THE RADIATION-CHEMICAL YIELDS OF H₃O⁺ AND OH- AS DETERMINED BY NANOSECOND CONDUCTIMETRIC MEASUREMENTS[†]

ROBERT F. ANDERSON, BORIVOJ VOJNOVIC and BARRY D. MICHAEL Cancer Research Campaign Gray Laboratory, Mount Vernon Hospital, Northwood, Middlesex HA6 2RN, England

(Received 21 August 1984; in revised form 24 October 1984)

Abstract—The radiation-chemical yields of ionic species formed upon irradiation of water by 3.5 MeV electrons have been determined directly using dc conductivity and optical measurements. Yields (expressed in μ mol J⁻¹) at 10 and 110 ns after the end of a 10 ns pulse are: for $H_{3}O^{+} = 0.371, 0.320;$ for $OH^{-} = 0.082, 0.045,$ and for $e_{ag} = 0.299$ and 0.275, respectively.

INTRODUCTION

ATTEMPTS to determine the yields of H₃O⁺ and OH⁻ that are formed following low LET irradiation of water [reaction (1)] have relied on (i) scavenging the e_{aq}^{-} to form a relatively stable radical anion⁽¹⁻⁴⁾ [reaction (2)] or its conversion to OH⁻ by reaction with $N_2O_{1}^{(1,4)}$ [reaction (3)] and (ii) computing the best curve to the observed change in conductivity during an electron pulse.⁽⁵⁾ The subsequent decay of the ionic species through neutralization [reaction (4)] has then been followed by time-resolved conductivity measurements and kinetic plots are extrapolated back to the time of the pulse to estimate the initial yields of H_3O^+ and OH^- .

(1)	$H_2O \leftrightarrow e_{aq}^-$, $OH, H^+, H_3O^+, OH^-, H_2O_2, H_2$,
(2)	$e_{aq}^- + S \rightarrow S^{-},$

(3a) e_{aq}^- + N₂O \rightarrow N₂ + O⁻, O⁻ + H₂O \rightarrow OH⁻ + OH,

$$(3b) \qquad 0 + H_2 O \rightarrow OH + OH$$

 $H_3O^+ + OH^- \rightarrow 2H_2O$. (4)

The reported radiation-chemical yields of H₃O⁺ and OH⁻ do vary, e.g. from $ca. 0.29^{(1,4)}$ to 0.34 μ mol J⁻¹ (2,5) for the yields of H₃O⁺ in N₂O- and Ar-saturated water, respectively. This variation in yields might in part arise from the perturbation of intraspur reactions by high concentrations of scavengers such as N₂O as well as from uncertainties in the mobilities of the radical anions of scavengers and the reactions undergone by H' atoms.

In this paper we report our simultaneous measurements of the increase in conductivity and absorption of the e_{aq}^{-} following pulse radiolysis of pure water. By utilizing both a short radiation pulse and a fast electronic rise time (<5 ns, 5 ns digitizer sampling interval) we have been able to determine the yields of H₃O⁺ and OH⁻ directly, both inside the spur and that which escapes the spur. Measurements were made before any significant post-spur (>100 ns) neutralization through reaction (4) occurred in the bulk solution.

EXPERIMENTAL

The dc conductivity method used⁽⁶⁾ utilizes a balanced, symmetrical conductivity cell which has four conducting walls and two optical faces. The cell constant 0.186 ± 0.004 cm⁻¹ was determined by the reduction of tetranitromethane.⁽⁷⁾ Details of the hybrid balun transformer, which rejects electron pulse interference, the compensated virtualearth wideband amplifier used to overcome the lowfrequency limitations of the transformer together with the optical detection system have been published.⁽⁸⁾ The electron pulse source was the Gray Laboratory's 4 MV Van de Graaff accelerator which produces pulses down to 1.5 ns duration at up to 5A. All irradiations were carried out at 21°C. Dosimetry was carried out using aerated KSCN solution assuming the $(SCN)_2^{-1}$ radical produced has a radiation-chemical yield of 0.29 μ mol J⁻¹ with a molar absorptivity ε of 758 m² mol⁻¹ at 472 nm.⁽⁹⁾ Water was purified ($\sigma = 0.06 \ \mu S \ cm^{-1}$) by a Milli-Q system (Millipore Inc.) and purged free of oxygen with N₂ gas. Simultaneous recordings of changes in optical absorption and conductivity were recorded on a Tektronix 7612D digitizer interfaced to a PDP 11/34 computer. The consequence of averaging transients acquired by the digitizer (5 ns sample in-

[†] Dedicated to Professor Schulte-Frohlinde on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday.



Fig. 1. Typical transients obtained in N_2 -purged water: (A) conductance transient obtained with positive polarizing voltage, (B) conductance transient (inverted) obtained with negative polarizing voltage, (C) resultant average of A and B, representing solution conductance change, (D) optical absorption transient at 715 nm, (2 cm path length), (E) electron pulse.

terval) was that reliable data could only be obtained 10 ns after the pulse even though the time resolution of both detection systems was better than 5 ns. Typical signals obtained upon pulse radiolysis (3.4 Gy in 10 ns) are shown in Fig. 1. Any remaining interference which the balanced conductivity detection system does not reject is almost completely eliminated by storing two transients at opposing polarities of polarizing voltage and subtracting them. In this way the signal magnitude is enhanced and the electron pulse artifacts rejected.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The increase in conductivity σ is a consequence of the formation of charged species during the pulse

[reaction (1)] and can be expressed as

(5)
$$\sigma = ([e_{aq}^-]_c \cdot \lambda_{e_{\bar{a}\bar{q}}}) + ([H_3O^+]_{c+d} \cdot \lambda_{H_3O^+}) + ([OH^-]_d \cdot \lambda_{OH^-}),$$

where the subscripts c and d refer to the concentrations of e_{aq} and OH⁻ respectively, in mol cm⁻³ and σ and λ are expressed in S cm⁻¹ and S cm² mol⁻¹, respectively.

The conductivity arising from the $[e_{aq}]_c$ and its counterion $[H_3O^+]_c$, σ^* (in S cm⁻¹) can be calculated from optical measurements of the $[e_{aq}]_c$ absorption at 715 nm where $\varepsilon = 1840 \text{ m}^2 \text{ mol}^{-1}$.⁽¹⁰⁾

(6)
$$\sigma^* = ([e_{aq}^-]_c \cdot \lambda_{e_{\bar{a}q}}) + ([H_3O^+]_c \cdot \lambda_{H_3O^+}).$$

The difference $\sigma - \sigma^*$ between this and the measured conductivity must arise from $[H_3O^+]_d$ and $[OH^-]_d$.

$$\sigma - \sigma^* = ([H_3O^+]_d \dot{\lambda}_{H_3O^+}) + ([OH^-]_d \dot{\lambda}_{OH^-}),$$
(7)

and hence the total $[H_3O^+]_{c+d}$ and $[OH^-]_d$ produced by the pulse can be found.

The data obtained from six measurements of conductivity for each polarity together with optical measurement data (in $H_2O + N_2$) are presented in Table 1.

Using these data in eqns (5)-(7) together with the literature values^(11,12) of $\lambda_{H_3O^+} = 331$, $\lambda_{OH^-} = 188$, and $\lambda_{e\bar{aq}} = 202$ S cm² mol⁻¹ (corrected to 21°C by $\Delta \lambda = 1.6\%$ per °C) gave the yields presented in Table 2.

The reduced conductivity in N₂O-saturated solution measured at 10 and 110 ns after a 10 ns pulse cannot be fully accounted for by the low mobility of the O⁻ species (compared with that of OH⁻) as its half-life is only 7 ns.⁽¹³⁾ The measurements indicate that reaction (4), as well as reaction (8), occurs in the spurs and that charge recombination is enhanced via reaction (4) in N₂O-saturated solution.

$$e_{aq}^- + H_3O^+ \rightarrow H^- + H_2O.$$

TABLE 1. OPTICAL ABSORBANCE[†] AND CONDUCTIVITY VALUES

(8)

	10^3 Absorbance (cm ⁻¹ Gy ⁻¹)		Conductivity (μ S cm ⁻¹ Gy ⁻¹)	
$\begin{array}{l} \text{System} \\ \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{N}_2 \\ \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{N}_2\text{O} \end{array}$	t(20) ns 5.59 ± 0.14	t(20) + 100 ns 5.01 ± 0.15	t(20) ns 0.132 ± 0.004 0.115 ± 0.004	t(20) + 100 ns 0.120 ± 0.004 0.102 ± 0.003

† At 715 nm.

Time (ns)	eaq	OH-	
(20) (20) + 100	0.299 ± 0.011 0.275 ± 0.09	$\begin{array}{r} 0.371 \ \pm \ 0.014 \\ 0.320 \ \pm \ 0.012 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 0.082 \ \pm \ 0.006 \\ 0.045 \ \pm \ 0.004 \end{array}$

TABLE 2. RADIATION-CHEMICAL YIELDS OF e_{aq}^- , H_3O^+ , and OH^- in water (pH 7) following pulse radiolysis with 3.5 MeV electrons

† 1 μ mol J⁻¹ = G (molecules 100 eV⁻¹) = 9.65.

The yield of H_3O^+ that escapes the spur is similar to other reported values^(2,4,5) whereas the yield of OH^- is lower. The yield of H_3O^+ at the shortest time measured (10 ns after a 10 ns pulse) is greater than all previous reported values.

Acknowledgments—The authors wish to thank Mr. D. S. Sehmi for the development of the computer programs. This work is supported by The Cancer Research Campaign.

REFERENCES

- 1. K. H. SCHMIDT and S. M. ANDER, J. Phys. Chem. 1969, 73, 2846.
- 2. G. C. BARKER, P. FOWLES, D. C. SAMMON and B. STRINGER, Trans. Faraday Soc. 1970, 66, 1498.
- 3. J. RABANI, M. GRATZEL, S. A. CHAUDHRI, G. BECK and A. HENGLEIN, J. Phys Chem. 1971, 75, 1759.

- 4. H. KLEVER, L. TOTH, B. WAGNER and D. SCHULTE-FROHLINDE, Phys. Chem. 1976, 80, 1265.
- 5. K. H. SCHMIDT and W. L. BUCK, Science 1966, 151, 70.
- 6. R. L. MAUGHAN, B. D. MICHAEL and R. F. ANDERSON, Radiat. Phys. Chem. 1978, 11, 229.
- 7. К. -D. Asmus, Int. J. Radiat. Phys. Chem. 1972, 4, 417.
- B. VOJNOVIC, Ph.D. thesis, The University of London, 1983.
- 9. R. H. SCHULER, L. K. PATTERSON and E. JANATA, J. Phys. Chem. 1980, 84, 2088.
- G. V. BUXTON, in The Study of Fast Processes and Transient Species by Electron Pulse Radiolysis, (Edited by J. H. Baxendale and F. Busi), p. 241, D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1982.
- 11. LANDOLT-BORNSTEIN, Zalhenwerte und Funktionen, II, Vol. 7, p. 257. Springer, Berlin, 1960.
- 12. G. BECK, Int. J. Radiat. Phys. Chem. 1969, 1, 361.
- 13. G. V. BUXTON, Trans. Faraday Soc. 1970, 66, 1656.