Taking a brief break from rate equations, we will examine what can be learned from a rate equation without knowing the explicit mechanistic assumptions.

Edwards, J. O.; Greene, E. F.; Ross, J. J. Chem. Educ. 1968, 45, 381.

A. <u>Given</u>:

 $A + B \longrightarrow P$ 

( $\underline{B}$  is assumed to be in excess.)

#### B. Rate Equation and Transition Structure Stoichiometry:

We have been discussing a very important principle of kinetics. To reiterate...

The rate equation tells you the stoichiometry of the rate limiting transition structure relative to the reactants. If you've assigned the structures of your reactants correctly, the rate equation provides the absolute stoichiometry of the rate limiting transition structure.

1. <u>Simple Rate Expressions</u>:

 $-d[\mathbf{A}]/d\mathbf{t} = k[\mathbf{A}][\mathbf{B}]^2$ 

You may conclude...

 $A + 2B \longrightarrow [AB_2]^{\neq} \longrightarrow P$ 

• Although the steps leading to the rate limiting transition structure are unclear, the stoichiometry of the transition structure is well-defined. This assumes that the structure of your starting material is correctly assigned.

2. Importance of Reactant Structure:

 $A + 2B \longrightarrow AB_2 \longrightarrow P$ 

If  $\underline{AB}_2$  does not form appreciably, then...

 $d[\mathbf{P}]/d\mathbf{t} = k'[\mathbf{A}][\mathbf{B}]^2$ 

If  $\underline{AB}_2$  becomes observable, then...

 $AB_2 \longrightarrow P$ 

Since <u>B</u> is in large excess,  $[\underline{AB}_2]$  is dependent upon [A], but is *independent* of [B]. However, if you don't realize  $\underline{AB}_2$  forms, you will incorrectly conclude that <u>B</u> is not in the rate limiting transition structure. In other words...

A → P

Similarly, if the dinuclear complex <u>AB</u> forms, then the reaction will appear to be 1st order (rather than 2nd order) in <u>B</u>.

### 3. Complex Rate Equations:

• By considering all limiting behaviors, we can ascertain the stoichiometries of the different transition structures. Of course, we must also consider the consequences of observable intermediates.

a. <u>Given</u>:

$$d[P]/dt = \frac{k'[A][B]^2}{1 + k''[B]^2}$$

such that k' and k'' are constants, possibly composite rate constants.

b. <u>Limiting Case 1</u>:  $k''[B]^2 >> 1$ 

d[P]/dt = k'''[A]

Therefore, at high [B] there is predicted to be a rate limiting transition structure of  $[A_T]^{\neq}$  stoichiometry.

c. <u>Limiting Case 2</u>:  $1 \gg k''[B]^2$ 

 $d[\mathbf{P}]/d\mathbf{t} = k'[\mathbf{A}][\mathbf{B}]^2$ 

Therefore, at low [B] there is predicted to be a rate limiting transition structure of  $[A_T(B_T)_2]^{\neq}$  stoichiometry.

### d. Consider Four Mechanisms:

i. Mechanism 1:

$$B + B \xrightarrow{k_1} B_2$$

$$d[P]/dt = \frac{k'[A][B]^2}{1 + k''[B]^2}$$

$$B_2 + A \xrightarrow{k_2} P$$

• If  $[B_2]$  stays low, the rates of both steps increase in proportion to  $[B]^2$ . Changing [B] will not change the rate limiting step and will not afford two limiting behaviors.

• If  $[B_2]$  is not observable at low [B] and becomes observable at high [B], we would predict two limiting behaviors. At low [B], the second step would be rate limiting with a rate limiting transition structure of  $[AB_2]^{\neq}$  stoichiometry. This is consistent with the rate law. However, at high [B] affording observable  $\underline{B}_2$ (i.e.,  $[B_2] \propto [B_T]$ ), mechanism 1 reduces to...

$$B_2 + A \xrightarrow{k_2} P$$

and the rate equation reduces to

 $d[P]/dt = k'[A][B_T]$ 

This is inconsistent with the given rate law.

### ii. Mechanism 2:

$$A + B \xrightarrow{k_1} AB$$

$$d[P]/dt = \frac{k'[A][B]^2}{1 + k''[B]^2}$$

$$AB + B \xrightarrow{k_2} P$$

• If [AB] stays low, then either the first step is rate limiting  $([AB]^{\neq})$  or the second step is rate limiting  $([AB_2]^{\neq})$ . This is inconsistent with the limiting behaviors described above.

• If [AB] is not observable at low [B] and becomes observable at high [B], we would predict two limiting behaviors. At low [B], the second step would be rate limiting with a rate limiting transition structure of  $[AB_2]^{\neq}$  stoichiometry. This is consistent with the rate law. However, at high [B] affording observable <u>AB</u> (i.e., [AB] = [A<sub>T</sub>]), mechanism 2 reduces to...

$$AB + B \xrightarrow{k_2} P$$

The rate law simplifies to...

 $d[P]/dt = k'[A_T][B]$ 

This is inconsistent with the original rate law.

iii. Mechanism 3:

$$A + 2B \xrightarrow{k_1} AB_2$$

$$d[P]/dt = \frac{k'[A][B]^2}{1 + k''[B]^2}$$

$$AB_2 \xrightarrow{k_2} P$$

• At low [B], <u>A</u> would be observable. Rate limiting conversion of <u>AB</u><sub>2</sub> would afford...

 $d[P]/dt = k_{obsd}[A_T][B]^2$ 

consistent with transition structure  $[AB_2]^{\neq}$ .

• At high [B],  $\underline{AB}_2$  would become observable. Rate limiting conversion of observable  $\underline{AB}_2$  would afford...

$$d[P]/dt = k_{obsd}[A_T]$$

consistent with transition structure  $[A_T]^{\neq}$  assuming that <u>AB</u><sub>2</sub> formed, but went undetected.

#### iv. Mechanism 4:

Illustrating the ambiguity of saturation kinetics...



• If  $[B_2]$  stays low, then  $[B_2] \propto [B]^2$ , and the last step could be rate limiting with a transition structure of  $[AB_2]^{\neq}$  stoichiometry. At high [B], the concentration of  $[B_2]$  could be sufficiently high (although not yet observable) to efficiently scavenge  $[A^*]$  as it forms. The first step becomes rate limiting with a transition structure of  $[A]^{\neq}$  stoichiometry. Both limiting behaviors are consistent with the original rate equation.