Variable Pressure Spectrophotometric Equilibrium and <sup>139</sup>La NMR Kinetic Studies of Lanthanum(III) Ion Complex Formation with 2,6-Dicarboxy-4hydroxypyridine in Aqueous Solution<sup>†</sup>

Y. DUCOMMUN, L. HELM, G. LAURENCZY and A. E. MERBACH\*

Institut de Chimie Minérale et Analytique, Université de Lausanne, 3 Place du Château, CH-1005 Lausanne, Switzerland

(Received November 11, 1988)

The rate constants for complex formation reactions of trivalent lanthanide aqua-ions are generally very fast, and consequently often difficult to measure. Reactions with multidentate ligands, however, can be slower when chelation is the rate-controlling process. The present work is a variable pressure study of the dissociation of the monocomplex of  $La^{3+}$  with a tridentate ligand, 2,6-dicarboxy-4-hydroxypyridine (eqn. (1)) by <sup>139</sup>La NMR lineshape analysis. The <sup>139</sup>La NMR method as applied to kinetic measurements has been described in a previous publication [1]. Using the spectrophotometrically determined equilibrium constant for this reaction, the rate constant and activation parameters for complex formation can then be derived.



## Experimental

La(ClO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>3</sub> and 2,6-dicarboxy-4-hydroxypyridine (H<sub>3</sub>dcp) solutions were prepared as decribed previously [1].

0020-1693/89/\$3.50

<sup>139</sup>La NMR spectra were obtained on a Bruker AM400 spectrometer with an <sup>17</sup>O high-pressure probe [2] modified to work at the <sup>139</sup>La resonance frequency. Variable pressure NMR measurements were recorded at 275.7 K and 339.5 K up to 200 MPa. The concentrations were  $C_{LaHdep} = 0.0788$  M and  $C_{La} = 0.0894$  M [1].

Spectrophotometric data were obtained on a Perkin-Elmer Lambda 7 spectrophotometer. The equilibrium constant at 298.2 K was determined from spectra at different concentrations ( $C_{\text{Hdep}} =$  $1.8 \times 10^{-6}$  M and  $2.0 \times 10^{-6} \leq C_{\text{La}} \leq 1.0 \times 10^{-4}$  M). The variable temperature (273.7 to 325.8 K) and pressure (up to 200 MPa at 298 K) measurements were carried out at 285 nm ( $\epsilon_{\text{LaHdep}} = 2987$  cm<sup>-1</sup>  $M^{-1}$  and  $\epsilon_{\text{Hdep}} = 8900$  cm<sup>-1</sup>  $M^{-1}$ , l = 5 cm) with a solution of  $C_{\text{Hdep}} = 1.8 \times 10^{-6}$  M and  $C_{\text{La}} = 2.0 \times 10^{-6}$  M ( $l = 1 \times 10^{-3}$  M NaClO<sub>4</sub>). The variable pressure study was made in a high-pressure optical cell built in our laboratory [3].

## **Results and Discussion**

In the slow exchange limit chosen for the NMR experiment, the measured transverse relaxation rate of the aquated lanthanum(III) ion,  $1/T_{2,La}$ , is given by eqn. (2). The effect of pressure on the dissociation rate constant  $k_r$  and on the quadrupolar relaxation rate  $1/T_{2Q,La}$  is given by eqns. (3) and (4) respective-

$$1/T_{2,La} = k_r + 1/T_{2Q,La}$$
 (2)

$$k_{\mathbf{r}} = k_{\mathbf{r},0} \exp(-\Delta V_{\mathbf{r}}^{\dagger} P/RT)$$
(3)

$$1/T_{2Q,La} = (1/T_{2Q,La})_0 \exp(-\Delta V_{Q,La}^* P/RT)$$
 (4)

ly. The  $k_{r,0}$  and  $(1/T_{2Q,La})_0$  parameters are defined as the zero pressure values. The data (Fig. 1) were analyzed using eqns. (2) to (4)  $(k_{r,0}^{339.5}, (1/T_{2Q,La})_0^{257.7}, \Delta V_r^{\ddagger}$  and  $\Delta V_{Q,La}^{\ddagger}$  as adjustable parameters) with a value of 8.7 s<sup>-1</sup> at 275.7 K (taken from ref. 1) for the  $k_r$  term in eqn. (2), which amounts to less than 1% of  $1/T_{2,La}$  at that temperature, and a value of 272 s<sup>-1</sup> at 339.5 K [1] for the  $1/T_{2Q,La}$  term, which is in turn a minor contribution of the measured relaxation rate (~20%). The stability constant  $K^{298}$  was obtained from

The stability constant  $K^{298}$  was obtained from data collected at several wavelengths between 255 and 315 nm and calculated with a minimizing computer program [4]. Its temperature dependence was analyzed with  $K^{298}$  (or  $\Delta S^{\circ}$ ) and  $\Delta H^{\circ}$  as adjusted parameters, and the variable pressure data were fitted to eqn. (5), with  $K_0$  and  $\Delta V^{\circ}$  as variables (Table 1).

$$\ln K = \ln K_0 - \Delta V^{\rm o} P/RT \tag{5}$$

© Elsevier Sequoia/Printed in Switzerland

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Part 39 of the series 'High-Pressure NMR Kinetics'; for part 38 see ref. 2.

<sup>\*</sup>Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.



Fig. 1. Observed <sup>139</sup>La NMR transverse relaxation rates  $1/T_{2,La}$  as a function of pressure at 275.7 K (**•**) and 339.5 K ( $\circ$ ).

TABLE 1. Pressure and Temperature Dependencies of the Stability Constant K

P (MPa) <sup>a</sup>	<i>T</i> (K)	$10^6 \times K (M^{-1})$
	273.7	6.3
	288.5	4.5
	298.2	3.9
	310.5	3.6
	325.9	3.2
0.1		3.9
25		3.1
50		3.5
75		2.6
100		2.0
125		2.1
175		1.6
200		1.5

<sup>a</sup>At 298 K.

Table 2 summarizes the kinetic, thermodynamic and NMR parameters. The kinetic parameters of the complex formation reaction may be discussed according to the Eigen-Wilkins mechanism, which considers ion-pairing to occur in a fast pre-equilibrium before the rate-determining interchange of water for the ligand, with rate constant  $k_{\rm I}$  [5]. The stability constant of the ion-pair complex can be evaluated using the Fuoss model, which yields a value of  $K_{os}$  = 1700 M<sup>-1</sup> (r = 500 ppm) [6]. The deduced value of  $5 \times 10^5$  s<sup>-1</sup> for  $k_1 (=k_f/K_{os})$  is small compared to the water exchange rate constant on  $La^{3+}$  (10<sup>8</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>  $\leq$  $k_{\rm ex} \leq 10^9 \, {\rm s}^{-1}$  [7]). This suggests that chelation is rate determining in forming the complex, as was previously observed with a similar ligand [8]. The electrostrictive and chelation-dechelation contributions to  $\Delta V_{\mathbf{f}}^{\dagger}$  and  $\Delta V_{\mathbf{r}}^{\dagger}$  are, however, hard to evaluate. The large expansion ( $\Delta V^{\circ} = +12.1 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1}$ )

TABLE 2. Kinetic, Thermodynamic and NMR Parameters

$\frac{\log K^{298} (M^{-1})}{k_r^{298} (s^{-1})} \\ k_f^{298} (M^{-1} s^{-1})$	$6.58 \pm 0.09^{a}$ 207 ± 51 <sup>b</sup> 8 × 10 <sup>8</sup> <sup>c</sup>
$\Delta H^{0} (\mathbf{kJ} \operatorname{mol}^{-1}) \Delta H_{\mathbf{x}}^{\ddagger} (\mathbf{kJ} \operatorname{mol}^{-1}) \Delta H_{\mathbf{f}}^{\ddagger} (\mathbf{kJ} \operatorname{mol}^{-1})$	$-9.4 \pm 1.5$ 38.3 ± 3.1 <sup>b</sup> 29 <sup>c</sup>
$\Delta S^{\circ} (J K^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1})$ $\Delta S_{\mathbf{f}}^{\ddagger} (J K^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1})$ $\Delta S_{\mathbf{f}}^{\ddagger} (J K^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1})$	+95 ± 5 +72 ± 8 <sup>b</sup> +23 <sup>c</sup>
$\Delta V^{o} (cm^{3} mol^{-1})$ $\Delta V_{\mathbf{r}}^{\ddagger} (cm^{3} mol^{-1})$ $\Delta V_{\mathbf{f}}^{\ddagger} (cm^{3} mol^{-1})$	+12.1 ± 1.5 -4.9 ± 0.3 +7 <sup>e</sup>
$\frac{1/T_{2Q,La}^{298} (s^{-1})}{1/T_{2Q,LaHdcp}^{298} (s^{-1})} E_{Q,La} (kJ mol^{-1}) E_{Q,LaHdcp} (kJ mol^{-1}) \Delta V_{Q,La}^{\ddagger} (cm^{3} mol^{-1})$	$550 \pm 83^{b}$ $20000 \pm 800^{b}$ $26.4 \pm 5.8^{b}$ $16.3 \pm 1.6^{b}$ $\pm 1.5 \pm 0.4$

<sup>a</sup>Quoted errors correspond to one standard deviation. <sup>b</sup>Taken from ref. 1.

<sup>c</sup>Derived from equilibrium and dissociation reaction kinetics data.

well reflects the strong electrostriction decrease due to charge neutralization in forming the complex. The activation volumes are of opposite signs and small with respect to the  $\Delta V^{o}$ , precluding decisive mechanistic conclusions, as would be possible in more clear-cut cases.

## Acknowledgement

The Swiss National Science Foundation is thanked for financial support (Grant 2.672-0.87).

## References

- 1 Y. Ducommun, L. Helm, G. Laurenczy and A.E. Merbach, Magn. Reson. Chem., 26 (1988) 1023.
- 2 C. Cossy, L. Helm and A. E. Merbach, submitted for publication.
- 3 D. T. Richens, Y. Ducommun and A. E. Merbach, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 109 (1987) 4444.
- 4 H. Gampp, M. Maeder, C. J. Meyer and A. D. Zuberbühler, *Talanta*, 32 (1985) 95 and 252.
- 5 (a) M. Eigen, Z. Electrochem., 64 (1960) 115; (b) R. G. Wilkins and M. Eigen, Adv. Chem. Ser., 49 (1965) 55.
  6 D. W. Margerum, G. R. Cayley, D. C. Weatherburn and
- 6 D. W. Margerum, G. R. Cayley, D. C. Weatherburn and G. K. Pagenkopf, in A. E. Martell (ed.), *Coordination Chemistry*, Vol. 2, ACS Monograph 174, American Chemical Society, Washington, 1978, p. 17.
- 7 C. Cossy and A. E. Merbach, Pure Appl. Chem., 60 (1988) 1785.
- 8 T. E. Eriksen, I. Grenthe and I. Puigdomenech, Inorg. Chim. Acta, 126 (1987) 131.