## A Redox-switchable Ligand for which the Binding Ability is enhanced by Oxidation of its Ferrocene Unit

Giancarlo De Santis, Luigi Fabbrizzi,\* Maurizio Licchelli, Piersandro Pallavicini and Angelo Perotti

Dipartimento di Chimica Generale, Università di Pavia, 27100 Pavia, Italy

Electrochemical investigations on a ferrocene-modified tetraamine diketone ligand have demonstrated an unusual enhancement of the binding ability towards Ni<sup>2+</sup> when the redox subunit is switched to the ferrocenium form.

Considerable attention has been paid in the last few years to conjugate systems containing a redox function and a fragment able to bind a metal cation; these systems can behave either as chemical sensors 1 or as redox-switchable ligands. 2 In particular, the redox and binding properties of quinone-modified lariat ethers and podands,3 of ferrocene-containing polythioethers (polythia ferrocenophanes) 4 and of conjugate molecules containing one or more crown ethers or polythiapolyaza crown ethers and one or more ferrocene units 5 have been investigated. The most interesting quantity pertinent to these systems is  $\Delta E$  $(\Delta E = E_{tc} - E_{tu})$ , i.e. the difference between the potentials due to the redox functions in the complexed  $(E_{\frac{1}{2}c})$  and uncomplexed  $(E_{\pm u})$  molecules. All the reported  $\Delta E$  values are positive: quite reasonably, the presence of a positive charge (the complexed metal cation) close to the redox centre makes easier the attainment of a lower oxidation state ( $\Delta E > 0$  in the case of reducible redox functions) and more difficult the attainment of a higher oxidation state ( $\Delta E > 0$  in the case of oxidizable redox functions).

We have now synthesised the new ferrocene-modified, water-soluble, tetradentate ligands  $H_2L^1$  and  $L^2$  by aminolysis of diethyl (ferrocenylmethyl)malonate  $^6$  with ethane-1,2-diamine and through the reduction of  $H_2L^1$  with diborane in tetrahydrofuran, respectively. The ligand  $H_2L^1$  contains a dioxotetraamino binding framework  $^7$  and is able to complex  $Ni^{2+}$  in water, with the simultaneous release of the two amido protons, forming the neutral, square-planar complex [NiL<sup>1</sup>] [equation (1)]. On the other hand,  $L^2$  bears a tetraamine

$$H_2L^1 + Ni^{2+} \rightleftharpoons \lceil NiL^1 \rceil + 2H^+$$
 (1)

binding fragment <sup>8</sup> and binds Ni<sup>2+</sup> in aqueous solution to give a square stereochemistry [equation (2)]. The complexation

$$L^2 + Ni^{2+} \Longrightarrow [NiL^2]^{2+}$$
 (2)

constants pertinent to equations (1) and (2) (i.e.  $K_{red}$ , see following discussion) have been determined by means of potentiometric titration experiments (Table 1).

Differential pulse voltammetry (DPV) and cyclic voltammetry (CV) of the uncomplexed systems  $H_2L^1$  and  $L^2$  in aqueous solution (0.1 mol dm<sup>-3</sup> in NaClO<sub>4</sub>) were carried out at pH values at which the presence of charged (protonated) species is precluded (see Table 1) and disclosed in both cases a one-electron reversible redox process, ascribed to oxidation of the ferrocene moiety to ferrocenium,  $E_+$  402 and 351 mV vs. normal

Table 1 Electrochemical and complexation equilibria data for  $H_2L^1$  and  $L^2$  and their nickel(II) complexes

	$H_2L^1$	$L^2$
$\log K_{\rm red}$	-9.73(5)	15.10(5)
$\log K_{\rm ox}{}^a$	-9.0(1)	14.7(1)
$E_{k}/\text{mv}$ (uncomplexed) <sup>b</sup>	$402^{\circ}$ (10.5)	351° (11.0)
$E_{\frac{1}{2}}^{2}$ (nickel complex) <sup>b</sup>	360° (10.5)	376° (7.0)
	` '	$1067^{\hat{a}}(7.0)$

<sup>a</sup> Calculated on the basis of the experimentally determined  $\Delta E$  (see text) and  $\log K_{\rm red}$  values. <sup>b</sup> vs. NHE, in aqueous solution, 0.1 mol dm<sup>-3</sup> in NaClO<sub>4</sub>,  $\pm 3$  mV; the pH values at which the experiments were carried out are given in parentheses. Notice that the p $K_a$  values for the first protonation are 8.85(1) for  $H_2L^1$  and 9.95(1) for  $L^2$ ; no variation was observed in the voltammograms on increasing the pH to the limiting value of 12. <sup>c</sup> Relative to ferrocene–ferrocenium. <sup>d</sup> Relative to the Ni<sup>II</sup>–Ni<sup>III</sup> couple.

hydrogen electrode (NHE), respectively. In spite of the similarity of the appended binding fragments, the ferrocene subunits display a strikingly different electrochemical behaviour upon co-ordination of the ligands to Ni<sup>2+</sup>. In particular, DPV and CV experiments on aqueous solutions of [NiL<sup>1</sup>] and [NiL<sup>2</sup>]<sup>2+</sup> (0.1 mol dm<sup>-3</sup> in NaClO<sub>4</sub>; pH adjusted to values at which 100% of the metal in solution was in the desired complexed form, see Table 1) revealed an opposite trend: in the case of [NiL<sup>2</sup>]<sup>2+</sup>, the ferrocene-ferrocenium redox change takes place at a more positive potential than in the free ligand  $(\Delta E = +25 \text{ mV})$ ; in the case of [NiL<sup>1</sup>] this oxidation takes place at a more negative value ( $\Delta E = -42$  mV). Thus, paradoxically, the presence of a proximate positively charged centre (Ni<sup>2+</sup>) makes it distinctly easier, and not more difficult, to form the positively charged ferrocenium subunit. The case of [NiL<sup>1</sup>] represents, to our knowledge, the first example of a redox-functionalized ligand that features a negative  $\Delta E$ .

The apparent paradox can be explained in terms of electro-

(b)
$$L^{2} + Ni^{2+} \xrightarrow{K_{red}} [NiL^{2}]^{2+}$$

$$E_{\frac{1}{2}u} \downarrow \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow | E_{\frac{1}{2}c}$$

$$[L^{2+}]^{+} + Ni^{2+} \xrightarrow{K_{ox}} [NiL^{2+}]^{3+}$$
Scheme 1

static effects. Placing a dipositive  $Ni^{2+}$  cation in the tetramine donor set of  $L^2$  makes the oxidation of the proximate ferrocene subunit more difficult. On the other hand, on complexation  $H_2L^1$  becomes deprotonated and a double negative charge forms on the ligand system. This negative charge is not completely offset by the  $Ni^{2+}$  ion and the oxidation potential of the appended ferrocene is thereby shifted cathodically.

A thorough explanation of the above effect is given, from a different point of view, by Scheme 1,9 in which the complexation and redox equilibria pertinent to ligand  $H_2L^1$  (a) or  $L^2$  (b) with  $Ni^{2+}$  are summarized:  $K_{red}$  represents the complexation constant relative to the neutral, ferrocene-bearing ligands, while  $K_{ox}$  is relative to the oxidized, *ferrocenium*-bearing ligands. Equation (3) 9 holds for the situation described by Scheme 1 and

$$\Delta E = (RT/nF)\ln(K_{\rm red}/K_{\rm ox}) \tag{3}$$

allows one to calculate  $K_{\rm ox}$  from the experimentally obtained  $\Delta E$  and  $K_{\rm red}$  values. In particular (see Table 1),  $K_{\rm ox} > K_{\rm red}$  in the case of  $H_2L^1$  and  $K_{\rm ox} < K_{\rm red}$  in the case  $L^2$ . Ligand  $L^2$  displays behaviour typical of all reported ferrocene-modified ligands,  $^{1.5,10}$  in which a decrease in the complexation constant is observed when a metal cation is co-ordinated by a ligand bearing a charged substituent (e.g. ferrocenium) instead of a neutral one (ferrocene).

The case of  $H_2L^1$  can be explained by a closer examination of the complexation process [equation (1)]. This can be split into two steps, represented by equations (4) and (5), whose equilib-

$$H_2L^1 \Longrightarrow [L^1]^{2-} + 2H^+ \tag{4}$$

$$[L^1]^{2^-} + Ni^{2^+} \Longrightarrow [NiL^1]$$
 (5)

rium constants are  $K_4$  and  $K_5$  (notice that individual values of  $K_4$  and  $K_5$  cannot be determined). Thus,  $K_{red} = K_4 K_5$ . Similar

equations (4\*) and (5\*) can be written for the oxidized,

$$[H_2L^{1*}]^+ \rightleftharpoons [L^{1*}]^- + 2H^+$$
 (4\*)

$$[L^{1*}]^{-} + Ni^{2+} \Longrightarrow [NiL^{1*}]^{+}$$
 (5\*)

ferrocenium-bearing ligand 1  $[H_2L^{1*}]^+$ . In this case,  $K_{ox} = K_4*K_5*$ . The electrostatic repulsive effect, exerted by the positively charged ferrocenium subunit in  $[H_2L^{1*}]^+$  on the leaving amido protons, makes the value of  $K_4*$  higher than that of  $K_4$ . On the other hand,  $K_5$  should be higher than  $K_5*$ , following the general trend. Thus, it appears that  $K_4*$  increases with respect to  $K_4$  more significantly than  $K_5*$  decreases with respect to  $K_5$ , and on balance  $K_{0x} > K_{red}$ .

respect to  $K_5$ , and on balance  $K_{\rm ox} > K_{\rm red}$ . The compound  ${\rm H_2L^1}$  represents the first example of a new class of redox-switchable ligands, capable of binding enhancement towards cations upon oxidation of the appended redox function. It should be noted that  $[{\rm NiL^2}]^{2+}$  undergoes a further one-electron reversible oxidation process, which is ascribed to the  ${\rm Ni^{II}}$  to  ${\rm Ni^{III}}$  change. Its  $E_{\frac{1}{2}}$  value (1067 mV vs. NHE) is more positive than that observed for plain  $[{\rm NiL^3}]^{2+}$  ( ${\rm L^3}=3.7$ -diazanonane-1,9-diamine) (1032 mV vs. NHE), as expected, 11 due to the electrostatic repulsive effects exerted by the proximate ferrocenium subunit. The complex  $[{\rm NiL^1}]$  displays a further irreversible wave in both CV and DPV profiles.

## References

- 1 P. D. Beer, Chem. Soc. Rev., 1989, 18, 409.
- 2 G. W. Gokel, Crown Ethers and Cryptands, The Royal Society of Chemistry, Cambridge, 1991, p. 151.
- 3 D. A. Gustowski, M. Delgado, V. J. Gatto, L. Echegoyen and G. W. Gokel, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1986, 108, 7553.
- 4 M. Sato, S. Tanaka, S. Akabori and Y. Habata, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 1986, 59, 1515; M. Sato, K. Suzuki and S. Akabori, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 1986, 59, 3611.
- P. D. Beer, E. L. Tite and A. Abbotson, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1991, 1691; P. D. Beer, A. D. Keefe, H. Sikanyika, C. Blackburn and J. F. McAleer, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1990, 3289; P. D. Beer, J. E. Nation, S. L. W. McWhinnie, M. E. Harman, M. B. Hursthouse, M. I. Ogden and A. H. White, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1991, 2485; C. D. Hall, N. W. Sharpe, I. P. Danks and Y. P. Sang, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1989, 419.
- 6 A. Dormond and J. Dacombe, Bull. Chem. Soc. Fr., 1968, 3673.
- 7 M. Kodama and E. Kimura, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1981, 694.
- 8 L. Fabbrizzi, R. Barbucci and P. Paoletti, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1972, 1529.
- 9 M. P. Andrews, C. Blackburn, J. F. McAleer and V. D. Patel, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1987, 1122.
- 10 G. W. Gokel, J. C. Medina, C. Li, T. T. Goodnow, M. T. Rojes, J. C. Hernandez-Medina, S. Munoz, A. Nakano, J. L. Atwood and A. E. Keifer, in Supramolecular Chemistry, eds. V. Balzani and L. De Cola, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1992, p. 429.
- 11 A. M. De Blas, G. De Santis, L. Fabbrizzi, M. Licchelli, P. Pallavicini and A. Poggi, in Supramolecular Chemistry, eds. V. Balzani and L. De Cola, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1992, p. 87.

Received 10th August 1992; Communication 2/04339D