The reaction of ONOO⁻ with carbonyls: Estimation of the half-lives of ONOOC(O)O⁻ and $O_2NOOC(O)O^-$ [†]

Sara Goldstein,*^a Johan Lind^b and Gabor Merényi^b

^a Department of Physical Chemistry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem 91904, Israel. E-mail: sarag@vms.huji.ac.il

^b Department of Chemistry, Nuclear Chemistry, The Royal Institute of Technology, S-10044 Stockholm 70, Sweden

Received 9th August 2001, Accepted 9th October 2001 First published as an Advance Article on the web 18th January 2002

The equilibrium constant for the formation of an adduct between a carbonyl and a hydroperoxide ion varies linearly with the acid dissociation constant of the hydroperoxide. Based on this relationship, the half-life of the adduct formed between $ONOO^-$ and CO_2 , $ONOOC(O)O^-$, is estimated to be shorter than 100 ns. Consequently, this adduct should not play any role whatsoever in chemical or biological systems. O_2NOO^- and CO_2 are believed to be involved in a fast equilibrium reaction forming an adduct, $O_2NOOC(O)O^-$. This adduct does not appear to homolyse either along the O–O or the N–O bond. Furthermore, at realistic CO_2 concentrations, the equilibrium should be shifted far to the $O_2NOO^- + CO_2$ side. Therefore, the rate of self-decomposition of O_2NOO^- into NO_2^- and O_2 is unaffected by the presence of bicarbonate.

Introduction

The importance of the coupling of 'NO with O_2^{-} to yield ONOO⁻ in biological systems was first suggested by Beckman *et al.*,¹ and since then a growing interest has centered on the chemical and biological properties of peroxynitrite (ONOOH/ONOO⁻). The decomposition of peroxynitrite is often accompanied by the formation of peroxynitrate (O_2NOOH/O_2NOO^-),^{2,3} and therefore the chemical properties of this peroxo species are also of great importance. Peroxynitrite ion reacts relatively fast with CO₂, *i.e.* $k = (2.9 \pm 0.3) \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at 24 °C,⁴ whereas peroxynitrate was found to be stable in the presence of bicarbonate.^{2,3} It was found that CO₂ reacts with ONOO⁻ to yield NO₃⁻ as a final product,^{5,6} and that this process proceeds *via* the formation of about 33% CO₃⁻ and 'NO₂ in the bulk of the solution,^{2,3,5-10} which are capable of oxidizing and nitrating a large variety of substrates.²⁻⁸ The reaction of ONOO⁻ with CO₂ most probably forms an adduct to one of the two C=O bonds of CO₂, *i.e.* ONOOC(O)O⁻, which homolyses to form about 33% 'NO₂ and CO₃⁻ free radicals, and the remainder forms NO₃⁻ and CO₂ (Scheme 1).



The decay of ONOO⁻ in the presence of excess CO₂ and the formation of several oxidized or nitrated substrates were shown to occur in the same kinetic step using the stopped-flow technique, which indicates that ONOOC(O)O⁻ does not accumulate within 2–3 ms, *i.e.* the lifetime of ONOOC(O)O⁻ must be significantly shorter than 2–3 ms.^{8,10} Merényi and Lind¹¹ estimated a lifetime for ONOOC(O)O⁻ on the order of submicroseconds. Surprisingly, it was found that peroxynitrate

is stable in the presence of bicarbonate,^{2,3} though there is no reason to assume that it reacts differently from peroxynitrite with CO₂. It is also expected that the half-life of $O_2NOOC(O)O^-$ would be significantly longer than that of ONOOC(O)O⁻ because similar species such as O₂NOOH¹² and O₂NOOCH₃¹³ are relatively stable, as they show no tendency to homolyse along the O-O bond. Under physiological conditions, where the most abundant species are ONOO⁻ and $O_2 NOO^-$, *i.e.* $pK_a(ONOOH) = 6.6^{14} pK_a(O_2 NOOH) = 5.9^{15}$ and the concentration of CO₂ exceeds 1 mM, the toxicity of these peroxo species are most probably governed by the products of their reaction with CO2. Therefore, the determination of the half-lives of ONOOC(O)O⁻ and O₂NOOC(O)O⁻ is important due to their potential role as reactive species in biochemical systems. In the present study we estimate the halflife of $ONOOC(O)O^{-}$ by relating the experimental data to the rate constants in Scheme 1, and explain why peroxynitrate is stable in the presence of bicarbonate.

FULL PAPER

Discussion

The reaction of ONOO⁻ with CO₂

In a recent publication the equilibrium constant K_5 was determined to be 0.32 M⁻¹ using NMR spectroscopy.¹⁶

$$HCO_3^- + H_2O_2 = HOOCO_2^- + H_2O_K_5 = 0.32 M^{-1}$$
 (5)

With $pK_a(H_2O_2) = 11.7$ and $pK(CO_2) = 6.36$ for the hydration of CO_2 ,¹⁷ we obtain $K_6 = 7 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}$.

$$CO_2 + HOO^- \Longrightarrow HOOC(O)O^- K_6 = 7 \times 10^4 M^{-1}$$
 (6)

The equilibrium constant K_1 was calculated by assuming that the equilibrium constant for the formation of an adduct between the C=O double bond of a certain compound and a hydroperoxide ion varies linearly with the acid dissociation constant of the hydroperoxide. Specifically, if the two hydroperoxide anions HOO⁻ and ONOO⁻ add to the C=O bond of CO₂, this assumption implies that $\log K_6 - \log K_1 \approx p K_a(H_2O_2)$

[†] Based on the presentation given at Dalton Discussion No. 4, 10–13th January 2002, Kloster Banz, Germany.

− p K_a (ONOOH) = 11.7 − 6.6 = 5.1, whence $K_1 \approx 1$ M⁻¹. The validity of the above relationship will be demonstrated below for the addition of these two hydroperoxides to acetaldehyde and acetone, *i.e.* log K_7 − log $K_8 \approx 5$.

$$R^{1}R^{2}C = O + HOO^{-} \rightleftharpoons R^{1}R^{2}C(OOH)O^{-}$$
(7)

$$R^{1}R^{2}C=O + ONOO^{-} \rightleftharpoons R^{1}R^{2}C(OONO)O^{-}$$
(8)

Our recent study¹³ on the reactions of CH₃CHO and (CH₃)₂CO with ONOO⁻ has disclosed the equilibrium constant of reaction 8 to be $\approx 2 \times 10^{-5}$ and $\approx 6 \times 10^{-8}$ M⁻¹, respectively. The equilibrium constant of reaction 7 was calculated using eqns. 9–11.

$$R^{1}R^{2}C = O + H_{2}O_{2} \rightleftharpoons R^{1}R^{2}C(OOH)OH$$
(9)

$$R^{1}R^{2}C(OOH)OH \rightleftharpoons R^{1}R^{2}C(OOH)O^{-} + H^{+} \quad (10)$$

$$R^{1}R^{2}C(OONO)OH \Longrightarrow R^{1}R^{2}C(OONO)O^{-} + H^{+}$$
 (11)

The equilibrium constants of reaction 9 for acetaldehyde and acetone are known (see Table 1). Utilizing the well-known linear relationship between the pK_a of a nucleophile and that of the nucleophile–carbonyl adduct,²⁰ we estimated $pK_{10} \approx 13.0$ and ≈ 13.3 for acetaldehyde and acetone, respectively.²¹ Thus, the K_7 -values are calculated from Hess' law, using the values of K_9 , K_{10} and $pK_a(H_2O_2)$, *i.e.* $K_7 = K_9K_{10}/K_a(H_2O_2)$. All the relevant equilibrium constants are compiled in Table 1. Comparing K_7 with K_8 for acetaldehyde and acetone, we find that $\log K_7 - \log K_8 \approx 4.5$ and ≈ 5 , respectively, which is almost the same as the difference between the pK_a values of the conjugate acids of the nucleophilic hydroperoxides, *i.e.* $pK_a(H_2O_2) - pK_a(ONOOH) = 11.7 - 6.6 = 5.1$. This good fit confirms the validity of our assumptions, which formed the basis for our estimated $K_1 \approx 1 M^{-1}$.

The Gibbs energy of formation of ONOO⁻ has been determined to be 16.4 kcal mol⁻¹,²³ and the literature values of the Gibbs energies for CO₂, CO₃⁻ and 'NO₂ are -92.2, -89.5 and 15.1 kcal mol⁻¹, respectively.^{24,25} Hence, $(\Delta G_1^{\circ} + \Delta G_2^{\circ}) = -RT \ln(K_1K_2) = 1.4$ kcal mol⁻¹, $K_1K_2 = 0.1$, $K_1 \approx 1$ M⁻¹ and $K_2 \approx 0.1$ M.

The experimental second order rate constant for the reaction of CO₃⁻ with 'NO₂ has been determined to be $k_{\rm R} = (4.3 \pm 1) \times 10^8 \,{\rm M}^{-1} \,{\rm s}^{-1}$ using the pulse radiolysis technique.²⁶ The authors started with approximately equimolar amounts of CO₃⁻ and 'NO₂ (a few times 10^{-5} M each), and their findings were consistent with a single kinetic step to yield CO₂ and NO₃⁻, *i.e.* peroxynitrite was not formed under these conditions. According to the model given in Scheme 1, $k_{\rm R} = \{k_4 + k_{-2}(k_{-1} + k_3)/(k_{-1} + k_2 + k_3)\}$, and since $k_3/(k_2 + k_3) = 0.67$, ^{2,3,5-10} it follows that $k_{\rm R}$ equals $(k_4 + 0.67k_{-2})$ if $k_{-1} \ll k_2$ or $(k_4 + k_{-2})$ if $k_{-1} \gg k_2$.

As the adduct can never accumulate, k_{-2} is not measurable and has to be estimated. Merényi *et al.*²⁷ have demonstrated that the reaction of 'OH/O'⁻ with 'NO₂ generates almost equal amounts of ONOOH/ONOO⁻ and NO₃⁻ + H⁺. This suggests that oxygen-centered radicals react with 'NO₂ in such a way that initially *ca*. half of the reaction results in N–O coupling while the other half gives rise to O–O coupling. We thus have reason to believe that the oxygen-centered CO₃⁻⁻ radical should react with 'NO₂ in a similar way to 'OH/O⁻⁻.

Assuming a generous range of uncertainty, we set therefore $k_4/k_{-2} = 0.1-10$. This implies that the lowest possible value of k_{-2} is $\approx 3 \times 10^7 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. However, if we consider the global equilibrium, characterized by $K_1K_2 = 0.1$, we can define the rate constant for radical formation as $k_f = 0.33 \times 2.9 \times 10^4 \approx 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, and therefore the rate constant of ONOO⁻ formation from the radicals, $k_b = 0.1/k_f \approx 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Since $k_b = k_{-1}k_{-2}/(k_{-1} + 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})$.

Table 1 Summary of the equilibrium constants of reactions 7–11 for acetaldehyde and acetone^{*a*}

	Acetaldehyde	Acetone
$K_9/\mathrm{M}^{-1}\ K_{10}/\mathrm{M}^{-1}\ K_{11}/\mathrm{M}^{-1}$	48^{b} $\approx 1 \times 10^{-13 d}$ $\approx 5 \times 10^{-13 e}$	$0.086^{c} \\ \approx 5 \times 10^{-14 d} \\ \approx 1.6 \times 10^{-12 e}$
$K_7/\mathrm{M}^{-1}\ K_8/\mathrm{M}^{-1}\ \mathrm{log}K_7 - \mathrm{log}K_8$	$ \begin{array}{l} \approx 2 \\ \approx 2 \times 10^{-5e} \\ \approx 5 \end{array} $	$\approx 2 \times 10^{-3}$ $\approx 6 \times 10^{-8e}$ ≈ 4.5

^{*a*} $K_7 = K_9 K_{10} / K_a (H_2 O_2)$, $p K_a (H_2 O_2) = 11.7$. ^{*b*} Ref. 18. ^{*c*} Ref. 19. ^{*d*} Ref. 21. ^{*e*} Ref. 13.

 $3k_2$), it follows that k_2 is at least two orders of magnitude higher than k_{-1} , whence $4.3 \times 10^8 = k_4 + 0.67k_{-2}$ applies. Thus, $k_{-2} \approx (0.31 - 6.9) \times 10^8 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and with $K_2 \approx 0.1 \text{ M}$, one calculates $k_2 \approx (0.31 - 6.9) \times 10^7 \text{ s}^{-1}$.

The overall rate constant of the adduct decomposition is $(k_{-1} + k_2 + k_3)$, where $k_3/k_2 \approx 2$.^{2,3,5–10}. Assuming the steady-state approximation for ONOOC(O)O⁻ and the radicals, rate law 12 is obtained, where $\beta = k_4/(k_4 + k_{-2})$.

$$-\frac{d[ONOO^{-}]}{dt} = \frac{k_1(\beta k_2 + k_3)}{k_{-1} + \beta k_2 + k_3} [ONOO^{-}][CO_2] =$$
(12)
2.9×10⁴[ONOO^{-}][CO_2]

As $K_1 \approx 1$ and since k_{-1} is much smaller than $(\beta k_2 + k_3)$, *i.e.* $k_1 \approx k_{-1} \approx 2.9 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, the overall rate constant of the adduct decomposition turns out to be larger than 10^7 s^{-1} . This estimation confirms and refines our previous conclusion that the half-life of ONOOC(O)O⁻ is very short, *i.e.* $t_{1/2} < 0.1 \mu$ s. Consequently, it should not play any role whatsoever in chemical or biological systems, except in the trivial sense of being an ephemeral intermediate on route from peroxynitrite to the oxidative radicals CO₃⁻⁻ and 'NO₂.

In view of the above, a detailed mechanism is given in Scheme 2, where $ONOOC(O)O^-$ is assumed to decompose

$$CO_{2} + NO_{3}^{-}$$

$$\uparrow k_{N}$$

$$ONOOC(O)O^{-} \xrightarrow{k_{cage}} [ONO^{\bullet} OC(O)O^{-}]_{cage} \xrightarrow{k_{diff}} {}^{\bullet}NO_{2} + CO_{3}^{\bullet-}$$
Scheme 2

via homolysis of the O–O bond forming $CO_3^{\cdot-}$ and 'NO₂ in a solvent cage.

The formation of CO₂ and NO₃⁻ most probably occurs in two steps. The first and rate-determining step, which is characterized by the rate constant k_N , should be a N–O coupling to yield a very unstable O₂NOC(O)O⁻. This should be followed by an extremely rapid heterolysis of the unstable O–C bond to produce CO₂ and NO₃⁻.

The reaction of O₂NOO⁻ with CO₂

The rate of decay of the peroxynitrate ion was found unaffected in the presence of 1–2 mM CO₂.^{2,3} The reaction of O₂NOO⁻ with CO₂ most probably forms O₂NOOC(O)O⁻ (eqn. 13), which can in principle undergo either homolysis of the O–O bond forming 'NO₃ and CO₃⁻⁻ (eqn. 14) or homolysis of the N–O bonds forming 'NO₂ and CO₄⁻⁻ (eqn. 15, Scheme 3).



809

The equilibrium constant of reaction 13 is calculated, similarly to the calculation of equilibrium 1, by assuming that the equilibrium constant for the formation of an adduct between a carbonyl and a hydroperoxide ion varies linearly with the acid dissociation constant of the hydroperoxide, *i.e.* $\log K_6 - \log K_{13} \approx p K_a(H_2O_2) - p K_a(O_2NOOH) = 11.7 - 5.9 = 5.8$, whence $K_{13} \approx 0.1 \text{ M}^{-1}$.

The Gibbs energy of formation of O₂NOO⁻ has been determined to be 9.4 kcal mol^{-1.28} Using the literature values of $\Delta_{\rm f}G^{\rm O}({\rm CO}_3^{\, \cdot -}) = -89.5$ kcal mol^{-1.24} and $\Delta_{\rm f}G^{\rm O}({}^{\, \cdot }{\rm NO}_3) = 31.3$ kcal mol^{-1,24} one calculates ($\Delta G_{13}^{\rm O} + \Delta G_{14}^{\rm O}) = 24.6$ kcal mol⁻¹, *i.e.* $K_{13}K_{14} \approx 1 \times 10^{-18}$ and $K_{14} \approx 1 \times 10^{-17}$ M. The latter low value reveals the impossibility of the homolysis along the O–O bond, *i.e.*, k_{14} is extremely small.

The value of $K_{13}K_{15}$ was estimated as follows. We assume that HO₂' (p K_a (HO₂') = 4.8)²⁵ can be treated as a hydroperoxide in its reaction with carbonyl compounds, *i.e.* K_{16} is described by a similar linear free energy relationship as those with *bona fide* hydroperoxide anions, and hence log $K_6 - \log K_{16} \approx 11.7 - 4.8$ (Fig. 1) and $K_{16} \approx 10^{-2} \text{ M}^{-1}$.



Fig. 1 The relationship between the pK_a 's of H_2O_2 , ONOOH, O_2 NOOH and HO_2 ' and the equilibrium constants of the formation of the adducts between the hydroperoxide ions and CO_2 , CH_3CHO and $(CH_3)_2CO$.

$$O_2^{\cdot-} + CO_2 \rightleftharpoons OOC(O)O^-$$
(16)

Using the literature values $\Delta_{\rm f} G^{\circ}({\rm O_2}^{\bullet-}) = 7.6$ kcal mol⁻¹²⁴ and $\Delta_{\rm f} G^{\circ}({\rm CO}_2) = -92.2$ kcal mol⁻¹, one calculates $\Delta_{\rm f} G^{\circ}({\rm CO}_4^{\bullet-}) = -81.8$ kcal mol⁻¹, which finally yields ($\Delta G_{15}^{\circ} + \Delta G_{13}^{\circ}$) ≈ 16.1 kcal mol⁻¹, *i.e.* $K_{13}K_{15} \approx 1 \times 10^{-12}$ and $K_{15} \approx 10^{-11}$ M. The last value, in particular, appears to be a very reasonable estimate, since the corresponding constants for other peroxynitrates, K_{17} and K_{18} , have previously been determined to be 1.4×10^{-1112} and 4.9×10^{-11} M⁻¹, ¹³ respectively.

$$O_2 NOOH \equiv 'NO_2 + HO_2'$$
 (17)

$$O_2 NOOCH_3 \rightleftharpoons 'NO_2 + CH_3O_2'$$
 (18)

We are thus confident that K_{15} is smaller than 10^{-10} M, and since k_{-15} cannot exceed *ca*. 1×10^{10} M⁻¹ s⁻¹, k_{15} should be smaller than 1 s^{-1} . With $K_{13} \approx 0.1$ M⁻¹ and given that the highest possible concentration of CO₂ is well below 0.1 M, K_{13} [CO₂] k_{15} can hardly exceed 10^{-2} s⁻¹. The latter value implies that less than 1% of O₂NOO⁻ can decompose *via* its reaction with CO₂, given that the rate of the self-decomposition of O₂NOO⁻ is *ca*. 1 s⁻¹ at room temperature.¹⁵ Therefore, the rate of the decomposition of O₂NOO⁻ into NO₂⁻ and O₂ is unaffected by the presence of realistic concentrations of CO₂.

Conclusions

Peroxynitrite ion reacts relatively fast with CO₂ forming an adduct, ONOOC(O)O⁻, whose half-life is estimated to be shorter than 100 ns. Consequently, this adduct should not play any role whatsoever in chemical or biological systems. O₂NOO⁻ and CO₂ are believed to be involved in a fast equilibrium reaction forming an adduct, O₂NOOC(O)O⁻. This adduct does not appear to homolyse either along the O–O or the N–O bond. Furthermore, at realistic CO₂ concentrations, the equilibrium should be shifted far to the O₂NOO⁻ + CO₂ side. Therefore, the rate of self-decomposition of O₂NOO⁻ into NO₂⁻ and O₂ is unaffected by the presence of bicarbonate.

Acknowledgements

G. M. and J. L. thank The Swedish Natural Science Research Council for financial support.

References

- 1 J. S. Beckman, T. W. Beckman, J. Chen, P. A. Marshall and B. A. Freeman, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 1990, **87**, 1620.
- 2 S. Goldstein and G. Czapski, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1998, 120, 3458.
- 3 G. R. Hodges and K. U. J. Ingold, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1999, 121, 10695.
- 4 S. V. Lymar and J. K. Hurst, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1995, 117, 8867.
- 5 R. M. Uppu, G. L. Squadrito and W. A. Pryor, Arch. Biochem. Biophys., 1996, 327, 335.
- 6 S. V. Lymar and J. K. Hurst, Inorg. Chem., 1998, 37, 294.
- 7 S. Goldstein and G. Czapski, Inorg. Chem., 1997, 36, 5113.
- 8 S. V. Lymar, Q. Jiang and J. K. Hurst, Biochemistry, 1996, 35, 7855.
- 9 M. G. Bonini, R. Radi, G. Ferrer-Sueta, A. M. Da C. Ferreira and O. Augusto, J. Biol. Chem., 1999, 274, 10802.
- 10 S. Goldstein, G. Czapski, J. Lind and G. Merényi, Chem. Res. Toxicol., 2001, 14, 1243.
 - 11 G. Merényi and J. Lind, Chem. Res. Toxicol., 1997, 10, 1216.
 - 12 J. M. Régimbal and M. Mozurkewich, J. Phys. Chem. A, 1997, 101, 8822
- 13 G. Merényi, J. Lind and S. Goldstein, J. Am. Chem. Soc., in the press.
- 14 T. Logager and K. Sehested, J. Phys. Chem., 1993, 97, 6664.
- 15 T. Logager and K. Sehested, J. Phys. Chem., 1993, 97, 10047.
- 16 D. E. Richardson, H. Yao, K. M. Frank and D. A. Bennet, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2000, **122**, 1729.
- 17 R. A. Alberty, J. Phys. Chem., 1995, **99**, 11028.
- 18 E. G. Sander and W. P. Jencks, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1968, 90, 4377.
- 19 M. C. V. Sauer and J. O. Edwards, J. Phys. Chem., 1971, 75, 3004.
- 20 E. G. Sander and W. P. Jencks, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1968, 90, 6154.
- 21 pK(R¹R²C(OH)₂)s, *i.e.* pK(CH₃CH(OH)₂) and pK((CH₃)₂C(OH)₂), are 13.6 and 14.5, respectively,²² and pK₁₁, *i.e.* pK (CH₃CH(OONO)-(OH) and pK((CH₃)₂C(OONO)(OH)) have been recently derived as ≈ 12.3 and ≈ 11.8 , respectively.¹³ Using the above values, as well as pK_a(ONOOH) = 6.6, pK_a(H₂O₂) = 11.7, pK_a(H₂O) = 15.7, and the linear free energy relationship between the pK_a of the conjugate acid of a nucleophile and the pK of the corresponding adduct to a carbonyl group¹⁹ which in the present case implies ((pK₁₀ - pK₁₁)/ (pK(R₁R₂C(OH)₂) - pK₁₁) \approx (11.7 - 6.6)/(15.7 - 6.6), we estimated pK₁₀ \approx 13.0 and \approx 13.3 for acetaldehyde and acetone, respectively.
- 22 R. P. Bell, in Advances in Physical Organic Chemistry, ed. V. Gold, Academic Press, London, 1966, vol. 4, pp. 1–29.
- 23 G. Merényi and J. Lind, *Chem. Res. Toxicol.*, 1998, **11**, 243.
- 24 R. E. Huie, C. L. Clifton and P. Neta, *Radiat. Phys. Chem.*, 1991, **38**, 477.
- 25 D. M. Stanbury, Adv. Inorg. Chem., 1989, 33, 69.
- 26 Z. B. Alfassi, T. Dhanasekaran, R. E. Huie and P. Neta, *Radiat. Phys. Chem.*, 1999, 56, 475.
- 27 G. Merényi, J. Lind, S. Goldstein and G. Czapski, J. Phys. Chem., 1999, 103, 5685.
- 28 S. Goldstein, G. Czapski, J. Lind and G. Merényi, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1998, 37, 3943.