Diastereoselective synthesis and two-step photocleavage of ruthenium polypyridyl complexes bearing a bisthioether ligand

*Michael S. Meijer and Sylvestre Bonnet**

Leiden Institute of Chemistry, Leiden University, P.O. Box 9502, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands.

*Corresponding author: *bonnet@chem.leidenuniv.nl*

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1) Table of contents

2) Atom numbering schemes used for NMR attribution

Scheme S1. Structural formulas of compounds 5, and 6, showing the atom numbering used in NMR attribution.

Scheme S2. Structural formulas of compounds [1](PF₆)₂, [2](PF₆)₂, and [3](PF₆)₂, showing the atom numbering **used in NMR attribution.**

3) Photosubstitution quantum yields of $[1-3](PF_6)$ ₂ under blue-light **irradiation**

Entry	Complex	Solvent	[Ru] / μ м	$\lambda_{\rm exc}$ / nm	$q_{\rm D}$ / mol \cdot s ⁻¹	t/min
	$[1] (PF_6)_2$	H ₂ O	72	443	2.65×10^{-8}	120
	$[2] (PF_6)_2$	H ₂ O	181	443	2.85×10^{-8}	120
3	$[3] (PF_6)_2$	H ₂ O	99	443	2.85×10^{-8}	120

Table S1. Conditions of the photoreactions monitored by UV-Vis absorption spectroscopy and MS.

Data treatment and quantum yield calculation: For a photosubstitution reaction in which a starting complex, **R**, is converted into a photoproduct, **P**, by the substitution of a ligand for one of more solvent molecules, the photosubstitution quantum yield, Φ_{λ} , can be directly calculated from the firstorder photochemical rate constant, $k_Φ$, derived directly from a mono-exponential fit of the change to the UV-Vis absorption spectrum at a certain wavelength *versus* time, if the following conditions are met:

- (a) both the reagent **R** and the photoproduct **P** are thermally stable, and have significantly different UV-Vis absorption spectra;
- (b) the photosubstituted ligand and the incoming solvent molecule do not absorb light at the irradiation wavelength, nor at the fitted wavelength;
- (c) the photochemical reaction is an (apparent) single step photoreaction;
- (d) irradiation is performed at a wavelength near the isosbestic point of the photoreaction, i.e. where the absorbance of the solution is constant throughout the photoreaction.

Under these circumstances, k_{Φ} can be converted into the photosubstitution quantum yield, Φ_{λ} , using Equation S1:

$$
\Phi_{\lambda} = \frac{k_{\Phi} n_{\mathbf{R}}}{q_{\mathbf{p}} \cdot (1 - 10^{-A}\lambda)} \tag{S1}
$$

where, k_{Φ} is the found photochemical rate constant, $n_{\mathbf{R}}$ is the amount of reagent at the start of the reaction, q_p is the incoming photon flux, and A_λ is the absorbance at the irradiation wavelength.

If the final condition (d) set above is not met, i.e. the irradiation is performed at a wavelength that is not an isosbestic point, the photosubstitution quantum yield can be calculated following a method discussed previously in detail by Bahreman and Bonnet.¹ Here, Φ_{λ} can be obtained from the slope of a plot of the number of mol of \mathbf{R} ($n_{\mathbf{R}}$) *vs.* the total number of mol of photons absorbed by \mathbf{R} ($Q_{i,\mathbf{R}}$) between $t = t_0$ and $t = t_i$. Thus, $Q_{i,\mathbf{R}}$ is calculated according to Equation S2:

$$
Q_{i,\mathbf{R}}(t) = \sum_{t=0}^{i} q_{i,\mathbf{R}} \qquad \qquad \text{Equation (S2)}
$$

where $q_{i,\mathbf{R}}$ is the moles of photons absorbed by **R** between two consecutive UV-Vis absorption measurements at t_{i+1} and t_i ($\Delta t = t_{i+1} - t_i$). Assuming that absorbance is constant in this time interval *Δt*, *qi,***^R** can be calculated according to Equation S3:

$$
q_{i,\mathbf{R}} = \left(\frac{(A_{\mathbf{R}})_{\text{ave}}}{(A_{\text{tot}})_{\text{ave}}}\right)_i \cdot (1 - 10^{-3 \cdot (A_{\text{tot}})_{\text{ave}}}) \cdot q_{\text{p}} \cdot \Delta t
$$
 Equation (S3)

where $(A_{\mathbf{R}})_{\text{ave}}$ is the average absorbance of **R** between two consecutive UV-Vis absorption measurements, $(A_{\text{tot}})_{\text{ave}}$ is the average total absorbance of the solution at the irradiation wavelength between the same consecutive UV-Vis absorption measurements, q_p is the photon flux of the irradiation source at the irradiation wavelength, and $(1 - 10^{-3}(A_{\text{tot}})$ is the probability of absorption of a photon. The multiplication factor 3 is necessary as irradiation is performed from the top of the 1.0×1.0 cm cuvette through 3 mL of solution, resulting in a 3 cm pathlength of irradiation, compared to a 1 cm pathlength for the measurement of absorbances (performed from the side of the cuvette).

The value of n_R , and by extension $(A_R)_{ave}$, is typically calculated by the two-wavelength method, where the time evolution of the concentrations of the two absorbing species (**R** and **P**) is obtained by following the time evolution of the absorbance at two different wavelengths, using the molar extinction coefficients (ε) of the two species at these wavelengths.¹

In this work, however, we discussed several sequential two-step photosubstitution reactions, following the general equation $\mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{I} \to \mathbf{P}$, whereby both conditions (c) and (d) above are not met. As the intermediate species (**I**) in the photoreaction cannot be isolated and is thermally unstable, its molar extinction coefficients (*ε*) is not known. Thus, the two-wavelength method cannot be used to calculate the time evolution of the concentrations of species **R**, **I** and **P** in time.

In this case, we performed a global fitting of the time-dependent evolution of the UV-Vis absorption spectra, using the Glotaran software package.² Using this approach, we obtained both the fitted UV-Vis absorption spectra of species **R**, **I** and **P**, as well as the time-evolution of the relative concentrations (Figure S15B for the photosubstitution of $[1](PF_6)$ ₂ in water). Using the known molar extinction coefficients of the starting compound **R**, we calculated the molar extinction coefficients of **I** and **P** (Figure S15A), and the total concentration of ruthenium $n_{\text{R,t=0}}$. From the time evolution of the relative concentrations and the molar absorption coefficient of all species, we could derive the time evolution of n_{R} , n_{I} , and n_{P} , as well as $Q_{i,\text{R}}$ and $Q_{i,\text{I}}$, the total number of mol of photons absorbed between $t = t_0$ and $t = t_i$ by **R** and **I**, respectively. The slope of the plot of n_R *vs.* $Q_{i,R}$ (Figure S15C) gives the quantum yield of the first step of the reaction. Similarly, the slope of the plot of n_{P} *vs.* Q_{iI} (Figure S15D) gives the quantum yield of the second step of the reaction.

Notably, in the global fitting performed using the Glotaran software package, we employed a sequential first-order kinetic model, which assumes that both reactions are first order reactions, i.e. only dependent of the concentration of the reacting species. This first-order approximation for photochemical reactions is only valid at wavelengths where the probability of absorbance does not change significantly over time, i.e. at the isosbestic point. As the reactions studied here are sequential two-step reactions, they have sequential, non-overlapping isosbestic points (Figure S15A), which prevents us from irradiating the solution at a point where the probability of absorbance does not change during both steps. Although the reactions studied here do therefore not strictly fulfil all the requirements for the application of a first-order kinetic model, we found that such a model fits the data well, as long as the molar extinction coefficients of the species involved are not too different at the irradiation wavelength. The slight deviation from linearity in Figure S15C and Figure S15D may be related to the use of this first-order approximation.

Kinetic data for the photosubstitution of $[2](PF_6)$ ₂ and $[3](PF_6)$ ₂ in water are shown in Figure S16 and Figure S17.

4) Singlet oxygen generation and phosphorescence quantum yield of [1– 3](PF6)2

The quantum yields of singlet oxygen generation and phosphorescence were determined in a custombuilt setup (Scheme S3). All optical parts were connected with optical fibres from Avantes, with a diameter of 200–600 μm. 500 μL of sample, consisting of the compound in deuterated methanol, was added to a 104F-OS semi-micro fluorescence cuvette from Hellma Analytics, and placed in a CUV-UV/VIS-TC temperature-controlled cuvette holder (Avantes). Temperature control was performed with the use of a TC-125 controller from Quantum Northwest. The sample was allowed to equilibrate at 298 K for 5 minutes. Emission spectroscopy was performed with a 450 nm fibre-coupled laser (LRD-0450, Laserglow), which was set to 50 mW at the cuvette (4 mm beam diameter; 0.4 W⋅cm⁻²) at a 90° angle with respect to the spectrometer. The excitation power was measured using a S310C thermal sensor connected to a PM100USB power meter (Thorlabs). The emission spectra were recorded using two separate spectrometers for the UV-Vis and NIR emission, i.e. from 300 nm to 1000 nm for the phosphorescence of the complex (Avantes 2048L StarLine spectrometer) and from 1000 nm to 1700 nm for the phosphorescence of singlet oxygen $(^1\Delta_g)$ around 1275 nm (Avantes NIR256-1.7TEC spectrometer, detector set to −12 °C). Both spectrometers were calibrated using an Avalight-HAL-CAL-ISP30 NIST traceable calibration lamp from Avantes directly before the measurement. The infrared emission spectrum was acquired within 9 seconds, after which the laser was turned off directly. Similarly, the visible emission spectrum was acquired within 2 seconds. UV-Vis absorption spectra before and after emission spectroscopy were measured using an Avalight-DHc halogen-deuterium lamp (Avantes) as light source (turned off during emission spectroscopy) and the before mentioned UV-Vis spectrometer as detector, both connected to the cuvette holder at a 180° angle. All spectra were recorded using Avasoft 8.5 software from Avantes and further processed using Microsoft Office Excel 2010 and Origin Pro 9.1 software.

Scheme S3. Setup used for singlet oxygen generation and phosphorescence quantum yield experiments. (1) CW laser light source, (2) collimating lens, (3) temperature-controlled cuvette holder. (4) double collimator, (5) UV-Vis (300–1000 nm) or NIR (1000–1700 nm) CCD spectrometer, (6) UV-Vis halogen-deuterium light source, and (7) optical fibres.

The quantum yields of phosphorescence and singlet oxygen production was calculated using the relative method with [Ru(bpy)_3]Cl_2 as the standard $(\Phi_\Delta = 0.73)^{3,4}$ $\Phi_\text{P} = 0.015$ in CD₃OD), according to Equation S4. The phosphorescence quantum yield of $\lceil Ru(bpy)_3 \rceil Cl_2$ in CD₃OD was determined by absolute methods (see below).

$$
\Phi_{\text{sam}} = \Phi_{\text{std}} \times \frac{A_{\text{std}}^{450}}{A_{\text{sam}}^{450}} \times \frac{E_{\text{sam}}}{E_{\text{std}}}
$$
 Equation (S4)

where *Φ* is the quantum yield, *A*⁴⁵⁰ is the absorbance at 450 nm (always kept below 0.1 for a 4 mm path length), *E* is the integrated emission peak of singlet oxygen at 1270 nm or the integrated phosphorescence emission peak between 520 and 950 nm, and *sam* and *std* denote the sample and standard, respectively.

5) Absolute phosphorescence quantum yield of $\left[\text{Ru(bpy)}_{3}\right] \text{Cl}_{2}$

The phosphorescence quantum yield (Φ_P) of $\text{[Ru(bov)}_3\text{]}C_2$ in deuterated methanol in air at room temperature (293 \pm 2 K) was determined by absolute methods using an integrating sphere-based setup, to serve as a standard for relative phosphorescence quantum yield measurements. $\Phi_{\rm P}$ was found to be 0.015 ± 0.002 . In order to validate the method used, $\Phi_{\rm P}$ was also determined in water, where we obtained a Φ_P in air of 0.044 \pm 0.005, which compares well to the literature value (0.040 \pm 0.002).⁵

Experimental setup: The integrating sphere setup used for determining the phosphorescence quantum yield is depicted in Scheme S4. The excitation source was a fibre-coupled CW 450-nm diode laser (LRD-0450, Laserglow), coupled into a 200-μm multimode optical fibre, leading to a collimating lens (F220SMA-B, Thorlabs). After collimation, the light passed a mechanical iris to produce a 4-mm diameter beam (*vide infra*) with 10 mW optical power (*P*exc = 80 mW∙cm−2). The excitation power was measured using a S310C thermal sensor connected to a PM100USB power meter (Thorlabs). A PTFE-coated AvaSphere-30-IRRAD integrating sphere (30 mm diameter, reflectance > 98%), fitted with three ports (entry, exit and sample port), and an AvaSpec-ULS2048L StarLine CCD spectrometer were obtained from Avantes. The integrating sphere and spectrometer were calibrated together using an Avalight-HAL-CAL-ISP30 NIST traceable calibration lamp from Avantes (9.5% relative uncertainty *versus* NIST standard), so that the observed intensities are expressed as a photon flux (mol photons⋅s⁻¹⋅nm⁻¹). The filter holder was fabricated by our own mechanical department, and held a NE520A (OD = 2) absorptive neutral density filter (Thorlabs) or a 500-nm longpass filter (FEL0500, Thorlabs, $T_{520-1000 \text{ nm}} = 92.1 \pm 0.9\%$). An Avalight-DHc (Avantes) deuterium-halogen lamp was used as a white-light source for the determination of the transmission functions of the filters used. The spectra were recorded with Avasoft 8.5 software from Avantes, and further processed with Microsoft Office Excel 2010 and Origin Pro 9.1 software.

Scheme S4. Setup used for absolute quantum yield measurements. (1) laser source, (2) collimating lens, and mechanical iris, (3) power meter (adjustable in position), (4) integrating sphere with sample tube in the centre, (5) filter holder, (6) 500-nm longpass filter or OD2 neutral density filter, (7) CCD spectrometer, (8) optical fibres.

Experimental procedure: A measurement tube, made of a quartz EPR-tube bottom $(\pm 7 \text{ cm length})$ fused to a NS-14 glass connector (± 2 cm length), was filled with a solution of $\left[\text{Ru(bpy)}\right]$ ($\left[\text{Cu(L)}\right]$ 50 μ M in CD₃OD), and closed with a septum under air. A second tube was filled with CD₃OD (50 μ L) and served as the blank. The tube precisely fitted into a hole made in the integrating sphere, and was suspended in the centre of the sphere, in the middle of the excitation laser beam. The laser diode was allowed to warm up for 10 minutes prior to the experiment to guarantee a stable optical power output. The measurements were always performed in the same order, i.e. (1) absorption measurement of the blank, (2) absorption measurement of the sample, and (3) emission measurement of the sample. In this way, the neutral density filter is not moved between the measurement of the blank and sample, ensuring equal attenuation of the non-absorbed excitation light for both spectra. Equally, the sample

is not moved between the measurement of its absorption and emission. For the absorption measurements, the neutral density filter was placed in the filter, and replaced by the 500-nm longpass filter for the emission measurement.

Quantum yield calculation method: The phosphorescence quantum yield (Φ_{P}) is defined by Equation S5:

$$
\Phi_{\rm P} = \frac{q_{\rm p-em}}{q_{\rm p-abs}} = \frac{\int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} I_{\rm P}(\lambda) d\lambda}{\int_{\lambda_3}^{\lambda_4} (I_{\rm exc\text{-}blank}(\lambda) - I_{\rm exc\text{-}sample}(\lambda)) d\lambda}
$$
 Equation (S5)

Here, *q*p-em is the emission photon flux (in photons∙s−1) integrated over the spectral range *λ*¹ to *λ*² (520–950 nm), q_{p-abs} is the photon flux absorbed by the ruthenium complex (in photons∙s⁻¹), and *I*_P(λ) is the spectral luminescence intensity (in photons⋅s⁻¹⋅nm⁻¹). q_{p-abs} is determined by subtracting the spectral light intensity of the excitation source that has passed through the sample $(I_{\text{exc-sample}})$, in photons∙s⁻¹⋅nm⁻¹) from the spectral light intensity of the excitation source that has passed through the blank sample (*I*exc-blank, in photons∙s−1 ∙nm−1), and by integrating over the excitation wavelength range *λ*³ to *λ*⁴ (400–500 nm).

The spectrometer and the integrating sphere were calibrated so that the observed intensities are directly proportional to the photon flux, i.e. *I*_P(λ)∝[mol photons·s⁻¹·nm⁻¹] Therefore, integrating these values over the relevant wavelength regions directly provided the flux of photons that arrived at the spectrometer.

Because the intensity of the emitted light is relatively low compared to that of the exciting laser source the absorption and emission of the sample cannot be measured at the same time. In other words, the laser light saturates the spectrometer, which prevents the emission to be measured simultaneously. To circumvent this problem, the absorption was measured using a neutral density filter with known transmittance (typically $F_{\text{attn}} \approx 0.0062$, i.e. ~ 99.4% attenuation). This filter was placed between the integrating sphere and the spectrometer to measure the absorbed photon flux. The data was corrected for the attenuation by the neutral density filter $(F_{\text{attn}}(\lambda))$ at each wavelength. For the measurement of the emission, this filter was replaced by a longpass filter $($ > 500 nm) to remove the excitation light. Additionally, the intensity of the emission measured was corrected for the minimal absorbance of this light by the shortpass filter used. This was performed by dividing the luminescence intensity at each wavelength by the transmission curve $T(\lambda)$ of the longpass filter at this wavelength. The accordingly corrected equation for $Φ_{UC}$ is Equation S6:

$$
\Phi_{\rm P} = \frac{\int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} \left(\frac{I_{\rm P}(\lambda)}{T(\lambda)}\right) d\lambda}{\int_{\lambda_3}^{\lambda_4} \frac{I_{\rm exc\text{-}blank}(\lambda) - I_{\rm exc\text{-}sample}(\lambda)}{F_{\rm attr}(\lambda)}} \equiv \frac{q_{\rm p\text{-}em}}{q_{\rm p\text{-}abs}} \tag{S6}
$$

6) DFT-minimized structures: comparison

 Λ -(*R*)-ax-(*R*)-eq-OH_{ax}-[1]²⁺ (Λ -b-[1]²⁺)

 $\Lambda\text{-}(R)\text{-ax-(S)-ax-OH}_{\mathsf{ax}}\text{-}\mathsf{[1]}^{2^+}\,(\Lambda\text{-d-}\mathsf{[1]}^{2^+})$

 $\Lambda\text{-}\mathsf{(S)\text{-}eq\text{-}\mathsf{(S)\text{-}ax\text{-}\mathsf{OH}}_{\text{eq}}\text{-}\mathsf{[1]}^{\text{-}t} \left(\Lambda\text{-}\mathsf{f\text{-}\mathsf{[1]}}^{\text{-}t}\right)$

 Λ -(S)-eq-(R)-eq-OH_{ax}-[1]²⁺ (Λ -a-[1]²⁺)

 Λ -(S)-eq-(S)-ax-OH_{ax}-[1]²⁺ (Λ -c-[1]²⁺)

 Λ -(S)-eq-(R)-eq-OH_{eq}-[1]²⁺ (Λ -e-[1]²⁺)

Figure S1. Structures of the isomers of $[1]^{2+}$ optimized by DFT in water (COSMO).

	Λ -a-[1] ²⁺	Λ -b-[1] ²⁺	Λ -c-[1] ²⁺	Λ -d-[1] ²⁺	Λ -e-[1] ²⁺	Λ-f-[1] ²⁺	Λ -g-[1] ²⁺	Λ -h-[1] ²⁺
Ru-S1	2.441	2.476	2.428	2.471	2.442	2.427	2.475	2.471
Ru-S2	2.467	2.449	2.456	2.449	2.464	2.453	2.447	2.451
Ru-N11	2.145	2.143	2.148	2.141	2.149	2.150	2.146	2.148
Ru-N12	2.142	2.131	2.146	2.133	2.146	2.144	2.132	2.132
Ru-N21	2.136	2.140	2.140	2.139	2.138	2.140	2.139	2.139
Ru-N22	2.141	2.150	2.141	2.145	2.143	2.143	2.149	2.148
S1-Ru-S2	88.7	92.8	93.1	96.7	87.9	93.2	92.3	96.8
S1-Ru-N11	94.0	105.3	93.5	104.5	94.1	93.7	105.6	105.2
S1-Ru-N21	91.8	85.0	91.7	85.5	91.7	91.8	85.5	84.8
S1-Ru-N22	93.1	82.4	94.0	82.9	93.5	93.9	82.5	82.9
S2-Ru-N11	83.4	83.2	92.6	92.4	84.0	92.7	83.4	91.9
S2-Ru-N12	91.8	93.8	87.3	88.6	91.6	87.1	93.8	88.0
S2-Ru-N22	103.5	103.8	95.0	94.4	103.6	95.2	104.1	95.5
N11-Ru-N12	77.2	77.2	77.1	77.1	77.1	77.1	77.1	77.1
N11-Ru-N21	95.7	96.1	94.5	95.3	95.1	94.2	95.6	94.8
N12-Ru-N21	87.6	88.5	89.2	89.0	88.6	89.1	88.4	90.1
N12-Ru-N22	95.5	94.4	95.4	94.8	95.2	95.2	94.0	94.1
N21-Ru-N22	77.3	77.2	77.3	77.4	77.3	77.3	77.3	77.4
σ^2 [a]	59.4	87.5	41.6	66.5	58.4	41.7	87.2	68.9
$\Delta_{\rm oct}$ ^[b]	0.0043	0.0046	0.0040	0.0045	0.0042	0.0039	0.0045	0.0045

Table S2. Calculated bond lengths (Å), bond angles (°), and structural distortion parameters in DFT-minimized geometries of complex $[1]^{2+}$ in water.

^[a] The bond angle variance is $\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{11} \sum_{n=1}^{12} (\theta_n - 90)^2$, where θ_n is one of the twelve angles in Table S2; ^[b] The meansquare relative deviation from average bond length is $\Delta_{oct} = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{n=1}^{6} \left(\frac{d_n - \bar{d}}{\bar{d}}\right)^2$, where d_n is one of the six bond lengths in Table S2 and \bar{d} is the average of those six bond lengths.

7) DFT-minimized structures: cartesian coordinates

Λ-(*R*)-ax-(*R*)-eq-OH_{ax}-[1]²⁺ (Λ-b-[1]²⁺)

Λ -(*R*)-ax-(*S*)-ax-OH_{ax}-[1]²⁺ (Λ -d-[1]²⁺)

Λ -(*S*)-eq-(*R*)-eq-OH_{eq}-[1]²⁺ (Λ -e-[1]²⁺)

Λ-(*S***)-eq-(***S***)-ax-OH_{eq}-[1]²⁺ (Λ-f-[1]²⁺)**

Λ -(*R*)-ax-(*R*)-eq-OH_{eq}-[1]²⁺ (Λ -g-[1]²⁺)

Λ **-(***R***)-ax-(***S***)-ax-OH_{eq}-[1]²⁺ (** Λ **-h-[1]²⁺)**

8) 2D NMR of [1]2+

Figure S2. Partial 1 H NOESY NMR spectrum of a solution of [1](PF6)2 in acetone-*d6***, showing the off-diagonal peaks between the HA6 proton and H2,ax, H4,ax, and –OH protons, and the HD6 proton and H2,eq, H4,eq, H3 protons. This confirms that the proton H3 is axial, and the –OH is thus oriented equatorially.**

Figure S3. Partial ¹H NOESY NMR spectrum of a solution of $[1](PF_6)_2$ in acetone-*d6*, showing the off-diagonal **peaks between the H1 protons and the H2, H3, HA6, HC3, HC6, and HD6 protons.**

9) Dark stability and photochemistry of $[1]^{2+}$ **-** $[3]^{2+}$

Figure S4. (a) Visible emission spectra of [1](PF6)2, [2](PF6)2, [3](PF6)2, and [Ru(bpy)3]Cl2 in aerated CD3OD at 293 K under blue-light irradiation (450 nm, 0.4 W∙cm^{−2}). (b) Near-infrared spectra of ¹O2 phosphorescence (λ **em =** 1275 nm) sensitized by $[1] (PF_6)_2$, $[2] (PF_6)_2$, $[3] (PF_6)_2$, and $[Ru(bpy)_3] Cl_2$ in aerated CD₃OD at 293 K under blue**light irradiation (450 nm, 0.4 W∙cm−2).**

Figure S5. Evolution of the UV-Vis absorption spectra of solutions of (A) [1](PF6)2 (106 µM), (B) [2](PF6)2 (112 µM), and (C) $[3]$ (PF₆)₂ (167 μ M) in H₂O in the dark for 53 h at 298 K under air.

Figure S6. Evolution of the UV-Vis absorption spectra of a solution of [1](PF6)2 in H2O (72 µM) upon irradiation (120 min) at 298 K with a 443 nm LED ($q_p = 2.65 \times 10^{-8}$ mol photons s^{-1}) under N₂. Inset: Time evolution of the **absorbance at 413 nm (red), 453 nm (black) and 491 nm (blue) during the irradiation.**

Figure S7. Mass spectrum taken in acetonitrile after 120 min of photolysis of an aqueous solution of [1](PF6)2 under N₂ at 298 K showing a peak corresponding to $\text{[Ru(bpy)2}(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})2]^{2+}$ **(calcd. m/z = 248.0).**

Figure S8. Mass spectrum taken in acetonitrile after 5 min of photolysis of an aqueous solution of [1](PF₆)₂ under N_2 at 298 K showing peaks corresponding to $\text{[Ru(bpy)_2(CH_3CN)_2]}^{2+}$ (calcd. $m/z = 248.0$), $\text{[Ru(bpy)_2(4)]}^{2+}$ (calcd. **m/z = 283.0), [Ru(bpy)₂(4)(CH₃CN)]²⁺ (calcd. m/z = 303.6), and {[Ru(bpy)₂(4)]−H_}⁺ (calcd. m/z = 565.1).**

Figure S9. Evolution of the UV-Vis absorption spectra of a solution of [2](PF6)2 in H2O (181 µM) upon irradiation (120 min) at 298 K with a 443 nm LED ($q_p = 2.85 \times 10^{-8}$ mol photons⋅s⁻¹) under N₂, showing both the overall **reaction** (A), as well as the spectral changes in the first 7 minutes (B, $\Delta t = 24$ s) and thereafter (C, $\Delta t = 6.4$ min) **separately. Time evolution (D) of the absorbance at 412 nm (red), 456 nm (black) and 491 nm (blue) during the irradiation, whereby the vertical dashed line indicates the end of the first reaction** $(t = 7 \text{ min})$ **.**

Figure S10. Evolution of the UV-Vis absorption spectra of a solution of [3](PF6)2 in H2O (99 µm) upon irradiation (120 min) at 298 K with a 443 nm LED ($q_p = 2.85 \times 10-8$ mol photons⋅s−1) under N₂, showing both the overall **reaction (A), as well as the spectral changes in the first 7 minutes (B,** $\Delta t = 24$ **s) and thereafter (C,** $\Delta t = 6.4$ **min) separately. Time evolution (D) of the absorbance at 412 nm (red), 456 nm (black) and 491 nm (blue) during the irradiation, whereby the vertical dashed line indicates the end of the first reaction (** $t = 7$ **min).**

Figure S11. Mass spectrum taken in acetonitrile after 5 min of photolysis of an aqueous solution of [2](PF₆)₂ under N_2 at 298 K showing peaks corresponding to $\left[\text{Ru(bpy)}_2(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_2\right]^{2+}$ (calcd. $m/z = 248.0$), $\left[\text{Ru(bpy)}_2(5)\right]^{2+}$ (calcd. $m/z = 290.0$, and $[\text{Ru(bpy)}_2(5)(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})]^{\frac{2}{7}}$ (calcd. $m/z = 310.6$).

Figure S12. Mass spectrum taken in acetonitrile after 120 min of photolysis of an aqueous solution of [2](PF6)2 under N₂ at 298 K showing a peak corresponding to $\left[\text{Ru(bpy)}_2(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_2\right]^{2+}$ **(calcd. m/z = 248.0).**

Figure S13. Mass spectrum taken in acetonitrile after 5 min of photolysis of an aqueous solution of [3](PF₆₎₂ under N_2 at 298 K showing peaks corresponding to $\text{[Ru(bpy)}_2(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_2]^2^+$ (calcd. $m/z = 248.0$), $\text{[Ru(bpy)}_2(6)]^2^+$ (calcd. **m/z** = 312.0), [Ru(bpy)₂(6)(CH₃CN)]²⁺ (calcd. m/z = 332.6), and {[Ru(bpy)₂(6)]−H}⁺ (calcd. m/z = 623.1).

Figure S14. Mass spectrum taken in acetonitrile after 120 min of photolysis of an aqueous solution of [3](PF6)2 under N₂ at 298 K showing a peak corresponding to $\left[\text{Ru(bpy)}_2(\text{CH}_3\text{CN})_2\right]^{2+}$ **(calcd. m/z = 248.0).**

10) Photosubstitution quantum yield measurements: modelling

Figure S15. Kinetic data for the two-step photosubstitution (λ = 443 nm, q_p = 2.65 \times 10⁻⁸ mol photons⋅s⁻¹) of $[1]$ (PF₆)₂ (72 μ M) in water under N₂ atmosphere at 298 K. (a) Globally fitted UV-Vis absorption spectra of $[1]^{2+}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ (solid line), $\frac{1}{11}$ ²⁺ (dashed line), and $\frac{1}{4}$ ²⁺ (dotted line) according to fitting using the Glotaran software package. (b) Fitted evolution of the relative concentrations of $[1]^{2+}$ (solid line), $[11]^{2+}$ (dashed line), and $[14]^{2+}$ (dotted line) **vs. irradiation time according to global fitting using Glotaran. (c) Plot of the amount of [1]2+ (in mol) vs. the total** amount of photons absorbed by $[1]^{2+}$ (Q _{total} in mol). The slope of the obtained trend line is the opposite of the **photosubstitution quantum yield for the formation of** $[11]^{2+}$ **from** $[1]^{2+}$ **. (d) Plot of the amount of** $[14]^{2+}$ **(in mol) vs.** the total amount of photons absorbed by $[11]^{2+}$ (\dot{Q}_{total} in mol). The slope of the obtained trend line is the **photosubstitution quantum yield for the formation of** $[14]^{2+}$ **from** $[11]^{2+}$ **.**

Figure S16. Kinetic data for the two-step photosubstitution (λ **= 443 nm,** q_p **= 2.85** \times **10⁻⁸ mol photons⋅s⁻¹) of** $[2]$ (PF₆)₂ (181 μ M) in water under N₂ atmosphere at 298 K. (a) Globally fitted UV-Vis absorption spectra of $[2]^{2+}$ **(solid line), [12]2+ (dashed line), and [14]2+ (dotted line) according to fitting using the Glotaran software package. (b)** Fitted evolution of the relative concentrations of $[2]^{2+}$ (solid line), $[12]^{2+}$ (dashed line), and $[14]^{2+}$ (dotted line) vs. irradiation time according to global fitting using Glotaran. (c) Plot of the amount of $[2]^{2+}$ (in mol) vs. the total amount of photons absorbed by $[2]^2$ ⁺ (Q _{total} in mol). The slope of the obtained trend line is the opposite of the **photosubstitution quantum yield for the formation of** $[12]^{2+}$ **from** $[2]^{2+}$ **. (d) Plot of the amount of** $[14]^{2+}$ **(in mol) vs.** the total amount of photons absorbed by $[12]^{2+}$ (\dot{Q}_{total} in mol). The slope of the obtained trend line is the **photosubstitution quantum yield for the formation of** $[14]^{2+}$ **from** $[12]^{2+}$ **.**

Figure S17. Kinetic data for the two-step photosubstitution (λ = 443 nm, q_p = 2.85 \times 10⁻⁸ mol photons⋅s⁻¹) of $[3]$ (PF₆)₂ (99 µM) in water under N₂ atmosphere at 298 K. (a) Globally fitted UV-Vis absorption spectra of $[3]^{2+}$ $($ solid line), $[13]^{2+}$ (dashed line), and $[14]^{2+}$ (dotted line) according to fitting using the Glotaran software package. **(b)** Fitted evolution of the relative concentrations of $[3]^{2+}$ (solid line), $[13]^{2+}$ (dashed line), and $[14]^{2+}$ (dotted line) vs. irradiation time according to global fitting using Glotaran. (c) Plot of the amount of $[3]^{2+}$ (in mol) vs. the total amount of photons absorbed by $[3]^{2+}$ (Q _{total} in mol). The slope of the obtained trend line is the opposite of the **photosubstitution quantum yield for the formation of** $[13]^{2+}$ **from** $[3]^{2+}$ **. (d) Plot of the amount of** $[14]^{2+}$ **(in mol) vs.** the total amount of photons absorbed by $[13]^{2+}$ (\dot{Q}_{total} in mol). The slope of the obtained trend line is the **photosubstitution quantum yield for the formation of** $[14]^{2+}$ **from** $[13]^{2+}$ **.**

Figure S19. 13 C-APT NMR spectrum of compound 5 in CDCl3.

Figure S21. 13 C-APT NMR spectrum of compound 6 in CDCl3.

Figure S22. ¹H NMR spectrum of compound [1](PF₆)₂ in acetone-*d6*.

Figure S23. 13C-APT NMR spectrum of compound [1](PF6)2 in acetone-*d6***.**

Figure S24. ¹H NMR spectrum of compound [2](PF₆)₂ in acetone-*d6*.

Figure S25. 13C-APT NMR spectrum of compound [2](PF6)2 in acetone-*d6***.**

Figure S27. 13C-APT NMR spectrum of compound [3](PF6)2 in acetone-*d6***.**

12) References

1. Bahreman, A.; Cuello-Garibo, J.-A.; Bonnet, S. Yellow-light sensitization of a ligand photosubstitution reaction in a ruthenium polypyridyl complex covalently bound to a rhodamine dye. *Dalton Trans.* **2014,** *43*, 4494-4505.

2. Snellenburg, J. J.; Laptenok, S.; Seger, R.; Mullen, K. M.; van Stokkum, I. H. M. Glotaran: A Java-Based Graphical User Interface for the R Package TIMP. *J. Stat. Soft.* **2012,** *49*, 22.

3. DeRosa, M. C.; Crutchley, R. J. Photosensitized singlet oxygen and its applications. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2002,** *233*, 351-371.

4. Garcìa-Fresnadillo, D.; Georgiadou, Y.; Orellana, G.; Braun, A. M.; Oliveros, E. Singlet-Oxygen (1Δg) Production by Ruthenium(II) complexes containing polyazaheterocyclic ligands in methanol and in water. *Helv. Chim. Acta* **1996,** *79*, 1222-1238.

5. Suzuki, K.; Kobayashi, A.; Kaneko, S.; Takehira, K.; Yoshihara, T.; Ishida, H.; Shiina, Y.; Oishi, S.; Tobita, S. Reevaluation of absolute luminescence quantum yields of standard solutions using a spectrometer with an integrating sphere and a back-thinned CCD detector. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2009,** *11*, 9850-9860.