www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

Yogeshwar Sharma
Associate Professor, Department
of Chemistry, Motilal Nehru
College, Benito Juarez Marg,
University of Delhi South
Campus, New Delhi, India

# A kinetic study on the complexation of Cu (II) with γ-aminobenzoic acid

Yogeshwar Sharma

Abstract
A kinetic study on interaction of Cu(II) with γ-aminobenzoic acid has been investigated at 25, 30, 35 and 40± 0.05°C in the pH range 2.01-3.14, using Aminco Morrow Stopped Flow Spectrophotometer. The ionic strength was maintained at 0.1 M KNO$_3$. The deprotonated form of γ-aminobenzoic acid is more reactive and the protonated form interacts only to a small extent. Kinetic results suggest that the ligand is not involved in the rate determining step which is, in fact, associated with the release of a water molecule from the shell of the metal ions prior to complexation with the ligand. Enthalpy, entropy of activation, energy of the molecule and heat of formation were also calculated. A mechanism consistent with the kinetic data has been suggested.

Keywords: kinetics, Cu(II) ions, γ-aminobenzoic acid, rate constant, activation parameters.

Introduction

γ-aminobenzoic acid occurs in free state and in compounds other than folic acid in combination with a polypeptide of glutamic acid. It is also excreted in human urine in conjugated form with metal ions and in human faeces. It also cures hypoprothrombinaemia produced in young rats by feeding sulphasuxidine. It stimulates the growth of bacteria in the intestinal tract of humans thereby synthesise vitamin K necessary to restore the blood clotting mechanism. Therefore, the kinetic study of metal ions by γ-aminobenzoic would give important information regarding type of interaction of polypeptide of glutamic acid to metal ions. The structure of γ-aminobenzoic acid can be represented as:

(γ-aminobenzoic acid) Zwitterion

According to Weber and Simeon eight membered rings are unstable due to large steric strain[6]. Thus it is obvious that reaction of Cu(II) with γ-aminobenzoic acid would proceed without *any* ring formation. The kinetics of complexation of metal ions Cu(II) by γ-aminobenzoic acid would give important information regarding the types of interaction of these ions with γ-aminobenzoic acid and the clearance of γ-aminobenzoic acid or metal ions in the form of metal -ligand complex through the animal body [1-5]. Such investigations are further desired for determining some important parameters, e.g. binding steps, rate constants corresponding to the binding steps Kos (outer sphere complex formation constant), ko (Rate constant of water exchange) and activation parameters corresponding to the interaction of various reactive forms of the γ-aminobenzoic acid.

Experimental method and materials

γ-aminobenzoic acid (B.D.H.), KNO$_3$ (B.D.H.) were used as such. Other chemicals used were of A.R. grade. The pH of ligand solution and metal ion solution was adjusted to same value

Correspondence
Yogeshwar Sharma
Associate Professor, Department
of Chemistry, Motilal Nehru
College, Benito Juarez Marg,
University of Delhi South
Campus, New Delhi, India

using 2, 6-lutidine (Merck Schuchardt) and HCl. However, a slight change in pH value (~ 0.05 units) was observed after mixing of two solutions. The final pH was recorded from Radiometer pH meter, *pH* M26. pH's reported are those of reaction mixtures. The temperature of the system was maintained by immersion type thermostat (German NBE model). The kinetic runs were made on Aminco Morrow stopped flow spectrophotometer under pseudo first order conditions, i.e., [Cu(II)] >>[γ-aminobenzoic acid] at 620nm by pH indicator method. The total transmittance change was kept small using linear log photometer so that relative voltage change could be observed on the oscilloscope. Copper nitrate, 10^{-3}M, buffer 10^{-2}M Lutidine and, μ= 0.1 M KNO_3 was mixed with ligand solution and the traces from the oscilloscope gave excellent first order plots, from which second order rate constants *(k_{obs})* were computed by the relation

$$k_{obs} = k'_{obs}[Cu(II)] \quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad \text{----------------------- (1)}$$

Where k'_{obs} is the pseudo first order rate constant.

Results and Discussion
Complexation of Cu(II)- γ-aminobenzoic acid
The kinetics of complexation of Cu(II)–γ-aminobenzoic acid was found to be of first order in copper ion, which was taken in large excess over ligand [8-9]. As protonated form of the ligand predominates in the pH range 2-5 (pKa_1 = 2.50, pKa_2 = 4.87) [18], the kinetic study of interaction has been made in the pH range 2.01-3.14 at ionic strength 0.1M KNO_3 and at temperatures 25, 30, 35 and 40± 0.05 °C, under the condition [Cu(II)] >> [γ-aminobenzoic acid]. Oscilloscope traces of voltage versus time were used to determine the values of pseudo-first order rate constants (k'_{obs}), and these were further utilized to evaluate the values of second order rate constants (k_{obs}), using equation (i). These rate constants are tabulated in Table 1.

Table 1: First order and Second order rate constants for the complexation of Cu(II) with γ-aminobenzoic acid at different pH's and temperatures

| Temp. (±0.05°C)	pH	k'_{obs} x 10^{-1}(s^{-1})	k_{obs} x 10^{-3} ($M^{-1}s^{-1}$)	Temp. (±0.05°C)	pH	k'_{obs} x 10^{-1}(s^{-1})	k_{obs} x 10^{-3} ($M^{-1}s^{-1}$)
25	2.03	9.58	1.78	30	3.15	143	26.5
25	2.21	11.7	2.18	35	2.04	26.6	4.95
25	2.48	23.2	4.32	35	2.28	34.6	6.44
25	2.72	43.6	8.10	35	2.51	49.7	9.23
25	2.91	56.0	10.4	35	2.72	75.9	14.1
25	3.04	82.3	15.3	35	3.03	116	21.5
25	3.14	102	18.9	35	3.14	154	28.6
30	2.06	15.9	2.96	40	2.01	36.4	6.78
30	2.21	23.2	4.32	40	2.22	42.6	7.92
30	2.48	33.3	6.18	40	2.50	66.7	12.4
30	2.72	56.5	10.5	40	2.72	99.5	18.5
30	2.91	82.9	15.4	40	2.91	142	26.4
30	3.03	125	23.3	40	3.02	198	36.8

I = 0.10 M KNO_3
[Cu(II)] = 5.38 x 10^{-2} M
[γ-aminobenzoic acid] = 4.86 x 10^{-3} M

The rate equation for Cu(II) – γ-aminobenzoic acid interaction can be written as

Rate $\quad$ = -d/dt[Cu(II)]
$\quad\quad\quad$ = -d/dt[γ-aminobenzoic acid]
$\quad\quad\quad$ = k_{obs} [γ-aminobenzoic acid] [Cu(II)] $\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad$ ---------------------(2)
$\quad\quad\quad$ = k'_{obs} [γ-aminobenzoic acid] $\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad$ -------------------- (3)

Where k'_{obs}= k_{obs} [Cu(II)]
The dissociation equilibria of γ-aminobenzoic acid can be represented as

$$\text{----- (4)}$$

$$K_1 = [H^+][HL] / [H_2L^+]$$

$$K_2 = [H^+][L^-] / [HL] \quad \text{------- (5)}$$

These three forms of ligand can react with Cu(II) ions as follows

$$H_2L^+ \quad + \; Cu(II) \xrightarrow{\quad k_1 \quad} \; CuL^+ \; + \quad 2H^+ \quad \text{------- (6)}$$

$$HL \quad + \; Cu(II) \xrightarrow{\quad k_2 \quad} \; CuL^+ \; + \quad H^+ \quad \text{------- (7)}$$

$$L^- \quad + \; Cu(II) \xrightarrow{\quad k_3 \quad} \; CuL^+ \quad \text{------- (8)}$$

Rate from equation 6, 7 and 8, can be written as

$$Rate = d/dt[CuL^+]$$
$$= \{ k_1 [H_2L^+] + k_2 [HL] + k_3[L^-]\}[Cu(II)] \quad \text{------- (9)}$$

From equation 5, it can be shown that

$$[L^-] = K_1 \; K_2 \; [H_2L^+] / [H^+]^2 \quad \text{------- (10)}$$

$$[HL] = K_1 \; [H_2L^+] / [H^+] \quad \text{------- (11)}$$

Substituting the values of [HL] and [L⁻] from equation (10) and (11) into equation (9) and on rearranging, we get:

$$Rate = \{ k_1 [H^+]^2 + k_1 K_1 [H^+] + k_3 K_1 K_2\} [Cu(II)] [H_2L^+] / [H^+]^2 \quad \text{------- (12)}$$

Substituting the values of [HL] and [L⁻] from equation (10) and (11) into equation (2), and on simplification, we get:

$$Rate = k_{obs} \{ k_1 [H^+]^2 + K_1 [H^+] + K_1 K_2\} [Cu(II)][H_2L^+] / [H^+]^2 \quad \text{------- (13)}$$

Comparing equation (12) and (13) and assuming that diprotonated form [H₂ L⁺] is unreactive, i.e. $k_1 \sim 0$, it can be shown that

$$k_{obs} \{ [H^+]^2 + K_1 [H^+] + K_1 K_2\} / K_1[H^+] = k_2 + k_3 K_2 / K_1[H^+] \quad \text{------- (14)}$$

Linear plots of $k_{obs} \{ [H^+]^2 + K_1 [H^+] + K_1 K_2\} / K_1[H^+]$ versus $[H^+]^{-1}$ at temperatures 25 30 35 and 40 ° C are shown in Fig.1. The values of K_1 and K_2 are obtained from the intercept and slope respectively. The values of K_1 and K_2 at 25°C were taken from literature and these values were corrected for different temperature using the equation (15)

Fig 1: Variation of k_{obs} {[H⁺]² + K₁[H⁺] + K₁k₂}x10⁻³ /K₁[H⁺] versus [H⁺]⁻¹ for Cu(II) -γ-aminobenzoic acid interaction at different temperatures

At the temperature of our investigation, the corrected values of K_3^T were evaluated using the thermodynamic relation:

$$pK_a^T = \{\triangle H \ (T_2 - T_1) / 4.576 T_2 . T_1\} + pK_a^{25 \ ^oC} \quad \text{--------------(15)}$$

The values of k_2 and k_3 are reported in Table 2. Values of energies of activation corresponding to specific rate constants k_2 and k_3 were calculated from linear plot of log k versus $1/T$ and those of entropies and enthalpies of activation corresponding to k_2 and k_3 were calculated from linear plot of log k/T versus $1/T$

Calculation of water exchange rate constant (k_o)
The rate of exchange on metal ion is controlled by the rate of water exchange and rate determining step is the loss of water molecule from the inner coordination sphere, i.e.

$$M(H_2O)_6^{2+} + L^{n-} \underset{Fast}{\overset{K_{os}}{\rightleftharpoons}} (H_2O)_5 M^{2+}(H_2O)L^{n-}$$

$$k_o \downarrow \ \begin{matrix} Slow \\ -H_2O \end{matrix}$$

$$(H_2O)_5 ML^{(2-n)+} \quad \text{--------------(16)}$$

The rate law in terms of outer sphere complex formation (K_{os}) and rate constant of water loss (k_o) from equation (19) be written as

$$d/dt \ (H_2O)_5 ML^{(2-n)+} = k_o \left[(H_2O)_5 M^{2+}(H_2O)L^{n-} \right]$$
$$= k_o K_{os} \left[M(H_2O)_6^{2+} \right] \left[L^{n-} \right] \quad \text{--------------(17)}$$

So the rate law in terms of outer sphere complex formation (Kos) for Cu(II)- γ-aminobenzoic acid can be written as

$$Rate = d/dt [Cu(II)L] = K_{os} k_o [Cu(II)] [L] \quad \text{--------------(18)}$$

Rate from equation 6, 7 and 8 can be written as

$$Rate = d/dt[CuL^+]$$
$$= \{ k_1 [H_2L^+] + k_2 [HL] + k_3[L^-]\}[Cu(II)] \quad \text{--------------(19)}$$

Assuming that the diprotonated form $[H_2L^+]$ is unreactive $k_1 \sim 0$, and $k_3 >> k_2$ (Table 2), therefore equation (19) reduces to

$$Rate = k_3[L^-][Cu(II)] \quad \text{--------------(20)}$$

Comparing equation 18 and 20, we get

$$k_3 = K_{os} k_o \quad \text{--------------(21)}$$

In order to calculate the value of k_o, we must know the value of K_{os}. The value of K_{os} was calculated using the equation which was given by Fuoss on statistical grounds,

$$K_{os} = 4\pi N \ a^3 . e^{-u/KT} / 3000 \quad \text{--------- (22)}$$

Where $u = Z_1 Z_2 e_o^2 / aD - Z_1 Z_2 e_o^2 x / D (1 + xa)$
And $x^2 = 8\pi N e_o^2 u/1000DKT$
Where
|		
N	=	Avogadro's number
a	=	Distance of closest approach of two ions
K	=	Boltzmann's constant
e_o	=	Charge of an electron in esu units
D	=	Bulk dielectric constant
u	=	Ionic strength
$Z_1 Z_2$	=	Charge of reactants

Distance of closest approach of two ions often taken 5Å for reactions of two aqua cations with ordinary ligands. After substituting the values of all the terms in equation (22), the value of K_{os} can be approximated to 1.98 mol dm^{-3} at all temperatures. The values of k_o are reported in Table 2. The high values of $\Delta H^{\#}$ corresponding to k_2 step confirm that the mono-protonated form γ-aminobenzoic acid is less reactive whereas low value of $\Delta H^{\#}$ corresponding to k_3 supports the high reactivity of deprotonated form of γ-aminobenzoic acid. The negative value of entropy corresponding to k_3 can be attributed to the fact that the transition state for this complex is highly charged and clearly shows that the reaction is between two oppositely charged ions (Table 3).

Table 2: Values of k_2 and k_3 and k_o for the complexation of Cu(II) with γ-aminobenzoic acid

Temp. (± 0.05°C)	k_2 x10^{-3}(M^{-1}s^{-1})	k_3 x10^{-6}(M^{-1}s^{-1})	k_o x10^{-6}(s^{-1})
25	---	0.83	0.42
30	1.20	0.92	0.46
35	2.50	1.04	0.53
40	3.50	1.20	0.60

**Fig 2:** Variation of log k_2 and log k_2 / T versus (1/T) for the interaction of Cu (II) -γ-aminobenzoic acid

Fig 3: Variation of log k_3 and log k_3 / T versus (1/T) on the interaction of Cu(II)-γ-aminobenzoic acid

Table 3: Values of activation parameters corresponding to k_2 and k_3 steps for the complexation of Cu(II) with γ-aminobenzoic acid

	k_2	k_3
$\Delta H^{\#}$(kJmol^{-1})	74.1±2.9	14.3±1.1
$\Delta E^{\#}$(kJmol^{-1})	81.0±1.7	15.9±0.6
$\Delta S^{\#}$(JK^{-1}mol^{-1})	27.6 ± 1.5	-108±4.5

Mechanism

The high values of $\Delta H^{\#}$ corresponding to k_2 step confirm that the monoprotonated form of γ-aminobenzoic acid is less reactive whereas low value of $\Delta H^{\#}$ corresponding to k_3 supports the high reactivity of deprotonated form of γ-aminobenzoic acid. (Table 3). Due to strong electrostatic interaction between the positive charge of Cu(II) and negative charge on the oxygen, it is inferred that k_2 is greater than k_3. The value of activation parameters corresponding to k_3 further confirm that the deprotonated form is more reactive than the zwitterionic form of the ligand. This mechanism is further confirmed by the values of energy of activation and entropy of activation.

Fig 4: Deprotonated form of γ-aminobenzoic acid
Final Geom Energy = -21526 kcal/mol
Heat of Formation = 34745.2703 kcal/mol

Fig 5: Protonated form of γ-aminobenzoic acid
Final Geom Energy = - 42524.18 kcal/mol
Heat of Formation = - 26.7593 kcal/mol

This mechanism is further confirmed from the molecular modelling method in which the energy as well as the heat of formation of the zwitterionic form and protonated form has been calculated. Values of the energies as well as heat of formation were calculated after optimizing the geometry of the molecules [14-17]. These values are given in Fig 4 and 5. It has been found that the deprotonated form is more reactive than the protonated form.

References
1. Wilkins RG, Acc. Chem. Res. 1970; 3:408.
2. Siegel H, McCornik DB. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1971; 43:2041.
3. Molinaro FS, Little RG, Jbers JA J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1977; 99:5628.
4. Eigen M, Wilkins RG. Adv. Chern. Ser. No. 1965; 49:55.
5. Eklund H *et al*, J. Mol. Bio. 1979; 1027:27.
6. Fast Reaction in Solution, E.F. Caldin, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1964.
7. Voss RH, Jordan RB, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1976; 98:2173.
8. Letter JE, Jordan RB. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1975; 97:2381.
9. Malhotra HC, Jain AK, J. Ind. Chem. Soc. 1990; 67:365.
10. Malhotra HC, Sharma GC, Gazz. Chim. Ital. 1988; 118:323.
11. Malhotra HC, Yogeshwar Sharma, Jain AK, J. Ind. Chem. Soc. 1990; 67:192
12. Malhotra HC, Jai Prakash, Sharma GC, J. Ind. Chern. Soc. 1986; LX III:1045
13. Thompson MA, Zerner MC. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1991; 113:8210.
14. Mark A, Thompson, Eric D, Glendening, David Feller J. Phys. Chem. 1994; 98:10465-10476.
15. Mark A Thompson, Gregory K Schenter J. Phys. Chem. 1995; 99:6374-6386.
16. Mark A Thompson, J. Phys. Chem. 1996; 100:14492-14507.
17. http/www.arguslab.com/arguslab.com/ArgusLab.html
18. http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~marisa/documents/pkatables.pdf