

IUPAC Task Group on Atmospheric Chemical Kinetic Data Evaluation – Data Sheet VI.A4.26 HET_SL_26

Data sheets can be downloaded for personal use only and must not be retransmitted or disseminated either electronically or in hard copy without explicit written permission.

The citation for this data sheet is: IUPAC Task Group on Atmospheric Chemical Kinetic Data Evaluation, <http://iupac.pole-ether.fr>.

This data sheet evaluated: May 2010; last change in preferred values: May 2010.

HOBr + HCl (aqueous sulphuric acid aerosol) → BrCl + H₂O

Experimental data

Parameter	wt% H ₂ SO ₄	Temp./K	Reference	Technique/ Comments
$\gamma(\text{HOBr})$				
0.023	69.8% (HCl = $0.22 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$)	228	Abbatt, 1995	CWFT-MS (a)
0.060	(HCl = $0.96 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$)			
0.12	(HCl = $2.5 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$)			
0.20	(HCl = $6.0 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$)			
0.2	60% (p(HCl) = 2.7×10^{-7} mbar)	210	Hanson & Ravishankara, 1995	CWFT-MS (b)
$\gamma(\text{HCl})$				
0.11±0.04	59.7% (p(HOBr) = 8×10^{-7} mbar)	228	Waschewsky and Abbatt, 1999	CWFT-MS (c)
0.032±0.008	65.6% (p(HOBr) = 1×10^{-6} mbar)	228		
0.060±0.015	70.1% (p(HOBr) = 3.4×10^{-5} mbar)	228		
0.19	58%; (p(HOBr) = 1×10^{-5} mbar)	250	Hanson, 2003	CWFT-CIMS (d)
0.07				
0.011	62%; (p(HOBr) = 1×10^{-5} mbar)			
0.002	65%; (p(HOBr) = 1×10^{-5} mbar)			
	69.5%; (p(HOBr) = 1×10^{-5} mbar)			

Comments

- (a) HOBr ($<1 \times 10^{12}$ molecule cm^{-3}) was generated by the reaction sequence: $\text{H} + \text{NO}_2 \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{NO}$ and $\text{OH} + \text{Br}_2 \rightarrow \text{HOBr}$, ionised by electron impact and detected as HOBr^+ . The carrier gas flow was humidified to maintain the H₂SO₄ concentration (69.8 wt %). Excess HCl (gas phase concentration $(0.2\text{-}7.0) \times 10^{12}$ molecule cm^{-3}) added simultaneously with HOBr ($>1 \times 10^{12}$ molecule cm^{-3}). HOBr loss was first order, and no systematic dependence of γ on [HOBr] was observed. Using measured values of $HD_1^{1/2}$ for HOBr ($(20 \pm 10) \text{ M atm}^{-1} \text{ cm s}^{-1/2}$) and for H* for HCl the cited γ value constrains the bimolecular rate constant for the HOBr + HCl reaction to be $1.4 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$.
- (b) HOBr was generated from the hydrolysis reaction of BrONO₂ on 60% H₂SO₄ and detected using SF₆⁻ chemi-ions. BrCl was observed as a gas phase product indicating a fast effective bimolecular reaction on H₂SO₄. A bimolecular rate constant for the HOBr + HCl reaction of $(0.3\text{-}1) \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ was derived from the uptake data.

- (c) HOBr ($\approx 5 \times 10^{-10}$ bar, measured by UV absorption at 254 nm) was generated ex-situ by passing a humidified flow of Br₂ in He over HgO, ionised by electron impact and detected as HOBr⁺. Decay of HCl and formation of BrCl was measured in presence of excess HOBr. Uptake coefficients determined from both kinetic curves were within 10%. γ increased with $p(\text{HOBr})^{1/2}$ at 65-70%. Bimolecular rate constants for the HOBr + HCl reaction derived from the uptake data using $H^*(\text{HOBr})$ determined in the same study were in the range of $(1.6 - 270) \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, increasing strongly with wt% H₂SO₄ and less so with temperature (213 -228 K). The [H₂SO₄] dependence is attributed to an acid catalysed mechanism and the temperature dependence to diffusion limitation. The following expression is given for calculations of γ for stratospheric conditions: $k^{\text{II}} = \exp(0.542 \times (\text{wt}\% \text{ H}_2\text{SO}_4) - 6.44 \times 10^3/T + 10.3)$
- (d) Rotating CWFT with stirring of the H₂SO₄ film (58 – 70 wt. %). HOBr (typically 10^{-10} atm) was generated by reacting BrONO₂ with water and detected using SF₆⁻ chemi-ions. First order loss of HCl was measured in the presence of excess HOBr $(0.2\text{-}2.0) \times 10^{-10}$ bar. Γ_b was extracted assuming $\alpha = 1.0$, and was $\propto p(\text{HOBr})^{1/2}$. Using H_{HCl} from Carslaw et.al. (1995) and H_{HOBr} determined in the same study (see reaction VI.A4.16) values of k^{II} were derived. The values ($k^{\text{II}} = (2.5\text{-}6.0) \times 10^7 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ over the range 58 -69.5% H₂SO₄ at 250 K) showed a lower dependence on acid strength compared to results of Waschewsky, G. C. G. and Abbatt, J. P. D., (1999), obtained at lower temperatures.

Preferred Values

Parameter	Value	T/K
α_s	1.0	190 - 250
$H^*_{\text{HOBr}}/\text{M.bar}^{-1}$	$5.22 \times 10^{-5} \exp(5427/T)$	210 - 270
$H^*_{\text{HCl}}/\text{M.bar}^{-1}$	$(0.094 - 0.61X + 1.2X^2) \exp(-8.68 + (8515 - 10718X^{0.7})/T)$	203
$k^{\text{II}}(\text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1})$	$\exp(154 - 1.63.W) \exp(-(38500 - 478.W)/T)$	200-230
$D_{\text{HCl}}/\text{cm}^2\text{s}^{-1}$	$7.8 \times 10^{-8} T/\eta$	190-240
<i>W</i> = wt% H ₂ SO ₄ , <i>X</i> = mole fraction H ₂ SO ₄		
<i>Reliability</i>		
$\Delta \log(\alpha)$	0.3	298

Comments on Preferred Values

The experimental studies show that the uptake coefficient of HOBr or HCl on H₂SO₄/H₂O containing HCl or HOBr increases with the concentration of the co-reactant in solution. The γ_{HOBr} values from the earlier study of Abbatt (1995) are uncertain because the assumed relative solubilities of HOCl and HCl were incorrect. The measured γ_{HCl} in the studies of Waschewsky and Abbatt (1999) and Hanson (2003) agree well and the γ values show a strong increase with the water content of the H₂SO₄ and a rather weak temperature dependence. The kinetics are consistent with the resistance model with a large surface accommodation coefficient ($\alpha_s = 1$), and rate of uptake controlled by bulk phase chemical reaction HOBr+HCl:

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} = \frac{1}{\alpha_s} + \frac{1}{\Gamma_b} \quad (1)$$

$$\Gamma_b = \frac{4RTH_{HOBr}}{c} \sqrt{D_l k^{II} H_{HCl}^* p_{HCl}} \quad \text{for } \gamma_{HOBr} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{or } \Gamma_b = \frac{4RTH_{HCl}^*}{c} \sqrt{D_l k^{II} H_{HOBr}^* p_{HOBr}} \quad \text{for } \gamma_{HCl} \quad (3)$$

where H^* are the Henry's solubility constants and D_l are the liquid diffusion coefficients for HOBr and HCl which are a function of mole fraction of H_2SO_4 , X .

There are significant differences in the heterogeneous reaction rate constants derived from the experimental uptake coefficients in the two studies. Thus the values of k^{II} derived by Waschewsky and Abbatt, (1999) from their data at 213 - 238 K was a factor of ~ 8 lower than the values expected from extrapolation from the 250 K value of k^{II} derived by Hanson (2003), based on an estimated activation energy of 15 kJ mol⁻¹. This discrepancy can be largely attributed to the use of different values for $H(HOBr)$ in the derivation of k^{II} . The preferred value for $H(HOBr) = 5.22 \times 10^{-5} \exp(5427/T)$ is based on Hanson (2003) (see IUPAC evaluation VI.4.16), which showed only a weak dependence on acid strength in the range 60 - 70% H_2SO_4 . Using this choice of $H(HOBr)$ Hanson gave coherent set of k^{II} as a function of T and wt% H_2SO_4 , from the results of all studies. k^{II} showed a very strong T-dependence at 60 wt% acid and a much weaker one at 70%. Hanson gives an expression for k^{II} for stratospheric conditions ($W = \text{wt}\% H_2SO_4$):

$$k^{II} (\text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}) = \exp(154 - 1.63.W) \exp(-(38500 - 478.W)/T)$$

This equation reproduces the experimentally derived k^{II} values at 210 – 228 K but the predicted values at 238 and 250 K are over estimated by a factor of 3 and 6 respectively. Nevertheless this is the recommended expression to calculate the values of the uptake coefficients for stratospheric conditions, using eqs.(1)–(3). The X -dependent expressions used for H_{HCl}^* (based on Shi et al, 2001; see this evaluation: VI.A4.14) and for H_{HOBr}^* (based on Hanson, 2003; see this evaluation: VI.A4.16), are given in the Table of preferred values. The expression for $D_l(HCl)$ from Klassen et al., 1998, based on viscosity data given by Shi et al., 2001 (see this evaluation: VI.A4.25).

Figure 1 shows a comparison of calculated γ_{HCl} with selected experimental values grouped for acid strengths of ~ 59 , 65 and 70%. The prediction is only good for lower acid strengths and temperatures.

References

- Abbatt, J. P. D.: J. Geophys. Res. 100, 14009-14017, 1995.
Hanson, D.R. and Ravishankara, A.R.: Geophys. Res. Lett. 22, 385 (1995).
Hanson, D.R.: J. Phys. Chem. A102, 4794 (1998)
Hanson, D. R.: J. Geophys. Res. 108, doi:10.1029/2002JD002519, 2003.
Klassen, J. K., Hu, Z. and Williams, L. R.: J. Geophys. Res. 103, 16197, 1998.
Shi, Q., Jayne, J. T., Kolb, C. E., Worsnop, D. R., and Davidovits, P.: J. Geophys. Res., 106, 24259, 2001.
Waschewsky, G. C. G. and Abbatt, J. P. D.: J. Phys. Chem. A 103, 5312 1999.

Figure 1: Plot of $p(\text{HOBr})$ dependence of uptake coefficient $\gamma(\text{HCl})$ at different H_2SO_4 wt%. symbols show experimental data: open symbols = 70%; half filled symbols = 65%; closed symbols = 59%. Lines show predicted uptake coefficients using recommended parameters. Temperature = 213 - 250 K.

