# **THERMODYNAMIC PROPERTIES OF THE DISSOCIATION OF 2-MERCAPTOPYRIDINE, 2-MERCAPTOPYRIMIDINE AND 2-THIOBARBITURIC ACID**

### A IZQUIERDO, J L BELTRAN and J GUITERAS

*Department of Analytical Chemistry, Umversrty of Barcelona, Barcelona (Spam)*  (Received 13 July 1987)

#### ABSTRACT

The changes in free energy, enthalpy and entropy for the dissociation and neutralization of 2-mercaptopyndme, 2-mercaptopyrumdme and 2-thlobarbltunc acid have been determined at  $25^{\circ}$ C in aqueous potassium nitrate medium of 0 1 M ionic strength The changes in dissociation free energy were calculated from dissociation constants determined potentiometncally and refined usmg the program MINIGLASS The neutrahzatlon enthalpy changes were determined by direct thermometric titration, using linearization methods and the least-squares program MINITERM

#### INTRODUCTION

Pyrimidines are compounds of biological and industrial interest They have antithyroidal activity and frequently act as bactericides or fungicides They have also been used in vulcanization processes, as corrosion inhibitors and m emulsions for photothermographc processes

The dissociation constants of many pyridine and pyrimidine derivatives are found m the literature, but there 1s no concordance m the temperatures and lomc strengths at which they have been deternuned, which makes it lmposslble to compare the results However, the avalable data are sometimes affected by relatively high uncertainties, as is the case of the  $pK$  of 2-mercaptopynrmdme [l], or there may even be important differences between the values reported by several authors, as m the case of 2-thobarblturic acid [1,2] In order to use either the linearization methods or the program MINITERM to calculate the neutralization enthalpies, the dissociatlon constants must be exactly known, for this reason they were determmed by a potentiometric method, in the same experimental conditions

Dissociation free energies ( $\Delta G_d$ ) were calculated from the dissociation constants Neutralization enthalpies  $(\Delta H_n)$  were determined by thermometnc titration, using two calculation procedures the method of hnearlzatlon by linear regression, developed by Mongay et al [3], including a correction parameter to compensate for the thermal loss caused by the imperfect adiabatic properties of the titration cell [4] and the least-squares refinement program, MINITERM, developped by Cerdà et al [5] and written in **BASIC** 

From the free energies and enthalpies, the corresponding entropies were calculated

### EXPERIMENTAL

## *Apparatus*

*Potentiometric measurements* 

Radiometer pHM84 pH Meter, with a Radiometer G202B glass electrode and a Radiometer K401 saturated calomel electrode

Metrohm Multidisomat E415 automatic burette, with a 10 cm<sup>3</sup> cylinder Tectron S 473 100 circulation thermostat

Automatic titration assembly, composed of

Hewlett Packard 3421A Data acquisition unit

Hewlett Packard 9816 computer

Hewlett Packard 7475 plotter

## *Thermometric measurements*

The thermometric titration assembly, built in this department, has been described m previous papers [6,7]

Thermometric data were processed using a IBM PC

## *Reagents*

2-Mercaptopyridine (Fluka purum) was purified by recrystallization from benzene

2-Mercaptopynrmdme and 2-thobarbltunc acid (Fluka purum) were purified by recrystallization from water

1 M HCl, standardized against recrystallized sodium tetraborate decahydrate, and 1 M NaOH, standardized against potassium hydrogen phthalate, were used for thermometric titrations

Solutions of 0.01 M HNO<sub>3</sub>, at 0.1 M ionic strength (potassium nitrate), standardized against sodium tetraborate decahydrate, and 0 06 M KOH, at 0 1 M lomc strength (potassium nitrate), standardized agamst potassium hydrogen phthalate, were used for potentiometric titrations Carbonate-free potassium hydroxide solution was prepared by precipitating carbonate ions by the addition of an excess of barium hydroxide, filtering, and later passing the solution through a cation exchanger (Amberlite IRA-120,  $K^+$  form)

Potassium nitrate was also purified by recrystallization

All reagents were of analytical grade quality, and boiled bidistilled water was used throughout

## *Procedures*

## **Dissociation** constants

The dissociation constants of the compounds were determined by potentiometric titration [8] in a jacketed vessel, thermostated at  $25 \pm 0.1$  °C by circulating water Acidic solutions (T S ) containing nitric acid-ligand rmxtures were titrated with potassium hydroxide solution, and durmg the titration pure nitrogen [9] was bubbled through the solution to remove dissolved oxygen

The variation of free hydrogen ion concentration was measured using the cell calomel electrode / T S / glass electrode

The electrode system was calibrated m terms of hydrogen ion concentration by the Gran method [10]

In the experimental conditions used, the value found for  $pK_w$  was  $13\,782 + 0\,007$ 

In the study of dissociation equilibria, the data pairs  $(V_t, pH)$  were transformed to  $(\bar{J}, pH)$ , where  $\bar{J}$  is the average number of protons bound to each ligand molecule [11] as defined by the following equation

$$
\bar{J} = \frac{H_{\rm t} - (h - K_{\rm w}/h)}{L_{\rm t}} = \frac{h\beta_1 + 2h^2\beta_2}{1 + h\beta_1 + h^2\beta_2}
$$

where  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$  are overall protonation constants,  $H_t$  is the total concentration of dissociable  $H^+$ ,  $L_t$  is the total concentration of ligand and *h* is the free hydrogen ion concentration

From the values of  $(\bar{J}, pH)$ , the protonation curves of the ligands were obtained (Figs 1 and 2)

## $Neutralization$  *enthalpies*

The calorific capacity of the titration vessel was determined, using the method of chemical calibration. The neutralization of sodium hydroxide with hydrochloric acid, whose neutralization enthalpy is known at any temperature [12] was selected as a suitable calibration reaction Several ahquots of sodium hydroxide were placed in the titration vessel, potassium nitrate was added to obtain a  $0.1$  M final ionic strength and the solution was diluted to 40 cm<sup>3</sup> After allowing it to reach thermal stability, it was titrated with 1 M hydrochloric acid solution

The calorific capacity can be determined from the increment of temperature recorded at any point of the titration (usually the end-point) using the equation

$$
\Delta T = \frac{\Delta H_{\rm n} V_{\rm a} M}{C_{\rm c} + V_{\rm a}}
$$



Fig 1 Protonation curves for 2-mercaptopyrimidine (C<sub>1</sub>  $\Box$  = 7 107 mM,  $\Delta$  = 6 903 mM) and 2-mercaptopyndine  $(C_1 \ \diamondsuit = 8\,366 \, \text{mM}, \ \circlearrowright = 3\,718 \, \text{mM})$  Solid lines are calculated for  $pK_1 = 6933$  and 9648, respectively

where  $C_c$  is the initial calorific capacity,  $V_a$  is the volume of titrant,  $\Delta T$  is the recorded temperature increment,  $M$  is the concentration of titrant (in mol  $1^{-1}$ ) and  $\Delta H_n$  is the neutralization enthalpy of the reaction (in cal  $mol^{-1}$ )



Fig 2 Protonation curves of thiobarbituric acid (C<sub>1</sub>  $\Box$  = 7 634 mM,  $\Delta$  = 8 230 mM) Solid line is calculated for  $pK_1 = 2$  124 and  $pK_2 = 10$  405

When ths equation was used with the temperature increments recorded at several points of the same titration, the calculated initial calorific capacity increased as the titration proceeded This could be attributed to heat losses ongmated by imperfect adiabatic properties of the titration vessel In order to compensate for this effect, a least-squares heat-leak correction method was used, makmg use of the linear equation

$$
Y = a + bX
$$

where

$$
a=-C_{\rm c}-V_{\rm a}
$$

and

 $b = -K_n/k$ 

*X* and Y, expressed as

$$
Y = \frac{MV_a \Delta H_n}{\Delta T_i} \qquad X = \frac{\Delta V_a}{\Delta T_i} \sum \frac{\Delta T_i + \Delta T_{i-1}}{2}
$$

were calculated for several points of the titration  $k$ , the rate of titrant addition (ml min<sup>-1</sup>), is a constant and  $K_n$ , the heat-leak coefficient in Newton's law  $(dQ = -K_n dt(T_i - T_{ex}))$ , (which remained almost invariant durmg the titration)

An initial calorific capacity of  $45.4 \pm 0.2$  cal K<sup>-1</sup> (mean of five determinations) was obtained for an initial volume of  $40 \text{ cm}^3$ 

Neutralization enthalpies were determined by thermometric titration with 1 M NaOH of 40 cm<sup>3</sup> of approximately  $1.5 \times 10^{-2}$  M solutions (at 0.1 M lomc strength) of the three compounds studied

As 1s generally the case, the titration vessel was not perfectly adiabatic For this reason the equations developed by Mongay et al [3] for the determination of the enthalpy at several points of the titration, after compensating for the heat leak [4], were used

For 2-mercaptopyridine and 2-mercaptopyrimidine, weak monoprotic acids, experimental data were adjusted to the linear equation  $Y = a + bX$ , where

$$
Y = \frac{\Delta T_i (C_c + V_a)}{C_0 V_0 \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \beta h} - \frac{1}{1 + \beta_0 h_0} \right]}
$$

$$
X = \frac{\Delta V_a}{C_0 V_0 \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \beta h} - \frac{1}{1 + \beta_0 h_0} \right]} \sum \left[ \frac{\Delta T_i + \Delta T_{i-1}}{2} \right]
$$

where  $a = \Delta H_n$ ,  $b = -K_n/k$ ,  $\beta_0$  is the initial value of the protonation constant and  $h_0$  is the initial free hydrogen ion concentration

For 2-thiobarbituric acid, a diprotic acid, experimental data were adjusted to the equation  $Y = a + bX + cZ$ , where

$$
Y = \frac{\Delta T (C_{\rm c} + V_{\rm a}) - \left[ \frac{C_{\rm 0} V_{\rm 0} (2 + \beta_{01} h_{\rm 0})}{1 + \beta_{01} h_{\rm 0} + \beta_{02} h_{\rm 0}^2} - h (V_{\rm 0} + V_{\rm a}) + \frac{V_{\rm 0} K_{\rm w}}{h_{\rm 0}} \right] \Delta H_{\rm w}}{C_{\rm 0} V_{\rm 0} A}
$$
  
\n
$$
Z = \frac{\Delta V_{\rm a}}{A} \sum \left[ \frac{\Delta T_{\rm r} + \Delta T_{\rm r-1}}{2} \right]
$$
  
\n
$$
A = \frac{1 + \beta_{1} h}{1 + \beta_{1} h + \beta_{2} h^{2}} - \frac{1 + \beta_{01} h_{\rm 0}}{1 + \beta_{01} h_{\rm 0} + \beta_{02} h_{\rm 0}^{2}}
$$
  
\n
$$
B = \frac{1}{1 + \beta_{1} h + \beta_{2} h^{2}} - \frac{1}{1 + \beta_{01} h_{\rm 0} + \beta_{02} h_{\rm 0}^{2}}
$$

where  $a = \Delta H_{n_x}$ ,  $b = \Delta H_{n_y}$ ,  $c = -K_{n_x}$ 

Recently, the program MINITERM, for the refinement of enthalpie from data obtained in thermometric titrations, was published  $[5]$  This program was also used to process our data and the results were compared with those obtained by the methods of regression

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Approximate values of the protonation constants were obtained by comparison of the experimental protonation curves with a series of normalized curves [13], and then these values were refined using the program MINI-GLASS [14] in  $pK_a$  mode The function minimized by this program, U, was defined in terms of  $-\log[H^+]$ 

$$
U = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ -\log[\mathrm{H}^{+}]_{\exp_{i}} + \log[\mathrm{H}^{+}]_{\text{calc}_{i}} \right]^{2}
$$

The dissociation constants were calculated from the values obtained for the protonation constants, which are listed in Table 1

Neutralization enthalpies were calculated using the procedures previously mentioned Their values are also shown m Table 1 In Fig 3 typical enthalpograms are represented

It can be observed that for 2-mercaptopyndme and 2-mercaptopynrmdine, weak monoprotic acids with moderate  $pK$  values, both MINITERM and linear regression methods with heat-leak correction gave comparable results, although deviations were shghtly less using MINITERM For acids of ths kmd, the method of regression, which can be carried out with a relatively simple pocket calculator, IS a valid procedure

 $X = B/A$ 





<sup>a</sup> Linearization method <sup>b</sup> MINITERM results  $\Delta H$ , kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>

2-Thiobarbituric acid, however, is a diprotic acid with a low  $pK$  for its first dissociation and a very high  $pK$  for its second dissociation. This means a high enthalpy for the first neutralization and a low one, much affected by heat leakage ongmated by imperfect adiabatic character, for the second neutralization. In this case, results obtained using MINITERM differed from those obtained by the method of regression, and they had lower deviations The results offered by MINITERM were in better agreement with those that could be expected from the dissociation constants and the recorded enthalpograms.

From the data of Table 1, free energies, enthalpies and entropies of neutralization, dissociation and protonation were calculated, taking into account the followmg relations Dissociation

$$
\text{HA} \rightleftarrows \text{H}^+ + \text{A}^- \qquad K_d = \frac{\left[\text{H}^+\right]\left[\text{A}^-\right]}{\left[\text{HA}\right]} \qquad \Delta G_d, \ \Delta H_d, \ \Delta S_d
$$



Fig  $\overline{3}$  Sample thermometric titrations of A, 2-thiobarbituric acid, B, 2-mercaptopyrimidine, C, 2-mercaptopyndme

TABLE 2

Compound	$pK_{A}$		$\Delta G_{\rm d}$ $\Delta H_{\rm d}$ $\Delta S_{\rm d}$	$pK_{n}$	$\Delta G_{\alpha}$	$\Delta H$ .	$\Delta S_{\rm c}$
2-Mercaptopyrimidine				$6948$ 948 512 -146 -6834	$-9.32$	$-785$	49
2-Mercaptopyridine			$9633$ 1314 845 -157	$-4149$		$-566 - 452$	38
2-Thiobarbituric acid	2 1 2 4			$290$ 057 $-78$ $-11658$ $-1590$ $-124$			11.7
				$10\,405$ 14 19 9 67 $-15\,2$ $-3\,377$ $-4\,61$ $-3\,3$			44

Units  $\Delta G$  and  $\Delta H$ , kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>,  $\Delta S$ , cal (K mol)<sup>-1</sup>

**Neutrallzatlon** 

$$
HA + OH^{-} \rightleftharpoons A^{-} + H_{2}O \qquad K_{n} = \frac{[A^{-}]}{[HA][OH^{-}]} = \frac{K_{d}}{K_{w}}
$$
  
\n
$$
\Delta G_{n} = \Delta G_{d} + \Delta G_{w} \qquad \Delta H_{n} = \Delta H_{d} + \Delta H_{w} \qquad \Delta S_{n} = \Delta S_{d} + \Delta S_{w}
$$
  
\nProtonation  
\n
$$
A^{-} + H^{+} \rightleftharpoons HA
$$

$$
K_{\rm p} = \frac{[\text{HA}]}{[\text{A}^-][\text{H}^+]} = \frac{1}{K_{\rm d}} \qquad K_{\rm p_1} = \beta_1 \qquad K_{\rm p_2} = \beta_2/\beta_1
$$

$$
\Delta G_{\rm p} = -\Delta G_{\rm d} \qquad \Delta H_{\rm p} = -\Delta H_{\rm d} \qquad \Delta S_{\rm p} = -\Delta S_{\rm d}
$$

In Table 2 the values of neutralization and dissociation free energies, enthalpies and entropies are shown. The change in entropy for the second neutralization of 2-thiobarbitunc acid is higher than could be expected considering the value of its  $pK$  and the changes in entropies for the other compounds This can probably be attributed to the uncertainty in the determination of its neutralization enthalpy

#### **REFERENCES**

- 1 B Stanovmk and M Tlsler, Arznemnttel Forschung, 14 (1964) 1004
- 2 B R Singh, R K Jain, M K Jain and R Gosh, Thermochim Acta, 78 (1984) 175
- 3 C Mongay, M C Garcia and G Rarms, Thermochnn Acta, 98 (1986) 213
- 4 G Rants, R Ibinez, M C Garcia and C Mongay, Tbermochm Acta, 98 (1986) 213
- 5 V Cerdà, J M Estela and R Jara, Thermochim Acta, 87 (1985) 13
- 6 J Lumblarres, C Mongay and V Cerdi, Analusls, 8 (1980) 62
- 7 A Izquierdo, J Carrasco and R Arenós, Thermochim Acta, 113 (1987) 257
- 8 F J C Rossotti and H S Rossotti, The Determination of Stability Constants, Chapman & Hall, New York, 1961
- 9 L Meltes, Polarographlc Techmques, Wiley, New York, 1965
- 10 G Gran, Analyst, 77 (1952) 661
- 11 J Bjerrum, Metal Ammme Formation m Aqueous Solution, Haase, Copenhagen, 1941
- 12 I Grenthe, H Ots and O Ginstrup, Acta Chem Scand, Ser A, 24 (1970) 1067
- 13 L G Sillén, Acta Chem Scand, Ser A, 10 (1956) 186
- 14 A Izquierdo and J L Beltrán, Anal Chim Acta, 181 (1986) 87