



**HAL**  
open science

## Atmospheric deuterium fractionation: HCHO and HCDO yields in the CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction

E. Nilsson, M. S. Johnson, F. Taketani, Y. Matsumi, M. D. Hurley, T. J. Wallington

► **To cite this version:**

E. Nilsson, M. S. Johnson, F. Taketani, Y. Matsumi, M. D. Hurley, et al.. Atmospheric deuterium fractionation: HCHO and HCDO yields in the CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions*, 2007, 7 (4), pp.10019-10041. <hal-00302959>

**HAL Id: hal-00302959**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00302959v1>**

Submitted on 18 Jun 2008

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

**HCHO and HCDO  
yields in the  
CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction**

E. Nilsson et al.

# Atmospheric deuterium fractionation: HCHO and HCDO yields in the CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction

**E. Nilsson<sup>1</sup>, M. S. Johnson<sup>1</sup>, F. Taketani<sup>2</sup>, Y. Matsumi<sup>2</sup>, M. D. Hurley<sup>3</sup>, and  
T. J. Wallington<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Copenhagen Center for Atmospheric Research, Department of Chemistry, University of  
Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 5, 2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

<sup>2</sup>Solar-Terrestrial Environment Laboratory and Graduate School of Science, Nagoya  
University, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan

<sup>3</sup>Research and Innovation Center, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn MI 48121-2053, USA

Received: 14 May 2007 – Accepted: 7 June 2007 – Published: 11 July 2007

Correspondence to: M. S. Johnson (msj@kiku.dk)

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version


Interactive Discussion

## Abstract

The formation of formaldehyde via hydrogen atom transfer from the methoxy radical to molecular oxygen is a key step in the atmospheric photochemical oxidation of methane, and in the propagation of deuterium from methane to molecular hydrogen. We report the results of the first investigation of the branching ratio for HCHO and HCDO formation in the  $\text{CH}_2\text{DO}+\text{O}_2$  reaction. Labeled methoxy radicals ( $\text{CH}_2\text{DO}$ ) were generated in a photochemical reactor by photolysis of  $\text{CH}_2\text{DONO}$ . HCHO and HCDO concentrations were measured using FTIR spectroscopy. Significant deuterium enrichment was seen in the formaldehyde product, from which we derive a branching ratio of  $88.2\pm 1.1\%$  for HCDO and  $11.8\pm 1.1\%$  for HCHO. The implications of this fractionation on the propagation of deuterium in the atmosphere are discussed.

## 1 Introduction

Changes in atmospheric chemistry during the Anthropocene are linked to perturbations to the carbon cycle (IPCC, 2001; Wang and Jacob, 1998), documented in part by isotopic analysis. The atmospheric oxidation of methane proceeds through a series of reactions:



The isotope effects in some of these steps have been addressed (Feilberg et al., 2005b; Keppler et al., 2006; Quay et al., 1999; Röckmann et al., 2002; Saueressig et al., 2001; Weston, 2001). An overview of the reaction system is shown in Fig. 1. The goal of the present work is to determine how deuterium propagates through the  $\text{CH}_3\text{O}+\text{O}_2$  reaction, which to our knowledge has not been described previously. The isotopic signatures of the specific steps can be used to reduce uncertainties regarding the sources and sinks of the trace gases involved. Formaldehyde is a key intermediate in the oxidation of methane and non-methane hydrocarbons (in particular isoprene) (Hak et al.,

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the $\text{CH}_2\text{DO}+\text{O}_2$ reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

2005; Palmer et al., 2006). The photolysis of formaldehyde is the only important in-situ source of molecular hydrogen in the atmosphere; at present about half of atmospheric  $H_2$  is produced in this way (Gerst and Quay, 2001). There is interest in using hydrogen as an energy carrier replacing conventional hydrocarbon fuels. Potential advantages include reductions in  $CO_2$ ,  $NO_x$  and hydrocarbon emissions. Potential impacts associated with leaks from storage and distribution systems are modest and include small increases in stratospheric water vapor and additional consumption of OH (that would otherwise react with  $CH_4$ ) and therefore a weak effect on greenhouse gas budgets (Prather, 2003; Schultz et al., 2003). There are significant uncertainties in our knowledge of the hydrogen budget (IPCC, 2001; Quay et al., 1999; Rhee et al., 2006b).

The present atmosphere is the foundation for predicting future trends in greenhouse gas emissions. Uncertainties concerning the sources and sinks of greenhouse gases have been identified by the IPCC as a significant obstacle to accurately predicting future climate change (IPCC, 2001). Isotopic analysis is an important tool for investigating sources and loss mechanisms for atmospheric trace gases (Brenninkmeijer et al., 2003; Johnson et al., 2002). Examples include understanding ice core records of injection of sulfur into the stratosphere (Baroni, 2007), quantifying terrestrial  $CO_2$  sinks (Miller et al., 2003), refining the nitrous oxide budget (von Hessberg et al., 2004) and identifying the missing source of atmospheric methyl chloride (Gola et al., 2005; Keppler et al., 2005). Two key sources of atmospheric hydrogen, fossil fuel combustion and biomass burning, are depleted in D, having  $\delta D(H_2)$  values of  $-196 \pm 10\%$  and  $-290 \pm 60\%$  respectively (Gerst and Quay, 2001). The processes removing molecular hydrogen from the atmosphere, soil uptake and OH reaction, are slower for HD than for  $H_2$  by factors of  $0.943 \pm 0.024$  (Gerst and Quay, 2001) and  $0.595 \pm 0.043$  (Ehhalt et al., 1989; Sander et al., 2006; Talukdar et al., 1996) respectively. These processes enrich deuterium in atmospheric hydrogen, however they are not sufficient to explain the high deuterium content of tropospheric hydrogen,  $\delta D(H_2) = 120 \pm 4\%$  (Gerst and Quay, 2001; Rahn et al., 2003). Therefore it is necessary that atmospheric photochemical processes enrich D in hydrogen relative to the starting material to balance the isotope

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the $CH_2DO+O_2$ reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

budget. The starting material is typically methane with a  $\delta D(CH_4)$  value of  $-86 \pm 3\%$  (Quay et al., 1999), or isoprene, which is likely to be at least as depleted in D as methane (Feilberg et al., 2007).

It has recently been shown that HCDO is photolysed more slowly than HCHO, and that it produces less HD than HCHO produces  $H_2$ , (Feilberg et al., 2007) which would seem to contradict the observation that the process converting  $CH_4$  to  $H_2$  leads to deuterium enrichment (McCarthy et al., 2004; Rahn et al., 2003; Röckmann et al., 2003; Zahn et al., 2006). However the contradiction could be resolved if the depletion of deuterium in hydrogen produced by formaldehyde photolysis is offset by an even stronger enrichment in D in the steps producing formaldehyde. Unfortunately the isotope effects in this portion of the mechanism are not well-characterized. The relative rate of  $CH_3D$  vs.  $CH_4$  oxidation is known, (Sander et al., 2006) but not the branching ratio for H vs. D abstraction from  $CH_3D$ . Atmospheric methyl radicals will be converted to methyl peroxy, which may react with NO to produce methoxy radicals. The formaldehyde and CO isotope effects have been described (Feilberg et al., 2004, 2005a, 2005c, 2007; Weston, 2001). This paper addresses a key un-described reaction in the methane oxidation mechanism.

The title reaction (the numbering scheme of Table 1 will be used throughout)



has been studied by several laboratories (Gutman et al., 1982; Lorenz et al., 1985; Wantuck et al., 1987) and the results have been analyzed and are available in kinetics compilations (Atkinson et al., 2006; NIST, 2007; Sander et al., 2006);  $k_2 = 1.9 \times 10^{-15} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at 298 K. The Arrhenius A-factor,  $3.9 \times 10^{-14} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$  is low for a hydrogen atom transfer reaction indicating that the mechanism may be more complex than a simple abstraction (Sander et al., 2006). Wantuck and coworkers, who investigated the absolute rate of the reaction in the range 298-973 K using laser induced fluorescence, distinguish three processes; simple hydrogen abstraction, isomerization ( $CH_3O + O_2 \rightarrow CH_2OH + O_2$ ), and decomposition ( $CH_3O + O_2 \rightarrow HCHO + H + O_2$ )

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the $CH_2DO + O_2$ reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

(Wantuck et al., 1987). The isomerization and decomposition processes explain the non-Arrhenius behavior at high temperature.

Setokuchi and Sato used variational transition state theory to derive the temperature dependence of the rate constant (Setokuchi and Sato, 2002), and the reaction mechanisms have been examined in two studies (Bofill et al., 1999; Jungkamp and Seinfeld, 1996). Setokuchi and Sato report a theoretical rate constant of  $9.9 \times 10^{-16} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at 300 K, slightly below the experimental rate constant. Their work assumes that the reaction proceeds by direct hydrogen abstraction via a pre-reaction complex, as shown by Bofill et al. (1999). Three possible mechanisms are discussed by Bofill et al. (1999). The two more complicated mechanisms are disregarded since the activation energy is around 20 times higher than for the direct hydrogen abstraction reaction. The hydrogen abstraction reaction is predicted to have an activation energy of only 11.7 kJ/mol and an A-factor of  $3.57 \times 10^{-14} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at 298 K. These results are obtained from relative energies calculated at the RCCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ level and CASSCF/6-311G(d,p) level, using harmonic vibrational frequencies. Bofill et al. explained the small A-factor obtained in both computational and experimental studies in terms of a cyclic transition state (Bofill et al., 1999).

To improve understanding of hydrogen in the atmosphere we conducted a smog chamber FTIR study of the products of the  $\text{CH}_2\text{DO} + \text{O}_2$  reaction. The results and a model of the photochemistry occurring in the reactor are presented herein and discussed with respect to the literature data and atmospheric implications.

## 2 Experimental and data analysis

### 2.1 FTIR-smog chamber system at Ford

The experimental system used in this work has been described previously (Wallington and Japar, 1989) and is summarized here. The system is composed of a Pyrex tube with aluminum end flanges and has a volume of 140 L. The reactor was surrounded by

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the $\text{CH}_2\text{DO} + \text{O}_2$ reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

22 UV fluorescent lamps which were used to generate methoxy radicals via the photolysis of methyl nitrite. Experiments were performed at ambient temperature ( $295\pm 2$  K) and a pressure of  $930\pm 10$  mbar. The concentrations of species in the photochemical reactor were determined using FTIR spectroscopy. The output beam of a Mattson Sirius 100 spectrometer was reflected through the reactor using White cell optics, giving an optical path length of 27 m. IR spectra at a resolution of  $0.25\text{ cm}^{-1}$  were obtained by co-adding 32 interferograms. Unless stated, quoted uncertainties are two standard deviations derived from least-squares regressions.

## 2.2 Experimental procedure

$\text{CH}_2\text{DONO}$  was synthesized by the drop-wise addition of concentrated sulfuric acid to a saturated solution of  $\text{NaNO}_2$  in  $\text{CH}_2\text{DOH}$  (Cambridge Isotope Laboratories Inc., >98%) (Sokolov et al., 1999).  $\text{CH}_3\text{ONO}$  was synthesized analogously. The isotopic purity of the  $\text{CH}_2\text{DONO}$  was checked using IR spectroscopy which indicated an upper limit for a possible  $\text{CH}_3\text{ONO}$  impurity of 0.016%. Cyclohexane was added to the reaction cell to limit unwanted reactions involving hydroxyl radicals. The concentration of cyclohexane in the initial reaction mixtures was about twice the concentration of methyl nitrite. During each experiment the reaction mixture was photolyzed in 5–7 steps, photolysis alternating with recording spectra, giving a total photolysis time of about 4 min.

The FTIR-spectra obtained from the experiments were analyzed using a nonlinear least squares spectral fitting procedure developed by Griffith (1996). Reference spectra for  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$  and  $\text{NO}_2$  were taken from the HITRAN database (Rothman et al., 2005). Absolute IR absorption cross sections for HCHO, HCDO and DCDO were measured in the LISA photochemical reactor at a resolution of  $0.125\text{ cm}^{-1}$ , a path length of 12 m, a temperature of 296 K and a total pressure of 1013 mbar as detailed by Gratien et al. (2007a, b). The remaining reference spectra were recorded using conditions (temperature, total pressure in cell, path length, resolution) nominally identical to those used in the experiments.

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the $\text{CH}_2\text{DO} + \text{O}_2$ reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

## 2.3 Chemical model

A model of the chemistry occurring in the smog chamber using the  $\text{CH}_3\text{ONO}$  precursor was constructed using Maple (Maplesoft, 2005). The chemical mechanism is shown in Table 1 and Fig. 2, which omit the isotopic variants of the reactions for brevity; the 35 reactions shown here expand into 125 isotopic sub-reactions. The entire model and output are available as electronic supplementary information (<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/7/10019/2007/acpd-7-10019-2007-supplement.pdf>). Reaction rates were obtained from standard compilations when available, see Table 1 (Atkinson et al., 2006; NIST, 2007; Sander et al., 2006). Initial conditions were set using the nominal conditions of the reactor, in addition to photolysis rates based on the known performance of the lamps in past experiments. The main goal of the model was to investigate the possible role of sources of formaldehyde other than the title reaction, and to examine the potential magnitude of various loss mechanisms for formaldehyde including reactions with OH and  $\text{HO}_2$ , and photolysis.

## 3 Results and analysis

Figure 3 shows an example of the spectrum measured after 20 s of photolysis of the  $\text{CH}_2\text{DONO}$  precursor, the fit to the spectrum, and the residual. The measured spectrum is accurately reproduced by the fitting procedure. Compounds included in the fit are  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{N}_2\text{O}$ ,  $\text{NO}_2$ , HCHO, HCDO,  $\text{CH}_2\text{DONO}$  and  $\text{HO}_2\text{NO}_2$ . Spectral fitting becomes progressively more challenging as the experiment proceeds. Figure 4 shows the same series (experiment, fit, residual) after 4 min of photolysis. In addition to the compounds mentioned above, DCDO, HCOOH, DCOOD, DCOOH and  $\text{CH}_2\text{DOH}$  were included in the later fits. While the match between experiment and modeled spectrum is not as good as in Fig. 3, the overall shape and fine structure of the spectrum are fitted well, and from this we can conclude that all but trace components of the reaction mixture are

### HCHO and HCDO yields in the $\text{CH}_2\text{DO} + \text{O}_2$ reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

accounted for. The region 1720–1750 cm<sup>-1</sup> is the most important since this is where we see the  $\nu(2)$  bands of HCHO and HCDO, at 1746 and 1724 cm<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. It is likely that the larger residual in this region (compare Figs. 3 and 4) is due to the large number of species.

5 In all experiments, formic acid is present at concentrations comparable to those of HCHO. The relation between the concentrations of the formic acids appears to be [DCOOH]>[HCOOH]>[DCOOD], but this relation can not be quantitatively verified due to the lack of calibrated reference spectra. DCDO is present at concentrations just slightly above the measurement threshold.

10 Figure 5 shows the results of the analysis, with the mole fraction of HCDO plotted versus that of HCHO. Results from three independent experiments are included in the Figure. The fit to the data points, taking into account the statistical errors in the determinations of  $x_{\text{HCDO}}$  and  $x_{\text{HCHO}}$ , gives a relative rate  $k_{\text{HCDO}}/k_{\text{HCHO}}$  of  $7.593 \pm 0.026$  for production of HCDO vs. HCHO in the abstraction of H from CH<sub>2</sub>DO by O<sub>2</sub>.

15 The photochemistry of the precursor introduced competing sources of and loss processes for formaldehyde. The model showed a particular sensitivity to the isotopic purity of the CH<sub>2</sub>DONO, since CH<sub>3</sub>ONO would produce only HCHO, the minor product of CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub>. A spectrum of the CH<sub>2</sub>DONO sample was recorded at relatively high pressure to look for traces of CH<sub>3</sub>ONO, which were not seen. The signal to noise ratio of the CH<sub>2</sub>DONO spectrum and the intensity of the CH<sub>3</sub>ONO reference result in an upper limit of 0.016% (mole fraction) for a possible CH<sub>3</sub>ONO impurity, and this number was used in the model as a worst-case scenario. The model showed that the title reaction is the dominant source of HCHO, accounting for >99.5% of the amount formed. During the course of the reaction the model shows that by the end of the experiment, 12% of the HCHO that is formed is lost via reaction with HO<sub>2</sub>, and 4% by reaction with OH.

25 The model showed that 2.4% of the HCDO formed did not come from the CH<sub>2</sub>DO precursor but instead reactions such as CH<sub>2</sub>DONO+OH→HCDO+NO+H<sub>2</sub>O, CHDOH+O<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>2</sub>DONO<sub>2</sub>+OH. By the end of four minutes of photolysis 12% of the

---

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

---

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[⏪](#)[⏩](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

HCDO has been lost through reaction with HO<sub>2</sub>, and 3% through reaction with OH. We are not aware of any reactions that would lead to isotopic scrambling of the hydrogen isotopes connected to the carbon atom.

The model was used to determine the branching ratio for HCDO vs. HCHO from the title reaction and without loss, as well as the actual concentration ratio of HCDO to HCHO that would be present in the cell. This indicated that the experimental results should be decreased by ~1.7%, which is insignificant compared to the other sources of error, discussed below. Even though some HCHO and HCDO is lost to reactions through the course of the experiment the model shows that this affects both formaldehyde isotopologues almost equally (i.e. in proportion to their concentration), thereby canceling when the relative rate is determined. Feilberg et al. (2004) have determined that the relative rate of reaction  $k_{\text{OH}+\text{HCHO}}/k_{\text{OH}+\text{HCDO}}$  is  $1.28 \pm 0.01$  (Feilberg et al., 2004). The relative rate for the bimolecular combination reaction  $k_{\text{HO}_2+\text{HCHO}}/k_{\text{HO}_2+\text{HCDO}}$  is not known but based on the mechanism only minor isotope effects are expected as D is a spectator. Nonetheless we assign a large uncertainty to the isotope effect of this reaction. In some cases when the reactivity of a deuterated species was not known a best estimate was made, for example the rate of H abstraction will scale with the number of H atoms, and a C–D bond's reactivity is 1/8 that of C–H, based on the reactivity of deuterated methanes. Since there is some unavoidable uncertainty in this process, it is reassuring that the model only indicated a minor correction; the final result is largely the direct result of the experiment and is rather insensitive to changes in the model.

The model takes advantage of earlier studies of the relative rate of reaction of the formaldehyde isotopologues with OH, (Feilberg et al., 2004) and of their relative photolysis rates and quantum yields (Feilberg et al., 2007). Sources of error in the experiment include the standard deviation of the measurement of the IR absorption cross sections of HCHO and HCDO, estimated to be 3% (Gratien et al., 2007a, b), and the error in the spectral fit shown in Fig. 5, 0.3%. The model predicts that altogether 19% of HCHO and 17% of HCDO have been lost after 4 min of photolysis (and that this results in a 1.7% correction to the product ratio). An error of 50% in the amount of HCHO and/or

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

HCDO lost was used in calculating the overall error, which includes for example uncertainty in the isotope effect of  $k_{\text{HO}_2+\text{HCHO}}/k_{\text{HO}_2+\text{HCDO}}$ . Altogether these considerations result in a relative rate of production of HCDO to HCHO of  $7.46\pm 0.76$ , equivalent to a branching ratio of  $88.2\pm 1.1\%$  for HCDO and  $11.8\pm 1.1\%$  for HCHO.

5 A fraction of the formaldehydes is lost through reaction over the course of the experiment, mainly by reaction with OH and  $\text{HO}_2$ . These radicals cannot be observed directly, but their concentrations can be approximated using the model and the model can be checked for its ability to predict the concentrations of long-lived species. The reaction of OH with  $\text{CH}_2\text{ONO}$  is the main competing source of HCDO, producing  $<2.5\%$  of the total. The source of OH is directly linked to methyl nitrite photolysis:



Cyclohexane was added to the cell to remove OH:



The mechanism (R1–R3) is straightforward, producing OH quantitatively when methyl nitrite is photolysed. In addition the lifetime of OH is controlled by (R4) since cyclohexane is present in excess; according to the model over 95% of OH reacts with  $c\text{-C}_6\text{H}_{12}$ . The relative concentration of  $c\text{-C}_6\text{H}_{12}$  changes by  $\sim 10^{-5}$  through the course of the experiment, maintaining a constant sink. Since the sources and sinks of OH are understood we feel that the model produces an accurate concentration, certainly within the 50% error assigned to the model correction.

According to the model over half of  $\text{HO}_2$  is produced by (R29),  $\text{RO}+\text{O}_2$ , and over 40% by the title reaction (R2). These production rates are largely constant throughout the experiment. Over half of  $\text{HO}_2$  reacts with NO via (R3), and 1/3 produces  $\text{HNO}_3$  through (R10). These rates are also relatively constant.  $\text{HO}_2$  cycles between (R11)

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the $\text{CH}_2\text{DO}+\text{O}_2$ reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

and (R20), converting formaldehyde into formic acid. One check that the model handles this reaction mechanism is shown in Fig. 6, the comparison between model and experimental formaldehyde concentrations.

Figure 6 also shows the carbon balance in the experiment and in the model. The fitting procedure can account for over 80% of the carbon in the experiment. One source of uncertainty is the lack of calibrated reference spectra for DCOOH, HCOOD and DCOOD; another is the estimated 3% error in the reference spectra for HCHO and HCDO.

The model provides insight into the reaction mechanism that would otherwise not be possible. The model supports the theory that a fraction of formaldehyde is lost by HOx reaction, and allows one to estimate what that fraction is. In addition the model demonstrates that alternative sources of formaldehyde are minor, and that the effect of side reactions on the branching ratio is minor.

## 4 Discussion

The greater activity of the H atom in methoxy towards abstraction by O<sub>2</sub>, relative to D, leads to an enrichment in deuterium in atmospheric hydrogen. As shown in Feilberg et al. (2007) this enrichment is only partly counteracted by depletion in the photolysis of formaldehyde to produce molecular hydrogen and thus photochemically produced hydrogen is expected to be enriched in deuterium relative to the starting material, methane. This finding is in agreement with the results of field and modeling studies (Gerst and Quay, 2001; Keppler et al., 2006; Quay et al., 1999; Rhee et al., 2006b; Röckmann et al., 2003; Zahn et al., 2006). In addition the mechanistic detail provided can help in extending and refining the results of such studies.

According to the theoretical study by Bofill et al. (1999) the reaction of the methoxy radical with molecular oxygen occurs via direct hydrogen atom transfer, with a ring-like transition state (Bofill et al., 1999) The activation energy was determined to be 11.7 kJ mol<sup>-1</sup> and when quantum tunneling was considered a rate constant was obtained that

### HCHO and HCDO yields in the CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

⏪

⏩

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

is in good agreement with the recommended experimental value. At room temperature hydrogen tunneling was the main route of reaction. This could explain the large value of the branching ratio in our study; hydrogen atoms, due to their lower mass, tunnel more easily than deuterium, thus enriching deuterium on the carbon. The higher zero point energy of the C–H bond relative to C–D also plays a role.

The results of this study can be used in detailed models of tropospheric chemistry to investigate the carbon cycle. Several studies of deuterium make use of simplified chemical mechanisms (Rahn et al., 2003; Rhee et al., 2006a; Röckmann et al., 2003), however much remains to be learned, especially given the high variability of deuterium content in atmospheric formaldehyde. For example, a recent study by Rice and Quay found variation in  $\delta D(\text{HCHO})$  between  $-296$  and  $+210\text{‰}$  for samples obtained in Seattle, Washington (Rice and Quay, 2006).

*Acknowledgements.* The authors wish to thank N. W. Larsen, O. J. Nielsen and C. J. Nielsen for helpful discussions. M. S. Johnson and E. Nilsson thank the Copenhagen Center for Atmospheric Research supported by the Danish Natural Science Research Council and the Villum Kahn Rasmussen Fund.

## References

- Atkinson, R., Baulch, D. L., Cox, R. A., Crowley, J. N., Hampson, R. F., Hynes, R. G., Jenkin, M. E., Rossi, M. J., and Troe, J.: Evaluated kinetic and photochemical data for atmospheric chemistry: Volume II – gas phase reactions of organic species, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 3625–4055, 2006, <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/6/3625/2006/>.
- Baroni, M., Thiemens, M. H., Delmas, R. J., and Savarino, J.: Mass-Independent Sulfur Isotopic Compositions in Stratospheric Volcanic Eruptions, *Science*, 315, 84–87, 2007.
- Bofill, J. M., Olivella, S., Sole, A., and Anglada, J. M.: The mechanism of methoxy radical oxidation by  $\text{O}_2$  in the gas phase. Computational evidence for direct H atom transfer assisted by an intermolecular noncovalent  $\text{O}\cdots\text{O}$  bonding interaction, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 121, 1337–1347, 1999.

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the $\text{CH}_2\text{DO} + \text{O}_2$ reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., Janssen, C., Kaiser, J., Röckmann, T., Rhee, T. S., and Assonov, S. S.: Isotope effects in the chemistry of atmospheric trace compounds, *Chem. Rev.*, 103, 5125–5161, 2003.

Ehhalt, D. H., Davidson, J. A., Cantrell, C. A., Friedman, I., and Tyler, S.: The Kinetic Isotope Effect in the Reaction of H<sub>2</sub> with OH, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 94, 9831–9836, 1989.

Feilberg, K. L., D'Anna, B., Johnson, M. S., and Nielsen, C. J.: Relative tropospheric photolysis rates of HCHO, (HCHO)-C-13, (HCHO)-O-18, and DCDO measured at the European photoreactor facility, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 109, 8314–8319, 2005a.

Feilberg, K. L., Griffith, D. W. T., Johnson, M. S., and Nielsen, C. J.: The C-13 and D kinetic isotope effects in the reaction of CH<sub>4</sub> with Cl, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 37, 110–118, 2005b.

Feilberg, K. L., Johnson, M. S., and Nielsen, C. J.: Relative reaction rates of HCHO, HCDO, DCDO, (HCHO)-C-13, and (HCHO)-O-18 with OH, Cl, Br, and NO<sub>3</sub> radicals, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 108, 7393–7398, 2004.

Feilberg, K. L., Johnson, M. S., and Nielsen, C. J.: Relative rates of reaction of C-13 O-16, C-12 O-18, C-12 O-17 and C-13 O-18 with OH and OD radicals, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 2318–2323, 2005c.

Feilberg, K. L., Johnson, M. S., Bacak, A., Röckmann, T., and Nielsen, C. J.: Relative tropospheric photolysis rates of HCHO and HCDO measured at the European Photoreactor Facility, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, in press, 2007.

Gerst, S. and Quay, P.: Deuterium component of the global molecular hydrogen cycle, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 106, 5021–5031, 2001.

Gola, A. A., D'Anna, B., Feilberg, K. L., Sellevag, S. R., Bache-Andreassen, L., and Nielsen, C. J.: Kinetic isotope effects in the gas phase reactions of OH and Cl with CH<sub>3</sub>Cl, CD<sub>3</sub>Cl, and (CH<sub>3</sub>Cl)-C-13, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 2395–2402, 2005,

<http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/5/2395/2005/>.

Gratien, A., Nilsson, E., Bache-Andreassen, L., Doussin, J.-F., Johnson, M. S., Nielsen, C. J., Stenstrøm, Y., and Picquet-Varrault, B.: UV and IR absorption cross-sections and relative photolysis rates of HCHO, HCDO and DCDO, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, in press, 2007a.

Gratien, A., Picquet-Varrault, B., Orphal, J., Perraudin, E., Doussin, J. F., and Flaud, J. M.: Laboratory intercomparison of the formaldehyde absorption cross sections in the infrared (1660–1820 cm<sup>-1</sup>) and ultraviolet (300–360 nm) spectral regions, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 112, D05305, doi:10.1029/2006JD007201, 2007b.

Griffith, D. W. T.: Synthetic calibration and quantitative analysis of gas-phase FT-IR spectra,

**HCHO and HCDO  
yields in the  
CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction**

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- Appl. Spectrosc., 50, 59–70, 1996.
- Gutman, D., Sanders, N., and Butler, J. E.: Kinetics of the Reactions of Methoxy and Ethoxy Radicals with Oxygen, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 86, 66–70, 1982.
- Hak, C., Pundt, I., Trick, S., et al.: Intercomparison of four different in-situ techniques for ambient formaldehyde measurements in urban air, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 2881–2900, 2005, <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/5/2881/2005/>.
- IPCC, Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis, Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2001.
- Johnson, M. S., Feilberg, K. L., von Hessberg, P., and Nielsen, O. J.: Isotopic processes in atmospheric chemistry, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 31, 313–323, 2002.
- Jungkamp, T. P. W. and Seinfeld, J. H.: The mechanism of methoxy radical oxidation: Hydrogen abstraction versus trioxy radical formation, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 263, 371–378, 1996.
- Keppler, F., Hamilton, J. T. G., Brass, M., and Röckmann, T.: Methane emissions from terrestrial plants under aerobic conditions, *Nature*, 439, 187–191, 2006.
- Keppler, F., Harper, D. B., Röckmann, T., Moore, R. M., and Hamilton, J. T. G.: New insight into the atmospheric chloromethane budget gained using stable carbon isotope ratios, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 2403–2411, 2005, <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/5/2403/2005/>.
- Lorenz, K., Rhasa, D., Zellner, R., and Fritz, B.: Laser Photolysis – Lif Kinetic Studies of the Reactions of CH<sub>3</sub>O and CH<sub>2</sub>CHO with O<sub>2</sub> between 300 K and 500 K, *Berichte Der Bunsen-Gesellschaft, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 89, 341–342, 1985.
- Maplesoft: Maple 10, Waterloo Maple Inc, 2005.
- McCarthy, M. C., Boering, K. A., Rahn, T., Eiler, J. M., Rice, A. L., Tyler, D. C., Schauffler, S., Atlas, E., and Johnson, D. G.: The hydrogen isotopic composition of water vapor entering the stratosphere inferred from high-precision measurements of  $\delta D(CH_4)$  and  $\delta D(H_2)$ , *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 109, D07304, doi:10.1029/2003JD004003, 2004.
- Miller, J. B., Tans, P. P., White, J. W. C., Conway, T. J., and Vaughn, B. W.: The atmospheric signal of terrestrial carbon isotopic discrimination and its implication for partitioning carbon fluxes, *Tellus Series B-Chemical and Physical Meteorology*, 55, 197–206, 2003.
- NIST: Chemical Kinetics Database on the Web, Standard Reference Database 17, Version 7.0 (Web Version), Release 1.4, <http://kinetics.nist.gov/kinetics/index.jsp>, 2007.
- Palmer, P. I., Abbot, D. S., Fu, T. M., et al.: Quantifying the seasonal and interannual variability

---

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- ity of North American isoprene emissions using satellite observations of the formaldehyde column, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 111, D12315, doi:10.1029/2005JD006689, 2006.
- Prather, M. J.: An environmental experiment with H<sub>2</sub>?, *Science*, 302, 581–582, 2003.
- Quay, P., Stutsman, J., Wilbur, D., Snover, A., Dlugokencky, E., and Brown, T.: The isotopic composition of atmospheric methane, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 13, 445–461, 1999.
- Rahn, T., Eiler, J. M., Boering, K. A., Wennberg, P. O., McCarthy, M. C., Tyler, S., Schauffler, S., Donnelly, S., and Atlas, E.: Extreme deuterium enrichment in stratospheric hydrogen and the global atmospheric budget of H<sub>2</sub>, *Nature*, 424, 918–921, 2003.
- Rhee, T. S., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., Brass, M., and Bruhl, C.: Isotopic composition of H<sub>2</sub> from CH<sub>4</sub> oxidation in the stratosphere and the troposphere, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 111, D23303, doi:10.1029/2005JD006760, 2006a.
- Rhee, T. S., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., and Röckmann, T.: The overwhelming role of soils in the global atmospheric hydrogen cycle, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 1611–1625, 2006b.
- Rice, A. L. and Quay, P. D.: Isotopic analysis of atmospheric formaldehyde by gas chromatography isotope ratio mass spectrometry, *Anal. Chem.*, 78, 6320–6326, 2006.
- Röckmann, T., Jockel, P., Gros, V., Braunlich, M., Possnert, G., and Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M.: Using C-14, C-13, O-18 and O-17 isotopic variations to provide insights into the high northern latitude surface CO inventory, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2, 147–159, 2002, <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/2/147/2002/>.
- Röckmann, T., Rhee, T. S., and Engel, A.: Heavy hydrogen in the stratosphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 3, 2015–2023, 2003, <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/3/2015/2003/>.
- Rothman, L. S., Jacquemart, D., Barbe, A., et al.: The HITRAN 2004 molecular spectroscopic database, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Ra.*, 96, 139–204, 2005.
- Sander, S. P., Friedl, R. R., Ravishankara, A. R., et al.: Chemical Kinetics and Photochemical Data for Use in Atmospheric Studies, Evaluation Number 15, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, 2006.
- Saueressig, G., Crowley, J. N., Bergamaschi, P., Bruhl, C., Brenninkmeijer, C. A. M., and Fischer, H.: Carbon 13 and D kinetic isotope effects in the reactions of CH<sub>4</sub> with O(<sup>1</sup>D) and OH: New laboratory measurements and their implications for the isotopic composition of stratospheric methane, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 106, 23 127–23 138, 2001.
- Schultz, M. G., Diehl, T., Brasseur, G. P., and Zittel, W.: Air pollution and climate-forcing impacts

---

**HCHO and HCDO  
yields in the  
CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction**E. Nilsson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- of a global hydrogen economy, *Science*, 302, 624–627, 2003.
- Setokuchi, O. and Sato, M.: Direct dynamics of an alkoxy radical ( $\text{CH}_3\text{O}$ ,  $\text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{O}$ , and *i*- $\text{C}_3\text{H}_7\text{O}$ ) reaction with an oxygen molecule, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 106, 8124–8132, 2002.
- 5 Sokolov, O., Hurley, M. D., Ball, J. C., Wallington, T. J., Nelsen, W., Barnes, I., and Becker, K. H.: Kinetics of the reactions of chlorine atoms with  $\text{CH}_3\text{ONO}$  and  $\text{CH}_3\text{ONO}_2$ , *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 31, 357–359, 1999.
- Talukdar, R. K., Gierczak, T., Goldfarb, L., Rudich, Y., Rao, B. S. M., and Ravishankara, A. R.: Kinetics of hydroxyl radical reactions with isotopically labeled hydrogen, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 100, 3037–3043, 1996.
- 10 von Hessberg, P., Kaiser, J., Enghoff, M. B., McLinden, C. A., Sorensen, S. L., Röckmann, T., and Johnson, M. S.: Ultra-violet absorption cross sections of isotopically substituted nitrous oxide species: (NNO)-N-14-N-14, (NNO)-N-15-N-14, (NNO)-N-14-N-15 and (NNO)-N-15-N-15, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 4, 1237–1253, 2004,  
<http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/4/1237/2004/>.
- 15 Wallington, T. J. and Japar, S. M.: Fourier-Transform Infrared Kinetic-Studies of the Reaction of HONO with  $\text{HNO}_3$ ,  $\text{NO}_3$  and  $\text{N}_2\text{O}_5$  at 295 K, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 9, 399–409, 1989.
- Wang, Y. H. and Jacob, D. J.: Anthropogenic forcing on tropospheric ozone and OH since preindustrial times, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 103, 31 123–31 135, 1998.
- 20 Wantuck, P. J., Oldenberg, R. C., Baughcum, S. L., and Winn, K. R.: Removal Rate-Constant Measurements for  $\text{CH}_3\text{O}$  by  $\text{O}_2$  over the 298–973 K Range, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 91, 4653–4655, 1987.
- Weston, R. E.: Oxygen isotope effects in the oxidation of methane to carbon monoxide, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 105, 1656–1661, 2001.
- Zahn, A., Franz, P., Bechtel, C., Grooss, J. U., and Röckmann, T.: Modelling the budget of middle atmospheric water vapour isotopes, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 2073–2090, 2006,  
25 <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/6/2073/2006/>.

---

**HCHO and HCDO  
yields in the  
 $\text{CH}_2\text{DO} + \text{O}_2$  reaction**E. Nilsson et al.

---

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction

E. Nilsson et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

**Table 1.** Reaction mechanism used to model methyl nitrite photolysis chemistry. The table does not list the analogous monodeutero reactions and isotopic cross reactions; the full list of reactions and rates is available as supplementary information (<http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/7/10019/2007/acpd-7-10019-2007-supplement.pdf>). The mechanism was truncated by assuming in (R28) that the peroxide has same reactivity as c-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>12</sub>.

Reaction	Rate coefficient	Comments
(R1) CH <sub>3</sub> ONO + hν → CH <sub>3</sub> O + NO	1.44 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	a
(R2) CH <sub>3</sub> O + O <sub>2</sub> → HCHO + HO <sub>2</sub>	1.9 × 10 <sup>-15</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b
(R3) HO <sub>2</sub> + NO → OH + NO <sub>2</sub>	8.1 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b
(R4) OH + cC <sub>6</sub> H <sub>12</sub> → H <sub>2</sub> O + RO <sub>2</sub>	6.7 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	c
(R5) RO <sub>2</sub> + NO → RO + NO <sub>2</sub>	3.0 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	c
(R6) NO <sub>2</sub> + hν → NO + O	2.88 × 10 <sup>-3</sup> cm <sup>2</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	d
(R7) O + O <sub>3</sub> + M → O <sub>3</sub> + M	7.1 × 10 <sup>-34</sup> cm <sup>6</sup> molecule <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R8) HCHO + hν → CO + H <sub>2</sub>	5.5 × 10 <sup>-5</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	d, f
(R9) HCHO + hν → CO + 2HO <sub>2</sub>	1.8 × 10 <sup>-5</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	d, f
(R10) HO <sub>2</sub> + NO <sub>2</sub> + M → PNA + M	1.8 × 10 <sup>-31</sup> cm <sup>6</sup> molecule <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R11) HO <sub>2</sub> + HCHO → HOCH <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	7.9 × 10 <sup>-14</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R12) HOCH <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> + RO <sub>2</sub> → HCOOH + RO + HO <sub>2</sub>	5.0 × 10 <sup>-14</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	c
(R13) CH <sub>2</sub> O + NO + M → CH <sub>3</sub> ONO + M	1.4 × 10 <sup>-29</sup> cm <sup>6</sup> molecule <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R14) CH <sub>3</sub> O + NO <sub>2</sub> + M → CH <sub>3</sub> ONO <sub>2</sub> + M	5.3 × 10 <sup>-29</sup> cm <sup>6</sup> molecule <sup>-2</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R15) OH + CH <sub>3</sub> ONO → HCHO + NO + H <sub>2</sub> O	3.0 × 10 <sup>-13</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b
(R16) HCHO + OH → H <sub>2</sub> O + CO + HO <sub>2</sub>	8.5 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b
(R17) HO <sub>2</sub> + HO <sub>2</sub> → H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	1.7 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R18) H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> + hν → 2OH	5.47 × 10 <sup>-6</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	d
(R19) CH <sub>3</sub> O + NO <sub>2</sub> → HCHO + HONO	2.0 × 10 <sup>-13</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b
(R20) 2HOCH <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> → 2HCOOH + 2HO <sub>2</sub>	5.5 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	g
(R21) CH <sub>2</sub> OH + OH → CH <sub>2</sub> OH + H <sub>2</sub> O	8.8 × 10 <sup>-13</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R22) CH <sub>2</sub> OH + O <sub>2</sub> → HCHO + HO <sub>2</sub>	9.6 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R23) O <sub>3</sub> + NO → NO <sub>2</sub>	1.9 × 10 <sup>-14</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b
(R24) CO + OH → CO <sub>2</sub> + HO <sub>2</sub>	2.3 × 10 <sup>-13</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R25) H <sub>2</sub> + OH → H <sub>2</sub> O + HO <sub>2</sub>	6.7 × 10 <sup>-15</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b
(R26) RO <sub>2</sub> + RO <sub>2</sub> → 2RO	8.2 × 10 <sup>-15</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	c
(R27) RO <sub>2</sub> + RO <sub>2</sub> → RO + cC <sub>6</sub> H <sub>12</sub>	2.0 × 10 <sup>-14</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	c
(R28) RO <sub>2</sub> + HO <sub>2</sub> → cC <sub>6</sub> H <sub>12</sub> (recycle)	3.5 × 10 <sup>-11</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	c
(R29) RO + O <sub>2</sub> → cC <sub>6</sub> H <sub>12</sub> + HO <sub>2</sub>	2.0 × 10 <sup>-17</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	c
(R30a) HOCH <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> + HO <sub>2</sub> → HOCH <sub>2</sub> OOH + O <sub>2</sub>	6.0 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	g, h
(R30b) HOCH <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> + HO <sub>2</sub> → HCOOH + H <sub>2</sub> O + O <sub>2</sub>	3.6 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	g, h
(R30c) HOCH <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> + HO <sub>2</sub> → HOCH <sub>2</sub> O + OH + O <sub>2</sub>	2.4 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	g, h
(R31) NO <sub>2</sub> + OH + M → HNO <sub>3</sub>	4.1 × 10 <sup>-11</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R32) CH <sub>3</sub> ONO <sub>2</sub> + OH → HCHO + H <sub>2</sub> O + NO <sub>2</sub>	3.0 × 10 <sup>-13</sup> cm <sup>3</sup> molecule <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>	b, e
(R33) HOCH <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> → HO <sub>2</sub> + HCHO	150.0 s <sup>-1</sup>	b

(a) This work.

(b) Rate coefficients from JPL (Sander et al., 2006).

(c) Based on reactivity of similar compounds.

(d) Photolysis rates calculated using estimated lamp flux curve and JPL cross sections to derive a photolysis rate relative to methyl nitrite.

(e) Based on JPL rate coefficient (Sander et al., 2006), using pressure of reactor.


(f) Formaldehyde photolysis with the Ford chamber lamps is about 0.05% as fast as that of methyl nitrite. It will be divided 1:3 between radical and molecular channels.

(g) Atkinson et al. (2006); NIST (2007)

(h) Jenkin et al. (2007)

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the $\text{CH}_2\text{DO} + \text{O}_2$ reaction

E. Nilsson et al.




**Fig. 1.** Propagation of deuterium through gas-phase atmospheric reactions converting methane to hydrogen.

[Title Page](#)
[Abstract](#)
[Introduction](#)
[Conclusions](#)
[References](#)
[Tables](#)
[Figures](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[◀](#)
[▶](#)
[Back](#)
[Close](#)
[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)

## HCHO and HCDO yields in the CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction

E. Nilsson et al.



**Fig. 2.** Reactions of the carbon-containing species included in the model. The figure does not show the analogous mono-deutero reactions and isotopic cross reactions.

Title Page

Abstract

Introduction

Conclusions

References

Tables

Figures

◀

▶

◀

▶

Back

Close


Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

**HCHO and HCDO  
yields in the  
CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction**

E. Nilsson et al.




**Fig. 3.** Typical measured spectrum, fit to spectrum, and residual of fit after 20 s of photolysis. Compounds included in the fit are H<sub>2</sub>O, N<sub>2</sub>O, NO<sub>2</sub>, HCHO, HCDO, CH<sub>2</sub>DONO and HO<sub>2</sub>NO<sub>2</sub>. For clarity the spectra are offset vertically by 0, -1 and -0.9 units.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

**HCHO and HCDO  
yields in the  
CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction**

E. Nilsson et al.




**Fig. 4.** Typical measured spectrum, fit to spectrum, and residual after 4 min of photolysis. Compounds included in the fit are the same as those in Fig. 3, plus DCDO, HCOOH, DCOOD, DCOOH and CH<sub>2</sub>DOH. For clarity the spectra have been offset vertically by 0, -1.2, and -1.3 units, respectively.

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

**HCHO and HCDO  
yields in the  
CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction**

E. Nilsson et al.




**Fig. 5.** Concentrations of HCHO and HCDO determined by fitting reference spectra to the experimental data. Results from three experiments are included in the figure. The slope of the line gives a branching ratio of  $7.593 \pm 0.026$ .

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)

**HCHO and HCDO  
yields in the  
CH<sub>2</sub>DO+O<sub>2</sub> reaction**

E. Nilsson et al.



**Fig. 6.** Products yields predicted by the model (filled symbols) and those observed experimentally (open symbols).

[Title Page](#)[Abstract](#)[Introduction](#)[Conclusions](#)[References](#)[Tables](#)[Figures](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[◀](#)[▶](#)[Back](#)[Close](#)[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)