Equilibrium Studies on Mercury(II)—Porphyrins in Aqueous Solution

# ADEGBOYE O. ADEYEMO and M. KRISHNAMURTHY

Department of Chemistry, Howard University, Washington, D.C. 20059, U.S.A.

Received September 29, 1983

#### Introduction

Recently we have reported [1] on mercury(II)– $H_2TPPS$  [2] equilibrium in aqueous solutions. The system was treated as a single equilibrium since the absorption spectra of the solution had an apparent isosbestic point during the titration. By comparison of the final spectrum with that of known mercury(II)-tetraphenylporphyrin [3] the composition of the resultant species were assumed to be two mercury(II) ions to one porphyrin. Since then we have studied this system under varying conditions employing in addition to  $H_2$  TPPS, a peripherally positively charged porphyrin,  $H_2$  TAPP, in water. Results of these studies have altered our conclusions drastically and are presented here.

### Experimental

Experimental details are the same as reported earlier [1]. Additional details are the following: H<sub>2</sub>TAPP was synthesized as in the literature [4]. An approximately  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  M solution of H<sub>2</sub>TAPP was used in the titrations with mercury(II) ions. Titrations with both porphyrins were also recorded in the Soret region (390-450 nm) using a 0.1 cm pathlength cuvette. Titrations employing further dilution of both H<sub>2</sub>TPPS (2.51 × 10<sup>-7</sup> M) and H<sub>2</sub>-TAPP (2.45 × 10<sup>-7</sup> M) were performed and recorded in the Soret region using a 10.0 cm pathlength cuvette.

#### **Results and Discussion**

Changes in the 480–700 nm region in the spectrum of  $H_2TAPP$  solution upon addition of mercury-(II)nitrate is presented in Fig. 1. Under the conditions of this titration, the freebase porphyrin exists in monomeric form. Resemblance of these changes to those obtained in the  $Hg^{2+}-H_2TPPS$ system indicates that the same type of product is obtained despite the peripheral positive charge.

0020-1693/84/\$3.00



Fig. 1. Changes in the spectrum of  $H_2$ TAPP solution (~10<sup>-5</sup> M) during the titration with  $Hg^{2+}$  (path length of cuvette = 1.0 cm).



Fig. 2. Changes in the spectrum of  $H_2 TAPP$  (5.12 × 10<sup>-5</sup> *M*) during the titration with  $Hg^{2+}$  (path length of the cuvette = 0.1 cm).

Here again, a set of well defined isosbestic points are observed at 556 nm and 490 nm, suggesting the absence of complex equilibria.

In order to understand the catalysis caused by mercury(II) ions in metal incorporation reaction [5, 6], a titration was carried out in the Soret region (400–450 nm), employing  $10^{-6} M H_2$ TAPP. In this titration no clear isosbestic point was observed Moreover in addition to the expected Sorets due to freebase (412 nm) and the product mercuryporphy-

© Elsevier Sequoia/Printed in Switzerland



Fig. 3. Changes in the spectrum of  $H_2 TAPP$  (2.5 × 10<sup>-7</sup> M) during the titration with  $Hg^{2+}$  (path length of the cuvette = 10.0 cm).

rin, a third peak was noted. But when the titration was repeated employing the same concentration of H<sub>2</sub>TAPP (5.12 ×  $10^{-5}$  M) as was employed before, the spectral changes were well defined with an isosbestic point at 421.5 nm (Fig. 2). Then titrations were carried out with H<sub>2</sub>TAPP concentration in the range of  $10^{-7}$  M. Spectral changes were well behaved with a clear cut isosbestic point at 415 nm (Fig. 3). The final product spectrum resembles that reported by Dorough et al. [7] for the normal 1:1 mercury(II)-tetraphenylporphyrin. Thus we treated this equilibrium observed in dilute porphyrin solutions as due to mono mercury-porphyrin. The same type of results were observed with H<sub>2</sub>-TPPS also.

If the species observed in dilute porphyrin solutions are 1:1, (mercury:ligand), the species observed in concentrated porphyrin solutions cannot be 2:1 (mercury:ligand) as more ligand is available per metal ion in these solutions. Moreover, if 1:1 species at all possible, it should also be observed as a step in the formation of 2:1. Therefore we hypothesized the species observed in concentrated porphyrin solutions to be 3:2 (mercury:porphyrin) double sandwich type complexes. Mercury(II) is well known to adopt tetrahedral geometry in coordination. This 3:2 arrangement would perfectly satisfy such a geometry. Other porphyrins, such as octaethylporphyrin [8], are known to form such 3:2 species. The fact that  $H_2$ TPP formed a 2:1 rather than 3:2 (double sandwich) complex with mercury(II) was explained in terms of possible steric hindrance between phenyl rings of the porphyrins. But it is well known that H<sub>2</sub>-TPPS and some of its metal complexes aggregate in water solutions. Thus the following two stoichiometries were assumed in the treatment of equilibria:

$$Hg^{2+} + H_2 TAPP = HgTAPP + 2H^+$$
 dilute solution (1)

$$(H_2 TAPP \approx 10^{-7} M)$$

 $3 Hg^{2+} + 2 H_2 TAPP = Hg_3 (TAPP)_2 + 4 H^{2+}$ (2)

Concentrated solution (H<sub>2</sub>TAPP  $\approx 10^{-5}$  M)

For reactions (1) and (2), the following equations can be derived:

$$K'_{1} = (A_{i} - A_{t})(A_{t} - A_{f})^{-1} \times \\ \times [(Hg^{2+}) \text{ added } - (A_{i} - A_{t})C_{T} (A_{i} - A_{f})^{-1}] \\ \text{and } K_{1} = K'_{1}(H^{+})^{2}$$
(3)  
$$K'_{2} = [(A_{i} - A_{t})/4(A_{t} - A_{f})^{2})] [2(A_{i} - A_{f})/C_{T}] \times$$

× 
$$[(Hg^{2*}) added - 3C_T(A_i - A_t)/2(A_i - A_f)]^{-3}$$
  
and  $K_2 = K'_1(H^*)^4$  (4)

$$d K_2 = K_1'(H')^4$$
 (4)

where  $A_i$ ,  $A'_t$  and  $A_f$  are absorbances of the solution at a constant wavelength initially, when varying amounts of  $Hg^{2+}$  are added and when  $Hg_3(TAPP)_2$ , (HgTAPP for eqn. (3)) is the only light absorbing species in solution, respectively;  $C_T$  is the total porphyrin concentration.

The equilibrium constants,  $-\log K_1$ , computed at 412 and 419 nm for 1:1 mercury-porphyrin complex are  $8.34 \pm 0.01$  and  $8.38 \pm 0.01$  respectively for peripherally positively charged porphyrin H<sub>2</sub>-TAPP. Similar constants computed at 412 and 419 nm are  $8.38 \pm 0.08$  and  $8.38 \pm 0.04$  (for the peripherally negatively charged porphyrin H<sub>2</sub>TPPS). The favorable comparison between these sets of equilibrium constants computed for the H<sub>2</sub>TPPS and H<sub>2</sub>TAPP rules out any notion of interference of either peripheral net charge or sulfonic acid groups in these systems.

The equilibrium constants computed for H<sub>2</sub>-TPPS at 412, 433, 518 and 616 nm are  $13.4 \pm 0.1$ ,  $13.7 \pm 0.2$ ,  $12.5 \pm 0.3$  and  $12.8 \pm 0.2$  respectively. Similar constants for H<sub>2</sub>TAPP, computed at 412, 433, 512 and 624 nm are 15.5  $\pm$  0.3, 15.1  $\pm$ 0.4,  $14.3 \pm 0.4$  and  $13.8 \pm 0.1$ , respectively. While for any system other than simple 1:1, this method of computation is not very sensitive or reliable, some broad conclusions can be made on these constants. Such large negative numbers indicate the general instability of the complex species. While H<sub>2</sub>TPPS is known to aggregate, H<sub>2</sub>TAPP does not aggregate under these conditions. Since in forming a double sandwich, any such aggregating or hydrophobic tendency would aid, it is not surprising that these constants are less negative for  $H_2$ TPPS system than for  $H_2$ TAPP system.

In conclusion, mercury(II) ions form weak complexes with water soluble porphyrins in ratio of 1:1 (metal`to ligand) in lower porphyrin concentrations and in ratio of 3:2 (metal to ligand) in high porphyrin concentrations.

# Acknowledgement

Financial assistance from grant # S06RR08016-11 from the MBRS Program, DRR/NIH is greatly acknowledged.

# References

- 1 A. Adeyemo and M. Krishnamurthy, Inorg. Chem., 16, 3355 (1977).
- 2 The following abbreviations for porphyrins employed in this study are used:  $H_2TPPS =$  the free base of tetra(*p*sulfonatophenyl)porphyrin;  $H_2TAPP =$  free base of tetra-(*p*-trimethylammoniumphenyl)porphyrin.
- 3 M. F. Hudson and K. M. Smith, Tetrahedron, 32, 597 (1976).
- 4 M. Krishnamurthy, Indian J. Chem., 15B, 964 (1977).
- 5 A. Thompson and M. Krishnamurthy, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem., 41, 1251 (1979).
- 6 M. Tabata and M. Tanaka, Inorg. Chim. Acta, 40, 71 (1980).
- 7 G. D. Dorough, J. R. Miller and F. M. Huennekens, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 73, 4315 (1951).
- 8 M. F. Hudson and K. M. Smith, Tetrahedron, 31, 3077 (1975).