

Published on Web 10/20/2004

Controlling Photochemistry with Distinct Hydrophobic Nanoenvironments

Lakshmi S. Kaanumalle,[†] Corinne L. D. Gibb,[‡] Bruce C. Gibb,^{*,‡} and V. Ramamurthy^{*,†}

Department of Chemistry, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118, and Department of Chemistry, University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana 70148

Received August 18, 2004; E-mail: bgibb@uno.edu; murthy@tulane.edu

Mimicking the ability of enzymes to bring about highly selective reactions requires the formation of a suitably distinct "active site".¹ Thus, ordered media have been used to increase the selectivity of photochemical reactions,^{2,3} while self-assembly via metal ion coordination⁴ or hydrogen bonding⁵ have been used to control a number of chemical processes. Recently, two of us reported on the self-assembly of cavitand **1**.⁶ In aqueous solution and in the presence of a suitable guest molecule, this host dimerizes to form a capsular complex with a cavity 1 nm wide and 2 nm long.⁷ In this communication, we examine the interior of this capsule using fluorescence spectrometry and present our first analysis of its ability to influence photoreactions of encapsulated guests. It transpires that through the assembly, the hydrophobic effect can engender transformations with specificities that rival those observed in the solid state.



The fluorescence spectrum of a turbid 10^{-5} M solution of pyrene in aqueous borate buffer shows both monomer and ground-state dimer emissions.⁷ The 1.70 ratio of the I_1/I_3 peaks (a measure of micropolarity of the medium) is consistent with pyrene in aqueous solution. The addition of two equivalents of **1** gives a clear solution whose fluorescence spectrum shows only monomer emission and a I_1/I_3 ratio of 1.01, similar to that observed for pyrene in benzene (1.05).⁸ ¹H NMR confirms the formation of a 2:1 capsular complex that assembles and disassembles slowly on the NMR (500 MHz) time scale.⁷ These analyses demonstrate that pyrene is encapsulated in an essentially hydrophobic environment inside the capsule dimer **1**₂.

1-Phenyl-3-*p*-tolyl-2-propanone **2a** (Scheme 1) also forms a strong capsular complex with host **1**.⁷ The C_s symmetry of the guest and the pseudo- D_{4h} symmetry of the capsule shell combine to form a C_s symmetric capsule in which each hemisphere is unique (Figure 1 and Figure S1 in Supporting Information).⁷ The para CH₃ group of the guest undergoes the most dramatic of environment changes upon binding. Its signal shifts upfield from 1.7 to -2.2 ppm, indicating that it is located deep within one of the tapering ends of the cavity.⁹

Irradiation of **2a** (and analysis of photoproducts by GC and ¹H NMR) in aqueous borate buffer solution yields only decarbonylated



Figure 1. Selected regions of the ¹H NMR of: (top) host **1** (see structure for designations), (middle) the capsular complex **1**₂**2a**, (bottom) the capsular complex **1**₂**9a**. Host concentration = 1 mM; guest concentration = 0.5 mM. Further addition of guests results in ¹H NMR peaks corresponding to free guest.

Table 1. Product Distributions upon Irradiation of Guests Encapsulated in Host $\mathbf{1_2}^a$

guest	3	4	5	68(ab)	9a/b	11
2a	-	-	41	15	44	_
2b	-	38	-	13	49	_
2c	96	-	-	2	-	2

^{*a*} Yields are an average of at least six runs and are estimated by GC using dodecane as the internal standard. Error limit $\pm 3\%$. For irradiation conditions, see Supporting Information.

products **3** (AA), **4** (BB), and **5** (AB) in the expected, statistical 1:1:2 ratio.¹⁰ No rearrangement products **6–11** were formed. In contrast, encapsulated compound **2a** in the capsule **1**₂ gave only AB-type products: the decarbonylated product **5**, the rearranged decarbonylated products, **6a**, **7a**, and **8a**, and the rearranged product, **9a** (Table 1). The observed 100% cage effect (5-3-4)/(3+4+5) is remarkable, and to our knowledge such high cage effects have only been reported in the solid state.¹¹ The more general observation that only AB-type products are formed from the secondary radical pair must arise from the differences in the rate of reaction and the rate of capsule disassembly. The rate of disassembly (<ca. 0.1–1 s⁻¹) is much slower than the known decarbonylation rate of

[†] Tulane University. [‡] University of New Orleans.

Scheme 1. Reaction Manifold of Guests 2a-c



phenyl acyl radical ($\sim 6 \times 10^6 \text{ s}^{-1}$)¹² and, by necessity, the rate of radical recombination. The capsule is leak proof on the time scale of the reaction.

The most striking observation from the photolysis of encapsulated 2a is the high yield of para rearrangement product 9a and absence of any ortho rearrangement product 10a and 11a. To investigate this further, the photolysis of 1,3-diphenylacetone 2b inside capsule 1_2 was also examined. Encapsulated **2b** gave a good yield of para rearrangement product 9b, decarbonylated derivatives 4, 6b, and 7b, but no ortho rearrangement product 10b (Table 1). This is in contrast to its behavior in hexane where only 1,2-diphenyl-ethane **4** is obtained.¹⁰ What is the origin of the high yields of **9a** or **9b**? To form these compounds the following criteria must be met:^{11,12} (a) a longer than normal lifetime of the primary radical pair (>200 \times ns), (b) intersystem crossing (ISC) from the triplet to the singlet radical pair-spin memory loss-faster than the rate of decarbonylation, (c) reorientation of the benzyl radical inside the cavity. The crucial factor is that the benzyl radical reorientation is controlled by the shape of the cavity. It is observed in cavitand-based hosts that guests with "knob-like" substituents adopt orientations in which the tapering end of the cavity is filled by the "knob".^{6,9} Upon generation of the radical pairs inside 1_2 there must be a rapid reorientation of the benzyl radical to a thermodynamically lower state in which the benzyl/incipient-methyl group fills the tapering ends of the capsule. That the "new" methyl group of 9a can occupy the base of the cavity was determined by ¹H NMR (Figure 1 bottom). Each guest methyl packs one of the "poles" of the capsule. On the other hand, **10a** and **10b** are not formed because they pack the cavity less efficiently. In stark contrast, encapsulation of guest 2c "packs" each pole with a methyl group. Hence, irradiation forms two radicals that are already oriented optimally. Thus, the major product of photolysis is decarbonylated 3. Only a trace of the ortho rearrangement product 11 is detected.

In summary, the nanoenvironment inside the capsule formed by cavitand **1** is essentially dry and leak-proof on the photolysis time scale. In addition to allowing photolysis reactions to be carried out in water, the capsule also controls (templates) the reaction outcome, with selectivities comparable to those in the solid state. We are currently examining other reactions inside this capsule.

Acknowledgment. V.R. and B.G. thank the NSF for financial support (CHE-9904187 and CHE-0212042 to V.R., and CHE-0111133 and CHE-0414413 to BG).

Supporting Information Available: Experimental details, emission spectra, 1D and 2D ¹H-NMR spectra of the different host–guest complexes. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

References

- (1) Garcia-Garibay, M. A. Current opinions in Solid State and Materials Science **1998**, *3*, 399-406.
- (2) (a) Photochemistry in Organized & Constrained Media; Ramamurthy, V., Ed.; VCH: New York, 1991. (b) Ramamurthy, V.; Eaton, D. F. Acc. Chem. Res. 1988, 21, 300. (c) Weiss, R. G.; Ramamurthy, V.; Hammond, G. S. Acc. Chem. Res. 1993, 26, 530–536. (d) Turro, N. J. Acc. Chem. Res. 2000, 33, 637–646. (e) Tung, C. H.; Wu, L. Z.; Zhang, P. P.; Chen, B. Acc. Chem. Res. 2003, 36, 39–47.
- (3) (a) Gamlin, J. N.; Jones, R.; Leibovitch, M.; Patrick, B.; Scheffer, J. R.; Trotter, J. Acc. Chem. Res. 1996, 29, 203–209. (b) Toda, F. Acc. Chem. Res. 1995, 28, 480–486. (c) Zimmerman, H. E.; Nesterov, E. E.; Acc. Chem. Res. 2002, 35, 77–85. (d) Garcia-Garibay, M. A. Acc. Chem. Res. 2003, 36, 491–498.
- (4) Yoshizawa, M.; Takeyama, Y.; Kusukawa, T.; Fujita, M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2002, 41, 1347–1349 and references therein.
- (5) Chen, J.; Körner, S.; Craig, S. L.; Rudkevich, D. M.; Rebek, J., Jr. Nature 2002, 415, 385–386 and references therein.
- (6) (a) Gibb, C. L. D.; Gibb, B. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 11408–11409. (b) Gibb, C. L. D.; Stevens, E. D.; Gibb, B. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2001, 123, 5849–5850. (c) Laughrey, Z. R.; Gibb, C. L. D.; Senechal, T.; Gibb, B. C. Chem. Eur. J. 2003, 9, 130–139.
- (7) See Supporting Information.
- (8) (a) Kalyanasundaram, K.; Thomas, J. K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1977, 99, 2039–2044.
 (b) Dong, D. C.; Winnik, M. A. Photochem. Photobiol. 1982, 35, 17–21.
- (9) (a) Jasat, A.; Sherman, J. C. Chem. Rev. 1999, 99, 932–967. (b) Warmuth, R.; Kerdelhué, J. L.; Carrera, S. S.; Langenwalter, K. J.; Brown, N. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2002, 41, 96–99.
- (10) (a) Robbins, W. K.; Eastman, R. H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1970**, 92, 6076– 6079. (b) Engel, P. S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1970**, 92, 6074–6075.
- (11) Turro, N. J.; Garcia-Garibay, M. In Photochemistry in Organized and Constrained Media; Ramamurthy, V., Ed.; VCH: New York, 1991; p 1.
- (12) (a) Turro, N. J.; Gould, I. R.; Baretz, H. B. J. Phys. Chem. 1983, 87, 531–532.
 (b) Lunazzi, L.; Ingold, K. U.; Scaiano, J. C. J. Phys. Chem. 1983, 87, 529–530.

JA0450197