

## CORRECTION

[View Article Online](#)  
[View Journal](#) | [View Issue](#)



Cite this: *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2020, **19**, 858

## Correction: Role of solute-solvent hydrogen bonds on the ground state and the excited state proton transfer in 3-hydroxyflavone. A systematic spectrophotometric study

Simone Lazzaroni,<sup>a,b</sup> Daniele Dondi,<sup>a</sup> Alberto Mezzetti<sup>\*c</sup> and Stefano Protti<sup>\*d</sup>

DOI: 10.1039/d0pp90017f  
 rsc.li/pps

Correction for 'Role of solute-solvent hydrogen bonds on the ground state and the excited state proton transfer in 3-hydroxyflavone. A systematic spectrophotometric study' by Simone Lazzaroni et al., *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2018, **17**, 923–933, DOI: 10.1039/C8PP00053K.

The authors would like to correct Table 1 as, upon further examination of the fluorescence spectra and fluorescence excitation spectra, they noticed that the position of the peak is not well-defined. This may be due to a series of factors: (1) simultaneous presence, in the same solution, of three different emission peaks ( $N^*$ ,  $T^*$ ,  $A^*$ ). The authors decided not to use any deconvolution or band decomposition procedure for reasons that will be explained in point (3) below. This may lead to some uncertainty ( $\pm 3$  nm) especially when the  $A^*$  band is present. (2) Presence of Raman peak(s) from the solvent which overlap with the emission peaks, leading to some uncertainty around the exact position of the latter. (3) Presence of subpopulations of species (especially of the  $A^*$  form, as previously noticed),<sup>1,2</sup> each one characterized by slightly different emission and absorption peaks.

Slight discrepancies compared to literature values are most likely due to differences in the excitation wavelength (for the emission spectra) or the chosen emission wavelength (for the fluorescence excitation spectra). Given the strict protocols which were followed for solvent purification and 3HF purification, the authors exclude any contributions from impurities, moisture, or other contaminants.

The correct Table 1 is shown below with the corrected values for the following:  $\lambda_{em(N)}$  in ethyl acetate, acetonitrile, 1,4-dioxane, tetrahydrofuran, methanol, formamide and *N*-methyl formamide;  $\lambda_{em(T)}$  in chloroform;  $\lambda_{em(A)}$  in acetone, ethanol and formamide; and  $\lambda_{ex(A)}$  in tetrahydrofuran, acetone, methanol, iso-propanol, 2-methoxyethanol, formamide, *N*-methylformamide and *N,N*-dimethylformamide.

The Royal Society of Chemistry apologises for these errors and any consequent inconvenience to authors and readers.

<sup>a</sup>Radchem Lab, Department of Chemistry, University of Pavia, Via Taramelli 10, Italy

<sup>b</sup>Laboratory of Applied Nuclear Energy, LENA, University of Pavia, Via Aselli 41, 27100 Pavia, Italy

<sup>c</sup>Laboratoire de Réactivité de Surface UMR CNRS 7197, Sorbonne Université, Faculté de Sciences et Ingénierie, Tour 43-53, 3<sup>ème</sup> étage, 4 Pl Jussieu, 75005 Paris, France. E-mail: alberto.mezzetti@upmc.fr

<sup>d</sup>PhotoGreen Lab, Department of Chemistry, University of Pavia, Via Taramelli 12, 27100 Pavia, Italy. E-mail: stefano.protti@unipv.it



**Table 1** Photophysical parameters for 3HF in different solvents. In parenthesis, the quantum yields are indicated

Solvent	$\lambda_{em(N)} (\Phi_N)$	$\lambda_{em(T)} (\Phi_T)$	$\lambda_{em(A)} (\Phi_A)$	$\lambda_{ex(A)}$
<b>Aqueous solution</b>				
NaOH (0.1 M)	—	—	519 (0.002)	400
<b>Alkanes</b>				
<i>n</i> -Pentane	—	530 (0.37)	—	—
<i>i</i> -Pentane	—	528 (0.32)	—	—
2,2,4-Trimethylpentane	—	523 (0.31)	—	—
<i>n</i> -Hexane	—	529 (0.33)	—	—
Cyclohexane	—	527 (0.28)	—	—
<b>Aromatics</b>				
Benzene	—	536 (0.23)	—	—
Toluene	—	530 (0.29)	—	—
<b>Haloaliphatics</b>				
Dichloromethane	—	528 (0.18)	—	—
Chloroform	400 ( $<10^{-3}$ )	532 (0.19)	—	—
Carbon tetrachloride	—	523 (0.24)	—	—
<b>Esters</b>				
Ethyl acetate	387 (0.0027)	529 (0.067)	—	—
<b>Nitriles</b>				
Acetonitrile	395 (0.0008)	525 (0.06)	468 (0.096)	420
<b>Ethers</b>				
1,4-Dioxane	394 (0.0028)	530 (0.067)	474 (0.055)	413
Diethyl ether	400 (0.0025)	537 (0.042)	474 (0.052)	412
Tetrahydrofuran	403 (0.001)	538 (0.040)	485 (0.119)	404
<b>Ketones</b>				
Acetone	400 (0.0048)	530 (0.030)	481 (0.046)	420
<b>Alcohols</b>				
Methanol	406 (0.009)	528 (0.017)	481 (0.029)	410
Ethanol	406 (0.0056)	531 (0.018)	478 (0.010)	414
<i>i</i> -Propanol	404 (0.0049)	532 (0.041)	495 (0.021)	411
2-Methoxyethanol	403 (0.009)	539 (0.053)	488 (0.018)	406
Triethylene glycol monomethyl ether	406 (0.0079)	540 (0.067)	484 (0.053)	411
2,2,2-Trifluoroethanol	407 (0.024)	503 (0.046)	—	—
<b>Amides</b>				
Formamide	406 (0.006)	526 (0.023)	490 (0.016)	412
<i>N</i> -Methylformamide	402 (0.009)	529 (0.035)	483 (0.130)	407
<i>N,N</i> -Dimethylformamide	400 (0.003)	539 (0.024)	492 (0.096)	431 (a twin peak at 417 nm)
<b>Sulfoxides</b>				
Dimethylsulfoxide	400 (0.0015)	534 (0.008)	502 (0.034)	428

## References

- 1 D. Loco, S. Protti, B. Mennucci and A. Mezzetti, *J. Mol. Struct.*, 2019, **1182**, 283–291.
- 2 B. Dereka, R. Letrun, D. Svehkarev, A. Rosspeintner and E. Vauthey, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2015, **119**, 2434–2443.

