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ABSTRACT: Photoinduced ligand dissociation of pyridine occurs much more readily in [Ru(tpy)(Me\textsubscript{2}bpy)(py)]\textsuperscript{2+} than in [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]\textsuperscript{2+} \((tpy = 2,2'-\text{bpy} = 6,6'-\text{bipyridine; py = pyridine).} The \(S_0\) ground state and the \(3\)MLCT and \(3\)MC excited states of these complexes have been studied using BP86 density functional theory with the SDD basis set and effective core potential on Ru and the 6-31G\(\ddagger\) basis set for the rest of the atoms. In both complexes, excitation by visible light and intersystem crossing leads to a \(3\)MLCT state in which an electron from a Ru d orbital has been promoted to a \(\pi^*\) orbital of terpyridine, followed by pyridine release after internal conversion to a dissociative \(3\)MC state. Interaction between the methyl groups and the other ligands causes significantly more strain in [Ru(tpy)(Me\textsubscript{2}bpy)(py)]\textsuperscript{2+} than in [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]\textsuperscript{2+}, in both the \(S_0\) and \(3\)MLCT states. Transition to the dissociative \(3\)MC states releases this strain, resulting in lower barriers for ligand dissociation from [Ru(tpy)(Me\textsubscript{2}bpy)(py)]\textsuperscript{2+} than from [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]\textsuperscript{2+}. Analysis of the molecular orbitals along relaxed scans for stretching the Ru–N bonds reveals that ligand photodissociation is promoted by orbital mixing between the ligand \(\pi^*\) orbital of tpy in the \(3\)MLCT state and the \(d\sigma^*\) orbitals that characterize the dissociative \(3\)MC states. Good overlap and strong mixing occur when the Ru–N bond of the leaving ligand is perpendicular to the \(\pi^*\) orbital of terpyridine, favoring the release of pyridine positioned in a cis fashion to the terpyridine ligand.

INTRODUCTION

There is a highly sustained interest in photoactivatable metal complexes for applications in the broad field of solar energy conversion, including the photocatalytic production of fuels from abundant sources and photovoltaic systems, as well as compounds that have increasing potential as tools in biomedical research.\cite{1–5} Photoactivated compounds that release biologically active species from a nontoxic metal-based chaperone in the presence of light are being developed, so that the release can be accomplished with spatiotemporal control over biological activity. Their potential as selective and specific tools for biological research as well as agents for photoactivated chemotherapy (PACT) has been noted.\cite{10–12}

Photoinduced therapies are being developed for the treatments of various disease states, including cancer and microbial infections.\cite{1–14} Active species currently being used include established inhibitors, neurotransmitters, drugs, and their derivatives.\cite{15–17} Therapies that rely on photoinactivation overcome the downsides of those that are currently in use which lack the ability to achieve location-specific inhibition and have low bioavailability, leading to dose escalation, drug resistance, and intensified side effects.\cite{18} A photoreleasable drug or inhibitor has the potential to minimize the risk and side effects by providing noninvasive methods for achieving high levels of control over the effects of drugs in diseased vs normal tissue.

Metal centers of interest include Pt(IV),\textsuperscript{19} Re(I),\textsuperscript{20} and Ir(III)\textsuperscript{21} as well as complexes containing Ru(II), which have all been investigated extensively. Photoactivatable Ru(II)-centered chaperones are typically composed of tridentate or bidentate chelators, such as 2,2’-6,6’-terpyridine (tpy), 2,2’-bipyridine (bpy), and 1,10-phenanthroline (phen) and their derivatives as ancillary ligands and one or more monodentate ligands as the active species for release. The low ligand exchange in Ru(II) complexes observed in the dark, together with their high photoreactivity, makes these complexes highly attractive as potential PACT agents. In photochemotherapy, absorption of a photon by the complex opens coordination sites on the ruthenium for binding to biomolecules, including DNA and proteins. Alternatively, the photodissociation can be used to release reactive molecules and species while the leftover ruthenium fragment is not toxic, which is a highly desirable property for chemical tools. The efficiency of a PACT agent is typically rated on the basis of its relative efficacy upon irradiation in comparison to dark conditions. Chaperone complexes that...
can release two or three monodentate active nitrile species have also been previously developed. In these compounds, only one of the biologically active ligands usually dissociates efficiently upon irradiation.

Whereas much of the initial work in the field focused on the photorelease of nitrile-bound inhibitors and drugs, the Turro group recently designed a photoactive Ru(II) complex able to deliver pyridine and pyridine-bound inhibitors efficiently with low-energy visible light, a requirement for tissue penetration. The release of pyridine and other N-heterocycles is important due to the very large number of active agents available that contain these functional groups, opening the field of PACT to include compounds that can achieve a method of cell death independent of oxygen concentration, unlike the case for photodynamic therapy, which requires oxygen. When the octahedral orientation is distorted using 6,6′-dimethyl-2,2′-bipyridine (Me₂bpy), these complexes become more photoactive. [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]²⁺ and [Ru(tpy)(Me₂bpy)(py)]²⁺ complexes (Scheme 1) are stable in the dark, and the latter releases pyridine efficiently upon irradiation with visible light, whereas pyridine ligand exchange is not observed in the former upon photoexcitation under the same conditions.

It is generally accepted that photoactivated dissociation and solvolysis occurs because a dissociative triplet metal-centered state is thermally accessible from the observed triplet metal–ligand charge transfer state. Through steric crowding about the Ru center, the Ru–N₅ and Ru–N₆ bonds are distorted in [Ru(tpy)(Me₂bpy)(py)]²⁺ relative to [Ru(tpy)-(bpy)(py)]²⁺. As a result, the energy difference between the ³MC and ³MLCT states is smaller in Ru(tpy)(Me₂bpy)(py)]²⁺, allowing for efficient population of the ³MC state and increase

Figure 1. Biorthogonal orbitals of SOMO₁ and SOMO₂ for the ³MLCT and ³MC states of (a) [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]²⁺ and (b) [Ru(tpy)(Me₂bpy)(py)]²⁺. Higher resolution plots of the biorthogonal and canonical SOMOs are available in Figure S1 and S2 of the Supporting Information.
in the quantum yield for photodissociation. In [Ru(tpy)(bpy)-(py)]^{2+}, the population of the 3MC state and photodissociation are unfavorable because the 3MC state is significantly higher in energy than the 3MLCT state.

For biomedical applications, it is desirable for the complex to absorb red or near-IR wavelengths of light, which penetrate tissue more deeply than shorter wavelengths in the visible and UV regions. It is also necessary that excitation is followed by conversion to an excited state that will promote ligand dissociation in ruthenium complexes. When the orbitals are oriented favorably, selectivity of photochemical ligand dissociation in ruthenium complexes is developed. A molecular orbital based explanation for the ligand charge transfer state (1MLCT) state is followed by ultrafast intersystem crossing to a triplet metal-centered state (3MC). The dissociative triplet metal-centered state (3MC) is known to be thermally accessible from the 3MLCT state.26

Upon irradiation with visible light, the pyridine ligand of [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]^{2+} and [Ru(tpy)(Me_{2}bpy)(py)]^{2+} complexes (Scheme 1) is known to be thermally accessible from the 3MLCT state.26

Upon irradiation with visible light, the pyridine ligand of [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]^{2+} and [Ru(tpy)(Me_{2}bpy)(py)]^{2+} complexes (Scheme 1) is known to be thermally accessible from the 3MLCT state.26

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The photoinduced ligand dissociation in the [Ru(tpy)(bpy)-(py)]^{2+} and [Ru(tpy)(Me_{2}bpy)(py)]^{2+} complexes (Scheme 1) has been studied experimentally and reported previously.24,34 Upon irradiation with visible light, the pyridine ligand

**COMPUTATIONAL METHODS**

Electronic structure calculations were performed using Gaussian 0939 and the BP86 density functional.40,41 For a set of Ru(II) polypyridyl complexes, Gonzalez and co-workers found that BP86 showed the best state ordering and state mixing in comparison to MS-CASPT2 calculations. In preparation for our earlier study, we examined a number of different functionals and found that the 3MC state of a RuTQA complex was 3–27 kcal/mol lower in energy than the 3MLCT state. The BP86 functional gave the smallest energy difference between the 3MLCT and 3MC states, whereas the hybrid functionals gave the largest energy differences. The SDD basis set and effective core potential were used for the central Ru atom. The 6-31G(d) basis set was used for the other atoms. Solvation effects in methanol were incorporated by using the implicit SMD solvation model and were included during structure optimization. The optimized structures were confirmed to be minima by harmonic vibrational frequency calculations. The S0, 3MLCT, and 3MC electronic configurations were tested for SCF stability and were characterized by examining the molecular orbital populations and the spin densities. GaussView was used to generate isodensity plots of the spin densities (isovalue 0.004 au), the canonical orbitals, and biorthogonal/corresponding orbitals (isovalue 0.04 au). To explore the potential energy surfaces for dissociation, relaxed potential energy surface scans were performed by stretching selected Ru–N bonds while the remaining coordinates were optimized. Transition states were obtained by optimizing the highest energy structures of the relaxed scans and were confirmed to have only one imaginary vibrational frequency.

**Table 1. Selected Calculated Bond Distances (Å) and Angles (deg) for [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]^{2+} and [Ru(tpy)(Me_{2}bpy)(py)]^{2+} Complexes in the S_{0}, 3MLCT, 3MC, and 3TS States in Methanol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Ru–N_{1}</th>
<th>Ru–N_{2}</th>
<th>Ru–N_{3}</th>
<th>Ru–N_{4}</th>
<th>Ru–N_{5}</th>
<th>Ru–N_{6}</th>
<th>N_{1}–Ru–N_{1}</th>
<th>N_{2}–Ru–N_{2}</th>
<th>N_{3}–Ru–N_{3}</th>
<th>N_{4}–Ru–N_{4}</th>
<th>N_{5}–Ru–N_{5}</th>
<th>N_{6}–Ru–N_{6}</th>
<th>φ^c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S_{0}</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>1.979</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>2.094</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>2.130</td>
<td>158.7</td>
<td>175.1</td>
<td>172.6</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>179.1</td>
<td>–2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MLCT</td>
<td>2.086</td>
<td>2.031</td>
<td>2.081</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>2.088</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>151.8</td>
<td>175.8</td>
<td>175.7</td>
<td>132.0</td>
<td>152.0</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>–2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MC+a</td>
<td>2.096</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>2.095</td>
<td>2.171</td>
<td>157.1</td>
<td>174.0</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MC_c</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>2.006</td>
<td>2.090</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>4.593</td>
<td>2.215</td>
<td>146.2</td>
<td>175.2</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>141.8</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3MC_d</td>
<td>2.120</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>2.131</td>
<td>4.384</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>147.0</td>
<td>135.9</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td>170.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TS_{1}</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>2.087</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>2.170</td>
<td>3.036</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>172.2</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>163.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five-coordinate 3MC structure that has released the pyridine. Optimized transition structures are shown in Figure 5. Dihedral angle φ is defined in Scheme 1.
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dissociates from $[\text{Ru(tpy)(Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^{2+}$ much more readily than from $[\text{Ru(tpy)(bpy})(\text{py})]^{2+}$, and in fact, ligand exchange from the latter is not observed under certain irradiation conditions. Typically, the $^1\text{MLCT}$ excited states of Ru complexes convert rapidly to a lower $^3\text{MLCT}$ state by intersystem crossing. It is generally accepted that ligand dissociation occurs via internal conversion of the $^3\text{MLCT}$ states to a dissociative $^3\text{MC}$ state. Therefore, exploration of the triplet potential energy surface is key to the understanding of the photodissociative behavior of these Ru complexes. The molecular orbitals and spin densities for the lowest $^3\text{MLCT}$ and the three lowest $^3\text{MC}$ states of the $[\text{Ru(tpy)(bpy})(\text{py})]^{2+}$ and $[\text{Ru(tpy)(Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^{2+}$ complex are shown in Figures 1 and 2 and in Figures S1 and S2 of the Supporting Information.

Figure 3. Relative energies of the $^3\text{MLCT}$ and $^3\text{MC}$ structures for (a) $[\text{Ru(tpy)(bpy})(\text{py})]^{2+}$ and (b) $[\text{Ru(tpy)(Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^{2+}$. The arrows indicate the positions of ligand dissociation. The definition of dihedral angle $\phi$ is shown in Scheme 1.

The difference between the $^3\text{MLCT}$ and $^3\text{MC}$ states can be discerned from the singly occupied molecular orbitals (SOMOs) and from the different spin densities on Ru. For the $^3\text{MLCT}$ state, SOMO$_1$ is a $d\pi$ orbital of Ru and SOMO$_2$ is a $\pi^*$ orbital of the tpy ligand, resulting in Mulliken spin densities of 0.93 and 0.98 on Ru for $[\text{Ru(tpy)(bpy})(\text{py})]^{2+}$ and $[\text{Ru(tpy)(Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^{2+}$, respectively. The two unpaired electrons in the $^3\text{MC}$ states occupy a $d\sigma$ orbital and a $d\sigma^*$ orbital on Ru, yielding spin densities on Ru ranging from 1.66 to 1.83 for $^3\text{MC}_1$, $^3\text{MC}_2$, and $^3\text{MC}_3$ for the two complexes. Because the SOMOs of the $^3\text{MC}$ states have $d\sigma^*$ antibonding character in Ru–N bonds, the various $^3\text{MC}$ states can be found by elongating different Ru–N bonds in the $^3\text{MLCT}$ excited state structure. The nature of these $^3\text{MC}$ states can be understood in terms of the different Ru $d$ orbitals involved in the...
SOMOs. In the $3^{\text{MC}}_1$ state, the Ru–N$_6$ bond dissociates and SOMO$_2$ is a $d\sigma^*_1$ orbital of Ru which is antibonding with N$_5$ and N$_6$, while SOMO$_1$ is a $d\sigma$ orbital of Ru (comparable to SOMO$_1$ of the $3^1\text{MLCT}$ state). SOMO$_1$ and SOMO$_2$ in the $3^{\text{MC}}_2$ state are similar to those in $3^{\text{MC}}_1$ since the Ru–N$_5$ bond is elongated along the same axis as Ru–N$_6$. In the $3^{\text{MC}}_3$ state, the Ru–N$_4$ bond is broken, and SOMO$_2$ is a $d\sigma^*_2$ orbital of Ru which is antibonding with N$_4$ and N$_5$.

The Ru–N bond lengths in the S$_0$, $3^1\text{MLCT}$, and $3^{\text{MC}}$ states of [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]$^{2+}$ and [Ru(tpy)(Me$_2$bpy)(py)]$^{2+}$ are compared in Table 1. Methyl substitution on the bpy ligand results in a more crowded structure and increases the calculated Ru–N$_4$ and Ru–N$_5$ bond lengths in the ground state. Similar increases in these bond lengths are found in the excited-state structures. The changes in the N–Ru–N angles also reflect this crowding. Only modest changes in the bond lengths are seen on excitation from S$_0$ to $3^1\text{MLCT}$. The S$_0$ to $3^1\text{MLCT}$ excitation energies for [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]$^{2+}$ and [Ru(tpy)(Me$_2$bpy)(py)]$^{2+}$ are 41.8 and 40.4 kcal/mol, respectively, indicating that the methyl groups have similar effects on the S$_0$ and $3^1\text{MLCT}$ states. Excitation to the $3^1\text{MLCT}$ state puts an electron in the tpy $\pi^*$ orbital, and the nodal patterns of this orbital explain the bond length changes in the tpy ligand seen on excitation (see Table S1 in the Supporting Information).

Stretching the Ru–N$_6$ bond in the $3^1\text{MLCT}$ optimized structure results in conversion to the $3^{\text{MC}}_1$ state. Geometry optimization of the $3^{\text{MC}}_1$ structure leads to a weakly bound six-coordinate structure which dissociates to a five-coordinate complex and a free pyridine that is about 2 kcal/mol higher in energy. Because SOMO$_2$ is a $d\sigma^*$ orbital aligned with both the Ru–N$_5$ and Ru–N$_6$ bonds, the latter is also somewhat elongated (Table 1). Figure 3 shows the relative energies of the optimized $3^1\text{MLCT}$ and $3^{\text{MC}}$ structures. The six-coordinate $3^{\text{MC}}_1$ structure for [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]$^{2+}$ is 9.8 kcal/mol higher in energy than the $3^1\text{MLCT}$ state. For [Ru(tpy)(Me$_2$bpy)(py)]$^{2+}$, the five-coordinate $3^{\text{MC}}_1$ structure is only 1.6 kcal/mol higher in energy than the $3^1\text{MLCT}$ state since elongation of the Ru–N$_6$ bond releases the strain from interaction between the pyridine and the methyl group of Me$_2$bpy.

Stretching of the Ru–bpy bonds leads to the $3^{\text{MC}}_2$ and $3^{\text{MC}}_3$ states. The $3^{\text{MC}}_2$ optimized structures are 15.8 and 8.1 kcal/mol higher in energy than the $3^1\text{MLCT}$ states for [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]$^{2+}$ and [Ru(tpy)(Me$_2$bpy)(py)]$^{2+}$, respectively. The difference can be attributed to the release of strain from interaction between tpy and the methyl group of Me$_2$bpy in the latter complex. In the $3^{\text{MC}}_3$ structure, the Ru–N$_5$ bond elongates and the N$_5$ pyridyl group of bpy rotates away from Ru.
For the $^3$MC$_1$ structures, the $N_4$ pyridyl group of bpy rotates away from Ru, resulting in structures that are 22.0 and 15.5 kcal/mol higher than $^3$MLCT for $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$ and $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$, respectively. The fact that $^3$MC$_1$ is the lowest-energy $^3$MC state is consistent with the experimental results that the ligand dissociation occurs at the $N_6$ position.

**Potential Energy Scan on Triplet Surface.** The energy barriers for the ligand dissociation on the triplet surface can be estimated by conducting relaxed scans from $^3$MLCT and stretching various Ru–N bonds. For each scan, one Ru–N bond was chosen, elongated in steps of 0.05 Å, and the energy was minimized with respect to all of the remaining coordinates at each step of the scan. When the Ru–$N_6$ bond in $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$ is elongated, there is a smooth transition from the $^3$MLCT to $^3$MC$_1$ state with a barrier of approximately 12 kcal/mol (Figure 4a). After the barrier, there is a weakly bound six-coordinate complex before the pyridine fully dissociates to the five-coordinate $^3$MC$_1$ complex. The transition state structure $^3$TS$_1$ for $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$ (Figure 5a) was found by optimizing the highest energy point on the scan, yielding a barrier height of 11.5 kcal/mol.

When the Ru–$N_6$ bond in $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$ is elongated, the transition from the $^3$MLCT to $^3$MC$_1$ state occurs at a shorter distance and has a barrier of only approximately 7 kcal/mol (Figure 4b). Transition state $^3$TS$_1$ for $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$ (Figure 5b) was found by optimizing the highest energy point on the scan. The optimized $^3$TS$_1$ is 6.9 kcal/mol higher in energy than the $^3$MLCT structure and has one imaginary frequency which corresponds to stretching of the Ru–$N_6$ bond. Following the IRC and the relaxed scan confirms that this transition state connects to the $^3$MC$_1$ structure. Structure $^3$TS$_1$ has a spin density of 1.38 on Ru (midway between 0.98 in $^3$MLCT and 1.66 in $^3$MC$_1$) and a Ru–$N_6$ bond length of 2.639 Å. The differences between $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$ and $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$ in both the barrier heights and the Ru–$N_6$ bond lengths can be understood in terms of an avoided crossing between the potential energy surfaces of the $^3$MLCT and $^3$MC$_1$ states as the Ru–$N_6$ bond is stretched (see Figure 3). Because the $^3$MLCT to $^3$MC$_1$ energy difference is smaller for $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$ than for $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$, the avoided crossing between the $^3$MLCT and $^3$MC$_1$ states occurs at a lower energy and shorter bond length for $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$. Other coordinates such as the Ru–$N_5$ bond length and various N–Ru–N angles also indicate that the transition state for $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{Me}_2\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$ occurs earlier along the reaction path with a greater release of strain in comparison to the transition state for $[\text{Ru(tpy)}(\text{bpy})(\text{py})]^2+$. Because the conversion of $^3$MLCT to $^3$MC involves electron transfer from the tpy ligand to Ru, some changes are also observed in the bond length of the tpy ligand (see Table S1 in the Supporting Information).
After the high point on the scan of the Ru−N6 in [Ru(tpy)(Me2bpy)(py)]2+, there is a 1.4 kcal/mol drop in energy (Figure 4b) and a 0.298 Å lengthening of the Ru−N5 bond (Figure S3 in the Supporting Information). Continuing the scan in the forward direction leads to the 3MC1 structure. The energy decreases monotonically while the Ru−N5 bond shortens and the Me2bpy ligand twists to a lower energy geometry. Scanning the Ru−N6 bond in the reverse direction also produces a monotonic decrease in energy (Figure 4b, green line), leading to the 3MLCT structure. Optimizing the highest energy point on this scan results in transition structure 3TS2 (Figure 5c), which is 5.4 kcal/mol above the 3MLCT state. The Ru−N6 bond length in 3TS2 is similar to that in 3TS1, but the Ru−N5 bond length is significantly longer and the spin density on Ru is higher. As discussed in the next paragraph, 3TS2 represents the barrier for a second, lower energy pathway for dissociation of the 3MLCT state to form the 3MC1 and pyridine.

Elongation of the Ru−N5 bond perpendicular to the tpy plane results in a smooth increase in the energy from the 3MLCT state to the 3MC2 state (Figure 6). The increase for [Ru(tpy)(Me2bpy)(py)]2+ is significantly smaller than for [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]2+. When the Ru−N5 bond in [Ru(tpy)(Me2bpy)(py)]2+ is stretched to 2.62 Å, the potential energy increases by 4.05 kcal/mol, the spin density on Ru increases gradually to 1.62, and the Ru−N6 bond elongates slightly to 2.26 Å. Because the bpy ligand is tethered to Ru at the N4 position, the N4 pyridyl does not dissociate. When the Ru−N5 bond is stretched beyond 2.62 Å, the potential energy continues to increase because of the twisting of the bpy ligand. If the Ru−N5 bond is frozen at 2.62 Å and another relaxed scan is conducted by stretching the Ru−N6 bond, the energy increases monotonically until the pyridine dissociates. Optimization of the highest point on this scan results in transition state 3TS2 (Figure 5c).

When the Ru−N4 bond, which is coplanar with the tpy ligand, is stretched, the estimated barrier for the transition to the 3MC3 state is 23 kcal/mol for [Ru(tpy)(bpy)(py)]2+ and 15 kcal/mol for [Ru(tpy)(Me2bpy)(py)]2+, values that are significantly higher than for the conversion to the 3MC1 and 3MC2 states (Figure 7). The higher barriers for breaking the Ru−N4 bond are consistent with experiment, which did not find photodissociation of the bpy ligand.

**MO Analysis along the Relaxed Scans.** In our previous study we analyzed the SOMOs along the relaxed potential energy scans and found that photodissociation of the nitrile-bound Ru polypyridyl complexes is facilitated by orbital mixing between the ligand π* orbital of the 3MLCT state and the Ru dπ* orbitals of a dissociative 3MC state. Figure 8 shows the corresponding plots for the SOMOs of [Ru(tpy)(Me2bpy)(py)]2+ as...
the Ru−N₆, Ru−N₅, and Ru−N₄ bonds are stretched. SOMO₂ in the ³MLCT state is a ligand-based π* orbital on tpy. When the Ru−N₆ bond is stretched longer than 2.52 Å, the ligand-based SOMO₂ mixes with the dσ₁⁻ orbital of Ru, which corresponds to SOMO₂ of ³MC₁ (Figure 8a). This orbital mixing promotes dissociation because the dσ₁⁻ orbital involves an antibonding interaction with the pyridine ligand. Stretching the Ru−N₅ bond (trans to Ru−N₆) also leads to similar orbital mixing of the tpy π* orbital and the Ru dσ₁⁻ orbital (Figure 8b). However, the Ru−N₅ bond does not dissociate because the bpy ligand is still tethered by the Ru−N₄ bond. Further elongation of the Ru−N₅ bond results in an increase in energy because of the twisting of the bpy ligand. In contrast to the orbital mixing seen when the Ru−N₅ and Ru−N₆ bonds are stretched, when the Ru−N₄ bond is stretched, the π* orbital of tpy remains orthogonal to the Ru dσ₂⁻ orbital that corresponds to SOMO₂. 

Figure 8. Isosurface plots of the SOMOs of [Ru(tpy)(Me₂bpy)(py)]²⁺ along the relaxed scan of the ³MLCT state for elongation of (a) Ru−N₆, (b) Ru−N₅, and (c) Ru−N₄.
Experimental studies of photoinduced ligand dissociation found that the pyridine ligand is released from \([\text{Ru}(tpy)(Me_2bpy)(py)]^{2+}\) significantly more efficiently than from \([\text{Ru}(tpy)(bpy)(py)]^{2+}\). To explore the ligand dissociation reaction on the triplet surface, we have calculated the energies and geometries of the 3MLCT and dissociative 3MC states. In comparison to \([\text{Ru}(tpy)(bpy)(py)]^{2+}\), the geometry of \([\text{Ru}(tpy)(Me_2bpy)(py)]^{2+}\) shows significant strain because of interaction of the methyl groups with the other ligands in both the \(S_0\) and 3MLCT states. Transition to the dissociative 3MC states releases this strain, resulting in lower barriers for ligand dissociation for \([\text{Ru}(tpy)(Me_2bpy)(py)]^{2+}\) than for \([\text{Ru}(tpy)(bpy)(py)]^{2+}\). By analyzing the molecular orbitals along relaxed scans for stretching the Ru–N bonds, we find that ligand photodissociation is promoted by orbital mixing between the ligand \(\pi^*\) orbital of the 3MLCT state and the \(d\sigma^*\) orbitals that characterize the dissociative 3MC states. Mixing can occur when the Ru–N bond perpendicular to a \(\pi\)-acceptor ligand is stretched and the \(\pi^*\) orbital of tpy and the \(d\sigma^*\) orbital of Ru have good overlap. Orbital mixing results in a smooth and continuous transition from 3MLCT to 3MC with a small barrier for photodissociation of the pyridine ligand in \([\text{Ru}(tpy)(Me_2bpy)(py)]^{2+}\). In contrast, when the Ru–N bond coplanar with the \(\pi\)-acceptor ligand is stretched, the ligand \(\pi^*\) and Ru \(d\sigma^*\) remain orthogonal; no mixing occurs, and the barrier for the transition from 3MLCT to 3MC is high. In addition to orbital mixing, ligand dissociation also depends on the rigidity of the ligand. When the Ru–N bond perpendicular to the \(\pi\)-acceptor is stretched, orbital mixing occurs but the bpy group does not dissociate from Ru; instead, bpy twists about its central bond in order to break the Ru–N bond in the 3MC state. Nevertheless, stretching of the Ru–N bond followed by elongation of the Ru–N bond can lead to a smaller barrier for transition from 3MLCT to 3MC, facilitating dissociation of the pyridine ligand. This work provides an understanding of the factors that lead to enhancements in photoinduced ligand dissociation and may be used to predict the structures of complexes for drug photorelease with improved properties.
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