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**Abstract:** The separation of hydrogen isotopes for applications such as nuclear fusion is a major societal challenge. Current technologies are energy intensive and inefficient. Nanoporous materials have the potential to separate hydrogen isotopes by kinetic quantum sieving, but high separation selectivity tends to correlate with low adsorption capacity, which can prohibit process scale-up. Here, we use organic synthesis to modify the internal cavities of cage molecules to produce hybrid materials that are excellent quantum sieves. By combining small-pore and large-pore cages together in a single solid, we produce a material with unprecedented separation performance that combines an excellent deuterium/hydrogen selectivity (8.0) with a high deuterium uptake (4.7 mmol/g).

**One Sentence Summary:** Molecular organic crystals can separate hydrogen from deuterium with record efficiency, as relevant in nuclear fuels processing.

**Main Text:**

Deuterium (D) is used as a neutron moderator, as a nonradioactive isotopic tracer, and in neutron scattering experiments. These applications need high-purity deuterium, which is expensive because of its low natural abundance (0.0156 mol %). Typically, D2 is produced by electrolysis of heavy water and extracted using the Girdler-sulfide process (*1*) or by cryogenic distillation at 24 K (*2*). Both processes are costly and energy intensive because of the multiple enrichment steps required (*3*).

An attractive alternative to purify D2 from H2/D2 gas mixtures is to adsorb D2 selectively on a microporous bed (4). Kinetic quantum sieving (KQS) using nanoporous solids was first proposed by Beenakker *et al.* (*5*). The KQS effect becomes pronounced when the difference in size between a hydrogen molecule and the confining space is comparable to the thermal de Broglie wavelength of molecular hydrogen, $λ\_{T}={h}/{\left(2πmk\_{B}T\right)^{{1}/{2}}}$. Quantum sieving has been exploited for the separation of gaseous isotope mixtures like D2 / H2 (*6*), but it is challenging to identify suitable porous solids. This is because KQS requires ultrafine pore apertures (around 3 Å) (*7, 8*), and this typically leads to materials with low pore volumes and, hence, low D2 adsorption capacities, making such processes difficult to scale. An analogous selectivity-capacity trade-off—or, for membranes, a selectivity-permeance trade-off—is observed for a wide range of other gas separations that do not involve KQS (*9-12*).

Various porous materials have been studied for hydrogen isotope separation including carbons (*13, 14*), carbon nanotubes (*15*), zeolites (*16, 17*), metal-organic-frameworks (MOFs) (*6*, *18-19*), covalent organic frameworks (COFs)(*20*), and 2D crystals (*21*). MOFs and COFs have received much attention because of their crystalline nature and synthetically tuneable pore size and functionality (*22*). However, even with MOFs or COFs, it is challenging to tune pore sizes at the exceptionally fine level required for KQS. For example, in MOFs, a common strategy for tuning the pore apertures is through systematic expansion or reduction of the number of the phenylene rings in the organic linker, with a discrete increment-decrement of ~ 2.8 Å (*23*); that is, much coarser than the size control needed for KQS.

Porous organic cages (POCs) (*24, 25*) are discrete molecules that have been used previously for the separation of xylene isomers (*26*), noble gases (*27*), and chiral molecules (*27*). POCs might also be promising candidates for H2/D2 separation but, unlike MOFs and COFs, it is difficult to tune the pore size in POCs simply by changing the constituent linkers. Because POCs are discrete molecules, small changes in their molecular structure can have profound effects on the solid-state packing of the cages and hence the pore structure (*24*). Modifying only the interior of the cage molecule, rather than the cage structure itself, could avoid altering the crystal packing. Internal functionalization is possible. For example, Mastalerz *et al*. described the post-synthetic modification of the interior of organic cages using a sixfold Williamson etherification (*28*), but this interior modification affected the cage shape, which in turn altered the crystal packing mode.

**Systematically tuning the pore size of organic cages by post-synthetic modification**
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**Fig. 1.** **Fine tuning pore size by molecular organic synthesis.** (**A**) Scheme showing the protect–functionalize–deprotect strategy for internal cage cavity modification. (**B**) Full synthesis route for the modified cages, corresponding to the scheme in **A**. **FT**, **AT**, **ET**,and **PT** represent products where the diamine group/s were tied with **f**ormaldehyde, **a**cetone, **e**thanal (acetaldehyde), and **p**ropionaldehyde; *x* and *y* represent different possible tying groups (*x* = **E**, **F** and *y* = **A**, **E**, **P**). (**C**) Representative single crystal structures of the modified cages showing accessible cavities (colored), along with calculated pore limiting envelopes for each system; (**D**) Summary of gas adsorption properties for a range of gases (histogram; left axis) and cage cavity volumes (right axis) of a single modified cage, as calculated by *VOIDOO* based on their crystal structures, probe radius = 2.0 Å (*29*).

We synthesized a series of internally post-functionalized porous organic cages that crystallized in an isostructural way. Specifically, we used a protection-deprotection strategy to produce cages where five out of the six internal reaction sites in the cage cavity were functionalized using a formaldehyde “tying” method we reported (*30*) (Fig. 1, A and B). After deprotection, the single unreacted diamine group can be reacted with a range of aldehyde or ketone precursors to achieve ultrafine control over the cage cavity size and, hence, the pore envelope (Fig. 1C). This method allowed us to tune the size and shape of the cage pore systematically at the atomic level without affecting the external cage shape and size, or its crystal packing. Using this strategy, we tuned the pore size for the series of POCs in the range 3.5 to 1.95 Å, which is a useful cut-off range for the separation of gas pairs such as H2/N2, H2/CO, CH4/N2, and Xe/Kr (*7*).

Previously, we reported that an organic cage with six diamine groups, **RCC3**, reacts with six formaldehyde molecules to form **6FT-RCC3** through the formation of cyclic aminal rings (*30*). Here, **RCC3** was reacted with six equivalents of acetaldehyde to form a new cage, **6ET-RCC3** (reaction *a*, Fig. 1B), wherebulkier ethylidene bridges replaced the six methylene bridges in **6FT-RCC3**. By contrast, **RCC3** reacted with just a single acetone molecule to form **1AT-RCC3** (*30*) reaction *b*, Fig. 1B); steric hindrance prevented further reaction in the cage cavity.

Based on this result, we developed a protection-deprotection strategy where we reacted the five unfunctionalized diamine groups in **1AT-RCC3** with gaseous formaldehyde in the solid state, through a single-crystal-to-single-crystal reaction, to form a new dual ‘tied’ cage molecule, **1AT-5FT-RCC3** (reaction *d*, Fig. 1B and fig. S1). Solid-state synthesis was essential here, in that when **1AT-RCC3** was mixed with formaldehyde in solution (CHCl3 or MeOH), the single acetone ‘protecting group’ was displaced to afford **6FT-RCC3** (reaction *c* in Fig. 1B and fig. S2). By exploiting the different chemical labilities of imidazolidine rings in **1AT**-**5FT**-**RCC3**, we could selectively hydrolyze the single propyl ‘tie’ by stirring inCHCl3:MeOH (1:1, *v*/*v*), thus synthesizing a new deprotected cage, **5FT-RCC3** (reaction *e* in Fig. 1B, fig. S3). After deprotection, we reacted the now vacant diamine group in **5FT-RCC3** with acetaldehyde and propionaldehyde to synthesize two new cages, **1ET-5FT-RCC3** and **1PT-5FT-RCC3** (reaction *f,* Fig. 1B). All reactions proceeded with nearly 100% conversion with no additional purification steps.

The parent cage for this study, **RCC3**, is derived from the shape-persistent imine precursor, **CC3**, which crystallized from most organic solvents to form a microporous solid with a diamondoid pore network (*24, 26, 27*). For guests to diffuse through this pore network, they must pass through the intrinsic cage cavities that act as the tetrahedral nodes (*25*). Hence, internal functionalization of the cages cavities provided a route to systematically fine tune pore size without altering the underlying shape and crystallization habit of the cage molecule (*31*). All cages were isostructural with **CC3**, as determinedby powder x-ray diffraction (PXRD) (fig. S4) and by single-crystal x-ray diffraction (fig. S5 and table S1). The high crystallographic symmetry of the structures (cubic *F*4132) did not allow us to determine if the different ‘tied’ groups were ordered in the microporous pore structures, but all cages had the same diamondoid pore structure.

To allow for the effect of molecular flexibility on the diffusivity of small gas molecules through these structures, we used molecular dynamics (MD) simulations to calculate a time-averaged pore-limiting envelope (PLE) (*27*), rather than measuring a single, static pore diameter. These calculations showed that postsynthetic modification allowed the PLE to range from 1.95 Å (**6ET-RCC3**) to 3.50 Å (**6FT-RCC3**), resulting in a tunability window of 1.55 Å (Fig. 1C). For context, this tunability window equates to the van der Waals (vdW) radius of a single nitrogen atom across the whole series of isostructural cages.

We studied the gas adsorption properties of these cages for four different gases (Fig. 1D). As expected, there is a positive correlation between the cage cavity volume and the overall gas uptake, especially under conditions where gases are close to saturation (*e.g.*, N2 at 77 K; orange bars in Fig. 1D). For example, **5FT-RCC3**,with the largest cage cavity in this series, showed the highest uptakes for all four of the gases studied. By contrast, **1AT-5FT-RCC3** showed much lower gas uptakes, and **6ET-RCC3** size-excluded krypton (Kr) and xenon (Xe) altogether.

This synthetic strategy was also used to tune gas selectivity for hard-to-separate gas pairs, such as Xe and Kr (*32*, *33*). Xenon is heavier and more polarizable than Kr, and it tends to form stronger vdW interactions with most sorbents unless the pores are specifically attuned for Kr adsorption. Preferential Kr adsorption is very rare. For example, just one MOF, **FMOFCu**, adsorbs Kr selectively over Xe at temperatures below 0 °C (*33*).

Most of these organic cages also exhibit higher uptakes for Xe than for Kr, but **1AT-5FT-RCC3** exhibited reverse uptake for these two gases. As shown in fig. S6, the estimated ideal Kr/Xe molar selectivity could be switched at temperature below 0 °C. We ascribe this effect to **1AT-5FT-RCC3** having a cavity ideally suited to accommodate Kr but too small for Xe. Inserting one additional methyl group to form **6ET-RCC3** rendered the cavity too small to allow adsorption of either gas.

**Hydrogen isotope separation using an ultrafine aperture cage**

Efficient KQS requires porous solids where the difference between aperture size and gas diameter is comparable to the de Broglie wavelength. The kinetic diameter of hydrogen is 2.89 Å and previous studies suggest that the optimum aperture size to achieve KQS with rigid frameworks lies below 3.40 Å (*20*). It is quite difficult to obtain porous materials with pore apertures in this range, and so far, only one material with pore size <3.00 Å has been reported to separate D2 and H2 (*6*).

Molecular dynamic simulations suggested that **6ET-RCC3** has a pore-limiting envelope (PLE) centered at 1.95 Å but with a relatively broad time-averaged size distribution, with a value near the minimum molecular dimension of H2 (2.2 Å; Fig. 1C) (*27*). Hydrogen adsorption isotherms obtained from **6ET-RCC3** exhibited hysteresis between 30 and 60 K (Fig. 2B). The H2 uptake reached a maximum at 50 K (4.8 mmol/g at 1 bar). We observed the same phenomena for D2 adsorption (fig. S7, S8). The hysteresis was largest at 30 K and decreased with increasing temperature, suggesting greater equilibration.

We also compared the H2 adsorption behavior for two other organic cages, **CC3** (*24*) and **6FT-RCC3**, with calculated pore envelopes of around 4.5 Å and 3.4 Å, respectively. Both **CC3** and **6FT-RCC3** exhibited reversible type I adsorption isotherms (fig. S9), typical of nanoporous materials without kinetic diffusion barriers. The two cages showed an increased H2 uptake with decreasing temperature, with maximum uptakes at 30 K of 8.0 and 8.2 mmol/g at 1 bar. Unlike **6ET-RCC3**, no hysteresis was observed for **CC3** or **6FT-RCC3**. This difference suggests that the methyl groups in the **6ET-RCC3** cavities were responsible for its temperature-dependent flexibility, as this is the only structural difference between **6FT-RCC3** and **6ET-RCC3**.

**Fig. 2**. **Kinetic quantum sieving using ultra-small-pore organic cages.** (**A**) Pore limiting envelope for **6ET-RCC3**. The image (inset) shows the single crystal structures of **6ET-RCC3** with its accessible cage cavity (colored). (**B**) Hydrogen adsorption (closed) and desorption (open) isotherms of **6ET-RCC3** at different temperatures. (**C**) Thermal desorption spectra (TDS) of **6ET-RCC3** obtained after exposure to a 10 mbar 1:1 D2/H2 isotope mixture at different exposure temperatures for a fixed exposure time (*t*exp) of 30 min. The desorption spectra after evacuation at exposure temperature were measured for a heating rate of 0.1 K/s. (**D**) D2/H2 selectivities and gas uptakes as function of exposure time at 30 K for **CC3**, **6FT-RCC3**, and **6ET-RCC3**;see supplementary for additional comparison (fig. S10, S11).

Cryogenic thermal desorption spectroscopy (TDS) measurements verified the hydrogen isotope separation performance of **6ET-RCC3**. H2 and D2 desorption rates of **6ET-RCC3** (Fig. 2C) were collected during heating under vacuum with a rate of 0.1 K/s, after prior exposure to 1:1 H2/D2 mixture (10 mbar) at various exposure temperatures (*T*exp) between 30 and 77 K for 10 min exposure time (*t*exp). The area under the desorption peak is proportional to the amount of the desorbing gas, hence the selectivity for D2 over H2 could be obtained from the ratio of the peak areas (*6*).

TDS measurements showed that the uptake in **6ET-RCC3** increased with increasing temperature until a maximum for H2 and D2 was reached at *T*exp of 60 K before decreasing again at 77 K. The selectivity, *S*D2/H2, decreased with increasing *T*exp and exhibited a maximum of 3.9 at 30 K, which is a fairly good separation performance compared with previous reports of kinetic quantum sieving (*6, 34*). The onset temperature of gas desorption is nearly identical to the exposure temperature, since after exposure the chamber is evacuated at *T*exp prior to cooling to 20 K. No desorption peak was observed above 60 K for *T*exp = 30 K, implying no deep penetration into the structure at this temperature. For higher *T*exp, the desorption spectra were unusually shifted to higher temperatures, which we attributed to an increased penetration depth of gas molecules deeper into the cage structure. In agreement with observations from pure gas isotherms, the properties of **6ET-RCC3** can be attributed to the temperature-dependent opening of the pore aperture, similar behavior as observed in MFU-4 reported previously (*6*), which exhibited different effective aperture size at different *T*exp. This flexibility enhanced the accessibility of the pores to isotope molecules at higher exposure temperatures.

Fig. 2D shows *S*D2/H2 and the total quantity of gas adsorbed for **6ET-RCC3**, **6FT-RCC3**, and **CC3** as a function of *t*exp at *T*exp = 30 K (for detailed TDS spectra please refer to table S2). **6ET-RCC3** showed an increase in uptake for longer *t*exp, revealing that diffusion was hindered. At 30 K, *S*D2/H2 decreased with longer *t*exp, from 3.9 to 3.3 in the range between 10 and 300 min of exposure, which is a typical KQS response. The KQS effect is based on the diffusion limitation of the lighter isotope; equilibrium is approached for both isotopes for longer exposure times. The total uptake for **6ET-RCC3** at 30 K was only 0.8 mmol/g at *t*exp of 300 min, which is related to the hysteresis observed in the isotherm experiment at 30 K. The total gas uptake obtained at 30 K for **CC3** and **6FT-RCC3** was much higher (8.0 mmol/g), which is consistent with the adsorption results (fig. S8). For the larger-pore materials, **CC3** and **6FT-RCC3**, *S*D2/H2 was lower and remained constant at 1.2 and 2.1, respectively, for different *t*exp, in keeping with rapid, barrier-free diffusion of H2 and D2.

**Enhanced quantum sieving performance in a two-component cage cocrystal**

**Fig. 3.** **Formation of a cocrystal enhances the D2/H2 separation performance.** (**A**) Left: Scheme showing the cocrystal, **Cocryst1**, formed by chiral recognition between two cages to integrate capacity and selectivity in a single material; Middle: simplified representation of the crystal structure of **Cocryst1**, with pore channels shown in yellow; Right: single crystal structure of **Cocryst1**. (**B**) H2 and D2 adsorption (closed) and desorption (open) isotherms of **Cocryst1** at different temperatures. (**C**) D2/H2 isotherm ratio as function of pressure for different temperatures. (**D**) TDS for **Cocryst1**, obtained after exposure to a 10 mbar 1:1 H2/D2 isotope mixture for different exposure temperatures (*T*exp) and a fixed exposure time (*t*exp) of 30 min. (**E**) D2/H2 selectivity as a function of *t*exp at 30 K (red), 40 K (blue) and 50 K (green). (**F**) TDS for **Cocryst1**, obtained after exposure to a 10 mbar 1:1 H2/D2 isotope mixture for different exposure times at 30 K. (**G**) The corresponding amount of adsorbed H2 (black), D2 (red) and selectivity (blue) as functions of *t*exp at 30 K.

These single-component cage crystals either exhibited good selectivity but poor gas capacity (**6ET-RCC3**) or good gas capacity but poor selectivity (**CC3** and **6FT-RCC3**). For the optimal separation of isotopes, the ideal KQS material should combine large cavities to store more D2 along with a narrow pore aperture to increase the kinetic separation. Taking advantage of the chiral recognition assembly of discrete cage molecules (*35*), we designed a cocrystal structure that combined two different cages: **6ET-RCC3** was chosen as the diffusion barrier, blocking H2 diffusion and providing the KQS effect, and **CC3** was chosen as the partner cage to provide enough pore space for high gas adsorption (Fig. 3A).

The structure of the cocrystal, **Cocryst1** (**6ET-RCC3**-*R* / **CC3**-*S*,1:1), is shown in Fig. 3A (right, see fig. S12 for structural details). Because the cage cavities formed the nodes of the diamondoid pore network, four selective **6ET-RCC3** cages surrounded each **CC3** storage. Gas molecules diffusing through the cocrystal were forced to traverse the small pores in **6ET-RCC3**.

**Cocryst1** was studied using D2 and H2 high-resolution adsorption experiments collected between 20 and 77 K (Fig. 3B; fig. S13 presents additional isotherms). The amount of gas absorbed at 1 bar showed a maximum at 40 K for both gases. As for **6ET-RCC3**, the hysteresis in **Cocryst1** was high at lower temperatures because of the large diffusion barrier, particularly at 30 K; at higher temperatures, a temperature-dependent opening of the aperture allowed both H2 and D2 molecules to diffuse faster.

The ratio of D2/H2 calculated for each point on the isotherms as a function of the pressure is presented in Fig. 3C. **Cocryst1** exhibited a maximum D2/H2 uptake ratio of 3.5 at 30 K and 25 mbar, which is consistent with the lack of equilibrium at 30 K, implying that the cocrystalpossessed good separation capabilities. To our knowledge, the D2 /H2 uptake ratio of **Cocryst1** is one of the largest values calculated from pure-gas adsorption isotherms (*6, 20, 34, 36, 37*).

We investigated actual gas separation by TDS. **Cocryst1** was exposed to 10 mbar of 1:1 H2/D2 mixture for 30 min at various exposure temperatures. The resulting TDS spectra for *T*exp 30, 40, and 50 K are shown in Fig. 3D; additional TDS spectra for **Cocryst1** are presented in fig. S14. The uptake after exposure to the gas mixture rose with increasing exposure temperature, until a maximum for the combined gas uptake was reached at 40 K. In contrast to **6ET-RCC3**, **Cocryst1** shows desorption up to 80 K for *T*exp = 30 K, indicating gas penetration of the cages at a lower exposure temperature. The uptake then decreased until no desorption peak is observed at 77 K. *S*D2/H2 reached a maximum of 7.7 at 30 K, and dropped to lower values at 40 and 50 K (Fig. 3E). For a constant exposure temperature of 30 K, thermally-activated flexibility was again observed. As exposure time increased from 10 to 600 min, *S*D2/H2 remained near 8.0 (7.7 to 8.2), but the D2 uptake was enhanced from 0.4 to 4.7 mmol/g (Fig. 3, F and G), indicating hindered diffusion. X-ray diffraction data indicate that **Cocryst1** remained highly crystalline and did not change its structure during the TDS measurements (fig. S18).

The kinetics of pure H2 and D2 gas uptake were studied by TDS after exposure at 30 K for exposure times varying from 10 to 1200 min (fig. S14). For both gases, **Cocryst1** showed a remarkable increase in uptake for longer exposure time. Whereas the D2 uptake was almost identical for exposure times between 600 and 1200 min, the H2 amount still increased at longer exposure times. Because D2 reached saturation faster, it likely had a much different diffusion rate than H2.

**Fig. 4. Summary of hydrogen isotope KQS selectivities and adsorption capacities for various porous materials (directly measured by TDS).** The list includes carbon (Takeda 3A (*38*)), MOFs (MFU-4 (*6,* *22,* *38*), MOF-5 (*38*), IFP (*39*)), COFs (Py@COF-1 (*40*), zeolite 5A (*16*), and porous organic cages (**CC3**, **6FT-CC3**, **6ET-CC3**, **Cocryst1**). The practical performance of a KQS adsorbent will be a combination of its selectivity and its capacity; on this basis, the cage cocrystal shows the most promising performance here.

The H2/D2 separation properties of **Cocryst1** were excellent; *S*D2/H2 ~ 8.0, combined with a greatly enhanced D2 uptake with respect to **6ET-RCC3** (4.7 mmol/g). The experimental *S*D2/H2 values for various reported porous KQS adsorbents are compared in Fig. 4 and table S3. Of these, only two other porous solids have combined a selectivity greater than 3 with a gas uptake larger than 1.0 mmol/g (dashed lines in Fig. 4). The cage cocrystal displays the best combination of selectivity and D2 uptake reported so far.

**Molecular simulations of the hydrogen isotope separation in organic cages**

**Fig. 5. Simulations provide insights into the mechanism for hydrogen isotope separation by the porous organic cages.** (**A**–**C**) A pair of neighboring cage molecules in **6ET-RCC3** (**A**), **Cocryst1** (**B**) or **CC3** (**C**); gray, white and blue atoms represent carbon, hydrogen and nitrogen, respectively, with pore spaces inside the cage molecules, defined by a spherical probe with diameter 2.2 Å, colored in red. In **A**, the colored pore space runs through a **6ET-RCC3** cage window with two methyl groups (left cage) and a second **6ET-RCC3** cage window with one methyl group (right cage); in **B**, the pore runs through a **6ET-RCC3** cage window with one methyl group (left cage) and a neighboring **CC3** cage window (right cage). (**D**–**E**) Predicted single-component adsorption isotherms of D2 and H2 in **6ET-RCC3** (**D**), **Cocryst1** (**E**) and **CC3** (**F**). Five independent simulations were performed to predict the adsorption uptake at each pressure at the respective temperature; the average of the five predicted uptakes was used to plot the isotherm, with error bars showing the maximum and the minimum of the five predictions. (**G**–**I**) Predicted D2/H2 selectivity, calculated using competitive adsorption simulations of an equimolar D2/H2 mixture for **6ET-RCC3** (**G**), **Cocryst1** (**H**) and **CC3** (**I**). Similarly, five independent simulations were performed to predict the average uptake and to determine the error bars. (**J**–**L**) PIMD simulations predict D2/H2 selectivity and gas diffusion for a single, isolated **6ET-RCC3** cage (see Supplementary Text, 2.13 for simulation details). (**J**) Transition state for the translocation of a quantum H2 molecule; a single snapshot is shown, with an overlay of all 32 replicas in the PIMD simulation, illustrating the nuclear quantum fluctuations. Additional translucent, red dots depict the fluctuations of the translocating H2 molecule, taken from 100 transition-state configurations. (**K**) Relative population of D2 over H2 inside the cage versus in the gas phase, as a function of temperature, compared with the observed experimental D2/H2 selectivities. (**L**) Free energy profiles for a single molecule of quantum H2 (black) or quantum D2 (red) diffusing through a window of an isolated **6ET-RCC3** molecule at 50 K. Definitions of errors in **K** and **L** are given in section 2.13, Supplementary Text.

To further probe the separation mechanism, we simulated equilibrium adsorption isotherms for both single-component adsorption (Fig.5, D to F) and an equimolar mixture of H2 and D2 (Fig. 5, G to I) in **CC3**, **6ET-RCC3** and **Cocryst1** by combining grand-canonical Monte Carlo (GCMC) simulations with the Feynman–Hibbs (FH) effective potential (*41*). We also used a hybrid GCMC/molecular dynamic scheme, allowing for direct sampling of host motions in adsorption simulations, which was shown before to be important for gas adsorption in porous organic cages (*27, 42*). The simulated adsorption isotherms (Fig. 5, D to I) are in good agreement with experiment, corroborating both the experimental adsorption data and the TDS results. All three cage crystals were predicted to be selective toward D2 over H2, with increased selectivity as the temperature decreases. Moreover, computation suggests, in agreement with experiment, that **Cocryst1** exhibits the high D2 selectivity of **6ET-RCC3** while achieving the higher gas uptake capacities associated with the **CC3** partner cage.

Diffusion of the hydrogen isotopes in **CC3**, **6ET-RCC3** and **Cocryst1** were investigated and interpreted by comparison of the free-energy barriers for H2 and D2 in a given crystal structure at infinite dilution (see section 2.10.3, Supplementary Text). In the transition-state theory approximation, molecular diffusivity can be derived from a rate constant for the molecule hopping over the free-energy barrier. Figure S31 (Supplementary Text) shows the free-energy profile for a diffusion pathway between the center of mass of a cage molecule and the center of mass of a neighboring cage, travelling across two cage windows. In **CC3** (Fig. S31 C), both H2 and D2 moved easily between the two cage molecules in an almost barrier-free way. By contrast, the congested cage cavities and narrowed window apertures in **6ET-RCC3** resulted in sharply peaked free-energy barriers (fig. S31 A), strongly decreasing the molecular diffusivity compared to **CC3**.

When two methyl groups were located in a single **6ET-RCC3** cage window, the pore space became disconnected and the diffusion barrier became too large to cross (off-scale in fig. S31 A; cage on the left). For windows with only one methyl group (fig. S31 A, cage on the right), the pore space ran through continuously between the cages and the free-energy barriers for H2 and D2 were lowered substantially. Crucially, **6ET-RCC3** cage windows containing one methyl group provided diffusion barriers that were different for D2 and H2 and acted as a kinetic sieve. This feature was also carried over into **Cocryst1** (fig. S31 B). In **Cocryst1**, the large **CC3** cavities also provided good dynamical relaxation, resulting in improved D2 kinetics and higher D2 uptakes.

We further combined path integral molecular dynamics (PIMD) simulations with quantum mechanical interaction evaluations to probe the adsorption and diffusion behaviors of H2 and D2 in the **6ET-RCC3** cage molecule, explicitly accounting for the quantum mechanical nature of both the electrons and the nuclei (Fig. 5, J to L). PIMD simulations predicted the binding free energy of D2 to be around 0.50 kJ mol-1 lower than for H2 across the temperature range 30–77 K. This difference in binding free energy translates into a relative population of D2 over H2 inside the cage of 4.21 at 50 K (Fig. 5H), rising to 24.65 at 30 K (see section 2.13, Supplementary Text). There is qualitative agreement between these simulated relative populations and the measured D2/H2 selectivity in the temperature range 30–77 K (Fig. 5K). We also estimated the free energy barriers for a single molecule of quantum H2 and quantum D2 diffusing out of the **6ET-RCC3** cage molecule (Fig. 5L). These simulations show that nuclear quantum effects both destabilize H2 relative to D2 inside the cage, and also provide a higher free energy barrier for diffusion of H2 through the cage windows. The different barrier heights can be understood as the different degrees of zero-point fluctuations that increase the effective size of H2 more than D2, thereby making it more difficult for H2 to pass through the window aperture.

Analysis of the various pore structures and the simulated adsorption and diffusion results (Fig. 5, fig. S30) could explain why the selectivity for **Cocryst1** was double that of **6ET-RCC3** (*S*D2/H2 = 8.2 vs 3.9). The small channels in **6ET-RCC3** led to single-file diffusion. Once a molecule penetrated the pore, no passing between the isotopes in the channels is possible. Hence, the desorption after exposure to a 1:1 mixture exhibited identical maximum temperatures for both isotopes (Fig. 2C)—the gas molecules left in the same order that they entered—whereas the maximum for pure gas desorption appeared lower for D2 than for H2 (Fig. 2B and fig. S7).

By contrast, **Cocryst1** consisted of a combination of large storage pores (**CC3**, also selective toward D2 over H2 at 30 K) and small separation pores, separated by a differential diffusional barrier (fig. S30 B, Fig. 5L). Penetration through the small apertures into the next larger cavity yielded an additional sieving effect, whereby D2 molecules can pass neighboring H2 molecules, unlike in the single-file pores of **6ET-RCC3**.As a result, **Cocryst1** had greatly enhanced D2/H2 selectivity, although there were half as many small windows as in **6ET-RCC3**.

**Outlook**

When the field of porous organic cages (POCs) began, there was a strong emphasis on producing materials with large pore volumes and high surface areas to rival solids such as MOFs (*24, 43-45*). Our study suggests that there are benefits in designing solids that are “barely porous” (*44*). By itself, this approach led to materials such as **6ET-RCC3** with low gas capacities, but by pairing small- and large-pore cages in a single cocrystal, we accessed a material with unprecedented gas separation properties. This strategy might be extended to give even better performance, for example, by introducing storage cages with larger capacities than **CC3**, providing that the differential diffusional barrier between cages is preserved.

Our approach allows extremely delicate tuning of pore size—the entire tunability window for this series of cages spans the diameter a single nitrogen atom—and ideally suits applications such as KQS. Although the synthetic method involves multistep organic synthesis (Fig. 1B), including protection and deprotection steps, each step proceeded in nearly 100% yield. Because there was no need to purify intermediates, there is good potential to scale up the amount of materials made for practical separations.

Computational studies (Fig. 5) helped to explain the superior H2/D2 separation performance of the cocrystal. While these calculations post-rationalized the experimental observations, the good agreement between theory and experiment suggests that the a priori design of new systems might be possible, perhaps using methods such as crystal structure prediction to identify suitable hypothetical systems (*35, 46*).
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