Supporting information

Evaluating the substitution effects of Bis(β-iminoenolate)copper(II) complexes on their Photophysical, DNA binding/photocleavage, and cytotoxic activity

Panneerselvam Arun Prasanth,^a Periyappan Nantheeswaran,^a Kaliyan Prabakaran^{b, e}, Rajendran Senthilnathan^c, Faruck Lukmanul Hakkim,^d Arunachalam Jothi,^c Muthu Seenivasa Perumal,^b Veerappan Anbazhagan,^{c*} Mariappan Mariappan^{a*}

- a) Department of Chemistry, SRMIST, Kattankulathur, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India, 603 203
- *b)* Department of Chemistry, The Gandhigram Rural Institute-Deemed to be University, Gandhigram, Dindigul district, Tamilnadu- 624 302, India.
- c) School of Chemical and Biotechnology, SASTRA Deemed University, Thirumalaisamudaram, Thanjavur, Tamil Nadu, India, 613 401
- *d)* The Hormel Institute, University of Minnesota, 801 16th Ave NE, Austin, MN 55912, United States of America.
- e) Department of Advanced Organic Materials Engineering, Chungnam National University, 220 Gung-dong, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon, 305-764, Republic of Korea.

* Corresponding author

M. M.: Phone: +91 8870249167; Fax: +91 44-27453903 e-mail: <u>tmmari@yahoo.com</u>, <u>mariappm@srmist.edu.in</u> V. A.: Phone: +91 4362-264101-3689; Fax: +91 4362-264120 Email: <u>anbazhagan@scbt.sastra.edu</u>



Fig. S1: Solvent dependent absorption (A, C, E) and emission spectra (B, D, F) for the compounds **1a-c**. For fluorescence spectra, 0.2 OD of the solution was prepared..



Fig. S2: (A) UV-Vis spectral titration of complex **1b** with CT DNA in Tris-HCl buffer (hypochromism) [1b]=10 μ M, [DNA_{NP}] = 0-100 μ M.. (B) Emission spectra of DAPI [50 μ M] bound to DNA in the presence of **1b** complex [10 μ M] with increasing concentration (0-50 μ M) in phosphate buffer.



Fig. S3: (A) Emission spectral overlap of DAPI, DAPI with DNA and quenching spectra of complexes **1a-c** [10 μ M] with the DAPI [50 μ M] and DNA emission maxima mixture in phosphate buffer solution. (B) Curve fitting of the ratio between I/Io with the increase in the complexes **1a-c** concentration (0-65 μ M).



Fig. S4: Thermal melting profile curves of CT DNA alone and in the presence of complexes **1a-c** in buffer B [**1a-c**]= 10 μ M, [DNA]= 100 μ M



Fig. S5: Plot of relative viscosity versus [1a-c]/[CT DNA] in in buffer C [1a-c] = 10 μ M, $[DNA] = 100\mu$ M



Fig. S6: DFT energy minimized tructure of representative structure of the complex 1c.



Table S1: Molar conductivity data for the completes recorded in methanol.Conductivity of Cu (II) complexes

S.No	Samples	200 mΩ	2 mΩ	200 μΩ	20 μΩ
1	Н	Nil	.001	2.0	2.25
2	F	Nil	.002	2.3	2.54
3	OMe	Nil	.001	2.1	2.35

Complexes concentration; 1 mM in10 ml MeOH

Compound	Oxidation ^b	Reduction ^b	
Compound	E _{1/2} (V vs SCE)	E _{1/2} (V vs SCE)	
Cu-OMe	+1.03	-1.21, -1.48	
Cu-H	+0.96	-1.35, -1.76	
Cu-F		-1.45, -1.91	

 Table S2: Redox potential data of compounds 1a-c in CH₃CN

Error limits: $E_{1/2,} \pm 0.02$ V, 0.1 M TBAPF₆

Table S3: Binding and quenching constant (K_b , K_{app} , K_{SV}) and Melting temperature data for the reference and studied complexes 1a-c.

Compound	<i>K</i> _b (M ⁻¹)	<i>K</i> _{SV} (M ⁻¹)	K _{app} (M ⁻¹)	T _m (°C)	ΔG (kJmol ⁻¹)
DNA		-	-	57.4	-
EB	> 10 ⁷	-	-	67.8	-44.86
DAPI	5.64×10^{5}	-	1.69×10^{5}	64.1	-34.23
Cu-OMe	1.29×10^{4}	2.12×10^{4}	1.98×10^{4}	58.1	-23.44
Cu-H	0.58×10^{5}	2.43×10^{4}	1.26×10^{5}	59.3	-27.15
Cu-F	1.57×10^{5}	2.97×10^{4}	1.74×10^{5}	61.6	-29.48

a) Error limits: K_b , $\pm 5\%$; T_m , $\pm 1 \text{ °C}$