Published in final edited form as:

Chem Commun (Camb). 2016 February 14; 52(13): 2705–2708. doi:10.1039/c5cc08682e.

A New Class of Ru(II) Polyazine Agents with Potential for Photodynamic Therapy

Roberto Padilla^a, José A. Rodriguez-Corrales^a, Lauren E. Donohoe^a, Brenda S. J. Winkel^{b,*}, and Karen J. Brewer^a

^aDepartment of Chemistry, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0212 VA 24061-0212

^bDepartment of Biological Sciences, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, VA 24061-0406

Abstract

Appending anthracene units to [(bpy)₂Ru(dpp)]²⁺ results in Ru(II) agents that exhibit dynamic photoreactivity towards DNA and protein. [(Anthbpy)(bpy)Ru(dpp)]²⁺ and [(Anthbpy)₂Ru(dpp)]²⁺ are the first metal-organic Ru(II) agent with dpp ligands shown to photomodify DNA in the presence or absence of oxygen, while also binding protein in an oxygen-dependent manner.

Ru(II) photosensitizers (PSs) have been investigated extensively as potential agents for photodynamic anti-cancer therapy (PDT).¹ The well-studied [Ru(bpy)₃]²⁺ PS mediates the oxidation of DNA via quenching of the [Ru(bpy)₃]²⁺ triplet metal-to-ligand charge transfer (³MLCT) excited state by molecular oxygen, ³O₂, upon light activation.² Ru(II) PSs that efficiently sensitize ³O₂ have been shown to modify DNA and/or protein within cells, which disrupts cell homeostasis leading to necrotic and/or apoptotic processes.^{2a, 3} Although Ru(II) agents that efficiently produce ¹O₂ are desirable for PDT, Ru(II) systems that exhibit multiple pathways of reactivity are sought in order to improve PDT efficacy.⁴ One approach has been to covalently append polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon (PAH) units that independently intercalate and oxidize DNA.^{4e, 5} The reactivity of these Ru(II) hybrid complexes has been found to be intimately associated with both the nature of the covalent linker and the type of chromophore appended to the Ru(II) unit, thus suggesting new avenues for optimizing the photoreactivity of Ru(II) agents for PDT.⁶

We recently described the synthesis and characterization of [(AnthbpyMe)(bpy)Ru(dpp)]²⁺ (**2**) and [(AnthbpyMe)₂Ru(dpp)]²⁺ (**3**) (AnthbpyMe = 4-[N-(2-anthryl)carbamoyl]-4'-methyl-2,2'-bipyridine; bpy = 2,2'-bipyridine; dpp = 2, 3-bis (2'-pyridyl) pyrazine (Figure 1)).⁷ The PAH, anthracene, has shown substantial promise for enhancing the PDT reactivity of Ru(II) complexes.^{7–8} Anthracene can by itself intercalate into the DNA double helix and, upon irradiation with UV light, oxidize adjacent sites in the DNA molecule through reactive oxygen species (ROS) or anthracene-derived cation

*Corresponding author: winkel@vt.edu (Brenda S.J. Winkel).

†Deceased October 24, 2014

Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Experimental details.

radicals.⁹ When appended to Ru(II) PSs, anthryl groups have been shown to promote enhanced binding to calf-thymus (CT) DNA by intercalative π -stacking, while facilitating DNA photocleavage by $\bullet\text{OH}$ and by sensitized $^3\text{O}_2$ mechanisms via the anthracene and Ru(II) units, respectively.⁸ We have shown that complexes **2** and **3** efficiently absorb light throughout the visible region, facilitated by several MLCT transitions with $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 459$ nm ($\epsilon = 16,000 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$) and 461 nm ($\epsilon = 21,000 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$), respectively.⁷ Upon excitation the anthracene-[Ru]-dpp hybrid arrangement provides multiple pathways, singlet-singlet, triplet-triplet, and/or singlet-triplet, for deactivation from the $^3\text{MLCT}$ excited state through energy/electron transfer, which is speculated to enhance the PDT potency that was observed for these complexes against mammalian cells in preliminary experiments,⁷ as also recently suggested for anthracene-[Ru]-bpy complexes.⁶

In this study, we demonstrate that $[(\text{AnthbpyMe})(\text{bpy})\text{Ru}(\text{dpp})]^{2+}$ (**2**) and $[(\text{AnthbpyMe})_2\text{Ru}(\text{dpp})]^{2+}$ (**3**) can modify DNA and protein through multifaceted pathways that appear to be unique to the anthracene-[Ru]-dpp systems. Gel shift assays were used to examine the potential reactivity of the title complexes with biomacromolecules under diverse conditions. These assays have been used extensively to monitor the DNA binding propensity of metal-organic complexes, including oxidation of DNA via ROSSs, by monitoring the electrophoretic migration of DNA.¹⁰ Altered migration of the DNA-complex adduct reflects a change in size, charge, and/or configuration of DNA, the latter involving conversion of supercoiled (SC) plasmid to open circular (OC) and/or linear (L) forms.

Figure 2 compares the effects of the Ru(II) complexes on DNA with and without photolysis and in the presence and absence of oxygen. Both title complexes, as well as the parent molecule, $[(\text{bpy})_2\text{Ru}(\text{dpp})](\text{PF}_6)_2$ (**1**), appear to be chemically inert toward DNA in the dark in the presence of oxygen (lane 1), with no detectable change in ethidium bromide fluorescence intensity or migration of the SC DNA. However, upon photolysis at 455 nm for 1 h in the presence of $^3\text{O}_2$, all three Ru(II) complexes alter the electrophoretic mobility of plasmid DNA (lanes 2 and 3). As previously reported, the parent complex (**1**) exhibited $^3\text{O}_2$ -dependent conversion of a substantial proportion of SC DNA to the OC form, but only in the presence of oxygen.^{10d} The title complexes **2** and **3** modified the plasmid DNA even more efficiently and did so both in the presence and absence of $^3\text{O}_2$. Under both conditions these complexes completely converted SC DNA to a mixture of OC DNA and a band with a distinctly different migration rate than either OC and L DNA (control lanes C and L). The primary difference between the two anthracene-[Ru]-dpp systems appears to be in the efficiency of the conversion, with the relative intensities of the OC and intermediate bands differing reproducibly in the presence of **2** versus **3**.

It is hypothesized that the photooxidation of DNA by the anthracene-[Ru]-dpp systems under $^3\text{O}_2$ is facilitated independently by the Ru(II) PS (via $^3\text{O}_2$) or anthracene (via $\bullet\text{OH}$ or anthracene-derived radicals) unit(s) to produce OC DNA. The intermediate band is speculated to consist of modified forms of OC or L DNA to which the complex is photochemically bound.¹¹ In the absence of $^3\text{O}_2$, the DNA modification is speculated to involve a $\bullet\text{OH}$ and/or anthracene-derived radical produced by the anthryl unit(s) to form the OC DNA, as has been reported for anthracene alone.^{8, 9f} In this case, the faster migrating band is speculated to consist of cross-linked DNA product(s), as has previously been

reported for several other anthracene derivatives.^{9b, 11a,b} Samples treated with complex **3** also exhibited a higher degree of smearing of the lower band, which is attributed to the steric constraints from the two-anthryl units which could enhance crosslinking of DNA through the formation of multiple photoadducts by a single Ru(II) complex.^{11c, 12} These results strongly suggest that the anthracene-[Ru]-dpp hybrid systems uniquely modify plasmid DNA via an ³O₂-independent mechanism attributed to the appended anthryl unit(s).

To further investigate the mechanism of photooxidation and the participation of •OH radicals in DNA binding and cleavage by these complexes, we examined the effects of the •OH scavengers DMSO, sodium iodide, and sodium benzoate^{8, 11c} on their ability to photomodify DNA (Figure 3). The parent complex (**1**) effectively converted a substantial proportion of the SC DNA to the OC form following 1 h of photolysis at 455 nm, whether or not •OH radical scavengers were present (Figure 3a). The presence of these scavengers also appeared to have little or no effect on the activity of complex **2** (Figure 3b). This finding suggests that [Ru]-derived singlet oxygen (¹O₂) and anthracene-derived radicals together mediate the formation of OC DNA and the band of intermediate mobility. Anthracene-derived radicals are hypothesized to occur via a known ³anthracene excited state that readily photooxidizes across the 9,10 position of the molecule.^{7, 13}

In contrast, although complex **3** displayed no change in reactivity toward DNA in the presence of DMSO (Figure 3c, lane 2), samples containing sodium-based scavengers exhibited a distinctly different profile (Figure 3c, lanes 3 – 5). In this case, complex **3** converted SC DNA to OC DNA and the intermediate-mobility band, but also produced a third band with accelerated mobility. A salt-induced change in interaction of anthracene with DNA, from intercalative to non-intercalative binding, has previously been hypothesized to facilitate cleavage of the DNA backbone.^{9c, 14} This effect, together with the presence of the second anthryl unit in complex **3**, could facilitate the formation of cross-linked DNA. This conclusion is further supported by the finding that the non-sodium based •OH radical scavenger, 5,5-dimethyl-1-pyrroline N-oxide (DMPO), display little to no reduction in the light-mediated conversion of SC DNA to the OC or L form by complex **2** or **3** (Figure S1).

To examine the modes of binding in further detail, the apparent DNA binding constants, K_b , of the three complexes were compared. In these experiments, UV-vis spectroscopy was used to monitor the MLCT (λ_{max}) during titration with CT DNA in the dark (Table 1; ESI).^{8, 15} The results suggest that complex **2** can efficiently intercalate into the DNA duplex via the anthracene motif, as indicated by the two orders of magnitude enhancement in K_b relative to the parent complex (**1**). In contrast, complex **3**, with two anthryl units, exhibited a K_b similar to **1**, suggesting that steric constraints may impede intercalation into the DNA duplex. However, the presence of two anthracene units could facilitate inter/intra crosslinking of DNA without influencing the MLCT transition. The results suggest that appending a second anthryl unit to the Ru(II) PS may negatively impact non-covalent intercalation, while still facilitating other binding modes that allow for DNA crosslinking.

Alternative targets for metal-organic Ru(II) agents are proteins that, like DNA, are abundant and essential cellular macromolecules.¹⁶ The disruption of protein functionality within cells can trigger oxidative stress and threaten cell viability.¹⁷ The oxidation of proteins can be

mediated by Ru(II) PSs through sensitization of $^3\text{O}_2$, ROS production, and/or direct attack by protein-derived radicals upon light activation.¹⁸ We therefore tested the propensity of our anthracene-[Ru]-dpp complexes to bind to and disrupt a prototypical protein, bovine serum albumin (BSA), by monitoring effects on electrophoretic migration and/or protein abundance by sodium dodecyl sulfate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE).

Figure 4 displays SDS-PAGE analysis of the interaction of complexes **1**, **2**, and **3** with BSA, with and without photolysis and in the presence and absence of oxygen at a 1:1 protein-to-metal complex (P:MC) molar ratio. The three complexes displayed very similar behavior under these conditions. The migration and intensity of the bands in the first four lanes of each panel were indistinguishable, suggesting that the complexes do not interact with and/or covalently bind to BSA in the dark at either RT or 37°C in the presence of $^3\text{O}_2$ (lanes RT and 37°C) or following photolysis in the absence of $^3\text{O}_2$ (lane FPT). However, a substantial decrease in fluorescence intensity was observed when the protein-complex solutions were photolyzed in the presence of $^3\text{O}_2$ (lane $^3\text{O}_2$). This suggests that the reported complexes can modify BSA via an $^3\text{O}_2$ -mediated mechanism, resulting in degradation of the protein and/or the production of high-molecular-weight cross-linked products through protein-derived radical reactions.^{16b, 19} No high molecular mass products were observed in these experiments, suggesting that the complexes degrade BSA, with absolute dependence on light and $^3\text{O}_2$. This is in contrast to the $^3\text{O}_2$ -independent interaction of (**2**) and (**3**) with DNA, indicating that the anthracene-[Ru]-dpp complexes interact with these two biological macromolecules through different mechanisms.

The light- and $^3\text{O}_2$ -mediated reactivity of these complexes was further investigated across a range of concentrations. Figure 5 displays the results of SDS-PAGE assays for solutions of protein-to-metal complex (P:MC) at 10:1, 1:1, and 1:10 molar ratios, photolyzed for 1 h in the presence of $^3\text{O}_2$. At a 10:1 ratio, all three complexes appeared to have a minimal effect on fluorescence of the BSA band in these gels (Figure 5a). However, at ratios of 1:1 and 1:10 P:MC (Figure 5b and c) all of the samples showed evidence of photo-oxidation of the protein. Moreover, the two anthracene-containing complexes showed evidence of covalent binding to the protein, remaining associated with the protein bands even under the denaturing conditions of this assay, indicated by the red fluorescence emanating from the [Ru] core in lanes 2 and 3, Figure 5c. It was also observed that complex **3** displays a lower activity toward BSA as compared to complex **2**, which can be attributed to steric interference from the second anthryl unit, as also observed for binding to DNA.

In summary, DNA gel shift and SDS-PAGE assays established that complexes **2** and **3** mediate DNA and protein damage upon photoactivation. The complexes were shown to bind and efficiently photocleave DNA in the presence or absence of $^3\text{O}_2$, while modification of BSA displayed absolute dependence on the presence of light and $^3\text{O}_2$. This study also demonstrated that appending a second anthryl unit to the $[(\text{bpy})_2\text{Ru}(\text{dpp})]^{2+}$ PS can negatively impact intercalative binding properties and may facilitate the formation of cross-linked DNA. The second anthryl unit also appears to reduce binding affinity for protein. This is the first study to show metal-organic complexes **2** and **3** are able to modify different biomacromolecules through various modes of interaction. The reported complexes offer versatile photomodification pathways toward biomacromolecules and show promise as

potential PDT agents. In addition, the dpp ligands in these complexes offer the potential to chelate additional metals and further diversify their activity.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to the National Science Foundation (grant CHE-1301131) for funding this work. Roberto Padilla received additional support from the National Institutes of Health (grant VT-IMSD-GM072767). This manuscript is dedicated to the memory of Karen Jenks Brewer and the generous spirit that sustained 22 years of collaboration with the Winkel group.

References

1. (a) Macdonald IJ, Dougherty TJ. *Journal of Porphyrins and Phthalocyanines*. 2001; 5:105.(b) Glazer EC. *Israel Journal of Chemistry*. 2013; 53:391.(c) Wang, H-t, Li, H-h, Huang, M-q, Huang, W-x, Ma, C-s, Wang, M-l, He, C-x, Liu, J-h, Zhang, Q-l. *Inorganic Chemistry Communications*. 2015; 55:30.(d) Huang H, Yu B, Zhang P, Huang J, Chen Y, Gasser G, Ji L, Chao H. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*. 2015; 54:14049. [PubMed: 26447888] (e) Liu J, Chen Y, Li G, Zhang P, Jin C, Zeng L, Ji L, Chao H. *Biomaterials*. 2015; 56:140. [PubMed: 25934287]
2. (a) Fleisher MB, Waterman KC, Turro NJ, Barton JK. *Inorganic Chemistry*. 1986; 25:3549.(b) Fiers W, Beyaert R, Declercq W, Vandenabeele P. *Oncogene*. 1999; 18:7719. [PubMed: 10618712]
3. (a) Liu Y, Hammitt R, Lutterman DA, Joyce LE, Thummel RP, Turro C. *Inorganic Chemistry*. 2009; 48:375. [PubMed: 19035764] (b) Sun Y, Joyce LE, Dickson NM, Turro C. *Chemical Communications*. 2010; 46:2426. [PubMed: 20379547]
4. (a) Fukuzumi S, Ohkubo K, Zheng X, Chen Y, Pandey RK, Zhan R, Kadish KM. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B*. 2008; 112:2738.(b) Garner RN, Gallucci JC, Dunbar KR, Turro C. *Inorganic Chemistry*. 2011; 50:9213. [PubMed: 21879748] (c) Sgambellone MA, David A, Garner RN, Dunbar KR, Turro C. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*. 2013; 135:11274. [PubMed: 23819591] (d) Albani BA, Peña B, Leed NA, de Paula NABG, Pavani C, Baptista MS, Dunbar KR, Turro C. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*. 2014; 136:17095. [PubMed: 25393595] (e) Mari C, Pierroz V, Ferrari S, Gasser G. *Chemical Science*. 2015; 6:2660.
5. (a) Lincoln R, Kohler L, Monro S, Yin H, Stephenson M, Zong R, Chouai A, Dorsey C, Hennigar R, Thummel RP, McFarland SA. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*. 2013; 135:17161. [PubMed: 24127659] (b) Shi G, Monro S, Hennigar R, Colpitts J, Fong J, Kasimova K, Yin H, DeCoste R, Spencer C, Chamberlain L, Mandel A, Lilge L, McFarland SA. *Coordination Chemistry Reviews*. 2015; 282–283:127.
6. (a) Ford WE, Rodgers MAJ. *Journal of Physical Chemistry*. 1992; 96:2917.(b) Tyson DS, Henbest KB, Bialecki J, Castellano FN. *Journal of Physical Chemistry A*. 2001; 105:8154.(c) Pittau R, Baba AI, Shaw JR, Simon JA, Thummel RP, Schmehl RH. *Coordination Chemistry Reviews*. 1998; 171:43.(d) McClenaghan ND, Leydet Y, Maubert B, Indelli MT, Campagna S. *Coordination Chemistry Reviews*. 2005; 249:1336.(e) de Carvalho IMM, de Sousa Moreira Í, Gehlen MH. *Inorganic Chemistry*. 2003; 42:1525. [PubMed: 12611519] (f) Reichardt C, Pinto M, Wächter M, Stephenson M, Kupfer S, Sainuddin T, Guthmuller J, McFarland SA, Dietzek B. *Journal of Physical Chemistry A*. 2015; 119:3986.(g) Stephenson M, Reichardt C, Pinto M, Wächter M, Sainuddin T, Shi G, Yin H, Monro S, Sampson E, Dietzek B, McFarland SA. *Journal of Physical Chemistry A*. 2014; 118:10507.(h) Abreu FD, Diógenes ICN, Lopes LGdF, Sousa EHS, de Carvalho IMM. *Inorganica Chimica Acta*. 2016; 439:92.
7. Padilla R, Maza WA, Dominijanni AJ, Winkel BSJ, Morris AJ, Brewer KJ. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A*. 2015 Under Review.
8. Mariappan M, Maiya BG. *European Journal of Inorganic Chemistry*. 2005; 2005:2164.
9. (a) Huang Y, Zhang Y, Zhang J, Zhang D-W, Lu Q-S, Liu J-L, Chen S-Y, Lin H-H, Yu X-Q. *Organic & Biomolecular Chemistry*. 2009; 7:2278. [PubMed: 19462036] (b) Modukuru NK, Snow KJ,

- Perrin BS Jr, Bhambhani A, Duff M, Kumar CV. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A*. 2006; 177:43.(c) Tan, WB. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Connecticut. Recognition, binding and cleavage of DNA by anthracene derivatives and heme proteins. (d) Kumar CV, Asuncion EH. *Journal of the Chemical Society*. 1992; 470(e) Kumar CV, Tan WB, Betts PW. *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry*. 1997; 68:177.(f) Dong S, Hwang HM, Harrison C, Holloway L, Shi X, Yu H. *Bulletin of environmental contamination and toxicology*. 2000; 64:467. [PubMed: 10754041]
10. (a) Mongelli MT, Heinecke J, Mayfield S, Okyere B, Winkel BSJ, Brewer KJ. *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry*. 2006; 100:1983. [PubMed: 17095094] (b) Jain A, Slebodnick C, Winkel BSJ, Brewer KJ. *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry*. 2008; 102:1854. [PubMed: 18674819] (c) Wachter E, Heidary DK, Howerton BS, Parkin S, Glazer EC. *Chemical Communications*. 2012; 48:9649. [PubMed: 22908094] (d) Mongelli MT, Heinecke J, Mayfield S, Okyere B, Winkel BSJ, Brewer KJ. *J. Inorg. Biochem.* 2006; 100:1983. [PubMed: 17095094] (e) Prussin Ii AJ, Zigler DF, Jain A, Brown JR, Winkel BSJ, Brewer KJ. *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry*. 2008; 102:731. [PubMed: 18262277]
11. (a) Blackburn GM, Taussig PE. *Biochemical Journal*. 1975; 149:289. [PubMed: 1191261] (b) Sinha BK, Chignell CF. *Photochemistry and Photobiology*. 1983; 37:33. [PubMed: 6836029] (c) Armitage B. *Chemical Reviews*. 1998; 98:1171. [PubMed: 11848929]
12. (a) Noll DM, Mason TM, Miller PS. *Chemical reviews*. 2006; 106:277. [PubMed: 16464006] (b) Bhan P, Miller PS. *Bioconjugate Chemistry*. 1990; 1:82. [PubMed: 1710145]
13. Wilson GJ, Launikonis A, Sasse WHF, Mau AWH. *Journal of Physical Chemistry A*. 1997; 101:4860.
14. Terry CA, Fernández M-J, Gude L, Lorente A, Grant KB. *Biochemistry*. 2011; 50:10375. [PubMed: 22014335]
15. (a) Schmechel DEV, Crothers DM. *Biopolymers*. 1971; 10:465. [PubMed: 5552655] (b) Wolfe A, Shimer GH, Meehan T. *Biochemistry*. 1987; 26:6392. [PubMed: 3427013]
16. (a) Dahl J-U, Gray MJ, Jakob U. *Journal of Molecular Biology*. 2015; 427:1549. [PubMed: 25698115] (b) Davies MJ. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*. 2003; 305:761. [PubMed: 12763058]
17. (a) Bose B, Dube A. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B*. 2006; 85:49.(b) Packer, L., Kellogg, EW. *Chemical Deterioration of Proteins, Photooxidative Damage to Mammalian Cells and Proteins by Visible Light*. Vol. 123. ACS; 1980. p. 83
18. Bose B, Dube A. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology*. 2006; 85:49.
19. (a) Stadtman ER. *Annual Review of Biochemistry*. 1993; 62:797.(b) Wright A, Bubb WA, Hawkins CL, Davies MJ. *Photochemistry and Photobiology*. 2002; 76:35. [PubMed: 12126305] (c) Silvester JA, Timmins GS, Davies MJ. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics*. 1998; 350:249. [PubMed: 9473299]

Figure 1. Structural representation of the parent molecule, $[(bpy)_2Ru(dpp)]^{2+}$ (1), and the anthryl derivatives, $[(AnthbpyMe)(bpy)Ru(dpp)]^{2+}$ (2), and $[(AnthbpyMe)_2Ru(dpp)]^{2+}$ (3).

Figure 2.

DNA gel shift assay for (a) $[(bpy)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ (**1**), (b) $[(AnthbpyMe)(bpy)Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ (**2**), and (c) $[(AnthbpyMe)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ (**3**). λ : DNA weight marker, C: pUC19 DNA, 1 = 5:1 (BP:MC) incubated in the dark for 1 h, 2 = 5:1 (BP:MC) exposed to a 455 nm LED for 1 h, with 3O_2 3 = 5:1 (BP:MC) exposed to a 455 nm LED for 1h without 3O_2 , L = linearized pUC19 DNA.

Figure 3.

DNA gel shift assay for (a) $[(bpy)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$, (b) $[(AnthbpyMe)(bpy)Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$, and (c) $[(AnthbpyMe)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ using a 5:1 BP:MC ratio. λ : DNA weight marker, C = pUC19 DNA, 1 = MC + DNA + $h\nu$, 2 = DMSO + MC + DNA + $h\nu$, 3 = NaI + MC + DNA + $h\nu$, 4 = NaCl + MC + DNA + $h\nu$, 5 = sodium benzoate + MC + DNA + $h\nu$, L= linearized pUC19 DNA. $h\nu$ = 455 nm LED irradiation with 3O_2 .

Figure 4.

SDS-PAGE assay for (a) $[(bpy)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$, (b) $[(AnthbpyMe)(bpy)Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$, and (c) $[(AnthbpyMe)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$. BSA = bovine serum albumin control, RT = 1:1 (P:MC) solution in the dark for 1 h at room temperature, 37°C = 1:1 (P:MC) solution in the dark for 1 h at 37°C, and FPT = 1:1 (P:MC) solution under 455 nm irradiation for 1 h without 3O_2 . 3O_2 = 1:1, (P:MC) solutions, under 455 nm irradiation for 1 h with 3O_2 .

Figure 5.

SDS-PAGE assay for (a) 10:1 (P:MC), (b) 1:1 (P:MC), and (c) 1:10 (P:MC) solutions containing BSA and (1) $[(bpy)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ (**1**), (2) $[(AnthbpyMe)(bpy)Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ (**2**), or (3) $[(AnthbpyMe)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ (**3**) under 455 nm irradiation for 1 h with 3O_2 . BSA = BSA control without complex.

Table 1

Results of absorption titration experiments

Complex	K_b/M^{-1}
$[(bpy)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ (1)	4.50×10^3
$[(AnthbpyMe)(bpy)Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ (2)	3.50×10^5
$[(AnthbpyMe)_2Ru(dpp)](PF_6)_2$ (3)	4.50×10^3

Standard deviation $\pm 10\%$