Synthesis and Photobiological Activity of Ru(II) Dyads Derived from Pyrrole-2-carboxylate Thionoesters
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ABSTRACT: The synthesis and characterization of a series of heteroleptic ruthenium(II) dyads derived from pyrrole-2-carboxylate thionoesters are reported. Ligands bearing a conjugated thiocarbonyl group were found to be more reactive toward Ru(II) complexation compared to analogous all-oxygen pyrrole-2-carboxylate esters, and salient features of the resulting complexes were determined using X-ray crystallography, electronic absorption, and NMR spectroscopy. Selected complexes were evaluated for their potential in photobiological applications, whereupon all compounds demonstrated in vitro photodynamic therapy effects in HL-60 and SK-MEL-28 cells, with low nanomolar activities observed, and exhibited some of the largest photocytotoxicity indices to date (>2000). Importantly, the Ru(II) dyads could be activated by relatively soft doses of visible (100 J cm⁻², 29 mW cm⁻²) or red light (100 J cm⁻², 34 mW cm⁻²), which is compatible with therapeutic applications. Some compounds even demonstrated up to five-fold selectivity for malignant cells over noncancerous cells. These complexes were also shown to photocleave, and in some cases unwind, DNA in cell-free experiments. Thus, this new class of Ru(II) dyads has the capacity to interact with and damage biological macromolecules in the cell, making them attractive agents for photodynamic therapy.

INTRODUCTION

The biological activity of transition-metal complexes (TMCs) has emerged as a major research focus in recent decades, particularly as metal-based scaffolds can offer significant advantages over organic compounds with regard to therapeutic and diagnostic applications.¹ Investigations concerning TMCs as anticancer agents are increasingly prominent,² with platinum- and ruthenium-based coordination complexes being the most widely studied.³,⁴ In fact a large body of work exists regarding cytotoxic metal-based anticancer compounds, which is too exhaustive to cover here.⁵−⁷ Certain Ru complexes, namely, NAMI-A, KP1019, and its sodium salt IT-139 (formerly called NKP-1339), have been investigated in clinical trials as single-agent, cytotoxic, or anti-metastatic alternatives to Pt-derived anticancer drugs.⁸ Indeed, while NAMI-A and KP1019 fell short of expectations in Phase I studies, IT-139 exhibited a manageable safety profile alongside promising single-agent anticancer activity and is currently under development as a multimodal anticancer drug. Unlike their Pt counterparts, Ru complexes feature three-dimensional chiral cations that can be designed to exhibit desirable aqueous solubility. Their modular architectures enable facile chemical modifications through derivatization of one or more ligands to sample endless molecular and chemical space with electronic properties of biological relevance. In addition, the expanded octahedral coordination environment of Ru affords access to a larger number of geometric isomers and stereoisomers for increased site discrimination toward biological targets, as well as to multiple oxidation states for in vivo activation.⁹,¹⁰ Ru compounds have also been extensively investigated as light-responsive prodrugs for photodynamic therapy (PDT).¹⁰−¹⁴ Briefly, PDT employs a nontoxic photosensitizer (PS) that is triggered by light to generate cytotoxic reactive oxygen species (ROS), notably singlet oxygen (¹O₂).¹⁵,¹⁶ The advantage of PDT over traditional forms of cancer therapy (i.e., chemotherapy and radiotherapy), and more recently immuno-therapy, is that it is highly selective, with toxicity confined to tissue where PS, light, and oxygen overlap spatiotemporally. In other words, off-site toxicity can be minimized by judicious control of the light delivery. Moreover, PDT is also known to invoke innate and adaptive antitumor immunity in addition to destruction of primary tumors and tumor vasculature.¹⁷−²⁰ Despite its potential, PDT is limited by the poor chemical characteristics of the few approved clinical PSs to date.¹⁸,¹⁹ These PSs are organic structures that require molecular oxygen.
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to exert a cytotoxic effect, thus precluding the treatment of hypoxic tissue, and cannot be activated by wavelengths of light that penetrate tissue best (700–900 nm).

Ru complexes have the potential to overcome these drawbacks. One such compound (TLD1433)\(^{14}\) and its proprietary light device has entered a Phase 1/2a clinical trial for treating nonmuscle invasive bladder cancer with PDT (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT03053635). This Ru-based compound belongs to a class of PSs called metal–organic dyads, which contain π-expansive organic chromophores tethered to neutral 2,2′-bipyridine (bpy), 1,10-phenanthroline (phen), or imidazo[4,5-\(f\)][1,10]phenanthroline (IP) ligands. These Ru dyads are characterized by low-lying triplet intraligand (\(^{3}\)IL) excited states with prolonged intrinsic lifetimes (tens to hundreds of microseconds) that are extremely sensitive to trace oxygen and other quenchers, yielding very potent PDT effects even at low oxygen tension, as well as oxygen-independent excited-state reactivity.\(^{14,21–23}\) These and other Ru-based PSs investigated as PDT agents have mostly employed neutral iminines as auxiliary ligands with absorption maxima less than 500 nm but can be activated effectively with red light, most likely due to direct triplet–triplet absorption that populates these highly effective excited states.

There has been some interest in cyclometalated Ru complexes for PDT, because they exhibit bactohromic shifts in their longest wavelength absorption maxima by more than 100 nm relative to their diimine counterparts.\(^{24–26}\) However, the lower-energy metal-to-ligand charge transfer (MLCT) transitions that are responsible for the longer wavelength absorption by cyclometalated Ru complexes also produce excited-state lifetimes that are much shorter due to the energy gap law, which limits the time available for bimolecular excited-state reactions that would be operative in PDT. In addition, some cyclometalated Ru systems were shown to be dark cytotoxic toward various cancer cell lines.\(^{27}\) Presumably, these two factors are responsible for some of the very small in vitro PDT effects reported\(^{23}\) and the perception that such systems are less useful for PDT. More recently, we demonstrated that some cyclometalated Ru C^N complexes derived from deprotonated phenylpyridine (phpy) and π-expansive organic chromophores yield in vitro PDT profiles that are as good as (or better than) some of our best Ru polypyridyl complexes.\(^{21}\) This finding sparked an interest in cyclometalated systems involving the widely studied organometallic C^N motif and other anionic ligands such as the pyrrolide anion.

The organometallic chemistry of the pyrrolide anion, though formally isoelectronic with and geometrically comparable to the well-established cyclopentadienyl ligand,\(^{28,29}\) is considerably underdeveloped.\(^{30,31}\) This lack of interest may stem from historical reports that describe pyrrolide–metal complexes as intrinsically unstable and difficult to handle.\(^{32,33}\) Since then, numerous pyrrolide-containing metal complexes have been reported: the ligands are often di- and cyclic tetrapyrroles as reported example of a metal complex featuring a pyrrolide \(\sigma\) and π-bonding metal complexes as opposed to the simple pyrrolic system, in which the pyrrolic anion may adopt both σ- and π-bonding modes, thus enhancing the chemical reactivity of the metal and providing it with significant steric and electronic flexibility.\(^{34,35}\) We recently reported the synthesis of the first heteroleptic pyrrolide 2,2'-bpy complexes of Ru(II).\(^{36}\) These complexes, formed via chelation of the metal center to the pyrrolic N-atoms as well as the oxygen atom of the carbonyl moiety of 2-formyl, 2-keto, and 2-carboxylato pyrroles, were found to be air- and moisture-stable, and were synthesized in excellent yields in all but the latter case, whereby attempts garnered success only in the case of electron-deficient pyrroles, specifically, those bearing halosubstituents about the pyrrolic ring. This was thought to be the result of the electron-withdrawing ester moiety having a destabilizing effect on the Ru–O bond, a trend also observed in a study concerning rhenium complexes of pyrrolic ligands.\(^{37}\) Cognizant that thiocarbonyl compounds typically display greater reactivity than their all-oxygen counterparts, likely due to the larger covalent radius and thus higher polarizability of the sulfur atom relative to oxygen, we hypothesized that conjugated pyrrolic thionoesters would act as improved ligands for Ru complexation. Herein, we report the synthesis and characterization of a family of these Ru(II) pyrrolic thionoester dyads and explore the potential of such complexes to act as PSs for PDT.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Synthesis and Characterization.** Initial efforts sought to confirm previous findings that 2-carboxylate pyrroles, in the absence of additional electron-withdrawing substituents, act as poor ligands for Ru complexation.\(^{36}\) Using slightly modified conditions, we thus explored the reaction of a simple trialkyl-substituted pyrrolic ester (1a), obtained via Knorr-type condensation,\(^{36}\) with Ru(bpy)_2Cl₂ under microwave irradiation. With the aim of providing stable, highly crystalline Ru(II) dyads that were soluble in organic solvents and thus facile to characterize, the bis(bpy) Ru(II) chloride salt 2a•Cl₂, generated in situ, was converted to the hexafluorophosphate salt upon treatment with NH₄PF₆. The resulting bis(bpy) Ru(II) salt 2a•PF₆ was isolated, albeit in low yield, following purification via column chromatography (20%, Scheme 1). While low, this yield was a marked improvement on previous attempts\(^{36}\) to complex alkyl 2-carboxylate pyrroles to Ru, an enhancement that was attributed to the modified isolation procedure that avoided titration of the crude complex salt. It is also interesting to note that these low yields are in stark contrast to those obtained for trialkyl-substituted 2-formyl or keto pyrroles, which were shown to be highly effective ligands for Ru complexation.\(^{36}\)

![Scheme 1. Synthesis of Ru(II) Complexes Derived from 2-Carboxylate (1a) and 2-Thiocarboxylate (3a) Pyrroles, Isolated as Their Hexafluorophosphate Salts](image)

Complexation of the analogous thionoester (3a)\(^{39}\) was subsequently examined. Vastly superior yields for chelation to Ru(II) emerged, as appreciated through comparison of complexation yields for 1a and 3a. Following the procedure described above, 4a•PF₆ was isolated in quantitative yield (Scheme 1). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first reported example of a metal complex featuring a pyrrolic ligand chelated through bidentate coordination involving the sulfur moiety of a pyrrole-2-carboxylate thionoester. In addition to the difference in isolated yields attained (Scheme 1), the pyrrolic ester- and thionoester-derived complexes (2a and 4a) also differed in appearance with the former observed to be deep
purple in the solid state and the latter deep red, with the variation more apparent in solution, whereupon the colors were more vibrant.

Subtle differences were also observed in the NMR spectra of these two dyads. Formation of heteroleptic [Ru(bpy)_2(LL)]^2+ complexes produces nonequivalence in all protons, leading to highly complex ^1H and ^13C NMR spectra, particularly in the aromatic regions. However, analysis of the alkyl-derived peaks in the ^1H NMR spectra revealed that replacing the carbonyl group of 2a with a thiocarbonyl group (4a) resulted in a deshielding effect upon nearby O-CH_2CH_3 protons (Table 1, entries 4 and 5), yet did not significantly affect the environment of the pyrrolic methyl substituents (Table 1, entries 1–3), a trend also observed for the respective ligands (1a and 3a).

Examination of the ^13C NMR spectra revealed a similar deshielding effect on the C = X group when moving from a carbonyl to a thiocarbonyl group (Table 1, entry 6). In the case of ligands 1a and 3a, the difference in chemical shift was as expected based on theoretical studies that suggest a linear relationship between 13C=O and their corresponding 13C=S values, conforming reasonably well to the equation δ(C=S) = 1.75 δ(C=O) − 79.7. Employing this equation provides a calculated value of 203.6 ppm for the C=S group of 3a, comparable to the experimental value of 199.5 ppm. Conversely, in the case of Ru(II) complexes 2a and 4a, the experimental value of 194.7 ppm for the C=S group of 4a did not compare well with the calculated value of 222.7 ppm, suggesting that Ru complexation mitigates the deshielding effect.

**X-ray Structure.** An X-ray crystal structure was obtained for the complex 4a, as the racemate, which confirmed the binding mode of the ligand and enabled structural analysis. Slow evaporation of a solution of 4a in methanol generated dark red crystals that were suitable for analysis via X-ray diffraction. Solving the structure revealed that complex 4a crystallizes in the monoclinic space group C2/c, with the Ru(II) center adopting a distorted octahedral geometry (Figure 1a).

The four Ru–Nppy bonds are in the range of 2.048(2)–2.070(2) Å, well within normal limits compared to the parent Ru(II) tris(2,2′-bpy) complex and similar heteroleptic Ru(II) bis(2,2′-bpy) dipyrrinato or pyrroline complexes. The Ru–Nppy bond length for 4a is 2.091(2) Å, marginally longer than those found in similar ruthenium–pyrrole complexes bearing α-formyl (CHO) or ester (C(O)OR) groups in place of the thionoester (C(S)OR) moiety (Figures 1b, 5, and 6).36 The Ru–Nppy bonds of known pyrroline and dipyrrinato derivatives are reported in the range of 2.076(2)–2.087(3) Å. The C=S bond of complex 4a (1.700(3) Å) is similar in length to that of uncoordinated pyrrole (1.650(2) Å),41 but it is ~0.4 Å longer than the carbonyl C=O–O bond of analogous 2-carboxylate pyrrole complex (2.128(1) Å), which is again longer than that of the 2-formyl pyrrole–ruthenium complex (2.097(2) Å). The bond length from C1 to C5 in compound 4a (2.070(2) Å) is similar to that of the mono-substituted C=O bonds of know pyrrolide and dipyrrinato complexes (2.076(2) Å, well within normal limits compared to the parent Ru(II) tris(2,2′-bpy) complex and similar heteroleptic Ru(II) bis(2,2′-bpy) dipyrrinato or pyrroline complexes). The Ru–S bond of 4a is 2.091(2) Å, marginally longer than those found in similar ruthenium–pyrrole complexes bearing α-formyl (CHO) or ester (C(O)OR) groups in place of the thionoester (C(S)OR) moiety (Figures 1b, 5, and 6).36

**Figure 1.** (a) X-ray structure of complex 4a (50% probability ellipsoids) with PF_6^- counterion. (b) Related literature compounds with published solved crystal structures.
Table 2. Synthesis of Pyrroles (3) and Corresponding Ru(II) Complexes (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>entry</th>
<th>pyrrole</th>
<th>R¹</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R³</th>
<th>R⁴</th>
<th>yield 3 (%)a</th>
<th>yield 4 (%)b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>72 (3a)</td>
<td>quant (4a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Bn</td>
<td>49 (3b)</td>
<td>quant (4b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>72 (3c)</td>
<td>quant (4c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Bn</td>
<td>50 (3d)</td>
<td>quant (4d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1e</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>59 (3e)</td>
<td>quant (4e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1f</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>Bn</td>
<td>47 (3f)</td>
<td>93 (4f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1g</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>58 (3g)</td>
<td>quant (4g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1h</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>(CH₂)₂CH₃</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>64 (3h)</td>
<td>quant (4h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1i</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>(CH₂)₂CH₃</td>
<td>(CH₂)₂CH₃</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>68 (3i)</td>
<td>quant (4i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1j</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>CO₂Et</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Et</td>
<td>52 (3j)⁵</td>
<td>quant (4j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1k</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Ph</td>
<td>Me</td>
<td>Bn</td>
<td>55 (3k)⁵</td>
<td>84 (4k)⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aIsolated yield. bCompounds isolated as their PF₆ salts. cReaction time of 4 h.

The thionoester-bearing pyrroles (3) were then examined as ligands in the microwave-assisted Ru(II) complexation reaction as per Scheme 1, providing the corresponding PF₆ salts in excellent yields (84%-quant, Table 2). This demonstrates that the complexation reaction is tolerant of a wide variety of structural features, including both ethyl and benzyl thionoesters (compare Table 2, entries 1 and 2; Table 2, entries 3 and 4; Table 2, entries 5 and 6), α- and β-free pyrroles (Table 2, entries 3, 4 and 7), long-chain alkyl substituents (Table 2, entries 8 and 9), electron-withdrawing substituents (Table 2, entry 10), and aryl substituents (Table 2, entry 11). In the case of the Ru(II) complex 4k a notably lower yield was obtained (84%, Table 2, entry 11), which can presumably be ascribed to electronic effects, owing to the incorporation of a conjugated aryl substituent, which may contribute to a destabilizing effect on the Ru–S bond. All complexes synthesized (4a–4k) were fully characterized and moisture- and air-stable.

Electronic Absorption. As expected, the longest wavelength absorption maxima for these cyclometalated systems were shifted by up to 100 nm relative to typical Ru(II) complexes derived from neutral diimine-based ligands, and their extinction coefficients were very similar to that of Photofrin at wavelengths where clinical PDT is currently delivered (∼630 nm). The absorption spectra of the Ru(II) complexes featuring pyrroline ligands 2-substituted with ester (2a) and thionoester (4a–k) moieties revealed intense bands in the UV, characteristic of internal π−π* transitions, and lower-energy MLCT transitions in the visible region.

Electronic absorption spectra for the ester-coordinated complex 2a and the analogous thionoester complexes (4) revealed significant differences in the absorption profiles (Figure 2). Most notably, thionoester-containing complex 4a exhibits increased molar absorptivity, relative to the corresponding ester 2a, in the high-energy MLCT transitions designated Ru(II) (dπ→LL parentage) in the band centered around 430 nm attributed to the n−π* transition of the thiocarbonyl group and, to a lesser extent, the lower-energy MLCT bands (≥575 nm) that can be assigned to overlapping Ru(dπ→bpy(π*) (symmetric) and Ru(II) (dπ→bpy(π*) (antisymmetric) transitions. However, the bathochromic shift of ∼25 nm in the longest wavelength Ru(dπ→bpy(π*) absorption maximum for 2a produced slightly larger extinction coefficients between 550 and 575 nm. Otherwise the local maxima were similar for the ester and thionoester congeners. Comparison of the absorption spectra obtained for Ru(II) complexes featuring ethyl (4a) and benzyl (4b) thioester pyrroline ligands showed no significant differences between the two. Comparing complexes with pyrrole ligands bearing β-alkyl (4b) and aryl (4k) substituents revealed similar profiles, although generally higher absorptivity was observed in the latter case (Figure 2).

Photobiology. Six of the Ru(II) complexes featuring 2-thionoester pyrroline ligands were selected for photobiological studies (4a–c, 4h, 4j,k); these samples represent both ethyl and benzyl thionoesters, and bear distinct structural features...
The light treatment was 100 J cm\(^{-2}\) according to an established in-house cellular assay.\(^9\) Brieﬂy, MEL-28 melanoma cells, and CCD human cell lines (HL-60 promyelocytic leukemia cells, SK-MEL-28 melanoma cells, and CCD-1064Sk human cell lines) were also assessed using noncancerous skin fibroblasts and SK-MEL-28 cells, which an established in-house cellular assay.\(^{9,52}\)

Inorganic Chemistry

Table 3. Photobiological Activity of Selected 2-Thionoester Pyrrolide Ru(II) Complexes in HL-60 Cells, with PS-to-Light Interval of 16 h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>compound(^a)</th>
<th>EC(_{50}) (µM)</th>
<th>PI(^c)</th>
<th>EC(_{50}) (µM)</th>
<th>PI(^c)</th>
<th>SF(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dark (^b)</td>
<td>visible (^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>red (^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>1.08 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.108 ± 0.004</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.357 ± 0.014</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>1.17 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.012 ± 0.001</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.145 ± 0.003</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>1.23 ± 0.40</td>
<td>0.161 ± 0.011</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.355 ± 0.008</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>1.74 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.042 ± 0.002</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.102 ± 0.016</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4j</td>
<td>1.43 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.076 ± 0.018</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.213 ± 0.005</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4k</td>
<td>1.42 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.014 ± 0.001</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.052 ± 0.003</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cisplatin(^a)</td>
<td>5.9 ± 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Compounds screened as their chloride salts. \(^b\)Light 100 J cm\(^{-2}\). \(^c\)PI = phototherapeutic index. \(^d\)SF = The ratio of dark EC\(_{50}\) values of CCD-1064Sk and HL-60 cells. \(^*\)Cisplatin is not a PS, but it serves as a control.

Table 4. Photobiological Activity of Selected 2-Thionoester Pyrrolide Ru(II) Complexes in SK-MEL-28 Cells, with PS-to-Light Interval of 16 h

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>compound(^a)</th>
<th>EC(_{50}) (µM)</th>
<th>PI(^c)</th>
<th>EC(_{50}) (µM)</th>
<th>PI(^c)</th>
<th>SF(^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dark (^b)</td>
<td>visible (^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>red (^b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>0.280 ± 0.028</td>
<td>0.004 ± 0.001</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.070 ± 0.007</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>2.19 ± 0.19</td>
<td>0.001 ± 0.0001</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>0.036 ± 0.002</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>2.01 ± 0.17</td>
<td>0.014 ± 0.0002</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>0.141 ± 0.015</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h</td>
<td>1.09 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.011 ± 0.002</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.040 ± 0.002</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4j</td>
<td>2.07 ± 0.12</td>
<td>0.004 ± 0.001</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>0.211 ± 0.027</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4k</td>
<td>0.281 ± 0.036</td>
<td>0.010 ± 0.0002</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.038 ± 0.004</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cisplatin(^a)</td>
<td>2.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Compounds screened as their chloride salts. \(^b\)Light 100 J cm\(^{-2}\). \(^c\)PI = phototherapeutic index. \(^d\)Cisplatin is not a photosensitizer, but it serves as a control. \(^*\)SF = The ratio of dark EC\(_{50}\) values of CCD-1064Sk and SK-MEL-28 cells.

including H, alkyl, ester, and aryl substituents. The hexafluorophosphate salts of these complexes were converted to their biologically compatible, water-soluble chloride salts via purifying using column chromatography (90%-quant yield, characterization details in Supporting Information). Successful counterion exchange was confirmed using electrospray ionization mass spectrometry (ESI-MS) in negative ion mode, which showed a disappearance of the signal corresponding to the PF\(_6\) anion. Four compounds have Me at both R\(^1\) and R\(^2\), and Et at R\(^3\), and differ only at R\(^3\): H (4c), Me (4a), −(CH\(_2\))\(_2\)CH\(_3\) (4h), or −CO\(_2\)Et (4j). Two are identical at R\(^1\) and R\(^3\) (Me) and differ only at R\(^1\): Et (4a) or Bn (4b). Another two are also identical at R\(^1\) and R\(^3\) (Me) and at R\(^1\) (Bn), differing only at R\(^2\): Me (4b) or Ph (4k). This small subset of compounds was chosen to determine the structure–activity effects with systematic changes to R\(^2\) and R\(^3\) and to highlight the utility of this new class of cyclometalated Ru(II) dyads for in vitro PDT (and, in some cases, as traditional but selective anticancer compounds).

The cytotoxicity and photocytotoxicity of these representative 2-thionoester pyrrolide Ru(II) dyads was assessed in three human cell lines (HL-60 promyelocytic leukemia cells, SK-MEL-28 melanoma cells, and CCD-1064Sk skin fibroblasts) according to an established in-house cellular assay.\(^9,52\) Briefly, cells were dosed with metal complex (1 nM-300 µM) and incubated for 16 h at 37 °C prior to a light or sham (dark) treatment. The light treatment was 100 J cm\(^{-2}\) delivered from a broadband visible lamp (34 mW cm\(^{-2}\)) or red light-emitting diodes (LEDs) at 625 nm (29 mW cm\(^{-2}\)) over the course of 49 and 57 min, respectively. The complexes, as monitored by UV–vis absorption spectroscopy, exhibited no photobleaching upon exposure to 100 J cm\(^{-2}\) of visible or red light delivered at an irradiance of 34 and 29 mW cm\(^{-2}\), respectively. Alamar Blue was added at 48 h post treatment, and cell viability was quantified 16 h later. Cells that were dosed at high concentrations of PS, where the PS interferes with absorption and emission of light by the cell viability dye, were also observed manually under a microscope. The effectiveness of the Ru(II) complexes as in vitro PDT agents was assessed by quantifying the dark and light cytotoxicity profiles as EC\(_{50}\) values (concentration required to reduce cell viability to 50%). Their photocytotoxicity indices (PIs) were then calculated as the ratio of dark to light EC\(_{50}\) values, reflecting the PDT therapeutic margin in a given cancer cell line. Dark EC\(_{50}\) values were also assessed using noncancerous skin fibroblasts (CCD–1064Sk) to determine any selective dark cytotoxicity toward cancer cells over normal cells. The selectivity factor (SF) is defined as the dark EC\(_{50}\) determined for CCD–1064Sk skin fibroblasts divided by the dark EC\(_{50}\) determined for a given cancer cell line. For comparison, larger PIs signify larger PDT effects, and SF values > 1 represent selectivity toward cancer cells. Note that, as long as the therapeutic dose is significantly less than the dark EC\(_{50}\) value of the normal cell line, it is not necessary to have inherent selectivity for cancer cells over normal cells. Rather, selectivity is achieved by spatial control of the light delivery.

As observed for some of the other classes of cyclometalated Ru(II) complexes, the in vitro cytotoxicity for the Ru(II) dyads derived from 2-thionoester pyrrolide ligands was high, with EC\(_{50}\) values as low as 280 nM in the absence of a light trigger. This cytotoxicity proved to be very sensitive to the substitution effects with systematic changes to R\(^2\) and R\(^3\).
S1). In SK-MEL-28 and CCD−1064Sk cells, where there was a much larger range of activities, 4a and 4k were the most cytotoxic, and 4c and 4j were the least cytotoxic (by 18-fold in CCD−1064Sk cells and 8-fold in SK-MEL-28 cells). Given that

Figure 3. In vitro cytotoxicity curves for compounds 4a−c, 4h, 4j, and 4k in HL-60, SK-MEL-28, and CCD-1064Sk cells.

Figure 4. In vitro PDT dose−response curves for compounds 4a−c, 4h, 4j, and 4k in HL-60 cells, with visible (blue), red (red), or no (black) light activation.
Both of these PI values are larger than that known for Photofrin light activation. Energetic visible light produced smaller EC50 values for all of thionoesters, R2 = Me produced potent dark toxicity (EC50 = being more toxic by almost eight-fold. For the ethyl or R2 = benzyl thionoesters (EC50 = 2.2 μM), while R2 = Ph did. The conclusion is that the nature of variances at R2, and vice versa. This is also the case when R4 = Bn, supported by large di-cytotoxicity was enhanced further with photoactivation using anticancer agents in the absence of a light trigger, this extends that surpass the gold standard cisplatin in both cancer cell lines studied (Tables 3 and 4), highlights the potential utility of these Ru(II) 2-thionoester pyrrolide dyads as traditional chemotherapeutics. While the six complexes investigated acted as promising compounds exhibit anticancer effects that surpass the gold standard cisplatin in both cancer cell lines studied (Tables 3 and 4), highlights the potential utility of these Ru(II) 2-thionoester pyrrolide dyads as traditional chemotherapeutics. While the six complexes investigated acted as promising anticancer agents in the absence of a light trigger, this cytotoxicity was enhanced further with photoactivation using broadband visible or red light (Figures 4 and 5). These ethyl thionoester complexes bearing R2 = H or R2 = −CO2Et were also the least cytotoxic in general. This selectivity, in addition to the observation that all of the compounds exhibit anticancer effects that surpass the gold standard cisplatin in both cancer cell lines studied (Tables 3 and 4), highlights the potential utility of these Ru(II) 2-thionoester pyrrolide dyads as traditional chemotherapeutics.

While the six complexes investigated acted as promising anticancer agents in the absence of a light trigger, this cytotoxicity was enhanced further with photoactivation using broadband visible or red light (Figures 4 and 5). The more energetic visible light produced smaller EC50 values for all of the complexes across all of the cell lines studied, but even red light produced PIs as large as 27 (4k) in HL-60 cells and greater than 60 (4b) in SK-MEL-28 cells (Tables 3 and 4). Both of these PI values are larger than that known for Photofrin (PI ≈ 10), albeit reported in a different cell line.5 The relative ordering of the light EC50 values measured for the different compounds varied between the two cancer cell lines studied and between the two light conditions used, underscoring the importance of being cautious with generalizations regarding PS activity and structure–activity relationships. Nevertheless, some trends could be discerned.

With visible light activation, 4b was exceptionally potent toward both cancer cell lines, with light EC50 values of 12 nM in HL-60 and 1 nM in SK-MEL-28, giving rise to PIs of 100 and greater than 2100, respectively (Tables 3 and 4). These large phototherapeutic margins afford the opportunity to deliver the PS at very low concentration, where it is completely nontoxic without the light trigger. One of the least active PSs in both cell lines with visible light activation was 4c (EC50 = 161 nM, PI 8 in HL-60; EC50 = 14 nM, PI = 144 in SK-MEL-28), demonstrating that the least phototoxic PS in this series is still up to 300-fold more phototoxic than Photofrin. The trends for light potencies were as follows: 4b ≈ 4k > 4h > 4j > 4a > 4c (HL-60/visible PDT); 4k > 4h > 4b > 4j > 4c ≈ 4a (HL-60/red PDT); 4b > 4a = 4j > 4k ≈ 4h > 4c (SK-MEL-28/visible PDT); and 4b ≈ 4k ≈ 4h > 4c > 4j (SK-MEL-28/red PDT). The trends for the PI values were: 4k ≈ 4b > 4h > 4j > 4a > 4c (HL-60/visible PDT); 4k > 4h > 4b ≈ 4j > 4a = 4c (HL-60/red PDT); 4b > 4j > 4c > 4h > 4a > 4k (SK-MEL-28/visible PDT); and 4b > 4h > 4c > 4j > 4k > 4a (SK-MEL-28/red PDT).

The benzyl thionoesters (4b and 4k) yielded the most potent visible light EC50 values and largest PIs in HL-60 cells. While benzyl thionoester 4b also gave the most potent visible light EC50 values and largest PI in SK-MEL-28 cells, ethyl thionoester 4j was also very potent. However, with red light

Figure 5. In vitro PDT dose–response curves for compounds 4a–c, 4h, 4j, and 4k in SK-MEL-28 cells, with visible (blue), red (red), or no (black) light activation.
activation in HL60 cells, ethyl thionoester 4h surpassed 4b. Close scrutiny revealed that the light-triggered activities of these Ru(II) dyads were sensitive to the cell line employed and the light treatment delivered. Nevertheless, 4b, 4i, and 4h emerged as good in vitro PDT agents with low nanomolar potencies and highlight the potential utility of both ethyl and benzyl thionoester Ru(II) dyads for PDT applications given the ability to fine-tune the photocytotoxicity via substituent changes about the pyrrole ring. Current efforts are underway to understand the photophysical and photochemical differences that may give rise to these differences in photobiological activity, and to explore additional variations at R2 and R3.

A possible source of the observed in vitro PDT effects is the generation of reactive intermediates such as cytotoxic 1O2, which can damage biological tissue and invoke cell death. Plasmid DNA serves as a convenient probe for testing the ability of PSs to photodamage biological macromolecules (regardless of whether DNA is the actual intracellular target). We used a DNA gel electrophoretic mobility shift assay54–56 to study the six compounds that were evaluated for their in vitro PDT effects. The migration distance of pUC19 DNA through the agarose gel depends on its size and topological form, and this topology is acutely dependent on DNA interactions with exogenous agents. Undamaged DNA (supercoiled, Form I) migrates the farthest, while condensed/aggregated may not move from the loading well at all (Form IV). Single-strand breaks in the DNA backbone cause relaxation of the supercoils to produce an open circular form (Form II), which migrates slightly more than Form I and IV. Single-strand breaks that occur on one side of the DNA bands (Figure 6, lanes 3–10). The light-treated DNA samples were compared to untreated DNA (Figure 6, lane 1), DNA treated with light only (Figure 6, lane 2), or DNA exposed to PS at the highest concentration without the light treatment (Figure 6, lane 11). EB was added to the samples before (Figure 6, EB) or after (non-EB) electrophoresis to emphasize strand breaks and unwinding, respectively. All of the Ru(II) thionoester dyads produced single-strand breaks in DNA in a concentration-dependent manner upon light exposure (Figure 6, conversion of Form I to Form II), indicating that the compounds could potentially generate intracellular cytotoxic reactive intermediates. No Form III DNA could be discerned, but some of the compounds (4b, 4h, 4k) did cause condensation57–59 (or aggregation) of the DNA (Form IV), while others (4a, 4c, or 4j) caused incomplete conversion to Forms II or IV. Compound 4b caused complete conversion to Form II before condensation, while 4k (and to a lesser extent 4h) caused both to occur simultaneously. Three of the compounds (4b, 4c, and 4h) caused unwinding of the DNA helix (Figure 6, non-EB), but this interaction did not correlate with the potency of the compound in terms of DNA photodamage. The compounds that produced the most DNA damage (4b, 4h, and 4k) were also characterized by DNA band disappearance at the highest concentrations of PS employed with or without a light treatment. Such effects could stem from fluorescence quenching of EB by distortion of the DNA helix and/or displacement of intercalated EB by the PS. The non-EB gels demonstrate the ability of some of the compounds to interact with DNA strongly enough to unwind it.

It is interesting to note that the estimated photoreactivities from the DNA gel mobility shift assays paralleled the in vitro light EC50 trends in HL-60 cells but not in SK-MEL-28 cells. The cell-free DNA damage experiment may not correlate with cellular PDT effects given that DNA might not be the intracellular biological target and that uptake, efflux, and metabolism affect such relationships. Regardless, the experiments point toward notable DNA interactions for this new class of compounds that includes light-induced single-strand breaks and condensation, as well as the ability to unwind the DNA helix. Whether some of these interactions (such as those observed in the dark for 4b, 4h, and 4k) result in the observed dark cytotoxicity, relative to many of the non-cyclometalated Ru(II) systems, remains to be discovered.

**CONCLUSION**

A novel series of heteroleptic ruthenium(II) complexes derived from pyrrole-2-carboxylate thionoesters were synthesized in excellent yield, demonstrating that use of a thiocarbonyl group as a chelating moiety in the bidentate ligand system serves to address the problems of poor reactivity encountered with the
analogous all-oxygen 2-carboxylate pyrroles. All complexes synthesized were characterized using $^1$H and $^{13}$C NMR and UV/vis spectroscopy, and X-ray crystallography was used to confirm the binding mode and gain structural information. Photobiological activity of selected complexes was assessed in HL-60 and SK-MEL-28 cells, and dark toxicity was further probed in normal skin fibroblasts. All of the compounds demonstrated in vitro PDT effects, and some were among the most potent reported to date. The selectivity exhibited by some demonstrated in vitro PDT probed in normal skin.

Photobiological activity of selected complexes was assessed in vitro PDT probed in normal skin.

**Inorganic Chemistry**

Highlights the rich diversity yet to be exploited in medicinal compounds varied by cell line and by light treatment condition. More importantly that all of the compounds are capable of indicating that DNA could be an intracellular target, but interacted strongly with DNA in cell-free experiments, and were characterized using $^{1}$H and $^{13}$C NMR and ESI-MS.

**暗光−条件下生长率 550 000 cells per milliliter by removing old culture medium and rinsing the cell layer once with Dulbecco’s phosphate-buffered saline (DPBS IX, Mediatech, 21−031-CV) followed by dissociation of the cell monolayer with 1X Trypsin−EDTA solution (0.25% w/v Trypsin/0.53 mM EDTA, ATCC 30−2101)). Complete growth medium was added to the cell suspension to allow complete growth medium was prepared in 200 mL portions as needed by combining RPMI 1640 (160 mL) and FBS (40 mL, pre aliquoted, and heat inactivated) in a 250 mL Millipore vacuum sterilizer (0.22 μm) and filtering.

**Cytotoxicity and Photocytotoxicity.** Cell viability experiments were performed in triplicate in 96-well ultralow attachment flat bottom microtiter plates (Corning Costar, Acton, MA), where outer wells along the periphery contained 200 μL of DPBS (2.68 mM potassium chloride, 1.47 mM potassium phosphate monobasic, 8.10 mM sodium phosphate dibasic, 2.68 mM potassium chloride, and 0.137 M sodium chloride (no Ca$^{2+}$ or Mg$^{2+}$)). DMSO in the assay wells was under 0.1% at the highest complex concentration.

**HL-60 Cell Culture.** HL-60 human promyelocytic leukemia cells (ATCC CCL-240) were cultured at 37 °C under 5% CO$2$ in RPMI 1640 (Mediatech Media MT-10−040-CV) supplemented with 20% fetal bovine serum (FBS; PAA Laboratories, A15−701) and were passaged three to four times per week according to standard aseptic procedures. Cultures were started at 200 000 cells per milliliter in 25 cm$^2$ tissue culture flasks and were subcultured when growth reached 800 000 cells mL$^{-1}$ to avoid senescence associated with prolonged high cell density. Complete growth medium was prepared in 200 mL portions as needed by combining RPMI 1640 (160 mL) and FBS (40 mL, pre aliquoted, and heat inactivated) in a 250 mL Millipore vacuum sterilizer (0.22 μm) and filtering.

**CDD-1064Sk Cell Culture.** Adherent CDD-1064Sk normal skin fibroblasts (ATCC CRL-2076) were cultured in Iscove’s Modified Dulbecco’s Medium (IMDM) supplemented with 10% FBS (PAA Laboratories, A15−701), incubated at 37 °C under 5% CO$2$ and were passaged two to three times per week according to standard aseptic procedures. CDD-1064Sk cells were started at 200 000 cells per milliliter in 75 cm$^2$ tissue culture flasks and were subcultured when growth reached 550 000 cells per milliliter by removing old culture medium and rinsing the cell layer once with Dulbecco’s phosphate-buffered saline (DPBS IX, Mediatech, 21−031-CV) supplemented with 10% FBS and were incubated at 37 °C under 5% CO$2$ and passaged two to three times per week according to standard aseptic procedures. SK-MEL-28 cells were started at 200 000 cells per milliliter in 75 cm$^2$ tissue culture flasks and were subcultured when growth reached 550 000 cells per milliliter by removing old culture medium and rinsing the cell layer once with Dulbecco’s phosphate-buffered saline (DPBS IX, Mediatech, 21−031-CV) followed by dissociation of the cell monolayer with 1X Trypsin−EDTA solution (0.25% w/v Trypsin/0.53 mM EDTA, ATCC 30−2101)). Complete growth medium was added to the cell suspension to allow appropriate aliquots of cells to be transferred to new cell vessels. Complete growth medium was prepared in 150 mL portions as needed by combining EMEM (15 mL) and FBS (15 mL, pre aliquoted, and heat inactivated) in a 250 mL Millipore vacuum sterilizer (0.22 μm) and filtering.

**CDD-1064Sk Cell Culture.** Adherent CDD-1064Sk normal skin fibroblasts (ATCC CRL-2076) were cultured in Iscove’s Modified Dulbecco’s Medium (IMDM) supplemented with 10% FBS (PAA Laboratories, A15−701), incubated at 37 °C under 5% CO$2$ and were passaged two to three times per week according to standard aseptic procedures. CDD-1064Sk cells were started at 200 000 cells per milliliter in 75 cm$^2$ tissue culture flasks and were subcultured when growth reached 550 000 cells per milliliter by removing old culture medium and rinsing the cell layer once with Dulbecco’s phosphate-buffered saline (DPBS IX, Mediatech, 21−031-CV) followed by dissociation of the cell monolayer with 1X Trypsin−EDTA solution (0.25% w/v Trypsin/0.53 mM EDTA, ATCC 30−2101)). Complete growth medium was added to the cell suspension to allow appropriate aliquots of cells to be transferred to new cell vessels. Complete growth medium was prepared in 150 mL portions as needed by combining EMEM (15 mL) and FBS (15 mL, pre aliquoted, and heat inactivated) in a 250 mL Millipore vacuum sterilizer (0.22 μm) and filtering.
medium (25 μL) and placed in a 37 °C, 5% CO2 water-jacketed incubator (Thermo Electron Corp., FormaSeries II, model 3110, HEPA Class 100) for 3 h to equilibrate (and allow for efficient cell attachment in the case of adherent cells). Ru-based compounds were serially diluted with DPBS and prewarmed at 37 °C before 25 μL aliquots of the appropriate dilutions were added to cells. PS-treated microplates were incubated at 37 °C under 5% CO2 for 16 h drug-to-light intervals. Control microplates not receiving a light treatment were kept in the dark in an incubator, and light-treated microplates were irradiated under one of the following conditions: visible light (400–700 nm, 34.2 mW cm−2) using a 190 W BenQ MS S10 overhead projector or red light (625 nm, 29.1 mW cm−2) from an LED array (PhotoDynamic Inc., Halifax, NS). Irradiation times using these two light sources were ∼49 and 57 min, respectively, to yield total light doses of 100 J cm−2. Both untreated and light-treated microplates were incubated for another 48 h before 10 μL aliquots of prewarmed Alamar Blue reagent (Life Technologies DAL 1025) were added to all sample wells and subsequently incubated for another 15 h. Fluorescence was quantified using a fluorescence microplate reader with the excitation filter set at 620 ± 40 nm and emission filter set at 530 ± 25 nm and emission filter set at 620 ± 40 nm. EC50 values for cytotoxicity (dark) and photo-cytotoxicity (light) were calculated from sigmoidal fits of the dose–response curves using Graph Pad Prism 6.0 according to eq 1 (below), where yi and yf are the initial and final fluorescence signal intensities. For cells growing in log phase and of the same passage number, EC50 values are generally reproducible to within ±25% in the sub-micromolar regime, ±10% below 10 μM, and ±5% above 10 μM. Phototherapeutic indices (PIs), a measure of the therapeutic window, were calculated from the ratio of dark to light EC50 values obtained from the dose–response curves.

\[
y = \frac{y_i + \frac{y_f}{1 + 10 \exp[(\log EC_{50} - x) \times (Hill slope)]}}{y_f}
\]  

**DNA Mobility-Shift Assays.** DNA modification by compounds 4a–c, 4h, 4j, and 4k was assessed according to a standard plasmid DNA gel mobility shift assay with 30 μL total sample volumes in 0.5 μL microfuge tubes. Transformed pUC19 plasmid (3 μL, N 95% form I) was added to 15 μL of 5 mM Tris-HCl buffer supplemented with 50 mM NaCl (pH 7.5). Serial dilutions of the Ru(II) compounds were prepared in doubly distilled water (ddH2O) and added in 7.5 μL aliquots to appropriate tubes to yield final Ru(II) concentrations ranging from 1 to 100 μM. Then, ddH2O (4.5 μL) was added to bring the final assay volumes to 30 μL. Control samples with no metal complex received 12 μL of water. Sample tubes were incubated at 37 °C before 25 μL aliquots of the appropriate tubes were incubated for another 48 h before 10 μL aliquots of prewarmed Alamar Blue reagent (Life Technologies DAL 1025) were added to all sample wells and subsequently incubated for another 15 h. Cell viability was determined on the basis of the ability of the Alamar Blue reagent to be metabolically converted to a fluorescent dye by only live cells. Fluorescence was quantified using a CytoFluor 4000 fluorescence microplate reader with the excitation filter set at 530 ± 25 nm and emission filter set at 620 ± 40 nm. EC50 values for cytotoxicity (dark) and photo-cytotoxicity (light) were calculated from sigmoidal fits of the dose–response curves using Graph Pad Prism 6.0 according to eq 1 (below), where yi and yf are the initial and final fluorescence signal intensities. For cells growing in log phase and of the same passage number, EC50 values are generally reproducible to within ±25% in the sub-micromolar regime, ±10% below 10 μM, and ±5% above 10 μM. Phototherapeutic indices (PIs), a measure of the therapeutic window, were calculated from the ratio of dark to light EC50 values obtained from the dose–response curves.

\[
y = \frac{y_i + \frac{y_f}{1 + 10 \exp[(\log EC_{50} - x) \times (Hill slope)]}}{y_f}
\]  
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