## Communications to the Editor

## The Heat of Formation of Krypton Difluoride ${ }^{1}$

Sir:
No thermochemical data for krypton compounds seem to have yet appeared in the literature. In the present work, the heat of thermal decomposition of krypton difluoride to its constituent elements has been measured.

The calorimetric method employed a system similar to dropping calorimeters used for enthalpy determinations. The "furnace," however, was at $25.0^{\circ}$, a temperature at which $\mathrm{KrF}_{2}$ decomposes only slowly, and the receiving aneroid calorimeter ${ }^{2}$ was at $93^{\circ}$, where $\mathrm{KrF}_{2}$ decomposes rapidly to $\mathrm{Kr}+\mathrm{F}_{2}$. The $\mathrm{KrF}_{2}$ samples were loaded into $78-\mathrm{ml}$ cans of $0.013-\mathrm{cm}$ thick stainless steel, through short Kovar-joined glass tubulations which were then sealed off. Five minutes before drop time, the cans were warmed from - 196 to $25^{\circ}$. After the first (decomposition) drop measurement, the can was raised to the $25.0^{\circ}$ zone, the calorimeter heated to its original starting temperature, and the drop measurement repeated. The difference between the two temperature changes of the calorimeter, multiplied by its heat capacity, gives the heat of decomposition of the sample at $25^{\circ}$.

Krypton difluoride was prepared by the method of MacKenzie and Fajer. ${ }^{3}$ Vapor pressures were measured with a Monel Bourdon gauge: $10 \pm 1 \mathrm{~mm}$ at $-15.5^{\circ}, 29 \pm 2 \mathrm{~mm}$ at $0.0^{\circ}$, and $73 \pm 3 \mathrm{~mm}$ at $15.0^{\circ}$. These are very close to the pressures given by Grosse, et al., ${ }^{4}$ attributed to $\mathrm{KrF}_{4}$, but with a slope of $\log p$ vs. $T^{-1}$ about $10 \%$ greater; $\Delta H_{\text {subl }}$ is $9.9 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mole}^{-1}$. Schreiner, Malm, and Hindman ${ }^{5}$ gave a value of roughly 30 mm at $0^{\circ}$. The decomposition rate at room temperature as a gas in a Monel and stainless steel system was ca. $10 \% \mathrm{hr}^{-1}$, and as a solid, substantially lower.

Before loading the calorimeter cells, they were treated overnight with fluorine, at a temperature initially 130 to $150^{\circ}$ which gradually decreased. This should minimize attack upon the cell by $\mathrm{KrF}_{2}$ at $25^{\circ}$ or by the $F_{2}$ liberated at $93^{\circ}$ in the calorimeter.

The amount of reaction was determined after the calorimeter run in up to three ways: volume of total gas recovered from the cell (three runs); volume of krypton recovered (all runs); weight loss of cell upon removal of the gases (eight runs). The cell was weighed and attached to a vacuum system with wax, and the tip of the glass tube was broken off. In the last three runs, the first section of the system included a Monel Bourdon gauge and a calibrated volume to permit measurement of the total gas. The fluorine was then removed by passage through an activated copper catalyst (in earlier runs, by transferring the gas mixture

[^0]with a Toepler pump to a bulb in which it was shaken overnight with mercury) and the krypton was transferred by a Toepler pump to a gas buret and measured, its purity subsequently being checked by mass spectrometry. The cell was back-filled with hydrogen or helium, removed from the vacuum line, stoppered, cleaned of wax, and reweighed. The three methods of analysis were all consistent with the assumption that the cell contained an equimolar mixture of Kr and $\mathrm{F}_{2}$.

From the extrapolated vapor pressure of 138 mm at $25.0^{\circ}$, the $78-\mathrm{ml}$ cell would contain 0.58 mmole of $\mathrm{KrF}_{2}$ at saturation. Five runs were made with from 0.30 to 0.44 mmole of $\mathrm{KrF}_{2}$; results were $14.2,18.3$, $13.8,14.7$, and $14.9 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mole}^{-1}$ for $-\Delta E_{1}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{KrF}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Kr}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g}) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Four runs were made with from 1.31 to 1.54 mmoles of $\mathrm{KrF}_{2}$. A correction of $9.3 \mathrm{cal} \mathrm{mmole}{ }^{-1}$ was added for the $\mathrm{KrF}_{2}$ in excess of 0.58 mmole to account for $\Delta E_{\text {subl }}$; results for $-\Delta E_{1}$ were $13.6,14.3,14.6$, and 13.9 kcal mole ${ }^{-1}$. Rejecting the anomalous 18.3, the average is 14.2. Converting to constant pressure, $\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}{ }^{\circ}(\mathrm{Kr}-$ $\left.\mathrm{F}_{2}(\mathrm{~g})\right)=+13.7 \mathrm{kcal}\left(\mathrm{mole}^{-1}\right.$ and $\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}{ }^{\circ}\left(\mathrm{KrF}_{2}(\mathrm{c})\right)=$ +3.7 kcal mole ${ }^{-1}$. Using +18.88 for $\Delta H_{\mathrm{f}}{ }^{\circ}(\mathrm{F}(\mathrm{g}))$ the thermochemical bond energy $E(\mathrm{Kr}-\mathrm{F})$ is 12.0 kcal , compared with 31 to 33 for $E(\mathrm{Xe}-\mathrm{F})$ in $\mathrm{XeF}_{2}, \mathrm{XeF}_{4}$, and $\mathrm{XeF}_{6}{ }^{6}{ }^{6}$
Measurements are continuing and a more detailed report will be published at a later date.
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## Oxidation of Molecular Nitrogen by Excited Singlet Oxygen Molecules in Aqueous Solution

Sir:
Excited singlet oxygen molecules in solution were shown to be formed in the reaction of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ with HOCl (or $\left.\mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right)^{1-3}$ or with alkaline pyrogallol, ${ }^{4}$ in the thermal decomposition of benzoyl peroxide, ${ }^{5}$ as well as in certain photosensitized oxidation reactions. ${ }^{6.7}$ The nature of these species has been discussed as well as their mode of decay. ${ }^{7-9}$ Excited oxygen molecules were shown to be capable of oxidizing unsaturated organic compounds in solution. ${ }^{6.7,10.11}$ An interaction between ${ }^{1} \Sigma \mathrm{O}_{2}$ and molecular nitrogen was demonstrated in the gas phase; ${ }^{12}$
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