Chelate Cooperativity in Supramolecular Systems

Hongmei Sun, M. Cristina Misuraca, Simon M. Turega and Christopher A. Hunter *

Department of Chemistry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 1EW (UK) Department of Chemistry, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S3 7HF (UK)

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of cooperativity pervades supramolecular chemistry and biology.1 However, the quantification and prediction of the magnitude of cooperative effects in multivalent systems remains a challenge.² The contribution of individual functional group interactions to the stability of a complex can be dissected using the chemical double mutant cycle (DMC) methodology developed in our laboratory.³ Through pairwise comparisons, the effect of all secondary interactions can be removed, and we have used this approach to measure the free energy contributions of a series of specific intramolecular hydrogen bonds in zinc porphyrin-pyridine complexes.⁴ Effective molarity (EM) is used as the key parameter to quantify chelate cooperativity in these systems. This poster compares effective molarities for intramolecular hydrogen bond interactions made with five different functional groups located at the same positions in the supramolecular architecture. The influence of functional group and intrinsic hydrogen bond strength on chelate cooperativity has been quantified by systematically comparing a large body of data on closely related systems.



Double mutant cycle methodology







Figure 3. Chemical double mutant cycles. The DMC used to dissect the thermodynamic contribution of the phosphine oxide (or A•D) H-bond to the overall stability of complex A is illustrated. The association constants measured for formation of 1:1 complexes in toluene at 298 K (logK) are colour-coded according to their role in the DMC (A, B, C and D). The most stable blue complexes (A) are the only systems that can make intramolecular phosphine oxide-phenol hydrogen bonds



Figure 5. Effective molarities. Comparison of values of EM measured in toluene and in TCE for formation of hydrogen bonds with the ligand oxygen atom highlighted in red. The solid line corresponds to logEM(L1) = logEM(L2), and the dashed lines to $logEM(L1) = logEM(L2) \pm 1$.

Effective molarity analysis



Figure 4. Partially bound states. Stepwise equilibria in the formation of a porphyrin–pyridine complex containing an intramolecular H-bond. K_0 is the intermolecular association constant for formation of the zinc–nitrogen interaction. K_{ref} EM is the equilibrium constant for formation of the intramolecular H-bond. K_{ref} is the equilibrium constant for formation of the corresponding intermolecular H-bond. In general, the value of $\Delta\Delta G^\circ$ measured by a DMC is related to the stepwise equilibria for formation of multiple intramolecular hydrogen bonds in complexes A-D by the following equations:

$$\frac{-\mathcal{M}G^0}{RT} = \frac{f_{\mathcal{A}}f_{\mathcal{D}}}{f_{\mathcal{B}}f_{\mathcal{C}}} \qquad f = 1 + \sum_i \sigma_i K_i EM_i + \sum_{i,j}^N \sigma_{ij} K_i EM_i K_j EM_j + \dots + \sigma_{ij-N} \prod_i^N K_i EM_i$$

where σ_{i} are statistical factors that account for the degeneracies of the partially bound states.

CONCLUSIONS

e

For all five types of functional group, the values of **EM range from 3 to 700 mM.** There is no solvent effect, and the variation in EM with geometric complementarity is also surprisingly small. For systems sharing the same supramolecular framework, the values of EM are the same within an order of magnitude. Trends in EM values are more similar for ligands with similar functional groups. For example, the agreement between the results for ester ligands (Lh) and amide ligands (Lg) is excellent. The data for phosphine oxide ligands (Li) and phosphonate diester ligands (La) are less well correlated, but this is a consequence of the fact that for these very polar functional groups, the intramolecular hydrogen bonds are strong enough to form even in systems with a significant geometric mismatch, which give rise to small EM values that are subject to a large error.

REFERENCES

Whitty, A. Nat Chem Biol. 2008, 4, 435.
Hunter, C. A.; Anderson, H. L. Angew Chem. Int. Ed. 2009, 48, 7488.
Ocokroft, S. L.; Hunter, C. A. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2007, 36, 172.
Hunter, C. A.; Misuraca, M. C.; Turega, S. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 582.



