BULLETIN OF THE CHEMICAL SOCIETY OF JAPAN VOL. 43 2626—2628 (1970)

Reactions of Recoil ³⁵S Atoms with Organic Compounds. I. The Distribution of ³⁵S Atoms on Mercaptobenzothiazole

Ko Taki

The Institute of Physical and Chemical Research, Yamato-machi, Saitama

(Received January 28, 1970)

The reaction of ³⁵S atoms produced by neutron irradiation has been studied recently.^{1,2)} An appreciable proportion of the ³⁵S appears in oxidized forms,^{3,4)} especially as sulfate. Several investigations^{5,6)} have been reported regarding the chemical forms of ³⁵S, and extensive studies of the sulfur atom produced by the photolysis^{7,8)} of SCO have also been reported. However, few investigations⁹⁾ have been reported regarding the reaction of a sulfur atom produced by nuclear recoil reaction with organic compounds.

In this paper, the distribution of $^{35}\mathrm{S}$ atoms in the molecules of mercaptobenzothiazole (I) and methylmercaptobenzothiazole (II) was studied; some differences in the reactions of the $^{35}\mathrm{S}$ atoms formed by the $^{35}\mathrm{Cl}(n,p)^{35}\mathrm{S}$ and $^{34}\mathrm{S}(n,\gamma)^{35}\mathrm{S}$ processes were also investigated.

$$\begin{array}{c|c} S \\ N \\ \hline \\ (I) \\ \hline \\ S^1 \\ \hline \\ S^8- \\ \end{array}$$

Experimental

Mercaptobenzothiazole (I) and methylmercaptobenzothiazole(II) (Tokyo Kasei Co.) were irradiated with JRR-1,2 and 3 reactors of the Japan Atomic Energy Research Institute in the absence of and in the presence of trichlorobenzene as a chlorine source. The irradiations were performed in a quartz ampule $(0.5\times3.0$

- 1) C. Chiotan, I. Zamfir and M. Szabo, *J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem.*, **26**, 1132 (1964).
- 2) K. Yoshihara, Ting-Chia Huang, H. Ebihara and N. Shibata, *Radiochim. Acta*, 3, 185 (1964).
- J. Cifka and V. Bracokova, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem., 28, 2483 (1966).
- 4) K. Taki and Y. Hishiki, J. Phys. Chem. Inst., 37, 106 (1961).
- 5) J. H. Freeman, M. Kasrai and A. G. Maddock, Chem. Commun., 1967, 979.
- C. Chiotan, I. Zamfir and T. Costera, J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem., 30, 2857 (1968).
- 7) E. M. Lown, E. L. Dedio, O. P. Strausz and H. E. Gunning, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, **89**, 1056 (1967).
- 8) E. M. Lown, H. S. Sandhu, H. E. Gunning and O. P. Strausz, *ibid.*, **90**, 7164 (1968).
 - 9) K. Taki, J. Phys. Chem. Inst., 38, 419 (1962).

cm) containing the sample.*1

Separation and Purification of an Irradiated Sample. For the degradation of an activated compound, the starting material (I and II) was added as a carrier to the irradiated sample; the purification was performed by recrystalization, reprecipitation, and solvent extraction.

Measurement of Radioactivity. All the samples were oxidized by the Shöniger¹⁰ method or by the method using a Pirie reagent,¹¹⁾ and the sulfate thus produced was precipitated by barium chloride. The activity of the barium sulfate thus obtained was measured at an infinite thickness by an end-window-type Geiger Müller counter. The specific activity of each compound was calculated from the saturation value of the apparent activity. The measurement of the total activity was carried out by the simultaneous irradiation of $(NH_4)_2SO_4$, NH_4Cl , and the targets. At each step of degradation of the sulfur compounds, the relative activity was measured. The degradation was performed by the following processes:¹²⁾

Results and Discussion

As is listed in Table 1, the reactions of the ³⁵S atoms in the presence and in the absence of ben-

^{*1} For the purpose of degassing, the sample was dissolved in pyridine or alcohol, and then the solvents were removed.

¹⁰⁾ W. Schöniger, Mikrochim. Acta, 1956, 869.

¹¹⁾ N. W. Pirie, Biochem. J., 26, 2041 (1932).

¹²⁾ B. Beilenson and F. M. Hamer, J. Chem. Soc., 1939, 143.

Table 1. Distribution (%) of $^{35}\mathrm{S}$ produced by $^{35}\mathrm{Cl}(n,p)^{35}\mathrm{S}$ process in the presence and absence of Benzoquinone

Benzoquinone %	S^1 S^8H		
	S ₁ -position	S ₈ -position	
0	2.4	97.6	
3.9	1.6	98.4	

Mercaptobenzothiazole 0.2 g 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene 0.1 g

Irradiation 2.5×10¹³ n/cm² sec, about 200 hr

Benzoquinone %	S^1 $-S^8$ - CH_3		
	S ₁ -position	S ₈ -position	
0	2.2	97.8	
3.5	5.7	94.3	

Methylmercaptobenzothiazole 0.4 g 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene 0.1 g Irradiation $2.5 \times 10^{13} \text{ n/cm}^2 \text{ sec}$, about 200 hr

zoquinone and oxygen as a radical scavenger¹³) gave almost the same ³⁵S distribution. This experimental fact suggests that all the reactions may be considered to be hot reactions and not thermal reactions. The radiochemical yield of the activated parent molecule (retention value) is about 2-5% for the ³⁵Cl(n,p)³⁵S process and about 30% for the ³⁴S(n, γ)³⁵S process. The distribution of the ³⁵S atoms in the molecule is much greater in the S₈-position than in the S₁-position in both mercaptobenzothiazole (II) and methylmercaptobenzothiazole (II). The experimental results can not be reasonably interpreted, but it may be con-

Table 2. Distribution (%) of $^{35}{\rm S}$ produced by $^{34}{\rm S}(n,\gamma)^{35}{\rm S}$ and $^{35}{\rm Cl}(n,p)^{35}{\rm S}$ process

Process	S ₁ - position	$\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\$	$\frac{S_8}{S_1}$	(Retention value) yield %
$34S(n, \gamma)^{35}S$	12.6	87.4	6.9	27.5
³⁵ Cl(n, p) ³⁵ S	5.4	94.6	17.5	4.8
Cl source: h-	Dichlorobe	enzene (35Cl	atoms/34	S atoms = 10

Irradiation $3 \times 10^{11} \,\mathrm{n/cm^2\,sec}$, 240 hr Targets were not degassed.

 $3^{4}S(n, \gamma)^{35}S$ 6.4 93.6 14.6 $3^{5}Cl(n, p)^{35}S$ 3.6 96.4 26.8 Cl source: Trichlorobenzene ($3^{5}Cl$ atoms/ $3^{4}S$ atoms=11

Irradiation 4×10¹³ n/cm² sec, 144 hr

sidered that the collisional exchange (a knock on exchange in terms of a billiard-ball model) of the sulfur atom is easier in the S₈-position than in the S₁-position in the molecule. By the collision of a hot atom, C–S–C bond rupture may occur in a moment. A large number of bond-cleaved intermediates may decompose, and some of them may combine in a short duration with slow-downed ³⁵S atoms which are located near the molecule. Therefore, the distribution of the ³⁵S atoms may be dependent on the stability of the bond-cleaved intermediate. It may be considered that the intermediate which is bond-cleaved at the S₈-position

position (N)—is more stable than that at the S_1 position (N)—SH in the mercaptobenzothiazole molecule.

Reaction of 35S Atoms Formed by Two Nuclear Reactions. In the presence of trichlorobenzene, since the activation cross-section of 34S and 35Cl is almost the same (0.26 barn for 34S and 0.17 barn for 35Cl) and since the number of atoms of 35Cl is much larger than that of 34S, the 34S- $(n, \gamma)^{35}$ S process can be disregarded. In this case the reactions are brought about by hot 35S atoms produced by the 35Cl(n, p)35S process. On the other hand, in the absence of trichlorobenzene the reactions are brought about by hot 35S atoms produced by the $^{34}{\rm S}(n,~\gamma)^{35}{\rm S}$ process. The experimental results on hot 35S atoms from the two formation processes are listed in Table 2. The ratio of 35S atoms at the S₈-position to those at the S_1 -position is smaller in the process of ${}^{34}S(n, \gamma){}^{35}S$ than in that of the 35Cl(n, p)35S process in all the runs, as is shown in Table 2; the 35S atoms formed from 34S exchange with S₈-sulfur more easily than the 35S atoms formed from 35Cl.

The chemical reaction may occur when hot atoms have been slowed¹⁴⁾ sufficiently (25 eV—50 eV).

Process	S ₁ - position	$-S^8$ - CH_3 S_8 - position	$\frac{S_8}{S_1}$	(Retention value) yield %
$^{34}S(n, \gamma)^{35}S$	12.5	87.5	7.0	
$^{35}Cl(n, p)^{35}S$	7.1	92.9	13.1	
Cl source; T	richlorober	nzene (35Cl	atoms/345	8 atoms = 10)
Irradiation	n 4×10 ¹³ n	/cm² sec, 20	00 hr	
2407 >250	15 1	00.0	4.0	

 $^{34}S(n, \gamma)^{35}S$ 17.1 82.9 4.8 29.7 $^{35}Cl(n, p)^{35}S$ 10.5 89.5 8.5 2.1 Cl source: Trichlorobenzene (^{35}Cl atoms/ ^{34}S atoms=20)

Irradiation $1 \times 10^{11} \,\mathrm{n/cm^2 \, sec}$, 288 hr

14) A. P. Wolf, C. S. Redvanly and R. C. Anderson, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., **79**, 3717 (1957).

¹³⁾ A. F. Trotman-Dickenson, "Free Radicals: An Introduction," Methuen & Co. Ltd., London (1959), p. 14

The reaction of sulfur atoms may not be affected by the initial recoil energy, about 17 keV for the 35 Cl(n, p) 35 S process and about 1 keV for the 34 S-(n, γ) 35 S process, because the recoil energy is too high to react with an organic compound. Also, because of the simultaneous irradiation of the sample for two nuclear reactions, the effect of radiation damage may be disregarded.

It has been reported that, in the reaction of the ^{11}C formed from the $^{12}C(n,\ 2n)^{11}C,\ ^{12}C(p,\ pn)^{11}C,^{15,16})$

and $^{12}\text{C}(\gamma, \text{n})^{11}\text{C}^{17)}$ processes, no essential differences are found among the processes.

The present author does not have any reasonable explanation for the experimental facts. It may, however, be presumably postulated that the distribution of ³⁵S atoms is affected by the original position of the nuclear-transformed atom in the molecule.

The author wishes to acknowledge the valuable assistance of Miss K. Motegi as well as to express his appreciation to Dr. T. Nozaki for his helpful discussions and suggestions. A part of this research was carried out with a Scientific Research Grant from the Ministry of Education, to which the author's thanks are due.

¹⁵⁾ G. Stöcklin H. Stangl, D. R. Christman, J. B. Cumming and A. P. Wolf, J. Phys. Chem., 67, 1735 (1963).

¹⁶⁾ G. Stöcklin and A. P. Wolf, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 85, 229 (1963).

¹⁷⁾ MacKay and R. Wolfgang, ibid., 83, 2399 (1961).