

1989

Electron Affinity of Chlorine Dioxide

Lucia M. Babcock

Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge

Thomas C. Pentecost

Grand Valley State University, pentecot@gvsu.edu

W. H. Koppenol

Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/chm_articles

 Part of the [Chemistry Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Babcock, Lucia M.; Pentecost, Thomas C.; and Koppenol, W. H., "Electron Affinity of Chlorine Dioxide" (1989). *Peer Reviewed Articles*. 27.

https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/chm_articles/27

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Chemistry Department at ScholarWorks@GVSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Peer Reviewed Articles by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@GVSU. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gvsu.edu.

maximum activity at optimal w_0 values ranging from 10 to 15. At the same time, adjusting a reversed micellar solution of high w_0 to the optimal range by adding surfactant may not improve catalytic efficiency due to adverse protein-surfactant interactions.²⁰ The ability to adjust w_0 through hydrate formation (keeping

surfactant concentration constant) may thus have implications to the design of protein-containing reversed micellar systems.

Acknowledgment. Support from the National Science Foundation (Grant CBT-8802564) is gratefully acknowledged.

Electron Affinity of Chlorine Dioxide

L. M. Babcock,^{*,†} T. Pentecost,[†] and W. H. Koppenol^{†,‡}

Department of Chemistry and Biodynamics Institute, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803 (Received: September 5, 1989)


The flowing afterglow technique was used to determine the electron affinity of chlorine dioxide. A value of 2.37 ± 0.10 eV was found by bracketing between the electron affinities of HS^* and SF_4 as a lower limit and that of NO_2 as an upper limit. This value is in excellent agreement with 2.32 eV predicted from a simple thermodynamic cycle involving the reduction potential of the $\text{ClO}_2/\text{ClO}_2^-$ couple and a Gibbs hydration energy identical with that of SO_2^* .

Introduction

Recently, the reduction potential of the formate radical, CO_2^* was calculated to be -1.8 V from the electron affinity of carbon dioxide and a Gibbs hydration energy estimated to be similar to those of other bent triatomic anions, namely, O_3^* , NO_2^- , and SO_2^* .¹ The assumption that these anions have similar Gibbs hydration energies can be tested by determining the electron affinity of the chlorine dioxide radical and calculating the Gibbs hydration energy from the difference with the well-known reduction potential of the $\text{ClO}_{2,\text{ao}}/\text{ClO}_{2,\text{ao}}^-$ couple. In the literature the following values for the electron affinity of chlorine dioxide are found: 2.8 eV,² 3.4 eV,³ 1.8 eV,⁴ and a range of 1.3–2.2 eV.⁵ If one assumes, given the similarity in molecular parameters,⁶ that the Gibbs solvation energy of ClO_2^- is similar to that of SO_2^* , 134 kJ/mol¹ relative to $\Delta_f G(H^+) = 0$, a value of 2.32 eV is predicted from the simple thermodynamic cycle: $\text{EA} + \Delta_s G^\circ(\text{ClO}_2^-) = E^\circ(\text{ClO}_{2,\text{g}}/\text{ClO}_{2,\text{ao}}^-)$. The parameters used in this calculation are the reduction potential of $E^\circ(\text{ClO}_{2,\text{ao}}/\text{ClO}_{2,\text{ao}}^-)$, 0.934 V at 25 °C,^{7,8} and the Gibbs hydration energy of chlorine dioxide, -0.4 kJ/mol.⁹ As shown below, a value close to this theoretical estimate is found. An accurate value for the electron affinity of chlorine dioxide might possibly be relevant to reactions of this molecule in the stratosphere. At night chlorine dioxide acts as a reservoir of chlorine monoxide¹⁰ which acts catalytically in the destruction of ozone.¹¹


Experimental Section

Chlorine dioxide was synthesized according to Bray.¹² Briefly, 15 g of oxalic acid and 4 g of potassium chlorate were mixed in a three-neck round-bottom flask that was subsequently kept at 55–60 °C in a water bath. Reaction 1 started after addition of



2 mL of water. Yellow chlorine dioxide gas, free from chlorine, evolved slowly for about 3 h. The presence of carbon dioxide minimizes the risk of an explosion¹³ and did not interfere with subsequent reactions. As an additional precaution, the reaction vessel was shielded from direct light by aluminum foil. The employed synthesis is considered safe,¹³ and it is therefore unfortunate that the experimental details are not mentioned in a recent monograph on chlorine dioxide.¹⁴ Excess chlorine dioxide was allowed to bubble through a solution of sodium hydroxide solution where it disproportionated.

Experimental determination of the electron affinity of chlorine dioxide was carried out on a flowing afterglow apparatus which has been described in detail elsewhere.¹⁵ The buffer gas employed in all cases was helium which, prior to introduction into the flow tube, was passed through a molecular sieve at 77 K to trap any condensable impurities. All reactions were studied at ambient temperatures at a pressure of 0.3 Torr (40 Pa), corresponding to typical helium flows of on the order of 10 standard liters/min. For charge-exchange reactions involving neutral chlorine dioxide, reactant anions were generated from corresponding neutrals by electron attachment. The NO_2^- , SF_4^- , SF_6^- , and SO_2^- reactant ions were produced from the corresponding parent neutral molecules, while SF_5^- , HS^- , Cl^- , Br^- , and I^- were generated by dissociative electron attachment to SF_6 , H_2S , CF_2Cl_2 , CH_3Br , and CH_3I , respectively. The NO_3^- anion was produced from NO_2 . These reactant anions were produced upstream near the ion source, and neutral ClO_2 was introduced approximately 65 cm downstream. ClO_2^- was produced upstream via electron transfer from SF_6^- :



Reaction 2 occurs at approximately the theoretical collision capture

- (1) Koppenol, W. H.; Rush, J. D. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1987**, *91*, 4429–4430.
- (2) Weiss, J. *Trans. Faraday Soc.* **1947**, *43*, 173–177.
- (3) Pritchard, H. O. *Chem. Rev.* **1953**, *52*, 529–563.
- (4) Baluev, A. B.; Nikitina, Z. K.; Fedorova, L. I.; Rosolovskii, V. Ya. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Khim.* **1980**, *9*, 1963–1971.
- (5) Wecker, D.; Christodoulides, A. A.; Schindler, R. N. *Int. J. Mass Spectrom. Ion Phys.* **1981**, *38*, 391–406.
- (6) Stanbury, D. M.; Lednicky, L. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1984**, *106*, 2847–2853.
- (7) Troitskaya, N. V.; Mishenko, K. P.; Flis, I. E. *Russ. J. Phys. Chem. (Engl. Transl.)* **1959**, *33*, 77–79.
- (8) Klänning, U. K.; Sehested, K.; Holcman, J. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1985**, *89*, 760–763.
- (9) Wagman, D. D.; Evans, W. H.; Parker, V. B.; Schumm, R. H.; Halow, I.; Bailey, S. M.; Churney, K. L.; Nuttal, R. L. *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **1982**, *11*, 37–38.
- (10) Solomon, S.; Mount, G. H.; Sanders, W.; Jakoubek, R. O.; Schmeltekopf, A. L. *Science* **1988**, *242*, 550–555.
- (11) McElroy, M. B.; Salawitch, R. J. *Science* **1989**, *243*, 763–770.
- (12) Bray, W. Z. *Phys. Chem.* **1906**, *54*, 569–608.
- (13) Abegg, R.; Auerbach, F. *Handbuch der Anorganischen Chemie*; S. Hirzel: Leipzig, 1913; 4 Band, 2 Abt., pp 169–170.
- (14) Masschelein, W. J. *Chlorine Dioxide: Chemistry and Environmental Impact of Oxychlorine Compounds*; Ann Arbor Science Publishers: Ann Arbor, MI, 1979.
- (15) Babcock, L. M.; Taylor, W. S.; Herd, C. R. *Int. J. Mass Spectrom. Ion Processes* **1987**, *81*, 259–272.

[†] Department of Chemistry.

[‡] Biodynamics Institute.




Figure 1. Mass spectrum of ClO_2^- reactant ion produced by electron transfer from SF_6^- to neutral ClO_2 . Inset is an expansion of mass region 65–75 showing the locations of $^{35}\text{ClO}_2^-$ and $^{37}\text{ClO}_2^-$ at 67 and 69 amu, respectively.

cross section.^{16–19} Since the electron affinity of SF_6 is relatively small, 1.05 eV,²⁰ reaction 3 is an excellent method for forming reactant anions. The chlorine dioxide flow was adjusted so that SF_6^- was depleted in the ClO_2^- reactant spectrum. Generation of reactant chlorine dioxide anions in this manner is clean, and only ClO_2^- is observed as shown in Figure 1. Reactant neutral gases were added approximately 85 cm downstream of the ion source. Reactant neutral gases as well as source gases for ions other than ClO_2^- were obtained commercially and used without purification. For all systems examined, reaction distances were ≥ 67 cm, which corresponds to reaction times of at least 15 ms.

Results

The use of flowing afterglow techniques and ion–molecule charge-transfer reactions to determine electron affinities is presented only briefly since it appears in more detail elsewhere.²¹ Because reactions studied in the flowing afterglow apparatus are thermal, observation of the charge-transfer reaction



indicates that $\text{EA}(\text{C}) \geq \text{EA}(\text{A})$. If, however, the charge-transfer reaction does not proceed, it is probable that $\text{EA}(\text{C}) < \text{EA}(\text{A})$, but caution must be exercised since charge transfer for polyatomic anions does not always occur even when energetically favorable.²² For this reason, it is best to examine charge-exchange reactions in both directions (that is, to examine both $\text{A}^- + \text{C}$ and $\text{C}^- + \text{A}$), and we have done so where possible; see Table I. These bracketing experiments place the electron affinity of chlorine dioxide above those for HS and SF_4 and below that of NO_2 . From established values for the electron affinities of these species (see Table I), we can place $\text{EA}(\text{ClO}_2)$ at 2.37 ± 0.10 eV. This value is in excellent agreement with the 2.32 eV predicted from the simple thermodynamic cycle discussed above.

Discussion

Our charge-exchange reactions indicate that the electron affinity of chlorine dioxide is less than that of nitrogen dioxide but greater

TABLE I: Charge-Exchange Reactions: $\text{ClO}_2^- + \text{X}$ and $\text{X}^- + \text{ClO}_2$

charge-exchange reaction	EA(X), ^a eV	limit on EA(ClO_2), eV
$\text{ClO}_2^- + \text{N}_2\text{O} \rightleftharpoons \text{N}_2\text{O}^-$	0.2 ± 0.1	≥ 0.2
$\text{ClO}_2^- + \text{CF}_2\text{Cl}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{CF}_2\text{Cl}_2^-$	0.4 ± 0.2	≥ 0.4
$\text{ClO}_2^- + \text{SF}_6 \rightleftharpoons \text{SF}_6^-$	1.05 ± 0.10	≥ 1.05
$\text{SF}_6^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightarrow \text{ClO}_2^-$	1.05 ± 0.10	≥ 1.05
$\text{ClO}_2^- + \text{SO}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{SO}_2^-$ ^b	1.107 ± 0.008	≥ 1.107
$\text{SO}_2^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightarrow \text{ClO}_2^-$	1.107 ± 0.008	≥ 1.107
$\text{ClO}_2^- + \text{CO} \rightleftharpoons \text{CO}^-$	1.4	≥ 1.4
$\text{HS}^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightarrow \text{ClO}_2^-$	2.32 ± 0.10	≥ 2.32
$\text{ClO}_2^- + \text{SF}_4 \rightleftharpoons \text{SF}_4^-$ ^b	2.35 ± 0.10^c	≥ 2.35
$\text{SF}_4^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightarrow \text{ClO}_2^-$	2.35 ± 0.10	≥ 2.35
$\text{ClO}_2^- + \text{NO}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO}_2^-$	2.38 ± 0.06^d	< 2.38
$\text{NO}_2^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{ClO}_2^-$ ^b	2.38 ± 0.06^d	< 2.38
$\text{ClO}_2^- + \text{Cl}_2 \rightarrow \text{Cl}_2^-$	2.4 ± 0.2	< 2.4
$\text{SF}_3^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{ClO}_2^-$	3.0 ± 0.3	< 3.0
$\text{I}^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{ClO}_2^-$ ^b	3.059	< 3.059
$\text{Br}^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{ClO}_2^-$ ^b	3.365	< 3.365
$\text{Cl}^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{ClO}_2^-$	3.617	< 3.617
$\text{NO}_3^- + \text{ClO}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{ClO}_2^-$	3.9 ± 0.2	< 3.9

^a See ref 20. ^b Other bimolecular product channels are present. ^c See ref 5. ^d See ref 21.

than those of HS and SF_4 . This ordering of electron affinities supports previous work by Dunkin et al.²³ who found that $\text{EA}(\text{Cl}_2) > \text{EA}(\text{NO}_2) > \text{EA}(\text{HS})$ and determined a value of 2.38 ± 0.06 eV for $\text{EA}(\text{NO}_2)$. It is also consistent with our previous work²¹ on SF_4 where charge-transfer reactions indicated the relative order $\text{EA}(\text{Cl}_2) > \text{EA}(\text{NO}_2) > \text{EA}(\text{SF}_4) > \text{EA}(\text{HS})$. The compilation by Lias et al.²⁰ gives a “best” value of 2.30 eV for $\text{EA}(\text{NO}_2)$, which along with “best” values for HS and SF_4 gives the relative ordering $\text{EA}(\text{SF}_4) > \text{EA}(\text{HS}) > \text{EA}(\text{NO}_2)$. This is not consistent with our previous SF_4 work²¹ or the work of Dunkin et al.,²³ which place $\text{EA}(\text{NO}_2)$ above $\text{EA}(\text{HS})$ and $\text{EA}(\text{SF}_4)$. We have chosen, therefore, to use the value 2.38 eV of Dunkin et al.²³ in determining $\text{EA}(\text{ClO}_2)$ and suggest that this higher value is closer to a “best value” than is 2.30 eV. It is interesting that the average value calculated from all electron affinities in the compilation²⁰ is 2.39 eV. However, as Table I illustrates, the electron affinities of the group HS, SF_4 , ClO_2 , NO_2 , and Cl_2 are quite similar, and all of the values in fact lie within experimental error of each other. While assignment of more exact electron affinities for these species will require more work, it seems that the relative order $\text{EA}(\text{Cl}_2) > \text{EA}(\text{NO}_2) > \text{EA}(\text{SF}_4) > \text{EA}(\text{HS})$ is appropriate.

In 1947, Weiss² calculated that the sum of the electron affinity and the Gibbs hydration energy of ClO_2^- was -121.2 kcal. Estimating the absolute Gibbs hydration energy of chlorine dioxide at -55 kcal/mol, he arrived at the widely quoted value of 2.8 eV. If one repeats his thermodynamic cycle with more recent parameters,⁹ a sum of -127.2 kcal results. With the Gibbs hydration energy given above, -70.5 kcal/mol relative to $\Delta_f G^\circ(\text{H}^+) = 102.5$ kcal/mol,²⁴ one finds an electron affinity of 2.47 eV, in good agreement with the experimentally determined value.

Wecker et al.⁵ have examined the rate coefficients and activation energy for thermal electron capture by chlorine dioxide and deduced a value of $\text{EA}(\text{ClO}_2) \leq 2.2$ eV. This is based upon a thermodynamic cycle that requires that $\text{EA}(\text{ClO}_2) < \text{EA}(\text{ClO})$. Again, our results are in good agreement with this deduced value when one considers that $\text{EA}(\text{ClO})$ is determined only to about 0.3 eV.

Acknowledgment. We thank Dr. Z. Maskos for translating ref 4. This work was supported by grants from the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund (L.M.B.) and the Council for Tobacco Research-U.S.A., Inc. (W.H.K.).

(16) Compton, R. N.; Christophorou, L. G.; Hurst, G. S.; Reinhardt, P. *W. J. Chem. Phys.* **1966**, *45*, 4634–4639.

(17) Fehsenfeld, F. C. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1970**, *53*, 2000–2004.

(18) Odom, R. L.; Smith, D. L.; Futrell, J. H. *J. Phys. B* **1975**, *8*, 1349.

(19) Foster, M. S.; Beauchamp, J. L. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1975**, *31*, 482–486.

(20) Electron affinities for all compounds with the exceptions of SF_4 and NO_2 are best values from: Lias, S. G.; Bartmess, J. E.; Liebman, J. F.; Holmes, J. L.; Levin, R. D.; Mallard, W. G. *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **1988**, *17* (Suppl. 1).

(21) Babcock, L. M.; Streit, G. E. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1981**, *75*, 3864–3870.

(22) Lifschitz, C.; Tiernan, T. O.; Hughes, B. H. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1973**, *59*, 3182–3192.

(23) Dunkin, D. B.; Fehsenfeld, F. C.; Ferguson, E. E. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1972**, *15*, 257–259.

(24) Rosseinsky, D. R. *Chem. Rev.* **1965**, *65*, 467–490.