# EFFECT OF $O_2$ ON MOLECULAR IODINE PRODUCTION FOLLOWING FLASH PHOTODISSOCIATION OF $CF_3I$

JULIE E. STRONG, HARRY F. PREST and ROBERT L. STRONG Department of Chemistry, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y. 12181 (U.S.A.) (Received August 18, 1978)

## Summary

The temporal production of molecular iodine following the gas phase flash photodissociation of  $CF_3I$  (CO<sub>2</sub> inert diluent gas) has been studied. In the absence of O<sub>2</sub> there is an induction period of about 200  $\mu$ s determined by quenching of  $I({}^2P_{1/2})$  atoms, followed by three-body recombination of ground state  $I({}^2P_{3/2})$  atoms. Addition of small amounts of O<sub>2</sub> greatly enhances the rate of I<sub>2</sub> production, such that at  $P(O_2) \ge 0.2$  Torr I<sub>2</sub> formation occurs during the photolyzing flash. These results are discussed in terms of formation of a strong intermediate exciplex ( $K \ge 10^4$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup>) between  $I({}^2P_{1/2})$  and O<sub>2</sub> as precursor to I<sub>2</sub> formation.

# 1. Introduction

The optically pumped atomic iodine laser, operating on the magnetic dipole allowed transition  ${}^{2}P_{1/2} \rightarrow {}^{2}P_{3/2}$  and oscillating at 1315 nm, was the first laser to utilize photodissociation as a mode of excitation [1]. The long natural lifetime of  $I({}^{2}P_{1/2})$  resulting from the electric dipole forbidden character of the radiative decay, the superior beam distortion and power-dissipating characteristics of gas relative to solid state lasers, the potential for nearly full extraction of the stored energy and the exceedingly high gain and potential for high power density operation make this laser a good prospect for repetitively pulsed laser plasma and fusion research. Pulse powers of 1 TW have recently been reported [2].

The photodissociation and stimulated emission steps

$$RI \xrightarrow{h\nu} R + xI^* + (1 - x)I$$

$$I^* \xrightarrow{h\nu} I + h\nu_{1315 nm}$$
(1)
(2)

where RI is an alkyl or perfluoroalkyl iodide molecule,  $I^* = I({}^2P_{1/2})$  and  $I = I({}^2P_{3/2})$ , are well established in the literature [1]. In many cases the fraction

x of excited atoms produced in reaction (1) is very high, e.g. 0.92 for  $CH_3I$ , 0.91 for  $CF_3I$  and greater than 0.99 for  $n-C_3F_7I$  [3], leading to a very high degree of population inversion and high gain stimulated emission. Premature termination of laser oscillation is now generally accepted [4] to occur from a high temperature rise and pyrolytic build-up of  $I_2$  which is an extremely efficient quencher of  $I^*$  atoms.

It has also been suggested [5] that population inversion and hence potential stimulated emission in the iodine atom system may be possible through energy transfer from  $O_2({}^{1}\Delta_g)$ :

$$I + O_2({}^{1}\Delta_g) \rightarrow I^* + O_2({}^{3}\Sigma_g^{-})$$
(3)

Continuous (c.w.) laser action has now been accomplished by generating  $O_2({}^{1}\Delta_g)$  chemically from the reaction of chlorine with  $H_2O_2$  [6], and population inversion has been observed when  $O_2({}^{1}\Delta_g)$  is produced by reaction between chlorine fluorosulfate and  $H_2O_2$  [7]; ground state iodine atoms are produced by the "energy-pooling" process [8]

$$2O_2({}^{1}\Delta_g) \rightarrow O_2({}^{3}\Sigma_g^{-}) + O_2({}^{1}\Sigma_g^{+})$$
(4)

$$O_2(^{1}\Sigma_g^{+}) + I_2 \rightarrow 2I + O_2(^{2}\Sigma_g^{-})$$
(5)

Energy transfer between  $O_2({}^{1}\Sigma_{g}^{*})$  and  $I_2$  leading to excited  $I_2$  (but not necessarily dissociation) is extremely efficient, occurring at every collision [9].

Reaction (3) is exothermic by only 3.3 kJ, and therefore nearly resonant with the reverse I<sup>\*</sup> quenching reaction. Possibly because of this molecular oxygen is also a very efficient quencher of  $I({}^{2}P_{1/2})$  atoms, although the O<sub>2</sub> quenching mechanism is not clear [10]. At sufficiently high concentrations of  $O_2({}^{1}\Delta_g)$ , and hence  $O_2({}^{1}\Sigma_g^{*})$  by energy pooling, I<sub>2</sub> is kept almost completely dissociated by reaction (5). We report here temporal studies on the formation of I<sub>2</sub> following production of I<sup>\*</sup> by the flash photolysis of CF<sub>3</sub>I in the presence of O<sub>2</sub> with no (initially)  $O_2({}^{1}\Delta_g)$  or  $O_2({}^{1}\Sigma_g^{*})$ , but under conditions of flash energy and "inert" third-body pressures such that pyrolytic production of I<sub>2</sub> was insignificant.

The reaction of  $CF_3$  radicals with  $O_2$  in low intensity (continuous) photolyses has been studied in several laboratories. Francis and Hazeldine [11] obtained  $CF_2O$ ,  $CO_2$  and  $SiF_4$  as the only detected products in the photolysis of  $CF_3I-O_2$  mixtures. They proposed a reaction scheme involving  $CF_3 + O_2$  additives:

$$CF_3 + O_2 \rightarrow CF_3O_2 \tag{6}$$

$$2CF_3O_2 \rightarrow 2CF_3O + O_2 \tag{7}$$

$$CF_3O \xrightarrow[wall]{SiO_2} CF_2O + SiF_4 + CO_2$$
 (8)

Similarly,  $CF_3O_2$  formation by the addition reaction (6) has been suggested in the photochemical fluorination of fluoroform in the presence of  $O_2$  [12]. Other products identified were  $CF_3O_2CF_3$  and  $CF_3O_3CF_3$ , with the latter undergoing partial conversion to  $CF_2O$  in the IR spectrophotometer detection cell. However, Heicklen [13] proposed direct formation of  $CF_2O$  by an exchange reaction

$$CF_3 + O_2 \rightarrow CF_2O + FO \tag{9}$$

Presumably  $F_2$  and  $O_2$  are then formed by

$$2FO \rightarrow F_2 + O_2 \tag{10}$$

although  $F_2$  was not found as a reaction product.

## 2. Experimental

The flash spectrophotometric apparatus has been described elsewhere [14]. A xenon-oxygen (approximately 80:1 mixture) flash lamp was discharged at 900 J (12.5  $\mu$ F, 12 kV) and its light filtered through 10 mm of a UV filter solution (200 g dm<sup>-3</sup> CoCl<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O and 100 g dm<sup>-3</sup> NiCl<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O in 1 M HCl, upper wavelength cut-off approximately 380 nm). The continuous analyzing beam from a 450 W Osram xenon arc was split after passing through the cell: time-resolved generation of I<sub>2</sub> following flash photodissociation of CF<sub>3</sub>I was monitored at 498 nm ( $\epsilon$ (I<sub>2</sub>, 498) = 585 dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>) with the Zeiss MM12 monochromator bandwidth maintained at about 1 nm; simultaneously, the flash profile was monitored at 360 nm with a Bausch and Lomb grating monoghromator.

All gases were introduced into a vacuum transfer system through a phosphorous pentoxide drying column. Oxygen (Matheson Research Grade minimum purity 99.99%) was used without further purification.  $CO_2$  (from dry ice),  $CF_3I$  (PCR Incorporated),  $SF_6$  (Matheson, Instrument Purity minimum purity 99.99%), xenon (Airco Research Grade, minimum purity 99.99%) and propane (Matheson, Instrument Purity, minimum purity 99.5%) were outgassed by several freeze-pump-thaw cycles prior to being condensed into the cylindrical quartz photolysis cell (100 mm light path, 25 mm internal diameter). The total amount of I<sub>2</sub> produced after each flash or series of flashes was measured spectrophotometrically at 498 nm on a Beckman DU Spectrophotometer.

The initial flashing of each  $I_2$ -free cell was carried out at room temperature. Molecular iodine accumulates by irreversible processes as detailed in Section 3, and following flashes on the same cell maintained at room temperature led to some transitory  $I_2$  dissociation that masked  $I_2$  photogeneration. (This dissociation probably occurs by energy transfer since direct photodissociation was prevented by the 380 nm cut-off filter; that no direct  $I_2$ photodissociation occurred was confirmed by flashing a cell containing only  $CO_2$  and  $I_2$ .) Accordingly, subsequent flashes were carried out after the condensable contents of the cell had first been frozen into a side-arm at -196 °C and then maintained at -39 °C with a benzyl chloride slush bath (vapor pressure of  $I_2$  at -39 °C,  $4.5 \times 10^{-4}$  Torr). Under these conditions, results on cells in which  $I_2$  had been produced previously were consistent with initial-flash temporal  $I_2$  production results.

## 3. Results and discussion

# 3.1. Photolysis of $CF_3I$ in the absence of $O_2$

Figure 1 is a typical oscillogram monitored at 498 nm showing temporal behavior of  $I_2$  production following UV flash photodissociation of CF<sub>3</sub>I in the presence of about 400 Torr CO<sub>2</sub>; comparable oscillograms were obtained with xenon or SF<sub>6</sub> as the inert diluent gas. It is seen that generation of  $I_2$  is preceded by an induction period of approximately 200  $\mu$ s. This induction period decreases with increasing pressure of CF<sub>3</sub>I, ranging from 190  $\mu$ s at 24 Torr CF<sub>3</sub>I to 425  $\mu$ s at 4 Torr CF<sub>3</sub>I.

A similar delay in  $I_2$  production occurs in the iodine photodissociation laser [15] where accumulation of  $I_2$  is attributed primarily to thermal decomposition of the active medium in the laser; the induction period is the time needed to reach a pyrolysis threshold temperature (about 1000 K). Pyrolysis of CF<sub>3</sub>I clearly cannot be the source of  $I_2$  in the non-laser flash results reported here, however. Under the flash conditions typically used (total flash energy of the order of 1 kJ with non-collimated light output distributed roughly uniformly over the UV and visible spectral regions), the temperature rise within the photolysis cell was limited to less than 1 °C per flash by the gas pressure (greater than 0.5 atm).

In the absence of  $CF_3I$  pyrolysis, three-body atom recombination is the major source of  $I_2$ . Photodissociation of  $CF_3I$  leads to over 90% I<sup>\*</sup> atoms [3]; these excited atoms do not combine themselves and they combine with



Fig. 1.  $I_2$  formation following flash photodissociation of  $CF_3I$  in  $CO_2$ : upper trace, scattered light from cell (monitored at 360 nm) showing time of flash initiation; lower trace, absorption at 498 nm. Sweep time, 50  $\mu$ s per major division; vertical sensitivity,  $4.9 \times 10^{14} I_2$  molecules cm<sup>-3</sup> per major division;  $P(CF_3I) = 16$  Torr;  $P(CO_2) = 400$  Torr.

ground state I atoms two orders of magnitude slower than recombination of two ground state atoms [16]. The induction period in  $I_2$  production in the absence of  $O_2$  thus results from time-delayed deactivation of  $I^*$ :

.

$$I^* + M \xrightarrow{R_{Q,M}} I + M \tag{11}$$

Trifluoromethyl radicals are very efficient quenchers of  $I^*: k_{Q,CF_1} = 2.9 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} [17]$ . However, the high pressure second order recombination  $2CF_3 \rightarrow C_2F_6$  is at least four times as fast as the deactivation  $CF_3 + I^* \rightarrow CF_3 + I [17, 18]$  so that under the conditions of the work reported here it is assumed that no quenching by  $CF_3$  occurs. (It should be noted that if appreciable deactivation by  $CF_3$  did occur during the short lifetime of the  $CF_3$  radicals in the system, then I<sub>2</sub> production would have occurred by recombination at a much shorter time than actually observed, as for example in Fig. 1). Conversely,  $CO_2$  and  $CF_3I$  are weak quenchers of  $I^*: k_{Q,M} = 1.3 \times 10^{-16}$  and  $3.5 \times 10^{-16}$  cm<sup>3</sup> molecule<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> for  $CO_2$  [19] and  $CF_3I$  [20] respectively. The results are qualitatively consistent, however, with the following mechanism utilizing the extremely efficient quenching by  $I_2(k_{Q,I_1} = 3.6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  [21]):

$$I^* + CO_2 \xrightarrow{\kappa_{Q,CO_2}} I + CO_2$$
 (12)

$$\mathbf{I}^* + \mathbf{I}_2 \qquad \xrightarrow{\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{Q},\mathbf{I}_2}} \qquad \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{I}_2 \tag{13}$$

$$2I + M \qquad \xrightarrow{R_{R,M}} \qquad I_2 + M \tag{14}$$

The third-order recombination rate constants  $k_{R,M}$  for CO<sub>2</sub>, CF<sub>3</sub>I and I<sub>2</sub> are  $5.0 \times 10^{-32}$  (this work, in agreement with earlier results [22]),  $3.1 \times 10^{-31}$  [23] and  $3.0 \times 10^{-30}$  [24] cm<sup>6</sup> molecule<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. In all of the work reported,  $P(CO_2)/P(I_2) > 6000$  and  $P(CO_2)/P(CF_3I) > 15$ , so that CO<sub>2</sub> is the predominant third body in reaction (14). We have simulated this mechanism on an EAI TR-10 analog computer using  $k_{Q,I_2}$  as an adjustable parameter, assuming M = CO<sub>2</sub> only and that the concentration of I\* at the time of maximum flash intensity is  $[I^*]_0 = 0.91$  ( $2 \times [I_2]_{\infty}$ ), where  $[I_2]_{\infty}$  is the total amount of I<sub>2</sub> produced for one flash. Results for the flash oscillogram in Fig. 1 are shown in Fig. 2, giving a best fit value for  $k_{Q,I_2}$  of 7.4 × 10<sup>-11</sup> cm<sup>3</sup> molecule<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. Computer simulations for CF<sub>3</sub>I pressures of 8 Torr and 24 Torr give best fit values of  $4.0 \times 10^{-11}$  and  $2.5 \times 10^{-11}$  cm<sup>3</sup> molecule<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> for  $k_{Q,I_2}$ . In view of the major assumptions involved in the simulations, these best fit values are in satisfactory ageement with the literature value given above and support mechanism (12) - (14) as the major source of the induction period preceding I<sub>2</sub> production.

Propane is an efficient quencher of  $I^*$ :  $k_{Q,C_3H_8} = 1.6 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3$ molecule<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> [25]. Addition of about 3 Torr propane to the reaction mixture of Fig. 1 greatly reduces the induction period but has negligible effect on the subsequent rate of I<sub>2</sub> production, as seen in Fig. 3. Inclusion of



Fig. 2. Computer simulation (solid curve) of experimental ( $^{\circ}$ ) formation of I<sub>2</sub> following flash photodissociation of CF<sub>3</sub>I in CO<sub>2</sub>:  $P(CF_3I) = 16$  Torr;  $P(CO_2) = 400$  Torr.



Fig. 3. I<sub>2</sub> formation following flash photodissociation of CF<sub>3</sub>I in CO<sub>2</sub> with C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub> quencher: upper trace, scattered light at 360 nm; lower trace, absorption at 498 nm. Sweep time, 100  $\mu$ s per major division; vertical sensitivity, 4.9 × 10<sup>14</sup> I<sub>2</sub> molecules cm<sup>-3</sup> per major division;  $P(CF_3I) = 16$  Torr;  $P(CO_2) = 400$  Torr;  $P(C_3H_8) = 3$  Torr.

$$I^* + C_3 H_8 \xrightarrow{k_{Q,C_3}H_8} I + C_3 H_8$$
(15)

in the computer simulation gives a best fit value for  $k_{Q,C,H_s}$  of  $5.6 \times 10^{-13}$  cm<sup>3</sup> molecule<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. Substitution of propane (400 Torr) for CO<sub>2</sub> completely eliminates the induction period and leads immediately following the flash to the expected third order recombination (Fig. 4).



Fig. 4. I<sub>2</sub> formation following flash photodissociation of CF<sub>3</sub>I in C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>8</sub>: upper trace, scattered light at 360 nm; lower trace, absorption at 498 nm. Sweep time, 500  $\mu$ s per major division; vertical sensitivity,  $4.9 \times 10^{14}$  I<sub>2</sub> molecule cm<sup>-3</sup> per major division;  $P(CF_3I) = 16$  Torr;  $P(C_3H_8) = 400$  Torr.

# 3.2. Photolysis of $CF_3I$ in the presence of $O_2$

Molecular oxygen is an extremely efficient quencher of I<sup>\*</sup> ( $k_{Q,O_1}$  =  $2.5 \times 10^{-11}$  cm<sup>3</sup> molecule<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> [26]) but is a poor third body in ground state I atom recombination, being only about half as effective as  $CO_2$  [27]. Addition of about 2 Torr  $O_2$  to the system represented in Fig. 1 should be as effective as 400 Torr propane in quenching  $I^*$ ; on this basis  $I_2$  production following flash photodissociation of  $CF_3I$  in the presence of  $O_2$  might be expected to follow that of Fig. 4. The results, however, are quite different, as shown by the oscillogram in Fig. 5. Although the induction period has been eliminated (less than 10  $\mu$ s) by addition of 2 Torr O<sub>2</sub> to CF<sub>3</sub>I (16 Torr) and  $CO_2$  (400 Torr), the rate of  $I_2$  production is rapid and essentially that of the activating flash intensity, *i.e.* about  $7 \times 10^{19}$  I<sub>2</sub> molecules cm<sup>-3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. This behavior is followed at all higher pressures of  $O_2$  and to  $O_2$  pressures less than 0.2 Torr. At  $P(O_2) \approx 0.03$  Torr, the rate of  $I_2$  production is less than that of the light intensity: initial rate =  $R_0(I_2) \approx 4 \times 10^{18}$  molecules  $cm^{-3} s^{-1}$ . Similarly, at  $P(O_2) = 1$  Torr,  $P(CF_3I) = 4$  Torr, the rate of  $I_2$ production is slightly less than the flash intensity profile.



Fig. 5. I<sub>2</sub> formation following flash photodissociation of CF<sub>3</sub>I in CO<sub>2</sub> with O<sub>2</sub> quencher: upper trace, scattered light at 360 nm; lower trace, absorption at 498 nm. Sweep time, 50  $\mu$ s per major division; vertical sensitivity, 4.9 × 10<sup>14</sup> I<sub>2</sub> molecules cm<sup>-3</sup> per major division;  $P(CF_3I) = 16$  Torr;  $P(CO_2) = 400$  Torr;  $P(O_2) = 2$  Torr.

At  $P(O_2) \ge 1$  Torr, the molecular iodine concentration reaches a maximum value at about 60  $\mu$ s after flash initiation followed by a first order disappearance  $(k_1 \approx 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1})$  that is independent of CF<sub>3</sub>I or O<sub>2</sub> pressure. The results are summarized in Table 1. It is seen that both the maximum I<sub>2</sub> concentration and the equilibrium concentration reached several hundred microseconds after the flash are roughly independent of O<sub>2</sub> pressure, but do increase with increasing CF<sub>3</sub>I pressure (and hence increased light absorption). The fall-off in a linear dependence at the highest (23 Torr) CF<sub>3</sub>I pressure is due in part to high, and hence non-linear, absorption by CF<sub>3</sub>I (decadic  $\epsilon = 155$  dm<sup>3</sup> mole<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup> at 270 nm).

This rapid  $I_2$  production cannot be due solely to three-body atom recombination of ground state atoms. Assuming that all of the I<sup>\*</sup> atoms are quenched in a time short compared with the flash duration and that the initial iodine atom concentration is twice that of  $[I_2]_{max}$ , then the initial rate of  $I_2$  production by ground state recombination at  $P(CO_2) \approx 400$  Torr would be about  $2.5 \times 10^{18}$  molecules cm<sup>-3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, or approximately 30 times slower than actually observed.

Enhanced I atom recombination in a large excess of  $O_2$  has been observed when the flash radiation extends as low as 200 nm [28]. This results from generation of more effective third bodies such as  $O_3$  and singlet  $O_2({}^{1}\Delta_g)$ :

$$2I + O_3 \rightarrow I_2 + O_3 \tag{16}$$

#### **TABLE 1**

Diluent gas (~400 Torr)	<i>P</i> (O <sub>2</sub> ) (Torr)	$[I_2]_{max} \times 10^{-14}$ (molecules cm <sup>-3</sup> )	$[I_2]_{\infty} \times 10^{-14}$ (molecules cm <sup>-3</sup> )	
$P(CF_3I) \approx 10 \text{ Torr}$				
CO,	0.03		6	
CO2	0.2		8	
CO <sub>2</sub>	1	9	7	
Xe	1	10	6	
SF <sub>6</sub>	1	8	6	
CO <sub>2</sub>	2	7	4	
$CO_2$	2	9	6	
$CO_2^-$	5	10	7	
$CO_2$	8	12	9	
$P(CF_3I) \approx 16 \text{ Torr}$				
CO <sub>2</sub>	1	13	10	
$C_3 \tilde{H_8}$	1	16	9	
CÕ <sub>2</sub>	2	14	10	
$CO_2$	4	14	10	
$CO_2$	6	17	13	
$CO_2$	9	17	13	
Diluent gas (~400 Torr)	P(CF <sub>3</sub> I) (Torr)	$[I_2]_{max} \times 10^{-14}$ (molecules cm <sup>-3</sup> )	$[I_2]_{\infty} \times 10^{-14}$ (molecules cm <sup>-3</sup> )	
$P(O_2) \approx 1 \text{ Torr}$		<u></u> _,, <u></u> _,	<u> </u>	
CO <sub>2</sub>	4	4	2	
Xe	4	4	2	
CO <sub>2</sub>	8	9	7	
Xe	8	10	6	
SF <sub>6</sub>	8	8	6	
CO <sub>2</sub>	16	13	10	
SF <sub>6</sub>	15	16	9	
CO <sub>2</sub>	23	16	11	

Molecular iodine production following room	temperature	flash	photolysis (	of CF <sub>2</sub>	I in	the
presence of $O_2$						

$$2I + O_2(^{1}\Delta_g) \rightarrow I_2 + O_2(^{1}\Delta_g)$$
(17)

or by inclusion of the rapid bimolecular step

 $2IO \rightarrow I_2 + O_2 \tag{18}$ 

The  $O_3$ ,  $O_2({}^1\Delta_g)$  and IO species result from photodissociation of  $O_2$  in the Herzberg region near 200 nm; Antrim *et al.* [28] obtained no kinetic evidence for IO formation from I or I<sup>\*</sup> atoms reacting with ground state  $({}^3\Sigma_g) O_2$  even though energetically favorable for I<sup>\*</sup> atoms (and possibly I + I<sup>\*</sup> atoms, depending on IO bond energy). (It should also be noted that in fact IO disappears by first order kinetics with  $t_{1/2} \approx 85 \,\mu s$  [29], rather than

by the second order combination required by reaction (18); this IO lifetime is too long to account for the rapid I<sub>2</sub> generation reported here.) Since the UV filter solution used in the work reported here limited radiation to  $\lambda >$ 235 nm and since inclusion of reactions (16) and (17) would require unreasonably large ground state I atom recombination rate constants (more than 5000 times that for  $O_2({}^3\Sigma_g)$  as a third body), we rule out formation of  $O_3$ ,  $O_2({}^1\Delta_g)$  and IO as significant intermediate contributors to I<sub>2</sub> formation.

Although I<sup>\*</sup> atoms in general recombine much slower than I atoms [16], a possible mechanism for the rapid build-up of  $I_2$  in the presence of  $O_2$  is the formation of a strong intermediate complex (exciplex) between I<sup>\*</sup> and ground state  $O_2$ :

$$O_2(^{3}\Sigma_g^{-}) + I^* \stackrel{\leftarrow}{\rightarrow} (O_2 \cdot I)^*$$
(19)

followed by

$$2(O_2 \cdot I)^* \rightarrow I_2 + 2O_2 \tag{20}$$

or

$$(O_2 \cdot I)^* + I \rightarrow I_2 + O_2 \tag{21}$$

A similar exciplex between  $I_2$  and  $O_2$  has been proposed in the laser-induced photodecomposition of  $CHI_3$  in the presence of trace amounts of  $I_2$  and  $O_2$  [30].

Stability of  $(O_2 \cdot I)^*$  may be enhanced by the near-resonant energies of I<sup>\*</sup> and  $O_2({}^{1}\Delta_g)$ . However, although near resonance enhances quenching of I<sup>\*</sup> [31] and Br( ${}^{2}P_{1/2}$ ) [32] atoms, it does not appear to be a major factor in  $O_2$  quenching of triplet states [33]. More reasonable perhaps is a high level of charge transfer complexation resulting from the large electron affinity of the I<sup>\*</sup> atom, which is greater than that of ground state I atoms by the excitation energy (0.94 eV).

We may estimate a lower limit for the strength of  $(O_2 \cdot I)^*$  if  $R_0(I_2) \ge 7 \times 10^{19}$  molecules cm<sup>-3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> (*i.e.* that of the photolysis flash). Assuming that reaction (19) is in equilibrium  $(K_{19})$ , that reaction (20) occurs at every encounter and that  $[I^*]_0 = 0.91$  ( $2 \times [I_2]_{max}$ ), then it follows from simple collision frequency for  $P(O_2) = 1$  Torr,  $P(CF_3I) = 8$  Torr ( $[I_2]_{max} \approx 10^{15}$  molecules cm<sup>-3</sup>, Table 1) that  $K_{19} \ge 10^4$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup>. This is very large in general compared with that for ground state I atom charge transfer complexes which in many cases may be solely contact interactions [34] although stability constants in excess of  $10^6$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> at 400 K have been obtained for complexes between I and NO or NO<sub>2</sub> [35].

## 3.3. Reactions following flash-initiated $I_2$ production

Undoubtedly other undetected transient species such as  $CF_3$  and  $CF_3O_2$  may contribute to the overall mechanism, as evidenced (Fig. 5) by the relatively slow first order disappearance of approximately 30% of the  $I_2$  following the photolyzing flash. The rate constant for the reaction of trifluoromethyl radicals with iodine

 $CF_3 + I_2 \rightarrow CF_3I + I$ 

is at least nine times smaller than that for two-body  $CF_3$  recombination [36], so that an unreasonably large  $CF_3$  concentration is required in order for reaction (22) to contribute substantially to  $I_2$  disappearance. This is also shown directly in other work in this laboratory, to be reported later, in which  $CF_3I$  or  $CF_3COCF_3$  is flash photolyzed with UV light in the presence of  $I_2$ ; although  $I_2$  is dissociated within the lifetime of the flash with a quantum yield suggesting very efficient collision energy transfer leading to  $I_2$  dissociation in addition to reaction (22), there is no induction period in the reappearance of  $I_2$  as would be required if reaction (22) is important several hundred microseconds after the flash.

Trifluoromethyl radicals react with  $O_2$  to form  $CF_3O_2$  radicals. Very little is known of the reactions of  $CF_3O_2$ , but undoubtedly they will react to some extent with  $I_2$  in addition to leading to fluorinated and oxygenated products such as  $CF_2O$ . If  $F_2$  is an intermediate, such as by reaction (10), then  $I_2$  may be decomposed by the bimolecular reaction [36, 37]

$$\mathbf{F}_2 + \mathbf{I}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{I}_2 \mathbf{F} + \mathbf{F} \tag{23}$$

Unidentified solid products were produced in all  $O_2$ - containing reaction mixtures, as shown by light scattering of the continuous analyzing beam immediately following the photolyzing flash. This cloudiness disappeared when the reaction mixture was frozen out with liquid nitrogen and then maintained at -39 °C, or after 24 h at room temperature for cells with  $P(O_2)$ less than 2 Torr. Mass spectral analyses suggested products considerably larger than CF<sub>2</sub>O but yields were too small and variable for characterization.

## Acknowledgments

Preliminary results were obtained by Mr. Raymond F. Brown (senior thesis, submitted to the Department of Chemistry, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute). One of us (J.E.S.) was a National Science Foundation Undergraduate Research Participant, Summer, 1977.

## References

- 1 J. V. V. Kasper and G. C. Pimentel, Appl. Phys. Lett., 5 (1964) 231.
- 2 G. Brederlow, K. J. Witte, E. Fill, K. Hohla and R. Volk, Digest of Technical Papers of the 1977 IEEE/OSA Conf. on Laser Engineering and Applications, Washington, D.C., June 1 - 3, 1977, IEEE J. Quantum Electron., QE-13 (9) (1977) 61D.
- 3 T. Donahue and J. R. Wiesenfeld, J. Chem. Phys., 63 (1975) 3130.
- 4 C. C. Davis, R. J. Pirkle, R. A. McFarlane and G. J. Wolga, IEEE J. Quantum Electron., QE-12 (1976) 334.
- 5 R. G. Derwent and B. A. Thrush, Chem. Phys. Lett., 9 (1971) 591.
- 6 W. E. McDermott, N. R. Pchelkin, D. J. Benard and R. R. Bousek, Appl. Phys. Lett., 32 (1978) 469.

(22)

- 7 A. T. Pritt, Jr., R. D. Coombe, D. Pilipovich, R. I. Wagner, D. Benard and C. Dymek, Appl. Phys. Lett., 31 (1977) 745.
- 8 S. J. Arnold, N. Finlayson and E. A. Ogryzlo, J. Chem. Phys., 44 (1966) 2529.
- 9 R. G. Derwent and B. A. Thrush, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 2, 68 (1972) 720.
- 10 J. J. Deakin and D. Husain, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 2, 68 (1972) 1603.
- 11 W. C. Francis and R. N. Hazeldine, J. Chem. Soc., (1955) 2151.
- 12 V. I. Vedeneev, M. A. Teitel boim and A. A. Shoikhet, Bull. Acad. Sci. USSR, 25 (1976) 1850; 26 (1977) 480.
- 13 J. Heicklen, J. Phys. Chem., 70 (1966) 112.
- 14 V. A. Brosseau, J. R. Basila, J. F. Smalley and R. L. Strong, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 94 (1972) 716.
- 15 I. M. Belousova, N. G. Gorshkov, O. B. Danilov, V. Yu. Zalesskii and I. L. Yachnev, Sov. Phys.-JETP, 38 (1974) 254.
- 16 A. A. Filyukov, V. B. Mitrofanov and T. V. Mishchenko, Khim. Vys. Energ., 10 (1976) 35.
- 17 G. A. Skorobogatov, V. G. Seleznev and O. N. Slesar, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 231 (1976) 1407.
- 18 G. A. Skorobogatov, V. S. Komarov and V. G. Seleznev, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 218 (1974) 886.
- 19 R. J. Donovan and D. Husain, Trans. Faraday Soc., 62 (1966) 2023.
- 20 D. Husain and J. R. Wiesenfeld, Trans. Faraday Soc., 63 (1967) 1349.
- 21 D. H. Burde, R. A. McFarlane and J. R. Wiesenfeld, Chem. Phys. Lett., 32 (1975) 296.
- 22 H. W. Chang and G. Burns, Can. J. Chem., 51 (1973) 3394.
- 23 B. P. Dymov, G. A. Skorobogatov, V. E. Khomenko and S. A. Shchukarev, Zh. Obshch. Khim., 47 (1977) 848.
- 24 H. Hippler, K. Luther and J. Troe, Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem., 77 (1973) 1104.
- 25 J. R. Wiesenfeld and G. L. Volk, J. Chem. Phys., 67 (1977) 509.
- 26 D. H. Burde and R. A. McFarlane, J. Chem. Phys., 64 (1976) 1850.
- 27 K. E. Russell and J. Simons, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A, 217 (1953) 271.
- 28 R. E. Antrim, G. Burns and J. K. K. Ip, Can. J. Chem., 55 (1977) 749.
- 29 D. Yu. Stupin, V. N. Tezikov and O. M. Kaplii, Khim. Vys. Energ., 7 (1973) 327.
- 30 H. Kornweitz, M. Brith and H. Friedmann, J. Photochem., 6 (1977) 221.
- 31 R. J. Butcher, R. J. Donovan and R. H. Strain, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 2, 70 (1974) 1839.
- 32 F. J. Wodarczyk and P. B. Sackett, Chem. Phys., 12 (1976) 65.
- 33 O. L. J. Gijzeman, F. Kaufman and G. Porter, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 2, 69 (1973) 708.
- 34 M. Tamres and R. L. Strong, Contact charge-transfer spectra, in R. Foster (ed.), Molecular Association, Vol. 2, Academic Press, London, 1979, p. 331.
- 35 H. van den Bergh and J. Troe, J. Chem. Phys., 64 (1976) 736.
- 36 J. W. Birks, S. D. Gabelnick and H. S. Johnston, J. Mol. Spectrosc., 57 (1975) 23.
- M. J. Coggliola, J. J. Valentini and Y. T. Lee, Int. J. Chem. Kinet., 8 (1976) 605.
   J. J. Valentini, M. J. Coggliola and Y. T. Lee, Discuss. Faraday Soc., 62 (1977) 232.