Lyoluminescence of Irradiated Carbohydrates. Induced Emission from Diphenylisobenzofuran

By PHILIP LAFLIN and PETER J. BAUGH*

(Cockcroft Building, Department of Chemistry and Applied Chemistry, University of Salford, Salford M5 4WT)

Summary Unexpectedly, the emission observed during the dissolution of irradiated carbohydrates in aerated aqueous acetone or an aqueous solution of micelles containing diphenylisobenzofuran is greatly enhanced with respect to the natural lyoluminescence.

LYOLUMINESCENCE (LL), the emission of light occurring during the rapid dissolution of irradiated tissue equivalent materials, such as amino acids and carbohydrates,^{1a,b} has attracted attention because of possible applications in comparative dosimetry. In an attempt to characterise the excited species responsible for the emission, originally proposed to be a form of excited molecular oxygen,² we have used diphenylisobenzofuran (DPBF). Generally, in photochemistry³ and biological work,⁴ the bleaching of DPBF (λ_{max} 410 nm) is an indication of singlet O₂ ($^{1}\Delta_{g}$) involvement. Unexpectedly,⁵ we observe an emission which is enhanced by a factor of > 10 over LL during dissolution of y-irradiated carbohydrates in aqueous acetone or an aqueous solution of micelles³ [sodium dodecylsulphate (SDS); 10⁻¹ mol dm⁻³] containing DPBF (ca. 10⁻⁵ mol dm⁻³) where normally if singlet O_2 was directly involved quenching of LL might be expected. No emission as an accompanying phenomenon has been reported during DPBF bleaching by singlet O_2^6 although DPBF does fluoresce with λ_{max} (emission) ca. 480 nm.7 Using solution filters we have established that the emission peaks at ca. 480 nm correspond approximately to the fluorescence maximum of DPBF and, hence, there appears to be an induced emission from this compound *i.e.* chemiluminescence (CL). Whether LL is wholly replaced by this emission or is generated concurrently is extremely difficult to determine spectrally. However, since LL is observed largely at wavelengths $> 440 \text{ nm}^{1a,b}$ direct energy transfer from the excited species responsible

for LL to DPBF [λ_{max} (excitation) ca. 350 nm] appears not to be feasible on energetic grounds.

with similar characteristics to that of DPBF but with an enhancement of only a factor of 2 over LL. The original LL is extremely weak and the dose range

DPBF-CL exhibits a similar O₂ and dose dependency to LL⁵ and is suppressed by radical scavengers, such as hydroquinone. Thus, peroxyl radicals (RO2.) generated from radicals trapped in the irradiated solid reacting with O₂ during dissolution are likely candidates for the initial precursors. The exact mechanism by which the CL occurs is difficult to ascertain but may involve a direct reaction of RO2 • radicals with DPBF, energy transfer from an excited carbonyl produced by disproportionation of RO2 radicals,8 or decomposition of some other intermediate product. As a probe for an excited triplet state precursor we have used anthracene (ca. 10⁻³ mol dm⁻³) dispersed in an aqueous solution of micelles in addition to DPBF and find that the DPBF-CL is suppressed in this instance. Anthracene alone in micelles exhibits a luminescence (λ_{max} ca. 390 nm)

over which it can be calibrated is limited^{1b} even when employing extremely sensitive electronic equipment. The CL which is many times enhanced as for DPBF (or luminol reported previously⁹) may offer a potentially more sensitive system for applications in dosimetry. Furthermore, in this context the utilisation of aqueous solutions containing micelles, as in scintillation work, extends the range of organic fluorescers which can be employed. This medium allows, in addition to efficient dispersion of the fluorescers, rapid dissolution of many types of carbohydrate essential to the detection of the emission, whereas an aqueous organic solvent limits the choice of carbohydrate also.

(Received, 11th October 1978; Com. 1098.)

1 (a) P. J. Baugh, M. G. Mahjani, S. C. Ellis, and D. Rees Evans, Internat. J. Radiation Phys. Chem., 1977, 10, 21; (b) K. V. Ettinger,

J. R. Mallard, S. Srirath, and A. Takavar, Phys. Med. Biol., 1977, 22, 481.
 ² N. A. Atari and K. V. Ettinger, Nature, 1974, 249, 341.

³ See for example A. A. Gorman, G. L. Lovering, and M. A. J. Rodgers, *Photochem. Photobiol*, 1976, 23, 399.
⁴ See for example, J. F. Piatt, A. S. Cheema, and P. J. O'Brien, *FEBS Letters*, 1977, 74, 251.
⁵ P. Laflin, S.R.C. CASE project report to the National Physical Laboratory, January 1978; P. J. Baugh and P. Laflin, *Internat. J.* Radiation Phys. Chem., in the press.
⁶ C. Dufraisse and S. Ecary, Compt. rend., 1946, 223, 735.
⁷ R. Adams and M. H. Gold, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1940, 62, 2038.

⁸ J. A. Howard and K. V. Ingold, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 1968, 90, 1056; G. Buchan, K. V. Ettinger, and A. Takavar, European Dosimetry Group Meeting, Fontenay-aux-Roses, October, 1977

⁹ N. A. Atari and K. V. Ettinger, Nature, 1974, 247, 193.