Published in final edited form as:

J Org Chem. 2017 June 16; 82(12): 6054–6070. doi:10.1021/acs.joc.7b00357.

Amphiphilic BODIPY-Hydroporphyrin Energy Transfer Arrays with Broadly Tunable Absorption and Deep Red/Near-Infrared Emission in Aqueous Micelles

Adam Meares, Andrius Satraitis, Joshua Akhigbe, Nithya Santhanam, Subramani Swaminathan, Melanie Ehudin, and Marcin Ptaszek

University of Maryland, Baltimore County, 1000 Hilltop Circle, Baltimore 21250, MD, USA,

Abstract

BODIPY-hydroporphyrin energy transfer arrays allow for development of family of fluorophores featuring a common excitation band at 500 nm, tunable excitation band in deep red/near-infrared window, and tunable emission. Their biomedical applications are contingent upon retaining their optical properties in aqueous environment. Amphiphilic arrays containing PEG-substituted BODIPY and chlorins or bacteriochlorins were prepared and their optical and fluorescence properties were determined in organic solvents and aqueous surfactants. The first series of arrays contains BODIPYs with PEG substituents attached to the boron, whereas in the second series, PEG substituents are attached to the aryl at the *meso* positions of BODIPY. For both series of arrays, excitation of BODIPY at 500 nm results in an efficient energy transfer to and bright emission of hydroporphyrin in deep-red (640–660 nm) or near-infrared (740–760 nm) spectral windows. In aqueous non-ionic surfactants (Triton X-100 and Tween 20) arrays from the second series exhibit significant quenching of fluorescence, whereas properties of arrays from the first series are comparable to those observed in polar organic solvents. Reported arrays possess large effective Stokes shift (115 – 260 nm), multiple excitation wavelengths, and narrow, tunable deep-red/near-IR fluorescence in aqueous surfactants, and are promising candidates for a variety of biomedical-related applications.

Graphical Abstract

Correspondence to: Marcin Ptaszek.

Supporting Information Available. Additional absorption and emission spectra, spectroscopic data for benchmark monomers, computational results, and copies of ^1H , ^{13}C spectra for new compounds. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>

Introduction

Multichromophoric energy transfer (ET) arrays enable construction of fluorophores with optical properties that are not available for single chromophores, and thereby can greatly expand the capabilities of fluorescence imaging and biosensing.^{1–7} In ET arrays, excitation energy flows from chromophores with higher excited state energies to that with the lowest energy (terminal acceptor) allowing, for example, construction of fluorophores with a large (pseudo)Stokes' shift,² development of a family of fluorophores with a common excitation wavelength and variable emission bands,^{3,4} and fluorophores multiple excitation wavelengths.⁵ Of particular interest are ET arrays with acceptors emitting in the deep-red or near-infrared spectral window, as they can be potentially used for deep-tissue *in vivo* imaging.^{3,6} We employed hydroporphyrins (chlorins and bacteriochlorins) as fluorescent entities in energy transfer arrays, due to their favorable properties for certain bioimaging applications.^{3,7} Hydroporphyrins possess narrow (FWHM < 25 nm) deep-red or near-IR emission bands, of which the maximum can be precisely tuned across a broad range (650 – 820 nm), by a variety of structural modifications.^{8–11} Collectively, these properties make hydroporphyrins excellent candidates for construction of probes for *in vivo* imaging,¹² and multicolor fluorescence-guided surgery.¹³ The later application would greatly benefit from a family of deep-red or near-IR fluorophores with (a) a large (pseudo)Stokes shift (> 100 nm), which allows for higher tumor-to-background ratio, due to elimination of both tissue autofluorescence and detection of the scattered light from excitation, and (b) two excitation wavelengths; a common one in green spectral window (500 nm), and a unique one in the deep-red/near-IR region (650 – 900 nm), which enables the selective detection of tumors localized on the surface of the tissue and in deep-tissue.¹³ In order to achieve these properties in hydroporphyrins, we recently synthesized a series of BODIPY-chlorin arrays.⁷ BODIPYs possess a strong absorption (with extinction coefficient up to 100,000 M⁻¹·cm⁻¹), which tunable across the visible region (500 – 700 nm).¹⁴ Thus, we prepared a series of arrays, with a common BODIPY absorbing at 500 nm (where hydroporphyrins exhibit rather low absorbance), and different chlorins, absorbing and emitting in 630–680 nm range, and found that excitation of arrays at the maximum of BODIPY absorbance results in strong

emission of chlorin, with the fluorescence quantum yield (Φ_f) comparable to that obtained from direct chlorin excitation.⁷ These favorable properties of BODIPY-chlorin arrays prompted us to further explore this strategy, with two principal aims in mind. First we intend to shift of emission wavelength maxima of BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays further into near-IR spectral window (> 700 nm). Our second goal is to develop BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays which will be suitable for a broad range of biomedical applications, particularly for *in vivo* imaging.

In order to achieve our first goal, we decided to synthesize a family of bacteriochlorin-BODIPY arrays. Bacteriochlorins possess a strong, long-wavelength absorption Q_y band and emission band in the range of 710–800 nm, as well as much weaker absorption Q_x band at around 490–550 nm.¹¹ Therefore, they should be an excellent energy acceptor from BODIPY. BODIPY can function as a either energy donor or acceptor, as has been demonstrated by the synthesis of a plethora of ET arrays, including BODIPY-porphyrin,¹⁵ BODIPY-corrole,¹⁶ and BODIPY-phthalocyanine¹⁷ arrays. To the best of our knowledge, the only reported BODIPY-bacteriochlorin arrays includes non-covalent assemblies in lipid vesicles¹⁸ or micelles,¹⁹ where energy transfer from BODIPY to bacteriochlorins occurs.

Achieving the second goal requires the ability to prepare arrays that retain their optical and photochemical properties in aqueous media. While reported BODIPY-chlorin arrays exhibit favorable optical properties, i.e. efficient energy transfer from BODIPY to chlorin, and minimal quenching of chlorin fluorescence in both polar and non-polar organic solvent, they are notoriously hydrophobic, and show no solubility in aqueous media.⁷ The preparation of water-soluble arrays containing hydroporphyrins presents several challenges. First, it would require installation of water-solubilizing groups on both hydroporphyrin and BODIPY. There are a large number of water-soluble BODIPY derivatives containing diverse water-solubilizing groups, including sulfonic acids,²⁰ zwitterionic ammonium-sulfonic acid substituents,²¹ phosphonates,²² polyethylene glycol (PEG),²³ and sugars.²⁴ Water-soluble synthetic chlorins and bacteriochlorins, containing phosphonate,^{25,26} PEG,^{26,27} carboxylates,^{26,28} or ammonium salts,^{26,29} were also reported. However, we presume, that synthesis of arrays containing water-solubilizing groups on both BODIPY and hydroporphyrins would be prohibitively labor- and cost-intensive, since it will add several synthetic and purification steps to already lengthy synthesis of hydrophobic arrays.

Moreover, in highly polar water, an additional concern is the potential for photoinduced electron transfer (PET), between arrays' components, which can significantly quench fluorescence of hydroporphyrin. Significant quenching of fluorescence in polar solvents, attributed to the PET, for particular chlorin-BODIPY arrays,⁷ and for other arrays containing hydroporphyrins³⁰ has been reported.

To circumvent both of the problems, associated with the use of BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays in biomedical imaging i.e. lack of water solubility and possible quenching of hydroporphyrin fluorescence by PET, we propose to encapsulate arrays into water-soluble nanostructures: micelles and vesicles. We hypothesize that insertion of the arrays into the hydrophobic part of a micelle/vesicle of low dielectric constant, will preserve arrays' favorable optical properties (high fluorescence quantum yield of hydroporphyrin emission

upon excitation at the maximum of BODIPY absorption) in aqueous media. Encapsulation into self-assembled micelles and vesicles is an established way to deliver hydrophobic photonic agents (e.g. fluorophores, or singlet oxygen photosensitizers) to the target cells.^{31–33} Thus, for example, tetrapyrrolic macrocycles and phthalocyanines were encapsulated in vesicles made from amphiphilic diblock polymers,³¹ Pluronic F127 micelles,³² and phospholipid bilayers.³³ Photophysical properties of hydroporphyrins were also examined for energy-related applications in phospholipid membranes, SDS, or Triton X-100 micelles.^{18,19,34–37} To the best of our knowledge, no synthetic, multichromophoric arrays, containing hydroporphyrins were studied in self-assembled micelles or bilayers.

Previous results suggested that the amphiphilic character of the chlorins and bacteriochlorins greatly facilitates their insertion into micelles or bilayers.³⁴ Therefore, here we prepared a series of amphiphilic arrays containing novel hydrophilic BODIPY derivatives and hydrophobic chlorins and bacteriochlorins (Chart 1). Preparation of arrays required synthesis of a set of novel, hydrophilic BODIPY derivatives (Chart 2) containing neutral oligoethylene glycol (PEG) water-solubilizing moieties. We then evaluated basic photochemical properties of arrays in organic solvents, as well as in aqueous surfactant solutions.

Results and Discussion

Design

Amphiphilic hydroporphyrin-BODIPY dyads (Chart 1) include two BODIPY-chlorin dyads (**C2-BDP** and **C3-BDP**) and four bacteriochlorin-BODIPY arrays (dyads **BC2-BDP**, **BC4-BDP** and **BC5-BDP**, and triad **BC3-BDP**). We also included two hydrophobic dyads **C1-BDP**, and **BC1-BDP**, for comparative spectroscopic studies. In arrays **C1-BDP**, **C2-BDP**, **BC1-BDP**, **BC2-BDP**, and **BC3-BDP**, the BODIPY is attached via acetylene linker at the hydroporphyrin 13- (or 3,13-) positions. For other dyads, BODIPY subunits are attached to the hydroporphyrin through diaryl-amide linkers, either at the 10-position of chlorin (**C3-BDP**) or 13-position of bacteriochlorin (**BC3-BDP**, **BC4-BDP**, and **BC5-BDP**). In arrays **C1/2-BDP**, and **BC1/3-BDP** BODIPY subunits are attached through a linker connected to the *meso* position, while in other dyads the linker is attached to the 3-position of BODIPY. Note, that **BC3-BDP** possesses a bolaamphiphilic character, i.e. hydrophilic substituents are situated on both sides of the hydrophobic core.³⁸

First, we synthesized hydrophilic BODIPY derivatives, equipped with functional groups suitable for their subsequent attachment to hydroporphyrins (Chart 2). As a water-solubilizing group we have chosen polyethylene-glycol (PEG) chains, due to their lack of charge (charged groups may cause undesirable interactions with biomolecules), and biocompatibility.³⁹ Two principal architectures of hydrophilic BODIPY derivatives were examined (Chart 2). In **BDP1** two PEG chains are attached to the boron atom, through a triazole moiety. **BDP2-3** possess a PEG group installed at the 2,4- and 6-positions of a *meso* aryl group, either directly (**BDP2**) or through triazole (**BDP3**). **BDP1** possesses a terminal acetylene which was further used for attachment to hydroporphyrins. In **BDP2-3**, additional functional groups were installed at the 3-position of BODIPY: iodo, *para*-aminophenyl, and

para-methoxycarbonylphenyl, for compounds **BDP3-I**, **BDP2-NH₂**, and **BDP3-COOMe**, respectively.

Synthesis

(1) BODIPY derivatives—BDP1 was synthesized following the reported procedures for boron-alkoxylation in BODIPY (Scheme 1).^{40,41} Thus, treatment of known **BDP4**⁷ with AlCl₃ in THF at 40 °C and subsequently with an excess of propargyl alcohol, afforded **BDP5** in 86% yield. Note, that the significant excess of alcohol is required for an efficient transformation of BODIPY into *B*-propargyloxy derivative. The PEG moiety was subsequently installed through a “click” reaction with azide **1**,⁴² under microwave irradiation,⁴³ which afforded **BDP6** in 58% yield. Click reaction under microwave irradiation was completed in 30 min. Subsequent removal of the protecting TMS group under standard conditions (K₂CO₃ in MeOH/THF) afforded target **BDP1** in 81% yield.

Synthesis of **BDP2** and subsequently **BDP2-NH₂** (Scheme 2) started from alkylation of 2,4,6-trihydroxybenzaldehyde **2** by tosyl-functionalized triethylene glycol monomethyl ether **3**, which afforded trialkoxyproduct **4** in 47% yield.⁴⁴ BODIPY was prepared by standard three-step, one-pot synthesis: reaction of aldehyde **4** with pyrrole, catalyzed by TFA, oxidation of resulting dipyrromethane by DDQ, and reaction in BF₃·OEt₃ afforded **BDP2** in 9% yield. The low isolated yield is due to extensive chromatographic purification, which was necessary to separate target **BDP2** from impurities. Mono-iodination at the 3 position of BODIPY was performed following a published procedure,^{45,46} using I₂/HIO₃ system, and mono-iodo product **BDP2-I** was isolated in 56% yield. This sample contained a small amount of unidentified impurity, separation of which using column chromatography proved to be very difficult. Subsequent Suzuki reaction of **BDP2-I** with boronic ester **5**, under previously reported conditions,⁴⁶ afforded **BDP2-NH₂** in 76% yield.

BDP3 and **BDP3-COOMe** were prepared following essentially the same protocol (Scheme 3). Condensation of aldehyde **6**⁴⁷ with 2,4-dimethylpyrrole, followed by oxidation with DDQ and complexation with BF₃·OEt₃ afforded **BDP3'** in 23% yield. Tetraethylene glycol methyl ether chains were installed by microwave-assisted click reaction, which afforded **BDP3** in 62% yield. Since **BDP3** is a hydrophilic and highly polar compound, we decided to perform further derivatization, necessary to obtain **BDP3-I** and **BDP3-COOMe**, on **BDP3'** anticipating that less polar and hydrophobic BODIPY derivatives would be easier to purify relative to their more polar and hydrophilic PEG-containing congeners (Scheme 4). Thus, iodination of **BDP3'** with I₂/HIO₃ afforded **BDP3'-I** in 46–61% yield. Both **BDP3'** and **BDP3'-I** were indeed much easier to purify on column chromatography than **BDP2** and **BDP2-I**, which is a chief advantage of the **BDP3** series of compounds compared to **BDP2**. At this point, tetraethylene glycol chains needed to be installed, since the presence of terminal acetylene moieties prevents a controlled Suzuki reaction (and any palladium-catalyzed reaction) on **BDP3'-I**. Microwave-assisted click reaction of **BDP3'-I** with azide-terminated triethylene glycol **1** afforded **BDP3-I** in 87% yield. Subsequent Suzuki reaction with boronic ester **7** allowed installation of the *p*-methoxycarbonylphenyl moiety in 70% yield (**BDP3-COOMe**).

(2) Hydroporphyrin-BODIPY dyads—Syntheses of arrays **C1/2-BDP**, and **BC1/3-BDP** were achieved following the reported procedure for analogous dyads,⁷ through Sonogashira reaction of acetylene-terminated BODIPY (**BDP-1** or **BDP-F**) and suitable bromochlorin (**C-Br**⁴⁸) or bromobacteriochlorins (**BC-P**² and **BC-Br**^{2,49}) with moderate yields (26–35%, Schemes 5–7). The low yield in the cases of **C2-BDP** and **BC2/3-BDP** is probably, at least in part, due to the liability of B-O bond under reaction conditions. This issue became evident during attempted optimization of Sonogashira reaction conditions, when K₂CO₃ was used as a base, and reactions delivered exceptionally low yield of expected product.

Dyad **C3-BDP** was synthesized in **C-COOH** (obtained quantitatively by hydrolysis of the corresponding methyl ester)⁷ and **BDP2-NH₂**, in the presence of EDC/DMAP system, in 30% yield (Scheme 8).

For the synthesis of **BC4-BDP** and **BC5-BDP** we first attempted EDC-mediated coupling of acid derived from hydrolysis of **BDP3-COOMe** with amine-functionalized bacteriochlorins **BC-P-NH₂** and **BC-E-NH₂** (Scheme 10). Required **BC-P-NH₂** and **BC-E-NH₂** were prepared in palladium coupling reactions of **BC-P**³ and **BC-E**,⁵⁰ respectively (Scheme 9). Hydrolysis of **BDP3-COOMe** resulted in low yield (22%) of corresponding carboxylic acid, due to extensive decomposition of BODIPY, and subsequent EDC-mediated amide formation with **BC-P-NH₂** also provided the desired product with moderate yield (22% yield, Scheme 10). Therefore, we pursued a different approach, in which we first installed a boronic pinacolate moiety on the bacteriochlorin and subsequently performed Suzuki reaction with **BDP3-I**. Thus, EDC-mediated reaction of **BC-P-NH₂** and **BC-E-NH₂** with benzoic acid derivative **8** provides corresponding boronic esters **BC-P-B** and **BC-E-B** in excellent yields (as judged from TLC analysis), however silica column purification provided the target compounds with moderate yields (29% and 33%, respectively, Scheme 11). This is probably due to the reported ability of silica to hydrolyze boronic esters.⁵¹ Therefore, **BC-P-B** and **BC-E-B** were purified by aqueous work-up (to remove any excess of **8**) and used directly in the next step. This procedure provides **BC-P-B** and **BC-E-B** in >70% yield, with approximately 90% or greater purity. Subsequent Suzuki reaction of **BC-P-B** and **BC-E-B** with **BDP3-I** provides the corresponding dyads in 22% and 30% yields, respectively (Scheme 12).

Characterization: The new BODIPY monomers and arrays were characterized by ¹H and ¹³C NMR and MS. ¹H NMR spectra of BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays indicated resonances of both hydroporphyrins and BODIPY units. High resolution ESI-MS shows peaks of *m/z* consistent with proposed structures. Note, that some BODIPY derivatives (dyads and monomers) consistently show excessive number of protons from the PEG substituents. However, excessive chromatographic purification does not change the proton ratio, and other analytical methods do not show the presence of the PEG impurities. High resolution MS show *m/z* consistent with proposed structures.

One of our main concerns here was the stability of **BDP1** in regards to B-O bonds, which are prone to reactions with acids, bases and nucleophiles.⁴⁰ This rises the questions whether such derivatives are stable under typical conditions used for bioimaging studies, and whether presence of B-O bonds permits synthetic manipulations on monomers and arrays containing

a **BDP1**-type structure, necessary for their further elaboration. Thus, first we determined that no noticeable changes in absorption spectrum were observed upon 24h storage of a diluted solution of **BDP1** in toluene, DMSO, and PBS (pH = 7.4). Then, we assessed the stability of **BDP1** under both basic and acidic conditions, in the presence of NaOH in THF/MeOH solution, and TFA in CH₂Cl₂ solution, respectively. In both cases significant changes in UV-vis absorption were observed, specifically disappearance of the BODIPY band, and formation of a new broad band at shorter wavelength, indicating decomposition of **BDP1** under these conditions. These observations have led to the conclusion, that **BDP1**-containing compounds should be sufficiently stable for bioimaging applications in biological media, but their reactivity towards acids and bases limits the number of synthetic transformations, available for modification of this and similar compounds.

Absorption and emission properties: Absorption and emission properties of arrays and monomers were determined in organic solvents (toluene and DMF), PBS (for water soluble BODIPY), and in micelles (i.e. aqueous Triton X-100 and Tween 20 solutions). The key aspects that we intended to determine are: (1) the fluorescence properties of water-soluble BODIPY in aqueous media; (2) the influence of solvent dielectric constants on the fluorescence quantum yield of BODIPY-hydroporphyrin dyads, specifically on the efficiency of energy and electron transfer between BODIPY and hydroporphyrins; and (3) whether amphiphilic BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays retain their fluorescence properties in aqueous micelles.

BODIPY: Absorption spectra of **BDP1-3** were determined in both PBS (pH = 7.4) and toluene (Figures 1 and Table 1). The spectra in PBS are of a similar width as in toluene, which indicates, that at least at the concentration of 10 μ M there is no aggregation. The absorption maxima for all three dyads in PBS are nearly identical, and the maxima of absorption are slightly bathochromically shifted (2–5 nm) in toluene. Installation of the aryl ring at the 3-position of BODIPY causes a red shift of absorption maxima of roughly 15 nm (Table 1, Figure 1).

The emission properties of water-soluble BODIPY were determined in both organic solvents (toluene and DMF) and aqueous media (PBS). Results are given in Table 1. All BODIPY show a strong emission band with Stokes' shift of 10–15 nm, and the maxima of emission bands for each compound are nearly independent of solvent. All examined water soluble BODIPY, except **BDP2**, show a very high fluorescence quantum yield Φ_f , exceeding in 0.75 in most cases, regardless of solvent. Two features are worth commenting on. First, Φ_f of **BDP1** in PBS is remarkably higher than in organic solvents (0.77 vs. 0.56). Second, the BODIPY derivatives, possessing electron-rich trialkoxyphenyl substituents at the *meso* positions (**BDP2**, **BDP3**, **BDP3'**, and **BDP3-COOMe**) show comparable Φ_f in non-polar toluene and polar solvents (DMF, PBS). It is well-known that BODIPY with electron-rich substituents at the *meso* position exhibit a significant reduction of the Φ_f in polar solvents, due to photoinduced electron transfer from *meso*-substituent to the BODIPY.⁵² It is possible, that the four methyl substituents on the BODIPY core increase the reduction potential of BODIPY to a level where PET is not energetically feasible. The only exception is **BDP2**, which shows a significant reduction of Φ_f in PBS (0.25), compared to that observed in

toluene (0.89). The reason for the observed quenching is unknown. Attachment of the aryl group to the BODIPY core, as in **BDP3-COOMe** does not impact Φ_f , which is still > 0.80 in both organic and aqueous solutions. Overall, these results indicate that both the **BDP1** and **BDP3** series of compound exhibit excellent fluorescence properties in aqueous media, and as such may be useful for fluorescence imaging applications.

Arrays

Absorption spectra of amphiphilic arrays in toluene (Figure 2, Table 2) are essentially the sum of the absorption spectra of the corresponding monomers: BODIPY and hydroporphyrins (for the absorption maxima of corresponding hydroporphyrin monomers see Table S1). Interestingly, the absorption maximum for BODIPY moiety in **BC5-BDP** varies noticeably compared to **BDP3-COOMe** (527 nm vs. 518 nm, respectively).

The absorption spectra of dyads in PBS/Triton X-100, at the array concentration of approximately 10 μM (assuming average extinction coefficient at the *B* band of chlorin⁵³ 150,000 $\text{M}^{-1} \cdot \text{cm}^{-1}$ and of bacteriochlorin⁵⁴ 100,000 $\text{M}^{-1} \cdot \text{cm}^{-1}$) are nearly identical as that in toluene for each array, with no noticeable broadening of the absorption bands. Apparently, there is no aggregation under this concentration. In case of Tween 20 we observed a different behavior. For dyads **C2-BDP**, **BC2-BDP** and **BC3-BDP**, an effective concentration of 10 μM of array can be achieved (based on the intensity of hydroporphyrin *B*-band). In case of **(B)C2-BDP** dyads, there are no significant differences in absorption spectra compared to those observed in toluene and Triton X-100, besides a small alteration of the bands relative intensities. For **BC3-BDP** however, a new band at $\lambda = 794 \text{ nm}$ is observed, together with a significant reduction of bacteriochlorin Q_y band intensity. The presence of distinctive, long-wavelength absorption band in micellar solution was previously reported for chlorophyll derivatives, and is indicative of formation of discrete assemblies.^{36,55} For **C3-BDP** and **BC4/5-BDP** dyads the dissolution of respective dyads in aqueous Tween 20 results in a severe broadening of absorption features, which suggest an extensive aggregation of the dyads. Absorption spectra obtained upon filtration of the resulting mixture through a 20 micron membrane are similar to that obtained in toluene and Triton X-100 solution (i.e. with non broadened bands) however in much lower concentration (e.g. absorption of the *B* band < 0.1 , which implies concentration below 1 μM), and with markedly altered band ratios (Figure S1, Supporting Information). No significant broadening or shifting of the BODIPY band was observed for any of examined arrays. To summarize (1) all examined arrays are much better soluble in Triton X-100 micelles. (2) Arrays where PEG substituents are presented on the boron of BODIPY are better soluble in aqueous Tween 20 micelles, and are less prone to aggregation than those possessing PEG substituents at the *meso*-aryl ring of BODIPY.

Next we examined the fluorescence properties of BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays. As expected, emission spectrum of each dyad is dominated by the emission of the hydroporphyrin moiety, regardless of wavelength of excitation, while emission of BODIPY subunit at around 500 nm is significantly diminished (Figure 3). Excitation fluorescence spectra, monitored at wavelength where hydroporphyrins emit exclusively ($> 650 \text{ nm}$), resemble corresponding absorption spectra. These observations indicate efficient energy

transfer from BODIPY to hydroporphyrin chromophore. Quantitatively, the energy transfer efficiency (ETE)^{2,4} was expressed as a ratio of fluorescence quantum yield Φ_f of hydroporphyrin subunit upon excitation at the maximum of BODIPY absorbance (500 nm) to the same Φ_f upon direct excitation of hydroporphyrin subunit at the maximum of the *B* absorption band. ETE for all dyads in toluene exceeds 0.90. The relatively high ETE for all dyads is probably driven by the overlap of the BODIPY emission band with the Q_x band of hydroporphyrins, however, the contribution via through-bond energy transfer mechanism cannot be ruled out, as either the conjugated phenylene or phenylacetylene linker is used in all cases, both of which promote through-bond ET in both porphyrin-BODIPY⁵⁶ and other BODIPY¹⁴ arrays. The fluorescence quantum yields Φ_f of hydroporphyrin components in toluene is comparable with the one observed for analogous monomers (see Table S1), which indicates that in toluene attachment of BODIPY does not affect emission properties of hydroporphyrins.

Next we determined the Φ_f of hydroporphyrin component in DMF, to examine the influence of solvent dielectric constants on the emission properties of arrays. Particularly, we intended to evaluate the influence of putative PET on the Φ_f , as PET is expected to be more efficient in solvents of high dielectric constants.⁵⁷ For chlorin arrays Φ_f in DMF is comparable to that in toluene, with the exception of **C1-BDP** for which 1.7-fold reduction of Φ_f is observed (Table 2). On the other hand, bacteriochlorin arrays exhibit reduction of Φ_f in DMF, ranging from 3.6-fold (for **BC1-BDP**) to 1.2-fold (for **BC5-BDP**), compared to those in toluene. The ETE in both toluene and DMF are fairly comparable for nearly all arrays, except for **BC4-BDP**, (0.70 in DMF vs. 0.90 in toluene). Greater reduction of Φ_f in DMF, observed for bacteriochlorin arrays than for the analogous chlorin arrays, can be explained by the lower oxidation potential of bacteriochlorins, compared to that of chlorins,⁵⁸ and therefore bacteriochlorins should be more prone to oxidative PET. Next, we analyzed the effect of substitution at the boron moiety on the Φ_f in DMF. Thus, Φ_f of **C1-BDP** in DMF is reduced 1.7-fold, compared to that in toluene (0.36 vs. 0.21, respectively), while for **C2-BDP** Φ_f is identical in both solvents (0.35). A similar trend is observed for **BC1-BDP** and **BC2-BDP**. Φ_f for **BC1-BDP** in DMF is significantly (3.6-fold) reduced, compared to that in toluene (0.22 vs. 0.07, respectively), whereas **BC2-BDP** and **BC3-BDP** shows comparable 1.2-fold reduction in DMF (0.19/0.20 in DMF, respectively compared to 0.24 in toluene). Since all above-discussed arrays exhibit a comparable ETE in DMF and toluene, the lesser reduction of Φ_f in polar solvent for arrays containing alkoxy-substituted BODIPY compared to fluorine-substituted one, must be due to less efficient PET in the former. We attribute this effect to the increased electron density on the BODIPY subunit upon replacement of fluoride by alkoxide, which makes resulting BODIPY harder to reduce. This assumption is confirmed by DFT calculations, which shows, that upon substitution of -F with methoxide, the energy of HOMO and LUMO increase from by 0.15 eV and 0.19 eV, which is an indirect indication for the decrease in the reduction potential (see Table S2, Supporting Information).

Then, we analyzed the results for arrays, where linker is connected to the BODIPY through the 3-position. For **C3-BDP** dyad no reduction of Φ_f in DMF compared to toluene is observed. This result is consistent with those observed previously for analogous dyads, with BODIPY attached at the 10-position of chlorin.⁷ For **BC4-BDP**, however, a quite significant

reduction of Φ_f is observed (0.12 in DMF vs. 0.22 in toluene), while for **BC5-BDP** this reduction is less pronounced (0.20 in DMF vs. 0.23 in toluene). Note, that for **BC5-BDP** the reduction of Φ_f in DMF is mainly due to lower ETE (0.82 in DMF vs. 0.91 in toluene). Negligible PET for **BC5-BDP** can be explained by the likely higher oxidation potential of the phenylacetylene-substituted bacteriochlorin compared to the phenyl-substituted one.^{30,59}

Finally, we determined the emission properties of dyads in aqueous micellar environment. Initially, we examined **BC2-BDP** in variety of aqueous media, including PBS/DMSO (95:5 v/v), and PBS solutions of Triton X-100, Pluronic F127, Tween 20, and poly(ethylene glycol) methyl ether-block-poly(ϵ -caprolactone) diblock polymer (PEG-PCL, Figure S2). Since in PBS/DMSO, Pluronic F127 and PEG-PCL **BC2-BDP** showed a significant reduction of fluorescence (> than 10-fold compared to these observed in organic solvents), these surfactants were ruled out from further examination. All other amphiphilic arrays were examined in Triton X-100 and Tween 20 solutions in PBS (pH 7.4) at the concentration of surfactant above CMC (Table 2). In Triton X-100 all examined arrays exhibit Φ_f comparable with that observed for DMF, with the exception of **C3-BDP** and **BC5-BDP**, for which Φ_f in Triton X-100 is markedly lower than in DMF (0.16 vs. 0.22 and 0.14 vs. 0.20, respectively), despite a nearly quantitative ETE in both cases.

On the other hand, Φ_f for arrays in Tween 20 is reduced, compared to that observed in DMF and Triton X-100, with the exception of dyads with alkoxyboron BODIPY - **C2-BDP** and **BC2-BDP**, where Φ_f is comparable to that in DMF.

Although broader and more detailed studies on the structure-property relationship in hydroporphyrin arrays need to be conducted to draw accurate conclusions, several findings are important. (1) Very efficient ETE from BODIPY to chlorin and bacteriochlorin has been observed for all examined arrays; ETE generally exceeds 0.9 in organic solvents and varies from 0.8 to 1 in aqueous surfactants. (2) The reduction of Φ_f for hydroporphyrin component in polar solvent and in aqueous surfactant solution is generally greater for bacteriochlorin arrays. (3) The substitution of electron-withdrawing fluorine on boron by electron-donating alkoxy-substituents leads to the higher Φ_f in both DMF and in aqueous surfactants. (4) Placement of water-solubilizing PEG groups on the boron in BODIPY moiety lead to arrays with superior optical properties in aqueous media than for arrays with PEG groups at the BODIPY *meso* position.

Stability of arrays in aqueous solutions: Stability of novel arrays in aqueous solution was evaluated both in the dark as well as upon exposure to light. Thus, solution of each array in PBS/Triton X100, with comparable absorbance at the maxima of bacteriochlorin *B* band and (0.1) were exposed to continuous irradiation with monochromatic light with the wavelength corresponding to the maximum absorbance of BODIPY, and the absorbance of the solution was monitored (Figures 4 and S4, see the Supporting Information for the experimental details). In each case a gradual decrease in the absorption of hydroporphyrin has been observed, whereas absorption band of BODIPY shows much slower bleaching, except for **C3-BDP**, where bleaching of BODIPY band was observed, whereas bands of chlorin remains unchanged (Figure S4). The rate of photobleaching for BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays is fairly independent from wavelength of excitation (i.e. whether

BODIPY of bacteriochlorin is excited, data not shown). No change in absorption was observed for the same solutions stored in the dark for 24h.

The photostability of the BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays is comparable with that of other hydroporphyrin energy transfer arrays, reported previously for *in vivo* imaging,⁶ and thus should not prevent application of arrays in bioimaging. The mechanism responsible for photobleaching of BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays is unknown, it might be associated with the singlet oxygen production by hydroporphyrins,⁶ or putative PET which leads to the oxidative degradation of hydroporphyrins.

In conclusion, we have synthesized novel water-soluble BODIPY derivatives, which retain a high Φ_f in aqueous media. A series of hydrophobic and amphiphilic BODIPY-chlorin and BODIPY-bacteriochlorin arrays have been synthesized, that featured a high ETE from BODIPY to hydroporphyrins. Significant reduction of Φ_f for BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays in polar solvents can be prevented by the proper molecular design, particularly by placing electron-donating alkoxy substituents at the boron in BODIPY. BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays allow development of a series of fluorophores with a common excitation wavelength in visible spectral window (e.g. arrays **C2-BDP**, **BC2-BDP**, and **BC3-BDP** have a common excitation wavelength at 505 nm) and a large pseudo-Stokes shift (150–240 nm for arrays reported here). Amphiphilic BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays show high Φ_f in aqueous surfactant, and thereby are potentially suitable for a variety of biomedical applications. The ultimate application in intracellular or *in vivo* imaging is contingent upon their low toxicity, cell permeability, etc. all these aspects are currently investigated in our laboratory.

Experimental Section

General

All commercially available reagents and solvents were used as received. Commercially available anhydrous solvents were used for palladium coupling reactions. THF was distilled from Na/benzophenone as required. Commercially available surfactants: Triton X-100, Tween 20, Pluronic F127, and PEG-PCL (PEG M_n ~5,000, PCL M_n ~13,000), were used as received. All reactions (except microwave-assisted click reactions) were performed under nitrogen atmosphere.

General Procedure for Palladium Catalyzed Reactions

All reagents with exception of palladium catalyst are transferred to Schlenk flask, dissolved in given solvent, and content of the flask was degassed by two cycles of freeze-pump-thaw. At this time palladium catalyst is added and a third cycle of free-pump-thaw is performed, and the reaction is stirred under N_2 at indicated temperature.

General Procedure for Microwave-assisted Reactions

Microwave-assisted reactions were performed in closed vessels (80 mL or 10 mL) equipped with a pressure sensor and stir bar, in a microwave reactor (CEM, Discover, Matthews, NC). Temperature of the reaction mixture was monitored by a built-in IR sensor. The reaction

cycle include (1) irradiation of a sample with 150 W for 2–3 minutes, upon which reaction temperature reaches 65–70 °C, (2) 30 min, “hold time” when reaction mixture was irradiated to keep the temperature at 65 °C, and (3) 10 min “cooling time” when reaction mixture was kept without irradiation in the closed vessel, until it reaches temperature of about 50 °C.

Purification

All column chromatographic purifications were performed using silica (32–63 microns), typically on 3.5 × 17 cm columns.

Characterization

All NMR spectra (400 MHz or 500 MHz) were acquired at the room temperature. Chemical shift were referenced for a signals of residual protons from chloroform (7.26 ppm for ¹H NMR) and for carbon from CDCl₃ (77.0 ppm). The FT-ICR analyzer was used for ESI HRMS.

Spectroscopic Studies

Fluorescence measurements were performed with a sample absorbance $A < 0.1$, and were corrected for the instrument response. Solutions of arrays in aqueous surfactants were prepared in the following ways: Triton X-100: A solid sample of array (~0.1 mg) was dissolved in 5.6 mg of Triton X-100 and diluted to total volume of 3 mL using PBS solution (this provides 3 mM TX-100, which is then diluted by 3 mM solution of Triton X-100 in PBS to achieve array concentration suitable for measurements. Other surfactant: A solution of given surfactant in PBS at indicated concentration (~3 mL) were mixed vigorously with solution of array (~0.1 – 0.3 mg) in dichloromethane (~1 mL) under a gentle stream of air until dichloromethane completely evaporates. The resulting solution was diluted to an array concentration suitable for measurement.

DFT calculations were performed using Spartan 10 for Windows (Wavefunction Inc, Irvine, CA).

Synthesis—Known compounds: **1**,³⁸ **C-Br**,⁴⁸ **BC-P**,³ **BC-Br₂**,⁴⁹ **BC-E**,⁵⁰ **C-COOH**,⁷ **BDP-4**,⁷ and **BDP-F**,⁷ were prepared following reported procedures.

BDP5—A solution of **BDP4** (50.0 mg, 119 μmol) and aluminum chloride (79.3 mg, 595 μmol) in freshly distilled THF (15 mL), was stirred vigorously at 40°C. After 30 minutes, the reaction mixture was cooled to room temperature and treated with propargyl alcohol (1.00 mL, 17.8 mmol) and stirred for an additional 10 minutes. At this time TLC [silica, CH₂Cl₂/EtOAc (9:1)] indicated all starting material and intermediate were consumed. Crude reaction mixture was concentrated, and the residue was dissolved in EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na₂SO₄), and concentrated. Flash column chromatography [silica, CH₂Cl₂/EtOAc (5:1)] yielded a red-orange foam (50.5 mg, 86%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): 8.028 (s, 9H), 1.40 (s, 6H), 2.06 (t, $J=2.2$ Hz, 2H), 2.58 (s, 6H), 3.81–3.83 (m, 4H), 5.96 (s, 2H), 7.25 (d, $J=8.4$ Hz, 2H), 7.60 (d, $J=8.0$ Hz, 2H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): 8 0.04, 14.8, 15.2, 50.0, 70.8, 83.2, 95.9, 104.5, 121.7, 124.0, 128.5, 132.6, 132.8,

135.9, 140.5, 142.1, 157.0; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[2M+Na]^+$ Calcd for $C_{60}H_{66}B_2N_4O_4Si_2Na$ 1007.4720; Found 1007.4718.

BDP6—A 80 mL microwave reaction vessel was charged with samples of **BDP5** (134.0 mg, 0.272 mmol), azide terminated tetraethylene glycol **1** (171.3 mg, 0.734 mmol), copper (II) sulfate pentahydrate (34.0 mg, 0.136 mmol), L-ascorbic acid sodium salt (26.9 mg, 0.136 mmol) and acetone/water (5:1, 24 mL). The solution was then exposed to microwave irradiation as described in General Procedure. Once the vessel cooled, the product was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4), and concentrated. Flash column chromatography [silica, dichloromethane/methanol (100:0) $\rightarrow$ (40:1) $\rightarrow$ (20:1)] yielded a viscous red oil (third fraction, green): 151 mg, 58%. It is worth noting that TLC suggests the reaction is incomplete after a single cycle of microwave exposure, however, a second exposure results in both decrease of product yield and introduction of a new impurity that elutes closely following the product, making purification difficult. 1H NMR ($CDCl_3$, 500 MHz): δ 0.24 (s, 9H), 1.36 (s, 6H), 2.50 (s, 6H), 3.32 (s, 6H), 3.46–3.51 (m, 4H), 3.56–3.64 (m, 20H), 3.76–3.84 (m, 4H), 4.25 (s, 4H), 4.37–4.46 (m, 4H), 5.90 (s, 2H), 7.27 (d, J = 7.7 Hz, 2H), 7.56 (d, J = 7.7 Hz, 2H); ^{13}C NMR ($CDCl_3$, 125 MHz): δ -0.1, 14.7, 15.0, 50.0, 56.7, 59.0, 69.6, 70.6, 70.7, 72.0, 95.7, 104.4, 121.5, 122.6, 123.9, 128.4, 132.6, 132.7, 135.7, 141.0, 141.9, 148.6, 155.9; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[M+Na]^+$ Calcd for $C_{48}H_{71}BN_8O_{10}SiNa$ 981.5056; Found 981.5073.

BDP1—A solution of **BDP6** (151.3 mg, 0.158 mmol) in THF/methanol (1:1, 30 mL), was treated with K_2CO_3 (28.4 mg, 0.205 mmol) and stirred vigorously for 30 minutes. The reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4), and concentrated to afford a viscous red oil (113.0 mg, 81%). 1H NMR ($CDCl_3$, 400 MHz): δ 1.35 (s, 6H), 2.49 (s, 6H), 3.16 (s, 1H), 3.31 (s, 6H), 3.46–3.50 (m, 4H), 3.56–3.60 (m, 20H), 3.78 (t, J = 5.3 Hz, 4H), 4.24 (s, 4H), 4.41 (t, J = 5.3 Hz, 4H), 5.90 (s, 2H), 7.30 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.55 (s, 2H), 7.60 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 2H); ^{13}C NMR ($CDCl_3$, 125 MHz): δ 14.8, 15.0, 50.1, 56.7, 59.1, 69.7, 70.54, 70.56, 70.64, 72.0, 78.5, 83.1, 121.6, 122.77, 122.84, 128.5, 132.5, 132.9, 136.1, 140.8, 141.9, 148.6, 156.0; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[M+Na]^+$ Calcd for $C_{45}H_{63}BN_8O_{10}Na$ 909.4660; Found 909.4652.

Aldehyde 4—A solution of aldehyde **2** (1.30 g, 8.43 mmol) and tosylate **3** (8.86 g, 27.8 mmol) in DMF (55 mL) was treated with K_2CO_3 (7.46 g, 54.0 mmol) and stirred at 100°C for 21 hours. Reaction mixture was diluted with CH_2Cl_2 , washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4) and concentrated. Flash column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /MeOH (50:1)] yielded a viscous, pale brown oil (1.80 g, 47%). 1H NMR ($CDCl_3$, 500 MHz): δ 3.22–3.26 (m, 17H), 3.39–3.43 (m, 13H), 3.45–3.65 (m, 43H), 3.71–3.78 (m, 7H), 4.01–4.05 (m, 6H), 6.00 (s, 2H), 10.22 (s, 1H); ^{13}C NMR ($CDCl_3$, 125 MHz): δ 58.73, 58.76, 61.4, 67.5, 68.6, 69.1, 69.2, 70.1, 70.2, 70.3, 70.35, 70.41, 70.43, 70.6, 70.8, 71.67, 71.68, 72.3, 92.2, 109.2, 162.8, 164.9, 187.1; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[M+Na]^+$ Calcd for $C_{28}H_{48}O_{13}Na$ 615.2987; Found 615.2993.

BDP2—A solution of aldehyde **4** (2.29 g, 3.86 mmol) and 2,4-dimethylpyrrole (0.80 mL, 7.73 mmol) in CH_2Cl_2 (40 mL) was treated with trifluoroacetic acid (5 drops) and stirred

vigorously at room temperature. After 5 hours, aldehyde (**4**) appeared fully consumed based upon TLC analysis (silica/CH₂Cl₂). DDQ (0.876 g, 3.86 mmol) was added, and the reaction mixture was stirred for an additional 30 minutes. Then triethylamine (7.5 mL, 54.0 mmol) and BF₃·OEt₂ (7.6 mL, 61.8 mmol) were added, and the reaction mixture was stirred for an additional 30 minutes. The reaction mixture was concentrated and dried under vacuum, to afford a purple-black residue. Purification required extensive column chromatography. The first column utilized flash chromatography [silica, EtOAc/acetone (9:1)] separating the proper BODIPY from the bulk material. The second column [silica, EtOAc] performed was a gravity column that separated out product from a blue colored, red fluorescent impurity. NMR suggested that a BODIPY-like impurity co-eluted with the desired product. A final gravity column [silica (3.5 × 13 cm), EtOAc], afforded the product as a red-orange, highly viscous oil (270.9 mg, 9%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 1.52 (s, 6H), 2.47 (s, 6H), 3.23–3.75 (m, 49H), 3.80–3.98 (m, 10H), 5.87 (s, 2H), 6.18 (s, 2H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 13.7, 14.5, 58.9, 59.00, 59.04, 61.7, 67.6, 69.0, 69.4, 69.7, 70.1, 70.3, 70.47, 70.54, 70.6, 70.66, 70.9, 71.0, 71.8, 71.89, 71.93, 72.5, 92.6, 105.5, 120.3, 132.2, 136.2, 142.2, 154.0, 157.2, 161.6; HRMS (ESI-TOF) *m/z* [M+Na]⁺ Calcd for C₄₀H₆₁BF₂N₂O₁₂Na 833.4185; Found 833.4175.

BDP2-I—In the first flask a solution of **BDP2** (93.2 mg, 0.115 mmol) and iodine (14.6 mg, 0.057 mmol) in ethanol/CH₂Cl₂ (2:1, 30 mL) were prepared. In a second flask, iodic acid (10.0 mg, 0.057 mmol) was dissolved in deionized water (10 mL), then added dropwise to the flask containing **BDP2**. The reaction solution was then stirred vigorously at 50°C for 45 min. The crude reaction mixture was diluted with CH₂Cl₂, washed (water and brine), dried (Na₂SO₄) and concentrated. Column chromatography [silica, EtOAc/acetone (8:1) → (4:1) → (2:1)] yielded a highly viscous pink/light red oil (59.8 mg, 56%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 1.57 (s, 3H), 1.59 (s, 3H), 2.52 (s, 3H), 2.58 (s, 3H), 3.31–3.42 (m, 18H), 3.47–3.58 (m, 12H), 3.62–3.78 (m, 11H), 3.87–3.91 (m, 2H), 3.98–4.03 (m, 4H), 4.12–4.17 (m, 2H), 5.98 (s, 1H), 6.22 (s, 2H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 14.0, 14.8, 15.8, 29.8, 59.1, 59.2, 67.8, 69.1, 69.5, 69.8, 70.4, 70.73, 70.74, 70.8, 71.0, 71.1, 71.9, 72.1, 83.3, 92.7, 105.4, 121.6, 131.6, 132.9, 136.5, 142.2, 144.6, 152.94, 156.7, 157.3, 162.0; HRMS (ESI-TOF) *m/z* [M+Na]⁺ Calcd for C₄₀H₆₀BF₂IN₂O₁₂Na 959.3151; Found 959.3134.

BDP2-NH₂—Following the general procedure for palladium catalyzed cross coupling reactions, a solution of **BDP2-I** (70.9 mg, 0.0757 mmol) and 4-aminophenylboronic acid pinacol ester **5** (49.6 mg, 0.227 mmol), Na₂CO₃ (80.2 mg, 0.757 mmol), and PdCl₂(dppf)·CH₂Cl₂ (3.1 mg, 3.79 μmol) in toluene/ethanol/water (7 mL, 4:1:2), was stirred at 80°C for 18 hours. Crude reaction mixture was concentrated, and the residue was dissolved in CH₂Cl₂, washed (water and brine), dried (Na₂SO₄) and concentrated. Column chromatography [silica, EtOAc/acetone (5:1) → (4:1) → (3:1) → (2:1)] yielded a red-pink film that is orange fluorescent (51.6 mg, 76%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 1.48 (s, 3H), 1.56 (s, 3H), 2.47 (s, 3H), 2.51 (s, 3H), 3.29–3.57 (m, 32H), 3.63–3.77 (m, 14H), 3.85–3.90 (m, 2H), 3.99–4.05 (m, 4H), 4.10–4.16 (m, 2H), 5.29 (s, 1H), 6.21 (s, 2H), 6.68 (d, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 6.94 (d, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 2H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 12.0, 13.4, 13.8, 14.6, 53.5, 59.0, 59.2, 67.7, 69.2, 69.5, 69.8, 70.2, 70.7, 70.8, 71.0, 71.1, 71.9, 72.0, 92.7, 106.0, 115.0, 120.2, 123.8, 131.2, 132.1, 132.2, 133.1, 136.1, 138.4, 141.7, 145.4, 153.5, 153.6,

157.3, 161.7; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z [M+Cs]⁺ Calcd for C₄₆H₆₆BF₂N₃O₁₂Cs 1034.3765; Found 1034.3742.

2,4,6-Tris(prop-2-yn-1-yloxy)benzaldehyde (6)—A solution of 2,4,6-trihydroxybenzaldehyde (1.00 g, 6.49 mmol), in anhydrous DMF (21 mL) was added to flask charged with K₂CO₃ (8.90 g, 64.3 mmol, dried under high vacuum, overnight). The resulting mixture was stirred at 60 °C for 30 min. A sample of propargyl bromide (2.87 mL, 25.8 mmol, 80% in toluene) was added dropwise. The resulting mixture was stirred at 80 °C for 1h. The resulting mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate and washed (water and brine), dried (Na₂SO₄) and concentrated. The resulting solid was suspended in diethyl ether (10 mL), sonicated and filtered to yield a light-brown solid (0.960 g, 55%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 400 MHz) δ 2.56 (t, J = 2.4 Hz, 1H), 2.60 (t, J = 2.4 Hz, 1H), 4.76 (d, J = 2.4 Hz, 2H), 4.78 (d, J = 2.4 Hz, 4H), 6.39 (s, 2H), 10.35 (s, 1H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 100 MHz) δ 56.3, 56.9, 76.8, 76.9, 77.5, 77.7, 94.1, 110.6, 161.8, 163.5; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z [M+H]⁺ Calcd for C₁₆H₁₃O₄ 269.0808; Found 269.0809.

BDP3'—A solution of aldehyde **6** (3.00 g, 11.2 mmol) and 2,4-dimethylpyrrole (2.30 mL, 22.4 mmol) in CH₂Cl₂ (110 mL) was treated with trifluoroacetic acid (5 drops) and stirred vigorously. After 30 minutes, **2** appeared fully consumed based upon TLC [silica/CH₂Cl₂]. A sample of DDQ (2.53 g, 11.2 mmol) was added, and stirring was continued for an additional 30 minutes. Then, triethylamine (22.0 mL, 157 mmol) and BF₃·OEt₂ (22.0 mL, 179 mmol) were added, and the resulting mixture was stirred for an additional 30 minutes. The crude reaction mixture was filtered through silica (6.5 × 10 cm column), all green fluorescent material was collected and concentrated. The resultant viscous oil was dissolved in 30 mL EtOAc and washed (water and brine), dried (Na₂SO₄) and concentrated. Column chromatography [silica, CH₂Cl₂/hexanes (3:1)] yielded a nearly pure product, with a minor pink-red impurity. To remove the impurity, product was dissolved in dichloromethane (40 mL), diluted with hexanes (20 mL) then dichloromethane was removed via rotary evaporator, being cautious to avoid removing the hexanes. The resulting precipitate was filtered and dried over vacuum to afford a red-orange solid (1.23 g, 23%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ 1.58 (s, 6H), 2.44 (t, J = 2.3 Hz, 2H), 2.54 (s, 6H), 2.58 (t, J = 2.4 Hz, 1H), 4.62 (d, J = 2.3 Hz, 4H) 4.77 (d, J = 2.4 Hz, 2H), 5.94 (s, 2H), 6.52 (s, 2H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 13.8, 14.8, 55.9, 56.5, 76.17, 76.21, 78.1, 78.4, 94.4, 106.9, 120.7, 132.1, 134.9, 142.4, 154.6, 155.9, 160.0; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z [M+Na]⁺ Calcd for C₂₈H₂₅BF₂N₂O₃Na 509.1823; Found 509.1818.

BDP3—A 10 mL microwave reaction vessel was charged with **BDP3'** (40.0 mg, 0.0823 mmol), azide terminated tetraethylene glycol **1** (76.7 mg, 0.329 mmol), copper(II) sulfate pentahydrate (10.3 mg, 0.0412 mmol), L-ascorbic acid sodium salt (8.2 mg, 0.0412 mmol), and acetone/water (6 mL, 5:1). The resulting mixture was irradiated in the microwave reactor as described in General Procedure. Crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na₂SO₄) and concentrated. Note that the product exhibits water solubility and it may be necessary to wash aqueous layer with EtOAc in a back extraction to recover all product. Column chromatography [silica, CH₂Cl₂/methanol (25:1)] afforded a highly viscous red-orange oil (60.5 mg, 62%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ

1.45 (s, 6H), 2.50 (s, 6H), 3.31 (s, 6H), 3.32 (s, 3H), 3.46–3.57 (m, 27H), 3.59–3.64 (m, 11H), 3.78 (t, $J = 5.4$ Hz, 4H), 3.88 (t, $J = 5.1$ Hz, 2H), 4.40 (t, $J = 5.4$ Hz, 4H), 4.57 (t, $J = 5.2$ Hz, 2H), 5.11 (s, 4H), 5.21 (s, 2H), 5.89 (s, 2H), 6.58 (s, 2H), 7.33 (s, 2H), 7.93 (s, 1H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz): δ 13.6, 14.6, 50.2, 50.4, 59.0, 59.1, 62.2, 63.4, 69.3, 69.5, 70.5, 70.55, 70.62, 70.65, 71.9, 72.0, 94.6, 106.6, 120.6, 123.8, 124.5, 132.2, 136.1, 142.3, 143.0, 144.0, 154.2, 156.7, 161.3; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}+\text{Na}]^+$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{55}\text{H}_{82}\text{BF}_2\text{N}_{11}\text{O}_{15}\text{Na}$ 1208.5954; Found 1208.5973.

BDP3'-I—In a first flask a solution of **BDP3'** (500 mg, 1.03 mmol) and iodine (131 mg, 0.517 mmol) in CH_2Cl_2 (80 mL) and ethanol (160 mL) was prepared. In a second flask, a solution of iodic acid (90.9 mg, 0.517 mmol) in deionized water (80 mL) was prepared. Once homogenous, the iodic acid solution (contents of the second flask) was added slowly to the BDP solution (first flask). The reaction mixture was then stirred at 50°C for 20 minutes. The reaction mixture was cooled, diluted with CH_2Cl_2 , washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4) and concentrated. Column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /hexane (1:1)] yielded the desired product (the second to last compound to elute, appearing bright orange on TLC). Bright orange solid (313.0 mg, 50%). Note that the desired product is the major product, however, there is a distribution of other iodo-BDP products. ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 500 MHz): δ 1.58 (s, 3H), 1.59 (s, 3H), 2.45 (t, $J = 2.3$ Hz, 2H), 2.55 (s, 3H), 2.59 (t, $J = 2.4$ Hz, 1H), 2.62 (s, 3H), 4.62 (d, $J = 2.2$ Hz, 4H), 4.77 (d, $J = 2.4$ Hz, 2H), 6.00 (s, 1H), 6.53 (s, 2H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz): δ 14.1, 15.0, 15.9, 55.9, 56.5, 76.30, 76.34, 78.0, 78.2, 83.8, 94.4, 106.6, 121.8, 131.5, 132.7, 134.9, 142.3, 144.6, 153.5, 155.8, 157.1, 160.2; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}+\text{Na}]^+$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{28}\text{H}_{24}\text{BF}_2\text{IN}_2\text{O}_3\text{Na}$ 635.0799; Found 635.0786.

BDP3-I—A microwave reaction vessel (80 mL) was charged with **BDP3'-I** (300.0 mg, 0.499 mmol), azide terminated tetraethylene glycol **1** (465.6 mg, 2.00 mmol), copper(II)sulfate pentahydrate (62.4 mg, 0.250 mmol), L-ascorbic acid sodium salt (49.5 mg, 0.250 mmol), and acetone/water (44 mL, 5:1). Contents of microwave vessel were then irradiated in the microwave reactor as described in the General Procedure. Crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4) and concentrated. Note that product exhibits water solubility and it may be necessary to wash aqueous layer with EtOAc in a back extraction to recover all product. Column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /methanol (40:1) $\rightarrow$ (30:1) $\rightarrow$ (20:1) $\rightarrow$ (15:1)] yielded a highly viscous red-orange oil (515.4 mg, 80%). Note that product began eluting with the CH_2Cl_2 /methanol (30:1) solvent system, however, product stuck to the silica and eluent polarity was increased to (20:1) with addition of pressure and eventual increase in polarity to (15:1) to force remaining product to elute. ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 500 MHz): δ 1.44 (s, 3H), 1.48 (s, 3H), 2.54 (s, 3H), 2.60 (s, 3H), 3.33 (s, 6H), 3.35 (s, 3H), 3.48–3.51 (m, 4H), 3.52–3.60 (m, 23H), 3.62–3.66 (m 10H), 3.81 (t, $J = 5.4$ Hz, 4H), 3.91 (t, $J = 5.1$ Hz, 2H), 4.43 (t, $J = 5.4$ Hz, 4H), 4.59 (t, $J = 5.1$ Hz, 2H), 5.10–5.16 (m, 4H) 5.23 (s, 2H), 5.98 (s, 1H), 6.62 (s, 2H), 7.36 (s, 2H), 7.95 (s, 1H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz): δ 13.7, 14.6, 15.4, 15.6, 50.0, 50.2, 58.8, 58.9, 62.0, 62.9, 69.1, 69.3, 70.26, 70.30, 70.35, 70.41, 70.44, 71.7, 71.8, 83.2, 94.5, 105.9, 121.6, 123.7, 124.4, 131.4, 132.7, 136.1, 141.9, 142.7, 143.6, 144.6, 152.6,

156.4, 156.7, 161.3; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z [M+H]⁺ Calcd for C₅₅H₈₂BF₂IN₁₁O₁₅ 1312.5101; Found 1312.5124.

BDP3-COOMe—Following the general procedure for palladium catalyzed cross coupling reactions, **BDP3-I** (100.0 mg, 0.0764 mmol), *p*-methylbenzoateboronic acid pinacol ester **7** (60.0 mg, 0.229 mmol), Na₂CO₃ (81.0 mg, 0.764 mmol) and PdCl₂(dppf)·CH₂Cl₂ (6.2 mg, 7.63 μmol) in toluene/ethanol/water (7 mL, 4:1:2) were stirred at 80 °C for 15 hours. Crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na₂SO₄) and concentrated. Column chromatography [silica, CH₂Cl₂/methanol (30:1) → (20:1)] yielded a viscous pink oil (70.3 mg, 70%). Note that as with **BDP3-I** the product stuck to silica and increased polarity was necessitated to remove all product from column. It is quite challenging to distinguish product from starting material based solely on TLC, however the product is highly fluorescent in comparison to starting material. ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): δ 1.43 (s, 3H), 1.47 (s, 3H), 2.50 (s, 3H), 2.56 (s, 3H) 3.33 (s, 6H), 3.35 (s, 3H), 3.47–3.59 (m, 31H), 3.61–3.66 (m, 11H), 3.80 (t, *J* = 5.3 Hz, 4H), 3.92 (t, *J* = 5.1 Hz, 2H), 3.93 (s, 3H), 4.35–4.46 (m, 4H), 4.58 (t, *J* = 5.2 Hz, 2H), 5.16 (s, 2H), 5.17 (s, 2H), 5.22 (s, 2H), 5.96 (s, 1H), 6.61 (s, 2H), 7.23 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.41 (s, 2H), 7.94 (s, 1H), 8.04 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 2H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 11.8, 13.3, 13.8, 14.7, 50.2, 50.4, 52.1, 58.96, 59.01, 62.1, 63.3, 70.45, 70.52, 70.59, 70.61, 71.89, 71.94, 94.6, 106.5, 121.1, 123.8, 124.5, 128.6, 129.6, 130.2, 131.6, 131.8, 132.8, 136.7, 138.1, 138.9, 142.9, 143.1, 143.9, 151.8, 155.3, 156.7, 161.4, 166.9; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z [M+Na]⁺ Calcd for C₆₃H₈₈BF₂N₁₁O₁₇Na 1342.6323; Found 1342.6353.

Dyad C1-BDP—Following the general procedure for palladium catalyzed cross coupling reactions, samples of **C-Br** (46 mg, 0.090 mmol), **BDP-F** (31 mg, 0.090 mmol), and P(*o*-tolyl)₃ (33 mg, 0.108 mmol), and Pd₂(dba)₃ (0.016 g, 0.018 mmol) in toluene/ triethylamine (5:1, 62 mL) were reacted as described in General Procedure. The progress of the reaction was monitored using absorption spectroscopy. After 4h a second batch of Pd₂(dba)₃ (0.016 g, 0.018 mmol) and P(*o*-tolyl)₃ (0.033 g, 0.108 mmol) was added and the reaction mixture was stirred at 60 °C. After 15 hours absorption spectroscopy showed disappearance of the Q_y band of starting chlorin at 650 nm. The reaction mixture was concentrated, and remaining solid was dried under high vacuum. Column chromatography [silica, hexane/ CH₂Cl₂ (1:1), second fraction (green) was collected] provided a semi-pure product, which was further purified by washing with methanol and methanol/CH₂Cl₂ (4:1), and column chromatography [silica, hexane/CH₂Cl₂ (2:1)], to obtain a green solid (0.023 g, 33%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 400 MHz): δ: -1.89 (br, 1H), -1.55 (br, 1H), 1.54 (s, 6H), 1.87 (s, 6H), 2.07 (s, 6H), 2.61 (apparent s, two overlapped singlets, 9H), 4.68 (s, 2H), 6.04 (s, 2H), 7.26 (s, 4H), 7.43 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 2H), 7.98 (d, *J* = 7.8 Hz, 2H), 8.46 (d, *J* = 3.7 Hz, 2H), 8.78 (s, 1H), 8.85 (s overlapped with a doublet), 8.92 (d, *J* = 4.6 Hz, 1H), 9.18 (d, *J* = 4.2 Hz, 2H), 9.30 (s, 1H), 9.72 (s, 1H); ¹³C NMR δ (100 MHz) : 14.8, 21.4, 21.6, 29.85, 31.2, 46.8, 52, 94.6, 95, 95.7, 106.9, 116.3, 121.0, 121.6, 124.2, 124.6, 127.9, 128.6, 128.7, 128.9, 131.4, 131.8, 132.6, 133.02, 133.05, 135.3, 135.4, 139.2, 139.7, 143.2, 152.3, 152.7, 156, 163.2, 176.3; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z [M+H]⁺ Calcd for C₅₂H₄₈BF₂N₆ 805.4004; Found 805.4005.

Dyad C2-BDP—Following the general procedure for palladium catalyzed cross coupling reactions, samples of **C1-Br** (15.0 mg, 27.9 μmol), **BDP1** (26.0 mg, 29.3 μmol), $(\text{PPh}_3)_2\text{PdCl}_2$ (2.9 mg, 4.2 μmol) in DMF/ Et_3N (2:1, 6 mL) were stirred at 80°C for 15 hours. The crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine, dried (Na_2SO_4) and concentrated. Flash column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /methanol (1:0) $\rightarrow$ (50:1) $\rightarrow$ (30:1) $\rightarrow$ (25:1) $\rightarrow$ (15:1) $\rightarrow$ (11:1)] followed by a second gravity column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /methanol (1:0) $\rightarrow$ (25:1) $\rightarrow$ (15:1)] afforded target dyad as a green solid (10.8 mg, 29%). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 500 MHz): δ -1.90 (s, 1H), -1.57 (s, 1H), 1.55 (s, 6H), 1.87 (s, 6H), 2.08 (s, 6H), 2.58 (s, 6H), 2.62 (s, 3H), 3.38 (s, 6H), 3.53–3.57 (m, 5H), 3.61–3.67 (m, 23H), 3.86 (t, J = 5.2 Hz, 4H), 4.36 (s, 4H), 4.49 (t, J = 5.2 Hz, 4H), 4.71 (s, 2H), 6.01 (s, 2H), 7.53 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 7.64 (s, 1H), 8.02 (d, J = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 8.47 (d, J = 4.2 Hz, 1H), 8.78 (s, 1H), 8.86 (s, 2H), 8.92 (d, J = 4.4 Hz, 1H), 9.18 (d, J = 4.4 Hz, 1H), 9.32 (s, 1H), 9.73 (s, 1H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz): δ 15.0, 15.1, 21.4, 21.6, 29.8, 31.2, 46.8, 50.2, 52.0, 56.8, 59.2, 69.8, 70.66, 70.74, 72.1, 86.2, 94.6, 95.0, 95.8, 106.9, 116.4, 121.0, 121.7, 122.9, 124.1, 124.4, 127.9, 128.8, 128.9, 131.8, 132.6, 132.8, 133.0, 133.1, 135.3, 135.8, 137.5, 137.9, 139.2, 139.7, 141.2, 141.8, 142.1, 148.7, 152.3, 152.8, 156.1, 163.3, 176.3; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}+\text{Na}]^+$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{76}\text{H}_{91}\text{BN}_{12}\text{O}_{10}\text{Na}$ 1365.6978; Found 1365.6953.

BC1-BDP—Following the general procedure for palladium catalyzed cross coupling reactions, samples of **BC1** (20.0 mg, 32.6 μmol), **BDP-F** (17.0 mg, 48.9 μmol), $(\text{PPh}_3)_2\text{PdCl}_2$ (4.6 mg, 6.5 μmol) in DMF/ Et_3N (2:1, 9 mL) were reacted at 80°C for 16 hours. The crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4) and concentrated. Column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /hexanes (1:1) $\rightarrow$ (2:1)] yielded a red-brown solid (7.4 mg, 26%). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 500 MHz): δ -1.47 (s, 1H), -1/26 (s, 1H), 1.57 (s, 6H), 1.93 (s, 6H), 1.96 (s, 6H), 2.60 (s, 6H), 4.06 (s, 3H), 4.34 (s, 2H), 4.43 (s, 2H), 4.55 (s, 3H), 6.04 (s, 2H), 7.42 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.99 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 8.23 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 8.42 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 8.53 (s, 1H), 8.57 (s, 1H), 8.67 (s, 1H) 8.77 (s, 2H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz): δ 14.5, 14.9, 30.9, 31.2, 45.3, 46.2, 47.2, 52.4, 52.5, 64.6, 89.2, 92.5, 97.0, 97.1, 97.6, 110.7, 121.5, 123.5, 123.6, 125.5, 128.5, 129.3, 130.4, 131.0, 131.2, 131.5, 132.4, 133.7, 134.7, 135.6, 136.1, 136.5, 136.8, 140.8, 141.3, 143.3, 153.9, 155.9, 162.2, 167.3, 169.0, 171.5; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}]^+$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{54}\text{H}_{51}\text{BF}_2\text{N}_6\text{O}_3$ 880.4087; Found 880.4079.

Dyad BC2-BDP—Following the general procedure for palladium catalyzed cross coupling reactions, samples of **BC1** (20.0 mg, 32.6 μmol), **BDP1** (43.4 mg, 48.9 μmol), $(\text{PPh}_3)_2\text{PdCl}_2$ (4.6 mg, 6.5 μmol) in DMF/ Et_3N (2:1, 9 mL) were reacted at 80°C for 4 hours. The crude reaction was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4) and concentrated. Column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /methanol (100:0) $\rightarrow$ (20:1)] yielded a red-brown solid (13.4 mg, 29%). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 500 MHz): δ -1.49 (s, 1H), -1.28 (s, 1H), 1.56 (s, 6H), 1.66 (s, 6H), 1.94 (s, 6H), 1.97 (s, 6H), 2.59 (s, 6H), 3.38 (s, 6H), 3.54–3.57 (m, 5H), 3.61–3.66 (m, 23H), 3.86 (t, J = 5.4 Hz, 4H), 4.06 (s, 3H), 4.34–4.36 (m, 6H), 4.47 (t, J = 5.4 Hz, 4H), 4.57 (s, 3H), 7.50 (d, J = 8.3 Hz, 2H), 7.64 (s, 2H), 8.01 (d, J = 8.3 Hz, 2H), 8.23 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 8.41 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 8.53 (s, 1H), 8.58 (s, 1H), 8.67 (s, 1H), 8.76–8.79 (m, 2H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz): δ 15.0, 15.2, 30.9, 31.2, 45.3,

46.1, 47.2, 50.2, 52.4, 52.5, 56.8, 59.2, 64.6, 69.8, 70.7, 70.67, 70.74, 72.1, 89.0, 92.7, 97.0, 97.1, 97.6, 110.9, 121.7, 122.9, 123.5, 123.7, 125.3, 128.6, 128.69, 128.72, 129.3, 130.6, 131.0, 131.2, 132.2, 132.3, 132.4, 132.8, 133.8, 135.2, 135.7, 136.0, 136.4, 136.7, 140.8, 141.4, 142.2, 148.8, 154.0, 155.9, 162.1, 167.3, 169.0, 171.4; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z [M + Na]⁺ Calcd for C₇₈H₉₅BN₁₂O₁₃ 1441.7139; Found 1441.7142.

Triad BC3-BDP—Following the general procedure for palladium catalyzed cross coupling reactions, samples of **BC1** (10.0 mg, 17.9 μ mol), **BDP1** (39.7 mg, 44.8 μ mol), (PPh₃)₂PdCl₂ (2.6 mg, 3.6 μ mol) were reacted in DMF/Et₃N (2:1, 9 mL) at 80°C for 2.5 hours. The crude reaction was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na₂SO₄) and concentrated. During extraction a precipitate was observed in the aqueous phase, this was extracted using CH₂Cl₂, which was subsequently washed with brine, dried (Na₂SO₄) and combined with the first extract (TLC indicated the two mixtures were nearly identical). Two size exclusion chromatography columns [Bio-Beads S-X1 Support#152–2151 (2.5 $\times$ 57 cm), THF] were performed to remove byproduct, followed with column chromatography [silica, CH₂Cl₂/methanol (100:0) $\rightarrow$ (20:1) $\rightarrow$ (10:1) $\rightarrow$ (5:1)] yielded a red-brown solid (13.0 mg, 33%). ¹H NMR shows impurities in the aromatic region which was identified on the basis of HRMS data {[obsd 1794.9300 (M+Na)⁺ calcd 1794.9300 (M+Na)⁺ [(M+Na)⁺, M = C₉₀H₁₂₄B₂N₁₆O₂₀]} as a product of homo-coupling of **BDP1**. This impurity can be removed through rigorous, iterative crystallization, however, the yield of highly pure **BC3-BDP** is negligible. Relative integration suggests this impurity is present in ~5–10%, however, it does not appear to have an impact on the photochemical properties of the sample (Φ_F and Φ_{ETE} recrystallized and non-recrystallized samples are the same within experimental uncertainty). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ -1.65 (s, 1H), -1.45 (s, 1H), 1.56 (s, 6H), 1.57 (s, 6H), 1.97 (s, 12H), 2.59 (s, 12H), 3.38 (s, 12H), 3.54–3.57 (m, 10H), 3.60–3.67 (m, 50H), 3.86 (t, J = 5.2 Hz, 9H), 4.34–4.36 (m, 10H), 4.46 (s, 3H), 4.49 (t, J = 5.0 Hz, 4H), 4.56 (s, 3H), 6.01 (s, 2H), 6.02 (s, 2H), 7.51 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 7.55 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 7.63 (s, 2H), 7.64 (s, 2H), 8.02 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 8.05 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 8.57 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 8.82–8.84 (m, 2H), 8.95 (s, 1H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, 125 MHz): δ 15.0, 15.2, 31.0, 31.1, 45.7, 45.8, 50.2, 52.0, 56.8, 59.2, 64.7, 69.8, 70.7, 70.8, 72.1, 121.69, 121.74, 122.9, 124.4, 124.7, 128.8, 128.9, 132.4, 132.6, 132.8, 134.7, 135.7, 135.9, 138.4, 141.2, 141.4, 142.1, 142.2, 148.8, 156.0, 156.1, 170.2; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z [M+2Na]²⁺ Calcd for C₁₁₅H₁₅₀B₂N₂₀O₂₁Na₂ 1107.0650; Found 1107.0677.

Dyad C3-BDP—A solution of **BDP2-NH₂** (35.0 mg, 0.0388 mmol), **C1-COOH** (15.0 mg, 0.0326 mmol), EDC·HCl (12.5 mg, 0.0652 mmol) and DMAP (8.0 mg, 0.0652 mmol) in DMF (3 mL) was stirred at room temperature for 4 days. The crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na₂SO₄), and concentrated. Column chromatography [silica, EtOAc/acetone (6:1) $\rightarrow$ (4:1)] yielded a red-purple solid (12.9 mg, 30%). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, 500 MHz): δ -2.36 (s, 1H), -1.97 (s, 1H), 1.59 (s, 3H), 1.62 (s, 3H), 2.08 (s, 6H), 2.58 (s, 6H), 3.37 (s, 6H), 3.39 (s, 3H), 3.47–3.54 (m, 4H), 3.47–3.54 (m, 8H), 3.54–3.59 (m, 6H), 3.66–3.70 (m, 2H), 3.70–3.76 (m, 6H), 3.76–3.79 (m, 2H), 3.89–3.92 (m, 2H), 4.05–4.10 (m, 4H), 4.15–4.19 (m, 2H), 4.76 (s, 2H), 5.97 (s, 1H), 6.27 (s, 2H), 7.29 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 7.84 (d, J = 8.4 Hz, 2H), 8.20 (s, 1H), 8.24 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 8.30 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 8.62 (d, J = 4.3 Hz, 1H), 8.79 (d, J = 4.7 Hz, 1H), 8.87 (d, J = 4.7 Hz,

1H), 8.96 (s, 1H), 8.99 (d, $J = 4.5$ Hz, 1H), 9.01 (d, $J = 4.3$ Hz, 1H), 9.08 (s, 1H), 9.27 (d, $J = 4.4$ Hz, 1H), 9.90 (s, 1H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz): δ 12.0, 13.5, 13.9, 14.8, 29.8, 31.3, 46.6, 52.2, 59.1, 59.2, 67.8, 69.3, 69.5, 69.8, 70.4, 70.7, 70.78, 70.81, 71.0, 71.2, 72.0, 72.1, 92.8, 94.7, 97.3, 105.9, 107.5, 119.8, 120.3, 120.7, 123.6, 124.1, 125.7, 127.9, 128.6, 130.5, 131.2, 131.8, 132.0, 132.2, 132.7, 132.8, 134.3, 134.5, 134.6, 134.9, 136.7, 137.0, 138.4, 139.6, 141.2, 142.6, 145.8, 151.1, 152.0, 152.6, 154.5, 157.4, 161.8, 163.3, 166.0, 175.6; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}]^+$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{75}\text{H}_{88}\text{BF}_2\text{N}_7\text{O}_{13}$ 1343.6508; Found 1343.6494.

Dyad BC4-BDP (prepared through Suzuki cross-coupling)—Following the general procedure for palladium coupling reactions, **BC2-B** (90% pure, 22.7 mg, 0.0239 mmol), **BDP3-I** (37.6 mg, 0.0286 mmol), Na_2CO_3 (25.3 mg, 0.239 mmol) and $\text{PdCl}_2(\text{dppf})\cdot\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ (3.9 mg, 4.78 μmol) in toluene/ethanol/water (7 mL, 4:1:2) were reacted at 80°C for 2 hours. Crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4) and concentrated. Size exclusion chromatography [Bio-Beads S-X1 Support#152-2151 (2.5 $\times$ 57 cm), THF], followed with chromatography column [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /methanol (35:1) $\rightarrow$ (30:1) $\rightarrow$ (25:1)] yielded a purple solid (10.0 mg, 22%). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz): δ 1.46 (s, 3H), 1.53 (s, 3H), 1.96 (s, 6H), 1.98 (s, 6H), 2.59 (s, 3H), 2.60 (2, 3H), 3.33–3.37 (m, 10H), 3.51–3.67 (m, 43H), 3.71 (s, 3H), 3.82 (t, $J = 5.3$ Hz, 4H), 3.91 (t, $J = 5.0$ Hz, 2H), 4.06 (s, 3H), 4.40 (s, 4H), 4.43 (t, $J = 5.3$ Hz, 4H), 4.60 (t, $J = 5.0$ Hz, 2H), 5.20 (s, 2H), 5.21 (s, 2H), 5.26 (s, 2H), 6.00 (s, 1H), 6.65 (s, 2H), 7.36 (d, $J = 7.9$ Hz, 2H), 7.44 (s, 2H), 7.97 (s, 1H), 7.98 (d, $J = 8.3$ Hz, 2H), 8.08 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2H), 8.15 (d, $J = 8.2$ Hz, 2H), 8.27 (d, $J = 8.0$ Hz, 2H), 8.41 (d, $J = 8.1$ Hz, 2H), 8.51 (s, 1H), 8.63–8.70 (m, 3H), 8.80 (s, 1H), 8.82 (s, 1H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz): δ 11.9, 13.9, 14.9, 29.8, 31.18, 31.23, 45.6, 45.8, 48.0, 50.3, 50.5, 51.9, 52.4, 59.08, 59.14, 62.2, 63.4, 63.5, 69.4, 69.6, 70.5, 70.57, 70.64, 70.67, 70.70, 70.72, 72.02, 72.05, 94.8, 96.7, 97.3, 106.6, 119.6, 121.9, 123.0, 124.0, 124.7, 127.5, 127.9, 128.9, 130.3, 130.7, 131.0, 131.9, 134.3, 134.5, 134.6, 134.9, 136.3, 136.8, 143.1, 144.0, 154.9, 155.6, 156.8, 160.2, 161.5, 165.9, 167.4, 169.4, 169.9; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}+2\text{Na}]^{2+}$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{101}\text{H}_{123}\text{BF}_2\text{N}_{16}\text{O}_{19}\text{Na}_2$ 979.4506; Found 979.4524.

Dyad BC4-BDP (prepared through EDC-mediated coupling)—A solution of **BDP3-COOMe** (63.2 mg, 0.0479 mmol) in THF/methanol (1:1, 6 mL) was treated with aqueous NaOH (1 mL, 3M) and stirred vigorously at room temperature for one hour. Crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (5% HCl and brine), and dried (Na_2SO_4). Note that considerable non-fluorescent color was observed in aqueous phase suggesting decomposition of BODIPY during reaction. Residue was then purified by column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /MeOH (20:1) $\rightarrow$ (15:1) $\rightarrow$ (5:1)] yielding **BDP3-COOH** as a pink film (13.5 mg, 22%). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz): δ 1.38 (s, 3H), 1.49 (s, 3H), 2.51 (s, 3H), 2.57 (s, 3H), 3.34 (s, 6H), 3.35 (s, 3H), 3.48–3.66 (m, 48H), 3.77 (t, $J = 5.4$ Hz, 4H), 3.90 (t, $J = 5.2$ Hz, 2H), 4.40 (t, $J = 5.4$ Hz, 4H), 4.59 (t, $J = 5.2$ Hz, 2H), 5.16 (s, 2H), 5.17 (s, 2H), 5.23 (s, 2H), 5.97 (s, 1H), 6.61 (s, 2H), 7.22 (d, $J = 8.2$ Hz, 2H), 7.40 (s, 2H), 7.95 (s, 1H), 8.09 (d, $J = 8.2$ Hz, 2H)] **BDP3-COOH** was then immediately used in the subsequent reaction without further characterization. **BC-P-NH₂** (7.5 mg, 12 μmol), **BDP3-COOH** (13.0 mg, 9.96 μmol), EDC·HCl (3.8 mg, 20 μmol) and DMAP (2.4 mg, 20 μmol) were dissolved in 3 mL of CH_2Cl_2 and stirred at room temperature, in darkness, for 18 hours. Crude reaction mixture was purified by column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /

MeOH (30:1)], to afford a purple film (5.0 mg, 22% from **BDP3-COOH**). Characterization data (^1H NMR, absorption, emission) are consistent with those obtained for the sample prepared via Suzuki cross-coupling.

Dyad BC5-BDP—Following the general procedure for palladium coupling reactions, **BC3-B** (95% pure, 32.0 mg, 0.035 mmol), **BDP3-I** (55.7 mg, 0.042 mmol), sodium carbonate (37.1 mg, 0.35 mmol) and $\text{PdCl}_2(\text{dppf})\cdot\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2$ (5.7 mg, 7.0 μmol) in toluene/ethanol/water (7 mL, 4:1:2) were reacted at 80°C for 2 hours. Crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4), and concentrated. Column chromatography [silica, CH_2Cl_2 /methanol (25:1)] yielded a purple-brown solid (28.5 mg, 41%). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 500 MHz): δ -1.80 (s, 1H), -1.55 (s, 1H), 1.43 (s, 3H), 1.53 (s, 3H), 1.95 (s, 12H), 2.56 (s, 3H), 2.59 (s, 3H), 3.33 (s, 6H), 3.36 (s, 3H), 3.48–3.66 (m, 41H), 3.79 (t, J = 5.2 Hz, 4H), 3.90 (t, J = 5.0 Hz, 2H), 3.99 (s, 3H), 4.38–4.46 (m, 8H), 4.50 (s, 3H), 4.59 (t, J = 4.9 Hz, 2H), 5.19 (s, 2H), 5.20 (s, 2H), 5.25 (s, 2H), 6.60 (s, 1H), 6.64 (s, 2H), 7.32 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.43 (s, 2H), 7.85 (s, 3H), 7.91 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 7.96 (s, 1H), 8.03 (d, J = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 8.15 (d, J = 8.1 Hz, 2H), 8.54 (s, 1H), 8.57 (s, 1H), 8.65 (s, 1H), 8.79–8.83 (m, 2H), 8.91 (s, 1H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 125 MHz): δ 11.9, 13.5, 13.9, 14.9, 31.0, 31.1, 45.6, 45.8, 47.8, 50.3, 50.5, 51.7, 52.5, 59.06, 59.13, 62.1, 63.3, 64.7, 69.3, 69.6, 70.4, 70.5, 70.59, 70.61, 70.66, 70.69, 71.96, 72.01, 94.7, 97.1, 97.8, 106.5, 113.3, 115.5, 120.3, 124.0, 124.7, 124.9, 125.0, 127.6, 128.5, 129.6, 129.8, 130.6, 131.70, 131.73, 132.6, 133.4, 135.0, 135.4, 135.7, 137.9, 138.0, 143.0, 144.0, 155.7, 156.7, 161.1, 161.5, 165.8, 166.8, 170.2, 170.6; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}+2\text{Na}]^{2+}$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{105}\text{H}_{123}\text{BF}_2\text{N}_{16}\text{O}_{19}\text{Na}_2$ 1003.9518; Found 1003.9541.

3-(4-Aminophenyl)-5-methoxy-8,8,18,18-tetramethyl-13-(4-methoxycarbonylphenyl)-bacteriochlorin (BC-P-NH₂)—A mixture of **BC-P** (30.0 mg, 0.0489 mmol), 4-aminophenylboronic pinacolate (11.6 mg, 0.0528 mmol), Cs_2CO_3 (161 mg, 0.0489 mmol), and $\text{Pd}(\text{PPh}_3)_4$ (9.1 mg, 0.0079 mmol) in toluene (6 mL) and DMF (3 mL) was stirred at 85°C under nitrogen atmosphere. After approximately 17 h, the mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate, washed (water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4), and concentrated. The residue was purified with column chromatography (silica, $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{Cl}_2/2\%$ MeOH) to afford a dirty green solid (26 mg, 69%). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz) δ -2.06 (s, 1H), -1.68 (s, 1H), 1.96 (s, 6H), 1.98 (s, 6H), 3.73 (s, 3H), 3.89 (brs, 2H), 4.07 (s, 3H), 4.40 (s, 2H), 4.42 (s, 2H), 6.98 (d, J = 8.44 Hz, 2H), 7.94 (d, J = 8.44 Hz, 2H), 8.28 (d, J = 8.44 Hz, 2H), 8.42 (d, J = 8.44 Hz, 2H), 8.62 (s, 1H), 8.63 (s, 1H), 8.70 (s, 1H), 8.82 (s, 2H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 100 MHz) δ 31.4, 31.5, 45.6, 46.2, 48.4, 51.9, 52.6, 63.8, 96.5, 96.8, 97.6, 114.9, 121.5, 123.3, 128.5, 128.6, 128.9, 130.5, 131.2, 132.4, 133.9, 134.1, 134.5, 135.3, 136.5, 141.8, 145.9, 155.7, 159.8, 167.7, 168.9, 170.3; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}]^+$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{39}\text{H}_{39}\text{N}_5\text{O}_3$ 625.3047; Found 625.3047.

3-(4-Aminophenylethynyl)-5-methoxy-8,8,18,18-tetramethyl-13-(4-methoxycarbonylphenylethynyl)bacteriochlorin (BC-E-NH₂)—A mixture of **BC-E** (20 mg, 0.031 mmol), 4-ethynylaniline (4.3 mg, 0.037 mmol), and $\text{PdCl}_2(\text{PPh}_3)_2$ (3.5 mg, 0.0050 mmol) in Et_3N (2 mL) and DMF (4 mL) was stirred at 80°C under nitrogen atmosphere. After approximately 2 h, the mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate, washed

(water and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4), and concentrated. The residue was purified with silica column chromatography [silica, hexane/ CH_2Cl_2 (1:3)] to afford a dark reddish powder (14 mg, 67%). ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 500 MHz) δ -1.87 (s, 1H), -1.57 (s, 1H), 1.95 (s, 12H), 3.93 (brs, 2H), 3.99 (s, 3H), 4.43 (s, 2H), 4.45 (s, 2H), 4.50 (s, 3H), 6.79 (d, J = 8.45 Hz, 1H), 7.68 (d, J = 8.45 Hz, 1H), 7.94 (d, J = 8.40 Hz, 1H), 8.19 (d, J = 8.40 Hz, 1H), 8.53 (s, 1H), 8.58 (s, 1H), 8.78 (d, J = 2.2 Hz, 1H), 8.81 (d, J = 1.9 Hz, 1H), 8.92 (s, 1H); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3 , 100 MHz) δ 31.3, 41.7, 46.2, 48.2, 51.8, 52.7, 64.9, 85.4, 88.4, 95.3, 95.8, 96.6, 96.9, 98.1, 114.0, 114.8, 115.1, 115.3, 124.6, 125.3, 128.8, 129.9, 130.1, 131.9, 132.1, 133.5, 135.2, 135.7, 135.9, 137.9, 147.1, 156.4, 160.9, 167.0, 169.8, 171.1; HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}]^+$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{43}\text{H}_{39}\text{N}_5\text{O}_3$ 673.3047; Found 673.3052.

BC-P-B—A solution of **BC-P-NH₂** (17.6 mg, 0.0281 mmol), 4-carboxylphenylboronic acid pinacol ester **8** (14.0 mg, 0.0562 mmol), EDC·HCl (10.8 mg, 0.0562 mmol), and DMAP (6.9 mg, 0.0562 mmol) in DMF (2 mL) was treated with hydroxybenzotriazole monohydrate (8.8 mg, 0.0562 mmol) and stirred for 64 hours. The reaction crude was diluted with EtOAc, washed (saturated aqueous NaHCO_3 (3x), water, and brine), dried (Na_2SO_4) and concentrated, yielding a green solid (22.7 mg, 94%). Proton NMR indicates a product with approximately 90% purity, which was deemed acceptable for subsequent reactions. Column chromatography of this compound leads to significantly lower yields (20–30% overall), streaking observed during TLC suggests this diminished yield is due to product adhering to silica. ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz): δ -1.97 (s, 1H), -1.66 (s, 1H), 1.39 (s, 3H), 1.40 (s, 12H), 1.96 (s, 6H), 1.98 (s, 6H), 3.71 (s, 2H), 4.06 (s, 2H), 7.95–8.05 (m, 6H), 8.10 (s, 1H), 8.16 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 8.25–8.30 (m, 3H), 8.42 (d, J = 8.3 Hz, 2H), 8.66 (s, 1H), 8.69 (s, 1H), 8.80 (s, 1H), 8.82 (s, 1H); HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}]^+$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{52}\text{H}_{54}\text{BN}_5\text{O}_6$ 855.4170; Found 855.4172.

BC-E-B—A solution of **BC-E-NH₂** (35.0 mg, 0.0519 mmol), 4-carboxylphenylboronic acid pinacol ester **8** (25.8 mg, 0.104 mmol), EDC·HCl (19.9 mg, 0.104 mmol), and DMAP (12.7 mg, 0.104 mmol) in DMF (3 mL) was stirred for 46 hours. The crude reaction mixture was diluted with EtOAc, washed (saturated aqueous NaHCO_3 (3x), water, and brine), then dried (Na_2SO_4) and concentrated, yielding a red-brown solid (32.9 mg, 70%). Proton NMR indicates a product with greater than 95% purity, and was used for the next step without purification. ^1H NMR (CDCl_3 , 400 MHz): δ -1.80 (s, 1H), -1.55 (s, 1H), 1.39 (s, 12H), 1.96 (s, 12H), 3.99 (s, 3H), 4.44 (s, 2H), 4.45 (s, 2H), 4.51 (s, 3H), 7.79 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 7.83 (d, J = 8.7 Hz, 2H), 7.89 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 7.92 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 7.97 (d, J = 8.2 Hz, 2H), 8.07 (s, 1H), 8.14 (d, J = 8.5 Hz, 2H), 8.55 (s, 1H), 8.57 (s, 1H), 8.81 (s, 1H), 8.82 (s, 1H), 8.91 (s, 1H); HRMS (ESI-TOF) m/z $[\text{M}]^+$ Calcd for $\text{C}_{56}\text{H}_{54}\text{BN}_5\text{O}_6$ 903.4171; Found 903.4164.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number U01CA181628. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official

views of the National Institutes of Health. We thank Dr. Zhanqian Yu for the exploratory work on synthesis of **BC1-BDP** and Mr. Brice Biggins for exploratory work on development of conditions for microwave-assisted click reaction.

References

1. Fan J, Hu M, Zhan P, Peng X. *Chem Soc Rev.* 2013; 42:29–43. [PubMed: 23059554]
2. (a) Zhao Y, Zhang Y, Lv X, Liu Y, Chen M, Wang P, Liu J, Guo W. *J Mater Chem.* 2011; 21:13168–13171. (b) Han J, Engler A, Qi J, Tung CH. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2013; 54:503–505. (c) Ulrich G, Goze C, Guardigli M, Roda A, Ziessel R. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2005; 44:3694–3698. (d) Ueno Y, Jose J, Loudet A, Pérez-Bolivar C, Anzenbacher P Jr, Burgess K. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:51–55. [PubMed: 21105708]
3. Yu Z, Ptaszek M. *J Org Chem.* 2013; 78:10678–10691. [PubMed: 24079536]
4. (a) Jiao GS, Thoresen LH, Kim TG, Haaland WC, Gao F, Topp MR, Hochstrasser RM, Metzker ML, Burgess K. *Chem Eur J.* 2006; 12:7616–7626. (b) Bandichhor R, Petrescu AD, Vespa A, Kier AB, Schroeder F, Burgess K. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2006; 128:10688–10689. [PubMed: 16910657] (c) Rong Y, Wu C, Yu J, Zhang X, Ye F, Zeigler M, Gallina ME, Wu IC, Zhang Y, Chan YH, Sun W, Uvdal K, Chiu DT. *ACS Nano.* 2013; 7:376–384. [PubMed: 23282278] (d) Wu L, Loudet A, Barhoumi R, Burghardt RC, Burgess K. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2009; 131:9156–9157. [PubMed: 19566090] (e) Zhang X, Xiao Y, He L, Zhang Y. *J Org Chem.* 2014; 79:6315–6320. [PubMed: 24921157] (f) Nampali S, Khot M, Kumar S. *Tetrahedron Lett.* 2000; 41:8867–8871.
5. Kee HL, Nothdurft R, Muthiah C, Diers JR, Fan D, Ptaszek M, Bocian DF, Lindsey JS, Culver JP, Holten D. *Photochem Photobiol.* 2008; 84:1061–1072. [PubMed: 18673324]
6. (a) Williams MPA, Ethirajan M, Ohkubo K, Chen P, Pera P, Morgan J, White WH III, Shibata M, Fukuzumi S, Kadish KM, Pandey RK. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2011; 22:2283–2295. (b) Patel NJ, Chen Y, Joshi P, Pera P, Baumann H, Missert JR, Ohkubo K, Fukuzumi S, Nani RR, Schermann MJ, Chen P, Zhu J, Kadish KM, Pandey RK. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2016; 27:667–680. (c) Grin MA, Toukach PV, Tsvetkov VB, Reshetnikov RI, Kharitonova OV, Kozlov AS, Krasnovsky AA, Mironov AF. *Dyes and Pigments.* 2015; 121:21–29.
7. Meares A, Santhaman N, Satraitis A, Yu Z, Ptaszek M. *J Org Chem.* 2015; 80:3858–3869. [PubMed: 25803423]
8. (a) Tamiaki, H., Kunieda, M. *Handbook of Porphyrin Sciences.* Kadish, KM. Smith, KM., Guillard, R., editors. Vol. 11. World Scientific Publishing; New Jersey, London, Singapore, Beijing, Shanghai, Hong-Kong, Taipei, Chennai: 2011. p. 223–285. (b) Lindsey JS. *Chem Rev.* 2015; 115:6534–6620. [PubMed: 26068531] (c) Taniguchi M, Lindsey JS. *Chem Rev.* 2017; 117:344–535. [PubMed: 27498781] (d) Lindsey JS, Mass O, Chen CY. *New J Chem.* 2011:511–516.
9. Kee HL, Kirmaier C, Tang Q, Diers JR, Muthiah C, Taniguchi M, Laha JK, Ptaszek M, Lindsey JS, Bocian DF, Holten D. *Photochem Photobiol.* 2007; 83:1110–1124. [PubMed: 17880506]
10. Taniguchi M, Cramer DL, Bhise AD, Kee HL, Bocian DF, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *New J Chem.* 2008; 32:947–958.
11. Yang E, Kirmaier C, Krayner M, Taniguchi M, Kim HJ, Diers JR, Bocian DF, Lindsey JS, Holten D. *J Phys Chem B.* 2011; 115:10801–10816. [PubMed: 21875047]
12. (a) Liu TWB, Chen J, Burgess L, Cao W, Shi J, Wilson BC, Zheng G. *Theranostics.* 2011; 1:354–362. [PubMed: 21938263] (b) Lovell JF, Jin CS, Huynh E, Jin H, Kim C, Rubinstein JL, Chan WCW, Cao W, Wang LV, Zheng G. *Nature Mat.* 2011; 10:324–332. (c) Cao W, Ng KK, Corbin I, Zhang Z, Ding L, Chen J, Zheng G. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2009; 20:2023–2031. (d) Mawn TM, Popov AV, Beardsley NJ, Stefflova K, Milkevitch M, Zheng G, Delikatny EJ. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2011; 22:2434–2443. (e) Popov AV, Mawn TM, Kim S, Zheng G, Delikatny EJ. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2010; 21:1724–1727. (f) Huynh E, Jin CS, Wilson BC, Zheng G. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2014; 25:796–801.
13. (a) Vinita AM, Sano K, Yu Z, Nakajima T, Choyke P, Ptaszek M, Kobayashi H. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2012; 23:1671–1679. (b) Harada T, Sano K, Sato K, Watanabe R, Yu Z, Hanaoka H, Nakajima T, Choyke PL, Ptaszek M, Kobayashi H. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2014; 25:362–369.
14. (a) Loudet A, Burgess K. *Chem Rev.* 2007; 107:4891–4932. [PubMed: 17924696] (b) Ziessel R, Harriman A. *Chem Comm.* 2011; 47:611–631. [PubMed: 20957235]

15. Khan TK, Bröring M, Mathur S, Ravikanth M. *Coord Chem Rev.* 2013; 257:2348–2387.. Selected recent examples: Eggenspillier A, Takai A, El-Khouly ME, Ohkubo K, Gros CP, Bernhard C, Goze C, Denat F, Barbe JM, Fukuzumi S. *J Phys Chem A.* 2012; 116:3889–3898. [PubMed: 22435751] Panda MK, Lazarides T, Charalambidis G, Nikolaou V, Coutsolelos AG. *Eur J Inorg Chem.* 2015:468–477. Brizet B, Eggenspillier A, Gros CP, Barbe J-M, Goze C, Denat F, Harvey PD. *J Org Chem.* 2012; 77:3646–3650. [PubMed: 22380918] Weber MD, Nikolaou V, Wittmann JE, Nikolaou A, Angaridis PA, Charalambidis G, Stangel C, Kahnt A, Coutsolelos AG, Costa RD. *Chem Commun.* 2016; 52:1602–1605. Hu G, Liu R, Alexy EJ, Mandal AK, Bocian DF, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *New J Chem.* 2016; 40:8032–8052.
16. (a) Basumatary B, Reddy RVR, Bhandary S, Sankar J. *Dalton Trans.* 2015; 44:20817–20821. [PubMed: 26581014] (b) Brizet B, Desbois N, Bonnot A, Langlois A, Dubois A, Barbe JM, Gros CP, Goze C, Denat F, Harvey PD. *Inorg Chem.* 2014; 53:3392–3403. [PubMed: 24661249]
17. (a) Rio Y, Seitz W, Goulloumis A, Vazquez P, Sessler JL, Guldi DM, Torres TA. *Chem Eur J.* 2008; 16:1929–1940. (b) Liu JY, Huang YS, Menting R, Roder B, Ermilov EA, Ng DKPA. *Chem Commun.* 2013; 49:2998–3000.
18. Sahin T, Harris MA, Vairaprakash P, Niedzwiedzki DM, Subramanian V, Shreve AP, Bocian DF, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *J Phys Chem B.* 2015; 119:10231–10243. [PubMed: 26230425]
19. (a) Adams PG, Collins AM, Sahin T, Subramanian V, Urban VS, Vairaprakash V, Tian Y, Evans DG, Shreve AP, Montano GA. *NanoLetters.* 2015; 15:2422–2428. (b) Harris MA, Sahin T, Jiang J, Vairaprakash P, Parkes-Loech PS, Niedzwiedzki DM, Kirmaier C, Loach PA, Bocian DF, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *Photochem Photobiol.* 2014; 90:1264–1276. [PubMed: 25039896]
20. (a) Li L, Han J, Nguyen B, Burgess K. *J Org Chem.* 2008; 73:1963–1970. [PubMed: 18271598] (b) Nierth A, Kobitski AY, Nienhaus GU, Jäschke A. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2010; 132:2646–2654. [PubMed: 20131767]
21. (a) Niu SI, Massif C, Ulrich G, Renard PY, Romieu A, Ziessel R. *Chem Eur J.* 2012; 18:7229–7242. [PubMed: 22544430] (b) Niu SL, Massif C, Ulrich G, Ziessel R, Renard PY, Romieu A. *Org Biomol Chem.* 2011; 9:66–69. [PubMed: 21088764] (b) Massif C, Dautrey S, Haeefe A, Ziessel R, Renard PY, Romieu A. *Org Biomol Chem.* 2012; 10:4330–4336. [PubMed: 22549735] (c) Niu SN, Ulrich G, Ziessel R, Kiss A, Renard PY, Romieu A. *Org Lett.* 2009; 11:2049–2052. [PubMed: 19379006] (d) Romieu A, Massif C, Rihn S, Ulrich G, Ziessel R, Renard PY. *New J Chem.* 2013; 37:1016–1027.
22. Bura T, Ziessel R. *Org Lett.* 2011; 13:3072–3075. [PubMed: 21598985]
23. (a) Ke MR, Yeung SL, Ng DKP, Fong WP, Lo PC. *J Med Chem.* 2013; 56:8475–8483. [PubMed: 24088087] (b) Atilgan S, Ekmekici Z, Dogan AL, Guc D, Akkaya EU. *Chem Comm.* 2006:4398–4400. [PubMed: 17057856] (c) Zhu S, Zhang J, Vegesna G, Luo F-T, Green SA, Liu H. *Org Lett.* 2011; 13:438–441. [PubMed: 21175151] (d) Atilgan S, Ozdemir T, Akkaya EU. *Org Lett.* 2008; 10:4065–4067. [PubMed: 18702498] (e) He H, Lo PC, Yeung SL, Fong WP, Ng DKP. *J Med Chem.* 2011; 54:3097–3102. [PubMed: 21417218] (f) Zhu S, Zhang J, Janjanam J, Bi J, Vegesna G, Tiwari A, Luo FT, Wei J, Liu H. *Anal Chim Acta.* 2013; 758:138–144. [PubMed: 23245906] (g) Isik M, Ozdemir T, Turan IS, Kolemen S, Akkaya EU. *Org Lett.* 2013; 15:216–219. [PubMed: 23256788] (h) Sui B, Yue X, Kim B, Belfield KD. *ACS Appl Mater Interface.* 2015; 7:17565–17568.
24. Leage ML, Mirloup A, Ripoll M, Stauffert F, Bodlenner A, Ziessel R, Compain P. *Beilstein J Org Chem.* 2015; 11:659–667. [PubMed: 26124868]
25. Borbas KE, Chandrashaker V, Muthiah C, Kee HL, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *J Org Chem.* 2008; 73:3145–3158. [PubMed: 18341349]
26. Jiang J, Yang E, Reddy KR, Niedzwiedzki DM, Kirmaier C, Bocian DF, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *New J Chem.* 2015; 39:5694–5714.
27. (a) Zhang N, Jiang J, Liu M, Taniguchi M, Mandal AK, Evans-Storms RB, Pitner JB, Bocian DF, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *New J Chem.* 2016; 40:7750–7767. (b) Mandal AK, Sahin T, Liu M, Lindsey JS, Bocian DF, Holten D. *New J Chem.* 2016; 40:9648–9656. (c) Liu M, Chen CY, Mandal AK, Chamdrashaker V, Evans-Storms RB, Pitner JB, Bocian DF, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *New J Chem.* 2016; 40:7721–7740.
28. Jiang J, Vairaprakash P, Reddy KR, Sahin T, Pavan MP, Lublan E, Lindsey JS. *Org Biomol Chem.* 2014; 12:86–103. [PubMed: 24150272]

29. Reddy KR, Lublan E, Pavan MP, Kim HJ, Yang E, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *New J Chem*. 2013; 37:1157–1173.
30. Kee HL, Diers RJ, Ptaszek M, Muthiah C, Fan D, Bocian DF, Lindsey JS, Culver JP, Holten D. *Photochem Photobiol*. 2009; 85:909–920. [PubMed: 19222800]
31. (a) Christian NA, Milone MC, Ranka SS, Li G, Frail PR, Davis KP, Bates FS, Therien MJ, Ghoroghchian PP, June CH, Hammer DA. *Bioconjugate Chem*. 2007; 18:31–40. (b) Ghoroghchian PP, Frail PR, Susumu K, Park TH, Wu SP, Uyeda HT, Hammer DA, Therien MJ. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2005; 127:15388–15390. [PubMed: 16262400] (c) Ghoroghchian PP, Frail PR, Susumu K, Blessington D, Brannan AK, Bates FS, Chance B, Hammer DA, Therien MJ. 2005; 102:2922–2927. (d) Wu SP, Lee I, Ghoroghchian P, Frail PR, Zheng G, Glickson JD, Therien MJ. *Bioconjugate Chem*. 2005; 16:542–550. (e) Ghoroghchian PP, Frail PR, Susumu K, Park TH, Wu SP, Uyeda HT, Hammer DA, Therien MJ. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2005; 127:15388–15390. [PubMed: 16262400] (f) Ghoroghchian PP, Frail PR, Li G, Zupancich JA, Bates FS, Hammer DA, Therien MJ. *Chem Mat*. 2007; 19:1309–1318. (g) Taratula O, Doddapaneni BS, Schumann C, Li X, Bracha S, Milovancev M, Alani AWG, Taratula O. *Chem Matter*. 2015; 27:6155–6165.
32. (a) Chu M, Li H, Wu Q, Wo F, Shi D. *Biomaterials*. 2014; 35:8357–8373. [PubMed: 25002262] (b) Li Y, Zhang F, Wang X-F, Chen G, Fu X, Tian W, Kitao O, Tamiaki H, Sasaki Si. *Dyes and Pigments*. 2017; 136:17–23.
33. (a) Lemon CM, Karnas E, Han X, Bruns OT, Kempa TJ, Fukumura D, Bavendi MG, Jain RK, Duda DG, Nocera DG. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2015; 137:2176–2180. (b) Kumar R, Ohulchansky TY, Roy I, Gupta SK, Borek C, Thompson ME, Prasad PN. *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces*. 2009; 1:1474–1481. [PubMed: 20355951] (c) Carter KA, Shao S, Hoopes MI, Luo D, Ahsan B, Grigoryants VM, Song W, Huang H, Zhang G, Pandey R, Geng J, Pfeifer BA, Scholes CP, Ortega J, Karttunen M, Lovell JF. *Nat Commun*. 2014; 5:3546. Article Number. [PubMed: 24699423]
34. Aravindu K, Mass O, Vairaprakash P, Springer JW, Yang E, Niedzwiedzki DM, Kirmaier C, Bocian DF, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *Chem Sci*. 2013; 4:3459–3477.
35. Gerola AP, Tsubone TM, Santana A, de Oliveira HPM, Hioka N, Caetano W. *J Phys Chem B*. 2011; 115:7364–7373. [PubMed: 21568354]
36. Agostiano A, Catucci L, Colafemmina G, Scheer H. *J Phys Chem B*. 2002; 106:1446–1454.
37. (a) Saga Y, Saiki T, Takahashi N, Shibata Y, Tamiaki H. *Photochem Photobiol*. 2014; 90:552–559. (b) Miyatake T, Tamiaki H. *Helv Chim Acta*. 1999; 82:797–810. (c) Miyatake T, Tamiaki H, Fujiwara M, Matsushita T. *Bioorg Med Chem*. 2004; 12:2173–2178. [PubMed: 15080917]
38. Fuhrhop J-H, Wang T. *Chem Rev*. 2004; 104:2901–2937. [PubMed: 15186184]
39. Knop K, Hoogenboom R, Fischer D, Schubert U. *Angew Chem Int Ed*. 2010; 49:6288–6308.
40. Brizet B, Bernhardt C, Volkova Y, Rousselin Y, Harvey PD, Goze C, Denat F. *Org Biomol Chem*. 2013; 11:7729–7737. [PubMed: 24113836]
41. Nguyen AL, Bobadova-Parvanova P, Hopfinger M, Fronczek FR, Smith KM, Vicente MGH. *Inorg Chem*. 2015; 54:3228–3236. [PubMed: 25797597]
42. Li G, Bhosale SV, Wang T, Hackbarth S, Roeder B, Siggel U, Fuhrhop J-H. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2003; 125:10693–10702. [PubMed: 12940755]
43. Kappe CO, Van der Eycken E. *Chem Soc Rev*. 2010; 39:1280–1290. [PubMed: 20309486] . Relevant examples of microwave-assisted click reactions: Yalagala RS, Mazinami SA, Maddalena LA, Stuart JA, Yan F, Yan H. *Carbohydrate Res*. 2016; 424:15–20. Desbois N, Pacquelet S, Dubois A, Michelin C, Gros CP. *Beilstein J Org Chem*. 2015; 11:2202–2208. [PubMed: 26664643] Locos OB, Heindl CC, Corral A, Senge MO, Scanlan EM. *Eur J Org Chem*. 2010:1026–1028. Garcia G, Naud-Martin D, Carrez D, Croisy A, Mailard P. *Tetrahedron*. 2011; 67:4924–4932. Bakleh ME, Sol V, Estieu-Gionnet K, Granet R, Délérès G, Krausz P. *Tetrahedron*. 2009; 65:7385–7392.
44. An analogous reaction, utilizing tetraethylene glycol monomethyl ether was reported in ref. 27c.
45. Ahrens J, Haberlag B, Scheja A, Tamm M, Bröring M. *Chem Eur J*. 2014; 20:2901–2912. [PubMed: 24338832]
46. Vegesna GK, Sripathi SR, Zhang J, Zhu S, He W, Luo F-T, Jahng WJ, Frost M, Liu H. *ACS Appl Mater Interface*. 2013; 5:4107–4112.
47. The synthesis of aldehyde 6 was recently reported in ref. 27c.

48. Ptaszek M, Lahaye D, Kraye M, Muthiah C, Lindsey JS. *J Org Chem.* 2010; 75:1659–1673. [PubMed: 20121051]
49. Kraye M, Ptaszek M, Kim H-J, Meneely KR, Fan D, Secor K, Lindsey JS. *J Org Chem.* 2010; 75:1016–1039. [PubMed: 20088604]
50. Yu Z, Ptaszek M. *Org Lett.* 2012; 14:3708–3711. [PubMed: 22783931]
51. Hitosugi S, Tanimoto D, Nakanishi W, Isobe H. *Chem Lett.* 2012; 41:972–973.
52. Sunahara H, Urano Y, Kojima H, Nagano T. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2007; 129:5597–5604. [PubMed: 17425310]
53. Strachan J-P, O'Shea DF, Balasubramanian T, Lindsey JS. *J Org Chem.* 2000; 65:3160–3172. [PubMed: 10814212]
54. Kim H-J, Lindsey JS. *J Org Chem.* 2005:5475–5486. [PubMed: 15989329]
55. (a) Kunieda M, Tamiaki H. *J Org Chem.* 2005; 70:820–828. [PubMed: 15675838] (b) Kunieda M, Mizoguchi T, Tamiaki H. *Photochem Photobiol.* 2004; 79:55–61. [PubMed: 14974716]
56. Li F, Yang SI, Ciringh Y, Seth J, Martin CH III, Singh DL, Kim D, Birge RR, Bocian DF, Holten D, Lindsey JS. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1998; 120:10001–10017.
57. Wasielewski MR. *Chem Rev.* 1992; 92:435–461.
58. Chang CK, Hanson LK, Richardson PF, Young R, Fajer J. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 1981; 78:2652–2656. [PubMed: 16593010]
59. Kang HS, Esemoto NN, Diers J, Niedzwiedzki D, Greco J, Akhigbe J, Yu Z, Pancholi C, Viswanathan BG, Nguyen JK, Kirmaier C, Birge R, Ptaszek M, Holten D, Bocian DF. *J Phys Chem A.* 2016; 120:379–385. [PubMed: 26765839]

Figure 1. Absorption (solid, $c \sim 10 \mu\text{M}$) and emission (dotted, $c \sim 1 \mu\text{M}$) spectra of BODIPY monomers in PBS (pH = 7.4): **BDP1** (black), **BDP2** (green), **BDP3** (red), and **BDP3-COOMe** (blue). All spectra were taken at room temperature.

Figure 2.

Upper panel: absorption spectra of chlorin-BODIPY dyads: **C2-BDP** (black), **C3-BDP** (blue). Lower panel: absorption spectra of bacteriochlorin-BODIPY arrays: **BC2-BDP** (black), **BC3-BDP** (blue), **BC4-BDP** (green), and **BC5-BDP** (red). All spectra were taken in toluene (c ~10 μ M) at room temperature and normalized at the highest band.

Figure 3.

Upper panel: emission spectra of chlorin-BODIPY dyads: **C2-BDP** (black), **C3-BDP** (blue). Lower panel: emission spectra of bacteriochlorin-BODIPY arrays: **BC2-BDP** (black), **BC3-BDP** (blue), **BC4-BDP** (green), and **BC5-BDP** (red). All spectra were taken in toluene ($c \sim 1 \mu\text{M}$) at room temperature, upon excitation at the onset of BODIPY absorption ($\sim 475 \text{ nm}$).

Figure 4.

Rate of photobleaching measured as the decay of absorbance for BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays upon irradiation at the wavelength corresponding to the BODIPY absorption maxima. A – absorbance measured at the maximum of Q_y band upon irradiation, A_0 – initial Q_y band absorbance. For details of measurement see Supporting Information.

Scheme 1.
 Synthesis of **BDP1**.

Scheme 2.

Synthesis of **BDP2** and **BDP2-NH₂**. For APg – see Chart 1.

Scheme 3. Synthesis of **BDP3**. For At – see Chart 1.

Scheme 4.
Synthesis of **BDP3-COOMe**. For At – see Chart 1.

Scheme 5.
Synthesis of dyads **C1-BDP** and **C2-BDP**.

Scheme 6.
Synthesis of dyads **BC1-BDP** and **BC2-BDP**.

Scheme 7.
Synthesis of dyad **BC3-BDP**.

Scheme 8.
Synthesis of dyad **C3-BDP**.

Scheme 9.
Synthesis of intermediates **BC-P-NH₂** and **BC-E-NH₂**.

Scheme 10.

Synthesis of dyad **BC4-BDP** through EDC-mediated coupling.

Scheme 11.
Synthesis of boronic esters **BC-P-B** and **BC-E-B**.

Scheme 12. Synthesis of dyads **BC4-BDP** and **BC5-BDP** through Suzuki cross-coupling.

Chart 1.
Structures of chlorin-BODIPY and bacteriochlorin-BODIPY dyads.

Compound	R ₃	R ₅	X
BDP1	-H	4-HC≡C-C ₆ H ₄ -	-Tp
BDP2	-H	-APg	-F
BDP2-NH₂	4-H ₂ N-C ₆ H ₄ -	-APg	-F
BDP3	-H	-At	-F
BDP3-I	-I	-At	-F
BDP3-COOMe	4-MeOOC-C ₆ H ₄ -	-At	-F

Chart 2.

Structures of novel hydrophilic BODIPY monomers reported here. For -Tp, -APg, and -At, see Chart 1.

Table 1

Absorption and emission properties of BODIPY.

Compound	λ_{abs} PBS (toluene)	λ_{em} PBS (toluene)	Φ_f^a PBS	Φ_f^a toluene	Φ_f^a DMF
BDP1	503 (505)	518 (519)	0.77	0.56	0.56
BDP2	503 (508)	514 (518)	0.25	0.89	0.80
BDP3	504 (507)	517 (520)	1.0	0.97	1.0
BDP3-COOMe	518 (521)	539 (539)	0.82	0.89	0.91
BDP3'	(509)	(520)	nd ^{b)}	1.0	1.0

^{a)} Fluorescence quantum yield was determined using Rhodamine 6G in MeOH ($\Phi_f = 0.88$), upon excitation at blue edge of the absorption band ($\lambda = 480\text{--}490\text{ nm}$).^{b)} Not determined.

Table 2

Absorption and emission properties of BODIPY-hydroporphyrin arrays.^{a)}

Compound	λ_{BODIPY}	λ_{QY}	λ_{em}	Φ_{tot} (ETE) ^{c)}	Φ_{DMF} (ETE) ^{c)}	Φ_{triton} ^{b)} (ETE) ^{c)}	$\Phi_{\text{Tween-20}}$ ^{b)} (ETE) ^{c)}
C1-BDP	503 nm	658 nm	661 nm	0.36 (0.96)	0.21 (0.98)	-	-
C2-BDP	507 nm	658 nm	661 nm	0.35 (0.96)	0.35 (0.95)	0.31 (1.04) ^{d)}	0.33 (1.04) ^{d)}
C3-BDP	523 nm	637 nm	639 nm	0.22 (0.97)	0.22 (0.94)	0.16 (0.95)	0.12 (0.78)
BC1-BDP	505 nm	745 nm	754 nm	0.25 (0.96)	0.07 (0.97)	-	-
BC2-BDP	505 nm	745 nm	754 nm	0.24 (1.00)	0.19 (0.93)	0.20 (1.2) ^{d)}	0.19 (1.12) ^{d)}
BC3-BDP	505 nm	759 nm	766 nm	0.24 (0.99)	0.20 (0.96)	0.19 (1.07) ^{d)}	0.10 (0.84)
BC4-BDP	519 nm	736 nm	744 nm	0.22 (0.90)	0.12 (0.70)	0.12 (0.92)	0.069 (0.80)
BC5-BDP	527 nm	761 nm	767 nm	0.23 (0.91)	0.20 (0.82)	0.14 (1.0)	0.10 (0.83)

^{a)} All wavelength maxima given for measurements obtained in toluene. Quantum yield of fluorescence measured upon excitation at the maxima of BODIPY absorbance, with absorbance at the highest absorption band ~ 0.1 (which corresponds to c.a. 1 μM concentration of dyad).

^{b)} measurements performed in 3 mM Triton X-100 and 0.1% (v/v) of Tween-20 all in PBS (pH = 7.4). Φ_f ($\pm 10\%$) was determined in air-equilibrated solvents, using tetraphenylporphyrin in toluene as a standard ($\Phi = 0.070^{11}$) and corrected for refractive index n of the medium. For all measurements done in aqueous surfactant value $n = 1.45$ was used,¹⁸ as an average between that for pure hydrocarbons (1.49) and pure water (1.39).

^{c)} Efficiency of energy transfer (ETE) is defined as ratio of the Φ_f measured upon excitation at the maximum of BODIPY absorbance to the Φ_f measured upon excitation at the maximum of B band of hydroporphyrin.

^{d)} In some cases ETE in aqueous micelles exceed 1.00, which may be a result of experimental uncertainty. Alternatively, it is possible, that due to localization of BODIPY and hydroporphyrin in environment of different refractive index, the intensity of light was slightly different for excitation of both components, despite identical illumination of bulk sample.