# **A possible "direct initiation" of cationic polymerization of isobutylene by boron trichloride in methylene chloride**

## **L. Bul, H.A. Nguyen, and E. Marechal\***

Laboratoire de Synthèse Macromoléculaire (CNRS, UA 24), Université P. et M. Curie, **12 Rue Cuvier, F-75005 Paris, France** 

## Summary.

Initiation of the cationic rolymerization of isobutvlene by BCl, requires a cocatalyst in most cases. However, we found conditions (  $\bar{\theta} = -30^{\circ}C$ ,  $CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>$  as solvent,  $BCL<sub>2</sub> \ge 0.01$  M ) where a direct initiation by  $BCL<sub>2</sub>$  (i.e. with no cocatalyst) is possible.We showed that in such conditions HCl is not a cocatalyst and that H20 content is too low to exnlain the results ( high vacuum, and highly purified reactants and solvent ).The conversion increases linearly with the increasing concentration of  $BCl<sub>3</sub>$ .A mechanism is nromosed.

## Introduction.

For a long time it has been accepted that isobutylene(IB) could be polymerized by Lewis acids,only in the presence of a cocatalyst(1).However,more recently, several authors claimed that, even in absence of a cocatalyst, IB polymerization can be initiated by various Lewis acids:AlBr $_2$  or AlCl $_2(2)$ , TiCl $_4$ (3),AlEtCl $_2$ (4).Depending on the mechanism they suggest,authors classified such polymerizations as "direct","spontaneous","ion radical" or"non protonic".In studies relative to the synthesis of telechelic oliaoisobutylenes we carried out polymerizations at concentrations higher than those mentioned above;the results are reported in this article.

#### Experimental.

Two techniques have been used: vacuum line and high vacuum with complete ly sealed apparatus.

vacuum line: IB is dried through a column of molecular sieve and a column of BaO(both are heated under vacuum at 200°C for 24hr). CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> is fresh ly distilled from P $_{2}$ O $_{\rm E}$  under nitrogen.BCl $_{2}$  is distilled just b&fo $^{\prime}$ e use.

polymerization: A mixture of IB and CH3Cl<sub>2</sub> is frozen in an all-glass recator which is connected to the vacuum line and denassed several times; when the solution is at the chosen temperature,  $BC1<sub>3</sub>$  is added;the polymerization is stopped by introducing methanol.

High vacuum: All reactants and solvent are dried using Sigwalt's technique(6).BCl $_2$  is distilled on two sodium films.  $\qquad \qquad \circ$ 

Molecular weight determination: GPC(Waters) µstyragel columns(500A,

**<sup>\*</sup> To whom offprint requests should be sent** 

500Å,100Å),solvent THF.Standard: diisobutylene,tetraisobutylene and polyisobutylene fractions(3 fractions  $M = 3500,7850$  and 14740) whose molecular weights were determined by vapor pressure osmometry.Viscosity values were determined in diisobutylene;viscosimetric average molecular weiahts are cal culated by Flory's relation for polyisobutylene(10).

Results and Discussions,

The results are reported in table 1.

Table I.

Polymerization of isobutylene in various experimental conditions at  $t = -30^{\circ}C$ .



(a) High vacuum,(b) High vacuum and reactants freshly distilled and dried over sodium films,(c) From viscosimet~ic determination,(d~ From GPC (see experimental part),(e) After 30 mn.  $Y_{\infty} = ([M]_{\infty} - [M]_{\infty} )/[M]_{\infty} \times 100$ , where  $[M]_{\infty}$  is the residual monomer when nolvmerization is stopped. is the residual monomer when polymerization is stopped.

In experiments 3 and 4 the conversion is high ( $>80\%$ ).In experiment 4, the conversion is 90% but the molecular weight of the resultinq polymer is only 56000.According to Kennedy(5) such a polymerization is initiated by the  $BC13/H_2^0$  system where  $H_2^0$  is the residual water in the reaction medium (exp.  $3^3$ and 4 are carried out in vacuum line and not in high purity conditions).

Although experiments I and 2 were carried out in high vacuum conditions, their results are not incompatible with a cocatalytic initiation:if the reaction mixture contains a cocatalyst,its content is probably lower in experiment 2(high vacuum and freshly distilled reactants) than in experiment 1(high vacuum) which fits the fact that conversion decreases (84 and 60%)

and molecular weight increases (104500 and 190000) from experiment 1 to experiment 2.

If a cocatalytic initiation takes place,what could be the coinitiator?

As hydrogen chloride might be present when  $BC1<sub>3</sub>$  concentration is high, we carried out a polymerization (exp.8) in presence of this compound:  $B\tilde{C}1_{2}$ is added to an IB solution maintained at  $-30^{\circ}$ C; after 30 mn, gazeous dry HCI (0.0016 M) is introduced and reaction is stopped after one hour.Practically no polymer is obtained (conversion below  $2\%)$  showing that HCl/BCl, system does not initiate isobutylene polymerization, at least in these conditions.The fact that HCI is not a cocatalyst in isobutylene polymerization was already mentioned by Pham (8) when the initiator is TiCl $_A$  and by Plesh (9) who studied IB-Aluminium halide systems.lt is interesting to mention that Hazure (11) showed that HCI is a cocatalyst of Diphenyl-l,l-ethylene dimerization when initiator is AlCl, but is not when initiator is TiCl $_{\rm a}$ .

As shown in experiment 3 and 4,w~ter is a cocatalyst for the polymerization of isobutylene initiated by BCl~;could residual water be responsible for the polymerization in experiments I and 2 ?This is hardly probable as water content of the reaction medium in experiments 1 and 2 is too low to ob tain such conversions.It could be assumed that  $H_2O$  is introduced as a BCl<sub>2</sub> complex;however such a complex has never been mefitioned and is probably  $ve^2$ ry unstable. Experiments carried out in the oresence of a proton trap (2,6- Ditertbutylpyridine) (15) did not change the conversion but decreased molecular weihgts of the polymers which does not favour the hypothesis of a cocatalytic process.

This analysis of the results obtained in experiments i to 4 shows that polymerizations 1 and 2 result very probably from a direct initiation by BCl $_2$ .The variation of Ln Y against  $|BCI_{2}|_{\circ}$ .(Figure 1) is linear;it shows that conversion decreases with decreasing  $|{\tt BCl}_{\infty}\,|$  and that no polymerization takes place when [BCI~]< 0.01M which fits-Kennedy's results which were obtained in somewhat different conditions (16).

Sauvet and al. (12) analyzed the different ways initiation can take place when no coinitiator is added.Longworth andP1esch (13) assumed that a self-initiation of the Lewis acid could take place;However, the kinetic analysis of such a system leads to conversion proportional to  $C_0^c$  or  $C_0^c$  (C<sub>o</sub> is the initial initiator concentration).

The hypothesis of a solvent coinitiation:  $\alpha$ 

$$
CH_2Cl_2 + BCl_3 \xrightarrow{BCl_4} BCl_4^{\theta}, \quad \text{CH}_2Cl
$$

 $C_{\rm H_2}$ CI,BCI $_{\rm a}^{\rm o}$  + H<sub>2</sub>C=C<sub>s</sub>  $-$  CICH<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>s</sub>  $_{\rm s}$  BCI $_{\rm a}^{\rm o}$ leads to conversion proportional to C<sub>o</sub> but is not supported By conductivity experiments (13).

On the other hand,the direct addition of Lewis acid on the double bond (12,14) can fit our results:

$$
BC1_{3} + CH_{2} = C(CH_{3})_{2} \longrightarrow C1_{3}B^{6-} - CH_{2}C(CH_{3})_{2}
$$
  
(M) (C,M)

However,there is a competitive formation of an inactive complex :

$$
BCI_3 + M \xrightarrow{k_o} [BCI_3, M] \xrightarrow{k_1} {}^{Tic1_4, M_2}_{k_1} \xrightarrow{\delta^- \delta^+} {}^{Tic1_4, M_2}_{C1_3B M}
$$

Let <code>L</code> and <code>R $\degree$  be respectively the concentration in BCl $_2$  and in active</code> centers at time t: Assuming that initiation is very rapid and  $\mathbin{\mathbb{M}}_{\mathsf{b}}\mathbin{\bar{\gg}}\mathsf{C}_{\mathsf{o}}$ 

$$
-\frac{dC}{dt} = k_o [M][C] \qquad \sim k_o [M] \circ [C]
$$
 1

$$
-\frac{d}{dt}\frac{[c,m]}{dt} = k_1 [M] \circ [c,m] + k_2 [c,m] - k_0 [M] \circ [c] \quad \underline{2}
$$

$$
-\frac{d}{dt}\frac{[R^{\theta}]}{dt} = k_2 [c,m] - k_1 [R^{\theta} ]
$$

where  $k_t$  is the rate constantof termination reaction.

Combining and solving differential equations 1 to 3 leads to:

$$
[C,M] = A (e^{Bt} - e^{Dt})
$$
  
\n
$$
A = \frac{k_0 k_2 [M]_0 [C]_0}{k_1 [M]_0 + k_2 - k_0 [N]_0}
$$
  
\n
$$
B = -k_0 [M]_0
$$
  
\n
$$
D = - (k_1 [M]_0 + k_2)
$$

where

combination of  $3$  and  $4$  gives :

$$
\frac{d}{dt}\frac{\left[ R^{\theta}\right]}{R} + k_t R^{\theta} = A (e^{\beta t} - e^{Dt})
$$

solving 5 gives :

$$
\left[\begin{array}{cc}R^{\theta} \end{array}\right] = \frac{A}{B+k_t} e^{Bt} - \frac{A}{D+k_t} e^{Dt} + \left(\frac{A}{D+k_t} - \frac{A}{B+k_t}\right) e^{-k_t t} \stackrel{f}{=} 0
$$

Let  $k_{p}$ be the propagation rate constant :

$$
-\frac{d \left[ M \right]}{dt} = k_p \left[ R^{\theta} \right] \left[ M \right]
$$

combining  $6$  and  $7$  and integrating the differential relation gives :

$$
\text{Ln } \frac{\text{[M]}}{\text{[M]}} = k_p A \left( \frac{e^{Bt}}{B(B+k_t)} - \frac{e^{Dt}}{D(D+k_t)} + \frac{e^{-k_t t}}{k_t (B+k_t)} - \frac{e^{-k_t t}}{k_t (D+k_t)} \right)
$$
\n
$$
+ A \left( \frac{-1}{B(B+k_t)} + \frac{1}{D(D+k_t)} - \frac{1}{k_t (B+k_t)} + \frac{1}{k_t (D+k_t)} \right) \frac{8}{16}}
$$

Let $[M_{\infty}]$  be the monomer concentration at the end of the polymerization :

$$
\text{Ln } \frac{\left[\mathbf{M}\right]}{\left[\mathbf{M}\right]} = \mathbf{A} \frac{k_p}{k_t} \left[ \frac{\mathbf{D} + k_t}{\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{D} + k_t)} - \frac{\mathbf{B} + k_t}{\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{B} + k_t)} \right]
$$

As A is rroportional to Figure I.  $|C_{\varphi}^{\perp}| = |BCI_{3}|\circ$ , relation <u>9</u> fits the plot in



Figure 1 : Variation of Ln (conversion) against  $[BC1<sub>3</sub>]$  o

In experiment 9 where the water concentration is much higher than in experiments 3 and 4 the conversion is 65% but the molecular weight of the polymer is only 4100.This can be due to the high number of reactive sites and to termination involving water.

#### References.

- i- P.H. Plesch. The Chem. of Cat. Polym. Pergamon Press (1963)
- 2- D.H. Grattan and P.H. Plesch.,Makrom. Chem. 181,751,(1980)
- 3- M. Marek, J. Pecka and M. Maleska. 6è Intern. Symp. of Cat. Pol. Ghent p. 21 (1983)
- 4- F.R. Kalafov,F.M. Nasirov,N.E. Melnikova,B.A. Krentsel and T.N. Schakltakltinsky. Hakrom. Chem. Rap. Commun. 6,29,(1985)
- 5- J.P. Kennedy, S.Y. Huang, S.C. Feinberg. J. Pol. Sci. Pol. Chem. 15, 2801,(1977)
- 6- G. Champetier, M. Fontanille, A.C. Korn and P. Sigwalt. J. Pol. Sci. 58,911,(1962)
- 7- P. Sigwalt. Polym. J. 17,1,57,(1985)
- $8-X.Y.$  Pham. Thesis, Paris,  $(1973)$
- 9- P.H. Plesch,H. Polanyi and H.A. Skinner. J. Chem. Soc. 257,(1947)
- I0- P.J. Flory. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 65,372,(1943)
- 11- M. Mazure, These de Doctorat d'Etat, Paris, (1979)
- 12- G. Sauvet,J.P. Vairon and P. Sigwalt. J. Pol. Sci. Polym. Chem. Ed. 16,3047,(1978)
- 13- W.R. Longworthand P.H. Plesch. J. Chem. Soc.1887,(1959)
- 14- W.H. Hunter and R.V. Yohe. J. Am. Chem. Soc.  $55,1248,(1933)$
- 15- L. Bui, H.A. Nguyen and E. Marechal. to be published.
- 16- J.P. Kennedy,S.Y. Huang and S.C. Feinberg. J. Pol. Sci.,Pol. Chem. Ed.,15,2869,(1977)

Accepted January 15, 1987 C