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The mechanism of the reaction of 1,3-dipolar compounds such as ozone is a matter of considerable current interest and controversy. ${ }^{3}$ For the cycloaddition of such substances with unsaturated compounds, arguments have been advanced for a concerted mechanism ${ }^{3}$ and also for one that involves diradical intermediates. ${ }^{3}$ We here report evidence on the mechanism of one reaction of a related type, the reaction of ozone with tert-butyl hydroperoxide, a reaction that formally involves the insertion of ozone into an $0-H$ bond. The formal insertion of ozone into $C-H$ bonds is known, and both concerted and radical mechanisms have been proposed. ${ }^{4}$

The reaction of ozone with organic hydroperoxides is known ultimately to produce free radicals. ${ }^{5}$ We have examined the reaction of ozone with tert-butyl hydroperoxide (TOOH) at -60 to $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in scveral solvents. When the reaction is nearly complete, the products (by glpc) consist of $78 \%$ tert-buty1 alcohol (TOH); $6 \%$ di-tert-butyl peroxide (TOOT); $4 \%$ acetone, and $8 \%$ recovered TOOH. At $50 \%$ reaction, 42 mmoles of ozone are consumed per 100 mmoles of TOOH used. ${ }^{2}$ We have studied the kinetics of the reaction in $\mathrm{CFCl}_{3}$ at $-4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, using pre-prepared solutions of ozone, mixing in the TOOH at time zero, and following the disappearance of the UV band of ozone at $267 \mathrm{~nm}(\varepsilon=2420)$ with time. (Ozone is generally about $4 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}$ and is the limiting reagent.) The products can be rationalized ${ }^{2,5}$ by steps $1-4$. However, this simple scheme predicts

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{TOOH}+\mathrm{O}_{3} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{i}}} \mathrm{TOO}+\mathrm{HO} \cdot+\mathrm{O}_{2}  \tag{1a}\\
& \mathrm{HO} \cdot+\mathrm{TOOH} \xrightarrow{\text { fast }} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\mathrm{TOO} .  \tag{1b}\\
& 2 \mathrm{TOO} \cdot \xrightarrow{\mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{t}}}\left[\mathrm{TO}_{4} \mathrm{~T}\right] \xrightarrow{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{a}}}\left[2 \mathrm{TO} \cdot+\mathrm{O}_{2}\right] \xrightarrow[(1-\mathrm{f})]{\mathrm{f}} \mathrm{TOOT}+\mathrm{O}_{2}  \tag{2a}\\
& \mathrm{TO} \cdot+\mathrm{TOOH} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{P}}} \mathrm{TOH}+\mathrm{TOO}  \tag{2b}\\
& \mathrm{TO} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}}} \xrightarrow{\text { acetone }+\mathrm{CH}_{3} .} \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

that the yield of TOOT should equal the amount of $0_{3}$ used (since eq $2 a$ terminates two radicals and eq la forms two). Since our products show a much lower relative yield of TOOT, eq 5 also must be added to the kinetic scheme.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{TOO}+\mathrm{o}_{3} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{x}}} \mathrm{TO}+2 \mathrm{O}_{2} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Acetone clearly arises from $\beta$-scission of tert-butoxy radicals (eq 4), demonstrating the radical nature of the reaction. Nevertheless, we have measured the competition between $\beta$-scission to give acetone (eq 4) and hydrogen abstraction from an added hydrogen donor QH (eq 6).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{TO}+\mathrm{QH} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{H}}} \mathrm{TOH}+\mathrm{Q} \cdot \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have used cyclohexane as the hydrogen donor in acetonitrile solvent at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Figure 1 shows a plot of the product ratio versus cyclohexane concentration, the slope of which equals $k_{H} / k_{\beta}$. As can be seen, our data yield 91 for this ratio, in good agreement with the literature value of $82 .{ }^{6}$ Thus, tert-butoxy radicals are involved in the production of both acetone and tertbutyl alcohol.

When the $T O O H$ concentration is relatively high, eq 3 is faster than eq 4 , and the acetone yields are very low. Thus, in $\mathrm{CFCl}_{3}$ at $-4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the acetone yield is $<1 \%$ at $50 \%$ reaction. Under these conditions, eq 4 can be neglected, and a steady state analysis of eqs $1,2,3$, and 5 gives eq 7. Equation 7 can be rearranged and plotted (using initial rates and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Rate}\left(-\mathrm{O}_{3}\right)=k_{i}[\mathrm{TOOH}]\left[\mathrm{O}_{3}\right]+k_{x}\left(\frac{k_{i}}{k_{t}}\right)^{0.5}[\mathrm{TOOH}]^{0.5}\left[\mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{1.5} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 1. A plot of relative yields of $\mathrm{TOH} / \mathrm{acetone}$ versus the concentration of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{12}$ as hydrogen donor. The slope equals $k_{H} / k_{B}$.


Figure 2. A plot of eq 7. The slope equals $k_{i}$, and values of this rate constant for both TOOH and the deuterated analogue, TOOD, are shown.
initial or average concentrations) as Rate/ $\left[\mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{4.5}[\mathrm{TOOH}]^{0.5}$ versus $[\mathrm{TOOH}]^{0.5} /\left[\mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{0.5}$; the slope of this plot equals $k_{i}$. (See Figure 2.) For $T 00 H$, this plot yields $k_{i}=5.4 \mathrm{sec}^{-1} \mathrm{M}^{-1}$; for tert-butyl hydroperoxide- $\mathrm{d}_{1}$ (TOOD), $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{i}}$ is obtained as $1.9 \mathrm{sec}^{-1} \mathrm{M}^{-1}$. Thus, $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{H}} / \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{D}}=2.8$ for step la. The intercept of these plots is equal to $k_{x}\left(k_{i} / k_{t}\right)^{0.5}$, from which approximate values of $k_{x}$ can be obtained. (The value of $2 k_{t}=74 \sec ^{-1} M^{-1}$ at $-4^{\circ} .{ }^{7}$ ) This treatment gives $k_{x} \simeq$ $25 \pm 8$ for both TOOH and TOOH , as shown in Figure 2.

This full analysis was done only at $-4^{\circ}$. However, approximate second order rate constants were obtained at $20^{\circ}$ and $-23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ by assuming eqs $1-3$ describe the system and plotting $1 n$ ( $0_{3}$ ) versus time. These plots are quite precise. (A similar technique has been used by Cvetanovic. ${ }^{8}$ ) Using rates obtained in this way, $E_{a}=7 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mole}$.

Several mechanisms can be envisioned for eq la. The first, and perhaps the one that might be regarded as most likely from the cycloaddition literature, is a concerted dipolar insertion. MECHANISM I: CONCERTED INSERTION.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{TOO}-\mathrm{H}+\delta+_{0=0-0}^{\delta-} \xrightarrow{\Delta \mathrm{H} \simeq 25} \underset{\text { Intermediate }}{\left[\mathrm{TO}_{5} \mathrm{H}\right]} \xrightarrow{\Delta \mathrm{H} \simeq-11} \mathrm{TOO}+\mathrm{O}_{2}+\mathrm{HO} \cdot \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this mechanism, tert-butyl hydropentoxide, $\mathrm{TO}_{5} \mathrm{H}$, is produced as a transient intermediate that subsequently undergoes homolysis. ${ }^{9 a}$ Using Benson's group additivity terms, ${ }^{9 b}$ however, the heats of the two steps in Mechanism I can be calculated to be the values shown in eq 8. Thus, the low value of the activation energy convincingly excludes the possibility of the endothermic penta-oxy compound being involved as an intermediate, and the insertion mechanism can be eliminated.

The second mechanism that might be envisioned is an electron transfer. This mechanism is MECHANISM II: ELECTRON-TRANSFER.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{TOOH}+\mathrm{O}_{3} \xrightarrow[\substack{\text { electron } \\ \text { transfer }}]{\text { slow }} \mathrm{TOOH}^{+}+\mathrm{O}_{3}-\underset{\substack{\text { proton } \\ \text { transfer }}}{\text { fast }} \mathrm{TOO}+\mathrm{HO} \cdot+\mathrm{O}_{2} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

excluded by the isotope effect, $k_{H} / k_{D}=2.8$. It also is inherently improbable since the difference in the electron affinity of ozone and ionization potential of $T O O H$ is over $8 \mathrm{eV} .{ }^{10}$

The mechanism we favor is a molecule-assisted homolysis (MAH) step ${ }^{11}$ that can be formulated MECHANISM III: MOLECULE-ASSISTED HOMOLYSIS.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{TOOH}+\mathrm{O}_{3} \xrightarrow{\Delta \mathrm{H} \simeq 29} \mathrm{TOO}+\mathrm{HO}_{3} . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

as in eq 10. (Since the decomposition of $\mathrm{HO}_{3} \cdot$ is exothermic, eq 11 is more endothermic than 10 and can be excluded.) The heat of reaction 10 is $14 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mole} .{ }^{12}$ Thus, the $E_{a}$ of the first, non-chain term in eq 7 would be expected to be approximately $14 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mole}$, whereas that of the second chain term would be: $5+14 / 2-6 / 2=9 \mathrm{kcal} /$ mole. Thus, this mechanism predicts an observed $E_{a}$ between 9 and $14 \mathrm{kcal/mole}$, depending on the kinetic chain lengths, in reasonable agreement with the observed value of $7 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mole}$. (All these values are probably $\pm 2 \mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mole}$.)

MAH reactions have been identified in a number of systems and have been the subject of a number of recent reports and reviews. ${ }^{11}$ In several examples, a hydrogen atom is postulated to be transferred, usually to an olefin as the acceptor molecule, ${ }^{11 d}$ but in few cases is the evidence completely compelling. ${ }^{11 e^{-h}}$ However, the reaction of $0_{3}$ with $T O O H$ does appear to involve an MAH reaction in which a hydrogen atom is transferred in the radical-producing step. ${ }^{12}$
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