



# Structural investigations into a new polymorph of F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ: towards enhanced semiconductor properties

Natalie T. Johnson, Michael R. Probert and Paul G. Waddell\*

Chemistry, School of Natural and Environmental Sciences, Newcastle University, Bedson Building, Edward's Walk, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK. \*Correspondence e-mail: paul.waddell@ncl.ac.uk

Received 6 April 2021

Accepted 17 June 2021

Edited by A. Lemmerer, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa

**Keywords:** polymorphism; F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ; charge transfer; pairwise interaction energies; crystal structure; semiconductor; quinodimethane.

**CCDC references:** 2090530; 2090529; 2090528

**Supporting information:** this article has supporting information at journals.iucr.org/c


During the course of research into the structure of 2,3,5,6-tetrafluoro-7,7,8,8-tetracyanoquinodimethane (F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ), C<sub>12</sub>F<sub>4</sub>N<sub>4</sub>, an important compound in charge-transfer and organic semiconductor research, a previously unreported polymorph of F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ was grown concomitantly with the known polymorph from a saturated solution of dichloromethane. The structure was elucidated using single-crystal X-ray diffraction and it was found that the new polymorph packs with molecules in parallel layers, in a similar manner to the layered structure of F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ. The structure was analysed using Hirshfeld surface analysis, fingerprint plots and pairwise interaction energies, and compared to existing data. The structure of a toluene solvate of F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ is also reported.


## 1. Introduction

2,3,5,6-Tetrafluoro-7,7,8,8-tetracyanoquinodimethane (F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ; Fig. 1) was first characterized using X-ray crystallography by Emge *et al.* (1981) [Cambridge Structural Database (CSD; Version 5.41 of November 2019; Groom *et al.*, 2016) refcode BAKPAE] and has been reported as both a homomolecular structure (BAKPAE01–03; Krupskaya *et al.*, 2015; Salzillo *et al.*, 2016; Shukla *et al.*, 2019) and the cofomer in various cocrystals, with 229 instances of such cocrystals in the CSD. F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ is of particular interest to materials scientists given its high electron affinity (Gao & Kahn, 2001) and stable anionic form, which make it suitable for use as a p-type dopant for a range of semiconductors (Gao & Kahn, 2001; Pingel *et al.*, 2012; Cochran *et al.*, 2014). These properties have also given rise to the use of F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ as an electron acceptor in charge-transfer complexes (Sutton *et al.*, 2016; Hu *et al.*, 2017; Fujii & Yamakado, 2018).

The family of F<sub>*n*</sub>TCNQ compounds (*n* = 0, 2, 4) was identified as an important series of molecules for the understanding of electron transport in crystals, due to the differences in electronic properties across the series of similar molecules (Krupskaya *et al.*, 2015). While F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ (*n* = 4) and TCNQ (*n* = 0) were found to have low electron mobility (0.1 and 0.2 cm<sup>2</sup> V<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> at room temperature, respectively), F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ (2,5-difluoro-7,7,8,8-tetracyanoquinodimethane, C<sub>12</sub>H<sub>2</sub>F<sub>2</sub>N<sub>4</sub>; Fig. 1) was found to have a much higher electron mobility of 6–7 cm<sup>2</sup> V<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> at room temperature (and up to 25 cm<sup>2</sup> V<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> at 150 K). Band-like electron transport, where the electron mobility increases upon lowering the temperature, has been observed in F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ but not in the other compounds.

Krupskaya *et al.* (2015) postulated that the difference in the crystal structures of the compounds could be the cause of the difference in electron mobility across the F<sub>*n*</sub>TCNQ family.





**Figure 1**  
The structure of  $F_n$ TCNQ, where  $X = \text{H}$  for  $F_2$ TCNQ and  $X = \text{F}$  for 2,3,5,6-tetrafluoro-7,7,8,8-tetracyanoquinodimethane ( $F_4$ TCNQ)

Solid-state structure is extremely important for electron mobility (Wang *et al.*, 2012; Coropceanu *et al.*, 2007) and  $F_2$ TCNQ has a markedly different structure to the other members of the family. In  $F_2$ TCNQ (BERZON03; Krupskaya *et al.*, 2015), the molecules pack in a layered structure with molecules in adjacent (010) layers coplanar with each other (Fig. 2). This is different to that of the reported structure of  $F_4$ TCNQ (BAKPAE03; Shukla *et al.*, 2019), where the molecules are packed in a herringbone manner (Fig. 3).

Further study of this family of compounds also attributed the high electron mobility of  $F_2$ TCNQ to its crystal structure (Chernyshov *et al.*, 2017; Sosorev, 2017; Ji *et al.*, 2018; Sosorev *et al.*, 2018). According to these studies, electron motility in the solid state is affected by the number of molecules in the reduced unit cell of the crystal structure, with lower values prohibiting intermolecular vibrations according to the rigid molecule approximation (Sosorev *et al.*, 2019). The absence of these modes results in a weakening of the electron–phonon interaction; a smaller electron–phonon interaction can indicate a lesser degree of charge localization in the structure, and hence greater electron mobility (Chernyshov *et al.*, 2017). As  $F_2$ TCNQ crystallizes with one molecule in its reduced unit cell (compared to two and four molecules in those of TCNQ and  $F_4$ TCNQ), it can be expected to exhibit greater electron motility as a result.

Raman spectroscopy has been used to investigate electron–phonon interactions in the crystal structure, where charge mobility has been shown to be related to the value of the lowest vibrational frequency mode (Fratini *et al.*, 2016). The lowest vibrational mode for  $F_2$ TCNQ was found to be almost

double the values for TCNQ and  $F_4$ TCNQ (polymorph I) (Chernyshov *et al.*, 2017; Sosorev *et al.*, 2018). Theoretical calculations have shown  $F_2$ TCNQ to have a three-dimensional charge carrier network (Ji *et al.*, 2018; Sosorev, 2017), which is attributed to its high charge mobility and band-like electron transport, while for  $F_4$ TCNQ and TCNQ, the charge mobility is hindered by the molecular structure and strong thermal disorder.


In the process of growing high-quality single crystals of  $F_4$ TCNQ, an additional polymorph of  $F_4$ TCNQ (polymorph II) was found that exhibits a layered structure similar to the structure of  $F_2$ TCNQ. The structure of this new polymorph was measured using single-crystal X-ray diffraction and compared to the known structures of  $F_4$ TCNQ using Hirshfeld surface analysis, fingerprint plots and pairwise interaction energies. The structure is also compared to the previously published structure of  $F_2$ TCNQ (BERZON03; Krupskaya *et al.*, 2015), as the data were measured at 100 K, the same temperature as the  $F_4$ TCNQ studies reported herein. When crystallized from toluene, a toluene– $F_4$ TCNQ solvate was obtained, the structure of which is also presented.

## 2. Experimental

### 2.1. Crystallization

$F_4$ TCNQ was purchased from Apollo Scientific as a solid with 97% purity and was used without further purification. Crystals suitable for single-crystal X-ray diffraction were grown *via* slow evaporation of the solvent from solutions of the compound in acetonitrile, dichloromethane (DCM) and toluene. All crystal formation took place within 24–48 h.

The crystals of  $F_4$ TCNQ grown from saturated solutions of both acetonitrile and DCM were found to be homomolecular. Crystallization from acetonitrile yielded only crystals of the previously reported structure (polymorph I), which form as yellow crystals with a regular block-like morphology, whereas in DCM, single crystals exhibiting two different morphologies were observed to form concomitantly, *i.e.* cubic crystals of polymorph I alongside octahedral crystals (Fig. 4). The octahedral crystals are the same yellow colour as those of poly-



**Figure 2**  
The structure of  $F_2$ TCNQ (CSD refcode BERZON03; Krupskaya *et al.*, 2015) highlighting the relationship between molecules in adjacent layers.

**Table 1**  
Experimental details.

	F <sub>4</sub> TCNQ polymorph I	F <sub>4</sub> TCNQ polymorph II	F <sub>4</sub> TCNQ–toluene solvate
Crystal data			
Chemical formula	C <sub>12</sub> F <sub>4</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	C <sub>12</sub> F <sub>4</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	C <sub>12</sub> F <sub>4</sub> N <sub>4</sub> ·C <sub>7</sub> H <sub>8</sub>
<i>M<sub>r</sub></i>	276.16	276.16	368.29
Crystal system, space group	Orthorhombic, <i>Pbca</i>	Orthorhombic, <i>Pnmm</i>	Monoclinic, <i>P2<sub>1</sub>/c</i>
Temperature (K)	100	100	150
<i>a</i> , <i>b</i> , <i>c</i> (Å)	9.1799 (3), 8.0482 (3), 14.5541 (5)	7.5140 (4), 11.6787 (6), 5.9347 (3)	8.1314 (2), 7.4141 (2), 13.6796 (4)
$\alpha$ , $\beta$ , $\gamma$ (°)	90, 90, 90	90, 90, 90	90, 100.551 (3), 90
<i>V</i> (Å <sup>3</sup> )	1075.28 (6)	520.79 (5)	810.76 (4)
<i>Z</i>	4	2	2
Radiation type	Ag <i>K</i> $\alpha$ , $\lambda$ = 0.56086 Å	Ag <i>K</i> $\alpha$ , $\lambda$ = 0.56086 Å	Cu <i>K</i> $\alpha$
$\mu$ (mm <sup>-1</sup> )	0.09	0.10	1.09
Crystal size (mm)	0.28 × 0.22 × 0.16	0.3 × 0.17 × 0.12	0.41 × 0.05 × 0.03
Data collection			
Diffractometer	Bruker Photon II CPAD	Bruker Photon II CPAD	Rigaku OD Xcalibur Atlas Gemini ultra
Absorption correction	Numerical ( <i>SADABS</i> ; Bruker, 2016)	Numerical ( <i>SADABS</i> ; Bruker, 2016)	Analytical [ <i>CrysAlis PRO</i> (Rigaku OD, 2015), based on expressions derived by Clark & Reid (1995)]
<i>T<sub>min</sub></i> , <i>T<sub>max</sub></i>	0.919, 0.982	0.931, 0.974	0.806, 0.975
No. of measured, independent and observed [ <i>I</i> > 2 $\sigma$ ( <i>I</i> )] reflections	189710, 5103, 4271	115983, 2628, 2285	10970, 1433, 1194
<i>R<sub>int</sub></i>	0.043	0.043	0.045
( <i>sin</i> $\theta$ / $\lambda$ ) <sub>max</sub> (Å <sup>-1</sup> )	1.043	1.043	0.597
Refinement			
<i>R</i> [ <i>F</i> <sup>2</sup> > 2 $\sigma$ ( <i>F</i> <sup>2</sup> )], <i>wR</i> ( <i>F</i> <sup>2</sup> ), <i>S</i>	0.034, 0.115, 1.09	0.031, 0.111, 1.07	0.039, 0.109, 1.08
No. of reflections	5103	2628	1433
No. of parameters	91	61	155
No. of restraints	0	0	161
H-atom treatment	–	–	H-atom parameters constrained
$\Delta\rho_{\max}$ , $\Delta\rho_{\min}$ (e Å <sup>-3</sup> )	0.75, –0.33	0.77, –0.26	0.44, –0.21

Computer programs: *APEX2* (Bruker, 2009), *CrysAlis PRO* (Rigaku OD, 2015), *SAINT* (Bruker, 2009), *SHELXT* (Sheldrick, 2015a), *SHELXL2014* (Sheldrick, 2015b), *OLEX2* (Dolomanov *et al.*, 2009) and *XPREF* (Bruker, 2009).

morph I but yield a drastically different crystal structure (polymorph II).


F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ crystallizes from toluene as a toluene–F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ solvate in the form of red needles.

## 2.2. Data collection

Crystals of polymorphs I and II and the toluene solvate were analysed using single-crystal X-ray diffraction. The crystal of polymorph I selected was grown from a saturated solution of acetonitrile, which produced larger and more


abundant crystals of this polymorph than were observed in similar DCM solutions. Although the structure of polymorph I has been elucidated previously at 100 K (Shukla *et al.*, 2019), the structure was redetermined in a manner more consistent with the data collection for polymorph II to allow for a more direct comparison between the two structures.

Crystals of polymorphs I and II were cooled slowly to 100 K at a rate of 1 K min<sup>-1</sup> using an Oxford Cryosystems N<sub>2</sub> cryostream cooler on a Bruker D8 Venture diffractometer. X-rays were generated using an Incoatec  $\mu$ S 3.0 Ag source (Ag *K* $\alpha$ ,  $\lambda$  = 0.56086 Å). The data collected were prone to



**Figure 3**

The structure of F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ polymorph I, highlighting the relationship between molecules in adjacent layers (left) and the herringbone arrangement of molecules along [100] (right).



**Figure 4**  
A crystal of  $F_4TCNQ$  polymorph I as mounted on the diffractometer (left). The octahedral crystal of  $F_4TCNQ$  polymorph II (right).

white radiation contamination (as described in Storm *et al.*, 2004); therefore, a 150  $\mu\text{m}$  aluminium filter was included to remove this white radiation before the beam impinging on the sample (Macchi *et al.*, 2011). The diffraction pattern was measured on a Photon II CPAD detector using the shutterless operation mode with a sample-to-detector distance of 65 mm.

A crystal of  $F_4TCNQ$ -toluene was measured using Cu radiation ( $\text{Cu } K\alpha$ ,  $\lambda = 1.54184 \text{ \AA}$ ) at 150 K on a Rigaku Oxford Diffraction Xcalibur Atlas Gemini diffractometer equipped with an Oxford Cryosystems  $N_2$  open-flow cooling device.

### 2.3. Refinement

Crystal data, data collection and structure refinement details are summarized in Table 1. H atoms were placed with idealized geometry, with  $U_{\text{iso}}(\text{H})$  values constrained to be an appropriate multiple of the  $U_{\text{eq}}$  value of the parent atom. In the toluene solvent structure of  $F_4TCNQ$ , the toluene molecule has been modelled as disordered over two sites across a centre of symmetry. The occupancies of the two parts were constrained to be 0.5 and the atomic displacement parameters were restrained. The geometry of the toluene molecule was also restrained.


## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1. Comparison of $F_4TCNQ$ polymorphs

Table 1 shows a summary of the experimental details for the crystallographic data from polymorphs I and II and the toluene solvate. Both forms of  $F_4TCNQ$  are very stable under ambient conditions; over a period of six months, no inter-conversion was observed between forms. Both polymorphs crystallize in the orthorhombic crystal system and centrosymmetric space groups. The atoms in  $F_4TCNQ$  in polymorph II sit on special positions in the unit cell, effectively a horizontal mirror plane, thereby halving the number of atoms in the asymmetric unit relative to polymorph I.

The molecular geometry of  $F_4TCNQ$  is almost identical in polymorphs I and II (with no statistically different bond lengths or angles). This is unsurprising owing to the planarity and conformational inflexibility of  $F_4TCNQ$  that is due to the high degree of conjugation within the molecule. However, despite their similar molecular structures, the packing of the molecules in the two crystal structures is markedly different.


The  $F_4TCNQ$  molecules in polymorph II are arranged to form layers coplanar with the crystallographic [001] plane and,



**Figure 5**  
View down the [100] (top) and [001] (bottom) crystallographic planes of  $F_4TCNQ$  polymorph II.

as a result, the molecules in each layer are arranged coplanar to those in adjacent layers (Fig. 5) at a coplanar distance of *ca* 2.98  $\text{\AA}$ . Within a layer, the molecules are related by crystallographic translations in the [100] and [010] directions. The orientation of the molecules in adjacent layers alternates with respect to the previous layer in a manner consistent with the symmetry of the *n*-glides in the [101] and [011] directions.

Layers of molecules can also be seen in polymorph I, but the molecules are not arranged coplanar to each other. In this case, the molecules within the structure can be described as packing in a herringbone pattern, as illustrated in Fig. 3, an alternative view of the crystal structure along the [011] plane.



**Figure 6**  
A view of polymorph I with adjacent layers visible in the [100] direction.




Figure 7  
Hirshfeld surface calculated for a molecule of  $F_4TCNQ$  in polymorph II.




Figure 8  
Hirshfeld surface of polymorph II, showing close contacts between atoms in adjacent layers, with adjacent molecules shown.

Adjacent molecules, drawn using a wireframe model, are also arranged in a herringbone formation, but at  $90^\circ$  to the herringbone chain highlighted in the figure. Along the [100]

direction in Fig. 6, molecules are arranged in alternating orientations, which also form a herringbone motif.

### 3.2. Hirshfeld surfaces

Hirshfeld surfaces were calculated for the two polymorphs (Spackman & Jayatilaka, 2009; McKinnon *et al.*, 2007). The normalized distance ( $d_{\text{norm}}$ ) between the closest external and internal atoms to any point on the surface is represented by the colour on the surface. A pair of atoms with  $d_{\text{norm}}$  less than the van der Waals radius of the atoms is shown in red and could indicate a close contact between those two atoms. These close contacts are important as they could indicate favourable interactions within the crystal, which could direct the packing of the molecules in the structure or influence the properties of the crystal (Bernstein, 1993).

The surface for polymorph II (Fig. 7) indicates that the majority of close contacts occur between molecules in adjacent layers. These occur in two different motifs: motif 1 between pairs of  $C \cdots F$  and  $C \cdots N$  interactions corresponding to close contacts between the atoms of the  $C-F$  bond of one molecule and those of the  $C \equiv N$  group of an adjacent molecule in





Figure 9  
Hirshfeld surface of polymorph II, showing close contacts between atoms in the same layer, with adjacent molecules shown.



**Figure 10**  
The Hirshfeld surface of polymorph I.


another layer (the atoms involved in this motif produce the most prominent red spots on the Hirshfeld surface), with a distance of 3.1197 (2) Å between the centroids of these two bonds; and motif 2 between only the terminal atoms of the aforementioned bonds, with the N and F atoms (Fig. 8) at a distance of 2.9885 (2) Å. Half of the C≡N and C–F atoms in a molecule exhibit close contacts of motif 1 only and the other half exhibit motif 2 only, with the same pattern of close contacts observed to form to both adjacent layers.

The arrangement of the atoms of motif 1 form a four-membered ring of close contacts. There are only four other non-organometallic structures in the CSD that contain this motif of close contacts (Wiscons *et al.*, 2018; Fan & Yan, 2014;

Ishida *et al.*, 2014; Sutton *et al.*, 2016). Two of these also contain F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ, and the motif occurs only between F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ molecules in the structure (Wiscons *et al.*, 2018; Sutton *et al.*, 2016).

There is only one type of close contact between molecules in the same layer, which forms between two F atoms in adjacent molecules (Fig. 9), with a distance of 2.8881 (7) Å, which is within the sum of the van der Waals radii (Alvarez, 2013). This is observed for two of the four F atoms in the molecule. Halogen bonding rules would suggest that this is a type-II contact, occurring because of the proximity of the F atoms in the structure, rather than due to the formation of a stabilizing/favourable interaction (Metrangolo & Resnati, 2013).

In contrast, there are fewer close contacts between molecules in polymorph I [22 versus 34 from one molecule, when totalled from those identified by Mercury (Macrae *et al.*, 2020)]. Most of the close contacts observed in polymorph II are not present in this arrangement – except for the F⋯N (motif 2) close contact (Fig. 10, and Fig. S1 in the supporting information shows the close contacts with adjacent molecules).



**Figure 11**  
Fingerprint plots for polymorphs I and II.

### 3.3. Fingerprint plots

Fingerprint plots (Spackman & McKinnon, 2002) result from the calculation of the distance to the closest internal and external atom for each point on the Hirshfeld surface, with the values displayed graphically. They have been used to compare polymorph structures by highlighting differences in the closest atomic contacts in the structures (McKinnon *et al.*, 2007). Those created for polymorphs I and II (Fig. 11) further illustrate the differences in packing between the two forms. In polymorph II, there are some additional points along the diagonal of the graph at short distances, which are a result of like–like F⋯F contacts, contacts between equivalent F atoms externally and internally of the Hirshfeld surface. In polymorph I, F atoms in adjacent molecules do not approach as closely as observed in polymorph II. This is evident in Fig. S2 (see supporting information), a version of the fingerprint plots where only points relating to F⋯F contacts are displayed in colour.

### 3.4. Energy comparisons

To further compare polymorphs, pairwise interaction energies were calculated using *CrystalExplorer* (Turner *et al.*, 2014,




Figure 12

Energy framework for polymorph II of  $F_4TCNQ$  calculated using *CrystalExplorer17.5*. The lines between molecules indicate the relative size of the pairwise energies between molecules.  $E_{tot}$  between molecules in adjacent layers are calculated as  $-33.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ .

2017). As both polymorphs form concomitantly in DCM, but only polymorph I has been reported in the literature, there may be an energetic preference for one polymorph over another. Pairwise interaction energies were calculated for a central molecule to surrounding molecules within a radius of  $3.8 \text{ \AA}$  and consist of scaled values for electrostatic, repulsive, polarization and dispersion contributions to the total interaction energy ( $E_{tot}$ ) using the [B3LYP/6-31G(d,p)] energy model. The tables of values are included in the supporting information (Tables S2 and S3). These values can be used to compute an approximate average energy of the structure, and thus indicate if one polymorph is more stable than another. Energy frameworks for  $F_4TCNQ$  polymorph I and  $F_2TCNQ$  have been discussed previously by Shukla *et al.* (2019).

For polymorph II, there are three different molecule pairs – one from the central molecule to molecules in adjacent layers, and two from molecules within the layers. The energy frameworks created from the calculations show that the largest  $E_{tot}$ ,  $-33.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ , is calculated between molecules in adjacent layers (Fig. 12). This value is much larger than the contributions between atoms in the same layers, which are less than  $-5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ . Within the layers, there are two different pairs of interactions (Fig. 13) – those that form close  $F \cdots F$  contacts between molecules and those that do not. Both pairs having positive electrostatic energies, indicating destabilizing contributions from electrostatic interactions. It is interesting to note that the molecules within the layers that have close  $F \cdots F$  contacts are calculated as having an overall stabilizing inter-




Figure 13

Energy framework for molecules within a layer of polymorph II of  $F_4TCNQ$ , calculated using *CrystalExplorer17.5*.

action, albeit small ( $-1.1 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ ), despite the positive electrostatic energy.

In polymorph I, the interaction energies have less variation. Fig. 14 shows a view of the energy framework for  $E_{tot}$ . The largest negative values of  $E_{tot}$  are found for molecules in the same herringbone chain, with the greatest overall being for molecules that are also in the same layer ( $-34.0 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ ). This value is the largest calculated  $E_{tot}$  of the two polymorphs. Smaller  $E_{tot}$  values are calculated between the other surrounding molecules. All pairs of molecules have negative calculated electrostatic energies,  $E_{ele}$ .

If mean pairwise energies are calculated by averaging the contributions of the surrounding molecules, we obtain values of  $-17.85$  and  $-23.03 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$  for polymorphs I and II, respectively (Equation S1 in the supporting information). These values are similar in energy, which is expected in concomitant polymorphism. It is interesting to note that the unreported polymorph II is lower in energy and likely the thermodynamic polymorph, which raises the question of why it has not been reported previously.

Crystallization conditions have been shown to play a role in polymorph formation (Bernstein & Bernstein, 2002; Isakov *et al.*, 2013; Tran *et al.*, 2012). In the previous reported structures of  $F_4TCNQ$  polymorph I that were deposited in the CSD, crystals were grown using vapour transport (Krupskaya *et al.*, 2015), solution growth (Salzillo *et al.*, 2016), sublimation (Shukla *et al.*, 2019) and from a solution of acetonitrile (Emge *et al.*, 1981). The growth of only polymorph I from recrystallizations with acetonitrile could suggest an interaction





Figure 14

Energy framework of  $F_4TCNQ$  polymorph I, calculated using *CrystalExplorer17.5* (with pairwise energies  $< 15 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$  removed for clarity).




**Figure 15**  
Views of  $F_2TCNQ$  along the  $[010]$  axis (left) and of  $F_4TCNQ$  along the  $[010]$  axis (right). In  $F_2TCNQ$ , molecules in adjacent layers (drawn with wireframe model) are in the same direction, which is not the case in  $F_4TCNQ$ .

between the solvent and the molecule which prohibits or makes it less favourable to form the polymorph II. This may be the result of an interaction between the cyano group of acetonitrile with the C–F bond of  $F_4TCNQ$ . A similar ring formed of these interactions is seen between acetonitrile and a C–F moiety in hexakis(pentafluorophenyl)[28]hexaphyrin (LIVHUV; Ishida *et al.*, 2014). If acetonitrile blocks other molecules of  $F_4TCNQ$  from associating with the C–F bond to form the stabilizing four-membered ring close contact motif by interacting in that position itself, then other interactions may take precedent during crystallization to direct the formation of the structure. If this is indeed the case, then polymorph II is able to form in DCM as the cyano group is absent from the solvent.

### 3.5. Comparison of polymorph II to $F_2TCNQ$

The reported structure of  $F_2TCNQ$  (Krupskaya *et al.*, 2015) was analysed in a similar way to the polymorphs of  $F_4TCNQ$ .



**Figure 16**  
Hirshfeld surface of  $F_2TCNQ$ , showing the close contacts between layers, with adjacent molecules shown.

The layered arrangement of molecules in  $F_2TCNQ$  (Fig. 2) is similar to  $F_4TCNQ$  polymorph II, with layers at a distance of 2.9275 (2) Å with respect to each other. The main difference between  $F_2TCNQ$  and polymorph II is a change in the orientation of the molecules in adjacent layers (Fig. 15). This change in orientation precludes the formation of the four-membered  $C\equiv N\cdots C-F$  close contact ring motif observed in polymorph II. Instead, as seen in the Hirshfeld surface (Fig. 16), a  $C-F\cdots C-F$  four-membered close contact motif is formed. A similar four-membered ring of close contacts is also seen between two cyano groups in adjacent layers in this structure. As  $F_2TCNQ$  contains H atoms, hydrogen bonds can and do form, with  $C-H\cdots N\equiv C$  contacts forming between the molecules within layers.

Pairwise interaction energies were calculated for CSD refcode BERZON03 (Krupskaya *et al.*, 2015; Table S4 in the supporting information). There are two different interacting modes between molecules in adjacent layers to a central molecule, unlike in polymorph II where there is only one. Similarly, there are two types of interaction to the central molecule from molecules in the same layer – one set of molecules that forms hydrogen bonds and another which has no close contacts; these are coloured in Fig. S13 (see supporting information).

Like polymorph II, the largest pairwise interaction energy is calculated between molecules in adjacent layers to the molecule with a C–F four-membered ring motif and a  $C-H\cdots N$  close contact. This value is smaller than the inter-layer interaction of polymorph II (–29.0 versus 33.0 kJ mol<sup>–1</sup>). The calculated energy of dispersion in this pair is larger than in polymorph II; however, the electrostatic energy is much smaller. Molecules that form close contacts to hydrogen, found within the layers, give the next largest value (–26.4 kJ mol<sup>–1</sup>). The smallest value corresponds to the other molecule within the layer, which forms no close contacts to the central molecule. The average energy for the surrounding interactions to the central molecule is calculated as –21.0 kJ mol<sup>–1</sup>.

### 3.6. Structure of $F_4TCNQ$ –toluene solvate

The  $F_4TCNQ$  and toluene molecules lie in layers perpendicular to the  $[101]$  direction; further details are in the supporting information (§S3).

## 4. Summary

The results reported here provide a clear example of polymorphism in  $F_4TCNQ$ . A second polymorph of  $F_4TCNQ$ , polymorph II, was grown concomitantly alongside the previously known polymorph I from a saturated solution of DCM. Pairwise interaction energies calculated in *Crystal-Explorer* show that both structures have similar total energies – with polymorph II being the lowest, suggesting that polymorph II may be the more thermodynamic polymorph. Polymorph II exhibits a layered structure, with one molecule in the reduced unit cell, which has been suggested to promote



electron mobility and charge transfer (Chernyshov *et al.*, 2017). The structure is also very similar to the reported structure of F<sub>2</sub>TCNQ, which does possess such properties. Further study of this polymorph could provide new insights into charge mobility in this family of compounds.

## Funding information

Funding for this research was provided by: Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) (award reference 1663905); Newcastle University.

## References

- Alvarez, S. (2013). *Dalton Trans.* **42**, 8617–8636.
- Bernstein, J. (1993). *J. Phys. D Appl. Phys.* **26**, B66–B76.
- Bernstein, J. & Bernstein, J. M. (2002). In *Polymorphism in Molecular Crystals*. London: Clarendon Press.
- Bruker (2009). *APEX2, SAINT and XPREP*. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Bruker (2016). *SADABS*. Bruker AXS Inc., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Chernyshov, I. Yu., Vener, M. V., Feldman, E. V., Paraschuk, D. Yu. & Sosorev, A. Yu. (2017). *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **8**, 2875–2880.
- Clark, R. C. & Reid, J. S. (1995). *Acta Cryst.* **A51**, 887–897.
- Cochran, J. E., Junk, M. J. N., Glauddell, A. M., Miller, P. L., Cowart, J. S., Toney, M. F., Hawker, C. J., Chmelka, B. F. & Chabinyk, M. L. (2014). *Macromolecules*, **47**, 6836–6846.
- Coropceanu, V., Cornil, J., da Silva Filho, D. A., Olivier, Y., Silbey, R. & Brédas, J.-L. (2007). *Chem. Rev.* **107**, 926–952.
- Dolomanov, O. V., Bourhis, L. J., Gildea, R. J., Howard, J. A. K. & Puschmann, H. (2009). *J. Appl. Cryst.* **42**, 339–341.
- Emge, T. J., Maxfield, M., Cowan, D. O. & Kistenmacher, T. J. (1981). *Mol. Cryst. Liq. Cryst.* **65**, 161–178.
- Fan, G. & Yan, D. (2014). *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 1–8.
- Fratini, S., Mayou, D. & Ciuchi, S. (2016). *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **26**, 2292–2315.
- Fujii, T. & Yamakado, H. (2018). *IUCrData*, **3**, x180077.
- Gao, W. & Kahn, A. (2001). *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **79**, 4040–4042.
- Groom, C. R., Bruno, I. J., Lightfoot, M. P. & Ward, S. C. (2016). *Acta Cryst.* **B72**, 171–179.
- Hu, P., Li, H., Li, Y., Jiang, H. & Kloc, C. (2017). *CrystEngComm*, **19**, 618–624.
- Isakov, A. I., Kotelnikova, E. N., Kryuchkova, L. Y. & Lorenz, H. (2013). *Trans. Tianjin Univ.* **19**, 86–91.
- Ishida, S., Higashino, T., Mori, S., Mori, H., Aratani, N., Tanaka, T., Lim, J. M., Kim, D. & Osuka, A. (2014). *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **53**, 3427–3431.
- Ji, L.-F., Fan, J.-X., Zhang, S.-F. & Ren, A.-M. (2018). *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **20**, 3784–3794.
- Krupskaya, Y., Gibertini, M., Marzari, N. & Morpurgo, A. F. (2015). *Adv. Mater.* **27**, 2453–2458.
- Macchi, P., Bürgi, H.-B., Chimpri, A. S., Hauser, J. & Gál, Z. (2011). *J. Appl. Cryst.* **44**, 763–771.
- Macrae, C. F., Sovago, I., Cottrell, S. J., Galek, P. T. A., McCabe, P., Pidcock, E., Platings, M., Shields, G. P., Stevens, J. S., Towler, M. & Wood, P. A. (2020). *J. Appl. Cryst.* **53**, 226–235.
- McKinnon, J. J., Jayatilaka, D. & Spackman, M. A. (2007). *Chem. Commun.* pp. 3814–3818.
- Metrangolo, P. & Resnati, G. (2014). *IUCrJ*, **1**, 5–7.
- Pingel, P., Schwarzl, R. & Neher, D. (2012). *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **100**, 143303.
- Rigaku OD (2015). *CrysAlis PRO*. Rigaku Oxford Diffraction Ltd, Yarnton, Oxfordshire, England.
- Salzillo, T., Masino, M., Kociok-Köhn, G., Di Nuzzo, D., Venuti, E., Della Valle, R. G., Vanossi, D., Fontanesi, C., Girlando, A., Brillante, A. & Da Como, E. (2016). *Cryst. Growth Des.* **16**, 3028–3036.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (2015a). *Acta Cryst.* **A71**, 3–8.
- Sheldrick, G. M. (2015b). *Acta Cryst.* **C71**, 3–8.
- Shukla, R., Ruzié, C., Schweicher, G., Kennedy, A. R., Geerts, Y. H., Chopra, D. & Chattopadhyay, B. (2019). *Acta Cryst.* **B75**, 71–78.
- Sosorev, A. Y. (2017). *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **19**, 25478–25486.
- Sosorev, A. Y., Chernyshov, I. Y., Paraschuk, D. Y. & Vener, M. V. (2019). *Molecular Spectroscopy*, pp. 425–458. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Sosorev, A. Y., Maslennikov, D. R., Chernyshov, I. Y., Dominskiy, D. I., Bruevich, V. V., Vener, M. V. & Paraschuk, D. Y. (2018). *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **20**, 18912–18918.
- Spackman, M. A. & Jayatilaka, D. (2009). *CrystEngComm*, **11**, 19–32.
- Spackman, M. A. & McKinnon, J. J. (2002). *CrystEngComm*, **4**, 378–392.
- Storm, A., Michaelsen, C., Oehr, A. & Hoffmann, C. (2004). *Proc. SPIE*, **5537**, 177–182.
- Sutton, A. L., Abrahams, B. F., D’Alessandro, D. M., Hudson, T. A., Robson, R. & Usov, P. M. (2016). *CrystEngComm*, **18**, 8906–8914.
- Tran, T. T.-D., Tran, P. H.-L., Park, J.-B. & Lee, B.-J. (2012). *Arch. Pharm. Res.* **35**, 1223–1230.
- Turner, M. J., Grabowsky, S., Jayatilaka, D. & Spackman, M. A. (2014). *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **5**, 4249–4255.
- Turner, M. J., McKinnon, J. J., Wolff, S. K., Grimwood, D. J., Spackman, P. R., Jayatilaka, D. & Spackman, M. A. (2017). *CrystalExplorer17*. University of Western Australia. <https://crystal-explorer.scb.uwa.edu.au/>.
- Wang, C., Dong, H., Hu, W., Liu, Y. & Zhu, D. (2012). *Chem. Rev.* **112**, 2208–2267.
- Wiscons, R. A., Goud, N. R., Damron, J. T. & Matzger, A. J. (2018). *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **57**, 9044–9047.

## supporting information

*Acta Cryst.* (2021). C77, 426-434 [https://doi.org/10.1107/S2053229621006252]

## Structural investigations into a new polymorph of F<sub>4</sub>TCNQ: towards enhanced semiconductor properties

**Natalie T. Johnson, Michael R. Probert and Paul G. Waddell**

### Computing details

Data collection: *APEX2* (Bruker, 2009) for polymorph\_i, polymorph\_ii; *CrysAlis PRO* (Rigaku OD, 2015) for toluene\_solvate. Cell refinement: *SAINTE* (Bruker, 2009) for polymorph\_i, polymorph\_ii; *CrysAlis PRO* (Rigaku OD, 2015) for toluene\_solvate. Data reduction: *SAINTE* (Bruker, 2009) for polymorph\_i, polymorph\_ii; *CrysAlis PRO* (Rigaku OD, 2015) for toluene\_solvate. For all structures, program(s) used to solve structure: *SHELXT* (Sheldrick, 2015a); program(s) used to refine structure: *SHELXL2014* (Sheldrick, 2015b); molecular graphics: *OLEX2* (Dolomanov *et al.*, 2009). Software used to prepare material for publication: *OLEX2* (Dolomanov *et al.*, 2009) and *XPREP* (Bruker, 2009) for polymorph\_i, polymorph\_ii; *OLEX2* (Dolomanov *et al.*, 2009) for toluene\_solvate.

### 2-[4-(Dicyanomethylidene)-2,3,5,6-tetrafluorocyclohexa-2,5-dien-1-ylidene]propanedinitrile (polymorph\_i)

#### Crystal data

C <sub>12</sub> F <sub>4</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	$D_x = 1.706 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$
$M_r = 276.16$	Ag $K\alpha$ radiation, $\lambda = 0.56086 \text{ \AA}$
Orthorhombic, <i>Pbca</i>	Cell parameters from 9611 reflections
$a = 9.1799 (3) \text{ \AA}$	$\theta = 2.9\text{--}35.1^\circ$
$b = 8.0482 (3) \text{ \AA}$	$\mu = 0.09 \text{ mm}^{-1}$
$c = 14.5541 (5) \text{ \AA}$	$T = 100 \text{ K}$
$V = 1075.28 (6) \text{ \AA}^3$	Cube, yellow
$Z = 4$	$0.28 \times 0.22 \times 0.16 \text{ mm}$
$F(000) = 544$	

#### Data collection

Bruker Photon II CPAD diffractometer	5103 independent reflections
Multi-layer optics monochromator	4271 reflections with $I > 2\sigma(I)$
$\varphi$ and $\omega$ scans	$R_{\text{int}} = 0.043$
Absorption correction: numerical (SADABS; Bruker, 2016)	$\theta_{\text{max}} = 35.8^\circ$ , $\theta_{\text{min}} = 2.8^\circ$
$T_{\text{min}} = 0.919$ , $T_{\text{max}} = 0.982$	$h = -19 \rightarrow 19$
189710 measured reflections	$k = -16 \rightarrow 16$
	$l = -30 \rightarrow 30$

#### Refinement

Refinement on $F^2$	5103 reflections
Least-squares matrix: full	91 parameters
$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.034$	0 restraints
$wR(F^2) = 0.115$	$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0599P)^2 + 0.1298P]$
$S = 1.09$	where $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$

$$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\max} = 0.001$$

$$\Delta\rho_{\max} = 0.75 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$$

$$\Delta\rho_{\min} = -0.33 \text{ e } \text{\AA}^{-3}$$

*Special details*

**Geometry.** All esds (except the esd in the dihedral angle between two l.s. planes) are estimated using the full covariance matrix. The cell esds are taken into account individually in the estimation of esds in distances, angles and torsion angles; correlations between esds in cell parameters are only used when they are defined by crystal symmetry. An approximate (isotropic) treatment of cell esds is used for estimating esds involving l.s. planes.

**Refinement.** Integration was performed using *SAINTE* (Bruker, 2012) with a 0.48 Å cut-off, default integration algorithm and best-plane background. The data were scaled and merged in *SADABS* using the default error model (Bruker, 2001); a correction for overloaded reflections and a numerical absorption correction based on the faces of the crystal were applied. The space group was identified in *XPREF* (Bruker, 2012) and the solution and refinement were performed in the *OLEX2* GUI (Dolomanov *et al.*, 2009) using *XT* and *XL*, respectively (Bruker, 2012).

*Fractional atomic coordinates and isotropic or equivalent isotropic displacement parameters (Å<sup>2</sup>)*

	<i>x</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>U</i> <sub>iso</sub> <sup>*</sup> / <i>U</i> <sub>eq</sub>
F1	0.34119 (3)	0.73648 (4)	0.55965 (2)	0.01881 (6)
F2	0.65038 (4)	0.99400 (4)	0.33962 (2)	0.01955 (6)
N1	0.34397 (5)	0.44491 (6)	0.42766 (3)	0.02166 (7)
N2	0.61198 (6)	0.67225 (7)	0.23109 (3)	0.02644 (9)
C1	0.41948 (4)	0.86469 (5)	0.53012 (3)	0.01461 (6)
C2	0.57501 (4)	0.99735 (5)	0.41743 (3)	0.01464 (6)
C3	0.49248 (4)	0.85233 (5)	0.44277 (3)	0.01399 (6)
C4	0.48306 (4)	0.71426 (5)	0.38721 (3)	0.01542 (6)
C5	0.40263 (5)	0.56860 (6)	0.41153 (3)	0.01741 (7)
C6	0.55569 (5)	0.69859 (6)	0.30068 (3)	0.01875 (7)

*Atomic displacement parameters (Å<sup>2</sup>)*

	<i>U</i> <sup>11</sup>	<i>U</i> <sup>22</sup>	<i>U</i> <sup>33</sup>	<i>U</i> <sup>12</sup>	<i>U</i> <sup>13</sup>	<i>U</i> <sup>23</sup>
F1	0.01913 (11)	0.01634 (11)	0.02097 (12)	−0.00341 (8)	0.00560 (8)	0.00344 (8)
F2	0.02069 (12)	0.02078 (12)	0.01719 (11)	−0.00031 (9)	0.00806 (9)	0.00220 (8)
N1	0.02127 (16)	0.01929 (15)	0.02442 (16)	−0.00355 (12)	0.00067 (12)	−0.00021 (12)
N2	0.0318 (2)	0.0309 (2)	0.01659 (14)	−0.00044 (17)	0.00326 (14)	−0.00232 (13)
C1	0.01318 (12)	0.01527 (12)	0.01537 (12)	−0.00081 (9)	0.00210 (9)	0.00315 (9)
C2	0.01350 (12)	0.01625 (13)	0.01416 (12)	0.00000 (9)	0.00261 (9)	0.00293 (9)
C3	0.01220 (11)	0.01563 (12)	0.01415 (12)	0.00033 (9)	0.00071 (9)	0.00261 (9)
C4	0.01433 (13)	0.01705 (13)	0.01488 (12)	−0.00006 (10)	−0.00045 (9)	0.00163 (10)
C5	0.01608 (14)	0.01779 (14)	0.01836 (14)	−0.00126 (11)	−0.00094 (11)	0.00064 (11)
C6	0.01994 (16)	0.02142 (16)	0.01489 (13)	−0.00005 (12)	−0.00028 (11)	0.00013 (11)

*Geometric parameters (Å, °)*

F1—C1	1.3289 (5)	C1—C3	1.4405 (5)
F2—C2	1.3274 (5)	C2—C3	1.4395 (5)
N1—C5	1.1559 (6)	C3—C4	1.3771 (6)
N2—C6	1.1566 (6)	C4—C5	1.4299 (6)
C1—C2 <sup>i</sup>	1.3484 (6)	C4—C6	1.4305 (6)

F1—C1—C2 <sup>i</sup>	118.46 (3)	C4—C3—C1	123.01 (4)
F1—C1—C3	118.91 (4)	C4—C3—C2	122.47 (4)
C2 <sup>i</sup> —C1—C3	122.62 (3)	C3—C4—C5	123.28 (4)
F2—C2—C1 <sup>i</sup>	118.69 (4)	C3—C4—C6	123.97 (4)
F2—C2—C3	118.45 (4)	C5—C4—C6	112.72 (4)
C1 <sup>i</sup> —C2—C3	122.85 (3)	N1—C5—C4	175.48 (5)
C2—C3—C1	114.52 (4)	N2—C6—C4	174.43 (6)

Symmetry code: (i)  $-x+1, -y+2, -z+1$ .

## 2-[4-(Dicyanomethylidene)-2,3,5,6-tetrafluorocyclohexa-2,5-dien-1-ylidene]propanedinitrile (polymorph\_ii)

### Crystal data

C<sub>12</sub>F<sub>4</sub>N<sub>4</sub>

$M_r = 276.16$

Orthorhombic, *Pnmm*

$a = 7.5140$  (4) Å

$b = 11.6787$  (6) Å

$c = 5.9347$  (3) Å

$V = 520.79$  (5) Å<sup>3</sup>

$Z = 2$

$F(000) = 272$

$D_x = 1.761$  Mg m<sup>-3</sup>

Ag  $K\alpha$  radiation,  $\lambda = 0.56086$  Å

Cell parameters from 9821 reflections

$\theta = 2.5\text{--}35.7^\circ$

$\mu = 0.10$  mm<sup>-1</sup>

$T = 100$  K

Octahedral, yellow

$0.3 \times 0.17 \times 0.12$  mm

### Data collection

Bruker Photon II CPAD

diffractometer

Multi-layer optics monochromator

$\varphi$  and  $\omega$  scans

Absorption correction: numerical

(SADABS; Bruker, 2016)

$T_{\min} = 0.931$ ,  $T_{\max} = 0.974$

115983 measured reflections

2628 independent reflections

2285 reflections with  $I > 2\sigma(I)$

$R_{\text{int}} = 0.043$

$\theta_{\max} = 35.8^\circ$ ,  $\theta_{\min} = 2.5^\circ$

$h = -15 \rightarrow 15$

$k = -24 \rightarrow 24$

$l = -12 \rightarrow 12$

### Refinement

Refinement on  $F^2$

Least-squares matrix: full

$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.031$

$wR(F^2) = 0.111$

$S = 1.07$

2628 reflections

61 parameters

0 restraints

$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0647P)^2 + 0.0518P]$

where  $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$

$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\max} = 0.001$

$\Delta\rho_{\max} = 0.77$  e Å<sup>-3</sup>

$\Delta\rho_{\min} = -0.26$  e Å<sup>-3</sup>

### Special details

**Geometry.** All esds (except the esd in the dihedral angle between two l.s. planes) are estimated using the full covariance matrix. The cell esds are taken into account individually in the estimation of esds in distances, angles and torsion angles; correlations between esds in cell parameters are only used when they are defined by crystal symmetry. An approximate (isotropic) treatment of cell esds is used for estimating esds involving l.s. planes.

**Refinement.** Integration was performed using *SAINTE* (Bruker, 2012) with a 0.48 Å cut-off, default integration algorithm and best-plane background. The data were scaled and merged in *SADABS* using the default error model (Bruker, 2001); a correction for overloaded reflections and a numerical absorption correction based on the faces of the crystal were applied. The space group was identified in *XPREP* (Bruker, 2012) and the solution and refinement were performed in the *OLEX2* GUI (Dolomanov *et al.*, 2009) using *XT* and *XL*, respectively (Bruker, 2012).

Fractional atomic coordinates and isotropic or equivalent isotropic displacement parameters ( $\text{\AA}^2$ )

	<i>x</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>z</i>	$U_{\text{iso}}^*/U_{\text{eq}}$
F1	0.84334 (4)	0.57162 (3)	0.500000	0.01752 (7)
F2	0.22159 (4)	0.64847 (3)	0.500000	0.01705 (7)
N1	0.88414 (7)	0.82906 (5)	0.500000	0.02014 (9)
N2	0.33496 (8)	0.89850 (5)	0.500000	0.02405 (11)
C1	0.67562 (6)	0.53722 (4)	0.500000	0.01313 (7)
C2	0.35867 (6)	0.57628 (4)	0.500000	0.01324 (7)
C3	0.53646 (6)	0.62208 (4)	0.500000	0.01262 (7)
C4	0.57115 (6)	0.73787 (4)	0.500000	0.01376 (7)
C5	0.74684 (7)	0.78452 (5)	0.500000	0.01551 (8)
C6	0.43587 (7)	0.82395 (4)	0.500000	0.01695 (8)

Atomic displacement parameters ( $\text{\AA}^2$ )

	$U^{11}$	$U^{22}$	$U^{33}$	$U^{12}$	$U^{13}$	$U^{23}$
F1	0.00841 (11)	0.01994 (14)	0.02420 (16)	-0.00123 (9)	0.000	0.000
F2	0.01019 (11)	0.01795 (13)	0.02302 (15)	0.00334 (9)	0.000	0.000
N1	0.01638 (17)	0.0230 (2)	0.02105 (19)	-0.00510 (14)	0.000	0.000
N2	0.0207 (2)	0.01925 (19)	0.0322 (3)	0.00476 (15)	0.000	0.000
C1	0.00854 (13)	0.01638 (16)	0.01447 (15)	0.00000 (11)	0.000	0.000
C2	0.00917 (13)	0.01611 (15)	0.01445 (15)	0.00121 (11)	0.000	0.000
C3	0.00982 (13)	0.01572 (15)	0.01233 (14)	0.00027 (11)	0.000	0.000
C4	0.01195 (14)	0.01585 (16)	0.01347 (15)	0.00005 (11)	0.000	0.000
C5	0.01391 (15)	0.01821 (17)	0.01441 (15)	-0.00209 (13)	0.000	0.000
C6	0.01531 (17)	0.01650 (17)	0.01903 (18)	0.00100 (13)	0.000	0.000

Geometric parameters ( $\text{\AA}$ ,  $^\circ$ )

F1—C1	1.3227 (5)	C1—C3	1.4407 (6)
F2—C2	1.3310 (6)	C2—C3	1.4390 (6)
N1—C5	1.1554 (7)	C3—C4	1.3772 (7)
N2—C6	1.1545 (8)	C4—C5	1.4281 (7)
C1—C2 <sup>i</sup>	1.3503 (7)	C4—C6	1.4296 (7)
F1—C1—C2 <sup>i</sup>	118.68 (4)	C4—C3—C1	122.55 (4)
F1—C1—C3	118.86 (4)	C4—C3—C2	122.73 (4)
C2 <sup>i</sup> —C1—C3	122.47 (4)	C3—C4—C5	123.34 (5)
F2—C2—C1 <sup>i</sup>	118.30 (4)	C3—C4—C6	123.77 (5)
F2—C2—C3	118.88 (4)	C5—C4—C6	112.90 (5)
C1 <sup>i</sup> —C2—C3	122.82 (4)	N1—C5—C4	175.67 (6)
C2—C3—C1	114.71 (4)	N2—C6—C4	175.73 (6)

Symmetry code: (i)  $-x+1, -y+1, -z+1$ .

2-[4-(Dicyanomethylidene)-2,3,5,6-tetrafluorocyclohexa-2,5-dien-1-ylidene]propanedinitrile toluene monosolvate (toluene\_solvate)

*Crystal data*

$C_{12}F_4N_4C_7H_8$

$M_r = 368.29$

Monoclinic,  $P2_1/c$

$a = 8.1314 (2) \text{ \AA}$

$b = 7.4141 (2) \text{ \AA}$

$c = 13.6796 (4) \text{ \AA}$

$\beta = 100.551 (3)^\circ$

$V = 810.76 (4) \text{ \AA}^3$

$Z = 2$

$F(000) = 372$

$D_x = 1.509 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$

Cu  $K\alpha$  radiation,  $\lambda = 1.54184 \text{ \AA}$

Cell parameters from 3336 reflections

$\theta = 5.5\text{--}66.3^\circ$

$\mu = 1.09 \text{ mm}^{-1}$

$T = 150 \text{ K}$

Needle, red

$0.41 \times 0.05 \times 0.03 \text{ mm}$

*Data collection*

Rigaku Xcalibur Atlas Gemini ultra diffractometer

Radiation source: fine-focus sealed X-ray tube, Enhance Ultra (Cu) X-ray Source

Mirror monochromator

Detector resolution:  $10.3968 \text{ pixels mm}^{-1}$

$\omega$  scans

Absorption correction: analytical

[CrysAlis PRO (Rigaku OD, 2015), based on expressions derived by Clark & Reid (1995)]

$T_{\min} = 0.806, T_{\max} = 0.975$

10970 measured reflections

1433 independent reflections

1194 reflections with  $I > 2\sigma(I)$

$R_{\text{int}} = 0.045$

$\theta_{\max} = 66.9^\circ, \theta_{\min} = 5.5^\circ$

$h = -9 \rightarrow 9$

$k = -8 \rightarrow 8$

$l = -16 \rightarrow 16$

*Refinement*

Refinement on  $F^2$

Least-squares matrix: full

$R[F^2 > 2\sigma(F^2)] = 0.039$

$wR(F^2) = 0.109$

$S = 1.08$

1433 reflections

155 parameters

161 restraints

Primary atom site location: dual

Hydrogen site location: inferred from neighbouring sites

H-atom parameters constrained

$w = 1/[\sigma^2(F_o^2) + (0.0549P)^2 + 0.3028P]$

where  $P = (F_o^2 + 2F_c^2)/3$

$(\Delta/\sigma)_{\max} = 0.001$

$\Delta\rho_{\max} = 0.44 \text{ e \AA}^{-3}$

$\Delta\rho_{\min} = -0.21 \text{ e \AA}^{-3}$

*Special details*

**Geometry.** All esds (except the esd in the dihedral angle between two l.s. planes) are estimated using the full covariance matrix. The cell esds are taken into account individually in the estimation of esds in distances, angles and torsion angles; correlations between esds in cell parameters are only used when they are defined by crystal symmetry. An approximate (isotropic) treatment of cell esds is used for estimating esds involving l.s. planes.

**Refinement.** The structure of the  $F_4\text{TCNQ}$ -toluene solvate has half a molecule of solvent in the asymmetric unit. The toluene molecule was modelled as disordered over two sites across a centre of symmetry. The occupancies of the two parts were constrained to be 0.5 and the atomic displacement parameters were restrained. The geometry of the toluene molecule was restrained.

Diffraction frames for the  $F_4\text{TCNQ}$ -toluene solvate crystal were integrated and scaled using *CrysAlis PRO* (Rigaku OD, 2006). Intensities were corrected for absorption using a multifaceted crystal model created by indexing the faces of the crystal for which data were collected (Clark & Reid, 1995). The structure solution and refinement were performed using *XL* and *XT* respectively within the *OLEX2* GUI.

Fractional atomic coordinates and isotropic or equivalent isotropic displacement parameters ( $\text{\AA}^2$ )

	<i>x</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>z</i>	$U_{\text{iso}}^*/U_{\text{eq}}$	Occ. (<1)
F1	0.43765 (13)	0.77387 (14)	0.62015 (7)	0.0346 (3)	
F2	0.40784 (14)	0.15463 (14)	0.52795 (7)	0.0350 (3)	
N1	0.2912 (2)	0.6437 (2)	0.79955 (11)	0.0415 (4)	
N2	0.2643 (2)	0.1032 (2)	0.71642 (13)	0.0463 (5)	
C1	0.41901 (19)	0.4595 (2)	0.58369 (11)	0.0261 (4)	
C2	0.4694 (2)	0.6385 (2)	0.56168 (12)	0.0269 (4)	
C3	0.4539 (2)	0.3239 (2)	0.51478 (12)	0.0271 (4)	
C4	0.3476 (2)	0.4196 (2)	0.66478 (12)	0.0288 (4)	
C5	0.3167 (2)	0.5505 (3)	0.73712 (12)	0.0318 (4)	
C6	0.3012 (2)	0.2405 (3)	0.68933 (13)	0.0333 (4)	
C7	-0.017 (3)	0.6337 (18)	0.5496 (11)	0.041 (2)	0.5
C8	0.0532 (18)	0.6483 (18)	0.4627 (8)	0.033 (2)	0.5
H8	0.0900	0.7594	0.4435	0.039*	0.5
C9	0.066 (2)	0.4980 (17)	0.4072 (11)	0.036 (2)	0.5
H9	0.1131	0.5074	0.3504	0.044*	0.5
C10	0.012 (2)	0.3361 (18)	0.4329 (10)	0.038 (2)	0.5
H10	0.0195	0.2367	0.3924	0.045*	0.5
C11	-0.052 (2)	0.3156 (18)	0.5158 (9)	0.035 (2)	0.5
H11	-0.0860	0.2020	0.5329	0.042*	0.5
C12	-0.068 (2)	0.4606 (15)	0.5758 (10)	0.032 (2)	0.5
H12	-0.1117	0.4451	0.6334	0.039*	0.5
C13	-0.0309 (7)	0.8049 (7)	0.6121 (4)	0.0565 (12)	0.5
H13A	0.0563	0.8879	0.6042	0.085*	0.5
H13B	-0.0200	0.7725	0.6809	0.085*	0.5
H13C	-0.1378	0.8606	0.5899	0.085*	0.5

Atomic displacement parameters ( $\text{\AA}^2$ )

	$U^{11}$	$U^{22}$	$U^{33}$	$U^{12}$	$U^{13}$	$U^{23}$
F1	0.0471 (6)	0.0294 (6)	0.0307 (5)	0.0035 (4)	0.0160 (4)	-0.0051 (4)
F2	0.0464 (6)	0.0256 (5)	0.0364 (5)	-0.0011 (4)	0.0167 (5)	0.0014 (4)
N1	0.0469 (10)	0.0491 (10)	0.0316 (8)	0.0035 (8)	0.0156 (7)	-0.0036 (7)
N2	0.0561 (11)	0.0425 (10)	0.0463 (9)	0.0016 (8)	0.0247 (8)	0.0084 (8)
C1	0.0238 (8)	0.0307 (9)	0.0238 (8)	0.0039 (7)	0.0046 (6)	0.0010 (6)
C2	0.0290 (8)	0.0273 (9)	0.0249 (8)	0.0053 (7)	0.0062 (6)	-0.0017 (7)
C3	0.0284 (9)	0.0254 (9)	0.0278 (8)	0.0024 (7)	0.0060 (6)	0.0019 (6)
C4	0.0275 (9)	0.0346 (9)	0.0252 (8)	0.0053 (7)	0.0068 (6)	0.0036 (7)
C5	0.0307 (9)	0.0391 (10)	0.0272 (8)	0.0022 (8)	0.0092 (7)	0.0042 (7)
C6	0.0338 (10)	0.0391 (11)	0.0294 (9)	0.0043 (8)	0.0122 (7)	0.0030 (8)
C7	0.036 (3)	0.049 (4)	0.037 (5)	0.009 (3)	0.001 (4)	-0.012 (3)
C8	0.031 (3)	0.038 (6)	0.030 (5)	0.003 (4)	0.008 (3)	0.000 (3)
C9	0.029 (3)	0.059 (5)	0.023 (4)	0.013 (4)	0.010 (3)	-0.006 (3)
C10	0.032 (3)	0.050 (4)	0.030 (4)	0.016 (3)	0.001 (3)	-0.018 (3)
C11	0.036 (3)	0.032 (4)	0.034 (4)	0.008 (3)	0.000 (3)	-0.005 (3)
C12	0.030 (3)	0.049 (5)	0.020 (5)	0.007 (4)	0.010 (3)	-0.004 (3)

---

C13	0.053 (3)	0.056 (3)	0.060 (3)	0.001 (2)	0.008 (2)	-0.010 (2)
-----	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------

---

*Geometric parameters (Å, °)*


---

F1—C2	1.3375 (19)	C4—C5	1.441 (3)
F2—C3	1.332 (2)	C4—C6	1.437 (3)
N1—C5	1.147 (2)	C7—C8	1.414 (9)
N2—C6	1.142 (3)	C7—C12	1.414 (10)
C1—C2	1.438 (3)	C7—C13	1.546 (10)
C1—C3	1.441 (2)	C8—C9	1.364 (8)
C1—C4	1.375 (2)	C9—C10	1.346 (10)
C2—C3 <sup>i</sup>	1.341 (2)	C10—C11	1.342 (9)
C3—C2 <sup>i</sup>	1.341 (2)	C11—C12	1.372 (8)
C2—C1—C3	114.15 (15)	C6—C4—C5	112.08 (14)
C4—C1—C2	123.11 (16)	N1—C5—C4	174.69 (19)
C4—C1—C3	122.72 (16)	N2—C6—C4	174.48 (19)
F1—C2—C1	118.28 (14)	C8—C7—C12	117.6 (8)
F1—C2—C3 <sup>i</sup>	118.62 (16)	C8—C7—C13	118.9 (8)
C3 <sup>i</sup> —C2—C1	123.10 (16)	C12—C7—C13	123.4 (8)
F2—C3—C1	118.35 (14)	C9—C8—C7	119.3 (9)
F2—C3—C2 <sup>i</sup>	118.91 (15)	C10—C9—C8	121.5 (9)
C2 <sup>i</sup> —C3—C1	122.73 (16)	C11—C10—C9	121.1 (9)
C1—C4—C5	124.16 (17)	C10—C11—C12	120.7 (9)
C1—C4—C6	123.71 (16)	C11—C12—C7	119.7 (9)

---

Symmetry code: (i)  $-x+1, -y+1, -z+1$ .