The Utilisation of the Fricke Dosimeter for Evaluating the Biological Radiation-protective Potential of Water-soluble Organic Compounds

By G. G. JAYSON

(Chemistry Department, Liverpool Regional College, Byrom Street, Liverpool)

and ANTONY C. WILBRAHAM*

(Chemistry Department, Florida Presbyterian College, St. Petersburg, Florida 33733)

WHILE the presence of organic impurities in Fricke dosimeter solutions^{1,2} during irradiation usually leads to increased ferric yields,³ the addition of cystamine produces a marked decrease. Cystamine is among the best of the known biological radiation-protective compounds.

This result forms the basis for our method of protection evaluation and is further supported by the results from some more recent experiments, using cysteamine and both oxidized and reduced glutathione. These latter compounds are known radiation protective substances—and all reduce radiolytic ferric yields when present in Fricke solutions during irradiation.

Fricke dosimeter solutions containing cystamine sulphate (0.01-10 mM) were prepared and irradiated with X-rays (250 pkv, 15 mA, dose-rate 958 rads/min.) under both aerated and deaerated conditions.

From the yield (ferric) vs. dose (total) curves, all of which were linear through the origin, $G(Fe^{3+})$ values were calculated and plotted as a function of the concentration of added cystamine (Figure). A common limiting value of $G(Fe^{3+}) = 4.5$ was obtained for both the aerated and deaerated systems.

The reactions during the radiolytic oxidation of ferrous ions are well understood^{2,4} and the rate



Dependence of ferric ion production, from irradiated ferrous ammonium solutions (Fricke solutions) upon the \log_{10} of the concentration of added cystamine.

constants for the individual reactions are known.⁵ Since, under the conditions of irradiation, cystamine does not react with hydrogen peroxide,⁶ it follows that interference must be with the Fe^{2+} vs. $\cdot OH$ and Fe^{2+} vs $\cdot O_2H$ interactions. Cystamine has been demonstrated to react readily with •OH⁶ and also, at high concentrations, with ·O₂H radicals.

The following interpretation is proposed to account for the present observations and particularly the numerical value of the limiting ferric yield, at high cystamine concentrations, in the presence or absence of oxygen:

Oxygen present:

$$H^+ + O_2H + RS SR \rightarrow RSSR + H_2O_2$$
 (1)

Oxygen absent:

$$H^+ + H^{\cdot} + Fe_2^+ \to Fe^{3+} + H_2$$
 (2)

then in both cases:

$$H_2O_2^{\dagger} + Fe_2^{+} \rightarrow Fe^{3+} + OH^{-} + OH \qquad (3)$$

$$\cdot OH_{\ddagger}^{\ddagger} + RS \cdot SR \rightarrow RS \cdot SR^{\intercal} + OH^{-}$$
(4)

$$\dot{RS} \cdot SR \rightarrow \text{products}$$
 (5)

Under both sets of conditions the limiting $G(Fe^{3+})$ is given by the expression:

$$G(\text{Fe}^{3+}) = G_{\text{H}} + G_{\text{H},0}$$
, *i.e.* $3.7 + 0.8 = 4.5$

As a test for the above proposals, the deaerated system was considered; a cystamine concentration exists at which half of the ·OH radicals react with cystamine and half react with ferrous ions. *i.e.* only partial scavenging by cystamine occurs, therefore:

$$G(Fe^{3+}) = G_{H} + \frac{1}{2} G_{\cdot OH} + \frac{3}{2} G_{H_{2}O_{2}}$$

i.e. $3 \cdot 7 + \frac{1}{2} (2 \cdot 7) + \frac{3}{2} (0 \cdot 8) = 6 \cdot 25$

From the Figure it is seen that this $G(Fe^{3+})$ value occurs in 1mm-ferrous solution at 0.08 mm cvstamine.

The ratio of the rate constants for reaction of ·OH with cystamine and of ·OH with ferrous ions7 must be the inverse of this concentration ratio $(\sim 12:1)$ which is in general agreement with the known⁸ rate constants of sulphur compounds with ·OH (3–9 \times 10⁹M⁻¹ sec.⁻¹) and in good agreement with the value $(5-9 \times 10^{9} \text{M}^{-1} \text{ sec.}^{-1})$ obtained by us in preliminary pulse radiolysis studies.

In aerated systems, containing Imm-ferrous and Imm-cystamine, virtually all the ·OH radicals will be scavenged by cystamine, while the $\cdot O_2H$ radicals will react with ferrous ions.6 Theoretically, $G(\text{Fe}^{3+})$ should equal $2G_{\text{H}} + G_{\text{H}_2O_2}$ or 8.2, a value in excellent agreement with that observed experimentally (ca. 8.0, Figure).

We thank the City of Liverpool Education Authorities for support of this work and for a Research Assistantship (to A.C.W.).

(Received, April 2nd, 1968; Com. 407.)

- † In the aerated system H₂O₂ includes both the radiolytic yield and the yield from reaction (1). \ddagger OH includes both the radiolytic yield and the yield from reaction (3).
- ¹ H. Fricke and S. Morse, Amer. J. Roentgenol. Radium Therapy, 1927, 18, 430.
- ² A. O. Allen, "Radiation Chemistry of Water and Aqueous Solutions," Van Nostrand, New York, 1961.
- ³ H. A. Dewhurst, Trans. Faraday Soc., 1952, 48, 905.
- ⁴ W. G. Barb, J. H. Baxendale, P. George, and K. R. Hargrave, Nature, 1949, 163, 692.
- ⁵ J. P. Keene, *Radiation Res.*, 1964, **22**, 14. ⁶ G. G. Jayson, T. C. Owen, and A. C. Wilbraham, *J. Chem. Soc.* (B), 1967, 944.
- ⁷G. G. Jayson, D. A. Stirling and A. J. Swallow, *Chem. Comm.*, 1967, 931.
 ⁸G. E. Adams, J. W. Boag, J. Currant, and B. D. Michael, in "Pulse Radiolysis," eds. M. Ebert, J. P. Keene, A. J. Swallow, and J. H. Baxendale, Academic Press, 1965, p. 131.