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#### Abstract

In the present study, the $4 f-4 f$ transitions of $\operatorname{Pr}(I I I)$ with hexafluoroacetylacetone $\left[\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{COCF}_{3}\right]$ and their adducts with structurally related ligands o-phenanthroline $\left[\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right.$ ] and bipyridyl [ $\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{2}$ ] complexes in various solvents viz., methanol $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$, acetonitrile $\left[\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right]$ and dimethyl formamide [ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{NCHO}$ ] have been successfully carried out. In the absorption difference and comparative absorption spectrophotometric study, the $4 f$ $4 f$ transition spectra yield sharp bands which were analyzed individually by Gaussian curve analysis, energy interaction parameters $\left(F_{K}, E^{K}\right)$, Lande spin orbit coupling $\left(\xi_{4 f}\right)$, nephelauxetic ratio $(\beta)$, bonding parameter $\left(b^{1 / 2}\right)$, percentage covalency $(\delta)$ and intensity parameters. By using partial multiple regression analysis method, these parameters were computed on computer to determine the possible geometry of complexes in solution and nature of the bond between lanthanide metal and ligands.
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## INTRODUCTION

In lanthanides the electrons are successively added to inner lying 4 f sub-shell filled by strongly positive and large sized ions. These ions undergo shrinkage in ionic size known as lanthanide contraction. This shrinkage influences the coordination chemistry of lanthanide and affects both coordination number and coordination geometry [1-2]. The use of lanthanides as absorption spectral probe in several biochemical reactions involving $\mathrm{Ca}^{+2}$ and $\mathrm{Mg}^{+2}$ has open up a new dimension for the fast developing field of optical spectroscopy [3].

Few researchers have been studied the solid complexes of $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ and $\mathrm{Nd}(\mathrm{III})$ from mononucleotide and mononucleosides dissolved in organic solvents and their spectra were recorded. Their results reveal that these complexes, when dissolved in the solvents, retained their nonacoordinated stereochemistry in their crystalline state [4-6]. The silent changes in the oscillator strength of $4 f-4 f$ bands as well as the change in magnitude of Judd Ofelt intensity parameters has led to an upsurge in the quantitative analysis of spectral behavior of $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{IIII})$ and $\mathrm{Nd}($ III $)$ in crystalline as well as in solution state. This change depends on the nature of solvent mixtures and varying affinities of ligands [7, 8].

In the present study, we have prepared $\left[\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}\right]$ complex and their adducts with structurally related nitrogen donor ligands Viz., o-phenanthroline and bipyridyl. Absorption spectra of $\operatorname{Pr}($ III $)$ have been interpreted in terms of Salter-Condon $\left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{K}}\right)$, Lande spin orbit coupling ( $\xi_{4 f}$ ), Racah $\left(\mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{K}}\right)$, nephelauxetic ratio ( $\beta$ ), bonding
parameter ( $\mathrm{b}^{1 / 2}$ ), percentage covalency ( $\delta$ ), oscillator strength and intensity parameters. By using partial multiple regression analysis method, these parameters were computed on computer. The computed parameters give information about the nature of complexation.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

$\operatorname{Pr}($ III ) chloride heptahydrated of $99.9 \%$ purity from M/s Indian Rare Earths Ltd., Hexafluoroacetylacetone $\left[\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{COCH}_{2} \mathrm{COCF}_{3}\right]$ from Aldrich Chemicals USA, nitrogen donor ligands viz., o-phenanthroline and bipyridyl were obtained from Sisco Chemical Laboratory. The AR grade $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$, DMF and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solvents (E. Merck) were used for recording the spectra. The elemental analysis was carried out on Carlo-Erba Strumentatzione Strada Rivoltand 200 9D Rodono Italy, at CSMCRI Bhavnagar. Pr(III) contents were determined gravimetrically as Oxinate using 8-hydroxyquinoline. All the spectra were recorded on Perkin Elmer Lambda-2 UV-Visible spectrophotometer in the range $380-620 \mathrm{~nm}$, in the concentration of $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ complexes in $10^{-2}$ Molar.

Synthesis of $\left[\operatorname{Pr}(h f a a)_{3}\left(\mathbf{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}\right]$
The $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ chloride heptahydrated 3.734 gm was dissolved in distilled water. The methanolic solution of hexafluoroacetylacetone 6.24 gm was added very slowly with constant stirring on magnetic stirrer which resulted in isolation of yellow crystalline solid. After neutralizing the contents with ammonia the product was filtered, washed thoroughly and recrystallized by methanol.

## Synthesis of $\left[\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{o p h})\right]$

The $\left[\mathrm{Pr}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}\right]$ of 4.15 gm added into methanolic solution of 0.992 gm of o-phenanthroline and put it for constant stirring. On addition of ammonia solution drop wise, the amount of yellow precipitated increased tremendously. The product was filtered, washed thoroughly and recrystallized by methanol. By using similar procedure, the bipyridyl complexes were synthesized. The synthesized adducts were characterized by using elemental analysis and molecular weight determination. These characterizations were carried out at CSMCRI, Bhavnagar, India.

The Coulombic and magnetic interaction between $4 f^{\mathrm{n}}$ electrons leads to energy level of $4 f^{\mathrm{n}}$ configuration. These interactions could be expressed in terms of the electronic repulsion parameters, Salter-Condon ( $\mathrm{F}_{2}, \mathrm{~F}_{4}, \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ ), Racah $\left(E^{1}, E^{2}, E^{3}\right)$, spin orbit interaction parameter and Lande spin orbit coupling $\left(\xi_{4 f}\right)$ as a first approximation [9, 10]. The energy $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{so}}$ arising from the most important magnetic interaction which is spin orbit interactions, may be written as,
$\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{so}}=\mathbf{A}_{\mathrm{so}} \xi_{\mathrm{yf}}$
Where $A_{s o}$ is the angular part of spin-orbit interaction and $\xi_{4 \mathrm{f}}$ is the radial integral and known as Lande's parameter. The energy $E_{j}$ of the $j^{\text {th }}$ level is given by the following equation,

$$
\mathbf{E}_{j}\left(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \xi_{4 f}\right)=\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{0 j}}\left(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{k}}^{0}{ }_{\mathbf{k}} \xi_{4 f}\right)+\sum_{\mathbf{k}=2,4,6}\left(\delta \mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{j}} / \delta \mathbf{F}_{\mathrm{k}}\right) \Delta \mathbf{F}_{\mathrm{k}}+\left(\delta \mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{j}} / \delta \xi_{4 f}\right) \Delta \xi_{4 \mathrm{f}}
$$

Where, $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{oj}}$ is the Zero order energy of the $\mathrm{j}^{\text {th }}$ level. It is given by Wong [11, 12]. The values of $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{oj}}$, partial derivative $\left(\delta \mathrm{E}_{j} / \delta \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}}\right)$ and $\left(\delta \mathrm{E}_{j} / \delta \xi_{4 f}\right)$, for different levels were known. The nephelauxetic effects measures the change in $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}}$ with respect to free ion and expressed by nephelauxetic ratio ( $\beta$ ), which is defined as,

$$
\beta=\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathbf{c} / \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\mathbf{f}} .}
$$

Where, c and f referred to complex and free ion. The amount of mixing of $4 f$ orbital and ligand orbital can be measured by the bonding parameter $\left(b^{1 / 2}\right)$ which is given by [13-17],

$$
b^{1 / 2}=[1-\beta / 2]^{1 / 2}
$$

The percentage covalency parameter ( $\delta$ ) is given by [18],

$$
\delta=[1-\beta / \beta] \times 100
$$

The experimental value of oscillator strength ( $\mathrm{P}_{\text {obs }}$ ) of absorption bands were calculated by performing Gaussian curve analysis using the following relationship,

$$
P_{\text {obs }}=4.60 \times 10^{-9} \epsilon_{\mathrm{m}}(\bar{v})(\mathrm{d} \bar{v})
$$

Where $\epsilon_{m}$ is the molar extinction coefficient corresponding to energy $(\bar{v})$

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Fig. 1 shows comparative absorption spectra of $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ complexes in methanol. There is marginal red shift of $4 f-4 f$ transition bands in $\left[\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}\right]$. The enhancement is more in case of o-phenanthroline indicates a better ligand than bipyridyl when recorded in methanol. The intensity of ${ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{3} \mathrm{P}_{2}>{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{3} \mathrm{P}_{1}>{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{3} \mathrm{P}_{0}>{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{1} \mathrm{D}_{2}$ [19, 20].


Fig. 1 Comparative absorption spectra of $\left.\left.\mathbf{1})\left[\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{O p h})\right], 2\right)\left[\operatorname{Pr}(\mathbf{h f a a})_{3}\left(\mathbf{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)\right], 3\right)\left[\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}(\right.$ bipy $\left.)\right]$ and complexes in methanol.
The molecular weights and analytical data are shown in Tables 1 and 2 respectively. The metal $\operatorname{Pr}($ III $)$ were estimated gravimetrically as oxinate by using 8 -hydroxy quinoline method.

Table 1 shows the observed and calculated values of molecular weight of $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ complexes.

| Complexes | Cal. MW | Obs. MW |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}\left(\mathbf{H}_{2} \mathbf{O}\right)_{2}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 9 . 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 8 . 2 0}$ |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}($ oph $)$ | $\mathbf{9 9 1 . 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 9 0 . 4 0}$ |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}($ bipy $)$ | $\mathbf{9 6 3 . 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 4 9 . 6 6}$ |

Table 2 shows the observed and calculated values of analytical data $\operatorname{Pr}($ III ) complexes.

| Complexes | \% metal |  | \% Carbon |  | \% Hydrogen |  | \% Nitrogen |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Obs | Cal | Obs | Cal | Obs | Cal | Obs | Cal |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}\left(\mathbf{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 9 6}$ | 16.20 | $\mathbf{2 0 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 . 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 2 1}$ | - | - |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{o p h})$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8 2}$ |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa) })_{3}($ bipy $)$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 . 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 . 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 . 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4 7}$ |

Table 3 shows experimental and computed values of $\mathrm{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ complexes in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$, DMF and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solvents. The r.m.s. deviation $\sigma$ are varies from 109.70 to 170.80 shows that accuration of the various energy interaction parameters.

Table 3 Observed and calculated energies $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ of $\mathrm{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ complexes in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathbf{O H}$, DMF and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathbf{C N}$ solvents.

| Complexes and Solvents | ${ }^{3} \mathbf{P}_{2}$ |  | ${ }^{3} \mathbf{P}_{1}$ |  | ${ }^{3} \mathbf{P}_{0}$ |  | ${ }^{1} \mathrm{D}_{2}$ |  | б r r.m.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathbf{O H}$ | Obs | Cal | Obs | Cal | Obs | Cal | Obs | Cal |  |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 22538 | 22386 | 21360 | 21233 | 20777 | 20774 | 16930 | 17118 | 128’28 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\right.$ hfaa) ${ }_{3}(\mathbf{o p h})$ | 22530 | 22389 | 21359 | 21235 | 20778 | 20736 | 16942 | 17116 | 129.55 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}$ (bipy) | 22529 | 22375 | 21352 | 21121 | 20770 | 20768 | 16917 | 17003 | 109.70 |
| DMF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{Pr}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 22532 | 22382 | 21232 | 21351 | 20760 | 20756 | 16920 | 17110 | 133.28 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{O p h})$ | 22536 | 22372 | 21227 | 21360 | 20750 | 20752 | 16933 | 17109 | 135.80 |
| $\mathbf{P r}\left(\right.$ hfaa) ${ }_{3}$ (bipy) | 22522 | 22359 | 21197 | 21310 | 20746 | 20738 | 16861 | 17110 | 156.69 |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{P r}(\text { hfaa) })_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 22421 | 22446 | 21243 | 21116 | 20689 | 20681 | 16827 | 17110 | 170.80 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{O p h})$ | 22512 | 22369 | 21339 | 21212 | 20745 | 20748 | 16922 | 17105 | 128.90 |
| $\mathbf{P r}(\text { hfaa })_{3}$ (bipy) | 22514 | 22332 | 21331 | 21198 | 20731 | 20733 | 16901 | 17085 | 137.46 |

Table 4 shows energy interaction parameters, Slator Condon $\left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}}\right)$, Lande spin orbit interaction $\left(\xi_{4 f}\right)$, nephelauxetic ratio ( $\beta$ ), bonding parameters $\left(\mathrm{b}^{1 / 2}\right.$ ) and percentage covalency ( $\delta$ ) for $\mathrm{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ complexes in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$, DMF and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solvents. It shows that the values of nephelauxetic effect $(\beta)$ in $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ complexes were varies from 0.921 to 0.929 which is less than unity. The value of bonding parameters ( $\mathrm{b}^{1 / 2}$ ) were varies from 0.127 to 0.132 and which is positive indicate covalent bonding between $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ and ligand. Table 5 shows experimental and computed values of oscillator strength, the r.m.s. deviation $\sigma$ varies from 0.68 to 2.98 .

Table 4 Computed values of energy interaction parameters Slator Condon $\left(F_{k}\right)$, Lande spin orbit coupling ( $\xi_{4 f}$ ), nephelauxetic ratio ( $\beta$ ), bonding parameters ( $\mathbf{b}^{1 / 2}$ ) and covalency parameter ( $\delta$ ) for $\mathrm{Pr}(\mathrm{IIII})$ complexes in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathbf{O H}$, DMF and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathbf{C N}$ solvents.

| Complexes and Solvent | $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{F}_{4}$ | F6 | ( $\xi_{4 f}$ ) | $\beta$ | $\left(\mathbf{b}^{1 / 2}\right)$ | ( 8 ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathbf{O H}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{P r}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 311.63 | 42.98 | 4.70 | 672.75 | 0.923 | 0.131 | 3.621 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{O p h})$ | 311.60 | 43.02 | 4.72 | 676.24 | 0.929 | 0.132 | 3.510 |
| $\mathbf{P r}(\text { hfaa })_{3}($ bipy $)$ | 311.72 | 43.12 | 4.74 | 670.53 | 0.923 | 0.129 | 3.340 |
| DMF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{P r}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 311.70 | 43.01 | 4.70 | 652.68 | 0.924 | 0.128 | 3.359 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{O p h})$ | 311.68 | 43.03 | 4.71 | 662.24 | 0.926 | 0.127 | 3.350 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\right.$ hfaa) ${ }_{3}(\mathbf{b i p y})$ | 311.75 | 43.10 | 4.72 | 571.37 | 0.921 | 0.130 | 3.527 |
| CH3CN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 311.08 | 42.98 | 4.70 | 655.58 | 0.924 | 0.131 | 3.531 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{O p h})$ | 311.31 | 42.94 | 4.68 | 676.38 | 0.931 | 0.143 | 3.511 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{b i p y})$ | 311.33 | 42.95 | 4.69 | 670.60 | 0.934 | 0.137 | 3.519 |

Table 5 Experimental and computed values of Oscillator strength $\left(\mathrm{Px}^{10}{ }^{6}\right)$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathbf{O H}, \mathrm{DMF}, \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathbf{C N}$.

| Complexes and Solvents | ${ }^{3} \mathbf{P}_{2}$ |  | ${ }^{3} \mathbf{P}_{1}$ |  | ${ }^{3} \mathbf{P}_{0}$ |  | ${ }^{1} \mathrm{D}_{2}$ |  | $\sigma$ r r.m.s. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Obs | Cal | Obs | Cal | Obs | Cal | Obs | Cal |  |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa) })_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 13.17 | 13.16 | 4.95 | 3.71 | 3.70 | 3.55 | 3.92 | 4.36 | 0.68 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}($ oph $)$ | 43.18 | 43.16 | 18.18 | 16.50 | 16.28 | 15.36 | 15.55 | 15.69 | 1.66 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}($ bipy $)$ | 30.35 | 31.40 | 11.97 | 9.80 | 9.05 | 8.66 | 13.04 | 12.54 | 1.44 |
| DMF |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{Pr}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 26.56 | 27.44 | 10.66 | 9.01 | 8.11 | 7.99 | 10.22 | 10.12 | 1.30 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{O p h})$ | 35.04 | 34.88 | 13.76 | 8.21 | 8.10 | 8.01 | 10.71 | 11.11 | 2.98 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{b i p y})$ | 18.55 | 17.92 | 7.51 | 4.88 | 4.56 | 4.54 | 6.45 | 6.40 | 1.30 |
| CH3CN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa) })_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 10.98 | 11.44 | 4.55 | 3.51 | 3.22 | 3.56 | 3.57 | 3.88 | 0.78 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{O p h})$ | 34.66 | 34.89 | 11.01 | 8.96 | 7.84 | 7.83 | 11.22 | 10.75 | 1.87 |
| $\mathbf{P r}(\text { hfaa })_{3}(\mathbf{b i p y})$ | 32.33 | 31.55 | 9.83 | 6.87 | 6.73 | 6.77 | 9.66 | 9.43 | 1.54 |

Table 6 shows Judd Ofelt intensity parameters. These parameters are derived from the observed oscillator strength. The variation of $T_{2}, T_{4}, T_{6}$ parameters clearly indicates the high sensitivity towards coordination. The symmetry of complexes changes as a result of the nature and position of the substituent, as well as the nature of solvent. The $\mathrm{T}_{4} / \mathrm{T}_{6}$ ratio varies between 0.15 to 0.34 which indicates the wide variation of oscillator strength of pseudo hypersensitive transitions.

Table 6 Judd Ofelt parameters $\left(\mathbf{T} \times 10{ }^{10}\right)$ for $\operatorname{Pr}($ IIII) Complexes in different solvents.

| Complexes and Solvent | T | T4 | T6 | $\mathrm{T}_{4} / \mathrm{T}_{6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 141.60 | 11.18 | 41.39 | 0.27 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\right.$ hfaa) ${ }_{3}(\mathbf{p p h})$ | 641.20 | 28.39 | 138.25 | 0.21 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\right.$ (hfaa) ${ }_{\mathbf{3}}(\mathbf{b i p y})$ | 865.01 | 25.30 | 96.15 | 0.26 |
| DMF |  |  |  |  |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 510.60 | 24.25 | 83.36 | 0.29 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}$ (hfaa)3(oph) | 620.80 | 44.50 | 130.40 | 0.34 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}$ (hfaa)3(bipy) | 198.98 | 23.80 | 109.68 | 0.22 |
| $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\text { hfaa })_{3}\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{2}$ | 165.55 | 9.68 | 31.98 | 0.30 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{hfaa})_{3}(\mathbf{0 p h})$ | 140.44 | 24.80 | 109.90 | 0.22 |
| $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\right.$ (hfaa) ${ }_{3}(\mathbf{b i p y})$ | 146.40 | 14.88 | 96.88 | 0.15 |

S. N. Misra et al [21-23] observed decrease in the values of $\left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{k}}, \mathrm{E}^{\mathrm{k}}\right)$ and $\xi_{4 \mathrm{f}}$ parameters as compared to corresponding parameters of aqueous ion. They also observed that $\operatorname{Pr}($ III ) complexes with $\beta$-diketones viz., bzac, acac, dbm, ttfa and nitrogen donor ligands viz., aniline, bromoaniline and chloroaniline and their ${ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{3} \mathrm{P}_{2}$, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{3} \mathrm{P}_{1},{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{3} \mathrm{P}_{0},{ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{1} \mathrm{D}_{2}$ transitions are not hypersensitive in orthodox sense [24-26] .

All these four transitions of $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{III}){ }^{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{3} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$, $\quad{ }^{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{4}} \rightarrow{ }^{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}},{ }^{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{4}} \rightarrow{ }^{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}} \quad$ and ${ }^{3} \mathbf{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}$ shows substantial variation of oscillator strength which confirm the ligand mediated pseudohypersensitivity of these pseudohypersensitive transitions. Karaker shows that the shape, energy and oscillator strength of hypersensitive and pseudohypersensitive transition could be correlated with diagnostic of the immediate coordination environment around the lanthanide ions and coordination number [27].

## CONCLUSION

The results of this study reveals that the $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{III})$ complexes with hexafluoroacetylacetone and their adducts with nitrogen donor ligands viz., o-phenanthroline and bipyridyl complexes creates high degree of intensification to ${ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{4} \rightarrow{ }^{3} \mathrm{P}_{2}$ pseudohypersensitive transitions, in different immediate coordination environment around lanthanide metal. The variation of $T_{2}, T_{4}$ and $T_{6}$ parameters clearly shows the high sensitivity towards the coordination. The change in the stereochemistry could change the distance between lanthanide metal and ligands.
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