IUPAC Task Group on Atmospheric Chemical Kinetic Data Evaluation – Data Sheet ROO_22

Website: http://iupac.pole-ether.fr. See website for latest evaluated data. Data sheets can be downloaded for personal use only and must not be retransmitted or disseminated either electronically or in hardcopy without explicit written permission. This data sheet updated: 12th November 2002.

$CH_3O_2 + CH_3O_2 \rightarrow CH_3OH + HCHO + O_2$	(1)
---	----	---

- $\rightarrow 2CH_3O + O_2$
 - \rightarrow CH₃OOCH₃ + O₂

(2)

(3)

 $\Delta H^{\circ}(1) = -331.0 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$ $\Delta H^{\circ}(2) = 13.6 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$ $\Delta H^{\circ}(3) = -146.5 \text{ kJ} \cdot \text{mol}^{-1}$

k/cm^3 molecule ⁻¹ s ⁻¹	Temp./K	Reference	Technique/ Comments
Absolute Rate Coefficients			
$(5.2 \pm 0.9) \ge 10^{-13}$	298	Cox and Tyndall, 1980^{1}	MM-UVAS (a,b)
$(3.7 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-13}$	298	Sander and Watson, 1980 ²	FP-UVAS (a,c)
$1.40 \ge 10^{-13} \exp[(223 \pm 41)/T]$	250-420	Sander and Watson, 1981 ³	FP-UVAS (a,d)
$(3.0 \pm 0.5) \ge 10^{-13}$	298		
$(4.4 \pm 1.0) \ge 10^{-13}$	298	McAdam, Veyret, and Lesclaux, 1987 ⁴	FP-UVAS (a,e)
$1.3 \ge 10^{-13} \exp[(220 \pm 70/T)]$	228-380	Kurylo and Wallington, 1987 ⁵	FP-UVAS (a,f)
$(2.7 \pm 0.45) \ge 10^{-13}$	298		
$(3.5 \pm 0.5) \ge 10^{-13}$	298	Jenkin <i>et al.</i> , 1988 ⁶	MM-UVAS (a,g)
$(3.6 \pm 0.55) \ge 10^{-13}$	300	Simon, Schneider, and Moortgat, 1990 ⁷	MM-UVAS (a,h)
$1.3 \ge 10^{-13} \exp(365/T)$	248-573	Lightfoot, Lesclaux, and Veyret, 1990 ⁸	FP-UVAS (a,i)
$(4.1 \pm 0.9) \ge 10^{-13}$	300		
Branching Ratios			
$k_2/k = 1/\{1 + \exp[(1131 \pm 30)/T]/(17 \pm$	223-333	Horie, Crowley, and Moortgat, 1990 ⁹	P-FTIR (j)
5)}			•
$k_2/k = 0.30$	298		
$k_2/k = 0.41 \pm 0.04$	296	Tyndall, Wallington, and Ball, 1998 ¹⁰	P-FTIR (k)
$k_{3}/k < 0.06$	296		

Rate coefficient data ($k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3$)

Comments

- (a) k is defined by $-d[CH_3O_2]/dt = 2k[CH_3O_2]^2$ and was derived from the measured overall second-order decay of CH_3O_2 radicals (k_{obs}) by correcting for secondary removal of the CH_3O_2 radicals.
- (b) [CH₃O₂] determined by absorption at 250 nm in modulated photolysis of Cl₂-CH₄-O₂ mixtures. $k/\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = 1.33 \text{ x } 10^5 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$, $\sigma = 3.9 \text{ x } 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2$ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ at 250 nm.
- (c) Flash-photolysis of $(CH_3)_2N_2$ -O₂ and Cl_2 -CH₄-O₂ mixtures. [CH₃O₂] monitored by long path UV absorption giving $k/\sigma = (1.06 \pm 0.07) \times 10^5$ cm s⁻¹ at 245 nm and $(2.84 \pm 0.36) \times 10^5$ cm s⁻¹ at 270 nm. Value quoted is a mean value using σ values obtained by Hochanadel *et al.*¹¹ Small effects of varying O₂ and adding CO are reported.

- (d) Flash-photolysis of Cl₂-CH₄-O₂ mixtures. σ determined from absorption at t = 0 extrapolated from decay curves and estimate of [CH₃O₂]_o from change in Cl₂ concentration in flash. $\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = (2.5 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ at } 298 \text{ K}, \text{ and } k/\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = (5.6 \pm 0.8) \times 10^4 \text{ exp}[(223 \pm 41)/T] \text{ cm s}^{-1} (250 \text{ K to } 420 \text{ K}) \text{ were obtained.}$
- (e) Flash-photolysis of Cl₂ in the presence of CH₄ and O₂ over the pressure range 169 mbar to 530 mbar (120 Torr to 400 Torr). [CH₃O₂] monitored by UV absorption. $k_{obs}/\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = 1.34 \text{ x } 10^5 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$ and $\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = 4.4 \text{ x } 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2$ molecule⁻¹ were obtained. k_{obs}/k taken to be 1.35.
- (f) Flash-photolysis of Cl₂ in the presence of CH₄-O₂-N₂ mixtures at pressures between 67 mbar and 530 mbar (50 Torr and 400 Torr). $k_{obs} = (1.7 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-13} \exp[(220 \pm 70)/T] \text{ cm}^3$ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ determined from measured values of $k_{obs}/\sigma(250)$ by taking $\sigma(250) = 3.30 \times 10^{-18}$ cm² molecule⁻¹ as previously determined by same authors. Here we have taken $k_{obs}/k =$ 1.35 to calculate *k*. k_{obs} shown to be independent of pressure over the range 67 mbar to 530 mbar (51 Torr to 403 Torr) at 298 K.
- (g) Modulated photolysis of Cl₂ in the presence of CH₄-O₂ mixtures at a total pressure of 1 bar (760 Torr). $k_{obs}/\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = 1.11 \text{ x } 10^5 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$ and $\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = (4.25 \pm 0.5) \text{ x } 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2$ molecule⁻¹ were obtained leading to $k_{obs} = (4.7 \pm 0.5) \text{ x } 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3$ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹. Cited value of *k* obtained by taking $k_{obs}/k = 1.35$ to allow for secondary removal of CH₃O₂.
- (h) Modulated photolysis of Cl₂ in the presence of CH₄-O₂ mixtures at pressures of 320 mbar (240 Torr). $k_{obs}/\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = 1.16 \text{ x } 10^5 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$ and $\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = 4.14 \text{ x } 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2$ molecule⁻¹ were obtained, leading to $k_{obs} = (4.8 \pm 0.5) \text{ x } 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3$ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹. The cited value of k was obtained by taking $k_{obs}/k = 1.35$ to allow for secondary removal of CH₃O₂.
- (i) Flash-photolysis of Cl₂ in the presence of CH₄-O₂-N₂ mixtures over the pressure range 270 mbar to 930 mbar (200 Torr to 700 Torr). CH₃O₂ radicals were monitored by UV absorption. The values $k_{obs}/\sigma(210 \text{ nm to } 260 \text{ nm}) = 1.17 \text{ x } 10^5 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$ and $\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = 4.8 \text{ x } 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2$ molecule⁻¹ were obtained. k_{obs}/k taken to be 1.35. At temperatures >373 K, the second-order decays of CH₃O₂ were affected by HO₂ radical reactions. The branching ratio was obtained from the effect of [HO₂] on the CH₃O₂ decays.
- (j) Study of the photooxidation of CH₄, initiated by Cl atoms generated from Cl₂, in a slow-flow system under steady-state illumination. Analysis of HCHO, CH₃OH and HCOOH products by FTIR spectroscopy.
- (k) Photolysis of CH₃N₂CH₃-O₂ and Cl₂-CH₄-O₂ mixtures, with analyses of reactants and products by FTIR spectroscopy.

Preferred Values

 $k = 3.5 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at } 298 \text{ K}.$ $k = 1.03 \times 10^{-13} \exp(365/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the temperature range } 200 \text{ K to } 400 \text{ K}.$ $k_2 = 1.3 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at } 298 \text{ K}.$ $k_2 = 7.4 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-520/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the temperature range } 220 \text{ K to } 330 \text{ K}.$

Reliability

 $\Delta \log k = \pm 0.12$ at 298 K. $\Delta (E/R) = \pm 200$ K. $\Delta \log k_2 = \pm 0.15$ at 298 K. $\Delta (E_2/R) = \pm 300$ K.

Comments on Preferred Values

The room temperature measurements of k_{obs}/σ of Cox and Tyndall (1980), Sander and Watson (1980, 1981), McAdam et al., (1987), Kurylo and Wallington (1987), Jenkin et al., (1988), Simon et al., (1988) and Lightfoot et al. (1990) are in excellent agreement and lead to the recommended value of $k_{obs}/\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = 1.24 \text{ x} 10^5 \text{ cm s}^{-1}$. The measurements of the absorption cross-section by Simon *et al.*⁷ form the basis of our recommendation of $\sigma(250 \text{ nm}) = 3.9 \text{ x} 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2$ molecule⁻¹. Thus, we recommend $k_{obs} = 4.8 \text{ x} 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3$ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ at 298 K. Taking the branching ratio of $k_2/k = 0.37$ at 298 K yields the value of k at 298 K given above.

The temperature dependence of k reported by Lightfoot *et al.*⁸ is in excellent agreement with the studies of Sander and Watson,³ Kurylo and Wallington⁵ and Jenkin and Cox.¹² Here we have recommended the E/R value of Lightfoot *et al.*⁸ on the basis of their more extensive temperature range, and the temperature-dependent branching ratio k_2/k . The recommended Arrhenius equation follows from the recommended values of k_{298} and E/R.

There have been a number of measurements of the branching ratio, k_2/k , which have been carefully reanalysed by Tyndall *et al.*¹⁰ The values of k_2/k at 298 K range from 0.30 to 0.45. Tyndall *et al.*¹⁰ recommend the average of 0.37±0.06 which is also accepted in the review of Tyndall *et al.*¹³ This value is taken as our preferred value at 298 K, with enhanced error limits. The two studies^{8,9} of the temperature dependence of the branching ratio involve different temperature ranges. Here we have selected the results of Horie *et al.*⁹ over the more atmospherically relevant temperature range of 200 K to 330 K, modified to reproduce our recommended value of k_2/k at 298 K. This has been combined with our recommended expression for *k* to obtain the preferred expression for k_2 . There is no convincing evidence for any contribution from Channel (3).¹⁰

It should be noted that, from an analysis of their own data⁹ together with the results of Lightfoot *et al.*,⁸ Anastasi *et al.*,¹⁴ Kan *et al.*,¹⁵ Parkes,¹⁶ Niki *et al.*¹⁷ and Weaver *et al.*,¹⁸ the equation $k_2/k = 1/\{1+[\exp(1330/T)]/33\}$ was obtained by Horie *et al.*⁹ for the more extensive temperature range 223 K to 573 K. This equation shows slight non-Arrhenius behaviour. Lightfoot *et al.*⁸ observed no pressure dependence of the branching ratio, k_2/k , over the range 0.28 bar to 1 bar.

References

- ¹ R. A. Cox and G. S. Tyndall, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 2, 76, 153 (1980).
- ² S. P. Sander and R. T. Watson, J. Phys. Chem. **84**, 1664 (1980).
- ³ S. P. Sander and R. T. Watson, J. Phys. Chem. **85**, 2960 (1981).
- ⁴ K. McAdam, B. Veyret, and R. Lesclaux, Chem. Phys. Lett. **133**, 39 (1987).
- ⁵ M. J. Kurylo and T. J. Wallington, Chem. Phys. Lett. **138**, 543 (1987).
- ⁶ M. E. Jenkin, R. A. Cox, G. D. Hayman, and L. J. Whyte, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 2, **84**, 913 (1988).
- ⁷ F. G. Simon, W. Schneider, and G. K. Moortgat, Int. J. Chem. **22**, 791 (1990).
- ⁸ P. D. Lightfoot, R. Lesclaux, and B. Veyret, J. Phys. Chem. 94, 700 (1990).
- ⁹ O. Horie, J. N. Crowley, and G. K. Moortgat, J. Phys. Chem. **94**, 8198 (1990).
- ¹⁰ G. S. Tyndall, T. J. Wallington, and J. C. Ball, J. Phys. Chem A **102**, 2547 (1998).
- ¹¹ C. J. Hochanadel, J. A. Ghormley, J. W. Boyle, and P. J. Ogren, J. Phys. Chem. 81, 3 (1977).
- ¹² M. E. Jenkin and R. A. Cox, J. Phys. Chem. **95**, 3229 (1991).
- ¹³ G. S. Tyndall, R. A. Cox, C. Granier, R. Lesclaux, G. K. Moortgat, M. J. Pilling, A. R. Ravishankara, and T. J. Wallington, J. Geophys. Res. **106**, 12157 (2001).
- ¹⁴ C. Anastasi, I. W. M. Smith, and D. A. Parkes, J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 1, 74, 1693 (1978).

- ¹⁵ C. S. Kan, J. G. Calvert, and J. H. Shaw, J. Phys. Chem. **84**, 3411 (1980).
- ¹⁶ D. A. Parkes, Int. J. Chem. Kinet. **9**, 451 (1977).
- ¹⁷ H. Niki, P. D. Maker, C. M. Savage, and L. P. Breitenbach, J. Phys. Chem. **85**, 877 (1981).
- ¹⁸ J. Weaver, J. Meagher, R. Shortridge, and J. Heicklen, J. Photochem. 4, 341 (1975).