

This document is the Accepted Manuscript version of a Published Work that appeared in final form in **JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY B**, copyright 2011 American Chemical Society after peer review and technical editing by the publisher. To access the final edited and published work see <https://doi.org/10.1021/jp200042f>

Postprint of: Cho C., Preiss U., Jungnickel C., Stolte S., Arning J., Ranke J., Klamt A., Krossing I., Thöming J., Ionic liquids: predictions of physicochemical properties with experimental and/or DFT-calculated LFER parameters to understand molecular interactions in solution, **JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY B**, Vol. 115, Iss. 19 (2011), pp. 6040 - 6050.

**Ionic Liquids: Predictions of Physicochemical Properties
with Experimental and/or DFT-Calculated LFER Parameters
to Understand Molecular Interactions in Solution**

Journal:	<i>The Journal of Physical Chemistry</i>
Manuscript ID:	jp-2011-00042f.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Cho, Chul-Woong; Universität Freiburg Preiss, Ulrich; Insitut fuer Anorganische und Analytische Chemie, AK Krossing Jungnickel, Christian; Gdansk University of Technology, Department of Chemical Technology Stolte, Stefan; University of Bremen, Centre for Envirmental Research and Sustainable Technology Arning, Juergen; University of Bremen, Centre for Envirmental Research and Sustainable Technology Ranke, Johannes; Universität Bremen, UFT Department of Sustainable Chemistry Klamt, Andreas; COSMOlogic Krossing, Ingo; Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Institut für Anorganische und Analytische Chemie Thöming, Jorg; University of Bremen - Centre for Envirmental Research and Sustainable Technology

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5 1 Ionic Liquids: Predictions of physicochemical properties with experimental and/or DFT-
6
7 2 calculated LFER parameters to understand molecular interactions in solution
8
9 3

104 Chul-Woong Cho^{a,b}, Ulrich Preiss^b, Christian Jungnickel^{a,c}, Stefan Stolte^a, Jürgen Arning^a, Johannes Ranke^a,
11
125 Andreas Klamt^{d,e}, Ingo Krossing^{b,f,*}, Jorg Thöming^{a,*}
13
14⁶

157 ^a Zentrum für Umweltforschung und nachhaltige Technologien (UFT) - Centre for Environmental Research and
16
178 Technology, University of Bremen, Leobener Straße, 28359 Bremen, Germany

189 ^b Freiburger Materialforschungszentrum FMF, University of Freiburg, Stefan-Meier-Str. 21, 79104 Freiburg,
19
200 Germany

21 ^c Chemical Faculty, Gdańsk University of Technology, ul. Narutowicza 11/12, 80-233 Gdańsk, Poland
22

23 ^d COSMOlogic GmbH & Co. KG, Burscheider Strasse 515, 51381 Leverkusen, Germany
24

25 ^e Institute of Physical and Theoretical Chemistry, University of Regensburg, Universitätsstrasse 31, 93040
26
27 Regensburg, Germany

28 ^f Institut für Anorganische und Analytische Chemie, Albertstraße 21, 79104 Freiburg, Germany and FRIAS Section
29
30 Soft Matter Science
31
32

33 *Corresponding author phone: +49(0)761 2036121(I.K.); +49(0)421 21863300(J.T.); fax: +49 (0)761 2036001 (I.K),
34
35 +49 (0)421 2188297 (J.T); e-mail: krossing@uni-freiburg.de (I.K.), thoeming@uni-bremen.de (J.T.)
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

In this paper we present evolutionary models to predict the octanol-water partitioning coefficient (Log P), the water solubility, and the critical micelle concentration (CMC) of ionic liquids (ILs) as well as the anionic activity coefficient and hydrophobicity in pure water and octanol-water respectively. They are based on a poly-parameter linear free energy relationship (LFER) using measured and/or DFT-calculated LFER parameters: the hydrogen-bonding acidity (A), hydrogen bonding basicity (B), polarizability/dipolarity (S), excess molar refraction (E), and McGowan volume (V) of IL ions. With both, calculated or experimental LFER descriptors of IL ions, the physicochemical parameters were predicted with an error bar of 0.182 to 0.217 for the octanol-water partitioning coefficient and 0.131 to 0.166 logarithmic units for the water solubility. Since experimentally determined solute parameters of anions are not available as of now, the CMC, anionic activity coefficient, and hydrophobicity was predicted with quantum-chemical methods with an R^2 of at least 0.99 as well as error bars below 0.168 logarithmic units. Prior to synthesis, these new approaches shall facilitate the assessment of the technical applicability of ionic compounds as well as their environmental fate.

Keywords: octanol-water partitioning coefficient, critical micelle concentration, water solubility, ionic liquids, cations, anions, DFT

Introduction

Over the past decade, the interest in ionic liquids (ILs) dramatically increased. They are alternative solvents, e.g. for use as electrolytes,^[1] in catalysis,^[2] and analytical chemistry.^[3] This is due to their excellent solvating ability for organic and inorganic matter in combination with unusual properties such as low vapor pressure, low melting point, thermal stability, and high ionic conductivity. Since, according to serious estimates, 10^6 to 10^{18} ILs may be selectively designed by the combination of cations and anions, the ILs' contribution to science may further increase.^[4] However, the multitude of possible IL variations poses difficulties for the targeted synthesis of an IL with a specific property. Therefore, recent efforts were devoted to the understanding of ILs on the molecular level^[5] and to the prediction of the basic physicochemical properties of ILs.^[6-13] Our groups have made some noteworthy additions here, *i.e.* an approach to understand and predict IL melting points,^[6, 7] viscosities and conductivities,^[8, 9] heat capacities, and temperature-dependent densities^[10] as well as temperature-dependent liquid entropies.^[11] Also, physicochemical properties related to biodegradation like the critical micelle concentration^[12] or the soil sorption coefficient^[13] can be predicted with the help of quantum chemical calculations using the molecular volume V_m .^[10] However, the insight into solute-solvent interaction of ILs is still in need of improvement. It holds the key to understanding various partitioning processes, such as liquid-gas, liquid-liquid and liquid-surface partitioning. They all were described and studied in a variety of ways that are mutually largely incomparable. For example, Sprunger *et al.*^[14, 15] studied ILs in combination with gas or water. They reported cation- and anion-specific equation coefficients of ILs for predicting the partitioning coefficient of solutes in 32 different IL systems. Van Meter *et al.*^[16] and Anderson *et al.*^[17] characterized surface-confined ILs as a stationary phase in the HPLC system. The data characterized by them is helpful to predict capacity factors of compounds in HPLC confined ILs. The study of Sprunger *et al.*^[14, 15] allows predicting the partitioning coefficient of compounds in IL mixtures. In general, predictions of solute-solvent interactions of relevant and experimentally hitherto not available parameters may be obtained based on thermodynamically refined group contribution methods like UNIFAC^[18], poly-parameter Linear Free Energy Relationships (pp-LFER)^[19], and methods based on quantum chemical calculations like continuum solvation models.^[20] Out of the pp-LFERs, the Abraham equation^[21-26] (eq. 1) is the most commonly used one:

$$SP = c + e E + s S + a A + b B + v V \quad (1)$$

In equation (1), the dependent variable SP refers to some property of a series of solutes in a fixed phase. These solute descriptors are based on the physically meaningful cavity model of solute-system interactions. Here, E represents the excess molar refraction in units of $(\text{cm}^3 \text{mol}^{-1})/10$, which models dispersive interactions arising from the greater polarizability of π and n- electrons. S represents the solute dipolarity and polarizability due to solute-solvent interaction between bond dipoles and induced dipoles. A and B indicate the hydrogen bond acidity and

1
2
3
4
5 basicity of the solute, respectively. V is the McGowan characteristic molar volume in units of $(\text{cm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1})/100$. The
6 coefficient e is a measure of the propensity of the phase to interact with solute π - and n -electron pairs; coefficient s
7 is a measure of the system dipolarity/polarizability; coefficient a is a measure of the hydrogen bond basicity, which
8 interacts with an acidic solute; and b is a measure of the hydrogen bond acidity, which interacts with a basic solute.
9 The system parameter v describes cavity formation in the case of bulk media. Finally, the parameter c is the
10 property dependent offset of the LFER and obtained as regression constant. Recently Abraham and Acree^[27-30] has
11 reported an extended model by adding two additional terms i.e. $j^+ J^+$ (for cation) and $j^- J^-$ (for anion) to the model
12 (eqn. 1) to describe solute transfer of ions and ionic species from water to organic solvents, and successfully used
13 to determine solute descriptors of ionic species.
14
15
16
17
18

19
20 For our predictive studies using the Abraham model, we experimentally determined the solute parameters of 30
21 different cations with high performance liquid chromatography^[31] and then, complementary, employed
22 computational methods. For the latter part, DFT-calculations at the (RI-)BP86/TZVP level in combination with
23 COSMO (COnductor-Screening MOdel), COSMO-RS (COSMO for Real Solvent, which is a model combining
24 quantum theory, surface interactions, and statistical thermodynamics),^[32] and OBPROP (version 1.1.2)^[33] were
25 used. Here we used a calculation model for S, A, and B based on 470 non-ionic compounds established by
26 Zissimos *et al.*^[34] that was for the first time extended to ionic compounds. The calculation methods for E and V
27 values established in our previous study,^[31] and for S, A, and B using COSMO-RS, are in detail explained in the
28 supporting information. It also provides both measured and calculated LFER values (Table S1 and S2).
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The main goal of the present work is to predict physico-chemical quantities based on LFER, to find the most
36 important contributing factors, and to thereby improve the understanding of the molecular interaction potentials of
37 ILs as a solute.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Result and Discussion

Using the experimentally and computationally determined LFER parameters of the representative ion set (see S.I.), system parameters for the prediction of the octanol-water partitioning coefficient, water solubility, and critical micelle concentration of ILs and anionic activity coefficient in water and anionic hydrophobicity in octanol-water were established.

Prediction of the octanol-water partitioning coefficient (log P)

The octanol-water partitioning coefficient (log P) as the ratio of the concentrations of a compound in two phases (*n*-octanol/ water) at the equilibrium indicates hydrophobicity. This property can be strongly related to the adsorption of a drug in the human body as well as bioaccumulation and migration of dissolved hydrophobic compounds in soil, sediments and groundwater.^[35-39] To choose an IL with a specific behavior in both the human body and the environment, it is necessary to establish a prediction model.

Determination of anionic hydrophobicity For the partitioning behavior of salts including ILs, we assumed that both cationic (log k_o) and anionic hydrophobicity (H_a) play an important role. The cationic hydrophobicity can be assessed by HPLC with a lipophilic stationary phase,^[40, 41] while it is difficult to directly measure anionic hydrophobicity, because most anions are rather small and therefore do not show a significant retention in the stationary phase. Thus, in order to determine anionic hydrophobicity for the typical IL anions [(CF₃SO₂)₂N]⁻, [PF₆]⁻, [BF₄]⁻, [SbF₆]⁻, [CF₃SO₃]⁻, Cl⁻, [NO₃]⁻, Br⁻, and [CH₃COO]⁻, we applied eq. 2, as established by Ranke *et al.*,^[42] to the model set. This model is based on the idea that the excess molar free energy of dissolving the ILs in water can be expressed as the sum of cationic and anionic contributions, where the former one is given by the capacity factor, and the latter one is extracted by a least squares fit of the model to the data.

$$\text{Log } P = m \log k_o + H_a + c \quad (2)$$

where k_o is the cationic capacity factor representing hydrophobicity defined by Stepnowski and Storoniak^[43], m is the slope that ideally equals unity, if all model assumptions are satisfied, and c is a constant. For the determination of the anionic contribution, cationic capacity factors were collected from literature^[40, 41] (Table S3). In Figure 1, log P data are plotted against the hydrophobicity of the cation. It turned out that the slopes are all equal, confirming the linear model specified in equation 2. By correlating the log P values of 45 ILs with log k_o of cations, we obtained $m = 1.423$, $c = -3.039$. Results are given in Table 1.




Figure 1. Measured octanol-water partitioning coefficient (log P) of ionic liquids as a function of the measured hydrophobicities of the cations^[40, 41] of various ionic liquids.

Table 1. The dimensionless hydrophobicity of anions in the octanol-water partitioning system.

Anions	Measured hydrophobicity (from eq. 2)	Predicted Hydrophobicity (from eq. 3)
$[(CF_3SO_2)_2N]^-$	1.504 ± 0.135	1.423
$[PF_6]^-$	0.191 ± 0.136	0.211
$[BF_4]^-$	-0.197 ± 0.177	-0.186
$[SbF_6]^-$	-0.248	-
$[CF_3SO_3]^-$	0.533	0.509
Cl^-	-0.443 ± 0.220	-0.537
$[NO_3]^-$	-0.518	-0.561
Br^-	-0.338	-0.261
$[CH_3COO]^-$	-0.628	-0.609

In order to establish a prediction of the anionic hydrophobicity without any experimental input, we employed the LFER with the five computed^[34] parameters E, S, A, B, and V, for the prediction based on the Abraham model. One data point ($[SbF_6]^-$) had to be excluded, because Sb is not parameterized in OBPROP's atomic contribution method.

Table 2. The system parameters (standard deviation) for predicting the anionic hydrophobicity with calculated LFER parameters of anion.

Eq.	c	e _a	S _a	a _a	b _a	v _a	R ²	SD	F	N
(3)	0.298(0.742)	-0.841(0.312)	0.263(0.660)	1.691(0.388)	-0.571(0.121)	1.319(0.149)	0.997	0.079	116.1	8
(4)	-0.956(0.169)					1.778(0.260)	0.886	0.261	46.7	8
(5)	-0.449(0.283)				-0.135(0.066)	1.503(0.249)	0.938	0.211	37.9	8
(6)	0.136(0.293)			0.844(0.246)	-0.370(0.100)	1.575(0.171)	0.977	0.143	57.5	8
(7)	0.581(0.178)	-0.756(0.193)		1.586(0.242)	-0.532(0.062)	1.288(0.108)	0.996	0.067	201.7	8

The results show that the full Abraham model with our calculated parameters can be used for prediction of the anion hydrophobicity with a standard deviation (SD) of **0.079** (dimensionless), which has the expected statistical and physicochemical meaning (Table 2). For a better understanding of the contribution of each parameter of the anion, we systematically simplified the Abraham equation in Table 2 to find the most important contributions for the molecular interactions. First of all, it is not surprising that the hydrophobicity correlates well with V_a according to equation (4) for which SD = **0.261**. Here we found that acetate with its high hydrogen-bonding basicity ability forms a large exception. In order to also include similarly basic anions, the hydrogen basicity values were added as parameter. For the combination of V_a and B_a, we found SD to decrease to **0.211** with all data points coming closer to the best-fit axis (eq. 5). In the next step, the hydrogen bonding acidity A_a was added (eq. 6). Indeed, the SD decreased to **0.143**. We then also added the refractive index (E_a) and dipolarity/polarizability (S_a), which further enhanced the accuracy (eq. 7). E_a only slightly increased the accuracy (SD = **0.067**) and S_a has very little importance, but in combination with V_a, B_a, and A_a, (eq. 3), they contribute to **reaching the best prediction (R² of 0.997)**.

Prediction of log P_{O/W} – For predicting the octanol-water partitioning coefficient of ILs, we used measured as well as calculated descriptors. Experimentally determined log P_{O/W} values **measured between very dilute condition and around 15 mM** were collected from literatures^[44-49] because log P is dependent on concentration^[45] and, for 25 chloride-based ILs, measured as part of this work (see S.I.). From theoretical considerations, we modified the Abraham equation by adding the anionic hydrophobicity parameter (H_a, dimensionless) (eq. 8).

$$\text{Log } P_{O/W} = c + e_c E_c + s_c S_c + a_c A_c + b_c B_c + v_c V_c + d H_a \quad (8)$$

With the measured cationic LFER descriptors presented by our group in a previous study^[31] and the experimentally determined anionic hydrophobicity constants, log P_{O/W} was predicted according to eq. (8) using a multiple linear regression with an SD of **0.182** log units and **R² = 0.984** (eq. 9 in Table 3).

Table 3. The system parameters (standard deviation) for predicting the octanol-water partitioning coefficient ($\log P_{O/W}$) of ionic liquids with measured cationic LFER parameters and including anionic hydrophobicity.

Eq.	c	e_c	s_c	a_c	b_c	v_c	d	R^2	SD	N	F
(9)	-4.678(0.190)	0.118(0.344)	-0.710(0.178)	-0.529(0.161)	-3.310(0.373)	2.985(0.139)	0.983(0.044)	0.984	0.182	44	373.3
(10)	-5.543(0.177)	-	-	-	-	2.653(0.113)	1.127(0.068)	0.947	0.315	44	363.2
(11)	-5.372(0.137)	-	-	-	-2.274(0.402)	2.576(0.086)	1.074(0.052)	0.970	0.234	44	435.9
(12)	-4.958(0.175)	-0.885(0.268)	-	-	-2.686(0.381)	2.932(0.133)	1.007(0.051)	0.977	0.213	44	410.4
(13)	-4.693(0.213)	-0.653(0.282)	-0.229(0.113)	-	-2.722(0.367)	2.803(0.143)	1.010(0.049)	0.979	0.204	44	355.6

As shown by equation (10), the cationic volume term combined with the anionic hydrophobicity are the most important parameters for the $\log P_{O/W}$ prediction of ILs, which already has a high accuracy with $R^2 = 0.947$, $SD = 0.315$. The next important term is the hydrogen bonding basicity ($R^2 = 0.970$, $SD = 0.234$ in eq. 11), and then excess molar refraction, which both enhance the predicting accuracy to $R^2 = 0.977$ and $SD = 0.213$ (eq. 12). Inclusion of S_c and A_c contributes very slightly to the prediction quality as shown by the small reduction of the SD values in eq. (13) and eq. (9), respectively. The system parameters according to eq. (9) – (13) for predicting $\log P_{O/W}$ with measured LFER parameters and anionic hydrophobicity are shown in Table 3. Here [IM11O2][Cl] and [IM11][(CF₃SO₂)₂N] were not investigated because their LFER parameters were not measured so far.

Using only calculated cationic LFER descriptors (including the calculated anionic hydrophobicity), the $\log P_{O/W}$ values of ILs were predicted following equation (8) giving a SD of 0.217 log units (Table 4). The order of importance of the contribution factors is similar to as with the measured parameters. The system parameters according to eq. (14) – (18) are shown in Table 4. Measured and predicted values using experimentally and computationally determined parameters are provided in Table 5.

Table 4. The system parameter (standard deviation) for predicting octanol-water partitioning coefficient ($\log P_{O/W}$) of ionic liquids with calculated cationic LFER descriptors and including anionic hydrophobicity.

Eq.	c	e_c	s_c	a_c	b_c	v_c	d	R^2	SD	N	F
(14)	-6.239(0.481)	-0.603(0.347)	0.794(0.458)	-0.901(0.235)	-6.765(1.130)	2.976(0.143)	1.007(0.049)	0.977	0.217	45	272.1
(15)	-5.514(0.168)	-	-	-	-	2.671(0.109)	1.114(0.0624)	0.949	0.309	45	387.9
(16)	-6.104(0.182)	-	-	-	-4.911(1.013)	2.914(0.101)	1.032(0.053)	0.967	0.250	45	404.9
(17)	-5.702(0.197)	-	-	-0.558(0.160)	-5.529(0.916)	2.874(0.090)	1.024(0.047)	0.975	0.221	45	389.2
(18)	-5.544(0.273)	-0.262(0.294)	-	-0.633(0.181)	-5.573(0.920)	2.977(0.146)	1.009(0.050)	0.975	0.222	45	309.9

Table 5. Measured and predicted log $P_{O/W}$ values of ionic liquids with calculated (calc.) and measured (exp.) LFER parameters.

Chemicals	Measured Log $P_{O/W}$	Predicted Log $P_{O/W}$ with	
		(calc. LFER parameters) according to eq. (14)	(exp. LFER parameters) according to eq. (9)
[IM14]Cl	$-2.77 \pm 0.068^{[a]}$, $-2.40^{[46, 47]}$	-2.59	-2.53
[IM16]Cl	$-1.73 \pm 0.003^{[a]}$	-1.77	-1.75
[IM18]Cl	$-0.60 \pm 0.003^{[a]}$	-0.95	-0.83
[IM19]Cl	$-0.13 \pm 0.005^{[a]}$	-0.56	-0.41
[IM1-10]Cl	$0.31 \pm 0.030^{[a]}$	-0.16	0.12
[IM1-1Ph]Cl	$-2.35 \pm 0.008^{[a]}$	-2.28	-2.41
[IM1-(1Ph-4Me)]Cl	$-1.80 \pm 0.010^{[a]}$	-1.89	-1.99
[IM1-2Ph]Cl	$-1.99 \pm 0.017^{[a]}$	-2.29	-2.33
[IM12=1]Cl	$-3.25 \pm 0.007^{[a]}$	-3.12	-3.13
[N1,1,10, Bz]Cl	$1.04 \pm 0.014^{[a]}$	1.12	0.95
[N1,1,12, Bz]Cl	$1.73 \pm 0.017^{[a]}$	1.89	1.87
[IM12O1]Cl	$-3.77 \pm 0.060^{[a]}$	-3.96	-3.48
[IM13OH]Cl	$-3.69 \pm 0.010^{[a]}$	-3.57	-3.96
[IM11O2]Cl	$-3.31 \pm 0.005^{[a]}$	-2.04	--
[Py4-4NMe2]Cl	$-2.13 \pm 0.008^{[a]}$	-1.96	-1.87
[Py6-4NMe2]Cl	$-1.15 \pm 0.011^{[a]}$	-1.27	-1.02
[Py4-3Me-5Me]Cl	$-2.38 \pm 0.003^{[a]}$	-2.63	-2.24
[C2Py]Cl	$-3.55 \pm 0.011^{[a]}$	-3.41	-3.46
[C4Py]Cl	$-2.82 \pm 0.017^{[a]}$	-2.64	-2.75
[C8Py]Cl	$-0.72 \pm 0.001^{[a]}$	-0.99	-1.01
[Py4-2Me]Cl	$-2.78 \pm 0.002^{[a]}$	-2.49	-2.54
[Py4-4Me]Cl	$-2.57 \pm 0.020^{[a]}$	-2.44	-2.45
[Py4-3Me]Cl	$-2.62 \pm 0.007^{[a]}$	-2.45	-2.44
[Py6-3Me]Cl	$-1.58 \pm 0.005^{[a]}$	-1.65	-1.62
[Py6-4Me]Cl	$-1.65 \pm 0.008^{[a]}$	-1.61	-1.38
[IM14][NO ₃]	$-2.42^{[46, 47]}$, $-2.9^{[48]}$	-2.61	-2.60
[IM14]Br	$-2.48^{[47]}$	-2.31	-2.43
[IM11][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	$-1.35 \pm 0.040^{[44]}$	-1.67	--
[IM12][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	$-1.18 \pm 0.03^{[44]}$; $-1.01(-1.05 \sim -0.95)^{[47]}$	-1.32	-1.33

[IM13][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-0.88 ± 0.02 ^[44]	-0.93	-0.76
[IM14][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-0.50 ± 0.03 ^[44] ; -0.58 (-0.96 ~ -0.208) ^[47]	-0.54	-0.62
[IM15][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-0.11 ± 0.03 ^[44]	-0.13	-0.22
[IM16][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	0.16 ± 0.02 ^[44] ; 0.19 (0.15 ~ 0.22) ^[47]	0.28	0.16
[IM17][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	0.57 ± 0.02 ^[44]	0.66	0.64
[IM18][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	0.79 ± 0.03 ^[44] ; 0.93 (0.80 ~ 1.05) ^[47]	1.11	1.08
[IM12][PF ₆]	-2.36 ± 0.08 ^[44]	-2.61	-2.62
[IM14][PF ₆]	-1.72 ± 0.06 ^[44] ; -1.66 ^[46,49] , -2.39 ^[48]	-1.83	-1.91
[IM16][PF ₆]	-1.20 ± 0.05 ^[44]	-1.02	-1.13
[IM18][PF ₆]	-0.35 ± 0.04 ^[44]	-0.19	-0.21
[IM12][BF ₄]	-2.66 ± 0.10 ^[44]	-3.01	-3.01
[IM14][BF ₄]	-2.40 ± 0.08 ^[44] ; -2.52 ^[46, 49]	-2.23	-2.29
[IM16][BF ₄]	-1.58 ± 0.08 ^[44]	-1.42	-1.51
[IM18][BF ₄]	-0.68 ± 0.06 ^[44]	-0.59	-0.59
[IM14][SbF ₆]	-2.39 ± 0.08 ^[44]	--	-2.34
[IM14][CF ₃ SO ₃]	-1.61 ± 0.05 ^[44]	-1.53	-1.57
[IM14][CH ₃ COO]	-2.77 ± 0.08 ^[44]	-2.66	-2.71

^[a] Measured for this study




Figure 2. The relationship of experimental and predicted $\log P_{O/W}$ values determined using measured (●) and calculated LFER parameters (○).

Prediction of the water solubility

Like $\log P_{O/W}$, the water solubility is a useful quantity, since it influences release, transport, environmental fate, and risk of a compound. For its prediction, experimental values at 293 - 298 K were collected from literature^[42, 50-60] and the anionic activity coefficients (C_a , determined by Ranke *et al.*^[42] and given in Table 6) were combined with the Abraham model.

Table 6. Dimensionless activity coefficients of ionic liquid anions in water measured (exp. data from Ranke *et al.*^[42]) and predicted with the calculated LFER parameters (calc.) according to eq. (19).

Anions	Measured activity coefficient of anion in water	Predicted activity coefficient of anion in water (calc., eq. 19)
[(6-2Et)2SS] ⁻	0.521	0.501
[BF ₄] ⁻	-1.268	-1.219
[CF ₃ SO ₃] ⁻	-1.343	-1.268
[PhBF ₃] ⁻	-1.853	-1.837
[B(CN) ₄] ⁻	-2.264	-2.209
[PF ₆] ⁻	-2.280; -2.178	-2.414

1			
2			
3			
4			
5	$[(C_4F_9)SO_3]^-$	-2.610	-2.700
6	$[(CF_3SO_2)_2N]^-$	-2.911; -2.868	-2.814
7			
8	$[AsF_6]^-$	-3.165	--
9			
10	$[(C_2F_5SO_2)_2N]^-$	-3.363	-3.556
11	$[(CF_3SO_2)_3C]^-$	-3.902; -3.841	-3.722
12			
13	$[(C_2F_5)_3PF_3]^-$	-4.883, -4.803	-4.788
14			
15			

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Determination of the anionic activity coefficient in water: The dimensionless activity coefficient of the anion in IL-saturated water^[42] (Table 6) was correlated with the calculated anionic LFER descriptors to establish a prediction model. We modified the model by adding an anionic charge density term $f_a(-1/V_a)$ (f_a is a system parameter). This modified equation can be used to predict anionic activity coefficient with a SD of 0.174 (eq. 19), which is better than when using the conventional Abraham model (eq. 20, SD = 0.389). Table 7 gives the system parameters for all predictions of the activity coefficients using calculated parameters according to eq. (19) and (25).

Table 7. System parameters (standard deviation) according to eq. (19) – eq. (25) for the prediction of the anionic activity coefficient in IL-saturated water using the calculated LFER parameters (calc.).

Eq.	<i>c</i>	<i>e_a</i>	<i>s_a</i>	<i>a_a</i>	<i>b_a</i>	<i>v_a</i>	<i>f_a</i>	R ²	SD	N	F
(19)	-3.103(0.760)	4.110(1.287)	-7.084(2.524)	-7.543(2.712)	4.783(1.233)	0.670(0.303)	-0.715(0.157)	0.994	0.174	11	112.0
(20)	-2.651(1.679)	3.654(2.861)	-6.287(5.613)	-7.404(6.044)	4.710(2.748)	-0.136(0.623)		0.963	0.389	11	26.2
(21)	-4.811(0.490)				1.549(0.279)			0.775	0.719	11	30.9
(22)	-4.389(0.304)				1.923(0.186)	-0.690(0.162)		0.931	0.421	11	54.0
(23)	-5.880(0.278)				1.655(0.125)		-0.898(0.146)	0.961	0.319	11	97.6
(24)	-4.913(0.401)	0.556(0.198)			1.287(0.160)		-0.789(0.114)	0.981	0.234	11	123.5
(25)	-4.151(0.790)	1.518(0.709)	-2.016(1.412)	-2.183(1.621)	2.401(0.800)		-0.582(0.193)	0.987	0.233	11	75.1

The anionic activity coefficient B_a is the most important parameter and already leads to $R^2 = 0.775$, $SD = 0.721$ (eq. 21). C_a increases with B_a . As shown in eq. (22), inclusion of the two terms B_a and V_a leads to an improvement ($SD = 0.421$). However, exchanging the volume for $-1/V_a$, the anionic charge density, further reduces the SD value to 0.319 (eq. 23). The parameter E is also critical and leads to a significant increase in anionic activity, as shown in eq. 24 ($SD = 0.234$). Adding S and A terms further slightly enhances the accuracy (eq. 25). Again, one data point ($[AsF_6]^-$) had to be excluded because As is not parameterized in OBPROP's atomic contribution method.

Using the experimental and calculated LFER descriptors of the cation, the water solubility of ILs was predicted. Like for the log P prediction model, we assumed that the cationic LFER parameters and the anionic contribution, expressed by dC_a (C_a is the anionic activity coefficient in water and d is system parameter), should be combined in one model as shown in equation (26).

$$\text{Log water solubility [g L}^{-1}] = c + e_c E_c + s_c S_c + a_c A_c + b_c B_c + v_c V_c + f_c (1/V_c) + d C_a \quad (26)$$

When using measured LFER parameters of the cation and activity coefficients of the anion, the water solubility of ILs can be predicted within the small error range of 0.138 log units (eq. 27, Figure 3).

Table 8. System parameters (standard deviation) for predicting the water solubility of ILs using measured LFER parameters and anion activity according to eq. (17) and (28).

Eq.	<i>c</i>	<i>e_c</i>	<i>s_c</i>	<i>a_c</i>	<i>b_c</i>	<i>v_c</i>	<i>f_c</i>	<i>d</i>	R ²	SD	N	F
(27)	1.395(0.265)	-0.429(0.453)	0.431(0.307)	0.280(0.206)	-	-1.769(0.170)	-	1.038(0.040)	0.979	0.138	27	198.9
(28)	1.662(0.183)	-	-	-	-	-1.734(0.081)	-	1.023(0.035)	0.976	0.135	27	513.8
(29)	6.061(2.078)	0.646(0.603)	-0.443(0.478)	-0.169(0.274)		-3.235(0.667)	-2.886(1.276)	1.043(0.036)	0.984	0.126	27	199.1

Naturally, the molar fraction of ILs in water increases with decreasing cation volume and increasing anion activity coefficient. Therefore, with just the two terms, we can predict the water solubility with $R^2 = 0.976$ and $SD = 0.135$

(eq. 28). Other parameters (E_c , S_c , and A_c) only slightly enhance the accuracy. B_c is not statistically important. The introduction of the $f_c 1/V_c$ charge density (f_c is the system parameter) term slightly reduces the SD values further (eq. 29). This means that the charge effect that accounts for IL-IL interactions plays a more important role in water than in the octanol-water system, where no IL phase is present and therefore, IL-IL interactions can be neglected. In the water solubility prediction with measured LFER parameters, 10 data points had to be excluded because their LFER parameters are not available so far. The system parameters according to eq. (27) and eq. (28) are provided in Table 8.

On the other hand, the water solubility of ILs was assessed using the predicted anion activity coefficient and the calculated cationic LFER descriptors according to equation 26 (eq. 30 to 35, Table 9).

Table 9. System parameters (standard deviation) for predicting the water solubility of ILs using calculated LFER parameters and anion activity according to eq. (30) – (35).

Eqn.	c	e_c	s_c	a_c	b_c	v_c	f_c	d	R^2	SD	N	F
(30)	4.586(1.548)	0.340(0.240)	-1.661(0.651)	1.166(0.359)	4.552(0.943)	-2.099(0.398)	-0.996(0.852)	1.085(0.041)	0.976	0.166	37	165.8
(31)	2.923(0.613)	0.289(0.237)	-1.405(0.617)	1.018(0.337)	4.205(0.900)	-1.660(0.132)		1.062(0.035)	0.974	0.167	37	190.9
(32)	2.536(0.518)		-0.907(0.457)	0.795(0.283)	3.433(0.632)	-1.598(0.122)		1.067(0.035)	0.973	0.168	37	214.1
(33)	1.677(0.298)			0.390(0.205)	2.474(0.427)	-1.734(0.105)		1.075(0.036)	0.970	0.176	37	256.5
(34)	2.074(0.216)				2.537(0.443)	-1.835(0.094)		1.082(0.038)	0.966	0.183	37	315.6
(35)	2.084(0.301)					-1.835(0.131)		1.102(0.052)	0.933	0.254	37	236.1

The system parameters in Tables 8 and 9 are different for the measured and calculated descriptors. This is likely due to the different statistical relation of measured and calculated parameters, as already noted by Klamt and Abraham in their pioneering study^[34] on neutral molecules. By contrast, the interactions due to dispersion, volume, anion activity, and anionic charge density in water are almost the same as when using measured values. This implies that only one independently derived set of LFER descriptors should be used, i.e. experimental or calculated LFER values. The measured and predicted water solubility with measured and calculated LFER parameters according to eq. (29) and (30), respectively, are provided in Table 10.

Table 10. The measured water and predicted log water solubility [g L^{-1}] of ionic liquids with measured (exp.) and calculated (calc.) LFER parameters according to eq. (29) and (30), respectively.

Ionic liquids	Measured log water solubility	Predicted log water solubility with	
		(exp. LFER parameters)	(calc. LFER parameters)
[IM12][B(CN) ₄]	-2.46 ^[49]	-2.39	-2.41
[IM12][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-3.12 ^[51] ; -3.1 ^[51] ; -3.08 ^[53] , -3.08 ^[51] ; -3.1 ^[50]	-3.04	-3.07
[IM13][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-3.29 ^[51] ; -3.28 ^[51] ; -3.27 ^[51]	-3.26	-3.21
[IM14][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ C]	-4.44 ^[50]	-4.55	-4.41
[IM14][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-3.51 ^[51] ; -3.51 ^[51] ; -3.54 ^[51] ; -3.53 ^[51] ; -3.49 ^[51] ; -3.46 ^[51] ; -3.5 ^[51] ; -3.5 ^[59]	-3.55	-3.42
[IM14][(C ₄ F ₉)SO ₃]	-3.15 ^[52] -3.0 ^[54] ; -2.92 ^[54] ; -2.96 ^[54] ;	-3.24	-3.30
[IM14][PF ₆]	-2.93 ^[57] ; -2.89 ^[55] ; -2.87 ^[55] ; -2.8 ^[53] ; - 2.9 ^[59] ; -2.9 ^[50]	-2.91	-2.99
[IM15][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-3.73 ^[51] ; -3.71 ^[51] ; -3.74 ^[51]	-3.74	-3.66
[IM16][(C ₂ F ₅) ₃ PF ₃]	-5.93 ^[59]	-5.99	-6.06
[IM16][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₃ C]	-5.04 ^[59]	-5.00	-4.91
[IM16][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-4.02 ^[51] ; -4.18 ^[59] ; -3.86 ^[53] ; -4.03 ^[50] ; -4.05 ^[51] ; -4.05 ^[51]	-4.00	-3.92
[IM16][PF ₆]	-3.41 ^[54] ; -3.45 ^[54] ; -3.35 ^[59] ; -3.36 ^[54]	-3.36	-3.49
[IM17][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-4.31 ^[51] ; -4.3 ^[51] ; -4.29 ^[51] -4.7 ^[61] ; -4.6 ^[61] ; -4.59 ^[59] ;	-4.19	-4.19
[IM18][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-4.14 ^[50] ; -4.1 ^[52] ; -4.1 ^[61] ; -4.5 ^[51] ; -4.49 ^[51] ; -4.47 ^[51]	-4.49	-4.48
[IM18][(C ₄ F ₉)SO ₃]	-4.23 ^[52]	-4.18	-4.35
[IM18][PF ₆]	-3.93 ^[59] ; -3.92 ^[54] ; -3.9 ^[54] ; -3.46 ^[56] ; -3.95 ^[54]	-3.85	-4.04
[IM18][BF ₄]	-2.93 ^[54]	-2.83	-2.75
[Py4-3Me][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-3.7 ^[50]	-3.67	-3.66
[Py4-4Me][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-3.69 ^[52]	-3.66	-3.63

[Py4-4Me][(C ₄ F ₉)SO ₃]	-3.03 ^[52]	-3.35	-3.51
[Py8-4Me][(C ₂ F ₅ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-5.4 ^[59]	-5.18	-5.53
[Py8-4Me][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-5.09 ^[59]	-4.72	-4.73
[Py8-4Me][(C ₄ F ₉)SO ₃]	-4.63 ^[59]	-4.42	-4.60
[Py8-4Me][PhBF ₃]	-3.6 ^[59]	-3.66	-3.67
[Py8-4Me][CF ₃ SO ₃]	-3.09 ^[59]	-3.14	-3.05
[Py8-4Me][BF ₄]	-2.98 ^[59]	-3.07	-3.00
[Pyr14][(C ₂ F ₅) ₃ PF ₃]	-5.43 ^[59]	--	-5.57
[Pyr14][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-3.59 ^[59] ; -3.57 ^[59]	--	-3.43
[Pyr16][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-4.12 ^[59]	--	-3.95
[Pyr18][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-4.71 ^[59]	--	-4.53
[Py6- 4NMe ₂][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-4.53 ^[59] ; -4.53 ^[50]	-4.66	-4.42
[IM16- 2Me][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-4.15 ^[50]	--	-4.09
[Pip14][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-3.78 ^[60]	--	-3.73
[Mor11O2][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-3.19 ^[59]	--	-3.26
[Py3OH][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-2.43 ^[59]	--	-2.52
[IM12OH][(CF ₃ SO ₂) ₂ N]	-2.34 ^[50]	--	-2.21
[N4444][(6-2Et) ₂ SS]	-1.52 ^[58]	--	-1.71




Figure 3. The relationship of experimental and predicted water solubility values determined with measured (●) and calculated LFER parameters (○) according to eq. (29) and eq. (30) respectively.

Prediction of the critical micelle concentration (CMC)

The critical micelle concentration (CMC) is a basic parameter of surface chemistry as well as colloid and environmental science. Specifically, it influences biological properties like toxicity and biodegradability. The process of micellization can be directly correlated to the interaction of amphiphiles with apolar surfaces such as micelles or cell membranes. Therefore, the CMC was predicted in order to investigate the molecular interaction at a rather high concentration in water. Since we assumed that cations and anions are forming aggregates, we used each parameter as the sum of cationic and anionic contributions (eq. 36). The CMC values of ILs at 293 - 298 K were collected from literature^[12, 61-84] and are given in Table 8.

$$\text{Log CMC [mmol L}^{-1}] = e(E_c+E_a) + s(S_c+S_a) + a(A_c+A_a) + b(B_a+B_c) + v(V_c+V_a) + c \quad (36)$$

Here, the prediction was carried out exclusively with calculated descriptors, because experimental anionic descriptors are not available so far. The results show that the CMC can be predicted within an error range of about 0.179 log units according to equation (36). However, there are some remarkable exceptions ([IM12]Br, [IM14]Br, [IM14][CF₃SO₄], and [IM14][C₈SO₄]). In order to include them, we introduced the charge density term (1/V_c and -1/V_a for cation and anion, respectively). In combination (eq. 37), the correlation was improved to R² = 0.989.

$$\text{Log CMC [mmol L}^{-1}] = 0.754(0.283)(E_c+E_a) - 1.174(0.704)(S_c+S_a) - 0.993(0.365)(A_c+A_a) + 0.531(0.169)(B_a+B_c) - 1.965(0.062)(V_c+V_a) - 0.123(0.033)1/V_c - 0.364(0.067)(-1/V_a) + 9.518(1.721) \quad (37)$$

$$R^2=0.989, SD=0.128, N=36, F=345.7$$

In another approach, we rewrote equation (29) as equation (38) with the assumption that each parameter of cation and anion is different.

$$\text{Log CMC} = c + e_c E_c + s_c S_c + a_c A_c + b_c B_c + v_c V_c + e_a E_a + s_a S_a + a_a A_a + b_a B_a + v_a V_a \quad (38)$$

The results showed that the CMC can be predicted with an SD of 0.168 log units, which is similar to equation (36), but with different system constants. To further reduce the SD, the charge density terms of cation and anion were added. Consequently, we found that this model can predict the CMC with the smallest error of 0.104 log units. The system parameters according to eq. (39) and (40) are given in Table 11 and predicted and measured CMC values are given in Table 12.

Table 11. System parameters (standard deviation) for predicting the critical micelle concentration of ILs using calculated LFER parameters.

Eqn.	c	e_c	s_c	a_c	b_c	v_c	e_a	s_a	a_a	b_a	v_a	g_c	f
(39)	4.838 (1.161)	-0.369 (0.257)	1.327 (0.263)	0.580 (0.765)	0.673 (1.864)	-2.010 (0.200)	0.212(0.368)	0.376 (1.014)	0.544 (0.673)	-0.299 (0.282)	-1.633 (0.247)		
		$R^2=0.982$	$SD=0.168$	$N=36$	$F=139.3$								
(40)	16.721 (0.265)	3.058 (0.814)	-7.647 (2.046)	-2.601 (0.868)	1.696 (1.189)	-1.648 (0.141)	0.796 (0.263)	-2.024 (0.802)	-2.731 (0.803)	1.452 (0.400)	-2.099 (0.184)	-0.411 (0.095)	0.623 (0.130)
		$R^2=0.994$	$SD=0.104$	$N=36$	$F=307.3$								

Table 12. The experimentally measured and predicted log CMC values [mmol L^{-1}] of ionic liquids assessed with calculated LFER parameters according to eq. (40).

Chemicals	Surface tension	Conductivity	Other	Predicted
[N1,1,1,8]Br			2.352 ^[61] 2.462 ^[62]	2.388
[N1,1,1,10]Cl	1.845 ^[63]	1.976 ^[64]		1.988
[N1,1,1,10]Br		1.797 ^[65]	1.792 ^[61] 1.780 ^[65]	1.807
[N1,1,1,12]Cl	1.255 ^[63]	1.346 ^[64] 1.328 ^[66]		1.400
[N1,1,1,12]Br			1.155 ^[60] 1.176 ^[67]	1.218
[N1,1,1,14]Cl	0.740 ^[68] 0.653 ^[63]	0.751 ^[64] 0.740 ^[69]		0.793
[N1,1,1,14]Br		0.580 ^[69]	0.544 ^[67]	0.612
[N1,1,1,16]Cl	0.114 ^[63]	0.164 ^[63]		0.168
[N1,1,1,16]Br			-0.046 ^[67]	-0.013
[N1,1,1,18]Cl			-0.456 ^[70]	-0.221
[IM12]Br	3.398 ^[71]	3.279 ^[71]		3.442
[IM14]Br	2.903 ^[71]	2.954 ^[71]		3.225
[IM14][BF ₄]	2.903 ^[72] 3.137 ^[12]	2.914 ^[72]		3.090
[IM14][CF ₃ SO ₃]	2.893 ^[12]			2.970
[IM14][C ₈ SO ₄]	1.608 ^[12]	1.491 ^[73]		1.632
[IM16]Cl	2.954 ^[63]			2.873
[IM16]Br	2.778 ^[71] 2.672 ^[76]	2.602 ^[71]	2.945 ^[74] 2.903 ^[74]	2.692
[IM18]Cl	2.342 ^[76] 2.000 ^[72] 2.342 ^[63]	2.369 ^[76] 1.954 ^[72]	2.301 ^[63]	2.316
[IM18]Br	2.176 ^[71]	2.176 ^[71]	2.255 ^[74]	2.135

1					
2					
3					
4					
5		2.083 ^[76]		2.279 ^[74]	
6	[IM18]I	2.000 ^[72]	2.176 ^[72]		2.156
7	[IM19]Br	1.602 ^[71]	1.477 ^[71]		1.845
8			1.869 ^[77]		
9					
10	[IM1-10]Cl	1.777 ^[76]	1.731 ^[76]	1.653 ^[63]	1.756
11		1.740 ^[63]	1.607 ^[78]	1.740 ^[63]	
12		1.601 ^[78]			
13					
14	[IM1-10]Br	1.301 ^[75]	1.602 ^[79]	1.623 ^[74]	1.575
15		1.467 ^[80]	1.613 ^[77]	1.663 ^[74]	
16			1.517 ^[80]		
17					
18	[IM1-12]Cl	1.176 ^[63]	1.129 ^[78]	0.845 ^[63]	1.267
19		1.120 ^[78]		1.114 ^[63]	
20					
21	[IM1-12]Br	0.634 ^[75]	0.991 ^[77]	1.000 ^[74]	1.086
22			0.929 ^[83]	1.079 ^[74]	
23			0.978 ^[81]		
24					
25	[IM1-12][BF ₄]	0.964 ^[80]	0.881 ^[80]		0.952
26	[IM1-14]Cl	0.602 ^[63]	0.498 ^[66]	0.477 ^[63]	0.652
27		0.532 ^[76]	0.566 ^[78]	0.602 ^[63]	
28		0.474 ^[78]			
29					
30	[IM1-14]Br		0.398 ^[77]		0.471
31			0.415 ^[80]		
32					
33	[IM1-16]Cl	0.114 ^[76]	0.057 ^[76]		0.060
34		-0.056 ^[82]	-0.066 ^[78]		
35		-0.061 ^[78]			
36					
37	[IM1-16]Br		-0.097 ^[75]		-0.121
38			-0.215 ^[77]		
39			-0.187 ^[81]		
40					
41	[IM1-18]Cl	-0.398 ^[76]	-0.347 ^[76]		-0.427
42	[Py ₈]Cl		2.439 ^[76]		2.334
43	Na[C ₈ SO ₄]			2.127 ^[83]	2.094
44	Na[C ₁₀ SO ₄]			1.477 ^[83]	1.480
45	Na[C ₁₂ SO ₄]			0.881 ^[84]	0.892
46	Na[C ₁₄ SO ₄]			0.301 ^[83]	0.269
47					
48					
49					
50					
51					
52					
53					
54					
55					
56					
57					
58					
59					
60					




Figure 4. The relationship of experimental and predicted critical micelle concentration [mmolL^{-1}] determined with calculated parameters according to eq. (40).

Recently, we introduced a CMC prediction method for ILs using the cubed molecular radius, the solvent-accessible surface, and COSMO-RS interactions such as hydrogen bonding, van der Waals, and misfit enthalpies.^[12] The results give an R^2 of 0.994, equal to that in the present study. However, in order to use this method, it is necessary to calculate the enthalpies for each IL, because the values change with the combination of cation and anion, while the present approach may be more comfortable, as the needed parameters can be easily derived by combining cation- and anion-specific LFER parameters without any quantum chemical calculation.

Conclusions

The extended models based on the Abraham equation can satisfactorily model log P, water solubility, and CMC of rather concentrated aqueous solutions of ILs using measured as well as calculated LFER parameters. Activity coefficient and hydrophobicity of the anion in water and octanol-water can equally be modeled using the calculated LFER descriptors. For the prediction of log P and water solubility, it is slightly advantageous to use the measured LFER descriptors over the calculated ones. However, the calculated parameters are much easier accessible and provide an easy approach to investigate parameters for ILs, which are experimentally not yet available.

In our prediction studies, the volume term (V) is the most important factor to determine physicochemical properties of ILs in solution. B is the second-most important contribution parameter, and other terms (E , S , and A) have only slight - but not ignorable - contributions. The combination of all parameters can enhance the predictability of the ILs' behavior in solution. For the anionic hydrophobicity hydrogen bonding basicity as a second key parameter in combination with V significantly contributes to the anionic molecular interaction in the octanol-water system. Similarly, both cationic volume and hydrogen bonding basicity with anionic hydrophobicity cause importantly ILs to partition in octanol-water. On the other hand, for the anionic activity coefficient in water, the single anionic hydrogen-bonding basicity term gives a better correlation than the volume, and changing the charge density term from V_c to $1/V_a$ with inclusion of the hydrogen-bonding basicity of the anion improves the prediction. In the case of the cationic contribution to the solubility in water, unlike the anionic activity coefficient, the $1/V_c$ term includes more molecular interaction than hydrogen-bonding basicity of cation: we assume that this has to be attributed to the fact that cations (e.g. imidazolium and pyridinium) have larger volumes and are less functionalized than anions. Moreover, the CMC at high concentrations was predicted with the assumption of ion-pairing and as well for the ion-dissociated form. In both cases, a good agreement was demonstrated, but the prediction using the ion-dissociated form is more accurate. The CMC also correlates readily with the volume term, but to include amphiphiles, the consideration of hydrogen bonding is required.

Experimental Section

Nomenclature

IL ions are abbreviated as $[IM1n]^+$ 1-methyl-3-alkylimidazolium (with $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 18$ being the number of carbon atoms in the unbranched alkyl chain), $[Py n]^+$ alkylpyridinium (with $n = 2, 4, 6, 8$), $[N1, 1, n]^+$ trimethylalkylammonium (with $n = 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18$), $[Pyr1n]^+$ alkylmethylpyrrolidinium (with $n = 4, 6, 8$), $[N1,1,n,Bz]^+$ benzylalkyldimethylammonium (with $n = 10, 12$), $[Pyn-4NMe2]^+$ 1-alkyl-4-(dimethylamino)pyridinium (with $n = 4, 6$), $[Pyn-2Me]^+$ 1-alkyl-2-methylpyridinium (with $n = 4, 6$), $[Pyn-3Me]^+$ 1-

1
2
3
4
5 350 alkyl-3-methylpyridinium (with $n = 4, 6$), [Pyn-4Me]⁺ 1-alkyl-4-methylpyridinium (with $n = 4, 6, 8$), [IM1-1Ph]⁺ 1-
6 51 benzyl-3-methyl-imidazolium, [IM1-(1Ph-4Me)]⁺ 1-methyl-3-(4-methylbenzyl)-imidazolium, [IM1-2Ph]⁺ 1-
7 52 methyl-3-(2-phenylethyl)-imidazolium, [IM1-2=1]⁺ (1-methyl-3-(2-propenyl)-imidazolium), [IM12O1]⁺ 1-(2-
8 53 methoxyethyl)-3-methyl-imidazolium, [IM13OH]⁺ 1-(3-hydroxypropyl)-3-methyl-imidazolium, [IM11O2]⁺ 1-
9 10 (ethoxymethyl)-3-methyl-imidazolium, [Py4-3Me-5Me]⁺ 1-butyl-3,5-dimethylpyridinium, [IM16-2Me]⁺ 1-hexyl-
11 12 2,3-dimethyl-imidazolium, [Pip14]⁺ 1-butyl-1-methylpiperidinium, [Mor11O2]⁺ 4-(ethoxymethyl)-4-
13 14 methylmorpholinium, [Py3OH]⁺ 1-(3-hydroxypropyl)pyridinium, [IM12OH]⁺ 1-(3-hydroxyethyl)pyridinium,
15 16 [N4,4,4,4]⁺ tetrabutylammonium combined selectively with Cl⁻, Br⁻, I⁻, [NO₃]⁻ Nitrate, [BF₄]⁻ tetrafluoroborate,
17 18 [PF₆]⁻ hexafluorophosphate, [(CF₃SO₂)₂N]⁻ bis(trifluoromethylsulfonyl)amide, [(C₂F₅SO₂)₂N]⁻
19 20 bis(pentafluoroethanesulfonyl)imide, [CF₃SO₃]⁻ trifluoromethanesulfonate, [SbF₆]⁻ hexafluoroantimonate,
21 22 [CH₃COO]⁻ acetate, [(6-2Et)2SS]⁻ bis(2-ethylhexyl)sulfosuccinate, [PhBF₃]⁻ trifluorophenylborate, [B(CN)₄]⁻
23 24 tetracyanidoborane, [(CF₃SO₂)₃C]⁻ tris(trifluoromethylsulfonyl)methide, [(C₂F₅)₃PF₃]⁻ trifluorotrakis(pentafluoro-
25 26 ethyl)phosphate, [AsF₆]⁻ hexafluoroarsenate, [(C₄F₉)SO₃]⁻ nonafluorobutyl sulfonate, [C_{*n*}SO₄]⁻ alkyl sulfate ($n = 8,$
27 28 10, 12, 14).

29 30 Measurement of the octanol-water partitioning coefficient

31 32 We measured the log P values of 25 chloride-based ILs (see the list of log P). Three 15 ml conical tube with cap
33 34 were filled with 3 ml of octanol and water respectively, and 15.0 mM of IL were added. The vials were vigorously
35 36 shaken for 10 min and allowed to stabilize for at least an hour and then centrifugation was performed to eliminate
37 38 the emulsion created by shaking process prior to injection into the HPLC system. Then, samples of 5 μL from each
39 40 phase were carefully withdrawn with a syringe. The withdrawn samples were diluted by a factor of 10 or 100 prior
41 42 to HPLC analysis.

43 44 For analyzing the quantity of ILs in each phase, we employed a Hilic stationary phase with acetonitrile (99.9 %, Fluka)
45 46 and buffer (15 mM KH₂PO₄ and 30 mM H₃PO₄) as eluent in the HPLC (Hewlett Packard System Series
47 48 1100), because cation has a good retention characteristic in Hilic system and applying phosphate buffer into the
49 50 mobile phase allows us to neglect influence of anion in the chromatographic system^[85]. The detection wavelengths
51 52 were 211 nm for imidazolium based ILs and 254 for pyridinium based ILs and ammonium based compounds with
53 54 benzyl substituents. The partitioning coefficients of ILs were determined as the ratio of the solute peak area in both
55 56 phases (eq. 41). The tests for partition coefficient of ILs were triplicate. C_{*o*}^{*i*} is the concentration of ILs in octanol
57 58 phase, and C_{*w*}^{*i*} is the concentration of ILs in water phase. ILs were donated by Merck.

$$59 60 \text{Log P} = \text{Log } C_o^i / C_w^i \quad (41)$$

61 62 Computational details

For the COSMO calculations of all parameters of ILs (sig2, sig3, HBD3, and HBA3), the structures of the single IL ions were optimized. Firstly, (RI-)BP86/SV(P) optimizations^[86-89] were carried out with the TURBOMOLE program package (version 5.10) using the Resolution of Identity (RI)^[89] for reasonable starting structures. Using AOFORCE^[90, 91], the vibrational frequencies of each ion were calculated. These structures were further refined with the TZVP^[92] basis set, after which a full optimization with inclusion of COSMO^[32] was performed ($\epsilon_r = \infty$). Finally sig 2, sig 3, HBD3, and HBA3 of the optimized ion of ILs were calculated with COSMO-RS^[32] using BP_TZVP_C21_0108 parameterization. The calculated sig 2, sig 3, HBD3, and HBA3 of all anions and cations ILs are given in Table S6.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the Universität Bremen, the Universität Freiburg, the Deutsche Bundesstiftung Umwelt DBU, and the DFG priority program SPP 1191. The authors acknowledge the use of the computing resources provided by the Black Forest Grid Initiative (BFG) (<http://www.bfg.uni-freiburg.de>) and the donation of IL samples by Merck Germany and **by Prof. Bernd Ondruska in the Universität Jena.**

Supporting information

We address measured and calculated LFER parameters of IL ions (Table S1 and S2), explanations in detail computational methods with sub-dataset (Table S3) and equations (Eq. S1–S5) for LFER parameters, and lipophilicity of cation for determining anionic hydrophobicity (Table S4). Supporting information for this article is available on the WWW under <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/chem.2010xxxxx>.

References

- [1] M. Galinski, A. Lewandowski, I. Stepnowski, *Electrochim. Acta* **2006**, *51*, 5567–5580.
- [2] T. Welton, *Coordin. Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *248*, 2459–2477.
- [3] J. F. Liu, J. A. Jonsson, G. B. Jiang, *Trac-Trends Anal. Chem.* **2005**, *24*, 20–27.
- [4] K. R. Seddon, The International George Papatheodorou Symposium: Proceedings, S. Boghosian, V. Dracopoulos, C. G. Kontoyannis, G. A. Voyiatzis (Eds.), Institute of Chemical Engineering and High Temperature Chemical Processes, Patras, Greece, **1999**, pp. 131.
- [5] H. Weingärtner, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **2008**, *47*, 654–670.
- [6] I. Krossing, J. M. Slattery, C. Daguene, P. J. Dyson, A. Oleinikova, H. Weingärtner, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128*, 13427–13434.
- [7] U. Preiss, S. Bulut, I. Krossing, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2010**, *114*, 11133–11140.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- [8] J. M. Slattery, C. Daguene, P. J. Dyson, T. J. S. Schubert, I. Krossing, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2007**, *46*, 5384–5388.
- [9] P. Eiden, C. Friedrich, S. Bulut, I. Krossing, **2010**, *J. Phys. Chem.*, accepted for publication..
- [10] U. P. R. M. Preiss, J. M. Slattery, I. Krossing, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2009**, *48*, 2290–2296.
- [11] U. Preiss, V. N. Emel'yanenko, S. P. Verevkin, D. Himmel, Y. U. Paulechka, I. Krossing, *ChemPhysChem* **2010**, DOI: 10.1002/cphc.201000614.
- [12] U. Preiss, C. Jungnickel, J. Thöming, I. Krossing, J. Luczak, M. Diedenhofen, A. Klamt, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009**, *15*, 8880–8885.
- [13] C. Jungnickel, M. Markiewicz, U. Preiss, W. Mroziak, P. Stepnowski, J. Optoelectron, *Adv. Mater. Symposia* **2009**, *1*, 82–87.
- [14] L. M. Sprunger, J. Gibbs, A. Proctor, W. E. Acree, Jr., M. H. Abraham, Y. Meng, C. Yao, J. L. Anderson, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* **2009**, *48*, 4145–4154.
- [15] L. Sprunger, M. Clark, W. E. Acree, Jr., M. Abraham, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **2007**, *47*, 1123–1129.
- [16] D. S. Van Meter, O. D. Suart, A. B. Carle, A. M. Stalcup, *J. Chromatogr. A* **2008**, *1191*, 67–71.
- [17] J. L. Anderson, J. Ding, T. Welton, D. W. Armstrong, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124* (47), 14247–14254.
- [18] A. Fredenslund, R. L. Jones, T. H. Prausnitz, *AIChE J.* **1975**, *21*(6), 1086–1099.
- [19] K.-U. Goss, R. P. Schwarzenhach, *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2001**, *35*(1), 1–9.
- [20] B. Mennucci, J. Tomasi, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1997**, *106*, 5151–5158.
- [21] M. H. Abraham, A. Ibrahim, A. M. Zissimos, *J. Chromatogr. A* **2004**, 29–47.
- [22] M. H. Abraham, J. M. Al-Hussaini, *J. Environ. Monit.* **2005**, *7*, 295–301.
- [23] M. H. Abraham, P. L. Grellier, R. A. McGill, *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin. Trans. 2* **1987**, 797–803.
- [24] M. H. Abraham, G. S. Whiting, *J. Chromatogr.* **1991**, *587*, 229–236.
- [25] M. H. Abraham, *J. Phys. Org. Chem.* **1993**, *6*, 660–684.
- [26] M. H. Abraham, H. S. Chadha, G. S. Whiting, R. C. Mitchell, *J. Pharm. Sci.* **1994**, *83*, 1085–1100.
- [27] M. H. Abraham, W. E. Acree, Jr., *J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, *75*(4), 1006–1015.
- [28] M. H. Abraham, W. E. Acree, Jr., *J. Org. Chem.* **2010**, *75*(9), 3021–3026.
- [29] M. H. Abraham, W. E. Acree, Jr., *New J. Chem.* **2010**, *34*(10), 2298–2305.
- [30] M. H. Abraham, W. E. Acree, Jr., *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2010**, *12*(40), 13182–13188.
- [31] C.-W. Cho, C. Jungnickel, S. Stolte, U. Preiss, J. Arning, J. Ranke, A. Klamt, I. Krossing, J. Thöming, **2010**, *Submitted to Journal of Chromatography A*
- [32] A. Klamt, G. Schüürmann, *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 2* **1993**, 799–805.
- [33] OBPROP (<http://openbabel.sourceforge.net>)
- [34] A. M. Zissimos, M. H. Abraham, A. Klamt, F. Eckert, J. Wood, *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.* **2002**, *42*, 1320–1331.
- [35] S. H. Yalkowsky, S. C. Valvani, *J. Pharm. Sci.* **1981**, *70*, 1177–1178.

- 1
2
3
4
5 [36] W. M. Meylan, P. H. Howard, R. S. Boethling, D. Aronson, H. Printup, S. Gouchie, *Environ. Toxicol.*
6 *Chem.* **1999**, *18*, 664–672.
7
8 [37] R. L. Swann, D. A. Laskowski, P. J. McCall, K. Vanderkuy, H. J. Dishburger, *Residue Rev.* **1983**, *85*, 17–
9 28.
10
11 [38] Y. H. Zhao, M. T. D. Cronin, J. C. Dearden, *Quant. Struct.-Act. Relat.* **1998**, *17*, 131–138.
12
13 [39] Y. H. Zhao, M. H. Abraham, J. Le, A. Hersey, C. N. Luscombe, G. Beck, B. Sherborne, I. Cooper, *Pharm.*
14 *Res.* **2002**, *19*, 1446–1457.
15
16 [40] J. Ranke, A. Müller, U. Bottin-Weber, F. Stock, S. Stolte, J. Arning, R. Störmann, B. Jastorff, *Ecotoxicol.*
17 *Environ. Safety* **2007**, *67*, 430–438.
18
19 [41] <http://chem.uft.uni-bremen.de/il-eco/> supported by Zentrum für Umweltforschung und nachhaltige
20 Technologien (UFT) and Merck, University of Bremen, Germany
21
22 [42] J. Ranke, A. Othman, P. Fan, A. Müller, *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **2009**, *1037*, 1271–1289.
23
24 [43] P. Stepnowski, P. Storoniak, *Environ. Sci. Poll. Res.* **2005**, *12*, 199.
25
26 [44] S. H. Lee, Biocatalysis in ionic liquids: Influence of physicochemical properties of ionic liquids on
27 enzyme activity and enantioselectivity, **2005**, Pohang University of Science and Technology, Korea
28
29 [45] S. H. Lee, S. B. Lee, *J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol.* **2009**, *84(2)*, 202–207.
30
31 [46] L. J. Ropel, Diffusion coefficients and 1-octanol-water partitioning coefficient of ionic liquids, **2004**,
32 Notre Dame, Indiana, IN, USA
33
34 [47] L. Ropel, L. S. Belvéze, S. N. V. Aki, A. Stadtherr, J. F. Brennecke, *Green Chem.* **2005**, *7*, 83–90.
35
36 [48] J. L. Kaar, A. M. Jesionowski, J. A. Berberich, R. Moulton, A. J. Russell, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*,
37 4125–4131.
38
39 [49] L. S. Belvéze, Modeling and Measurement of Thermodynamic Properties of Ionic Liquids, **2004**,
40 University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA
41
42 [50] A. Chapeaux, L. D. Simoni, M. A. Stadtherr, J. F. Brennecke, *J. Chem. Eng. Data* **2007**, *52*, 2462–2467.
43
44 [51] M. G. Freire, P. J. Carvalho, R. L. Gardas, I. M. Marrucho, L. M. N. B. F. Santos, J. A. P. Coutinho, *J.*
45 *Phys. Chem. B* **2008**, *112*, 1604–1610.
46
47 [52] N. Papaiconomou, N. Yakelis, J. Salminen, R. Bergman, J. M. Prausnitz, *J. Chem. Eng. Data* **2006**, *51*,
48 1389–1393.
49
50 [53] H. Luo, S. Dai, P. V. Bonnesen, *Anal. Chem.* **2004**, *76*, 2773–2779.
51
52 [54] M. G. Freire, C. M. S. S. Neves, P. J. Carvalho, R. L. Gardas, A. M. Fernandes, I.M. Marrucho, L.M. N. B.
53 F. Santos, J. A. P. Coutinho, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2007**, *111*, 13082–13089.
54
55 [55] N.V. Shvedene, S.V. Borovskaya, V.V. Sviridov, E. R. Ismailova, I. V. Pletnev, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **2005**,
56 *381*, 427–430.
57
58 [56] J. L. Anthony, E. J. Maginn, J. F. Brennecke, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2001**, *105*, 10942–10949.
59
60 [57] S. Carda-Broch, A. Berthod, D. W. Armstrong, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **2003**, *375*, 191–199.

- 1
2
3
4
489 [58] N. Nishi, T. Kawakami, F. Shigematsu, M. Yamamoto, T. Kakiuchi, *Green Chem.* **2006**, *8*, 349–355.
5
490 [59] N. Papaiconomou, J. Salminen, J.-M. Lee, J. M. Prausnitz, *J. Chem. Eng. Data* **2007**, *52*, 833–840.
7
491 [60] J. Salminen, N. Papaiconomou, R. A. Kumara, J. Lee, J. Kerr, J. Newmana, J. M. Prausnitz, *Fluid Phase*
8
492 *Equilib.* **2007**, *261*, 421–426.
10
493 [61] G. D’Errico, O. Ortona, L. Paduano, V. Vitagliano, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **2001**, *239*, 264–271.
12
494 [62] W. Mosquera, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **1998**, *206*, 66–76.
13
495 [63] M. Blesic, M. H. Marques, N. V. Plechkova, K. R. Seddon, L. P. N. Rebelo, A. Lopes, *Green Chem.* **2007**,
15
496 *9*, 481–490.
17
497 [64] T. M. Perger, M. Bester-Rogac, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **2007**, *313*, 288–295.
18
498 [65] I. Chakraborty, S. P. Moulik, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2007**, *111*, 3658–3664.
20
499 [66] S. K. Mehta, K. K. Bhasin, R. Chauhan, S. Dham, *Colloids Surf. A* **2005**, *255*, 153–157.
22
500 [67] P. Hansson, B. Joensson, C. Stroem, O. Soederman, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2000**, *104*, 3496–3506.
23
501 [68] Y. Hayami, H. Ichikawa, A. Someya, M. Aratono, K. Motomura, *Colloid Polym. Sci.* **1998**, *276*, 595–600.
25
502 [69] S. Durand-Vidal, M. Jardat, V. Dahirel, O. Bernard, K. Perrigaud, P. Turq, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2006**, *110*,
26
503 15542–15547.
28
504 [70] R. Ueoka, Y. Murakami, *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin Trans. 2* **1983**, 219–224.
30
505 [71] I. Goodchild, L. Collier, S. L. Millar, I. Prokeš, J. C. D. Lord, C. P. B. Butts, J. Bowers, J. R. P. Webster,
31
506 R. K. Heenan, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **2007**, *307*, 455–468.
33
507 [72] J. Bowers, C. P. Bitts, P. J. Matin, M. C. Vergara-Gurierrez, *Langmuir* **2004**, *20*, 2191–2198.
35
508 [73] Z. Miskolczy, K. Sebok-Nagy, L. Biczok, S. Gokturk, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2004**, *400*, 296–300.
36
509 [74] J. Wang, H. Wang, S. Zhang, H. Zhang, Y. Zhao, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2007**, *111*, 6181–6188.
38
510 [75] Q. Q. Baltazar, J. Chandawalla, K. Sawyer, J. L. Anderson, *Colloids Surf. A* **2007**, *302*, 150–156.
39
511 [76] C. Jungnickel, J. Łuczak, J. Ranke, J. F. Fernandez, A. Müller, J. Thöming, *Colloids Surf. A* **2008**, *316*,
41
512 278–284.
43
513 [77] R. Vanyúr, L. Biczok, Z. Miskolczy, *Colloids Surf. A* **2007**, *299*, 256–261.
44
514 [78] O. A. El Seoud, P. A. R. Pires, T. Abdel-Moghny, E. L. Bastos, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **2007**, *313*, 296–
46
515 304.
48
516 [79] J. Sirix-Plenet, L. Gaillon, P. Letellier, *Talanta* **2004**, *63*, 979–986.
49
507 [80] B. Dong, N. Li, L. Zheng, L. Yu, T. Inoue, *Langmuir* **2007**, *23*, 4178–4182.
51
518 [81] T. Inoue, H. Ebina, B. Dong, L. Zheng, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **2007**, *314*, 236–241.
52
519 [82] S. Thomaier, K. Werner, *J. Mol. Liq.* **2007**, *130*, 104–107.
54
520 [83] F. Quina, *J. Phys. Chem.* **1995**, *99*, 17028–17031.
56
521 [84] T. Sasaki, M. Hattori, J. Sasaki, K. Nukina, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* **1975**, *48*, 1397–1403.
57
522 [85] P. Stepnowski, A. Muller, P. Behred, J. Ranke, J. Hoffmann, *J. Chromatogr. A* **2003**, *993* (1–2), 173–178.
59
523 [86] A. Schäfer, C. Horn, R. Ahlrichs, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *97*, 2571–2577.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- [87] A. D. Becke, *Phys. Rev. A* **1988**, 38, 3098–3100.
- [88] S. Vosko, L. Wilk, M. Nusair, *Can. J. Phys.* **1980**, 58, 1200–1211.
- [89] J. P. Perdew, *Phys. Rev. B* **1986**, 33, 8822–8824.
- [90] P. Deglmann, F. Furche, R. Ahlrichs, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2002**, 362, 511–518.
- [91] P. Deglmann, F. Furche, *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, 117, 9535 – 9538.
- [92] A. Schäfer, C. Huber, R. Ahlrichs, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, 100, 5829–5835.
- [93] T. Sasaki, M. Hattori, J. Sasaki, K. Nukina, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* **1975**, 38, 1397–1403.