# **Kinetics of Excited-State Proton Transfer of Doubly Protonated 2-Aminoacridine**

Rong Yang<sup>1</sup> and Stephen G. Schulman<sup>1,2</sup>

Received February 19, 2001; accepted March 21, 2001

2-Aminoacridine has been used to extend the quantitation of excited-state proton-transfer kinetics in concentrated acid media to  $\cong 13 M$  sulfuric acid. The reasons for the large discrepancy between the excited-state dissociation constant determined from kinetic measurements and that calculated from a thermodynamic cycle are discussed.

KEY WORDS: Proton transfer; excited state; kinetics; 2-aminoacridine.

# INTRODUCTION

It has been about 50 years since Weller [1,2] first elucidated the quantitative relationship between the acidity dependences of the fluorescence of aromatic acids and bases and the kinetics and equilibria of their proton transfers in both the ground and the excited states. Weller's equations accurately describe the reactions of interest only when they occur in dilute, aqueous solutions. A treatment using a Hammett acidity function and taking account of water as a reactant [3], however, has been successfully used to quantitate the excited-state protontransfer kinetics of molecules which have neutral conjugate bases and singly charged conjugate acids and which ionize in concentrated acid media (pH ≪1) [3,4]. The derivation in ref. 3 may be applied to molecules with monocationic conjugate bases and dicationic conjugate acids by modifying the derivation to include  $H_{+}$  instead of  $H_0$  (the Hammett acidity function for molecules with neutral conjugate bases and monocationic conjugate acids). When this is done, the relationship between the relative quantum yields of fluorescence of conjugate acid and base and the acidity function becomes

$$\frac{\Phi/\Phi_0}{\Phi'/\Phi'_0 - \alpha_b} a_w^r = \frac{1}{k_a(0)\tau_0} + \frac{k_b(0)\tau'_0}{k_a(0)\tau_0} \times h_+ a_w^n \frac{\Phi'/\Phi'_0}{\Phi'/\Phi'_0 - \alpha_b}$$
(1)

which, when the ground- and excited-state inflection regions are well separated, so that  $\alpha_b = 0$ , as is the case here, becomes

$$(\Phi/\Phi_0/\Phi'/\Phi'_0)a_{\rm w}^r = 1/k_{\rm a}(0)\tau_0 + \frac{k_{\rm b}(0)\tau'_0}{k_{\rm a}(0)\tau_0}h_+a_{\rm w}^n \quad (2)$$

where  $a_w$  is the activity of water,  $h_+ = \operatorname{antilog}(-H_+)$ , and  $\alpha_{\rm b}$  is that fraction of the ground-state population which is found as the conjugate base. The relative quantum yield of fluorescence of the conjugate acid,  $\Phi/\Phi_0$ , is given as the quotient of  $\Phi$ , the fluorescence efficiency of the conjugate acid under the occurrence of excited-state proton transfer, and  $\Phi_0$ , the fluorescence efficiency of the isolated conjugate acid ( $\Phi = \Phi_0$  when  $H_+ \ll pK_a^*$ ). The relative quantum yield of fluorescence of the conjugate base,  $\Phi'/\Phi'_0$ , is analogous to  $\Phi/\Phi_0$ . The lifetimes  $\tau_0$  and  $\tau'_0$  are, respectively, the fluorescence decay times of the conjugate acid and base. The exponent n represents the number of water molecules which are required in the deprotonation reactions for the Hammett indicator used to determine the  $H_{\perp}$  scale over that region of acidity in which the excited-state reaction of interest occurs. The exponent r is the number of water molecules which react

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>College of Pharmacy, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32610-0485.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> To whom correspondence should be addressed. Fax: 352-392-9455.



Fig. 1. Relative quantum yield of fluorescence  $(\Phi/\Phi_0)$  of 2-aminoacridine as a function of  $H_+$ .

with the excited conjugate acid to form the transitionstate or activated complex species which is common to the excited-state protonation and deprotonation reactions. The rate constants  $k_a(0)$  and  $k_b(0)$  correspond to the pseudo-first-order deprotonation of the conjugate acid and the second-order protonation of the conjugate base, respectively, as if the reaction were occurring at infinite dilution in pure water.

The present work demonstrates the applicability of Eq. (2) to the excited-state proton transfer of 2-aminoacridine.

### **EXPERIMENTAL**

A sample of 2-aminoacridine was a gift from Dr. D. Jackman (Utah State University). Pure 2-aminoacridine was obtained with atmospheric-pressure liquid chromatography using silica as the stationary phase. The compound was gradient eluted from the column with methanol:chloroform (5 vol% MeOH in CHCl<sub>3</sub> to 40 vol% MeOH in CHCl<sub>3</sub>). Purity was confirmed by thinlayer chromatography on silical gel using 5 vol% MeOH in CHCl<sub>3</sub> as the mobile phase, which was alkalinized by the addition of 1 drop of  $NH_4OH$ .

A description of the instrumentation used may be found elsewhere [3]. A  $1.9 \times 10^{-5} M$  solution of 2aminoacridine was used for all uv–visible absorption studies and for the determination of the fluorescence lifetimes. The solution used for the fluorescence titration was  $1.9 \times 10^{-6} M$  in 2-aminoacridine. Fluorescence was excited at 349 nm (an isosbestic point in the absorption spectrum), and an analytical wavelength of 495 nm was used in the analysis of the fluorescence spectra.

Sulfuric acid solutions were made with analyticalgrade  $H_2SO_4$  and deionized, distilled water. All acid solutions were checked for spurious emission prior to being used.

**Table I.** Low-Frequency Absorption ( $\nu_a$ ) and Fluorescence ( $\nu_a$ ) Maxima and Fluorescence Decay Times ( $\tau_0$ ) and Ground-State pKa [15] of Doublyand Singly Protonated 2-Aminoacridine

|            | $\overline{\nu}_{a}~(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}	imes 10^{-4})$ | $\overline{\nu}_{\rm f}~({ m cm}^{-1}	imes 10^{-4})$ | $\overline{ u}_{0-0}~({ m cm}^{-1}	imes~10^{-4})^a$ | $	au_0^{(ns)}$ | p <i>K</i> a |
|------------|--|--|---|----------------|--------------|
| Dication   | 2.49   | 2.11   | 2.30  | $7.8 \pm 0.1$  | 1.1          |
| Monocation | 2.17   | 1.69   | 1.93  | $7.9 \pm 0.3$  |              |

<sup>a</sup> The estimated frequencies of the 0–0 bands (pure electronic transitions) are obtained for each species by averaging the low-frequency absorption and fluorescence maxima for each species.

#### **Excited-State Proton Transfer Kinetics of 2-Aminoacridine**

**Table II.** Rate Constants and  $pK_a^*$  of the Prototropic Dissociation 2-Aminoacridine Dication in the Lowest Excited Singlet State

| $k_{\rm a}(0)~({\rm s}^{-1})$ | $k_{\rm b}(0)~(M^{-1}~{\rm s}^{-1})$ | р <i>К</i> <sub>a</sub> <sup>*</sup> (25°С) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| $1.2 + 0.1 \times 10^{10}$    | $4.9 \pm 0.5 \times 10^{5}$          | $-4.39 + 0.06^{a}$<br>$-6.7 + 0.3^{b}$      |

<sup>*a*</sup> Calculated as  $pK_{a}^{*}(0) = -\log [k_{a}(0)/k_{b}(0)].$ 

<sup>b</sup> Estimated from the Forster cycle [12] and the data in Table I.

Values of  $a_w$  were taken from Refs. 6 and 7. Values of  $H_+$  up to 7 M H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> were taken from Ref. 8. Lovell and Schulman [9], in a redetermination of the  $H_+$  scale in H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, have shown that the values of  $H_+$  in Ref. 8 for H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> > 7 M are in error.  $H_+$  data for H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> > 7 M should, therefore, be taken from Ref. 9. Lovell and Schulman also observed that  $H_+$  and  $H_0$  are identical when H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> > 7 M, and hence, the  $H_0$  data found in Refs. 10 and 11 could be used as  $H_+$  over the applicable concentration range.

The fluorescence lifetimes of mono- and diprotonated 2-aminoacridine were measured at pH = 4.01 and  $H_{+} = -8.7$ , respectively.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The relative quantum yield of fluorescence of dicationic 2-aminoacridine is shown in Fig. 1 as a function of  $H_+$ . The inflection region of the titration occurs in sulfuric acid between the concentrations of  $\cong 8 M H_2SO_4$  and  $\cong 15 M H_2SO_4$ . Table I lists the spectral maxima and fluorescence decay times of the conjugate acid and base.

According to Eq. (1), a plot of  $[(\Phi/\Phi_0)/$  $(\Phi'/\Phi'_0)$ ]  $a'_w$  vs  $h_+a'^n_w$  should be linear and have a slope of  $k_{\rm b}(0)\tau_0'/k_{\rm a}(0)\tau_0$  and an ordinate intercept of  $1/k_{\rm a}(0)\tau_0$ . Figure 2 is a plot of this type for 2-aminoacridine, with n = 2 and r = 1 (other values of n and r do not fit the data because the plots are not linear). Thus, one molecule of water enters into the ground-state indicator reaction and two into the excited-state 2-aminoacridine dication dissociation reaction. Several other molecules [3] have reactions with hydration requirements of three or four water molecules, but those reactions occur in acid such that  $[H_2SO_4] \le 6 M$  (in which  $a_w \ge 0.48$ ). The relatively low hydration requirement of the 2-aminoacridine reaction may be due to the relative scarcity of water in the medium (0.15  $\geq a_w \geq 0.008$ ) over the inflection region of the titration and may reflect less than the extent of hydration that would be observed in dilute acidic aqueous solutions.

Table I lists the low-frequency absorption and fluorescence maxima as well as the ground-state  $pK_a$  of the dication and monocation derived from 2-aminoacridine.

Table II presents  $k_a(0)$ ,  $k_b(0)$ , and  $pK_a^*(0) = -\log k_a(0)/k_b(0)$  as calculated from the slope and intercept of the line in Fig. 2. Also included in Table II is  $pK_a^*$  (F.C.), which is  $pK_a^*$  calculated from the Förster



**Fig. 2.** Plot of  $[(\Phi/\Phi_0)/\Phi'/\Phi'_0)] a_w^r$  vs  $h_+a_w^n$  for 2-aminoacridine, with n = 2 and r = 1.

cycle) [12] and the data in Table I. The agreement between  $pK_a^*(0)$  and  $pK_a^*(F.C.)$  is poor, showing a disparity of 2.3 log units. Normally a discrepancy of no more than 0.3 log unit is observed between excited-state equilibrium constants measured by both methods. The discrepancy is likely due to differences in hydration numbers between the species extant in concentrated acid, where the kinetic measurements were made, and in dilute aqueous solutions, where the spectra of the monocation were taken. These difference can lead to increments in the entropy of dissociation [13] and in the enthalpies of hydration and solvent relaxation which are not reflected in the Förster cycle calculation. This subject is currently under study in this laboratory.

An earlier study [14] showed that for proton-transfer reactions to reach equilibrium during the lifetime of the lowest excited singlet state, the rate of the dissociation reaction must be much higher than the rate of photophysical deactivation of the excited conjugate acid. The product of the dissociation rate constant and the lifetime of the lowest excited singlet state of the dication is 91, suggesting that excited-state proton transfer is much faster  $(1.2 \times 10^{10} \text{ s}^{-1})$  than photophysical deactivation of the excited dication  $(1.3 \times 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1} = 1/\tau_0)$  and that 2-aminoacridine does attain a near-equilibrium situation between its photoexcited dication and monocation. The attainment of prototypic equilibrium in the lowest excited singlet state appears to be considerably more common in reactions represented by fluorimetric titration curves whose inflection regions lie in acidity regions corresponding to concentrated mineral acid solutions than in those corresponding to dilute aqueous solutions. This is undoubtedly a reflection of the greater acidity of the conjugate acids of the reactions occurring in concentrated acidic media.

## REFERENCES

- 1. A. Weller (1952) Z. Electrochem. 56, 662.
- 2. A. Weller (1961) Prog. React. Kinet. 1, 187.
- 3. S. G. Schulman and B. S. Vogt (1981) J. Phys. Chem. 85, 2074.
- 4. B. S. Vogt and S. G. Schulman (1983) Chem. Phys. Lett. 95, 159.
- 5. R. F. Martin and J. H. Y. Tong (1969) Aust. J. Chem. 22, 487.
- W. F. Giauque, E. M. Hornung, J. E. Kunzler, and T. R. Rubin (1960) J. Am. Chem. Soc. 82, 62.
- 7. R. A. Robinson and R. H. Stokes (1955) *Electrolyte Solutions*, Butterworths, London.
- P. Vetesnik, J. Bielavsky, and M. Vecera (1968) Coll. Czech. Chem. Comm. 33, 1687.
- 9. M. W. Lovell and S. G. Schulman (1983) Anal. Chem. 55, 963.
- 10. M. A. Paul and F. A. Long (1957) Chem. Rev. 57, 1.
- 11. .M. J. Jorgensen and D. R. Hartter (1963) J. Am. Chem. Soc. 85, 878.
- 12. Th. Forster (1950) Z. Phys. Chem. (Frankfurt am Main) 54, 42.
- 13. H. H. Jaffe and H. L. Jones (1965) J. Org. Chem. 30, 964.
- S. G. Schulman, L. S. Rosenberg, and W. R. Vincent, Jr. (1979) J. Am. Chem. Soc. 101, 139.
- A. Albert, J. R. Goldacre, and J. N. Phillips (1948) J. Chem. Soc., 2240.