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## 1. Photophysical characterization

Absorption spectra were recorded on a PG T80/T80+ or a Varian Cary 100 Bio spectrophotometer at rt. Fluorescence measurements were performed on a FS5 Edinburgh Instruments spectrometer by use of slits corresponding to the bandpass of 1.00 nm for the excitation and 1.50 nm for the emission. The fluorescence spectra were corrected with respect to the fluctuations in lamp intensity and detection optics. The samples were dissolved in acetonitrile and the concentrations were adjusted to absorbances of less than 0.1 at the excitation wavelengths 280 , 290, and 300 nm . The solutions were purged by $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ for 20 min prior to the measurements. The measurements were conducted at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.


Figure S1. Normalized excitation ( $\lambda_{\mathrm{em}}=400 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) and emission $\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=290 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$ spectra of 2aminobiphenyl (1) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$.


Figure S2. Normalized excitation ( $\lambda_{\mathrm{em}}=400 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) and emission $\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=290 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$ spectra of 3aminobiphenyl (2) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$.


Figure S3. Normalized excitation $\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{em}}=400 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$ and emission $\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=290 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$ spectra of 4aminobiphenyl (3) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$.


Figure S4. Fluorescence spectra of 2-aminobiphenyl (1) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ at different water concentration (left) and the corresponding Stern-Volmer plot (right).


Figure S5. Fluorescence spectra of 3-aminobiphenyl (2) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ at different water concentration (left) and the corresponding Stern-Volmer plot (right).


Figure S6. Fluorescence spectra of 4-aminobiphenyl (3) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ at different water concentration (left) and the corresponding Stern-Volmer plot (right).

The following equation was used for the determination of fluorescence quantum yields:
$\Phi=\Phi_{\mathrm{R}} \frac{I}{I_{\mathrm{R}}} \frac{A_{\mathrm{R}}}{A}\left(\frac{n_{D}}{n_{D}^{R}}\right)^{2}$
wherein
$\Phi_{\mathrm{f}}$ - quantum yield of fluorescence
$\Phi_{\mathrm{R}}$ - quantum yield of fluorescence of reference compound, $N$-acetyltryptophanamide in water (0.12)
$I$ - intensity of fluorescence (integral of the corrected emission spectrum)
$I_{\mathrm{R}}$ - intensity of fluorescence (integral of the corrected emission spectrum) for the reference compound
$A$ - absorbance of the solution at the excitation wavelength
$A_{\mathrm{R}}-$ absorbance of the solution of the reference compound at the excitation wavelength $n_{\mathrm{D}}$ - refractive index of the solvent (acetonitrile)
$n_{D}{ }^{R}$ - refractive index of the solvent use to dissolve the reference compound (water)

Table S1. Stokes shifts and quantum yields of fluorescence for $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solutions of 1-3.

| Compound | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stokes shift $/ \mathbf{c m}^{\mathbf{- 1}}$ | 7047 | 6642 | 7525 |
| $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathbf{f}}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $0.21 \pm 0.04$ | $0.26 \pm 0.03$ | $0.55 \pm 0.05$ |

${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ Measured by use of $N$-acetyltryptophanamide in water as a reference ( $\Phi_{\mathrm{f}}=0.12$ ).

Time-correlated single photon counting (TC-SPC) measurements were performed on an Edinburgh Instruments FS5 spectrometer equipped with a pulsed laser at 280 nm . The duration of the pulse was $\approx 800 \mathrm{ps}$. The fluorescence signals at 370 or 390 nm were monitored over 1023 channels with the time increment of $\approx 20 \mathrm{ps} /$ channel. The decays were collected until they reached 3000 counts in the peak channel. A suspension of silica gel in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was used as a scattering solution to obtain instrument response function (IRF). Absorbances at the excitation wavelength were $<0.1$. Prior to the measurements the solutions were purged with a stream of nitrogen for 20 min . The measurement was performed at $\mathrm{rt}\left(25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$. Decays of fluorescence were fit to a sum of exponentials according to the following expression:
$F(t)=A+\alpha_{1} \exp \left(-\frac{t}{\tau_{1}}\right)+\alpha_{2} \exp \left(-\frac{t}{\tau_{2}}\right)+\alpha_{3} \exp \left(-\frac{t}{\tau_{3}}\right)+\ldots$


Figure S7. Decay of fluorescence of 2-aminobiphenyl (1) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ (left) at 390 nm ( $\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=282$ nm ) and weighted residuals between the fitted and experimental values (right).


Figure S8. Decay of fluorescence of 3-aminobiphenyl (2) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ (left) at 390 nm ( $\lambda_{\text {ex }}=282$ nm ) and weighted residuals between the fitted and experimental values (right).


Figure S9. Decay of fluorescence of 4-aminobiphenyl (3) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ (left) at 370 nm ( $\lambda_{\text {ex }}=282$ nm ) and weighted residuals between the fitted and experimental values (right).

Table S2. Decay times from singlet excited state for $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solutions of $\mathbf{1 - 3}$ measured by TCSPC.

|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\tau_{1} / \mathrm{ps}$ | $70 \pm 20$ | $70 \pm 60$ | $40 \pm 30$ |
|  | $(0.07)^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $(0.02)$ | $(0.03)$ |
| $\tau_{2} / \mathrm{ns}$ | $2.54 \pm 0.01$ | $6.59 \pm 0.01$ | $6.28 \pm 0.01$ |
|  | $(0.93)$ | $(0.98)$ | $(0.97)$ |

${ }^{a}$ The values in the parenthesis correspond to contribution of decay component obtained from the pre-exponential factors.


Figure S10. Fluorescence spectra of $2\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=280 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1: 1)$ or $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (1:1), left: and the corresponding decays of fluorescence at 400 nm (right). The fitting data can be found in Table S3.


Figure S11. Fluorescence spectra of $\mathbf{3}\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=280 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1: 1)$ or $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (1:1), left: and the corresponding decays of fluorescence at 380 nm (right). The fitting data can be found in Table S3.

Table S3. Decay times ( $\tau_{1} / \mathrm{ps}, \tau_{2} / \mathrm{ns}$ ) from singlet excited state for $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (1:1) or $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-(1: 1)$ solutions of $\mathbf{1 - 3}$ measured by TC-SPC. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $30 \pm 30(0.05)^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $\approx 50(0.02)$ | $80 \pm 30(0.02)$ |
|  | $3.58 \pm 0.01(0.95)$ | $7.12 \pm 0.01(0.98)$ | $4.42 \pm 0.01(0.93)$ |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ | $170 \pm 50(0.03)$ | $80 \pm 50(0.02)^{2}$ | $20 \pm 20(0.02)$ |
|  | $4.70 \pm 0.01(0.97)$ | $6.98 \pm 0.01(0.98)$ | $4.63 \pm 0.01(0.93)$ |

${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ The solutions were not purged by $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ prior to the measurement. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ The values in parenthesis correspond to the decay contributions obtained from the pre-exponential factors.

## 2. Acid-base properties

## Determination of $\mathrm{p} \boldsymbol{K}_{\mathrm{a}}, \mathbf{U V}$-vis titration

A stock solution of 4-aminobiphenyl ( $\mathbf{3}, 3.88 \mathrm{mg}$ ) was prepared in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The prepared stock solution ( 5 mL ) was diluted to 25 mL with $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ and 5 mL of this solution was diluted to 25 mL with water. The diluted solution $\left(c=3.67 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ was titrated with a solution of sulfuric acid (three different solution of sulfuric acid were used: $c_{1}=1 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{M}, c_{2}$ $\left.=1 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{M}, c_{3}=1 \times 10^{-1} \mathrm{M}\right)$. After each addition of the acid, the pH -values were measured by a Mettler Toledo SevenMulti pH -meter and UV-vis spectra were recorded. The measurements were performed at $25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and the resulting spectra were processed by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis using the SPECFIT program. ${ }^{1}$ In the analysis surface was defined by all UV-vis spectra from 211 nm to 320 nm at different pH values.

A stock solution of 3-aminobiphenyl (2, 8.85 mg ) was prepared in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The prepared stock solution ( 5 mL ) was diluted to 10 mL with water and 5 mL of this solution was diluted to 25 mL with water. The diluted solution $\left(c=2.09 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}\right)$ was titrated with a solution of sulfuric acid. In the analysis surface was defined by all UV-vis spectra from 281 nm to 330 nm at different pH values.


Figure S12. Absorption spectra of $2\left(c_{0}=2.09 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1: 4)$ at different pH values (left), and dependence of the absorbance at 300 nm on pH (right). The black dots are the experimental values and the red line correspond to the model involving one step protonation equilibrium, the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ value of the ground state determined by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis is $3.94 \pm 0.03$.

A stock solution of 2-aminobiphenyl (1, 4.23 mg ) was prepared in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The prepared stock solution ( 5 mL ) was diluted to 25 mL with water. The diluted solution ( $c=2.00$ $\times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}$ ) was titrated with a solution of sulfuric acid. In the analysis surface was defined by all UV-vis spectra from 251 nm to 325 nm at different pH values.


Figure S13. Absorption spectra of $\mathbf{1}\left(c_{0}=2.00 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1: 4)$ at different pH values (left), and dependence of the absorbance at 295 nm on pH (right). The black dots are the experimental values and the red line correspond to the model involving one step protonation equilibrium, the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ value of the ground state determined by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis is $3.48 \pm 0.02$.

## Determination of $\mathrm{p} \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}}$ and $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}{ }^{*}$, fluorescence titration

A stock solution of 4-aminobiphenyl (3, 3.88 mg ) was prepared in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The prepared stock solution $(0.246 \mathrm{~mL})$ was diluted to 10 mL with $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ and 5 mL of this solution was diluted to 25 mL with water. The diluted solution $\left(c=4.51 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{M}\right)$ was titrated with a solution of sulfuric acid (four different solution of sulfuric acid were used: $c_{1}=1 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{M}, c_{2}$ $=1 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{M}, c_{3}=1 \times 10^{-1} \mathrm{M}$, and the fourth solution was concentrated sulfuric acid). After each addition of the acid, the pH -values were measured by a Mettler Toledo SevenMulti pH meter and fluorescence spectra were recorded by exciting sample at 260 nm and at 280 nm , by use of slits corresponding to the bandpass of 2.5 nm for the excitation and 5.0 nm for the emission. For the measurement of $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$, the pH values were varied in the range 5.38-2.78, and for the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}{ }^{*}$ in the range 2.64-0.59. The measurements were performed at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and the resulting spectra were processed by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis using the

SPECFIT program. In the analysis surface was defined by all fluorescence spectra from 340 nm to 450 nm at different pH values.



Figure S14. Fluorescence spectra $\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=260 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$ of $\mathbf{3}\left(c_{0}=4.51 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{M}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1: 4)$ at different pH values (left), and dependence of the fluorescence intensity at 382 nm on pH (right). The black dots are the experimental values and the red line correspond to the model involving one step protonation equilibrium, the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ value of the ground state determined by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis is is $3.80 \pm 0.04$.

A stock solution of 3-aminobiphenyl ( $2,8.85 \mathrm{mg}$ ) was prepared in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The prepared stock solution ( 0.85 mL ) was diluted to 25 mL with $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ and 5 mL of this solution was diluted to 25 mL with water. The diluted solution $\left(c=1.42 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ was titrated with a solution of sulfuric acid (four different solution of sulfuric acid were used: $c_{1}=1 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{M}, c_{2}$ $=1 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{M}, c_{3}=1 \times 10^{-1} \mathrm{M}$, and the fourth solution was concentrated sulfuric acid). After each addition of the acid, the pH -values were measured by a Mettler Toledo SevenMulti pH meter and fluorescence spectra were recorded by exciting sample at 280 nm and at 300 nm , by use of slits corresponding to the bandpass of 10 nm for the excitation and 2.5 nm for the emission. For the measurement of $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$, the pH values were varied in the range 4.70-2.16, and for the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}{ }^{*}$ in the range $1.42-0.08$. The measurements were performed at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and the resulting spectra were processed by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis using the SPECFIT program. In the analysis surface was defined by all fluorescence spectra from 375 nm to 475 nm at different pH values.


Figure S15. Fluorescence spectra ( $\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=280 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) of $2\left(c_{0}=1.42 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1: 4)$ at different pH values (left), and dependence of the fluorescence intensity at 411 nm on pH (right). The black dots are the experimental values and the red line correspond to the model involving one step protonation equilibrium, the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ value of the ground state determined by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis is $3.74 \pm 0.06$.


Figure S16. Fluorescence spectra $\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=280 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$ of $\mathbf{2}\left(c_{0}=1.42 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ at different pH values (left), and dependence of the fluorescence intensity at 411 nm on pH (right). The black dots are the experimental values and the red line correspond to the model involving one step protonation equilibrium, the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}{ }^{*}$ value of the excited state determined by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis is $0.15 \pm 0.03$.

A stock solution of 2-aminobiphenyl ( $1,4.08 \mathrm{mg}$ ) was prepared in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The prepared stock solution $(0.87 \mathrm{~mL})$ was diluted to 10 mL with $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ and 5 mL of this solution was diluted to 25 mL with water. The diluted solution $\left(c=1.67 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ was titrated with a solution of sulfuric acid (four different solution of sulfuric acid were used: $c_{1}=1 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{M}, c_{2}$ $=1 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{M}, c_{3}=1 \times 10^{-1} \mathrm{M}$, and the fourth solution was concentrated sulfuric acid). After
each addition of the acid, the pH -values were measured by a Mettler Toledo SevenMulti pH meter and fluorescence spectra were recorded by exciting sample at 260 nm and at 280 nm , by use of slits corresponding to the bandpass of 10 nm for the excitation and 2.5 nm for the emission. For the measurement of $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$, the pH values were varied in the range 5.38-2.34, and for the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}{ }^{*}$ in the range $1.56-0.09$. The measurements were performed at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and the resulting spectra were processed by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis using the SPECFIT program. In the analysis surface was defined by all fluorescence spectra from 370 nm to 470 nm at different pH values.



Figure S17. Fluorescence spectra ( $\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=280 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) of $\mathbf{1}\left(c_{0}=1.67 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1: 4)$ at different pH values (left), and dependence of the fluorescence intensity at 406 nm on pH (right). The black dots are the experimental values and the red line correspond to the model involving one step protonation equilibrium, the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ value of the ground state determined by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis is $3.27 \pm 0.02$.



Figure S18. Fluorescence spectra $\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=280 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$ of $\mathbf{1}\left(c_{0}=1.67 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ at different pH values (left), and dependence of the fluorescence intensity at 406 nm on pH (right). The black dots are the experimental values and the red line correspond to the model involving one step protonation equilibrium, the $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ * value of the excited state determined by multivariate nonlinear regression analysis is $0.56 \pm 0.04$.

## 3. Synthetic procedures

## $N, N$-dimethyl-2-aminobiphenyl



The compound was prepared according to the modification of the published procedure for the methylation of arylamines. ${ }^{2}$ In a flask ( 100 mL ), 2-aminobiphenyl ( $2.0 \mathrm{~g}, 12 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and sodium hydrogen phosphate ( $4.3 \mathrm{~g}, 30 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were suspended in dry DMF ( 25 mL ) and methyl iodide ( $4.5 \mathrm{~mL}, 72 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. The reaction mixture was stirred at rt for 24 h . The reaction mixture was diluted with water $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with ethyl acetate $(3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layers were combined, washed with brine $(2 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$ and distilled water ( $3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried over magnesium sulfate and concentrated in vacuum to afford 1.3 $\mathrm{g}(55 \%)$ of the product in the form of a yellowish oil.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 300 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta / \mathrm{ppm}: 7.53-7.51(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) 7.36(\mathrm{tt}, 2 \mathrm{H}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz})$ $7.26(\mathrm{tt}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 7.23 (ddd, $1 \mathrm{H}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 7.15 (dd, $1 \mathrm{H}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.05(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.98(\mathrm{dt}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=7.4$ $\mathrm{Hz}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.49(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 75 \mathrm{MHz}\right) \delta / \mathrm{ppm}: 151.1,142.0,134.4$, 131.1, 128.3, 127.9, 127.8, 126.1, 121.4, 117.4, 42.4.

## 4. Irradiation experiments

## Time dependence

2-aminobiphenyl ( $\mathbf{1}, 35 \mathrm{mg}$ ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(70 \mathrm{~mL})$. An aliquot ( 10 mL ) of the prepared solution was added to a quartz test tube and the prepared sample was diluted by solution of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL}, \mathrm{pD}=1.94)$. In this way, seven samples were prepared. Each sample was purged with nitrogen for 15 min and irradiated in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor ( 8 lamps, 300 nm ) over different time. After the irradiations, the samples were diluted with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with dichloromethane ( $3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated in vacuum. Deuterium incorporation was determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and MS.


2-aminobiphenyl (1) ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ): $\delta / \mathrm{ppm} 7.43$ (dd, $2 \mathrm{H}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=8.2$ Hz, H-3'), 7.40 (d, 2H, $J=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-2$ '), 7.33 (t, 1H, $J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-4$ '), 7.10 (dt, $J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, J$ $=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-4), 7.04(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-6), 6.83(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=7.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3), 6.77$ (dt, $J=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-5$ ).

Upon irradiation, the intensity of the signal at $\delta 7.40 \mathrm{ppm}$ corresponding to $\mathrm{H}-2^{\prime}$ is reduced (see Fig S20). Upon longer irradiation time, higher extend of D-exchange can be achieved, see NMR spectra at the end of this SI.


Figure S19. The dependence of the deuterium exchange at the positions 2 and 2' (marked positions) of the phenyl group in 2-aminobiphenyl (1) on photolysis time, determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (left) and the yield of mono- and dideuterated compound determined by MS (right, for MS data see Figure S 21 ). The irradiation was performed in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 2)$ at $\mathrm{pD} \approx 2$.


Figure S20. Expanded aromatic region of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ spectra of $\mathbf{1}$ before (bottom) and after (top) the photolysis ( $2 \mathrm{~h}, 300 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 2)$.


| 170.1 |  | 1257549 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 171.1 | 1 | 294099.34 |
| 172.1 | 1 | 32035.7 |



| 169 |  | 40914.48 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 170 |  | 2515595.75 |
| 171 | 1 | 752816.56 |
| 172.1 | 1 | 104845.41 |



| 170.1 |  | 925038.25 |
| ---: | :---: | ---: |
| 171.1 |  | 549233.06 |
| 172.1 | 1 | 140486.77 |



| 170.1 |  | 644811.88 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 171.1 |  | 660241.44 |
| 172.1 | 1 | 278381.06 |
| 173.1 | 1 | 51888.98 |

Figure S21. MS (ESI + ) data after irradiation ( 300 nm ) of $\mathbf{1}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 2)$ at $\mathrm{pD} \approx 2$, after $15 \mathrm{~min}, 30 \mathrm{~min}, 60 \mathrm{~min}$ and 120 min (from top to bottom); the right panels show ion abundances. The D-exchange content was plotted vs time and shown in Figure S19.

## Quantum yield of deuterium exchange in 2-aminobiphenyl

2-Aminobiphenyl (1) (3 mg) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ and a solution of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ $(\mathrm{pD}=2.05,1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The solution was purged with nitrogen for 15 min and irradiated 12 h at 254 nm (1 lamp) in a quartz cell for fluorescence measurements. After the irradiation, the samples were diluted with a saturated solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with dichloromethane ( $3 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate and concetrated in vacuum. The deuterium incorporation was determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and MS. As
a primary actinometer a solution of potassium iodide/iodate $\left(\Phi_{254}=0.74\right)^{3}$ was used, and as a secondary actinometer a solution of 2-phenylphenol ( 3 mg ) in a mixture of solvents ( 2.25 mL of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ and 0.75 mL of $\left.\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ was used $\left(\Phi_{254}=0.041\right) .{ }^{4}$ The measurement was performed in triplicate (Table S3).

The number of the absorbed photons for the $\mathrm{KIO}_{3} / \mathrm{KI}$ was calculated from:
$n($ absorbed photons $)=\frac{\Delta A_{352} \cdot V_{\text {irr }}}{\varepsilon_{352} \cdot l \cdot \Phi_{\text {lit }}}$
where:
$\Delta A_{352}$ - absorbance difference at 352 nm for the irradiated and non-irradiated sample $V_{\text {irr }}$ - volume of the solution which was irradiated
$\varepsilon_{352}$ - molar absorption coefficient for $\mathrm{I}_{3}{ }^{-}$in solution which contains iodides and iodates, 27600
$\mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$
$l$ - length of the optical path ( 1 cm in all experiments)
$\Phi_{\text {lit. }}$ - quantum yield ( $\Phi_{254}=0.74$ ), the precise value was calculated from:
$c\left(\mathrm{I}^{-}\right)=\frac{A_{300}}{1.061} \quad[\mathrm{M}]$
$\Phi=0.75 \cdot\left[1+0.02\left(\frac{T}{{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}}-20.7\right)\right] \cdot\left[1+0.23\left(\frac{c\left(\mathrm{I}^{-}\right)}{\mathrm{M}}-0.577\right)\right]$

Determination of quantum yield with the solution of 2-phenylphenol as a secondary actinometer:
$\Phi=\frac{\Delta I}{\Delta I_{\text {ref }}} \Phi_{\text {ref }}$
where:
$\Phi_{\text {ref }}$-quantum yield for 2-phenylphenol $\left(\Phi_{254}=0.041\right)$
$\Delta I$ - integral that corresponds to exchanged H -atoms at the position 2' (marked position) of the phenyl group
$\Delta I_{\text {ref }}$ - integral that corresponds to exchanged H-atoms at the position 2' (marked position) of the reference compound


reference compound
Structure of the studied compound (left) and the reference compound (right).
Table S4. Quantum yields of deuterium exchange in 2-aminobiphenyl (1) measured by two different methods.

| No. of Exp. | Primary Actinometer | Secondary Actinometer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $0.0144 \pm 0.0003$ | $0.014 \pm 0.005$ |
| 2 | 0.023 | 0.018 |
| 3 | 0.012 | 0.016 |

## Photolysis of 2-aminobiphenyl, dependence on water concentration.

2-Aminobiphenyl (1) ( 25 mg ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. Aliquot ( 10 mL ) of the prepared solution was added to a quartz test tube ( 5 samples were prepared). To each of the test tubes, $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ and solution of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{pD}=2.04)$ were added as it is shown in the Table below. The samples were purged with nitrogen for 15 min and irradiated in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor ( 8 lamps, 300 nm ) over 4 h . After the irradiation, the samples were diluted with saturated solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with dichloromethane $(3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated in vacuum. The deuterium incorporation was determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and MS.

Table S5. Content of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ and $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ in the irradiated solutions of 2-aminobiphenyl

| Volume ratio ( $\left.\mathbf{C H}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{C N}: \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{O}\right)$ | $\boldsymbol{V}\left(\mathbf{C H}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{C N}\right) / \mathbf{m L}$ | $\boldsymbol{V}\left(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{S O}_{\mathbf{4}} / \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{O}\right) / \mathbf{m L}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $999: 1$ | 4.985 | 0.015 |
| $99: 1$ | 4.850 | 0.150 |
| $95: 5$ | 4.250 | 0.750 |
| $9: 1$ | 3.500 | 1.500 |
| $4: 1$ | 2.000 | 3.000 |



Figure S22. Dependence of the deuterium exchange at the position 2 of the phenyl group in $\mathbf{1}$ on $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ content, determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (left) and the yield of mono- and dideuterated compound determined by MS (right). The irradiation was performed over $4 \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{pD}=2.04$.

## Preparation and photolysis of deuterated 2-aminobiphenyl

2-Aminobiphenyl (1) ( $212 \mathrm{mg}, 1.25 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in dry diethyl ether ( 10 mL ). The solution was cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $n$-buthyllithium solution in hexane was added $(V=1 \mathrm{~mL}, c=$ $2.5 \mathrm{M}, 2.50 \mathrm{mmol})$. The mixture was stirred for 30 min and after that $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added ( $22.6 \mu \mathrm{~L}$, 1.25 mmol ). This process (addition of $n$-buthyllithium and deuterated water) was repeated two times. After the third addition of water, the mixture was concentrated in vacuum. The crude product was dissolved in dry dichloromethane and allowed to crystalize. The precipitate was filtered off. Again, the solvent was removed on a rotary evaporator and the crude product was dissolved in dry $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. An aliquot ( 1 mL ) of the prepared solution was added to a quartz test tube and diluted to 15 mL with dry $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$. The solution was purged with nitrogen for 15 min and irradiated in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor (8 lamps 300 nm lamps) over 16 h . After the photolysis, the sample was concentrated in vacuum and purified by chromatography on silica gel using dichloromethane as an eluent.

No deuterium incorporation could be observed by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and MS.

## Photolysis of 2, dependence on water solution pD.

2-Aminobiphenyl (1) (45 mg) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(90 \mathrm{~mL})$. An aliquot ( 10 mL ) of the prepared solution was added to a quartz test tube ( 9 samples were prepared). Each of the sample was prepared by addition of 5 mL of the following solutions in Table S5. The samples were purged with nitrogen for 15 min and irradiated in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor (8 lamps, 300 nm ) over 4 h . After the irradiation, the samples were diluted with saturated
solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with dichloromethane $(3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated in vacuum. The deuterium incorporation was determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and MS.

Table S6. pD values and content of the irradiated solutions of 2-aminobiphenyl

| Sample | pD |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 .}$ | 0.96 (solution of $\mathrm{D}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) |
| $\mathbf{2 .}$ | 1.68 (solution of $\mathrm{D}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) |
| $\mathbf{3 .}$ | 2.24 (solution of $\mathrm{D}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) |
| $\mathbf{4 .}$ | 3.02 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |
| $\mathbf{5 .}$ | 3.95 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |
| $\mathbf{6 .}$ | 6.15 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |
| $\mathbf{7 .}$ | 7.00 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |
| $\mathbf{8 .}$ | 8.08 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |
| $\mathbf{9 .}$ | 10.05 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |



Figure S23. Dependence of the deuterium exchange at the position 2' (marked position) of the phenyl group in 1 on pD , determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (left) and the yield of mono- and dideuterated compound determined by MS (right). The irradiation was performed over 4 h .

## Photolysis of $\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{N}$-dimethyl-2-aminobiphenyl.

$N, N$-dimethyl-2-aminobiphenyl ( 5 mg ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solution was transferred to a quartz test tube and the sample was diluted by a solution of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ( 5 $\mathrm{mL}, \mathrm{pD}=2.05$ ). The sample was purged with nitrogen for 15 min and irradiated in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor ( 8 lamps, 300 nm ) over 4 h . After the irradiations, the sample was diluted with a saturated solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with dichloromethane
$(3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated in vacuum. Deuterium incorporation was determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR. Under the same condition, irradiation of nonmethylated 2-aminobiphenyl ( 5 mg ) was performed. The control experiment in the dark was performed with both compounds (methylated and nonmethylated) at the same concentrations and in the presence of the sulfuric acid, $\mathrm{pD}=2$.

Table S7. Deuterium exchange (replaced H-atoms) at the position 2' of the phenyl group for the methylated and nonmethylated 2-aminobiphenyl, determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR. The irradiation was performed over 4 h .

| Compound | Irradiation | Control exp. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2-aminobiphenyl (1) | 1.166 | 0 |
| $N, N$-dimethyl-2-aminobiphenyl 1(NMe $\mathbf{2})$ | 0.075 | 0.007 |

## Time dependence

3-aminobiphenyl (2) ( 25 mg ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. An aliquot ( 10 mL ) of the prepared solution was added to a quartz test tube and the prepared sample was diluted by a solution of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL}, \mathrm{pD}=2.03)$. By this way 5 samples were prepared. Each sample was purged with nitrogen for 15 min and irradiated in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor ( 8 lamps, 300 nm ) over different time. After the irradiations, the samples were diluted with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with dichloromethane ( $3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated in vacuum. Deuterium incorporation was determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR.


3-aminobiphenyl (2) ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.600 \mathrm{MHz},\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO}\right): \delta / \mathrm{ppm} 7.57(\mathrm{dd}, 2 \mathrm{H}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=7.5$ Hz, H-2'), 7.41 (dd (t), $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3^{\prime}\right), 7.31\left(\mathrm{tt}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-4^{\prime}\right), 7.13$ (dd, $1 \mathrm{H}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-5), 6.95(\mathrm{dd}(\mathrm{t}), 1 \mathrm{H}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-2), 6.86(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=1.8$ $\mathrm{Hz}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-6$ ), 6.66 (dd, 1H, $J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-4$ ).

Upon irradiation, the intensity of the signal at $\delta 6.66 \mathrm{ppm}$ corresponding to $\mathrm{H}-4$ is reduced (see Fig S24).


Figure S24. Dependence of the deuterium exchange at the position 4 of the aniline in 3aminobiphenyl (2) on photolysis time, determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR. The irradiation was performed in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 2)$.


Figure S25. Expanded aromatic region of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ spectra of 3aminobiphenyl (2) before (bottom) and after (top) the photolysis (4h, 300 nm ) in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{-}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ (1:2).

## Preparative irradiation of 3-aminobiphenyl.

A solution of 3-aminobiphenyl (2) ( 100 mg ) in a mixture of acetonitrile ( 80 mL ) and a solution of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in water ( 20 mL ) was transferred to a quartz vessel equipped with a stirring magnet. The sample was purged with nitrogen for 30 min and irradiated in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor ( 8 lamps, 300 nm ) over 12 h . After the photolysis, the sample was concentrated in vacuum and purified by chromatography on silica gel using dichloromethane as an eluent. According to TLC, only one product was obtained in this reaction. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum of this product is given below:


Figure S26. Expanded aromatic region of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum $\left(\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of $\mathbf{2}$ after the photolysis ( $\mathrm{pD}=2,12 \mathrm{~h}, 300 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 4)$ and chromatography. Photoproduct and reactant are present in a ratio of 1:1.


Figure S27. Expanded aromatic region of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ spectra of $\mathbf{2}$ before (bottom) and after (top) the photolysis ( $\mathrm{pD}=2,12 \mathrm{~h}, 300 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 4)$.


Figure S28. Expanded aromatic region of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra $\left(\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ after the photolysis of 2 (top) and after reduction of 3-nitrobiphenyl with hydrazine monohydrate and activated Raney nickel (bottom).


Figure S29. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ HMBC NMR spectrum ( $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO},{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $600 \mathrm{MHz},{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ NMR 61 MHz ) of $\mathbf{2}$ after the photolysis $(\mathrm{pD}=2,12 \mathrm{~h}, 300 \mathrm{~nm})$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 4)$ and chromatography.


Figure S30. ESI-MS-MS spectrum (peak 183 in negative mode) of $\mathbf{2}$ after the photolysis ( pD $=2,12 \mathrm{~h}, 300 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 4)$ and chromatography.

Peak at 155 indicates that water could be one of the fragmentation products.

## Reduction of 3-nitrobiphenyl

To the solution of 3-nitrobiphenyl ( $100 \mathrm{mg}, 0.502 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in a mixture of ethanol $(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ and dichloroethane ( 1 mL ) suspension of activated Raney nickel ( 100 mg ) in ethanol ( 1.5 mL ) was
added at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ under an argon atmosphere. After that, a mixture of hydrazine monohydrate and water $\left(w\left(\mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4} \times \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)=80 \%, 200 \mu \mathrm{~L}\right)$ was added dropwise (at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The mixture was stirred until the TLC indicated the complete consumption of the starting material. The reaction mixture was filtered and the solvent was removed on a rotary evaporator. According to TLC, only one product was obtained in this reaction. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum of this crude product is given below:


Figure $\mathrm{S} 31 .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CO}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of a mixture containing $\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{4}$ after the reduction of nitrobiphenyl; bottom panel is enlarged aromatic region of the spectrum.

## Time dependence

4-aminobiphenyl (3) ( 35 mg ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(70 \mathrm{~mL})$. An aliquot ( 10 mL ) of the prepared solution was added to a quartz test tube and the prepared sample was diluted by a solution of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL}, \mathrm{pD}=1.99)$. By this way 7 samples were prepared. Each sample was purged with nitrogen for 15 min and irradiated in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor ( 8 lamps, 300 nm ) over different time. After the irradiations, the samples were diluted with a saturated solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with dichloromethane $(3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated in vacuum. Deuterium incorporation was determined by MS.


Figure S32. Dependence of the yield of mono- and dideuterated 3 on photolysis time, determined by MS. The irradiation was performed in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 2)$.

## Photolysis of 4-aminobiphenyl, dependence on water solution pD.

4-Aminobiphenyl (3) (30 mg) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(60 \mathrm{~mL})$. An aliquot ( 10 mL ) of the prepared solution was added to a quartz test tube ( 6 samples were prepared). Each of the sample was prepared by addition of 5 mL of the following solutions in Table S6. The samples were purged with nitrogen for 15 min and irradiated in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor (8 lamps, 300 nm ) over 4 h . After the irradiation, the samples were diluted with saturated solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with dichloromethane $(3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate and concentrated in vacuum. The deuterium incorporation was determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and MS.


4-aminobiphenyl (3) ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $600 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ): $\delta / \mathrm{ppm} 7.51$ (dd, $2 \mathrm{H}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=8.3$ $\mathrm{Hz}, \mathrm{H}-2^{\prime}$ ), 7.37 (d, $2 \mathrm{H}, J=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-2$ ), 7.35 (dd, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3^{\prime}\right), 7.21$ (tt, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, J=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-4{ }^{\prime}\right), 6.79(\mathrm{~d}, 2 \mathrm{H}, J=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{H}-3)$.
Upon irradiation, the intensity of the signal at $\delta 7.51 \mathrm{ppm}$ corresponding to $\mathrm{H}-2^{\prime}$ is reduced (see Fig S33).

Table S8. pD values and content of the irradiated solutions of 3 .

| Sample | $\mathbf{p D}$ |
| :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1 .}$ | 0.80 (solution of $\mathrm{D}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) |
| $\mathbf{2 .}$ | 1.96 (solution of $\mathrm{D}_{3} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) |
| $\mathbf{3 .}$ | 2.98 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |
| $\mathbf{4 .}$ | 5.00 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |
| $\mathbf{5 .}$ | 7.07 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |
| $\mathbf{6 .}$ | 9.04 (deuterated phosphate buffer) |



Figure S33. Dependence of the deuterium exchange at the position 2' (marked position) of the phenyl group 3 on pD , determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (left) and the yield of mono- and dideuterated compound determined by MS (right). The irradiation was performed over 4 h .


Figure S34. Expanded aromatic region of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ spectra of $\mathbf{3}$ before (bottom) and after (top) the photolysis ( $\mathrm{pD}=1,4 \mathrm{~h}, 300 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1: 2)$.

## Irradiation under $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ and $\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{2}}$

Aminobiphenyl 1, 2, or $\mathbf{3}(5 \mathrm{mg})$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and poured to a quartz test tube, to which a solution of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ in $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL}, \mathrm{pD}=1.94)$ was added. In this way 6 solutions were prepared, two per compound. Three solutions were purged with nitrogen for 15 min and the other three were purged with $\mathrm{O}_{2}$. The test tubes were irradiated at the same time in a Luzchem LZC-4X photochemical reactor ( 8 lamps, 300 nm ) over 3h. After the irradiations, the samples were diluted with a saturated aqueous solution of $\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}(50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with dichloromethane $(3 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The combined organic layers were dried over sodium sulfate and
concentrated in vacuum. Deuterium incorporation was determined by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR. The extent of D-incorporation and yield of the photo-redox product are given in Table S9.

Table S9. Content of D-exchange and photo-redox yield. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{2}$-purged | $\mathrm{O}_{2}$-purged |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $52 \% \mathrm{D}$ | $12 \% \mathrm{D}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $19 \% \mathrm{D}, 55 \%$ photo-redox | $11 \% \mathrm{D}, 0 \%$ photo-redox |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $5 \% \mathrm{D}$ | $5 \% \mathrm{D}$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Determined from ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR.

## 5. Laser Flash Photolysis

Stock solutions of 2-aminobiphenyl (1, 2.81 mg ) and 3-aminobiphenyl ( $2,0.78 \mathrm{mg}$ ) were prepared in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(25 \mathrm{~mL})$. An aliquot ( 5 mL ) of the prepared solution was added to a volumetric flask ( 2 samples). 2 samples were prepared: in the first flask previously added solution was diluted with $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ to 25 mL ; the second sample was prepared by addition of pure water ( 6.25 mL ) and after that diluted to 25 mL with $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$. The final concentration for all samples was $1.33 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}$, corresponding to the absorbances at $266 \mathrm{~nm} A=0.30$. The measurements were performed on a LP980 Edinburgh Instruments spectrophotometer. For the excitation the fourth harmonic of a Q-smart Q450 Quantel YAG laser at 266 nm was used. The energy of the laser pulse at 266 nm was set to $\approx 20 \mathrm{~mJ}$ and the pulse duration was 7 ns . Absorbances at the excitation wavelength were set to 0.3 . The static cells were used and they were frequently exchanged to assure no absorption of light by photoproducts. The solutions were purged by Ar or $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ for 15 min prior to the measurements, which were conducted at 25 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.


Figure S35. Absorption spectrum of 2-aminobiphenyl (1) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ (left) and in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4: 1$, right) before and after the LFP experiment.


Figure S36. Transient absorption spectra of 2-aminobiphenyl (1, $\left.c=1.33 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}\right)$ in Arpurged $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}, A_{266}=0.3$, laser pulse 20 mJ , and decay of the transient at 420 nm .


Figure S37. Transient absorption spectra of 2-aminobiphenyl ( $1, c=1.33 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}$ ) in Arpurged (left) and $\mathrm{O}_{2}$-purged (right) $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4: 1), A_{266}=0.3$, laser pulse 20 mJ .


Figure S38. Decay of transient absorption at 360 nm for Ar- and $\mathrm{O}_{2}$-purged $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (4:1) solution of $\mathbf{1}\left(c=1.33 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}\right)$.

In the Ar-purged $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solution of $\mathbf{1}$, a transient was detected that absorbed at $300-500 \mathrm{~nm}$, with a maximum at $\approx 350 \mathrm{~nm}$. It decayed with the lifetime of $\tau=130 \pm 30 \mathrm{~ns}$. In addition, a
long-lived transient was detected that absorbed also at $300-500 \mathrm{~nm}$, whose intensity was too low to get its decay kinetics precisely.

In the Ar-purged $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (4:1), a similar transient was detected that decayed with the lifetime of $\tau=110 \pm 10 \mathrm{~ns}$, and a long-lived transient that decayed in the millisecond timescale whose decay kinetics could not be precisely determined. In the $\mathrm{O}_{2}$-purged solution, the short-lived transient was quenched and its decay was at the limits of detection, comparable to the duration of the laser pulse. The long-lived is probably not quenched by $\mathrm{O}_{2}$.

Based on the quenching by $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ and, the short-lived transient was assigned to the triplet-triplet absorption. The assignment is in accord with the published triplet-triplet absorption spectra of aniline ${ }^{5}$ or $p$-phenylenediamine. ${ }^{6}$ The long-lived transient was tentatively assigned to N centred radical formed by H -atom detachment, which is an ubiquitous process in the photochemistry of triplet aniline derivatives. ${ }^{7}$ The assignment is based on the published spectra of similar N-radical species. ${ }^{8,9,10}$ The anticipated short-lived aza-QM was not detected, due to its low quantum yield for the formation. Note that it is anticipated to have a short lifetime, in accord with similar aza-quinone methide ${ }^{11}$ and quinone methide species formed in the ESIPT to carbon. ${ }^{12}$


Figure S39. Absorption spectrum of 3-aminobiphenyl (2) in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ (left) and in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4: 1$, right) before and after the LFP experiment.


Figure S40. Transient absorption spectra of 3-aminobiphenyl (2, $\left.c=3.68 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ in Arpurged $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}, A_{266}=0.3$, laser pulse 20 mJ .


Figure S41. Transient absorption spectra of 3-aminobiphenyl (2, $\left.c=3.68 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ in Arpurged (left) and $\mathrm{O}_{2}$-purged (right) $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4: 1), A_{266}=0.3$, laser pulse 20 mJ .


Figure S42. Decay of transient absorption of 2 at 360 nm for Ar - and $\mathrm{O}_{2}$-purged $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (4:1) solution of 3-aminobiphenyl ( $c=3.68 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{M}$ ).

In the Ar-purged $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solution of the $m$-compound, a transient was detected that absorbed strongly at $300-500 \mathrm{~nm}$, with a maximum at $\approx 350 \mathrm{~nm}$, and decayed with the lifetime of $\tau=$ $120 \pm 10 \mathrm{~ns}$. In addition, a long-lived transient was detected that absorbed at $350-550 \mathrm{~nm}$, whose intensity was too low to get its decay kinetics precisely.

In the Ar-purged $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(4: 1)$, a similar transient was detected that decayed somewhat slower with the lifetime of $\tau=250 \pm 20 \mathrm{~ns}$, and a long-lived transient that decayed in the millisecond time-scale whose decay kinetics could not be precisely determined. In the $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ purged solution, the short-lived transient was quenched and it decayed with $\tau=30 \pm 10 \mathrm{~ns}$. The long-lived is probably not quenched by $\mathrm{O}_{2}$.

Based on the quenching by $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ and comparison with some published spectra of aniline triplet excited states, ${ }^{5,6}$ the short-lived transient was assigned to the triplet-triplet absorption. The long-lived transient was tentatively assigned to a N -centred radical, based on the comparison with the published spectra, ${ }^{8,9,10}$ but due to its low intensity of the transient absorption further studies were precluded. The anticipated radical-cation and solvated electrons were not detected.

## 6. Computations

Table S10. ADC(2) vertical excitation energies and oscillator strengths (in parentheses) of the four lowest excited states of 2-aminobiphenyl (1) in vacuo and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solution approximated with the COSMO solvation model.

|  | In vacuo cc-pVDZ | aug-cc-pVDZ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COSMO } \\ & \text { cc-pVDZ } \end{aligned}$ | aug-cc-pVDZ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S 1 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 4.64 \\ & (0.0752) \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.44 \\ & (0.0740) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.60 \\ & (0.1010) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.45 \\ & (0.0940) \end{aligned}$ |
| S 2 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 5.11 \\ & (0.0024) \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.73 \\ & (0.0042) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.10 \\ & (0.0020) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.97 \\ & (0.0041) \end{aligned}$ |
| $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.47 \\ & (0.0575) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.96 \\ & (0.0056) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.44 \\ & (0.0946) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.03 \\ & (0.0034) \end{aligned}$ |
| S4 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 5.84 \\ & (0.0239) \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.13 \\ & (0.0285) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.96 \\ & (0.1198) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.18 \\ & (0.0775) \end{aligned}$ |
| S4 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 6.01 \\ & (0.1485) \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.32 \\ & (0.0288) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.05 \\ & (0.4455) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.48 \\ & (0.0399) \end{aligned}$ |



$$
\mathrm{S}_{0} \leftarrow \mathrm{~S}_{1}(87 \%)
$$



$\mathrm{S}_{0} \leftarrow \mathrm{~S}_{2}(99 \%)$



$$
\mathrm{S}_{0} \leftarrow \mathrm{~S}_{3}(62 \%)
$$

Figure S43. NTO orbitals for the first three singlet excited states for $\mathbf{1}$ computed at the $\operatorname{ADC}(2) /$ aug-cc-pVDZ level of theory. The dominant hole-particle pairs are shown only, the contribution is given in parenthesis. Note that at the $\operatorname{ADC}(2) /$ aug-cc-pVDZ level, the $S_{3}$ state becomes the $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ state.

Table S11. ADC(2) vertical excitation energies and oscillator strengths (in parentheses) of the four lowest excited states of 3-aminobiphenyl (2) in vacuo and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solution approximated with the COSMO solvation model.

| In vacuo |  | COSMO |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | cc-pVDZ <br> $(0.60$ <br> $(0.0642)$ | aug-cc-pVDZ <br> $(0.40$ | cc-pVDZ | aug-cc-pVDZ |


$\mathrm{S}_{0} \leftarrow \mathrm{~S}_{1}(85 \%)$



$\mathrm{S}_{0} \leftarrow \mathrm{~S}_{3}(55 \%)$
Figure S44. NTO orbitals for the first three singlet excited states for 2 computed with $\operatorname{ADC}(2) /$ aug-cc-pVDZ. The dominant hole-particle pairs are shown only, the contribution is given in parenthesis. As in $\mathbf{1}$, at the $\operatorname{ADC}(2) /$ cc-pVDZ level, the $S_{1}$ state is unaffected, the Rydberg state is destabilized, while the $S_{3}$ state at the $\operatorname{ADC}(2) /$ aug-cc-pVDZ level becomes the $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ state.

Table S12. ADC(2) vertical excitation energies and oscillator strengths (in parentheses) of the four lowest excited states of 4-aminobiphenyl (3) in vacuo and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solution approximated with the COSMO solvation model.

| In vacuo |  | COSMO |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | cc-pVDZ <br> $(0.67$ <br> $0.0230)$ | aug-cc-pVDZ <br> $(0.44$ | cc-pVDZ | aug-cc-pVDZ |


 $\mathrm{S}_{0} \leftarrow \mathrm{~S}_{1}(84 \%)$
 $\mathrm{S}_{0} \leftarrow \mathrm{~S}_{2}(98 \%)$

$\mathrm{S}_{0} \leftarrow \mathrm{~S}_{3}(81 \%)$

Figure S45. NTO orbitals for the first three singlet excited states for $\mathbf{3}$ computed at the $\operatorname{ADC}(2) /$ aug-cc-pVDZ level of theory. The dominant hole-particle pairs are shown only, the contribution is given in parenthesis. As in $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$, at the $\mathrm{ADC}(2) / \mathrm{cc}-\mathrm{pVDZ}$ level, the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state is unaffected, the Rydberg state is destabilized, while the $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ state at the $\mathrm{ADC}(2) /$ aug-cc-pVDZ level becomes the $S_{2}$ state.


Figure S46. Projection of the electron density difference of the $S_{1}$ state (left), $S_{2}$ state (middle) and $S_{3}$ state (right) on the electron isodensity surface of the ground state, $S_{0}$ for 1. Areas of increase (depletion) of electron density in the excited states are shown in blue (red). The calculations were performed with the ADC(2)/cc-pVDZ method.


Figure S47. Projection of the electron density difference of the $S_{1}$ state (left), $S_{2}$ state (middle) and $S_{3}$ state (right) on the electron isodensity surface of the ground state, $S_{0}$ for 2. Areas of increase (depletion) of electron density in the excited states are shown in blue (red). The calculations were performed with the $\operatorname{ADC}(2) / \mathrm{cc}-\mathrm{pVDZ}$ method.


Figure S 48 . Projection of the electron density difference of the $S_{1}$ state (left), $S_{2}$ state (middle) and $S_{3}$ state (right) on the electron isodensity surface of the ground state, $S_{0}$ for 3 . Areas of increase (depletion) of electron density in the excited states are shown in blue (red). The calculations were performed with the ADC(2)/cc-pVDZ method.


Figure S49. The computed charges (a.u.) at MP2/cc-pVDZ and ADC(2)/cc-pVDZ levels of theory for $\mathbf{1}$ in $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ (left) and optimized $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ (right), respectively.


Figure S50. The computed charges (a.u.) at MP2/cc-pVDZ and ADC(2)/cc-pVDZ levels of theory for $\mathbf{2}$ in $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ (left) and optimized $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ (right), respectively.


Figure S51. The computed charges (a.u.) at MP2/cc-pVDZ and ADC(2)/cc-pVDZ levels of theory for $\mathbf{3}$ in $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ (left) and optimized $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ (right), respectively.


Figure S52. Computed NPA (CPCM $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/Def2-TZVPP) charges (a.u.) for 1-3 in the $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ (top) and $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ (bottom) states.

$1\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}\right)$

$2\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}\right)$

$3\left(T_{1}\right)$

Figure S53. Computed triplet spin densities ( $\left.\mathrm{CPCM}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)-\mathrm{PBE} 0-\mathrm{D} 3 / \mathrm{Def} 2-\mathrm{TZVPP}\right)$ for 1-3 based on Hirshfeld population analyses.


Figure S54. Potential energy profiles of the three lowest singlet excited states ( $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ red, $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ blue, $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ green) and the ground state ( $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ grey) along the reaction path from the FC geometry of $\mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{2} \mathbf{O}$ to the nearest $\mathrm{S} 1 / \mathrm{S} 0$ conical intersection. For the Cartesian coordinates of the Franck-Condon geometry and the minimum energy $\mathrm{S}_{1} / \mathrm{S}_{0}$ conical intersection see Tables S17 and S18.


Figure S55. Potential energy profiles of the ground state ( $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ magenta), the three lowest singlet excited states ( $\mathrm{S}_{1}-\mathrm{S}_{3}$ blue) and the three lowest triplet states ( $\mathrm{T}_{1}-\mathrm{T}_{3}$ red) along the reaction path from the FC geometry of $\mathbf{2}$ to the minimum energy $\mathrm{T}_{1} / \mathrm{S}_{0}$ conical intersection (step 25). For Cartesian coordinates of the relevant structures (A-D in Figure 8) see Tables S19-S22.


Figure S56. Potential energy profiles of the ground state ( $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ grey) and the five lowest singlet excited states ( $\mathrm{S}_{1}-\mathrm{S}_{5}$ red, blue, green, magenta, orange) along the reaction path from the FC geometry of $\mathbf{3}$ to the minimum energy $\mathrm{S}_{1} / \mathrm{S}_{0}$ conical intersection. For Cartesian coordinates of the relevant structures (A-D in Figure 9) see Tables S23-S26.

Table S13
MP2/cc-pvdz minimum of $\mathbf{1}$ optimized in the gas phase (A in Figure 7)

| C | -1.6036105 | 0.7016508 | 0.0305986 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -0.1833455 | 0.7014278 | 0.0517732 |
| C | 0.5027399 | 1.9329360 | 0.0899605 |
| C | -0.1837018 | 3.1544201 | 0.1223345 |
| C | -1.5876915 | 3.1498609 | 0.1113351 |
| C | -2.2848883 | 1.9355548 | 0.0664564 |
| C | 0.5884845 | -0.5674846 | 0.0115489 |
| C | 1.6229538 | -0.7396179 | -0.9339337 |
| C | 2.3862144 | -1.9169553 | -0.9555581 |
| C | 2.1254259 | -2.9436064 | -0.0330380 |
| C | 1.0968486 | -2.7846499 | 0.9105052 |
| C | 0.3336731 | -1.6070901 | 0.9340223 |
| N | -2.3314881 | -0.5042714 | 0.0415306 |
| H | 1.8156722 | 0.0547800 | -1.6622439 |
| H | 3.1824380 | -2.0350139 | -1.6969469 |
| H | 2.7197228 | -3.8620212 | -0.0494402 |
| H | 0.8924809 | -3.5774766 | 1.6367221 |
| H | -0.4604198 | -1.4803193 | 1.6757098 |
| H | 1.5972560 | 1.9161420 | 0.1164695 |
| H | 0.3697727 | 4.0966095 | 0.1614093 |
| H | -2.1449974 | 4.0911153 | 0.1375092 |
| H | -3.3806033 | 1.9356350 | 0.0529808 |
| H | -3.2457474 | -0.3936693 | -0.3943504 |
| H | -1.8271890 | -1.2579564 | -0.4253549 |

Table S14
Geometry of the lowest energy point of $\mathbf{1}$ on the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state MEP optimized with $\mathrm{ADC}(2) / \mathrm{cc}-$ pVDZ (B in Figure 7)

| C | -1.5416848 | 0.7715686 | 0.1060358 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -0.0767627 | 0.7224640 | 0.0461459 |
| C | 0.5579822 | 1.9988650 | -0.0990473 |
| C | -0.1906904 | 3.1969421 | -0.0191634 |
| C | -1.5990564 | 3.2201104 | 0.1403228 |
| C | -2.2796388 | 1.9753775 | 0.1849047 |
| C | 0.6137614 | -0.5352512 | 0.0334333 |
| C | 1.7843829 | -0.7204051 | -0.7817890 |
| C | 2.4232269 | -1.9529536 | -0.8570342 |
| C | 1.9650853 | -3.0647967 | -0.0996295 |
| C | 0.8599865 | -2.8935384 | 0.7506831 |
| C | 0.1873815 | -1.6643848 | 0.8307568 |
| N | -2.1954249 | -0.4050957 | -0.0819201 |
| H | 2.1259932 | 0.1106066 | -1.4089975 |
| H | 3.2851123 | -2.0688416 | -1.5235337 |
| H | 2.4835698 | -4.0264562 | -0.1544862 |
| H | 0.5364154 | -3.7192456 | 1.3951131 |
| H | -0.5630931 | -1.5168255 | 1.6165773 |
| H | 1.6487106 | 2.0445348 | -0.1592053 |
| H | 0.3491448 | 4.1484835 | -0.0731927 |
| H | -2.1467958 | 4.1633714 | 0.1908747 |
| H | -3.3748223 | 1.9286279 | 0.1885471 |
| H | -3.2106528 | -0.4471088 | -0.0861675 |
| H | -1.6421349 | -1.2638196 | -0.1805912 |

Table S15
Geometry of the highest energy point of $\mathbf{1}$ after $\mathbf{B}$ on the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state MEP optimized with $\mathrm{ADC}(2) / \mathrm{cc}-\mathrm{pVDZ}$ ( $\mathbf{C}$ in Figure 7)
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -1.4911359 & 0.7763464 & 0.0859706\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -0.0227189 & 0.7652697 & 0.0404225\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 0.5893375 & 2.0476471 & -0.0787749\end{array}$
C $\quad-0.1819493 \quad 3.2257406 \quad-0.0273120$
C $\quad-1.5954517 \quad 3.2152614 \quad 0.1055078$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -2.2496133 & 1.9675414 & 0.1568142\end{array}$
C $0.6624900 \quad-0.4922054 \quad 0.0703064$
C $1.8187928-0.7278970-0.7481972$
C $2.3622287-1.9978636-0.8756705$
C $\quad 1.8007683-3.1101957-0.1692975$
C $\quad 0.7287280-2.8958345 \quad 0.6974764$
C $0.1351968-1.6192575 \quad 0.8354805$
N $-2.0854183-0.4243955-0.1310277$
H $2.2288484 \quad 0.1033229-1.3340775$
H $\quad 3.2191272$-2.1532772 -1.5401037
H $\quad 2.2400410$-4.1069317 -0.2707588
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { H } & 0.3484522 & -3.7250427 & 1.3065394\end{array}$
H $\quad-0.4693454-1.4139799 \quad 1.7299431$
H $\quad 1.6801095 \quad 2.1131026$-0.1225544
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { H } & 0.3356614 & 4.1898519 & -0.0709709\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.1623733 & 4.1477408 & 0.1479324\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.3436998 & 1.9032987 & 0.1767891\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { H } & -3.0936482 & -0.5217739 & -0.0286297\end{array}$

Table S16
Post conical intersection structure of $\mathbf{1}$ on the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state MEP optimized with $\mathrm{ADC}(2) / \mathrm{cc}-\mathrm{pVDZ}$
(D in Figure 7)

| C | -1.5118923 | 0.7760514 | 0.0280954 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -0.0744362 | 0.7986227 | 0.0039871 |
| C | 0.5654981 | 2.0407386 | -0.0347949 |
| C | -0.1865890 | 3.2403456 | -0.0132939 |
| C | -1.5767398 | 3.2221364 | 0.1054137 |
| C | -2.2359720 | 1.9776298 | 0.1427767 |
| C | 0.6621434 | -0.4878521 | 0.0304300 |
| C | 1.7675394 | -0.7140219 | -0.7655828 |
| C | 2.3580053 | -2.0027666 | -0.8791244 |
| C | 1.7899624 | -3.0848025 | -0.1514527 |
| C | 0.6894591 | -2.9045310 | 0.6687259 |
| C | -0.0283367 | -1.6155144 | 0.7339966 |
| N | -2.1525330 | -0.4176002 | -0.2655251 |
| H | 2.1957571 | 0.1146554 | -1.3438434 |
| H | 3.2249196 | -2.1531011 | -1.5307227 |
| H | 2.2566957 | -4.0754753 | -0.2182129 |
| H | 0.3314676 | -3.7387000 | 1.2836869 |
| H | -0.3750882 | -1.3697216 | 1.7602949 |
| H | 1.6590707 | 2.0873454 | -0.0827482 |
| H | 0.3424628 | 4.1961887 | -0.0636748 |
| H | -2.1510257 | 4.1513082 | 0.1545783 |
| H | -3.3308049 | 1.9277784 | 0.1871713 |
| H | -3.1449282 | -0.4156766 | 0.0099456 |
| H | -1.0746417 | -1.5494925 | 0.1740884 |

Table S17
MP2/cc-pvdz minimum of the $\mathbf{1}$ monohydrate optimized in the gas phase $\left(\mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{O} \mathrm{S}_{0 \text { min }}\right)$
C $\quad-1.3364513 \quad 0.8808715 \quad-0.1836421$
C $\quad 0.0817463 \quad 0.8814551-0.2164351$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 0.7600580 & 2.1198697 & -0.2020005\end{array}$
C $\quad 0.0641842 \quad 3.3360773-0.1380212$
C $\quad-1.3400969 \quad 3.3243845 \quad-0.0914037$
C $\quad-2.0306896 \quad 2.1042293-0.1106083$
C $0.8608802-0.3842486-0.2938682$
C $\quad 0.6791833-1.4161194 \quad 0.6569174$
C $\quad 1.4588775-2.5834335 \quad 0.5879097$
C $\quad 2.4254773-2.7386778 \quad-0.4210250$
C $\quad 2.6096385-1.7178739-1.3700647$
C $\quad 1.8332649-0.5493603-1.3061180$
N $-2.0681774-0.3401981-0.1558680$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { O } & -2.1117545 & -1.2939552 & 2.6378241\end{array}$
H $\quad 0.6119331 \quad 4.2834242$-0.1173414
H $\quad 1.8557575 \quad 2.1122264 \quad-0.2188243$
H $\quad-3.1266085$ 2.0939508 -0.0742848
H $\quad-1.9009079 \quad 4.2629690 \quad-0.0340726$
H $\quad 1.9672768$ 0.2427890 -2.0514982
H $\quad 3.3577059-1.8324164-2.1619102$
H $\quad 3.0318404-3.6494482 \quad-0.4676885$
H $\quad 1.3177650-3.3710406 \quad 1.3364574$
H $\quad-0.0626158-1.3000678 \quad 1.4547852$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.9675080 & -0.2283660 & -0.6282438\end{array}$
H $\quad-1.5495570-1.0822374-0.6330411$
H $\quad-2.2268472-0.9157519 \quad 1.7449938$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -2.1943746 & -2.2390517 & 2.4570722\end{array}$

Table S18
Geometry of the $\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{~S}_{0}$ conical intersection of $\mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{O}$ optimized with $\mathrm{ADC}(2) / \mathrm{cc}-\mathrm{pVDZ}$ in the gas phase ( $\mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{O} \mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{~S}_{0} \mathrm{CI}$ )

C $\quad-1.2812346 \quad 0.9158404 \quad-0.2226219$
C $\quad 0.1531549 \quad 0.9759360 \quad-0.2626528$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 0.7632107 & 2.2306952 & -0.2906654\end{array}$
C $\quad-0.0152407 \quad 3.4158876-0.2729532$
C $\quad-1.4022222 \quad 3.3635575$-0.1528034
C $\quad-2.0303678 \quad 2.1019185-0.1048493$
C $0.9317105-0.2912174 \quad-0.2777455$
C $0.3140910-1.4488731 \quad 0.4410860$
C $\quad 1.0589458-2.7161692 \quad 0.3097520$
C $\quad 2.1395709-2.8422956-0.5484664$
C $2.6529300-1.7283259-1.2612503$
C $2.0162872-0.4618229-1.1080732$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{N} & -1.9013792 & -0.3009674 & -0.4841883\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { O } & -2.3983688 & -1.3731602 & 2.6473813\end{array}$
H $\quad 0.4915590 \quad 4.3834336-0.3332459$
H $\quad 1.8551290 \quad 2.3005280 \quad-0.3404549$
H
H $\quad-1.9995753 ~ 4.2781851 \quad-0.1069125$
H $\quad 2.3973602 \quad 0.3946343-1.6782683$
H $\quad 3.5103817-1.8334624-1.9336114$
H $\quad 2.6313141$-3.8167743 -0.6537287
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { H } & 0.7421321 & -3.5798061 & 0.9067537\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & 0.0413675 & -1.2287078 & 1.4947291\end{array}$
H $\quad-2.8935726-0.2967122-0.1992078$
H $\quad-0.7597009-1.4209653-0.0546035$
H $-1.9311385-0.8232579 \quad 2.0087500$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { H } & -1.9636410 & -2.2264002 & 2.5239657\end{array}$

Table S19
MP2/cc-pvdz minimum of $\mathbf{2}$ monohydrate optimized in the gas phase (A in Figure 8)

| C | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 1.4116780 |
| C | 1.2414350 | 0.0000000 | 2.0844042 |
| C | 2.4478927 | 0.0050037 | 1.3680968 |
| C | 2.4346848 | 0.0061223 | -0.0365157 |
| C | 1.2058819 | 0.0017890 | -0.7173111 |
| C | -1.2737811 | -0.0005780 | 2.1719987 |
| C | -2.3412871 | -0.8404121 | 1.7927196 |
| C | -3.5282262 | -0.8299568 | 2.5409480 |
| C | -3.6684737 | 0.0105500 | 3.6538682 |
| C | -2.6118624 | 0.8599996 | 4.0487977 |
| C | -1.4228008 | 0.8406187 | 3.2905155 |
| N | -2.7669522 | 1.7699916 | 5.1013863 |
| O | -0.0074381 | 2.9934948 | 5.6597329 |
| H | -4.3552831 | -1.4890768 | 2.2589928 |
| H | -2.2256543 | -1.5193767 | 0.9429857 |
| H | -4.6037668 | 0.0157367 | 4.2239792 |
| H | 1.2538264 | -0.0376164 | 3.1786037 |
| H | 3.4007809 | -0.0052055 | 1.9067624 |
| H | 3.3746817 | 0.0078941 | -0.5961931 |
| H | 1.1862309 | 0.0092085 | -1.8115716 |
| H | -0.9553404 | 0.0228809 | -0.5337028 |
| H | -0.6046360 | 1.5048768 | 3.5816512 |
| H | -1.8763098 | 2.0686251 | 5.5012471 |
| H | -3.3926908 | 1.4305268 | 5.8278559 |
| H | 0.7861828 | 2.4961332 | 5.4221246 |
|  | -0.0759115 | 3.6314356 | 4.93 |

Table S20
Geometry of the lowest energy point of $\mathbf{2}$ monohydrate on the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state MEP optimized with ADC(2)/cc-pVDZ (B in Figure 8)

| C | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 1.4345240 |
| C | 1.2868912 | 0.0000000 | 2.0713839 |
| C | 2.4702285 | -0.0060308 | 1.3275610 |
| C | 2.4446137 | -0.0001952 | -0.0809440 |
| C | 1.1894072 | -0.0012040 | -0.7294127 |
| C | -1.2097762 | 0.0287635 | 2.2083673 |
| C | -2.5229245 | -0.2409598 | 1.6366873 |
| C | -3.7134771 | -0.2671967 | 2.3843838 |
| C | -3.7111353 | -0.0129502 | 3.7755255 |
| C | -2.4441071 | 0.2882885 | 4.3610282 |
| C | -1.2276540 | 0.3210233 | 3.6199373 |
| N | -2.3797837 | 0.5764357 | 5.6889044 |
| O | 0.2880034 | 1.2708910 | 6.5615127 |
| H | -4.6517269 | -0.5019095 | 1.8726977 |
| H | -2.5881738 | -0.4649261 | 0.5684825 |
| H | -4.6164686 | -0.0602445 | 4.3864652 |
| H | 1.3484984 | -0.0608374 | 3.1633436 |
| H | 3.4318577 | -0.0236797 | 1.8536547 |
| H | 3.3736874 | -0.0004132 | -0.6587288 |
| H | 1.1420815 | 0.0082911 | -1.8241721 |
| H | -0.9481712 | 0.0320836 | -0.5463061 |
| H | -0.3214604 | 0.6312682 | 4.1413900 |
| H | -1.4805848 | 0.8220389 | 6.1226305 |
| H | -3.2293373 | 0.5920855 | 6.2449538 |
| H | 0.9124831 | 0.5572398 | 6.3679704 |
| H | 0.6277965 | 1.9967948 | 6.0187071 |

Table S21
Geometry of the $\mathrm{S}_{1} / \mathrm{T}_{1}$ crossing of $\mathbf{2}$ monohydrate on the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state MEP optimized with ADC(2)/cc-pVDZ (C in Figure 8)
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 0.0000000 & 0.0000000 & 0.0000000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 0.0000000 & 0.0000000 & 1.4163540\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 1.2463640 & 0.0000000 & 2.0920573\end{array}$
C $\quad 2.4488272-0.0184562 \quad 1.3715157$
C $2.4357023-0.0239422 \quad-0.0332452$
C $\quad 1.2055819-0.0067359 \quad-0.7152962$
C $\quad-1.2536980 \quad 0.0476938 \quad 2.1900988$
C $\quad-2.4285360 \quad-0.6490349 \quad 1.7889800$
C $\quad-3.6057274 \quad-0.6128210 \quad 2.5563864$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -3.6470852 & 0.1225322 & 3.7491237\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -2.4933582 & 0.8372220 & 4.1744328\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -1.3121068 & 0.7919925 & 3.3835358\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{N} & -2.4797343 & 1.5834490 & 5.3124076\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { O } & -0.3094420 & 2.8090814 & 5.9618412\end{array}$
H $\quad-4.4882039-1.1755822 \quad 2.2371093$
H $\quad-2.4001615-1.2602936 \quad 0.8815539$
H $\quad-4.5513164 \quad 0.1486497 \quad 4.3675406$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { H } & 1.2662305 & 0.0087446 & 3.1878413\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { H } & 3.4004824 & -0.0328819 & 1.9113512\end{array}$
H $\quad 3.3757421-0.0307353-0.5918045$
H $\quad 1.1877348$ 0.0259751 -1.8090997
H $\quad-0.9510995$ 0.0469845 -0.5420858
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.4351818 & 1.3642502 & 3.7110846\end{array}$
H $\quad-1.2389878 \quad 2.2987198 \quad 5.7285836$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.3815893 & 1.5549445 & 5.8025161\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 0.5080808 & 2.0418762 & 5.5747885\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.2356936 & 3.4840598 & 5.2406553\end{array}$

Table S22
Geometry of the $T_{1} / S_{0}$ crossing of $\mathbf{2}$ monohydrate on the $T_{1}$ state MEP optimized with $\mathrm{ADC}(2) / \mathrm{cc}-\mathrm{pVDZ}$ (D in Figure 8)
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 0.0000000 & 0.0000000 & 0.0000000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 0.0000000 & 0.0000000 & 1.4120130\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.2380175 & 0.0000000 & 2.0923938\end{array}$
C $2.4438300-0.0019397 \quad 1.3766634$
C $\quad 2.4333438-0.0036317-0.0270024$
C $\quad 1.2084580 \quad 0.0016451 \quad-0.7132011$
C $\quad-1.2675869 \quad 0.0215283 \quad 2.1822231$
C $\quad-2.3872864-0.7581462 \quad 1.8039265$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -3.5728369 & -0.7305513 & 2.5615575\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -3.6634199 & 0.0719047 & 3.7012987\end{array}$
C $\quad-2.5545143 \quad 0.8667240 \quad 4.1152268$
C $\quad-1.3721952 \quad 0.8299506 \quad 3.3232522$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{N} & -2.5686179 & 1.6559969 & 5.2202965\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { O } & -0.3539528 & 2.9993478 & 5.8189580\end{array}$
H $\quad-4.4239495-1.3537671 \quad 2.2695340$
H $\quad-2.3200511 \quad-1.41713650 .9323278$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.5848608 & 0.0879542 & 4.2952257\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { H } & 1.2497233 & 0.0039812 & 3.1878681\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { H } & 3.3916664 & -0.0031695 & 1.9205293\end{array}$
H $\quad 3.3747789-0.0009993-0.5820223$
H $\quad 1.1932106 \quad 0.0279624-1.8059940$
H $\quad-0.9525456 \quad 0.0347618$-0.5410414
H $\quad-0.5267156 \quad 1.4534883 \quad 3.6279164$
H $\quad-1.2177960$ 2.4725921 $\quad 5.6469675$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.4794915 & 1.6065104 & 5.6925147\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 0.6028736 & 2.0954817 & 5.3144798\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.3249579 & 3.6154935 & 5.0651704\end{array}$

Table S23
MP2/cc-PVDZ minimum of $\mathbf{3}$ pentahydrate optimized in the gas phase (A in Figure 9)

| C | -2.3694646 | -1.0637998 | -0.1441668 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -0.9831083 | -1.0723468 | -0.4122657 |
| C | -0.3136805 | 0.1543380 | -0.6237402 |
| C | -1.0096926 | 1.3713664 | -0.5675218 |
| C | -2.3858443 | 1.3432432 | -0.3022354 |
| C | -3.0802611 | 0.1457815 | -0.0904900 |
| C | -0.2287764 | -2.3497420 | -0.4603695 |
| C | 0.6571330 | -2.6130016 | -1.5291781 |
| C | 1.3768928 | -3.8201209 | -1.5741489 |
| C | 1.2240822 | -4.7735332 | -0.5489403 |
| C | 0.3419277 | -4.5177807 | 0.5170087 |
| C | -0.3839592 | -3.3150763 | 0.5590929 |
| N | -3.1003559 | 2.6284170 | -0.2357952 |
| O | 2.9061794 | 0.6132115 | -0.1345923 |
| O | 2.1144483 | 2.7917561 | 1.2903415 |
| O | 0.4664629 | 4.3206157 | -0.0966860 |
| O | 2.8861241 | -1.9295799 | 0.8595818 |
| O | -1.8003358 | 4.3302056 | 1.1939470 |
| H | -0.4813608 | 2.3213167 | -0.7036465 |
| H | 0.7694497 | 0.1685664 | -0.7826482 |
| H | -1.0592837 | -3.1123527 | 1.3980961 |
| H | 0.2180192 | -5.2572115 | 1.3149699 |
| H | 1.7832974 | -5.7137888 | -0.5859580 |
| H | 2.0479174 | -4.0231610 | -2.4152822 |
| H | 0.7631666 | -1.8799498 | -2.3365201 |
| H | -2.9017123 | -2.0095291 | 0.0005508 |
| H | -4.1586065 | 0.1442790 | 0.1062256 |
| H | -4.0561751 | 2.5066394 | 0.1192275 |
| H | -2.5629012 | 3.3445514 | 0.4218236 |
| H | -3.1802311 | 3.0592843 | -1.1667989 |
| H | 0.9346119 | 5.0742637 | -0.4801852 |
| H | 1.1626287 | 3.8139677 | 0.4031862 |
| H | -0.9064455 | 4.4560951 | 0.7618279 |
| H | -1.5951471 | 4.1358268 | 2.1200140 |
| H | 2.8811389 | 3.1070957 | 1.7860263 |
| H | 2.4546438 | 2.0040222 | 0.8062132 |
| H | 2.9186008 | -0.2768758 | 0.2881671 |
| H | 3.7076149 | 0.6134894 | -0.6754618 |
| H | 2.4460562 | -2.1620862 | 1.6885586 |
| H | 2.4969461 | -2.5583966 | 0.2317725 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table S24
Post $\mathrm{S}_{2} / \mathrm{S}_{1}$ conical intersection geometry of $\mathbf{3}$ pentahydrate on the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state MEP optimized with ADC(2)/cc-pVDZ (B in Figure 9)

| C | -2.3323819 | -1.1547437 | -0.1131700 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -0.9437866 | -1.1900755 | -0.4288468 |
| C | -0.2908310 | 0.0419928 | -0.7254215 |
| C | -0.9842588 | 1.2518765 | -0.6536001 |
| C | -2.3643279 | 1.2696980 | -0.3551358 |
| C | -3.0342086 | 0.0544301 | -0.0958654 |
| C | -0.1957068 | -2.4307783 | -0.4548838 |
| C | 0.8565906 | -2.6424513 | -1.4459045 |
| C | 1.4181972 | -3.9726082 | -1.5339086 |
| C | 1.2298523 | -4.9164454 | -0.4803680 |
| C | 0.3708190 | -4.6203041 | 0.6265611 |
| C | -0.4159272 | -3.4222437 | 0.5709062 |
| N | -3.0420977 | 2.5278131 | -0.2708663 |
| O | 2.8713058 | 0.8903408 | -0.0422146 |
| O | 1.9506366 | 2.9188124 | 1.2217406 |
| O | 0.3531737 | 4.2934737 | 0.0708974 |
| O | 2.8203634 | -1.6768485 | 0.6319548 |
| O | -1.7819879 | 4.4059975 | 1.2914511 |
| H | -0.4580790 | 2.1950831 | -0.8322900 |
| H | 0.7862716 | 0.0466813 | -0.9145421 |
| H | -1.1367621 | -3.2012391 | 1.3663956 |
| H | 0.2509685 | -5.3269634 | 1.4517140 |
| H | 1.7389548 | -5.8845110 | -0.5313073 |
| H | 2.0082354 | -4.2545758 | -2.4124848 |
| H | 0.9002409 | -1.9730261 | -2.3136615 |
| H | -2.8704207 | -2.0962702 | 0.0413271 |
| H | -4.1149308 | 0.0563122 | 0.0889777 |
| H | -4.0538555 | 2.3929172 | -0.1905593 |
| H | -2.3447633 | 3.6901589 | 0.8791686 |
| H | -2.8905556 | 3.0685635 | -1.1296972 |
| H | 0.6475051 | 5.1819218 | -0.1788084 |
| H | 1.1603299 | 3.6933190 | 0.6016425 |
| H | -0.5279145 | 4.3737141 | 0.6548262 |
| H | -1.8272629 | 4.2663777 | 2.2484182 |
| H | 2.6981125 | 3.3283799 | 1.6797632 |
| H | 2.3337402 | 2.1241035 | 0.7169213 |
| H | 2.8458319 | -0.0384549 | 0.3176055 |
| H | 3.6491745 | 0.8948996 | -0.6168335 |
| H | 2.3471171 | -2.0591459 | 1.3856250 |
| H | 2.3726357 | -2.1061922 | -0.1255126 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table S25
Characteristic ESPT to Ring-1 geometry of $\mathbf{3}$ pentahydrate on the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state MEP optimized with ADC(2)/cc-pVDZ (C in Figure 9)

| C | -2.3388279 | -1.1869566 | -0.1549691 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -0.9324386 | -1.1818968 | -0.4190762 |
| C | -0.2886406 | 0.0565366 | -0.7283958 |
| C | -0.9959862 | 1.2506242 | -0.6942210 |
| C | -2.3935368 | 1.2375094 | -0.4096666 |
| C | -3.0499704 | 0.0042685 | -0.1162620 |
| C | -0.1386326 | -2.4154684 | -0.3584838 |
| C | 1.0766914 | -2.5312971 | -1.2526784 |
| C | 1.4554826 | -3.9310099 | -1.4698253 |
| C | 1.2233003 | -4.8896026 | -0.4697607 |
| C | 0.4031510 | -4.5948010 | 0.6405992 |
| C | -0.3725773 | -3.3765458 | 0.6039994 |
| N | -3.0962154 | 2.4141934 | -0.3868611 |
| O | 2.7438704 | 0.9065348 | -0.1072811 |
| O | 1.9874485 | 2.8586754 | 1.3518674 |
| O | 0.3082353 | 4.3039275 | -0.1005226 |
| O | 2.8820683 | -1.5228329 | 0.5739078 |
| O | -1.8911620 | 4.4692990 | 1.4195176 |
| H | -0.4861429 | 2.2076326 | -0.8587856 |
| H | 0.7866862 | 0.0754131 | -0.9251508 |
| H | -1.1597617 | -3.2223983 | 1.3535014 |
| H | 0.2444089 | -5.3213430 | 1.4444096 |
| H | 1.6576538 | -5.8896694 | -0.5754947 |
| H | 2.0029487 | -4.2150021 | -2.3775769 |
| H | 0.9989158 | -1.9422452 | -2.1881824 |
| H | -2.8528837 | -2.1375691 | 0.0203377 |
| H | -4.1279911 | 0.0019441 | 0.0829244 |
| H | -4.1138638 | 2.3543462 | -0.3542142 |
| H | -2.4253172 | 3.7056607 | 1.1504616 |
| H | -2.7465362 | 3.1732041 | -0.9741263 |
| H | 0.5471897 | 5.1930047 | -0.3957694 |
| H | 1.4459497 | 3.4552173 | 0.7808228 |
| H | -0.4322381 | 4.4526753 | 0.5322784 |
| H | -1.8855173 | 4.4194429 | 2.3851986 |
| H | 2.6909607 | 3.4208851 | 1.6980648 |
| H | 2.5276539 | 1.6783647 | 0.4916493 |
| H | 2.7901088 | -0.5261701 | 0.4658813 |
| H | 3.6169150 | 1.0800250 | -0.4820792 |
| H | 2.3831341 | -1.7799420 | 1.3615479 |
| H | 1.9554653 | -2.0546443 | -0.5575709 |
|  |  |  |  |

Table S26
$\mathrm{S}_{1} / \mathrm{S}_{0}$ conical intersection geometry of $\mathbf{3}$ pentahydrate optimized with $\mathrm{ADC}(2) / \mathrm{cc}-\mathrm{pVDZ}$ ( $\mathbf{D}$ in Figure 9)

| C | -2.2983337 | -1.2947310 | -0.4617157 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -0.8715257 | -1.2947310 | -0.4617157 |
| C | -0.1531030 | -0.0726469 | -0.4617157 |
| C | -0.8213642 | 1.1362226 | -0.5401775 |
| C | -2.2496259 | 1.1421051 | -0.4770314 |
| C | -2.9813928 | -0.0859599 | -0.3648002 |
| C | -0.0669139 | -2.5579514 | -0.4290424 |
| C | 1.0635139 | -2.7276313 | -1.4373800 |
| C | 1.4236873 | -4.1792081 | -1.4471120 |
| C | 1.3202581 | -5.0169802 | -0.3693078 |
| C | 0.7054773 | -4.5831039 | 0.8397772 |
| C | -0.1800511 | -3.3634145 | 0.6541574 |
| N | -2.8677465 | 2.3163404 | -0.5773111 |
| O | 2.5212655 | 1.2936983 | -0.4401712 |
| O | 1.8554376 | 3.1311019 | 1.5507165 |
| O | -0.1184779 | 4.3961815 | -0.2196368 |
| O | 3.0769321 | -1.2901502 | 0.9903861 |
| O | -2.1239665 | 4.5673420 | 1.7197182 |
| H | -0.2717254 | 2.0698192 | -0.6631083 |
| H | 0.9325226 | -0.0876891 | -0.4832869 |
| H | -1.0294507 | -3.2222636 | 1.3455950 |
| H | 0.3954675 | -5.3060080 | 1.6176568 |
| H | 1.6695920 | -6.0552184 | -0.4574432 |
| H | 1.6541982 | -4.6581400 | -2.4384225 |
| H | 0.7467722 | -2.4136552 | -2.4383816 |
| H | -2.8519233 | -2.2364305 | -0.4210541 |
| H | -4.0602751 | -0.0607962 | -0.1964803 |
| H | -3.8889292 | 2.3746593 | -0.6119862 |
| H | -2.5072125 | 3.7114130 | 1.9862537 |
| H | -2.3214456 | 3.1843718 | -0.6570322 |
| H | 0.1807636 | 5.2441321 | -0.5816069 |
| H | 1.3618125 | 3.6778686 | 0.9132132 |
| H | -0.6932758 | 4.6512794 | 0.5300683 |
| H | -2.0061792 | 5.0072909 | 2.5835742 |
| H | 2.5315425 | 3.7325537 | 1.8908701 |
| H | 2.4483562 | 1.8518712 | 0.3668022 |
| H | 2.8502891 | -0.4666538 | 0.5142519 |
| H | 3.4669436 | 1.3201782 | -0.6403138 |
| H | 2.2251048 | -1.7766729 | 0.9594689 |
| H | 1.9329735 | -2.0584216 | -1.1862423 |

Table S27. Energies and lowest frequencies for structures computed with density functional theory $\left(\mathrm{CPCM}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)\right.$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP) and time-dependent density functional theory (TD-CPCM $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP).

|  |  |  | Lowest | Oscillator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Structure | Electronic | E (Hartree) | frequency <br> $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ | Strength |
|  | State |  |  |  |
| $1\left(\mathrm{~S}_{0}\right)$ | $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ | -518.249820973 | 54.7180 | N/A |
| $2\left(\mathrm{~S}_{0}\right)$ | $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ | -518.252473842 | 58.8191 | N/A |
| $3\left(\mathrm{~S}_{0}\right)$ | $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ | -518.252775589 | 70.2348 | N/A |
| $1\left(\mathrm{~S}_{1}\right)^{*}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | -518.115935698 | 69.2880 | 0.3913 |
| $2\left(\mathrm{~S}_{1}\right)^{*}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | -518.116042331 | 32.0661 | 0.2338 |
| $3\left(\mathrm{~S}_{1}\right)^{*}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | -518.114080020 | 15.8123 | 1.1427 |
| $1\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}\right)$ | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | -518.144970898 | 56.3583 | N/A |
| $2\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}\right)$ | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | -518.148449963 | 44.8309 | N/A |
| $3\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}\right)$ | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | -518.150733522 | 40.4575 | N/A |

*Computed at TD-CPCM $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP.

Table S28
$1\left(\mathrm{~S}_{0}\right)$ optimized at $\mathrm{CPCM}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 2.93666100 & -1.00483600 & -0.76262300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 1.54940300 & -1.03062500 & -0.76393900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 0.81666800 & -0.15663000 & 0.03961200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 1.51443300 & 0.74201300 & 0.84990900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 2.90132100 & 0.77101600 & 0.85007900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 3.61784200 & -0.10156400 & 0.04185200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.48716700 & -1.69060200 & -1.39588100\end{array}$
$\mathrm{H} \quad 1.02109300-1.73223400-1.39926600$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 0.96357200 & 1.40951200 & 1.50392000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.42348300 & 1.47151300 & 1.49105000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 4.70095100 & -0.07949700 & 0.04157100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -0.66276100 & -0.21334100 & 0.05379000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -1.44871100 & 0.91581000 & -0.25210100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -1.29854900 & -1.41336800 & 0.36454000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{C} & -2.84251700 & 0.79845100 & -0.19724300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -2.67951600 & -1.52354600 & 0.40889500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -0.68100300 & -2.27492800 & 0.59409000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -3.44865600 & -0.40059800 & 0.13098700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.44964900 & 1.66636000 & -0.43173100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -3.14639100 & -2.46657100 & 0.66383900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.53052400 & -0.45690600 & 0.16661000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{N} & -0.88070500 & 2.09792100 & -0.68454200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -1.44404900 & 2.92373000 & -0.57069100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & 0.08659100 & 2.24748300 & -0.45427700\end{array}$

Table S29
2 ( $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ ) optimized at $\mathrm{CPCM}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 3.01744100 & -1.30444200 & -0.47247900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 1.64553100 & -1.10633500 & -0.50950600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.07737700 & 0.07362700 & -0.02437700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}C & 1.92838400 & 1.04964300 & 0.49877700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}C & 3.30034000 & 0.85224500 & 0.53729200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{C} & 3.85161200 & -0.32604300 & 0.05169500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.43713700 & -2.22454500 & -0.86191200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.00680000 & -1.86864800 & -0.93998300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.50802900 & 1.96495600 & 0.89852100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.94101000 & 1.61974600 & 0.95546700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 4.92350400 & -0.48059100 & 0.08138600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -0.38455600 & 0.28627100 & -0.06398800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -0.91367900 & 1.54866900 & -0.34150800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -1.25381600 & -0.77496700 & 0.17602900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -2.28918300 & 1.72408700 & -0.37433100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -2.63974700 & -0.60422600 & 0.14382400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -0.85184700 & -1.75332200 & 0.41649400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -3.15130900 & 0.66722100 & -0.13572600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.69965400 & 2.70268000 & -0.59571100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.25390800 & 2.38081800 & -0.55241100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.22470700 & 0.81902500 & -0.16412500\end{array}$
$\mathrm{N} \quad-3.48650700 \quad-1.68104200 \quad 0.33605900$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.09548000 & -2.45554700 & 0.84703700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.41570000 & -1.45176800 & 0.64862200\end{array}$

Table S30
3 ( $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ ) optimized at $\mathrm{CPCM}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP

| C | -2.39136900 | -1.14699500 | 0.34830800 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -1.00896000 & -1.14023400 & 0.34605900\end{array}$
C $\quad-0.28002700-0.00041400-0.00189800$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -1.00919300 & 1.13930900 & -0.34967700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -2.39154200 & 1.14466700 & -0.35530100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -3.11292600 & -0.00190400 & -0.00569800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}C & 1.19401600 & 0.00020000 & -0.00001200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 1.91472400 & 1.14261600 & 0.36050600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 3.30121700 & 1.14439100 & 0.35940000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 4.00377300 & 0.00087200 & 0.00283200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 3.30252200 & -1.14300700 & -0.35506100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.91601500 & -1.14188500 & -0.35896500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.92514000 & -2.04646900 & 0.63555700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -0.48410600 & -2.03956100 & 0.64759800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.38213900 & 2.03564900 & 0.66616000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.83564600 & 2.04181300 & 0.64880200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 5.08713100 & 0.00117700 & 0.00383300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.83797000 & -2.04015300 & -0.64342800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.38437800 & -2.03509600 & -0.66576500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.48458900 & 2.04108100 & -0.64423000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.92571100 & 2.04390100 & -0.64244300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{N} & -4.49207800 & -0.01942800 & -0.06404800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.94611500 & -0.72774800 & 0.48863500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.94655800 & 0.87570800 & 0.01066000\end{array}$

Table S31
$1\left(\mathrm{~S}_{1}\right)$ optimized at TD-CPCM $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 2.98260400 & -1.19542000 & -0.39769400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.61400100 & -1.28140200 & -0.38686400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 0.79859700 & -0.18262200 & 0.03578700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 1.49884100 & 0.96053600 & 0.56141900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 2.87594400 & 1.02339000 & 0.53997200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{C} & 3.64443700 & -0.03240200 & 0.04390800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.56238000 & -2.03761400 & -0.75995400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.13849800 & -2.17863800 & -0.76513100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 0.94851900 & 1.74250000 & 1.07050400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.36763200 & 1.89677500 & 0.95570800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & 4.72573100 & 0.02261100 & 0.04195800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -0.62227100 & -0.26978500 & -0.00242800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{C} & -1.45829700 & 0.91547100 & -0.17278300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{C} & -1.33603500 & -1.48719400 & 0.10672600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -2.84898000 & 0.87674300 & 0.00234600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -2.71536100 & -1.51080200 & 0.23741500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -0.78592600 & -2.41581100 & 0.18018300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -3.48660600 & -0.33556000 & 0.22633500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.41613500 & 1.79114400 & -0.13189900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -3.21063400 & -2.46548900 & 0.37276800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.56142000 & -0.38135100 & 0.33825300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{N} & -0.87734600 & 2.03264900 & -0.63093200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 0.10749500 & 2.04588300 & -0.84821700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -1.41594500 & 2.86572800 & -0.80247200\end{array}$

Table S32
2 ( $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ ) optimized at TD-CPCM( $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 3.02865800 & -1.40819400 & 0.00006000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.66296800 & -1.23846600 & 0.00009500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 1.06633100 & 0.06168800 & 0.00002800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.97888300 & 1.16162200 & -0.00021800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 3.34296900 & 0.97281500 & -0.00028500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 3.90151300 & -0.31202200 & -0.00007800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.43233700 & -2.41563400 & 0.00016300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.03874400 & -2.12287700 & 0.00011300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.61047900 & 2.17923700 & -0.00041700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.99257300 & 1.84202000 & -0.00052600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 4.97468500 & -0.45402100 & -0.00008300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & -0.35149800 & 0.23864700 & 0.00021700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -0.95136100 & 1.55173400 & 0.00044300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -1.26820200 & -0.83094100 & 0.00035200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -2.32296800 & 1.76670500 & 0.00004600\end{array}$
C $\quad-2.65587300 \quad-0.60414000 \quad-0.00008200$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.93349700 & -1.85950300 & 0.00068000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & -3.21347600 & 0.70681300 & -0.00037200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.69304600 & 2.78456100 & 0.00017500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.31216900 & 2.42367000 & 0.00115900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.28663100 & 0.84507400 & -0.00046300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{N} & -3.49716400 & -1.64551900 & -0.00022000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.15693300 & -2.59300900 & 0.00008400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.49405400 & -1.50844400 & -0.00057700\end{array}$

Table S33
3 ( $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ ) optimized at TD-CPCM $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -2.38915600 & -1.21615500 & -0.00246200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -1.02532600 & -1.22028100 & -0.00583300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -0.25317700 & 0.00000300 & -0.00480600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -1.02533500 & 1.22028000 & -0.00688200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -2.38916500 & 1.21615900 & -0.00354000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -3.11829500 & -0.00000400 & 0.00145800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 1.15960700 & 0.00000500 & -0.00139500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.92672100 & 1.22283600 & 0.00095900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 3.29759700 & 1.20946500 & 0.00339200\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 4.01699300 & -0.00000400 & 0.00368800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 3.29759400 & -1.20946700 & 0.00225900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.92671400 & -1.22282700 & -0.00009300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.93311400 & -2.15440000 & -0.00286100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -0.51959900 & -2.17502500 & -0.00891400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.42220700 & 2.17980700 & 0.00181200\end{array}$
H
$3.83498700 \quad 2.15185200 \quad 0.00534500$
$5.10001800-0.00000700 \quad 0.00544000$
$3.83498300-2.15186000 \quad 0.00322700$
$1.42220200-2.17980600-0.00043000$
$-0.51962500 \quad 2.17502700-0.01112300$
$-2.93312900 \quad 2.15439200-0.00488200$
$-4.46851300-0.00000500 \quad 0.00481000$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.98898300 & -0.85913700 & 0.02951600\end{array}$

H
$-4.98899100 \quad 0.85913600 \quad 0.02872000$

Table S34
$1\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}\right)$ optimized at $\mathrm{CPCM}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 3.00748500 & -1.19507600 & -0.23321700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 1.64159100 & -1.28498800 & -0.33132300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{C} & 0.79254400 & -0.16804400 & -0.03455700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.45412400 & 1.01487700 & 0.43682900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & 2.82463100 & 1.08089700 & 0.53443800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 3.62650800 & -0.01096900 & 0.18980000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.61474700 & -2.05568400 & -0.49054400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.20441100 & -2.21063200 & -0.68078600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 0.86434800 & 1.85567500 & 0.77606000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.28422900 & 1.98857200 & 0.90931400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 4.70447000 & 0.04905500 & 0.26927400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -0.60246900 & -0.25885400 & -0.17373500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -1.49105000 & 0.93306300 & -0.19279500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{C} & -1.31837200 & -1.52011200 & -0.20607900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & -2.80462600 & 0.84000500 & 0.25267500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -2.61662400 & -1.57761200 & 0.18702100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -0.78932800 & -2.43629400 & -0.43002000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -3.36701100 & -0.40140500 & 0.51269900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.41114800 & 1.73943900 & 0.28593400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -3.10556000 & -2.54370600 & 0.25291000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.39473600 & -0.48594300 & 0.83824300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{N} & -1.01461000 & 2.06719500 & -0.74984700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -1.62778100 & 2.84529300 & -0.92254500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.12176400 & 2.07317600 & -1.20944700\end{array}$

Table S35
$2\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}\right)$ optimized at $\mathrm{CPCM}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 3.02425700 & -1.41176800 & 0.00009800\end{array}$
C $\quad 1.66078700-1.24351900 \quad 0.00005100$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 1.05710200 & 0.05490800 & -0.00004500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.97095700 & 1.15591100 & 0.00000300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}C & 3.33618900 & 0.96871900 & 0.00005700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 3.89298600 & -0.31206700 & 0.00008700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.43117600 & -2.41742600 & 0.00017600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.03637200 & -2.12732500 & 0.00006700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.60050900 & 2.17181400 & 0.00005900\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.98566200 & 1.83762500 & 0.00006700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 4.96647300 & -0.45247800 & 0.00012600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & -0.34603400 & 0.23009300 & -0.00015400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & -0.94479000 & 1.58199300 & -0.00033300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -1.27092400 & -0.84545200 & -0.00016800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & -2.30296900 & 1.78793000 & 0.00004500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -2.63151400 & -0.63441400 & 0.00006000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -0.92469700 & -1.87077900 & -0.00037300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & -3.18848400 & 0.71758200 & 0.00040700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.68751100 & 2.80082100 & 0.00002400\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.29912400 & 2.44808800 & -0.00089200\end{array}$
H
N
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.22514300 & -2.60112000 & -0.00038000\end{array}$
H
$-4.50997400-1.45922300 \quad 0.00017400$

Table S36
$3\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}\right)$ optimized at $\mathrm{CPCM}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)$-PBE0-D3/def2-TZVPP
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -2.38185200 & -1.21966000 & -0.00633000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -1.02659200 & -1.23090800 & -0.00906600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -0.24073600 & -0.00000800 & -0.00663500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -1.02658200 & 1.23089800 & -0.00925100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -2.38184300 & 1.21965400 & -0.00651800\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}C & -3.11514400 & 0.00000200 & 0.00175500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 1.15308500 & -0.00001000 & -0.00254000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 1.92539700 & 1.22302200 & 0.00027000\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 3.29349600 & 1.20995200 & 0.00506100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 4.01196800 & 0.00001200 & 0.00744300\end{array}$
C $\quad 3.29351200-1.20994000 \quad 0.00487400$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{C} & 1.92541500 & -1.22303100 & 0.00006500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.92802700 & -2.15732500 & -0.00942300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{H} & -0.52327300 & -2.18669000 & -0.01168500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.42042800 & 2.17901800 & -0.00086900\end{array}$
$3.83201500 \quad 2.15129000 \quad 0.00718700$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 5.09427700 & 0.00001700 & 0.01134700\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 3.83204600 & -2.15127000 & 0.00687600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & 1.42046300 & -2.17903500 & -0.00146300\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -0.52326100 & 2.18668000 & -0.01228100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -2.92801700 & 2.15732100 & -0.00974600\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{N} & -4.47532400 & 0.00000600 & -0.02551500\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.97506900 & -0.85180500 & 0.16200100\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -4.97505600 & 0.85185100 & 0.16189000\end{array}$

## 7. NMR spectra

${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 300 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethyl-2-aminobiphenyl


${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 300 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethyl-2-aminobiphenyl (aromatic region)


${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 75 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethyl-2-aminobiphenyl


${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\} \mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 75 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of $N, N$-dimethyl-2-aminobiphenyl (aromatic region)

${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 4 days of irradiation



[^0]freq. of 0 ppm: 600.170012 MHz processed size: 65536 co
LB: 0.300 GF: 0.0000
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, enlarged aromatic part) of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 4 days of irradiation


file: ...024-01-18_NB_N-480_3-4_MeOD2111fid expt: <zg30>
transmitter freq.: 600.173706 MH
width: $11904.76 \mathrm{~Hz}=19.8355 \mathrm{ppm}=0.181652 \mathrm{~Hz} / \mathrm{pt}$
freq. of 0 ppm : 600.170012 MHz
processed size: 65536 complex points
LB: 0.300 GF: 0.0000
number of scans: 8
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 4 days of irradiation



[^1]size: 32768 complex point
LB: $1.000 \quad$ GF: 0.0000
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, enlarged aromatic part) of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 4 days of irradiation



MS (ESI + ) of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 2 days of irradiation



| $m / z$ | Absolute Intensity | Relative Intensity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 170.2 | 689356 | 100 |
| 171.2 | 620070 | 89.95 |
| 172.25 | 191088 | 27.72 |

MS data indicates the presence of $50 \%$ 1, $40 \%$ 1-D and $10 \%$ 1-2D

MS (ESI + ) of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 4 days of irradiation



| $m / z$ | Absolute Intensity | Relative Intensity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 170.2 | 201273 | 24.54 |
| 171.2 | 820348 | 100 |
| 172.2 | 624254 | 76.1 |
| 173.25 | 74603 | 9.09 |

MS data indicates the presence of $12 \%$ 1, 21\% 1-D, 35\% 1-2D and $1 \%$ 1-3D
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 8 days of irradiation



[^2]rocessed size: 65536 complex points
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, enlarged aromatic part) of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 8 days of irradiation


file: ...F|2024-01-23_NB_N-481-4_MeODI11fid expt: <zg30>
transmitter freq.: 600.173706 MHz
time domain size: 65536 points
width: $11904.76 \mathrm{~Hz}=19.8355 \mathrm{ppm}=0.181652 \mathrm{~Hz} / \mathrm{pt}$
freq. of 0 ppm: 600.170012 MHz
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${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right)$ of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 8 days of irradiation
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${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, enlarged aromatic part) of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 8 days of irradiation



[^3]number of scans: 2560
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 600 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, enlarged aromatic part) of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 2 (top), 4 (middle), and 8 days (bottom) of irradiation
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${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\left\{{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\right\}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}, 150 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, enlarged aromatic part) of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 4 (top) and 8 days (bottom) of irradiation
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MS (ESI + ) of 2-amino-2'-deuteriobiphenyl (1-D) after 8 days of irradiation



| $m / z$ | Absolute Intensity | Relative Intensity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 171.2 | 226175 | 23.82 |
| 172.2 | 949348 | 100 |
| 173.2 | 129439 | 13.63 |

MS data indicates the presence of $0 \%$ 1, $18 \%$ 1-D, $79 \%$ 1-2D and $2 \%$ 1-3D
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