Rate constant and branching ratio of the reaction of ethyl peroxy radicals with methyl peroxy radicals

Cuihong Zhang,a,b,c Chuanliang Li,c,d Weijun Zhang,a Xiaofeng Tang,c,d,e Laure Pillier,c Coralie Schoemaecker,c,d,f and Christa Fittschen,c,d,e,c

The cross-reaction of ethyl peroxy radicals (C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$) with methyl peroxy radicals (CH$_3$O$_2$) (R1) has been studied using laser photolysis coupled to time resolved detection of the two different peroxy radicals by continuous wave cavity ring down spectroscopy (cw-CRDS) in their AÃ–X̃ electronic transition in the near-infrared region, C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ at 7602.25 cm$^{-1}$, and CH$_3$O$_2$ at 7488.13 cm$^{-1}$. This detection scheme is not completely selective for both radicals, but it is demonstrated that it has great advantages compared to the widely used, but unselective UV absorption spectroscopy. Peroxy radicals were generated from the reaction of Cl-atoms with the appropriate hydrocarbon (CH$_4$ and C$_2$H$_4$) in the presence of O$_2$, whereby Cl-atoms were generated by 351 nm photolysis of Cl$_2$. For different reasons detailed in the manuscript, all experiments were carried out under excess of C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ over CH$_3$O$_2$. The experimental results were best reproduced by an appropriate chemical model with a rate constant for the cross-reaction of $k = (3.8 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-15}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$ and a yield for the radical channel, leading to CH$_3$O and C$_2$H$_5$O, of ($\phi_{1a} = 0.40 \pm 0.20$).

Introduction

The oxidation of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in the troposphere is mainly driven by hydroxyl radicals (OH) and leads, after addition of O$_2$, to the formation of organic peroxy radicals (RO$_2$). The fate of these RO$_2$ radicals depends on the chemical composition of the environment and a detailed review on their chemistry has been given by G. Tyndall and colleagues.1,2 Briefly, in a polluted atmosphere they mainly react with nitric oxide (NO) to form alkoxy radicals or react with nitrogen dioxide (NO$_2$) to form peroxynitrates (RO$_2$NO$_2$). Subsequent to the reaction with NO, alkoxy radicals can react with O$_2$ to form hydroperoxy radicals (HO$_2$) together with carbonyl compounds. HO$_2$ further oxidises NO into NO$_2$ and thus regenerates OH, closing the quasi-catalytic cycle. The photolysis of the produced NO$_2$ leads subsequently to the formation of ozone (O$_3$) and is the only relevant formation path of tropospheric ozone. In clean environments with low NO$_x$ (NO$_x$ = NO + NO$_2$) concentrations, the fate of RO$_2$ change and their dominant loss becomes the reaction with HO$_2$ forming hydroperoxides ROOH and terminating the radical reaction chain. Other reaction pathways under low NO$_x$ conditions for RO$_2$ radicals are either self-reaction (RO$_2$ + RO$_2$) or cross-reaction with other RO$_2$ (RO$_2$ + R’O$_2$) or with OH radicals (RO$_2$ + OH).3 Methane and ethane are amongst the most abundant hydrocarbons, and their atmospheric oxidation leads to the formation of methyl peroxy (CH$_3$O$_2$) and ethyl peroxy (C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$) radicals. For both radicals, the kinetic and product distribution for the self-reaction has been studied numerous times (for CH$_3$O$_2$13–12 and for C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$13–26), the same is true for their reaction with HO$_2$ (for CH$_3$O$_2$5,9,27–32 and for C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$13,14,20,26,30,33–41). Their reaction with OH radicals has been the subject of a few studies (for CH$_3$O$_2$3,36–41 and for C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$42–44). The cross-reaction between both peroxy radicals has only been measured once using UV absorption spectroscopy45 whereby the experimental details given in that paper are sparse and it is not clear how the rate constant was extracted from the absorption time profiles measured at only one wavelength where the cross sections of both radicals are very similar. As for the product distribution of this cross reaction, three pathways can be expected:

\[
C_2H_5O_2 + CH_3O_2 \rightarrow C_2H_5O + CH_3O + O_2 \quad (R1a)
\]
→ C₂H₂O₂ + CH₃OCHO + O₂ (R1b)

→ C₃H₆ + CH₂O + O₂ (R1c)

whereby currently no information is available on the branching ratio between these pathways.

The investigation of this reaction is not straightforward, because secondary chemistry cannot be avoided. Both radicals will react in self-reactions, leading to analogous reaction products. The measurements are complicated, because the product of the reaction path (R1a) leads, after rapid reaction with O₂, to the formation of HO₂ radicals

\[ \text{CH}_3\text{O} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{O} + \text{HO}_2 \]  

(R2)

\[ \text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{O} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{CHO} + \text{HO}_2 \]  

(R3)

with the HO₂ radicals reacting subsequently with both peroxy radicals:

\[ \text{CH}_3\text{O}_2 + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{O}_2\text{H} + \text{O}_2 \]  

(R4)

\[ \text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{O}_2 + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{O}_2\text{H} + \text{O}_2 \]  

(R5)

The rate constants of (R4) and (R5) are faster than the rate constant of (R1), and thus the CH₃O₂ and C₂H₅O₂ decays are accelerated. Therefore, determining the rate constant k₁ from observed CH₃O₂ and C₂H₅O₂ decays depends also on the branching ratio k₄/k₃ as well as the branching ratios for the two self-reactions used in the data treatment: for a given experimental C₂H₅O₂ or CH₃O₂ decay the retrieved rate constant k₁ will decrease with increasing branching ratio.

In this work we present a more direct measurement of the rate constant of (R1). Measurements have been carried out under an excess of C₂H₅O₂ radicals over CH₃O₂, and both radicals have been followed in their A-X electronic transition using two different wavelengths. HO₂ concentration time profiles have been measured simultaneously in a highly selective way in the 2ν₁ vibrational overtone at 6638.21 cm⁻¹.

Experimental

Experimental setup

The setup has been described in detail before⁴⁶-⁴⁹ and is only briefly discussed here. The setup mainly consists of a 0.79 m long flow reactor made of stainless steel. The beam of a pulsed excimer laser (Lambda Physik LPX 202i), running at 351 nm, passed the reactor longitudinally. The flow reactor contained two identical continuous wave cavity ring-down spectroscopy (cw-CRDS) absorption paths, which were installed in a small angle with respect to the photolysis path. An overlap of the near IR-path with the photolysis beam of 0.288 m is achieved with an excimer beam width delimited to 2 cm. Both beam paths were tested for a uniform overlap with the photolysis beam before experiments. For this purpose, both cw-CRDS instruments were operated to simultaneously measure HO₂ concentrations. Deviations between HO₂ concentrations were less than 5%, demonstrating that the photolysis laser was well aligned, i.e. both light paths probed a very similar photolysed volume in the reactor. A small helium purge flow prevented the mirrors from being contaminated. Three different DFB lasers are used for the detection of the three species: HO₂: NEL NLK15EBA, 6629 ± 17 cm⁻¹, on CRDS path 1, CH₃O₂: NEL NLK18EAAA, 7480 ± 20 cm⁻¹ on CRDS path 2, C₂H₅O₂: AOI-1312-BF-20-CW-F1-H2-N127, 7622 ± 15 cm⁻¹ on CRDS path 2. They are coupled into one of the cavities by systems of lenses and mirrors. Each probe beam passed an acousto-optic modulator (AOM, AOptoelectronic) to rapidly turn off the 1st order beam once a threshold for light intensity at the exit of the cavity was reached, in order to measure the ring-down event. Then, the decay of light intensity was recorded and an exponential fit is applied to retrieve the ring-down time. The absorption coefficient α is derived from eqn (1).

\[ \alpha = [A] \times \alpha_A = \frac{R_1}{c} \left( \frac{1}{t} - \frac{1}{t_0} \right) \]  

(1)

where τ is the ring-down time with an absorber present (i.e. after the photolysis pulse); t₀ is the ring-down time with no absorber present (i.e. before the photolysis pulse); αₐ is the absorption cross section of the absorbing species A; R₁ is the ratio between cavity length (79 cm) and effective absorption path (28.8 cm); c is the speed of light.

Ethyl- and methylperoxy radicals were generated by pulsed 351 nm photolysis of C₂H₅/CH₃/Cl₂/O₂ mixtures inducing the following reactions:

\[ \text{CH}_3 + \text{HCl} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3 + \text{HCl} \]  

(R8)

\[ \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{Cl} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{HCl} \]  

(R9)

\[ \text{CH}_3 + \text{O}_2 (+ \text{M}) \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{O}_2 (+ \text{M}) \]  

(R10)

\[ \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{O}_2 (+ \text{M}) \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{O}_2 (+ \text{M}) \]  

(R11a)

\[ \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{HO}_2 \]  

(R11b)

In order to rapidly convert the different radicals (C₂H₅, CH₃, C₂H₅O and CH₃O) into peroxy or HO₂ radicals ((R2), (R3), (R10) and (R11)), all experiments have been carried out in 100 Torr O₂ (Air Liquide, Alpha Gaz 2).

C₂H₆ (Air Liquide, N35), CH₄ (Air Liquide, N45) and Cl₂ (Air Liquide, 5% in Helium) were used directly from the cylinder: a small flow was added to the mixture through a calibrated flow meter (Bromkhorst, Tylan). All experiments were carried out at 298 K.

Results and discussion

Determination of the absorption cross sections

Detecting peroxy radicals in the A-X electronic transition in the near IR region has the potential of a more selective detection for peroxy radicals compared to UV absorption spectroscopy. In order to demonstrate this, we have carried out measurements for the determination of the rate constant of the cross reaction between CH₃O₂ and C₂H₅O₂ radicals. The rate constant of this reaction was measured only once using UV absorption
spectroscopy\textsuperscript{45} whereby the experimental details given in that paper were sparse. It is not clear how the rate constant was extracted from the absorption time profiles measured only at one wavelength where the cross sections of both radicals are very similar.

The A–X transitions of peroxy radicals consist generally of peaks with a few cm\textsuperscript{-1} FWHM on a rather broad background.\textsuperscript{50} To check for the mutual selectivity of the detection for both radicals, the absorption cross sections for both radicals have been measured at three different wavelengths: at one “peak” of the A–X transitions of the CH\textsubscript{3}O\textsubscript{2} radical at 7488.14 cm\textsuperscript{-1} (named in the following M\textsubscript{1}, green symbols in Fig. 1), at the maximum of the transition of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5}O\textsubscript{2} at 7596.47 cm\textsuperscript{-1} (named E\textsubscript{1}, red symbols in Fig. 1) and at a “plateau” at 7602.25 cm\textsuperscript{-1} (named E\textsubscript{2}, blue symbols in Fig. 1).

The upper graphs of Fig. 1 show for one Cl-concentration the absorption time profiles for both radicals (left: CH\textsubscript{3}O\textsubscript{2}, right: C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5}O\textsubscript{2}) at all three wavelengths. It can be seen that both radicals still absorb at the wavelength corresponding to the transition of the counterpart radical: for both radicals the absorption at its peak is around 4 times larger than at the peak of the counterpart radical (second column Table 1). The absorption cross sections at the peak wavelengths are known from earlier works\textsuperscript{3,51,52} and have been used here to obtain the absorption cross sections at the peak wavelength of the counterpart radical from the relative intensities in Fig. 1 type experiments (experiments using 3 different Cl-atom concentrations have been carried out). The results are summarized in Table 1 and illustrated in the lower graph of Fig. 1.

It can be seen that the absorption cross sections for both radicals at the “counterpart wavelengths” (in italic in Table 1) are small (1.5 and 5.5 \times 10\textsuperscript{-21} cm\textsuperscript{2}), but not zero, and thus complete selectivity cannot be obtained.

### Determination of the rate constant
To get best selectivity for investigating the cross reaction between both radicals, C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5}O\textsubscript{2} was used for all experiments in excess over CH\textsubscript{3}O\textsubscript{2} for different reasons:

- To limit the reaction of Cl-atoms with peroxy radicals: the reaction of Cl-atoms with CH\textsubscript{4} is much slower than the reaction of Cl-atoms with C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} (0.01 and 5.9 \times 10\textsuperscript{-11} cm\textsuperscript{3} s\textsuperscript{-1} for CH\textsubscript{4} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}, respectively).\textsuperscript{54} Therefore, to even obtain identical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CH\textsubscript{3}O\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5}O\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>CH\textsubscript{4}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma (M\textsubscript{1})/\text{cm}^2)</td>
<td>(\sigma (E\textsubscript{1})/\text{cm}^2)</td>
<td>(\sigma (E\textsubscript{2})/\text{cm}^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7488.13 cm\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
<td>7596.47 cm\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
<td>7602.25 cm\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH\textsubscript{3}O\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5}O\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>CH\textsubscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma (M\textsubscript{1})/\text{cm}^2)</td>
<td>(\sigma (E\textsubscript{1})/\text{cm}^2)</td>
<td>(\sigma (E\textsubscript{2})/\text{cm}^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7488.13 cm\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
<td>7596.47 cm\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
<td>7602.25 cm\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH\textsubscript{3}O\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5}O\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>CH\textsubscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma (M\textsubscript{1})/\text{cm}^2)</td>
<td>(\sigma (E\textsubscript{1})/\text{cm}^2)</td>
<td>(\sigma (E\textsubscript{2})/\text{cm}^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7488.13 cm\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
<td>7596.47 cm\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
<td>7602.25 cm\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CH$_2$O$_2$ and C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ concentrations, already 580 times more CH$_4$ than C$_2$H$_6$ is needed. And because CH$_4$ is absorbing in the near IR region (the absorption cross sections for CH$_4$ at the three wavelengths are given in Table 1 and is shown as magenta stick spectrum$^{23}$ in Fig. 1), the amount of CH$_4$ that can be added in our experiments is limited to a few $10^{17}$ cm$^{-3}$. If an excess of CH$_2$O$_2$ would have been chosen, only a few $10^{13}$ cm$^{-3}$ C$_2$H$_6$ would need to be added to obtain comparable C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ concentrations. Such low hydrocarbon concentrations would lead to Cl-atom decays too slow to avoid major complications due to the reaction of Cl-atoms with CH$_3$O$_2$ or C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$.

- To limit absorption of the ‘counterpart’ radical and thus increase selectivity: the ratio of the absorption cross sections between both radicals at a given wavelength (last row of Table 1) is higher at the methyl peroxy transition: $\sigma$(CH$_2$O$_2$) is 14.6 times higher compared to $\sigma$(C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$) at (M1), while the inverse ratio is only 1.81 and 1.38 at (E1) and (E2), respectively. Therefore, in the example of a 10-fold (5-fold) excess of CH$_2$O$_2$ over C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$, the absorbance at (M1) would be more than 99% due to CH$_2$O$_2$ (i.e. excellent selectivity), but at (E1) only 15% (27%) and at (E2) only 12% (22%) of the absorbance would be due to C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$, respectively. In the example of a 10-fold (5-fold) excess of C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ over CH$_2$O$_2$, the absorbance at (E1) would be around 95% (90%) and at (E2) 93% (87%) due to C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ (i.e. still good selectivity), but now at (M1) around 59% (75%) of the signal is due to CH$_3$O$_2$ absorption.

- To maximize the importance of the cross-reaction: the self-reaction of C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ is 3.5 times slower than that of CH$_2$O$_2$ (or 2 times, taking the very recent determination of the CH$_2$O$_2$ self-reaction rate constant by Onel et al.$^{12}$), making the loss through self-reaction less important in a reaction system with excess C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ compared to excess CH$_2$O$_2$.

Therefore, experiments with a 5- to 10-fold excess of C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ over CH$_2$O$_2$ should lead to a good sensitivity towards the rate constant of the cross-reaction: decays at (E1) or (E2) represent nearly pure C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ decays mostly governed by the self-reaction, the correction of these profiles due to CH$_2$O$_2$ absorption is very minor. Simultaneously measured profiles obtained at (M1) can now be corrected for C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ absorption, and the remaining CH$_2$O$_2$ decay is mostly due to the cross reaction with C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$: the rate constant of the cross reaction can be extracted with good sensitivity.

Even though the absorption cross section for C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ is higher on (E1) compared to (E2), all experiments have been carried out at (M1) and (E2) due to the much lower CH$_4$ absorption cross sections at (E2) compared to (E1): even though C$_2$H$_2$O$_2$ is used in excess, high CH$_4$ concentrations (up to $3 \times 10^{17}$ cm$^{-3}$) were still added and absorbed too much light at (E1).

Three series of experiments have been carried out, and the experimental conditions are summarized in Table 2. The initial Cl-atom concentrations (column 1) have been measured before each experiment through measuring and fitting HO$_2$ decays from the reaction of Cl-atoms with excess CH$_3$OH. C$_2$H$_6$ and CH$_4$ concentrations (column 2 and 3) have been obtained from flow and pressure measurements, and the initial peroxy radical concentrations (column 4 and 5) and their ratio (column 6) have then been calculated using the literature values of the rate constants for (R8) and (R9), as given in Table 3. To demonstrate the relatively good selectivity towards both radicals, the percentage of the absorbances at M1 and E2, that are due to the searched-after radical, have then been calculated using the radical concentrations and the absorption cross sections from Table 1 (column 7 and 8).

Fig. 2 shows the experimental absorption time-profiles obtained at M1 and E2 for the 3 series (highest C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ excess upper graph, note the different y-axis for both wavelengths, and lowest C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ excess bottom graphs) as colored dots: the absorption time-profiles obtained at M1, the wavelength mostly selective to CH$_2$O$_2$, are shown in the left column, the profiles obtained at E2, mostly selective to C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$, are shown in the right column.

The profiles at both wavelengths have been simulated simultaneously using the model from Table 3, by best reproducing the signals at M1 as

$$ z_{M1} = \sigma_{CH_2O_2,M1} \times [CH_2O_2] + \sigma_{C_2H_5O_2,M1} \times [C_2H_5O_2] $$

and the signals at E2 as:

$$ z_{E2} = \sigma_{CH_2O_2,E2} \times [CH_2O_2] + \sigma_{C_2H_5O_2,E2} \times [C_2H_5O_2] $$

using the corresponding absorption cross sections such as given in Table 1. These simulations are shown as full lines. The dotted lines in each graph represent the part of the absorption that is due to the “major” radical, i.e. CH$_2$O$_2$ in the left column and C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ in the right column.

The model contains, next to peroxy self-and cross reactions, also some secondary chemistry of Cl-atoms: these reactions

### Table 2 Experimental conditions used for measuring the rate constant of the cross reaction between CH$_2$O$_2$ and C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Cl]/10$^{13}$ cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>[C$_2$H$_6$]/10$^{15}$ cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>[CH$_4$]/10$^{17}$ cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>[C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$]$_0$/10$^{13}$ cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>[CH$_2$O$_2$]$_0$/10$^{13}$ cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>[C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$]$_0$/[CH$_2$O$_2$]$_0$</th>
<th>$z_{CH_2O_2}$ at E2 (%)</th>
<th>$z_{CH_2O_2}$ at M1 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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could not completely be avoided, even though their impact is minor. Preliminary results in our laboratory indicate that the reaction of Cl-atoms with C₂H₅O₂ leads with a rate constant of around $1 \times 10^{-10}$ cm³ s⁻¹ and a yield of 50% to formation of C₂H₅O and Cl₂O, while no clear statement can currently be made for the fate of the other 50%. The rate constant of this reaction has also been determined by Marić et al.⁴⁴ to be $1.6 \times 10^{-10}$ cm³ s⁻¹, and therefore this reaction has been included into the mechanism (see Table 3) and tests have been run with the rate constant being varied between 1.0–1.6 $\times 10^{-10}$ cm³ s⁻¹, but the impact on simulated profiles and thus on the sought-after rate constant was within the noise of the experimental profiles.

Fig. 3 shows for the example of the highest C₂H₅O₂ excess (upper graphs of Fig. 2) the breakdown of the fate of the 2 peroxy radicals into the different possible reaction paths: the left graphs represent CH₃O₂, the right graphs C₂H₅O₂. The red symbols represent the fraction of the peroxy radical, which has reacted in the cross reaction (R1): it can be seen that for CH₃O₂, this reaction is the major fate for all initial radical concentrations (upper graph represent blue symbols from Fig. 2), while for C₂H₅O₂ this reaction is a minor loss. The major reaction path for C₂H₅O₂ is its self-reaction (black symbols), with the cross-reaction with HO₂ being the secondary contributor (blue symbols).

These two pathways are very minor for CH₃O₂. For both radicals, the fraction having reacted with Cl-atoms (green symbols), is small, up to 5% for CH₃O₂ in the worst case of high initial radical concentration.

**Determination of branching ratio**

Simultaneously measured HO₂ profiles allow in principle the estimation of the branching ratio for the radical and molecular path of the cross reaction. The right graph of Fig. 4 shows the HO₂ profiles obtained for the series with the highest C₂H₅O₂/CH₃O₂ ratio. The initial fast rise of HO₂ has two origins: it is partially due to the reaction of Cl-atoms with the peroxy radicals (R6) and partially due to the small fraction of C₂H₅ that form HO₂ in reaction with O₂ (R11b) rather than the C₂H₅O₂ radical. The first process is taken into account in the C₂H₅O₂ ratio. The initial fast rise of HO₂ has two origins: it is partially due to the small fraction of C₂H₅ that form HO₂ in reaction with O₂ (R11b) rather than the C₂H₅O₂ radical.

**Table 3 Reaction mechanism used to fit all experiments in this work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>k cm³ s⁻¹</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl + CH₃</td>
<td>CH₃ + ClH</td>
<td>1.0 $\times 10^{-13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl + C₂H₅</td>
<td>C₂H₅ + ClH</td>
<td>5.9 $\times 10^{-11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl + O₂ + M</td>
<td>CH₂O₂ + M</td>
<td>1.4 $\times 10^{-13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₅ + O₂ + M</td>
<td>C₂H₅O₂ + M</td>
<td>4.8 $\times 10^{-12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₅ + O₂</td>
<td>C₂H₅ + HO₂</td>
<td>3.5 $\times 10^{-14}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Other secondary chemistry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>k cm³ s⁻¹</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl + O₂ + M</td>
<td>CH₂O₂ + M</td>
<td>1.5 $\times 10^{-13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl + O₂ + M</td>
<td>CH₂O₂ + M</td>
<td>2.3 $\times 10^{-13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂O₂ + HO₂</td>
<td>CH₂O₂O + O₂</td>
<td>8 $\times 10^{-15}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂O₂ + HO₂</td>
<td>CH₂OOH + O₂</td>
<td>5.2 $\times 10^{-12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₅O₂ + HO₂</td>
<td>C₂H₅OOH + O₂</td>
<td>6.2 $\times 10^{-12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C₂H₅O₂</td>
<td>2C₂H₅O₂ + O₂</td>
<td>3.2 $\times 10^{-14}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C₂H₅O₂</td>
<td>2C₂H₅O₂ + O₂</td>
<td>7.0 $\times 10^{-14}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C₂H₅O₂</td>
<td>2C₂H₅O₂ + O₂</td>
<td>1.3 $\times 10^{-13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C₂H₅O₂</td>
<td>2C₂H₅O₂ + O₂</td>
<td>2.2 $\times 10^{-13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₂O₂ + HO₂</td>
<td>CH₂O₂ + HO₂</td>
<td>1.1 $\times 10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2HO₂</td>
<td>H₂O₂ + O₂</td>
<td>1.7 $\times 10^{-12}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary Cl-atom reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>k cm³ s⁻¹</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cl + CH₂O₂</td>
<td>ClO + CH₂O₂</td>
<td>5–8 $\times 10^{-11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl + CH₂O₂</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>5–8 $\times 10^{-11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl + CH₂O₂</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>7.5 $\times 10^{-11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl + CH₂O₂</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>7.5 $\times 10^{-11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl + CH₂O₂</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>7.32 $\times 10^{-11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl + CH₂O₂ + O₂</td>
<td>ClO + CH₂O₂ + O₂</td>
<td>1.6 $\times 10^{-12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO₂ + ClO</td>
<td>Cl₂ + HOCl</td>
<td>6.9 $\times 10^{-12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIO₂ (+M)</td>
<td>Cl₂ + O₂ (+M)</td>
<td>6.2 $\times 10^{-13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl₂ + O₂ (+M)</td>
<td>Cl₂O₂ (+M)</td>
<td>1.6 $\times 10^{-13}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other secondary chemistry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>k cm³ s⁻¹</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₅O₂ + C₂H₅O₂</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>7 $\times 10^{-12}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₅O₂ + HO₂</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>1 $\times 10^{-10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₅O₂ + HO₂</td>
<td>Products</td>
<td>2 $\times 10^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO₂</td>
<td>diffusion</td>
<td>3 $\times 10^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
peroxy self- and cross reactions and the consumption through cross reaction of HO$_2$ with the peroxy radicals. Best results are obtained with a branching ratio towards the radical channel of $\phi_{1a} = 0.40$, i.e. very similar to the branching fraction of the two self-reactions, $\phi_{12a} = 0.32$ and $\phi_{13a} = 0.37$ for C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ and CH$_3$O$_2$, respectively. To demonstrate the influence of the cross reaction on the HO$_2$ profiles, the full black lines in the right graph represent for the highest radical concentration the simulation with the best rate constant and a branching ratio varied by $\pm 0.2$. It can be seen that such variation of the branching ratio makes the model clearly deviating from the experimental results and therefore we estimate the uncertainty of the branching fraction from the comparison between model and experiment to be better than $\pm 0.2$.

However, a major problem for estimating the branching ratio in these experiments is, that even for the self-reactions of the simplest peroxy radicals CH$_3$O$_2$ and C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ there are still large uncertainty in rate constant and branching ratio. For CH$_3$O$_2$ the IUPAC recommendation$^{54}$ since many years was $k_{13} = 3.5 \times 10^{-14}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$ with a branching ratio of 0.37 for the radical channel. In a very recent work, Onel et al.$^{12}$ have re-determined the rate constant and found only $k_{13} = (2.0 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-15}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$, nearly 2 times slower, but they confirmed the radical yield as recommended by IUPAC. They convincingly argue that earlier experiments suffered from interferences of the fast reaction of Cl-atoms with CH$_3$O$_2$ and this would have increased the apparent rate constant. The rate constant for the self-reaction of C$_2$H$_5$O$_2$ radicals was also recommended by IUPAC for many years at $k_{12} = 7.6 \times 10^{-14}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$ with a radical yield of 0.63, based on the measurement of stable end products. Recently, Noell et al.$^{14}$ and Shamas et al.$^{24}$ obtained through direct radical measurements a much lower yield for the radical path and a
subsequently higher rate constant (0.32 radical yield leading to \( k_{12} = (1.0 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} \)). A possible explanation for this disagreement could be a non-negligible yield of dimer-formation, ROOR, in the self-reaction of peroxy radicals. The decomposition of such dimer on reactor walls could lead to formation of aldehydes and thus appear as additional radical formation when measuring stable end products. The dimeric product has very recently been detected in the self-reaction of \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{O}_2 \) using advanced vacuum ultraviolet (VUV) photoionization mass spectrometry with a yield of 10 \( \pm \) 5\% . The dimer has also been directly detected by CIMS with a yield of 23\% in the self-reaction of \( \text{HOC}_2\text{H}_4\text{O}_2 \) radicals and has been proven to decompose easily on quartz or metal surfaces.\(^6\) But even though the cross reaction (R1) is the major \( \text{HO}_2 \) production path in the current experiments and the two self-reactions are only minor contributors, the above described uncertainties increase of course directly the uncertainty of the deduced yield in this work. Also, the \( \text{HO}_2 \) signal quality is poor in these experiments due to the absorption of high \( \text{CH}_4 \) and \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) concentrations, therefore we estimate the final uncertainty of the radical yield to be \( \phi_{1a} = 0.40 \pm 0.20 \). It should be noted that the uncertainty in the branching ratio has negligible influence on the determination.
of the rate constant: a change in radical yield for (R1) from 0.2 to 0.6 is barely visible in the modelled absorption-time profiles at both wavelengths.

To demonstrate the sensitivity of the observed absorption-time profiles to the rate constant of the cross reaction, the left graph of Fig. 4 shows the CH3O2 profiles of the same experiments, i.e. high excess of C2H5O2. The full lines show again the model from Table 3, while the dashed lines represent a variation of $k_1 = (3.8 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$. Such variation brings the simulated profiles outside the experimental data. In these simulations, the branching ratio $\phi_{1a}$ has been adapted to best reproduce the HO2 profiles (dashed coloured lines on the right graph): for the upper and lower limit of $k_1$, $\phi_{1a}$ was changed to 0.31 (for $k_1 = 4.8 \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$) and 0.54 (for $k_1 = 2.8 \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$) to best reproduce HO2. However, this variation has no influence on the CH3O2 profiles as can be seen in Fig. 3 the cross reaction with HO2 is only a minor path for CH3O2 and therefore no change in the branching ratio has a negligible effect on the CH3O2 profile. From these simulations we estimate the uncertainty of the rate constant of the cross reaction to be $k_1 = (3.8 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$.

The simulation corresponding to the lower limit of the rate constant (upper curves in Fig. 4) is close to the only published value for the cross reaction rate constant$^{45} (k_1 = 2.0 \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$), and is can be seen that the observed absorption time profiles are poorly reproduced by such a model. In the work of Villenave et al. no details are given on how the rate constant was obtained by solely measuring UV absorption profiles, and therefore no speculation about possible reasons for the disagreement can be proposed.

The geometric mean value rule is an empirical approach that allows for the estimation of cross-reaction rate coefficients from the self-recombination rate constants of the reacting partners$^{66}$

$$k_{A+B} = 2 \times \sqrt{k_{A+A} \times k_{B+B}}$$

It has shown to work to better than 20% in the prediction of radical–radical rate coefficients for a series of hydrocarbon radicals$^{69}$ and has proven to be valid also for the cross reaction of HO2 and DO2 radicals.$^{70}$ When applying this rule to the cross reaction of CH3O2 and C2H5O2 and using the values for the self-reactions from Table 3, one obtains an excellent agreement ($k_{1, geometric rule} = 3.74 \times 10^{-11}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$) with the rate constant obtained in this work. However, when using the value for the CH3O2 self-reaction recently obtained by Onel et al.$^{12}$ the geometric mean rule predicts a rate constant for the cross reaction of only $k_1 = 2.9 \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$. In Fig. 5 are shown the results for both wavelength for the experiments with the lowest C2H5O2 excess, using this rate constant for the cross reaction.

It can be seen that this rate constant does not allow to reproduce the observed absorption-time profiles, as the decays at both wavelengths are clearly too slow. However, it has not been demonstrated that in the case of cross-reactions of peroxy radicals the geometric mean rule is a good approximation, in particular because there are no reliable determinations of the rate constants for self- and cross-reactions of peroxy radicals to validate the approach. Therefore, from the current experiments one cannot infer about the rate constant of the CH3O2 self-reaction. But it is clear that recent research using more selective detection methods for peroxy radicals, compared to UV absorption, have challenged long-standing results on even the simplest peroxy radicals, and more research is necessary to better understand their reactivity under low NOx conditions.

**Conclusion**

The rate constant for the cross reaction of the two most simple and abundant peroxy radicals, CH3O2 and C2H5O2, has been determined by following their concentration-time profiles in their respective A–X electronic transition. A good selectivity has been obtained by working under excess of C2H5O2 and by monitoring CH3O2 radical at 7488.13 cm$^{-1}$ and C2H5O2 radicals at 7602.25 cm$^{-1}$. A rate constant for the cross reaction of $k_1 = (3.8 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-13}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$ and a yield for the radical channel of $\phi_{1a} = 0.40 \pm 0.20$ have been obtained. The present rate constant is nearly two times faster than the only earlier value, but in excellent agreement with an estimation based on the mean geometric rule. This work shows again, that the chemistry of peroxy radicals under low NO conditions is still
not well understood and more work is needed to improve the knowledge.
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