This article was downloaded by: [Tomsk State University of Control Systems and Radio]

On: 17 February 2013, At: 06:10

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House,

37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Molecular Crystals

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information: http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/gmcl15

X- and γ -Radiation Damage to Single Crystal Anthracene

L. A. Harrah ^a & R. C. Hughes ^a

^a Sandia Laboratory, Albuquerque, New Mexico Version of record first published: 21 Mar 2007.

To cite this article: L. A. Harrah & R. C. Hughes (1968): X- and γ -Radiation Damage to Single Crystal Anthracene, Molecular

Crystals, 5:1, 141-143

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15421406808082935

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

X- and γ -Radiation Damage to Single Crystal Anthracene[†]

L. A. HARRAH and R. C. HUGHES Sandia Laboratory, Albuquerque, New Mexico Received April 19, 1968

Recently Blum, Mattern, Arndt, and Damask¹ reported the production of both optically absorbing and paramagnetic species in the gamma radiolysis of crystals of anthracene. They found no such behavior on exposure of this material to 50 keV X-rays.

Since for both 50 keV X-rays and Co⁶⁰ gamma rays the majority of chemical events following the primary interaction of the photon with the material are produced by the secondary electrons, it would be quite surprising to find a qualitative difference between these two radiations. Quantitative differences may occur due to change in the linear energy transfer (LET) of the secondary electrons, but in aqueous systems in this range of LET, the product yields vary only by about 30%.²

Their conclusion that there is a qualitative difference in the behavior between Co⁶⁰ gamma and 50 keV X-radiolysis, of enormous importance to any theory of radiation chemistry, has led us to re-examine the behavior of anthracene toward low energy X-radiation.

A single crystal of anthracene obtained from the Harshaw Chemical Company was exposed in air to radiations from an X-ray tube operated at 50 kV peak, and filtered to remove radiation below 6 keV, for times sufficient to give doses of 2×10^6 and 8×10^6 rads. This crystal, 0.2 cm thick and 0.5 cm² area, after 8×10^6 rads exhibited an increased optical absorption in the range 4200–6000 Å similar in nature to that observed by Blum *et al.*, ¹ for Co⁶⁰

[†] This work supported by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

 γ -radiolysis. The optical density change at 4600 Å was measured to be 0.1 compared to 0.08 calculated from their data obtained at 1.48×10^8 rads, assuming linear increase of optical density with dose. This is, within the relative errors of the two measurements, the same value.

E.S.R. measurements were performed on this same crystal and signals were detected for doses as low as 2.2×10^6 rads. The spectrum obtained at a dose of 8×10^6 rads is identical to that found following gamma-radiolysis. A high purity crystal obtained from R. Arndt gave nearly the same optical spectrum and an identical E.S.R. spectrum to the Harshaw crystal.

We would like to suggest that the crosslinked radical proposed in Blum et al., is unlikely to be responsible for the observed signal. Ingalls and Kivelson have shown that radicals derived from aromatic systems by ionizing radiation are often assignable to substituted cyclohexadienyl moieties. Most radiolyses of hydrocarbons result in radicals derived from the parent hydrocarbons by simple dissociations and additions and do not involve major rearrangements of the type suggested by the previously proposed structure.

A radical derived from anthracene by hydrogen atom addition to the 9 position in anthracene, dibenzo cyclohexadienyl(I), can adequately account for the observed spectrum. Nearly equal

$$(I)$$

interactions with the two protons on carbon 9 and the single proton on carbon 10 can explain the major splittings observed while unresolved hyperfine interaction with the remaining eight ring protons is responsible for the rather large line widths.

A simple molecular orbital calculation of the spin densities in I was performed and isotropic hyperfine couplings calculated using

McConnell's relationship⁴ and the observed coupling parameters of Fessenden and Schuler.⁵

The calculated splitting from the lone proton at position 10 was 12.4 gauss and the splittings calculated for the two protons at position 9 were 12.1 gauss. These splittings are in reasonable agreement with the isotropic part of observed axial Hamiltonian of Blum et al., 14.8 gauss for three nearly equivalent protons.

In contrast to anthracene, the most common radiation chemical product in 9-methyl anthracene would involve removal of a methyl proton. This radical also is expected to have three almost

equivalent protons which coincidentally have about the same isotropic hyperfine interaction as (I). This explains the similarity in *powder* spectra observed by Blum *et al.*, for anthracene and 9-methyl anthracene.

REFERENCES

- Blum, H., Mattern, P. L., Arndt, R. A., and Damask, A. C., Molecular Crystals 3, 269 (1967).
- 2. See, for example, Chapiro, A., Radiation Chemistry of Polymeric Systems, Interscience Publishers, pp. 59-62.
- 3. Ingalls, R. B. and Kivelson, D., J. Chem. Phys. 38, 1907 (1963).
- 4. McConnell, H. M., J. Chem. Phys. 24, 632, 764 (1956).
- 5. Fessenden, R. W. and Schuler, R. H., J. Chem. Phys. 39, 2147 (1963).