



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

This is an author version of the contribution published on:

Questa è la versione dell'autore dell'opera:

B. Sur, M. Rolle, C. Minero, V. Maurino, D. Vione, M. Brigante, G. Mailhot. Formation of Hydroxyl Radicals by Irradiated 1-Nitronaphthalene (1NN): Oxidation of Hydroxyl Ions and Water by the 1NN Triplet State. *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.* **2011**, *10*, 1817-1824.

DOI: 10.1039/c1pp05216k

The definitive version is available at:

La versione definitiva è disponibile alla URL:

<http://www.rsc.org/pps>

Formation of hydroxyl radicals by irradiated 1-nitronaphthalene (1NN): oxidation of hydroxyl ions and water by the 1NN triplet state

Babita Sur,^{a,b} Maura Rolle,^a Claudio Minero,^a Valter Maurino,^a Davide Vione,^{a,c,*} Marcello Brigante,^{d,e,*} Gilles Mailhot^{d,e}

5
The excited triplet state of 1-nitronaphthalene (³1NN*) reacts with OH⁻ with a second-order reaction rate constant of (1.66±0.08)·10⁷ M⁻¹ s⁻¹ (μ±σ). The reaction yields the •OH radical and the radical anion 1NN^{-•}. In aerated solution, the radical 1NN^{-•} would react with O₂ to finally produce H₂O₂ upon hydroperoxide/superoxide disproportionation. The photolysis of H₂O₂ is another potential source of •OH, but such a pathway would be a minor one in circumneutral (pH 6.5) or in basic solution ([OH⁻] = 0.3-0.5 M). The oxidation of H₂O by ³1NN*, with rate constant 3.8±0.3 M⁻¹ s⁻¹, could be the main •OH source at pH 6.5.





Introduction

15 Photochemical reactions are important pathways for the transformation of naturally occurring compounds and of man-made xenobiotics in surface and atmospheric waters. The photoinduced transformation of a dissolved molecule can take place by direct photolysis or indirect photochemistry. The latter involves reaction with transient species, produced upon irradiation of sunlight-absorbing molecules called photosensitisers.¹⁻⁶ In surface waters, the main photosensitisers are chromophoric dissolved organic matter (CDOM), nitrite, nitrate and, probably to a lesser extent, Fe species.⁷⁻¹³ Nitrite is also a well known photosensitiser in fog, rain and dew water.^{14,15} A recent study has shown that sunlight-absorbing organic compounds in rainwater have a very low to nil photoactivity, thus behaving in a very different way than surface-water CDOM.¹⁶

20 The main transient species that are produced by the photosensitisers upon sunlight absorption are hydroxyl (•OH) and carbonate (CO₃^{-•}) radicals, singlet oxygen (¹O₂) and the excited triplet states of CDOM (³CDOM*).¹⁷ CDOM is by far the main photosensitiser in surface waters: it is the only source of ¹O₂ and ³CDOM*^{18,19} and is usually the main source of •OH.^{20,21} Despite the major role of CDOM as •OH producer in surface waters, the exact pathways of this process are still unknown. Several hypotheses have been formulated, including the •OH generation *via* formation of H₂O₂ by irradiated CDOM.^{22,23} Photogenerated hydrogen peroxide could take part in Fenton and Fenton-like processes in the presence of Fe species^{24,25} or undergo photolysis to yield •OH.¹⁷ A recent study has shown that H₂O₂ may be involved in the photochemical production of •OH by humic and fulvic acids under irradiation, but such a pathway would not be the only one and not even the most important.²⁶

25 An alternative hypothesis for CDOM-mediated •OH production could be the oxidation of water and/or OH⁻ by ³CDOM*, but limited evidence is presently available of the possibility of such a process. There is more evidence of the ability of the excited triplet states to simulate the •OH reactivity, by inducing the hydroxylation of •OH probe molecules.²⁷ For instance, the triplet state of anthraquinone-2-

30 sulphonate (AQ2S) is thermodynamically unable to oxidise water to •OH,^{28,29} but it simulates the hydroxyl radical reactivity in the presence of otherwise effective •OH probe molecules such as benzene and terephthalic acid.^{30,31} However, it is known that the excited triplet state of 1-nitronaphthalene, ³1NN*, is able to react with OH⁻.³² Many features of such a reaction, studied by laser flash photolysis (LFP), are compatible with the formation of •OH.³³ Recent evidence has been provided that irradiated 1NN yields •OH, but the exact reaction pathway is still unknown.³⁴ Oxidation of H₂O/OH⁻ by ³1NN* is a possibility, but an alternative pathway could involve generation of H₂O₂ followed by its photolysis (in the following reaction scheme, S is a dissolved substrate and ISC = inter-system crossing):³²⁻³⁷



80 The two alternative pathways for •OH production by irradiated 1NN (H₂O/OH⁻ oxidation by ³1NN* or H₂O₂ generation and photolysis) have a very interesting parallelism with the processes under debate for the photochemical generation of •OH by CDOM.²⁶ Therefore, 1NN under irradiation could be a very useful model system to understand the pathways of •OH production by organic matter in surface waters. The goal of the present study is the elucidation of the processes involved in •OH formation by irradiated 1NN. This implies a study of the reaction between ³1NN* and OH⁻, as well as the assessment of H₂O₂ photoproduction by 1NN under irradiation.

85 The formation of •OH by irradiated 1NN has been demonstrated by use as probe reactions of both benzene and terephthalic acid hydroxylation (to phenol and 2-hydroxyterephthalic acid, respectively).³⁴ Such processes can be suitable for the assessment of •OH photoproduction by 1NN at circumneutral pH, but they would not be recommended to study reactions that occur in the presence of OH⁻ in basic solution. Phenol has $pK_a = 10$ ³⁸ and, therefore,

its yield from benzene and/or its stability in aqueous solution could be modified at basic pH. As far as terephthalic acid is concerned, we have recently found that its yield of hydroxylation has a significant pH dependence³¹ that could bias the interpretation of the experimental results of the present study. The transformation of nitrobenzene (NB) is not selective enough as probe reaction for $\bullet\text{OH}$ generation in surface waters,^{30,39} but it can satisfactorily be exploited in simplified laboratory solutions where the probability of interfering processes is much lower.⁴⁰ Moreover, NB transformation has been found to undergo interference by the AQ2S triplet state to a lesser extent than the hydroxylation of benzene.³⁰ For these reasons, coupled with the fact that it does not take part to acid-base equilibria, NB was chosen as $\bullet\text{OH}$ probe molecule under basic conditions after a preliminary control of the absence of interference by ³1NN*.

In contrast, the hydroxylation of benzene to phenol was adopted as $\bullet\text{OH}$ probe reaction under circumneutral conditions. Under such circumstances the production rate of $\bullet\text{OH}$ is fairly low (*vide infra*) and the transformation of a primary compound (NB) would not be sensitive enough. Indeed, low $\bullet\text{OH}$ formation rates require a low initial NB concentration for the detection, otherwise a too limited fraction of NB would be transformed. However, low NB gives detection problems and does not ensure scavenging of the majority of photoproduced $\bullet\text{OH}$. A high initial NB concentration would scavenge the majority of $\bullet\text{OH}$, but the reaction would produce a very limited percentage transformation of NB. The variation of NB concentration with time would thus be comparable to or even lower than the analytical reproducibility, preventing a proper measurement of $\bullet\text{OH}$ formation. In contrast, benzene at relatively high concentration can be used to detect $\bullet\text{OH}$ when the formation rate of the latter is low. Under such conditions there would be formation of low but still detectable amounts of phenol.²⁰

Experimental

Reagents and materials

1-Nitronaphthalene (1NN, purity grade 99%), nitrobenzene (>99%), methanol (gradient grade), NaOH (99%) and phenol (>99%) were purchased from Aldrich, 2-propanol (LiChrosolv gradient grade), benzene (for gas chromatography) and H_3PO_4 (85%) from VWR Int. All reagents were used as received, without further purification.

Irradiation experiments

Irradiation was carried out under a set of five 40 W Philips TL K05 UVA lamps, with emission maximum at 365 nm. The lamp irradiance between 300 and 400 nm was $20 \pm 1 \text{ W m}^{-2}$, measured with a CO.FO.ME.GRA. (Milan, Italy) power meter. The samples (5 mL total volume) were placed into cylindrical Pyrex glass cells (4.0 cm diameter, 2.3 cm height) closed with a lateral screw cap, and were magnetically stirred during irradiation. The incident radiation reached the cells mainly from the top, and the optical path length of the solution was $b = 0.4 \text{ cm}$. The incident photon flux in solution

was actinometrically determined using the ferrioxalate method. The absorption spectrum of $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_2\text{O}_4)_3^{3-}$ and the variation with wavelength of the quantum yield of Fe^{2+} generation were taken into account.⁴¹ If one knows, as a function of the wavelength, the fraction of radiation absorbed by $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_2\text{O}_4)_3^{3-}$, the quantum yield of Fe^{2+} photoproduction and the shape of the lamp spectrum (*vide infra*), it is possible to use the measured formation rate of Fe^{2+} to fix the value of the incident spectral photon flux density $p^\circ(\lambda)$. The photon flux $P_o = \int_{\lambda} p^\circ(\lambda) d\lambda$ was $1.6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Einstein L}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. The

irradiation temperature was around 305 K. Figure 1 reports the emission spectrum of the adopted lamps, measured with an Ocean Optics SD 2000 CCD spectrophotometer and normalised to the actinometry results, as well as the absorption spectrum of 1NN, taken with a Varian Cary 100 Scan UV-Vis spectrophotometer.




Figure 1. Spectral photon flux density $p^\circ(\lambda)$ of the adopted UVA lamp. Molar absorption coefficient ϵ of 1NN.

Analytical determinations

After irradiation the solutions were allowed to cool for 10-15 min under refrigeration, to minimise the volatilisation of 1NN and, when applicable, that of benzene. Analysis was then carried out by High Performance Liquid Chromatography coupled with UV-Vis detection (HPLC-UV). The adopted Merck-Hitachi instrument was equipped with AS2000A autosampler (100 μL sample volume), L-6200 and L-6000 pumps for high-pressure gradients, Merck LiChrocart RP-C18 column packed with LiChrospher 100 RP-18 (125 mm \times 4.6 mm \times 5 μm), and L-4200 UV-Vis detector (detection wavelength 220 nm). In the case of 1NN alone and of 1NN + NB, isocratic elution was carried out with 60:40 CH_3OH :aqueous H_3PO_4 (pH 2.8) at 1.0 mL min^{-1} flow rate. In the case of 1NN + benzene, the eluent was a 50:50 mixture of the already cited components. The retention times were (min): phenol (2.9), benzene (8.9), NB (4.0), 1NN (11.1 or 24.7). The column dead time was 0.90 min.

Kinetic treatment of the data

The time evolution data of NB were fitted with pseudo-first order equations of the form $C_t = C_o \exp(-k t)$, where C_t is the concentration of NB at the time t , C_o its initial concentration, and k the pseudo-first order degradation rate constant. The initial transformation rate of NB is $Rate_{NB} = k C_o$. The time evolution of phenol (formed from benzene + $\bullet\text{OH}$) was fitted with $C_t = k_p^f C_o (k_p^d - k_B^d)^{-1} [\exp(-k_B^d t) - \exp(-k_p^d t)]$, where C_t is the concentration of phenol at the time t , C_o the initial concentration of benzene, k_p^f and k_p^d the pseudo-first order formation and transformation rate constants of phenol, respectively, and k_B^d the pseudo-first order transformation rate constant of benzene. The initial formation rate of phenol is $Rate_p = k_p^f C_o$. The reported errors on the rates were derived from the scattering of the experimental data around each fitting curve and represent $\mu \pm \sigma$. The reproducibility of repeated runs was around 10-15%.

Laser flash photolysis experiments

A Nd:YAG laser system instrument (Quanta Ray GCR 130-01) operated at 355 nm (third harmonic) with typical energies of 60 mJ (the single pulse was ~ 9 ns in duration) was used to study the reactions involving the excited state of 1NN ($^3\text{1NN}^*$). Individual cuvette samples (3 mL volume) were used for a maximum of two consecutive laser shots. The transient absorbance at the pre-selected wavelength was monitored by a detection system consisting of a pulsed xenon lamp (150 W), monochromator and a photomultiplier (1P28). A spectrometer control unit was used for synchronising the pulsed light source and programmable shutters with the laser output. The signal from the photomultiplier was digitised by a programmable digital oscilloscope (HP54522A). A 32 bits RISC-processor kinetic spectrometer workstation was used to analyse the digitised signal.

Solutions of 1NN and, when relevant, NaOH, 2-propanol and NB were prepared in Milli-Q water and their stability was regularly checked by means of UV spectroscopy. The decay of the triplet state of 1NN ($^3\text{1NN}^*$) and the formation of the radical anion ($1\text{NN}^{\bullet-}$) were monitored at 620 and 380 nm, respectively. The pseudo-first order decay and growth constants were obtained by fitting the absorbance vs. time data with single or double exponential equations. The error was calculated from the fit of the experimental data. All the experiments were performed at ambient temperature (295 ± 2 K) in aerated solution.

Results and discussion

Laser flash photolysis experiments

In a first series of experiments it was studied the reactivity between $^3\text{1NN}^*$, monitored at 620 nm, and the OH^- ion. Figure 2 shows the time evolution of the $^3\text{1NN}^*$ spectral traces as a function of the concentration of added NaOH, while the pseudo-first order rate constants of $^3\text{1NN}^*$ vs. NaOH concentration are reported in Figure 3.




Figure 2. Decay of $^3\text{1NN}^*$ (monitored at 620 nm) as a function of NaOH concentration. The traces were obtained upon LFP (355 nm) excitation of 1NN (0.1 mM) (full circles), with addition of 0.1 mM NaOH (open circles) or 0.3 mM NaOH (full triangles).




Figure 3. Pseudo-first order degradation rate constant of $^3\text{1NN}^*$, produced upon irradiation of 0.1 mM 1NN, as a function of the concentration of added NaOH. Laser pulse: 60 mJ, 355 nm, aerated solution. Error bars derived at the 3σ level simply from the scattering of the experimental data. Regression line is dashed, 95% confidence bands are dotted.

The slope of the regression line shown in Figure 3 gives the second-order reaction rate constant between $^3\text{1NN}^*$ and OH^- , which is $k_{^3\text{1NN}^*,\text{OH}^-} = (1.66 \pm 0.08) \cdot 10^7 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ($\mu \pm \sigma$). Considering that $^3\text{1NN}^*$ usually behaves as a single-electron oxidant,³² it is likely that its reaction with OH^- yields $\bullet\text{OH}$ and the radical anion of 1NN, $1\text{NN}^{\bullet-}$. The formation of $1\text{NN}^{\bullet-}$ is supported by the detection of a signal at 380 nm, which is the well-known absorption maximum of the radical anion.³²⁻³⁴ However, demonstrating the actual formation of $\bullet\text{OH}$ by $^3\text{1NN}^* + \text{OH}^-$ requires more direct evidence, which was obtained from steady irradiation experiments (*vide infra*).

The reactivity between $^3\text{1NN}^*$ and 2-propanol was also studied, considering that the alcohol can be a useful $\bullet\text{OH}$ scavenger in steady irradiation experiments. Figure 4 reports the pseudo-first order degradation rate constant of $^3\text{1NN}^*$ as a function of 2-propanol concentration. From the fit line one

gets a second-order rate constant $k_{3\text{INN}^*, 2\text{-propanol}} = (4.2 \pm 2.2) \cdot 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. 2-Propanol up to 1.0 M concentration is not able to behave as an effective scavenger of $^3\text{INN}^*$. Therefore, the addition of the alcohol to an irradiated system would cause significant scavenging of $\cdot\text{OH}$ but not of $^3\text{INN}^*$.

Lack of significant reactivity was found between $^3\text{INN}^*$ and NB, the latter adopted up to 0.6 mM initial concentration. This means that NB is not expected to undergo transformation upon reaction with $^3\text{INN}^*$, which would allow the use of NB as a selective $\cdot\text{OH}$ probe in the presence of irradiated INN.




Figure 4. Pseudo-first order degradation rate constant of $^3\text{INN}^*$ as a function of the concentration of 2-propanol. Laser pulse: 60 mJ, 355 nm, pH 6.5, aerated solution. Error bars derived at the 3σ level simply from the scattering of the experimental data. Regression line is dashed, 95% confidence bands are dotted.

Steady irradiation experiments

Effect of 2-propanol on the direct photodegradation of INN

Figure 5 reports the initial transformation rates of 0.1 mM INN upon UVA irradiation at the natural pH (6.5), as a function of the concentration of added 2-propanol.




Figure 5. Initial transformation rates of 0.1 mM INN as a function of the concentration of 2-propanol. UVA irradiation, pH 6.5, aerated solution. The insert shows the rate trend for 2-propanol concentration values up to 0.3 mM. The dashed curve is the fit of the experimental data with $\text{Rate}_{\text{INN}} = R_{\text{INN}, \cdot\text{OH}}(\text{equation 7}) + c$.

The INN rate data have a double trend, with a very marked initial decrease of the rate for relatively low alcohol concentrations, followed by a further but less steep decrease above 0.1 M 2-propanol. Considering that the alcohol is an effective $\cdot\text{OH}$ scavenger but that it does not react with $^3\text{INN}^*$, as is shown by laser flash photolysis data, a likely explanation is that the transformation of INN upon UVA irradiation follows two pathways:

(i) A minor pathway (< 15%) could be the reaction between INN and $\cdot\text{OH}$, photogenerated by $^3\text{INN}^*$. In such a case there would be competition between 2-propanol and INN for reaction with $\cdot\text{OH}$. Although the reaction rate constant between INN and $\cdot\text{OH}$ in aqueous solution is not known, it is reasonable that 2-propanol at mM levels is able to effectively inhibit reaction between 0.1 mM INN and $\cdot\text{OH}$. If this hypothesis is correct, the data reported in the insert of Figure 5 allow the determination of the reaction rate constant between INN and $\cdot\text{OH}$, $k_{\cdot\text{OH}, \text{INN}}$. Assume $k_{\cdot\text{OH}, 2\text{-prop}} = 1.9 \cdot 10^9 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ as the second-order reaction rate constant between 2-propanol and $\cdot\text{OH}$,⁴² and $R_{\cdot\text{OH}}$ as the formation rate of $\cdot\text{OH}$. The rate of INN transformation because of reaction with $\cdot\text{OH}$, $R_{\text{INN}, \cdot\text{OH}}$ is given by $R_{\cdot\text{OH}}$ times the fraction of $\cdot\text{OH}$ that reacts with INN, in competition with 2-propanol. Therefore, one obtains:

$$R_{\text{INN}, \cdot\text{OH}} = \frac{R_{\cdot\text{OH}} k_{\cdot\text{OH}, \text{INN}} [\text{INN}]}{k_{\cdot\text{OH}, \text{INN}} [\text{INN}] + k_{\cdot\text{OH}, 2\text{-prop}} [2\text{-propanol}]} \quad (7)$$

In addition to reaction with $\cdot\text{OH}$, INN also undergoes other transformation processes (possibly linked with $^3\text{INN}^*$ evolution) that would account for the plateau reached by Rate_{INN} , as reported in the insert of Figure 5. One thus obtains $\text{Rate}_{\text{INN}} = R_{\text{INN}, \cdot\text{OH}} + c$. The fit of the experimental data with the latter equation (with $R_{\text{INN}, \cdot\text{OH}}$ described by equation 7) yielded $k_{\cdot\text{OH}, \text{INN}} = (8.25 \pm 0.38) \cdot 10^7 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$.

(ii) The main pathway of INN transformation would involve $^3\text{INN}^*$, which could e.g. be able to oxidise ground-state INN, in analogy with results concerning the photochemistry of anthraquinone-2-sulphonate.²⁸ Figure 4 suggests that 2-propanol at the studied concentration values is not expected to scavenge $^3\text{INN}^*$ to a significant extent, but some secondary reactivity could involve the radical species that are formed upon reaction between 2-propanol and $\cdot\text{OH}$. A possibility could be the recombination between oxidised 2-propanol and INN^{\cdot} , which would yield back 2-propanol and INN and decrease the rate of INN transformation. An additional possibility could be the oxidation of 2-propanol radical species by oxidised INN, which would probably yield back INN (thereby lowering its transformation rate) together with acetone.⁴³ The latter compound was actually detected upon irradiation of INN and 2-propanol (data not shown), by adopting a pre-column derivatisation reaction with 2,4-dinitrophenylhydrazine followed by HPLC-UV analysis.⁴³

Photodegradation of NB induced by INN under irradiation in the presence of NaOH

NB was used as $\cdot\text{OH}$ probe in basic solution. Absence of direct NB photolysis under the adopted irradiation conditions

was preliminary checked and confirmed. Table 1 reports the initial transformation rate of 0.01 mM NB (R_{NB}) upon UVA irradiation, in the presence of 0.1 mM INN and with different concentration values of NaOH. The increase of R_{NB} with increasing NaOH is consistent with the generation of $\cdot\text{OH}$ by irradiated INN under basic conditions.

Table 1. Initial transformation rates of 0.01 mM NB (R_{NB}) upon UVA irradiation of 0.1 mM INN, for different concentration values of NaOH. Irradiation took place in aerated solution.

$C_{\text{NaOH}}, \text{M}$	$R_{\text{NB}}, \text{M s}^{-1}$
0	$(3.37 \pm 2.05) \cdot 10^{-10}$
0.3	$(2.48 \pm 0.73) \cdot 10^{-9}$
0.5	$(2.89 \pm 0.41) \cdot 10^{-9}$

Note that NB degradation is extremely unlikely to undergo interference by ${}^3\text{INN}^*$, which showed negligible reactivity toward NB itself. Together with the data reported in Figure 3 (reactivity between ${}^3\text{INN}^*$ and OH^-), such findings suggest that the following reaction takes place in the presence of INN and NaOH under irradiation:



The formation of $\text{INN}^{\cdot-}$ postulated in reaction (8) is consistent with the LFP signal detected at 380 nm.

Generation of H_2O_2 by INN under irradiation and its possible role in $\cdot\text{OH}$ photoproduction

Figure 6 reports the time trend of H_2O_2 generated upon UVA irradiation of 0.1 mM INN and 0.01 mM NB in aerated solution, in the absence of NaOH and in the presence of 0.3 M NaOH.




Figure 6. Time trend of H_2O_2 upon UVA irradiation of 0.1 mM INN and 0.01 mM NB in aerated solution, without NaOH and with 0.3 M NaOH.

Interestingly, both the initial formation and the transformation rate of H_2O_2 are higher in the presence of NaOH. The higher formation rate is probably linked with the reaction (8) between ${}^3\text{INN}^*$ and OH^- , which enhances the transformation of NB (Table 1) and yields $\text{INN}^{\cdot-}$. In aerated solution the radical anion is expected to yield H_2O_2 via reactions (3-5), and an enhanced $\text{INN}^{\cdot-}$ generation would lead to higher H_2O_2

production.

The much higher transformation rate of H_2O_2 in the presence of NaOH, which yields a time evolution with a maximum after 3-5 hour irradiation, could be accounted for by an enhanced production of reactive species, including $\cdot\text{OH}$, under basic conditions. Moreover, with a pK_a of 11.6,³⁸ H_2O_2 would be fully deprotonated to HO_2^- in the presence of 0.3 M NaOH. The conjugated base HO_2^- would be less stable than H_2O_2 . For instance, the reaction rate constant between HO_2^- and $\cdot\text{OH}$ is $7.5 \cdot 10^9 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, to be compared with $2.7 \cdot 10^7 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for H_2O_2 .⁴²

Figure 6 shows that the concentration of H_2O_2 is lower than 0.1 mM for irradiation times up to 15 h. Figure 7 reports the time evolution of 0.01 mM NB upon UVA irradiation of 0.1 mM INN + 0.3 M NaOH, and of 0.1 mM H_2O_2 + 0.3 M NaOH. It is apparent that 0.1 mM H_2O_2 does not induce significant degradation of NB, despite the presence of H_2O_2 in the system right from the start.

H_2O_2 could be able to induce NB transformation upon production of $\cdot\text{OH}$ by photolysis (reaction 6).¹⁷ The negligible transformation of NB upon UVA irradiation of 0.1 mM H_2O_2 + 0.3 M NaOH suggests that the formation of $\cdot\text{OH}$ by H_2O_2 was negligible under the adopted irradiation conditions. This means that irradiated INN in basic solution is expected to induce NB transformation by producing $\cdot\text{OH}$ via reaction (8) (OH^- oxidation), rather than upon formation of H_2O_2 (reactions 1-5) followed by photolysis (reaction 6).




Figure 7. Time evolution of 0.01 mM NB upon UVA irradiation of 0.1 mM INN + 0.3 M NaOH, and of 0.1 mM H_2O_2 + 0.3 M NaOH. Irradiation was carried out in aerated solution.

Benzene hydroxylation to phenol induced by irradiated INN in circumneutral solution

Figure 8 reports the time evolution of phenol formed from 0.5 mM benzene, upon UVA irradiation of 0.1 mM INN or of 0.1 mM H_2O_2 at the natural pH of the solution (6.5). The initial level of hydrogen peroxide was chosen to be higher than the H_2O_2 concentration formed upon UVA irradiation of INN without NaOH (Figure 6). It has been shown previously that phenol formation from benzene in the presence of INN under irradiation is mostly caused by the photoproduction of $\cdot\text{OH}$.³⁴

Therefore, the much higher phenol formation upon irradiation of 1NN compared to H₂O₂ suggests that H₂O₂ generation and photolysis gives a minor to negligible contribution to [•]OH photoproduction by 1NN under circumneutral conditions. An alternative pathway is the oxidation of OH⁻ or H₂O by ³1NN*.




Figure 8. Time evolution of phenol, formed from 0.5 mM benzene, upon UVA irradiation of 0.1 mM 1NN or of 0.1 mM H₂O₂ at pH 6.5. Irradiation was carried out in aerated solution.

Considering that the reaction between benzene and [•]OH yields phenol with 95% yield⁴⁴ and that the initial rate of phenol formation with 1NN + benzene (Figure 8) is $R_{\text{Phenol}} = (4.96 \pm 0.37) \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ M s}^{-1}$, one gets $R_{\bullet\text{OH}} = (0.95)^{-1} R_{\text{Phenol}} = (5.22 \pm 0.39) \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ M s}^{-1}$. By knowing the reaction rate constant between ³1NN* and OH⁻ ($k_{31\text{NN}^*,\text{OH}^-} = (1.66 \pm 0.08) \cdot 10^7 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$), the photon flux absorbed by 1NN, and the quantum yield of ³1NN* formation upon 1NN irradiation ($\Phi_{31\text{NN}^*} = 0.63$),⁴⁵ one can obtain the contribution of the reaction ³1NN* + OH⁻ to [•]OH photogeneration at pH 6.5.

The photon flux absorbed by 1NN is $P_a^{1\text{NN}} = \int p^\circ(\lambda) [1 - 10^{-\varepsilon(\lambda)b[1\text{NN}]}] d\lambda$, where $p^\circ(\lambda)$ is the lamp volumetric spectral photon flux density in solution, $\varepsilon(\lambda)$ is the molar absorption coefficient of 1NN (Figure 1), $b = 0.4 \text{ cm}$ and $[1\text{NN}] = 0.1 \text{ mM}$. One gets $P_a^{1\text{NN}} = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ Einstein L}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, and the rate of ³1NN* formation is $R_{31\text{NN}^*} = \Phi_{31\text{NN}^*} P_a^{1\text{NN}} = 1.6 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ M s}^{-1}$. At pH 6.5 ($[\text{OH}^-] = 3 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{ M}$) the reaction with OH⁻ is a minor ³1NN* sink and the pseudo-first order rate constant for ³1NN* deactivation is $k_{31\text{NN}^*} = 6.4 \cdot 10^5 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (see the laser flash photolysis data of Figure 3). One gets $[^31\text{NN}^*] = R_{31\text{NN}^*} k_{31\text{NN}^*}^{-1} = 2.5 \cdot 10^{-12} \text{ M}$. The formation rate of [•]OH upon reaction (8) between ³1NN* and OH⁻ would be $R_{\bullet\text{OH}}^{31\text{NN}^*,\text{OH}^-} = k_{31\text{NN}^*,\text{OH}^-} [^31\text{NN}^*] [\text{OH}^-] = 1.2 \cdot 10^{-12} \text{ M s}^{-1}$. The value of $R_{\bullet\text{OH}}^{31\text{NN}^*,\text{OH}^-}$ thus estimated is over two orders of magnitude lower than $R_{\bullet\text{OH}} = (5.22 \pm 0.39) \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ M s}^{-1}$. This means that reaction (8) cannot be a significant source of [•]OH under circumneutral conditions.

An alternative hypothesis is that [•]OH is generated upon oxidation of H₂O by ³1NN*. One would have $R_{\bullet\text{OH}}^{31\text{NN}^*,\text{H}_2\text{O}} = k_{31\text{NN}^*,\text{H}_2\text{O}} [^31\text{NN}^*] [\text{H}_2\text{O}]$ (with $[\text{H}_2\text{O}] \sim 55 \text{ M}$) and, under the

hypothesis that $R_{\bullet\text{OH}}^{31\text{NN}^*,\text{H}_2\text{O}} = R_{\bullet\text{OH}}$, one obtains $k_{31\text{NN}^*,\text{H}_2\text{O}} = R_{\bullet\text{OH}} [^31\text{NN}^*]^{-1} [\text{H}_2\text{O}]^{-1} = 3.8 \pm 0.3 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Note that the reaction with H₂O would give a first-order degradation rate constant $k'_{31\text{NN}^*} = k_{31\text{NN}^*,\text{H}_2\text{O}} [\text{H}_2\text{O}] = 2.1 \cdot 10^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ that would just be a small fraction of the deactivation rate constant of ³1NN* at pH 6.5 ($k_{31\text{NN}^*} = 6.4 \cdot 10^5 \text{ s}^{-1}$), which is reasonable.

Kinetic considerations suggest that the oxidation of H₂O by ³1NN* to produce [•]OH is a reasonable process, but the thermodynamic point of view is to be considered as well. The reduction potential of 1NN is $E^\circ(1\text{NN}/1\text{NN}^{\bullet-}) = -0.40 \text{ V}$,⁴⁶ and the triplet state ³1NN* is about 2.4 eV above the ground one.⁴⁷ It is thus suggested that the potential $E^\circ(^31\text{NN}^*/1\text{NN}^{\bullet-}) \sim 2 \text{ V}$, coherently with the ability of ³1NN* to oxidise the halogenide anions to the corresponding radicals.³³ Such a potential has to be compared with $E^\circ = 2.59 \text{ V}$ for the reaction [•]OH + H⁺ + e⁻ → H₂O.⁴⁶ One obtains that at pH 6.5 the oxidation reaction of H₂O to [•]OH by ³1NN* has $E = -0.2 \text{ V}$, which corresponds to an equilibrium rate constant $K_{\text{eq}} = 0.03$. It is thus suggested that some [•]OH can be formed starting from ³1NN* and H₂O, with no initial [•]OH, but the actual position of the equilibrium will likely depend more on the concomitant decay/scavenging processes of ³1NN* and [•]OH than on the value of K_{eq} .

It is possible to derive an upper limit for the reaction rate constant $k_{31\text{NN}^*,\text{H}_2\text{O}}$ from the Arrhenius equation, $k = A \cdot e^{-E_a/RT}$, with $E_a = 0.2 \text{ eV} = 20 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ (assuming no additional energy barrier for the reaction) and $A = 10^{10} \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ (diffusive control in aqueous solution). One gets $k_{31\text{NN}^*,\text{H}_2\text{O}} < 10^6 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, which is perfectly compatible with the rate constant value derived from kinetic considerations. Furthermore, with $k_{31\text{NN}^*,\text{H}_2\text{O}} = 3.8 \pm 0.3 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ one gets $E_a = 54 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$, corresponding to an activation energy barrier of 34 kJ mol⁻¹ in addition to the 20 kJ mol⁻¹ for the reaction to take place. Therefore, the hypothesised oxidation reaction of H₂O to [•]OH by ³1NN*, with the low rate constant obtained in this study and that would be sufficient to account for the experimental data, appears to be reasonable from both a thermodynamic and a kinetic point of view.

Conclusions

1NN under UVA irradiation in basic solution is able to produce [•]OH radicals following reaction (8) between ³1NN* and OH⁻. Such a reaction has a rate constant $k_{31\text{NN}^*,\text{OH}^-} = (1.66 \pm 0.08) \cdot 10^7 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, measured by laser flash photolysis. Despite the production of sub-0.1 mM levels of H₂O₂ upon irradiation of 1NN (reactions 1-5), the photolysis of hydrogen peroxide (reaction 6) is a minor pathway to [•]OH photogeneration under both basic and circumneutral conditions. Oxidation of H₂O and OH⁻ by ³1NN* would be the main sources of [•]OH, with the former process strongly prevailing under circumneutral conditions. The use of NB as [•]OH probe in basic solution and of 2-propanol as [•]OH scavenger is appropriate in the studied system because of the lack of reactivity of either NB or 2-propanol toward ³1NN*.

Acknowledgements

Financial support by PNRA – Progetto Antartide is gratefully acknowledged. The work of BS in Torino was financially supported by Compagnia di San Paolo, Torino, Italy. The authors also thank Blaise Pascal University for the financial support provided for 1 month visit of DV in the LPMM laboratory. GM and MB thank the Auvergne region and the “Fédération des Recherches en Environnement” for the financial support.

Notes and references

^a Dipartimento di Chimica Analitica, Università di Torino, Via P. Giuria 5, 10125 Torino, Italy. <http://www.chimicadellambiente.unito.it/davide.vione@unito.it>

^b Department of Chemical Engineering, Calcutta University, 92 Acharya P. C. Road, Kolkata 700009, India.

^c Centro Interdipartimentale NatRisk, Università di Torino, Via L. Da Vinci 44, 10095 Grugliasco (TO), Italy. <http://www.natrisk.org>

^d Clermont Université, Université Blaise Pascal, Laboratoire de

Photochimie Moléculaire et Macromoléculaire (LPMM), F-63000,

Clermont-Ferrand, France. marcello.brigante@univ-bpclermont.fr

^e CNRS, UMR 6505, F-63177 Aubière, France.

Literature cited

- 1 Q. T. Liu, R. I. Cumming and A. D. Sharpe, Photo-induced environmental depletion processes of beta-blockers in river water, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2009, **8**, 768-777.
- 2 S. Canonica and U. Laubscher, Inhibitory effect of dissolved organic matter on triplet-induced oxidation of aquatic contaminants, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2008, **7**, 547-551.
- 3 M. M. Caldwell, J. F. Bornman, C. I. Ballare, s. D. Flint and G. Kulandaivelu, Terrestrial ecosystems, increased solar ultraviolet radiation, and interactions with other climate change factors, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2007, **6**, 252-266.
- 4 R. G. Epp, D. J. Erickson, N. D. Paul and B. Sulzberger, Interactive effects of solar UV radiation and climate change on biogeochemical cycling, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2007, **6**, 286-300.
- 5 A. Paul, S. Hackbarth, R. D. Vogt, B. Roder, B. K. Burnison and C. E. W. Steinberg, Photogeneration of singlet oxygen by humic substances: comparison of humic substances of aquatic and terrestrial origin, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2004, **3**, 273-280.
- 6 A. L. Boreen, W. A. Arnold and K. McNeill, Photodegradation of pharmaceuticals in the aquatic environment: A review, *Aquat. Sci.*, 2003, **65**, 320-341.
- 7 J. P. Escalada, A. Pajares, J. Gianotti, A. Biasutti, S. Criado, P. Molina, W. Massad, F. Amat-Guerri and N. A. Garcia, Photosensitized degradation in water of the phenolic pesticides bromoxynil and dichlorophen in the presence of riboflavin, as a model of their natural photodecomposition in the environment, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, 2011, **186**, 466-472.
- 8 J. J. Guerard, Y. P. Chin, H. Mash and C. M. Hadad, Photochemical fate of sulfadimethoxine in aquaculture waters, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2009, **43**, 8587-8592.
- 9 J. Peuravuori and K. Pihlaja, Phototransformations of selected pharmaceuticals under low-energy UVA-vis and powerful UVB-UVA irradiations in aqueous solutions - the role of natural dissolved organic chromophoric material, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 2009, **394**, 1621-1636.
- 10 J. J. Werner, K. McNeill and W. A. Arnold, Environmental photodegradation of mefenamic acid, *Chemosphere*, 2005, **58**, 1339-1346.
- 11 P. L. Miller and Y. P. Chin, Photoinduced degradation of carbaryl in a wetland surface water, *J. Agr. Food Chem.*, 2002, **50**, 6758-6765.
- 12 J. J. Cui, H. M. Huang, S. Cook and K. Zeng, Effect of photosensitizer riboflavin on the fate of 2,4,6-trinitrotoluene in a freshwater environment, *Chemosphere*, 2001, **44**, 621-625.
- 13 S. Chiron, C. Minero and D. Vione, Photodegradation processes of the antiepileptic drug carbamazepine, relevant to estuarine waters, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2006, **40**, 5977-5983.
- 14 T. Arakaki, T. Miyake, M. Shibata and H. Sakugawa, Photochemical formation and scavenging of hydroxyl radical in rain and dew waters, *Nippon Kagaku Kaishi*, 1999, **5**, 335-340.
- 15 C. Anastasio and K. G. McGregor, Chemistry of fog waters in California's Central Valley: 1. In situ photoformation of hydroxyl radical and singlet molecular oxygen, *Atmos. Environ.*, 2001, **35**, 1079-1089.
- 16 A. Albinet, C. Minero and D. Vione, Photochemical generation of reactive species upon irradiation of rainwater: Negligible photoactivity of dissolved organic matter, *Sci. Total. Environ.*, 2010, **408**, 3367-3373.
- 17 J. Hoigné, Formulation and calibration of environmental reaction kinetics; oxidations by aqueous photo-oxidants as an example. In: Stumm, W., Editor, *Aquatic Chemical Kinetics*, Wiley, New York, 1990, pp. 43-69.
- 18 S. Canonica, Oxidation of aquatic organic contaminants induced by excited triplet states, *Chimia*, 2007, **61**, 641-644.
- 19 D. E. Latch and K. McNeill, Microheterogeneity of singlet oxygen distributions in irradiated humic acid solutions, *Science*, 2006, **311**, 1743-1747.
- 20 D. Vione, G. Falletti, V. Maurino, C. Minero, E. Pelizzetti, M. Malandrino, R. Ajassa, R. I. Olariu and C. Arsene, Sources and sinks of hydroxyl radicals upon irradiation of natural water samples, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2006, **40**, 3775-3781.
- 21 F. al Housari, D. Vione, S. Chiron and S. Barbati, Reactive photoinduced species in estuarine waters. Characterization of hydroxyl radical, singlet oxygen and dissolved organic matter triplet state in natural oxidation processes, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2010, **9**, 78-86.
- 22 K. M. G. Mostofa and H. Sakugawa, Spatial and temporal variations and factors controlling the concentrations of hydrogen peroxide and organic peroxides in rivers, *Environ. Chem.*, 2009, **6**, 524-534.
- 23 R. M. Dalrymple, A. K. Carfagno and C. M. Sharpless, Correlations between dissolved organic matter optical properties and quantum yields of singlet oxygen and hydrogen peroxide, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2010, **44**, 5824-5829.
- 24 E. M. White, P. P. Vaughan and R. G. Zepp, Role of the photo-Fenton reaction in the production of hydroxyl radicals and photobleaching of colored dissolved organic matter in a coastal river of the southeastern United States, *Aquat. Sci.*, 2003, **65**, 402-414.
- 25 A. W. Vermilyea and B. M. Voelker, Photo-Fenton reaction at near neutral pH, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2009, **43**, 6927-6933.
- 26 S. E. Page, W. A. Arnold and K. McNeill, Assessing the contribution of free hydroxyl radical in organic matter-sensitized photohydroxylation reactions, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 2011, **45**, 2818-2825.
- 27 D. Gan, M. Jia, P. P. Vaughan, D. E. Falvey and N. V. Blough, Aqueous photochemistry of methyl-benzoquinone, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2008, **112**, 2803-2812.
- 28 V. Maurino, D. Borghesi, D. Vione and C. Minero, Transformation of phenolic compounds upon UVA irradiation of anthraquinone-2-sulfonate, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2008, **7**, 321-327.
- 29 P. R. Maddigapu, A. Bedini, C. Minero, V. Maurino, D. Vione, M. Brigante, G. Mailhot and M. Sarakha, The pH-dependent photochemistry of anthraquinone-2-sulfonate, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2010, **9**, 323-330.
- 30 D. Vione, M. Ponzo, D. Bagnus, V. Maurino, C. Minero and M. E. Carlotti, Comparison of different probe molecules for the quantification of hydroxyl radicals in aqueous solution, *Environ. Chem. Lett.*, 2010, **8**, 95-100.
- 31 T. Charbouillot, M. Brigante, G. Mailhot, P. R. Maddigapu, Claudio Minero and D. Vione, Terephthalic acid as probe for [•]OH quantification in natural waters: Performance and selectivity as a function of temperature, pH and composition of atmospherically relevant aqueous media, *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A: Chem.*, in press. DOI: 10.1016/j.jphotochem.2001.05.003.

- 32 L. J. A. Martins, M. M. M. M. Fernandez, T. J. Kemp, S. J. Formosinho and J. S. Branco, Interaction of halide and pseudohalide ions with the triplet state of 1-nitronaphthalene. Effect of acidity: a flash photolysis study, *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans.*, 1991, **87**, 3617-3624.
- 5 33 M. Brigante, T. Charbouillot, D. Vione and G. Mailhot, Photochemistry of 1-nitronaphthalene: A potential source of singlet oxygen and radical species in atmospheric waters. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2010, **114**, 2830-2836.
- 10 34 P. R. Maddigapu, C. Minero, V. Maurino, D. Vione, M. Brigante, T. Charbouillot, M. Sarakha and G. Mailhot, Photochemical and photosensitized reactions involving 1-nitronaphthalene and nitrite in aqueous solution, *Photochem. Photobiol. Sci.*, 2011, **10**, 601-609.
- 15 35 M. Mochizuki, S. Yamazaki, K. Kano and T. Ikeda, Kinetic analysis and mechanistic aspects of autoxidation of catechins, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta-Gen. Subj.*, 2002, **1569**, 35-44.
- 36 B. G. Kwon and J. H. Lee, A kinetic method for HO_2^{\bullet} / $\text{O}_2^{\bullet-}$ determination in advanced oxidation processes, *Anal. Chem.*, 2004, **76**, 6359-6364.
- 20 37 C. von Sonntag, Advanced oxidation processes: mechanistic aspects, *Wat. Sci. Technol.*, 2008, **58**, 1015-1021.
- 38 A. E. Martell, R. M. Smith and R. J. Motekaitis, *Critically selected stability constants of metal complexes database, version 4.0*, 1997.
- 39 D. Vialaton and C. Richard, Phototransformation of aromatic pollutants in solar light: Photolysis versus photosensitized reactions under natural water conditions, *Aquat. Sci.*, 2002, **64**, 207-215.
- 25 40 D. Vione, S. Khanra, S. Cucu Man, P. R. Maddigapu, R. Das, C. Arsene, R. I. Olariu, V. Maurino and C. Minero, Inhibition vs. enhancement of the nitrate-induced phototransformation of organic substrates by the $\bullet\text{OH}$ scavengers bicarbonate and carbonate, *Wat. Res.*, 2009, **43**, 4718-4728.
- 30 41 H. J. Kuhn, S. E. Braslavsky and R. Schmidt, Chemical actinometry, *Pure Appl. Chem.*, 2004, **76**, 2105-2146.
- 42 G. V. Buxton, C. L. Greenstock, W. P. Helman and A. B. Ross, Critical review of rate constants for reactions of hydrated electron, hydrogen atoms and hydroxyl radicals ($\bullet\text{OH}/\bullet\text{O}$) in aqueous solution, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data*, 1988, **17**, 513-886.
- 35 43 P. Nissenon, D. Dabdub, R. Das, V. Maurino, C. Minero and D. Vione D, Evidence of the water-cage effect on the photolysis of NO_3^- and FeOH^{2+} Implications of this effect and of H_2O_2 surface accumulation on photochemistry at the air-water interface of atmospheric droplets, *Atmos. Environ.*, 2010, **44**, 4859-4866.
- 40 44 U. Deister, P. Warneck and C. Wurzinger, $\bullet\text{OH}$ radicals generated by NO_3^- photolysis in aqueous solution: Competition kinetics and a study of the reaction $\bullet\text{OH} + \text{CH}_2(\text{OH})\text{SO}_3^-$, *Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem.*, 1990, **94**, 594-599.
- 45 45 T. Fournier, S. M. Tavender, A. W. Parker, G. D. Scholes and D. Phillips, Competitive energy and electron-transfer reactions of the triplet state of 1-nitronaphthalene: A laser flash photolysis and time-resolved resonance Raman study, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 1997, **101**, 5320-5326.
- 50 46 P. Wardman, Reduction potentials of one-electron couples involving free radicals in aqueous solution, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data*, 1989, **17**, 1027-1717.
- 55 47 J. S. Zugazagoitia, C. X. Almora-Diaz and J. Peon, Ultrafast intersystem crossing in 1-nitronaphthalene. An experimental and computational study, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2008, **112**, 358-365.