

# IUPAC Task Group on Atmospheric Chemical Kinetic Data Evaluation – Data Sheet O<sub>x</sub>\_VOC15

Datasheets can be downloaded for personal use only and must not be retransmitted or disseminated either electronically or in hardcopy 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 datasheet last evaluated: July 2018; last change in preferred values: July 2018

## O<sub>3</sub> + 2-methylpropene → products

### Rate coefficient data

$k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$	Temp./K	Reference	Technique/ Comments
<i>Absolute Rate Coefficients</i>			
$1.8 \times 10^{-17}$	283 ± 2	Becker et al., 1974	S-UVA (a)
$(1.36 \pm 0.02) \times 10^{-17}$	299 ± 2	Japar et al., 1974	S-CL/GC-FID (a)
$3.17 \times 10^{-15} \exp[-(1671 \pm 23)/T]$	225-363	Huie and Herron, 1975	MS/MS (a)
$1.16 \times 10^{-17}$	298*		
$1.45 \times 10^{-17}$	295 ± 1	Grimsrud et al., 1975	F-CL (a)
$1.2 \times 10^{-17}$	294 ± 2	Adeniji et al., 1981	S-CL (a)
$2.5 \times 10^{-15} \exp[-(1592 \pm 115)/T]$	240-324	Treacy et al., 1992	S-CL (a)
$(1.09 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{-17}$	298		
$1.24 \times 10^{-17}$	296 ± 2	Neeb and Moortgat, 1999	S-FTIR (b)
$(1.11 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-17}$	298	Wegener et al., 2007	S-UVA/GC-FID (c)
$3.39 \times 10^{-15} \exp[-(1697 \pm 52)/T]$	295.6-349.8	Shi et al., 2011	S-UVA (a)
$(1.09 \pm 0.02) \times 10^{-17}$	295.6		
<i>Relative Rate Coefficients</i>			
$(1.15 \pm 0.04) \times 10^{-17}$	296 ± 2	Greene and Atkinson, 1992	RR/GC-FID (d)
$1.89 \times 10^{-15} \exp[-(2122 \pm 102)/T]$	278-353	Avzianova and Ariya, 2002	RR/GC-FID (e)
$(1.10 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-17}$	298		

### Comments

- $k$  determined from the observed first-order rate of ozone decay (measured by the first technique shown) in the presence of known excess concentrations of 2-methylpropene (measured either by the second technique shown, or with the initial concentration determined by quantified dilution of the pure gas).
- $k$  determined from the observed first-order rate of propene decay in the presence of known excess concentrations of ozone, with both reagents measured by FTIR. Cyclohexane added to scavenge HO radicals.
- Experiments carried out with comparable concentrations of each reagent, in the presence of excess CO as an HO radical scavenger. The system was simulated using an explicit chemical mechanism, with  $k$  optimized to recreate the observed decays in the concentrations of ozone (measured by the first technique shown) and 2-methylpropene (measured by the second technique shown).
- Relative rate study, with *n*-octane present to scavenge HO radicals. The concentrations of 2-methylpropene and propene (the reference compound) were measured by GC. The measured value

of  $k(\text{O}_3 + 2\text{-methylpropene})/k(\text{O}_3 + \text{propene}) = 1.14 \pm 0.04$  is placed on an absolute basis using  $k(\text{O}_3 + \text{propene}) = 1.01 \times 10^{-17} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at 296 K (IUPAC, current recommendation).

- (e) Relative rate method carried out at 760 Torr (1.013 bar) of air diluent in a 3 L volume Pyrex reactor, with 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene being present to scavenge the HO radicals formed. The concentrations of 2-methylpropene and propene (the reference compound) were monitored by GC. The measured rate coefficient ratios were placed on an absolute basis by Avzianova and Ariya (2002) using the Arrhenius expression of Treacy et al. (1992) for  $\text{O}_3 + \text{propene}$ . The measured rate coefficient ratios were not tabulated, except at room temperature, assumed to be 298 K. The rate coefficient ratio  $k(\text{O}_3 + 2\text{-methylpropene})/k(\text{O}_3 + \text{propene}) = 0.327 \exp[-(242 \pm 102)/T]$ , derived from the data provided in Avzianova and Ariya (2002), is placed on an absolute basis using  $k(\text{O}_3 + \text{propene}) = 5.5 \times 10^{-15} \exp(-1880/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  (IUPAC, current recommendation). The 298 K rate coefficient calculated from the Arrhenius expression ( $1.52 \times 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) is a factor of 7 lower than the room temperature rate coefficient cited by Avzianova and Ariya (2002), and their Arrhenius plots indicate that the temperature dependence for  $\text{O}_3 + 2\text{-methylpropene}$  is similar to that for  $\text{O}_3 + \text{but-1-ene}$  ( $E/R = 1750 \text{ K}$ ). The Arrhenius expression cited by Avzianova and Ariya (2002) is clearly in error.

### Preferred Values


Parameter	Value	T/K
$k / \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$	$1.15 \times 10^{-17}$	298
$k / \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$	$2.92 \times 10^{-15} \exp(-1650/T)$	220-370
<i>Reliability</i>		
$\Delta \log k$	$\pm 0.05$	298
$\Delta E/R$	$\pm 200$	220-370

### Comments on Preferred Values

The preferred value of  $E/R$  is based on the average of those reported by Huie and Herron (1975), Treacy et al. (1992) and Shi et al. (2011), which are in good agreement. The Arrhenius parameters given by Avzianova and Ariya (2002) are inconsistent with the reported room temperature value of  $k$  (see comment (d)), and their value of  $E/R$  is significantly greater than the preferred value.

The preferred value of  $k$  at 298 K is based on the average of the direct determinations of Huie and Herron (1975), Treacy et al. (1992), Wegener et al. (2007) and Shi et al. (2011) and the relative rate determinations of Greene and Atkinson (1992) and Avzianova and Ariya (2002), corrected to 298 K, where necessary, using the preferred value of  $E/R$ . These values are in very good agreement, lying within  $\pm 5\%$  of the preferred value. The absolute determinations of Japar et al. (1974), Adeniji et al. (1981) and Neeb and Moorgat (1999) are also consistent with the preferred value, lying 12-16% higher. Grimsrud et al. (1975) and Becker et al. (1983) report values of  $k$  lying about 30% and a factor of two higher, respectively.

It is well established that the reaction proceeds by initial addition of  $\text{O}_3$  to form an energy-rich "primary ozonide" which rapidly decomposes to form two sets of primary carbonyl product plus (excited) Criegee intermediate, as shown in the schematic below. Reported yields of acetone ( $\text{CH}_3\text{C}(\text{O})\text{CH}_3$ ) and formaldehyde (HCHO) suggest important contributions from both decomposition channels, (a) and (b), with HCHO also expected to have secondary sources (see below). Values of  $k_a/(k_a+k_b)$  lying in the range 0.30-0.35 can be inferred from the reported molar yields of acetone (Grosjean et al., 1996; Tuazon et al., 1997; Neeb and Moortgat, 1999), consistent with the value given in the schematic.



The further chemistry of  $[\text{CH}_2\text{OO}]^*$  is expected to follow the pathways described in the data sheet for the  $\text{O}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4$  reaction (Ox\_VOC5), although their relative importance is not necessarily the same. The schematic above shows some established features of the further chemistry of  $[(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}]^*$ , with suggested approximate contributions of the product pathways at 298 K and atmospheric pressure inferred from reported end product studies.

$[(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}]^*$  may either decompose, or be collisionally deactivated to form the stabilized Criegee intermediate  $(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}$  (sCI). The total yield of stabilized Criegee intermediates (i.e.  $\text{CH}_2\text{OO}$  and  $(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}$ ) has been reported to be  $(17.4 \pm 3.2)\%$  by Hatakayama et al. (1986), based on scavenging with added  $\text{SO}_2$  and quantification of the product  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$ . Assuming that the relative importance of the reaction pathways for  $[\text{CH}_2\text{OO}]^*$  formed from 2-methylpropene are similar to those for  $[\text{CH}_2\text{OO}]^*$  formed from ethene, the reported sCI yield is almost fully accounted for by  $\text{CH}_2\text{OO}$ . Consistent with this, Neeb et al. (1997) inferred a yield of 13% specifically for  $\text{CH}_2\text{OO}$ , based on scavenging with added  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  and quantification of the product  $\text{HOCH}_2\text{OOH}$ . This suggests that the major fate of  $[(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}]^*$  formed from 2-methylpropene ozonolysis is decomposition, with only a minor fraction stabilized to form  $(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}$ .

The dominant decomposition route for both  $[(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}]^*$  and  $(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}$  is expected to form HO radicals by an accepted decomposition mechanism involving abstraction of a  $\beta$ -hydrogen via a vinyl hydroperoxide intermediate (Fenske et al., 2000; Kroll et al., 2001), also forming the 1-methylvinoxy or acetyl radical ( $\text{CH}_3\text{C}(\text{O})\text{CH}_2$ ) as a co-product. Direct and indirect evidence for the formation of HO radicals has been reported in numerous studies (e.g. Atkinson and Aschmann, 1993; Neeb and Moortgat, 1999; Paulson et al., 1999; Rickard et al., 1999; Wegener et al., 2007; Alam et al., 2013), with yields in the range 60–84% (preferred value, 69%). A minor contribution to HO formation may also result from decomposition of  $[\text{CH}_2\text{OO}]^*$ . Assuming that the relative importance of the reaction pathways for  $[\text{CH}_2\text{OO}]^*$  formed from 2-methylpropene are similar to those for  $[\text{CH}_2\text{OO}]^*$  formed from ethene, this contribution is estimated to be about 5%, suggesting that decomposition of  $[(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}]^*$  and  $(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}$  contributes about 64%. Based on reported kinetic data (summarised and evaluated in datasheets CGI\_14 and CGI\_18 to CGI\_20), decomposition is also expected to be the major fate of  $(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{COO}$  under tropospheric conditions.

The acetyl radical ( $\text{CH}_3\text{C}(\text{O})\text{CH}_2$ ) reacts with  $\text{O}_2$  under atmospheric conditions. This is expected to form a stabilized peroxy radical, which can undergo conventional bimolecular reactions (e.g. with  $\text{NO}$ ,  $\text{HO}_2$  and other peroxy radicals) initiating reaction sequences forming a large number of potential products, with examples shown in the schematic. These include methyl glyoxal ( $\text{CH}_3\text{C}(\text{O})\text{CHO}$ ), hydroxyacetone ( $\text{CH}_3\text{C}(\text{O})\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$ ), methanol ( $\text{CH}_3\text{OH}$ ) and  $\text{CO}_2$ , which have been reported to be formed with respective yields of about 15 %, 7 %, 5 % and 28 % (Neeb and Moortgat, 1999; Tuazon et al., 1997).  $\text{CO}_2$  may also be formed from the decomposition of  $[\text{CH}_2\text{OO}]^*$ , with an estimated yield of about 7 % (assuming the relative importance of the pathways is similar to those in the ethene system). The chemistry also results in significant secondary formation of  $\text{HCHO}$ . Total molar yields in the range 95–101 % have been reported by Grosjean et al. (1996), Tuazon et al. (1997) and Neeb and Moortgat (1999), which is consistent with major primary and secondary sources in the system.

## References

- Adeniji, A. A., Kerr, J. A. and Williams, M. R.: *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 13, 209, 1981.
- Alam, M. S., Rickard, A. R., Camredon, M., Wyche, K. P., Carr, T., Hornsby, K. E., Monks, P. S. and Bloss, W. J.: *J. Phys. Chem.*, 117, 12468, 2013.
- Becker, K. H., Schurath, U. and Seitz, H.: *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 6, 725, 1974.
- Atkinson, R. and Aschmann, S. M.: *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 27, 1357, 1993.
- Avzianova, E. V. and Ariya, P. A.: *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 34, 678, 2002.
- Fenske, J. D., Hasson, A. S., Paulson, S. E., Kuwata, K. T., Ho, A. and Houk, K. N.: *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 104, 7821, 2000.
- Greene, C. R. and Atkinson, R.: *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 24, 803, 1992.
- Grimsrud, E. P., Westberg, H. H. and Rasmussen, R. A.: *Int. J. Chem. Kinet., Symp. 1*, 183, 1975.
- Grosjean, E., de Andrade, J. B. and Grosjean, D.: *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 30, 975, 1996.
- Huie, R. E. and Herron, J. T.: *Int. J. Chem. Kinet., Symp. 1*, 165, 1975.
- Japar, S. M., Wu, C. H. and Niki, H.: *J. Phys. Chem.*, 78, 2318, 1974.
- Kroll, J. H., Sahay, S. R., Anderson, J. G., Demerjian, K. L. and Donahue, N. M.: *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 105, 4446, 2001.
- Shi, Y.Z., Xu, Y.F. and Jia, L.: *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 43, 238, 2011.
- Neeb, P. and Moortgat, G. K.: *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 103, 9003, 1999.
- Neeb, P., Sauer, F., Horie, O. and Moortgat, G. K.: *Atmos. Environ.*, 31, 1417, 1997.
- Paulson, S. E., Chung, M. Y., Hasson, A. S.: *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 103, 8125, 1999.
- Rickard, A. R., Johnson, D., McGill, C. D. and Marston, G.: *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 103, 7656, 1999.
- Treacy, J., El Hag, M., O'Farrell, D. and Sidebottom, H.: *Ber. Bunsenges. Phys. Chem.*, 96, 422, 1992.
- Tuazon, E. C., Aschmann, S. M., Arey, J. and Atkinson, R.: *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 31, 3004, 1997.
- Wegener, R., Brauers, T., Koppmann, R., Bares, S. R., Rohrer, F., Tillmann, R., Wahner, A., Hansel, A. and Wisthaler, A.: *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 112, 2007, doi: 10.1029/2006JD007531.

- Becker et al. (1974)
- Huie and Herron (1975)
- ◇ Adeniji et al. (1981)
- ◆ Neeb and Moortgat (1999)
- × Shi et al. (2011)
- Avzianova and Ariya (2002)
- Recommendation
- Japar et al. (1974)
- + Grimsrud et al. (1975)
- Treacy et al. (1992)
- ▲ Wegener et al. (2007)
- Greene and Atkinson (1992)
- - Avzianova and Ariya (2002) Arrhenius expression

