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Bonding in nitrile photo-dissociating ruthenium drug candidates—A local vibrational mode study

Margaret McCutcheon, Marek Freindorf, and Elfi Kraka

ABSTRACT

In this work, we investigated bonding features of 15 ruthenium(II) nitrile complexes of the type [Ru(tpy)(L)-(CH\textsubscript{3}CN)]\textsuperscript{2+}, containing the tridentate tpy ligand (tpy = 2,2′:6′,2″-terpyridine) and various bidentate ancillary ligands L; 12 compounds originally synthesized by Loftus et al. [J. Phys. Chem. C 123, 10291–10299 (2019)] and three new complexes. We utilized local vibrational force constants derived from the local mode theory as a quantitative measure of bond strength complemented with the topological analysis of the electron density and the natural bond orbital analysis. Loftus et al. suggested that nitrile dissociation occurs after light induced singlet–triplet transition of the original complexes and they used as a measure of nitrile release efficiency quantum yields for ligand exchange in water. They observed larger quantum yields for complexes with smaller singlet–triplet energy gaps. The major goal of this work was to assess how the Ru–NC and Ru–L bond strengths in these 15 compounds relate to and explain the experimental data of Loftus et al., particularly focusing on the question whether there is a direct correlation between Ru–NC bond strength and measured quantum yield. Our study provides the interesting result that the compounds with the highest quantum yields also have the strongest Ru–NC bonds suggesting that breaking the Ru–NC bond is not the driving force for the delivery process rather than the change of the metal framework as revealed by first results of a unified reaction valley approach investigation of the mechanism. Compounds with the highest quantum yield show larger electronic structure changes upon singlet–triplet excitation, i.e., larger changes in bond strength, covalency, and difference between the singlet and triplet HOMOs, with exception of the compound 12. In summary, this work provides new insights into the interplay of local properties and experimental quantum yields forming in synergy a useful tool for fine tuning of existing and future design of nitrile releasing ruthenium compounds. We hope that this work will bring theoretical and experimental studies closer together and serves as an incubator for future collaboration between computational chemists and their experimental colleagues.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Cancer, the uncontrolled growth of cells, is one of the most well-known diseases plaguing mankind. In the later stages, a cancer diagnosis is often a death sentence due to the inability of the human body to tolerate the necessary chemotherapeutic chemicals. Current-generation chemotherapy drugs rely strongly on a platinum ion to twist DNA during the metaphase of cell growth. However, next generation cancer treatments incorporate a ruthenium (II) ion, which has many desirable properties compared to platinum. Particularly relevant are drugs currently undergoing clinical trials—NKP1339, NAMI-A, RM175, and RAPTA-C. Such drugs are preferable to platinum based chemotherapies due to their cytotoxicity against cisplatin resistant cells and their higher selectivity toward tumor cells. These ruthenium-based drugs exhibit a variety of complex geometries. Arene half-sandwich complexes provide methods of linking arenes such as p-cymene groups and benzene groups to a ruthenium center and then adding a releasable cytotoxic component, such as diphosphanes, triazole, hydrozone, or a glutathione S-transferase inhibitor. In addition, piano-stool geometries have been shown to be effective in treating cancer through anti-proliferative effects. Rafols et al. have recently reported the synthesis of piano-stool ruthenium compounds showing excellent cytotoxicity after incubation in aged dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO). Yet another unique geometry synthesized by da Silva et al. has shown cytotoxic effects through the inhibition of topoisomerase IB. Gupta et al. have synthesized acetylacetone ruthenium complexes that induce apoptosis and are of particular interest due to
their lipophilicity and associated cell delivery. As the library of these ruthenium based compounds grows, the scientific community has observed the effectiveness of ruthenium (II) complexes deriving from a variety of properties unique to the metal.

Due to ruthenium’s and iron’s similar electronic structure, ruthenium compounds are able to undergo active transport into the cell via iron transporters. This also accounts for the selectivity of ruthenium based compounds towards tumor cells, as cancerous cells up-regulate the intake of iron to proliferate. Ruthenium compounds have been shown to accumulate inside the mitochondria and endoplasmic reticulum to inhibit kinase pathways. The most important properties of ruthenium complexes, however, are their favorable adsorption properties, photochemical, and photophysical properties, making them promising candidates for photoactive metalloantibiotics and photo-chemotherapy, where the drugs become activated after receiving visible light irradiation of the tumor in vivo, again so far mostly relying on platinum based drugs.

Ruthenium’s properties as a transition metal are what makes it so important in the search for next-generation chemotherapeutics. It exhibits five oxidation states with (II) and (III) being the most common and typically forms six coordinations. These coordination complexes are typically formed with polypyridines and exhibit long-lived excited states though not all excited states are accessible. This characteristic is explained by the mixing of the ruthenium d orbitals and the ligand’s π and π’ orbitals. Arené-coordinated complexes can be synthesized to show a considerable gap between the ground state and the metal-centered (MC) state. Exploiting the nature of this energy gap is key to the development of photo-dissociative drugs. Metal-to-ligand-charge-transfer (MLCT) allows for a charge to be moved from ruthenium to one of the coordinated ligands.

Polypyridyl ruthenium (II) complexes that have been involved so far in a wide range of applications ranging from solar energy, molecular switches, and biological sensors to photo-redox catalysis show also a high potential as photo-activated chemotherapeutic. Upon irradiation of light, electronic excitation of the singlet ground state of the polypyridyl ruthenium (II) complex takes place followed by intersystem crossing to a lower lying excited triplet state out of which ligand dissociation for the controlled release of DNA binding drugs, kinase inhibitors, or other cytotoxic reagents occurs, which qualifies these compounds as potential drug delivery systems. Lofts et al. synthesized 12 ruthenium (II) complexes of the type [Ru(tpy)(L)-(CH$_3$CN)]$^{1+}$, containing the tridentate tpy ligand (tpy = 2,2′,6′,2″-terpyridine), various bidentate ancillary ligands L, shown in Fig. 1(a), and the methyl nitride group as a model for nitrile-based drugs. They found that these complexes are stable in the dark but absorb light throughout the visible range and form long-lived excited triplet states out of which nitride dissociation occurs as depicted in Fig. 1(b), leading to a five-coordinated Ru(II) triplet intermediate. After relaxation to the singlet state, the association of a water molecule from the aqueous environment follows, filling the empty Ru coordination site. As a measure of drug release efficiency, these authors suggested recorded quantum yields (QY) for water association. In addition to QYs, they derived singlet–triplet splitting energy differences (ST) for the original ruthenium (II) complexes 1–12 from emission spectra taken at 77 K. Two distinct groups emerged from their study—Group 1 complexes 1–7 with larger STs and lower QYs, i.e., drug delivery efficiencies (shown in red in Fig. 2), and Group 2 complexes 8–11 with smaller STs and higher QYs, i.e., drug delivery efficiencies (shown in blue in Fig. 2 and one outlier), 12 with an ST splitting comparable to that of other Group 2 members but with the smallest overall QY found in their study. In the following work, Lofts et al. provided evidence that the population of triplet ligand field (3LF) excited states is not necessary for photo-induced nitride dissociation based on their finding that compounds with the greatest QYS have the longest 3MLCT excited state lifetimes, i.e., they are less able to populate the dissociative (3LF) states.

Intrigued by the Loftus proposal, we explored in this work the question if the QYS, which assess the drug release efficiency in a holistic way via monitoring ligand exchange correlate with local measures, in particular the strength of the ruthenium–nitride (Ru–NC) bond, and how different ruthenium-ancillary ligands L influence the Ru–NC bond strength, with the overall goal to develop a protocol for fine-tuning drug release efficiencies of these complexes based on Ru–CN and Ru–L bond properties. We utilized...
local vibrational stretching force constants $k^a$ derived from the local mode analysis (LMA) developed in our group. LMA was complemented with the topological analysis of the electron density using Bader’s quantum theory of atoms-in-molecule (QTAIM) and the natural orbital (NBO) analysis to round up our bonding analysis.

Based on preliminary results and recent literature, we added three novel complexes to the original Loftus set [i.e., Group 3, see Fig. 1(a)] as potential candidates with increased drug release efficiency.

This manuscript is structured in the following way: first, computational methods applied in this work are summarized, followed by a discussion of our results. Then, some conclusions are drawn, and work in progress is highlighted.

## II. COMPUTATIONAL METHODS

As a quantitative measure of bond strength for the Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds investigated in this work, we used local vibrational force constants $k^a$ derived from LMA, which is based on vibrational spectroscopy. The theoretical background of LMA, originally developed by Konkoli and Cremer, can be found in a comprehensive review article. The local vibrational modes of a molecule are the local counterparts of normal vibrational modes, which are generally delocalized due to electronic and mass-coupling. Therefore associated normal mode stretching force constants are of limited use as individual bond strength descriptors. In contrast, local vibrational stretching force constants derived from uncoupled local vibrational modes directly reflect the intrinsic strength of a chemical bond and/or weak chemical interaction. We have successfully applied local stretching force constants to characterize covalent bonds and weak chemical interactions, such as halogen bonds, chalcogen bonds, pnictogen bonds, and hydrogen bonds, as well as so-called π-hole interactions.

It is convenient to compare the bond strengths in a series of compounds using a bond strength order (BSO), rather than comparing the local force constant values. These properties are related via a power relationship according to a generalized Badger rule derived by Kraka et al.

$$\text{BSO} = a(k^a)^b.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The constants $a$ and $b$ in Eq. (1) can be determined via two reference compounds with known $k^a$ and the requirement that the BSO is zero for a zero force constant. In our study, the power relation between $k^a$ and BSO [Eq. (1)] has been based on two reference molecules, RuH and RuO, for which we calculated Mayer’s bond orders at the PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD level of theory leading to values of 0.9373 and 1.4812 for RuH and RuO, respectively. By scaling Mayer’s bond order of RuH to 1.0, the scaled value of Mayer’s bond order of RuO was 1.5803. Local mode force constants $k^a$ at the same level of theory for RuH and RuO are 2.143 and 6.978 mdyn/A, respectively, which led to the power relation coefficients $a = 0.7441$ and $b = 0.3879$, applied throughout this work.

The covalent character of the Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds was assessed via the Cremer–Kraka criterion, which is based on the value of the energy density $H_b$ taken at the bond critical point $r_b$ on the electron density bond path between the two atoms involved in the chemical bond or weak chemical interaction. A negative value of $H_b$ indicates the covalent character of the bond/interaction, whereas a positive value reflects the dominant electrostatic character. The NBO analysis was applied to round up our bonding analysis.

Density Functional Theory (DFT) was used for all geometry optimizations, frequency calculations, and wave function analyses performed in this work. All calculations were carried out with the PBE0 hybrid functional, which has been found to produce experimentally accurate geometries for ruthenium tetracarbonyl polymers and methylimidazole complexes. We used this functional in combination with the Dunning and Kendall’s cc-pVTZ basis set. In order to account for relativistic effects for ruthenium, the Stuttgart–Dresden effective core potential (SDD) was applied, which is a quasi-relativistic $ab initio$ pseudo-potential substituting the M(Z-28)$^+$ core orbitals of the second row transition elements, used together with the corresponding optimized GTO valence basis set and with the corresponding spin–orbit coupling operator.

This model chemistry is comparable to that used by Loftus et al. (PBE/def2-TZVP/SDD), but the cc-pVTZ basis set is larger and more flexible, containing more basis functions per atom and has been found to have higher accuracy in accounting for relativistic effects and effective core potentials. A comparison of theoretically calculated bond lengths compared with those obtained from x-ray crystallography by Loftus and co-workers depicts a linear correlation between experimental and theoretical values obtained at the PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD (Ru) level of theory (see Fig. S1 of the supplementary material). The harmonic normal vibrational frequencies of the Ru–NC bonds (449–502 cm$^{-1}$) in Ru–Npy compounds with a second phenyl ligand bound to the ruthenium reported by Garza-Ortiz et al. cover about the same range as our harmonic local vibrational frequencies (see Table S1 of the supplementary material), showing the dominant Ru–CN character of these modes. The Cartesian coordinates and symmetries of...
the geometry optimized complexes 1–15 (singlet and triplet states), the corresponding complexes after nitrile dissociation (singlet and triplet states), and the complexes with the associated water ligand (only calculated in their singlet state) are collected in Tables S4–S6 of the supplementary material. For the triplet state calculations, unrestricted DFT was applied,\textsuperscript{115} and, for all DFT calculations, an ultrafine integral grid was used.\textsuperscript{116} DFT calculations were carried out with Gaussian 16.\textsuperscript{117} The local mode force constants were calculated with the LMODEA package.\textsuperscript{118} The electron density analysis was performed with the AIMAll program,\textsuperscript{119} and Mayer bond orders were calculated with Gaussian 16.\textsuperscript{120} NBO Ru d-orbital occupations of HOMO and LUMO orbitals were determined with the program NBO6.\textsuperscript{121}

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section is structured in the following way: in Sec. III A, the bond strength of the Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds and their relationship are analyzed. In Sec. III B, these results are discussed in the context of nitrile release and water association, including a comparison with the experimental QY’s of Loftus \textit{et al.},\textsuperscript{28} and in Sec. III C, first mechanistic studies on the nitrile release are presented.

In Table I, calculated Ru–NC and Ru–L bond lengths R (Å), local mode force constants $k^b$ (mdyn/Å), and corresponding bond strength orders BSO, electron density $\rho_b$ ($e/Å^3$), and energy density $H_b$ (hartree/Å$^3$) at the bond critical point b for complexes 1–15. PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD level of theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>R (Å)</th>
<th>$k^b$ (mdyn/Å)</th>
<th>BSO</th>
<th>$\rho_b$ ($e/Å^3$)</th>
<th>$H_b$ (hartree/Å$^3$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ru–CN bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.020</td>
<td>1.395</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>−0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>1.624</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>−0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>1.607</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>−0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.016</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>−0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>−0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.006</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>−0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.003</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>−0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>1.852</td>
<td>0.945</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>−0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>−0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>−0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>1.842</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>−0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>1.8490</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>−0.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>−0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>−0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.994</td>
<td>1.713</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>−0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru–L bond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.087</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>−0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.086</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>−0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.064</td>
<td>1.814</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>−0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>−0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>2.014</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>−0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>1.653</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>−0.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>1.466</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>−0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.044</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>−0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.073</td>
<td>2.085</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>−0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>1.829</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>−0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>−0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.073</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>−0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.071</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>−0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>2.108</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>−0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-La</td>
<td>2.049</td>
<td>2.101</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>−0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Lb</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>2.426</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>−0.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIG. 3. (a) BSO values of all Ru–NC bonds (singlet and triplet states) and (b) BSO values of all Ru–L bonds (singlet and triplet states) obtained with the power relationship $\text{BSO} = 0.7441 \times (k^a)^{0.3879}$, calculated at the PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD level of theory. See text and Eq. (1) for the derivation of the power relationship. (c) Comparison of Ru–NC to Ru–L BSO values. Group 1 compounds 1–7 in red, Group 2 compounds 8–12 in blue, and Group 3 compounds 13–15 in green.

FIG. 4. Correlation between energy density $H_b$ and BSO (a) for Ru–NC bonds (singlet and triplet states) and (b) for Ru–L bonds (singlet and triplet states) calculated at the PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD level of theory. (c) Correlation between $H_b$(Ru–NC) and $H_b$(Ru–L). Group 1 compounds 1–7 in red, Group 2 compounds 8–12 in blue, and Group 3 compounds 13–15 in green.
in Table I and Fig. 3(b) show a bond strength range between 0.86 and 1.05 for the Ru–L bonds. In contrast to the Ru–NC bond, there is no uniform bond weakening trend for the Ru–L bond upon ST excitation, as reflected by the BSO differences in Table S2 of the supplementary material. Some Ru–L bonds are weaker in their singlet state than in their triplet state, and for others, the opposite is true. Overall, \( \Delta [\text{BSO}(T) - \text{BSO}(S)] \) values vary between −0.8 and 0.7.

Figure 3(c) depicts the relationship between the BSO values of Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds. Although there is no significant correlation between the strength of the ruthenium nitrile bond and that of the ruthenium ancillary ligand bond, there is a trend that to some extent a weaker Ru–L bond corresponds to a stronger Ru–NC bond. A more strongly associated ancillary ligand siphons electron density from the Ru–NC bond, thus weakening it. We also observe several groupings in Fig. 3(c) among the singlet and triplet states of compounds 8–11 and the triplet states of 1–7 and 12. In comparing the triplet states of 8–11 with the singlet states, the Ru–NC bond is weakened while Ru–L is strengthened. This is consistent with the chemical thinking that in the triplet state, electron density moves out of the Ru–NC bond toward the ancillary ligand, thus accounting for the photo-dissociation of the compound. This difference is even more pronounced in our proposed compounds 13 and 14. These compounds show an increase in Ru–L strength with a simultaneous decrease in Ru–NC. Most interesting in this context is that compound 12 has a lower QY than expected, appearing in Fig. 1 as a clear outlier of Group 2. Our local mode analysis provides a rationale for that. During the singlet to triplet transition, both Ru–NC and Ru–L are weakened in compound 12. The simultaneous weakening of both bonds in 12 suggests that the nitrile is unable to efficiently photo-dissociate lacking reorganization of electron density to the ancillary ligand, i.e., nitrile is not freed easily from the complex.

Figure 4 evaluates the covalent character of the Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds via the correlation between \( H_0 \) and BSO. According to the Cremer–Kraka criterion\(^{99,100}\) described above, we find that all Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds investigated in this work are of covalent character with \( H_0 \) values in the range of −0.12 to −0.20 (hartree/Å\(^3\)) for Ru–NC bonds (see Table I and Fig. 4(a)) and a somewhat larger range of −0.07 to −0.28 (hartree/Å\(^3\)) for Ru–L bonds (see Table I and Fig. 4(b)). In both cases, we find the trend that stronger bonds (larger BSO values) show more covalent character (more negative \( H_0 \) values). Figure 4(c) shows the comparison of the \( H_0 \) values of Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds, showing the trend that a more covalent Ru–L bond correlates with a less covalent Ru–NC bond. As with BSO comparisons, we observe that, in the case of Ru–NC bonds, the singlet states show more covalent character, whereas the opposite holds for the Ru–L bonds. For compounds 8–11, this energy density difference between singlet and triplet states is larger than that for 1–10, and it is most pronounced for compounds 13–15. Thus, we predict that our proposed compounds will show greater rearrangement of energy density from Ru–NC to Ru–L and, therefore, greater photo-dissociation of the nitrile group.

Loftus et al.\(^{28}\) emphasized in their work the potential role of the Ru-d orbitals; they concluded that greater ruthenium d-character of the singlet state HOMO is associated with a lower quantum yield for the water association. In our work, we explored if there is a relationship between the Ru-d character of the HOMO for both singlet and triplet states and the Ru–NC bond strength depicted in

---

**A. Bond analysis**

As revealed from the data in Table I and Fig. 3(a), the strength of the ruthenium–nitrile bonds covers a range between 0.80 and 0.95 (including complexes in their singlet and triplet states). Interesting to note is that the strongest Ru–NC bonds of complexes in their singlet state are found for Group 2 members (BSO values of 0.846–0.916) and Group 3 members (BSO values of 0.887–0.917). We observe the general trend that upon excitation from singlet to triplet state, the Ru–NC bond becomes weaker (see BSO differences in Table S2 of the supplementary material). Interesting to note is that the Ru–NC bond weakening upon ST excitation is most pronounced for Group 2 and Group 3 members with \( \Delta [\text{BSO}(T) - \text{BSO}(S)] \) values in the 0.06 range for Group 2 and in the 0.08 range for Group 3, relating increased QYs to larger changes of the Ru–NC bonds.

---

**FIG. 5.** Comparison of Ru–NC BSO with the percentage contribution of Ru-d character to the HOMO. Ru–NC BSO vs Ru-d character of the singlet HOMO (a); Ru–NC BSO vs Ru-d character of the triplet HOMO (b); Ru–NC vs Ru-d character of the HOMO, both singlet and triplet. PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD level of theory.

shows the corresponding \( H_0 \) plots for the Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds, and Fig. 5 focuses on the Ru d-orbital occupations of HOMO orbitals.
Fig. 5(a) and between the Ru-d character of the HOMO for both singlet and triplet states and the Ru–L bond strength depicted in Fig. 5(b). As obvious from Fig. 5, for both Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds, there is no significant correlation between these two quantities but we do observe some trends and groupings of compounds. Group 2 compounds 8–11 (shown in blue, with the highest QYs for water association) have a Ru-d character between 40% and 60% in their singlet states. Group 1 compounds (shown in red, with smaller QYs) show the largest Ru-d character with values up to 80%. In contrast, our proposed compounds (13–15) (shown in green) have the smallest Ru-d character of the singlet HOMO with less than 20% Ru-d character found for compound 15. Thus, we assert that these compounds will show greater quantum yields than the original Loftus compounds. Figure 5(b) shows the correlation between the Ru-d character of the HOMO for both singlet and triplet states and the Ru–L bond strength showing a similar trend than that found for the Ru–NC bonds; the largest Ru-d character of about 80% for Group 2 members in their singlet states, medium values of 60% for Group 1 compounds, and smallest Ru-d character in the 20% range for Group 3 compounds.

Examination of the HOMO and LUMO orbitals provides further insights into the patterns observed in the correlation between Ru-d character and bond strength. In the following, some representative examples are discussed. A complete set of HOMO and LUMO plots for compounds 1–15, singlet and triplet states is compiled in the supplementary material (Figs. S5–S19).

HOMO and LUMO of compound 4 (triplet state) are shown in Fig. 6(a) as a representative of Group 1. The primary orbital contribution of the triplet HOMO comes from the Ru-d and the tpy ligand orbitals with no contribution from nitrile orbitals. The triplet LUMO of compound 4 is also predominantly localized on the tpy ligand. The same is observed for the other Group 1 members, 1–3 and 5–7 (see Figs. S5–S7 and S9–S11 of the supplementary material). Since the tpy ligand does not change across the compounds investigated in this work, this explains why there is no direct correlation between the triplet Ru-d character and the Ru–NC or Ru–L bond strength, as revealed in Fig. 5. Figure 6(b) shows HOMO and LUMO of compound 9 (triplet state), and Fig. 6(c) shows HOMO and LUMO of compound 12 (triplet state). Both are members of Group 2. However, there is a distinct difference. Figure 6(b) shows that the HOMO of 9 is predominantly localized on the auxiliary ligand but shifts toward the tpy ligand in the LUMO. This rearrangement of electron density upon excitation in the triplet state can be considered as a major factor for the increased quantum yield of 8–11. However, as evident from Fig. 6(c), the HOMO LUMO pattern of compound 12 resembles the Group 1 pattern; therefore, the substantially lower QY of this Group 2 member clarifies this compound as an outlier. In Fig. 6(d), the singlet HOMO of compound 9 (left) is compared with that of compound 14 (right), a Group 3 member. The compound 9 HOMO is localized at the ancillary ligand L. It is this localization and lack of Ru-d character that Loftus et al.28 have shown to be strongly correlated with the quantum yield. This also confirms the influence of ligand L on the nitrile release for 8–11, which we used as a design tool for our compounds. As illustrated in Fig. 6(d), compound 14 shows the same localization of the singlet HOMO to the ancillary ligand, as is also found for the other Group 3 members (see Figs. S17–S19 of the supplementary material), i.e., our proposed compounds show the same triplet HOMO/LUMO electron density redistribution as the most successful compounds synthesized by Loftus et al.,28 adding another strong argument to the Ru-d orbital analysis for the potential of compounds 13–15 as a model for the fine-tuning and future design.
of Ru(II) nitrile releasing drug candidates with modified auxiliary ligands.

**B. Local vs global description of nitrile release**

This section is devoted to the question if our local bond descriptors, particularly the Ru–NC correlate with the QYs of the water association, which was suggested by Loftus \textit{et al.} as an experimental measure of nitrile release. As illustrated in Fig. 1(b), the QYs are a holistic overall measure, resulting from several distinct reaction steps: (i) transition of the original six-coordinated Ru(II) complex into a long-lived triplet state upon exposure to light; (ii) nitrile release from the triplet state via the transformation into a five-coordinated Ru(II) complex; (iii) relaxation of the five-coordinated Ru(II) complex to the singlet state; and (iv) association of one water molecule and back-transformation into a six-coordinated Ru(II) complex. In Table II, the energetics for these steps are collected. The ST splitting energies (column one of Table II) cover a large range between 22 and 56 kcal/mol. As depicted in Fig. 2, QYs are related to the amount of energy needed to excite the original complex from the singlet to the triplet state, i.e., the lower the ST, the better the energy gap. With ST splitting energies in the range of 22 kcal/mol, compounds 13–15 have the lowest ST gaps, so we predict they will give high quantum yields, and are, therefore, valuable potential candidates to be explored by experiment.

Nitrile dissociation is an endothermic process for all 15 compounds, with smaller energy values for compounds 1–6 ranging from 7 to 14 kcal/mol. It is interesting to note that nitrile release of compound 7 is almost 55 kcal/mol most endothermic process found in our study, followed by Group 2 compounds with values in the 47 kcal/mol range. Group 3 compounds 13–15 show a large stretch from 20 to 40 kcal/mol. Overall, it can be concluded that the endothermicity of the nitrile dissociation does not directly relate to the observed QYs, and furthermore, there is no correlation between the Ru–NC bond strength and endothermicity of this process as shown in Fig. 7. Triplet to singlet (TS) relaxation is as expected exothermic for all compounds ranging from −8 to −18 kcal/mol and water association is even more exothermic with energies between −19 and −26 kcal/mol. Energies and quantum yields describe a chemical process in a holistic and overall way, making it difficult to extract individual information or mechanistic details.

**TABLE II.** Singlet triplet splittings, reaction energies for subsequent nitrile dissociation, TS (triplet to singlet) relaxations after nitrile release, and reaction energies for the subsequent water association [as sketched in Fig. 1(a)]. All values in (kcal/mol) as sketched in Fig. 1(a), PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD level of theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>ST splitting</th>
<th>Nitrile dissociation</th>
<th>TS relaxation</th>
<th>Water association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.86 (47.46)</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>−18.09</td>
<td>−25.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56.41 (47.46)</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>−17.41</td>
<td>−25.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.17 (46.03)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>−17.62</td>
<td>−25.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>53.61 (44.89)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>−16.24</td>
<td>−24.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>46.50 (46.03)</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>−17.76</td>
<td>−24.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>48.11 (43.17)</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>−14.38</td>
<td>−25.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>52.82 (41.74)</td>
<td>54.71</td>
<td>−13.36</td>
<td>−23.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>35.48 (37.45)</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>−10.02</td>
<td>−24.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.05 (38.88)</td>
<td>47.61</td>
<td>−9.81</td>
<td>−24.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>36.05 (39.17)</td>
<td>47.65</td>
<td>−9.85</td>
<td>−24.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.48 (37.17)</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>−9.83</td>
<td>−23.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.04 (38.03)</td>
<td>46.82</td>
<td>−10.08</td>
<td>−23.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>−7.87</td>
<td>−18.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.41</td>
<td>40.84</td>
<td>−8.20</td>
<td>−18.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>36.08</td>
<td>−9.12</td>
<td>−22.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \) Experimentally derived ST splittings from emission maxima taken from Ref. 28 in parenthesis.
occurs from the triplet states, the focus is on triplet BSO(Ru–NC) and BSO(Ru–L) values in the following.

Figure 8(a) shows the correlation between the Ru–NC bond strength and the quantum yield for water association, and Fig. 8(b) shows the corresponding correlation for the Ru–L bonds. In both cases, there is no significant correlation between these two quantities, Group 1 and Group 2 members (with the exception of outlier 12 from two clusters, as found for the correlation between ST splitting energies and QYs shown in Fig. 2).

The most striking result revealed by Fig. 8(a) is that Group 2 members 8–11 with the largest observed quantum yields for water association have the strongest Ru–NC bonds in their triplet state with BSO values between 0.883 and 0.888, which also contains the Ru–NC bond of the outlier 12, whereas the members of Group 1, compounds 1–7, with smaller QYs covering a large range of BSO values with compound 1 having the weakest Ru–NC bond (BSO = 0.847) and 7 the strongest Ru–NC bond (BSO = 0.894) of the whole set. Figure 8(b) shows a similar trend for the Ru–L bonds, i.e., Group 1 member BSOs are more spread out than those of Group 2 members. This leads to the important conclusion that modifying the Ru–NC and/or Ru–L bond strengths does not necessarily lead to a specific enhancement of the quantum yield, as clarified by the LMA analysis; modification of the quantum yield needs a more elaborate and complex effort.

C. Mechanism of nitrile release

Ongoing work is devoted to investigate the mechanism of the light induced ST transition, nitrile release, and water association with our Unified Reaction Valley Approach (URVA). URVA analyzes the curvature of the reaction path traced out by the reacting species on the potential energy surface on their way from reactants via transition state to products. Curvature peaks mark important chemical events, and the decomposition of the curvature peaks into internal coordinate components, such as bond length, bond angles, and puckering coordinates, elucidates which coordinates contribute to a certain chemical event such as bond forming/breaking or rehybridization. In contrast, curvature minima reflect locations of minimal change, often denoting the transition from one chemical event to the next. The region between two curvature minima including a curvature peak identifies a reaction phase. In this way, different families of chemical reactions are characterized by different numbers and patterns of chemical phases, which can be used as their fingerprint. Most important from an energetic point of view are the curvature peaks before the transition state because they identify the processes which contribute to the energy barrier.

In the following, first results for the nitrile dissociation reaction for complex 1 as a representative for Group 1 and for complex 8 as a representative for Group 2 are highlighted. We used as reaction path the intrinsic reaction coordinate (IRC) path of Fukui together with the improved reaction path following the procedure of Hratchian and Kraka. The URVA analysis was performed with the program package pURVA.

Figure 9 summarizes the results of the URVA analysis for complex 1. Figure 9(a) shows the energy profile as a function of the reaction parameter s. The activation and the reaction energies are 6.5 and 4.8 kcal/mol, respectively, i.e., dissociation proceeds with a small barrier and is a slightly endothermic process [see also Ref. 126]. As revealed by the curvature profile [black solid line, Fig. 9(b)], there are six distinct reaction phases [marked with small blue numbers, Fig. 9(b)]. Before the transition state, there is one large curvature peak with a shoulder stretching into phase 3, which is responsible for the activation barrier. Most interesting to note is that this curvature peak results from bond, dihedral, and pyramidalization angles involving the metal and connected ligand atoms.
FIG. 9. URVA analysis for nitrile dissociation of complex 1. (a) Energy profile. (b) Reaction path curvature and its decomposition into selected internal components. (c) Changes of the selected bond lengths. (d) Changes of the selected atomic charges. Curvature minima are shown as broken vertical lines and labeled as M1, M2, and so on. Reaction phases are indicated by blue numbers. The position of the transition state (TS) \( s = 0 \) is indicated by a dotted line. Negative \( s \) values for the entrance and positive \( s \) values for the exit channel. PBE0/6-31g(d,p)/SDD level of theory.

[dashed black line, Fig. 9(b)], i.e., changes in the Ru coordination sphere in connection with reducing the coordination number from 6 to 5. In contrast, there is no significant curvature contribution from the Ru–NC component [red line in Fig. 9(b)] until phase 6, confirming the observation that there is no correlation between Ru–NC bond strength and ease of nitrile release. In the first three phases, the Ru–NC distance remains constant, starting in phase 4 the Ru–NC bond length linearly increases until reaching its final value at the end of phase 6. After TS, we observe a somewhat increasing polarization of the Ru–NC bond, making the Ru atom of this bond more positive, and the N atom of the Ru–NC bond slightly more negative [see Fig. 9(d)] contributing to the stabilization of the van der Waals complex. As illustrated in Fig. 10(b), nitrile release is driven by a change of the metal coordination sphere, which in turn supports the elongation/cleavage of the Ru–NC bond. This is often found in transition metal catalysis where changes of the metal sphere, which are less energy demanding than the direct bond breaking initiate a actual bond breaking step. The same picture emerges for complex 8. The reaction starts from the triplet complex with a Ru–NC bond length of 2.026 Å and ends at a van der Waals complex with a loosely connected nitrile ligand with an elongated Ru–NC bond of 2.819 Å [see Fig. S4(c) of the supplementary material]. The activation and the reaction energies are 6.9 and 6.6 kcal/mol, respectively [see Fig. S4(a) of the supplementary material], i.e., dissociation proceeds with a slightly larger barrier and somewhat increased endothermicity (1.6 kcal/mol) compared to complex 1. The curvature pattern is somewhat different as revealed by the curvature profile [black solid line in Fig. S4(b)]. There are five distinct reaction phases [marked
with small blue numbers in Fig. S4(b) of the supplementary material]. The large curvature peak of the reaction profile of complex 1 is replaced by two smaller peaks, one in phase 2 and one in phase 4, with a small curvature enhancement in phase 3 in between. The final curvature peak at the end of phase 5 is more pronounced. However, as for complex 1, the curvature peaks before the transition state are dominated by bond, dihedral, and pyramidalization angles involving the metal and connected ligand atoms [dashed black line in Fig. S4(b) of the supplementary material], i.e., again changes in the Ru coordination sphere in connection with reducing the coordination number from 6 to 5 drive the reaction. There is no significant curvature contribution from the Ru–NC component [red line in Fig. S4(b) of the supplementary material] until phase 5, confirming that there is no correlation between Ru–NC bond strength and ease of nitrile release for members of Group 1 with smaller QYs as well as for members of Group 2 with higher QYs. Also, for complex 8, the Ru–NC distance remains constant in the first three phases, and in phase 4, the Ru–NC bond length starts to increase linearly until reaching its final value at the end of phase 5. The main difference between the two complexes can be seen in the larger polarization of the Ru–NC bond for complex 8. At the end of the reaction, the Ru atom has a positive charge of 0.7 (compared to 0.6 for complex 1) and the N atom of the Ru–NC bond has a negative charge of ~3.8 [compared to ~3.0 for complex 1, see Fig. S4(d) of the supplementary material]. In summary, both reactions show a similar mechanism, which starts from the change of the metal coordination sphere initiating bond polarization due to electron density transfer between the Ru to N atoms and bond elongation. Therefore, we conclude that fine-tuning and new design efforts of nitrile releasing ruthenium compounds may benefit most from ancillary ligands L supporting the change of the ruthenium coordination sphere and enhancing the charge transfer between the Ru and the N atom of the nitrile group.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

The main goals of this study were (i) to calculate local bond properties for a set nitrile releasing ruthenium(II) complexes with various bidentate ancillary ligand L, particularly Ru–NC and Ru–L bond strengths utilizing local mode force constants complemented with QTAIM and NBO analyses; (ii) to explore how these local properties relate to one another and how they are connected to global properties, i.e., QYs for ligand exchange and ST splitting energies, introduced by Loftus et al.15 as a measure of nitrile release efficiency; and (iii) to propose new ancillary ligands and assess their value for further experimental exploration. The most important outcomes of this study can be summarized as follows:

- Compounds with the highest quantum yields have the strongest Ru–NC bonds suggesting that breaking the Ru–NC bond is not the driving force for the delivery process rather than the change of the metal framework, as revealed by first results of a unified reaction valley approach investigation of the mechanism.
- Compounds with the highest quantum yields show larger electronic structure changes upon singlet–triplet excitation, i.e., larger changes in bond strength, covalency, and difference between singlet and the triplet HOMOs, with exception of compound 12, identified as an outlier. Thus, potential candidates should follow this trend as well.
- Our new compounds 13–15 show the same triplet HOMO/LUMO electron density redistribution as the most successful compounds synthesized by Loftus et al.,15 and even smaller ST splitting energies and Ru-d orbital contributions than the original Loftus set, qualifying them as valuable candidates to be explored by experiment.

In summary, this work provides new insights into the interplay of local properties and experimental quantum yields forming in synergy a powerful tool for fine tuning of existing and future design of new nitrile releasing ruthenium compounds. We hope that this work will bring theoretical and experimental studies closer together and serves as an incubator for future collaboration between computational chemists and their experimental colleagues.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The supplementary material contains the following: experimental vs calculated frequencies for Ru–NC bonds, bond strength order differences between singlet and triplet states for Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds, additional bond lengths comparison for Ru–NC and Ru–L bonds, URVA analysis for complex 8, HOMO and LUMO orbital plots for compounds 1–15 in their singlet and triplet states, Cartesian coordinates of all original 15 ruthenium complexes (singlet and triplet states, geometry optimized at the PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD level of theory), Cartesian coordinates of all 15 ruthenium complexes after nitrile dissociation (singlet and triplet states, geometry optimized at the PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD level of theory), HOMO/LUMO electron density redistribution as the most successful compounds synthesized by Loftus et al.,15 and even smaller ST splitting energies and Ru-d orbital contributions than the original Loftus set, qualifying them as valuable candidates to be explored by experiment.

FIG. 10. Change of the Ru coordination sphere upon nitrile release for complex 1.

PBE0/cc-pVTZ/SDD level of theory.
of theory), and Cartesian coordinates of all 15 ruthenium–H₂O complexes (singlet states, geometry optimized at the PBE0/cc-pVTZ/ SDD level of theory). Reaction movies for the nitrile release of complexes 1 and 8.
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