

# FREE-RADICAL AND MOLECULE THERMOCHEMISTRY FROM STUDIES OF GAS-PHASE IODINE-ATOM REACTIONS

DAVID M. GOLDEN AND SIDNEY W. BENSON

Department of Thermochemistry and Chemical Kinetics, Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California 94025

Received August 30, 1968

## Contents

I. Introduction	125
II. Background	125
A. Mechanism	125
B. Discussion of Assumption that $E_2 = 0 \pm 1$ kcal/mole	126
C. Uncertainties	126
III. Rate Expressions	127
IV. Experimental Methods	128
V. Results	128
A. Equilibrium Studies	128
1. $\text{RH} + \text{I}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{RI} + \text{HI}$	128
2. $\text{RI}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{Olefin} + \text{I}_2$	129
3. $\text{RH} + \text{I}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{Olefin} + 2\text{HI}$	129
4. Positional and Geometric Isomerization of Olefins	129
B. Kinetic Studies	130
1. Free-Radical Heats of Formation	130
2. Pyrolysis of Organic Iodides	133
VI. Discussion	133

## I. Introduction

The ultimate goal of the chemist is to be able to make accurate *a priori* predictions of the products and the rates of chemical reactions. At this stage in the development of chemistry, chemists are able to predict the products of a wide range of reactions and are beginning to have a more limited success in predicting rates.

Chemical reactions are, in general, made up of a number of "elementary" steps. Some combination of the rates of these steps determines the rate of the over-all process. It thus becomes necessary to know the rate constants or, better still, the activation parameters for those elementary steps. The activation parameters in turn are related to, and often accessible from, thermochemical parameters of reactants, products, and intermediates. The thermochemistry of short-lived intermediates is most accurately obtained from kinetic studies. This review is concerned with a specific class of such kinetic studies.

The vast majority of these particular reactions have been studied in these laboratories, and this review is undertaken in large measure, in the hope that others will discover the use-


fulness of the techniques discussed herein, and will add to the paucity of thermochemical data on free radicals.

We have tried to keep abreast of the literature through July 1968.


## II. Background

### A. MECHANISM

The gas-phase reactions of both aliphatic and aromatic iodides (RI) with HI go quantitatively to parent hydrocarbon (RH) and  $\text{I}_2$  at measurable rates in the 200–500° temperature range.



In 1934, Ogg<sup>1</sup> measured the rates for the reactions with R equal to  $\text{CH}_3$ ,  $\text{C}_2\text{H}_5$ , and  $n\text{-C}_3\text{H}_7$ . His interpretation of the results included a mechanism which was part radical chain and part bimolecular, and yielded rate constants which Benson and O'Neal<sup>2a</sup> and Sullivan,<sup>2b</sup> with the advantage of 25 years of increased understanding of the significance of Arrhenius parameters, showed to be inconsistent with parameters for similar reactions. These workers<sup>2</sup> have proposed the simple mechanism



and shown that Ogg's<sup>1</sup> data were consistent with this mechanism. Furthermore, it follows that if the entropy and heat of formation for the iodide (RI) are known, measurements of  $\Delta H^\circ_{1,2}$  and  $\Delta S^\circ_{1,2}$  may be used to obtain values of the heat of formation and entropy of the radical. Similarly, measurements of  $\Delta H^\circ_{3,4}$  and  $\Delta S^\circ_{3,4}$  yield the same information, if the values are known for the hydrocarbon. If one can measure, or


(1) R. A. Ogg, Jr., *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **56**, 526 (1934).

(2) (a) S. W. Benson and H. E. O'Neal, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **34**, 514(1 961);

(b) J. H. Sullivan, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **65**, 722 (1961).

knows, the activation energies for either of the pairs, 1 and 2, or 3 and 4, one has measured the heat of formation of the radical. A reasonable amount of evidence has accumulated to indicate that  $E_2 = 0 \pm 1$  and  $E_3 = 1 \pm 1$  kcal/mole. (This represents a change, as prior to this time the value  $E_3 = 1.5 \pm 1$  kcal/mole has been used.) Some of this will be discussed presently. In the meantime, accepting these as constant values means that measurements of  $E_1$  or  $E_4$  will yield the enthalpy of interest.

The above simple mechanism rests on the assumptions that I and  $I_2$  are in equilibrium, and that the following reactions are negligible.



Steady-state analysis yields the relation

$$\frac{(\text{R})}{(\text{I})} = \frac{k_1(\text{RI}) + k_4(\text{RH})}{k_2(\text{I}_2) + k_8(\text{HI})} \ll 1$$

In consequence, the only important terminations are I-atom recombination. This is true even though I-atom recombination requires a third body,<sup>3</sup> whereas  $\text{R} + \text{I} \rightarrow \text{RI}$  or  $2\text{R} \rightarrow \text{R}_2$  does not. Since initiation is  $I_2$  decomposition, the first condition is achieved.

Reactions of type a could compete as initiation steps, if  $DH^\circ(\text{R}-\text{I})$  is very weak. This has not been observed.

Reactions of type b can never compete with reactions 2 and 3 and are totally unimportant since reactions 2 and 3 proceed at about 1 in 100 collisions, whereas reaction b probably has an  $A$  factor of 1 in 1000 and some considerable activation energy.

An interesting observation concerning the radical trapping ability of HI is that from the fact that the bond dissociation energy (BDE) is  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{H}-\text{I}) = 71.3$  kcal/mole, this is the strongest bond an I atom can make and one of the weakest that an H atom makes. This further implies that a radical R will always abstract H from HI, never I.


## B. DISCUSSION OF ASSUMPTION THAT

$$E_2 = 0 \pm 1 \text{ KCAL/MOLE}$$

The values for  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(\text{R}\cdot, \text{g})$  obtained by the kinetic methods described in this review rest on the assumption that the activation energy for reaction 2 is  $0 \pm 1$  kcal/mole. There are several experimental indications, if not proofs, of this statement.

Christie<sup>4</sup> has measured the rate constant  $k_2$  at room temperature as part of an investigation of the oxidation of  $\text{CH}_3\text{I}$ . Her value, which is based on assigning a value of  $10^{10.5} M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$  to  $\text{CH}_3$  radical combination, is  $10^{10.0} M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$ . Using Flowers and Benson's<sup>5</sup> value of  $\log A_1 = 11.4 M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$ , and  $\Delta S^\circ_{12}(560\text{K}) = 6.2$  gibbs/mole,  $\log A_2(560\text{K}) = 10.0 M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$ . Thus,  $E_2 \approx 0$  kcal/mole.

Further evidence is the agreement between the I-atom method and photobromination work<sup>6</sup> on ethyl and *t*-butyl



(3) G. Porter, *Science*, **160**, 1299 (1968).

(4) M. Christie, *Proc. Roy. Soc.*, **A244**, 411 (1958).

(5) M. C. Flowers and S. W. Benson, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **38**, 882 (1963).

(6) G. C. Fettis and A. F. Trotman-Dickenson, *J. Chem. Soc.*, 3037 (1961).

radicals. The photobromination values are obtained by measuring the activation energy  $E_x$  directly and the activation energy  $E_{-x}$  relative to  $E_2$  for  $\text{R} = \text{CH}_3$ . All values are based on the assumption  $E_2 \approx 0$ . Thus, while the values of  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{CH}_3-\text{H})$  obtained by these two methods, which agree exactly, are based on the same assumption, the values for  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_5-\text{H})$  and  $DH^\circ_{298}(t\text{-C}_4\text{H}_9-\text{H})$ , which also agree exactly, are based on  $E_2 \approx 0$  for different R's. The agreement here bespeaks the fact that all  $E_2$ 's are the same.

Amphlett and Whittle,<sup>7</sup> using for the combination of  $\text{CF}_2$  radicals  $\log A_0 = 10.36 M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$  and  $E_0 = 0.0 \pm 0.5$  kcal/mole, deduce that for  $\text{R} = \text{CF}_3$ ,  $\log A_2 = 9.42 M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$  and  $E_2 = 0.0 \pm 0.5$  kcal/mole.

One of the best arguments for the assumption is that BDE's derived using it are generally transferable.<sup>8</sup>

Recently in the author's laboratory, a technique for measuring rate constants of reactions, such as 2 or 3, over wide temperature ranges (300–1000°) has been developed.<sup>9a,b</sup> Preliminary evidence is that  $k_3(400^\circ)$  for  $\text{R} = \text{CH}_3$  is  $\sim 10^9 M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$ , and very little change is seen at 1000°. This method has the great advantage of being independent of any other rate constant, such as combination. Rate constants are obtained relative only to effusion from a Knudsen cell. A program is underway to determine  $k_2$  and/or  $k_3$  for various R's.

The fact of the zero activation energy for reaction 2 raises the question of cause. There are many radical abstraction reactions which are exothermic, but all show activation energy. An explanation in this case may come from such evidence as the stability of the molecule  $I_3$ .<sup>3</sup> This stability must mean that  $I_2$  can expand its valence shell and thus the species  $(\text{RI}_2)$  may also be stable and reaction 2 may be analogous to a radical-radical disproportionation reaction. Of course, the zero activation energy would then mean that the expansion of the valence shell would have to be a zero activation energy process itself.

It is also interesting to note that the activation energy in the exothermic direction, herein defined as the intrinsic activation energy ( $E_i$ ) for reactions of the type  $\text{R} + \text{HX} \rightarrow \text{RH} + \text{X}$  ( $\text{X} = \text{F}, \text{Cl}, \text{Br}, \text{and I}$ ), is quite small, being 0, 1, 3, and 1 kcal/mole, respectively.<sup>10</sup>

## C. UNCERTAINTIES

In this review, we have often taken the liberty of recalculating derived thermochemical quantities from measured rate parameters. This will often mean that the reader will find discrepancies between values quoted here and in earlier sources.

We have followed the general philosophy of treating the experimental data in what we now consider to be the correct way. Such treatment may lead to values of thermochemical parameters which are only slightly different from those originally reported. While we recognize that this could cause some confusion, it is our hope that this review will illustrate the uniform standards that should be applied to data of this type.

(7) J. C. Amphlett and E. Whittle, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, **63**, 2695 (1967).

(8) S. W. Benson, "Thermochemical Kinetics," John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1968.

(9) (a) S. W. Benson and G. N. Spokes, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **89**, 2525 (1967); (b) S. W. Benson, D. M. Golden, and R. Jackson, Abstracts, S-191, 155th National Meeting of The American Chemical Society, San Francisco, Calif., March 1968.

(10) G. C. Fettis and J. H. Knox, *Progr. Reaction Kinetics*, **2**, 2 (1964).

We have indicated our preferred values in Table II, taking into account other measurements besides those reviewed here.


Error limits reported for a particular work are standard deviations, with a standard deviation of  $\pm 1$  kcal/mole assigned to the values of  $E_2$  and  $E_3$  used.

The values of mean heat capacity [ $\Delta C_p^\circ = 1/2(\Delta C_p^\circ_{298} + \Delta C_p^\circ_T)$ ] used come from standard sources,<sup>11</sup> as well as from group additivity<sup>8,12</sup> and estimation methods for radicals discussed by Benson<sup>8</sup> and O'Neal and Benson.<sup>13</sup> An uncertainty of  $\pm 2$  gibbs/mole was assigned to all values of  $\Delta C_p^\circ$ , and  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}$  reflects this error as well as those above. Additional errors in  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(R \cdot, g)$  reflect the uncertainty in the heat of formation of the requisite RI and/or RH. Since  $DH^\circ_{298}(R-H) = \Delta H^\circ_{4,3}(298) - DH^\circ_{298}(H-I)$ , the error in the BDE may be lower than the error in the heat of formation of the radical.

Our estimates of the best values are assigned a lower uncertainty than the individual measurements because of the precision of overlapping experiments.

### III. Rate Expressions

The equilibrium constant for the over-all reaction A lies quite far to the right in the temperature range (500–800°K) suitable for kinetic studies for most R's. Thus, if one calculates the rate of  $I_2$  formation using the steady-state approximation and neglecting  $k_4$ ,<sup>2</sup> for reaction A eq 1 results.



$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d(I_2)}{dt} &= \frac{k_1 K_{I_2}^{1/2} (I_2)^{1/2} (RI)}{1 + k_2(I_2)/k_3(HI)} \\ &= K_{1,2} K_{I_2}^{1/2} k_3 \frac{(RI)(HI)}{(I_2)^{1/2}} \text{ for } k_2(I_2) \gg k_3(HI) \quad (1) \\ &= k_1 K_{I_2}^{1/2} (RI)(I_2)^{1/2} \text{ for } k_2(I_2) \ll k_3(HI) \end{aligned}$$

Examination of this expression will show that the rate of appearance of  $I_2$  with time should start off slowly and be catalyzed by  $I_2$ , which appears initially with a rate whose order in  $I_2$  is one-half. After a time, the rate should then be inhibited by  $I_2$ , which has an order of negative one-half in the limit of large  $I_2$ /HI ratios. Such behavior has been observed in all cases studied, including the lack of HI dependence in the early stages of the reaction. The changing nature of this expression with  $I_2$ /HI ratios makes it convenient to break the data for such systems into two parts. The first part, when  $0.01 < (I_2)/(HI) < 0.1$ , is treated according to eq 1 with an estimated value of  $k_2/k_3$ . (Note that since  $k_2/k_3$  is of the order of 5 (see below), an error of  $\pm 10\%$  in this value leads to errors in  $k_1$  no greater than  $+3\%$ .) The second part, when  $0.1 < (I_2)/(HI) < \sim 2.0$ , is best treated by rearranging (1) to

$$\frac{(I_2)}{(HI)} = \frac{k_1 k_3}{k_2} \left[ \frac{K_{I_2}^{1/2} (RI)(I_2)^{1/2}}{d(I_2)/dt} \right] - \frac{k_3}{k_2} \quad (2)$$

and plotting  $(I_2)/(HI)$  vs. the term in brackets. The slope divided by the intercept gives  $k_1$  and the intercept  $k_3/k_2$ .


(Note that values of  $k_3/k_2$  obtained in this region can be used in the treatment of data by eq 1. Note as well, that practical upper limits of  $(I_2)/(HI)$  are reached at the point where  $d(I_2)/dt$  becomes so small that the error in measuring it is large.)

Determination of  $k_1$  over a reasonable temperature range will then yield  $E_1$ . One also can use the temperature dependence of  $k_3/k_2$  (i.e.,  $E_3 - E_2$ ), as a consistency check on the assumption concerning these values.

There are several instances when this method develops difficulties. The first is when the  $\Delta H^\circ_f$  of the iodide is not known, the second (discussed in section II) when the iodide is unstable with respect to homolytic scission of the C-I bond, thus complicating the kinetic expression by introducing a different initiation step, and, third, when the iodide is unstable with respect to HI elimination and olefin formation. These three difficulties can all be circumnavigated. (More difficult is the case when either of the decompositions is heterogeneous.)

The first above-mentioned difficulty can be eliminated by measuring the equilibrium constant of reaction A. Actually, since the equilibrium lies so far to the right in (A), practicality demands that one start with the hydrocarbon and  $I_2$  and measure the equilibrium amounts of RI and HI. Usually entropies are either available or can be estimated with sufficient accuracy to justify a "third-law" measurement of the enthalpy. "Second-law" measurements are also possible.

If it is feasible to measure equilibrium in a homogeneous system (no catalyst), then the approach to equilibrium may also be followed, and one can measure  $k_4$ , and thus  $\Delta H^\circ_f(R)$  with the same experiment. The rate expression is



$$\frac{d(RI)}{dt} = \frac{k_4 K_{I_2}^{1/2} (I_2)^{1/2} (RH)}{1 + k_3(HI)/k_2(I_2)} \left[ 1 - \frac{(RI)(HI)}{(RH)(I_2)} \frac{1}{K_{eq}} \right] \quad (3)$$


which, since  $(I_2) \gg (HI)$  and  $(RH)$  and  $(I_2)$  are essentially constant, becomes

$$\frac{d(RI)}{dt} = k_4 K_{I_2}^{1/2} (I_2)^{1/2} (RH) \left[ 1 - \frac{(RI)(HI)}{(RI)_{eq}(HI)_{eq}} \right] \quad (4)$$


Given the equilibrium and exothermicity of reaction 1, measurement of rates, starting from RI and HI, is accomplished at lower temperatures and with smaller quantities of reactants, thus minimizing the possibility of secondary reactions. On the other hand, secondary reactions are rare, owing to the radical trapping abilities of  $I_2$  and HI, and starting from  $RH + I_2$  leads to the rate constant  $k_4$ , unencumbered with the inhibition ratio  $k_3/k_2$ .

The difficulty of R-I bond breaking being a competing initiation step, which is serious only in cases where R is stabilized by delocalization, is overcome either by measuring the kinetics of  $RH + I_2$ , or starting the kinetic study of  $RI + HI$  with some  $I_2$ , as well.

The difficulty of HI elimination from the iodide adds complications, but can be handled by starting with  $RH + I_2$  and taking into account the extra steps in the mechanism



such that the over-all reaction produces olefin + 2HI. The kinetic expression is



(11) (a) F. D. Rossini, *et al.*, "API Tables," Carnegie Press, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1963; (b) D. R. Stull, Ed., "JANAF Thermochemical Tables," Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich., 1963.

(12) S. W. Benson, *et al.*, *Chem. Rev.*, in press.

(13) H. E. O'Neal and S. W. Benson, *Intern. J. Chem. Kinetics*, in press.

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d(\text{HI})}{dt} = - \frac{d(\text{I}_2)}{dt} = \frac{k_4 K_{\text{I}_2}^{1/2} (\text{I}_2)^{1/2} (\text{RH}) \left[ 1 - \frac{(\text{olefin})(\text{HI})^2}{(\text{RH})(\text{I}_2)} \frac{1}{K_{\text{o,q}}} \right]}{1 + k_3 (\text{HI}) / k_2 (\text{I}_2) \left[ 1 + \frac{k_1 K_{\text{I}_2}^{1/2} (\text{I}_2)^{1/2}}{k_3} \right]} \quad (5)$$

This complicated expression simplifies extremely in those cases where the iodide is very unstable with respect to the olefin. Here the rate is controlled by step 4 of (i)

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d(\text{HI})}{dt} = k_4 K_{\text{I}_2}^{1/2} (\text{I}_2)^{1/2} (\text{RH}) \quad (6)$$

If, however, the stability of iodide is such that  $K_{\text{o,q}}$  is not very large, and  $k_3$  is of moderate size, the expression becomes


$$Z = a_1 + a_2 \frac{(\text{HI})}{(\text{I}_2)^{1/2}} + b \frac{(\text{HI})}{(\text{I}_2)} \quad (7)$$

where

$$Z = \frac{(\text{RH})(\text{I}_2)^{1/2} \left[ 1 - \frac{(\text{olefin})(\text{HI})^2}{(\text{RH})(\text{I}_2)} \frac{1}{K_{\text{o,q}}} \right]}{\frac{1}{2} \frac{d(\text{HI})}{dt}}$$


and  $a_1^{-1} = k_4 K_{\text{I}_2}^{1/2}$ ,  $a_2^{-1} = k_6 K_{\text{o,q}}$ , and  $b = a_1 (k_3 / k_2)$ . Often  $k_3$  is known from independent experiments, and the  $a_2$  term may be brought to the left-hand side of (7) so that a linear plot can be made.

There is another type of reaction, closely related to the above, that yields heats of formation of radicals. This is the iodine-catalyzed positional isomerization of olefins.



$$\frac{-d(\text{O}_1\text{H})}{dt} = (k_a + k_b) K_{\text{I}_2}^{1/2} (\text{I}_2)^{1/2} \left[ (\text{O}_1\text{H}) - \frac{(\text{O}_1\text{H})_0}{1 + K_{\text{a,b}}} \right] \quad (8)$$

where the mechanism is simply



and neglecting the small ( $\sim 1\%$  at equilibrium) formation of the iodides

$$k_a = \frac{k_4 k_3'}{k_3 + k_3'} \cong k_4 / 2$$

Thus, the heat of formation of the radical  $\text{O}_{1-2}$  can be ascertained by making use of the assumption concerning the activation energy of reaction 3.

#### IV. Experimental Methods

Gas-phase studies of the reactions described above lend themselves very nicely to spectroscopic investigation. Toward this end, Benson and coworkers<sup>14</sup> have employed a Cary 15 spectrophotometer which has been suitably modified so that the transmission of light may be measured through a quartz

reaction vessel encased in an oven. Gas chromatographic analysis has also been employed.<sup>15</sup>

Reactions of the type A are followed most accurately by monitoring the appearance of  $\text{I}_2$  with time. This is done simply by following optical density at  $\sim 500 \text{ m}\mu$ , where only the  $\text{I}_2$  absorbs. Mass balance checks can be performed by measurements in the ultraviolet region where RI and HI and some of the RH's absorb.

The largest source of error is in the determination of  $d(\text{I}_2)/dt$  (or  $d(\text{HI})/dt$ ). This quantity has usually been determined by drawing tangents to the  $(\text{I}_2)$  vs. time curve over time increments ( $\Delta t$ ), such that the  $(\text{I}_2)$  increments ( $\Delta \text{I}_2$ ) were large compared to the error in determining them. Recently, time-sharing computer services have become available, and the slopes can be determined accurately by fitting the curve to a polynomial and taking the derivative.<sup>16</sup> In fact, the availability of the computer makes the integrated form of eq 1<sup>5</sup> usable, as well.

Reactions of the type B are followed by monitoring the appearance of absorbance in the ultraviolet, related to the formation of RI and HI. Mass balances at  $500 \text{ m}\mu$ , while performed, are difficult since very little  $\text{I}_2$  is consumed. The same comments are appropriate here concerning the slope, as above.

In reactions of the type C, either  $\text{I}_2$  disappearance or HI appearance may be monitored, since the equilibrium is such that moderate-to-large amounts of  $\text{I}_2$  are consumed.


Gas chromatography can always be used to help check the mass balances, and, in the case of reactions of the type D, ratios of the olefins at various times determined by this method are the measured quantities desired when using the integrated form of eq 8.

All systems described herein have been shown to fit the simple mechanism, yet each system finds a way of turning up its own individual complexities, such that no measurement may be described as routine. The individual papers cited describe the specific trials and tribulations, not the least of which is heterogeneity of either the reactions in question (rare), or of side reactions (not uncommon).

These have always been overcome to some degree or other, and description of the methods is best left to the individual papers. A generally applicable solution to problems of heterogeneity has been the formation of a thin Teflon film in the reactor by putting some tetrafluoroethylene (gas phase) in the reactor, along with some initiator. One then scans the ultraviolet-visible range and removes the excess reactant before the windows become occluded.

## V. Results

### A. EQUILIBRIUM STUDIES



The equilibrium constant for this type of reaction has been measured for various R's. These values determine the entropies and heats of formation of the various iodides.

(14) D. M. Golden, R. Walsh, and S. W. Benson, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **87**, 4053 (1965).

(15) J. H. Knox and R. G. Musgrave, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, **63**, 2201 (1967).


(16) S. Furuyama, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, *Intern. J. Chem. Kinetics*, in press.

Table I  
Equilibrium Data

$RH + I_2 \rightleftharpoons RI + HI$	$\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(RI,g)$ , kcal/mole	$S^\circ{}_{298}(RI,g)$ , gibbs/mole	Ref
R = CH <sub>3</sub>	3.28 ± 0.16; 3.40 ± 0.05	60.47 <sup>a</sup>	14, 17
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>5</sub> CH <sub>2</sub>	30.43 ± 0.32	81.16 ± 0.71	c
C <sub>3</sub> H <sub>5</sub>	23.0 ± 0.6	77.8 <sup>a</sup>	e
CH <sub>3</sub> CO	-30.3 ± 0.5	76.0 <sup>a</sup>	26
CF <sub>2</sub>	-139.4 ± 0.17	73.32 <sup>a</sup>	36
$RI \rightleftharpoons olefin + HI$ olefin = isobutylene	$\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(RI,g)$ -17.2 ± 0.3	$S^\circ{}_{298}(RI,g)$ 82.5 <sup>f</sup>	Ref 20b
$RI_2 \rightleftharpoons olefin + I_2$ olefin = ethylene propylene cyclopropane acetylene	$\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(RI_2,g)$ -15.9 ± 0.2 8.6 ± 0.4 10.6 ± 0.5 <sup>d</sup> 49.2 ± 0.1 (trans) 49.2 ± 0.1 (cis)	$S^\circ{}_{298}(RI_2,g)$ 83.3 ± 0.5 94.6 ± 1.0 93.0 <sup>1,4</sup> 79.6 <sup>a</sup> (trans) 78.5 (cis)	Ref 20a 20a 20a f
$RH + I_2 \rightleftharpoons olefin + 2HI$ R = <i>i</i> -C <sub>3</sub> H <sub>7</sub> <i>t</i> -C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>9</sub>	$\Delta H^\circ(T, ^\circ K)$ -30.75 ± 0.4 (600) -27.1 ± 0.3 (550)	$\Delta S^\circ(T, ^\circ K)$ -33.0 ± 0.5 (600) -37.8 ± 0.6 (550)	Ref g h
$olefin + I_2 \rightleftharpoons olefin + I_2$ Butene-1 $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -butene-2 Pentene-1 $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -pentene-2 Heptene-1 $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -heptene-2 Heptene-1 $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -heptene-3 <i>cis</i> - $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -butene-2 <i>cis</i> - $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -pentene-2 <i>cis</i> - $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -heptene-3 <i>cis</i> - $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -pentadiene-1,3 <sup>b</sup> <i>trans</i> -heptene-2 $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -heptene-3 <i>cis</i> - $\rightleftharpoons$ <i>trans</i> -1,2-diiodoethylene	$\Delta H^\circ{}_{298}$ -2.8 ± 0.2 -2.6 ± 0.1 -2.7 ± 0.2 -2.7 ± 0.2 -1.2 ± 0.2 -0.75 ± 0.1 -0.90 ± 0.1 -1.00 ± 0.2 0.05 ± 0.1 0 ± 0.1	$\Delta S^\circ{}_{298}$ -3.1 ± 0.4 -1.4 ± 0.1 -1.2 ± 0.4 -0.9 ± 0.4 -1.3 ± 0.2 0.0 ± 0.4 +0.6 ± 0.1 -0.1 ± 0.4 +0.3 ± 0.1 +1.1 ± 0.1	Ref i j k k i j k l k


<sup>a</sup> Third-law method using known or estimated  $S^\circ(RI)$ . <sup>b</sup> NO rather than I<sub>2</sub> catalyzed. <sup>c</sup> R. Walsh, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **88**, 650 (1966). <sup>d</sup> RI<sub>2</sub> is 1,3-diiodopropane. <sup>e</sup> A. S. Rodgers, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **88**, 3194 (1966). <sup>f</sup> S. Furuyama, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **72**, 3204 (1968). <sup>g</sup> P. S. Nangia and S. W. Benson, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **86**, 2770 (1964). <sup>h</sup> H. Teranishi and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, **85**, 2890 (1963). <sup>i</sup> D. M. Golden, K. W. Egger, and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, **86**, 5416 (1964). <sup>j</sup> K. W. Egger and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, **88**, 236 (1966). <sup>k</sup> K. W. Egger, *ibid.*, **89**, 504 (1967). <sup>l</sup> K. W. Egger and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, **87**, 3311 (1965).

Often when measuring these equilibrium constants as a function of temperature, two methods of treating the data are available. The "second-law" method, involving the determination of the enthalpy and entropy changes for the reaction from the slope and intercept of a linear plot of  $\log K$  vs.  $T^{-1}$  may be used, but precision is severely limited by the temperature range over which the study is made. If all the entropies are known, the "third-law" method may be used to evaluate the enthalpy change at any given temperature. In reactions of this type, the only entropy value that is likely to be unknown is that of RI, and often these values can be estimated to  $\pm 1$  gibbs/mole.<sup>8</sup> The third-law method is inherently more precise, and, if a large temperature range is also feasible, any differences in thermochemical parameters between the two methods may often be a warning of systematic errors.



This reaction has been studied where the olefin is ethylene,

propylene, and isobutylene, as well as acetylene. Cyclopropane is also conveniently placed in this grouping.



Data are available for R = *i*-C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>7</sub> and *t*-C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>, affording in these particular cases confirmation of values for the enthalpy and entropy of hydrogenation, and demonstrating the usefulness of the I<sub>2</sub> technique for obtaining such values.

#### 4. Positional and Geometric Isomerization of Olefins

The systems studied have been the positional isomerizations of butene-1 to butene-2, pentene-1 to pentene-2, heptene-1 to heptene-3, and heptene-2 to heptene-3, geometrical isomerizations of butene-2, pentene-2, pentadiene-1,3, heptene-2, heptene-3, and 1,2-diiodoethylene. These results lead to accurate values of the differences in enthalpy and entropy

Table II  
Kinetic Data for Evaluating  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}$  (R, g) and  $DH^\circ{}_{298}$  (R-H) from I-Atom Reactions<sup>a</sup>

R	System <sup>b</sup>	(T) <sup>c</sup>	Log A <sub>1</sub> <sup>d</sup>	E <sub>1</sub> <sup>e</sup>	Log A <sub>3</sub> /A <sub>2</sub>	E <sub>3</sub> - E <sub>2</sub> <sup>f</sup>
CH <sub>3</sub> (methyl)	A	560	11.4 ± 0.2	20.5 ± 0.5	-0.5 ± 0.4	0.8 ± 1.0
	B	583				
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>5</sub> (ethyl)	A	550	10.7 ± ?	19.5 ± ?		
	C	556	11.0 ± 0.3	17.1 ± 0.7	-0.6 ± 0.4	0.9 ± 1.0
n-C <sub>3</sub> H <sub>7</sub> (n-propyl)	C	572				
i-C <sub>3</sub> H <sub>7</sub> (isopropyl)	C	600				
sec-C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>9</sub> (sec-butyl)	C	572				
	C	750				
t-C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>9</sub> (t-butyl)	C	550			-0.1 ± 0.5	1.4 ± 0.7
	C	540				
HCO (formyl)	C	513			-1.0 ± 0.4	0.9 ± 0.9
CH <sub>3</sub> CO (acetyl)	A	515	10.9 ± 0.2	14.6 ± 0.5	-0.5 ± 0.4	1.5 ± 1.0
	B	481				
HOCH <sub>2</sub> (hydroxymethyl)	C	589				
(CH <sub>3</sub> ) <sub>2</sub> (OH)C (2-hydroxyisopropyl)	C	527				
CH <sub>3</sub> OCH <sub>2</sub> (methoxymethyl)	B	580			0.05 ± 0.2	0.9 ± 0.5
c-C <sub>4</sub> H <sub>7</sub> O (tetrahydrofuran-2-yl)	C	570			-0.1 ± 0.4	1.0 ± 1 <sup>†</sup>
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>5</sub> (phenyl)	A	700	11.4 ± 0.1	28.4 ± 0.2	-0.5 ± 0.3	0.4 ± 1.0
C <sub>2</sub> H <sub>3</sub> (vinyl) <sup>†,h</sup>	A	~640	11.2 ± ?	26.5 ± ?		
ICH <sub>2</sub> (iodomethyl)	A	522	11.5 ± 0.2	15.1 ± 0.4	-0.5 ± 0.5 <sup>h</sup>	0.9 ± 1
I <sub>2</sub> CH (diiodomethyl)	A	455	11.6 ± 0.1	9.4 ± 0.2	-0.5 ± 0.5 <sup>h</sup>	0.9 ± 1
CF <sub>3</sub> (trifluoromethyl)	B	630				
	A	599	10.8 ± ?	17.6 ± ?		
CH <sub>2</sub> ---CH---CH <sub>2</sub> (allyl)	..	554			-0.69 ± 0.03	0.51 ± 0.06
	B	527				
CH <sub>2</sub> ---CH---CH(CH <sub>3</sub> ) (methylallyl)	D	519				
	C	750				
CH <sub>2</sub> ---CH---CH---CH---CH <sub>2</sub> (pentadienyl)	D	458				
	B	513				
C <sub>6</sub> H <sub>5</sub> CH <sub>2</sub> (benzyl)	A	?	?	4.1 ± ?		

<sup>a</sup> Values to the left of divider are experimental; values to the right are derived from them, based on key assumptions. <sup>b</sup> See text. <sup>c</sup> Mean temperature of measurement (°K). <sup>d</sup> M<sup>-1</sup> sec<sup>-1</sup>. <sup>e</sup> Kcal/mole. <sup>f</sup> Gibbs/mole;  $\Delta C_p^\circ = 1/4(\Delta C_p^\circ T_m + \Delta C_p^\circ{}_{298})$ ; evaluated as discussed in ref 8. Uncertainty = ±2. <sup>g</sup>  $\Delta H^\circ{}_{1,3}$  or  $\Delta H^\circ{}_{4,3}$ , depending upon whether E<sub>1</sub> or E<sub>4</sub> is measured. <sup>h</sup> Bond dissociation energy (BDE) derived from this particular I-atom experiment. <sup>†</sup> Selected from all available works, not just I-atom values. See S. W. Benson, *J. Chem. Educ.*, **42**, 502 (1965);

between isomers and may be combined with an independent value to obtain heats and entropies for a whole set of isomers.

The results and references are found in Table I.

## B. KINETIC STUDIES

### 1. Free-Radical Heat of Formation

Employing the various rate expressions discussed above, many simple free radicals have been investigated. The apparent universal applicability of the simple mechanism gives confidence in the generality of these methods for determining radical thermochemistry.

#### a. CH<sub>3</sub>· (Methyl)

Flowers and Benson<sup>6</sup> (FB) spectrophotometrically followed the appearance of I<sub>2</sub>, using system A [RI + HI ⇌ RH + I<sub>2</sub>] and rate expression 2. The rate parameters they obtained are listed in Table II.

The value of  $\Delta H^\circ{}_{1,3}$ (298°K) determined by FB is sufficient to yield a value of the bond dissociation energy (BDE)

$DH^\circ{}_{298}$ (CH<sub>3</sub>-I), but, in order to obtain the heat of formation of CH<sub>3</sub>, a value of  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}$ (CH<sub>3</sub>I, g) is needed.

Golden, Walsh, and Benson<sup>14</sup> measured the equilibrium constant for system B and combined their results (shown in Table I) with those of FB to obtain  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}$ (CH<sub>3</sub>, g) = 34.1 ± 1.2 kcal/mole.

Goy and Pritchard<sup>17</sup> also measured the equilibrium constant for system B, as well as the rate constant k<sub>4</sub>. From their value of E<sub>4</sub> = 35.0 ± 1.1 kcal/mole, and E<sub>3</sub> = 1 ± 1 kcal/mole,  $\Delta H^\circ{}_{298}$ (CH<sub>3</sub>, g) = 34.8 ± 1.6 kcal/mole may be derived.

Boyd, *et al.*,<sup>18</sup> report values of A<sub>1</sub> and E<sub>1</sub>, which are slightly different from those of FB, but give very little information concerning the experimental parameters.

#### b. C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>· (Ethyl)

Hartley and Benson<sup>19</sup> followed the appearance of I<sub>2</sub>, using

(17) C. A. Goy and H. O. Pritchard, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **69**, 3040 (1965).

(18) R. K. Boyd, *et al.*, *ibid.*, **67**, 719 (1963).

(19) D. B. Hartley and S. W. Benson, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **39**, 132 (1963).

$\text{Log } A_4^d$	$E_4^e$	$\Delta C_p^{\circ f}$	$\Delta H^\circ(298^\circ\text{K})^{g,h}$	$\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(\text{R},\text{g})^g$	$DH^\circ{}_{298}(\text{R-H})_1^{g,h}$	$DH^\circ{}_{298}(\text{R-H})_2^{g,h}$	Ref
$12.0 \pm 0.4$	$35.0 \pm 1.1$	1.22	$20.2 \pm 1.2$	$34.1 \pm 1.2$	$104.1 \pm 1.2$		5, 14
		1.8	$33.5 \pm 1.6$	$34.8 \pm 1.6$	$104.8 \pm 1.6$	$104 \pm 1$	17
		1.2	$18.9 \pm ?$	$32.8 \pm ?$	$102.8 \pm ?$		18
		-1.0	$17.4 \pm 1.3$	$25.9 \pm 1.3$	$98.2 \pm 1.3$	$98 \pm 1$	19
$11.1 \pm 0.6$	$26.4 \pm 1.5$	-0.3	$25.3 \pm 1.9$	$24.3 \pm 1.9$	$96.6 \pm 1.9$		15
		1.1	$28.3 \pm 1.8$	$22.6 \pm 1.8$	$99.3 \pm 1.8$	$98 \pm 1$	15
$11.2 \pm 0.4$	$25.0 \pm 1.0$	0.6	$23.8 \pm 1.5$	$18.2 \pm 1.5$	$95.1 \pm 1.5$		21
$11.0 \pm 0.7$	$23.8 \pm 1.9$	0.4	$22.7 \pm 2.2$	$17.1 \pm 2.2$	$94.0 \pm 2.2$	$95 \pm 1$	15
$11.4 \pm ?$	$25.6 \pm ?$	0.5	$24.0 \pm ?$	$13.0 \pm ?$	$95.3 \pm ?$	$95 \pm 1$	22
$10.9 \pm 0.2$	$21.4 \pm 0.5$	-2.3	$21.0 \pm 1.2$	$7.6 \pm 1.2$	$91.8 \pm 1.2$		23
$11.3 \pm 0.4$	$22.6 \pm 1.1$	-2.3	$22.2 \pm 1.6$	$8.8 \pm 1.6$	$93.0 \pm 1.6$		15
$10.9 \pm 0.1$	$17.4 \pm 0.1$	1.3	$16.2 \pm 1.0$	$7.7 \pm 1.9$	$87.5 \pm 1.0$	$87 \pm 1$	24
		-2.3	$15.1 \pm 1.3$	$-4.7 \pm 1.3$	$87.1 \pm 1.3$	$87 \pm 1$	25, 26
$10.3 \pm 0.3^k$	$15.7 \pm 0.7$	0.0	$14.7 \pm 1.3$	$-5.7 \pm 1.3$	$86.1 \pm 1.3$		26
$11.5 \pm 0.4$	$26.0 \pm 0.9$	1.3	$24.6 \pm 1.5$	$-4.2 \pm 1.5$	$95.9 \pm 1.5$	$94 \pm 2$	27
$11.1 \pm 0.1$	$20.5 \pm 0.2$	-0.5	$19.6 \pm 1.1$	$-26.6 \pm 1.1$	$90.7 \pm 1.1$	$91 \pm 1$	29
$11.5 \pm 0.2$	$23.2 \pm 0.4$	1.2	$21.9 \pm 1.2$	$-6.9 \pm 1.2$	$93.2 \pm 1.2$	$93 \pm 1$	30
$11.7 \pm 0.2$	$21.5 \pm 0.6$	0 <sup>m</sup>	$20.5 \pm 1.5$	$-4.3 \pm 1.5$	$91.8 \pm 1.5$	$92 \pm 1$	31
		-3.0	$28.9 \pm 1.3$	$80.0 \pm 1.3$	$112.3 \pm 1.3$	$112 \pm 1$	32
			26.5	$\geq 68$	$\geq 108$	$\geq 108 \pm 2$	33
		-0.4	$15.2 \pm 1.2$	$55.0 \pm 1.6$	$103.8 \pm 1.6$	$103 \pm 2$	34
		0.2	$9.4 \pm 1.2$	$79.8 \pm 2.2$	$102.7 \pm 2.5$	$103 \pm 2$	35
$10.6 \pm 1.0$	$36.3 \pm 3$	1.1	$34.9 \pm 3.2$	$112.0 \pm 3.6$	$106.2 \pm 3.2$	$106 \pm 1$	36
		-1.3	$18.0 \pm ?$	$110.8 \pm ?$	$107.4 \pm ?$		18
							7
$10.2 \pm 0.1$	$18.0 \pm 0.3$	-1.2	$17.3 \pm 1.1$	$41.4 \pm 1.1$	$88.6 \pm 1.1$	$89 \pm 1$	38
$9.3 \pm 0.3$	$12.4 \pm 0.6$	1.2	$11.2 \pm 1.3$	$30.4 \pm 1.3$	$82.5 \pm 1.3$	$83 \pm 1$	39
$10.0 \pm ?$	$15.3 \pm ?$	1.0	$13.8 \pm ?$	$33.0 \pm ?$	$85.1 \pm ?$		22
$9.5 \pm 0.2$	$9.6 \pm 0.3$	0.6	$8.5 \pm 1.0$	$52.9 \pm 1.0$	$79.8 \pm 1.0$	$80 \pm 1$	40
$8.4 \pm 1.2$	$14.4 \pm 2.2$	2.0	$13.0 \pm 3.1$	$44.2 \pm 3.1$	$84.3 \pm 3.1$		41
		?	$\sim 4.1 \pm ?$	$45.1 \pm ?$	$85.2 \pm ?$	$85 \pm 1$	18

J. A. Kerr, *Chem. Rev.*, **66**, 465 (1966); and S. W. Benson; "Thermochemical Kinetics," John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1968  
<sup>j</sup> Complicated by HI addition to vinyl iodide. <sup>k</sup> This was a one-temperature study. The  $A$  factor is an estimate. <sup>l</sup> Assigned as 1 kcal/mole  
<sup>m</sup> No data available; error taken as  $\pm 3$  gibbs/mole.

system A and rate expression 2. These, combined with the known value for  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{I},\text{g}) = -2.13$  kcal/mole,<sup>20</sup> lead to  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_5,\text{g}) = 25.9 \pm 1.3$  kcal/mole.

Knox and Musgrave (KM),<sup>15</sup> using gas chromatographic techniques and system C, measured  $k_4$ , and their  $E_4$  leads to  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_5,\text{g}) = 24.3 \pm 1.9$  kcal/mole. They prefer to modify their Arrhenius parameters, such that  $E_4 = 27.6$ , and thus  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_5,\text{g}) = 25.5 \pm ?$  kcal/mole.

#### c. $n\text{-C}_3\text{H}_7\cdot$ ( $n$ -Propyl)

Knox and Musgrave<sup>15</sup> have also measured  $k_4$  for  $n$ -propyl, using system C, from which may be obtained a value  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(n\text{-C}_3\text{H}_7,\text{g}) = 22.6 \pm 1.8$  kcal/mole. This would lead to a primary C-H BDE of  $99.3 \pm 1.8$  kcal/mole. The authors preferred value of  $E_4 = 28.9$  would yield  $DH^\circ{}_{298}(n\text{-C}_3\text{H}_7\text{-H}) = 98.6$  kcal/mole.

#### d. $i\text{-C}_3\text{H}_7\cdot$ ( $i$ -Propyl)

Nangia and Benson<sup>21</sup> used system C and eq 7 to obtain  $k_4$ . Their value of  $E_4$  yields  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(i\text{-C}_3\text{H}_7,\text{g}) = 18.2 \pm 1.5$  kcal/mole.

KM<sup>15</sup> have measured the same rate constant in the same system and have obtained a value which leads to  $\Delta H_f^\circ{}_{298}(i\text{-C}_3\text{H}_7,\text{g}) = 17.1 \pm 2.2$  kcal/mole. The authors list a preferred value of  $E_4$  that is greater by 0.9 kcal/mole. This preferred value is arrived at, presumably by adjusting the pre-exponential factor to be one-half that for primary H abstraction in propane.

#### e. $sec\text{-C}_4\text{H}_9\cdot$ ( $sec$ -Butyl)

Chekkov, Tsailingol's, and Ioffe<sup>22</sup> have used system C with a high-temperature flow experiment to measure  $k_4$ . Inter-

(20) (a) S. W. Benson and A. Amano, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **36**, 3464 (1962); (b) *ibid.*, **37**, 197 (1962).

(21) P. S. Nangia and S. W. Benson, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **86**, 2773 (1964).

(22) E. E. Chekkov, A. L., Tsailingol's, and I. I. Ioffe, *Neftekhimiya*, **7**, 717 (1967); *Chem. Abstr.*, **68**, 48759k (1968).

preting the rate constants given in *Chemical Abstracts* to be  $k_4 K_1^{1/2}$  with units of  $M^{-1/2} \text{ sec}^{-1}$ , one obtains  $\log k_4 = 11.4 \pm ? - (24.6 \pm ?)/\theta M^{-1} \text{ sec}^{-1}$  at  $T_m = 750^\circ\text{K}$ .

The value of  $A_4$  compares well with all others, and  $E_4 = 25.6 \pm ?$  leads to  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{sec-butyl-H}) = 95.3 \pm ?$ , in excellent agreement with  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{isopropyl-H})$ .

#### f. $t\text{-C}_4\text{H}_9\cdot$ (*t*-Butyl)

Teranishi and Benson (TB)<sup>23</sup> have used system C and eq 7 to obtain  $k_4$ . They report  $E_4(500^\circ\text{K}) = 21.4 \pm 0.5$ , which leads to  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(t\text{-C}_4\text{H}_9, \text{g}) = 7.6 \pm 1.2$  kcal/mole.  $DH^\circ_{298}(t\text{-C}_4\text{H}_9\text{-H}) = 91.8 \pm 1.2$  kcal/mole.

KM<sup>16</sup> again using the same system have obtained  $E_4(540^\circ\text{K}) = 22.6 \pm 1.1$  kcal/mole, and thus values 1.2 kcal/mole greater than TB. KM, however, prefer a value of 0.7 kcal lower than their measured number.

#### g. $\text{HCO}\cdot$ (Formyl)

Walsh and Benson<sup>24</sup> have used system C in a case where eq 6 may be used for initial values to determine  $k_4$ . They then also determined  $k_3/k_2$  by adding HI. They obtain a value consistent with an  $87.5 \pm 1.1$  kcal/mole value for  $DH^\circ(\text{H-CHO})$ . [ $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(\text{CHO}\cdot, \text{g})$  has a higher error, since  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}$  for formaldehyde is not well known.]

#### h. $\text{CH}_3\text{CO}\cdot$ (Acetyl)

O'Neal and Benson,<sup>25</sup> as amended by Walsh and Benson,<sup>24</sup> using system A obtained a value of  $E_1(515^\circ\text{K}) = 14.6 \pm 0.5$ , which yields  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(\text{CH}_3\text{CO}, \text{g}) = 4.7 \pm 1.3$  kcal/mole.

Walsh and Benson<sup>26</sup> have used system B at one temperature to determine  $k_4$  and have used a value of  $10^{10.3}$  for  $A_4$ .<sup>26</sup> This leads to a value of  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(\text{CH}_3\text{CO}, \text{g}) = 5.7 \pm 1.3$  kcal/mole, and this suggests that  $-5.2$  would be a good value. The error limits may then be  $\pm 1$  kcal/mole. This leads to  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{CH}_3\text{CHO}) = 87 \pm 1$  kcal/mole.

#### i. $\cdot\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ (Hydroxymethyl)

Cruikshank and Benson<sup>27</sup> have measured the rate of the reaction of  $\text{I}_2$  with  $\text{CH}_3\text{OH}$ , a system like C, except that the formaldehyde thus formed would itself react to give CO and HI. From a study, made difficult by surface effects, they concluded that the C-H BDE is greater than  $95.9 \pm 1.5$  kcal/mole. This value combined with the value of  $\leq 92$  kcal/mole from photobromination studies<sup>28</sup> makes  $94 \pm 2$  kcal/mole seem reasonable.

#### j. $(\text{CH}_3)_2\dot{\text{C}}(\text{OH})\cdot$ (2-Hydroxypropan-2-yl)

Walsh and Benson<sup>29</sup> showed that the effect on the BDE of a tertiary C-H bond of substituting OH for  $\text{CH}_3$  was very

small. Using system C, they found  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}[(\text{CH}_3)_2\dot{\text{C}}(\text{OH}), \text{g}] = -27.1 \pm 1.1$  kcal/mole and  $DH^\circ_{298}[(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{C}(\text{OH})\text{-H}] = 90.2 \pm 1.1$  kcal/mole.

#### k. $\text{CH}_3\text{OCH}_2\cdot$ (Methoxymethyl)

Cruikshank and Benson<sup>30</sup> have studied the rate of abstraction of H by I from dimethyl ether, using system B. The iodide is stable here, as there is no elimination of HI possible. Their results indicate that there is no substantial difference between the C-H bond here and that in  $\text{CH}_3\text{OH}$ . They have also been able to ascertain the equilibrium constant at various temperatures and from a "second-law" treatment have shown that the entropy of  $\text{CH}_3\text{OCH}_2\text{I}$  is quite a bit lower than that of  $\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{I}$ , indicating perhaps a strong dipolar interaction hindering internal rotation.

#### l. $c\text{-C}_4\text{H}_7\text{O}\cdot$ (Tetrahydrofuran-2-yl)

Cruikshank and Benson<sup>31</sup> have studied this system. The products are furan and HI, so that system C equations are applicable. Once again, as with other oxygen-containing compounds, there are surface problems, but they manage to overcome these and to show that the BDE for the  $\alpha$ -H's is  $92 \pm 2$  kcal/mole.

#### m. $\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\cdot$ (Phenyl)

Rodgers, Golden, and Benson,<sup>32</sup> using system A, have shown that  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{-H}) = 112.3 \pm 1.5$  kcal/mole. This value is 5-10 kcal higher than previously believed and has had a great effect on the choice of mechanisms for most aromatic substitution reactions. In particular, it appears unlikely that H-atom abstractions from the aromatic ring ever takes place.

This is the highest BDE ever measured by this method.

#### n. $\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\cdot$ (Vinyl)

Rodgers, Golden, and Benson<sup>33</sup> have used system A with vinyl iodide and HI. Unfortunately, this system is complicated by the addition of HI to the vinyl group, and the only information abstractable from the data is  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{-H}) \geq 108 \pm 2$  kcal/mole, and therefore the  $\pi$ -bond energy in  $\text{C}_2\text{H}_2$  is equal to or greater than 70 kcal/mole.

#### o. $\cdot\text{CH}_2\text{I}$ (Iodomethyl)

Furuyama, Golden, and Benson<sup>34,35</sup> have used system A, where  $\text{R} = \text{CH}_2\text{I}$  and thus  $\text{RI} = \text{CH}_2\text{I}_2$  and  $\text{RH} = \text{CH}_2\text{I}$ , to obtain  $E_1 = 14.1 \pm 0.4$ , and thus  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{H-CH}_2\text{I}) = 103.8 \pm 1.6$  kcal/mole, a number which is surprisingly similar to  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{H-CH}_3)$ .

(23) H. Teranishi and S. W. Benson, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **85**, 2887 (1963).

(24) R. Walsh and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, **88**, 4570 (1966).

(25) H. E. O'Neal and S. W. Benson, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **37**, 540 (1962).

(26) R. Walsh and S. W. Benson, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **70**, 3751 (1966).

(27) F. Cruikshank and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, in press.

(28) E. Buckley and E. Whittle, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, **58**, 536 (1962).

(29) R. Walsh and S. W. Benson, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **88**, 3480 (1966).

(30) F. Cruikshank and S. W. Benson, *Int. J. Chem. Kinetics*, in press.

(31) F. Cruikshank and S. W. Benson, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, in press.

(32) A. S. Rodgers, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, **89**, 4578 (1967).

(33) A. S. Rodgers, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, unpublished work.

(34) S. Furuyama, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, *Int. J. Chem. Kinetics*, in press.

(35) S. Furuyama, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, in press.



p.  $\cdot\text{CHI}_2$  (Diiodomethyl)

Furuyama, Golden, and Benson<sup>35</sup> have again used system A where now  $\text{R} = \text{CHI}_2$  to obtain  $E_1 = 9.4 \pm 0.2$ , and thus  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{CHI}_2\text{-H}) = 102.7 \pm 2.5$  kcal/mole, showing that the addition of I atoms does not weaken the C-H bond very much, if at all. The large uncertainty in BDE is due to the uncertainty in  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(\text{CHI}_3, \text{g})$ , which is extrapolated to 59.8 kcal/mole.

q.  $\text{CF}_3\cdot$  (Trifluoromethyl)

Goy, Lord, and Pritchard<sup>36</sup> have used system B and obtained  $E_4 = 36.3 \pm 3$ . The value obtained for  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{CF}_3\text{-H})$  is  $106.2 \pm 3.2$  kcal/mole, which despite the large error agrees well with other values<sup>37</sup> from the bromination and chlorination of fluoroform, as well as that from the use of system A by Boyd, *et al.*<sup>18</sup>

Amphlett and Whittle<sup>7</sup> have determined  $k_3/k_2$  independently for  $\text{R} = \text{CF}_3$ .

r.  $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHCH}_2\cdot$  (Allyl)

Golden, Rodgers, and Benson,<sup>38</sup> using system B, have obtained  $E_4 = 18.0 \pm 0.3$  kcal/mole. This leads to  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(\text{C}_3\text{H}_5, \text{g}) = 41.4 \pm 1.1$  kcal/mole and  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{C}_3\text{H}_5\text{-H}) = 88.6 \pm 1.1$  kcal/mole. Comparing this to  $DH^\circ_{298}(n\text{-C}_3\text{H}_7\text{-H}) = 98 \pm 1$ , the stabilization energy in allyl radical is  $10 \pm 1.5$  kcal/mole.

s.  $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHCHCH}_3\cdot$  (Methylallyl)

Egger, Golden, and Benson,<sup>39a</sup> as well as Benson, Bose, and Nangia<sup>39b</sup> have used system D (the positional isomerization of butene) to determine  $k_4$ . Their value of  $E_4(519^\circ\text{K}) = 12.4 \pm 0.6$  kcal/mole leads to  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(\text{C}_4\text{H}_7, \text{g}) = 30.4 \pm 1.3$  kcal/mole and  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{C}_4\text{H}_7\text{-H}) = 82.5 \pm 1.3$ . Comparing this to  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{sec-C}_4\text{H}_9\text{-H}) = 95 \pm 1$  kcal/mole, the stabilization energy in the methylallyl radical is  $12.5 \pm 1.5$  kcal/mole.

Chekhov, Tsailngol's, and Ioffe<sup>22</sup> have also obtained  $k_4$  using system C. Their value, as best ascertained from *Chemical Abstracts*, is  $\log k_4(750^\circ\text{K}) = 10.0 - (15.3/\theta) M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$ , which leads to  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(\text{C}_4\text{H}_7, \text{g}) = 33.0$ , and stabilization of  $\sim 10$  kcal/mole. It is difficult to judge what weight should be given this work, as no error limits are available. Most examples of methylallylic stabilization seem to be *ca.* 12 or 13 kcal/mole, but 3-kcal differences may be undetectable because of uncertainties in other quantities. Their value for  $A_4$  also seems high, comparing with the value for  $\text{R} = \text{allyl}$ . On the other hand, their values for *sec*-butyl radical obtained in the same system are reasonable.

t.  $\text{CH}_2=\text{CHCHCH}=\text{CH}_2\cdot$  (Pentadienyl)

Egger and Benson<sup>40</sup> have used system D once again to mea-

sure  $E_4(458^\circ\text{K}) = 9.60 \pm 0.25$  kcal/mole. Thus  $\Delta H^\circ_{298}(\text{pentadienyl-H}) = 79.8 \pm 1$  kcal/mole, which represents a stabilization of  $15 \pm 1.5$  kcal/mole, when compared to  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{sec-C-H}) = 95.0 \pm 1$  kcal/mole.

u.  $\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_2\cdot$  (Benzyl)

Walsh, Golden, and Benson,<sup>41</sup> in a study in which they determined accurate thermochemical parameters for benzyl iodide, also cursorily followed the rate in system B. They found that  $DH^\circ_{298}(\text{benzyl-H}) = 84.3 \pm 3.1$  kcal/mole, which adequately fixed the value at  $85.0 \pm 1$  kcal/mole from other available values.<sup>42</sup> This means that the stabilization energy in the benzyl radical is  $13 \pm 1.5$  kcal/mole.

## 2. Pyrolysis of Organic Iodides

It has been shown that the pyrolyses of organic iodides take place through simple eliminations and through the atom and radical processes discussed above.

The pyrolysis of alkyl iodides is controlled largely by the dehydroiodination of the iodide. (In the case of diiodides, deiodination occurs.) These reactions seem to occur by two pathways: one a unimolecular elimination, the other an I-atom-catalyzed path. Kinetic parameters have been reported, and it has been suggested<sup>16</sup> that the catalyzed pathway includes some contribution from donor-acceptor complexes.

Benson and co-workers<sup>16,43</sup> have argued that the pyrolysis of 1,2-diiodoethylene and 1,2-diiodoethane, as well as *n*-propyl iodide, *n*-butyl iodide, *sec*-butyl iodide, isobutyl iodide, and ethyl chloride (in the presence of I atoms), all show a concerted I-atom-catalyzed step in which the olefin is formed, together with  $\text{I}_2$ , HI, or HCl, as the case may be. Where quantitative measures of the rate constants of these reactions are available, they all have activation energies only slightly in excess of the endothermicity ( $\Delta E^\circ$ ). Since I-atom addition to olefins is  $\sim 6$  kcal/mole endothermic, a radical mechanism is ruled out for these systems. The HI eliminations have  $A$  factors of the order of  $10^{10} M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$ , while the  $\text{I}_2$  elimination  $A$  factor is about  $10^{11.5} M^{-1} \text{sec}^{-1}$ . In the pyrolyses, these are followed by the rapid  $\text{RI} + \text{HI}$  atom and radical reactions.

## VI. Discussion

There is every indication that the values of  $DH^\circ(\text{R-H})$  for ethyl, isopropyl, and *t*-butyl radicals are characteristic of primary, secondary, and tertiary C-H bonds.<sup>44a, b</sup> This statement which is equivalent to a statement that the rule of bond additivity applies<sup>12</sup> to  $\Delta H^\circ$  of the radical allows the calculation of the heat of formation of any unstabilized radical, since the heats of formation of RH are usually known or easily estimated.

The values for the BDE's  $DH^\circ(\text{H-CH}_2\text{OH})$ ,  $DH^\circ[\text{H-CH}(\text{CH}_3)\text{OH}]$ , and  $DH^\circ[\text{H-C}(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{OH}]$  are interesting. The first is 94 and the third is 91 kcal/mole. The second is

(36) C. A. Goy, A. Lord, and H. O. Pritchard, *J. Phys. Chem.*, **71**, 1086 (1967).

(37) J. C. Amphlett, J. W. Coomber, and E. Whittle, *ibid.*, **70**, 593 (1966).

(38) D. M. Golden, A. S. Rodgers, and S. W. Benson, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **88**, 3196 (1966).

(39) (a) K. W. Egger, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, **86**, 5420 (1964); (b) S. W. Benson, A. N. Bose, and P. Nangia, *ibid.*, **85**, 1388 (1963).

(40) K. W. Egger and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, **88**, 241 (1966).

(41) R. Walsh, D. M. Golden, and S. W. Benson, *ibid.*, **88**, 650 (1966).

(42) G. L. Esteban, J. A. Kerr, and A. F. Trotman-Dickenson, *J. Chem. Soc.*, 3873 (1963).

(43) S. W. Benson, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **38**, 1945 (1963).

(44) (a) S. W. Benson, *J. Chem. Educ.*, **42**, 502 (1965); (b) J. A. Kerr, *Chem. Rev.*, **66**, 465 (1966).

probably  $\sim 92$ , as the same sort of photobromination experiments which give  $\leq 92$  for methanol and  $\leq 90$  for ethanol.<sup>45</sup>

The differences in the C-H BDE's are reflected in the  $\pi$ -bond strength defined as the difference between the O-H BDE in the alcohol and the O-H BDE in the radical formed from removing the H atom discussed above. Such a definition leads to  $\pi$ -bond strengths in acetone, acetaldehyde, and formaldehyde of 78, 76, and 73 kcal/mole, respectively. The transferability of the  $\pi$  bond in olefins is well known, the similarly defined quantities of isobutylene, propylene, and ethylene being 58, 59, and 59 kcal/mole, respectively. A comparison of these two sets would seem to indicate an opposite effect of  $\text{CH}_3$  groups on the two types of  $\pi$  bonds. These differences warrant the attention of those who wish to quantitatively describe chemical bonding.

Values of the strength of the dative bond in  $\text{C}\equiv\text{O}$ , defined similarly to that of the  $\pi$  bond, can be obtained from both the formyl and acetyl radical values of Table II. Both give values of  $\sim 68$  kcal/mole, as do other available data on compounds of the type  $\text{CH}_3\text{COX}$  and  $\text{XCOX}$ .

The stabilization energies discussed previously are defined operationally as the difference between the appropriate alkyl C-H bond and the C-H bond to the radical in question. The magnitude of these energies had been a question of some debate until recently, but the values presented here seem to be agreed on at present.

The more recently measured value of the stabilization energy in the allyl radical (10 kcal/mole) probably means that the value in the methylallyl radical (12.5 kcal/mole) includes a stabilization effect due to the extra methyl group which one might call an inductive effect. Note, however, that the stabilization energy in pentadienyl radical (15 kcal/mole) indicates that the extra vinyl group has an effect only half as great as the first. An attempt at explaining this has been based on the concept that the stabilization in allyl radical is due to simple

delocalization of the extra electron in the manner depicted by the valence-bond structures<sup>40</sup>



The methyl inductive effect is due to the stabilization of the partial positive charge by a methyl group. The pentadienyl radical is written



and, if the stabilization energy in allyl radical is due in part to lessening of electron-electron repulsion, and in part due to the electrostatic interaction of the positive and negative ends, one might expect pentadienyl to have roughly twice the former, but less of the latter.

The high value of the C-H bond dissociation energy in benzene is a departure from earlier values and has implications for the mechanism of aromatic substitution and addition. Radicals almost surely add to aromatic rings, to form the cyclohexadienyl type of radical, which itself has  $\sim 25$  kcal/mole of stabilization energy, rather than abstract the strongly bound H atom. This would appear to be true of the vinyl C-H BDE as well.<sup>31</sup>

In summary, BDE's measured by the techniques described here are among the most accurately determined and are the type of measurements needed, both to formulate a quantitative theory of chemical bonding and to have a thermochemical base on which to found the *a priori* estimation of activation parameters. At the same time, it should be kept firmly in mind that in calculating a rate constant, cumulative errors might exceed 2 kcal/mole, a number which in itself represents a factor of about 10 in rate of convenient temperatures.

*Acknowledgment.* This review and a good deal of the articles cited have been supported in part by Public Health Service Grant No. AP 00353-04, Department of Air Pollution.

(45) A. M. Tarr and E. Whittle, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, **60**, 2039 (1964).