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Over the past decade, a debate has emerged over the chemical mechanism to explain the aqueous photolysis of pyruvic acid and its photoproducts.1–12 The first steps of the mechanism are generally agreed upon: pyruvic acid absorbs a photon, undergoes intersystem crossing and internal con-version, and then initiates further chemistry from the T$_1$ surface. From here, the mechanisms in the literature diverge. In 2006, Guzman et al.6 suggested a mechanism that proceeds by proton-coupled electron transfer to explain two products: dimethyltartaric acid and an oxo-C$_7$ species, for which two possible structures were provided. Griffith et al.2 later presented a different mechanism, in which hydrogen abstraction by triplet-state pyruvic acid initiates radical chemistry that yields dimethyltartaric acid and other observed products, namely, acetoin and lactic acid. Griffith et al.’s identification of acetoin and lactic acid was based on three independent NMR techniques: gHMBCa ($^{13}$C–$^1$H correlation), $^1$H gCOSY ($^1$H–$^1$H correlation), and DOSY (viscosity corrected diffusion constant data).2 The high level of agreement in the results from these techniques between standards and post-photolysis solutions offers irrefutable evidence that both acetoin and lactic acid are generated from the photolysis of aqueous pyruvic acid under certain conditions. Their identification was initially disputed by Eugene et al.;3 however, Griffith et al. addressed these concerns.

In their recent publication, Eugene and Guzman1 claim to have “unambiguously” identified their oxo-C$_7$ product, while again disputing the formation of acetoin and lactic acid,2 making new arguments against these products on the basis of NMR and high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS) studies.1 Because they do not observe signals with the mass-to-charge ratios that correspond to acetoin and lactic acid in their HRMS, they conclude the products are absent. However, as mass spectrometry is not inherently quantitative, lack of signal does not confirm a species’ absence. Furthermore, work by Reed Harris et al.,3 which builds from Griffith et al.’s mechanism,2 indicates that, if sufficient oxygen is present during photolysis, the formation of acetoin and lactic acid is severely inhibited. Eugene and Guzman1 state that their solutions are usually sparged with air, so lack of acetoin or lactic acid under those conditions is, in fact, consistent with the Griffith et al. mechanism.2 However, Eugene and Guzman1 also indicate some reactions were instead sparged with nitrogen, which would create conditions favorable for generating acetoin and lactic acid.5 They do not specify the sparging conditions for each result presented in their recent paper, making it impossible to decipher which data correspond to which conditions. That is significant because of the well-documented sensitivity of pyruvic acid’s photochemistry to oxygen.5

Beyond not accounting for some of the implications of previous work, problems persist in Eugene and Guzman’s recent paper. In the post-photolysis spectrum said to verify the absence of acetoin (Figure 6D),1 they highlight four $^1$H NMR peaks in regions where acetoin absorbs. While it is unclear what the expected product distribution should be because the sparging conditions were not specified, a standard addition of acetoin to this sample results in an increase in three of the four peaks, and Eugene and Guzman cite the lack of increase in the peak at $\sim$1.35 ppm as evidence that acetoin is absent.1 It seems, however, more likely that the fourth peak results from another product, unrelated to acetoin; therefore, the increase in the three peaks upon addition of acetoin likely confirms its formation during the photolysis of pyruvic acid. Furthermore, the $^1$H NMR spectral regions near 4.4 ppm, where quartets due to acetoin and lactic acid have been identified with numerous methods,2 are not shown. Instead, they are assigned without further explanation to two products, namely, 2-hydroxy-2-((3-oxobutan-2-yl)oxy)-propanoic acid (one of the initially suggested oxo-C$_7$ structures8) and 2-(1-carboxy-1-hydroxythoxy)-2-methyl-3-oxobutanoic acid (termed oxo-C$_8$).1

Additionally, the mechanism proposed by Eugene et al.1 is problematic for several reasons. First, the oxo-C$_7$ product is a hemiketal, a generally unstable class of compounds that exist in equilibrium with their carbonyl and hydroxyl components, here pyruvic acid and acetoin. Second, the suggested intermediate species, oxo-C$_8$, is a hemiketal of a tertiary alcohol. In general, tertiary alcohols almost never form hemiketals or hemiacetals.14 This one would likely decompose into pyruvic acid and ß-acetolactic acid, then thermally decarboxylate to form acetoin under ambient conditions. Third, radical reactions are generally indiscriminate, especially those that require escape from the initial solvent cage, as is required for this mechanism. It is odd, then, that reactions between the acetyl $\cdot$ radical (and its
Figure 1. 150 MHz $^{13}$C gCOSY NMR spectrum from Eugene and Guzman, with lines added for clarity. The black line is drawn through on-diagonal peaks, which correspond to the one-dimensional $^{13}$C spectrum. The green lines connect the cross peaks originally labeled A, B, and D, while the purple lines connect the cross peaks originally labeled E, F, and G. Circled regions indicate where the cross peaks B, D, and E are absent from one side of the diagonal.

The obvious issue is their interpretation of "cross peak C" as a structural link between the carbon signals at ~81 and ~86 ppm. The peak at ~81 ppm, however, is an off-diagonal peak, and, therefore, cannot be indicative of couplings between any carbons. This "connection" is the only evidence that all of the peaks assigned to the oxo-C7 species exist on the same molecule. Instead, without "cross peak C", it is likely that the sets of cross peaks A, B, and D, and E, F, and G come from two different molecules. Furthermore, their corresponding shifts and implied couplings are consistent with acetoin and lactic acid. Finally, gCOSY spectra should be totally symmetric about the diagonal, indicating peaks that do not appear on both sides have low intensities, near the cutoff threshold, and, therefore, may be due to noise instead of couplings. Cross peaks B, D, and E are very weak, each appearing on only one side of the diagonal (see blue circled regions in Figure 1), making their identification as cross peaks speculative.

Because of this problematic two-dimensional identification of the oxo-C7 product, the remaining structural information provided for oxo-C7 relies on experimentally unverified one-dimensional $^1$H NMR assignments that are based solely on predictive software, which may not account for deviations in chemical shift that occur in mixed solutions. This is also true for the oxo-C8 product, as no two-dimensional evidence for the structure is presented. Their other attempts at identification of the compounds, mass spectrometry and carbonyl labeling chemistry, only confirm that the observed products have chemical formulas of C$_7$H$_{12}$O$_5$ and C$_8$H$_{12}$O$_7$ and contain one and two carboxylic acid groups, respectively, as well as one additional carbonyl group each. This does not provide structural evidence about the linkages between functional groups, and, therefore, no direct structural evidence for the oxo-C8 product is presented.

To conclude, despite the claims of Eugene and Guzman, they do not structurally identify their oxo-C7 and oxo-C8 products, thereby failing to confirm their mechanism. Their recent paper also does not disprove the generation of lactic acid and acetoin under oxygen-limited conditions. Furthermore, the mechanism of Griffith et al., with expansions by Reed Harris et al. and Rapf et al., is entirely consistent with the data presented by Eugene and Guzman.
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