

Solvatochromic and Computational Study of Ground State and Excited State Dipole Moments of Coumarin Dyes in Polar and Non-polar solvent Environments

Geethanjali H S¹, Nagasree G², Nagaraja D³

¹ Department of Physics, Bangalore Institute of Technology, Bangalore, Karnataka, India-560004

² Department of Physics, City Engineering College, Bangalore, Karnataka, India-560062

³ Department of Physics, Bangalore Institute of Technology, Bangalore, Karnataka, India-560004

Abstract—The solvent effect on the photophysical properties of two coumarin derivatives 4-Hydroxy-3-nitrocoumarin (C1) and 3-(Bromoacetyl)coumarin (C2) is examined using UV-VIS and fluorescence spectroscopic procedure in polar and non-polar solvent environments. Lippert, Bakshiev and Kawaski-Chamma-Viallet correlations were evoked for the calculation of their excited state dipole moments as well as change in the dipole moment. Meanwhile Reichardt's microscopic solvent polarity parameter E_T^N is also used for the same. The ground state dipole moment is evaluated using Gaussian 16 program and geometry optimization using DFT method at 6-311++G (d, p)/B3LYP. The excited state dipole moments of both the compounds calculated from different equations are found to be higher than that of ground state indicating the intramolecular charge transfer (ICT) and twisted intramolecular charge transfer (TICT) in their emitting singlet states

Index Terms—Coumarin derivatives, Solvatochromism, dipole moments and Gaussian studies

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a well-known fact that the photo physical properties of organic compounds such as ground state dipole moment (μ_g), excited state dipole moment (μ_e), quantum efficiency, fluorescence quenching etc depend on solvent environment. In solvent environment, the initial and final state of a molecule is either steady or disturbed by *solvation energy*. The solvation energy differences between initial and excited states termed as Solvatochromic shift and it is one of the simplest and most widely used method to calculate μ_g and μ_e . [1-6]. When EM radiation falls on

the molecule, the electric vector present in it affects the charge distribution and hence the dipole moment of the molecule is altered. This change is also influenced by solvent parameters such as viscosity and polarity (as mentioned earlier). The knowledge of dipole moments and change in dipole moment is required to design optical sensors, dye lasers, to understand the charge distribution, and charge cloud distribution in singlet (S) and triplet (T) states.

Coumarins are well known laser dyes for the blue – green spectral region and exhibit a strong fluorescence in UV and VISIBLE region. They have widespread applications such as laser dyes, fluorescent probes to determine the rigidity and fluidity of living cells and its surrounding medium, fluorescent indicators, estimation of enzymes, etc [7,8].

THEORY

Theories in solvatochromism for the estimation of μ_g and μ_e consider general solvent effects and they link the solvent effects to dielectric constant (ϵ) and refractive index (n) of the solvent [2,7]. The three linear equations used are [9-13]

Lippert-Mataga equation

$$(\bar{\nu}_a - \bar{\nu}_f) = S_1 \Delta f(\epsilon, n) + const \quad (1)$$

Bakshiev equation

$$(\bar{\nu}_a - \bar{\nu}_f) = S_2 f_1(\epsilon, n) + const \quad (2)$$

Kawaski-Chamma-Viallet relation

$$\frac{1}{2}(\bar{\nu}_a + \bar{\nu}_f) = -S_3 f_2(\epsilon, n) + const \quad (3)$$

Here $(\bar{\nu}_a - \bar{\nu}_f)$ is stokes' shift,

Δf = Lippert-Mataga solvent polarity function

f_i = Baksheiv solvent polarity function

f_2 =Kawski-Chamma-Viallet solvent polarity function.

In terms of ϵ and n they can be written as.

$$\Delta f(\epsilon, n) = \left[\frac{\epsilon - 1}{2\epsilon + 1} - \frac{n^2 - 1}{2n^2 + 1} \right] \quad (4)$$

$$f_1(\epsilon, n) = \frac{2n^2 + 1}{n^2 + 2} \left[\frac{\epsilon - 1}{\epsilon + 2} - \frac{n^2 - 1}{n^2 + 2} \right] \quad (5)$$

and

$$f_2(\epsilon, n) = \frac{2n^2 + 1}{2(n^2 + 2)} \left[\frac{\epsilon - 1}{\epsilon + 2} - \frac{n^2 - 1}{n^2 + 2} \right] + \frac{3}{2} \left[\frac{n^4 - 1}{(n^2 + 2)^2} \right] \quad (6)$$

S_1 , S_2 and S_3 in the above equations are the slopes of linear fit of corresponding equations. They depend critically on the change of the solute's dipole moment upon excitation ($\Delta\mu = \mu_e - \mu_g$) and the size of the cavity radius (a). They are given by

$$S_1 = \frac{2}{hc} \frac{(\mu_e - \mu_g)^2}{a^3} \quad (7)$$

$$S_2 = \frac{2}{hc} \frac{(\mu_e - \mu_g)^2}{a^3} \quad (8)$$

$$S_3 = \frac{2}{hc} \frac{(\mu_e^2 - \mu_g^2)}{a^3} \quad (9)$$

here ' a ' is the Onsager radius and it is calculated by calculating the molecular volume[14]. The other terms have their usual meaning. μ_g and μ_e are calculated using equations

$$\mu_g = \frac{S_3 - S_2}{2} \left[\frac{hca^3}{2S_2} \right]^{1/2} \quad (10)$$

$$\mu_e = \frac{S_3 + S_2}{2} \left[\frac{hca^3}{2S_2} \right]^{1/2} \quad (11)$$

$$\mu_e = \left[\frac{S_3 + S_2}{S_3 - S_2} \right] \mu_g \text{ for } (S_3 > S_2) \quad (12)$$

As mentioned earlier specific effects of solvents such as polarization and hydrogen bonding effect on spectroscopic properties are not included in these theories. Hence for better understanding of the dipole moment change, microscopic solvent polarity parameter (E_T^N) is employed as suggested by Reichardt[15] and adopted by many researchers in their work[16-18]. The corresponding linear equation is

$$\bar{\nu}_a - \bar{\nu}_f = 11307.6 \left[\left(\frac{\Delta\mu}{\Delta\mu_B} \right)^2 \left(\frac{a_B}{a} \right)^3 \right] E_T^N + \text{const} \quad (13)$$

Here $\Delta\mu_B$ (9D) and a_B (6.2Å⁰) are the difference in dipole moment and Onsager radius of betaine dye, respectively. The change in dipole moment ($\Delta\mu$) can

be obtained from the slope (S) of the Stokes' shift versus E_T^N graph and it is given by

$$\Delta\mu = (\mu_e - \mu_g) = \sqrt{\frac{S \times 81}{(6.2/a)^3 \times 11307.6}} \quad (14)$$

II. EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

Two coumarin derivatives namely 4-Hydroxy-3-nitrocoumarin (C₉H₅NO₅) (C1) and 3-(Bromoacetyl)coumarin(C₁₁H₇BrO₃) (C2) are used in this study. Their structures are given in Fig-1(a) and (b). They are procured from Sigma Aldrich




Fig 1-(a) Molecular structure of 4-Hydroxy-3-nitrocoumarin




Fig 1-(b) Molecular structure of 3-(Bromoacetyl)coumarin

Spectroscopic properties of these solutes are examined in both polar and non-polar solvents environment. Spectroscopic grade Polar solvents like water, acetone, acetonitrile, DMF, DMSO etc have large dipole moment and have considerable charge separation. On the other hand non polar solvents such as alkanes, benzene, toluene, diethylether, pyridine etc have very low dipole moment and do not have appreciable charge separation. 1,4,diaxne (DX), diethylethr(DEE), tetrahydrofuran (THF), dichloromethane(DCM), dimethylsulfoxide(DMSO), acetonitrile (ACN), Toluene (TOL), butanol(BU) and methanol(ME) are used for the study. The concentration of the solution maintained at 1×10^{-4} M to satisfy Beer-Lambert's law and to nullify the self-absorption. The absorption spectrum of sample at 300K is recorded using UV-Visible Spectrophotometer (Hitachi UH5300) keeping scanning wavelength in the range is 200 nm-500 nm at

0.5 nm scanning speed. The absorption spectra of C1 and C2 in 1,4,diaxane and acetonitrile are given in Fig-2.




Fig.2. The absorption spectra of C1 and C2 in 1,4,diaxane and acetonitrile




Fig.3. The fluorescence spectrum of C1 and C2 in 1,4,diaxane and acetonitrile

The emission spectra at 300K is taken using F-2700 Spectrophotometer keeping the slit width at 5 nm and operating voltage 700 V. The wavelength corresponds to absorption peak is taken as excitation wavelength. The emission spectra of C1 and C2 in 1,4 diaxane and acetonitrile are given in Fig-3

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Solvatochromic study

The solvatochromic data such as absorption and emission peak (in nm), absorption and emission wavenumber (in cm^{-1}), Stokes shift and arithmetic mean of wavenumbers of both C1 and C2 are given in Table-1 and Table-2. While Δf , f_1 and f_2 are calculated from equations (4) (5) & (6) E_T^N are chosen from literature [3,18].

We noticed a small shift in the absorption peak towards longer wavelength as the solvent polarity increases. However emission peak shifts by 28 nm in C1 and 16nm in C2. This indicates possible $\pi \rightarrow \pi^*$ transitions.

The insignificant shift in absorption spectra is because of the less polar nature of the ground states of studied compounds and hence ground state energy distribution is not affected. On the other hand substantial shift of emission peak shows that excited states interact more strongly with polar solvents and obviously the excited state dipole moment is greater than ground state dipole moment.




Fig.4. Plots of solvent polarity v/s spectroscopic data for C1

The linear plots of Lippert's and Bakshiev's polarity function versus Stokes shift, Kawski-Chamma-Viallet's polarity function versus arithmetic mean Stokes shift and Microscopic solvent polarity parameter versus Stokes shift are plotted. These plots are represented in Fig-4 and Fig.5. The slopes and number of data points are presented in Table.3.




Fig.5. Plots of solvent polarity v/s spectroscopic data for C2

The theoretically estimated ground state dipole moment using Gaussian 16 program, B3LYP hybrid functional and the 6-311 G ++(d,p)[19,20] basis set, excited state dipole moments calculated using Lippert equation, Bakhsiev equation and Kawski-Chamma-Viallet equations for both the compounds are given in Table.4. Ground state and excited state dipole moment for C1 are also calculated using equation (10) and equation (11). For C2 this exercise is not performed because of $S_3 < S_2$. The change in dipole moment is evaluated from microscopic solvent polarity parameter versus Stokes shift graph as well as from equations (10) and (11) and the data is presented in Table.4.

From the calculated values of μ_g & μ_e we can make out that the excited state dipole moment of both the compounds is larger than the ground state value. This is because of more polar nature of the excited states, intramolecular charge transfer (ICT) and twisted intramolecular charge transfer (TICT)[21,22].

Computational study

The structures of C1 and C2 underwent optimization through density functional theory(DFT), employing the B3LYP hybrid functional and the 6-311 G ++(d,p) basis set. The resulting optimized structure of C1 achieved a minimum energy of -777.32645 Hartree (-21.15 keV). It exhibited a dipole moment of 7.063 Debye and a polarization of 139.06533 atomic units. For C2 the resulting optimized structure achieved a minimum energy of -3220.779038 Hartree (-87.64 keV). It exhibited a dipole moment of 6.73 Debye and a polarization of 147.52 atomic units. The ground state dipole moments obtained from computational studies are normally on higher side because calculation of this type assumes that molecules are involved in the gas phase and does not include solvent interactions[23]. Optimized geometries, ESP maps and HOMO-LUMO surfaces of C1 and C2 are as shown in Fig-6




Fig.6. Images of ESP and HOMO-LUMO for C1 and C2

Table 1: Absorption peak, emission peak, absorption wavenumber ($\bar{\nu}_a$), emission wave number ($\bar{\nu}_f$), Stokes shift ($\Delta\bar{\nu}$) and arithmetic mean of wavenumbers of C1

Solvent	λ_a (nm)	λ_f (nm)	$\bar{\nu}_a$ (cm ⁻¹)	$\bar{\nu}_f$ (cm ⁻¹)	$\Delta\bar{\nu} = \bar{\nu}_a - \bar{\nu}_f$ (cm ⁻¹)	$\frac{\bar{\nu}_a + \bar{\nu}_f}{2}$ (cm ⁻¹)
TOL	272	550	36764.71	18181.82	18582.89	27473.26
DX	273	548	36630.04	18248.18	18381.86	27439.11
DEE	272	555	36764.71	18018.02	18746.69	27391.36
THF	272	556	36764.71	17985.61	18779.09	27375.16
DCM	271	557	36900.37	17953.32	18947.05	27426.85
BU	273	566	36630.04	17667.84	18962.19	27148.94
DMSO	275	576	36363.64	17361.11	19002.53	26862.37
ACN	276	578	36231.88	17301.04	18930.85	26766.46
ME	271	557	36900.37	17953.32	18947.05	27426.85

Table 2: Absorption peak, emission peak, absorption wavenumber ($\bar{\nu}_a$), emission wave number ($\bar{\nu}_f$), Stokes shift ($\Delta\bar{\nu}$) and arithmetic mean of wavenumbers of C2

Solvent	λ_a (nm)	λ_f (nm)	$\bar{\nu}_a$ (cm ⁻¹)	$\bar{\nu}_f$ (cm ⁻¹)	$\Delta\bar{\nu} = \bar{\nu}_a - \bar{\nu}_f$ (cm ⁻¹)	$\frac{\bar{\nu}_a + \bar{\nu}_f}{2}$ (cm ⁻¹)
TOL	275	552	36363.64	18115.94	18247.69	27239.79
DX	271	560	36832.41	17857.14	18975.27	27344.78
DEE	272	560	36764.71	17857.14	18907.56	27310.92
THF	274	558	36496.35	17921.15	18575.20	27208.75
DCM	272	562	36697.25	17793.59	18903.65	27245.42
BU	272	563	36697.25	17761.99	18935.26	27229.62
DMSO	274	568	36496.35	17605.63	18890.72	27050.99
AN	272	555	36764.71	18018.02	18746.69	27391.36
ME	271	556	36900.37	17985.61	18914.76	27442.99

Table.3: Types of Correlations, Slope and Number of data points for C1 and C2

Correlations	Compound	Slope (S)	No. of data
Lippert Correlation (S_1)	C1	1759.147	9
	C2	2178.622	7
Bakhshiev's correlation (S_2)	C1	594.807	9
	C2	749.847	7
Kawski-Chamma-Viallet's correlation (S_3)	C1	-1419.044	8
	C2	-472.538	7
E_T^N correlation (S)	C1	512.757	8
	C2	893.271	7

Table 4: The calculated values of radius (a), μ_g , μ_e and dipole moment change ($\Delta\mu$) for C1 & C2

compound	a (Å)	μ_g^a (D)	μ_g^b (D)	μ_e^c (D)	μ_e^d (D)	μ_e^e (D)	μ_e^f (D)	μ_e^g (D)	$\Delta\mu^h$ (D)	$\Delta\mu^i$ (D)
C1	3.3678	7.0630	1.0409	2.5432	9.6472	8.5657	7.4345	7.8300	1.5023	0.7673
C2	3.5180	6.7300	---	---	9.8004	8.5310	6.8800	7.8111	---	1.0811

$$D = \text{Debye} = 3.33564 \times 10^{-30} \text{ Cm} = 10^{-18} \text{ esu cm}$$

^a ground state dipole moment using Gaussian 16 program, B3LYP hybrid functional and the 6-311 G ++(d,p)[19,20] basis set

^b Experimental ground state dipole moments calculated from Eq. (10)

^c Experimental excited-state dipole moments calculated from Eq. (11)

^d Excited state dipole moments calculated from Lippert's Eq. (7)

^e Excited state dipole moments calculated from Bakshiev's Eq. (8)

^f Excited state dipole moments calculated from Kawaski-Chamma-Viallet parameter Eq.(9)

^g Excited state dipole moments calculated from E_T^N parameter Eq.(14)

^h Change in dipole moments for μ_e and μ_g from Eq. (10) & (11)

ⁱ Change in dipole moments calculated from E_T^N parameter Eq. (14)

IV. CONCLUSIONS

From the solvatochromic and computational studies photophysical properties of two coumarin derivatives in different solvent environment we have arrived at certain conclusions. The insignificant shift in the absorption peaks and significant shifts in emission peaks denotes the possible $\pi \rightarrow \pi^*$ transitions and also stresses the fact that the ground states are less affected and excited states are more affected due to interaction of solute with the solvents. The higher values of excited state dipole moments the high polar nature of the compounds in excited state and the high polar nature is attributed to ICT and TICT. It is believed that the experimental results presented in this article may be useful for designing of newer molecules and sensors for explicit applications

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research work is sponsored by the VISION GROUP ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (VGST), Department of IT, BT & ST, Government of Karnataka, India. The authors duly acknowledge the magnanimous support of (VGST), Department of IT, BT & ST, Government of Karnataka, India

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION

Geethanjali H S: Conceptualization, Data analysis and original script writing.

Nagasree G: Experimental work, Result analysis, cross verification of references

Nagaraja D: Conceptualization, calculation and editing the script

REFERENCES

- [1] Rohatgi-Mukherjee KK. Fundamental of Photochemistry. Wiley Eastern Ltd, New Delhi India. 1992
- [2] Lackowicz J R. Principles of Fluorescence Spectroscopy. Plenum Press, New York. 1983
- [3] H. S. Geethanjali, R. M. Melavanki, D. Nagaraja, N. R. Patil, J. Thipperudrappa and R. A. Kusanur. Luminescence., 2016, 31(5), 1046-1053. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bio.3067>
- [4] Melavanki RM, Patil HD, Umapathy S, Kadadevaramath JS. Journal of Fluorescence. 2012, 22, 137-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10895-011-0939-7>
- [5] Geethanjali HS, Nagaraja D, Melavanki RM. Estimation of dipole moments and quantum yield 5-chloro-2-methoxyphenyl Boronic acid in different solvents environment. Journal of Fluorescence. 2015, 25, 745-753. DOI 10.1007/s10895-015-1561-x
- [6] Gayatri BR, Mannekutla JR, Inamdar SR. Effect of binary solvent mixtures (DMSO/water) on the dipole moment and lifetime of coumarin dyes. Journal of Molecular Structure. 2008, 889, 383-393. 10.1016/j.molstruc.2008.02.020
- [7] Valeur B. Molecular Fluorescence: Principles and Applications, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, Germany. 2002

- [8] Sarkar SD and Nahar L. Progress in the Chemistry of Naturally Occurring Coumarins. Progress in the Chemistry of Organic Natural Products. 2017, 106, 241-246. 10.1007/978-3-319-59542-9_3
- [9] Lippert EV, Elektrochem Z. Spektroskopische Bestimmung des Dipolmomentes aromatischer Verbindungen im ersten angeregten Singulettzustand. Zeitschrift für Elektrochemie, Berichte der Bunsengesellschaft für physikalische Chemie. 1957, 61, 962-975.
- [10] Mataga KN, Kaifu Y, Koizumi. Solvent Effects upon Fluorescence Spectra and the Dipolemoments of Excited Molecules. Bulletin of the Chemical Society of Japan. 1956, 29, 465-470. <https://doi.org/10.1246/bcsj.29.465>
- [11] Bakshiev NG. Universal intermolecular interactions and their effect on the position of the electronic spectra of molecules in two-component solutions. VII. Theory. Optika I Spektroskopiya. 1964, 16, 821-832.
- [12] Chamma A, P Viallet CR. Academie des sciences. Paris, Series C., 1970, 270, 1901-1904
- [13] Kawaski A, Rabek J. Progress in Photochemistry and Photophysics. Vol 5, CRC Press, Boca Raton, USA, 1992.
- [14] <https://www.molinspiration.com/cgi/properties>
- [15] Reichardt C. Solvents and Solvent Effects in Organic Chemistry. Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim., 2010. 10.1002/9783527632220
- [16] Ravi M, Soujanya T, Samanta A, Radhakrishnan TP. Excited-state dipole moments of some Coumarin dyes from a solvatochromic method using the solvent polarity parameter, E_N^T . J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 1995 91 (17), 2739–2742. <https://doi.org/10.1039/FT9959102739>
- [17] Patil NR, Melavanki RM, Kapatkar SB, Ayachit NH, Saravanan J. Solvent effect on absorption and fluorescence spectra of three biologically active Carboxamides (C1, C2 and C3). Estimation of ground and excited state dipole moment from a solvatochromic method using the solvent polarity parameter. Journal of Fluorescence. 2011, 21, 1213–22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10895-010-0800-4>
- [18] Shivaleela B, Shivraj GG, Hanagodimath SM. Estimation of Dipole moments by solvatochromic shift method, spectroscopic analysis UV-Visible, HOMO-LUMO, ESP map, Mulliken atomic charges, NBO and NLO properties of benzofuran derivative. Results in Chemistry. 2023, 6, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rechem.2023.101046>
- [19] Gaussian 03 program (Gaussian Inc., Wallingford CT), 2004
- [20] Frisch MJ, et al, Gaussian 09, Revision B.01, Gaussian Inc. J. Comput. Chem., 2016
- [21] Yue HP, Shao MS, Man SW, Zhong HL, Chuan D. Study on photophysical properties of intramolecular charge transfer (ICT) compound: 4-(diphenylamino)biphenyl-4'-boronic acid. Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A: Chemistry. 2005, 170, 15–19. 10.1016/j.jphotochem.2004.08.001
- [22] Desai VR, Hunagund SM, Basanagouda M, Kadadevarmath JS, Sidarai AH. Solvent Effects on the Electronic Absorption and Fluorescence Spectra of HNP: Estimation of Ground and Excited State Dipole Moments. Journal of Fluorescence. 2016, 26 (4), 1391–1400. DOI:10.1007/s10895-016-1830-3
- [23] Bilal A, Mustafa A, Hasan E. Solvent Effect on The Ground and Excited State Dipole Moments of Fluorescein. Journal of Molecular Structure: THEOCHEM. 2001, 548, 165–171. 10.1016/S0166-1280(01)00513-9