ON THE APPLICABILITY OF THE RELATIVE EXCIMER YIELD EQUATION TO ELECTROGENERATED CHEMILUMINESCENCE

Key words: Luminescence, Fluorescence, Singlet, Triplet, Algebra

J. T. Maloy

Department of Chemistry West Virginia University Morgantown, WV 26506

Allen J. Bard

Department of Chemistry The University of Texas at Austin Austin, TX 78712

In a recent communication, Keszthelyi¹ claims that our application² of the well-known equation used to describe the relative yield of excimer and monomer emission in spectroscopic studies^{3,4}

$$\frac{\Phi_{\mathrm{D}}}{\Phi_{\mathrm{M}}} = \frac{k_{\mathrm{f}}^{\dagger}}{k_{\mathrm{f}}} \frac{\tau_{\mathrm{D}}^{\dagger}}{1 + \alpha \tau_{\mathrm{D}}^{\dagger} k_{\mathrm{d}}} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\tau_{\mathrm{M}}^{\dagger}} + (1 + \alpha) k_{\mathrm{a}} [A] \right) \tag{1}$$

to electrogenerated chemiluminescence (ECL) studies in the presence of a quenching agent (Q) is "mathematically invalid" because the treatment does not apply when $\alpha = R_{\rm D}/R_{\rm M}$ (where $R_{\rm D}$ is the rate of excimer formation and $R_{\rm M}$ is the rate of formation of the excited singlet state monomer) approaches infinity. As we have pointed out, however, this treatment is perfectly general for all steady state luminescent processes, independent of the mode of excitation, and holds for any value of α . Direct substitution in Equation 1 reveals that

MALOY AND BARD

$$\frac{1 \text{im}}{\Phi_{M}} \frac{\Phi_{D}}{\Phi_{M}} = \frac{k'_{f} \tau'_{D} k_{a}}{k_{f}} [A] = m_{1} [A]$$
 (2)

Simple rearrangement of Equation 1 yields

$$\frac{{}^{\Phi}_{D}}{{}^{\Phi}_{M}} = \frac{{}^{k'}_{f}}{{}^{k}_{f}} \frac{{}^{\tau'}_{D}}{{}^{\alpha^{-1}} + {}^{\tau'}_{D}k_{a}} \left(\frac{1}{{}^{\tau'}_{M}} + (\alpha^{-1} + 1)k_{a}[A] \right)$$
(3)

so that

$$\lim_{\alpha \to \infty} \frac{\Phi_{D}}{\Phi_{M}} = \frac{k^{\dagger}f}{k_{f}k_{d}} \left(\frac{1}{\tau^{\dagger}M} + k_{a}[A] \right)$$
(4)

Thus, for the case of "pure" T-route ECL, a plot of $^{\circ}_{D}/^{\circ}_{M}$ vs. [A] has a slope of $k'_{f}k_{a}/k_{f}k_{d}$ (which is independent of [Q]) and an intercept of $k'_{f}/k_{f}k_{d}$ $^{\dagger}_{M}$ (which may have a minimum value of $k'_{f}/k_{f}k_{d}^{\dagger}_{M}$ when [Q] is zero). The slope may also be written as

$$\frac{k'f^ka}{kf^kd} = \frac{m_1}{kd^\tau D}$$
 (5)

where $\mathbf{m}_{\hat{\mathbf{1}}}$ is the slope obtained in the prompt fluorescence experiment (a \rightarrow 0). Since

$$k_{d}\tau'_{D} = \frac{k_{d}}{k'_{f} + k'_{o} + k_{d} + k_{2}[Q]}$$
(7)

it is obvious that the slope of the ϕ_D/ϕ_M vs. [A] plot in "pure" T-route ECL may never be less than that obtained in prompt fluorescence studies.

We have no comments on the remainder of the communication at issue; most of these concepts have been discussed previously elsewhere (see reference 1, and references contained therein). We maintain, however, that our treatment of excimer emission in the presence of a quenching agent in the ECL experiment is valid.

RELATIVE EXCIMER YIELD EQUATION

REFERENCES

- 1. C. P. Keszthelyi, Spec. Ltrs., 7, 409 (1974).
- 2. J. T. Maloy and A. J. Bard, <u>J. Amer. Chem. Soc.</u>, 93, 5968 (1971).
- 3. C. A. Parker and C. G. Hatchard, Trans. Faraday Soc., 59, 284 (1963).
- 4. J. B. Birks, <u>J. Phys. Chem.</u>, 67, 1299 (1963).

Received 12/19/74 Accepted 1/06/75