

# Nucleophilic activation of hydrogen peroxide. On the formation and the reactivity of 1*H*-1,2,4-triazoleperoxycarboxylic acid and *O*-*p*-nitrophenylmonoperoxy-carbonic acid †

PERKIN  
2

Carsten Bender and Hans-Dieter Brauer\*


Institut für Physikalische und Theoretische Chemie, Universität Frankfurt/M.,  
Marie-Curie-Straße 11, 60439 Frankfurt/M., Germany

Received (in Cambridge, UK) 13th May 1999, Accepted 26th August 1999


Measurements of the infrared phosphorescence of singlet molecular oxygen ( $^1\text{O}_2$ ) at 1270 nm have been employed to demonstrate the formation of  $^1\text{O}_2$  in the system *N,N'*-carbonyldi-1,2,4-triazole (CDT)–hydrogen peroxide and in the system 1*H*-1,2,4-triazolecarboxylic acid *p*-nitrophenyl ester (TCNP)–hydrogen peroxide in tetrahydrofuran. At hydrogen peroxide concentrations of  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \geq 2 [\text{CDT}]$  or  $\geq 2 [\text{TCNP}]$  one molecule of  $^1\text{O}_2$  is generated per molecule of CDT and TCNP, respectively. In both systems a very reactive peroxy-intermediate is formed. In the system CDT– $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  the 1*H*-1,2,4-triazoleperoxycarboxylic acid (**1**) is generated, in TCNP– $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  the *p*-nitrophenylmonoperoxy-carbonic acid (**4**). For the epoxidation of cyclohexene in THF by **1** a rate constant  $k_{15} \approx 3 \times 10^6 \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  can be estimated. For **4** the corresponding rate constant was found to be  $k_{20} \approx 6 \times 10^{-2} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ . The Arrhenius parameters of the formation of **1** and **4**, respectively, and in addition of their consecutive reactions with hydrogen peroxide were determined. The results are consistent with the assumption that the nucleophilic displacements by hydrogen peroxide at the carbonyl carbon atom are addition–elimination processes, which take the form of a  $\text{B}_{\text{AC}}2$ -mechanism.

## Introduction

Staab<sup>1</sup> was the first to demonstrate that the carbonyl group of diazolides of carbonic acid is strongly electronically activated on account of the two electron-withdrawing heterocycles. *N,N'*-carbonyldiimidazole (CDI), *e.g.*, reacts with pure water at room temperature within a few seconds to give two molecules of imidazole and one molecule of carbon dioxide.




Since hydrogen peroxide is more nucleophilic than water<sup>1</sup> it is not surprising that azolides (*N*-acetylazoles) of the carbonic acid also react with hydrogen peroxide. Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> have investigated the system *N,N'*-carbonyldi-1,2,4-triazole (CDT)– $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  in different organic solvents and postulated that 1*H*-1,2,4-triazoleperoxycarboxylic acid as a reactive peroxy-intermediate is produced which effectively epoxidizes olefins like cyclohexene (*vide infra*). Moreover, the authors have observed that in this system, in the absence of olefins, molecular singlet oxygen ( $^1\text{O}_2$ ) is quantitatively formed according to eqn. (2).



In contrast to the system CDT– $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ , the system CDI– $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  was found to be ineffective with respect to the epoxidation of olefins and no  $^1\text{O}_2$  generation was observed.<sup>2</sup>

Up to now the mechanism of  $^1\text{O}_2$  formation in the system

CDT– $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  postulated by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> was not studied in detail. To get more insight into the kinetics of reaction (2) we have investigated this reaction in tetrahydrofuran (THF) by measuring the formation of  $^1\text{O}_2$  on the basis of the  $^1\text{O}_2$  phosphorescence at  $\lambda = 1270 \text{ nm}$ .<sup>3</sup> Additionally, employing the same method we have studied the system CDI– $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and the system 1*H*-1,2,4-triazolecarboxylic acid *p*-nitrophenyl ester (TCNP)– $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ .



## Experimental

### Materials

The following compounds and solvents, respectively, were purchased from Fluka and used as received: *N,N'*-carbonyldiimidazole (CDI) (*purum*, ~97%, mp 112–115 °C), *N,N'*-carbonyldi-1,2,4-triazole (CDT) ( $\geq 98\%$ , mp 145–150 °C), *N*-(trimethylsilyl)-1,2,4-triazole (*puriss.*  $\geq 99\%$  (GC)), 4-nitrophenyl chloroformate (*purum*,  $\geq 97\%$ ), cyclohexene (*puriss.* p.a.), 9,10-dimethylanthracene (DMA) (*purum*, ~97%), THF (for HPLC), chloroform ( $\text{CHCl}_3$  for IR-spectroscopy) and diethyl ether ( $\text{Et}_2\text{O}$ , *puriss.*  $\geq 99.5\%$ ;  $\text{H}_2\text{O} \leq 0.005\%$ ). Benzene (*p.a.*,  $\text{H}_2\text{O} < 0.03\%$ ) was obtained from Riedel-de Haën. 30% Hydrogen peroxide (*pract.*) came from Merck. CDI, CDT and the stabilizer free THF from Fluka were stored under dry nitrogen. Water free solutions of hydrogen peroxide in  $\text{CHCl}_3$  and  $\text{Et}_2\text{O}$  were prepared according to literature procedure.<sup>4</sup>

### Preparation of 1*H*-1,2,4-triazolecarboxylic acid *p*-nitrophenyl ester (TCNP)

*p*-Nitrophenyl chloroformate (6.9 g, 34 mmol) was dissolved in 30 mL of dry benzene. A solution of 5 mL of *N*-(trimethylsilyl)-

† The IUPAC name for carbonic acid is hydroxyformic acid.

1,2,4-triazole (34 mmol) in 30 mL of dry benzene was added dropwise to the stirred solution of the chloroformate at room temperature. After addition was completed the mixture was stirred for another 15 minutes, while precipitation of the product was observed. The product was filtered and washed with dry benzene and dried *in vacuo*. The yield of the product was 5.9 g (72%), mp 144–146 °C (Found: C, 46.06; H, 2.69; N, 23.96. C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>6</sub>N<sub>4</sub>O<sub>4</sub> requires: C, 46.13; H, 2.58; N, 23.93%);  $\nu_{\max}/\text{cm}^{-1}$  3400 (>C=N-), 1600, 1580 and 1500 (C=C), 1790 (C=O), 1530 and 1320 (N=O), 1290 (C–O). Infrared spectra were taken on a Philips model IR-PU 9700 infrared spectrometer and were run as potassium bromide pellets.

### Gas volumetric measurements

The gas volumetric measurements were carried out according to the procedures described by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> For determination of the purity of CDT the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> evolved in the reaction between CDT and double distilled water at  $T = 25^\circ\text{C}$  was measured. 95 mg of CDT yielded 12.7 mL of CO<sub>2</sub> (90% of theoretical yield).

Moreover, we have measured the volumes of gases evolved in the reactions between CDT and 30% hydrogen peroxide both in the absence and in the presence of cyclohexene and 9,10-dimethylantracene, respectively.

### Singlet oxygen infrared emission measurements

The near-infrared luminescence (IRL) spectrometer used in our studies for recording the steady state <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> phosphorescence emission at  $\lambda = 1270$  nm has been described in detail.<sup>3,5–7</sup>

For the intensity of the <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> phosphorescence emission,  $I_p$ , eqn. (3) holds,<sup>6</sup> where  $c$  is a constant of the IRL spectrometer,

$$I_p(t) = ck_p\tau_\Delta \frac{d[{}^1\text{O}_2]}{dt} \quad (3)$$

$k_p$  is the rate constant of the <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> phosphorescence emission,  $\tau_\Delta$  is the lifetime of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> and  $d[{}^1\text{O}_2]/dt$  denotes the rate of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> formation.

If the product  $C = c k_p \tau_\Delta$  is known for a given solvent or a solvent mixture, the concentration of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> can be calculated from the plot of  $I_p(t)$  versus time according to eqn. (4). The

$$[{}^1\text{O}_2] = \frac{1}{C} \int_{t=0}^{t=\infty} I_p(t) dt \quad (4)$$

value of  $c$  strongly depends on the sensitivity of the germanium diode. In our measurements two different germanium diodes of the type North Coast EO 817L were employed. For the older one a value of  $c_1 = (3.0 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{11} \text{ mV dm}^3 \text{ s mol}^{-1}$  (ref. 6) was determined and for the new one a value of  $c_2 = (1.4 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{11} \text{ mV dm}^3 \text{ s mol}^{-1}$  was obtained.

The values of  $\tau_\Delta$  of the solvent mixtures (THF–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (30%)) were directly measured with our home built IRL spectrometer.<sup>3</sup> The values obtained are presented below. For the calculation of the amount of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> evolved in the different systems a value of  $k_p = (0.45 \pm 0.10) \text{ s}^{-1}$  was used, which agrees very well within the error limits with  $k_p$  values determined for pure THF.<sup>8</sup>

Reactions were carried out in thermostatted 1 cm quartz cuvettes. To the THF solutions of CDT, CDI and TCNP 30% hydrogen peroxide was added by a micro syringe. Vigorous stirring was necessary. The initial concentrations of CDT and TCNP used are given in the legends of the figures or in the text.


### Rate law and expression for $I_p(t)$

For reaction (2) Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> have postulated a three step mechanism, shown in Scheme 1. In the first step 1*H*-1,2,4-triazoleperoxycarboxylic acid (**1**) should be generated which, moreover, should react with hydrogen peroxide in the second

**Table 1** Results of the volumetric measurements of the reaction of *N,N'*-carbonyldi-1,2,4-triazole (CDT) with 30% hydrogen peroxide in THF at  $T = 25^\circ\text{C}$ ;  $[\text{CDT}] = 1.0 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$

System	equiv. <sup>a</sup>	equiv. <sub>corr.</sub> = $\frac{\text{equiv.}(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2)}{\text{equiv.}(\text{H}_2\text{O})}$
CDT–H <sub>2</sub> O <sup>b</sup>	0.9 ± 0.1	—
CDT–H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> <sup>c</sup>	1.8 ± 0.1	2.0
CDT–H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> –DMA <sup>d</sup>	0.9 ± 0.2	1.0
CDT–H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> –cyclohexene <sup>e</sup>	1.0 ± 0.1	1.1

<sup>a</sup> Mean value of 3 measurements. <sup>b</sup>  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}] = 100 \times [\text{CDT}]$ . <sup>c</sup>  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] = 20 \times [\text{CDT}]$ . <sup>d</sup> Solution saturated with DMA,  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] = 15 \times [\text{CDT}]$ . <sup>e</sup>  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] = [\text{cyclohexene}] = 15 \times [\text{CDT}]$ .



**Scheme 1**

step to give most probably the elusive diperoxycarboxylic acid (**2**). Assuming that **2** is unstable (with respect to the properties of **2** no prediction was made<sup>2</sup>) and generates in the third step very fast finally CO<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>O and <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>, then the rate of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> formation is determined by the competitive, consecutive second-order reactions (5) and (6).<sup>9</sup>

The particular difficulty of such a type of reaction is that the reaction steps are second-order. However, the solution is simpler when hydrogen peroxide is in large excess and thus we have in effect two successive first-order reactions.

Under first-order conditions for  $I_p(t)$  eqn. (8) can be derived,

$$I_p(t) = Ck_6'[\text{CDT}]_0 \frac{k_5'}{k_6' - k_5'} \{ \exp(-k_5't) - \exp(-k_6't) \} \quad (8)$$

where  $C$  represents the product  $c k_p \tau_\Delta$ ,  $[\text{CDT}]_0$  is the initial concentration of CDT and  $k_5' = k_5[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$  and  $k_6' = k_6[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$  denote the pseudo first-order rate constants of reactions (5) and (6), respectively. The rate constant of the slow reaction can be evaluated from the plot of  $\ln I_p(t)$  versus  $t$  which yields at longer reaction time a straight line with the slope equal to  $k_5'$  or  $k_6'$  (*vide infra*). The rate constant of the faster reaction can be calculated from  $t_{\max}$ , *i.e.* from the time at which  $I_p(t)$  exhibits its maximum.  $t_{\max}$  is defined in eqn. (9).


$$t_{\max} = \frac{1}{k_6' - k_5'} \ln \left( \frac{k_6'}{k_5'} \right) \quad (9)$$

It must be noted that on the basis of eqn. (8) or eqn. (9) it cannot be deduced which of the reactions is the faster one.

## Results and discussion

### A. Investigation of the system *N,N'*-carbonyldi-1,2,4-triazole (CDT)–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>

**A.1 Gas volumetric measurements.** First we performed gas volumetric measurements with the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> using 30% hydrogen peroxide. The results summarized in Table 1 agree excellently with the data of Rebek *et al.*,<sup>2</sup> who used 98% hydrogen peroxide for their measurements. In the absence of olefins or <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> acceptors 2.0 equiv. of gas are generated. When



**Fig. 1**  $I_p(t)$  as a function of time of the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF. The inset shows the corresponding plot of  $\ln I_p(t)$  versus time. Conditions: [CDT] =  $1.25 \times 10^{-2}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>; [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] =  $1.25 \times 10^{-1}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>;  $T = 10^\circ\text{C}$ . — = experimental curve; ---- = theoretically calculated curve according to eqn. (8) using  $c_1 = (3.0 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{11}$  mV dm<sup>3</sup> s mol<sup>-1</sup>;  $k_p = (0.45 \pm 0.10)$  s<sup>-1</sup> and  $\tau_A = (18 \pm 1)$   $\mu\text{s}$ ;  $k_f'(\text{CDT}) = 7.2 \times 10^{-3}$  s<sup>-1</sup>;  $k_s'(\text{CDT}) = 3.4 \times 10^{-3}$  s<sup>-1</sup>.

the THF solution contains excess cyclohexene, or is saturated with DMA only 1.0 equiv. of gas is evolved. The observation that the results of the gas volumetric measurements are independent of the percentage of hydrogen peroxide (98% or 30%) is consistent with the fact that hydrogen peroxide is more nucleophilic than water.<sup>1</sup>


**A.2 <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> phosphorescence intensity as a function of time.** Fig. 1 shows a plot of  $I_p(t)$  versus time of the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. The shape of this curve is consistent with eqn. (8). In accordance with a consecutive reaction for the <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> formation an induction period (here about 20 s) is observed. The plot of  $\ln I_p(t)$  versus time, depicted in the inset of Fig. 1, results in a straight line at about  $t \geq 800$  s with a slope equal to  $-k_s'(\text{CDT})$ , the rate constant of the slow reaction (*vide supra*).

With the values of  $k_s'(\text{CDT})$  and  $t_{\text{max}} = 253$  s the rate constant  $k_f'(\text{CDT})$  of the faster reaction can be estimated according to eqn. (9). At  $T = 10^\circ\text{C}$  the pseudo first-order rate constants were found to be  $k_f'(\text{CDT}) = (7.2 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-3}$  s<sup>-1</sup>;  $k_s'(\text{CDT}) = (3.4 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-3}$  s<sup>-1</sup>. With [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] =  $1.25 \times 10^{-1}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup> for the corresponding second-order rate constants the following values can be calculated:  $k_f = (5.8 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-2}$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>;  $k_s = (2.7 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-2}$  dm<sup>3</sup> mol<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>.


As already mentioned, *a priori* it cannot be decided which of the two rate constants is connected with reaction (5) or reaction (6). This question will be discussed after the presentation of further experimental results.

According to eqn. (4) the concentration of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> generated in the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> can be evaluated from the area under the  $I_p(t) \rightarrow t$  curve between  $t = 20$  s and  $t = 2250$  s. The area was found to be  $ar = (34100 \pm 4\%)$  mV s. With the values of  $c_1$ ,  $k_p$  and  $\tau_A$  given in the legend of Fig. 1 for the concentration of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> a value of [<sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>] =  $(1.4 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-2}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup> can be estimated, whereby the error limit is mainly determined by the uncertainty of  $k_p$ . The value of [<sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>] obtained agrees very well within the error limits with the initial concentration of [CDT] =  $1.25 \times 10^{-2}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup> and confirms the result of the gas volumetric measurements which have also shown that according to eqn. (2) one molecule of CDT yields at least one <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> molecule.

Fig. 1 also shows the  $I_p(t) \rightarrow t$  curve theoretically estimated according to eqn. (8). The values of the different parameters



**Fig. 2** Plots of  $I_p(t)$  versus  $t$  of the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF determined at three different temperatures. Conditions: [CDT] =  $1.25 \times 10^{-2}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>; [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] =  $1.25 \times 10^{-1}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>.



**Fig. 3** Plots of  $\ln k_5$  and  $\ln k_6$  versus  $1/T$  of the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF; with  $k_5 = k_f'(\text{CDT})$  and  $k_6 = k_s'(\text{CDT})$  {see text}. Conditions: [CDT] =  $1.25 \times 10^{-2}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>; [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] =  $1.25 \times 10^{-1}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>.


used for the estimation are given in the legend of Fig. 1. As one can see the experimental and theoretical curves do not completely cover one another, but the difference between the areas lies within the error limits of about 15%.

**A.3 Temperature dependence of the second-order rate constants.** Fig. 2 shows the  $I_p(t) \rightarrow t$  curves observed for the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> as a function of temperature. The maximum of  $I_p(t)$  increases and is shifted to shorter times with increasing temperature. The areas under the different curves are found to be equal within about 10%.

Measurements were performed in the temperature range between  $T = 5^\circ\text{C}$  and  $T = 20^\circ\text{C}$ . At temperatures  $T > 20^\circ\text{C}$  the reproducibility of the  $I_p(t) \rightarrow t$  runs becomes worse. The Arrhenius plots of  $k_f'(\text{CDT})$  and  $k_s'(\text{CDT})$  are given in Fig. 3. From these plots the following values for the Arrhenius parameters are obtained: i) for the fast reaction,  $\ln A_a(f) = 13 \pm 3$ ,  $E_{aa}(f) = 37 \pm 5$  kJ mol<sup>-1</sup>; ii) for the slow reaction,  $\ln A_a(s) = 10 \pm 1$ ,

$E_{aa}(s) = 33 \pm 3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ ; where  $A_a$  and  $E_{aa}$  denote apparent Arrhenius parameters (*vide infra*).

For both reaction (5) and reaction (6) relatively small values of the Arrhenius parameters are found. Especially from the small values of  $A_a(f) \approx 4 \times 10^5 \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  and of  $A_s(s) \approx 2 \times 10^4 \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  it can be deduced that in both reactions a preequilibrium takes place in which Criegee-intermediates are involved. The data are in accordance with the rule that the nucleophilic displacement by hydrogen peroxide at a carbonyl carbon atom is an addition–elimination process, which takes the form of a  $B_{AC}2$ -mechanism,<sup>10</sup> as outlined in Scheme 2.



Moreover, in both reactions the second step ( $k_{5b}$  and  $k_{6b}$ , respectively) is rate determining, which is expected since in both reactions the leaving group (1,2,4-triazole) is more basic than the entering nucleophile (hydrogen peroxide).<sup>10</sup>

According to Scheme 2 the rate constants  $k_5$  and  $k_6$  are defined by eqns. (10) and (11), where  $K_{5a}$  and  $K_{6a}$  are the

$$k_5 = K_{5a} k_{5b} \quad (10)$$

$$k_6 = K_{6a} k_{6b} \quad (11)$$

constants of the preequilibria (5a) and (5b) and  $k_{5b}$  and  $k_{6b}$  denote the first-order rate constants of the decomposition of the corresponding Criegee-intermediates.

For reaction (6), *e.g.*, the Arrhenius equation (12) holds, where

$$k_6 = A_a(6) \exp[-E_{aa}(6)/RT] \quad (12)$$

$A_a(6)$  and  $E_{aa}(6)$  are defined by eqns. (13) and (14), where  $A(6b)$

$$A_a(6) = A(6b) \exp[\Delta S^\circ(6a)/R] \quad (13)$$


$$E_{aa}(6) = \Delta H^\circ(6a) + E_a(6b) \quad (14)$$

and  $E_a(6b)$  represent the Arrhenius parameters of reaction (6b) and  $\Delta S^\circ$  and  $\Delta H^\circ$  denote the reaction entropy and the reaction enthalpy, respectively, of equilibrium (6a).

Since the formation of the Criegee-intermediates is probably accompanied by negative values of  $\Delta S^\circ$  and  $\Delta H^\circ$  the low values of the Arrhenius parameters obtained are understandable.


**A.4 Assignment of  $k_f$  and  $k_s$ .** Now the question should be discussed which of the reactions (5) and (6) is the faster one. In

this respect the results of the measurements carried out by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> are of interest. The authors have measured the epoxidation of cyclohexene by the system CDT– $H_2O_2$  in different solvents at  $T = 25^\circ\text{C}$  assuming that the peroxy-carboxylic acid **1** is the epoxidizing agent. Surprisingly, the second-order rate constant “ $k_{ep}$ ” determined by measuring the initial rates of epoxidation was found to be insensitive to solvent basicity, whereas in general for conventional peroxy-carboxylic acids rates of epoxidation decrease as the Lewis basicity of the solvent increases. The values of “ $k_{ep}$ ” determined in  $CHCl_3$ , THF and  $Et_2O$  are about  $7.5 \times 10^{-2} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ . This result is interpreted assuming that **1** does not react in the form **1a**, *i.e.* in a form generally postulated for conventional peroxy-carboxylic acids,<sup>11</sup> but in the “more” stabilized form **1b**.



However this interpretation fails in so far as together with our results it can be deduced that the second-order rate constant “ $k_{ep}$ ” determined by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> cannot be identical with  $k_{15}$ , the real rate constant of the epoxidation of cyclohexene by **1**.

As the authors report, at the beginning the epoxidation occurs according to a second-order reaction. This implies, if **1** is the real epoxidizing agent, that reaction (15) must occur much



more quickly than reaction (6) (*vide infra*). Obviously, Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> have measured the rate determining step of the epoxidation of cyclohexene. Thus the authors have determined the rate constant of reaction (5) which could be insensitive with respect to the Lewis basicity of the solvent. This reaction should be faster than reaction (6), since the carbonyl group of CDT may be more electronically activated and therefore more reactive towards hydrogen peroxide than that of **1**.



From the Arrhenius plots depicted in Fig. 3 for the rate constants  $k_f(\text{CDT})$  and  $k_s(\text{CDT})$  at  $T = 25^\circ\text{C}$  the values  $k_f(\text{CDT}) = (1.3 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-1} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  and  $k_s(\text{CDT}) = (4.4 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-2} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  are obtained. Within the error limits the value of  $k_f(\text{CDT})$  agrees with the value of “ $k_{ep}$ ”(THF) obtained by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> confirming the assumption that reaction (5) occurs faster than reaction (6). To test whether  $k_f(\text{CDT}) = k_5$  is insensitive to the basicity of the solvents, we have performed measurements with the system CDT– $H_2O_2$  in  $CHCl_3$  and  $Et_2O$  at  $10^\circ\text{C}$  employing water free solutions of hydrogen peroxide in  $CHCl_3$  and  $Et_2O$ , respectively. However in none of the systems  $I_p(t)$  versus  $t$  curves were observed suitable for the evaluation of the rate constants  $k_f'$  and  $k_s'$ , which probably results from the inhomogeneity caused by the water produced during the reaction of CDT with hydrogen peroxide.<sup>12</sup>

Nevertheless, if reaction (5) is the faster one then the equality  $k_6 = k_s(\text{CDT})$  holds. With  $k_6 = 4.4 \times 10^{-2} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  and the experimental conditions used by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> for the investigation of the epoxidation of cyclohexene:  $[\text{cyclohexene}] = 4.0 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$ ;  $[\text{CDT}] = 8.0 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  and  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] = 3.3 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  the rate constant  $k_{15}$  can be estimated according to the inequality  $k_{15} [\text{1}] [\text{cyclohexene}] \gg k_6 [\text{1}] [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \Rightarrow k_{15} \gg k_6 [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]/[\text{cyclohexene}]$  and with  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \approx [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]_0 - [\text{CDT}] = 2.5 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  it follows that  $k_{15} \gg (4.4 \times 10^{-2}) \times (2.5 \times 10^{-1})/4 \times 10^{-2} = 2.8 \times 10^{-1} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , *i.e.*  $k_{15} \approx 3 \times 10^0 \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ .


Up to now for peroxy-carboxylic acids such a high value of a rate constant for olefin epoxidation in THF has not been

observed. Values of this order of magnitude are known for epoxidation of olefins by dioxiranes as epoxidizing agents.<sup>13</sup>

Therefore it must be considered whether an epoxidizing agent other than **1** is involved. One possible hypothesis is to assume that **1** decomposes immediately after generation according to eqn. (16) to give, besides 1,2,4-triazole, carbon trioxide (CO<sub>3</sub>) **3**, which could react in the absence of an olefin with hydrogen peroxide to give the diperoxy-carbonic acid **2**. Obviously CO<sub>3</sub>, which should exist in the dipolar structure<sup>14</sup> as described in eqn. (16), may be a powerful epoxidation agent comparable with dioxiranes.



However the assumption that **1** is unstable and decomposes very fast into CO<sub>3</sub> and 1,2,4-triazole is based on the experience that the parent 1*H*-1,2,4-triazolecarboxylic acid is very unstable and decomposes immediately after formation into 1,2,4-triazole and CO<sub>2</sub>.<sup>1</sup> But this conclusion is not compelling. In the case of the *N*-benzoylperoxycarbamic acid (BPC), first synthesized by




Höft and Ganschow,<sup>4</sup> the authors have shown that BPC is very stable at room temperature, whereas the parent *N*-benzoyl-carbamic acid is very unstable at room temperature and decomposes immediately after generation into benzamide and CO<sub>2</sub>.<sup>4</sup>

Moreover, the formation of CO<sub>3</sub> in the system CDT-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> may not be compatible with the small difference observed for the second-order rate constants of the reactions (5) and (6) (*vide supra*). It can be assumed that the addition of hydrogen peroxide to CO<sub>3</sub> according to eqn. (17) will occur much more quickly than the nucleophilic displacement by hydrogen peroxide at the carbonyl atom of **1** and even of CDT, respectively. Consequently, if CO<sub>3</sub> is generated a greater difference between the rate constants of the consecutive second-order reaction could be expected. Thus the assumption made by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> that the peroxycarboxylic acid **1** is the epoxidizing agent appears to be most probable. Considering the value of  $k_s'(\text{CDT}) = 3.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$  obtained under pseudo first-order conditions at  $T = 10^\circ\text{C}$  (see Fig. 1) for the lifetime of **1** a value of  $\tau(\mathbf{1}) = 1/k_s' \approx 5 \text{ min}$  can be estimated indicating that **1** is more stable than its parent 1*H*-1,2,4-triazolecarboxylic acid.

To get more information about the *in situ* generated peroxy-intermediates in systems like CDT-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> we have additionally studied the system 1*H*-1,2,4-triazolecarboxylic acid *p*-nitrophenyl ester (TCNP)-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF. In this system <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> should be generated according to a mechanism discussed for CDT-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>.

## B. Investigation of the system 1*H*-1,2,4-triazolecarboxylic acid *p*-nitrophenyl ester (TCNP)-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>

**B.1 <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> Phosphorescence intensity as a function of time.** Fig. 4 shows a run of  $I_p(t)$  versus  $t$  obtained under pseudo first-order conditions at  $T = 20^\circ\text{C}$ . The corresponding plot of  $\ln I_p(t)$  versus  $t$  is depicted in the inset of Fig. 4. The form of the  $I_p(t)$  curve is consistent with the expectation that TCNP reacts with hydrogen peroxide in the same manner as CDT.



**Fig. 4**  $I_p(t)$  as a function of time of the system TCNP-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF. The inset shows the corresponding plot of  $\ln I_p(t)$  versus time. Conditions: [TCNP] =  $5.2 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$ ; [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] =  $5.2 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$ ;  $T = 20^\circ\text{C}$ . — = experimental curve; ---- = theoretically calculated curve according to eqn. (8) using  $c_2 = (1.4 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{11} \text{ mV dm}^3 \text{ s mol}^{-1}$ ;  $k_p = (0.45 \pm 0.10) \text{ s}^{-1}$  and  $\tau_A = (15 \pm 1) \mu\text{s}$ ;  $k_f'(\text{TCNP}) = 5.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;  $k_s'(\text{TCNP}) = 3.7 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$ .


The pseudo first-order rate constants and the corresponding second-order rate constants of the slow reaction and the fast reaction, respectively, were found to be:  $k_f'(\text{TCNP}) = (5.9 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $k_f(\text{TCNP}) = (1.1 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-3} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;  $k_s'(\text{TCNP}) = (3.7 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $k_s(\text{TCNP}) = (7.1 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-4} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ .

The value of  $k_f'(\text{TCNP})$  is by a factor of 100 smaller than that of  $k_f'(\text{CDT}) = 1.1 \times 10^{-1} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  obtained at  $T = 20^\circ\text{C}$  (see Fig. 3) and the value of  $k_s(\text{TCNP})$  is also smaller than that of  $k_s(\text{CDT}) = 3.7 \times 10^{-2} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , but only by a factor of about 50. It would appear that also in the system TCNP-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> the first addition-elimination process occurs faster than the second one. Thus the difference in the rate constants indicates that the carbonyl group of CDT is more electronically activated than that of TCNP and moreover that the carbonyl group of the peroxycarboxylic acid **1** is also more activated than that of the peroxy acid generated in the system TCNP-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (*vide infra*).

The area under the experimental  $I_p(t)$  curve amounts to  $ar = (45350 \pm 4\%) \text{ mV s}$ . With the values of  $c_2$ ,  $k_p$  and  $\tau_A$  given in the legend of Fig. 4 for the concentration of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> evolved a value of  $[\text{O}_2] = (4.8 \pm 0.7) \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  is obtained. Within the error limits this value agrees very well with the initial concentration of [TCNP] =  $5.2 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  used in this experiment. This result distinctly shows that as observed for CDT-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the system TCNP-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> one molecule of TCNP yields one molecule of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> if pseudo first-order conditions are employed.

In Fig. 4 the theoretically evaluated  $I_p(t)$ -curve is also depicted. As already found for the system CDT-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> the area under the theoretical curve is a little bit smaller than that of the experimental one. The difference between the areas only amounts to about 6%.

The experimental data found so far for the system TCNP-H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> are consistent with the following conclusions: i) in the first addition-elimination process 1,2,4-triazole should be eliminated, since this compound is less basic than the alternative leaving group (*p*-nitrophenyl anion); ii) consequently in this process *O-p*-nitrophenylmonoperoxy-carbonic acid **4** should be formed (see Scheme 3); iii) for the lifetime of **4** a value of  $\tau(\mathbf{4}) = 1/k_s'(\text{TCNP}) = 45 \text{ min}$  can be estimated. This value confirms the



Scheme 3




Fig. 5 Plots of  $\ln k_{18}$  and  $\ln k_{19}$  versus  $1/T$  of the system TCNP–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF; with  $k_{18} = k_f(\text{TCNP})$  and  $k_{19} = k_s(\text{TCNP})$  {see text}. Conditions: [TCNP] =  $5.2 \times 10^{-2}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>; [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] =  $5.2 \times 10^{-1}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>.

observation that *O*-arylmonoperoxy-carbonic acids are more stable than the corresponding esters of the parent acid.<sup>15</sup>

In analogy to the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> for the formation of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> in the system TCNP–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> the mechanism described in Scheme 3 can be presumed. This mechanism is confirmed by the results of the measurements at different temperatures.

### B.2 Temperature dependence of the second-order rate constants.

Measurements were performed between  $T = 15$  °C and  $T = 30$  °C. The Arrhenius plots of  $k_{18} = k_f(\text{TCNP})$  and  $k_{19} = k_s(\text{TCNP})$  are presented in Fig. 5. For the apparent Arrhenius parameters the following values were obtained:  $\ln A_a(18) = 22 \pm 7$ ,  $E_{aa}(18) = (68 \pm 17)$  kJ mol<sup>-1</sup>;  $\ln A_a(19) = 11 \pm 3$ ,  $E_{aa}(19) = (46 \pm 7)$  kJ mol<sup>-1</sup>.

Again especially the low values of  $A_a$  found for reaction (18) and the slower reaction (19), respectively, indicate that in both reactions a preequilibrium between the educts and a Criegee-intermediate takes place according to a B<sub>AC</sub>2-mechanism. Whereas the values of  $A_a$  obtained for the fast and slow reactions in the different systems agree very well within the error


limits, the values of  $E_{aa}$  determined for reaction (19) and reaction (20) are distinctly greater than the corresponding  $E_{aa}$  values of reaction (5) and reaction (6), respectively. These results mean that the difference between the rate constants of the fast and the slow reaction observed in the different systems is mainly determined by the different  $E_{aa}$  values.

### C. Miscellaneous measurements


**C.1 Investigation of the system TCNP–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the presence of cyclohexene.** According to Schemes 1, 2 and 3 for both systems it is assumed that in the first addition–elimination process a reactive peroxycarboxylic acid is formed: **1** in the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and **4** in the system TCNP–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. **1** is found to be, by a factor of 50, more reactive towards hydrogen peroxide than **4**. Moreover, according to our evaluation **1** should be, by a factor of 50, more reactive towards cyclohexene than towards hydrogen peroxide. A similar behaviour with respect to the reactivity should also hold for **4**. To test this hypothesis we have carried out measurements with the system TCNP–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> under pseudo first-order conditions in the presence of different concentrations of cyclohexene at  $T = 20$  °C. The results are shown in Fig. 6.

Only for the lowest cyclohexene concentration of [cyclohexene] = [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>]/20 =  $2.68 \times 10^{-2}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup> a very small flat  $I_p(t)$ -signal is observed after adding hydrogen peroxide to the TCNP–cyclohexene solution. This signal increases very slowly but it increases considerably at about 500 s to a narrow  $I_p$ -signal. Moreover, it is found that the greater the cyclohexene concentration the smaller the signal and the later it is detected. At a cyclohexene concentration of [cyclohexene] =  $2.68 \times 10^{-1}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup> after about 1250 s a small  $I_p$ -signal is still observed. For equal concentrations of cyclohexene and hydrogen peroxide no  $I_p$ -signal can be detected.

In fact, these results confirm the expectation that **4** is more reactive towards cyclohexene (eqn. (20)) than towards hydrogen



peroxide. The result that at equal concentrations of cyclohexene and hydrogen peroxide no <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> can be detected distinctly demonstrates that **4** is practically completely consumed by the reaction with cyclohexene. The rate constant  $k_{20}$  for this reac-



**Fig. 6**  $I_p(t)$  as a function of time of the system TCNP–cyclohexene– $H_2O_2$  in THF at different cyclohexene concentrations. The inset presents the plot of  $1/\sqrt{I_p(t)}$  versus time {see text} for [cyclohexene] =  $2.68 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$ . Conditions: [TCNP] =  $5.35 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$ ;  $[H_2O_2] = 5.35 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$ ;  $T = 20^\circ\text{C}$ . M denotes the concentration in  $\text{mol dm}^{-3}$ .

tion can be approximately evaluated. For equal concentrations of TCNP and cyclohexene of  $5.35 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  and  $[H_2O_2] = 5.35 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  (see legend of Fig. 6)  $^1O_2$  formation is not observed within the first 800 s. From this result it can be deduced that within this time the following inequality holds:

$$k_{20} \gg \frac{k_{19}[H_2O_2]}{[\text{cyclohexene}]}$$

with  $[H_2O_2] \approx [H_2O_2]_0 - [\text{TCNP}]$  and  $k_{19} = 7.1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  one obtains

$$k_{20} \gg \frac{(7.1 \times 10^{-4}) \times (4.81 \times 10^{-1})}{5.35 \times 10^{-2}} = 6.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}, \text{ i.e.}$$


$$k_{20} \approx 6 \times 10^{-2} \text{ dm}^3 \text{ mol}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}.$$

Thus **4** is, by a factor of 50, less reactive towards cyclohexene than **1**, but in comparison with conventional peroxy-carboxylic acids like peroxybenzoic acid **4** is about a factor of 100 more reactive.<sup>2</sup> In this respect it is interesting to recall the fact that **4** is about a factor of 50 less reactive towards hydrogen peroxide than **1**. Obviously the reactivity of **1** and **4** towards hydrogen peroxide runs parallel to the reactivity of both peroxycarboxylic acids towards cyclohexene.

With respect to the shape of the  $I_p(t)$ -signals shown in Fig. 6 it must be stated that the changes in  $I_p(t)$  cannot be described exactly either by a first-order reaction or by a second-order reaction. For a second-order reaction a plot of  $1/\sqrt{I_p(t)}$  versus time should give a straight line.<sup>16</sup> Such a plot of the first  $I_p(t)$ -signal is given in the inset of Fig. 6. From this plot it can be deduced that in the system TCNP–cyclohexene– $H_2O_2$ , under the conditions used, a second-order reaction distinctly contributes to the overall formation of  $^1O_2$  (*vide infra*).

In addition we have performed similar measurements with the system CDT– $H_2O_2$  at different cyclohexene concentrations in THF at  $T = 10^\circ\text{C}$ . Surprisingly this system exhibits different behaviour.

As shown in Fig. 7 for the lowest cyclohexene concentration of [cyclohexene] =  $[H_2O_2]/20 = 1.25 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  (system (a)) about two seconds after addition of hydrogen peroxide an



**Fig. 7**  $I_p(t)$  as a function of time of the system CDT–cyclohexene– $H_2O_2$  in THF at different cyclohexene concentrations. The inset shows the plot of  $1/\sqrt{I_p(t)}$  versus time for the system (c). Conditions: [CDT] =  $2.5 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$ ;  $[H_2O_2] = 2.5 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$ ;  $T = 10^\circ\text{C}$ . M denotes the concentration in  $\text{mol dm}^{-3}$ .

$I_p(t)$ -signal of about 4 mV is observed which increases enormously at about 9 seconds. As observed for the system TCNP–cyclohexene– $H_2O_2$  the greater the cyclohexene concentration the longer the time at which the  $I_p(t)$ -signal is observed. But in contrast to the system TCNP–cyclohexene– $H_2O_2$  the height of the narrow  $I_p(t)$ -signal increases with increasing cyclohexene concentrations and at equal concentration of cyclohexene and hydrogen peroxide (system (c)) the highest  $I_p(t)$ -signal could be detected.

Moreover, the shape of the  $I_p(t)$ -signals can only be described by a second-order reaction as the straight line of the plot of  $1/\sqrt{I_p(t)}$  versus time for the system (c) given in the inset of Fig. 7 demonstrates.


These results cannot be explained by the reaction mechanisms described so far. But it must be noted that they do not contradict the observation of Rebek *et al.*,<sup>2</sup> who found that 90% of cyclohexene is epoxidized by CDT– $H_2O_2$ . The amounts of  $^1O_2$  generated in both systems under the conditions employed are small (<4%) compared to the amounts expected for the systems investigated in the absence of cyclohexene.

In connection with the results presented in Figs. 6 and 7 the behaviour of the system CDI– $H_2O_2$  is of interest.

**C.2 Investigation of the system  $N,N'$ -carbonyldiimidazole (CDI)– $H_2O_2$ .** Measurements with the system CDI– $H_2O_2$  in THF carried out by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> have shown that this system is unsuitable for the epoxidation of cyclohexene. Only 1.5% 1,2-epoxycyclohexane was obtained. We have investigated this system under pseudo first-order conditions with [CDI] =  $2.5 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  and  $[H_2O_2] = 2.5 \times 10^{-1} \text{ mol dm}^{-3}$  at  $T = 10^\circ\text{C}$ . The result is given in Fig. 8.

Surprisingly,  $^1O_2$  formation is observed. But the amount of  $^1O_2$  is very small compared with the amount generated in the system CDT– $H_2O_2$  under the same conditions. However it is comparable to that of system (c) presented in Fig. 7. In addition the  $I_p(t)$ -signal is also consistent with a second-order reaction, which is evidently shown by the plot of  $1/\sqrt{I_p(t)}$  versus  $t$  given in the inset of Fig. 8. It must be noted that neither in this case nor in the two cases discussed above can the second-order rate constant be evaluated, since neither the exact rate law nor the concentrations of the corresponding reacting compounds are known.


As already reported by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup> in the system  $N,N'$ -




**Fig. 8**  $I_p(t)$  as a function of time of the system CDI–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF. The inset shows the corresponding plot of  $1/\sqrt{I_p(t)}$  versus time. Conditions: [CDI] =  $2.5 \times 10^{-2}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>; [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] =  $2.5 \times 10^{-1}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>;  $T = 10$  °C.

carbonyldi-2,4-dimethylpyrazole–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and in the system CDI–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> coloured side products are developed. It can be assumed that in both systems in analogy to the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the first addition–elimination process a very reactive peroxy-carboxylic acid is formed and that the corresponding acids can react with the azoles generated in the first process. The assumption that a reactive peroxy-carboxylic acid can react for instance with imidazole is confirmed by the observation that the *in situ* generated peroxy-carboxylic acid **1** reacts with imidazole. Addition of an excess of imidazole to the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> results immediately in the quenching of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> formation.

In contrast to 1,2,4-triazole both 2,4-dimethylpyrazole and imidazole contain a carbon–carbon double bond, which probably can be epoxidized by a reactive peroxy-carboxylic acid. Assuming that among other things the epoxide can react further with the reactive peroxy-carboxylic acid according to eqn. (21) the  $I_p(t)$ -signal observed for the system CDI–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> can be explained.




This possibility has encouraged us to assume that 1,2-epoxycyclohexane produced in the systems TCNP–cyclohexene–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and CDT–cyclohexene–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> could react with **4** and **1**, respectively, to give <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> according to eqn. (22).



Attempts with the systems CDT–1,2-epoxycyclohexane–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and TCNP–1,2-epoxycyclohexane–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> confirm this hypothesis. Fig. 9 shows for example the  $I_p(t)$ -signal observed for the system CDT–1,2-epoxycyclohexane–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. In the inset the plot of  $1/\sqrt{I_p(t)}$  versus  $t$  is given, which yields a straight line as expected for a second order reaction (see eqn. (22)).

However, it is evident that only a small amount of 1,2-epoxycyclohexane reacts with the *in situ* generated **1** to give <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>. The same observation is made for the system TCNP–1,2-epoxycyclohexane–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. As yet we have no plausible explanation for these observations.



**Fig. 9**  $I_p(t)$  as a function of time of the system CDT–1,2-epoxycyclohexane–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF. The inset shows the corresponding plot of  $1/\sqrt{I_p(t)}$  versus time. Conditions: [CDT] =  $2.5 \times 10^{-2}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>; [1,2-epoxycyclohexane] =  $2.5 \times 10^{-1}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>; [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] =  $2.5 \times 10^{-1}$  mol dm<sup>-3</sup>;  $T = 20$  °C.

Apart from this the different behaviour observed for the systems CDT–cyclohexene–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and TCNP–cyclohexene–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (see Figs. 6 and 7) obviously reflects the different reactivity of the *in situ* generated peroxy-carboxylic acids **1** and **4**. For both systems it can be deduced that in the presence of a large excess of cyclohexene compared to CDT and TCNP, respectively, and even at equal concentrations of cyclohexene and hydrogen peroxide the reactions between the peroxy-carboxylic acids and hydrogen peroxide cannot compete with the corresponding epoxidation reactions. Moreover, for the system TCNP–cyclohexene–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> this may hold also for the reaction between **4** and 1,2-epoxycyclohexane, whereas in the system CDT–cyclohexene–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> the reaction between **1** and 1,2-epoxycyclohexane clearly can compete with the formation of 1,2-epoxycyclohexane. Consequently in the system CDT–cyclohexene–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> the rate of the reaction between **1** and 1,2-epoxycyclohexane is high enough under the conditions used that <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> generated in this reaction can be detected.<sup>6</sup>

The  $I_p(t)$ -signals of the system TCNP–cyclohexene–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> observed at low cyclohexene concentrations can be explained by the contribution of two reactions to the overall <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> formation, namely by the reaction between **4** and 1,2-epoxycyclohexane and by the reaction between **4** and hydrogen peroxide.

Further it should be noted that in contrast to **1** and **4** neither hydrogen peroxide (30%) nor conventional peroxy-carboxylic acids like *m*-chloroperoxybenzoic acid react with 1,2-epoxycyclohexane to generate <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>.

## Conclusions

The results of the investigation of the system CDT–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF are consistent with the assumption that in this system 1*H*-1,2,4-triazoleperoxy-carboxylic acid **1** is formed as first postulated by Rebek *et al.*<sup>2</sup>

The results of the investigation of the system TCNP–H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in THF are in accordance with the assumption that in this system *O*-*p*-nitrophenylmonoperoxy-carbonic acid **4** is generated.

Both peroxy-carboxylic acids are powerful epoxidizing agents. The reactivity of **1** towards olefins is comparable with that of dimethyldioxirane, *e.g.*, **1** is, by a factor of about ten thousand, more reactive towards cyclohexene than conventional peroxy-carboxylic acids like peroxybenzoic acid. The reactivity of **4**



towards olefins exceeds after all that of peroxybenzoic acid by a factor of one hundred.<sup>2</sup>

The disadvantage of the *in situ* generated peroxydicarboxylic acids **1** and **4** is that they are also very reactive towards hydrogen peroxide. Thus in the case of less reactive olefins (*e.g.* dec-1-ene) this reaction successfully competes with the epoxidizing reaction resulting in a low efficiency of the formation of the epoxide desired.<sup>2</sup>

Whereas derivatives of the carbonic acid containing one hydroxy group are very unstable,<sup>17</sup> the lifetimes of **1** and **4** calculated under the pseudo first-order conditions demonstrate that both peroxydicarboxylic acids (which contain a peroxy hydroxy group) are more stable than their parent carboxylic acids.

### Acknowledgements

Financial support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Schwerpunktprogramm "Sauerstofftransfer/Peroxidchemie") and the Fonds der Chemischen Industrie is gratefully acknowledged.

### References

- 1 H. A. Staab, *Angew. Chem.*, 1962, **74**, 407.
- 2 J. Rebek, R. McCready, S. Wolf and A. Mossman, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1979, **44**, 1485.
- 3 R. Schmidt and H.-D. Brauer, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1987, **109**, 6976.
- 4 E. Höft and S. Ganschow, *J. Prakt. Chem.*, 1972, **314**, 156.
- 5 R. Schmidt, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 1988, **151**, 369.
- 6 K. Böhme and H.-D. Brauer, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1992, **31**, 3468.
- 7 R. Schmidt and E. Afshari, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1990, **94**, 4377.
- 8 R. D. Scurlock, S. Nonell, S. E. Braslawsky and P. R. Ogilby, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1995, **99**, 3521.
- 9 A. A. Frost and R. G. Pearson, *Kinetics and Mechanism*, 2nd edn., J. Wiley & Sons, New York, 1961, p. 178.
- 10 (a) R. Curci and J. O. Edwards, in *Catalytic Oxidations with Hydrogen Peroxide as Oxidant*, ed. G. Strukul, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1992, p. 45; (b) C. K. Ingold, *Structure and Mechanism in Organic Chemistry*, 2nd edn., Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 1969, p. 1129.
- 11 R. Curci, R. A. DiPrete, J. O. Edwards and G. Modena, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1970, **35**, 740 and references cited therein.
- 12 In this respect it should be noted that measurements of the rate of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> formation are very sensitive to impurities (quenchers of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>) and slight changes in the surroundings. Whereas in general rate constants are determined by measuring the changes in the concentrations of the educts and/or products, here the derivation of the concentration of <sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub> is determined. Already insignificant changes of [<sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>] in a given time can cause distinct changes in the rate d[<sup>1</sup>O<sub>2</sub>]/dt.
- 13 A. L. Baumstark and C. J. McCloskey, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1987, **28**, 3311.
- 14 P. A. LaBonville, R. Kugel and J. R. Ferraro, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1977, **67**, 1477.
- 15 R. M. Coates and J. W. Williams, *J. Org. Chem.*, 1974, **39**, 3054.
- 16 A. Lange and H.-D. Brauer, *J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans. 2*, 1996, 805.
- 17 H. R. Christen, *Grundlagen der Organischen Chemie*, 1. Aufl., Sauerländer, Aarau, 1970, p. 271.

Paper 9/03852C