expressed in terms of the principal component  $\tilde{A}_{zz}^{SD}$ , which contains an integral over all space of the electron density, and an asymmetry parameter  $\eta^{SD}$  that is, in general, non-zero. The sum of the squares of the tensor parameters in the PAF is therefore

$$\sum_{\mu=-2}^{+2} |\widetilde{A}_{2\mu}^{SD}|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(3 + (\eta^{SD})^2\right) \left(\widetilde{A}_{zz}^{SD}\right)^2.$$
(8.91)

Evaluating the expression for the Redfield relaxation superoperator, and substituting it into Eq. (8.85) gives us the expression for  $T_1$ :

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{T_1} &= S(S+1) \left(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^2\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{A}_{zz}^{\text{SD}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{60} j_{21}(\omega_I) + \frac{1}{30} j_{22}(\omega_S + \omega_I) + \frac{1}{180} j_{22}(\omega_S - \omega_I)\right] \quad (8.92) \\ &= \frac{S(S+1) \left(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^2\right)}{90} \left(\frac{\tilde{A}_{zz}^{\text{SD}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ &\times \left[\frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1 + \omega_I^2 \tau_{c,1}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S + \omega_I)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_I)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2}\right], \end{split}$$

where to go to the second line, we have substituted in the explicit expressions for the reduced spectral densities. In addition we can calculate the PRE contribution to  $T_2$ , which is

$$\begin{split} &\frac{1}{T_2} = S(S+1) \left(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^2\right) \left(\frac{A_{22}^{\text{SD}}}{h}\right)^{-} \\ & \times \left[\frac{1}{90} j_{21}(0) + \frac{1}{60} j_{22}(\omega_S) + \frac{1}{120} j_{21}(\omega_l) + \frac{1}{60} j_{22}(\omega_S + \omega_l) + \frac{1}{360} j_{22}(\omega_S - \omega_l)\right] (8.94) \\ & = \frac{S(S+1) \left(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^2\right)}{180} \left(\frac{\widetilde{A}_{22}^{\text{SD}}}{h}\right)^2 \\ & \times \left[4\tau_{c,1} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1 + \omega_s^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1 + \omega_l^2 \tau_{c,1}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S + \omega_l)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_l)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2}\right]. \quad (8.95) \end{split}$$

## 8.6.2. Relaxation due to the spin-dipolar interaction with localised electrons (the Solomon mechanism)

When the nucleus is sufficiently far from the paramagnetic centre, typically at distances of more than 4 Å, we can safely approximate the unpaired electrons as being localised at the paramagnetic ion, and therefore treat them as point dipole moments of spin *S*. The dipolar coupling interaction then simplifies to the interaction between an electronic point dipole and a nuclear point dipole, allowing us to write the spin-dipolar tensor parameters as

$$A_{zz}^{\rm SD} = 2b_{\rm SI},\tag{8.96}$$

$$\eta^{\rm SD} = 0, \tag{8.97}$$

where  $b_{Sl}$  is the dipolar coupling constant for the interaction between the two point dipoles, which is given by Eq. (2.175). The  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  time constants are then calculated by substituting these values into Eqs. (8.93) and (8.95). This results in the familiar expression for  $T_1$ 

$$\frac{1}{T_{1}} = S(S+1) \left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{1}{5} j_{21}(\omega_{I}) + \frac{2}{5} j_{22}(\omega_{S}+\omega_{I}) + \frac{1}{15} j_{22}(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})\right] (8.98)$$

$$= \frac{2}{15} S(S+1) \left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^{2}$$

$$\times \left[\frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_{I}^{2} \tau_{c,1}^{2}} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}+\omega_{I})^{2} \tau_{c,2}^{2}} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2} \tau_{c,2}^{2}}\right], \quad (8.99)$$

and for  $T_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T_2} &= S(S+1) \left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[\frac{2}{15} j_{21}(0) + \frac{1}{5} j_{22}(\omega_S) + \frac{1}{10} j_{21}(\omega_I) \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{1}{5} j_{22}(\omega_S + \omega_I) + \frac{1}{30} j_{22}(\omega_S - \omega_I) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{15} S(S+1) \left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[ 4\tau_{c,1} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1 + \omega_S^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1 + \omega_I^2 \tau_{c,1}^2} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S + \omega_I)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_I)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$
(8.101)

These expressions were first calculated by Solomon, and so relaxation by the point-dipole part of the hyperfine interaction is sometimes referred to as the Solomon mechanism [97]. It is of interest to note that, once we have set S = 1/2 and replaced all the correlation times with the same time  $\tau_c$ , these expressions are identical to those for the relaxation time constants due to the stochastic fluctuation of the dipolar coupling tensor between two nuclei in a diamagnetic molecule in solution experiencing unrestricted rotation [184,258,259,253,96].

## 8.6.3. Relaxation due to the Fermi-contact interaction (the Bloembergen mechanism)

The second mechanism for paramagnetic nuclear relaxation in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory is via the isotropic Fermi-contact interaction, as first described by Bloembergen [98]. As we have seen the fluctuating local field at the nucleus can be induced by chemical exchange and electronic relaxation, so the Bloembergen mechanism comprises scalar relaxation of both the first and second kinds [184].

The calculation of the contributions to  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  proceeds as follows. The sum of the square modulus of the PAF tensor components reduces to a single term, which is

$$|A_{00}^{\rm FC}|^2 = 3\left(A^{\rm FC}\right)^2,\tag{8.102}$$

where  $A^{\text{FC}}$  is the Fermi-contact coupling constant in Eq. (2.171). The double commutators can now be computed in the same way as for the Solomon mechanism, which gives the following simple expression for  $T_1$ :

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{1}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{\rm FC}}{\hbar}\right)^2 j_{02}(\omega_{\rm S} - \omega_{\rm I})$$
(8.103)

$$=\frac{2}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^{2}\frac{\tau_{\text{E},2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{l})^{2}\tau_{\text{E},2}^{2}},$$
(8.104)

and likewise the following expression for  $T_2$ :

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{6}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{FC}}{\hbar}\right)^2 [j_{01}(0) + j_{02}(\omega_S - \omega_I)]$$
(8.105)

$$=\frac{1}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{FC}}{\hbar}\right)^{2}\left[\tau_{E,1}+\frac{\tau_{E,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{E,2}^{2}}\right].$$
(8.106)

#### 8.6.4. The Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations

The final step in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory is to note that the contributions from the relaxation rate constants  $R_i$  from the different mechanisms are additive, which is the result of neglecting cross-correlation between the Fermi-contact and spin-dipolar interactions. Hence we can write down the overall Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equation for  $T_1$  by summing the Solomon and Bloembergen contributions, which gives [96]

$$\frac{1}{T_{1}} = \frac{2}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{FC}}{\hbar}\right)^{2}\frac{\tau_{E,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{E,2}^{2}} + \frac{2}{15}S(S+1)\left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \times \left[\frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_{I}^{2}\tau_{c,1}^{2}} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}+\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}}\right].$$
(8.107)

Similarly the corresponding expression for  $T_2$  is [96]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T_2} &= \frac{1}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{FC}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[\tau_{E,1} + \frac{\tau_{E,2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_I)^2 \tau_{E,2}^2}\right] + \frac{1}{15}S(S+1)\left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ &\times \left[4\tau_{c,1} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1 + \omega_S^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1 + \omega_I^2 \tau_{c,1}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S + \omega_I)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_I)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

$$(8.108)$$

These equations provide a description of the PRE in systems experiencing rapid rotational diffusion such that  $\tau_{R}$  is not much longer than the electronic relaxation times  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$ . The theory therefore applies to small complexes in solution. In situations where the dynamics are slowed so that  $\tau_{\rm R}, \tau_{\rm M} \gg T_{1e}, T_{2e}$ , the correlation times  $\tau_{c,q}$  and  $\tau_{E,q}$  are approximately equal to  $T_{qe}$ , so the relaxation properties of the nucleus are dominated by the electron relaxation and are essentially independent of any molecular dynamics. However this is not observed experimentally for systems undergoing sluggish rotational dynamics, such as large biomolecules in solution, a subject we return to in Section 8.7. A special case of slow dynamics occurs in rigid solids, where  $\tau_{R}$ essentially becomes infinite. This represents a violation of the Redfield theory as the observation time is no longer much greater than  $\tau_{\rm R}$ , and so care needs to be taken when writing down the relaxation rate constants under such conditions. This is the subject of Section 8.9.

#### 8.6.5. Shortcomings of the Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan theory

The Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan model presented here is the simplest possible theory of the PRE and so, inevitably, contains a number of approximations that may not be valid in all situations. The use of the point-dipole model for the unpaired electrons is questionable for distances from the paramagnetic centre of less than 4 Å [260], and deviations have been reported even for distances beyond 10 Å [261]. However, as we have seen, this simplification can be addressed relatively simply by using a more complex form of the spin-dipolar coupling tensor [262].

Additional approximations that have been made are that the reduced correlation functions are all assumed to have the form of a simple exponential decay. For the rotational correlation function, this is only true for small- to medium-sized molecules in solution. However for larger molecules, such as proteins, more sophisticated dynamic correlation functions are needed that account for simultaneous restricted rotation and internal motions, such as are used in the Lipari–Szarbo model [263]. A related problem is the assumption of mono-exponential electronic relaxation, which we have seen is generally not valid even in the Redfield limit if S > 1. Multi-exponential electronic relaxation, and the resulting effect on the PRE, has been treated by Westlund in the Redfield limit, and under conditions of high field so that the Zeeman interactions

dominate  $\hat{H}_0$  [264]. The resulting model is referred to as the generalised Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory.

A more serious problem concerns the approximation that the processes of chemical exchange, rotational diffusion, and electronic relaxation are uncorrelated, which allows us to write the overall correlation function as the product of three separate functions, each of which corresponds to one of these processes. This assumption probably holds when the three processes occur on very different timescales, but this is often not the case and this deficiency is not easy to repair. Nevertheless work has been performed in this area by Bertini et al. [109] and Kruk et al. [110].

#### 8.7. Curie-spin relaxation

The Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan theory does not provide a correct description of large paramagnetic molecules with sluggish rotational diffusion where electron relaxation is the fastest stochastic process described by the correlation function. The reason for this is that we have ignored the effect of the differences in the populations of the electronic spin energy levels due to the relatively large electronic magnetic moment. It is this which is responsible for the measurable Curie spin in Eq. (3.62). It was shown by Gueron [100], and Vega and Fiat [101] that in situations where electronic relaxation occurs on a much shorter timescale than the rotational processes, the primary role of the former is to generate a thermal average of the electronic spin, equal to the Curie spin, and the role of the latter is to cause a random spatial fluctuation in the hyperfine interaction to the Curie spin on a longer timescale. Given that the Curie spin is proportional to  $B_0$ we would expect the relaxation effects due to the Curie spin to become more important at high field.

For an ensemble of spin-only transition-metal ions, the Curie spin is parallel to the external magnetic field, conventionally the *z*-direction. We must therefore modify the expression for the longitudinal electronic spin operator  $\hat{S}_{10}(t)$ , which we write as the sum of a time-independent Curie-spin term, and a fluctuating remainder  $\hat{s}_{10}(t)$  with zero time average:

$$\widehat{S}_{10}(t) = \langle \widehat{S}_{10} \rangle \widehat{1}_{S} + \widehat{S}_{10}(t).$$
 (8.109)

This expression indicates that the electronic spin operator  $\widehat{S}_{10}(t)$  fluctuates about its average value of  $\langle \widehat{S}_{10} \rangle \hat{1}_s$ . This decomposition changes the expression of the ensemble average  $\overline{\widehat{S}_{10}(t)\widehat{S}_{10}(t-\tau)}$  compared to that used in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory. The new expression is

$$\widehat{S}_{10}(t)\widehat{S}_{10}(t-\tau) = \langle \widehat{S}_{10} \rangle^2 \widehat{1}_{\mathsf{S}} + \overline{\widehat{s}_{10}(t)} \langle \widehat{S}_{10} \rangle + \langle \widehat{S}_{10} \rangle \overline{\widehat{s}_{10}(t-\tau)} \\
+ \overline{\widehat{s}_{10}(t)} \widehat{\overline{s}_{10}(t-\tau)}$$
(8.110)

$$= \langle \hat{S}_{10} \rangle^2 \hat{1}_S + \overline{\hat{s}_{10}(t)\hat{s}_{10}(t-\tau)}$$
 (8.111)

$$= \langle \widehat{S}_{10} \rangle^2 \widehat{1}_S + \left[ \widehat{S}_{10}^2 - \langle \widehat{S}_{10} \rangle^2 \widehat{1}_S \right] g_0^S(\tau), \tag{8.112}$$

where to go to the second line we have used the fact that  $\hat{s}_{10}(t) = 0$ , and to go to the last line we have interpreted  $\hat{s}_{10}^2$  as the difference between the squares of  $\hat{S}_{10}$  and the Curie term  $\langle \hat{S}_{10} \rangle \hat{1}_S$ . We see that the expression comprises two terms. The first is the Curie term  $\langle \hat{S}_{10} \rangle^2 \hat{1}_S$  which, as the absence of any  $\tau$ -dependence suggests, is independent of the electronic relaxation processes. This is because the effects of electronic relaxation have already been accounted for in the calculation of the Curie spin. The second term is a remainder that is affected by longitudinal electronic relaxation through the electronic correlation function  $g_0^S(\tau)$ . This part is similar to that in the corresponding Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan expression, with the difference that it is reduced in size by  $\langle \hat{S}_{10} \rangle^2 \hat{1}_S$ . The operators representing the coherences  $\widehat{S}_{1\pm 1}(t)$  are unchanged, as the transverse components of the Curie spin are zero. Therefore the ensemble average  $\overline{\widehat{S}_{1\pm 1}(t)\widehat{S}_{1\pm 1}(t-\tau)}$  has the same expression as in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory:

$$\widehat{S}_{1\pm1}(t)\widehat{S}_{1\mp1}(t-\tau) = \overline{\widehat{S}_{1\pm1}(t-\tau)}\widehat{S}_{1\mp1}(t) = \widehat{S}_{1\pm1}\widehat{S}_{1\mp1}g_{\pm1}^{S}(\tau) \quad (8.113)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2}\widehat{S}_{\pm}\widehat{S}_{\mp}g_{\pm1}^{S}(\tau). \quad (8.114)$$

We now have two new interactions to include in our calculation  
of the relaxation time constants in addition to those considered in  
the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory: the Fermi-contact and  
spin-dipolar interactions between the nuclear spin and the Curie  
spin. We therefore need two additional reduced correlation func-  
tions to describe the stochastic time dependence of these interac-  
tions, and two corresponding reduced spectral densities which we  
label 
$$g_l^c(\tau)$$
 and  $j_l^c(\omega)$ , with  $l = 0, 2$ , respectively. The Fermi-contact  
interaction to the Curie spin has the following reduced correlation  
function and spectral density with  $l = 0$ :

$$g_{0}^{C}(\tau) = exp(-|\tau|/\tau_{M}), \qquad (8.115)$$

$$j_0^c(\omega) = \frac{2\tau_M}{1+\omega^2 \tau_M^2}.$$
 (8.116)

The interaction is spatially isotropic, and so the overall correlation time is simply the chemical exchange correlation time  $\tau_{\rm M}$ . The relaxation mechanism is therefore an example of scalar relaxation of the first kind. For the spin-dipolar interaction the reduced correlation function and spectral density, with l = 2, are given by

$$g_2^{\rm C}(\tau) = \exp\left(-|\tau|/\tau_{\rm D}\right),$$
 (8.117)

$$j_{2}^{c}(\omega) = \frac{2\tau_{\rm D}}{1 + \omega^{2}\tau_{\rm D}^{2}}.$$
(8.118)

The interaction is spatially anisotropic, and so the correlation time  $\tau_{\rm D}$  is now a combination of the correlation times for the chemical exchange and the rotational diffusion of the system:

$$\tau_{\rm D}^{-1} = \tau_{\rm M}^{-1} + \tau_{\rm R}^{-1}. \tag{8.119}$$

We recall that these interactions are not modulated by electronic relaxation, as this is already accounted for in the calculation of the Curie spin.

# 8.7.1. Relaxation due to the spin-dipolar interaction with delocalized electrons

We can now derive the expressions for the Curie relaxation time constants via the spin-dipolar interaction with a source of delocalized electrons. The calculation can be summarised as follows. We take the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equation, and replace any term that depends on  $T_{1e}$  with two similar terms. The first term is a Curie term that is weighted by  $S_c^2$  (where  $S_c$  denotes the Curie spin  $\langle \widehat{S}_{10} \rangle$ ) and in which  $\tau_{c,1}$  is replaced with  $\tau_D$ , and the second is weighted by  $S(S + 1)/3 - S_c^2$  and otherwise unchanged. In addition, any terms that depend on  $T_{2e}$  are unchanged. The new expression for  $T_1$  is:

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \left(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^2\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{A}_{zz}^{\text{SD}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[S_{\text{C}}^2 \frac{1}{20} j_2^{\text{C}}(\omega_l) + \left(\frac{1}{3}S(S+1) - S_{\text{C}}^2\right) \frac{1}{20} j_{21}(\omega_l) + S(S+1) \left(\frac{1}{30} j_{22}(\omega_S + \omega_l) + \frac{1}{180} j_{22}(\omega_S - \omega_l)\right)\right]$$
(8.120)

$$= \frac{1}{90} \left(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^2\right) \left(\frac{\widetilde{A}_{zz}^{\text{SD}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[S_{\text{C}}^2 \frac{9\tau_{\text{D}}}{1 + \omega_l^2 \tau_{\text{D}}^2} + \left(\frac{1}{3}S(S+1) - S_{\text{C}}^2\right) \frac{9\tau_{\text{c},1}}{1 + \omega_l^2 \tau_{\text{c},1}} + S(S+1) \left(\frac{6\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1 + (\omega_S + \omega_l)^2 \tau_{\text{c},2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_l)^2 \tau_{\text{c},2}^2}\right)\right].$$
(8.121)

We can write this expression as the sum of two separate terms

$$T_1^{-1} = (T_1^{\rm C})^{-1} + (T_1^{\rm SBM})^{-1},$$
 (8.122)

where we define  $T_1^{C}$  as the Curie contribution and  $T_1^{SBM}$  as a modified Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan contribution to the overall  $T_1$ :

$$\frac{1}{T_1^{\mathsf{C}}} = \left(3 + \left(\eta^{\mathsf{SD}}\right)^2\right) \left(\frac{\widetilde{A}_{zz}^{\mathsf{SD}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[S_{\mathsf{C}}^2 \frac{1}{20} j_2^{\mathsf{C}}(\omega_l)\right],\tag{8.123}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_1^{\text{SBM}}} = \left(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^2\right) \left(\frac{N_{22}}{\hbar}\right) \left[ \left(\frac{1}{3}S(S+1) - S_c^2\right) \frac{1}{20} j_{21}(\omega_l) + S(S+1) \left(\frac{1}{30} j_{22}(\omega_S + \omega_l) + \frac{1}{180} j_{22}(\omega_S - \omega_l)\right) \right]. \quad (8.124)$$

In exactly the same way we can write down an overall expression for the  $T_2$  time constant, which is

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{T_2} &= \left(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^2\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{A}_{2z}^{\text{SD}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ &\times \left[S_c^2 \left(\frac{1}{30} j_2^c(0) + \frac{1}{40} j_2^c(\omega_l)\right) + \left(\frac{1}{3} S(S+1) - S_c^2\right) \left(\frac{1}{30} j_{21}(0) + \frac{1}{40} j_{21}(\omega_l)\right) \\ &+ S(S+1) \left(\frac{1}{60} j_{22}(\omega_S) + \frac{1}{60} j_{22}(\omega_S + \omega_l) + \frac{1}{360} j_{22}(\omega_S - \omega_l)\right)\right] \quad (8.125) \\ &= \frac{1}{180} \left(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^2\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{A}_{2z}^{\text{SD}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ &\times \left[S_c^2 \left(12\tau_D + \frac{9\tau_D}{1 + \omega_l^2 \tau_D^2}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{3} S(S+1) - S_c^2\right) \left(12\tau_{c,1} + \frac{9\tau_{c,1}}{1 + \omega_l^2 \tau_{c,1}^2}\right) \\ &+ S(S+1) \left(\frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1 + \omega_S^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S + \omega_l)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_l)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2}\right)\right] . \quad (8.126) \end{split}$$

This expression can also be decomposed into the constituent Curie  $T_2^{\rm C}$  and modified Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan  $T_2^{\rm SBM}$  parts

$$T_2^{-1} = (T_2^{\rm C})^{-1} + (T_2^{\rm SBM})^{-1},$$
 (8.127)

where

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{T_2^{\mathsf{C}}} &= \left(3 + \left(\eta^{\mathsf{SD}}\right)^2\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{A}_{zz}^{\mathsf{SD}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[S_{\mathsf{C}}^2 \left(\frac{1}{30} j_2^{\mathsf{C}}(0) + \frac{1}{40} j_2^{\mathsf{C}}(\omega_l)\right)\right], \quad (8.128)\\ \frac{1}{T_2^{\mathsf{SBM}}} &= \left(3 + \left(\eta^{\mathsf{SD}}\right)^2\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{A}_{zz}^{\mathsf{SD}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[\left(\frac{1}{3} S(S+1) - S_{\mathsf{C}}^2\right) \left(\frac{1}{30} j_{21}(0) + \frac{1}{40} j_{21}(\omega_l)\right) + S(S+1) \left(\frac{1}{60} j_{22}(\omega_S) + \frac{1}{60} j_{22}(\omega_S + \omega_l) + \frac{1}{360} j_{22}(\omega_S - \omega_l)\right)\right]. \quad (8.129) \end{split}$$

We note that both Curie terms depend only on spectral densities of the form  $j_2^{C}(\omega)$ , and the correlation time  $\tau_{D}$ .

# 8.7.2. Relaxation due to the spin-dipolar interaction with localised electrons

If we can approximate the unpaired electron density at the paramagnetic centre as a localised electronic spin *S*, we can use the point-dipole form of the spin-dipolar interaction and set  $\tilde{A}_{zz}^{SD} = 2b_{SI}$  and  $\eta^{SD} = 0$ . The  $T_1$  time constant is now

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \left(\frac{b_{Sl}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[S_c^2 \frac{3}{5} j_2^C(\omega_l) + \left(\frac{1}{3}S(S+1) - S_c^2\right) \frac{3}{5} j_{21}(\omega_l) + S(S+1) \left(\frac{2}{5} j_{22}(\omega_S + \omega_l) + \frac{1}{15} j_{22}(\omega_S - \omega_l)\right)\right]$$

$$= \frac{2}{15} \left(\frac{b_{Sl}}{5}\right)^2 \left[S_c^2 \frac{9\tau_D}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{5}S(S+1) - S_c^2\right) \frac{9\tau_{c,1}}{2}\right]$$
(8.130)

$$+S(S+1)\left(\frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}+\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}}+\frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}}\right)\right],\quad(8.131)$$

and  $T_2$  becomes

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{T_2} &= \left(\frac{b_{Sl}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[ S_{\mathsf{C}}^2 \left(\frac{2}{5} j_2^{\mathsf{C}}(0) + \frac{3}{10} j_2^{\mathsf{C}}(\omega_l) \right) + \left(\frac{1}{3} S(S+1) - S_{\mathsf{C}}^2 \right) \left(\frac{2}{5} j_{21}(0) + \frac{3}{10} j_{21}(\omega_l) \right) \\ &+ S(S+1) \left(\frac{1}{5} j_{22}(\omega_S) + \frac{1}{5} j_{22}(\omega_S + \omega_l) + \frac{1}{30} j_{22}(\omega_S - \omega_l) \right) \right] \qquad (8.132) \\ &= \frac{1}{15} \left(\frac{b_{Sl}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[ S_{\mathsf{C}}^2 \left(12\tau_{\mathsf{D}} + \frac{9\tau_{\mathsf{D}}}{1 + \omega_l^2 \tau_{\mathsf{D}}^2} \right) + \left(\frac{1}{3} S(S+1) - S_{\mathsf{C}}^2 \right) \left(12\tau_{\mathsf{c},1} + \frac{9\tau_{\mathsf{c},1}}{1 + \omega_l^2 \tau_{\mathsf{c},1}^2} \right) \end{split}$$

$$+S(S+1)\left(\frac{6\tau_{c2}}{1+\omega_{S}^{2}\tau_{c2}^{2}}+\frac{6\tau_{c2}}{1+(\omega_{S}+\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c2}^{2}}+\frac{\tau_{c2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c2}^{2}}\right)\right].$$
 (8.133)

The Curie contributions to both time constants now have the simple forms

$$\frac{1}{T_1^c} = \left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 S_C^2 \frac{3}{5} j_2^c(\omega_I),$$
(8.134)

$$\frac{1}{T_2^{\rm C}} = \left(\frac{b_{\rm SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 S_{\rm C}^2 \left(\frac{2}{5} j_2^{\rm C}(0) + \frac{3}{10} j_2^{\rm C}(\omega_{\rm I})\right). \tag{8.135}$$

### 8.7.3. Relaxation due to the Fermi-contact interaction

Finally we consider the effect of the Curie spin on the Fermicontact relaxation mechanism. Since the Fermi-contact term is spatially isotropic, we expect that any Curie contribution to the relaxation rates is due to modulation only by chemical exchange, and so only contains terms that depend on the reduced spectral density  $j_0^C(0)$ . As before we take each term in the Solomon–Bloem bergen–Morgan expression and replace any term that depends on  $T_{1e}$  with a Curie term and a modified Solomon–Bloembergen– Morgan term, and leave unchanged any terms that depend on  $T_{2e}$ . The Fermi-contact contribution to the nuclear  $T_1$  depends only on  $T_{2e}$ , and so is unchanged by the effect of the Curie spin:

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{1}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 j_{02}(\omega_S - \omega_I)$$
(8.136)

$$=\frac{2}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{\rm FC}}{\hbar}\right)^2\frac{\tau_{\rm E,2}}{1+(\omega_{\rm S}-\omega_{\rm I})^2\tau_{\rm E,2}^2}.$$
(8.137)

By contrast the expression for  $T_2$  acquires a Curie term with reduced spectral density  $j_0^c(0)$ :

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{T_2} &= \left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[\frac{1}{2}S_{\text{C}}^2 j_0^{\text{C}}(0) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{3}S(S+1) - S_{\text{C}}^2\right) j_{01}(0) \\ &+ \frac{1}{6}S(S+1) j_{02}(\omega_S - \omega_I)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{3}S(S+1) \left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[3S_{\text{C}}^2 \tau_{\text{M}} + 3\left(\frac{1}{3}S(S+1) - S_{\text{C}}^2\right) \tau_{\text{E},1} \\ &+ \frac{\tau_{\text{E},2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_I)^2 \tau_{\text{E},2}^2}\right]. \end{split}$$
(8.139)

As before we can write each total rate constant as the sum of a Curie term and a modified Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan term. The former are given by

$$\frac{1}{T_1^C} = 0, (8.140)$$

$$\frac{1}{T_2^C} = \left(\frac{A^{\rm FC}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2} S_{\rm C}^2 j_0^{\rm C}(0). \tag{8.141}$$

Again we note that the Curie relaxation only affects the transverse PRE.

8.7.4. Comparison of the Curie terms with the relaxation rate constants due to stochastic fluctuation of the paramagnetic chemical shielding interaction

Having introduced the relaxation rate constants resulting from the Curie interaction, we now explore how we may interpret these contributions. Following the introduction of the Curie spin in Section 3.2, we showed how the parameters of the induced paramagnetic shielding could be related to the Curie spin. As a reminder we reproduce the relevant expressions for the isotropic shielding, shielding anisotropy, and asymmetry parameter below:

$$\sigma_{\rm iso} = \frac{S_{\rm C} A^{\rm FC}}{\hbar \gamma_{\rm I} B_0},\tag{8.142}$$

$$\Delta \sigma = \frac{S_C A_{zz}^{SD}}{h \gamma_I B_0},\tag{8.143}$$

$$\eta = \eta^{\rm SD}.\tag{8.144}$$

If the electrons are localised at the paramagnetic centre, the anisotropy and asymmetry become

$$\Delta \sigma = \frac{2S_{\rm C} b_{\rm SI}}{\hbar \gamma_{\rm I} B_0},\tag{8.145}$$

$$\eta = 0. \tag{8.146}$$

Since the Curie spin induces a shielding tensor at the nucleus via the hyperfine interaction, we can interpret the Curie relaxation mechanism as resulting from the stochastic modulation of this shielding tensor due to fast chemical exchange, and rotational diffusion. The random Hamiltonian that we use is

$$\hat{H}_1(t) = \hbar \gamma_I \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}(t) \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{I}}, \qquad (8.147)$$

where the time dependence is encoded entirely in the shielding tensor through changes in the orientation of the PAF, with the associated correlation time  $\tau_{R}$ , and changes in the PAF components themselves, with the associated correlation time  $\tau_{M}$ . We consider relaxation due both to the isotropic parts of the shielding, which depend on the Fermi-contact coupling constant, and to the anisotropic part, which depends on the spin-dipolar coupling parameters. The relevant irreducible spherical tensor operators are given in Table 8.4, and the sums of the squares of the PAF parameters are:

$$\sum_{\mu} |\tilde{K}_{l\mu}|^2 = \begin{cases} 3\hbar^2 \gamma_l^2 \sigma_{\rm iso}^2, & l = 0\\ \frac{1}{2}\hbar^2 \gamma_l^2 \Delta \sigma^2 (3 + \eta^2), & l = 2. \end{cases}$$
(8.148)

Incorporating these expressions into the Redfield superoperator in Eq. (8.25), and computing the expectation values of the longitudinal and coherence *I*-spin operators, gives us the following expressions for the Curie longitudinal and transverse relaxation time constants:

$$\frac{1}{T_1^{\rm C}} = \frac{1}{20} \omega_I^2 \Delta \sigma^2 (3 + \eta^2) j_2^{\rm C}(\omega_I)$$
(8.149)

$$= \frac{1}{10} \omega_{\rm I}^2 \Delta \sigma^2 (3 + \eta^2) \frac{\tau_{\rm D}}{1 + \omega_{\rm I}^2 \tau_{\rm D}^2}, \qquad (8.150)$$

$$\frac{1}{T_2^{\mathsf{C}}} = \frac{1}{2}\omega_l^2 \sigma_{\mathrm{iso}}^2 j_0^{\mathsf{C}}(0) + \omega_l^2 \Delta \sigma^2 (3+\eta^2) \left[\frac{1}{30} j_2^{\mathsf{C}}(0) + \frac{1}{40} j_2^{\mathsf{C}}(\omega_l)\right] \quad (8.151)$$

$$=\omega_{I}^{2}\sigma_{iso}^{2}\tau_{M}+\omega_{I}^{2}\Delta\sigma^{2}(3+\eta^{2})\left[\frac{1}{15}\tau_{D}+\frac{1}{20}\frac{\tau_{D}}{1+\omega_{I}^{2}\tau_{D}^{2}}\right].$$
 (8.152)

Table 8.4

The spin operators  $\hat{T}_{lm}^{(n)}$ , and frequencies  $\omega_m^{(n)}$  for the chemical shielding interaction used in the calculation of the PRE.

1	т	$\widehat{T}_{lm}^{(n)}$ $n = 1$	$\omega_m^{(n)}$ n=1
0	0	$-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}B_0\widehat{I}_z$	0
2	0	$\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}B_0\widehat{I}_z$	0
	$\pm 1$	$\pm \frac{1}{2}B_0\hat{I}_{\pm}$	$\pm \omega_l$
	±2	0	$\pm 2\omega_l$

It is easily verified that these expressions are the same as those calculated previously by substituting in the expressions for the shielding tensor parameters in Eqs. (8.142)–(8.146). In particular we note that the isotropic shielding interaction contributes only to  $T_2^C$ , and not to  $T_1^C$ , as it does not correspond to a transition between nuclear energy levels, as shown by the dependence on  $j_0^C(0)$ . In addition this term only contributes in the presence of fast chemical exchange. The anisotropic shielding contributes both to  $T_1^C$  and  $T_2^C$  relaxation due to modulation by both fast chemical exchange and rotational diffusion.

## 8.7.5. The importance of the Curie term

Following the discussion of Curie relaxation, the obvious practical question is under what circumstances does the Curie contribution become an important contribution to the overall PRE? We recall that under the typical conditions of high-resolution NMR, namely high magnetic field and high temperature, we can approximate the expression of the Curie spin in the high-temperature limit, with the result that  $|S_C| \ll 1$ . Therefore we might expect the contribution to the PRE to be insignificant since it is proportional to  $S_C^2$ , whereas the corresponding factors in the modified Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan contribution are  $S(S+1)/3 - S_C^2$  and S(S+1). For example, an ensemble of electronic spins S = 1 immersed in a magnetic field of 11.74 T at a temperature of 298 K induces a Curie spin of -0.035, and the corresponding Curie term is weighted by  $S_C^2 = 0.001$ . Nevertheless the Curie term can become the dominant factor in

T<sub>2</sub> relaxation under conditions of fast electronic relaxation and long rotational correlation times, so that  $T_{1e}, T_{2e} \ll \tau_R$ , as is observed for proteins in solution. Additionally we can expect the Curie term to become more important at high field, since  $S_c^2 \propto B_0^2$ , in complete analogy to the increase in the importance of CSAinduced relaxation at high field in diamagnetic systems. This is illustrated in Fig. 8.6, which shows the Curie and modified Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan contributions to the spin-dipolar  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  rates of a <sup>1</sup>H nucleus plotted as functions of  $\tau_{\rm R}$ , for two different electronic relaxation times ( $T_{1e}$  is assumed to be equal to  $T_{2e}$ ) of 0.1 and 1.0 ps, using the parameters for the Curie spin given in the previous paragraph, and assuming there is no chemical exchange. For electronic relaxation times of 1.0 ps, the longitudinal relaxation rate is dominated by the Solomon-Bloembergen-Mor gan contribution, as shown in (a). The Curie term varies according to the spectral density  $j_2^{\rm C}(\omega_l)$ , which reaches a maximum value at  $\tau_{R} = 0.3$  ns. By contrast the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan contribution is independent of  $\tau_{R}$  in the slow-rotation limit as the



**Fig. 8.6.** Comparison of the size of the Curie and Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan terms in the spin-dipolar relaxation rate constants under the influence of slow rotational diffusion. The plots in (a) and (b) show the longitudinal and transverse rate constants  $T_1^{-1}$  and  $T_2^{-1}$  as a function of  $\tau_R$ , which takes relatively long values of up to 10 ns, and constant electron relaxation time constants  $T_{1e} = T_{2e} = 1$  ps. The corresponding plots in (c) and (d) show the longitudinal and transverse rate constants  $T_1^{-1}$  and  $T_2^{-1}$  as a function of  $\tau_R$  with shorter electronic relaxation time constants of  $T_{1e} = T_{2e} = 0.1$  ps. The relaxation curves correspond to  $a_2^{-1}$  H nucleus coupled to an electronic spin S = 1 at 11.74 T. The Curie spin is calculated at 298 K, and takes the value  $S_C = -3.5 \times 10^{-2}$ . The constant  $C = (3 + (\eta^{5D})^2)(A_{zz}^{SD}/h) / 12$ , or  $(b_{SI}/h)^2$ .

overall correlation time is dominated by the rapid electron relaxation, i.e.  $\tau_{c,q} \approx T_{qe}$ . The transverse relaxation rate, shown in (b), shows very different behaviour with the Curie contribution becoming larger than the Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan contribution when  $\tau_{R}$  is longer than approximately 1 ns. At longer  $\tau_{R}$ , the Curie term dominates completely due to the dependence  $j_2^{\rm C}(0)$ , which is larger than  $j_{21}(0)$  as  $\tau_R \gg \tau_{c,q} \approx T_{qe}$ . If we reduce the electronic relaxation times to 0.1 ps, the Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan contributions to both the longitudinal and transverse relaxation rates, shown in (c) and (d), are reduced, with the result that the Curie term is a larger relative contribution still to the overall relaxation rates. We note here that for large paramagnetic systems with slow rotational dynamics, the transverse relaxation rate is completely dominated by Curie relaxation, whereas the longitudinal relaxation rate is dominated by Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan relaxation. For systems with rotational dynamics that are intermediate between those of small molecules in solution and large systems, with correlation times of approximately 1 ns, both the Curie and Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan mechanisms are important for both longitudinal and transverse relaxation.

# 8.8. Cross-correlation between the paramagnetic and diamagnetic relaxation mechanisms in solution

We now turn our attention to an interesting feature of relaxation in paramagnetic systems that is observed in large biomolecules, which is the interference between the relaxation mechanisms resulting in the PRE and the relaxation mechanisms due to non-paramagnetic interactions. So far we have assumed that the random modulations of different interactions that act as local fields for relaxation vary independently of each other, so that the relaxation rates are purely additive. However in some cases the fluctuations are not independent, but are strongly correlated. One example that is commonly encountered is that of the dynamic processes in a protein that cause fluctuations in both the <sup>15</sup>N CSA and <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>15</sup>N dipolar coupling interactions. Here is it clear that the same source of fluctuations causes random modulations of both the interactions, which are then obviously not mutually independent. This phenomenon is referred to as cross-correlated relaxation (CCR), and results in an additional relaxation rate constant that is added to the others.

Here we investigate the effect of cross correlation observed in a spin system comprising two spin-1/2 nuclei  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , coupled together by a dipolar coupling interaction with constant  $b_{12}$ , both of which experience a spin-dipolar interaction with an electronic spin *S* with constants  $b_{S1}$  and  $b_{S2}$ . The spin system and nuclearspin energy levels are illustrated in Fig. 8.7(a) and (b). In this spin system we have defined the Larmor frequency of  $I_1$ ,  $\omega_{0,1}$ , to be negative and the Larmor frequency of  $I_1$ ,  $\omega_{0,2}$ , to be positive. Therefore we may interpret Fig. 8.7 as representing the spins in an H–N amide group in a paramagnetic protein, with  $I_1 = {}^{1}$ H and  $I_2 = {}^{15}$ N. To simplify the discussion we neglect chemical exchange, and assume that the only sources of the stochastic fluctuations are unrestricted rotational diffusion and electronic relaxation.

### 8.8.1. Nuclear–nuclear dipolar-coupling relaxation and crosscorrelation with the Curie mechanism

We proceed to calculate the full form of the relaxation superoperator corresponding to the spin system in Fig. 8.7(a). The Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  that contains all the time-dependent random interactions is given by

$$\widehat{H}_{1}(t) = \widehat{H}_{C}^{(1)}(t) + \widehat{H}_{C}^{(2)}(t) + \widehat{H}_{SBM}^{(S1)}(t) + \widehat{H}_{SBM}^{(S2)}(t) + \widehat{H}_{DD}^{(12)}(t).$$
(8.153)



**Fig. 8.7.** Illustration of a combined nuclear–electronic spin system in which we observe cross-correlated relaxation between the nuclear–nuclear dipolar coupling and Curie mechanisms. The spin system is shown in (a). The Larmor frequencies of the two nuclear spins  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , denoted  $\omega_{0,1}$  and  $\omega_{0,2}$  are assumed to be negative and positive respectively, so that the system represents a <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>15</sup>N spin system in a protein. The dipolar coupling between the two nuclei is  $b_{12}$ . The electronic spin *S* has Larmor frequency  $\omega_S$  and interacts with the two nuclei via point-dipolar-coupling interactions with constants  $b_{S1}$  and  $b_{S2}$ . The nuclear energy levels and transition frequencies are shown in (b).

The first two terms  $\widehat{H}_{C}^{(1)}(t)$  and  $\widehat{H}_{C}^{(2)}(t)$  represent the interactions of nuclear spins  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  with the Curie spin of the paramagnetic centre. As discussed in Section 8.7.4, both interactions can be represented by the corresponding SA subject to rotational diffusion, and so they also include the orbital contributions to the SA that are present in diamagnetic systems. The spin operators are  $\hat{T}_{C1,2m}$ and  $\hat{T}_{C2,2m}$ , which take the expressions in Table 8.4. Both of these terms are responsible for the Curie PREs, and the CSAcontributions to relaxation in diamagnetic systems. The third and fourth terms in the Hamiltonian are  $\widehat{H}^{\rm (S1)}_{
m SBM}(t)$  and  $\widehat{H}^{\rm (S2)}_{
m SBM}(t)$ , which represent the time-dependent spin-dipolar interactions between  $I_1$  and S, and  $I_2$  and S respectively that are modulated by rotational diffusion and electronic relaxation. The spin operators are given in Table 8.2. Both terms are responsible for the modified Solomon contribution to the PREs. The final term in the Hamiltonian is  $\hat{H}_{\text{DD}}^{(12)}(t)$ , which represents the nuclear-nuclear dipolar coupling interaction that is modulated by rotational diffusion. The spin operators  $\widehat{T}_{\mathrm{DD},2m}^{(n)}$  are given in Table 8.2 with the substitutions  $I o I_1$  and  $S \rightarrow I_2$ .

We can now write the total relaxation superoperator  $\hat{\Gamma}$  as a sum of terms:

$$\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}} = \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{PRE}^{(1)} + \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{PRE}^{(2)} + \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{DD}^{(12)} + \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{CCR}^{(1)} + \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{CCR}^{(2)}.$$
(8.154)

The terms  $\widehat{\Gamma}_{PRE}^{(1)}$  and  $\widehat{\Gamma}_{PRE}^{(2)}$  are responsible for the total PRE experienced by spins  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  due to both the Solomon and Curie relaxation mechanisms. Both superoperators and the corresponding relaxation rates as the same as calculated previously. The relaxation contribution from the nuclear–nuclear dipolar interaction is due to  $\widehat{\nabla}_{III}$ 

the term  $\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{\text{DD}}^{(12)}$  , which takes the expression

$$\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{\text{DD}}^{(12)}\widehat{O} = \frac{3b_{12}^2}{5\hbar^2} \sum_{mn} \left[ \widehat{T}_{\text{DD},2-m}^{(n)}, \left[ \left( \widehat{T}_{\text{DD},2-m}^{(n)} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{O} \right] \right] j^{\text{R}} \left( -\omega_{-m}^{(n)} \right).$$
(8.155)

The spectral density function  $j^{R}(\omega) = 2\tau_{R}/(1 + \omega^{2}\tau_{R}^{2})$  represents unrestricted rotational diffusion. Finally the relaxation contributions due to CCR for  $I_{1}$  and  $I_{2}$  are represented by the superoperator terms  $\hat{\Gamma}_{CCR}^{(1)}$  and  $\hat{\Gamma}_{CCR}^{(2)}$ . We only consider the cross correlation between the Curie and nuclear–nuclear dipolar interactions. Assuming the SAs of both nuclear spins are axially symmetric (which is the case for a single point-spin-dipolar hyperfine interaction), with anisotropies  $\Delta \sigma_{2}^{S}$  and  $\Delta \sigma_{2}^{S}$  respectively, the two CCR superoperators have the expressions:

$$\begin{split} \widehat{\Gamma}_{\text{CCR}}^{(1)} \widehat{O} &= \frac{3\gamma_1 b_{12} \Delta \sigma_1^{\text{S}}}{10\hbar} d_{00}^{(2)}(\vartheta_1) \sum_m \left\{ \left[ \widehat{T}_{\text{DD},2-m}^{(0)}, \left[ \left( \widehat{T}_{\text{C1},2-m} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{O} \right] \right] \right. \\ &+ \left[ \widehat{T}_{\text{C1},2-m}, \left( \left[ \widehat{T}_{\text{DD},2-m}^{(0)} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{O} \right] \right] \right\} j^{\text{R}} (-\omega_{-m}^{(0)}), \quad (8.156) \\ \left. \widehat{\Gamma}_{\text{CCR}}^{(2)} \widehat{O} &= \frac{3\gamma_2 b_{12} \Delta \sigma_2^{\text{S}}}{10\hbar} d_{00}^{(2)} (\vartheta_2) \sum_{n} \left\{ \left[ \widehat{T}_{\text{DD},2-m}^{(0)}, \left[ \left( \widehat{T}_{\text{C2},2-m} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{O} \right] \right] \right\} \end{split}$$

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{0}} = \frac{3\gamma_{2}D_{12}\Delta\sigma_{2}^{2}}{10\hbar} d_{00}^{(2)}(\vartheta_{2}) \sum_{m} \left\{ \left[ \widehat{T}_{\text{DD},2-m}^{(0)}, \left[ \left( \widehat{T}_{\text{C2},2-m}^{(0)} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{0}} \right] \right] \right\} \\ + \left[ \widehat{T}_{\text{C2},2-m}, \left( \left[ \widehat{T}_{\text{DD},2-m}^{(0)} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{0}} \right] \right] \right\} j^{\text{R}} \left( -\omega_{-m}^{(0)} \right), \qquad (8.157)$$

where  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  are the two nuclear gyromagnetic ratios. The angle  $\vartheta_1$  is the angle between the PAF of the SA tensor of  $I_1$  and the  $I_1$ – $I_2$  internuclear vector; and likewise for  $\vartheta_2$ .

Using these expressions we compute the relaxation rates for both longitudinal and transverse relaxation in turn.

#### 8.8.2. Longitudinal relaxation

8.8.2.1. The Solomon equations. When we apply the total relaxation superoperator in Eq. (8.154) to the total nuclear-spin density operator, we obtain a set of differential equations that link the relaxation behaviour of the expectation values of the operators that represent the total  $I_1$  longitudinal magnetization  $\hat{I}_{1z}$ , the total  $I_2$  longitudinal magnetization  $\hat{I}_{2z}$ , and the longitudinal two-spin order  $2\hat{I}_{1z}\hat{I}_{2z}$ . These equations are referred to as the Solomon equations for two nuclear spins, and are given by

$$\frac{dI_{1z}}{dt} = -R_1^{(1)} \left( I_{1z} - I_{1z}^{(0)} \right) - \sigma_{12} \left( I_{2z} - I_{2z}^{(0)} \right) - \Delta_1^{(1)} 2I_{1z} I_{2z},$$
(8.158)

$$\frac{dI_{2z}}{dt} = -\sigma_{12} \left( I_{1z} - I_{1z}^{(0)} \right) - R_1^{(2)} \left( I_{2z} - I_{2z}^{(0)} \right) - \Delta_1^{(2)} 2I_{1z}I_{2z}, \qquad (8.159)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}2I_{1z}I_{2z}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\Delta_1^{(1)} \left( I_{1z} - I_{1z}^{(0)} \right) - \Delta_1^{(2)} \left( I_{2z} - I_{2z}^{(0)} \right) - R_1^{(1,2)} 2I_{1z}I_{2z}, \quad (8.160)$$

where  $I_{1z}$  and  $I_{2z}$  are the expectation values of  $\hat{I}_{1z}$  and  $\hat{I}_{2z}$ ,  $I_{1z}^{(0)}$  and  $I_{2z}^{(0)}$ are the corresponding expectation values at equilibrium, and  $2I_{1z}I_{2z}$ is the expectation value of  $2\hat{I}_{1z}\hat{I}_{2z}$  (which has an equilibrium value of zero). The rate constants  $R_1^{(1)}$ ,  $R_1^{(2)}$ , and  $R_1^{(1,2)}$  are the selfrelaxation rate constants for  $I_{1z}$ ,  $I_{2z}$ , and  $2I_{1z}I_{2z}$  and describe their return to their equilibrium values. The cross-relaxation rate constant  $\sigma_{12}$  describes the process by which  $I_{1z}$  and  $I_{2z}$  are interconverted, and is responsible for the nuclear Overhauser effect which is used to establish the close spatial proximity of nuclei in molecules. The last two cross-relaxation rate constants  $\Delta_1^{(1)}$  and  $\Delta_1^{(2)}$ describe the interconversion between  $I_{1z}$  and  $2I_{1z}I_{2z}$ , and  $I_{2z}$  and  $2I_{1z}I_{2z}$  respectively.

*8.8.2.2. Longitudinal self-relaxation.* The three longitudinal self-relaxation rate constants are given by:

$$R_{1}^{(1)} = R_{1}^{\text{PRE},(1)} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{3}{20} j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1}) + \frac{3}{10} j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} + \omega_{0,2}) + \frac{1}{20} j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} - \omega_{0,2})\right]}_{\text{PDP},(1)}, \quad (8.161)$$

$$R_{1}^{(2)} = R_{1}^{\text{PRE},(2)} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{3}{20} j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,2}) + \frac{3}{10} j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} + \omega_{0,2}) + \frac{1}{20} j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} - \omega_{0,2})\right]}_{\gamma^{00,(2)}}, \quad (8.162)$$

$$R_{1}^{(12)} = \underbrace{R_{1}^{\text{PRE},(1)} + R_{1}^{\text{PRE},(2)}}_{R_{1}^{\text{PRE},(12)}} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{3}{20} J^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1}) + \frac{3}{20} J^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,2})\right]}_{R_{1}^{\text{PDE},(12)}}.$$
(8.163)

Each rate constant is the sum of a PRE term and a contribution from the nuclear–nuclear dipolar coupling relaxation mechanism. For example the self-relaxation rate constant for spin  $I_1$  is the sum of the longitudinal PRE  $R_1^{\text{PRE},(1)}$ , which is given by Eq. (8.131), and the longitudinal nuclear–nuclear dipolar coupling rate constant  $R_1^{\text{DD},(1)}$ . The corresponding expression for spin  $I_2$  takes a similar expression. The rate constant for the longitudinal two-spin order is the sum of a PRE term  $R_1^{\text{PRE},(1,2)}$ , which is the sum of the two one-spin longitudinal PREs  $R_1^{\text{PRE},(1)}$  and  $R_1^{\text{PRE},(2)}$ , and a longitudinal nuclear–nuclear dipolar coupling rate constant  $R_1^{\text{DD},(1,2)}$ . We note that the three rate constants do not have a term due to the CCR.

8.8.2.3. Longitudinal cross-relaxation. The cross-relaxation rate constant  $\sigma_{12}$  is given by the expression

$$\sigma_{12} = \left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[\frac{3}{10}j^{\rm R}(\omega_{0,1} + \omega_{0,2}) - \frac{1}{20}j^{\rm R}(\omega_{0,1} - \omega_{0,2})\right]. \tag{8.164}$$

This rate constant is due only to the nuclear–nuclear dipolar coupling interaction, as this is the only term in the Hamiltonian that connects the two nuclear spins. Therefore we expect no paramagnetic relaxation contribution to the conventional NOE. However the situation is different for cross relaxation between each longitudinal magnetization term and the longitudinal two-spin order term. Here the two cross-relaxation rate constants  $\Delta_1^{(1)}$  and  $\Delta_1^{(2)}$  are only non-zero because of the CCR between the nuclear–nuclear dipolar coupling and the Curie mechanism. They are given by

$$\Delta_1^{(1)} = \frac{3}{10} \left( \frac{b_{12}}{\hbar} \right) \gamma_1 B_0 \Delta \sigma_1^S d_{00}^{(2)}(\vartheta_1) j^{\mathsf{R}}(\omega_{0,1}), \tag{8.165}$$

$$\Delta_1^{(2)} = \frac{3}{10} \left( \frac{b_{12}}{\hbar} \right) \gamma_2 B_0 \Delta \sigma_2^S d_{00}^{(2)}(\vartheta_2) j^{\mathsf{R}}(\omega_{0,2}).$$
(8.166)

This is also observed for cross correlation between a dipolar coupling and a CSA in diamagnetic systems [255]. In the absence of CCR both relaxation rate constants are zero. Hence the detection of polarization transfer, such as  $\hat{I}_{1z} \rightarrow 2\hat{I}_{1z}\hat{I}_{2z}$ , may indicate the presence of CCR.

### 8.8.3. Transverse relaxation

8.8.3.1. The Solomon equations. We now examine transverse relaxation processes that affect coherences. The observable singlequantum coherences for a spin system comprising two nuclei have a more complicated form than for a simple one-spin system. For a system of two nuclear spins-1/2 there are four such coherences, which are indicated on energy levels in Fig. 8.7(b). Two of the coherences involve a spin-state flip of spin  $I_1$ , with the second spin  $I_2$  in an unchanged spin state of either  $\alpha$  or  $\beta$ . These two coherences form a doublet, and are represented by the product operators  $\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\alpha}$ and  $\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\beta}$ , where  $\hat{I}_{1+}$  is the raising operator for spin  $I_i$  and  $\hat{I}_{i\alpha}$  and  $\hat{I}_{i\beta}$ are the two projection operators for spin  $I_i$  in the two spin states. Likewise there are two coherences representing a spin flip of  $I_2$ , which are represented by the product operators  $\hat{I}_{1\alpha}\hat{I}_{2+}$  and  $\hat{I}_{1\beta}\hat{I}_{2+}$ .

The two spin- $I_1$  coherences  $\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\alpha}$  and  $\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\beta}$  may have different phases. Therefore we may represent their superposition as a combination of an in-phase coherence operator  $\hat{I}_{1+}$ , in which both  $\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\alpha}$  and  $\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\beta}$  have the same phase, and an anti-phase coherence operator  $2\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2z}$ , in which both  $\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\alpha}$  and  $\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\beta}$  have phases that differ by  $\pi$ . Likewise we can also define the in-phase  $\hat{I}_{2+}$  and anti-phase  $2\hat{I}_{1z}\hat{I}_{2+}$  coherence operators for  $I_2$ . The four operators are given by:

$$\hat{I}_{1+} = \hat{I}_{1+} \hat{I}_{2\alpha} + \hat{I}_{1+} \hat{I}_{2\beta},$$
(8.167)

$$2\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2z} = \hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\alpha} - \hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2\beta}, \qquad (8.168)$$

$$I_{2+} = I_{1\alpha}I_{2+} + I_{1\beta}I_{2+}, \tag{8.169}$$

$$2I_{1z}I_{2+} = I_{1\alpha}I_{2+} - I_{1\beta}I_{2+}.$$
(8.170)

The relaxation behaviour of the magnetization terms representing the in-phase and anti-phase coherence of spin  $I_1$  is described by a pair of connected differential equations that are given by

$$\frac{dI_{1+}}{dt} = -R_2^{(1)}I_{1+} - \Delta_2^{(1)}2I_{1+}I_{2z}, \tag{8.171}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\,2I_{1+}I_{2z}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\Delta_2^{(1)}I_{1+} - R_2^{(1,2)}\,2I_{1+}I_{2z}.\tag{8.172}$$

The in-phase and anti-phase magnetization terms both relax according to the transverse self-relaxation rate constants  $R_2^{(1)}$  and  $R_2^{(1,2)}$ , and cross relax with rate constant  $\Delta_2^{(1)}$ . Likewise the in-phase and anti-phase magnetization terms of spin  $I_2$  are connected by the following pair of differential equations:

$$\frac{dI_{2+}}{dt} = -R_2^{(2)}I_{2+} - \Delta_2^{(2)}2I_{1z}I_{2+}, \qquad (8.173)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}2I_{12}I_{2+}}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\Delta_2^{(2)}I_{2+} - R_2^{(2,1)}2I_{12}I_{2+}. \tag{8.174}$$

The in-phase and anti-phase self-relaxation rate constants are  $R_2^{(2)}$  and  $R_2^{(2,1)}$ , and the cross-relaxation rate constant is  $\Delta_2^{(2)}$ .

8.8.3.2. *Transverse self-relaxation*. The four self-relaxation rate constants are given by:

$$\Delta_2^{(1)} = \left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right) \gamma_1 B_0 \Delta \sigma_1^{\rm S} d_{00}^{(2)}(\vartheta_1) \left[\frac{1}{5} j^{\rm R}(0) + \frac{3}{20} j^{\rm R}(\omega_{0,1})\right],\tag{8.179}$$

$$\Delta_2^{(2)} = \left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right) \gamma_2 B_0 \Delta \sigma_2^{\rm S} d_{00}^{(2)}(\vartheta_2) \left[\frac{1}{5} j^{\rm R}(0) + \frac{3}{20} j^{\rm R}(\omega_{0,2})\right]. \tag{8.180}$$

This is intriguing because it implies that during a delay an in-phase coherence on  $I_1$  can evolve into an anti-phase coherence, also on  $I_1$ , via a relaxation-induced transformation of the form  $\hat{I}_{1+} \rightarrow 2\hat{I}_{1+}\hat{I}_{2z}$ . A subsequent pulse or combination of pulses can then transform this anti-phase term into an anti-phase term on the second spin  $I_2$ . This is an example of relaxation-allowed coherence transfer [265].

In solution NMR in the absence of CCR the only way in which such a coherence transfer can occur is if the isotropic *J*-coupling  $J_{12}$  between the two spins is non-zero. In this case the transformation from the in-phase to anti-phase coherences is

$$\widehat{I}_{1+} \to \widehat{I}_{1+} \cos\left(\pi J_{12} t\right) - i2\widehat{I}_{1+}\widehat{I}_{2z} \sin\left(\pi J_{12} t\right).$$
(8.181)

The anti-phase term can then be transferred to a coherence on  $I_2$ . Therefore in the absence of CCR, as for small molecules, the observation of such a coherence transfer indicates that the two

$$R_{2}^{(1)} = R_{2}^{\text{PRE},(1)} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{1}{10}j^{\text{R}}(0) + \frac{3}{20}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,2}) + \frac{3}{40}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1}) + \frac{3}{20}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} + \omega_{0,2}) + \frac{1}{40}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} - \omega_{0,2})\right]}_{R_{2}^{\text{DD},(1)}},$$
(8.175)

$$R_{2}^{(2)} = R_{2}^{\text{PRE},(2)} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{1}{10}j^{\text{R}}(0) + \frac{3}{20}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1}) + \frac{3}{40}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,2}) + \frac{3}{20}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} + \omega_{0,2}) + \frac{1}{40}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} - \omega_{0,2})\right]}_{\text{PRE},(2)},$$
(8.176)

$$R_{2}^{(1,2)} = \underbrace{R_{2}^{\text{PRE},(1)} + R_{1}^{\text{PRE},(2)}}_{R_{2}^{\text{PRE},(12)}} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{1}{10}j^{\text{R}}(0) + \frac{3}{40}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1}) + \frac{3}{20}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} + \omega_{0,2}) + \frac{1}{40}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} - \omega_{0,2})\right]}_{\text{spb}(12)},$$
(8.177)

$$R_{2}^{(2,1)} = \underbrace{R_{1}^{\text{PRE},(1)} + R_{2}^{\text{PRE},(2)}}_{R_{2}^{\text{PRE},(2,1)}} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{1}{10}j^{\text{R}}(0) + \frac{3}{40}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,2}) + \frac{3}{20}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} + \omega_{0,2}) + \frac{1}{40}j^{\text{R}}(\omega_{0,1} - \omega_{0,2})\right]}_{R_{2}^{\text{DD},(2,1)}}.$$
(8.178)

The two rate constants for in-phase relaxation  $R_2^{(i)}$  are each the sum of a transverse PRE term, given by Eq. (8.133), and a diamagnetic term due to the nuclear-nuclear dipolar coupling  $R_2^{\text{DD},(i)}$ . The two anti-phase self-relaxation rate constants are more complicated. For example the PRE contribution to the rate constant for  $2I_{1+}I_{2z}$ ,  $R_2^{(1,2)}$ , is the sum of the one-spin PRE terms for transverse relaxation of  $I_1$   $R_2^{\text{PRE},(1)}$  and longitudinal relaxation of  $I_2$   $R_1^{\text{PRE},(2)}$ . The remaining contribution  $R_2^{\text{DD},(1,2)}$  is due to the nuclear-nuclear dipolar coupling. We note that none of the self-relaxation rate constants has a contribution from CCR. However this is not the full story; the relaxation rate constants above give only the *average* relaxation rate of the two coherences represented by each in-phase or anti-phase operator. As we will see each component of the doublet relaxes at a different rate.

8.8.3.3. Relaxation-induced coherence transfer. The cross-relaxation between the in-phase and anti-phase coherence terms is very interesting. The two cross-relaxation rate constants are only non-zero in the presence of CCR between the nuclear-nuclear dipolar coupling and Curie relaxation mechanisms. They are given by:

spins are coupled by a *J*-coupling interaction. This is used extensively in correlation spectroscopy to identify the bonding networks within molecules. However for large macromolecules in solution which exhibit measurable CCR we may observe relaxation-induced coherence transfer, which complicates the interpretation of the spectrum. This is particularly important to bear in mind for homonuclear correlation spectroscopy (COSY) of paramagnetic proteins [266].

8.8.3.4. Differential line broadening due to cross-correlation between the nuclear–nuclear dipolar and Curie relaxation mechanisms. The self-relaxation rate constants given in Eqs. (8.175)–(8.178) are the average rate constants for the in- and anti-phase coherences of the two spins. However, as we have already pointed out, this does not provide a complete picture of the transverse selfrelaxation of the system, for which we need to consider the relaxation properties of the expectation values  $I_{1+}I_{2\alpha}$ ,  $I_{1+}I_{2\beta}$ ,  $I_{1\alpha}I_{2+}$ , and  $I_{1\beta}I_{2+}$  which represent the four individual coherences. In large paramagnetic macromolecules experiencing slow rotational diffusion, CCR between the nuclear–nuclear dipolar coupling and Curie mechanisms results in different transverse relaxation rates for the two coherences  $I_{1+}I_{2\alpha}$  and  $I_{1+}I_{2\beta}$ , and therefore different linewidths in the spectrum. We calculate this effect here in the spin-diffusion limit where  $|\omega_{0,1}\tau_{R}| \gg 1$ , where we can approximate the spectral density functions as  $j^{R}(0) = 2\tau_{R}$ , and  $j^{R}(\omega_{0,1}) \approx j^{R}(\omega_{0,2}) \approx j^{R}(\omega_{0,1} + \omega_{0,2}) \approx j^{R}(\omega_{0,1} - \omega_{0,2}) \approx 0$ . Under this condition the two expectation values  $I_{1+}I_{2\alpha}$  and  $I_{1+}I_{2\beta}$  relax independently with different self-relaxation rate constants  $R_{2}^{(1,\alpha)}$  and  $R_{2}^{(1,\beta)}$  that are given by:

$$R_{2}^{(1,\alpha)} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{10} \left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} j^{R}(0)}_{\text{DD}} \underbrace{+ \frac{1}{10} \left(\gamma_{1} B_{0} \Delta \sigma_{1}^{S}\right)^{2} j^{R}(0)}_{\text{Curie}}}_{\text{Curie}} \\ \underbrace{+ \frac{1}{5} \left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right) \left(\gamma_{1} B_{0} \Delta \sigma_{1}^{S}\right) d_{00}^{(2)}(\vartheta_{1}) j^{R}(0)}_{\text{OU}}, \tag{8.182}$$

$$R_{2}^{(1,\beta)} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{10} \left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} j^{R}(0)}_{\text{DD}} \underbrace{+ \frac{1}{10} \left(\gamma_{1} B_{0} \Delta \sigma_{1}^{S}\right)^{2} j^{R}(0)}_{\text{Curie}}}_{\frac{-\frac{1}{5} \left(\frac{b_{12}}{\hbar}\right) \left(\gamma_{1} B_{0} \Delta \sigma_{1}^{S}\right) d_{00}^{(2)}(\vartheta_{1}) j^{R}(0)}{\text{Curie}}.$$
(8.183)

Both rate constants have the same contribution from the dipolar (DD) and Curie relaxation mechanisms, and the difference arises only from the different sign of the CCR contribution. The conclusion is that the effect of CCR is to reduce the relaxation rate of one coherence in the doublet, and to increase the relaxation rate of the second. Which rate is increased and which is reduced depends on the overall sign of the CCR contribution, which depends in turn on the signs of  $b_{12}$ ,  $\gamma_1$ ,  $\Delta \sigma_1^S$ , and  $d_{00}^{(2)}(\vartheta_1)$ . This effect is also utilized for large proteins in solution in a method called Transverse Relaxation-Optimized SpectroscopY (TROSY), where the CCR between the diamagnetic CSA and DD relaxation mechanisms is used to maximise the resolution at high magnetic fields [267].

If, as predicted by the relaxation differential equations, the decay due to transverse relaxation is exponential, the linewidths of the two peaks (defined as the full-width at half-maximum) are equal to  $2R_2^{(1,\alpha)}$  and  $2R_2^{(1,\beta)}$ . This means that the CCR manifests itself in the spectrum by the two components of the doublet having different linewidths, with one peak being narrowed and the other broadened. Fig. 8.8 illustrates the form of the in-phase and antiphase doublets that are obtained with and without CCR for different values of the J-coupling constant. The average linewidth is set to 100 Hz, with the CCR contribution equal to  $\pm 50$  Hz. Spectra with values of  $J_{12}$  ranging from 200 Hz down to 0 Hz are depicted. In the absence of CCR both components of the doublet have the same linewidth. In the absence of CCR the effect of reducing  $J_{12}$  on the in-phase doublet is to reduce the separation between the two components of the doublet, until the splitting is no longer resolved. Finally, at  $J_{12} = 0$ , the two components are at the same frequency and we see a singlet. For the anti-phase doublet, reducing  $J_{12}$ causes increased cancellation between the intensities of the peaks. At zero coupling the intensities cancel exactly resulting in zero spectral intensity. Thus, in the absence of CCR effects, anti-phase coherences can only be generated and observed if the two spins interact via a non-zero J-coupling.

However if we introduce the CCR effect the result is different. The two components of the doublet have different linewidths with one being narrowed (here the high-frequency component) and the other broadened. This superposition of different linewidths is still seen with zero *J*-coupling as it results from the incoherent effect of the dipolar coupling between the spins and of their paramagnetic SAs. The most notable effect at zero *J*-coupling is seen in the anti-phase doublet in which the intensities do not cancel because of the different linewidths; the result is that this antiphase doublet can still be observed, in complete contrast to the situation without CCR. Hence in the presence of CCR it is possible both to generate anti-phase coherences via cross-relaxationallowed coherence transfer, and to observe the resulting anti-



**Fig. 8.8.** Simulated in-phase and anti-phase doublets with and without cross-correlation between the dipolar-coupling and Curie relaxation mechanisms for different *J*-coupling constants. In the absence of CCR the linewidth of both components is 100 Hz. The CCR contribution to the linewidth is 50 Hz, with the high-frequency line being narrowed and the low-frequency line broadened. The coupling constants  $J_{12}$  are as indicated.
phase doublet [265]. As noted earlier this means that the interpretation of NMR spectra that correlate between pairs of spins via the *J*-coupling need to be interpreted with care, since cross-relaxationallowed coherence transfer results in correlations even with zero *J*coupling [266].

# 8.9. Paramagnetic relaxation enhancements in non-dynamic solid insulators

We now turn to a different motional regime to those considered so far, in which chemical exchange and random reorientation of the interaction tensor, on a timescale that is conducive to efficient relaxation, are completely absent. This situation is regularly encountered in rigid solids, including materials and crystalline phases of small molecules in a rigid lattice with no flexible parts, so there is neither overall tumbling nor internal motional dynamics on the relevant timescale. The only motions that are present are due to vibrations, which are not an efficient source of nuclear relaxation, and so such diamagnetic systems often exhibit very long  $T_1$  relaxation times, of the order of minutes or hours. On the other hand, paramagnetic systems still exhibit short relaxation times as the vibrational motion still causes efficient electronic relaxation [120], and the relaxing electrons act to relax the nuclei.

When deciding on the model to use for the PRE in these systems, it is tempting to use the Curie model of Gueron [100], and Vega and Fiat [101], and extend  $\tau_R$  and  $\tau_M$  to infinity. However this is *not* valid as the extension of the correlation times in this way would cause a violation of one of the basic assumptions of Redfield theory, which is that the observation time must be longer than the correlation times. We therefore begin instead from the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan model and ignore chemical exchange and stochastic reorientation from the beginning, so that the overall

correlation times are simply equal to the electronic longitudinal and transverse relaxation time constants:

$$\tau_{E,q} = \tau_{c,q} = T_{qe}, \qquad q = 1, 2.$$
 (8.184)

We then take the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations and make the substitution of the correlation times directly, resulting in the following nuclear  $T_1$  relaxation time constant

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{2}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{FC}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \frac{T_{2e}}{1+(\omega_S-\omega_I)^2 T_{2e}^2} + \frac{2}{15}S(S+1)\left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ \times \left[\frac{3T_{1e}}{1+\omega_I^2 T_{1e}^2} + \frac{6T_{2e}}{1+(\omega_S+\omega_I)^2 T_{2e}^2} + \frac{T_{2e}}{1+(\omega_S-\omega_I)^2 T_{2e}^2}\right], \quad (8.185)$$

and the following nuclear  $T_2$  relaxation time constant

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{FC}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[T_{1e} + \frac{T_{2e}}{1+(\omega_S - \omega_l)^2 T_{2e}^2}\right] + \frac{1}{15}S(S+1)\left(\frac{b_{Sl}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ \times \left[4T_{1e} + \frac{6T_{2e}}{1+\omega_S^2 T_{2e}^2} + \frac{3T_{1e}}{1+\omega_l^2 T_{1e}^2} + \frac{6T_{2e}}{1+(\omega_S + \omega_l)^2 T_{2e}^2} + \frac{T_{2e}}{1+(\omega_S - \omega_l)^2 T_{2e}^2}\right].$$
(8.186)

These expressions assume a point-dipole model for the electrons. However the correction for delocalisation effects is relatively straightforward, as we have seen.

Fig. 8.9 shows a general comparison of the Solomon and Bloembergen longitudinal and transverse relaxation rates for a <sup>1</sup>H nucleus in a field of 11.74 T, for a range of electronic relaxation times, with the assumption that  $T_{1e} = T_{2e} \equiv \tau_s$ . In (a) and (b) are shown the Solomon and Bloembergen contributions to the longitudinal relaxation rates plotted against  $\tau_s$ . We see that, for dipolar and Fermi-contact couplings that are equal, the Solomon contribution is always the larger of the two, and completely dominates for all electronic relaxation times, apart for times



**Fig. 8.9.** Comparison of the sizes of the longitudinal and transverse relaxation rates due to the Solomon and Bloembergen mechanisms in a non-dynamic solid as a function of the electron relaxation time. It is assumed that  $T_{1e} = T_{2e} \equiv \tau_5$ . The variation of the longitudinal rates is shown in (a), and the transverse rates in (c), both up to a  $\tau_5$  of 10 ns. In (b) and (d) are shown expansions of the plots in (a) and (b), up to a  $\tau_5$  of 2 ps. The nuclear spins are <sup>1</sup>H in an external field of 11.74 T. The constant  $C = S(S + 1) (3 + (\eta^{SD})^2) (A_{2D}^{SD}/H) / 12$ , i.e.  $S(S + 1) (b_{SI}/H)^2$  for the Solomon mechanism, and  $S(S + 1) (A^{FC}/H)^2$  for the Bloembergen mechanism.

below approximately 1.0 ps where the Bloembergen contribution is still smaller, but nevertheless significant. Both the Solomon and overall relaxation rate are dominated by the reduced spectral density  $j_{21}(\omega_l)$  which, for an external field of 11.74 T, reaches a maximum at  $T_{1e} = 0.32$  ns. Shorter electronic relaxation times, such as those of the order of 0.1–1.0 ps that are observed for lanthanides, therefore lead to longer values of  $T_1$ . We see a different variation for the transverse relaxation rates in (c) and (d). Here the Solomon and Bloembergen terms are comparable, and are dominated by the reduced spectral densities  $j_{21}(0)$  and  $j_{01}(0)$ respectively, both of which depend on  $T_{1e}$ . Both contributions to the relaxation rate therefore simplify increase with  $T_{1e}$ .

The trends shown in Fig. 8.9 indicate a general property of the relaxation properties of paramagnetic systems, which is that, in the absence of dynamic or motional effects, the enhancements in both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are dominated by electronic longitudinal relaxation via the time constant  $T_{1e}$ . Slower electronic longitudinal relaxation rapidly increases the rate of the transverse PRE, and rapidly increases the longitudinal PRE to a maximum at  $T_{1e} = 1/|\omega_l|$ , after which it slowly drops off.

### 8.10. Paramagnetic relaxation enhancements due to lanthanide ions

We next provide a very brief review of the expressions for the relaxation rate constants that could be applied to lanthanide systems. As we saw in Chapter 6, the EPR interaction and paramagnetic shift tensors due to lanthanide ions can be extremely complicated, as a result of the need to consider the effects of strong SO coupling and the low-lying excited states due to the crystal-field interaction and higher-energy SO coupling levels. However we also saw that we can simplify matters by assuming that *kT* is sufficiently large that the crystal-field energy levels are all significantly populated, and treating the lanthanide ions as free metal ions [62]. To a reasonable approximation, we can then take the expressions for the relaxation rate constants derived earlier, and replace *S* with *J*, and  $g_e$  with  $g_J$  to obtain the correct expressions.

In the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan relaxation model, we take the Fermi-contact coupling constant  $A^{FC}$  and spin-dipolar coupling constant to be:

$$A^{\rm FC} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_j \hbar \gamma_I}{3S} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{0}), \qquad (8.187)$$

$$b_{JI} = \frac{\mu_0 \mu_B g_J \hbar \gamma_I}{4\pi R^3}.$$
(8.188)

Then replacing *S* with *J* we obtain the following expression for  $T_1$ :

$$\frac{1}{T_{1}} = \frac{2}{3}J(J+1)\left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \frac{\tau_{\text{E},2}}{1+(\omega_{\text{S}}-\omega_{\text{I}})^{2}\tau_{\text{E},2}^{2}} + \frac{2}{15}J(J+1)\left(\frac{b_{JI}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \\ \times \left[\frac{3\tau_{\text{c},1}}{1+\omega_{\text{I}}^{2}\tau_{\text{c},1}^{2}} + \frac{6\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1+(\omega_{\text{S}}+\omega_{\text{I}})^{2}\tau_{\text{c},2}^{2}} + \frac{\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1+(\omega_{\text{S}}-\omega_{\text{I}})^{2}\tau_{\text{c},2}^{2}}\right].$$
(8.189)

Likewise the  $T_2$  time constant is

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{3}J(J+1)\left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[\tau_{\text{E},1} + \frac{\tau_{\text{E},2}}{1+(\omega_5-\omega_l)^2\tau_{\text{E},2}^2}\right] + \frac{1}{15}J(J+1)\left(\frac{b_{Sl}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ \times \left[4\tau_{\text{c},1} + \frac{6\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1+\omega_5^2\tau_{\text{c},2}^2} + \frac{3\tau_{\text{c},1}}{1+\omega_l^2\tau_{\text{c},1}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1+(\omega_5+\omega_l)^2\tau_{\text{c},2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1+(\omega_5-\omega_l)^2\tau_{\text{c},2}^2}\right].$$
(8.190)

For relaxation due to slow molecular motions we can use the Curie model, in which the "Curie spin" is now defined as the thermal average of the *z* component of the total angular momentum operator  $\hat{I}_{z}$ :

$$J_{\rm C} \equiv \langle \hat{J}_z \rangle \tag{8.191}$$

$$= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}g_J J(J+1)B_0}{3kT}.$$
 (8.192)

The expressions for the total  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  relaxation time constants including both the Fermi-contact and spin-dipolar contributions, are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T_{1}} &= \frac{2}{3}J(J+1)\left(\frac{A^{FC}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \frac{\tau_{E,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{E,2}^{2}} + \frac{2}{15}\left(\frac{b_{JI}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \\ &\times \left[J_{C}^{2}\frac{9\tau_{D}}{1+\omega_{I}^{2}\tau_{D}^{2}} + \left(\frac{1}{3}J(J+1) - J_{C}^{2}\right)\frac{9\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_{I}^{2}\tau_{c,1}} \right. \\ &+ J(J+1)\left(\frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}+\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}}\right)\right], \quad (8.193) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T_2} &= \frac{1}{3}J(J+1) \left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[3J_{\text{C}}^2 \tau_{\text{M}} + 3\left(\frac{1}{3}J(J+1) - J_{\text{C}}^2\right) \tau_{\text{E},1} + \frac{\tau_{\text{E},2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_I)^2 \tau_{\text{E},2}^2}\right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{15} \left(\frac{b_{JI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[J_{\text{C}}^2 \left(12\tau_{\text{D}} + \frac{9\tau_{\text{D}}}{1 + \omega_I^2 \tau_{\text{D}}^2}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{3}J(J+1) - J_{\text{C}}^2\right) \left(12\tau_{\text{c},1} + \frac{9\tau_{\text{c},1}}{1 + \omega_I^2 \tau_{\text{c},1}^2}\right) \\ &+ (J+1) \left(\frac{6\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1 + \omega_S^2 \tau_{\text{c},2}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1 + (\omega_S + \omega_I)^2 \tau_{\text{c},2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_I)^2 \tau_{\text{c},2}^2}\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$
(8.194)

For lanthanide ions the Fermi-contact coupling interaction is relatively small compared to the spin-dipolar interaction, due to the contracted nature of the 4*f* orbitals and the corresponding reduced electronic-spin transfer. Therefore we expect the Solomon mechanism to dominate the Bloembergen mechanism in the overall relaxation behaviour. Furthermore electronic relaxation for lanthanide ions is considerably faster than for 3*d* ions, as we will see in the following section, and so for typical ranges of rotational and chemical-exchange correlation times we are able to approximate the overall correlation times as  $\tau_{c,q} \approx \tau_{E,q} \approx T_{qe}$ , with the result that electronic relaxation is the stochastic process that dominates the PRE in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan model. For slower rotational dynamics, Curie relaxation is very important.

## 8.11. Relaxation properties of specific paramagnetic metal ions

Following the examination of the theory of the PRE we now quantify the PREs of different paramagnetic metal ions in different motional regimes, and due to the Solomon, Bloembergen, and Curie mechanisms. To compare the PREs due to different metal ions on a particular nucleus in a particular system requires a quantification of the values of  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  of that particular metal ion in that particular system. Electronic relaxation times have been measured extensively for complexes and metalloproteins in solution and glasses, and these values have been used to estimate the PREs of nuclei in similar complexes by Bertini et al. [15]. Table 8.5 gives the ranges of electronic relaxation times for a selection of first-, second-, and third-row d-block transition-metal ions, and also the calculated longitudinal PREs  $R_1$  and  $R_2$ , and Table 8.6 gives the equivalent values for the lanthanide ions. The tables include calculations for a <sup>1</sup>H nucleus in a small complex in solution with a rotational correlation time of  $\tau_{\rm R} = 10^{-10}$  s, and a large biomolecule in solution with  $\tau_R = 10^{-8}\,s$  assuming spin-dipolar Solomon and Curie mechanisms respectively at 298 K and a nucleus-ion separation of 5 Å, and at a <sup>1</sup>H Larmor frequency of -800 MHz. Also

Summary of the relaxation properties of, and PREs due to, a selection of transition-metal ions. For each ion is given the range of  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  electronic relaxation times, taken from Bertini, Luchinat, and Parigi [15] and the additional references indicated, and grouped together as a relaxation time  $\tau_5$ . The corresponding ranges of PRE rates  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  for a <sup>1</sup>H experiencing a hyperfine coupling to the unpaired electrons are also given for the Bloembergen mechanism, and the dipolar-interaction mechanism in the fast- ( $\tau_R = 10^{-10}$  s) and slow-rotation ( $\tau_R = 10^{-8}$  s) limits. The equations used are indicated. The Bloembergen relaxation rates are calculated assuming a one-electron Fermi-contact coupling constant of 4.47 MHz. The dipolar relaxation rates are calculated assuming the point-dipole model with a separation between nucleus and paramagnetic centre of 5 Å. In all cases it is assumed there is no chemical exchange. The magnetic field is 18.78 T, and the temperature used in the Curie-spin is 298 K. HS refers to 'high-spin' and LS to 'low-spin'.

Ion	Configuration	S	$\tau_{s}/s^{a}$	Bloembergen	relaxation rates/s <sup>-1</sup>	Dipolar relaxation rates/s <sup>-1</sup>					Refs.	
						Rigid solids		Small molecules $(\tau_R = 10^{-10} \text{ s})$		Large molecules $(\tau_R = 10^{-8} \text{ s})$		
				$R_1^{\mathbf{b}}$	R <sub>2</sub> <sup>c</sup>	$R_1^{d}$	$R_2^{e}$	$R_1^{f}$	$R_2^{g}$	$R_1^{h}$	$R_2^{i}$	
Ti <sup>3+</sup>	3 <i>d</i> <sup>1</sup>	1/2	$10^{-10} - 10^{-11}$	0.4-4	1977-19,757	47-378	55-505	43-223	50-269	47-375	112-557	[267,269]
V0 <sup>2+</sup>	$3d^1$	1/2	10 <sup>-8</sup>	0.004	1,975,720	19	31,595	376	501	37	15,840	[269–272]
V <sup>3+</sup>	$3d^2$	1	$10^{-11}$	2	1318	126	147	115	134	126	551	[272,274]
V <sup>2+</sup>	$3d^3$	3/2	10 <sup>-9</sup>	0.02	109,762	902	16,244	1782	2327	977	16,137	[275]
Cr <sup>3+</sup>	$3d^3$	3/2	$5 \times 10^{-9} 5 \times 10^{-10}$	0.004-0.04	54,881-548,811	187-1620	8706-79,058	1680-1869	2156-2483	279-1663	9705-53,729	[275,116,277]
Cr <sup>2+</sup>	$3d^4$	2	$10^{-11} - 10^{-12}$	2-16	107-989	45-379	51-442	45-345	51-402	46-375	3687-4072	[278]
Mn <sup>3+</sup>	$3d^4$	2	$10^{-10} - 10^{-11}$	0.2-2	989-9879	379-3026	442-4040	345-1783	402-2155	375-2967	4072-7585	[272,277,279]
Mn <sup>2+</sup>	3 <i>d</i> <sup>5</sup>	5/2	10 <sup>-8</sup>	0.002	922,002	219	368,611	4387	5842	433	188,333	[115,280]
Fe <sup>3+</sup> HS	3 <i>d</i> <sup>5</sup>	5/2	$10^{-9} - 10^{-11}$	0.02-2	923-92,200	553-2106	645-37,903	503-4158	587-5429	545-2254	8366-41,657	[276,281,282]
Fe <sup>3+</sup> LS	3 <i>d</i> <sup>5</sup>	1/2	$10^{-11} - 10^{-13}$	4-36	38-1978	1–47	1–55	1-43	1–50	2-47	58-112	[282,284]
Fe <sup>2+</sup> HS	3 <i>d</i> <sup>6</sup> , 5–6 coord.	2	$10^{-12} - 10^{-13}$	16-18	19–107	12-45	12-51	12-45	12–51	13-46	3648-3687	[284,286]
	3 <i>d</i> <sup>6</sup> , 4 coord.	2	10 <sup>-11</sup>	2	989	379	442	345	402	375	4072	[287]
Co <sup>2+</sup> HS	3 <i>d</i> <sup>7</sup> , 5–6 coord.	3/2	$5\times 10^{-12}10^{-13}$	4-20	21-551	7–119	7–139	7–114	7–133	8-119	1428-1558	[287,289]
	$3d^7$ , 4 coord.	3/2	10 <sup>-11</sup>	2	1099	237	277	215	252	235	1694	[290]
Co <sup>2+</sup> LS	$3d^7$	1/2	$10^{-9} - 10^{-10}$	0.04-0.4	19,757-197,572	180-378	505-3249	223-356	269-465	197-375	557-3021	-
Ni <sup>2+</sup>	3 <i>d</i> <sup>8</sup> , 5–6 coord.	1	10 <sup>-10</sup>	0.2	13,172	1009	1347	594	718	998	1733	[291]
	$3d^8$ , 4 coord.	1	10 <sup>-12</sup>	22	143	15	17	15	17	15	421	[291,293]
Cu <sup>2+</sup>	3 <i>d</i> <sup>9</sup>	1/2	$5\times 10^{-9}10^{-9}$	0.007-0.04	197,572–987,860	37-180	3249-15,812	356-374	456-497	56-197	3021-10,594	-
Ru <sup>3+</sup>	$4d^5$	1/2	$10^{-11} - 10^{-12}$	4–33	214-1978	6-47	6-55	6-43	6-50	6-47	63-112	[272,294]
Re <sup>3+</sup>	$5d^4$	1	$10^{-12} - 10^{-13}$	22–24	25-143	4-15	4–17	4–15	4–17	4–15	408-421	[295]

<sup>a</sup> Quoted as a range of values for  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$ .

<sup>b</sup> Eq. (8.104).

<sup>c</sup> Eq. (8.106).

<sup>d</sup> Eq. (8.185).

<sup>e</sup> Eq. (8.185). <sup>e</sup> Eq. (8.186). <sup>f</sup> Eq. (8.99). <sup>g</sup> Eq. (8.101). <sup>h</sup> Eq. (8.131). <sup>i</sup> Eq. (8.133).

Summary of the relaxation properties of, and PREs due to, the lanthanide ions. For each ion is given the range of T<sub>1e</sub> and T<sub>2e</sub> electronic relaxation times, taken from Bertini, Luchinat, and Parigi [15] and the additional references indicated, and grouped together as a relaxation time  $\tau_5$ . The corresponding ranges of PRE rates  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  for a <sup>1</sup>H experiencing a hyperfine coupling to the unpaired electrons are also given for the Bloembergen mechanism, and the dipolarinteraction mechanism in the fast- ( $\tau_R = 10^{-10}$  s) and slow-rotation ( $\tau_R = 10^{-8}$  s) limits. The equations used are indicated with J used in lieu of S. The Bloembergen relaxation rates are calculated assuming a one-electron Fermi-contact coupling constant of 2.23 MHz. The dipolar relaxation rates are calculated assuming the point-dipole model with a separation between nucleus and paramagnetic centre of 5 Å. In all cases it is assumed there is no chemical exchange. The magnetic field is 18.78 T, and the temperature used in the Curie-spin is 298 K.

Ion	Configuration	J	$ au_S/S^a$	Bloembergen s <sup>-1</sup>	relaxation rates/	Dipolar relaxation rates/s <sup>-1</sup>						Refs.
						Rigid solids		Small molecules $(\tau_R = 10^{-10} \text{ s})$		Large molecules ( $\tau_R = 10^{-8}$ s)		
_				$R_1^{\mathbf{b}}$	$R_2^c$	$R_1^{d}$	R <sub>2</sub> <sup>e</sup>	$R_1^{\rm f}$	$R_2^{g}$	$R_1^{h}$	R <sub>2</sub> <sup>i</sup>	
Ce <sup>3+</sup>	$f^1$	5/2	$4\times 10^{-13}10^{-13}$	76-123	80-230	3–7	3-8	3–7	3-8	3–7	263-267	-
Pr <sup>3+</sup>	$f^2$	4	$3\times 10^{-13}6\times 10^{-14}$	24-63	25-95	4-13	4-14	4-13	4-14	4-13	1033-1043	[295,297]
Nd <sup>3+</sup>	$f^3$	9/2	$8 \times 10^{-13}  2 \times 10^{-13}$	19–27	32-86	11-21	11-24	11-21	11-24	11–21	1088-1100	[296]
Sm <sup>3+</sup>	$f^5$	5/2	$2\times 10^{-13}5\times 10^{-14}$	0.2-0.5	0.2-0.6	0.2-0.6	0.2-1	0.2-0.6	0.2-1	0.2-0.5	3–4	[295,297]
Eu <sup>2+</sup>	$f^7$	7/2	$5\times 10^{-14}10^{-14}$	2-8	2-8	3-16	3-16	3-16	3-16	18-29	24,948-24,960	[296]
Gd <sup>3+</sup>	$f^7$	7/2	$10^{-8} - 10^{-9}$	0.002-0.02	84,479-844,793	393-3782	68,069-661,976	7466-7879	9750-10,492	770-3986	84,825-343,744	[297-303]
Tb <sup>3+</sup>	f <sup>8</sup>	6	$8\times 10^{-13}2\times 10^{-13}$	34-48	58-155	78-154	80-171	78-153	80-170	103-176	56,200-56,287	[296]
Dy <sup>3+</sup>	f <sup>9</sup>	15/2	$10^{-12}  4 \times 10^{-13}$	50-86	162-323	132-214	140-241	132-212	139-239	167-244	80,856-80,951	[295,297]
Ho <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{10}$	8	$8 \times 10^{-13}  2 \times 10^{-13}$	92-128	157-416	93-183	95-204	93-182	95-203	130-215	79,632–79,733	[295,297]
Er <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{11}$	15/2	$8\times 10^{-13}3\times 10^{-13}$	134-202	302-603	94-150	98-166	94-149	98-165	116-170	53,056-53,121	[295,297]
Tm <sup>3+</sup>	f <sup>12</sup>	6	$2\times 10^{-12}5\times 10^{-13}$	84-251	595-1920	73-190	79–219	73–186	78-215	80-194	20,614-20,750	[296]
Yb <sup>3+</sup>	$f^{13}$	7/2	$5\times 10^{-13}2\times 10^{-13}$	361-376	458-856	17–26	17–28	17-26	17–28	17–26	2676-2687	[299,304,296,297]

<sup>a</sup> Quoted as a range of values for  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$ .

- <sup>b</sup> Eq. (8.104).
- <sup>c</sup> Eq. (8.106).

<sup>d</sup> Eq. (8.185).

<sup>e</sup> Eq. (8.186).

<sup>f</sup> Eq. (8.99). <sup>g</sup> Eq. (8.101).

<sup>h</sup> Eq. (8.131). <sup>i</sup> Eq. (8.133).

included are calculations for the Bloembergen mechanism for a one-electron Fermi-contact coupling constant of 4.47 MHz.

The nuclear relaxation of molecules in solution is very well understood [247,253,254,96], and the predominant difficulty in calculating PREs is the incorporation of the details relating to the electronic relaxation processes [96]. On the other hand, in solids both nuclear and electronic relaxation are poorly understood by comparison. Tables 8.5 and 8.6 also include estimates of the PREs obtained in solid materials assuming that the range of electronic relaxation times matches that in solution.

# 8.11.1. The d-block transition-metal ions

The electronic relaxation times in Table 8.5 have been grouped together into a generic electronic correlation time  $\tau_s$ . There is a very wide range of such times, which lie between  $10^{-8}$  and  $10^{-13}$  s. The electronic relaxation of *d*-block transition-metal ions is due to the stochastic modulation of both the permanent anisotropic EPR tensors, and any transient changes in their values due to distortions of the coordination sphere. Of the EPR tensors the ZFS provides the dominant effect, followed by the *g*-anisotropy. Both are due to SO coupling effects, and their sizes depend on the size of the many-electron SO coupling parameter  $\lambda$ . Therefore there is a general trend for a larger SO coupling energy to result in faster electronic relaxation.

High-spin metal ions with half-full *d*-shells essentially have zero SO coupling energy, and therefore the ZFS and *g*-anisotropy are very small. This is the reason for the relatively long  $\tau_s$  of  $10^{-8}$  s for Mn<sup>2+</sup>. Transition-metal ions of other configurations relax more quickly due to the presence of SO coupling. However ions with S = 1/2 have no ZFS, and so the electronic relaxation is due principally to the *g*-anisotropy. The result is that the relaxation for such ions may also be comparatively slow, as can be seen for VO<sup>2+</sup> and Cu<sup>2+</sup>, which have  $\tau_s$  values between  $10^{-8}$  and  $10^{-9}$  s.

The expression for the longitudinal PRE  $R_1$  is dominated by the spectral density  $j(\omega_l)$ , which is a maximum when  $\tau_c = 1/|\omega_l|$  which, for the examples given here, is  $2.0 \times 10^{-10}$  s. Therefore for electronic relaxation times below this value, increasing  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  increases  $R_1$ , whereas increasing  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  above  $2.0 \times 10^{-10}$  s has the effect of reducing  $R_1$ . The transverse PRE  $R_2$  is dominated by the spectral density j(0) at longer correlation times, which increases linearly with the correlation time. By contrast, in the extreme-narrowing limit, such that  $\tau_c \ll 1/|\omega_l|$ , the Solomon longitudinal and transverse PREs are equal.

This explains why the overall longitudinal PRE is dominated by the Solomon mechanism, rather than the Bloembergen mechanism, as only the former depends on the spectral density  $j(\omega_l)$ , and the latter depends only on  $j(\omega_s \pm \omega_l)$ , which is much smaller in these motional regimes. The Bloembergen mechanism, however, makes a more important contribution to the transverse PRE due to the dependence on i(0). Transition-metal ions with electronic relaxation times in the range  $10^{-11}$ – $10^{-13}$  s, such as low-spin Fe<sup>3+</sup>, high-spin 5- and 6-coordinate Co<sup>2+</sup>, Ru<sup>3+</sup>, and Re<sup>3+</sup>, have Solomon relaxation rates for rigid solids and small complexes that are approximately equal. On the other hand metal ions with slowly relaxing electrons, with time constants in the range  $10^{-8}$  –  $10^{-9}$  s such as Mn<sup>2+</sup> and Cu<sup>2+</sup>, exhibit transverse Solomon PREs that are significantly larger than their longitudinal counterparts. In the slow-rotation regime, such that Curie-spin relaxation becomes important, we see that the most significant effects are seen on the transverse PREs, which increase substantially due to the increasing  $\tau_{\rm R}$ .

Superimposed upon the dependence on the electronic relaxation times is the observation that metal ions with higher spins *S* give larger PREs due to the dependence on S(S + 1).

#### 8.11.2. The lanthanide ions

For molecules in solution the electronic relaxation times  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  of the lanthanide ions generally take values from 0.01 to 0.1 ps, and so are shorter than those of the first-row transition-metal ions. This is due to the larger SO coupling of the former. The smaller electronic relaxation times of the lanthanides tend to result in lower PREs, particularly for transverse relaxation, than for the 3*d* metal ions. Table 8.6 summarises the range of electronic relaxation times, grouped together as 'electronic correlation times'  $\tau_s$ , and the resulting calculated PREs. For the non-dynamic solid and small molecule  $T_1 \approx T_2$ , and so the relaxation properties are in the extreme-narrowing limit. We leave this regime as  $\tau_R$  increases, as for large biomolecules dominated by slow rotational diffusion. These systems are then subject to Curie relaxation, and the transverse relaxation rates are several orders of magnitude larger than the longitudinal rates.

8.11.2.1. The  $Gd^{3+}$  ion:  $4f^7$ ,  ${}^8S_{7/2}$ . An important exception to the general relaxation behaviour of the trivalent lanthanides is Gd<sup>3+</sup>, which possesses a half-full 4f shell and therefore effectively has an SO coupling interaction of zero. The Gd<sup>3+</sup> ion exhibits electronic relaxation times of the order of 1 to 10 ns, which are up to six orders of magnitude greater than for the other lanthanides. These longer electronic correlations result in larger PREs for all relaxation mechanisms with the exception of longitudinal relaxation due to the Bloembergen mechanism, which is negligible compared to the other lanthanides. In particular the larger  $\tau_s$  values have the effect of increasing the rate of transverse relaxation, which is now dominated by the term proportional to  $\tau_s$ , in all cases so that it is orders of magnitude faster than for the other ions. The large relaxation effects result in Gd<sup>3+</sup> complexes exerting long-range PREs, which make these systems good contrast agents for MRI [128,130]. However it is difficult to study the paramagnetic NMR effects within these complexes as the large short-range PRE tends to render the nuclei unobservable.

#### 8.12. Key concepts

- Under conditions of fast stochastic dynamics, such that the timescale of motion is much shorter than the reciprocal of the relevant interaction, electronic and nuclear relaxation can be described using Redfield theory.
- Redfield theory is usually valid for nuclear relaxation in solution, and in solids containing rapidly fluctuating electrons.
- Redfield theory does not usually provide a good description of electronic relaxation, and is only valid in highly-symmetric complexes.
- The principal mechanisms of electronic relaxation are modulation of the transient and/or static zero-field splitting, and phonons.
- Under high-field and fast-motional conditions, nuclear relaxation is described by the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations.
- The principal mechanisms of nuclear relaxation are the spindipolar hyperfine interaction (the Solomon mechanism), and the Fermi-contact interaction (Bloembergen mechanism).
- In systems where the rotational dynamics are slow compared to the rates of electronic relaxation the nuclear transverse relaxation is dominated by the Curie mechanism.
- In paramagnetic biomolecules with slow rotational diffusion in solution there is cross correlation between the nuclear–nuclear dipolar coupling to a second nuclear spin and paramagnetic SA, which results in the two components of the doublet having different linewidths. Relaxation–allowed coherence transfer can therefore occur between the two nuclei even in the absence of a *J*-coupling between them.

- In solids with no rotational dynamics, Curie relaxation is absent.
- Metal ions with S = 1/2 and half-full  $d^5$  configurations have relatively long electronic relaxation times due to the absence of the ZFS.
- Electronic relaxation times tend to decrease down a *d*-block triad due to the increasing spin-orbit coupling.
- The paramagnetic relaxation enhancement due to lanthanide ions is typically smaller than that for first-row *d*-block transition-metal ions, due to the faster electronic relaxation.

# Chapter 9: Relaxation in paramagnetic systems under general conditions

In Chapter 8 a treatment of nuclear relaxation was presented, valid for (1) high-field conditions, (2) fast motional dynamics, (3) a non-relativistic description of the electron spin, and (4) incorporating a phenomenological description of the electronic relaxation. In this chapter we expand on the previous description, by adopting a full quantum-mechanical treatment of the relaxation processes. This enables us to derive expressions for the PRE where the electronic relaxation is outside the Redfield limit, and including relativistic effects such as SO coupling. The electronic relaxation is therefore treated properly, and the resulting expressions for the PRE are valid at all fields.

We begin by deriving a general expression for the PRE under general conditions, employing a version of Redfield theory in which we treat both the spin system and lattice using quantum mechanics. Whilst this expression is correct and general, it resembles a 'black box' in that it is not always obvious how to use it to obtain usable expressions that are easily understood. We therefore illustrate the scope of the formalism by deriving the expressions for the PRE in a number of special cases, including low external field, fast rotational motion in solution, and including the effects of vibrations on electronic relaxation. In all cases the treatments are valid for arbitrary electronic spin *S*. Finally we examine the case of relaxation in metallic solids.

Further reading on the general theory of paramagnetic relaxation can be found in the reviews of Kowalewski et al. [95,94].

### 9.1. Introduction to the slow-motion theory of relaxation

#### 9.1.1. The different approaches for slow relaxation dynamics

In the description of the PRE in Chapter 8 we modelled the problem as a quantum mechanical spin system, comprising both the nuclear and electronic spins, coupled to a lattice that is treated classically, and which comprises the remaining parts of the system such as the molecular framework. The random time variation of the classical degrees of freedom of the lattice is the cause of the relaxation of the spin system. This time dependence is included in the Hamiltonian describing the spin-lattice coupling  $\hat{H}_1(t)$ , which is characterised by a strength parameter which is  $\omega_{lL}$  in angular units. The validity of the entire semi-classical Redfield description is restricted to the motional-narrowing, or Redfield, limit which we quoted as  $|\omega_{lL}|\tau_c \ll 1$ , where  $\tau_c$  is the correlation time we defined earlier. If the spin-lattice coupling strength is sufficiently large, or else the correlation time is sufficiently long so that the Redfield limit is violated, we must formulate the problem in another way. This problem is frequently encountered when the spin system contains electronic spins, as they are frequently subject to very large anisotropic interactions, such as the ZFS. In fact the electron-lattice coupling parameters are typically so large that we find ourselves in the *slow-motion limit*  $|\omega_{II}|\tau_{c} \gg 1$ .

Three practical approaches to resolving this problem can be found in the literature. The first is the *Swedish slow-motion theory*, which introduces the concept of a nuclear spin interacting with a composite lattice, comprising both the quantized electronic degrees of freedom, and the classical degrees of freedom due to rotational diffusion, distortions, chemical exchange, etc. [103,94,106,107]. The second approach is the Grenoble method, which models the rotational diffusion and collision dynamics using a large number of random configurations of the spin system, with each given a random trajectory of the relevant parameters describing the fluctuations of the spin-dipolar coupling vector, and static and transient ZFS parameters [111,112]. The third approach is the Ann Arbor method, in which the electronic dynamics are treated using electronic wavefunctions rather than in Liouville space [112-115]. Although these three methods represent, at first sight, very different formulations of electronic relaxation and the PRE, it has been shown by Belorizky et al. that they predict very similar results under certain conditions, implying that the underlying physics is the same in each case [252].

Fig. 9.1 shows comparisons of the NMRD PREs simulated using the Swedish slow-motion, Grenoble, and Ann Arbor models for two different metal ions, and two different rotational correlation times [252]. In all cases the simulations were performed under the following conditions:

- Two values of the electronic spin quantum number were chosen, S = 7/2 corresponding to Gd<sup>3+</sup>, and S = 1 corresponding to high-spin Ni<sup>2+</sup>. The nucleus was <sup>1</sup>H.
- The ZFS Hamiltonian comprises both a static and transient part, which were chosen to be axially symmetric, with magnitudes given by  $\Delta_s$  and  $\Delta_t$  respectively. These interactions were the sources of electronic relaxation.
- The source of the nuclear relaxation was the spin-dipolar interaction. The PAF of this interaction did not coincide with that of the static ZFS, but they were assumed to be separated from each other by the polar angle θ, which was assumed fixed.
- Both the spin-dipolar and ZFS interactions were modulated by rotational diffusion with correlation times  $\tau_r$ .
- The transient ZFS was modulated by distortions of the metal coordination geometry due to solvent collisions with correlation time  $\tau_{v}$ .

The simulations for S = 7/2 were performed with static and transient ZFS parameters of  $\Delta_s = 0.01 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $\Delta_t = 0.05 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , a spin-dipolar coupling constant of 16.7 MHz, and  $\theta$  angles of 0° and 90°. These ZFS parameters are typical values for Gd<sup>3+</sup>, and the coupling constant corresponds to a dipolar interaction with <sup>1</sup>H at a distance of 310 pm from the metal ion. The distortional correlation time was  $\tau_v = 5$  ps. The <sup>1</sup>H PRE profiles are shown in Fig. 9.1(a) and (b) for rotational correlation times of  $\tau_r = 100 \text{ ps}$ and 1 µs respectively. In both cases modulation of the transient ZFS is within the Redfield approximation. However the rotational modulation of the ZFS and spin-dipolar interaction only satisfy the Redfield condition for the shorter rotational correlation time in (a). We also see that all three slow-motion theories predict essentially the same behaviour, being indistinguishable above fields of 0.1 T, and with only a small deviation of the Ann Arbor method from the others at lower fields.

The simulations for S = 1 were performed for larger static and transient ZFS parameters of  $\Delta_s = 1 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $\Delta_t = 10 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , typical for high-spin Ni<sup>2+</sup>, with all other parameters the same as for S = 7/2. The results, for the rotational correlation times of  $\tau_r = 100 \text{ ps}$  and 1 µs, are shown in Fig. 9.1(c) and (d). Here the static and transient ZFS dynamics are outside the Redfield limit in both cases, and the spin-dipolar interaction dynamics are only within the Redfield limit for the shorter rotational correlation time in (c). This proved to be a difficult problem that was beyond the Ann Arbor method, for which the results deviated considerably (data not shown) [252]. However it is striking that both the



**Fig. 9.1.** Simulated proton PRE NMRD profiles, calculated using the three slow-motion models for two different metal ions. The profiles in (a) and (b) are calculated for an electronic spin quantum number S = 7/2, and rotational correlation times of (a)  $\tau_r = 100$  ps and (b) 1 µs. The static and transient ZFS parameters are  $\Delta_s = 0.01$  cm<sup>-1</sup> and  $\Delta_t = 0.05$  cm<sup>-1</sup>. The profiles in (c) and (d) are calculated for S = 1, rotational correlation times of (c)  $\tau_r = 100$  ps and (d) 1 µs, and static and transient ZFS parameters of  $\Delta_s = 1$  cm<sup>-1</sup> and  $\Delta_t = 10$  cm<sup>-1</sup>. Note that no Ann Arbor data are shown for (c) and (d) as the results diverge. In all cases the spin-dipolar coupling constant is  $b_{SI} = 16.7$  MHz, and the distortional correlation time is  $\tau_v = 5$  ps.  $\blacktriangle$  the Ann Arbor method;  $\bullet$  the Swedish slow-motion method;  $\blacksquare$  the Grenoble method. Adapted from [252], with the permission of AIP Publishing.

Swedish slow-motion and Grenoble methods predict the same behaviour at all fields.

In the light of the similarities between the Swedish and Grenoble approaches, we choose a single method when describing the formalism of electronic and nuclear relaxation in paramagnetic systems, namely the Swedish slow-motion theory.

#### 9.1.2. The Swedish slow-motion theory

We often encounter the situation where the interactions between the nuclei and their surroundings are sufficiently weak to satisfy the Redfield condition, and so can be treated using Redfield theory, even when the interactions between the electrons and their surroundings are not. This situation has been treated separately by Hwang et al. [305,306], and a number of groups in Sweden [103–105,108]. The idea is to sidestep the problem of the strong coupling between the electrons and their surroundings by treating the electrons as *part of the lattice*. Therefore the lattice is now a composite comprising both the classical degrees of freedom, such as the rotational dynamics, and the quantised degrees of freedom of the electronic interactions. The spin system now comprises only the nuclear spin, the coupling of which to the lattice can be treated properly using Redfield theory.

Clearly this description can only be realised by treating the lattice as a quantum object, requiring the full quantum formulation of the Redfield theory [184,254,94], which we give in the following section using the stochastic Liouville formalism. In addition to catering for the slow-motion dynamics of the unpaired electrons, the stochastic Liouville formalism also has the advantage of being able to treat the electronic relaxation of spins S > 1 properly, rather than phenomenologically as in the Solomon–Bloember gen–Morgan theory. The Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory also assumes that the only electronic interaction is the spatially isotropic Zeeman interaction, meaning that the resulting equations are only valid at external magnetic fields that are sufficiently high that the ZFS can be neglected. This restriction is lifted in the stochastic Liouville formalism and all relevant electronic spin interactions, including SO coupling effects such as the *g*-anisotropy and the ZFS, are included.

# 9.2. The stochastic Liouville formalism

We now introduce the stochastic Liouville formalism, and derive the form of the relaxation superoperator.

# 9.2.1. The Hamiltonian and Liouvillian

The Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  describing the entire system, including the nuclear spin system and the composite lattice comprising both the classical degrees of freedom of motion and the quantized electronic degrees of freedom, is

$$H = H_I + H_L + H_{IL}. \tag{9.1}$$

The Hamiltonian is divided into three parts describing the nuclear spin system ( $\hat{H}_l$ ), the lattice ( $\hat{H}_L$ ), and the coupling between the two ( $\hat{H}_L$ ). Note that, unlike in the semi-classical formulation of the Redfield theory, all the terms are time-independent. In the Liouville formalism the total Hamiltonian is associated with a total Liouvillian  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ . The Liouvillian is a commutation superoperator which is defined so that is acts on an operator  $\hat{O}$  to produce a new operator according to the following transformation [258]:

$$\widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}\widehat{\mathbf{0}} = \left[\widehat{H}, \widehat{\mathbf{0}}\right]. \tag{9.2}$$

The total Liouvillian is the sum of the three Liouvillians describing the spin system  $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_l$ , lattice  $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_L$ , and spin–lattice coupling  $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_{lL}$ :

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{l} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{lL}.$$
(9.3)

Each Liouvillian is defined by a relation analogous to that in Eq. (9.2).

9.2.1.1. The nuclear spin system. The Hamiltonian and Liouvillian describing the nuclear spin system contain in principle all the terms associated with the nuclear spin interactions, such as the Zeeman interaction, chemical and paramagnetic shielding, nuclear quadrupolar interaction, and dipolar and *J*-couplings. As in Chapter 8 we restrict the discussion to a single nuclear spin 1/2 and neglect the effects of the chemical shielding. Therefore the spin Hamiltonian is simply the nuclear Zeeman interaction

$$H_I = \hbar \omega_I I_z, \tag{9.4}$$

as before.

9.2.1.2. The spin-lattice coupling. In this formulation of the Redfield theory, the spin-lattice coupling Hamiltonian is simply the hyperfine coupling Hamiltonian. However there is an important difference in the exact form of the Hamiltonian in this formalism compared to the semi-classical Redfield theory. Before, we wrote down the (spin-lattice) hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian in the irreducible spherical tensor basis as

$$\widehat{H}_{lL} = \sum_{l=0}^{2} \sum_{m=-l}^{+l} (-1)^{m} A_{lm} \widehat{T}_{l-m}, \qquad (9.5)$$

where the operators  $\hat{T}_{lm}$  contain both nuclear and electronic spin operators. This form is appropriate in the semi-classical Redfield formalism as we have separated the nuclear–electronic spin system (in  $\hat{T}_{lm}$ ) from the classical degrees of freedom of the lattice (in  $A_{lm}$ ). However this form is not appropriate in the present formalism as the electronic spins are now part of the lattice. We therefore rewrite Eq. (9.5) as follows:

$$\widehat{H}_{lL} = \sum_{l=0}^{2} \sum_{m=-l}^{+l} (-1)^{m} A_{lm} \sum_{m'=-1}^{+1} \langle 11, -m', -m+m' | l-m \rangle \widehat{I}_{1-m'} \widehat{S}_{1,-m+m'}$$
(9.6)

$$=\sum_{m'=-1}^{+1}\widehat{I}_{1-m'}\sum_{l=0}^{2}\sum_{m=-l}^{+l}(-1)^{m}\langle 11,-m',-m+m'|l-m\rangle\widehat{S}_{1,-m+m'}A_{lm}.$$
 (9.7)

The nuclear spin properties are now contained in the rank-one operators  $\hat{I}_{1m}$ , and the composite lattice properties are encoded in the products  $\hat{S}_{1,-m+m'}A_{lm}$ . To complete the formulation of the hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian we define the rank-one lattice operators  $\hat{L}_{1m}$  as

$$\widehat{L}_{1m} = \sum_{l=0}^{2} \sum_{m'=-l}^{+l} (-1)^{m+m'} \langle 11, -m, -m' + m|l - m' \rangle \widehat{S}_{1, -m'+m} A_{lm'},$$
(9.8)

and write the hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian as the scalar contraction of  $\hat{I}_{1m}$  and  $\hat{L}_{1m}$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{lL} = \sum_{m=-1}^{+1} (-1)^m \widehat{I}_{1-m} \widehat{L}_{1m}.$$
(9.9)

For completeness we simplify the expression for the lattice operator in Eq. (9.8) by introducing the index q = m - m' to give

$$\widehat{L}_{1m} = \sum_{l=0}^{2} \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} (-1)^{q} \langle 11, -m, q | l, q - m \rangle \widehat{S}_{1q} A_{lm-q}$$
(9.10)

$$= (-1)^{m} \sum_{l=0}^{2} (-1)^{l} \sqrt{2l+1} \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} \begin{pmatrix} l & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \widehat{S}_{1q} A_{lm-q}.$$
(9.11)

In the following discussion on the expressions for the PRE rate constants it proves convenient to write the lattice operator  $\hat{L}_{1m}$  as a sum of contributions of different ranks *l*:

$$\widehat{L}_{1m} = (-1)^m \sum_{l=0}^2 \widehat{L}_{1m}^{(l)}, \tag{9.12}$$

where the term  $\widehat{L}_{1m}^{(l)}$  is given by

$$\widehat{L}_{1m}^{(l)} = (-1)^l \sqrt{2l+1} \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} \begin{pmatrix} l & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \widehat{S}_{1q} A_{lm-q}.$$
(9.13)

Hence  $\hat{L}_{1m}^{(0)}$  describes the contact contributions to the spin–lattice coupling,  $\hat{L}_{1m}^{(1)}$  gives the contribution due to antisymmetric part of the hyperfine interaction, and  $\hat{L}_{1m}^{(2)}$  describes the spin-dipolar contribution.

9.2.1.3. The lattice. The electronic-spin part of the lattice is described by a Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_S$  which comprises the electronic Zeeman interaction  $\hat{H}_Z$ , the static ZFS  $\hat{H}_{ZFS,S}$ , and the transient ZFS  $\hat{H}_{ZFS,T}$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{S} = \widehat{H}_{Z} + \widehat{H}_{ZFS,S} + \widehat{H}_{ZFS,T}.$$
(9.14)

With each contribution and with the sum is associated a Liouvillian. The total electronic spin Liouvillian  $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_s$  is the sum of the electronic Zeeman  $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_z$ , static ZFS  $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,T}$  and transient ZFS  $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,T}$  Liouvillians:

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,S} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,T}.$$
(9.15)

As discussed in Chapter 8 the static part of the ZFS is the time average of the ZFS interaction during the rapid distortions of the coordination geometry due to vibrations and collisions, and the transient ZFS is the deviation from the average.

The total lattice Liouvillian is obtained by adding the electronic spin Liouvillian to other Liouvillians that describe the stochastic motion within the relevant degrees of freedom, which for example include stochastic rotational diffusion, stochastic distortions, stochastic translational motion, chemical exchange, and vibrations. The total lattice Liouvillian is therefore written as

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{R} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{D} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{T} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{M} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{V}.$$
(9.16)

The stochastic rotational diffusion Liouvillian is  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_R = -i\hat{\Gamma}_R$ , where  $\hat{\Gamma}_R$  is the stationary Markov operator that describes the conditional probability distributions of orientations via the differential equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}P(\Omega|\Omega_0) = -\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_R P(\Omega|\Omega_0), \tag{9.17}$$

where  $P(\Omega|\Omega_0)$  is the probability that at time t the orientation is given by the Euler angles  $\Omega$  if the orientation was  $\Omega_0$  at t = 0. The Liouvillian  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_D$  describing the stochastic distortions of the lattice geometry due to collisions can similarly be written in terms of the stationary Markov operator  $\hat{\Gamma}_D$  as  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_D = -i\hat{\Gamma}_D$ . The stochastic translational motion is described by  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_T$ , and chemical exchange is represented by  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_M$ . The quantum vibrational motion of the lattice is represented by the Liouvillian  $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_V$ .

## 9.2.2. The density operator

The quantum states of the system  $|N\rangle$  are written as the direct product of the nuclear spin states  $|IM_I\rangle$  with the lattice states  $|L\rangle$ :

$$|N\rangle = |IM_I\rangle \otimes |L\rangle. \tag{9.18}$$

In addition the entire system is described by a density operator  $\hat{X}(t)$ , which is the direct product of the density operators that represent the nuclear spin system  $\hat{\rho}(t)$  and the lattice  $\hat{P}(t)$ :

$$\widehat{X}(t) = \widehat{\rho}(t) \otimes \widehat{P}(t). \tag{9.19}$$

The lattice is a much larger entity than the spin system, and so we can assume that it remains in thermal equilibrium at a temperature  $T_L$  that is unchanged by exchanges of energy with the spin system. The lattice density operator is therefore time-independent and equal to the equilibrium lattice density operator  $\hat{P}_0$ ,

$$\widehat{P}_{0} = \frac{\exp\left(-\beta_{L}\widehat{H}_{L}\right)}{\operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left[\exp\left(-\beta_{L}\widehat{H}_{L}\right)\right]},$$
(9.20)

where Tr<sub>L</sub> is the trace taken over all the lattice states  $|L\rangle$ , and  $\beta_L = 1/(kT_L)$ . From the definition in Eq. (9.20), it is easy to see that the trace of  $\hat{P}_0$  over the lattice states is unity:

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left(\widehat{P}_{0}\right) = 1. \tag{9.21}$$

Combining this property with Eq. (9.19) we see that

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left(\widehat{X}(t)\right) = \hat{\rho}(t)\operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left(\widehat{P}_{0}\right) \tag{9.22}$$

$$=\hat{\rho}(t),\tag{9.23}$$

i.e. that the nuclear spin density operator is equal to the total density operator after taking the trace over the lattice states. This property is important in the derivation of the nuclear spin relaxation superoperator in the following section.

# 9.3. Derivation of the stochastic Liouville equation

In this section we derive the equation of motion for nuclear relaxation, the form of the relaxation superoperator, and the longitudinal and transverse relaxation rate constants using the stochastic Liouville formalism.

# 9.3.1. The relaxation superoperator

The starting point is the Redfield master equation for the evolution of the density operator of the combined nuclear spin system and lattice, which takes a similar form to the corresponding expression in the semi-classical Redfield theory in Eq. (8.5):

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\widehat{X}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^\infty \left[\widehat{H}_{lL}^{\mathrm{T}}(t), \left[\widehat{H}_{lL}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau), \widehat{X}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\right]\right] \mathrm{d}\tau.$$
(9.24)

As for the semi-classical theory described in the previous chapter, the application of Eq. (9.24) is subject to two key approximations concerning the strength of the coupling between the spin system and the lattice, and the correlation time. Firstly the strength of the coupling must be sufficiently small compared to the inverse of the correlation time that it satisfies the motional-narrowing condition in Eq. (8.6), which is adapted here:

$$|\omega_{IL}|\tau_c \ll 1. \tag{9.25}$$

Secondly, in order to truncate the perturbation expansion to second order and extend the upper time limit in the integral to infinity, we assume that the spin system is only observed at times satisfying the inequalities in Eq. (8.7):

$$\tau_{\rm c} \ll t \ll \left| \frac{1}{\omega_{\rm IL}} \right|. \tag{9.26}$$

Eqs. (8.5) and (9.24) are therefore subject to the same set of approximations in Redfield theory. However there are two key differences between them. Firstly Eq. (9.24) is not averaged over an ensemble of systems. We will see that this average is replaced by the sum over all lattice states in the full quantum-mechanical treatment of the lattice. Secondly the double commutator in Eq. (9.24) contains the density operator  $\widehat{X}^{T}(t)$  rather than the difference between  $\widehat{X}^{T}(t)$  and the equilibrium density operator  $\widehat{X}_{0}$ . The inclusion of the equilibrium density operator in the semiclassical master Eq. (8.5) was phenomenological, and was required because otherwise the semi-classical theory would predict that  $\hat{\rho}(t) \to 0$  rather than  $\hat{\rho}_0$  as  $t \to \infty$ , i.e. it predicts a steady state corresponding to an infinite temperature. This anomaly arises because of the failure to treat the lattice 'properly' as a quantum object. However, as the lattice is modelled as a quantum object here, this phenomenological correction is not needed. The superscript 'T' of the spin-lattice coupling Hamiltonian and density operator indicates that these operators are in the interaction representation of the spin and lattice Hamiltonians, which is defined as

$$\widehat{H}_{IL}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = \exp\left[i\left(\widehat{H}_{I} + \widehat{H}_{L}\right)t/\hbar\right]\widehat{H}_{IL}\exp\left[-i\left(\widehat{H}_{I} + \widehat{H}_{L}\right)t/\hbar\right],\qquad(9.27)$$

$$\widehat{X}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = \exp\left[\mathrm{i}\left(\widehat{H}_{l} + \widehat{H}_{L}\right)t/\hbar\right]\widehat{X}(t)\exp\left[-\mathrm{i}\left(\widehat{H}_{l} + \widehat{H}_{L}\right)t/\hbar\right],\qquad(9.28)$$

using the conventional notation of operator transformations. In terms of the corresponding Liouvillians the transformations have the form

$$\widehat{H}_{IL}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = \exp\left[i\left(\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{I} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L}\right)t/\hbar\right]\widehat{H}_{IL},\tag{9.29}$$

$$\widehat{X}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = \exp\left[i\left(\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{l} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L}\right)t/\hbar\right]\widehat{X}(t).$$
(9.30)

We are interested in the relaxation behaviour of the nuclear spin system, rather than the combined spin system and lattice, and so we require an equation of motion of the nuclear-spin-system density operator  $\hat{\rho}(t)$ . This is derived from Eq. (9.24) by taking the trace over all lattice states, and using Eq. (9.23) to obtain:

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}^{T}(t)}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} Tr_{L}\left(\hat{X}^{T}(t)\right)$$
(9.31)

$$= -\frac{1}{\hbar^2} \int_0^\infty \mathrm{Tr}_L \Big\{ \Big[ \widehat{H}_{IL}^{\mathrm{T}}(t), \Big[ \widehat{H}_{IL}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau), \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \widehat{P}_0 \Big] \Big] \Big\} \mathrm{d}\tau, \qquad (9.32)$$

where for reasons of compactness, we have omitted the direct product symbol in the product  $\hat{\rho}^{T}(t)\hat{P}_{0}$  both here and in the subsequent equations. Eq. (9.32) is valid for any coupling interaction between the nuclear spin system and lattice. However we are interested in the particular case of a hyperfine interaction as described by the Hamiltonian in Eq. (9.9). When transformed into the interaction representation this Hamiltonian has the form

$$\hat{H}_{lL}^{T}(t) = \sum_{m=-1}^{+1} (-1)^{m} \hat{I}_{1-m}^{T}(t) \hat{L}_{1m}^{T}(t)$$

$$= \sum_{m=-1}^{+1} (-1)^{m} \left[ \exp\left(i\hat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{l}t/\hbar\right) \hat{I}_{1-m} \right] \left[ \exp\left(i\hat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L}t/\hbar\right) \hat{L}_{1m} \right],$$
(9.34)

where  $\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{T}(t)$  and  $\widehat{L}_{1m}^{T}(t)$  are the forms of the nuclear-spin and lattice operators in the spin and lattice interaction representations, which are defined respectively by the Liouvillians  $\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{l}$  and  $\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L}$ . The form of the lattice operators in the lattice interaction representation depends on which terms we include in the lattice Liouvillian, which we do not specify at this stage. By contrast the nuclear-spin Liouvillian simply contains the nuclear Zeeman interaction, and so the spin-operators  $\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{T}(t)$  and their adjoints have a very simple form:

$$\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) = \widehat{I}_{1-m} \exp(\mathrm{i}\omega_{-m}t), \qquad (9.35)$$

$$\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)^{\dagger} = \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \exp(-i\omega_{-m}t).$$
(9.36)

The rank-one operators  $\hat{I}_{1m}$  and their characteristic frequencies  $\omega_m$  are specified in Table 9.1.

On substituting the hyperfine Hamiltonian into Eq. (9.32) we obtain

$$\begin{split} \frac{d\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{dt} &= -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m,m'} (-1)^{m+m'} \exp\left[\mathrm{i}(\omega_{-m'} - \omega_{-m})t\right] \\ &\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{ \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'} \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t), \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \widehat{P}_{0} \right] \right] \right\} \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\omega_{-m}\tau\right) \mathrm{d}\tau. \end{split}$$

$$(9.37)$$

The double commutator is simplified by using the identity

$$\left[\widehat{A}\widehat{B},\widehat{C}\widehat{D}\right] = \widehat{A}\widehat{C}\left[\widehat{B},\widehat{D}\right] + \widehat{A}\left[\widehat{B},\widehat{C}\right]\widehat{D} + \widehat{C}\left[\widehat{A},\widehat{D}\right]\widehat{B} + \left[\widehat{A},\widehat{C}\right]\widehat{D}\widehat{B}.$$
(9.38)

Table 9.1

The rank-one nuclear-spin operators  $\hat{1}_{1m}$ , and frequencies  $\omega_m$  used for the calculation of the PRE in the stochastic Liouville formalism.

т	$\widehat{I}_{1m}$	$\omega_m$
0	Îz	0
$\pm 1$	$\mp \sqrt{rac{1}{2}} \widehat{I}_{\pm}$	$\pm \omega_l$

Noting that all nuclear-spin operators commute with all lattice operators, and that the trace of a commutator is zero, we obtain, after some effort, the following expression for the trace of the double commutator:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left\{\left[\widehat{I}_{1-m'}\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t),\left[\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger},\widehat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)\widehat{P}_{0}\right]\right]\right\} \\ &=\left[\widehat{I}_{1-m'},\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}\widehat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)\right]\operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left\{\left[\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger},\widehat{P}_{0}\right]\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)\right\} \\ &+\left[\widehat{I}_{1-m'},\left[\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger},\widehat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)\right]\right]\operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left\{\widehat{P}_{0}\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)\right\}. \end{aligned}$$
(9.39)

The equation of motion of the nuclear-spin density operator is now

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m,m'} (-1)^{m+m'} \exp\left[\mathrm{i}(\omega_{-m'} - \omega_{-m})t\right] \\ &\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \left[ \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \right] \right] \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{ \widehat{P}_{0} \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \right\} \\ &- \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \right] \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{ \left[ \widehat{P}_{0}, \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \right] \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \right\} \right] \\ &\times \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\omega_{-m}\tau\right) \mathrm{d}\tau. \end{aligned}$$
(9.40)

Although at first sight this equation has a rather complicated form, the second term in the integrand can be simplified (see Appendix F) to give [254]

$$\begin{bmatrix} \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \end{bmatrix} \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big\{ \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{P}_{0}, \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \end{bmatrix} \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \Big\}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \begin{bmatrix} \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}_{0} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big\{ \widehat{P}_{0} \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \Big\},$$

$$(9.41)$$

from which the equation of motion can now be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m,m'} (-1)^{m+m'} \\ &\times \exp\left[\mathrm{i}(\omega_{-m'} - \omega_{-m})t\right] \left[\widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \left[\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right] \\ &\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{\widehat{P}_{0}\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\right\} \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\omega_{-m}\tau\right) \mathrm{d}\tau. \end{aligned} (9.42)$$

The equilibrium nuclear-spin density operator is present in the double commutator as a direct consequence of the fact that we are now treating the lattice as a quantum-mechanical object. It is no longer a phenomenological correction, as it is in the semi-classical theory.

In the equation of motion 9.42 we see that the individual terms have been factored into a part that depends only on the nuclear spin, and a factor that depends only on the composite lattice. We associate the latter with the correlation function and spectral density. Hence we define the correlation function  $G_{mm'}(\tau)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} G_{mm'}(\tau) &= \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big[ \widehat{P}_{0} \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \Big] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big[ \widehat{P}_{0} \exp \Big( i \widehat{H}_{L}(t-\tau) \Big) \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger} \exp \Big( -i \widehat{H}_{L}(t-\tau) \Big) \\ &\times \exp \Big( i \widehat{H}_{L}t \Big) \widehat{L}_{1m'} \exp \Big( -i \widehat{H}_{L}t \Big) \Big] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big[ \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger} \exp \Big( -i \widehat{H}_{L}(t-\tau) \Big) \exp \Big( i \widehat{H}_{L}t \Big) \widehat{L}_{1m'} \exp \Big( -i \widehat{H}_{L}t \Big) \\ &\times \exp \Big( i \widehat{H}_{L}(t-\tau) \Big) \widehat{P}_{0} \Big] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big[ \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger} \exp \Big( i \widehat{H}_{L}\tau \Big) \widehat{L}_{1m'} \exp \Big( -i \widehat{H}_{L}\tau \Big) \widehat{P}_{0} \Big] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big[ \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger} \Big\{ \exp \Big( i \widehat{\widehat{L}}_{L}\tau \Big) \widehat{L}_{1m'} \Big\} \widehat{P}_{0} \Big], \end{aligned}$$
(9.43)

where to go to the third line, we have noted that  $\hat{P}_0$  commutes with  $\hat{H}_L$  by definition, and that the trace of a product of operators is invariant to a cyclic permutation of those operators. We see that in this definition of the correlation function, the ensemble average in the semi-classical theory has been replaced by the trace over the lattice functions. We now define the spectral density at fre-

quency  $\omega$ ,  $K_{mm'}(\omega)$ , as the Fourier–Laplace transform of the correlation function:

$$K_{mm'}(\omega) = \int_0^\infty G_{mm'}(\tau) \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau.$$
(9.44)

Substituting these expressions into Eq. (9.42) we obtain

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}^{T}(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m,m'} (-1)^{m+m'} \exp\left[i(\omega_{-m'} - \omega_{-m})t\right] \\ \times \left[\hat{I}_{1-m'}, \left[\hat{I}^{\dagger}_{1-m}, \hat{\rho}^{T}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right] \operatorname{Re}(K_{mm'}(-\omega_{-m})).$$
(9.45)

Note that the imaginary part of the spectral density has a negligible effect on the relaxation behaviour of the nuclear spins, and so we retain only the real part [96]. In the semi-classical Redfield theory we implemented the same assumption by extending the lower limit of the Fourier transform from 0 to  $-\infty$ .

The final part of the derivation concerns the oscillating phase factor  $\exp[i(\omega_{-m'} - \omega_{-m})t]$  that is present in each of the terms of the double sum. The frequency difference  $\omega_{-m'} - \omega_{-m}$  takes values that are equal to  $0, \pm \omega_l$ , or  $\pm 2\omega_l$  depending on the indices m and m'. As noted in the derivation of the semi-classical Redfield equation of motion, the terms associated with a non-zero frequency difference oscillate too rapidly (on the order of the nuclear Larmor frequency) to contribute to the relaxation process, which occurs on a much longer timescale. Therefore the only terms that contribute significantly to the relaxation behaviour of the nuclear spins are the secular terms with m' = m. Following the retention of only the secular terms the equation of motion simplifies to

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m} \left[ \hat{I}_{1-m}, \left[ \hat{I}^{\dagger}_{1-m}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0} \right] \right] \mathrm{Re}(K_{mm}(-\omega_{-m})).$$
(9.46)

We can now write this equation in terms of the relaxation superoperator  $\hat{\Gamma}$  as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\hat{\Gamma}\big(\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\big),\tag{9.47}$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}\hat{O} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \sum_{m} \left[ \hat{I}_{1-m}, \left[ \hat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{O} \right] \right] \operatorname{Re}(K_{mm}(-\omega_{-m})).$$
(9.48)

As we have seen in Chapter 8 it is the relaxation superoperator that is the key to calculating and understanding the relaxation properties of the spin system.

## 9.3.2. The longitudinal and transverse relaxation times

The longitudinal and transverse nuclear relaxation times due to the PRE can be calculated from the relaxation superoperator using expressions that are analogous to those in Eqs. (8.83) and (8.86). The expression for  $T_1$  is

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{\left(\widehat{I}_z | \widehat{\Gamma} | \widehat{I}_z\right)}{\left(\widehat{I}_z | \widehat{I}_z\right)} \tag{9.49}$$

$$=\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{z}\widehat{\Gamma}\widehat{I}_{z}\right)}{\mathrm{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{z}^{2}\right)}.$$
(9.50)

This bears a clear resemblance to Eq. (8.83), with the important difference that the trace is now taken only over the nuclear spin states, rather than over the nuclear and the electronic spin states. We recall that the latter are now accounted for in the trace over the lattice states in the expression for the time-correlation function. The corresponding expression for  $T_2$  is

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{\left(\hat{l}_+ |\hat{\Gamma}| \hat{l}_+\right)}{\left(\hat{l}_+ |\hat{l}_+\right)} \tag{9.51}$$

$$=\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{-}\widehat{\Gamma}\widehat{I}_{+}\right)}{\mathrm{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{-}\widehat{I}_{+}\right)}.$$
(9.52)

Applying the relaxation superoperator in Eq. (9.48) we obtain the following expressions for  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  in terms of the spectral densities:

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re}(K_{-1-1}(-\omega_l) + K_{11}(\omega_l)),$$
(9.53)

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re}(K_{00}(0) + K_{-1-1}(-\omega_I)).$$
(9.54)

It is shown in Appendix  ${\rm F}$  that, to a very good approximation, we can write

$$Re(K_{-1-1}(-\omega_I)) = Re(K_{11}(\omega_I)),$$
(9.55)

from which we obtain the following simplified expressions for the relaxation time constants:

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{2}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re}(K_{11}(\omega_I)), \tag{9.56}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re}(K_{00}(0) + K_{11}(\omega_l)).$$
(9.57)

The expressions in Eqs. (9.56) and (9.57) are completely general, and also somewhat deceptively simple. However we must remember that there is considerable complexity hidden in the form of the time-correlation function and spectral density, in Eqs. (9.43) and (9.44) respectively. We can gain some insight into the PRE expressions by writing the lattice operators as sums of terms of different ranks *l*, as in Eq. (9.12). From Eq. (9.43), the time-correlation functions then have the form

$$G_{mm}(\tau) = \sum_{l,l'} G_{mm}^{(ll')}(\tau),$$
(9.58)

where the  $G_{mm}^{(ll')}(\tau)$  are equal to

$$G_{mm}^{(ll')}(\tau) = \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left[ \left( \widehat{L}_{1m}^{(l)} \right)^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left( i \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L} \tau \right) \widehat{L}_{1m}^{(l')} \right\} \widehat{P}_{0} \right].$$
(9.59)

The Fourier–Laplace transform is linear, and so the spectral density can also be written as a sum of terms that depend on the double index ll':

$$K_{mm}(\omega) = \sum_{l,l'} K_{mm}^{(ll')}(\omega), \qquad (9.60)$$

$$K_{mm}^{(ll')}(\omega) = \int_0^\infty G_{mm}^{(ll')}(\tau) \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau, \qquad (9.61)$$

where we have used Eq. (9.44). It can be shown (cf. Appendix F) that the spectral densities  $K_{mm}^{(ll')}(\omega)$  satisfy the following relation

$$\operatorname{Re}\left(K_{-m-m}^{(l'l)}(-\omega_{m})\right) \approx \operatorname{Re}\left(K_{mm}^{(ll')}(-\omega_{-m})\right).$$
(9.62)

The expressions for  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  can now be written as a sum of terms, as follows:

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{2}{\hbar^2} \sum_{l,l'} \operatorname{Re}\left(K_{11}^{(ll')}(\omega_l)\right),\tag{9.63}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \sum_{l,l'} \operatorname{Re} \left( K_{00}^{(ll')}(0) + K_{11}^{(ll')}(\omega_l) \right).$$
(9.64)

In both expressions the 'self' terms with l = l' = 0 are those in which both lattice operators that appear in the expression for the spectral density depend on the rank-zero component of the hyperfine tensor, and therefore depend only on the contact interaction terms. They therefore correspond to the part of the PRE that is a generalisation of the Bloembergen mechanism discussed Chapter 8. The self terms with l = l' = 2 depend only on the spin-dipolar terms, and therefore represent a generalisation of the part of the PRE that is due to the Solomon mechanism. Both of these contributions are present in their NR forms in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory. There are additional contributions, not seen in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan formalism, that arise from terms with l = 0 and l' = 2, and l = 2 and l' = 0, which represent crosscorrelations between the contact and spin-dipolar interactions [94]. There are also self- and cross-correlation terms involving the antisymmetric hyperfine terms, but these are usually neglected.

## 9.3.3. Summary of the formalism

We have outlined the stochastic Liouville formalism of nuclear relaxation in a paramagnetic system. Unlike the previous treatment in Chapter 8, the present formalism has the advantage that it can be applied under conditions of arbitrary external magnetic field, slow motional dynamics, incorporating relevant SO coupling effects describing the electronic spin, and treating electronic relaxation explicitly rather than phenomenologically. However, unlike the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan and Curie formalisms, the stochastic Liouville treatment has a disadvantage in that it is something of a 'black box' and does not permit easy interpretation of the forms of the relaxation time constants without detailed calculations. The expressions for  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  in Eqs. (9.56) and (9.57) are deceptive in their apparent simplicity, with the spectral density hiding a considerable amount of complexity.

Following a discussion of electronic relaxation in the Redfield limit in Section 9.4, we devote the remainder of this chapter to reestablishing some of the insight lost in the increased complexity of the relaxation model by examining some very specific applications of the theory. Firstly we revisit the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory and establish the connection between it and the present formalism in Section 9.5. Then we examine the PRE properties of low-symmetry complexes with  $S \ge 1$  in solution at low field in Section 9.6 [139,140], complexes with  $S \ge 1$  in solution under fast-rotational dynamics [307] in Section 9.7, and the effects of vibrations on the PRE in solution [120] in Section 9.8. This final section includes a perspective for calculating the PRE in solids [308,309].

### 9.4. Electronic relaxation in the Redfield limit

We have seen that in many cases electronic relaxation cannot be described by the Redfield theory, especially when the coupling of the electronic spin to the rest of the lattice is large, and the timescale of modulation is sufficiently long. This is why, when describing nuclear relaxation, we include the electronic spin in the composite lattice, so that the effects of electronic relaxation can still be accounted for whilst treating the coupling of the nuclear spin to the composite lattice in the Redfield limit. However there are cases when the electronic relaxation processes *are* within the Redfield limit, and under such circumstances we may want to describe this relaxation explicitly. This is also done with the stochastic Liouville formalism, as we now outline.

#### 9.4.1. The spin system, lattice, and spin-lattice coupling

As for nuclear relaxation we can write the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  as a sum of terms due to the spin system  $\hat{H}_s$ , the lattice  $\hat{H}_F$ , and the coupling between them  $\hat{H}_{sF}$ :

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_S + \hat{H}_F + \hat{H}_{SF}. \tag{9.65}$$

The way in which we partition the various interactions between the spin system, lattice, and spin–lattice coupling is a rather delicate matter, and depends on the dynamics of the system we are studying. For example under conditions of fast rotational diffusion, the rotational motion modulates the spatially anisotropic interactions, such as the static ZFS and anisotropic Zeeman interactions. The electronic spin system Liouvillian  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{S}^{fast}$  then contains the unmodulated isotropic Zeeman interaction  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{Z,iso}$ :

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S}^{\text{fast}} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z,\text{iso}}.$$
(9.66)

The spin-lattice coupling Liouvillian  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{SF}^{\text{fast}}$  then contains the rotationally-modulated static ZFS  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ZFS,S}$  and anisotropic Zeeman  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{Z,\text{aniso}}$  interactions, as well as the transient ZFS  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{ZFS,T}$ , which is modulated by distortions of the metal-ion coordination site:

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{SF}^{\text{fast}} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z,\text{aniso}} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,S} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,T}.$$
(9.67)

The lattice Liouvillian  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{F}^{\text{fast}}$  contains the terms that lead to modulation of the spin-lattice coupling interactions due to rotational diffusion  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{R}$ , distortions due to solvent collisions  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{D}$ , and vibrational motions  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{V}^{(0)} - i\widehat{\Gamma}_{V}$ :

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{F}^{\text{fast}} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{R} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{D} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{V}^{(0)} - i\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{V}.$$
(9.68)

The rotational diffusion term is responsible for motional modulation of the static ZFS and *g*-anisotropy, whilst the collisions and vibrations modulate the transient ZFS.

In the other limit of slow rotational diffusion, the rotational motion is unable to completely average out the static ZFS and anisotropic Zeeman interactions. These interactions are effectively stationary, and are therefore removed from the spin-lattice coupling Liouvillian and included in the electronic spin Liouvillian

 $\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S}^{\text{slow}}$ , which is given by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{S}^{slow} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{Z} + \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{ZFS,S}, \tag{9.69}$$

where  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_z$  is the sum of the isotropic and anisotropic Zeeman interactions. The modulation of the transient ZFS by collisions and vibrations still occurs on a sufficiently fast timescale, and so the spin-

lattice coupling Liouvillian  $\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{SF}^{slow}$  still contains this interaction:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{SF}^{slow} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{ZFS,T}.$$
(9.70)

Finally the lattice Liouvillian  $\widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_{F}^{\text{slow}}$  is given by the fast-motional expression, but with the rotational diffusion term removed:

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{F}^{\text{slow}} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{D} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{V}^{(0)} - i\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{V}.$$
(9.71)

We now discuss the form of the spin–lattice coupling Hamiltonian, which for  $S \ge 1$  always contains the transient ZFS, and may also contain the anisotropic Zeeman, and static ZFS interactions. However we can usually neglect the Zeeman term and consider only the ZFS terms, which dominate the electronic relaxation properties. The Hamiltonians of both the static and transient ZFS contributions have the same operator form, namely

$$\widehat{H}_{SF} = \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} (-1)^m \widehat{F}_{2m} \widehat{S}_{2-m}, \qquad (9.72)$$

where  $\hat{F}_{2m}$  are the lattice operators that describe the size and spatial properties of the interaction. If we consider only classical (nonquantized) degrees of freedom of the lattice, such as rotational diffusion of the static ZFS or distortional motion of the transient ZFS in the pseudo-rotation model, the lattice operators  $\hat{F}_{2m}$  can be replaced by functions describing the spatial variation. As before we transform this Hamiltonian into the interaction representation of the spin system and the lattice to give the new operator  $\hat{H}_{re}^{t}(t)$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{SF}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) = \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S}t\right) \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{F}t\right) \widehat{H}_{SF}$$

$$(9.73)$$

$$=\sum_{m=-2}^{+\infty}(-1)^{m}\widehat{F}_{2m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\widehat{S}_{2-m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t).$$
(9.74)

The interaction-representation spin and lattice operators  $\widehat{S}_{2m}^{T}(t)$  and  $\widehat{F}_{2m}^{T}(t)$  are given by

$$\widehat{S}_{2m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) = \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{s}t\right)\widehat{S}_{2m},\tag{9.75}$$

$$\widehat{F}_{2m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) = \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_F t\right)\widehat{F}_{2m}.$$
(9.76)

As we have seen before it is usual to write the spin operator  $\widehat{S}_{2m}$  as the sum of terms  $\widehat{S}_{2m}^{(n)}$ , each of which evolves at a characteristic frequency  $\omega_m^{(n)}$  under the action of the electronic spin Liouvillian:

$$\exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{s}t\right)\widehat{S}_{2m} = \sum_{n}\widehat{S}_{2m}^{(n)}\exp\left(i\omega_{m}^{(n)}t\right).$$
(9.77)

The exact form of this partitioning, and indeed whether it needs to be done at all, depends on the form of  $\widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S}$ , and whether or not, in the slow-motion limit, it includes the static ZFS.

# 9.4.2. The electronic spin relaxation superoperator

In the Redfield limit we can describe the relaxation of the electronic density operator  $\hat{\rho}_{S}(t)$  with the following equation of motion:

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}_{S}^{r}(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m,m'} \sum_{n,n'} (-1)^{m+m'} \exp\left[i\left(\omega_{-m'}^{(n')} - \omega_{-m}^{(n)}\right)t\right] \\ \times \left[\widehat{S}_{2-m'}^{(n')}, \left[\left(\widehat{S}_{2-m}^{(n)}\right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{\rho}_{S}^{T}(t) - \widehat{\rho}_{S,0}\right]\right] J_{mm'}(-\omega_{-m}^{(n)}).$$
(9.78)

where  $\hat{\rho}_{S}^{T}(t)$  is the electronic density operator in the interaction representation and  $\hat{\rho}_{S,0}$  is the equilibrium electronic density operator. As for nuclear relaxation the electronic relaxation behaviour is defined by a time-correlation function, which we denote  $\langle \hat{F}_{2m}(0)^* \hat{F}_{2m'}(-\tau) \rangle$ , and which is given by

$$\langle \widehat{F}_{2m}(\mathbf{0})^{\dagger} \widehat{F}_{2m'}(-\tau) \rangle = \operatorname{Tr}_{F} \left[ \widehat{F}_{2m}^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{F}\tau\right) \widehat{F}_{2m'} \right\} \widehat{P}_{0} \right].$$
(9.79)

The trace is taken over the lattice states, and  $\hat{P}_0$  is the equilibrium lattice density operator. The spectral density functions  $J_{mm'}(\omega)$  in Eq. (9.78) are then defined as the real part of the Fourier–Laplace transform of the time-correlation functions:

$$J_{mm'}(\omega) = \operatorname{Re}\left[\int_0^\infty \langle \widehat{F}_{2m}(0)^{\dagger} \widehat{F}_{2m'}(-\tau) \rangle \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau\right].$$
(9.80)

If we remove the oscillating non-secular terms with  $m \neq m'$  and  $n \neq n'$  from the equation of motion, we obtain the following expression

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}_{S}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{e}(\hat{\rho}_{S}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{S,0}), \qquad (9.81)$$

where  $\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_e$  is the electronic relaxation superoperator, which is given by

$$\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{e}\widehat{O} = \frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m} \sum_{n} \left[ \widehat{S}_{2-m}^{(n)}, \left[ \left( \widehat{S}_{2-m}^{(n)} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{O} \right] \right] J_{mm} \left( -\omega_{-m}^{(n)} \right).$$
(9.82)

However we note that the secular approximation must be applied with care. As we will see, non-secular terms can sometimes make an important contribution to the relaxation properties of the electronic spin.

### 9.5. The Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan theory revisited

In this section we briefly revisit the Solomon–Bloembergen–M organ theory originally examined in Section 8.6 using the semiclassical Redfield theory. We will once again obtain the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations, showing that the theory of relaxation derived using the stochastic Liouville formalism is exactly equivalent to the semi-classical theory when subject to the same set of restrictions, namely high-field conditions, and a classical description of chemical exchange and rotational diffusion.

#### 9.5.1. The lattice

The lattice comprises the quantised electronic states, the classical rotational degrees of freedom, and the degrees of freedom associated with chemical exchange. The corresponding Liouvillian must account for all these parts of the lattice, and is therefore written as follows:

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{e} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{R} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{M}.$$
(9.83)

The Liouvillian superoperators  $\widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_R$  and  $\widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_M$  account for the stochastic rotational diffusion and exchange processes. The former superoperator changes the spatial orientation of the system by acting on the classical Wigner rotation matrix elements as follows:

$$D_{mm'}^{(l)}(\Omega_{\rm PL}(t)) = \exp\left(-i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{R}t\right) D_{mm'}^{(l)}(\Omega_{\rm PL}(0)), \tag{9.84}$$

i.e. the orientation of the PAF is changed from  $\Omega_{PL}(0)$  at time t = 0, to  $\Omega_{PL}(t)$  at time t.

Chemical exchange has the effect of shuttling the nuclear spin between different sites in which the hyperfine interaction tensor components are different. This can be described by the action of  $\hat{a}$ 

 $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_M$  on the PAF components of the hyperfine tensor  $\widetilde{A}_{l\mu}(t)$  as follows:

$$\widetilde{A}_{l\mu}(t) = \exp\left(-i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{M}t\right)\widetilde{A}_{l\mu}(0).$$
(9.85)

Once again we have assumed that the chemical exchange and rotational diffusion processes occur on sufficiently different timescales to be independent of each other.

As we have seen previously with the Solomon–Bloembergen– Morgan theory the only coherent electronic interaction that we consider is the electronic Zeeman interaction, with Liouvillian

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{Z}$ . The electronic Zeeman Liouvillian transforms the electronic spin operators  $\hat{S}_{1q}$  as follows:

$$\exp\left(-i\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{Z}t\right)\widehat{S}_{1q} = \widehat{S}_{1q}\exp\left(-iq\omega_{S}t\right),\tag{9.86}$$

i.e. the operator evolves at frequency  $-q\omega_s$ . We also need a mechanism for electronic relaxation, which is accounted for here by  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_e = -i\hat{\Gamma}_e$ , where  $\hat{\Gamma}_e$  is the electronic relaxation superoperator. We recall that in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory the relaxation processes are not accounted for explicitly, but are modelled phenomenologically by the effective electronic longitudinal and transverse relaxation times  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$ . The transformations are:

$$\exp\left(-i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{e}t\right)\widehat{S}_{10}=\widehat{S}_{10}\exp\left(-t/T_{1e}\right),$$
(9.87)

$$\exp\left(-i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{e}t\right)\widehat{S}_{1\pm1} = \widehat{S}_{1\pm1}\exp\left(-t/T_{2e}\right),\tag{9.88}$$

where  $\hat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_e = -i\hat{\hat{\Gamma}}_e$  is the Liouvillian that describes electronic relaxation via the Markov superoperator  $\hat{\hat{\Gamma}}_e$ .

#### 9.5.2. The spectral densities

The nuclear relaxation times are calculated from Eqs. (9.63) and (9.64). The Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan theory ignores the effects of cross-correlation between the hyperfine coupling interactions of different spatial ranks, and only considers the NR Fermi-contact and spin-dipolar contributions. Hence the relaxation times have the following simplified expressions

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{2}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re} \Big( K_{11}^{\rm FC}(\omega_I) + K_{11}^{\rm SD}(\omega_I) \Big), \tag{9.89}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re} \Big( K_{00}^{FC}(0) + K_{11}^{FC}(\omega_l) + K_{00}^{SD}(0) + K_{11}^{SD}(\omega_l) \Big),$$
(9.90)

where we have replaced the superscripts (00) and (22) with 'FC' and 'SD' respectively. Hence the spectral densities  $K_{mm}^{\rm FC}(\omega)$  contribute to the Bloembergen mechanism, and the spectral densities  $K_{mm}^{SD}(\omega)$ contribute to the Solomon mechanism.

To proceed we write down the form of the time-correlation function  $G_{mm}^{(l)}(\tau)$  by combining Eq. (9.13) for the lattice operator of spatial rank *l* with Eq. (9.59), and write the components of the hyperfine tensor in the PAF of the spin-dipolar interaction tensor. The result is

$$G_{mm}^{(ll)}(\tau) = (2l+1) \sum_{q,q'=-1}^{+1} {l \choose m-q} \frac{1}{q} \frac{1}{-m} {l \choose m-q'} \frac{1}{q'} \frac{1}{-m} \\ \times \sum_{\mu,\mu'=-l}^{+l} \operatorname{Tr}_{L} \Big[ \widetilde{A}_{l\mu}(0)^{*} D_{\mu,m-q}^{(l)}(\Omega_{PL}(0))^{*} \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \\ \times \Big\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L}\tau\right) \widetilde{A}_{l\mu'}(0) D_{\mu',m-q'}^{(l)}(\Omega_{PL}(0)) \widehat{S}_{1q'} \Big\} \widehat{P}_{0} \Big].$$
(9.91)

We factorize the trace into three parts, comprising the product of the PAF hyperfine tensor components, an orientational part comprising the Wigner rotation matrix elements, and a trace over the electronic spin states:

$$\begin{split} G_{mm}^{(ll)}(\tau) &= (2l+1) \sum_{q,q'=-1}^{+1} \begin{pmatrix} l & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} l & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ &\times \sum_{\mu,\mu'=-l}^{+l} \left\langle \widetilde{A}_{l\mu}(0)^* \left\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{M}\tau\right) \widetilde{A}_{l\mu'}(0) \right\} \right\rangle \left\langle D_{\mu,m-q}^{(l)}(\Omega_{PL}(0))^* \right. \\ &\times \left\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{R}\tau\right) D_{\mu',m-q'}^{(l)}(\Omega_{PL}(0)) \right\} \right\rangle \\ &\times \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left(i\left(\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{e}\right)\tau\right) \widehat{S}_{1q'} \right\} \widehat{P}_{0.S} \right] \qquad (9.92) \\ &= (2l+1) \sum_{q,q'=-1}^{+1} \begin{pmatrix} l & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} l & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ &\times \sum_{\mu,\mu'=-l}^{+l} \left\langle \widetilde{A}_{l\mu}(0)^* \widetilde{A}_{l\mu'}(-\tau) \right\rangle \left\langle D_{\mu,m-q}^{(l)} \left(\Omega_{PL}(0)\right)^* D_{\mu',m-q'}^{(l)} \left(\Omega_{PL}(-\tau)\right) \right\rangle \\ &\times \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left(i\left(\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{e}\right)\tau\right) \widehat{S}_{1q'} \right\} \widehat{P}_{0.S} \right], \qquad (9.93) \end{split}$$

where  $\hat{P}_{0,S}$  is the equilibrium density operator of the electronic spin. Eq. (9.93) now contains three independent correlation functions. The rotational correlation function, which correlates the Wigner rotation matrix elements, can be written as an integral over all Euler angles  $\Omega_{\rm PL}$  as follows:

$$\left\langle D_{\mu,m-q}^{(l)}(\Omega_{\rm PL}(0))^* D_{\mu',m-q'}^{(l)}(\Omega_{\rm PL}(-\tau)) \right\rangle$$

$$= \left[ \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_{\Omega} D_{\mu,m-q}^{(l)}(\Omega_{\rm PL})^* D_{\mu',m-q'}^{(l)}(\Omega_{\rm PL}) d\Omega_{\rm PL} \right] g_l^{\rm R}(\tau)$$

$$= \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \delta_{\mu\nu\ell} \delta_{\sigma\rho\ell} g_l^{\rm R}(\tau).$$
(9.94)

$$=\frac{1}{2l+1}\delta_{\mu\mu'}\delta_{qq'}g_l^{\mathbb{R}}(\tau),\tag{9.95}$$

where  $g_{i}^{R}(\tau)$  is the reduced rotational correlation function used in the Solomon-Bloembergen theory, as defined in Chapter 8, and we have assumed isotropic tumbling. The chemical exchange correlation function can be simplified by setting  $\mu = \mu'$ :

$$\left\langle \widetilde{A}_{l\mu}(0)^* \widetilde{A}_{l\mu}(-\tau) \right\rangle = |\widetilde{A}_{l\mu}|^2 g^{\mathsf{M}}(\tau), \qquad (9.96)$$

where  $g^{M}(\tau)$  is the chemical exchange reduced correlation function. We note that we have encountered both of these results before, in Chapter 8. The remaining correlation function is the electronic correlation function, which has the form of the trace of a product of electronic spin operators over the spin states. In the hightemperature limit the equilibrium density operator can be approximated by  $\hat{P}_{0,S} = \hat{1}_S / (2S + 1)$ , with only a small deviation of order  $\beta_L$ . This allows us to simplify the electronic correlation function as follows

$$Tr_{S}\left[\widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger}\left\{\exp\left(i\left(\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z}+\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{e}\right)\tau\right)\widehat{S}_{1q}\right\}\widehat{P}_{0,S}\right]$$
$$=\frac{1}{2S+1}Tr_{S}\left[\widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger}\widehat{S}_{1q}\right]\exp\left(iq\omega_{S}\tau\right)g_{q}^{S}(\tau),$$
(9.97)

where we have set q = q' as required by the form of the rotational correlation function, and  $g_a^S(\tau)$  is the reduced electronic correlation function we defined in Chapter 8. The trace can be simplified to give

$$\frac{1}{2S+1} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \widehat{S}_{1q} \right] = \frac{1}{2S+1} (-1)^{q} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \widehat{S}_{1-q} \widehat{S}_{1q} \right]$$
(9.98)

$$=\frac{2S+1}{2S+1}(-1)^{-4}\frac{3}{3}(S\|S_1\|S)^{-1}$$
(9.99)

$$=\frac{1}{3}S(S+1).$$
 (9.100)

Combining Eqs. (9.93)–(9.100) we obtain the final expression for the time-correlation function:

\_

$$G_{mm}^{(ll)}(\tau) = \frac{1}{3}S(S+1) \left[ \sum_{\mu} |\widetilde{A}_{l\mu}|^2 \right] \sum_{q} \begin{pmatrix} l & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix}^2 \qquad (9.101)$$
$$\times \exp\left(iq\omega_S \tau\right) g_{lq}(\tau),$$

where  $g_{la}(\tau)$  is the total correlation function. Taking the Fourier– Laplace transform of the correlation function finally gives us the spectral density

$$K_{mm}^{(ll)}(\omega) = \frac{1}{6}S(S+1) \left[ \sum_{\mu} |\tilde{A}_{l\mu}|^2 \right] \sum_{q} \begin{pmatrix} l & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix}^2 j_{l,|q|+1}(\omega - q\omega_S),$$
(9.102)

where  $j_{lq}(\omega)$  is the total reduced spectral density in the Solomon– Bloembergen-Morgan theory.

9.5.3. The Solomon–Morgan–Bloembergen equations

9.5.3.1. The Solomon mechanism. Focussing on the spin-dipolar part of the hyperfine interaction we remember that

$$\sum_{\mu=-2}^{+2} |\widetilde{A}_{2\mu}|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( 3 + \left( \eta^{\text{SD}} \right)^2 \right) \left( \widetilde{A}_{zz}^{\text{SD}} \right)^2, \tag{9.103}$$

and obtain the following expression for the spectral density:

$$K_{mm}^{SD}(\omega) = \frac{1}{12}S(S+1)\left(3 + (\eta^{SD})^{2}\right)\left(\tilde{A}_{zz}^{SD}\right)^{2} \times \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} \left(\frac{2}{m-q} \frac{1}{q} - m\right)^{2} j_{2,|q|+1}(\omega - q\omega_{S}).$$
(9.104)

The important spectral densities for calculating the relaxation times are  $K_{11}^{SD}(\omega_l)$  and  $K_{00}^{SD}(0)$ , which are calculated to be:

$$\begin{split} K_{11}^{\text{SD}}(\omega_{I}) &= \frac{1}{2}S(S+1)\Big(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^{2}\Big)\Big(\widetilde{A}_{zz}^{\text{SD}}\Big)^{2} \\ &\times \Big[\frac{1}{60}j_{21}(\omega_{I}) + \frac{1}{30}j_{22}(\omega_{S} + \omega_{I}) + \frac{1}{180}j_{22}(\omega_{S} - \omega_{I})\Big], \\ K_{00}^{\text{SD}}(0) &= S(S+1)\Big(3 + (\eta^{\text{SD}})^{2}\Big)\Big(\widetilde{A}_{zz}^{\text{SD}}\Big)^{2}\Big[\frac{1}{90}j_{21}(0) + \frac{1}{60}j_{22}(\omega_{S})\Big]. \end{split}$$

When the unpaired electronic spin behaves as a point dipole moment,  $\tilde{A}_{zz}^{SD} = 2b_{Sl}$ ,  $\eta^{SD} = 0$ , and the spectral densities become:

$$K_{11}^{\text{SD}}(\omega_{l}) = \frac{1}{2}S(S+1)b_{Sl}^{2}\left[\frac{1}{5}j_{21}(\omega_{l}) + \frac{2}{5}j_{22}(\omega_{S}+\omega_{l}) + \frac{1}{15}j_{22}(\omega_{S}-\omega_{l})\right]$$
$$K_{00}^{\text{SD}}(0) = S(S+1)b_{Sl}^{2}\left[\frac{2}{15}j_{21}(0) + \frac{1}{5}j_{22}(\omega_{S})\right].$$

*9.5.3.2. The Bloembergen mechanism.* We now turn our attention to the Bloembergen mechanism, where the PRE is due to the Fermicontact interaction. Noting that

$$|A_{00}|^2 = 3\left(A^{FC}\right)^2, \tag{9.105}$$

we obtain the following spectral density function:

$$K_{mm}^{\rm FC}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}S(S+1) \left(A^{\rm FC}\right)^2 \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} \left(\begin{matrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{matrix}\right)^2 j_{0,|q|+1}(\omega-q\omega_5).$$
(9.106)

The two spectral density functions that determine the PRE  $K_{11}^{FC}(\omega_l)$  and  $K_{00}^{PC}(0)$  are therefore:

$$K_{11}^{\text{FC}}(\omega_I) = \frac{1}{2}S(S+1)\left(A^{\text{FC}}\right)^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1\\ 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}^2 j_{02}(\omega_S - \omega_I)$$
(9.107)

$$=\frac{1}{6}S(S+1)\left(A^{\rm FC}\right)^2 j_{02}(\omega_S-\omega_I),$$
(9.108)

$$K_{00}^{\rm FC}(0) = \frac{1}{2}S(S+1) \left(A^{\rm FC}\right)^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1\\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 j_{01}(0)$$
(9.109)

$$=\frac{1}{6}S(S+1)\left(A^{\rm FC}\right)^2 j_{01}(0). \tag{9.110}$$

9.5.3.3. The PRE. On substituting the expressions for the spectral densities into Eqs. (9.89) and (9.90) we obtain the Solomon–Bloem bergen–Morgan equations for the PRE. The expression for  $T_1$  is

$$\frac{1}{T_{1}} = \frac{2}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{FC}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \frac{\tau_{E,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{E,2}^{2}} \\
+ \frac{2}{15}S(S+1)\left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^{2} \left[\frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_{I}^{2}\tau_{c,1}^{2}} \\
+ \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}+\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{S}-\omega_{I})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}}\right],$$
(9.111)

and the corresponding expression for  $T_2$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T_2} &= \frac{1}{3}S(S+1) \left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[\tau_{\text{E},1} + \frac{\tau_{\text{E},2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_I)^2 \tau_{\text{E},2}^2}\right] \\ &+ \frac{1}{15}S(S+1) \left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[4\tau_{\text{c},1} + \frac{6\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1 + \omega_S^2 \tau_{\text{c},2}^2} + \frac{3\tau_{\text{c},1}}{1 + \omega_I^2 \tau_{\text{c},1}^2} \right. \\ &+ \frac{6\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1 + (\omega_S + \omega_I)^2 \tau_{\text{c},2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{\text{c},2}}{1 + (\omega_S - \omega_I)^2 \tau_{\text{c},2}^2}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{9.112}$$

where we have used the explicit Lorentzian expressions for the reduced spectral densities. We note that these are exactly the same expressions given in Eqs. (8.107) and (8.108) in Chapter 8.

9.6. Low-field theory of the PRE in low-symmetry complexes in solution

#### 9.6.1. Introduction

The Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan equations describe the PRE under high-field conditions, where the Zeeman interaction is the dominant electronic spin interaction. However the theory is not applicable under conditions of low magnetic field where the ZFS dominates the electronic energy level structure. This lowfield limit is of interest when studying the field-dependent behaviour of relaxation rates in NMR dispersion (NMRD) experiments, for which it is important to have corresponding expressions for the PRE [96]. Here we summarise the low-field theory of the PRE in paramagnetic complexes in solution as described by Westlund [138], Bertini et al. [109], and Nilsson and Kowalewski [139,140], derive the PRE due to an electronic spin S = 1 subject to an axially symmetric static ZFS, and highlight the differences from the highfield Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan approach. Finally we summarize the work done in deriving expressions for an S = 1 and 3/2 subject to a rhombic static ZFS, and electronic spins S = 2, 5/2, 3, and 7/2.

The low-field theory is subject to the following assumptions:

- 1. We are in the limit of low magnetic field, which we define as the regime where the axial ZFS anisotropy *D* is much greater than the electronic Zeeman splitting,  $|D| \gg \mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0$ .
- 2. The electronic relaxation can be described in the Redfield limit, which requires that the electronic relaxation processes occur on a sufficiently fast timescale.
- 3. Rotational diffusion is much slower than the electronic spin dynamics, so that we can apply the decomposition approximation. Hence this is also an example of the slow-rotation limit.
- 4. The relevant electronic spin interactions, namely the static ZFS and Zeeman interactions, are not fully averaged by molecular reorientation, and so do not contribute to electronic relaxation. This is a consequence of Assumption 3.
- 5. For S > 3/2, quartic and higher-order ZFS terms are neglected.
- 6. The spin-dipolar hyperfine interaction and static ZFS tensor share a common PAF.

As in the previous section we now define the lattice and the corresponding Liouvillian, and derive the spectral densities for an arbitrary electronic spin *S*. We then restrict the discussion to S = 1 and derive the electronic relaxation rates, and incorporate these into the calculation and discussion of the PRE.

#### 9.6.2. The lattice

The paramagnetic complex is assumed to be of low symmetry, so that the electronic spin is subject to a static ZFS in addition to the Zeeman interaction. The combined lattice is a composite of the electronic and rotational degrees of freedom, and is represented by a Liouvillian that is given by the sum of the electronic and rotational diffusion Liouvillians:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_L = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_S + \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_R, \tag{9.113}$$

where

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,S} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{e}.$$
(9.114)

The electronic Zeeman Liouvillian can be neglected at low magnetic fields such that  $|D| \gg \mu_{\rm B} g_e B_0$ , as outlined in Assumption 1 above. The superoperator  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_e$  describes the electronic relaxation due to the transient ZFS, which can be modelled by the pseudo-rotation model of Rubinstein et al. [116]. The overall lattice equilibrium density operator  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0$  is the direct product of the equilibrium density

operators of the electron spin  $\hat{P}_{0,S}$  and rotational degrees of freedom  $\hat{P}_{0,L}$ :

$$\widehat{P}_0 = \widehat{P}_{0,S} \otimes \widehat{P}_{0,L}. \tag{9.115}$$

As in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory, the electronic equilibrium density operator in the high-temperature limit is simply  $\hat{1}_S/(2S+1)$ .

### 9.6.3. The spectral densities

As we have seen before the PRE is due to the hyperfine interaction, which couples the nuclear spin to the unpaired electrons in the lattice. Here we consider only the spin-dipolar interaction, which is represented by the following Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}^{SD}$  and lattice operator  $\hat{L}_{1m}^{SD}$ :

$$\widehat{H}^{\rm SD} = \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} (-1)^m \widehat{I}_{1-m} \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\rm SD}, \tag{9.116}$$

$$\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\text{SD}} = (-1)^m \sqrt{30} b_{SI} \sum_{q=-1}^{+1} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \widehat{S}_{1q} D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\text{PL}}), \quad (9.117)$$

where  $\Omega_{PL}$  is the set of Euler angles that gives the orientation of the common PAF of the spin-dipolar and static ZFS tensors in the laboratory frame, and we have assumed that the electronic spin can be modelled as a point dipole moment. The spectral density functions  $K_{nmn}^{SD}(\omega)$  are therefore given by

$$\begin{split} K_{mm}^{\text{SD}}(\omega) &= 30b_{SI}^{2} \sum_{q,q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \int_{0}^{\infty} \text{Tr}_{L} \Big[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\text{PL}}(0))^{*} \Big\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L}\tau\right) \widehat{S}_{1q'} D_{0,m-q'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\text{PL}}(0)) \Big\} \widehat{P}_{0} \Big] \\ & \times \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau. \end{split}$$
(9.118)

The expression in Eq. (9.118) is identical to that used in the slow-motion theory. However to proceed into the low-field regime we need further steps. Firstly, because the electron spin dynamics are dominated by the static ZFS, we need to express the electronic spin operators  $\hat{S}_{1q}$  in terms of the spin operators in the PAF  $\tilde{S}_{1q}$ , through the following relation:

$$\widehat{S}_{1q} = \sum_{p} \widetilde{S}_{1p} D_{pq}^{(1)}(\Omega_{\text{PL}}).$$
(9.119)

Secondly we apply the following contraction law for the products of Wigner rotation matrix elements [191]:

$$D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\rm PL})D_{pq}^{(1)}(\Omega_{\rm PL}) = \sum_{C=1}^{3} (2C+1) \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & C \\ 0 & p & -p \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & C \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} D_{-p,-m}^{(C)}(\Omega_{\rm PL})^{*}.$$
 (9.120)

Applying Eqs. (9.119) and (9.120) to Eq. (9.118) we obtain

$$\begin{split} K_{mm}^{\text{SD}}(\omega) &= 30b_{SI}^{2} \sum_{q,q'} \sum_{p,n} (-1)^{p+n} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix}^{2} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix}^{2} \\ & \times 9 \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & p & -p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & n & -n \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \int_{0}^{\infty} \text{Tr}_{L} \Big[ \widetilde{S}_{1n}^{\dagger} D_{nm}^{(1)} (\Omega_{\text{PL}}(0))^{*} \Big\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L}\tau\right) \widetilde{S}_{1p} D_{pm}^{(1)} (\Omega_{\text{PL}}(0)) \Big\} \widehat{P}_{0} \\ & \times \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau, \end{split}$$
(9.121)

where we have retained only those contacted Wigner rotation matrix elements with rank C = 1 [139].

We now invoke Assumption 3, and apply the decomposition approximation to separate the rotational diffusion dynamics from the electronic spin dynamics. The lattice trace is therefore given by

$$\begin{split} & \operatorname{Tr}_{L} \bigg[ \widetilde{S}_{1n}^{\dagger} D_{nm}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(0))^{*} \bigg\{ \exp \bigg( i \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L} \tau \bigg) \widetilde{S}_{1p} D_{pm}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(0)) \bigg\} \widehat{P}_{0} \bigg] \\ &= \langle D_{nm}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(0))^{*} D_{pm}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(-\tau)) \rangle \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \bigg[ \widetilde{S}_{1n}^{\dagger} \bigg\{ \exp \bigg( i \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S} \tau \bigg) \widetilde{S}_{1p} \bigg\} \widehat{P}_{0,S} \bigg]. \end{split}$$

$$(9.122)$$

As the molecule is tumbling isotropically the spatiallydependent factor simplifies to

$$\langle D_{nm}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(\mathbf{0}))^* D_{pm}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(-\tau)) \rangle = \frac{1}{3} \delta_{pn} \exp\left(-\tau/(3\tau_R)\right).$$
(9.123)

The rotational correlation time  $\tau_R$  above corresponds to a ranktwo tensor. However since we are describing the reorientational motion of a rank-one tensor, we require a factor of 1/3 in the exponent. We now simply the spectral density to

$$K_{mm}^{\text{SD}}(\omega) = 90b_{SI}^{2} \left[ \sum_{q} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix}^{2} \sum_{q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix}^{2} \right] \\ \times \sum_{p} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & p & -p \end{pmatrix}^{2} \times \frac{1}{2S+1} \int_{0}^{\infty} \text{Tr}_{S} \left[ \widetilde{S}_{1p}^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S}\tau\right) \widetilde{S}_{1p} \right\} \right] \\ \times \exp\left[ -(i\omega+1/(3\tau_{R}))\tau \right] d\tau.$$
(9.124)

The Wigner 3*j* symbols can be written in terms of their numerical values [191]:

$$\sum_{q} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m - q & q & -m \end{pmatrix}^2 = \frac{1}{3},$$
(9.125)

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & p & -p \end{pmatrix}^2 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{30}, & p = \pm 1, \\ \frac{2}{15}, & p = 0, \end{cases}$$
(9.126)

to give the final expression for the spectral density:

$$K_{mm}^{\rm SD}(\omega) = \frac{b_{SI}^2 S(S+1)}{9} \left[ s_{-1-1}^{\rm SD}(\omega) + 4s_{00}^{\rm SD}(\omega) + s_{11}^{\rm SD}(\omega) \right], \tag{9.127}$$

which we note is independent of *m*. The functions  $s_{pp}^{SD}(\omega)$  are the electronic spin spectral density functions defined in the common PAF as

$$\begin{split} S_{pp}^{SD}(\omega) &= \frac{3}{S(S+1)(2S+1)} \\ &\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \text{Tr}_{S} \bigg[ \widetilde{S}_{1p}^{\dagger} \bigg\{ \exp \bigg( i \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S} \tau \bigg) \widetilde{S}_{1p} \bigg\} \bigg] \exp \left[ -(i\omega + 1/(3\tau_{R}))\tau \right] d\tau. \end{split}$$

$$(9.128)$$

The functions  $s_{pp}^{\text{SD}}(\omega)$  contain all the information pertaining to the electron spin dynamics. In particular  $s_{00}^{\text{SD}}(\omega)$  describes the spin dynamics of longitudinal relaxation, and  $s_{\pm 1\pm 1}^{\text{SD}}(\omega)$  describes transverse relaxation in the common PAF of the spin-dipolar and ZFS tensors.

The nuclear relaxation rates can now be written down in terms of the  $s_{pp}^{SD}(\omega)$  as follows. The longitudinal PRE is given by

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{2b_{SI}^2 S(S+1)}{9\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re}[s_{-1-1}^{SD}(\omega_I) + 4s_{00}^{SD}(\omega_I) + s_{11}^{SD}(\omega_I)], \quad (9.129)$$

and the transverse PRE is

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{b_{SI}^2 S(S+1)}{9\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re}\left[s_{-1-1}^{SD}(0) + 4s_{00}^{SD}(0) + s_{11}^{SD}(0) + s_{-1-1}^{SD}(\omega_I) + 4s_{00}^{SD}(\omega_I) + s_{11}^{SD}(\omega_I)\right].$$
(9.130)

(

So far these expressions are general for any electronic spin *S*, subject to a static ZFS of any symmetry, under the Assumptions 1–6 above. We have not yet specified explicitly the form of the electronic relaxation, which is our next step.

#### 9.6.4. Electronic relaxation

The relaxation of the unpaired electronic spin is due to the transient ZFS interaction, the Hamiltonian of which is written in the PAF of the static ZFS as

$$\widehat{H}_{ZFS,T} = \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} (-1)^m F_{2m} \widetilde{S}_{2-m}, \qquad (9.131)$$

where  $F_{2m}$  are the spatial functions in the irreducible spherical tensor basis. The electronic relaxation superoperator is  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{del} = -i\hat{\Gamma}_{ZFS,T}$ , where  $\hat{\Gamma}_{ZFS,T}$  is the superoperator representing the stochastic modulation of the transient ZFS. This modulation is described by the pseudo-rotation model of Rubinstein et al., which assumes that the transient ZFS has a constant amplitude and a direction that changes with time according to a rotational diffusion equation [116]. Therefore, as we have seen before, the transient ZFS is described by two parameters: the magnitude  $\Delta_t$  and correlation time  $\tau_{\nu}$ . As before the magnitude is defined as follows:

$$\Delta_{\rm t}^2 = \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} |\tilde{F}_{2m}|^2 \tag{9.132}$$

$$=\frac{2}{3}D_{\rm t}^2+2E_{\rm t}^2, \tag{9.133}$$

where the  $\tilde{F}_{2m}$  are the transient ZFS spatial functions in their (timedependent) PAF, and  $D_t$  and  $E_t$  are the axial and rhombic anisotropies that are assumed to be constant in the pseudo-rotation model.

We assume that the electronic relaxation is in the Redfield limit (Assumption 2), and so can be described by the equation of motion in Eq. (9.78):

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}_{S}^{r}(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m,m'} \sum_{n,n'} (-1)^{m+m'} \exp\left[i\left(\omega_{-m'}^{(n')} - \omega_{-m}^{(n)}\right)t\right] \\ \times \left[\widetilde{S}_{2-m'}^{(n')}, \left[\left(\widetilde{S}_{2-m}^{(n)}\right)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}_{S}^{T}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{S,0}\right]\right] J_{mm'}(-\omega_{-m}^{(n)}).$$
(9.134)

The relaxation rates are defined in terms of the spectral density functions  $J_{mm'}(\omega)$ , which are given in terms of the correlation functions  $\langle F_{2m}(0)^*F_{2m'}(-\tau)\rangle$  by Eq. (9.80):

$$J_{mm'}(\omega) = \operatorname{Re}\left[\int_0^\infty \langle F_{2m}(0)^* F_{2m'}(-\tau) \rangle \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau\right].$$
(9.135)

In the pseudo-rotation model the correlation functions  $\langle F_{2m}(0)^*F_{2m'}(-\tau)\rangle$  are

$$F_{2m}(\mathbf{0})^* F_{2m'}(-\tau) \rangle = \sum_{\mu,\mu'} \widetilde{F}_{2\mu}^* \widetilde{F}_{2\mu'} \langle D_{\mu m}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\rm FP}(\mathbf{0}))^* D_{\mu'm'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\rm FP}(-\tau)) \rangle \quad (9.136)$$

$$=\sum_{\mu,\mu'}\widetilde{F}_{2\mu}^{*}\widetilde{F}_{2\mu'}\frac{1}{5}\delta_{\mu\mu'}\delta_{mm'}\exp(-\tau/\tau_{\nu})$$
(9.137)

$$=\frac{1}{5}\delta_{mm'}\exp(-\tau/\tau_{v})\sum_{\mu}|\widetilde{F}_{2\mu}|^{2}$$
(9.138)

$$=\frac{1}{5}\delta_{mm'}\Delta_{\rm t}^2\exp(-\tau/\tau_\nu),\qquad(9.139)$$

where  $\Omega_{FP}(t)$  are the time-dependent Euler angles that describe the constantly-changing orientation of the PAF of the transient ZFS in the PAF of the static ZFS. The spectral density functions are therefore

$$J_{mm'}(\omega) = \frac{\Delta_t^2}{5} \frac{\tau_v}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_v^2} \delta_{mm'},$$
(9.140)

which we note are non-zero only for m = m'. The equation of motion now simplifies to

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}_{S}^{T}(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m} \sum_{n,n'} \exp\left[i\left(\omega_{-m}^{(n')} - \omega_{-m}^{(n)}\right)t\right] \\ \times \left[\widetilde{S}_{2-m}^{(n')}, \left[\left(\widetilde{S}_{2-m}^{(n)}\right)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}_{S}^{T}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{S,0}\right]\right] J_{mm}(-\omega_{-m}^{(n)}).$$
(9.141)

If we remove the non-secular terms with  $n \neq n'$  from the equation of motion, we obtain the following expression:

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}_{S}^{T}(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m} \sum_{n} \left[ \widetilde{S}_{2-m}^{(n)}, \left[ \left( \widetilde{S}_{2-m}^{(n)} \right)^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}_{S}^{T}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{S,0} \right] \right] J_{mm} \left( -\omega_{-m}^{(n)} \right).$$
(9.142)

As in Section 9.4.2, we note that non-secular terms can sometimes make an important contribution.

9.6.4.1. Electronic relaxation of S = 1 in an axially-symmetric environment. We now illustrate the theory of electronic relaxation in low-field conditions with the calculation of the relaxation time constants of the simplest spin system that is subject to a ZFS interaction, namely an electronic spin S = 1 in an axially-symmetric complex. This case was originally treated by Bertini et al. [109]. We can neglect the electronic Zeeman interaction for integer spin

at low field, and so the coherent part of  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_S$  is simply the static ZFS interaction. The *static* ZFS is axially symmetric with an anisotropy D and an associated frequency of transition  $\omega_D = D/(2\pi)$ , whilst the *transient* ZFS possesses both an axial and rhombic anisotropy  $D_t$  and  $E_t$ , as the *instantaneous* distortion of the coordination environment need not necessarily be axial. The electronic relaxation superoperator is

$$\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{\text{ZFS,T}}\widehat{O} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \sum_{m} \sum_{n,n'} \left[ \widetilde{S}_{2-m}^{(n')}, \left[ \left( \widetilde{S}_{2-m}^{(n)} \right)^{\dagger}, \widehat{O} \right] \right] J_{|m|} \left( -\omega_{-m}^{(n)} \right), \tag{9.143}$$

where we have retained the sum over both *n* and *n'*. The operators  $\widehat{S}_{2m}^{(n)}$  of the transient ZFS and their characteristic frequencies  $\omega_m^{(n)}$  due to evolution under the static ZFS are given in Table 9.2. We also write the spectral density functions as  $J_{|m|}(\omega) \equiv J_{+m+m}(\omega) = J_{-m-m}(\omega)$ , where we take +m as positive, as they are independent of the sign of *m*.

The longitudinal relaxation of the spin is described by two time constants  $T_{1e}^{(10)}$  and  $T_{1e}^{(20)}$ , which describe the relaxation of the expectation values of the operators  $\hat{S}_{10}$  and  $\hat{S}_{20}$  respectively. They are determined from the following expressions:

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma_{1e}^{(10)}} = \frac{\left(\widehat{S}_{10}|\,\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{ZFS,T}|\,\widehat{S}_{10}\right)}{\left(\widehat{S}_{10}|\,\widehat{S}_{10}\right)},\tag{9.144}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{1e}^{(20)}} = \frac{\left(\hat{S}_{20}|\hat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{ZFS,T}|\hat{S}_{20}\right)}{\left(\hat{S}_{20}|\hat{S}_{20}\right)}.$$
(9.145)

Table 9.2

The spin operators  $\hat{S}_{2m}^{(n)}$  and associated frequencies  $\omega_m^{(n)}$  of an electronic spin S = 1 subject to an axially symmetric static ZFS interaction.

	$\widehat{S}_{2m}^{(n)}$		ω	(n) m
т	n = 1	<i>n</i> = 2	n = 1	n = 2
0	$\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \left( \widehat{S}_z^2 - S(S+1)\widehat{1}_S \right)$	-	0	-
$\pm 1$	$\pm \frac{1}{2} \widehat{S}_z \widehat{S}_{\pm}$	$\pm \frac{1}{2} \widehat{S}_{\pm} \widehat{S}_z$	$\omega_{\rm D}$	$-\omega_{\rm D}$
$\pm 2$	$\frac{1}{2}\widehat{S}_{\pm}^2$	_	0	-

Explicit calculations give the following time constants:

$$\frac{1}{T_{1e}^{(10)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} [J_1(\omega_D) + 4J_2(0)], \qquad (9.146)$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{1e}^{(20)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} [3J_1(\omega_D)].$$
(9.147)

We see that the two spectral densities present in these expressions are  $J_1(\omega_D)$  and  $J_2(0)$ . The reason why these spectral densities are evaluated at these frequencies is readily understood by reference to Fig. 4.3. The former spectral density function refers to a transition between either the states  $|1 - 1\rangle \rightarrow |10\rangle$  or  $|1 + 1\rangle \rightarrow |10\rangle$ , both of which occur with transition frequency  $\omega_D$  at zero field. Hence  $J_1(\omega)$  is evaluated at frequency  $\omega_D$ . The latter spectral density refers to a transition between the states  $|1 - 1\rangle \rightarrow |1 + 1\rangle$ , which occurs at zero frequency due to their degeneracy at zero field. Hence  $J_2(\omega)$  is evaluated at zero frequency.

The transverse relaxation is described by three time constants  $T_{2e}^{(1\pm1)}$ ,  $T_{2e}^{(2\pm1)}$ , and  $T_{2e}^{(2\pm2)}$ , which refer to the relaxation of the operators  $\widehat{S}_{1\pm1}$ ,  $\widehat{S}_{2\pm1}$ , and  $\widehat{S}_{2\pm2}$  respectively. They are calculated from:

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(1\pm1)}} = \frac{\left(\widehat{S}_{1\pm1}|\,\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{\text{ZFS},\text{T}}|\,\widehat{S}_{1\pm1}\right)}{\left(\widehat{S}_{1\pm1}|\,\widehat{S}_{1\pm1}\right)},\tag{9.148}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(2\pm1)}} = \frac{\left(\widehat{S}_{2\pm1}|\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{ZFS,T}|\widehat{S}_{2\pm1}\right)}{\left(\widehat{S}_{2\pm1}|\widehat{S}_{2\pm1}\right)},$$
(9.149)

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(2\pm2)}} = \frac{\left(\widehat{S}_{2\pm2}|\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{ZFS,T}|\widehat{S}_{2\pm2}\right)}{\left(\widehat{S}_{2\pm2}|\widehat{S}_{2\pm2}\right)},$$
(9.150)

which, in turn, give the expressions:

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(1\pm1)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left[ \frac{3}{2} J_0(0) + \frac{5}{2} J_1(\omega_D) + J_2(0) \right], \tag{9.151}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(2\pm1)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left[ \frac{3}{2} J_0(0) + \frac{1}{2} J_1(\omega_D) + J_2(0) \right], \tag{9.152}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(2\pm2)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} [J_1(\omega_D) + 2J_2(0)].$$
(9.153)

We will see that the important electronic relaxation processes that determine the PRE at low field are those that contribute to  $T_{1e}^{(10)}$  and  $T_{2e}^{(1\pm1)}$ .

# 9.6.5. Nuclear relaxation

9.6.5.1. Nuclear relaxation due to S = 1 in an axially-symmetric environment. We now derive the closed expressions for the longitudinal and transverse relaxation times constants for the PRE due to an electronic spin S = 1 in an axially-symmetric coordination environment, as treated by Bertini et al. [109]. In order to calculate the forms of the PRE time constants we must evaluate the electronic spectral density functions in Eq. (9.128) for the electronic spin system in question. We begin by determining the transformation of the electronic Liouvillian  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_S$  on the rank-one electronic spin operators. For the S = 1 spin at low field, the Liouvillian transforms the ransforms the rank-one spin operators as follows:

$$\exp\left(-i\widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,S}t\right)\widetilde{S}_{10}=\widetilde{S}_{10},\tag{9.154}$$

$$\exp\left(-i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,S}t\right)\widetilde{S}_{1\pm1} = \cos(\omega_D t)\widetilde{S}_{1\pm1} \mp i\sqrt{2}\sin(\omega_D t)\widetilde{S}_{2\pm1}, \quad (9.155)$$

where we are in the PAF of the static ZFS. The incoherent transient ZFS Liouvillian causes the expectation values of the rank-one operators to decay in a mono-exponential fashion according to their longitudinal or transverse relaxation time constants:

$$\exp\left(-\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{\text{ZFS},T}t\right)\widetilde{S}_{10} = \widetilde{S}_{10}\exp\left(-t/T_{1e}^{(10)}\right),\tag{9.156}$$

$$\exp\left(-\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{\text{ZFS},\text{T}}t\right)\widetilde{S}_{1\pm 1} = \widetilde{S}_{1\pm 1}\exp\left(-t/T_{2e}^{(1\pm 1)}\right).$$
(9.157)

The traces in Eq. (9.128) therefore evaluate to

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left[\widetilde{S}_{10}^{\dagger}\left\{\exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S}\tau\right)\widetilde{S}_{10}\right\}\right] = \frac{1}{3}S(S+1)(2S+1)\exp\left(-\tau/T_{1e}^{(10)}\right) \quad (9.158)$$
$$= 2\exp\left(-\tau/T_{1e}^{(10)}\right), \qquad (9.159)$$

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left[\widetilde{S}_{1\pm1}^{\dagger}\left\{\exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S}\tau\right)\widetilde{S}_{1\pm1}\right\}\right] = \frac{1}{3}S(S+1)(2S+1)$$
$$\times \cos(\omega_{D}\tau)\exp\left(-\tau/T_{2e}^{(1\pm1)}\right)$$
(9.160)

$$= 2\cos(\omega_D \tau) \exp\left(-\tau/T_{2e}^{(1\pm 1)}\right). \quad (9.161)$$

Following Fourier transformation we obtain the following expressions for the electronic spectral density functions:

$$\operatorname{Re}[s_{00}^{\mathrm{SD}}(\omega)] = \frac{\tau_{c,1}}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_{c,1}^2},$$
(9.162)

$$\operatorname{Re}[s_{\pm 1\pm 1}^{\mathrm{SD}}(\omega)] = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega + \omega_D)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega - \omega_D)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} \right], \quad (9.163)$$

where  $\tau_{c,1}$  and  $\tau_{c,2}$  are correlation times that depend upon the electronic longitudinal and transverse relaxation times respectively, and the rotational correlation time:

$$\tau_{c,1}^{-1} = \left(T_{1e}^{(10)}\right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{3}\tau_{R}^{-1},\tag{9.164}$$

$$\tau_{c,2}^{-1} = \left(T_{2e}^{(1+1)}\right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{3}\tau_{R}^{-1}.$$
(9.165)

The expressions for  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  are given by Eqs. (9.129) and (9.130), and have the following forms:

$$\frac{1}{T_{1}} = \frac{4b_{SI}^{2}}{9\hbar^{2}} \left[ \frac{4\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_{I}^{2}\tau_{c,1}^{2}} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{I}+\omega_{D})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{I}-\omega_{D})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}} \right], \quad (9.166)$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{2}} = \frac{2b_{SI}^{2}}{9\hbar^{2}} \left[ 4\tau_{c,1} + \frac{2\tau_{c,2}}{1+\omega_{D}^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}} + \frac{4\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_{I}^{2}\tau_{c,1}^{2}} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{I}-\omega_{D})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_{I}-\omega_{D})^{2}\tau_{c,2}^{2}} \right]. \quad (9.167)$$

In the limit of low field, large static ZFS, and slow motional dynamics such that  $|\omega_D \tau_{c,2}| \gg 1$ , the relaxation rates are dominated by the terms that do not contain the ZFS frequency:

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{16b_{SI}^2}{9\hbar^2} \frac{\tau_{c,1}}{1 + \omega_I^2 \tau_{c,1}^2},\tag{9.168}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{8b_{SI}^2}{9\hbar^2} \left[ \tau_{c,1} + \frac{\tau_{c,1}}{1 + \omega_I^2 \tau_{c,1}^2} \right].$$
(9.169)

Hence for both relaxation processes the characteristics of the PRE are dominated by the terms that contain the correlation time  $\tau_{c,1}$ , which in the slow-rotation limit is dominated by the electronic longitudinal relaxation properties.

9.6.5.2. Nuclear relaxation due to higher electronic spins. The expressions for the PRE in the low-field, slow-motion limit have also been derived for systems of higher electronic spin, and in environments of lower symmetry. Westlund derived the PRE expression for  $T_1$ 

due to an electronic S = 1 in a rhombic environment [138]. The expression is clearly more complicated than for the axial case, as it depends on both the static axial and rhombic ZFS anisotropies, as well as three electronic relaxation times rather than two. Corresponding expressions have also been derived by Nilsson et al. for S = 3/2 in both axial and rhombic environments, and S = 2, S = 5/2, S = 3, and S = 7/2 in axially-symmetric environments [139,140]. For low-field expressions of the PRE for arbitrary electronic spin, we use the general expressions in Eqs. (9.129) and (9.130).

# 9.7. The PRE under fast-rotation conditions in solution

## 9.7.1. Introduction

When the rotational motion of the paramagnetic complex is rapid, the application of the decomposition approximation to the rotational and electronic spin dynamics is not as straightforward as it is under slow-motion conditions. One significant difference the fast-motion regime has from the slow-motion regime is that the rapid motion modulates both the static ZFS and the spindipolar hyperfine interactions, with the former acting as a source of electronic relaxation, and the latter resulting in nuclear relaxation. This situation was investigated by Kruk and Kowalewski, under conditions of high and low external field [307].

This situation is of considerable interest for studying the relaxation properties of contrast agents in aqueous solution in MRI [128,130]. A specific class of systems that we focus on here is paramagnetic complexes in solution, where the bound ligands are taken from the solvent, an example of which is the aqueous hexaaquairon(II) complex  $[Fe(H_2O)_6]^{2+}$ . It is assumed that the solvent molecules are in chemical exchange between the bound (ligand) and unbound (bulk) states. Under these circumstances we can identify two separate contributions to the PRE, known as the inner-sphere and outer-sphere contributions. In the inner-sphere mechanism the solvent molecules experience a substantial PRE when bound to the metal ion in the complex. The measured contribution to the nuclear relaxation rate depends upon this PRE, and upon the rate of exchange between the bound and unbound states. The second, and less important, outer-sphere mechanism is the PRE experienced by solvent molecules that never enter into the complex with the metal ion. It depends on the translational diffusion of the solvent molecules through the bulk.

The fast rotational theory of the PRE describes both of these mechanisms. The main assumptions are:

- 1. The unperturbed electronic Hamiltonian is the Zeeman interaction at high field, and the static ZFS interaction at low field.
- 2. The fast motion results in orientational averaging of the static ZFS interaction, so that it acts as a source of electronic relaxation in addition to the transient ZFS.
- 3. The electronic relaxation is in the Redfield limit.
- 4. The spin-dipolar hyperfine and static ZFS interactions share the same PAF.
- 5. For outer-sphere relaxation the translational and rotational diffusion and electronic spin relaxation are all uncorrelated with each other.

Note that the second assumption is the opposite to that made in the slow-rotation theory.

#### 9.7.2. A simple model of inner- and outer-sphere relaxation

Before we examine the inner- and outer-sphere mechanisms in the stochastic Liouville formalism we summarise a simple theory for the PRE due to a complex in solution, proposed by Luz and Meiboom [121]. The overall longitudinal PRE  $1/T_1$  is written as the sum of the inner-sphere and outer-sphere contributions. These contributions have a complicated form, which are characterised by the longitudinal inner- and outer-sphere PREs  $1/T_{1,IS}$  and  $1/T_{1,OS}$ . However, as we will see, the inner-sphere contribution is not simply equal to  $1/T_{1,IS}$ .

The model of Luz and Meiboom deals specifically with innersphere relaxation in which the solvent molecules are in exchange between the bound (B) and unbound (U) states. These two sites have lifetimes of  $\tau_{\rm B}$  and  $\tau_{\rm U}$  respectively, and are associated with different longitudinal relaxation times  $T_{1,\rm B}$  and  $T_{1,\rm U}$ . The central assumption is that the paramagnetic species is dilute, so that the number of bound molecules  $n_{\rm B}$  is much lower than the number of unbound molecules  $n_{\rm U}$ . Hence the ratio of bound to unbound molecules f, which is defined as

$$f = \frac{n_{\rm B}}{n_{\rm U}} = \frac{\tau_{\rm B}}{\tau_{\rm U}},\tag{9.170}$$

is much less than unity, i.e.  $f \ll 1$ .

The nuclear spins of solvent molecules in both states give bulk magnetization vectors. As we are, at present, only considering longitudinal relaxation, we focus on the *z*-components of the magnetization vectors of the spins in their bound and unbound states  $M_{z,B}(t)$  and  $M_{z,U}(t)$ . Following the assumption of the dilute nature of the paramagnetic species these magnetization components satisfy  $|M_{z,B}(t)| \ll |M_{z,U}(t)|$  at all times. The equilibrium values of the magnetization vector components,  $M_{z,B}^{(0)}$  and  $M_{z,U}(t)^{(0)}$ , are related to the ratio f via  $f = M_{z,B}^{(0)}/M_{z,U}^{(0)}$ . The longitudinal relaxation behaviour of the magnetizations in the two states is governed by a pair of simultaneous differential equations [258]:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}M_{z,\mathrm{B}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{T_{1,\mathrm{IS}}} \left( M_{z,\mathrm{B}}(t) - M_{z,\mathrm{B}}^{(0)} \right) - \frac{1}{\tau_{\mathrm{B}}} M_{z,\mathrm{B}}(t) + \frac{1}{\tau_{\mathrm{U}}} M_{z,\mathrm{U}}(t), \ (9.171)$$
$$\frac{\mathrm{d}M_{z,\mathrm{U}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{1}{T_{1,\mathrm{U}}} \left( M_{z,\mathrm{U}}(t) - M_{z,\mathrm{U}}^{(0)} \right) - \frac{1}{\tau_{\mathrm{U}}} M_{z,\mathrm{U}}(t) + \frac{1}{\tau_{\mathrm{B}}} M_{z,\mathrm{B}}(t), \ (9.172)$$

where we have noted that the longitudinal relaxation time in the bound state  $T_{1,B}$  is simply the inner-sphere relaxation time  $T_{1,IS}$ . We should note that the treatment of chemical exchange in this model is different to that in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory of the PRE. In the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory the rate of chemical exchange is assumed to be sufficiently fast that it falls into the Redfield limit where it can be treated as a relaxation process, and the exchange lifetime used as a correlation time. However in the present situation the exchange need not be fast, and we note that Eqs. (9.171) and (9.172) are also valid in the limits of slow and intermediate exchange, which are outside the Redfield regime.

Since the fraction of bound solvent molecules f is small, we can approximate  $dM_{z,B}(t)/dt \approx 0$ , and simplify Eq. (9.171) to give an expression for the *z*-magnetization of the nuclear spins in the bound molecules in terms of the *z*-magnetization from the spins in the unbound molecules:

$$M_{z,B}(t) = f\left(\frac{\tau_{B}M_{z,U}^{(0)} + T_{1,IS}M_{z,U}(t)}{\tau_{B} + T_{1,IS}}\right).$$
(9.173)

By substituting this into Eq. (9.172) and simplifying we obtain an expression for the relaxation behaviour of the nuclear spins in the unbound molecules:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}M_{z,\mathrm{U}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\left(\frac{1}{T_{1,\mathrm{U}}} + \frac{f}{\tau_{\mathrm{B}} + T_{1,\mathrm{IS}}}\right) \left(M_{z,\mathrm{U}}(t) - M_{z,\mathrm{U}}^{(0)}\right). \tag{9.174}$$

This expression is of the form

$$\frac{dM_{z,U}(t)}{dt} = -\frac{1}{T_{1,eff}} \left( M_{z,U}(t) - M_{z,U}^{(0)} \right), \tag{9.175}$$

where  $T_{1,\text{eff}}$  is an effective longitudinal relaxation time constant which is given by

$$\frac{1}{T_{1,\text{eff}}} = \frac{1}{T_{1,\text{U}}} + \frac{f}{\tau_{\text{B}} + T_{1,\text{IS}}}.$$
(9.176)

In the NMR experiment the observed signal is dominated by the nuclear spins in the unbound solvent molecules, as  $|M_{z,B}(t)| \ll |M_{z,U}(t)|$ , and so Eq. (9.176) is the longitudinal relaxation time constant that is actually measured. The second term in Eq. (9.176) is the enhancement of the relaxation rate,  $1/T_{1,U}$ , that would otherwise be observed in the absence of the paramagnetic species and so we associate it with the inner-sphere PRE:

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{f}{\tau_{\rm B} + T_{\rm 1,IS}},\tag{9.177}$$

which we see is related to the longitudinal nuclear relaxation time constant  $T_{1,IS}$ , the lifetime  $\tau_B$  associated with the bound state, and the fraction f of bound molecules.

The outer-sphere relaxation contribution to the overall PRE is included by simply adding the term  $1/T_{1,OS}$  to Eq. (9.177):

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{f}{\tau_{\rm B} + T_{\rm 1,IS}} + \frac{1}{T_{\rm 1,OS}}.$$
(9.178)

A description of outer-sphere relaxation is more difficult, as it requires a description of the stochastic variation of the distance between the nucleus and paramagnetic centre. We can also derive an analogous expression for the inner- and outer-sphere transverse PREs. The following sections are concerned with the calculation of the expressions for the inner- and outer-sphere relaxation time constants  $T_{q,IS}$  and  $T_{q,OS}$  that are used in Eq. (9.178), using the stochastic Liouville formalism.

#### 9.7.3. Inner-sphere relaxation at high field

In formulating the inner-sphere PREs  $1/T_{1,IS}$  and  $1/T_{2,IS}$  we model the ligand as being bound to the metal ion so that the distance between the nuclear spin and paramagnetic centre is fixed. The PRE is then calculated using the expression for the spectral density  $K_{mm}^{SD}(\omega)$ :

$$\begin{split} K_{mm}^{\text{SD}}(\omega) &= 30b_{Sl}^2 \sum_{q,q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \int_0^\infty \text{Tr}_L \Big[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} D_{0,m-q}^{(2)} (\Omega_{\text{PL}}(0))^* \Big\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_L \tau\right) \widehat{S}_{1q'} D_{0,m-q'}^{(2)} (\Omega_{\text{PL}}(0)) \Big\} \widehat{P}_0 \Big] \\ & \times \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau. \end{split}$$

$$(9.179)$$

The relevant degrees of freedom in the lattice are those pertaining to the electronic spin, the rotational diffusion, and the distortion of the complex geometry via collisions. The Liouvillian is therefore given by:

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_L = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_S + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_R + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_D, \qquad (9.180)$$

where the electronic spin Liouvillian comprises terms for the electronic Zeeman interaction and the static and transient ZFS interactions:

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S} = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,S} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{ZFS,T}.$$
(9.181)

The equilibrium lattice density operator is given by the direct product of the electronic spin and rotational diffusion density operators:  $\hat{P}_0 = \hat{P}_{0.S} \otimes \hat{P}_{0.R}$ .

In the high-field limit the electronic Zeeman interaction dominates the electronic energy levels, and the static and transient ZFS interactions cause electronic relaxation via their stochastic time dependence, the former by rapid rotational diffusion and the latter by collisional distortions. The spin-dipolar hyperfine tensor is also modulated by the rotational diffusion. We can reformulate Eq. (9.179) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} K_{mm}^{\text{SD}}(\omega) &= 30b_{SI}^{2}\sum_{q,q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \int_{0}^{\infty} \text{Tr}_{R} \left[ D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\text{PL}}(0))^{*} \text{Tr}_{S} \left[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left( i \left( \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S} + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{D} \right) \tau \right) \widehat{S}_{1q'} \right\} \right] \\ & \times D_{0,m-q'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\text{PL}}(-\tau)) \widehat{P}_{0} \right] \times \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau, \end{aligned}$$
(9.182)

where we have assumed that the static ZFS and spin-dipolar interactions have the same PAF, and so are both modulated according to the same time-dependent set of Euler angles  $\Omega_{PL}(t)$ . If we further assume that the rotational motion is so rapid that the electronic spins experience only the average effect of the reorientation we can factorize the part of the correlation function containing the electronic spin degrees of freedom from the part containing the rotational diffusion, as we have done before:

$$\begin{split} K_{mm}^{\rm SD}(\omega) &= 30 b_{SI}^2 \sum_{q,q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \int_0^\infty \langle D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\rm PL}(0))^* D_{0,m-q'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\rm PL}(-\tau)) \rangle \\ & \times \operatorname{Tr}_S \Big[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \Big\{ \exp\Big( i \Big( \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_Z - i \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_e \Big) \tau \Big) \widehat{S}_{1q'} \Big\} \widehat{P}_{0,S} \Big] \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau \end{split}$$
(9.183)

$$= 6b_{SI}^{2} \sum_{q} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m - q & q & -m \end{array} \right)^{2} \\ \times \int_{0}^{\infty} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left(i\left(\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} - i\,\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{e}\right)\tau\right) \widehat{S}_{1q} \right\} \widehat{P}_{0,S} \right] \\ \times \exp\left[-(i\omega + 1/\tau_{R})\tau\right] d\tau, \qquad (9.184)$$

where the electronic relaxation Liouvillian  $\hat{\Gamma}_e$  is the sum of two terms corresponding to electronic relaxation under the static ZFS

 $\widehat{\Gamma}_{ZFS,S}$  and transient ZFS  $\widehat{\Gamma}_{ZFS,T}$ , i.e.  $\widehat{\Gamma}_e = \widehat{\Gamma}_{ZFS,S} + \widehat{\Gamma}_{ZFS,T}$ .

We define the electronic spectral density in the laboratory frame as

$$\begin{split} S_{pp}^{\text{SD}}(\omega) &= \frac{3}{S(S+1)(2S+1)} \int_{0}^{\infty} \text{Tr}_{S} \Big[ \widehat{S}_{1p}^{\dagger} \Big\{ \exp\left(i \Big(\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} - i \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{e} \Big) \tau \Big) \widehat{S}_{1p} \Big\} \Big] \\ &\times \exp\left[-(i\omega + 1/\tau_{R})\tau\right] d\tau, \end{split}$$
(9.185)

which is the high-field equivalent of Eq. (9.128), but with the factor of 1/3 removed from the exponent as the correlation time now describes the effect of rotational diffusion on rank-two spatial tensors. We note the following differences: in the present expression the spin operators are expressed in the laboratory frame, rather than the PAF of the static ZFS tensor, and the static ZFS interaction appears as a relaxation superoperator. The spectral densities that are used to calculate the PREs are therefore given by:

$$K_{11}^{\text{SD}}(\omega_I) = \frac{1}{15} b_{SI}^2 S(S+1) \left( s_{11}^{\text{SD}}(\omega_I) + 3s_{00}^{\text{SD}}(\omega_I) + 6s_{-1-1}^{\text{SD}}(\omega_I) \right), \quad (9.186)$$
  
$$K_{00}^{\text{SD}}(0) = \frac{1}{15} b_{SI}^2 S(S+1) \left( 3s_{11}^{\text{SD}}(0) + 4s_{00}^{\text{SD}}(0) + 3s_{-1-1}^{\text{SD}}(0) \right). \quad (9.187)$$

The resulting expressions for the longitudinal and transverse innersphere relaxation time constants are therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T_{1,IS}} &= \frac{2b_{SI}^2}{15\hbar^2}S(S+1)\operatorname{Re}\bigl(s_{11}^{SD}(\omega_I) + 3s_{00}^{SD}(\omega_I) + 6s_{-1-1}^{SD}(\omega_I)\bigr), \quad (9.188)\\ \frac{1}{T_{2,IS}} &= \frac{b_{SI}^2}{15\hbar^2}S(S+1)\operatorname{Re}\bigl(3s_{11}^{SD}(0) + 4s_{00}^{SD}(0) + 3s_{-1-1}^{SD}(0) \\ &+ s_{11}^{SD}(\omega_I) + 3s_{00}^{SD}(\omega_I) + 6s_{-1-1}^{SD}(\omega_I)\bigr). \end{aligned}$$

These are the time constants that are used in the expressions of the form of Eq. (9.177) to describe the overall inner-sphere PRE at high field. These expressions are valid for arbitrary electronic spin, and for electronic relaxation outside the Redfield limit. Further simplification requires both the selection of a particular electronic spin, and the assumption that the electronic relaxation processes are within the Redfield limit. If we assume the latter, the electronic relaxation rates are defined by spectral densities of the form already computed in Eq. (9.140). The spectral densities due to relaxation under reorientational motion of the static ZFS tensor  $J^{\rm S}_{\rm mm'}(\omega)$  and collisional modulation of the transient ZFS tensor  $J^{\rm T}_{\rm mm'}(\omega)$  are therefore given by

$$J_{mm'}^{\rm S}(\omega) = \frac{\Delta_{\rm s}^2}{5} \frac{\tau_{\rm R}}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_{\rm R}^2} \delta_{mm'},\tag{9.190}$$

$$J_{mm'}^{\rm T}(\omega) = \frac{\Delta_{\rm t}^2}{5} \frac{\tau_{\nu}}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_{\nu}^2} \delta_{mm'}, \qquad (9.191)$$

where  $\Delta_s^2 = 2D^2/3 + 2E^2$  is the strength of the static ZFS interaction. We now explore the special case of the inner-sphere PREs due to an electronic spin S = 1.

9.7.3.1. Inner-sphere relaxation for electronic S = 1 at high field. In the case of a paramagnetic centre with electronic spin S = 1, the electronic spectral densities in Eq. (9.185) are characterised by the longitudinal and transverse electronic time constants  $T_{1e}^{(1\pm)}$  and  $T_{2e}^{(1\pm1)}$ . When combined with the rotational correlation time we obtain the following overall correlation times  $\tau_{c.1}$  and  $\tau_{c.2}$ :

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{c,1}} = \frac{1}{T_{1e}^{(10)}} + \frac{1}{\tau_R},$$
(9.192)

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{c,2}} = \frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(1\pm1)}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{R}}.$$
(9.193)

We recall that these correlation times are those encountered in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory, but without the contribution from chemical exchange, which is included separately in the expression for the inner-sphere PRE in Eq. (9.177).

The real parts of the electronic spectral densities are given by

$$\operatorname{Re}[s_{\pm 1\pm 1}^{SD}(\omega)] = \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1 + (\omega \mp \omega_{S})^{2} \tau_{c,2}^{2}},$$
(9.194)

$$\operatorname{Re}[s_{00}^{\mathrm{SD}}(\omega)] = \frac{\tau_{\mathrm{c},1}}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_{\mathrm{c},1}^2}.$$
(9.195)

Inserting these into Eqs. (9.188) and (9.189) we obtain the same Solomon contributions to the longitudinal and transverse relaxation rate constants that are calculated from the Solomon–Bloembergen– Morgan theory:

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{T_1} &= \frac{2}{15} S(S+1) \left( \frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar} \right)^2 \\ &\times \left[ \frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_I^2 \tau_{c,1}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_S+\omega_I)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_S-\omega_I)^2 \tau_{c,2}^2} \right], \end{split}$$
(9.196)

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{15}S(S+1)\left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ \times \left[4\tau_{c,1} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+\omega_S^2\tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_I^2\tau_{c,1}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_S+\omega_I)^2\tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_S-\omega_I)^2\tau_{c,2}^2}\right].$$
(9.197)

Here the electronic relaxation has been calculated explicitly, rather than included phenomenologically in the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory, and so these expressions are more rigorous. However we should note that they are only exact for a paramagnetic centre with electronic spin S = 1, and are not valid for higher electronic spins where the electronic relaxation requires more than two time constants for a proper description. In this case we either use Eqs. (9.188) and (9.189) directly, or else resort to the Solomon–Bl oembergen–Morgan theory with a phenomenological description of the electronic relaxation via effective longitudinal and transverse relaxation time constants.

#### 9.7.4. Outer-sphere relaxation at high field

The outer-sphere PRE is due to stochastic modulation of the spin-dipolar hyperfine tensor by translational diffusion. As for the inner-sphere case electronic relaxation is still due to rotational modulation of the static ZFS and distortional modulation of the transient ZFS. The total lattice Liouvillian is therefore the same as for the inner-sphere case, with the addition of the stochastic translational-motion Liouvillian  $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_T$ :

$$\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_L = \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_S + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_R + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_D + \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_T.$$
(9.198)

We also extend the lattice density operator to include the translational degrees of freedom, which are represented by the equilibrium density operator  $\hat{P}_{0,T}$ . The overall equilibrium lattice density operator is now the direct product of the equilibrium density operators for the electronic, rotational, and translational subsystems:  $\hat{P}_0 = \hat{P}_{0,S} \otimes \hat{P}_{0,R} \otimes \hat{P}_{0,T}$ .

The outer-sphere longitudinal and transverse PREs  $1/T_{1,OS}$  and  $1/T_{2,OS}$  are given by

$$\frac{1}{T_{1,0S}} = \frac{2}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re}\Big(K_{11}^{OS}(\omega_I)\Big),\tag{9.199}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{2,0S}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re} \Big( K_{00}^{0S}(0) + K_{11}^{0S}(\omega_I) \Big),$$
(9.200)

where the outer-sphere spectral density function  $K_{mm}^{OS}(\omega)$  is:

$$\begin{split} K_{mm}^{OS}(\omega) &= 30 c_{Sl}^{2} \sum_{q,q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \frac{D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\mathrm{OL}}(0))^{*}}{r(0)^{3}} \left\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L}\tau\right) \widehat{S}_{1q'} \frac{D_{0,m-q'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\mathrm{OL}}(0))}{r(0)^{3}} \right\} \widehat{P}_{0} \right] \\ & \times \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau, \end{split}$$
(9.201)

where  $c_{SI} = \mu_0 \mu_B g_{iso} \hbar \gamma_I / (4\pi)$  is a constant describing the strength of the spin-dipolar coupling. There are two differences between this function and the corresponding inner-sphere spectral density in Eq. (9.179). Firstly the distance between the nuclear and electronic spins r(t) is allowed to vary stochastically in the outer-sphere case. We recall that we treat r as constant in the inner-sphere case. Secondly the angular dependence of the outer-sphere dipolar coupling vector is encoded in the Euler angles  $\Omega_{OL}$ , which give the orientation of the dipolar coupling PAF in the laboratory frame. We note that this PAF does not necessarily coincide with the common PAF of the inner-sphere spin-dipolar hyperfine interaction and static ZFS tensors. We assume that the translational motion is statistically uncorrelated with the electronic spin dynamics, and that the solvent molecules in the outer sphere move independently of the complex. Hence the translational motion is also uncorrelated with the rotational motion of the complex. Thus we can factor the trace in Eq. (9.201) into a part containing only the translational degrees of freedom, and a part pertaining only to the electronic spin:

$$\begin{split} K_{mm}^{OS}(\omega) &= 30c_{SI}^{2} \sum_{q,q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \int_{0}^{\infty} \left\langle \frac{D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{OL}(0))^{*}}{r(0)^{3}} \frac{D_{0,m-q'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{OL}(-\tau))}{r(-\tau)^{3}} \right\rangle \\ & \times \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \left[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left(i\left(\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} - i\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{e}\right)\tau\right) \widehat{S}_{1q'} \right\} \widehat{P}_{0,S} \right] \times \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau. \end{split}$$

$$(9.202)$$

A description of the correlation function for translational diffusion is provided by Kruk et al. [122,123]. The translational diffusion in the presence of intermolecular interactions is described by the Smoluchowski equation. Formally this equation gives the time variation of the probability  $P(\mathbf{r}(t)|\mathbf{r}(0))$  of locating a molecule at position  $\mathbf{r}(t)$  at time t, given that it started at position  $\mathbf{r}(0)$  at time t = 0:

$$\frac{\partial P(\boldsymbol{r}(t)|\boldsymbol{r}(0))}{\partial t} = D_{12}\boldsymbol{\nabla} \cdot \left[\boldsymbol{\nabla} P(\boldsymbol{r}(t)|\boldsymbol{r}(0)) + P(\boldsymbol{r}(t)|\boldsymbol{r}(0))\boldsymbol{\nabla} \left(\frac{U(\boldsymbol{r}(t))}{kT}\right)\right].$$
(9.203)

This equation considers two molecules, namely the metal-ion complex and the solvent molecule in the outer sphere, with translational diffusion coefficients  $D_1$  and  $D_2$ , and is parameterised by  $D_{12} = D_1 + D_2$ , which is the relative translational diffusion coefficient of the two molecules. The mutual interaction energy is denoted  $U(\mathbf{r}(t))$ , and is assumed to depend only on the distance r(t) between the complex and outer-sphere solvent molecule, i.e.  $U(\mathbf{r}(t)) = U(r(t))$ . The potential can then be calculated from a radial distribution function  $g_{rdf}(r)$  according to

$$\ln [g_{\rm rdf}(r)] = -\frac{U(r)}{kT}.$$
(9.204)

The translational time-correlation function can then be shown to be equal to

$$\left\langle \frac{D_{mk}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\rm OL}(0))^*}{r(0)^3} \frac{D_{m'k'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\rm OL}(-\tau))}{r(-\tau)^3} \right\rangle = \frac{4\pi}{5} N_S g^{\rm T}(\tau) \delta_{mm'} \delta_{kk'}, \tag{9.205}$$

where  $N_s$  is the density of the electronic spins, and  $g^T(\tau)$  is the reduced translational correlation function that is given by

$$g^{\mathrm{T}}(\tau) = \int d\mathbf{r}(-\tau) \int d\mathbf{r}(0) \left\langle \frac{D_{mk}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\mathrm{OL}}(0))^{*}}{r(0)^{3}} \frac{D_{m'k'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\mathrm{OL}}(-\tau))}{r(-\tau)^{3}} \right\rangle \\ \times P(\mathbf{r}(-\tau)|\mathbf{r}(0))g_{\mathrm{rdf}}(r(0)).$$
(9.206)

With this form of the translational correlation function the outersphere spectral density function in Eq. (9.202) takes the form:

$$\begin{split} K_{mm}^{OS}(\omega) &= 24\pi N_S c_{SI}^2 \sum_q \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix}^2 \\ &\times \frac{1}{2S+1} \int_0^\infty \mathrm{Tr}_S \Big[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \Big\{ \exp\left(\mathrm{i} \left(\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_Z - \mathrm{i} \,\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_e\right) \tau\right) \widehat{S}_{1q} \Big\} \Big] g^{\mathrm{T}}(\tau) \\ &\times \exp(-\mathrm{i}\omega\tau) \mathrm{d}\tau. \end{split}$$
(9.207)

We see that the outer-sphere PREs are proportional to the density of paramagnetic centres, as expected. This expression can be written more simply by defining the outer-sphere electronic spectral density functions  $s_{qq}^{OS}(\omega)$  as

$$\begin{split} s^{OS}_{qq}(\omega) &= \frac{3}{S(S+1)(2S+1)} \\ &\times \int_0^\infty \mathrm{Tr}_S \Big[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \Big\{ \exp \Big( i \Big( \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_Z - i \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_e \Big) \tau \Big) \widehat{S}_{1q} \Big\} \Big] g^{\mathrm{T}}(\tau) \\ &\times \exp \left( -i\omega\tau \right) d\tau. \end{split}$$

This has the same form as the expression for inner-sphere relaxation in Eq. (9.185), with the difference that the factor containing the rotational correlation time has been replaced with the translational-motion correlation function. Combining Eqs. (9.207) and (9.208) gives us the following expressions for the longitudinal and transverse PREs for outer-sphere relaxation at high field:

$$\frac{1}{T_{1,0S}} = \frac{8\pi N_S c_{SI}^2 S(S+1)}{15\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re}\left(s_{+1+1}^{OS}(\omega_I) + 3s_{00}^{OS}(\omega_I) + 6s_{-1-1}^{OS}(\omega_I)\right), \quad (9.209)$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{2,0S}} = \frac{4\pi N_S c_{SI}^2 S(S+1)}{15\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re}\left(3s_{+1+1}^{OS}(0) + 4s_{00}^{OS}(0) + 3s_{-1-1}^{OS}(0) + s_{+1+1}^{OS}(\omega_I) + 3s_{00}^{OS}(\omega_I) + 6s_{-1-1}^{OS}(\omega_I)\right), \quad (9.210)$$

which are valid for arbitrary electronic spin. Further simplification, say for a particular spin *S*, requires a closed expression for the translational correlation function.

# 9.7.5. Inner- and outer-sphere relaxation at low field

Under conditions of low field the static ZFS interaction dominates the electronic Zeeman interaction, and the latter can be neglected. The electronic relaxation is caused by the distortional modulation of the transient ZFS, independently of the rate of rotation, and both the electronic relaxation properties and the innersphere relaxation rates behave according to the low-field model of Nilsson and Kowalewski, and as already described in Section 9.6 [139,140].

The corresponding low-field outer-sphere relaxation behaviour is slightly different, and needs special consideration. The effects have been described by Kruk et al. [122,123]. We start from the outer-sphere spectral density in Eq. (9.201):

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{K}_{mm}^{OS}(\omega) &= 30 c_{SI}^2 \sum_{q,q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \int_0^\infty \mathrm{Tr}_L \left[ \widehat{S}_{1q}^{\dagger} \frac{D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\mathrm{OL}}(0))^*}{r(0)^3} \left\{ \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_L \tau\right) \widehat{S}_{1q'} \frac{D_{0,m-q'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\mathrm{OL}}(0))}{r(0)^3} \right\} \widehat{P}_0 \right] \\ & \times \exp(-\mathrm{i}\omega\tau) \mathrm{d}\tau, \end{split}$$

$$(9.211)$$

where the lattice Liouvillian is now given by

$$\widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_L = \widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_S + \widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_R + \widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_T, \qquad (9.212)$$

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{S} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{ZFS,S} + \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{Z} - i\widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{ZFS,T}.$$
(9.213)

Following the derivation of the slow-motion theory spectral density in Section 9.6, we recall that in the low-field limit the electronic spin is quantized in the PAF of the static ZFS interaction, and so we write the electronic spin operators in that PAF using the relation in Eq. (9.119). This gives the following general expression for the spectral density function:

$$\begin{split} K_{mm}^{OS}(\omega) &= 30c_{SI}^{2} \sum_{q,q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \sum_{p,p'} \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \bigg[ \tilde{S}_{1p}^{\dagger} D_{pq}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(0))^{*} \frac{D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{OL}(0))^{*}}{r(0)^{3}} \\ & \times \bigg\{ \exp\bigg( i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{L} \tau \bigg) \widetilde{S}_{1p'} D_{p'q'}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(0)) \frac{D_{0,m-q'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{OL}(0))}{r(0)^{3}} \bigg\} \widehat{P}_{0} \bigg] \\ & \times \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau. \end{split}$$
(9.214)

This function is simplified by applying the following three assumptions:

(9.208)

- 1. The translational and rotational motion are completely uncorrelated. Therefore the Euler angles  $\Omega_{PL}$  are independent to the angles  $\Omega_{OL}$ .
- 2. The rotational diffusion occurs on a sufficiently slow timescale compared to the electronic dynamics that the two are uncorrelated.
- 3. The electronic dynamics are uncorrelated with the translational motion.

We can now factorize the translational, rotational, and electronic parts of the spectral density to obtain:

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{K}_{mm}^{OS}(\omega) &= 30c_{SI}^{2}\sum_{q,q'} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q & q & -m \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 & 1 \\ m-q' & q' & -m \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \sum_{p,p'} \int_{0}^{\infty} \langle D_{pq}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(0))^{*} D_{p'q'}^{(1)}(\Omega_{PL}(-\tau)) \rangle \\ & \times \left\langle \frac{D_{0,m-q}^{(2)}(\Omega_{OL}(0))^{*}}{r(0)^{3}} \frac{D_{0,m-q'}^{(2)}(\Omega_{OL}(-\tau))}{r(-\tau)^{3}} \right\rangle \\ & \times \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left[ \widetilde{S}_{1p}^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S}\tau\right) \widetilde{S}_{1p'} \right\} \widehat{P}_{0,S} \right] \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau. \end{split}$$
(9.215)

The two factors in angular brackets can be simplified as before, to give us the final expression for the spectral density:

$$K_{mm}^{\rm OS}(\omega) = \frac{8\pi}{9} N_{\rm S} c_{\rm SI}^2 S(S+1) \big( s_{11}^{\rm OS}(\omega) + s_{00}^{\rm OS}(\omega) + s_{-1-1}^{\rm OS}(\omega) \big), \quad (9.216)$$

where the  $s_{pp}^{\rm OS}(\omega)$  are electronic spectral density functions, which have the form

$$\begin{split} s_{pp}^{OS}(\omega) &= \frac{3}{S(S+1)(2S+1)} \\ &\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \Big[ \widetilde{S}_{1p}^{\dagger} \Big\{ \exp\left(i\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{S}\tau\right) \widetilde{S}_{1p} \Big\} \Big] g^{\mathrm{T}}(\tau) \\ &\times \exp[-(i\omega+1/(3\tau_{\mathrm{R}}))\tau] \mathrm{d}\tau. \end{split}$$
(9.217)

These spectral density functions have a similar form to those used to calculate the inner-sphere relaxation spectral density at low field, but with the difference that the outer-sphere function contains information about the translational dynamics through the reduced spectral density  $g^{T}(\tau)$ . The resulting low-field outer-sphere PREs are:

$$\frac{1}{T_{1,OS}} = \frac{16\pi N_S c_{SI}^2 S(S+1)}{9\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re} \left( s_{+1+1}^{OS}(\omega_I) + s_{00}^{OS}(\omega_I) + s_{-1-1}^{OS}(\omega_I) \right), \quad (9.218)$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{2,0S}} = \frac{8\pi N_S c_{SI}^2 S(S+1)}{9\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re} \left( s_{+1+1}^{OS}(0) + s_{00}^{OS}(0) + s_{-1-1}^{OS}(0) + s_{+1+1}^{OS}(\omega_I) + s_{00}^{OS}(\omega_I) + s_{-1-1}^{OS}(\omega_I) \right).$$
(9.219)

As for the high-field case, further simplification requires a closedform expression for the translational correlation function.

#### 9.8. The effect of vibrational motion on the PRE

#### 9.8.1. Introduction

We now turn our attention to the role of vibrational motions (phonons) on the PRE, and expand on the discussion in Section 8.4.4. Vibrational motions occur on a timescale of the order of 100 fs, which is too short to influence nuclear relaxation directly [184]. This is because the correlation time where the contribution of the spectral density to the relaxation rate is a maximum is  $\tau_c = |1/\omega_l|$ , which for a nuclear Larmor frequency of -500 MHz, corresponding to a <sup>1</sup>H at 11.74 T, is 0.3 ns. However phonons do

have a more substantial effect on electronic relaxation, as the magnitude of the electronic Larmor frequency is 658 times higher than that of <sup>1</sup>H [310]. For example an unpaired electron at 11.74 T experiences optimum relaxation with a correlation time of 500 fs. This mechanism for electronic relaxation provides an alternative to the modulation of the transient ZFS due to solvent collisions. The pseudo-rotation model of the latter process, where the transient ZFS is assumed to have constant amplitude and a PAF that changes direction with time, is clearly an over-simplified description of the distortion of the coordination environment, and can only be applied to molecular systems in solution. The inclusion of phonons removes many of these restrictions, and results in a theory of electronic relaxation, and therefore the PRE, that can be extended to solid systems.

In this section we follow Kruk et al. [120] and explore the effects of phonons on the PRE, to reveal a hierarchy of events: the relaxation of the vibrational degrees of freedom leads to electronicspin relaxation, which in turn leads to nuclear-spin relaxation. We begin by treating the vibrational motion of the lattice using quantum mechanics, assuming that it lies within the Redfield limit. The effect of this motion on the transient ZFS is then highlighted, leading to a description of the electronic relaxation behaviour, which we also assume can be described by the Redfield theory. We assume that the paramagnetic centre is located in an environment with a vibrationally-averaged geometry that is cubic, so we may ignore the static ZFS interaction. We then calculate the electronic relaxation times for the specific case of a spin S = 1 in high field. Finally we derive the expressions for the PRE, and show that for S = 1 at high field we recover the Solomon–Bloembergen–Mor gan equations.

#### 9.8.2. The vibrational subsystem

We begin by considering a paramagnetic molecule in solution. In this case the vibrational motion can be modelled using a Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  that comprises three terms [118]:

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_{\rm V} + \hat{H}_{\rm B} + \hat{H}_{\rm VB}. \tag{9.220}$$

The first term  $\hat{H}_{V}$  describes the vibrational motion of the isolated molecule. The second term  $\hat{H}_{B}$  describes the liquid bath (lattice), to which the molecule is coupled via the third term  $\hat{H}_{VB}$ . We note that the form of  $\hat{H}$  is reminiscent of the Hamiltonian in the stochastic Liouville formalism used to describe a combined spin system and lattice.

An isolated molecule comprising *N* atoms possesses 3N - 6 normal modes of vibration if non-linear, or 3N - 5 if linear. For a particular normal mode *i* the displacement of the atoms during the vibration is described by the normal coordinate operator  $\hat{q}_i$ , which is a particular mass-weighted linear combination of the atomic displacements. The motion for each mode can be approximated by a simple harmonic oscillator with a reduced mass  $\mu_i$  that vibrates at frequency  $\omega_{V,i}$ . The Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_V$  is a sum of terms  $\hat{H}_{V,i}$ , each one of which represents a single mode:

$$\widehat{H}_{\mathsf{V}} = \sum_{i} \widehat{H}_{\mathsf{V},i},\tag{9.221}$$

where each  $\hat{H}_{V,i}$  is given by

$$\hat{H}_{V,i} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu_i} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \hat{q}_i^2} + \frac{1}{2} \mu_i \omega_{V,i}^2 \hat{q}_i^2.$$
(9.222)

We note that the normal modes are mutually orthogonal, and therefore independent of each other. For brevity we define a normalcoordinate vector  $\hat{q}$  of all the normal coordinates. Note that we have defined the system so that the equilibrium displacement of the molecule corresponds to  $\hat{\boldsymbol{q}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{0}}$ . The vibrational state of the molecule is described by a wavefunction  $|n_1n_2...\rangle$ , where  $n_i$  is the vibrational quantum number for normal mode i, which takes values  $n_i = 0, 1, 2, ...$  The total energy of the system  $E_{n_1n_2...}$  is the sum of the individual energies  $E_{n_i}$  of each mode:

$$E_{n_1 n_2 \dots} = \sum_i E_{n_i}, \tag{9.223}$$

$$E_{n_i} = \left(n_i + \frac{1}{2}\right) \hbar \omega_{\mathrm{V},i}.\tag{9.224}$$

The vibrational Liouvillian  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{V}^{(0)}$  corresponds to  $\widehat{H}_{v}$ , and therefore represents the coherent vibrational motion of all normal modes. The vibrational frequencies generally take values of the order 100–1000 cm<sup>-1</sup>, and so the populations of the energy levels do not conform to the high-temperature approximation. Therefore the equilibrium population  $p_{n_1n_2...}^{(0)}$  of each state  $|n_1n_2...\rangle$  is given by the full Boltzmann distribution:

$$p_{n_1 n_2 \dots}^{(0)} = \frac{\exp\left(-\beta_L E_{n_1 n_2 \dots}\right)}{Z_V},\tag{9.225}$$

where  $Z_V$  is the partition function:

$$Z_{V} = \operatorname{Tr}_{V} \left[ \exp\left(-\beta_{L} \widehat{H}_{V}\right) \right]$$

$$= \sum \exp\left(-\beta_{L} E_{n, n_{e}}\right).$$
(9.226)
(9.227)

and the trace is taken over all the vibrational states.

The Hamiltonian describing the bath  $\hat{H}_{\rm B}$  need not be stated explicitly. However the coupling of the normal modes of vibration to the bath is of particular interest. The corresponding Hamiltonian is equal to the intermolecular potential  $V(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2, ...)$  with which the normal modes interact. We expand the potential as a Taylor series in the  $q_i$  to give the expression for  $\hat{H}_{\rm VB}$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm VB} = \sum_{i} \left( \frac{\partial V}{\partial \hat{q}_{i}} \right)_{\hat{q} = \hat{\mathbf{0}}} \widehat{q}_{i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \left( \frac{\partial^{2} V}{\partial \hat{q}_{i} \partial \hat{q}_{j}} \right)_{\hat{q} = \hat{\mathbf{0}}} \widehat{q}_{i} \widehat{q}_{j} + \cdots, \qquad (9.228)$$

where we have defined the potential in the equilibrium molecular geometry  $V(\hat{0}, \hat{0}, ...)$  to be zero. The relaxation of the vibrational subsystem is due to fluctuations in  $\hat{H}_{VB}$ . For example the first term in Eq. (9.228) contains the intermolecular forces  $F_i = \partial V/\partial q_i$ , and so fluctuations in this first term are due to the time modulation of these forces, which can be shown to occur on a sub-picosecond timescale [118,119]. These fluctuations occur on a timescale that is much shorter than the timescale of vibrational relaxation, and so we are in the Redfield limit. The relaxation is governed by the relaxation superoperator  $\hat{\Gamma}_V$ , and is characterized by two time constants associated with each normal mode,  $T_{1V,i}$  and  $T_{2V,i}$ , with the former giving the lifetime of a vibrational state, and the latter governing the width of the transition observed in the vibrational spectrum.

We determine the time evolution of the vibrational density operator for the entire system  $\hat{\rho}_V(t)$  via the Liouville–von Neumann equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{V}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\left(\mathrm{i}\widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{\mathrm{V}}^{(0)} + \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{\mathrm{V}}\right)\hat{\rho}_{\mathrm{V}}(t),\tag{9.229}$$

where we have included the effects of coherent vibrational motion

via  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{V}^{(0)}$ , and vibrational relaxation via  $\widehat{\Gamma}_{V}$ . We now focus on a simplified system possessing a single normal mode of vibration with normal coordinate q, vibrational frequency  $\omega_{V}$ , and longitudinal

and transverse relaxation times  $T_{1V}$  and  $T_{2V}$ . Further we assume that only the ground state  $|0\rangle$  and first excited state  $|1\rangle$ , with energies  $E_0$ and  $E_1$ , need be considered, as these are the only states with nonnegligible equilibrium populations  $p_0^{(0)}$  and  $p_1^{(0)}$ . In Liouville space this system is described by a set of four basis operators  $\hat{\rho}_{V,mn} \equiv |m\rangle\langle n|$ . As with NMR the operators with m = n correspond to the population of state  $|n\rangle$ , and those with  $m \neq n$  correspond to a coherence between states  $|m\rangle$  and  $|n\rangle$ . Writing the Liouville–von Neumann Eq. (9.229) explicitly for the matrix elements  $\rho_{V,mn}$  we obtain

$$\begin{split} \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{V,00}(t) \\ \rho_{V,11}(t) \\ \rho_{V,01}(t) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -T_{1V}^{-1} \exp(-\beta_L E_1)/Z_V & T_{1V}^{-1} \exp(-\beta_L E_0)/Z_V & 0 & 0 \\ T_{1V}^{-1} \exp(-\beta_L E_1)/Z_V & -T_{1V}^{-1} \exp(-\beta_L E_0)/Z_V & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i\omega_V - T_{2V}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & i\omega_V - T_{2V}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\times \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{V,00}(t) \\ \rho_{V,11}(t) \\ \rho_{V,01}(t) \\ \rho_{V,01}(t) \end{pmatrix}. \end{split}$$
(9.230)

The block-diagonal form of the Liouville supermatrix allows us to solve the equation separately for the populations, and each of the coherences. The matrix elements of the two population operators are coupled by two simultaneous differential equations, which have the following solutions:

$$\rho_{\rm V,00}(t) = \left[p_1^{(0)}\rho_{\rm V,00}(0) - p_0^{(0)}\rho_{\rm V,11}(0)\right] \exp(-|t|/T_{\rm 1V}) + p_0^{(0)}, \qquad (9.231)$$

$$\rho_{\rm V,11}(t) = \left[-p_1^{(0)}\rho_{\rm V,00}(0) + p_0^{(0)}\rho_{\rm V,11}(0)\right]\exp(-|t|/T_{\rm 1V}) + p_1^{(0)}.$$
 (9.232)

We see that at infinite time both population operators relax according to the time constant  $T_{1V}$ , and tend to their equilibrium expressions of  $p_n^{(0)}$ . The matrix elements of the two coherence operators evolve independently of each other according to

$$\rho_{\rm V,10}(t) = \rho_{\rm V,10}(0) \exp(-i\omega_{\rm V} t) \exp(-|t|/T_{\rm 2V}), \tag{9.233}$$

$$\rho_{\rm V,01}(t) = \rho_{\rm V,01}(0) \exp(+i\omega_{\rm V}t) \exp(-|t|/T_{\rm 2V}). \tag{9.234}$$

The coherence operators precess at frequency  $\pm \omega_{\rm V}$ , and decay to zero with the time constant  $T_{\rm 2V}$ .

#### 9.8.3. Electronic relaxation

The electronic spin is coupled to the lattice of quantum vibrations through the ZFS interaction. We now derive the form of the electronic relaxation rates by considering the resulting fluctuations in the transient ZFS. The evolution of the electronic spin is governed by the following Liouville-von Neumann equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}_{S}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\left(\mathrm{i}\,\widehat{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}_{Z} + \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{e}\right)\hat{\rho}_{S}(t),\tag{9.235}$$

where the coherent evolution is due to the electronic Zeeman interaction (we recall that the static ZFS is zero), and the relaxation is governed by the relaxation superoperator  $\hat{\Gamma}_e$  in Eq. (9.82). This relaxation is due to the modulation of the transient ZFS by the phonons, and so we can write  $\hat{\Gamma}_e$  in terms of the transient ZFS and relaxation Liouvillians as

$$-i\widehat{\Gamma}_{e} = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{ZFS,T} + \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{V}^{(0)} - i\widehat{\Gamma}_{V}.$$
(9.236)

The transient ZFS Hamiltonian is

 $\widehat{}$ 

$$\widehat{H}_{\text{ZFS,T}} = \sum_{m=-2}^{+2} (-1)^m \widehat{F}_{2m} \widehat{S}_{2-m}, \qquad (9.237)$$

where we have written the spatial tensors  $\hat{F}_{2m}$  explicitly as operators to acknowledge that they depend on the normal coordinate operators  $\hat{q}$ . As before we write  $\hat{F}_{2m}$  in terms of the corresponding tensors  $\tilde{F}_{2m}$  in the PAF of the interaction:

$$\widehat{F}_{2m} = \sum_{m'=-2}^{+2} \widetilde{F}_{2m'} D_{m'm}^{(2)}(\Omega_{\rm FL}).$$
(9.238)

The PAF tensor components  $\tilde{F}_{2m'}$  are functions of the normal coordinates, and so fluctuate with time during the vibrations. We can therefore define a set of functions  $h_{2m'}(\hat{q})$ , which depend on  $\hat{q}$ , and write the operators explicitly as

$$\widehat{F}_{2m} = \sum_{m'=-2}^{+2} h_{m'}(\widehat{q}).$$
(9.239)

We assume that the transient ZFS is independent of rotational motion, and so the form of  $\hat{F}_{2m}$  does not depend on *m*. For small displacements of the atomic positions from their equilibrium positions we can expand  $h_{m'}(\hat{q})$  as a Taylor series in the normal coordinates as follows:

$$h_{m'}(\hat{\boldsymbol{q}}) = h_{m'}(\hat{\boldsymbol{0}}) + \sum_{i} \left(\frac{\partial h_{m'}}{\partial \hat{q}_{i}}\right)_{\hat{\boldsymbol{q}}=\hat{\boldsymbol{0}}} \hat{q}_{i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \left(\frac{\partial^{2} h_{m'}}{\partial \hat{q}_{i} \partial \hat{q}_{j}}\right)_{\hat{\boldsymbol{q}}=\hat{\boldsymbol{0}}} \hat{q}_{i} \hat{q}_{j} + \cdots$$

$$(9.240)$$

The zeroth order term  $h_{m'}(\hat{\mathbf{0}})$  gives the magnitude and direction of the ZFS after motional averaging due to the vibrations, and therefore corresponds to the static ZFS. As already stated we treat this term as zero. The higher-order terms in the Taylor expansion correspond to the transient ZFS.

The electronic relaxation rates depend on the following spectral density function  $J(\omega)$ :

$$J(\omega) = \operatorname{Re}\left[\int_{0}^{\infty} \langle \widehat{F}_{2m}(0)^{\dagger} \widehat{F}_{2m}(-\tau) \rangle \exp(-i\omega\tau) d\tau\right], \qquad (9.241)$$

which, in turn, depends on the following the time-correlation function:

$$\langle \widehat{F}_{2m}(\mathbf{0})^{\dagger} \widehat{F}_{2m}(-\tau) \rangle = \mathrm{Tr}_{V} \bigg[ \widehat{F}_{2m}^{\dagger} \bigg\{ \exp\bigg( i \bigg( \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{V}^{(0)} - i \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{V} \bigg) \tau \bigg) \widehat{F}_{2m} \bigg\} \widehat{P}_{V,0} \bigg],$$
(9.242)

where the trace is taken over all vibrational states, and  $\hat{P}_{V,0}$  is the equilibrium lattice density operator for the vibrational subsystem. We note that, since  $\hat{F}_{2m}$  do not depend on the index *m*, neither does the spectral density nor the correlation function. Because there is no coupling between the normal modes we are able to write the total spectral density as the sum of terms  $J_i(\omega)$  due to each normal mode:

$$J(\omega) = \sum_{i} J_i(\omega). \tag{9.243}$$

To facilitate the discussion we therefore restrict ourselves again to considering a system with a single normal mode. The final result can then be easily generalised to several normal modes. From Eq. (9.240) we write the transient ZFS spatial tensor operators  $\hat{F}_{2m}$  as Taylor series in  $\hat{q}$ , truncating at second order to give

 $\widehat{F}_{2m} = A\widehat{q} + B\widehat{q}^2, \tag{9.244}$ 

where the constants A and B are given by

$$A = \sum_{m'=-2}^{+2} \left( \frac{\partial h_{m'}}{\partial \hat{q}} \right)_{\hat{q}=\hat{0}},$$
(9.245)

$$B = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m'=-2}^{+2} \left( \frac{\partial^2 h_{m'}}{\partial \hat{q}^2} \right)_{\hat{q}=\hat{0}}.$$
 (9.246)

We can now write the correlation function in terms of the normal coordinate as follows:

$$\begin{split} \langle \widehat{F}_{2m}(\mathbf{0})^{\dagger} \widehat{F}_{2m}(-\tau) \rangle &= A^2 \langle \hat{q}(\mathbf{0})^{\dagger} \hat{q}(-\tau) \rangle + B^2 \langle \hat{q}^2(\mathbf{0})^{\dagger} \hat{q}^2(-\tau) \rangle \\ &+ AB \langle \hat{q}(\mathbf{0})^{\dagger} \hat{q}^2(-\tau) \rangle \\ &+ BA \langle \hat{q}^2(\mathbf{0})^{\dagger} \hat{q}(-\tau) \rangle. \end{split}$$
(9.247)

The terms in angular brackets denote correlation functions of powers of the normal coordinate operators, which have the following general expressions:

$$\langle \hat{q}^{x}(0)^{\dagger} \hat{q}^{y}(-\tau) \rangle = \operatorname{Tr}_{V} \left[ \hat{q}^{x}(0)^{\dagger} \left\{ \exp\left( i \left( \widehat{\widehat{\mathcal{L}}}_{V}^{(0)} - i \widehat{\widehat{\Gamma}}_{V} \right) \tau \right) \hat{q}^{y}(0) \right\} \widehat{P}_{V,0} \right] (9.248)$$

$$= \frac{1}{Z_{V}} \operatorname{Tr}_{V} \left[ \hat{q}^{x}(0)^{\dagger} \hat{q}^{y}(-\tau) \exp\left( -\beta_{L} \widehat{H}_{V} \right) \right]$$

$$(9.249)$$

$$=\sum_{m,n}\frac{\exp(-\beta_{L}E_{m})}{Z_{V}}\langle m|\hat{q}^{x}(0)^{\dagger}|n\rangle\langle n|\hat{q}^{y}(-\tau)|m\rangle.$$
(9.250)

We therefore compute the correlation function by evaluating all the terms in Eq. (9.247) in turn. Once again we consider only the states n = 0 and n = 1.

We begin by evaluating the first term in  $A^2$  in Eq. (9.247), which corresponds to the first-order coupling between the electronic spin and the vibrational lattice. To facilitate the calculation we write the normal coordinate operator as a linear combination of the vibrational basis operators  $\hat{\rho}_{V,mn}$ :

$$\hat{q} = \sum_{m,n} \langle m | \hat{q} | n \rangle \hat{\rho}_{\mathsf{V},mn},\tag{9.251}$$

The matrix elements  $\langle m | \hat{q} | n \rangle$  can be shown to be given by [207]

$$\langle m|\hat{q}|n\rangle = \left(\frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_{\rm V}}\right)^{1/2} \left[(n+1)^{1/2}\delta_{m,n+1} + (n)^{1/2}\delta_{m,n-1}\right],$$
 (9.252)

where  $\mu$  is the reduced mass associated with the normal mode. Restricting ourselves to the two lowest-lying states we obtain the following expression for  $\hat{q}$ :

$$\hat{q} = \left(\frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_{\rm V}}\right)^{1/2} [\hat{\rho}_{\rm V,10} + \hat{\rho}_{\rm V,01}],\tag{9.253}$$

which we see depends only on the two coherence operators. The time dependence of  $\hat{q}$  is determined by using the expressions for the time dependence of the vibrational coherence operators  $\hat{\rho}_{V,10}(t)$  and  $\hat{\rho}_{V,01}(t)$  which we have previously computed in Eqs. (9.233) and (9.234). The resulting expression for  $\hat{q}(t)$  is therefore

$$\begin{split} \hat{q}(t) &= \left(\frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_{\rm V}}\right)^{1/2} [\hat{\rho}_{\rm V,10}(0)\exp\left(-i\omega_{\rm V}t\right) + \hat{\rho}_{\rm V,01}(0)\exp\left(i\omega_{\rm V}t\right)]\exp\left(-|t|/T_{\rm 2V}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_{\rm V}}\right)^{1/2} [|1\rangle\langle 0|\exp\left(-i\omega_{\rm V}t\right) + |0\rangle\langle 1|\exp\left(i\omega_{\rm V}t\right)]\exp\left(-|t|/T_{\rm 2V}\right). \end{split}$$

Combining this expression and Eq. (9.250) gives us the correlation function  $\langle \hat{q}(0)^{\dagger} \hat{q}(-\tau) \rangle$ , which is:

$$\langle \hat{q}(0)^{\dagger} \hat{q}(-\tau) \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_{\rm V}} \left[ p_0^{(0)} \exp\left(i\omega_{\rm V}\tau\right) + p_1^{(0)} \exp\left(-i\omega_{\rm V}\tau\right) \right] \exp\left(-\tau/T_{\rm 2V}\right).$$
(9.254)

The corresponding contribution to the spectral density  $J^{(1)}(\omega)$  is given by the Fourier–Laplace transform, and is equal to

$$J^{(1)}(\omega) = \frac{A^2\hbar}{2\mu\omega_V} \left[ p_0^{(0)} \frac{T_{2V}}{1 + (\omega - \omega_V)^2 T_{2V}^2} + p_1^{(0)} \frac{T_{2V}}{1 + (\omega + \omega_V)^2 T_{2V}^2} \right].$$
(9.255)

We see that the first-order contribution contains spectral-density components at frequencies  $\omega - \omega_V$  and  $\omega + \omega_V$ , and contains a correlation time that is equal to the transverse relaxation time constant  $T_{2V}$  of the vibrational subsystem.

The second term (in  $B^2$ ) in Eq. (9.247) represents a second-order coupling between the electronic spin and the vibrational lattice. Repeating the analysis for the first-order term, we begin by writing the operator  $\hat{q}^2$  in terms of the basis operators  $\hat{\rho}_{V,mn}$ :

$$\hat{q}^2 = \sum_{m,n} \langle m | \hat{q}^2 | n \rangle \hat{\rho}_{V,mn},$$
(9.256)

where the matrix elements  $\langle m | \hat{q}^2 | n \rangle$  are [207]

$$\langle m | \hat{q}^2 | n \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_V} \left[ ((n+1)(n+2))^{1/2} \delta_{m,n+2} + (2n+1)\delta_{mn} + (n(n-1))^{1/2} \delta_{m,n-2} \right],$$
(9.257)

Considering only the states n = 0 and n = 1 we obtain:

$$\hat{q}^2 = \frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_{\rm V}} [\hat{\rho}_{\rm V,00} + 3\hat{\rho}_{\rm V,11}]. \tag{9.258}$$

In contrast to the expression for  $\hat{q}$ , which depends only on the coherence operators,  $\hat{q}^2$  depends only on the population operators. The time dependence of the population operators in Eqs. (9.231) and (9.232) gives us the following time-dependent expression for  $\hat{q}^2(t)$ :

$$\hat{q}^{2}(t) = \frac{\hbar}{\mu\omega_{\rm V}} \Big[ p_{0}^{(0)} |1\rangle\langle 1| - p_{1}^{(0)} |0\rangle\langle 0| \Big] \exp\left(-|t|/T_{1\rm V}\right) + \frac{\hbar}{2\mu\omega_{\rm V}} \Big[ p_{0}^{(0)} + 3p_{1}^{(0)} \Big] \hat{1}_{\rm V}.$$
(9.259)

The first term in Eq. (9.259) is time dependent due to the longitudinal relaxation of the vibrational lattice, whereas the second represents its equilibrium configuration. In determining the electronic relaxation properties we are interested in the deviation of the vibrational lattice from its equilibrium configuration, and so we remove this second term and replace Eq. (9.259) with the following:

$$\hat{q}^{2}(t) = \frac{\hbar}{\mu \omega_{\rm V}} \left[ p_{0}^{(0)} |1\rangle \langle 1| - p_{1}^{(0)} |0\rangle \langle 0| \right] \exp\left(-|t|/T_{\rm 1V}\right).$$
(9.260)

The correlation function is therefore evaluated to be

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{q}^{2}(0)^{\dagger} \hat{q}^{2}(-\tau) \rangle &= \left(\frac{\hbar}{\mu \omega_{V}}\right)^{2} \left[ p_{0}^{(0)} \left( p_{1}^{(0)} \right)^{2} + \left( p_{0}^{(0)} \right)^{2} p_{1}^{(0)} \right] \exp\left( -\tau/T_{1V} \right) \end{aligned} (9.261) \\ &= \left(\frac{\hbar}{\mu \omega_{V}}\right)^{2} \frac{\exp\left( -\beta_{L} \hbar \omega_{V} \right)}{\left( 1 + \exp\left( -\beta_{L} \hbar \omega_{V} \right) \right)^{2}} \exp\left( -\tau/T_{1V} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The resulting second-order contribution from this normal mode to the spectral density  $I^{(2)}(\omega)$  is

$$J^{(2)}(\omega) = B^2 \left(\frac{\hbar}{\mu \omega_V}\right)^2 \frac{\exp\left(-\beta_L \hbar \omega_V\right)}{\left(1 + \exp\left(-\beta_L \hbar \omega_V\right)\right)^2} \frac{T_{1V}}{1 + \omega^2 T_{1V}^2}.$$
 (9.263)

We see that this contribution to the spectral density does not depend on the vibrational frequency, and is characterised by a correlation time equal to the longitudinal vibrational relaxation time constant  $T_{1V}$ . This is because the operator  $\hat{q}^2$  depends on the population operators, and not on the coherence operators, of the vibrational subsystem.

The remaining terms in Eq. (9.247) do not contribute to the spectral density, as the mixed-order correlation functions are zero:

$$\langle \hat{q}(0)^{\dagger} \hat{q}^{2}(-\tau) \rangle = \langle \hat{q}^{2}(0)^{\dagger} \hat{q}(-\tau) \rangle = 0.$$
 (9.264)

Therefore the total spectral density  $J(\omega)$  for this single normal mode, up to second order, is

$$J(\omega) = J^{(1)}(\omega) + J^{(2)}(\omega)$$
(9.265)  
$$= \frac{A^{2}\hbar}{2\mu\omega_{V}} \left[ p_{0}^{(0)} \frac{T_{2V}}{1 + (\omega - \omega_{V})^{2}T_{2V}^{2}} + p_{1}^{(0)} \frac{T_{2V}}{1 + (\omega + \omega_{V})^{2}T_{2V}^{2}} \right]$$
$$+ B^{2} \left( \frac{\hbar}{\mu\omega_{V}} \right)^{2} \frac{\exp\left(-\beta_{L}\hbar\omega_{V}\right)}{\left(1 + \exp\left(-\beta_{L}\hbar\omega_{V}\right)\right)^{2}} \frac{T_{1V}}{1 + \omega^{2}T_{1V}^{2}}.$$
(9.266)

In a system with more than one normal mode, we simply sum the individual contributions to the spectral density from each mode to obtain the total spectral density, as in Eq. (9.243). The resulting spectral density is then

$$J(\omega) = \sum_{i} \left[ \frac{A_{i}^{2}\hbar}{2\mu_{i}\omega_{V,i}} \left\{ p_{0,i}^{(0)} \frac{T_{2V,i}}{1 + (\omega - \omega_{V,i})^{2}T_{2V,i}^{2}} + p_{1,i}^{(0)} \frac{T_{2V,i}}{1 + (\omega + \omega_{V,i})^{2}T_{2V,i}^{2}} \right\} + B_{i}^{2} \left( \frac{\hbar}{\mu_{i}\omega_{V,i}} \right)^{2} \frac{\exp\left(-\beta_{L}\hbar\omega_{V,i}\right)}{\left(1 + \exp\left(-\beta_{L}\hbar\omega_{V,i}\right)\right)^{2}} \frac{T_{1V,i}}{1 + \omega^{2}T_{1V,i}^{2}} \right],$$
(9.267)

where we have added a subscript *i* to the parameters that are different for different normal modes. These results are general for an arbitrary electronic spin. We now examine the special case of S = 1.

9.8.3.1. Electronic relaxation of a spin S = 1. As already discussed the electronic relaxation properties of a paramagnetic centre with S = 1 are characterised by a relaxation time constant for each spin basis operator. The relaxation processes of the two basis operators  $\hat{S}_{10}$  and  $\hat{S}_{20}$  are described by the two time constants  $T_{1e}^{(10)}$  and  $T_{1e}^{(20)}$ , whilst the operators  $\hat{S}_{1\pm 1}$ ,  $\hat{S}_{2\pm 1}$ , and  $\hat{S}_{2\pm 2}$  relax according to the transverse time constants  $T_{2e}^{(1\pm 1)}$ ,  $T_{2e}^{(2\pm 1)}$ , and  $T_{2e}^{(2\pm 2)}$ . The time constants are calculated from the electronic relaxation superoperator

 $\widehat{\Gamma}_{e}$  in Eq. (9.82), and in the current formalism are given by

$$\frac{1}{T_{1e}^{(10)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} [J(\omega_S) + 4J(2\omega_S)], \qquad (9.268)$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{1e}^{(20)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} [3J(\omega_s)], \tag{9.269}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(1\pm1)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left[ \frac{3}{2} J(0) + \frac{5}{2} J(\omega_s) + J(2\omega_s) \right],$$
(9.270)

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(2\pm1)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \left[ \frac{3}{2} J(0) + \frac{1}{2} J(\omega_S) + J(2\omega_S) \right],$$
(9.271)

$$\frac{1}{T_{2e}^{(2\pm2)}} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} [J(\omega_S) + J(2\omega_S)].$$
(9.272)

We recall that we have neglected the static ZFS throughout this section, and so the spectral densities are evaluated at multiples of the electronic Larmor frequency.

#### 9.8.4. The PRE

The electronic relaxation behaviour derived in the preceding section can be included in the spectral density functions describing the nuclear-spin relaxation. We can then use the following familiar equations to derive expressions for the longitudinal and transverse PREs:

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{2}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re} \Big( K_{11}^{\text{FC}}(\omega_I) + K_{11}^{\text{SD}}(\omega_I) \Big),$$
(9.273)

$$\frac{1}{T_2} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \operatorname{Re} \Big( K_{00}^{\text{FC}}(0) + K_{11}^{\text{FC}}(\omega_l) + K_{00}^{\text{SD}}(0) + K_{11}^{\text{SD}}(\omega_l) \Big).$$
(9.274)

(9.276)

These expressions can be evaluated in any motional regime, and at any field, as discussed in this chapter. As stressed at the beginning of this section the main role of the vibrational motions is to influence the electronic relaxation. Once this has been characterised the electronic relaxation properties are used in the common expression for the PRE.

9.8.4.1. The high-field PRE due to an electronic spin S = 1. A final example of a calculation of nuclear-spin relaxation concerns the PRE due to an electronic spin S = 1 at high field, and in the absence of a static ZFS interaction. The relevant electronic relaxation time constants are given in Eqs. (9.268) and (9.270). If we include them in the expressions for the PRE, we simply recover the Solomon–B loembergen–Morgan equations:

$$\begin{split} \frac{1}{T_1} &= \frac{2}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \frac{\tau_{\text{E},2}}{1+(\omega_S-\omega_I)^2\tau_{\text{E},2}^2} + \frac{2}{15}S(S+1)\left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ &\times \left[\frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_I^2\tau_{c,1}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_S+\omega_I)^2\tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_S-\omega_I)^2\tau_{c,2}^2}\right], \quad (9.275) \\ \frac{1}{T_2} &= \frac{1}{3}S(S+1)\left(\frac{A^{\text{FC}}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \left[\tau_{\text{E},1} + \frac{\tau_{\text{E},2}}{1+(\omega_S-\omega_I)^2\tau_{\text{E},2}^2}\right] + \frac{1}{15}S(S+1)\left(\frac{b_{SI}}{\hbar}\right)^2 \\ &\times \left[4\tau_{c,1} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+\omega_S^2\tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{3\tau_{c,1}}{1+\omega_I^2\tau_{c,1}^2} + \frac{6\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_S+\omega_I)^2\tau_{c,2}^2} + \frac{\tau_{c,2}}{1+(\omega_S-\omega_I)^2\tau_{c,2}^2}\right]. \end{split}$$

As we discussed in Chapter 8, these expressions are also relevant for solid-state paramagnetic systems.

#### 9.9. Longitudinal relaxation in metallic solids

#### 9.9.1. Introduction

The final topic that we review in our discussion of relaxation in paramagnetic systems is nuclear spin relaxation in solid metals. The primary interest here is to compare the result with the expressions for the PRE in solid insulators that have been derived in previous sections. Here we restrict the discussion to high-field conditions, so that we can compare the PRE calculated for a metal with the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan expression for a solid insulator in Eqs. (8.185) and (8.186).

As for the other cases discussed in this chapter, understanding the PRE in metallic systems requires us to treat the lattice as a quantum mechanical object, because the degrees of freedom include the energy levels associated with the electronic bands in addition to the electronic spins. However in contrast to the other cases of relaxation that we have discussed we do not employ Redfield theory. Instead we restrict the discussion to longitudinal relaxation, which we describe as being due to energy exchange between the nuclear spin system and the lattice, via transitions between the nuclear spin states accompanied by simultaneous transitions between the electronic states. The longitudinal relaxation rates were first described in this way by Korringa [311], whose treatment was later expanded upon by Abragam [184] and Slichter [246]. However this description is wholly inadequate for describing transverse relaxation, for which we would require a Redfield treatment [253,96].

We proceed according to the following assumptions:

- 1. We are in the high-field regime, so that the nuclear-spin dynamics are dominated by the nuclear Zeeman interaction.
- 2. The temperature is sufficiently high that the nuclear-spin-state populations are described by the high-temperature approximation to the Boltzmann distribution.

- 3. We expect the only significant contributions to the PRE to be due to conduction electrons near the Fermi level. It is assumed that the corresponding wavefunctions have substantial *s*character, so that the hyperfine interaction is dominated by the Fermi-contact part.
- 4. The stochastic process that causes nuclear relaxation is the motion of the conduction electrons. The correlation time is given by the average duration over which the electron remains localized on a given atom.

### 9.9.2. Longitudinal relaxation due to transitions between energy levels

As we have pointed out above, the longitudinal relaxation rate of a system can be calculated by considering the transitions between the energy levels of the system that are induced by stochastic processes. In order to conserve energy, any transition between the nuclear spin states must be accompanied by a transition of equal energy and in the opposite direction between the lattice states. This is illustrated in Fig. 9.2, which shows an absorptive transition for a nuclear spin 1/2 from the state  $|+1/2\rangle$  to  $|-1/2\rangle$  occurring simultaneously with an emissive transition in the lattice from state  $|\mathbf{k}, m_s\rangle$  to  $|\mathbf{k}', m_s'\rangle$ . We are interested in the return to equilibrium of the populations of the nuclear spin states  $|n\rangle$ , as this corresponds to longitudinal relaxation. We can explain the relaxation process as arising from the rates of change of the state populations  $p_n$ , which are given by:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}p_n}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sum_m (p_m W_{mn} - p_n W_{nm}). \tag{9.277}$$

The positive term  $p_m W_{mn}$  in Eq. (9.277) describes the increase in  $p_n$  due to a transition from state  $|m\rangle$ , whereas the negative term  $-p_n W_{nm}$  describes a reduction in  $p_n$  due to a transition to state  $|m\rangle$ . The transition coefficient  $W_{mn}$  is the number of transitions from  $|m\rangle$  to  $|n\rangle$  that occur per unit time. At equilibrium the populations have their equilibrium values  $p_n^{(0)}$ , and their rate of change is zero. Therefore from Eq. (9.277), we are able to deduce the following relationship between  $W_{mn}$  and  $W_{nm}$ :

$$p_m^{(0)}W_{mn} = p_n^{(0)}W_{nm}.$$
(9.278)

The longitudinal relaxation rate governing this return to equilibrium depends on the transition coefficients and the energies of the states. It can be shown that the expression is

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum_{m,n} W_{mn} (E_m - E_n)^2}{\sum_n E_n^2}.$$
(9.279)

It we only consider the effects of the conduction electrons near the Fermi surface, Eq. (9.279) corresponds to the longitudinal PRE. We now require expressions for the transition coefficients.

#### 9.9.3. The longitudinal PRE of nuclei in a metal

We first consider transitions of the combined system from the initial occupied state  $|M_l \mathbf{k} m_s\rangle$  to the final unoccupied state



**Fig. 9.2.** Illustration of the nuclear relaxation process for a nuclear spin coupled to an electronic lattice. Here the nuclear-spin absorption transition is accompanied by an emission transition in the lattice, so that energy is exchanged between the two parts of the system.

 $|M'_l \mathbf{k}' m'_s \rangle$ . The corresponding transition coefficients  $W_{M_l \mathbf{k} m_s, M'_l \mathbf{k}' m'_s}$  are given by the Fermi golden rule:

$$W_{M_{l}km_{s},M_{l}'k'm_{s}'} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |\langle M_{l}km_{s}|\hat{H}_{lL}|M_{l}'k'm_{s}'\rangle|^{2} \delta \Big(E_{M_{l}} + E_{km_{s}} - E_{M_{l}'} - E_{k'm_{s}'}\Big)$$
(9.280)

where  $E_{M_l}$  is the energy of nuclear spin state  $|M_l\rangle$ , and  $E_{km_s}$  is the energy of the lattice state  $|\mathbf{k}m_s\rangle$ , and the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{IL}$  is describes the coupling between the nuclear spin system and the lattice, which here is due to the Fermi-contact interaction. We see that, due to the Dirac delta function, the rate of transition is nonzero only if the total energy is conserved, i.e.  $E_{M_l} + E_{km_s} = E_{M'_l} = E_{k'm'_s}$ . These transition coefficients refer to transitions from the nuclear spin state  $|M_I\rangle$  to  $|M'_I\rangle$  that are accompanied by a transition between particular lattice states. However the same nuclear spin transitions can also occur simultaneously with other lattice transitions. We are therefore interested in the overall transition coefficient  $W_{M_l,M_l}$  that describes the number of nuclear-spin transitions per unit time that occur, irrespective of the latticestate transitions involved. This is computed by summing the  $W_{M_l \mathbf{k} m_s, M_s \mathbf{k}' m_s'}$  both over all occupied initial lattice states  $|\mathbf{k} m_s\rangle$ , and over all unoccupied final lattice states  $|\mathbf{k}'m'_{s}\rangle$ :

$$W_{M_{l},M_{l}'} = \sum_{km_{s} \text{ occ. } k'm_{s}' \text{ unocc.}} W_{M_{l}km_{s},M_{l}'k'm_{s}'}$$
(9.281)

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{k}m_{s},\mathbf{k}'m_{s}'} W_{M_{l}\mathbf{k}m_{s},M_{l}'\mathbf{k}'m_{s}'} f_{m_{s}}(\mathbf{k}) \Big[ 1 - f_{m_{s}'}(\mathbf{k}') \Big].$$
(9.282)

The Fermi–Dirac function  $f_{m_s}(\mathbf{k})$  can be interpreted as the probability that the state  $|\mathbf{k}m_s\rangle$  is occupied, and so  $\left[1 - f_{m'_s}(\mathbf{k}')\right]$  is the corresponding probability that  $|\mathbf{k}'m'_s\rangle$  is unoccupied. Therefore the inclusion of the factor  $f_{m_s}(\mathbf{k})\left[1 - f_{m'_s}(\mathbf{k}')\right]$  in the second line allows us to remove the restriction of only summing over occupied or unoccupied states.

The coupling between the nuclear spin system and the lattice is described by the Fermi-contact interaction Hamiltonian from Eq. (2.191). Here we consider the coupling to a single electron, which gives us the following Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{ls}$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{ls} = \frac{2}{3} \mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_l \delta(\mathbf{r}) \hat{\mathbf{l}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{s}}, \qquad (9.283)$$

where the nucleus is at  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{0}$ . The first step in the calculation of the transition coefficients is to evaluate the matrix element of  $\hat{H}_{ls}$  in Eq. (9.280) using the combined states  $|M_l \mathbf{k} \mathbf{m}_s\rangle = |M_l\rangle |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})\rangle |m_s\rangle$ :

$$\langle M_{I}\boldsymbol{k}m_{s}|\hat{H}_{Is}|M_{I}'\boldsymbol{k}'m_{s}'\rangle = \frac{2}{3}\mu_{0}\mu_{B}g_{e}\hbar\gamma_{I}\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{0})^{*}\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}'}(\boldsymbol{0})$$
$$\times \langle M_{I}|\hat{\boldsymbol{l}}|M_{I}'\rangle \cdot \langle m_{s}|\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}|m_{s}'\rangle.$$
(9.284)

Inserting this into the expression for the transition coefficient in the combined spin-lattice system, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W_{M_{l}\boldsymbol{k}\boldsymbol{m}_{s},M_{l}\boldsymbol{k}'\boldsymbol{m}_{s}'} &= \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \frac{4}{9} \mu_{0}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2} g_{e}^{2} \hbar^{2} \gamma_{l}^{2} |\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{0})|^{2} |\phi_{\boldsymbol{k}'}(\boldsymbol{0})|^{2} \\ &\times \delta \Big( E_{M_{l}} + E_{\boldsymbol{k}\boldsymbol{m}_{s}} - E_{M_{l}'} - E_{\boldsymbol{k}'\boldsymbol{m}_{s}'} \Big) \\ &\times \sum_{ij} \langle M_{l} |\hat{l}_{i} |M_{l}' \rangle \langle M_{l}' |\hat{l}_{j} |M_{l} \rangle \langle \boldsymbol{m}_{s} |\hat{s}_{i} | \boldsymbol{m}_{s}' \rangle \\ &\times \langle \boldsymbol{m}_{s}' |\hat{s}_{j} | \boldsymbol{m}_{s} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

$$(9.285)$$

We see that the rate of the transition is proportional to the electronic spin density at the nucleus in both the initial and final states.

We obtain the total transition coefficient for each pair of nuclear spin states by combining Eqs. (9.282) and (9.285).

Recalling that the sums over  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $\mathbf{k}'$  can be replaced by integrals according to Eq. (2.30), we obtain the double integral:

$$\begin{split} W_{M_{l},M_{l}'} &= V^{2} \sum_{m_{s},m_{s}'} \iint \langle W_{M_{l}\boldsymbol{k}m_{s},M_{l}'\boldsymbol{k}'m_{s}'} \rangle_{E_{\boldsymbol{k}},E_{\boldsymbol{k}'}} f_{m_{s}}(E_{\boldsymbol{k}}) \\ &\times \left[ 1 - f_{m_{s}'}(E_{\boldsymbol{k}'}) \right] g_{m_{s}}(E_{\boldsymbol{k}}) g_{m_{s}'}(E_{\boldsymbol{k}'}) dE_{\boldsymbol{k}} dE_{\boldsymbol{k}'} \end{split}$$
(9.286)  
$$&= \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \frac{4}{9} \mu_{0}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2} g_{e}^{2} \hbar^{2} \gamma_{l}^{2} V^{2} \sum_{i,j} \langle M_{l} | \widehat{l}_{i} | M_{l}' \rangle \langle M_{l}' | \widehat{l}_{j} | M_{l} \rangle \\ &\times \sum_{m_{s},m_{s}'} \langle m_{s} | \widehat{s}_{i} | m_{s}' \rangle \langle m_{s}' | \widehat{s}_{j} | m_{s} \rangle \\ &\times \iint \langle | \phi_{\boldsymbol{k}}(\boldsymbol{0}) |^{2} \rangle_{E_{\boldsymbol{k}}} \langle | \phi_{\boldsymbol{k}'}(\boldsymbol{0}) |^{2} \rangle_{E_{\boldsymbol{k}'}} f_{m_{s}}(E_{\boldsymbol{k}}) \\ &\times \left[ 1 - f_{m_{s}'}(E_{\boldsymbol{k}'}) \right] g_{m_{s}}(E_{\boldsymbol{k}}) g_{m_{s}'}(E_{\boldsymbol{k}'}) \\ &\times \delta \Big( E_{M_{l}} + E_{\boldsymbol{k}m_{s}} - E_{M_{l}'} - E_{\boldsymbol{k}'m_{s}'} \Big) dE_{\boldsymbol{k}} dE_{\boldsymbol{k}'}, \end{aligned}$$
(9.287)

where we have used the density of states for electrons in a particular spin state  $g_{m_s}(E_k)$ , and *V* is the volume of the metal. The first integral over the energy  $E_{k'}$  is easy to compute due to the Dirac delta function. The result is

$$W_{M_{l},M_{l}'} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \frac{4}{9} \mu_{0}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2} g_{e}^{2} \hbar^{2} \gamma_{I}^{2} V^{2} \sum_{ij} \langle M_{I} | \widehat{I}_{i} | M_{I}' \rangle \langle M_{I}' | \widehat{I}_{j} | M_{I} \rangle$$

$$\times \sum_{m_{s},m_{s}'} \langle m_{s} | \widehat{s}_{i} | m_{s}' \rangle \langle m_{s}' | \widehat{s}_{j} | m_{s} \rangle \times \int \langle |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^{2} \rangle_{E_{\mathbf{k}}} \langle |\phi_{\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{0})|^{2} \rangle_{E_{\mathbf{k}'}} f(E_{\mathbf{k}m_{s}})$$

$$\times \Big[ 1 - f(E_{\mathbf{k}'m_{s}'}) \Big] g_{m_{s}}(E_{\mathbf{k}}) g_{m_{s}'}(E_{\mathbf{k}'}) dE_{\mathbf{k}}, \qquad (9.288)$$

where we have replaced  $f_{m_s}(E_k)$  with  $f(E_{km_s})$ , and  $E_{k'}$  is equal to

$$E_{\mathbf{k}'} = E_{\mathbf{k}} + E_{m_s} - E_{m'_s} + E_{M_l} - E_{M'_l}.$$
(9.289)

To make further progress we now make some simplifications. In the expression relating the energies of the two *k*-states in Eq. (9.289), we neglect the electronic and nuclear transition energies  $E_{m'_s} - E_{m_s}$  and  $E_{M'_l} - E_{M_l}$ , and set  $E_{k'} = E_k \equiv E$ . This statement amounts to saying that  $W_{mn} = W_{nm}$ , which we recall results in zero nuclear polarization, which is unphysical. However we are able to neglect the difference between  $W_{mn}$  and  $W_{nm}$  here as this effect has already been included in Eq. (9.278) [246]. Therefore a better interpretation of this statement is that it amounts to assuming low nuclear polarization. Hence this theory of relaxation implicitly contains a high-temperature approximation. This further allows us to replace the density of states for a particular spin state  $g_{m_s}(E)$  with g(E)/2, where g(E) is the total density of states. This gives us

$$W_{M_{I},M_{I}^{\prime}} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \frac{1}{9} \mu_{0}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2} g_{e}^{2} \hbar^{2} \gamma_{I}^{2} V^{2} \sum_{i,j} \langle M_{I} | \widehat{I}_{i} | M_{I}^{\prime} \rangle$$

$$\times \langle M_{I}^{\prime} | \widehat{I}_{j} | M_{I} \rangle \sum_{m_{s},m_{s}^{\prime}} \langle m_{s} | \hat{s}_{i} | m_{s}^{\prime} \rangle \langle m_{s}^{\prime} | \hat{s}_{j} | m_{s} \rangle$$

$$\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \langle | \phi_{k}(\mathbf{0}) |^{2} \rangle_{E}^{2} f(E) [1 - f(E)] g(E)^{2} dE. \qquad (9.290)$$

The integral is evaluated by noting that the factor containing the Fermi–Dirac functions f(E)[1 - f(E)] is proportional to a Dirac delta function:

$$f(E)[1 - f(E)] = -kTf'(E)$$
(9.291)

$$=kT\,\delta(E-E_{\rm F}),\tag{9.292}$$

from which we obtain

$$\begin{split} &\int_{0}^{\infty} \langle \left| \phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0}) \right|^{2} \rangle_{E}^{2} f(E) [1 - f(E)] g(E)^{2} dE \\ &= \langle \left| \phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0}) \right|^{2} \rangle_{E_{F}}^{2} g(E_{F})^{2} kT. \end{split}$$
(9.293)

The sum over the product of the electronic spin matrix elements is simply

$$\sum_{m_s,m'_s} \langle m_s | \hat{s}_i | m'_s \rangle \langle m'_s | \hat{s}_j | m_s \rangle = \operatorname{Tr}_s \left( \hat{s}_i \hat{s}_j \right)$$
(9.294)

$$=\frac{1}{2}\delta_{ij}.$$
 (9.295)

The final expression for the transition coefficients is therefore:

$$W_{M_{I},M_{I}'} = \frac{\pi}{9} \mu_{0}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2} g_{e}^{2} \hbar \gamma_{I}^{2} V^{2} \langle |\phi_{k}(\mathbf{0})|^{2} \rangle_{E_{F}}^{2} g(E_{F})^{2} \\ \times kT \sum_{i} \langle M_{I} | \widehat{I}_{i} | M_{I}' \rangle \langle M_{I}' | \widehat{I}_{i} | M_{I} \rangle.$$
(9.296)

The transition coefficient is proportional to the square of the average single-electron spin density at the Fermi level  $\langle |\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_F}$ , and to the square of the density of states at the Fermi level  $g(E_F)$ . This means that the rate of nuclear-spin transitions is dominated by the conduction electrons at the Fermi level. As the temperature increases the number of electrons that are promoted into excited states increases. Since these electrons are all in the vicinity of the Fermi level this means that we can expect the rate of nuclear transitions mediated by the Fermi-contact interaction with these electrons to also increase. This is observed by the proportionality of  $W_{M_I, M_I'}$  to *T*.

It now remains to compute the longitudinal PRE, which is done by inserting Eq. (9.296) into Eq. (9.279) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{T_{1}} = \frac{\pi}{18} \mu_{0}^{2} \mu_{B}^{2} g_{e}^{2} \hbar \gamma_{l}^{2} V^{2} \langle |\phi_{k}(\mathbf{0})|^{2} \rangle_{E_{F}}^{2} g(E_{F})^{2} kT$$

$$\frac{\sum_{i} \sum_{M_{I}, M_{I}'} \langle M_{I} | \hat{I}_{i} | M_{I}' \rangle \langle M_{I}' | \hat{I}_{i} | M_{I} \rangle \left( E_{M_{I}} - E_{M_{I}'} \right)^{2}}{\sum_{M_{I}} E_{M_{I}}^{2}}$$
(9.297)

$$= -\frac{\pi}{18}\mu_0^2\mu_B^2 g_e^2 \hbar\gamma_I^2 V^2 \langle |\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_F}^2 g(E_F)^2 kT \frac{\sum_i Tr_I \left(\left[\hat{H}_{IZ}, \hat{I}_i\right]^2\right)}{Tr_I \left(\hat{H}_{IZ}^2\right)}, \qquad (9.298)$$

where to go to the second line we have invoked the high-field approximation and assumed that the nuclear spin Hamiltonian is dominated by the Zeeman Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{IZ} = -\hbar \gamma_I B_0 \hat{I}_z$ . The numerator and denominator of the quotient are evaluated to be

$$\sum_{i} \operatorname{Tr}_{I}\left(\left[\widehat{H}_{IZ},\widehat{I}_{i}\right]^{2}\right) = -\hbar^{2}\gamma_{I}^{2}B_{0}^{2}\operatorname{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{x}^{2}+\widehat{I}_{y}^{2}\right), \qquad (9.299)$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{H}_{IZ}^{2}\right) = \hbar^{2}\gamma_{I}^{2}B_{0}^{2}\mathrm{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{Z}^{2}\right),\tag{9.300}$$

and since the following identity applies for all nuclear spins *I*:

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{x}^{2}\right) = \operatorname{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{y}^{2}\right) = \operatorname{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{z}^{2}\right), \tag{9.301}$$

we calculate the quotient to be -2. The final expression for the longitudinal PRE is therefore

$$\frac{1}{T_1} = \frac{\pi}{9} \mu_0^2 \mu_B^2 g_e^2 \hbar \gamma_I^2 V^2 \langle |\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_F}^2 g(E_F)^2 kT.$$
(9.302)

As we have already commented for the transition coefficient  $W_{M_l,M'_l}$ , we see that the PRE increases with the square of the total electron spin density at the nucleus  $\langle |\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_c} g(E_F)$ , which is dominated by the electrons close in energy to the Fermi level, and with the temperature.

#### 9.9.4. The Korringa relation

There is an important relationship between the longitudinal PRE in Eq. (9.302) and the Knight shift in Eq. (7.165), which is known as the Korringa relation [311,184,246]. Specifically the two expressions can be combined to give a quantity  $T_1K^2$  that is equal to

$$T_1 K^2 = \left(\frac{\chi_{\rm P}}{g(E_{\rm F})}\right)^2 \frac{4}{\pi kT} \frac{1}{\mu_0^2 \mu_{\rm B}^2 g_e^2 \hbar \gamma_I^2}.$$
(9.303)

We see that this quantity depends only on the magnetic susceptibility, the density of states at the Fermi level, and the temperature. In the special case of non-interacting electrons the magnetic susceptibility is given by the Pauli expression in Eq. (7.178), and the Korringa relation becomes [311]:

$$T_1 K^2 = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi kT} \left(\frac{\gamma_s}{\gamma_l}\right)^2,\tag{9.304}$$

where  $T_1K^2$  depends only on the temperature, and the ratio of the electronic and nuclear gyromagnetic ratios. In principle it should be possible to use the Korringa relation to calculate  $T_1$  relaxation times from Knight shifts. However care should be taken in the application of the Korringa relation, since it has been shown that, for simple metals, the experimental  $T_1$  values are greater than the values predicted. This is because of the neglect of effects such as electron–electron interactions, and other relaxation mechanisms.

# 9.9.5. Comparison of the longitudinal PRE in solid insulators and metals

An initial comparison of the longitudinal PRE in a metal in Eq. (9.302) with the corresponding expression for a solid insulator from the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory in Eq. (8.185) appears to indicate that there is little similarity between the two expressions. The most obvious difference is that in a metal the dominant source of relaxation is a Bloembergentype mechanism due to the Fermi-contact interaction, whereas we have shown that in an insulator the Bloembergen contribution is negligible compared to the Solomon contribution. However on closer examination there is greater similarity than one would expect.

Here we compare the longitudinal PRE in a metal to the Bloembergen expression in a solid insulator. In order to facilitate the discussion we take the expression for the metal in Eq. (9.302), and assume the free-electron model. The density of states at the Fermi level then takes the simple expression  $g(E_F) = 3N/(2VE_F)$ , where N is the number of electrons, and we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{T_1^{\text{metal}}} = \frac{\pi}{4} \left( \mu_0 \mu_{\text{B}} g_e \gamma_I \right)^2 \left( N \langle |\phi_k(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_{\text{F}}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\hbar}{E_{\text{F}}} \right) \left( \frac{kT}{E_{\text{F}}} \right). \tag{9.305}$$

We can rationalize this expression as follows. The factor  $N\langle |\phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{0})|^2 \rangle_{E_F}$  is the total electronic density at the nucleus due to the *N* electrons, which is computed from the average one-electron density due to the electrons at the Fermi surface. The factor  $\hbar/E_F$  can be interpreted as follows. The fluctuation local field exerted by the electronic spin on the nucleus has a correlation time which is the average duration for which the conduction electron remains localized at the nucleus. The order of magnitude of this correlation time is  $\hbar/E_F$  [184]. For typical values of the Fermi energy in simple metals  $\hbar/E_F \ll |\omega_S - \omega_I|$ , indicating that we are in the extreme narrowing limit. Finally the factor  $kT/E_F$  gives the fraction of electrons that participate in the relaxation process at finite temperature, with

the remainder having no overall contribution due to the spin pairing.

For a solid insulator the longitudinal PRE due to the Bloembergen mechanism is give in Eq. (8.185). If we assume that the paramagnetic centre has a single unpaired electron, so that S = 1/2, and also assume that we are in the extreme-narrowing limit we obtain the following expression:

$$\frac{1}{T_{1}^{\text{insul.}}} = \frac{2}{9} \left( \mu_{0} \mu_{B} g_{e} \gamma_{I} \right)^{2} \rho^{\alpha - \beta}(\mathbf{0})^{2} T_{2e}.$$
(9.306)

This expression bears some similarity to Eq. (9.305). The electronspin density at the nucleus is now given by  $\rho^{\alpha-\beta}(\mathbf{0})$  which, unlike in the metal, is a contribution from a single unpaired electron. This reflects the fact that in an insulator the Fermi-contact interaction is short-range, as the electrons are largely localised in the metal coordination site, rather than delocalised throughout the material as in a metal. In addition the PRE is proportional to the electron  $T_{2e}$ , which plays the role of the correlation time. However we should note that  $T_{2e}$  has a very different interpretation to the correlation time in the metal, as in the insulator the electrons are largely localised, and the electronic relaxation is largely due to the vibrational motions.

## 9.10. Key concepts

- A general treatment of electronic and nuclear relaxation can be made using the stochastic Liouville–von Neumann equation.
- The resulting expressions for nuclear relaxation include the effects of electronic relaxation for spins *S* > 1 that is outside the Redfield limit, spin–orbit coupling effects on the electronic spin (*g*-anisotropy, and static ZFS), and low-field conditions.
- Under high-field conditions and for S = 1 we recover the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations (Eqs. (9.111) and (9.112)). For higher electronic spins we recover the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations assuming a phenomenological treatment of electronic relaxation.
- Under conditions of low field and slow motions the PREs are given by Eqs. (9.129) and (9.130) for arbitrary electronic spin, and Eqs. (9.166) and (9.167) for S = 1.
- Metal ions in solution that coordinate to the solvent molecules have a complicated relaxation process that can be separated into inner- and outer-sphere mechanisms (Eq. (9.178)). The expressions for the inner-sphere relaxation rates at high field determined by Redfield theory are given in Eqs. (9.188) and (9.189). For inner-sphere relaxation at high field the expressions for S = 1 reduce to the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan equations. The expressions for the outer-sphere relaxation rates are given in Eqs. (9.209) and (9.210) at high field, and Eqs. (9.218) and (9.219) at low field.
- Vibrational motions are an important source of electronic relaxation both in solution and in solid insulators. The PRE expressions at high field are the Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan equations.
- In a metal the PRE is mainly due to the Fermi-contact interaction with the delocalised electrons, and so shares some similarities with the Bloembergen mechanism in solid insulators. The longitudinal PRE is given in Eq. (9.302).

# Chapter 10: Inhomogeneous broadening due to the bulk paramagnetic susceptibility

The description of the paramagnetic shielding tensor has so far focussed on the *local* effects of the paramagnetic metal centres on the observed nuclear spin. However in certain cases we must also consider the *bulk* magnetic properties of the system, which can affect the measured values of the shift and the inhomogeneous linewidth in the spectrum. Such effects can be present in solution, single crystals, and solid powders. The important points to consider are the shape of the crystal containing the nucleus in solid samples, any neighbouring crystallites, and the shape of the sample container. These bulk properties are collectively known as bulk magnetic susceptibility (BMS) effects as they depend on the susceptibility tensor of the entire sample. The BMS has been shown to influence both the measured paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy, and the line shape and linewidth [154,155]. The treatment of the BMS effects in this chapter is based on the theory of classical electrodynamics, on which further information can be found in standard textbooks such as the one by Jackson [187]. Here we focus on paramagnetic solids, considering first single crystals, and then microcrystalline powders.

# 10.1. The BMS shift in a single crystal

# 10.1.1. The demagnetising field in a single crystal

In Section 2.2 we introduced the concept that a magnetic field can be described either in terms of the *H*-field H(r) or the *B*-field B(r), which are related by Eq. (2.9), which is repeated below for convenience:

$$\boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \mu_0(\boldsymbol{H}(\boldsymbol{r}) + \boldsymbol{M}(\boldsymbol{r})), \tag{10.1}$$

and where we have explicitly written in the dependence on position of both fields and the magnetization. The *H*-field  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{r})$  is equal to the sum of the applied *H*-field  $\mathbf{H}_0$  and a demagnetising *H*-field  $\mathbf{H}_D(\mathbf{r})$ , which is an opposing field produced by the combined effect of all the magnetic moments in the solid crystal. The magnetic *B*-field  $\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r})$  is therefore given by

$$\boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \mu_0(\boldsymbol{H}_0 + \boldsymbol{H}_D(\boldsymbol{r}) + \boldsymbol{M}(\boldsymbol{r}))$$
(10.2)

$$= \boldsymbol{B}_0 + \boldsymbol{B}_\mathrm{D}(\boldsymbol{r}), \tag{10.3}$$

where  $\mathbf{B}_0 = \mu_0 \mathbf{H}_0$  is the applied *B*-field, and  $\mathbf{B}_D(\mathbf{r}) = \mu_0(\mathbf{H}_D(\mathbf{r}) + \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}))$  is the demagnetising *B*-field. So far this description is valid for any magnetic solid. Restricting the discussion to paramagnetic solids, the bulk magnetization *inside* the crystallite  $\mathbf{M}_c$  is due to the applied field  $\mathbf{H}_0$ , and can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{M}_{c} = \boldsymbol{\chi}_{V} \cdot \boldsymbol{H}_{0}, \tag{10.4}$$

where  $\chi_V$  is the bulk magnetic susceptibility tensor per unit volume, which in general is anisotropic. By contrast the magnetization outside the crystallite M(r) is zero.

For an object of micrometre dimensions or larger, the demagnetising fields can be calculated from classical magnetostatics, where we model the crystallite as a uniformly-magnetized object occupying a spatial volume *V* that is bounded by a surface *S*. The demagnetising *H*-field  $H_D(\mathbf{r})$  is then given by the vector gradient of a scalar potential  $\Phi_D(\mathbf{r})$  [187]

$$\boldsymbol{H}_{\mathrm{D}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = -\nabla \Phi_{\mathrm{D}}(\boldsymbol{r}),\tag{10.5}$$

where we have acknowledged that both the field and scalar potential vary with position  $\mathbf{r}$ , the origin of which is the centre of mass of the crystallite. Note that the nucleus can be located either inside this crystallite, or outside in a second crystallite. The scalar potential is given by the following integral expression:

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{D}}(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \iiint_{V} \frac{\mathbf{\nabla}' \cdot \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \mathrm{d}V' + \frac{1}{4\pi} \oiint_{S} \frac{\mathbf{n}' \cdot \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \mathrm{d}a', \qquad (10.6)$$

where  $\mathbf{r}'$  is the vector giving the position of the paramagnetic centre,  $\mathbf{r}$  is the position of the nucleus,  $\mathbf{n}'$  is the unit vector normal to the surface pointing outwards, and da' is an infinitesimal area located on the surface *S*. The first integral is over the volume of the crystallite, and the second integral is taken its bounding surface.

Both integrals are evaluated with respect to the primed coordinates. In the paramagnetic regime we assume that within the crystallite  $M(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{M}_c$  and is uniform throughout *V*, and hence both  $\mathbf{V}' \cdot \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}')$  and the volume integral are equal to zero, which leaves us with

$$\Phi_{\rm D}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{\rm S} \frac{\boldsymbol{n}' \cdot \boldsymbol{M}_{\rm c}}{|\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}'|} d\boldsymbol{a}'.$$
(10.7)

From Eqs. (10.4), (10.5), and (10.7) the magnetic field  $H_D$  takes the following form [152]:

$$\boldsymbol{H}_{\mathrm{D}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = -\boldsymbol{N}(\boldsymbol{r}) \cdot \boldsymbol{\chi}_{V} \cdot \boldsymbol{H}_{0}, \tag{10.8}$$

where N(r) is the demagnetising tensor, which has the following components  $N_{ij}(r)$ :

$$N_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_i} \iint_{S} \frac{n'_j}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} da'$$
(10.9)

$$= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{S} \frac{r_{i} - r'_{i}}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|^{3}} n'_{j} da'.$$
(10.10)

The demagnetising *H*-field is therefore a matrix product of three parts, each of which is due to a different physical property of either the system or the experimental conditions. The demagnetising field has a magnitude proportional to  $H_0$ , but with a reduced size, and has a different direction due to the demagnetising and volume susceptibility tensors. The latter tensor  $\chi_{\nu}$ encodes the influence of the (generally anisotropic) magnetic moments of the paramagnetic ions in the crystallite, in the same way as the single-ion susceptibility influences the local paramagnetic shielding tensor as shown in Chapter 4, via the g- and ZFS tensors. The demagnetising tensor N(r) contains all the information about the shape of the crystallite via the surface integral. We therefore expect it to be anisotropic for crystallites that deviate from spherical symmetry. This is also the only contribution to  $H_{\rm D}(\mathbf{r})$  that is position dependent. The trace of the demagnetising tensor can be calculated to be

$$\operatorname{Tr}(\boldsymbol{N}(\boldsymbol{r})) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{S} \frac{(\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}') \cdot \boldsymbol{n}'}{|\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}'|^{3}} \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{a}'$$
(10.11)

$$= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \iiint_{V} \nabla' \cdot \left\{ \frac{(\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}')}{|\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}'|^3} \right\} \mathrm{d}V'$$
(10.12)

$$= \iiint_{V} \delta(\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}) \mathrm{d}V' \tag{10.13}$$

$$= \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathbf{r} \text{ is outside the crystallite,} \\ 0, & \text{if } \mathbf{r} \text{ is outside the crystallite,} \end{cases}$$
(10.14)

where to go to the second line we have used the divergence theorem for the integrals of vector fields [190]. Fig. 10.1 gives three examples of demagnetising tensors for crystals of different shapes that can be used for calculating the *internal* demagnetising field. We see that for each tensor the trace is equal to unity. In all three examples the form of N(r) matches the symmetry of the crystal shape. With the axis system shown this results in all three matrices being diagonal, and so these axes give the PAF of the tensor. If instead we take an axis system that is fixed to the laboratory frame of reference the tensor N(r) is of course not diagonal. We note that in any direction *i* where the crystal dimension extends to infinity there is no bounding surface, and so  $N_{ii} = 0$ .

Once we have calculated  $H_D(\mathbf{r})$  we can calculate the demagnetising *B*-field from

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{0}}(\boldsymbol{H}_{\mathrm{D}} + \boldsymbol{M}(\boldsymbol{r})) \tag{10.15}$$

$$= -\mu_0 \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{\chi}_V \cdot \mathbf{H}_0 + \mu_0 \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}) \tag{10.16}$$

$$= -\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \mathbf{\chi}_{V} \cdot \mathbf{B}_{0} + \mu_{0} \mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r}), \qquad (10.17)$$

where  $\mathbf{M}(\mathbf{r})$  is equal to  $\chi_V \cdot \mathbf{H}_0 = \chi_V \cdot \mathbf{B}_0 / \mu_0$  inside the crystallite, and zero outside the crystallite. Alternatively we can calculate  $\mathbf{B}_D(\mathbf{r})$  directly from the vector potential  $\mathbf{A}_D(\mathbf{r})$  from the relation

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{D}}(\boldsymbol{r}), \qquad (10.18)$$

where the vector potential is given by

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{D}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \iiint_{V} \frac{\boldsymbol{\nabla}' \times \boldsymbol{M}(\boldsymbol{r}')}{|\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}'|} \mathrm{d}V' + \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \oiint_{S} \frac{\boldsymbol{M}(\boldsymbol{r}') \times \boldsymbol{n}'}{|\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}'|} \mathrm{d}a'.$$
(10.19)



**Fig. 10.1.** The demagnetising tensors of three uniformly-magnetized crystals of different three-dimensional shapes that give the demagnetising field at any point *within* each crystal. The crystal shapes are (a) a sphere, (b) an infinitely-long cylindrical rod, and (c) a plane extending to infinity in two dimensions. The arrows in (b) and (c) indicate the directions in which the crystals extend to infinity. The axis system is shown to the left.

If we, once again, assume that M(r) is independent of position within the crystallite the volume integral is equal to zero and the vector potential reduces to

$$\boldsymbol{A}_{\mathrm{D}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \oint_{\mathrm{S}} \frac{\boldsymbol{M}_{\mathrm{c}} \times \boldsymbol{n}'}{|\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}'|} \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{a}'. \tag{10.20}$$

The calculation of  $B_D(r)$  directly from the vector potential gives the same result as the calculation starting from the scalar potential via  $H_D(r)$ . The former method was used by Kubo et al. [152], whereas the latter is the approach of Dickinson et al. [153].

The demagnetising *B*-field can be thought of as being due to a chemical shielding at the nuclear spin. This BMS chemical shielding  $\sigma^{\text{BMS}}$  can be calculated by equating the two forms of the nuclear Zeeman interaction:

$$-\hbar\gamma_{I}\boldsymbol{B}(\boldsymbol{r})\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{I}} = -\hbar\gamma_{I}\boldsymbol{B}_{0}\cdot\left(\boldsymbol{1}-\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{BMS}}(\boldsymbol{r})\right)\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{I}}$$
(10.21)

$$[\boldsymbol{B}_0 + \boldsymbol{B}_D(\boldsymbol{r})] \cdot \boldsymbol{1} = \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot (\boldsymbol{1} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{BMS}}(\boldsymbol{r})), \qquad (10.22)$$

which gives

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{\mathrm{D}}(\boldsymbol{r}) \cdot \boldsymbol{1} = -\boldsymbol{B}_{0} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\boldsymbol{r}). \tag{10.23}$$

The final expression for the BMS shielding tensor is therefore

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{BMS}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\chi}_{V} \cdot \left( \boldsymbol{N}(\boldsymbol{r})^{T} - \boldsymbol{1} \right), & \text{inside the crystallite,} \\ \boldsymbol{\chi}_{V} \cdot \boldsymbol{N}(\boldsymbol{r})^{T}, & \text{outside the crystallite.} \end{cases}$$
(10.24)

Both the isotropic and anisotropic parts of the BMS shielding tensor depend on the nature of the paramagnetic centres via the bulk susceptibility tensor, and the crystallite shape via the demagnetizing tensor.

#### 10.1.2. The BMS shift of a spherical crystallite

We now consider the simple case of a spherical crystallite with radius  $a_c$ . The scalar potential is given by Eq. (10.7) following a conversion to spherical polar coordinates  $\mathbf{r} \rightarrow (r, \theta, \phi)$  and  $\mathbf{r}' \rightarrow (r', \theta', \phi')$ :

$$\Phi_{\rm D}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{a_{\rm c}^2}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \mathrm{d}\phi' \int_0^{\pi} \mathrm{d}\theta' \sin\theta' \\ \times \frac{M_{\rm c,x}\sin\theta'\cos\phi' + M_{\rm c,y}\sin\theta'\sin\phi' + M_{\rm c,z}\cos\theta'}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|}.$$
(10.25)

The integrals can be computed by using the following identity for  $|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|^{-1}$  [187]:

$$\frac{1}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} = 4\pi \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^{+l} \frac{1}{2l+1} \frac{r_{-}^{l}}{r_{>}^{l+1}} Y_{lm}(\theta', \phi')^{*} Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi),$$
(10.26)

where the  $Y_{lm}(\theta, \phi)$  are spherical harmonic functions of rank l and order m. The distance  $r_{<}$  is equal to the smaller of r and r', and likewise  $r_{>}$  to the larger of the two. Of the terms in Eq. (10.26), only those with l = 1 give a non-zero contribution to the integral, and so the scalar potential has the simple expression

$$\Phi_{\rm D}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \frac{1}{3} a_{\rm c}^2 \left(\frac{r_{<}}{r_{>}^2}\right) \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{M}_{\rm c} \cdot \boldsymbol{r}}{r}\right). \tag{10.27}$$

If the observed nuclear spin is located inside the crystallite the scalar potential becomes  $\Phi_{\rm D}^{\rm in}(\mathbf{r})$ , which is

$$\Phi_{\rm D}^{\rm in}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \frac{1}{3}\boldsymbol{M}_{\rm c}\cdot\boldsymbol{r},\tag{10.28}$$

and the corresponding demagnetising *H*-field  $H_{\rm D}^{\rm in}$  is

$$H_{\rm D}^{\rm in} = -\frac{1}{3}M_{\rm c} \tag{10.29}$$

$$=-\frac{1}{3}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{V}\cdot\boldsymbol{H}_{0}. \tag{10.30}$$

Comparing this with Eq. (10.8) we see that the demagnetising tensor  $N(\mathbf{r})$  is equal to

$$N(r) = \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{1},$$
 (10.31)

which is isotropic, as expected for a spherical crystallite. The BMS shielding of the nucleus inside the crystallite is now easily calculated from Eq. (10.24), giving

$$\sigma^{\text{BMS}} = -\frac{2}{3}\chi_V$$
, inside the crystallite. (10.32)

If the observed nuclear spin is outside the crystallite in question the scalar potential  $\Phi_{\rm D}^{\rm out}(\mathbf{r})$  is:

$$\Phi_{\rm D}^{\rm out}(\boldsymbol{r}) = a_{\rm c}^3 \frac{\boldsymbol{M}_{\rm c} \cdot \boldsymbol{r}}{3r^3} \tag{10.33}$$

$$=V_{\rm c}\frac{\boldsymbol{M}_{\rm c}\cdot\boldsymbol{r}}{4\pi r^3} \tag{10.34}$$

$$=\frac{\mathbf{m}_{c}\cdot\mathbf{r}}{4\pi r^{3}},\tag{10.35}$$

where  $V_c = 4\pi a_c^3/3$  is the volume of the crystallite, and  $\boldsymbol{m}_c = V_c \boldsymbol{M}_c$  is its total magnetic moment. The demagnetising field  $\boldsymbol{H}_D^{out}$  evaluates to

$$H_{\rm D}^{\rm out} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[ \frac{3r(m_{\rm c} \cdot r)}{r^5} - \frac{m_{\rm c}}{r^3} \right],\tag{10.36}$$

which we immediately recognise as the field exerted by a point dipole moment  $m_c$  at position r. We therefore obtain the result that a nucleus outside the crystallite experiences a dipolar coupling interaction with the crystallite, and that the crystallite can be modelled as a point dipole with a magnetic moment equal to the bulk value  $m_c$ . The demagnetising tensor has the components

$$N_{ij}(\boldsymbol{r}) = -V_{\rm c}C_{ij}^{\rm dip}(\boldsymbol{r}), \qquad (10.37)$$

where  $C^{dip}$  is the reduced point-dipolar coupling tensor:

$$C_{ij}^{\rm dip}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{3r_i r_j - r^2 \delta_{ij}}{4\pi r^5}.$$
 (10.38)

Eq. (10.24) gives the corresponding BMS shielding tensor:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{BMS}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = -V_{\text{c}}\boldsymbol{\chi}_{V} \cdot \boldsymbol{C}^{\text{dip}}(\boldsymbol{r}), \quad \text{outside the crystallite}, \quad (10.39)$$

which is an analogous expression to that obtained for the spindipolar contribution to the local paramagnetic shielding tensor in terms of the single-paramagnetic-centre susceptibility tensor in Eq. (4.182).

# 10.1.3. The IBMS and ABMS contributions to the paramagnetic shielding tensor

The contributions to the BMS shielding tensor of a nucleus both inside and outside a given crystallite can be separated into two groups: those due to the isotropic volume susceptibility of the crystallite, and those due to the volume susceptibility anisotropy. The former contributions give rise to isotropic bulk magnetic susceptibility (IBMS) effects, whilst the latter are responsible for the anisotropic bulk magnetic susceptibility (ABMS) effects. Four terms can be clearly distinguished, which are listed in Table 10.1 for a spherical crystallite, along with their irreducible spherical tensor ranks.

If the observed nucleus is within the crystallite in question, the two contributions to the BMS shielding tensor are 1 and 2. Term 1 is the IBMS contribution, with a size that is proportional to the isotropic volume susceptibility  $\chi_V^{iso}$  and simply changes the isotropic shift. Term 2, on the other hand, is the ABMS contribution which is purely anisotropic, with anisotropy parameters that are

proportional to those of the anisotropic volume susceptibility  $\chi_V^{an}$ . These IBMS and ABMS shielding parameters are

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm IBMS,1} = -\frac{2}{3}\chi_V^{\rm iso},\tag{10.40}$$

$$\Delta \sigma^{\text{ABMS},2} = -\frac{2}{3} \Delta \chi_{\nu}, \qquad (10.41)$$

$$\eta^{\text{ABMS,2}} = \eta^{\chi_{\nu}},\tag{10.42}$$

where  $\sigma_{iso}^{IBMS,1}$ ,  $\Delta \sigma^{ABMS,2}$ , and  $\eta^{ABMS,1}$  are the isotropic shielding, SA, and asymmetry parameter of the BMS shielding tensor, and  $\chi_v^{iso}$ ,  $\Delta \chi_v$ , and  $\eta^{\chi_v}$  are the isotropic part, anisotropy, and asymmetry parameter of the volume susceptibility. Both the IBMS and ABMS contributions depend only on the volume susceptibility, and so are independent of both the size of the crystallite, and the position of the nucleus within the crystallite. Terms 1 and 2 are the "bulk equivalents" of the local shielding terms in the susceptibility formalism, given in Table 5.1, that are the contact shift  $-\chi^{iso}C^{con}$  and SA  $-\Delta \chi C^{con}$ .

For a nuclear spin outside the crystallite, the IBMS and ABMS contributions to the shielding tensor are terms 3 and 4, both of which depend on the dipolar coupling between the nucleus and the whole crystallite. Term 3 is purely anisotropic, with anisotropic shielding parameters that depend solely on the dipolar coupling tensor. The resulting anisotropy  $\Delta \sigma^{\text{IBMS},3}$  and asymmetry  $\eta^{\text{IBMS},3}$  are

$$\Delta \sigma^{\rm IBMS,3} = -\frac{V_{\rm c}}{2\pi r^3} \chi_V^{\rm iso},\tag{10.43}$$

$$\eta^{\text{IBMS},3} = 0.$$
 (10.44)

The ABMS term 4 is a matrix product between the anisotropic part of the volume susceptibility tensor and the dipolar coupling tensor, and so contains parts of irreducible spherical tensor ranks 0 (isotropic), 1 (anisotropic and antisymmetric), and 2 (anisotropic and symmetric). The isotropic part  $\sigma_{iso}^{ABMS,4}$  has the form of a PCS:

$$\sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm ABMS,4} = -\frac{V_{\rm c}}{12\pi r^3} \bigg[ \Delta \chi_{V,\rm ax} \big( 3\cos^2(\theta) - 1 \big) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{V,\rm rh} \sin^2(\theta) \cos(2\phi) \bigg],$$
(10.45)

where  $\Delta \chi_{V,ax}$  and  $\Delta \chi_{V,rh}$  are the axial and rhombic anisotropies of the volume susceptibility tensor, and  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are the spherical polar angles which give the orientation of  $\chi_v^{an}$  with respect to the vector **r** connecting the nucleus to the centre of the crystallite. In contrast to the situation where the nucleus is inside the crystallite, the BMS shielding tensor contributions of a nucleus outside the crystallite are proportional to the volume  $V_c$ . This is because the dipolar coupling constant is proportional to the bulk magnetic moment of the crystallite, which is itself proportional to its volume. Therefore, doubling the volume of the crystallite has the effect of doubling both the isotropic and anisotropic parts of the BMS shielding tensor. In addition the tensor parameters all vary with the distance between

Table 10.1

Terms contributing to the BMS paramagnetic shielding tensor of a nucleus due to a single spherical crystallite. The individual contributions 1–4 are separated according to whether they act on a nucleus that is either inside or outside the crystallite in question, and whether they are due to the isotropic (IBMS) or anisotropic (ABMS) part of the volume susceptibility tensor of the crystallite.

Location	Туре		$\sigma^{ ext{BMS}}$	
		Term	Expression	Rank
Inside	IBMS	1	$-\frac{2}{3}\chi_V^{iso}$	0
	ABMS	2	$-\frac{2}{3}\chi_V^{an}$	2
outside	IBMS	3	$-V_{\rm c} \chi_{\rm V}^{\rm iso} C^{\rm dip}(\boldsymbol{r})$	2
	ABMS	4	$-V_{\rm c} \boldsymbol{\chi}_V^{\rm an} \cdot \boldsymbol{C}^{\rm dip}(\boldsymbol{r})$	0, 1, 2

the nucleus and the centre of the crystallite as  $1/r^3$ . Terms 3 and 4 are the "bulk equivalents" of the local terms  $-\chi^{iso}C^{dip}$  and  $-\Delta \chi \cdot C^{dip}$  in Table 5.1, which are the spin-dipolar parts of the local paramagnetic shielding tensor.

If the crystallite is non-spherical the expressions in Table 10.1 no longer apply, and we must use Eq. (10.24) in its most general form. In this case terms 1 and 2 both contain mixtures of parts of ranks 0, 1, and 2 as **N** has an anisotropic component. Term 3 still has no isotropic part as Tr(N(r)) = 0 outside the crystallite. Analytical and numerical calculations of the demagnetising fields have been made for a range of geometries, both in the fields of NMR in chemistry and MRI of living organisms. Notable examples of geometries that have been considered include cylinders [311,313], parallelepipeds [314], triangular surfaces [315], and cones, ellipsoids, paraboloids, and hyperboloids [153]. We should also consider the case where the nucleus has a measurable local shielding tensor  $\sigma^{S}$  in addition to the BMS shielding tensor. The local contribution is due to nearby paramagnetic centres A, located within an Ewald sphere with dimensions much smaller than the crystallite, and centred on the nucleus. The remainder of the crystallite is modelled classically, and contributes the BMS shielding tensor. This situation is shown in Fig. 10.2(a). When calculating the BMS shielding, it is important to subtract the contribution from the Ewald sphere, equal to  $-2\chi_V/3$ , from the top expression in Eq. (10.24). This gives us a BMS shielding of  $\sigma^{BMS} = \chi_V \cdot (N(r^T) - 1/3)$  inside the crystallite. In this case, the IBMS term 1 has an isotropic part of zero for crystallites of any shape, but the ABMS term 2 has both an isotropic and anisotropic part for crystallites that deviate from spherical symmetry.

If the nucleus is outside a non-spherical crystallite, the resulting demagnetising tensor no longer has the form of a simple dipolar coupling interaction to a point dipole  $m_c$ . Nevertheless we can still interpret N(r) as the spatial part of a coupling interaction that approximately resembles a point-dipolar coupling interaction for approximately spherical crystallites. If the nuclear spin is sufficiently far from the crystallite so that  $r \gg r'$ , we can approximate the interaction as a point-dipolar coupling. This can be seen by writing the scalar potential as

$$\Phi_{\rm D}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \oint_{\mathcal{S}} \frac{\mathbf{n}' \cdot \mathbf{M}_{\rm c}}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} \mathrm{d}\mathbf{a}' \tag{10.46}$$

$$=\frac{1}{4\pi}\iiint_{V}\mathbf{V}'\cdot\left\{\frac{\mathbf{M}_{c}}{|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}'|}\right\}\mathrm{d}V'$$
(10.47)

$$=\frac{1}{4\pi}\iiint_{V}\boldsymbol{M}_{c}\cdot\left\{\frac{\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{r}'}{|\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{r}'|^{3}}\right\}\mathrm{d}V',$$
(10.48)

where to the go the second line we have used the divergence theorem [190]. This result is so far general for a nuclear spin in any location. However if we now assume that  $r \gg r'$ , we can simplify the expression for the scalar potential as follows

$$\Phi_{\rm D}(\boldsymbol{r}) = \frac{\boldsymbol{M}_{\rm c} \cdot \boldsymbol{r}}{4\pi r^3} \iiint_{\rm V} \mathrm{d}V' \tag{10.49}$$

$$=\frac{M_{\rm c}\cdot r}{4\pi r^3}V_{\rm c} \tag{10.50}$$

$$=\frac{\mathbf{m}_{c}\cdot\mathbf{r}}{4\pi r^{3}},\tag{10.51}$$

which gives the expression for the scalar potential of a point-dipolar coupling interaction in Eq. (10.35) [187]. The demagnetising tensor is therefore the dipolar coupling tensor in Eq. (10.37).

# 10.2. The BMS shift in a polycrystalline powder

10.2.1. The IBMS and ABMS contributions to the paramagnetic shielding

The treatment of the BMS effects of a single crystallite can now be extended to the case of polycrystalline solids, which represents a far larger number of studies in solid-state NMR. This case was originally considered by both VanderHart and Earl [148], and Alla and Lippmaa [149], for both diamagnetic and paramagnetic samples. The model we use is that of Kubo et al. [152], which is itself a modification of the model of Schwerk et al. [151], and is shown in Fig. 10.2. As shown in Fig. 10.2(a) we assume that the observed nucleus I is inside crystallite  $c_0$ , and possesses a local paramagnetic shielding tensor  $\sigma^{s}$  which is a sum of contributions from the nearby paramagnetic centres  $S^{(A)}$ . The form of this tensor is the subject of Chapters 3–7. The nuclear spin is at the centre of an Ewald sphere [187], with dimensions that are much smaller than those of the crystallite, within which the sum of contributions from the paramagnetic centres A converges. It is then assumed that the remainder of the crystallite is a uniformly-magnetised continuum which contributes a BMS shielding tensor  $\sigma_0^{BMS}$  to the total shielding of I, which can be calculated using the methods described both in this section and in Section 10.1. The sample itself contains a number of crystallites  $c_k$  that are assumed to occupy the sites of a close-packed lattice with occupancy  $p_k$ , which takes values of 0 or 1 if the site is unoccupied or occupied respectively. Each crystallite contributes a term  $\sigma_{\nu}^{\text{BMS}}$  to the total BMS shielding tensor of *I*. Once again it is assumed that the sum of these contributions converges with an Ewald sphere with dimensions that are smaller than those of the sample container (Fig. 10.2(b)). The remainder of the sample is assumed to be uniformly magnetised, as shown in Fig. 10.2(c).

The total paramagnetic shielding tensor  $\sigma$  of the nuclear spin *I* is equal to the sum of the local  $\sigma^{s}$  and BMS  $\sigma^{BMS}$  contributions:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{BMS}},\tag{10.52}$$

where  $\sigma^{\text{BMS}}$  is given by

$$\sigma^{\text{BMS}} = \chi_{V}^{(0)} \cdot \left( N^{(0)} \left( \boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(0)} \right)^{T} - \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{1} \right) + \sum_{k \neq 0} p_{k} \chi_{V}^{(k)} \cdot N^{(k)} \left( \boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)} \right)^{T} + \chi_{V}^{(R)} \cdot \left( N^{(R)} \left( \boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(R)} \right)^{T} - \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{1} \right),$$
(10.53)

where  $\boldsymbol{\chi}_{V}^{(k)}$  and  $\boldsymbol{r}^{(k)}$  are the volume susceptibility and the position of the centre of mass of crystallite k. The terms in Eq. (10.53) can be summarised as follows. The first term is due to the uniformlymagnetized region of the crystallite  $c_0$ , and the second is a sum of all the shielding contributions from the other crystallites  $c_k$ . The third term is due to the uniformly-magnetized region of the sample container, the centre of mass of which is located at position  $r^{(R)}$ , and which has a bulk volume susceptibility  $\chi_V^{(R)}$ , and produces a demagnetising tensor  $N^{(R)}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^{(R)})$ . It is important to note that in calculating both the first and third terms in Eq. (10.53) we have subtracted the contributions from the respective Ewald spheres. The two Ewald spheres would contribute the shielding tensors  $-2\chi_V^{(0)}/3$  and  $-2\chi_V^{(R)}/3$  to the first and third terms respectively. Subtracting these contributions from each respective term prevents the double counting of the parts of the sample included in the Ewald spheres. In the case of the first term, the contribution from the Ewald sphere in Fig. 10.2(a) is already included in  $\sigma^{S}$ , whereas for the third term the contribution is already included in  $\sigma^{s}$  and the first two terms of the BMS shielding tensor.

The BMS contribution can be written as the sum of the IBMS and ABMS parts  $\sigma^{\text{IBMS}}$  and  $\sigma^{\text{ABMS}}$ :

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{BMS}} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{IBMS}} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{ABMS}}, \tag{10.54}$$



**Fig. 10.2.** Illustration of the model of a polycrystalline sample. In (a) is shown a single crystallite  $c_0$  that contains the nucleus *I* of interest. The nucleus experiences a local paramagnetic shielding  $\sigma^{S}$  that is due to the nearby paramagnetic metal ions  $S^{(A)}$ . The Ewald sphere is a sphere centred on the nucleus with a radius that is much smaller than the dimensions of the crystallite and within which the sum of contributions to  $\sigma^{S}$  converges. The remainder of the crystallite is modelled as a uniformly-magnetized continuum (shown in grey) which contributes to the BMS shielding tensor  $\sigma_0^{BMS}$  of *I*. In (b) is shown a set of closely-packed crystallites  $c_k$ , with  $k \neq 0$ , within a Ewald sphere, each of which contributes a BMS shielding tensor  $\sigma_k^{BMS}$  to *I*. We assume that the distribution of the orientations of the bulk magnetic susceptibility tensors is random. This Ewald sphere is part of the entire sample which is held in a container as shown in (c). The remainder of the sample is assumed to be uniformly magnetised.

$$\sigma^{\text{IBMS}} = \chi_{V}^{(0),\text{iso}} \left( N^{(0)} \left( \boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(0)} \right)^{T} - \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{1} \right) + \sum_{k \neq 0} p_{k} \chi_{V}^{(k),\text{iso}} N^{(k)} \left( \boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)} \right)^{T} + \chi_{V}^{(R),\text{iso}} \left( N^{(R)} \left( \boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(R)} \right)^{T} - \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{1} \right),$$
(10.55)

$$\sigma^{\text{ABMS}} = \chi_{V}^{(0),\text{an}} \cdot \left( \mathbf{N}^{(0)} \left( \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^{(0)} \right)^{T} - \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{1} \right) + \sum_{k \neq 0} p_{k} \chi_{V}^{(k),\text{an}} \\ \cdot \mathbf{N}^{(k)} \left( \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^{(k)} \right)^{T} + \chi_{V}^{(R),\text{an}} \cdot \left( \mathbf{N}^{(R)} \left( \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}^{(R)} \right)^{T} - \frac{1}{3} \mathbf{1} \right), \quad (10.56)$$

where  $\chi_V^{(k),\text{iso}}$  and  $\chi_V^{(k),\text{an}}$  are the isotropic and anisotropic parts of the volume susceptibility tensor of the *k*th crystallite, and  $\chi_V^{(R),\text{iso}}$  and  $\chi_V^{(R),\text{an}}$  are the isotropic and anisotropic parts of the volume susceptibility tensor of the uniformly-magnetised continuum part of the sample container.

If all the crystallites and the sample container are perfectly spherical, the first and third terms drop out of Eq. (10.53), and we are left with the sum over the dipolar coupling tensors of the neighbouring crystallites. The IBMS and ABMS parts of the BMS shielding tensor are then

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{IBMS}} = -\sum_{k \neq 0} p_k V_c^{(k)} \chi_V^{(k),\text{iso}} \mathbf{C}^{\text{dip}} \left( \boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)} \right)$$
(10.57)

$$= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{k \neq 0} p_k V_c^{(k)} \chi_V^{(k), \text{iso}} \left[ \frac{3 (\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)}) (\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)}) - |\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)}|^2}{|\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)}|^5} \right], \quad (10.58)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{ABMS}} = -\sum_{k\neq 0} p_k V_c^{(k)} \boldsymbol{\chi}_V^{(k),\text{an}} \cdot \boldsymbol{C}^{\text{dip}} (\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)})$$
(10.59)

$$= -\frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{k\neq 0} p_k V_c^{(k)} \boldsymbol{\chi}_V^{(k), \mathrm{an}} \cdot \left[ \frac{3(\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)})(\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)}) - |\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)}|^2 \mathbf{1}}{|\boldsymbol{r} - \boldsymbol{r}^{(k)}|^5} \right], \ (10.60)$$

where  $V_c^{(k)}$  is the volume of the *k*th crystallite. We see that, in this case, the IBMS shielding is purely anisotropic and symmetric, and has the spatial properties of the total dipolar coupling field experienced by the nucleus, whereas the ABMS shielding tensor has components of irreducible spherical tensor ranks 0, 1, and 2.

## 10.2.2. BMS inhomogeneous broadening

It was shown in Section 2.6 that the chemical shielding tensor depends on the two Euler angles describing the orientation of the PAF in the laboratory frame,  $\alpha_{PL}$  and  $\beta_{PL}$ . As we will see in the following Chapter 11, in a static powder where crystallites of all orientations are present, this leads to a broadening of the NMR resonance with the width of the line proportional to the SA. Whilst this description is complete as far as the local shielding tensor  $\sigma^{S}$  is concerned, the BMS contribution is more complicated and requires more careful consideration. It was shown by both VanderHart and Earl [148], and Alla and Lippmaa [149], that the presence of BMS effects, particularly the ABMS, leads to a broader distribution of shifts, and is therefore an additional source of inhomogeneous broadening.

In the high-field approximation the chemical shielding  $\sigma$  of a nuclear spin in a particular crystallite q can be written in terms of the irreducible spherical tensor components  $\sigma_{00}$  and  $\sigma_{20}$  as

$$\sigma(q, \alpha_{\rm PL}, \beta_{\rm PL}) = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_{00}(q) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_{20}(q, \alpha_{\rm PL}, \beta_{\rm PL}), \qquad (10.61)$$

where we have explicitly written the dependence of the terms on q and the Euler angles  $\alpha_{PL}$  and  $\beta_{PL}$ . We emphasise that q labels all the crystallites with the same orientation, as defined by  $(\alpha_{PL}, \beta_{PL})$ . In order to calculate the spectrum of the whole powder, we first average over the crystallites q with the same orientation, and then perform the average over the Euler angles.

For the local shielding this first averaging step is easy as  $\sigma^{s}$  depends only on the Euler angles ( $\alpha_{PS,L}, \beta_{PS,L}$ ):

$$\sigma^{\rm S}(\alpha_{\rm PS,L},\beta_{\rm PS,L}) = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma^{\rm S}_{00} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma^{\rm S}_{20}(\alpha_{\rm PS,L},\beta_{\rm PS,L}), \tag{10.62}$$

where  $(\alpha_{PS,L}, \beta_{PS,L})$  are the Euler angles giving the orientation of the PAF 'PS' of  $\sigma_{20}^{S}$  in the laboratory frame 'L'. We therefore see that the subset of crystallites q with the same orientation have exactly the same shielding tensor, and so an average over this subset will result in a sharp resonance in the NMR spectrum.

The IBMS and ABMS contributions both depend on q and the Euler angles giving the orientations of their respective PAFs:

$$\sigma^{\text{IBMS}}(q, \alpha_{\text{PI,L}}, \beta_{\text{PI,L}}) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sigma_{20}^{\text{IBMS}}(q, \alpha_{\text{PI,L}}, \beta_{\text{PI,L}}), \qquad (10.63)$$

$$\sigma^{\text{ABMS}}(q, \alpha_{\text{PA,L}}, \beta_{\text{PA,L}}) = -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \sigma_{00}^{\text{ABMS}}(q) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \sigma_{20}^{\text{ABMS}}(q, \alpha_{\text{PA,L}}, \beta_{\text{PA,L}}), \quad (10.64)$$

where 'PI' and 'PA' refer to the PAFs of the anisotropic parts of the IBMS and ABMS shielding tensors respectively and we have used the fact that, from Eq. (10.58), the isotropic part of the IBMS shielding tensor is zero. If we average over the crystallites q with the same orientation q we obtain a very different result than for the local shielding tensor. This is because, from Eqs. (10.58) and (10.60), both the IBMS and ABMS shielding tensors of a particular crystallite depend on the configurations of the surrounding crystallites k, via  $p_k$ , their sizes, via  $V_c^{(k)}$ , and the orientations of their volume susceptibility tensors. As each crystallite is orientated independently of the others, this means that averaging over q results in a distribution of anisotropic shifts from the IBMS of the surrounding crystallites, and a distribution of both isotropic and anisotropic shifts from their ABMSes. Both effects are a source of inhomogeneous broadening in the NMR spectrum, and are often collectively referred to as BMS broadening.

# 10.3. Key concepts

- A sample (solution or single crystal) containing an ensemble of paramagnetic ions generates a demagnetising field that adds to the local paramagnetic magnetic fields. The demagnetising field can be described in terms of a bulk magnetic volume susceptibility tensor.
- The bulk magnetic susceptibility tensor leads to a BMS contribution to the shielding tensor (Eq. (10.24)).
- In a spherical crystal the bulk isotropic susceptibility changes the isotropic shift, and the bulk susceptibility anisotropy changes the shift anisotropy (Table 10.1).
- In a non-spherical crystal the bulk susceptibility anisotropy also affects the isotropic shift.
- In a powder sample the demagnetising fields of the surrounding crystallites result in bulk isotropic and anisotropic contributions to the paramagnetic shielding (Eqs. (10.58) and (10.60)).
- The bulk susceptibility anisotropies of the surrounding crystallites result in inhomogeneous broadening of the resonance (the anisotropic bulk magnetic susceptibility broadening).

## Chapter 11: The NMR spectrum for non-interacting spins

Up until now we have examined in some detail the theoretical aspects of the paramagnetic shielding interactions, the PRE, and bulk susceptibility effects. Now we focus on the impact these effects have on the NMR spectrum. We begin by summarising the quantum mechanical description of the nuclear-spin interactions, with a focus on the chemical shielding and quadrupolar interactions up to second order, and how we can use this description to calculate the resulting NMR spectrum for systems in solution, and static and spinning powders. Then we examine the specific forms of the conventional one-dimensional NMR spectra for spin I = 1/2 nuclei subject to a paramagnetic shielding interaction, and quadrupolar nuclei subject to both paramagnetic shielding and first- and second-order quadrupolar interactions.

#### 11.1. The quantum mechanics of NMR

### 11.1.1. The Hamiltonian, propagator, and density operator

In NMR a sequence of pulses and delays is referred to as a pulse sequence. The effects of the sequence on the spin system are described by a Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}(t)$  that is in general time-dependent, and comprises all the relevant interactions of the spin system and the effects of the radiofrequency (RF) pulses. This Hamiltonian is written as the sum of a term  $\hat{H}_0(t)$  that describes the spin interactions, and a term  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  that describes the RF pulses:

$$\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_0(t) + \hat{H}_1(t).$$
 (11.1)

The former term is time-dependent when the sample is rotated, for example under magic-angle spinning (MAS), and is timeindependent otherwise. The latter term is time-dependent because the RF field amplitudes and phases vary throughout the sequence. This time dependence can either be piecewise, where the sequence can be broken down into sections within each of which the pulse amplitudes and phases are constant, or continuous, where the amplitudes and phases vary throughout the sequence.

The response of the nuclear spin system to the pulse sequence is described by the time evolution of the density operator  $\hat{\rho}(t)$  during the sequence. The coherent time evolution of  $\hat{\rho}(t)$  is governed by the Liouville–von Neumann equation:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar} \Big[\hat{H}(t), \hat{\rho}(t)\Big]. \tag{11.2}$$

Note that here we neglect the effects of incoherent processes such as relaxation. To include them in Eq. (11.2) we need to add an additional term, which for relaxation processes is described in Chapters 8 and 9. The solution to the Liouville–von Neumann equation in Eq. (11.2) has the general form

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \hat{U}(t,0)\hat{\rho}(0)\hat{U}(t,0)^{-1},$$
(11.3)

where  $\widehat{U}(t,0)$  is the propagator corresponding to  $\widehat{H}(t)$ . In general the expression for the Hamiltonian at an arbitrary time point  $t_1, \widehat{H}(t_1)$ , does not commute with the Hamiltonian evaluated at a second arbitrary time point  $t_2, \widehat{H}(t_2)$ . In this case the propagator describing the evolution between  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  has the general form

$$\widehat{U}(t_2, t_1) = \widehat{T} \exp\left(-\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathrm{d}t \,\widehat{H}(t)\right),\tag{11.4}$$

where  $\hat{T}$  is the Dyson time-ordering operator, which ensures that the events described by the Hamiltonian occur in the proper order. Whilst this form of the propagator is general it is not analytically useful, and further analysis of the sequence generally requires other methods such as average Hamiltonian theory [193] or Floquet theory [316–319]. However in certain special cases the propagator does reduce to a simpler and more useful form.

In the first case, if the Hamiltonian evaluated at an arbitrary time always commutes with the Hamiltonian at a second arbitrary time, the propagator is:

$$\widehat{U}(t_2, t_1) = \exp\left(-\frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathrm{d}t \,\widehat{H}(t)\right). \tag{11.5}$$

This situation is encountered in solid-state MAS NMR when the spin interactions contain only single-spin operators of rank  $\lambda$  and order zero  $\hat{I}_{\lambda 0}$ , such as the nuclear interactions discussed in Chapter 2,

during a period of free precession where there are no pulses, so that  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  is zero.

In the second case the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  is time-independent, and the propagator reduces to the simple form

$$\widehat{U}(t_2, t_1) = \exp\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar}\widehat{H}(t_2 - t_1)\right).$$
(11.6)

For example this situation is encountered in solution NMR, and the solid-state NMR of static systems, during periods of free precession. In NMR sequences where the time dependence due to the pulses is piecewise, the propagator describing the evolution during the whole sequence can be written as the product of propagators of the form of Eq. (11.6). For instance consider a sequence comprising two consecutive sections, which are labelled  $S_{12}$  and  $S_{23}$  respectively. Section  $S_{12}$  starts at time  $t = t_1$  and ends at  $t_2$  and is described by the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{12}$ , and the second section  $S_{23}$  described by  $\hat{H}_{23}$  commences at  $t_2$  and continues until time  $t_3$ . The overall propagator describing the evolution of the spin system between times  $t_1$  and  $t_3$  is given by the product of the two propagators representing each sequence:

$$\hat{U}(t_3, t_1) = \hat{U}_{23}(t_3, t_2)\hat{U}_{12}(t_2, t_1)$$
  
=  $\exp\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar}\hat{H}_{23}(t_3 - t_2)\right)\exp\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar}\hat{H}_{12}(t_2 - t_1)\right).$  (11.7)

The equilibrium density operator  $\hat{\rho}_0$  represents the equilibrium state of the system in the absence of RF irradiation, and where there is no dynamic change due to the interactions of the spins with either the external magnetic field or each other. We therefore see that, from Eq. (11.2),  $\hat{\rho}_0$  must commute with the system Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_0(t)$ . We have seen that the nuclear-spin interactions are dominated by the Zeeman interaction, and so the general expression for  $\hat{\rho}_0$  is

$$\hat{\rho}_0 = \frac{\exp(-\beta H_Z)}{\operatorname{Tr}_I \left[\exp(-\beta \widehat{H}_Z)\right]}$$
(11.8)

$$= \frac{\exp(\beta \hbar \gamma_I B_0 \widehat{I}_z)}{\operatorname{Tr}_I \left[ \exp(\beta \hbar \gamma_I B_0 \widehat{I}_z) \right]}.$$
(11.9)

In the high-temperature limit we expand the exponentials to firstorder in a Taylor series, and obtain the following expression for  $\hat{\rho}_0$ :

$$\hat{\rho}_0 \approx \frac{\hat{1} + \beta h \gamma_l B_0 \hat{l}_z}{2l+1}.$$
(11.10)

The first term in  $\hat{1}$  commutes with all Hamiltonians, does not produce any observable signal, and so we can ignore it. The second is proportional to  $\hat{I}_z$  and has a magnitude  $\hbar\gamma_I B_0/((2I+1)kT)$ . The maximum amplitude of the observable signal following excitation is equal to this factor, and so we see that we obtain higher sensitivity for nuclei with larger gyromagnetic ratios, and under conditions of larger applied magnetic fields and lower temperatures. In practice, when analysing pulse sequences, we usually ignore this factor and write  $\hat{\rho}_0 = \hat{I}_z$ .

#### 11.1.2. Radiofrequency pulses and sequences

A general RF pulse of duration  $\tau_p$  with a time-dependent RF field amplitude  $\omega_1(t)$  and phase  $\phi_1(t)$  applied to a nuclear spin *I* has the following Hamiltonian:

$$\widehat{H}_{1}(t) = \omega_{1}(t)\widehat{R}_{z}(\phi_{1}(t))\widehat{I}_{x}\widehat{R}_{z}(\phi_{1}(t))^{-1}$$
(11.11)

$$=\omega_{1}(t) \left[ \cos{(\phi_{1}(t))} \widehat{I}_{x} + \sin{(\phi_{1}(t))} \widehat{I}_{y} \right], \qquad (11.12)$$

where  $\widehat{R}_a(\phi) = \exp\left(-i\phi\widehat{I}_a\right)$  is the unitary operator that represents a rotation of the spin operator in spin space through an angle  $\phi$  about
an axis *a*. The propagator representing the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  at arbitrary time takes the general form in Eq. (11.4). Neglecting the spin interactions in  $\hat{H}_0(t)$  and considering only the effect of  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  during the pulse, the net evolution can be represented as an overall rotation through a net angle  $\xi$  about a net axis with orientation relative to *z* specified by the spherical polar angles  $(\theta, \phi)$ . The propagator that describes this net transformation due to the sequence  $\hat{U}_{seq}$  then has the form

$$\widehat{U}_{seq} = \widehat{R}_z(\phi)\widehat{R}_y(\theta)\widehat{R}_z(\xi)\widehat{R}_y(\theta)^{-1}\widehat{R}_z(\phi)^{-1}.$$
(11.13)

In the case where both the amplitude  $\omega_1$  and phase  $\phi_1$  are constant during the pulse, the net pulse propagator is

$$\widehat{U}_{\text{seq}} = \widehat{R}_z(\phi_1)\widehat{R}_z(\xi_1)\widehat{R}_z(\phi_1)^{-1}, \qquad (11.14)$$

where  $\xi_1 = \omega_1 \tau_p$  is the flip angle of the pulse.

### 11.1.3. The spin interactions

We recall that the internal spin interactions are treated as perturbations to the nuclear Zeeman interaction, that the Zeeman Hamiltonian is removed from  $\hat{H}_0(t)$ , and that the remaining system Hamiltonians are calculated using the secular approximation [184]. The particular spin interactions with which we concern ourselves in this chapter are the secular chemical shift and quadrupolar interactions to second order. Hence all the terms in  $\hat{H}_0(t)$ commute with each other at all times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , i.e.  $\left[\hat{H}_0(t_2), \hat{H}_0(t_1)\right] = 0$ . The total Hamiltonian is written as a sum of terms due to different interactions, each of which is the product of a spatial tensor  $K_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$  of space rank *l*, and a spin tensor operator  $\hat{I}_{i0}^{(\Lambda)}$  of spin rank  $\lambda$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{0}(t) = \sum_{\Lambda,L\delta} K_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t) \widehat{I}_{\lambda0}^{(\Lambda)}, \qquad (11.15)$$

where  $\Lambda$  labels the distinct interactions. We note that the space tensor components  $K_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$  are generally time-dependent if sample rotation is employed, and are time-independent otherwise. We also point out that for some interactions different spatial tensors of the same space rank may couple to spin tensors of different spin ranks. For example in the case of the second-order quadrupolar interaction there are two spatial tensors of space rank zero, one of which couples to the rank-one spin tensor and the other of which couples to the rank-three spin tensor. These two spatial tensors are different, and so we also indicate a dependence of  $K_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$  on  $\lambda$  via the subscript. Likewise there are two spatial tensors of ranks two that couple to the spin tensors of ranks one and three, and also two rankfour spatial tensors. To facilitate the calculation of the frequencies of evolution under  $\hat{H}_0(t)$  we rewrite the Hamiltonian in terms of the frequency components  $\Omega_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$  and reduced spin tensor operators  $\hat{t}_{i0}^{(\Lambda)}$  as follows:

$$\widehat{H}_{0}(t) = \hbar \sum_{\Lambda, l, \lambda} \Omega_{\lambda, l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t) \widehat{t}_{\lambda 0}^{(\Lambda)}.$$
(11.16)

The reduced tensor operators are given in terms of the  $\widehat{I}_{i0}^{(\Lambda)}$  by

$$\hat{t}_{\lambda 0}^{(\Lambda)} = N_{\lambda 0}^{(\Lambda)} \widehat{I}_{\lambda 0}^{(\Lambda)}, \qquad (11.17)$$

where  $N_{\lambda 0}^{(\Lambda)}$  are normalizing factors that are equal to

$$N_{00}^{(\Lambda)} = 1, \qquad N_{10}^{(\Lambda)} = 1, \qquad N_{20}^{(\Lambda)} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}, \qquad N_{00}^{(\Lambda)} = \frac{\sqrt{10}}{3}.$$
 (11.18)

The operators therefore have the expressions

$$\hat{t}_{00} = \hat{1},$$
 (11.19)

$$t_{10} = I_z,$$
 (11.20)

$$\hat{t}_{20} = \hat{I}_z^2 - \frac{1}{3}I(I+1)\hat{1}, \qquad (11.21)$$

$$\hat{t}_{30} = \frac{1}{3} \Big[ 5\hat{I}_z^3 - (3I(I+1) - 1)\hat{I}_z \Big].$$
(11.22)

The frequency components are related to the spatial tensor components via

$$K_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t) = \hbar N_{\lambda 0}^{(\Lambda)} \Omega_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t).$$
(11.23)

For the one-spin interactions that we have so far considered the frequencies of the components with different spatial and spin ranks are given in Table 11.1.

The overall propagator  $\widehat{U}_0(t_2, t_1)$  that describes the time evolution of the density operator under these interactions, in the absence of RF irradiation, is

$$\widehat{U}_{0}(t_{2},t_{1}) = \exp\left(-\frac{i}{\hbar}\int_{t_{1}}^{t_{2}}dt\,\widehat{H}_{0}(t)\right).$$
(11.24)

Remembering the commutation properties of all the terms of  $\hat{H}_0(t)$ , we can write  $\hat{U}_0(t_2, t_1)$  as

$$\widehat{U}_0(t_2, t_1) = \prod_{\Lambda, l, \lambda} \exp\left(-i\Phi_{\lambda, l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t_2, t_1)\widehat{t}_{\lambda 0}^{(\Lambda)}\right), \qquad (11.25)$$

where the phase factor  $\Phi_{\lambda,l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t_2,t_1)$  is the integral of the frequency  $\Omega_{\lambda,l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$  between times  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ :

$$\Phi_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t_2,t_1) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \mathrm{d}t \,\Omega_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t). \tag{11.26}$$

We note that in this case the order of multiplication of the terms in Eq. (11.25) does not matter as all the Hamiltonian terms commute with each other.

### Table 11.1

The frequency components  $\Omega_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}$  occurring in the Hamiltonian for certain nuclear spin interactions  $\Lambda$  arising from the different combinations of space ranks l and spin ranks  $\lambda$ .

Interaction $\Lambda$	λ		$\Omega^{(\Lambda)}_{\lambda, 0}$	
		l = 0	<i>l</i> = 2	l = 4
1st-order quadrupolar	2	-	$\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\omega_{Q}\nu_{20}$	-
1st-order chemical shielding	1	$-\omega_0\sigma_{ m iso}$	$-\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\omega_0\sigma_{20}$	-
2nd-order quad-quad	1	$4\omega_{Q}^{2}[4I(I+1)-3]w_{00}^{(Q,Q)}/(45\sqrt{5}\omega_{0})$	$2\omega_Q^2[4I(I+1)-3]w_{20}^{(Q,Q)}/\left(45\sqrt{14}\omega_0 ight)$	$-2\omega_{Q}^{2}[4I(I+1)-3]w_{40}^{(Q,Q)}/\Big(15\sqrt{70}\omega_{0}\Big)$
	3	$4\omega_Q^2w_{00}^{(Q,Q)}/\Bigl(5\sqrt{5}\omega_0\Bigr)$	$-4\sqrt{2}\omega_{ ext{Q}}^{2}w_{20}^{(Q,Q)}/ig(5\sqrt{7}\omega_{0}ig)$	$-204\omega_{Q}^{2}w_{40}^{(Q,Q)}/\Big(45\sqrt{70}\omega_{0}\Big)$
2nd-order quad-shield	2	$-2\omega_{\rm Q}w_{00}^{({\rm C2},{ m Q})}/\sqrt{5}$	$\omega_{\rm Q} \Big[ \sqrt{2} w_{20}^{({\rm C1},{\rm Q})} + \sqrt{2/7} w_{20}^{({\rm C2},{\rm Q})} \Big]$	$4\sqrt{2/35}\omega_{Q}w_{40}^{(C2,Q)}$
2nd-order shield-shield	1	$\omega_0 \Big[ \sqrt{1/12} w_{00}^{(C1,C1)} + \sqrt{1/20} w_{00}^{(C2,C2)} \Big]$	$\omega_0 \Big[ \sqrt{1/24} w_{20}^{(C1,C1)} - \sqrt{1/2} w_{20}^{(C1,C2)} - \sqrt{1/56} w_{20}^{(C2,C2)} \Big]$	$-\omega_0\sqrt{2/35}w_{40}^{(C2,C2)}$

SN

### 11.1.4. Basis operators

The nuclear spin wavefunction of a single nuclear spin *I* is conveniently written as a linear combination of 2I + 1 basis functions. These basis functions are usually taken to be the eigenfunctions of the Zeeman Hamiltonian  $|IM\rangle$ , which are orthonormal:

$$\langle IM_1 | IM_2 \rangle = \delta_{M_1, M_2}. \tag{11.27}$$

In addition the description of the nuclear spin dynamics is facilitated by writing the density operator as a superposition of basis operators  $\{\widehat{B}_i\}$ , of which there are  $(2l + 1)^2$  and which are chosen to be orthogonal according to

$$\left(\widehat{B}_{i}|\widehat{B}_{j}\right) = \operatorname{Tr}_{l}\left(\widehat{B}_{i}^{\dagger}\widehat{B}_{j}\right) \tag{11.28}$$

$$= N\delta_{ii}, \tag{11.29}$$

where N is a normalization factor.

Of course there is a choice of several bases. One common basis is the set of irreducible spherical tensor operators  $\{\hat{I}_{\lambda\mu}\}$  of ranks  $\lambda$ from 0 to 2*I*, and orders  $\mu$  from  $-\lambda$  to  $+\lambda$ , in integer steps [191]. These operators have been used extensively in this review for both nuclear and electronic spins. However for the subsequent discussion we adopt the single-element basis operators, which are denoted  $\{|IM_1\rangle\langle IM_2|\}$ . These operators are so-called because in the Zeeman function basis each operator represents a single element of the density matrix. The single-element basis operators can be grouped as follows. There are 2I + 1 operators for which  $M_1 = M_2$ , and which represent the populations of the corresponding states. We refer to these as population operators and denote them  $\widehat{I}_p^{(M)}$ :

$$\widehat{I}_{\mathbf{p}}^{(M)} = |IM\rangle\langle IM|. \tag{11.30}$$

The remaining 2I(2I + 1) operators each represent a coherence between two different states. Half of these have  $M_1 < M_2$ , and are referred to as lowering operators  $\widehat{I}_{-}^{(M_2,M_1)}$ . They are given by

$$\widehat{I}_{-}^{(M_2,M_1)} = |IM_1\rangle\langle IM_2|.$$
(11.31)

The remaining coherence operators have  $M_1 > M_2$  and are referred to as raising operators  $\widehat{I}^{(M_1,M_2)}_{\perp}$ :

$$\widehat{I}_{+}^{(M_1,M_2)} = |IM_1\rangle \langle IM_2|.$$
(11.32)

These basis operators can be used to write down expressions for other operators. For example the Cartesian operators  $\{\hat{1}, \hat{I}_z, \hat{I}_-, \hat{I}_+\}$  are given by:

$$\hat{1} = \sum_{M=-I}^{+I} \widehat{I}_{p}^{(M)}, \tag{11.33}$$

$$\widehat{I}_{z} = \sum_{M=-I}^{+I} M \widehat{I}_{p}^{(M)}, \qquad (11.34)$$

$$\widehat{I}_{-} = \sum_{M=-I+1}^{+I} \sqrt{I(I+1) - M(M-1)} \widehat{I}_{-}^{(M,M-1)}, \qquad (11.35)$$

$$\widehat{I}_{+} = \sum_{M=-I}^{+I-1} \sqrt{I(I+1) - M(M+1)} \widehat{I}_{+}^{(M+1,M)}.$$
(11.36)

We see that both  $\hat{1}$  and  $\hat{l}_z$  are written in terms of the 2I + 1 population operators. The identity operator represents the total population of all the spin states, and remains invariant as required. The operator  $\hat{l}_z$  represents the differences in populations of the spin states. The operator  $\hat{l}_-$  is written in terms of the 2I coherence operators  $\hat{I}_-^{(M,M-1)}$  with  $M_1 - M_2 = -1$ , and so represents nuclear spin

magnetization in the transverse plane. Likewise  $\hat{I}_+$  is written in terms of the 2*I* coherence operators  $\hat{I}_+^{(M+1,M)}$  with  $M_1 - M_2 = +1$ .

## 11.1.5. NMR frequencies and spin order

In order to make use of the advantages afforded by decomposing the density operator into a sum of basis operators, we need to determine how each basis operator evolves under the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_0(t)$  that describes the internal spin interactions. We do this by calculating the evolution over time of a single basis operator  $\hat{\rho}(0) = |IM_i\rangle\langle IM_j|$  subject to a single term in the Hamiltonian with a particular space-rank and spin-rank. The propagator is given by a single factor from Eq. (11.25). Applying this to  $\hat{\rho}(0)$  and allowing the system to evolve we obtain the density operator  $\hat{\rho}(t)$  at time t:

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \exp\left(-i\Phi^{(\Lambda)}_{\lambda,l0}(t,0)\hat{t}_{\lambda0}\right)\hat{\rho}(0)\exp\left(+i\Phi^{(\Lambda)}_{\lambda,l0}(t,0)\hat{t}_{\lambda0}\right),\tag{11.37}$$

where we have dropped the superscript (A) from the reduced spherical tensor spin operator  $\hat{t}_{\lambda 0}$  as these operators are the same for all one-spin interactions. The spin states  $|IM_i\rangle$  are also eigenstates of the operators  $\hat{t}_{\lambda 0}$ , and so we can determine  $\hat{\rho}(t)$  in a straightforward manner:

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \exp\left(-i\Phi_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t,0)\hat{t}_{\lambda0}\right)|IM_i\rangle\langle IM_j|\exp\left(+i\Phi_{\lambda,0}^{(\Lambda)}(t,0)\hat{t}_{\lambda0}\right) \quad (11.38)$$

$$= \exp\left(-i\Xi_{\lambda,M_iM_j}\Phi_{\lambda,l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t,0)\right)|IM_i\rangle\langle IM_j|.$$
(11.39)

We see that the basis operator simply acquires a phase  $-\Xi_{\lambda,M_iM_j}\Phi_{\lambda,l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t,0)$  that is proportional to the intrinsic phase  $\Phi_{\lambda,l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t,0)$  of the interaction, multiplied by a factor  $\Xi_{\lambda,M_iM_j}$  that is given by

$$\Xi_{\lambda,M_iM_i} = \langle IM_i | \hat{t}_{\lambda 0} | IM_i \rangle - \langle IM_j | \hat{t}_{\lambda 0} | IM_j \rangle.$$
(11.40)

The factor  $\Xi_{\lambda,M_iM_j}$  is the spin-order of rank  $\lambda$  that defines the singleelement basis operator  $|IM_i\rangle\langle IM_j|$  [320]. The spin orders of ranks 0, 1, 2, and 3 are given the symbols  $s_{M_iM_j}$ ,  $p_{M_iM_j}$ ,  $d_{M_iM_j}$ , and  $f_{M_iM_j}$  in analogy with the hydrogen-like atomic orbitals in electronic structure theory [320]. They take the forms:

$$I_{iM_i} = \Xi_{0,M_iM_i} \tag{11.41}$$

$$=0, (11.42)$$

$$p_{M_i M_j} = \Xi_{1, M_i M_j} \tag{11.43}$$

$$= M_i - M_j, \tag{11.44}$$

$$d_{M,M_i} = \Xi_{2,M,M_i} \tag{11.45}$$

$$= M_i^2 - M_i^2.$$
(11.45)  
= M\_i^2 - M\_i^2. (11.46)

$$f_{M_iM_i} = \Xi_{3,M_iM_i}$$
 (11.47)

$$= \frac{1}{3} \left[ 5 \left( M_i^3 - M_j^3 \right) - (3I(I+1) - 1)(M_i - M_j) \right].$$
(11.48)

The *s*-order  $s_{M_iM_j}$  is associated with the identity operator and does not affect the evolution of the density operator, so we do not consider it further. The *p*-order  $p_{M_iM_j}$  is also known as coherence order, which is an important concept in signal selection in multiple-pulse NMR experiments [321]. The rank-two spin order  $d_{M_iM_j}$  is known as either *d*-order or satellite order [322]. Finally the rank-three order  $f_{M_iM_j}$  is referred to as *f*-order. If for a particular interaction the Hamiltonian term of a particular space rank *l* is associated with more than one spin rank  $\lambda$ , we can use the spin-order defined in Eq. (11.40) to define a total frequency  $\Omega_{[0M,M_i}^{(\Lambda)}(t)$  that depends only on *l*:

$$\Omega^{(\Lambda)}_{l0,M_iM_j}(t) = -\sum_{\lambda} \Xi_{\lambda,M_iM_j} \Omega^{(\Lambda)}_{\lambda,l0}(t).$$
(11.49)

For the interactions considered here this only applies to the secondorder quadrupolar interaction, where the terms of spatial ranks 0, 2, and 4 are each associated with two spin ranks 1 and 3. For this interaction we can write the frequencies in Eq. (11.49) for the three space ranks l = 0, 2, and 4 in terms of the *c*-order parameters  $c_{l,M_iM_j}$ , which are given by:

$$c_{0,M_iM_j} = \frac{9}{5} f_{M_iM_j} + \frac{4I(I+1) - 3}{5} p_{M_iM_j}, \qquad (11.50)$$

$$c_{2,M_iM_j} = -\frac{18}{5} f_{M_iM_j} + \frac{4I(I+1)-3}{10} p_{M_iM_j},$$
(11.51)

$$c_{4,M_iM_j} = -\frac{51}{5} f_{M_iM_j} - \frac{3[4I(I+1)-3]}{10} p_{M_iM_j}.$$
(11.52)

For all the one-spin interactions in Table 11.1, the frequencies defined in Eq. (11.49) are given in Table 11.2.

Using these definitions we can write down the evolution of the density operator term  $|IM_i\rangle\langle IM_j|$  under the action of a Hamiltonian term corresponding to a particular interaction  $\Lambda$  and space rank l summed over the relevant spin ranks  $\lambda$ . The result is:

$$\hat{\rho}(t) = \exp\left(i\Phi_{l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(t,0)\right)|IM_i\rangle\langle IM_j|,\tag{11.53}$$

$$\Phi_{l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(t_2,t_1) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} dt \,\Omega_{l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(t).$$
(11.54)

The accrued phase factor  $\Phi_{l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(t,0)$  is simply the time integral of the frequency component.

During signal detection in the NMR experiment we acquire the two transverse components of the bulk nuclear magnetization,  $M_x$  and  $M_y$ , simultaneously using quadrature detection, and combine them into a single quadrature quantity  $M_+ = M_x + iM_y$ . The magnetization components  $M_x$  and  $M_y$  are proportional to the expectation values of  $\hat{I}_x$  and  $\hat{I}_y$ . Hence the quantity  $M_+$  is proportional to the expectation value of  $\hat{I}_+$ , and so the signal s(t) is given by

$$s(t) = \frac{\operatorname{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{+}\widehat{\rho}(t)\right)}{\operatorname{Tr}_{I}\left(\widehat{I}_{+}\widehat{I}_{-}\right)}.$$
(11.55)

The only term of the density operator that contributes to the trace in the numerator is  $\hat{I}_{-}$ , which we see from Eq. (11.35) represents the sum of the basis operators of coherence (*p*-) order –1. Each operator  $\hat{I}_{-}^{(M,M-1)}$  contributing to  $\hat{I}_{-}$  evolves under a characteristic frequency to accrue a phase  $\Phi_{I0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda)}(t,0)$ , which gives the following expression for  $\hat{\rho}(t)$ :

$$\sum_{M=-I+1}^{+I} \widehat{I}_{-}^{(M,M-1)} \sqrt{I(I+1) - M(M-1)} \exp\left(i\Phi_{I_0,M-1,M}^{(A)}(t,0)\right). \quad (11.56)$$

Following summation over all relevant interactions  $\Lambda$ , we obtain the following signal in the time domain:

$$s(t) = \frac{3}{2I(I+1)(2I+1)} \sum_{M=-l+1}^{+l} [I(I+1) - M(M-1)] \\ \times \prod_{\Lambda} \exp\left(i\Phi_{I0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda)}(t,0)\right).$$
(11.57)

We see that a nuclear spin *I* has 2*I* observable signal components, which in general evolve with different frequencies to give 2*I* distinct peaks in the NMR spectrum.

### 11.1.6. Solution NMR

In the absence of sample rotation the frequency components  $\Omega_{IO,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}$  are time-independent, and are related to the PAF components of the irreducible spherical spatial tensor in its PAF  $\widetilde{K}_{\lambda,lm'}^{(\Lambda)}$  by the expression

$$\Omega_{I0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)} = -\sum_{\lambda} \frac{\Xi_{\lambda,M_iM_j}}{\hbar N_{\lambda0}^{(\Lambda)}} \sum_{mm'} \widetilde{K}_{\lambda,lm'}^{(\Lambda)} D_{m'm}^{(l)}(\Omega_{\Lambda C}) D_{m0}^{(l)}(\Omega_{CL}).$$
(11.58)

The Euler angles  $\Omega_{AC}$  describe the orientation of the PAF  $\Lambda$  in a frame of reference that is fixed relative to the molecular geometry in molecular systems, or the crystal geometry for solid crystals C. The  $\Omega_{AC}$  are a fixed property of the system under study. The Euler angles  $\Omega_{CL}$  give the orientation of the crystal/molecular-fixed reference frame relative to the laboratory reference frame L, and so depend on the orientation of that particular crystal or molecule in the sample container. We see that for static systems at high field the frequency depends only on two of the Euler angles,  $\alpha_{CL}$  and  $\beta_{CL}$ , of the latter set.

In an isotropic solution of molecules, there are no restrictions on the orientations that the molecules, and therefore the PAFs of the interaction tensors, are able to take. Furthermore the molecules are tumbling rapidly in comparison to the Larmor frequency, so that each molecule samples all possible orientations, resulting in the overall frequency component being given simply by the orientational average over the Euler angles ( $\alpha_{CL}$ ,  $\beta_{CL}$ ,  $\gamma_{CL}$ ). The orientational dependence is contained wholly within the Wigner rotation matrix elements  $D_{m0}^{(l)}(\alpha_{CL}, \beta_{CL}, \gamma_{CL})$ , and so the relevant integral is

$$\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} d\alpha_{\rm CL} \int_0^{\pi} d\beta_{\rm CL} \sin(\beta_{\rm CL}) \int_0^{2\pi} d\gamma_{\rm CL} D_{m0}^{(l)}(\alpha_{\rm CL}, \beta_{\rm CL}, \gamma_{\rm CL}) = \delta_{l0} \delta_{m0},$$
(11.59)

which we have simplified using the orthogonality relations of the  $D_{mm'}^{(l)}(\alpha_{\text{CL}}, \beta_{\text{CL}}, \gamma_{\text{CL}})$ . We see that the only terms that survive the orientational averaging are those of rank l = 0, which are, by definition, the isotropic terms. Each term in the density operator therefore evolves under a total isotropic frequency  $\Omega_{\text{iso},M,M_i}$ , which is given

#### Table 11.2

```
The frequency components \Omega_{0,0,M,I}^{(\Lambda)} from different nuclear spin interactions \Lambda for different space ranks l, given in terms of the spin orders \Xi_{\lambda,M,M_i}.
```

	. ,			
Interaction $\Lambda$	λ	$\Omega_{l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}$		
		l = 0	l = 2	l = 4
1st-order quadrupolar	2	-	$-d_{M_iM_j}\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\omega_{ m Q}  u_{ m 20}$	-
1st-order chemical shielding	1	$p_{M_iM_j}\omega_0\sigma_{ m iso}$	$p_{M_iM_j}\sqrt{rac{2}{3}}\omega_0\sigma_{20}$	-
2nd-order quad-quad	1,3	$-c_{0,M_{i}M_{j}}4\omega_{Q}^{2}w_{00}^{(Q,Q)}/\Big(9\sqrt{5}\omega_{0}\Big)$	$-c_{2,M_iM_j}4\omega_Q^2w_{20}^{(Q,Q)}/\left(9\sqrt{14}\omega_0 ight)$	$-c_{4,M_iM_j}4\omega_Q^2 w_{40}^{(Q,Q)}/\Big(9\sqrt{70}\omega_0\Big)$
2nd-order quad-shield	2	$d_{M_iM_j} 2\omega_Q w_{00}^{(C2,Q)}/\sqrt{5}$	$-d_{M_iM_j}\omega_Q \Big[\sqrt{2}w_{20}^{(C1,Q)} + \sqrt{2/7}w_{20}^{(C2,Q)}\Big]$	$-d_{M_iM_j}4\sqrt{2/35}\omega_Q w_{40}^{(C2,Q)}$
2nd-order shield-shield	1	$-p_{M_iM_j}\omega_0 \Big[\sqrt{1/12}w_{00}^{(C1,C1)} + \sqrt{1/20}w_{00}^{(C2,C2)}\Big]$	$-p_{M_iM_j}\omega_0 \Big[ \sqrt{1/24} w_{20}^{(C1,C1)} - \sqrt{1/2} w_{20}^{(C1,C2)} - \sqrt{1/56} w_{20}^{(C2,C2)} \Big]$	$p_{M_iM_j}\omega_0\sqrt{2/35}w_{40}^{(C2,C2)}$

by sum of the isotropic first-order shift frequency  $\Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(C)}$ , the second-order isotropic quadrupolar frequency  $\Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(Q,Q)}$ , the second-order isotropic frequency due to the cross-term between the quadrupolar and shift interactions  $\Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(Q,C)}$ , and the second-order isotropic shift frequency  $\Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(C,C)}$ .

$$\Omega_{\text{iso},M_iM_j} = \Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(C)} + \Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(Q,Q)} + \Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(Q,C)} + \Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(C,C)}.$$
(11.60)

Therefore the total phase acquired during signal acquisition is simply  $\Omega_{iso,M_iM_j}t$ :

$$\Omega_{\text{iso},M_iM_j}t = \left[\Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(C)} + \Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(Q,Q)} + \Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(Q,C)} + \Omega_{00,M_iM_j}^{(C,C)}\right]t.$$
 (11.61)

## 11.1.7. Solid-state NMR of static powders

In a solid sample with no tumbling the frequency components  $\Omega_{l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}$  are given by Eq. (11.58), with all spatial ranks contributing. In a single crystal the evolution frequency depends on the crystal orientation through the pair of Euler angles ( $\alpha_{\text{CL}}$ ,  $\beta_{\text{CL}}$ ). The corresponding time-domain signal is  $s(\alpha_{\text{CL}}, \beta_{\text{CL}}; t)$ , which is given by

$$s(\alpha_{\rm CL}, \beta_{\rm CL}; t) = \frac{3}{2I(I+1)(2I+1)} \sum_{M=-I+1}^{+I} [I(I+1) - M(M-1)] \times \prod_{\Lambda} \exp\left(i\Omega_{I0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda)}(\alpha_{\rm CL}, \beta_{\rm CL})t\right),$$
(11.62)

and which gives a spectrum containing 2*I* distinct lines. The spectral positions of all these lines are, in general, orientation-dependent, varying with the crystal orientation.

If we have an ensemble of such crystallites with random orientations, such as in a solid powder, the total signal s(t) is the average over all orientations ( $\alpha_{CL}$ ,  $\beta_{CL}$ ) of the individual signals  $s(\alpha_{CL}, \beta_{CL}; t)$ . For a large ensemble of crystallites this average is given by the double integral

$$s(t) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\alpha_{\rm CL} \int_0^{\pi} d\beta_{\rm CL} \sin(\beta_{\rm CL}) s(\alpha_{\rm CL}, \beta_{\rm CL}; t).$$
(11.63)

The resulting NMR spectrum therefore contains a continuum of spectral intensity the width and shape of which is defined by the anisotropies  $\Delta K$  and asymmetry parameters  $\eta^{\kappa}$  of the interactions. Hence the anisotropic interactions result in resonance broadening, with the centre of mass of the resonance located at the isotropic frequency.

## 11.1.8. Solid-state NMR of spinning powders

In a spinning solid sample the Euler angles that specify the orientation of the crystal in the laboratory frame are time-dependent [323]. To recognise this we define the orientation of the PAF in the laboratory frame via three frame transformations, each of which is associated with its own set of Euler angles. As for static samples we first specify the orientation of the PAF  $\Lambda$  in the crystal-fixed frame C with the Euler angles  $\Omega_{\Lambda C}$ , which are fixed according to the geometry of the system. Secondly we specify the orientation of the crystal frame in a rotor-fixed frame R with Euler angles  $\Omega_{CR}$ . This second set of angles changes as we change the orientation of the crystal in the sample container, and so are the angles we average over in a powder. Finally the orientation of the rotor frame relative to the laboratory frame L is defined by a set of time-dependent Euler angles  $\Omega_{RL}(t)$ . If the spinning axis of the rotor is inclined at a fixed angle  $\beta_{RL}$  relative to the external magnetic field, and the rotor spins at frequency  $\omega_{\mathrm{r}}$  from an initial angular position  $\alpha_{RL}(0)$ , this set of Euler angles is  $\Omega_{RL}(t) = (\alpha_{RL}(0) + \omega_r t, \beta_{RL}, 0)$ . We can now rewrite the frequencies  $\Omega_{c,l0,M,M_i}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t)$  as Fourier series [324]

$$\Omega_{c,l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t) = \sum_{m=-l}^{+l} \omega_{c,lm,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR}) \exp\left(-im\omega_{r}t\right),$$
(11.64)

where the coefficients  $\omega_{c,lm,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR})$  are frequencies that are given by the following expression:

$$\begin{split} \omega_{c,lm,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR}) &= -\exp(-im\alpha_{RL}(0)) \, d_{m0}^{(l)}(\beta_{RL}) \\ &\times \sum_{\lambda} \frac{\Xi_{\lambda,M_{i}M_{j}}}{\hbar N_{\lambda0}^{(\Lambda)}} \sum_{m'm'} \widetilde{K}_{lm'}^{(\Lambda)} D_{m'm'}^{(l)}(\Omega_{\Lambda C}) D_{m'm}^{(l)}(\Omega_{CR}). \end{split}$$
(11.65)

The frequency is periodic over the rotor period  $\tau_r = 2\pi/\omega_r$ . Note that, although the expression in Eq. (11.64) is a sum of complex plane waves, the frequencies are in fact real. This is because the coefficients in Eq. (11.65) satisfy  $\omega_{c,l-m,M,M_j}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR}) = \omega_{c,lm,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR})^*$ , and so the terms in the sum with  $m \neq 0$  form conjugate pairs, and the remaining term with m = 0 is real. At this point it is useful to introduce the concept of a carousel c, which is a subset of crystallites that during the sample rotation occupy the same orientations but at different times. As shown by Levitt a single carousel contains crystallites with the same Euler angles  $\alpha_{CR}$  and  $\beta_{CR}$ , but different  $\gamma_{CR}$  [325]. Therefore the dependence of the frequencies and phases on  $\alpha_{CR}$  and  $\beta_{CR}$  is indicated with a subscript c, while the dependence on  $\gamma_{CR}$  is given explicitly. From Eq. (11.65) the  $\gamma_{CR}$ -dependence has the simple form:

$$\omega_{c,lm,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR}) = \omega_{c,lm,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(0) \exp(-im\gamma_{CR}).$$
(11.66)

In Eq. (11.64) we see that a frequency component of spatial rank *l* comprises 2l + 1 components *m* that oscillate at frequencies  $-m\omega_r$ . This proves to be important when calculating the signal from a powder sample. We see that the component with m = 0 is time-independent, and corresponds to a constant frequency. In particular we note that the time-independent coefficient with m = 0 is also independent of  $\gamma_{CR}$ .

The phase  $\Phi_{c,I0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR}; t_2, t_1)$  accrued during evolution under the Hamiltonian is calculated from the time integral of the frequency in Eq. (11.64):

$$\Phi_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t_{2},t_{1}) = \omega_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}(t_{2}-t_{1}) + \sum_{m\neq0} \frac{\omega_{c,lm,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR})}{-im\omega_{r}} \times [\exp(-im\omega_{r}t_{2}) - \exp(-im\omega_{r}t_{1})]. \quad (11.67)$$

The phase is the sum of a part due to the time-independent frequency, and another part due to the time-dependent and periodic frequency. The complex exponential phase factor due to the latter is both periodic and cyclic, and so can be written as a complex Fourier series. The combined phase factor is then  $\exp\left(i\Phi_{c,ID,M,M_i}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t,0)\right)$ :

$$\exp\left(\mathrm{i}\Phi_{\mathrm{c},\mathrm{l}0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{\mathrm{CR}};t,0)\right) = \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\omega_{\mathrm{c},\mathrm{l}0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}t\right)\sum_{\mu=-\infty}^{+\infty}A_{\mathrm{c},\mathrm{l}0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{\mathrm{CR}})$$
$$\times \exp\left[\mathrm{i}\phi_{\mathrm{c},\mathrm{l}0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{\mathrm{CR}})\right]\exp\left[\mathrm{i}\mu\omega_{\mathrm{r}}t\right].$$
(11.68)

The complex coefficients of the Fourier series have magnitudes  $A_{c,l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{CR})$  and phases  $\phi_{c,l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}$ . The evolution under the periodic part of the Hamiltonian therefore results in a spectral resonance that is split into a manifold of spinning sidebands. The  $\mu$ th-order sideband appears at frequency  $\omega_{c,l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)} + \mu\omega_r$ , with an intensity  $A_{c,l0,M_iM_i}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{CR})$  and a phase  $\phi_{c,l0,M_iM_i}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{CR})$  that are given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ i\phi_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{CR}) \exp\left[ i\phi_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{CR}) \right] \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\tau_{r}} \int_{0}^{\tau_{r}} \exp\left[ i\sum_{m\neq 0} \frac{\omega_{c,lm,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR})}{-im\omega_{r}} \left[ \exp\left(-im\omega_{r}t\right) - 1 \right] \right] \\ & \times \exp\left[ -i\mu\omega_{r}t \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$
(11.69)

We can elucidate an important symmetry property relating to the dependence on  $\gamma_{CR}$  of the sideband intensities and phases, which was first described by Levitt [325]. Due to the  $\gamma_{CR}$ -dependence of the coefficients given in Eq. (11.66) we deduce that the frequency component at time *t* of a crystallite with angle  $\gamma_{CR}$  is equal to the frequency of a different crystallite with  $\gamma_{CR} = 0$  evaluated at time  $t + \gamma_{CR}/\omega_r$ :

$$\Omega_{c,0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t) = \Omega_{c,0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(0;t + \gamma_{CR}/\omega_r).$$
(11.70)

From this we can derive the following symmetry relation pertaining to the accrued phase:

$$\Phi_{c,l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t,0) = \Phi_{c,l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(0;t+\gamma_{CR}/\omega_r,0) - \Phi_{c,l0,M_iM_j}^{(\Lambda)}(0;\gamma_{CR}/\omega_r,0).$$
(11.71)

Substituting this into Eq. (11.68) we obtain

$$\exp\left(i\omega_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}t\right)\sum_{\mu=-\infty}^{+\infty}A_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{CR})\exp\left[i\phi_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{CR})\right]$$

$$\times\exp\left[i\mu\omega_{r}t\right]=\exp\left(i\omega_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}t\right)\sum_{\mu=-\infty}^{+\infty}A_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(0)$$

$$\times\exp\left[i\phi_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(0)\right]\exp\left[i\mu(\omega_{r}t+\gamma_{CR})\right]$$

$$\times\exp\left[-i\sum_{m\neq0}\frac{\omega_{c,lm,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}(0)}{-im\omega_{r}}\left[\exp\left(-im\gamma_{CR}\right)-1\right]\right],$$
(11.72)

from which we see that the sideband intensities are independent of  $\gamma_{\rm CR}$ , and the sideband phases have the following well-defined  $\gamma_{\rm CR}$  dependence:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{CR}) &= A_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(0) \equiv A_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}, \end{aligned} \tag{11.73} \\ \phi_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(\gamma_{CR}) &= \phi_{c,l0,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(0) + \mu\gamma_{CR} \\ &- \sum_{m \neq 0} \frac{\omega_{c,lm,M_{i}M_{j}}^{(\Lambda)}(0)}{-im\omega_{r}} [\exp(-im\gamma_{CR}) - 1]. \end{aligned} \tag{11.74}$$

Henceforth we denote the sideband intensity as  $A_{c,l0,M_i}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}$ .

The signal component due to evolution under the Hamiltonian of a particular interaction for a single crystal is

$$s_{c}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t) = \frac{3}{2I(I+1)(2I+1)} \sum_{M=-I+1}^{+I} [I(I+1) - M(M-1)] \\ \times \exp\left(i\Phi_{c,l0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t,0)\right).$$
(11.75)

The signal due to the whole powder is conveniently calculated in two steps. Firstly we average the signal  $s_c^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t)$  over all the  $\gamma_{CR}$  angles to obtain the signal  $\bar{s}_c^{(\Lambda)}(t)$  from carousel c:

$$\bar{s}_{\rm c}^{(\Lambda)}(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\gamma_{\rm CR} \, s_{\rm c}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{\rm CR}; t), \tag{11.76}$$

and secondly we average  $\bar{s}_c^{(\Lambda)}$  over the remaining Euler angles  $\alpha_{CR}$  and  $\beta_{CR}$  to obtain the signal from the whole powder  $s^{(\Lambda)}(t)$ :

$$s^{(\Lambda)}(t) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\alpha_{CR} \int_0^{\pi} d\beta_{CR} \sin(\beta_{CR}) \overline{s}_c^{(\Lambda)}(t).$$
(11.77)

For the first step we start from Eq. (11.72) and expand the final phase factor as a Fourier series:

$$\begin{split} S_{c}^{(\Lambda)}(\gamma_{CR};t) &= \frac{3}{2I(I+1)(2I+1)} \sum_{M=-I+1}^{+I} \left[ I(I+1) - M(M-1) \right] \\ &\times \exp\left( i\omega_{c,l0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda)} t \right) \sum_{\mu,\mu'=-\infty}^{+\infty} A_{c,l0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)} A_{c,l0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda),(\mu')} \\ &\times \exp\left[ i \left( \phi_{c,l0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}(0) - \phi_{c,l0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda),(\mu')}(0) \right) \right] \\ &\times \exp\left[ i \gamma_{CR}(\mu - \mu') \right] \exp\left[ i \mu \omega_{r} t \right]. \end{split}$$
(11.78)

Following integration over the angle  $\gamma_{CR}$  the only terms that remain are those with  $\mu = \mu'$ , which gives the following time-domain signal for the carousel:

$$\bar{s}_{c}^{(\Lambda)}(t) = \frac{3}{2I(I+1)(2I+1)} \sum_{M=-I+1}^{+I} [I(I+1) - M(M-1)] \\ \times \exp\left(i\omega_{c,l0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda)}t\right) \sum_{\mu=-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[A_{c,l0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}\right]^{2} \exp\left[i\mu\omega_{r}t\right].$$
(11.79)

All the sidebands have zero phase, and each has an intensity that is equal to the square of the corresponding single-crystal sideband intensity. Finally the signal from the whole powder is given by

$$S^{(\Lambda)}(t) = \frac{3}{2I(I+1)(2I+1)} \sum_{M=-I+1}^{+I} [I(I+1) - M(M-1)] \times \sum_{\mu=-\infty}^{+\infty} I_{\mu,M-1,M}(t) \exp[i\mu\omega_{\rm r}t], \qquad (11.80)$$

where the time-dependent sideband functions are given by

$$I_{\mu,M-1,M}(t) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} d\alpha_{CR} \int_{0}^{\pi} d\beta_{CR} \times \sin(\beta_{CR}) \exp\left(i\omega_{c,l0,M-1,M}^{(\Lambda)}t\right) \left[A_{c,l0,M_{l}M_{l}}^{(\Lambda),(\mu)}\right]^{2}.$$
 (11.81)

The overall effect on the powder spectrum of the sample rotation is twofold. Firstly the broad resonance due to the anisotropic interaction observed under static conditions is split into a manifold of spinning sidebands. Secondly the linewidth of each spinning sideband is given by the range of the static frequencies  $\omega_{c,l0}^{(\Lambda)}$  that we obtain following powder averaging. From Eq. (11.65) we see that these frequency components are proportional to the reduced Wigner matrix elements  $d_{00}^{(l)}(\beta_{RL})$ . For frequencies with l = 0 this factor is  $d_{00}^{(0)}(\beta_{RL}) = 1$ , indicating that these frequencies are unaffected by the sample rotation. This is exactly as expected as these frequencies are due to spatially isotropic interactions that are, by definition, independent of crystallite orientation. These frequencies always appear in the NMR spectrum, but do not cause any orientation-dependent broadening of the resonance. For anisotropic frequencies of rank l = 2 the scaling factor is:

$$d_{00}^{(2)}(\beta_{\rm RL}) = (3\cos^2(\beta_{\rm RL}) - 1)/2.$$
(11.82)

This factor, plotted as a function of  $\beta_{\text{RL}}$  in Fig. 11.1, is zero if we set the angle of the rotor axis  $\beta_{\text{RL}}$  to the magic angle, which is given by  $\tan^{-1}(\sqrt{2}) = 54.74^{\circ}$  [326,323]. Hence magic-angle spinning (MAS) completely removes the broadening of the spinning-sidebands from rank-two interactions.

Interactions of spatial rank l = 4 have static frequencies that are scaled down by

$$d_{00}^{(4)}(\beta_{\rm RL}) = \left(35\cos^4(\beta_{\rm RL}) - 30\cos^2(\beta_{\rm RL}) + 3\right)/8. \tag{11.83}$$

This factor is also plotted as a function of rotor angle in Fig. 11.1. Spinning at the magic angle does not completely remove these frequency components, which are instead scaled down by a factor of -7/18. Hence the broadening due to this spread of frequencies is decreased by the same factor. The matrix element  $d_{00}^{(4)}(\beta_{\rm RL})$  does have two angles at which it is zero, namely  $30.56^\circ$  and  $70.12^\circ$ , and inclining the rotor axis at either of these two angles has the result of completely removing the broadening due to rank-four interactions. However spinning at either of these two angles does not suppress the broadening due to the rank-two interactions, which are then scaled down by factors of 0.61 and -0.33 respectively.

### 11.2. The shift and shift anisotropy in paramagnetic NMR

### 11.2.1. The chemical shielding frequencies

The Hamiltonian describing the chemical shielding interaction, truncated to first order in the secular approximation, is given by Eq. (2.94) and reproduced here for convenience:

$$\widehat{H} = -\hbar\omega_0 \left( -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\sigma_{00} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\sigma_{20} \right) \widehat{I}_z.$$
(11.84)

The terms in parentheses combine to give the chemical shielding, the irreducible spherical tensor components of which transform under a spatial rotation according to

$$\sigma_{lm} = \sum_{m'=-l}^{+l} \widetilde{\sigma}_{lm'} D_{m'm}^{(l)}(\alpha_{PL}, \beta_{PL}, \gamma_{PL}).$$
(11.85)

The tensor is given in its most general form, without reference to the various contributions that are specific to the metal ion under consideration, or to the chemical environment. This enables us to highlight the features of the spectrum that are common to all paramagnetic systems. We do not consider the second-order shielding interaction, as it is predicted to be negligible compared to the other second-order interactions we have discussed.

From Table 11.2 we can write down the isotropic and anisotropic frequencies,  $\Omega_{iso,M_iM_j}$  and  $\Omega_{SA,M_iM_j}$ , under which a coherence represented by the basis operator  $|IM_i\rangle\langle IM_j|$  evolves, as:

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{iso},M_iM_j} = p_{M_iM_j}\omega_0\sigma_{\mathrm{iso}},\tag{11.86}$$

$$\Omega_{\text{SA},M_iM_j} = p_{M_iM_j} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \omega_0 \sigma_{20}. \tag{11.87}$$

For any nuclear spin *I* all the observable coherences have the same coherence order  $p_{M_iM_i} = -1$ , and so all 2*I* components in Eq. (11.57)



**Fig. 11.1.** Plot of the reduced Wigner rotation matrix elements  $d_{00}^{(2)}(\beta_{\text{RL}})$  and  $d_{00}^{(4)}(\beta_{\text{RL}})$  as a function of the rotor angle  $\beta_{\text{RL}}$ . The angles at which the broadening due to the rank-two and rank-four anisotropic interactions is completely removed by spinning are indicated by arrows.

evolve at the same isotropic and anisotropic frequencies, which we denote  $\Omega_{iso} = -\omega_0 \sigma_{iso}$  and  $\Omega_{SA} = -\omega_0 \left(\sqrt{2/3}\right) \sigma_{20}$ . If the chemical shielding is the only interaction present this means that the 2*I* components appear at the same position in the NMR spectrum, and so only a single distinct resonance is observed. This section therefore provides a complete description of the paramagnetic effects both for nuclear spins-1/2, and for quadrupolar nuclei in cubic environments for which  $C_Q = 0$ . To complete the picture for quadrupolar nuclei in non-cubic environments we also need to consider the quadrupolar interaction.

### 11.2.2. Solution NMR

We first consider a paramagnetic complex in an isotropic solution. The general features of solution NMR have been reviewed many times and can be found, for example, in the textbooks by Ernst et al. [258], Levitt [1], and Keeler [255].

In solution we have seen that only the isotropic interactions remain during molecular tumbling. Therefore the only shielding contribution is the isotropic frequency  $\Omega_{iso} = -\omega_0 \sigma_{iso}$ , which contains the local contributions due to the hyperfine coupling to the paramagnetic centres, including contact and pseudo-contact terms.

The lineshape and linewidth in the spectrum originate from two different sources: incoherent homogeneous, and inhomogeneous.<sup>1</sup> The former is due to the stochastic fluctuation of the local field experienced by the nucleus, which gives rise to relaxation as discussed in Chapters 8 and 9, whereas the latter is due to the distribution of Larmor frequencies over the sample volume. In the absence of inhomogeneous broadening the time-domain signal, referred to as the free-induction decay (FID), *s*(*t*) due to a single resonance is

$$s(t) = s_{e}^{\text{hom}}(t) \exp\left(i\Omega_{\text{iso}}t\right), \tag{11.88}$$

where  $s_e^{\text{hom}}(t)$  is the envelope function describing the signal decay due to relaxation. The spectrum  $S(\omega)$  is the Fourier transform of s(t), which is given by

$$S(\omega) = \int_0^\infty dt \, s(t) \exp(-i\omega t). \tag{11.89}$$

As we saw in Chapters 8 and 9, for a single spin I = 1/2 nucleus in the Redfield relaxation limit we can model the relaxation envelope function as a mono-exponential decay with a time constant  $T_2$ , giving the following FID:

$$s(t) = \exp\left(i\Omega_{iso}t\right)\exp\left(-t/T_2\right). \tag{11.90}$$

For quadrupolar nuclei with I > 1 the decay is in general multiexponential. However we still model it here using a monoexponential decay function that is parameterized by an effective  $T_2$ . For small paramagnetic complexes in solution, the  $T_2$  relaxation time constant is given by the Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan expression in Eq. (8.108). The  $T_2$  time constants of large biomolecules, on the other hand, are dominated by Curie relaxation processes, and  $T_2$  is given by Eq. (8.152). The Fourier transform of this function gives a spectrum with the Lorentzian lineshape:

$$S(\omega) = L_A(T_2; \omega - \Omega_{iso}) + iL_D(T_2; \omega - \Omega_{iso}).$$
(11.91)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Here we note that our usage of the terms 'homogeneous' and 'inhomogeneous' differs from the usage by Maricq and Waugh [323]. We use the terms to refer to the sources of line broadening in the spectrum, whilst Maricq and Waugh use the same terms to refer to the commutation properties of the Hamiltonians of spin interactions. Nevertheless, we note that there is a correspondence between the conventions. For instance the shift interaction is termed inhomogeneous by Maricq and Waugh, and a distribution of shifts leads to inhomolgeneous broadening according to the convention used here; homonuclear dipolar coupling interactions are homogeneous interactions, and lead to coherent homogeneous broadening in the spectrum of solids. The only contribution to spectral broadening not considered by Maricq and Waugh is due to relaxation, which is homogeneous.

The real and imaginary parts of the spectrum are the absorptionmode and dispersion-mode Lorenztian functions  $L_A(T; \omega)$  and  $L_D(T; \omega)$ , which are given by

$$L_A(T;\omega) = \frac{T}{1 + \omega^2 T^2},$$
(11.92)

$$L_{\rm D}(T;\omega) = -\frac{\omega T^2}{1+\omega^2 T^2}.$$
(11.93)

In high-resolution NMR we examine only the real part of the spectrum with the absorption-mode lineshape. The spectrum therefore contains a single, sharp peak at position  $\Omega_{iso}$  and with a linewidth (defined as the full-width at half-maximum, FWHM) of  $2/T_2$  rad s<sup>-1</sup>. An example is shown in Fig. 11.2(a).

In many cases the inhomogeneous broadening cannot be neglected, with notable contributions from the inhomogeneity of the applied magnetic field  $B_0$  due to instrumental limitations, and a BMS contribution due to the non-spherical shape of the sample container, as discussed in Section 10.2. The effect of the container shape, usually cylindrical, on the spectral resolution has been studied at length [327,328,313]. In the presence of inhomogeneity of the local magnetic field, the offset frequency becomes a function of position  $\mathbf{r}$ , and so can be written as  $\Omega(\mathbf{r})$ . We define it in terms of the position-dependent deviation  $\Delta\Omega(\mathbf{r})$  from the nominal offset  $\Omega_{iso}$ :

$$\Omega(\mathbf{r}) = \Omega_{\rm iso} + \Delta \Omega(\mathbf{r}). \tag{11.94}$$

The FID is then given by averaging over all positions to give

$$s(t) = s_{\rm e}^{\rm inhom}(t) [\exp\left(i\Omega_{\rm iso}t\right) \exp\left(-t/T_2\right)], \tag{11.95}$$

which is the product of the inhomogeneous envelope function  $s_e^{\text{inhom}}(t)$ , and, in brackets, the FID in the absence of inhomogeneous effects. The envelope function depends on the function  $f(\mathbf{r})$  that describes the distribution of  $\Delta\Omega(\mathbf{r})$  and, assuming the ideal case of constant signal per unit volume inside the active volume and zero signal outside, is given by an integral over the sample volume *V*:

$$s_{\rm e}^{\rm inhom}(t) = \frac{1}{V} \iiint_V d^3 r f(\mathbf{r}) \exp{(i\Delta\Omega(\mathbf{r})t)}.$$
(11.96)

The inhomogeneous spectral lineshape  $S_e^{\text{inhom}}(\omega)$  is defined as the Fourier transform of  $s_e^{\text{inhom}}(t)$ :

$$S_{\rm e}^{\rm inhom}(\omega) = \int_0^\infty dt \, s_{\rm e}^{\rm inhom}(t) \exp(-i\omega t). \tag{11.97}$$

The FID in Eq. (11.95) is the product of two functions, and so the resulting spectrum  $S(\omega)$  is simply the convolution of the inhomogeneous linewidth function  $S_e^{inhom}(\omega)$  and the Lorentzian in Eq. (11.91):

$$S(\omega) = 2\pi [L_A(T_2; \omega - \Omega_{iso}) + iL_D(T_2; \omega - \Omega_{iso})] * S_e^{inhom}(\omega),$$
(11.98)

where the convolution of two functions is indicated by the \*, and is defined as

$$(f * g)(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} f(x)g(\omega - x)dx.$$
(11.99)

The overall spectral lineshape is therefore a mixture of the Lorentzian from the homogeneous decay, and the inhomogeneous lineshape. It is common to assume that the inhomogeneous lineshape is a Gaussian, or Lorentzian. In the latter case we can define an overall rate of signal decay which is mono-exponential, and characterised by a time constant  $T_2^*$ , which is equal to

$$\frac{1}{T_2^{\star}} = \frac{1}{T_2} + \frac{1}{T_2^{\dagger}},\tag{11.100}$$



**Fig. 11.2.** Simulated spectra of paramagnetic systems subject to a shielding interaction, and in the absence of inhomogeneous broadening. This picture is complete for spins-1/2, and quadrupolar nuclei in cubic environments where  $C_Q = 0$ . The high-resolution, isotropic solution spectrum is shown in (a), showing a single peak at the isotropic offset. A powder sample in the solid state gives the classic CSA powder pattern in (b), which splits into a series of spinning sidebands under MAS, as shown in (c). The chemical shielding parameters are  $-\omega_0 \Delta \sigma^s / 2\pi = 500$  kHz, and  $\eta^s = 0.3$ , and the frequency is measured relative to the isotropic offset  $\Omega_{\rm Iso}$ . The MAS pectrum was simulated at 60 kHz MAS.

where  $T_2^{\dagger}$  is the time constant associated with the monoexponential inhomogeneous decay.

### 11.2.3. Solid-state NMR of static powders

The case of static powder solids is more complex than isotropic solutions, as we must now explicitly consider the effect of the anisotropic shielding terms on the form of the spectrum. The Hamiltonian in the absence of BMS effects was derived in Section 2.6. For a crystallite q in which the PAF of the shielding tensor has an orientation relative to the crystal frame given by the Euler angles ( $\alpha_{PC}$ ,  $\beta_{PC}$ ,  $\gamma_{PC}$ ), the Hamiltonian is given by Eq. (2.109) [195]:

$$\widehat{H} = \hbar(\Omega_{\rm iso} + \Omega_{\rm SA}(\Omega_{\rm PC}, \Omega_{\rm CL}))\widehat{I}_z, \qquad (11.101)$$

where we have written the isotropic offset  $\Omega_{iso} = -\omega_0 \sigma_{iso}$  as before, and  $\Omega_{SA}(\Omega_{PC}, \Omega_{CL})$  is the anisotropic contribution to the offset of crystallite *q*, and is given in terms of the anisotropic shielding  $\sigma_{SA}(\Omega_{PC}, \Omega_{CL})$ :

$$\Omega_{\mathsf{SA}}(\Omega_{\mathsf{PC}},\Omega_{\mathsf{CL}}) = -\omega_0 \sigma_{\mathsf{SA}}(\Omega_{\mathsf{PC}},\Omega_{\mathsf{CL}}), \qquad (11.102)$$

$$\sigma_{\rm SA}(\Omega_{\rm PC},\Omega_{\rm CL}) = \frac{1}{2} \Delta \sigma \Big\{ 3\cos^2(\beta_{\rm PL}) - 1 - \eta \cos(2\alpha_{\rm PL})\sin^2(\beta_{\rm PL}) \Big\}.$$
(11.103)

We have written  $\sigma_{SA}(\Omega_{PC}, \Omega_{CL})$  in terms of the Euler angles  $(\alpha_{PL}, \beta_{PL})$  that describe the overall rotation from the PAF to the laboratory frame via the crystal frame. Note that  $\sigma_{SA}(\Omega_{PC}, \Omega_{CL})$ , and therefore  $\Omega_{SA}(\Omega_{PC}, \Omega_{CL})$ , depends on neither  $\gamma_{PL}$  nor  $\gamma_{CL}$ . The homogeneous decay of the corresponding coherence during acquisition now depends on *two* processes: incoherent homogeneous, and coherent homogeneous. The former process is due to transverse relaxation, characterised by the time constant  $T_2$  as described in Chapters 8 and 9, and the latter is a non-random dephasing due to the extended network of dipolar couplings in each crystallite [195]. The coherent homogeneous decay is commonly assumed to be mono-exponential and characterised by a time constant  $T_2^{coh}$ . The time constant that describes the overall homogeneous decay is  $T'_2$ , and is calculated from the following expression:

$$\frac{1}{T_2'} = \frac{1}{T_2} + \frac{1}{T_2^{\text{coh}}}.$$
(11.104)

The FID of the single crystallite following excitation  $s(\Omega_{PC}, \Omega_{CL}; t)$  also depends on the same Euler angles, and has a form that is similar to the FID of an isotropic solution, with the difference that the offset includes the anisotropic term, and the decay time constant is  $T'_2$  and not  $T_2$ :

$$s(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}}; t) = \exp\left(i\Omega_{\text{iso}}t\right) \exp\left(i\Omega_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}})t\right) \exp\left(-t/T_{2}'\right).$$
(11.105)

The Fourier transform yields the spectrum, which contains a Lorentzian peak  $S(\Omega_{PC}, \Omega_{CL}; \omega)$  at position  $\Omega_{iso} + \Omega_{SA}(\Omega_{PC}, \Omega_{CL})$ , with a linewidth equal to  $2/T'_2$  rad s<sup>-1</sup>. The spectrum is

$$\begin{split} S(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}}; \omega) &= L_{\text{A}}(T_{2}'; \omega - \Omega_{\text{iso}} - \Omega_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}})) \\ &+ iL_{D}(T_{2}'; \omega - \Omega_{\text{iso}} - \Omega_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}})). \end{split} \tag{11.106}$$

In order to obtain the form of the spectrum of the complete powder we must average the single-crystallite spectrum  $S(\Omega_{PC}, \Omega_{CL}; \omega)$  over all possible orientations, giving

$$\begin{split} S(\omega) = & \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\alpha_{\text{CL}} \int_0^{\pi} \sin(\beta_{\text{CL}}) d\beta_{\text{CL}} \left[ L_A(T_2'; \omega - \Omega_{\text{iso}} - \Omega_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}})) \right] \\ & + i L_D(T_2'; \omega - \Omega_{\text{iso}} - \Omega_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}})) \right]. \end{split}$$
(11.107)

The powder spectrum has a width that is proportional to the SA  $|\omega_0\Delta\sigma^s|$ , as shown by the example in Fig. 11.2(b). We note that neither the FID nor the spectrum of the powder depends on the Euler angles  $\Omega_{PC}$ . This is a result of all crystallite orientations being represented in the spectrum, so that the information about the absolute orientation of the PAF in the crystal frame is lost. One consequence of this is the well-known observation that one cannot extract the absolute values of  $\Omega_{PC}$  from the spectrum of a powder sample.

Hitherto we have neglected the inhomogeneous broadening we would expect from the BMS effects. We have shown that these effects can be partitioned into IBMS and ABMS contributions. The former gives a purely anisotropic offset  $\Omega_{SA}^{IBMS}(\Omega_{PI,C}(q), \Omega_{CL}, q)$ , whilst the latter gives both isotropic and anisotropic contributions  $\Omega_{iso}^{ABMS}(q)$  and  $\Omega_{SA}^{ABMS}(\Omega_{PA,C}(q), \Omega_{CL}, q)$  for spherical crystallites. They are given in terms of the corresponding chemical shieldings:

$$\Omega^{\text{IBMS}}_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PI,C}}(q),\Omega_{\text{CL}},q) = -\omega_0 \sigma^{\text{IBMS}}_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PI,C}}(q),\Omega_{\text{CL}},q), \tag{11.108}$$

$$\Omega_{\rm iso}^{\rm ABMS}(q) = -\omega_0 \sigma_{\rm iso}^{\rm ABMS}(q), \tag{11.109}$$

$$\Omega_{\mathsf{SA}}^{\mathsf{ABMS}}(\Omega_{\mathsf{PA},\mathsf{C}}(q),\Omega_{\mathsf{CL}},q) = -\omega_0 \sigma_{\mathsf{S}}^{\mathsf{ABMS}}(\Omega_{\mathsf{PA},\mathsf{C}}(q),\Omega_{\mathsf{CL}},q), \tag{11.110}$$

where  $\Omega_{PLC}$  and  $\Omega_{PA,C}$  give the orientations of the IBMS and ABMS shielding PAFs in the crystal reference frame. Here we have defined a parameter q which describes the variation of the isotropic shift, SA, asymmetry, and Euler angles giving the orientation of the BMS tensor in the crystal frame. If we assume that the crystallites are spherical, and make the somewhat unrealistic assumption that they are held in a spherical sample container, the BMS shielding contribution to a particular crystallite depends only on the dipolar coupling interaction with the *neighbouring* crystallites, and has no part from the internal bulk susceptibility. Hence the BMS shielding of the crystallite under consideration depends only on the configuration of the surrounding crystallites, which is defined by q.

In order to calculate the spectrum from the complete sample, we average over all the crystallites in two steps: firstly for all crystallites with the same configuration parameter q we average over the Euler angles  $\Omega_{\text{CL}}$ ; secondly we average over the configurations q. If we define the total BMS frequency  $\Delta\Omega(\Omega_{\text{Pl},\text{C}}(q), \Omega_{\text{PA},\text{C}}(q), \Omega_{\text{CL}}, q)$  as

$$egin{aligned} \Delta\Omega(\Omega_{ extsf{Pl,C}}(q),\Omega_{ extsf{Pl,C}}(q),\Omega_{ extsf{CL}},q) &= \Omega_{ extsf{SA}}^{ extsf{BBMS}}(\Omega_{ extsf{Pl,C}}(q),\Omega_{ extsf{CL}},q) &\ &+ \Omega_{ extsf{iso}}^{ extsf{ABMS}}(q) &\ &+ \Omega_{ extsf{SA}}^{ extsf{ABMS}}(\Omega_{ extsf{PA,C}}(q),\Omega_{ extsf{CL}},q), & (11.111) \end{aligned}$$

we can write the FID  $s(q, \Omega_{CL}; t)$  from a particular crystallite orientation with a particular BMS configuration as

$$s(q, \Omega_{\text{CL}}; t) = \exp(i\Omega_{\text{iso}}t) \exp(i\Omega_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}})t) \\ \times \exp(i\Delta\Omega(\Omega_{\text{PI,C}}(q), \Omega_{\text{PA,C}}(q), \Omega_{\text{CL}}, q)t) \exp(-t/T'_2).$$
(11.112)

The signal from the whole powder is then

$$S(\omega) = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} d\alpha_{CL} \int_{0}^{\pi} \sin(\beta_{CL}) d\beta_{CL}$$
$$\times \frac{1}{N_q} \int dq f(q) s(q, \Omega_{CL}; t), \qquad (11.113)$$

where f(q) is a function describing the distribution of configurations, and  $N_q$  is a normalization factor.

The integral over the configurations q only affects the phase factor  $\exp(i\Delta\Omega(\Omega_{Pl,C}(q), \Omega_{PA,C}(q), \Omega_{CL}, q)t)$ . At this point, to simplify the discussion, we make the simplifying assumption that the integral over q is independent of the crystallite orientation  $\Omega_{CL}$ , which is equivalent to stating that the inhomogeneous broadening depends only on the surrounding crystallites. This assumption is justified if the sum over the configurations contains a complete average over the orientation of the PAFs in the crystal frame, i.e. an average over all values of  $\Omega_{PL,C}(q)$  and  $\Omega_{PA,C}(q)$ . If this is the case the integral over q is independent of the Euler angles  $\Omega_{CL}$ , in the same way that the integral over  $\Omega_{CL}$  in the absence of inhomogeneous broadening is independent of  $\Omega_{PC}$ . We can then define a BMS decay envelope function  $s_e^{BMS}(t)$  that describes the coherent decay due to the inhomogeneous broadening. This envelope function has a similar form to that for the isotropic solution:

$$S_{e}^{\text{BMS}}(t) = \frac{1}{N_{q}} \int dq f(q) \\ \times \exp\left(i\Delta\Omega(\Omega_{\text{PL,C}}(q), \Omega_{\text{PA,C}}(q), \Omega_{\text{CL}}, q)t\right).$$
(11.114)

The Fourier transform of the envelope function  $S_e^{\text{BMS}}(\omega)$  is defined in the same way as in Eq. (11.97). The FID from the sample is

$$\begin{split} s(t) &= s_{\rm e}^{\rm BMS}(t) \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\alpha_{\rm CL} \int_0^{\pi} \sin(\beta_{\rm CL}) \, d\beta_{\rm CL} \\ &\times \exp\left(i\Omega_{\rm iso}t\right) \exp\left(i\Omega_{\rm SA}(\Omega_{\rm PC},\Omega_{\rm CL})t\right) \exp\left(-t/T_2'\right), \quad (11.115) \end{split}$$

which is the product of the FID in the absence of the BMS, and the BMS envelope function. The overall spectrum  $S(\omega)$  is then the convolution of  $S_e^{BMS}(\omega)$  with the expression in Eq. (11.107):

$$\begin{split} S(\omega) &= 2\pi \bigg[ \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} d\alpha_{\text{CL}} \int_{0}^{\pi} \sin(\beta_{\text{CL}}) d\beta_{\text{CL}} \bigg[ L_A(T_2'; \omega - \Omega_{\text{iso}} - \Omega_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}})) \\ &+ i L_D(T_2'; \omega - \Omega_{\text{iso}} - \Omega_{\text{SA}}(\Omega_{\text{PC}}, \Omega_{\text{CL}})) \bigg] \bigg] * S_e^{\text{BMS}}(\omega), \end{split}$$

$$(11.116)$$

The BMS lineshape has a complicated form which is non-trivial to model since it ultimately requires a description of how particles of different sizes and shapes are packed in a compressed powder [329,151]. It may, however, be approximated as a Gaussian, for which case an example of the resulting overall spectrum is shown in Fig. 11.3(a). It can be seen that the inhomogeneous broadening smears out the distinctive spectral features of the classic SA powder pattern. Some notable experimental examples of this lineshape in static solid-state NMR spectra include the battery samples presented by Kim et al. [54].

## 11.2.4. Solid-state NMR of spinning powders

Under MAS conditions the anisotropic frequency is timedependent, periodic, and cyclic over the rotor period  $\tau_r$ . Therefore, as we have seen, the single-crystal FID  $s_c(\gamma_{CR}; t)$  is split into a series of spinning-sideband contributions:

$$s_{c}(\gamma_{CR};t) = \exp(i\Omega_{iso}t)\exp\left(i\Phi_{c}^{SA}(\gamma_{CR};t,0)\right)\exp\left(-t/T_{2}'\right) \quad (11.117)$$
$$= \exp(i\Omega_{iso}t)\exp\left(-t/T_{2}'\right)$$

$$\times \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} A_{\rm c}^{(m)} \exp\left(i(\phi_{\rm c}^{(m)}(\gamma_{\rm CR}) + m\omega_{\rm r}t)\right).$$
(11.118)

We note that  $T'_2$  depends on the MAS frequency, since faster spinning has the effect of weakening the extended dipolar coupling network, thus reducing the rate of coherent dephasing. The singlecrystal sideband amplitudes and phases are denoted  $A_c^{(m)}$  and  $\phi_c^{(m)}(\gamma_{\rm CR})$ . Following Fourier transformation we obtain the spinning sideband manifold in the spectrum:

$$S_{c}(\gamma_{CR};\omega) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} A_{c}^{(m)} \exp\left(i\phi_{c}^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR})\right) \left[L_{A}(T_{2}';\omega-\Omega_{iso}-m\omega_{r}) + iL_{D}(T_{2}';\omega-\Omega_{iso}-m\omega_{r})\right].$$
(11.119)

The orientation dependence is contained wholly within the sideband amplitudes  $A_c^{(m)}$  and phases  $\phi_c^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR})$ . The former depend only on  $\alpha_{RL}$  and  $\beta_{RL}$ , whereas the latter depend on all three angles. The spectrum of the whole powder is therefore obtained by averaging the complex sideband coefficients over all orientations. The resulting spectrum is

$$S(\omega) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} I^{(m)} \left[ L_A(T'_2; \omega - \Omega_{iso} - m\omega_r) + iL_D(T'_2; \omega - \Omega_{iso} - m\omega_r) \right],$$
(11.120)

where the *m*th-order sideband intensity  $I^{(m)}$  is equal to

$$I^{(m)} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\alpha_{CR} \int_0^{\pi} \sin(\beta_{CR}) d\beta_{CR} \left[ A_c^{(m)} \right]^2.$$
(11.121)

An example of the spectrum obtained by MAS is shown in Fig. 11.2 (c), which has been simulated using the same SA parameters as the spectrum of the static powder in Fig. 11.2(b).

The effect of the IBMS and ABMS on the inhomogeneous broadening can be considered in a similar way as for the static powder, but with the inclusion of MAS. The isotropic ABMS shift frequency is labelled  $\Omega_{iso}^{ABMS}(q)$ , and we group together the IBMS and ABMS



**Fig. 11.3.** The effect of the inhomogeneous BMS broadening on static and MAS NMR spectra of a paramagnetic powder. The static spectra are shown in (a), and the MAS spectra are shown in (b). In both cases we partition the spectrum into two parts. The first is the spectrum in the absence of BMS effects, which exhibits either the classic CSA powder pattern, or the spinning-sideband manifold. The second shows the spectral lineshape due solely to BMS effects which, for the static case can be assumed to be Gaussian, and for the MAS case to be a manifold of spinning sidebands, each with a Gaussian lineshape. In both cases the final spectrum is given by the convolution of these two parts. The chemical shielding parameters are  $-\omega_0\Delta\sigma^s/2\pi = 500$  kHz, and  $\eta^s = 0.3$ , and the frequency is measured relative to the isotropic offset  $\Omega_{iso}$ . The MAS spectrum was simulated at 60 kHz MAS. For the static case the Gaussian function has a mean of 0 kHz and a standard deviation of 200 kHz. For the MAS case each individual sideband is a Gaussian function with a standard deviation of 10 kHz, and the intensities of the Gaussians in the manifold are weighted by a Gaussian function with a standard deviation of 200 kHz.

contributions to the SA to give the total BMS anisotropic frequency  $\Omega_c^{\text{BMS,SA}}(q, \gamma_{\text{CR}}; t)$ . During evolution under MAS the observable coherences accrue a periodic phase  $\Phi_c^{\text{BMS,SA}}(q, \gamma_{\text{CR}}; t, 0)$  due to the evolution of the BMS SA. We compute the complete FID by averaging over the Euler angles  $\gamma_{\text{CR}}$  all the contributions from crystallites with the same q, and then averaging over q. As for the static case, we assume that the average of the BMS phase factors over q results in a BMS time-domain envelope function that is the same for all crystallite orientations  $\Omega_{\text{CR}}$ . This function is then given by

$$\begin{split} s_{\rm e}^{\rm BMS}(t) &= \frac{1}{N_q} \int {\rm d}q f(q) \exp\left({\rm i}\Omega_{\rm iso}^{\rm ABMS}(q)t\right) \exp\left({\rm i}\Phi_{\rm c}^{\rm BMS,SA}(q,\gamma_{\rm CR};t,0)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N_q} \int {\rm d}q f(q) \exp\left({\rm i}\Omega_{\rm iso}^{\rm ABMS}(q)t\right) \\ &\times \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} B_{\rm c}^{(m)}(q) \exp\left({\rm i}(\xi_{\rm c}^{(m)}(q,\gamma_{\rm CR}) + m\omega_{\rm r}t)\right), \end{split}$$
(11.122)

where we have expanded the periodic phase factor due to the BMS SA as a Fourier series with sideband intensities  $B_c^{(m)}(q)$  and phases  $\xi_c^{(m)}(q, \gamma_{CR})$ . We are able to write  $s_e^{BMS}(t)$  in the following form:

$$s_{e}^{\text{BMS}}(t) = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} s_{e}^{(m)}(t) \exp{(im\omega_{r}t)},$$
(11.123)

where

$$\begin{split} s_{\rm e}^{(m)}(t) &= \frac{1}{N_q} \int \mathrm{d}q f(q) \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\Omega_{\rm iso}^{\rm ABMS}(q)t\right) B_{\rm c}^{(m)}(q) \\ &\times \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\xi_{\rm c}^{(m)}(q,\gamma_{\rm CR})\right) \end{split} \tag{11.124}$$

are sideband functions that decay with time. The envelope function is therefore a spinning-sideband manifold, in which each sideband experiences an inhomogeneous decay. The intensities  $B_c^{(m)}(q)$  only affect the overall magnitudes of the  $s_e^{(m)}(t)$ , whereas  $\Omega_{\rm iso}^{\rm ABMS}(q)$ changes the overall rate of inhomogeneous decay. Therefore all the sidebands exhibit the same inhomogeneous broadening. The Fourier transform of  $s_e^{\rm BMS}(t)$  gives the function  $S_e^{\rm BMS}(\omega)$  which specifies the inhomogeneous broadening that we observe in the spinning-sideband manifold of the spectrum. This function has the form

$$S_{\rm e}^{\rm BMS}(\omega) = 4\pi^2 \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} S_{\rm e}^{(m)}(\omega) * \delta(\omega - m\omega_{\rm r}).$$
(11.125)

The delta functions  $\delta(\omega - m\omega_r)$  in Eq. (11.125) are the Fourier transforms of the complex exponentials  $\exp(im\omega_r t)$ , and the line-shape functions  $S_e^{(m)}(\omega)$  are the Fourier transforms of the decay functions  $s_e^{(m)}(t)$ . The spectral inhomogeneous broadening function  $S_e^{\text{BMS}}(\omega)$  therefore comprises a series of spinning sidebands whose effect is to broaden the spinning sidebands in the final spectrum, which is the convolution of Eqs. (11.120) and (11.125), as shown in Fig. 11.3(b) for Gaussian broadening. In addition to the ABMS broadening of the individual sidebands, we also see a perturbation of the sideband intensities from the 'nominal' intensities we would expect from a simple SA. The distribution of intensities shows a Gaussian distribution superimposed upon the nominal pattern.

The predicted form of the spinning-sideband manifold in the presence of BMS effects is illustrated with the solid-state <sup>7</sup>Li MAS NMR spectra of LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> and LiFePO<sub>4</sub> shown in Fig. 11.4 [31]. Both transition metals are in the +2 oxidation state and occupy distorted octahedral sites as part of a TMO<sub>6</sub> unit, where TM refers to the transition metal, and have high-spin electronic configurations. The metal ion Mn<sup>2+</sup> has the octahedral electronic configuration  $t_{2g}^2 e_g^2$  corresponding to a ground term  ${}^6A_{1g}$  in the standard notation of group theory. For this system the SO-coupling effects can be

neglected, and the metal ion behaves as a spin-only paramagnetic centre with an isotropic g-tensor that is close to the free-electron value, and a small ZFS. The susceptibility is approximately isotropic, and so the ABMS is negligible. The metal ion Fe<sup>2+</sup>, on the other hand, has an electron configuration of  $t_{2g}^4 e_g^2$ , giving an orbitallydegenerate ground term of  ${}^{5}T_{2g}$ . The EPR parameters are therefore influenced by SO coupling, giving an anisotropic g-tensor and nonzero ZFS as a result of the distortion from cubic symmetry. Both the susceptibility anisotropy and ABMS are therefore non-zero. As can be seen from the full spectra in Fig. 11.4(a), both spinningsideband manifolds show a Gaussian distribution of sideband intensities superimposed on the nominal pattern, which can be ascribed to the influence of the IBMS in both cases. The manifold of LiFePO<sub>4</sub> is also expected to be distorted by the ABMS, though we expect this effect to be smaller. In addition if we examine the centrebands of both manifolds, we see that the linewidth of 90 ppm for LiFePO<sub>4</sub> is considerably larger than that for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub>, despite the former sample giving a longer  $T'_2$  value for <sup>7</sup>Li. The larger linewidth for LiFePO<sub>4</sub> can be ascribed to the ABMS inhomogeneous line broadening that is absent in the spectrum of LiMnPO<sub>4</sub>.

### 11.3. Paramagnetic NMR of integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei

We now examine the form of the NMR spectrum of an integerspin quadrupolar nucleus subject to a first-order quadrupolar interaction. We focus on the simplest case of nuclei with nuclear spin I = 1. The first-order quadrupolar interaction is wholly anisotropic, and so does not influence the observed resonance frequencies in solution. We therefore consider the spectra of solid-state powders under both static and MAS conditions.

## 11.3.1. Static solid powders

We derived the Hamiltonian for the first-order quadrupolar interaction in Chapter 2, with the result given in Eq. (2.141). The Hamiltonian is characterised by a frequency of interaction  $\Omega_Q(\Omega_{QC}, \Omega_{CL})$ , which is given in terms of the quadrupolar splitting frequency  $\omega_Q$ , asymmetry parameter  $\eta^Q$ , the Euler angles specifying the orientation of the PAF in the crystal frame  $\Omega_{QC}$ , and the orientation of the crystal frame in the laboratory frame  $\Omega_{CL}$ :

$$\Omega_{Q}(\Omega_{QC},\Omega_{CL}) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \omega_{Q} v_{20}$$
(11.126)  
=  $\frac{1}{2} \omega_{Q} \Big[ 3\cos^{2}(\beta_{QL}) - 1 + \eta^{Q} \sin^{2}(\beta_{QL}) \cos(2\alpha_{QL}) \Big].$ (11.127)

There are two observable coherences, represented by the operators  $|10\rangle\langle 1 + 1|$  and  $|1 - 1\rangle\langle 10|$ , which result in two distinct resonances in the spectrum. The two frequencies  $\Omega_{Q,M_iM_j}(\Omega_{QC}, \Omega_{CL})$  are given by the expression in Table 11.2 in terms of the satellite order *d* by

$$\Omega_{\mathbf{Q},M_iM_j}(\Omega_{\mathbf{QC}},\Omega_{\mathbf{CL}}) = -d_{M_iM_j}\Omega_{\mathbf{Q}}(\Omega_{\mathbf{QC}},\Omega_{\mathbf{CL}}).$$
(11.128)

The two coherences have d-values of -1 and +1 respectively, and so the two resonance frequencies are:

$$\Omega_{Q,M_iM_j}(\Omega_{QC},\Omega_{CL}) = \begin{cases} +\Omega_Q(\Omega_{QC},\Omega_{CL}), & |10\rangle\langle 1+1|, \\ -\Omega_Q(\Omega_{QC},\Omega_{CL}), & |1-1\rangle\langle 10|. \end{cases}$$
(11.129)

The resulting FID for a single crystallite is calculated from Eq. (11.62), and is given by

$$s(\Omega_{\rm QC}, \Omega_{\rm CL}; t) = \frac{1}{2} [\exp[+i\Omega_{\rm Q}(\Omega_{\rm QC}, \Omega_{\rm CL})t] + \exp[-i\Omega_{\rm Q}(\Omega_{\rm QC}, \Omega_{\rm CL})t]] \quad (11.130)$$
$$= \cos[\Omega_{\rm Q}(\Omega_{\rm QC}, \Omega_{\rm CL})t]. \quad (11.131)$$

The resulting spectrum contains two peaks at frequencies  $\pm \Omega_Q(\Omega_{QC}, \Omega_{CL})$  and is symmetrical about the reference frequency, which here is zero. Following the calculation of the powder average over the Euler angles  $\Omega_{CL}$ , the two resonances broaden to give the



**Fig. 11.4.** Solid-state <sup>7</sup>Li MAS NMR spectra of the cathode materials LiTMPO<sub>4</sub>, TM = Mn, Fe. For both spectra the full spinning-sideband manifold is shown in (a), and an expansion of the centreband is shown in (b). The MAS frequency is 60 kHz.

same characteristic lineshapes as for the SA interaction in Fig. 11.2 (b), with one lineshape related to the other by a reflection about the reference frequency. The resulting symmetrical spectrum is shown in Fig. 11.5(a), and exhibits a shape known as a Pake pattern [195].

### 11.3.2. Solid powders under MAS

Under MAS conditions the quadrupolar frequency, now denoted  $\Omega_c^Q(\gamma_{CR};t)$ , is time dependent and periodic. Therefore the two components of the FID each split into a spinning-sideband manifold, with the two manifolds related to each other by complex conjugation.

$$s_{c}(\gamma_{CR};t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ \exp\left[ +i\Phi_{c}^{Q}(\gamma_{CR};t,0) \right] + \exp\left[ -i\Phi_{c}^{Q}(\gamma_{CR};t,0) \right] \right] \quad (11.132)$$
$$= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[ E_{c}^{(m)} \exp\left( i(\epsilon_{c}^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR}) + m\omega_{r}t) \right) + E_{c}^{(m)} \exp\left( -i(\epsilon_{c}^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR}) + m\omega_{r}t) \right) \right] \quad (11.133)$$

$$=\sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} E_{\rm c}^{(m)} \cos\left(i(\epsilon_{\rm c}^{(m)}(\gamma_{\rm CR}) + m\omega_{\rm r}t)\right), \tag{11.134}$$

where  $\Phi_c^Q(\gamma_{CR}; t, 0)$  is the periodic phase accrued by evolution of the frequency  $\Omega_c^Q(\gamma_{CR}; t)$ . The intensity and phase of the *m*th order sideband of the  $|10\rangle\langle 1+1|$  coherence are  $E_c^{(m)}/2$  and  $\epsilon_c^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR})$  respectively, whereas for the  $|1-1\rangle\langle 10|$  coherence they are  $E_c^{(-m)}/2$  and  $-\epsilon_c^{(-m)}(\gamma_{CR})$ . Therefore the *m*th-order sideband of the sum of the two manifolds has a total complex intensity of  $\left[E_c^{(m)}\exp\left(i\epsilon_c^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR})\right) + E_c^{(-m)}\exp\left(-i\epsilon_c^{(-m)}(\gamma_{CR})\right)\right]/2$ , which is equal to the complex intensity of the -mth-order following complex conjugation. This results in a spectrum that is symmetrical about the reference frequency. This symmetry is also preserved in the powder average, as shown by the MAS spectrum in Fig. 11.5(c).

# 11.3.3. First-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions

In paramagnetic systems the NMR spectrum contains information about the paramagnetic shift and SA, as described in Section 11.2, in addition to the first-order quadrupolar interaction. An example is given in Fig. 11.5, in which the spectra in (a) and (c) are modified by including an SA interaction. The spectrum of the static powder is shown in Fig. 11.5(b), and the corresponding spectrum under MAS is in Fig. 11.5(d). Both spectra contain information about the size of the quadrupolar interaction, via  $\omega_Q$  and  $\eta^Q$ , and the size of the SA, via  $\Delta \sigma^S$  and  $\eta^S$ , and information about the relative orientation of one PAF relative to the other. Extracting all the available information can be a difficult task due to the complexity of the spectrum, which is exacerbated by the presence of substantial inhomogeneous broadening and multiple nuclear sites.

### 11.4. Paramagnetic NMR of half-integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei

We now examine the form of the NMR spectrum of a halfinteger-spin quadrupolar nucleus subject to a first-order quadrupolar interaction, using the simplest case of I = 3/2 as an example. The principal difference between half-integer spins and integer spins is that the observable coherences of the former can be divided into a central transition (CT), which does not evolve under the first-order quadrupolar interaction, and a series of satellite transitions (STs) which do. For quadrupolar nuclei in symmetric environments with no CSA/SA, the resulting spectra are dominated by a narrow peak due to the CT, with the STs resulting in broader features that may be difficult to observe. However for nuclei with broad CT resonances, due either to a particularly large quadrupolar interaction or an SA, the STs cannot be neglected and must be considered for a proper interpretation of the spectra. In contrast to the previous section we also consider the effect of the second-order quadrupolar interaction, and the second-order cross term between the quadrupolar and SA interactions. Unlike the first-order interaction, the second-order interaction does affect the evolution of the CT coherence, and leads to broadening of the corresponding peak.

## 11.4.1. First-order quadrupolar interaction

11.4.1.1. Static solid powders. The frequencies of evolution under the first-order quadrupolar interaction are given by the expression in Eq. (11.128) in terms of the satellite order *d*. For a spin I = 3/2 there are two observable ST coherences  $|\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\rangle\langle\frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{2}|$  and  $|\frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{2}\rangle\langle\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}|$ , which have *d* values of -2 and +2 respectively and so evolve under the first-order interaction with distinct frequencies. By contrast the CT coherence  $|\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\rangle\langle\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}|$  has d = 0, and so does not evolve. There are therefore three individual resonances in the FID, which evolve at the following frequencies:

$$\Omega_{Q,M_iM_j}(\Omega_{QC},\Omega_{CL}) = \begin{cases} +2\Omega_Q(\Omega_{QC},\Omega_{CL}), & |\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\rangle\langle \frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{2}|, \\ 0, & |\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\rangle\langle \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}|, \\ -2\Omega_Q(\Omega_{QC},\Omega_{CL}), & |\frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{2}\rangle\langle \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}|. \end{cases}$$
(11.135)

The single-crystal FID is calculated from Eq. (11.62), and has the expression

$$s(\Omega_{\rm QC}, \Omega_{\rm CL}; t) = \frac{1}{10} [3 \exp[+2i\Omega_{\rm Q}(\Omega_{\rm QC}, \Omega_{\rm CL})t] + 4 + 3 \exp[-2i\Omega_{\rm Q}(\Omega_{\rm QC}, \Omega_{\rm CL})t]]$$
(11.136)

$$= \frac{1}{5} [3 \cos [2\Omega_{\rm Q}(\Omega_{\rm QC}, \Omega_{\rm CL})t] + 2].$$
(11.137)

An example of a spectrum of a powder sample is shown in Fig. 11.6 (a). The spectrum is dominated by a sharp peak due to the CT, which is at zero frequency. The two STs give considerably broader resonances of lower intensity. A vertical expansion of the spectrum, shown in Fig. 11.6(c), reveals the form of the two ST resonances which, like the spectrum of the spin I = 1 nucleus in Fig. 11.5(a), combine to give a Pake pattern [195].

11.4.1.2. Solid powders under MAS. Under MAS the quadrupolar frequency  $\Omega_c^Q(\gamma_{CR};t)$  is time-dependent and periodic. As the spin system evolves the two ST coherences evolve at frequencies  $\pm 2\Omega_c^Q(\gamma_{CR};t)$ , and accrue periodic phases of  $\pm 2\Phi_c^Q(\gamma_{CR};t,0)$ , whereas the CT coherence does not evolve. The result is that the FID contains a time-independent contribution from the CT, and two periodic contributions from the STs that each split into spinning-sideband manifolds:



**Fig. 11.5.** Simulated powder spectra of a spin I = 1 nucleus subject to first-order quadrupolar and shielding interactions. The spectrum of a static powder with the first-order quadrupolar interaction only is shown in (a). Inclusion of the shift anisotropy under static conditions gives the more complicated spectrum in (b). Under MAS each resonance splits into a manifold of spinning sidebands, as shown in (c) and (d). The spectrum in (c) was simulated with the same first-order quadrupolar coupling parameters as (a) and in the absence of the shift anisotropy. Inclusion of the shift anisotropy gives the MAS spectrum in (d). The quadrupolar interaction parameters are  $C_Q = 1.19$  MHz (corresponding to  $\omega_Q/2\pi = 892.5$  kHz),  $\eta^Q = 0.52$ , and  $\Omega_{QC} = (0^\circ, 0^\circ, 0^\circ)$ . The chemical shielding parameters are  $-\omega_0 \Delta \sigma^5/2\pi = 500$  kHz,  $\eta^5 = 0.3$ , and  $\Omega_{PC} = (0^\circ, 90^\circ, 0^\circ)$ . The frequency is measured relative to the isotropic offset  $\Omega_{iso}$ . The MAS spectrum was simulated at 60 kHz MAS.

$$s_{c}(\gamma_{CR};t) = \frac{3}{10} \left[ \exp\left[ +2i\Phi_{c}^{Q}(\gamma_{CR};t,0) \right] + \exp\left[ -2i\Phi_{c}^{Q}(\gamma_{CR};t,0) \right] \right] + \frac{2}{5} \quad (11.138)$$
$$= \frac{3}{10} \sum_{r}^{+\infty} \left[ F_{c}^{(m)} \exp\left( i(\theta_{c}^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR}) + m\omega_{r}t) \right) \right]$$

$$+F_{c}^{(m)}\exp\left(-i(\theta_{c}^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR})+m\omega_{r}t)\right)\right]+\frac{2}{5}$$
(11.139)

$$= \frac{3}{5} \sum_{m=-\infty}^{+\infty} F_c^{(m)} \cos\left(i(\theta_c^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR}) + m\omega_r t)\right) + \frac{2}{5},$$
(11.140)

where  $F_c^{(m)}$  and  $\theta_c^{(m)}(\gamma_{CR})$  are the intensity and phase of the *m*thorder sideband in the manifold of the  $|\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\rangle\langle \frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{2}|$  ST. As for the spin I = 1 MAS spectrum, the spinning-sideband manifold of the second ST is related to the first by a reflection about the reference frequency. The resulting MAS spectrum of the powder contains a single sharp peak due to the CT and a symmetrical and broad spinning-sideband manifold due to the two STs, whose centrebands are coincident with each other and with the CT peak, as shown in Fig. 11.6(e).

### 11.4.2. Second-order quadrupolar interaction

We now turn our attention to the second-order quadrupolar interaction, the Hamiltonian of which is given in Eq. (2.149). The frequency components, in Table 11.2, comprise an isotropic term, a rank-two term, and a rank-four term, that are proportional to the spin-order parameters  $c_{0,M_iM_j}$ ,  $c_{2,M_iM_j}$ , and  $c_{4,M_iM_j}$  respectively. For all three contributions to the frequency both STs have the same value of  $c_i$ , which is different to that of the CT. Hence the value of  $c_0$ 

is -6 for both STs and +3 for the CT,  $c_2$  takes values of +6 and -12 for the STs and CT, and  $c_4$  is equal to +24 and -27 for the STs and CT. The resulting frequencies of evolution for the three transitions are therefore:

$$-\frac{4\omega_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2}}{9\omega_{0}}\left[-\frac{6w_{00}^{(Q,\mathbb{Q})}}{\sqrt{5}}+\frac{6w_{20}^{(Q,\mathbb{Q})}}{\sqrt{14}}+\frac{24w_{40}^{(Q,\mathbb{Q})}}{\sqrt{70}}\right], \quad \left|\frac{3}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\right\rangle \left\langle\frac{3}{2}+\frac{3}{2}\right|, \quad (11.141)$$

$$-\frac{4\omega_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2}}{9\omega_{0}}\left[\frac{3w_{00}^{(Q,\mathbb{Q})}}{\sqrt{5}} - \frac{12w_{20}^{(Q,\mathbb{Q})}}{\sqrt{14}} - \frac{27w_{40}^{(Q,\mathbb{Q})}}{\sqrt{70}}\right], \quad \left|\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right\rangle \left\langle\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right|, \quad (11.142)$$

$$-\frac{4\omega_{Q}^{2}}{9\omega_{0}}\left[-\frac{6w_{00}^{(Q,Q)}}{\sqrt{5}}+\frac{6w_{20}^{(Q,Q)}}{\sqrt{14}}+\frac{24w_{40}^{(Q,Q)}}{\sqrt{70}}\right], \quad \left|\frac{3}{2}-\frac{3}{2}\right\rangle\left\langle\frac{3}{2}-\frac{1}{2}\right|. \quad (11.143)$$

The effect of these second-order contributions is shown in the spectra in Fig. 11.6, with the spectra calculated to first-order also shown for comparison. The full spectrum of the static powder in Fig. 11.6 (b), the vertical expansion highlighting the STs in (d), and the MAS spectrum in (f) show a negligible change in the form of the ST resonances, since the broadening due to the first-order quadrupolar is much larger than the second-order broadening. In fact the only change that is immediately apparent is the reduction in the intensity of the CT peak, which is due to the broadening from the rank-four frequency component. Since the CT is unaffected by the first-order interaction, this second-order rank-four term is the only source of broadening in the CT peak due to the quadrupolar interaction, and so is non-negligible.



**Fig. 11.6.** Simulated powder spectra of a spin I = 3/2 nucleus subject to a first- and second-order quadrupolar interaction. The spectrum of a static powder with the first-order quadrupolar interaction only is shown in (a). In (b) is shown the same spectrum calculated with the second-order quadrupolar interaction. The spectra in (c) and (d) are vertical expansions of (a) and (b) in order to highlight the broad ST resonances. Under MAS the ST resonances split into spinning-sideband manifolds, giving the spectra in (e) and (f). The spectrum in (e) was simulated with the first-order quadrupolar interaction only, whereas (f) includes the second-order interaction. The quadrupolar interaction parameters are  $C_0 = 3.3$  MHz (corresponding to  $\omega_0/2\pi = 825$  kHz),  $\eta^2 = 0.21$ , and  $\Omega_{QC} = (0^\circ, 0^\circ, 0^\circ)$ . The nuclear Larmor frequency is  $\omega_0/2\pi = -105.9$  MHz, giving  $\omega_0^2/(2\pi\omega_0) = -6.4$  kHz. The MAS spectrum was simulated at 60 kHz MAS.

The CT peak is highlighted more clearly in the spectra of Fig. 11.7, which are expansions of those shown in Fig. 11.6. The spectra in Fig. 11.7(a) and (c) are calculated under static conditions and MAS respectively assuming the first-order quadrupolar interaction only. In the spectrum of the static powder in (a) the sharp peak of the CT is superimposed on the broad ST resonances, which here cannot be seen. Under MAS the sharp CT peak also contains a small contribution from the centrebands of the two ST spinningsideband manifolds, as shown in (c). We recall that, to first order, the centrebands of the two STs are resonant both with each other and the CT, here at zero frequency. The introduction of the secondorder interaction has two noticeable effects on the spectrum of the static powder, in Fig. 11.7(b). Firstly we see that the CT resonance is broadened due to the combination of the rank-two and rank-four frequency components. Secondly the centre of mass of the resonance is shifted from zero frequency due to the second-order isotropic frequency. Under MAS the broadening of the CT is reduced but not eliminated, as shown by the spectrum in Fig. 11.7(d). This is because, whilst the rank-two broadening is indeed removed the rank-four broadening is only scaled by a factor of -7/18. We note that this negative factor also results in a reversal of the lineshape relative to the frequency axis. Magic-angle spinning also reveals an additional feature of the second-order interactions. Because the CT and STs have different values of  $c_0$  the former no longer appears at the same isotropic frequency as the latter. The opposite signs of the two  $c_0$  values results in the CT and ST centrebands being shifted in opposite directions. Clearly care must be taken to recognize the ST centrebands and not to confuse them with additional nuclear sites.

## 11.4.3. Second-order quadrupolar and paramagnetic shift anisotropy interactions

In paramagnetic systems, NMR spectra are also affected by the SA interaction. Under static conditions the SA leads to an additional broadening of the spectrum, as shown in Fig. 11.8(a). The CT and ST resonances are both broadened by the rank-two SA, which leads to a complicated lineshape. As for the spin I = 1 case this spectrum also depends on the relative orientation of the SA tensor relative to the EFG tensor. Under MAS the broad lineshape splits into a manifold of spinning sidebands, as shown in Fig. 11.8(b). Like the

static spectrum, the sideband manifold is very complicated and difficult to interpret, as it contains contributions principally from the first-order quadrupolar and SA interactions for the STs, and the SA for the CT. An expansion of the region containing the centrebands, Fig. 11.8(c), shows that the sidebands are broadened by the rankfour frequency components.

Finally we briefly mention the second-order cross term between the quadrupolar and SA interactions, the Hamiltonian of which is given in Eq. (2.152). The frequency components, given in Table 11.2, comprise an isotropic, a rank-two, and a rank-four term, all of which are proportional to the satellite order  $d_{M_iM_j}$ . The evolution frequencies of the three transitions are therefore:

$$-2\omega_{Q}\left[\frac{2}{\sqrt{5}}w_{00}^{(C2,Q)} - \left(\sqrt{2}w_{20}^{(C1,Q)} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{7}}w_{20}^{(C2,Q)}\right) - 4\sqrt{\frac{2}{35}}w_{40}^{(C2,Q)}\right], \ \left|\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right\rangle \left\langle\frac{3}{2} + \frac{3}{2}\right|,$$
(11.144)

$$0, \left|\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right\rangle \left\langle\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\right|, \tag{11.145}$$

$$+2\omega_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\frac{2}{\sqrt{5}}w_{00}^{(C2,\mathbb{Q})} - \left(\sqrt{2}w_{20}^{(C1,\mathbb{Q})} + \sqrt{\frac{2}{7}}w_{20}^{(C2,\mathbb{Q})}\right) - 4\sqrt{\frac{2}{35}}w_{40}^{(C2,\mathbb{Q})}\right], \left|\frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{2}\right\rangle \left\langle\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\right|.$$
(11.146)

We see that the CT is unaffected by this cross term, and so experiences no additional broadening or resonance shift, whereas the two ST coherences evolve with frequencies of opposite sign. One consequence of this is that the centrebands of the two STs no longer appear at the same isotropic frequency. Hence the centreband region of the MAS spectrum now contains three distinct peaks instead of two, one for each transition.

### 11.5. Key concepts

- A paramagnetic solution results in an NMR spectrum where the shift is dominated by the isotropic paramagnetic shift, and the linewidth is given by a combination of the paramagnetic relaxation enhancement, and the inhomogeneous broadening due to the non-spherical shape of the sample container.
- A static paramagnetic powder results in an NMR spectrum where the shift is dominated by the isotropic paramagnetic shift, and the lineshape and linewidth are due to the shift anisotropy and bulk magnetic susceptibility broadening.
- A spinning paramagnetic powder produces a spinning-sideband manifold with an isotropic frequency given by the isotropic paramagnetic shift. The pattern of sideband intensities is due to both the shift anisotropy and the bulk magnetic susceptibility. The linewidth of each spinning sideband is due to a combination of the anisotropic bulk magnetic susceptibility broadening, paramagnetic relaxation enhancement, and the extended network of dipolar couplings between nuclei.
- Quadrupolar nuclei in paramagnetic systems have additional interactions due to the first- and second-order quadrupolar interactions.
- For integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei the quadrupolar interaction is an additional source of resonance broadening under static conditions, and gives rise to a spinning-sideband manifold under MAS.
- For half-integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei the central transition is broadened by the second-order quadrupolar interaction in both static and spinning powders. The satellite transitions are broadened by the first-order quadrupolar interaction under



**Fig. 11.7.** Expansions of the simulated powder spectra of a spin I = 3/2 nucleus shown in Fig. 11.6 to highlight the CT. The spin is subject to a first- and second-order quadrupolar interaction. The CT resonance of a static powder with the first-order quadrupolar interaction only is shown in (a). In (b) is shown the same CT resonance calculated with the second-order quadrupolar interaction. The spectra in (c) and (d) were simulated under MAS. The spectrum in (c) was simulated with the first-order quadrupolar interaction only, whereas (d) includes the second-order interaction. The quadrupolar interaction parameters are  $C_Q = 3.3$  MHz (corresponding to  $\omega_0/2\pi = 825$  kHz),  $\eta^Q = 0.21$ , and  $\Omega_{QC} = (0^\circ, 0^\circ, 0^\circ)$ . The frequency is measured relative to the isotropic offset  $\Omega_{iso}$ . The nuclear Larmor frequency is  $\omega_0/2\pi = -105.9$  MHz, giving  $\omega_0^2/(2\pi\omega_0) = -6.4$  kHz. The MAS spectrum was simulated at 60 kHz MAS.



**Fig. 11.8.** Simulated powder spectra of a spin I = 3/2 nucleus subject to a secondorder quadrupolar interaction and a shift anisotropy. The spectrum of the static powder is shown in (a), which under MAS splits into the spinning-sideband manifold in (b). The spectrum in (c) is an expansion of (b) showing the centreband and the first-order sidebands of both the CT and ST resonances. The quadrupolar interaction parameters are  $C_Q = 3.3$  MHz (corresponding to  $\omega_Q/2\pi = 825$  kHz),  $\eta^Q = 0.21$ , and  $\Omega_{QC} = (0^\circ, 0^\circ, 0^\circ)$ . The chemical shielding parameters are  $-\omega_0 \Delta \sigma^5/2\pi = 500$  kHz,  $\eta^S = 0.3$ , and  $\Omega_{PC} = (0^\circ, 90^\circ, 0^\circ)$ . The frequency is measured relative to the isotropic offset  $\Omega_{iso}$ . The nuclear Larmor frequency is  $\omega_0/2\pi = -105.9$  MHz, giving  $\omega_Q^2/(2\pi\omega_0) = -6.4$  kHz. The MAS spectrum was simulated at 60 kHz MAS.

static conditions, and give rise to an extensive spinningsideband manifold under MAS. The isotropic peak of the satellite manifold is shifted relative to the isotropic peak of the manifold of the central transition by the second-order quadrupolar interaction, and so care must be taken not to confuse the former with an additional nuclear site.

### Chapter 12: A survey of NMR methods for paramagnetic systems

In this chapter we survey the experimental NMR methods that have either been used on, or are applicable to, paramagnetic systems. There are many NMR pulse sequences that have been designed for diamagnetic systems, including small- to mediumsized molecules in solution [255], large biomolecules in solution [330], solid materials [331,2], and biosolids [332]. However many of these methods cannot be easily applied to equivalent paramagnetic systems due to the large shifts, SAs, and short relaxation times. The methods we survey can be divided into two groups: the relatively small proportion of those which were designed for diamagnetic systems but can be applied to paramagnetic systems with little or no modification, and those which are designed specifically for paramagnetic systems in order to circumvent the drawbacks caused by the presence of paramagnetic centres, or to evaluate quantitatively paramagnetic effects. In addition we provide some general guidance on how to acquire NMR spectra of paramagnetic species.

We divide the survey into two parts. Firstly we discuss methods for solution NMR. Many of the topics covered here have already been discussed by Bertini et al. [333,334,15], and so we keep the discussion brief. Secondly we discuss solid-state NMR methods. The development and application of solid-state NMR methods for paramagnetic materials and biomolecules is a field that has seen considerable progress in recent years, and so we devote more space to it here.

We also add that this survey is not intended to be the final word on paramagnetic NMR methodology. There are still many potential improvements in RF probe technology and experimental schemes to be made in order to be able to study ever more demanding systems.

#### 12.1. NMR pulse sequences

One- and two-dimensional NMR pulse sequences follow the general scheme in Fig. 12.1. The general one-dimensional scheme in Fig. 12.1(a) comprises a preparation period, which contains an excitation sequence of duration  $\tau_{\text{exc}}$ . This sequence is either a single RF pulse or a combination of pulses, and generates observable coherences of order p = -1. The coherences are then observed in the detection period of time *t*. The resulting FID is then subjected to Fourier transformation to produce the spectrum.

The general two-dimensional sequence, shown in Fig. 12.1(b), is more complex. Here the preparation period generates coherences which may or may not be directly observable. These coherences evolve during the evolution period, which comprises a time variable  $t_1$  that is incremented stepwise. This is followed by a mixing period, during which magnetization is transferred from one nuclear species to another via a coupling interaction. The mixing period generates observable coherences of order p = -1, which are observed during the detection period  $t_2$ . The acquisition strategy is as follows. Firstly we set  $t_1 = 0$  and acquire a spectrum during  $t_2$  in real time. We then increment  $t_1$  by an amount  $\Delta t_1$  and repeat the experiment to acquire a second FID in  $t_2$ . This process is repeated until we have extended the evolution time  $t_1$  to the desired value. The data are stored as data points sampled at discrete values of  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , resulting in a two-dimensional FID  $s(t_1, t_2)$  which is stored as an array, as shown in Fig. 12.2(a). This FID is subjected to a two-dimensional Fourier transform to give a two-dimensional spectrum  $S(\omega_1, \omega_2)$ , which is a function of the indirect frequency  $\omega_1$  and the direct frequency  $\omega_2$ :

$$S(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \int_0^\infty dt_1 \int_0^\infty dt_2 s(t_1, t_2)$$
  
 
$$\times \exp(-i\omega_1 t_1) \exp(-i\omega_2 t_2).$$
(12.1)

This is also presented as an array (Fig. 12.2(b)).

## 12.2. Solution NMR methods for paramagnetic systems

### 12.2.1. The general strategy

There are two principal observations associated with obtaining an NMR spectrum of a paramagnetic compound in solution. Firstly the large isotropic shifts result in a spectrum with a spectral dispersion that is considerably larger than that for diamagnetic molecules. This means that it is harder to excite the full spectral range efficiently with the RF powers that are typically available for solution NMR probes. Since the range of frequencies that are excited by a pulse, known as the bandwidth, is generally proportional to the RF field amplitude  $\omega_1$ , we expect pulse sequences containing only



Fig. 12.1. General schemes for one- and two-dimensional NMR pulse sequences. The general one-dimensional scheme is shown in (a), and the two-dimensional scheme is in (b).

short, high-power RF pulses to be more applicable than sequences with longer periods of low-power irradiation, such as spin lock pulses and periods of decoupling. High-power spin-lock periods and decoupling sequences are not advisable as they may damage both the probe and the sample.

The second observation we encounter is that the relaxation times are typically very short due to the large PREs. On the one hand, the short  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  time constants result in a considerable loss of signal during an experiment, which severely limits the length of the pulse sequence that we can successfully employ. In addition the short  $T_2$  gives very broad peaks in the spectrum. This is particularly problematic for large molecules such as proteins, where there is an appreciable Curie contribution to transverse relaxation. Both effects lead to low sensitivity, and some peaks may be missing altogether. On the other hand the short  $T_1$  can be a useful property, as the dominant factor that determines the total length of the experiment is the recycle delay, which is the time between the individual scans we allow for the spin system to relax back to equilibrium, which is set to between  $3T_1$  and  $5T_1$ for a quantitative spectrum. The short  $T_1$  values allow us to reduce the recycle delay, so that we can acquire more scans in a certain experiment time. This partly offsets the reduction in sensitivity resulting from broad peaks and signal losses during the sequence.

12.2.1.1. Spectral editing using relaxation time differences. When acquiring NMR spectra of paramagnetic molecules in solution one difficulty that may arise is that the broad, low-intensity signals from the paramagnetic species are difficult to observe as they are dominated by sharper, more intense signals from diamagnetic species, for example the solvent. This is frequently the case for paramagnetic proteins, where the solvent peak(s) dominate the spectrum. Fortunately solvent peaks can be suppressed easily by exploiting the fact that their longitudinal relaxation time constants

are significantly longer than those for paramagnetic species. We denote the solvent and paramagnetic-species  $T_1$  times  $T_1^{\text{long}}$  and  $T_1^{\text{short}}$  respectively. If we set the recycle delay so that it is equal to  $5T_1^{\text{short}}$ , but shorter than  $T_1^{\text{long}}$ , and acquire several scans, the signals components from the paramagnetic species are fully-relaxed at the start of each new scan, whereas the solvent signals are not. The former signals are acquired with maximum intensity, reflecting the size of their equilibrium longitudinal magnetization, whereas the latter are almost completely saturated. The resulting spectrum then contains far more of the signals from the paramagnetic species, with the longer-relaxing solvent signals being largely suppressed. This is a simple example of spectral editing, where the signal components with longer  $T_1$  values are selectively suppressed to allow the observation of the signals with shorter  $T_1$  time constants. The saturation is usually not perfect, and so improved techniques are required.

A more effective  $T_1$ -spectral-editing technique is based on the Water Eliminated Fourier Transform (WEFT) pulse sequence, which is shown in Fig. 12.3(a) [335]. The sequence is the simple inversion–recovery sequence, which can be used to measure  $T_1$ . The *z*-magnetization vectors from all the signal components are inverted by the 180° pulse, and then relax during the subsequent recovery delay  $\tau$ . For WEFT the delay  $\tau$  is set to  $T_1^{\text{long}} \ln 2$ , at which time the *z*-magnetization due to the solvent passes through zero. If however  $T_1^{\text{short}}$  is sufficiently short the *z*-magnetization of the paramagnetic species is fully relaxed. The second pulse of 90° flip angle then excites coherences the magnitudes of which are proportional to the recovered *z*-magnetization, with the result that the spectrum contains only the rapidly-relaxing signal components from the paramagnetic species.

The WEFT experiment has been improved by employing the same sequence, but using different values of the recovery delay  $\tau$ 



Fig. 12.2. Array representation of the FID and spectrum from a two-dimensional experiment. The FID is shown in (a), and the spectrum is in (b).

[336]. It has been shown that if the recycle delay is shortened so that the solvent peaks are saturated, but is also sufficiently long to enable full relaxation of the paramagnetic signals, then one can find a value of the delay  $\tau$  at which the solvent signals have zero intensity after several scans (super WEFT). This experiment has been applied to paramagnetic proteins in solution in order to separate signals from the protein experiencing a moderate PRE from those that relax with a larger PRE. Aa an example, 200 MHz <sup>1</sup>H super WEFT NMR spectra of a heme-containing cytochrome c mutant Ala80cytc are shown in Fig. 12.4 [337,334]. The super WEFT spectrum obtained with both  $\tau$  and the recycle delay set to 250 ms, spectrum (a), shows several signals with paramagnetic shifts that take them outside the normal diamagnetic region, and which exhibit  $T_1$  times of approximately 100 ms. However these signals obscure the peaks from the axially-coordinated histidine, which have shorter  $T_1$  times, of the order of a few ms. These more rapidly-relaxing signals can be observed in the spectrum of Fig. 12.4(b), which was acquired by setting the  $\tau$  and the recycle delays to 20 ms and 33 ms respectively.

Fig. 12.3(b) shows an alternative pulse sequence for suppressing the solvent signals, which is referred to as MOdified Driven Equilibrium Fourier Transform (MODEFT) [338]. Here the delay  $\tau$ is chosen to be short compared to  $T_1^{long}$ , and long compared to  $T_1^{\text{short}}$ . If these conditions are met, the solvent signals experience no significant relaxation during the spin echo, and the combined effect of the two  $90^{\circ}$  and  $180^{\circ}$  pulses is to rotate the equilibrium solvent magnetization by 360° so that it returns to its equilibrium position and the solvent signals are not excited. However the paramagnetic signals experience significant relaxation during the spin echo, at the end of which the magnetization has returned to equilibrium. The final pulse then acts as a simple excitation pulse, and we observe the paramagnetic signals. Typically super WEFT performs better than MODEFT when a single signal is to be suppressed, but MODEFT has comparable, or better, results when more than one slowly-relaxing signal needs to be suppressed [334].

### 12.2.2. Small molecules

There is an extensive suite of pulse sequences available for small molecules in solution, a comprehensive survey and explanation of which can be found in Keeler [255]. Here we provide a brief overview of sequences that have been employed in paramagnetic NMR.

12.2.2.1. Homonuclear through-bond correlations. One very important class of experiments is that of homonuclear through-bond correlation experiments. Correlations are observed between nuclear spins that are coupled to each other via a through-bond *J*coupling interaction. The strength of this interaction is quantified by the *J*-coupling constant *J*, which typically has a magnitude of 0-20 Hz for <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>1</sup>H interactions, and 0-100 Hz for <sup>13</sup>C–<sup>13</sup>C couplings. In the experiments described here the observation of a correlation requires that the indirect evolution time  $t_1$  be sufficiently long to allow measurable evolution of the *J*-coupling. The desired signal varies as  $\sin(\pi J t_1)$  and so the evolution time required for maximum cross-peak signal is of the order 1/(2J) [255], which for <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>1</sup>H correlation experiments means that  $t_1$  must extend to times of the order of 25 ms. Clearly this may present a problem for systems with large transverse PREs.

Fig. 12.5 shows three pulse sequences that have been successfully used [333]. The simplest experiment, shown in Fig. 12.5(a) is the COrrelation SpectroscopY (COSY) sequence, which has a mixing period comprising a single 90° pulse. There are only two pulses in the sequence, which is an advantage in that this minimizes the potential for problems with non-ideal excitation to occur. A simulated example of a spectrum is shown in Fig. 12.6(a). The spectrum contains both diagonal-peak multiplets, and cross-peak multiplets that indicate the presence of homonuclear correlations. Each diagonal-peak multiplet appears as an in-phase array, meaning that all the individual peaks have the same phase. By contrast the cross peaks are anti-phase in each dimension, so that the two components have intensities of opposite sign. The resulting multiplet appears as an anti-phase square array in the two-dimensional spectrum. This form of the spectrum has a disadvantage when the linewidth is comparable to or larger than the *I*-coupling, as the components of the cross-peak multiplet cancel to an extent, resulting in a low-intensity multiplet, whereas the diagonal peaks reinforce. Therefore it is often observed in rapidly-relaxing systems that COSY spectra exhibit very intense diagonal-peak multiplets that dominate the cross-peak multiplets. Furthermore the diagonal peaks are out of phase with the cross peaks by 90° in both dimensions. Hence if the cross peaks are phased to double absorption (i.e. absorption mode in both dimensions), as is conventionally done, the diagonal peaks are in double dispersion, and therefore have lineshapes with broad bases that can mask the presence of nearby cross-peaks.

The Double-Quantum-Filtered COSY (DQF-COSY) experiment (Fig. 12.5(b)) is an improvement over the basic COSY sequence. The mixing period comprises a double-quantum filter of two 90° pulses between which only double-quantum coherences (with  $p = \pm 2$ ) are retained. The main advantage over basic COSY is that the diagonal- and cross-peak multiplets have the same phase, and both appear as anti-phase square arrays so that there is a more equal balance of intensities. This is seen in the simulated spectrum in Fig. 12.6(b). In addition the double-quantum filter ensures that any nuclear spins that are not *J*-coupled do not contribute to the spectrum, and so there are no intense singlet resonances. The only disadvantage of the DQF-COSY experiment is that the double-quantum filter reduces the sensitivity relative to conventional COSY by a factor of two.

The  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{1}\text{H}$  COSY spectrum of (2-NCH<sub>3</sub>-21-CH<sub>3</sub>CTPP)-NiCl in CDCl<sub>3</sub> is shown in Fig. 12.7 [339]. Here the Ni<sup>2+</sup> ion coordinates to a porphyrin ring 2-NCH<sub>3</sub>-21-CH<sub>3</sub>CTPPH, the structure of which is also shown, with the result that the  ${}^{1}\text{H}$  nuclei experience appreciable paramagnetic shifts. Despite the larger dispersion of 60 ppm the COSY experiment yields a substantial number of  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{1}\text{H}$  through-bond correlations. This is in part because the transverse PREs, which cause losses in sensitivity during the COSY pulse



**Fig. 12.3.** Pulse sequences for the selective suppression of signals from nuclear species with long  $T_1$ . The basic sequence for the WEFT and super WEFT experiments is shown in (a), and (b) shows the MODEFT sequence. The filled and unfilled rectangles indicate pulses with nominal flip angles of 90° and 180° respectively, and phase *x*.



**Fig. 12.4.** <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra of the cyanide adduct of a cytochrome c mutant Ala80cytc acquired using the super WEFT pulse sequence. In (A) is shown the spectrum acquired with  $\tau = 250$  ms and a recycle delay of 250 ms. The spectrum in (B) was acquired with  $\tau = 20$  ms and a recycle delay of 33 ms, and clearly shows the two signals of the axially-coordinated histidine at 16.1 and -3.4 ppm [337]. Reproduced from [334], with permission from Elsevier.

sequence, due to Ni<sup>2+</sup> are relatively modest compared to other 3*d* metal ions, as seen from Table 8.5. Hence complexes of these other ions may be less suitable for  ${}^{1}H{-}^{1}H$  COSY.

It should be noted that, in order to maximize the signal-to-noise ratio of the cross peaks in the two-dimensional COSY spectrum, it is important to tailor the time-domain weighting functions to the expected  $T_2$  time constants [258]. For a two-spin system the time

modulation of the cross-peak multiplet between spins 1 and 2 in the FID has the form  $\sin(\Omega_1 t_1) \sin(\pi J t_1) \exp(i\Omega_2 t_2) \sin(\pi J t_2)$  $\exp\left(-t_1/T_2^{(1)}\right) \exp\left(-t_2/T_2^{(2)}\right)$ , where  $T_2^{(i)}$  is the transverse relaxation time constant for spin *i*. When relaxation is negligible the signal maximum in the FID is at  $t_1 = t_2 = 1/(2J)$ , and so we require a weighting function with a maximum at this point. However for



**Fig. 12.5.** Pulse sequences and coherence-transfer pathways for two-dimensional homonuclear through-bond correlation experiments. The basic COSY sequence in shown in (a), the DQF-COSY sequence is shown in (b), and (c) shows the TOCSY sequence. The filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90° and phase *x*. In the TOCSY experiment the grey rectangle represents continuous irradiation during an isotropic mixing sequence such as DIPSI-2.



**Fig. 12.6.** Examples of homonuclear through-bond correlation spectra of a two-spin system. The basic COSY spectrum shown in (a), the DQF-COSY spectrum is shown in (b), and in (c) is the TOCSY spectrum. The chemical shift offset frequencies of the two spins are  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$ , and the coupling between them, in Hz, is *J*. The one-dimensional traces shown above each two-dimensional spectrum are taken parallel to the  $\omega_2$ -axis at  $\omega_1 = \Omega_1 + \pi J$ , as indicated by the arrow. Positive contours are coloured red, and negative contours are black.

paramagnetic systems where  $JT_2 \ll 1$  we require a weighting function with maxima at approximately  $t_1 = t_2 = T_2$ . Typically we then acquire data points in the  $t_1$  dimension only out to a maximum time of  $2T_2$ .

The TOtal Correlation SpectroscopY (TOCSY) sequence is shown in Fig. 12.5(c). The mixing period is a z-filter, comprising two pulses between which coherences are suppressed and only longitudinal terms are retained, that contains a period of isotropic mixing. The latter, which is a period of continuous low-power RF irradiation with duration  $\tau_{\rm m}$ , which is referred to as the mixing time, is responsible for correlating signals. Transfer from one nuclear spin to another occurs due to the J-coupling, which for maximum signal requires  $\tau_m$  to be of the order of 1/(2J). This mixing may result in low sensitivity due to (1) the length of the mixing time giving large relaxation losses and (2) inefficient transfer due to the low RF field amplitude of the irradiation being insufficient to cover the spectral range of the paramagnetic shifts. The former problem is mitigated by compromising on the length of the mixing time, and ensuring that it is no longer than  $T_2$ . However the form of the spectrum has a distinct advantage over COSY and DOF-COSY as all the multiplets are in phase. This means the cross-peak multiplets due to J-couplings that are comparable to the linewidth have a larger intensity, and so are easier to observe. An example of the simulated spectrum is shown in Fig. 12.6(c). One additional difference between TOCSY and the other experiments is that, for sufficiently long mixing times, we observe 'relay' cross peaks between spins that are not directly coupled to each other, provided that both are within the same continuously-coupled network of spins. For example consider a linear spin system A–M–X, in which A is coupled to M and M is coupled to X, but A and X are not coupled to each other. Both COSY and DQF-COSY give cross-peak multiplets between A and M, and M and X, only. However TOCSY also gives a cross-peak multiplet between A and X, due to a relayed transfer from A to M, and then from M to X (and vice versa). This allows TOCSY to be used to identify isolated spin systems within a molecule.

An example of a  ${}^{1}\text{H}-{}^{1}\text{H}$  TOCSY spectrum is shown in Fig. 12.8 (b) [340]. The system is the medium-sized lanthanide-ion complex YbH(oep)(tpp), the structure of which is shown in (a). Here the isotropic shift dispersion is relatively modest, as the  ${}^{1}\text{H}$  shifts are dominated by a small PCS, and the Yb<sup>3+</sup> induces a comparatively modest PRE. For this reason the isotropic mixing sequence is able to induce a transfer with sufficient efficiency across the spectrum in order to observe a number of crosspeaks.

12.2.2.2. Homonuclear through-space correlations. A second type of homonuclear correlation experiment that is very important for structure determination involves through-space magnetization transfers between nuclear spins via the dipolar coupling. In solution the dipolar couplings are averaged to zero by molecular tumbling of the molecules. However the stochastic fluctuations of the internuclear vectors result in a cross-relaxation mechanism in which magnetization is transferred from one nuclear spin to the other. This transfer mechanism, referred to as the nuclear Overhauser effect (NOE), is useful for determining both the conformations adopted by flexible molecules, and relative stereochemistry.

There are two pulse sequences that are commonly used. This first is the Nuclear Overhauser Effect SpectroscopY (NOESY) sequence, which is shown in Fig. 12.9. The sequence has the same form as the TOCSY sequence, but without the isotropic mixing element; instead the mixing sequence is a simple *z*-filter of duration  $\tau_{\rm m}$ . The transfer of *z*-magnetization from one spin to another occurs during  $\tau_m$ , which for diamagnetic systems is usually between 100 ms and 1 s. For paramagnetic systems, on the other hand, one should set  $\tau_m$  so that is does not exceed  $T_1$ . The twodimensional spectrum contains both diagonal and cross peaks, both with the absorption lineshape. One interesting feature of the NOESY experiment is that the relative signs of the cross and diagonal peaks change with the correlation time  $\tau_c$ . For small molecules with rotational correlation times, of the order of  $10^{-10}$  s, the cross peaks are of opposite sign to the diagonal peaks. Hence if we process the spectrum so that the diagonal peaks are of negative intensity, the cross-peaks are positive. A NOESY spectrum simulated for such a small molecule is shown in Fig. 12.10(a). On the other hand, large biomolecules with longer correlation times, of the order of  $10^{-8}$  s, the sign of the cross-peaks is inverted so that it is the same as that of the diagonal peaks. This is shown in the plot of the ratio of the cross-peak and diagonal peak as a function of correlation time for a two-spin system in Fig. 12.10(b). It can be seen that there is a intermediate correlation time at which the rate of cross relaxation is zero; the precise value depends on the Larmor frequencies of the nuclei, and therefore the magnetic field, but is generally of the order of  $5 \times 10^{-10}$  s. This is disadvantageous if the molecule under study happens to have such a correlation time, as no cross peaks are observed.

The second experiment avoids this problem. The pulse sequence of this Rotating frame Overhauser Effect SpectroscopY (ROESY) experiment is shown in Fig. 12.11. Here the mixing period comprises a spin lock of the single-quantum coherences, during



**Fig. 12.7.** Experimental two-dimensional  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{1}\text{H}$  COSY spectrum of (2-NCH<sub>3</sub>-21-CH<sub>3</sub>CTPP)-NiCl in CDCl<sub>3</sub>. The upper spectrum shows the high chemical shift region of the pyrrole protons, and the lower spectrum shows the meso-phenyl region with lower shifts. The structure of the porphyrin ring 2-NCH<sub>3</sub>-21-CH<sub>3</sub>CTPPH is shown above the spectra. Adapted with permission from [339]. Copyright (1996) American Chemical Society.

which cross-relaxation takes place. The spin lock is often applied off resonance to avoid transfer via the TOCSY mechanism. The advantage of ROESY over NOESY is that the cross and diagonal peaks are always of opposite sign for any correlation time, as shown by the plot of the ratio of the intensities of the cross peak and diagonal peak in Fig. 12.10(b), and so the spectrum has the same form as that in Fig. 12.10(a). The disadvantage of ROESY is that it is necessary to spin lock for times of the order of 100 ms, and so only low RF field amplitudes can be used. This may be problematic for paramagnetic molecules with large spectral dispersion.

A comparison between the NOESY and ROESY spectra of the lanthanide complex YbH(oep)(tpp) is shown in Fig. 12.8(c) and (d) [340]. For this system it can be seen that there are a number of cross peaks observed in the ROESY spectrum (19–22) that are not seen by NOESY. As for the TOCSY spectrum applied to this complex, we note that the modest shift dispersion and PRE induced by Yb<sup>3+</sup> ensure that the spin-lock transfer in the ROESY sequence is relatively efficient.

The through-space NOE transfer can also be achieved using onedimensional techniques, such as the steady-state and selectiveinversion NOE pulse sequences shown in Fig. 12.12(a) and (b). In the steady-state experiment the longitudinal magnetization of one spin is perturbed from its equilibrium value by selective saturation for a time of the order of 1–100 ms. During the irradiation the magnetization is transferred via cross relaxation. A final 90° pulse then excites the resonances, which are observed during acquisition. The NOE transfer leads to an enhancement or diminution of the resonance intensities of the spins that are close in space to the irradiated spin. This enhancement can be seen more easily by subtracting from the steady-state spectrum a reference onedimensional spectrum in which the amplitude of the irradiation field is set to zero or, more commonly, the irradiation frequency is set well outside the spectrum of interest. Furthermore it is found experimentally that it is preferable not to fully saturate the signal of interest, but rather to irradiate with just sufficient power to reduce the intensity to 60% of its initial value [341,342]. The full set of NOE transfers can be obtained by repeating the experiment, irradiating each spin in turn. The inversion-transfer experiment follows a similar principle. Here one spin is perturbed from equilibrium by a selective 180° inversion pulse. The NOE transfer happens during the subsequent mixing time  $\tau_m$ , and the spectrum is excited by the final 90° pulse. Once again the signal changes caused by the NOE are observed following subtraction of a reference spectrum.

Fig. 12.13 shows a series of difference spectra acquired for YbH (oep)(tpp) using the steady-state NOE sequence [340]. In the difference spectra the positive peaks from nuclei experiencing an NOE transfer are of low intensity, but can still be easily identified even when they are close to the more intense negative peak of the irradiated nuclear spin. The selective steady-state method has also been used to provide an unequivocal assignment of the resonances in the small paramagnetic molecule YbDOTMA in solution, which is an analogue of the MRI contrast agent GdDOTA[343]. This assignment was used to elucidate the confirmation adopted in solution.

12.2.2.3. Homonuclear exchange correlations. The final homonuclear correlation experiment we consider is EXchange SpectroscopY (EXSY). This method correlates between nuclear species that are in slow chemical exchange, which is defined as being when the rate of exchange is small compared to the differences in chemical shifts expressed in frequency units. The pulse sequences are the same as for the NOESY and ROESY experiments in Figs. 12.9 and 12.11. In both cases the transfer of magnetization between nuclear spins occurs during the mixing periods  $\tau_{\rm m}$ , and result in similar spectra. We note that when we are in the fast exchange limit, such that the rate of exchange is large compared to the difference in chemical shifts, the two distinct peaks in the spectrum collapse into a single resonance the linewidth of which depends in part on the exchange lifetime  $\tau_{\rm M}$ . Fig. 12.14 gives an example of a simulated spectrum that would be observed for slow exchange between two sites with offset frequencies  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$ .

Two-dimensional <sup>1</sup>H EXSY has been used to study the slowexchange dynamics of the two isomeric forms of molecules derived from the MRI contrast agent GdDOTA. Expansions of the <sup>1</sup>H EXSY spectra of YbDOTA<sup>-</sup> acquired at two temperatures are shown in Fig. 12.15 [296]. The spectrum acquired at 25 °C in Fig. 12.15(a) shows several cross peaks between resonances of the two isomeric forms of the molecule. When the temperature is lowered to 0 °C in Fig. 12.15(b), the rate of exchange is reduced and fewer cross peaks are observed at the same mixing time. An analogous study has been made of the molecule YbDOTMA in solution [343].



**Fig. 12.8.** Experimental two-dimensional  ${}^{1}H-{}^{1}H$  homonuclear correlation spectra of the YbH(oep)(tpp) complex acquired in solution at 11.74 T and 298 K. The structure of the complex is shown in (A) with Ln<sup>3+</sup> = Yb<sup>3+</sup>. The spectra shown are (B) a TOCSY spectrum with an isotropic mixing time of 40 ms, (C) a NOESY spectrum with a mixing time of 40 ms, and (D) a ROESY spectrum with a spin-lock time of 20 ms. Adapted with permission from [340]. Copyright (1996) American Chemical Society.



**Fig. 12.9.** Pulse sequence and coherence-transfer pathway for the two-dimensional NOESY and EXSY experiments. The filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of  $90^{\circ}$  and phase x.

12.2.2.4. Heteronuclear through-bond correlations. A central experiment in any spectral assignment strategy is correlation between different types of nuclear spin. For the NMR of small organic molecules the most acquired correlations are between <sup>1</sup>H and a heteronucleus X, which may for example be <sup>13</sup>C or <sup>15</sup>N at natural abundance. When choosing a pulse sequence we have a choice over which nucleus to excite at the beginning of the sequence, and which to observe. If the excited nuclear spin has gyromagnetic ratio  $\gamma_{\rm exc}$  and longitudinal relaxation time constant  $T_1^{\rm exc}$ , and the observed nucleus has gyromagnetic ratio  $\gamma_{\rm obs}$ , it can be shown that the overall sensitivity is approximately proportional to [258]

$$\gamma_{\rm exc}\gamma_{\rm obs}^{3/2} \left[1 - \exp\left(-T/T_1^{\rm exc}\right)\right],\tag{12.2}$$

where T is the recycle delay. Eq. (12.2) represents an optimistic expectation for the achievable sensitivity, and in practice must be multiplied by factors that account for the efficiency of the coherence transfer(s) in the sequence, the quality factor of the probe for the observed nucleus, and the inverse linewidth of the observed nucleus. For diamagnetic molecules there is a sensitivity advantage to both exciting and detecting <sup>1</sup>H (via two transfers), as it has firstly the larger gyromagnetic ratio, and secondly generally lower  $T_1$  values which allow us to shorten the recycle delay. For paramagnetic molecules the advantage is less clear as the shorter  ${}^{1}H T_{2}$  time constants lead both to a loss in the efficiency of the coherence transfers, which is exacerbated by the use of a second transfer back to <sup>1</sup>H, and to broader <sup>1</sup>H lines. Nevertheless it is generally observed that for small paramagnetic molecules <sup>1</sup>H excitation and detection is preferable, whereas for large paramagnetic biomolecules with significant Curie broadening better sensitivity can be obtained by detecting the narrower heteronucleus resonances.

One experiment that has been successfully applied to paramagnetic molecules is the Heteronuclear Multiple-Quantum Correlation (HMQC) sequence for one-bond correlations shown in Fig. 12.16(a). The <sup>1</sup>H spin is excited by the first pulse, and then evolves under the heteronuclear *J*-coupling during the delay  $\tau_1$ . The coherence is transferred to X by the first X pulse, which generates multiple-quantum coherences between the two spins of total coherence orders -2, 0, and +2. The chemical shift of X then



**Fig. 12.10.** Example of a homonuclear through-space correlation spectrum of a two-spin system in a small molecule acquired using either the NOESY or ROESY pulse sequence. The two-dimensional spectrum is shown in (a). The chemical shift offset frequencies of the two spins are  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$ . Positive contours are coloured red, and negative contours are black. The plot in (b) shows the variation of the intensity of the cross peak divided by the intensity of the diagonal peak as a function of correlation time for both two-dimensional NOESY and ROESY. The plot in (b) was calculated for two <sup>1</sup>H nuclei separated by 5 Å, in a magnetic field of 11.74 T. The NOE/ROE mixing time is 100 ms. Here the correlation time at which the NOE enhancement is zero is 360 ps.



**Fig. 12.11.** Pulse sequence and coherence-transfer pathway for the two-dimensional ROESY experiment. The filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90° and phase *x*, and the grey rectangle is a spin-lock pulse of duration  $\tau_m$  and phase *y*.

evolves during  $t_1$ , before the second X pulse regenerates the <sup>1</sup>H single-quantum coherence and the *J*-coupling evolves during the second delay  $\tau_1$ . Finally <sup>1</sup>H is detected during  $t_2$ . If heteronuclear decoupling is applied to X during detection the spectrum contains a single peak, as shown by the simulated spectrum in Fig. 12.17(a). For paramagnetic systems heteronuclear decoupling may be ineffective, or deleterious to the quality of the spectrum. In this case the decoupling pulses can be omitted during acquisition (Fig. 12.16(b)), resulting in a spectrum containing a doublet with an in-phase splitting in the direct dimension, as shown in Fig. 12.17(b).

The advantage of this experiment is its simplicity: there are only four pulses in the sequence, which reduces the effects of imperfections when applied to paramagnetic systems. The two most significant sources of error are the 180° pulse on <sup>1</sup>H, and the heteronuclear decoupling during acquisition. The first problem arises because the bandwidths of 180° pulses are generally lower than those of 90° pulses. However if the conventional pulse proves to have insufficient bandwidth to excite the whole <sup>1</sup>H spectrum it can be replaced by more broadband composite 180° pulses, such as the broadband inversion pulses (BIPs) of Smith et al. [344]. The second problem is due to the large spectral dispersion of paramagnetic systems, which may make decoupling inefficient. However if this is the case the decoupling can simply be omitted.

The peak intensity is proportional to  $\sin^2(\pi J_{IS}\tau_1)$ , where  $J_{IS}$  is the one-bond heteronuclear J-coupling constant, and so the optimum value for  $\tau_1$  is  $1/(2J_{IS})$ . For one-bond correlations between <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C the coupling constant is typically 140 Hz, resulting in an optimum  $\tau_1$  of 3.6 ms, as shown in Fig. 12.17(d). However for short  $T_2$  it is usually found that the optimum delay is shorter, as shown in Fig. 12.17(d) where a  $T_2$  of 4 ms reduces the optimum value of  $\tau_1$  to 2.4 ms. The maximum peak intensity is reduced to 0.22 of the value expected with no relaxation. Such losses are expected for paramagnetic systems, but may be unacceptable when sensitivity is at a premium. In these cases we can simply omit the second delay  $\tau_1$  to mitigate this sensitivity loss, which gives the pulse sequence in Fig. 12.16(b). The resonance now appears as an anti-phase doublet, as shown in Fig. 12.17(c), with an intensity proportional to  $\sin(\pi I_{IS}\tau_1)$  with no relaxation. However when we account for relaxation with the same  $T_2$  of 4 ms, we see in Fig. 12.17(d) that the optimum  $\tau_1$  is again reduced to 2.4 ms, but that the intensity of the peak is reduced only to 0.48. Thus the omission of the second delay  $\tau_1$  can result in double the sensitivity compared to the first sequence.

A second heteronuclear correlation experiment that is widely used is the Heteronuclear Single-Quantum Correlation (HSQC). The basic pulse sequence, which contains more pulses than the HMQC sequence, is shown in Fig. 12.16(c). This experiment correlates the anti-phase single-quantum coherences of the *S*-spin in  $t_1$ against the in-phase single-quantum coherence of the *I*-spin in  $t_2$ . The anti-phase coherences are generated and reconverted by a pair of heteronuclear spin-echo sequences, with half-echo delays  $\tau_1$ . The form of the spectra in the presence and absence of heteronuclear decoupling during acquisition is, as shown in Fig. 12.17(a) and (b), the same as for the corresponding HMQC spectra. The



Fig. 12.12. Pulse sequences for the (a) one-dimensional steady-state, and (b) one-dimensional selective-inversion-transfer NOESY experiments. The filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90°, and unfilled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 180°. The grey rectangle indicates a saturation pulse-sequence element.



**Fig. 12.13.** One-dimensional NOE difference spectra of the YbH(oep)(tpp) complex acquired at 11.74 T and 298 K. The upper trace is the reference spectrum, labelled with the integrals of selected regions. The six spectra (A)–(D), (F), and (J) are the NOE difference spectra acquired following saturation of the corresponding <sup>1</sup>H indicated in the reference spectrum. In all cases the irradiated <sup>1</sup>H gives a negative peak in the difference spectrum, and the <sup>1</sup>H nuclei experiencing an NOE transfer give positive peaks. The structure of YbH(oep)(tpp) is given in Fig. 12.8(a). Reproduced with permission from [340]. Copyright (1996) American Chemical Society.

intensity of the resonance is proportional to  $\sin^2 (2\pi J_{IS}\tau_2)$ , which is a maximum when  $\tau_2$  is set to  $1/(4J_{IS})$ , if we neglect relaxation effects. For a coupling constant of 140 Hz, the optimum  $\tau_2$  is 1.8 ms. As for the HMQC experiment, the reconversion of the *I*spin coherences from anti-phase to in-phase immediately prior to acquisition in the HSQC experiment can be omitted for systems with short  $T_2$  times. The arguments for the improved sensitivity resulting from the omission of the second spin echo are the same as for the HMQC experiment given above, and so the plots in Fig. 12.17(d) also apply to the HSQC sequences with  $\tau_1 = 2\tau_2$ . This resulting HSQC pulse sequence is shown in Fig. 12.16(d), and produces a spectrum with an anti-phase splitting as shown in Fig. 12.17(c).

When any of these HMQC or HSQC sequences are applied to proteins in aqueous solution, it is very important to suppress the water signal. This can be done, for example, by incorporating pulse-sequence elements based on experiments like WEFT. This has been done recently by Ciofi-Baffoni et al. who incorporated water suppression in an HSQC sequence to give the IR-HSQC-AP experiment [345].



**Fig. 12.14.** Example of a homonuclear EXSY spectrum of a two-spin system in which the two nuclear spins are in slow exchange. The chemical shift offset frequencies of the two spins are  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$ . Positive contours are coloured red.



**Fig. 12.15.** Expanded region of the two-dimensional <sup>1</sup>H EXSY spectrum of YbDOTA<sup>–</sup> acquired at two temperatures. The structure of YbDOTA<sup>–</sup> is given above the spectra. The spectrum acquired at  $25^{\circ}$ C is shown in (A), and the spectrum at 0 °C is shown in (B). The <sup>1</sup>H Larmor frequency is –400 MHz, and the mixing time is 5 ms. Adapted with permission from [296]. Copyright (1992) American Chemical Society.

## 12.3. Solution NMR of paramagnetic proteins

The study of the structure and dynamics both of paramagnetic metalloproteins [346] in solution, and proteins carrying a paramagnetic tag [347], has seen substantial progress over the years. As for small molecules the paramagnetic ion in the protein is a rich



**Fig. 12.16.** Pulse sequences and coherence-transfer pathways for the two-dimensional HMQC and HSQC experiments. The basic HMQC sequence is shown in (a), in which we detect the in-phase doublet during acquisition. Heteronuclear decoupling may be employed in order to observe a singlet. Alternatively we can observe the anti-phase doublet using the sequence in (b). The delays  $\tau_1$  have an optimum value of  $1/(2J_{15})$  in the absence of relaxation. The basic HSQC sequence is shown in (c), in which we observe either the in-phase doublet on using the teronuclear decoupling, a singlet. We can also observe the anti-phase doublet directly using the HSQC sequence in (d). The delays  $\tau_2$  have an optimum value of  $1/(4J_{15})$ . The filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90°, and unfilled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 180°. The grey rectangle represents broadband heteronuclear decoupling. All pulses have phase x.



**Fig. 12.17.** Examples of heteronuclear correlation spectra of a two-spin heteronuclear spin system *I*–S acquired using either the HMQC or HSQC experiment. The chemical shift offset frequencies of the two spins are  $\Omega_I$  and  $\Omega_S$ , and the heteronuclear *J*-coupling constant is *J*. In (a) is shown the spectrum obtained with heteronuclear *S*-spin decoupling during acquisition. In the absence of decoupling we obtain a doublet with an in-phase splitting in  $\omega_2$ , as shown in (b). Alternatively we can acquire immediately after the final 90° pulse(s), and obtain a spectrum with an anti-phase doublet, as shown in (c). Positive contours are coloured red, and negative contours are black. In (d) are shown the peak intensities obtained with and without transverse relaxation for the HMQC (as a function of  $\tau_1$ ) and HSQC (as a function of  $\tau_2$ ) pulse sequences that generate the in-phase and anti-phase doublets. These curves were generated with *J* = 140 Hz and  $T_2 = 4$  ms.

source of structural information that can be exploited, but also presents spectroscopic challenges. Many of these challenges are the same as for small molecules. However there is an additional problem that we meet when studying paramagnetic proteins, which is that the transverse PREs are augmented by substantial Curie relaxation, which leads to very severe line broadening. These features are briefly discussed here, beginning with drawing a parallel with diamagnetic proteins.



**Fig. 12.18.** Illustration of the structure of a protein. The primary structure, comprising the sequence of amino acids, is shown in (a). The first step in the NMR structural analysis of the protein is to perform a sequential assignment of the nuclear spins along the backbone (HN, CO, CA, CB), and of the nuclear spins in the sidechains (SC). Following this the three-dimensional secondary and tertiary structures are determined by measuring distance restraints. This may involve measuring distances between <sup>1</sup>H nuclei in the backbone or sidechains via dipolar-based methods (b), or measuring the PCS induced by a paramagnetic centre (c).



**Fig. 12.19.** Schematic highlighting the different regions of a metalloprotein containing a paramagnetic metal ion that behave differently in the NMR experiment. There is a socalled 'blind sphere' centred on the metal ion, of typical radius 8–10 Å, where the nuclear spins cannot be observed using conventional NMR pulse sequences. The size of this sphere for any given protein is reduced if we employ protonless NMR methods and observe <sup>13</sup>C instead. Beyond the blind sphere there is a region where the nuclear spins can be observed using conventional methods, and which exhibit long-range paramagnetic effects, such as PCS and PRE, that are measurable. Beyond this region the nuclear spins are sufficiently far from the paramagnetic centre for the paramagnetic shifts and relaxation effects to be too small to be measurable.

## 12.3.1. General strategy for resonance assignment and structural restraints

When used to describe a protein the term 'structure' has a more complex meaning than for a small molecule. This is because a protein is a macromolecule, and exhibits structural features on four different levels. Proteins are formed from a sequence of amino acids, of which there are twenty with the basic structure H<sub>2</sub>NC\*HRCO<sub>2</sub>H, via a series of peptide bonds. Each amino acid comprises a carboxylic acid group, and an amine and sidechain R joined to the  $\alpha$  carbon. The precise sequence of amino acids that forms the protein, an example of which is shown in Fig. 12.18(a), is referred to as the primary structure. The primary structure comprises two parts, referred to as the backbone and the sidechains. The former comprises a repeating sequence of the directly-bonded atoms of an amide nitrogen (N), which is joined to an  $\alpha$  carbon (CA), which is joined to a carbonyl carbon (CO, or C'). To this basis sequence we also add the amide proton ( $H^N$ ),  $\alpha$  proton ( $H^{CA}$ ), and the  $\beta$  carbon (CB), to give an extended backbone. The sidechains (SC) comprise the R groups of the amino acids.

The amino acid sequence can then form local structural conformations, such as  $\alpha$ -helices or  $\beta$ -sheets; an example of the latter is shown in Fig. 12.18(b). These structural features are due to cooperative hydrogen bonds, and are referred to as secondary structure. The tertiary structure is the overall three-dimensional shape that the protein adopts when it folds, as shown in Fig. 12.18(c). Finally, individual protein units can aggregate to form larger assemblies, the quaternary structure.

Frequently a strategy for obtaining structural information about the protein comprises two parts. Firstly we need to obtain a complete assignment of the nuclear resonances along the protein backbone and sidechains. For the backbone this requires a so-called sequential assignment in which the connectivities of the N, CO, CA, CB, H<sup>N</sup>, H<sup>CA</sup>, and possibly H<sup>CB</sup> are established using threeand higher-dimensional triple-resonance experiments that correlate the <sup>1</sup>H, <sup>13</sup>C, and <sup>15</sup>N nuclear spins. These experiments combine heteronuclear one-bond coherence transfers, using schemes based on either the HSQC or HMQC experiments and homonuclear <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C–<sup>13</sup>C transfers either following spin-echo pulse sequence elements, or using TOCSY. There are experimental schemes that accomplish one-bond coherence transfers between spins within each amino acid, and other schemes that perform transfers across the CO–N bonds in order to establish connectivities between the



**Fig. 12.20.** Illustration of the sequential assignment procedure using  ${}^{13}C/{}^{15}N$  experiments. The relevant one-bond *J*-coupling constants are given. Reproduced with permission [346]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.

resonances of one amino acid and those of the neighbouring residue. These experimental schemes are well-established, and generally follow the pattern that <sup>1</sup>H is both excited and directly detected in order to maximize sensitivity as in the HSQC experiment [348]. In addition similar techniques are used for the sequential assignment of the amino acid sidechains [348].

Secondly, having obtained the assignment of the full set of resonances, we employ experimental schemes to establish which nuclear spins have a close spatial proximity. These distance restraints are then used in a restrained molecular dynamics simulation to determine how the protein folds in the tertiary structure. Typically we employ three- and higher-dimensional tripleresonance experiments which contain a NOESY through-space transfer block in order to measure distance restraints between the backbone protons, restraints between protons on the backbone and those on the sidechains, and restraints between sidechain protons [348].

In paramagnetic proteins we have the additional advantage that the paramagnetic effects can be used to measure the positions of the nuclear spins relative to the metal ion. These so-called paramagnetic restraints can then be combined with the other distance restraints described above. However we also encounter problems that arise from the large shifts and PREs that are experienced by nuclei close to the metal ion. These mean that nuclear spins close to the metal centre are harder to observe using conventional experimental schemes which use practicable RF fields and contain several coherence-transfer steps with an overall duration of several milliseconds. The result is that the protein contains a so-called blind sphere centred on the metal ion, within which we do not observe the nuclear spins using conventional experimental pulse sequences. This is illustrated in Fig. 12.19, which also includes the other regions into which we can divide the protein, depending upon the effect of the paramagnetic centre. The size of the blind sphere depends on the nature of the metal ion, and in particular the size of the PRE. For example metal ions which induce large PREs, such as Mn<sup>2+</sup>, Cu<sup>2+</sup>, and Gd<sup>3+</sup>, have larger blind spheres than metal ions associated with substantially lower induced PREs, such as the other trivalent lanthanide ions. If we employ both the excitation and detection of protons the typical radius of the blind sphere is in the range 8-10 Å for a 10 kDa protein, and becomes larger for increasing molecular mass. One key reason for the presence of the blind sphere is that the nuclear spins close to the metal ion experience a large SA which, in combination with the slow rotational diffusion of the protein, results in severe line broadening due to transverse Curie relaxation. However we can reduce the size of the sphere by employing protonless NMR methods, in which the strategies for both assignment and distance restraints are based only on <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>15</sup>N, which are of lower gyromagnetic ratio and therefore experience a lower PRE [349,350,346,351,352]. Here we trade sensitivity for increased resolution. In such cases the blind sphere radius may be reduced to approximately 5.5 Å.

At distances from the metal centre beyond the blind sphere there is a region in which the nuclear spins are observable by conventional (or adapted) NMR experiments and exhibit measurable paramagnetic effects, such as the PCS and PRE, as shown in Fig. 12.19. It is in this region that paramagnetic restraints can be used to refine the tertiary structure of the protein. Finally in very large proteins there is a further region at longer distances from the metal ion in which there are no paramagnetic shifts or relaxation effects. However we may see broadening from the BMS due to a non-spherical sample. Here standard NMR experiments can be used exactly as for diamagnetic proteins.



**Fig. 12.21.** The IPAP and S<sup>3</sup>E pulse sequences for direct detection of CO with removal of the splitting due to the CO–CA *J*-coupling. The IPAP sequences are shown in (a) and (b). The sequence in (a) acquires the in-phase (IP) spectrum, and the anti-phase (AP) spectrum is acquired by (b). As shown in (c) the sum and difference of the two spectra give different components of the doublet. A frequency shift of each component to the position of the CO shift followed by a second summation gives the final decoupled spectrum. The same result can be achieved with the S<sup>3</sup>E experiment in (d), but with a shorter sequence. The delay  $\Delta$  is set to  $1/(2J_{COCA})$ . Narrow and broad shapes indicate CO-or CA-selective 90° and 180° pulses respectively. The phases are: (a)  $\phi_{IPAP} = x$ , -x, and  $\phi_{rec} = x$ , -x; (b)  $\phi_{IPAP} = -y$ , y, and  $\phi_{rec} = x$ , -x; (d)  $\phi_{S3E}(1) = \pi/4$ ,  $\pi/4$ ,  $\phi_1(1) = x$ , y,  $\phi_2(1) = x$ , y,  $\phi_{rec}(1) = x$ , -x, where (1) and (2) are the two experiments required to separate the inplase and anti-phase spectra. Reproduced from [362], with permission from Elsevier.



**Fig. 12.22.** The DIPAP pulse sequences for direct detection of CA with removal of the two splittings due to the CO–CA and CA–CB *J*-couplings. The four sequences acquire spectra that are (a) in-phase with respect to both couplings (IP-IP), (b) anti-phase with respect to the CO–CA coupling only (AP-IP), (c) anti-phase with respect to the CA–CB coupling only (IP-AP), and (d) anti-phase with respect to both couplings (AP-AP). In (e) are shown the four spectra acquired from a single amino acid, plus the decoupled spectrum obtained from a suitable combination of the four spectra. The delays  $\Delta$  and  $\zeta$  are set to  $1/(2J_{CACB})$  and  $1/(2J_{COCA})$  respectively. Narrow and broad shapes indicate CO-or CA-settive 90° and 180° pulses respectively. The phases are:  $\phi_{DIPAP}(A) = y$ , -y,  $\phi_{DIPAP}(B) = x$ , -x,  $\phi_{DIPAP}(C) = -y$ , y,  $\phi_{DIPAP}(D) = x$ , -x, and  $\phi_{rec} = x$ , -x. Reproduced from [362], with permission from Elsevier.

### Table 12.1

Two- and three-dimensional protonless NMR experiments available for obtaining sequential assignments of the C and N spins [362]. For each experiment the observed correlations are given, where the subscript refers to the residue number in the sequence.

Experiment	Correlations	Refs.
2D		
CACO-IPAP/S <sup>3</sup> E	$CA_i - CO_i$	[352,359
CBCACO-IPAP/S <sup>3</sup> E	$CB_i - CO_i, CA_i - CO_i$	[350,352]
CCCO-IPAP/S <sup>3</sup> E	$C(B,G,D,E)_i$ — $CO_i$ , $CA_i$ — $CO_i$	[352]
CON-IPAP	$N_i - CO_{i-1}$	[352,364
CANCO-IPAP	$CA_{i}$ — $CO_{i-1}$ , $CA_{i-1}$ — $CO_{i-1}$	[360,361
CBCANCO-IPAP	$CA_{i}$ — $CO_{i-1}$ , $CA_{i-1}$ — $CO_{i-1}$ , $CB_{i}$ — $CO_{i-1}$ , $CB_{i-1}$ — $CO_{i-1}$	[352]
3D		
CBCACO-IPAP/S <sup>3</sup> E	$CB_i - CA_i - CO_i, CA_i - CA_i - CO_i$	[350]
CCCO-IPAP/S <sup>3</sup> E	$C(B,G,D,E)_i$ — $CA_i$ — $CO_i$ , $CA_i$ — $CA_i$ — $CO_i$	[352]
CANCO-IPAP	$CA_i - N_i - CO_{i-1}, CA_{i-1} - N_i - CO_{i-1}$	[360,361
CBCANCO-IPAP	$CA_{i-1} - N_i - CO_{i-1}, CB_{i-1} - N_i - CO_{i-1}$	[352]
CCCON-IPAP	$CA_{i-1} - N_i - CO_{i-1}, C(B,G,D,E)_{i-1} - N_i - CO_{i-1}$	[352]
CBCANCO-IPAP	$CA_{i}-N_{i}-CO_{i-1}, CA_{i-1}-N_{i}-CO_{i-1}, CB_{i}-N_{i}-CO_{i-1}, CB_{i-1}-N_{i}-CO_{i-1}$	[352]



**Fig. 12.23.** Illustration of the information available from the different paramagnetic restraints in a paramagnetic protein, applied to the N—H amide bond. The pseudo-contact shift (PCS) of the <sup>1</sup>H can be used to determine the position of the H with respect to the magnetic susceptibility tensor of the unpaired electrons, via the distance between the nucleus and paramagnetic centre *r*, and the angles  $(\theta, \phi)$  that define the orientation of the paramagnetic centre–nucleus vector with respect to the PAF of the susceptibility tensor (a). The <sup>1</sup>H paramagnetic relaxation enhancement (PRE) is used to determine the distance *r* of the H from the paramagnetic centre (b). Both the cross-correlated relaxation (CCR) and residual dipolar coupling (RDC) provide structural restraints for the H—N bond. The CCR broadening of <sup>1</sup>H provides both the distance *r* between the paramagnetic centre and H, and the angle  $\psi$  between the paramagnetic susceptibility tensor.

## 12.3.2. Paramagnetic NMR methods

12.3.2.1. Inside the blind sphere. Despite being referred to as the 'blind sphere' it is actually possible to observe and assign the nuclear spins within this region if we use pulse sequences that

are optimized for large shifts and large PREs. Residue-specific assignments of the protons can be performed using simple NMR pulse sequences such as the one-dimensional steady-state NOE experiment [353], and two-dimensional COSY and NOESY





**Fig. 12.24.** Structures of molecular fragments used as paramagnetic tags. Fragments (1)–(3) are nitroxide radicals, (4)–(6) are metal-binding tags based on EDTA, (7)–(9) are caged lanthanide-binding tags, and (10)–(12) are metal-binding tags based on dipicolinic acid. Reproduced from [347], with permission from Elsevier.

[354,355]. If necessary, additional sequences can be employed to aid the assignment, such as <sup>1</sup>H TOCSY and <sup>1</sup>H $^{-13}$ C HMQC [47].

1

4

6

8

Great care must be taken in interpreting the COSY spectra of paramagnetic biomolecules with slow rotational diffusion. It has been shown by Bertini et al. that in addition to the expected cross peaks that indicate *J*-coupling, cross peaks may also appear due to relaxation-induced coherence transfer even in the absence of a *J*coupling [266]. This is due to cross-correlation between the relaxation mechanism involving the dipolar coupling of the two spins in question with the Curie relaxation mechanism of one of the spins. As discussed in Section 8.8.3, the presence of the cross-peak multiplet is due to cross-relaxation between the in-phase and antiphase coherences of the spin that is induced by cross-correlated relaxation (CCR). In addition the CCR results in the two components of the doublet having different linewidths in the two dimensions, and so for zero *J*-coupling we do not obtain the perfect cancellation that we would see without CCR. The result is that with CCR, even in the limit of zero *J*-coupling, we can both generate an anti-phase coherence which is transferred to the second spin during the mixing period, and observe an anti-phase doublet in the cross-peak multiplet. However the COSY experiment remains an extremely useful assignment aid in the blind sphere of paramagnetic proteins [356].

12.3.2.2. Outside the blind sphere. Nuclear species outside the socalled blind sphere can be observed by employing the standard NMR experiments for diamagnetic proteins. For example twodimensional  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}^{15}\text{N}$  HSQC spectroscopy has been performed on the 30 kDa complex between the N-terminal domain of the  $\epsilon$  subunit and the  $\theta$  subunit of *Escherichia coli* DNA polymerase III both in the absence and presence of a paramagnetic metal ion [357]. In order to reduce sensitivity losses due to transverse Curie relaxation, the sequence in Fig. 12.16(d) was used in which the antiphase splitting is detected in the direct <sup>1</sup>H dimension in the absence of <sup>15</sup>N decoupling.

Since <sup>1</sup>H has a larger gyromagnetic ratio than either <sup>13</sup>C or <sup>15</sup>N, both initial excitation and detection of <sup>1</sup>H are used in conventional sequences to maximize the sensitivity, according to Eq. (12.2) [348]. However the larger gyromagnetic ratio also leads to a larger Curie transverse PRE in paramagnetic proteins, which leads to a reduction in sensitivity due to the increased line broadening observed in the <sup>1</sup>H dimension, and coherence decay during transfer steps that involve <sup>1</sup>H. For nuclei that are close to the metal ion the relaxation losses incurred may negate any increase in sensitivity from the initial excitation and detection of <sup>1</sup>H. In these cases it has been shown that protonless NMR experiments, in which the initial excitation and observation are both on <sup>13</sup>C lead to better sensitivity closer to the metal centre, and allow us to detect nuclei closer to the paramagnetic ion, reducing the radius of the blind sphere from 8–10 Å to 4–5 Å [349,358,350,346,351,352,359–362]. For example single-resonance <sup>13</sup>C COSY, <sup>13</sup>C multiple-quantum experiments between CO and CA (COCAMQ), and <sup>13</sup>C NOESY have been shown to be useful for the detection of signals in  $Cu^{2+}/Zn^{2+}$ superoxide dismutase (SOD), allowing detection as close as 4 Å to the Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion [349], and in Tb<sup>3+</sup>-substituted human oncomodulin (OM), where the use of protonless methods reduces the radius of the blind sphere from 16 Å to 8 Å [358].

A sequential assignment of the backbone and sidechain resonances can be achieved using a combination of the  $^{13}C/^{15}N$  experiments CON, CANCO, CACO, CBCACO, and  $^{13}C$  TOCSY [350,346]. The assignment procedure is illustrated in Fig. 12.20. We begin with the CACO experiment, which correlates between the CO and CA nuclei of the same amino acid residue. The CO is correlated to the CB via the CBCACO experiment, and the CA is correlated with the other carbons of the sidechain via the TOCSY. We then connect the sequence of amino acid residues together by measuring correlations between CO and N via the CON experiment, and the CA and CO via the CANCO experiment.

In the resulting spectra a significant limitation in the available <sup>13</sup>C resolution is the one-bond homonuclear *J*-coupling between the CO and CA, and the CA and CB carbons. Therefore it is of advantage to decouple these interactions, to obtain narrower resonances. Whilst in general homonuclear J-decoupling is very difficult, we are assisted in the present case by the uniformity of CO-CA and CA-CB J-coupling constants, which take values of 55 Hz and 35 Hz respectively. This uniformity allows us to apply methods such as the In-Phase Anti-Phase (IPAP) and Selective-Spin-State Excitation (S<sup>3</sup>E) methods shown in Fig. 12.21 [362]. In the IPAP method two sequences are employed (Fig. 12.21(a) and (b)) which acquire two spectra of the CO resonances, in which the splitting due to the CO-CA coupling is in-phase (IP) and anti-phase (AP) respectively. This is achieved by allowing the CO coherence to evolve during selective spin-echoes in which the total echo delay is  $\Delta = 1/(2J_{COCA})$  = 9.1 ms. As shown in Fig. 12.21(c), the sum of the IP and AP spectra yields a spectrum in which only one component of the doublet is present, and the difference yields the other component. Finally a frequency shift of the components in the two spectra, so that they lie at the CO shift, followed by summation, results in a CO spectrum that is homonuclear  $J_{COCA}$ decoupled. The S<sup>3</sup>E method achieves the same result, but using the sequence in Fig. 12.21(d). Here two spectra are acquired following evolution during two selective spin-echo sequences with total echo delays of  $\Delta/2 = 1/(4J_{COCA})$  = 4.5 ms. These are combined as for the IPAP method to give the decoupled CO spectrum. It is worth noting that the S<sup>3</sup>E method has the advantage of using the shorter pulse sequences, and so incurs lower losses due to transverse Curie relaxation. Both methods can be incorporated into any more sophisticated correlation experiment in which the CO dimension is directly acquired.

Both the IPAP and S<sup>3</sup>E methods can also be implemented for direct observation of the CA resonances in order to remove the splitting due to the CO-CA coupling. The resulting spectra will, of course, still contain the splitting due to the other large *I*-coupling between CA and CB. However this latter splitting can be removed too by employing the Double IPAP (DIPAP) method shown in Fig. 12.22 [362]. Here we acquire four spectra using the pulse sequences in Fig. 12.22(a)-(d), in which the CA resonance is (a) in-phase with respect to both couplings (IP-IP), (b) antiphase with respect to the CO-CA coupling only (AP-IP), (c) antiphase with respect to the CA–CB coupling only (IP-AP), and (d) anti-phase with respect to both couplings (AP-AP) as shown in Fig. 12.22(e). These four spectra are then summed and subtracted to give four new spectra, each one of which contains a single component of the doublet of doublets. Following a frequency shift and sum, we obtain the homonuclear-decoupled CA spectrum. As for the simple IPAP and S<sup>3</sup>E methods, the DIPAP method can be incorporated into any pulse sequence which detects the CA spins directly. The disadvantage of the DIPAP method compared to the simple IP method is that the selective spin echoes have a longer total echo time  $\Delta$ , which is required for the complete conversion of the CA-CB in-phase coherence to an anti-phase coherence. Hence  $\Delta = 1/(2J_{CACB})$  = 14.3 ms, which reflects the shorter CA–CB coupling constant compared to the CO-CA coupling constant.



**Fig. 12.25.** The <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>15</sup>N HSQC spectrum of the 30 kDa complex between the Nterminal domain of the  $\epsilon$  subunit and the  $\theta$  subunit of *Escherichia coli* DNA polymerase III in the absence and presence of a paramagnetic metal ion. The spectrum contains the anti-phase doublets of the two proteins, one binding paramagnetic Dy<sup>3+</sup> (yellow and blue peaks) and the other with no metal ion (red and black peaks). Straight dotted lines connect each paramagnetic resonance with the diamagnetic equivalent. Also shown is the one-dimensional trace in the <sup>1</sup>H dimension taken at  $\delta_1 = 115$  ppm and  $\delta_2 = 7.4$  ppm. The PCS is given by the overall change in chemical shift of the resonance, the transverse PRE is given by the overall line broadening, the CCR effects are measured from the difference in linewidth of the two components of the anti-phase doublet, and the RDC is calculated from the change in the splitting across the doublet. Reproduced with permission from [357]. Copyright (2004) American Chemical Society.

A large number of two- and three-dimensional protonless NMR experiments has been proposed for the sequential assignment of the backbone and sidechains of paramagnetic proteins, incorporating the IPAP or S<sup>3</sup>E methods where appropriate. These are listed in Table 12.1 [362] Once the assignment has been obtained we can acquire structural restraints with a <sup>13</sup>C NOESY experiment [363], and combine these with a set of paramagnetic structural restraints as described in Section 12.3.3.

### 12.3.3. Paramagnetic structural restraints

The NMR methods described in the previous section for observing the nuclei outside the blind sphere are used to obtain structural restraints describing the position of either the nucleus or a chemical bond with respect to the paramagnetic centre. These restraints can then be used in combination with conventional restraints, such as those obtained from NOESY, to obtain the three-dimensional protein structure. Here we describe four such restraints, namely the PCS, PRE, cross-correlated relaxation (CCR) between the Curie and diamagnetic dipolar mechanisms, and the residual dipolar coupling (RDC). The distance and orientation information that can be obtained from these four restraints is illustrated in Fig. 12.23 [357]. In addition we discuss a fifth restraint, namely the contact shift measured inside the so-called blind sphere, and how it is used to provide structural information for nuclei located in the metal binding site.

12.3.3.1. Intrinsic paramagnetic centres and paramagnetic tagging. When discussing paramagnetic structural restraints in protein NMR, we divide proteins into two groups. The first group comprises metalloproteins with one or more metal binding sites [346]. This includes proteins where the bound metal ion is paramagnetic or else becomes paramagnetic during the relevant metabolic process, such as in superoxide dismutase (SOD) where the copper ion changes between the Cu<sup>+</sup> and Cu<sup>2+</sup> oxidation states. However we also include proteins that bind diamagnetic ions, such as Ca<sup>2+</sup> or Zn<sup>2+</sup>, which can be substituted with paramagnetic ions for the purpose of introducing paramagnetic effects into the NMR spectrum.

The second group contains all other types of protein that do not have an intrinsic metal binding site, but for which it would be desirable to introduce a paramagnetic species into the structure in order to measure the resulting paramagnetic effects to give more information on the structure and dynamics. The paramagnetic centre is introduced in the form of a tag, which is a molecular fragment that is attached to part of the protein [347]. There is a wide variety of different tags, each with different paramagnetic shift and PRE properties and which are optimized for the measurement of different paramagnetic restraints. A selection of organicradical and metal-binding tags is summarized in Fig. 12.24 [347]. The simplest tags are nitroxide labels (Fig. 12.24(1)-(3)), which have an unpaired electron in the NO group, and which can be easily attached to a cysteine amino acid residue that is exposed on the surface of the protein. The NO radical exhibits relatively slow electronic relaxation, and so is particularly useful for inducing large PREs in the region immediately surrounding the tag. The other tags are molecular fragments that bind metal ions. For instance peptides that are used to mimic a metal-binding site can be attached to either terminus of the protein. Other examples include tags based on ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid (EDTA) (Fig. 12.24(4)-(6)), caged lanthanide-binding tags (Fig. 12.24(7)-(9)), and tags based on dipicolinic acid (Fig. 12.24(10)–(12)), which can be used to introduce metal ions onto specific surface-exposed amino acid residues. Such tags can bind to either 3d-transition-metal ions or lanthanide ions, depending on the particular paramagnetic restraint we wish to measure. The metal ions  $Mn^{2+}$ ,  $Cu^{2+}$ , and  $Gd^{3+}$  can be used to induce large PREs, whereas  $Co^{2+}$  and non-Gd<sup>3+</sup> lanthanide ions induce large PCS and RDC effects [347].

12.3.3.2. The diamagnetic reference. When performing measurements on a paramagnetic system, we should note that the paramagnetic contributions cannot be measured in isolation. Rather the quantity we measure contains contributions both from the



**Fig. 12.26.** PARACEST data acquired from aqueous solutions of two lanthanide complexes Ln–DOTA–4AmCE with a concentration of 63 mM, pH of 7, and at room temperature. The PARACEST profiles were obtained at 4.7 T with a 1.0 s presaturation pulse, and the two <sup>1</sup>H spectra at the top were acquired at 11.74 T in order to be able to identify the signal from the bound water. The two lanthanide ions are (a)  $Eu^{3+}$  and (b)  $Nd^{3+}$ . In both cases the signal due to the bulk solvent water is assigned a shift of 0 ppm, and the bound water signals appear at 50 ppm and -32 ppm for Eu–DOTA–4AmCE and Nd–DOTA–4AmCE respectively. On irradiation of the bound water signals the bulk water signal is reduced in intensity by 57% and 48% respectively [386,388]. Reproduced from [390], with permission from Elsevier.



**Fig. 12.27.** MAS NMR spectra of the compound **1** acquired at 11.74 T. The <sup>1</sup>H spectra acquired at 11 kHz and 33 kHz MAS are shown in (a) and (b). The corresponding <sup>13</sup>C spectra acquired without decoupling at 11 kHz and 33 kHz MAS are shown in (c) and (d). All experiments were acquired using the spin-echo pulse sequence shown, with an echo delay of 90  $\mu$ s. Adapted with permission from [7]. Copyright (2006) American Chemical Society.

diamagnetic (orbital) and paramagnetic effects. Therefore when obtaining paramagnetic restraints we need to perform two sets of measurements, one on a diamagnetic reference protein and the other on the paramagnetic protein. If the two proteins have the same structure, and the same diamagnetic electronic properties, the difference between a quantity measured on one and that measured on the other is equal to the paramagnetic contribution. For a paramagnetic metallotprotein with a Co<sup>2+</sup>-binding site, a suitable diamagnetic reference would be the same protein with the metal ion substituted with the diamagnetic  $Zn^{2+}$  ion. The question whether the two systems really do have the same structure and diamagnetic electronic properties is rather a delicate one. However we can assume that any local structural distortions resulting from the change of metal ion are limited to within a few Å of the ion, and so are not measurable on the spins we observe outside the blind sphere, tens of Å from the metal ion. For short-range effects such as the contact shifts, however, the distortions of the metal binding site are more problematic, and the use of a diamagnetic reference may not be appropriate.

The measurement of paramagnetic restraints is illustrated with  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{15}\text{N}$  HSQC spectra of the 30 kDa complex between the N-terminal domain of the  $\epsilon$  subunit and the  $\theta$  subunit of *Escherichia coli* DNA polymerase III in the absence and presence of a paramagnetic metal ion, shown in Fig. 12.25 [357].

12.3.3.3. *Pseudo-contact shifts.* The paramagnetic shifts of nuclei outside the blind sphere can be ascribed entirely to the PCS, which in the point-dipole approximation is given by Eq. (5.77), reproduced below for convenience:

$$\delta_{PCS} = \frac{1}{12\pi r^3} \left[ \Delta \chi_{ax} \left( 3\cos^2(\theta) - 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{rh} \sin^2(\theta) \cos(2\phi) \right].$$
(12.3)

The PCS is calculated from the difference in chemical shift between corresponding resonances in the paramagnetic and diamagnetic proteins, as shown in Fig. 12.25. The PCS can be used to back-calculate the distance *r* of the nucleus (here H) from the metal ion, and the angles  $(\theta, \phi)$  that fix the orientation of the ion-nucleus vector relative to the PAF of the magnetic susceptibility tensor  $\Lambda \chi$ , as shown in Fig. 12.23(a) [42,16]. Clearly a PCS is only observed for metal ions that have an anisotropic susceptibility tensor.

12.3.3.4. Contact shifts. For amino-acid residues close to the metal ion the shifts may also have an appreciable contribution from the contact interaction. The contact shifts have a sign and size that depend on the orbital occupancy of the metal ion, and the overlap between these metal orbitals and the s-orbitals of the observed nuclear spin, via any intermediate orbitals of bridging atoms. Therefore measurement of the contact shifts should provide important information regarding the geometry and unpaired electronic-spin transfer within the metal binding site [365]. However the measurement and interpretation of the contact shifts presents some difficulties. Firstly the distortion of the metal-binding site on substituting the paramagnetic metal ion with a diamagnetic analogue is expected to be significant enough that the orbital shifts also change, and so we cannot simply subtract one shift from another. Secondly these nuclei are also expected to have a significant PCS, which cannot be separated from the contact shift. Thirdly, even with reliable experimental contact shifts, their use



**Fig. 12.28.** Pulse sequences and coherence-transfer pathways, and the simulated MAS NMR spectra due to an SA, for the one-pulse and spin-echo experiments. The pulse sequence for the one-pulse experiment is shown in (a). If the FID is collected immediately after an ideal pulse the spinning-sideband manifold of the MAS spectrum (b) has uniform phase. However in reality there is a short dead time  $\delta_{de}$  between excitation and acquisition, as seen in the sequence in (c), which results in the loss of the first points of the FID, and a phase-distorted spectrum (d). The phase distortion is removed by employing the spin-echo sequence (e) [21], in which the isotropic and anisotropic shifts are refocused at the start of acquisition, resulting in a spectrum of uniform phase (f). Unless otherwise indicated filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 180°, and all pulses have phase *x*.



**Fig. 12.29.** Experimental one-pulse and spin-echo spectra of the cathode material LiFe<sub>0.5</sub>Mn<sub>0.5</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> at 11.74 T and 60 kHz MAS. The one-pulse (0.55  $\mu$ s at 455 kHz RF field amplitude) <sup>7</sup>Li spectrum with 8192 scans is shown in (a), and exhibits poor phase properties. Using a spin-echo pulse sequence gives the spectrum in (b) with uniform phase. The reduced excitation bandwidth of the spin echo presents no problems because the isotropic chemical shifts of the different sites lie within a range of 60 kHz. The one-pulse (0.65  $\mu$ s at 417 kHz RF field amplitude) <sup>31</sup>P spectrum with 32,768 scans has very poor sensitivity and phase, as shown in (c). Use of the spin echo gives some improvement in the phase across the spectrum, and a much better signal-to-noise ratio, but at the expense of excitation bandwidth, as the isotropic shifts cover a range of 800 kHz. The spectra in (a)–(d) have been plotted against both chemical shift and frequency scales. For the latter the frequency is calculated as  $\omega_0 \delta_{rel}$ , where  $\delta_{rel}$  is the chemical shift measured relative to 0 ppm for <sup>7</sup>Li and 6000 ppm for <sup>31</sup>P. In (e) and (f) are shown simulations of the excitation profile of a 400 kHz 90° pulse, and the inversion profile of a 400 kHz MAS, for a range of CSAs. Reproduced from [35], with permission from Elsevier.

as structural restraints is not straightforward without the use of first-principles quantum-chemistry or DFT calculations. For these reasons, contact shifts are currently not as widely used as PCS. However they have been used extensively for certain types of system, such as iron–sulphur proteins [355,365–368], heme proteins [369–372], and blue copper proteins [373–375].

12.3.3.5. Paramagnetic relaxation enhancements. The PRE of a nuclear spin is calculated from the difference in measured relaxation rate constants between paramagnetic and diamagnetic systems. As shown in Chapter 8 for both the Solomon-Bloembergen–Morgan and Curie mechanisms, the PRE has a simple variation with the distance of the nucleus from the metal ion of  $1/r^6$ ; it can therefore be used to back-calculate this distance, as shown in Fig. 12.23(b) [99,101]. The paramagnetic contribution

to the linewidth  $\lambda_{PRE}$  is dominated by the transverse Curie PRE and, from Eq. (8.128), is given by

$$\lambda_{\text{PRE}} = \frac{k}{r^6} \left[ 4\tau_{\text{R}} + \frac{3\tau_{\text{R}}}{1 + \omega_l^2 \tau_{\text{R}}^2} \right],\tag{12.4}$$

in the absence of chemical exchange, and where k is a constant. This PRE can be measured either from the decay during a spin-echo sequence or, as shown in Fig. 12.25, from the difference in linewidth between the paramagnetic and diamagnetic systems.

12.3.3.6. Cross-correlated relaxation. As shown in Chapter 8 the effect of the CCR between the Curie and nuclear–nuclear dipolar coupling relaxation mechanisms on the H—N amide relaxation properties is to give a doublet in the <sup>1</sup>H dimension in which the

two components have different linewidths. The difference between the two linewidths is given by

$$\Delta\lambda_{\rm CCR} = \kappa \frac{3\cos^2(\vartheta) - 1}{r^3} \left[ 4\tau_{\rm R} + \frac{3\tau_{\rm R}}{1 + \omega_I^2 \tau_{\rm R}^2} \right], \tag{12.5}$$

where  $\vartheta$  is the angle between the N—H vector and the vector connecting the paramagnetic centre to the observed nucleus, the latter being of length *r*, and  $\kappa$  is a constant. This dependence on *r* and  $\vartheta$  is shown in Fig. 12.23(c). The CCR restraint is determined from the difference in linewidth between the two doublet components as shown for example in Fig. 12.25 [376–379].

12.3.3.7. Residual dipolar couplings. For a protein in isotropic solution, unrestricted rotational diffusion has the effect of completely averaging out anisotropic NMR interactions such as nuclear–nuclear dipolar couplings. Therefore the splitting in the resonances in the  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{15}\text{N}$  HSQC spectrum is equal to the one-bond  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{15}\text{N}$  J-coupling  $J_{\text{IS}}$ . The same is true of a paramagnetic protein in which the magnetic susceptibility of the metal ion is isotropic. However for a paramagnetic protein with a susceptibility anisotropy, there is an energetic preference for the susceptibility tensor to orientate so that the axis of the PAF with the largest susceptibility component is parallel to the external field. Hence the rotational diffusion is no longer unrestricted, and the nuclear–nuclear dipolar couplings are averaged to a value that is non-zero, and referred to as the RDC. Therefore the splitting in the HSQC resonance is given by  $J_{\text{IS}} + D_{\text{RDC}}$ , where the RDC  $D_{\text{RDC}}$  is given by

$$D_{\rm RDC} = K \left[ \Delta \chi_{\rm ax} \left( 3\cos^2(\Theta) - 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{\rm rh} \sin^2(\Theta) \cos(2\Phi) \right].$$
(12.6)

This is illustrated in Fig. 12.25. The RDC depends on the angles  $(\Theta, \Phi)$  which specify the orientation of the N—H bond relative to the PAF of the susceptibility tensor, as shown in Fig. 12.23(d), and so can be used to back-calculate these restraints [380,16,381]. In practice the RDCs are measured from the differences in the splittings measured in paramagnetic and diamagnetic systems.

### 12.3.4. Solvent PREs for measuring protein-solvent interactions

In addition to refining the three-dimensional protein structure it has been shown that paramagnetic restraints can be used to study the interactions between protein residues and solvent molecules. A key restraint used in these studies is the solvent PRE [382– 385,546,547]. Here the solvent is doped with a paramagnetic molecule, which enhances the relaxation rates of any nuclei in residues that are exposed to the solvent via the spin-dipolar interaction. Therefore this solvent PRE can be used to distinguish between residues that are located on the solvent-exposed surface of the protein, and those that are located in the protein core and are not in contact with the solvent. In order for this technique to be effective it is crucial that we use a paramagnetic centre that induces a relatively large PRE. For this reason the popular choices of paramagnetic centres for measuring solvent PREs are those with slow electronic relaxation such as Gd<sup>3+</sup> complexes similar to those used as MRI contrast agents, nitroxyl radicals, or molecular oxygen.

### 12.4. Measuring chemical exchange in solution NMR and MRI

In this section we briefly review the role of paramagnetic systems in the measurement of chemical exchange, and the observation of species with low concentrations in both solution NMR of small molecules and biomolecules, and in MRI. The specific methods we discuss are Chemical Exchange dependent Saturation Transfer (CEST) [386], and application of CEST with paramagnetic shift reagents (PARACEST) [387–389].

### 12.4.1. Chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (CEST)

The CEST and PARACEST experiments are generally used to observe the NMR signals of dilute concentrations of a solute species in aqueous solution, where the former has exchangeable protons that are in slow chemical exchange with the water molecules of the latter [390]. We recall that slow chemical exchange is defined as when the exchange rate constants k describing the process are smaller than the difference in resonance frequencies of the signals of the two environments  $\Delta\Omega$ , i.e.  $k \leq |\Delta\Omega|$ . The peak of the protons in the solute environment may be of too low intensity to be observable in a conventional NMR spectrum. However we are able to detect the presence of this environment by performing a saturation-transfer experiment in which we irradiate the solute peak with a lowpower presaturation pulse of RF field amplitude  $\omega_1 \leq |\Delta \Omega|$ , which causes a transfer of saturation via chemical exchange with the solvent proton sites. Therefore we observe the presence of the solute indirectly by direct detection of the solvent, resulting in an effective sensitivity enhancement of the solute signals. In addition CEST also enables us to measure the rate constants of the chemical exchange process, which are a probe of the pH of the system, and to perform imaging experiments on dilute species [390].

The CEST experiment can be described easily using the Bloch-McConnell equations:

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{M}_{B}(t)}{dt} = \gamma_{l}\boldsymbol{M}_{B}(t) \times \boldsymbol{B}(t) - \boldsymbol{R}_{B}[\boldsymbol{M}_{B}(t) - \boldsymbol{M}_{0,B}] - \boldsymbol{k}_{BU}\boldsymbol{M}_{B}(t) + \boldsymbol{k}_{UB}\boldsymbol{M}_{U}(t),$$
(12.7)

$$\frac{d\boldsymbol{M}_{U}(t)}{dt} = \gamma_{I}\boldsymbol{M}_{U}(t) \times \boldsymbol{B}(t) - \boldsymbol{R}_{U}[\boldsymbol{M}_{U}(t) - \boldsymbol{M}_{0,U}] - \boldsymbol{k}_{UB}\boldsymbol{M}_{U}(t) + \boldsymbol{k}_{BU}\boldsymbol{M}_{B}(t).$$
(12.8)

Here we assume two-site exchange between the "bound" protons in the solute (B) and the "unbound" protons in the solvent (U). The magnetization vectors from each environment are denoted  $M_B(t)$  and  $M_U(t)$  respectively, and the equilibrium magnetization vectors are  $M_{0,B}$  and  $M_{0,U}$ . The longitudinal and transverse relaxation of each environment is governed by the relaxation supermatrices  $R_B$  and  $R_U$ , and the chemical exchange processes  $B \rightarrow U$  and  $U \rightarrow B$  are described by the exchange supermatrices  $k_{BU}$  and  $k_{UB}$ . The magnetic field, incorporating both the static  $B_0$  field and that due to the RF pulse, is B(t). We focus on the *z*-magnetization components from the two environments, as it is these that give the observable signal components following the selective saturation and excitation. The relevant parts of the Bloch–McConnell equations are:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}M_{z,B}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \omega_1 M_{y,B} - \frac{1}{T_{1,B}} [M_{z,B}(t) - M_{0,B}] - k_{BU} M_{z,B}(t) + k_{UB} M_{z,U}(t),$$
(12.9)

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}M_{z,\mathrm{U}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \omega_1 M_{y,\mathrm{U}} - \frac{1}{T_{1,\mathrm{U}}} [M_{z,\mathrm{U}}(t) - M_{0,\mathrm{U}}] - k_{\mathrm{UB}} M_{z,\mathrm{U}}(t) + k_{\mathrm{BU}} M_{z,\mathrm{B}}(t),$$
(12.10)



**Fig. 12.30.** Illustration of the frequency-stepping method for obtaining a wideline MAS NMR spectrum [397,396]. The complete spectrum is shown in (a) with the frequencies to which the transmitter is tuned in turn indicated by arrows. The individual sub-spectra, shown in (b), are summed to recover the spectrum in (a). Adapted from [396], with the permission of AIP Publishing.



**Fig. 12.31.** Solid-state <sup>17</sup>O MAS NMR spectrum of La<sub>2</sub>NiO<sub>4+3</sub> acquired using frequency stepping, with assignments [415]. The crystal structure of La<sub>2</sub>NiO<sub>4+3</sub> is shown in (a), with the oxygen sites in axial O<sub>ax</sub>, equatorial O<sub>eq</sub>, and interstitial O<sub>i</sub> positions. The individual sub-spectra were acquired at the indicated transmitter offsets and summed to give the sum spectrum in (b). Each sub-spectrum was acquired with the rotor-synchronized spin-echo pulse sequence  $30^{\circ}-\tau_{r}-60^{\circ}-\tau_{r}$ , where the pulse lengths were scaled down by l + 1/2 = 3. An expansion of the spectral region between 2000 and -1000 ppm is shown in (c), showing the assignments to the LaAlO<sub>3</sub> impurity phase, and interstitial O<sub>i</sub> in La<sub>2</sub>NiO<sub>4+5</sub>. The spectra were acquired at 7.05 T and 12.5 kHz MAS, with 120,000 scans per sub-spectrum and a recycle delay of 0.5 s. Spinning sidebands are indicated with asterisks. Reproduced with permission from [415]. Copyright (2016) American Chemical Society.

where  $M_{i,B}(t)$  and  $M_{i,U}(t)$  are the *i*-components of the magnetization vectors for the solute and solvent protons,  $M_{0,B}$  and  $M_{0,U}$  are the equilibrium values of the *z*-components,  $T_{1,B}$  and  $T_{1,U}$  are the two longitudinal relaxation time constants, and  $k_{BU}$  and  $k_{UB}$  are the exchange rate constants for the two processes  $B \rightarrow U$  and  $U \rightarrow B$ . We assume that  $|M_{z,B}(t)| \ll |M_{z,U}(t)|$  so that we can only observe the peak due to the solvent.

To simplify the description of CEST we focus on three limiting cases. Firstly we take the situation where the low-power presaturation is far off resonance for both the solvent and solute protons. In this case the Bloch–McConnell equations show that neither  $M_{z,B}$  nor  $M_{z,U}$  is perturbed from its equilibrium value, and the excitation following the presaturation gives the conventional spectrum. Secondly if the carrier is resonant with the solvent peak and we achieve complete saturation  $M_{z,U}$  is zero at the end of the spin lock, and we observe no solvent signal in the corresponding spectrum. The final case is the most interesting, and is when the carrier frequency is resonant with the solute peak. Here we saturate the solute magnetization so that  $M_{z,B} = 0$ . The solvent magnetization reaches a time-independent steady-state  $M_{z,U}^{SS}$ , the expression for which is calculated from Eq. (12.10):

$$M_{z,U}^{\rm SS} = \frac{1}{1 + T_{1,U}k_{\rm UB}}M_{0,U}.$$
 (12.11)

From this expression we see immediately that the steady-state solvent magnetization is of the same sign as the equilibrium magnetization, but has a reduced magnitude. In the resulting spectrum we still observe the solvent peak, but with a reduced intensity compared to the conventional spectrum. This reduction in intensity of the solvent peak is easier to detect than the solute peak in the conventional spectrum, and so CEST is able to detect the solute indirectly with an effective sensitivity enhancement [390]. This description is simplified for perfect saturation and ignores

imperfect saturation and near-off-resonance effects of the presaturation. However these can be accounted for as described by Zhou and van Zijl [390].

In practice we apply CEST by performing a series of saturation– excitation experiments with different carrier frequencies, and acquiring the spectrum of the solvent peak for each. When the carrier is resonant with the solute peak we observe a decrease in the solvent resonance, and are therefore able to identify the chemical shift of the solute resonance. Further the complete solvent intensity profile as a function of carrier frequency can be fitted to the Bloch–McConnell equations to extract the chemical exchange rate constants.

## 12.4.2. Paramagnetic shift reagents in chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (PARACEST)

To be able to perform a CEST experiment we need to be able to selectively irradiate the exchangeable proton of the solute, which also requires the exchange to be slow or intermediate, i.e.  $k \leq |\Delta\Omega|$ . For diamagnetic systems the proton chemical shift of the solute is typically within 6 ppm of the bulk water, and so CEST is limited to the study of exchange rate constants of up to the order of 1 kHz. However we can employ paramagnetic solute systems, such as chelated lanthanide ions, to study faster exchange processes. In these systems the bound protons experience paramagnetic shifts which increase the chemical shift difference from the bulk water, and so increase the upper bound of the exchange rate constant we are able to study by orders of magnitude. This application of CEST is referred to as PARACEST [387–389].

The first examples of PARACEST were demonstrated for lanthanide complexes by Zhang and Sherry [387,388]. The studied the lanthanide complexes Ln–DOTA–4AmCE, with Ln = Pr, Nd, Eu, and Yb, which bind water molecules via a slow exchange process. Two PARACEST profiles for Eu–DOTA–4AmCE and Nd–DOTA– 4AmCE are shown in Fig. 12.26(a) and (b) [390]. In both cases



**Fig. 12.32.** Pulse sequence and coherence-transfer pathway for the one-dimensional CPMG experiment [417,418]. The time points at which the isotropic shift is refocussed are indicated with arrows. Unless otherwise indicate filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of  $90^{\circ}$  and unfilled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of  $180^{\circ}$ , and all pulses have phase *x*.

the intensity of the bulk water signal (assigned a shift of 0 ppm) was monitored as a function of the frequency of the presaturation pulse. For both profiles the observed features can be explained with reference to the simple saturation model described in Section 12.4.1. In the case of Eu–DOTA–4AmCE in Fig. 12.26(a), we observe no reduction in the intensity of the bulk water signal when the presaturation is far off-resonance from both the bulk and bound water signals, for example at  $\pm 80$  ppm. When the presaturation frequency is at 0 ppm we completely saturate the magnetization due to bulk water with the result that the peak is completely suppressed. The feature that is of particular interest is the reduction in the intensity of the bulk water peak that is observed when the presaturation frequency is set to 57 ppm, which corresponds to the chemical shift of the bound water molecule. The saturation of the magnetization of this bound water molecule caused a transfer in the polarization to the bulk water signal resulting in a reduction of 57%. Furthermore the width of this dip in the PARACEST profile was used to estimate the exchange lifetime of the bound water, which was found to be 380 µs [387,388]. Similar features were observed in the PARACEST profile of Nd-DOTA-4AmCE in Fig. 12.26(b). Here the reduction in the bulk water peak was observed with a carrier frequency of -32 ppm, and the broader dip indicated a faster exchange process with a lifetime of  $80 \, \mu s$ [387,388].

In vivo, the form of the PARACEST profiles is sensitive to a number of physiological conditions, such as pH and temperature. This has been exploited in a number of studies, and lanthanide complexes have been used to measure pH [389], detect the presence of particular metabolites [391], perform imaging within cells [392], and measure temperature [393].

### 12.5. Solid-state NMR methods for paramagnetic systems

### 12.5.1. The general strategy

When applying NMR methods to paramagnetic materials in the solid state we are faced with a task which has many similarities to, but also many differences from, the analysis of paramagnetic molecules in solution.

Some features of a paramagnetic NMR spectrum do not change between the two cases. Notably, a nucleus next to a paramagnetic centre displays identical isotropic paramagnetic shifts, contact or pseudo-contact in origin, independently of whether the NMR analysis is performed in solution or in the solid state. Therefore in both cases the spectroscopist may be confronted with the acquisition of signals with very large chemical shift dispersions, and with the interpretation of peak positions significantly different from conventional diamagnetic chemical shifts. This is a situation that already falls within the expertise of a solid-state NMR spectroscopist, as the community already has considerable experience in working with broad resonances in diamagnetic samples, due to the CSA and quadrupolar interactions. The Solomon–Blombergen–Morgan relaxation mechanisms operate in the solid state in an analogous way to solution, and accelerate nuclear relaxation. As experienced in solution NMR, the resulting PREs may lead to a reduction in sensitivity due to signal loss during the pulse sequence, but at the same time have the effect of allowing rapid acquisition of a large number of scans by reducing the recycle delay.

However a first main difference comes from the Curie broadening, which is the limiting factor in the study of large paramagnetic molecules by solution NMR. In solids, whilst there may still be a contribution to Curie relaxation from slow internal motions of the system, the overall rate of Curie relaxation, and the corresponding contribution to the linewidth, is generally lower than in solution. This is of particular importance for the study of systems containing paramagnetic centres for which the correlation times for the electronic fluctuations are short ( $< 10^{-11}$  s). In solids, these centres (typically Co<sup>II</sup>, Fe<sup>II</sup>, Ln<sup>III</sup>) significantly enhance the longitudinal relaxation of the surrounding spins, but have a negligible effect both on their observed linewidths and their coherence lifetimes, and so do not significantly reduce the efficiency of magnetization transfers.

A number of other phenomena affect a paramagnetic NMR spectrum specifically in the solid state. In addition to the features of paramagnetic systems in solution, we now also need to account for large anisotropic interactions, such as the paramagnetic shift anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions. These lead to broader spectra than are generally observed in solution NMR, which can lead to further difficulties in obtaining broadband excitation. This spectral broadening therefore also leads to a reduction in sensitivity. The strength of the SAs in particular is very large in solid materials that contain a dense array of paramagnetic ions, as the paramagnetic contributions add up.

Another important difference in solids is the presence of BMS effects, which lead to large inhomogeneous broadening in both static and MAS spectra. In solid materials containing paramagnetic ions with rapid electronic relaxation, it is generally found that it is this effect, and not the transverse PRE, that gives the largest contribution to the linewidth, and hence is the factor that limits resolution.

The sizes of the shift and SA, and the inhomogeneous broadening, scale with the external magnetic field, and so a low magnetic field (200 MHz or lower) results in a spectrum with lower dispersion that is easier to excite with practicable RF field amplitudes. However, this has the primary disadvantage that the overall sensi-



**Fig. 12.33.** Pulse sequence and coherence-transfer pathways of the CP-HETCOR experiment with direct detection [19,419]. The filled rectangle indicates a pulse with a nominal flip angle of 90° and phase x. The two shaded rectangles indicate the spin-lock pulses applied during cross polarization. The spin-lock pulses are applied simultaneously for a contact time  $\tau_{con}$  during which the nominal *l*-spin and *S*-spin RF field amplitudes are set to a Hartmann–Hahn matching condition:  $|\omega_{1,l} - \omega_{1,S}| = n\omega_{r}$ , or  $\omega_{1,l} + \omega_{1,S} = n\omega_{r}$ , where n = 1, 2.



**Fig. 12.34.** Comparison between the direct-excitation <sup>13</sup>C MAS spectrum, <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>13</sup>C CP spectrum, and <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>13</sup>C TEDOR spectrum of the compound **1**, the structure of which is shown in Fig. 12.27 [7]. The direct-excitation <sup>13</sup>C spectrum acquired at 33 kHz MAS is shown in (a). The CP spectrum in (b) was acquired with a contact time of 500  $\mu$ s, and the TEDOR spectrum in (c) was obtained with a recoupling time of 60  $\mu$ s. Adapted with permission from [7]. Copyright (2006) American Chemical Society.

tivity is reduced. A workaround can be adopted for nuclei with more than one NMR-active isotope, for example <sup>1/2</sup>H and <sup>6/7</sup>Li. As the shift and SA scale with the gyromagnetic ratio, studying the isotope with the lower  $\gamma_1$  produces a narrower spectrum, which is easier to excite. However, as in the case of reducing the magnetic field, nuclei with lower  $\gamma_1$  also have lower intrinsic sensitivity. In

addition the second-order quadrupolar interaction scales inversely with the external field, and so a low field increases the resonance broadening associated with this interaction in the spectra of quadrupolar nuclei such as <sup>23</sup>Na.

All of these observations suggest that the development of pulse sequences incorporating broadband excitation that can excite a wide range of shifts and SAs at high field would be advantageous. In recent years there has been growing interest in studying solids with increasingly strong paramagnetic effects, such as battery materials with a large density of paramagnetic ions in the lattice [54]. This has provided strong motivation for developing broadband NMR sequences specifically optimized for paramagnetic materials, as described in Section 12.5.7 [57]. These methods provide a solution to studying nuclei with high gyromagnetic ratios and large SAs at high field. They include the development of tailored RF pulse schemes, and their combination into more sophisticated sequences, for example to resolve individual local environments [7,31], or otherwise to separate the spectral features of a local environment due to different spin interactions [393,396,200]. In the presence of multiple nuclear local environments, each experiencing multiple interactions, these tools help to resolve complicated spectra with multiple overlapping features, and to extract the required interaction parameters with sitespecific resolution.

Another difference between the NMR of solids and solutions is the presence of large homonuclear and heteronuclear dipolar couplings in the former, which are generally difficult to decouple.

It was recognized early on by Clayton et al. that heteronuclear <sup>1</sup>H decoupling is ineffective for increasing the resolution in the



**Fig. 12.35.** Pulse sequences and coherence-transfer pathways for the TEDOR experiments with direct- and indirect-detection. The pulse sequence for direct detection of the heteronucleus is shown in (a) [420]. The sequence in (b) is designed for indirect (proton) detection. The numbers of repetitions of the inversion pulses  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  must be odd in order to ensure refocussing of the SA of the active spin. For  $n_1 = n_2 = 0$ , these sequences are referred to as the DINEPT [27] and DHSQC experiments respectively [28]. Unless otherwise indicated, filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90° and unfilled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90°. All pulses have phase x, with the exception of the 180° TEDOR recoupling pulses inside the loops, which have phases  $\phi_i$  that vary independently according to the XY-8 supercycle *xyxyyxyx* [421].


**Fig. 12.36.** Illustration of the RAPT sequence for enhancing the signal from the CT of a half-integer-spin quadrupolar nucleus [422]. The effect of ST saturation is illustrated on the nuclear-spin energy level diagrams for a spin I = 3/2 in (a). Saturation of the two STs leads to the simultaneous removal of the ST polarization, and enhancement of the CT polarization. The RAPT pulse sequence is shown in (b). The saturation period comprises a pair of pulses with flip angle  $\beta$  and alternating phases +*x* and -*x* with total length  $\tau_c$ , that is repeated *N* times. The final pulse is a CT-selective, low-power pulse calibrated to deliver a 90° rotation to the CT polarization.



**Fig. 12.37.** Illustration of the application of RAPT to the <sup>25</sup>Mg NMR of the battery material Mg<sub>6</sub>MnO<sub>8</sub>. The enhancement profile showing the RAPT enhancement as a function of repetition frequency  $\nu$  is shown in (a). The optimum enhancement is obtained with values of  $\nu$  between 250 and 270 kHz, corresponding to an estimated  $C_Q$  of 3.3–3.6 MHz. A spectrum acquired separately with a repetition rate of 270 kHz is shown in (b), and exhibits an enhancement of 1.6. Reproduced by permission of the PCCP Owner Societies [59].

NMR spectra of paramagnetic complexes, due to the difficulty in efficiently irradiating the very broad resonances [23]. In addition, the use of high-power decoupling requires that the recycle delay is set to a minimum of five times the total decoupling time to prevent damage to the probe. This requirement often extends the recycle delay to longer than is required for complete longitudinal relaxation, which for paramagnetic systems means that the short  $T_1$  is not being exploited. This idea was taken further by Ishii et al. who suggested that, because decoupling is at best ineffective and at worse has a deleterious effect on the spectrum, it is better not to decouple and to rely instead on fast MAS to average out the dipolar couplings [26,6].



**Fig. 12.38.** Pulse sequences and coherence-transfer pathways for the spin-diffusion and RFDR homonuclear correlation experiments. The basic spin-diffusion pulse sequence is shown in (a). Modification of this sequence to include RFDR homonuclear recoupling during the *z*-filter gives the sequence in (b) [426]. Unless otherwise indicated filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90° and unfilled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 180°. All 90° pulses have phase *x*. The phases  $\phi$  of the 180° RFDR pulses vary according to the XY-8 supercycle *xyxyyxyx* [421].

Increasing the MAS frequency also has an additional beneficial effect on resolution and sensitivity, as the signal in the spinningsideband manifolds is concentrated in fewer sidebands that are more widely separated in the spectrum. Furthermore, the recycle delay now only reflects the short  $T_1$  of the system, and not any requirements due to the decoupling, and so scans can be acquired more rapidly. An example of the benefits of fast spinning, rapid pulsing, and no decoupling are shown by the <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C MAS spectra of a paramagnetic organometallic complex in Fig. 12.27 [7]. The <sup>1</sup>H spectra acquired at 11 kHz and 33 kHz in (a) and (b) show that there is a clear improvement in both resolution and sensitivity on increasing the MAS frequency. The improvement is even more marked for <sup>13</sup>C. The spectacular enhancement experienced in sensitivity and resolution as compared to slower rates is nowadays amplified by the continuous development of new probes capable of faster MAS, allowing efficient detection of previously unobservable nuclei in highly paramagnetic substances.

### 12.5.2. One-dimensional NMR

12.5.2.1. One-pulse and spin-echo spectroscopy. The simplest pulse sequence for obtaining a one-dimensional MAS spectrum is the one-pulse sequence shown in Fig. 12.28(a). The sequence comprises a single pulse which generates p = -1 coherences that are observed during acquisition. In order to obtain maximum sensitivity the pulse flip angle should be set to a nominal value of 90°. However under circumstances where the pulse is of too low an RF field amplitude to ensure broadband excitation, a shorter pulse of the same amplitude can deliver a more uniform excitation response as there is less time for substantial deviations from ideal behaviour. The resulting sensitivity is lower, but this can be offset when we note the partial excitation means that the system is closer to its equilibrium configuration than after a 90° pulse, and so a shorter recycle delay can be used. In the ideal case this excitation pulse gives a spectrum with a uniformly-excited spinningsideband manifold, as shown in Fig. 12.28(b).



**Fig. 12.39.** Experimental two-dimensional  ${}^{13}C{}^{-13}C$  dipolar correlation spectrum acquired with  ${}^{13}C{}^-$  and  ${}^{15}N{}^-$ labelled Cu(DL-Ala)<sub>2</sub> with RFDR mixing at 40 kHz MAS. The two-dimensional correlation sequence was preceded by a  ${}^{1}H{}^{-13}C$  dipolar transfer with the DINEPT sequence [27]. The RFDR mixing period comprised a train of 4 µs 180° pulses (125 kHz) and was of total duration 1.6 ms. Reproduced from [427], with the permission of AIP Publishing.

However we encounter a problem imposed by instrumental limitations, which means that this ideal performance is not observed in practice. In practice the acquisition period does not immediately follow excitation, since (1) the pulse has a non-zero duration, and (2) we require a delay of a few  $\mu$ s, known as the dead time  $\delta_{de}$ , to switch from excitation mode to observation mode. Both effects lead to significant phase dispersion across the spectrum. As shown in the sequence in Fig. 12.28(c), the inclusion of the dead time means that we miss the initial points of the FID, and therefore do not acquire the initial evolution of both the isotropic shift and SA. This is more problematic for the larger spectral widths needed for paramagnetic systems, as the sampling rate of the FID is inversely proportional to the spectral width. The quality of the spectrum, shown in Fig. 12.28(d), is severely degraded by the resulting large frequency-dependent phase errors.

A solution to this problem is to employ the rotor-synchronised spin-echo pulse sequence shown in Fig. 12.28(e) [21]. Here the  $90^{\circ}$ 

excitation pulse is followed by two delays each of which is of the same duration  $n\tau_r$ , equal to an integer number of rotor periods n, that sandwich a 180° pulse, and we absorb the dead time into the second delay. The coherence-transfer pathway shown is the sole pathway available for ideal pulses, but in practice cycling of the 180° pulse phase is employed to eliminate unwanted pathways that arise from non-ideal behaviour such as insufficient bandwidth [321]. The sequence has the property that it refocuses the evolution of both the isotropic chemical shift and time-dependent SA at the start of acquisition. The refocussing process can be explained as follows. During a delay  $\tau$  the sum of the frequencies due to both the isotropic and anisotropic shifts is proportional to the coherence order, and is given by  $-p\Omega_{iso} - p\Omega_{c}^{SA}(\tau)$ . During the first delay  $n\tau_{r}$ the time-dependent SA self-refocusses due to the periodicity under MAS, and the total acquired phase is  $-\Omega_{iso}(n\tau_r - 0) \Phi_c^{SA}(n\tau_r, 0) = -\Omega_{iso}n\tau_r$ . In the same way we can calculate the phase acquired following the 180° pulse as  $\Omega_{iso}(2n\tau_r - n\tau_r) +$  $\Phi_c^{SA}(2n\tau_r, n\tau_r) = \Omega_{iso}n\tau_r$ . The two phases accrued before and after the 180° pulse then sum to zero. This refocussing means that at the start of acquisition we have effectively put the spin system into the same state as we would obtain from ideal one-pulse excitation, and we obtain the same spectrum without phase errors, as shown in Fig. 12.28(f). If the 180° pulse is sufficiently broadband, the only difference between the two sequences is the signal loss from dephasing during the spin echo. This dephasing is due to relaxation and coherent homogeneous processes, but not to inhomogeneous decay as the chemical shift distribution of the latter is refocussed by the echo.

Experimental examples of spectra obtained from the one-pulse and spin-echo pulse sequences are shown in Fig. 12.29 [35]. The system is the battery cathode material LiFe<sub>0.5</sub>Mn<sub>0.5</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, which has two species of paramagnetic transition-metal ions Fe<sup>2+</sup> and  $Mn^{2+}$  in a 1:1 ratio. The <sup>7</sup>Li one-pulse and spin-echo spectra are shown in Figs. 12.29(a) and (b). The former clearly shows a frequency-dependent phase error across the spectrum, due to evolution of the SA during the dead time, which is removed in the latter. The range of isotropic shifts of the multiple Li sites is comparatively small at 90 ppm, which is approximately equal to the inhomogeneous broadening of the individual sidebands. The <sup>31</sup>P spectrum, by contrast, displays overlapping spinningsideband manifolds from 32 distinct local environments with a



**Fig. 12.40.** Experimental two-dimensional <sup>6</sup>Li EXSY spectra acquired with monoclinic  $Li_3Fe_2(PO_4)_3$  at 25 kHz MAS. The one-dimensional spectrum contains three distinct resonances for the three Li sites A, B, and C. The spectrum in (a) was acquired with a mixing time of 0.5 ms, and shows no cross peaks. The spectrum in (b) was recorded with a longer mixing time of 3.0 ms, and exhibits cross peaks due to exchange between all three sites. The temperature is 311 K. Reproduced with permission from [429]. Copyright (2010) American Chemical Society.



**Fig. 12.41.** Experimental two-dimensional  ${}^{1}H{-}{}^{13}C$  TEDOR spectra acquired with compound **1** of Fig. 12.27 using the pulse sequence in Fig. 12.35(a). The MAS frequency is 30 kHz, the loop counters were both set to 1, and the *z*-filter was omitted. The recoupling time of 60  $\mu$ s is selective for short-range transfers over the distance scale of a single H–C bond. The spectrum in (a) shows the region of the spectrum with the isotropic peaks. The black one-dimensional spectra along the  ${}^{1}H$  and  ${}^{13}C$  dimensions represent projections of the two-dimensional spectrum onto those axes, and the red traces are cross-sections extracted at the frequencies indicated by the dashed lines. The lines are broadened into ridges by inhomogeneous broadening. Applying a shearing transformation to the spectrum (see text for details) gives the spectrum in (b) where the horizontal dimension represents the high-resolution zero-quantum (ZQ) dimension. Reproduced with permission from [7]. Copyright (2006) American Chemical Society.

range of isotropic shifts of 4000 ppm [31]. The one-pulse spectrum in Fig. 12.29(c) also has a frequency-dependent phase error, and a very poor signal-to-noise ratio that is worse than for <sup>7</sup>Li. This is due to the larger range of isotropic shifts which leads to a greater degree of differential evolution during the dead time. The spinecho spectrum in Fig. 12.29(d) has improved phase properties and sensitivity, despite the  $T'_2$  decay during the echo, but also shows a smaller excitation bandwidth. This is because the range of isotropic frequencies over which we obtain quantitative inversion (the inversion bandwidth) with a  $180^{\circ}$  pulse is lower than the corresponding isotropic frequency range over which we obtain quantitative excitation (the excitation bandwidth) with a 90° pulse. This can be seen from the simulated 90° pulse excitation and 180° pulse inversion profiles shown in Fig. 12.29(e) and (f). Nevertheless the spin-echo sequence is an indispensable experiment in solid-state paramagnetic NMR. In addition to onedimensional spectroscopy, the spin-echo pulse sequence can be appended to any of the more complex sequences presented here, such as those used for two-dimensional correlations, in order to obtain uniform phase in the direct dimension.

We make a final comment about the application of these pulse sequences to quadrupolar nuclei, considering half-integer and integer spins separately. In the solid state the NMR spectrum of an half-integer nuclear spin is dominated by the sharp and intense resonance due to the CT, with the ST resonances broadened to the point where they are sometimes difficult to detect. Hence in practice the spectrum is sometimes obtained by applying excitation pulses that are of low power, so that  $\omega_1 \ll \omega_Q$ , and are therefore selective for the CT. In this case the excitation Hamiltonian due to an excitation pulse phase *x* applied to a spin experiencing a first-order quadrupolar interaction can be approximated as

$$\overline{H}_{Q}^{(1)} + \omega_{1} \widehat{I}_{x} \approx \overline{H}_{Q}^{(1)} + \omega_{1} (I + 1/2) \widehat{I}_{x}^{(+1/2, -1/2)}.$$
(12.12)

where  $\widehat{I}_{x}^{(+1/2,-1/2)} = (\widehat{I}_{+}^{(+1/2,-1/2)} + \widehat{I}_{-}^{(+1/2,-1/2)})/2$ . We see that the effective RF field amplitude is  $\omega_1(I + 1/2)$ , i.e. it has been scaled up by the spin-dependent factor (I + 1/2) [331]. Therefore we only apply the pulse for a time that is shorter by a factor (I + 1/2) than the nominal pulse length. In paramagnetic systems we often need to apply higher-power pulses to fully excite the CT resonance, which is broadened by a large SA interaction. For nuclear species with small quadrupolar interactions, such as <sup>7</sup>Li, this means that the RF field amplitude is comparable to or greater than  $\omega_{Q}$ , so that no scaling of the pulse length is required. However nuclear species with larger  $\omega_{Q}$  frequencies, such as <sup>23</sup>Na and <sup>27</sup>Al, often still require a scaling of the pulse length. For example this means that the spin-



**Fig. 12.42.** Two-dimensional  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{13}\text{C}$  correlation spectra of a paramagnetic Cu(II)cyclam complex at 30 kHz MAS. The DINEPT spectrum is shown in (a), and the DHSQC spectrum is shown in (b). The recoupling times for the generation of antiphase coherences and reconversion back to in-phase coherences were both 33.33 µs. Adapted with permission from [28]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.

echo sequence applied to <sup>23</sup>Na with I = 3/2 is  $45^{\circ}-\tau_r-90^{\circ}-\tau_r$ , where the flip angles are the nominal values calibrated in the absence of the quadrupolar interaction.

For integer-spin nuclei such as <sup>2</sup>H and <sup>6</sup>Li, all the observable transitions are affected by the quadrupolar interaction to first order. In powder samples we generally excite all the observable transitions, and so do not scale the pulse length.

12.5.2.2. Frequency stepping. A simple method to overcome the bandwidth problem and obtain a quantitative, broadband onedimensional spectrum is to set the transmitter offset to different values, with a step size that is equal to or smaller than the RF field amplitude, and to acquire a of sub-spectrum for each offset. The sub-spectra are then summed to give the final spectrum. The concept is illustrated for MAS NMR in Fig. 12.30, which shows a spectrum in (a) obtained by summing the sub-spectra shown in (b) [396]. This method has usually been applied to static solids, for both quadrupolar nuclei and paramagnetic systems with large interactions, and has been referred to as spin-echo mapping



**Fig. 12.43.** Pulse sequence, coherence-transfer pathway, and pulse timings of the two-dimensional PASS and MAT experiments for separating the isotropic shift and SA. The pulse sequence is shown in (a). To obtain a PASS spectrum the timings for the 180° refocussing pulses shown in (b) are used [431]. The timings in (c) are used for a MAT experiment, for which both *N*- and *P*-type datasets are required [432]. Unless otherwise indicated, filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90° and unfilled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 180°, and all pulses have phase *x*.

[398–404,54], Variable-Offset Cumulative Spectroscopy (VOCS) [405–407], and frequency stepping [408–413]. The accurate reconstruction of the spectrum is a delicate matter, particularly under MAS where the number of published examples is smaller [397,414]. However a recent theoretical treatment of frequency stepping under MAS has shown that the spinning-sideband manifolds can be properly reproduced by careful summation of the sub-



**Fig. 12.44.** Simulated spectra illustrating the two two-dimensional spectroscopic methods for separating overlapping spinning-sideband manifolds. The conventional one-dimensional spectrum contains two overlapping spinning-sideband manifolds, both with Gaussian inhomogeneous broadening of the isotropic shifts. The PASS spectrum, in which the isotropic shift is refocussed in  $\omega_1$ , is shown in (a). The sidebands of the two manifolds are aligned parallel to the  $\omega_1 = \omega_2$  main diagonal, and centred at  $\omega_1 = 0$ . The isotropic resonances, indicated by arrows, are now clearly separated in the one-dimensional trace to the right taken parallel to  $\omega_2$ . The MAT spectrum is shown in (b). Here the two spinning-sideband manifolds are parallel to  $\omega_2$ , and centred at the isotropic resonances is shown to the right containing only the isotropic resonances is shown to the right. The inhomogeneous broadening is parallel to  $\omega_2$  main diagonal.

spectra [396]. Accordingly the number of experimental examples in material science is currently increasing [57,58,415]. An example of frequency stepping applied to a particularly challenging material is the solid-state <sup>17</sup>O MAS NMR spectrum of La<sub>2</sub>NiO<sub>4+ $\delta$ </sub> [415], shown in Fig. 12.31. The crystal structure in Fig. 12.31(a) shows three distinct <sup>17</sup>O sites which, with an additional resonance due to a LaAlO<sub>3</sub> impurity phase, give at least four resonances with isotropic shifts over a range of 8000 ppm as shown in the sumspectrum in (b). There is additional broadening due to the SA interactions, which broaden the spectrum over 20,000 ppm. The sumspectrum was acquired with the spin-echo pulse sequence 30°- $\tau_r$ -60°- $\tau_r$ , where the nominal pulse lengths are reduced by a factor of three in the CT-selective regime. An expansion of the spectrum between 2000 and –1000 ppm is shown in Fig. 12.31(c).

Traditionally the acquisition of frequency-stepped solid-state NMR spectra has necessitated a manual retuning of the probe for each new sub-spectrum, making the whole process rather cumbersome. However Pecher et al. have recently developed an external



**Fig. 12.45.** Two-dimensional <sup>13</sup>C MAT spectrum at room temperature of  $[(C_2H_5)_4-N]_2[Fe_4S_4(S^{13}CH_2C_6H_5)_4]$ . The two-dimensional spectrum is shown in (a). The resonance marked by the vertical arrow is due to the strongest sharp line at 0 ppm from the natural abundance <sup>13</sup>C spins in the terminal methyl groups of the counterions. In (b) is shown the one-dimensional trace taken from the horizontal slice at 101 ppm. Reproduced with permission from [433]. Copyright (2000) American Chemical Society.

automatic tuning and matching (eATM) robot, applicable to both static and MAS experiments, which allows the whole acquisition to be automated [416]. This has resulted in an increase in the efficiency of acquisition of frequency-stepped NMR spectra, for example outside normal working hours without regular user input.

12.5.2.3. Homonuclear signal enhancement of spin-1/2 nuclei: CPMG. One important limitation on the sensitivity that can be obtained in the one-dimensional spectrum of paramagnetic systems is the rapid decay of the FID due to both relaxation and inhomogeneous effects. For paramagnetic solids it is generally found that for metal ions with SO coupling the inhomogeneous broadening of each side-band is an order of magnitude greater than the linewidth due to relaxation, and so represents the larger sensitivity limitation. How-ever greater sensitivity can be obtained by refocussing the inhomogeneous decay during the FID by applying the Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill sequence in Fig. 12.32 [417,418]. Here the acquisition period comprises a series of concatenated spin-echoes with

delays equal to the rotor period, during which the points of the FID are acquired. Both the isotropic shift and inhomogeneous decay are refocussed at the end of each echo, as indicated by the arrows on the coherence-transfer pathway in Fig. 12.32, and so the decay envelope of the FID is given by the longer homogeneous decay time constant  $T'_2$ , resulting in greater sensitivity.

12.5.2.4. Heteronuclear signal enhancement of spin-1/2 nuclei: CP and TEDOR. One important method used in solid-state MAS NMR to enhance the signal from nuclei with a low gyromagnetic ratio is to transfer coherences from nuclear spins with a higher gyromagnetic ratio. For instance this idea is commonly employed for organic microcrystalline solids in order to enhance the lownatural-abundance <sup>13</sup>C signal by transferring coherences from the large bath of highly-abundant <sup>1</sup>H nuclei. For diamagnetic systems the most commonly-used pulse sequence is the Cross-Polarization (CP) experiment, which is shown in Fig. 12.33 [19,419]. The enhancement experiment is run here as a onedimensional version of this sequence, where  $t_1$  is set to zero. The coherence-transfer step comprises a pair of spin-lock pulses that are applied to the two channels simultaneously for a contact time  $\tau_{\rm con}$  (typically a few ms), and with RF-field amplitudes  $\omega_{1,I}$  and  $\omega_{1,S}$ that satisfy either a zero-quantum Hartmann-Hahn condition  $|\omega_{1,l} - \omega_{1,s}| = n\omega_r$  (*n* = 1, 2) [19], or a double-quantum condition  $\omega_{1,l} + \omega_{1,s} = n\omega_r$  (*n* = 1, 2). It is generally found that applying a ramp to the <sup>1</sup>H spin lock improves the Hartmann–Hahn transfer, as this compensates for mismatching due to RF inhomogeneity and offset effects [419]. For paramagnetic systems the efficiency of the CP transfer is reduced considerably compared to diamagnetic systems, as shown by the comparison of the direct <sup>13</sup>C MAS and <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>13</sup>C CP spectra of a paramagnetic organometallic solid in Fig. 12.34(a) and (b) [7]. The comparison shows that the optimum CP experiment can actually be less sensitive than the directexcitation experiment! The reasons for this are (1) the difficulty of efficiently spin-locking a resonance with a large SA under MAS with practicable RF field amplitudes, and (2) signal losses due to relaxation during the spin-lock pulses. The latter problem results in short optimum contact times, here 500 µs, but even then the former problem still results in poor transfer.

An improvement in the heteronuclear coherence transfer can be obtained by employing the Transferred-Echo DOuble-Resonance (TEDOR) sequence [420], as first demonstrated by Kervern et al. [7]. The basic pulse sequence is shown in Fig. 12.35(a), with  $t_1$  set to zero. Here the *I*-spin in-phase coherences excited by the first pulse evolve during the *I*-spin-echo. During each half of the echo a series of recoupling 180° inversion pulses is applied to the *S*-spin, resulting in the recoupling of the heteronuclear dipolar coupling and the generation of anti-phase coherences. The coherences are then transferred to the *S*-spin by the pair of 90° pulses, after which the observable in-phase coherences on *S* are regenerated by the second recoupling sequence. The *S*-spin FID is then observed following a *z*-filter. The advantage of TEDOR over CP is that it uses



**Fig. 12.46.** Pulse sequence and coherence-transfer pathway of the two-dimensional MAT-PASS experiment for separating the isotropic shift and SA [434]. The experiment comprises  $N_{inc}$  increments, where  $N_{inc}$  is a power of 2. The evolution time  $t_1$  is incremented from an initial value of  $\tau_r$  to a final value of  $2\tau_r$  in steps of  $\delta t_1 = \tau_r/N_{inc}$ . The length of the sequence between the first pulse and start of acquisition therefore increases from  $11\tau_r/3$  to  $14\tau_r/3$ . Filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90°, and all pulses have phase *x*.

only short, high-power pulses, which allows the use of higher RF field amplitudes, and avoids the need to spin-lock the large anisotropic resonances. This leads to a more efficient transfer, as shown by the  $^{1}H^{-13}C$  TEDOR spectrum in Fig. 12.34(c) which was acquired with a short recoupling time of 60 µs. We should note that although TEDOR is more efficient than CP, it still does not give a signal enhancement compared to the direct excitation spectrum, which is due to the short relaxation times leading to a reduction in the coherence intensities during the recoupling sequence. However the strength of this method is that it enables the efficient acquisition of two-dimensional heteronuclear correlation spectra, as described in Section 12.5.5.

12.5.2.5. Signal enhancement of half-integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei: RAPT. We have seen in Section 11.4 that quadrupolar nuclei of half-integer spin give NMR spectra with ST resonances that are broadened to the point of being undetectable, and relatively sharp CT resonances. For this reason solid-state NMR of quadradrupolar nuclei usually employs low-power RF excitation pulses of amplitudes  $\omega_1 \ll |\omega_0|$  that are selective for the CT [199]. In paramagnetic systems however the CT resonance is broadened by the large SA, which gives a broad spinning-sideband manifold, and therefore requires a higher-power pulse for excitation [56]. Practicable RF field amplitudes of the order of 100 kHz still result in a pulse that is CT selective for quadrupolar nuclei such as <sup>23</sup>Na, where a typical  $C_0$  value of 3 MHz results in a quadrupolar splitting frequency of 750 kHz. One consequence of this is that the polarization that is excited, given by the population difference of the two states connected by the CT, is lower than the maximum available if we consider all the states, as shown in Fig. 12.36(a) for a spin I = 3/2. This results in a spectrum with a lower signal-to-noise ratio than is theoretically feasible.



**Fig. 12.47.** The <sup>31</sup>P MAT-PASS spectrum of Li<sub>3</sub>Fe<sub>2</sub>(PO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>3</sub> acquired at 19.6 T and 30 kHz MAS. The one-dimensional spectrum shown in (a) comprises three overlapping resonances, which are completely separated in the two-dimensional MAT-PASS spectrum in (b). The isotropic spectrum that is shown was obtained following a shear (described in Section 12.5.8) and projection. The MAT-PASS spectrum was acquired using the frequency-stepping scheme with two sub-spectra with the carrier positions denoted by Tx1 and Tx2 [396]. Reproduced with permission from [434]. Copyright (2012) American Chemical Society.

In order to quantify the intensity of the CT that is available we can write the equilibrium density operator  $\hat{I}_z$  as a linear combination of the *z*-spin operators involving the pairs of states  $|IM\rangle$  and  $|I - M\rangle$ , which we write as  $\hat{I}_z^{(M,-M)} = (\hat{I}_p^{(M)} - \hat{I}_p^{(-M)})/2$ . Hence the available polarization for the CT is represented by  $\hat{I}_z^{(1/2,-1/2)}$ . Using these operators  $\hat{I}_z$  is given by

$$\widehat{I}_{z} = \sum_{M=1/2}^{l} 2M \widehat{I}_{z}^{(M,-M)}.$$
(12.13)

Therefore we see the pair of levels giving the *M*Q transition has a polarization that is greater than that of the CT by a factor of 2*M*. In principle we can increase the polarization of the CT by saturating all the STs so that their net polarization is reduced to zero, as shown for the spin I = 3/2 in Fig. 12.36(a). This has the effect of transforming the equilibrium density operator into a non-equilibrium population operator in which all the terms have the same polarization I + 1/2:

$$\sum_{M=1/2}^{l} (l+1/2) \hat{l}_{z}^{(M,-M)}.$$
(12.14)

Hence the polarization of the CT has increased from 1 to I + 1/2, which results in a sensitivity enhancement of the CT resonance by a factor of I + 1/2, i.e. a factor of 2 for I = 3/2.

Enhancement of the CT polarization can be achieved in practice by using the Rotor-Assisted Population Transfer (RAPT) pulse sequence shown in Fig. 12.36(b) [422]. The CT-selective excitation pulse is preceded by the saturation sequence which comprises N pairs of RF pulses of flip-angle  $\beta$  and with alternating phases of +*x* and -*x* separated by short delays  $\delta$ . Each unit of  $\beta_{+x} - \delta - \beta_{-x} - \delta_{-x}$  $\delta$  has a total length of  $\tau_c$ . The effect of this sequence is to apply a net rotation to the ST magnetization terms, leaving the CT magnetization along z, whilst increasing its magnitude. The excitation of this enhanced CT polarization is achieved with a CT-selective pulse [423]. It has been shown by Prasad et al. that the optimum value of the cycle time  $\tau_c$  is the inverse of the quadrupolar splitting frequency  $2\pi/\omega_0$ , and is independent of  $\eta^Q$  [424]. This provides a simple method to allow the  $C_0$  parameter to be estimated, where we acquire a series of RAPT spectra with varying  $\tau_c$  to obtain the value corresponding to the maximum enhancement. This is of particular interest for paramagnetic systems, where the presence of the SA and inhomogeneous broadening in addition to the broadening from the quadrupolar interaction means that it is essentially impossible to measure the quadrupolar interaction parameters from a single one-dimensional spectrum.

The application of RAPT to paramagnetic Mg-ion battery materials is particularly striking. The only stable isotope of Mg that is NMR active is <sup>25</sup>Mg, which is of spin I = 5/2 and suffers from very low sensitivity due to both a low gyromagnetic ratio, and a low natural abundance of 10%. Fig. 12.37 shows the experimental application of RAPT to the material Mg<sub>6</sub>MnO<sub>8</sub> [59]. In (a) is shown the enhancement obtained as a function of the RAPT repetition frequency  $v = 1/\tau_c$ . A maximum enhancement of 1.6 is obtained for repetition rates 250-270 kHz. This is half of the theoretical maximum of I + 1/2 = 3, but nevertheless represents a very useful tool for increasing the sensitivity of the NMR experiment. Furthermore this maximum in the profile at the optimum repetition frequency  $v_{opt} = 3C_Q/40$  gives an estimate of the  $C_Q$  value of between 3.3 and 3.6 MHz, which is in remarkably good agreement with the range of values of 3.64-3.69 MHz predicted from DFT [59]. The optimum spectrum showing the spinning-sideband manifold of the CT is shown in Fig. 12.37(b).

#### 12.5.3. Homonuclear through-space correlations

One important mechanism for homonuclear correlation spectroscopy in solids is spin diffusion, in which we transfer longitudinal magnetization from one spin to another via the homonuclear dipolar coupling [425]. This mechanism is particularly effective for <sup>1</sup>H nuclei, where it is referred to as proton spin diffusion (PSD), as the large gyromagnetic ratio gives large dipolar coupling constants, and therefore relatively rapid transfer. This mechanism bears a superficial resemblance to the NOE transfer in solution, but there is a fundamental difference. In solution the coherent dipolar coupling is averaged to zero by isotropic molecular tumbling, and so the NOE transfer occurs entirely through the stochastic modulation of the dipolar interaction. It is therefore a relaxation process. On the other hand the spin-diffusion mechanism in solids is due to the coherent dipolar coupling interaction, which is not averaged as there is no isotropic molecular tumbling. It can therefore occur in systems with no rotational dynamics. The basic pulse sequence is the same as used for NOESY in solution (Fig. 12.9(a)), and is shown in Fig. 12.38 (a). This sequence has been shown to be efficient for  ${}^{1}H{-}{}^{1}H$  transfer in systems experiencing moderate PREs and at moderate MAS (20-30 kHz), where typical mixing times are of the order of 100  $\mu$ s [28]. The rate of transfer due to spin diffusion is reduced with increasing MAS frequency, and under fast MAS conditions (> 40 kHz) may require mixing times of 100 ms. For paramagnetic systems this causes a severe reduction in sensitivity due to the rapid longitudinal relaxation that also occurs during the mixing period.

However the rate of transfer can be increased by employing a homonuclear dipolar recoupling sequence during the mixing time. One suitable sequence is the Radio-Frequency Driven Recoupling (RFDR) scheme, which is constituted by a chain of elements  $\tau_r/2-180^\circ - \tau_r/2$  comprising a high-power 180° pulse, as represented by the sequence in Fig. 12.38(b) [426]. As for the previous sequences discussed, the suitability for paramagnetic systems is due to the use of short, high-power pulses to obtain the best possible inversion bandwidth. An experimental example of a homonuclear <sup>13</sup>C–<sup>13</sup>C RFDR correlation spectrum of <sup>13</sup>C- and <sup>15</sup>N-labelled Cu(DL-Ala)<sub>2</sub> acquired at 40 kHz MAS is shown in Fig. 12.39 [427]. The spectrum shows the correlations between the three <sup>13</sup>C nuclei within each alanine molecule, due to both the short-range (onebond) transfers between CA and CO and CA and CB, and to the longer-range transfer between CO and CB. The use of RFDR is crucial to obtaining any transfer as the fast MAS completely sup-



**Fig. 12.48.** Isotropic slices extracted from the <sup>7</sup>Li MAT-PASS spectra of the as-synthesized Na-ion cathode material P2–Na<sub>0.8</sub>[Li<sub>0.12</sub>Ni<sub>0.22</sub>Mn<sub>0.66</sub>]O<sub>2</sub> and at three different states of charge along the first electrochemical cycle. The spectra were acquired at a magnetic field strength of 4.70 T and at 60 kHz MAS. Reproduced with permission from [56]. Copyright (2014) American Chemical Society.

### Table 12.2

Amplitude  $\omega_1(t)$ , phase  $\phi_p(t)$ , and frequency sweep  $\omega_{rf}(t)$  profiles for a selection of swept-frequency adiabatic pulses. For each scheme the transmitter offset is swept through a range of frequencies  $\Delta\omega$  during the pulse length of  $\tau_p$  with a maximum RF field amplitude of  $\omega_1^{max}$ . For the hyperbolic secant pulse  $\beta$  is a dimensionless parameter given by  $\beta = \operatorname{sech}^{-1}(f)$ , where *f* is the fraction of  $\omega_1^{max}$  at which the beginning and end of the amplitude profile are truncated. Typically this truncation factor is set to 1%, and so  $\beta = \operatorname{sech}^{-1}(0.01) = 5.2983$ . For the tanh/tan pulse  $\xi$  and  $\kappa$  are dimensionless parameters which take values  $\xi = 10$  and  $\kappa = \tan^{-1}(20)$ . For the WURST pulse *n* is a factor controlling the rate at which the amplitude profile is smoothed from zero to  $\omega_1^{max}$  at the start and end of the pulse; typically n = 20.

Pulse scheme	$\omega_1(t)$	$\phi_{p}(t)$	$\omega_{ m rf}(t)$
Hyperbolic secant [436]	$\omega_1^{\max} \mathrm{sech} (\beta (2t/\tau_p - 1))$	$-\frac{\Delta\omega\tau_{\rm p}}{4\beta} \left[ \ln\left( {\rm sech} \big(\beta(2t/\tau_{\rm p}-1) \big) \right) \right]$	$rac{\Delta\omega}{2}  anh \left( eta(2t/ au_{ m p}-1)  ight)$
tanh/tan [437]	$ \begin{split} &\omega_1^{\max} \tanh\left(\frac{2\xi t}{\tau_{\rm p}}\right), \qquad 0 \leqslant t \leqslant \tau_{\rm p}/2 \\ &\omega_1^{\max} \tanh\left(2\xi \left(1-\frac{t}{\tau_{\rm p}}\right)\right),  \tau_{\rm p}/2 < t \leqslant \tau_{\rm p} \end{split} $	$-\tfrac{\Delta\omega\tau_{\rm p}}{4\kappa\tan\kappa}\ln\left(\cos\left(\kappa(1-2t/\tau_{\rm p})\right)\right)$	$-\frac{1}{2}\Delta\omega \cot(\kappa) \tan\left(\kappa(1-2t/\tau_{\rm p})\right)$
WURST [438]	$\omega_1^{\max} \left(1 - \left\ \sin\left(\pi \left(\frac{t}{\tau_p} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\right)\right\ ^n\right)$	$rac{\Delta\omega}{2} \left( rac{t^2}{ au_p} - t + rac{ au_p}{4}  ight)$	$rac{\Delta\omega}{2} \left( rac{2t}{ au_{ m p}} - 1  ight)$

presses any direct spin diffusion between the <sup>13</sup>C nuclei on the timescale of longitudinal relaxation.

In order to ensure pure-phase lineshapes in the twodimensional spectra, it is recommended that the  $t_1$  increment is set to an integer multiple of the rotor period, so that there is no net evolution of the SA and only the isotropic shifts appear in the  $\omega_1$  dimension. The spectrum therefore has the form given in Fig. 12.14, with the exception that the resonance is split into a spinning-sideband manifold in  $\omega_2$ . In cases where the dispersion of isotropic shifts is larger than the spinning frequency, it is necessary to employ a  $t_1$  increment that is shorter than the rotor period. In this case we also obtain spinning sidebands in the  $\omega_1$  dimension, and no longer have pure-phase lineshapes [428]. This problem may be removed by refocussing the evolution of the SA during  $t_1$  using the methods described in Section 12.5.6 to obtain an  $\omega_1$  dimension free from spinning sidebands.

## 12.5.4. Homonuclear exchange correlations

Correlations between nuclear sites experiencing slow chemical exchange can be obtained using the same two-dimensional EXSY sequence as for solution NMR in Fig. 12.9(a), and with the same requirement that the mixing time takes a maximum value of the order of  $T_1$ . One interesting application of EXSY in paramagnetic solids has been the study of lithium exchange dynamics in lithium-ion-conducting materials [429,430]. An example is the two-dimensional <sup>6</sup>Li EXSY spectra acquired on monoclinic Li<sub>3</sub>Fe<sub>2</sub>(-PO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>3</sub> at moderate MAS of 25 kHz shown in Fig. 12.40. The conventional one-dimensional spectrum contains three resonances A, B, and C corresponding to the three distinct Li sites in the material. The <sup>7</sup>Li spins have comparatively short  $T_1$  times of 1.1 ms, and so <sup>6</sup>Li was used to measure the exchange as the lower  $\gamma_I$  gives smaller PREs, thus allowing the use of longer mixing times. Spectra

acquired using two mixing times are shown. A short mixing time of 0.5 ms gives the spectrum in Fig. 12.40(a) with no cross peaks. However increasing the mixing time to 3.0 ms gives correlations between all three sites, as shown in Fig. 12.40(b), indicating that there is exchange amongst all the sites.

### 12.5.5. Heteronuclear through-space correlations

The two-dimensional heteronuclear correlation experiments that have been most successfully employed for paramagnetic systems are based on the TEDOR [7] (Fig. 12.35(a)), Dipolar Insensitive Nucleus Enhanced by Polarization Transfer (DINEPT) [27], and Dipolar Heteronuclear Single-Quantum Correlation (DHSQC) [28] experiments. As we have already seen for one-dimensional spectroscopy, these sequences give superior sensitivity compared to the CP-based HETeronuclear CORrelation (HETCOR) experiment in Fig. 12.33.

As for heteronuclear correlation spectroscopy in solution, there is a choice to whether we observe the <sup>1</sup>H spin or heteronuclear spin in these experiments. In solid-state NMR there is a preference for direct detection of the heteronucleus as the observation of the narrower peaks usually offsets any penalty in sensitivity from the lower gyromagnetic ratio. Fig. 12.35(a) shows the TEDOR sequence that would be used for direct detection. When the loop counters  $n_1$ and  $n_2$  are both set to 1 we obtain a sequence that is closely related to the DINEPT experiment of Wickramasinghe and Ishii [27]. An example of a two-dimensional <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>13</sup>C TEDOR spectrum acquired for a paramagnetic organometallic complex is shown in Fig. 12.41(a) [7]. A short recoupling time of 60 µs was used to selectively transfer the coherences over a distance scale corresponding to a single H–C bond. The spectrum allows the unambiguous assignment of the corresponding resonances. We also note that the resonances are broadened along a ridge that is



**Fig. 12.49.** The amplitude, phase, and frequency-sweep profiles of three widely-used adiabatic pulse schemes. The amplitude, phase, and frequency-sweep profile for the tanh/tan pulse scheme are shown in (a), (b), and (c) [437]. This class of pulse is suitable for the broadband SHAP. The plots in (d), (e), and (f) show the amplitude, phase, and frequency-sweep profiles for WURST, which is used as a low-power S<sup>3</sup>AP [438]. Finally (g), (h), and (i) show the amplitude, phase, and frequency-sweep profiles for the hyperbolic secant, which can also be used as an S<sup>3</sup>AP [436].



**Fig. 12.50.** Broadband pulse sequences employing adiabatic refocussing pulses, and coherence-transfer pathways, for the double adiabatic spin-echo and aMAT experiments. The double adiabatic spin-echo sequence is shown in (a) with the coherence-transfer pathway [29]. The arrow indicates the time point at which the isotropic shift is refocussed. The SHAP need not be an integer multiple of the rotor period in length. The aMAT sequence is shown in (b) [31]. Here the length of the SHAP is an integer multiple *m* of the rotor period. Filled rectangles with a nominal flip angle of 90°, and unfilled rectangles with a diagonal stroke indicate SHAPs. All pulses have phase *x*.

inclined relative to both axes. This is due to the inhomogeneous broadening which is a consequence of the ABMS effects discussed in Chapter 10. Because the broadening is a distribution of chemical shifts it leads to an elongation of the resonance in the two-dimensional spectrum that is inclined relative to the  $\omega_1$  axis with a gradient of  $\Delta \omega_2 / \Delta \omega_1 = |\gamma_s / \gamma_1|$ , which is here equal to 1/4 [258]. We are able to recover the intrinsically higher resolution in the absence of the ABMS broadening by shearing the two-dimensional spectrum parallel to  $\omega_2$  to give a new frequency axis

 $\omega'_2 = \omega_2 + \kappa \omega_1$ , where  $\kappa$  is a shear ratio equal to  $-|\gamma_5/\gamma_1|$ , and then projecting onto  $\omega'_2$ . The spectra are shown in Fig. 12.41(b).

With the use of faster MAS it becomes possible to observe the <sup>1</sup>H spectrum directly. This allows us to employ a version of the TEDOR sequence with indirect detection, as shown in Fig. 12.35 (b), which benefits from the higher sensitivity of observing the nucleus with the larger  $\gamma_l$ . This sequence is related to the DHSQC experiment used by Swamy et al. by setting  $n_1 = n_2 = 0$  [28]. A comparison of the directly and indirectly-detected <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>13</sup>C correla-



**Fig. 12.51.** Experimental examples of the improved inversion and refocussing properties of SHAPs compared to conventional pulses when applied to paramagnetic materials. In (a) and (b) are shown the conventional <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P rotor-synchronized spin-echo spectra of the cathode material LiFe<sub>0.5</sub>Mn<sub>0.5</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> at 11.74 T and 60 kHz MAS. The RF field amplitudes are 455 kHz for <sup>7</sup>Li and 417 kHz for <sup>31</sup>P. The <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P double-SHAP-echo spectra are shown in (c) and (d) at 60 kHz MAS, with the latter showing increased bandwidth. The SHAP is a tanh/tan pulse sweeping through 5 MHz in 50 µs at RF field amplitudes of 455 kHz for <sup>7</sup>Li and 417 kHz for <sup>31</sup>P. Panel (e) shows the integrated intensity of the <sup>7</sup>Li spectrum following SHAP inversion at different RF field amplitudes and MAS frequencies. The integrated intensity of the <sup>31</sup>P spectrum following SHAP inversion at different RF field amplitudes is shown in (f). Reproduced from [35], with permission from Elsevier.



**Fig. 12.52.** <sup>1</sup>H MAS spectra of the organometallic compound  $Tb[C_5H_3N(COO)_2Na]_3$  acquired using double-SHAP-spin-echo and SHAP-CPMG pulse sequences [30]. The double-SHAP-spin-echo spectra acquired at MAS frequencies of 20, 33, and 66 kHz are shown in (a), (b), and (c). Panel (d) shows the SHAP-CPMG pulse sequence that was used to acquire the FID at 66 kHz MAS in (e). The corresponding spectra are shown in (f) and (g). Reproduced with permission from [30]. Copyright (2007) American Chemical Society.

tion spectra of a paramagnetic Cu(II) complex is shown in Fig. 12.42 [28]. The DINEPT spectrum acquired at 30 kHz MAS and a recoupling time of 33.33  $\mu$ s is shown in (a). The corresponding DHSQC spectrum is shown in (b). In both cases the combination of fast MAS and short recoupling times enabled the acquisition of spectra with good sensitivity and resolution.

#### 12.5.6. Separation of shift and shift anisotropy interactions

The experimental methods presented in the previous sections are designed to measure correlations between the isotropic shifts of different nuclear sites. However in paramagnetic solids there are other interactions which lead to spectral broadening and a loss of resolution, but are also useful sources of structural information where they can be measured. One such interaction is the SA, which we have seen appears in the MAS NMR spectrum as a spinningsideband manifold. In solid materials in which a particular nucleus is present in more than one site, the NMR spectrum contains multiple spinning-sideband manifolds that, in general, overlap. It is therefore a matter of great interest to use an experiment that can separate the SA from the isotropic shifts, so that both can be measured.

There are two widely-used two-dimensional experiments that remove the overlap between the spinning-sideband manifolds, that are referred to as the Phase-Adjusted Spinning Sidebands (PASS) experiment [431], and the Magic-Angle Turning (MAT) experiment [432]. They both have the same basic pulse sequence, which comprises a 90° excitation pulse followed by a sequence of n180° refocussing pulses that occupy a recoupling delay  $T = N\tau_r$ , where *N* is an integer. This recoupling period forms the evolution period of the two-dimensional experiment, and is followed by direct acquisition. An example pulse sequence with five 180° pulses is shown in Fig. 12.43(a). We define the timings in the pulse sequence so that acquisition begins at t = 0, which means that the time point immediately following the excitation pulse is t = -T. The timing of the *q*th pulse is defined as  $-T + \tau_q$ . Hence the total phase accrued during the evolution period  $\Phi_{c}(\gamma; 0, -T)$  is given by the sum of the phases due to the isotropic and anisotropic shifts, and is given by:



**Fig. 12.53.** The two-dimensional <sup>31</sup>P aMAT spectrum of the cathode material LiFe<sub>0.5</sub>Mn<sub>0.5</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> acquired at 11.74 T and 60 kHz MAS. The SHAP is a tanh/tan pulse sweeping through 5 MHz in 50 μs at an RF field amplitude of 417 kHz. The length of the MAT recoupling period is 7 rotor periods, excluding the pulse lengths.



**Fig. 12.54.** Simulated inversion performance of  $S^3$ APs under MAS. In (a) are shown contour plots of the inversion of the powder sample as a function of RF field amplitude and carrier frequency at MAS frequencies of 20, 40, 60, 80, and 100 kHz. In each case, the  $S^3$ AP is a WURST-20 pulse of length 1 ms with a sweep width equal to the spinning frequency. The best inversion occurs when the transmitter is resonant with one of the sidebands and the RF field amplitude is sufficiently high to satisfy the adiabatic condition for all crystallites. In (b) are shown horizontal cross sections through the contour plots, taken at the positions shown by the horizontal white dashed lines. The plots show the inversion as a function of transmitter offset. The RF amplitude profiles in (c) are cross sections taken at the positions of the vertical white dashed lines in the contour plots. The arrows in the plots in (b) and (c) indicate the transmitter offset and lowest RF field amplitude at which the best inversion performance is obtained for each MAS frequency. Each pair of optimum values is also indicated by the intersection of the two white dashed lines in each contour plot in (a). The optimum values of (sideband order, RF field amplitude) for the five MAS frequencies are: (-2, 20 kHz) at 20 kHz MAS, (+2, 30 kHz) at 40 kHz MAS, (+2, 50 kHz) at 60 kHz MAS, (0, 30 kHz) at 80 kHz MAS, and (0, 20 kHz) at 100 kHz MAS. The shift tensor parameters are: isotropic shift 0 kHz, SA +200 kHz, and asymmetry parameter 0.3. Reproduced from [35], with permission from Elsevier.

$$\begin{split} \Phi_{\rm c}(\gamma;\mathbf{0},-T) &= \Omega_{\rm iso}\tau_{\rm seq} + \Phi_{\rm c}^{\rm SA}(\gamma;\mathbf{0},-T+\tau_n) \\ &- (-1)^n \sum_{q=1}^n (-1)^q \Phi_{\rm c}^{\rm SA}(\gamma;-T+\tau_q,-T+\tau_{q-1}), \ \ (12.15) \end{split}$$

where we define  $\tau_0 = 0$ , and the effective evolution time of the isotropic shift  $\tau_{seq}$  is

$$\tau_{\text{seq}} = T - 2\sum_{q=1}^{n} (-1)^{n+q} \tau_q.$$
(12.16)

Whilst in conventional two-dimensional spectroscopy we map the evolution during the indirect dimension by incrementing the evolution time, we do not do so in the PASS and MAT experiments. Instead the total length of the evolution period is kept constant at *T*, and we map out the evolution of the isotropic shift or SA by varying the timings  $\tau_q$  of the *n* refocusing pulses. In order to quantify the extent of evolution we define a "pseudo- $t_1$ " variable  $\Theta$ , which is known as the pitch. If we have  $N_{inc}$  increments, the pitch for the *j*th increment  $(j = 1, 2, ..., N_{inc})$  is  $\Theta = 2N\pi(j-1)/N_{inc}$ . We now

make a decision as to whether we wish to refocus the isotropic shift or SA during the evolution period. In the former case we obtain the PASS experiment, and in the latter we obtain MAT.

12.5.6.1. PASS. In the PASS experiment we refocus the isotropic shift in all the increments, and allow the SA to evolve progressively. Therefore the phase acquired during the evolution block in Eq. (12.15) becomes

$$\Phi_{\rm c}(\gamma; \mathbf{0}, -T) = \Phi_{\rm c}^{\rm SA}(\gamma; \mathbf{0}, \Theta/\omega_{\rm r}), \qquad (12.17)$$

and the effective evolution time of the isotropic shift is zero for all increments:

$$\tau_{\text{seq}} = 0. \tag{12.18}$$

If we define the pulse timings in terms of angles  $\theta_q = \omega_r \tau_q$  and the total length of the evolution block via an angle  $\theta_T = \omega_r T$ , we obtain a set of five simultaneous equations that must be solved for each value of the pitch in order to obtain the required pulse timings. Four equations pertain to the evolution of the SA, and are:



**Fig. 12.55.** The <sup>77</sup>Se and <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra of compounds **1** and **2** at 11.74 T, and 11 and 60 kHz MAS respectively, and the inversion performance with an S<sup>3</sup>AP [32]. The conventional spectra are shown in (a) and (e). The spectra obtained following inversion with a 69 kHz and 200 kHz hard pulse, respectively, are shown in (b) and (f). Spectra obtained following inversion by irradiation of the centreband with an S<sup>3</sup>AP are shown in (c) and (g). The inversion of the spectrum of **1** was achieved with a WURST-20 S<sup>3</sup>AP with a sweep width of 10 kHz, duration of 5 ms, and peak RF field amplitude of 10 kHz. The inversion of **2** was achieved with a hyperbolic secant S<sup>3</sup>AP with a sweep width of 70 kHz, duration of 495 µs, and peak RF field amplitude of 60 kHz. Simulations showing the expected degree of inversion vs RF power are shown in (d) and (h). The <sup>77</sup>Se spectra of **1** were obtained with <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>77</sup>Se CP followed by a *z*-filter during which the inversion pulse was applied. The <sup>1</sup>H spectra of **2** were obtained with a oduble-SHAP-echo sequence, using a tanh/tan SHAP of sweep width 10 MHz, length 60 µs, and peak RF field amplitude 200 kHz. The centrebands are marked with an asterisk. Reproduced from [32], with the permission of AIP Publishing.

$$2\sum_{q=1}^{n} (-1)^{q} \exp\left(-im\theta_{q}\right) + 1 - (-1)^{n} \exp(-im(\Theta + \theta_{T})) = 0, \quad m = \pm 1, \pm 2,$$
(12.19)

whilst the fifth is the requirement that the isotropic shift is refocussed for all increments:

$$\theta_{\rm T} - 2\sum_{q=1}^{n} (-1)^{n+q} \theta_q = 0.$$
(12.20)

If we employ a sequence with  $n = 5 \, 180^\circ$  pulses, these simultaneous equations can be solved to give unambiguous timings for each increment. The solutions are non-trivial, but can be obtained by numerical solution of the five equations [431]. An example of the pulse timings is plotted in Fig. 12.43(b) for a recoupling block with a length of one rotor period.

When implementing the PASS experiment we set the number of increments  $N_{inc}$  to a power of two that is larger than the expected number of sidebands in the broadest manifold. A simulated PASS spectrum in shown in Fig. 12.44(b). We see that the two

spinning-sideband manifolds that overlap in the one-dimensional spectrum are aligned parallel to the main diagonal  $\omega_1 = \omega_2$  in the two-dimensional spectrum, and are separated. The isotropic shifts can be obtained by extracting a one-dimensional trace at  $\omega_1 = 0$ , which contains the centrebands. We note here that both the homogeneous and inhomogeneous linewidth in the indirect dimension are exactly zero. This is because firstly the evolution block has a constant length, and so there is no differential  $T'_2$  dephasing as we increment the pitch; the  $T'_2$  dephasing therefore only reduces the overall intensity of the spectrum. Secondly the refocussing of the isotropic shift in the indirect dimension also has the effect of refocussing the inhomogeneous decay. Therefore both sources of line broadening only lead to broadening in  $\omega_2$ .

12.5.6.2. MAT. The second strategy for separating the spinningsideband manifolds is to allow the isotropic shift to evolve progressively during the evolution block, and to refocus the SA for all increments, which results in the MAT experiment [432]. In this case the pitch is used to define the increase of  $\tau_{seq}$  from zero to a maximum value via



**Fig. 12.56.** Illustration of echo formation in, and shear of, a two-dimensional FID. A two-dimensional FID  $s(t_1, t_2)$  is shown in (a), sampled on a Cartesian grid  $(t_1, t_2)$ . The red arrow indicates the formation of an echo of a particular interaction with spin-order  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  in  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ . After an active shear, where the time domain data rather than the coordinate axes are transformed, parallel to  $t_2$  with shear ratio  $\kappa_2 = a_1/a_2$  we obtain the FID  $s(t'_1, t'_2)$  in (b), in which the Cartesian grid of sample points is distorted into a parallelogram. The green area has been sheared out of the original sampling grid. In (c) the shear has been calculated from the inverse Fourier transform of exp $(+i\omega_2\kappa_2t_1)S(t_1, \omega_2)$ . Here the Cartesian grid is preserved, and the green area is folded back into the original acquisition window.

$$\tau_{seq} = \pm \frac{\Theta}{\omega_r}, \qquad (12.21)$$

where the + sign refers to the P-type spectrum, and the - sign to the N-type spectrum. The total phase acquired during the evolution block is then

$$\Phi_{\rm c}(\gamma; \mathbf{0}, -T) = \pm \Omega_{\rm iso} \frac{\Theta}{\omega_{\rm r}}.$$
(12.22)

As for PASS these restrictions give us five simultaneous equations that need to be solved to obtain the correct pulse timings. The first refers to the evolution of the isotropic shift:

$$\theta_{\rm T} - 2\sum_{q=1}^{n} (-1)^{n+q} \theta_q = \pm \Theta,$$
(12.23)

and the remaining four to the refocussing of the SA:

$$2\sum_{q=1}^{n} (-1)^{q} \exp\left(-im\theta_{q}\right) + 1 - (-1)^{n} \exp\left(-im\theta_{T}\right)$$
  
= 0,  $m = \pm 1, \pm 2.$  (12.24)

The solution to these five equations is simpler than for PASS. We again employ n = 5 180° pulses, but with timings that are now given by [432]:

$$\tau_q = \frac{N\tau_r}{6} \left[ q \pm \left( \frac{1 - (-1)^q}{2N_{\text{inc}}} \right) (j-1) \right],$$
(12.25)

where the number of rotor periods N can take any integer value that is *not* an integer multiple of 3. These solutions are plotted graphically in Fig. 12.43(c) for the N-type and P-type experiments. The MAT spectrum simulated with the same parameters as for the PASS spectrum discussed above is shown in Fig. 12.44(c). Here the spinning-sideband manifolds are parallel to the  $\omega_2$  dimension, and the  $\omega_1$  dimension contains the isotropic spectrum that can be obtained by a projection onto this axis. We also note that the inhomogeneous broadening is parallel to  $\omega_1 = \omega_2$ , in contrast to PASS, since now the isotropic shift evolves during the indirect dimension.

An example of MAT performed at slow MAS (0.5–1.5 kHz) is given in Fig. 12.45 [433]. Fig. 12.45(a) shows the twodimensional <sup>13</sup>C MAT spectrum of the system  $[(C_2H_5)_4N]_2[Fe_4S_4$  $(S^{13}CH_2C_6H_5)_4]$ , in which a single C atom has been <sup>13</sup>C labelled. The correlation reveals a broad spinning-sideband manifold with an isotropic shift of 101 ppm, which is shown in Fig. 12.45(b).

12.5.6.3. MAT-PASS. The PASS and MAT methods are both potentially very powerful for obtaining interpretable NMR data that would otherwise be of too low resolution to be usable. However both experiments have a weakness, which is that they employ a train of 180° pulses, which we have seen have a comparatively low bandwidth. One solution to this is to instead use more broadband pulse schemes, as described in Section 12.5.7. A second solution, proposed by Hung et al., replaces all of the 180° pulses by 90° pulses which have a greater bandwidth [434]. The resulting MAT-PASS pulse sequence is shown in Fig. 12.46. The sequence also reintroduces the real  $t_1$  evolution variable, which takes values from  $\tau_r$ to  $2\tau_r$  in steps of  $\delta t_1 = \tau_r / N_{inc}$ . The spectrum has the same form as the conventional PASS spectrum in Fig. 12.44(c). However the overall improvement in the bandwidth comes at the cost of reduced sensitivity. Whereas the coherence-transfer pathway in the conventional PASS/MAT sequence is the only one produced



**Fig. 12.57.** Pulse sequences and symmetry-transfer pathways for correlating the paramagnetic shift anisotropy and quadrupolar lineshapes for spin I = 1 nuclei. Also shown are the transfer pathways for the coherence order p and satellite order d. The sequence in (a) is for the shifting p-echo experiment of Antonijevic and Wimperis in which the first-order quadrupolar interaction is refocussed at the end of  $t_1$  [394]. The sequence for the shifting d-echo experiment of Walder et al. is shown in (b) [200]. Here the SA is refocussed at the end of  $t_1$ . The time points at which the shift and shift anisotropy, and the quadrupolar interaction are refocussed are indicated on the relevant symmetry pathways with arrows. Filled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90° and unfilled rectangles indicate pulses with a nominal flip angle of 90°. All pulses have phase x.

under ideal conditions, in the MAS-PASS sequence the coherencetransfer pathway shown is only one of the four possible pathways that are generated by the pulses. Hence the overall sensitivity is reduced by a factor of four compared to conventional PASS; one reduction by two is due to the transfer  $p = +1 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow +1$  by the combination of the second and third pulses, the second factor of two is due to the transfer  $p = +1 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow -1$  by the combination of the fourth and fifth pulses. A second disadvantage is that the evolution block does not have a fixed duration, and but increases by one rotor period from  $11\tau_r/3$  to  $14\tau_r/3$ . For materials with large PREs this leads to a measurable difference in coherence dephasing for different increments, and hence a coherent linewidth in the indirect dimension, and therefore an imperfect separation of the spinning-sideband manifolds [431].

Nevertheless the sequence has been used successfully in separating the spinning-sideband manifolds of multiple sites in paramagnetic battery materials. An example of such an application is the application of MAT-PASS to the <sup>31</sup>P MAS NMR of  $\text{Li}_3\text{Fe}_2(\text{PO}_4)_3$ , as shown in Fig. 12.47 [434]. The one-dimensional spectrum in Fig. 12.47(a) comprises overlapping resonances from three distinct local environments. These three environments are fully separated in the two-dimensional MATPASS spectrum shown in Fig. 12.47 (b). Whilst this pulse sequence does have a greater bandwidth than conventional PASS or MAT, it should be noted that here the



**Fig. 12.58.** Illustration of the single shear parallel to  $t_1$  with ratio  $\kappa_1 = -1$  required for the separation of the paramagnetic shift and shift anisotropy from the first-order quadrupolar interaction in (a) the shifting *p*-echo of Antonijevic and Wimperis [394], and (b) the shifting *d*-echo sequence of Walder et al. [200].



**Fig. 12.59.** Simulated spectra of the shifting *p*-echo and shifting *d*-echo experiments, illustrating the effect of changing the relative orientation of the PAFs of the paramagnetic shielding and quadrupolar interaction tensors for an *I* = 1 nucleus. The Euler angles  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$  define the coordinate transformation from the PAF of the quadrupolar interaction tensor to the PAF of the paramagnetic shielding tensor. Other simulation parameters include  $\omega_0/2\pi = 61.496022$  MHz,  $C_Q = 120$  kHz,  $\eta^Q = 0.8$ ,  $\Delta\sigma^S = 150$  ppm, and  $\eta^S = 0.8$ . Note that the projection onto each axis remains unchanged as the relative orientation changes. Reproduced from [200], with the permission of AIP Publishing.



**Fig. 12.60.** Experimental <sup>2</sup>H spectra acquired using the shifting *p*-echo and shifting *d*-echo experiments on polycrystalline CuCl<sub>2</sub>·2D<sub>2</sub>O. The experimental shifting *p*-echo spectrum and best-fit simulated spectrum are shown in (ia) and (ib), with the best-fit residuals in (ic). Note that the experimental spectrum contains a sharp spike at zero frequency in the quadrupolar dimension. The experimental shifting *d*-echo spectrum and best-fit simulated spectrum are also shown in (iia) and (iib), with the best-fit residuals in (iic). Here there is no zero-frequency spike, and the experimental shifting *d*-echo spectrum has a signal-to-noise ratio that is larger by a factor of two. Reproduced from [200], with the permission of AIP Publishing.

MAT-PASS spectrum had to be acquired as two sub-spectra, using the frequency-stepping method [396]. This issue of broadband NMR is addressed in the following Section 12.5.7. A second compelling example of MAT-PASS is its use in monitoring the change in the multiple <sup>7</sup>Li sites in the Na-ion cathode material P2-Na<sub>0.8</sub> [Li<sub>0.12</sub>Ni<sub>0.22</sub>Mn<sub>0.66</sub>]O<sub>2</sub> during the first electrochemical cycle [56].



**Fig. 12.61.** Pulse sequence and symmetry-transfer pathways for the COASTER experiment, which correlates the paramagnetic shift anisotropy and quadrupolar lineshape for half-integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei under sample rotation [395]. The spinning axis of the sample is orientated at 70.12° to the external field. In this sequence we correlate a signal due to a multiple-quantum coherence in  $t_1$  (in this case the p = +3 coherence) against the observable (p = -1) CT coherence in  $t_2$ . The sets of symmetry pathways in (a) and (b) show the p-,  $c_0$ -, and  $c_2$ -order during experiments for I = 3/2 and 5/2 respectively. The arrows on the symmetry pathways indicate the time points at which the relevant interactions are refocussed. Both pulses have phase x.

Fig. 12.48 shows isotropic slices taken from MAT-PASS spectra recorded on the pristine material, and at three different stages along the electrochemical cycle.

#### 12.5.7. Broadband NMR methods for spin-1/2 nuclei

12.5.7.1. Adiabatic pulse schemes. The methods for solid-state paramagnetic NMR have hitherto focussed on the pulse sequences that can be used to obtain the desired information about the system under study, such as isotropic shifts, heteronuclear correlations etc. However the discussion has focussed only on the sequence and, with the exception of the section on frequency stepping, not on how may we achieve a broadband spectrum in the case where the spread of the resonances is substantially larger than the practicable RF field amplitude. When this is the case, conventional pulses are not suitable for excitation and alternative schemes are needed. The frequency-stepping scheme that has already been discussed has proved useful for obtaining one-dimensional spectra, but is not a universal solution to the problem of broadband NMR as (1) there is a substantial increase in the experiment time required to acquire all the sub-spectra, and (2) this increase limits the practical application to one-dimensional spectroscopy. There is a requirement for pulse schemes that can acquire a broadband spectrum in a single experiment, and which can be easily incorporated into the more sophisticated multi-dimensional experimental pulse sequences that we have presented here.

One broadband pulse scheme that has been used widely in both solution NMR and MRI is the swept-frequency adiabatic pulse [435]. The important defining feature of all adiabatic pulses is that they are designed to have a transmitter offset which sweeps through the spectrum, rather than being fixed at a predefined frequency. The pulse is defined by a pulse length  $\tau_{p}$ , a time-dependent RF field amplitude  $\omega_1(t)$  and a time-dependent phase  $\phi_p(t)$  that are both symmetric about the mid-point of the pulse. The RF field amplitude is designed so that it increases smoothly from zero at the start of the pulse to a maximum value of  $\omega_1^{\max}$ , and then decreases back to zero at the end of the pulse. The timedependent phase is designed so that it induces a time-dependent sweep of the transmitter offset,  $\omega_{\rm rf}(t) = d\phi_{\rm p}(t)/dt$ , which covers a range of frequencies  $\Delta \omega$ , and that is approximately linear at  $t = \tau_p/2$ . Many such pulse schemes have been designed, including the hyperbolic secant [436], tanh/tan [437], and WURST [438] pulses. The expressions for the RF field amplitude, phase, and induced transmitter offset are given in Table 12.2. These amplitude, phase, and frequency profiles are plotted in Fig. 12.49. The profiles for the tanh/tan pulse are shown in Fig. 12.49(a)-(c), for the WURST pulse in Fig. 12.49(d)-(f), and the hyperbolic secant pulse in Fig. 12.49(g)-(i).

The theory by which these pulses achieve inversion of a spin has been described in detail for isotropic systems in solution [435,439], and for solids under MAS [35], and so we give only the salient points here. The rotating-frame Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}(t)$  describing an adiabatic pulse applied to a spin with a time-dependent shift frequency  $\Omega(t)$  due to, for example, an SA under MAS, is given by

$$\widehat{H}(t) = \Omega(t)\widehat{I}_z + \omega_1(t)\widehat{R}_z(\phi_p(t))\widehat{I}_x\widehat{R}_z(\phi_p(t))^{-1}.$$
(12.26)

We can also define this Hamiltonian in the frequency-modulated frame, where the phase modulation of the pulse is converted into the modulation of the transmitter offset to give  $\hat{H}_0(t)$ :

$$\widehat{H}_0(t) = \widehat{R}_z(\phi_p(t))^{-1}\widehat{H}(t)\widehat{R}_z(\phi_p(t)) - \frac{\mathsf{d}\phi_p(t)}{\mathsf{d}t}\widehat{I}_z$$
(12.27)

$$= (\Omega(t) - \omega_{\rm rf}(t))\widehat{I}_z + \omega_1(t)\widehat{I}_x.$$
(12.28)

We can now define an effective field of magnitude  $\omega_{\rm eff}^{(0)}(t)$  and angle of tilt from  $z \ \theta^{(0)}(t)$ , which are given by

$$\left[\omega_{\rm eff}^{(0)}(t)\right]^2 = (\Omega(t) - \omega_{\rm rf}(t))^2 + \omega_1(t)^2,$$
(12.29)

$$\tan\left[\theta^{(0)}(t)\right] = \frac{\omega_1(t)}{\Omega(t) - \omega_{\rm rf}(t)},\tag{12.30}$$

and rewrite  $\hat{H}_0(t)$  as

$$\widehat{H}_{0}(t) = \omega_{\text{eff}}^{(0)}(t)\widehat{R}_{y} \Big(\theta^{(0)}(t)\Big)\widehat{I}_{z}\widehat{R}_{y} \Big(\theta^{(0)}(t)\Big)^{-1}.$$
(12.31)

For the schemes shown in Table 12.2 and Fig. 12.49 we see that the effective field is aligned along +z at the beginning of the pulse. During the pulse, the RF field amplitude increases to its maximum value, the transmitter offset increases from a negative value to a



**Fig. 12.62.** Illustration of the double shear and scaling transformations applied to a two-dimensional FID acquired using the COASTER experiment. The first shear is parallel to  $t_2$  and maps the  $c_2$ -echo of the rank-two second-order quadrupolar interaction onto the  $t'_1$  axis. The second shear is parallel to  $t'_1$  and maps the *p*-echo of the rank-two SA interaction onto the  $t''_2$  axis.

# Table 12.3

The shear ratios and scaling factors  $\kappa_2$  and  $\zeta'_1$ , and  $\kappa'_1$  and  $\zeta''_2$  required for the COASTER experiment that correlates the  $p_1 = +3$  coherence  $|I + 3/2\rangle\langle I - 3/2|$  with the observable CT coherence with  $p_2 = -1$ ,  $|I - 1/2\rangle\langle I + 1/2|$ , for different nuclear spins *I*.

Ι	<i>c</i> <sub>2,1</sub>	<i>c</i> <sub>2,2</sub>	$\kappa_2$	$\zeta'_1$	$p_2/p_2'$	$p_1$	$p'_1$	$\kappa'_1$	$\zeta_2''$
3/2	0	-12	0	1	-1	3	3	-1/3	4/3
5/2	60	-32	-15/8	23/8	-1	3	9/23	-23/9	32/9
7/2	144	-60	-12/5	17/5	-1	3	3/17	-17/3	20/3
9/2	252	-96	-21/8	29/8	-1	3	3/29	-29/3	32/3



**Fig. 12.63.** Comparison of simulated two-dimensional COASTER spectra showing the effect of changing the quadrupolar interaction and chemical shielding asymmetry parameters in the case where the two tensors have the same PAF. Other simulation parameters included I = 3/2,  $\omega_0/2\pi = 100$  MHz,  $C_Q = 3$  MHz,  $\sigma_{iso} = 0$  ppm, and  $\Delta\sigma^S = 33$  ppm. The one-dimensional projections onto the quadrupolar anisotropy axis  $\omega'_2(Q)$  are the same for each  $\eta^Q$  value. Similarly the one-dimensional projections onto the shielding anisotropy axis  $\omega'_1(\sigma)$  are the same for each  $\eta^S$  value. Reproduced from [320], with permission from Elsevier.

positive value, and the effective field is rotated about the *y*-axis from +z to -z, and is therefore inverted.

If we are describing population inversion of a nuclear spin with initial density operator  $\hat{I}_z$ , the magnetization at the start of the pulse is aligned parallel to the effective field, and so is spin-

locked to it. If the effective field inverts sufficiently slowly, the magnetization remains spin-locked throughout the pulse, and so is also inverted. If on the other hand we are describing refocusing of coherences, as occurs during a spin echo, the initial magnetization is orthogonal to the effective field at the start of the pulse.



**Fig. 12.64.** Comparison of simulated COASTER spectra showing the effect of the relative orientation of the quadrupolar and chemical shielding anisotropy tensors on the twodimensional spectrum. Other simulation parameters included I = 3/2,  $\omega_0/2\pi = 100$  MHz,  $C_Q = 3$  MHz,  $\eta^Q = 0.25$ ,  $\sigma_{iso} = 0$  ppm,  $\Delta\sigma^S = 33$  ppm, and  $\eta^S = 0.5$ . Note that the projection onto each axis remains unchanged as the relative orientation of the quadrupolar coupling and chemical shielding tensors changes. Reproduced from [320], with permission from Elsevier.



**Fig. 12.65.** Sheared <sup>59</sup>Co COASTER spectrum of K<sub>3</sub>[Co(CN)<sub>6</sub>] at 9.4 T (left), with a simulation (right) using the parameters  $C_Q = 6.2$  MHz,  $\delta_{iso} = 14$  ppm,  $\eta^Q = 1.0$ ,  $\Delta \sigma = -62$  ppm,  $\eta = 0.25$ , and Euler angles describing the relative orientation of the two tensors  $\alpha = 90^{\circ}$  and  $\beta = \gamma = 0^{\circ}$ . Reproduced with permission from [395]. Copyright (2008) American Chemical Society.

Here it is the plane in which the magnetization evolves during the pulse that is tilted as the effective field inverts, and which leads to refocussing.

The question is, what do we mean by "if the effective field inverts sufficiently slowly"? This question can be answered by transforming the frame of reference of the adiabatic pulse from the frequency-modulated frame to the first adiabatic frame as follows, to give the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_1(t)$  [435]:

$$\widehat{H}_{1}(t) = \widehat{R}_{y} \left( \theta^{(0)}(t) \right)^{-1} \widehat{H}_{0}(t) \widehat{R}_{y} \left( \theta^{(0)}(t) \right) - \frac{\mathrm{d}\theta^{(0)}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} \widehat{I}_{y}$$
(12.32)

$$=\omega_{\rm eff}^{(0)}(t)\hat{I}_z - \dot{\theta}^{(0)}(t)\hat{I}_y, \qquad (12.33)$$

in which the effective field is now along +z, and we have introduced the transverse field  $\dot{\theta}^{(0)}(t)$  along -y to account for the motion of the first adiabatic frame relative to the frequency-modulated frame. To achieve perfect inversion or refocussing we require the total field in the first adiabatic frame to remain along *z* throughout the pulse, which is achieved if  $|\omega_{\text{eff}}^{(0)}(t)| \gg |\dot{\theta}^{(0)}(t)|$  throughout the pulse. This is quantified via the quality factor  $Q^{(1)}$ , which is defined by

$$\frac{1}{Q^{(1)}} = \max \left| \frac{\dot{\phi}^{(0)}(t)}{\omega_{\text{eff}}^{(0)}(t)} \right|$$
(12.34)  
$$= \max \left| \frac{\dot{\omega}_1(t)[\Omega(t) - \omega_{\text{rf}}(t)] - \omega_1(t)[\dot{\Omega}(t) - \dot{\omega}_{\text{rf}}(t)]}{\omega_{\text{off}}^{(0)}(t)^3} \right|.$$
(12.35)

For good inversion or refocussing behaviour we require  $Q^{(1)} \gg 1$ ; this is the so-called adiabatic condition.

In an isotropic solution, where the shift offset is timeindependent and equal to zero, and for typical values of the sweep width  $\Delta\omega$  and RF field amplitude, the adiabatic condition is weakest at  $t = \tau_p/2$  where the transmitter is resonant with the spin. Here  $\omega_1(\tau_p/2) = \omega_1^{\text{max}}$ ,  $\omega_{\text{rf}}(\tau_p/2) = 0$ ,  $\omega_{\text{eff}}^{(0)}(\tau_p/2) = \omega_1^{\text{max}}$ , and the adiabatic condition simplifies to  $[\omega_1^{\text{max}}]^2 \gg |\dot{\omega}_{\text{rf}}(\tau_p/2)|$ . Therefore it can be seen that if a particular pulse is not adiabatic, it can be made so simply by raising the RF field amplitude.

For solid samples under MAS the application of adiabatic pulses is generally very difficult since the modulation of the SA leads to rapid oscillations in both the size and tilt angle of the effective field, and hence a weakening of the adiabatic condition. This is particularly problematic for paramagnetic species where the combination of large SAs and fast spinning results in quality factors that are typically much lower than unity for typical pulse schemes. Therefore special measures need to be taken in order for adiabatic pulses to work properly [35]. Two such methods have been developed, which are referred to as short high-power adiabatic pulses (SHAPs)



**Fig. 12.66.** Two-dimensional <sup>13</sup>C-detected solid-state NMR spectra of the paramagnetic metalloprotein  $[U^{-13}C, ^{15}N]$ - $(Cu^{2+},Zn^{2+})$ -SOD. The assigned NCACB double-quantum spectrum is shown in (a). The black contours correspond to positive cross peaks indicating one-bond <sup>15</sup>N—<sup>13</sup>C correlations, and red contours indicate negative cross peaks due to two-bond <sup>15</sup>N—<sup>13</sup>C correlations. Extracts from the <sup>13</sup>C—<sup>13</sup>C PDSD correlation spectrum are shown in (b) and (c). The MAS frequency is 15 kHz. Reproduced with permission from [452]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.

#### Table 12.4

Two-dimensional <sup>13</sup>C-detected solid-state NMR experiments for establishing the sequential assignment of the protein backbone. The sequence of spins indicates the order, from left to right, in which the coherences are transferred. Heteronuclear transfers are performed using CP, and homonuclear <sup>13</sup>C-<sup>13</sup>C transfers are performed via the *J*-coupling. An atomic label in parentheses indicates that the coherence is transferred to the corresponding spin, but does not evolve during the evolution period or acquisition. An atomic label without parentheses indicates that the chemical shift of that nuclear spin evolves during either the evolution period or acquisition. For each experiment the correlations observed are given, where the subscript refers to the residue number in the sequence.

Experiment	Correlations	Ref.
2D (H)NCA-S <sup>3</sup> E (H)N(CA)CO-S <sup>3</sup> E (H)NCO-S <sup>3</sup> E (H)N(CO)CA-S <sup>3</sup> E	$N_i - CA_i$ $N_i - CO_i$ $N_{i+1} - CO_i$ $N_{i+1} - CA_i$	[456] [457] [456] [457]



**Fig. 12.67.** Two-dimensional solid-state NMR spectra at 60 kHz MAS of the paramagnetic metalloprotein [U-<sup>2</sup>H,<sup>13</sup>C,<sup>15</sup>N]-(Cu<sup>2+</sup>Zn<sup>2+</sup>)-SOD. The (H)N(CO)CA-S<sup>3</sup>E spectrum is shown in (a). The expansion shown is reproduced in (b) (red contours) superimposed upon the NC projection of the three-dimensional (H)CA(CO)NH spectrum (grey contours). Reproduced with permission from [457]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.

#### Table 12.5

Two- and three-dimensional <sup>1</sup>H-detected solid-state NMR experiments for establishing the sequential assignment of the protein backbone and sidechains. The sequence of spins indicates the order, from left to right, in which the coherences are transferred. Heteronuclear transfers are performed using CP, and homonuclear <sup>13</sup>C-<sup>13</sup>C transfers are performed via the *J*-coupling. An atomic label in parentheses indicates that the coherence is transferred to the corresponding spin, but does not evolve during an evolution period or acquisition. An atomic label without parentheses indicates that the chemical shift of that nuclear spin evolves during either an evolution period or acquisition. For each experiment the correlations observed are given, where the subscript refers to the residue number in the sequence.

Experiment	Correlations	Refs.
2D		
(H)NH	$N_i - H_i^N$	[463,465]
(H)CH	$CA_i - H_i^{CA}$ , C-H sidechains	[466]
3D		
(H)NCAH	$N_i - CA_i - H_i^{CA}$	[466]
(H)CANH	$CA_i - N_i - H_i^N$	[463,465]
(H)CO(CA)NH	$CO_i - N_i - H_i^N$	[463,465]
(H)N(CO)CAH	$N_{i+1}$ — $CA_i$ — $H_i^{CA}$	[466,548]
(H)COCAH	$CO_i - CA_i - H_i^{CA}$	[466,548]
(H)(CA)CB(CA)NH	$CB_i - N_i - H_i^N$	[464,465]
(H)CO(N)CAH	$CO_i$ — $CA_{i+1}$ — $H_{i+1}^{CA}$	[466,548]
(H)CA(CO)NH	$CA_i - N_{i+1} - H_{i+1}^N$	[463]
(H)(CO)CA(CO)NH	$CA_i - N_{i+1} - H_{i+1}^N$	[464,465]
(H)CONH	$CO_i - N_{i+1} - H_{i+1}^N$	[463,465]
(H)(CA)CB(CA)(CO)NH	$CB_i - N_{i+1} - H_{i+1}^N$	[465]
(H)N(CA)(CO)NH	$N_{i} - N_{i+1} - H_{i+1}^{N}$	[466,549]
(H)N(CO)(CA)NH	$N_{i+1} - N_i - H_i^N$	[466,549]
(H)CCH TOCSY	sidechains	[466,548]

#### Table 12.6

Three-dimensional <sup>1</sup>H-detected solid-state NMR experiments for measuring dipolarcoupling-based distance restraints between protons on the protein backbone and sidechains. The sequence of spins indicates the order, from left to right, in which the coherences are transferred. Heteronuclear transfers are performed using CP, and homonuclear <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>1</sup>H through-space transfers are performed using the RFDR pulse sequence. An atomic label in parentheses indicates that the coherence is transferred to the corresponding spin, but does not evolve during an evolution period or acquisition. An atomic label without parentheses indicates that the chemical shift of that nuclear spin evolves during either an evolution period or acquisition. For each experiment the correlations observed are given, where the subscript refers to the residue number in the sequence.

Experiment	Contacts	Ref.
<i>3D</i> H(H)NH RFDR H(H)CH RFDR H(H)CH aromatic RFDR (H)NHH RFDR (H)CHH RFDR	H <sup>N</sup> —H <sup>N</sup> , H <sup>CA</sup> —H <sup>N</sup> H <sup>CA</sup> —H <sup>CA</sup> , sidechains sidechains H <sup>H</sup> —H <sup>H</sup> , H <sup>N</sup> —H <sup>CA</sup> H <sup>CA</sup> —H <sup>CA</sup> , sidechains	[466] [466] [463] [466]



**Fig. 12.68.** Solid-state (H)NH spectra of SOD acquired at 60 kHz MAS. The spectrum in (a) is of the diamagnetic reference protein  $(Cu^+,Zn^{2+})$ -SOD, and in (b) is shown the corresponding spectrum of the paramagnetic form  $(Cu^{2+},Zn^{2+})$ -SOD.

[29], and single-sideband-selective adiabatic pulses (S<sup>3</sup>APs) [31–34].

12.5.7.2. Short, high-power adiabatic pulses (SHAPs). The first, and currently most successful, adiabatic pulse scheme for paramagnetic systems is the short high-power adiabatic pulse (SHAP) [29]. These pulses are designed with a large sweep width to give a large bandwidth, and a short duration to minimize signal losses due to the PRE. In order to compensate for the weakening of adiabicity due to the modulation of the SA during MAS, we also use an RF field amplitude that is significantly larger than would be needed for isotropic spin systems. The SHAP represents a "brute force"



**Fig. 12.69.** Measurement of the PCS values of the protein SOD at 60 kHz MAS. The two-dimensional (H)NH spectra of  $Co^{2+}$ -SOD (magenta) and  $Zn^{2+}$ -SOD (black) are superimposed in (a). The magnetic susceptibility tensor of  $Co^{2+}$  in SOD is represented in (b) as a set of PCS isosurfaces with positive (blue) and negative (red) values of  $\pm 1$ ,  $\pm 0.25$ , and  $\pm 0.1$  ppm. The spectrum in (c) is taken from the three-dimensional (H)CONH spectrum and exhibits a PCS in the <sup>1</sup>H, <sup>15</sup>N, and <sup>13</sup>CO dimensions. The spectra in (d)–(g) are taken from the NH planes in the (H)CONH spectrum, and show the shift of the peak due to a PCS in both the <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>15</sup>N dimensions. Reproduced with permission from [46]. Copyright (2012) American Chemical Society.

solution to obtaining an adiabatic response for a system with a large SA under MAS. The class of pulse that is used to satisfy these requirements is the tanh/tan, which is used in MRI to obtain a large bandwidth [437]. The expressions for the amplitude, phase, and frequency-sweep profiles are given in Table 12.2. When designing a pulse suitable for paramagnetic MAS NMR the following optimization protocol should be followed:

- 1. The dimensionless parameters  $\xi$  and  $\kappa$  are set to  $\xi = 10$  and  $\kappa = \tan^{-1} (20)$ , and are not varied.
- 2. The sweep width  $\Delta \omega$  is set so that it is greater than the expected width of the spectrum. Typically we choose 5 MHz as an initial value, and may increase this if necessary.
- 3. The pulse length  $\tau_p$  is chosen to be as short as possible, whilst still maintaining the adiabatic condition; typical values are 50–100 µs. For inversion and the spin-echo experiment it is not necessary for the pulse length to be an integer number of rotor periods. However this restriction does apply to more complex experiments such as MAT.
- 4. Once the pulse has been created, the RF field amplitude is optimized. This is done either by optimizing the spectral intensity in a spin-echo experiment, or the inversion performance, by increasing the RF power.

In addition to broadband inversion, SHAPs can also be incorporated into a spin-echo experiment using the pulse sequence in Fig. 12.50(a). This sequence, referred to as the double-SHAP-spinecho experiment, comprises two echoes the separation between the starting points of which is an integer number of rotor periods. The reason why two echoes are required is that the first SHAP imparts a frequency-dependent phase error to the coherences which leads to a dephasing of the signal in the powder. However the second SHAP refocusses this phase error, leading to a complete refocussing of both the shift and SA at the end of the second echo. This refocussing property of the double echo is referred to as the excitation-sculpting principle [440–442,35].

The inversion and refocussing performance are illustrated experimentally on the cathode material LiFe<sub>0.5</sub>Mn<sub>0.5</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> at 11.74 T and 60 kHz MAS in Fig. 12.51 [35]. A comparison between the <sup>7</sup>Li conventional spin-echo and double-SHAP-echo experiments is given in Fig. 12.51(a) and (c). The two spectra appear to be identical, which is due to the small range of isotropic shifts of 90 ppm, and the relatively long relaxation times of approximately 1 ms [31]. However the <sup>31</sup>P double-SHAP-echo in Fig. 12.51(d) shows a significant improvement in the broadband excitation bandwidth compared to the conventional spin-echo spectrum in Fig. 12.51 (b). This is due to the 32 distinct local <sup>31</sup>P environments having an isotropic shift dispersion of 4000 ppm (800 kHz at 11.74 T) which is too large for the practicable RF field amplitude of 417 kHz [31]. This improvement in bandwidth comes at the expense of reduced sensitivity due to the larger PRE losses during the two SHAPs which have a combined length of 100  $\mu$ s, which is comparable to the range of <sup>31</sup>P  $T'_2$  times of 130–330 µs.

The inversion performance is also given for both <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P with varying RF field amplitude in Fig. 12.51(e) and (f). For <sup>7</sup>Li we obtain complete inversion of the spectrum for a range of MAS frequencies and sweep widths with RF field amplitudes above 350 kHz. We note that higher RF field amplitudes are required at higher MAS rates, as the faster modulation of the SA leads to a greater weakening of the adiabatic condition. For <sup>31</sup>P we obtain 75% inversion at an RF field amplitude of 400 kHz. In this case higher RF fields may only give a moderate increase in performance as there are intensity losses due to the short  $T_1$  and  $T'_2$  times.

One advantage of SHAPs is that they are easily incorporated into more sophisticated experimental pulse schemes to give a more broadband spectrum. Fig. 12.52 illustrates the use of a tanh/tan SHAP in the CPMG experiment at 66 kHz MAS. The system is the lanthanide-binding organometallic complex Tb[C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>3</sub>N(COO)<sub>2</sub>Na]<sub>3</sub>, which gives a broad <sup>1</sup>H spectrum with a large SA, and has substantial inhomogeneous broadening of the sidebands due to the ABMS [30]. The <sup>1</sup>H spectra acquired using the double-SHAP-echo experiment at 20, 33, and 66 kHz MAS are shown in Fig. 12.52(a)-(c). Here we again see the benefit of applying fast MAS to a system with a very large SA. We see that the sidebands are broadened considerably, with baseline resolution only being obtained at 66 kHz MAS. Incorporating the SHAPs into the CPMG sequence gives the SHAP-CPMG experiment in Fig. 12.52(d), which was used to acquire the FID in Fig. 12.52(e). This FID exhibits a relatively slow decay corresponding to a  $T'_2$  of 1.68 ms. This indicates that the losses due to  $T'_2$  to be expected in longer pulse sequences are not as severe as from the large inhomogeneous line broadening in the conventional spectra would suggest. The SHAP-CPMG spectra are shown in Fig. 12.52(f) and (g). They have a higher sensitivity than the double-SHAP-echo spectra, and a homogeneous linewidth of 190 kHz.

A second striking application of SHAPs to paramagnetic NMR is in the two-dimensional MAT experiment used to separate overlapping spinning-sideband manifolds. The resulting adiabatic magicangle turning (aMAT) sequence is shown in Fig. 12.50(b). Here a sixth pulse q = 0 is inserted immediately after the first excitation pulse in order to complete the refocussing of the phase errors from the other SHAPS, and remains fixed in this position for all increments. The other five SHAPs are inserted with timings that are the same as those in the conventional MAT sequence. Fig. 12.53 shows the experimental <sup>31</sup>P aMAT spectrum acquired on LiFe<sub>0.5</sub>-Mn<sub>0.5</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> at 11.74 T and 60 kHz MAS [31]. The 32 local <sup>31</sup>P environments each have a broad spinning-sideband manifold with isotropic shifts covering a range of 4000 ppm. These resonances overlap in the one-dimensional spectrum, as illustrated in Fig. 12.51(d), but have been partially separated into eight distinct groups of resonances in the aMAT spectrum, thus allowing the assignment and interpretation [31].

The SHAP is both effective and versatile, and has been successfully applied to a range of paramagnetic systems [30,72,10,31,443,56,57,444,445,60,446]. However the main weakness in the SHAP scheme is that the RF field amplitude required increases with faster MAS rates Therefore it may not be possible to obtain complete inversion at very fast MAS, such as 100 kHz, especially for nuclei of low gyromagnetic ratio where the RF field amplitude is limited. This issue is addressed by the second adiabatic pulse scheme.

12.5.7.3. Single-sideband-selective adiabatic pulses (S<sup>3</sup>APs). The single-sideband-selective adiabatic pulse S<sup>3</sup>AP employs a lower-power pulse in which the transmitter frequency is swept through a single sideband [32]. The basic method had been previously used to invert the broad spinning-sideband manifolds of ST resonances of quadrupolar nuclei in diamagnetic systems, where it was shown that both the hyperbolic secant and WURST pulse schemes are suitable for single-sideband irradiation [447–450]. The theory of broadband inversion by single-sideband adiabatic was then developed by employing a formalism from Caravatti et al. [451], and combining this with a Floquet-theory description of the resulting effective Hamiltonian [316–319] to provide a complete description of the S<sup>3</sup>AP [31,33].

The basic idea behind a S<sup>3</sup>AP is that the bandwidth of the pulse is limited so that it affects only the irradiated sideband. The resonance of the SA is modulated by the MAS, and so shifts in and out of the effective pulse bandwidth during the course of the pulse, with the result that the spin is only resonant for a fraction of the total irradiation time. An alternative view is that the pulse is resonant for the whole of the irradiation time, and it is the RF field amplitude that is scaled down. If the pulse irradiates the *m*thorder sideband, the effective Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}(t)$  for a single crystallite is [32]:

$$\widehat{H}_{\text{eff}}^{(1)}(t) = \omega_1(t) A_c^{(m)} \widehat{R}_z \Big( \phi_p - \phi_c^{(m)}(\gamma_{\text{PR}}) \Big) \widehat{I}_x \widehat{R}_z \Big( \phi_p - \phi_c^{(m)}(\gamma_{\text{PR}}) \Big)^{-1},$$
(12.36)

which corresponds to a pulse with an effective RF field amplitude  $\omega_1(t)A_c^{(m)}$  that is scaled down by the sideband intensity, and an effective phase  $\phi_p - \phi_c^{(m)}(\gamma_{PR})$  that is offset by minus the sideband phase. This Hamiltonian describes the part of the spin dynamics that gives rise to adiabatic inversion and refocussing, provided the RF field amplitude is sufficiently high to offset the weakening of the condition by the scaling down of the effective RF field amplitude by  $A_c^{(m)}$ . There is also a contribution to the spin dynamics from the rapidly-oscillating SA which is not included in this effective Hamiltonian. However this oscillation is averaged out over the course of a rotor period, and has no overall effect [32].

The advantage of the S<sup>3</sup>AP over the SHAP is that the typical RF field amplitudes are equal to or lower than the spinning frequency, and so broadband inversion can be achieved using much lower

power. This is shown by the simulations in Fig. 12.54 [35], where the inversion performance of a spin subject to an SA of 200 kHz with a WURST-20  $S^{3}AP$  of duration 1 ms is compared at 20, 40, 60, 80, and 100 kHz MAS. The extent of inversion is plotted against both the RF field amplitude and carrier frequency in Fig. 12.54(a). We see that the performance of the S<sup>3</sup>AP increases with MAS frequency, as a greater proportion of the sideband intensity is then concentrated in the centreband m = 0, and the weakening of the adiabatic condition is reduced. Additionally the one-dimensional plots of inversion as a function of carrier frequency in Fig. 12.54 (b) indicate that a larger spinning frequency allows the use of a larger sweep width without irradiating the neighbouring sidebands, thus increasing the bandwidth of isotropic shifts over which we invert. Finally the use of faster MAS also increases the range of RF field amplitudes (up to the MAS frequency) over which we obtain complete inversion, as shown by the one-dimensional RF field profiles in Fig. 12.54(c). The disadvantage of the S<sup>3</sup>AP is that the pulses are longer by at least an order of magnitude, and so significant signal losses due to the short relaxation times are expected.

The general recommendations for implementing an S<sup>3</sup>AP are:

- 1. Select either the hyperbolic-secant or WURST waveform. For the hyperbolic secant set the amplitude truncation factor to 1%, and therefore  $\beta = \operatorname{sech}^{-1}(0.01) = 5.2983$ . For the WURST set n = 20. For both waveforms set the sweep width to the MAS frequency.
- 2. Set the pulse length between 0.5 and 5 ms. Longer pulse lengths result in greater relaxation losses during the pulse, but an adiabatic condition that is more easily satisfied.
- 3. Optimize the peak RF field amplitude from 0 kHz to the spinning frequency.

Fig. 12.55 shows two experimental examples of S<sup>3</sup>AP inversion at slow and fast MAS. Fig. 12.55(a)-(c) show the <sup>77</sup>Se NMR spectra of the diamagnetic compound 1 at 11 kHz MAS. The conventional <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>77</sup>Se CP spectrum in (a) was inverted both with a high-power conventional 180° pulse (b) and with a low-power (10 kHz), 5 ms WURST-20  $S^{3}AP$  tuned to the centreband (c). Here the S<sup>3</sup>AP gives complete inversion, which matches the theoretical prediction from the simulated inversion profiles as a function of RF field amplitude in Fig. 12.55(d). The second example is the paramagnetic compound 2 at 60 kHz MAS which presents a more exacting test. The one-dimensional <sup>1</sup>H double-SHAP-echo spectrum is shown in Fig. 12.55(e). Inversion with a conventional pulse at the high RF field amplitude yields a poor performance as shown in Fig. 12.55(f). A hyperbolic secant S<sup>3</sup>AP applied to the centreband of length 495 µs and RF field amplitude 60 kHz performs considerably better, delivering 75% inversion, as shown in Fig. 12.55(g). The simulated inversion performance as a function of RF field amplitude is shown in Fig. 12.55(h), which includes the effects of  $T_1$  relaxation and  $T'_2$  dephasing. The imperfect inversion performance is attributable mainly to relaxation losses. This method is expected to be more widely used with the advent of faster MAS, where shorter S<sup>3</sup>APs with larger isotropic bandwidths can be used.

#### 12.5.8. Separation of shift-anisotropy and quadrupolar interactions

In this section we present experimental schemes that are designed to separate the contributions to the spectral lineshape from the paramagnetic SA and quadrupolar interactions. The motivation for developing experiments of this type is that quadrupolar nuclei in paramagnetic systems have complicated spectra, as seen in Fig. 11.5 for I = 1 and Fig. 11.8 for I = 3/2, from which the information about the two interactions cannot easily be extracted.

Nevertheless the tensor parameters are useful indicators of the structural and electronic properties. We present the current state-of-the-art schemes that are applicable to integer and halfinteger spins. We recall that there is a fundamental difference between the two types of quadrupolar nucleus, with half-integer spins having a CT but not the integer spins. Therefore the two types of spin can have different symmetry pathways, and so need different, specifically-tailored, pulse sequences. We therefore treat integer and half-integer spins differently. For the former we review two experimental methods for static conditions [394,200], and for the latter we present a technique for a powder spinning at 70.12° to the field [395]. Before exploring these methods in detail we first introduce the idea of a two-dimensional echo, which is a concept used to understand the time points in a pulse sequence where a particular interaction is refocussed, and then discuss shearing and scaling transformations, which are processing operations used to convert a two-dimensional FID into a spectrum where different interactions are separated along different principal frequency axes.

12.5.8.1. Two-dimensional echoes. The experimental schemes presented here are based on two-dimensional pulse sequences in which the evolutions due to the shift/SA and quadrupolar interactions are refocussed at different points in the sequence. Therefore the two interactions give rise to resonance broadening along different dimensions in the two-dimensional spectrum, thus leading to their separation. We begin by illustrating the concept of a general  $\Xi$ -echo in two-dimensional spectroscopy, where  $\Xi$  is the spinorder parameter that defines the frequency of evolution of the interaction in question, and how the corresponding tensor parameters can be extracted. The discussion here is limited to frequency components of interactions that are time-independent, such as isotropic interactions, all interactions in static solids, or the residual components of anisotropic interactions that remain timeindependent under MAS such as the residual rank-four secondorder quadrupolar interaction which broadens the resonance.

The two-dimensional experiments presented here are designed so that different coherences  $|M_1\rangle\langle M_2|$  and  $|M_3\rangle\langle M_4|$  evolve during  $t_1$ and  $t_2$ . Under a particular interaction  $\Lambda$ , the two coherences evolve at different frequencies  $\Omega_{l0,M_1M_2}^{(\Lambda)}$  and  $\Omega_{l0,M_3M_4}^{(\Lambda)}$  in  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , and so the total phase acquired in the FID  $\Phi_{l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t_1, t_2)$  is given by

$$\Phi_{l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t_1, t_2) = \Omega_{l0, M_1 M_2}^{(\Lambda)} t_1 + \Omega_{l0, M_3 M_4}^{(\Lambda)} t_2.$$
(12.37)

We are already familiar with the concept of refocussing in a spinecho experiment, where the total phase accrued due to evolution of the chemical shift is equal to zero at the end of an echo. We can generalize this concept and define an echo in a two-dimensional FID to be the time points at which  $\Phi_{l0}^{(\Lambda)}(t_1, t_2) = 0$  [320]. The two evolution frequencies  $\Omega_{l0,M_1M_2}^{(\Lambda)}$  and  $\Omega_{l0,M_3M_4}^{(\Lambda)}$  differ only in their spin-order parameters, which we here refer to as  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ . Therefore the refocussing condition can be expressed succinctly as [320]

$$a_1 t_1 + a_2 t_2 = 0. \tag{12.38}$$

Therefore the refocussing of the interaction  $\Lambda$  occurs at all time points that lie on a straight line in  $(t_1, t_2)$  that is inclined at a gradient of  $-a_1/a_2$  from the  $t_1$ -axis and passes through the origin, as shown in Fig. 12.56(a). This line is referred to as an echo ridge. In principle we can perform a skew projection of the twodimensional FID onto this line to obtain a one-dimensional FID in which there is no evolution of this interaction  $\Lambda$ , and which can be Fourier transformed to give a one-dimensional spectrum in which the spectral features due to this interaction are not present. Hence we have separated the interaction  $\Lambda$  from any others that may be present, therefore leading to a simpler spectrum. However skew projections are difficult to perform in practice, and we prefer instead to shear the FID so that the echo ridge is transformed to lie along either the  $t_1$ - or  $t_2$ -axis [320].

12.5.8.2. Shearing and scaling transformations. A shear transformation is characterized by both a "direction" and "size". The former is defined by the axis along which the transformation takes place, and the latter by the shear ratio  $\kappa$ . We have two obvious choices of axis, namely the two principal axes  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ . If we perform an active shear parallel to  $t_2$ , as shown in Fig. 12.56(b), we transform the rectangular sampling grid of the FID into a parallelogram. The time points of the sheared spectrum are measured relative to a new coordinate system  $(t'_1, t'_2)$  which is calculated from the old coordinate system  $(t_1, t_2)$  by

$$\mathbf{t}' = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\kappa_2} \mathbf{t}. \tag{12.39}$$

The matrix  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\scriptscriptstyle \mathcal{K}_2}$  defines the mapping due to the shear, and is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\kappa_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0\\ \kappa_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{12.40}$$

where  $\kappa_2$  is the shear ratio for the shear parallel to  $t_2$ . The explicit expressions relating  $(t'_1, t'_2)$  to  $(t_1, t_2)$  are

$$\begin{pmatrix} t_1' \\ t_2' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \kappa_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 + \kappa_2 t_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (12.41)

The result of the shear is to shift the orientation of the echo ridge so that it lies closer to the new  $t'_1$  axis. If we set the shear ratio to

$$\kappa_2 = \frac{a_1}{a_2},\tag{12.42}$$

then we can see that after the shear the echo ridge is parallel to  $t'_1$ , as shown in Fig. 12.56(b). The extraction of the slice of the twodimensional FID along this axis yields a one-dimensional FID in which there is no evolution of the interaction at any time point, and the resulting spectrum contains no spectral features due to this interaction. However before extracting the slice we should note that the apparent evolution frequencies of the other interactions along  $t'_1$ are not necessarily equal to the nominal frequencies we would expect from a conventional one-dimensional spectrum. In general these remaining frequencies are scaled up or down by some factor. Therefore in order to recover the correct frequencies we need to scale the  $t'_1$  time by some scaling factor  $\zeta'_1$ . The coordinate transformation matrix is  $\mathcal{T}_{\zeta'_1}$ , and is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\zeta_1'} = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1' & 0\\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{12.43}$$

Hence the total transformation comprises a shear parallel to  $t_2$  with a ratio  $\kappa_2$ , followed by a scaling of the new  $t'_1$  axis by a factor  $\zeta'_1$ . The coordinate system resulting from both transformations is then related to the old system by

$$\mathbf{t}' = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\zeta_1'} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\kappa_2} \mathbf{t}$$
(12.44)

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1' & \mathbf{0} \\ \kappa_2 & \mathbf{1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1' t_1 \\ t_2 + \kappa_2 t_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (12.45)

The illustration of the shear in Fig. 12.56(b) is as a simple translation of the rows parallel to  $t_2$  by a distance that is defined by the shear ratio. Whilst this is conceptually the simplest way to implement a shear, it is also inconvenient in practice since the Cartesian grid of sampling points in Fig. 12.56(a) is distorted into a parallelogram, and part of the FID (in green) is transformed outside the original sampling window. A more convenient method for performing the shear is to first compute the Fourier transform of the FID with respect to  $t_2$  to give the mixed time-frequency domain function  $S(t_1, \omega_2)$ :

$$S(t_1, \omega_2) = \int_0^\infty s(t_1, t_2) \exp(-i\omega_2 t_2) dt_2.$$
(12.46)

We then multiply each point in this domain by a complex phase factor  $\exp(+i\omega_2\kappa_2t_1)$ . The result can be shown to be equal to the Fourier transform of the sheared FID  $s(t_1, t_2 + \kappa_2t_1)$  [190]:

$$s(t_1, t_2 + \kappa_2 t_1) \leftrightarrow \exp\left(+i\omega_2\kappa_2 t_1\right)S(t_1, \omega_2).$$
(12.47)

Hence the inverse Fourier transform of  $\exp(+i\omega_2\kappa_2t_1)S(t_1,\omega_2)$  with respect to  $\omega_2$  yields the sheared FID, which is shown in Fig. 12.56(c). This method has the advantage over the simple translation that now the Cartesian grid of sampling points is preserved, and the green region of points which was sheared outside the grid in Fig. 12.56(b) is folded back inside to the rectangular sampling space in Fig. 12.56(c).

Finally we can calculate the evolution frequencies of an arbitrary interaction following the combined shear and scale. The original evolution frequencies during  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ , which are  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$ , are transformed into  $\Omega'_1$  and  $\Omega'_2$  in the new coordinate system. These frequencies are calculated from:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Omega_1' & \Omega_2' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t_1' \\ t_2' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_1' & \Omega_2' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1' & 0 \\ \kappa_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \end{pmatrix}$$
(12.48)

$$= (\Omega_1 \quad \Omega_2) \binom{t_1}{t_2}, \qquad (12.49)$$

and are given by the following expressions:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Omega_1' & \Omega_2' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_1 & \Omega_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1' & 0 \\ \kappa_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1}$$
(12.50)

$$= \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_1 - \kappa_2 \Omega_2 \\ \zeta_1 & \Omega_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$
(12.51)

We note that the two evolution frequencies  $\Omega'_1$  and  $\Omega'_2$  are associated with new effective spin-order parameters  $a'_1$  and  $a'_2$  in the new coordinate system.

Alternatively we can shear the FID parallel to  $t_1$  to map the echo ridge onto the new  $t'_2$  axis and scale then scale  $t'_2$ . The coordinate transformation is

$$\boldsymbol{t}' = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\zeta_2'} \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\kappa_1} \boldsymbol{t}, \tag{12.52}$$

where  $\mathcal{T}_{\kappa_1}$  is the shear matrix characterised by the shear ratio  $\kappa_1$ , and  $\mathcal{T}_{\zeta_2}$  represents the subsequent scaling of  $t'_2$  by the factor  $\zeta'_2$ :

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\zeta_2'} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \zeta_2' \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \boldsymbol{\mathcal{T}}_{\kappa_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \kappa_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
(12.53)

The explicit expressions for the new time coordinates are:

$$\boldsymbol{t}' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \kappa_1 \\ 0 & \zeta_2' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} t_1 + \kappa_1 t_2 \\ \zeta_2' t_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (12.54)

In order to map the echo ridge onto  $t'_2$  we require the shear ratio to be equal to

$$\kappa_1 = \frac{a_2}{a_1}.\tag{12.55}$$

In analogy with the shear parallel to  $t_2$  it is more convenient in practice to implement the shear parallel to  $t_1$  by first computing the mixed frequency–time domain  $S(\omega_1, t_2)$  by Fourier transformation with respect to  $t_1$  and then multiplying each point by the phase factor exp ( $+i\omega_1\kappa_1t_2$ ). The inverse Fourier transform of the result is then the sheared FID  $s(t_1 + \kappa_1t_2, t_2)$ :

$$s(t_1 + \kappa_1 t_2, t_2) \leftrightarrow \exp\left(+i\omega_1 \kappa_1 t_2\right) S(\omega_1, t_2).$$
(12.56)

Finally we can calculate the evolution frequencies relative to the transformed coordinate system to be:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Omega_1' & \Omega_2' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_1 & \Omega_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \kappa_1 \\ 0 & \zeta_2' \end{pmatrix}^{-1}$$
 (12.57)

$$= \left(\Omega_1 \quad \frac{\Omega_2 - \kappa_1 \Omega_1}{\zeta_2'}\right). \tag{12.58}$$

Here the slice of the sheared FID along  $t'_2$  is a one-dimensional FID in which the interaction  $\Lambda$  does not evolve. The Fourier transform of this slice is therefore a one-dimensional spectrum with no spectral features due to this interaction.

We now use these shearing methods in combination with stateof-the-art pulse sequences to obtain two-dimensional separation of the paramagnetic SA and quadrupolar interactions for both integer-spin [394,200], and half-integer-spin nuclei [395].

12.5.8.3. Integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei. Two related experimental methods have been developed for separating the spectral broadening from the SA and first-order quadrupolar interactions of nuclear spins I = 1 in static solids. Under static conditions we can in principle measure the effects on the spectrum of two different interactions: the isotropic shift and SA both evolve in the same way with frequencies that are proportional to the coherence order p, and the first-order quadrupolar interaction evolves with a frequency that is proportional to the satellite order d.

The first pulse sequence that was developed to separate these two interactions is the shifting *p*-echo experiment of Antonijevic and Wimperis, and is shown in Fig. 12.57(a) [394]. The p- and dsymmetry pathways are also shown. The former is explicitly selected unambigously by phase cycling [321], whereas the latter is only selected implicitly. This means that the *d*-symmetry pathways shown are those that correspond to the *p*-symmetry pathway that is explicitly selected. The sequence contains a solid echo during the evolution period  $t_1/2-90^{\circ}-t_1/2$  in which the pulse does not change the sign of *p*, but does change the sign of *d*. This means that the shift and SA evolve uninterrupted throughout  $t_1$ , whereas the quadrupolar interaction is refocussed at the end of  $t_1$ . Prior to acquisition there is a second solid echo which refocusses the evolution of both interactions during the two delays  $\tau$ , and leads to the formation of a *p*-echo during acquisition. Therefore there are two echoes formed during the pulse sequence: the *p*-echo is formed at points where  $t_1 = t_2$ , and the *d*-echo is formed at  $t_2 = 0$ . This is shown in the representation of the two-dimensional FID in Fig. 12.58(a). The quadrupolar interaction echo ridge is therefore aligned along the  $t_1$ -axis, whereas the shift/SA ridge echo is along  $t_1 = t_2$ . In order to complete the separation of the evolution of the two interactions in the FID we map the shift/SA echo ridge onto  $t'_2$  by applying a shear parallel to  $t_1$  with shear ratio  $\kappa_1 = -1$ . We then obtain the correct signs of the frequencies in  $t'_1$  by applying a scaling along this axis with factor  $\zeta'_1 = -1$ . The resulting FID is shown in Fig. 12.58(a), with the quadrupolar and shift/SA ridge echoes along  $t'_1$  and  $t'_2$  respectively. A two-dimensional Fourier transform therefore yields a spectrum in which the quadrupolar broadening is present only in the  $\omega_2'$  dimension, and the shift/SA appears only in the  $\omega'_1$  dimension.

There is room for improvement in this experiment as the coherence-order selection in each solid echo only retains half the total signal components, and so the sequence gives a maximum sensitivity that is one quarter of that theoretically attainable in the one-dimensional experiment. Secondly the selection of the symmetry pathways as shown, when the RF field amplitude is not much larger than both the SA and quadrupolar frequencies, results in a spike appearing at zero frequency in the quadrupolar frequency dimension.

An improvement to the shifting *p*-echo experiment was proposed by Walder et al. who developed the shifting *d*-echo pulse sequence shown in Fig. 12.57(b) [200]. Here the solid echo during the evolution period is replaced with a spin echo, with the result that the *p*- and *d*-symmetry pathways are altered so that it is the *p*-echo that is now formed at  $t_2 = 0$  and the *d*-echo that is formed at  $t_1 = t_2$ . The two-dimensional FID is shown in Fig. 12.58(b). As for the shifting *p*-echo experiment, complete separation of the two interactions is achieved using the same shearing and scaling transformations, with the result that the quadrupolar frequency is present only in the  $\omega'_1$  dimension, and the shift/SA appears only in the  $\omega'_2$  dimension.

The use of the spin echo is advantageous for two reasons: firstly the zero-frequency spike in the quadrupolar dimension is eliminated, and secondly the spin echo does not suffer from the reduction in signal intensity of the solid echo, with the result that the shifting *d*-echo experiment has double the sensitivity of the shifting *p*-echo experiment. The disadvantage of the shifting *d*-echo sequence is the lower bandwidth of the 180° pulse compared to the 90° pulse.

Simulated two-dimensional spectra generated using these methods are shown in Fig. 12.59, showing the effect of the relative orientation between the PAFs of the two tensors  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$  [200]. It should be noted that for all spectra the projections are the same. An experimental example is given in Fig. 12.60, which shows the <sup>2</sup>H shifting *p*-echo and shifting *d*-echo spectra of solid CuCl<sub>2</sub>·2D<sub>2</sub>O in (ia) and (iia) respectively. In both cases a clean separation of the shift/SA and quadrupolar spectra is achieved, with the shifting decho spectrum in Fig. 12.60(iia) giving the superior result, with suppression of the zero-frequency spike and a signal-to-noise ratio that is higher by a factor of two. In both cases it is possible to extract unambiguous shift/SA and quadrupolar tensor parameters, which would be difficult to do from the one-dimensional spectrum only. The simulated spectra from the best-fit tensor parameters are shown in Fig. 12.60(ib) and (iib) respectively, with the best-fit residuals shown in Fig. 12.60(ic) and (iic).

This experiment is extremely useful for extracting the tensor parameters in paramagnetic systems containing a single I = 1nuclear site. However for more complex materials there are potential difficulties. Firstly the presence of inhomogeneous broadening due to BMS effects distorts the spectrum in the shift/SA dimension, so that it may not be easily interpretable. However it should be noted that this broadening does not appear in the quadrupolar dimension, which remains clean, and so we have the intriguing possibility of being able to extract quadrupolar coupling parameters even when there is severe BMS broadening. A second difficulty is that in materials with multiple sites there is expected to be considerable overlap in the two-dimensional spectrum and in both projections. If the number of sites is not already known this may lead to uninterpretable spectra. Nevertheless this method is extremely powerful, and is expected both to be widely used, and to inspire other methods for separating two or more large anisotropic interactions.

12.5.8.4. Half-integer-spin quadrupolar nuclei. A related method for separating the shift/SA interaction from the quadrupolar interaction for half-integer-spin nuclei, known as the COrrelation of Anisotropies Separated Through Echo Refocusing (COASTER) experiment, has been presented by Ash et al. [395]. It was initially designed for separating the CSA from the second-order quadrupolar broadening in diamagnetic materials, and is included in this survey as it represents an elegant method that is potentially applicable to paramagnetic species, even though there are as yet no paramagnetic examples. The COASTER pulse sequence is shown

in Fig. 12.61. It is a simple sequence that comprises two pulses, and is designed to correlate a symmetrical multiple-quantum coherence  $|IM\rangle\langle I - M|$ , such as the triple-quantum coherence p = +3, in  $t_1$  with the CT coherence  $|I - 1/2\rangle\langle I + 1/2|$  with p = -1in  $t_2$ . The experiment is carried out on a spinning powder, but with the rotor aligned at 70.12° to the field, rather than at the magic angle. This choice of angle ensures that the rank-four secondorder quadrupolar broadening is completely removed by the sample rotation. It we assume that the increments in both  $t_1$  and  $t_2$  are rotor-synchronised, so that the sidebands are folded onto the centreband, the remaining interactions that evolve are those that are time-independent. They include the isotropic shift and residual SA remaining due to spinning off the magic angle, both of which evolve at frequencies proportional to p, the rank-zero secondorder quadrupolar shift, the frequency of which is proportional to  $c_0$ , and the rank-two second-order quadrupolar anisotropy the frequency of which is proportional to  $c_2$ . We can define a symmetry pathway for all three symmetry-order parameters, which are also shown in Fig. 12.61 for I = 3/2 (a) and I = 5/2 (b). Each of these interactions is refocussed along a distinct echo ridge. For the shift and SA this echo ridge is

$$p_1 t_1 + p_2 t_2 = 0, \tag{12.59}$$

where for all spins  $p_1 = +3$  for the triple-quantum experiment and  $p_2 = -1$ . For the rank-zero and rank-two quadrupolar interactions the echo ridges are:

$$c_{0.1}t_1 + c_{0.2}t_2 = 0, (12.60)$$

$$c_{2,1}t_1 + c_{2,2}t_2 = 0. (12.61)$$

We note that both of these echo ridges are different for different spins and, for the coherence-transfer pathway in Fig. 12.61(a) there is no  $c_0$  echo. Both the residual SA and rank-two second-order quadrupolar interaction are manifested as spectral broadening and therefore require separation in the two-dimensional experiment. By contrast the rank-zero second-order quadrupolar interaction does not broaden the spectrum and only shifts the resonances, and so we do not consider it further.

A schematic of the FID showing both the p and  $c_2$  echo ridges is shown in Fig. 12.62. Here we have two echo ridges which require mapping onto the two principal time axes, which we achieve with two combined shear and scale transformations. Firstly we apply a shear parallel to the  $t_2$  axis to give a new coordinate system  $(t'_1, t'_2)$ , followed by a scaling of the  $t'_1$  axis. If we set the shear and scaling parameters to

$$\kappa_2 = \frac{c_{2,1}}{c_{2,2}}, \qquad \zeta_1' = 1 + |\kappa_2|,$$
(12.62)

the result is the FID shown in Fig. 12.62 in which the  $c_2$ -echo is now along the  $t'_1$  axis. The result of this first transformation is to change the *p* echo ridge so that it is aligned in the  $(t'_1, t'_2)$  coordinate system so that

$$p_1't_1' + p_2't_2' = 0, (12.63)$$

where  $p'_1$  and  $p'_2$  are given by

$$p'_1 = \frac{p_1 - \kappa_2 p_2}{\zeta'_1}, \qquad p'_2 = p_2.$$
 (12.64)

We now need a second shear parallel to  $t'_1$ , giving a new coordinate system  $(t''_1, t''_2)$ , to map the *p*-echo onto the  $t''_2$  axis followed by a scaling of this axis. The shearing and scaling parameters are:

$$\kappa_1' = \frac{p_2'}{p_1'}, \qquad \zeta_2'' = 1 + |\kappa_1'|.$$
 (12.65)

The final FID, shown in Fig. 12.62, exhibits a  $c_2$  echo along  $t_2''$  and a *p*-echo along  $t_1''$ . In the resulting two-dimensional spectra, the shift/ SA and second-order quadrupolar interactions appear in the  $\omega_1''$  and  $\omega_2''$  dimensions respectively. The shearing ratios and scaling parameters required for the triple-quantum COASTER experiment are given for nuclear spins I = 3/2 to 9/2 in Table 12.3.

Simulated examples of sheared COASTER spectra are given in Figs. 12.63 and 12.64 [320]. Figs. 12.63 shows the effect on the two-dimensional lineshape of varying both the SA and quadrupolar asymmetry parameters, whilst Fig. 12.64 shows the effect of varying the relative orientation of the two tensors ( $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\gamma$ ) and keeping other parameters constant. We see that the two one-dimensional projections can be used to obtain  $\Delta \sigma^s$ ,  $\eta^s$ ,  $C_Q$ , and  $\eta^Q$  and that the relative orientation of the two PAFs can be obtained from the two-dimensional lineshape.

An experimental COASTER spectrum is shown in Fig. 12.65 along with a simulation taken from the best-fit tensor parameters [395]. The spectrum is of the <sup>59</sup>Co resonance in low-spin (diamagnetic)  $K_3$ [Co(CN)<sub>6</sub>], and is indispensable for obtaining unambiguous tensor parameters.

The main disadvantages of COASTER are the same as for the shifting p- and d-echo experiments. Whilst high-quality spectra can be obtained for single-site materials, more complex systems containing multiple sites will be more difficult to interpret. In addition the use of sample spinning at 70.12° means that this experiment cannot be easily implemented with commercial MAS probes. Nevertheless we expect this method to be of interest to paramagnetic solid-state NMR.

#### 12.6. Solid-state NMR of paramagnetic proteins

The solid-state NMR of proteins has experienced significant advances in recent years, having moved from a position where very few previously-unknown structures had been solved, to the point where systems of significant complexity and interest to the field of biology are being studied. The driving force behind these advances has been twofold. Firstly developments in fast-spinning probe technology, allowing up to 100 kHz MAS and beyond, have improved the spectral resolution and allowed the second advance, which is the development and application of more sophisticated pulse sequences for obtaining sequential resonance assignments and distance restraints. One crucial aspect of these advances is the employment of <sup>1</sup>H-detection, which improves sensitivity and allows us to obtain unambiguous distance restraints more rapidly. Here we focus on the application to paramagnetic proteins, highlighting experimental schemes that have either been already applied, or otherwise have significant potential.

### 12.6.1. General strategy

In solid-state NMR of proteins, the extensive network of large <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>1</sup>H dipolar couplings results in very short <sup>1</sup>H coherence lifetimes  $T'_2$  at moderate MAS rates. The peaks in the <sup>1</sup>H spectrum are therefore very broad, and coherence-transfer blocks involving <sup>1</sup>H are often very inefficient, with the result that direct <sup>1</sup>Hdetection is not used routinely. Therefore <sup>13</sup>C detection is normally used, as part of pulse sequences that correlate resonances of N<sup>H</sup>, CO, CA, and CB. In addition to the large coherence broadening, the solid-state spectra also exhibit substantial inhomogeneous broadening due to structural disorder and, in the case of paramagnetic proteins, the ABMS. The result is that, even employing <sup>13</sup>C detection, small proteins give broader lines than in solution. However one advantage of solid-state NMR for large, paramagnetic proteins is that in the solid state there is no overall slow rotational diffusion, with rotational dynamics due only to the internal motions of the protein, and so the Curie broadening is substantially reduced for large systems compared to solution. This indicates that solid-state NMR can potentially be used to study large systems which in solution would have peaks broadened beyond detection due to the slow rotational diffusion.

As in solution NMR, the solid protein can be divided into regions in which the nuclear spins exhibit different effects due to the paramagnetic centre, as shown in Fig. 12.19. As in solution there is a blind sphere centred on the metal ion, in which the nuclear spins cannot be observed using conventional experimental methods. Beyond the blind sphere is a region which can be observed using these methods, and in which the nuclear spins are subject to measurable long-range paramagnetic effects, such as the PCS and PRE. The outermost region was characterized in solution NMR as showing no measurable paramagnetic effects. However in the solid state this description is not completely accurate. This is because the extended network of <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>1</sup>H dipolar couplings allows polarization to be transferred from one nuclear spin in this region, to another nuclear spin closer to the metal ion, and vice versa. For example one consequence of spin diffusion is that the measured  $T_1$  relaxation times of a particular spin are the average of the  $T_1$  values of the spins from which polarization has been transferred. This is not because the true relaxation times have changed, but rather the polarization spends only a fraction of the total time on any particular spin, due to rapid spin diffusion. Hence the nuclear spins in this outermost region are expected to exhibit  $T_1$  times that are shorter than their true values, due to the exchange of polarization with nuclear spins that are closer to the metal ion, and exhibit a measurable PRE. Hence the two outermost regions in Fig. 12.19 can be more accurately labelled as follows when discussing solid proteins. The inner of the two can be labelled as 'visible with measurable *direct* paramagnetic effects', as the nuclear spins exhibit a direct long-range interaction with the paramagnetic centre. The outermost region can then be labelled as 'no measurable direct paramagnetic effects, but shows indirect paramagnetic effects due to spin diffusion'. As discussed, one such indirect paramagnetic effect would be a relayed longitudinal PRE. The precise distances from the metal ion that define the boundaries between these different regions depend upon the nuclear species that are excited and observed, for example <sup>1</sup>H or <sup>13</sup>C, whether the proton concentration is diluted by deuteration, the MAS frequency, and the types of experiments that are used, for example utilizing scalar- or dipolar-based coherence transfers.

If we employ fast MAS (in the 60 kHz regime and above) and proton dilution by deuteration, we weaken the coherent effect of the dipolar coupling network, which has the effect of slowing spin diffusion sufficiently to suppress this relayed transfer. Under such conditions we approach the situation encountered in solution NMR, and Fig. 12.19 resumes its original interpretation.

### 12.6.2. <sup>13</sup>C-detection

Historically the solid-state NMR of proteins has been performed under moderate MAS of 20 kHz and employing <sup>13</sup>C-detection. The experimental schemes used include two- or three-dimensional correlation experiments to establish the connectivity between the N<sup>H</sup> and the CO, CA, or CB resonances along the backbone, and spin-diffusion to measure <sup>13</sup>C-<sup>13</sup>C distance restraints between C resonances on the backbone and sidechains. These methods have been used on paramagnetic proteins for the assignment [452] and the measurement of paramagnetic restraints [45]. They mainly concern two enzymes in microcrystalline form, human superoxide dismutase (SOD) and the catalytic domain of matrixmetalloproteinase-12 (MMP-12), two proteins with high-affinity binding sites for divalent paramagnetic cations such as Cu<sup>2</sup> (SOD) or  $Co^{2+}$  (MMP and SOD). Example spectra are shown in Fig. 12.66 [452] for a paramagnetic metalloprotein [U-<sup>13</sup>C,<sup>15</sup>N]-Cu<sup>2+</sup>-Zn<sup>2+</sup> superoxide dismutase (SOD). The NCACB and <sup>13</sup>C-<sup>13</sup>C

through-space correlation spectra acquired using proton-driven spin diffusion (PDSD) are shown in Fig. 12.66(a), and Fig. 12.66 (b) and (c) respectively. Here resonances as close to the paramagnetic Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion as 5 Å are observed. An additional notable example is the study of the reactive state of a copper-binding misfolded amyloid  $\beta$  (A $\beta$ ) fibril [453]. Proton relaxation data lead to the conclusion that the Cu<sup>2+/+</sup> ions are bound to histidine amino acid residues, and act as reaction centres for the redox reaction with ascorbate and oxygen to produce H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. This cycle was followed by measuring <sup>1</sup>H  $T_1$  data to monitor the interconversion between the Cu<sup>2+</sup> and Cu<sup>+</sup> oxidation states.

In addition to studying metalloproteins, paramagnetic effects have been used to accelerate acquisition of NMR spectra of low concentrations of diamagnetic proteins following doping with a paramagnetic agent [454]. For diamagnetic proteins the total experiment time required to obtain a spectrum is limited by the relatively long recycle delays of 1-4 s required for complete longitudinal relaxation. This so-called  $T_1$  barrier often means that data cannot be acquired on low concentrations of protein in a practicable time. To address this problem Wickramasinghe et al. proposed a method in which the protein sample is prepared so that it is doped with a paramagnetic complex which enhances the relaxation rates of the <sup>1</sup>H nuclei, resulting in a shorter recycle delay, and thus allowing accelerated acquisition even for nanomolar concentrations of protein [454]. The protein sample studied was a fibrillized and uniformly <sup>13</sup>C- and <sup>15</sup>N-labeled  $A\beta$  peptide of 87 nM concentration, which had been doped with a 200 mM concentration of Cu<sup>2+</sup>-binding EDTA. The PRE was transmitted directly to the surface-exposed <sup>1</sup>H of the protein, and then transferred throughout the protein via <sup>1</sup>H spin diffusion. This enabled the acquisition of a <sup>13</sup>C–<sup>13</sup>C correlation spectrum in a time of 2.7 h with a recycle delay of 55 ms.

The combined use of faster spinning (initially between 40 and 60 kHz) and lower-power decoupling reduces the coherent broadening, leading to both longer coherence lifetimes  $T'_2$ , and reduced linewidths in the spectrum [9]. The lengthening of the coherence lifetimes is a particularly important advantage as it increases the efficiency of coherence transfer blocks, and thus allows the use of longer and more sophisticated pulses sequences for sequential assignment [455]. Experiments were developed employing <sup>13</sup>Cdetection and fast MAS at 60 kHz for sequential assignment of the backbone resonances, in analogy to the protonless experiments employed in solution [362]. These experiments, which are listed in Table 12.4, were designed to correlate the amide N resonance to either the CO and CA resonances in either the same or preceding amino acid residue in a two-dimensional spectrum. In all cases the S<sup>3</sup>E block was used in the direct <sup>13</sup>C dimension in order to decouple the CO–CA one-bond *I*-coupling.

The (H)NCA-S<sup>3</sup>E pulse sequence works as follows [456]. We begin with excitation of all the <sup>1</sup>H nuclei, and then transfer the coherence to the amide N via CP. The N chemical shifts are then encoded during the evolution period, forming the indirect dimension of the FID and spectrum. Following this there is a second CP transfer from N to the closest CA nucleus (corresponding to the directly-bonded CA), after which we detect the CA directly with S<sup>3</sup>E. The (H)NCO-S<sup>3</sup>E sequence works in the same way, and correlates the directly-bonded N and CO resonances [456]. The remaining two sequences (H)N(CA)CO-S<sup>3</sup>E and (H)N(CO)CA-S<sup>3</sup>E are more complicated, as they both include a J-based coherence-transfer block to transfer unambiguously between the directly-bonded CO and CA resonances of the same amino acid residue [457]. Here, following the CP transfer from N to CO/CA, the J-based sequence transfers the coherence to the other carbon immediately prior to acquisition. The assigned (H)N(CO)CA-S<sup>3</sup>E spectrum of [U-<sup>2</sup>H,<sup>13</sup>C,<sup>15</sup>N]-(Cu<sup>2+</sup>,Zn<sup>2+</sup>)-SOD is shown in Fig. 12.67(a) [457]. In this sample of SOD the protons were uniformly deuterated, and the exchangeable amide deuterons were 100% back-exchanged for protons in H<sub>2</sub>O. In this <sup>13</sup>C-detected experiment resonances up to 8 Å in proximity to the Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion are observed. This is an improvement on the corresponding three-dimensional <sup>1</sup>Hdetected experiment (H)CA(CO)NH, the NC plane of which is superimposed upon the (H)N(CO)CA-S<sup>3</sup>E spectrum in Fig. 12.67(a), and which has peaks within 11 Å of the Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion missing.

# 12.6.3. <sup>1</sup>H-detection

More recently, with the availability of faster-spinning probes, <sup>13</sup>C-detection in solid-state protein NMR has been superseded by <sup>1</sup>H-detection. The advantages of the latter include increased sensitivity, and the ability now to measure dipolar-based distance restraints between protons.

In order to obtain useful resolution in the <sup>1</sup>H-dimension of spectra, initial strategies employed the complete deuteration of the amino acid residues in order to weaken the dipolar coupling network, followed by either complete [458,459] or partial reprotonation at the exchangeable amide sites [460–462]. The choice of the level of reprotonation is a compromise between sensitivity and resolution: higher reprotonation levels give greater sensitivity, but also reintroduce more <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>1</sup>H dipolar couplings that lead to shorter coherence lifetimes and lower resolution. At moderate MAS frequencies of 10–20 kHz, 10%–30% reprotonation is typically used.

At faster MAS frequencies of 60 kHz, the spinning is able to suppress the coherent decay and broadening sufficiently to allow us to use 100% amide reprotonation in a deuterated background [463]. The sensitivity is increased due both to the higher concentration of amide protons, and to the longer coherence lifetimes due to fast spinning and perdeuteration, which allow *J*-based <sup>13</sup>C-<sup>13</sup>C transfer to be used in combination with heteronuclear coherence transfers. This allows the application of pulse sequences for sequential backbone assignment, such as the two-dimensional (H)NH sequence [463], and the three-dimensional (H)CONH, (H)CANH, (H)CO(CA)NH, (H)CA(CO) NH [463], (H)(CO)CA(CO)NH, (H)(CA)CB(CA)NH [464], and (H)(CA) CB(CA)(CO)NH [465] sequences. Furthermore, the increased amide concentration gives increased sensitivity in the measurement of <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>1</sup>H distance restraints using three-dimensional sequences such as the (H)NHH RFDR experiment [463].

Whilst this method provides us with a complete backbone assignment and with information about the protein fold, it does not give us an unambiguous and high-precision structure as we have used neither the HA protons nor the sidechains to provide distance restraints. In order to detect these resonances we need to use fully-protonated proteins with a more extensive dipolarcoupling network. Recently the advent of very-fast spinning probes capable of 100 kHz MAS has enabled high-resolution <sup>1</sup>H-detected spectra with sufficiently long coherence lifetimes to be acquired on such fully-protonated systems [466]. This in turn has led to the suite of experiments for backbone and sidechain assignment being greatly expanded with the complete set of experiments given in Table 12.5. In turn the assignment of the CA and sidechain protons allows us to interpret the distance restraints measured between these protons, using the set of experiments in Table 12.6. It is anticipated that 100 kHz MAS and <sup>1</sup>H-detection will provide invaluable tools for the study of paramagnetic proteins in the solid state.

# 12.6.4. Paramagnetic restraints

In complete analogy with solution NMR, paramagnetic restraints have also been used in solid-state NMR to give information on the position of an observed nucleus with respect to the paramagnetic centre. Pseudo-contact shifts have been measured, using <sup>13</sup>C-detection and MAS frequencies between 8 and 12 kHz, for the protein matrix metalloproteinase (MMP) [45]. The <sup>13</sup>C PCS values were determined by comparing the Co<sup>2+</sup>-substituted protein CoMMP with the diamagnetic Zn<sup>2+</sup>substituted protein ZnMMP. Here dilution of the paramagnetic protein into a diamagnetic sample, or vice versa, prior to crystallization was needed to suppress the intermolecular or intramolecular PCSs respectively from the total contributions. While intramolecular PCSs allowed the refinement of the threedimensional structure in combination with spin-diffusion and chemical shift data, the intermolecular PCSs allowed the determination of the relative orientations of neighbouring molecules in the crystals. Longitudinal amide N PREs have also been used as structural restraints for the B1 immunoglobulin-binding domain of protein G (GB1) by utilizing six cysteine-EDTA-Cu<sup>2+</sup> mutants [102]. The relaxation rates were measured using <sup>13</sup>C-detected S<sup>3</sup>E experiments at 40 kHz MAS.

Measurements of both PREs and PCSs have been performed on SOD using perdeuteration and 100% back-exchange of the amide protons, fast MAS at 60 kHz, and <sup>1</sup>H-detection. This experimental setup allows the rapid measurement of hundreds of site-specific paramagnetic effects, as discussed in Section 13.8. Relaxation rates were measured on the Cu-Zn<sup>2+</sup>-SOD protein with the Cu ion in both the diamagnetic +1 and paramagnetic +2 oxidation states [11]. The two assigned two-dimensional (H)NH spectra are shown in Fig. 12.68(a) and (b) respectively. For both proteins, amide  $^{15}NT_1$ and  $T_{1\rho}$  relaxation times and <sup>13</sup>CO  $T_1$  and  $T_{1\rho}$  relaxation times were measured. The PCS values for <sup>1</sup>H<sup>N</sup>, amide <sup>15</sup>N, <sup>13</sup>CO, and <sup>13</sup>CA were measured by comparing the shifts obtained in the threedimensional (H)CONH and (H)CANH spectra of the diamagnetic reference  $(Zn^{2+}-SOD)$  with a paramagnetic protein Co<sup>2+</sup>-SOD. The two (H)NH spectra exhibiting PCS are shown in Fig. 12.69. Both sets of structural restraints were used in combination with RFDR distance restraints obtained between the amide protons to provide structural refinement.

# 12.7. Key concepts

- Small paramagnetic molecules in solution can be studied using homonuclear through-bond correlation experiments COSY, DQF-COSY, TOCSY, through-space correlation experiments such as 1D saturation-transfer NOE and 2D NOESY, and the heteronuclear correlation experiments HSQC and HMQC. Exchange processes can be measured using EXSY.
- Conventional <sup>1</sup>H-detected methods for paramagnetic proteins in solution can be used to observe nuclei far (>5–8 Å) from the paramagnetic centre. Nuclei closer to the paramagnetic centre cannot generally be observed with these methods, and so are in the so-called blind sphere.
- The use of protonless <sup>13</sup>C experiments enables observation closer to the metal, and can reduce the radius of the blind sphere to 5 Å in some cases.
- For proteins in solution, PCS, PRE, CCR, and RDC measurements can be used for structural restraints.
- Solid-state NMR of paramagnetic materials is best performed using very fast MAS, short recycle delays, and no <sup>1</sup>Hdecoupling even in <sup>1</sup>H-containing systems. Cross polarization is rarely useful for obtaining a sensitivity enhancement or establishing heteronuclear correlations.
- Low external magnetic fields, or the use of nuclei with low gyromagnetic ratios give smaller paramagnetic shifts and shift anisotropies, but inevitably result in sensitivity losses. In particular, if isotopic enrichment to improve sensitivity (e.g., with <sup>6</sup>Li) is possible, this is a useful and simple strategy for spectral simplification.

- Care should be used in interpreting a spectrum acquired with a spin-echo sequence, as the band width excited with a 180° pulse is much narrower than that excited with a shorter (less than or equal to 90°) pulse.
- Frequency-stepping experiments or shaped RF pulses may be required to excite the full spectrum.
- Solid-state homonuclear correlation spectra can be acquired using RFDR and EXSY. Heteronuclear correlations can be acquired using TEDOR sequences. Quadrupolar nuclei can be studied using signal-enhancement methods such as RAPT, and two-dimensional techniques to separate the quadrupolar and SA interactions such as shifting d/p-echo experiments (for I = 1) and COASTER (for half-integer spins).
- Solid-state NMR of proteins can be performed using both <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H-detected experiments.
- For proteins in the solid state, PCS and PRE measurements can be used as structural restraints.

#### Chapter 13: Case studies in paramagnetic NMR

### 13.1. Introduction

The presentation of the theory of paramagnetic NMR in the first part of this review aimed to do two things. Firstly we attempted a completely general description of the paramagnetic properties that affect the NMR spectrum and its interpretation. The result was a full, if sometimes complicated, formulation. Secondly we adapted the resulting formulations to different situations such as different types of metal ion, and molecules in solution vs solid state materials, showing how the general treatment may be simplified or modified to provide a more accessible explanation of the features in the NMR spectrum for different systems. In this chapter we now see how these theoretical ideas are translated into practice by presenting some specific case studies in paramagnetic NMR from the literature. The examples comprise studies of small molecules in solution, solid materials such as battery cathodes, metalloproteins both in solution and the solid state, lanthanide-containing systems with interesting luminescent properties, actinide-containing systems, and multi-domain polymers used in pharmaceutical controlled-release formulations. In addition the case studies present the different paramagnetic effects arising from different types of paramagnetic centres, including isolated 3d transition-metal ions, coupled clusters of such metal ions, lanthanide ions, actinide ions, and organic radicals.

We attempt to answer questions such as the following: When should we use the EPR and susceptibility formalisms for the paramagnetic shift? In which situations do we need to consider relativistic effects, and which particular relativistic effects are important? What is the relative importance of the contact and pseudo-contact shifts, under what circumstances do we only need to consider one of these contributions, and how do we use them to obtain information on the structure and/or electronic properties? What is the impact of the paramagnetic relaxation enhancement, how does the consequent broadening compare with bulk susceptibility contributions, and how may these effects be used to obtain structural information? How do all these different effects vary with the metal ion or organic radical, and the type of system? This chapter is not intended to be a comprehensive review of the literature. Rather, the examples presented have been chosen to highlight how these specific paramagnetic effects vary depending on the nature of the paramagnetic centre and the system as a whole.

The following sections in this chapter are organized to separate the case studies according to the nature of the paramagnetic centre. Sections 13.2-13.8 describe systems containing 3*d* metal ions, Sections 13.9-13.11 lanthanide-containing systems,

Sections 13.12 and 13.13 recent work on actinide systems, and Section 13.14 the paramagnetic effects due to organic radicals, such as those used for DNP.

Section 13.2 summarizes the experimental and theoretical work performed in the EPR-formalism calculation of the paramagnetic shifts of **metallocene complexes** [40,42]. Here the shifts are dominated by the Fermi-contact contribution, and it is shown how the magnitude and size of the shift vary considerably with the electronic configuration of the 3*d* metal ions. This work provided a validation of the EPR formalism for the paramagnetic shift of 3*d*-block metal ions, and the contact shifts provided an experimental probe of the electronic structure.

In Section 13.3 we examine the theoretical study of **cobalt pyrazolylborates in solution** [467]. In contrast to the metallocenes it is shown here that the larger SO coupling effects of the Co<sup>2+</sup> ion induce large SO coupling contributions to the total paramagnetic shift, including contact and pseudo-contact shifts due to the ZFS. The calculated shifts were used to correct an error in the original assignment of the experimental NMR spectra, demonstrating the importance of such computations.

In Section 13.4 the focus changes to solid materials, with the specific case of layered **LiMO<sub>2</sub> Li-ion cathode materials** [49,55]. Here the 3*d* metal ions induce large shifts at the Li sites that are dominated by the contact interaction, and which vary with the metal ion and coordination geometry of the M—O—Li bonding. It is highlighted how the pathway contribution model can be used to rationalize the shifts in terms of the delocalization and polarization spin-transfer mechanisms. We also see how the combined NMR/DFT study of these materials was used to investigate dynamic distortions in the local structure of the metal binding site due to the dynamic Jahn–Teller effect.

The next Section 13.5 presents a study on a different class of solid materials, the **Prussian blue analogues** [4,8]. These examples provide a particularly elegant illustration of the polarization mechanism of spin transfer using the observation of contact shifts.

The final case study involving 3d metal ions in solid materials is presented in Section 13.6, and focusses on Li-ion cathode materials based on LiFePO<sub>4</sub> [468,31,55]. Here it is shown how the different metal ions induce very different paramagnetic effects in the NMR spectrum, such as variations in the contact shifts, relaxation enhancements, and inhomogeneous broadening. As in Section 13.4 it is shown how the total shifts can be decomposed into distinct pathway contributions which reveal the nature of the spintransfer mechanism over each bonding pathway. It is also shown how the pathway model can be used to rationalize the NMR spectra for LiMPO<sub>4</sub> materials with mixed metal compositions [31]. By simulating the spectra of these materials and assigning all of the multiple and overlapping resonances, it was shown that these materials form a random distribution of transition metal ions in the metal sites. Finally we describe the first application of the EPR formalism to a solid material, focusing on the purecomposition materials LiMPO<sub>4</sub>.

The next two sections describe case studies of proteins that bind 3*d* metal ions. Section 13.7 describes a solution NMR study of a **ferredoxin protein comprising Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub> clusters** [365]. We focus on the contact shifts of the amino-acid residues that bind directly to the cluster. In particular we examine how the exchange interactions between the metal ions affects the temperature dependence of the shifts, and how the geometry of the bonding between the observed nucleus and the cluster influences the signs and sizes of the contact shifts. In particular the temperature dependence was used to gain insight into the electronic structure of the Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub> cluster. The second biological example is the use of long-range paramagnetic distance restraints for determining the structure of a metalloprotein in the solid state, as described in Section 13.8 [463,46]. Here pseudo-contact shifts and paramagnetic relaxation enhancements are used to refine the three-dimensional structure of **superoxide dismutase (SOD)**.

The next three studies concern the paramagnetic shifts in systems containing lanthanide ions. Section 13.9 presents a case study of the shifts in solid **lanthanide stannates** [65,69]. It is shown that they are dominated by contact shifts, and that the lanthanide-dependent trends are described well by the Golding–Halton theory. This study therefore provided evidence for a covalent interaction between the 5*d* orbitals of the lanthanide ion and the coordinated ligands.

Section 13.10 presents the study of a lanthanide complex with interesting luminescent applications in **bio-imaging** [469]. The system forms a **supramolecular complex with the guanidinium cation in solution**. The shifts of the cation have a paramagnetic contribution that is due to the pseudo-contact shift, and which is accurately described by the Bleaney theory.

Section 13.11 presents a detailed study of the effects of different lanthanide ions when incorporated into a metal-binding site of the protein **calbindin**  $D_{9k}$  [75]. The measured pseudo-contact shifts due to 11 out of 13 of the paramagnetic lanthanides are used to calculate the susceptibility anisotropy parameters, which are shown to agree well with the Bleaney theory. The use of the Bleaney theory then allows the crystal-field splitting parameters to be extracted.

The next two sections concern recent contributions to the use of paramagnetic NMR spectroscopy to study actinide systems. Section 13.12 presents computational work on rationalizing the shifts obtained in three **actinyl tris-carbonate complexes** in solution. The calculations are a sophisticated application of relativistic quantum chemistry to NMR and EPR parameters [92,93].

Section 13.13 describes an experimental study of five **actinide oxides** by <sup>17</sup>O MAS solid-state NMR [13]. This work demonstrated the first acquisition of high-resolution MAS NMR for these highly radioactive materials, and opened the door to obtaining a better understanding of the behaviour of actinides in solid-state chemistry and materials science. In particular it was used to measure and rationalize trends in the actinide electronic magnetic moments.

Finally we present a recent contribution which describes and applies a new method for measuring domain sizes in materials comprising multiple components, such as **pharmaceutical controlled-release formulations**, in Section 13.14 [470]. Here selective doping of the material with a solution of an organic biradical induces a paramagnetic relaxation enhancement which, when combined with spin diffusion, can be used to measure domain sizes on the nm–µm length scale. This work provided a direct measurement of the domain sizes in these materials, of direct relevance to the pharmaceutical industry.

#### 13.2. Transition-metal metallocenes $M(C_5H_5)_2$

#### 13.2.1. Background

Transition-metal metallocene complexes are classic examples of molecular magnetic materials. They adopt the sandwich structure shown in Fig. 13.1 in which one divalent *d*-block metal ion bonds to two cyclopentadienyl anions ( $C_5H_5^-$ , or  $Cp^-$ ) via an  $\eta^5$ covalent interaction with the conjugated  $\pi$ -orbitals. The nominal forms of the 3*d* orbitals are also shown, along with their energy splitting as predicted from ligand-field theory. More details about



**Fig. 13.1.** The structure and *d*-orbital splitting of the 3*d* metallocene complexes. The nominal forms of the 3*d* orbitals are also shown. Two sets of symmetry labels are given for each orbital set, corresponding to those appropriate for the point group of the staggered conformation  $(D_{5d} : a_{1g}, e_{1g}, and e_{2g})$ , and for the symmetry of the orbitals relative to the fivefold rotation axis  $(d_{\sigma}, d_{\pi}, and d_{\delta})$ .

the molecular orbitals, including energy level diagrams calculated from hybrid-functional DFT, are given by Xu et al. [471]. Discussions about the metallocenes usually consider the two Cp<sup>-</sup> ligands to adopt either an eclipsed conformation (point group  $D_{5h}$ ), or to be staggered ( $D_{5d}$ ). Energy calculations of the two conformations indicate that the eclipsed forms are energetically more stable for ferrocene, nickelocene, and vanadocene [472]. However the energy differences between the two conformers are very small, being 3.0, 0.4, and 0.7 kJ mol<sup>-1</sup> for ferrocene, nickelocene, and vanadocene respectively, and at room temperature, where kT corresponds to 2400 kJ mol<sup>-1</sup>, the Cp<sup>-</sup> ligands rotate freely. Thus, it makes little difference which conformation we examine, and so here we consider the staggered conformation.

Here we compare the experimental <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H shifts of the family of metallocene complexes Cp<sub>2</sub>V, Cp<sub>2</sub>Cr, Cp<sub>2</sub>Mn, Cp<sub>2</sub>Fe, Cp<sub>2</sub>Co, and Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni, and show that they can be used, in combination with hybrid DFT calculations, as an experimental probe of the electronic structure. The electronic configurations of the *d*-orbitals in the six metallocene complexes are shown in Fig. 13.2. These diagrams are helpful aids for counting the number of unpaired electrons. However, when a system contains unpaired electrons, it is not correct to assume that the energies of the up- and down-spin ( $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ) electrons are the same, as implied by these diagrams. We see that  $Cp_2Fe$  has a low-spin  $d^6$  configuration, which gives a closed-shell diamagnetic compound. Hence the shifts in this molecule are due entirely to the orbital (i.e. chemical shift) contribution. However the other five compounds are all paramagnetic, and the orbital angular momentum is quenched to first order as the electronic states are either singly or doubly degenerate (i.e. are A or E states). The  $Mn^{2+}$  has a half-filled *d*-shell, and behaves as a spin-only ion, but for the other compounds we expect second-order SO coupling effects to be present due to the mixing of the electronic excited states with the ground state. Furthermore, due to the axial symmetry of the complex, the hyperfine, g-, and ZFS tensors are axially symmetric, i.e. the asymmetry parameters of the hyperfine and g-tensors,  $\eta^A$  and  $\eta^g$ , and the rhombic ZFS parameter *E* are all zero.

The rationalization of the metallocene shifts has a long history in the literature, beginning with the work of McConnell and Holm who offered two different explanations for the observed proton shifts in nickelocene. They initially suggested that  $\alpha$  electronic spin density is transferred from the Ni *d*-orbitals into the ligand  $\pi$  orbitals [473], and later reversed this argument to propose a mechanism where  $\beta$  spin density (i.e., spin density of the opposite sign) is instead transferred from the ligand to the partially-occupied



**Fig. 13.2.** The *d*-orbital splitting and electronic configurations of the metallocene compounds  $Cp_2M$  in  $D_{5d}$  symmetry. The corresponding electronic terms are  ${}^{4}A_{2g}$  (V),  ${}^{3}E_{2g}$  (Cr),  ${}^{6}A_{1g}$  (Mn),  ${}^{1}A_{1g}$  (Fe),  ${}^{2}E_{1g}$  (Co), and  ${}^{3}A_{2g}$  (Ni).

*d*-orbitals [474]. This proposal has since been corroborated with the aid of hybrid DFT calculations [475].

### 13.2.2. Paramagnetic shifts

There have been numerous NMR studies of metallocene complexes over the years, both in solution [476-481] and in the solid state [3,482–484]. A <sup>1</sup>H spectrum of a solution of a mixture of the five metallocene compounds Cp<sub>2</sub>V, Cp<sub>2</sub>Cr, Cp<sub>2</sub>Fe, Cp<sub>2</sub>Co, and Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni is shown in Fig. 13.3 [42]. The variation of the chemical shift with the metal ion, 600 ppm, is very large compared to the standard 10 ppm range of diamagnetic <sup>1</sup>H shifts. The only compound with a shift that falls into this standard region is the diamagnetic Cp<sub>2</sub>Fe, which exhibits both a small shift and narrow line. The large value of the shifts from the other compounds, which has recently been discussed by Kaupp and Köhler [42], is due to unpaired electron density that is transferred between the metal ion and the Cpligands. The <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H orbital shifts are both approximately constant across the series of compounds, with the result that the trend in the total chemical shift matches that of the Fermi-contact shift. One striking feature that is immediately apparent is that in the compounds Cp<sub>2</sub>V and Cp<sub>2</sub>Cr, the unpaired electrons of which occupy the  $e_{2g}$  and  $a_{1g}$  orbitals, both give large positive paramagnetic shifts, whereas Cp<sub>2</sub>Co and Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni, the unpaired electrons of which reside in the  $e_{1g}$  orbitals, both give large negative shifts.

The isotropic paramagnetic shift is calculated from Eq. (4.109) to be



**Fig. 13.3.** Solution <sup>1</sup>H spectrum of a mixture of  $Cp_2V$ ,  $Cp_2Cr$ ,  $Cp_2Fe$ ,  $Cp_2Co$ , and  $Cp_2Ni$  in toluene-d<sub>8</sub> at 305 K. The peaks labelled S are due to the residual protonated solvent. Reproduced from [42], with permission from Elsevier.



**Fig. 13.4.** Breakdown of the contributions to the total <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H chemical shifts of selected metallocenes determined by first-principles calculations (with PBE0), and comparison with the experimental shifts, at 298 K. The <sup>13</sup>C shift contributions are shown in (a), and the <sup>1</sup>H shifts are shown in (b). The calculated shift contributions for Cp<sub>2</sub>V, Cp<sub>2</sub>Cr, Cp<sub>2</sub>Mn, and Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni are taken from Refs. [39,42], and the calculated shifts for Cp<sub>2</sub>Co are taken from Refs. [485,42]. The experimental <sup>13</sup>C chemical shifts in solution are taken from Ref. [477] (Ni), [479] (Co), [478] (Mn), [476] (Cr), and [481] (V). The experimental <sup>1</sup>H chemical shifts in solution are taken from Refs. [476] (Ni), [479] (Co), and [480] (Mn, Cr, V). All solid-state chemical shifts are taken from Ref. [483], with the exception of the <sup>13</sup>C shift for Cr which is taken from Ref. [485].

$$\delta_{\rm iso}^{\rm S} = \frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{3h\gamma_{\rm I}} {\rm Tr}[\boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{Z} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}], \qquad (13.1)$$

where the cross-terms between the different components of **g**. **Z**. and **A** are given in Table 5.1. In total there are nine contributions to the total shift, of which four are a contact shift and four a pseudo-contact (dipolar) shift, with the remaining term being the orbital shift. The values of the different terms have been calculated [485,40], and tabulated by Kaupp and Köhler [42], and the results are presented here in Fig. 13.4. The terms are grouped together as follows. Firstly the orbital shift is separated from the other terms, in order to isolate the effect of the unpaired electrons. Secondly three of the contact-shift terms are separated into two groups, corresponding to the NR Fermi-contact shift proportional to  $g_e A^{FC} Z$ , and an SO contribution  $g_e A^{FC2} \mathbf{Z} + \Delta g_{iso} A^{FC} \mathbf{Z}$ , where  $A^{FC}$  is given by Eq. (2.171), which are non-zero even in the absence of the ZFS. Thirdly there is a single term in the PCS which is non-zero in the absence of a ZFS:  $\Delta g \cdot \mathbf{Z} \cdot \mathbf{A}^{SD}$ , where  $\mathbf{A}^{SD}$  is given by Eq. (2.172). Finally the remaining four terms are grouped together. In general whilst all the paramagnetic terms change in size with the introduction of the ZFS, the defining feature of the last group is that all the terms in it are only non-zero if the ZFS is also non-zero. The shift contributions were all computed using calculated values for the ZFS anisotropy D and g-shift tensor, and it is these values that are presented in Fig. 13.4 [485,40]. However there are two exceptions. The calculated values of the ZFS anisotropy for both Ni and Cr, 104.4 and  $-2.0 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ , were shown to be far from the experimental values of 30 and -15.1 cm<sup>-1</sup>, being severely over- and underestimated

respectively. For this reason the corresponding ZFS contributions to the paramagnetic shift for both <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H were recalculated accordingly [42]. Whilst the presentation of these 'mixed results' appears to be inconsistent, we should remind ourselves that the ZFS contributions to the shift, which are only non-zero ifwe include the ZFS, are generally affected to a proportionately greater extent than the other contributions in the high-temperature limit |D| < kT (kT is approximately 200 cm<sup>-1</sup> at the temperatures under consideration). Therefore we gain a better picture of the relative importance of the different contributions if we adjust the ZFS contributions accordingly.

Inspection of Fig. 13.4 immediately shows that the only significant contributions to both the <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H chemical shifts are the orbital and NR Fermi-contact terms, with the latter being dominant, i.e. the effect of the SO coupling, via the *g*-shift, ZFS, and hyperfine tensor, is negligible. This is also reflected in the comparatively small values observed experimentally for the *g*-shift and ZFS tensor parameters, which are given in Table 13.1. The *g*-shift and ZFS tensor parameters are particularly small for Cp<sub>2</sub>Mn, due to the *d*-shell being half filled resulting in the quenching of the SO coupling to second-order. The largest ZFS contribution is for Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni, as the Ni<sup>2+</sup> ion has the largest *D* value, and the smallest is for Cp<sub>2</sub>Co, where the electronic spin S = 1/2 results in the complete absence of the ZFS interaction.

### 13.2.3. Interpretation

We have seen that the Fermi-contact coupling constant is proportional to the unpaired electronic spin density in the *s*-orbital

Table 1	13.1
---------	------

Experimental I	principal	values o	f the g-	and ZFS	tensors fo	or selected	metallocene	complexes.
			<u> </u>					

Compound		g-tensor		ZFS tensor		
	$g_{\parallel}$	$g_{\perp}$	Refs.	$D/cm^{-1}$	Refs.	
Cp <sub>2</sub> Ni	2.00	$2.06 \pm 0.10, 2.11 \pm 0.03$	[486,487]	25.6-33.6	[486-488]	
Cp <sub>2</sub> Co	2.012	1.981-1.994	[489]	_		
$Cp_2Mn$	1.99-2.01	1.99-2.01	[490]	0.25-0.50	[491]	
Cp <sub>2</sub> Cr	2.012	1.988	[492]	-15.1	[493]	
Cp <sub>2</sub> V	$\textbf{2.002, 2.002} \pm 0.001$	$1.99\text{, }1.990\pm0.002$	[494,495]	0.83-2.7	[494-496]	

A.J. Pell et al. / Progress in Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy 111 (2019) 1-271

 Table 13.2

 Calculated Fermi-contact shifts and transferred electronic spin densities for <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H in selected metallocenes [42].

Compound	$\delta_{\rm FC}(^{13}{\rm C})/{\rm ppm}$	$ ho^{(lpha-eta)}(^{13}{ m C})/10^{-3}$ a.u.	$\delta_{\rm FC}(^1{\rm H})/{\rm ppm}$	$ ho^{(lpha-eta)}({}^{1}\mathrm{H})/10^{-3}$ a.u.
Cp <sub>2</sub> Ni	1537.1	9.73	-239.7	-1.52
Cp <sub>2</sub> Co	602.9	5.09	-38.9	-0.33
Cp <sub>2</sub> Mn	1706.1	6.17	-0.8	0.00
Cp <sub>2</sub> Cr	-342.9	-2.17	302.1	1.91
Cp <sub>2</sub> V	-537.2	-2.72	333.4	1.69



**Fig. 13.5.** The unpaired electronic spin density in (a) Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni and (b) Cp<sub>2</sub>V. Red and blue isosurfaces indicate positive and negative spin density respectively, and are evaluated at  $\pm 10^{-4}$  a.u. Adapted from [485], with the permission of AIP Publishing.

of the nucleus N  $\rho^{(\alpha-\beta)}(N)$ , and so the Fermi-contact shift has a size that is also proportional to  $\rho^{(\alpha-\beta)}(N)$  and has the same sign. This is seen in Table 13.2, where the Fermi-contact shifts and the associated electronic spin densities are given. Visual representations of the electronic spin density are also shown for Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni and Cp<sub>2</sub>V in Fig. 13.5(a) and (b) respectively [485]. Here we can see immediately that for both complexes the spin densities at the <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H nuclei have opposite sign. This effect is reproduced for all the paramagnetic metallocene complexes, and results in the signs of the <sup>1</sup>H Fermi-contact coupling constants (and shifts) having opposite signs to the <sup>13</sup>C coupling constants (and shifts). This change in sign is due to spin polarization of the C–H  $\sigma$  bond by the unpaired electron density in the  $\pi$  orbital [497].

We now focus on rationalizing the <sup>13</sup>C Fermi-contact shifts, concentrating on the two particular cases of Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni and Cp<sub>2</sub>V. The <sup>13</sup>C Fermi-contact shift of Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni is large and positive, whereas the corresponding shift for Cp<sub>2</sub>V has smaller magnitude and is negative. The corresponding opposite sign in the <sup>13</sup>C spin densities, which is clearly seen in Fig. 13.5 [485], can be explained by decomposing total Fermi-contact coupling constants into contributions from the individual molecular orbitals, to determine which of the two spintransfer mechanisms proposed by McConnell is correct [475]. This analysis also explains why Cp<sub>2</sub>V has a smaller shift than Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni, despite having more unpaired electrons.

In Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni the two  $e_{2g}$  orbitals (of  $d_{\delta}$  symmetry) and the single  $a_{1g}$  orbital (of  $d_{\sigma}$  symmetry) are fully occupied, and each of the two  $e_{1g}$  orbitals (of  $d_{\pi}$  symmetry) has a single unpaired electron, as shown in Fig. 13.2. Aquino et al. showed that the two  $d_{\pi}$  orbitals do indeed donate  $\alpha$  electron spin density into unoccupied orbitals of the Cp<sup>-</sup> ligands according to McConnell's first mechanism, resulting in a positive spin density at <sup>13</sup>C and a positive Fermi-contact shift [475]. However this mechanism only accounts for approximately 15% of the total <sup>13</sup>C Fermi-contact shift, and so is not the dominant

effect. The more important contribution is the donation of  $\beta$  spin density from the occupied ligand  $\pi$  orbitals into the  $d_{\pi}$  of the Ni<sup>2+</sup>, according to McConnell's second mechanism. The corresponding reduction in  $\beta$  spin density in the ligand  $\pi$  system leaves an excess of  $\alpha$  spin density, which in turn polarizes the  $\sigma$  orbitals, giving a positive <sup>13</sup>C Fermi-contact shift. This second effect accounts for the remaining 85% of this shift.

There is an alternative description of the electron transfer due to McConnell's second mechanism in terms of the difference between the molecular orbitals (MOs) containing the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  electron spins. Although this description gives us a superficially different explanation of the process, the underlying chemistry is the same. The important idea is that the MOs containing the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ electrons are not the same, and have different energies. As we have already remarked, this is a feature of the electronic structure that is missing from the simplified *d*-orbital splitting diagrams shown in Fig. 13.2. Of particular relevance to metallocenes, the metal dorbitals lie close in energy to the  $\pi$ -orbitals of the Cp<sup>-</sup> ligands. For Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni, the lower energy, bonding, and occupied (formally ligand-based)  $\beta e_{1g}$  MOs lie close in energy to the  $\alpha$  *d*-orbitals (formally the Ni d-orbital-dominated MOs). The coefficient of the occupied  $e_{1g} d_{\pi}^{\alpha}$  orbital (containing the  $\alpha$  electron) in the  $e_{1g}$  MO wavefunction is different to that of the  $d^{\beta}_{\pi}$  orbital, and it is this inequality that results in the difference in  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  electronic spin densities on both Ni<sup>2+</sup> and the ligand. A similar explanation is invoked to explain the polarization mechanism involving O 2p orbitals in Section 13.4.2.

The case of Cp<sub>2</sub>V is much more complex. Here, as seen in Fig. 13.2, the  $V^{2+}$  ion formally has three unpaired 3*d*-electrons, one each in the two  $e_{2g}$  ( $d_{\delta}$ ) orbitals and single  $a_{1g}$  ( $d_{\sigma}$ ) orbital. Aquino et al. showed that the contribution from the two  $d_{\delta}$  orbitals to the Fermi-contact coupling constant is very small, with a magnitude of 7% of the total [475]. In order to properly understand the negative shift, we need to include a number of contributions. Firstly there is some transfer of  $\alpha$  electron spin from the V<sup>2+</sup>  $d_{\alpha}$  into the ligand  $\sigma$  orbitals, according to McConnell's first mechanism, giving a positive Fermi-contact coupling constant and shift. Secondly donation of  $\beta$  spin density from the ligand to the metal  $d_{\sigma}$ results in excess  $\alpha$  spin density in the  $\sigma$  valence orbitals at the <sup>13</sup>C, which in turn polarizes the <sup>13</sup>C 1s orbitals with  $\beta$  spin density. This gives a large negative contribution to the Fermi-contact shift. Thirdly there are further negative contributions from non-nearestneighbour  $\sigma$  orbitals and polarization of the  $\pi$  orbitals [475]. The overall Fermi-contact shift is a sum of these contributions, and turns out to be negative overall. We can also rationalize the smaller magnitude of the shift relative to that of Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni. In Cp<sub>2</sub>V only one unpaired electron (the  $d_{\sigma}$ ) contributes to the Fermi-contact interaction, and there is signicant cancellation of the different contributions, in Cp<sub>2</sub>Ni there are two unpaired electrons (the  $d_{\pi}$ ) and the two main contributions to the shift reinforce each other.

# 13.2.4. The delocalization error

The final point that we make here concerns a practical point in the calculation of the Fermi-contact shift. Accurate values of the Fermi-contact shift can only be obtained if we calculate the transfer of the electronic spin density correctly, i.e. if we treat the delocalization of the electrons properly. Failure to do so results in a socalled *delocalization error*.

In practice calculations of the paramagnetic shift employ some formulation of DFT to describe the spin densities. The spin densities can vary strongly with the choice of exchange–correlation functional, potentially leading to a large range of Fermi-contact shifts! The resulting delocalization errors are well known, and have been observed in a range of systems including metallocenes [498], acetylacetonato complexes [499,498], and solid Li-ion battery materials [54,31,57–59,500,501,60].

In particular the calculation of the spin density donated from the ligand to the metal, such as that observed in metallocene complexes, is particularly sensitive to delocalization errors [502]. The general trend is that this electron transfer is underestimated when calculated using pure Hartree–Fock methods, which result in electrons that are too strongly localized, and is overestimated when calculated with non-hybrid functionals, which result in electrons that are too extensively delocalized. The use of hybrid functionals results in a situation that is between these two extremes, and their use is therefore very important in DFT calculations of Fermicontact shifts, as described in Section 13.4.

# 13.3. Co(II) pyrazolylborate complexes in solution

# 13.3.1. Background

The paramagnetic NMR properties of the metallocene complexes in the previous section are dominated by non-relativistic effects, with the isotropic shift being dominated by the Fermicontact interaction. However this is not a general observation for all small molecular complexes. We illustrate this point here by presenting a combined experimental and theoretical study of three  $Co^{2+}$  complexes, the structures of which are shown in Fig. 13.6. These three molecules are referred to as systems 1 (a), 2 (b), and 3 (c). The <sup>1</sup>H shifts of these complexes have been measured in solution by Długopolska et al. [503], and more recently calculated by Rouf et al. [467].

The Co<sup>2+</sup> ion is in a slightly-distorted octahedral coordination environment, and has a high-spin electronic configuration which can be approximated by the orbital splitting diagram shown in Fig. 13.7. The electronic ground state therefore has spin S = 3/2, and can be labelled using the term  ${}^{4}T_{1g}$ . In this distorted coordination environment the Co<sup>2+</sup> is expected to have larger SO coupling effects than seen in the metallocenes, which in turn lead to greater SO coupling contributions to the paramagnetic shifts.



**Fig. 13.7.** Splitting and occupancy of the  $Co^{2+}$  *d*-orbitals in an octahedral coordination site.

### 13.3.2. The EPR tensor parameters

Rouf et al. calculated the total hyperfine tensor using DFT, and the *g*- and ZFS tensors using the ab initio CASSCF and NEVPT2 methods [467]. Both the *g*-shift and ZFS tensor parameters are larger than for the metallocenes, with system 1 giving a total isotropic *g*-value of 2.119, and ZFS anisotropies of D = -112.3 cm<sup>-1</sup> and E = -15.7 cm<sup>-1</sup>. In particular the large *D* value is expected to give a substantial contribution to both the contact and pseudo-contact shift.

## 13.3.3. Paramagnetic shifts

The paramagnetic shift is given by Eq. (13.1), with the components listed in Table 5.1. The total calculated shifts of the three systems are compared with the experimental values in Fig. 13.8, along with the breakdown of the former into the different components. There is a large degree of variation between the systems, and for the individual <sup>1</sup>H sites within each complex, but there are generally only three significant contributions to each paramagnetic shift, which are the contact-shift term  $g_e A^{FC} Z$ , and the two PCS contributions  $g_e Z \cdot A^{SD}$  and  $\Delta g \cdot Z \cdot A^{SD}$ . The two PCS terms are particularly significant in gauging the contribution of the SO coupling, as both are only non-zero if we account for the ZFS or, for  $\Delta g \cdot Z \cdot A^{SD}$ , g-anisotropy. The relatively large values of the ZFS parameters can therefore be attributed to the significant PCS.

The variation of the shifts immediately illustrates the difficulties of assigning NMR spectra of paramagnetic molecules without using calculations. If we examine the contact shifts for system 1 in more detail (Fig. 13.8(a)), we see that the values for 3-H, 4-H, and 5-H are similar, falling in the range 30–40 ppm. This cannot be intuitively explained simply by reference to the structure in Fig. 13.6(a), as 3-H is nominally three bonds from the Co<sup>2+</sup> ion, whereas 4-H and 5-H are both four bonds away. This observation emphasizes that the size of the unpaired electron transfer depends on more complicated factors than simply the number of bonds involved, but also depends on the coordination geometry, as all



**Fig. 13.6.** Structures of the high-spin Co<sup>2+</sup> pyrazolylborate complexes. The three complexes are referred to as (a) system 1, (b) system 2, and (c) system 3. For each complex the chemically distinct <sup>1</sup>H environments are labelled. Reproduced with permission from [467]. Copyright (2015) American Chemical Society.



**Fig. 13.8.** Breakdown of the contributions to the total <sup>1</sup>H chemical shifts of the three Co(II) pyrazolylborate complexes determined by first-principles calculations, and the comparison with the experimental shifts. The shifts for system 1 are shown in (a), system 2 in (b), and system 3 in (c). The calculated and experimental shifts are taken from Refs. [503,467].

these factors influence the overlap between the relevant orbitals. The overall shifts cannot be assigned correctly by considering only the contact shift, as the two PCS contributions are significant. This is particularly important for 5-H in system 1, as the negative PCS is larger in magnitude than the positive contact shift, resulting in an overall shift that is negative.

System 2 is a modification of system 1 where the 3-H has been replaced by a methyl group, which is labelled 3-Me. If we compare the chemical shifts obtained from system 2, in Fig. 13.8(b), with those in system 1 we see some interesting similarities and differences. The total shift, and associated contributions, for 4-H and B-H have similar values in the two systems, although the experimental shift of the latter is significantly less positive in system 2. These observations indicate that 4-H and B-H have similar chemical environments in the two complexes, and that the two protons occupy similar spatial positions with respect to the Co<sup>2+</sup> ion. However we see significant differences for 5-H in the two complexes. In system 2, there is a comparatively poor agreement between experiment and calculation, but the significant reduction in the magnitude of the experimental shift compared to system 1 indicates that the two environments are significantly different. According to the calculations this is because the PCS is now positive, rather than negative, indicating that the spatial geometry of the ring containing 5-H is different.

System 3 is a significantly larger complex in which the 3-Me is replaced by a  $-C_4H_3S$  ring. The three protons 3-H', 4-H', and 4-H' all have smaller shifts than the other protons, which is due to the greater distance and bond separation of the former from the metal ion. Nevertheless we see that both the contact shift and PCS are still significant, which in the case of the former indicates that the spin transfer still persists over more than five bonds. The significant PCS is due to the long-range nature of the dipolar coupling.

### 13.4. Layered transition-metal oxides LiMO<sub>2</sub>

#### 13.4.1. Background

Paramagnetic materials are of particular interest in the field of energy storage as, for example, they form key constituents of many Li-ion battery electrodes. The electrochemical properties of a battery are driven by the redox processes of the metal ions in the electrodes, and so understanding the changes to the local structure of metal ion and the electron-spin transfer to the surrounding atoms is key to gaining insight into the mechanisms of charge and discharge, and how these processes both function and fail. Many of these materials are either paramagnetic in their pristine phases, or become paramagnetic on electrochemical cycling, and so paramagnetic solid-state NMR is an indispensable method for studying them.

Layered lithium transition-metal oxide materials of the form LiMO<sub>2</sub> are a promising class of cathode materials. The diamagnetic material LiCoO<sub>2</sub>, which was first used as a cathode by Goodenough et al. [504], has been used since 1991 in commercial Li-ion batteries originally developed by Sony. Considerable effort has been invested in using other metal ions in these materials which have lower toxicity and are cheaper than the Co<sup>3+</sup> ion, or that improve electrochemical properties such as the capacity. These materials adopt a layered "O3" (ordered rock salt) structure comprising alternating layers of edge-sharing LiO<sub>6</sub> and MO<sub>6</sub> octahedra, as shown in Fig. 13.9(a) [49]. Although there is only one crystallographically distinct Li site in between the MO<sub>6</sub> layers, cation subsitution of the M sites creates a series of different local environments. Here we present the influence of three species of metal ion on the <sup>7</sup>Li chemical shifts, namely Cr<sup>3+</sup>, Co<sup>3+</sup>, and Ni<sup>3+</sup>, as initially described by Carlier et al. [49] and later elaborated on by Middlemiss et al. [55]. The electronic configurations of these

a) The O3-LiMO<sub>2</sub> structure



b) The different types of interactions in the O3-LiM<sub>v</sub>Co<sub>1-v</sub>O<sub>2</sub> structure



**Fig. 13.9.** Structure of the O3-LiMO<sub>2</sub> materials. The alternating LiO<sub>6</sub> and MO<sub>6</sub> layers are shown in (a). In (b) are shown the two Li local environments Li(2) and Li(3) in the dilute materials LiM<sub>y</sub>Co<sub>1-y</sub>O<sub>2</sub> that exhibit large contact shifts. Reproduced with permission from [49]. Copyright (2003) by the American Physical Society.

three metal ions in an octahedral environment are given in Fig. 13.10. The Cr<sup>3+</sup> ion has a paramagnetic term  ${}^{4}A_{2g}$  corresponding to a quenched singly-degenerate orbital state with spin S = 3/2, and the Co<sup>3+</sup> ion has a low-spin diamagnetic configuration of  ${}^{1}A_{1g}$ . In both cases the non-degenerate spatial configurations result in no significant distortions from the nominal octahedral symmetry. The Ni<sup>3+</sup> ion, on the other hand, has a doubly-degenerate spatial term of  ${}^{2}E_{2g}$ , which we expect to result in a Jahn–Teller distortion parallel to the  $C_4$  rotation axis of the metal site. It will be seen that the  ${}^{7}$ Li solid-state NMR combined with hybrid DFT calculations can be used to detect such a distortion.

# 13.4.2. Spin-transfer pathways in $LiM_yCo_{1-y}O_2$

In the oxide materials with a single transition-metal species the total paramagnetic shift is dominated by the contact interaction with the six nearest-neighbour (nn) metal ions via a 90° M–O–Li electron transfer, and the six next-nearest-neighbour (nnn) metal ions via 180° M–O–Li electron transfers, the bonding geometries of which are shown in Fig. 13.9(b). Carlier et al. [49] and Middlemiss et al. [55] investigated these individual pathways by DFT calculations on the mixed-metal species  $\text{LiCr}_{1/8}\text{Co}_{7/8}\text{O}_2$  and  $\text{LiNi}_{1/8}\text{Co}_{7/8}\text{O}_2$ , in which the concentration of the metal ion is



**Fig. 13.10.** The *d*-orbital splitting and occupancy of the  $Cr^{3+}$ ,  $Co^{3+}$ , and  $Ni^{3+}$  metal ions in the octahedral coordination sites of  $LiM_vCo_{1-v}O_2$ .

#### Table 13.3

Experimental  $^7\text{Li}$  shifts observed in three  $\text{Li}M_y\text{Co}_{1-y}\text{O}_2$  layered oxides, with assignments.

Material	Shift/ ppm	Sign of calculated spin density	Assignment	Ref.
LiCr <sub>0.10</sub> Co <sub>0.90</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	35 0 70	+ -	Li(3) Li(1) Li(2)	[505]
LiCoO <sub>2</sub> LiNio 30C00 70O2	0 110	+	All Li(2)	[506] [507]
0.300.70 - 2	0 -15	-	Li(1) Li(3)	11

diluted. This dilution enables us to obtain experimental shifts from each of these individual isolated pathways, which can then be compared to the calculated values. We can then rationalize these individual contributions directly according to the Goodenough– Kanamori rules. For both materials the <sup>7</sup>Li solid-state NMR spectrum contains three peaks with distinct shifts, which are given in Table 13.3. Both mixed materials have a shift at 0 ppm which can be assigned by comparison with the diamagnetic LiCoO<sub>2</sub> as being due to the Li(1) site (or local environment) for which all the nn and nnn metal ions are Co<sup>3+</sup>. Each mixed material also has two additional shifts, one positive and one negative, which are due to the Li(2) and Li(3) sites illustrated in Fig. 13.9(b). Densityfunctional theory calculations were helpful in confirming the assignments of these shifts.

The dominant contributions to the chemical shifts in these materials is the contact shift. The important contributions in the EPR formalism are expected to be those that are proportional to the NR Fermi-contact coupling constant, namely  $g_e A^{FC} \mathbf{Z}$ ,  $\Delta g_{iso} A^{FC} \mathbf{Z}$ , and  $A^{FC} \Delta g \cdot \mathbf{Z}$  with the term due to  $A^{FC,2}$  being negligible. However it is more convenient to express the contact shift  $\delta^{con}$  in terms of the susceptibility formalism in Eq. (7.126),

$$\delta^{\rm con} = \frac{\chi}{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B} g_e \hbar \gamma_I} \left( \frac{\mathcal{A}^{\rm FC}}{2S} \right), \tag{13.2}$$

where  $A^{FC} = \mathcal{A}^{FC}/(2S)$ , and the SO coupling effects giving rise to the *g*-shift and ZFS, as well as the exchange interactions, are contained in the isotropic magnetic susceptibility  $\chi$ . Assuming a Curie–Weiss temperature expression for the susceptibility we obtain

$$\delta^{\rm con} = \frac{\mu_{\rm eff}^2}{3\mu_{\rm B}g_e\hbar\gamma_I k(T-\Theta)} \left(\frac{\mathcal{A}^{\rm FC}}{2S}\right).$$
(13.3)

Hence the size of the contact shift is proportional to the size of the unpaired electronic spin density transferred to the Li 2*s* orbital, and both quantities have the same sign. When more than one metal ion *i* transfers spin density to the nucleus N via a pathway  $P_i$ , the total spin density  $\rho^{(\alpha-\beta)}(N)$  is the sum of the individual contributions  $\rho_{P_i}^{(\alpha-\beta)}(N)$  [55]:

$$\rho^{(\alpha-\beta)}(N) = \sum_{i} \rho_{P_i}^{(\alpha-\beta)}(N), \qquad (13.4)$$

which in turn means that the total contact shift can be written as the sum of the individual pathway contributions  $\delta_{P_i}^{con}$  as follows:

$$\delta^{\rm con} = \sum_{i} \delta^{\rm con}_{P_i},\tag{13.5}$$

where each contribution is given by an expression such as in Eq. (13.2) or (13.3).

In Section 7.9 we saw that the sign of the transferred electronic spin density, and therefore the sign of the contact shift, can be



**Fig. 13.11.** The different M—O—Li spin-transfer mechanisms in  $\text{LiM}_y\text{Co}_{1-y}\text{O}_2$ . The delocalization mechanisms for the 90° and 180° pathways are shown in (a), and the corresponding polarization mechanisms are shown in (b), involving direct overlap with partially filled and empty  $t_{2g}/e_g$  orbitals in (a) and (b) respectively.

deduced from the Goodenough-Kanamori rules for 90° and 180° M-O-Li bonding geometries. Here we must distinguish between electron delocalization and polarization transfer mechanisms. In the former the metal 3*d*-orbital containing the unpaired electron overlaps with the Li 2s via an O 2p-orbital, resulting in a positive electron density at Li, whereas in the latter the metal 3d and Li 2s overlap with different orthogonal O 2p-orbitals, which results in a polarization of negative electron density at Li. These two mechanisms are illustrated in Fig. 13.11 for both 90° and 180° M-O-Li bonding geometries. The two delocalization mechanisms shown in Fig. 13.11(a) occur for the 90° geometry when the unpaired electron is in the metal  $t_{2g}$ , and the 180° geometry when the unpaired electron is in the metal  $e_g$  orbital. The two polarization mechanisms shown in Fig. 13.11(b) are operative for the 90° geometry when the unpaired electron is in the metal  $e_g$ , and the 180° geometry when the unpaired electron is in the metal orbital  $t_{2g}$ .

In the case of LiCr<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>O<sub>2</sub> the unpaired electrons reside only in the  $t_{2g}$  orbitals, which indicates that the 90° Cr—O–Li results in spin delocalization, and the 180° Cr—O–Li mechanism in spin polarization. The delocalization and polarization mechanisms can be readily interpreted by using simple MO theory [5]. The delocalization mechanism for the Cr<sup>3+</sup> ion results from the anti-bonding MO formed from the half-occupied  $t_{2g}$  *d*-orbital and the nearby (overlapping) O 2*p*-orbital, which results in a direct transfer of spin density to the 2*p*-orbital, and thus into the adjacent Li 2*s* orbital. The polarization mechanism results from a bonding MO involving the overlap of the empty  $e_g$  orbital with the relevant (overlapping) filled O 2*p*-orbital. The spin density in this case results from the different coefficients of the atomic orbitals in the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  MOs, with an increased contribution of the coefficient of the  $e_g$  orbital to the  $\alpha$  MO being driven by the exchange interaction, which serves



**Fig. 13.12.** Calculated spin-density transfer map in a M—O—Li plane in the LiM<sub>y</sub>-Co<sub>1-y</sub>O<sub>2</sub> materials, for Cr<sup>3+</sup> (a) and Ni<sup>3+</sup> (b). The DFT calculations were performed using the generalized gradient approximation (GGA) in the Vienna ab initio Simulation Package (VASP). Positive and negative contours are shown with solid and dashed lines respectively. Reproduced with permission from [49]. Copyright (2003) by the American Physical Society.
to lower the overall energy of the system. Hence the spin density transferred to the two lithium sites Li(2) and Li(3) is negative and positive respectively. This is indeed the case as shown by the electron spin density map calculated by Carlier et al. in Fig. 13.12 (a) [49]. The exact orbitals involved for each transfer are shown in Fig. 13.13. Hence the shifts of 35 ppm and -70 ppm can be assigned to Li(3) and Li(2) respectively, as shown in Table 13.3.

In LiNi<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>O<sub>2</sub> the unpaired electron resides in the  $e_g$  orbital, and so we expect the spin-transfer mechanisms to be different. For the 90° bonding geometry the half-filled  $e_g$  polarizes the  $t_{2g}$  orbi-

tals, resulting in negative spin density on the Li 2s as shown in Fig. 13.11(b), which now gives a negative contact shift for Li(3). For the 180° bonding geometry the situation is more complicated, as there are two competing transfer mechanisms. Firstly the half-filled  $e_g$  delocalizes positive spin density into the Li 2s, as shown in Fig. 13.11(a). However this same  $e_g$  orbital also polarizes the *other* unfilled  $e_g$  orbital, resulting in an additional transfer of negative spin density to Li, as shown in Fig. 13.11(b) (albeit for an analogous case where the 1/2-filled  $t_{2g}$  orbital polarizes the  $e_g$  orbital). The overall spin density is due to the combination of these two

M in	involved	M-O-Li	M-O-Li transfer	resulting sign
LiM1/8C07/8O2	spin orbital	angle	ACTIVE TO CONTRACT AND A DECEMBER OF	on Li
Cr <sup>3+</sup> (t <sub>2g</sub> <sup>3</sup> )	t <sub>2g</sub>	90°	delocalization (t <sub>2g</sub> -p <sub>π</sub> -s hybridization)	positive
	t <sub>29</sub>	180°	polarization of the e <sub>g</sub> -p <sub>o</sub> -s orbitals M $(only d_{x^2-y^2} has been represented)$	negative
Ni <sup>3+</sup> (t <sub>2g</sub> <sup>e</sup> e <sub>g</sub> <sup>1</sup> )	eg	90°	polarization of the $t_{2g}$ - $p_{\pi}$ -s orbitals $ \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \\$	negative
	eg	180°	delocalization (e <sub>g</sub> *-p $\sigma$ -s hybridization) M V V (only d <sub>x<sup>2</sup>-y<sup>2</sup></sub> is shown)	positive
			polarization of the $e_g$ - $p_\sigma$ -s orbitals $ \begin{array}{c}  & & & \\  & & $	negative

**Fig. 13.13.** Illustration of the orbitals involved in the spin-transfer mechanisms in  $LiM_yCo_{1-y}O_2$  for the specific cases of  $Cr^{3+}$  and  $Ni^{3+}$ . Reproduced with permission from [49]. Copyright (2003) by the American Physical Society.

transfers. It turns out that the electron delocalization is the dominant process, giving a positive spin transfer and therefore a positive contact shift for Li(2), as shown by the spin-density map in Fig. 13.12(b) [49]. The relevant orbital interactions are summarized in Fig. 13.13.

#### 13.4.3. <sup>7</sup>Li contact shifts in $LiM_yCo_{1-y}O_2$

The spin-density calculations of Carlier et al. established the link between the electronic spin transfer and the NMR shifts observed in the spectrum, via the contact interaction. However they did not obtain the actual values of the interaction, and nor was the effect of the expected Jahn-Teller distortion of the metal coordination sites accounted for. Both of these issues were addressed in a DFT study by Middlemiss et al. [55]. The first principles solid-state DFT calculations were performed using the CRYS-TAL09 linear combination of atomic orbitals code, with two hybrid exchange correlation functionals. Firstly the B3LYP functional incorporating 20% Hartree–Fock exchange (Hvb20) was employed. as this is known to perform well in the calculation of the electronic structure and band gaps of a range of materials, particularly those with transition-metal ions. Secondly a related functional with 35% Hartree-Fock exchange (Hyb35) was used as this gives values of magnetic coupling constants that are in good agreement with experiment. In particular the Hyb20 and Hyb35 calculations provide a range of values of the contact shift that are in good agreement with the experimental values.

The Hyb20 structural optimization of the two mixed transitionmetal oxides confirms the presence of a Jahn-Teller elongation along one of the pseudo- $C_4$  rotation axes, resulting in two long (L) M–O bonds and four short (S) M–O bonds, the values of which are given in Table 13.4. No Jahn-Teller distortion is expected for LiCr<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>O<sub>2</sub> due to the non-degenerate orbital ground state of the octahedral configuration, as shown by the negligible difference in calculated bond lengths, whereas there is a substantial distortion for  $LiNi_{1/8}Co_{7/8}O_2$ . One effect of these distortions is to lift the chemical equivalence of the Li sites, so that instead of the three sites expected from the octahedral environment we obtain five, which are shown in Fig. 13.14 [55]. The Li(1) site with only  $Co^{3+}$ in the nn and nnn remains distinct, and is now labelled Li(b). The Li(2) with the 180° M–O–Li bonding geometry is now split into two distinct sites Li(c) and Li(d) in the ratio 1:2, which are defined by a long (L) and short (S) M–O bond respectively. Finally the Li(3) site with the 90° M–O–Li bonding geometry is split into two distinct sites Li(a) and Li(e). Site Li(a) is defined by a spin transfer via two short M-O and O-Li bonds (SS) bonds, whereas for Li(e) the transfer is via two long and two short (SL) bonds.

The contact shifts were obtained from the Fermi-contact coupling constant from Eq. (13.2) using the values of  $\mu_{\text{eff}}$  and  $\Theta$  in 13.4. The two effective magnetic moments correspond to electronic configurations with quenched orbital angular momenta and S = 3/2 and S = 1/2 respectively. It was assumed that there are no measurable exchange interactions between the dilute paramagnetic metal ions, giving Weiss constants of zero. The results of the calculations of the contact shifts using the Hyb20 and Hyb35

#### Table 13.4

The M—O bond lengths obtained from the Hyb20 DFT calculations, and magnetic parameters for  $\text{LiM}_y\text{Co}_{1-y}\text{O}_2$  with M =  $\text{Cr}^{3+}$  and Ni<sup>3+</sup>, and y = 1/8. The effective magnetic moments were calculated from the spin-only values, and it was assumed that the Weiss constants are zero.

Material	M—O bond	l lengths/Å	$\mu_{ m eff}/\mu_{ m B}$	Θ/K
	Short (S)	Long (L)		
LiCr <sub>1/8</sub> Co <sub>7/8</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	1.96	1.97	3.87	0
LiNi <sub>1/8</sub> Co <sub>7/8</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	1.89	2.02	1.73	0

functionals are given in Table 13.5 [55]. The results for LiCr<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>-O<sub>2</sub> are in agreement with the prior calculations of Carlier et al., namely that the 90° M—O—Li sites correspond to the positive shift, and the 180° M—O—Li sites to the negative shift. Examining the calculated values in more detail we see that the small Jahn–Teller elongation gives a negligible difference between the shifts of the two Li(3) sites, Li(a) and Li(e), with both functionals, and also a negligible difference between the shifts of the two Li(2) sites Li (c) and Li(d). In addition the small shift for Li(b) confirms the prior assertion that M—Li spin transfer beyond next-nearest neighbour is negligible.

As expected, the Jahn–Teller distortion in LiNi<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>O<sub>2</sub> results in a greater shift difference between Li(a) and Li(e), and also between Li(c) and Li(d). This highlights the sensitivity of the contact shift to such structural distortions. Therefore, if the distortion is static, as assumed in the calculations, we would expect to see five distinct resonances in the NMR spectrum instead of three. In particular we would be able to distinguish between the two shifts for Li(c) and Li(d). However the observation of only three distinct shift indicates that the Jahn–Teller distortion is not static, but rather is dynamic in nature. If we assume rapid dynamics on the NMR timescale this process can be accounted for simply by averaging the shifts of the Li(a) and Li(e) sites to give a single axial average, and equivalently for Li(c) and Li(d). The values obtained for both LiCr<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and LiNi<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>O<sub>2</sub> are in excellent agreement with experiment.

The results of the combined NMR and DFT approach of Middlemiss et al. present a compelling body of evidence for the observation of a dynamic Jahn–Teller distortion in the Ni<sup>3+</sup>-containing materials, and highlight the power of paramagnetic NMR to distinguish between static and dynamic structural distortions [55].

### 13.5. Prussian blue analogue materials $A_n M'_x [M(CN)_6]_y \cdot z H_2 O$

#### 13.5.1. Background

Prussian blue analogues (PBAs) constitute one of the most important families of inorganic polymer materials. The original Prussian blue, ferric ferrocyanide  $Fe_4[Fe(CN)_6]_3 \cdot zH_2O$ , is a synthetic dye that was discovered by the Berlin dye maker Diesbach in 1703



**Fig. 13.14.** Local coordination environment for the  $Cr^{3+}$  and Ni<sup>3+</sup> metal ion in the LiM<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>O<sub>2</sub> structure subject to a Jahn–Teller distortion. Shown are the four short (S) and two long (L) M–O bonds to the equatorial and axial oxygens O and O', and four of the five Li sites. The Li(b) site with no M nn or nnn interactions is not shown. Reproduced with permission from [55]. Copyright (2013) American Chemical Society.

#### Table 13.5

Computed <sup>7</sup>Li contact shifts for the different sites in LiCr<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and LiNi<sub>1/8</sub>Co<sub>7/8</sub>O<sub>2</sub> using Hyb20 and Hyb35 functionals. Axial average values (assuming fast dynamic Jahn-Teller distortion) of the 90° nn shifts are equal to  $(\delta^{con}(a) + 2\delta^{con}(e))/3$ , and of the 180° nn shifts are equal to  $(\delta^{con}(c) + 2\delta^{con}(d))/3$ . Values taken from Ref. [55].

F	Pathways		LiCr <sub>1/8</sub> Co <sub>7/8</sub> O <sub>2</sub>		LiNi <sub>1/8</sub> Co <sub>7/8</sub> O <sub>2</sub>		
Li site	Bond lengths	Hyb20/ppm	Hyb35/ppm	Expt/ppm	Hyb20/ppm	Hyb35/ppm	Expt/ppm
90° i	nn pathways						
a	SS	46.0	29.8		4.2	10.0	
e	SL	44.3	26.6		-23.1	-21.6	
Ax	ial average	44.9	27.7	35	-14.0	-11.1	-15
180° i	nnn pathways						
d	S	-81.2	-79.4		34.4	21.2	
с	L	-87.4	-84.7		314.8	259.2	
Ax	ial average	-83.3	-81.2	-70	127.9	100.6	110
No nn o	r nnn pathways						
b	-	1.5	-0.4	0	-2.2	-2.0	0

[508]. More recently a large variety of PBAs have attracted interest in diverse fields such as hydrogen gas storage [509], biosensors [510], waste recovery [511], molecular sieves [512], and battery electrode materials [513].

The formula for a general PBA is  $A_nM'_x[M(CN)_6]_y \cdot ZH_2O$ , where A an alkali metal cation, and M and M' are six-coordinate octahedral transition-metal cations. The structure, shown in Fig. 13.15, is a cubic lattice comprising alternating  $M(CN)_6$  octahedra and A/M' metal ions, which are linked by the  $CN^-$  ligands [8]. Only a certain proportion of the  $M(CN)_6$  sites are occupied (as low as 60%), with each resulting vacancy being filled with z' 'structural' H<sub>2</sub>O molecules that coordinate to the nearest z' M' metal ions, and additional 'crystallization' interstitial H<sub>2</sub>O molecules. This results in PBAs readily absorbing water from the air.

The bonding interactions in PBAs can be understood as follows. Firstly each metal ion M coordinates to six CN<sup>-</sup> anions in an octahedral complex. The molecular orbital energy diagram of a CN<sup>-</sup> ligand is shown in Fig. 13.16. The highest-occupied molecular orbital (HOMO) is the  $3\sigma$ , which is mainly formed from the C  $2p_{\sigma}$  orbital. The electron pair is therefore aligned along the C–-N axis



**Fig. 13.15.** The ideal cubic structure for a PBA  $A_nM'_x[M(CN)_6]_y \cdot zH_2O$ . The grey octahedra indicate the  $M(CN)_6$  units; large light grey spheres are A/M' metal ions; small black spheres are structural  $H_2O$  molecules; small dark grey spheres are C atoms; and small light grey spheres are N atoms. The interstitial  $H_2O$  is omitted. Reproduced with permission from [8]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.



Fig. 13.16. Molecular orbital energy diagram for the CN<sup>-</sup> ligand in PBAs.

pointing away from N. The six  $3\sigma$  orbitals of the six ligands interact with the  $e_{\sigma}$  set of metal 3*d*-orbitals. Since the electrons in each  $3\sigma$ are predominantly located on C, this results in the formation of six M–C  $\sigma$ -bonds. If we only consider these  $\sigma$ -bonds the  $t_{2\sigma}$  set of metal 3*d*-orbitals remains non-bonding. However the six  $2\pi$  lowest unoccupied molecular orbitals (LUMOs) of the six ligands do have symmetry that is compatible with an interaction with the  $t_{2g}$ . These anti-bonding orbitals are mainly formed from the C  $2p_{\pi}$ . The interaction stabilizes the  $t_{2g}$  containing the *d*-electrons relative to the  $e_g$ , resulting in an increase in the ligand energy splitting parameter  $\Delta_{oct}$ , and thus a low-spin electronic configuration. A simplified molecular orbital diagram for  $Fe(CN)_6^{3-}$  that accounts for the important interactions is shown in Fig. 13.17, in which  $1t_{2g}$  HOMO and  $2e_g$  LUMO are highlighted [514]. When incorporated into the cubic lattice of the PBA the M(CN)<sub>6</sub> octahedra alternate with the A/M' metal ions, so that the latter interact with the N atoms of the CN<sup>-</sup> ligands.

The magnetic exchange interactions between the paramagnetic centres result in magnetic ordering at low temperatures, which may persist up to room temperature. For example the PBA V[Cr (CN)<sub>6</sub>]<sub>0.86</sub>·2.8H<sub>2</sub>O exhibits magnetic ordering with a Curie temperature of 315 K [515]. However many other PBAs are in the high-temperature paramagnetic regime at room temperature, many of which have been studied extensively with solid-state NMR by Köhler et al. [4,8,516,517,218]. Here we present a case study comprising two particular examples, namely the materials Cs<sub>2</sub>K[Fe (CN)<sub>6</sub>] [4], and Cd<sub>3</sub>[Fe<sub>x</sub>Co<sub>1-x</sub>(CN)<sub>6</sub>]<sub>2</sub>·15H<sub>2</sub>O [8], in which the Fe<sup>3+</sup> and Co<sup>3+</sup> ions are low-spin, with *S* = 1/2 and *S* = 0 respectively.



**Fig. 13.17.** Simplified molecular orbital energy diagram for the Fe(CN)<sup>3-</sup><sub>6</sub> octahedral unit in PBAs, showing the most important contributions to the  $\sigma$ - and  $\pi$ -bonds between the Fe<sup>3+</sup> ion and CN<sup>-</sup> ligands. The  $1t_{2g}$  and  $2e_g$  orbitals that are predominantly due to the metal 3*d* orbitals are highlighted by the dashed box.

### 13.5.2. Solid-state NMR spectra

The <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>15</sup>N solid-state MAS NMR spectra of  $Cs_2K[Fe<sup>III</sup>(CN)_6]$ acquired at 326.4 K are shown in Fig. 13.18 [4]. In the <sup>13</sup>C spectrum, acquired at 15 kHz MAS, we can resolve two spinning-sideband manifolds with negative isotropic chemical shifts of -3269 and -3295 ppm which are ascribed to  $CN^-$  ligands in the axial and equatorial positions. The orbital contributions to these shifts are assumed to be equal to those of the diamagnetic analogue  $Cs_2K$ [Co(CN)<sub>6</sub>]. Following subtraction of the orbital shifts, we obtain paramagnetic shifts of -3134 and -3160 ppm for the axial and equatorial positions. As for the transition-metal oxide materials of the previous section, these paramagnetic contributions are dominated by the contact shift, which indicates that the Fe<sup>3+</sup> ion transfers a negative spin density to C. The spinning-sideband manifolds



**Fig. 13.18.** <sup>15</sup>N and <sup>13</sup>C solid-state MAS NMR spectra of  $Cs_2K[Fe(CN)_6]$  at 326.4 K. The <sup>15</sup>N and <sup>13</sup>C spectra were acquired at 5 and 15 kHz MAS respectively. The centrebands of the resonances due to axial and equatorial CN<sup>-</sup> ligands are indicated with a  $\Box$  and  $\bigcirc$  respectively. Adapted with permission from [4]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.

are mainly due to the NR spin-dipolar interaction. A fit of the sideband intensities yields anisotropy parameters of 603 and 628 ppm for the axial and equatorial C.

The <sup>15</sup>N spectra were acquired at 5 kHz MAS, and also exhibit two spinning-sideband manifolds due to axial and equatorial N with chemical shifts of 727 and 704 ppm respectively. Following adjustment by subtracting the orbital shifts we obtain positive paramagnetic shifts of 810 and 783 ppm respectively, which are also dominated by the contact contribution, and indicate that the spin density transferred to both N 2*s* orbitals is positive. The shift anisotropy values, again dominated by the NR spin-dipolar interaction, are 1073 and 1023 ppm for axial and equatorial N.

To aid in the interpretation of the NMR shifts observed for <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>15</sup>N it would also be instructive to be able to monitor the transfer of unpaired electronic spin density to the metal ions in the A/M' positions. However neither Cs nor K has favourable nuclear spin properties for NMR, and so a different PBA analogue with a different metal ion in this position is needed. Flambard et al. studied a series of PBAs  $Cd_3^{II}[Fe_x^{III}Co_{1-x}^{III}(CN)_6]_2$ ·15H<sub>2</sub>O, with *x* = 0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, and 1, using <sup>113</sup>Cd solid-state MAS NMR [8]. The <sup>113</sup>Cd nucleus has spin *I* = 1/2, sufficient sensitivity, and a diamagnetic shift range of 500 to -125 ppm, and so the authors were able to determine the spin-transfer mechanism to this metal position for the first time.

From the stoichiometry of these PBAs it can be seen that only two thirds of the  $M(CN)_6$  sites are occupied, leaving one third vacancies (vac), each of which contains six 'structural' water molecules coordinated to the nearest  $Cd^{2+}$  metal ion, and a variable quantity of 'crystallization' water. The unit cell formula is therefore  $[Cd_4^{II}{M^{II}(CN)_6}_{8/3}(vac)_{4/3}] \cdot xH_2O$  with x = 12-20, and the coordination of the  $Cd^{2+}$  metal ion can be described as  $Cd^{II}(NCM)_{6-a}(OH_2$  $vac)_a$ . One important question that can be answered by solidstate NMR is whether the vacancies are ordered in the lattice, with limits on the values of *a*, or distributed randomly, with *a* taking all possible values from 0 to 6.

The solid-state <sup>113</sup>Cd NMR spectrum acquired at 15 kHz MAS and 310 K of the diamagnetic material  $Cd_3^{II}[Co^{III}(CN)_6]_2 \cdot 15H_2O$  (with x = 0) is shown in Fig. 13.19 position 1 [8]. Two peaks are observed in the paramagnetic region at 63 and 81 ppm, which can be ascribed to the cis and trans isomers of the Cd sites



**Fig. 13.19.** <sup>113</sup>Cd solid-state MAS NMR spectra of  $Cd_3[Fe_xCo_{1-x}(CN)_6]_2 \cdot 15H_2O$  acquired at 310 K and 15 kHz MAS. The  $Fe^{3+}$  contents are x = (1) 0, (2) 0.25, (3) 0.5, (4) 0,75, and (5) 1. Dashed lines indicate the shifts at which <sup>113</sup>Cd experiences a contact shift pathway contribution from 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5  $Fe^{3+}$  ions. Reproduced with permission from [8]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.

Cd<sup>II</sup>(NCCo)<sub>4</sub>(OH<sub>2</sub>vac)<sub>2</sub>, suggesting some ordering of the vacancies. By contrast the all-Fe material  $Cd_3^{II}[Fe^{III}(CN)_6]_2 \cdot 15H_2O$  (with x = 1) gives a <sup>113</sup>Cd spectrum with four distinct sites, as shown in Fig. 13.19 position 5. All four peaks are shifted to large negative values centred on -1300 ppm, which immediately suggests a contact interaction due to a transfer of negative electronic spin density along Fe—C—N—Cd to the Cd s-orbital, i.e. of the same sign as for C and opposite to N. The two most intense peaks at -1275 and -1327 can be attributed to the cis and trans isomers of  $Cd^{II}(NCFe)_4(OH_2vac)_2$ , with each shift being the sum of four pathway contributions Fe-C-N-Cd. Taking the average of the two contact shifts (i.e. the average deviation from the diamagnetic shifts from the all-Co compound) allows us to compute an average contribution from each pathway of -343 ppm. Immediately this allows us to assign the two lower-intensity peaks at -1000 ppm and -1537 ppm to the Cd<sup>II</sup>(NCFe)<sub>3</sub>(OH<sub>2</sub>vac)<sub>3</sub> and Cd<sup>II</sup> (NCFe)<sub>5</sub>(OH<sub>2</sub>vac) sites, where the Cd<sup>2+</sup> ion is connected to Fe<sup>3+</sup> by three and five pathways respectively. We note that there is no peak at -1880 ppm, which would be due to Cd<sup>II</sup>(NCFe)<sub>6</sub>, again indicating that the vacancies are not randomly distributed.

The pathway contribution model of the contact shifts is further supported by the <sup>113</sup>Cd spectra of  $Cd_3[Fe_xCo_{1-x}(CN)_6]_2 \cdot 15H_2O$  with x = 0.25, 0.5, and 0.75, which are shown in Fig. 13.19 positions 2–4. A total of six distinct Cd environments is observed, in which the shifts are equally spaced by 300–350 ppm, which correspond to Cd sites coordinating to between zero and five  $Fe^{3+}$  ions via similar pathways. The sites can be written explicitly as  $Cd(para)_{6-a}(dia)_a$ , with para corresponding to NCFe and dia to either  $OH_2vac$  or NCCo. Within each resonance multiple peaks can be resolved, which correspond to different cis/trans or mer/fac isomers of the different Cd  $(para)_{6-a}(dia)_a$  sites. Once again the non-observation of the Cd site with a = 6 indicates that the vacancies are partially ordered in the lattice [8].

#### 13.5.3. Interpretation of the contact shifts

The NMR data can be used to elucidate a mechanism for the unpaired electronic spin transfer from the Fe<sup>3+</sup> ion throughout the lattice to the s-orbitals of the other atoms. The measured chemical shifts are dominated by the contact shift, and are negative for both <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>113</sup>Cd, and positive for <sup>15</sup>N. This can be explained by the polarization mechanism as follows. Firstly the unpaired electron in the Fe<sup>3+</sup>  $t_{2g}$  orbital is delocalized into an anti-bonding  $\pi$ orbital of the CN<sup>-</sup> ligand. However this  $\pi$ -orbital has a node along the C-N axis, and is therefore of incompatible symmetry for overlap with the C 2s. Therefore this unpaired electron polarizes the  $e_g$ orbital of the Fe<sup>3+</sup> with a positive density. The result is negative electron density polarized in the C 2s, and a negative <sup>13</sup>C contact shift. This negative density then polarizes the N 2s orbital with electron density of the opposite sign, i.e. positive, leading to a positive <sup>15</sup>N contact shift. Finally the s-orbital of the Cd is polarized by the N 2s, resulting in negative electron density and a negative contact shift. This 'relay' of the polarization effect through the lattice is shown in Fig. 13.20. We expect the electron transfer to become weaker as we move further from the Fe<sup>3+</sup> ion, which is why the <sup>13</sup>C contact shifts have a greater magnitude than the <sup>15</sup>N contact shifts (-3100 vs 800 ppm). For Cd that receives electron density along a single pathway the magnitude of the transfer is smaller still, giving a relatively small contact shift of -343 ppm. However for Cd sites with multiple transfer pathways, the individual transferred densities and pathway contributions are additive giving relatively large negative shifts up to -1900 ppm.

On a final point we note that the spin-polarization transfer has the effect of aligning the electronic spins of the  $Fe^{3+}$  ions, and so we might expect the materials  $Cd_3[Fe_xCo_{1-x}(CN)_6]_2$ .15H<sub>2</sub>O to exhibit



**Fig. 13.20.** Diagram indicating the sign of the transferred electronic spin density in  $Cd_3[Fe(CN)_6]_2$ .15H<sub>2</sub>O. The atoms are denoted as follows: Cd, large white circle; Fe, large light grey circle; N, small white circle; C small dark grey circle. The arrows represent both the magnitude of the transferred density, via their length, and the sign, with up indicating positive spin, and down indicating negative spin. Reproduced with permission from [8]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.

ferromagnetic ordering at low temperature. However magnetic susceptibility measurements indicate that there is no such effect, suggesting that the polarization mechanism is inefficient at ordering metal ions that are separated by six bonds [8].

# 13.6. Olivine-type lithium transition-metal phosphate cathode materials LiMPO<sub>4</sub>

### 13.6.1. Background

The olivine class of materials LiMPO<sub>4</sub> with M = Mn<sup>2+</sup>, Fe<sup>2+</sup>, Co<sup>2+</sup>, and Ni<sup>2+</sup> has attracted a lot of interest in recent years as providing potential candidates for cathode materials in Li-ion batteries [518]. The pure-Fe phase, which is used commercially, has a Fe<sup>2+</sup>/Fe<sup>3+</sup> couple of 3.4 V vs Li<sup>+</sup>/Li. However this is not high enough for many applications, and so higher-voltage materials, such as with M = Mn<sup>2+</sup> and Co<sup>2+</sup> for which the corresponding redox couples are of 4.1 V and 4.8 V vs Li<sup>+</sup>/Li respectively, have been extensively studied. Whilst these metal ions have been exploited both in pure Mn and Co phases, the mixed phases LiFe<sub>x</sub>M<sub>1-x</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, where M is in a solid solution with Fe, tend to have better electrochemical performance, which in part is attributed to the local and long-range distortions of the lithiated and partially delithiated phases caused by cation substitution. Understanding these local structural effects is therefore key to understanding the electrochemistry.

The olivine structure of LiMPO<sub>4</sub> is shown in Fig. 13.21. The material has *Pbnm* symmetry, and comprises edge- and cornersharing  $MO_6$  octahedra and  $PO_4$  tetrahedra. There are three crystallographically distinct O positions  $O_1$ ,  $O_2$ , and  $O_3$  that have occurences in the ratio 1:1:2. The Li ions occupy the octahedral



**Fig. 13.21.** Crystal structure of the olivine LiMPO<sub>4</sub> materials showing the  $MO_6$  (yellow) and PO<sub>4</sub> (grey) polyhedra, and the Li sites (blue). The [010] channels with high Li mobility are vertical. Reproduced with permission from [55]. Copyright (2013) American Chemical Society.

LiO<sub>6</sub> sites in the [010] channels, along which they have greater mobility compared to other directions. On delithiation the Li ions are removed from the channels, with the connectivity of the other structural units remaining largely unaltered. This accounts for the favourable electrochemical performance of the material. In the lithiated phases LiMPO<sub>4</sub> the octahedral transition metal sites are slightly distorted, but the splitting of the *d*-orbitals is nevertheless accurately described by the idealized splitting in the O<sub>h</sub> point group. As shown in Fig. 13.22 the four metal ions Mn<sup>2+</sup>, Fe<sup>2+</sup>, Co<sup>2+</sup>, and Ni<sup>2+</sup> all have a high-spin electronic configuration.

In order to understand the effect of the local structure of the metal ions on the NMR properties in the mixed phases, it is necessary to fully understand the pure phases. We therefore present the combined NMR/DFT case studies of Middlemiss et al. [55], and Pigliapochi et al. to describe the form of the shifts and SAs in these materials in both the <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectra. In the former study we employ the scaling-factor model, and describe the shift and SA in terms of the Fermi-contact and spin-dipolar hyperfine interactions, using the values for the effective magnetic moment and Weiss constant in Table 13.6. The total shift is the sum of multiple pathways from more than one metal ion, and so in order to isolate the different pathway contributions a spin-flip approach was employed, as is described in detail in the next section. In the latter study the EPR formalism is used to investigate the explicit effect of the g-shift tensor on the shift and SA. Additionally we present some trends for the longitudinal relaxation times  $T_1$ , coherence lifetimes  $T'_{2}$  and total sideband linewidths in order to show the different effects the different metal ions have on these quantities. Finally the single-phase results can be exploited to investigate the multi-phase materials [31].

#### 13.6.2. 6/7Li NMR shifts and relaxation properties

The <sup>7</sup>Li NMR spectra of the full series of pure-phase LiMPO<sub>4</sub> acquired by Tucker et al. are shown in Fig. 13.23 [468]. The spectra were recorded at an external field corresponding to a <sup>7</sup>Li Larmor frequency of -38.9 MHz and under 10 kHz MAS. An initial inspection indicates that the isotropic chemical shifts for the four materials fall in the range 70 ppm to -100 ppm. Whilst this is outside the standard diamagnetic range we will see that the isotropic shifts are comparatively smaller than those measured in similar systems with a dense network of paramagnetic metal ions. The shift anisotropy  $\Delta \delta^S$  is given in the scaling-factor formalism by an expression analogous to the isotropic shift in Eq. (13.3), which is proportional to the total spin-dipolar anisotropy  $\Delta A^{SD}$ , and the asymmetry parameter  $\eta^S$  is equal to that of the spin-dipolar interaction

$$\Delta \delta^{\rm S} = \frac{\mu_{\rm eff}^2}{3\mu_{\rm B}g_e \hbar \gamma_l k(T-\Theta)} \left(\frac{\Delta \mathcal{A}^{\rm SD}}{2S}\right),\tag{13.6}$$

$$\eta^{\rm S} = \eta^{\rm SD}.\tag{13.7}$$

We expect this to be the dominant contribution to the spinningsideband intensities, with an additional contribution to the appar-

#### Table 13.6

The magnetic parameters defining the magnetic susceptibility and contact shifts of LiMPO<sub>4</sub>. Data taken from Refs. [468,519,520].

Material	$\mu_{ m eff}/\mu_{ m B}$	$\Theta/K$
LiMnPO <sub>4</sub>	5.4	-58
LiFePO <sub>4</sub>	5.3	$-72.5\pm0.2$
LiCoPO <sub>4</sub>	4.578	-77
LiNiPO <sub>4</sub>	3.1	-60



**Fig. 13.23.** The <sup>7</sup>Li MAS NMR spectra of LiMPO<sub>4</sub> with M =  $Mn^{2*}$ , Fe<sup>2+</sup>, Co<sup>2+</sup>, and Ni<sup>2+</sup>. The centrebands are marked with an \*. The Larmor frequency is -38.9 MHz, and the MAS frequency is 10 kHz. Adapted with permission from [468]. Copyright (2002) American Chemical Society.

ent anisotropy due to the BMS effects and in particular the IBMS. The envelope of the sideband intensities in Fig. 13.23 indicates that the effective anisotropies for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub>, LiFePO<sub>4</sub>, and LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> have similar magnitudes, which are significantly larger than for LiNiPO<sub>4</sub>. Furthermore the 'slant' of the intensities around the centreband indicates that the asymmetry parameters for all the systems have similar values, and that the SAs have the same sign. Finally we note that the individual spinning sidebands have considerably larger linewidths for LiFePO<sub>4</sub> and LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> than for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> and LiNiPO<sub>4</sub>. This is ascribed to the larger ABMS broadening due to the magnetic anisotropy of the Fe<sup>2+</sup> and Co<sup>2+</sup> metal ions which have electronic ground states  ${}^{5}T_{2g}$ ,  ${}^{4}T_{1g}$  respectively, compared to Mn<sup>2+</sup> and Ni<sup>2+</sup> ( ${}^{6}A_{1g}$ , and  ${}^{3}A_{2g}$ ) in which the orbital angular momentum is guenched to first order. This is discussed in more detail later in this section.

13.6.2.1. Contact shifts. We can try to rationalize the form of the paramagnetic shifts using DFT calculations. Middlemiss et al. computed the total <sup>6/7</sup>Li Fermi-contact shifts for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub>, LiFePO<sub>4</sub>, and



**Fig. 13.22.** The idealized *d*-orbital splitting and electronic configurations of  $Mn^{2+}$ ,  $Fe^{2+}$ ,  $Co^{2+}$ , and  $Ni^{2+}$  in LiMPO<sub>4</sub>. The corresponding electronic states are denoted by the terms  ${}^{6}A_{1g}$ ,  ${}^{5}T_{2g}$ ,  ${}^{4}T_{1g}$ , and  ${}^{3}A_{2g}$ .

LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> using the CRYSTAL09 code [55]. The total electronic spin density at the Li site  $\rho_{\rm sat}^{(\alpha-\beta)}({\rm Li})$  was computed in the fictitious ferromagnetic, or saturated, state in which all the effective electronic spins on the metal ions are aligned, giving the total Fermicontact coupling constant  $A^{FC}$ . This result was then scaled into the paramagnetic regime using Eq. (13.3), and the magnetism parameters in Table 13.6 used to give the total shift  $\delta^{con}$ . In addition the individual pathway contributions were also calculated using the spin-flip approach. Here, in order to calculate the contribution from a metal ion *i* along pathway  $P_i$  we flip the electronic spin of one metal ion within the supercell used in the calculations, and repeat the calculation to give a new electronic spin density  $\rho_{\text{flip},P_i}^{(\alpha-\beta)}(\text{Li})$ , and hence a new contact shift  $\delta_{\text{flip},P_i}^{\text{con}}(\text{Li})$ . The difference between the initial density  $\rho_{\rm sat}^{(\alpha-\beta)}({\rm Li})$  and the new density gives the contribution to the electronic spin density from metal ion  $\boldsymbol{i}$ along pathway  $P_i$ , i.e.  $\rho_{P_i}^{(\alpha-\beta)}(\text{Li}) = \left(\rho_{\text{sat}}^{(\alpha-\beta)}(\text{Li}) - \rho_{\text{flip},P_i}^{(\alpha-\beta)}(\text{Li})\right)/2$ . This spin-flip approach is then repeated for all the metal ions within the cell. Since the same scaling factor parameters are applied to all the metal ions, the pathway contribution to the contact shift can be calculated from the difference in the corresponding shifts:  $\delta_{P_i}^{\text{con}}(\text{Li}) = \left(\delta^{\text{con}}(\text{Li}) - \delta_{\text{flip},P_i}^{\text{con}}(\text{Li})\right)/2.$ 

In practice, the periodic boundary conditions used in the DFT calculation mean that a spin-flip applied to a particular metal ion is also applied to all the other metal ions at symmetry-related positions outside the supercell. Therefore in order to isolated a single pathway with each spin flip, it is necessary to use a supercell that is significantly larger than the basic unit cell.

Fig. 13.24 shows the local Li environment with the short-range pathways identified by Middlemiss et al. [55]. For Li there are six pathways in total that fall into three crystallographically distinct pairs for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> and LiFePO<sub>4</sub> that are labelled  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ , and  $P_3$ . For



**Fig. 13.24.** The Fermi-contact pathways and contributions for  $^{6/7}$ Li in LiMPO<sub>4</sub>. For Co<sup>2+</sup> the values marked *a* correspond to Li neighbouring O<sub>3H</sub>, and those marked *b* are Li neighbouring O<sub>3L</sub>. Reproduced with permission from [55]. Copyright (2013) American Chemical Society.

LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> the situation is more complex, since there is a spontaneous lowering of the symmetry of the supercell which is characterized by the  $O_3$  sites splitting into two sub-groups  $O_{3H}$  and  $O_{3L}$ which have higher and lower transferred spin densities than the average. This structure is stabilized relative to the more symmetric space group by 8 kJ mol<sup>-1</sup>. This results in the equivalence being lifted within pairs of pathways, resulting in six distinct pathways in total. The lower symmetry also results in the Li sites no longer being equivalent, but rather splitting into two distinct sub-sites with distinct total contact shifts. However there is no conclusive evidence of two distinct sites in the <sup>7</sup>Li NMR spectrum, suggesting that the lower-symmetry structure does not persist at the temperatures at which the data were acquired. In addition there are several longer-range (distant) pathways that are not shown. The different pathway contributions calculated from the Hyb20 and Hvb35 functionals are also given in Fig. 13.24.

The individual short-range pathway contributions are all small, with values between -20 ppm and +40 ppm depending on the pathway and functional used. Therefore it is necessary to include the more distant contributions in order to reproduce the total contact shift. We should also bear in mind that, given the small contact shifts, the PCS may now represent a larger relative contribution to the total paramagnetic shift. This is discussed later in the context of the EPR formalism.

The results for the contact shift are summarised in Table 13.7. The shifts calculated directly ('Direct') are compared to the sums of the pathway contributions including and excluding the longerrange pathway contributions. Whilst the general agreement is good, there are discrepancies between the calculated shifts and the experimental values, in some cases with the errors being of approximately the same order of magnitude as the shifts themselves. This may be due to the basis set not being adequate in this case, or to the neglect of the PCS.

13.6.2.2. Linewidths and PREs. The variation of the sideband linewidth, coherence lifetimes, and longitudinal relaxation times is also worth discussing in detail. It is apparent that there is an increase in linewidth on replacing Mn<sup>2+</sup> with either Fe<sup>2+</sup> or Co<sup>2+</sup>, the source of which it is instructive to elucidate. Fig. 13.25(a) shows both the <sup>7</sup>Li  $T_1$  and  $T'_2$  time constants for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> and LiFePO<sub>4</sub> acquired at a different field of 11.74 T at 60 kHz MAS. Both time constants are longer for the latter material than for the former. The PREs of the longitudinal and transverse relaxation rates can each be modelled as a sum of contributions from the different metal ions, each of which is given by the Solomon-Bloembergen-Morgan equations in 8.185 and 8.186. The trend can explained by a combination of the reduction of S from 5/2 to 2 on going from Mn<sup>2+</sup> to Fe<sup>2+</sup>, and possible changes in the electronic relaxation times  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$ . The values of  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  are both unknown, but it is likely that the interactions between the electronic spins of the network of metal ions have the effect of accelerating electronic relaxation so that it is faster than in complexes in solution that contain a single metal ion. If the  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  are sufficiently short for the nuclear relaxation to be in the extreme-narrowing

Table 13.7

Comparison of the experimental shifts and calculated contact shifts of <sup>6/7</sup>Li in LiMPO<sub>4</sub>. See text for details. The calculated shifts are from Ref. [55], and the experimental shifts are from Refs. [468,521].

Material	<sup>6/7</sup> Li shifts Hyb20/ppm				Expt/ppm		
	Direct	$\sum_i P_i$ total	$\sum_i P_i$ short-range only	Direct	$\sum_i P_i$ total	$\sum_i P_i$ short-range only	
LiMnPO <sub>4</sub>	116.6	123.3	116.6	73.0	70.3	69.3	57, 68
LiFePO <sub>4</sub>	38.4	40.1	31.5	-0.2	-7.4	-8.1	-8, -15
LiCoPO <sub>4</sub>	7.6	7.7	0.3	-19.1	-19.2	-22.8	-86, -92
	-39.7	-38.0	-41.2	-52.7	-52.8	-53.9	



**Fig. 13.25.** Longitudinal relaxation time constants, coherence lifetimes, and linewidths in the <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectra of LiMPO<sub>4</sub> acquired at 11.74 T and 60 kHz MAS. The <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P  $T_1$  and  $T'_2$  time constants are shown in (a). In (b) and (c) are plotted the contributions to the total sideband linewidth in the <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P spectra respectively. The total linewidth was measured from the average FWHM of the sidebands. The homogeneous linewidth was computed from the coherence lifetime, and is equal to  $2/T'_2$  rad s<sup>-1</sup>. The inhomogeneous linewidths.

limit, this means that longer electronic relaxation times result in larger PREs. Generally we expect the half-filled *d*-shell of  $Mn^{2+}$  to have longer  $T_{1e}$  and  $T_{2e}$  times than the *T*-term of the Fe<sup>2+</sup> ion, due to the SO coupling strength in the latter, which would explain why the PREs in LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> are longer. Strictly speaking the coherence lifetimes also depend on the coherent dephasing, but we would also expect a lower transverse PRE to give a longer  $T'_2$ .

The total sideband linewidth can be decomposed into a homogeneous part, equal to  $2/T'_2$  rad s<sup>-1</sup>, and an inhomogeneous part which is equal to the difference between the total and homogeneous parts. The sideband linewidths in the <sup>7</sup>Li spectrum are shown in Fig. 13.25(b), and clearly indicate that the increase on going from LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> to LiFePO<sub>4</sub> is due entirely to an increase in the inhomogeneous part, and occurs in spite of an accompanying decrease in the homogeneous linewidth. In fact for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> the total linewidth is almost entirely homogeneous and due to transverse relaxation and a residual coherent dephasing. The absence of any significant inhomogeneous broadening is due to the Mn<sup>2+</sup> ions having no bulk susceptibility anisotropy. On the other hand, for LiFePO<sub>4</sub> the line broadening is due almost entirely to the inhomogeneous contribution due to the ABMS of the magnetically ani-

### 13.6.3. <sup>31</sup>P NMR shifts and relaxation properties

sotropic Fe<sup>2+</sup> ion.

The <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectra of LiMnPO<sub>4</sub>, LiFePO<sub>4</sub>, and LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> acquired in a field of 11.74 T at 60 kHz MAS are shown in Fig. 13.26. An initial inspection shows a decrease in the isotropic shift on going from  $Mn^{2+}$  to  $Fe^{2+}$ , and again from  $Fe^{2+}$  to  $Co^{2+}$ , from 7866 ppm to 3558 ppm to 2926 ppm. This is accompanied by a decrease in the width of the spinning-sideband manifold, indicating a reduction in the SA. Interestingly the change in the slant of the sidebands around the centreband for LiFePO<sub>4</sub> and LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> compared to LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> indicate a change in the sign of the anisotropy. This feature is discussed later in the context of the EPR formalism. Finally we observe an increase in the sideband linewidth, which we can again ascribe to a larger ABMS effect on going across the series.

13.6.3.1. Contact shifts. Compared to the <sup>6/7</sup>Li shifts, it is noticeable that the <sup>31</sup>P shifts are significantly larger, indicating a stronger orbital overlap along the M-O-P pathways than for the M-O-Li pathways, and therefore a larger Fermi-contact interaction. The calculation of the total contact shifts, and the individual pathways, proceeds using the same method as for the <sup>6/7</sup>Li shifts. There are five short-range pathways in total, which are shown in Fig. 13.27. For LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> to LiFePO<sub>4</sub> two of the pathways, denoted  $P_2$ , are equivalent and give the same contribution to the shift. However for LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> the lower symmetry which lifts the equivalency of the two  $O_3$  sites, as described for  $^{6/7}$ Li, also lifts the equivalence of the two  $P_2$  pathways, with one transfer going via an  $O_{3H}$  and the other via an O<sub>3L</sub>. However the P sites remain equivalent, and therefore still give a single distinct total contact shift, and in any case it should be reiterated that there is no evidence for the lowersymmetry structure persisting at higher temperatures. The values of the different pathway contributions are also given in Fig. 13.27. They have a larger magnitude than the short-range M-O-Li pathway contributions, up to 2000 ppm, with the result that longer-range pathways can be neglected. For each pathway the M–O–P coordination angles are approximately 120°, with the exception of  $P_1$  where the angle is 94°, and so it is difficult to rationalize the sign of the electron-spin transfer. All the contributions are positive indicating a dominance of the delocalization spin-transfer mechanism, with the exception of  $P_3$  for LiFePO<sub>4</sub> which is small, and changes sign depending on the amount of Hartree–Fock exchange used, and  $P_1$  for LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> which is strongly negative indicating polarization. Generally it is likely that both delocalization and polarization mechanisms are active.

The total calculated and experimental contact shifts are summarised in Table 13.8. We see that since the contact interaction is larger, the agreement between experiment and theory is better for <sup>31</sup>P than for <sup>6/7</sup>Li. This may be partly because the PCS is now insignificant. Furthermore, if we compare the results of the directly calculated contact shift with the sum of the pathways we see that the longer-range pathway contributions are negligible, and the shifts are dominated by the five nearest-neighbour interactions.

13.6.3.2. Linewidths and PREs. The <sup>31</sup>P longitudinal relaxation time constants  $T_1$  and coherence lifetimes  $T'_2$  for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub>, LiFePO<sub>4</sub>, and LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> acquired at 11.74 T and 60 kHz MAS are plotted in Fig. 13.25(a). Generally speaking the time constants are shorter



**Fig. 13.26.** The <sup>31</sup>P MAS NMR spectra of LiMPO<sub>4</sub> with  $M = Mn^{2+}$ , Fe<sup>2+</sup>, and Co<sup>2+</sup>. The centrebands are marked with an \*. The magnetic field is 11.74 T, and the MAS frequency is 60 kHz.



**Fig. 13.27.** The Fermi-contact pathways and contributions for <sup>31</sup>P in LiMPO<sub>4</sub>. For Co<sup>2+</sup> the  $P_2$  values marked *a* correspond to P interacting via O<sub>3H</sub>, and those marked *b* are P interacting via O<sub>3L</sub>. Adapted with permission from [55]. Copyright (2013) American Chemical Society.

than the corresponding values for <sup>7</sup>Li, but exhibit the same trend, increasing from LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> to LiFePO<sub>4</sub>; the values for LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> are longer still. The reason for this trend is the same as for <sup>7</sup>Li, a combination of the reduction in *S* from 5/2 to 2 to 3/2, and a possible

reduction in the electronic relaxation times on going from Mn<sup>2+</sup> to Fe<sup>2+</sup> to Co<sup>2+</sup>.

The trend in the linewidths shown in Fig. 13.25(c) is analogous to that for <sup>7</sup>Li. The major difference is that the linewidths for all three materials are now dominated by the inhomogeneous contribution, which increases across the series, dominating over an accompanying decrease in the homogeneous linewidths. For LiFePO<sub>4</sub> and LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> the inhomogeneous line broadening can be attributed to the ABMS effect, whilst for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> it is due to a temperature gradient across the spinning sample [31].

#### 13.6.4. Shifts and shift anisotropies in the EPR formalism

The previous discussion of the paramagnetic shift employs the susceptibility (i.e. scaling factor) formalism, which is the conventional approach for solid materials such as LiMPO<sub>4</sub> and LiMO<sub>2</sub>. However it should also be possible to describe the shift in terms of the EPR formalism, which is an approach that has recently been adopted by Pigliapochi et al. [500], and Mondal et al. [501,522]. Here the EPR tensors for each distinct metal ion *A* are calculated, with each giving a contribution to the paramagnetic shielding tensor in Eq. (7.147). For solid-state systems, there are currently no reported SO hyperfine tensor calculations, and until the very recent contribution from Mondal and Kaupp [522], there were no similar schemes for calculating the ZFS tensor. The work by Pigliapochi et al. therefore restricted the SO coupling calculation to the *g*-tensor. The total shift tensor *s* in the EPR formalism is then

$$\boldsymbol{S}^{S} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathsf{B}} \boldsymbol{S}(S+1)}{3\hbar \gamma_{l} \boldsymbol{k}(T-\Theta)} \sum_{\boldsymbol{A},\boldsymbol{i}} \boldsymbol{g}^{(\boldsymbol{A})} \cdot \left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}^{(\boldsymbol{A},\boldsymbol{i})}}{2S}\right),\tag{13.8}$$

where the sum is taken both over the distinct metal ions *A* in the supercell, and over the supercells *i*.

In LiMPO<sub>4</sub> there is one crystallographically distinct  $M^{2+}$  ion per unit cell. However this does not mean that the sum over *A* comprises a single term. Whilst the  $M^{2+}$  ions are indeed symmetryrelated, and have the same principal *g*-tensor components, there are actually four metal ions that are distinguished by having different PAF orientations relative to the crystal frame of reference. This means that the four *g*-tensors have the same principal components, and PAFs that are related to each other by the symmetry operations describing the *Pnma* space group. This has profound consequences for calculating the effect of the *g*-anisotropy on the shift tensor, which are described below.

In the absence of the ZFS tensor there is a total of six terms in the EPR formalism that contribute to either the isotropic shift, SA, or both. The isotropic shift comprises two contact terms,  $g_e A^{FC}$  and  $\Delta g_{iso} A^{FC}$ , and a single pseudo-contact term,  $\Delta g \cdot A^{SD}$ . The two contact terms have a direct correspondence with the susceptibility formalism, since the total isotropic *g*-tensor  $g_e + \Delta g_{iso}$  is hidden inside the effective magnetic moment  $\mu_{eff}$  which is used in the factor that scales the Fermi-contact coupling constant. The  $A^{FC}$  constant can be calculated in the same way as previously described, either directly or using the pathway-decomposition approach. The PCS term  $\Delta g \cdot A^{SD}$  is a new contribution that is not accounted for in the scaling-factor formalism, and the calculation of this term

Table 13.8

Comparison of the experimental shifts and calculated contact shifts of <sup>31</sup>P in LiMPO<sub>4</sub>. See text for details. The calculated shifts are from Ref. [55], and the experimental shifts are from Ref. [521].

Material	<sup>31</sup> P shifts Hyb20/ppm				Expt/ppm		
	Direct	$\sum_i P_i$ total	$\sum_i P_i$ short-range only	Direct	$\sum_i P_i$ total	$\sum_i P_i$ short-range only	
LiMnPO <sub>4</sub>	8650	8704	8661	7250	7225	7235	7296
LiFePO <sub>4</sub>	4361	4385	4385	3500	3451	3517	3352
LiCoPO <sub>4</sub>	3720	3755	3766	3054	3063	3069	2756



**Fig. 13.28.** Breakdown of the contributions to the total <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P chemical shifts in the EPR formalism for the series of olivine phosphate materials LiMnPO<sub>4</sub>, LiFePO<sub>4</sub>, LiCoPO<sub>4</sub>, and LiNiPO<sub>4</sub> determined by DFT calculations, and the comparison with the experimental shifts. The <sup>7</sup>Li shifts are shown in (a), and the <sup>31</sup>P shifts are shown in (b).

requires more care. The PCS contribution for each metal ion A is a matrix product of the site-specific g-tensor  $\mathbf{g}^{(A)}$  and the total hyperfine tensor due to the metals A from all the supercells,  $\sum_i \mathcal{A}^{(A,i)}/(2S)$ . This latter quantity can be calculated using a spinflip approach in an analogous way to obtaining the pathway contributions to the Fermi-contact coupling constant. The supercell is selected so that it contains one each of the distinct metal ions A, the spins of which are aligned so that they are parallel. The resulting electron spin density is then used to calculate the total hyperfine spin-dipolar tensor. Following this each metal ion is spinflipped in turn, and the new hyperfine coupling tensor calculated. If the supercell contains only one metal ion of each distinct type, then the periodic boundary conditions ensure that the flipping of A causes the same flipping of all the spins A in all the supercells. Therefore the difference between the two electron spin densities gives us the total though-space 'pathway' contribution from  $A, \sum_i \mathcal{A}^{(A,i)}/(2S).$ 

The calculated <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P paramagnetic shift contributions for the full series of LiMPO<sub>4</sub> materials are shown in Fig. 13.28 [500]. The <sup>7</sup>Li shifts in Fig. 13.28(a) indicate that, of the terms calculated, the two contact shifts are generally dominant, with the exception of LiCoPO<sub>4</sub> where there is an appreciable PCS. Regarding the contact terms, for LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> only the NR Fermi-contact shift  $g_e A^{FC}$  contributes, due to the zero SO coupling strength in the half-filled *d*shell. For the other systems the SO contribution to the contact shift  $\Delta g_{iso} A^{FC}$  is important due to the significant isotropic *g*-shift of 0.17– 0.35. The differences between the calculated and experimental shifts in Fig. 13.28(a) may be partly due to the neglect of the ZFS, and so it would be of considerable interest to include this contribution.

The dominance of the contact shift for  $Mn^{2+}$  and  $Fe^{2+}$  indicates that the scaling-factor formalism described in the previous section should give an accurate description of the shift, as is indeed shown in Table 13.7. Furthermore for  $Co^{2+}$  the neglect of the PCS is one factor that explains the significant deviation of the calculated and experimental shifts in Table 13.7. It has been recently shown by Mondal and Kaupp that the ZFS interaction also introduces a substantial contribution to the PCS [522].

The <sup>31</sup>P shifts in Fig. 13.28(b) are easier to rationalize. In all cases the PCS is negligible, and the total shift is dominated entirely by contact contributions. Once again only the term  $g_e A^{FC}$  is important for  $Mn^{2+}$ , with the SO part becoming more important across the series. The overall agreement between theory and experiment is better, with the calculated shifts tending to slightly overestimate the experimental values.

We now turn to a feature of paramagnetic solid-state NMR that is all too often neglected in these studies, which is the measurement and interpretation of the shift anisotropy. Part of the reason for the neglect of the SA is the difficulty in measuring accurate values, since the intensity distributions of the spinning-sideband manifolds are perturbed by BMS effects. Nevertheless it is still possible to obtain a reasonable estimate of the SA  $\Delta\Delta^{S}$  from a fit of the sideband manifolds, and it proves instructive to compare these values to calculation. The experimental and fitted <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P spinning-sideband manifolds of LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> and LiFePO<sub>4</sub>, acquired at 11.74 T and 60 kHz MAS, are shown in Fig. 13.29 [500]. There are some deviations between the experimental and fitted sideband intensities, due to the neglect of BMS effects in the latter, but the quality of the fit is sufficient to extract a good estimate of the anisotropy. The comparison between the fitted values and the calculations is shown in Fig. 13.30 for <sup>7</sup>Li (a) and <sup>31</sup>P (b). The agreement is remarkably good, given the difficulty of obtaining good experimental values. One noteworthy point is that the calculations manage to reproduce the change in sign of the <sup>31</sup>P SA in LiFePO<sub>4</sub> relative to the other SAs.

The breakdown of the total calculated SAs into the individual terms is also given in Fig. 13.30. There are four contributions to the SA, comprising one contact term  $A^{FC}\Delta g$  and three spin-dipolar terms  $g_e A^{SD}$ ,  $\Delta g_{iso} A^{SD}$ , and  $\Delta g \cdot A^{SD}$ . For the material LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> only the NR dipolar term  $g_e A^{SD}$  contributes to both the <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P SA. For LiFePO<sub>4</sub> there are significant contributions from the other dipolar terms  $\Delta g_{iso} \pmb{A}^{SD}$  and  $\Delta g \cdot \pmb{A}^{SD}$ . However the most interesting feature is the large contact SA  $A^{FC}\Delta g$  contribution to the <sup>31</sup>P SA of LiFePO<sub>4</sub>, since it is this term that results in the negative overall SA. The importance of this term stems from the fact that the total Fermi-contact interaction with <sup>31</sup>P is large compared to <sup>7</sup>Li. This result demonstrates that it is not only the isotropic shift that provides information on the bonding environment of the metal ion and the nucleus, but also the SA. The measurement and interpretation of the SA in these systems points the way forward to the use of the SA as a structural restraint in the NMR of paramagnetic materials.

#### 13.6.5. Experiments and calculations on $LiFe_xMn_{1-x}PO_4$

The final topic in this case study is the use of paramagnetic solid-state MAS NMR and DFT calculations in the investigation of the mixed-metal-ion olivine phosphates  $\text{LiFe}_x \text{Mn}_{1-x} \text{PO}_4$  with x = 0.25, 0.5, and 0.75. These materials have the same basic structure as shown in Fig. 13.21, and the same local Li and P environments as in Figs. 13.24 and 13.27. However the metal-ion sites are occupied by a solid-solution of the metal ions  $\text{Mn}^{2+}$  and  $\text{Fe}^{2+}$ . One consequence of this is that there are now multiple local P environments, as the chemical environment of these sites is dominated by the short-range contact interactions between the five metal



**Fig. 13.29.** Comparison of the experimental and fitted spinning-sideband manifolds of the <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P MAS NMR spectra of LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> and LiFePO<sub>4</sub>. The <sup>7</sup>Li and <sup>31</sup>P spectra of LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> are shown in (a) and (c), and the corresponding spectra of LiFePO<sub>4</sub> are shown in (b) and (d). The field is 11.74 T, and the spectra were acquired at 60 kHz MAS. The centreband is marked with an \*. Adapted with permission from [500]. Copyright (2017) by American Physical Society.



**Fig. 13.30.** Breakdown of the contributions to the total  ${}^{7}Li$  and  ${}^{31}P$  shift anisotropies in the EPR formalism for the olivine phosphate materials LiMnPO<sub>4</sub> and LiFePO<sub>4</sub> determined by DFT calculations, and the comparison with the experimental SAs. The  ${}^{7}Li$  SAs are shown in (a), and the  ${}^{31}P$  SAs are shown in (b). The experimental SAs were taken from the fitted spectra in 13.29(a)–(d).

ions. Hence there are  $2^5 = 32$  P sites in the material, the populations of which are given by the probability of a random distribution of Mn<sup>2+</sup> and Fe<sup>2+</sup> resulting in the corresponding occupancies of the five metal sites.

The NMR spectra of  $\text{LiFe}_x\text{Mn}_{1-x}\text{PO}_4$  with x = 0, 0.25 0.5, 0.75, and 1 were acquired at 11.74 T and 60 kHz MAS [31] using the double-adiabatic spin-echo pulse sequence in Fig. 12.50(a) [35], and are shown in Fig. 13.31(a). The spectra of the three mixed phases are very complicated, as each is a superposition of 32 spinning-sideband manifolds with different isotropic shifts. As such it is impossible to obtain any detailed information from these spectra, and we can simply note that at lower values of *x* the overall spectral intensity is biased towards the all-Mn shift of 7866 ppm due to the higher statistical probability of more metal sites being occupied by Mn<sup>2+</sup> than Fe<sup>2+</sup>. Similarly at higher Fe<sup>2+</sup>

content the spectral intensity is biased more towards the all-Fe shift of 3558 ppm.

The lack of resolution between the different resonances is due in large part to the overlap between the different spinningsideband manifolds. This overlap was removed using the aMAT experiment in Fig. 12.50(b), giving a set of two-dimensional correlation spectra such as that for LiFe<sub>0.5</sub>Mn<sub>0.5</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> shown in Fig. 12.53. The complete set of isotropic projection spectra is shown in Fig. 13.31(b). The beauty of this experiment is that it enabled the resolution of eight distinct groups of isotropic resonances, in which are located the resonances of the 32 local environments.

The total contact shifts for each site can be calculated from the pre-existing pathway contributions given in Fig. 13.27, which saves effort otherwise required to calculate the shifts for each extended structure. The calculated shifts were compared with



**Fig. 13.31.** <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectra of the five  $\text{LiFe}_x \text{Mn}_{1-x} \text{PO}_4$  materials (x = 0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1), all of which occur in the olivine-type structure. The one-dimensional spectra containing overlapping sideband patterns are shown in (a), and the projections of the aMAT spectra containing just the isotropic shifts are shown in (b). Adapted with permission from [31]. Copyright (2012) American Chemical Society.

the values obtained from a fit of the three spectra of the mixed phases using the same pathway-contribution model in order to obtain a full assignment, as shown in Fig. 13.32. The full set of 32 sites is given in (a), and the experimental and fitted spectra are compared in (b) labelled with the assignments [31]. In this investigation, pathway contributions for the two metal ions were also calculated for different coordination geometries in order to model the effects of structural disorder due to the substitution of one metal ion for another.

To summarize, this study concerns one of the most complex paramagnetic materials that has been investigated with solidstate NMR to date, and provides a notable benchmark for future NMR studies of paramagnetic systems. It was successfully repeated on the mixed-phase  $\text{LiCo}_{1-x}\text{Fe}_x\text{PO}_4$  materials [57], and the aMAT experiment has also been applied to other battery materials including P2–Na<sub>x</sub>[Li<sub>y</sub>Ni<sub>z</sub>Mn<sub>1-y-z</sub>]O<sub>2</sub> with (0 < x, y, z < 1) [56].

#### 13.7. Contact shifts in ferredoxins due to coupled $Fe_4S_4$ clusters

#### 13.7.1. Background

Ferredoxins are proteins containing iron–sulphur cores that mediate electron transfers in metabolic processes [523]. The key constituent of a ferredoxin is a  $Fe_xS_y$  unit, which can either donate or accept electrons causing a change in the oxidation state of the Fe ions, and catalysing biological redox reactions. We therefore present an example of a solution paramagnetic NMR study here as it forms a link to the previous discussion of battery materials.

The particular example we present is that of Bertini et al. [365], which includes the assignment and interpretation of the <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C contact shifts in the cysteine residues of ferredoxin from *Clostrid-ium acidi urici*, which catalyzes the reduction of  $CO_2$  to formate

[524]. This and similar studies are notable as they are interesting examples of the application of solution NMR to observe nuclear spins from residues that directly coordinate to a metal ion. Ferredoxin from Clostridium acidi urici, the structure of which is shown in Fig. 13.33(a), contains two Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub> cores, each one of which can either exist in an oxidized state [Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub>]<sup>2+</sup> or a reduced state [Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub>]<sup>+</sup>. In the oxidized state each cluster formally contains two Fe<sup>3+</sup> ions and two Fe<sup>2+</sup> ions, and has a diamagnetic electronic spin ground state of S = 0 indicating some antiferromagnetic alignment of the spins. However some temperature-dependent paramagnetism arises from the population of the excited electronic spin states. The reduced-state cluster contains one Fe<sup>3+</sup> ion and three  $Fe^{2+}$  ions, and has an electronic spin ground state of S = 1/2. Each Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub> cluster binds to four cysteine amino acid residues, with each Fe ion forming a bond to the S of the -CBH<sub>2</sub>-SH sidechain, as shown in Fig. 13.33(b). The bonding between the cluster and the cvsteine residue can therefore be represented as Fe-S-CB(HB<sub>1</sub>,  $HB_2$ )—CA(HA<sub>1</sub>)—. The nuclear spins of the cysteine sidechain and backbone are therefore expected to experience large paramagnetic shifts with a large contact contribution. In addition the exchange coupling constants within the cluster are of the same order of magnitude as kT at room temperature, and so we expect a non-Curie temperature dependence of the paramagnetic shifts of the type shown in Section 7.5.2 [47].

Bertini et al. investigated both the oxidized form of the protein, with both clusters in the state  $[Fe_4S_4]^{2+}$ , and a partially reduced form [365]. Partial reduction gives the complex mixture of species shown in Fig. 13.34, which are in exchange. There are two partially-reduced species, in which one cluster is oxidized and the other reduced, which are in fast exchange on the NMR time-scale. Both species are also in slow exchange with both the fully-oxidized and fully-reduced species.

### 13.7.2. NMR spectroscopy and assignment

Fig. 13.35(a) shows the one-pulse <sup>1</sup>H solution NMR spectrum of ferredoxin from *C. acidi urici* taken from Bertini et al. [365]. Eight resonances are resolved above 10 ppm (labelled A-H). These signals exhibited short relaxation times and temperature-dependent shifts, and so were ascribed to <sup>1</sup>Hs of the coordinated cysteine residues. These signals were assigned using COSY and NOESY, which identified A-H as the CB protons HB1 or HB2, and established correlations to the other geminal HB nuclei A'-H'. In addition correlations to the CA protons HA were also observed in the NOESY spectrum. These were assigned using a structural model of the related ferredoxin from Clostridium pasteurianum [365]. This resulted in the identification of eight groups of two HB and one HA protons, each corresponding to a single cysteine residue. However this was insufficient to assign each cysteine to a particular cluster, and so further experiments were performed on a partially-reduced sample of ferredoxin from C. acidi urici.

Fig. 13.35(b) shows the <sup>1</sup>H spectrum of the partially-reduced ferredoxin. We note that the resonances are broader than for the oxidized sample, which is due to the ground spin state of the cluster no longer being diamagnetic, but paramagnetic with S = 1/2. The cross-peaks between these broad signals in the COSY and NOESY spectra were expected to be weak, and so the assignment was performed using EXSY to identify correlations between the slowly-exchanging oxidized and intermediate species. Comparison of the spectra in Fig. 13.35(a) and (b) and subtraction results in two further spectra of the fully-reduced species (c), and the two intermediate species (d). The full set of chemical shifts for the oxidized, intermediate, and reduced ferredoxin species allowed the assignment of each set of cysteine <sup>1</sup>H signals to either cluster I or II, i.e. the eight groups of signals could now be assigned to specific clusters.



**Fig. 13.32.** Results of the fitting of the isotropic projections of the aMAT spectra. Pathway contributions of the  $Mn^{2+}$  and  $Fe^{2+}$  ions to the total contact shift were varied to fit the isotropic projections of the experimental <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectra. The M-O-P pathway labels are shown in (a) together with the 32 possible configurations in the mixed  $Mn^{2+}/Fe^{2+}$  phases. The comparison of the experimental and fitted isotropic spectra is shown in (b) for the x = 0.75, 0.5, and 0.25 phases. The contact shifts and relative intensities of the 32 peaks occurring in each spectrum are shown in the absence of line shape effects in (c), with labelling as in (a). The intensities shown in (c) take into account both the stoichiometry-dependent probability of the configuration and the  $T'_2$  dephasing effects. Adapted with permission from [31]. Copyright (2012) American Chemical Society.



**Fig. 13.33.** Structure of a ferredoxin and the Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub> cluster. The protein is shown in (a), and the Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub> cluster is shown in (b). The cluster is coordinated to four cysteine residues, with each Fe ion bonding to a S atom of a cysteine sidechain. The Fe ions are coloured pink, the S atoms are yellow, and the CB atoms are coloured black.



**Fig. 13.34.** Representation of the equilibrium between the oxidation states of the two Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub> clusters in a ferredoxin following the addition of a reducing agent to the fully-oxidized protein. The two intermediate-reduced species are in fast exchange with each other, and in slow exchange with both the fully-oxidized and fully-reduced species. Fast-exchange processes are indicated by thick solid arrows, and slow-exchange processes are indicated by thin dashed arrows.



**Fig. 13.35.** The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra acquired at 600 MHz and 298 K of the ferredoxin from *C. acidi urici.* The spectrum of the fully-oxidized species is shown in (a). Following partial reduction the spectrum in (b) was obtained. The spectra in (c) and (d) are of the fully-reduced species, and the two intermediate reduced species respectively. Spectrum (d) was obtained by acquiring a spectrum of a 90%/10% oxidized/partially-reduced species and subtracting from it spectrum (a). Spectrum (c) was obtained by subtracting (d) from the spectrum of a sample containing both partially- and fully-reduced ferredoxin. The reported assignment is given in Table 13.9. Adapted with permission from [365]. Copyright (1994) American Chemical Society.

The final step in the assignment process was to identify the residue number of each of the eight cysteines by establishing correlations to other residues in the amino acid sequence. This was achieved using a combination of NOESY and TOCSY on the fullyoxidized ferredoxin species. The full sequence-specific assignment of HB1, HB2, and HA is given in Table 13.9.

#### Table 13.9

Assignment of the <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum in Fig. 13.35(a) of the oxidized ferredoxin from C. *acidi urici*.

	Cluster	I		Cluster	II
Residue	Atom	Assignment	Residue	Atom	Assignment
Cys11	HB1 HB2 HA	B' B B"	Cys40	$HB_1$ $HB_2$ HA	A' A A"
Cys14	$HB_1$ $HB_2$ HA	D D' D''	Cys43	$HB_1$ $HB_2$ HA	C C' C"
Cys47	HB₁ HB₂ HA	E' E E''	Cys18	HB <sub>1</sub> HB <sub>2</sub> HA	F' F F''
Cys8	$HB_1$ $HB_2$ HA	G G' G"	Cys37	$HB_1$ $HB_2$ HA	H H' H"



**Fig. 13.36.** The experimental temperature dependence of the chemical shifts of the cysteine <sup>1</sup>HB signals of fully-reduced ferredoxin from *C. acidi urici.* The data were obtained from EXSY spectra acquired at temperatures between 282 K and 300 K. The dashed lines give the estimated values of the angle-independent shifts for each CBH<sub>2</sub> pair. Reproduced with permission from [365]. Copyright (1994) American Chemical Society.

Following the complete <sup>1</sup>H assignment, a <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>13</sup>C HMQC spectrum was acquired to identify the <sup>13</sup>CA and <sup>13</sup>CB resonances in each cluster, which was the first time this had been achieved at natural abundance on a paramagnetic protein [365]. From the HMQC spectrum all eight <sup>13</sup>CB resonances and six out of eight <sup>13</sup>CA resonances were assigned.

### 13.7.3. Temperature dependence of the contact shifts

Having obtained the assignment of the cysteine resonances, the paramagnetic shifts were extracted in order to gain insight into both the electronic structure of the  $Fe_4S_4$  cluster, and the mechanism of unpaired spin-transfer from the Fe to the nuclear spins. As discussed in Section 12.3.3 it is necessary to have a complete assignment of a diamagnetic analogue of the paramagnetic system of interest in order to subtract the orbital chemical shifts, and this strategy relies on the orbital contributions to the shifts not changing significantly on substitution of the paramagnetic ion for the diamagnetic one. In the present case the reference system was a zincfinger protein, where the orbital shifts were taken to be the chemical shifts of the nuclei in the cysteine residues bound to Zn [365].

The temperature dependence of the paramagnetic shifts due to a coupled cluster of paramagnetic ions may be diagnostic of the spin state of the whole cluster and give estimates of the exchange coupling constant, as shown in Section 7.5.2. With this aim in mind the chemical shifts of the CB protons in the fully-reduced protein were obtained from the EXSY spectrum over a range of temperatures between 282 and 300 K. The results are shown in Fig. 13.36 [365]. Although the temperature range is too narrow to obtain a detailed picture of the electronic structure of the Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub> cluster, the temperature dependence does offer some insight, and b indicates that the Fe ions are at least pairwise inequivalent [365]. Notably, for each cluster, two pairs of HB protons have chemical shifts that increase with temperature, and two pairs have shifts that decrease with temperature. This behaviour has been referred to as anti-Curie and Curie respectively. However we avoid the use of such terminology here as it oversimplifies the true temperature dependence, which we have seen may be considerably more complicated. The fact that half of the HB proton shifts increase with temperature indicates the presence of at least one antiferromagnetic coupling, so that the increase in temperature leads to a larger thermal population of a spin state with a larger spin S, and hence a greater magnetic moment.

#### 13.7.4. Angular dependence of the contact shifts

The CB nuclei are separated from the coordinating Fe by two bonds, the CA and HB by three bonds, and the HA by four bonds. We expect the shifts of these nuclear spins to be dominated by the Fermi-contact interaction, which we have seen depends on the bonding geometry relative to the metal ion. Hence we can obtain information on the spin-transfer mechanism from the dependence of the paramagnetic shift on the geometry of the cysteine relative to the  $Fe_4S_4$  cluster. Here we focus on the contact shifts of the HB and CA spins which, due to the three-bond separation, have a geometry relative to the Fe that can be described by reference to Fig. 13.37 (a). Here the geometry is specified by a dihedral angle  $\theta$  which describes the angular separation between the planes defined by the Fe-S-CB linkage and the S-CB-HB linkage. If the unpaired electron density from the Fe resides mainly in the Fe–S  $\sigma$  bond, the contact shift  $\delta_{\rm con}^{\sigma}$  can be shown to obey a Karplus relation of the form:

$$\delta_{\rm con}^{\sigma} = a' \cos^2(\theta) + b' \cos(\theta) + c', \tag{13.9}$$

where *a*', *b*', and *c*' are coefficients [527]. Eq. (13.9) follows from the fact that the overlap of the Fe—S  $\sigma$  bond with the HB *s*-orbital is at a maximum when Fe—S and CB—HB bonds are either co- or antiparallel, corresponding to  $\theta = 0$  and  $\pi$ , and a minimum when they are orthogonal with  $\theta = \pi/2$ . The magnitude of the contact shift varies accordingly. On the other hand, if the unpaired electron density is mainly located in a F—S  $\pi$  bond, a different Karplus relation is needed to give the contact shift  $\delta_{con}^{\pi}$ :

$$\delta_{\rm con}^{\pi} = a'' \sin^2(\theta) + c'', \tag{13.10}$$

where a'' and c'' are different coefficients [528,529]. Here the maximum overlap between the orbital containing the electron density

and the HB *s*-orbital occurs when the Fe—S and CB—HB bonds are orthogonal. In the general case both transfer mechanisms may contribute to the overall contact shift  $\delta_{con}$ , which is then a sum of Eqs. (13.9) and (13.10):

$$\delta_{\rm con} = a\sin^2(\theta) + b\cos(\theta) + c, \qquad (13.11)$$

where a = a'' - a', b = b', and c = a' + c' + c''. The relative magnitudes of a and b indicate whether the dominant electron transfer is via the  $\pi$  or  $\sigma$  bonds. The same considerations also apply to the CA contact shift, with the difference that the dihedral angle is defined between the Fe—S—CB and S—CB—CA planes.

The Karplus hypothesis was tested by plotting the contact shifts against the observed dihedral angle for a range of systems, including the <sup>1</sup>HB and <sup>13</sup>CA shifts of oxidized ferredoxin from *C. acidi urici* in the present case study [365], and the <sup>1</sup>HB contact shifts from oxidizied *C. pasteurianum* ferrdoxin [354], reduced *C. vinosum* high-potential protein (HiPIP) [525], and reduced *E. halophila* HiPIP II [526]. The plot is reproduced in Fig. 13.37(b). The data generally follow the trend in Eq. (13.11). We firstly notice that all the contact shifts are positive, which indicates that the electron delocalization mechanism dominates the contact interaction. When fitted to the HB shifts from *C. acidi urici* ferredoxin, we obtain the following parameters for the Karplus relation: a = 11.5, b = -2.9, and c = 3.7 ppm. Both the positive value of a and the observation that |a| > |b| indicate that the electron transfer mechanism is dominated by delocalization from the Fe—S  $\pi$  bond.

# 13.8. Paramagnetic distance restraints in the metalloprotein superoxide dismutase (SOD)

### 13.8.1. Background

We now change to a paramagnetic NMR study of a different protein sample, with a case study that illustrates the use of longrange paramagnetic structural restraints to determine the structure of a protein in the solid state. The chosen study is that by Knight et al. on the metalloenzyme superoxide dismutase (SOD) [463,11,46]. Superoxide dismutase is a dimer comprising  $2 \times 153$ amino-acid residues, each unit of which binds to two metal ions  $M_1^{m+}$  and  $M_2^{n+}$  [530,531]. The enzyme has the physiological function of oxidizing the superoxide anion  $O_2^-$ , which is produced as a byproduct of metabolic processes and can cause cell damage if not regulated. The form of the protein which binds one Cu and one Zn ion, (Cu<sup>n+</sup>,Zn<sup>2+</sup>)-SOD, catalyses the removal of superoxide via the following two reactions:

$$Cu^{2+}-SOD + O_2^- \rightarrow Cu^+-SOD + O_2$$
(13.12)

$$Cu^+$$
-SOD +  $O_2^-$  + 2H<sup>+</sup>  $\rightarrow Cu^{2+}$ -SOD + H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. (13.13)

We see that the Cu ion is essential to the process, as the reactions are driven by the redox between the paramagnetic  $Cu^{2+}$  and diamagnetic  $Cu^+$  oxidation states.

One advantageous aspect of SOD for the application of paramagnetic restraints is that different metal ions can be incorporated into the binding sites depending on which restraints we wish to measure, as shown in Fig. 13.38 [532]. For example the  $(Cu^{n+}, Zn^{2+})$ -SOD form was used to measure PREs as the long electronic relaxation times of 2.5 ns in the Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion in the paramagnetic form resulted in large induced nuclear relaxation rates [11]. A section of the (H)NH spectrum is shown in Fig. 13.38(a) [532]. Here the diamagnetic reference protein was the reduced form (Cu<sup>+</sup>,Zn<sup>2+</sup>)-SOD. However the Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion has a small magnetic anisotropy, as defined by the axial and rhombic susceptibility anisotropies, and so gives only small PCSs as seen in the (H)NH spectrum of Fig. 13.38(a) [532]. For this reason PCS values were measured on (E,Co<sup>2+</sup>)-SOD, where E indicates that the second binding site is empty, as the lar-



**Fig. 13.37.** Plots of the contact shifts of the nuclei three bonds away from a Fe ion against the dihedral angle  $\theta$ . In (a) is shown the dihedral angle  $\theta$  between the two planes defined by the Fe–S–CB atoms on the one hand, and the S–CB–HB atoms on the other. The HB contact shift depends strongly on  $\theta$  via a Karplus relation. There is also an analogous dependence for the CA contact shift on the dihedral angle between the planes containing the Fe–S–CB and S–CB–CA. The plot in (b) shows the <sup>1</sup>H contact shifts from the CH<sub>2</sub> protons (left-hand axis) from the following proteins: oxidized ferredoxin from *C. acidi urici* (•) [365]; oxidized ferredoxin from *C. pasteurianum* ( $\bigcirc$ ) [354]; reduced HiPIP I from *C. vinosum* ( $\triangle$ ) [525]; and reduced HiPIP I from *E. halophila* ( $\nabla$ ) [526]. Here the dihedral angle is between the voltes defined by Fe–S–CB and S–CB–CA. The curve is the best fit of Eq. (13.11) to the <sup>1</sup>H shifts from oxidized ferredoxin from *C. acidi urici* (•) with *a* = 11.5, *b* = –2.9, and *c* = 3.7 ppm. Adapted with permission from [365]. Copyright (1994) American Chemical Society.

ger magnetic anisotropy of the Co<sup>2+</sup> ion gives larger PCSs that are more easily measurable, as shown by the (H)NH spectrum of this protein in Fig. 13.38(b) [46,532]. The electronic relaxation times of the Co<sup>2+</sup> ion are shorter than for Cu<sup>2+</sup>, taking typical values of 1–10 ps. The coherence lifetimes are therefore longer, which allowed for more sensitive acquisition of PCS values closer to the metal ion. In this case the diamagnetic reference was (E,Zn<sup>2+</sup>)-SOD.

In this study all the NMR data for the assignment, measurement of PCSs and PREs, and the  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{1}\text{H}$  distance restraints were acquired under 60 kHz MAS on a sample that was perdeuterated with the exchangeable amide protons 100% back-exchanged. Tripleresonance proton-detected three-dimensional HCN experiments were acquired using a subset of the pulse sequences summarized in Tables 12.5 and 12.6.

### 13.8.2. Resonance assignment and structure calculation using nonparamagnetic ${}^{1}H-{}^{1}H$ distance restraints

The sequential assignment of the backbone amide <sup>15</sup>N, <sup>1</sup>H<sup>N</sup>, <sup>13</sup>CO, and <sup>13</sup>CA was performed using the two-dimensional (H)NH sequence and the three-dimensional (H)CANH, (H)CONH, (H)CA(CO)NH, and (H)CO(CA)NH pulse sequences. For the diamagnetic reference protein (E,Zn<sup>2+</sup>)-SOD all these resonances were assigned for 145 out of a total of 147 non-proline amino acid residues [463]. The assignment of the two Cu-bound proteins was performed using the same set of experiments, from which 136 amide resonances were assigned for  $(Cu^+,Zn^{2+})$ -SOD, and 116 for  $(Cu^{2+},Zn^{2+})$ -SOD respectively.

Paramagnetic distance restraints alone are insufficient to generate a three-dimensional structure of a protein, and must be combined with conventional restraints used for diamagnetic proteins. Therefore <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>1</sup>H distance restraints between the backbone <sup>1</sup>H<sup>N</sup> were also measured on (Cu<sup>+</sup>,Zn<sup>2+</sup>)-SOD. Using the (H)NHH-RFDR sequence 297 such distance restraints were obtained. These were combined with dihedral angle restraints and ambiguous hydrogen-bond restraints in a simulated annealing routine. In the absence of any paramagnetic restraints, the structure calculation yielding the bundle of structures shown in Fig. 13.39(a). The precision of the structure is comparatively low, having a root-meansquare deviation (rmsd) from the mean of 3.1 Å.

### 13.8.3. Paramagnetic relaxation enhancement as structural restraints

The precision of the calculated structure was improved by the inclusion of PREs from (Cu<sup>2+/+</sup>,Zn<sup>2+</sup>)-SOD. The resolution necessary to measure the relaxation rates was obtained from the two-dimensional (H)NH spectra of the two proteins, which are shown in Fig. 12.68. Here 103 resonances were resolved, indicating that the (H)NH pulse sequence (shown in Fig. 13.40(a)) could be modified to include the necessary relaxation-measurement elements. The <sup>15</sup>N *R*<sub>1</sub> relaxation rates were measured by incorporating an inversion-recovery block after the first CP step in the (H)NH



**Fig. 13.38.** Two-dimensional (H)NH solid-state MAS NMR spectra of two forms of SOD. The spectra of paramagnetic ( $Cu^{2+},Zn^{2+}$ )-SOD and its diamagnetic reference ( $Cu^{+},Zn^{2+}$ )-SOD, which are shown in (a), were used to measure PREs due to the  $Cu^{2+}$  ion. In (b) are shown the spectra of paramagnetic ( $E,Co^{2+}$ )-SOD and its diamagnetic reference ( $E,Zn^{2+}$ )-SOD, with the former showing PCSs in both frequency dimensions. Reproduced with permission from [532]. Copyright (2013) American Chemical Society.



**Fig. 13.39.** Structure bundles of SOD calculated from solid-state NMR data using different types of restraint. The bundle in (a) was calculated with no paramagnetic restraints, and has an rmsd of 3.1 Å. The structures in (b) were calculated using PREs, using an initial trial magnetic susceptibility tensor fitted from the mean structure in (a). Here the rmsd is 1.6 Å. In (c) is shown the structure bundle calculated using PCSs, with an rmsd of 1.7 Å. The final structure bundle, shown in (d), was calculated using both PCSs and PREs and has an rmsd of 1.4 Å. The  $Co^{2+}$  and  $Cu^{n+}$  ions are shown in pink and violet respectively, and the aquamarine ribbon is the mean NMR structure for each case. Reproduced with permission from [532]. Copyright (2013) American Chemical Society.

sequence as shown in Fig. 13.40(b). Measurements of the <sup>13</sup>CO  $R_1$  values were performed using the sequence in Fig. 13.40(d), which is based on the (H)CONH sequence (shown in Fig. 13.40(c)) in which the <sup>13</sup>CO evolution time is replaced with an inversion-recovery block. The site-specific relaxation rates are shown in Fig. 13.41. It should be noted that the measurement of these rates benefitted substantially from 60 kHz MAS and perdeuteration, as the weakening of the <sup>1</sup>H dipolar-coupling network reduced any coherent effects. This is particularly important for the measurement of the <sup>13</sup>CO  $R_1$  rate constants shown in Fig. 13.41(g) and (h).

The PREs were calculated by subtracting the  $(Cu^+,Zn^{2+})$ -SOD relaxation rates constants from the corresponding  $(Cu^{2+},Zn^{2+})$ -SOD rate constants. This resulting in a total of 90 <sup>15</sup>N PREs and 85 <sup>13</sup>CO PREs being obtained from spins between 10 Å and 24 Å from the Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion. These PREs were ascribed to the Solomon mechanism with the correlation time dominated by the electronic relaxation time, which was given the literature value of 2.5 ns [15]. The PRE varies with the distance *R* from the Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion as  $1/R^6$ , enabling a distance to be calculated. In the structure calculation these distances were included with the other distance restraints, but were allowed to vary by 3 Å either side of the predicted value. In addition 25 <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>15</sup>N cross peaks that were observed in the (H)NH of

the diamagnetic protein, but not the paramagnetic protein, were assumed to be broadened beyond detection by a PRE due to the close proximity to the  $Cu^{2+}$  ion, and so were assigned an upper distance *R* of 10 Å. The corresponding structure bundle is shown in Fig. 13.39(b). It shows an increase in precision compared to the bundle in (a), with a lower rmsd of 1.6 Å, and particularly good definition around the metal binding sites.

This case study illustrates the utility of paramagnetic distance restraints in refining the structure of a protein. These restraints are extremely useful both in solution studies [45], and particularly in the solid state, where lower resolution and other difficulties often result in insufficient diamagnetic restraints being available for a high-precision structure calculation.

#### 13.8.4. Pseudo-contact shifts as structural restraints

To further improve the precision of the calculated structure, PCS values from  $(E,Co^{2+})$ -SOD were measured and used. The initial assignment of the resonances of  $(E,Co^{2+})$ -SOD was achieved by comparing the (H)CANH and (H)CONH spectra with those acquired for  $(E,Zn^{2+})$ -SOD, and assigning those resonances that were easily identifiable, as shown in Fig. 12.69(d)–(g). From these assigned resonances PCS values were extracted by subtracting the chemical



**Fig. 13.40.** Pulse sequences used to measure relaxation rate constants of the backbone amide <sup>15</sup>N and <sup>13</sup>C spins in solid-state proteins. Measurement of the <sup>15</sup>N  $R_1$  rate constants was performed using a sequence based on the standard (H)NH experiment shown in (a). To measure the <sup>15</sup>N  $R_1$  values an inversion–recovery element was incorporated to give the sequence in (b). The <sup>13</sup>CO  $R_1$  rate constants were measured using a modification of the (H)CONH pulse sequence in (c). Here the  $t_1$  evolution time was replaced by an inversion–recovery element, giving the sequence in (d). Narrow rectangles indicate 90° pulses, and broader rectangles are 180° pulses.



**Fig. 13.41.** The relaxation rate constants measured for microcrystalline ( $Cu^{n+}Zn^{2+}$ )-SOD. Four examples of <sup>15</sup>N and <sup>13</sup>CO longitudinal relaxation decay curves are shown in (a)–(d). In all four cases the red curves are from the diamagnetic reference protein ( $Cu^+Zn^{2+}$ )–SOD, and the blue curves showing the enhanced relaxation decay are from the paramagnetic form ( $Cu^{2+}Zn^{2+}$ )–SOD. The plots in (e)–(h) show the <sup>15</sup>N and <sup>13</sup>CO  $R_1$  values for each residue for the two proteins. The shown data are: (e) <sup>15</sup>N  $R_1$  of ( $Cu^+Zn^{2+}$ )–SOD, (f) <sup>15</sup>N  $R_1$  of ( $Cu^{2+}Zn^{2+}$ )–SOD, (g) <sup>13</sup>CO  $R_1$  of ( $Cu^+Zn^{2+}$ )–SOD, and (h) <sup>13</sup>CO  $R_1$  of ( $Cu^{2+}Zn^{2+}$ )–SOD. The secondary structure, in which the Cucordinating histidine residues are marked with an \*, is shown above panel (e). The parts highlighted in grey indicate where the residues are within 12 Å of the Cu metal ion. Reproduced with permission from [532]. Copyright (2013) American Chemical Society.

shifts of  $(E,Zn^{2+})$ -SOD from those of  $(E,Co^{2+})$ -SOD. These PCSs were then used in combination with the low-resolution structure in Fig. 13.39(a) to fit an approximate magnetic susceptibility tensor, from which the PCSs of all hitherto unassigned resonances were predicted. The determination of the susceptibility tensor required a total of eight parameters to be fitted, namely the axial and rhombic anisotropies, the three Euler angles specifying the orientation, and the three Cartesian coordinates of the Co<sup>2+</sup> ion, with the initial position estimated from the positions of the amino acids with resonances broadened by the PRE. If the predicted shifts matched those observed in the spectra, the corresponding resonances were assigned. The susceptibility tensor was then refitted until all the visible peaks were assigned and a consistent susceptibility tensor obtained. The final susceptibility tensor that was obtained had axial and rhombic anisotropies of  $(1.03\pm0.03)\times10^{-32}~m^3$  and  $(0.91\pm0.02)\times10^{-32}~m^3$ , and a total of 445 PCSs were assigned comprising 111  $^1H^N$ , 223  $^{13}C$ , and 111  $^{15}N$  PCSs.

The structure calculation then proceeded by combining the 445 PCSs with the 297  $^{1}$ H $^{-1}$ H contacts and other diamagnetic restraints to obtain the structure shown in Fig. 13.39(c). The overall precision was significantly improved, as indicated by the reduction in the rmsd from 3.1 Å to 1.7 Å. In particular a substantial improvement was seen in the definition of the backbone in the vicinity of the Co<sup>2+</sup> binding site.

The simultaneous use of the PRE and PCS paramagnetic restraints in combination with the  ${}^{1}H{-}{}^{1}H$  contacts was also evaluated. The final structure, which is shown in Fig. 13.39(d), showed a further increase in resolution with an rmsd that dropped to 1.4 Å. Once again particularly high definition was observed in the vicinity of the binding site of the paramagnetic metal ion.

To conclude this section we note that the work on the structure refinement of SOD described here made the assumption that the PRE and PCS structural restraints were intramolecular only. To describe it another way, the assumption was made there were no PRE or PCS effects from the metal ions of neighbouring dimers in the crystal, and that the measured restraints could therefore be interpreted as being due solely to the metal ion in the same dimer as the observed nucleus. In the case of SOD this assumption is valid, since the metal binding sites are sufficiently far from the protein surface to make any intermolecular spin-dipolar interactions negligible. However for a general microcrystalline protein the total PCS measured is the sum of the intermolecular and intramolecular parts, and it is usually necessary to account for both [533]. The concept is illustrated in Fig. 13.42 [534]. It is possible to separate the intermolecular PCS from the intramolecular PCS using paramagnetic dilution, as has been demonstrated for the protein Co-MMP [12]. In order to isolate the intramolecular part one crystallizes a dilute, uniformly <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>15</sup>N labelled, paramagnetic protein in the presence of a greater concentration of the diamagnetic reference protein which has natural abundance <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>15</sup>N, as shown in Fig. 13.42 [534]. The NMR spectra are therefore dominated by the labelled paramagnetic protein molecules which, for a sufficiently high degree of dilution, experience a negligible intermolecular PCS. The PCS values that are measured can therefore be ascribed entirely to the intramolecular part, and can be used to refine the tertiary structure of the protein as described in this section. If on the other hand we wish to measure the intermolecular PCSs we can adopt an alternative dilution scheme, illustrated in Fig. 13.42, in which only the diamagnetic reference protein is uniformly <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>15</sup>N labelled, and is diluted in the presence of a greater concentration of the paramagnetic protein which has <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>15</sup>N at natural abundance levels. Here we observe only the diamagnetic protein molecules in the NMR spectrum, and so there are no intramolecular PCSs. The total PCSs that we do measure are entirely intermolecular, and can be used to determine the crystal structure [534]. Finally it is also possible to use PCSs containing both inter- and intramolecular contributions for structure determination without the need for dilution, as shown by Luchinat et al. [12].

#### 13.9. Lanthanide stannates $Ln_2Sn_2O_7$ in the solid state

#### 13.9.1. Background

Lanthanide ions have unique luminescent properties which make them promising candidates for new materials for including solid-state lighting, sensing, and imaging applications [535–538]. A full understanding of their paramagnetic NMR properties is crucial both for assigning the NMR spectra, and for extracting details



Fig. 13.42. Illustration of the intra- and intermolecular contributions to the PCS in a microcrystalline protein, and how they may be separated using two different dilution schemes. Paramagnetic metal ions are indicated by the small PCS plots, and the diamagnetic reference ions are indicated by small red circles. Reproduced from Ref. [534] with permission of The Royal Society of Chemistry.



**Fig. 13.43.** Local environment of the  $Sn^{4+}$  ion in  $Y_2Sn_2O_7$ . The  $SnO_6$  octahedron of the B site coordinates to six nearest-neighbour Y atoms. The same coordination environment is expected in the lanthanide-substituted materials  $Ln_2Sn_2O_7$ .

about the electronic structure pertaining to the unpaired electrons. As has been discussed, the understanding of the paramagnetic shifts due to lanthanide ions is less advanced than for *d*-block transition-metal ions. However the simplified theories of Golding and Halton for the contact shift [61], and Bleaney for the PCS [62], have proved very useful in this regard.

Here we present an early case study by Grey et al. who investigated a series of lanthanide stannate compounds  $Ln_2Sn_2O_7$  incorporating different lanthanide ions with different concentrations [65,66]. The contact shifts were probed by studying the compositions  $Ln_2Sn_2O_7$  with 100% lanthanide content, where the paramagnetic shifts are dominated by the short-range contact interaction in the first coordination shell. In addition the effects of lower lanthanide contents were also studied in the solid-solution compositions  $Y_{2-x}Ln_xSn_2O_7$ , in which shifts due to the longer-range PCS from ions in more distant coordination shells could be probed. Here we focus on the former materials, and defer a discussion of the PCS to different systems in subsequent sections.

All the compounds  $Ln_2Sn_2O_7$  adopt the pyrochlore structure with space group Fd3m. These stannates are known for all

lanthanides ions, with the exception of Ce<sup>3+</sup>, and also for Y<sup>3+</sup>. The Sn<sup>4+</sup> ion is located at the B site of the structure, which is at the centre of an octahedral SnO<sub>6</sub> coordination environment, which is shown in Fig. 13.43. The Ln<sup>3+</sup> ions have a larger radius, and so occupy the larger A site which is coordinated to a distorted cubic environment of eight O ions. The SnO<sub>6</sub> is coordinated to six Ln<sup>3+</sup> ions, which are expected to dominate the contact shift of the <sup>119</sup>Sn resonance.

#### 13.9.2. Paramagnetic shifts

Grey et al. measured the <sup>119</sup>Sn solid-state MAS NMR spectra of the diamagnetic materials with  $Ln^{3+} = La^{3+}$  and  $Lu^{3+}$ , and of the paramagnetic materials with  $Ln^{3+} = Nd^{3+}$ ,  $Sm^{3+}$ ,  $Eu^{3+}$ , and  $Yb^{3+}$ [69]. The spectra are shown in Fig. 13.44. It can be seen immediately that the isotropic chemical shift is highly dependent on the nature of the lanthanide ion, varying from -4000 ppm for Nd<sup>3+</sup> to 5000 ppm for Eu<sup>3+</sup>. The variation of the width of the spinningsideband manifold is also striking, with a comparatively small SA being observed for Sm<sup>3+</sup>, and a particularly large value for Yb<sup>3+</sup>.

The two diamagnetic materials  $La_2Sn_2O_7$  and  $Lu_2Sn_2O_7$  have similar isotropic chemical shifts of -642 and -641 ppm respectively, which are due entirely to the orbital contribution. The fact that there is negligible difference between these two orbital shifts indicates that there is little variation across the entire lanthanide series, and suggests that we can obtain the paramagnetic shifts simply by subtracting the average of -641.5 ppm from the total chemical shifts. In addition both  $La_2Sn_2O_7$  and  $Lu_2Sn_2O_7$  have a negligible SA, which we can see from their spectra given that only the centreband is present under slow MAS of 3-4 kHz. This indicates that the SA observed for the paramagnetic materials is due entirely to paramagnetic effects.

We now turn to the question as to the nature of the paramagnetic shift, and whether it is dominated by the contact or pseudocontact contributions. Close examination of Fig. 13.44 indicates that shifts are mainly due to the contact interaction, as the variation of the chemical shifts relative to the mean orbital shift better matches the Golding-Halton contact coefficients in Table 6.5 than the Bleaney coefficients in Table 6.4, as noted by Grey et al. [66]. This can be seen particularly for Eu<sup>3+</sup>, which has the largest shift measured here, and which is predicted to have a small PCS and a large contact shift. The match is seen better in Fig. 13.45, which plots the measured paramagnetic shift against the theoretical Golding-Halton contact coefficients in Table 6.5. We observe a trend that is approximately linear as expected, and so the paramagnetic shifts are dominated by the contact shift. As for the solid materials with transition-metal paramagnetic centres, we expect the contact shift to be mainly due to the short-range contact interactions from the nearest-neighbour Ln<sup>3+</sup> ions in the first coordination shell. From reference to Fig. 13.44 we see that there are six such contributions to the contact shift, along six pathways Ln–O–Sn. Deviations from the ideal linear trend in Fig. 13.45 can be ascribed to shortcomings in the Golding-Halton theory of contact shifts.

If the spin-dipolar interaction were the sole contribution to the SA, we would expect the measured SA to correlate with the coefficients  $C^{SA} = g_j^2 J (J + 1)$  in Table 6.4. This provides a qualitative explanation for the increase in the SA on going from Sm<sup>3+</sup> to Nd<sup>3+</sup> and then to Yb<sup>3+</sup>, but does not explain the very large SA seen for Eu<sup>3+</sup>. It is clear that we also have to consider other contributions to the spinning-sideband manifold, such as the contact shift anisotropy and BMS effects.

### 13.9.3. The $Y_{2-x}Ln_xSn_2O_7$ materials with mixed composition

Grey et al. also studied the solid-solution compositions  $Y_{2-x}Sm_xSn_2O_7$  [65,66]. Several isotropic resonances were observed in the <sup>119</sup>Sn NMR spectra, including those with paramagnetic shift contributions from the second and third coordination shells. Fig. 13.46 shows a series of <sup>119</sup>Sn MAS NMR spectra for  $Y_{2-x}Sm_xSn_2O_7$  of different compositions [65]. The material with x = 0 gives a single sharp peak at -575 ppm (position A in Fig. 13.46). This is simply the orbital contribution to the total shift, and takes a similar value to the shift for the diamagnetic materials La<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> and Lu<sub>2</sub>Sn<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> in Fig. 13.44. Additionally the material with x = 2 has a single resonance with a broad spinning-sideband manifold and an isotropic shift of -100 ppm, which we have seen is mainly a contact shift (position G in Fig. 13.46). In the mixed com-



**Fig. 13.44.** Solid-state <sup>119</sup>Sn NMR spectra of the pyrochlores  $Ln_2Sn_2O_7$  at a field of 4.7 T and MAS frequencies of 3–4 kHz. The paramagnetic shifts are calculated by subtracting the chemical shifts of one of the diamagnetic systems,  $La_2Sn_2O_7$  or  $Lu_2Sn_2O_7$ . Adapted with permission from [69]. Copyright (1989) American Chemical Society.



**Fig. 13.45.** Plot of the experimental <sup>119</sup>Sn paramagnetic shifts of  $Ln_2Sn_2O_7$  against the theoretical relative contact shift coefficients  $C^{con}$  in Table 6.5, calculated by Golding and Halton [61]. The experimental shifts are taken from Grey et al. [69].

positions we see additional resonances centred at positions B–F which are discretely spaced. In the light of the previous discussion of pathway contributions in Sections 13.4,13.5,13.6 we can interpret the contact contributions to the shifts at positions A and G as being due to zero and six nearest-neighbour  $\text{Sm}^{3+}$  ions respectively. Therefore the other resonances observed at B–F have contact contributions from between one and five nearest-neighbour  $\text{Sm}^{3+}$  ions. From these spectra we are able to calculate the average pathway contribution to be 79 ppm.

In addition to the dominant contact contributions the observed shifts are likely to have a substantial PCS part, giving rise to splittings in the isotropic resonances at each of the seven main positions, and which can be rationalized by the Bleaney theory. However in order to study the PCSs due to a series of lanthanide ions, we turn our attention to a different system.

# 13.10. The interaction between guanidinium and tris-dipicolinate lanthanide ions in solution: (Gua)<sub>3</sub>[Ln(DPA)<sub>3</sub>]

#### 13.10.1. Background

The optical spectroscopy of lanthanide complexes is characterized by excited states with comparatively long lifetimes, which may be of the order of  $\mu$ s to ms. These long lifetimes open up the possibility of using these systems for sensitivity-enhanced bio-imaging [539]. One interesting feature of the spectroscopy of some lanthanide-containing complexes is the ability to excite an electronic transition by the simultaneous absorption of two photons, whose energies sum to the required energy of transition. The technique of two-photon absorption-induced fluorescence represented a major breakthrough in bio-imaging [540].

One class of interesting biological systems is that of anionic lanthanide tris-dipicolinate complexes  $Ln(DPA)_3^{3-}$  co-crystallized with proteins such as hen egg-white lysozyme, thaumatin, and urate oxidase. There is an intermolecular interaction which is particularly favourable with the guanidinium part of the amino acid arginine [541]. The nature of this interaction, and the luminescent properties of the complexes, were investigated in some detail by D'Aléo et al. who prepared a series of  $Ln(DPA)_3^{3-}$  complexes in aqueous solution with guanidinium cations  $(Gua^+)$  [469]. The stoichiometric composition of  $(Gua)_3[Ln(DPA)_3]$  is shown in Fig. 13.47. The interaction between  $Ln(DPA)_3^{3-}$  and  $Gua^+$  was probed with <sup>15</sup>N solution NMR of the  $Gua^+$  cation isotopically enriched with <sup>15</sup>N. The spectra were dominated by the paramagnetic effects of the unpaired 4*f* electrons of the lanthanide ions.

#### 13.10.2. Pseudo-contact shifts

D'Aléo et al. acquired the <sup>15</sup>N NMR spectra of  $(Gua)_3[Ln(DPA)_3]$  with seven of the paramagnetic trivalent lanthanide ions, and the diamagnetic lanthanide ion  $Lu^{3+}$ . These spectra are shown in



**Fig. 13.46.** Solid-state <sup>119</sup>Sn MAS NMR spectra of  $Y_{2-x}Sm_xSn_2O_7$  with different compositions *x*. The six spectra collectively reveal the presence of seven main resonances at positions A–G, which are due to a number of nearest-neighbour Sm<sup>3+</sup> ions that increases from zero to six, with an average contact-shift pathway contribution of 79 ppm. Adapted with permission from Springer Nature [65], copyright 1987.

Fig. 13.48, along with the spectrum of Gua HCl for comparison. The  $Gua^+$  cation can either be bound to the  $Ln(DPA)_3^{3-}$  anion through an ionic intermolecular interaction, or unbound as a free cation. We expect the Gua<sup>+</sup> to chemically exchange between these two environments, a hypothesis that is confirmed by all the <sup>15</sup>N NMR spectra where the presence of a single peak further indicates that we are in the fast-exchange limit and observe the average of the bound and unbound states. The substantial range of chemical shifts, from 64 to 70 ppm, is attributed to the different paramagnetic shifts of the lanthanide ions. The solution of Gua-HCl gives a shift at 68.5 ppm, attributed to the orbital contribution, which can be used as a diamagnetic reference to be subtracted from the other shifts to give the paramagnetic contributions. This choice is supported by the observation that the shift of (Gua)<sub>3</sub>[Lu(DPA)<sub>3</sub>] is only 0.04 ppm higher than that of Gua HCl, which is a negligible difference and within the experimental linewidth. The linewidths are fairly uniform across the series, with the obvious exception of Gd<sup>3+</sup> where the peak is broadened considerably. Therefore it appears that the transverse PRE does not add significantly to the observed broadening in the diamagnetic complexes, apart for (Gua)<sub>3</sub>[Gd(DPA)<sub>3</sub>] where the long electronic relaxation times of the  $Gd^{3+}$  ion, due to the half-filled 4*f* shell and subsequent zero SO coupling strength, result in a short  $T_2$ .

As stated above the supramolecular interaction is ionic in nature, and so we would expect the contact interaction between the <sup>15</sup>N and the  $Ln^{3+}$  ion to be zero, with the result that the shifts are entirely PCSs. One initial observation suggesting that this is indeed the case is the very small paramagnetic shift of 0.14 ppm due to  $Gd^{3+}$ . According to Golding and Halton the contact shift for  $Gd^{3+}$ is expected to be one of the largest in the lanthanide series [61], whereas the PCS according to Bleaney is zero [62]. We therefore ascribe the shift of 0.14 ppm to either a variation in the orbital shift, or an error that is within the experimental linewidth.

A more complete analysis is presented in Fig. 13.49, in which the experimental paramagnetic shifts are plotted against the Bleaney coefficients  $C_J^{pcs}$  from Table 6.4. There is an excellent linear trend, which is expected for shifts that are entirely pseudocontact. The one significant discrepancy is for Eu<sup>3+</sup>, which is expected as the populations of the excited *J*-levels are neglected in the plot. Nevertheless the correlation is striking, and provides experimental evidence for the validity of the Bleaney theory in this



**Fig. 13.47.** Chemical structure of the  $(Gua)_3[Ln(DPA)_3]$  complexes. Adapted with permission from [469]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.



**Fig. 13.48.** Solution <sup>15</sup>N NMR spectra of a series of  $(Gua)_3[Ln(DPA)_3]$  complexes with different lanthanide ions in D<sub>2</sub>O at 16.44 T. The spectra each contain a single peak due to the <sup>15</sup>N-enriched guanidinium cation. The notation [Ln] is a shorthand for the [Ln(DPA)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>3-</sup> anion. Reproduced with permission from [469]. Copyright John Wiley and Sons.

particular case. It would be satisfying to be able to calculate the crystal-field splitting parameters from this correlation. However the slope of the line contains contributions from the crystal-field splitting, the spin-dipolar interaction, and indeed the rate of chemical exchange, which cannot be separated here. To do so would require additional information about the relative position of the <sup>15</sup>N to the metal ion and the exchange properties. This is explored in the following section.

13.11. Paramagnetic effects of lanthanide ions in the dicalcium protein calbindin  $D_{9k}$ 

#### 13.11.1. Background

In our final case study of the paramagnetic shifts due to lanthanide ions we present the work of Bertini et al. who measured the PCSs due to a series of lanthanide ions incorporated into the protein dicalcium calbindin  $D_{9k}$ , which is denoted Ca<sub>2</sub>Cb [75]. The PCSs were used to refine the calculated structures, and the extracted susceptibility anisotropy parameters for each lanthanide ion were studied in order to gauge the quality of the agreement with the Bleaney theory.

Dicalcium calbindin  $D_{9k}$  binds two  $Ca^{2+}$  ions [542]. It is found in mammalian intestinal epithelial cells where it mediates the transport of  $Ca^{2+}$ . In the present case study the  $Ca^{2+}$  ion in the C-terminal binding site was replaced by the full series of lanthanide ions from  $La^{3+}$  to  $Lu^{3+}$ , with the exceptions of Pm<sup>3+</sup> and Gd<sup>3+</sup>, to give a series of 13 protein derivatives that are denoted CaLnCb. The chemical shifts for each amide <sup>1</sup>H<sup>N</sup> and <sup>15</sup>N were measured for all the derivatives, and the paramagnetic shifts were obtained by subtracting the corresponding shifts of either the CaLaCb or CaLuCb protein.

The advantages of using a protein such as  $D_{9k}$  to measure these paramagnetic shifts are twofold. Firstly as the NMR was performed using conventional pulse sequences the nuclei were observed outside the blind sphere, the radius of which is dependent on the particular lanthanide ion in the binding site. This means that the paramagnetic shifts could be ascribed entirely to PCSs, as the contact shifts drop to zero outside the blind sphere. Secondly the large number of PCSs available can be used to determine both the orientation and anisotropy parameters of the magnetic susceptibility tensor to a high degree of precision. Both of these points enabled a comprehensive evaluation of the Bleaney theory, which we described in Section 6.5 [75].

### 13.11.2. Pseudo-contact shifts

The chemical shifts of the amide <sup>1</sup>H<sup>N</sup> and <sup>15</sup>N resonances were measured by acquiring a <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>15</sup>N HSQC spectrum for each CaLnCb derivative. Four representative spectra are shown in Fig. 13.50 [75]. The spectra shown are of (a) diamagnetic CaLaCb  $(4f^0)$ , (b) an example with an early paramagnetic lanthanide  $(4f^2)$  CaPrCb, (c) a 'mid' lanthanide  $(4f^8)$  CaTbCb, and (d) a late lanthanide  $(4f^{12})$  CaTmCb. The procedure for assigning the PCSs and calculating the magnetic susceptibility tensor was similar to that described in Section 13.8.4 [46]. The PCSs themselves were calculated from the chemical shifts of each resonance by subtracting the corresponding shifts of a suitable diamagnetic reference protein. Two diamagnetic derivatives were available here, namely CaLaCb and CaLuCb, which were found to have measurably different sets of orbital shifts. It was found that a better fit of the PCSs was obtained if the former derivative CaLaCb was chosen as the reference for the early lanthanides Ce, Pr, Nd, Sm, and Eu, and if the latter reference CaLuCb was chosen as the reference for the late lanthanides Tb. Dv. Ho. Er. Tm. and Yb. This observation is consistent with the decrease in the ionic radius of the lanthanide ion across the series resulting in minor changes in the protein structure [75]. For each sample a set of about 1000 <sup>1</sup>H<sup>N</sup> and <sup>15</sup>N PCSs were measured. For each of these sets the susceptibility tensor was fitted to the PCS values using an initial trial structure of CaCeCb determined in solution by NOEs, using the following expression for the PCS:



**Fig. 13.49.** Plot of the experimental <sup>15</sup>N paramagnetic shifts of  $(Gua)_3[Ln(DPA)_3]$  taken from Fig. 13.48 against the theoretical relative PCS coefficients  $C_j^{pcs}$  in Table 6.4, calculated by Bleaney [62].

$$\delta_{iso}^{\text{pcs}} = \frac{1}{12\pi R^3} \left[ \Delta \chi_{\text{ax}} \left( 3\cos^2(\theta) - 1 \right) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{\text{rh}} \sin^2(\theta) \cos(2\phi) \right], \quad (13.14)$$

where *R*,  $\theta$ , and  $\phi$  define the position of the nuclear relative to the PAF of the susceptibility tensor, and  $\Delta \chi_{ax}$  and  $\Delta \chi_{rh}$  are the axial and rhombic anisotropies of the tensor. Finally the protein structure and tensor parameters were simultaneously calculated by combining the total of 1097 PCSs for all lanthanides simultaneously with 1539 NOEs and 39 <sup>3</sup>J-coupling constants.

The axial and rhombic susceptibility anisotropy parameters  $\Delta \gamma_{ax}$ and  $\Delta \chi_{\rm rb}$ , and the three axes specifying the orientation of the PAF, were determined for all 11 paramagnetic derivatives. It was found that all the axis orientations were within 15° of the average for all the derivatives, with the exception of CaSmCb for which a larger deviation of 20° was found. This indicates that the coordination environments for all the ions are broadly similar, with the small variations reflecting minor short-range structural changes. The values of the axial and rhombic anisotropy parameters are plotted against the Bleaney coefficients  $C_J^{pcs}$  from Table 6.4 in Fig. 13.51 (a) and (b). An approximately linear correlation, indicated by the dashed best-fit lines, is observed for both anisotropy parameters. A perfect correlation would indicate firstly that the Bleaney theory is good description of the PCS of these systems, and secondly that the crystal-field splitting parameters  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^0$  and  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^2$  are the same for all the paramagnetic derivatives CaLnCb. Whilst there are some deviations from the ideal case, the data in Fig. 13.51 nevertheless allowed the determination of the average crystal-field splitting parameters for the series of proteins [75].

#### 13.11.3. Extracting the crystal-field splitting parameters

From Fig. 13.51 we are in a position to calculate the average crystal-field splitting parameters. As discussed in Section 6.5, the Bleaney theory gives the following expressions for the axial and rhombic susceptibility anisotropies in terms of the energy coefficients  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^0$  and  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^2$  of the crystal-field interaction Hamiltonian in Eq. (6.51):

$$\Delta \chi_{\rm ax} = -\frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2}{30(kT)^2} C_J^{\rm pcs} \langle r^2 \rangle 3A_2^0, \tag{13.15}$$

$$\Delta \chi_{\rm rh} = -\frac{\mu_0 \mu_{\rm B}^2}{30 (kT)^2} C_J^{\rm pcs} \langle r^2 \rangle 2A_2^2. \tag{13.16}$$

Hence the slopes of the best-fit lines to the plots of  $\Delta \chi_{ax}$  against  $C_J^{pcs}$  and  $\Delta \chi_{rh}$  against  $C_J^{pcs}$  in Fig. 13.51(a) and (b) yield  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^0 = 179 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  and  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^2 = 143 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ . The corresponding crystal-field splitting parameters for each protein were found to vary within ±30% of these averages.

Bertini et al. performed a more sophisticated analysis than that above, from which a refined value of the axial crystal-field splitting parameter was obtained. In summary both the excited-state contributions to the PCSs in CaSmCb and CaEuCb were taken into account, and the Bleaney expression was extended to third order in 1/(kT). The result was an improved agreement between the experimental and calculated axial susceptibility anisotropy for each lanthanide, as shown in Fig. 13.52 [75]. The average parameter  $\langle r^2 \rangle A_2^0$  was refined to 169 cm<sup>-1</sup>, with a variation of ±15% for different lanthanide ions.

This case study represents the most compelling evidence to date for the validity of the Bleaney theory for the PCS due to lanthanide ions. The reasons for this are that 11 out of 13 of the paramagnetic lanthanide ions could be incorporated into the C-terminal Ca<sup>2+</sup> binding site, that a large number of PCSs that could be measured, and that the observed nuclei are sufficiently far from the lanthanide ion that only the PCS contributes to the isotropic paramagnetic shift. This study was also able to quantify the variation of the orien-



**Fig. 13.50.** Four examples of solution <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>15</sup>N HSQC spectra of different CaLnCb derivatives acquired at 18.79 T and 300 K. The four derivatives are (a) diamagnetic CaLaCb, (b) CaPrCb, (c) CaTbCb, and (d) CaTmCb. Reproduced with permission from [75]. Copyright (2001) American Chemical Society.

tation of the PAF of the magnetic susceptibility tensor across the lanthanide series and the variation in the crystal-field splitting parameters, and account for higher-order terms in the Bleaney theory. These are factors that are sometimes erroneously cited as fundamental shortcomings of the Bleaney theory.

#### 13.12. Actinyl tris-carbonate complexes in solution

#### 13.12.1. Background

Studies of actinide complexes and materials by NMR are currently very sparse, mainly due to the radioactivity of such systems making it difficult to obtain experimental data. Additionally, computations of the paramagnetic shifts are difficult to perform, as the heavy open-shell actinide ions require a full relativistic treatment [213]. Nevertheless such calculations have been performed very recently by Gendron et al. on small actinyl complexes containing either one or two 5*f* electrons [92,93]. Although there are many issues still to be addressed, this work is of profound interest to theoreticians and experimentalists alike, and opens a new frontier in paramagnetic NMR.

The compounds we examine in this section are the actinyl triscarbonates  $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{5-}$ ,  $NpO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$ , and  $PuO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$ , all of which adopt axial symmetry within the point group  $D_{3h}$ , and for which experimental <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectra have been obtained [230,231]. The paramagnetic centres in the first two complexes are U<sup>5+</sup> and Np<sup>6+</sup> respectively, each with the same open-shell configuration  $5f^1$ . The metal ion in the third complex is Pu<sup>6+</sup>, with configuration  $5f^2$ .

### 13.12.2. Paramagnetic shifts

One point of interest for the original experimental studies of these complexes was to establish information about the kinetics of these complexes in solution. The general actinyl tris-carbonate complexes are known to exchange bound carbonate with free carbonate in aqueous solution according to the following scheme:

$$AnO_{2}(CO_{3})_{3}^{n-} + {}^{*}CO_{3}^{2-} \rightleftharpoons AnO_{2}(CO_{3})_{2}({}^{*}CO_{3})^{n-} + CO_{3}^{2-}.$$
 (13.17)

The experimental <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectra of the three complexes  $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{5-}$ , NpO<sub>2</sub>(CO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub><sup>4-</sup>, and PuO<sub>2</sub>(CO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub><sup>4-</sup> in aqueous solution are shown in Fig. 13.53(a)-(c). In all three spectra we observe a single peak due to the paramagnetic species  $AnO_2(CO_3)_3^{n-}$  which is generally broad, with the exception of NpO<sub>2</sub>(CO<sub>3</sub>) $^{4-}_{3-}$ , and distinct from an additional resonance due to the  $CO_3^2/HCO_3^-$  species. The spectra indicate that the exchange of carbonate bound to the complex with free carbonate is in the slow exchange limit, whereas the additional exchange between the  $CO_3^{2-}$  and  $HCO_3^{-}$  ions is in the fastexchange limit. As was noted during the discussion on CEST and PARACEST in Section 12.4.1, the larger chemical shift dispersion of paramagnetic species in solution allows us to obtain distinct chemical shifts for such species exchanging with larger rate constants than is possible for diamagnetic complexes. Two additional peaks in the spectrum in Fig. 13.53(b) are due to the additional complex  $(NpO_2)_3(CO_3)_6^{6-}$ .

The paramagnetic shifts of the three actinul tris-carbonate complexes were calculated by Gendron et al. [92,93]. They employed the general formula for the paramagnetic shielding tensor of van den Heuvel and Soncini given in Eq. (4.103), which is reproduced below for convenience:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{S} = \frac{2}{\hbar \gamma_{I} Q_{0}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_{n}) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu, \mu} \frac{\langle n\nu | \hat{m}_{i} | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | \mathcal{F}_{j} | n\nu \rangle}{E_{m} - E_{n}} + \frac{\beta}{\hbar \gamma_{I} Q_{0}} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_{n}) \sum_{\nu, \nu'} \langle n\nu | \hat{m}_{i} | n\nu' \rangle \langle n\nu' | \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j} | n\nu \rangle.$$
(13.18)



**Fig. 13.51.** The axial and rhombic susceptibility anisotropies, and associated errors, calculated for the CaLnCb derivatives from PCSs, plotted against the theoretical relative PCS coefficients  $C_{j}^{pcs}$  in Table 6.4, calculated by Bleaney [62]. The axial and rhombic anisotropies are plotted in (a) and (b). The susceptibility anisotropies were calculated by Bertini et al. [75].



**Fig. 13.52.** Experimental (filled circles) and calculated (open squares) axial susceptibility anisotropy values for the series of CaLnCb derivatives. The calculated values used an axial crystal-field splitting parameter of  $A_2^0 \langle r^2 \rangle = 169 \text{ cm}^{-1}$  as determined by Bertini et al. [75], and a correction for temperature up to terms in  $1/T^3$ . The right-hand vertical axis shows the expected RDC at 18.79 T and 298 K in Hz. Reproduced with permission from [75]. Copyright (2001) American Chemical Society.

They divided the shielding tensor in Eq. (13.18) into two parts, with the first referred to as linear-response (LR) contribution, and the second as the Curie contribution. Here the sums are over all the electronic states, which in practice include both the ground state and any low-lying excited states. When the only significant contribution is from the electronic ground state, the shielding tensor can be written using Eq. (6.24) in terms of the EPR parameters for that manifold. Gendron et al. employed that form of the EPR formalism, using the lowest-order tensor components for the *g*-, hyperfine, and ZFS tensors and neglecting the higher-order terms. In this case the paramagnetic shielding comprises only the Curie contribution, and the resulting shift  $\delta^{Curie}$  is calculated from Eq. (4.109), giving

$$\delta^{\text{Curie}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{3\hbar\gamma_{I}}\text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{Z}\cdot\boldsymbol{A}],\tag{13.19}$$



**Fig. 13.53.** <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectra of a series of actinyl tris-carbonate complexes acquired in aqueous solution. In (a) are shown the spectra of a 4.598 × 10<sup>-2</sup> M solution of  $UO_2(CO_3)_5^3$  mixed with 1 M Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>, acquired at -75.45 MHz. The spectra were acquired at a series of temperatures between 273 and 313 K. The spectra of a 0.05 M solution of NpO<sub>2</sub>(CO<sub>3</sub>) $_5^4$  mixed with Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> acquired at -62.9 MHz, 273 K, and variable pH are shown in (b). The inset shows the resonances due to (NpO<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>(CO<sub>3</sub>) $_6^6$ at 303 K. The spectra in (c) are of a 0.2 M solution of PuO<sub>2</sub>(CO<sub>3</sub>) $_3^4$  mixed with 1 M Na<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub> and 1 M NaClO<sub>4</sub> acquired at -62.9 MHz, a pH of 9.5, and variable temperatures between 277 and 350 K. Adapted with permission from [230,231]. Copyright (1995 and 2005) American Chemical Society.

where the *g*-, hyperfine, and ZFS tensors *g*, *A*, and *D* refer to the pseudo-spin of the electronic ground state. The components of the tensor *Z* are given by Eq. (4.113), which is reproduced here:

$$Z_{kl} = \frac{2}{Q_0} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{m \neq n} \sum_{\nu,\mu} \frac{\langle n\nu | S_k | m\mu \rangle \langle m\mu | S_l | n\nu \rangle}{E_m - E_n} + \frac{\beta}{Q_0} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta E_n) \sum_{\nu,\nu'} \langle n\nu | \widehat{S}_k | n\nu' \rangle \langle n\nu' | \widehat{S}_l | n\nu \rangle.$$
(13.20)

Finally, the description of the shift is completed by noting that if the electronic ground state has pseudo-spin 1/2, the shift simplifies to the form calculated from Eq. (4.118):

$$\delta^{\text{Curie}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{B}} S(S+1)}{9 \hbar \gamma_l kT} \text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}], \qquad (13.21)$$

where S = 1/2. The contributions to the shifts were separated into the Curie and LR contributions, with each contribution further separated into the parts due to the Fermi-contact shift, PCS (due to the spin-dipolar interaction), and PSO shift.

The calculations of the paramagnetic shifts were performed using the CASSCF and RASSCF methods. The results quoted here are from calculations comprising 12 occupied orbitals and 100 unoccupied orbitals in addition to the active space, and include corrections for solvent effects.

#### 13.12.3. Interpretation

The total calculated shifts were calculated using Eq. (13.18) and are plotted, along with their individual contributions and the experimental shifts, for the three actinyl tris-carbonate complexes in Fig. 13.54. For all three compounds the orbital shift was assumed to be equal to the chemical shift of 168.22 ppm of the diamagnetic isostructural analogue  $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$  (containing  $U^{6+}$  ions with no 5*f* electrons). The experimental shifts shown in Fig. 13.54 were therefore re-referenced to  $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$ , and therefore comprise only the contributions from paramagnetic effects. For all three complexes, it can be seen that the Curie terms are the dominant contributions to the total shift, with the LR parts representing only minor corrections.

For the two complexes with a single 5f electron,  $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{5-}$  and  $NpO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$ , the single largest contribution to the shift is from the PSO part of the Curie shift, with the next largest terms being the Curie PCS and LR PSO. Interestingly, we see that the contact shifts are negligible in  $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{5-}$ . Gendron et al. also employed the EPR representation of the shift. For these two  $5f^1$  complexes both the ground state and lowest-lying excited state are doublets, and can be modelled with pseudo-spin 1/2. Their Curie contributions to the shift were therefore calculated from Eq. (13.21). The results are given in Table 13.10 [93]. The paramagnetic shift is therefore well approximated in the EPR formalism, here considering only the two lowest-lying electronic states.

In the case of  $PuO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$ , the addition of the second 5*f* electron has the effect of increasing the paramagnetic shift substantially. Here the Curie contact shift and Curie pseudo-contact shift are significant, but are also of opposite sign and largely cancel,

leaving the Curie PSO shift as the remaining dominant contribution. All the LR terms were found to be negligible.

The lowest-lying excited state was calculated to be 3580 cm<sup>-1</sup> above the ground state, and so could be neglected in the EPR representation of the shift. The EPR parameters of the ground state were calculated twice, once assuming a pseudo-spin of 1/2 and once assuming a pseudo-spin of 1, and are tabulated in Table 13.11. We see that all the EPR parameters vary depending on which model we use for the ground state. In particular we see that the inclusion of ZFS in the pseudo-spin-1 model has the effect of reducing the magnitude of all the other parameters relative to their values in the pseudo-spin-1/2 model, as expected. Nevertheless, the two pictures give the same values for the shift in each case, and the same contributions at this temperature. However we should note that the temperature dependence of the shift, within the range where only the ground manifold is occupied, will be different for the two models. This is due to the inclusion of the tensor Z in the pseudo-spin-1 model, which does not have a simple Curie temperature dependence.

For these carbonate systems, the accurate reproduction of the experimental paramagnetic shifts sets a benchmark in computational paramagnetic NMR of actinide systems. The general trends identified for these systems suggest that (1) the Curie terms dominate the LR contributions, and (2) the most important of the Curie terms is that due to the PSO contribution. However it is currently unclear whether these trends are in fact general, or only specific to these particular types of complex. Nevertheless, it is expected that calculations of this type will become more widely employed in paramagnetic NMR of actinide complexes in the future.

#### 13.13. Solid actinide oxides

#### 13.13.1. Background

The second case study of paramagnetic actinide systems we present is the <sup>17</sup>O MAS solid-state NMR study of cubic actinide oxides by Martel et al. [13]. Solid actinide systems have remained elusive to NMR due both to their well-known high radiotoxicity, and to the technological challenges associated with fast spinning. This study therefore represents an impressive contribution to our understanding of the NMR properties of such solids.

#### 13.13.2. Paramagnetic shifts

Five actinide oxides were enriched with <sup>17</sup>O, and studied with <sup>17</sup>O NMR at fast MAS of 55 kHz. The chosen oxides were ThO<sub>2</sub>  $(5f^0, \text{ diamagnetic}), \text{ UO}_2 (5f^2), \text{ NpO}_2 (5f^3), \text{ PuO}_2 (5f^4), \text{ and } \text{AmO}_2$ 



**Fig. 13.54.** Breakdown of the contributions to the total <sup>13</sup>C chemical shifts of the three actinyl tris-carbonate complexes determined by first-principles calculations, and the comparison with the experimental shifts. The quoted shifts are for experimental temperatures of 273 K ( $UO_2(CO_3)_5^{5-}$  and  $NO_2(CO_3)_5^{4-}$ ), and 295 K ( $PuO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$ ). The calculated shifts are taken from Ref. [93], and the experimental shifts from Ref. [231] ( $UO_2(CO_3)_5^{5-}$ ), and [230] ( $NPO_2(CO_3)_5^{4-}$ ). All shifts have been referenced relative to the orbital shift of the diamagnetic complex  $UO_2(CO_3)_5^{4-}$ .

Table 13.10

Comparison of the Curie shifts obtained from the two lowest-lying doublet states of  $UO_2(CO_3)_3^{5-}$  and  $NPO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$  at 273 K. The corresponding relative energies of the states and their populations (at 273 K) are also given relative to the ground state of each molecule. Data computed by Gendron et al. [93].

Complex	State	Energy/cm <sup>-1</sup>	Population/%	$\delta^{ m Curie}/ m ppm$	Total $\delta^{\text{Curie}}/\text{ppm}$
$UO_2(CO_3)_3^{5-}$	Ground, $E_{3/2}$ Lowest-lying excited, $E_{1/2}$	0 132	79 21	-94.0 -121.2	-99.5
$NpO_2(CO_3)_3^{4-}$	Ground, $E_{3/2}$ Lowest-lying excited, $E_{1/2}$	0 356	87 13	-106.5 -136.6	-110.4

#### Table 13.11

EPR parameters and Curie shifts calculated for the electronic ground state of  $PuO_2(CO_3)_4^{A-}$  at 295 K. Two sets of parameters were computed, assuming an electronic manifold of either pseudo-spin 1/2 or pseudo-spin 1. Both the hyperfine constants and their Curie shifts are also broken down into their Fermi-contact, spin-dipolar (PCS), and PSO contributions. In all cases the rhombic EPR parameters ( $g_{\perp}, A_{\perp}^{total}, A_{\perp}^{FC}, A_{\perp}^{SD}, A_{\perp}^{PSO}$ , and *E*) are zero. Data computed by Gendron et al. [93].

Pseudo-spin	$g_{\parallel}$	$A_{\parallel}^{\rm total}/{ m MHz}$	$A_{\parallel}^{\rm FC}/{ m MHz}$	$A_{\parallel}^{\rm SD}/{ m MHz}$	$A_{\parallel}^{\rm PSO}/{ m MHz}$	$D/cm^{-1}$	$\delta^{\text{Curie}}$	$\delta_{\rm FC}^{\rm Curie}$	$\delta_{\mathrm{PCS}}^{\mathrm{Curie}}$	$\delta_{\rm PSO}^{\rm Curie}$
1/2	-5.687	3.76	$-1.40 \\ -0.70$	1.56	3.60	_	-379.0	141.6	-157.6	-363.0
1	-2.843	1.88		0.78	1.80	3974	-379.0	141.6	-157.6	-363.0

 $(5f^5)$ . The spectra acquired under both static and MAS conditions are shown in Fig. 13.55. In the spectra of the static powders we see that the measured shifts cover a large range, from +800 ppm to -800 ppm, and depend strongly on the actinide ion. We also see that the diamagnetic oxide ThO<sub>2</sub> has a comparatively large shift of 576 ppm, indicating that all the oxides have substantial orbital shifts which may themselves vary considerably with the actinide ion, and which therefore complicate the interpretation of the NMR spectra. In addition, the resonances of the paramagnetic oxides are broad, each having linewidths in the range of 100– 500 ppm. Since the oxides have a long-range structure that is cubic, there is no contribution from the quadrupolar interaction to the line broadening, and so the linewidths can be ascribed mainly to paramagnetic effects.

When MAS is applied, the most striking change to the spectra is the narrowing of these resonances to a few ppm, with the exception of that of AmO<sub>2</sub>. For the other oxides the broadening observed from the static samples was therefore ascribed to the spin-dipolar shift anisotropy. The different behaviour seen for AmO<sub>2</sub> was shown to be due to a combination of more than one disordered phase, and oxide vacancies [13]. A second consequence of MAS is the shifting of all the resonances, with the exception of the peak from ThO<sub>2</sub>, closer to zero. This is expected, since the increased temperature of the sample due to frictional heating reduces the Curie spin, and therefore reduces the paramagnetic contribution to the shift.

As we saw in Section 13.12, the interpretation of the paramagnetic shifts due to actinide ions is complex. However in the present study, it was assumed that the cubic structure of the oxides results in a magnetic anisotropy that is zero, and as a consequence there is no contribution from the PCS. Additionally, contributions from the PSO were neglected, and the paramagnetic contribution to the shift was interpreted as a contact shift. This shift  $\delta^{S}$  was calculated from the Curie spin using the expression in Eq. (3.68):

$$\delta^{S} = -\frac{\langle \widehat{S}_{z} \rangle A^{FC}}{\hbar \gamma_{I} B_{0}}.$$
(13.22)

However we note that the expression for the Curie spin is more complicated than that used for 3*d*-metal ions, in which only the electronic Zeeman interaction, and possibly the ZFS, is included. Martel et al. computed the Curie spin using a Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  that is given by [13]

$$\widehat{H} = \widehat{H}_{\text{FI}} + \widehat{H}_{\text{CF}} + \widehat{H}_{\text{Z}}.$$
(13.23)

Here  $\hat{H}_{FI}$  is the Hamiltonian representing all the free-ion interactions such as Coulomb repulsion, and SO coupling which was here



**Fig. 13.55.** Solid-state <sup>17</sup>O NMR spectra acquired on a series of five enriched actinide oxides, at a Larmor frequency of -54.25 MHz, under both static conditions and 55 kHz MAS. Adapted with permission from [13]. Copyright (2014) American Chemical Society.

determined in the regime intermediate between the Russell–Saunders and *jj* schemes. The crystal-field interaction Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{CF}$  was written in the form of Eq. (6.6). For the cubic structure of the oxides, the rank-two tensor components are zero, and we retain only a subset of the rank-four and rank-six tensors, giving a Hamiltonian of the form:

$$\widehat{H}_{CF} = B_4 \left[ \widehat{C}_0^{(4)} + \sqrt{\frac{5}{14}} \Big( \widehat{C}_{+4}^{(4)} + \widehat{C}_{-4}^{(4)} \Big) \right] + B_6 \left[ \widehat{C}_0^{(6)} - \sqrt{\frac{7}{2}} \Big( \widehat{C}_{+4}^{(6)} + \widehat{C}_{-4}^{(6)} \Big) \right].$$
(13.24)

The interaction is described by the operators  $\hat{C}_q^{(k)}$  of rank *k* and order *q*, and the two crystal-field splitting parameters  $B_4$  and  $B_6$ , which indicate the strengths of the rank-four and rank-six contributions respectively. The final term is the electronic Zeeman interaction comprising both the spin and orbital parts, given by Eq. (4.11).

$$\widehat{H}_{Z} = \mu_{\mathrm{B}} B_{0} \left( \widehat{L}_{z} + 2 \widehat{S}_{z} \right), \tag{13.25}$$

where it is assumed that  $g_e \approx 2$ . The total Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}$  was diagonalized, and the Curie spin calculated. Assuming that the Fermicontact coupling constant is the same for all the actinides,  $-3\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle kT/\mu_B B_0$  is proportional to the experimental shift. Both quantities are plotted in Fig. 13.56. We see that, as an initial approximation, the variation of the Curie spin does account for the underlying trend in the variation of shift along the series of these actinides. However the quantitative agreement is comparatively poor, for example with the Curie spin alone unable to account for the observed changes in sign of the shift on moving from PuO<sub>2</sub> to AmO<sub>2</sub>. The agreement can presumably be improved by including other relevant terms in the shift, such as the orbital contribution, which we can see is substantial for the diamagnetic oxide ThO<sub>2</sub>, the PSO, and higher order terms describing the magnetic anisotropy in a cubic system.

Nevertheless this study is a very interesting milestone in paramagnetic NMR of actinide materials, and is expected to encourage more work in this area. In particular, given the work described in Section 13.12, it is expected that calculations of the shift in this type of solid will evolve in parallel to the experimental techniques, and provide a useful tool in the study of actinide chemistry.

# 13.14. Probing the nanostructure of composite materials using relayed paramagnetic relaxation enhancement

#### 13.14.1. Background

In the final case study of this review we consider a topic that is different to those we have studied in previous sections. Previously we have highlighted studies where the system of interest contained isolated paramagnetic metal ions, or where such ions could be easily introduced, and used the paramagnetic effects to obtain both local- and long-range structural information. The effects considered were principally the paramagnetic shifts, but some insight was also obtained from measurements of the PREs. In this final study however we highlight the work of Schlagnitweit et al., who developed a new method to investigate the sizes of different domains of nm- $\mu$ m length scale in multi-component materials using a paramagnetic dopant [470].

Multi-component materials are defined as comprising two or more particles or domains with different properties such as structural order and dynamics. Examples include multi-phase systems such as alloys, composites, and mixtures of polymers. The bulk properties of such systems depend on the sizes of the domains and particles, and can be altered accordingly. For this reason it is important to be able to characterize the range of size and shape of the domains *in situ*. Schlagnitweit proposed an NMR method for doing this utilizing the PRE of a paramagnetic dopant combined with spin diffusion [470]. This method was applied both to a model system comprising a suspension polymer nanoparticles, and then to a polymer mixture of ethyl cellulose (EC)/hydroxypropyl cellulose (HPC) in a film. This latter system is of particular interest as a coating of the film on pellets is used as a pharmaceutical controlled-release formulation.

The following two sections outline the basic method for measuring the domain sizes, and describe the application to the EC/ HPC film.

# 13.14.2. The relay of the paramagnetic relaxation enhancement by spin diffusion

Here we briefly describe the method to measure the domain sizes of a two-component material, comprising domains A and B. Schlagnitweit et al. suggested that in order to measure the length scale of domain A we can dope the second domain B with a solution of a paramagnetic molecule of known concentration. The doping procedure is illustrated in Fig. 13.57 (left panel), where the



**Fig. 13.56.** Plot of  $-A(\hat{S}_z)$  and the isotropic <sup>17</sup>O shifts against the number of 5*f* electrons for the five actinide oxides. The constant *A* is given by  $A = -3kT/\mu_BH_0$ . Adapted with permission from [13]. Copyright (2014) American Chemical Society.

surface of an EC nanoparticle is impregnated with a solution containing an organic radical [470]. The paramagnetic centres impregnate both domain B and the surface of domain A, and therefore induce a large PRE throughout the former and at the latter. The longitudinal relaxation time of a particular nuclear site in domain A  $T_1(\mathbf{r})$  becomes position dependent, decreasing as we approach the surface of A with a distance dependence  $1/r^6$ . We have seen that this direct PRE can be used to probe distances from the metal ion up to 100 Å, and so is not able to probe longer length scales of the order nm- $\mu$ m, with the large region of the domain that is far from the surface not experiencing a measurable PRE. However spin diffusion transfers longitudinal magnetization from the centre of the domain A to the surface, where it experiences enhanced relaxation, which is referred to as a relayed paramagnetic relaxation enhancement (R-PRE). The key to the method is that in smaller undoped domains spin diffusion transfers the magnetization to the surface more rapidly, thus resulting in a greater decrease in the apparent  $T_1$  relaxation time from the whole domain. Hence a comparison of the longitudinal relaxation behaviour of the domain A in the impregnated sample and the undoped sample reveals information about the size and shape of domain A. In addition multiple measurements can be performed with different concentrations of paramagnetic molecules in domain B. allowing an evaluation of the uncertainty of the measurements.

The longitudinal relaxation can be measured using a saturation-recovery experiment, where the longitudinal magnetization is saturated and allowed to recover during a variable delay  $\tau$ . This is followed by a 90° pulse which converts the recovered polarization into observable coherences. The signals measured during this experiment in the undoped and doped samples are denoted  $S_{\text{core}}(\tau)$ and  $S_{\text{doped}}(\tau)$  respectively, and the comparison between the two used to determine the domain size and shape is quantified with a R-PRE enhancement factor that is defined as  $\varepsilon(\tau) = S_{\text{doped}}(\tau)/S_{\text{core}}(\tau)$ .

In the undoped sample the longitudinal relaxation time constant is assumed to be uniform throughout the domain A, and is referred to as  $T_1^{\text{core}}$ . In the doped sample  $T_1(\mathbf{r})$  is position dependent, and takes boundary values of  $T_1^{\text{core}}$  in the centre of domain A, which is far from the surface, and a short value  $T_1^{\text{surface}}$  at the surface due to the direct PRE. In practice the value of  $T_1^{\text{surface}}$  can be taken to be the same as the corresponding value measured in the solvent in the doped domain B. Elsewhere in domain A we can calculate  $T_1(\mathbf{r})$  since the direct PRE decreases with the distance r from the surface as  $1/r^6$ .



**Fig. 13.57.** Illustration of the selective doping of a particular domain in bi-domain samples. On the left is shown a water-based suspension of EC nanoparticles. The radical is impregnated in the solution (light blue), and dopes the surface of the EC nanoparticles (red). On the right is shown a composite system containing domains of EC (red) and HPC (blue) in films covering pellets in controlled-release formulations. The radical solution impregnates the water-soluble HPC domain. This induces a PRE at the surface of the EC domains. Reproduced with permission from [470]. Copyright (2015) American Chemical Society.

Spin diffusion in an extended domain is a complicated process to model rigorously using a full quantum–mechanical treatment. Fortunately it can be modelled classically using a diffusion equation which incorporates a longitudinal relaxation sink [425]. The polarization  $I_z(\mathbf{r}, t)$  at position  $\mathbf{r}$  and time t in domain A evolves as

$$\frac{\partial I_z(\boldsymbol{r},t)}{\partial t} = D\nabla^2 I_z(\boldsymbol{r},t) - \frac{I_z(\boldsymbol{r},t) - I_{z,0}}{T_1(\boldsymbol{r})},$$
(13.26)

where *D* is the spin-diffusion coefficient, and  $I_{z,0}$  is the equilibrium polarization normalized to  $I_{z,0}(\mathbf{r}) = 1$ . The total polarization from the whole domain A  $I_{z,A}(t)$  is found by integrating  $I_z(\mathbf{r}, t)$  over all distances  $\mathbf{r}$  within the domain for each time point, i.e.  $I_{z,A}(t) = V^{-1} \int_V I_z(\mathbf{r}, t) d^3 r$ . If the domains A are present with a distribution of sizes and shapes, it is necessary to compute the average value of  $I_{z,A}(t)$  in order to obtain the total polarization from the whole sample.

In the study of Schlagnitweit et al. the computation of the spindiffusion dynamics was simplified by assuming that the domains A were spherical [470]. The spin-diffusion equation in Eq. (13.26) was simplified by replacing **r** with the distance *r*, whose origin is located at the centre of the sphere. The longitudinal relaxation time constants at the surface and centre of the sphere were set to  $T_1(r_{max}) = T_1^{surface}$  and  $T_1(0) = T_1^{core}$  respectively, where  $r_{max}$  is the radius of the sphere, and the variation of  $T_1(r)$  at intermediate radii was modelled using the  $1/(r - r_{max})^6$  distance dependence of the PRE. We expect that there is a thin surface layer of domain A, of a thickness  $\delta r$ , which cannot be observed using conventional NMR pulse sequences and so occupies a so-called 'blind zone'. In this study  $\delta r$  was assumed to be 2 Å [470]. With this condition we can write down an expression for the longitudinal relaxation time constant at arbitrary radius inside the domain as

$$\frac{1}{T_1(r)} = \left(\frac{1}{T_1^{\text{core}}} + \frac{1}{T_1^{\text{surface}}}\right) \left(\frac{\delta r}{r - r_{\text{max}} - \delta r}\right)^6.$$
(13.27)

Finally the solution to the diffusion equation requires two boundary conditions, which were set to

$$I_z(r,0) = 0, \qquad \frac{\partial I_z(r_{\max},t)}{\partial t} = 0, \qquad (13.28)$$

which are interpreted as follows. The first boundary condition indicates that the polarization at time t = 0 is zero throughout the entire domain following saturation. The second condition indicates

that the rate of change of the polarization at the domain surface is zero, so that no polarization leaves the domain.

# 13.14.3. Measurement of domain sizes in ethyl cellulose/hydroxypropyl cellulose film coatings in pharmaceutical controlled-release formulations

The R-PRE method was applied to a polymer mixture of EC/HPC in a film, which is used as a pharmaceutical controlled-release formulation [470]. The doping procedure is illustrated in Fig. 13.57 (right panel). The paramagnetic molecule that was chosen is the organic biradical AMUPol, the structure of which is also shown in Fig. 13.57. This organic molecule contains two NO<sup>•</sup> radical functional groups, which have comparatively long electronic relaxation times [167], and therefore are suitable for inducing large direct PREs. Two aqueous solutions of the biradical were prepared with concentrations of 15 mM and 30 mM, which were used to impregnate the water-soluble HPC domain (B). The method was then used to determine the sizes of the EC domains (A).

The  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{13}\text{C}$  CP spectrum of a doped sample acquired at 8 kHz MAS is shown in Fig. 13.58. The spectrum exhibits a well-resolved methyl peak at 15 ppm from the EC domain, which was used to monitor the relaxation behaviour in this domain. Also shown in the spectrum is the expected position of the corresponding resonance in the doped HPC domain. The peak is absent due to the fast relaxation due to the direct PRE induced throughout this domain.

The longitudinal relaxation of the methyl <sup>13</sup>C in the EC domain was monitored by applying a saturation-recovery sequence following the <sup>1</sup>H-<sup>13</sup>C CP transfer. The recovery curves were measured for the undoped sample, and samples where the HPC domain was doped with the two radical solutions of 15 mN and 30 mM, and are shown in Fig. 13.59(a). The R-PRE enhancement curves for the two concentrations were also calculated, and are shown in Fig. 13.59 (b). The spin-diffusion equation was solved for the two radical concentrations using a diffusion coefficient of 0.8 nm<sup>2</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>, values of  $T_1^{\text{surface}}$  that were measured to be 19 ms and 13 ms for the concentrations of 15 mM and 30 mM respectively, and a value of  $T_1^{\text{core}}$  that was extracted from the saturation-recovery curve of the undoped sample. This left  $r_{\text{max}}$  as the only variable parameter in the diffusion equation to be fitted. Following the fitting procedure the EC domain sizes  $d_{\rm EC}$  was found to be  $90 \pm 10$  nm and  $70 \pm 10$  nm when calculated from the data of the samples doped at concentrations of 15 mM and 30 mM respectively [470]. Furthermore, using the EC/HPC volume ratio of 70/30 in these films and assuming spherical HPC domains allowed the determination of the HPC domain sizes  $d_{\text{HPC}}$  of 182  $\pm$  10 nm and 142  $\pm$  10 nm respectively.

In summary this technique represents a powerful method for measuring domain sizes of multi-component materials *in situ*. Although a simple spherical model for the EC domains sizes was used in this study, the method can easily be extended to more sophisticated models for the shape. Therefore this approach is expected to be widely applicable to other multi-component systems.

#### 13.15. Key concepts

- Paramagnetic NMR is widely applicable to systems in solution or the solid state, including small molecules, proteins, and solid materials.
- Both the paramagnetic centre and the system in which is it located profoundly change the paramagnetic effects that are measured, including the shifts, shift anisotropies, paramagnetic relaxation enhancements, and inhomogeous broadening.
- Contact shifts provide short-range structural information about the system close to a paramagnetic centre.



**Fig. 13.58.** <sup>1</sup>H–<sup>13</sup>C solid-state CP MAS NMR spectrum of the composite EC/HPC cellulose film coatings, where the HPC domain is impregnated with a 30 mM aqueous solution of AMUPol. The spectrum was acquired at 11.74 T and 8 kHz MAS. The methyl resonance at 15 ppm is from the EC domain, and was used to measure the relaxation rates in this domain. The dashed line labelled HPC marks the expected position of the corresponding HPC resonance. Here it is not observable due to the large PRE from the paramagnetic dopant. Reproduced with permission from [470]. Copyright (2015) American Chemical Society.

- Pseudo-contact shifts and dipolar-based paramagnetic relaxation enhancements provide long-range structural information.
- The shift anisotropy generally contains long-range information from the spin-dipolar interaction, and short-range information from the contact interaction.
- In small molecules both non-relativistic and spin-orbit coupling effects can be important contributions to the paramagnetic shifts, resulting in both contact and pseudo-contact contributions.
- In proteins contact shifts are important for nuclei separated from the paramagnetic centre by only a few bonds. For resonances located outside the 'blind sphere' the shifts are dominated by pseudo-contact shifts.
- In solid materials, such as battery electrodes, the contact interaction provides information about the bonding and electron transfer between the paramagnetic centre and the observed nucleus. The shift anisotropies are dominated by the spindipolar interaction, but may also have an important part due to the contact interaction.
- The paramagnetic relaxation enhancement extends over a range of the order of 10–20 Å, but when combined with spin diffusion can be used to probe length scales of the order nm–µm in multicomponent materials.

# Chapter 14: Concluding remarks and the future of paramagnetic NMR

To conclude this review we summarize the current state of the art in the theory and practice of paramagnetic NMR spectroscopy, as described in the earlier chapters, and outline some of the ongoing research in these areas. In recent years the amount of activity in development of theory and methods in the field of paramagnetic NMR spectroscopy has increased considerably, as has the complexity of the systems under study. The field is poised for some very exciting developments in the future, in the development of both the theory and methods, and in extending the fields of application. Improved understanding of the spin physics of these systems will also be important as the applications of dynamic nuclear polarization to an increasingly large range of systems grow, exploiting both organic and inorganic radicals.

Solution NMR studies have been conducted for several years, both on small molecules and large paramagnetic proteins. Whilst theoretical formalisms for the paramagnetic shielding tensor have also been known for many years, it has not been until relatively



**Fig. 13.59.** The build-up and relaxation enhancement factor curves due to the longitudinal R-PRE in the EC domain of the composite EC/HPC cellulose film coating following a saturation–recovery sequence. The curves in (a) show the build-up of the signal  $S(\tau)$  as a function of the recovery delay  $\tau$  of the sequence. The curves are measured from the integral of the EC methyl peak at 15 ppm in the spectrum in Fig. 13.58. Three recovery curves are shown that were measured without paramagnetic doping  $S_{core}(t)$  (grey), and following impregnation with 15 mM AMUPol (blue) and 30 mM AMUPol (black). In (b) are shown the relaxation enhancement curves  $\varepsilon(\tau) = S_{doped}(\tau)/S_{core}(\tau)$ . The dashed lines indicate the margin of error. Adapted with permission from [470]. Copyright (2015) American Chemical Society.

recently that completely general formalisms have been developed, such as those by Pennanen and Vaara, and van den Heuvel and Soncini (see Chapters 3–6). These models have, in turn, opened the door to calculations of paramagnetic shielding tensors due to first-row *d*-block metal-ions from first principles using quantum chemistry and DFT, which incorporate SO coupling effects on the hyperfine, *g*-, and ZFS tensors. In addition the PREs due to these

metal ions can be interpreted under different experimental conditions and motional dynamics. These models have increased in sophistication from incorporating only a phenomenological treatment of electronic relaxation (Chapter 8) to explicit treatments (Chapter 9).

Studies of paramagnetic proteins in solution have reached a high level of sophistication in terms of both the methods used, and the interpretation and use of the paramagnetic effects to obtain structural information. In the latter case it has been demonstrated that PCSs, PREs, RDCs, and CCRs can all be used to supplement other distance restraints in order to obtain increasingly accurate and precise structures (Chapters 12 and 13).

In the field of solid-state NMR recent progress has been substantial. The systems being studied today cover a diverse range of fields including battery materials, surface catalysts, inorganic phosphors, pharmaceutical systems, and metalloproteins (Chapter 13). The ability to study systems of increasing complexity, including compositional disorder, has been enabled by the current drive in developing new solid-state NMR methods to achieve broadband excitation and separation of the different available NMR parameters (Chapters 11 and 12). The theory of the paramagnetic shielding tensor for first-row d-block metal-ions in the solid state has evolved in parallel to that in solution (Chapter 7). Initially these methods included the effects of SO coupling and magnetic ordering in an empirical way, but more recently these properties have also been calculated from first principles. For example, the data obtained from ab initio calculations, which generate 0 K hyperfine (Fermi contact and spin dipolar) information, can be used to predict room-temperature properties via a variety of methods, from the use of calculated spin-only magnetic susceptibilities or the direct use of experimental data such as magnetic susceptibility curves, to direct calculations of magnetic couplings and their use in mean field (Ising) models or Monte Carlo simulations [543], the latter proving extremely useful in disordered systems. Although by no means routine, it is now relatively straightforward to rationalize the spectra of paramagnetic materials, starting by using the often intuitive Goodenough-Kanamori rules to predict the size of the Fermi contact shifts from the nature of the overlap between metal and ligand orbitals. The shifts of the individual M—L—N sites (M = paramagnetic metal, L = ligand, N = nucleus under observation) can then be readily calculated from first principles calculations. Here, the use of a clever "flipping" method allows the contributions from different metals (and pathways) to be easily separated [55]. Although the calculations are not exact, with errors coming from the choice of functionals used and the scaling factors employed to convert 0 K data into the paramagnetic regime, they provide considerable insight into the signs and magnitudes of the shifts. Given the inherent assumptions, further inclusion of additional terms (such as the pseudocontact shifts/spin-orbit couplings) are often not warranted, unless examining systems with very small Fermi-contact shifts. This can arise in cases where the paramagnetic ions are more than two bonds away from the NMR nucleus, in systems with competing and opposing Fermi contact shift contributions, or where the shifts are inherently small due to very weak and largely ionic bonds.

In comparison with solution NMR the PRE in the solid state is poorly understood, and this has hindered its use for extracting structural and dynamic information. Similarly, BMS effects in solid-state NMR spectra have been studied, but have yet to be routinely exploited, for example to obtain information on crystallite shape and packing (Chapter 10). They have been shown to play an extremely important role in determining the shifts of resonances in solid samples, particularly those with unusual geometries such as the planar geometries of pouch cell batteries [155]. However it remains a challenge to model the effects of magnetic inhomogeneities on, for example, sideband intensities in MAS NMR. Nonetheless, analysis of the intensities of the sideband manifolds provides a relatively straightforward way to extract structural information. Sometimes the information can be extremely simple to extract, for example, the sign of the asymmetry of the tensor being used to determine whether Li and Na ions are located within Li/Na or transition-metal layers of (Li/Na) MO<sub>2</sub> battery electrode materials [55,543].

The interpretation of the shifts due to lanthanides and actinides is less advanced, with the former generally relying on theories developed in the 1970s by Golding and Halton, and by Bleaney (Chapter 6). Because the ratio of the pseudo-contact to the Fermi-contact shift is generally larger than for transition metal ions, it is often more straightforward to use the PCS to extract structural information. Despite some recent progress in calculations of paramagnetic shifts of actinide complexes [213,92,93], actinide NMR is at a relatively early stage of development, with the experimental NMR being hampered by practical considerations (beyond those of the paramagnetism) associated with the radioactivity and toxicity of the metal ions.

The broad scope of the application of paramagnetic NMR to a number of systems in chemistry, materials science, and biology has been due to the advances in all these different areas of theory and application. In particular, developments in paramagnetic solid-state NMR have opened up the field to systems in chemistry and materials science where complex compositional disorder is a key component of the properties of many materials. Further developments in NMR methods, calculations of paramagnetic shift tensors and PREs, and their implementation in extracting structural and dynamic information will further increase the ability of NMR to study more complex systems in a wider range of disciplines.

#### Acknowledgements

We acknowledge Prof. Lyndon Emsley (Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne), Dr. Raphaële J. Clément (University of California, Berkeley), Dr. Ieuan D. Seymour, Ms. Roberta Pigliapochi, Dr. David M. Halat, Mr. Jeongjae Lee (University of Cambridge), Dr. Ladislav Benda, Mr. Kevin J. Sanders, Mr. Andrea Bertarello (Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon), Dr. Judith Schlagnitweit (Karolinska Institutet), Prof. Ivano Bertini, Prof. Claudio Luchinat, Dr. Giacomo Parigi (University of Florence), Prof. Martin Kaupp, Mr. Arobendo Mondal (Technische Universität Berlin), Prof. Juha Vaara, Dr. Jiri Mares (University of Oulu), Prof. Philip J. Grandinetti (Ohio State University), Prof. Jozef Kowalewski (Stockholm University), Dr. Gwendal Kervern (University of Nancy), Prof. Gottfried Otting (Australian National University), Prof. Lorenzo Di Bari (University of Pisa), Prof. Marcellus Ubbink (University of Leiden), and Prof. Bradley F. Chmelka (University of California, Santa Barbara) for many useful discussions about various aspects of the theory and practice of paramagnetic NMR.

This work was supported by the People Programme (Marie Curie Actions Initial Training Networks (ITN)) of the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme FP7/2007–2013/ under REA grant agreement No. 317127, the "pNMR" project. AJP received funding from the Swedish Research Council (2016-03441), and GP received funding from the European Research Council (ERC-2015-CoG GA no. 648974).

### Appendix A. The Wigner-Eckart theorem

The appendices in this review make extensive use of the evaluation of the matrix elements of spin operators in manifolds of particular spin states. This evaluation is greatly facilitated by use of the Wigner–Eckart theorem, which gives an expression for the matrix element of the irreducible spherical tensor operator of rank k and order q,  $\hat{T}_{kq}$ , that connects the states  $|J'M'\rangle$  and  $|JM\rangle$ , where J and J' are the (spin, orbital, or total) angular momentum quantum numbers, and M and M' are the corresponding azimuthal quantum numbers. The version of the theorem used here employs the convention of Brink and Satchler [191], but not, for example, that of Edmonds [227]. The expression can be given either in terms of the Clebsch–Gordan coefficient  $\langle JM | J' kM' q \rangle$  or the Wigner 3j symbol as:

$$\langle JM|\widehat{T}_{kq}|J'M'\rangle = (-1)^{2k} \langle J||\widehat{T}_{k}||J'\rangle \langle JM|J'kM'q\rangle$$
(A.1)

$$= (-1)^{J'+k+M} \langle J \| \widehat{T}_k \| J' \rangle \sqrt{2J+1} \begin{pmatrix} J & J' & k \\ -M & M' & q \end{pmatrix}.$$
(A.2)

The theorem effectively separates the matrix elements into a part that is orientation-independent, and contains all the physics of the situation, and a second part that contains all the information pertaining to the orientation of the system. On the first line the Wigner-Eckart theorem is quoted in terms of the Clebsch-Gordan coefficient  $\langle JM|J'kM'q\rangle$ . The quantity  $\langle J||\hat{T}_k||J'\rangle$  is a reduced matrix element of the rank-*k* tensor  $\hat{T}_k$ , which depends only on the rank k, and the quantum numbers J and J' that define the sizes of the angular momenta of the states. It therefore contains all the information about the system independent of orientation. The orientation dependence of the total matrix elements  $\langle JM | \hat{T}_{ka} | J'M' \rangle$  depends on the magnetic quantum numbers M and M', and the order of the tensor q, which information is contained entirely in the Clebsch-Gordan coefficient. On the second line is given the same expression in terms of the Wigner 3*j* symbol, which is the quantity in parentheses. The second expression is equivalent to the first, with the orientation dependence now being encoded in the 3*j* symbol.

#### A.1. The projection theorem

A special case of the Wigner–Eckart theorem is the projection theorem for vector operators, which pertains to the matrix elements of irreducible spherical tensor operators of rank one that are evaluated between states with the same value of *J*. For a vector operator  $\hat{V}$  the projection theorem is [191]

$$\langle JM|\hat{\boldsymbol{V}}|JM'\rangle = \frac{1}{J(J+1)} \langle JM|\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{V}})|JM'\rangle$$
(A.3)

$$= a_J(\hat{\boldsymbol{V}}) \langle JM | \hat{\boldsymbol{J}} | JM' \rangle, \tag{A.4}$$

where  $a_j(\hat{V})$  is a scalar coefficient that depends on the reduced matrix element of  $\hat{V}$ :

$$a_J(\hat{\mathbf{V}}) = \frac{\langle J \| \hat{\mathbf{V}} \| J \rangle}{\sqrt{J(J+1)}}.$$
(A.5)

This theorem can be interpreted as follows using a classical vector model. We note that the classical equivalent of the operator in Eq. (A.3),  $J(J \cdot V)/(J(J + 1))$ , is simply the projection of V along the unit vector  $J/\sqrt{J(J + 1)}$ . According to the vector model V is precessing about J, with the result that the component of V that is perpendicular to J averages to zero, leaving only the component that is parallel to J. In the quantum mechanical picture the vector operator  $\hat{V}$  evolves under the action of a Hamiltonian defined by  $\hat{J}$ . The parts of the matrix elements originating from  $\hat{V}$  that do not commute with  $\hat{J}$  then average to zero.

# A.1.1. Magnetic moments due to ions subject to Russell–Saunders spin–orbit coupling

The projection theorem for vector operators is important when considering the electronic magnetic moment and the corresponding Zeeman interaction of electronic spins subject to SO coupling. In the case where both S and L are non zero, the properties of the electrons are defined by the total angular momentum J, which is given by the following expression in the Russell–Saunders coupling scheme:

$$\boldsymbol{J} = \boldsymbol{L} + \boldsymbol{S}. \tag{A.6}$$

The total magnetic moment  $\mu_j$  is the sum of the electronic orbital and spin magnetic moments  $\mu_l$  and  $\mu_s$ :

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{J} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{L} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{S} \tag{A.7}$$

$$= -\mu_{\mathsf{B}}(\boldsymbol{L} + \boldsymbol{g}_{e}\boldsymbol{S}). \tag{A.8}$$

Clearly **J** and  $\mu_j$  are not collinear. However we can apply the projection theorem to the vector operators corresponding to the total angular momentum and magnetic moment,  $\hat{J}$  and  $\hat{\mu}_j$ , which relates the matrix elements of the two as follows:

$$\langle JM|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{J}|JM'\rangle = -\mu_{\rm B}g_{J}\langle JM|\boldsymbol{J}|JM'\rangle,\tag{A.9}$$

where  $g_J$  is the Landé *g*-factor. It is for this reason that the magnetic moment operator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{m}}$ , as defined by van den Heuvel and Soncini via the expression  $-\boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{m}}$ , is taken to be  $\hat{\boldsymbol{m}} = -\mu_{\rm B}g_J\hat{\boldsymbol{J}}$ , and the electronic Zeeman Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H}_Z = \mu_{\rm B} g_I \boldsymbol{B}_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{\tilde{J}}. \tag{A.10}$$

# Appendix B. Relativistic corrections to the hyperfine coupling tensor

In this appendix we give expressions for the NR and SO contributions to the hyperfine coupling tensor that may be used in quantum-chemical and DFT calculations. The treatment here follows that of Arbuznikov et al., who adopt the SI convention for atomic units, and extends the presentation of the hyperfine tensor in Section 4.1 [211].

#### B.1. The vector potential

In atomic units, the vector potential  $\mathbb{A}^{(A)}(\mathbf{r}_i)$  describing the interaction between a point-like nucleus *A* at position  $\mathbf{R}_A$  and an electron *i* at position  $\mathbf{r}_i$  is given by:

$$\mathbb{A}^{(A)}(\mathbf{r}_i) = \alpha^2 \gamma_I^{(A)} \frac{\hat{I}^{(A)} \times \mathbf{r}_{iA}}{r_{iA}^3}, \tag{B.1}$$

where  $\hat{I}^{(A)}$  and  $\gamma_i^{(A)}$  are the nuclear spin operator and gyromagnetic ratio of nucleus *A*, and  $\boldsymbol{r}_{iA} = \boldsymbol{r}_i - \boldsymbol{R}_A$  is the position of the electron *i* relative to the nucleus.

#### B.2. The non-relativistic hyperfine interaction

The lowest-order contributions to the hyperfine interaction Hamiltonian are the Fermi-contact and spin-dipolar terms, which were discussed in Section 2.8, and are of order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$  in the fine-structure constant. The corresponding hyperfine interaction Hamiltonians  $\hat{H}_{FC}^{(A)}$  and  $\hat{H}_{SD}^{(A)}$  describing the coupling between nucleus *A* and all the electrons *i* have the following expressions in atomic units:

$$\widehat{H}_{FC}^{(A)} = \frac{4\pi}{3} \alpha^2 g_e \gamma_I^{(A)} \sum_i \delta(\mathbf{r}_{iA}) \hat{\mathbf{s}}_i \cdot \hat{\mathbf{I}}^{(A)}, \tag{B.2}$$

$$\widehat{H}_{\text{SD}}^{(A)} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 g_e \gamma_l^{(A)} \sum_i \hat{\boldsymbol{s}}_i \cdot \frac{3 \boldsymbol{r}_{iA} \boldsymbol{r}_{iA} - r_{iA}^2 \boldsymbol{1}}{r_{iA}^5} \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{f}}^{(A)}.$$
(B.3)

If we expand the total electronic wavefunction as a superposition of molecular orbitals and the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  spin functions:  $|\epsilon\rangle$ 

$$|\psi(\mathbf{r})\rangle = \sum_{\epsilon} c_{\epsilon}^{\alpha} |\epsilon\rangle |\alpha\rangle + c_{\epsilon}^{\beta} |\epsilon\rangle |\beta\rangle, \qquad (B.4)$$

where  $c_{\epsilon}^{\alpha}$  and  $c_{\epsilon}^{\beta}$  are the coefficients giving the  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  spin in each orbital, we obtain the following expressions for the Fermi-contact coupling constant  $A^{FC}$  and spin-dipolar coupling tensor  $A_{uv}^{SD}$ :

$$A^{\rm FC} = \frac{4\pi}{3} \alpha^2 g_e \gamma_I^{(A)} \frac{1}{2S} \sum_{\epsilon,\tau} P_{\epsilon\tau}^{\alpha-\beta} \langle \epsilon | \delta(\mathbf{r}_A) | \tau \rangle, \tag{B.5}$$

$$A_{uv}^{\rm SD} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 g_e \gamma_I^{(A)} \frac{1}{2S} \sum_{\epsilon,\tau} P_{\epsilon\tau}^{\alpha-\beta} \left\langle \epsilon \left| \frac{3r_{A,u} r_{A,v} - r_A^2 \delta_{uv}}{r_A^5} \prime \right| \tau \right\rangle. \tag{B.6}$$

Here  $P_{\epsilon\tau}^{\alpha-\beta} = \overline{c_{\epsilon}}^{\alpha} c_{\tau}^{\alpha} - \overline{c_{\epsilon}}^{\beta} c_{\tau}^{\beta}$  is the spin density matrix.

### B.3. The spin-orbit-coupling correction to the hyperfine interaction

We consider second-order perturbation corrections to the hyperfine interaction from the one- and two-electron SO interactions with Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{SO}$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{SO} = \frac{1}{4} \alpha^2 g_e \left[ \sum_{B} Z_B \sum_{i} \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{l}}_{iB}}{r_{iB}^3} - \sum_{i,j}^{\prime} \frac{(\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_i + 2\widehat{\mathbf{s}}_j) \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{l}}_{ij}}{r_{ij}^3} \right].$$
(B.7)

The first term represents the one-electron interaction, and comprises a sum over all nuclei *B*, which have charges  $Z_B$ , and electrons *i*. The second term represents the two-electron SO interaction, and comprises a sum over pairs of electrons *i* and *j*, and contains both the spin-same-orbit and spin-other-orbit parts. The two operators  $\hat{\mathbf{l}}_{iB}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{l}}_{ij}$  are the orbital angular momentum operators of electron *i* with respect to the positions of the nucleus *B* and a second electron *j* respectively. They take the forms:

$$\hat{\mathbf{l}}_{iB} = (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{R}_B) \times \left( -i\hat{\mathbf{V}}_i + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}_i) \right), \tag{B.8}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{l}}_{ij} = (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) \times \left( -i\hat{\mathbf{V}}_i + \mathbf{\mathbb{A}}(\mathbf{r}_i) \right), \tag{B.9}$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_i$  is the gradient operator for electron *i*.

The field-independent parts of the one- and two-electron orbital angular momentum operators depend on  $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_i$ . These terms combine with the Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_{PSO}^{(A)}$  representing the paramagnetic spin-orbital interaction (PSO) of nucleus *A* 

$$\widehat{H}_{\rm PSO}^{(A)} = \alpha^2 \gamma_I^{(A)} \sum_i \frac{\boldsymbol{l}_{iA}}{r_{iA}^3} \cdot \widehat{\boldsymbol{I}}^{(A)}, \tag{B.10}$$

to give the following one-electron  $A_{uv}^{\text{SO-I}(1)}$  and two-electron contributions  $A_{uv}^{\text{SO-I}(2)}$  to the hyperfine tensor:

$$A_{uv}^{\text{SO-I}(1)} + A_{uv}^{\text{SO-I}(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \alpha^4 g_e \gamma_l^{(A)} \frac{1}{2S} \left[ \sum_{k}^{\text{occ}(\alpha)} \sum_{a}^{\text{virt}(\alpha)} \frac{\langle k\alpha | \hat{h}_u^{SO} | a\alpha \rangle \langle a\alpha | \hat{l}_{A,v} / r_A^3 | k\alpha \rangle}{E_{k\alpha} - E_{a\alpha} - \Delta E_{k \to a}^{\text{xc}}} - \sum_{k}^{\text{occ}(\beta)} \sum_{a}^{\text{virt}(\beta)} \frac{\langle k\beta | \hat{h}_u^{SO} | a\beta \rangle \langle a\beta | \hat{l}_{A,v} / r_A^3 | k\beta \rangle}{E_{k\beta} - E_{a\beta} - \Delta E_{k \to a}^{\text{xc}}} \right].$$
(B.11)

Here the sums are over the occupied orbitals k, which are denoted  $|k\alpha\rangle$  and  $|k\beta\rangle$  for  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  electrons, and over the virtual orbitals a, denoted  $|a\alpha\rangle$  and  $|a\beta\rangle$ . These orbitals have energies  $E_{k\alpha}$ ,  $E_{k\beta}$ ,  $E_{a\alpha}$ , and  $E_{a\beta}$  respectively. The energy terms  $\Delta E_{k\to a}^{xc}$  are the Malkin correc-

tion factors, which are used as semi-empirical scalings of the energy denominators when performing DFT [544]. The operator  $\hat{h}_u^{SO}$  denotes the spatial part of the SO coupling Hamiltonian in Eq. (B.7). We note that both the SO-I contributions to the hyperfine tensor are of order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^4)$ , as expected, and that both have spherical rank contributions of 0, 1, and 2.

The contributions of the magnetic field to the orbital angular momenta are given by the terms containing the vector potential. These give one- and two-electron corrections to the hyperfine Hamiltonian, which are collected together in  $\hat{H}_{SO}^{(A)}$ :

$$\widehat{H}_{SO}^{(A)} = \frac{1}{4} \alpha^2 g_e \left[ \sum_{B} Z_B \sum_{i} \widehat{s}_i \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{r}_{iA} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{iB})\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{r}_{iA}\mathbf{r}_{iB}}{r_{iA}^3 r_{iB}^3} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{I}}^{(A)} - \sum_{ij}' (\widehat{s}_i + 2\widehat{s}_j) \cdot \frac{(\mathbf{r}_{iA} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij})\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{r}_{iA}\mathbf{r}_{ij}}{r_{iA}^3 r_{ij}^3} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{I}}^{(A)} \right]$$
(B.12)

In the second-order perturbation expansion Eq. (B.12) gives a oneelectron contribution  $A_{uv}^{\text{SO-II}(1)}$  and a two-electron part  $A_{uv}^{\text{SO-II}(2)}$ . The former is given by

$$A_{uv}^{\text{SO-II}(1)} = \frac{1}{4} \alpha^4 g_e \gamma_I^{(A)} \frac{1}{2S} \sum_{\epsilon, \tau} P_{\epsilon\tau}^{\alpha-\beta} \left\langle \epsilon | \sum_B Z_B \frac{\delta_{uv}(\mathbf{r}_A \cdot \mathbf{r}_B) - r_{A,u} r_{B,v}}{r_A^3 r_B^3} | \tau \right\rangle,$$
(B.13)

and the latter is expected to be negligible within the validity of perturbation theory. We note that the SO-II contribution is of order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^4)$ , and has parts of spherical rank 0, 1, and 2.

The total SO coupling correction to the hyperfine coupling tensor is therefore the sum of the SO-I and SO-II parts:

$$\boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SO}} = \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SO-I}(1)} + \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SO-I}(2)} + \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SO-II}(1)}, \tag{B.14}$$

which we normally formulate in the following way to aid comparison with experiment:

$$A^{\rm SO} = A^{\rm FC,2} \mathbf{1} + A^{\rm SD,2} + A^{\rm as}.$$
(B.15)

# Appendix C. The Pennanen–Vaara formalism for the paramagnetic shift

We now describe the Pennanen-Vaara theory for the paramagnetic chemical shift [40], which is an important recent contribution to the description of the chemical shifts of systems with SO coupling and an arbitrary electronic spin multiplicity 2S + 1, that can be readily applied to ab initio calculations. The initial part of the derivation gives an exact expression for the chemical shielding, is valid for an arbitrary electronic spin S under high-temperature conditions, and makes no assumptions about the relative orientations of the tensors in the EPR Hamiltonian. Following this derivation, a number of assumptions are applied in order to make further progress. These assumptions are (i) that the effective electronic spin S is equal to the real spin of the ion, (ii) that the SO coupling is weak in comparison to the ligand-field interaction, (iii) that the spin system can be described by the EPR Hamiltonian in Eq. (4.36), and (iv) that we need only consider contributions from the ground state spin manifold, i.e. there are no thermally-accessible excited states. Assumption (iii) effectively means that the final expression is only exact for electronic spins up to S = 1 and is only an approximation for larger spins, and all four assumptions limit the theory to 3d metal ions. Nevertheless the theory has been applied successfully to 3*d* complexes with S > 1 [545].

We start by noting that we can model the spin system as a cloud of electrons which establish a thermal equilibrium over their states according to the Boltzmann distribution. The energies of these states are modified by the presence of the external perturbations of the nuclear magnetic moment and the applied magnetic field, and so we can write the energy of state  $|n\rangle E_n$  as a Taylor series in the components of  $\hat{I}$  and  $B_0$ :

$$E_{n} = E_{n}^{(0,0)} + \sum_{\alpha} E_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} + \sum_{\kappa} E_{n}^{(0,\kappa)} \widehat{I}_{\kappa} + \sum_{\alpha,\kappa} E_{n}^{(\alpha,\kappa)} B_{0,\alpha} \widehat{I}_{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} E_{n}^{(\alpha\beta,0)} B_{0,\alpha} B_{0,\beta} + \cdots$$
(C.1)

In Eq. (C.1)  $E_n^{(0,0)}$  is the part of the energy that is independent of **B**<sub>0</sub> and  $\hat{I}$ , and the coefficients  $E_n^{(\alpha\beta,\dots,\kappa\lambda,\dots)}$  are given by

$$E_{n}^{(\alpha\beta\ldots,\kappa\lambda\ldots)} = \left(\frac{\partial^{N}E_{n}}{\partial B_{0,\alpha}\partial B_{0,\beta}\ldots\partial\hat{I}_{\kappa}\partial\hat{I}_{\lambda}\ldots}\right)_{B_{0}=\mathbf{0},\hat{I}=\mathbf{0}},\tag{C.2}$$

where *N* is the total number of times that  $E_n$  is differentiated. Therefore the coefficients are calculated by differentiating  $E_n$  a certain number of times with respect to the components of the magnetic field and nuclear spin, and then setting those quantities equal to zero. The significance of the terms in the Taylor series can be appreciated by referring to the EPR Hamiltonian. For example the contribution  $E_n^{(0,0)}$  can be related directly to the ZFS interaction, which is independent of both **B**<sub>0</sub> and **Î**. The term  $\sum_{\alpha} E_n^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha}$  represents the energy contribution from the electronic Zeeman interaction as both elements are proportional to the components of the field and are independent of the nuclear spin. In addition the terms  $\sum_{\kappa} E_n^{(0,\kappa)} \hat{I}_{\kappa}$ and  $\sum_{\alpha,\kappa} E_n^{(\alpha,\kappa)} B_{0,\alpha} \hat{I}_{\kappa}$  originate from the hyperfine interaction, and the nuclear Zeeman and chemical shielding interactions respectively.

As we have already discussed, the electron relaxation in an open-shell (i.e. paramagnetic) system occurs on a timescale that is several orders of magnitude shorter than nuclear relaxation, and so at all relevant times the electron cloud is at thermal equilibrium, and the system is described by a Boltzmann distribution over the energy levels. Using this idea Moon and Patchkovskii stated that the chemical shielding can be determined from the part of the Boltzmann average of the energy that is linear in the applied field and the nuclear spin:

$$\hbar\gamma \sum_{ij} B_{0,i} \sigma_{ij} \widehat{I}_j = \frac{\sum_n E_n \exp(-\beta W_n)}{\sum_n \exp(-\beta W_n)},$$
(C.3)

where  $\beta = 1/kT$ . Note that we distinguish between the energies that are averaged in the distribution  $E_n$ , and the energies that are used to compute the Boltzmann factors  $W_n$ . This is because the transitions that establish the thermal equilibrium of the electron cloud occur on a shorter timescale than those from which we acquire the NMR spectrum, and consequently we may omit all the terms from  $W_n$  that have a dependence on  $\hat{I}$ . We can therefore write  $W_n$  as a Taylor series in  $B_0$  only:

$$W_{n} = W_{n}^{(0,0)} + \sum_{\alpha} W_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} W_{n}^{(\alpha\beta,0)} B_{0,\alpha} B_{0,\beta} + \cdots,$$
(C.4)

i.e.  $W_n^{(\alpha,..,\kappa,..)} = 0$  for  $\kappa \neq 0$ . Because the ZFS is the largest term in the EPR Hamiltonian, by far the largest term in the expansion of  $W_n$  is  $W_n^{(0,0)}$ , and so we can write the exponential Boltzmann factors as

$$\exp(-\beta W_n) \approx \exp(-\beta W_n^{(0,0)}) \\ \times \left\{ 1 - \beta \left[ \sum_{\alpha} W_n^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} W_n^{(\alpha\beta,0)} B_{0,\alpha} B_{0,\beta} + \ldots \right] \right. \\ \left. + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \left[ \sum_{\alpha} W_n^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} + \ldots \right]^2 + \ldots \right\}.$$
(C.5)

Substituting the expansions for  $E_n$  and  $\exp(-\beta W_n)$  into Eq. (C.3) and multiplying both sides by the denominator we obtain the following unwieldy expression:

$$\begin{split} &\eta \gamma \sum_{ij} B_{0,i} \sigma_{ij} \widehat{I}_{j} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta W_{n}^{(0,0)}) \\ &\times \left\{ 1 - \beta \left[ \sum_{\alpha} W_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} W_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} B_{0,\beta} + \ldots \right] \\ &+ \frac{\beta^{2}}{2} \left[ \sum_{\alpha} W_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} + \ldots \right]^{2} + \ldots \right\} \\ &= \sum_{n} \left\{ E_{n}^{(0,0)} + \sum_{\alpha} E_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} + \sum_{\kappa} E_{n}^{(0,\kappa)} \widehat{I}_{\kappa} + \sum_{\alpha,\kappa} E_{n}^{(\alpha,\kappa)} B_{0,\alpha} \widehat{I}_{\kappa} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} E_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} B_{0,\beta} + \ldots \right\} \times \exp(-\beta W_{n}^{(0,0)}) \\ &\times \left\{ 1 - \beta \left[ \sum_{\alpha} W_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} W_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} B_{0,\beta} + \ldots \right] \\ &+ \frac{\beta^{2}}{2} \left[ \sum_{\alpha} W_{n}^{(\alpha,0)} B_{0,\alpha} + \cdots \right]^{2} + \cdots \right\}. \end{split}$$
(C.6)

We obtain the expression for the chemical shielding by collecting terms of the same order in  $B_{0,i}$  and  $\hat{l}_{j}$ . This gives

$$\sigma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\hbar\gamma} \frac{1}{Q_0} \sum_{n} \exp(-\beta W_n^{(0,0)}) \left\{ E_n^{(i,j)} - \beta W_n^{(i,0)} E_n^{(0,j)} \right\}$$
(C.7)

$$= \frac{1}{\hbar\gamma} \Big\{ \langle \widehat{E}^{(ij)} \rangle_0 - \beta \langle \widehat{W}^{(i,0)} \widehat{E}^{(0,j)} \rangle_0 \Big\}, \tag{C.8}$$

where  $Q_0$  is the partition function at zero field and nuclear magnetic moment,

$$Q_0 = \sum_n \exp\left(-\beta W_n^{(0,0)}\right),\tag{C.9}$$

 $\widehat{E}$  and  $\widehat{W}$  represent the Hamiltonians including and excluding terms depending on the nuclear magnetic moment respectively, and the notation  $\langle \widehat{U} \rangle_0$  refers to a Boltzmann average of the expectation value of the operator  $\widehat{U}$  carried out at zero field and nuclear magnetic moment:

$$\langle \widehat{U} \rangle_{0} = \frac{\text{Tr}\left[\exp\left(-\beta \widehat{W}^{(0,0)}\right) \widehat{U}\right]}{Q_{0}}.$$
(C.10)

So far this expression is exact, but unhelpful. In order to gain more insight into the factors affecting the chemical shielding we must now implement the approximations (i)–(iv) above. The discrimination between  $\hat{E}$  and  $\hat{W}$  is no longer needed, having served its purpose, and we can associate both with the EPR Hamiltonian in Eq. (4.36). The derivatives are given by

$$\widehat{E}^{(i,j)} = -\hbar\gamma \left(\delta_{ij} - \sigma_{ij}^{\text{orb}}\right)\widehat{1},\tag{C.11}$$

$$\widehat{W}^{(i,0)} = \mu_{\rm B} \sum_{k} g_{ik} \widehat{S}_{k}, \tag{C.12}$$

$$\widehat{E}^{(0,j)} = \sum_{l} \widehat{S}_{l} A_{lj}. \tag{C.13}$$

Substituting these into the expression for  $\sigma_{ij}$  in Eq. (C.8) we obtain the Pennanen–Vaara formula for the chemical shielding:

$$\sigma_{ij} = \sigma_{ij}^{\text{orb}} - \frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{\hbar\gamma kT} \sum_{kl} g_{ik} \langle \hat{S}_k \hat{S}_l \rangle_0 A_{lj}, \qquad (C.14)$$

which can be written as

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\text{orb}} - \frac{\mu_{\text{B}}}{\hbar\gamma kT} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \langle \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{A}.$$
(C.15)

The chemical shielding is the sum of the temperature-independent orbital shielding and the temperature-dependent paramagnetic shielding, which is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathrm{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathrm{B}}}{\hbar\gamma kT} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \langle \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle_{0} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}. \tag{C.16}$$

Eq. (C.16) is the main result of the Pennanen–Vaara theory, in which the paramagnetic shielding tensor is the product of three matrices, namely the g-tensor, hyperfine tensor, and the dyadic  $\langle \hat{S}\hat{S} \rangle_0$ . The information from the g- and hyperfine tensors is encoded directly, in an analogous way to that for the shielding for spin-only systems we obtained in Chapter 3. This is because the g-tensor originates from the electronic Zeeman interaction, which is proportional to the applied field, and the hyperfine interaction is proportional to the nuclear spin. The ZFS tensor does not enter the expression directly, because it has no direct effect on the way the electron cloud is modified by the presence of the magnetic field or nuclear spins, but it is present indirectly in the Boltzmann average because it is responsible for the splittings of the energy levels at zero field and zero nuclear magnetic moment. The dyadic tensor  $\langle \hat{S}\hat{S} \rangle_0$  comprises both an isotropic part and a symmetric anisotropy, but no antisymmetric part. It is worth noting that the PAF of  $\langle \hat{S}\hat{S} \rangle_0$  coincides with the PAF of the ZFS tensor.

One consequence of the splitting of the electronic energy levels at zero field is to introduce a strong non-Curie temperature dependence in the shielding tensor. This is more easily appreciated by expanding the dyadic  $\langle \hat{S} \hat{S} \rangle_0$  as a Taylor series in  $\beta = 1/kT$ :

$$\begin{split} \langle \widehat{S}_{i} \widehat{S}_{j} \rangle_{0} &= \frac{1}{2S+1} \operatorname{Tr} \left[ \widehat{S}_{i} \widehat{S}_{j} \left( 1 - \beta \sum_{kl} \widehat{S}_{k} D_{kl} \widehat{S}_{l} \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\beta^{2}) \end{split} \tag{C.17} \\ &= \frac{1}{2S+1} \sum_{n} \langle n | \widehat{S}_{i} \widehat{S}_{j} | n \rangle \\ &- \frac{\beta}{2S+1} \sum_{kl} D_{kl} \sum_{n} \langle n | \widehat{S}_{i} \widehat{S}_{j} \widehat{S}_{k} \widehat{S}_{l} | n \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\beta^{2}). \end{split} \tag{C.18}$$

The first-order term is simply [184]

$$\frac{S(S+1)}{3}\delta_{ij},\tag{C.19}$$

which is the familiar factor we encountered for spin-only systems. The corresponding first-order term in the shielding tensor is therefore

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\mathsf{S}} = -\frac{\mu_{\mathsf{B}} \mathbf{S}(\mathsf{S}+1)}{3\hbar \gamma k T} \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}. \tag{C.20}$$

Incidentally this is an exact expression for the shielding with zero ZFS, as was originally derived by Moon and Patchkovskii [39]. Furthermore, if we set the *g*-tensor equal to  $g_e$ , we obtain the spin-only expression in Eq. (3.70). In the presence of the ZFS interaction the Boltzmann average at zero field and nuclear magnetic moment is computed with the states  $|n\rangle$  that are equal to the eigenstates of the ZFS Hamiltonian, which can be written as linear combinations of the eigenstates of the Zeeman Hamiltonian  $|SM_S\rangle$ :

$$|n\rangle = \sum_{M_s} c_{M_s} |SM_s\rangle. \tag{C.21}$$

The second-order term is the dyadic is more complex, but can be shown after some tedious algebra to yield

$$-\frac{\beta}{2S+1}\sum_{kl}D_{kl}\sum_{n}\langle n|\widehat{S}_{i}\widehat{S}_{j}\widehat{S}_{k}\widehat{S}_{l}|n\rangle = -\frac{\beta}{30}D_{ij}S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3).$$
(C.22)

Note that this term is equal to zero if S < 1, which is a condition for the absence of the ZFS interaction. The total paramagnetic shielding tensor up to second order in  $\beta$  is therefore

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{S} \approx -\frac{\mu_{\mathsf{B}}S(S+1)}{3\hbar\gamma kT}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{A} + \frac{\mu_{\mathsf{B}}S(S+1)(2S-1)(2S+3)}{30\hbar\gamma (kT)^{2}}\boldsymbol{g}\cdot\boldsymbol{D}\cdot\boldsymbol{A},$$
(C.23)

which is identical to the expression originally derived by Bleaney [62]. The deviation from the Curie behaviour can be clearly seen in the second term, which varies as  $1/T^2$  and is of opposite sign to the first-order term.

Finally we note that, although we could not in general apply the high-field approximation to the EPR Hamiltonian because the ZFS may be the dominant interaction, we can apply it more safely for typical 3*d* transition-metal complexes as the interaction due to the shielding tensor  $\sigma^{s}$  is dominated by the nuclear Zeeman interaction.

#### C.1. The terms in the paramagnetic shift tensor

We can break down the expression for the paramagnetic shielding tensor in Eq. (C.16) into a sum of individual cross terms by substituting in the expressions for the g-tensor in Eqs. 4.37, 4.38, and 4.39, and the hyperfine tensor in Eqs. 4.40, 4.41, and 4.42. The resulting terms are listed in Table C.1, up to fourth order in the fine-structure constant  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^4).$  Truncating at  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^4)$  means that we retain only the terms that contain at most one SO coupling term in the product  $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{A}$ . For example term 1  $g_e A^{FC}$  is the product of two NR parts of the g- and hyperfine tensors  $g_e$  and  $A^{FC}$  which are  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^0)$  and  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$  respectively, and so is  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$  overall, whereas term 3  $g_e A^{FC,2}$  is the product of the NR part of **g** with an SO part of **A**, and so is  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^4)$  overall. Terms containing the product of two SO terms, such as  $\Delta g \cdot A^{SD,2}$  are neglected. Also included in Table C.1 is an assignment of the nine paramagnetic terms according to the form of hyperfine interaction from which they originate, i.e. a contact (con), dipolar (dip), or antisymmetric (as) term.

### Appendix D. Derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor for arbitrary spin multiplicity to second order

This appendix details the calculation of the paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor up to second order in 1/(kT) in terms of the tensor parameters in the EPR Hamiltonian generalised for arbitrary spin multiplicity, starting from both the Pennanen–Vaara and van den Heuvel–Soncini formulae. The Pennanen–Vaara expression in terms of the electron magnetic moment  $\hat{m}$  and hyperfine field  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ operators can be expanded to second order to give:

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\rm S} = \frac{\beta}{\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}} \langle \hat{m}_i \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j \rangle_0 \tag{D.1}$$

$$=\frac{1}{\hbar\gamma_{l}}\left[\beta\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{S}(\hat{m}_{i}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j})}{2S+1}-\beta^{2}\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{S}(\hat{m}_{i}\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j}\hat{H}_{0})}{2S+1}\right]+\mathcal{O}(\beta^{3}).$$
 (D.2)

We denote the trace of a product operator over the entire direct product spin space as  $Tr_s$ , and the trace of a one-spin operator over the manifold of states pertaining to that spin simply as Tr. Substituting in the expressions for  $\hat{\boldsymbol{m}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{F}}}$ , and  $\hat{H}_0$  gives the following expression

$$\begin{split} \sigma_{ij}^{S} &= -\frac{\mu_{B}}{\hbar\gamma_{I}} \left[ \frac{\beta}{2S+1} \sum_{kk' qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{kq,i} A_{k'q',j} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left( \widehat{S}_{k-q} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \right) \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{\beta^{2}}{2S+1} \sum_{kk' k'' qq'q''} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g_{kq,i} A_{k'q',j} D_{k''q''} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} \left( \widehat{S}_{k-q} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \widehat{S}_{k''-q''} \right) \right] \\ &\left. + \mathcal{O}(\beta^{3}), \end{split}$$
(D.3)

#### Table C.1

List of the terms arising in the Pennanen–Vaara expression for the paramagnetic shielding. The terms are numbered 1–9, with their assigned terms ('orb' (orbital), 'con' (contact), 'dip' (dipolar), and 'as' (antisymmetric)) and the irreducible spherical tensor ranks with and without the ZFS. Adapted from Pennanen and Vaara [40].

Term	Туре	Order	Without ZFS		With ZFS		
			Expression	Spherical tensor rank	Expression	Spherical tensor rank	
0	orb	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$	$\sigma^{ m orb}$	0, 1, 2	$\sigma^{ m orb}$	0, 1, 2	
1	con		$g_e A^{FC}$	0	$g_e A^{FC} \langle \hat{S} \hat{S} \rangle_0$	0, 2	
2	dip		$g_e A^{SD}$	2	$g_e \langle \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0, 1, 2	
3	con	$\mathcal{O}(\alpha^4)$	$g_e A^{FC,2}$	0	$g_e A^{FC,2} \langle \hat{S} \hat{S} \rangle_0$	0, 2	
4	dip		$g_e A^{SD,2}$	2	$g_e \langle \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\text{SD},2}$	0, 1, 2	
5	as		$g_e A^{as}$	1	$g_e \langle \hat{S}\hat{S} \rangle_0 \cdot A^{as}$	1, 2	
6	con		$\Delta g_{iso} A^{FC}$	0	$\Delta g_{iso} A^{FC} \langle \hat{S} \hat{S} \rangle_0$	0, 2	
7	dip		$\Delta g_{iso} \mathbf{A}^{SD}$	2	$\Delta g_{iso} \langle \hat{S} \hat{S} \rangle_0 \cdot A^{SD}$	0, 1, 2	
8	con		$A^{\rm FC}\Delta g$	1, 2	$A^{\text{FC}}\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \langle \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle_0$	0, 1, 2	
9	dip		$\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0, 1, 2	$\Delta \boldsymbol{g} \cdot \langle \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \hat{\boldsymbol{S}} \rangle_0 \cdot \boldsymbol{A}^{\mathrm{SD}}$	0, 1, 2	

where the first-order shielding contains terms that are proportional to the trace of the product of two irreducible spherical tensor spin operators, and the second-order shielding contains terms proportional to the trace of the product of three such operators.

The van den Heuvel–Soncini expression, when expanded to second-order in 1/(kT), is equal to

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\rm S} = \frac{1}{\hbar\gamma_{\rm I}} \left\langle \int_0^\beta dw \exp(w\hat{H}_0) \hat{m}_i \exp(-w\hat{H}_0) \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j \right\rangle_0 \tag{D.4}$$

$$=\frac{1}{h\gamma_i}\left[\beta\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{S}(\hat{m}_i\hat{\mathcal{F}}_j)}{2S+1}-\beta^2\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{S}\left(\hat{m}_i\hat{\mathcal{F}}_j\hat{H}_0\right)}{2S+1}+\frac{\beta^2}{2}\frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{S}\left(\left[\hat{m}_i,\hat{\mathcal{F}}_j\right]\hat{H}_0\right)}{2S+1}\right]+\mathcal{O}(\beta^3),\quad(\mathrm{D.5})$$

which is equal to the Pennanen–Vaara expression with the addition of a second-order term that depends on the trace  $\text{Tr}_{S}([\hat{m}_{i},\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{j}]\hat{H}_{0})$ . Substituting in the EPR tensor parameters results in the following expression:

Г

$$\begin{split} \sigma_{ij}^{S} &= -\frac{\mu_{B}}{h\gamma_{l}} \left[ \frac{\beta}{2S+1} \sum_{kk'qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g_{kq,i} A_{k'q',j} \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \Big( \widehat{S}_{k-q} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \Big) \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{\beta^{2}}{2S+1} \sum_{kk'k''qq'q''} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g_{kq,i} A_{k'q',j} D_{k''q''} \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \Big( \widehat{S}_{k-q} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \widehat{S}_{k''-q''} \Big) \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{\beta^{2}}{2(2S+1)} \sum_{kk'k''qq'q''} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g_{kq,i} A_{k'q',j} D_{k''q''} \mathrm{Tr}_{S} \Big( \Big[ \widehat{S}_{k-q}, \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \Big] \widehat{S}_{k''-q''} \Big) \right] \\ &\left. + \mathcal{O}(\beta^{3}). \end{split}$$

Both expressions are the same to first order in 1/(kT), and can be computed by calculating the trace of  $\hat{S}_{k-q}\hat{S}_{k'-q'}$ . This can be done easily by using the Wigner–Eckart theorem for the matrix elements of irreducible spherical tensor operators [191]. The trace is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}\right) &= \sum_{MM'} \langle SM | \widehat{S}_{k-q} | SM' \rangle \langle SM' | \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} | SM \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{D.7} \\ &= (-1)^{k+k'} (2S+1) \langle S | | \widehat{S}_{k} | | S \rangle \langle S | | \widehat{S}_{k'} | | S \rangle \\ &\times \sum_{MM'} (-1)^{2S+M+M'} \begin{pmatrix} S & S & k \\ -M & M' & -q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S & S & k' \\ -M & M' & q' \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{D.8}$$

where the arrays in parentheses are Wigner 3*j* symbols. We have written the product of the phase factors from the two matrix elements as  $(-1)^{S+k+M}(-1)^{S+k'+M'} = (-1)^{2S+k+k'+M+M'}$ . We could equally

well have written it as  $(-1)^{S+k+M}(-1)^{-S-k'-M'} = (-1)^{k-k'+M-M'}$ , and then simplified by noting that, from the symmetry of the first Wigner 3*j* symbol, the only non-zero terms in the sum satisfy M - M' = -q. The final phase factor is therefore  $(-1)^{k-k'-q}$ . The expression can now be simplified by using the orthogonality properties of the 3*j* symbols, and we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} & \left( \widehat{S}_{k-q} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \right) = (-1)^{k-k'-q} (2S+1) \langle S \| \widehat{S}_{k} \| S \rangle \langle S \| \widehat{S}_{k'} \| S \rangle \\ & \times \sum_{MM'} \begin{pmatrix} S & S & k \\ -M & M' & -q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S & S & k' \\ -M & M' & q' \end{pmatrix} \quad (D.9) \\ & = (-1)^{q} \begin{pmatrix} 2S+1 \\ 2k+1 \end{pmatrix} \langle S \| \widehat{S}_{k} \| S \rangle^{2} \delta_{kk'} \delta_{q-q'}. \end{aligned}$$

The operators  $\hat{S}_{k-q}$  therefore form an orthogonal basis set. The resulting expression can now be used to give the first-order paramagnetic chemical shielding, which is the same for both the Pennanen–Vaara and van den Heuvel–Soncini formalisms, and is given in Eq. (6.27).

The second-order shielding tensor in both formalisms contains a trace of the product of three irreducible spherical tensor spin operators. This trace can also be computed using the Wigner–Eckart theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pi r_{S} \Big( \widehat{S}_{k-q} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} \widehat{S}_{k''-q''} \Big) \\ &= \sum_{MM'M''} \langle SM | \widehat{S}_{k-q} | SM' \rangle \langle SM' | \widehat{S}_{k'-q'} | SM'' \rangle \langle SM'' | \widehat{S}_{k''-q''} | SM \rangle \\ &= (-1)^{k+k'+k''} (2S+1)^{3/2} \langle S | \widehat{S}_{k} | | S \rangle \langle S | | \widehat{S}_{k'} | | S \rangle \\ &\times \sum_{MM'M'} (-1)^{3S+M+M'+M''} \begin{pmatrix} S & S & k \\ -M & M' & -q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S & S & k' \\ -M' & M'' & -q' \end{pmatrix} \\ &\times \begin{pmatrix} S & S & k'' \\ -M'' & M & -q'' \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (-1)^{k+k'+k''} (-1)^{2S} (2S+1)^{3/2} \langle S | | \widehat{S}_{k} | | S \rangle \langle S | | \widehat{S}_{k'} | | S \rangle \langle S | | \widehat{S}_{k''} | | S \rangle \\ &\times \begin{cases} k' & k'' & k \\ S & S & S \end{cases} \begin{pmatrix} k' & k'' & k \\ -q' & -q'' & -q \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$
(D.11)

To go to the last line, we have used the fact that the sum of the product of three 3*j* symbols is equal to the product of a Wigner 6*j* symbol (the array in braces) and a 3*j* symbol. The computation of this trace completes the expansion of the Pennanen–Vaara expression to  $1/(kT)^2$ .

All that remains is to evaluate the final term in the van den Heuvel–Soncini formula, which depends on the following trace:

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\left[\widehat{S}_{k-q},\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}\right]\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}\right) = \operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q},\widehat{S}_{k'-q'},\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}\right) - \operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k'-q'},\widehat{S}_{k-q},\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}\right).$$
(D.12)

We have already computed the first term on the right-hand side of Eq. (D.12), and the second term is easily deduced by swapping the indices kq and k'q'. This is done simply by swapping the first and second columns in each of the 3*j* and 6*j* symbols in Eq. (D.11); the former acquires a phase factor of  $(-1)^{k+k'+k''}$  under such an operation, whilst the latter is invariant. We therefore obtain

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}\widehat{S}_{k-q}\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}\right) = (-1)^{k+k'+k''}\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}\right).$$
(D.13)

We have seen that, in order to satisfy the constraints of time reversal of the Hamiltonian, the spin operators in both the Zeeman and hyperfine terms must be of odd rank, i.e. k and k' must be odd, and the ZFS spin operators must be of even rank, i.e. k'' must be even. Therefore k + k' + k'' is an even number, and the trace in Eq. (D.12) must be zero:

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\left[\widehat{S}_{k-q},\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}\right]\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}\right) = \mathbf{0}.$$
(D.14)

The Pennanen-Vaara and van den Heuvel-Soncini formalisms therefore give the same result to  $1/(kT)^2$ . The full second-order term is given in Eq. (6.28).

### Appendix E. Derivation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor for a system containing multiple, coupled paramagnetic centres of arbitrary spin multiplicity to second order

In this appendix we give the detailed calculation of the paramagnetic shielding tensor of a nucleus due to its hyperfine coupling with a cluster of interacting transition-metal ions, to second order in  $1/(kT)^2$ . The final result leads directly to Eq. (7.53) in Chapter 7.

As shown in Appendix D the general van den Heuvel–Soncini formula of the paramagnetic shielding tensor to  $O(\beta^2)$  is

$$\sigma_{ij}^{\rm S} = \frac{1}{\hbar\gamma_l} \left[ \beta \frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{\rm S}(\hat{m}_i \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j)}{\omega} - \beta^2 \frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{\rm S}(\hat{m}_i \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j \hat{H}_0)}{\omega} + \frac{\beta^2}{2} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}_{\rm S}\left([\hat{m}_i, \hat{\mathcal{F}}_j] \hat{H}_0\right)}{\omega} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\beta^3), \tag{E.1}$$

where  $\hat{m}$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$  are the total electronic magnetic moment and hyperfine field operators respectively, and  $\hat{H}_0$  is the Hamiltonian in the absence of the external magnetic field and nuclear magnetic moments, and the cluster has a total of  $\omega$  electronic spin states. The cluster comprises a set of transition-metal ions *A* with electronic spins  $S^{(A)}$ , and so the electronic magnetic moment and hyperfine field operators are each a sum of terms, one for each metal ion:

$$\hat{m}_{i} = -\mu_{\rm B} \sum_{A} \sum_{kq} (-1)^{q} g_{kq,i}^{(A)} \widehat{g}_{k-q}^{(A)}, \tag{E.2}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{i} = \sum_{A} \sum_{kq} (-1)^{q} A_{kq,i}^{(A)} \hat{\mathbf{S}}_{k-q}^{(A)}, \tag{E.3}$$

where  $g_{kq,i}^{(A)}$  and  $A_{kq,i}^{(A)}$  are the *g*-tensor and hyperfine tensor components, and  $\widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)}$  is the irreducible spherical tensor spin operator of rank *k* and order *q* for ion *A*. We recall that the irreducible spherical ranks of the tensors in Eqs. (E.2) and (E.3) must be odd. The expression for  $\widehat{H}_0$  contains a part due to the ZFS interactions of each ion, and a part due to the exchange coupling interactions for all pairs of ions:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H}_{0} &= \sum_{A} \sum_{kq} (-1)^{q} D_{kq}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)} \\ &+ \sum_{A>B} \sum_{kq} (-1)^{q} J_{kq}^{(AB)}(k_{1}k_{2}) \widehat{T}_{k-q}^{(AB)}(k_{1}k_{2}). \end{aligned} \tag{E.4}$$

The irreducible spherical tensor components of rank *k* and order *q* of the ZFS interaction of ion *A* are  $D_{kq}^{(A)}$ , and the exchange coupling between ions *A* and *B* is represented by the spatial tensor  $J_{kq}^{(AB)}(k_1k_2)$ , and the spin tensor  $\widehat{T}_{k-q}^{(AB)}(k_1k_2)$  which is formed by coupling together the two one-spin tensor operators  $\widehat{S}_{k_1q_1}^{(A)}$  and  $\widehat{S}_{k_2q_2}^{(B)}$ :

$$\widehat{T}_{k-q}^{(AB)}(k_1k_2) = \sum_{q_1,q_2} \widehat{S}_{k_1q_1}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{k_2q_2}^{(B)} \langle k_1k_2q_1q_2 | k-q \rangle$$
(E.5)

$$= (-1)^{k_1 - k_2 - q} \sqrt{2k + 1} \sum_{q_1, q_2} \widehat{S}_{k_1 q_1}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{k_2 q_2}^{(B)} \begin{pmatrix} k_1 & k_2 & k \\ q_1 & q_2 & q \end{pmatrix}. \quad (E.6)$$

We note that the ZFS tensor contains only components of even rank, which for transition-metal ions can take at most only the values k = 2 and 4, with the maximum value being  $2S^{(A)}$ . The conventional exchange coupling tensor that is formed by coupling together two rank-one spin operators can take overall ranks k = 0, 1, and 2, which represent the isotropic exchange, antisymmetric DM, and symmetric dipolar-coupling interactions respectively. If the two spins are coupled together in the opposite order, so that (*AB*) is replaced by (*BA*), and ( $k_1, k_2$ ) by ( $k_2, k_1$ ) in Eq. (E.6), the resulting tensor  $\hat{T}_{k-n}^{(AA)}(k_2k_1)$  is given by

$$\widehat{T}_{k-q}^{(BA)}(k_2k_1) = (-1)^{k_1+k_2+k} \widehat{T}_{k-q}^{(AB)}(k_1k_2),$$
(E.7)

i.e. it acquires a phase factor  $(-1)^{k_1+k_2+k}$  due to the symmetry properties of the 3*j* symbol. Therefore in order to maintain the same Hamiltonian, the exchange tensor parameters must satisfy

$$J_{kq}^{(BA)}(k_2k_1) = (-1)^{k_1+k_2+k} J_{kq}^{(AB)}(k_1k_2).$$
(E.8)

This implies that swapping the order of the coupled spins results in a sign change for the antisymmetric DM interaction, but not for the symmetric isotropic exchange, nor the dipolar coupling interactions.

The spin operators used in the Hamiltonian are 'product operators' that are defined in a direct product space. Hence for example the notations  $\widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)}$  and  $\widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{k'q'}^{(B)}$  are shorthand for the following direct products:

$$\widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)} \equiv \widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)} \otimes \widehat{S}_{00}^{(B)} \otimes \widehat{S}_{00}^{(\Gamma)} \otimes \dots,$$
(E.9)

$$\widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'q'}^{(B)} \equiv \widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)} \otimes \widehat{S}_{k'q'}^{(B)} \otimes \widehat{S}_{00}^{(\Gamma)} \otimes \dots, \qquad (E.10)$$

where  $\hat{S}_{00}^{(A)}$  is the irreducible spherical tensor spin operator that is equal to the identity. The number of spin states  $\omega$  in Eq. (E.1) is therefore given by the product of the numbers of states of each spin:

$$\omega = \prod_{A} (2S^{(A)} + 1). \tag{E.11}$$

Using the aforementioned notation for the traces over the electronic spin states, i.e. that the trace of a product operator over the entire direct product spin space is denoted as  $Tr_s$ , and the trace of a one-spin operator over the manifold of states pertaining to that spin simply as Tr, we can write the traces  $Tr_s$  of the product operators  $\hat{S}_{kq}^{(A)}$  and  $\hat{S}_{kq}^{(A)} \hat{S}_{k'q'}^{(B)}$  as the products of the one-spin traces Tr:

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)}\right) = \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)}\right)\operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{00}^{(B)}\right)\operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{00}^{(\Gamma)}\right)\ldots, \tag{E.12}$$

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'q'}^{(B)}\right) = \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{kq}^{(A)}\right)\operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{k'q'}^{(B)}\right)\operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{00}^{(\Gamma)}\right)\dots$$
(E.13)
Each one-spin trace  $Tr(\widehat{S}_{k-q})$  can be evaluated using the Wigner-Eckart theorem [191]:

$$\operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}\right) = \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}\widehat{S}_{00}\right) = \sum_{MM'} \langle SM | \widehat{S}_{k-q} | SM' \rangle \langle SM' | \widehat{S}_{00} | SM \rangle \quad (E.14)$$

$$\times (-1)^{k-q} (2S+1) \langle S \| S_k \| S \rangle \langle S \| S_0 \| S \rangle$$
$$\times \sum_{MM'} \begin{pmatrix} S & S & k \\ -M & M' & -q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} S & S & 0 \\ -M & M' & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$
(E.15)

Using the orthogonality relations for the Wigner 3*j* symbols [191] we can simplify the sum to give the simple identity

$$\operatorname{Tr}(\hat{S}_{k-q}) = (2S+1)\langle S \| \hat{S}_0 \| S \rangle^2 \delta_{k0} \delta_{q0}$$
(E.16)

$$= (2S+1)\delta_{k0}\delta_{a0}.\tag{E.17}$$

The significance of this identity is that the trace of any one-spin irreducible spherical tensor operator  $\hat{S}_{k-q}$  is zero unless the rank k is zero.

The paramagnetic chemical shielding tensor due to a system of coupled transition-metal ions with arbitrary electronic spins is given by combining Eqs. (E.1)-(E.6) to give

$$\begin{split} \sigma^{\rm S}_{ij} &= -\frac{\mu_{\rm B}}{h_{\rm Y_{\rm I}}} \left[ \frac{\beta}{\omega} \sum_{A,B} \sum_{kk'qq'} (-1)^{q+q'} g^{(A)}_{kq,A} A^{(B)}_{k'q'j} {\rm Tr}_{\rm S} \Big( \hat{S}^{(A)}_{k-q} \hat{S}^{(B)}_{k'-q'} \Big) \right. \\ &- \frac{\beta^2}{\omega} \sum_{A,B,\Gamma} \sum_{kk'k''qq'q''} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g^{(A)}_{kq,i} A^{(B)}_{k'q'j} D^{(\Gamma)}_{k''q''} {\rm Tr}_{\rm S} \Big( \hat{S}^{(A)}_{k-q} \hat{S}^{(B)}_{k'-q'} \hat{S}^{(\Gamma)}_{k''-q''} \Big) \\ &- \frac{\beta^2}{\omega} \sum_{A,B} \sum_{\Gamma > \Delta} \sum_{kk'k''qq'q''} \sum_{k_1,k_2} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g^{(A)}_{kq,i} A^{(B)}_{k'q',j} J^{(\Gamma\Delta)}_{k''q''} (k_1k_2) \\ &\times {\rm Tr}_{\rm S} \Big( \hat{S}^{(A)}_{k-q} \hat{S}^{(B)}_{k'-q'} \hat{T}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}_{k''-q''} (k_1k_2) \Big) \\ &+ \frac{\beta^2}{2\omega} \sum_{A,B,\Gamma} \sum_{kk'k''qq'q''} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g^{(A)}_{kq,i} A^{(B)}_{k'q',j} D^{(\Gamma)}_{k''q''} {\rm Tr}_{\rm S} \Big( \Big[ \hat{S}^{(A)}_{k-q}, \hat{S}^{(B)}_{k'-q'} \Big] \hat{S}^{(\Gamma)}_{k''-q''} \Big) \\ &+ \frac{\beta^2}{2\omega} \sum_{A,B} \sum_{\Gamma > \Delta} \sum_{kk'k''qq'q''} \sum_{k_{1,k_2}} (-1)^{q+q'+q''} g^{(A)}_{kq,i} A^{(B)}_{k'q',j} J^{(\Gamma\Delta)}_{k''q'} (k_1k_2) \\ &\times {\rm Tr}_{\rm S} \Big( \Big[ \hat{S}^{(A)}_{k-q}, \hat{S}^{(B)}_{k'-q'} \Big] \hat{T}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}_{k''-q''} (k_1k_2) \Big) \bigg]. \end{split}$$

This expression contains five terms. The first is of order  $\mathcal{O}(\beta)$  and contains only the *g*- and hyperfine tensor components. The remaining terms are all of order  $\mathcal{O}(\beta^2)$ , with the second and fourth terms originating from the ZFS interactions, and the third and fifth terms originating from the exchange-coupling interactions. We now evaluate all five terms, using the Wigner–Eckart theorem to simplify the traces.

For the first term we have two situations that must be considered separately: either A = B or  $A \neq B$ . If we set A = B the trace is

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(A)}\right) &= \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(A)}\right) \prod_{B \neq A} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{00}^{(B)}\right) \\ &= (-1)^{q} \left(\frac{2S^{(A)}+1}{2k+1}\right) \\ &\times \langle S^{(A)} \| \widehat{S}_{k}^{(A)} \| S^{(A)} \rangle^{2} \delta_{kk'} \delta_{q-q'} \left(\frac{\mathcal{O}}{2S^{(A)}+1}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{E.18}$$

$$= (-1)^{q} \left(\frac{\omega}{2k+1}\right) \langle S^{(A)} \| \widehat{S}_{k}^{(A)} \| S^{(A)} \rangle^{2} \delta_{kk'} \delta_{q-q'}.$$
(E.20)

On substituting this into the expression for the shielding tensor we obtain the first-order shift due to a cluster of non-interacting metal ions that is similar to the expression we derived in Appendix D. If we instead set  $A \neq B$  the trace becomes

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)}\right) = \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\right)\operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)}\right)\prod_{\Gamma\neq A,B}\operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{00}^{(\Gamma)}\right)$$
(E.21)

$$=\omega\delta_{k0}\delta_{k'0}\delta_{q0}\delta_{q'0} \tag{E.22}$$

$$= 0.$$
 (E.23)

This term is equal to zero as the one-spin irreducible spherical tensor operators do not have zero ranks.

The trace of the second term only has one non-zero contribution, which is with  $A = B = \Gamma$ . The trace is therefore equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}^{(A)}\right) &= \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}^{(A)}\right) \prod_{B \neq A} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{00}^{(B)}\right) \quad (E.24) \\ &= (-1)^{k+k'+k''}(-1)^{2S^{(A)}}(2S^{(A)}+1)^{1/2}\omega \\ &\times \langle S^{(A)} \|\widehat{S}_{k}^{(A)}\| \|S^{(A)}\rangle \langle S^{(A)} \|\widehat{S}_{k''}^{(A)}\| \|S^{(A)}\rangle \langle S^{(A)} \|\widehat{S}_{k''}^{(A)}\| \|S^{(A)}\rangle \\ &\times \left\{ \begin{array}{cc} k' & k'' & k \\ S^{(A)} & S^{(A)} & S^{(A)} \end{array} \right\} \left( \begin{array}{cc} k' & k'' & k \\ -q' & -q'' & -q \end{array} \right), \end{aligned} \end{aligned}$$

$$\end{aligned}$$

$$\end{aligned}$$

which is again reminiscent of the second-order expression we derived in Appendix D.

We have not hitherto encountered the third term. Setting  $A \neq B$ ,  $\Gamma = A$ , and  $\Delta = B$ : we obtain the following result for the trace:

$$\begin{split} & \operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'-q}^{(B)}\widehat{T}_{k''-q''}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}(k_{1}k_{2})\right) \\ &= (-1)^{k_{1}-k_{2}-q''}\sqrt{2k''+1}\sum_{q_{1},q_{2}} \binom{k_{1}}{-q_{1}} \frac{k_{2}}{-q_{2}} \frac{k''}{q''} \\ &\times \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k_{1}-q_{1}}^{(A)}\right)\operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)}\widehat{S}_{k_{2}-q_{2}}^{(B)}\right)\prod_{\Gamma\neq A,B} \operatorname{Tr}\left(\widehat{S}_{00}^{(\Gamma)}\right) \\ &= (-1)^{k_{1}-k_{2}-q''}\sqrt{2k''+1}\sum_{q_{1},q_{2}} \binom{k_{1}}{-q_{1}}\frac{k_{2}}{-q_{2}}\frac{k''}{-q_{1}'} \\ &\times (-1)^{q}\left(\frac{2S^{(A)}+1}{2k+1}\right)\langle S^{(A)}\|\widehat{S}_{k}^{(A)}\|S^{(A)}\rangle^{2}\delta_{kk_{1}}\delta_{q-q_{1}} \\ &\times (-1)^{q'}\left(\frac{2S^{(B)}+1}{2k'+1}\right)\langle S^{(B)}\|\widehat{S}_{k'}^{(B)}\|S^{(B)}\rangle^{2}\delta_{k'k_{2}}\delta_{q'-q_{2}} \\ &\times \frac{\omega}{(2S^{(A)}+1)(2S^{(B)}+1)} \\ &= \omega(-1)^{k-k'+q+q'-q''}\sqrt{2k''+1}\frac{\langle S^{(A)}\|\widehat{S}_{k}^{(A)}\|S^{(A)}\rangle^{2}}{2k+1}\frac{\langle S^{(B)}\|\widehat{S}_{k'}^{(B)}\|S^{(B)}\rangle^{2}}{2k'+1} \\ &\times \binom{k}{q}\frac{k'}{q'}\frac{k'}{q''}\delta_{kk_{1}}\delta_{k'k_{2}}. \end{split}$$
(E.26)

Alternatively we can also set  $A \neq B$ ,  $\Gamma = B$ , and  $\Delta = A$  to obtain a similar result:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_{S} & \left( \widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)} \widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)} \widehat{T}_{k''-q''}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}(k_{1}k_{2}) \right) \\ &= \omega(-1)^{k''+q+q'-q''} \sqrt{2k''+1} \frac{\langle S^{(A)} \| \widehat{S}_{k}^{(A)} \| S^{(A)} \rangle^{2}}{2k+1} \frac{\langle S^{(B)} \| \widehat{S}_{k'}^{(B)} \| S^{(B)} \rangle^{2}}{2k'+1} \\ & \times \begin{pmatrix} k & k' & k'' \\ q & q' & q'' \end{pmatrix} \delta_{kk_{2}} \delta_{k'k_{1}}. \end{aligned}$$
(E.27)

These are the only two non-zero contributions to the third term. In both we notice that (k, k', k'') must satisfy the triangle condition. We see that Eq. (E.27) is the same as Eq. (E.26) with an extra phase factor of  $(-1)^{k+k'+k''}$  due to the acyclic permutation of the first and second columns of the Wigner 3*j* symbol. The ranks *k* and *k'* are odd, so that the electronic Zeeman and hyperfine interaction Hamiltonians satisfy the time-reversal requirements, and so the sign of Eq. (E.27) is only changed for the terms of the exchange interaction Hamiltonian that have odd rank k'', i.e. for the antisymmetric DM term, but not the isotropic exchange nor the dipolar coupling interactions. Combining the two contributions gives the overall expression for the third term:

Ċ

$$\begin{split} -\beta^{2} & \sum_{kk'k''qq'q''} \sqrt{2k''+1} \begin{pmatrix} k & k' & k'' \\ q & q' & q'' \end{pmatrix} \\ & \times \left[ \sum_{A>B} (-1)^{k-k'} g_{kq,i}^{(A)} A_{k'q',j}^{(B)} J_{k''q''}^{(AB)} (kk') \frac{\langle S^{(A)} \| \tilde{S}_{k}^{(A)} \| S^{(A)} \|^{2}}{2k+1} \frac{\langle S^{(B)} \| \tilde{S}_{k'}^{(B)} \| S^{(B)} \|^{2}}{2k'+1} \right] \\ & + \sum_{A
(E.29)$$

To go to the last line we have used the symmetry property of the exchange coupling tensor parameters in Eq. (E.8).

To evaluate the fourth term we must calculate the following trace:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}_{S}\Big(\Big[\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}, \widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)}\Big]\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}^{(\Gamma)}\Big) &= \mathrm{Tr}_{S}\Big(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)}\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}^{(\Gamma)}\Big) \\ &\quad - \mathrm{Tr}_{S}\Big(\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)}\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}^{(\Gamma)}\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{E.30}$$

where as for term two, the only relevant contributions are those with  $A = B = \Gamma$ . We have already computed the first term on the right-hand side, and the second term is easily deduced by swapping the indices kq and k'q'. This is done simply by swapping the first and second columns of the 3j and 6j symbols; the former acquires a phase factor of  $(-1)^{k+k'+k''}$  under such an operation, whilst the latter is invariant. We therefore obtain

$$Tr_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}^{(A)}\right) = (-1)^{k+k'+k''}Tr_{S}\left(\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(A)}\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}^{(A)}\right).$$
(E.31)

We have seen that, in order to satisfy the constraints of time reversal of the Hamiltonian, the spin operators in both the Zeeman and hyperfine terms must be of odd rank, i.e. k and k' must be odd, and the ZFS spin operators must be of even rank, i.e. k'' must be even. Therefore k + k' + k'' is an even number, and the trace must be zero:

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left(\left[\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}, \widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)}\right]\widehat{S}_{k''-q''}^{(\Gamma)}\right) = \mathbf{0}.$$
(E.32)

There is therefore no contribution from the fourth term, and the second-order shift due to the ZFS interaction is contained wholly in the second term.

The fifth term contains the trace

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{S}\Big(\Big[\widehat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}, \widehat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)}\Big]\widehat{T}_{k''-q''}^{(\Gamma\Delta)}(k_{1}k_{2})\Big). \tag{E.33}$$

As we have seen for the third term, the only contributions that appear are with  $A \neq B$ , and so must also have  $\Gamma = A$  and  $\Delta = B$ , or  $\Gamma = B$  and  $\Delta = A$ . The commutator  $[\hat{S}_{k-q}^{(A)}, \hat{S}_{k'-q'}^{(B)}]$  is therefore of two operators that act on different spins, and so is always zero. Hence the fifth term is trivially zero, and the effects of the exchange coupling are contained wholly in the third term.

### Appendix F. Simplification of the relaxation superoperator and spectral densities in the stochastic Liouville formalism

In this appendix we provide the full derivation of two particular features of the stochastic Liouville formalism that were stated in Section 9.3.1, namely the inclusion of the equilibrium nuclear-spin density operator in the expression for the relaxation superoperator, and an important symmetry property of the spectral density. The discussion closely follows that provided by Goldman [254].

#### F.1. The relaxation superopertor

Here we show that the expression for the Stochastic Liouville equation in Section 9.3.1

$$\begin{split} \frac{\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m,m'} (-1)^{m+m'} \exp\left[\mathrm{i}(\omega_{-m'} - \omega_{-m})t\right] \\ &\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \left[ \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \right] \right] \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{ \widehat{P}_{0} \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \right\} \\ &- \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \right] \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{ \left[ \widehat{P}_{0}, \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \right] \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \right\} \right] \\ &\times \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\omega_{-m}\tau\right) \mathrm{d}\tau, \end{split}$$
(F.1)

can be simplified to the following

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m,m'} (-1)^{m+m'} \exp\left[\mathrm{i}(\omega_{-m'} - \omega_{-m})t\right] \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0} \right] \right] \\ &\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{ \widehat{P}_{0} \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) \right\} \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\omega_{-m}\tau\right) \mathrm{d}\tau, \end{aligned}$$
(F.2)

which includes the expression  $\hat{\rho}^{T}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}$  in the double commutator. Hence we justify the phenomenological inclusion of the equilibrium nuclear spin density operator in the semi-classical Redfield theory. In order to prove this correspondence, we need to show that the following expression in the second term of Eq. (F.1) can be simplified to give

$$\begin{split} & \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) \right] \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{ \left[ \widehat{P}_{0}, \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \right] \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) \right\} \exp\left( i\omega_{-m}\tau \right) \\ &= \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}_{0} \right] \right] \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{ \widehat{P}_{0} \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) \right\} \exp\left( i\omega_{-m}\tau \right). \end{split}$$
(F.3)

Firstly we examine the factor that depends only on the lattice. We write the trace explicitly in terms of the sum over the lattice states  $|L\rangle$ , which are eigenstates of the lattice Hamiltonian  $\hat{H}_L$  with energies that are given by

$$E_L = \langle L | \widehat{H}_L | L \rangle. \tag{F.4}$$

The matrix representation of the equilibrium lattice density operator is diagonal in this basis, and has the following matrix elements:

$$\langle L|\hat{P}_{0}|L\rangle = \frac{\exp\left(-\beta_{L}E_{L}\right)}{\operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left[\exp\left(-\beta_{L}\hat{H}_{L}\right)\right]}.$$
(F.5)

The trace over the lattice states is therefore equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left\{\left[\widehat{P}_{0},\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}\right]\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\right\} \\ &= \sum_{LL'}\left[\langle L|\widehat{P}_{0}|L\rangle\langle L|\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}|L'\rangle\langle L'|\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)|L\rangle \\ &-\langle L|\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}|L'\rangle\langle L'|\widehat{P}_{0}|L'\rangle\langle L'|\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)|L\rangle\right] \end{aligned} \tag{F.6} \\ &= \sum_{LL'}\langle L|\widehat{P}_{0}|L\rangle\langle L|\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}|L'\rangle\langle L'|\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)|L\rangle \\ &\times \left[1 - \frac{\langle L'|\widehat{P}_{0}|L'\rangle}{\langle L|\widehat{P}_{0}|L\rangle}\right] \end{aligned} \tag{F.7}$$

$$< [1 - \exp\left(\beta_L(E_L - E_{L'})\right)]. \tag{F.8}$$

To proceed further we note that Eq. (F.1) contains an integral over the time variable  $\tau$ , which we now calculate. The dependence on  $\tau$  is found in two factors, namely the complex exponential

exp ( $i\omega_{-m}\tau$ ), and the lattice operator  $\hat{L}_{1m}^{T}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}$ . The  $\tau$ -dependence of the matrix element of the latter can be elucidated as follows:

$$\begin{split} \langle L | \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} | L' \rangle &= \langle L | \exp\left(-\mathrm{i}\widehat{H}_{L}\tau/\hbar\right) \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)^{\dagger} \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\widehat{H}_{L}\tau/\hbar\right) | L' \rangle \ \text{(F.9)} \\ &= \langle L | \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)^{\dagger} | L' \rangle \ \exp\left[\mathrm{i}(\Omega_{L'} - \Omega_{L})\tau\right], \qquad (F.10) \end{split}$$

where  $\Omega_L = E_L/\hbar$  is the angular frequency associated with the lattice energy  $E_L$ . The integral over  $\tau$  is simply

$$\int_{0}^{\infty} \exp\left[i(\omega_{-m} + \Omega_{L'} - \Omega_{L})\right] d\tau = \pi \delta(\omega_{-m} + \Omega_{L'} - \Omega_{L}), \quad (F.11)$$

where  $\delta(\omega)$  is the Dirac delta function [190]. This integral is equal to zero unless  $\omega_{-m} = \Omega_L - \Omega_{L'}$ , and so we can immediately make the following replacement in Eq. (F.8):

$$\exp\left(\beta_{L}(E_{L}-E_{L'})\right) \to \exp\left(\beta_{L}\hbar\omega_{-m}\right). \tag{F.12}$$

This Boltzmann factor is now independent of L and L', and so the trace in Eq. (F.8) now simplifies to

$$\operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left\{\left[\widehat{P}_{0},\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}\right]\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)\right\}$$

$$\rightarrow \sum_{ll'}\langle L|\widehat{P}_{0}|L\rangle\langle L|\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}|L'\rangle\langle L'|\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)|L\rangle[1-\exp\left(\beta_{L}\hbar\omega_{-m}\right)] \quad (F.13)$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr}_{ll'}\left\{\widehat{P}_{0},\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}|L'\rangle\langle L'|\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)|L\rangle[1-\exp\left(\beta_{L}\hbar\omega_{-m}\right)] \quad (F.14)$$

$$= \operatorname{Tr}_{L}\left\{\widehat{P}_{0}\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\right\}\left[1-\exp\left(\beta_{L}\hbar\omega_{-m}\right)\right].$$
(F.14)

We can now partially simplify Eq. (F.3) by making the following replacement:

$$\begin{split} & \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) \right] \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big\{ \left[ \widehat{P}_{0}, \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \right] \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) \Big\} \exp\left(i\omega_{-m}\tau\right) \\ & \rightarrow \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) \right] \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big\{ \widehat{P}_{0} \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) \Big\} \\ & \times \left[ 1 - \exp\left(\beta_{L} \hbar \omega_{-m}\right) \right] \exp\left(i\omega_{-m}\tau\right). \end{split}$$
(F.15)

We see that the trace over the lattice operators has been written in the same format as in the right-hand side of Eq. (F.3).

In the second stage of the derivation we consider the nuclearspin part of Eq. (F.3). We have already seen that the transformation of the spin operator  $\hat{I}^{\dagger}_{1-m}$  into the interaction representation is described by the following expression:

$$\hat{I}_{1-m}^{T}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} = \hat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \exp\left(-i\omega_{-m}(t-\tau)\right).$$
(F.16)

The corresponding transformation of the matrix elements of  $\hat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}$  in the eigenbasis  $|i\rangle$  of  $\hat{H}_{I}$  is

$$\langle i | \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\mathsf{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} | j \rangle = \langle i | \exp\left(i\widehat{H}_{l}(t-\tau)/\hbar\right) \widehat{I}_{1-m}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} \exp\left(-i\widehat{H}_{l}(t-\tau)/\hbar\right) | j \rangle$$
(F.17)  
$$= \langle i | \widehat{I}_{1-m}(t-\tau)^{\dagger} | j \rangle \exp\left[-i(\omega_{j}-\omega_{i})(t-\tau)\right],$$
(F.18)

where  $\omega_i$  is the angular frequency associated with the energy  $\hbar \omega_i$  of state  $|i\rangle$ . On comparing Eqs. (F.16) and (F.18) we can write  $\omega_{-m}$  as

$$\omega_{-m} = \omega_i - \omega_i. \tag{F.19}$$

We now introduce the formal expression for the equilibrium nuclear-spin density operator:

. \

$$\hat{\rho}_{0} = \frac{\exp\left(-\beta_{L}\widehat{H}\right)}{\operatorname{Tr}_{l}\left[\exp\left(-\beta_{L}\widehat{H}\right)\right]},\tag{F.20}$$

where  $Tr_{I}$  is the trace taken over all the nuclear spin states. The Boltzmann factor in Eq. (F.15) can now be written as

$$1 - \exp\left(\beta_L \hbar \omega_{-m}\right) = 1 - \exp\left(\beta_L \hbar (\omega_j - \omega_i)\right)$$
(F.21)

$$= 1 - \frac{\langle l|\rho_0|l\rangle}{\langle j|\hat{\rho}_0|j\rangle} \tag{F.22}$$

$$=\frac{\langle j|\hat{\rho}_{0}|j\rangle - \langle i|\hat{\rho}_{0}|i\rangle}{\langle j|\hat{\rho}_{0}|j\rangle}.$$
 (F.23)

The product of the matrix element of  $\hat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}\hat{\rho}^{\rm T}(t)$  and the Boltzmann factor is therefore

$$\begin{split} \langle i | \hat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} | j \rangle \langle j | \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) | k \rangle [1 - \exp(\beta_{L} \hbar \omega_{-m})] \\ &= \langle i | \hat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} | j \rangle \langle j | \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) | k \rangle \left[ \frac{\langle j | \hat{\rho}_{0} | j \rangle - \langle i | \hat{\rho}_{0} | i \rangle}{\langle j | \hat{\rho}_{0} | j \rangle} \right] \\ &= \left\langle i | \left[ \hat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}_{0} \right] | j \rangle \left\langle j | \hat{\rho}_{0} | j \right\rangle^{-1} \left\langle j | \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) | k \right\rangle. \end{split}$$
(F.24)

Hence we make the following replacement in the nuclear-spin part of Eq. (F.15):

$$\begin{split} & \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) \right] [1 - \exp\left(\beta_L \hbar \omega_{-m}\right)] \\ & \rightarrow \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \left[ \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}_0 \right] \hat{\rho}_0^{-1} \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t) \right]. \end{split}$$
(F.25)

We are almost there. The final step is to apply the high-temperature limit to the nuclear-spin energy levels, and note that the nuclear-spin density operator at all times is equal to the sum of the identity operator and a small deviation with a leading term of order  $\beta_L$ . The result is that  $\hat{\rho}_0^{-1}\hat{\rho}^{T}(t)$  approximates the identity operator  $\hat{1}_I$ , and we obtain

$$\left[\widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger} \hat{\rho}^{\mathsf{T}}(t)\right] \left[1 - \exp\left(\beta_{L} \hbar \omega_{-m}\right)\right] \to \left[\widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \left[\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right].$$
(F.26)

Substituting this into Eq. (F.15) we obtain Eq. (F.3), and therefore

$$\begin{split} \frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} &= -\frac{1}{\hbar^{2}} \sum_{m,m'} (-1)^{m+m'} \\ &\times \exp\left[\mathrm{i}(\omega_{-m'} - \omega_{-m})t\right] \left[\widehat{I}_{1-m'}, \left[\widehat{I}_{1-m}^{\dagger}, \hat{\rho}^{\mathrm{T}}(t) - \hat{\rho}_{0}\right]\right] \\ &\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \left\{\widehat{P}_{0}\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\mathrm{T}}(t-\tau)^{\dagger}\widehat{L}_{1m'}^{\mathrm{T}}(t)\right\} \exp\left(\mathrm{i}\omega_{-m}\tau\right) \mathrm{d}\tau, \quad (F.27) \end{split}$$

as required.

#### F.2. Symmetry properties of the spectral density

Here we derive a useful 'symmetry-related' identity concerning the spectral density  $K_{mm'}(\omega)$ , that is relevant to the application of the stochastic Liouville formalism for relaxation. We begin by writing the expression for the time-correlation function  $G_{mm'}(\tau)$ in Eq. (9.43) as a sum over the lattice states  $|L\rangle$ :

$$G_{mm'}(\tau) = \operatorname{Tr}_{L} \left[ \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger} \exp\left(i\widehat{H}_{L}\tau/\hbar\right) \widehat{L}_{1m'} \exp\left(-i\widehat{H}_{L}\tau/\hbar\right) \widehat{P}_{0} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{LL'} \langle L|\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger}|L'\rangle \langle L'|\widehat{L}_{1m'}|L\rangle \langle L|\widehat{P}_{0}|L\rangle \exp\left[i(\Omega_{L'} - \Omega_{L})\tau\right].$$
(F.29)

Using this in the expression for the real part of the spectral density in Eq. (9.44) we obtain, for  $\omega = -\omega_{-m}$ :

$$\operatorname{Re}[K_{mm'}(-\omega_{-m})] = \operatorname{Re}\left[\int_{0}^{\infty} G_{mm'}(\tau) \exp(i\omega_{-m}\tau) d\tau\right]$$
(F.30)  
$$= \operatorname{Re}\left[\sum_{LL'} \langle L|\hat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger}|L'\rangle \langle L'|\hat{L}_{1m'}|L\rangle \langle L|\hat{P}_{0}|L\rangle \\ \times \int_{0}^{\infty} \exp[i(\omega_{-m} + \Omega_{L'} - \Omega_{L})\tau] d\tau\right]$$
(F.31)  
$$= \pi \operatorname{Re}\sum_{LL'} \langle L|\hat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger}|L'\rangle \langle L'|\hat{L}_{1m'}|L\rangle \langle L|\hat{P}_{0}|L\rangle \\ \times \delta(\omega_{-m} + \Omega_{L'} - \Omega_{L}).$$
(F.32)

We now write an expression for the time-correlation function  $G_{-m'-m}(\tau)$ :

(F.36)

$$\begin{aligned} G_{-m'-m}(\tau) &= \mathrm{Tr}_{L} \Big[ \widehat{L}_{1-m'}^{\dagger} \exp\left(i\widehat{H}_{L}\tau/\hbar\right) \widehat{L}_{1-m} \exp\left(-i\widehat{H}_{L}\tau/\hbar\right) \widehat{P}_{0} \Big] \end{aligned} \tag{F.33} \\ &= \sum_{LL'} \langle L' | \widehat{L}_{1-m'}^{\dagger} | L \rangle \langle L | \widehat{L}_{1-m} | L' \rangle \langle L' | \widehat{P}_{0} | L' \rangle \exp\left[-i(\Omega_{L'} - \Omega_{L})\tau\right] \end{aligned} \tag{F.34} \\ &= \sum \langle L | \widehat{L}_{1-m} | L' \rangle \langle L' | \widehat{L}_{1-m'}^{\dagger} | L \rangle \langle L' | \widehat{P}_{0} | L' \rangle \exp\left[-i(\Omega_{L'} - \Omega_{L})\tau\right] \end{aligned} \tag{F.35}$$

$$= \sum_{ll'} (l_{l-m} l_{l}) (l_{l-m'} l_{l}) (l_{l-m'} l_{l}) (l_{l}) (l_{l})$$

 $\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger} = (-1)^m \widehat{L}_{1-m},$ 

and so the expression for  $G_{-m'-m}(\tau)$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} G_{-m'-m}(\tau) &= (-1)^{m+m'} \sum_{ll'} \langle L | \hat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger} | L' \rangle \langle L' | \hat{L}_{1m'} | L \rangle \langle L' | \hat{P}_{0} | L' \rangle \\ &\times \exp\left[ -i(\Omega_{L'} - \Omega_{L}) \tau \right] \\ &= (-1)^{m+m'} \sum_{ll'} \langle I | \hat{L}_{1m'}^{\dagger} | L' \rangle \langle I' | \hat{L}_{1m'} | L \rangle \langle I | \hat{P}_{0} | I \rangle \end{aligned}$$
(F.37)

$$= (-1)^{m+m} \sum_{LL'} \langle L|L_{1m}|L' \rangle \langle L'|L_{1m'}|L \rangle \langle L|P_0|L \rangle$$

$$\times \exp\left[-i(\Omega_{L'} - \Omega_L)\tau\right] \left\{ \frac{\langle L'|\hat{P}_0|L' \rangle}{\langle L'|\hat{P}_0|L' \rangle} \right\}$$
(F.38)

$$= (-1)^{m+m'} \sum_{LL'} \langle L|\hat{L}^{\dagger}_{1m}|L'\rangle \langle L'|\hat{L}_{1m'}|L\rangle \langle L|\hat{P}_{0}|L\rangle$$

$$(1.36)$$

$$\times \exp\left[-i(\Omega_{L'} - \Omega_L)\tau\right] \exp\left[\beta_L(E_L - E_{L'})\right]. \tag{F.39}$$

This gives the following expression for the real part of the spectral density  $K_{-m'-m}(+\omega_{-m})$ :

$$\operatorname{Re}[K_{-m'-m}(+\omega_{-m})] = \operatorname{Re}\left[\int_{0}^{\infty} G_{-m'-m}(\tau) \exp(-i\omega_{-m}\tau) d\tau\right]$$

$$= (-1)^{m+m'} \operatorname{Re}\left[\sum_{LL'} \langle L|\hat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger}|L'\rangle \langle L'|\hat{L}_{1m'}|L\rangle \langle L|\hat{P}_{0}|L\rangle \exp\left[\beta_{L}(E_{L}-E_{L'})\right]$$

$$\times \int_{0}^{\infty} \exp\left[-i(\omega_{-m}+\Omega_{L'}-\Omega_{L})\tau\right] d\tau\right]$$

$$(F.41)$$

$$(F.41)$$

$$= (-1)^{m+m'} \pi \operatorname{Re} \sum_{LL'} \langle L | \widehat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger} | L' \rangle \langle L' | \widehat{L}_{1m'} | L \rangle \langle L | \widehat{P}_0 | L \rangle \exp \left[ \beta_L (E_L - E_{L'}) \right] \\ \times \delta(\omega_{-m} + \Omega_{L'} - \Omega_L).$$
(F.42)

The Dirac delta function on the last line indicates that  $\omega_{-m} = \Omega_L - \Omega_{L'}$ , and therefore the energy difference in the Boltzmann factor can be replaced by  $E_L - E_{L'} = \hbar \omega_{-m}$ . The final expression for Re[ $K_{-m'-m}(+\omega_{-m})$ ] is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re}[K_{-m'-m}(+\omega_{-m})] &= (-1)^{m+m'} \exp\left[\beta_L \hbar \omega_{-m}\right] \\ &\times \pi \operatorname{Re}\sum_{LL'} \langle L|\widehat{L}_{1m}^{\dagger}|L'\rangle \langle L'|\widehat{L}_{1m'}|L\rangle \langle L|\widehat{P}_0|L\rangle \\ &\times \delta(\omega_{-m} + \Omega_{L'} - \Omega_L). \end{aligned}$$
(F.43)

On comparing Eq. (F.43) with Eq. (F.32) we obtain the identity

$$\operatorname{Re}[K_{-m'-m}(+\omega_{-m})] = (-1)^{m+m'} \exp[\beta_L \hbar \omega_{-m}] \operatorname{Re}[K_{mm'}(-\omega_{-m})],$$
(F.44)

i.e. the two spectral densities differ only by a sign and multiplicative Boltzmann factor. In the high-temperature limit, where  $|\beta_L \hbar \omega_{-m}| \ll 1$ , we can ignore the Boltzmann factor and the relationship between the two spectral densities simplifies to

$$\operatorname{Re}[K_{-m'-m}(+\omega_{-m})] \approx (-1)^{m+m'} \operatorname{Re}[K_{mm'}(-\omega_{-m})].$$
(F.45)

In the secular approximation the relevant terms in the relaxation superoperator have m' = m. The identity in Eq. (F.45) is then

$$\operatorname{Re}[K_{-m-m}(+\omega_{-m})] \approx \operatorname{Re}[K_{mm}(-\omega_{-m})].$$
(F.46)

Noting that  $\omega_{-m} = -\omega_m$ , we can write Eq. (F.46) in the following equivalent way:

$$\operatorname{Re}[K_{-m-m}(-\omega_m)] \approx \operatorname{Re}[K_{mm}(-\omega_{-m})].$$
(F.47)

#### References

- [1] M.H. Levitt, Spin Dynamics, Wiley and Sons, Ltd, Chichester, 2008.
- [2] L. Emsley, I. Bertini, Frontiers in solid-state NMR technology, Acc. Chem. Res. 46 (2013) 1912–1913.
- [3] H. Heise, F.H. Köhler, M. Herker, W. Hiller, Inter- and intramolecular spin transfer in molecular magnetic materials. Solid-state NMR spectroscopy of paramagnetic metallocenium ions, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 124 (2002) 10823– 10832.
- [4] F.H. Köhler, R. Lescouëzec, Highly resolved spin-density distribution in the Prussian-blue precursors Cs<sub>2</sub>K and Cs<sub>2</sub>K, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 43 (2004) 2571–2573.
- [5] C.P. Grey, N. Dupré, NMR studies of cathode materials for lithium-ion rechargeable batteries, Chem. Rev. 104 (2004) 4493–4512.
- [6] N.P. Wickramasinghe, M. Shaibat, Y. Ishii, Enhanced sensitivity and resolution in H-1 solid-state NMR spectroscopy of paramagnetic complexes under very fast magic angle spinning, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 127 (2005) 5796–5797.
- fast magic angle spinning, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 127 (2005) 5796–5797.
  [7] G. Kervern, G. Pintacuda, Y. Zhang, E. Oldfield, C. Roukoss, E. Kuntz, E. Herdtweck, J.M. Basset, S. Cadars, L. Emsley, Solid-state NMR of a paramagnetic DIAD-Fe-II catalyst: sensitivity, resolution enhancement, and structure-based assignments, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 128 (2006) 13545–13552.
- [8] A. Flambard, F.H. Köhler, R. Lescouëzec, Revisiting prussian blue analogues with solid-state MAS NMR spectroscopy: spin density and local structure in [Cd<sub>3</sub>[Fe(CN)<sub>6</sub>]<sub>2</sub>]·15H<sub>2</sub>2009], Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 48 (2009) 1673–1676.
- [9] I. Bertini, L. Emsley, M. Lelli, C. Luchinat, J.F. Mao, G. Pintacuda, Ultrafast MAS solid-state NMR permits extensive C-13 and H-1 detection in paramagnetic metalloproteins, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 132 (2010) 5558–5559.
- [10] J. Estephane, E. Groppo, J.G. Vitillo, A. Damin, D. Gianolio, C. Lamberti, S. Bordiga, E.A. Quadrelli, J.M. Basset, G. Kervern, L. Emsley, G. Pintacuda, A. Zecchina, A multitechnique approach to spin-flips for Cp<sub>2</sub>Cr(II) chemistry in confined state, J. Phys. Chem. C 114 (2010) 4451–4458.
- [11] M.J. Knight, A.J. Pell, I. Bertini, I.C. Felli, L. Gonnelli, R. Pierattelli, T. Herrmann, L. Emsley, G. Pintacuda, Structure and backbone dynamics of a microcrystalline metalloprotein by solid-state NMR, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 109 (2012) 11095–11100.
- [12] C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, E. Ravera, M. Rinaldelli, Solid-state NMR crystallography through paramagnetic restraints, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 134 (2012) 5006–5009.
- [13] L. Martel, N. Magnini, J.-F. Vigier, J. Boshoven, C. Selfslag, İ. Farnan, J.-C. Griveau, J. Somers, T. Fanghänel, High-resolution solid-state oxygen-17 NMR of actinide-bearing compounds: an insight into the 5f chemistry, Inorg. Chem. 53 (2014) 6928–6933.
- [14] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, Chapter 1: Introduction, Coord. Chem. Rev. 150 (1996) 1–28.
- [15] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, Solution NMR of Paramagnetic Molecules; Application to Metallobiomolecules and Models, Elsevier, London, 2001.
- [16] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, Magnetic susceptibility in paramagnetic NMR, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 40 (2002) 249–273.
- [17] J. Koehler, J. Meiler, Expanding the utility of NMR restraints with paramagnetic compounds: background and practical aspects, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 59 (2011) 360–389.
- [18] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, E. Ravera, NMR of paramagnetic molecules. Applications to metallobiomolecules and models, vol. 2, second ed., Elsevier Science, 2016.
- [19] A. Pines, M.G. Gibby, J.S. Waugh, Proton-enhanced NMR of dilute spins in solids, J. Chem. Phys. 59 (1973) 569–590.
- [20] P. Hodgkinson, Heteronuclear decoupling in the NMR of solids, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 46 (2005) 197–222.
- [21] E.L. Hahn, Spin echoes, Phys. Rev. 80 (1950) 580-594.
- [22] A.W. Hing, S. Vega, J. Schaefer, Transferred-echo double resonance NMR, J. Magn. Reson. 96 (1992) 205–209.
- [23] A.N. Clayton, C.M. Dobson, C.P. Grey, High-resolution C-13 MAS NMR-spectra of paramagnetic lanthanide complexes, J. Chem. Soc. - Chem. Commun. (1990) 72–74.
- [24] K. Liu, D. Ryan, K. Nakanishi, A. McDermott, Solid-state NMR studies of paramagnetic coordination complexes: a comparison of protons and deuterons in detection and decoupling, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 117 (1995) 6897–6909.
- [25] D.P. Raleigh, C.P. Grey, C.M. Soffe, C.M. Dobson, Multiple-frequency decoupling in magic-angle-spinning NMR of paramagnetic solids, J. Magn. Reson. 97 (1992) 162–170.
- [26] Y. Ishii, N.P. Wickramasinghe, S. Chimon, A new approach in 1D and 2D C13 high-resolution solid-state NMR spectroscopy of paramagnetic organometallic complexes by very fast magic-angle spinning, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 125 (2003) 3438–3439.
- [27] N.P. Wickramasinghe, Y. Ishii, Sensitivity enhancement, assignment, and distance measurement in C-13 solid-state NMR spectroscopy for paramagnetic systems under fast magic angle spinning, J. Magn. Reson. 181 (2006) 233–243.
- [28] S.K.K. Swamy, A. Karczmarska, M. Makowska-Janusik, A. Kassiba, J. Dittmer, Solid-state NMR correlation experiments and distance measurements in paramagnetic metalorganics exemplified by Cu-Cyclam, ChemPhysChem 14 (2013) 1864–1870.
- [29] G. Kervern, G. Pintacuda, L. Emsley, Fast adiabatic pulses for solid-state NMR of paramagnetic systems, Chem. Phys. Lett. 435 (2007) 157–162.
- [30] G. Kervern, S. Steuernagel, F. Engelke, G. Pintacuda, L. Emsley, Absence of Curie relaxation in paramagnetic solids yields long H-1 coherence lifetimes, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 129 (2007) 14118.

- [31] R.J. Clément, A.J. Pell, D.S. Middlemiss, F.C. Strobridge, J.K. Miller, M.S. Whittingham, L. Emsley, C.P. Grey, G. Pintacuda, Spin-transfer pathways in paramagnetic lithium transition metal phosphates from combined broadband isotropic solid-state MAS NMR spectroscopy and DFT calculations, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 134 (2012) 17178–17185.
- [32] A.J. Pell, G. Kervern, L. Emsley, M. Deschamps, D. Massiot, P.J. Grandinetti, G. Pintacuda, Broadband inversion for MAS NMR with single-sideband-selective adiabatic pulses, J. Chem. Phys. 134 (2011) 024117.
- [33] A.J. Pell, K.J. Sanders, S. Wegner, G. Pintacuda, C.P. Grey, Low-power broadband solid-state MAS NMR of <sup>14</sup>N, J. Chem. Phys. 146 (2017) 194202.
- [34] K.J. Sanders, A.J. Pell, S. Wegner, C.P. Grey, G. Pintacuda, Broadband MAS NMR spectroscopy in the low-power limit, Chem. Phys. Lett. 697 (2018) 29–37.
- [35] A.J. Pell, G. Pintacuda, Broadband solid-state MAS NMR of paramagnetic systems, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 84–85 (2015) 33–72.
- [36] H.M. McConnell, D.B. Chesnut, Isotropic hyperfine interactions in  $\pi$ -electron radicals, J. Chem. Phys. 28 (1958) 107–117.
- [37] H.M. McConnell, R.E. Robertson, Isotropic nuclear resonance shifts, J. Chem. Phys. 29 (1958) 1361–1365.
- [38] R.J. Kurland, B.R. McGarvey, Isotropic NMR shifts in transition metal complexes: the calculation of the Fermi contact and pseudocontact terms, J. Magn. Reson. 2 (1970) 286–301.
- [39] S. Moon, S. Patchkovskii, Calculation of NMR and EPR parameters: theory and applications, in: Chapter 20. First-Principles Calculations of Paramagnetic NMR Shifts, 2004 (Kaupp et al. [202]).
- [40] T.O. Pennanen, J. Vaara, Nuclear magnetic resonance chemical shift in an arbitrary electronic spin state, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100 (2008) 133002.
- [41] J. Vaara, S.A. Rouf, J. Mares, Magnetic couplings in the chemical shift of paramagnetic NMR, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 11 (2015) 4840–4849.
- [42] M. Kaupp, F.H. Köhler, Combining NMR spectroscopy and quantum chemistry as tools to quantify spin density distributions in molecular magnetic compounds, Coord. Chem. Rev. 253 (2009) 2376–2386.
- [43] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, Chapter 2: The hyperfine shift, Coord. Chem. Rev. 150 (1996) 29–75.
- [44] I. Bertini, P. Turano, A.J. Vila, Nuclear-magnetic-resonance of paramagnetic metalloproteins, Chem. Rev. 93 (1993) 2833–2932.
- [45] S. Balayssac, I. Bertini, A. Bhaumik, M. Lelli, C. Luchinat, Paramagnetic shifts in solid-state NMR of proteins to elicit structural information, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 105 (2008) 17284–17289.
- [46] M.J. Knight, İ.C. Felli, R. Pierattelli, I. Bertini, L. Emsley, T. Herrmann, G. Pintacuda, Rapid measurement of pseudocontact shifts in metalloproteins by proton-detected solid-state NMR spectroscopy, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 134 (2012) 14730–14733.
- [47] I. Bertini, F. Briganti, C. Luchinat, A. Scozzafava, M. Sola, <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy and the electronic structure of the high potential iron-sulfur protein from *Chromatium vinosum*, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 113 (1991) 1237–1245.
- [48] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, Chapter 5: Magnetic coupled systems, Coord. Chem. Rev. 150 (1996) 131–161.
- [49] D. Carlier, M. Ménétrier, C.P. Grey, C. Delmas, G. Ceder, Understanding the NMR shifts in paramagnetic transition metal oxides using density functional theory calculations, Phys. Rev. B 67 (2003) 174103.
- [50] R.J. McCarty, J.F. Stebbins, Transition metal dopant cation distributions in MgO and CaO: new inferences from paramagnetically shifted resonances in <sup>17</sup>O, <sup>25</sup>Mg, and <sup>43</sup>Ca NMR spectra, J. Phys. Chem. C 120 (2016) 11111–11120.
- [51] J.F. Stebbins, R.J. McCarty, A.C. Palke, Solid-state NMR and short-range order in crystalline oxides and silicates: a new tool in paramagnetic resonances, Acta Cryst. C73 (2017) 128–136.
- [52] J.F. Stebbins, Toward the wider application of <sup>29</sup>Si NMR spectroscopy to paramagnetic transition metal silicate minerals: copper(II) silicates, Am. Mineral. 102 (2017) 2406–2414.
- [53] J.F. Stebbins, R.J. McCarty, A.C. Palke, Towards the wider application of <sup>29</sup>Si NMR spectroscopy to paramagnetic transition metal silicate minerals and glasses, 2: Fe(II), Co(II), and Ni(II) silicates, Am. Mineral. 103 (2018) 776–791.
   [54] J. Kim, D.S. Middlemiss, N.A. Chernova, B.Y.X. Zhu, C. Masquelier, C.P. Grey,
- [54] J. Kim, D.S. Middlemiss, N.A. Chernova, B.Y.X. Zhu, C. Masquelier, C.P. Grey, Linking local environments and hyperfine shifts: a combined experimental and theoretical <sup>31</sup>P and <sup>7</sup>Li solid-state NMR study of paramagnetic Fe(III) phosphates, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 132 (2010) 16825–16840.
- [55] D.S. Middlemiss, A.J. Ilott, R.J. Clément, F.C. Strobridge, C.P. Grey, Density functional theory-based bond pathway decompositions of hyperfine shifts: equipping solid-state NMR to characterize atomic environments in paramagnetic materials, Chem. Mater. 25 (2013) 1723–1734.
- [56] J. Xu, R.J. Lee, R.J. Clément, X. Yu, M. Leskes, A.J. Pell, G. Pintacuda, X.-Q. Yang, C.P. Grey, Y.S. Meng, Identifying the critical role of Li substitution in P2−Na<sub>x</sub>[Li<sub>y</sub>Ni<sub>2</sub>Mn<sub>1-y-z</sub>]O<sub>2</sub> (0 < x, y, z < 1) intercalation cathode materials for high energy Na-ion batteries, Chem. Mater. 26 (2014) 1260–1269.
- [57] F.C. Strobridge, D.S. Middlemiss, A.J. Pell, M. Leskes, R.J. Clément, F. Pourpoint, Z. Lu, J.V. Hanna, G. Pintacuda, L. Emsley, A. Samoson, C.P. Grey, Characterising local environments in high energy density Li-ion battery cathodes: a combined NMR and first principles study of LiFe<sub>x</sub>Co<sub>1-x</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, J. Mater. Chem. A 2 (2014) 11948–11957.
- [58] I.D. Seymour, D.S. Middlemiss, D.M. Halat, N.M. Trease, A.J. Pell, C.P. Grey, Characterizing oxygen local environments in paramagnetic battery materials via <sup>17</sup>O NMR and DFT calculations, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 138 (2016) 9405–9408.
- [59] J. Lee, I.D. Seymour, A.J. Pell, S.E. Dutton, C.P. Grey, A systematic study of <sup>25</sup>Mg NMR in paramagnetic transition metal oxides: applications to Mg-ion battery materials, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 19 (2017) 613–625.

- [60] R. Pigliapochi, I.D. Seymour, C. Merlet, A.J. Pell, D.T. Murphy, S. Schmid, C.P. Grey, Structural characterization of the Li-ion battery cathode materials  $\text{LiTi}_x \text{Mn}_{2-x} \text{O}_4$  (0.2  $\leq x \leq 1.5$ ): a combined experimental <sup>7</sup>Li NMR and first-principles study, Chem. Mater. 30 (2018) 817–829.
- [61] R.M. Golding, M.P. Halton, A theoretical study of the <sup>14</sup>N and <sup>17</sup>O N.M.R. shifts in lanthanide complexes, Aust. J. Chem. 25 (1972) 2577–2581.
- [62] B. Bleaney, Nuclear magnetic resonance shifts in solution due to lanthanide ions, J. Magn. Reson. 8 (1972) 91–100.
- [63] A.M. Funk, K.-L.N.A. Finney, P. Harvey, A.M. Kenwright, E.R. Neil, N.J. Rogers, P. K. Senanayake, D. Parker, Critical analysis of the limitations of Bleaney's theory of magnetic anisotropy in paramagnetic lanthanide coordination complexes, Chem. Sci. 6 (2015) 1655–1662.
- [64] B.R. McGarvey, Temperature dependence of the pseudocontact shift in lanthanide shift reagents, J. Magn. Reson. 33 (1979) 445–455.
- [65] A.K. Cheetham, C.M. Dobson, C.P. Grey, R.J.B. Jakeman, Paramagnetic shift probes in high-resolution solid-state NMR, Nature 328 (1987) 706–707.
- [66] C. P Grey, M.E. Smith, A.K. Cheetham, C.M. Dobson, R. Dupree, <sup>89</sup>Y MAS NMR study of rare-earth pyrochlores: paramagnetic shifts in the solid state, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 112 (1990) 4670–4675.
- [67] N.C. George, A.J. Pell, G. Dantelle, A. Llobet, M. Balasubramanian, G. Pintacuda, B.F. Chmelka, R. Seshadri, Local environments of dilute activator ions in the solid-state lighting phosphor Y<sub>3-x</sub>Ce<sub>x</sub>Al<sub>5</sub>O<sub>12</sub>, Chem. Mater. 25 (2013) 3979– 3995.
- [68] R.J. McCarty, J.F. Stebbins, Investigating lanthanide dopant distributions in yttrium aluminum garnet (YAG) using solid state paramagnetic NMR, Solid State Nucl. Magn. Reson. 79 (2016) 11–22.
- [69] C.P. Grey, C.M. Dobson, A.K. Cheetham, R.J.B. Jakeman, Studies of rare-earth stannates by <sup>119</sup>Sn MAS NMR. The use of paramagnetic shift probes in the solid state, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 111 (1989) 505–511.
- [70] A.R. Brough, C.P. Grey, C.M. Dobson, Structural information from NMR-studies of paramagnetic solids - Na-23 MAS spectra of sodium lanthanide salts of ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid, J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun. (1992) 742– 743.
- [71] A.R. Brough, C.P. Grey, C.M. Dobson, Paramagnetic ions as structural probes in solid-state NMR: distance measurements in crystalline lanthnide acetates, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 115 (1993) 7318–7327.
- [72] G. Kervern, A. D'Aleo, O. Maury, L. Emsley, G. Pintacuda, Crystal structure determination of powdered paramagnetic lanthanide complexes by proton NMR, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 48 (2009) 3082–3086.
- [73] N.C. George, J. Brgoch, A.J. Pell, C. Cozzan, A. Jaffe, G. Dantelle, A. Llobet, G. Pintacuda, R. Seshadri, B.F. Chmelka, Correlating local compositions and structures with the macroscopic optical properties of Ce<sup>3+</sup>-doped CaSc<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>, an efficient green-emitting phosphor, Chem. Mater. 29 (2017) 3538–3546.
- [74] M. Vonci, K. Mason, E.A. Suturina, A.T. Frawley, S.G. Worswick, I. Kuprov, D. Parker, E.J.L. McInnes, N.F. Chilton, Rationalization of anomalous pseudocontact shifts and their solvent dependence in a series of c<sub>3</sub>-symmetric lanthanide complexes, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 139 (2017) 14166–14172.
- [75] I. Bertini, M.B.L. Janik, Y.-M. Lee, C. Luchinat, A. Rosato, Magnetic susceptibility tensor anisotropies for a lanthanide ion series in a fixed protein matrix, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 123 (2001) 4181–4188.
- [76] I. Bertini, C. Del Bianco, I. Gelis, N. Katsaros, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, M. Peana, A. Provenzani, M.A. Zoroddu, Experimentally exploring the conformational space sampled by domain reorientation in calmodulin, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 101 (2004) 6841–6846.
- [77] I. Bertini, P. Kursula, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, J. Vahokoski, M. Wilmanns, J. Yuan, Accurate solution structures of proteins from X-ray data and a minimal set of NMR data: calmodulin-peptide complexes as examples, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 131 (2009) 5134–5144.
- [78] G. Pintacuda, M. John, X.-C. Su, G. Otting, NMR structure determination of protein-ligand complexes by lanthanide labeling, Acc. Chem. Res. 40 (2007) 206–212.
- [79] T. Zhuang, H.-S. Lee, B. Imperiali, J.H. Prestegard, Structure determination of a Galectin-3-carbohydrate complex using paramagnetism-based NMR constraints, Protein Sci. 17 (2008) 1220–1231.
- [80] P.H.J. Keizers, A. Saragliadis, Y. Hiruma, M. Overhand, M. Ubbink, Design, synthesis, and evaluation of a lanthanide chelating protein probe: CLaNP-5 yields predictable paramagnetic effects independent of environment, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 130 (2008) 14802–14812.
- [81] L. de la Cruz, T.H.D. Nguyen, K. Ozawa, J. Shin, B. Graham, T. Huber, G. Otting, Binding of low molecular weight inhibitors promotes large conformational changes in the dengue virus NS2B-NS3 protease: fold analysis by pseudocontact shifts, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 133 (2011) 19205–19215.
- [82] Y. Kobashigawa, T. Saio, M. Ushio, M. Sekiguchi, M. Yokochi, K. Ogura, F. Inagaki, Convenient method for resolving degeneracies due to symmetry of the magnetic susceptibility tensor and its application to pseudo contact shift-based protein–protein complex structure determination, J. Biomol. NMR 53 (2012) 53–63.
- [83] L. Cerofolini, G.B. Fields, M. Fragai, C.F.G.C. Geraldes, G. Luchinat, C. Parigi, E. Ravera, D.I. Svergun, J.M.C. Teixeira, Examination of matrix metalloproteinase-1 in solution, J. Biol. Chem. 288 (2013) 30659–30671.
- [84] J.-Y. Guan, P.H.J. Keizers, W.-M. Liu, F. Löhr, S.P. Skinner, E.A. Heeneman, H. Schwalbe, M. Ubbink, G. Siegal, Small-molecule binding sites on proteins established by paramagnetic NMR spectroscopy, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 135 (2013) 5859–5868.

- [85] H. Yagi, K.B. Pilla, A. Maleckis, B. Graham, T. Huber, G. Otting, Threedimensional protein fold determination from backbone amide pseudocontact shifts generated by lanthanide tags at multiple sites, Structure 21 (2013) 883–890.
- [86] D.J. Crick, J.X. Wang, B. Graham, J.D. Swarbrick, H.R. Mott, D. Nietlispach, Integral membrane protein structure determination using pseudocontact shifts, J. Biomol. NMR 61 (2015) 197–207.
- [87] W. Van den Heuvel, A. Soncini, NMR chemical shift in an electronic state with arbitrary degeneracy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 073001.
- [88] A. Soncini, W. Van den Heuvel, Communication: paramagnetic NMR chemical shift in a spin state subject to zero-field splitting, J. Chem. Phys. 138 (2013) 021103.
- [89] W. Van den Heuvel, A. Soncini, NMR chemical shift as analytical derivative of the Helmholtz free energy, J. Chem. Phys. 138 (2013) 054113.
- [90] B. Martin, J. Autschbach, Temperature dependence of contact and dipolar NMR chemical shifts in paramagnetic molecules, J. Chem. Phys. 142 (2015) 054108.
- [91] B. Martin, J. Autschbach, Erratum: "temperature dependence of contact and dipolar NMR chemical shifts in paramagnetic molecules" [J. Chem. Phys. 142, 054108 (2015)], J. Chem. Phys. 145 (2016) 049901.
- [92] F. Gendron, K. Sharkas, J. Autschbach, Calculating NMR chemical shifts for paramagnetic metal complexes from first-principles, J. Phys. Chem. Lett. 6 (2015) 2183–2188.
- [93] F. Gendron, J. Autschbach, Ligand NMR chemical shift calculations for paramagnetic metal complexes: 5f<sup>1</sup> vs 5f<sup>2</sup> actinides, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 12 (2016) 5309–5321.
- [94] J. Kowalewski, D. Kruk, G. Parigi, NMR relaxation in solution of paramagnetic complexes: recent theoretical progress for S ≥ 1, Adv. Inorg. Chem. 57 (2005) 41–104.
- [95] J. Kowalewski, L. Nordenskiöld, B. Nikolas, P.-O. Westlund, Theory of nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic systems in solution, Prog. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 17 (1985) 141–185.
- [96] J. Kowalewski, Mäler, Nuclear Spin Relaxation in Liquids: Theory, Experiments, and Applications, Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton, 2006.
- [97] I. Solomon, Relaxation processes in a system of two spins, Phys. Rev. 99 (1955) 559–565.
- [98] N. Bloembergen, Proton relaxation times in paramagnetic solutions, J. Chem. Phys. 27 (1957) 572–573.
- [99] N. Bloembergen, L.O. Morgan, Proton relaxation times in paramagnetic solutions. Effects of electron spin relaxation, J. Chem. Phys. 34 (1961) 842–850.
- [100] M. Gueron, Nuclear relaxation in macromolecules by paramagnetic ions: a novel mechanism, J. Magn. Reson. 19 (1975) 58–66.
- [101] A.J. Vega, D. Fiat, Nuclear relaxation processes of paramagnetic complexes. The slow motion case, Mol. Phys. 31 (1976) 347–355.
- [102] I. Sengupta, P.S. Nadaud, J.J. Helmus, C.D. Schwieters, C.P. Jaroniec, Protein fold determined by paramagnetic magic-angle spinning solid-state NMR spectroscopy, Nature Chem. 4 (2012) 410–417.
- [103] N. Benetis, J. Kowalewski, L. Nordenskiöld, H. Wennerström, P.O. Westlund, Nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic systems. The slow motion problem for electron spin relaxation, Mol. Phys. 48 (1983) 329–346.
- [104] N. Benetis, J. Kowalewski, L. Nordenskiöld, H. Wennerström, P.O. Westlund, Dipole-dipole nuclear spin relaxation. A cross correlation correction to the Solomon–Bloembergen equation for T<sub>2</sub>, Mol. Phys. 50 (1983) 515–530.
- [105] N. Benetis, J. Kowalewski, L. Nordenskiöld, H. Wennerström, P.O. Westlund, Nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic systems (S = 1) in the slow-motion regime for the electron spin. II. The dipolar  $T_2$  and the role of scalar interaction, J. Magn. Reson. 58 (1984) 261–281.
- [106] T. Larsson, P.-O. Westlund, J. Kowalewski, S.H. Koenig, Nuclear-spin relaxation in paramagnetic complexes in the slow-motion regime for the electron spin: the anisotropic pseudorotation model for S = 1 and the interpretation of nuclear magnetic relaxation dispersion results for a low-symmetry Ni(II) complex, J. Chem. Phys. 101 (1994) 1116–1128.
- [107] T. Nilsson, J. Kowalewski, Slow-motion theory of nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic low- symmetry complexes: a generalization to high electron spin, J. Magn. Reson. 146 (2000) 345–358.
- [108] P.O. Westlund, H. Wennerström, L. Nordenskiöld, J. Kowalewski, N. Benetis, Nuclear spin-lattice and spin-spin relaxation in paramagnetic systems in the slow-motion regime for the electron spin. III. Dipole-dipole and scalar spin-spin interaction for S = 3/2 and S = 5/2, J. Magn. Reson. 59 (1984) 91–109.
- [109] I. Bertini, J. Kowalewski, C. Luchinat, T. Nilsson, G. Parigi, Nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic complexes of S = 1: electron spin relaxation effects, J. Chem. Phys. 111 (1999) 5795–5807.
- [110] D. Kruk, T. Nilsson, J. Kowalewski, Nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic systems with zero-field splitting and arbitrary electron spin, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 3 (2001) 4907–4917.
- [111] P.H. Fries, E. Belorizky, Relaxation theory of the electronic spin of a complexed paramagnetic metal ion in solution beyond the Redfield limit, J. Chem. Phys. 126 (2007) 204503.
- [112] S. Rast, P.H. Fries, E. Belorizky, A. Borel, L. Helm, A.E. Merbach, A general approach to the electronic spin relaxation of Gd(III) complexes in solustions, Monte Carlo simulations beyond the Redfield limit, J. Chem. Phys. 115 (2001) 7554–7563.
- [113] S.M. Abernathy, R.R. Sharp, Spin dynamics calculations of electron and nuclear spin relaxation times in paramagnetic solutions, J. Chem. Phys. 106 (1997) 9032–9043.

- [114] N. Schaefle, R.R. Sharp, Electron spin relaxation due to reorientation of a permanent zero field splitting tensor, J. Chem. Phys. 121 (2004) 5387–5394.
- [115] N. Schaefle, R.R. Sharp, Four complementary theoretical approaches for the analysis of NMR paramagnetic relaxation, J. Magn. Reson. 176 (2005) 160– 170.
- [116] M. Rubinstein, A. Baram, Z. Luz, Electronic and nuclear relaxation in solutions of transition metal ions with S = 3/2 and 5/2, Mol. Phys. 20 (1971) 67–80.
- [117] S. Rast, P.H. Fries, E. Belorizky, Static zero field splitting effects on the electronic relaxation of paramagnetic metal ion complexes in solution, J. Chem. Phys. 113 (2000) 8724–8735.
- [118] P.-O. Westlund, R.M. Lynden-Bell, A study of vibrational dephasing of the A<sub>1</sub> modes of CH<sub>3</sub>CN in a computer simulation of the liquid phase, Mol. Phys. 60 (1987) 1189–1209.
- [119] P.-O. Westlund, R.M. Lynden-Bell, The effects of pressure and temperature on vibrational dephasing in a simulation of liquid CH<sub>3</sub>CN, Mol. Phys. 61 (1987) 1541–1547.
- [120] D. Kruk, J. Kowalewski, P.-O. Westlund, Nuclear and electron spin relaxation in paramagnetic complexes in solution: effects of the quantum nature of molecular vibrations, J. Chem. Phys. 121 (2004) 2215–2227.
- [121] Z. Luz, S. Meiboom, Proton relaxation in dilute solutions of cobalt(II) and nickel(II) ions in methanol and the rate of methanol exchange of the solvation sphere, J. Chem. Phys. 40 (1964) 2686–2692.
- [122] D. Kruk, T. Nilsson, J. Kowalewski, Outer-sphere nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic systems: a low-field theory, Mol. Phys. 99 (2001) 1435–1445.
- [123] D. Kruk, J. Kowalewski, Nuclear spin relaxation in ligands outside of the first coordination sphere in a gadolinium (III) complex: effects of intermolecular forces, J. Chem. Phys. 117 (2002) 1194–1200.
- [124] T. Nilsson, G. Parigi, J. Kowalewski, Experimental NMRD profiles for some low-symmetry Ni(II) complexes (S = 1) in solution and their interpretation using slow-motion theory, J. Phys. Chem. A 106 (2002) 4476–4488.
- [125] D. Kruk, J. Kowalewski, Field-dependent proton relaxation in aqueous solutions of some manganese(II) complexes: a new interpretation, J. Biol. Inorg. Chem. 8 (2003) 512–518.
- [126] D.H. Powell, O.M.N. Dhubhghaill, D. Pubanz, L. Helm, Y.S. Lebedev, W. Schlaepfer, A.E. Merbach, Structural and dynamic parameters obtained from <sup>17</sup>O NMR, EPR, and NMRD studies of monomeric and dimeric Gd<sup>3\*</sup> complexes of interest in magnetic resonance imaging: an integrated and theoretically self-consistent approach, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 118 (1996) 9333–9346.
- [127] E. Tóth, F. Connac, L. Helm, K. Adzamli, A.E. Merbach, <sup>17</sup>O-NMR, EPR and NMRD characterization of [Gd(DTPA-BMEA)(H<sub>2</sub>O)]: a neutral MRI contrast agent, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. (1998) 2017–2021.
- [128] P. Caravan, J.J. Ellison, T.J. McMurry, R.B. Lauffer, Gadolinium(III) chelates as MRI contrast agents: structure, dynamics, and applications, Chem. Rev. 99 (1999) 2293–2352.
- [129] P.L. Anelli, I. Bertini, M. Fragai, L. Lattuada, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, Sulfonamidefunctionalized gadolinium DTPA complexes as possible contrast agents for MRI: a relaxometric investigation, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. (2000) 625–630.
- [130] P. Caravan, Strategies for increasing the sensitivity of gadolinium based MRI contrast agents, Chem. Soc. Rev. 35 (2006) 512–523.
- [131] E.J. Werner, S. Avedano, M. Botta, B.P. Hay, E.G. Moore, S. Aime, K.N. Raymond, Highly soluble tris-hydroxypyridonate Gd(III) complexes with increased hydration number, fast water exchange, slow electronic relaxation, and high relaxivity, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 129 (2007) 1870–1871.
- [132] D. T Schühle, J. Schatz, S. Laurent, L. Vander Elst, R.N. Muller, M.C.A. Stuart, J.A. Peters, Calix[4]arenes as molecular platforms for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) contrast agents, Chem. Eur. J. 15 (2009) 3290–3296.
- [133] E. Gianolio, S. Porto, R. Napolitano, S. Baroni, G.B. Giovenzana, S. Aime, Relaxometric investigations and MRI evaluation of a liposome- loaded pHresponsive gadolinium(III) complex, Inorg. Chem. 51 (2012) 7210–7217.
- [134] M.W. Rotz, K.S.B. Culver, G. Parigi, K.W. MacRenaris, C. Luchinat, T.W. Odom, T.J. Meade, High relaxivity Gd(III)-DNA gold nanostars: investigation of shape effects on proton relaxation, ACS Nano 9 (2015) 3385–3396.
- [135] W. Nusser, R. Kimmich, Protein backbone fluctuations and NMR field-cycling relaxation spectroscopy, J. Phys. Chem. 94 (1990) 5637–5639.
  [136] S.H. Koenig, R.D. Brown III, Field-cycling relaxometry of protein solutions and
- [136] S.H. Koenig, R.D. Brown III, Field-cycling relaxometry of protein solutions and tissue: implications for MRI, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 22 (1990) 487–567.
- [137] I. Bertini, O. Galas, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, A computer program for the calculation of paramagnetic enhancements of nuclear-relaxation rates in slowly rotating systems, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. A 113 (1995) 151–158.
- [138] P.-O. Westlund, A low-field paramagnetic nuclear spin relaxation theory, J. Chem. Phys. 108 (1998) 4945–4953.
- [139] T. Nilsson, J. Kowalewski, Low-field theory of nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic low-symmetry complexes for electron spin systems of S = 1, 3/2, 2, 5/2, 3 and 7/2, Mol. Phys. 98 (2000) 1617–1638.
- [140] T. Nilsson, J. Kowalewski, Erratum: Low-field theory of nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic low-symmetry complexes for electron spin systems of S = 1, 3/2, 2, 5/2, 3 and 7/2, Mol. Phys. 99 (2001) 369–370.
- [141] J.-P. Korb, R.G. Bryant, The physical basis for the magnetic field dependence of proton spin-lattice relaxation rates in proteins, J. Chem. Phys. 115 (2001) 10964–10974.
- [142] R. Kimmich, E. Anoardo, Field-cycling NMR relaxometry, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 44 (2004) 257–320.
- [143] M.F. Roberts, A.G. Redfield, High-resolution <sup>31</sup>P field cycling NMR as a probe of phospholipid dynamics, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 126 (2004) 13765– 13777.

- [144] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, <sup>1</sup>H NMRD profiles of paramagnetic complexes and metalloproteins, Adv. Inorg. Chem. 57 (2005) 105–172.
- [145] G. Ferrante, S. Sykora, Technical aspects of fast field cycling, Adv. Inorg. Chem. 57 (2005) 405–470.
- [146] C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, E. Ravera, Can metal ion complexes be used as polarizing agents for solution DNP? A theoretical discussion, J. Biomol. NMR 58 (2014) 239–249.
- [147] G. Liu, M. Levien, N. Karschin, G. Parigi, C. Luchinat, M. Bennati, One-thousand-fold enhancement of high field liquid nuclear magnetic resonance signals at room temperature, Nat. Chem. 9 (2017) 676–680.
   [148] D.L. VanderHart, W.L. Earl, Resolution in <sup>13</sup>C NMR of organic solids using
- [148] D.L. VanderHart, W.L. Earl, Resolution in <sup>13</sup>C NMR of organic solids using high-power proton decoupling and magic-angle sample spinning, J. Magn. Reson. 44 (1981) 361–401.
- [149] M. Alla, E. Lippmaa, Resolution limits in magic-angle rotation NMR spectra of polycrystalline solids, Chem. Phys. Lett. 87 (1982) 30–33.
- [150] C.P. Grey, C.M. Dobson, A.K. Cheetham, Susceptibility matching in MAS NMR. The determination of hyperfine tensors from paramagnetic stannates, J. Magn. Reson. 98 (1992) 414–420.
- [151] U. Schwerk, D. Michel, M. Pruski, Local magnetic field distribution in a polycrystalline sample exposed to a strong magnetic field, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. A 119 (1996) 157–164.
- [152] A. Kubo, T.P. Spaniol, T. Terao, The effect of bulk magnetic susceptibility on solid state NMR spectra of paramagnetic compounds, J. Magn. Reson. 133 (1998) 330–340.
- [153] R. Dickinson, A.T. Royappa, F. Tone, L. Ujj, G. Wu, Distribution of non-uniform demagnetization fields in paramagnetic bulk solids, J. Appl. Phys. 110 (2011) 013902.
- [154] N.M. Trease, L. Zhou, H.J. Chang, B.Y. Zhu, C.P. Grey, *In situ* NMR of lithium ion batteries: bulk susceptibility effects and practical considerations, Solid State Nucl. Magn. Reson. 42 (2012) 62–70.
- [155] L. Zhou, M. Leskes, A.J. Ilott, N.M. Trease, C.P. Grey, Paramagnetic electrodes and bulk magnetic susceptibility effects in the *in situ* NMR studies of batteries: application to Li<sub>1.08</sub>Mn<sub>1.92</sub>O<sub>4</sub> spinels, J. Magn. Reson. 234 (2013) 44–57.
- [156] A.W. Overhauser, Polarization of nuclei in metals, Phys. Rev. 92 (1953) 411– 415.
- [157] T.R. Carver, C.P. Slichter, Polarization of nuclear spins in metals, Phys. Rev. 92 (1953) 212–213.
- [158] T.R. Carver, C.P. Slichter, Experimental verification of the Overhauser nuclear polarization effect, Phys. Rev. 102 (1956) 975–980.
- [159] L.R. Becerra, G.J. Gerfen, R.J. Temkin, D.J. Singel, R.G. Griffin, Dynamic nuclear polarization with a cyclotron resonance maser at 5 T, Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 3561–3564.
- [160] M. Rosay, L. Tometich, S. Pawsey, R. Bader, R. Schauwecker, M. Blank, P.M. Borchard, S.R. Cauffman, K.L. Felch, R.T. Weber, R.J. Temkin, R.G. Griffin, W.E. Maas, Solid-state dynamic nuclear polarization at 263 GHz: spectrometer design and experimental results, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 12 (2010) 5850– 5860.
- [161] A.B. Barnes, G. De Paëpe, P.C.A. van der Wel, K.-N. Hu, C.-G. Joo, V.S. Bajaj, M.L. Mak-Jurkauskas, J.R. Sirigiri, J. Herzfeld, R.J. Temkin, R.G. Griffin, High-field dynamic nuclear polarization for solid and solution biological NMR, Appl. Magn. Reson. 34 (2008) 237–263.
- [162] T. Maly, G.T. Debelouchina, V.S. Bajaj, K.-N. Hu, C. -G Joo, M.L. Mak-Jurkauskas, J.R. Sirigiri, P.C.A. van der Wel, J. Herzfeld, R.J. Temkin, R.G. Griffin, Dynamic nuclear polarization at high magnetic fields, J. Chem. Phys. 128 (2008) 052211.
- [163] G.T. Debelouchina, M.J. Bayro, P.C.A. van derWel, M.A. Caporini, A.B. Barnes, M. Rosay, W.E. Maas, R.G. Griffin, Dynamic nuclear polarization-enhanced solid-state NMR spectroscopy of GNNQQNY nanocrystals and amyloid fibrils, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 12 (2010) 5911–5919.
   [164] G.J. Gerfen, L.R. Becerra, D.A. Hall, R.G. Griffin, R.J. Temkin, D.J. Singel, High
- [164] G.J. Gerfen, L.R. Becerra, D.A. Hall, R.G. Griffin, R.J. Temkin, D.J. Singel, High frequency (140 GHz) dynamic nuclear polarization: polarization transfer to a solute in frozen aqueous solution, J. Chem. Phys. 102 (1995) 9494–9497.
- [165] D.A. Hall, D.C. Maus, G.J. Gerfen, S.J. Inati, L.R. Becerra, F.W. Dahlquist, R.G. Griffin, Polarization-enhanced NMR spectroscopy of biomolecules in frozen solution, Science 276 (1997) 930–932.
- [166] C. Song, K.-N. Hu, C.-G. Joo, T.M. Swager, R.G. Griffin, TOTAPOL: a biradical polarizing agent for dynamic nuclear polarization experiments in aqueous media, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 128 (2006) 11385–11390.
- [167] C. Sauvée, M. Rosay, G. Casano, F. Aussenac, R.T. Weber, O. Ouari, P. Tordo, Highly efficient, water-soluble polarizing agents for dynamic nuclear polarization at high frequency, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 52 (2013) 10858– 10861.
- [168] C. Sauvée, G. Casano, S. Abel, A. Rockenbauer, D. Akhmetzyanov, H. Karoui, D. Siri, F. Aussenac, W. Maas, R.T. Weber, T. Prisner, M. Rosay, P. Tordo, O. Ouari, Tailoring of polarizing agents in the bTurea series for cross.effect dynamic nuclear polarization in aqueous media, Chem. Eur. J. 22 (2016) 5598–5606.
- [169] A. Zagdoun, G. Casano, O. Ouari, G. Lapadula, A.J. Rossini, M. Lelli, M. Baffert, D. Gajan, L. Veyre, W.E. Maas, M. Rosay, R.T. Weber, C. Thieuleux, C. Copéret, A. Lesage, P. Tordo, L. Emsley, A slowly relaxing rigid biradical for efficient dynamic nuclear polarization surface-enhanced NMR spectroscopy: expeditious characterization of functional group manipulation in hybrid materials, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 134 (2012) 2284–2291.
- [170] A. Zagdoun, G. Casano, O. Ouari, M. Schwarzwälder, A.J. Rossini, F. Aussenac, M. Yulikov, G. Jeschke, C. Copéret, A. Lesage, P. Tordo, L. Emsley, A slowly relaxing rigid biradical for efficient dynamic nuclear polarization surface-

enhanced NMR spectroscopy: expeditious characterization of functional group manipulation in hybrid materials, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 135 (2013) 12790–12797.

- [171] D.J. Kubicki, G. Casano, M. Schwarzwälder, S. Abel, C. Sauvée, K. Ganesan, M. Yulikov, A.J. Rossini, G. Jeschke, C. Copéret, A. Lesage, P. Tordo, O. Ouari, L. Emsley, Rational design of dinitroxide biradicals for efficient cross-effect dynamic nuclear polarization, Chem. Sci. 7 (2016) 550–558.
- [172] P.C.A. van der Wel, K.-N. Hu, J. Lewandowski, R.G. Griffin, Dynamic nuclear polarization of amyloidogenic peptide nanocrystals: GNNQQNY, a core segment of the yeast prion protein Sup35p, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 128 (2006) 10840–10846.
- [173] M.L. Mak-Jurkauskas, V.S. Bajaj, M.K. Hornstein, M. Belenky, R.G. Griffin, J. Herzfeld, Energy transformations early in the bacteriorhodopsin photocycle revealed by DNP-enhanced solid-state NMR, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 105 (2008) 883–888.
- [174] V.S. Bajaj, M.L. Mak-Jurkauskas, M. Belenky, J. Herzfeld, R.G. Griffin, Functional and shunt states of bacteriorhodopsin resolved by 250 GHz dynamic nuclear polarization-enhanced solid-state NMR, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 106 (2009) 9244–9249.
- [175] G.T. Debelouchina, G.W. Platt, M.J. Bayro, R.G. Griffin, Magic angle spinning NMR analysis of  $\beta_2$ -microglobulin amyloid fibrils in two distinct morphologies, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 132 (2010) 10414–10423.
- [176] M.J. Bayro, T. Maly, N.R. Birkett, C.E. MacPhee, C.M. Dobson, R.G. Griffin, Highresolution MAS NMR analysis of PI3–SH3 amyloid fibrils: backbone conformation and implications for protofilament assembly and structure, Biochemistry 49 (2010) 7474–7484.
- [177] K. Jaudzems, A. Bertarello, S.R. Chaudhari, A. Pica, D. Cala-De Paepe, E. Barbet-Massin, A.J. Pell, I. Akopjana, S. Kotelovica, D. Gajan, O. Ouari, K. Tars, G. Pintacuda, A. Lesage, Dynamic nuclear polarization enhanced biomolecular NMR spectroscopy at high magnetic field with fast magic-angle spinning, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 57 (2018) 7458–7462, https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201801016.
- [178] A. Lesage, M. Lelli, D. Gajan, M.A. Caporini, V. Vitzthum, P. Miéville, J. Alauzun, A. Roussey, C. Thieuleux, A. Mehdi, G. Bodenhausen, C. Copéret, L. Emsley, Surface enhanced NMR spectroscopy by dynamic nuclear polarization, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 132 (2010) 15459–15461.
- [179] M.A. Hope, D.M. Halat, P.C.M.M. Magusin, S. Paul, L. Peng, C.P. Grey, Surfaceselective direct <sup>17</sup>O DNP NMR of CeO<sub>2</sub> nanoparticles, Chem. Commun. 53 (2017) 2142–2145.
- [180] M.F. Delley, G. Lapadula, F. Núnez-Zarur, A. Comas-Vivas, V. Kalendra, G. Jeschke, D. Baabe, M.D. Walter, A.J. Rossini, A. Lesage, L. Emsley, O. Maury, C. Copéret, Local structures and heterogeneity of silica-supported M(III) sites evidenced by EPR, IR, NMR, and luminescence spectroscopies, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 139 (2017) 8855–8867.
- [181] B. Corzilius, A.A. Smith, A.B. Barnes, C. Luchinat, I. Bertini, R.G. Griffin, High-field dynamic nuclear polarization with high-spin transition metal ions, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 133 (2011) 5648–5651.
- [182] M. Kaushik, T. Bahrenberg, T.V. Can, M.A. Caporini, R. Silvers, J. Heiliger, A.A. Smith, H. Schwalbe, R.G. Griffin, B. Corzilius, Gd(III) and Mn(II) complexes for dynamic nuclear polarization: small molecular chelate polarizing agents and applications with site-directed spin labeling of proteins, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 18 (2016) 27205–27218.
- [183] K.R. Thurber, R. Tycko, Perturbation of nuclear spin polarizations in solid state NMR of nitroxide-doped samples by magic-angle spinning without microwaves, J. Chem. Phys. 140 (2014) 184201.
- [184] A. Abragam, Principles of Nuclear Magnetism, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1961.
- [185] A. Abragam, B. Bleaney, Electron Paramagnetic Resonance of Transition Ions, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1970.
- [186] J.A. Weil, J.R. Bolton, Electron Paramagnetic Resonance: Elementary Theory and Practical Applications, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, 2007.
- [187] J.D. Jackson, Classical Electrodynamics, third ed., John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, USA, 1999.
- [188] S. Blundell, Magnetism in Condensed Matter, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001.
- [189] N.W. Ashcroft, N.D. Mermin, Solid State Physics, Thomson Learning, London, UK, 1976.
- [190] K.F. Riley, M.P. Hobson, S.J. Bence, Mathematical Methods for Physics and Engineering, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [191] D.M. Brink, G.R. Satchler, Angular Momentum, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993.
  [192] N.F. Ramsey, Magnetic shielding of nuclei in molecules, Phys. Rev. 78 (1950)
- 699–703. [193] U. Haeberlen, J.S. Waugh, Coherent averaging effects in magnetic resonance,
- Phys. Rev. 175 (1968) 453–467. [194] S.E. Ashbrook, J. McManus, M.J. Thrippleton, S. Wimperis, Second-order cross-
- term interactions in high-resolution MAS NMR of quadrupolar nuclei, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 55 (2009) 160–181.
- [195] M. Mehring, Principles of High-Resolution NMR in Solids, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [196] C.P. Bean, J.D. Livingston, Superparamagnetism, J. Appl. Phys. 30 (1959) 120S-129S.
- [197] S. Bedanta, W. Kleemann, Superparamagnetism, J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys. 42 (2009) 013001.
- [198] L. Bordonali, Y. Furukawa, M. Kraken, F.J. Litterst, C. Sangregorio, M.F. Casula, A. Lascialfari, <sup>1</sup>H NMR study of the spin dynamics of fine superparamagnetic nanoparticles, Phys. Rev. B 85 (2012) 174426.

- [199] S.E. Ashbrook, M.J. Duer, Structural information from quadrupolar nuclei in solid state NMR, Concept. Magn. Reson. A 28A (2006) 183–248.
- [200] B.J. Walder, K.K. Dey, M.C. Davis, J.H. Baltisberger, P.J. Grandinetti, Twodimensional NMR measurement and point dipole model prediction of paramagnetic shift tensors in solids, J. Chem. Phys. 142 (2015) 014201.
- [201] J. Autschbach, S. Patchkovskii, B. Pritchard, Calculation of hyperfine tensors and paramagnetic NMR shifts using the relativistic zeroth-order regular approximation and density functional theory, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 7 (2011) 2175–2188.
- [202] M. Kaupp, M. Bühl, V.G. Malkin (Eds.), Calculation of NMR and EPR Parameters: Theory and Applications, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 2004.
- [203] A.C. Hennum, W. Klopper, T. Helgaker, Direct perturbation theory of magnetic properties and relativistic corrections for the point nuclear and Gaussian nuclear models, J. Chem. Phys. 115 (2001) 7356–7363.
- [204] E. Malkin, I. Malkin, O.L. Malkina, V.G. Malkin, M. Kaupp, Scalar relativistic calculations of hyperfine coupling tensors using the Douglas–Kroll–Hess method with a finite-size nucleus model, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 8 (2006) 4079–4085.
- [205] J. Autschbach, Magnitude of finite-nucleus-size effects in relativistic density functional computations of indirect nmr nuclear spin-spin coupling constants, ChemPhysChem 10 (2009) 2274–2283.
- [206] J. Autschbach, Relativistic effects on electron-nucleus hyperfine coupling studied with an exact 2-component (X2C) Hamiltonian, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 13 (2017) 710–718.
- [207] P. Atkins, R. Friedman, Molecular Quantum Mechanics, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.
- [208] R. Boca, Zero-field splitting in metal complexes, Coord. Chem. Rev. 248 (2004) 757–815.
- [209] C.J. Pickard, F. Mauri, First-principles theory of the EPR g-tensor in solids: defects in quartz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88 (2002) 086403.
- [210] T.O. Pennanen, J. Vaara, M. Kaupp, Density-functional calculations of relativistic spin-orbit effects on nuclear magnetic shielding in paramagnetic molecules, J. Chem. Phys. 123 (2005) 174102.
- [211] A.V. Arbuznikov, J. Vaara, M. Kaupp, Relativistic spin-orbit effects on hyperfine coupling tensors by density-functional theory, J. Chem. Phys. 120 (2004) 2127–2139.
- [212] F. Neese, Calculation of the zero-field splitting tensor on the basis of hybrid density functional and Hartree-Fock theory, J. Chem. Phys. 127 (2007) 164112.
- [213] J. Autschbach, NMR calculations for paramagnetic molecules and metal complexes, Annu. Rep. Comput. Chem. 11 (2015) 3–36.
- [214] M. Gerloch, R.F. McMeeking, Paramagnetic properties of unsymmetrical transition-metal complexes, J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. (1975) 2443–2451.
- [215] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, Appendices, Coord. Chem. Rev. 150 (1996) 265–292.
   [216] E.A. Suturina, I. Kuprov, Pseudocontact shifts from mobile spin labels, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 18 (2016) 26412–26422.
- [217] L. Benda, J. Mares, E. Ravera, G. Parigi, C. Luchinat, M. Kaupp, J. Vaara, Pseudocontact NMR shifts over the paramagnetic metalloprotein CoMMP-12 from first principles, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 55 (2016) 14713–14717.
- [218] F.H. Köhler, O. Storcheva, Paramagnetic prussian blue analogues CsM<sup>II</sup>, The quest for spin on cesium ions by use of <sup>133</sup>Cs MAS NMR spectroscopy, Inorg. Chem. 54 (2015) 6801–6806.
- [219] B. Henderson, G.F. Imbusch, Optical Spectroscopy of Inorganic Solids, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989.
- [220] K.W.H. Stevens, Matrix elements and operator equivalents connected with the magnetic properties of rare earth ions, Proc. Phys. Soc. A 65 (1952) 209– 215.
- [221] H.A. Buckmaster, R. Chatterjee, Y.H. Shing, The application of tensor operators in the analysis of EPR and ENDOR spectra, Phys. Stat. Sol. A 13 (1972) 9–50.
- [222] C. Rudowicz, M. Karbowiak, Terminological confusions and problems at the interface between the crystal field Hamiltonians and the zero-field splitting Hamiltonians—Survey of the CF1+4ZFS confusion in recent literature, Physica B 451 (2014) 134–150.
- [223] J.S. Griffith, Some investigations in the theory of open-shell ions Part I. The spin-Hamiltonian, Mol. Phys. 3 (1960) 79–89.
- [224] H.A. Buckmaster, Y.H. Shing, A survey of the EPR spectra of Gd<sup>3+</sup> in single crystals, Phys. Stat. Sol. A 12 (1972) 325–361.
- [225] S.A. Marshall, R.A. Tilton, Zeeman interaction for the <sup>8</sup>S term of Gd<sup>3+</sup> in ThO<sub>2</sub>, Phys. Lett. A 30 (1969) 216–217.
- [226] H.A. Buckmaster, R. Chatterjee, Y.H. Shing, Determination of the generalized spin-hamiltonian parameters of Gd<sup>3+</sup> in lanthanum ethylsulphate at 290 K, J. Magn. Reson. 4 (1971) 85–89.
- [227] A.R. Edmonds, Angular Momentum in Quantum Mechanics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1957.
- [228] C. Görller-Walrand, K. Binnemans, Handbook on the Physics and Chemistry of Rare Earths, vol. 23, Elsevier, 1996.
- [229] T. Marks, A.M. Seyam, Stable uranium(IV) alkyl and aryl complexes, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 94 (1972) 6545–6546.
- [230] D.L. Clark, D.E. Hobart, M.P. Neu, Actinide carbonate complexes and their importance in actinide environmental chemistry, Chem. Rev. 95 (1995) 25– 48.
- [231] K. Mizuoka, I. Grenthe, Y. Ikeda, Structural and kinetic studies on uranyl(V) carbonate complex using <sup>13</sup>C NMR spectroscopy, Inorg. Chem. 44 (2005) 4472–4474.
- [232] H. Xiang, C. Lee, H.-J. Koo, X. Gong, M.-H. Whanbo, Magnetic properties and energy-mapping analysis, Dalton Trans. 42 (2013) 823–853.

- [233] H.-J. Koo, H.J. Xiang, C. Lee, M.-H. Whangbo, Effect of magnetic dipole–dipole interactions on the spin orientation and magnetic ordering of the spin-ladder compound Sr<sub>3</sub>Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, Inorg. Chem. 48 (2009) 9051–9053.
- [234] D. Dai, H.J. Xiang, M.-H. Whangbo, Effects of spin-orbit coupling on magnetic properties of discrete and extended magnetic systems, J. Comput. Chem. 29 (2008) 2187–2209.
- [235] I. Dzyaloshinskii, A thermodynamic theory of "weak" ferromagnetism of antiferromagnetics, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 4 (1958) 241–255.
- [236] T. Moriya, New mechanism of anisotropic superexchange interaction, Phys. Rev. Lett. 4 (1960) 228–230.
- [237] D.S. Middlemiss, F. Blanc, C.J. Pickard, C.P. Grey, Solid-state NMR calculations for metal oxides and gallates: shielding and quadrupolar parameters for perovskites and related phases, J. Magn. Reson. 204 (2010) 1–10.
- [238] F. Neese, Metal and ligand hyperfine couplings in transition metal complexes: the effect of spin-orbit coupling as studied by coupled perturbed Kohn–Sham theory, J. Chem. Phys. 118 (2003) 3939–3948.
- [239] J.B. Goodenough, Theory of the role of covalence in the perovskite-type manganites [La,M(II)]MnO<sub>3</sub>, Phys. Rev. 100 (1955) 564–573.
- [240] J. Kanamori, Superexchange interaction and symmetry properties of electron orbitals, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 10 (1959) 87–89.
- [241] J.B. Goodenough, An interpretation of the magnetic properties of the perovskite-type mixes crystals La<sub>1-x</sub>Sr<sub>x</sub>CoO<sub>1-2</sub>, J. Phys. Chem. Solids 6 (1958) 287–297.
- [242] S. Lee, S. Choi, J. Kim, H. Sim, C. Won, S. Lee, S.A. Kim, N. Hur, J.-G. Park, Antiferromagnetic ordering in Li<sub>2</sub>MnO<sub>3</sub> single crystals with a twodimensional honeycomb lattice, J. Phys. Condens. Matter 24 (2012) 456004.
- [243] E.J. Lee, C. Kan, H.J. Xiang, R.K. Kremer, S.-H. Lee, Z. Hiroi, M.-H. Whangbo, Spin reorientation in the square-lattice antiferromagnets RMnAsO (R = Ce, Nd): density functional analysis of the spin-exchange interactions between the rare-earth and transition-metal ions, Inorg. Chem. 51 (2012) 6890–6897.
- [244] C.H. Townes, C. Herring, W.D. Knight, The effect of electronic paramagnetism on nuclear magnetic resonance frequencies in metals, Phys. Rev. 77 (1950) 852–853.
- [245] J.P. Yesinowski, Solid-state NMR of inorganic semiconductors, Top. Curr. Chem. 306 (2012) 229–312.
- [246] C.P. Slichter, Principles of Magnetic Resonance, Harpter & Row, New York, Evanston, and London, 1963.
- [247] A.G. Redfield, The theory of relaxation processes, Adv. Magn. Reson. 1 (1965) 1–32.
- [248] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, Chapter 3: Relaxation, Coord. Chem. Rev. 150 (1996) 77–110.
- [249] D. Kruk, Theory of Evolution and Relaxation of Multi-spin Systems, Arima Publishing, Bury St Edmunds, UK, 2007.
- [250] D. Kruk, Understanding Spin Dynamics, Pan Stanford Publishing Pte Ltd, Singapore, 2016.
- [251] R.K. Harris, R. Wasylishen (Eds.), Paramagnetic Relaxation in Solution, John Wiley, Chichester, 2011.
- [252] E. Belorizky, P.H. Fries, L. Helm, J. Kowalewski, D. Kruk, R.R. Sharp, P.-O. Westlund, Comparison of different methods for calculating the paramagnetic relaxation enhancement of nuclear spins as a function of the magnetic field, J. Chem. Phys. 128 (2008) 052315.
- [253] M. Goldman, Quantum Description of High-Resolution NMR in Liquids, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991.
- [254] M. Goldman, Advances in magnetic resonance: formal theory of spin-lattice relaxation, J. Magn. Reson. 149 (2001) 160–187.
- [255] J. Keeler, Understanding NMR Spectroscopy, second ed., Wiley and Sons, Ltd, Chichester, 2010.
- [256] J.H. Van Vleck, Paramagnetic relaxation times for titanium and chrome alum, Phys. Rev. 57 (1940) 426–447.
- [257] R. Orbach, Spin-lattice relaxation in rare-earth salts, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A 264 (1961) 458–484.
- [258] R.R. Ernst, G. Bodenhausen, A. Wokaun, Principles of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance in One and Two Dimensions, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1987.
- [259] M. Goldman, P.J. Grandinetti, A. Llor, Z. Olejniczak, R.J. Sachkeben, J.W. Zwanziger, Theoretical aspects of higher-order truncations in solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance, J. Chem. Phys. 97 (1992) 8947–8960.
- [260] I. Bertini, A. Donaire, C. Luchinat, A. Rosato, Paramagnetic relaxation as a tool for solution structure determination: *Clostridium pasteurianum* ferredoxin as an example, Proteins: Struct., Function, Genet. 29 (1997) 348–358.
- [261] L.X. Ma, A.M.M. Jorgensen, G.O. Sorensen, J. Ulstrup, J.J. Led, Elucidation of the paramagnetic R-1 relaxation of heteronuclei and protons in Cu(II) plastocyanin from anabaena variabilis, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 122 (2000) 9473– 9485.
- [262] L. Nordenskiöld, A. Laaksonen, J. Kowalewski, Applicability of the Solomon-Bloembergen equation to the study of paramagnetic transition metal-water complexes. An *ab initio* SCF-MO study, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 104 (1982) 379–383.
- [263] E. Toth, L. Helm, K.E. Kellar, A.E. Merbach, Gd(DPTA-bisamide)alkyl copolymers: a hint for the formation of MRI contrast agents with very high relaxivity, Chem. Eur. J. 5 (1999) 1202–1211.
- [264] P.-O. Westlund, A generalised Solomon–Bloembergen–Morgan theory for arbitrary electron spin quantum number S the dipole–dipole coupling between a nuclear spin I = 1/2 and an electron spin system S = 5/2, Mol. Phys. 85 (1995) 1165–1178.
- [265] S. Wimperis, G. Bodenhausen, Relaxation-allowed cross-peaks in twodimensional N.M.R. correlation spectroscopy, Mol. Phys. 66 (1989) 897–919.

- [266] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, D. Tarchi, Are true scalar proton-proton connectivities ever measured in COSY spectra of paramagnetic macromolecules?, Chem Phys. Lett. 203 (1993) 445–449.
- [267] K. Pervushin, R. Riek, G. Wider, K. Wüthrich, Attenuated T<sub>2</sub> relaxation by mutual cancellation of dipole–dipole coupling and chemical shift anisotropy indicates an avenue to NMR structures of very large biological macromolecules in solution, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 94 (1997) 12366–12371.
- [268] R.C. Wilson, R.J. Myers, Electron paramagnetic resonance spectrum and spin relaxation for  $Ti(H_2O)_{3^+}^{3^+}$  in aqueous solution and in frozen glass, J. Chem. Phys. 64 (1976) 2208–2211.
- [269] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, Z. Xia, Electronic relaxation of the titanium(III) hexaaqua complex detected by solvent water <sup>1</sup>H NMRD spectroscopy, Inorg. Chem. 31 (1992) 3152–3154.
- [270] R.N. Rogers, G.E. Pake, Paramagnetic relaxation in solutions of VO<sup>++</sup>, J. Chem. Phys. 33 (1960) 1107–1111.
- [271] D. Kivelson, Electric-field fluctuations and spin relaxation in liquids, J. Chem. Phys. 45 (1966) 1324–1332.
- [272] D.C. McCain, R.J. Myers, Spin-lattice and spin-spin relaxation times for VO<sup>2+</sup> in aqueous solution, J. Phys. Chem. 71 (1967) 192–200.
- [273] D.R. Eaton, The nuclear magnetic resonance of some paramagnetic transitionmetal acetylacetonates, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 87 (1965) 3097–3102.
- [274] A.M. Chmelnick, D. Fiat, Hydration of the vanadium (III) ion by oxygen-17 and proton magnetic resonance, J. Magn. Reson. 8 (1972) 325–331.
- [275] G.L. McPherson, R.C. Koch, G.D. Stucky, Electron spin resonance spectra of V<sup>2+</sup>, Mn<sup>2+</sup>, and Ni<sup>2+</sup> in single crystals of CsMgBr<sub>3</sub> and CsMgI<sub>3</sub>, J. Chem. Phys. 60 (1974) 1424–1431.
- [276] B.R. McGarvey, Line widths in the paramagnetic resonance of transition ions in solution, J. Phys. Chem. 61 (1957) 1232–1237.
- [277] G.N. La Mar, F.A. Walker, Proton nuclear magnetic resonance and electron spin resonance investigation of the electronic structure and magnetic properties of synthetic low-spin ferric porphyrins, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 95 (1973) 1782–1790.
- [278] G.N. La Mar, G.R. Van Hecke, Proton nuclear magnetic resonance studies of spin delocalization in low-spin chelates of chromium (II) and iron (III) with symmetrically substituted *o*-phenanthrolines and  $\alpha, \alpha'$ -bipyridines, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 91 (1969) 3442–3450.
- [279] S.H. Koenig, R.D. Brown III, M. Spiller, The anomalous relaxivity of Mn<sup>3+</sup>(TPPS<sub>4</sub>), Magn. Reson. Med. 4 (1987) 252–260.
- [280] M. Grant, H.W. Dodgen, J.P. Hunt, Water exchange between solvent and aquomanganese(II) and aquophenanthrolinemanganese(II) complexes, Inorg. Chem. 10 (1971) 71–72.
- [281] I. Bertini, F. Capozzi, C. Luchinat, Z. Xia, Nuclear and electron relaxation of Fe (OH<sub>2</sub>)<sup>2+</sup><sub>6</sub>, J. Phys. Chem. 97 (1993) 1134–1137.
- [282] I. Bertini, O. Galas, C. Luchinat, L. Messori, G. Parigi, A theoretical analysis of the <sup>1</sup>H nuclear magnetic relaxation dispersion profiles of diferric transferrin, J. Phys. Chem. 99 (1995) 14217–14222.
- [283] L.P. Yu, G.N. La Mar, K. Rajarathnam, <sup>1</sup>H NMR resonance assignment of the active site residues of paramagnetic proteins by 2D bond correlation spectroscopy: metcyanomyoglobin, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 112 (1990) 9527–9534.
   [284] L. Banci, I. Bertini, S. Marconi, R. Pierattelli, S.G. Sligar, Cytochrome P450 and
- aromatic bases: a <sup>1</sup>H NMR study, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 116 (1994) 4866–4873.
- [285] Y. Ducommun, K.E. Newman, A.E. Merbach, High-pressure <sup>17</sup>O NMR evidence for a gradual mechanistic changeover from  $i_a$  to  $i_d$  for water exchange on divalent octahedral metal ions going from manganese(II) to nickel(II), Inorg. Chem. 19 (1980) 3696–3703.
- [286] L. Banci, I. Bertini, S. Marconi, R. Pierattelli, <sup>1</sup>H-NMR study of reduced heme proteins myoglobin and cytochrome P450, Eur. J. Biochem. 215 (1993) 431–437.
- [287] M.T. Werth, M. Kurtz Jr., 'H-NMR spectra of rubredoxins: new resonances assignable to α-CH and β-CH<sub>2</sub> hydrogens of cysteinate ligands to iron(II), J. Am. Chem. Soc. 109 (1987) 273–275.
- [288] A.M. Chmelnick, D. Fiat, Magnetic resonance studies of ion solvation. The hydration of the colbaltous ion, J. Chem. Phys. 47 (1967) 3986–3990.
   [289] L. Banci, I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, <sup>1</sup>H NMRD studies of solutions of paramagnetic
- [289] L. Banci, I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, <sup>1</sup>H NMRD studies of solutions of paramagnetic metal ions in ethyleneglycol, Inorg. Chim. Acta 100 (1985) 173–181.
- [290] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, M. Mancini, G. Spina, The electron-nucleus dipolar coupling. The effect of zero-field splitting of an S = 3/2 manifold, J. Magn. Reson. 59 (1984) 213–222.
- [291] C. Chachaty, A. Forchioni, J. Virlet, J.C. Ronfard-Haret, Spin densities, ligand exchange and <sup>13</sup>C relaxation in aniline-Ni II complexes, Chem. Phys. Lett. 29 (1974) 436–440.
- [292] G.N. La Mar, Electron spin relaxation in pseudo-tetrahedral cobalt(II) and nickel(II) complexes in solution, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 87 (1965) 3567–3571.
- [293] L.-J. Ming, L. Banci, C. Luchinat, I. Bertini, J.S. Valentine, Characterisation of copper-nickel and silver-nickel bovine superoxide dismutase by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy, Inorg. Chem. 27 (1988) 4458–4463.
- [294] U.E. Steiner, Bürßner, Theoretical treatment of magnetic field dependent incage backward electron transfer during photooxidation of Ru(II) complexes, Z. Phys. Chem. N.F. 169 (1990) 159–180.
- [295] A. Paulo, A. Domingos, A.P. de Matos, I. Santos, Synthesis, characterization, and study of the redox properties of rhenium(V) and rhenium(III) compounds with tetrakis(pyrazo1-1-y1)borate, Inorg. Chem. 33 (1994) 4729–4737.
- [296] S. Aime, M. Botta, G. Ermondi, NMR study of solution structures and dynamics of lantbanide(III) complexes of DOTA, Inorg. Chem. 31 (1992) 4291–4299.
- [297] I. Bertini, F. Capozzi, C. Luchinat, G. Nicastro, Z. Xia, Water proton relaxation for some lanthanide aqua ions in solution, J. Phys. Chem. 97 (1993) 6351– 6354.

- [298] G.P. Vishnevskaya, B.M. Kozyrev, Effect of solvent on the paramagnetic relaxation constants in liquid solutions of gadolinium nitrate, J. Struct. Chem. 7 (1966) 20–24.
- [299] A. Hudson, J.W.E. Lewis, Electron spin relaxation of <sup>8</sup>S ions in solution, Trans. Faraday Soc. 66 (1970) 1297–1301.
- [300] V.M. Malhotra, H.A. Buckmaster, J.M. Dixon, Estimation of  $\tau_1$  for Yb<sup>3+</sup> ions from the temperature variation of the EPR linewidths for Gd<sup>3+</sup> in YbCl<sub>3</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O single crystals, J. Phys. C: Solid St. Phys. 13 (1980) 3921–3931.
- [301] G. Hernandez, M.F. Tweedle, R.G. Bryant, Proton magnetic relaxation dispersion in aqueous glycerol solutions of Gd(DTPA)<sup>2-</sup> and Gd(DOTA)<sup>-</sup>, Inorg. Chem. 29 (1990) 5109–5113.
- [302] S. Aime, L. Barbero, M. Botta, Trends in NMR studies of paramagnetic Gd(III) complexes as potential contrast agents in MRI, Magn. Reson. Imag. 9 (1991) 843–847.
- [303] S.H. Koenig, From the relaxivity of Gd(DTPA)<sup>2-</sup> to everything else, Magn. Reson. Med. 22 (1991) 183–190.
- [304] S.K. Misra, U. Orhun, Spin-lattice relaxation time of Yb<sup>3+</sup> in YbCl<sub>3</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O, Solid State Commun. 63 (1987) 867–869.
- [305] L.P. Hwang, C.-Y. Ju, Proton spin relaxations in solutions of paramagnetic complex with S = 3/2 in slow motion region, J. Chem. Phys. 83 (1985) 3775–3789.
- [306] P.L. Wang, J.-H. Lee, S.-M. Huang, L.P. Hwang, Proton spin relaxation in solutions of the complex tris(acetylacetonato)chromium(III), J. Magn. Reson. 73 (1987) 277–286.
- [307] D. Kruk, J. Kowalewski, Nuclear spin relaxation in paramagnetic systems  $(S \ge 1)$  under fast rotation conditions, J. Magn. Reson. 162 (2003) 229–240.
- [308] D. Kruk, A. Kubica, W. Masierak, A.F. Privalov, M. Wojciechowski, W. Medycki, Quadrupole relaxation enhancement—application to molecular crystals, Solid State Nucl. Magn. Reson. 40 (2011) 114–120.
- [309] W. Masierak, M. Florek-Wojciechowski, I. Oglodek, R. Jakubas, A.F. Privalov, B. Kresse, F. Fujara, D. Kruk, Dynamics of [C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>5</sub>N<sub>2</sub>]<sub>6</sub>[Bi<sub>4</sub>Br<sub>18</sub>] by means of <sup>1</sup>H NMR relaxometry and quadrupole relaxation enhancement, J. Chem. Phys. 142 (2015) 204503.
- [310] S.A. Al'tshuler, K.A. Valiev, On the theory of longitudinal relaxation of paramagnetic salt compounds, Sov. Phys. JETP 35 (1958) 661–668.
- [311] J. Korringa, Nuclear magnetic relaxation and resonance line shift in metals, Physica 16 (1950) 601–610.
- [312] G. Mozurkewich, H.I. Ringermacher, D.I. Bolef, Effect of demagnetization on magnetic resonance line shapes in bulk samples: application to tungsten, Phys. Rev. B 20 (1979) 33–38.
- [313] T.M. Barbara, Cylindrical demagnetization fields and microprobe design in high-resolution NMR, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. A 109 (1994) 265–269.
- [314] C.H. Durney, J. Bertolina, D.C. Ailion, R. Christman, A.G. Cutillo, A.H. Morris, S. Hashemi, Calculation and interpretation of inhomogeneous line broadening in models of lungs and other heterogeneous structures, J. Magn. Reson. 85 (1989) 554–570.
- [315] S.N. Hwang, F.W. Wehrli, The calculation of the susceptibility-induced magnetic field from 3D NMR images with applications to trabecular bone, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. B 109 (1995) 126–145.
- [316] J.H. van Vleck, The dipolar broadening of magnetic resonance lines in crystals, Phys. Rev. 74 (1948) 1168–1183.
- [317] H. Primas, Generalized perturbation theory in operator form, Rev. Mod. Phys. 35 (1963) 710–712.
- [318] M. Goldman, P.J. Grandinetti, A. Llor, Z. Olejniczak, J.R. Sachleben, J. Zwanziger, Theoretical aspects of higher-order truncations in solid-state nuclear-magnetic-resonance, J. Chem. Phys. 97 (1992) 8947–8960.
- [319] M. Leskes, P.K. Madhu, S. Vega, Floquet theory in solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance, Prog. NMR. Spectrosc. 57 (2010) 345-380.
- [320] P.J. Grandinetti, J.T. Ash, N.M. Trease, Symmetry pathways in solid-state NMR, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 59 (2011) 121–196.
- [321] G. Bodenhausen, H. Kogler, R.R. Ernst, Selection of coherence-transfer pathways in NMR pulse experiments, J. Magn. Reson. 58 (1984) 370–388.
- [322] S. Antonijevic, G. Bodenhausen, Quadrupolar transfer pathways, J. Magn. Reson. 180 (2006) 297–304.
- [323] M.M. Maricq, J.S. Waugh, NMR in rotating solids, J. Chem. Phys. 70 (1979) 3300–3316.
- [324] M.H. Levitt, D.P. Raleigh, F. Creuzet, R.G. Griffin, Theory and simulations of homonuclear spin pair systems in rotating solids, J. Chem. Phys. 92 (1990) 6347–6364.
- [325] M.H. Levitt, Why do spinning sidebands have the same phase?, J Magn. Reson. 82 (1989) 427–433.
- [326] E.R. Andrew, A. Bradbury, R.G. Eades, Removal of dipolar broadening of nuclear magnetic resonance spectra of solids by specimen rotation, Nature 183 (1959) 1802–1803.
- [327] D.T. Edmonds, M.R. Wormald, Theory of resonance in magnetically inhomogeneous specimens and some useful calculations, J. Magn. Reson. 77 (1988) 223–232.
- [328] L.F. Fuks, F.S.C. Huang, C.M. Carter, W.A. Edelstein, P.B. Roemer, Susceptibility, lineshape, and shimming in high-resolution NMR, J. Magn. Reson. 100 (1992) 229–242.
- [329] L.E. Drain, The broadening of magnetic resonance lines due to field inhomogeneities in powdered samples, Proc. Phys. Soc. 80 (1962) 1380– 1382.
- [330] J. Cavanagh, W.J. Fairbrother, A.G. Palmer III, M. Rance, N.J. Skelton, Protein NMR spectroscopy: principles and practice, Academic Press, London, 2007.

- [331] M.J. Duer, Introduction to Solid-State NMR Spectroscopy, Blackwell, Oxford, 2005.
- [332] R. Tycko, Biomolecular solid state NMR: advances in structural methodology and applications to peptide and protein fibrils, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. 52 (2001) 575–606.
- [333] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, Chapter 7: two-dimensional spectra and beyond, Coord. Chem. Rev. 150 (1996) 185-220.
- [334] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, Chapter 9: Hints on experimental techniques, Coord. Chem. Rev. 150 (1996) 243–264.
- [335] S.L. Patt, B.D. Sykes, Water eliminated Fourier transform NMR spectroscopy, J. Chem. Phys. 56 (1972) 3182–3184.
- [336] T. Inubushi, E.D. Becker, Efficient detection of paramagnetically shifted NMR resonances by optimizing the WEFT pulse sequence, J. Magn. Reson. 51 (1983) 128–133.
- [337] K.L. Bren, H.B. Gray, L. Banci, I. Bertini, P. Turano, Paramagnetic <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy of the cyanide derivative of Met80Ala-iso-1-cytochrome c, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 117 (1995) 8067–8073.
- [338] J. Hochmann, H. Kellerhals, Proton NMR on deoxyhemoglobin: use of a modified DEFT technique, J. Magn. Reson. 38 (1990) 23–39.
- [339] P.J. Chmielewski, L. Latos-Grazynski, T. Glowiak, Reactions of nickel(II) 2-Aza-5,10,15,20-tetraphenyl-21- carbaporphyrin with methyl iodide. The first structural characterization of a paramagnetic organometallic nickel(II) complex, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 118 (1996) 5690–5701.
- [340] I. Bertini, A. Coutsolelos, A. Dikiy, C. Luchinat, G.A. Spyroulias, A. Troganis, Structural and dynamic information on double-decker Yb<sup>3+</sup> and Dy<sup>3+</sup> porphyrin complexes in solution through <sup>1</sup>H NMR, Inorg. Chem. 35 (1996) 6308–6315.
- [341] L. Banci, I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, M.S. Viezzoli, A comment on the proton NMR spectra of cobalt(II)-substituted superoxide dismutases with histidines deuteriated in the .epsilon.1-position, Inorg. Chem. 29 (1990) 1438–1440.
- [342] J.T.J. Lecomte, S.W. Unger, G.N. La Mar, Practical considerations for the measurement of the homonuclear overhauser effect on strongly relaxed protons in paramagnetic proteins, J. Magn. Reson. 94 (1991) 112–122.
- [343] L. Di Bari, G. Pintacuda, P. Salvadori, Solution equilibria in YbDOTMA, a chiral analogue of one of the most successful contrast agents for MRI, GdDOTA, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem. (2000) 75–82.
- [344] M.A. Smith, H. Hu, A.J. Shaka, Improved broadband inversion performance for NMR in liquids, J. Magn. Reson. 151 (2001) 269–283.
- [345] S. Ciofi-Baffoni, A. Gallo, R. Muzzioli, M. Piccioli, The IR-<sup>15</sup>N-HSQC-AP experiment: a new tool for NMR spectroscopy of paramagnetic molecules, J. Biomol. NMR 58 (2015) 123–128.
- [346] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, R. Pierattelli, NMR spectroscopy of paramagnetic metalloproteins, ChemBioChem 6 (2005) 1536–1549.
- [347] P.H.J. Keizers, M. Ubbink, Paramagnetic tagging for protein structure and dynamics analysis, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 58 (2011) 88–96.
- [348] M. Sattler, J. Schleucher, C. Griesinger, Heteronuclear multidimensional NMR experiments for the structure determination of proteins in solution employing pulsed field gradients, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 34 (1999) 93–158.
- [349] W. Bermel, I. Bertini, I.C. Felli, R. Kümmerle, R. Pierattelli, <sup>13</sup>C direct detection experiments on the paramagnetic oxidized monomeric copper, zinc superoxide dismutase, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 125 (2003) 16423–16429.
- [350] W. Bermel, I. Bertini, L. Duma, I.C. Felli, L. Emsley, R. Pierattelli, P.R. Vasos, Complete assignment of heteronuclear protein resonances by protonless NMR spectroscopy, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed, 44 (2005) 3089–3092.
- [351] W. Bermel, I. Bertini, I.C. Felli, Y.-M. Lee, L. Luchinat, R. Pierrattelli, Protonless NMR experiments for sequence-specific assignment of backbone nuclei in unfolded proteins, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 128 (2006) 3918–3919.
- [352] W. Bermel, I. Bertini, I.C. Felli, R. Kümmerle, R. Pierattelli, Novel <sup>13</sup>C direct detection experiments, including extension to the third dimension, to perform the complete assignment of proteins, J. Magn. Reson. 178 (2006) 56–64.
- [353] I. Bertini, F. Briganti, C. Luchinat, A. Scozzafava, <sup>1</sup>H NMR studies of the oxidized and partially reduced 2(4Fe-4S) ferredoxin from *clostridium pasteurianum*, Inorg. Chem. 29 (1990) 1874–1880.
- [354] I. Bertini, F. Briganti, C. Luchinat, L. Messori, R. Monnanni, A. Scozzafava, G. Vallini, 2D <sup>1</sup>H NMR studies of oxidized 2(4Fe–4S) ferredoxin from *clostridium pasteurianum*, FEBS. Lett. 289 (1991) 253–256.
- [355] S.C. Busse, G.N. La Mar, J.B. Howard, Two-dimensional NMR investigation of iron-sulfur cluster electronic and molecular structure of oxidized clostridium pasteurianum ferredoxin. Interpretability of contact shifts in terms of cysteine orientation, J. Biol. Chem. 266 (1991) 23714–23723.
- [356] I. Bertini, F. Capozzi, C. Luchinat, M. Piccioli, A.J. Vila, Applications of COSY to paramagnetic heme-containing systems, J. Magn. Reson. 95 (1991) 244–252.
- [357] G. Pintacuda, M.A. Keniry, T. Huber, A.Y. Park, N.E. Dixon, G. Otting, Fast structure-based assignment of <sup>15</sup>N HSQC spectra of selectively <sup>15</sup>N-labeled paramagnetic proteins, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 126 (2004) 2963–2970.
- [358] E. Babini, I. Bertini, F. Capozzi, I.C. Felli, M. Lelli, C. Luchinat, Direct carbon detection in paramagnetic metalloproteins to further exploit pseudocontact shift restraints, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 126 (2004) 10496–10497.
  [359] I. Bertini, B. Jiménez, M. Piccioli, <sup>13</sup>C direct detected experiments:
- [359] I. Bertini, B. Jiménez, M. Piccioli, <sup>13</sup>C direct detected experiments: Optimization for paramagnetic signals, J. Magn. Reson. 174 (2005) 125–132.
- [360] I. Bertini, L. Duma, I.C. Felli, M. Fey, C. Luchinat, R. Pierattelli, P.R. Vasos, A heteronuclear direct-detection NMR spectroscopy experiment for proteinbackbone assignment, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 43 (2004) 2257–2259.

- [361] W. Bermel, I. Bertini, I.C. Felli, R. Pierattelli, P.R. Vasos, A selective experiment for the sequential protein backbone assignment from 3D heteronuclear spectra, J. Magn. Reson. 172 (2005) 324–328.
- [362] W. Bermel, I. Bertini, I.C. Felli, M. Piccioli, R. Pierattelli, <sup>13</sup>C-detected protonless NMR spectroscopy of proteins in solution, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 48 (2006) 25–45.
- [363] I. Bertini, I.C. Felli, R. Kümmerle, D. Moskau, R. Pierattelli, <sup>13</sup>C-<sup>13</sup>C NOESY: an attractive alternative for studying large macromolecules, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 126 (2004) 464-465.
- [364] M. Kostic, S.S. Pochapsky, T.C. Pochapsky, Rapid recycle <sup>13</sup>C', <sup>15</sup>N and <sup>13</sup>C, <sup>13</sup>C'heteronuclear and homonuclear multiple quantum coherence detection for resonance assignments in paramagnetic proteins: Example of Ni<sup>2\*</sup>containing acireductone dioxygenase, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 124 (2002) 9054– 9055.
- [365] I. Bertini, F. Capozzi, C. Luchinat, M. Piccioli, A.J. Vila, The Fe<sub>4</sub>S<sub>4</sub> centers in ferredoxins studied through proton and carbon hyperfine coupling. Sequencespecific assignments of cysteines in ferredoxins from *clostridium acidi urici* and *clostridium pasteurianum*, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 116 (1994) 651–660.
- [366] R. Krishnamoorthi, J.L. Markley, M.A. Cusanovich, C.T. Przysiecki, T.E. Meyer, Hydrogen-1 nuclear magnetic resonance investigation of high-potential ironsulfur proteins from Ectothiorhodospira halophila and Ectothiorhodospira vacuolata: a comparative study of hyperfine-shifted resonances, Biochemistry 25 (1986) 60–67.
- [367] I. Bertini, A. Donaire, B.A. Feinberg, C. Luchinat, M. Piccioli, H. Yuan, Solution structure of the oxidized 2[4Fe-4S] ferredoxin from Clostridium pasteurianum, Eur. J. Biochem. 232 (1995) 192–205.
- [368] S. Aono, D. Bentrop, I. Bertini, A. Donaire, C. Luchinat, Y. Niikura, A. Rosato, Solution structure of the oxidized Fe<sub>7</sub>S<sub>8</sub> ferredoxin from the thermophilic bacterium *Bacillus schlegelii* by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy, Biochemistry 37 (1998) 9812–9826.
- [369] R.O. Louro, I.J. Correia, L. Brennan, I.B. Coutinho, A.V. Xavuer, D.L. Turner, Electronic structure of low-spin ferric porphyrins: <sup>13</sup>C NMR studies of the influence of axial ligand orientation, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 120 (1998) 13240– 13247.
- [370] I. Bertini, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, F.A. Walker, Heme methyl <sup>1</sup>H chemical shifts as structural parameters in some low-spin ferriheme proteins, J. Biol. Inorg. Chem. 4 (1999) 515–519.
- [371] F.A. Walker, Magnetic spectroscopic (EPR, ESEEM, Mössbauer, MCD and NMR) studies of low-spin ferriheme centers and their corresponding heme proteins, Coord. Chem. Rev. 185–186 (1999) 471–534.
- [372] L. Banci, I. Bertini, G. Cavallaro, C. Luchinat, Chemical shift-based constraints for solution structure determination of paramagnetic low-spin heme proteins with bis-His and His-CN axial ligands: the cases of oxidized cytochrome b(5) and Met80Ala cyano-cytochrome c, J. Biol. Inorg. Chem. 7 (2002) 416–426.
- [373] I. Bertini, S. Ciurli, A. Dikiy, R. Gasanov, C. Luchinat, G. Martini, N. Safarov, High-field NMR studies of oxidized blue copper proteins: the case of spinach plastocyanin, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 121 (1999) 2037–2046.
- [374] I. Bertini, C.O. Fernández, B.G. Karlsson, J. Leckner, C. Luchinat, B.G. Malmström, A.N. Nersissian, R. Pierattelli, E. Shipp, J.S. Valentine, A.J. Vila, Structural information through NMR hyperfine shifts in blue copper proteins, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 122 (2000) 3701–3707.
- [375] D.F. Hansen, J.J. Led, Determination of the geometric structure of the metal site in a blue copper protein by paramagnetic NMR, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 103 (2006) 1738–1743.
- [376] R. Ghose, J.H. Prestegard, Electron spin-nuclear spin cross-correlation effects on multiplet splittings in paramagnetic proteins, J. Magn. Reson. 128 (1997) 138-143.
- [377] J. Boisbouvier, P. Gans, M. Blackledge, B. Brutscher, D. Marion, Long-range structural information in NMR studies of paramagnetic molecules from electron spin–nuclear spin cross-correlated relaxation, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 121 (1999) 7700–7701.
- [378] I. Bertini, J. Kowalewski, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, Cross correlation between the dipole-dipole interaction and the curie spin relaxation: the effect of anisotropic magnetic susceptibility, J. Magn. Reson. 152 (2001) 103–108.
- [379] G. Pintacuda, K. Hohenthanner, G. Otting, N. Müller, Angular dependence of dipole-dipole-Curie-spin cross-correlation effects in high-spin and low-spin paramagnetic myoglobin, J. Biomol. NMR 27 (2003) 115–132.
- [380] J.R. Tolman, J.M. Flanagan, M.A. Kennedy, J.H. Prestegard, Nuclear magnetic dipole interactions in field-oriented proteins: information for structure determination in solution, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 92 (1995) 9279–9283.
- [381] L. Banci, I. Bertini, J.G. Huber, C. Luchinat, A.J. Rosato, Partial orientation of oxidized and reduced cytochrome b<sub>5</sub> at high magnetic fields: Magnetic susceptibility anisotropy contributions and consequences for protein solution structure determination, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 120 (1998) 12903–12909.
- [382] S.W. Fesik, G. Gemmecker, E.T. Olejniczak, A.M. Petros, Identification of solvent-exposed regions of enzyme-bound ligands by nuclear magnetic resonance, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 113 (1991) 7080–7081.
- [383] T. Madl, W. Bermel, K. Zangger, Use of relaxation enhancements in a paramagnetic environment for the structure determination of proteins using NMR spectroscopy, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 48 (2009) 8259–8262.
- [384] G. Otting, Protein NMR using paramagnetic ions, Annu. Rev. Biophys. 39 (2010) 387–405.
- [385] T. Madl, T. Guttler, D. Gorlich, M. Sattler, Structural analysis of large protein complexes using solvent paramagnetic relaxation enhancements, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 50 (2011) 3993–3997.

- [386] K.M. Ward, A.H. Aletras, R.S. Balaban, A new class of contrast agents for MRI based on proton chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer (CEST), J. Magn. Reson. 143 (2008) 78–87.
- [387] S. Zhang, P. Winter, K. Wu, A.D. Sherry, A novel Europium(III)-based MRI contrast agent, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 123 (2001) 1517–1578.
- [388] S. Zhang, A.D. Sherry, Physical characteristics of lanthanide complexes that act as magnetization transfer (MT) contrast agents, J. Solid State Chem. 171 (2003) 38–43.
- [389] S. Aime, A. Barge, D. Delli Castelli, F. Fedeli, A. Mortillaro, F.U. Nielsen, E. Terreno, Paramagnetic lanthanide(III) complexes as pH-sensitive chemical exchange saturation transfer (CEST) contrast agents for MRI applications, Magn. Reson. Med. 47 (2002) 639–648.
- [390] J. Zhou, P.C.M. van Zijl, Chemical exchange saturation transfer imaging and spectroscopy, Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 48 (2006) 109–136.
- [391] S. Aime, D. Delli Castelli, E. Terreno, A paramagnetic MRI-CEST agent responsive to lactate concentration, J. Am. Chem. Soc 124 (2002) 9364–9365.
- [392] S. Aime, C. Carrera, D. Delli Castelli, S. Geninatti Crich, E. Terreno, Tunable imaging of cells labeled with MRI-PARACEST agents, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 44 (2005) 1813–1815.
- [393] S. Zhang, A.D. Sherry, C.R. Malloy, in: Proceedings of the 13th Annual Meeting ISMRM Miami, 2005, p. 2707.
- [394] S. Antonijevic, S. Wimperis, Separation of quadrupolar and chemical/paramagnetic shift interactions in two-dimensional  ${}^{2}\text{H}$  I = 1 nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy, J. Chem. Phys. 122 (2005) 044312.
- [395] J.T. Ash, N.M. Trease, P.J. Grandinetti, Separating chemical shift and quadrupolar anisotropies via multiple-quantum NMR spectroscopy, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 130 (2008) 10858–10859.
- [396] A.J. Pell, R.J. Clément, C.P. Grey, L. Emsley, G. Pintacuda, Frequency-stepped acquisition in nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy under magic angle spinning, J. Chem. Phys. 138 (2013) 114201.
- [397] S.W. Sparks, P.D. Ellis, <sup>195</sup>Pt shielding tensors in potassium hexachloroplatinate(IV) and potassium tetrachloroplatinate(II), J. Am. Chem. Soc. 108 (1986) 3215–3218.
- [398] M.T. Sananes, A. Tuel, J.C. Volta, A study by <sup>31</sup>P NMR spin-echo mapping of VPO catalysts: I. Characterization of the reference phases, J. Catal. 145 (1994) 251–255.
- [399] M.T. Sananes, A. Tuel, J.C. Volta, Characterization of different precursors and activated vanadium phosphate catalysis by <sup>31</sup>P NMR spin echo mapping, J. Catal. 148 (1994) 395–398.
- [400] M.T. Sananes, A. Tuel, Magnetic properties of vanadium phosphorus oxide catalysts studied by spin echo mapping <sup>31</sup>P nmr, J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun. (1995) 1323–1324.
- [401] Y.Y. Tong, Nuclear spin-echo Fourier-transform mapping spectroscopy for broad NMR lines in solids, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. A 119 (1996) 22–28.
- [402] L. Canesson, A. Tuel, The first observation of NMR-invisible phosphorus in cobalt-substituted aluminophosphate molecular sieves, Chem. Commun. (1997) 241.
- [403] L. Canesson, Y. Boudeville, A. Tuel, Local environment of phosphorus atoms in CoAPO<sub>4</sub>-n molecular sieves: A <sup>31</sup>P NMR study, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 119 (1997) 10754–10762.
- [404] G. Mali, A. Ristic, V. Kaucic, <sup>31</sup>P NMR as a tool for studying incorporation of Ni, Co, Fe, and Mn into aluminophosphate zeotypes, J. Phys. Chem. B 109 (2005) 10711–10716.
- [405] D. Massiot, I. Farnan, N. Gautier, D. Trumeau, A. Trokiner, J.P. Courures, <sup>71</sup>Ga and <sup>69</sup>Ga nuclear magnetic resonance study of  $\beta$ -Ga<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>: resolution of fourand six-fold coordinated Ga sites in static conditions, Solid State Nucl. Magn. Reson. 4 (1995) 241–248.
- [406] R.W. Schurko, S. Wi, L. Frydman, Dynamic effects on the powder line shapes of half-integer quadrupolar nuclei: a solid-state NMR study of XO<sub>4</sub>- groups, J. Chem. Phys. A 106 (2002) 51–62.
- [407] J. Ash, P.J. Grandinetti, Solid-state NMR characterization of <sup>69</sup>Ga and <sup>71</sup>Ga in crystalline solids, Magn. Reson. Chem. 44 (2006) 823–831.
- [408] L.A. O'Dell, A.J. Rossini, R.W. Schurko, Acquisition of ultra-wideline NMR spectra from quadrupolar nuclei by frequency-stepped WURST-QCPMG, Chem. Phys. Lett. 468 (2009) 330–335.
- [409] L.A. O'Dell, R.W. Schurko, Fast and simple acquisition of solid-state <sup>14</sup>N NMR spectra with signal enhancement via population transfer, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 131 (2009) 6658–6659.
- [410] M.-H. Thibault, B.E.G. Lucier, R.W. Schurko, F.-G. Fontaine, Synthesis and solid-state characterization of platinum complexes with hexadentate aminoand iminophosphine ligands, Dalton Trans. (2009) 7701–7716.
- [411] A.W. MacGregor, L.A. O'Dell, R.W. Schurko, New methods for the acquisition of ultra-wideline solid-state NMR spectra of spin-1/2 nuclides, J. Magn. Reson. 208 (2011) 103–111.
- [412] K. Harris, A. Lupulescu, B.E.G. Lucier, L. Frydman, R.W. Schurko, Broadband adiabatic inversion pulses for cross polarization in wideline solid-state NMR spectroscopy, J. Magn. Reson. 224 (2012) 28–47.
- [413] L.A. O'Dell, The WURST kind of pulses in solid-state NMR, Solid State Nucl. Magn. Reson. 55-56 (2013) 28-41.
- [414] J. Cabana, J. Shirakawa, G. Chen, T.J. Richardson, C.P. Grey, MAS NMR study of the metastable solid solutions found in the LiFePO<sub>4</sub>/FePO<sub>4</sub> system, Chem. Mater. 22 (2010) 1249–1262.
- [415] D.M. Halat, R. Dervisoglu, G. Kim, M.T. Dunstan, F. Blanc, D.S. Middlemiss, C.P. Grey, Probing oxide-ion mobility in the mixed ionic-electronic conductor  $La_2NiO_{4+\delta}$  by solid-state presup170 MAS NMR spectroscopy, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 138 (2016) 11958–11969.

- [416] O. Pecher, D.M. Halat, J. Lee, Z. Liu, K.J. Griffith, M. Braun, C.P. Grey, Enhanced efficiency of solid-state NMR investigations of energy materials using an external automatic tuning/matching (eATM) robot, J. Magn. Reson. 275 (2017) 127–136.
- [417] H.Y. Carr, E.M. Purcell, Effects of diffusion on free precession in nuclear magnetic resonance experiments, Phys. Rev. 94 (1954) 630–638.
- [418] S. Meiboom, D. Gill, Modified spin-echo method for measuring nuclear magnetic relaxation times, Rev. Sci. Instr. 29 (1958) 688–691.
- [419] G. Metz, X. Wu, S.O. Smith, Ramped-amplitude cross polarization in magicangle-spinning NMR, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. A 110 (1994) 219–227.
- [420] R.H. van Eck, W.S. Veeman, Spin density description of rotational-echo double-resonance, transferred-echo double-resonance and two-dimensional transferred-echo double-resonance solid state nuclear magnetic resonance, Solid State Nucl. Magn. Reson. 2 (1993) 307–315.
- [421] T. Gullion, D.B. Baker, M.S. Conradi, New, compensated Carr-Purcell sequences, J. Magn. Reson. 89 (1990) 479–484.
- [422] Z. Yao, H.-T. Kwak, D. Sakellariou, L. Emsley, P.J. Grandinetti, Sensitivity enhancement of the central transition NMR signal of quadrupolar nuclei under magic-angle spinning, Chem. Phys. Lett. 327 (2000) 85–90.
- [423] N.M. Trease, K.K. Dey, P.J. Grandinetti, Optimum excitation of "enhanced" central transition populations, J. Magn. Reson. 200 (2009) 334–339.
- [424] S. Prasad, H.-T. Kwak, T. Clark, P.J. Grandinetti, A simple technique for determining nuclear quadrupole coupling constants with RAPT solid-state NMR spectroscopy, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 124 (2002) 4964–4965.
- [425] N. Bloembergen, On the interaction of nuclear spins in a crystalline lattice, Physica 15 (1949) 386-426.
- [426] A.E. Bennett, J.H. Ok, R.G. Griffin, S. Vega, Chemical shift correlation spectroscopy in rotating solids: radio frequency-driven dipolar recoupling and longitudinal exchange, J. Chem. Phys. 96 (1992) 8624–8627.
- [427] N.P. Wickramasinghe, M.A. Shaibat, C.R. Jone, L.B. Casabianca, A.C. de Dios, J.S. Harwood, Y. Ishii, Progress in <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance for paramagnetic systems under very fast magic angle spinning, J. Chem. Phys. 128 (2008) 052210.
- [428] Y. Ishii, R. Tycko, Multidimensional heteronuclear correlation spectroscopy of a uniformly N-15- and C-13-labeled peptide crystal: toward spectral resolution, assignment, and structure determination of oriented molecules in solid-state NMR, J. Chem. Am. Soc. 122 (2000) 1443–1455.
- [429] L.J.M. Davis, I. Heinmaa, G.R. Goward, Study of lithium dynamics in monoclinic Li<sub>3</sub>Fe<sub>2</sub>(PO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>3</sub> using <sup>6</sup>Li VT and 2D exchange MAS NMR spectroscopy, Chem. Mater. 22 (2010) 769–775.
- [430] L.J.M. Davis, B.L. Ellis, T.N. Ramesh, L.F. Nazar, A.D. Bain, G.R. Goward, <sup>6</sup>Li 1D EXSY NMR spectroscopy: a new tool for studying lithium dynamics in paramagnetic materials applied to monoclinic Li<sub>2</sub>VPO<sub>4</sub>F, J. Phys. Chem. C 115 (2011) 22603–22608.
- [431] O.N. Antzutkin, S.C. Shekar, M.H. Levitt, Two-dimensional sideband separation in magic-angle-spinning NMR, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. A 115 (1995) 7–19.
- [432] J.Z. Hu, D.W. Alderman, C. Ye, R.J. Pugmire, D.M. Grant, An isotropic chemical shift-chemical shift anisotropy magic-angle slow-spinning 2D NMR experiment, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. A 105 (1993) 82–87.
- [433] M. Crozet, M. Chaussade, M. Bardet, L. Emsley, B. Lamotte, J.-M. Mouesca, Carbon-13 solid-state NMR studies on synthetic model compounds of [4Fe-4S] clusters in the 2+ state, J. Phys. Chem. A 104 (2000) 9990–10000.
- [434] I. Hung, L. Zhou, F. Pourpoint, C.P. Grey, Z. Gan, Isotropic high field NMR spectra of Li-ion battery materials with anisotropy > 1 MHz, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 134 (2012) 1898–1901.
- [435] M. Garwood, L. DelaBarre, The return of the frequency sweep: designing adiabatic pulses for contemporary NMR, J. Magn. Reson. 153 (2001) 155– 177.
- [436] J. Baum, R. Tycko, A. Pines, Broad-band and adiabatic inversion of a 2-level system by phase-modulated pulses, Phys. Rev. A 32 (1985) 3435–3447.
- [437] T.L. Hwang, P.C.M. van Zijl, M. Garwood, Fast broadband inversion by adiabatic pulses, J. Magn. Reson. 133 (1998) 200–203.
- [438] E. Kupce, R. Freeman, Adiabatic pulses for wide-band inversion and broadband decoupling, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. A 115 (1995) 273–276.
- [439] M. Deschamps, G. Kervern, D. Massiot, G. Pintacuda, L. Emsley, P.J. Grandinetti, Superadiabicity in magnetic resonance, J. Chem. Phys. 129 (2008) 204100.
- [440] S. Conolly, G. Glover, D. Nishimura, A. Macovski, A reduced power selective adiabatic spin-echo pulse sequence, Magn. Reson. Med. 18 (1991) 28–38.
- [441] T.L. Hwang, A.J. Shaka, Water suppression that works. excitation sculpting using arbitrary wave-forms and pulsed-field gradients, J. Magn. Reson. Ser. A 112 (1995) 275–279.
- [442] K. Stott, J. Stonehouse, J. Keeler, T.L. Hwang, A.J. Shaka, Excitation sculpting in high-resolution nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy: application to selective NOE experiments, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 117 (1995) 4199–4200.
- [443] M. Bini, S. Ferrari, C. Ferrara, M.C. Mozzati, D. Capsoni, A.J. Pell, G. Pintacuda, P. Canton, P. Mustarelli, Polymorphism and magnetic properties of Li<sub>2</sub>MSiO<sub>4</sub> (M = Fe, Mn) cathode materials, Sci. Rep. 3 (2013) 3452.
- [444] A. Bertarello, T. Schubeis, C. Fuccio, E. Ravera, M. Fragai, G. Parigi, L. Emsley, G. Pintacuda, C. Luchinat, Paramagnetic properties of a crystalline iron-sulfur protein by magic-angle spinning NMR spectroscopy, Inorg. Chem. 56 (2017) 6624–6629.
- [445] B. Burcher, K.J. Sanders, L. Benda, G. Pintacuda, E. Jeanneau, A.A. Danopolous, P. Braunstein, H. Olivier-Bourbigou, P.-A.R. Breuil, Straightforward access to stable, 16-valence-electron phosphine-stabilized Fe<sup>0</sup> olefin complexes and their reactivity, Organometallics 36 (2017) 605–613.

- [446] E. Mitoudi-Vagourdi, W. Papawassiliou, S. Müllner, A. Jaworski, A.J. Pell, P. Lemmens, R.K. Kremer, M. Johnsson, Synthesis and physical properties of the oxofluoride Cu<sup>2</sup>(SeO<sub>3</sub>)F<sub>2</sub>, Inorg. Chem. 57 (2018) 4640–4648, https://doi.org/ 10.1021/acs.inorgchem.8b00372.
- [447] R. Siegel, T.T. Nakashima, R.E. Wasylishen, Sensitivity enhancement of NMR spectra of half-integer spin quadrupolar nuclei in solids using hyperbolic secant pulses, J. Magn. Reson. 184 (2007) 85–100.
- [448] K.K. Dey, S. Prasad, J.T. Ash, M. Deschamps, P.J. Grandinetti, Spectral editing in solid-state MAS NMR of quadrupolar nuclei using selective satellite inversion, J. Magn. Reson. 185 (2007) 326–330.
- [449] T.T. Nakashima, R.E. Wasylishen, R. Siegel, K.J. Ooms, Sensitivity enhancement of solid-state NMR spectra of half-integer spin quadrupolar nuclei: double- or single-frequency sweeps? Insights from the hyperbolic secant experiment, Chem. Phys. Lett. 450 (2008) 417–421.
- [450] T.T. Nakashima, R. Teymoori, R.E. Wasylishen, Using hyperbolic secant pulses to assist characterization of chemical shift tensors for half-integer spin quadrupolar nuclei in MAS powder samples, Magn. Reson. Chem. 47 (2009) 465–471.
- [451] P. Caravatti, G. Bodenhausen, R.R. Ernst, Selective pulse experiments in highresolution solid-state NMR, J. Magn. Reson. 55 (1983) 88–103.
- [452] G. Pintacuda, N. Giraud, R. Pierattelli, A. Böckmann, I. Bertini, L. Emsley, Solidstate NMR spectroscopy of a paramagnetic protein: assignment and study of human dimeric oxidized Cu<sup>II</sup>–Zn<sup>II</sup> superoxide dismutase (SOD), Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 46 (2007) 1079–1082.
- [453] S. Parthasarathy, B. Yoo, D. McElheny, W. Tay, Y. Ishii, Capturing a reactive state of amyloid aggregates, J. Biol. Chem. 289 (2014) 9998–10010.
- [454] N.P. Wickramasinghe, S. Parthasarathy, C.R. Jones, C. Bhardwaj, F. Long, M. Kotecha, S. Mehboob, L.W.-M. Fung, J. Past, A. Samoson, Y. Ishii, Nanomole-scale protein solid-state NMR by breaking intrinsic <sup>1</sup>H t<sub>1</sub> boundaries, Nature Meth. 6 (2009) 215–218.
- [455] I. Bertini, L. Emsley, I.C. Felli, S. Laage, A. Lesage, J. Lewandowski, A. Marchetti, R. Pierattelli, G. Pintacuda, High-resolution and sensitivity through-bond correlations in ultra-fast magic angle spinning (MAS) solid-state NMR, Chem. Sci. 2 (2011) 345–348.
- [456] S. Laage, A. Lesage, L. Emsley, I. Bertini, I.C. Felli, R. Pierattelli, G. Pintacuda, Transverse-dephasing optimized homonuclear *j*-decoupling in solid-state NMR spectroscopy of uniformly 13C-labeled proteins, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 131 (2009) 10816–10817.
- [457] E. Barbet-Massin, A.J. Pell, M.J. Knight, A.L. Webber, I.C. Felli, R. Pierattelli, L. Emsley, A. Lesage, G. Pintacuda, <sup>13</sup>C-detected through-bond correlation experiments for protein resonance assignment by ultra-fast MAS solid-state NMR, ChemPhysChem 14 (2013) 3131–3137.
- [458] V. Chevelkov, B.J. van Rossum, F. Castellani, K. Rehbein, A. Diehl, M. Hohwy, S. Steuernagel, F. Engelke, H. Oschkinat, B. Reif, <sup>1</sup>H detection in MAS solid-state nmr spectroscopy of biomacromolecules employing pulsed field gradients for residual solvent suppression, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 125 (2003) 7788–7789.
- [459] E.K. Paulson, C.R. Morcombe, V. Gaponenko, B. Dancheck, R.A. Byrd, K.W. Zilm, Sensitive high resolution inverse detection NMR spectroscopy of proteins in the solid state, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 125 (2003) 15831–15836.
- [460] L. Zheng, K.W. Fishbein, R.G. Griffin, J. Herzfeld, Two-dimensional solid-state proton NMR and proton exchange, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 115 (1993) 6254–6261.
- [461] V. Chevelkov, K. Rehbein, A. Diehl, B. Reif, Ultrahigh resolution in proton solid-state NMR spectroscopy at high levels of deuteration, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 45 (2006) 3878–3881.
- [462] U. Akbey, S. Lange, W.T. Franks, R. Linser, K. Rehbein, A. Diehl, B.J. van Rossum, B. Reif, H. Oschkinat, Optimum levels of exchangeable protons in perdeuterated proteins for proton detection in MAS solid-state NMR spectroscopy, J. Biomol. NMR 46 (2010) 67–73.
- [463] M.J. Knight, A.L. Webber, A.J. Pell, P. Guerry, E. Barbet-Massin, I. Bertini, I.C. Felli, L. Gonnelli, R. Pierattelli, L. Emsley, A. Lesage, T. Herrmann, G. Pintacuda, Fast resonance assignment and fold determination of human superoxide dismutase by high-resolution proton-detected solid-state MAS NMR spectroscopy, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 50 (2011) 11697–11701.
- [464] E. Barbet-Massin, A.J. Pell, K. Jaudzems, W.T. Franks, J.S. Retel, S. Kotelovica, I. Akopjana, K. Tars, L. Emsley, H. Oschkinat, A. Lesage, G. Pintacuda, Out-and-back <sup>13</sup>C-<sup>13</sup>C scalar transfers in protein resonance assignment by proton-detected solid-state NMR under ultra-fast MAS, J. Biomol. NMR 56 (2013) 379–386.
- [465] E. Barbet-Massin, A.J. Pell, J.S. Retel, L.B. Andreas, K. Jaudzems, W.T. Franks, A. J. Nieuwkoop, M. Hiller, V. Higman, P. Guerry, A. Bertarello, M.J. Knight, M. Felletti, T. Le Marchand, S. Kotelovica, I. Akopjana, K. Tars, M. Stoppini, V. Bellotti, M. Bolognesi, S. Ricagno, J.J. Chou, R.G. Griffin, H. Oschkinat, A. Lesage, L. Emsley, T. Herrmann, G. Pintacuda, Rapid proton-detected NMR assignment for proteins with fast magic angle spinning, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 136 (2014) 12489–12497.
- [466] L.B. Andreas, K. Jaudzems, J. Stanek, D. Lalli, A. Bertarello, T. Le Marchand, D. Cala-De Paepe, S. Kotelovica, I. Akopjana, B. Knott, S. Wegner, F. Engelke, A. Lesage, L. Emsley, K. Tars, T. Herrmann, G. Pintacuda, Structure of fully protonated proteins by proton-detected magic-angle spinning NMR, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 113 (2016) 9187–9192.
- [467] S.A. Rouf, J. Mares, J. Vaara, <sup>1</sup>H chemical shifts in paramagnetic Co(II) pyrazolylborate complexes: a first-principles study, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 11 (2015) 1683–1691.
- [468] M.C. Tucker, M.M. Doeff, T.J. Richardson, R. Fiñones, E.J. Cairns, J.A. Reimer, Hyperfine fields at the Li site in LiFePO<sub>4</sub>-type olivine materials for lithium rechargeable batteries: a <sup>7</sup>Li MAS NMR and SQUID study, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 124 (2002) 3832–3833.

- [469] A. D'Aléo, G. Pompidor, B. Elena, J. Vicat, P.L. Baldeck, L. Toupet, R. Kahn, C. Andraud, O. Maury, Two-photon microscopy and spectroscopy of lanthanide bioprobes, ChemPhysChem 8 (2007) 2125–2132.
- [470] J. Schlagnitweit, M. Tang, M. Baias, S. Richardson, S. Schantz, L. Emsley, Nanostructure of materials determined by relayed paramagnetic relaxation enhancement, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 137 (2015) 12482–12485.
- [471] Z.-F. Xu, Y. Xie, W.-L. Feng, H.F. Schaefer III, Systematic investigation of electronic and molecular structures for the first transition metal series metallocenes M(C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub> (M = V, Cr, Mn, Fe, Co, and Ni), J. Phys. Chem. A 107 (2003) 2716–2729.
- [472] B.P. Pritchard, S. Simpson, E. Zurek, J. Autschbach, Computation of chemical shifts for paramagnetic molecules: a laboratory experiment for the undergraduate curriculum, J. Chem. Educ. 91 (2014) 1058–1063.
- [473] H.M. McConnell, C.M. Holm, Proton resonance shifts in nickelocene, J. Chem. Phys. 27 (1957) 314–315.
- [474] H.M. McConnell, C.M. Holm, Proton resonance shifts in paramagnetic metal aromatic complexes, J. Chem. Phys. 28 (1958) 749–750.
- [475] F. Aquino, B. Pritchard, J. Autschbach, Scalar relativistic computations and localized orbital analyses of nuclear hyperfine coupling and paramagnetic NMR chemical shifts, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 8 (2012) 598–609.
- [476] F.H. Köhler, W. Proßdorf, Metallocenes: first models for nuclear magnetic resonance isotope shifts in paramagnetic molecules, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 100 (1978) 5970–5972.
- [477] F.H. Köhler, K.-H. Doll, W. Proßdorf, Extreme <sup>13</sup>C-NMR data as information on organometal radicals, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 19 (1980) 479–480.
- [478] N. Hebendanz, F.H. Köhler, G. Müller, Electron spin adjustment in manganocenes. Preparative, paramagnetic NMR and X-ray study on substituent and solvent effects, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 108 (1986) 3281–3289.
- [479] H. Eicher, F.H. Köhler, Determination of the electronic structure, the spin density distribution, and approach to the geometric structure of substituted cobaltocenes from NMR spectroscopy in solution, Chem. Phys. 128 (1988) 297–309.
- [480] N. Hebendanz, F.H. Köhler, F. Scherbaum, B. Schlesinger, NMR spectroscopy of paramagnetic complexes. Part 36-<sup>2/1</sup>H NMR of paramagnetic metallocenes: primary and secondary isotope effects and signal narrowing, Magn. Reson. Chem. 27 (1989) 798-802.
- [481] F.H. Köhler, X. Xie, Vanadocene as a temperature standard for <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>1</sup>H MAS NMR and for solution-state NMR spectroscopy, Magn. Reson. Chem. 35 (1997) 487–492.
- [482] J. Blümel, M. Herker, W. Hiller, F.H. Köhler, Study of paramagnetic chromocenes by solid-state NMR spectroscopy, Organometallics 15 (1996) 3474–3476.
- [483] H. Heise, F.H. Köhler, X. Xie, Solid-state NMR spectroscopy of paramagnetic metallocenes, J. Magn. Reson. 150 (2001) 198–206.
- [484] S. Altmannshofer, E. Herdtwerk, F.H. Köhler, R. Miller, R. Möller, E.-W. Scheidt, W. Scherer, C. Train, Crystal-packing-induced antiferromagnetic interactions of metallocenes: cyanonickelocenes, -cobaltocenes, and ferrocenes, Chem. Eur. J. 14 (2008) 8013–8024.
- [485] P. Hrobárik, R. Reviakine, A.V. Arbuznikov, O.L. Malkina, V.G. Malkin, F.H. Köhler, M. Kaupp, Density functional calculations of NMR shielding tensors for paramagnetic systems with arbitrary spin multiplicity: validation on 3d metallocenes, J. Chem. Phys. 126 (2007) 024107.
  [486] R. Prins, J.D.W. van Voorst, C.J. Schinkel, Zero-field splitting in the triplet
- [486] R. Prins, J.D.W. van Voorst, C.J. Schinkel, Zero-field splitting in the triplet ground state of nickelocene, Chem. Phys. Lett. 1 (1967) 54–55.
- [487] P. Baltzer, A. Furrer, J. Hulliger, A. Stebler, Magnetic properties of nickelocene. A reinvestigation using inelastic neutron scattering and magnetic susceptibility, Inorg. Chem. 27 (1988) 1543–1548.
- [488] S. Li, Y.M. Hamrick, R.J. Van Zee, W. Weltner Jr., Far-infrared magnetic resonance of matrix-isolated nickelocene, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 114 (1992) 4433–4434.
- [489] J. Hulliger, L. Zoller, J.H. Ammeter, Orientation effects in EPR powder samples induced by the static magnetic field, J. Magn. Reson. 48 (1982) 512–518.
- [490] J. Voitländer, E. Schimitschek, Paramagnetische Resonanzuntersuchungen an einem Mangan-di-cyclopentadienylkomplex, Z. Elektrochem. 61 (1957) 941– 943.
- [491] M.E. Switzer, R. Wang, M.F. Rettig, A.H. Maki, Electronic ground states of manganocene and 1,1'-dimethylmanganocene, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 96 (1974) 7669–7674.
- [492] V.P. Desai, E. König, B. Kanellakopulos, Magnetic susceptibility and electron paramagnetic resonance of chromocene and 1,1'-dimethyl-chromocene: evidence for the dynamic Jahn–Teller effect, J. Chem. Phys. 78 (1983) 6299–6306.
- [493] E. König, R. Schnakig, B. Kanellakopulos, R. Klenze, Magnetism down to 0.90 K, zero-field splitting, and the ligand field in chromocene, Chem. Phys. Lett. 50 (1977) 439–441.
- [494] R. Prins, P. Biloen, J.D.W. van Voorst, Electron spin resonance of vanadocene, J. Chem. Phys. 46 (1967) 1216–1217.
- [495] R. Prins, J.D.W. van Voorst, Bonding in sandwich compounds, J. Chem. Phys. 49 (1968) 4665–4673.
- [496] H.H. Dearman, W.W. Porterfield, H.M. McConnell, Paramagnetic resonance of bis-cyclopentadienyl vanadium in ferrocene, J. Chem. Phys. 34 (1961) 696– 697.
- [497] H.M. McConnell, Indirect hyperfine interactions in the paramagnetic resonance spectra of aromatic free radicals, J. Chem. Phys. 24 (1956) 764–766.
- [498] B. Martin, J. Autschbach, Kohn–Sham calculations of NMR shifts for paramagnetic 3d metal complexes: protocols, delocalization error, and the

curious amide proton shifts of a high-spin iron(II) macrocycle complex, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. 18 (2016) 21051-21068.

- [499] B. Pritchard, J. Autschbach, Theoretical investigation of paramagnetic NMR shifts in transition metal acetylacetonato complexes: analysis of signs, magnitudes, and the role of the covalency of the ligand-metal bonding, Inorg. Chem, 51 (2012) 8340-8351.
- [500] R. Pigliapochi, A.J. Pell, I.D. Seymour, C.P. Grey, D. Ceresoli, M. Kaupp, DFT investigation of the effect of spin-orbit coupling on the NMR shifts in paramagnetic solids, Phys. Rev. B 95 (2017) 054412.
- [501] A. Mondal, M.W. Gaultois, A.J. Pell, M. Iannuzzi, C.P. Grey, J. Hutter, M. Kaupp, Large-scale computation of NMR shifts for paramagnetic solids using CP2K, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 14 (2018) 377-394.
- [502] A.J. Cohen, P. Mori-Sanchéz, W. Yang, Challenges for density functional theory, Chem. Rev. 112 (2012) 289-320.
- [503] K. Długopolska, T. Ruman, M. Danilczuk, D. Pogocki, Analysis of NMR shifts of high-spin cobalt(II) pyrazolylborate complexes, Appl. Magn. Reson. 35 (2008) 271-283.
- [504] K. Mizushima, P.C. Jones, P.J. Wiseman, J.B. Goodenough,  $Li_xCoO_2$  (0 < x < 1): a new cathode material for batteries of high energy density, Mater. Res. Bull. 15 (1980) 783-789.
- [505] C. Pan, Y.J. Lee, B. Ammundsen, C.P. Grey, <sup>6</sup>Li MAS NMR studies of the local structure and electrochemical properties of Cr-doped lithium manganese and lithium cobalt oxide cathode materials for lithium-ion batteries, Chem. Mater. 14 (2002) 2289–2299.
- [506] M. Carewska, S. Scaccia, F. Croce, S. Argumugam, Y. Wang, S. Greenbaum, Electrical conductivity and <sup>6,7</sup>Li NMR studies of Li<sub>1+v</sub>CoO<sub>2</sub>, Solid State Ionics 93 (1997) 227-237.
- [507] C. Marichal, J. Hirschinger, P. Granger, M. Ménétrier, A. Rougier, C. Delmas, <sup>6</sup>Li and <sup>7</sup>Li NMR in the LiNi<sub>1-v</sub>Co<sub>v</sub>O<sub>2</sub> solid solution ( $0 \le y \le 1$ ), Inorg. Chem. 34 1995) 1773-1778.
- [508] J. Woodward, Praeparatio Caerulei Prussiaci Ex Germania Missa, Philos. Trans. R. Soc. London 33 (1724) 15–17.
- [509] S.S. Kaye, J.R. Long, Hydrogen storage in the dehydrated Prussian blue analogues M<sub>3</sub>[Co(CN)<sub>6</sub>]<sub>2</sub> (M = Mn, Fe, Co, Ni, Cu, Zn), J. Am. Chem. Soc. 127 (2005) 6506-6507.
- [510] A. Karyakin, E. Karyakin, L. Gorton, Amperometric biosensor for glutamate using Prussian blue-based artificial peroxidase as a transducer for hydrogen peroxide, Anal. Chem. 72 (2000) 1720-1723.
- [511] M.T.G. Valentini, R. Stella, L. Maggi, G. Ciceri, Copper hexacyanoferate(II) and (III) as trace cesium adsorbers from natural waters, J. Radioanal. Nucl. Chem. 114 (1987) 105–112.
- [512] G. Boxhoorn, J. Moolhuysen, J.G.F. Coolegem, R.A. Van Santen, Cyanometallates: an underestimated class of molecular sieves, J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun. (1985) 1305-1307.
- [513] A. Eftekhari, Potassium secondary cell based on Prussian blue cathode, J. Power Sour. 126 (2004) 221-228.
- [514] J.J. Alexander, H.B. Gray, Molecular orbital theory for metal complexes: ferrocyanide and cobalticyanide ions, Coord. Chem. Rev. 2 (1967) 29-43.
- [515] S. Ferlay, T. Mallah, R. Ouahes, P. Veillet, M. Verdaguer, A room-temperature organometallic magnet based on Prussian blue, Nature 378 (1995) 701-703.
- [516] A. Flambard, F.H. Köhler, R. Lescouëzec, B. Revel, Probing spin density and local structure in the Prussian blue analogues CsCd[Fe/Co(CN)<sub>6</sub>]·0.5H<sub>2</sub>O and Cd<sub>3</sub>[Fe/Co(CN)<sub>6</sub>]<sub>2</sub>·15H<sub>2</sub>O with solid-state MAS NMR spectroscopy, Chem. Eur. I. 17 (2011) 11567-11575.
- [517] N. Baumgärtel, A. Flambard, F.H. Köhler, R. Lescouëzec, Paramagnetic hexacyanometalates. The diversity of spin distribution studied by <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>15</sup>N MAS NMR spectroscopy, Inorg. Chem. 52 (2013) 12634-12644.
- [518] A.K. Padhi, K.S. Nanjundaswamy, J.B. Goodenough, Phospho-olivines as positive-electrode materials for rechargeable lithium batteries, J. Electrochem. Soc. 144 (1997) 1188–1194.
- [519] H. Ehrenberg, N.N. Bramnik, A. Senyshyn, H. Fuess, Crystal and magnetic structures of electrochemically delithiated  $\rm Li_{1-x}CoPO_4$  phases, Solid State Sci. 11 (2009) 18-23.
- [520] N.A. Chernova, G.M. Nolis, F.O. Omenya, H. Zhou, Z. Li, M.S. Whittingham, What can we learn about battery materials from their magnetic properties?, J Mater Chem. 21 (2011) 9865–9875. [521] S.L. Wilcke, Y.-J. Lee, E.J. Cairns, J.A. Reimer, Covalency measurements via
- NMR in lithium metal phosphates, Appl. Magn. Reson. 32 (2007) 547–563.
- [522] A. Mondal, M. Kaupp, Quantum-chemical approach to NMR chemical shifts in paramagnetic solids applied to LiFePO<sub>4</sub> and LiCoPO<sub>4</sub>, J. Phys. Chem. Lett. 9 (2018) 1480–1484.
- [523] A.J. Thompson, Metalloproteins, Verlag Chemie, Weinheim FRG, 1985.
- [524] R.K. Thauer, CO<sub>2</sub> reduction to formate in *clostridium acidi-urici*, J. Bacteriol. 114 (1973) 443-444.
- [525] I. Bertini, F. Capozzi, S. Ciurli, C. Luchinat, M. Messori, L. Piccioli, Identification of the iron ions of high potential iron protein from Chromatium vinosum within the protein frame through two-dimensional NMR experiments, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 114 (1992) 3332-3340.
- [526] L. Banci, I. Bertini, F. Capozzi, P. Carloni, S. Ciurli, C. Luchinat, M. Piccioli, The iron-sulfur cluster in the oxidized high-potential iron protein from Ectothiorhodospira halophila, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 115 (1993) 3431-3440.
- [527] M. Karplus, Vicinal proton coupling in nuclear magnetic resonance, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 85 (1963) 2870-2871.
- [528] C. Heller, H.M. McConnell, Radiation damage in organic crystals. II. Electron spin resonance of  $(CO_2H)CH_2CH(CO_2H)$  in  $\beta$ -succinic acid, J. Chem. Phys. 32 (1960) 1535-1539.

- [529] E.W. Stone, A.H. Maki, Hindered internal rotation and ESR spectroscopy, J. Chem. Phys. 37 (1962) 1326-1333.
- [530] J.M. McCord, I. Fridovich, Superoxide dismutase. an enzymic function for erythrocuprein (hemocuprein), J. Biol. Chem. 244 (1969) 6049-6055.
- [531] H.E. Parge, R.A. Hallewell, J.A. Tainer, Atomic structures of wild-type and thermostable mutant recombinant human Cu, Zn superoxide-dismutase, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 89 (1992) 6109-6113.
- [532] M.J. Knight, I.C. Felli, R. Pierattelli, L. Emsley, G. Pintacuda, Magic angle spinning NMR of paramagnetic proteins, Acc. Chem. Res. 46 (2013) 2108-2116
- [533] S. Balayssac, I. Bertini, M. Lelli, C. Luchinat, M. Maletta, Paramagnetic ions provide structural restraints in solid-state NMR of proteins, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 129 (2007) 2218-2219.
- [534] A. Bhaumik, C. Luchinat, G. Parigi, E. Ravera, M. Rinaldelli, NMR crystallography on paramagnetic systems: solved and open issues, CrystEngComm. 15 (2013) 8639-8656.
- [535] D. Parker, Luminescent lanthanide sensors for pH, pO2 and selected anions, Coord. Chem. Rev. 205 (2000) 109-130.
- [536] S. Faulkner, S.J.A. Pope, B.P. Burton-Pye, Lanthanide complexes for luminescence imaging applications, Appl. Spectrosc. Rev. 40 (2005) 1-31.
- [537] T. Gunnlaugsson, J.P. Leonard, Responsive lanthanide luminescent cyclen complexes: from switching/sensing to supramolecular architectures, Chem. Commun. (2005) 3114–3131.
- [538] S. Pandya, J. Yu, D. Parker, Engineering emissive europium and terbium complexes for molecular imaging and sensing, Dalton Trans. (2006) 2757-2766
- [539] N. Weibel, L.J. Charbonnière, M. Guardigli, A. Roda, R. Ziessel, Engineering of highly luminescent lanthanide tags suitable for protein labeling and timeresolved luminescence imaging, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 126 (2004) 4888-4896.
- [540] W. Denk, J.H. Strickler, W.W. Webb, Two-photon laser scanning fluorescence microscopy, Science 248 (1990) 73-76.
- [541] G. Pompidor, A. D'Aéo, J. Vicat, L. Toupet, N. Giraud, R. Kahn, O. Maury, Protein crystallography through supramolecular interactions between a lanthanide complex and arginine, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 47 (2008) 3388-3391.
- [542] H.J. Vogel, T. Drakenberg, S. Forsen, J.D.J. O'Neill, T. Hofmann, Structural differences in the two calcium binding sites of the porcine intestinal calcium binding protein: a multinuclear NMR study, Biochemistry 24 (1985) 3870– 3876.
- [543] J. Billaud, R.J. Clément, A.R. Armstrong, J. Canales-Váquez, P. Rozier, C.P. Grey, P.G. Bruce,  $\beta$ -NaMnO<sub>2</sub>: a high-performance cathode for sodium-ion batteries, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 136 (2014) 17243-17248.
- [544] V.G. Malkin, O.L. Malkina, M.E. Casida, D.R. Salahub, Nuclear magnetic resonance shielding tensors calculated with a sum-over-states density functional perturbation theory, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 116 (1994) 5898–5909. [545] J. Mares, H. Liimatainen, T.O. Pennanen, J. Vaara, Magnetic properties of
- <sup>2+</sup>(aq) from first principles, J. Chem. Theory Comput. 7 (2011) 3248-3260.
- [546] G. Pintacuda, G. Otting, Identification of protein surfaces by NMR measurements by a paramagnetic lanthanide chelate, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 124 (2002) 372-373.
- [547] C. Öster, S. Kosol, C. Hartlmüller, J.M. Lamley, D. Juga, A. Oss, M.-L. Org, K. Vanatalu, A. Samoson, T. Madl, J.R. Lewandowski, Characterisation of proteinprotein interfaces in large complexes by solid-state NMR solvent paramagnetic relaxation enhancements, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 139 (2017) 12165-12174.
- [548] J. Stanek, L.B. Andreas, K. Jaudzems, D. Cala, D. Lalli, A. Bertarello, T. Schubeis, I. Akopjana, S. Kotelovica, K. Tars, A. Pica, S. Leone, D. Picone, Z.-Q. Xu, N.E. Dixon, D. Martinez, M. Berbon, N. El Mammeri, A. Noubhani, S. Saupe, B. Habenstein, A. Loquet, G. Pintacuda, Backbone and side-chain proton NMR assignment in fully protonated proteins: microcrystals, sedimented assemblies, and amyloid fibrils, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 55 (2016) 15504-15509.
- [549] L.B. Andreas, J. Stanek, T. Le Marchand, A. Bertarello, D.C.-D. Paepe, D. Lalli, M. Krejcikova, C. Doyen, C. Oester, B. Knott, S. Wegner, F. Engelke, I.C. Felli, R. Pierattelli, N.E. Dixon, L. Emsley, T. Herrmann, G. Pintacuda, Protein residue linking in a single spectrum for magic-angle spinning NMR assignment, J. Biomol. NMR 62 (2015) 253–261.
- LS: Russell-Saunders.

ABMS: anisotropic bulk magnetic susceptibility.

aMAT: adiabatic magic-angle turning.

An: actinide.

AO: atomic orbital.

AP: anti-phase.

BMS: bulk magnetic susceptibility.

CA: alpha carbon (protein).

CASSCF: complete active space self-consistent-field method.

CB: beta carbon (protein).

CCR: cross-correlated relaxation.

CEST: chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer.

CO: carbonyl carbon (protein). COASTER: correlation of anisotropies separated through echo refocusing.

COSY: correlation spectroscopy.

CP: cross polarization.

CPMG: Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill. CSA: chemical shift anisotropy. CT: central transition. DFT: density functional theory. DHSQC: dipolar heteronuclear single-quantum correlation. DINEPT: dipolar insensitive nucleus enhanced by polarization transfer. DIPAP: double in-phase anti-phase. DIPSI: decoupling in the presence of scalar interactions. DM: Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya. DNA: deoxyribonucleic acid. DNP: dynamic nuclear polarization. DQF-COSY: double-quantum-filtered correlation spectroscopy. EC: ethyl cellulose. EDTA: ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid. EFG: electric-field gradient. EPR: electron paramagnetic resonance. ESR: electron spin resonance. EXSY: exchange spectroscopy. FC: Fermi contact. FID: free-induction decay. FWHM: full-width at half-maximum. GGA: generalized gradient approximation. H<sup>CA</sup>: alpha proton (protein). H<sup>N</sup>: amide proton (protein). HETCOR: heteronuclear correlation. HF: hyperfine. HMQC: heteronuclear multiple-quantum correlation. HOMO: highest-occupied molecular orbital. HPC: hydroxypropyl cellulose. HS: high-spin. HSQC: heteronuclear single-quantum correlation. IBMS: isotropic bulk magnetic susceptibility. IP: in-phase. IPAP: in-phase anti-phase. IS: inner-sphere. LCAO: linear combination of atomic orbitals. LF: ligand field. Ln: lanthanide. LR: linear-response. LS: low-spin. LUMO: lowest-unoccupied molecular orbital. MAS: magic-angle spinning. MAT: magic-angle turning. MATPASS: magic-angle turning phase-adjusted spinning sidebands. MATPASS: nuclear magnetic resonance dispersion. MMP: metalloproteinase. MO: molecular orbital.

MRI: magnetic resonance imaging. NH: amide nitrogen (protein). NMR: nuclear magnetic resonance. NOE: nuclear Overhauser effect. NOESY: nuclear Overhauser effect spectroscopy. NQR: nuclear quadrupole resonance. NR: non-relativistic. OM: oncomodulin. OS: outer-sphere. PAF: principal axis frame. PARACEST: paramagnetic chemical exchange dependent saturation transfer. PASS: phase-adjusted spinning sidebands. PBA: Prussian Blue analogue. PCS: pseudo-contact shift. PDSD: proton-driven spin diffusion. PRE: paramagnetic relaxation enhancement. PSD: proton spin diffusion. PSO: paramagnetic spin orbital. R-PRE: relayed paramagnetic relaxation enhancement. RAPT: rotor-assisted population transfer. RDC: residual dipolar coupling. RF: radio-frequency. RFDR: radio-frequency driven recoupling. RKKY: Ruderman-Kittel-Kasuya-Yosida. *ROE:* rotating-frame Overhauser enhancement. ROESY: rotating-frame Overhauser effect spectroscopy. S3AP: single-sideband-selective adiabatic pulse. S3E: selective-spin-state excitation. SA: shift anisotropy. SC: sidechain (protein). SD: spin-dipolar. SHAP: short high-power adiabatic pulse. SHAP-CPMG: short high-power adiabatic pulse Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill. SO: spin orbit. SOD: superoxide dismutase. SS: spin-spin. ST: satellite transition. TEDOR: transferred-echo double resonance. TM: transition metal. TOCSY: total correlation spectroscopy. TROSY: transverse relaxation-optimized spectroscopy. VASP: Vienna ab initio Simulation Package. VOCS: variable offset cumulative spectroscopy. WEFT: water eliminated Fourier transform. WURST: wideband, uniform rate, smooth truncation. Z: Zeeman. ZFS: zero-field splitting. ZQ: zero-quantum.

MODEFT: modified driven equilibrium Fourier transform.

### Theory, Practice, and Applications of Paramagnetic Relaxation Enhancement for the Characterization of Transient Low-Population States of Biological Macromolecules and Their Complexes

G. Marius Clore\*,<sup>†</sup> and Junji Iwahara\*,<sup>‡</sup>

Laboratory of Chemical Physics, Building 5, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Disease, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland 20892-0520, and Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Sealy Center for Structural Biology and Molecular Biophysics, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, Texas 77555-0647

Received January 26, 2009

#### Contents

1.	Introdu	Introduction				
2.	Theore	etical Aspects	4110			
	2.1. Pa	ramagnetic NMR Parameters	4110			
	2.1.1.	Isotropic and Anisotropic Unpaired-Electron Systems	4110			
	2.1.2.	PRE through Direct Dipole-Dipole Interactions	4111			
	2.1.3.	PRE through Curie-Spin Relaxation	4111			
	2.1.4.	Pseudocontact Shifts	4111			
	2.1.5.	Residual Dipolar Couplings	4112			
	2.1.6.	Advantages of Paramagnetic Systems with an Isotropic <i>g</i> -Tensor	4112			
	2.2. Eff froi Ma	ect of Fast Dynamics on the PRE Arising m a Paramagnetic Probe Conjugated to a cromolecule	4113			
	2.2.1.	Model-free Extension of the Solomon-Bloemenbergen Equations	4113			
	2.2.2.	Effect of Fast Internal Motions on PRE $^1\text{H-}\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$	4114			
	2.3. Eff	ect of Slow Dynamics on the PRE	4114			
	2.3.1.	PRE $\Gamma_2$ Rates in an Exchanging System	4114			
	2.3.2.	PRE-Based Amplification of Information Relating to Minor States	4115			
3.	Experimental Analysis of <sup>1</sup> H PRE Data					
	ramagnetic Probes	4116				
	3.1.1.	Paramagnetic Probes Attached to Proteins	4117			
	3.1.2.	Paramagnetic Probes Attached to Nucleic Acids	4117			
	3.1.3.	Paramagnetic Cosolutes for Probing Molecular Surfaces	4118			
	3.2. Pu PR	lse Sequences for the Measurement of $E^{-1}H-\Gamma_2$ Rates	4118			
	3.2.1.	$\Gamma_{\rm 2}$ Measurement for $^{\rm 15}\rm N-Attached$ $^{\rm 1}\rm H-Nuclei$	4119			
	3.2.2.	$\Gamma_{\rm 2}$ Measurement for $^{\rm 13}\text{C-Attached}$ $^{\rm 1}\text{H-Nuclei}$	4119			
	3.3. Pra	actical Considerations for $\Gamma_2$ Measurements	4120			
	3.3.1.	Choice of Time Points	4120			
	3.3.2.	Undesired Solvent PRE Effects at High Sample Concentration	4120			
	3.3.3.	Field Dependence of PRE $^1\text{H-}\Gamma_2$	4120			

University of Texas Medical Brand	ch.
-----------------------------------	-----

	3.3.4.	Effect of Diamagnetic Impurities on PRE	4120
3	8.4. PR Thr	E Back-calculation from the ree-Dimensional Structure	4121
	3.4.1.	PRE Arising from Paramagnetic Probes Attached to Macromolecules	4122
	3.4.2.	Otting-LeMaster Approach for Predicting Solvent PREs	4123
4.	Applica	ations	4124
4	4.1. Investigations of the Target Search Process in Protein-DNA Interactions		
	4.1.1.	Nonspecific Protein–DNA Interactions	4124
	4.1.2.	Locating the Cognate Target Site in Specific Protein-DNA Interactions	4125
4	.2. En Ass	counter Complexes in Protein—Protein sociation	4128
	4.2.1.	Protein—Protein Complexes from the Bacterial Phosphotransferase System	4128
	4.2.2.	Encounter Complexes in Protein—Protein Electron Transfer	4131
	4.2.3.	Ultraweak Self-association	4132
	4.2.4.	Transient Events Involved in N-Terminal Autoprocessing of HIV-1 Protease	4133
4	.3. Tra Pro	nsient Domain-Domain Interactions in oteins	4133
	4.3.1.	Interdomain Dynamics in Maltose-Binding Protein	4133
	4.3.2.	Conformational Space Sampled by Denatured and Intrinsically Disordered Proteins	4135
5.	Conclu	ding Remarks	4135
6.	6. Acknowledgments		4136
7.	Refere	nces	4136
1. Int	roduc	tion	

Understanding the function of biological macromolecules and their complexes at the physicochemical level requires knowledge of both their structure and dynamics. Conventional biophysical techniques, such as crystallography and NMR, have yielded incredibly detailed structural information at the atomic level on highly populated static states.<sup>1</sup> In the context of the energy landscape representation of macromolecules, highly populated states are located within the global free energy minimum region of a relatively rough free energy hypersurface.<sup>2–5</sup> Much less is known, however, about lowly populated, higher free energy states which cannot be

<sup>\*</sup> E-mail: G.M.C., mariusc@mail.nih.gov; J.I., j.iwahara@utmb.edu.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> National Institutes of Health.



Marius Clore is Chief of the Protein NMR Section at the NIH (1988-present). He received his M.D. and Ph.D. degrees at University College Hospital Medical School and the MRC National Institute for Medical Research in London and was joint Head of the Biological NMR group at the Max Planck Institute for Biochemistry in Munich (1984-1988). His major research interests lie in the application of NMR spectroscopy to study the structure and dynamics of macromolecular complexes.



Junji lwahara is currently an Assistant Professor in the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology at the University of Texas Medical Branch (2007-present). He received his Ph.D. degree at the University of Tokyo and was a Senior Research Fellow in the Laboratory of Chemical Physics at the NIH (2002-2007). His current interests lie in the use of NMR spectroscopy to study highly dynamic processes such as protein translocation on DNA.

trapped and are therefore invisible to conventional structural and biophysical techniques. Because such lowly populated states are generally invisible does not mean that they are not important. Indeed, many biological processes, including macromolecular recognition and binding, enzyme catalysis, allostery, and self-assembly, may proceed via intermediates involving fast but infrequent transitions between the free energy global minimum state and higher free energy states. Consider, for example, the process of recognition between two macromolecules. There are two opposing constraints governing this process, namely specificity and speed.<sup>6</sup> If an interaction is too specific, the speed of recognition will likely be slow. If, on the other hand, the speed of interaction is too fast, specificity will likely be sacrificed. The dilemma, therefore, is how biological processes manage to achieve both speed and specificity. Extensive kinetic $^{7-13}$  and theoretical work<sup>6,14-16</sup> has suggested that one mechanism that can be used to enhance speed without sacrificing specificity is to reduce the dimensionality of the search process or more generally to incorporate a nonspecific attractive potential.<sup>6</sup> In the context of protein-DNA interactions, where a transcription factor must be able to locate its specific DNA target site within a sea of nonspecific DNA sites, nonspecific DNA binding can be used to facilitate specific recognition via a combination of one-dimensional diffusion or sliding along the DNA, coupled with jumping from one DNA molecule to another.<sup>17–26</sup> Similarly for protein—protein interactions, nonspecific encounter complexes can be rapidly formed and subsequently relax to the stereospecific complex via two-dimensional diffusion on the surface of the proteins coupled with electrostatic guiding.<sup>6,9,27–29</sup> In this review, we will survey recent developments in paramagnetic relaxation enhancement (PRE), as measured by NMR spectroscopy, and show how this technique can provide unique information that permits one to both detect and visualize lowly populated states of macromolecules and their complexes.

Macromolecular NMR spectroscopy has seen many developments over the last two decades. The advent of twodimensional NMR led to the first three-dimensional structure determinations of small (<8-10 kDa) proteins and nucleic acids.30,31 The introduction of heteronuclear three- and fourdimensional NMR spectroscopy in the late 1980s and early 1990s<sup>32,33</sup> extended the range of applicability of the method to systems in the 20-30 kDa range.<sup>34,35</sup> Subsequently, the introduction of transverse relaxation optimized spectroscopy  $(\text{TROSY})^{36-40}$  permitted structures of systems in the 40-80 kDa range to be determined<sup>41-46</sup> and supra-molecular complexes in the 500 kDa range to be studied.<sup>47-50</sup> Most NMR measurements, such as the nuclear Overhauser effect (NOE), which yields short ( $\leq 6$  Å) interproton distance restraints that provide the mainstay of all NMR structure determinations, and three-bond scalar couplings that yield torsion angle restraints, are based on short-range local interactions. The power of the NOE is that a large number of short-range interproton distances between residues far apart in the linear sequence of amino acids are sufficiently constraining to yield the three-dimensional structure of a protein.<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless, long-range information can still be very helpful. In this regard, the introduction of residual dipolar couplings (RDCs), measured on weakly aligned macromolecules dissolved in dilute liquid crystalline media,52,53 provides long-range orientational information (relative to an external alignment tensor) that has led to significant increases in coordinate accuracy.<sup>54–58</sup> Long-range distance information in the 10–35 Å range can also be obtained through the use of paramagnetic NMR. 59-63

For investigations of dynamics by NMR, <sup>2</sup>H-, <sup>13</sup>C-, and <sup>15</sup>N-relaxation measurements have provided a wealth of information on the pico- to nanosecond time scale. Recent advances in relaxation dispersion spectroscopy have yielded insights into processes on the micro- to millisecond time scale.<sup>64–67</sup> Quantitative studies of slower exchange processes involving macromolecules can be carried out using techniques such as heteronuclear *z*-exchange spectroscopy<sup>25,68–71</sup> and hydrogen/deuterium exchange experiments.<sup>72,73</sup>

There are two NMR approaches that can be used to study lowly populated states under equilibrium conditions, namely relaxation dispersion spectroscopy and paramagnetic relaxation enhancement. Relaxation dispersion spectroscopy provides detailed kinetic information on exchange processes between major species and lowly populated states on the micro- to millisecond time scale, providing there are substantial chemical shift differences between the states. In the absence of substantial chemical shift differences between the states, exchange line broadening will not occur and no relaxation dispersion will be observed. In addition to kinetic rate constants, relaxation dispersion measurements yield chemical shifts for the minor species which can be used to obtain some qualitative structural insight into the nature of the minor species. More recently, combining relaxation dispersion with weak alignment has permitted the extraction, under favorable circumstances, of highly sensitive bond vector orientation information for the minor species in the form of RDCs and anisotropic chemical shifts.<sup>74,75</sup>

Over the past few years, paramagnetic NMR has emerged as an alternative, orthogonal, and powerful tool to investigate various dynamic processes involving macromolecules. In particular, the PRE arising from unpaired electrons with an isotropic g-tensor (such as a nitroxide spin-label or EDTA- $Mn^{2+}$ ) has proved to be a particularly versatile tool that can provide information about structural aspects of dynamic process owing to the  $\langle r^{-6} \rangle$  distance dependence of the PRE between the paramagnetic center and the nucleus of interest. The PRE arises from magnetic dipolar interactions between a nucleus and the unpaired electrons of the paramagnetic center which result in an increase in nuclear relaxation rates. In contrast to the NOE, where the effects are small and therefore limited to short-range (< 6 Å) interactions between protons, the PRE effect is very large, owing to the large magnetic moment of an unpaired electron, permitting distances up to 35 Å (depending on the paramagnetic group) to be detected. The key for using the PRE to study lowly populated states resides in the finding that the observed PRE rates in the fast exchange regime are population weighted averages of the PREs for the major and minor species.<sup>24</sup> Thus, providing the paramagnetic center-proton distances are shorter in the minor species than in the major one, the imprint of the minor species will be apparent in the observed PRE rates, thereby enabling structural information on the minor species to be extracted.

Despite the long history of the PRE (in fact, Solomon described the equations for the PRE in his famous paper on the NOE in 1955),<sup>76</sup> application to biological macromolecules was limited for a long time to metal-binding proteins.<sup>60</sup> General use of the PRE for nonmetal binding proteins is dependent on the introduction of an extrinsic paramagnetic center via conjugation to a specific, solvent exposed, site.<sup>77</sup> Further, quantitative application of the PRE to structure determination requires the appropriate theoretical and computational framework for refinement directly against PRE relaxation rates, taking into account the intrinsic flexibility of paramagnetic centers that are attached to the macromolecule via linkers with several rotatable bonds.<sup>78</sup> The first applications of the PRE involved studies on spin-labeled lysozyme and bovine pancreatic trypsin inhibitor in the mid-1980s in which PRE effects were converted to approximate distance restraints,<sup>79,80</sup> but it is only with recent biochemical and computational advances that the technique has come into more general use. Using this type of PRE data, macromolecular structures have been characterized for soluble proteins,<sup>81-84</sup> protein-protein complexes,<sup>85-89</sup> proteinoligosaccharide complexes,90-92 protein-nucleic acid complexes,78,93-96 and membrane proteins.97,98 Unfolded or partially unfolded states of proteins have also been investigated by PRE.<sup>99-109</sup> A recent major advance in the field of dynamics of macromolecular interactions is the finding that in the fast exchange regime the intermolecular PRE can provide a powerful probe to detect and characterize lowly populated intermediates in macromolecular binding events,



Figure 1. Major long-range observables in paramagnetic NMR.

thereby providing structural information on encounter complexes that cannot be obtained by any other biophysical technique.<sup>24,27,28,110,111</sup> The same principle can also be applied to other dynamic processes such as nonspecific protein–DNA interactions,<sup>23,112</sup> interdomain motions,<sup>113,114</sup> and transient protein associations.<sup>115–117</sup>

The main focus of this review is on the PRE as a tool to investigate lowly populated states of macromolecules and their complexes. In section 2, we describe the theoretical aspects of the PRE and the effects of dynamics on the PRE. In this context, we explain how the PRE permits amplification of information for minor states in exchanging systems. The advantages of using the PRE on transverse magnetization arising from unpaired electrons with an isotropic *g*-tensor are also discussed. In section 3, we describe the experimental aspects of the PRE experiment including paramagnetic probes, pulse sequences, and back-calculation of the PRE, as well as practical considerations. Finally, in section 4, we review recent applications of the PRE to investigate various dynamic processes involving biological macromolecules.

#### 2. Theoretical Aspects

#### 2.1. Paramagnetic NMR Parameters

#### 2.1.1. Isotropic and Anisotropic Unpaired-Electron Systems

In paramagnetic systems there are three NMR experimental observables that yield long-range structural information: PREs, pseudocontact shifts (PCSs), and residual dipolar couplings (RDCs). The PRE can be detected in any paramagnetic system, whereas PCSs and RDCs can only be observed in systems with an anisotropic electron g-factor. Figure 1 summarizes the major long-range paramagnetic NMR observables in systems with isotropic and anisotropic electron g-factors. PCSs and RDCs are dependent on the magnetic susceptibility tensor (usually referred to as the  $\chi$ -tensor). The electron g-tensor and  $\chi$ -tensor are closely related. In general, if the electron g-tensor is anisotropic, the  $\chi$ -tensor is also anisotropic. If the zero-field-splitting (ZFS) is negligible compared to the electron spin Zeeman energy, the relationship between the  $\chi$ - and g-tensors is given bv<sup>118</sup>

$$\chi_{kk} = \frac{\mu_0 N_{\rm A} \mu_{\rm B}^2 S(S+1)}{3k_{\rm B} T} g_{kk}^2 \tag{1}$$

where *S* is the electron spin quantum number,  $\mu_0$  is the permeability of free space,  $\mu_B$  is the magnetic moment of the free electron,  $N_A$  is Avogadro's number,  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant, *T* is the temperature, and  $g_{kk}$  is an element of the *g*-tensor (with k = x, y, or *z*). Nitroxide spin

radicals, EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup>, and DTPA-Gd<sup>3+</sup> are isotropic electron systems, whereas Fe<sup>3+</sup>, Dy<sup>3+</sup>, and many other paramagnetic metal ions represent anisotropic systems.

#### 2.1.2. PRE through Direct Dipole-Dipole Interactions

The longitudinal ( $\Gamma_1$ ) and transverse ( $\Gamma_2$ ) PRE rates are conventionally described by the Solomon–Bloembergen (SB) equations:<sup>76,119</sup>

$$\Gamma_{1} = \frac{2}{5} \left(\frac{\mu_{0}}{4\pi}\right)^{2} \gamma_{I}^{2} g^{2} \mu_{B}^{2} S(S+1) J_{SB}(\omega_{I})$$
(2)

$$\Gamma_2 = \frac{1}{15} \left( \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \right)^2 \gamma_1^2 g^2 \mu_B^2 S(S+1) \{ 4J_{SB}(0) + 3J_{SB}(\omega_I) \}$$
(3)

where g is the electron g-factor,  $\gamma_{\rm I}$  is the proton gyromagnetic ratio,  $\omega_{\rm I}/2\pi$  is the Larmor frequency of the proton, and  $J_{\rm SB}(\omega)$ is the generalized spectral density function for the reduced correlation function, given by

$$J_{\rm SB}(\omega) = r^{-6} \frac{\tau_{\rm c}}{1 + \left(\omega\tau_{\rm c}\right)^2} \tag{4}$$

The correlation time,  $\tau_c$ , is defined as  $(\tau_r^{-1} + \tau_s^{-1})^{-1}$ , where  $\tau_r$  is the rotational correlation time of the macromolecule and  $\tau_s$  is the effective electron relaxation time. The Solomon–Bloembergen theory makes the simplifying approximation that electron relaxation is not coupled to molecular tumbling. This is reasonable because the electron relaxation lifetime is comparable to or shorter than the rotational correlation time of a macromolecule. In the case of Mn<sup>2+</sup> ( $S = \frac{5}{2}$ ), electron relaxation is multiexponential.<sup>120</sup> Theoretical considerations, however, have shown that the SB equation with a single effective electron relaxation rate,  $\tau_s^{-1}$ , does not introduce any significant errors at high magnetic field strengths (>10 T).<sup>121</sup>

The Solomon–Bloembergen theory assumes that dipole–dipole interaction vectors are rigid in the molecular frame. Since PRE interaction vectors may be quite long (up to 35 Å for  $Mn^{2+}$ ), they are less susceptible to small fluctuations in atomic positions, making this assumption reasonable in many cases. However, this approximation will break down if the ensemble space sampled by the paramagnetic group is quite large. The extension of the Solomon–Bloembergen equations to deal with this problem will be described in section 2.2.

#### 2.1.3. PRE through Curie-Spin Relaxation

Curie-spin relaxation arises from dipole–dipole interaction between a nucleus and the time-averaged magnetization of the electrons. The  $\Gamma_2$  rate due to Curie-spin relaxation is given by<sup>122</sup>

$$\Gamma_{2,\text{Curie-spin}} = \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{\mu_0}{4\pi} \right)^2 \frac{\omega_I^2 g^4 \mu_B^4 S^2 (S+1)^2}{(3k_B T)^2 r^6} \left( 4\tau_r + \frac{3\tau_r}{1+(\omega_I \tau_r)^2} - 4\tau_c - \frac{3\tau_c}{1+(\omega_I \tau_c)^2} \right)$$
(5)

(In some examples in the literature, the last two terms are neglected, which is only valid when  $\tau_s \ll \tau_r$ ). From eq 5 it follows that the PRE rate for Curie-spin relaxation is

approximately proportional to the square of the magnetic field. In the case of nitroxide spin radicals,  $\tau_{\rm c} \approx \tau_{\rm r}$ , and therefore, Curie-spin relaxation is negligible. For metal ions with an anisotropic g-tensor and a very short electron relaxation time (e.g., Fe<sup>3+</sup>, Dy<sup>3+</sup>), Curie-spin relaxation is the major component of the  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ - $\Gamma_{2}$  rates for macromolecules. For isotropic metal ions such as  $Mn^{2+}$  and  $Gd^{3+}$ , Curie-spin relaxation is almost negligible for medium-size macromolecules (~40 kDa). For example, in the case of the 20 kDa SRY/DNA- EDTA-Mn2+ complex, the contribution of Curiespin relaxation to the overall  $\Gamma_2$  rates at 308 K is estimated to be only 2%, even at a  $^1\mathrm{H}\text{-}\mathrm{frequency}$  of 800 MHz.  $^{123}$  The relative contribution of Curie-spin relaxation depends on the size of the system. For a very large system with  $\tau_r$  larger than 50 ns, corresponding to a molecular weight > 100 kDa, the contribution could be larger than 20% at 800 MHz.

#### 2.1.4. Pseudocontact Shifts

Pseudocontact shifts (PCSs) are observed only in paramagnetic systems with anisotropic unpaired electrons such as those in  $Dy^{3+}$ ,  $Tb^{3+}$ , and  $Fe^{3+}$  ions. The magnitude of the PCS,  $\delta_{PCS}$ , is given by<sup>118</sup>

$$\delta_{\text{PCS}} = \frac{1}{12\pi} r^{-3} \Big\{ \Delta \chi_{\text{ax}} (3\cos^2\theta - 1) + \frac{3}{2} \Delta \chi_{\text{rh}} \sin^2\theta \cos 2\phi \Big\}$$
(6)

where *r* is the distance between the metal ion and the nuclear spin  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are the angles describing the position of the nuclear spin with respect to the principal axes (with the metal ion at the origin) of the magnetic susceptibility tensor ( $\chi$ ), and  $\Delta \chi_{ax}$  and  $\Delta \chi_{rh}$  are the axial and rhombic components, respectively, of the magnetic susceptibility tensor, defined as

$$\Delta \chi_{ax} = \chi_{zz} - \frac{1}{2}(\chi_{xx} + \chi_{yy}) \tag{7}$$

$$\Delta \chi_{\rm rh} = \chi_{xx} - \chi_{yy} \tag{8}$$

It should be noted that the PCS displays a  $r^{-3}$  distance dependence, in contrast to the  $r^{-6}$  dependence for the PRE. As a result, the distance range for the experimentally detected PCS is relatively long. For example, the distance range for the PCS arising from Dy<sup>3+</sup> can extend to ~40 Å, providing the principal axis of the  $\chi$ -tensor is fixed within the molecular frame, as is the case for metalloproteins. When an extrinsic metal ion is attached to a macromolecule using a chelator with a flexible linker, the magnitude of the PCS is significantly reduced, owing to the fact that the principal axes of the  $\chi$ -tensor fluctuate within the frame of the macromolecule. Immobilization of the metal chelator, for example by using bidentate ligands that can be conjugated to two neighboring sites simultaneously, will increase the observed PCS.<sup>124,125</sup>

There have been extensive studies in which the PCS has been used to investigate dynamics in metal binding proteins.<sup>126–128</sup> However, these PCS applications have not gained widespread popularity outside the area of metal binding proteins for two main reasons. First, the theoretical framework required to describe the relationship between PCS and dynamics has not yet been adequately established. Second, a practical problem arises from the presence of enantiomers for many metal chelators, such as EDTA, conjugated to macromolecules. Since the enantiomers exhibit slightly different  $\chi$ -tensors, the corresponding PCSs are also different, and as a result, multiple sets of crosspeaks appear.<sup>129–131</sup> Metal chelators designed to solve this problem have been developed.<sup>124,125,129,132</sup> With widespread use of these new compounds, PCS could become a widely used technique for investigations of dynamical processes.

#### 2.1.5. Residual Dipolar Couplings

A molecule containing a paramagnetic center with an anisotropic *g*-tensor will undergo partial alignment in the magnetic field, giving rise to residual dipolar couplings (RDCs):<sup>118</sup>

$$D_{AB} = \frac{hB_0^2 \gamma_A \gamma_B}{240\pi^3 kT} r_{AB}^{-3} \Big\{ \chi_{ax} (3 \cos^2 \theta - 1) + \frac{3}{2} \chi_{rh} \sin^2 \theta \cos 2\phi \Big\}$$
(9)

where  $D_{AB}$  is the residual dipolar coupling observed between nuclei A and B,  $r_{AB}$  is the distance between nuclei A and B,  $\theta$  is the angle between the A–B internuclear vector and the z axis of the  $\chi$ -tensor,  $\phi$  is the angle between the projection of the A–B internuclear vector on the xy plane and the x axis of the  $\chi$ -tensor,  $B_0$  is the static magnetic field strength, and h is Planck's constant. Although eqs 6 and 9 are formally similar, they provide different, albeit complementary information, since the variables r,  $\theta$ , and  $\phi$  are defined with respect to a paramagnetic center–nucleus vector in eq 6 and to an internuclear vector in eq 9.

For naturally occurring metal binding proteins where the metal ion(s) is at a fixed position in the molecular frame, the RDCs can be fairly large, especially at a high magnetic field. For example, in the case of calbindin D9k with a  $Dy^{3+}$  ion bound at the C-terminal metal binding site, the metal-induced RDCs for backbone amide  $^{15}N^{-1}H$  vectors spanned from -26 Hz to +19 Hz at 800 MHz and from -11 Hz to +8 Hz at 500 MHz.<sup>133</sup>

On the other hand, a  $Dy^{3+}$  ion bound to an extrinsic metal chelator attached to the macromolecule via a flexible linker will exhibit much smaller RDCs. This is because the flexibility of the linker reduces the magnitude of the molecular alignment of the macromolecule with respect to the magnetic field even though the alignment for the conjugated metal chelator may be sizable. In the case of the Trigger Factor protein with EDTA-Dy<sup>3+</sup> conjugated to a cysteine residue, the largest observed  ${}^{1}D_{\rm NH}$  RDC was only 8 Hz at 800 MHz.<sup>129</sup>

#### 2.1.6. Advantages of Paramagnetic Systems with an Isotropic g-Tensor

As described above, paramagnetic systems with an anisotropic *g*-tensor can potentially provide three different NMR observables (PRE, PCS, and RDC) while systems with an isotropic *g*-tensor yield only the PRE. However, this does not necessarily mean that an anisotropic system is more useful in practice. In fact, there are a number of practical advantages to using an isotropic system, especially for dynamic investigations.

One advantage is that separate assignment of resonances in the paramagnetic state is unnecessary, since there is no PCS for an isotropic *g*-tensor. Figure 2 shows an example



**Figure 2.** (A) <sup>1</sup>H<sup>-15</sup>N HSQC spectra recorded on SRY/DNA-EDTA complexes (right,  $Mn^{2+}$ -chelated; left,  $Ca^{2+}$ -chelated).<sup>94</sup> Note that the crosspeak locations for the diamagnetic ( $Ca^{2+}$ ) and paramagnetic ( $Mn^{2+}$ ) states are identical. (B) <sup>1</sup>H transverse relaxation for Met-30 in the SRY/DNA-EDTA complexes (red,  $Mn^{2+}$ chelated; black,  $Ca^{2+}$ -chelated). (C) Location of dT-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> in the complex. Protein residues that exhibit a PRE <sup>1</sup>H<sub>N</sub>- $\Gamma_2$  rate larger than 15 s<sup>-1</sup> are colored in red. Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>94</sup> published in *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* (American Chemical Society) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

for an SRY/DNA-EDTA complex.94 In this case, the paramagnetic and diamagnetic states consist of Mn<sup>2+</sup> and Ca<sup>2+</sup>, respectively, chelated to an EDTA group that is covalently attached to the DNA. The chemical shifts for the diamagnetic and paramagnetic resonances are identical because the unpaired electrons of Mn<sup>2+</sup> are isotropic. For an anisotropic electron system, however, resonances need to be assigned separately for the diamagnetic and paramagnetic states, owing to the presence of PCS in the latter. From a practical perspective, the resonance assignment for the paramagnetic state can be very challenging, because of lower sensitivity as a consequence of PRE. In favorable cases, z-exchange spectroscopy can be used for assignment purposes. In this approach, the paramagnetic and diamagnetic metal ions with the same or near identical affinities are mixed and exchange crosspeaks are qualitatively used to correlate signals from the paramagnetic and diamagnetic states.<sup>134</sup> For this method to work, however, the exchange rates for metal binding should range from approximately 0.1 to  $100 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . Alternatively, resonance assignments for the paramagnetic state can be carried out using so-called "protonless" NMR spectroscopy that employs <sup>15</sup>N/<sup>13</sup>C heteronuclear correlation specroscopy in conjunction with direct <sup>13</sup>C detection.<sup>135–142</sup> Since the magnitudes of  $\Gamma_2$  for <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>15</sup>N nuclei are substantially smaller than that for <sup>1</sup>H, this type of heteronuclear correlation spectroscopy permits assignment of <sup>13</sup>C/ <sup>15</sup>N resonances in the paramagnetic state. (Note, of course, that direct detection of <sup>13</sup>C instead of <sup>1</sup>H reduces the sensitivity of the experiments owing to the dependence of the signal-to-noise ratio on  $\gamma^{3/2}$ , where  $\gamma$  is the gyromagnetic ratio of the detected nucleus.)

Another advantage of using a paramagnetic system with an isotropic g-tensor is that the analysis of the PRE is much more straightforward. For an anisotropic system, the PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rates are difficult to interpret quantitatively, owing to two factors. First,  $\Gamma_2$  for an anisotropic system arises principally from Curie-spin relaxation, for which cross-correlations with other relaxation mechanisms are significant.143,144 While cross-correlation could potentially provide an additional source of information for structural studies on a static system,143-146 the effect simply complicates the study of dynamic systems. Second, the exchange contributions arising from conformational dynamics or molecular interactions to the transverse relaxation rate,  $R_2$ , can be substantially different for the diamagnetic and paramagnetic states, owing to the presence of PCSs. In such a situation, the PRE  $\Gamma_2$ rate cannot simply be measured as a difference between the  $R_2$  rates for the diamagnetic and paramagnetic states.<sup>112</sup> Although the PRE  $\Gamma_1$  rate can be measured for both anisotropic and isotropic systems, cross-relaxation and hydrogen exchange with water molecules can, in general, significantly reduce the accuracy of the  $\Gamma_1$  measurement. For an isotropic system, on the other hand, the contribution of Curie-spin relaxation to the PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rate is negligible and the PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rate is dominated by direct dipole-dipole interactions between a nucleus and the unpaired electrons of the paramagnetic center. In this case, the PRE  $\Gamma_2$  relaxation does not exhibit cross-correlation with other relaxation mechanisms because of cancellation by rapid electron relaxation. (Note that Curie-spin relaxation is caused by timeaveraged magnetization and is independent of electron relaxation). In addition, since there is no PCS for an isotropic system, the exchange contributions to  $R_2$  are identical for the diamagnetic and paramagnetic states and are therefore canceled out when  $\Gamma_2$  is measured as  $\Gamma_2 = R_2^{\text{para}} - R_2^{\text{dia}}$ , where  $R_2^{\text{para}}$  and  $R_2^{\text{dia}}$  are the transverse relaxation rates in the paramagnetic and diamagnetic states, respectively.

# 2.2. Effect of Fast Dynamics on the PRE Arising from a Paramagnetic Probe Conjugated to a Macromolecule

Artificially introduced paramagnetic groups are generally attached to the macromolecule of interest through linkers that have several rotatable bonds. Hence, the paramagnetic centers are intrinsically flexible. In addition, the observed <sup>1</sup>H nuclei may be located in mobile regions of the macromolecule. Here, we describe the effect of fast dynamics in the picosecond to nanosecond time scale on the PRE for paramagnetic systems with an isotropic *g*-tensor.

#### 2.2.1. Model-free Extension of the Solomon–Bloemenbergen Equations

A "model-free" formalism<sup>147</sup> can be readily incorporated into the Solomon–Bloembergen theory to evaluate the influence of internal motions on the PRE.<sup>78</sup> If the internal motions are not coupled with overall tumbling of the molecule, the correlation function,  $C_{\rm I}(t)$ , for internal motion of the interaction vector within the molecular frame can be approximated by

$$C_{\rm I}(t) = {\bf S}^2 + (1 - {\bf S}^2) \exp(-t/\tau_{\rm i})$$
 (10)

where  $S^2$  is the square of the generalized order parameter (not to be confused with the electron spin quantum number S) and  $\tau_i$  is the correlation time for internal motion. Although the "model-free" formalism is commonly used for fixedlength interaction vectors such as  ${}^{15}N{-}^{1}H$  or  ${}^{13}C{-}^{1}H$  bond vectors, it can also be applied to variable length vectors such as those for homonuclear  ${}^{1}H{-}^{1}H$  dipolar interactions.  ${}^{148,149}$ In this case, the order parameter is defined as  ${}^{149}$ 

$$\mathbf{S}^{2} = \frac{4\pi}{5} \langle r^{-6} \rangle^{-1} \sum_{m=-2}^{2} \left| \left| \frac{Y_{2}^{m}(\Omega^{\text{mol}})}{r^{3}} \right| \right|^{2}$$
(11)

where  $Y_2^m(\Omega)$  are second-order spherical harmonics and  $\Omega^{mol}$  are Euler angles in the molecular frame. As Brüschweiler et al.<sup>148</sup> demonstrated for <sup>1</sup>H—<sup>1</sup>H dipolar interactions, it is useful to approximate the order parameter **S**<sup>2</sup> by decomposition into its radial and angular components:

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{PRE}}^2 \approx \mathbf{S}_{\text{PRE,angular}}^2 \mathbf{S}_{\text{PRE,radial}}^2$$
 (12)

where the angular  $(S^2_{\text{PRE},\text{angular}})$  and radial  $(S^2_{\text{PRE},\text{radial}})$  order parameters are defined as

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{PRE,angular}}^2 = \frac{4\pi}{5} \sum_{m=-2}^2 |\langle Y_2^m(\Omega^{\text{mol}}) \rangle|^2 \qquad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{PRE,radial}}^2 = \langle r^{-6} \rangle^{-1} \langle r^{-3} \rangle^2 \tag{14}$$

It is assumed that the effective electron relaxation rate  $\tau_s^{-1}$  is not influenced by the correlation times for either overall or internal motions of the interaction vector. For a transition metal ion, electron relaxation primarily arises from modulation of the zero-field splitting tensor (as a consequence of collisions with solvent molecules) and is therefore governed by a very short lifetime between collisions,  $\tau_{\nu}$  (~5 ps for water at physiological temperature).<sup>120</sup> Since internal motion faster than  $\tau_{\nu}$  would affect the effective electron relaxation rate  $\tau_s^{-1}$ , we focus on cases where the correlation time  $\tau_i$  for internal motion is significantly longer than  $\tau_{\nu}$ . Under these conditions, incorporation of the correlation function  $C_{\rm I}(t)$  for internal motions into the correlation function for the PRE transforms  $J_{\rm SB}(\omega)$  in the SB equation (eq 4) into

$$J_{\text{SBMF}}(\omega) = \langle r^{-6} \rangle \left\{ \frac{\mathbf{S}^2 \tau_{\text{c}}}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_{\text{c}}^2} + \frac{(1 - \mathbf{S}^2) \tau_{\text{t}}}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_{\text{t}}^2} \right\}$$
(15)

where  $\tau_t$  is the total correlation time, defined as  $(\tau_r^{-1} + \tau_s^{-1} + \tau_i^{-1})^{-1}$ . When the original SB equations (eqs 2–4) are expressed in the form

$$\Gamma_m = r^{-6} f_{\text{SB},m}(\tau_c), \quad (m = 1 \text{ or } 2)$$
 (16)

incorporation of the model-free formalism transforms eq 16 into

$$\Gamma_m = \mathbf{S}^2 \langle r^{-6} \rangle f_{\mathrm{SB},m}(\tau_c) + (1 - \mathbf{S}^2) \langle r^{-6} \rangle f_{\mathrm{SB},m}(\tau_t)$$
(17)

For simplicity, we refer to the SB equations incorporating the model-free formalism as the SBMF equations. The SBMF equations reduce to the SB equations under conditions where the internal motion is either very slow (and eventually,  $\tau_t \approx \tau_c$ ) or highly restricted in space ( $\mathbf{S}^2 \approx 1$ ).



**Figure 3.** Influence of the correlation time  $\tau_i$  for internal motion on (A) <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_1$  and (B) <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rates at 500 MHz. The vertical axis displays the  $\Gamma/\Gamma^0$  ratio, where  $\Gamma$  is calculated with the full SBMF equation (eq 17) and  $\Gamma^0$  with only the first term of the SBMF equation.  $\Gamma^0$  corresponds to  $\Gamma$  when  $\tau_i \rightarrow 0$ . Curves, calculated with the correlation time  $\tau_c [=(\tau_r^{-1} + \tau_s^{-1})^{-1}]$  set to 3 ns, are shown with three different values of the order parameter  $\mathbf{S}^2$  for PRE interaction vectors:  $S_{Mn-H}^2 = 0.9$  (solid line), 0.7 (dashed line), and 0.5 (long—short dashed line). The dependences of the <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_1$  and <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rates on  $\tau_i$  are field-dependent, and the maximum of the <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_1$ /<sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_1^0$  curve is located around  $\tau_i \sim 1/\omega_1$ . Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>78</sup> published in *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* (American Chemical Society) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

The SB (eq 16) and SBMF (eq 17) equations are valid for systems with isotropic tumbling. For nonglobular systems exhibiting significant diffusion anisotropy, the PRE also depends on the angles between the principal axes of the diffusion tensor and the electron–nucleus interaction vector. The effect of anisotropic tumbling can be readily incorporated according to previous literature.<sup>150,151</sup> However, the impact of anisotropic tumbling is not significant unless the rotational correlation time dominates the overall correlation time.

### 2.2.2. Effect of Fast Internal Motions on PRE $^1\text{H-}\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$

The impacts of motional effects on  ${}^{1}\text{H}-\Gamma_{1}$  and  ${}^{1}\text{H}-\Gamma_{2}$  rates are very different. Owing to the large distances involved, the variation in the values of the order parameters for PRE interaction vectors is rather small. However, the internal motion correlation time  $\tau_{i}$  is likely to have a wide range of values depending on the internal dynamics of individual  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ nuclei in the macromolecule (e.g., side chain versus backbone). The contribution of  $\tau_{i}$  can be evaluated using the second term of the SBMF equation (eq 17). The dependences of  ${}^{1}\text{H}-\Gamma_{1}$  and  ${}^{1}\text{H}-\Gamma_{2}$  rates on  $\tau_{i}$  are shown in Figure 3. In the case where the order parameters  $\mathbf{S}^{2}$  for the PRE interaction vectors are as small as 0.5, the  ${}^{1}\text{H}-\Gamma_{1}$  rate exhibits a strong dependence on  $\tau_{i}$  (in particular for  $\tau_{i} < 1/\omega_{\text{H}}$ ); indeed, the value of  $\Gamma_1$  can be up to five times larger than that of  $\Gamma_1$  in the absence of internal motion, depending on the value of  $\tau_i$ (Figure 3A). The <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rate, on the other hand, is significantly less sensitive to the internal correlation time  $\tau_i$  (Figure 3B). Thus, for structure analysis using <sup>1</sup>H-PRE data arising from flexible paramagnetic groups, the analysis of  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ - $\Gamma_{1}$ requires accurate information on the values of  $\tau_i$  for the individual PRE interaction vectors, whereas a simple estimation of  $\tau_i$  is sufficient for analysis of <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  data. Consequently,  ${}^{1}$ H- $\Gamma_{2}$  data provide far more useful structural restraints, since they are not affected by the motional effects within the macromolecule. In addition, proton  $T_1$  relaxation is not a single-exponential process, owing to cross-relaxation (and water-exchange in the case of amide protons), and hence the observed  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ - $\Gamma_{1}$  values will also be perturbed by such effects.

#### 2.3. Effect of Slow Dynamics on the PRE

In section 2.2, we described the effect of fast dynamics  $(\sim 10^{-11}-10^{-8} \text{ s time scale})$  on the PRE where the impact of dynamics is at the level of the autocorrelation function. Dynamics more relevant to macromolecular interactions, however, typically occur on slower time scales. Here we describe the effects of slower dynamics  $(\sim 10^{-6}-10^{-1} \text{ s time scale})$  on the PRE. The principle of amplification of information relating to low population states in an exchanging system will also be discussed.

#### 2.3.1. PRE $\Gamma_2$ Rates in an Exchanging System

The effect of slower dynamics on the PRE can be simulated using the McConnell equations,<sup>152</sup> which represent the most fundamental description of the effects of chemical exchange in NMR. The matrix form of the McConnell equations for transverse magnetization is given by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\mathbf{m} = -(\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{K} - i\mathbf{W})\mathbf{m}$$
(18)

where **m** is a vector containing the transverse magnetizations of the exchanging states, **R** is a relaxation matrix, **K** is a kinetic matrix, and **W** is a chemical shift matrix. In the case of two-state exchange,  $A \leftrightarrow B$ , the vector and matrices in eq 18 are given as follows:

$$\mathbf{m} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{\rm A}^+ \\ M_{\rm B}^+ \end{pmatrix} \tag{19}$$

$$\mathbf{R} = \begin{pmatrix} R_{2,A} + \Gamma_{2,A} & 0\\ 0 & R_{2,B} + \Gamma_{2,B} \end{pmatrix}$$
(20)

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} k_{\mathrm{AB}} & -k_{\mathrm{BA}} \\ -k_{\mathrm{AB}} & k_{\mathrm{BA}} \end{pmatrix}$$
(21)

$$\mathbf{W} = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega_{\rm A} & 0\\ 0 & \Omega_{\rm B} \end{pmatrix} \tag{22}$$

where  $M^+$  is a transverse magnetization represented by a complex variable  $M_x + iM_y$ ,  $R_2$  is a transverse relaxation rate,  $k_{AB}$  and  $k_{BA}$  are the kinetic rate constants for the A  $\rightarrow$ B and B  $\rightarrow$  A processes, respectively, and  $\Omega/2\pi$  is the chemical shift frequency. In the paramagnetic state, the relaxation matrix contains both the intrinsic  $R_2$  and the PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rates, while in the diamagnetic state the relaxation matrix contains only the intrinsic  $R_2$  rates. Expansion of eqs 19–22 for a three-state (e.g., see Led and Grant<sup>153</sup>) or general *N*-state exchange is straightforward.

Using the McConnell equations, one can simulate apparent PRE rates for exchanging systems. Numerical solutions of the McConnell equations can be readily obtained using either the exponential matrix formalism or by numerical integration. Simulations require initial conditions determined by the equilibrium populations of individual states. If the number of states exceeds two, it is convenient to consider the equilibrium populations in terms of a partition function, Q. For example, the partition function Q for a consecutive three-state exchange  $A \leftrightarrow B \leftrightarrow C$  (with species A as a reference) system is given by

$$Q = 1 + \frac{k_{\rm AB}}{k_{\rm BA}} + \frac{k_{\rm AB}}{k_{\rm BA}} \frac{k_{\rm BC}}{k_{\rm CB}}$$
(23)

and the populations of states A, B, and C are calculated to be 1/Q,  $(k_{AB}/k_{BA})/Q$ , and  $(k_{AB}/k_{BA})(k_{BC}/k_{CB})/Q$ , respectively. Solutions of the McConnell equations provide time-domain data (i.e., free induction decay), and subsequent Fourier transformation yields an NMR spectrum for the exchanging system. Line shape fitting against the simulated spectrum permits analysis of apparent relaxation rates. Two simulations with and without the PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rate in the **R** matrix provide apparent relaxation rates for paramagnetic  $(R_{2,para}^{app})$  and diamagnetic  $(R_{2,dia}^{app})$  states, and the apparent PRE rate can be calculated as  $\Gamma_2^{\text{app}} = R_{2,\text{para}}^{\text{app}} - R_{2,\text{dia}}^{\text{app}}$  in exactly the same manner as in an experimental measurement. Strictly speaking, this corresponds to  $\Gamma_2^{app}$  in the case without a refocusing pulse. Effects of refocusing pulses can be considered in the context of the McConnell equations as described by Allerhand.<sup>154</sup> However, simulations of apparent PRE rates with and without refocusing pulses result in virtually identical  $\Gamma_2$  values. This is due to the fact that the exchange contributions to the  $R_2$ rates for the paramagnetic and diamagnetic states are virtually identical and are therefore canceled in the calculation of  $\Gamma_2$ .

#### 2.3.2. PRE-Based Amplification of Information Relating to Minor States

The PRE provides a unique technique for obtaining structural information about low population states in an exchanging system.<sup>24</sup> The underlying basis of this phenomenon can be ascertained from simulations based on the McConnell equations. Figure 4 illustrates the impact on the transverse PRE  ${}^{1}$ H- $\Gamma_{2}$  rate observed on the resonance of a major species A (population  $p_A$ , 99%) with a paramagnetic center-proton distance of  $r_{\rm A} = 30$  Å on the presence of a minor species B (population  $p_{\rm B}$ , 1%) with a corresponding distance of  $r_{\rm B} = 8$  Å. Due to the  $r^{-6}$  dependence of the PRE, the PRE rates span a very broad range. For this particular case, with a molecular weight of  $\sim 30$  kDa, the PRE <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$ rate arising from  $Mn^{2+}$  for species A ( $\Gamma_{2,A}$ ) is only 2 s<sup>-1</sup>, whereas that for species B ( $\Gamma_{2,B}$ ) is 5.6 × 10<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. Figure 5 shows the relationship between  $k_{ex}$  and  $\Gamma_2^{app}$  for this system. The apparent value of  $\Gamma_2$  ( $\Gamma_2^{app}$ ) observed for the resonance of the major species A is highly dependent on the exchange rate  $k_{ex} = k_{AB} + k_{BA}$  between the major and minor species. If  $k_{ex}$  is slow (<50 s<sup>-1</sup>), the presence of the minor species B has no effect and the value of  $\Gamma_2^{app}$  is the same as that expected for the major species A. For larger  $k_{ex}$ , however,  $\Gamma_2^{\text{app}}$  is highly influenced by the minor species B. When  $k_{\text{ex}}$ 



**Figure 4.** PRE-based amplification of information on low population states. (A) Two site exchange system comprising a major species A (99%) and a minor species B (1%). (B) Line shape simulation of the resonance of species A illustrating the effect of exchange on the apparent PRE  $\Gamma_{3}^{\text{gpp}}$  rate. When the exchange rate  $k_{\text{ex}}$  is fast, the apparent PRE  $\Gamma_{3}^{\text{gpp}}$  rate can be dominated by the invisible minor state even though its population is as small as 1%. In these simulations, the intrinsic relaxation rates for species A and B were set to 50 s<sup>-1</sup> for the diamagnetic state. The resonances arising from species A and B are located at -50 and 50 Hz, respectively. The chemical shifts for the diamagnetic and paramagnetic are assumed to be identical, since a paramagnetic system with an isotropic electron *g*-tensor such as  $Mn^{2+}$  does not generate a pseudocontact shift. Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>24</sup> published in *Nature* (Nature Publishing Group) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.



**Figure 5.** Relationship between exchange rate  $k_{ex}$  and apparent PRE  $\Gamma_2^{app}$  rate for the two-state exchange system shown in Figure 4.

 $\gg \Gamma_{2,B} - \Gamma_{2,A}$  (the fast exchange regime on the  $\Gamma_2$  relaxation time scale),  $\Gamma_2^{app}$  is the weighted population average of the  $\Gamma_2$  rates for the two species:

$$\Gamma_2^{\text{app}} \approx p_{\text{A}} \Gamma_{2,\text{A}} + p_{\text{B}} \Gamma_{2,\text{B}}$$
(24)

It should be noted that even with  $p_{\rm B}$  set to as low as 0.01,  $\Gamma_{2}^{\rm app}$  is dominated by the term arising from species B under



**Figure 6.** Relationships between chemical shift difference  $|\Omega_A - \Omega_B|/2\pi$  and apparent PRE  $\Gamma_2^{app}$  rate for the two-state exchange system in Figure 4.



**Figure 7.** PRE simulations for a consecutive three-state exchange system.

these conditions and has a value  $\sim$ 30-fold larger than  $\Gamma_{2,A}$  because  $\Gamma_{2,B}$  is so much larger than  $\Gamma_{2,A}$ . As a result, one can infer the presence of the minor species and, in addition, obtain some structural information on it because the PRE is a distance-dependent quantity.

Although amplification of information relating to the minor state represents a fascinating phenomenon, it is important to be aware that quantitative analysis is only possible under conditions where  $k_{\text{ex}} \gg |\Gamma_{2,\text{B}} - \Gamma_{2,\text{A}}|$ . If  $k_{\text{ex}}$  does not satisfy this inequality, information on  $k_{\text{ex}}$  and the chemical shift difference  $\Omega_{\text{A}} - \Omega_{\text{B}}$  between the corresponding resonances of the two species are required, as shown in Figure 6. Further, when  $|\Omega_{\text{A}} - \Omega_{\text{B}}| \ll k_{\text{ex}} \ll |\Gamma_{2,\text{B}} - \Gamma_{2,\text{A}}|$  holds because of a very large  $\Gamma_{2,\text{B}}$  (*i.e.* a short  $r_{\text{B}}$  distance), the apparent PRE  $\Gamma_{2}^{\text{app}}$  becomes virtually independent of  $r_{\text{B}}$ .

Apparent PRE  $\Gamma_2^{app}$  rates in exchanging systems comprising more than two states follow a similar pattern to that for a two-state exchange system. Figure 7 shows simulations for a consecutive three-state exchange system A  $\leftrightarrow$  B  $\leftrightarrow$  C.



**Figure 8.** Three types of PRE: (A) intramolecular PREs arising from the paramagnetic group within the same molecule; (B) intermolecular PREs arising from the paramagnetic group located on the interaction partner; (C) solvent PREs arising from random collisions between a macromolecule and paramagnetic cosolute molecules.

Values of the PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rates for A, B, and C were set to 2, 31, and 5.6 × 10<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, corresponding to electron<sup>-1</sup>H distances of  $r_A = 30$  Å,  $r_B = 19$  Å, and  $r_C =$ 8 Å, respectively. In these simulations, two sets of kinetic rate constants were used: in the first set,  $k_{AB} = 200$  s<sup>-1</sup> and  $k_{BA} = k_{BC} = k_{CB} = 20000$  s<sup>-1</sup> (Figure 7; top); in the second set,  $k_{AB} = k_{BC} = k_{CB} = 200$  s<sup>-1</sup> and  $k_{BA} = 20000$  s<sup>-1</sup> (Figure 7; bottom). For both cases, the populations of A, B, and C are 98%, 1%, and 1%, respectively. (See the partition function given by eq 23.) However, the apparent  $\Gamma_2^{\text{app}}$  rate is highly affected by the presence of state C only for the former set of rate constants, as is easily deduced from the simulations for a two-state exchange system.

#### 3. Experimental Analysis of <sup>1</sup>H PRE Data

#### 3.1. Paramagnetic Probes

Chemical probes used for paramagnetic NMR can be divided into two classes: (1) nitroxide stable radicals,  $>N-O^{,}$ , and (2) metal chelators (such as EDTA, DTPA, and metalbinding peptides) that bind paramagnetic metal ions with very high affinity. These two classes of paramagnetic probes can be covalently attached to both proteins and nucleic acids and used for the observation of intramolecular or intermolecular PREs (Figure 8A and B). Free probes, in the form of paramagnetic cosolute molecules, are also useful to identify solvent accessible regions of the molecular surface of a macromolecule (Figure 8C). In this section, we describe paramagnetic probes that have gained widespread use in paramagnetic NMR for structural and dynamic investigations of macromolecular systems.



**Figure 9.** Paramagnetic probes for protein labeling at a surface exposed cysteine residue. (1) MTSSL;<sup>81,82</sup> (2) iodoacetamido-PROXYL;<sup>102</sup>(3) iodoacetamido-TEMPO; (4) maleimide-TEMPO;<sup>114,155</sup> (5) *S*-(2-pyridylthio)cysteaminyl-EDTA;<sup>84,157,158</sup> (6) MTS-EDTA;<sup>129</sup> and (7) CLaNP-5.2.<sup>124,159</sup> These compounds are conjugated to a cysteine thiol group. (Compounds 2–4 can also react with other types of amino acids, depending on reaction conditions.) Gray-colored groups are replaced with a cysteine S $\gamma$  atom after conjugation. For maleimide-TEMPO (compound 4), the C=C double bond becomes a single bond and the cysteine S $\gamma$  atom is bonded to one of the carbon atoms. Compound 7 is conjugated to two cysteine residues in close spatial proximity on the surface of the protein. For the metal chelators (compounds 5–7), atoms involved in metal coordination are indicated by an asterisk.

#### 3.1.1. Paramagnetic Probes Attached to Proteins

A solvent-exposed cysteine residue, which can be readily introduced by site-directed mutagenesis, is most commonly used as the conjugation site for site-specific incorporation of a paramagnetic probe on a protein. Figure 9 shows several different types of paramagnetic probes designed for cysteine modification. Compounds 1-4 are nitroxide stable spin radicals,<sup>81,82,102,114,155,156</sup> while compounds 5-7 are derivatives of metal chelators.<sup>84,124,129,157–159</sup> Most of the nitroxidederivatives shown in Figure 9 were originally developed for EPR spectroscopy.

Conjugation of a paramagnetic probe based on disulfide chemistry<sup>81,82,84</sup> is probably the most commonly used. This type of reaction is thiol-specific, and virtually no conjugation reactions other than on cysteine residues are found. Although this reaction is convenient, the final product is not very stable, owing to disulfide-exchange reactions causing gradual accumulation of cross-linked protein dimer in the NMR sample. For example, in the case of a 6-month-old sample comprising a cysteaminyl-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> conjugate of <sup>15</sup>N-labeled HPr (E32C), the dimer population was found to be as high as 30%.<sup>123</sup> Considering that a relatively small percentage of diamagnetic contamination can affect the PRE measurements (see section 3.3.4), NMR experiments on this type of conjugate should be carried out within a week or two of sample preparation.

In terms of sample stability, paramagnetic probes conjugated with iodo- or bromoacetamide-derivatives<sup>102,156</sup> are advantageous, since they irreversibly form a stable C–S bond. A drawback is their lower reaction specificity. These reagents can also react with histidine, methionine, and lysine residues at a slower rate. Careful optimization of the reaction conditions to avoid undesired conjugations is therefore necessary, as described by Gillespie and Shortle.<sup>102</sup> Although cysteine modification by the maleimide-derivative is popular in biochemistry, Kosen pointed out the instability of the maleimide conjugate and recommended the use of the other compounds.<sup>77</sup>

The presence of multiple cysteine residues in a protein makes selective incorporation of a paramagnetic group difficult, especially if such cysteine residues are functionally important and cannot therefore be mutated to serine or alanine. Direct incorporation of a spin-labeled amino acid in solid-phase peptide synthesis is feasible.<sup>160–165</sup> The method is potentially very powerful in that it permits site-specific incorporation of nitroxide stable radicals at desired positions even if there are cysteine residues at different locations. However, application of this method is currently limited to polypeptides shorter than about 50 residues. Incorporation of a reactive keto group using the method developed by Schultz and co-workers<sup>166</sup> may provide an alternative approach to site-directed incorporation of paramagnetic groups for PRE studies.

A short amino-acid sequence that binds to a paramagnetic metal ion can be genetically introduced. The ATCUN motif is a short N-terminal sequence (NH<sub>2</sub>-X1-X2-His) that binds paramagnetic Cu<sup>2+</sup> with high affinity. In the case of the Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion bound to the ATCUN motif, the electron *g*-tensor is almost isotropic, and therefore Curie-spin relaxation and pseudocontact shifts are negligible. PRE <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rates arising from ATCUN-Cu<sup>2+</sup> can be used for quantitative analysis. The HHP motif (NH<sub>2</sub>-His-His-Pro) placed at the N-terminus of a protein binds Ni<sup>2+</sup> and results in the formation of a dimer in which two molecules of the protein are bound to a single Ni<sup>2+</sup> ion.<sup>167</sup> The lanthanide binding motif (Tyr-Val-Asp-Thr-Asn-Asp-Gly-Ala-Tyr-Glu-Gly-Asp-Glu-Leu) is a 15residue sequence that specifically binds lanthanide ions and can be incorporated either genetically<sup>168</sup> or chemically.<sup>125</sup>

#### 3.1.2. Paramagnetic Probes Attached to Nucleic Acids

For chemically synthesized nucleic acids the incorporation of a paramagnetic group is straightforward. Phosphoramiditederivatives of nucleotides bearing a paramagnetic group have been developed, and they can be incorporated at any desired position of the DNA or RNA during the course of solidphase synthesis. Just as for proteins, either a nitroxide spin radical or a metal-chelator for incorporation of a paramagnetic metal ion can be covalently attached to nucleic acids.

EDTA-derivatized nucleotides (Figure 10) have been used most frequently in PRE studies of protein–DNA interactions.<sup>23,24,78,94,112,169</sup> The phosphoramidite for dT-EDTA is commercially available, and dT-EDTA can be incorporated at any desired position using a normal DNA synthesizer. Synthesis of a similar EDTA-derivative of the cytosine nucleotide (dC-EDTA) has also been carried out.<sup>170</sup> Although



**Figure 10.** EDTA-derivatized DNA bases.<sup>94,170,171</sup> These modified bases can be incorporated at any desired position by solid-phase DNA synthesis.



Figure 11. Nitroxide-derivatives of DNA/RNA bases.<sup>95,175–177</sup>

dT-EDTA was originally developed for sequence specific DNA cleavage via the Fenton reaction with Fe<sup>2+</sup> chelated to the EDTA group,<sup>171</sup> cleavage does not occur with either Mn<sup>2+</sup> or Ca<sup>2+,94</sup> Since divalent ions bind DNA with a dissociation constant  $K_{\text{diss}}$  in the  $10^{-4}-10^{-3}$  M range,<sup>172-174</sup> it is important to remove divalent ions at undesired locations by extensive washing.<sup>24,94</sup>

Various types of nitroxide-conjugated nucleotides have been developed mostly for EPR (see review by Keyes and Bobst<sup>175</sup>). Some of these derivatives may not be suitable for NMR purposes because of the requirements of larger amounts, higher conjugation efficiency, and higher chemical stability. To date, the nitroxide-labeled bases represented by compounds **3** and **4** in Figure 11 have been successfully used for NMR investigations.<sup>95,176,177</sup>

#### 3.1.3. Paramagnetic Cosolutes for Probing Molecular Surfaces

Small paramagnetic compounds added to macromolecular solutions as cosolute molecules provide a unique means of obtaining information on the molecular surface of macromolecules. Random collisions of a macromolecule with the paramagnetic cosolute at relatively high concentration cause sizable PREs for <sup>1</sup>H nuclei of the macromolecule depending



Figure 12. Cosolute paramagnetic probes for probing molecular surfaces.

on their depth from the molecular surface (Figure 8C). For simplicity and clarification, we refer to such PREs as solvent PREs.

Three paramagnetic cosolute molecules have gained popularity: TEMPOL,<sup>178,179</sup> O<sub>2</sub>,<sup>180,181</sup> and Gd-diethylenetriamine pentacetic acid-bismethylamide (Gd-DTPA-BMA)<sup>23,182</sup> (Figure 12). Since these are neutral molecules with no net charge, their spatial distribution with respect to a macromolecule in solution is generally assumed to be uniform. This approximation appears to be valid for O<sub>2</sub> and Gd-DTPA-BMA, and the resulting PRE patterns can be predicted reasonably well from the macromolecular structure (see section 3.4.2). Hydrophobic patches on macromolecular surfaces, however, tend to bias the spatial distribution of TEMPOL via preferential hydrophobic interactions. The solvent PRE is also useful for identifying binding interfaces in macromolecular complexes.<sup>23,181</sup> For the latter application, the solvent PREs for the free and complexed states are compared. Since the binding interface is exposed in the free state but buried in the complex, the solvent PRE rates for the binding interface decrease upon complex formation.

In some circumstances, probes that exhibit a biased distribution of collision sites on macromolecules can also be useful. For example, use of a positively charged paramagnetic probe (e.g., charged derivatives of TEMPOL) can permit the identification of negatively charged patches on the molecular surface.<sup>183,184</sup> Another example is the use of spin-labeled lipids to identify lipid-contacting regions of membrane proteins.<sup>185,186</sup>

## 3.2. Pulse Sequences for the Measurement of PRE $^{1}\text{H-}\Gamma_{2}$ Rates

The PRE rate  $\Gamma_2$  is measured as the difference in transverse relaxation rates between the paramagnetic ( $R_{2,para}$ ) and diamagnetic ( $R_{2,dia}$ ) states of the macromolecule:

$$\Gamma_2 = R_{2,\text{para}} - R_{2,\text{dia}} \tag{24}$$

This subtraction cancels out relaxation mechanisms common to both states such that the only remaining relaxation mechanism arises from electron-nucleus interactions (i.e., the PRE effect). For the case of systems with an isotropic electron g-tensor, chemical exchange contributions to the transverse relaxation rate,  $R_2$ , are also canceled. This is not the case, however, for systems with an anisotropic electron g-tensor. In this instance, the exchanging species may experience different pseudocontact shifts, and therefore, the exchange contributions can be significantly different in the paramagnetic and diamagnetic states.



**Figure 13.** Pulse sequence for the measurement of PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rates on H<sub>N</sub> protons. Details are given in Iwahara et al.<sup>123</sup> published in *J. Magn. Reson.* (Elsevier) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

In many papers in the literature, the ratio  $I_{para}/I_{dia}$  of the signal intensities for the paramagnetic ( $I_{para}$ ) and diamagnetic ( $I_{dia}$ ) states is inappropriately referred to as the PRE. Such a ratio is not physically meaningful, because it depends not only on the PRE <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rate but also on the corresponding PRE <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_1$  rate, the delays for coherence transfers, and the type of data processing. For quantitative PRE investigations of macromolecules, measurement of actual PRE <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rates is required, and for systems with an isotropic electron *g*-tensor, such measurements are straightforward.

#### 3.2.1. $\Gamma_2$ Measurement for <sup>15</sup>N-Attached <sup>1</sup>H-Nuclei

Figure 13 shows the pulse sequence used to measure <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rates on <sup>1</sup>H-nuclei directly bonded to <sup>15</sup>N.<sup>83,123</sup> The period for the <sup>1</sup>H transverse relaxation measurement is incorporated in the first INEPT scheme. During the <sup>1</sup>H transverse period of  $T + 2\tau_a$ , <sup>15</sup>N 180 pulses swap the slow and fast relaxing components (represented by  $H_v - 2H_v N_z$  and  $H_v + 2H_v N_z$ , respectively) and the contributions from the two components are identical, making the overall decay a single-exponential process with an average relaxation rate. The observed relaxation rate corresponds to  $1/T_2$  for <sup>1</sup>H in-phase terms, since the transverse relaxation rates for the  $H_v$  and  $2H_rN_z$ terms are expected to be virtually identical for macromolecules. (Note that  $T_1$  relaxation of  $N_z$  is much slower than <sup>1</sup>H- $T_2$  relaxation). Identical experiments are performed for the paramagnetic and diamagnetic samples to obtain  $\Gamma_2$  (cf. eq 24).

This pulse sequence can readily be modified to a transverse relaxation optimized (TROSY) version. In this instance, Boltzmann <sup>15</sup>N-magnetization should be destroyed at the beginning of the pulse sequence so that all observables are modulated by <sup>1</sup>H transverse relaxation during the time interval T.

A two-time-point measurement provides a simple means of obtaining  $\Gamma_2$  rates and their corresponding errors without making use of any fitting procedures. In this approach, <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rates are determined from two time points (T = 0 and  $\Delta T$ ) for transverse relaxation as follows:

$$\Gamma_{2} = R_{2,\text{para}} - R_{2,\text{dia}} = \frac{1}{T_{\text{b}} - T_{\text{a}}} \ln \frac{I_{\text{dia}}(T_{\text{b}}) I_{\text{para}}(T_{\text{a}})}{I_{\text{dia}}(T_{\text{a}}) I_{\text{para}}(T_{\text{b}})}$$
(25)

where  $I_{\text{dia}}$  and  $I_{\text{para}}$  are the peak intensities for the diamagnetic and paramagnetic states, respectively. It should be noted that the effects of homonuclear  ${}^{3}J_{\text{HNH}\alpha}$ -modulation during the



**Figure 14.** Comparison of  ${}^{1}$ H- $\Gamma_{2}$  rates obtained from a simple twotime point measurement versus a conventional eight-time point measurement. Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>123</sup> published in *J. Magn. Reson.* (Elsevier) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

delay *T* are canceled out by using identical times and taking ratios for the two states. The errors in  $\Gamma_2$  can be propagated from eq 25 based on partial derivatives with respect to peak intensities and are given by

$$\sigma(\Gamma_2) = \frac{1}{T_b - T_a}$$

$$\sqrt{\left\{\frac{\sigma_{\text{dia}}}{I_{\text{dia}}(T_a)}\right\}^2 + \left\{\frac{\sigma_{\text{dia}}}{I_{\text{dia}}(T_b)}\right\}^2 + \left\{\frac{\sigma_{\text{para}}}{I_{\text{para}}(T_a)}\right\}^2 + \left\{\frac{\sigma_{\text{para}}}{I_{\text{para}}(T_b)}\right\}^2}$$
(26)

where  $\sigma_{dia}$  and  $\sigma_{para}$  are the standard deviations of the noise in the spectra recorded for the diamagnetic and paramagnetic states, respectively. Figure 14 shows a comparison of PRE <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rates determined from two- versus eight-time points for the same overall measurement time, and it can be seen that agreement is excellent.

#### 3.2.2. $\Gamma_2$ Measurement for <sup>13</sup>C-Attached <sup>1</sup>H-Nuclei

Figure 15 shows the pulse sequence used to measure PRE  ${}^{1}$ H- $\Gamma_{2}$  rates for  ${}^{1}$ H $\alpha$  protons directly bonded to  ${}^{13}$ C.<sup>78</sup> This experiment is recorded as a 2D  ${}^{1}$ H $-{}^{15}$ N correlation experiment with the initial excitation on  ${}^{1}$ H $\alpha$  nuclei, followed by coherence transfers to  ${}^{1}$ H $_{N}$  through  ${}^{13}$ C $\alpha$ ,  ${}^{13}$ C', and  ${}^{15}$ N nuclei. A scheme for  ${}^{1}$ H- $\Gamma_{2}$  relaxation is incorporated in the first INEPT transfer step. Since CSA-DD cross relaxation is negligible for H $\alpha$ , the scheme is simpler than that for the  $\Gamma_{2}$  measurement on H<sub>N</sub>. 2D spectra with different *T*-delays are recorded in an interleaved manner to determine PRE  $\Gamma_{2}$  rates.

The same scheme can also be incorporated into a  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{13}\text{C}$ HSQC experiment to measure PRE  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}\Gamma_2$  for other  ${}^{13}\text{C}{-}$ attached protons (Figure 15). Although the T<sub>2</sub> process for methyl CH<sub>3</sub> protons is biexponential due to cross-correlation,  ${}^{187}$  a two-time point measurement using eq 25 still gives reasonably accurate  $\Gamma_2$  values as long as the PRE affects both components of the biexponential decay equally. Indeed, the PRE measured on methyl protons in the SRY/DNA-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> complex using this method exhibited excellent agreement with those calculated from the structure.<sup>78</sup> In favorable cases, even two methyl groups in the same Leu or Val residue can be stereospecifically distinguished based on the measured  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}\Gamma_2$  rates and the three-dimensional structure.



**Figure 15.** Pulse sequences for the measurement of PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rates on (A) <sup>1</sup>H $\alpha$  directly bonded to <sup>13</sup>C and (B) all other <sup>13</sup>C-attached protons. Details are given in the Supporting Information of Iwahara et al.<sup>78</sup> published in *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* (American Chemical Society) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.



**Figure 16.** Error in PRE  $\Gamma_2$  as a function of  $\Delta T$  in the two-time point measurement. Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>123</sup> published in *J. Magn. Reson.* (Elsevier) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

### 3.3. Practical Considerations for $\Gamma_2$ Measurements

#### 3.3.1. Choice of Time Points

In the context of a two-time point measurement of  $\Gamma_2$ , the time points should be chosen to minimize the errors in the measured  $\Gamma_2$  rates. Figure 16 illustrates the theoretical relationship between  $\Delta T$  and the error in  $\Gamma_2$ , obtained using eq 26 and the following equation:

$$I_{\text{para}}(0) = I_{\text{dia}}(0) \frac{R_{2,\text{dia}}}{R_{2,\text{dia}} + \Gamma_2} \exp(-\Gamma_2 \tau)$$
(27)

where  $\tau$  represents the overall <sup>1</sup>H transverse relaxation period for the coherence transfers (set to 9.9 ms). Equation 27 assumes a Lorentzian line shape in the <sup>1</sup>H-dimension, equal recovery levels during the repetition delay, and the same concentration and number of scans for both the diamagnetic and paramagnetic samples. Under these conditions, the error  $\sigma(\Gamma_2)$  is minimal when  $T_a = 0$  and  $T_b \sim 1.15/(R_{2,dia} + \Gamma_2)$ . As can be seen from Figure 16, the larger the value of  $\Gamma_2$ , the narrower the optimal range of  $\Delta T$ . Therefore, the second time point should be set to be optimal for a relatively large  $\Gamma_2$  value expected for the system under study. For example, if the range of expected  $\Gamma_2$  rates is 0 to 75 s<sup>-1</sup>, a second time point  $T_{\rm b}$  at ~1.15/( $R_{2,\rm dia}$ + 50) s represents a reasonable choice. (However, if diamagnetic contamination in the paramagnetic sample is greater than ~3%, smaller values are required for accurate measurement of intramolecular  $\Gamma_2$ rates; see below.)

#### 3.3.2. Undesired Solvent PRE Effects at High Sample Concentration

For PRE analysis, the sample concentration should be relatively low ( $\sim 0.2-0.5$  mM) to avoid contributions from additional undesired PREs arising from random "elastic" collisions between a molecule and the paramagnetic group of another molecule. This effect corresponds to the "solvent PRE" discussed in section 3.1.3. Whether or not this effect is significant can be easily ascertained by carrying out PRE measurements at different sample concentrations, since the magnitude of the solvent PRE is directly proportional to the sample concentration. For example, solvent PRE effects were observed for some residues of ubiquitin tagged with AT-CUN-Cu<sup>2+</sup> at its N-terminus at high sample concentration ( $\sim 2$  mM) but were insignificant at lower concentrations (<0.6 mM).<sup>83</sup>

Due to the requirement of low sample concentration, the measurement of PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rates can be somewhat timeconsuming in the absence of a cryogenic probe. The total measurement time (including data acquisition for both diamagnetic and paramagnetic samples) on a cryoprobe required to obtain reasonably precise data with errors less than ~10% for  $\Gamma_2 \sim 50 \text{ s}^{-1}$  is about two days for a ~0.3 mM nondeuterated sample comprising a system of ~20 kDa in size.

#### 3.3.3. Field Dependence of PRE $^{1}H-\Gamma_{2}$

Since  $\Gamma_2$  for a macromolecule is dominated by the value of the spectral density function at zero frequency, <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rates measured at high magnetic field ( $B_0 > 10$  T) should be dependent on  $B_0$  if (a) the PRE correlation time  $\tau_c$  is fielddependent or (b) the contribution from Curie-spin relaxation (whose rate is proportional to  $B_0^2$ ) is non-negligible.

In the case of the SRY/DNA-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> complex, the field-dependence of <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  is very weak (Figure 17). The relative contribution of Curie-spin relaxation depends upon the size of the system. For a very large system with a rotational correlation time  $\tau_r$  larger than 50 ns (corresponding to a molecular weight in excess of 100 kDa), the contribution could be larger than 20% at 800 MHz. In the case of a nitroxide spin label, the electron spin relaxation time  $\tau_s$  (>10<sup>-7</sup> s) is much longer than  $\tau_r$ ,<sup>188,189</sup> and the PRE correlation time  $\tau_c$ , defined as  $(\tau_r^{-1} + \tau_s^{-1})^{-1}$ , is virtually identical to  $\tau_r$ , resulting in a field-independent <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$ . For a macromolecular system with conjugated EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup>, for which  $\tau_s$  is comparable to  $\tau_r$ ,<sup>78,94,130</sup> <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  could be field-dependent because of the field-dependence of  $\tau_s$ .

#### 3.3.4. Effect of Diamagnetic Impurities on PRE <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$

In practice, no matter how carefully a paramagnetic sample may be prepared, contamination by trace amounts ( $\sim 1-5\%$ ) of the corresponding diamagnetic species is almost impos-



**Figure 17.** Field-dependence of  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ - $\Gamma_{2}$  rates arising from dT-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> in the SRY/DNA-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> complex. Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>123</sup> published in *J. Magn. Reson.* (Elsevier) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

sible to avoid, owing to several factors: (a) incomplete conjugation of the extrinsic paramagnetic group and insufficient purification of the conjugated species; (b) the presence of diamagnetic impurities in the paramagnetic stock solution (e.g., trace amounts of diamagnetic metals such as  $Zn^{2+}$  and  $Ca^{2+}$  in stock solutions of  $Mn^{2+}$  for the EDTA- $Mn^{2+}$  system; the reduced species for a nitroxide spin label); (c) chemical instability of the conjugated states (discussed in a later section). Thus, it is important to ascertain the impact of diamagnetic contamination on the measured  ${}^{1}H-\Gamma_{2}$  rates. In fact, the effect of diamagnetic impurities on PRE measurements can be significant but fortunately can be reduced with careful setting of experimental conditions, as shown below.<sup>123</sup>

Under conditions where the chemical shifts for the diamagnetic and paramagnetic states are identical and they do not exchange with each other, the signal intensity for the paramagnetic sample containing a trace amount of the diamagnetic species with population  $p_d$  is given by

$$I(T) = (1 - p_{\rm d})I_{\rm para}(T) + p_{\rm d}I_{\rm dia}(T)$$
(28)

Figure 18 displays the theoretical relationship between the true value of <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  and the apparent value ( $\Gamma_2^{app}$ ) that would be obtained from a two-time-point measurement for two values of  $\Delta T$  and diamagnetic contaminations ranging from 0 to 5%.  $\Gamma_2^{app}$  is always smaller than the true  $\Gamma_2$  value. For the case with  $R_{2,\text{dia}} = 50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $\Gamma_2 = 60 \text{ s}^{-1}$ , and  $p_d = 2\%$ , the apparent value of  $\Gamma_2$  from the two-time-point measurement with  $\Delta T = 18$  ms is 52 s<sup>-1</sup>. For  $p_d = 5\%$ ,  $\Gamma_2^{app}$  is reduced to 44 s<sup>-1</sup>. Note that the percentage error in  $\Gamma_2$  is much larger than  $p_{\rm d}$ . This is due to the fact that the PRE significantly reduces the contribution of the first term in eq 28. The deviation from the true value of  $\Gamma_2$  can be reduced by using a relatively small value of  $\Delta T$ , thereby reducing the relative contribution from the second term in eq 28. For example, the apparent values of  $\Gamma_2$  obtained with  $\Delta T = 6$  ms are 55  $s^{-1}$  for  $p_d = 2\%$  and 48  $s^{-1}$  for  $p_d = 5\%$ .

Figure 19 shows correlations between experimental  ${}^{1}\text{H}_{N}$ - $\Gamma_{2}$  data measured with  $\Delta T = 4$  and 40 ms on  ${}^{15}\text{N}$ -HPr(E32C) conjugated with EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> at Cys32. As expected from the above considerations, the measured  $\Gamma_{2}$  values derived from the experiment with  $\Delta T = 40$  ms are systematically smaller than those obtained with  $\Delta T = 4$  ms, indicating the presence of a diamagnetic impurity. From this correlation,  $p_{d}$  was estimated to be 3%. The same population for the diamagnetic impurity can also be obtained from the intensities of residual peaks that should be completely broadened beyond detection yet appear with low intensity because of the diamagnetic contamination (Figure 19b).

In the case of intermolecular PRE measurements on a complex where dissociation and association processes are in the fast exchange regime on the relaxation time scale, the observed  $\Gamma_2$  is simply scaled down by a factor of  $(1 - p_d)$  and the effect of a diamagnetic impurity is much weaker than that for the intramolecular case considered above.

#### 3.4. PRE Back-calculation from the Three-Dimensional Structure

In this section, we review the computational methods required to back-calculate PRE rates from macromolecular structures. While the back-calculation is straightforward for a static system, motional effects need to be taken into consideration for a dynamic system.



**Figure 18.** Theoretical effect of diamagnetic impurities on the measurement of  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ - $\Gamma_{2}$  rates. Adapted from Iwahara et al.  ${}^{123}$  published in *J. Magn. Reson.* (Elsevier) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.



**Figure 19.** Experimentally observed effect of diamagnetic impurities on  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ - $\Gamma_{2}$  rate measurements. Adapted from Iwahara et al.  ${}^{123}$  published in *J. Magn. Reson.* (Elsevier) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

#### 3.4.1. PRE Arising from Paramagnetic Probes Attached to Macromolecules

Two averaging techniques have been proposed for backcalculating NMR parameters in systems with flexibility: timeaveraging of restrained molecular dynamics trajectories<sup>190–193</sup> and ensemble-averaging.<sup>194–200</sup> To date, the latter approach has been adopted for PRE back-calculation.<sup>78,100,105</sup>

The computational method we have developed to backcalculate <sup>1</sup>H-PREs makes use of a multiple conformer representation for the paramagnetic group.<sup>78</sup> This approach has been implemented as the "prePot" pseudoenergy term in the macromolecular structure determination software package Xplor-NIH.<sup>201,202</sup> The target function for the PRE restraints,  $E_{\text{PRE}}$ , is defined as

$$E_{\rm PRE} = k_{\rm PRE} \sum_{i} w_i \{ \Gamma_2^{\rm obs}(i) - \Gamma_2^{\rm cal}(i) \}^2$$
(29)

where  $k_{\text{PRE}}$  is a force constant,  $w_i$  is a weighting factor that is defined for each restraint,  $\Gamma_2^{obs}(i)$  and  $\Gamma_2^{calc}(i)$  (cf. eq 17 in section 2.2.1) are the observed and calculated PRE rates, respectively, and the summation is over individual  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ - $\Gamma_{2}$  PRE data. To account for the finite conformational space occupied by a flexible paramagnetic group, N different conformers are used to represent the paramagnetic group in the calculations, while the remainder of the molecule is represented by a single structure. Individual conformers are treated independently under the restraints of the <sup>1</sup>H-PRE target function and can overlap with each other, since interactions between the conformers are excluded from the nonbonded interaction energy term. The N conformers represent a discrete jump model where fractions of individual sites and the transition probability over a long period of time are uniform and equal to 1/N. Since members of the ensemble can overlap structurally, this model is also valid for a case with fewer sites and uneven distributions, providing N is large enough. To obtain the ensemble average of  $\Gamma_2$ , the ensemble-averaged quantity  $\langle r^{-6} \rangle$  for the electron-proton distance r must be calculated as follows:

$$\langle r^{-6} \rangle = \frac{1}{Nn_{\rm p}} \sum_{h}^{N} \sum_{s}^{n_{\rm p}} r_{\rm hs}^{-6} \tag{30}$$

where  $n_p$  is the number of equivalent protons (i.e., 1 for NH or CH; 2 for equivalent aromatic protons that are degenerate owing to fast ring flipping; 3 for methyl protons). This quantity is used to back-calculate the PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rate based on either the SB (eq 16) or SBMF (eq 17) equations. The direct application of the SBMF equation requires the explicit use

of order parameters  $S^2$  for the PRE interaction vectors as defined by eq 11. These order parameters are calculated directly from the *N*-site discrete jump model of the paramagnetic group used in the simulated annealing calculations, assuming that positional fluctuations of the analyzed <sup>1</sup>H nucleus are small compared to the paramagnetic center-<sup>1</sup>H distance and hence do not contribute to  $S^2$  for the <sup>1</sup>H-PRE interaction vector. For the *N*-state jump model, the order parameters can be calculated using eq 12 together with the following equations:

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{PRE,angular}}^{2} = \frac{1}{N^{2} n_{\text{p}}^{2}} \sum_{k,s,t}^{N} \left\{ \frac{3}{2} \left( \frac{\vec{r}_{\text{hs}} \cdot \vec{r}_{kt}}{r_{\text{hs}} r_{kt}} \right)^{2} - \frac{1}{2} \right\}$$
(31)

$$\mathbf{S}_{\text{PRE,radial}}^{2} = \frac{(\sum_{h s}^{Nn_{p}} r_{\text{hs}}^{-3})^{2}}{Nn_{p} \sum_{h}^{N} \sum_{s}^{n_{p}} r_{\text{hs}}^{-6}}$$
(32)

Owing to increased complexity, the use of the SBMF equation in the PRE back-calculation is computationally more expensive. Figure 20 displays correlations between experimental  $\Gamma_2$  data obtained for the SRY-DNA complex with the dT-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> paramagnetic label located at three separate sites (one at a time) and the calculated  $\Gamma_2$  rates using a three-conformer ensemble for the paramagnetic labels. Quantitative agreement between observed ( $\Gamma_2^{obs}$ ) and calculated ( $\Gamma_2^{calc}$ ) rates is given by the PRE *Q*-factor, calculated as

$$Q = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i} \{\Gamma_{2}^{\text{obs}}(i) - \Gamma_{2}^{\text{cal}}(i)\}^{2}}{\sum_{i} \Gamma_{2}^{\text{obs}}(i)^{2}}}$$
(33)

For the SRY-DNA complex, the overall Q-factor for a three-member ensemble representation for the paramagnetic labels is 0.20 for backbone protons (H<sub>N</sub> and H $\alpha$ ) and 0.26 for side chain protons.

The introduction of a multiple ensemble representation for the paramagnetic labels results in a substantial decrease in both the working (i.e., PRE data included in the refinement) and free PRE Q-factors (i.e., PRE data excluded from refinement and used for complete cross-validation), indicating that the back-calculation method results in improved coordinate accuracy without overfitting of the data. Independent confirmation that the ensemble representation of the para-



**Figure 20.** Correlation between observed and calculated PRE <sup>1</sup>H- $\Gamma_2$  rates for the NMR structure of the SRY-DNA complex. The experimental data comprise PREs collected for the EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> paramagnetic label at three different sites, one at a time. Each paramagnetic label was represented by a three-conformer ensemble.<sup>78</sup> Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>94</sup> published in *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* (American Chemical Society) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

magnetic label results in a substantial improvement in coordinate accuracy is provided by cross-validation against RDCs.<sup>78</sup> Indeed, if the paramagnetic label is represented by only a single species, coordinate accuracy decreases substantially.<sup>78</sup>

The method of PRE back-calculation presented in this section can also be applied to an exchanging system, as discussed later on in section 4.2, providing that every process involved is in fast exchange on the PRE time scale.

#### 3.4.2. Otting—LeMaster Approach for Predicting Solvent PREs

The PRE arising from paramagnetic cosolute molecules such as those displayed in Figure 12 depends on many factors, including translational diffusion constants, electron relaxation time, and rotational correlation time. Hwang and Freed proposed a general theory to describe the solvent PRE effect in which pair-correlation functions, related to a potential of averaged forces between the molecules, are considered.<sup>203,204</sup> Despite its generality, application of the Hwang–Freed theory to macromolecules is extremely complicated and consequently of no practical use. Although the hard-sphere model that provides the simplest pair-correlation functions was found to be effective for systems involving small molecules, and predictions based on the model are in poor agreement with the experimental data.

An empirical approach to predict solvent PREs from threedimensional structure was proposed independently by two



**Figure 21.** Otting—LeMaster<sup>180,182</sup> approach for predicting solvent PREs from structure. For the prediction, distances from a <sup>1</sup>H nucleus to grid points that can be occupied by cosolute molecules are calculated and used in eq 34.

groups.<sup>180,182</sup> We refer to this approach as the Otting–LeMaster approach. In this method, the coordinates of the macromolecule are embedded in a cubic lattice with grid spacing <1.0 Å (Figure 21). For each hydrogen atom of the macromolecule, the following quantity is calculated:

$$A_{\rm OL} = \sum_{\rm grid} \delta_{\rm grid} r_{\rm grid-H}^{-6}$$
(34)

where  $r_{\text{grid-H}}$  is a distance between a <sup>1</sup>H-nucleus and a grid point, and where  $\delta_{\text{grid}}$  is 0 for grid points that overlap with the macromolecule and 1 for the others. All grid points within the van der Waals radius plus the molecular radius of the paramagnetic cosolute from any atom in the macromolecule are regarded as overlapped. Summation is over the entire lattice. A solvent PRE is predicted to be  $aA_{OL}$ , for which a is a scaling factor common to all protons in the macromolecule. Since the scaling factor *a* includes the effects of the concentration of cosolute, correlation-times, etc. and can therefore not be determined explicitly, its value is obtained by numerical optimization against the experimental data. Profiles of solvent PREs predicted with this empirical approach have been found to be in reasonably good agreement with experimental observations. LeMaster's group applied this approach to solvent PRE  ${}^{1}$ H- $\Gamma_{1}$  data arising from O<sub>2</sub> for the backbone amide <sup>1</sup>H<sub>N</sub> protons in rubredoxin proteins.<sup>180</sup> Otting's group applied the method to solvent PRE  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ - $\Gamma_{1}$  data arising from Gd-DTPA-BMA for  ${}^{13}\text{C}$ -attached <sup>1</sup>H nuclei in ubiquitin.<sup>182</sup> The same approach was also found to be useful for the prediction of solvent PRE  ${}^{1}\text{H}$ - $\Gamma_{2}$  data arising from Gd-DTPA-BMA for specific- and nonspecific protein-DNA complexes (Figure 22).<sup>23</sup>

Since the Otting-LeMaster approach permits backcalculation of solvent PREs from the structure, solvent PRE data may potentially be used as restraints in NMR structure calculations. Such restraints would be unique in that they constrain depths of observed <sup>1</sup>H nuclei from the molecular surface. Currently, however, two problems need to be overcome to make this practical. First, back-calculation of solvent PREs using this approach is computationally too expensive, owing to the requirement for three-dimensional integration. Second, the partial derivatives of the backcalculated solvent PREs with respect to the atomic coordinates, which are essential to build a pseudoenergy potential for structure calculation, are difficult to compute.



**Figure 22.** Comparison of observed and calculated solvent PRE profiles for the HoxD9 homeodomain free in solution and bound to DNA in specific and nonspecific complexes. (A) Experimental solvent PRE profiles for free HoxD9 (black) and HoxD9 bound specifically (red) and nonspecifically (green) to DNA. (B) Predicted solvent PREs ratios for free to specifically bound HoxD9 calculated using the Otting—LeMaster approach.<sup>23</sup> (C) Experimentally observed solvent PRE ratios for free to nonspecifically bound HoxD9. (D) Experimentally observed solvent PRE ratios for free to specifically bound HoxD9. (D) Experimentally observed solvent PRE ratios for free to specifically bound HoxD9. Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>23</sup> published in *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* (National Academy of Sciences) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

#### 4. Applications

In this section we discuss a series of PRE applications aimed at studying species involved in rapid dynamic processes and interconversions at equilibrium. These include the study of nonspecific protein–DNA interactions, investigations into the search process whereby a specific DNAbinding protein locates its target site, the detection and characterization of encounter complexes in both specific and nonspecific protein–protein interactions, the probing of large scale interdomain motions involving lowly sampled states, and finally investigations aimed at probing the conformational space sampled by denatured or intrinsically disordered proteins.

#### 4.1. Investigations of the Target Search Process in Protein–DNA Interactions

#### 4.1.1. Nonspecific Protein–DNA Interactions

Nonspecific protein–DNA interactions play a crucial role in increasing the efficiency whereby specific DNA binding proteins locate their cognate DNA binding site within a sea of nonspecific DNA sites. Nonspecific protein–DNA interactions, however, are particularly difficult to study since they are intrinsically dynamic. That is to say, these interactions involve both one-dimensional diffusion of the protein along the DNA and hopping of the protein from one DNA molecule or segment to another.<sup>9,20,205</sup> As a consequence, characterizing nonspecific interactions of a protein with DNA in terms of both structure and dynamics is highly challenging, since the experimental observables represent an ensemble average of many rapidly exchanging states, with the protein moving between multiple overlapping sites on the DNA. One way around this problem is to design an experimental system in which the protein is constrained to only a single location on the DNA, for example by using a length of DNA that is exactly equal to the length of the DNA binding site and/or by making use of cross-linking.<sup>206–210</sup> However, the dynamic nature of the nonspecific interactions is lost, and, further, the biological relevance is questionable, since it is hard to exclude that such structures may represent partially specific complexes or are heavily influenced by extrinsic effects imposed, for example, by crystal packing forces or crosslinking agents. An alternative approach is to directly study nonspecific interactions in a naturally dynamic environment by means of the PRE.

The first nonspecific protein-DNA interaction we studied involved the A box of the classical HMG-box protein, HMGB-1.112 HMGB-1A is an architectural protein that binds nonspecifically in the minor groove of DNA, causing the DNA to bend.<sup>211,212</sup> The DNA binding domain of HMGB-1A is highly homologous to that of the male sex-determining factor SRY, another member of the HMG-box family.<sup>213,214</sup> In contrast to HMGB-1A, SRY binds sequence specifically to DNA with an affinity that is approximately 2 orders of magnitude higher ( $K_D \sim 20$  nM versus 0.9  $\mu$ M). The <sup>1</sup>H $^{-15}$ N correlation spectrum of the HMGB-1A/DNA complex with a 14-bp DNA duplex reveals a single set of well-resolved narrow cross-peaks (Figure 23A). From such a spectrum it would be impossible to ascertain whether HMGB-1A was binding to only a single site on the DNA or to multiple sites with rapid exchange between the available binding modes (Figure 23B). Intermolecular PRE data recorded on the complexes with paramagnetic labels (dT-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup>) positioned at either end of the DNA resolve the situation unambiguously (Figure 24). The intermolecular PRE profiles obtained with SRY are fully consistent with a single specific complex, and as expected, the PRE profiles observed for the two paramagnetic labels are completely different (Figure 24A, lower left-hand panel). In the case of the HMGB-1A/ DNA complex, however, the intermolecular PRE profiles obtained with the two paramagnetic labels are virtually identical, and moreover, the magnitude of the PREs is considerably larger than that observed for SRY (Figure 24A, upper left-hand panel). The observed PRE profiles for the HMGB-1A/DNA complex are characteristic of a protein binding to multiple DNA binding sites in two possible orientations differing by a 180° rotation (cf. Figure 24 A, upper right-hand panels).

The intermolecular PRE data for the HMGB-1A complex can be further analyzed using a semiquantitative approach to obtain an estimate of the populations of the individual binding sites.<sup>112</sup> With *N* discrete binding sites in rapid exchange, the ensemble average  $\langle \Gamma_2 \rangle$  rate is given by a population weighted average of the  $\Gamma_2$  rates for the individual states:

$$<\Gamma_2> = \sum_{k=1}^N \rho_k \Gamma_{2,k} \tag{35}$$

where  $\rho_k$  and  $\Gamma_{2,k}$  are the population and  $\Gamma_2$  rate for state *k*, respectively. The populations  $\rho_k$  can be obtained by back-calculating the  $\Gamma_2$  rates from structural models of the 26



**Figure 23.** NMR characterization of the HMGB-1A/DNA nonspecific complex. (A)  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{15}\text{N}$  correlation spectrum of U-[ ${}^{15}\text{N}{}^{13}\text{C}$ ]-HMGB-1A in the presence of a 14-bp DNA duplex (natural isotopic abundance) at a ratio of 1:1.5 protein to DNA to ensure that all protein is bound and only a single molecule of protein is bound per 14-bp DNA duplex. (B) The  ${}^{1}\text{H}{-}{}^{15}\text{N}$  correlation spectrum does not permit one to distinguish between a single binding mode (top) and multiple binding modes in rapid exchange with one another (bottom). Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>112</sup> published in *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* (American Chemical Society) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

possible states, 13 in each of the two possible orientations (Figure 25B), and minimizing the  $\chi^2$  function:

$$\chi^{2} = \sum_{i} \frac{\{\Gamma_{2,\text{obs}(i)} - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \rho_{k} \Gamma_{2,\text{calc},k(i)}\}^{2}}{\sigma(i)^{2}}$$
(36)

λ

where *i* is the residue number,  $\Gamma_{2,obs}(i)$  is the observed value of  $\Gamma_2$  for residue *i*,  $\Gamma_{2,calc,k}(i)$  is the calculated value of  $\Gamma_2$  for binding state k, and  $\sigma(i)$  is the experimental error for  $\Gamma_{2,obs}(i)$ . The structural models were generated from the crystal structure of the HMGB-1A/cisplatin-modified DNA complex.<sup>212</sup> Despite the relatively crude nature of the model, the overall Q-factor after minimization is 0.36 with a correlation coefficient of 0.71. The occupancy of HMGB-1A molecules in orientations 1 and 2 is essentially equal, with maximal occupancy for sites 5-8 in orientation 1 and sites 6-9 in orientation 2. The site of intercalation of Phe37 is located at the edge of the DNA binding site, and full coverage of the DNA binding site ( $\sim$ 7 bp) is obtained at intercalation sites 5-13 in orientation 1 and intercalation sites 1-9 in orientation 2 (Figure 24B). Thus, one would expect reduced occupancy of sites 1-4 in orientation 1 and sites 10-13 in orientation 2, as a consequence of a progressive decrease in protein-DNA contacts. However, the reduced populations for sites 9-13 in orientation 1 and sites 1-5 in orientation 2 presumably reflect a subtle degree of sequence preference, since the distribution is not the same as that expected from simple statistical considerations if the interaction energy at a given site was only dependent on base-pair coverage.

The PRE has also been used to characterize diffusion and hopping of the homeodomain HoxD9 on nonspecific DNA.<sup>23</sup> As in the case of HMGB-1A, very similar intermolecular PRE profiles with large PREs are observed with the paramagnetic label positioned at either end of the DNA duplex. Interestingly, the RDCs measured on HoxD9 bound

specifically and nonspecifically to DNA in a dilute liquid crystalline medium of phage pf1 are virtually identical with a correlation coefficient of 0.99 and a pairwise rms difference of only 2.3 Hz. Further, the measured RDCs for both the specific and nonspecific complexes are in excellent agreement with those calculated from the crystal structure of the Antennapedia homeodomain-DNA complex<sup>215</sup> with RDC R-factors<sup>56</sup> of 13.7 and 15.2%, respectively. These data indicate that (i) the binding orientation of HoxD9 with respect to the long axis of the DNA at each nonspecific site is effectively identical to that for the specific complex; (ii) end effects that could potentially result in alternative binding modes are insignificant; (iii) alignment in the pf1 medium is dominated by the negative charges on the DNA phosphate backbone and is minimally sensitive to protein location on the DNA; and (iv) the DNA is essentially straight.<sup>23</sup> (In the case of the HMGB-1A/DNA complex where HMGB-1A induces a  $\sim 50^{\circ}$  bend in the DNA, the alignment would be dependent upon protein location, since this determines the site of the bend on the DNA and, therefore, the overall shape of the DNA.)

#### 4.1.2. Locating the Cognate Target Site in Specific Protein–DNA Interactions

A sequence specific DNA binding protein must be able to locate its specific target site within a sea of nonspecific sites. Nonspecific DNA binding can facilitate this process by permitting both intramolecular one-dimensional sliding on the DNA coupled with intermolecular translocation involving hopping from one DNA molecule to another or from one nonspecific DNA site to another.<sup>9,20,205</sup> Intermolecular PRE measurements provide a direct means for investigating these processes.

The HoxD9 homeodomain binds specifically to DNA with a  $K_{\rm diss}$  of ~1.5 nM in 100 mM salt compared to a  $K_{\rm diss}$  of 0.2–0.4  $\mu$ M for nonspecific binding.<sup>23,24</sup> Intermolecular PRE



**Figure 24.** PRE characterization of HMGB-1A binding nonspecifically to DNA. (A) Comparison of the intermolecular PRE profiles observed for the nonspecific HMGB-1A/DNA complex (top) and the specific SRY/DNA complex (bottom) with two DNA duplexes bearing the dT-EDTA- $Mn^{2+}$  paramagnetic label at the two ends of the DNA. A diagrammatic depiction of the states giving rise to the observed PREs is shown on the right-hand side of the figure. (B) Semiquantitative analysis of the intermolecular PRE data used to estimate the distribution and occupancy of HMGB-1A binding sites along a 14-bp DNA duplex. There are a total of 13 potential intercalation sites for Phe-37 and HMGB-1A binding in two orientations related by a 180° rotation (top left panel), giving rise to a total of 26 states. Minimization of the  $\chi^2$  function shown in eq 36 results in a PRE *Q*-factor of 0.36 (top right panel) with optimized distributions for the two orientations shown in the bottom two panels. Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>112</sup> published in *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* (American Chemical Society) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

data were collected for the HoxD9/DNA complex with the specific DNA site located in the center of a 24-bp DNA duplex and paramagnetic labels (dT-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup>) placed at four different sites (Figure 25A).<sup>24</sup> At low salt (20 mM NaCl) the intermolecular PRE data are completely consistent with a model derived from the crystal structure of the Antennapedia homeodomain/DNA complex<sup>215</sup> with a combined Q-factor for all four paramagnetic labels of 0.26 (Figure 25C). Thus, large magnitude PREs are only observed for residues in close proximity to the label in the specific complex (Figure 25E). As the salt concentration is raised (100 and 160 mM NaCl), however, the intermolecular PRE data become completely inconsistent with the structure with a Q-factor of 0.66 (Figure 25D) and large intermolecular PREs are observed on regions of the protein far away from the paramagnetic label in the specific complex (Figure 25F). Moreover, the PRE data observed with the paramagnetic label at sites 1 (base pair 2) and 4 (base pair 23) are very similar, and likewise for the PRE data observed with the paramagnetic label at sites 2 (base pair 5) and 3 (base pair

18) (Figure 25F). In all cases, however, the residues of HoxD9 that exhibit large intermolecular PREs are located close to or at the DNA binding interface and can therefore readily come close to the paramagnetic labels. The  $^{1}\text{H}^{-15}\text{N}$  correlation spectrum of HoxD9 is minimally perturbed by salt and the RDCs for HoxD9 at low and high salt are highly correlated. The observed intermolecular PREs at high salt must therefore reflect the footprint of a stochastic search process in which there is rapid exchange between HoxD9 bound to nonspecific sites at low occupancy and HoxD9 bound to the specific site. The occupancy of the minor species can be estimated to be less than 1% based on the observed  $K_{\text{diss}}$  values for specific and nonspecific DNA binding of HoxD9.

The intermolecular PRE profiles observed for the HoxD9/ DNA complex at high salt can be attributed to two processes: intramolecular sliding and intermolecular translocation. From  $^{15}N_z$ -exchange spectroscopy and line-shape analysis along with the 'mixture' approach, the latter is known to occur rapidly via direct transfer between specific sites, as well as Transient Low-Population States of Macromolecules



**Figure 25.** Intermolecular PREs observed for the specific HoxD9/DNA complex in low and high salt corresponding to slow and fast exchange regimes on the PRE relaxation time scale, respectively, for the interconversion between the specific complex and lowly populated (<1%) nonspecific complexes. (A) 24-bp DNA duplex with the specific site centrally located (boxed) and the location of the four paramagnetic labels (one at a time) indicated. (B) Diagrammatic representation of the specific complex (left) and the target search process whereby the specific complex is located (right). (C) and (D) Correlation between observed and calculated PREs for all four sites at low (20 mM NaCl) and high (160 mM) NaCl, respectively. The calculated rates are obtained from a model derived from the crystal structure of the *Antennapedia* homeodomain/DNA complex. (E and F) Intermolecular PRE profiles observed at low (20 mM NaCl) and high (100 and 160 mM NaCl), respectively. The PRE data are mapped on the structural model of the specific complex, with the color coding depicting the observed PRE rates. Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>24</sup> published in *Nature* (Nature Publishing Group) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

nonspecific sites, located on different DNA molecules without necessitating the dissociation of HoxD9 from its specific DNA site into free solution, a process that is very slow ( $k_{diss} < 0.01 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ).<sup>23,25</sup> The apparent rate of intermolecular translocation is dependent on the concentration of free DNA as well as the salt concentration. To ascertain the relative contributions of intra- and intermolecular translocation, PRE measurements were carried out on two samples comprising equimolar concentrations of specific and nonspecific DNA

duplexes with a ratio of protein/DNA<sub>specific</sub>/DNA<sub>nonspecific</sub> of 1:1.5:1.5.<sup>24</sup> In sample 1, the nonspecific duplex bears the paramagnetic label so that any observed PRE must involve rapid exchange via intermolecular translocation between the major specific complex (that is observed in the NMR spectrum) and lowly populated complexes on the nonspecific DNA duplex (Figure 26A). In sample 2, the specific DNA duplex has the paramagnetic label and therefore the intermolecular PREs observed on the resonances of the specific



**Figure 26.** Assessing the contributions of intramolecular sliding and intermolecular translocation for the HoxD9/DNA complex. (A) PRE data were collected on two samples comprising an equimolar concentration of specific and nonspecific DNA duplexes with the paramagnetic label attached to the end of the nonspecific duplex in sample 1 and to the end of the specific duplex in sample 2. The location of the specific site and the paramagnetic label are indicated in blue and red, respectively. (B) PRE profiles observed for samples 1 (blue) and 2 (red) are shown in the top panel, and the ratio of the observed PRE rates for the two samples is shown in the bottom panel. (C) Schematic representation of sliding along the DNA starting from the specific site with HoxD9 colored according to the  $\Gamma_2(\text{sample 2})/\Gamma_2(\text{sample 1})$  ratio. Adapted from Iwahara et al.<sup>24</sup> published in *Nature* (Nature Publishing Group) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

complex can arise from both intra- and intermolecular translocation events. The PRE profiles observed for the two samples are very similar (Figure 26B). However, the PREs for residues 24-33 (loop between helices 1 and 2 and N-terminus of helix 2) and 41-42 (N-terminus of helix 3) are 30-100% larger for sample 2 than those for sample 1, whereas the PREs for the N-terminal arm (that binds in the minor groove of the DNA) are essentially the same for the two samples (Figure 26B, bottom panel). The data from sample 1 indicate that intermolecular translocation is a major contributor to the observed PREs, while the larger effects for selected regions seen in sample 2 are directly attributable to intramolecular translocation, which gives rise to bias, since the orientation of HoxD9 on the specific site will be favored as the protein slides along the DNA (Figure 26C). The alternative orientation (180° relative to that at the specific site) requires at least one intermolecular translocation event from the DNA bearing the specific site to nonspecific DNA sites located on another DNA molecule (either the specific duplex, in which case only one translocation event is needed, or the nonspecific one, in which case two translocation events are required from the specific to the nonspecific duplex and back to the specific duplex).

# 4.2. Encounter Complexes in Protein—Protein Association

Transient kinetic studies on many protein—protein interactions suggest that the initial step involves the formation of a pre-equilibrium encounter complex that subsequently relaxes to the stereospecific complex. This picture is further supported by the results of both mutagenesis studies and Brownian dynamics simulations, which have shown that the association rate constant can be modulated by charge alterations on the protein surface distal from the specific interaction site.<sup>10–12,14–16,216</sup> These data suggest that, by analogy with protein—DNA interactions, nonspecific encounter complexes may accelerate the formation of the stereospecific complex either via a reduction in the dimen-



**Figure 27.** Schematic representation of protein—protein association with the initial binding event involving the formation of an ensemble of encounter complexes that subsequently relax to the stereospecific complex. The two proteins are displayed in red and blue with the respective interaction surfaces for the stereospecific complex shown in white and yellow. Adapted from Suh et al.<sup>28</sup> published in *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* (American Chemical Society) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

sionality of the search process, in this instance from three dimensions to two, or by the presence of a nonspecific attractive potential.<sup>6,217</sup> The presence of an ensemble of encounter complexes in rapid exchange with the stereospecific complex (Figure 27) can be probed under equilibrium conditions by means of intermolecular PRE measurements, providing the stereospecific complex is relatively weak (i.e.,  $K_{\text{diss}}$  in the micromolar range or higher).

#### 4.2.1. Protein—Protein Complexes from the Bacterial Phosphotransferase System

The protein—protein complexes of the bacterial phosphotransferase system (PTS) are relatively weak and in fast exchange with equilibrium dissociation constants ( $K_{diss}$ ) spanning the micromolar to millimolar range.<sup>218</sup> These complexes direct phosphoryl transfer from one protein to the next along the PTS pathway that is coupled to sugar transport across the membrane and sugar phosphorylation. We carried out intermolecular PRE measurements on three complexes involving the interaction of the protein HPr with



**Figure 28.** PREs observed for the EIN-HPR complex with EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> conjugated to an engineered surface cysteine residue at three separate sites (E5C, E25C, and E32C). (A) Correlation between observed and calculated intramolecular  $\Gamma_2$  rates for HPr within the EIN-HPr complex. (B) Correlation between observed and calculated intermolecular  $\Gamma_2$  rates measured on EIN arising from paramagnetically labeled HPr. (C) Intermolecular PRE profiles observed for the three paramagnetically labeled sites, with the experimental  $\Gamma_2$  rates shown as red circles and the expected  $\Gamma_2$  rates calculated from the structure of the stereospecific complex<sup>42</sup> denoted by the black line. The insets depict ribbon diagrams of the complex showing the paramagnetic label (with the distribution of Mn<sup>2+</sup> displayed as an ensemble of three red balls) on HPr and the location on EIN of intermolecular PREs that display significant discrepancies between observed and calculated values (with color coding of the difference  $\Delta \Gamma_2$  between observed and calculated  $\Gamma_2$  rates shown at the top of the figure). Adapted from Tang et al.<sup>27</sup> published in *Nature* (Nature Publishing Group) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

its upstream partner, the N-terminal domain of enzyme I (EIN) ( $K_{\rm diss} \sim 10 \ \mu$ M), and two downstream partners, enzymes IIA<sup>mannitol</sup> (IIA<sup>Mtl</sup>) and IIA<sup>mannose</sup> (IIA<sup>Man</sup>) ( $K_{\rm diss} = 30-50 \ \mu$ M).<sup>27</sup> In all three cases, the structures of the stereospecific complex had been determined by NMR on the basis of extensive NOE and RDC data.<sup>42,44,219</sup> These structures were fully consistent with the formation of a pentaco-ordinate phosphoryl transition state with trigonal bipyramidal geometry without necessitating any significant displacement in the backbone coordinates of the residues immediately adjacent to the active site histidines. To investigate the presence of nonspecific encounter complexes, HPr was labeled with EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> at three sites (E5C, E25C, and E32C).<sup>27</sup>

The intramolecular PRE data for HPr within the EIN-HPr complex are fully consistent with the structure of HPr, and the PRE Q-factor for all three paramagnetic sites combined is only 0.18 (Figure 28A). However, agreement between the observed intermolecular PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rates measured on <sup>15</sup>Nlabeled EIN and those calculated from the structure of the stereospecific complex shows much poorer agreement with a Q-factor of 0.61 (Figure 28B). The regions of agreement and discrepancy are clearly visualized in the PRE profiles (Figure 28C). For all three paramagnetic labels, there are clearly regions where there is good qualitative agreement between observed and calculated  $\Gamma_2$  rates. However, in each case, there are also regions where large PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rates are observed but small PRE  $\Gamma_2$  rates are predicted (Figure 28C). These discrepancies can be attributed to the presence of a small population of nonspecific encounter complexes in rapid exchange with the stereospecific complex.<sup>27</sup>

A semiquantitative description of the encounter complex ensemble can be obtained by rigid body simulated annealing refinement<sup>202,220</sup> against the PRE data using a representation comprising the stereospecific complex (whose structure is known and fixed) with population p in rapid exchange with an ensemble of encounter complexes comprising N states with population (1 - p) (Figure 29A).<sup>27</sup> These calculations minimize the difference between observed and calculated  $\Gamma_2$ rates for all three paramagnetic sites simultaneously. The target function comprises the PRE potential, a quartic van der Waals repulsion term to prevent atomic overlap between EIN and HPr, and a very weak radius of gyration restraint to ensure that each member of the ensemble makes at least some intermolecular contacts. The paramagnetic groups on HPr are represented by a three-conformer ensemble to account for their intrinsic flexibility. The coordinates of the EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> moieties (with atomic overlap of EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> groups permitted, since these represent a distribution of states) were optimized by simulated annealing in torsion angle space against the intramolecular PRE data for HPr within the context of the EIN-HPr complex as described in section 3.4.1. The intramolecular PRE Q-factor was 0.18 (Figure 28A). Calculations were carried out either by keeping EIN fixed and allowing an ensemble of HPr molecules to rotate and translate or by the converse (HPr fixed and ensemble of EIN molecules) with essentially identical results. Complete cross-validation indicates that the encounter complex ensemble is best represented by an ensemble size of N= 10-20 at a population of  $\sim 10\%$  (Figures 29B and C), yielding an overall intermolecular PRE Q-factor of 0.21 (Figure 29D).
A simple, concise, and informative manner to visualize the encounter complex ensemble is afforded by a reweighted atomic probability density map (Figure 29E) in which the contribution of each atom is rescaled depending on the distribution of its positions in the ensemble.<sup>221</sup> The reweighted atomic density  $\rho$  at point **q** is defined as

$$\rho(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{l=1}^{N_a} w_l \sum_{k=1}^{N_s} \rho_a(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_{kl})$$
(37)

where  $N_s$  is the number of structures in the ensemble,  $N_a$  is the number of atoms in each structure,  $\mathbf{q}_{kl}$  is the position of atom *l* in structure *k*,  $\rho_a(\mathbf{q})$  is a normalized distribution for a single atom, and

$$w_l^{-1} = \max \sum_k \rho_a(\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_{kl})$$
 (38)

By this means, for a given atom, the relative probability of a given position is preserved but the contribution of one atom relative to another is reweighted such that the maxima of each contribution are constant, thereby yielding an isosurface that provides a comprehensive representation of the most likely structures. In the case of the EIN-HPr complex, the probability map for the encounter complex ensemble is constructed from 100 independent calculations, each of ensemble size N = 20; that is a total of  $N_s = 2000$  structures.

Two features of the atomic probability map for the EIN-HPr encounter complex ensemble stand out (Figure 29E). First, there is a qualitative correlation between the encounter complex ensemble distribution and the electrostatic surface potential, with the positively charged surface of HPr populating the largely negative surface of EIN. Second, the occupancy of the encounter complexes in the vicinity of the stereospecific complex is low, indicating that once HPr locates this region, formation of the stereospecific complex occurs with high probability. Thus, binding and specific recognition occurs within the context of a rough, funnelshaped energy landscape<sup>29,222</sup> possessing many local minima comprising the sites occupied by the encounter complexes and a global minimum occupied by the stereospecific complex. The characteristics of the nonspecific encounter complexes are distinct from the stereospecific complex. The latter possesses a well-defined array of complementary van der Waals and electrostatic interactions, with the latter being critical in determining the orientation of binding. In the case of the nonspecific encounter complex ensemble, the buried accessible surface area is on average an order of magnitude smaller and the gap index is much larger, indicating that the interface is less well packed. In addition, the average fraction of charged residues at the interfaces of the nonspecific encounter complexes appears to be somewhat increased relative to that at the interface of the stereospecific complex.

The salt dependence of the intermolecular PREs, originating from HPr paramagnetically labeled at E5C and E25C, reveals that the magnitude of the intermolecular PREs attributable to the stereospecific complex displays only a small dependence on salt concentration. This can be fully accounted for by the dependence of the overall  $K_{diss}$  on salt concentration, as determined by isothermal titration calorimetry, resulting in a small decrease in the population of bound EIN as the salt concentration is increased (Figure 30). The magnitude of the intermolecular PREs originating from the ensemble of nonspecific encounter complexes, however,



Figure 29. Semiquantitative depiction of the nonspecific encounter complex ensemble of EIN-HPr. (A) The representation used for rigid body ensemble refinement comprises an equilibrium mixture of the stereospecific complex (whose structure is known and fixed) and a nonspecific encounter complex ensemble of size N in rapid exchange with one another. The overall calculated  $\Gamma_2$  rate is a population weighted average of the  $\Gamma_2$  rates of the species present in solution. (B) Dependence of the working ( $Q_e$  and  $Q_{ee}$ ) and complete cross-validated ( $Q_{\rm free}$ ) PRE Q-factors on ensemble size N at a population of 10% for the encounter complex ensemble. ( $Q_e$ is the average Q-factor for all 100 calculated ensembles, and  $Q_{ee}$  is the ensemble of ensembles average Q-factor.) Complete crossvalidation shows that the optimal size of N lies between 10 and 20. (C) Dependence of the working Q factors on the population of the encounter complex ensemble for an ensemble size of N = 20. (D) Correlation between observed and calculated intermolecular  $\Gamma_2$  rates for N = 20 and a population of 10% for the encounter complex ensemble. (E) Two views depicting the atomic probability distribution of the encounter complex ensemble of HPr (green mesh plotted at a threshold of 20% maximum and calculated from 100 independent calculations of ensemble size N = 20 at a population of 10%) on the molecular surface of EIN (color coded by electrostatic potential,  $\pm 8kT$ ) with the location of HPr in the stereospecific complex shown as a blue ribbon. Adapted from Tang <sup>7</sup> published in *Nature* (Nature Publishing Group) while the et al.<sup>2</sup> authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

is much more sensitive to salt concentration, implying that the population of nonspecific encounter complexes is significantly more affected by ionic strength than that of the stereospecific complex (Figure 30).<sup>28</sup> These results demonstrate the importance of electrostatic interactions in the formation of the ensemble of nonspecific encounter complexes and are fully consistent with Debye–Hückel theory, since the less compact interfacial packing for the nonspecific



**Figure 30.** Differential salt dependence of intermolecular PREs attributable to the stereospecific EIN-HPR complex and the nonspecific encounter complex ensemble. (A) Correlation of intermolecular  $\Gamma_2$  rates arising from the stereospecific complex (left-hand panels) and the ensemble of nonspecific encounter complexes (right-hand panels) at 0.15 (red), 0.3 (green), and 0.5 (blue) M NaCl versus the corresponding  $\Gamma_2$  rates at 0 M NaCl for EIN-HPr(E5C) and EIN-HPr(E25C) paramagnetically labeled with EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup>. (B) Ionic strength dependence of the  $K_{diss}$  for the EIN-HPr complex determined by isothermal titration calorimetry (left-hand panel) and dependence of the slopes of the  $\Gamma_2$ (NaCl) versus  $\Gamma_2$ (0 M NaCl) correlations (from panel A) versus the normalized bound population  $p_{\text{bound}}$ (NaCl)/ $p_{\text{bound}}$ (0 M NaCl) of stereospecific complex. Adapted from Suh et al.<sup>28</sup> published in *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* (American Chemical Society) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

encounter complexes relative to the stereospecific complex permits more effective screening of intermolecular electrostatic interactions by ions in solution.<sup>28</sup>

Similar results were also observed for the IIA<sup>Mtl</sup>—HPr and IIA<sup>Man</sup>\_-HPr complexes (Figure 31).<sup>27</sup> (Note that IIA<sup>Mtl</sup> and IIA<sup>Man</sup> bear no similarity in terms of primary, secondary, tertiary, or quaternary structure). With the paramagnetic label (E5C-EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup>) placed on the opposite side of HPr's binding site for IIA<sup>Mtl</sup> and IIA<sup>Man</sup>, there are regions on the surface of IIA<sup>Mtl</sup> and IIA<sup>Man</sup> in both complexes that exhibit intermolecular  $\Gamma_2$  rates that are much larger than those back-calculated from the respective structures of the stereospecific complexes (Figure 31A and E). The largest discrepancies involve regions on IIA<sup>Mtl</sup> and IIA<sup>Man</sup> rich in acidic residues (Figure 31B and C and Figure 31 F and G), the distribution of which correlates qualitatively with the negative electrostatic potential on the surface of these proteins (Figure 31D and H), suggesting that long-range electrostatic interactions

play an important role in the formation of these particular encounter complexes.

Recently, replica exchange Monte Carlo simulations using a coarse-grained energy function have been used to study the interactions of the EIN-HPr, IIAMtl-HPr, and IIA<sup>Man</sup>-HPr complexes from a theoretical perspective.<sup>29</sup> The simulations recover the structures of the stereospecific complexes together with an ensemble of nonspecific encounter complexes at an occupancy of  $\sim 10\%$ , and they reproduce the overall experimental binding affinities well. The picture that emerges from both the experimental and theoretical work is one in which the overall funnel-shaped energy landscape of complex formation is dominated by the stereospecific complex, a small number of structured nonspecific encounter complexes, and a diffuse cloud of loosely bound encounter complexes connecting the stereospecific and nonspecific binding sites with each other and the unbound state.29

# 4.2.2. Encounter Complexes in Protein—Protein Electron Transfer

In the phosphoryl transfer complexes of the PTS discussed in the previous section, the configuration of the stereospecific complex is dictated by rigid constraints imposed by chemistry with only small variations in the distance between the two active site histidines depending on whether the phosphoryl transfer reaction proceeds via an associative or dissociative mechanism.<sup>42,44,219</sup> In the case of electron transfer reactions, however, which proceed principally via electron tunneling modulated by the intervening bonding networks, such highly strict geometric requirements are not present, and hence a multitude of closely related configurations can still potentially support electron transfer.<sup>223</sup>

The crystal structure of the complex between cytochrome c peroxidase (CcP) and cytochrome c (Cc) provides a static picture of an electron transfer complex.<sup>224</sup> Brownian dynamics simulations, however, suggest a multitude of complexes, including several discrete and energetically accessible minima.<sup>14</sup> While the most stable minimum corresponds to the crystal structure, other minima have smaller metal-metal separations.<sup>223</sup> Since the CCp-Cc complex is weak, the PRE provides an ideal approach to answer these questions experimentally.<sup>110</sup> Using a very qualitative interpretation of the PRE data in which the PREs were converted to approximate distance restraints with bounds of  $\pm 4$  Å, Volkov et al.<sup>110</sup> showed that most of the PRE restraints were consistent with a single structure that is close to the crystal structure (backbone rms difference of 2.2 Å). However, a number of nonrandomly distributed PRE restraints were consistently violated, indicating that the single docked structure is insufficient to explain all the experimental PRE data. Volkov et al.<sup>110</sup> were able to show that the dominant protein-protein orientation, corresponding approximately to the crystal structure, is occupied >70% of the lifetime of the complex, with the remainder of the time being spent in an ensemble of encounter complexes. The authors were further able to deduce that the conformational space explored by Cc on the surface of CcP in the encounter complexes constitutes about half the molecular surface of CcP with the crystal structure configuration located at approximately the center of this surface.

In the context of electron transfer, the results on the Cc-CcP complex are relevant not only to the mechanism of protein complex formation but also to the modulation of



**Figure 31.** Observed and calculated intermolecular PREs for the  $IIA^{Mtl}$ -HPr (panels A–D) and  $IIA^{Man}$ -HPr (panels E–H) complexes with HPr paramagnetically labeled with EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> at position E5C. A comparison of the observed PRE profiles (red circles) with those back-calculated from the structures of the stereospecific complexes (black lines) is shown in parts A and E. Structures of the two stereospecific complexes color coded according to the difference,  $\Delta\Gamma_2$ , between observed and calculated intermolecular  $\Gamma_2$  rates are shown in parts B and F. Residues of IIA<sup>Mtl</sup> (C) and IIA<sup>Man</sup> (G) that display a large  $\Delta\Gamma_2$  are colored in cyan on a molecular surface representation, with HPr shown as a green ribbon; corresponding electrostatic potential isosurfaces ( $\pm 5kT$ ) are shown in parts D and H, respectively, using the same views. Adapted from Tang et al.<sup>27</sup> published in *Nature* (Nature Publishing Group) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

electron transfer rates.<sup>110</sup> The observation that the dominant protein—protein orientation in solution corresponds approximately to that observed in the crystal structure is consistent with the finding that electron transfer rates are similar in solution and in the crystal.<sup>225,226</sup> However, forward and backward electron transfer rates are differentially modulated by dynamic processes, and forward electron transfer rates appear to be conformationally gated, implying that the most stable binding configuration is not necessarily the most electron transfer active.<sup>226</sup>

The relevance of encounter complexes to electron transfer is illustrated even more dramatically in the case of the adrenoxin (Adx) and Cc.<sup>111</sup> Adx and Cc associate to form a very weak and short-lived complex that is electron transfer active. In this instance, the PRE data indicate that the Adx-Cc complex is in fact a pure encounter complex ensemble.

## 4.2.3. Ultraweak Self-association

Ultraweak macromolecular self-association ( $K_{diss} > 10$  mM) is beyond the limit of detection of conventional

biophysical techniques such as sedimentation velocity and therefore very difficult to study. Such weak interactions, however, likely play a critical role in the initial nucleation events involved in spontaneous self-assembly of higher-order architectures, including viral capsid formation, crystallization, and amyloid fibril formation.

As an example of ultraweak self-association, we investigated the self-association of HPr using the PRE.<sup>116</sup> No evidence of self-association could be detected by sedimentation velocity, providing an upper limit of 1-2% for any higher order soluble species. Intermolecular PRE measurements were carried out using a 1:1 mixture of <sup>15</sup>N-labeled HPr and HPr paramagnetically labeled with EDTA-Mn<sup>2+</sup> at three positions (one at a time): E5C, E25C, and E32C. Large intermolecular PREs were observed with the paramagnetic label at E5C and E32C, compared to negligible effects with the label at E25C, thereby unequivocally demonstrating the presence of very weak self-association (Figure 32A). Selfassociation could be completely eliminated by the addition of EIN, indicating that the EIN-HPr interface overlaps with



**Figure 32.** Ultraweak self-association of HPr. (A) Intermolecular PRE profiles with EDTA- $Mn^{2+}$  at positions E5C (top) and E32C (bottom panel). The location of the intermolecular PREs is shown in the insets. (B) Correlation between observed and calculated PREs with the self-associated state represented by an ensemble of size N = 4 at a population of 1%. (C) Reweighted atomic probability density maps (green mesh, plotted at a threshold of 20% maximum) showing the distribution of <sup>15</sup>N-labeled HPr on the surface of paramagnetically labeled HPr (left panel) and of paramagnetically labeled HPr (right panel with residues experiencing large intermolecular PREs colored in red, green, blue, and yellow using the same color scheme as in part A). Adapted from Tang et al.<sup>116</sup> published in *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* (American Chemical Society) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

that for self-association of HPr. The PREs are also modulated differentially by ionic strength, as well as by a surface charge mutation (S46D), revealing the presence of several clusters of self-associated species. Using a similar computational methodology to that employed to explore the distribution of nonspecific encounter complexes for the interaction of EIN and HPr (section 4.2.1), it could be shown that the selfassociated state was optimally represented by an ensemble of species of size N = 4 at an overall occupancy of  $\sim 1\%$ (Figure 31B), corresponding to a  $K_{diss} \geq 15$  mM. From the atomic probability distribution representing the self-associated species, one can deduce that the ensemble of selfassociated states is driven by both electrostatic and hydrophobic interactions (Figure 32C).

# 4.2.4. Transient Events Involved in N-Terminal Autoprocessing of HIV-1 Protease

Mature HIV-1 protease is a dimer in which residues from each subunit contribute to the catalytic active site.<sup>227</sup> HIV-1

protease plays a critical role in viral maturation by processing the Gag and Gag-Pol polyproteins into mature structural and functional proteins, including itself. The full-length transframe region (TFR)-protease precursor is monomeric but undergoes maturation by intramolecular N-terminal cleavage of a putative precursor dimer.<sup>228-230</sup> This cleavage event is associated with the appearance of mature-like catalytic activity. Cleavage at the C-terminal end of the protease occurs intermolecularly and involves an active protease dimer.231 How then does N-terminal cleavage of the HIV-1 protease precursor occur when the N- and C-termini of the mature protease are part of an intersubunit  $\beta$ -sheet located distal from the active site? To address this question, we carried out PRE measurements on a miniprecursor protease construct, SFNFPRD25N, comprising a four-residue N-terminal extension derived from the TFR and a D25N mutation to abolish catalytic activity.<sup>117</sup> The four-residue N-terminal extension is sufficient to result in a monomeric species whose secondary and tertiary structures are the same as those of the mature protease, with the exception of the N- and C-termini, which are disordered and no longer form an intersubunit  $\beta$ -sheet. The experimental design is similar to that employed in the study of HPr self-association. The miniprecursor was spin-labeled at three sites (T12C, E34C, and V82C, one at a time), and significant intermolecular PRE effects were observed with the nitroxide label at two of the three sites (T12C and V82C) (Figure 33A). These data permit one to reconstruct the probability distribution of very weakly self-associated states (Figure 33C). The miniprecursor forms highly transient, lowly populated (3-5%) dimeric encounter complexes ( $K_{\text{diss}} = 3-5 \text{ mM}$ ) that involve the mature dimer interface but occupy a wide range of subunit orientations relative to the mature dimer. The occupancy of the mature dimer orientation is extremely low, thereby accounting for the very low enzymatic activity of the precursor. Additional PRE measurements with the nitroxide label positioned close to the N-terminus of the miniprecursor reveal that the N-terminal extension makes both transient intra- and intersubunit contacts with the substrate binding site and cleft (Figures 33B and D). Thus, the N-terminal extension is available for autocleavage when the correct dimer orientation is sampled within the encounter complex ensemble of miniprecursor self-associated species (Figure 33D).

# 4.3. Transient Domain–Domain Interactions in Proteins

Large-scale domain rearrangements are known to play a critical role in ligand binding, recognition, catalysis, and regulation. Such motions include transitions between alternative states (e.g., closed versus open conformations) as well as transitions from intrinsically disordered states to ordered ones upon binding.

# 4.3.1. Interdomain Dynamics in Maltose-Binding Protein

Maltose binding protein (MBP) belongs to a large class of periplasmic proteins in which ligand binding is associated with large domain reorientation from an open *apo* state to a closed *holo* state.<sup>232</sup> The ligand binding site consists of residues from the N- and C-terminal domains and is fully accessible in the *apo* state; in the *holo* state, the ligand is buried by the two domains. For this reason, MBP and related proteins have been compared to a venus fly trap. The general question that arises for proteins such as MBP is whether the



Figure 33. PRE investigation of transient events involved in N-terminal autoprocessing of the SFNFPRD25N HIV-1 protease miniprecursor. (A) Intermolecular PRE profiles observed with nitroxide labels at positions T12C and V82C located at the periphery of the substrate binding cleft and dimer interface of the mature protease. The observed  $\Gamma_2$  rates are shown as red circles, the calculated  $\Gamma_2$  rates (derived from ensemble rigid body simulated annealing calculations) for a N = 4 representation for the ensemble of self-associated states at a population of 5% are shown as black lines (PRE *Q*-factor = 0.22), and the  $\Gamma_2$  rates back-calculated from the structure of the mature protease at populations of 1 and 2% are shown as blue and green lines, respectively. (B) PRE profiles observed with the nitroxide spin label attached at the N-terminus of SFNFPRD25N with intermolecular PREs (obtained from a mixed sample of <sup>15</sup>N-labeled precursor and nitroxide-labeled precursor) shown in red and the sum of intra- and intermolecular PREs (obtained from a sample comprising dual <sup>15</sup>N- and nitroxide-labeled miniprecursor) in blue. (C) Atomic probability density map (gray mesh plotted at a threshold of 20% of maximum) showing the distribution of the spin-labeled (T12C, E34C, and V82C) subunit relative to the isotopically labeled subunit (red ribbon) in the  $^{SFNF}PR_{D25N}$  encounter complexes, with the location of the second subunit in the mature protease shown as a blue ribbon. (D) Interand intramolecular PREs with  $\Gamma_2$  rates >10 s<sup>-1</sup> color-coded in red and blue, respectively, onto the molecular surface of the mature protease dimer originating from the N-terminal spin-label. Adapted from Tang et al.<sup>117</sup> published in *Nature* (Nature Publishing Group) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

*apo* state exists as a single species in which the *holo* conformation is energetically inaccessible in the absence of ligand and interdomain rearrangement is induced by ligand binding, or whether the predominantly open *apo* state coexists in rapid equilibrium with alternative lowly populated species that approximate the closed *holo* state.

In the case of MBP, domain reorientation upon ligand binding involves a  $\sim 35^{\circ}$  rigid body domain reorientation between the N- (NTD) and C-(CTD) domains, involving

hinge bending within the linker region connecting the two domains.<sup>233,234</sup> RDCs measured on the *apo* and *holo* states of MBP are fully consistent with the respective crystals structures (with RDC R-factors of  $\sim 13-14\%$ ).<sup>235</sup> Since RDCs are exquisitely sensitive to bond vector orientation,<sup>58</sup> it follows that the predominant conformation of the *apo* and *holo* states in solution corresponds to the open and closed states observed in the *apo* and *holo* crystal structures, respectively. However, RDCs represent a linear weighted average of the species present in solution and therefore will not be sensitive to the presence of lowly populated states.<sup>114</sup> Thermodynamic and mutagenesis data further indicate that the upper limit for the occupancy of the *holo* conformation in the absence of ligand is only 0.002%.<sup>236</sup>

PRE measurements on MBP were carried out by placing a nitroxide label (one at a time) on the surface of the NTD (D41C) and CTD (S211C).<sup>114</sup> In the presence of ligand, the PRE data from both sites are fully consistent with the holo crystal structure. In the absence of ligand, however, a different picture emerges: although the PRE data obtained for S211C are compatible with the apo crystal structure, the PRE profile for D41C reveals major discrepancies between the observed and calculated interdomain PREs observed on the CTD. Specifically, the magnitudes of the PREs originating from D41C and observed within the CTD are considerably larger than expected from the apo crystal structure (Figure 34A) with an interdomain PRE Q-factor of 0.49 (Figure 34B). The PRE profiles for MBP in the absence of ligand cannot be accounted for by a simple mixture of apo and holo conformations. Further, although the PRE data can be fit to a single alternative conformation, this conformation is inconsistent with the RDC data (RDC *R*-factor of  $24 \pm 3\%$  compared to 14% for the *apo* crystal structure). One can therefore conclude that apo MBP in solution exists as a mixture of at least two species, with the predominant one corresponding to the apo crystal structure. Simulated annealing refinement against the PRE data using a two-member ensemble comprising a major open state (corresponding to the *apo* crystal structure) and a minor species in a 95%:5% mixture satisfies the experimental PRE data with Q-factors of 0.21 and 0.24 for the D41C (Figure 34B) and S211C data, respectively, and is fully consistent with both RDC and small-angle X-ray scattering data.<sup>114</sup> In this instance, representation of the minor species by a larger ensemble of states does not result in any significant improvement in agreement with the experimental PRE data and yields the same physical and structural picture.

The lowly populated species calculated from the PRE data represents a partially closed state (Figure 34C) that is distinct from the *holo* conformation.<sup>114</sup> The transition between the major open and minor partially closed apo species involves a hinge body rotation of 33°. The minor partially closed apo state and the holo conformation differ by an 18° rotation as well as a 6 Å translation (Figure 34D). The latter relieves electrostatic repulsion in the holo conformation between negatively charged residues that line the substrate binding cleft, thereby rendering the *holo* conformation energetically inaccessible in the absence of sugar substrate.<sup>236</sup> In the presence of sugar, an array of intermolecular hydrogen bonds between these residues and the substrate stabilizes the holo conformation. In the absence of sugar, translation of the CTD out of the sugar-binding pocket in the partially closed apo state not only reduces electrostatic repulsion between the NTD and CTD but also leaves the sugar binding surface on



Figure 34. Dynamic interconversion between major open and minor, partially closed states of apo MBP. (A) Comparison of the observed PRE profile for apo MBP spin-labeled at position D41C (red circles) with that back-calculated on the basis of the apo crystal structure (open state). (B) Correlation between observed and calculated  $\Gamma_2$  rates for the D41C data obtained with the *apo* crystal structure alone (left panel) and upon inclusion of a minor, partially closed species at an occupancy of 5% (right panel) derived by conjoined rigid body/torsion angle simulated annealing refinement. (C) Comparison of the major open (blue cylinder) and minor partially closed (green smoothed backbone trace with the reweighted atomic probability map shown as a green mesh) forms of the CTD of apo MBP with the NTD of the two species superimposed (gray ribbon). (D) Comparison of the relative orientation of the CTD in the minor partially closed state of apo MBP (green cylinder) and the holo crystal structure (closed state) of MBP (red cylinders) with the crystal structure (open state) of apo MBP shown as a molecular surface color-coded according to electrostatic potential. Adapted from Tang et al.<sup>114</sup> published in *Nature* (Nature Publishing Group) while the authors were U.S. Government employees at the National Institutes of Health.

the CTD exposed and therefore accessible for binding. The presence of a partially closed *apo* state in rapid equilibrium with the predominant open state may facilitate the transition to the *holo* conformation upon sugar binding. Further, since the predominant structural fluctuations in *apo* MBP do not involve the energetically disfavored *holo* conformation but a related partially closed conformation, one could regard the conformational transition to the *holo* conformation upon sugar binding as an example of induced fit.

# 4.3.2. Conformational Space Sampled by Denatured and Intrinsically Disordered Proteins

Denatured and intrinsically disordered proteins occupy an ensemble of non-native conformational states.<sup>237</sup> One might expect that these states constitute a statistical random coil, but this need not necessarily be the case, owing to the

presence of residual structure or local non-native collapse around hydrophobic clusters.<sup>238</sup> By comparing the observed PREs with those expected from a statistical random coil, one can deduce the existence of residual structure or compaction. PRE measurements have been carried out on a wide range of partially unfolded, unfolded, and intrinsically unstructured proteins.<sup>99–109</sup>

The expected profile for a random coil, calculated using the mean field approximation to an unperturbed wormlike chain, predicts that the PRE should extend to  $\sim 15$  residues from the site of a nitroxide spin label.<sup>108</sup> Depending on the location of the spin label, this behavior can be reproduced. In other cases, however, PRE effects have been observed to extend well beyond the 15 residue limit and, in addition, may not be evenly distributed. In general, the PRE data on unfolded and intrinsically disordered proteins have provided definitive evidence of multiple distinct hydrophobic clusters which include both non-native interactions and in some instances residual native contacts.99-108 For chemically denatured N-PGK,<sup>109</sup> on the other hand, significant PREs, distributed almost uniformly throughout the sequence, were observed from multiple spin labels, suggesting the existence of a collapsed state with no coherent three-dimensional structure and a radius approximately 20% larger than that of the folded state.

# 5. Concluding Remarks

Although the PRE was first described in the 1950s<sup>76</sup> and early 1960s<sup>119</sup> and has been extensively used in the study of metalloproteins,<sup>59,60,118</sup> it is only relatively recently that the appropriate theoretical and computational framework has been established to permit direct quantitative refinement against PRE relaxation rates for systems in which an extrinsic paramagnetic center (covalently attached to the macromolecule of interest via a linker with several rotatable bonds) samples a wide range of conformational space.<sup>78</sup> Quantitative refinement against PRE relaxation rates not only affords a powerful tool in three-dimensional solution structure determination but also permits structural information on lowly populated states to be derived under conditions where the minor and major species are in fast exchange on the PRE relaxation time scale.

From the perspective of structure determination, the PRE permits a large number of long-range distance interactions, up to 35 Å in the case of  $Mn^{2+}$ , between the paramagnetic center and the protons of the macromolecule(s) to be probed. In contrast, the NOE which forms the backbone of all NMR structure determination is restricted to short-range interproton distances less than about 6 Å.<sup>30–32,51</sup> It is not simply the ability to sample long-range distances that makes the PRE so useful. The unambiguous identification of a PRE effect is entirely straightforward, since the assignment of crosspeaks in 2D or 3D correlation spectra is already known from through-bond scalar triple resonance experiments. This is in stark contrast to the assignment of NOE cross-peaks where extensive spectral overlap can render unambiguous identification to a single interproton interaction difficult even in four-dimensional spectra.

While the NOE cannot provide information concerning long-range order, since the effects are limited to 6 Å, it is evident that a large number of such short-range contacts, even if interpreted in the most generous and qualitative manner, are in fact highly constraining from a structural perspective when dealing with globular proteins.<sup>51</sup> Qualitative

interpretation of PRE data, however, is much less useful in this regard, since a distance restraint of  $20 \pm 5$  Å or  $20 \pm 10$  Å is not particularly conformationally restrictive. This is why direct refinement against the PRE rates is so important from the perspective of structure determination, since it is only by this means that the full power of the PRE can be truly exploited.<sup>78</sup>

The PRE is not the only biophysical technique that can probe long-range distance interactions. Fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET)<sup>239</sup> and double electron-electron resonance (DEER)<sup>240,241</sup> allow separations of 10-100 Å and 20-60 Å, respectively, to be studied and, in contrast to solution NMR methods, are not limited by molecular size. However, both FRET and DEER require the introduction of two probes, a fluorescence donor and acceptor for the former and two nitroxide labels for the later, and more importantly, only a single pairwise distance can be measured per sample, with each distance requiring a new double chromophorelabeled or double spin-labeled sample. The PRE, of course, can probe hundreds of distances simultaneously in a single sample, thereby permitting one not only to derive threedimensional structural information but also to detect and visualize lowly populated species.

As with any labeling method, the introduction of extrinsic PRE labels can potentially alter the interaction energy, structure, or kinetics of the interacting molecules. For this reason, care should be taken in choosing the sites of labeling. The absence of significant structural perturbations involving the high-populated state of the labeled molecule and the complex can be easily assessed by NMR spectroscopy using chemical shifts as an indicator. The absence of any significant chemical shift perturbations (e.g., in a  ${}^{1}H^{-15}N$  correlation spectrum) outside the immediate vicinity of the labeled residue indicates that any potential structural perturbations are too small to be characterized by NMR. Likewise, residual dipolar couplings can readily be used to verify the absence of any significant perturbations in backbone structure. Overall interactions energies can be derived by titration experiments (e.g., using NMR, fluorescence, or isothermal titration calorimetry to determine overall equilibrium constants). In the examples discussed here involving protein-protein and protein-DNA interactions, as well as multidomain proteins, no significant structural or energetic perturbations were detected upon introduction of the paramagnetic labels.<sup>23–25,27,78,94,112,114,116,117</sup>

The application of the PRE for structure determination of complexes or multidomain proteins is restricted to systems in slow exchange on the PRE relaxation time scale. Under these conditions, the observed intermolecular or interdomain PREs reflect a single state, and direct refinement against the PRE rates using a single structure representation of the macromolecule can proceed in the same way as using the intramolecular PREs for structure determination/refinement of a single protein.<sup>78</sup>

Perhaps the most exciting aspects of the PRE are the recent findings that, under fast exchanging conditions, intermolecular or interdomain PREs can provide the footprint of low population species providing a significant number of paramagnetic center—proton distances are shorter in the minor species than the major one.<sup>24</sup> This PRE footprint permits one to detect, visualize, and characterize lowly populated states of macromolecules and their complexes under equilibrium conditions, shedding information on states that are effectively

invisible to other biophysical and structural techniques. These states are of considerable interest, since they play a crucial role in a wide range of dynamical processes, including molecular recognition and binding, allostery, induced-fit, and self-assembly. In this review, we have shown how the PRE in the fast exchange regime can be used to demonstrate sliding and hopping of transcription factors on DNA;<sup>24</sup> to identify and structurally characterize nonspecific encounter complexes in protein-protein association;<sup>27,28,110,111</sup> to detect ultraweak self-association,<sup>116</sup> a process that is vital, for example, for N-terminal autoprocessing of the monomeric HIV-1 protease precursor;<sup>117</sup> to probe large scale interdomain motions in multidomain proteins involving rare transitions;<sup>114</sup> and to characterize ensembles of unfolded and intrinsically disordered states of proteins, including the sampling of nonnative partially collapsed states. 99-109

# 6. Acknowledgments

We thank Attila Szabo and Chun Tang for useful discussions. This work was supported by the Intramural Program of the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, National Institutes of Health (to G.M.C.), by the AIDS Targeted Antiviral Program of the Office of the Director of the National Institutes of Health (to G.M.C.), and by Grant H-1683 from the Welch Foundation (to J.I.).

# 7. References

- Branden, C.; Tooze, J. *Introduction to Protein Structure*, 2nd ed.; Garland Publishing Inc.: New York, 1998.
- (2) Bryngelson, J. D.; Onuchic, J. N.; Socci, N. D.; Wolynes, P. G. Proteins 1995, 21, 167.
- (3) Onuchic, J. N.; Luthey-Schulten, Z.; Wolynes, P. G. Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. 1997, 48, 545.
- (4) Miyashita, O.; Onuchic, J. N.; Wolynes, P. G. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2003, 100, 12570.
- (5) Miyashita, O.; Wolynes, P. G.; Onuchic, J. N. J. Phys. Chem. B 2005, 109, 1959.
- (6) Zhou, H. X.; Szabo, A. Phys. Rev. Lett. 2004, 93, 178101.
- (7) Berg, O. G.; von Hippel, P. H. Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biophys. Chem. 1985, 14, 131.
- (8) Berg, O. G.; von Hippel, P. H. J. Mol. Biol. 1987, 193, 723.
- (9) von Hippel, P. H.; Berg, O. G. J. Biol. Chem. 1989, 264, 675.
- (10) Schreiber, G.; Fersht, A. R. Nat. Struct. Biol. 1996, 3, 427.
- (11) Vijayakumar, M.; Wong, K. Y.; Schreiber, G.; Fersht, A. R.; Szabo, A.; Zhou, H. X. J. Mol. Biol. 1998, 278, 1015.
- (12) Selzer, T.; Schreiber, G. Proteins 2001, 45, 190.
- (13) Schreiber, G. Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol. 2002, 12, 41.
- (14) Northrup, S. H.; Boles, J. O.; Reynolds, J. C. Science **1988**, 241, 67.
- (15) Gabdoulline, R. R.; Wade, R. C. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **2002**, *12*, 204.
- (16) Spaar, A.; Dammer, C.; Gabdoulline, R. R.; Wade, R. C.; Helms, V. Biophys. J. 2006, 90, 1913.
- (17) Berg, O. G.; Winter, R. B.; von Hippel, P. H. *Biochemistry* **1981**, 20, 6929.
- (18) Winter, R. B.; Berg, O. G.; von Hippel, P. H. *Biochemistry* **1981**, 20, 6961.
- (19) Halford, S. E.; Szczelkun, M. D. Eur. Biophys. J. 2002, 31, 257.
- (20) Halford, S. E.; Marko, J. F. Nucleic Acids Res. 2004, 32, 3040.
- (21) Hu, T.; Shklovskii, B. I. Phys. Rev. E: Stat., Nonlinear, Soft Matter Phys. 2006, 74, 021903.
- (22) Hu, T.; Shklovskii, B. I. Phys. Rev. E: Stat., Nonlinear, Soft Matter Phys. 2007, 76, 051909.
- (23) Iwahara, J.; Zweckstetter, M.; Clore, G. M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2006, 103, 15062.
- (24) Iwahara, J.; Clore, G. M. Nature 2006, 440, 1227.
- (25) Iwahara, J.; Clore, G. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006, 128, 404.
- (26) Doucleff, M.; Clore, G. M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2008, 105, 13871.
- (27) Tang, C.; Iwahara, J.; Clore, G. M. Nature 2006, 444, 383.
- (28) Suh, J. Y.; Tang, C.; Clore, G. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2007, 129, 12954.
- (29) Kim, Y. C.; Tang, C.; Clore, G. M.; Hummer, G. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2008, 105, 12855.

- (30) Wüthrich, K. *NMR of Proteins and Nucleic Acids*; John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1986.
- (31) Clore, G. M.; Gronenborn, A. M. Crit. Rev. Biochem. Mol. Biol. 1989, 24, 479.
- (32) Clore, G. M.; Gronenborn, A. M. Science 1991, 252, 1390.
- (33) Bax, A.; Grzesiek, S. Acc. Chem. Res. 1993, 26, 131.
- (34) Clore, G. M.; Wingfield, P. T.; Gronenborn, A. M. *Biochemistry* **1991**, *30*, 2315.
- (35) Garrett, D. S.; Seok, Y. J.; Liao, D. I.; Peterkofsky, A.; Gronenborn, A. M.; Clore, G. M. *Biochemistry* **1997**, *36*, 2517.
- (36) Salzmann, M.; Pervushin, K.; Wider, G.; Senn, H.; Wüthrich, K. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **1998**, *95*, 13585.
- (37) Pervushin, K. Q. Rev. Biophys. 2000, 33, 161.
- (38) Riek, R.; Pervushin, K.; Wüthrich, K. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **2000**, 25, 462.
- (39) Tugarinov, V.; Muhandiram, R.; Ayed, A.; Kay, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 10025.
- (40) Tugarinov, V.; Sprangers, R.; Kay, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 4921.
- (41) Caffrey, M.; Cai, M.; Kaufman, J.; Stahl, S. J.; Wingfield, P. T.; Covell, D. G.; Gronenborn, A. M.; Clore, G. M. *EMBO J.* **1998**, *17*, 4572.
- (42) Garrett, D. S.; Seok, Y. J.; Peterkofsky, A.; Gronenborn, A. M.; Clore, G. M. Nat. Struct. Biol. 1999, 6, 166.
- (43) Williams, D. C., Jr.; Cai, M.; Clore, G. M. J. Biol. Chem. 2004, 279, 1449.
- (44) Williams, D. C., Jr.; Cai, M.; Suh, J. Y.; Peterkofsky, A.; Clore, G. M. J. Biol. Chem. 2005, 280, 20775.
- (45) Tugarinov, V.; Choy, W. Y.; Orekhov, V. Y.; Kay, L. E. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2005, 102, 622.
- (46) Hu, J.; Hu, K.; Williams, D. C., Jr.; Komlosh, M. E.; Cai, M.; Clore, G. M. J. Biol. Chem. 2008, 283, 11024.
- (47) Fiaux, J.; Bertelsen, E. B.; Horwich, A. L.; Wüthrich, K. Nature 2002, 418, 207.
- (48) Horst, R.; Bertelsen, E. B.; Fiaux, J.; Wider, G.; Horwich, A. L.; Wüthrich, K. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2005, 102, 12748.
- (49) Sprangers, R.; Gribun, A.; Hwang, P. M.; Houry, W. A.; Kay, L. E. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2005, 102, 16678.
- (50) Sprangers, R.; Kay, L. E. Nature 2007, 445, 618.
- (51) Clore, G. M.; Gronenborn, A. M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 1998, 95, 5891.
- (52) Tjandra, N.; Bax, A. Science 1997, 278, 1111.

2009 | doi: 10.1021/cr900033p

Publication Date (Web): June 12,

- (53) Clore, G. M.; Starich, M. R.; Gronenborn, A. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1998, 120, 10571.
- (54) Tjandra, N.; Omichinski, J. G.; Gronenborn, A. M.; Clore, G. M.; Bax, A. Nat. Struct. Biol. 1997, 4, 732.
- (55) Clore, G. M.; Starich, M. R.; Bewley, C. A.; Cai, M.; Kuszewski, J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1999, 121, 6513.
- (56) Clore, G. M.; Garrett, D. S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1999, 121, 9008.
- (57) Clore, G. M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2000, 97, 9021.
- (58) Bax, A.; Kontaxis, G.; Tjandra, N. Methods Enzymol. 2001, 339, 127.
- (59) Bertini, I.; Luchinat, C.; Aime, S. NMR of Paramagnetic Substances; Elsevier: Amsterdam, 1996.
- (60) Bertini, I.; Luchinat, C.; Piccioli, M. *Methods Enzymol.* **2001**, *339*, 314.
- (61) Clore, G. M.; Tang, C.; Iwahara, J. Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol. 2007, 17, 603.
- (62) Clore, G. M. Mol. Biosyst. 2008, 4, 1058.
- (63) Pintacuda, G.; John, M.; Su, X. C.; Otting, G. Acc. Chem. Res. 2007, 40, 206.
- (64) Palmer, A. G.; Kroenke, C. D.; Loria, J. P. Methods Enzymol. 2001, 339, 204.
- (65) Mittermaier, A.; Kay, L. E. Science 2006, 312, 224.
- (66) Korzhnev, D. M.; Kay, L. E. Acc. Chem. Res. 2008, 41, 442
- (67) Loria, J. P.; Berlow, R. B.; Watt, E. D. Acc. Chem. Res. 2008, 41, 214.
- (68) Montelione, G. T.; Wagner, G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1989, 111, 3096.
- (69) Wider, G.; Neri, D.; Wüthrich, K. J. Biomol. NMR 1991, 1, 93.
- (70) Farrow, N. A.; Zhang, O.; Forman-Kay, J. D.; Kay, L. E. J. Biomol. NMR 1994, 4, 727.
- (71) Sahu, D.; Clore, G. M.; Iwahara, J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2007, 129, 13232.
- (72) Bai, Y. Chem. Rev. 2006, 106, 1757.
- (73) Krishna, M. M.; Hoang, L.; Lin, Y.; Englander, S. W. Methods 2004, 34, 51.
- (74) Vallurupalli, P.; Hansen, D. F.; Kay, L. E. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2008, 105, 11766.
- (75) Vallurupalli, P.; Hansen, D. F.; Kay, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 2734.
- (76) Solomon, I. Phys. Rev. 1955, 99, 559.
- (77) Kosen, P. A. Methods Enzymol. 1989, 177, 86.

- (78) Iwahara, J.; Schwieters, C. D.; Clore, G. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 5879.
- (79) Schmidt, P. G.; Kuntz, I. D. Biochemistry 1984, 23, 4261.
- (80) Kosen, P. A.; Scheek, R. M.; Naderi, H.; Basus, V. J.; Manogaran, S.; Schmidt, P. G.; Oppenheimer, N. J.; Kuntz, I. D. *Biochemistry* 1986, 25, 2356.
- (81) Battiste, J. L.; Wagner, G. Biochemistry 2000, 39, 5355.
- (82) Gaponenko, V.; Howarth, J. W.; Columbus, L.; Gasmi-Seabrook, G.; Yuan, J.; Hubbell, W. L.; Rosevear, P. R. Protein Sci. 2000, 9, 302.
- (83) Donaldson, L. W.; Skrynnikov, N. R.; Choy, W. Y.; Muhandiram, D. R.; Sarkar, B.; Forman-Kay, J. D.; Kay, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2001, 123, 9843.
- (84) Dvoretsky, A.; Gaponenko, V.; Rosevear, P. R. FEBS Lett. 2002, 528, 189.
- (85) Card, P. B.; Erbel, P. J.; Gardner, K. H. J. Mol. Biol. 2005, 353, 664.
- (86) Gross, J. D.; Moerke, N. J.; von der Haar, T.; Lugovskoy, A. A.; Sachs, A. B.; McCarthy, J. E.; Wagner, G. *Cell* **2003**, *115*, 739.
- (87) Mahoney, N. M.; Rastogi, V. K.; Cahill, S. M.; Girvin, M. E.; Almo, S. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000, 122, 7851.
- (88) Mal, T. K.; Ikura, M.; Kay, L. E. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 14002.
- (89) Rumpel, S.; Becker, S.; Zweckstetter, M. J. Biomol. NMR 2008, 40, 1.
- (90) Jain, N. U.; Venot, A.; Umemoto, K.; Leffler, H.; Prestegard, J. H. Protein Sci. 2001, 10, 2393.
- (91) Johnson, P. E.; Brun, E.; MacKenzie, L. F.; Withers, S. G.; McIntosh, L. P. J. Mol. Biol. 1999, 287, 609.
- (92) Macnaughtan, M. A.; Kamar, M.; Alvarez-Manilla, G.; Venot, A.; Glushka, J.; Pierce, J. M.; Prestegard, J. H. *J. Mol. Biol.* **2007**, *366*, 1266.
- (93) Varani, L.; Gunderson, S. I.; Mattaj, I. W.; Kay, L. E.; Neuhaus, D.; Varani, G. *Nat. Struct. Biol.* **2000**, *7*, 329.
- (94) Iwahara, J.; Anderson, D. E.; Murphy, E. C.; Clore, G. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 6634.
- (95) Ramos, A.; Varani, G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1998, 120, 10992.
- (96) Ueda, T.; Kato, A.; Ogawa, Y.; Torizawa, T.; Kuramitsu, S.; Iwai, S.; Terasawa, H.; Shimada, I. J. Biol. Chem. 2004, 279, 52574.
- (97) Roosild, T. P.; Greenwald, J.; Vega, M.; Castronovo, S.; Riek, R.; Choe, S. Science 2005, 307, 1317.
- (98) Liang, B. Y.; Bushweller, J. H.; Tamm, L. K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006, 128, 4389.
- (99) Bertoncini, C. W.; Jung, Y. S.; Fernandez, C. O.; Hoyer, W.; Griesinger, C.; Jovin, T. M.; Zweckstetter, M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2005, 102, 1430.
- (100) Dedmon, M. M.; Lindorff-Larsen, K.; Christodoulou, J.; Vendruscolo, M.; Dobson, C. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 476.
- (101) Gillespie, J. R.; Shortle, D. J. Mol. Biol. 1997, 268, 170.
- (102) Gillespie, J. R.; Shortle, D. J. Mol. Biol. 1997, 268, 158.
- (103) Kristjansdottir, S.; Lindorff-Larsen, K.; Fieber, W.; Dobson, C. M.; Vendruscolo, M.; Poulsen, F. M. J. Mol. Biol. 2005, 347, 1053.
- (104) Lietzow, M. A.; Jamin, M.; Jane Dyson, H. J.; Wright, P. E. J. Mol. Biol. 2002, 322, 655.
- (105) Marsh, J. A.; Neale, C.; Jack, F. E.; Choy, W. Y.; Lee, A. Y.; Crowhurst, K. A.; Forman-Kay, J. D. *J. Mol. Biol.* **2007**, *367*, 1494.
- (106) Song, J.; Guo, L. W.; Muradov, H.; Artemyev, N. O.; Ruoho, A. E.; Markley, J. L. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **2008**, *105*, 1505.
  (107) Vise, P.; Baral, B.; Stancik, A.; Lowry, D. F.; Daughdrill, G. W.
- (107) Vise, P.; Baral, B.; Stancik, A.; Lowry, D. F.; Daughdrill, G. W. *Proteins* **2007**, *67*, 526.
- (108) Felitsky, D. J.; Lietzow, M. A.; Dyson, H. J.; Wright, P. E. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2008, 105, 6278.
- (109) Cliff, M. J.; Craven, C. J.; Marston, J. P.; Hounslow, A. M.; Clarke, A. R.; Waltho, J. P. J. Mol. Biol. 2009, 385, 266.
- (110) Volkov, A. N.; Worrall, J. A.; Holtzmann, E.; Ubbink, M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2006, 103, 18945.
- (111) Xu, X.; Reinle, W.; Hannemann, F.; Konarev, P. V.; Svergun, D. I.; Bernhardt, R.; Ubbink, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 6395.
- (112) Iwahara, J.; Schwieters, C. D.; Clore, G. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 12800.
- (113) Baker, K. A.; Hilty, C.; Peti, W.; Prince, A.; Pfaffinger, P. J.; Wider, G.; Wüthrich, K.; Choe, S. *Biochemistry* **2006**, *45*, 1663.
- (114) Tang, C.; Schwieters, C. D.; Clore, G. M. *Nature* **2007**, *449*, 1078. (115) Hansen, D. F.; Hass, M. A.; Christensen, H. M.; Ulstrup, J.; Led,
- J. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 6858. (116) Tang, C.; Ghirlando, R.; Clore, G. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 4048.
- (117) Tang, C.; Louis, J. M.; Aniana, A.; Suh, J. Y.; Clore, G. M. Nature 2008, 455, 693.
- (118) Bertini, I.; Luchinat, C.; Parigi, G. Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 2002, 40, 249.
- (119) Bloembergen, N.; Morgan, L. O. J. Chem. Phys. 1961, 34, 842.
- (120) Rubinstein, M.; Baram, A.; Luz, Z. Mol. Phys. 1971, 20, 67.

#### 4138 Chemical Reviews, 2009, Vol. 109, No. 9

- (121) Westlund, P. O. Mol. Phys. 1995, 85, 1165.
- (122) Guéron, M. J. Magn. Reson. 1975, 19, 58.
- (123) Iwahara, J.; Tang, C.; Clore, G. M. J. Magn. Reson. 2007, 184, 185.
- (124) Keizers, P. H.; Desreux, J. F.; Overhand, M.; Ubbink, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2007, 129, 9292.
- (125) Su, X. C.; McAndrew, K.; Huber, T.; Otting, G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 1681.
- (126) Bertini, I.; Del Bianco, C.; Gelis, I.; Katsaros, N.; Luchinat, C.; Parigi,
   G.; Peana, M.; Provenzani, A.; Zoroddu, M. A. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 2004, *101*, 6841.
- (127) Bertini, I.; Gupta, Y. K.; Luchinat, C.; Parigi, G.; Peana, M.; Sgheri, L.; Yuan, J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2007, 129, 12786.
- (128) Hulsker, R.; Baranova, M. V.; Bullerjahn, G. S.; Ubbink, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 1985.
  (129) Ikegami, T.; Verdier, L.; Sakhaii, P.; Grimme, S.; Pescatore, B.;
- (129) Ikegami, T.; Verdier, L.; Sakhaii, P.; Grimme, S.; Pescatore, B.; Saxena, K.; Fiebig, K. M.; Griesinger, C. J. Biomol. NMR 2004, 29, 339.
- (130) Pintacuda, G.; Moshref, A.; Leonchiks, A.; Sharipo, A.; Otting, G. J. Biomol. NMR 2004, 29, 351.
- (131) Vlasie, M. D.; Comuzzi, C.; van den Nieuwendijk, A. M.; Prudencio, M.; Overhand, M.; Ubbink, M. Chemistry 2007, 13, 1715.
- (132) Su, X. C.; Man, B.; Beeren, S.; Liang, H.; Simonsen, S.; Schmitz, C.; Huber, T.; Messerle, B. A.; Otting, G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 10486.
- (133) Barbieri, R.; Bertini, I.; Cavallaro, G.; Lee, Y. M.; Luchinat, C.; Rosato, A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 5581.
- (134) John, M.; Headlam, M. J.; Dixon, N. E.; Otting, G. J. Biomol. NMR 2007, 37, 43.
- (135) Babini, E.; Bertini, I.; Capozzi, F.; Felli, I. C.; Lelli, M.; Luchinat, C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 10496.
- (136) Balayssac, S.; Bertini, I.; Luchinat, C.; Parigi, G.; Piccioli, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006, 128, 15042.
- (137) Bermel, W.; Bertini, I.; Felli, I. C.; Kummerle, R.; Pierattelli, R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 16423.
- (138) Bermel, W.; Bertini, I.; Felli, I. C.; Kummerle, R.; Pierattelli, R. J. Magn. Reson. 2006, 178, 56.
- (139) Bertini, I.; Felli, I. C.; Gonnelli, L.; Pierattelli, R.; Spyranti, Z.; Spyroulias, G. A. J. Biomol. NMR 2006, 36, 111.
- (140) Bertini, I.; Jimenez, B.; Piccioli, M. J. Magn. Reson. 2005, 174, 125.
- (141) Bertini, I.; Jimenez, B.; Pierattelli, R.; Wedd, A. G.; Xiao, Z. Proteins 2008, 70, 1196.
- (142) Caillet-Saguy, C.; Delepierre, M.; Lecroisey, A.; Bertini, I.; Piccioli, M.; Turano, P. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006, 128, 150.
- (143) Boisbouvier, J.; Gans, P.; Blackledge, M.; Brutscher, B.; Marion, D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1999, 121, 7700.
- (144) Pintacuda, G.; Kaikkonen, A.; Otting, G. J. Magn. Reson. 2004, 171, 233.
- (145) Madhu, P. K.; Grandori, R.; Hohenthanner, K.; Mandal, P. K.; Muller, N. J. Biomol. NMR 2001, 20, 31.
- (146) Hus, J. C.; Marion, D.; Blackledge, M. J. Mol. Biol. 2000, 298, 927.
- (147) Lipari, G.; Szabo, A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 4546.

Publication Date (Web): June 12, 2009 | doi: 10.1021/cr900033p

- (148) Brüschweiler, R.; Roux, B.; Blackledge, M.; Griesinger, C.; Karplus, M.; Ernst, R. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1992**, 114, 2289.
- (149) Olejniczak, E. T.; Dobson, C. M.; Karplus, M.; Levy, R. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1984, 106, 1923.
- (150) Benetis, N.; Kowalewski, J. J. Magn. Reson. 1985, 65, 13.
- (151) Woessner, D. E. J. Chem. Phys. 1962, 37, 647.
- (152) McConnell, H. M. J. Chem. Phys. 1958, 28, 430.
- (153) Led, J. J.; Grant, D. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1977, 99, 5845.
- (154) Allerhand, A.; Thiele, E. J. Chem. Phys. 1966, 45, 902.
- (155) Griffith, O. H.; McConnell, H. M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 1966, 55, 8.
- (156) Ogawa, S.; McConnell, H. M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 1967, 58, 19.
- (157) Ebright, Y. W.; Chen, Y.; Pendergrast, P. S.; Ebright, R. H. Biochemistry 1992, 31, 10664.
- (158) Ermacora, M. R.; Delfino, J. M.; Cuenoud, B.; Schepartz, A.; Fox, R. O. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 1992, 89, 6383.
- (159) Keizers, P. H.; Saragliadis, A.; Hiruma, Y.; Overhand, M.; Ubbink, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 14802.
- (160) Hanson, P.; Millhauser, G.; Formaggio, F.; Crisma, M.; Toniolo, C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1996, 118, 7618.
- (161) Milov, A. D.; Tsvetkov, Y. D.; Gorbunova, E. Y.; Mustaeva, L. G.; Ovchinnikova, T. V.; Raap, J. *Biopolymers* 2002, 64, 328.
- (162) Monaco, V.; Formaggio, F.; Crisma, M.; Toniolo, C.; Hanson, P.; Millhauser, G.; George, C.; Deschamps, J. R.; Flippen-Anderson, J. L. *Bioorg. Med. Chem.* **1999**, *7*, 119.
- (163) Monaco, V.; Formaggio, F.; Crisma, M.; Toniolo, C.; Hanson, P.; Millhauser, G. L. *Biopolymers* 1999, 50, 239.
- (164) Shenkarev, Z. O.; Paramonov, A. S.; Balashova, T. A.; Yakimenko, Z. A.; Baru, M. B.; Mustaeva, L. G.; Raap, J.; Ovchinnikova, T. V.; Arseniev, A. S. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* **2004**, *325*, 1099.

- (165) Lindfors, H. E.; de Koning, P. E.; Drijfhout, J. W.; Venezia, B.; Ubbink, M. J. Biomol. NMR 2008, 41, 157.
- (166) Wang, L.; Zhang, Z.; Brock, A.; Schultz, P. G. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **2003**, *100*, 56.
- (167) Jensen, M. R.; Lauritzen, C.; Dahl, S. W.; Pedersen, J.; Led, J. J. *J. Biomol. NMR* **2004**, *29*, 175.
- (168) Wöhnert, J.; Franz, K. J.; Nitz, M.; Imperiali, B.; Schwalbe, H. J. Am. *Chem. Soc.* 2003, *125*, 13338.
   (40) Object of Control
- (169) Chirivino, E.; Giordano, C.; Faini, S.; Cellai, L.; Fragai, M. Chem. Med. Chem. 2007, 2, 1153.
   (170) G. C. D. Li,
- (170) Giordano, C.; Del Bianco, C.; Faini, S.; Napoli, A.; Sindona, G.; Cellai, L. Synthesis—Stuttgart 2004, 1835.
- (171) Dreyer, G. B.; Dervan, P. B. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 1985, 82, 968.
- (172) Braunlin, W. H.; Drakenberg, T.; Nordenskiold, L. *Biopolymers* 1987, 26, 1047.
- (173) Froystein, N. A.; Davis, J. T.; Reid, B. R.; Sletten, E. Acta Chem. Scand. 1993, 47, 649.
- (174) Rai, P.; Cole, T. D.; Wemmer, D. E.; Linn, S. J. Mol. Biol. 2001, 312, 1089.
- (175) Keyes, R. S.; Bobst, A. M. In *Biological Magnetic Resonance*; Berliner, L. J., Ed.; Plenum Press: New York, 1998; Vol. 14.
- (176) Cai, S.; Zhu, L.; Zhang, Z.; Chen, Y. Biochemistry 2007, 46, 4943.
- (177) Qin, P. Z.; Hideg, K.; Feigon, J.; Hubbell, W. L. *Biochemistry* **2003**, 42, 6772.
- (178) Fesik, S. W.; Gemmecker, G.; Olejniczak, E. T.; Petros, A. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1991, 113, 7080.
- (179) Petros, A. M.; Mueller, L.; Kopple, K. D. Biochemistry 1990, 29, 10041.
- (180) Hernandez, G.; Teng, C. L.; Bryant, R. G.; LeMaster, D. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 4463.
- (181) Sakakura, M.; Noba, S.; Luchette, P. A.; Shimada, I.; Prosser, R. S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 5826.
- (182) Pintacuda, G.; Otting, G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 372.
- (183) Likhtenshtein, G. I.; Adin, I.; Novoselsky, A.; Shames, A.; Vaisbuch, I.; Glaser, R. *Biophys. J.* **1999**, *77*, 443.
- (184) Teng, C. L.; Bryant, R. G. J. Magn. Reson. 2006, 179, 199.
- (185) Hilty, C.; Wider, G.; Fernandez, C.; Wüthrich, K. ChemBioChem 2004, 5, 467.
- (186) Kutateladze, T. G.; Capelluto, D. G.; Ferguson, C. G.; Cheever, M. L.; Kutateladze, A. G.; Prestwich, G. D.; Overduin, M. *J. Biol. Chem.* **2004**, *279*, 3050.
- (187) Ollerenshaw, J. E.; Lidar, D. A.; Kay, L. E. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2003**, *91*, 217904.
- (188) Thomas, D. D.; Dalton, L. R.; Hyde, J. S. J. Chem. Phys. 1976, 65, 3006.
- (189) Wien, R. W.; Morrisett, J. D.; McConnell, H. M. Biochemistry 1972, 11, 3707.
- (190) Pearlman, D. A.; Kollman, P. A. J. Mol. Biol. 1991, 220, 457.
- (191) Torda, A. E.; Brunne, R. M.; Huber, T.; Kessler, H.; Vangunsteren, W. F. J. Biomol. NMR **1993**, *3*, 55.
- (192) Torda, A. E.; Scheek, R. M.; Vangunsteren, W. F. Chem. Phys. Lett. 1989, 157, 289.
- (193) Torda, A. E.; Scheek, R. M.; Vangunsteren, W. F. J. Mol. Biol. 1990, 214, 223.
- (194) Bonvin, A. M.; Brunger, A. T. J. Mol. Biol. 1995, 250, 80.
- (195) Bonvin, A. M.; Vis, H.; Breg, J. N.; Burgering, M. J.; Boelens, R.; Kaptein, R. J. Mol. Biol. 1994, 236, 328.
- (196) Brüschweiler, R.; Blackledge, M.; Ernst, R. R. J. Biomol. NMR **1991**, *1*, 3.
- (197) Clore, G. M.; Schwieters, C. D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 2923.
- (198) Clore, G. M.; Schwieters, C. D. Biochemistry 2004, 43, 10678.
- (199) Clore, G. M.; Schwieters, C. D. J. Mol. Biol. 2006, 355, 879.
- (200) Schwieters, C. D.; Clore, G. M. Biochemistry 2007, 46, 1152.
- (201) Schwieters, C. D.; Kuszewski, J. J.; Tjandra, N.; Clore, G. M. J. Magn. Reson. 2003, 160, 65.
- (202) Schwieters, C. D.; Kuszewski, J. J.; Clore, G. M. Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc. 2006, 48, 47.
- (203) Freed, J. H. J. Chem. Phys. 1978, 68, 4034.
- (204) Hwang, L. P.; Freed, J. H. J. Chem. Phys. 1975, 63, 4017.
- (205) Givaty, O.; Levy, Y. J. Mol. Biol. 2009, 385, 1087.
- (206) Winkler, F. K.; Banner, D. W.; Oefner, C.; Tsernoglou, D.; Brown, R. S.; Heathman, S. P.; Bryan, R. K.; Martin, P. D.; Petratos, K.; Wilson, K. S. *EMBO J.* **1993**, *12*, 1781.
- (207) Banerjee, A.; Santos, W. L.; Verdine, G. L. Science 2006, 311, 1153.
- (208) Kalodimos, C. G.; Biris, N.; Bonvin, A. M.; Levandoski, M. M.; Guennuegues, M.; Boelens, R.; Kaptein, R. Science 2004, 305, 386.
- (209) Viadiu, H.; Aggarwal, A. K. Mol. Cell 2000, 5, 889.
- (210) Gewirth, D. T.; Sigler, P. B. Nat. Struct. Biol. 1995, 2, 386.
- (211) Agresti, A.; Bianchi, M. E. Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev. 2003, 13, 170.
- (212) Ohndorf, U. M.; Rould, M. A.; He, Q.; Pabo, C. O.; Lippard, S. J. *Nature* 1999, 399, 708.

- (213) Werner, M. H.; Huth, J. R.; Gronenborn, A. M.; Clore, G. M. Cell 1995, 81, 705.
- (214) Murphy, E. C.; Zhurkin, V. B.; Louis, J. M.; Cornilescu, G.; Clore, G. M. J. Mol. Biol. 2001, 312, 481.
- (215) Fraenkel, E.; Pabo, C. O. Nat. Struct. Biol. 1998, 5, 692.
- (216) Selzer, T.; Albeck, S.; Schreiber, G. Nat. Struct. Biol. 2000, 7, 537.
- (217) Adams, G.; Delbruck, M. In *Structural Chemistry and Molecular Biology*; Rich, A., Davidson, N., Eds.; Freeman & Co.: San Francisco, 1968.
- (218) Deutscher, J.; Francke, C.; Postma, P. W. Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev. 2006, 70, 939.
- (219) Cornilescu, G.; Lee, B. R.; Cornilescu, C. C.; Wang, G.; Peterkofsky, A.; Clore, G. M. J. Biol. Chem. 2002, 277, 42289.
- (220) Schwieters, C. D.; Clore, G. M. J. Magn. Reson. 2001, 152, 288.
- (221) Schwieters, C. D.; Clore, G. M. J. Biomol. NMR 2002, 23, 221.
- (222) Levy, Y.; Wolynes, P. G.; Onuchic, J. N. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2004, 101, 511.
- (223) Nocek, J. M.; Zhou, J. S.; De Forest, S.; Priyadarshy, S.; Beratan, D. N.; Onuchic, J. N.; Hoffman, B. M. *Chem. Rev.* **1996**, *96*, 2459.
- (224) Pelletier, H.; Kraut, J. Science 1992, 258, 1748.
- (225) Kang, S. A.; Marjavaara, P. J.; Crane, B. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 10836.
- (226) Hoffman, B. M.; Celis, L. M.; Cull, D. A.; Patel, A. D.; Seifert, J. L.; Wheeler, K. E.; Wang, J.; Yao, J.; Kurnikov, I. V.; Nocek, J. M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2005, 102, 3564.
- (227) Wlodawer, A.; Vondrasek, J. Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct. 1998, 27, 249.

- (228) Louis, J. M.; Nashed, N. T.; Parris, K. D.; Kimmel, A. R.; Jerina, D. M. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 1994, 91, 7970.
- (229) Louis, J. M.; Wondrak, E. M.; Kimmel, A. R.; Wingfield, P. T.; Nashed, N. T. J. Biol. Chem. 1999, 274, 23437.
- (230) Louis, J. M.; Weber, I. T.; Tozser, J.; Clore, G. M.; Gronenborn, A. M. Adv. Pharmacol. 2000, 49, 111.
- (231) Wondrak, E. M.; Nashed, N. T.; Haber, M. T.; Jerina, D. M.; Louis, J. M. J. Biol. Chem. 1996, 271, 4477.
- (232) Tam, R.; Saier, M. H., Jr. Microbiol. Rev. 1993, 57, 320.
- (233) Sharff, A. J.; Rodseth, L. E.; Spurlino, J. C.; Quiocho, F. A. Biochemistry 1992, 31, 10657.
- (234) Quiocho, F. A.; Spurlino, J. C.; Rodseth, L. E. Structure 1997, 5, 997.
- (235) Evenas, J.; Tugarinov, V.; Skrynnikov, N. R.; Goto, N. K.; Muhandiram, R.; Kay, L. E. J. Mol. Biol. 2001, 309, 961.
- (236) Millet, O.; Hudson, R. P.; Kay, L. E. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2003, 100, 12700.
- (237) Dyson, H. J.; Wright, P. E. Nature Rev. Mol. Cell. Biol. 2005, 6, 197.
- (238) Neri, D.; Billeter, M.; Wider, G.; Wüthrich, K. Science 1992, 257, 1559.
- (239) Hillisch, A.; Lorenz, M.; Diekmann, S. Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol. 2001, 11, 201.
- (240) Altenbach, C.; Kusnetzow, A. K.; Ernst, O. P.; Hofmann, K. P.; Hubbell, W. L. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2008, 105, 7439.
- (241) Klug, C. S.; Feix, J. B. Methods Cell. Biol. 2008, 84, 617.

CR900033P

# Fundamental Concepts of NMR in Paramagnetic Systems Part I: The Isotropic Shift

James D. Satterlee

Department of Chemistry Washington State University Pullman, WA 99164-4630

Received January 19, 1990

A simple model is presented as the basis for explaining the equations that describe the isotropic shift for paramagnetic molecules in solution. The simplest case is that of an axially symmetric molecule for which the Curie Law is valid and for which zero field splitting and second-order Zeeman effects are small. It is used as a point of departure for considering the many underlying factors that affect observation of NMR resonances in paramagnetic molecules.

#### INTRODUCTION

For years, metallobiochemistry and transition-metal chemistry have contributed to the extensive literature on the application of NMR to paramagnetic molecules. More recently, development of paramagnetic contrast-enhancing agents useful in NMR imaging has widened interest in the NMR of paramagnetic molecules (1). Unfortunately, one frequently encounters misuses and misconceptions associated with paramagnetic NMR phenomena. A commonly encountered example is the attribution of the large resonance shifts demonstrated by paramagnetic molecules to the "contact shift." We shall see that the contact contribution to the observed shift is but one of two major factors, and, in fact, in certain systems it may even play a minimal role in the magnitudes of observed shifts.

Additional interest in performing NMR spectroscopy with paramagnetic molecules has recently been fueled by developments in metallobiochemistry and physiology. For example, water soluble paramagnetic shift reagents have opened the door to quantitative studies of cations in intact cells (2, 3). Furthermore, many metalloproteins distributed throughout the biosphere are appropriately paramagnetic (4).

This article is meant to be an introduction to the underlying principles governing NMR shifts in paramagnetic molecules. In Part II, the subject of relaxation in paramagnetic molecules and criteria for successful observation of NMR in paramagnetic molecules will be described. No derivations will be presented. Rather, the goal of this article is to provide a conceptual basis for chemists, physiologists, and medical researchers to understand why paramagnetic molecules can be advantageous, as well as how and why they work. The complexity associated with this task stems from the fact that, from the NMR viewpoint (as opposed to the electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) viewpoint), the most useful paramagnetic species are f-block and d-block transition elements. Consequently a detailed understanding necessitates familiarity with a variety of disparate topics,

including transition-metal chemistry, lanthanide chemistry, factors governing metal ion electronic structures, bulk magnetism, quantum mechanics, operator algebra, perturbation theory, crystal-field and ligand-field theories, as well as both EPR and NMR spectroscopy. Approached abruptly, such a task may be daunting, particularly to medical researchers, since these topics are not normally part of the medical school curriculum.

For the more advanced reader, there are two major treatises (and abundant literature, some of which is cited herein) on NMR in paramagnetic molecules (4, 5). These should be referred to by those desiring complete descriptions of the ideas that will be developed here.

### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The effect of paramagnetic ions upon solution NMR parameters was appreciated soon after the original experimental verification of the NMR phenomenon (6). Early workers realized that the unique manifestations of paramagnetic ions arose from the interaction between unpaired electron magnetic moments and individual nuclear magnetic moments. Initially, quantitation of nuclear relaxation time ratios,  $(T_1/T_2)$ , stimulated development of equations needed to account for the observed paramagnetic effects. Such early experiments were analogous to shift-reagent and relaxation-reagent experiments that might well be carried out today. They were particularly concerned with relaxation time changes for H<sub>2</sub>O, D<sub>2</sub>O, or solutes, caused by the presence of added paramagnetic transition metal ions (7-13). It is interesting to note the more recent applications of transition-metal complexes as imaging contrast agents (1) in work that mimics those early results.

Between 1948 and 1961, several concepts were developed (6-14) that later allowed formulation of a comprehensive theory (21-23) for paramagnetic induced shifts and relaxation. These concepts included the ideas that interactions between unpaired electron magnetic moments and nuclear magnetic moments occur via dipole-dipole (6-8) coupling and Fermi (15) contact coupling (11, 16), and that these electron-nuclear interactions can affect both nuclear relaxation times (6, 12, 14, 16) and observed shifts (7, 8, 9, 10). Particularly relevant to this article (Part I) is the work by McConnell and Holm (9) in which they apparently reported the first intramolecular paramagnetic nuclear (proton) resonance shifts, both in the solid state and in toluene solutions, for a stable intact paramagnetic complex (nickelocene). Furthermore, they established (9) a precedent for interpreting the origin of these shifts, which have come to be known as isotropic shifts. Their work first explicitly associated isotropic shifts with unpaired spin-density delocalization via metal-ligand bonding and is significant for that fact as well. Another important idea that originated before 1961 and is relevant here is that electron spin-lattice relaxation times of metal ions in solution can affect proton NMR relaxation times, and implicitly those of other nuclei as well. As we shall see in Part II, this point is important for deciding which paramagnetic transition metals will provide resolvable spectra, or which will perform more successfully as relaxation reagents.

## **OBSERVED SHIFTS**

For a paramagnetic molecule in solution, the observed (intramolecular) nuclear resonance spectrum arises from both diamagnetic and paramagnetic shifts, given by Eq. [1].

$$(\Delta\nu/\nu)_{observed} = (\Delta\nu/\nu)_{diamagnetic} + (\Delta\nu/\nu)_{paramagnetic}$$
 [1]

The term  $(\Delta\nu/\nu)$  represents the particular shift in ppm, where the numerator  $(\Delta\nu)$  is the frequency difference between the resonance of interest and the frequency of an internal reference, whereas the denominator  $(\nu)$  is the absolute frequency of the spectrometer. The last term is called the isotropic (or sometimes the hyperfine) shift and results from the presence of molecular paramagnetism. From Eq. [1], it should be clear that for a given nucleus in a molecule, the isotropic shift is additive to its "normal" diamagnetic shift.

The general approach to calculating NMR transition energies and frequencies is to use an eigenfunction-eigenvalue equation similar to the Schrödinger equation in which the operator contains all terms that can affect the spin-state energies, and hence the transition, or resonance frequencies (i.e., the observed shifts)(17, 18). This approach is called the Hamiltonian formalism because the

operator in this equation is called the Hamiltonian. Some parts of the Hamiltonian reflect only diamagnetic interactions such as those between nuclear spins and the external field (the Zeeman interaction and chemical shielding) and among the nuclear spins (spin-spin coupling). The remainder of the Hamiltonian contains terms describing the interactions between nuclear spins and the unpaired electrons. These parts represent the paramagnetic effects that occur as a result of the unpaired electron-nucleus interactions. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, it is these parts that give rise to the isotropic shift for a particular nucleus, and it is customary to relabel the paramagnetic term in Eq. [1] as  $(\Delta \nu / \nu)_{isotropic}$ . Properly, if one wishes to analyze only isotropic shifts, then rearrangement of Eq. [1] to Eq. [2] indicates that isotropic shifts are the difference between observed resonance positions in a paramagnetic molecule and resonance positions of corresponding nuclei in an identical diamagnetic molecule.

$$(\Delta \nu / \nu)_{isotropic} = (\Delta \nu / \nu)_{observed} - (\Delta \nu / \nu)_{diamagnetic}$$
 [2]

A practical example of this is demonstrated by Figs. 1 and 2 and Table 1, provided for a paramagnetic bispyridine-tetraphenylporphyrin-Fe<sup>3+</sup> complex.

.



Figure 1. (Left) Structure of tetraphenylporphyrin Fe(III) viewed along the z axis; (Right) the bis(3-methyl)pyridine adduct of tetraphenylporphyrin Fe(III) viewed edge-on with the porphyrin ring structure edited. Free rotation about the pyridine-iron bond occurs.



Figure 2. 100 MHz Proton NMR spectrum of bis(3-methyl)pyridinetetraphenylporphyrin Fe(III) at -60°C in methylene chloride.

TABLE 1Isotropic Shifts (ppm) in Bis(3-methyl)pyridinetetraphenylporphyrin Fe(III) at -60°C

Porphyrin			3-Methylpyridine		
meso-phenyl	pyrrole				
о-Нр-Нт-Н		2,6-H	3-CH,	4-H	
-5.02 -2.06 -0.19	-34.0	-12.9	13.1	18.2	

For those not familiar with this topic, perhaps the most striking feature is the magnitude of the shifts in the proton spectrum (Fig. 2). They extend from 25 ppm to lower shielding to nearly -30 ppm to higher shielding, which is far outside the range of commonly encountered diamagnetic shifts (i.e., -2 to 12 ppm relative to TMS). In fact, the proton shift range of the spectrum shown in Fig. 2 is quite compact considering that observed proton shifts of as much as 150 ppm to both higher and lower shielding from, say TMS, are common for paramagnetic molecules.

With regard to quantifying an isotropic shift, note that the individual isotropic shifts reported in Table 1 are smaller than the observed resonance shifts for each of the corresponding protons found in the spectrum (Fig. 2). Employing the principle described by Eq. [2], a tabulated isotropic shift for a particular proton is the difference between its observed shift in the Fe<sup>3+</sup> (paramagnetic) complex and its shift in a suitable diamagnetic complex such as the diamagnetic tetraphenylporphyrin Ru<sup>2+</sup> complex. Clearly, the more nearly isostructural the paramagnetic complex and its diamagnetic reference compound, the more accurate will be the isotropic shift values so determined. Zinc (II) is another species that forms useful diamagnetic reference complexes.

The molecular symmetry inherent in the complex's physical structure and the arrangement of electrons in the iron ion's d-orbitals, both of which are characteristic of the porphyrin complex shown in Fig. 1, allow for simplified versions of equations that are useful for describing the important factors governing the isotropic shift. Recall that the early paramagnetic NMR work discussed in the previous section suggested that there were two principal interactions between unpaired electrons and nuclei within a molecule. The first of these intramolecular interactions is the dipole-dipole interaction that produces a dipolar contribution to the isotropic shift (see Eq. [3]). This factor represents non-exchange type coupling (i.e., an interaction energy) between electron magnetic moments and nuclear magnetic moments. It is a through-space type of interaction whose derivation commonly assumes that the electron magnetic moments are localized on the metal, and that the nuclear moments are localized on the rest of the molecule (the ligands). This interaction is then treated as originating from spatially discrete point dipoles. The second interaction is called the Fermi contact interaction (15) and is a result of unpaired spin density being transferred off the metal onto the ligands. Thus, the contact term in Eq. [3] relates to the extent of metal-ligand bonding and the precise way in which unpaired spin density appears on ligands. Both sigma and pi orbitals can be involved.

In the case of the ferric porphyrin complex (Fig. 1), these interactions are given by Eqs. [3-5]. Although these equations are strictly valid only under a very limited set of circumstances peculiar to porphyrin complexes like those in Fig. 1, further qualitative consideration of each will provide additional insights about virtually all of the important factors governing isotropic shifts in general.

$$(\Delta \nu / \nu)_{isotropic} = (\Delta \nu / \nu)_{contact} + (\Delta \nu / \nu)_{dipolar}$$
[3]

$$(\Delta \nu / \nu)^{i}_{dipolar} = \frac{\beta^{2} S(S+1)}{9kT} [g_{\mu}^{2} - g_{\perp}^{2}] \frac{\{1 - 3\cos^{2}\theta^{i}\}}{r_{i}^{3}}$$
[4]

$$(\Delta \nu / \nu)_{contact}^{i} = \{A_{con}\}^{i} \frac{\overline{g}\beta S(S+1)}{3g_{n}\hbar kT}$$
[5]

These equations look complicated primarily because they are filled with constants and symbols. The important parts of each will be fully defined in the discussions that follow for each of Eqs. [3-5]. The more advanced (or impatient!) reader may wish to refer immediately to more detailed discussions (4, 5).

Consider first the contact shift term (Eq. [5]). It contains the constant  $A_{con}$ , called the hyperfine coupling constant. This is a coupling constant in the same sense as nuclear spin-spin coupling constants (J values) except that the coupling described by  $A_{con}$  is between an electron and a particular nucleus. Also,  $A_{con}$  is indexed in Eq. [5] to indicate that different nuclei in a molecule may have different hyperfine coupling constants. This means, for example, that in the ferric porphyrin complex (Fig. 1),  $A_{con}$  can be different for the chemically different types of protons represented by the separate resonances shown in the spectrum (Fig. 2). To illustrate these two points, one can refer to the Hamiltonian term (Eq. [6]) from which Eq. [5] is developed.

$$\mathbf{H}' = \mathbf{A}_{con} \mathbf{I} \cdot \mathbf{S}$$
 [6]

Note the similarity of Eq. [6] to the Hamiltonian term for spin-spin coupling  $(JI_1 \cdot I_2)$ . It is simply a scalar coupling between nuclear (I) and electron (S) angular momentum vectors. McConnell and Holm (9) introduced this term for the first time, and one can well understand how their EPR background contributed to this concept because Eq. [6] is part of the complete spin Hamiltonian for an isolated hydrogen atom (17). In that context, the equation developed for  $A_{con}$  (Eq. [7]) shows that for a particular nucleus the magnitude of the hyperfine coupling constant depends upon  $|\Psi^i(0)|^2$ .

$$\{A_{con}\}^{i} = (8\pi/3)g\beta g_{n}\beta_{n}|\Psi^{i}(0)|^{2}$$
<sup>[7]</sup>

This term includes the square of a wavefunction for the  $i^{th}$  nucleus, evaluated at that nucleus (i.e., zero distance from the nucleus), and expresses the probability of finding unpaired spin density at that particular nucleus. Relying on elementary quantum mechanics (18) allows one to conclude that, for  $A_{con}$  to be nonzero, unpaired spin density must appear in an orbital with s character, since only for s-type orbitals is  $|\Psi|^2$  nonzero when evaluated at the nucleus. This is a point to ponder. If unpaired spin density originates in metal ion d-orbitals, how can it show up in a ligand s-orbital? Conceptually, the answer is given by McConnell's (and later Bloembergen's) suggestion that spin density is delocalized from metal-to-ligand orbitals, followed by polarization of bonding electrons (9-11, 16, 17, 19). Of course, unpaired spin density delocalization (when more than one unpaired electron is present on the metal) is much more complicated, and detailed analyses reveal that both metal-to-ligand and ligand-to-metal transfer can, in principle, occur (19).

Perhaps the most important concept that  $A_{con}$  introduces is the fact that extensive metal-ligand covalency, or bonding, must be present in order for spin density to be delocalized. Without bonds between metal and ligands, no spin density transfer could occur;  $A_{con}$  would be zero, and no contact shift would be observed. In such a case, any isotropic shift would arise only from the dipolar (sometimes called pseudocontact) shift described in its simplest form in Eq. [4].

Before considering the dipolar, or pseudocontact, shift equation, some additional comments concerning Eq. [5] are appropriate. Aside from the collection of constants, one finds  $\overline{g}$  (the rotationally averaged electron g-factor),  $\beta$  (the Bohr magneton), and the quantity S(S+1) (where S = total spin angular momentum quantum number). All three of these factors, then, are properties of the metal-centered, unpaired electrons. What this means is that a metal's electronic properties govern the nuclear isotropic shift. In particular, the product  $g\beta$  can be thought of as a proportionality factor relating the free electron magnetic moment ( $\mu_e$ ) and the electron spin angular momentum (S)(17) according to Eq. [8]. Here, g for a free electron is isotropic, i.e., it is a scalar.

$$\mu_e = -g\beta S$$
 [8]

In Eq. [8], g is the free electron g-factor, whose value is 2.002322, and  $\beta = eh/2mc$  (e = electron charge, h = Planck's constant, m = electron rest mass, and c = speed of light). Deviations from this value of g are interpreted as being due to spin-orbit coupling, a phenomenon wherein the electron spin angular momentum and orbital angular momentum do not act independently, but rather as a coupled system (17, 18, 24).

In general,  $\overline{g}$  in Eq. [5] and g in Eq. [8] are not identical. To see why this is the case, one must understand that the common use of g in EPR spectroscopy is to describe anisotropy in the electron distribution in a molecule. Not surprisingly, molecular electron distributions are more frequently anisotropic (since electrons occur in orbitals with distinct spatial orientations) than isotropic (spherically symmetric). Whereas an isotropic distribution can be described by a scalar quantity (i.e., as in Eq. [8]), an anisotropic distribution is best described by a g cast in tensor form (a 3 x 3 array representing g in 3-dimensional space)(17). That is, one can normally expect two or three different g values for a molecule, corresponding to measurements along a set of molecule-centered Cartesian (x, y, z) axes. Here is where molecular symmetry plays a role. For example, in a porphyrin system similar to the one being considered here (Fig. 1), where real site symmetry of the transition metal could be considered to be  $D_{4h}$ , one would find that the two g values corresponding to axes lying in the porphyrin plane  $(g_{xx}, g_{yy})$  were equal, while  $g_{2x}$ , lying along the axial ligand (z) axis, would be different. In this case, two numerically different g values occur, and these are called  $g_1$  and  $g_{\parallel}$  (e.g., Eq. [4]). In more highly anisotropic systems, three different g values occur, such as demonstrated by NO<sub>2</sub> trapped in crystals (20). So, for Eq. [5] to be valid, an isotropic g value is required, or an approximation is used that involves averaging g values.

From this discussion, one can see that qualitatively Eqs. [4] and [5] have both  $\beta S(S+1)$  and gfactor terms in common. Therefore, they predict that, all other things being equal, larger isotropic shifts will be displayed by molecules with larger numbers of unpaired electrons (larger values of S). This idea is somewhat naive, but leads to another qualitatively useful idea that, all other things being equal, the larger the magnetic moment, the larger will be the isotropic shift. It is easy to see, therefore, that isotropic shifts are generated by the large hyperfine fields that occur at the nucleus via electron-nuclear interactions. These hyperfine fields are the result of unpaired electron magnetic moments centered on the metal.

The dipolar, or pseudocontact, shift equation (Eq. [4]) results from considering the interaction of two point dipoles for which the Hamiltonian term is given by Eq. [9] (where, as before, the subscript n refers to nuclear constants, and  $\mathbf{r}$  is the vector between the electron magnetic moment (S) and the nuclear magnetic moment (I)).

$$\mathbf{H}^{\prime\prime} = -g\beta g_n \beta_n \left[ \frac{\mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{S}}{\mathbf{r}^3} - \frac{3(\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{r})(\mathbf{I} \cdot \mathbf{r})}{\mathbf{r}^5} \right]$$
[9]

Practically,  $\mathbf{r}$  is the metal-nucleus distance, generally determined by structural analysis or estimated by computer modelling. Therefore, the interaction between nuclear and electron magnetic moments via this mechanism is analogous to the classical interaction between two bar magnets. There is an angular dependence to the interaction energy of two bar magnets. It should not be surprising that the dipolar shift equation contains an angular function as well. In Eq. [4],  $\theta$  refers to the angle between  $\mathbf{r}$  and the principal axis of quantization, or highest order symmetry axis, as illustrated in Fig. 3. For the molecule illustrated in Fig. 1, this would be (to a first approximation) the vertical



Figure 3. Definition of factors in the dipolar shift equation for an axially symmetric molecule, using metal-centered Cartesian coordinates: M represents the metal, H represents a remote proton,  $\mathbf{r}$  is the metal-proton distance vector.

pyridine-Fe-pyridine axis. When a molecule exhibits lower than axial symmetry, more complicated g-factor and angular (geometric factor) functions are required.

The  $(1 - 3\cos^2\theta)/r^3$  term is frequently referred to as the "geometric factor." The numerator becomes zero when  $\theta = 54.7$ , the so-called "magic angle." Nuclei lying anywhere on the spatial cones described by this angle (Fig. 4) experience no dipolar shift. Furthermore, dipolar shifts are



Figure 4. Magic angle cones for an axially symmetric molecule in which the molecule-centered z axis is the principal axis.

of opposite signs for identical nuclei lying on opposite sides of the cone. For example, if a proton lying inside the cone experiences a deshielding dipolar shift, a proton lying outside the cone experiences a shielding, and vice versa. In the case of the molecule shown in Fig. 1, this means that the protons of the coordinated pyridines will demonstrate an opposite dipolar shift compared to the protons of the porphyrin. The relative directions of these shifts obviously depend upon the sign of the magnetic anisotropy, represented by the g-factor term in Eq. [4], and that depends upon the relative magnitudes of  $g_{\perp}$  and  $g_{\parallel}$ .

The form of Eq. [4] suggests that the magnitude of a dipolar shift depends upon the magnitudes of the g anisotropy (term 2), the geometric factor (term 3), and the distance of a nucleus from the metal (expressed as  $r^3$ ). Equation [4] thus predicts that the largest dipolar shifts should occur for nuclei that have the largest geometric factor, that are closest to a metal, and that have the largest g anisotropy.

Finally, both the contact and dipolar equations explicitly contain temperature in the denominator, thereby indicating that isotropic shifts are temperature-dependent. This is illustrated in Fig. 5, for



Figure 5. Proton Curie plot for the spectrum shown in Fig. 2.

the complex pictured in Fig. 1, with the observed spectrum shown in Fig. 2. It is obvious from Fig. 5 that large temperature dependencies are possible, which makes temperature an important experimental parameter. Molecules, for which the Curie Law approximation holds (see next section), exhibit linear plots of shift vs. T.<sup>1</sup> Curvature in such "Curie plots" indicates the basic oversimplification of Eqs. [4] and [5] and the need to incorporate additional features, such as the second-order Zeeman interaction (see below), into the description.

## QUALIFICATIONS

Earlier it was stated that Eqs. [4] and [5] were derived using certain restrictive assumptions. Chief among these is the assumption that the magnetic susceptibility (which is proportional to the magnetic moment) obeys the Curie Law (Eq. [10]).

$$x_{ii} = C/T = \frac{g_{ii}\beta^2 S(S+1)}{3kT}$$
 [10]

In this case,  $x_{ii}$  refers to a principal component of the magnetic susceptibility tensor, C is called the Curie constant, and the other symbols have their previous definitions. In the development of Eqs. [4] and [5] from Eqs. [9] and [6], respectively, the general theory (21, 23) involves terms in  $x_{xx}$ ,  $x_{yy}$ , and  $x_{zz}$ . By substituting the right-hand side of Eq. [10] for the susceptibility, those equations are brought into the simple forms shown in Eqs. [4] and [5]. Application of Eq. [10] is strictly valid only for a single unpaired spin for which the coupling of electron spin (S) and orbital (L) angular momenta is small. In fact, spin-orbit coupling is sizeable for heavier transition elements and becomes even larger than ligand field effects for the lanthanides and actinides. In the lanthanide shift reagents, for example, the spin-orbit coupling is so effective that Eq. [10] must be modified by employing J(J+1), where J = L+S, rather than S(S+1). When J is a good quantum number for a system, then the Landé g-factor,  $g_J$ , is also employed, rather than the free-electron g term.

A related issue of particular relevance to lanthanides is the second-order Zeeman (SOZ) interaction. This refers to the second term in Van Vlcck's (25) expression for the magnetic susceptibility. It contains a matrix element that mixes ground and excited electronic states of a metal ion via spin and orbital operators. Thus, it accounts for thermal population of more than the electronic orbital configuration described by the orbital ground "term symbol." Equations [4] and [5], in the form presented, require the assumption that only the orbital ground state is populated, meaning that the SOZ is negligible. Furthermore, it is assumed that only a single Kramers' doublet (17) is populated. In this case, the term Kramers' doublet refers to a special situation that occurs for molecules with odd numbers of unpaired electrons. For the low-spin  $d^3$  ferric-porphyrin with a single unpaired electron ( $S = \frac{1}{2}$ ), a single two-fold spin degeneracy (the doublet) occurs in the absence of an applied field, corresponding to the two allowed electron spin orientations,  $+\frac{1}{2}$  and  $-\frac{1}{2}$ . This is represented by the spin multiplicity, 2S+1, being equal to 2 (a doublet). In the absence of a field, both spins have equal energy. The doubly degenerate electron spin level is then written as  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$  (the Kramers' doublet). Of course, when a field is applied, these two spin levels have different energies and an EPR spectrum may, in principle, be observed. Molecules with odd numbers of electrons frequently occur, particularly for transition-metal ions. When more than one unpaired electron occurs ( $S > \frac{1}{2}$ ), account must be taken of the fact that, in such cases, several Kramers' doublets may be populated, (i.e.,  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$ ;  $\pm \frac{3}{2}$ ;  $\pm \frac{5}{2}$ ; et cetera).

## CONCLUSION

The goal of this essay has been to introduce the novice to the basic equations and factors needed to understand and interpret isotropic NMR shifts. A simple example, an axially symmetric ferric porphyrin complex, has been used as a basis for this discourse. However, it should be possible for the reader to conclude that the practical analysis of isotropic shifts can frequently be very complicated, because of the variety of metal ions, the multitude of possible metal oxidation and spin states, and the many possible physical structures that are a result of ligands complexing the free ions.

A case in point is provided by the lanthanide shift reagents. A variety of studies have consistently shown that the lanthanides exhibit varying abilities for inducing shifts on substrates (2, 3, 30, 31). Results collected for the lanthanide series show that some of these shift reagents lead to shielding, some induce deshielding, and some induce virtually no shift at all. It is generally assumed that all lanthanide shift reagents act similarly. A typical experiment aimed at resolving overlapping peaks in the spectrum of a molecule of interest (the substrate) involves adding a soluble lanthanide complex. In general, the concentration of the shift reagent is kept much lower than the substrate concentration, and the substrate is considered to be in rapid exchange so that only a small fraction of the total substrate molecules is associated with the shift reagent at any given time. The observed induced shifts for the substrate, then, arise from the population-weighted average of the complexed (to the shift reagent) vs. free forms. Clearly, the magnitude of induced shift for the substrate increases with increasing lanthanide complex concentration. It has become evident from a number of studies that the induced shifts for the substrates (primarily for proton spectroscopy) are predominantly dipolar in origin. The reader should, by now, be able to predict that lanthanide ion complexes should exhibit variable abilities as spectra-resolving shift reagents because of variations in an assortment of related properties, including magnetic anisotropy, orbital ground state, the symmetry of the complex, and varying temperature.

However, it is also true that in favorable cases, much detailed information concerning bonding and electronic structure can be obtained from analysis of isotropic shift patterns (19, 26, 27). This is particularly true for small molecules, some of which can be constructed to mimic the immediate environment of metal ions in biological systems, making valid conclusions drawn from the models useful in interpreting data for the much more complicated biological structures.

NMR in paramagnetic molecules encompasses an extensive literature. It is particularly fortunate that the Specialist Periodical Reports on Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy (published by the Chemical Society) provides a yearly compendium in this area. Some flavor of the extent of this field has been described in this article. Isotropic shifts are only one aspect of this field, and in Part II, electron and nuclear relaxation will be described.

# REFERENCES

- R. C. Brasch, "Contrast Media," Clinical Magnetic Resonance Imaging, Radiology Research and Education Foundation, San Francisco, 1983, 291-302; U. Schmiedl, M. Ogan, H. Paaganen, M. Marotti, L. E. Crooks, A. C. Brito, R. C. Brasch, "Albumin Labelled with Gd-DTPA as an Intravascular, Blood-Pool Enhancing Agent for MR Imaging: Biodistribution and Imaging Studies," Radiology, 1987, 162, 205-210.
- 2. M. M. Pike, J. C. Frazer, D. F. Dedrick, J. S. Ingwall, P. D. Allen, C. S. Springer Jr., T. W. Smith, "<sup>23</sup>Na and <sup>39</sup>K NMR Studies of Perfused Rat Hearts," *Biophys. J.*, 1985, 48, 159-173.
- 3. M. M. Pike, E. T. Fossell, T. W. Smith, C. S. Springer Jr., "High Resolution <sup>23</sup>Na NMR Studies of Human Erythrocytes: Use of Aqueous Shift Reagents," Am. J. Physiol., 1984, 246, C528-C536.
- 4. I. Bertini and C. Luchinat, NMR of Paramagnetic Molecules in Biological Systems, Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, CA, 1986.
- 5. G. N. La Mar, In NMR of Paramagnetic Molecules, W. De W. Horrocks, Jr., R. H. Holm, Eds., Academic, New York, 1973.
- 6. N. Bloembergen, E. M. Purcell, R. V. Pound, "Relaxation Effects in Nuclear Resonance Absorption," Phys. Rev., 1948, 73, 679-712.
- 7. N. Bloembergen and W. C. Dickinson, "On the Shift of the Nuclear Magnetic Resonance in Paramagnetic Solutions," *Phys. Rev*, 1950, 79, 179-180.
- 8. W. C. Dickinson, "The Time Average Magnetic Field at the Nucleus in Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Experiments," Phys. Rev., 1951, 81, 717-731.

- H. M. McConnell and C. H. Holm, "Proton Resonance Shifts in Nickelocene," J. Chem. Phys., 1957, 26, 324-315.
- 10. H. M. McConnell and R. E. Robertson, "Isotropic Nuclear Resonance Shifts," J. Chem. Phys., 1958, 29, 1361-1365.
- 11. H. M. McConnell and D. B. Chesnut, "Theory of Isotropic Hyperfine Interactions in pi-Electron Radicals," J. Chem. Phys., 1958, 28, 107-117; ibid 28, 991-992.
- R. A. Bernheim, T. H. Brown, H. S. Gutowsky, D. E. Woessner, "Temperature Dependence of Proton Relaxation Times in Aqueous Solutions of Paramagnetic Ions," J. Chem. Phys., 1959, 30, 950-956.
- 13. N. Bloembergen and L. O. Morgan, "Proton Relaxation Times in Paramagnetic Solutions. Effects of Electron Spin Relaxation," J. Chem. Phys., 1961, 34, 842-850.
- 14. I. Solomon, "Relaxation Processes in a System of Two Spins," Phys. Rev., 1955, 99, 559-565.
- 15. E. Fermi, "Uber die Magnetischen Momente der Atomkerne," Z. Physik., 1930, 60, 320-333.
- N. Bloembergen, "Proton Relaxation Times in Paramagnetic Solutions," J. Chem. Phys., 1955, 27, 572-573.
- 17. A. Carrington, A. D. McLachlan, Introduction to Magnetic Resonance, Harper and Row, New York, 1967.
- I. N. Levine, Quantum Chemistry (3rd edition), Allyn and Bacon, Newton, MA, 1983, ch. 11; M. W. Hanna, Quantum Mechanics in Chemistry, Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park, CA, 1969.
- 19. G. N. La Mar, "Spin Delocalization and Electronic Structure," in Ref. 5, 1973, 85-126.
- 20. J. B. Brailsford and J. R. Morton, "Paramagnetic Resonance Spectra of NO<sub>2</sub> Trapped in Alkali Halides," J. Mag. Res., 1969, 1, 575-583.
- 21. J. P. Jesson, "The Paramagnetic Shift," in Ref. 5, 1973, 1-83.
- 22. J. P. Jesson, "Theory of Isotropic Nuclear Resonance Shifts in Octahedral Co<sup>2+</sup> Systems," J. Chem. Phys., 1967, 47, 579-581.
- 23. R. J. Kurland and B. R. McGarvey, "Isotropic NMR Shifts in Transition Metal Complexes: The Calculation of Fermi Contact and Pseudocontact Terms," J. Mag. Res., 1970, 2, 286-230.
- 24. H. L. Schlafer and G. Gliemann, Basic Principles of Ligand Field Theory, Wiley Interscience, London, 1969.
- 25. J. H. Van Vleck, The Theory of Electric and Magnetic Susceptibilities, Oxford University Press, London, 1932.
- J. D. Satterlee and G. N. La Mar, "A Proton NMR Study of Imidazole-Iron Bonding in Low-Spin Ferric Complexes with Synthetic Porphyrins," J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1976, 98, 2804-2808.
- 27. G. N. La Mar and F. Ann Walker, In "NMR of Paramagnetic Metalloporphyrins," The Porphyrins, D. Dolphin, Ed., Academic, New York, 1979, IV, 61-157.
- 28. J. D. Satterlee, In "NMR Spectroscopy of Paramagnetic Haem Proteins," Ann. Repts. NMR Spectrosc., G. A. Webb, Ed., Academic, London, 17, 79-178.
- 29. C. Ho and J. M. Russu, "Proton NMR Investigation of Hemoglobins," Meth. Enzymol., 1981, 76, 275-312.

- 30. R. E. Lenkinski, In "Lanthanide Complexes of Peptides and Proteins," Biol. Mag. Res., L. J. Berliner, J. Reuben, Eds., Plenum, New York, 1984, 4, 23-72.
- 31. T. J. Wenzel, NMR Shift Reagents, CRC, Florida, 1987.