at absorption zones of different complexes), some conclusions concerning the kinetics of different complexes formation may be reached.

Spectroscopic examination of the emitted light were also performed, using a spectrograph, which analyses the outgoing beam of light. A similar technique has also been adopted from time to time in absorption measurements. For that purpose the source of light (tungsten bulb, flash burner, etc.) is provided to be installed in the irradiation chamber.

A recent application of the device described here is the illumination of certain solutions with highintensity filtered or monochromatic light (visible, ultra-violet) of the γ -irradiated sample. By using this technique some interesting effects have been observed.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna for support.

S. MINC Z. P. ZAGÓRSKI

Department of Radiation Chemistry, Institute of Nuclear Research, Warsaw.

¹Zagórski, Z. P., and Ney, W., Nukleonika, 5, 219 (1960). ² Dainton, F. S., Disc. Farad. Soc., 12, 44 (1952).

pH Effects in the Radiolysis of Aquo-**Organic Systems**

RECENT studies of pH effects in the radiolysis of aqueous solutions have demonstrated the existence of two types of reducing species in irradiated water. The indications are that these species correspond to the solvated electron, H_2O^- , and the H atom^{1,2}. Hayon and Weiss have proposed that the marked pHdependence of hydrogen yields in the radiolysis of air-free solutions of organic compounds is consistent with:

$$H_2O \longrightarrow H_2O^+ + e \tag{1}$$

$$e + H_2 O \longrightarrow H_2 O^-$$
 (2)

$$H^{+} + H_{2}O \longrightarrow H + H_{2}O \qquad (3)$$

$$H + RH \longrightarrow H_2 + R$$
 (4)

where (3) and hence (4) become less important at the higher pH values as competing reactions lead to removal of H_2O^- through:

$$2\mathbf{H}_{2}\mathbf{O}^{-} \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_{2} + 2\mathbf{O}\mathbf{H}^{-} \tag{5}$$

or through capture by solute, for example:

$$\mathbf{H}_{2}\mathbf{O}^{-} + R\mathbf{Cl} \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_{2}\mathbf{O} + \mathbf{Cl}^{-} + R \tag{6}$$

Now, in the radiolysis of air-free formic acid solutions, the yield not only of hydrogen but also of carbon dioxide decreases with increasing pH, and the yield of carbon dioxide becomes essentially zero at pH7 and above³. This latter phenomenon has been interpreted elsewhere⁴ in terms of an effect of pH on the relative rates of the two reactions:

$$2 \text{ COOH} \longrightarrow \text{HCOOH} + \text{CO}_2 \tag{7}$$

$$2 \text{ COOH} \longrightarrow (\text{COOH})_2 \tag{7a}$$

Allan and Scholes⁵, on the other hand, have recently proposed that carbon dioxide is produced under all conditions of pH (through an unspecified mechanism), and that it is afterwards removed through a back reaction between carbonate and the solvated electron

$$H_{2}O^{-} + H_{2}CO_{3} \longrightarrow COOH + OH^{-} + H_{2}O$$
 (8)

followed by 7a or the equivalent. Although carbon dioxide in aqueous solution is known to be reduced to formic and(or) oxalic acid under various conditions

of radiolysis^{5,6}, there is a question as to whether or not reaction 8 could account for the fact that the 'steady-state' concentration of carbonate in alkaline formate solutions is essentially zero³. To obtain information on this point, we have investigated the products labelled with carbon-14 formed in the γ -ray radiolysis of the systems (I) 0.1 M HCOONa-0.01 M NaH¹⁴CO₃.(II) 0.1 M H¹⁴COONa-0.01 MNaHCO₃.

The radiometric and analytical techniques were those developed in an earlier radiation-chemical study of aqueous formic acid solutions labelled with carbon-14 (ref. 4). Both H¹⁴COOH and (¹⁴COOH)₂ were determined because of the possibility of the step:

$$HCOOH + {}^{14}COOH \longrightarrow COOH + H{}^{14}COOH$$

At a dose of 9 \times 10¹⁸ eV./ml., we obtained with solution (I) the values $G(H^{14}COOH) \simeq 0.14$, $G(^{14}COOH)_2 \simeq 0.01$. Solution (II) under the same conditions of irradiation gave $G(^{14}COOH)_2 \simeq 1.5$. It is concluded, therefore, that the reductive reaction (8) is relatively unimportant even at carbonate concentrations as high as one-tenth that of the formic acid. Presumably, the solvated electron is removed in alkaline formic acid solutions through reaction (5).

In this connexion it is of interest to note that a reaction mechanism formally equivalent to the sequence (1) to (5) can be derived on the assumption that the electron formed in step (1) undergoes dissociative capture to yield the hydride ion:

$$H_2O + e \longrightarrow H^- + OH$$
 (2a)

The appearance of H- at an electron-impact potential of 5.6 eV. has been associated by Laidler' with a repulsive state of the H2O- molecule ion. Factors influencing the relative yields of processes 2 and 2ahave been treated by Magee and Burton⁸.

Disposition of H- may be formulated in terms of the competing steps:

$$\mathbf{H}^{-} + \mathbf{H}_2 \mathbf{O} \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_2 + \mathbf{O} \mathbf{H}^{-} \tag{5a}$$

$$\mathbf{H}^{-} + \mathbf{H}_{3}\mathbf{O}^{+} \rightarrow \mathbf{H} + \mathbf{H}_{3}\mathbf{O}$$
(3*a*)

Reaction (5a) has recently been identified experimentally in electron-impact studies of Muschlitz and Bailey⁸. The proposal that H atoms could be liberated in the bulk of the solution through step (3a) is predicated on the hypothesis that electron transfer in aqueous solution may occur at large separations¹⁰.

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

WARREN M. GARRISON BOYD M. WEEKS SIBYL COLE

Lawrence Radiation Laboratory. Crocker Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley 4, California.

- ¹ Barr, N. F., and Allen, A. O., J. Chem. Phys., **63**, 928 (1959). Paper presented at the American Chemical Society Meeting, San Francisco, April 1958. ¹ Hayon, E., and Weiss, J., Proc. Second Intern. Conf. on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, **29** (1958).
- ⁹ Fricke, H., Hart, E. J., and Smith, H. P., J. Chem. Phys., 6, 229 (1958).
- ⁴ Garrison, W. M., Bennett, W., and Cole, S., Rad. Res., 9, 647 (1958). ⁵ Allan, J. T., and Scholes, G., Nature, 187, 218 (1960).
- ⁶ Garrison, W. M., and Rollefson, G. K., Disc. Farad. Soc., 12, 155 (1952).
- ⁷ Laidler, K. J., J. Chem. Phys., 22, 1740 (1954).
- ¹ Magee, J. L., and Burton, M., J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 73, 523 (1951).
 ⁹ Muschlitz, E. E., and Bailey, T. L., J. Phys. Chem., 60, 681 (1956).
 ¹⁰ Farkas, A., and Farkas, L., Trans. Farad. Soc., 34, 1120 (1938).