Fractional Conversion

Reaction: aA+bB→cC+dD

• Conversion,
$$X_{j} = \frac{N_{j0} - N_{j}}{N_{i0}}$$

$$N_{j0}$$
: initial mole of j^{th} reactant

$$N_i$$
: Final mole of j^{th} reactant

$$N_A = N_{A0} (1 - X_A)$$

$$N_{\rm B} = N_{\rm B0} \left(1 - X_{\rm B} \right)$$

Representation of an Elementary Reaction

➤ Elementary reactions are often represented by an equation showing both the molecularity and the rate constant.

$$2A \xrightarrow{k_1} 2R$$

represents a biomolecular irreversible reaction with second-order rate constant k_1 , implying that the rate of reaction is

$$-r_{\mathbf{A}} = r_{\mathbf{R}} = k_1 C_{\mathbf{A}}^2$$

ightharpoonup It would not be proper to write $A \xrightarrow{k_1} R$ for this would imply that the rate expression is

$$-r_{\rm A} = r_{\rm R} = k_1 C_{\rm A}$$

Must be careful to distinguish between the one particular equation that represents the elementary reaction and the many possible representations of the stoichiometry.

Cont...

• Writing the elementary reaction with the rate constant, may not be sufficient to avoid ambiguity. It is necessary to specify the component to which the rate constant is referred.

$$B + 2D \rightarrow 3T$$

- $\sim~$ If the rate is measured in terms of B, the rate equation is $-r_{
 m B}=k_{
 m B}C_{
 m B}C_{
 m B}^2$
- If it refers to D, the rate equation is
- Or if it refers to the product T, then
- O But from the stoichiometry $-r_{\rm B} = -\frac{1}{2}r_{\rm D} = \frac{1}{3}r_{\rm T}$

$$-r_{\rm D} = k_{\rm D} C_{\rm B} C_{\rm D}^2$$

$$r_{\rm T} = k_{\rm T} C_{\rm B} C_{\rm D}^2$$

$$k_{\rm B} = \frac{1}{2} k_{\rm D} = \frac{1}{3} k_{\rm T}$$

- ☐ Rate expression: which k? (assuming elementary reaction)
- ➤ Hence, to avoid ambiguity when the stoichiometry involves different numbers of molecules of the various components, we must specify the component being considered.

Kinetic Models for Nonelementary Reactions

- To explain the kinetics of nonelementary reactions assume that a sequence of elementary reactions is actually occurring but that we cannot measure or observe the intermediates formed because they are only present in very minute quantities.
- Observe only the initial reactants and final products, or what appears to be a single reaction.
 - If the kinetics of the reaction $A_2 + B_2 \rightarrow 2AB$ indicates that the reaction is nonelementary, we may postulate a series of elementary steps to explain the kinetics, such as $A_2 \rightleftharpoons 2A^*$

$$A^* + B_2 \rightleftharpoons AB + B^*$$

$$A^* + B^* \rightleftarrows AB$$

where the asterisks refer to the unobserved intermediates.

✓ To test our postulation scheme, we must see whether its predicted kinetic expression corresponds to experiment.

The types of intermediates we may postulate are suggested by the chemistry of the materials. These may be grouped as follows.

<u>Free Radicals:</u> Free atoms or larger fragments of stable molecules that contain one or more unpaired electrons are called free radicals.

Unstable and highly reactive.

$$CH_3$$
, C_2H_5 , I , H , CCl_3

<u>Ions and Polar Substances:</u> Electrically charged atoms, molecules, or fragments of molecules. such as

$$N_3^-$$
, Na^+ , OH^- , H_3O^+ , NH_4^+ , $CH_3OH_2^+$, I^-

These may act as active intermediates in reactions

Molecules. Consider the consecutive reactions $A \rightarrow R \rightarrow S$

- Ordinarily treated as multiple reactions.
- if the intermediate R is highly reactive its mean lifetime will be very small and its concentration in the reacting mixture can become too small to measure.
- In such a situation R may not be observed and can be considered to be a reactive intermediate.

<u>Transition Complexes.</u> The numerous collisions between reactant molecules result in a wide distribution of energies among the individual molecules.

• This can result in strained bonds, unstable forms of molecules, or unstable association of molecules which can then either decompose to give products, or by further collisions return to molecules in the normal state.

Such unstable forms are called transition complexes

Postulated reaction schemes involving these four kinds of intermediates can be of two types.

Nonchain Reactions: In the nonchain reaction the intermediate is formed in the first reaction and then disappears as it reacts further to give the product. Thus,

```
Reactants → (Intermediates)*
(Intermediates)* → Products
```

<u>Chain Reactions:</u> In chain reactions the intermediate is formed in a first reaction, called the chain initiation step. It then combines with reactant to form product and more intermediate in the chain propagation step. Occasionally the intermediate is destroyed in the chain termination step. Thus,

<u>Peactant</u> (Intermediate)*

Initiation

```
Reactant \rightarrow (Intermediate)* Initiation

(Intermediate)* + Reactant \rightarrow (Intermediate)* + Product Propagation

(Intermediate)* \rightarrow Product Termination
```

The essential feature of the chain reaction is the propagation step. In this step the intermediate is not consumed but acts simply as a catalyst for the conversion of material. Thus, each molecule of intermediate can catalyze a long chain of reactions, even thousands, before being finally destroyed.

Example: Molecular intermediates, nonchain mechanism

The general class of enzyme-catalyzed fermentation reactions

$$A \xrightarrow{\text{with}} R$$

with experimental rate

$$r_{R} = \frac{k[A][E_{0}]}{[M] + [A]}$$

$$constant$$

is viewed to proceed with intermediate (A. enzyme)* as follows:

$$A + \text{enzyme} \rightleftharpoons (A \cdot \text{enzyme})^*$$

 $(A \cdot \text{enzyme})^* \rightarrow R + \text{enzyme}$

Proposed by Michaelis and Menten (1913)

In these elementary reactions we hypothesize the existence of either of two types of intermediates.

Type 1. An unseen and unmeasured intermediate X usually present at such small concentration that its rate of change in the mixture can be taken to be zero. Thus, we assume

[X] is small and
$$\frac{d[X]}{dt} \approx 0$$

This is called the steady-state approximation.

Type 2. Where a homogeneous catalyst of initial concentration Eo is present in two forms, either as free catalyst E or combined in an appreciable extent to form intermediate X, an accounting for the catalyst gives

$$[\mathsf{E}_\mathsf{O}] = [\mathsf{E}] + [\mathsf{X}]$$

$$[\mathsf{E}_0] = [\mathsf{E}] + [\mathsf{X}]$$

We then also assume that either

$$\frac{d\mathbf{X}}{dt} = 0$$

or that the intermediate is in equilibrium with its reactants; thus,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \text{reactant} \\ A \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \text{catalyst} \\ E \end{pmatrix} \stackrel{1}{\rightleftharpoons} \begin{pmatrix} \text{intermediate} \\ X \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$K = \frac{k_1}{k_2} = \frac{[X]}{[A][E]}$$

Search for reaction mechanism

• The irreversible reaction:

$$A + B = AB$$

 Rate of formation of product has been found to be well correlated by the following rate equation:

$$r_{AB} = kC_B^2$$
...independent of C_A

☐ What reaction mechanism is suggested by this rate expression if the chemistry of the reaction suggests that the intermediate consists of an association of reactant molecules and that a chain reaction does not occur?

<u>Model 1.</u> Hypothesize a two-step reversible scheme involving the formation of an intermediate substance A_2^* not actually seen and hence thought to be present only in small amounts. Thus,

$$2A \stackrel{k_1}{\longleftrightarrow} A_2^*$$

$$A_2^* + B \stackrel{k_3}{\rightleftharpoons} A + AB$$

which really involves four elementary reactions

$$2A \xrightarrow{k_1} A_2^*$$

$$A_2^* \xrightarrow{k_2} 2A$$

$$A_2^* + B \xrightarrow{k_3} A + AB$$

$$A + AB \xrightarrow{k_4} A_2^* + B$$

$$r_{AB} = k_3[A_2^*][B] - k_4[A][AB]$$

$$r_{A_2^*} = \frac{1}{2} k_1 [A]^2 - k_2 [A_2^*] - k_3 [A_2^*] [B] + k_4 [A] [AB]$$

• Because the concentration of A_2^* is always extremely small we may assume that its rate of change is zero or

$$r_{\mathbf{A}_2^*} = 0$$

This is the steady-state approximation. Combining Eqs;

$$[\mathbf{A}_{2}^{*}] = \frac{\frac{1}{2} k_{1}[\mathbf{A}]^{2} + k_{4}[\mathbf{A}][\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}]}{k_{2} + k_{3}[\mathbf{B}]}$$

$$r_{AB} = \frac{\frac{1}{2} k_1 k_3 [A]^2 [B] - k_2 k_4 [A] [AB]}{k_2 + k_3 [B]}$$

- Since predicted rate expression does not match experimental rate expression, let us see if any of its simplified forms will.
- \triangleright Thus, if k_2 , is very small, this expression reduces to

$$r_{\rm AB} = \frac{1}{2} k_1 [A]^2$$

➤ If k₄, is very small, **r**, reduces to

$$r_{AB} = \frac{(k_1 k_3 / 2 k_2)[A]^2[B]}{1 + (k_3 / k_2)[B]}$$

☐ Neither of these special forms, matches the experimentally found rate, Thus, the hypothesized mechanism, is incorrect, so another needs to be tried.

Model 2. First note that the stoichiometry A+B=AB is symmetrical in A and B, so just interchange A and B in Model 1, put $k_2 = 0$ and we will get $r_{AB} = k[B]^2$, which is what we want.

So the mechanism that will match the second order rate equation is

$$B + B \xrightarrow{1} B_{2}^{*}$$

$$A + B_{2}^{*} \underset{4}{\overset{3}{\rightleftharpoons}} AB + B$$

$$r_{AB} = (1/2) k_1[B]^2$$

$$2A \stackrel{k_1}{\rightleftharpoons} A_2^*$$

$$2A \underset{k_2}{\overset{k_1}{\longleftrightarrow}} A_2^*$$

$$A_2^* + B \underset{k_4}{\overset{k_3}{\longleftrightarrow}} A + AB$$

$$r_{AB} = \frac{1}{2} k_1 [A]^2$$
With $k_2 = 0$

With
$$k_2 = 0$$