www.rsc.org/dalton

# **The kinetics of the oxidation of thiourea by 12-tungstocobaltate(III) ion: evidence for anionic, neutral and protonated thiourea species in acetic acid–acetate buffer and perchloric acid solution**

# **Manu Mehrotra and Raj N. Mehrotra \***

*Department of Chemistry, JNV University, Jodhpur 342 005, India. E-mail: raj\_n\_mehrotra@hotmail.com*

*Received 14th April 2003, Accepted 26th June 2003 First published as an Advance Article on the web 8th August 2003*

The kinetics of the redox reaction between 12-tungstocobaltate( $\text{III}$ ) ion,  $\text{[Co(III)W]}^{5-}$ , and thiourea is studied in acetic acid–acetate buffered solutions ( $3.4 \leq pH \leq 5.6$ ), and dilute perchloric acid solution. The reaction in buffered solution is first order both in  $[Co(III)W]^{5-}$  and low  $[H_2NCNH_2]$ . A simultaneous first- and second order dependence is observed at high  $[H_2NCSNH_2]$ . The rate is independent of pH  $\leq 4.6$  due to the participation of  $H_2NCSNH_2$ . In solutions of pH  $\geq$  4.6, the rate increases with the pH due to the dissociation of  $H_2NCSNH_2$  to the reactive H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sup>-</sup> ion. In dilute perchloric acid solutions the rate increases with increasing [H<sup>+</sup>] due to the participation of protonated NH<sub>2</sub>C<sup>+</sup>SHNH<sub>2</sub> species. The seat of the reaction is thought to be the enolic S atom (not protonated S) rather than the protonated nitrogen of the NH<sub>2</sub> group as in the oxidations of NH<sub>2</sub>OH,  $H_2NNH_2$  and N<sub>3</sub>H where the rate is retarded by the increase in  $[H^+]$ . The acid dissociation constant,  $K_a$ , of protonated  $NH_2C^+SHNH_2$  is estimated to be 0.048 mol dm<sup>-3</sup> at 40 °C. The Marcus theory is used to estimate the self-exchange rate  $(k_{22})$  of the  $H_2NCSNH_2$  $(H_2N)_2CSSC(NH_2)_2$  couple. The estimated  $k_{22}$  is 2.44  $\times 10^{-10}$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. The low value is attributed to the stable dimeric  $(H_2N)_2CSSC(NH_2)_2$  species.

# **Introduction**

In the oxidation of thiolactic acid,<sup>1</sup> hydroxylamine,<sup>2</sup> hydrazine<sup>3</sup> and azide<sup>4</sup> by 12-tungstocobaltate(III) ([Co(III)W]<sup>5-</sup>) the species  $CH_3CH(SH)COO^-$ ,  $NH_2OH$ ,  $N_2H_4$  and  $N_3^-$  ion, having a lone pair of electron, happened to be more reactive than the species  $CH_3CH(SH)COOH$ ,  $NH_3OH^+$ ,  $N_2H_5^+$  and  $HN_3$  that are devoid of such a pair. The Keggin structure of [Co**III**W] **<sup>5</sup>** ion**<sup>5</sup>** precluded an inner-sphere mechanism since the central Co<sup>III</sup> atom is strongly shielded. Hence, the oxidations were treated as outer-sphere supported by the application of the Marcus cross relation.**<sup>6</sup>**

Thiourea with a lone pair of electrons on S atom is the obvious choice to further substantiate the high reactivity of the species with lone pair of electrons. The extremely slow oxidation of urea was not attempted. The Ce(IV),<sup>7</sup> Co(III),<sup>8</sup>  $Mn(III)_{aq}$ ,<sup>9</sup> Cu(II) complexes,<sup>10</sup> H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>,<sup>11</sup> iodate,<sup>12</sup> Os(VIII),<sup>13</sup> Fe(III),<sup>14</sup> Ti(VI),<sup>15</sup> [Mn(cdta)]<sup>-</sup>,<sup>16</sup> (H<sub>4</sub>cdta = *trans*-cyclohexane-1,2-diamine-*N*,*N*,*N*,*N*-tetraacetic acid) oxidations were considered inner-sphere; those by  $\text{IrCl}_6^{2-}$  ion,<sup>17</sup> and  $\text{[Co(III)]}$ -W]**<sup>5</sup>** ions **<sup>18</sup>** were found outer-sphere.

The study was under taken to reinvestigate the effects of  $[H^+]$ and the ionic strength on the observed rate and, if possible, to deduce the self-exchange rate of  $2H_2NCSNH_2-(H_2N)_2CSSC$ -(NH**2**)**2** couple using Marcus theory.**<sup>6</sup>**

The present study in acetate–acetic acid buffer and perchloric acid medium confirms some of the previous observations and presents a new insight into the rate law. The rate law is a combination of two terms; a first-order in [thiourea] (0.005–0.1 mol  $dm^{-3}$ ) and a second order in [thiourea] (>0.1 mol  $dm^{-3}$ ) against first-order dependence in H**2**NCSNH**2** reported in the previous study.**<sup>18</sup>** The rate was independent of pH (3.40 to 4.60) but increased at high pH in the range (4.60 to 5.57). The rate measurements at  $[HClO_4] \leq 0.1$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup> exhibited a linear dependence on  $[H^+]$  whereas a second order dependence in  $[H^+]$  was noted for  $[HClO<sub>4</sub>] > 0.1$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>. However, the appropriate correlation between  $k_{obs}$  and  $[H^+]$  for the entire range of investigated [H**<sup>+</sup>**] is discussed later.

# **Experimental**

The thiourea sample was recrystallised from warm 20% v/v aqueous ethanol.**<sup>10</sup>** The purity of the recrystallised sample was checked by determining its melting point (found  $181 \degree C$ ; lit.  $180-182 \degree C^{10}$ . The solutions were prepared immediately before use to avoid complications due to slow decomposition reactions occurring in the presence of perchloric acid.<sup>9</sup>  $K_5$ [Co(III)W]<sup>5-</sup> was prepared by the method described by Baker and McCutcheon.**<sup>19</sup>** Acids were suitably diluted and standardised against a standard alkali solution. The sodium acetate–acetic acid buffer solutions  $(0.2 \text{ mol dm}^{-3})$  of different pH were prepared as described,**<sup>20</sup>** and the pHs were checked with a Systronics 335 digital pH meter.

# **Rate measurement**

The disappearance of  $[Co(III)W]^{5-}$  was measured at 390 nm on a Union Giken RA-401 stopped flow spectrophotometer under pseudo-first-order conditions ( $[H_2NCSNH_2] \geq C\sigma(\text{III})W^{5-}$ ) at constant ionic strength  $(0.5 \text{ mol dm}^{-3}, \text{LiClO}_4)$  unless stated otherwise. The *k***obs**, the pseudo-first-order rate parameter, were calculated with the interfaced microcomputer programmed for collecting and analysing the data by averaging the volt–time curves. The usual first order plots were linear for more than three half-lives and the reproducibility of  $k_{obs}$  was within  $\pm 5\%$ . There was no erratic increase in the absorbance of the reaction solution in the stopped flow cell reported in the oxidation of hydrogen peroxide ( $pH > 1$ ) caused by the breakdown of the oxidation product formamidine disulfide ion to colloidal sulfur.<sup>11</sup> The effect of the variation of  $[H_2NCNH_2]$  on rate at pH 4.45 is investigated at several temperatures. The effect of variation of  $pH$  and  $[H^+]$  are investigated at one temperature with high  $[H_2NCNH_2]$  (0.15 mol dm<sup>-3</sup>).

# **Stoichiometry**

The stoichiometry of the reaction was estimated at 390 nm with different concentration ratios of  $[Co(III)W]^{5-}$  and  $H_2NCSNH$ <sub>2</sub>

**Table 1** The dependence of  $k_{obs}$  on [thiourea] at different temperatures.  $10^4$  [Co(III)W]<sup>5-</sup> = 1.5 mol dm<sup>-3</sup>;  $\mu$  = 0.50 mol dm<sup>-3</sup>; pH = 4.45

[NH <sub>2</sub> CSNH <sub>2</sub> ]/mol dm <sup>-3</sup>	$k_{\rm obs}/\rm s^{-1}$ $25^{\circ}$ C	$30^{\circ}$ C	$35^{\circ}$ C	$40^{\circ}$ C	$45^{\circ}$ C
0.005	0.0611	0.0719	0.0810	0.0922	0.115
0.010	0.119	0.142	0.166	0.186	0.231
0.015	0.182	0.219	0.249	0.279	0.346
0.025	0.299	0.359	0.426	0.458	0.584
0.035	0.421	0.501	0.584	0.646	0.812
0.050	0.603	0.711	0.846	0.915	1.17
0.075	0.908	1.06	1.24	1.39	1.73
0.10	1.21	1.43	1.64	1.85	2.34
0.15	2.04	2.42	2.62	3.11	3.58
0.20	2.88	3.54	3.85	4.48	5.36
0.30	4.83	5.90	6.61	7.83	9.56
0.40	7.13	8.58	10.0	12.0	14.9
0.45	8.43	10.4	11.8	14.2	18.2
0.50	9.61	12.3	13.9	16.7	21.6
0.55	11.1	14.1	16.1	19.1	25.5
0.60	12.7	16.1	18.2	22.1	29.7

though the oxidant was always in excess. The ratio  $\Delta$ [Co(III)- $W|5^{-}/\Delta[NH_2CSNH_2] = 1.0 \pm 0.03$  indicated that the stoichiometric equation of the reaction is expressible by eqn. (1).

$$
2[Co(\text{III})\text{W}]^{5-} + 2\text{H}_2\text{NCSNH}_2 \rightarrow 2[Co(\text{II})\text{W}]^{6-} +
$$
  
(H<sub>2</sub>N)<sub>2</sub>CSSC(NH)<sub>2</sub><sup>2+</sup> + 2H<sup>+</sup> (1)

#### **Oxidation product**

At the completion of the reaction between concentrated solutions of  $H_2NCSNH_2$  and  $[Co(III)W]^{5-}$ , 200 mL of ethanol and 60 mL of concentrated HCl were added to the reaction mixture. It resulted in the formation of white crystals that were filtered, washed and dried in a vacuum desiccator. These crystals decomposed at 168  $\degree$ C indicating that the crystals are those of formimidine dihydrochloride.**21** The oxidation product of thiourea is formamidine disulfide **<sup>22</sup>** and the dihydrochloride salt is formed in presence of concentrated hydrochloric acid.**<sup>22</sup>** The other oxidation product was characterised to be  $[Co(II)W]^{6-}$  by comparing the spectra of the spent reaction mixture with that of a solution prepared from its authentic sample.

#### **Test for free radical**

The reactant solutions, taken in separate glass stoppered conical flasks, were degassed with nitrogen before 1 mL of acrylonitrile was added to each solution. These clear solutions, no cloudiness was observed for some time, were mixed, swirled and left for sometime when cloudiness appeared indicating the formation of free radicals during the course of the reaction.

#### **Mechanism and discussion**

The order of the reaction with respect to thiourea is dependent on [thiourea] (Table 1). The reaction has strict first order dependence in  $[H_2NCSNH_2] \le 0.10$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup> since the plot of  $k_{obs}$  against  $[H_2NCSNH_2]$  passing through the origin indicated that no intermediates are involved and the bimolecular collision between  $[Co(III)W]^{5-}$  and  $H_2NCSNH_2$  molecules. The measurement of the optical density of reaction mixtures with increasing [thiourea] did not suggest the formation of any intermediate. At high [thiourea]  $\geq 0.01$  mold m<sup>-3</sup> (Table 1), there are a simultaneous first and second-order paths since the plot of  $k_{obs}$  [H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub>] against [H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub>] is linear indicating the formation of a weak intermediate **C**. A similar intermediate is suggested in the  $IrCl<sub>6</sub><sup>2-</sup>$  oxidation,<sup>17</sup> perhaps the only other study carried out under similar pH conditions, and that  $IrCl<sub>6</sub><sup>2</sup>$ is as substitution inert as  $[Co(III)W]^{5-}$ .

The results further indicate that the reactive thiourea species is very much dependent on the pH of the medium since  $[Co(III)W]^{5-}$  ion is not affected by changes in pH<sup>1</sup> and  $[H^+]$  ion.<sup>2</sup>

The rate is independent of pH  $(\leq 4.63)$  and then it increases at higher pH  $(≥ 4.63)$  (Table 2). This suggested the possibility of OH<sup>-</sup> ion assisted dissociation of thiourea as considered in equilibrium (3). Similar equilibria have been considered in the oxidation of thiourea by  $IrCl<sub>6</sub><sup>2-</sup>$  ion<sup>17</sup> and in the oxidation of 1-octanethiol<sup>23</sup> by Fe(CN) $_6^{3-}$  ion. The results are indicative of the higher reactivity of the anionic species compared to that of the molecular species.

The results in perchloric acid solutions (Table 3) indicated the possibilities of either the participation of  $H^+$  in the ratedetermining step or the participation of the mono-protonated thiourea as the reacting species. The first possibility is unlikely since the profile of the rate against  $[H^+]$  is non-linear leaving the likely possibility of the protonated thiourea acting as the reactive species. The protonation of thiourea is known in solutions of strong acids,**<sup>24</sup>** and the protonated species is considered reactive in several redox reactions.**7,8,9,25**

The rate–pH profile in the  $IrCl_6^{2-}$  oxidation of thiourea indicated monoprotonated thiourea species are not formed**<sup>17</sup>** at pH 1.1. Hence, in solutions of low pH  $( \leq 4.63)$  there is no other species present except H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub>. This explains the observed independence of the rate on the ionic strength (Table 4) in buffer solution of pH 4.1. It is further concluded that the alkali metal ions are unlikely to mediate as a bridge between  $[Co(III)W]^{5-}$  ion and the reactive thiourea species having no charge even though  $Li^+$  ion-pairs with  $[Co(III)W]^{5-}$  ion.

An attempt is made to propose a unified mechanism. The deduced rate law is then subjected to the prevailing experimental conditions under any given environment. The following reactions constitute the most plausible unified mechanism of the reaction.

$$
[Co(\text{III})\text{W}]^{5-} + \text{H}_2 \text{NCSNH}_2(\text{high}) \frac{K_c}{\text{Cou})\text{W}} \dots \text{H}_2 \text{NCSNH}_2]^{\text{5-}}
$$
 (2)

$$
H_2NCSNH_2 + OH^- \xrightarrow{K} H_2NCSNH^- + H_2O \tag{3}
$$

$$
\text{NH}_2\text{C}^*\text{SHNH}_2 \xrightarrow{K_{\text{a}}} \text{NH}_2\text{CSNH}_2 + \text{H}^* \tag{4}
$$

[Co(
$$
\text{III}
$$
) $\text{W}$ ]<sup>5-</sup> + NH<sub>2</sub>C<sup>+</sup>SHNH<sub>2</sub> $\frac{K'}{K}$   
[Co( $\text{III}$ )W....NH<sub>2</sub>CSHNH<sub>2</sub>]<sup>4-</sup> (5)

 $[Co(III)W]^{5-} + H_2NCSNH_{2(\text{low})} \xrightarrow{k}$  $[Co(II)W]^{6-} + H$ , NCS<sup>\*\*</sup>NH<sub>2</sub>

(6)

pН	3.40	3.60	3.95	4.23	4.45	4.63	4.80	4.99		5.57	
$k_{\rm obs}/s^{-1}$	4.03 <sup>a</sup>	4.01 <sup>a</sup>	4.05 <sup>a</sup>	4.01 <sup>a</sup>	4.03 <sup>a</sup>	4.01	4.17	4.27	4.79	5.95	

**Table 3** The dependence of  $k_{obs}$  on [H<sup>+</sup>] at constant ionic strength at 40 °C. 10<sup>4</sup> [Co(III)W]<sup>5-</sup> = 1.5 mol dm<sup>-3</sup>; [NH<sub>2</sub>CSNH<sub>2</sub>] = 0.15 mol dm<sup>-3</sup>;  $\mu$  = 0.5 mol dm<sup>-</sup>



$$
C \xrightarrow{k_{\text{C}}}[C_{\text{O}}(\text{I})\text{W}]^{6-} + H_2 \text{NCS}^* \text{NH}_2 \tag{7}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{H}_2 \text{NCSNH}_2 &\xrightarrow{\kappa_{\mathbf{C2}}} \mathbf{C} \\ [\text{Co}(\text{II})\text{W}]^{6-} + \mathbf{H}_2 \text{NCS}^{+} \text{NH}_2(\text{H}_2 \text{NCSNH}_2) \end{aligned} \tag{8}
$$

[
$$
Co(\text{III})\text{W}
$$
]<sup>5-</sup> + H, NCSNH<sup>-</sup>  $\xrightarrow{K_9}$   
[ $Co(\text{II})\text{W}$ ]<sup>6-</sup> + H<sub>2</sub> NCSNH<sup>-</sup> (9)

 $[Co(III)W....NH<sub>2</sub>CSHNH<sub>2</sub>]<sup>4-</sup>  $\xrightarrow{k_10}$$  $[Co(II)W]^{6-} + H_2NCS^*NH_2 + H^*$  (10)

$$
2H_2NCSNH \xrightarrow{\text{fast}} (H_2N)_2CSSC(NH)_2 \qquad (11)
$$

$$
\frac{\text{[Co(m)W]}^{5-} + \text{H}_2\text{NCS}^{+}\text{NH}_2(\text{H}_2\text{NCSNH}_2) \xrightarrow{\text{fast}}}{\text{[Co(m)W]}^{6-} + (\text{H}_2\text{N})_2\text{CSSC}(\text{NH}_2)_2^{2^+}}
$$
(12)

$$
2H_2NCS^{\bullet*}NH_2 \xrightarrow{\text{fast}} (H_2N)_2CSSC(NH)_2^{2^+} \tag{13}
$$

$$
(H2N)2CSSC(NH2)22+ + 2OH- \xrightarrow{\text{last}}
$$
  

$$
(H2N)2CSSC(NH)2 + 2H2O (14)
$$

The rate law derived from the consideration of the above reactions is in eqn. (15)

The rate law (15) could be written as eqn. (16) considering that  $K_a + [H^+] \ge K K_a[OH^-] + (k_c K_a + K' K_a^{-1}[H^+])[H_2NC-$ SNH**2**] where all the concentrations are the initial concentrations. The application of the rate law in eqn. (16) is discussed below under different experimental conditions.

## **Reaction in solutions pH** ≤ **4.6 and low [thiourea]**

The thiourea does not undergo any chemical change in solutions of  $pH \leq 4.6$ . Therefore, the reactive species is  $H_2NCSNH_2$ . The reactions that contribute to the rate are the reactions (6) and (13). Thus, the rate law (16) accordingly changes to the eqn. (17).

**Table 5** The calculated values of  $k$  (= $k_{12}$ ),  $k_c K_c$  and  $k_{c2} K_c$ <sup>*a*</sup>

$Temp^{\circ}C$	25	30	35	40	45.
$k/dm^3$ mol <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	12.1	142	16.5	18.5	23.3
$k_c K / dm^3$ mol <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	10.8	12.3	13.5	15.2	16.4
$k_{\rm e}$ , K <sub>o</sub> /dm <sup>6</sup> mol <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	173	24.1	28.4	36.2	54.0
$^a \Delta H^{\text{I}}{}_{\nu} = 22.2 \pm 1.1 \text{ kJ} \text{ mol}^{-1}$ , $\Delta S^{\text{I}}{}_{\nu} = -150 \pm 3.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}$ , $\Delta G^{\text{I}}{}_{\nu} =$					
66.9 ± 0.9 kJ mol <sup>-1</sup> , $\Delta H_{k,k_s}^{\text{I}} = 14 \pm 1 \text{ kJ} \text{ mol}^{-1}$ , $\Delta S_{k,k_s}^{\text{I}} = -161 \pm 1 \text{ kJ} \text{ mol}^{-1}$					
2 J K <sup>-1</sup> mol <sup>-1</sup> , $\Delta H^{T}$ k <sub>c2</sub> K <sub>c</sub> = 40 ± 4 kJ mol <sup>-1</sup> , $\Delta S^{T}$ <sub>k-K</sub> = $-71$ ± 13 J K <sup>-1</sup>					
$mol^{-1}$ .					

$$
k_{\text{obs}} = k[\text{H}_2 \text{NCSNH}_2] \tag{17}
$$

The values of *k* at different temperatures are in Table 5. The calculated values of the activation parameters are reported therein and would be discussed later.

## **Reaction in solutions**  $\leq$  **pH 4.6 and high [thiourea]**

The simultaneous first and second-order dependence in [H**2**NCSNH**2**] is explained by considering the reactions (2), (7), (8), (12) and (13). The rate law based on these reactions is given by the eqn. (18).

$$
k_{\text{obs}} = (k_{\text{c}}K_{\text{c}} + k_{\text{c2}}K_{\text{c}}[H_2NCSNH_2])[H_2NCSNH_2] \quad (18)
$$

The linear plots of  $k_{obs}$ /[H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub>] against [H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub>], Fig. 1, are consistent with the eqn. (18). The unfailing difference between the *k* and  $k_c K$  values ( $k > k_c K$ ), Table 5, rationalises the reactions (2) and (7) as an alternative to the reaction (6) which occurs only at low  $[H_2NCSNH_2]$  and in the absence of an intermediate. It is significant to note that the enthalpy of activation,  $\Delta H^{I}_{k}$ , for the reaction at low  $[H_{2}NCNH_{2}]$  is 8 kJ mol<sup>-1</sup> more than the  $\Delta H^{\text{I}}_{k,\text{K}_{\text{c}}}$  value at high  $[H_2NCNH_2]$ . It is consistent with the fact that the enthalpy of activation for bimolecular collision path is higher than the path involving the decay of the intermediate for the formation of the intermediate is usually exothermic. The more negative value of the entropy,  $\Delta S^{\text{I}}_{k,\text{K}_{c}} =$  $-161$  J K<sup>-1</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> is consistent with the relatively more ordered nature of the intermediate complex than the transition state formed in a reaction requiring the bimolecular collision. These observations thus rationalise the formation of the intermediate at high [H**2**NCSNH**2**].

$$
\frac{-d[Co(\text{III})\text{W}^{5-}]}{dt} = \frac{(k + k_c K_c + k_{c2} K_c[H_2 \text{NCSNH}_2] + k_9 K[OH^-] + k_{10} K K_a^{-1}[H^+]][Co(\text{III})\text{W}^{5-}][H_2 \text{NCSNH}_2]}{K_a + [H^+] + K K_a[OH^-] + (k_c K_a + K K_a^{-1}[H^+]][H_2 \text{NCSNH}_2]} \tag{15}
$$

$$
k_{\text{obs}} = \frac{(k + k_{\text{e}}K_{\text{e}} + k_{\text{e}2}K_{\text{e}}[H_2NCSNH_2] + k_9K[OH^-] + k_{10}KK_a^{-1}[H^+])[H_2NCSNH_2]}{K_a + [H^+]}
$$
(16)



**Fig. 1** The linear plots of  $k_{obs}$ /[H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub>] against [H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub>] with intercepts on the rate ordinate, consistent with the eqn. (18), at temperatures 25 ( $\blacksquare$ ), 30 ( $\spadesuit$ ), 35 ( $\spadesuit$ ), 40 ( $\Box$ ) and 45 °C ( $\odot$ ). (10<sup>4</sup> [Co(III)W<sup>5-</sup>] 1.5 mol dm<sup>-3</sup>,  $\mu$  = 0.5 mol dm<sup>-3</sup> and pH = 4.45).

The reaction (19), which could be an alternative to reaction (8), if the intermediate **C** is not assumed, is based on the highly improbable tri-molecular collision. This is one more reason for the assumption of the existence of the intermediate **C**, which is very likely in the presence of high concentrations of thiourea; **C** has been suggested to have a role in  $IrCl_6^{2-}$  oxidation.<sup>17</sup>

$$
[Co(\text{III})\text{W}]^{5-} + 2\text{H}_2\text{NCSNH}_2 \xrightarrow{k_3} [Co(\text{II})\text{W}]^{6-} + \text{H}_2\text{NCS}^+\text{NH}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{NCSNH}_2 \quad (19)
$$

#### **Reaction in buffer solutions**  $\geq$  **pH 4.6**

The thiourea species present under the specified condition are H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sup>-</sup> that are in equilibrium through the reaction (3). The other reactions contributing to the rate are (2), (7), (9), (11), (13) and (14). The rate law (16) is therefore modified to the rate law in eqn. (20).

$$
k_{\text{obs}} = (k_{\text{c}}K_{\text{c}} + k_{9}K[\text{OH}^{-}])[H_{2}NCSNH_{2}]
$$
 (20)

If [OH<sup>-</sup>] is replaced by  $K_w/[H^+]$ ,  $K_w$  is the ionization constant of water, the eqn. (20) is reduced to the final rate eqn. (21).

$$
\frac{k_{obs}}{[H_2NCSNH_2]} = k_c K_c + \frac{k_9 K K_w}{[H^+]}
$$
(21)

The required linear plot of  $k_{\text{obs}}/[H_2NCSNH_2]$  against  $[H^+]^{-1}$  $([H^+] = 10^{-pH})$  with intercept, Fig. 2, is consistent with the eqn. (21). The values of the slope and intercept of the plot in Fig. 2 give  $k_9 K K_w = 3.94 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$  and  $k_c K_c = 25.0 \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , respectively, at 49 °C. A value of  $k_9K = 7.18 \times 10^7$  dm<sup>6</sup> mol<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> is obtained by substituting the  $K_w$  value,  $5.47 \times 10^{-13}$  at 50 °C.<sup>26</sup> Since the value of  $K$  is not known,<sup>17</sup> therefore the value of  $k<sub>9</sub>$  could not be resolved. This supports the high reactivity of thiourea anion.

The reaction (22) could be an alternative to the reaction (9) if there is simultaneous second order dependence in  $[H_2NC-$ SNH**2**]. The inclusion of the reaction (22) in the mechanism would modify the rate law (21) to (23) without affecting the conclusion about the high reactivity of anionic thiourea species except that the numerical value of  $k_9K$  would be equal to  $k_2 K_c K$ **[H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub>].** 

$$
C + H_2 NCSNH \frac{k_2}{[Co(II)W]^6} + H_2 NCSNH + H_2 NCSNH, \quad (22)
$$



**Fig. 2** The linear plot of  $k_{obs} / [H_2 NCSNH_2]$  against  $[H^+]^{-1}$  with intercepts on the rate ordinate, consistent with the eqn. (21), in the pH range 4.63–5.7. The rate is independent of pH < 4.63.  $(10^4$ [Co(III)W<sup>5–</sup>] 1.5,  $[H_2NCSNH_2] = 0.15$  and  $\mu = 0.5$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>, at 49 °C).

$$
\frac{k_{obs}}{[H_2NCSNH_2]} = k_c K + \frac{k_2 K_c K K_w [H_2NCSNH_2]}{[H^+]}
$$
 (23)

#### **Reaction in presence of strong acid**

Since thiourea is known to be protonated in solutions of strong acids **<sup>24</sup>** and the protonated species is considered reactive in several redox reactions,<sup>7,8,9,25</sup> the equilibria  $(2)$ ,  $(4)$ ,  $(5)$ , reactions (7), (10) and (13) contribute to the rate under this condition. The rate law (16) is thus modified to the rate law in eqn. (24) which could be arranged to the eqn. (25).

$$
k_{\text{obs}} = \frac{(k_{10}K[\text{H}^+] + k_{\text{c}}K_{\text{c}}K_{\text{a}})[\text{H}_2\text{NCSNH}_2]}{K_{\text{a}} + [\text{H}^+]} \tag{24}
$$

$$
\frac{k_{obs}(K_{\rm a} + [H^+])}{[H_2NCSNH_2]} = (k_{10}K'[H^+] + k_{\rm c}K_{\rm c}K_{\rm a})
$$
\n(25)

The linear plot of the left hand side of eqn.  $(25)$  against [H<sup>+</sup>], with  $K_a = 0.066$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup> at 25 °C (ref. 23) since the value at 40 °C is not known, is in Fig. 3. The use of  $K_a = 0.048$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>, selected by the method of trial and error based on the criterion that the plot should not show any curvature, also resulted in a linear plot with the intercept =  $0.744$  s<sup>-1</sup> and slope = 116 dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. Thus  $k_c K_c = 15.5$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> is obtained at 40 °C, which is in close agreement with the value of  $15.2 \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ obtained from the data under excess of thiourea and  $pH \leq 4.6$ . This close agreement between the  $k_c K_c$  values from the two data under different conditions is a strong support for the commonality of the reactions (2) and (7) under two different conditions and the correctness of the  $K_a$  value at 40 °C. The other plots in Fig 3 are for the other arbitrary values of  $K_a$  = 0.03 that show positive curvature (yielding a negative intercept suggesting that the chosen  $K_a$  value is unacceptable) and 0.2 that shows a negative curvature (yielding a positive intercept with a higher intercept value). The value of  $k_{10}K' = 116$  dm<sup>3</sup>  $\text{mol}^{-1}$  s<sup>-1</sup> rationalises the high reactivity of the protonated thiourea species.

#### **Reactive form of protonated thiourea**

The two tautomeric forms **A** and **B** of protonated thiourea are known to exist in acidic solution.**<sup>24</sup>** The observed rate, therefore, refers to the reaction either with any one of the tautomeric form or both. It is difficult to characterize the reactive tautomeric species based on the present rate data.



**Fig. 3** The linear plots of  $k_{obs}(K_a + [H^+]) / [H_2NCSNH_2]$  against  $[H^+]$ for  $K_a$  values, chosen arbitrarily, = 0.03 ( $\triangle$ ), 0.2 ( $\bullet$ ), lit.,<sup>23</sup> = 0.066 ( $\Box$ ) and the chosen value at 40 °C = 0.048 mol dm<sup>-3</sup> (O).  $(10^4$ [Co(III)W<sup>5-</sup>] 1.5,  $[H_2NCSNH_2] = 0.15 \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  and  $\mu = 0.5 \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$ .



However, a guess about the reactive tautomer is attempted by comparing the kinetics of the present oxidation with those of hydroxylamine,**<sup>2</sup>** hydrazine **<sup>3</sup>** and azide **<sup>4</sup>** which are protonated at the NH**2** group in acidic solutions. Since a retardation in the observed rate with increasing  $H^+$  ion is not realized,<sup>2-4</sup> the seat of the reaction can not be at NH**2** group. Therefore the likely seat of reaction is the S atom in the enol form that explains the different kinetic behaviour of thiolactic acid,**<sup>1</sup>** the seat of the reaction being the protonated S atom, from thiourea. The common reason for the retardation of the rate in thiolactic acid,**<sup>1</sup>** hydroxylamine,**<sup>2</sup>** hydrazine **<sup>3</sup>** and azide,**<sup>4</sup>** is the non-availability of the electron pair at the seat of the reaction. It is for this reason that the reactive protonated thiourea is represented as NH**2**C-SHNH**2** where the positive charge is spread over the C atom as shown in the structure **B** of the two tautomeric forms.

## **Marcus cross relation**

The Marcus theory<sup>6</sup> can be used to estimate the self-exchange rate of the unknown 2H**2**NCSNH**2**–(H**2**N)**2**CSSC(NH**2**)**2** couple by adopting a method based on the free energies **<sup>27</sup>** as described in the following equations. In eqn. (27),  $\Delta G_{12}^{\text{I}}$  is the free energy of activation for a cross reaction,  $\Delta G^{\text{I}}_{11}$  and  $\Delta G^{\text{I}}_{22}$  are the free energies of activation for the self-exchange reactions of oxidant and reductant couples; ∆*w*, the electric work term required to bring the reactants *i* and *j* to the contact distance  $\sigma$  (=  $r_i + r_j$ ) in the precursor complex, is given by the eqn. (28) and the free energy change for the cross reaction,  $\Delta G^{\circ}_{12}$ , is given by the eqn. (29). In eqn. (30),  $N_A$  is the Avogadro number,  $z_i$  and  $z_j$  are the charges on the reactants,  $\varepsilon$  and  $\varepsilon_0$  are the permittivity of the bulk medium and in vacuum respectively and  $\kappa$  is defined in eqn. (31). Similarly,  $k_B$  and  $h$  are the Boltzmann and Planck constants respectively in the Eyring equation, eqn. (32), which is used to determine the free energies of activation.

$$
\Delta G_{12}^{\text{I}} = 0.5(\Delta G_{11}^{\text{I}} + \Delta G_{22}^{\text{I}} + \Delta G_{12}^{\circ} + \Delta W) \tag{27}
$$

$$
\Delta w = w_{12} + w_{21} - w_{11} - w_{22} \tag{28}
$$

$$
\Delta G^{\circ}_{12} = -nF\Delta E^{\circ} \tag{29}
$$

$$
w_{ij} = z_i z_j e_0^2 N_A / 4\pi \varepsilon \varepsilon_0 \sigma (1 + \kappa \sigma) \tag{30}
$$

$$
\kappa = (2e_0^2 N_A \mu/\varepsilon \varepsilon_0 k_B T)^{1/2}
$$
 (31)

$$
k_{ij} = k_{\rm B} T h^{-1} \exp(-\Delta G^{I}_{ij}/RT) \tag{32}
$$

The  $\Delta G^{\circ}_{12}$ , calculated with  $E^{\circ}_{22}$  (2H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub> + 2e<sup>-</sup>  $(H_2N)$ , CSSC(NH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>2</sub>) = 0.418 V<sup>28</sup> and  $E_{11}^{\circ}$  = 1.01 V<sub>1</sub><sup>29</sup> is -114.2  $kJ \text{ mol}^{-1}$ . The  $\Delta G^I_{11}$ , calculated with  $k_{11} = 0.91 \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at  $\mu = 0.5$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup> and 25 °C,<sup>30</sup> is = 73.2 kJ mol<sup>-1</sup>. The electric work terms,  $w_{11} = 16$ ,  $w_{21} = -9.69$ ,  $w_{12} = w_{22} = 0$  kJ mol<sup>-1</sup> were calculated from eqn. (30) using  $r_{11} = 0.5$  nm and  $r_{22} = 0.28$  nm, calculated from the relation  $r = \sqrt[3]{(3 \times \text{Mol. Wt. / 4}\pi \times N_A \times \text{Mol. Wt. / 4\pi \times$ density).<sup>31</sup> The value of  $\kappa$ , obtained with eqn. (31), is  $2.32 \times 10^9$ nm<sup>-1</sup>. The  $\Delta G^{\text{I}}_{22}$ , from substituting the known values of  $\Delta w$ ,  $\Delta G^{\text{I}}_{11}$ ,  $\Delta G^{\text{I}}_{12}$  (66.9 kJ mol<sup>-1</sup>, Table 5) and  $\Delta G^{\circ}_{12}$  in eqn. (27), is 200.4 kJ mol<sup>-1</sup> which gives an extremely low value of  $k_{22}$ , 4.86  $\times$  $10^{-23}$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. The extremely low value is possibly due to S–S bonds in the dimeric  $(H_2N)_2CSSC(NH_2)_2$  species. The simple Marcus theory, given by eqn. (33), is valid when the driving force is not too large,  $\ln f_{12} \approx 0$  and the work terms cancel (see eqn. (36)), has been used with considerable success.

$$
k_{12} = (k_{11} \, k_{22} \, K_{12})^{0.5} \tag{33}
$$

The predicted rate (value of  $k_{12}$ ), calculated from the eqn. (33), using the estimated value of  $k_{22}$  is about 2700 times slower than the observed rate indicating the breakdown of the Marcus theory. The breakdown of the Marcus theory has been reported in the  $Ce(IV)$  sulfate oxidation of thiourea probably due to the strong interaction between the reactants involved in the formation of the free radicals.**<sup>7</sup>** The reactions of *N*-alkylphenothiazines with  $Fe_{aq}^{3+}$  ion<sup>32</sup> and  $Mn_{aq}^{3+}$  ion<sup>33</sup> are 300–500 times slower than the predicted one.

One of the referees pointed out that the calculated value of the self-exchange rate constant  $k_{22}$ , using the eqn. (34) and (35), is  $7 \times 10^{-16}$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> which is at least six orders of magnitude more positive than the value obtained from the consideration of the free energies.

$$
k_{12} = (k_{11}k_{22} K_{12} \log f_{12})^{0.5}
$$
 (34)

where  $\log f_{12}$  is expressed by the eqn. (35).

$$
\log (\log f_{12}) = (\log K_{12})^2 / 4 \log (k_{11}k_{22} / Z^2) (Z^2 = 10^{22} )
$$
 (35)

If one puts the experimental values for  $k_{11}$ ,  $k_{12}$ ,  $K_{12}$  and log  $f_{12}$  $= 2.1 \times 10^{-3}$  (obtained by back calculation) into eqn. (34) one obtains a value of  $7 \times 10^{-16}$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> for  $k_{22}$ . However, if the values of  $k_{11}$ ,  $K_{12}$  and  $k_{22}$  (4.86  $\times$  10<sup>-23</sup> dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) are substituted then the calculated value of  $k_{12}$  is  $3.2 \times 10^{-2}$  dm<sup>3</sup>  $\text{mol}^{-1}$  s<sup>-1</sup> which is much less than the experimental value of 12.1  $dm^3$  mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>.

The breakdown of the eqn. (33) suggested that the driving force is probably large, the  $f_{12}$  term may be significant and the work terms are not cancelling and therefore there is necessity to consider the use of the modified expression**<sup>34</sup>** given in eqn. (36).

$$
k_{12} = (k_{11} k_{22} K_{12} f_{12})^{0.5} W_{12}
$$
 (36)

where

$$
\ln f_{12} = \frac{\left[\ln K_{12} + (w_{12} - w_{21})/RT\right]^2}{4\left[\ln \left(k_{11}k_{22}/A_{11}A_{22}\right) + \left(w_{11} + w_{22}\right)/RT\right]}
$$
(37)

$$
W_{12} = \exp\left[\frac{-(w_{12} + w_{21} - w_{11} - w_{22})}{2RT}\right]
$$
 (38)

The eqn. (37) and (38) were solved using a computer program. The estimate of  $k_{22}$  was obtained from an iterative

**Table 6** The values of  $k_{12}$  (= $k_{obs}$ /[substrate]) and  $\Delta E^{\circ}$  for some nitrogenous compounds **<sup>18</sup>**

Substrate	Hydrazine	$GSH^a$	HNO,	Thiourea
$\frac{k_{12}}{\Delta E}$	0.018 $-0.27$	$5 \times 10^7$ 0.78	1.22 0.07	$12.5 \times 10^3$ 0.59
	$\alpha$ GSH = reduced glutathione.			

procedure. Initially a guessed value of  $k_{22}$  was supplied to the program which returned the values of  $k_{22}$  and  $f_{12}$ ; the value of  $k_{22}$  so obtained was used next when fresh values of  $k_{22}$  and  $f_{12}$ were returned by the program. The procedure was repeated till constant values of  $k_{22}$  and  $f_{12}$  were obtained. The final values obtained were:  $k_{22} = 2.44 \times 10^{-10}$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> and  $f_{12} = 0.168$ . The values of  $K_{12}$  and  $W_{12}$  were 8.74  $\times$  10<sup>8</sup> and 67 respectively and remained constant throughout.

Thus, the value of  $k_{22}$  obtained from the use of the modified eqn. (36)–(38) is at least five orders of magnitude more positive than the value obtained from the use of eqn. (34) and (35). This signifies the importance of the work terms.

It is of interest to re-plot the data of the previous authors, (Table 6),<sup>18</sup> who plotted  $\log k_{12}$  against  $E^{\circ}$  and obtained a linear plot with a slope value  $-8.6$ , by correctly plotting log  $k_{12}$ against  $\Delta E^{\circ}$  (the difference of the redox potentials of the oxidant and reductant). The eqn. (33) could be written as eqn. (39) where  $K_{12}$  is related to  $\Delta E^{\circ}$  by the eqn. (40) with *n* denoting the total number of electrons changing in the reaction. The  $n = 1$ was assumed by the previous authors.**<sup>18</sup>** The substitution of log  $K_{12}$  in eqn. (39) by  $\Delta E^{\circ}/0.0591$  gives the eqn. (41) which suggests a linear plot when log  $k_{12}$  is plotted against  $\Delta E^{\circ}$  with a slope equal to 8.46.

$$
\log k_{12} = 0.5(\log k_{11} + \log k_{22} + \log f) + 0.5\log K_{12} \quad (39)
$$

$$
\log K_{12} = n\Delta E^{\circ}/0.0591\tag{40}
$$

 $\log k_{12} = 0.5(\log k_{11} + \log k_{22} + \log f) + 8.46\Delta E^{\circ}$  (41)



**Fig. 4** The linear plot of log  $k_{12}$  (=  $k_{obs}$ /[H<sub>2</sub>NCSNH<sub>2</sub>]) against  $\Delta E^{\circ}$  has a slope of 8.6 against the expected value of 8.5.

The required plot, Fig. 4, is linear with a slope value 8.6 which is in fair agreement with the predicted slope value of 8.5, corroborates the outer-sphere nature of the reaction.

## **Acknowledgements**

The financial grants from UGC (F.12-59/1997) and (F.12-147/ 2001) are acknowledged with thanks. Thanks are also due to the DST grant (2/17/83-STP-III) for the purchase of the stopped-flow spectrophotometer. Dr. K.M. Gangotri, Head of the Department, is thanked for laboratory facilities.

## **References**

- 1 Raj N. Mehrotra, S. Dholiya, Kamla Sharma and A. Prakash, *Indian J. Chem., Sect. A*, 1998, **37**, 973.
- 2 B. Goyal, A. Prakash and Raj N. Mehrotra, *Indian J. Chem.*, 1999, **38A**, 541.
- 3 Rupa Shah, A. Prakash and Raj N. Mehrotra, *Indian J. Chem.*, 1999, **38A**, 680.
- 4 B. Goyal, Manu Mehrotra, A. Prakash and Raj N. Mehrotra, *Inorg. React. Mech.*, 2000, **1**, 289.
- 5 J. Burgess, *Ions in Solutions*, Ellis Horwood, Chichester, 1988.
- 6 R. A. Marcus, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1963, **67**, 853; R. A. Marcus, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1968, **72**, 891; R. A. Marcus, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 1964, **15**, 155.
- 7 U. D. Gomwalk and A. McAuley, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, 1968, 2948.
- 8 A. McAuley and U. D. Gomwalk, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, 1969, 977; A. McAuley and R. Shanker, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 1973, 2321.
- 9 G. Davies, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1972, **11**, 2488.
- 10 G. Davies and D. J. Loose, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1976, **15**, 694; G. Davies, R. Higgins and D. J. Loose, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1976, **15**, 700.
- 11 M. Hoffmann and J. O. Edwards, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1977, **16**, 3333.
- 12 G. Rabi and M. T. Beck, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 1985, 1669.
- 13 Z. Amjad and A. McAuley, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 1977, **26**, 127.
- 14 M. Putselnik and R. Sokoniewiez, *Monatsh. Chem.*, 1978, **109**, 33.
- 15 J. D. Lydon and R. C. Thompson, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1984, **23**, 3694.
- 16 S. Gangopadhyay, S. K. Saha and P. Banerjee, *Transition Met. Chem.*, 1991, **16**, 355.
- 17 H. N. Po, H. Eran, Y. Kim and J. E. Byrd, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1979, **18**, 197. 18 M. A. Olataunji, G. A. Ayoko and F. O. Ohiani, *Transition Met.*
- *Chem.*, 1994, **19**, 253. 19 L. C. W. Baker and T. P. McCutcheon, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1956, **78**, 4503.
- 20 *Vogel's Textbook of Quantitative Inorganic Analysis*, 4th edn., Longman, 1986, p. 45.
- 21 P. W. Priestler and L. Berger, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1947, **69**, 232.
- 22 P. W. Priestler, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1949, **71**, 2849.
- 23 K. B. Wiberg, H. Maltz and M. Okano, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1968, **7**, 830.
- 24 T. J. Lane, J. A. Ryan and L. J. Walter, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1956, **78**, 5560.
- 25 W. A. Alexander, C. J. Mash and A. Mcauley, *Analyst (London)*, 1970, **95**, 675.
- 26 *Handbook of Chemistry and Physics*, ed. C. D. Hodgman, The Chemical Rubber Publishing Co., Boca Raton, FL, 1962, p. 1752.
- 27 A. Wanat, R. van Eldik and G. Stochel, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 1998, 2497.
- 28 P. W. Priseler and L. Berger, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1947, **69**, 322.
- 29 L. Eberson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1983, **105**, 3192.
- 30 P. Rasmussen and C. H. Brubaker, Jr., *Inorg. Chem.*, 1964, **3**, 977.
- 31 M. E. Peover, *Electrochim. Acta*, 1968, **13**, 1083; H. Kojima and A. J. Bard, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1975, **97**, 6317.
- 32 E. Pelizzetti and E. Mentasti, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1979, **18**, 583.
- 33 E. Pelizzetti, *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*, 1980, 484.
- 34 D. H. Macartney and N. Sutin, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1983, **22**, 3530 and ref. 36(*a*).