Determination of the Apparent Reaction Rate Constants for Ozone Degradation of Substituted Phenols and QSPR/QSAR Analysis

Liu, H.¹, Tan, J.¹, Yu, H. X.², Liu, H. X.¹, Wang, L.S.², and Wang, Z.Y.^{1,2*}

¹School of Biological and Chemical Engineering, Jiaxing University, Zhejiang Jiaxing, 314001, People's Republic of China

² State Key Laboratory of Pollution Control and Resources Reuse, School of Environment, Nanjing University, Jiangsu Nanjing 210093, People's Republic of China

Received 3 Sep 2009:	Revised 27 Nov 2009:	Accepted 4 Apr. 2009
Received 5 Bep. 2009,	iterised 27 1101. 2009,	Theophea Tripi. 2009

ABSTRACT: Although extensive experimental work has been carried out during the last several years, experimental reaction rate constants are available only for hundreds of compounds. Therefore, it is useful to develop a theoretical prediction method, which can be used to obtain estimates of the necessary kinetic parameters. One of the most successful approaches to predict chemical properties starting only from molecular structural information is quantitative structure–activity/property relationships modeling (QSAR/QSPR). The purpose of this paper is to study the relationships between concentrations of 26 substituted phenols and reaction times during the ozonation process and determine the reaction orders and apparent reaction rate constants (lgk'). Then, optimized geometries of the substituted phenols were carried out at the B3LYP/6-311G** level using the Gaussian 03 software package. The structural and thermodynamic parameters obtained were taken as theoretical descriptors to establish a novel QSPR/QSAR model for -lgk' of the substituted phenols, with a regression coefficient R = 0.909 and standard deviation SD = 0.141. Finally, the stability of the model for -lgk' predictions was checked by the *t*-test, showing satisfactory results. Results obtained reveal the reliability of QSPR/QSAR model for the prediction of ozone degradations rate constant of organic compounds.

Key word: Ozonation, Degradation rate, Density functional theory (DFT), Multiple linear regressions, Structural and thermodynamic parameters, E_{LUMO}

INTRODUCTION

With the development of the chemical industry, substituted phenols have been increasingly used for the synthesis of drugs and other chemicals. Substituted phenolic compounds, most of which are persistent and/or toxic organic pollutants, can be categorized as carcinogens, or malformation and mutation causing substances. Among these compounds, chlorophenol has been considered as one of 129 controlled priority pollutants by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Keith, et al., 1979). In recent years, increasing attention has been paid to phenols in wastewater (Kuscu, et al., 2005; Fang, et al., 2006; Subramanyam, et al., 2007; Dalal, et al., 2007; Xie, et al., 2008). Because the molecular structure of substituted phenols has a benzene ring with high chemical stability, it is difficult to completely degrade them by conventional biochemical or physical chemistry means.

Ozonation is one of the most efficient technologies for treating wastewaters. Due to intensive oxidation, ozone can degrade most organic compounds into CO₂ and H₂O. A number of novel advanced ozonation processes have been developed to improve oxidation efficiency. Shen et al. (2008) studied the kinetics and mechanisms of degradation of p-chloronitrobenzene in water by ozonation and concluded that the phenols can undergo ring-opening reactions to produce low molecular carboxylic acids and finally CO₂. The main intermediate products were phenol, p-chlorophenol, p-nitrophenol, 2-chloro-5-nitrophenol, 5-chloro-2nitrophenol, 5-nitro-catechol, para-benzoquinone, 5nitro-1,2,3-trihydroxy phenol, trihydroxy semiquinone and glycolic acid. Sánchez-Polo et al. (2007) compared the efficiency of UV photodegradation in combination with various advanced oxidation processes (O₂, UV/H_2O_2 , O_2 /activated carbon) for the degradation of naphthalenesulfonic acids in aqueous solution and investigated the kinetics and the mechanisms involved in these processes. Chu et al. (2007) investigated the ozonation of synthetic wastewater containing an azo dye, CI Reactive Black 5, using a microbubble genera-

^{*}Corresponding author E-mail: wangzun315cn@163.com

tor and a conventional bubble contactor. Harrison et al. (2007) explored the degradation mechanisms of citronellal reactions with ozone and OH radicals. Gramatica et al. (1999) studied the tropospheric degradation of organic compounds by OH, NO, radicals and ozone and developed statistical models for predicting the oxidation rate constants of OH and NO, for many heterogeneous compounds by the quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR) and quantitative structure-property relationship (QSPR) method. In addition, QSPR/QSAR models were developed to predict degradation rate constants of tropospheric ozone and to study the degradation reactivity mechanism of 116 diverse compounds (Ren, et al., 2007). The aim of the present study was to analyze the ozonation efficiency and the relationship between degradation rate and the structure of substituted phenols. The apparent reaction rate constants (-lgk') for the ozone degradation of 26 common substituted phenols were measured for the first time in this study. In addition, optimized geometries of substituted phenols were carried out at the B3LYP/6-311G** level using the Gaussian 03 program. Finally, correlation of the model between the apparent reaction rate constants and calculated parameters was established by the QSPR/QSAR method.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Ozone was generated by an ozone generator (Jinghua Jianqiao Environmental Protection Science and Technique Co., Ltd., DJ-Q2020A, China). The experiments were conducted in a 250 mL three-necked flask. The initial concentration of substituted phenol was 5.00×10^{-4} mol/L and the volume of solution was 100 mL. During experiments, ozone was continuously introduced into the reactor and maintained at a constant concentration (0.00118 mol/L). Excess ozone in the outlet gas was absorbed by 10% sodium thiosulfate solution. All experiments were conducted at 298.15 K. During the reaction process, the concentrations of substituted phenols were detected after different reaction time periods by UV spectrophotometer at their maximum absorption wavelengths (Spectrumlab 752s, LengGuang. Tech., China). The reaction order and apparent reaction rate constants were obtained from the chemical reaction rate equation. At the same time, blank experiments with 4-nitrophenol and 2,3-dichlorophenol was carried by replacing ozone with the continuous introduction of air into the reactor at the same rate. After an equal time to the ozone degradation, we found that the concentrations of these two compounds were virtually unchanged. The results indicate that disappearance of substituted phenols was due to the reaction with ozone alone.

All calculations for the 26 substituted phenols were carried out with the Gaussian 03 program. The

geometries of all the substituted phenols were optimized at the B3LYP/6-311G** level and frequency calculations were performed to ensure they were at the potential energy surface minima. The structural and thermodynamic parameters were calculated. Structural parameters in this study included molecular volume (V_i) , molecular average polarizability (α), dipole moment (μ), energy of the highest occupied molecular orbital ($E_{\rm HOMO}$), energy of the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital ($E_{\rm LUMO}$), the most negative atomic partial charge in molecule (q^-) and the most positive partial charge on a hydrogen atom (qH⁺). Thermodynamic parameters calculated were as follows: standard enthalpies (H^{0}), standard Gibbs energies (G^{0}), standard entropy (S^{0}), standard heat capacities at constant volume (C_{v}^{0}), and thermal correction to energy (E_{th}^{0}).

To determine the optimum number of components for the correlation model, the leave-one-out (LOO) cross-validation procedure was used to validate the derived QSPR/QSAR model by the SPSS for Windows (version 12.0) software program. The quality of the derived QSPR/QSAR model was evaluated in terms of the LOO cross-validation correlation coefficient (q), the squared regression coefficient (R), the standard deviation (SD) and the *t*-test.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

-dC/dt

The reaction equation for ozone degradation of substituted phenols can be expressed as follows. Substituted phenols + $O_3 \longrightarrow Ps$ (products and intermediates) Equation 1 Based on Equation 1, the ozone degradation rate equation can be presented as follows.

$$= kC_{\rm e}^{\rm m}C_{\rm co}^{\rm n}$$
 Equation 2

where C_t (mol/L) and C_{03} (mol/L) are the concentrations of substituted phenols and ozone in aqueous solution, respectively, at reaction time *t*; *k* is the reaction rate constant, and m and n are the reaction orders of substituted phenols and ozone, respectively.Because the concentration of ozone was always saturated in the ozonation process, it can be regarded as a constant, assuming that C_{03} has no influence on the ozone diffusion rate under stirring in aqueous solution. Thus Equation 2 can be simplified as Equation 3.

$$-dC/dt = k'C_{\cdot}^{m}$$
 Equation 3

where k2 is an apparent reaction rate constant and m is then the total reaction order.

When total reaction order (m) is zero, the reaction equation can be shown as Equation 4.

$$C_t = C_0 - k't$$
 Equation 4

where C_0 is the initial concentration of substituted

phenol in the reaction system. If the total reaction order (m) is unity, the reaction equation can be shown as Equation 5.

 $lg(C_{t}/[C]) = lg(C_{0}/[C]) - k't$ Equation 5

where [C] is the unit concentration.

The concentrations versus reaction time of ozone degradation for 26 substituted phenols were investigated during the ozonation processes and the experimental results for the four substituted phenols (1,4dihydroxybenzene, 2-naphthol, 3-chlorophenol and 2nitrophenol) are shown in Fig. 1. It can be seen that the concentration of substituted phenols decreased linearly with reaction time. Among these four compounds, the ozone degradation of 1,4dihydroxybenzene was the fastest, while 2-naphthol was the slowest. Thus, it can be concluded that the aqueous ozone degradation reaction rate equation is in agreement with Equation 4. Therefore, the reaction order is zero and the apparent reaction rate constant (-k') is equal to the linear slope in Fig. 1.

All substituted phenols and their calculated structural parameters at the B3LYP/6-311G** level are listed in Table 1 and their calculated thermodynamic parameters and apparent reaction rate constants (-lgk') are listed in Table 2. Using the resulting structural and thermodynamic parameters as variables, correlation equations for the apparent rate constants were developed by multiple linear regressions with SPPS 12.0, in which the apparent rate constants were the independent variables listed in Table 3. The regression coefficients (R), standard deviations (SD), the regression coefficients of LOO cross-validation (q) and the Root Mean Square of Prediction (RMSEP) are also listed in Table 3.

The optimum equation was determined by comparing the regression coefficients (R and q). As shown in Table 3, the values of *R* increased with the number of variables. Thus the four-variable Equation.9 was selected as the optimum equation with R = 0.909, SD = 0.141 and q = 0.856. The optimum equation contains four variables $E_{\rm LUMO},\,\alpha,\,q^{-}$ and S . Inspection of Equation 9 may lead to the following interpretations: (1) - $\lg k'$ decreases with $E_{\scriptscriptstyle LUMO}$. This is because reaction activity increases with the $E_{\rm LUMO}$ value so it is easier for substituted for substituted phenols with larger $E_{\rm LUMO}$ values to degrade than those with smaller E_{LUMO} values. (2) The smaller the q^{-} (the value is negative) value is, the smaller $-\lg k'$ will be. This is because if the charge is more negative, the electron acting with ozone is more easily lost and therefore $-\lg k'$ decreases. (3) Furthermore, S'expresses the degree of disorder: the larger the degree of disorder, the larger the degradation ability. (4) In addition, if α increases, $-\lg k'$ increases, i.e. the apparent rate constant decreases. The volume of the molecule increases with increasing α , the molecule is thus more stable and $-\lg k'$ increases. The predicted $-\lg k'$ of all the substituted phenols and the differences between them and experimental values are listed together in Table 2. From Table 2, we can see the experimental values of $-\lg k'$ were close to the values predicted by Equation 9. The maximum deviation between the values predicted by Equation 9 and the experimental values is -0.290 for the compound 2,6-dinitrophenol and the second large difference is -0.262 for 3methoxyphenol. The standard regression coefficients and *t*-values of the independent variables in Equation 9 are listed in Table 4. The order of the standard regression coefficients is as follows: $\alpha > S > E_{\text{LUMO}} > q$. Thus, it can be concluded that α effects -lgk most strongly. Moreover, it can be seen that all *t*-values are larger than the standard *t*-value, indicating that all four variables are significant. Therefore, it can be concluded that the optimum equation (Equation 9) obtained in this study is robust.



Fig. 1. Plots of concentration of substituted phenols vs. reaction time

(◆) 1,4-Dihydroxybenzene, (■) 2-Naphthol, (▲) 3chlorophenol, (×) 2-Nitrophenol

Furthermore, in order to check the reliability of the predictive model developed in this study, the 26 substituted phenols in Table 1 were divided into two groups: the first three compounds of every four in order were included in the first group (training sets) and the remaining compounds were all included in the second group (external test sets). Using the same regression method as mentioned above, validation models that fitted the -lgk' values with the parameters of the 20 compounds in first group were created as shown in Equation 10.

 $-lgk' = 9.124 + 6.195 q^{-} + 0.016 \alpha - 0.007 S^{*} - 3.090 E_{LUMO}$ n = 20, R = 0.918, SD = 0.149, q = 0.833, RMSEP = 0.130

| a
10 ⁻³⁰ esu | 127.281 | 97.496 | 127.918 | 89.904 | 68.587 | 77.361 | 82.020 | 82.145 | 68.373 | 76.992 | 79.891 | 67.856 | 76.853 | 111.764 | 110.373

 | 80.015
 | 81.900
 | 81.673 | 75.148 | 87.828
 | 86.732 | 88.129 | 87.972 | 99.814
 | 75.571 | 114.914 |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|---
--

--
--|---|---
---|--|---|--
--|---|--|
| μ
Deby e | 3.6877 | 4.0117 | 5.7286 | 1.1054 | 2.6551 | 1.4076 | 2.5445 | 5.3084 | 2.3776 | 1.6385 | 5.7901 | 0.5377 | 1.1355 | 1.0642 | 1.3987

 | 5.7302
 | 0.6173
 | 0.8754 | 0.9279 | 3.1456
 | 4.0858 | 1.2947 | 2.4247 | 2.0605
 | 1.1662 | 1.4971 |
| <i>q</i> , | -0.32 06 | -0.3236 | -0.2884 | -0.3676 | -0.3695 | -0.3657 | -0.3701 | -0.34 11 | -0.3607 | -0.3636 | -0.3494 | -0.3840 | -0.3686 | -0.3607 | -0.3536

 | -0.3106
 | -0.3507
 | -0.3630 | -0.33 92 | -0.33 94
 | -0.3378 | -0.33 59 | -0.3492 | -0.33 13
 | -0.3551 | -0.37 38 |
| $q{ m H}^+$ e | 0.2540 | 0.2762 | 0.2439 | 0.2446 | 0.2441 | 0.2448 | 0.2441 | 0.2555 | 0.2451 | 0.2450 | 0.2522 | 0.2438 | 0.2457 | 0.2477 | 0.2430

 | 0.2520
 | 0.2437
 | 0.2472 | 0.2707 | 0.2787
 | 0.2780 | 0.2554 | 0.2541 | 0.2783
 | 0.2505 | 0.2456 |
| ELUMO
eV | -0.1085 | -0.1296 | -0.09 64 | -0.0046 | -0.0149 | -0.0106 | -0.0122 | -0.0889 | -0.0052 | -0.0105 | -0.0953 | -0.0086 | -0.0058 | -0.0436 | -0.0456

 | -0.0855
 | 0.0001
 | -0.0013 | -0.0254 | -0.0392
 | -0.0350 | -0.0380 | -0.0385 | -0.0496
 | -0.0260 | -0.0064 |
| $E_{ m HOMO}$ eV | -0.2204 | -0.2836 | -0.2063 | -0.2166 | -0.2083 | -0.2199 | -0.2056 | -0.2625 | -0.2200 | -0.2250 | -0.2575 | -0.2303 | -0.2234 | -0.2147 | -0.2108

 | -0.2588
 | -0.2094
 | -0.2169 | -0.2395 | -0.2412
 | -0.2466 | -0.2449 | -0.2529 | -0.2498
 | -0.2405 | -0.2198 |
| $\overset{V_{ m m}}{{ m \AA}^3}$ | 2 03.1 01 | 1 76.3 95 | 2 09.6 66 | 171.615 | 1 38.3 93 | 1 52.8 56 | 1 63.0 83 | 156.045 | 1 37.9 88 | 1 54.7 48 | 154.144 | 136.445 | 150.496 | 1 86.2 03 | 1 92.0 65

 | 1 52.7 43
 | 1 63.070
 | 1 58.683 | 1 45.4 59 | 1 76.5 17
 | 1 72.8 64 | 173.440 | 1 67.6 24 | 1 90.3 25
 | 1 46.7 84 | 2 13.7 76 |
| Mo lecule | 2,4,6-Trini trophen ol | 2,6-Dinitrophenol | 2-Nitroso-1-naphthol | 3,4-Dimethylphenol | 1,4-Dihyd roxyb en zen e | 4-Methylphenol | 4-Methox yphenol | 4-Nitrophen ol | 1,3-Dihyd roxyb en zen e | 3-Methylphenol | 3-Nitrophen ol | 1,2-Dihyd roxyb en zen e | 2-Methylphenol | 2-Naphthol | 1-Naphthol

 | 2-Nitrophen ol
 | 2-Methox yphenol
 | 3-Methox yphenol | 2-Chlorophenol | 2,4-Dichlo to pheno l
 | 2,3-Dichlo to phenol | 2,5-Dichlo to pheno l | 3,5-Dichlo to pheno l | 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol
 | 3-Chlorophenol | 5-Methyl-2-
is oprop vlphen ol |
| No. | - | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9 | L | 8 | 6 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15

 | 16
 | 17
 | 18 | 19 | 20
 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24
 | 25 | 26 |
| | No. Molecule $V_{\hat{A}}^{m}$ E_{HOMO} E_{LUMO} qH^{+} $q\dot{P}$ μ μ a^{-a} esu | No. Molecule $V_{A^3}^{m}$ E_{HOMO}^{HOMO} E_{LUMO}^{LLUMO} qH^+ $q^ q^ \mu$ $1^ 3.6877$ 127.281 | No. Molecule V_{A}^{m} E_{HOMO} E_{LUMO} qH^{+} q^{i} q^{j} μ 10^{-30} esu 10^{-30} esu $1 2,4,6$ -Trinitrophenol 203.101 0.2204 0.2204 -0.1085 0.2540 -0.3206 3.6877 127.281 $2 2,6$ -Dinitrophenol 176.395 0.2836 -0.1296 0.2762 -0.3236 4.0117 97.496 | No. Molecule V_{A}^{m} E_{HOMO} E_{LUMO} qH^{+} \dot{q} \dot{q} μ $10^{-30}e_{SU}$ $10^{-30}e_{SU}$
1 2,4,6-Trinitrophenol 203.101 0.2204 -0.1085 0.2540 -0.3206 3.6877 127.281
2 2,6-Dinitrophenol 176.395 0.2836 -0.1296 0.2762 -0.3236 4.0117 97.496
3 2-Nitroso-1-naphthol 209.666 0.2063 -0.0964 0.2439 -0.2884 5.7286 127.918 | No.Molecule $V_{\rm a}$ $E_{\rm HOMO}$ $E_{\rm LUMO}$ qH^+ q q μ μ $10^{-30} {\rm esu}$ 12,4,6-Trinitrophenol203.1010.2204-0.10850.2540-0.32063.6877127.28122,6-Dinitrophenol176.3950.2836-0.12960.2762-0.32364.011797.49632-Nitroso-1-naphthol209.6660.2063-0.09640.2439-0.28465.7286127.91843,4-Dimethylphenol171.6150.2166-0.00460.2446-0.36761.105489.904 | No.Molecule $V_{\rm A3}$ $E_{\rm HOMO}$ $E_{\rm LUMO}$ $q {\rm H}^+$ \dot{q} \dot{q} μ $10^{-30} {\rm esu}$ 12,4,6-Trinitrophenol2,03,1010.2204-0.10850.2540-0.32063.6877127.28122,6-Dinitrophenol1,76.3950.2836-0.12960.2762-0.32364.011797.49632-Nitroso-1-naphthol2,09.6660.2063-0.09640.2439-0.28845.7286127.91843,4-Dimethylphenol1,71.6150.2166-0.00460.2446-0.36761.105489.90451,4-Dihydroxybenzene138.3930.2083-0.01490.2441-0.36752.655168.587 | No.Molecule $V_{\rm M}^{\rm m}$ $E_{\rm HOMO}$ $E_{\rm LUMO}$ $q_{\rm H}^{\rm H}$ \dot{q} \dot{q} $\mu_{\rm H}$ $10^{-30} {\rm esu}$ 12,4,6-Trinitrophenol203.1010.22040.10850.2540-0.32063.6877127.28122,6-Dinitrophenol176.3950.2836-0.12960.2762-0.32364.011797.49632-Nitroso-1-naphthol209.6660.2063-0.09640.2439-0.32364.011797.49643,4-Dimethylphenol171.6150.2166-0.00460.2446-0.36761.105489.90451,4-Dihydroxybenzene138.3930.2083-0.01490.2441-0.36952.655168.58764.Methylphenol152.8560.2199-0.01060.2448-0.36571.407677.361 | No.Molecule $V_{\rm m}$ $E_{\rm HOMO}$ $E_{\rm LUMO}$ $q_{\rm H}^+$ \dot{q} \dot{q} μ $g_{\rm H}$ 22,6-Dinitrophenol176.3950.206.30.206.30.216.60.206.20.216.20.233.64.011797.49632-Nitroso-1-naphthol171.6150.216.60.206.60.206.20.203.60.244.60.238.45.7286127.91843,4-Dimethylphenol171.6150.21060.244.60.244.60.265.71.407677.36174-Methylphenol152.8560.21990.201060.244.80.265.71.407677.36174-Met | No.Molecule $V_{\rm H}$ $E_{\rm HOMO}$ $E_{\rm LUMO}$ $e_{\rm V}$ $e_{\rm V}$ $e_{\rm V}$ $e_{\rm V}$ $e_{\rm V}$ $e_{\rm U}$ $e_{\rm UMO}$ $e_{\rm H}^+$ $e_{\rm UMO}$ $e_{\rm H}^+$ $e_{\rm U}$ $e_{\rm $ | No.Molecule $V_{\rm AII}$ $E_{\rm HOMO}$ $E_{\rm LUMO}$ $q_{\rm H^+}$ q' q' μ q' q' μ q' q' μ q' | No.Molecule $V_{\rm A}^{\rm m}$ $E_{\rm eV}$ | No.Molecule $V_{\rm A3}$ Enouo $E_{\rm LUNO}$ qH^+ q' q' $\mu_{\rm B}$ $\mu_{\rm BSR}$ $10^{-36} {\rm esu}$ 12.4,6-Trinirophenol203.1010.2204-0.10850.2540-0.32063.6877127.28122,6-Dinitrophenol176.3950.2336-0.112960.2762-0.32364.011797.49632.Nitroso-1-maphthol209.6660.2063-0.09640.2439-0.37661.105489.90443,4-Dimethylphenol171.6150.2166-0.00460.2441-0.36761.105489.90451,4-Dihydroxybenze138.3930.2083-0.01490.2441-0.36761.105489.90464-Methylphenol152.8560.2199-0.01060.2441-0.36761.407677.36174-Methylphenol152.8560.2199-0.01060.2441-0.36761.407677.36174-Methylphenol153.0830.2056-0.01220.2441-0.36761.407677.36174-Methylphenol153.9880.2256-0.01220.2441-0.36761.407677.36184-Nitrophenol156.0450.2256-0.01220.2441-0.36761.407677.36191.3-Dihydroxybenzene137.9880.2250-0.01220.24510.36771.407677.361103-Methylphenol154.7480.2250-0.0265-0.34115.304482.145113-Nitr | No.Molecule $V_{\rm AB}^{\rm a}$ Enono $E_{\rm LUNO}$ $q_{\rm H}^{\rm a}$ q' q' μ q' μ q' μ q' μ q' μ q' μ μ q' μ | No.Molecule $V_{\rm A3}^{\rm a}$ Enono
eVELINO $qH^{\rm i}$ q' q' μ g' g | No.Molecule V_{a} E_{uono} E_{uono} e_{v} <th>No.Molecule$Y_{33}$$E_{HOMO}$$E_{LIMO}$$qH^{-1}$$q$$q$$\mu$$g$$10^{-3} \mathrm{esc}$12.4.6-Trinitrophenol203.1010.2204-0.10850.2540-0.32663.6877127.28122.6-Dinitrophenol176.3950.2836-0.10660.2439-0.32663.6877127.29132.Nitros-Implthol209.6660.2063-0.00460.24490.24498.2736127.91843.2-Nitros-Implthol171.6150.2166-0.00460.2441-0.36951.073618.83751.4-Dihydroxybenzine132.38560.2199-0.01060.2441-0.36952.655168.37364-Methylphenol1.71.6150.2166-0.01020.2441-0.36952.655168.37374-Methylphenol1.37.9880.2056-0.01220.2441-0.36952.655168.37374-Methylphenol1.55.0450.2199-0.01060.2441-0.36957.36184-Nitrophenol1.56.0450.2200-0.01220.2441-0.36957.36191.3-Dihydroxybenzine137.9880.2256-0.01490.2441-0.36957.361103-Methylphenol155.0450.2200-0.0265-0.01490.2441-0.36971.407677.361113-Nitrophenol155.0449.2200-0.01220.2441-0.36971.407677.361121.3-Dihydroxybenzine1</th> <th>No. Molecule V_{m}^{m} Enono e_{V} <t< th=""><th>No. Molecule V_{3}^{m} Enono $E_{1,100}$ qH q e D_{ebye} $10^{-3}e_{em}$ 1 2.4/6 Trinirophenol 203.101 0.2204 -0.1085 0.232.06 3.6877 127.281 2 2.6-Dinirophenol 176.395 0.2835 -0.1085 0.232.06 3.6877 127.281 3 2.Nitrophenol 17.615 0.2865 0.20046 0.2323.6 4.0117 97.966 5 1.4-Dihydroxybenzee 138.393 0.2083 -0.03676 1.1054 89.904 5 4.4-Dinkethylphenol 171.615 0.2166 -0.0046 0.2446 -0.3676 1.1054 89.904 7 4 Methylphenol 177.312 9.2446 0.2655 -0.3676 1.1054 89.904 7 4 Methylphenol 156.455 0.2083 0.2446 0.3677 1.4076 75.918 9 4.411 0.36645 0.2205 0.2441 -0.3676 1.4076 75.918 1</th><th>No. Molecule χ_3^{m} Erono $\epsilon_{\rm eV}$ $\epsilon_{\rm eV}$</th><th>No. Molecule V_{m}^{m} Errono e_{V} vo. e_{V}</th><th>No. Molecule V_{a1} Enono E_{a1} to the evolution of the evolut</th><th>No. Molecule V_{ab} Enono E_{a} e_{a}</th><th>No. Molecule χ_3^{TI} Enono $\epsilon_{\rm eV}$ vo. ϵ vo.<!--</th--><th>No. Molecule Y_{ab}^{a} Enono qH^{a} <t< th=""><th>No. Molecule $\frac{V_{30}}{V_{3}}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{W}{e_V}$ $\frac{W}{e_V}$</th><th>No. Molecule χ_{31}^{a} Euron E_{LONO} Φ_{LONO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOOO} $\Phi_{LONOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO$</th></t<></th></th></t<></th> | No.Molecule Y_{33} E_{HOMO} E_{LIMO} qH^{-1} q q μ g $10^{-3} \mathrm{esc}$ 12.4.6-Trinitrophenol203.1010.2204-0.10850.2540-0.32663.6877127.28122.6-Dinitrophenol176.3950.2836-0.10660.2439-0.32663.6877127.29132.Nitros-Implthol209.6660.2063-0.00460.24490.24498.2736127.91843.2-Nitros-Implthol171.6150.2166-0.00460.2441-0.36951.073618.83751.4-Dihydroxybenzine132.38560.2199-0.01060.2441-0.36952.655168.37364-Methylphenol1.71.6150.2166-0.01020.2441-0.36952.655168.37374-Methylphenol1.37.9880.2056-0.01220.2441-0.36952.655168.37374-Methylphenol1.55.0450.2199-0.01060.2441-0.36957.36184-Nitrophenol1.56.0450.2200-0.01220.2441-0.36957.36191.3-Dihydroxybenzine137.9880.2256-0.01490.2441-0.36957.361103-Methylphenol155.0450.2200-0.0265-0.01490.2441-0.36971.407677.361113-Nitrophenol155.0449.2200-0.01220.2441-0.36971.407677.361121.3-Dihydroxybenzine1 | No. Molecule V_{m}^{m} Enono e_{V} <t< th=""><th>No. Molecule V_{3}^{m} Enono $E_{1,100}$ qH q e D_{ebye} $10^{-3}e_{em}$ 1 2.4/6 Trinirophenol 203.101 0.2204 -0.1085 0.232.06 3.6877 127.281 2 2.6-Dinirophenol 176.395 0.2835 -0.1085 0.232.06 3.6877 127.281 3 2.Nitrophenol 17.615 0.2865 0.20046 0.2323.6 4.0117 97.966 5 1.4-Dihydroxybenzee 138.393 0.2083 -0.03676 1.1054 89.904 5 4.4-Dinkethylphenol 171.615 0.2166 -0.0046 0.2446 -0.3676 1.1054 89.904 7 4 Methylphenol 177.312 9.2446 0.2655 -0.3676 1.1054 89.904 7 4 Methylphenol 156.455 0.2083 0.2446 0.3677 1.4076 75.918 9 4.411 0.36645 0.2205 0.2441 -0.3676 1.4076 75.918 1</th><th>No. Molecule χ_3^{m} Erono $\epsilon_{\rm eV}$ $\epsilon_{\rm eV}$</th><th>No. Molecule V_{m}^{m} Errono e_{V} vo. e_{V}</th><th>No. Molecule V_{a1} Enono E_{a1} to the evolution of the evolut</th><th>No. Molecule V_{ab} Enono E_{a} e_{a}</th><th>No. Molecule χ_3^{TI} Enono $\epsilon_{\rm eV}$ vo. ϵ vo.<!--</th--><th>No. Molecule Y_{ab}^{a} Enono qH^{a} <t< th=""><th>No. Molecule $\frac{V_{30}}{V_{3}}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{W}{e_V}$ $\frac{W}{e_V}$</th><th>No. Molecule χ_{31}^{a} Euron E_{LONO} Φ_{LONO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOOO} $\Phi_{LONOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO$</th></t<></th></th></t<> | No. Molecule V_{3}^{m} Enono $E_{1,100}$ qH q e D_{ebye} $10^{-3}e_{em}$ 1 2.4/6 Trinirophenol 203.101 0.2204 -0.1085 0.232.06 3.6877 127.281 2 2.6-Dinirophenol 176.395 0.2835 -0.1085 0.232.06 3.6877 127.281 3 2.Nitrophenol 17.615 0.2865 0.20046 0.2323.6 4.0117 97.966 5 1.4-Dihydroxybenzee 138.393 0.2083 -0.03676 1.1054 89.904 5 4.4-Dinkethylphenol 171.615 0.2166 -0.0046 0.2446 -0.3676 1.1054 89.904 7 4 Methylphenol 177.312 9.2446 0.2655 -0.3676 1.1054 89.904 7 4 Methylphenol 156.455 0.2083 0.2446 0.3677 1.4076 75.918 9 4.411 0.36645 0.2205 0.2441 -0.3676 1.4076 75.918 1 | No. Molecule χ_3^{m} Erono $\epsilon_{\rm eV}$ | No. Molecule V_{m}^{m} Errono e_{V} vo. e_{V} | No. Molecule V_{a1} Enono E_{a1} to the evolution of the evolut | No. Molecule V_{ab} Enono E_{a} | No. Molecule χ_3^{TI} Enono $\epsilon_{\rm eV}$ vo. ϵ vo. </th <th>No. Molecule Y_{ab}^{a} Enono qH^{a} <t< th=""><th>No. Molecule $\frac{V_{30}}{V_{3}}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{W}{e_V}$ $\frac{W}{e_V}$</th><th>No. Molecule χ_{31}^{a} Euron E_{LONO} Φ_{LONO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOOO} $\Phi_{LONOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO$</th></t<></th> | No. Molecule Y_{ab}^{a} Enono qH^{a} <t< th=""><th>No. Molecule $\frac{V_{30}}{V_{3}}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{W}{e_V}$ $\frac{W}{e_V}$</th><th>No. Molecule χ_{31}^{a} Euron E_{LONO} Φ_{LONO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOOO} $\Phi_{LONOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO$</th></t<> | No. Molecule $\frac{V_{30}}{V_{3}}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{E_{LDMO}}{e_V}$ $\frac{W}{e_V}$ | No. Molecule χ_{31}^{a} Euron E_{LONO} Φ_{LONO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOO} Φ_{LONOOO} $\Phi_{LONOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO$ |

Table 1. Structural descriptors of substituted phenols by B3LYP/6-311G

Ozone Degradation of Substituted Phenols

			-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
	S ⁹	J/mold K	398.241	422.329	413.530	375.732	338.088	334.335	368.418	371.384	336.092	362.740	373.330	327.632	345.833	366.385	373.535	372.799	366.046	365.836	340.151	372.292	370.359	372.242	372.585	399.304	342.632	444.299
	$C_{\rm V}^{\theta}$	J/mol. K	160.724	158.402	166.983	141.783	112.554	109.127	130.963	126.909	111.771	117.215	127.583	102.646	116.708	140.796	141.955	126.968	130.399	130.549	106.600	123.750	123.261	123.784	124.328	138.792	107.993	185.075
· ·	$E_{ m th}$	10.J/mol	416.576	314.800	414.028	441.236	302.022	362.075	379.665	301.934	302.378	364.698	301.533	300.097	364.966	417.521	417.446	301.738	380.133	379.966	267.027	244.651	244.693	244.634	244.241	222.840	266.404	596.948
•	е _ө	Hartree	-590.447	-716.584	-590.431	-386.079	-382.714	-346.778	-421.999	-512.036	-382.716	-346.781	-512.034	-382.712	-346.780	-461.110	-461.109	-512.025	-421.995	-422.002	-767.111	-1226.738	-1226.734	-1226.739	-1226.742	-1686.369	-767.110	-464.676
	$_{\theta}H$	Hartree	-590.402	-716.536	-590.384	-386.037	-382.676	-346.740	-421.957	-511.994	-382.678	-346.740	-511.991	-382.675	-346.740	-461.069	-461.066	-511.983	-421.954	-421.960	-767.073	-1226.696	-1226.692	-1226.697	-1226.700	-1686.324	-767.071	-464.626
		10.7/mor	391.737	288.143	387.426	418.182	284.051	344.837	358.189	281.037	284.716	345.192	280.484	283.901	346.044	396.441	395.621	280.732	358.864	358.750	249.725	223.851	224.023	223.826	223.439	199.040	248.812	566.298
	TE	Hartree	-590.561	-716.657	-590.543	-386.206	-382.792	-346.879	-422.102	-512.110	-382.795	-346.880	-512.107	-382.790	-346.880	-461.229	-461.226	-512.098	-422.099	-422.106	-767.175	-1226.790	-1226.787	-1226.791	-1226.794	-1686.410	-767.174	-464.854
		Diff.	0.127	-0.290	0.009	0.215	0.080	0.160	0.187	0.009	-0.161	-0.137	0.049	-0.068	0.126	-0.065	-0.029	0.144	-0.164	-0.262	0.096	0.018	-0.017	0.021	-0.071	-0.007	0.001	0.029
	$-\lg k$	Cal	6.191	6.229	6.863	5.767	5.707	5.882	5.701	6.102	5.722	5.680	6.032	5.673	5.759	6.376	6.344	6.192	5.768	5.709	5.989	6.023	6009	6.040	5.973	6.111	5.902	5.672
		Exp.	6.064	6.519	6.854	5.552	5.627	5.722	5.514	6.093	5.883	5.817	5.983	5.741	5.633	6.441	6.373	6.048	5.932	5.971	5.893	6.005	6.026	6.019	6.044	6.118	5.901	5.643
	No.		1	7	б	4	5	9	Ζ	8	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26

	Table 5. Regression equations for -igk	of substituted	phenois		
Eq.	Equation	R	SD	q	RMSEP
6	$-\lg k' = 9.551 + 10.248 q^{-1}$	0.732	0.210	0.656	2.230
7	$-\lg k' = 8.034 + 7.700 q' + 0.007 \alpha$	0.799	0.194	0.678	2.227
8	$-\lg k' = 9.751 + 9.154 q + 0.015 \alpha - 0.005 S_{\theta}$	0.870	0.163	0.826	0.172
9	$-lgk' = 8.769 + 5.017 q + 0.0171 \alpha - 0.007 s - 3.581 E_{LUMO}$	0.909	0.141	0.856	0.159

Table 3. Regression equations for -lgk of substituted phenols

The RMSEP value of Equation 10 for the external test set (the second group) is 0.130. Moreover, the SD value of Equation 10 (0.149) is smaller and the values of R and q are similar to those obtained from Equation 9. *t*-values of the independent variables for Equation 10 are listed in Table 4. indicating that all the values are larger than the standard *t*-value. These results confirm that the model obtained is reliable and has good predictive ability.

Table 4.Checking statistical values for Equation 9 and 10

Varia bl es	SR	$T (t_{\alpha/2}=1.706)$ (Equation 9)	$T(t_{\alpha 2}=1.725)$ (Equation 10)
E_{LUMO}	-0.4784	-2.904	-2.080
q^{-}	0.3584	2.414	2.398
α	0.8717	5.700	4.909
S	-0.8127	-4.716	-4.038

CONCLUSION

Ozonation is one of the most efficient technologies for treating wastewaters. However, the experimental determination of such reaction rate constants is difficult, costly and time-consuming, and there are many uncertainties in chamber conditions. Therefore, reliable theoretical models to estimate rate constants of the degradability of chemicals are strongly required. Among them, quantitative structure-activity/property relationships (QSAR/QSPR) study is a useful and effective alternative approach to predict rate constants of this process. In this study, the ozone degradations of 26 substituted phenols in aqueous solutions were investigated at 298.15 K. The results show that the ozonation reaction order is zero and the apparent reaction rate constants of all substituted phenols were obtained from the chemical reaction rate equation. Based on the optimized geometries of substituted phenols, using the Gaussian 03 program, a novel QSPR/ QSAR model for apparent reaction rate constants (lgk2) was developed by a multiple linear regression method. The optimum model (Equation 9) obtained in this work contains four variables E_{LUMO} , q, α and S, for which the regression coefficient R = 0.909 and the standard deviation SD = 0.141. Furthermore, the optimum equation shows that -lgk2 increases with increasing $q^{\scriptscriptstyle \rm T}$ and α and decreases with increasing $E_{\rm LUMO}$ and S. The results of the *t*-test indicate that the model exhibits optimum stability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Financial support by the provincial Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang (Y507280) is gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

Chu, L. B., Xing, X. H., Yu, A. F., Zhou, Y. N., Sun, X. L. and Benjamin, J. (2007). Enhanced ozonation of simulated dyestuff wastewater by micro bubbles. Chemosphere, **68**, 1854-1860.

Dalal, S. and Gupta, M. N. (2007). Treatment of phenol wastewater by horseradish peroxidase immobilized by bioaffinity layering. Chemosphere, **67**, 741-747.

Fang, H. H. P., Liang, D. W., Zhang, T. and Liu Y. (2006). Anaerobic treatment of phenol in wastewater under thermophilic condition. Water Res., **40**, 427-434.

Gramatica, P., Consonni, V. and Todeschini, R. (1999). QSAR study on the tropospheric degradation of organic compounds. Chemosphere, **38**, 1371-1378.

Harrison, J. C., Ham, J. E. and Wells, J. R., (2007). Citronellal reactions with ozone and OH radical: Rate constants and gas- phase products detected using PFBHA derivatization. Atmos. Environ., **41**, 4482-4491.

Keith, L. H. and Telliard, W. A. (1979). Chapin D. Priority pollutants: a prospective view. Environ. Sci. Technol., **13**, 416-424.

Kuscu, O. S. and Delia, T. S. (2005). Performance of anaerobic baffled reactor (ABR) treating synthetic wastewater containing p-nitrophenol. Enzyme Microb. Tech., **36**, 888-895.

Shen, J.M., Chen, Z.L., Xu, Z.Z., Li, X.Y., Xu, B.B. and Qi, F. (2008). Kinetics and mechanism of degradation of pchloronitrobenzene in water by ozonation. J. Hazard. Mater., **152**, 1325-1331.

Ren, Y. Y., Liu, H. X., Yao, X. J. and Liu, M. C. (2007). Prediction of ozone tropospheric degradation rate constants by projection pursuit regression. Anal. Chim. Acta., **589**, 150-158.

Sánchez-Polo, M., Rivera-Utrilla, J., Méndez-Díaz, J. D., Canonica, S. and Gunten, U. (2007). Photooxidation of naphthalenesulfonic acids: Comparison between processes based on O_3 , O_3 /activated carbon and UV/H₂O₂. Chemosphere, **68**, 1814-1820.

Subramanyam, R. and Mishra, I. M. (2007). Biodegradation of catechol (2-hydroxy phenol) bearing wastewater in an UASB reactor. Chemosphere, **69**, 816-824.

Xie, Y. J., Liu, H., Liu, H. X., Zhai, Z. C. and Wang Z. Y. (2008). Determination of solubilities and n-Octanol/Water partition coefficients and QSPR study for substituted phenols. Bull. Environ. Contam. Toxicol., **80**, 319-323.