A Tri-Phase Sorting System: Coordination Cages in Ionic Liquids

*Angela B. Grommet, Jeanne L. Bolliger, Colm Browne, and Jonathan R. Nitschke**

Abstract: *Host-guest chemistry is usually carried out in either water or organic solvents. To investigate the utility of alternative solvents, three different coordination cages were dissolved in neat ionic liquids. By using ^{19}F NMR to observe the presence of free and bound guest molecules, all three cages were demonstrated to be stable and capable of encapsulating guests in ionic solution. Different cages were found to preferentially dissolve in different phases, allowing for the design of a tri-phase sorting system. Within this system, three coordination cages, Fe_4L_6 **2**, Fe_8L_{12} **3**, and Fe_4L_4 **4**, each segregated into a distinct layer. Upon the addition of a mixture of three different guests, each cage (in each separate layer) selectively bound its preferred guest.*

Designing new functionality into supramolecular cage systems can be accomplished *via* two different routes: by building a cage with a cavity of specific size,[1] shape,[2] or chemical functionality;[3] or by changing the environmental conditions that govern guest binding.[4] The first method may require considerable synthetic effort,[5] whereas the second requires only variation of the reaction temperature or solvent. Guest binding is enhanced, for example, in a solvent in which the guest is poorly solvated.[6] Whereas extensive solution-based host-guest investigations have been carried out either in water[7] or in organic solvents,[8] far fewer studies have involved a third class of solvents – ionic liquids (ILs). These salts, which are molten below 100 ºC, are good solvents for encapsulation of guests into organic capsules such as cucurbiturils[9] and calixarenes.[10] Likewise, Daguenet and Dyson have demonstrated that a Ni metallacage binds chloride in a range of ionic liquids.[11]

Here we introduce the concept of using different coordination cages in multiple IL phases simultaneously. Three cages are shown to be stable and capable of encapsulating guests in imidazolium and phosphonium ILs, allowing us to selectively dissolve cages in specific phases and bind specific guests within hosts. We present a tri-phase system (consisting of water and two mutually immiscible, hydrophobic ILs[12]) in which each of three different cages is soluble in only one layer. Upon the addition of three different guests, each cage selectively encapsulates the guest to which it binds most favorably, influencing the composition of each layer.

Non-deuterated ILs were used in this study, precluding the use of ^{1}H NMR techniques. ILs are non-volatile, preventing the use of ESI-MS as well (see SI Section S2). The use of ^{19}F NMR, however, proved to be a fruitful method for the characterization of host-guest complexes of cages in IL solution, with fluorinated guests reporting the presence of the cage.

When a fluorinated prospective guest molecule was dissolved in an IL, its characteristic spectrum was observed by ^{19}F NMR. If this spectrum remained unchanged after the addition of a cage, we inferred no complexation to have occurred. In this case, the cage might not be stable in the IL. Or the cage could be intact, but there may be no driving force for encapsulation: the prospective guest might be too large, for example.

A significant change in the ^{19}F chemical shifts of the guest, however, would be consistent with guest encapsulation in fast exchange on the NMR timescale, allowing us to conclude that the cage is intact and functional.[13] The observation of an additional set of ^{19}F guest peaks would indicate the presence of both free and encapsulated guests in slow exchange, also confirming guest binding within a stable cage.[14]

To probe the stability of coordination cages in ILs, a solution of cage **1**[15] (3.3 mM) in 1-ethyl-3-methylimidazolium ethylsulfate ([emim][$EtOSO_3$]) was prepared (Scheme 1a). After 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene (5 equiv) was added to a solution of **1** in [emim][$EtOSO_3$] and the mixture was stirred for 1 week at 296 K (Scheme 1b), three signals were observed by ^{19}F NMR (Figure S8b). Signals corresponding to trifluoromethanesulfonate (triflate or TfO^-, the counterion for cage **1**) and free 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene were observed at the same chemical shift values in the presence and absence of the cage. We attribute the new peak to 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene within **1**, in slow exchange with free 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene on the NMR timescale**.**

As previously reported, iron(II) tetrahedral cages can be "unlocked" by adding *p*-toluenesulfonic acid, resulting in guest release.[16] We inferred that cage **1** should also be "unlockable" in an IL. Since a cage must first be "locked" in order to be "unlocked", success further confirms that the cage remains intact and functional in the IL (Scheme 1c). *p*-Toluenesulfonic acid (10 equiv) was thus added to a solution of 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene⊂**1** in [emim][$EtOSO_3$]. After stirring at room temperature overnight, the purple solution was observed to turn brown, and the ^{19}F NMR peak assigned to encapsulated 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene disappeared (Figure S8c). The signals from triflate and free 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene, however, remained unchanged. The disappearance of the ^{19}F peak at -105.85 ppm suggested that cage **1** had indeed "unlocked" to release encapsulated 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene. The ^{1}H NMR spectrum of the sample after the color change confirmed that the IL had not decomposed.

In water and acetonitrile, strongly binding guests have been shown to displace weakly binding guests within coordination cages.[17] Competition experiments carried out using a cage in IL solution were undertaken in order to further

[*] A. B. Grommet, Dr. J. L. Bolliger, Dr. C. Browne[†], Prof. J. R. Nitschke
Department of Chemistry
University of Cambridge
Lensfield Road, Cambridge, CB2 1EW (UK)
E-mail: jrn34@cam.ac.uk
Homepage: http://www-jrn.ch.cam.ac.uk
[†] Current Address: Dr. C. Browne
School of Chemistry
University of Manchester
Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL (UK)

Supporting information for this article is given via a link at the end of the document.



Scheme 1. a) Cage **1** was observed to dissolve in the IL [emim][$EtOSO_3$]. b) Guest **A** was observed to bind within **1** by ^{19}F NMR. c) Guest **A** was released from "unlocked" **1** following the addition of *p*-toluenesulfonic acid.

probe whether guest encapsulation proceeds similarly in ILs. Two fluorinated guests, 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene **A** and 1-fluoroadamantane **B**, were added to separate solutions of cage **1** dissolved in [emim][$EtOSO_3$]. After one week, the binding constants of the two guests were determined by integrating the ^{19}F signals from the free and encapsulated species (Section S6). 1-Fluoroadamantane (K_a = 150 M^{-1}) was observed to bind more strongly than 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene (K_a = 80 M^{-1}), which in turn bound more strongly than triflate (K_a = 4.4 M^{-1}), the counterion for **1**. No significant change to the ^{19}F NMR spectrum was observed after an additional week, indicating that equilibrium had been attained (see Section S6 for a short discussion on the kinetics and thermodynamics of this system).

Based on these affinity differentials, we designed a sequence of guest exchanges involving **1** dissolved in [emim][$EtOSO_3$] (Scheme 2). Initially, ^{19}F NMR signals for both free and encapsulated triflate were observed (Figure S12a). After the addition of 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene **A** (5 equiv), the signal for encapsulated triflate disappeared and was replaced by peaks assigned to free and encapsulated **A** (Figure S12b), indicating that **A** had replaced bound triflate. Following the addition of 1-fluoroadamantane **B** (5 equiv), the peak for encapsulated **A** diminished in intensity and peaks assigned to free and encapsulated **B** appeared (Figure S12c). Using the free triflate signal as a point of comparison, the proportion of cage **1** binding 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene was determined to be 58% before and 20% after the addition of 1-fluoroadamantane (see Section S6 for further discussion). The decrease in the proportion of cage binding 1,3,5-trifluorobenzene indicated that **B** displaced the more weakly binding **A**, as anticipated based upon their binding constants.



Scheme 2. Selective guest exchange within **1** dissolved in [emim][$EtOSO_3$], based upon affinity differentials.

The properties of ILs, such as their polarity and hydrophobicity, can be tuned through the choice of the cation and anion, each of which contribute different characteristics to the bulk liquid.[12] ILs can thus be designed to dissolve different solutes selectively and be rendered mutually miscible or immiscible. In concert with coordination cages, complex phase-sorting behavior may thus be engineered, as shown in Scheme 3. In this tri-phase system, the triflimide anions of [$P_{6,6,6,14}$][NTf_2] and [emim][NTf_2] render these ILs hydrophobic. The large, lipophilic [$P_{6,6,6,14}$]$^+$ and small, more polar [emim]$^+$ cations do not associate strongly with each other, making the two ILs mutually immiscible. Together with water, these two ILs form a tri-phase system.

Cage **2**[16] (Scheme 3) bears twelve sulfonate groups, rendering this cage highly soluble in water and insoluble in the two hydrophobic IL layers. Cage **3**[18] (Scheme 3) is decorated with 24 decyl chains, making it lipophilic and insoluble in water. Although [emim][NTf_2] is hydrophobic, it is also highly polar – a combination of properties unique to ILs.[19] Therefore, only [$P_{6,6,6,14}$][NTf_2] offers a suitably lipophilic solvent for cage **3**.

Selecting a cage that dissolves readily in [emim][NTf_2] required a nuanced approach. Cage **1** is only sparingly soluble in [emim][NTf_2], despite having good solubility in the similar IL, [emim][$EtOSO_3$]. Since the only difference between these two ILs is their anion, we hypothesized that the more fluorous environment in [emim][NTf_2] contributed to the poor solubility of cage **1**. We therefore incorporated twelve fluorine atoms into the periphery of cage **4** by employing 5-fluoro-2-formylpyridine as a subcomponent instead of the parent 2-formylpyridine used in the preparation of **1** (Section S3). This change resulted in a marked increase in the solubility of the cage in [emim][NTf_2], and cage **4** was therefore used in the sorting system of Scheme 3. As seen in Figure 1, the affinity of each cage (**2**-**4**) for its designated layer was visually conspicuous. Each of three vials were filled with 0.5 mL of each phase (water, [$P_{6,6,6,14}$][NTf_2] and [emim][NTf_2]); and solid samples of cage **2**, cage **3**, and cage **4** were added to the first, second, and third vials, respectively. After the addition of cage, all vials were shaken vigorously and the phases were allowed to settle. Cage **2** was thus observed to be soluble only in water (Figure 1a), whereas cage **3** dissolved only in [$P_{6,6,6,14}$][NTf_2] (Figure 1b), and cage **4** only in [emim][NTf_2]



Scheme 3. Within a tri-phase system, cages **2**, **3** and **4** were observed to partition selectively into H_2O, $[P_{6,6,6,14}][NTf_2]$, and $[emim][NTf_2]$, and to bind selectively 1-fluorobenzene, 9-trifluoroacetylanthracene, and 1-fluoroadamantane, respectively.

(Figure 1c).

By considering the partially overlapping guest-binding preferences of the three cages in Scheme 3, we were able to bring about a situation wherein each host bound a single guest selectively in its respective phase. Many of the guests bound by cage **2** can also be encapsulated by cage **4**. In water, benzene binds strongly to **2** and weakly to the fluorine-free analogue of **4** (cage **1**).[15, 20] We therefore selected 1-fluorobenzene as a guest for **2**. Cage **3** has been previously shown to encapsulate 9-acetylanthracene in cyclohexane.[18] Since a fluorinated guest is required for this experiment, 9-trifluoroacetylanthracene was chosen as a guest for cage **3**. This guest is too large to bind inside **2** or **4** and therefore can only be encapsulated by **3**. Cage **1** has been previously shown to encapsulate adamantane with high affinity in acetonitrile;[15] 1-fluoroadamantane was therefore selected as a guest for cage **4**.

To a tri-phase mixture of **2** in water (5.0 mM), **3** in $[P_{6,6,6,14}][NTf_2]$ (1.5 mM), and **4** in $[emim][NTf_2]$ (1.5 mM), 30 equiv each (relative to **2**, **3** or **4**) of 1-fluorobenzene, 9-trifluoroacetylanthracene, and 1-fluoroadamantane were added. The mixture was stirred for 2 weeks at room temperature. A control experiment, in which identical amounts of the three phases and guests were present, but no cages, was set up and stirred in parallel. The layers were then allowed to separate, and each layer was isolated for analysis by ^{19}F NMR.



Figure 1. Equal volumes (0.5 mL) of water (top layer), $[P_{6,6,6,14}][NTf_2]$ (middle layer), and $[emim][NTf_2]$ (bottom layer) were added to each vial. Each vial was shaken vigorously for 10 seconds and allowed to settle before the photo was taken. a) Cage **2** is soluble only in water. b) Cage **3** is soluble only in $[P_{6,6,6,14}][NTf_2]$. c) Cage **4** is soluble only in $[emim][NTf_2]$.

In the top layer (**2** in H_2O), a ^{19}F NMR peak was observed for encapsulated 1-fluorobenzene (Figure S15). No peaks were observed for any free guests in water because all three guests were preferentially soluble in the IL layers. In the middle layer (**3** in $[P_{6,6,6,14}][NTf_2]$), ^{19}F NMR peaks were observed for encapsulated 9-trifluoroacetylanthracene, free 9-trifluoroacetylanthracene, free triflimide, free 1-fluorobenzene, and free 1-fluoroadamantane (Figure S16). In the bottom layer (**4** in [emim][NTf_2]), ^{19}F NMR peaks were observed for encapsulated 1-fluoroadamantane, free 9-trifluoroacetylanthracene, free triflimide, free 1-fluorobenzene, and free 1-fluoroadamantane (Figure S17). The cage in each layer thus encapsulated only the guest that it was observed to bind most strongly. Crucially, this system allowed guests to be partitioned into phases that they would have avoided in the absence of the hosts.

This study establishes the functionality of guest-binding coordination cages in IL phases, which have become an increasingly-used alternative to traditional organic solvents,[21] with potential applications in fields as diverse as catalysis,[22] cellulose processing,[23] CO_2 sequestration,[24] and extraction.[25] This work adds to the toolbox of complex self-assembled systems[26] by extending the preparation of such systems into new solvents. The tri-phase system described here appears extensible, for example, to fluorous phases. Given the selective guest binding here observed, new applications are envisaged in chemical separations or new phase-transfer catalysis.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the European Research Council (259352). We also thank the Cambridge Chemistry NMR service for experimental assistance.

Keywords: coordination cages • host-guest systems • supramolecular chemistry • encapsulation • ionic liquid

[1] a) Y. Fang, T. Murase, S. Sato, M. Fujita, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 613-615; b) C. A. Schalley, A. Lutzen, M. Albrecht, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2004**, *10*, 1072-1080; c) Q. Zhang, K. Tiefenbacher, *Nat. Chem.* **2015**, *7*, 197-202.

[2] a) S. Turega, W. Cullen, M. Whitehead, C. A. Hunter, M. D. Ward, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 8475-8483; b) M. W. Schneider, I. M. Oppel, A. Griffin, M. Mastalerz, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2013**, *52*, 3611-3615.

[3] a) C. García-Simón, R. Gramage-Doria, S. Raoufmoghaddam, T. Parella, M. Costas, X. Ribas, J. N. H. Reek, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**, *137*, 2680-2687; b) M. Han, R. Michel, B. He, Y.-S. Chen, D. Stalke, M. John, G. H. Clever, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2013**, *52*, 1319-1323.

[4] a) J. S. Mugridge, A. Zahl, R. van Eldik, R. G. Bergman, K. N. Raymond, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 4299-4306; b) A. Stephenson, S. P. Argent, T. Riis-Johannessen, I. S. Tidmarsh, M. D. Ward, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 858-870; c) K. Tiefenbacher, K.-d. Zhang, D. Ajami, J. Rebek, *J. Phys. Org. Chem.* **2015**, *28*, 187-190; d) M. Whitehead, S. Turega, A. Stephenson, C. A. Hunter, M. D. Ward, *Chem. Sci.* **2013**, *4*, 2744-2751; e) O. Dumele, N. Trapp, F. Diederich, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2015**, n/a-n/a.

[5] a) P. A. Gale, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2006**, *39*, 465-475; b) B. P. Hay, T. K. Firman, B. A. Moyer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 1810-1819; c) J. J. Lavigne, E. V. Anslyn, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2001**, *40*, 3118-3130.

[6] D. H. Leung, R. G. Bergman, K. N. Raymond, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 2798-2805.

[7] a) B. A. Moyer, R. Custelcean, B. P. Hay, J. L. Sessler, K. Bowman-James, V. W. Day, S.-O. Kang, *Inorg. Chem.* **2013**, *52*, 3473-3490; b) Y. Ruan, E. Dalkiliç, P. W. Peterson, A. Pandit, A. Dastan, J. D. Brown, S. M. Polen, C. M. Hadad, J. D. Badjić, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2014**, *20*, 4251-4256; c) S. T. J. Ryan, J. Del Barrio, I. Ghosh, F. Biedermann, A. I. Lazar, Y. Lan, R. J. Coulston, W. M. Nau, O. A. Scherman, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 9053-9060; d) T. Sawada, H. Hisada, M. Fujita, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 4449-4451; e) T. Sawada, M. Yoshizawa, S. Sato, M. Fujita, *Nat. Chem.* **2009**, *1*, 53-56; f) P. R. Symmers, M. J. Burke, D. P. August, P. I. T. Thomson, G. S. Nichol, M. R. Warren, C. J. Campbell, P. J. Lusby, *Chem. Sci.* **2015**, *6*, 756-760.

[8] a) C. J. Bruns, D. Fujita, M. Hoshino, S. Sato, J. F. Stoddart, M. Fujita, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 12027-12034; b) A. Galán, G. Gil-Ramírez, P. Ballester, *Org. Lett.* **2013**, *15*, 4976-4979; c) T. Liu, Y. Liu, W. Xuan, Y. Cui, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2010**, *49*, 4121-4124.

[9] a) P. Montes-Navajas, A. Corma, H. Garcia, *J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem.* **2008**, *279*, 165-169; b) L. Wang, X. Wang, M. Qi, R. Fu, *J. Chromatogr. A* **2014**, *1334*, 112-117.

[10] a) P. K. Mohapatra, A. Sengupta, M. Iqbal, J. Huskens, W. Verboom, *Inorg. Chem.* **2013**, *52*, 2533-2541; b) J.-h. Shi, Q.-q. Jia, S.-x. Xu, *Chromatographia* **2012**, *75*, 779-787; c) M. Matsumoto, N. Oku, K. Kondo, *Solvent Extr. Res. Dev., Jpn.* **2013**, *20*, 219-224.

[11] C. Daguenet, P. J. Dyson, *Inorg. Chem.* **2007**, *46*, 403-408.

[12] A. Arce, M. J. Earle, S. P. Katdare, H. Rodriguez, K. R. Seddon, *Chem. Commun.* **2006**, 2548-2550.

[13] B. R. Hall, L. E. Manck, I. S. Tidmarsh, A. Stephenson, B. F. Taylor, E. J. Blaikie, D. A. V. Griend, M. D. Ward, *Dalton Trans.* **2011**, *40*, 12132-12145.

[14] K. D. Shimizu, J. Rebek, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **1995**, *92*, 12403-12407.

[15] J. L. Bolliger, T. K. Ronson, M. Ogawa, J. R. Nitschke, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2014**, *136*, 14545-14553.

[16] P. Mal, D. Schultz, K. Beyeh, K. Rissanen, J. R. Nitschke, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, 8297-8301.

[17] a) S. C. Ma, M. M. J. Smulders, Y. R. Hristova, J. K. Clegg, T. K. Ronson, S. Zarra, J. R. Nitschke, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 5678-5684; b) M. M. J. Smulders, J. R. Nitschke, *Chem. Sci.* **2012**, *3*, 785-788.

[18] C. Browne, S. Brenet, J. K. Clegg, J. R. Nitschke, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2013**, *52*, 1944-1948.

[19] Y. Fukaya, H. Ohno, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2013**, *15*, 4066-4072.

[20] M. M. J. Smulders, S. Zarra, J. R. Nitschke, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 7039-7046.

[21] K. R. Seddon, *Nat. Mater.* **2003**, *2*, 363-365.

[22] a) R. Kumar, Saima, A. Shard, N. H. Andhare, Richa, A. K. Sinha, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2015**, *54*, 828-832; b) H.-P. Steinrück, P. Wasserscheid, *Catal. Lett.* **2015**, *145*, 380-397; c) P. Wasserscheid, W. Keim, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2000**, *39*, 3772-3789.

[23] a) J. L. Song, H. L. Fan, J. Ma, B. X. Han, *Green Chem.* **2013**, *15*, 2619-2635; b) P. S. Barber, C. S. Griggs, G. Gurau, Z. Liu, S. Li, Z. Li, X.

Lu, S. Zhang, R. D. Rogers, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2013**, *52*, 12350-12353; c) A. George, A. Brandt, K. Tran, S. M. S. N. S. Zahari, D. Klein-Marcuschamer, N. Sun, N. Sathitsuksanoh, J. Shi, V. Stavila, R. Parthasarathi, S. Singh, B. M. Holmes, T. Welton, B. A. Simmons, J. P. Hallett, *Green Chem.* **2015**, *17*, 1728-1734.

[24] J. E. Brennecke, B. E. Gurkan, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.* **2010**, *1*, 3459-3464.

[25] X. Q. Sun, H. M. Luo, S. Dai, *Chem. Rev.* **2012**, *112*, 2100-2128.

[26] a) J. E. Beves, B. A. Blight, C. J. Campbell, D. A. Leigh, R. T. McBurney, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2011**, *50*, 9260-9327; b) H. T. Chifotides, K. R. Dunbar, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2013**, *46*, 894-906; c) S. Dhers, H. L. C. Feltham, S. Brooker, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2015**, *296*, 24-44; d) Z. Huang, L. Yang, Y. Liu, Z. Wang, O. A. Scherman, X. Zhang, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 5351-5355; e) H. Weissman, B. Rybtchinski, *Curr Opin Colloid In* **2012**, *17*, 330-342; f) K. M. C. Wong, M. M. Y. Chan, V. W. W. Yam, *Adv. Mater.* **2014**, *26*, 5558-5568; g) Z. Zhang, D. S. Kim, C.-Y. Lin, H. Zhang, A. D. Lammer, V. M. Lynch, I. Popov, O. Š. Miljanić, E. V. Anslyn, J. L. Sessler, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2015**.

Entry for the Table of Contents

COMMUNICATION

Coordination cages were demonstrated to be stable and capable of selectively encapsulating guests in ionic liquid solutions. A tri-phase sorting system was designed, comprising water and two mutually-immiscible hydrophobic ionic liquids, such that three different coordination cages were each soluble in a single layer. Upon the addition of a mixture of three different guests, each cage bound its preferred guest.

*Angela B. Grommet, Jeanne L. Bolliger, Colm Browne, and Jonathan R. Nitschke**

Page No. – Page No.

A Tri-Phase Sorting System: Coordination Cages in Ionic Liquids