

## Effect of ionic strength on complex equilibria between lanthanide metal ions and substituted pyrazole in dioxane -water mixture

G.H. MURHEKAR\*, M.L. NARWADE and A.R. RAUT

Department of Chemistry, Government Vidarbha Institute of Science and Humanities,  
Amravati - 444 604 (India).

(Received: August 08, 2009; Accepted: October 15, 2009)

### ABSTRACT

The proton ligand stability constants of 3 (4'-chlorophenyl) - 4- benzoyl -5 (2-hydroxy phenyl) pyrazole (L) and metal ligand stability constants of Pr (III), Nd (III) and Sm (III) complexes have been investigated at 0.02, 0.04, 0.06, 0.08 and 0.1 M ionic strength in dioxane-water mixture, pH metrically. From the values of pK and logK, the values of thermodynamic constants at zero ionic strength can be calculated. The value of pK and logK are found to be decreased with increasing ionic strengths of 1M KNO<sub>3</sub> solution

**Key words:** Stability constants, ionic strength, lanthanide metal ions, pyrazole.

### INTRODUCTION

Substituted azoles have played an important role in many biological systems and used as a antibiotic, anticancer drugs<sup>1-5</sup>. Substituted pyrazoles play an important role in chelation and stability of complexes. Pyrazoles differ strongly from pyrazoline in its remarkable stability and more basic character. The important physical property of pyrazoles is the existence of tautomerism. Stability constants of transition metal ions complex with substituted pyrazoles was studied<sup>6-7</sup>. The influence of ionic strength on stability constant of Co (II), Sr (III), and Pr (III) complexes with substituted pyrazoles was reported<sup>8</sup>. The complexes of Pr (III) with substituted pyrazoles were studied by Davies *et al*<sup>9</sup>. Determination of stability constants of transition metal ions with substituted pyrazoles and oxazoles reported pH-metrically<sup>10</sup>. Stability

constants for the lanthanide metal complexes in aqueous Solution at 25°C and 0.5 M ionic strength has also reported<sup>11</sup>. Gupta *et al*<sup>12</sup> have determined the stability constants of transition metal ion complexes with disalicylamide at different ionic strength. Palaskar<sup>13</sup> have studied the effect of ionic strength and dielectric constant of Cu (II) 3-nitrophthalic acid, potentiometrically at different ionic strengths in aqueous medium. Ultrasonic promoted synthesis of substituted pyrazoles & studies on proton ligand stability constants of some substituted pyrazoles has reported recently<sup>14-15</sup>. Hence an attempt has been made to study the determination of proton - ligand stability constants and metal - ligand stability constants of Pr(III) & Nd(III) complexes with 3 (2'-chlorophenyl) - p4-pyridoyl -5 (2-hydroxy phenyl) pyrazole (L) at various ionic strength ( i.e. 0.02, 0.04, 0.06, 0.08, 0.1M ) at 28 ± 0.1°C in 70% dioxane - water mixture.

**EXPERIMENTAL**

The work has been studied by Calvin - Bjerrum pH - metric titration technique. All pH measurements were carried out with ELICO- LI 10 pH meter (accuracy  $\pm 0.05$  units) using combined electrode assembly at  $28 \pm 0.1^\circ\text{C}$ . Pr (III), Nd (III) and Sm(III) was used in the form of its nitrate and concentration was estimated by EDTA. Ethanol, sodium hydroxide, and  $\text{KNO}_3$ , were used are of A.R. Grade. The substituted pyrazoles is prepared by standard method<sup>16-17</sup>. It is insoluble in water and hence 70% dioxane- water (v/v) was used as a solvent.

**Calvin Bjerrum Titration Technique**

The titrations were carried out in an inert atmosphere of nitrogen. The ionic strength of solution was maintained constant by adding an appropriate amount of 1M  $\text{KNO}_3$  solution. The values were recorded by pH meter. These values converted to  $[\text{H}^+]$  values by applying the correction proposed by Van Uitert & Hass<sup>18</sup>.

**RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

Substituted pyrazoles may be considered as a monobasic acid having one replaceable  $\text{H}^+$  ion

**Table : Proton- ligand stability constants & metal- ligand stability constants at various ionic strength****Table 1a: For system: Pr(III) – L**

Ionic Strength( $\mu$ )	$\sqrt{\mu}$			pK	LogK <sub>1</sub>	logK <sub>2</sub>
0.02	0.1414	0.1238	0.1453	10.40	8.64	2.79
0.04	0.2000	0.1666	0.1355	9.62	7.60	2.00
0.08	0.2449	0.1967	0.1235	9.00	7.00	1.00
0.08	0.2828	0.2204	0.1066	8.72	6.55	0.89
0.10	0.3163	0.2402	0.0813	8.23	5.97	0.53

**Table 1b: For system: Nd(III) – L**

Ionic Strength( $\mu$ )				pK	LogK <sub>1</sub>	logK <sub>2</sub>
0.02	0.1414	0.1238	0.1453	10.40	8.80	3.00
0.04	0.2000	0.1666	0.1355	9.62	8.00	2.29
0.08	0.2449	0.1967	0.1235	9.00	7.75	1.90
0.08	0.2828	0.2204	0.1066	8.72	6.14	1.00
0.10	0.3163	0.2402	0.0813	8.23	5.55	0.63

**Table 1c: For Sm (III) – L**

Ionic Strength( $\mu$ )				pK	LogK <sub>1</sub>	logK <sub>2</sub>
0.02	0.1414	0.1238	0.1453	10.40	9.00	3.10
0.04	0.2000	0.1666	0.1355	9.62	8.24	3.98
0.08	0.2449	0.1967	0.1235	9.00	7.99	2.30
0.08	0.2828	0.2204	0.1066	8.72	7.20	2.15
0.10	0.3163	0.2402	0.0813	8.23	6.25	1.80

from phenolic OH group and can therefore be represented as



The titration data were used to construct the curve between volume of NaOH vs pH. They are called as acid titration curve, ligand titration curve and metal titration curve. The pK values of ligand and logK values of Pr(III), Nd(III) and Sm(III) complexes at various ionic strength were calculated by Irving and Rossotti's method [19]. It is shown in

table no. (1), (2) and (3) has given bellow. It could be seen from table (1), (2) and (3) that the pK and logK values are found to be decreases with increasing ionic strength.

The pK and logK values were employed to calculate the thermodynamic constants with the help of Bronster equation<sup>20</sup>.

$$\log K = \log K^0 + A \Delta Z^2 \sqrt{\mu} \quad \dots(1)$$

and

**Table 4: Thermodynamic dissociation constants pK<sup>0</sup> at zero ionic strength**

System	Plot	pK <sup>0</sup> and logK <sup>0</sup>
L	pK vs	12.55
	pK vs $\sqrt{\mu} / (1 + \mu)$	12.30
	pK vs $[\sqrt{\mu} - 0.3] / (1 + \mu)$	11.76
L- Pr (III)	logK <sub>1</sub> vs	12.00
	logK <sub>1</sub> vs $\sqrt{\mu} / (1 + \mu)$	11.94
	logK <sub>1</sub> vs $[\sqrt{\mu} - 0.3] / (1 + \mu)$	11.00
	logK <sub>2</sub> vs	5.92
	logK <sub>2</sub> vs $\sqrt{\mu} / (1 + \mu)$	5.21
	logK <sub>2</sub> vs $[\sqrt{\mu} - 0.3] / (1 + \mu)$	4.53
L-Nd (III)	logK <sub>1</sub> vs	10.59
	logK <sub>1</sub> vs $\sqrt{\mu} / (1 + \mu)$	11.02
	logK <sub>1</sub> vs $[\sqrt{\mu} - 0.3] / (1 + \mu)$	11.16
	logK <sub>2</sub> vs	4.57
	logK <sub>2</sub> vs $\sqrt{\mu} / (1 + \mu)$	5.03
	logK <sub>2</sub> vs $[\sqrt{\mu} - 0.3] / (1 + \mu)$	5.57
L-Sm(III)	logK <sub>1</sub> vs	10.49
	logK <sub>1</sub> vs $\sqrt{\mu} / (1 + \mu)$	10.80
	logK <sub>1</sub> vs $[\sqrt{\mu} - 0.3] / (1 + \mu)$	10.96
	logK <sub>2</sub> vs	4.49
	logK <sub>2</sub> vs $\sqrt{\mu} / (1 + \mu)$	4.98
	logK <sub>2</sub> vs $[\sqrt{\mu} - 0.3] / (1 + \mu)$	5.01

Table 5 : Slopes and “Z<sup>2</sup> values from the plots of pK and logK Vs

System	pK vs		logK <sub>1</sub> vs		logK <sub>2</sub> vs	
	Slope	z <sup>2</sup>	Slope	z <sup>2</sup>	Slope	z <sup>2</sup>
L	0.59	0.37	-	-	-	-
L – Pr (III)	-	-	0.466	0.189	0.267	0.140
L – Nd (III)	-	-	0.219	0.064	0.125	0.072
L-Sm(III)	-	-	0.118	0.057	0.120	0.059

Table 6: Values of “Z<sup>2</sup>

System	Constants	Reaction equilibria	Value of “Z <sup>2</sup>	
			Expected	Observed
L	pK	HL <sup>-</sup> ↔ H <sup>+</sup> + L <sup>-</sup>	0.279	0.879
Pr(III) - L	log K <sub>1</sub>	Pr <sup>3+</sup> + L <sup>-</sup> ↔ H <sup>+</sup> + (Pr L) <sup>+</sup>	- 2.000	-7.00
	log K <sub>2</sub>	(Pr L) <sup>+</sup> + L <sup>-</sup> ↔ Pr L <sub>2</sub>	- 0.117	- 0.288
Nd(III)-L	log K <sub>1</sub>	Nd <sup>3+</sup> +L <sup>-</sup> ↔ H <sup>+</sup> + (Nd L) <sup>2+</sup>	- 0.175	- 0.600
	log K <sub>2</sub>	(Nd L) <sup>2+</sup> +L <sup>-</sup> ↔ (Nd L <sub>2</sub> ) <sup>+</sup>	- 0.139	-0.500
Sm(III)-L	log K <sub>1</sub>	Sm <sup>3+</sup> +L <sup>-</sup> ↔ H <sup>+</sup> + (Sm L) <sup>2+</sup>	- 0.173	- 0.588
	log K <sub>2</sub>	(Sm L) <sup>2+</sup> +L <sup>-</sup> ↔ (Sm L <sub>2</sub> ) <sup>+</sup>	- 0.132	- 0.432

$$pK = pK^0 - A \Delta Z^2 - \sqrt{\mu} \quad \dots(2)$$

Where, A – Debye-Huckel constant,  $\Delta Z^2$ -Difference in the square of the charges of product and reactant ions,  $K^0$  – Is the formation constant at zero ionic strength,  $\mu$  - ionic strength

The values of pK, logK<sub>1</sub>, and logK<sub>2</sub> were plotted against the values of  $\sqrt{\mu}$ . The plot of logK vs  $\sqrt{\mu}$  and pK, vs  $\sqrt{\mu}$  gave straight lines. The magnitude of  $\Delta Z^2$  and slope were calculated from graphs. The data obtained of pK and logK values could be utilized to know the mechanism of complex equilibria. The expected and observed values for  $\Delta Z^2$  values for the corresponding dissociation and association equilibria are given below.

It is observed from the table-05, that the slope values of pK and are more than expected values, while the logK values are less than expected

values. Those values do not give conclusive evidence regarding the magnitude of the charges of reacting species. The discrepancy may be due to the limited applicability of Bronsted equation.

The plots of pK, logK Vs  $\sqrt{\mu}$ ,  $\log K_1 / (1 + \sqrt{\mu})$  and  $[\log K_2 - 0.3 \sqrt{\mu}] / (1 + \sqrt{\mu})$

are also plotted and slope values were determined. It shows that modified Debye -Huckel equation also not show much more improvement in the slope values. The discrepancy observed and expected slope value was thought to be due to the concentration and did not activity terms used in the equation of stability constants.

#### Thermodynamic stability constants

The thermodynamic stability constants observed from various plots at zero ionic strength are presented in table - 04.

It can be seen that there is good an agreement among thermodynamic constants obtained from various plots.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are very thankful to the Director, Govt. Vidarbha Institute of Science and Humanities, Amravati for providing necessary research facilities.

#### REFERENCES

1. Patel H.D.; Mistry B.D. *Orient. J. Chem*, **19**(2): (2003).
2. Knorr L.; *Ber dt, chem.Ges*, **16**: 2579, (1963).
3. Banerjea D.; *Asian J. Chem.*, **19**(1): 787-789 (2007).
4. Banerajea D.; *J ind. Chem. Soc.*, **80**: 459 (2003).
5. Sanjay Kumar, Kapour G. and Surolia,; *Synthetic Comm.*, **36**(2): 215-226 (2006).
6. Jamode V. S. and Kale A. S.; *Asian J. Chem*, **19**(1): 787-789 (2007).
7. Lukic S.R., Leovac V. M.; *Nano metal org. Chem.*, **32**(05): 873-884 (2004).
8. Agrawal P.B. Narwade M. L.; *Orient J. Chem* **17**(1): (2001).
9. Grahman M. D., Harry A. and Michael D. W.; *Acta Cryst*, **61**: 221-223 (2005).
10. Agrawal P.B., Diman A.A. and Wadodkar K.N.; *Orient J. Chem.*, **16**(1): 169-170 (2000).
11. Manchery P.M. and Jefferery James; *J. sol. Chem.*, **18**(18): 735-742 (1989).
12. Gupta A and Pannu B.S; *Asian J. Chem.*, **6**(1): 1742 (1994).
13. Palaskar N.G. and Samyak ; *J. of Chem.*, 26-29 (1998).
14. Parmar P.J., Patil K.N., and Narwarde M.L. ; *Act Ciencia Indica*, XXXII(02) (2006).
15. Saleh TS., and El -Rahman NMA ; *Ultrasonic Sonochem*, **16**(2) (2009).
16. Murhekar G. H. *M. Phil. Dissertation*, SGB Amravati University Amravati , (2008).
17. Vogel A.I.; *A text book of practical organic chemistry* , 177 (1956).
18. Van Uitert L.G., and Hass C. ; *J. Am. Chem Soc* **75**(1): 451 (1953).
19. Irving H. and Rossotti H. ; *J.Chem. Soc*, 2904 (1954) .
20. Amis E.S.; *Solvent effect on relations rates and mechanism* academic press, New York, 24 (1966).