This article was downloaded by: On: *29 January 2011* Access details: *Access Details: Free Access* Publisher *Taylor & Francis* Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



### Supramolecular Chemistry

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information: http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713649759

# Macrocyclic 14-Membered Ring Diketal Dilactams: Evaluation of their Divalent Cation Binding Properties

Yvon Pointud<sup>a</sup>; Anne-Gaelle Valade<sup>b</sup>; Christelle Pointon<sup>b</sup>; Denise Dugat<sup>b</sup>; Georges Jeminet<sup>b</sup>; Jose-Luis Beltran<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Thermodynamique des Solutions et des Polymères, UMR CNRS, Université Blaise Pascal de Clermont-Ferrand, Aubière, France <sup>b</sup> Synthèse et Etude de Systèmes à Intérêt Biologique, UMR CNRS, Université Blaise Pascal de Clermont-Ferrand, Aubière, France <sup>c</sup> Department de Quimica Analitica, Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

Online publication date: 13 May 2010

**To cite this Article** Pointud, Yvon , Valade, Anne-Gaelle , Pointon, Christelle , Dugat, Denise , Jeminet, Georges and Beltran, Jose-Luis(2003) 'Macrocyclic 14-Membered Ring Diketal Dilactams: Evaluation of their Divalent Cation Binding Properties', Supramolecular Chemistry, 15: 4, 261 – 269

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/1061027021000041456 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1061027021000041456

## PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

#### Taylor & Francis Taylor & Francis Group

# Macrocyclic 14-Membered Ring Diketal Dilactams: Evaluation of their Divalent Cation Binding Properties

YVON POINTUD<sup>a</sup>, ANNE-GAELLE VALADE<sup>b</sup>, CHRISTELLE POINTON<sup>b</sup>, DENISE DUGAT<sup>b</sup>,\*, GEORGES JEMINET<sup>b</sup> and JOSE-LUIS BELTRAN<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Thermodynamique des Solutions et des Polymères, UMR CNRS 6003, Université Blaise Pascal de Clermont-Ferrand, Aubière, France; <sup>b</sup>Synthèse et Etude de Systèmes à Intérêt Biologique, UMR CNRS 6504, Université Blaise Pascal de Clermont-Ferrand, 24 avenue des Landais, 63177 Aubière, France; <sup>c</sup>Department de Quimica Analitica, Universitat de Barcelona, Diagonal 647, E-08028, Barcelona, Spain

Received (in Austin, USA) 4 March 2002; Accepted 9 September 2002

The binding abilities of a new class of 14-membered ring ligands bearing diketal dilactam functions were explored by UV-visible spectrophotometry. Their formation constants, determined in THF solution, showed appreciable complexation with divalent cations (stability order:  $Sr^{2+} \ge Ca^{2+} > Zn^{2+} \ge Mg^{2+} > Ba^{2+}$ ) whereas no association was observed with monovalent cations. The stoichiometry of the complexes formed was essentially 1:1 although sometimes a low percentage (<10%) of 1:2 (cation–ligand) species was detected. The corresponding formation constants determined by computation (STAR program) were in the range  $1.5 < \log \beta_{11} < 4.8$  and  $4.4 < \log \beta_{12} < 7.1$ . They depend significantly on the nature of the substituents. In addition, solvent extractions carried out in a water–chloroform system showed the highest constants (log  $K_{ex}$ ) for the most substituted macrocycles 7b and 7c (norephedrine series) with a lipophilic skeleton.

*Keywords*: Macrocyclic diketal dilactams; Formation constants; Divalent cation complexation; UV-visible spectrophotometry

#### INTRODUCTION

Since the synthesis and cation complexing abilities of the crown ethers were reported [1], much effort has been exerted in macrocyclic chemistry to construct preorganized multidentate systems able to coordinate with specific substrates [2–4]. A great number of models with ranging ring size, substituents and types of donor atoms have been studied. Extensive reviews have been published in this field [5,6].

One approach for obtaining new macrocyclic systems is to use organic synthesis methods

involving specific or novel reactions. In this connection, we recently reported the synthesis of achiral and chiral macrocyclic dilactams, variously substituted and bearing two ketal moieties [7,8]. They were generated in two steps from  $\beta$ -amino-alcohols *via* a novel transacetalisation reaction (Scheme 1), the mechanism of which was shown to depend on the stereochemistry of the intermediate hydroxyamidoketal [7].

The original structure of these new ligands, which contain secondary amides and infrequently encountered acetal functions, prompted us to investigate their cationic recognition properties. In addition, the presence in the molecules of two *cis* or *trans* methoxy substituents might modulate the stability of the cation–ligand interactions. Work on macrocyclic amides has already underlined the preferential selectivity of these compounds in favour of alkaline-earth cations [9–14]. The binding constants were increased in the case of *N*-substituted structures [12].

To explore quantitatively the properties of our hosts and evaluate the influence of the substituents, studies were undertaken by UV-visible spectrophotometry, which shows a high sensitivity without consuming too much material and is well-suited for the study of association constants ranging from  $10^2$  to  $10^5 1 \text{ mol}^{-1}$  [15]. Measurements were carried out in solution and in a two-phase system. They consisted of: (i) determination of the complex stoichiometry and formation constants in THF solution, (ii) evaluation of the extractive properties by the liquid–liquid extraction technique.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author. Tel.: + 33-4-73-40-71-27; Fax: + 33-4-73-40-77-17. E-mail: dndugat@chimtp.univ-bpclermont.fr

ISSN 1061-0278 print/ISSN 1029-0478 online © 2003 Taylor & Francis Ltd DOI: 10.1080/1061027021000041456



### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Determination of Stoichiometries and Formation Constants of Complexes

The study involves the picrate ion absorbance in UV-visible spectrometry [16,17]. In a solvent of low polarity (THF), the cation complexation results in the conversion of a tight picrate ion pair into a loose ion pair. This change, due to an increase in

the anion-cation interionic distance, induces a bathochromic shift of the UV absorption maximum.

SCHEME 2

The possible formation of three types of complexes was envisaged between the ligand L and the metal M, namely ML, ML<sub>2</sub> and M<sub>2</sub>L, characterized,

262



FIGURE 1 UV absorption spectra of 7b-CaPi<sub>2</sub> (A): X = 0; (B): X = 1; (C): X = 23; (D): X = 75.

respectively, by the following equilibria and formation constants:  $\beta_{11}$ ,  $\beta_{12}$ ,  $\beta_{21}$ .

$$M + L \rightleftharpoons ML \qquad \beta_{11} = [ML]/[M] [L]$$
$$M + 2L \rightleftharpoons ML_2 \qquad \beta_{12} = [ML_2]/[M] [L]^2$$
$$2M + L \rightleftharpoons M_2L \qquad \beta_{21} = [M_2L]/[M]^2[L]$$

The recorded spectra for each series of experiments, conducted with increasing *X* ratio (X = [L]/[M]) could be divided into two categories: (i) curves characterized by the presence of one isosbestic point whatever the value of *X*; this corresponds to the exclusive 1:1 complex formation (Fig. 1), (ii) curves shifted for high *X* values and that no longer intersected the isosbestic point (Fig. 2); this can be explained by the appearance of a second complex of higher stoichiometry, which was identified as a 1:2 species.

The processing of the experimental data involved computational methods (STAR and STAR-FA programs) [18]. All the results obtained with alkaline-earth and zinc picrates are grouped in Table I which also contains, for comparison, the formation constants, determined under the same conditions, of previously described complexes: metal picrates–18-membered ring tetralactams I and II [12] (Scheme 3).

Computational processing of the results clearly pointed to the formation of either a single type of complex ML or two complex species ML and  $ML_2$ . Both stoichiometries proved satisfactory and suggested that formation of  $M_2L$  complexes could be ruled out.

When the experiments were consistent with the additional formation of the  $ML_2$  complex alongside the preponderant formation of the ML complex, the calculations showed that the  $ML_2/ML$  ratio remained low (<10%), even for high X values.



FIGURE 2 UV absorption spectra of **5c**-SrPi<sub>2</sub>, (A): X = 0; (B): X = 1.6; (C): X = 6.6; (D): X = 25.

In these cases, the constants log  $\beta_{12}$  ranged from 4.45 (**2b**-Sr<sup>2+</sup>) to 7.08 (7**c**-Zn<sup>2+</sup>), the mean value being near 5. This corresponds to an equilibrium ML + L = ML<sub>2</sub> with low stability constants  $K_{12}$  (1.23–2.14).

For all the compounds, the 1:1 complex was the more stable species. The concentration plots are of the same type as for compound **5c** (Fig. 3).

The log  $\beta_{11}$  values ranged from 1.51 to 4.80 with a mean value close to 3, which indicated moderate interactions. The most stable associations were observed for Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Sr<sup>2+</sup>, the ionic radii of which are close to 1Å. The least complexed cation was Ba<sup>2+</sup> for which, moreover, no ML<sub>2</sub> formation was observed.

The ionic selectivity can be ordered as follows:  $Ca^{2+} \approx Sr^{2+} > Zn^{2+} \approx Mg^{2+} > Ba^{2+}$  with the corresponding ligand orders for  $Ca^{2+}$  : 7c > 1c > $7b>5b>7a\approx 4c>6c>5c>\ 3a,b\ >\ 3c\ >\ 6b>$  $4a,b>2c>2b \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Sr}^{2+}:7b\approx 1c>5b>7c>$  $3c>5c>4c>2b\approx 2c>6c>4a,b>3a,b>7a>$ 6b. These rankings show that the best binding abilities correspond to the macrocycles substituted at the 2 and 3 positions (compounds 7). For 3-monosubstituted ligands 3-6, the ranking iBu > Me > Bn > Ph for  $Ca^{2+}$  and iBu > Ph > Me > Bnfor  $Sr^{2+}$  indicates that the complexation: (i) was a function of the substituent bulkiness in the presence of alkyl groups, (ii) might be modified by the "picrate effect" with any substituents as a result of  $\pi - \pi$ interactions between picrate ion and the aromatic unit of the ligand [19]. The lowest constants were observed for 3,3-dimethyl compounds 2, probably because of the steric hindrance induced by the two methyl groups on C-3 preventing approach of the cation to both faces of the ligand. Finally, the unsubstituted macrocycle 1c held an unexpected place in the above order.

Considering now the stereochemistry of the OMe group, the *cis* compounds **4c** and **6c** exibited higher constants than their *trans* homologues **4b** and **6b** for

1c $\beta_{11}$ 3.83         3.83         22b $\beta_{11}$ 3.83         3.83         235         278         3.83	$\begin{array}{c} 0.01\\ 0.02\\ 0.02\\ 0.01\\ 0.01\\ 0.01\\ 0.01\\ 0.03\\ 0.03\\ 0.01\\ 0.01\end{array}$	3.87 4.77 1.63 1.63 3.29 3.10 3.10 3.10 3.10 3.69 4.76 3.69 5.69	0.01 0.19 0.03 0.01 0.01 - 0.01	4.80 6.40 3.27	0.03	2.10	0.10	3 50	0.07
2b $\beta_{11}^{P12}$ 2.78 2c $\beta_{11}^{P12}$ 2.78 $\beta_{12}$ 1.51 3a,b (17:83) $\beta_{11}^{P12}$ 2.78 $\beta_{12}^{P12}$ 3.00 $\beta_{12}^{P12}$ 3.00 $\beta_{12}^{P12}$ 2.90 $\beta_{12}^{P12}$ 2.90 $\beta_{12}^{P12}$ 2.45 $\beta_{11}^{P12}$ 2.15 5c $\beta_{11}^{P12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}^{P12}$ 5.56 $\beta_{12}^{P12}$ 5.56	$\begin{array}{c} 0.02\\ 0.01\\ 0.05\\ 0.01\\ 0.01\\ 0.01\\ 0.03\\ 0.03\\ 0.01\end{array}$	4.76 3.29 3.10 3.10 3.10 3.10 3.4.76 3.55 5.69 5.69	0.03 	3.27 3.45	71.112			00.0	10.0
2c $\beta_{11}^{-1}$ 1.51 - 2 3a,b (17:83) $\beta_{11}^{-1}$ 1.51 - 1.51 - 1.51 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.90 - 2.91 - 2.90 - 2.91 - 2.92 - 2.9	$\begin{array}{c} & - \\ 0.05 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.01 \\ - \\ 0.03 \\ - \\ 0.01 \end{array}$	- 1.83 3.29 3.10 4.76 3.3.69 5.69	- 0.01 - 0.01 0.01		0.03	$\frac{-}{1.90}$	0.20	2.03	0.07
2c $\beta_{11}$ 1.51 $3a,b$ (17:83) $\beta_{12}$ - $3a,b$ (17:83) $\beta_{11}$ 3.00 $3c$ $\beta_{12}$ - $3c$ $\beta_{12}$ 2.90 $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ 2.90 $4a,b$ (16:84) $\beta_{11}$ 2.90 $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ 2.45 $4c$ $\beta_{11}$ 2.15 $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ 2.15 $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $6b$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $5.40$	0.05 	1.83 - 3.29 - 3.10 - 4.76 3.3.69 - 5.69	0.01 - 0.01 - 0.01	C4-14	0.01	I	I	I	I
$\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $ 3a, b$ (17:83) $\beta_{11}$ $3.00$ $3c$ $\beta_{12}$ $ 3c$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.90$ $4a, b$ (16:84) $\beta_{11}$ $2.90$ $4a, b$ (16:84) $\beta_{11}$ $2.90$ $4c$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.45$ $6b$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.15$ $6b$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.15$ $6b$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.79$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.79$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.76$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.65$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.740$	0.01 0.01 0.01 0.03 0.03 0.01	3.29 3.10 3.10 4.76 3.3.69 5.69	- 0.01 - 0.01	3.27	0.03	ND	Ŋ	2.39	0.18
3a,b (17:83) $\beta_{11}$ $3.00$ 3c $\beta_{12}$ $3.00$ 3c $\beta_{12}$ $2.90$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.90$ $4a,b$ (16:84) $\beta_{11}$ $2.90$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.45$ $4c$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.15$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.15$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.09$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.78$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $6b$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.65$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$	0.01  0.01  0.03 	3.29   4.76 3.3.69 5.69	0.01 - 0.01	4.46	0.01	ND	QN	4.87	0.12
3c $\beta_{12}^{12}$ -       4a,b (16:84) $\beta_{11}^{12}$ 2.90       4c $\beta_{11}^{12}$ 2.45       5b $\beta_{11}^{12}$ 2.15       5c $\beta_{12}^{12}$ - $\beta_{12}^{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}^{12}$ 5.78 $\beta_{12}^{12}$ 5.78 $\beta_{12}^{12}$ 5.65 $\beta_{12}^{12}$ 5.65	0.01 0.01 0.03 0.03 -	3.10  3.4.76 5.69 	_ 0.01	2.92	0.01	2.42	0.02	3.13	0.01
3c $\beta_{11}$ 2.90       4a,b (16:84) $\beta_{12}$ 2.45       4c $\beta_{11}$ 2.45       4c $\beta_{11}$ 2.15       5b $\beta_{11}$ 2.15       5c $\beta_{11}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 2.78 $\beta_{12}$ 2.65 $\beta_{12}$ 2.65 $\beta_{12}$ 2.65 $\beta_{12}$ 2.65 $\beta_{12}$ 2.65 $\beta_{12}$ 2.78	0.01 - 0.01 - - - -	3.10 - 2.85 3.69 5.69	0.01	I	I	I	I	5.75	0.08
4a,b (16:84) $\beta_{11}^{12}$ -         4c $\beta_{11}^{12}$ 2.45         4c $\beta_{11}^{12}$ 2.15         5b $\beta_{11}^{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}^{12}$ -       -         5c $\beta_{11}^{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}^{12}$ -       - $\beta_{12}^{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}^{12}$ -       - $\beta_{12}^{12}$ 2.09       - $\beta_{12}^{12}$ 2.09       - $\beta_{12}^{12}$ 2.09       - $\beta_{12}^{12}$ -       -       - $\beta_{12}^{12}$ -       -       -       -       -       - </td <td>0.01 </td> <td>- 2.85 3.69 5.50</td> <td></td> <td>3.67</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>2.12</td> <td>0.06</td> <td>3.20</td> <td>0.01</td>	0.01 	- 2.85 3.69 5.50		3.67	0.01	2.12	0.06	3.20	0.01
4a,b (16:84) $\beta_{11}$ 2.45       4c $\beta_{12}$ 2.15       4c $\beta_{11}$ 2.15       5b $\beta_{11}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.09$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.09$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $2.09$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.76$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.740$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.76$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.740$	0.01 - 0.03 - -	2.85 4.76 3.69 5.60	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
4c $\beta_{12}$	- 0.03 - -	4.76 3.69 5.50	0.04	3.14	0.03	2.37	0.02	2.75	0.01
4c $\beta_{11}$ 2.15 5b $\beta_{12}$ 5c $\beta_{11}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 5.78 $\beta_{11}$ 5.78 $\beta_{12}$ 5.78 $\beta_{12}$ 5.78 $\beta_{12}$ 5.78	0.03 - 0.01	3.69 5 50	0.04	5.37	0.12	I	I	5.81	0.01
5b $\beta_{12}$ -       5c $\beta_{11}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ 2.74       5c $\beta_{11}$ $3.74$ 6b $\beta_{11}$ $5.78$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.740$		100	0.04	3.38	0.01	2.87	0.01	2.55	0.02
5b $\beta_{11}$ 2.09       5c $\beta_{12}$ 2.09 $\beta_{12}$ 5.78 $\beta_{12}$ 5.78 $\beta_{12}$ 5.78 $\beta_{12}$ 5.40 $\beta_{12}$ 5.74 $\beta_{12}$ 5.74	0.01 -	20.0	0.20	I	I	I	I	I	I
5c $\beta_{11}$	I	3.77	0.01	4.10	0.03	1.78	0.03	2.27	0.30
5c $\beta_{11}$ $3.74$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.65$ $\beta_{11}$ $2.65$ $\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{22}$ $5.40$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.78$ $3.74$		I	I	6.95	0.03	I	I	I	I
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.01	3.31	0.01	3.61	0.03	2.53	0.01	3.33	0.01
6b $\beta_{11}$ 2.65 $\beta_{12}$ 5.40 $\beta_{12}$ 5.40 $\beta_{12}$ 5.40 $\beta_{12}$ 5.40 $\beta_{13}$	0.13	I	I	5.85	0.12	I	I	I	I
$\beta_{12}$ $\beta_{12}$ $5.40$	0.01	2.91	0.02	2.25	0.03	2.00	0.46	2.77	0.01
60 D 778	0.01	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
<b>b</b> 11 <b>5</b> .70	0.08	3.62	0.04	3.17	0.01	2.58	0.02	2.52	0.01
$\beta_{12}$ 5.00	0.25	5.17	0.14	I	I	I	I	5.40	0.05
<b>7a</b> $\beta_{11}$ 3.49	0.07	3.69	0.03	2.59	0.02	2.67	0.02	3.21	0.02
$\beta_{12}$ 5.24	0.32	5.47	0.21	I	I	I	I	I	I
<b>7b</b> $\beta_{11}$ 3.01	0.01	3.83	0.01	4.80	0.03	3.26	0.01	UC	UC
$\beta_{12}$ –	I	I	I	6.40	0.20	I	I	UC	UC
<b>7c</b> $\beta_{11}$ 3.19	0.01	3.92	0.03	3.82	0.01	2.75	0.04	4.55	0.01
$\beta_{12}$ –	I	5.14	0.36	I	I	I	I	7.08	0.01
I* $\beta_{11}$ UC	UC	3.96	Х	4.87	Х	3.36	Х	I	I
$\beta_{12}$ UC	UC	6.00	Υ	7.47	Υ	5.53	Υ	I	I
II* $\beta_{11}$ 5.48	Υ	5.57	Υ	6.50	Υ	4.88	Х	I	I
$\beta_{12}$ 7.48	γ	7.96	Υ	9.50	Υ	7.83	Υ	I	I

Y. POINTUD et al.

 $^{-7}$ c metal nicrates-ligands 1cmplan constants (log  $B_{\rm ii}$ ) and standard deviation  $\sigma$ (log  $B_{\rm ii}$ ) (molar scale) for co TABLE I Formation

264



I : R = H
 II : R = Bn
 SCHEME 3



FIGURE 3 Concentration profile of  $5c\text{-}SrPi_2\text{, }$  (A):  $ML_2\text{; }$  (B): M; (C): ML.

both cations  $Ca^{2+}$  and  $Sr^{2+}$ , while this phenomenon was reversed for isomers **5b** and **5c** owing probably to the bulkiness of the iBu substituent. In contrast, for the 2- or 3-phenyl compounds **7** and **3**, the stereoisomers **b** and **c** showed different selectivities towards  $Ca^{2+}$  (**7c** > **7b**; **3a**, **b** > **3c**) and  $Sr^{2+}$ (**7b** > **7c**; **3c** > **3a**, **b**).

On the whole, for 1:1 complex formation, which was the dominant process, the selectivity range observed for a given ligand could be explained by the high flexibility of the 14-membered ring structures. The results are quite comparable to those obtained by Cazaux *et al.* [12] for the *N*-diunsubstituted tetralactam I while the corresponding *N*-tetrabenzyl compound II shows higher constants (Table I).

These first results, obtained in homogeneous medium for a new family of ligands, had to be completed by examination of their behaviour in a biphasic system, which is more representative of a transport situation, one of the main present targets for macrocyclic compounds [20]. This aspect was accordingly examined in a second study.

#### Liquid-Liquid Extraction

The method was based on the extraction of a metal picrate from an aqueous into a chloroform phase

TABLE II Extraction constant (log  $K_{ex}$ ) and lipophilicity (log P) of the ligands

		$\log K_{\rm ex}$		
Ligand	Ca <sup>2+</sup>	Sr <sup>2+</sup>	Zn <sup>2+</sup>	log P*
1c	1.62	2.30	_	0.5
3a,b	2.55	-	-	1.6
3c	1.99	3.49	2.86	1.6
4c	2.42	3.77	-	0.6
5b	3.56	3.86	-	2.3
6c	3.44	3.50	-	2.4
7b	3.71	4.25	2.29	2.6
7c	3.82	4.05	3.69	2.6
$\mathbf{I}^{\dagger}$	3.97 <sup>‡</sup>	5.07 <sup>‡</sup>	0 <sup>‡</sup>	1.9

\*Lipophilicity measured by RPTLC technique.  $^{+}$  Ref. [12].  $^{+}$  Values calculated from the extraction ratio (E%) given in Ref. [12].

TABLE III Selectivity of ligands  $1c{-}7c$  for  $\mathrm{Sr}^{2+}$  compared with  $\mathrm{Ca}^{2+}$  and  $\mathrm{Zn}^{2+}$ 

Ligand	$K_{\rm ex}  ({\rm Sr})^{2+} / K_{\rm ex}  ({\rm Ca})^{2+}$	$K_{\rm ex}  ({\rm Sr})^{2+} / K_{\rm ex}  ({\rm Zn})^{2+}$
1c	4.8	_
3c	31.6	4.3
4c	22.6	_
5b	2.0	_
6c	1.1	_
7b	3.4	90.5
7c	1.7	2.3

containing the ligand [21,22]. At the analytical equilibria, the picrate concentration in the organic phase ( $C_{exp}$ ) was determined by measuring the absorption of the anion by UV-visible spectro-photometry.

The measurements were carried out for macrocycles that presented the best binding abilities in a homogeneous system, namely 1c, 3a–c, 4c, 5b, 6c, 7b and 7c with Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Sr<sup>2+</sup> and Zn<sup>2+</sup>. Table II gives the extraction constants (log  $K_{ex}$ ) and the lipophilicity (log P) of the ligands.

The best extracting properties were observed for macrocycles **7b** and **7c** with  $Sr^{2+}$ , the *trans* **7b** configuration of the methoxy groups being more favourable to the association. Furthermore, whatever the ligand,  $Sr^{2+}$  was the most easily extracted cation. The following order:  $Sr^{2+} > Ca^{2+} > Zn^{2+}$  is a function of the size and hydration energy of the cation [23,24]. The corresponding selectivities vs.  $Ca^{2+}$  and  $Zn^{2+}$  are presented in Table III. The best ratios are observed for  $Sr^{2+}/Ca^{2+} \approx 32$  (**3c**) and  $Sr^{2+}/Zn^{2+} \approx 90$  (**7b**). The extraction constants are in the range of that calculated for the 18-membered ring tetralactam **I** with  $Ca^{2+}$  [12] (Table II).

#### **Comparison of Monophasic and Biphasic Systems**

Comparing both systems, important similarities could be seen with regard to the three cations studied. Firstly, 2,3-disubstituted compounds 7 were the best performing ligands. Secondly, in the 3-monosubstituted series 4-6, the bulky iBu substituent (macrocycles 5) gave the highest constants. Finally, the stereochemistry of the OMe group led to the same order of selectivity for compounds 7 and 3 (*vide supra*), exclusive series in which isomers **b** and **c** were studied in both cases. In contrast, the most striking difference concerned the unsubstituted macrocycle **1c**, which showed a poor extracting capability, whereas it displayed, with  $Sr^{2+}$  in homogeneous system, a complexing constant identical to that of **7b**. The explanation of this discrepancy may lie in the very different lipophilicity of the skeletons as shown in Table II.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Spectrophotometric grade THF was used rapidly to prevent peroxidation. Spectrophotometric grade chloroform was washed three times with water to eliminate traces of ethanol. Acetonitrile was used without further purification. Water was distilled three times on quartz (resistivity  $> 10^6$  ohm cm<sup>-1</sup>).

#### **Recording Absorption Spectra**

UV-visible spectra were run on a double-beam Kontron Uvikon 941 spectrophotometer, driven with Uvikon 900 software from Bio-Tek Instrument (scan speed: 200 nm min<sup>-1</sup>; bandwidth: 2 nm; absorption accuracy: 0.001) using 1 cm thick cells. They were recorded from 200 to 500 nm in 0.5 nm steps. The experimental absorbance range was from 0.2 to 2.

# General Procedure for the Preparation of Compounds

The 14-membered ring diketal dilactams were synthesized and recrystallized as previously described [7,8]. Metal picrates were prepared by the method of Silberrad and Phillips [25], i.e. from the corresponding metal carbonate and picric acid.

#### Determination of Stoichiometry and Stability Constants

An approximately  $5 \times 10^{-5}$  molar ( $C_{\rm M}^0$ ) solution of the relevant metal picrate was prepared in THF, 1 ml of which was placed in the spectrometer cell. More of this solution was used to prepare a  $10^{-3}$  M ( $C_{\rm L}^0$ ) solution of ligand. Using a microsyringe, amounts of this solution were incrementally added to the cell through a silicone septum inserted in its Teflon tap. In these conditions, the metal picrate concentration was kept constant at molarity  $C_{\rm M}^0$ , the ligand analytical concentration  $C_{\rm L}$  being variable. The  $C_L/C_M^0$  ratio was progressively increased first in 0.1 unit steps, then beyond 1 in 1 unit steps and beyond 10 in 10 unit steps first up to a value of 80 (compounds **3a**–**c** and **7b**) and then to a value of 40 (all other compounds). The pure solvent was used in the reference cell. Experiments were performed at 25°C.

For each solution, the Beer's law relationship for the absorbance is written:

$$A(\lambda) = l[\varepsilon_{\rm M}(\lambda)C_{\rm M} + \varepsilon_{\rm ML}(\lambda)C_{\rm ML} + \varepsilon_{\rm ML2}(\lambda)C_{\rm ML2} + \ldots]$$

where *l* is the optical path length in cm;  $\epsilon$ : the molar absorption coefficient and *C*<sub>i</sub> the concentration of the species present in the solution (the concentrations of these neutral pairs being very low, it could be assumed that concentrations and activities were identical).

The absorbance data obtained at the different metal-ligand ratios were processed by using the STAR program [18], which simulates the equilibria involved and refines the binding constants by minimizing the least-square function corresponding to each model. For each cation-ligand pair, the stability constants were calculated taking into account first the formation of a single complex ML and second the formation of both ML and ML<sub>2</sub> complexes as suggested by the absorbance variations. The program gives several statistical characteristic parameters to test the chosen chemical model, among which  $\sigma_{\rm r}$  the standard deviation of the absorbance that may be compared to the instrumental error of the spectrometer (<0.005)and  $\langle r_{i,j} \rangle$ , the residual mean. The choice of model was also guided by use of the STAR-FA program [18], which suggests the number of absorbing species in solution by factor analysis of the absorbance data matrix ( $\approx$ 45 wavelengths and 24 solutions). The formation of ML<sub>2</sub> was considered when the standard deviation  $\sigma$  (log  $\beta_{12}$ ) was less than 0.40. Table IV groups together the formation constants (log  $\beta_{ii}$ ) and the statistical tests given by STAR for the Ca<sup>2+</sup>-ligand complexes 1c–7c.

In addition, Table V gives, as an example, the information obtained with STAR and STAR-FA for the complexes corresponding to the studied macrocycles and the Ca<sup>2+</sup> ion. It comprises: (i) the number of complexes, (ii) the UV characteristics ( $\lambda_{max}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{max}$ ), (iii) the bathochromic shift.

#### Extractions

The first measurements yielded low extraction values. Consequently, it was necessary to set a well-defined experimental protocol to obtain good reproducibility and reliability. For this purpose, the solvents (CHCl<sub>3</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>O) were first saturated with each other to prevent volume changes of either phase

TABLE IV Formation constants (log  $\beta_{ii}$ ) and statistical tests given by star for complexes 1c--7c with  $Ca^{2+}$ 

Ligand		$\log \beta_{ii}$	$\sigma(\log \beta_{\rm ii})$	$\sigma_{ m r}$	$\langle r_{i,j} \rangle$
1c	$\beta_{11}$	3.87	0.01	2.9	2.0
	$\beta_{12}$	4.77	0.19		
2b	$\beta_{11}$	1.63	0.03	4.5	3.7
	$\beta_{12}$	_	-		
2c	$\beta_{11}$	1.83	0.01	3.3	2.7
	$\beta_{12}$	_	_		
3a,b (17:83)	$\beta_{11}$	3.29	0.01	4.3	1.5
	$\beta_{12}$	-	_		
3c	$\beta_{11}$	3.10	0.01	2.6	1.9
	$\beta_{12}$	_	-		
4a,b (16:84)	$\beta_{11}$	2.85	0.04	2.8	2.1
	$\beta_{12}$	4.76	0.04		
4c	$\beta_{11}$	3.69	0.04	1.9	1.3
	$\beta_{12}$	5.59	0.20		
5b	$\beta_{11}$	3.77	0.01	6.6	5.1
	$\beta_{12}$	-	-		
5c	$\beta_{11}$	3.31	0.01	4.0	3.1
	$\beta_{12}$	_	_		
6b	$\beta_{11}$	2.91	0.02	3.5	2.8
	$\beta_{12}$	-	-		
6c	$\beta_{11}$	3.62	0.04	2.5	1.9
	$\beta_{12}$	5.17	0.14		
7a	$\beta_{11}$	3.69	0.03	5.3	3.4
	$\beta_{12}$	5.47	0.21		
7b	$\beta_{11}$	3.83	0.01	5.2	4.04
	$\beta_{12}$	-	-		
7c	$\beta_{11}$	3.92	0.03	3.6	2.5
	$\beta_{12}$	5.14	0.36		

occurring during the extractions; the cores of each phase were then used exclusively. The experiments were carried out by adding a chloroform solution of ligand ( $C_L^0 \approx 10^{-2}$  M, 1 ml) to an aqueous solution of metal picrate ( $C_M^0 \approx 10^{-2}$  M, 1 ml) in cone-shaped tubes, which were shaken for 15 min at 25°C on a vortex mixer, and then centrifuged for 15 min at 4000 rpm to promote complete phase separation. All the solutions were prepared by weighing. The densities of these solutions were considered equal to those of the equilibrated solvents, i.e.  $d_w = 1.000$  g cm<sup>-3</sup> for the aqueous solution and  $d_o = 1.454$  g cm<sup>-3</sup> for the

chloroform solution. Three to five samples ( $V_{\rm P} \approx 100-200 \,\mu$ l) of the chloroform phase were diluted in CH<sub>3</sub>CN ( $\approx 2 \,\text{ml}$ ). The corresponding spectra were recorded with CH<sub>3</sub>CN in the reference cell.

Calibration curves enabled us to determine the concentration of cations (Cmes) in the CH3CN solutions. The spectra obtained in acetonitrile were not modified by the addition of CHCl<sub>3</sub> aliquots. Thus, for each metal picrate ( $Ca^{2+}$ ,  $Sr^{2+}$  and  $Zn^{2+}$ ), the curves  $A(\lambda) = f(C_{\text{MPi2}})$  of twelve CH<sub>3</sub>CN solutions ( $c \approx 10^{-5} - 10^{-4}$  M) were plotted. These curves were not always straight lines owing to the formation of the MPi<sup>+</sup> pair in acetonitrile. They were run for  $\lambda = 370$  nm near the maximum of the main optical absorption band of the free anion picrate ( $\lambda \approx 380$  nm). A polynomial development (least square) fitted the curves from 0 to  $10^{-3}$  M. It was linear for Sr<sup>2+</sup> and quadratic for Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Zn<sup>2+</sup>. The densities of the CHCl<sub>3</sub>–CH<sub>3</sub>CN mixtures were measured using the following experimental relation:

$$d = 0.777 + \left(\frac{0.305 \times m_{\mathrm{CHCl}_3}}{m_{\mathrm{CH}_3\mathrm{CN}}}\right)$$

where  $m_{\text{CHCl}_{3'}}$  mass of the sample;  $m_{\text{CH}_3\text{CN}}$ , mass of acetonitrile (2 ml).

The concentration of the cation in the chloroform phase was then:

$$C_{\rm exp} = [\mathrm{M}^{2+}]_{\rm o} = C_{\rm mes} \left(\frac{1 + m_{\rm CHCl_3}}{m_{\rm CH_3CN}}\right) \left(\frac{d_{\rm CHCl_3}}{d}\right)$$

The picrate partition ratio  $K_p$  between the two layers was calculated by differential UV-visible spectrophotometry using an analogue procedure.

$$(M^{2+})_{w} + 2(Pi^{-})_{w} \rightleftharpoons (MPi_{2})_{o}$$
  
 $[MPi_{2}]_{o}$   $[MPi_{2}]_{o}$ 

$$K_{\rm p} = \frac{1}{[{\rm M}^{2+}]_{\rm w} [{\rm Pi}^{-}]_{\rm w}^2} = \frac{1}{[{\rm M}^{2+}]_{\rm w}^3}$$

TABLE V UV characteristics of species in equilibrium for the complexes Ca<sup>2+</sup> ligands 1c-7c

	STAR/FA	STAR						
Ligand	Complex number	$\lambda_1^*$	$\lambda_1 - \lambda_{Ca}^*$	${\epsilon_1}^{\dagger}$	$\lambda_2^*$	$\epsilon_2^{\dagger}$		
1c	2	334	1	24715	355	‡		
2b	1	353	20	‡	_	_		
2c	1	354	21	‡	_	_		
3a.b (17:83)	1	342	9	26703	_	_		
3c	1	342	9	27068	_	_		
4a,b (16:84)	2	338	5	23832	348	25700		
4c	2	335	2	22330	357	39190		
5b	1	341	8	25600	_	_		
5c	1	343	10	26100	_	_		
6b	1	344	11	26460	_	_		
6c	2	338	11	23831	354	‡		
7a	2	339	6	23825	360	54862		
7b	1	342	9	27174	_	_		
7c	2	339	6	24600	361	ŧ		

\* in nm.  $\dagger$  in  $1 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}$ .  $\ddagger$  Inaccurate value.  $\lambda_1$ : absorption wave length of the ML complexes;  $\lambda_2$ : absorption wave length of the ML<sub>2</sub> complexes.

where  $M^{2+}$  is the bivalent cation;  $Pi^-$  the picrate anion; L the ligand; w the aqueous phase and o the organic phase.

The organic phase picrate concentration  $[MPi_2]_o$  was found to be  $\approx 10^{-7}$  M.

Following Cram [22], the selected model was characterized by equilibria I and II:

$$(M^{2+})_{w} + 2(Pi^{-})_{w} \rightleftharpoons (MPi_{2})_{o} \tag{I}$$

$$(M^{2+})_{w} + 2(Pi^{-})_{w} + (L)_{o} \rightleftharpoons (MLPi_{2})_{o}$$
 (II)

For divalent cations, the extraction constant  $K_{ex}$  was expressed by the following relation:

$$K_{\rm ex} = \frac{[{\rm MLPi}_2]_{\rm o}}{4[{\rm M}^{2+}]_{\rm w}^3 [{\rm L}]_{\rm o}}$$

The conservation of mass gave four relations that enabled us to calculate successively  $[M^{2+}]_{wv}$   $[MPi_2]_{ov}$   $[MLPi_2]_{ov}$   $[L]_o$  and  $K_{ex}$  from  $C_M^0$ ,  $C_L^0$ ,  $C_{exp}$  and  $K_p$ :

$$S \begin{cases} C_{exp} = [MPi_2]_o + [MLPi_2]_o \\ C_M^0 = [M^{2+}]_w + Q_v \times C_{exp} \\ [MPi_2]_o = 4 K_p [M^{2+}]_w^3 \\ C_L^0 = [L]_o + [MLPi_2]_o \end{cases}$$

where  $Q_v$  (experimental ratio):  $V_{CHCl_3}/V_{H_2}O$ .

For each couple studied, the data necessary for the calculation of the extraction constants are reported in Table VI.

#### Lipophilicity Determination

Lipophilicities of the ligands were determined by their TLC retention  $R_{\rm F}$  according to Ellgehausen [26]. The TLC system was calibrated with a set

of reference compounds of known lipophilicities [27] (acetophenone:  $\log P = 1.58$ ; nitrobenzene:  $\log P = 2.39$ ; naphthalene:  $\log P = 3.37$ ). TLC was performed with 0.25 mm thick glass-backed RP-18F<sub>254</sub>S reversed-phase plates using methanol–water (80:20) as solvent.

#### CONCLUSIONS

We have explored the binding abilities of a new class of 14-membered ring ligands bearing two secondary amide and acetal functions. Two studies were performed by UV-visible spectrophotometry: determination of the formation constants in tetrahydrofuran solution and evaluation of their extractive properties in a biphasic system.

The results obtained reveal that with divalent cations, the best complexations were with Sr<sup>2+</sup> and  $Ca^{2+}$ , the ionic radii of which are close to 1 Å. In contrast, no association was detected with monovalent cations. This preference for more highly charged cations is probably due to the presence of high polarity coordination sites (CO amide), as already reported [12,28]. The complexes formed were essentially of the ML type; they were sometimes accompanied by a small percentage of ML<sub>2</sub>. Also, the number of skeletons examined showed that the complexation and recognition properties depend on the nature of the 2 and 3-substituents and enabled us to make a first selection from among the different structures. The highest formation and extraction constants were observed for the highly substituted 2,2'-phenyl-3,3'-methyl macrocycles 7b and 7c. The log  $\beta_{11}$  values obtained for the Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Sr<sup>2+</sup> cations are in the same range as those determined in the same conditions for the 18-membered ring

TABLE VI Extraction results

Complex	$\binom{C_{\rm M}^0}{(10^{-3}{ m M})}$	$C_{\rm L}^0$ (10 <sup>-3</sup> M)	$Q_{\rm v}$	Kp	$\underset{(10^{-6}\text{M})}{\overset{C_{exp}}{M}}$	$[M^{2+}]_{w}$ (10 <sup>-3</sup> M)	[L] <sub>o</sub> (10 <sup>-3</sup> M)	[MLPi <sub>2</sub> ] <sub>o</sub> (10 <sup>-6</sup> M)	K <sub>ex</sub>
1c-Ca <sup>2+</sup>	7.084	13.281	1.64	1.43	2.83	7.079	13.280	0.80	42
$1c-Sr^{2+}$	5.492	11.812	1.37	0.18	1.70	5.489	11.810	1.58	202
<b>3a,b-</b> Ca <sup>2+</sup>	9.203	10.362	1.00	1.43	15.87	9.187	10.350	11.44	356
$3c-Ca^{2+}$	9.278	9.770	1.00	1.43	7.64	9.270	9.767	3.08	99
$3c-Sr^{2+}$	5.765	3.332	2.22	0.18	8.03	5.747	3.324	7.89	3126
$3c-Zn^{2+}$	8.238	26.123	0.92	0.15	41.68	8.199	26.082	41.34	719
$4c-Ca^{2+}$	7.123	11.871	1.04	1.43	6.55	7.116	11.867	4.49	263
$4c-Sr^{2+}$	4.672	11.830	1.62	0.18	27.85	4.627	11.802	27.77	5940
<b>5b-</b> Ca <sup>2+</sup>	3.912	8.112	0.81	1.43	7.32	3.906	8.105	69.82	3614
$5b-Sr^{2+}$	3.146	9.860	0.70	0.18	8.86	3.140	9.852	8.84	7242
<b>6c-</b> Ca <sup>2+</sup>	5.756	13.784	1.36	1.43	29.36	5.716	13.755	28.29	2753
<b>6c-</b> Sr <sup>2+</sup>	5.456	12.458	1.41	0.18	25.36	5.421	12.433	25.24	3187
7 <b>b-</b> Ca <sup>2+</sup>	8.142	14.768	1.07	1.43	155.94	7.975	14.615	153.00	5160
$7b-Sr^{2+}$	4.168	11.045	1.06	0.18	54.49	4.110	10.991	54.44	17828
$7b-Zn^{2+}$	10.446	9.254	1.08	0.15	9.00	10.436	9.246	8.30	197
<b>7c-</b> Ca <sup>2+</sup>	6.311	6.634	1.53	1.43	44.07	6.243	6.591	42.70	6651
$7c-Sr^{2+}$	5.248	6.952	1.28	0.18	43.20	5.193	6.909	43.10	11136
$7c-Zn^{2+}$	6.748	7.758	0.94	0.15	45.71	6.705	7.713	45.50	4895

tetralactam I including two secondary and two tertiary amide functions [12]. They should be improved by substituting both N-amide groups with lipophilic chains.

Based on the above information concerning our ligands, it is now possible to envisage an extension of this work by NMR studies in order (i) to identify the coordination sites, (ii) to determine the importance, in the complexation, of the ketal functions infrequently encountered in macrocyclic structures, (iii) finally to emphasize the differences of conformations between the flexible free ligands and their cationic complexes. This work will be the object of a following paper.

Thus, after the discovery of new macrocyclic compounds generated by an original methodology [7,8], we can now design a new class of ligands offering an interesting selectivity towards Sr<sup>2+</sup> and  $Ca^{2+}$ , the binding properties of which should be improved.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors thank M. Cochet and E. Perfetti for technical assistance.

#### References

- Pedersen, C. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1967, 89, 7017.
   Pedersen, C. J. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 1988, 27, 1021.
   Cram, D. J. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 1988, 27, 1009.
   Lehn, J.-M. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl. 1988, 27, 89.
   Izatt, R. M.; Pawlak, K.; Bradshaw, J. S.; Bruening, R. L. Chem. Br. 1021 01, 1721 Rev. 1991, 91, 1721.

- [6] Izatt, R. M.; Bradshaw, J. S.; Nielsen, S. A.; Lamb, J. D.; Christensen, J. J. Chem. Rev. 1985, 85, 271.
- Valade, A.-G.; Dugat, D.; Jeminet, G.; Royer, J.; Husson, H.-P. Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2001, 2041.
- Dugat, D.; Chiaroni, A.; Riche, C.; Royer, J.; Husson, H.-P. Tetrahedron Lett. 1997, 38, 5801.
- Nakatsuji, Y.; Kobayashi, H.; Okahara, M.; Matsushima, K. Chem. Lett. 1982, 1571.
- [10] Petranek, J.; Ryba, O. Tetrahedron Lett. 1977, 4249.
- Petranek, J.; Ryba, O. Collect. Czech. Chem. Commun. 1980, 45, [11] 1567
- [12] Pigot, T.; Duriez, M.-C.; Picard, C.; Cazaux, L.; Tisnès, P. Tetrahedron 1992, 48, 4359.
- [13] Cathala, B.; Picard, C.; Cazaux, L.; Tisnès, P.; D'Silva, C. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2 1996, 685.
- [14] Szumna, A.; Gryko, D. T.; Jurczak, J. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin 2 2000, 1553.
- [15] Schneider, H. S.; Kramer, R.; Simona, S.; Schneider, U. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1988, 110, 6442.
- [16] Wong, K. H.; Bourgoin, M.; Smid, J. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1974, 715.
- [17] Bourgoin, M.; Wong, K. H.; Hui, J. Y.; Smid, J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1975, 97, 3462
- [18] Beltran, J.-L.; Codony, R.; Prat, M. D. Analytica Chimica Acta 1993, 276, 441
- [19] Talanova, G. G.; Elkarim, N. S. A.; Talanov, V. S.; Hanes, Jr., R. E.; Hwang, H.-S.; Bartsch, R. A.; Rogers, R. D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1999**, 121, 11281.
- Ranganathan, D. Acc. Chem. Res. 2001, 34, 919. [20]
- Frensdorff, H. K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1971, 93, 4684. [21]
- [22] Moore, S. S.; Tarnowski, T. L.; Newcomb, N.; Cram, D. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1977, 99, 6398.
- [23] Dietrich, B. J. Chem. Educ. 1985, 62, 954.
  [24] Friedman, H. L.; Krishman, C. V. In Aqueous Solutions of Simple [24] Electrolytes in Water, A Comprehensive Treatise; Franks, F., Ed.; Plenum Press: New York, 1973; Vol. 3, p 55.
- Silberrad, O.; Phillips, H. A. J. Chem. Soc. 1908, 93, 474. [25]
- [26] Ellgehausen, H.; D'Hondt, C.; Fuerer, R. Pestic. Sci. 1981, 12, 219.
- [27] Leo, A.; Hansch, C.; Elkins, D. Chem. Rev. 1971, 71, 525.
- More, W. E.; Ammann, D.; Bissig, R.; Pretsch, E.; Simon, W. In *Progress in Macrocyclic Chemistry*; Izatt, R. M., Christensen, J. J., Eds.; Wiley: New York, 1979; Vol. 1, pp 1–61. [28]