Supporting Information

Efficient Fluorescent Chemosensor for HSO₄⁻ Based on a Strategy of Anion-Induced Rotation-Displaced H-Aggregates

Jiajia Chang,^a Chang Liu,^a Yan Lu,^a Song He,^a Liancheng Zhao^{a, b} and Xianshun Zeng^{*a}

^a Key Laboratory of Display Materials & Photoelectric Devices, Ministry of Education, Department of Materials Chemistry, School of Materials Science & Engineering, Tianjin University of Technology, Tianjin 300384, China.

^b School of Materials Science & Engineering, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin 150001, China.

Materials and methods

1. Instruments

All solvents and reagents (analytical grade and spectroscopic grade) were obtained commercially and used as received. NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker spectrometer at 400 (¹H NMR) MHz and 100 (¹³C NMR) MHz. Chemical shifts (δ values) were reported in ppm down field from internal Me₄Si (¹H and ¹³C NMR). High-resolution mass spectra (HRMS) were acquired on an Agilent 6510 Q-TOF LC/MS instrument (Agilent Technologies, Palo Alto, CA) equipped with an electrospray ionization (ESI) source. Elemental analyses were performed on a Vanio-EL elemental analyzer (Analysensystem GmbH, Germany). UV absorption spectra were recorded on a UV-3600 UV-VIS spectrophotometer (Shimadzu, Japan). Fluorescence measurements were performed using an F-4600 fluorescence spectrophotometer (Hitachi, Japan). Melting points were recorded on a Boethius Block apparatus and are uncorrected.

2. Synthesis of L1-L4

2.1 Synthesis of L1



To a 50 ml flask, was charged N-methyl-2,3,3'-trimethylindolium iodide (602 mg, 2.0 mmol), 4-hyrdoxybenzoaldehyde (244 mg, 2 mmol) and anhydrous ethanol (15 mL). The reaction mixture was washed with nitrogen flow for 30 min to remove oxygen, and then stirred at 80 °C for 72 h in dark. After cooling to room temperature, the solvent was removed under reduced pressure. The residue was dissolved

in DMF (10 mL) and NaBF₄ (1.10 g, 10.0 mmol) was added in one portion to the solution. The suspension was stirred for another 3 h in dark at room temperature. The suspension was filtered through a short celite column and the filtrate was condensed to dryness under reduced pressure. The residue was recrystallized from acetonitrile (10 mL) and dichloromethane (10 mL). **L1** was obtained as a brownish powder (0.606 g) in 83% yield; mp: 113 °C-116 °C; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z: $[M - BF_4^-]^+$ Calcd for C₁₉H₂₀NO 278.1545; Found 278.1546; ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO-d₆) (δ , ppm) 8.35 (d, 1H, *J* = 16.4 Hz, ethenyl), 8.12 (d, 2H, *J* = 8.8 Hz, phenyl), 7.83 (d, 2H, *J* = 7.2 Hz, indolinyl), 7.61(t, 1H, *J* = 7.2 Hz, indolinyl), 7.57 (t, 1H, *J* = 7.2 Hz, indolinyl), 7.45(d, 1H, *J* = 16.4 Hz, ethenyl), 6.95 (d, 2H, *J* = 8.8 Hz, phenyl), 4.07 (s, 3H, N-Me), 1.76 (s, 6H, Me); ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, DMSO-d₆) (δ , ppm) 182.37, 163.93, 154.61, 144.13, 142.78, 134.58, 129.82, 129.73, 129.99, 123.75, 117.29, 115.66, 110.35, 52.71, 35.22, 26.66; Calcd for C₁₉H₂₀BF₄NO·0.5CH₂Cl₂: C 57.45, H 5.19, N 3.44; Found: C 57.15, H 5.42, N, 3.37.

2.2 Synthesis of L2



The reaction was performed with 3,5-dimethoxyl-4-hydroxybenzoaldehyde (0.364 g, 2.0 mmol) and N-methyl-2,3,3'-trimethylindolium iodide (0.602 g, 2.0 mmol) by using the same method as that for **L1**. A yellow solid was obtained (0.655 g): Yield 77%; mp 222-224 °C; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z: $[M - BF_4^-]^+$ Calcd for C₂₁H₂₄NO₃ 338.1756; Found 338.1760; ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO-d₆) (δ , ppm) 8.39 (d, 1H, *J* = 16.0 Hz, ethenyl), 7.89 (d, 1H, *J* = 8.4 Hz, indolinyl), 7.86 (d, 1H, *J* = 8.4 Hz, indolinyl), 7.68-7.60 (m, 4H, indolinyl, aryl), 7.50 (d, 1H, *J* = 16.0 Hz, ethenyl), 4.16 (s, 3H, N-Me), 3.95 (s, 6H, OMe), 1.83 (s, 6H, Me); ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, DMSO-d₆) (δ , ppm) 181.70, 155.04, 149.24, 144.05, 142.81, 129.72, 129.46, 125.95, 123.64, 115.38, 110.20, 110.07, 57.42, 52.53, 34.97, 26.66; Calcd for C₂₁H₂₄BF₄NO₃: C, 59.32; H, 5.69; N, 3.29; Found: C 59.18, H 5.58, N, 3.19.

2.3 Synthesis of L3



The reaction was performed with 3-hydroxybenzoaldehyde (0.244 g, 2.0 mmol) and

N-methyl-2,3,3'-trimethylindolium iodide (0.602 g, 2.0 mmol) by using the same method as that for L1. A yellow solid was obtained (0.621 g): Yield 85%; 216-218 °C; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z: $[M - BF_4^-]^+$ Calcd for C₁₉H₂₀NO 278.1545; Found 278.1545; Calcd: 278.1539; ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO-d₆) (δ , ppm) 8.33 (d, 1H, J = 16.4 Hz, ethenyl), 7.93-7.87 (m, 2H, indolinyl, phenyl), 7.65-7.41 (m, 5H, indolinyl, phenyl, ethenyl), 7.39 (t, 1H, J = 8.0 Hz, phenyl), 7.05 (dd, 1H, J = 8.0 Hz; 2.0 Hz, phenyl), 4.16 (s, 3H, N-Me), 1.78 (s, 6H, Me); ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, DMSO-d₆) (δ , ppm) 182.92, 158.72, 154.08, 144.56, 142.76, 136.78, 131.20, 130.47, 129.96, 123.85, 122.59, 121.29, 117.34, 116.26, 114.18, 53.25, 35.60, 26.22; Calcd for C₁₉H₂₀BF₄NO: C 62.49, H 5.52, N 3.84; Found: C 62.45, H 5.46, N, 3.66.

2.4 Synthesis of L4



The reaction was performed with 4-methoxyl-3-hydroxybenzoaldehyde (0.304 g, 2.0 mmol) and N-methyl-2,3,3'-trimethylindolium iodide (0.602 g, 2.0 mmol) by using the same method as that for L1. A yellow solid was obtained (0.656 g): Yield 83%; mp 216-218 °C; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z: [M - BF₄-]⁺ Calcd for C₂₀H₂₂NO₂ 308.1651; Found 308.1650; ¹H NMR (400 MHz, DMSO-d₆) (δ , ppm) 9.39 (s, 1H, OH), 8.30 (d, 1H, *J* = 16.4 Hz, ethenyl), 7.86-7.81 (m, 2H, phenyl, indolinyl), 7.71 (dd, 1H, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2.0 Hz, indolinyl), 7.66(d, 1H, *J* = 2.0 Hz, phenyl), 7.62-7.55 (m, 2H, indolinyl), 7.43(d, 1H, *J* = 16.4 Hz, ethenyl), 7.14 (d, 1H, *J* = 8.4 Hz, phenyl), 4.09 (s, 3H, N-Me), 3.92 (s, 3H, OMe), 1.76 (s, 6H, Me); ¹³C NMR (100 MHz, DMSO-d₆) (δ , ppm) 182.34, 154.56, 154.01, 147.84, 144.18, 142.74, 129.78, 128.65, 126.65, 123.72, 116.63, 115.70, 112.93, 111.23, 57.00, 52.74, 35.14, 26.50; Calcd for C₂₀H₂₂BF₄NO₂: C, 60.78; H, 5.61; N, 3.54; Found: C 60.81, H 5.37, N, 3.32.

3. Solutions for Spectroscopy.

The fluorescence and absorption titrations were carried out in ethanol-water (1:1, v/v). The dyes **L1-L4** and anions were dissolved in ethanol-deionized (v/v, 1 : 1) to obtain 10⁻³ M stock solutions. Before spectroscopic measurements, the solution was freshly prepared by diluting the high concentration stock solution to the corresponding solution. All of the experiments were performed at barometric pressure and room temperature.



Fig. S1 UV-vis responses of the chemosensor **L1** (10 μ M) upon the addition of the sodium salts (10.0 equiv) of PO₄³⁻, HPO₄²⁻, H₂PO₄⁻, NO₃⁻, SO₄²⁻, HSO₄⁻, Cl⁻, CO₃²⁻, F⁻, and Ac⁻ in H₂O-EtOH (1:1,v/v).



Fig. S2 UV-vis responses of the chemosensor **L2** (10 μ M) upon the addition of the sodium salts (10.0 equiv) of PO₄³⁻, HPO₄²⁻, H₂PO₄⁻, NO₃⁻, SO₄²⁻, HSO₄⁻, Cl⁻, CO₃²⁻, F⁻, and Ac⁻ in H₂O-EtOH (1:1,v/v).



Fig. S3 UV-vis responses of L3 (10 μ M) upon the addition of the sodium salts (10.0 equiv) of PO₄³⁻, HPO₄²⁻, H₂PO₄⁻, NO₃⁻, SO₄²⁻, HSO₄⁻, Cl⁻, CO₃²⁻, F⁻, and Ac⁻ in H₂O-EtOH (1:1,v/v).



Fig. S4 UV-vis responses of L4 (10 μ M) upon the addition of the sodium salts (10.0 equiv) of PO₄³⁻, HPO₄²⁻, H₂PO₄⁻, NO₃⁻, SO₄²⁻, HSO₄⁻, Cl⁻, CO₃²⁻, F⁻, and Ac⁻ in H₂O-EtOH (1:1,v/v).



Figure S5. Fluorescence spectra of **L1** (10.0 μ M) upon the addition of the sodium salts (10.0 equiv.) of various anion in ethanol/H₂O (1 : 1, v/v). Inset: histogram representing the fluorescence changes of **L1** at 525 nm in the presence of anions. From 1 to 11: PO₄³⁻, HPO₄²⁻, H₂PO₄⁻, NO₃⁻, SO₄²⁻, HSO₄⁻, Cl⁻, CO₃²⁻, F⁻, Ac⁻, and **L1** alone. For the entire test, excitation and emission were performed at 434 and 525 nm.



Figure S6. Fluorescence spectra of L2 (10.0 μ M) upon the addition of the sodium salts (10.0 equiv.) of various anion in ethanol/H₂O (1 : 1, v/v). Inset: histogram representing the fluorescence changes of L2 at 552 nm in the presence of anions. From 1 to 11: PO₄³⁻, HPO₄²⁻, H₂PO₄⁻, NO₃⁻, SO₄²⁻, HSO₄⁻, Cl⁻, CO₃²⁻, F⁻, Ac⁻, and L2 alone. For the entire test, excitation and emission were performed at 458 and 562 nm.



Figure S7. Fluorescence spectra of L1 (10.0 μ M) upon the addition of sodium salts (10.0 equiv.) of various anion in ethanol/H₂O (1 : 1, v/v). Inset: Histogram representing the ratio changes of fluorescence intensities at 528 nm and 568 nm of L1 (10 μ M) in H₂O-EtOH (1: 1, v/v) in the presence of 10.0 equiv. of anions and L1 alone. 1: L1 + PO₄³⁻, 2: L1 + HPO₄²⁻, 3: L1 + H₂PO₄⁻, 4: L1 + NO₃⁻, 5: L1 + SO₄²⁻, 6: L1 + HSO₄⁻, 7: L1 + Cl⁻, 8: L1 + CO₃²⁻, 9: L1 + F, 10: L1 + Ac⁻ and 11: L1 alone. $\lambda_{ex} = 476$ nm.



Figure S8. Fluorescence spectra of L2 (10.0 μ M) upon the addition of the sodium salts (10.0 equiv.) of PO₄³⁻, HPO₄²⁻, H₂PO₄⁻, NO₃⁻, SO₄²⁻, HSO₄⁻, Cl⁻, CO₃²⁻, F⁻, and Ac⁻ in ethanol/H₂O (1 : 1, v/v). For the entire test, excitation was performed at 501 nm.



Figure S9. Absorption spectra for L1 (10.0 μ M) in the presence of 10 equiv. of HSO₄⁻ in EtOH-H₂O (1 : 1, v/v) at different temperatures: 23, 33, 43, 53, 63, 68, 73, 78, 80 °C. The red dash line represents the free L1.



Figure S10. Concentration-dependent UV/Vis absorption spectra. a) concentration-dependent UV/Vis absorption spectra of **L1** in ethanol/H₂O (1 : 1, v/v) from 5.0×10^{-6} M to 8.0×10^{-5} M; b) the concentration-dependent relationship of **L1** at 434 nm.



Figure S11. The linear changes of the absorbances of L1 at 434 nm (a) and at 541 nm (b) as a function of HSO_4^- concentration. For both a) and b), $[HSO_4^-]/[L1]: 0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0$ equivalents.



Figure S12. Curve of absorbance intensity ratio (A_{434}/A_{541}) of **L1** versus increasing concentration of HSO₄⁻. The concentration of **L1** was 10 μ M. The dissociation constant K_d was deduced to be 7.04×10^{-5} M (with correlation coefficient R = 0.997).



Figure S13. Job's plot of L1 in ethanol/H₂O (1:1, v/v) showing the 1:1 stoichiometry of the complex between HSO_4^- anion and L1. The total concentration of [L1] and [HSO_4^-] is 10⁻⁵ mol/L. Absorbance is recorded at 542 nm.



Figure S14. Absorption spectra of the chemosensor L2 (10.0 μ M) to increasing concentrations of HSO₄⁻ in H₂O-EtOH (1: 1, v/v). [HSO₄⁻]/[L2] = 0, 0.63, 1.26, 1.89, 2.52, 3.15, 3.77, 4.40, 5.03, 5.66, 6.29, 6.92, 8.18, 9.44, 13.21, 19.50, 32.08. Inset: the absorbances of L2 at 458 nm as a function of the HSO₄⁻ concentrations.



Figure S15. Curve of absorbances of L2 versus increasing concentration of HSO₄⁻. The concentration of L2 was 10 μ M. The dissociation constant K_d was deduced to be 3.91×10^{-5} M (with correlation coefficient R = 0.998).



Figure S16. Job's plot of L2 in ethanol/H₂O (1:1, v/v) showing the 1:1 stoichiometry of the complex between HSO₄⁻ and L2. The total concentration of [L2] and [HSO₄⁻] is 10^{-5} mol/L. Fluorescence intensity is recorded at 562 nm.



Figure 17. Fluorescent titration spectra of L1 (6.0 μ M) in the presence of different concentrations of HSO₄⁻ in ethanol-water (1 : 1, v/v), [HSO₄⁻]/[L1] = 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0, 1.4, 1.8, 2.2, 2.6, 3.0, 3.4, 3.8, 4.2, 4.6, 5.0, 5.4, 5.8, 6.2, 6.6, 7.0, 8.0, 8.6, 9.2, 10.0, 12.0, 14.0, 20.0, 30.0. Inset: the fluorescence intensities of L1 at 525 nm as a function of the HSO₄⁻ concentrations. $\lambda_{ex} = 434$ nm.



Figure 18. Fluorescent titration spectra of L2 (6.0 μ M) in the presence of different concentrations of HSO₄⁻ in ethanol-water (1 : 1, v/v), [HSO₄⁻]/[L2] = 0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, 4.5, 5.0, 5.5, 6.0, 6.5, 7.0, 7.5, 8.0, 8.5, 9.0, 9.5, 10.5, 11.5, 13.5, 17.5. Inset: the fluorescence intensities of L2 at 562 nm as a function of the HSO₄⁻ concentrations. $\lambda_{ex} = 458$ nm.



Figure S19. Curve of fluorescence intensity of L1 (6 μ M) at 568 nm versus increasing concentration of HSO₄. The dissociation constant K_d was deduced to be 5.86 \times 10⁻⁵ M (with correlation coefficient R = 0.9913).



Figure S20. Curve of fluorescence intensity ratio (F_{528}/F_{568}) of **L1** (6 µM) versus increasing concentration of HSO₄⁻. The dissociation constant K_d was deduced to be 6.68× 10⁻⁵ M (with correlation coefficient R = 0.9921).



Figure S21. a) Change in the ratio (($F_i - F_{L1}$)/($F_{HSO4} - F_{L1}$)) of fluorescence intensity of L1 at 525 nm upon the addition of 10 equiv. of HSO₄⁻ in the presence of 5 equiv. of back anions in ethanol-water (1 : 1, v/v). $\lambda_{ex} = 434$ nm. Slit: 10.0 nm. b) Change in the ratio (($F_i - F_{L2}$)/($F_{HSO4} - F_{L2}$)) of fluorescence intensity of L2 at 562 nm upon the addition of 10 equiv. of HSO₄⁻ in the presence of 5 equiv. of back anions in ethanols in ethanols in ethanols in ethanols in ethanols in ethanols in the ratio (($F_i - F_{L2}$)/($F_{HSO4} - F_{L2}$)) of fluorescence intensity of L2 at 562 nm upon the addition of 10 equiv. of HSO₄⁻ in the presence of 5 equiv. of back anions in ethanols in ethanols in ethanols in ethanols in the ratio ((I = 1, v/v). $\lambda_{ex} = 458$ nm. Slit: 10.0 nm.



Figure S22. pH profile. a) Profile of pH dependence of the fluorescence intensity of L1 at 525 nm in the absence and presence of HSO_4^- in ethanol-water (1 : 1, v/v). b) Profile of pH dependence of the fluorescence intensity of L2 at 562 nm in the absence and presence of HSO_4^- in ethanol-water (1 : 1, v/v).



Figure S23. Detection limits of L1 and L2. a) Emission at 525 nm of L1 (6 μ M) at different concentrations of HSO₄⁻ (0, 3.0 × 10⁻⁷, 4.2 × 10⁻⁶, 7.3 × 10⁻⁶, 1.12 × 10⁻⁵, 1.62 × 10⁻⁵, 2.12 × 10⁻⁵, 2.62 × 10⁻⁵, 3.12 × 10⁻⁵, 3.62 × 10⁻⁵, 6.6 × 10⁻⁵ M) added, normalized between the minimum emission (0.0 M HSO₄⁻) and the emission at 6.6 × 10⁻⁵ M HSO₄⁻. The detection limit was determined to be 1.0×10^{-7} M. b) Emission at 562 nm of L2 (6 μ M) at different concentrations of HSO₄⁻ (0, 1.0 × 10⁻⁶, 2.0 × 10⁻⁶, 3.0 × 10⁻⁶, 4.0 × 10⁻⁶, 5.0 × 10⁻⁶, 6.0 × 10⁻⁶, 7.0 × 10⁻⁶, 9.0 × 10⁻⁶, 1.0 × 10⁻⁵, 2.4 × 10⁻⁵ M) added, normalized between the minimum emission (0.0 M HSO₄⁻) and the emission at 2.4 × 10⁻⁵ M HSO₄⁻. The detection limit was determined to be 1.0 × 10⁻⁶, 4.0 × 10⁻⁶, 5.0 × 10⁻⁶, 6.0 × 10⁻⁶, 7.0 × 10⁻⁶, 9.0 × 10⁻⁶, 1.0 × 10⁻⁵, 2.4 × 10⁻⁵ M) added, normalized between the minimum emission (0.0 M HSO₄⁻) and the emission at 2.4 × 10⁻⁵ M HSO₄⁻. The detection limit was determined to be 1.0 × 10⁻⁶ M.



Figure S24. ¹H NMR of the chemosensor L1 (400 MHz, DMSO-d₃).



Figure S25. ¹³C NMR of the chemosensor L1 (100 MHz, DMSO-d₆).



Figure S26. ¹H NMR of the chemosensor L2 (400 MHz, DMSO-d₆).



Figure S27. ¹³C NMR of the chemosensor L2 (100 MHz, DMSO-d₆).



Figure S28. ¹H NMR of the chemosensor L3 (400 MHz, DMSO-d₆).



Figure S29. ¹³C NMR of the chemosensor L3 (100 MHz, DMSO-d₆).



Figure S30. ¹H NMR of the chemosensor L4 (400 MHz, DMSO-d₆).



Figure S31. ¹³C NMR of the chemosensor L4 (100 MHz, DMSO-d₆).