







 Cite this: *RSC Adv.*, 2020, 10, 9093

# Effect of NH<sub>3</sub> and HCOOH on the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> + HO → HO<sub>2</sub> + H<sub>2</sub>O reaction in the troposphere: competition between the one-step and stepwise mechanisms†

 Tianlei Zhang,<sup>†</sup> <sup>\*ac</sup> Mingjie Wen,<sup>‡</sup> <sup>ac</sup> Zhaopeng Zeng,<sup>‡</sup> <sup>a</sup> Yousong Lu,<sup>‡</sup> <sup>b</sup> Yan Wang,<sup>‡</sup> <sup>a</sup> Wei Wang,<sup>†</sup> <sup>a</sup> Xianzhao Shao,<sup>\*a</sup> Zhiyin Wang<sup>a</sup> and Lily Makroni<sup>\*b</sup>

The H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> + HO → HO<sub>2</sub> + H<sub>2</sub>O reaction is an important reservoir for both radicals of HO and HO<sub>2</sub> catalyzing the destruction of O<sub>3</sub>. Here, this reaction assisted by NH<sub>3</sub> and HCOOH catalysts was explored using the CCSD(T)-F12a/cc-pVDZ-F12//M06-2X/aug-cc-pVTZ method and canonical variational transition state theory with small curvature tunneling. Two possible sets of mechanisms, (i) one-step routes and (ii) stepwise processes, are possible. Our results show that in the presence of both NH<sub>3</sub> and HCOOH catalysts under relevant atmospheric temperature, mechanism (i) is favored both energetically and kinetically than the corresponding mechanism (ii). At 298 K, the relative rate for mechanism (i) in the presence of NH<sub>3</sub> (10, 2900 ppbv) and HCOOH (10 ppbv) is respectively 3–5 and 2–4 orders of magnitude lower than that of the water-catalyzed reaction. This is due to a comparatively lower concentration of NH<sub>3</sub> and HCOOH than H<sub>2</sub>O which indicates the positive water effect under atmospheric conditions. Although NH<sub>3</sub> and HCOOH catalysts play a negligible role in the reservoir for both radicals of HO and HO<sub>2</sub> catalyzing the destruction of O<sub>3</sub>, the current study provides a comprehensive example of how acidic and basic catalysts assisted the gas-phase reactions.

 Received 2nd January 2020  
 Accepted 13th February 2020


DOI: 10.1039/d0ra00024h

[rsc.li/rsc-advances](http://rsc.li/rsc-advances)

## 1. Introduction

Hydrogen peroxide (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) is of great importance not only because it is involved in various biological and atmospheric processes,<sup>1</sup> but it's also one of the major sources of hydroxyl (HO) and hydroperoxyl (HO<sub>2</sub>) radicals which play an important role in combustions and atmospheric chemical processes.<sup>1</sup> Hydroxyl radical (HO) plays an important role in maintaining the balance of atmospheric composition and forming reactive peroxides.<sup>2,3</sup> Also, from the standpoint of degradation ability,<sup>4,5</sup> HO radicals can react with one ozone molecule to produce molecular oxygen and the HO<sub>2</sub> radicals in the upper atmosphere. As an important reaction in HO<sub>x</sub> chemistry, the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> +

HO reaction shown in eqn (1) can determine the consumption of HO radicals in HO<sub>x</sub> chain reactions. Meanwhile, this reaction is also an important reservoir<sup>5,6</sup> for both radicals of HO and HO<sub>2</sub> catalyzing the destruction of ozone (O<sub>3</sub>).



It is obvious from previous reports that the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> + HO reaction has been extensively studied both experimentally<sup>7–12</sup> and theoretically.<sup>10,13–15</sup> In terms of experiments, for the gas-phase reaction of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> + HO, Vakhtin *et al.*<sup>16</sup> obtained its rate coefficient  $(1.78 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-12}$  cm<sup>3</sup> per molecule per s at 296 K through the laser-induced resonance fluorescence technology. Similar to the report of Vakhtin *et al.*,<sup>16</sup> NASA/JPL<sup>17</sup> evaluation suggested the rate coefficient for the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> + HO reaction between 200 and 300 K was  $1.8 \times 10^{-12}$  cm<sup>3</sup> per molecule per s. In addition, the results obtained by the experimental group<sup>18,19</sup> revealed that the rate coefficients for the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> + HO reaction have positive temperature dependence within different temperature ranges. From the theoretical point of view, Francisco's group<sup>20</sup> has studied the mechanism of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> + HO reaction at the CCSD(T)/CBS//MP2/aug-cc-pVDZ level, and their calculated rate coefficient was  $1.56 \times 10^{-12}$  cm<sup>3</sup> per molecule per s at 298 K, which was in good agreement with the experimental results reported by Vaghjani and coworkers.<sup>10</sup> Then,

<sup>a</sup>Shaanxi Key Laboratory of Catalysis, School of Chemical & Environment Science, Shaanxi University of Technology, Hanzhong, Shaanxi 723001, P. R. China. E-mail: ztianlei88@163.com; xianzhao@snut.edu.cn; Fax: +86-916-2641083; Tel: +86-916-2641083

<sup>b</sup>Key Laboratory for Macromolecular Science of Shaanxi Province, School of Chemistry & Chemical Engineering, Shaanxi Normal University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710062, P. R. China. E-mail: lilymakroni@gmail.com

<sup>c</sup>Shanghai Key Laboratory of Molecular Catalysis and Innovative Materials, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, P. R. China

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: 10.1039/d0ra00024h

‡ Mingjie Wen, Zhaopeng Zeng, Yousong Lu and Yan Wang are contributed equally to this work.



a water-assisted  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO}$  reaction has been reported by Francisco's group. Their calculations show that the rate coefficient for the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO}$  reaction with  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  was  $4.09 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3$  per molecule per s at 298 K, which was 2.6 times larger than the value of the unassisted reaction. Subsequently, the reactions of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots (\text{H}_2\text{O})_n$  ( $n = 1-3$ ) + HO and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \cdots (\text{H}_2\text{O})_n$  ( $n = 1-3$ ) have been investigated by our group,<sup>21</sup> where the catalytic effect of  $(\text{H}_2\text{O})_n$  ( $n = 1-3$ ) is mainly taken from the contribution of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , and in  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ -assisted reaction, one-step process occurring through cage-like hydrogen bonding network complex and the transition state is kinetically favorable. However, this effort has focused only on the process of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO}$  reaction without and with water. As far as we know, the effect of  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HCOOH}$  on  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction has not been elucidated in the literature yet.

As the most abundant of all alkaline gases, the concentration of  $\text{NH}_3$  was found to be 10 ppm in dairy farms and 30 ppb in a polluted ambient atmosphere.<sup>22-25</sup> Meanwhile,  $\text{NH}_3$  has similar efficiency as  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  in catalyzing many hydrogen abstraction reactions.<sup>26-30</sup> Based on the fact that the possibility of the  $\text{NH}_3$ -catalytic effect on the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction has been investigated theoretically in this work. Also, owing to the significant abundance of  $\text{HCOOH}$  in the atmosphere,  $\text{HCOOH}$  can also be an effective catalyst like  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{NH}_3$ . It has been proved in previous investigations that  $\text{HCOOH}$  can decrease the energy significantly for several atmospheric hydrogen abstraction reactions.<sup>31-37</sup> Thus, it is also necessary to study the possible catalytic effect of  $\text{HCOOH}$  on the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO}$  reaction.

In the present work, the effect of  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HCOOH}$  on the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction has been investigated from both energetic and kinetic aspects, which was organized in two ways. Firstly, the roles of  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HCOOH}$  in the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction have been studied by both stepwise mechanism and one-step process. Then, the relative impacts of  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HCOOH}$  and their competition with  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  have been investigated by considering the dependence of rate coefficient on temperature and catalyst concentrations. Through our research, we expect to provide significant theoretical guidance for further revealing of the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction assisted by acidic, neutral and basic catalysts in the actual atmospheric environment.

## 2. Computational methods

### 2.1 Electronic structure calculation


The electronic structure calculations have been carried out by the Gaussian 09 program.<sup>38</sup> Geometries of all the species including reactants, pre-reactive complexes, transition states, post-reactive complexes, and products were optimized at the M06-2X/aug-cc-pVTZ level. The corresponding frequencies of the optimized geometries were computed at the same level to prove the characteristics of the transition states with one imaginary frequency and the stationary points possess all real frequencies. The minimum energy paths (MEPs) were obtained by intrinsic reaction coordinate (IRC)<sup>39-41</sup> calculations at the same level which confirms TSs, reactants, and products. IRC

calculations also confirmed the presence of pre- and post-reactive complexes at the entry and exit site of reaction path.

To improve the accuracy of the energetics, using M06-2X/aug-cc-pVTZ optimized geometries, single-point energy was calculated using ORCA<sup>42</sup> at the CCSD(T)-F12a/cc-pVDZ-F12 level,<sup>43-45</sup> and the scaled ZPEs were added to them. The scaling factor employed to adjust the ZPEs was 0.9490.<sup>46</sup> The reliability of CCSD(T)-F12a/cc-pVDZ-F12 method was further tested by the single point energies of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction at the W3X-L and W2X<sup>47</sup> using MRCC<sup>48,49</sup> program packages. It is noted that quantitative barrier heights<sup>47,50-53</sup> for complex atmospheric reactions can be obtained using W3X-L, where the accuracy of W2X and W3X-L can respectively reach for the all-electron scalar-relativistic CCSD(T)/CBS and CCSD(Q)/CBS. Here, the calculated results showed that the unsigned error of CCSD(T)-F12a/cc-pVDZ-F12 is less than  $0.5 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  (Table S1†), when compared with W3X-L results. Therefore, the affordable CCSD(T)-F12a/cc-pVDZ-F12 method is chosen to do single point energy calculations for the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction assisted by  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HCOOH}$ .

### 2.2 Chemical kinetics calculations

$\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction assisted by catalyst X (X =  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HCOOH}$ ) can be regarded as a sequential bimolecular reaction shown in eqn (2).



In eqn (2), the dimer  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HO}$  is assumed to be less important than  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{X}$  and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{X}$ , due to the small concentration of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and HO radicals. So, the sequential bimolecular route would first occur through the formation of a bimolecular complex BC ( $\text{X} \cdots \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  or  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{X}$ ), and then bimolecular complex combines with the other reactant (HO or  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ ) to form the trimolecular complex TC ( $\text{HO} \cdots \text{X} \cdots \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ ). Subsequently, the trimolecular complex undergoes a unimolecular reaction *via* the corresponding TS to form the products. Assuming a steady-state approximation, trimolecular complex TC is in equilibrium with bimolecular complex BC and reactant ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  or HO), the bimolecular rate coefficient ( $k_b$ ) for the reaction between BC and reactant ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  or HO) can be written as eqn (3) and calculated by employing Polyrate 8.2 program<sup>54</sup> coupled with the steady-state approximation.

$$k_b = \frac{k_2}{k_{-2} + k_{\text{uni}}} k_{\text{uni}} \quad (3)$$

Here assuming  $k_{-2}$  is much larger than  $k_{\text{uni}}$ ,  $k_b$  of eqn (3) can be simplified as eqn (4).

$$k_b = K_{\text{eq2}} \times k_{\text{uni}} \quad (4)$$

This kinetic model is reasonably correct at the high-pressure limit. In eqn (4), the equilibrium constant  $K_{\text{eq2}}$  can be written in



eqn (5), while the rate coefficient constant ( $k_{\text{uni}}$ ) from trimolecular complex to the products can be minimized by varying the transition state dividing surface along the reaction coordinate to get the CVT rate coefficients given by eqn (6) and (7):<sup>55–58</sup>

$$K_{\text{eq}2}(T) = \sigma \frac{Q_{\text{TC}}}{Q_{\text{R}} Q_{\text{BC}}} \exp\left(\frac{E_{\text{R}} + E_{\text{BC}} - E_{\text{TC}}}{RT}\right) \quad (5)$$

$$k^{\text{GT}}(T, s) = \Gamma L^{\ddagger} \times \frac{k_{\text{B}} T}{h} \frac{Q_{\text{TS}}^{\ddagger}(T, s)}{Q_{\text{TC}}(T)} \exp\left(-\frac{V_{\text{MEP}}(s)}{k_{\text{B}} T}\right) \quad (6)$$

$$k^{\text{CVT}}(T) = \min_s k^{\text{GT}}(T, (s)) = k^{\text{GT}}[T, s^{\text{CVT}}(T)] \quad (7)$$

where  $Q_{\text{TC}}$ ,  $Q_{\text{BC}}$  and  $Q_{\text{R}}$  in eqn (5) is respectively the total partition function of the trimolecular complex TC, bimolecular complex BC and reactant (HO or  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ );  $E_{\text{TC}}$ ,  $E_{\text{BC}}$  and  $E_{\text{R}}$  is respectively the energy of trimolecular complex TC, bimolecular complex BC and reactant (HO or  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ ).  $k^{\text{GT}}(T, s)$  in eqn (6) and  $k^{\text{CVT}}(T)$  in eqn (7) is respectively the rate coefficient of generalized and canonical variational transition state theory.  $\Gamma$  is the small curvature tunneling (SCT)<sup>59,60</sup> correction,  $L^{\ddagger}$  is the reaction path degeneracy,  $h$  is the Planck's constant,  $k_{\text{B}}$  is the Boltzmann constant,  $V_{\text{MEP}}(s)$  is the classical barrier height and  $Q_{\text{TS}}^{\ddagger}$  is the total partition functions for the transition state. It should be noted that  $K_{\text{eq}2}$  calculated here has been successfully performed in calculating the complexes<sup>61–65</sup> of  $\text{H}_2\text{O} \cdots \text{VOC}$ ,  $\text{H}_2\text{O} \cdots \text{HCHO}$ ,  $\text{H}_2\text{O} \cdots \text{CH}_3\text{COCH}_3$ ,  $\text{H}_2\text{O} \cdots \text{CH}_2\text{NH}$ ,  $\text{H}_2\text{O} \cdots \text{HO}_2$ ,  $\text{H}_2\text{O} \cdots \text{SO}_2$ , and  $\text{H}_2\text{O} \cdots \text{NO}_2$ . In this work, we do not consider the effects of partial pressure on the formation of these complexes because there are no experimental data to show that the equilibrium constants of these complexes are determined by pressure.

The equilibrium constant for the formation of the bimolecular complex ( $K_{\text{eq}1}$ ) can also be calculated using corresponding partition functions and energies (obtained from electronic structure calculations) as eqn (8)

$$K_{\text{eq}1}(T) = \sigma \frac{Q_{\text{BC}}}{Q_{\text{R}} Q_{\text{X}}} \exp\left(\frac{E_{\text{R}} + E_{\text{X}} - E_{\text{BC}}}{RT}\right) \quad (8)$$

where  $Q_{\text{BC}}$  and  $Q_{\text{R}}$  are the total partition functions of the bimolecular complex and reactants, respectively;  $E_{\text{BC}}$  and  $E_{\text{R}}$  are the energies of bimolecular complex and reactants, respectively. From the above, the rate ( $\nu$ ) of the sequential bimolecular reaction can be written as:

$$\nu = K_{\text{eq}1} \times K_{\text{eq}2} \times k_{\text{uni}} \times [\text{X}] \times [\text{HO}] \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \quad (9)$$

Here,  $\nu$  is considered as a measure of the relative efficiencies of the different catalysts under atmospheric conditions.

## 3. Results and discussions

### 3.1 Reactants

In the presence of catalyst X, the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} + \text{X}$  reaction going through a termolecular reaction has a much lower probability than the sequential bimolecular reaction. In this work, the sequential bimolecular reaction is that, initially, the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} + \text{X}$  reaction goes through a two-body complex between catalyst

X and one of the two reactants ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  or HO) and then the two-body complex will react with the other reactant. It should be noted that, because of the small concentration of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and HO radicals, the concentration of dimer  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HO}$  is much lower as compared to the dimers of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{X}$  and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{X}$ . Thus,  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HO}$  complex can be neglected and it is not taken into account here. Such investigations have been studied in similar investigations,<sup>52,66–70</sup> where the dimer between the two reactants has not been involved in X assisted reactions. Above step is followed since it is very necessary to first identify the stable binary complexes of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{X}$  and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{X}$ . To achieve this aim, we performed a stable global minimum searching of geometrical configurations using Tsinghua Global Minimum (TGMin) program<sup>71,72</sup> to search out variety geometrical configurations of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{X}$  and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{X}$  complexes firstly. Secondly initial structures obtained for these binary complexes were selected for geometry optimization using the M06-2X/6-31+G(d,p) level. Then, the structures within 5.0 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> of the global minimum were re-optimized by M06-2X/aug-cc-pVTZ level. The optimized structures for the most stable  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{X}$  and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{X}$  complexes have been shown in Fig. 1. As displayed in Fig. 1, the stable binary  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3$  complex shows a five-membered ring with two hydrogen bonds ( $\text{H4} \cdots \text{N}$ , 1.85 Å;  $\text{H1} \cdots \text{O2}$ , 2.67 Å) involved. Its stabilization energy is 6.6 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> relative to the separate reactants of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and  $\text{NH}_3$ , and is respectively stabilized by 1.1 and 6.6 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> than the other two binary complexes of  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{NH}_3 \cdots \text{HO}$ . Binary complexes of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH}$  and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{HCOOH}$  were formed with stabilization energies of 10.1 and 4.9 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. The energy difference between these two complexes can be explained in terms of ring size formed within their structures. The former complex is formed with a seven-membered ring structure, while the latter complex forms a six-membered ring structure.

### 3.2 Mechanism and kinetic for $\text{NH}_3$ -assisted reaction

Depending on the type of the binary complex discussed above, three different binary mechanisms, labelled as  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{HO}$ ,  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ , and  $\text{NH}_3 \cdots \text{HO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ , were obtained (as illustrated in Fig. 2). Among the three  $\text{NH}_3$  assisted  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reactions, one proceeds through both one-step and stepwise mechanisms and the other two occur-only through a one-step mechanism. The relative energies to the separate reactants in the presence of  $\text{NH}_3$  are given in Table S5.†

As for Channel R\_AM1, the reaction starting with  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{HO}$  reactants leads to a termolecular hydrogen bond complex IM\_AM1 with a binding energy of 9.5 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> relatives to the separate  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{HO}$  reactants. Because of the geometry, additional two hydrogen bonds ( $\text{N} \cdots \text{H5}$ , 1.99 Å;  $\text{O3} \cdots \text{H1}$ , 2.14 Å) were formed in complex IM\_AM1 as compared to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3$  complex. This leads to complex IM\_WM1 shows a quasi-planar cage-like hydrogen bonding network structure. Starting from complex IM\_AM1, Channel R\_AM1 proceeds through the transition state TS\_AM1 where the O atom of HO radical extracts one H atom of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  moiety in  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3$  complex. As illustrated in Fig. 2(a), TS\_AM1 has a computed






Fig. 1 The optimized structures for the most stable complex of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (or HO) with catalyst X ( $X = \text{NH}_3$  and HCOOH) at the CCSD(T)-F12a/cc-pVDZ-F12//M06-2X/aug-cc-pVTZ level.

barrier of  $9.2 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  relative to complex IM\_AM1. This barrier height is much lower than that for  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction without catalyst X, which has an energy barrier of  $14.1 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  as compared to corresponding pre-reactive complex IM1 (Table S5<sup>†</sup>). Similarity, compared with the reaction without X, the computed free energy barrier ( $\Delta G$ , 298 K) of the transition state TS\_AM1 to the complex IM\_AM1 is reduced to  $9.6 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  from  $14.1 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ . Differently from complex IM\_AM1 and transition state TS\_AM1, post-reactive complex IMF\_AM1 shows a planar structure with its stabilization energy of  $42.5 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  relative to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{HO}$  reactants.

As for Channel R\_AM2, when  $\text{NH}_3$  has introduced into the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction, two kinds of entrance channels,  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{HO}$  (Path R\_AM2a) and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (Path R\_AM2b), have been displayed in Fig. 2(b). When binary complex  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3$  and HO play as reactants, the reaction occurs in stepwise route, which is similar to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  catalyzed reactions<sup>21,28,62,73,74</sup> of  $\text{HO}_2 + \text{HO}$ ,  $\text{HO}_2 + \text{HS}$ ,  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO}$ ,  $\text{HO}_2 + \text{Cl}$ , and  $\text{HO}_2 + \text{NH}_2$ , as well as  $\text{NH}_3$ -catalyzed  $\text{HO}_2 + \text{Cl}$  reaction.<sup>28</sup> The first step begins with pre-reactive complex IM\_AM2, which transforms into seven-membered ring complex IM\_AM3 through transition state TS\_AM2 by a ring enlargement. It is noted that complex IM\_AM3 has a binding energy of  $11.8 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ , larger by  $5.3 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  that of complex IM\_AM2. At the same time, the barrier height of the ring enlargement is only  $2.6 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ , revealing that this elementary step can occur easily both thermodynamically and kinetically. In the second step, the IM\_AM3 complex undergoes a direct hydrogen abstraction by the O atom of HO moiety abstracting one H atom of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  moiety. This elementary step overcomes a barrier height of  $4.4 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ , which is higher by

$1.8 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  than the corresponding barrier height for the step of ring enlargement. This reveals that the second step is the rate-determining step. When  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  act as reactants, the reaction occurs in one elementary step, which is similar to the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction in the absence of a catalyst. Starting from  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reactants, Path R\_AM2b starts with pre-reactive complex IM\_AM3 and proceeds through the transition state TS\_AM3 to from the post-reactive complex IMF\_AM3, which has been discussed above. To check the competition between  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{HO}$  and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  in Channel R\_AM2, the rate *via* the routes of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{HO}$  (Path R\_AM2a) and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  (Path R\_AM2b) is respectively given in eqn (10) and (11).

$$v_{\text{R\_AM2a}} = \frac{d[\text{HO}_2]}{dt} = K_{\text{eq1a}} \times k_{\text{R\_AM2a}} \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \times [\text{NH}_3] \times [\text{HO}] \quad (10)$$

$$v_{\text{R\_AM2b}} = \frac{d[\text{HO}_2]}{dt} = K_{\text{eq1b}} \times k_{\text{R\_AM2b}} \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \times [\text{NH}_3] \times [\text{HO}] \quad (11)$$

where  $K_{\text{eq1a}}$  and  $K_{\text{eq1b}}$  respectively denote the equilibrium constant for the formation of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3$ ;  $k_{\text{R\_AM2a}}$  and  $k_{\text{R\_AM2b}}$  respectively denote the bimolecular rate constant of Path R\_AM2a and Path R\_AM2b. The calculated rate ratio for  $v_{\text{R\_AM2a}}/v_{\text{R\_AM2b}}$  reveals that the entrance of  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  is more important than that of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3$  and HO with the ratio of  $v_{\text{R\_AM2a}}/v_{\text{R\_AM2b}}$  is  $5.99 \times 10^{-6}$  to  $2.36 \times 10^{-5}$  between 280 and 320 K (Table 1). As a result, Channel R\_AM2 occurs mainly through  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reactants. Similarity, the  $\text{NH}_3 \cdots \text{HO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reaction (Path R\_AM3b) only has been taken into account in Channel R\_AM3, and the reaction starting






Fig. 2 Schematic potential energy diagrams for  $\text{NH}_3$  catalyzed  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction at the CCSD(T)-F12a/cc-pVDZ-F12//M06-2X/aug-cc-pVTZ level.

from  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3 + \text{HO}$  reactants (Path R\_AM3a) has been neglected because the ratio of  $\nu_{\text{R\_AM3a}}/\nu_{\text{R\_AM3b}}$  listed in Table 1 is  $3.45 \times 10^{-3}$  to  $7.24 \times 10^{-3}$  between 280 and 320 K.

Regarding Channel R\_AM3 starting from  $\text{NH}_3 \cdots \text{HO} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reactants, seven-membered ring complex IM\_AM5 proceeded through transition state TS\_AM5 to post-reactive complex R\_AM2 and R\_AM3 is possibly due to that Channel R\_AM2 involves a direct hydrogen abstraction, whereas double

that the barrier height of Channel R\_AM3 is  $31.0 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  higher than the corresponding barrier height value involved in Channel R\_AM2, while the computed free energy barrier ( $\Delta G$ , 298 K) of Channel R\_AM3 is higher by  $32.9 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  than that of Channel R\_AM2. Such energy difference between Channels R\_AM2 and R\_AM3 is possibly due to that Channel R\_AM2 involves a direct hydrogen abstraction, whereas double



**Table 1** The bimolecular rate coefficients ( $\text{cm}^3$  per molecules per s) and rate ratio for  $\text{NH}_3$  catalyzed  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction within the temperature range of 280–320 K

T/K	$k_{\text{R\_AM1}}$	$k_{\text{R\_AM2a}}$	$k_{\text{R\_AM2b}}$	$\nu_{\text{R\_AM2a}}/\nu_{\text{R\_AM2b}}$	$k_{\text{R\_AM3a}}$	$k_{\text{R\_AM3b}}$	$\nu_{\text{R\_AM3a}}/\nu_{\text{R\_AM3b}}$	$\nu_{\text{R\_AM2b}}/\nu_{\text{R\_AM3b}}$	$\nu_{\text{R\_AM1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_AM2b}}$
280	$1.35 \times 10^{-10}$	$2.06 \times 10^{-16}$	$5.91 \times 10^{-11}$	$5.99 \times 10^{-6}$	$2.49 \times 10^{-34}$	$3.54 \times 10^{-28}$	$3.45 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.75 \times 10^{20}$	3.95
290	$1.13 \times 10^{-10}$	$2.54 \times 10^{-16}$	$4.68 \times 10^{-11}$	$8.77 \times 10^{-6}$	$4.98 \times 10^{-34}$	$3.92 \times 10^{-28}$	$4.24 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.46 \times 10^{20}$	3.91
298	$9.95 \times 10^{-11}$	$2.98 \times 10^{-16}$	$3.93 \times 10^{-11}$	$1.17 \times 10^{-5}$	$8.84 \times 10^{-34}$	$4.47 \times 10^{-28}$	$4.93 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.42 \times 10^{20}$	3.92
300	$9.64 \times 10^{-11}$	$3.09 \times 10^{-16}$	$3.75 \times 10^{-11}$	$1.25 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.02 \times 10^{-33}$	$4.63 \times 10^{-28}$	$5.14 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.24 \times 10^{20}$	3.91
310	$8.39 \times 10^{-11}$	$3.70 \times 10^{-16}$	$3.06 \times 10^{-11}$	$1.74 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.14 \times 10^{-33}$	$5.81 \times 10^{-28}$	$6.14 \times 10^{-3}$	$6.09 \times 10^{19}$	3.94
320	$7.43 \times 10^{-11}$	$4.38 \times 10^{-16}$	$2.55 \times 10^{-11}$	$2.36 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.58 \times 10^{-33}$	$7.69 \times 10^{-28}$	$7.24 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.93 \times 10^{19}$	4.01

hydrogen transfers were involved in Channel R\_AM3. This mechanism discrepancy between Channels R\_AM2 and R\_AM3 is consistent with water-catalyzed  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction.<sup>21</sup> Hence, double hydrogen transfers mechanisms are considered to be much less probable than the direct hydrogen abstraction mechanism with the mechanism from the IM\_AM5 complex being the most unlikely due to the high energy barrier. As a result, the double hydrogen transfer mechanism has not been involved in the HCOOH-catalyzed reaction below. Furthermore, the calculated rate ratio for  $\nu_{\text{R\_AM1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_AM2b}}$  reveals that Channel R\_AM1 is more important than that of Channel R\_AM2 with the ratio of  $\nu_{\text{R\_AM1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_AM2b}}$  is 3.95–4.01 between 280 and 320 K (Table 1).

### 3.3 Mechanism and kinetic for HCOOH-assisted reaction

The potential energy surfaces of the reaction channels in the presence of HCOOH for  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  formations occurring through Channels R\_FA1 and R\_FA2 have been displayed in Fig. 3. As for Channel R\_FA1 starting from  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{HO}$  reactants, the route begins with the formation of the complex IM\_FA1. Complex IM\_FA1 forms a hydrogen-bonded configuration with a binding energy of  $5.9 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  as compared to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{HO}$  reactants. The structure of IM\_FA1 resembles that of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH}$  complex with additional two hydrogen bonds ( $\text{H3} \cdots \text{O5}$ ,  $1.98 \text{ \AA}$ ;  $\text{O1} \cdots \text{H4}$ ,  $1.99 \text{ \AA}$ ) formed between HO and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH}$  complex. Starting from IM\_FA1 complex, the O atom of HO radical directly abstracts the H4 of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  moiety in  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH}$  complex, overcoming transition state TS\_FA1 with an energy of  $0.6 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  with respect to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{HO}$  reactants. The barrier height of Channel R\_FA1 is  $6.5 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ , which is lower by  $7.6 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  than the similar route in the absence of a catalyst. Meanwhile, the computed free energy barrier ( $\Delta G$ , 298 K) is reduced to  $7.2 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  from  $14.1 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  in the bare  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO}$  reaction. This indicates that HCOOH in Channel R\_FA1 plays a positive catalytic role in the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction by reducing the energy barrier.

Because of relative energy, Channel R\_FA2 occurring through the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{HO}$  reactants is more favorable than that starting from  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reactants. Given the relative concentration, the concentration of binary complex of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH}$  ( $2.10 \text{ molecules per cm}^3$ ) is much higher than that of the binary complex of  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{HCOOH}$  ( $4.17 \times 10^{-5} \text{ molecules per cm}^3$ ). However, as listed in Table 2, the ratio

( $\nu_{\text{R\_FA2a}}/\nu_{\text{R\_FA2b}}$ ) between  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{HO}$  (Path R\_FA2a) and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reaction (Path R\_FA2b) in Channel R\_FA2 is 0.02–0.03 between 280 and 320 K. The above facts reveal that for Channel R\_FA2, the interaction between  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  would be more favorable than the action *via*  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{HO}$  route. As for Path R\_FA2b, beginning with the  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reactants, the reaction involves the formation of pre-reactive complex IM\_FA3 with the binding energy of  $11.3 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  as compared to  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reactants. In the viewpoint of geometrical structure, IM\_FA3 shows a nine-membered ring with three hydrogen bonds ( $\text{H3} \cdots \text{O5}$ ,  $1.84 \text{ \AA}$ ;  $\text{O4} \cdots \text{H5}$ ,  $1.79 \text{ \AA}$ ;  $\text{O2} \cdots \text{H1}$ ,  $1.75 \text{ \AA}$ ) involved. After complex IM\_FA3, Path R\_FA2 occurs through transition state TS\_FA3 where the O atom of HO radical abstracts the H atom of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  followed by the elongation of the  $\text{H5} \cdots \text{O4}$  and  $\text{H1} \cdots \text{O2}$  bonds respectively by  $0.09 \text{ \AA}$  and  $0.11 \text{ \AA}$ . TS\_FA3, as illustrated in Fig. 3, has a computed energy barrier of  $8.9 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  relative to complex IM\_FA3, lying at  $7.3 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  below the separate reactants of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} + \text{HCOOH}$ . This barrier height is much lower than the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction, whose energy barrier is determined to be  $14.1 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ . Similarity, the computed free energy barrier ( $\Delta G$ , 298 K) is reduced to  $8.9 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  from  $14.1 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$  in the bare  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO}$  reaction. This indicates that HCOOH in Channel R\_FA2 also plays a positive catalytic role in reducing the energy barrier of the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction.

As a result of the above, HCOOH-assisted  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction mainly occurs through  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{HO}$  reaction (Path R\_FA1) and  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reaction (Path R\_FA2b) by one-step route. Moreover, one-step route occurring through  $\text{HO} \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  reaction is more competitive than  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH} + \text{HO}$  reaction with the ratio of  $\nu_{\text{R\_FA1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_FA2b}}$  is 5.24–3.30 between 280 and 320 K (Table 2).

### 3.4 Relative impact of $\text{NH}_3$ and HCOOH in troposphere

From the mechanism and kinetic discussed above, X-assisted  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction mainly proceeds through the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{X} + \text{HO}$  reaction by one-step mechanism. Here, the relative rates for  $\text{NH}_3$  and HCOOH to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  have been calculated to get a realistic diagram of the relative impact of the  $\text{NH}_3$  and HCOOH in the troposphere. To achieve this aim, one-step reaction mechanism of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction assisted by  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  at the CCSD(T)-F12a/cc-pVDZ-F12//M06-2X/aug-cc-pVTZ level has been shown in Fig. S1,<sup>†</sup> while its rate






Fig. 3 Schematic potential energy diagrams for favorable channels of HCOOH catalyzed  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction at the CCSD(T)-F12a/cc-pVDZ-F12//M06-2X/aug-cc-pVTZ level.

coefficient within the temperature range of 213–320 K is listed in Table S6.† Thus, the relative rate for  $\text{NH}_3$  to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  as well as the relative rate for HCOOH as compared to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  is respectively given in eqn (12) and (13).

$$\frac{\nu_{\text{R\_AM}}}{\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}} = \frac{K_{\text{eq1a}} \times k_{\text{R\_AM1}} \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \times [\text{NH}_3] \times [\text{HO}]}{K_{\text{eq1f}} \times k_{\text{R\_WM}} \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}] \times [\text{HO}]}$$

$$= \frac{K_{\text{eq1a}} \times k_{\text{R\_AM1}} \times [\text{NH}_3]}{K_{\text{eq1f}} \times k_{\text{R\_WM}} \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}]}$$

$$\frac{\nu_{\text{R\_FA}}}{\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}} = \frac{K_{\text{eq1d}} \times k_{\text{R\_FA1}} \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \times [\text{HCOOH}] \times [\text{HO}]}{K_{\text{eq1f}} \times k_{\text{R\_WM}} \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}] \times [\text{HO}]}$$

$$= \frac{K_{\text{eq1d}} \times k_{\text{R\_FA1}} \times [\text{HCOOH}]}{K_{\text{eq1f}} \times k_{\text{R\_WM}} \times [\text{H}_2\text{O}]}$$

where  $K_{\text{eq1a}}$ ,  $K_{\text{eq1d}}$ , and  $K_{\text{eq1f}}$  respectively denote the equilibrium constant for the formation of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{NH}_3$ ,  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{HCOOH}$  and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \cdots \text{H}_2\text{O}$ ;  $k_{\text{R\_AM1}}$ ,  $k_{\text{R\_FA1}}$  and  $k_{\text{R\_WM}}$  respectively denote the bimolecular rate coefficient for the favorable one-step mechanism in  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction assisted by  $\text{NH}_3$ , HCOOH and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ .  $[\text{NH}_3]$ ,  $[\text{HCOOH}]$  and  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}]$  are the concentration of  $\text{NH}_3$ , HCOOH and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ , which was obtained from previous report values.<sup>55,64,65,70,75</sup>

The relative rates for  $\nu_{\text{R\_AM1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}$  and  $\nu_{\text{R\_FA1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}$  within the temperature range of 280–320 K are given in Table 3. As seen in Table 3, when the concentrations of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  at 100% ( $2.60 \times 10^{17}$  molecule per  $\text{cm}^3$  to  $2.30 \times 10^{18}$  molecule per  $\text{cm}^3$ )<sup>76</sup> RH and  $\text{NH}_3$  at 10 ppbv ( $2.60 \times 10^{11}$  molecule per  $\text{cm}^3$  to  $2.30 \times 10^{11}$  molecule per  $\text{cm}^3$ ),<sup>22–24</sup> the calculated  $\nu_{\text{R\_AM1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}$  value is below  $2.47 \times 10^{-3}$  to  $9.40 \times 10^{-5}$  within the temperature range

Table 2 The bimolecular rate coefficients ( $\text{cm}^3$  per molecules per s) and rate ratio for HCOOH catalyzed  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction within the temperature range of 280–320 K

T/K	$k_{\text{R\_FA1}}$	$k_{\text{R\_FA2a}}$	$k_{\text{R\_FA2b}}$	$\nu_{\text{R\_FA2a}}/\nu_{\text{R\_FA2b}}$	$\nu_{\text{R\_FA1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_FA2b}}$
280	$9.50 \times 10^{-11}$	$3.95 \times 10^{-13}$	$1.86 \times 10^{-8}$	0.02	5.24
290	$7.32 \times 10^{-11}$	$3.87 \times 10^{-13}$	$1.09 \times 10^{-8}$	0.02	4.64
298	$6.07 \times 10^{-11}$	$3.82 \times 10^{-13}$	$7.29 \times 10^{-9}$	0.03	4.19
300	$5.81 \times 10^{-11}$	$3.81 \times 10^{-13}$	$6.64 \times 10^{-9}$	0.03	4.10
310	$4.67 \times 10^{-11}$	$3.78 \times 10^{-13}$	$4.20 \times 10^{-9}$	0.03	3.65
320	$3.83 \times 10^{-11}$	$3.79 \times 10^{-13}$	$2.76 \times 10^{-9}$	0.03	3.30



**Table 3** The pseudo-first-order rate coefficients ( $\text{cm}^3$  per molecules per s) for  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HCOOH}$  catalyzed  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction within the temperature range of 280–320 K

<i>T</i> /K	$k'_t(\text{R\_WM})$ (100% RH)	$k'_t(\text{R\_AM1})$ (10 ppbv)	$k'_t(\text{R\_AM1})$ (2900 ppbv)	$k'_t(\text{R\_FA1})$ (high 10 ppbv)
280	$2.13 \times 10^{-17}$	$5.25 \times 10^{-20}$	$1.53 \times 10^{-17}$	$5.19 \times 10^{-19}$
290	$3.29 \times 10^{-17}$	$3.20 \times 10^{-20}$	$9.35 \times 10^{-18}$	$2.34 \times 10^{-19}$
298	$4.63 \times 10^{-17}$	$2.29 \times 10^{-20}$	$6.50 \times 10^{-18}$	$1.27 \times 10^{-19}$
300	$5.01 \times 10^{-17}$	$2.02 \times 10^{-20}$	$5.99 \times 10^{-18}$	$1.12 \times 10^{-19}$
310	$7.54 \times 10^{-17}$	$1.39 \times 10^{-20}$	$3.99 \times 10^{-18}$	$5.82 \times 10^{-20}$
320	$1.01 \times 10^{-16}$	$9.49 \times 10^{-21}$	$2.76 \times 10^{-18}$	$3.07 \times 10^{-20}$

<i>T</i> /K	$\nu_{\text{R\_AM1}}(10 \text{ ppbv})/\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}(100\% \text{ RH})$	$\nu_{\text{R\_AM1}}(2900 \text{ ppbv})/\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}(100\% \text{ RH})$	$\nu_{\text{R\_FA1}}(\text{high})/\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}(100\% \text{ RH})$
280	$2.47 \times 10^{-3}$	0.72	$2.44 \times 10^{-2}$
290	$9.73 \times 10^{-4}$	0.28	$7.13 \times 10^{-3}$
298	$4.94 \times 10^{-4}$	0.14	$2.75 \times 10^{-3}$
300	$4.04 \times 10^{-4}$	0.12	$2.23 \times 10^{-3}$
310	$1.84 \times 10^{-4}$	$5.29 \times 10^{-2}$	$7.72 \times 10^{-4}$
320	$9.40 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.74 \times 10^{-2}$	$3.05 \times 10^{-4}$

of 280–320 K. Moreover, when the concentration of  $\text{NH}_3$  at 2900 ppbv ( $7.60 \times 10^{13}$  molecule per  $\text{cm}^3$  to  $6.70 \times 10^{13}$  molecule per  $\text{cm}^3$ ),<sup>25</sup> the calculated  $\nu_{\text{R\_AM1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}$  is still below 0.72–2.74  $\times 10^{-2}$ . This reveals that the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction with  $\text{NH}_3$  cannot compete with the reaction in the presence of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ . Similarly, when the concentration of  $\text{HCOOH}$  at  $2.60 \times 10^{11}$  molecule per  $\text{cm}^3$  to  $2.30 \times 10^{11}$  molecule per  $\text{cm}^3$ ,<sup>77</sup> the calculated  $\nu_{\text{R\_FA1}}/\nu_{\text{R\_WM}}$  value is  $2.44 \times 10^{-2}$  to  $3.05 \times 10^{-4}$  within the temperature range of 280–320 K, indicating that the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction with  $\text{HCOOH}$  also cannot compete with the corresponding reaction in the presence of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ .

## 4. Summary and conclusions

The effect of catalyst X (X =  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HCOOH}$ ) on the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction was investigated by using quantum chemical calculations and canonical variational transition state theory with small curvature tunneling correction. Two kinds of acid–base catalyzed mechanism, namely one-step route and stepwise processes, were found in the reaction assisted by catalyst X. As for the one-step route, the reaction proceeded through similar direct hydrogen abstraction with the reaction without catalyst X. We found one-step mechanism that is promoted by a low energy barrier, was respectively predicted to take place at a bimolecular rate coefficient of  $9.95 \times 10^{-11}$   $\text{cm}^3$  per molecule per s ( $\text{NH}_3$ -assisted reaction) and  $6.07 \times 10^{-11}$   $\text{cm}^3$  per molecule per s ( $\text{HCOOH}$ -assisted reaction) at 298 K, and is very closed to the rate coefficient for the reaction without catalyst X. Stepwise processes here were explored by direct hydrogen abstraction and double hydrogen abstraction transfer mechanism, and were found to be kinetically more favorable *via* direct hydrogen abstraction. However, this hydrogen abstraction in a stepwise route is essentially less important than the hydrogen abstraction in a one-step mechanism.

Within the temperature ranging from 280 K to 320 K, the pseudo-first-order rate coefficient for one-step mechanism in the presence of  $\text{NH}_3$  (10 ppbv) and  $\text{HCOOH}$  (10 ppbv) is only  $5.25 \times 10^{-20}$  to  $9.49 \times 10^{-21}$   $\text{cm}^3$  per molecule per s and  $5.19 \times 10^{-19}$  to  $3.07 \times 10^{-20}$   $\text{cm}^3$  per molecule per s, respectively. This was largely decreased by 3–5 and 2–4 orders of magnitude than the reaction assisted by  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  in which the positive water effect is significant under atmospheric conditions. This catalytic difference between catalyst X and  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$  is possibly due to a much lower concentration of  $\text{NH}_3$  and  $\text{HCOOH}$  relative to  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ . Despite the fact that  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{HO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  reaction with catalyst X is not so efficient to shift the overall  $\text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  formation rate, the present study provides a comprehensive model of how acidic and basic catalysts assisted the gas-phase reactions.

## Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No: 21603132), the Shaanxi Provincial Natural Science Foundation (No: 2019JM-336 and 2019JQ-880), the Shaanxi Provincial Department of Education Project (18JK0147 and 18JS022), Shanghai Science and Technology Committee (16DZ2270100).

## References

- 1 T. P. Marcy, D. W. Fahey, R. S. Gao, P. J. Popp, E. C. Richard, T. L. Thompson, K. H. Rosenlof, E. A. Ray, R. J. Salawitch, C. S. Atherton, D. J. Bergmann, B. A. Ridley, A. J. Weinheimer, M. Loewenstein, E. M. Weinstock and M. J. Mahoney, *Science*, 2004, **304**, 261–265.





- 2 P. A. Ariya, R. Sander and P. J. Crutzen, *J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos.*, 2000, **105**, 17721–17738.
- 3 Y. Elshorbany, I. Barnes, K. H. Becker, J. Kleffmann and P. Wiesen, *Z. Physiol. Chem.*, 2010, **224**, 967–987.
- 4 A. Mansergas and J. M. Anglada, *ChemPhysChem*, 2007, **8**, 1534–1539.
- 5 S. A. Nizkorodov, W. W. Harper, B. W. Blackmon and D. J. Nesbitt, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2000, **104**, 3964–3973.
- 6 T. J. Wallington, K. W. Jucks and G. S. Tyndall, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 1998, **30**, 707–709.
- 7 E. Jiménez, T. Gierczak, H. Stark, J. B. Burkholder and A. R. Ravishankara, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2004, **108**, 1139–1149.
- 8 A. A. Turnipseed, G. L. Vaghjiani, T. Gierczak, J. E. Thompson and A. R. Ravishankara, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1991, **95**, 3244–3251.
- 9 G. L. Vaghjiani and A. R. Ravishankara, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1990, **92**, 996–1003.
- 10 G. L. Vaghjiani, A. R. Ravishankara and N. Cohen, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1989, **93**, 7833–7837.
- 11 F. Temps and H. Gg. Wagner, *Bunsen-Ges. Phys. Chem., Ber.*, 1982, **86**, 119–125.
- 12 W. J. Marinelli and H. S. Johnston, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1982, **77**, 1225–1234.
- 13 F. Atadinc, H. Günaydin, A. S. Özen and V. Aviyente, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 2005, **37**, 502–514.
- 14 R. R. Baldwin and R. W. Walker, *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans.*, 1979, **75**, 140–154.
- 15 P. H. Wine, D. H. Semmes and A. R. Ravishankara, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1981, **75**, 4390–4395.
- 16 A. B. Vakhtin, D. C. McCabe, A. R. Ravishankara and S. R. Leone, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2003, **107**, 10642–10647.
- 17 S. P. Sander, D. M. Golden, M. J. Kurylo, G. K. Moortgat, P. H. Wine, A. R. Ravishankara, C. E. Kolb, M. J. Molina, B. J. Finlayson-Pitts and R. E. Huie, *Chemical kinetics and photochemical data for use in atmospheric studies evaluation number 15*, 2006.
- 18 E. Vöhringer-Martinez, B. Hansmann, H. Hernandez-Soto, J. S. Francisco, J. Troe and B. Abel, *Science*, 2007, **315**, 497–501.
- 19 Z. K. Hong, R. D. Cook, D. F. Davidson and R. K. Hanson, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2010, **114**, 5718–5727.
- 20 R. J. Buszek, M. Torrent-Sucarrat, J. M. Anglada and J. S. Francisco, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2012, **116**, 5821–5829.
- 21 T. L. Zhang, X. G. Lan, Y. H. Zhang, R. Wang, Y. Q. Zhang, Z. Y. Qiao and N. Li, *Mol. Phys.*, 2019, **117**, 516–530.
- 22 J. J. Orlando, G. S. Tyndall and G. P. Brasseur, *Atmospheric chemistry and global change*, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- 23 V. P. Aneja, D. R. Nelson, P. A. Roelle, J. T. Walker and W. Battye, *J. Geophys. Res.: Atmos.*, 2003, **108**(D4), 4152.
- 24 J. X. Warner, Z. Wei, L. L. Strow, R. R. Dickerson and J. B. Nowak, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 2015, **15**, 35823–35856.
- 25 N. Hiranuma, S. D. Brooks, D. C. O. Thornton and B. W. Auvermann, *J. Air Waste Manage. Assoc.*, 2010, **60**, 210–218.
- 26 B. Bandyopadhyay, P. Biswas and P. Kumar, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2016, **18**, 15995–16004.
- 27 B. Bandyopadhyay, P. Kumar and P. Biswas, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2017, **121**, 3101–3108.
- 28 T. L. Zhang, Y. Q. Zhang, M. J. Wen, Z. Tang, B. Long, X. H. Yu, C. B. Zhao and W. L. Wang, *RSC Adv.*, 2019, **9**, 21544–21556.
- 29 B. Long, X. F. Tan, Y. B. Wang, J. Li, D. S. Ren and W. J. Zhang, *ChemistrySelect*, 2016, **1**, 1421–1430.
- 30 M. L. Wei, X. F. Tan, Z. W. Long and B. Long, *RSC Adv.*, 2017, **7**, 56211–56219.
- 31 S. Mallick, S. Sarkar, P. Kumar and B. Bandyopadhyay, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2017, **122**, 350–363.
- 32 S. Ghoshal and M. K. Hazra, *RSC Adv.*, 2015, **5**, 17623–17635.
- 33 R. J. Buszek, A. Sinha and J. S. Francisco, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2011, **133**, 2013–2015.
- 34 M. K. Hazra and T. Chakraborty, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2006, **110**, 9130–9136.
- 35 G. D. Silva, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2010, **49**, 7523–7525.
- 36 M. K. Hazra and T. Chakraborty, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2005, **109**, 7621–7625.
- 37 B. Long, Z. Long, Y. Wang, X. Tan, Y. Han, C. Long, S. Qin and W. Zhang, *ChemPhysChem*, 2012, **13**, 323–329.
- 38 M. J. Frisch, G. Trucks, J. A. Pople, *et al.*, *Gaussian 09, Revision A.01*, Gaussian Inc, Pittsburgh, PA, 2009.
- 39 K. Fukui, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 1981, **14**, 363–368.
- 40 C. Gonzalez and H. B. Schlegel, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1989, **90**, 2154–2161.
- 41 M. page and J. W. McIver Jr, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1988, **88**, 922–935.
- 42 F. Neese, *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev.: Comput. Mol. Sci.*, 2012, **2**, 73–78.
- 43 N. Bork, J. Elm, T. Olenius and H. Vehkamäki, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2014, **14**, 12023–12030.
- 44 N. Myllys, J. Elm, R. Halonen, T. Kurtén and H. Vehkamäki, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2016, **120**, 621–630.
- 45 J. Elm and K. Kristensen, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2017, **19**, 1122–1133.
- 46 D. Kashinski, G. Chase, R. Nelson, O. Di Nallo, A. Scales, D. VanderLey and E. F. C. Byrd, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2017, **121**, 2265–2273.
- 47 B. Chan and L. Radom, *J. Chem. Theory Comput.*, 2015, **11**, 2109–2119.
- 48 Z. Rolik, L. Szegedy, I. Ladjánszki, B. Ladóczki and M. Kállay, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2013, **139**, 094105.
- 49 M. Kállay, Z. Rolik, I. Ladjánszki, L. Szegedy, B. Ladóczki, J. Csontos and B. Kornis, *MRCC, A Quantum Chemical Program Suite*, 2015, see www.mrcc.hu, 2019.
- 50 B. Long, J. L. Bao and D. G. Truhlar, Unimolecular reaction of acetone oxide and its reaction with water in the atmosphere, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2018, **115**, 6135–6140.
- 51 B. Long, J. L. Bao and D. G. Truhlar, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2017, **19**, 8091–8100.
- 52 B. Long, J. L. Bao and D. G. Truhlar, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2016, **138**, 14409–14422.
- 53 B. Long, J. L. Bao and D. G. Truhlar, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2018, **141**, 611–617.



- 54 Y. Chuang, J. Corchado, P. Fast, J. Villà, E. Coitino, W. Hu, Y. Liu, G. Lynch, K. Nguyen and C. Jackels, *POLYRATE, Version 8.2*, Department of Chemistry and Supercomputer Institute, University of Minnesota, Minnesota, CP, 1999.
- 55 J. L. Bao and D. G. Truhlar, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2017, **46**, 7548–7596.
- 56 B. C. Garrett and D. G. Truhlar, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1979, **70**, 1593–1598.
- 57 B. C. Garrett and D. G. Truhlar, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1979, **101**, 4534–4548.
- 58 B. C. Garrett, D. G. Truhlar, R. S. Grev and A. W. Magnuson, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1980, **84**, 1730–1748.
- 59 Y. P. Liu, G. C. Lynch, T. N. Truong, D. H. Lu, D. G. Truhlar and B. C. Garrett, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1993, **115**, 2408–2415.
- 60 D. H. Lu, T. N. Truong, V. S. Melissas, G. C. Lynch, Y. P. Liu, B. C. Garrett, R. Steckler, A. D. Isaacson, S. N. Rai, G. C. Hancock, J. G. Lauderdale, T. Joseph and D. G. Truhlar, *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 1992, **71**, 235–262.
- 61 T. L. Zhang, R. Wang, H. Chen, S. T. Min, Z. Y. Wang, C. B. Zhao, Q. Xu, L. X. Jin, W. L. Wang and Z. Q. Wang, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, **17**, 15046–15055.
- 62 T. L. Zhang, X. G. Lan, Z. Y. Qiao, R. Wang, X. H. Yu, Q. Xu, Z. Y. Wang, L. X. Jin and Z. Q. Wang, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, **20**, 8152–8165.
- 63 C. Iuga, J. R. Alvarez-Idaboy and A. Vivier-Bunge, *Theor. Chem. Acc.*, 2011, **129**, 209–217.
- 64 M. A. Ali, M. Balaganesh and K. C. Lin, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, **20**, 4297–4307.
- 65 R. Wang, Q. Y. Yao, M. J. Wen, S. B. Tian, Y. Wang, Z. Y. Wang, X. H. Yu, X. Z. Shao and L. Chen, *RSC Adv.*, 2019, **9**, 16195–16207.
- 66 M. A. Ali, M. Balaganesh and S. Jang, *Atmos. Environ.*, 2019, **207**, 82–92.
- 67 Z. G. Dong, F. Xu and B. Long, *Comput. Theor. Chem.*, 2018, **1140**, 7–13.
- 68 F. Y. Liu, X. F. Tan, Z. W. Long, B. Long and W. J. Zhang, *RSC Adv.*, 2015, **5**, 32941–32949.
- 69 X. F. Tan, B. Long, D. S. Ren, W. J. Zhang, Z. W. Long and E. Mitchell, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2018, **20**, 7701–7709.
- 70 S. Sarkar, B. K. Oram and B. Bandyopadhyay, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2019, **123**, 3131–3141.
- 71 X. Chen, Y. F. Zhao, L. S. Wang and J. Li, *Comput. Theor. Chem.*, 2017, **1107**, 57–65.
- 72 Y. F. Zhao, X. Chen and J. Li, *Nano Res.*, 2017, **10**, 3407–3420.
- 73 T. L. Zhang, C. Yang, X. K. Feng, J. X. Kang, L. Song, Y. S. Lu, Z. Y. Wang, Q. Xu, W. L. Wang and Z. Q. Wang, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2016, **18**, 17414–17427.
- 74 T. L. Zhang, K. Wang, Z. Y. Qiao, Y. Q. Zhang, L. Geng, R. Wang, Z. Y. Wang, C. B. Zhao and L. X. Jin, *RSC Adv.*, 2018, **8**, 37105–37116.
- 75 B. Du and W. C. Zhang, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2013, **117**, 6883–6892.
- 76 S. Sarkar, S. Mallick, D. Kaushik, P. Kumar and B. Bandyopadhyay, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2017, **19**, 27848–27858.
- 77 T. Stavrou, J. Müller, J. Peeters, A. Razavi, L. Clarisse, C. Clerbaux, P. F. Coheur, D. Hurtmans, M. De Mazière, C. Vigouroux, N. M. Deutscher, D. W. T. Griffith, N. Jones and C. Paton-Walsh, *Nat. Geosci.*, 2012, **5**, 26–30.

