

Journal of Fluorine Chemistry 74 (1995) 149-157



Gaseous ion-molecule reactions of F^- , CF_3^- , $C_2F_5^-$, CF_3^+ and $C_2F_5^+$ with hexafluoropropene oxide

Timothy Su^{a,*}, Gerald B. Hammond^a, Robert A. Morris^b, A.A. Viggiano^b, John F. Paulson^b, Joel F. Liebman^c, Aaron C.L. Su^d

^a Department of Chemistry. University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth, North Dartmouth, MA 02747, USA

^b Phillips Laboratory, Geophysics Directorate, Ionospheric Effects Division (GPID), Hanscomb AFB, MA 01731-3010. USA

^e Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD 21228-5398, USA

^d Polymer Products Department, Experimental Station, E.I. duPont de Nemours & Company, Wilmington, DE 19898, USA

Received 8 November 1994; accepted 8 February 1995

Abstract

The gas-phase reactions of F^- , CF_3^- , $C_2F_5^-$, CF_3^+ and $C_2F_5^+$ with hexafluoropropene oxide (HFPO, C_3F_6O) have been studied using a selected ion flow tube (SIFT) instrument at 300 K. Reactions of $C_4F_9^-$ and $C_3F_7^+$ with HFPO have also been studied as secondary reactions. Reaction rate constants and product branching fractions were measured. The F^- , CF_3^- and $C_2F_5^-$ ions react rapidly with HFPO. The major reaction process is the formation of CF_2O and the corresponding negative product ions. A minor pathway is the production of the ion CF_3O^- . Another reaction channel of F^- and $C_3F_7^-$ ion is the only product observed for the reaction of CF_3^+ with HFPO. The $C_3F_7^+$ ion reacts with HFPO by F^- transfer to produce $C_3F_7O^-$. The $C_3F_7^+$ which, in turn, reacts with HFPO to regenerate $C_2F_5^+$, forming a cationic catalytic cycle for the formation of the inferred neutrals C_2F_4O and C_4F_8O from HFPO. Both $C_2F_5^+$ and $C_3F_7^+$ react with HFPO to produce neutral C_3F_8 and the corresponding positive ions. A rather rapid association reaction was observed between $C_3F_7^+$ and HFPO, forming the adduct $C_6F_{13}O^+$. A systematic estimation for the enthalpies of formation for a series of perfluorinated neutrals and ionic species is also presented.

Keywords: Ion-molecule reactions; Hexafluoropropene oxide; Fluorine ion; Trifluoromethyl ion; F-ethyl ion; Reaction kinetics

1. Introduction

Hexafluoropropene oxide (HFPO, C_3F_6O , 2,2,3-trifluoro-3-trifluoromethyloxirane) has been regarded as the most important member among fluorocarbon epoxides [1]. It is the starting material of many products which are of industrial importance [1]. Many reactions of HFPO have been studied in solution. The most common reactions are those with nucleophiles. For example, HFPO reacts readily with primary amines [2], secondary amines [3,4], tertiary amines [3,4] and enamines [5]. These reactions frequently result in the isomerization of HFPO to perfluoropropionyl fluoride. Numerous studies have been performed regarding the oligomerization of HFPO by anionic polymerization [6–15]. HFPO can react with fluorinated [16–19] and non-fluorinated [20–22] ethers and epoxides to form polyethers.

Reactions with water [3], alcohols [23–28], thiols [3,25] organometallic compounds [29,30] and many other nucle-

0022-1139/95/\$09.50 © 1995 Elsevier Science S.A. All rights reserved *SSDI* 0022-1139(95)03266-5

ophiles, including bifunctional nucleophiles [2], have also been observed. Some reactions of HFPO with electrophiles in solution (although rare) have been reported [31,32]. In these reactions, the oxirane ring is converted into a ketone functionality. HFPO has also been used as a source of difluorocarbene [33,34] which is obtained by heating HFPO to temperatures above 150 °C.

Although HFPO has been much studied in solution and has been the raw material for many products of important industrial and medical applications [1], gas-phase ionic reactions of HFPO have not been explored. Knowledge of the ion chemistry of HFPO in the gas phase may provide insight to its intrinsic properties, which may lead to new applications. We report here a study of reactions of several positive and negative ions with HFPO in the gas phase under thermal conditions at 300 K.

2. Experimental details

The experiments were performed at 300 K using the selected ion flow tube (SIFT) instrument at Phillips Labo-

^{*} Corresponding author.

ratory. The technique has been fully described in the literature [35]. The following is a brief description of the details specific to the present study. Fluoride ions were generated by electron impact on SF₆ in a high-pressure (0.1–1 Torr) ion source. Similarly, CF_3^- was generated from HFPO, and $C_2F_5^-$, CF_3^+ and $C_2F_5^+$ were produced from C_2F_6 or n- C_8F_{18} .

The ions were then mass-selected in a quadrupole mass spectrometer and injected through a Venturi inlet into a stainless-steel flow tube 1 m in length. Inside the flow tube the ions were entrained in the fast flow ($\sim 10^4$ cm s⁻¹) of He carrier gas which flowed from the Venturi inlet. The HFPO reactant neutral was introduced into the flow tube, and the reactant and product ions were sampled through a 0.2-mm diameter orifice in a truncated nose cone, mass analyzed in a second quadrupole mass spectrometer and detected by a channel particle multiplier.

Rate constants were calculated from the reaction times and the slopes of least-squares fits of the natural logarithm of the reactant ion signal plotted versus the added HFPO reactant gas concentration. The reaction time was obtained from the reaction distance and from direct ion time-of-flight measurements in the flow tube. The accuracy of the measured overall rate constants is $\pm 25\%$, and the experimental precision is $\pm 15\%$. Since the rate constant for an individual reaction channel is equal to the overall rate constant multiplied by the product branching fraction for that channel, the accuracy with which the branching fraction can be measured must be considered. We estimate the uncertainty in the channel-specific rate constants to be $\pm 35\%$ with a precision of $\pm 20\%$.

Product ion branching fractions were measured by operating the downstream mass spectrometer at low resolution to avoid mass discrimination. For branching fraction determinations, the product ion signals were recorded as a function of reactant neutral flow rate at a low extent of reaction. Reported branching fractions are the result of extrapolating the branching fractions to zero reactant neutral flow rate in order to account for secondary reactions in the flow tube. The values reported are the averages of several runs.

Reaction rate constants for secondary reactions were estimated by the method described elsewhere [36]. Taking into account the additional uncertainty, the overall uncertainty for the secondary rate constant is estimated to be $\pm 50\%$.

3. Thermochemical data

Reported thermochemical data are taken from the compilation of Lias et al. [37] except for those given in Table 1. Note that the thermochemical data in this report are for gasphase species.

Enthalpies of formation were estimated for those species for which thermochemical data are not available in the literature. The estimation process presented in this section provides a systematic approach to estimating the enthalpies of formation of perfluorinated neutral or ionic species, although some of the species being estimated may not be needed for the experimental results in this report. In the estimations below, all unreferenced thermochemical data have been taken from either the compilation of Lias et al. [37] or Pedley et al. [43].

The enthalpies of formation of the perfluoroacyl fluorides, C_2F_4O and the various isomers of C_4F_8O and $C_5F_{10}O$ may be estimated as follows. Consider the following gas-phase isodesmic reactions [44] and tacitly assume that they are thermoneutral

 $CF_3CF_3 + CH_3COF \longrightarrow CF_3COF + CH_3CF_3$ (1)

 $CF_3COOH + CH_3COF \longrightarrow CF_3COF + CH_3COOH$ (2)

$$CF_3CN + CH_3COF \longrightarrow CF_3COF + CH_3CN$$
 (3)

The three predicted values for ΔH_f of C₂F₄O are -1042 ± 7 , -1041 + 4 and -1014 ± 4 kJ mol⁻¹, respectively. The first two results are consonant with each other as well as with the earlier suggested estimate of one of the authors [45]. The third result is not¹. Admitting a rather large error bar, we suggest the $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [CF₃COF, g] to be -1035 ± 15 kJ mol⁻¹, where we find ourselves 'preferring' the enthalpy of formation values of hexafluoroethane and trifluoroacetic acid over that of trifluoroacetonitrile. To derive the enthalpies of formation of larger perfluoroacyl fluorides, a constant -CF2group increment should not be assumed ². Nonetheless, we will assume that the general $-CF_{2}$ - group increment³ is the difference of the enthalpies of formation of CF₃CF₂COF and CF₃COF, which is -439 ± 9 kJ mol⁻¹. Equating this value to the difference between the $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ values of CF₃CF₂CF₃ and CF_3CF_3 , $\Delta H_c[CF_3CF_2COF, g]$ was derived to be -1474 kJ mol⁻¹. To obtain $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [CF₃(CF₂)₂COF, g], we assume the difference between this quantity and that of CF₃CF₂COF to be equal to that between $CF_3(CF_2)_2CF_3$ and $CF_3CF_2CF_3$. There is no calorimetric measurement of the enthalpy of formation of perfluorobutane. However, let us assume that perfluoroalkanes become 'normal' (having an essentially constant difference of enthalpies of formation for successive $-CF_2$ -group increment) as in the case of perfluoropropane ⁴ and that reaction (4) is thermoneutral.

$$3CF_3CF_2CF_3 + CF_3(CF_2)_5CF_3 \longrightarrow 4CF_3(CF_2)_2CF_3 \quad (4)$$

Thus, $\Delta H_f[CF_3(CF_2)_2CF_3, g]$ is deduced to be -2183 kJ mol⁻¹ and $\Delta H_f[CF_3(CF_2)_2COF, g]$ is derived to be $-1874 \text{ kJ} \text{ mol}^{-1}$.

We now turn to estimating $\Delta H_{\rm f}[(CF_3)_2CFCOF, g]$. It is well established that the difference between the enthalpies of formation of the n-propyl and isopropyl species,

¹ The required enthalpy of formation of CH_3CN has been taken from Ref. [46].

² For a recent discussion of the thermochemistry of fluorinated species, including the lack of constancy of various group increments, see Ref. [47].

³ We mean by the $-CF_{2-}$ group what is more properly written as $C(F)_2(CF_2)_2$ — see Ref. [48].

⁴ For a discussion of the CH_2 group and 'normalcy' in the conceptually simpler series $CH_3(CH_2)_n$, see Ref. [49].

Table 1 Enthalpies of formation at 298 K

Gaseous species	$\Delta H_{\rm f}^{\rm G}$ (kJ mol ⁻¹)	Reference
CF ₂ O	- 606	[38]
CF_3^+	361	[39]
$iso-C_3F_7$	-322	[40]
$\sec -C_4 F_9$	- 2067	[41]
C_3F_6 (perfluoropropene)	- 1152	[42]
C_4F_8	- 1552	estimate ^a
HFPO (hexafluoropropene oxide,		
$F_3 \xrightarrow{F_2} \xrightarrow{F_2}$	- 1130	estimate ^a
CF.COF	- 1035	estimate ^a
CF ₃ (CF ₂),COF	- 1874	estimate ^a
CF30		
CF ₃ CF–CF	- 1884	estimate ^a
O II		
$CF_3-C-CF_2CF_3$	- 1797	estimate ^a
$CF_3(CF_2)_3COF$	-2274	estimate ^a
$C_2F_5-CF-C=O$	- 2284	estimate ^a
O II		
$CF_3-C(CF_2)_2CF_3$	-2197	estimate ^a
CF ₃ CO ⁺	- 322	estimate ^a
CF ₃ CF ₂ CO ⁺	-289	estimate ^a
CF ₃ COCF ₂ ⁺	- 54	estimate ^a
F		
$CF_3CF_2 - C - O - CF(CF_3)_2$	-2086	estimate ^a
CF ₃ CF ₃		
$CF_3CF-O-C_+-CF_3$	-2173	estimate *
CF3		
$CF_3CF_2CF_2-O-C_+$ CF_3	- 2163	estimate ^a

^a See text.

CH₃CH₂CH₂X and (CH₃)₂CHX, is some 8 kJ mol⁻¹ [50] regardless of the electronegativity of group X. It does not appear particularly unreasonable to assume a similar difference for their perfluoro derivatives. As such, $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [(CF₃)₂CFCOF, g] equals – 1884 kJ mol⁻¹. Alternatively, Eq. (5) can be used to derive the most general –CF₂– group enthalpy increment:

$$\Delta H_{\rm df}[-\rm CF_2-] = \Delta H_f[\rm CF_3(\rm CF_2)_2\rm CF_3, g]$$
$$-\Delta H_f[\rm CF_3\rm CF_2\rm CF_3, g] \tag{5}$$

Numerically, the value is -400 kJ mol^{-1} . This allows us to immediately derive $\Delta H_{\rm f}[\text{CF}_3\text{CF}_2\text{COCF}_3, \text{ g}]$ to be equal to $-1797 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ by summing the enthalpy of formation of

gaseous hexafluoroacetone and that of the --CF₂- increment. Relatedly, $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [CF₃(CF₂)₃COF] equals - 2274 kJ mol⁻¹. Likewise, $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [CF₃CF₂CF=CF₂] is derived from adding a -CF₂- group increment to $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [CF₃CF=CF₂] to be - 1552 kJ mol⁻¹. In this report, it is assumed that both 1-C₄F₈ and 2-C₄F₈ have the same enthalpy of formation.

The enthalpy of formation of HFPO is estimated by assuming that cyclo- $[(CF_2)_2O]$ has the same strain energy as cyclo- $[(CF_2)_2CH_2]$ and that the following reaction is thermoneutral:

$$R_{f} - O - R_{f} + cyclo - [(CF_{2})_{2}CH_{2}] \longrightarrow$$

$$R_{f} - CH_{2} - R_{f} + cyclo - [(CF_{2})_{2}O] \quad (6)$$

where R_f is a perfluoroalkyl group. That is, the difference in enthalpies of formation between $cyclo-[(CF_2)_3O]$ and cyclo- $[(CF_2)_2CH_2]$ is the same as that between the perfluoro ether R_1 –O– R_1 and the dihydrogen perfluoroalkane R_1 –CH₂– R_f . Knowing that the enthalpies of formation for R_f -O- R_f with $R_f = C_3 F_7$, $C_4 F_9$ and $C_5 F_{11}$ are -3148, -3979 and -4806 kJ mol⁻¹, respectively, ΔH_f [CF₃-O-CF₃] may be derived by $-CF_2$ - group increments to be $-1550 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ The difference in enthalpy of formation between CF₃CH₂CF₃ $(-1406 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1})$ and CF₃-O-CF₃, and thus, that between $cyclo-[(CF_2)_2CH_2]$ and $cyclo-[(CF_2)_2O]$, is ca. 140 kJ mol⁻¹. Taking the enthalpy of formation for cyclo- $[(CF_2)_2CH_2]$ as -590 ± 43 kJ mol⁻¹ [51], the enthalpy of formation of cyclo- $(CF_2)_2O$ is then (-590-140) kJ mol^{-1} or $-730 \text{ kJ} \text{ mol}^{-1}$. The quantity $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [HFPO] can be estimated by calculating the change of $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ when one of the F atoms in cyclo- $[(CF_2)_2O]$ is replaced by a CF₃ group. Assuming that the difference between ΔH_i (CF₃)₂CFX and $\Delta H_{\rm f}[{\rm CF_3CF_3X}]$ is the same as that between $\Delta H_{\rm f}[{\rm CF_3CF_2CF_2X}]$ and $\Delta H_{\rm f}[{\rm CF_3CF_2X}]$ (i.e. -400 kJ mol^{-1}), $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [HFPO] is then derived to be -1130 kJ mol⁻¹

We now turn to the isomers $CF_3CF_2CF(CF_3)COF$ and $CF_3(CF_2)_2COCF_3$. Following from the analysis of Liebman [50], we conclude that the difference between the enthalpies of formation of n- and sec-butyl derivatives is the same as that between n- and i-propyl derivatives, and from the above discussion we assert that perfluorination does not affect the result. Adding -400 kJ mol^{-1} to the enthalpies of formation of perfluoroisobutyryl fluoride and perfluoro-2-butanone results in -2284 and -2197 kJ mol⁻¹ as predicted enthalpies of formation for these $C_5F_{10}O$ isomers, respectively.

Although it is more precarious to estimate the enthalpies of formation for ions ⁵, a reasonable estimation for the series of ions CF_3CO^+ , $CF_3CF_2CO^+$ and $CF_3(CF_2)_2CO^+$ can be made as follows. It is not unreasonable to assume that reactions (7) and (8) are essentially thermoneutral:

$$CF_3C(OH)_2^+ + CH_3CO^- \longrightarrow$$

 $CF_3CO^+ + CH_3C(OH)_2^- (7)$

 $CF_3CNH^+ + CH_3CO^+ \longrightarrow CF_3CO^+ + CH_3CNH^+$ (8)

From reactions (7) and (8), the discordant values of 143 and 179 kJ mol⁻¹, respectively, are derived for $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [CF₃CO⁺, g]. Much of the discrepancy of the energetics of reactions (7) and (8) is shared by the neutral species of reactions (1) or (2), and (3). Having favored reaction (1) and (2) over (3), we again prefer results from trifluoroacetic acid over those from trifluoroacetonitrile and so suggest $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [CF₃CO⁺, g] to be ca. 150 kJ mol⁻¹. Were size effects ⁵ irrelevant, then the difference between the enthalpies of formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ and CF₃CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ and CF₃CO⁺ is the same as the difference between the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ and CF₃CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ and CF₃CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ and CF₃CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ and CF₃CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ and CF₃CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ and CF₃CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the same as the difference formation of CF₃CP₂CO⁺ is the sam

ference between CF₃CF₂CF₃ and CF₃CF₃. Also, the difference between $CF_3(CF_2)_2CO^+$ and $CF_3CF_2CO^+$ is the same as that of CF₃(CF₂)₂CF₃ and CF₃CF₂CF₃. Ignoring size effects, $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [CF₃CF₂CO⁺, g] would equal -289 kJ mol⁻¹ and $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ [CF₃(CF₂)₂CO⁺, g] would equal - 689 kJ mol⁻¹. From Ref. [45], we find the proton affinities of CF_3CN , CF₃CF₂CN and CF₃(CF₂)₂CN are 695, 699 and 700 kJ mol⁻¹, respectively, suggesting that size effects may well be negligible for highly fluorinated species⁶, and they will in fact be neglected here. Intuitively, using hydrocarbon analogies, $CF_3CF_2CO^+$ should be more stable than its isomer $CF_3COCF_2^+$ (after al, acyl cations are more stable than β ketoalkyl cations). Yet, it is not unambiguous here at first glance that the two α -fluorines destabilize the acyl cation in the former species while the two α -fluorines stabilize the latter. For lack of other information, we approximate ΔH_1 [CF₃COCF₂⁺, g] by assuming thermoneutrality for

$$CF_{3}COCF_{3} + C_{2}F_{5}^{+} \longrightarrow CF_{3}COCF_{2}^{+} + C_{2}F_{6}$$
(9)

The result is -54 kJ mol^{-1} with an error bar of >60 kJ mol⁻¹ because of huge uncertainties in the experimental measurements of $\Delta H_f[CF_3CF_2^+, g]$.

The enthalpy of formation for $C_6F_{13}O^+$ with the structure $CF_3CF_2-C^+(F)-O-CF(CF_3)_2$ may be estimated by assuming reactions (10) and (11) to be thermoneutral:

$$CF_3CF_2COOCF(CF_3)_2 + CF_3C(OH)F^+ \longrightarrow$$

 $CF_{3}COOH + C_{6}F_{13}O$ (10)

$$CF_3CF_3COOCF_3 + (CF_3)_2CFOH \longrightarrow$$

$$CF_3CF_2COOCF(CF_3)_2 + CF_3COH$$
 (11)

and that

$$\Delta H_{\rm t}$$
[(CF₃)₂CF₂] + 25 kJ mol⁻¹

$$=\Delta H_{\rm f}[(\rm CF_3)_2\rm CFOH]$$
(12)

based on other organic F, OH replacements (see Refs. [52– 54] and the studies cited therein). This gives $\Delta H_f[CF_3CF_2-C^+(F)-O-CF(CF_3)_2] = -2135$ kJ mol⁻¹. A more accurate value can be obtained by considering (1) the effect of the CF₃CF₂ group on the stability of the cation compared to the CF₃ group in CF₃C(OH)F⁺ and (2) the effect of (CF₃)₂CF on the stability of the cation compared to that of H. Since the proton affinity of CF₃CF₂CN is 4 kJ mol⁻¹ higher than that of CF₃CN, replacing the CF₃ group by the CF₃CF₂ group would stabilize the cation by 4 kJ mol⁻¹. Looking at a collection of oxygen bases, ketones, esters, alcohols and ethers, the proton affinity of RH is some 43 kJ mol⁻¹ higher than that of RCF₃ [52]. But the functional group of interest is

⁵ By size effects we lump together the awareness that the ionization poten tials and proton affinities for the series $CH_3(CH_2)_nX$ respectively decrease and increase with *n*, i.e. a charge center is stabilized by larger affixed groups (For example, see the introduction to Ref. [37])

⁶ By contrast, the proton affinities of their all-hydrogen analogs CH₃CN, CH₃CH₂CN and CH₃CH₂CH₂CH₂CN are 788, 806 and 810 kJ mol⁻¹. It is a moot point whether the difference is because of 'more stuff' even for smaller perfluoroalkyl chains and so saturation is achieved earlier or that there is increasing electron withdrawal as the perfluoro chain gets longer which cancels the size effect.

1	5	1
1	2	-

Table 2
Branching fractions and total rate constants for reactions of selected negative ions with HFPO measured at 300 K

Reaction	Branching fraction	Total rate constant $(10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$	
$F^- + C_3 F_6 O \longrightarrow C_2 F_5^- + C F_2 O$	0.65	11	
$\longrightarrow CF_3^- + C_2F_4O$	0.30		
\longrightarrow CF ₃ O ⁻ + C ₂ F ₄	0.05		
$CF_3^- + C_3F_6O \longrightarrow C_3F_7 + CF_2O$	0.61	11	
$\longrightarrow C_2F_5^- + C_2F_4O$	0.22		
$\longrightarrow CF_{0}O^{-} + C_{1}F_{0}$	0.17		
$C_2F_5^- + C_3F_6O \longrightarrow C_4F_0^- + CF_2O$ $ _{C_4F_6O}$	0.75	7.3	
		3.0	
$\longrightarrow CF_3O^- + C_4F_8$	0,17		
\longrightarrow F ⁻⁺ +C ₅ F ₁₀ O	0.07		
$\longrightarrow CF_3 + C_4F_8O$	0.01		

Table 3

Branching fractions and total rate constants for reactions of selected positive ions with HFPO measured at 300 K a

Reaction	Branching fraction	Total rate constant $(10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$	
$CF_3^+ + C_3F_6O \longrightarrow C_3F_7^+ + CF_2O$	1.00	7.2	
$\xrightarrow{C_{4}} C_{2}F_{5}^{+} + C_{4}F_{8}O$		2.2	
$ \longrightarrow C_3F_5O^+ + C_3F_8 $		1.4 5.4	
$C_2F_5^+ + C_3F_4O \longrightarrow C_3F_7^+ + C_5F_4O$	0.83	7.6	
$\longrightarrow C_2F_3O^+ + C_3F_8$	0.17		

^a Rate constant for secondary reactions are individual reaction rate constants.

 $(CF_3)_2CF$, where two F atoms are replaced by CF_3 groups. It was shown earlier that changing F to CF_3 decreases the proton affinity by ca. 5 kJ mol⁻¹. Assuming additivity and no saturation, a decrease in proton affinity is equivalent to an increase in enthalpy of formation; we therefore conclude that $\Delta H_1[CF_3CF_2-C^+(F)-O-CF(CF_3)_2] = -2135-4+$ $43+2\times 5 = -2086$ kJ mol⁻¹.

We now turn to the ions $(CF_3)_2C^+-O-CF(CF_3)_2$ and $(CF_3)_2C^+-O-CF_2CF_2CF_3$. Let us assume that the difference between the enthalpies of formation of $(CF_3)_2COR^+$ and $CF_3CF_2CFOR^+$ is independent of the affixed group R: as such, take R = H for our estimates. The first new cation is recognized as protonated hexafluoroacetone and has a suggested enthalpy of formation of -495 kJ mol⁻¹. Ignoring size effects as suggested earlier in this text, $\Delta H_f[CF_3CF_2CFOH^+, g]$ equals the sum of $\Delta H_{f^-}[CF_3CFOH^+, g]$ and that of the universal $-CF_2$ - increment. This new enthalpy of formation is -582 kJ mol⁻¹, resulting in a difference of ion enthalpies of formation of 87 kJ mol⁻¹ favoring the latter cation. As such, the enthalpy of formation of $(CF_3)_2C^+-O-CF(CF_3)_2$ is predicted to be (-2086-87) kJ mol⁻¹ = -2173 kJ mol⁻¹. From the difference of enthal-

pies of formation between n-propyl and isopropyl species mentioned above, the $\Delta H_{\rm f}$ value of $(CF_3)_2C^+$ -O- $CF_2CF_2CF_3$ is estimated to be -2163 kJ mol⁻¹.

4. Results and discussion

Rate constants and branching fractions for the reactions of selected negative ions and positive ions with HFPO are presented in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

4.1. Reactions of negative ions $(F^-, CF_3^- \text{ and } C_2F_5^-)$ with HFPO

HFPO reacts rapidly with F^- , CF_3^- and $C_2F_5^-$. In all three cases, the major reaction channel is the formation of CF_2O and the corresponding negative ions.

0.1

Reaction	ΔH (kJ mol ⁻¹)	Rate constant $(10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$	Equation No
$F^- + C_3F_6O \rightarrow C_2F_5^- + CF_2O$ $CF_5^- + C_5F_0 \rightarrow C_5F_5^- + CF_2O$	- 294	7.2	(13)
$C_2F_5^- + C_3F_6O \rightarrow C_4F_9^- + CF_2O$	- 476	5.5	(15)

It appears that these reactions take place by nucleophilic attack at the more substituted carbon of the epoxide with concomitant ring-opening as shown below:

The presence of CF_3O^- was also observed, being formed at relatively slower rates as a product of the reactions of F^- , CF_3^- and $C_2F_5^-$ with HFPO:

Reaction	ΔH (kJ mol ⁻¹)	Rate constant (10^{-10} cm^3) s^{-1}	Equation No.
$F^- + C_3F_6O \rightarrow CF_3O^- + C_2F_4$	- 342	0.5	(16)
$CF_3^- + C_3F_6O \rightarrow CF_3O^- + C_3F_6$	- 436	1.9	(17)
$C_2F_5 - + C_3F_6O \rightarrow CF_3O - + C_4F_8$	- 417	1.2	(18)

The formation of CF_3O^- in these reactions probably originates from reactions (13)–(15) immediately followed by F^- transfer from (RCFCF₃)⁻ to CF₂O.

Fluoride ion was also observed (7%) in the reaction of $C_2F_5^-$ with HFPO. A small amount of F^- formation arises from the collision-induced dissociation [55] of $C_2F_5^-$ (<1%). The remaining fluoride ion is produced in the reaction of $C_2F_5^-$ with HFPO (19):

Reaction	ΔH (kJ mol ⁻¹)	Rate constant $(10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$	Equation No.
$C_2F_5^- + C_3F_6O \rightarrow F^- + C_5F_{10}O$	-249 or - 336	0.5	(19)

The reaction may occur via a nucleophilic ring-opening on either end of the epoxide, yielding different isomers of $C_5F_{10}O$:

Mechanism I:
$$\Delta H = -249 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$$

Mechanism II: $\Delta H = -336 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccc} & & & & & & & & \\ F_{1} & & & & & & & & \\ F_{2} & & & & & & & \\ F_{2} & & \\ F$$

In mechanism I, $C_2F_5^-$ attacks the terminal carbon resulting in the formation of F⁻ and the CF₃COCF₂CF₂CF₃ isomer. In mechanism II, on the other hand, the ion attacks the more substituted carbon, leading to a more stable isomer CF₃CF₂CF(CF₃)COF (see Table 1) as a product. Furthermore, in mechanism II, the negative charge on the O atom of the intermediate is stabilized by two electron-withdrawing F atoms attached to the nearest carbon, whereas in mechanism I, the negative charge is stabilized by only one nearest F atom. In the light of the above reasoning, the reaction most likely proceeded via mechanism II.

The presence of C_2F_4O was also inferred as a product of the reactions of F^- and CF_3^- with HFPO:

Reaction	ΔH (kJ mol ⁻¹)	Rate constant $(10^{-10}$ cm ³ s ⁻¹)	Equation No.
$F + C_3F_6O \rightarrow CF_3^- + C_2F_4O$	- 304	3.3	(20)
$CF_{3}^{-} + C_{3}F_{6}O \rightarrow C_{2}F_{5}^{-} + C_{2}F_{4}O$	- 324	2.4	(21)

These reactions probably occur by an attack at the terminal carbon:

$$F_{3}C \longrightarrow F_{2}$$

$$F_{2} \longrightarrow CF_{3}-C \longrightarrow CF_{3}CFO + RCF_{2}$$

$$R = F^{*} \text{ or } CF_{3}^{*}$$

$$R = F^{*} \text{ or } CF_{3}^{*}$$

Although this reaction mechanism is similar to that proposed for reactions (13)-(15), the attack on the terminal carbon leads to a less stable intermediate [see discussion of reaction (19)] and, consequently, a lower reaction rate.

As a secondary reaction in the study of the $C_2F_5^-$ reactions with HFPO, $C_4F_9^-$ was observed to react with HFPO forming $C_3F_7O^-$ via a fluoride ion transfer process:

Reaction	ΔH (kJ mol ⁻¹)	Rate constant $(10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$	Equation No.
$C_4F_9^- + C_3F_6O \rightarrow C_3F_7O^- + C_4F_8$	- 209	3.0	(22)

The association reaction of F^- and HFPO was not observed, however. It should be noted that in the study of the F^- reactions, $C_4F_9^-$ was observed as a secondary ion and $C_3F_7O^$ as a tertiary ion. In fact, $C_3F_7O^-$ is the most abundant product ion at high pressures. Traces of CF_3^{-1} were also detected. We believe that this product is a result of impurities in the system.

In solution, most nucleophiles react with HFPO by attacking the more substituted carbon [2–5,24,25,30,56]. Our results indicate that the reactions in the gas phase have the same preference. Attack at the terminal carbon was also observed in solution for nucleophiles exhibiting large steric hindrance [57]. In the gas phase however, small nucleophiles (F^- , CF_3^-) attack HFPO at the terminal carbon quite readily [see reactions (20) and (21)]. However, $C_2F_5^-$ does not follow this trend. This is probably not an effect of steric hindrance. The heat of reaction for the process $C_2F_5^- + C_3F_6O \rightarrow C_3F_7^- + C_2F_4O$ is -420 kJ mol⁻¹ which is more exothermic than both reactions (20) and (21). The reason why this reaction was not observed is yet unclear.

4.2. Reactions of positive ions (CF_3^+ and $C_2F_5^+$) with HFPO

Although reactions of HFPO with electrophiles in solution are rare, HFPO appears to react quite readily with CF_3^+ and $C_2F_5^+$ in the gas phase with rate constants comparable to those for the reactions with the corresponding negative ions. The $C_3F_7^+$ ion is the only product of the reaction between HFPO and CF_3^+ , and it is the major product in the reaction between HFPO and $C_2F_5^+$.

Reaction	Δ <i>H</i> (kJ mol ⁻¹)	Rate constant $(10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$	Equation No.
$CF_{3}^{+} + C_{3}F_{6}O \rightarrow C_{3}F_{7}^{+} + CF_{2}O$	- 159	7.2	(23)
$C_2F_5^+ + C_3F_6O \rightarrow C_3F_7^+ + C_2F_4O$	-227	6.3	(24)

In both cases the formation of $C_3F_7^+$ occurs with similar rates, suggesting a common mechanism. The reactions are probably initiated by the positive ion attacking the oxygen atom:



 $R = F \text{ or } CF_3$

Reaction of $C_2F_5^+$ with HFPO also produces $C_2F_3O^+$.

Reaction	ΔH (kJ mol ⁻¹)	Rate constant $(10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$	Equation No.
$C_2F_5^+ + C_3F_6O \rightarrow C_2F_3O^+ + C_3F_8$	- 503	1.3	(25)

As secondary processes in the study of the CF_3^+ reaction with HFPO, $C_3F_7^+$ was observed to react with HFPO producing $C_2F_5^+$, $C_3F_5O^+$ and $C_6F_{13}O^+$:

Reaction	ΔH (kJ mol ⁻¹)	Rate constant $(10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})$	Equation No.
$C_{3}F_{7}^{+} + C_{3}F_{6}O \rightarrow C_{2}F_{5}^{+} + C_{4}F_{8}O$	- 422 or - 345	2.2	(26)
$ \rightarrow C_3F_5O^+ + C_3F_8 \rightarrow C_6F_{13}O^+ $	- 385 < - 634	1.4 5.4	(27) (28)

Reaction (26) could occur by any of the following mechanisms:



or



The first mechanism, which results in a more stable isomer of C_4F_8O (see Table 1) as a product, is the more probable reaction process. A small portion of $C_2F_5^+$ could be produced by collision-induced dissociation [40]. Reactions (25) and (27) yield C_3F_8 with similar rates. This result suggests that they proceed via a similar mechanism:



 $(R = F \text{ or } CF_3).$

This mechanism involves two F shifts. Alternatively, ringopening can take place between oxygen and the more substituted carbon:



Both of the above mechanisms yield the same products. The latter however proceeds via a more stable (secondary) carbonium ion as an intermediate and is therefore considered to be the more likely process. The ionic product $(C_2F_3O^-)$ in reaction (25) possibly rearranges itself via an F^- shift to form the isomer CF_3CO^+ which is believed to be more stable than the isomer CF_2CFO based on a similar argument as that for the $C_3F_5O^+$ ion discussed in Section 3.

It is possible that reaction (27) occurs by a simple onestep F^- transfer:



This mechanism is less likely since F^- transfer was not observed in the reactions of CF_3^+ and $C_2F_5^+$ with HFPO.

An association reaction (28) was observed. This adduct is probably a stabilized intermediate of reaction (27). While the structure of $C_6F_{13}O^+$ is not clear, an estimation of the enthalpies of formation of a few possible isomers of $C_6F_{13}O^+$ (see Table 1) suggests that reaction (28) is highly exothermic.

Reactions (24) and (26) together constitute a catalytic cycle, i.e., the formation of C_2F_4O and C_4F_8O from C_3F_6O catalyzed by either $C_2F_5^+$ or $C_3F_7^+$:

	$C_2F_5^+ + C_3F_6O$	\rightarrow	$C_3F_7^+ + C_2F_4O$
	$\frac{C_3F_7 + C_3F_6O}{$	→ 	$C_2F_5^+ + C_4F_8O$
net:	2C ₄ F ₆ O	\rightarrow	$C_2F_4O + C_4F_8O$

A similar ion-catalyzed scheme has been reported for the reaction of CF_3^+ with C_2F_4 [58]. Combination of reactions (13) and (19) have a similar catalytic property. However, because reaction (19) is much slower than reaction (13), this catalytic cycle is not considered to be important.

5. Summary and conclusions

Several types of reactions were observed for the interactions of selected positive and negative fluorocarbon ions with HFPO in the gas phase. Many of these reactions proceed rapidly. Negative ions prefer the attack at the more substituted carbon of the epoxide. The major channel for all three negative ions studied is the transfer of C_2F_4 from HFPO to form the neutral product CF_2O and the corresponding ions. A minor channel is the formation of the CF_3O^- ion by a $C_2F_3^+$ transfer from HFPO. Attack at the terminal carbon of HFPO by F^- and CF_3^- to produce C_2F_4O via a CF_2 transfer was also observed with lower reactivities compared to the attack at the more substituted carbon.

HFPO reacts with CF_3^+ , $C_2F_5^+$ and $C_3F_7^+$ quite rapidly, with rate constants comparable to the negative ion reactions studied. These ions attack the oxygen atom of HFPO with a subsequent ring-opening. Most of the positive ion reactions occur with multiple steps. While negative ions favor a transfer of an ion or a neutral species with HFPO, positive ions prefer a formal exchange reaction. The major reaction of both CF_3^+ and $C_2F_5^+$ with HFPO is a formal exchange of an F⁻ ion from the positive ion with an O^{2-} ion derived from HFPO to form $C_3F_7^+$. Reactions of $C_2F_5^+$ and $C_3F_7^+$ with HFPO also occur via a formal exchange of two F⁻ ions from the positive ion with an O^{2-} ion from HFPO to form C_3F_8 .

The reaction of $C_2F_5^+$ with HFPO features an interesting complication in that the $C_3F_7^+$ product ion also reacts with HFPO to regenerate $C_2F_5^+$ with a comparable rate. This twostep sequence leads to the formation of C_2F_4O and C_4F_8O catalyzed by $C_2F_5^+$.

Acknowledgments

Part of this work was supported by a contract between E.I. duPont de Nemours and Company and T. Su through the University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth. Financial support from the National Science Foundation (CHE-9122304) to G. Hammond is acknowledged with gratitude.

References

- H. Millauer, W. Schwertfeger and G. Siegemund, Angew. Chem., Int Ed. Engl., 24 (1985) 161.
- [2] H. Kawa, H.A. Hamouda and N. Ishikawa, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 53 (1980) 1694.
- [3] D. Sianesi, A. Pasetti and F. Tarli, J. Org. Chem., 31 (1966) 2312.
- [4] I.L. Knunyants, V.V. Shokina and I.V. Galakhov, *Khim. Geterotsikl. Soedin.*, (1966) 873.
- [5] T. Ishihara, T. Seki and T. Ando, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 55 (1982) 3345.
- [6] G.M. Tyul'ga, V.A. Gubanov, D.S. Rondarev, R.M. Ryazanova and I.M. Dolgopol'skii, *Zh. Org. Khim.*, 16 (1980) 300.
- [7] J.T. Hill, J. Macromol. Sci., Chem., 8 (1974) 499
- [8] N.V. Veretennikov, V.A. Gubanov, I.M. Dolgopol'skii and G.M. Khrostik, Zh. Org. Khim., 12 (1976) 1668.
- [9] J.T. Hill and J.P. Erdman, ACS Symp. Ser., 59 (1977) 269.
- [10] T.G. Shchibrya, A.V. Ignatenko, S.P. Krukovskii and V.A. Ponomarenko, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Khim.*, (1980) 700.
- [11] Y. Duan, D. Ni and Y. He, Kao Fen Tzu T'ung Hsun. (1981) 139: [Chem. Abs., 95 (1981) 204 487k].
- [12] P. Shpakov, V.A. Gubanov, G.M. Tyul'ga, A.V. Zak, P.E. Troichanskaya and L.M. Kazakova, Zh. Prikl. Khim. (Leningrad), 54 (1981) 2726.
- [13] T.G. Shchibrya, S.P. Krukovskii and V.A. Ponomarenko, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Khim., (1982) 1999.
- [14] V.A. Gubanov, G.M. Tyul'ga, M.A. Sherman, I.G. Solodkaya, L.A. Kazakova, A.V. Zad and P.P. Shpakor, *Zh. Org. Khim.*, 19 (1983) 1151.
- [15] Ya.M. Vilenchik, G.I. Lekontseva, F.M. Mukhametshin, A.I. Shumikhinia, S.P. Krukovskii and V.A. Ponomarenko, *Izv. Akad. Nauk* SSSR, Ser. Khim., (1983) 1891.
- [16] B.C. Anderson (to du Pont), DOS 1 593 233,1969.
- [17] K.J.L. Paciorek, T.I. Ito, J.H. Nakahara and R.H. Kratzer, Ind. Eng. Chem., Prod. Res. Dev., 22 (1983) 5.
- [18] C.G. Krespan and A.P. King (to du Pont), Eur. OS 62 324,1982
- [19] T.R. Darling and C.G. Krespan (to du Pont), Eur. OS 62 323,1982
- [20] H.A. Wiist (to du Pont), DBP 1 251 300,1957
- [21] Y. Oda, K. Uchida and S. Morikawa (to Ashai Glass, (Jpn. Pat. 7 821 109,1987.
- [22] Y. Oda, K. Uchida and S. Morikawa (to Ashai Glass), Jpn. Pat 7 821 110,1978.
- [23] I.L. Knunyants, V.V. Shokina and V.V. Tyuleneva, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk* SSSR, 169 (1966) 594.
- [24] Shanghai Institute of Organic Chemistry, Hua Hsueh Hsueh Pao, 34 (1976) 53; [Chem. Abs., 86 (1977) 170 817q].
- [25] D. Sianesi, A. Pasetti and F. Tarli (to Montecatini Edison), DOS 1 593 046,1969.
- [26] V.I. Soloutin, I.A. Piterskikh, K.I. Pashkevich, I.Ya. Postovskii and B.N. Kodess, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Khim.*, (1980) 439.
- [27] A. Pasetti, F. Tarli and D. Sianesi, Gazz. Chim. Ital., 98 (1968) 277.
- [28] L.W. Breed, R.L. Elliott and C.F. Key, Ind. Eng. Chem., Prod. Res. Dev., 11 (1972) 88.

- [29] R.O'B. Watts, C.G. Allison, K.P. Barthod and P. Tarrant, J. Fluorine Chem., 3 (1973) 7.
- [30] R.O'B. Watts and P. Tarrant, J. Fluorine Chem., 6 (1975) 481.
- [31] I.L. Knunyants, V.V. Shokina and E.I. Mysov, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, Ser. Khim., (1973) 2725.
- [32] I.L. Knunyants, V.V. Shokina and L.M. Zabotnova, USSR Pat. 433 125,1974.
- [33] W. Mahler and P.R. Resnick, J. Fluorine Chem., 3 (1973) 451.
- [34] P.B. Sargeant, J. Org. Chem., 35 (1970) 678.
- [35] D. Smith and N.G. Adams, Adv. At. Mol. Phys., 24 (1988) 1.
- [36] T. Su, A.C.L. Su, A.A. Viggiano and J.F. Paulson, J. Phys. Chem., 91 (1987) 3683.
- [37] S.G. Lias, J.E. Bartmess, J.F. Liebman, J.L. Holmes, R.D. Levin and W.G. Mallard, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data, 17 (1988) (Suppl. 1) 1.
- [38] J.A. Montgomery, Jr., H.H. Michels and J.S. Francisco, Chem. Phys. Lett., 220 (1994) 391.
- [39] E.R. Fisher and P.B. Armentrout, J. Mass Spectrom. Ion Phys., 101 (1990) R1.
- [40] T. Su, L. Kevan and T.O. Tiernan, J. Chem. Phys., 54 (1971) 4871.
- [41] Estimated from dissociative electron attachment data: (a) S.M. Spyrou, I. Sauers and L.G. Christophorou, J. Chem. Phys., 78 (1983) 2700; (b) S.M. Spyrou, S.R. Hunter and L.G. Christophorou, J. Chem. Phys., 83 (1985) 641.
- [42] T.S. Papina, V.P. Kolesoy and Y.G. Golanova, Russ. J. Phys. Chem., 61 (1987) 1168.
- [43] J.B. Pedley, R.D. Naylor and S.P. Kirby, *Thermochemical Data of Organic Compounds*. 2nd edn., Chapman & Hall, London, 1986.
- [44] W.J. Hehre, R. Ditchfield, L. Radom and J.A. Pople, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 92 (1970) 4796.
- [45] S.G. Lias, J.F. Liebman and R.D. Levin, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data, 13 (1984) 695.
- [46] X.W. An and M. Mansson, J. Chem. Thermodyn., 15 (1983) 287.
- [47] S.W. Slayden, J.F. Liebman and W.G. Mallard, in S. Patai and Z. Rappoport (eds.), *The Chemistry of Functional Groups Supplement D2: The Chemistry of Organic Halides, Pseudohalides and Azides*, John Wiley, Chichester, UK, in press.
- [48] See J.F. Liebman, W.R. Dolbier, Jr. and A. Greenberg, J. Phys. Chem., 90 (1986) 394.
- [49] J.F. Liebman, K.S.K. Crowford and S.W. Slayden, in S. Patai and Z. Rappoport (eds.), *The Chemistry of Functional Groups Supplement S: The Chemistry of Sulphur-containing Functional Groups*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK, 1993.
- [50] See, for example, J.F. Liebman, in S. Patai and Z. Rappoport (eds.), *The Chemistry of Sulphonic Acids, Esters and their Derivatives*, John Wiley, Chichester, UK, 1991.
- [51] J.F. Liebman and A. Greenberg, Chem. Rev., 89 (1989) 1225.
- [52] J.F. Liebman, in J.F. Liebman, A. Greenberg and W.R. Dolbier (eds.), Fluorine-containing Molecules; Structure, Reactivity, Synthesis and Applications. VCH Publishers, Inc., New York, 1988.
- [53] D.L. Kunkel, A.D. Fant and J.F. Liebman, J. Mol. Struct., 300 (1993) 509.
- [54] J.F. Liebman, J.A. Martinho Simões and S.W. Slayden, Struct. Chem., in press.
- [55] T. Su, L. Kevan and T.O. Tiernan, J. Phys. Chem., 75 (1971) 2534.
- [56] J.A. Young, Fluorine Chem. Rev., 1 (1967) 389.
- [57] R.A. Bekker, G.V. Asratyan and B.L. Dyatkin, *Zh. Org. Khim.*, 9 (1973) 1644.
- [58] R.A. Morris, A.A. Viggiano and J.F. Paulson, J. Phys. Chem., 97 (1993) 6208.