Accepted Manuscript

Ag(I) camphor complexes: Antimicrobial activity by design



M. Fernanda N.N. Carvalho, Silvestre Leite, Joana P. Costa, Adelino M. Galvão, Jorge H. Leitão

PII:	S0162-0134(19)30380-0
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinorgbio.2019.110791
Article Number:	110791
Reference:	JIB 110791
To appear in:	Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry
Received date:	5 June 2019
Revised date:	19 July 2019
Accepted date:	21 July 2019

Please cite this article as: M.F.N.N. Carvalho, S. Leite, J.P. Costa, et al., Ag(I) camphor complexes: Antimicrobial activity by design, Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinorgbio.2019.110791

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Ag(I) camphor complexes: antimicrobial activity by design

M. Fernanda N.N. Carvalho,*^a Silvestre Leite, ^{a,b} Joana P. Costa, ^a Adelino M. Galvão, ^a Jorge H.

Leitão*^{,b}

^a Centro de Química Estrutural, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Rovisco Pais,

1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal. E-mail: fcarvalho@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

^b Instituto de Bioengenharia e Biociências, Departamento de Bioengenharia, Instituto Superior Técnico

Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Rovisco Pais, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal.

(*) Corresponding author:

M. Fernanda N.N. Carvalho , Centro de Química Estrutural, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Rovisco Pais, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal. E-mail: fcarvalho@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

Abstract

Eleven new complexes of general formula $[Ag(NO_3)(L)_2]$ corresponding to Ag(I) camphorimine complexes $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NY)_2]$ (Y=NMe₂ (1); OH (2); C₆H₅ (3); 4-MeC₆H₄ (4); 3,5-(CH₃)₂C₆H₃ (5); $3-OHC_6H_4$, (6); $3-CIC_6H_4$ (7); $4-CIC_6H_4$ (8); $4-FC_6H_4$ (9); $4-CF_3C_6H_4$ (10)) and the camphor sulforylimine complex [Ag(NO₃)(O₂SNC₁₀H₁₄NY)₂] (Y=NH₂) were synthesized/characterized and their structural properties and antibacterial activity studied to gain insights into the structure-antimicrobial activity relationships. Five of the complexes were selected as representative examples and structures were optimized by Density functional theory calculations. The results show that the imine substituents (Y) at the camphor ligands drive the structure of the complexes from distorted octahedral to trigonal prismatic or linear ionic while the effect of the sulfonylimine ring does not appreciably affects the geometry of the complex. The lipophilicity and polarity which are important parameters concerning the biological activity of the complexes are also high dependent of the characteristics of the camphor ligands. The redox properties of the complexes studied by cyclic voltammetry showed that their reduction potentials are essentially independent of their electronic and steric properties. The antibacterial activity of all the complexes, against Gram-positive (S. aureus Newman) and Gramnegative (Escherichia coli ATCC25922, Pseudomonas aeruginosa 477, Burkholderia contaminans IST408) strains was evaluated through calculation of MIC values. Results show that complexes with camphor imine ligands (1-10) that combine high lipophylicity with low dipolar moment (3-5) exhibit enhanced antibacterial activity. The ability to establish hydrogen bonding emerged as an important contribution to the antibacterial activity of the camphor sulphonylimine complex **11** (Y=NH₂).

Keywords: Antibacterials, silver complexes, camphorimines, Gram-positive bacteria, Gram-negative bacteria, structure-activity relationships.

Introduction

Complexes are chemical entities where metal and ligands bind to afford compounds with properties distinct from their precursors. Through the choice of the metal and the design of the ligands it is possible to drive the properties, reactivity and applications of the complexes. The characteristics of the metal are of utmost relevance concerning the biological interactions and toxicity of the complex.

Silver antiseptic properties are known since long ago. For instance, Hippocrates used silver in wound care, and the ancient Egyptians used silver vessels to preserve the quality of the drinking water. Due to its antimicrobial properties and general non-adverse effects for humans, silver and silver derivatives are presently used mainly as antimicrobials.¹ Examples of medical uses of silver compounds include coating of bandages to protect burns and wounds, coating of catheters as well as medical devices. ^{1,2,3} Non-medical uses may be found for example on coating of polyethylene fabrics for food packing.⁴ A recent review reported that *ca*. fifty antimicrobial products based on silver were industrially patented.⁵

Silver ions (Ag⁺) are highly toxic to microorganisms, while the reduced form (Ag⁰) is relatively inert.⁶ The broad spectrum of antimicrobial activities of silver ions is due to the non-specific mechanisms that include the ability to bind to DNA, proteins and thiol groups, and generation of intracellular reactive oxygen species. These non-specific mechanisms interfere with enzymes and membrane proteins such as those involved in electron transport and energy generation and membrane ion exchange systems.^{7,8} Recent studies highlighted that electron transfer processes⁹ and interaction with efflux pumps¹⁰ are important aspects in the antimicrobial activity of silver compounds. Yan and colleagues have recently reported the use of proteomics to investigate the cellular responses of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* to silver nanoparticles. These authors found a total of 59 proteins as being

regulated by silver, 5 of them involved in silver binding. Furthermore, the main pathways found as being involved in the antibacterial activity of silver nanoparticles were interference with the cell membrane functions, and the generation of intracellular reactive oxygen species.⁷ In complexes, the characteristics of the ligands and the silver ions (Ag⁺) combine, sometimes enhancing the antimicrobial activity of the complex compared to the silver precursors (e.q. AgNO₃), even when the free ligand is not active as in the case of camphor derivatives.¹¹ How the metal and the ligands cooperate to enhance the antimicrobial activity of the complexes remains unclear, although there is some consensus that the silver ion must be involved in the generation of reactive oxidative species, binding to DNA, interaction with cell membranes or the thiol groups of vital enzymes.⁹ The ligands are thus thought to provide the complexes with characteristics suitable to act as carriers to deliver the silver ion into the cell. Therefore, complexes with weak binding ligands (nitrogen or oxygen) are expected to perform better than those with ligands that bind tightly to silver (phosphorus or sulphur). Such assumption is supported by a considerable number of Ag(I) complexes with N or O binding ligands reported as having antimicrobial properties.¹² Additionally, the formation of strong Ag-S bonds enabling the replacement of iron or zinc from proteins at the cell wall is one of the processes considered as responsible for silver antimicrobial activity.¹³

Silver complexes with N-type ligands (camphor imines) fulfil the conditions to suitably deliver silver ions to the microbial cell. In fact, these complexes display relevant antimicrobial properties as corroborated by the high to moderate antibacterial or very high antifungal activities.^{14,15} The characteristics of the camphor imine substituents (Y) in the delivery process of Ag(I) to the cells is still to understand. The results obtained till now point to distinct mechanisms underlying the antimicrobial activity of camphor imine silver complexes towards bacteria or fungi, since the complex with the highest antibacterial activity is distinct from that with the highest antifungal activity. We have also

concluded that a geometry-activity relationship may exist, since complexes that differ just in the *meta* and *orto* position of the substituent at the aromatic ring in the camphor ligand, have considerably different antimicrobial activities. However, parameters such as hydrogen bridging, electron delocalization or the hydrophobic/hydrophilic character of the ligands are still to be evaluated. In the present work, new complexes were synthesized and their antibacterial activity was evaluated. The compounds were designed to get insights into the relationships between structural and electronic properties (hydrogen bridging, electron delocalization, and hydrophobicity/hydrophilicity) and antibacterial activity.

Results and discussion

Synthesis and characterization

A selection of camphor derivatives of the imine, hydrazone or sulphonyl imine types having distinct structural and electronic properties were used as ligands (Figure 1) to prepare eleven new complexes that differ in the mono camphor character from those whose antimicrobial properties were studied before.¹⁴





CAMPHOR IMINE Y= OH (²L); C₆H₅ (³L); 4-MeC₆H₄ (⁴L); 3,5-Me₂C₆H₃ (⁵L);3-OHC₆H₄ (⁶L); 3-CIC₆H₄ (⁷L); 4-CIC₆H₄ (⁸L); 4-FC₆H₄ (⁹L); 4-CF₃C₆H₄ (¹⁰L); CAMPHOR HYDRAZONE Y=NMe₂ (¹L)

CAMPHOR SULPHONYLIMINE Y= NH_2 (¹¹L) or NMe_2 (¹²L)

Figure 1 – Camphor imine (right) and camphor sulphonylimine (left) type-ligands used in this study

The structural characterization of the camphor imine ($OC_{10}H_{14}NY$) ligands Y=4-CH₃C₆H₄ and Y=3-ClC₆H₄ was made by X-rays diffraction analysis and their ORTEP drawings and their relevant bond lengths and angles are depicted in Figure 2 (cif file is available from CCDC).



Figure 2 - ORTEP drawings (ellipsoids with 25% probability) for camphor ligands OC₁₀H₁₄NY: a) Y=4-CH₃C₆H₄, [C=O, 120.5(3) pm; CN, 127.4(3) pm]; b) Y=3-ClC₆H₄. [C=O, 119.7(39) pm; CN 126.5(3) pm]

The new complexes fit in the formula $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NY)_2]$ (Y=NMe₂, **1**; OH, **2**; C₆H₅, **3**; 4-MeC₆H₄, **4**; 3,5-(CH₃)₂C₆H₃), **5**; 3-OHC₆H₄, **6**; 3-ClC₆H₄, **7**; 4-ClC₆H₄, **8**; 4-FC₆H₄, **9**; 4-CF₃C₆H₄, **10**) or $[Ag(NO_3)(O_2SNC_{10}H_{14}NNH_2)_2]$ (**11**) that essentially differ in the imine (**1-10**) or sulfonylimine (**11**) character of the camphor ligand (Figure 2).

The choice of the substituents (Y) at position 3 of the camphor skeleton (see number labelling at Figure 1) was directed towards the synthesis of complexes where hydrogen (2, 6, 11) or halide (7-10) could facilitate biological interactions due to the distinct electronic and/or geometric characteristics of the complexes. Complexes 2-10 are of the imine type (-C=N-R) while complexes 1 and 11 are of the hydrazone type (-C=N-NR₂) and complex 11 is of the sulphonylimine type (Figure 1). Complex 12 was also synthesized for comparative purposes since its structural characterization by X-rays¹¹ was obtained before. A relevant parameter concerning the interaction of compounds with the cells is their lipophilic/hydrophilic character. Lipophilic compounds can diffuse through the cytoplasmic membrane while the hydrophilic compounds do not. The characteristics of the camphor substituent (Y) may prompt considerably different lipophilicities as predicted from log P = log [octanol]/[water] calculated using ACDC software, thus tune the activity of the complex.

The complexes were characterized by elemental analysis (EA) and spectroscopic techniques (FTIR, NMR). According to the elemental analysis all complexes fit in the 2:1 ligand to metal ratio. By FTIR the camphor imine complexes (**1-10**) display bands in the ranges typical stretching frequencies for C=O (v_{CO} , 1707-1754 cm⁻¹) and C=N (v_{CN} , 1577-1654 cm⁻¹). The camphor sulphonylimine complex (**11**) displays two IR bands in the region of C=N stretching with values that differ considerably (C=NSO₂, 1637 cm⁻¹; C=N-N, 1575 cm⁻¹) due to the distinct electronic properties of the sulphonylimine and the hydrazone groups. Additional IR bands (1379-1385 cm⁻¹) evidence the nitrate (NO₃⁻) group. By ¹³C NMR the carbon atom of the *keto* (position 2, Figure 2) and the imine (position 3, Figure 2) groups of the camphor ligands display chemical shifts in the narrow ranges of 204-207 ppm (**1-10**) and 173-175 ppm (**2-9**), respectively. The chemical shifts of the carbon atoms (*C*=N-N: 145.2 ppm, **1**; 155.0 ppm, **10**; 141.8 ppm, **11**) of the hydrazone type complexes are lower than those of the imine groups evidencing a higher shielding. The chemical shift of the sulphonylimine carbon atom (*C*=N-SO₂: 186.4,

11) is between the hydrazone and keto groups suggesting intermediate electron densities. The analytical and spectroscopic characteristics of the camphor hydrazone complexes (**1** and **11**) fit well in the chalice-type structural arrangement found for $[Ag(NO_3)(O_2SNC_{10}H_{13}NNMe_2)_2]$ (**12**).¹¹

The coordination of the camphor imine/hydrazone ligands to silver can involve the imine nitrogen atom as found for $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{13}NC_6H_4NC_{10}H_{13}O)]^{16}$ (Figure 3a), combined imine/keto as found for $[(CuCl)_2(Me_2NNC_{10}H_{14}O)]_n^{17}$ or the *keto* group may enable coordination to the same (Figure 3b) or sequential (Figure 3c) silver atoms as found for metals of group 10.¹⁸



Figure 3- Types of coordination of camphor imines: a)- mono-hapto; b)- di-hapto; c)- bridging The characteristics of the imine substituent (Y), tunes the structural arrangement and may play a role in the interactions of the complex with the biological cell. Computational calculations were conducted to optimize the geometries of a selection of complexes in order to ascertain on the effect of different Y groups in the biological activity, if any.

Calculations

Compounds 1- 4, 8 and 12 were selected as representative of the different types of the Ag(I) camphor complexes under study and their geometries were optimized by DFT.

In the case of complexes with aromatic substituents (**3**, **4** and **8**) the aim was the study of the effect of the electron donor or donor characteristics of the substituent on the structural/antibacterial properties of the complexes.

The calculated and experimental data (obtained by X-Ray diffraction analysis)¹⁰ for complex $[Ag(NO_3)(O_2SNC_{10}H_{13}NNMe_2)_2]$ (**12**) are in good agreement (Table 1). The optimized relevant distances and angles for the selected complexes are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1 – Calculated distances / angles and dipole moment for complexes $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NY)_2]$ (1-4, 8) and $[Ag(NO_3)(O_2SNC_{10}H_{13}NNMe_2)_2]$ (12)

Distance (Å) /				Y		
Angles (°)	NMe ₂ (1)	OH (2)	C ₆ H₅ (3)	4-MeC ₆ H ₅ (4)	4-CIC ₆ H ₅ (8)	NMe ₂ (12)
Ag-N(Y)	2.39/2.47	2.23	2.28/2.33	2.28/2.34	2.28/2.34	2.83
Ag-Z ^a	2.59/2.66	2.75/2.85	2.84/2.92	2.84/2.89	2.84/2.91	2.32 (2.40) ^b
Ag-O1 _(NO3)	2.40	2.70	2.41	2.42	2.42	2.45
Ag-O2 _(NO3)	2.67	2.74	2.69	2.69	2.68	2.45
C=N	131	129	129	129	129	129
C=O	126	125	125	125	125	-
N-Ag-N	144.8	160.3	144.4	143.8	144.6	136.1 (138.2)
Z-Ag-Z ^a	82.3	77.8	68.2	70.1	68.4	91.8
Z-Ag-O	167.9/136.5	139.4/132.7	162.5/144.2	158.4/148.8	162.2/144.2	128.7/127.7
Dipole (D)	10.00	10.03	11.37	11.37	14.11	15.40

^a Z=O or N. ^b Experimental data obtained by X-rays diffraction analysis.¹¹

According to the calculated bond lengths and angles, the geometry of the Ag(I) complexes vary from octahedral (1, 12) to trigonal prismatic (3, 4, 8) or linear ionic (2). At complexes 1 and 12 (hydrazone type) the camphor ligands act as bidentate through the nitrogen of the imine and the oxygen atoms of the ketone groups (1) or through the nitrogen atoms of the imine and sulphonylimine groups (12) within a chalice-type arrangement (Figure 2). The coordination sphere is completed by the NO₃⁻ group that acts as a bidentate O-O ligand such as in the high distorted octahedral silver-nitrate complex

 $[Ag(NO_3)L_2]$ (L=2-(bis(methylthio)methylene)-1-phenylbutane-1,3-dione. ¹⁹ Distortion from the octahedral geometry is lower in **1** (imine type) than in **12** (sulphonylimine type) (Figure 4).



Figure 4 – Calculated structures for $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{13}NY)_2]$ (1) and $[Ag(NO_3)(O_2SNC_{10}H_{13}NY)_2]$ (12) (Y=NMe₂)

At complexes **3**, **4** and **8** of the camphor imine ligands that differ in the characteristics of the substituent (Y, aromatic) at the camphor skeleton, the ligands behave as mono dentate binding to silver through the imine nitrogen atoms with bond lengths that do not differ in the three complexes (Table 1). The oxygen atom of the camphor ketone group occupies a close non-binding distance such as in group 10 (Pd, Pt) complexes.²⁰ The geometries tend to trigonal prismatic (Figure 5).



-

10

Figure 5 – Calculated structures for $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{13}NY)_2]$ (Y=C₆H₅, **3**; 4-MeC₆H₄, **4**; 4-ClC₆H₄, **8**)

According to calculations, complex **2** (Y=OH) shows a considerably high cationic character (Q=0.67). Therefore, the interaction of the nitrate group with the metal has an essentially outer sphere (non-bonding) character (Figure 6).



Figure 6 – Calculated structure for $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{13}NOH)_2]$ (2)

Results from calculations clearly evidence that the characteristics of the camphor substituents (Y) drive the geometry and the coordination numbers (NC) of the complexes as well as the dipole moment (Table 1). The coordination number varies from six (octahedral) to three (trigonal prismatic) or two (linear) fostering a variable number of coordinative vacant positions and interactions with the microbial cell wall. The dipole moment drives the polarity of the complexes which is of utmost relevance to biological interactions.

Structure - antibacterial activity relationships

Bacteria are commonly divided in Gram-positive and Gram-negative categories according to the characteristics of their cell wall. Both are composed of a cell membrane or cytoplasmitc membrane, which is surrounded by a thick layer of peptidoglycan and teichoic acids in the case of Gram-positive

bacteria, while in the case of Gram-negative bacteria, a thin layer of peptidoglycan is contained in the periplasmic space that is surrounded by an outer membrane to which lipopolysaccharides are anchored. Gram-negative therefore have an additional barrier to antimicrobials which provides an extra protective layer keeping the vital role of material exchanges with the exterior of the cell. In order to gain insights into the relationships between structure of the silver camphor imine complexes and their antibacterial activity both Gram-negative and Gram positive bacteria were included in this study.

A relevant parameter concerning the interaction of compounds with the bacterial cell membrane is their lipophilic/hydrophilic character. Lipophilic compounds can cross the cytoplasmic membrane by diffusion while hydrophilic compounds need to be transported through the membrane to reach intracellular targets. At complexes, the substituent (Y) at the camphor imine ligand (Figure 1) may prompt considerably different lipophilicities, as predicted from log P = log [octanol]/[water] (using ACDC software), thus tuning the antibacterial activity of the complex.

The antibacterial properties of the complexes $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NY)_2]$ (1-10) and $[Ag(NO_3)(O_2SNC_{10}H_{13}NY)_2]$ (11,12) towards the Gram-positive *Staphylococcus aureus* Newman, and the Gram-negative *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* 477, *Escherichia coli* ATCC25922, and *Burkholderia contaminans* IST408, were assessed by determining the MIC values by microplate dilution assay and by fitting the data with a modified Gompertz equation as previously described.¹⁶ All complexes display antibacterial activities (Tables 2 and 3).

12

					MIC (µg/mL)		
	LIGAND Y	E_p^{red} Volt ^a	E. coli ATCC25922	P. aeruginosa 477	B. contaminans IST408	S. aureus Newman	Log P ^b
1	NMe ₂		58	54	41	134	0.97 ± 0.60
2	ОН	0.11	51	52	59	119	1.06 ± 0.59
3	C_6H_5	0.12	59	55	91	54	2.94 ± 0.58
4	4-MeC ₆ H ₄		37	53	66	55	3.40 ± 0.58
5	3,5-Me ₂ C ₆ H ₃	0.11	40	52	105	47	3.86 ± 0.59
6	3-OHC ₆ H ₄	0.074	52	53	75	113	2.36 ± 0.59
7	3-CIC ₆ H ₄	0.044	53	53	44	110	3.65 ± 0.59
8	4-CIC ₆ H ₄	0.12	52	55	57	151	3.78 ± 0.59
9	4-FC ₆ H ₄	0.097	59	53	77	93	3.24 ± 0.62
10	$4-CF_3C_6H_4$	0.11	52	60	55	105	3.91 ± 0.61

Table 2 – Data for complexes $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NY)_2]$

^a Potential in Volt (±10 mV) vs sce. ^b Partition coefficient in octanol/water predicted using ACDC software.

Table 3 - Data for complexes [Ag(NO₃)(O₂SNC₁₀H₁₃NY)₂]

	X				MIC (μg/mL)		
	LIGAND Y	$m{E}_p^{red}$ Volta	E. coli ATCC25922	P. aeruginosa 477	B. contaminans IST408	S. aureus Newman	Log P ^b
11	NH ₂	0.10	52	36	38	114	-0.99 ± 0.69
12	NMe ₂	0.17	107	108	56	257	-0.69 ± 0.70
	[Ag(NO ₃)]	0.18	47	39	74	73	_

^a Potencial in Volt (±10 mV) vs sce. ^b Predicted partition coefficient in octanol/water using ACDC software.

A first insight into table 2 shows that the antimicrobial activity of the complexes (1-10) towards P. aeruginosa is almost independent of the characteristics of the camphor ligands and the structure of the complexes, in contrast to the other bacterial strains. Such behaviour points to the mechanisms underlying the antimicrobial activity of the complexes towards *P. aeruginosa* as being essentially distinct from those towards E. coli, S. aureus or B. contaminans (Tables 2). A Pseudomonas-specific process apparently overwhelms other mechanisms involved in the antimicrobial activity of the silver camphorimine complexes and drives a structure-independent process while for the other strains the characteristics of the complexes modulated their antibacterial activity. A trait specific of *P. aeruginosa* strains is their ability to secrete pyocyanin, a redox active compound involved in the activation of molecular oxygen and formation of hydrogen peroxide. A recent study by Muller⁶ showed that the silver ion (Ag⁺) competes with molecular oxygen by electron transfer from pyocyanin and concomitantly decreases the production of hydrogen peroxide from molecular oxygen. A redox process mediated by pyocyanin leading to $Ag^+ \rightarrow Ag^0$ reduction, decomposition of the camphorimine complex and generation of a naked silver species (conceivably of the nano size) can explain the complexes-independent anti-P. aeruginosa activity. To support such proposal the redox properties of a selection of the complexes were studied by cyclic voltammetry. The results show that the potentials at which the silver metal sites reduce (Tables 2 and 3) are slightly higher than the potential at which pyocyanin oxidizes (E=-0.34 V)⁶ thus accounting for a favourable redox process between them. Such process conceivably buffers the activity of the complexes due to less Ag⁺ ion being available to promote electron capture and cell wall impairment which is one of the mechanisms responsible for the antimicrobial action of silver compounds.²¹ That is not the case of the camphor sulphonylimine complexes **11** and **12** that reveal structural dependent activity towards *P. aeruginosa*. Complex **11** exhibits MIC values almost 3 times lower than complex 12 (36 and 108 µg/mL, respectively, Table 3).

The main structural difference between **11** and **12** refers to the Y group at the amine substituent (Figure 1) that at complex **11** (Y=NH₂) is prone to establish hydrogen bonding with carboxyl or amino groups of proteins or other molecular components of the bacterial cells enabling the anti-bacterial activity of the complex against *P. aeruginosa*. Non-covalent bonding is less feasible in the case of **12** (Y=NMe₂) thus the antibacterial activity is much lower. Further support to hydrogen bonding relevance towards the antibacterial activity of the complexes is obtained from the MIC values of complexes **11** and **12** (Table 3) where **11** performs better than complex **12** for the Gram-positive and Gram-negative strains studied. From the set of complexes under study, complexes **2** (Y=OH) and **6** (C_6H_4OH) could in principle establish hydrogen bridges with the cell components. However, the cationic character / linear geometry of **2** and the low acidity of **6** (due to electron delocalization through the aromatic ring) decrease hydrogen bonding establishment.

Complexes **3-5** display the lowest MIC values towards the Gram-positive *S. aureus* which are *ca.* half of the values calculated for complexes **6-10** (Table 2). Since, the geometry of complexes **3-10** is trigonal prismatic according to calculations (Figure 5) their distinct activities must rely on the characteristics of the aromatic imine group (Figure 1) that is essentially non-polar [C₆H₄R: R=4-H (**3**), R=4-Me (**4**), R=3,5-Me₂ (**5**)] or polar [R=3-OH (**6**), R=3-Cl (**7**), R=4-Cl (**8**), R=4-F (**9**), R=4-CF₃ (**10**)]. Complexes **1-10** perform better towards *Gram-negative* than *Gram-positive* bacteria, except complexes **3-5** that display similar activities towards *S. aureus*, *E. coli* and *P. aeruginosa* (Table 2). In fact, complexes **4** and **5** display the lowest MIC values towards Gram-negative *E. coli* (37 and 40

μg/mL, respectively) and additionally **5** displays the lowest value against *S. aureus* (47 μg/mL). These data points to high lipophilicity (estimated^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} through calculation of logP values, Table 2 and 3) associated with low polarity as structural features favouring the antibacterial activity of the silver complexes. High lipophilicity enables molecules to cross the membrane by diffusion to reach

the bacterial cytoplasm ²² while hydrophilic compounds such as β -lactams need to use the outer membrane porins or other transport systems to gain access to the interior of the bacterial cell.

The activity of the silver camphor imine complexes (1-12) towards *B. contaminans* contrasts with the above mentioned, since low lipophilicity irrespectively of the polarity, tends to favours the antimicrobial activity of the complexes (1, 2, 11, 12) with hydrogen bridging also playing a role in the process, as observed for complex 11 that displays the lowest MIC values towards *B. contaminans* (Table 3). This strain belongs to a large group of species known as the Burkholderia cepacia complex, characterized by possessing large genomes encoding more than 7500 genes and encompassing numerous membrane transport systems which might be "highjacked" by hydrophilic camphor complexes.²³

The results presented herein show that bacterial resistance to antimicrobials is multifactorial and often strain-specific including intrinsic resistance as a result of structural features such as poor membrane permeability, constitutive expression of efflux pumps, high resistance due to the acquisition of resistance genes or genetic modifications and active efflux mechanisms.²⁴

The antimicrobial activities of complexes **1-12** reflect the differences in the mechanisms used by each strain to resist to the antimicrobials and additionally show that the relationships between the structures of the complexes and their activity are highly dependent of the strain. Therefore, generalization is not possible since a wide variety of mechanisms can be used by each bacterial stain, the compounds they secret, electron transfer processes between the cell and the complexes and many other parameters. However, it is evident from the herein results that the activity of the Ag(I) camphor imine can be tuned towards Gram-positive or Gram-negative bacteria through design of the camphor ligands.

16

Conclusions

Two sets of new silver camphor complexes [Ag(NO₃)(L)₂], that essentially differ on the ligands [camphor imine (OC₁₀H₁₄NY); camphor sulphonylimine (SO₂NC₁₀H₁₄NY)] were designed, synthesized/characterized and their antibacterial properties evaluated through calculation of the MIC values. All complexes display antimicrobial activity towards Gram-positive (*Staphylococcus aureus Newman*) and Gram-negative bacteria (*Pseudomonas aeruginosa* 477, *Escherichia coli* ATCC 25922, *Burkholderia contaminans* IST408) with magnitudes that vary according to the characteristics of the substituent (Y) of the camphor imine ligand and the bacteria strain.

The structures of a selection of complexes (1-4, 8 and 12) were optimized by Density Functional Theory. Data revealed that the geometries considerably vary according to the substituent (Y) at the imine group (NY). Hydrazone type substituents (Y=NR₂) prompt complexes with octahedral distorted geometries (1, 12) and coordination number equal to six due to cooperative binding of the nitrogen and oxygen atoms of the imine ligand (1) or the two nitrogen atoms of the sulphonylimine ligand (12), while nitrate (NO₃⁻) binds through two oxygen atoms. Complex 2 (Y=OH) has a cationic character with a linear geometry, the ligand binding the silver atom through the imine nitrogen atom, the NO₃⁻ ion occupying the outer sphere of the complex. Complexes 3, 4 and 8 display trigonal prismatic geometries (Y=C₆H₄R) with the ligands (L) binding the metal through the nitrogen atom and the nitrate through one of the oxygen atoms.

As a general trend, the Ag(I) complexes (1-12) perform better towards Gram-negative than Grampositive bacteria. Exceptions are complexes 3-5 that display similar MIC values for *P. aeruginosa*, *E. coli* and *S. aureus*. The combined high lipophilicity and low polarity of complexes 3-5 is considered to enhance their activity towards *S. aureus*. These parameters also seem relevant for the lowest MIC

values displayed by complexes **4** and **5** against *E. coli*. Hydrogen bonding in **11** is considered to account for the enhanced activity against *P. aeruginosa* (MIC, 36 μ g/mL) and *B. contaminans* (MIC, 38 μ g/mL) compared to the related complex **12**.

In contrast to the sensitivity of the geometry and the antibacterial activity of the complexes to the electronic and steric characteristics of the imine substituents (Y), Y-independent antibacterial activity of complexes **1-10** was found towards *P. aeruginosa*. Such behaviour was attributed to reduction of the silver site by the redox active pyocyanin secreted by *P. aeruginosa*. Such electron transfer process is feasible according to the redox potentials of the complexes measured by cyclic voltammetry.

In what concerns the geometry and the antimicrobial activity of the complexes no direct relationship was found, however, there is a relationship between the characteristics of the camphor imine substituents (Y) the geometry and the antibacterial activity of the complexes (1-10). Complexes with camphor imine ligands combining high lipophilicity with low dipolar moment (3-5) exhibit low MIC values, thus high activity towards Gram-positive *S. aureus*, while camphor imine complexes with high polarity (6-10) perform better towards Gram-negative bacteria. The high polarity and low lipophilicity of the camphor sulphonylimine complexes (11, 12) apparently favour the activity against Gram-negative bacteria with further enhancement due hydrogen bonding in the case of complex 11. Therefore, the rational design of complexes driving their activity towards Gam-positive or Gram-negative is feasible through choice of the suitable substituent (Y) of the camphor imine or camphor sulphonylimine ligand.

Experimental

The complexes were synthesized under nitrogen using Schlenk and vacuum techniques. Camphor ligands ($OC_{10}H_{14}NY$: Y=OH, C₆H₅, NH₂, NMe₂ and O₂SNC₁₀H₁₄NNH₂) were prepared according to

reported procedures.²⁵ Silver nitrate, (1*R*)-(+)-camphor, (1*S*)-(+)-10-sulfonic acid and amines were purchased from Sigma Aldrich. Acetonitrile (PA grade) was purchased from Carlo Erba purified by conventional techniques²⁶ and distilled before use. The FTIR spectra were obtained from KBr pellets using a JASCO FT/IR 4100 spectrometer. The NMR spectra (¹H, ¹³C, ¹⁹F, DEPT, HSQC and HMBC) were obtained from CD₂Cl₂, CD₃CN, Acetone-d₆ or CDCl₃ solutions using a Bruker Avance II+ (300 or 400 MHz) spectrometers. NMR chemical shifts are referred to TMS (δ = 0 ppm). The redox properties were studied by cyclic voltammetry using a three compartments cell equipped with a Pt wire electrode and interfaced with a VoltaLab PST050 equipment. The cyclic voltammograms were obtained using NBu₄BF₄ as electrolyte (0.10 M) in CH₃CN. The potentials were measured in Volts (± 10 mV) *versus* SCE at 200 mV/s using (Fe(η⁵-C₅H₅)₂]^{0/+} ($E_{1/2}^{red}$ =0.382 V; CH₃CN) as internal reference.

Synthesis

Camphor derivatives

The new camphor imines were obtained from camphorquinone by reaction with the appropriate amine or hydrazine in ethanol, using Forster procedures²⁷ and improvements.^{11,28,29}

Characterization details:

$OC_{10}H_{14}NC_{6}H_{4}CH_{3}-4$

Elem. Anal. (%) for $C_{17}H_{21}NO$: Found.: C, 80.4; N, 5.5 H, 8.3. Calc.: C, 80.0; N, 5.5; H, 8.2.IR (cm⁻¹): 1748 (C=O), 1652 (C=N). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 7.15 (d, *J*=8.0 Hz, 2H); 6.84 (d, *J*=8.0 Hz, 2H); 2.84 (d, *J*=4.7 Hz, 1H); 2.33 (s, 3H); 2.17-2.01 (m, 1H); 1.91-1.77 (m, 1H); 1.72-1.55 (m, 2H) 1.08 (s, 3H); 0.96 (s, 3H); 0.87 (s, 3H). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 206.3 (C=O); 171.4 (C=N); 146.6, 135.4 (CPh_{ipso}); 129.6, 120.9 (CPh); 58.0 (C1); 50.2 (C4); 44.8 (C7); 30.2 (C6); 24.4 (C5); 21.0, 17.6 (C9, C10); 9.1 (C8).

OC₁₀H₁₄NC₆H₃(CH₃)₂-3,5

Elem. Anal. (%) for C₁₈H₂₃ON: Found.: C, 80.3; N, 5.5; H, 9.0. Calc.: C, 80.3; N, 5.2; H, 8.6; IR (cm⁻¹): 1748 (C=O); 1663 (C=N); 1601 (Ph); ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 6.79 (s, 1H); 6.50 (s, 2H); 2.80 (d, *J*=4.7 Hz, 1H); 2.29 (s, 6H); 2.10-2.01 (m, 1H); 1.88-1.78 (m, 1H); 1.68-1.56 (m, 2H); 1.08 (s, 3H); 0.96 (s, 3H); 0.88 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 206.6 (C=O); 171.4 (C=N); 149.6, 138.6 (CPh_{ipso}); 126.9, 117.9 (CPh); 58.1 (C1); 50.1 (C4); 44.5 (C7); 30.1, 24.4 (C5, C6); 21.4 ((CH₃)₂); 21.0, 17.5 (C9, C10); 9.1 (C8).

$OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_4OH-3$

Elem. Anal. (%) for $C_{16}H_{19}O_2N \cdot 1/5H_2O$: Found.: C, 73.6; N, 5.7; H, 7.6. Calc.: C, 73.7; N, 5.4; H, 7.4. IR (cm⁻¹): 3361 (OH); 1748 (C=O); 1666 (C=N); 1580 (Ph). ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 7.17 (t, *J*=8.0 Hz, 1H); 6.64 (d, *J*=8.0 Hz, 1H); 6.47-6.38 (m, 2H); 2.82 (d, *J*= 4.7 Hz, 1H); 2.11-2.01 (m, 1H); 1.88-1.77 (m, 1H); 1.68-1.53 (m, 2H); 1.07 (s, 3H); 0.96 (s, 3H); 0.87 (s, 3H). ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 206.5 (C=O); 172.2 (C=N); 156.5, 150.7 (CPh_{ipso}); 130.0, 112.6, 112.3, 107.8 (CPh); 58.2 (C1); 50.2 (C4); 44.5 (C7); 30.1, 24.4 (C5, C6); 21.0, 17.5 (C9, C10); 9.0 (C8).

$OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_4CF_3\text{-}4$

Elem. Anal. (%) for C₁₇H₁₈F₃ON·¼H₂O: Found.: C, 64.8; N, 4.6; H, 5.5. Calc.: C, 65.1; N, 4.5; H, 5.9;IR (cm⁻¹): 1752 (C=O); 1672 (C=N); 1609 (Ph); 1325, 1112 (CF₃); ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 7.60 (d, *J*=8.3 Hz, 2H); 6.94 (d, *J*=8.3 Hz, 2H); 2.70 (d, *J*=4.6 Hz, 1H); 2.13-2.02 (m, 1H); 1.93-1.80 (m, 1H); 1.73-1.51 (m, 2H); 1.10 (s, 3H); 0.97 (s, 3H); 0.91 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 205.8 (C=O); 173.2 (C=N); 152.9, 126.9 (CPh_{ipso}); 126.3 (q, J=3.8 Hz) (CF₃); 120.0 (CPh); 58.2 (C1); 50.1 (C4); 44.5 (C7); 30.0, 24.4 (C5, C6); 21.1, 17.4 (C9, C10); 9.0 (C8).

$OC_{10}H_{14}NC_{6}H_{4}F-4$

Elem. Anal. (%) for C₁₆H₁₈ONF·½H₂O: Found.: C, 71.4; N, 5.7; H, 7.0. Calc.: C, 71.6; N, 5.2; H, 7.1; IR (cm⁻¹): 1747 (C=O); 1655 (C=N); 1591 (Ph); ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 7.05 (t, *J*=8.3 Hz, 2H); 6.94-6.89 (m,

2H); 2.82 (d, *J*=4.6 Hz, 1H); 2.15-2.06 (m, 1H); 1.91-1.82 (m, 1H); 1.71-1.56 (m, 2H); 1.09 (s, 3H); 0.98 (s, 3H); 0.88 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 206.2 (C=O); 172.1 (C=N); 145.3, 126.2 (CPh_{ipso}); 122.5, 122.4, 115.9, 115.7 (CPh); 58.0 (C1); 50.1 (C4); 44.7 (C7); 30.2, 24.3 (C5, C6); 21.0, 17.5 (C9, C10); 9.1 (C8)

$OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_4CI-4$

Elem. Anal. (%) for C₁₆H₁₈ONCI: Found: C, 69.5; 5.0; 6.5; Calc.: C, 69.7; N, 5.1; H, 6.5; IR (cm⁻¹): 1747 (C=O); 1673 (C=N); 1662 (C=N); ¹H NMR (Acetone-d₆, δ_{ppm}): 7.41 (d, J=8.6 Hz, 2H); 6.91 (d, J=8.6 Hz, 2H); 2.82 (sbr, 1H); 2.17-2.09 (m, 1H); 1.96-1.88 (m, 1H); 1.68-1.54 (m, 2H); 1.03 (s, 3H); 1.01 (s, 3H); 0.87 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (Acetone-d₆, δ_{ppm}): 205.8 (C=O); 173.6 (C=N); 150.0, 130.7 (CPh_{ipso}); 130.0, 122.6 (CPh); 58.6 (C1); 51.0 (C4); 45.0 (C7); 30.7, 24.7 (C5, C6); 21.0, 17.6 (C9, C10); 9.3 (C8).

$OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_4CI\text{--}3$

Elem. Anal. (%) for C₁₆H₁₈ONCl·1/20 CHCl₃: Found.: C, 68.7; N, 5.1; H, 6.6. Calc.: C, 68.4; N, 5.0; H, 6.4. IR (cm⁻¹): 1754 (C=O); 1681 (C=N); 1589 (Ph); ¹H NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 7.20 (t, *J*=8 Hz, 1H); 7.13 (d, *J*=8 Hz, 1H); 6.88 (d, *J*=1.8 Hz, 1H); 6.76 (d, *J*=7.6 Hz, 1H); 2.77 (d, *J*=4.8 Hz, 1H); 2.14-2.03 (m, 1H); 1.91-1.81 (m, 1H); 1.70-1.53 (m, 2H); 1.09 (s, 3H); 0.98 (s, 3H); 0.90 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CDCl₃, δ_{ppm}): 206.0 (C=O); 172.9 (C=N); 151.0, 134.7 (CPh_{ipso}); 130.1, 125.2, 120.3, 118.4 (CPh); 58.2 (C1); 50.1 (C4); 44.5 (C7); 30.1, 24.4 (C5, C6); 21.0, 17.5 (C9, C10); 9.0 (C8).

Complexes

The complexes were synthesized using the following typical procedure: $AgNO_3$ (0.50 mol) was added to the solution of the suitable ligand (1.0 mol) in acetonitrile (ca. 5 ml). Then the mixture was

protected from light, stirred for *ca*. 2h at RT and filtered (if necessary) to remove silver particles. The solvent was then evaporated till precipitation starts. Cooling in the fridge for ca. 1day favours precipitation of the yellowish complexes that may then be obtained by filtration (Yield =50-65%). Characterization details:

$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NNMe_2)_2]$ (1)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₂₀H₄₀N₅O₅ · 2H₂O: Found.: C, 46.1; N, 11.1; H, 6.6; Calc.: C, 46.3; N, 11.3; H, 7.1; IR (cm⁻¹): 1707 (C=O); 1566 (C=N); 1385 (NO₃); ¹H NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 3.22 (d, *J*=4.3, 1H); 3.12 (s, 6H); 2.14-2.02 (m, 1H); 1.83-1.71 (m, 1H); 1.56-1.46 (m, 1H); 1.42-1.31 (m, 1H); 0.95 (s, 3H); 0.94 (s, 3H); 0.81 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 206.3 (C=O); 145.2 (C=N); 57.5 (C1); 51.7 (C4); 46.9 ((CH₃)₂); 46.7 (C7); 30.8 (C6); 26.4 (C5); 21.0, 18.1 (C9, C10); 9.6 (C8).

$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NOH)_2]$ (2)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₂₀H₃₀N₃O₇: Found.: C, 45.1; N, 7.3; H, 5.7; Calc.: C, 45.1; N, 7.9; H, 5.6. IR (cm⁻¹): 3433 (OH); 1743 (C=O); 1643(C=N); 1379 (NO₃); ¹H NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 10.33 (s, 1H); 3.19 (d, *J*=4.3 Hz, 1H); 2.22 (s, 1H); 2.14-1.73 (3); 1.50-1.37 (1); 0.99 (s, 3H); 0.96 (s, 3H); 0.82 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 205.3 (C=O); 160.6 (C=N); 59.2 (C1); 47.5 (C4); 45.5 (C7); 31.4 (C6); 24.4 (C5); 20.8, 17.7 (C9, C10); 9.3 (C8).

$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_5)_2]$ (3)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₃₂H₃₈N₃O₅: Found.: C, 58.7; N, 6.7; H, 6.1. Calc.: C, 58.9; N, 6.4; H, 5.8; IR (cm⁻¹): 1746 (C=O); 1659 (C=N); 1592 (Ph); 1379 (NO₃). ¹H NMR (CD₂Cl₂, δ_{ppm}): 7.38 (d, J=7.8 Hz, 2H); 7.25 (t, J=7.3 Hz, 1H); 7.03 (d, J=8 Hz, 2H); 2.885 (d, J=4.8 Hz, 1H); 2.17-2.07 (m, 1H); 1.95-1.85 (m, 1H); 1.69-1.53 (m, 2H); 1.07 (s, 3H); 0.97 (s, 3H); 0.82 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂, δ_{ppm}): 205.6 (C=O); 174.4 (C=N);

22

148.1 (CPh_{ipso}); 129.7, 127.3, 121.9 (CPh); 58.5 (C1); 51.2 (C4); 45.2 (C7); 30.5 (C6); 24.6 (C5); 21.4, 17.4 (C9, C10); 9.1 (C8).

$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_4CH_3-4)_2] (4)$

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₃₄H₄₂N₃O₅·½HNO₃: Found.: C, 58.5; N, 7.1; H, 6.4. Calc.: C, 58.2; N, 6.7; H, 6.0. IR (cm⁻¹): 1747 (C=O); 1654 (C=N); 1384 (NO₃). ¹H NMR (CD₂Cl₂, δ_{ppm}): 7.17 (d, *J*=8.0 Hz, 2H); 6.96 (d, *J*=8.0 Hz, 2H); 2.91 (d, *J*=4.8 Hz, 1H); 2.33 (s, 3H); 2.21-2.05 (m, 1H); 1.93-1.80 (m, 1H); 1.65-1.50 (m, 2H); 1.05 (s, 3H); 0.97 (s, 3H); 0.78 (s, 3H). ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂, δ_{ppm}): 205.5 (C=O); 173.3 (C=N); 145.2, 137.8 (CPh_{ipso}); 130.2, 122.4 (CPh); 58.4 (C1); 51.3 (C4); 45.3 (C7); 30.5 (C6); 24.4 (C5); 21.3, 21.1, 17.4 (CH₃, C9, C10); 9.0 (C8).

$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_3(CH_3)_2-3,5)_2]$ (5)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₃₆H₄₆N₃O₅ 2H₂O: Found.: C, 57.9; N, 5.9; H, 6.4; Calc.: C, 58.1; N, 5.6; H, 6.7; IR (cm⁻¹): 1754 (C=O); 1680 (C=N); 1592 (Ph); 1383 (NO₃); ¹H NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 6.88 (s, 1H); 6.54 (s, 2H); 2.80 (d, *J*=4.4 Hz, 1H); 2.30 (s, 6H); 2.12-2.04 (m, 1H); 1.92-1.86 (m, 1H); 1.63-1.54 (m, 2H); 1.05 (s, 3H); 0.98 (s, 3H); 0.84 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 207.3 (C=O); 173.4 (C=N); 150.3, 140.0 (CPh_{ipso}); 128.0, 118.9 (CPh); 58.9 (C1); 51.2 (C4); 45.2 (C7); 30.8 (C6); 24.8 (C5); 21.3 ((CH₃)₂); 21.2, 17.4 (C9, C10); 9.3 (C8).

$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_4OH-3)_2]$ (6)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₃₂H₃₈N₃O₇·2H₂O: Exp.: C, 53.0; N, 6.1; H, 5.1. Calc.: C, 53.3; N, 5.8; H, 5.8.

IR (cm⁻¹): 3375 (OH); 1750 (C=O); 1664 (C=N); 1588 (Ph); 1384 (NO₃).

¹H NMR (CD₂Cl₂, δ_{ppm}): 7.22 (t, *J*=7.8 Hz, 1H); 6.89 (s, 1H) 6.81 (s, 1H); 6.47 (d, *J*=7.3 Hz, 1H); 3.01 (d, *J*=4.6 Hz, 1H); 2.25-2.14(m, 1H); 1.99-1.88 (m, 1H); 1.71-1.58 (m, 2H); 1.07 (s, 3H); 1.01 (s, 3H); 0.78 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂, δ_{ppm}): 205.6 (C=O); 174.4 (C=N); 158.8, 148.5 (CPh_{ipso}); 130.5, 115.5, 112.5, 109.9 (CPh); 58.5 (C1); 51.6 (C4); 45.3 (C7); 30.6 (C6); 24.4 (C5); 21.3, 17.2 (C9, C10); 9.0 (C8).

$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_4CI-3)_2]$ (7)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₃₂H₃₆N₃O₅Cl₂·2H₂O: Found.: C, 50.7; N, 5.8; H, 5.1; Calc.: C, 50.7; N, 5.5; H, 5.3; IR (cm⁻¹): 1755 (C=O); 1684 (C=N); 1590 (Ph); 1381 (NO₃); ¹H NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 7.38 (t, *J*=8.0 Hz, 1H); 7.22 (d, *J*=8.0 Hz, 1H); 6.95 (s, 1H); 6.83 (d, *J*=7.9, 1H); 2.75 (d, *J*=4.7 Hz, 1H); 2.09-2.03 (m, 1H); 1.92-1.87 (m, 1H); 1.65-1.56 (m, 2H); 1.05 (s, 3H); 0.98 (s, 3H); 0.86 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 206.9 (C=O); 174.7 (C=N); 152.2, 135.3 (CPh_{ipso});131.6, 125.9, 120.8, 119.3 (CPh); 58.9 (C1); 51.1 (C4); 45.1 (C7); 30.7 (C6); 24.6 (C5); 21.2, 17.4 (C9, C10); 9.3 (C8).

$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_4CI-4)_2]$ (8)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₃₂H₃₆N₃O₅Cl₂·H₂O: Found.: C, 52.1; N, 5.9; H, 4.9; Calc.: C, 52.2; N, 5.7; H, 5.2. IR (cm⁻¹): 1745 (C=O); 1663 (C=N); 1383 (NO₃); ¹H NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 7.41 (d, *J*=8.7 Hz, 2H); 6.92 (d, *J*=8.7 Hz, 2H); 2.78 (d, *J*=4.8 Hz, 1H); 2.12-2.03 (m, 1H); 1.92-1.87 (m, 1H); 1.64-1.55 (m, 2H); 1.04 (s, 3H); 0.98 (s, 3H); 0.84 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 206.9 (C=O); 174.4 (C=N); 149.3; 130.0; 123.1; 122.9; 58.9 (C1); 51.1 (C4); 45.2 (C8); 30.7 (C6); 24.6 (C5); 21.1, 17.4 (C9, C10); 9.2 (C8).

[Ag(NO₃)(OC₁₀H₁₄NC₆H₄F-4)₂] (9)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₃₂H₃₆N₃O₅F₂ · 1.5H₂O: Exp.: C, 53.5; N, 6.0; H, 5.0; Calc.: C, 53.7; N, 5.9; H, 5.4; IR (cm⁻¹): 1747 (C=O); 1651 (C=N); 1499 (Ph); 1384 (NO₃);

¹H NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 7.16 (t, J=8.5 Hz, 2H); 6.99-6.96 (m, 2H); 2.805 (d, J=4.6 Hz, 1H); 2.11-2.04 (m, 1H); 1.91-1.86 (m, 1H); 1.66-1.55 (m, 2H); 1.05 (s, 3H); 0.98 (s, 3H); 0.84 (s, 3H);

 ^{13}C NMR (CD_3CN, δ_{ppm}): 207.1 (C=O); 173.9 (C=N); 162.8, 160.4, 146.6 (CPh_{ipso}); 123.5, 123.4, 116.8,

116.6 (CPh); 58.8 (C1); 51.1 (C4); 45.3 (C7); 30.8 (C6); 24.6 (C5); 21.1, 17.5 (C9, C10); 9.3 (C8);

$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NC_6H_4CF_3-4)_2]$ (10)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₃₄H₃₆N₃O₅F₆: Found.: C, 51.8; N, 5.3; H, 4.5; Calc.: C, 51.8; N, 5.3; H, 4.6;

IR (cm⁻¹): 1751 (C=O); 1671 (C=N); 1609 (Ph); 1383 (NO₃); 1325, 1113 (CF₃); ¹H NMR (CD₂Cl₂, δ_{ppm}): 7.635 (d, *J*=8.3 Hz, 2H); 7.10 (d, *J*=8.3 Hz, 2H); 2.78 (d, *J*=4.7 Hz, 1H); 2.19-2.04 (m, 1H); 1.97-1.82 (m, 1H); 1.72-1.48 (m, 2H); 1.08 (s, 3H); 0.98 (s, 3H); 0.85 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CD₂Cl₂, δ_{ppm}): 205.2 (C=O); 175.6 (C=N); 127.0 (q, J=3.8 Hz); 121.7 (CPh); 58.6 (C1); 51.2 (C4); 45.1 (C7); 30.4, 24.6 (C5, C6); 21.5, 17.3 (C9, C10); 9.0 (C8); ¹⁹F NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 62.54 (CF₃), using BF₄^{*} (Br₄NBF₄) as reference (δ_{ppm} =-151.9 ppm).

$[Ag(NO_3)(O_2SNC_{10}H_{13}NNH_2)_2]$ (11)

Elem. Anal. (%) for AgC₂₀H₃₀N₇S₂O₇: Found.: C, 37.3; N, 14.6; S, 9.7; H, 4.9; Calc.: C, 36.8; N, 15.0; S, 9.8; H, 4.6; IR (cm⁻¹): 3401, 3280, 3200 (N-H); 1637, 1575 (C=N); 1383 (NO₃); 1330 (SO₂ asym); 1158 (SO₂ sym). ¹H NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 7.92 (s, 0.4H (*Z*-isomer)); 7.21 (s, 1.6H (*E*-isomer)); 3.30, 3.10 (2d, *J*=13.7 Hz, 2H); 3.045 (d, *J*=4.1 Hz, 1H); 2.89 (s, 1H); 2.77 2.89 (s, 1H); 2.19-2.00 (m, 2H); 1.71-1.46 (m, 2H); 1.05 (s, 3H); 0.82 (s, 3H); ¹³C NMR (CD₃CN, δ_{ppm}): 186.4 (C2); 141.8 (C3); 64.5 (C1); 50.0 (C8); 48.5 (C7); 47.4 (C4); 30.4, 23.9 (C5, C6); 19.5, 18.6 (C9, C10).

Antibacterial activity determinations

The Gram-positive *Staphylococcus aureus Newman*, and the Gram-negative *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* 477, *Escherichia coli* ATCC 25922, and *Burkholderia contaminans* IST408 were used in this work. When in use, bacteria were maintained in Lennox Broth (LB) solid medium (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, USA), otherwise cultures were kept frozen at -80°C. Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) of camphorimine Ag(I) complexes were assessed by microdilution assays in Muller-Hinton broth (MH) (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, USA) using at least 3 independent experiments carried out in duplicate, as previously described.^{14,16} For these purposes, overnight bacterial cultures grown at 37 °C in MH with orbital shaking (250 rev.min⁻¹) were diluted with fresh MH medium to a final optical density,

measured at 640 nm (OD_{640}) of 0.02, in a Hitachi U-2000 UV/Vis spectrophotometer. 100 µL aliquots of cell suspensions were mixed in 96-wells polystyrene plates with 100 µL of fresh MH containing previously serially diluted (1:2) camphorimine Ag(I) complexes from stock solutions. The OD_{640} of the cultures were measured after 24 h of incubation at 37°C using a SpectrostarNano microplate reader (BMG Labtech, Germany). The MIC values were estimated by fitting the OD_{640} mean values with a Gompertz modified equation.¹⁴

Computational details

The optimization of the structures and the molecular geometry of the complexes were carried out by DFT calculations using GAMESS-US,³⁰ version R3 with a CAMB3LYP functional,³¹ and 65% HF exact exchange at long range and 19% at short range, using a SBKJC basis set.

X-ray diffraction

X-ray data for camphor imine ligands OC₁₀H₁₄NY (Y=4-CH₃C₆H₄ and Y=3-ClC₆H₄) was collected at room temperature using a Bruker AXS-KAPPA APEX II area detector apparatus equipped with a graphitemonochromated Mo K α (λ =0.71073 Å) and were corrected for Lorentz polarization and, empirically, for absorption effects. The structures were solved by direct methods using SHELX97³² and refined by full matrix least squares against F² using SHELX97 all included in the suite of programs WinGX v1.70.01 for Windows.³³ The non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically and the H atoms were inserted in idealized positions and allowed to refine riding on the parent atom. Crystal data and refinement parameters are summarized in Table 4. Illustrations of the molecular structures were made with ORTEP3.³⁴

		Y
	4-CH ₃ C ₆ H ₄	3-CIC ₆ H ₄
Empirical formula	C ₁₇ H ₂₁ NO	C ₁₆ H ₁₈ CINO
Formula weight	255.36	275.78
Crystal system	Orthorhombic	Orthorhombic
Space group	P212121	P212121
Unit cell dimensions		
a/ Å	9.991(1)	7.212(2)
b/ Å	10.386(2)	10.921(3)
c/ Å	20.214(5)	18.562(5)
α/ deg	90	90
β/ deg	90	90
γ/ deg	90	90
Volume (Å ⁻³)	1467.6(5)	1461.9(7)
Z, Dcal (g/cm ³)	4, 1.156	4, 1.253
Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹)	0.071	0.253
F(000)	552	584
Crystal size (mm ³)	0.3 x 0.2 x 0.3	0.3 x 0.3 x 0.4
θ range for data collection (deg)	2.01 to 30.56	2.16 to 30.78
Index ranges	-9<=h<=9, -13<=k<=14, -24<=l<=28	-10<=h<=9, -15<=k<=12, -26<=l<=25
Reflections collected / unique	9955 / 4447 [R(int)=0.050]	10378 / 4497 [R(int) = 0.041]
Data/restraints/parameters	4447 / 0 / 176	4497 / 0 / 175
Final R (observed)	R1 = 0.055, wR2 = 0.127	R1 = 0.0485, wR2 = 0.136
A C		

Table 4 - Crystallographic data for camphor imines (OC₁₀H₁₄NY, figure 2)

Acknowledgements: Financial support by FCT-Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia through projects ID/QUI/00100/2013, UID/BIO/04565/2013, Grant BL-CQE/2018-013 and the NMR Network (IST-UTL Node) for facilities are gratefully acknowledged.

References

- 1 S. Silver, FEMS Microbiology Reviews 27 (2003) 341-353.
- 2 L.J. Wilkinson, R.J. White, J.K. Chipman, J. Wound Care 20 (2011) 543-549.
- 3 P. Singha, J. Locklin, H. Handa 50, Acta Biomaterialia (2017) 20-40.
- 4 W.-G. Kwak, M. H. Oh, S.-Y. Son, M.-S. Gong, Macromolecular Research 23(6) (2015) 509-517.
- 5 W.Sim, R.T. Barnard, M.A.T. Blaskovich, Z.M. Ziora, Antibiotics 7, (2018) 93.
- 6 M. Muller, Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. (2018) May 14. pii: AAC.00672-18. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00672-18
- K. Mijnendonckx, N. Leys, J. Mahillon, S. Silver, R. Van Houdt, Biometals. 2013, 26(4), 609-621. doi:
 10.1007/s10534-013-9645-z.
- 8 X. Yan, B. He, L. Liu, G. Qu, J. Shi, L. Hu, G. Jiang, Metallomics. 10(4) (2018) 557-564.
- 9 M.I. Azocar, G. Gomez, P. Levin, M. Paez, H. Muñoz, N. Dinamarca, J. Coord. Chem. 67, (2014) 3840-3853.
- 10 F. Long, C.-C. Su, M.T. Zimmermann, S.E. Boyken, K.R. Rajashankar, R.L. Jernigan, E.W. Yu, Nature 467 (2010) 484-488.
- 11 J.M.S. Cardoso, I. Correia, A.M. Galvão, F. Marques, M.F.N.N. Carvalho, J. Inorg. Biochem. 2017, 166, 55-63.
- 12 X. Liang, S. Luan, Z. Yin, M. He, C. He, L.Yin, Y. Zou, Z. Yuan, L. Li, X. Song, C. Lv, W. Zhang, Eur. J. Med. Chem. 157 (2018) 62-80.
- 13 F. Barras, L. Aussel, B.Ezraty, Antibiotics 7 (2018) 79.
- J. M. S. Cardoso, S. I. Guerreiro, A. Lourenço, M. M. Alves, M. F. Montemor, N. P Mira, J. H. Leitão, M. F.
 N.N. Carvalho, PLOS ONE (2017) May 9, 1-15.
- 15 J.H. Leitão, S.A. Sousa, S.A. Leite, M.F.N.N. Carvalho, Antibiotics 7(3) (2018) 65.

- J.M.S. Cardoso, A.M. Galvão, S.I. Guerreiro, J.H. Leitão, A.C. Suarez, M.F.N.N. Carvalho, Dalton Trans., 45 (2016) 7114-7123.
- 17 M.F.N N. Carvalho, M.T. Duarte, T.A. Fernandes, A.M. Galvão, A.M. Botelho do Rego, Inorg. Chem. 49 (2010) 10330-37.
- 18 A.S.D. Ferreira, M.F.N.N. Carvalho, A. M. Galvão, L. F. Veiros, Inorg. Chimica Acta, 395 (2013) 169-175.
- 19 S. M. Soliman, Y. N. Mabkhot, A. Barakat, H. A. Ghabbour, J. Coord. Chem. 70 (2017) 1339-1356.
- 20 M.F.N.N. Carvalho, L.M.G. Costa, A.J.L. Pombeiro, A. Schier, W. Scherer, S.K. Harbi, U. Verfürth, R. Herrmann, Inorg. Chem. 33 (1994) 6270-6277.
- S. Medici, M. Peana, G. Crisponi, V. M. Nurchi, J. I. Lachowicz, M. Remelli, M. A. Zoroddu, Coord. Chem. Rev. 327-328 (2016) 349-359.
- 22 I. Ghai, S. Ghai, Infection and drug resistance 11 (2018) 523-530.
- 23 S.A. Sousa, J.R. Feliciano, T. Pita, S.I. Guerreiro, J.H. Leitão, Genes 8 (2017) 43.
- A. Lamut, L.M. Peterlin, D. <u>Kikelj</u>, T. <u>Tomašič</u>, Med Res Rev. (2019) 1-45.
- 25 M.F.N.N. Carvalho, L.M.G. Costa, A.J.L. Pombeiro, A. Schier, W. Scherer, S.K. Harbi, U. Verfürth, R. Herrmann, Inorg. Chem. 33 (1994) 6270-6277.
- 26 W.L.F. Armarego, C.L.L. Chai, Purification of Laboratory Chemicals, sixth ed., Elsevier Inc, Oxford, 2008.
- 27 M.O. Forster, H. Spinner, J. Chem. Soc. 101 (1912) 1340.
- 28 J.D. White, D.J. Wardrop, K.F. Sundermann, Org. Synth. Coll. 10 (2004) 204.
- 29 S.D. Denmark, I. Rivera, J. Org. Chem. 59 (1994) 6887.
- 30 M.W. Schmidt, K.K. Baldridge, J.A. Boatz, S.T. Elbert, M.S. Gordon, J.H. Jensen, S. Koseki, N. Matsunaga, K.A. Nguyen, S. Su, T.L. Windus, M. Dupuis, J.A. Montgomery J. Comput. Chem. 14 (1993), 1347-1363.
- 31 T. Yanai, D. Tew, N. Handy, Chem. Phys. Lett. 393 (2004) 51–57.
- 32 G.M. Sheldrick, SHELX-97- Programs for Crystal Structure Analysis (Release 97-2), Institüt für Anorganische Chemie der Universität, Tammanstrasse 4, D-3400 Göttingen, Germany (1998).

- 33 L.J. Farrugia, WINGX J. Appl. Crystallogr. 32 (1999) 837.
- 34 L.J. Farrugia, J. Appl. Crystallogr. 30 (1997) 565.

SCREEP

FIGURES AND TABLES





CAMPHOR IMINE Y= OH, C_6H_5 , 4-Me C_6H_4 , 3,5-Me $_2C_6H_3$, 3-OH C_6H_4 , 3-CIC $_6H_4$, 4-CIC $_6H_4$, 4-FC $_6H_4$, 4-CF $_3C_6H_4$,

CAMPHOR HYDRAZONE Y=NMe₂

CAMPHOR SULFONYIMINE Y=NMe₂ or NH₂

Figure 1 – Camphor imine (right) and camphor sulphonylimine (left) type-ligands used in this study



Figure 2 - ORTEP drawings (ellipsoids with 25% probability) for camphor ligands OC₁₀H₁₄NY: a) Y=4-CH₃C₆H₄, [C=O, 120.5(3) pm; CN, 127.4(3) pm]; b) Y=3-ClC₆H₄. [C=O, 119.7(39) pm; CN 126.5(3) pm]



Figure 3- Types of coordination of camphor imines: a)- mono-hapto; b)- di-hapto; c)- bridging



Figure 4 – Calculated structures for $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{13}NY)_2]$ (1) and $[Ag(NO_3)(O_2SNC_{10}H_{13}NY)_2]$ (12)





Figure 5 – Calculated structures for [Ag(NO₃)(OC₁₀H₁₃NY)₂] (Y=C₆H₅, **3**; 4-MeC₆H₄, **4**; 4-ClC₆H₄, **8**)



Figure 6 – Calculated structure for $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{13}NOH)_2]$ (2)

Distance (Å) /				Y		
Angles (°)	NMe ₂ (1)	OH (2)	C ₆ H₅ (3)	4-MeC ₆ H ₅ (4)	4-CIC ₆ H ₅ (8)	NMe ₂ (12)
Ag-N(Y)	2.39/2.47	2.23	2.28/2.33	2.28/2.34	2.28/2.34	2.83
Ag-Z ^a	2.59/2.66	2.75/2.85	2.84/2.92	2.84/2.89	2.84/2.91	2.32 (2.40) ^b
Ag-O1 _(NO2)	2.40	2.70	2.41	2.42	2.42	2.45
Ag-O2 _(NO2)	2.67	2.74	2.69	2.69	2.68	2.45
C=N	131	129	129	129	129	129
C=O	126	125	125	125	125	-
N-Ag-N	144.8	160.3	144.4	143.8	144.6	136.1 (138.2)
Z-Ag-Z ^a	82.3	77.8	68.2	70.1	68.4	91.8
Z-Ag-O	167.9/136.5	139.4/132.7	162.5/144.2	158.4/148.8	162.2/144.2	128.7/127.7
Dipole (D)	10.00	10.03	11.37	11.37	14.11	15.40

Table 1 – Calculated distances / angles and dipole moment for complexes and $[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NY)_2]$ (1-4, 8) and $[Ag(NO_3)(O_2SNC_{10}H_{13}NNMe_2)_2]$ (12)

^a Z=O or N. ^b Experimental data obtained by X-rays diffraction analysis.¹¹

			MIC (µg/mL)				
	LIGAND Y	E_p^{red} Volt ^a	E. coli ATCC25922	P. aeruginosa 477	B. contaminans IST408	S. aureus Newman	Log P ^b
1	NMe ₂		58	54	41	134	0.97 ± 0.60
2	ОН	0.11	51	52	59	119	1.06 ± 0.59
3	C_6H_5	0.12	59	55	91	54	2.94 ± 0.58
4	4-MeC ₆ H ₄		37	53	66	55	3.40 ± 0.58
5	3,5-Me₂C ₆ H₃	0.11	40	52	105	47	3.86 ± 0.59
6	3-OHC ₆ H ₄	0.074	52	53	75	113	2.36 ± 0.59
7	3-CIC ₆ H ₄	0.044	53	53	44	110	3.65 ± 0.59
8	4-CIC ₆ H ₄	0.12	52	55	57	151	3.78 ± 0.59
9	$4-FC_6H_4$	0.097	59	53	77	93	3.24 ± 0.62
10	$4-CF_3C_6H_4$	0.11	52	60	55	105	3.91 ± 0.61

Table 2 – Data for complexes	$[Ag(NO_3)(OC_{10}H_{14}NY)_2]$
------------------------------	---------------------------------

^a Potencial in Volt (±10 mV) *vs* sce. ^b Partition coefficient in octanol/water predicted using ACDC software.

Table 3 - Data for complexes [Ag(NO₃)(O₂SNC₁₀H₁₃NY)₂]

					MIC (μg/mL)		
	LIGAND Y	E_p^{red} Volt ^a	E. coli ATCC25922	P. aeruginosa 477	B. contaminans IST408	S. aureus Newman	Log P ^b
11	NH ₂	0.10	52	36	38	114	-0.99 ± 0.69
12	NMe ₂	0.17	107	108	56	257	-0.69 ± 0.70
	[Ag(NO ₃)]	0.18	47	39	74	73	_

^a Potencial in Volt (±10 mV) vs sce. ^b Predicted partition coefficient in octanol/water using ACDC software.

	Y				
	4-CH ₃ C ₆ H ₄	3-CIC ₆ H ₄			
Empirical formula	C ₁₇ H ₂₁ NO	C ₁₆ H ₁₈ CINO			
Formula weight	255.36	275.78			
Crystal system	Orthorhombic	Orthorhombic			
Space group	P2 ₁ 2 ₁ 2 ₁	P212121			
Unit cell dimensions					
a/ Å	9.991(1)	7.212(2)			
b/ Å	10.386(2)	10.921(3)			
c/ Å	20.214(5)	18.562(5)			
α/ deg	90	90			
β/ deg	90	90			
γ/ deg	90	90			
Volume (Å ⁻³)	1467.6(5)	1461.9(7)			
Z, Dcal (g/cm ³)	4, 1.156	4, 1.253			
Absorption coefficient (mm ⁻¹)	0.071	0.253			
F(000)	552	584			
Crystal size (mm ³)	0.3 x 0.2 x 0.3	0.3 x 0.3 x 0.4			
θ range for data collection (deg)	2.01 to 30.56	2.16 to 30.78			
Index ranges	-9<=h<=9, -13<=k<=14, -24<=l<=28	-10<=h<=9, -15<=k<=12, -26<=l<=25			
Reflections collected / unique	9955 / 4447 [R(int)=0.050]	10378 / 4497 [R(int) = 0.041]			
Data/restraints/parameters	4447/0/176	4497 / 0 / 175			
Final R (observed)	R1 = 0.055, wR2 = 0.127	R1 = 0.0485, wR2 = 0.136			

Table 4 - Crystallographic data for camphor imines (OC₁₀H₁₄NY, figure 2)

R CER

Graphical abstract



The antibacterial activity of Ag(I) camphor imine complexes can be tuned through choice of the imine

substituents at the camphor ligands.

K ANN

HIGHLIGHTS

- Eleven new silver camphorimine complexes [Ag(NO₃)(L-Y)₂] were synthesized
- Structures of representative complexes were optimized by Density Functional Theory
- All complexes have antibacterial activity towards Gram-positive/Gram-negative bacteria
- The Y substituent drives the geometry/antibacterial activity of complexes
- The complexes perform better towards Gram-negative than Gram-positive bacteria

A CERTICO