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This compilation updates and expands a previous evaluation of kinetic data on elementary, homogeneous, gas phase reactions of neutral species involved in combustion systems [J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data 21, 411 (1992)]. The work has been carried out under the auspices of the European Community Energy Research and Development Program. Data sheets are presented for some 78 reactions and two tables in which preferred rate parameters are presented for reactions of ethyl, i-propyl, t-butyl, and allyl radicals are given. Each data sheet sets out relevant thermodynamic data, experimental kinetic data, references, and recommended rate parameters with their error limits. A table summarizing the recommended rate data is also given. The new reactions fall into two categories: first, to expand the previous compilation relating largely to the combustion in air of methane, ethane and aromatic compounds; and second, provide data for some of the key radicals involved in the combustion of higher alkanes.
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1. Introduction

This publication is the first supplement to the set of data sheets of critically evaluated data for combustion processes published in the Journal of Chemical Reference Data 21, 411–734 (1992).

Both the previous and the present publication were prepared by the CEC Group on Evaluation of Kinetic Data for Combustion Modelling which was established as one of the projects within the European Community Energy Research and Development Program.

The original compilation was intended for use in computer modelling of the combustion of methane and ethane in air and it also dealt with a number of reactions of importance in the chemistry of exhaust gases, mainly involving NO, and in the combustion of aromatic compounds. This first supplement updates the original and extends it to cover the reactions of a number of radicals particularly important in the combustion of higher alkanes. It also provides a more extensive coverage of the reactions of nitrogen containing species.

In updating, a new data sheet has been provided for all reactions for which new data have been published since our previous work. For reactions where no new data have become available, reference must be made back to the original compilation but the Summary Table, included in this supplement, contains the recommended rate parameters for all of the reactions evaluated by the group to date.

The general approach to updating has been to reproduce the tables of data from the previous data sheet, adding in the new data. However, for reactions where the data are particularly extensive and the new data are largely in agreement with our previous recommendations, only the new data are tabulated. In such cases the reader can gain a complete picture of the range and quality of the data from the graph (if presented) or must refer back to the original compilation. In a very few instances where the new data consist of a single study agreeing with our previous recommendations, we have not updated, at this stage. For reasons given in 2.1 some of the combination/dissociation reactions dealt with in our previous publication are presented again despite there being no new data.

The formal cut-off point for the literature searching was January 1992, but the group continued to monitor the literature during the preparation of the manuscript and every attempt was made to incorporate more recent studies of importance, in particular the material presented at the 24th Symposium (International) on Combustion, held in 1992.

2. Guide to the Data Sheets

2.1. Scope and Reaction Ordering

For each reaction, a data sheet is presented setting out relevant thermodynamic data, rate coefficient measurements, an assessment of the reliability of the data, references, and, as well, preferred values of the rate coefficients are suggested. In deciding on a format for the presentation we have been influenced by the data sheets prepared by the CODATA Task Group for Modelling Atmospheric Chemistry. Our format follows theirs closely but we have made more extensive use of graphs because of the need to convey some idea of the quality of the data over a wide temperature range.

In this present supplement, we have departed from this format in presenting data on the reactions of ethyl, i-propyl, t-butyl and allyl radicals. The reactions of these radicals are of key importance in modelling the combustion of higher alkanes but in most cases there are insufficient data to warrant production of a full data sheet. For most of the reactions of these species we have therefore presented our recommendations in the form of tables, with relevant comments on the preferred values, but without detailed display of the data.

These reactions are grouped in order using a system widely adopted in publications of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The grouping is made on the basis of the attacking atom or radical in the order set out in the following list.

O Atom Reactions
O₂ Reactions
H Atom Reactions
H₂ Reactions
OH Radical Reactions
H₂O Reactions
HO₂ Radical Reactions
H₂O₂ Reactions
N Atom Reactions
NH Radical Reactions
NH₂ Radical Reactions
NH₃ Reactions
C Atom Reactions
C₂ Radical Reactions
CH Radical Reactions
$^3$CH$_2$ Radical Reactions
$^1$CH$_2$ Radical Reactions
CH$_3$ Radical Reactions
CH$_4$ Reactions
CHO Radical Reactions
HCHO Reactions
CH$_3$OH Radical Reactions
CH$_3$O Radical Reactions
CH$_3$O$_2$ Radical Reactions
CH$_3$OH Reactions
CH$_3$OOH Reactions
CN Radical Reactions
NCO Radical Reactions
C$_2$H Radical Reactions
C$_2$H$_3$ Radical Reactions
C$_2$H$_4$ Radical Reactions
C$_2$H$_6$ Reactions
CHCO Radical Reactions
CH$_2$CHO Radical Reactions
CH$_3$CO Radical Reactions
CH$_3$CHO Reactions
C$_2$H$_2$O Radical Reactions
C$_2$H$_2$OOH Reactions
C$_2$H$_5$ Radical Reactions
i-C$_3$H$_7$ Radical Reactions
s-C$_3$H$_7$ Reactions
i-C$_3$H$_8$ Radical Reactions
s-C$_3$H$_8$ Reactions
C$_2$H$_2$O Radical Reactions
C$_2$H$_5$CH$_3$ Radical Reactions
C$_2$H$_5$CH$_2$ Reactions
p-C$_6$H$_4$(CH$_3$)$_2$ Reactions
C$_6$H$_5$C$_2$H$_5$ Radical Reactions

Thus, the reaction

\[ \text{CN} + \text{CH}_4 \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{CH}_3 \]

will be found under CN radical reactions. For reactions not classified by this rule, e.g. radical-radical reactions, the rule that species higher on the list take precedence over those lower applies. Thus, the reaction

\[ \text{OH} + \text{CH}_4 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{M} \]

will be found under OH radical reactions. The same rule applies to reactions between species of a non-radical nature. For the purposes of the classification O$_2$ and NO are treated as radicals only in their reactions with non-radical species.

An exception to this ordering is the placement of dissociation reactions immediately after their corresponding reverse reaction, the combination of the dissociation products. Thus the data sheet for the reaction

\[ \text{C}_3\text{H}_6 + \text{M} \rightarrow 2\text{CH}_3 + \text{M} \]

will be found immediately following the data sheet for the reaction

\[ \text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_3 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{C}_3\text{H}_6 + \text{M} \]

This arrangement is followed wherever a full analysis of the pressure dependence of pairs of such reactions is carried out. In other cases where the data do not justify such a treatment or where only the combination or the decomposition reaction is dealt with, the normal ordering prevails.

In this supplement the data sheets on dissociation/combination reactions contain more extensive graphical presentation of the recommendations than was the case in the original publication in this series (CEC, 1992). For completeness, therefore, the data sheets for a number of such reactions, dealt with in CEC, 1992, are presented again in this present supplement with this enhanced graphical treatment.

2.2. Conventions Concerning Rate Coefficients

It is assumed that all reactions in the compilation are elementary reactions.

The relationship between rate and rate coefficient for a reaction described by a stoichiometric equation such as

\[ A + A \rightarrow B + C \]

is given by

\[ \text{Rate} = -(1/2)\frac{d[A]}{dt} = \frac{d[B]}{dt} = \frac{d[C]}{dt} = k[A]^2. \]

2.3. Guide to the Tables

Each data sheet begins with a heading giving all the reaction paths considered feasible whether there is evidence for their occurrence or not.

These are followed by the thermodynamic quantities $\Delta H^\circ$ and $\Delta S^\circ$ at 298 K and an expression for the equilibrium constant, $K$, in units of atmospheres, for each of the reaction channels for which there are data available. All thermodynamic data refer to a standard state of 1 atmosphere. The source of the thermodynamic data is discussed later in this Introduction.

The kinetic data for the reactions are summarized under the two headings (i) Rate Coefficient Measurements, and (ii) Reviews and Evaluations. To keep the size of the compilation within reasonable bounds, in most cases only the rate coefficient measurements back to the most recent comprehensive review are recorded. Where there is no suitable review, or where there are only few measurements, all of the measured values are tabulated. Also to limit the size of the review, if in a particular study, measurements of the rate coefficient have been made over a range of temperatures, the results are tabulated as a temperature dependent expression (usually Arrhenius in form) rather than as the individually reported data points. For bimolecular reactions, the temperature dependence of the rate coefficient is expressed either as $k = A \exp(-R/T)$ or $AT^n \exp(-C/T)$ whichever is the more appropriate, where $A$, $n$, $B$ and $C$ are constants. In some cases, the form with $C = 0$, leading to $k = AT^n$, gives the best representation. The expressions used for pressure dependent combination and dissociation reactions are discussed in detail later.
Among the Reviews and Evaluations there are a number of which are referred to so frequently that rather than repetitively give their full reference, *in extenso*, we list them among the references in this Introduction and refer the reader back to this list. These reviews are those of the IUPAC Task Group\(^5\)–\(^7\), the NASA Panel\(^9\) and our original publication referred to as CEC, 1992\(^1\).

The tables of data are supplemented by a series of Comments summarizing the experimental details. For measurements giving rate coefficient ratios, the absolute value derived from them and given in the table may be different from that quoted in the original paper because the evaluator has chosen to use a value of the reference rate coefficient different from that used by the original author. Such differences are indicated and justified by appropriate entries in the Comments section.

Under *Preferred Values* the rate coefficient values recommended for use by modellers are presented as a temperature dependent expression over a stated temperature range. Wherever possible, an attempt has been made to make recommendations for high temperatures even if this requires a considerable extrapolation from the low temperature data and consequent assignment of large error limits. However, in many cases, particularly for reactions likely to have a large activation energy, or where alternative reaction channels may become important, it has not been considered safe to extrapolate much beyond the range of existing measurements.

Wherever possible, the preferred values are based almost exclusively on experimental data but in a few cases estimates have been made based on analogous reactions. No attempt has been made to include calculated values of rate parameters but theoretical and empirical estimates have not been ignored. They have often provided valuable background and guidance on whether experimental values are ‘reasonable’.

The preferred rate constant expression is followed by a statement of the error limits in log \(k\) at the extremes of the recommended temperature range. Some comments on the assignment of errors are given later in this Introduction.

The section ‘‘Comments on Preferred Values’’ contains a brief account of how expressions for the preferred values were arrived at and comments on the quality of the available data.

The data sheets conclude with a list of the relevant references and in many cases graphs to illustrate the quality of the data. Where there are few data points for a particular reaction all are recorded but for well studied reactions, where much data are available, for the sake of clarity, expressions, rather than the original points, are displayed in some cases.

### 2.4. Treatment of Combination and Dissociation Reactions

The rates of combination and the reverse dissociation reactions

\[
A + B + M \overset{\text{\small \Delta T}}{\rightleftharpoons} AB + M,
\]

depend on the temperature, \(T\), the nature, and the concentration of the third body \([M]\). The rate coefficients of these reactions have to be expressed in a form which is more complicated than those for simple bimolecular reactions. The combination reactions are described by a pseudo-second-order rate law.

\[
\frac{d[AB]}{dt} = k[A][B]
\]

in which the second-order rate constant depends on \([M]\). The low pressure third-order limit is characterized by \(k_0\),

\[
k_0([M]) = \lim_{[M] \to 0} k([M])
\]

The high pressure second-order limit is characterized by \(k_w\),

\[
k_w = \lim_{[M] \to \infty} k([M])
\]

which is independent of \([M]\). For a combination reaction in the low-pressure range, the summary table gives a second-order rate constant expressed as the product of a third-order rate constant and the third body concentration. The transition between the third-order and the second-order range is represented by a reduced fall off expression of \(k/k_w\) as a function of

\[
\frac{k_0[M]/k_w}{[M]/[M]_{\text{ref}}} = \frac{[M]/[M]_{\text{ref}}}{[M]/[M]_{\text{ref}}}
\]

where the ‘‘centre of the fall-off curve’’ \([M]_{\text{ref}}\) indicates the third body concentration for which the extrapolated \(k_0[M]/k_w\) would be equal to \(k_w\). The dependence of \(k\) on \([M]\) in general is complicated and has to be analyzed by unimolecular rate theory. For moderately complex molecules at not too high temperatures, however, a simple approximate relationship holds:

\[
k = \frac{k_0k_{\text{ref}}[M]}{k_0[M] + k_w} F = k_0[M] \left(1 + \frac{1}{[M]/[M]_{\text{ref}}}\right)^F
\]

where \(F\) at the rhs represent the Lindemann-Hinshelwood expression, and the additional broadening factor \(F\), at not too high temperature, is approximately given by

\[
\log F \approx \frac{\log F_c}{1 + \left[\left(\log([M]/[M]_{\text{ref}})/N\right)^2\right]},
\]

where \(N = 0.75 - 1.27\ log F_c\). The temperature dependence of \(F_c\), which is sometimes significant, can be estimated by the procedure of Troe\(^1\)\(^2\). The results can usually be represented\(^9\), approximately by an equation

\[
F_c = (1-a)\exp(-T/T^{**}) + a \exp(-T/T^*) + \exp(-T^{**}/T),
\]

where \(a, T^*, T^{**},\) and \(T^{***}\) are constants. The first two terms
are of importance for atmospheric conditions, but the last term in most cases becomes relevant only at high temperatures. In this way, the three quantities, \( k_0, k_w \), and \( F_c \) with

\[
[M]_c = \frac{k_w}{k_0},
\]

characterize the fall-off curve for the present application. Alternatively, the three quantities \( k_w, [M]_c \), and \( F_c \) (or \( k_0, [M]_c \), and \( F_c \)) can be used.

Theoretical predictions\(^7\)\(^\text{--}^9\) of \( F_c \) have been derived from rigid RRKM-type models including weak collision effects. Systematic calculations of this type have been presented by Patrick and Golden\(^10\) for reactions of atmospheric interest. It is debatable whether these calculations can be applied to radical recombination reactions without barriers, where rotational effects are important. Changes in \( F_c \) would require changes in the limiting \( k_0 \) and \( k_w \) values. For the purpose of this evaluation, this will be irrelevant in most cases, if the preferred \( k_0 \) and \( k_w \) are used consistently together with the preferred \( F_c \) values.

If detailed calculations are made it is sometimes found that alternative expressions for \( F_c \) may be more appropriate.

The dependence of \( k_0 \) and \( k_w \) on the temperature is represented in the \( T \) exponent \( n \),

\[
k \propto T^n
\]

(except for the cases with an established energy barrier in the potential). We have used this form of temperature dependence because it often gives a better fit to the data over a wider range of temperature than does the Arrhenius expression.

In a few instances, the rate constant for the reaction has been measured under conditions where it is almost certainly pressure dependent but where the measurements cannot be analysed to give values of \( k_0 \), \( k_w \), and \( F_c \). In such cases an expression for \( k \) only is quoted.

To avoid ambiguity, the subscripts denoting infinite and pressure limiting rate constants have, in places, been written as superscripts e.g. \( k_\infty \), \( k_1 \) rather than \( k_{1w} \) and \( k_{1c} \).

2.5. Assignment of Errors

The reliability of a preferred expression for \( k \) is expressed in terms of an estimated \( \Delta \log k \) at the extremes of the temperature range covered by the recommended expression. Thus a quoted \( \Delta \log k = \pm X \) is equivalent to the statement that the range of values of \( k \) encompassed by these error limits may be found by multiplication and division of \( k \) by a factor \( F_c \), where \( X = \log F_c \).

No attempt has been made to assign explicit error limits to the temperature coefficient of \( k \). The assignment of error limits in \( \Delta \log k \) at the extremes of the temperature range indicates how the quality of the data varies with temperature without attempting to define the form which this variation takes. In the opinion of the evaluators the available data rarely merit a more elaborate assignment of errors over a wide temperature range.

The assignment of error limits in \( k \) is a subjective assessment by the evaluators. Modern techniques are capable in favourable circumstances of measuring rate coefficients with the precision represented by a standard deviation as small as 10%. However, data obtained in different laboratories on the same reaction and often by the same technique are rarely concordant to the extent that might be expected from the precision of the measurements; mean values may differ by many standard deviations. This is indicative of systematic errors which are difficult to detect and which cannot be simply incorporated into quoted error limits.

2.6. Thermodynamic Data

There are substantial uncertainties associated with the thermodynamic data of a number of species appearing in the compilation. For the sake of internal consistency the thermodynamic data have been taken from a single compilation, that prepared for the Sandia Chemkin Program\(^11\). We have also made use of the NIST compilation\(^12\) but that does not extend to temperatures sufficiently high for combustion modelling. The Sandia compilation is sufficiently comprehensive to cover most of the species appearing in the kinetics tables. In a few cases, the present evaluation of the kinetic data has led to an assignment of enthalpies of formation at variance with those in the thermodynamic data base. This has been commented on in the text but has not been incorporated into the thermodynamic data quoted. The Sandia compilation does not include data for aromatic compounds. The data for these have been derived from a variety of sources.

In the present tables the standard enthalpy change at 298 K and the equilibrium constant as a function of temperature are given for each reaction channel. The equilibrium constant is expressed in the form \( K = AT^n \exp(B/T) \), where \( A, B \) and \( n \) at constants. The quality of the thermodynamic data rarely justify the use of expressions for \( K(T) \) involving more than three constants even through the Sandia data compilation expresses the thermodynamic quantities in terms of polynomials involving seven coefficients. To obtain the expression for \( K(T) \) values of \( K \) were calculated from the Sandia data base at several temperatures over the range 300 - 6000 K and fitted to the three constant expressions by a least squares procedure.

Because \( K \) is very sensitive to the thermodynamic quantities, particularly \( \Delta H^\circ \), any rate coefficient calculated from the equilibrium constant and the rate coefficient for the reaction in one direction may be subject to substantial uncertainty.

Wherever kinetic data are available for the rate coefficient for the reaction in both forward and reverse directions, an attempt has been made to reconcile it with the thermodynamic data quoted. For a number of important species there are no thermodynamic data available pointing to the need for experimental measurements aimed at providing such data, particularly for key radicals.
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### Table 1. Bimolecular Reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta$ log $k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$O$ Atom Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + H_2 \rightarrow OH + H$</td>
<td>$8.5 \times 10^{-35} T^{0.83} \exp(-3160/T)$</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$ at 300 K falling to $\pm 0.2$ for $T &gt; 500$ K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + OH \rightarrow O_2 + H$</td>
<td>$2.0 \times 10^{-31} \exp(12/T)$</td>
<td>220–500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2.4 \times 10^{-32} \exp(-353/T)$</td>
<td>1000–2000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + HO_2 \rightarrow OH + O_2$</td>
<td>$5.3 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ at 300 K rising to $\pm 0.5$ at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + H_2O_2 \rightarrow OH + HO_2$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-2000/T)$</td>
<td>300–500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + NO \rightarrow O_2 + N$</td>
<td>$1.14 \times 10^{-19} T^{0.13} \exp(-19200/T)$</td>
<td>1000–5000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + N_2 \rightarrow N + NO$</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^{-26} \exp(-38300/T)$</td>
<td>1400–4000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + NH \rightarrow NO + H$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>1000–3380</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + NH_2 \rightarrow OH + NH_2$</td>
<td>$1.6 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-3670/T)$</td>
<td>500–2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + CH \rightarrow CO + H \rightarrow CHO^* + e$</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$ at 300 K rising to $\pm 0.7$ at 2500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + CH_2 \rightarrow CO + 2H \rightarrow CO + H_2$</td>
<td>$1.4 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + CH_3 \rightarrow HCHO + H$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{-16} T^{1.26} \exp(-4270/T)$</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ at 300 K falling to $\pm 0.15$ at 2500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + CHO \rightarrow OH + CO \rightarrow CO_2 + H$</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + HCHO \rightarrow OH + CHO$</td>
<td>$6.9 \times 10^{-13} T^{0.77} \exp(-1930/T)$</td>
<td>250–2200</td>
<td>$\pm 0.1$ at 250 K rising to $\pm 0.3$ at 2200 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + CH_3O \rightarrow O_2 + CH_3 \rightarrow OH + HCHO$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ at 300 K rising to $\pm 0.7$ at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + CH_2OOH \rightarrow OH + CH_2O \rightarrow OH + CH_3OOH$</td>
<td>$3.3 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-2390/T)$</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ at 300 K rising to $\pm 0.5$ at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + CN \rightarrow CO + N(S) \rightarrow CO + N(3D)$</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300–5000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$ at 300 K rising to $\pm 0.6$ at 5000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + NCO \rightarrow NO + CO \rightarrow O_2 + CN$</td>
<td>$7.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>1450–2600</td>
<td>$\pm 0.8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + HCN \rightarrow NCO + H \rightarrow CO + NH \rightarrow OH + CN$</td>
<td>$2.3 \times 10^{-16} T^{2.4} \exp(-3075/T)$</td>
<td>450–2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$ at 450 K rising to $\pm 0.3$ at 2500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + CH \rightarrow CO + CH_2 \rightarrow CO + CH_3$</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O + CH_2 \rightarrow OH + CH_2 \rightarrow CO + CH_3 \rightarrow HCO + CH_2$</td>
<td>$5 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Bimolecular Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta$ log $k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O + C$_2$H$_4$ → CH$_2$CHO + H  
→ HCO + CH$_3$  
→ HCHO + CH$_3$  
→ CH$_2$CO + H$_2$ | $2.25 \times 10^{-17} T^{1.89} \exp(-90/T)$ | 300-2000 | ± 0.1 for $T < 1000$ K  
rising to ± 0.3 at 2000 K |
| O + C$_2$H$_4$ → CH$_2$CHO + H  
→ HCHO + CH$_3$ | $1.1 \times 10^{-10}$ | 300-2500 | ± 0.3 from 300 to 1000 K |
| O + C$_2$H$_4$ → OH + CH$_3$ | $1.66 \times 10^{-12} T^{0.5} \exp(-2920/T)$ | 300-1200 | ± 0.3 at 300 K falling to  
± 0.15 at 1200 K |
| O + CH$_2$CO → 2CO + H | $1.6 \times 10^{-10}$ | 300-2500 | ± 0.3 |
| O + CH$_3$CO → HCO + CO  
→ HCO + H + CO  
→ HCO + HCO | $3.8 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-680/T)$ | 230-500 | ± 0.3 |
| O + CH$_3$CO → OH + CH$_3$CO  
→ OH + CH$_2$CHO | $3.2 \times 10^{-10}$ | 298-1500 | ± 0.3 at 298 K rising to  
± 1.0 at 1500 K |
| O + CH$_3$CHO → OH + CH$_3$CO  
→ OH + CH$_2$CHO | $9.7 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-90/T)$ | 298-1500 | ± 0.05 at 298 K rising to  
± 0.5 at 1500 K |
| O + CH$_2$O → OH + C$_2$H$_5$OH  
→ OH + C$_2$H$_5$OOO | $3.3 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-2390/T)$ | 300-1000 | ± 0.3 at 300 K rising to  
± 0.5 at 1000 K |
| O + C$_2$H$_5$ → CH$_2$CHCHO + H  
→ HCHO + C$_2$H$_5$ | $3.0 \times 10^{-10}$ | 300-1000 | ± 0.2 over the range 300–600 K;  
± 0.4 over the range 600–1000 K |
| O + C$_2$H$_5$ → OH + C$_2$H$_5$H  
→ C$_2$H$_4$O  
→ CH$_2$O + C$_2$H$_5$ | $(k_1 + k_2) = 5.9 \times 10^{-12} T^{0.5} \exp(-473/T)$ | 298-2000 | ± 0.3 |
| O + C$_2$H$_5$OH → products | $2.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1460/T)$ | 290-600 | ± 0.3 |
| O + C$_2$H$_5$CH$_4$ → HCO + C$_2$H$_5$  
→ C$_2$H$_5$CHO + H  
→ CH$_2$O + C$_2$H$_5$ | $5.5 \times 10^{-10}$ | 300 | ± 0.3 |
| O + C$_2$H$_4$OH → OH + C$_2$H$_5$H  
→ C$_2$H$_5$O  
→ CH$_2$O + C$_2$H$_5$ | No recommendation |
| O + C$_2$H$_5$CH$_3$ → products | $5.3 \times 10^{-11} T^{0.1} \exp(-1260/T)$ | 298-2800 | ± 0.1 at 298 K rising to  
± 0.4 at 2800 K |
| O + C$_2$H$_5$CHO → OH + C$_2$H$_5$CO  
→ OH + C$_2$H$_5$CHO  
→ C$_2$H$_5$O)CHO | $1.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-910/T)$ | 298-1500 | ± 0.3 at 298 K rising to  
± 0.7 at 1500 K |
| O + p-C$_2$H$_5$(CH$_3$)$_3$ → products | $5.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1630/T)$ | 298-600 | ± 0.3 |
| O + C$_4$H$_6$C$_2$H$_4$ → products | $2.8 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-1840/T)$ | 298-600 | ± 0.3 |

**O$_2$ Reactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta$ log $k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O + CH$_4$ → HO$_2$ + CH$_3$ | $6.6 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-28630/T)$ | 500-2000 | ± 0.5 at 500 K rising to  
± 1.0 at 2000 K |
| O + C$_2$H$_6$ → HO$_2$ + C$_2$H$_5$ | $1.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-26100/T)$ | 500-2000 | ± 0.5 at 500 K rising to  
± 1.0 at 2000 K |
### Table 1. Bimolecular Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/$\text{cm}^3\text{molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta \log k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O_2 + \text{HCHO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{HCO}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-20460/T)$</td>
<td>700-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2 + \text{CH}_3\text{CHO} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{CH}_3\text{CO}$</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-19700/T)$</td>
<td>600-1100</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$ at 600 K rising to $\pm 1.0$ at 1100 K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{CH}_3\text{CHCH}_2$</td>
<td>$3.2 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-19700/T)$</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ at 800 K rising to $\pm 0.5$ at 600 K and 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{CH}_3 \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-20000/T)$</td>
<td>700-1200</td>
<td>$\pm 0.7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$H$ Atoms Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{O}$</td>
<td>$1.62 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-7470/T)$</td>
<td>300-5000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.1$ at 300 K rising to $\pm 0.5$ at 5000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{O}_2 + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{Ar}$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{O}_2 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{O}_2 + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{N}_2$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{H} + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{Ar}$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{H} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{OH} + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{Ar}$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{OH} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{N}_2$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$7.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-710/T)$ $2.8 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-440/T)$ $5.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-866/T)$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ $\pm 0.3$ $\pm 0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow 2\text{OH}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{O}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{H}_2$</td>
<td>$7.5 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-9270/T)$</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{HO}_2$</td>
<td>$2.8 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-1890/T)$ $1.7 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1800/T)$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ $\pm 0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{N}$</td>
<td>$3.6 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-2491/T)$</td>
<td>1500-4500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{NH} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{N}$</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>1500-2500</td>
<td>$\pm 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{NH}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{NH}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>2000-3000</td>
<td>$\pm 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{CO} + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{HCO} + \text{M}$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + ^3\text{CH}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CH}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(900/T)$</td>
<td>300-3000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{CH}_3 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + ^1\text{CH}_2$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-7600/T)$</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>$\pm 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow \text{CH}_4$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{CH}_4 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CH}_3$</td>
<td>$2.2 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-4045/T)$</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$ at 300 K and 2500 K reducing to $\pm 0.05$ over range 500-1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{CHO} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CO}$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{HCHO} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{HCO}$</td>
<td>$2.1 \times 10^{-16} \exp(-1090/T)$</td>
<td>300-1700</td>
<td>$\pm 0.1$ at 300 K rising to $\pm 0.3$ at 1700 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H + \text{CH}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{HCHO}$</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1. Bimolecular Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta \log k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H + HNCO → NH$_2$ + CO → H$_2$ + NCO</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td>500–1000</td>
<td>± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + NCO → NH + CO → HCN + O</td>
<td>$3.4 \times 10^{-18} T^{-0.27} \exp(-10190/T)$</td>
<td>1400–1500</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_2$H$_2$ → H$_2$ + C$_2$H</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-1400/T)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_2$H$_3$ → H$_2$ + C$_2$H$_2$ → C$_2$H$_4$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_2$H$_4$ → H$_2$ + C$_2$H$_3$ → C$_2$H$_5$</td>
<td>$9.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-7500/T)$</td>
<td>700–2000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_2$H$_5$ → 2CH$_3$ → C$_2$H$_6$</td>
<td>$6.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>± 0.3 at 300 K rising to ± 0.7 at 2000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_2$H$_6$ → H$_2$ + C$_2$H$_5$</td>
<td>$2.4 \times 10^{-15} T^{1.5} \exp(-3730/T)$</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>± 0.15 at 300 K rising to ± 0.3 at 2000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + CHCO → CH$_2$ + CO → H$_2$ + C$_2$O → HCCOH</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + CH$_3$CO → CH$_2$ + CO → CH$_2$CHO</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1700/T)$</td>
<td>200–2000</td>
<td>± 0.5 at 200 K rising to ± 1.0 at 2000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + CH$_3$CHO → H$_2$ + CH$_3$CO → H$_2$ + CH$_3$CHO</td>
<td>$6.8 \times 10^{-13} T^{1.16} \exp(-1210/T)$</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>± 0.1 at 300 K rising to ± 0.4 at 2000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_2$H$_2$ → C$_2$H$_3$ → C$_2$H$_3$ + CH$_3$ (k$_1$ + k) = $2.8 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 300 K rising to ± 0.5 at 1000 K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_3$H$_6$ + M → C$_6$H$_4$ + M</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_3$H$_6$ → H$_2$ + C$_2$H$_3$ → C$_2$H$_4$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_3$H$_6$O + M → C$_6$H$_5$OH + M</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_3$H$_5$ → H$_2$ + C$_2$H$_3$ + M</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_3$H$_5$ → C$_2$H$_4$ + H$_2$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_3$H$_5$ → C$_2$H$_3$ + H + C$_3$H$_4$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_4$H$_8$ → C$_6$H$_5$CH$_3$ + M</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + p-C$_6$H$_5$(CH$_3$)$_2$ → products</td>
<td>$5.8 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + C$_6$H$_5$C$_2$H$_4$ → H$_2$ + C$_6$H$_2$C$_2$H$_4$ → C$_6$H$_2$C$_2$H$_2$</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Bimolecular Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta \log k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H$_2$ Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2 + Ar \rightarrow 2H + Ar$</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2 + H_2 \rightarrow 2H + H_2$</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OH Radical Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + H_2 \rightarrow H_2O + H$</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{-16} T^{1.6} \exp(-1660/T)$</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>± 0.1 at 300 K rising to ± 0.3 at 2500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + OH \rightarrow H_2O + O$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{-15} T^{1.14} \exp(-50/T)$</td>
<td>250-2500</td>
<td>± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + OH + M \rightarrow H_2O + M$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + HO_2 \rightarrow H_2O + O_2$</td>
<td>$4.8 \times 10^{-11} \exp(250/T)$</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 300 K rising to ± 0.5 at 2000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + H_2O_2 \rightarrow H_2O + HO_2$</td>
<td>$1.3 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-670/T)$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 300 K rising to ± 0.5 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + NH \rightarrow NO + H_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow H_2O + N$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + NH_2 \rightarrow O + NH_3$</td>
<td>$3.3 \times 10^{-14} T^{6.09} \exp(-250/T)$</td>
<td>500-2500</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow H_2O + NH$</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + CO \rightarrow H + CO_2$</td>
<td>$1.05 \times 10^{-15} T^{1.5} \exp(-1800/T)$</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 300 K rising to ± 0.5 at 2000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + CH_2 \rightarrow H + CH_3OH$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow H + CH_2O$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1400/T)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + CH_4 \rightarrow H_2O + CH_3$</td>
<td>$2.6 \times 10^{-17} T^{1.43} \exp(-1400/T)$</td>
<td>250-2500</td>
<td>± 0.07 at 250 K rising to ± 0.15 at 1200 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + CHO \rightarrow H_2O + CO$</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + HCHO \rightarrow H_2O + CHO$</td>
<td>$5.7 \times 10^{-18} T^{1.18} \exp(225/T)$</td>
<td>300-3000</td>
<td>± 0.1 at 300 K rising to ± 0.7 at 3000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + CN \rightarrow O + HCN$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>1500-3000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow NCO + H$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + HCN \rightarrow H_2O + CN$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-5400/T)$</td>
<td>1500-2500</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow HOCN + H$</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + CH_2OOH \rightarrow H_2O + CH_30$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{-12} \exp(130/T)$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 300 K rising to ± 0.4 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow H_2O + CH_3OH$</td>
<td>$1.8 \times 10^{-12} \exp(220/T)$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + C_2H_2 \rightarrow H_2O + C_2H_4$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-6500/T)$</td>
<td>1000-2000</td>
<td>± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow H + CH_2CO$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + C_2H_4 \rightarrow H_2O + C_2H_3$</td>
<td>$3.4 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-2990/T)$</td>
<td>650-1500</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH + C_2H_6 \rightarrow H_2O + C_2H_5$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{-17} T^{2.5} \exp(-435/T)$</td>
<td>250-2000</td>
<td>± 0.07 at 250 K rising to ± 0.15 at 2000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$T$/K</td>
<td>Error limits ($\Delta$ log $k$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + CH$_2$CO $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$OH + CO $\rightarrow$ H$_2$CO + HCO</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>$\pm 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + CH$_3$CHO $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + CH$_2$CO $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + CH$_3$CHO</td>
<td>$3.9 \times 10^{-14} \exp(560/T)$</td>
<td>250-1200</td>
<td>$\pm 0.1$ at 250 K rising to $\pm 0.3$ at 1200 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_2$H$_5$OOH $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + C$_2$H$_5$OO</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^{-12} \exp(190/T)$</td>
<td>250-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ at 250 K rising to $\pm 0.7$ at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_2$H$_5$ $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + C$_2$H$_4$ $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$CHCH$_2$OH $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$CHCHO</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_6$H$_6$OH $\rightarrow$ C$_6$H$_5$(OH)$_2$ $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + C$_6$H$_5$OH $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + C$_6$H$_4$OH</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>1000-1150</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_6$H$_5$CH$_3$ $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + C$_6$H$_5$CH$_2$ $\rightarrow$ C$_6$H$_5$CH$_2$OH</td>
<td>$8.6 \times 10^{-15} T \exp(-440/T)$</td>
<td>400-1200</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$ at 400 K reducing to $\pm 0.3$ at 1200 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_6$H$_5$CHO $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + C$_6$H$_5$CO $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + C$_6$H$_5$CHO</td>
<td>$1.3 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>298-1500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ at 298 K rising to $\pm 0.5$ at 1500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + p-C$_6$H$_4$(CH$_3$)$_2$ $\rightarrow$ C$_6$H$_5$CH$_2$CH$_3$ + H$_2$O $\rightarrow$ p-C$_6$H$_4$(CH$_3$)$_2$OH</td>
<td>$6.4 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1440/T)$</td>
<td>500-960</td>
<td>$\pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_6$H$_5$C$_6$H$_6$ $\rightarrow$ HOCC$_6$H$_2$C$_6$H$_5$ $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + C$_6$H$_6$C$_6$H$_5$ $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O + C$_6$H$_6$C$_6$H$_5$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H$_2$O Reactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta$ log $k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$O + M $\rightarrow$ H + OH + M</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HO$_2$ Radical Reactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta$ log $k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HO$_2$ + HO$_2$ $\rightarrow$ H$_3$O$_2$ + O$_2$</td>
<td>$7.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-6030/T)$ + $2.2 \times 10^{-12} \exp(820/T)$</td>
<td>550-1250</td>
<td>$\pm 0.15$ between 550-800 K rising to $+ 0.4$ at 1250 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO$_2$ + NH$_2$ $\rightarrow$ NH$_3$ + O$_2$ $\rightarrow$ HNO + H$_2$O</td>
<td>$2.6 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>$\pm 0.4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO$_2$ + CH$_3$ $\rightarrow$ OH + CH$_2$O $\rightarrow$ O$_2$ + CH$_4$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>$\pm 0.7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO$_2$ + CH$_4$ $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O$_2$ + CH$_3$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-12440/T)$</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$ at 600 K rising to $\pm 0.3$ at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO$_2$ + HCHO $\rightarrow$ H$_2$O$_2$ + CHO</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-6580/T)$</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

Table 1. Bimolecular Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta$ log $k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{HO}_3 + \text{CH}_2\text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{OOH} + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$4.1 \times 10^{-13}$ exp(790/T)</td>
<td>298-700</td>
<td>$\pm 0.1$ at 298 K rising to $\pm 0.3$ at 700 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow \text{HCHO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{O}_2$</td>
<td>$k/k = 1.0 \pm 0.1$ over whole range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{HO}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{O}$</td>
<td>$3.7 \times 10^{-12}$ exp(-8650/T)</td>
<td>600-900</td>
<td>$\pm 0.15$ at 600 K rising to $\pm 0.25$ at 900 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{HO}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_5$</td>
<td>$2.2 \times 10^{-11}$ exp(-10300/T)</td>
<td>500-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$ at 500 K rising to $\pm 0.3$ at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{HO}_2 + \text{CH}_2\text{CHO} \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{CH}_2\text{CO}$</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{-12}$ exp(-6000/T)</td>
<td>900-1200</td>
<td>$\pm 0.7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{products}$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>500-900</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{HO}_3 + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3$</td>
<td>$6.6 \times 10^{-12}$ exp(-790/T)</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ at 750 K rising to $\pm 0.5$ at 600 K and 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3$</td>
<td>$9.1 \times 10^{-13}$ exp(-14500/T)</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{HO}_3 + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_2\text{H} \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_2\text{H}_2$</td>
<td>$4.4 \times 10^{-13}$ exp(-5680/T)</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$ at 750 K rising to $\pm 0.5$ at 600 K and 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_2\text{H}_2$</td>
<td>$5.3 \times 10^{-13}$ exp(-9760/T)</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_2\text{H}_3$</td>
<td>$9 \times 10^{-12}$ exp(-14500/T)</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>$\pm 1.0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ Reactions

$\text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{M} \rightarrow 2\text{OH} + \text{M}$ See Table 2

$\text{N}$ Atom Reactions

$\text{N} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{O}$ | $1.5 \times 10^{-14}$ exp(-3270/T) | 298-5000 | $\pm 0.12$ over range 300–1000 K rising to $\pm 0.8$ over range 1000–5000 K |
| $\text{N} + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{H}$ | $4.7 \times 10^{-11}$ | 300-2500 | $\pm 0.1$ at 300 K rising to $\pm 0.3$ at 2500 K |
| $\text{N} + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{O}$ | $7.1 \times 10^{-11}$ exp(-790/T) | 1400-4000 | $\pm 0.2$ |
| $\text{N} + \text{CN} \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{C}$ | $3 \times 10^{-10}$ | 300-2500 | $\pm 1.0$ |
| $\text{N} + \text{NCO} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{CN}$ | No recommendation | | |
| $\rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{CO}$ | $3.3 \times 10^{-11}$ | 1700 | $\pm 0.5$ |

$\text{NH}$ Radical Reactions

$\text{NH} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{OH}$ | $(k_1 + k_2) = 1.3 \times 10^{-15}$ exp(-770/T) | 270-550 | $\pm 0.25$ |
| $\rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{H}$ | $6.5 \times 10^{-11}$ exp(-9000/T) | 2200-3500 | $\pm 0.5$ |

$\text{NH} + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{N}_2\text{O} + \text{H}$ | $5.0 \times 10^{-11}$ | 270-380 | $\pm 0.2$ |
| $\rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{N} + \text{O}$ | $2.8 \times 10^{-10}$ exp(-6400/T) | 2220-3350 | $\pm 0.5$ |

$\text{NH}_2$ Radical Reactions

$\text{NH}_2 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{products}$ | $<3 \times 10^{-18}$ | 298 |

$\text{NH}_2 + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$ | $1.8 \times 10^{-12}$ exp(650/T) | 220-2000 | $\pm 0.5$ |
<p>| $\rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{H} + \text{OH}$ | $(k_2 + k_3)/k = 0.12$ at 298 K |
| $\rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{OH}$ | | |
| $\rightarrow \text{N}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2$ | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3\ \text{molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/\text{K} )</th>
<th>Error limits (( \Delta \log k ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NH(_3)</strong> Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{NH}_3 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{NH}_3 + \text{H} ) ( \rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{H}_2 )</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C Atom Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{C} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{CN} + \text{N} )</td>
<td>( 8.7 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-22600/T) )</td>
<td>2000-5000</td>
<td>( \pm 0.2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{C} + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{CN} + \text{O} ) ( \rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{N} )</td>
<td>( 2.5 \times 10^{-11} ) ( 8.0 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>300 ( 1500-4050 )</td>
<td>( \pm 0.3 ) ( \pm 0.3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_1/k_2 = 0.6 \pm 0.25; k_{i/k} = 0.4 \pm 0.25 ) over range 1500-4050 K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(^1\text{C}_2) and (^2\text{C}_2) Radical Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CH Radical Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CHO} + \text{O} ) ( \rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{OH} )</td>
<td>( 5.5 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>( \pm 0.3 ) at 300 K rising to ( \pm 0.5 ) at 2000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_2 + \text{H} ) ( \rightarrow \text{CH}_3 )</td>
<td>( 2.4 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-1760/T) )</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>( \pm 0.3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 9.5 \times 10^{-17} \exp(380/T) )</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{N} ) ( \rightarrow \text{CHN}_2 )</td>
<td>( 2.6 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-9030/T) )</td>
<td>2000-4000</td>
<td>( \pm 0.3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{NH} ) ( \rightarrow \text{CN} + \text{OH} ) ( \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{O} )</td>
<td>( 2.0 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>300-4000</td>
<td>( \pm 0.25 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{CO} \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 4.6 \times 10^{-13} \exp(860/T) )</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{CO}_2 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 5.7 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-345/T) )</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{CH}_2 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 5.0 \times 10^{-13} \exp(200/T) )</td>
<td>200-700</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 3.5 \times 10^{-10} \exp(61/T) )</td>
<td>200-700</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 2.2 \times 10^{-10} \exp(173/T) )</td>
<td>200-700</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 1.8 \times 10^{-10} \exp(132/T) )</td>
<td>200-700</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{C}_3\text{H}_6 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 1.9 \times 10^{-10} \exp(240/T) )</td>
<td>300-700</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{n-C}_3\text{H}_10 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 4.4 \times 10^{-10} \exp(28/T) )</td>
<td>250-700</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{i-C}_3\text{H}_10 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 2.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(240/T) )</td>
<td>300-700</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{neo-C}_3\text{H}_12 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 1.6 \times 10^{-10} \exp(340/T) )</td>
<td>300-700</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{CH}_2\text{C}_2\text{H}_3 \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{CH} + \text{CH}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{products} )</td>
<td>( 1.6 \times 10^{-10} \exp(260/T) )</td>
<td>300-700</td>
<td>( \pm 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1. Bimolecular Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta \log k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

$^3$CH$_3$ Radical Reactions

$^3$CH$_3$ + $^3$CH$_3$ → C$_2$H$_4$ + H$_2$

$^3$CH + CH$_2$ → C$_2$H$_4$ + H

$^3$CH$_2$ + C$_2$H$_2$ → C$_4$H$_4$

$^1$CH$_3$ Radical Reactions

$^1$CH$_3$ + Ar → $^1$CH$_3$ + Ar

$^1$CH$_3$ + NO → products

$^1$CH$_3$ + N$_2$ → $^1$CH$_2$ + N$_2$

$^1$CH$_3$ + CH$_4$ → $^1$CH$_2$ + CH$_4$

$^1$CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_2$ → $^1$CH$_2$ + C$_2$H$_2$

$^1$CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_4$ → $^1$CH$_2$ + C$_2$H$_2$

$^1$CH$_3$ + C$_5$H$_5$ → $^1$CH$_2$ + C$_5$H$_5$

$^1$CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_4$ → $^1$CH$_2$ + C$_2$H$_4$

$^1$CH$_3$ + H$_2$ → CH$_3$ + H

$^1$CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_2$ → CH$_3$CCH$_2$

$^1$CH$_3$ + CH$_3$ → CH$_3$ + H

$^1$CH$_3$ + H$_2$ → CH$_3$ + H

$^1$CH$_3$ + CH$_3$ → C$_2$H$_4$ + H

$^1$CH$_3$ + H$_2$ → CH$_4$ + H

$^1$CH$_3$ + CH$_3$ → C$_2$H$_4$ + H

$^1$CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_2$ → C$_2$H$_4$ + H

CH$_3$ Radical Reactions

CH$_3$ + M → CH$_3$ + H + M

CH$_3$ + O$_2$ → CH$_3$O + O

CH$_3$ + O$_2$ → HCHO + OH

CH$_3$ + H$_2$ → CH$_4$ + H

EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3\ \text{molecule}^{-1}\ \text{s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/\text{K})</th>
<th>Error limits ((\Delta \log k))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CH}_3 + \text{CO} + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{CO} + \text{M})</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_2 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{H})</td>
<td>(5 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-6800/T))</td>
<td>1300–2500</td>
<td>(\pm 0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{H}_2)</td>
<td>No recommendation (see data sheets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_6)</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CH}_3 + \text{HCHO} \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{HCO})</td>
<td>(1.3 \times 10^{-21} T^{0.1} \exp(-990/T))</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>(\pm 0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CH}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{M})</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{C}_2\text{H})</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CH}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_3)</td>
<td>(6.9 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-5600/T))</td>
<td>400–3000</td>
<td>(\pm 0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rightarrow \text{n-C}_3\text{H}_7)</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CH}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4)</td>
<td>(1.9 \times 10^{-12})</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>(\pm 0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rightarrow \text{C}_3\text{H}_6)</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CH}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_5)</td>
<td>(2.5 \times 10^{-10} T^{0.5} \exp(-3043/T))</td>
<td>300–1500</td>
<td>(\pm 0.1) at 300 K rising to (\pm 0.2) at 1500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_2\text{CHO} \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{CH}_2\text{CO})</td>
<td>(3.3 \times 10^{-10} T^{0.8} \exp(-1240/T))</td>
<td>300–1250</td>
<td>(\pm 0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{CH}_2\text{CHO})</td>
<td>No recommendation (see data sheets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{CH}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_5 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{CCH}_3)</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{CH}_2\text{CCH}_2)</td>
<td>(3.5 \times 10^{-13})</td>
<td>500–1200</td>
<td>(\pm 0.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**\(\text{CH}_4\) Reactions**

\(\text{CH}_4 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3 + \text{H} + \text{M}\) | See Table 2 |

**\(\text{CHO} \) Radical Reactions**

\(\text{CHO} + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{CO} + \text{Ar}\) | See Table 2 |

\(\text{CHO} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{HO}_2\) | \(5.0 \times 10^{-12}\) | 300–2500 | \(\pm 0.3\) |

\(\rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{CO}_2\) | | | |

\(\rightarrow \text{HCO}_2\) | | | |

\(\text{CHO} + \text{CHO} \rightarrow \text{HCHO} + \text{CO}\) | \(5.0 \times 10^{-11}\) | 300 | \(\pm 0.3\) |

**\(\text{HCHO} \) Reactions**

\(\text{HCHO} + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{CHO} + \text{M}\) | \(\rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CO} + \text{M}\) | See Table 2 |

**\(\text{CH}_3\text{OH} \) Reactions**

\(\text{CH}_3\text{OH} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{HO}_2\) | \(2.6 \times 10^{-9} T^{1.5}\) | 300–1200 | \(\pm 0.1\) at 300 K rising to \(\pm 0.3\) at 1200 K |

| \(1.2 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-1800/T)\) | | | |

**\(\text{CH}_3\text{O} \) Radical Reactions**

\(\text{CH}_3\text{O} + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{HCHO} + \text{H} + \text{M}\) | See Table 2 |

\(\text{CH}_3\text{O} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{HCHO} + \text{HO}_2\) | \(3.6 \times 10^{-14} \exp(-880/T)\) | 300–1000 | \(\pm 0.1\) at 500 K rising to \(\pm 0.3\) at 300 K and 1000 K |
### Table 1. Bimolecular Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta \log k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CH$_3$O$_2$ Radical Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$O$_2$ + CH$_3$O$_2$ → CH$_3$O + CH$_3$O + O$_2$</td>
<td>9.1 × 10$^{-14}$ exp(420/T)</td>
<td>298-700</td>
<td>± 0.1 at 298 K increasing to ± 0.3 at 700 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$O + CH$_3$H$_2$ → CH$_3$O + CH$_3$CH$_2$O</td>
<td>2.0 × 10$^{-11}$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CH$_3$OH Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$OH + Ar → CH$_3$ + OH + Ar</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$OH + H → CH$_3$O + H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$OH + H$_2$O + Ar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CN Radical Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN + O$_2$ → NCO + O</td>
<td>1.2 × 10$^{-11}$ exp(210/T)</td>
<td>290-4500</td>
<td>± 0.15 over the range 290-4500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN + H$_2$ → HCN + H</td>
<td>3.2 × 10$^{-20}$ $T^{2.48}$ exp($-820/T$)</td>
<td>200-3500</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 200 K rising to ± 0.5 at 3500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN + H$_2$O → HCN + OH</td>
<td>1.3 × 10$^{-11}$ exp($-3750/T$)</td>
<td>500-3000</td>
<td>± 0.3 at 500 K rising to ± 0.5 at 3000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN + CH$_4$ → HCN + CH$_3$</td>
<td>1.5 × 10$^{-19}$ $T^{2.64}$ exp(150/T)</td>
<td>290-1500</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCO Radical Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCO + M → N + CO + M</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCO + NO → N$_2$O + CO</td>
<td>2.3 × 10$^{-6}$ $T^{-1.31}$ exp($-380/T$)</td>
<td>290-3000</td>
<td>± 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C$_3$H Radical Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H + O$_2$ → CO$_2$ + CH</td>
<td>3.0 × 10$^{-11}$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H + H$_2$ → C$_2$H$_2$ + H</td>
<td>1.8 × 10$^{-11}$ exp($-1090/T$)</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>± 0.3 at 300 K rising to ± 0.5 at 2500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H + C$_2$H$_2$ → C$_6$H$_4$ + H</td>
<td>1.5 × 10$^{-10}$</td>
<td>300-2700</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H + CH$_4$ → products</td>
<td>3.0 × 10$^{-12}$</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H + C$_2$H$_6$ → products</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$T$/K</td>
<td>Error limits (Δ log $k$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_3$ Radical Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_2 + M \rightarrow C_2H_4 + H + M$</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4 + O_2 \rightarrow HO_2 + C_2H_2$</td>
<td>$9.0 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>± 0.3 over range 300–600 K; ± 0.5 over range 600–2000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow H_2CO + CHO$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow C_2H_2O + O$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow C_3H_5O_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4$ Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4 + M \rightarrow C_2H_2 + H_2 + M$</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow C_2H_3 + H + M$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_3$ Radical Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_5 + M \rightarrow C_2H_4 + H + M$</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_2 + O_2 \rightarrow C_2H_4 + HO_2$</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{-12} \exp(100/T)$</td>
<td>600–1200</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4 + H_2 \rightarrow C_2H_4 + H$</td>
<td>$5.1 \times 10^{-24} \exp(-4750/T)$</td>
<td>700–1200</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 700 K rising to ± 0.6 at 1200 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4 + C_2H_2 \rightarrow C_2H_5CHCH$</td>
<td>$5.6 \times 10^{-14} \exp(-3520/T)$</td>
<td>300–600</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4 + C_2H_2 \rightarrow \kappa-C_6H_6$</td>
<td>$1.8 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-3670/T)$</td>
<td>300–600</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4 + C_2H_2 \rightarrow \kappa-C_6H_{10}$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow C_2H_5 + C_2H_4$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4 + C_2HCHO \rightarrow C_2H_2 + C_2H_2CO$</td>
<td>$2.9 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-3660/T)$</td>
<td>300–700</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4 + C_2HCHO \rightarrow C_2H_4 + C_2H_2CO$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow C_2H_2CH_3 + CH_2CH_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow C_2H_4 + C_2H_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_4$ Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_4 + M \rightarrow CH_2 + CH_3 + M$</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$\text{HCO}$ Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHCO + O$_2$ → CO$_2$ + HCO</td>
<td>$2.7 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-430/T)$</td>
<td>300–550</td>
<td>± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow 2CO + OH$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow C_2O + HO_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow CH_2CO$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C\text{H}_2\text{CHO}$ Radical Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$\text{CHO}$ + O$_2$ → HO$_2$ + CH$_2$CO</td>
<td>$k_1 = 2.6 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>250–500</td>
<td>± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow HCHO + CO + OH$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow O_2CH_2CHO$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$\text{CHO}$ Radical Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$\text{CHO}$ + O$_2$ + M → CH$_3$CO$_3$ + M</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_2$CHO Reactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_2$CHO + M → CH$_3$ + HCO + M</td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1. Bimolecular Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits (Δ log $k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$C_2H_5O$ Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_5O + M \rightarrow HCHO + CH_3 + M$</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_5O + O_2 \rightarrow CH_3CHO + HO_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-830/T)$</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$C_2H_5OOH$ Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_5OOH + M \rightarrow C_2H_5O + OH + M$</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$C_3H_7$ Radical Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + M \rightarrow CH_3CH_2 + H + M$</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + O_2 \rightarrow CH_3CH_2 + HO_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{-15} \exp(-11400/T)$</td>
<td>600–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_6H_12 + H$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.6 \times 10^{-15} \exp(-9450/T)$</td>
<td>600–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + H_2 \rightarrow C_3H_8 + H$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.8 \times 10^{-14} T^{1.4} \exp(-9550/T)$</td>
<td>300–1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + CH_3 \rightarrow C_3H_8 + CH_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.6 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.4} \exp(-11670/T)$</td>
<td>300–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_6H_12 + C_3H_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.6 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.4} \exp(-13120/T)$</td>
<td>600–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_6H_12 + C_3H_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.4} \exp(-9620/T)$</td>
<td>600–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_6H_12 + C_3H_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.9 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.3} \exp(-9990/T)$</td>
<td>300–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_3H_8 + C_3H_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.2} \exp(-132/T)$</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_3H_8 + C_3H_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.9 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.2} \exp(-9990/T)$</td>
<td>300–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_3H_8 + C_3H_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.3 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.3} \exp(-8660/T)$</td>
<td>300–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + 2-C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_6H_12 + 2-C_3H_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.6 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.4} \exp(-8180/T)$</td>
<td>600–1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + 2-C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_6H_12 + 2-C_3H_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.3 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.4} \exp(-12160/T)$</td>
<td>600–1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + i-C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_6H_12 + (CH_2)CCH_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + i-C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_6H_12 + (CH_2)CCH_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.9 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.3} \exp(-9990/T)$</td>
<td>300–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + i-C_3H_7 \rightarrow C_6H_12 + (CH_2)CCH_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.7 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.3} \exp(-7800/T)$</td>
<td>300–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + HCHO \rightarrow C_3H_8 + HCO$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{-16} T^{1.8} \exp(-9155/T)$</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_3H_7 + C_3H_8CHCH \rightarrow C_3H_8 + C_3H_8CHCH$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.3 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.3} \exp(-8660/T)$</td>
<td>600–1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$i-C_3H_7$ Radical Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i-C_3H_7 + M \rightarrow C_3H_8 + H + M$</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Table 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i-C_3H_7 + O_2 \rightarrow C_3H_8 + HO_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.3 \times 10^{-16} \exp(+1290/T)$</td>
<td>600–800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i-C_3H_7 + H_2 \rightarrow C_3H_8 + H$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.3 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.4} \exp(-4360/T)$</td>
<td>300–1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i-C_3H_7 + C_3H_7 \rightarrow (CH_2)CHCHCH$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.3 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.3} \exp(-3470/T)$</td>
<td>300–600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i-C_3H_7 + C_3H_7 \rightarrow (CH_2)CHCHCH$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.5 \times 10^{-12} T^{1.3} \exp(-3470/T)$</td>
<td>300–600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$T$/K</td>
<td>Error limits (Δ log k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i$-C$_3$H$_7 + i$-C$_3$H$<em>7 \rightarrow C_6$H$</em>{14}$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.1 at 300 K rising to ± 0.3 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow C_3$H$_8 + C_2$H$_6$</td>
<td>4.2 × 10$^{-12}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.1 at 300 K rising to ± 0.5 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i$-C$_3$H$_7 + i$-C$_3$H$<em>7$CHO $\rightarrow C_6$H$</em>{14}$</td>
<td>See Table 3</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow C_3$H$_8 + (CH_3)_2$CHO</td>
<td>6.6 × 10$^{-14}$ exp($-3170/T$)</td>
<td>300-650</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow C_3$H$_8 + CH_2CH(CH_3)CHO$</td>
<td>5.3 × 10$^{-14}$ exp($-4780/T$)</td>
<td>500-650</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C$_2$H$_4$ Reactions

$$C_2$$H$_4 + M \rightarrow CH_3 + C_2$$H$_2$ + M$$ See Table 2

### $t$-C$_4$H$_9$ Radical Reactions

$t$-C$_4$H$_9 + M \rightarrow t$-C$_4$H$_9 + H + M$ See Table 2

$t$-C$_4$H$_9 + O_2 \rightarrow t$-C$_4$H$_9$ + HO$_2$ | 5 × 10$^{-14}$ exp($+2115/T$) | 600-800 | ± 0.5 |

$t$-C$_4$H$_9 + H \rightarrow t$-C$_4$H$_9$ + H | 3.1 × 10$^{-36}$ T$^{-0.14}$ exp($-4510/T$) | 300-1200 | ± 0.5 |

$t$-C$_4$H$_9 + C_2$H$_2 \rightarrow (CH_3)_2$CCHCH | 1.2 × 10$^{-12}$ exp($-4320/T$) | 300-600 | ± 0.5 |

$t$-C$_4$H$_9 + C_2$H$_4 \rightarrow (CH_3)_2$CCH$_2$CH$_2$ | 3.3 × 10$^{-14}$ exp($-4020/T$) | 300-650 | ± 0.5 |

$t$-C$_4$H$_9 + t$-C$_4$H$_9 \rightarrow C_7$H$_{18}$ See Table 3 |
| $\rightarrow i$-C$_4$H$_{10} + i$-C$_4$H$_6$ | 1.2 × 10$^{-7}$ T$^{-1.79}$ | 300-1000 | ± 0.15 at 300 K rising to ± 0.5 at 1000 K |

$t$-C$_4$H$_9 + t$-C$_4$H$_9$CHO $\rightarrow i$-C$_4$H$_{10}$ + t-C$_4$H$_4$CO | 1.0 × 10$^{-14}$ exp($-3200/T$) | 300-700 | ± 0.5 |
| $\rightarrow i$-C$_4$H$_{10} + CH_2C(CH_3)CHO$ | 3.9 × 10$^{-14}$ exp($-5540/T$) | 500-700 | ± 0.5 |

### C$_6$H$_5$ Radical Reactions

$$C_6$$H$_5 + M \rightarrow C_6$$H$_5$ + C$_2$H$_3$ + M$$ See Table 2

### C$_7$H$_7$ Radical Reactions

$$C_7$$H$_7$ $\rightarrow$ linear-C$_7$H$_7$ + M$$ See Table 2

### C$_6$H$_6$ Reactions

$$C_6$$H$_6$ Reactions

$C_6$H$_6$ + M → $C_6$H$_5$ + C$_2$H$_3$ + M $$ See Table 2

$\rightarrow C_6$H$_5 + C_2$H$_3$ + M $$ See Table 2

$\rightarrow C_7$H$_7$ + M $$ See Table 2

### C$_6$H$_7$CHO Radical Reactions

$C_6$H$_7$CHO $\rightarrow C_6$H$_5$ + 2C$_2$H$_3$ + M $$ See Table 2

$\rightarrow C_6$H$_5 + C_2$H$_3$ + M $$ See Table 2

$\rightarrow C_7$H$_7$ + M $$ See Table 2

### C$_6$H$_7$CH$_3$ Reactions

$C_6$H$_7$CH$_3$ + M → $C_6$H$_7$CH$_2$ + H + M $$ See Table 2

$\rightarrow C_6$H$_5 + CH_3 + M $$ See Table 2
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

TABLE 1. Bimolecular Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits (Δ log $k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

$p$-C$_6$H$_4$(CH$_3$)$_2$ Reactions

$p$-C$_6$H$_4$(CH$_3$)$_2$ + M → C$_6$H$_6$CH$_2$CH$_3$ + H + M

See Table 2

C$_7$H$_8$C$_3$H$_2$ Reactions

C$_7$H$_8$C$_3$H$_2$ + M → C$_6$H$_6$CH$_2$ + CH$_4$ + M

→ C$_6$H$_6$ + C$_2$H$_4$ + M

→ C$_7$H$_6$CH$_2$ + H$_2$ + M

→ C$_7$H$_6$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M

→ C$_7$H$_6$CHCH$_3$ + H + M

See Table 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k_0 / s^{-1}$</th>
<th>$k_0 / cm^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta \log k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_2 + Ar \rightarrow 2H + Ar$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 3.7 \times 10^{-18} \exp(-48350/T)$</td>
<td>$2500-8000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2 + H_2 \rightarrow 2H + H_2$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 1.5 \times 10^{-9} \exp(-48350/T)$</td>
<td>$2500-8000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2O + N_2 \rightarrow H + OH + N_2$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 0.8 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-52920/T)$</td>
<td>$2000-6000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2O_2 + M \rightarrow 2OH + M$</td>
<td>$k_0(Ar) = 3 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-21600/T)$</td>
<td>$1000-1500$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0(N_2) = 2 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-22900/T)$</td>
<td>$700-1500$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0 = 3 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-24400/T)$</td>
<td>$1000-1500$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_i(M) = 0.5$</td>
<td>$700-1500$</td>
<td>$\Delta F_i = \pm 0.1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$NH_3 + Ar \rightarrow NH_2 + H + Ar$</td>
<td>$k_0(1) = 7.4 \times 10^{-9} \exp(-41560/T)$</td>
<td>$2000-3000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0(1) = 8.3 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-55170/T)$</td>
<td>$2000-3000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.4$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_i = 0.58 \exp(-7/4581) + 0.42 \exp(-7/102)$</td>
<td>$2000-3000$</td>
<td>$\Delta F_i = \pm 0.1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CH_2 + M \rightarrow CH_2 + H + M$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 1.7 \times 10^{-9} \exp(-45600/T)$</td>
<td>$1500-3000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CH_3 + M \rightarrow CH_3 + H + M$</td>
<td>$k_0(Ar) = 7.5 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-45700/T)$</td>
<td>$1000-1700$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0(Ar) = 7.8 \times 10^{-3} T^{-1.4} \exp(-59200/T)$</td>
<td>$1700-5000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0(CH_3) = 1.4 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-45700/T)$</td>
<td>$1000-2000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0 = 2.4 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-52800/T)$</td>
<td>$1000-3000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_i(At) = \exp(-7/1350) + \exp(-7/102) + 0.69 \exp(-7/2210)$</td>
<td>$1000-2000$</td>
<td>$\Delta F_i = \pm 0.1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_i(CH_4) = 0.31 \exp(-7/90) + 0.69 \exp(-7/2210)$</td>
<td>$1000-2000$</td>
<td>$\Delta F_i = \pm 0.1$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$HCO + Ar \rightarrow H + CO + Ar$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 2.6 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-7930/T)$</td>
<td>$600-2500$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$HCHO + M \rightarrow H + CHO + M$</td>
<td>$k_0(1) = 3.7 \times 10^{-12} T^{-1.5} \exp(-48660/T)$</td>
<td>$1700-3200$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0(2) + 0.7 = 0.4$</td>
<td>$2000-3000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CH_2O + M \rightarrow HCHO + H + M$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 9.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-6790/T)$</td>
<td>$300-1700$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CH_2OH + Ar \rightarrow CH_2 + OH + Ar$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 1.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-33080/T)$</td>
<td>$1000-2000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0 = 1.7 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-45740/T)$</td>
<td>$1000-2000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_i = 0.18 \exp(-7/200) + 0.82 \exp(-7/1438)$</td>
<td>$1000-2000$</td>
<td>$\Delta F_i = \pm 0.1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CH_2OH + Ar \rightarrow CH_2 + OH + Ar$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 6 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-21300/T)$</td>
<td>$500-800$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.2$ at 600 K rising to $\pm 0.5$ at 300 and 800 K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$NCO + Ar \rightarrow N + CO + Ar$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 1.7 \times 10^{-9} \exp(-23500/T)$</td>
<td>$1450-2600$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.4$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_4 + M \rightarrow C_2H_2 + H + M$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 6.9 \times 10^{-7} T^{-1.5} \exp(-22900/T)$</td>
<td>$500-2500$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0 = 2 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-20000/T)$</td>
<td>$500-2500$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_i = 0.35$</td>
<td>$500-2500$</td>
<td>$\Delta F_i = \pm 0.1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_2 + M \rightarrow C_2H_2 + H_2 + M$</td>
<td>$k_0(Ar,Kr) = 5.8 \times 10^{-5} \exp(-36000/T)$</td>
<td>$1500-3200$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0(Ar) = 4.3 \times 10^{-5} \exp(-48600/T)$</td>
<td>$1500-3200$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_2 + C_2H_4 \rightarrow C_2H_2 + H + C_2H_4$</td>
<td>$k_0 = 1.7 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-16800/T)$</td>
<td>$700-900$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0 = 3.2 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-20000/T)$</td>
<td>$700-1100$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_i = 0.25 \exp(-7/97) + 0.75 \exp(-7/1379)$</td>
<td>$700-1100$</td>
<td>$\Delta F_i = \pm 0.1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2H_2 + M \rightarrow 2CH_2 + M$</td>
<td>$k_0(1) = 1.1 \times 10^{-13} T^{-1.5} \exp(-47090/T)$</td>
<td>$300-2000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0(N_2) = 1.1 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-47090/T)$</td>
<td>$300-2000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0(CH_4) = 4.5 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-49300/T)$</td>
<td>$800-1000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0 = 1.8 \times 10^{-6} T^{-1.4} \exp(-45700/T)$</td>
<td>$300-2000$</td>
<td>$\pm 0.3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_i(At,N_2) = 0.38 \exp(-7/73) + 0.62 \exp(-7/1180)$</td>
<td>$300-2000$</td>
<td>$\Delta F_i = \pm 0.1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_i(CH_2) = 0.54 \exp(-7/1250)$</td>
<td>$800-1000$</td>
<td>$\Delta F_i = \pm 0.1$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2. Decomposition Reactions — Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k_0/\text{cm}^2\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>Error limits ($\Delta \log k$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH$_2$O + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$ + CO + M</td>
<td>$k_0$(He) = $1.0 \times 10^{-1}$ exp($-7080/T$)</td>
<td>400-500</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_0$(Ar) = $7.0 \times 10^{-18}$</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_n = 2.8 \times 10^{19}$ exp($-8630/T$)</td>
<td>500-500</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_c$(He) = 0.5</td>
<td>400-500</td>
<td>$\Delta F_c = \pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_2$CHO + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$ + CHO + M</td>
<td>$k_0(1\text{ atm.}) = 7 \times 10^{15}$ exp($-41100/T$)</td>
<td>750-1200</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_2$O + M $\rightarrow$ HCHO + CH$_3$ + M</td>
<td>$k_n = 8 \times 10^{12}$ exp($-10830/T$)</td>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>$\pm$ 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[estimate]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_2$OH + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$O + OH + M</td>
<td>$k_n = 4 \times 10^{12}$ exp($-21600/T$)</td>
<td>400-800</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[estimate]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$CH$_2$ + H + M</td>
<td>$k_n = 1.5 \times 10^{13}$ $T^{0.16}$ exp($-30050/T$)</td>
<td>800-1500</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H + He $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$ + H + He</td>
<td>$k_0 = 3.6 \times 10^{7}$ exp($-14200/T$)</td>
<td>750-830</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_n = 8.76 \times 10^{-8}$ $T^{0.26}$ exp($-17870/T$)</td>
<td>170-1000</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_c$(He) = 0.35</td>
<td>750-830</td>
<td>$\Delta F_c = \pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H + Ar $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$ + C$_2$H + Ar</td>
<td>$k_0 = 1.3 \times 10^{-5}$ exp($-32700/T$)</td>
<td>700-2000</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_n = 1.1 \times 10^{12}$ exp($-42470/T$)</td>
<td>700-2000</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_c = 0.24 \exp(-7/1946) + 0.76 \exp(-T/38)$</td>
<td>700-2000</td>
<td>$\Delta F_c = \pm 0.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H + M $\rightarrow$ i-C$_2$H + H + M</td>
<td>$k_n = 8.3 \times 10^{13}$ exp($-19200/T$)</td>
<td>300-800</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_2$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$ + C$_2$H + M</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ linear-C$_4$H$_4$ + M</td>
<td>$4.0 \times 10^{13}$ exp($-36700/T$)</td>
<td>1450-1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_4$H$_2$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_3$H$_4$ + H + M</td>
<td>$9.0 \times 10^{13}$ exp($-54060/T$)</td>
<td>1200-2500</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.4 at 1200 K reducing to $\pm$ 0.3 at 2500 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_3$H$_4$ + C$_2$H$_2$ + M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_2$O + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$ + CO + M</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{11}$ exp($-22100/T$)</td>
<td>1000-1580</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_2$CH$_2$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$ + 2C$_2$H + M</td>
<td>$5.1 \times 10^{13}$ exp($-36370/T$)</td>
<td>1350-1900</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.3 at 1350 K rising to $\pm$ 0.5 at 1900 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$ + C$_2$H$_2$ + M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$(BCH) + M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_2$CH + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$CH$_2$ + H + M</td>
<td>$3.1 \times 10^{13}$ exp($-44890/T$)</td>
<td>920-2200</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.3 at 920 K rising to $\pm$ 0.5 at 2200 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_3$H$_2$ + CH$_3$ + M</td>
<td>$k_n = 7.8 \times 10^{35}$exp($-59400/T$)</td>
<td>1500-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-C$_3$H$_2$(CH$_2$)$_2$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_3$H$_2$(CH$_2$)$_2$ + H + M</td>
<td>$4.0 \times 10^{13}$ exp($-42600/T$)</td>
<td>1400-1800</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_2$C$_2$H + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$CH$_2$ + CH$_3$ + M</td>
<td>$6.1 \times 10^{13}$ exp($-37800/T$)</td>
<td>770-1800</td>
<td>$\pm$ 0.1 at 770 K rising to $\pm$ 0.4 at 1800 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$ + C$_2$H$_4$ + M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_2$CH$_3$ + H + M</td>
<td>No recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Combination Reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>( k_0 \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/K )</th>
<th>Error limits (( \Delta \log k ))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{O}_2 + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{Ar} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 1.7 \times 10^{-16} T^{0.4} )</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{O}_2 + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{H}_2 )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 5.8 \times 10^{-16} T^{0.4} )</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{O}_2 + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{HO}_2 + \text{N}_2 )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 3.9 \times 10^{-16} T^{0.4} )</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{H} + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{Ar} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 1.8 \times 10^{-16} T^{1.5} )</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{H} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2 )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 2.7 \times 10^{-16} T^{0.4} )</td>
<td>100-5000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{OH} + \text{H}_2 \text{O} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 \text{O} + \text{H}_2 \text{O} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 3.9 \times 10^{-16} T^{1.0} )</td>
<td>300-3000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{OH} + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 \text{O} + \text{Ar} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 2.3 \times 10^{-16} T^{1.0} )</td>
<td>300-3000</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{OH} + \text{N}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 \text{O} + \text{N}_2 )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 6.1 \times 10^{-16} T^{1.0} )</td>
<td>300-3000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{CO} + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{HCO} + \text{Ar} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 5.3 \times 10^{-16} \exp(-370/T) )</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{CH}_3 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{M} )</td>
<td>( k_0 (\text{He}) = 1.8 \times 10^{-16} T^{1.4} )</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{CH}_3 + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{He} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 3.3 \times 10^{-16} \exp(-740/T) )</td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{He} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{He} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 0.44 )</td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{M} )</td>
<td>( \text{No recommendation} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{M} )</td>
<td>( (k^* + k_0) = 2.8 \times 10^{-30} )</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 300 K rising to ± 0.5 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{OH} + \text{OH} + \text{H}_2 \text{O} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 \text{O} + \text{HO}_2 \text{O} )</td>
<td>( k_0 (\text{N}_2) = 6.1 \times 10^{-16} T^{0.76} )</td>
<td>300-3000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{OH} + \text{H}_2 \text{O} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 \text{O} + \text{OH} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 4 \times 10^{-30} )</td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{OH} + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{HO} + \text{Ar} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{-16} \exp(-740/T) )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{Ar} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 3.3 \times 10^{-16} )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{M} )</td>
<td>( k_0 (\text{N}_2) = 6.1 \times 10^{-16} T^{0.76} )</td>
<td>250-1400</td>
<td>± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{OH} + \text{H}_2 \text{O} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 \text{O} + \text{OH} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 4 \times 10^{-30} )</td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{OH} + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{HO} + \text{Ar} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{-16} T^{0.76} )</td>
<td>200-1500</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{Ar} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{Ar} )</td>
<td>( k_0 = 3.3 \times 10^{-17} )</td>
<td>200-1500</td>
<td>± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>$k_p$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$T$/K</td>
<td>Error limits ($\Delta$ log $k$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + CH$_4$ + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$OH + M</td>
<td>$k_p$(He) = $2.3\times10^{-27}$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_p$(Ar) = $4.4\times10^{-9}$ T$^{-0.2}$</td>
<td>1000-2000</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_p = 1.0 \times 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{p}$(Ar) = 0.18 exp($-T/7200$) + 0.82 ($-T/1438$)</td>
<td>1000-2000</td>
<td>± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_2$H$_4$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_5$OH + M</td>
<td>See data sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$CH$_2$OH + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$CHO + 2H + M</td>
<td>$(k_1^2 + k_2) = 2.5 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_4$OH + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 3.8 \times 10^{-12}$ exp($-340/T$)</td>
<td>240-340</td>
<td>± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_2$H$_4$OH + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_5$(OH)$_2$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 2.8 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_2$H$_5$CH$_3$ + M $\rightarrow$ HO$_2$C$_2$H$_5$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 3.8 \times 10^{-12}$ exp($180/T$)</td>
<td>200-300</td>
<td>± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_4$H$_9$(CH$_3$)$_2$OH + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_5$(CH$_3$)$_2$OH + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 1.4 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + C$_4$H$_9$(CH$_3$)$_2$OH + M $\rightarrow$ HO$_2$C$_2$H$_5$ + M</td>
<td>7.5 $\times$ 10$^{-12}$ at $p = 1$ atm.</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_4$ + M</td>
<td>2.0 $\times$ 10$^{-11}$ exp($-3330/T$) at $p = \leq 10$ Torr.</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_4$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_4$ + H + M</td>
<td>5.3 $\times$ 10$^{-12}$ exp($-2660/T$)</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 300 K rising to ± 0.3 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_4$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_4$ + H + M</td>
<td>2.9 $\times$ 10$^{-10}$ independent of $p$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.3 at 300 K rising to ± 0.7 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_4$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_4$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_4$ + H + M</td>
<td>1.6 $\times$ 10$^{-10}$ independent of $p$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>± 0.2 at 300 K rising to ± 0.5 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$ + O$_2$ + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$O$_2$ + M</td>
<td>$k_p$(Ar) = 1.55 $\times$ 10$^{-21}$ T$^{-3.3}$</td>
<td>300-800</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_p$(N$_2$) = 1.6 $\times$ 10$^{-12}$ T$^{-0.3}$</td>
<td>300-800</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_a = 1.3 \times 10^{-13}$ T$^{-3.2}$</td>
<td>300-800</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{p}$(Ar) = 0.466 - 1.30 $\times 10^{-4}$ T</td>
<td>300-800</td>
<td>Δ$F_{p} = \pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$ + CO + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$CO + M</td>
<td>$k_p$(He) = 3.0 $\times$ 10$^{-15}$ exp($-1910/T$)</td>
<td>400-500</td>
<td>± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_p$(N$_2$) = 4.2 $\times$ 10$^{-36}$</td>
<td>300-350</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_a = 8.4 \times 10^{-12}$ exp($-3460/T$)</td>
<td>300-500</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{p}$(He) = 0.5</td>
<td>400-500</td>
<td>Δ$F_{p} = \pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{p}$(N$_2$) = 0.6</td>
<td>300-350</td>
<td>Δ$F_{p} = \pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$ + CH$_3$ + Ar $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_5$ + Ar</td>
<td>$k_a = 6.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_a = 3.5 \times 10^{-7}$ T$^{-0.9}$ exp($-1390/T$)</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{p} = 0.38$ exp($-T/773$) + 0.62 exp($-T/1180$)</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>Δ$F_{p} = \pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_5$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 1 \times 10^{-12}$ exp($-3900/T$)</td>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ n-C$_3$H$_7$ + M</td>
<td>3.5 $\times$ 10$^{-13}$ exp($-3700/T$)</td>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_5$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 5.6 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$_2$H$_5$CHCH$_3$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 1.7 \times 10^{-10}$ T$^{-0.2}$ exp($66/T$)</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$ + C$_2$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ n-C$_3$H$_7$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 1.9 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$ + C$_3$H$_5$ + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$CH$_2$CH$_2$CH$_2$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 3.3 \times 10^{-11}$ exp($66/T$)</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>$k_0$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$T$/K</td>
<td>Error limits ($\Delta \log k$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH$_3$CO + O$_2$ + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$CO + M</td>
<td>$2 \times 10^{-12}$ for $p = 1$–4 Torr.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_7$ + C$_3$H$_7$ + M → CH$_2$CHCH$_2$CH$_2$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 1.7 \times 10^{-11}$ exp(132/T)</td>
<td>300–600</td>
<td>± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k_d = 2.0 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>600–1000</td>
<td>± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_3$H$_7$ + 2-C$_3$H$_7$ + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$CHCH$_2$CH(CH$_3$)CHCH$_3$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 1.0 \times 10^{-13}$ exp($-9520/T$)</td>
<td>600–1200</td>
<td>± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H$_7$ + i-C$_3$H$_7$ + M $\rightarrow$ (CH$_3$)CHCH$_2$CH$_2$ + M</td>
<td>$k_a = 6.8 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>± 0.1 at 300 K rising to ± 0.3 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to ± 0.3 at 1000 K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$-C$_4$H$_9$ + $t$-C$_4$H$_9$ + M $\rightarrow$ C$<em>8$H$</em>{18}$</td>
<td>$k_a = 5.2 \times 10^{-8}$ T$^{-1.75}$</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>± 0.15 at 300 K rising to ± 0.3 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

5. Data Sheets

O + NO → O₂ + N

Thermodynamic Data

$$\Delta H_{298} = 133 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$$
$$\Delta S_{298} = -13.4 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$$
$$K_p = 7.6 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-15930/T)$$

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6.03 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-19900/T)$</td>
<td>1575-1665</td>
<td>Kaufman and Decker, 1959¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.0 \times 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>Wray and Teare, 1962²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.48 \times 10^{-14}$</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>Clark et al., 1969³</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.89 \times 10^{-17} \exp(-19450/T)$</td>
<td>2500-4100</td>
<td>Hanson et al., 1974⁴</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.89 \times 10^{-18} \exp(-19450/T)$</td>
<td>1750-2100</td>
<td>McCullough, 1977⁵</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2.8 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-19450/T)$</td>
<td>1000-3000</td>
<td>Baulch et al., 1973⁶</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.3 \times 10^{-18} \exp(-20850/T)$</td>
<td>1500-5000</td>
<td>Hanson and Salimian, 1984⁷</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.4 \times 10^{-15} \exp(-19250)$</td>
<td>1000-5000</td>
<td>Cohen, 1991⁸</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Static reactor study using [O₂]/[NO] mixtures in ratios from 0 to 40. Reaction progress monitored by UV absorption spectrometry of unreacted NO. Equilibrium of O atoms with O₂ was assumed.

(b) Shock tube study of NO/O₂/Ar mixtures, with monitoring of NO behind the shock by absorption at 127 nm. Data fitting was performed with a detailed kinetic mechanism, however, only data acquired in NO/O₂/Ar = 0.5%/0.25%/99.25% mixtures near 5000 K were sufficiently insensitive to other rate constants to derive k.

(c) Reflected shock study of N₂O decomposition using mass spectrometric detection of NO, O₂ and O. k derived from small changes in measured NO concentration.

(d) Shock tube study of N₂O/Ar or N₂O/Kr mixtures with [NO] decays monitored at 5.3 μm. Rate constant derived by fitting observed [NO] decay to a detailed kinetic model.

(e) Flow tube study with NO/Ar mixtures, decomposition of NO as a function of flow rate monitored by chemiluminescence. Detailed modelling of kinetics and flow used to derive k.

(f) Based primarily on data for reverse reaction.

(g) Based on data from Refs. 1–5.

Reliability

$$\Delta \log k = \pm 0.3.$$

Comments on Preferred Values

The experimental data available for this reaction are confined to temperatures above 1500 K. All of the studies are in good agreement. The data have been most recently reviewed by Hanson and Salimian⁷ and by Cohen⁸ who derive very similar expressions for k. We accept their analysis and recommend an expression for k very similar to Cohen’s.

References


Preferred Values

$$k = 1.14 \times 10^{-15} \exp(-19200/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$$
over range 1000–5000 K.
The diagram shows a plot of reaction rates versus temperature for the reaction $O + NO \rightarrow O_2 + N$. The axes are labeled $T/K$ on the x-axis and $\log(k/cm^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1})$ on the y-axis. The graph includes experimental data from various sources, such as Kaufman and Decker 1959, Wray and Teare 1962, Clark et al 1969, Hanson et al 1974, McCullough et al 1977, and the current evaluation 1993.
Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_{298}^\circ = 313.5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^\circ = 11.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 1.98 \times 10^{10}\exp(-37690/7) \]

Rate Coefficient Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.1 \times 10^{-16} \exp(-38000/T))</td>
<td>2000-3000</td>
<td>Duff and Davidson, 1959²</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.82 \times 10^{-16})</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>Livesey, Roberts, and Williams, 1971²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.3 \times 10^{-17} \exp(-39000/T))</td>
<td>1900-2250</td>
<td>Bachmaier, Eberius, and Just, 1973³</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.2 \times 10^{-17} \exp(-39000/T))</td>
<td>1900-2400</td>
<td>Iverach, Baden, and Kirou, 1974⁴</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.0 \times 10^{-17} \exp(-38000/T))</td>
<td>2120-2480</td>
<td>Haussa, Naima, and Williams, 1976⁶</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.25 \times 10^{-18} \exp(-38200/T))</td>
<td>1880-2350</td>
<td>Blauweiss, Metts, and Peeters, 1977⁶</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.06 \times 10^{-19} \exp(-38370/T))</td>
<td>2380-3850</td>
<td>Monat, Hanson, and Kruger, 1979⁷</td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.95 \times 10^{-19} \exp(-38370/T))</td>
<td>2120-2230</td>
<td>Seery and Zabieiski, 1980⁸</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.0 \times 10^{-19} \exp(-38300/T))</td>
<td>2400-4100</td>
<td>Thiehen and Roth, 1984⁹</td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviews and Evaluations</th>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.3 \times 10^{-19} \exp(-38000/T))</td>
<td>2000-5000</td>
<td>Baulch, Drysdale, and Horne, 1973⁹</td>
<td>(j)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.0 \times 10^{-19} \exp(-38570/T))</td>
<td>2000-4000</td>
<td>Hansman and Saltsman, 1984¹⁰</td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.3 \times 10^{-20} \exp(-37370/T))</td>
<td>1500-4100</td>
<td>Cohen, 1991¹²</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Determined by detailed analysis of the results from the single-pulse shock tube study of Glick et al.,¹³ in which NO was measured behind a shock wave through mixtures of air in an inert diluent.

(b) NO concentration profile measured by probe sampling and chemical analysis in the burned gas of an atmospheric pressure premixed propane-oxygen flame to which N₂ had been added. O atoms were assumed to be in equilibrium with OH which was measured by line absorption spectroscopy. Single value of k at the mean flame temperature was obtained by fitting to a simple mechanism and an A-factor calculated assuming an activation energy of 315 kJ mol⁻¹. However, [O] was overestimated by a factor of 2 owing to use of a low value for the OH oscillator strength (see comment (b)). The corrected value reported here is based on the oscillator strength given by Smith and Crosley.¹⁴

(c) NO concentration profiles in atmospheric pressure premixed hydrocarbon-air flames measured by probe sampling and UV absorption spectroscopy. The expression for k obtained by fitting the rate of formation of NO in fuel-lean flames to the simple Zeldovich mechanism, assuming equilibrium concentrations of O atoms.

(d) NO concentration profiles in flat, premixed lean or slightly fuel-rich hydrocarbon-air flames measured by probe sampling and IR analysis. [O] calculated assuming equilibrium of O with O₂, CO, and CO₂ which were also measured. Expression for k derived by fitting rate of NO formation to an extended Zeldovich mechanism.

(e) NO concentration profiles in the burned gas region of fuel-lean, premixed CH₄-O₂-N₂ flames measured by probe sampling and chemiluminescent detection. O atoms assumed to be in equilibrium with OH which was measured by line absorption spectroscopy. Assuming the activation energy recommended by Baulch et al.,¹⁰ the A-factor was adjusted to give the best fit of the data to an extended Zeldovich mechanism. However, as in reference (2), k was underestimated by a factor of 2 owing to use of a low value of the OH oscillator strength (see comment (b)). The reported expression for k was corrected to the value shown here using the oscillator strength given by Smith and Crosley.¹⁴

(f) NO and O concentration profiles measured in post-flame region of low-pressure hydrocarbon-O₂-N₂ flames using molecular beam sampling mass spectrometry. Temperatures were inferred from partial equilibrium considerations and species concentration measurements. Rate coefficients obtained by fitting to the Zeldovich mechanism and found to agree to within ±20% of the expression previously recommended by Baulch et al.,¹⁰ which was the expression reported.

(g) Shock tube study. O atoms generated by pyrolysis of N₂O in N₂/O₂/Kr mixtures optimised to maximise the sensitivity of the results to k. [NO] measured behind the incident shock wave by IR emission at 5.3 μm and absorption of CO laser radiation at 5.17 μm. Results fitted to a 9-step kinetic mechanism to derive k. Uncertainty estimated to be ±35% over the temperature range.

(h) NO and N₂ concentration profiles measured in post-flame region of low pressure CH₄-air flames using molecular beam sampling mass spectrometry and microprobe sampling with chemiluminescence analysis. [OH] profiles measured by resonance absorption and partial equilibrium assumptions used to infer [O]. Expression for k derived by fitting to Zeldovich mechanism.
(i) Shock tube study. O atoms generated by pyrolysis of N$_2$O in N$_2$/N$_2$O/Ar mixtures. [O] and [N] measured by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy as a function of time behind reflected shock wave to give $k$ directly. Uncertainty in $k$ estimated to be ±40%.

(j) Review of pre-1973 studies. Value derived from low temperature data for reverse reaction obtained by Clyne and Thrush$^{15,16}$ was revised downward by a factor of ~2 to accommodate results from the early shock tube studies of the forward reaction. Estimated uncertainty is $\Delta \log k = ±0.3$.

(k) Comprehensive review of all previous direct and indirect determinations of $k$ to 1980. Recommends rate expression determined by Monat et al.$^7$. Uncertainty estimated to be ±35%.

(l) Review of studies of the reaction in the forward and reverse direction since 1973. The recommended three-parameter Arrhenius expression for $k$ is a fit to the experimental data of Monat et al.$^7$ and Thielen and Roth$^9$ for the forward reaction and the data of Davidson and Hanson$^{17}$ for the reverse reaction. Estimated uncertainty is $\Delta \log k = ±0.3$.

Preferred Value

$$k = 3.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-38300/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the range 1400–4000 K.}$$

Reliability

$\Delta \log k = ±0.2$ over the range 1400–4000 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

There is complete agreement among all the studies in the value of the activation energy of the reaction, and with the exception of the result of Blauwens et al.$^6$, there is good agreement among the measurements of the A-factor made since 1973. The most direct determinations of $k$ are considered to be those of Monat et al.$^7$ and Thielen and Roth$^9$ which are in excellent agreement and are the basis of the present recommendation. There have been two recent shock tube measurements of $k$ for the reverse reaction at temperatures overlapping the range covered by Monat et al.$^7$ and Thielen and Roth$^9$. The temperature dependent results of Davidson and Hanson$^{17}$ are entirely consistent with the equilibrium constant and the preferred rate for the forward reaction, but the temperature independent data for $k$(N + NO) of Koshi et al.$^{18}$ are not.

References

EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ O + N_2 \rightarrow N + NO \]

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Duff and Davidson 1959
- Livesey et al 1971
- Bachmaier et al 1973
- Iverach et al 1973
- Harris et al 1976
- Blauwens et al 1977
- Monat et al 1979
- Seery and Zabielski 1980
- Thielen and Roth 1984
- This Evaluation 1993
Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_f(1) = -297.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta H_f(2) = -94.2 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_f(1) = -16.8 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_f(2) = -5.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(1) = 3.6 \times 10^{-10} T^{2.23} \exp(+38460/T) \]
\[ K_p(2) = 1.5 \times 10^{-12} T^{4.0} \exp(+12140/T) \]

Rate Coefficient Data (\( k = k_1 + k_2 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k ) (cm(^3) molecule(^{-1}) s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( T ) (K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5 \times 10^{-10}</td>
<td>2730–3380</td>
<td>Mertens et al., 1991(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Shock tube study of HNCO/N\(_2\)O/Ar mixtures with NH(X\(^\Sigma\)) monitored at 336 nm by laser absorption. [NH] profiles fitted to reaction mechanism. [NH] shown to be sensitive to \( k \) and insensitive to value of the branching ratio.

Preferred Values

\[ k = 1.5 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the range 1000–3380 K.} \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.5 \text{ over the range 1000–3380 K.} \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The only study of this reaction at elevated temperatures, by Mertens et al.,\(^1\) gives a temperature independent rate constant of 1.5 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ over the range 2730–3380 K.} \text{ Another study, by Temps,}\(^2\) is reported in Ref. 1 to give a value of 8.3 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at 298 K} \text{ which would require an activation energy of approximately -8 kJ mol}^{-1} \text{ for the two studies to be compatible.} \text{ A temperature coefficient of k of this magnitude could possibly be accommodated by a combination of the error limits of the measurements and/or changes in the mechanism with temperature. However, we limit our recommendation to the value of Mertens et al.}\(^1\) extending their temperature range but increasing the error limits to take into account the possibility of a small temperature coefficient for k. \text{ There are no experimental studies of the branching ratios.} \text{ A theoretical study of Melius and Binkley}\(^3\) suggests that both channels are likely to be of comparable importance. \text{ References}\(|\)


Rate Coefficient Data (\( k = k_1 + k_2 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k ) (cm(^3) molecule(^{-1}) s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( T ) (K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.06 \times 10^{-14}</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Vaghjiani and Ravishankara, 1990(^5)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9 \times 10^{-13} T^{0.37} \exp(-1390/T)</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

Comments

(a) Pulsed photolysis–resonance fluorescence technique. O(\(^{3}P\)) generated by \(O_2\) photolysis at 532 nm in the presence of excess \(CH_2OOH\).
(b) Based on analogy with \(O + HCHO\) reaction.

Preferred Value

\[ k = 3.3 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-2390/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \] over the range 300–1000 K.

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.5 \text{ at 1000 K reducing to } \pm 0.3 \text{ at 300 K}. \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The room temperature data of Vaghjiani and Ravishankara\(^1\) are the only reported experimental values of the rate constant for the reaction of \(O(\^{3}P)\) with \(CH_2OOH\). The preferred temperature dependence is obtained assuming an \(A\)-factor for the reaction of \(O\) with \(CH_2OOH\) equal to that for \(O + CH_3OH\), given in the evaluation of Herron\(^3\).

Comparison with the rate constant for the reaction: \(O + H_2O_2 = OH + HO_2 (1.7 \times 10^{-15} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at 298 K})\) indicates that abstraction of the peroxidic H is slower suggesting that channel (2) is dominant.

References

2. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).

\[ O + C_2H_2 \rightarrow CO + ^{3}CH_2 \quad (1) \]
\[ \quad \rightarrow C_2H_2O + H \quad (2) \]

Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_{\text{f}}^{\circ}(1) = -200 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{f}}^{\circ}(1) = -12.2 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(1) = 4.4 \times 10^{-3} \exp(+23500/T) \]

\[ \Delta H_{\text{f}}^{\circ}(2) = -80.4 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{f}}^{\circ}(2) = -6.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(2) = 1.77 \times 10^{11} \exp(+9500/T) \]

Rate Coefficient Data \((k = k_1 + k_2)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k_1/k = 0.5)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Homann and Weilman, 1983(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_1/k = 0.6)</td>
<td>290–540</td>
<td>Peeters, Schaefer, and Vinckier, 1986(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_1/k = 0.8)</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>Peeters et al., 1987(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.1 \times 10^{-10}\exp(-330/T))</td>
<td>290–1510</td>
<td>Mahmoud and Fontijn, 1984(^4)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.6 \times 10^{-11}\exp(-1900/T))</td>
<td>370–876</td>
<td>Russell et al., 1988(^5)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.78 \times 10^{-11}\exp(-2714/T))</td>
<td>850–1950</td>
<td>Michael and Wagner, 1990(^6)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2/k = 0.80)</td>
<td>200–284</td>
<td>Bohn and Stuhl, 1990(^7)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.3 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1527/T))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.6 \times 10^{-27} \exp(-250/T))</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^8)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

\(3.6 \times 10^{-27} \exp(-250/T)\)

Comments

(a) Discharge flow (O/\(C_2H_2/\text{He}\)), nozzle beam sampling with mass spectrometric detection.
(b) Flow reactor, \(O\) generated by discharge through \(O_2\), molecular beam sampling with mass spectrometric detection.
(c) Flow reactor, \(O\) and \(H\) generated by discharge. \(k_1/k\) determined from the dependence of the CH\(_2\) signal on [\(H\)]/[\(O\)], based on secondary generation of CH\(_2\) via H + HCCO.
(d) Flash photolysis, resonance fluorescence. \(O\) generated from photolysis of \(O_2\) or \(CO_2\).
(e) Laser flash photolysis, photoionization mass spectrometry. \(O\) generated from photolysis of \(SO_2\), \(C_2H_2\) from photolysis of \(C_2H_5Br\).
(f) Flash photolysis, shock tube study. \(O\) atoms generated from photolysis of \(NO\) and detected by resonance absorption. Branching ratio from \(H\) yield of \(O + C_2H_2\) vs \(H\) yield from \(O + H_2\). An analysis of the available kinetic data gave \(k = 1.2 \times 10^{-17} \exp(-786/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}\) over the temperature range 195–2500 K.
(g) \(O\) atoms generated by \(H_2\) laser photolysis (160 nm) of \(NO\) and detected by the \(O + NO\) chemiluminescence.
(h) Review of all studies up to 1989.
Preferred Values

\[ k = 1.2 \times 10^{-17} \exp(-786/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 195–2500 K.} \]

\[ k_2/k = 0.7 \text{ over range 300–2500 K.} \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.2 \]

\[ \Delta (k_2/k) = \pm 0.2 \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The recent shock tube measurements of Michael and Wagner\(^6\) are in excellent agreement with the data of Russell \textit{et al.}\(^5\), in the region in which they overlap and their recommendation, which incorporates earlier measurements, has been adopted. It appears that the measurements of Mahmud and Fontijn\(^4\) are in error, especially in the middle temperature range.

Michael and Wagner's\(^6\) determination of \( k_2/k \) is the most direct because the H yield was calibrated directly against that for \( \text{O} + \text{H}_2 \) but to obtain our recommended value, for a wide temperature range, their value has been combined with the lower temperature data of Peeters \textit{et al.}\(^2\,3\) and Homann and Wellman\(^1\).

References


\(^8\)CEC. 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ O + C_2H_2 \rightarrow CO + \text{^3}CH_2 \]
\[ \rightarrow C_2HO + H \]

EXPERIMENTAL DATA
- Peeters and Mahnen 1973
- Vandooren and Van Tiggelen 1977
- Lohr and Roth 1981
- Aleksandrov et al 1981
- Homann and Wellman 1983
- Frank et al 1986
- Mahmud and Fontijn 1987
- Russell et al 1988
- Westenberg and deHaas 1989
- Hoyerman et al 1969
- Westenberg and deHaas 1977
- This Evaluation 1993
O + C₂H₄ → CH₂CHO + H
(1)
→ HCO + CH₃
(2)
→ HCHO + CH₂
(3)
→ CH₂CO + H₂
(4)

Thermodynamic data
ΔH°₂₉₈(1) = -58.5 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS°₂₉₈(1) = 2.3 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹
Kp(1) = 0.127 T⁻₀·₀·₁₀⁻²₀⁺₀·₁₀.exp(+7030/T)
ΔH°₂₉₈(2) = -112 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS°₂₉₈(2) = 38.5 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹
Kp(2) = 4.5·₁₀⁻⁴ T⁻₀·₁₀⁻⁷⁺₀·₁₀.exp(+13100/T)
ΔH°₂₉₈(3) = -30.5 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS°₂₉₈(3) = 33.9 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹
Kp(3) = 6.08·₁₀⁻¹⁰⁻⁰·₁₀⁻²₀⁺₀·₁₀.exp(+3210/T)
ΔH°₂₉₈(4) = -353.0 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS°₂₉₈(4) = -7.7 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹
Kp(4) = 0.369 T⁻₀·₁₀⁻⁷⁺₀·₁₀.exp(+42280/T)

Rate Coefficient Data (k = k₁ + k₂ + k₃ + k₄)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td>1.3·₁₀⁻¹³.exp(-2770/T)</td>
<td>1052-2284</td>
<td>Klemm et al., 1990¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and Evaluations</td>
<td>5.75·₁₀⁻¹⁵ exp(5/28)</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>CEC, 1992²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
(a) High temperature study using the flash photolysis-shock tube technique. O atoms produced by photolysis of NO and monitored by atomic resonance absorption spectrometry. Pseudo first order decay of O in excess C₂H₄. Also give an expression for k based on data from Ref. 5-11 of k = 9.3·₁₀⁻¹².exp(-752/T) + 1.5·₁₀⁻¹⁰.exp(-3450/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ over range 300-2300 K.
(b) Based on the analysis of Klemm et al.² of a large body of literature data.

Preferred Values
k = 2.25·₁₀⁻¹⁵⁻⁰·₁₀⁻²₀⁺₀·₁₀.exp(-92/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ over range 300-2000 K.
k⁺/k⁻ = 0.35 at P > 3 Torr and T > 300 K.
k⁺/k⁻ = 0.60
k⁺/k⁻ = 0.05

Reliability
Δlogk = ±0.1 for T < 1000 K increasing to ±0.3 at 2000 K.
Δk⁺/k⁻ = ±0.05
Δk⁺/k⁻ = ±0.10
Δk⁻/k⁻ = ±0.10

Comments on Preferred Values
The new measurements of Klemm et al.¹ substantially extend the temperature range of the experimental data base, and agree reasonably well with the data from Mahmud et al.¹² at temperatures in the range 1100-1500 K. Klemm et al.¹ note that the discrepancy between the bi-exponential expression reported earlier by them² and that reported by Mahmud et al.¹² arises mainly from the lower temperature data of Mahmud et al.¹². Klemm et al.¹ give the following expression obtained from a fit to all the data including those of Mahmud et al.¹².

k = 9.4·₁₀⁻¹².exp(-749/T) + 1.8·₁₀⁻¹⁰.exp(-3740/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹

The preferred expression is derived by performing a three parameter, A T.exp(B/T), fit to the curve generated from the bi-exponential expression of Klemm et al.¹ over the range 300-2000 K, from the data of Klemm et al.³ and those in Refs. 4-11.

New data for the yield of H atoms¹³ confirms that the branching ratio k⁺/k⁻ is pressure dependent at low pressures. The recommendation based on earlier work of Smalley et al.¹⁴ and Koda et al.¹⁵,¹⁶ is unchanged.

References
²CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

O + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} → CH\textsubscript{2}CHO + H
→ HCO + CH\textsubscript{3}
→ HCHO + CH\textsubscript{2}
→ CH\textsubscript{2}CO + H\textsubscript{2}

EXPERIMENTAL DATA
- Klemm et al., 1987
- Mahmud et al., 1987
- Browarzik and Stuhl, 1984
- Fonderie et al., 1983
- Nicovich and Ravishankara, 1969
- Perry, 1984
- Klemm et al., 1990
- This Evaluation, 1993

Log (k/cm\textsuperscript{3} molecule\textsuperscript{-1} s\textsuperscript{-1})

\begin{align*}
\text{T/K} & \quad 2000 & 1000 & 500 & 200 \\
10^{-10} & \quad \circ & \quad \square & \quad \text{△} & \quad \text{▽} \\
10^{-10.5} & \quad \text{△} & \quad \text{□} & \quad \text{○} & \quad \text{□} \\
10^{-11} & \quad \text{□} & \quad \text{△} & \quad \text{○} & \quad \text{△} \\
10^{-11.5} & \quad \text{△} & \quad \text{○} & \quad \text{△} & \quad \text{○} \\
10^{-12} & \quad \text{○} & \quad \text{△} & \quad \text{○} & \quad \text{△} \\
10^{-12.5} & \quad \text{△} & \quad \text{○} & \quad \text{△} & \quad \text{○} \\
10^{-13.0} & \quad \text{○} & \quad \text{△} & \quad \text{○} & \quad \text{△}
\end{align*}
BAULCH ET AL.

\[
\begin{align*}
O + CH_2CO & \rightarrow OH + CH_2CO \quad (1) \\
& \rightarrow CO_2 + CH_3 \quad (2)
\end{align*}
\]

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta H^\circ_{\text{f}(1)} &= -239.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S^\circ_{\text{f}(1)} &= -2.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p(1) &= 9.4 \times 10^{-7} T^{0.27} \exp(+29400/T) \\
\Delta H^\circ_{\text{f}(2)} &= -474.0 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S^\circ_{\text{f}(2)} &= -19.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p(2) &= 3.0 \times 10^{-2} T^{0.27} \exp(+57700/T)
\end{align*}
\]

**Rate Coefficient Data** \(k = k_1 + k_2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2(\times)10(^{-10})</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Miyoshi, Matsui, and Washida, 1989(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_1/k = 0.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2/k = 0.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3(\times)10(^{-11})</td>
<td>&gt;300</td>
<td>Wamatz, 1984(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6(\times)10(^{-11})</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0(\times)10(^{-10})</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td>Herron, 1988(^4)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Discharge flow system. Reactants and products monitored by photoionization mass spectrometry. \(k\) measured relative to \(k_{\text{CH_3CO + O_2}}\). \(k_{\text{CH_3CO + O_2}} = (6.3 \pm 0.5)\times10^{-3}\) from the effect of \([O_2]\) on the yield of CH_3CO in the reaction of acetaldehyde in excess oxygen atoms. Given value of \(k\) based on \(k_{\text{CH_3CO + O_2}} = 2.0\times10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}\) from present evaluation. Branching ratio \(k_1/k\) from the yield of ketene and \(k_2/k\) from the yield of methyl radicals, both measured independently.

(b) Estimate.

(c) Estimate based on analogy of O atom reactions with alkyl radicals. Suggest channel (2) is dominant.

(d) As (c) but higher value preferred.

**Preferred Value**

\[
\begin{align*}
k &= 3.2\times10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the range 298-1500 K.} \\
k_1/k &= 0.2 \text{ at 298 K.} \\
k_2/k &= 0.8 \text{ at 298 K.}
\end{align*}
\]

**Reliability**

\[
\Delta \log k = \pm 1.0 \text{ at 1500 K reducing to } \pm 0.3 \text{ at 298 K.} \\
\Delta k_1/k = \pm 0.1 \text{ at 298 K.} \\
\Delta k_2/k = \pm 0.2 \text{ at 298 K.}
\]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The preferred values are based on the experimental measurements of Miyoshi et al.\(^1\), which are consistent with the kinetics of other O-atom + radical reactions of similar type. In view of the rapid rate of this reaction, little, if any, temperature dependence of the rate is expected. The branching ratio, which is also based on the measurements of Miyoshi et al.\(^1\), may change with temperature and the values can only be recommended with any confidence for room temperature.

**References**


EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ \text{O} + \text{CH}_3\text{CHO} \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{CH}_2\text{CO} \quad (1) \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{CH}_3\text{CO} \quad (2) \]

\text{Thermodynamic Data}
\[ \Delta H_{\text{f}}(1) = -67.5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta H_{\text{f}}(2) = -19.8 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 2.2 \times 10^7 e^{-4.65/\text{T}} \exp(+7780/\text{T}) \]
\[ \Delta S_{\text{f}}(1) = 25.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{\text{f}}(2) = 26.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 9.6 \times 10^7 e^{-0.455/\text{T}} \exp(+2050/\text{T}) \]

\text{Rate Coefficient Data } (k = k_1 + k_2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \theta \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/\text{K} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td>3.9 \times 10^{-13}</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Miyoshi, Matsui, and Washida, 1989⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.7 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-910/T)</td>
<td>298-1500</td>
<td>CEC, 1992²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\text{Comments}
(a) Discharge flow system. Reactants and products monitored by photoionization mass spectrometry. Pseudo first order decay of CH\(_3\)CHO in excess oxygen atoms.
(b) See Comments on Preferred Values.

\text{Preferred Value}
\[ k = 9.7 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-910/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the range 298-1500 K.} \]

\text{Reliability}
\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.5 \text{ at 1500 K reducing to } \pm 0.05 \text{ at 298 K}. \]

\text{Comments on Preferred Values}
The new room temperature data agree with previous measurements within the experimental uncertainty. There is no change in the preferred values which are based on the low temperature data of Mack and Thrush³, Michael and Lee⁴ and Singleton et al.⁵. No information is available on the branching ratio. If it is assumed that \( k_2 = 1/2 \ k(\text{O} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4) \) then the second channel only becomes significant \((k_2/k > 0.1)\) at \( T > 700 \text{ K} \). However, the extrapolated value is a factor of 2 higher than the overall rate given by Beeley et al.⁶. The contribution of the second channel is negligible at \( T < 500 \text{ K} \), where the only reliable studies were conducted.

\text{References}
²CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).

\text{Comment}
There are no experimental data for the reaction of \( \text{O}^3\text{P} \) with \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{OOH} \). The same rate expression as for the \( \text{O} + \text{CH}_3\text{OOH} \) reaction is recommended: \( k = 3.3 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-2390/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{, with channel (2) dominant.} \)
Rate Coefficient Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.0-10^{-14} exp(-2768/T)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Mani and Sauer, 1968</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-10^{-10} exp(-2867/T)</td>
<td>883-963</td>
<td>Ming, 1969</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3-10^{-10} exp(-3019/T)</td>
<td>1300-1700</td>
<td>Fujii and Asaba, 1972</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3-10^{-11} exp(-2214/T)</td>
<td>255-305</td>
<td>Bonanno et al., 1972</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4-10^{-14} exp(-2240/T)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Atkins and Pitts, 1974</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8-10^{-11} exp(-2240/T)</td>
<td>298-462</td>
<td>Colussi et al., 1975</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8-10^{-11} exp(-2003/T)</td>
<td>299-392</td>
<td>Atkins and Pitts, 1975</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7-10^{-11} exp(-2010/T)</td>
<td>299-440</td>
<td>Atkins and Pitts, 1979</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6-10^{-11} exp(-2470/T)</td>
<td>298-867</td>
<td>Nicovich, Gump, and Ravishankara, 1982</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3-10^{-10} exp(-3020/T)</td>
<td>1600-2300</td>
<td>Hsu, Lin, and Lin, 1984</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-10^{-11} exp(-2250/T)</td>
<td>300-670</td>
<td>Tappe, Schiephake, and Wagner, 1989</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-10^{-11} exp(-2350/T)</td>
<td>1200-1450</td>
<td>Leidreiter and Wagner, 1989</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4-10^{-11} exp(-2611/T)</td>
<td>600-1300</td>
<td>Ko, Ade and Fontijn, 1991</td>
<td>(m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revisions and Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5-10^{-11} exp(-2130/T)</td>
<td>298-600</td>
<td>Cvetanovic, 1987</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2-10^{-11} exp(-570/T)</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>CEC, 1992</td>
<td>(o)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Pulse radiolysis with product analysis by gas chromatography. O atoms originate from radiolysis of CO2 and NO2 at high pressures. Rate coefficient from absorption profiles of transient species.

(b) Evaluation of an overall rate coefficient from a flow reactor study.

(c) Single pulse shock tube with gas chromatographic analysis of stable products and absorption/emission measurements during the progress of the reaction were used to investigate the kinetic behaviour of benzene/argon mixtures containing small amounts of oxygen.

(d) Flow system study. The decrease of O atoms was monitored by ESR detection and changes in benzene concentration were followed by mass spectrometry. It was found that O atoms removal is much faster than benzene decrease. Therefore it was assumed that the O atoms react with radicals produced in the initiation reaction. The rate coefficient for channel (2) was evaluated from the mass spectrometric measurements.

(e) Phase shift, O + NO chemicluminescence. O atoms are generated by Hg photosensitized decomposition of NO2.

(f) Flash photolysis–resonance fluorescence. O atoms are generated by VUV photolysis of O3 and NO.

(g) Flash photolysis–resonance fluorescence. O atoms are generated by VUV photolysis of O2.

(h) The oxidation of benzene under fuel lean conditions was studied behind reflected shock waves using a stabilized cw CO laser to monitor CO production. The formed CO was modelled by a 25 step reaction mechanism. A rate coefficient for channel (1) was determined.

(i) Flow reactor, mass spectrometric detection of O-atoms produced by microwave discharge in O2. O-atom concentration in excess by factors 32–80. Total pressure range: 2.4–11.6 mbar, T–range: 300–870 K. At temperatures above 670 K an upward curvature of the Arrhenius plot is observed. Authors therefore recommend a rate expression only up to T = 670 K.

(j) Reaction studied under well isolated conditions (100–160 ppm benzene) behind incident shock waves at total densities of about 1–10^{-2} mol cm^{-3}. Thermal decomposition of ozone (6–25 ppm) was used as O atom source. O(3P) atoms monitored by ARAS at 130.5 nm. Values of k2 from this work found to fit well with extrapolation of lower temperature data for k from Refs. 6–9.

(k) High temperature fast flow reactor study. O(3P) generated by 193 nm photolysis of SO2 and monitored by resonance fluorescence in excess C2H6. Results for rate of removal of O(3P) consistent with low temperature data and with higher temperature results of Leidreiter and Wagner. It is concluded that the same reaction channel is dominant up to 1400 K (channel 2) and fit to all these data gives expression for k2 very similar to that recommended here.

(l) Critical evaluation and compilation of chemical kinetic data of O(3P) atoms with unsaturated hydrocarbons.

(m) Fit to the data from Refs. 1–10.
**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 5.9 \times 10^{-23} \exp(-473/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 300–2000 K.} \]

\[ k_2 = 3.7 \times 10^{-11} \exp(2280/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 298–1400 K.} \]

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 298–2000 K.} \]

\[ \Delta \log k_2 = \pm 0.3 \text{ at 298 K falling to } \pm 0.2 \text{ at 1400 K.} \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

There is a large variety of studies on benzene oxidation in the lower temperature range, up to \( \approx 900 \text{ K.} \) The shock tube data for the higher temperature range are derived from reaction systems with reduced sensitivity. The preferred value for \( k_2 \) is based mainly on the measurements of Refs. 5–9, 11, 12, 15. From the excellent agreement between these data and from thermochemical arguments (see also Ref. 12) it is concluded that below about 1500 K reaction pathway (1) plays only a minor role with respect to the addition channel (2).

**References**

15. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).

---

**O + C_{6}H_{5}OH → products**

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/K )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 2.1 \times 10^{-14} \exp (-1455/T) )</td>
<td>292–873</td>
<td>Frerichs et al., 1990</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Flow reactor, mass spectrometric detection, O atoms produced in microwave discharge of \( \text{O}_2 \), O atom concentration in excess by factors 70–580. Total pressure range: 2.3–3.4 mbar.

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 2.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp (-1455/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 290–600 K.} \]

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 290–600 K.} \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The preferred value is based on the only available measurement of Ref. 1. It is restricted to temperatures below 600 K. At higher temperatures this study indicates an upward curvature of the Arrhenius plot.

**References**

\[ O + C_6H_5CHO \rightarrow OH + C_6H_5CO \quad (1) \]
\[ \rightarrow OH + C_6H_5CHO \quad (2) \]
\[ O + C_6H_5CHO (+ M) \rightarrow C_6H_5(O)CHO (+ M) \quad (3) \]

Rate Coefficient Data \( (k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k / \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/K )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 4.8 \cdot 10^{-13} )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Filby and Gusten, 1978(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Discharge flow; time resolved EPR detection of O in excess benzaldehyde. Pressure = 4.7 Torr He.

**Preferred Values**

\[ k_1 = 1.0 \cdot 10^{-11} \exp(-910/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \] over range 298–1500 K.

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.7 \text{ at } 1500 \text{ K reducing to } \pm 0.3 \text{ at } 298 \text{ K.} \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The only experimental kinetic data for this reaction are at room temperature. The \( k \) value is essentially identical to that for the reaction of O atoms with acetaldehyde, indicating that the main channel is \( H^- \) abstraction from the carbonyl group. The preferred rate expression applies to channel (1) and is based on the room temperature measurement and the temperature dependence for \( O + CH_3CHO \) (see this evaluation). There is no direct information on the alternative channels (2) and (3) where O attacks the aromatic ring. The importance of these channels can be assessed from the \( O + C_6H_5 \) reaction. Applying the recommended expression from this evaluation for \( k(O + C_5H_5) = 1.2 \cdot 10^{-22} T^{3.66} \exp(-570/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) to the other channels, \((k_2 + k_3)\) is approximately a factor of 40 lower than \( k_1 \) at 300 K but the rates are about equal to 1000 K.

**References**

\(^1\)W.G. Filby and H. Gusten, Atmos. Environ. 12, 1563 (1978).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

O + p-C6H4(CH3)2 → products

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.5·10^{-13}</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Mani and Sauer, 1968¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8·10^{-13}</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Atkinson and Pitts, Jr., 1974²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3·10^{-11} exp (-1280/T)</td>
<td>299-392</td>
<td>Atkinson and Pitts, Jr., 1975³</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9·10^{-11} exp (-1540/T)</td>
<td>298-600</td>
<td>Nicovich, Gump, and Ravishankara, 1982⁴</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3·10^{-11} exp (-1540/T)</td>
<td>298-868</td>
<td>Frerichs et al., 1989⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviews and Evaluations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6·10^{-11} exp (-1490/T)</td>
<td>298-600</td>
<td>Cvetanovic, 1987⁶</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6·10^{-11} exp (-1490/T)</td>
<td>298-600</td>
<td>CEC, 1992⁷</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) O from pulse radiolysis of CO₂ or N₂O. k from absorption spectra of transients (not positively identified). p = 60 bar.
(b) Phase shift-NO chemiluminescence. O atoms from Hg-photosensitized decomposition of N₂O. p = 72 mbar.
(c) Flash photolysis–resonance fluorescence. O atoms from VUV photolysis of O₂, Diluent N₂ or Ar at 76 mbar.
(d) Flow reactor with mass spectrometric detection, O atoms produced by microwave discharge in O₂. O atom concentration in excess by factors 45–172. Total pressure range: 2.2–4.5 mbar.
(e) Critical evaluation and compilation of chemical kinetic data of O(P) atoms with unsaturated hydrocarbons.
(f) Accepts evaluation of Cvetanovic.⁶

Preferred Values

\[ k = 5.1·10^{-11} \text{ exp}(-1630/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \] over range 298–600 K.

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.3 \] over range 298–600 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

In our previous recommendation the evaluation of Cvetanovic⁶ was accepted. The new study of Frerichs et al.⁵ provides further reliable results over an extended temperature range. The preferred value is based on the measurements of Refs. 2–5 but is still restricted to temperatures below 600 K. Above this value, the results of two studies⁴,⁵ indicate an upward curvature of the Arrhenius plot which requires further study.

References

¹ Mani and M.C. Sauer, Jr., Advanc. Chem. Ser. 82, 142 (1968).
⁷ CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
O + p-C₆H₄(CH₃)₂ → products

T/K

Log (k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹)

EXPERIMENTAL DATA
○ Mani and Sauer 1968
▼ Atkinson and Pitts Jr 1974
----- Atkinson and Pitts Jr 1975
----- Nicovich et al 1982
----- Frerichs et al 1989
----- This Evaluation 1993
**EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING**

### O + C₂H₅CH₃ → products

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4×10⁻¹¹ exp (−1640/T)</td>
<td>393–495</td>
<td><a href="#">Jones and Cvetanovic, 1961</a></td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9×10⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>303</td>
<td><a href="#">Grovenstein and Mosher, 1970</a></td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3×10⁻¹³</td>
<td>298</td>
<td><a href="#">Mani and Sauer, 1968</a></td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5×10⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>300</td>
<td><a href="#">Atkinson and Pitts, 1974</a></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8×10⁻¹¹ exp (−1942/T)</td>
<td>298–402</td>
<td><a href="#">Colussi et al., 1975</a></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4×10⁻¹¹ exp (−1560/T)</td>
<td>299–392</td>
<td><a href="#">Atkinson and Pitts, 1979</a></td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3×10⁻¹² exp (−1359/T)</td>
<td>373–648</td>
<td><a href="#">Furuyama and Ebata, 1975</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6×10⁻¹¹ exp (−1535/T)</td>
<td>299–440</td>
<td><a href="#">Atkinson and Pitts, 1979</a></td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7×10⁻¹⁰ exp (−3625/T)</td>
<td>1700–2800</td>
<td><a href="#">McLain, Jachimowski, and Wilson, 1979</a></td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3×10⁻¹¹ exp (−1910/T)</td>
<td>296–932</td>
<td><a href="#">Nicovich, Gump, and Ravishankara, 1982</a></td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8×10⁻¹¹ exp (−1770/T)</td>
<td>306–630</td>
<td><a href="#">Tappe, Schliephake, and Wagner, 1989</a></td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviews and Evaluations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T exp (−1260/T)</th>
<th>T exp (−1260/T)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7×10⁻¹¹</td>
<td>298–932</td>
<td><a href="#">Cvetanovic, 1987</a></td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3×10⁻¹²</td>
<td>298–2800</td>
<td><a href="#">CEC, 1992</a></td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) O atoms from Hg photosensitized decomposition of N₂O. Ratio derived from relative k data in competitive studies. Reference reaction was O → cyclopentene → products. Evaluated by Cvetanovic.

(b) Same method as in (a). Reference reaction was O + benzene → products. Evaluated by Cvetanovic.

(c) O atoms from pulse radiolysis of CO₂ and N₂O at high pressures. Rate coefficient from absorption spectra of transient species.

(d) Phase shift, O + NO chemiluminescence. O atoms from Hg photosensitized decomposition of N₂O.

(e) Microwave discharge–fast flow reactor. O atoms from N + NO.

(f) Flash photolysis–resonance fluorescence. O atoms from VUV photolysis of O₂ and NO.

(g) Incident shock wave investigation of the oxidation mechanism of C₅H₅O₂Ar and C₅H₅CH₂O₂Ar mixtures by monitoring UV and IR emission of CO, CO₂. Arrhenius expression for the product channel C₅H₅CH₂ + OH estimated by comparison with data for benzene.

(h) Flash photolysis–resonance fluorescence. O atoms from VUV photolysis of O₂.

(i) Flow reactor with mass spectrometric detection, O-atoms produced by microwave discharge in O₂. O atom concentration in excess by factors 86–518. Total pressure range: 3.9–11.9 mbar. T-range: 300–870 K. At temperatures above 630 K an upward curvature of the Arrhenius plot is observed.

(j) Critical evaluation and compilation of chemical kinetic data of O(¹P) atoms with unsaturated hydrocarbons.

(k) See Comments on Preferred Values.

**Reliability**

Δlog k = ±0.4 at 2800 K reducing to ±0.1 at 300 K.

**Comments on Preferred Values**

Our previous recommendations remain unchanged.

The results of nine studies (Refs. 2–6, 8–11) in which the rate coefficient for total O consumption by toluene was measured, are in excellent agreement for the range from room temperature up to about 1000 K. The temperature dependence of the rate coefficient at higher temperatures is difficult to define because the only available rate expression has not been measured directly, but has been estimated from modelling a relatively complex reaction system. It has been assumed that at higher temperatures the reaction proceeds predominantly by direct abstraction of a H atom. The reliability at 2800 K has been estimated by comparing the shock tube values with the values obtained by linear extrapolation of the k values in the T-range 300–1000 K.

**References**

11. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
O + C₂H₂C₆H₆ → products

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm² molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate Coefficient Measurements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Mani and Sauer, 1968⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹²</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Grovenstein and Mosher, 1970²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8·10⁻¹¹ exp (-1840T)</td>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>Tappe et al., 1989⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviews and Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹³</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Cvetanovic, 1987⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>298(1 bar)</td>
<td>CEC, 1992⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) O from pulse radiolysis of CO₂ or N₂O. k from absorption spectra of transients (not positively identified), p ~ 53 bar.
(b) Ratio derived from relative k data in competition experiments. Reference reaction was O + benzene → products. p = 1 bar. Evaluated by Cvetanovic.⁴
(c) Flow reactor with mass spectrometric detection, O-atoms produced by microwave discharge in O₂. O-atom concentration in excess by factors 10⁷–10⁴. Total pressure range: 2.2–4.3 mbar. T-range: 300–870 K. At temperatures above 500 K an upward curvature of the Arrhenius plot is observed.
(d) Critical evaluation and compilation of chemical kinetic data of O(¹P) atoms with hydrocarbons.
(e) Accepts the evaluation of Cvetanovic.⁴

Preferred Values

k = 2.8·10⁻¹¹ exp(-1840/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ over range 298–600 K.

Reliability

Δlog k = ±0.3 over range 298–600 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

The preferred expression is that obtained in the recent study of Tappe et al.,² which is in reasonable agreement at 300 K with the earlier results of Grovenstein and Mosher² which were the basis of our previous recommendations.²

References

¹Mani and M.C. Sauer, Jr., Advanc. Chern. Ser. 82, 142 (1968).
⁵CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).

O₂ + C₂H₆ → HO₂ + CH₂CHCH₂

Thermodynamic Data

ΔH₂⁰ = 151.7 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS₂⁰ = 37.1 kJ mol⁻¹
K₀ = 0.4887 exp(-18170/T)

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm² molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate Coefficient Measurements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2·10⁻¹⁶ exp(-19670T)</td>
<td>673–793</td>
<td>Stothard and Walker, 1991¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviews and Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1·10⁻¹⁰ exp(-23950/T)</td>
<td>⁵</td>
<td>Tsang, 1991²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O₂ + C₂H₆ → HO₂ + CH₂CHCH₂

Thermodynamic Data

ΔH₂⁰ = 151.7 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS₂⁰ = 37.1 kJ mol⁻¹
K₀ = 0.4887 exp(-18170/T)
Comments
(a) Oxidation of C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{6} under conditions where chain length is low, \( k \) obtained by equating rate of initiation to rate of termination, which was determined directly. Minor corrections (<20\%) made for radical branching reactions.
(b) Estimate based on view that rate of abstraction should be similar to that of secondary C—H in alkanes.

Preferred Value
\[
k = 3.2 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-19700/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 600–1000 K.}
\]

Reliability
\[
\Delta \log k = \pm 0.3 \text{ at } 800 \text{ K rising to } \pm 0.5 \text{ at } 1000 \text{ K and 600 K.}
\]

Comments on Preferred Values
Although there are no other independent data to compare with the one available experimental study\textsuperscript{1}, the rate coefficient values are in excellent agreement with those of the analogous reaction O\textsubscript{2} + HCHO \rightarrow HO\textsubscript{2} + HCO for which \( k = 3.4 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-19580/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) was obtained\textsuperscript{2} between 713 and 813 K, the enthalpies of reaction being the same within ±4 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1}. The low A factor for O\textsubscript{2} + C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{6} is consistent with loss of entropy of activation due to the emerging electron-delocalized allyl radical.

Thermodynamic Data
\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta H^\circ & = 165.0 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S^\circ & = 23.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p & = 1.93 \times 10^{10} \exp(-19860/T)
\end{align*}
\]

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-19100/T)</td>
<td>~1000</td>
<td>Bittker, 1988\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-20800/T)</td>
<td>1000–1200</td>
<td>Emdee, Brezinsky, and Glassman, 1992\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
(a) Reported by Emdee \textit{et al.} in Ref. 2. Based on computer modelling fit in studies of toluene oxidation at about 1000 K.
(b) Based on computer modelling fit to data obtained on the oxidation of toluene at atmospheric pressure between 1100 and 1200 K. Authors claim high sensitivity of the rate of toluene consumption to the value for \( k \) and hence estimate value of \( k \). Activation energy estimated from reaction endothermicity, and pre-exponential factor adjusted to achieve best fit to the rate of toluene consumption. At 1100 K the value of \( k \) is a factor of about 5 lower than recommended by Bittker. Mechanism still very uncertain and very complex, and any radical branching not isolated will result in high values of \( k \).

Preferred Value
\[
k = 3 \times 10^{-14} \exp(-20,000/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 700–1200 K.}
\]

Reliability
\[
\Delta \log k = \pm 0.7 \text{ over range 700–1200 K.}
\]

Comments on Preferred Values
Although the activation energies given by Bittker\textsuperscript{1} and by Emdee \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{2} are reasonable since \( \Delta H = E \), the A factor is probably about two orders of magnitude too high. Directly determined values of \( k_{HF} = 3.4 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-19580/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) for HCHO + O\textsubscript{2} \rightarrow HCO + HO\textsubscript{2} and \( k_{HF} = 3.2 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-19670/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) for C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{6} + O\textsubscript{2} \rightarrow C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{5} + HO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{4} confirm the validity of \( \Delta H = E \) for the primary initiation reaction RH + O\textsubscript{2} \rightarrow R + HO\textsubscript{2}. However, \( A \) for C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{5}CH\textsubscript{3} + O\textsubscript{2} is a factor of 10 greater than \( A_{HF} \) and a factor of 100 greater than \( A_{HF} \). Stothard and Walker\textsuperscript{4} have suggested that \( A_{HF}/A_{HF}=10 \) is reasonable and arises from an increased loss of entropy of activation due to electron delocalization in the emerging allyl radical. Formation of the benzyl radical also involves electron delocalization and the recommendation is thus based on equal \( A \) factors for C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{6} + O\textsubscript{2} and C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{5}CH\textsubscript{3} + O\textsubscript{2}. Support\textsuperscript{5} for this view comes from the value of \( k(\text{HO}\textsubscript{2} + \text{HCHO} \rightarrow \text{HCO} + \text{HO}\textsubscript{2})/k(\text{HO}\textsubscript{2} + \text{C}_{6}\text{H}_{5}\text{CH}_{3} \rightarrow \text{C}_{6}\text{H}_{5}\text{CH}_{2} + \text{H}_{2}\text{O}_{2}) = 14 \) at 750 K, the two reactions having the same activation energy to within 4 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1}, so that the difference in rate constants arises mostly from the much lower \( A \) factor for HO\textsubscript{2} + C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{5}CH\textsubscript{3}.

In addition, thermochemical calculation of the rate constant for the reverse reaction, HO\textsubscript{2} + C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{5}CH\textsubscript{3} \rightarrow O\textsubscript{2} + C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{5}CH\textsubscript{2}
from the Emdee et al. data\(^3\) gives a value of \(3.5 \cdot 10^{-10}\ \text{cm}^3\ \text{molecule}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}\) at 1100 K which is at least a factor of 10 too high and compares with \(k = 3.3 \cdot 10^{-12}\) between 700 and 800 K determined experimentally for \(\text{C}_3\text{H}_6 + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{C}_3\text{H}_4\text{O} + \text{O}_2\). Use of the recommended value of \(k\) gives a value of \(2.0 \cdot 10^{-12}\ \text{cm}^3\ \text{molecule}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}\) for the reverse reaction, \(\text{HO}_2 + \text{C}_3\text{H}_3\text{CH}_3 \rightarrow \text{C}_3\text{H}_4\text{CH}_3 + \text{O}_2\).

**References**


\[ H + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{O} \]

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H_{298}^0 = 70.2 \ \text{kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^0 = 24.9 \ \text{J K}^{-1} \ \text{mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 3.02 \cdot 10^{-22} \exp(-8620/T) \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Rate Coefficient Measurements} & T/K & \text{Reference} & \text{Comments} \\
9.96 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-11427/T) & 1900-2650 & \text{Fujii and Shin, 1988}^1 & (a) \\
1.55 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-7440/T) & 1450-3370 & \text{Masten et al., 1990}^2 & (b) \\
2.64 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-8490/T) & 1050-2700 & \text{Yuan et al., 1991}^3 & (c) \\
1.15 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-6917/T) & 1102-2055 & \text{Shin and Michael, 1991}^4 & (d) \\
1.55 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-7270/T) & 2050-5305 & \text{Du and Hessler, 1992}^5 & (e) \\
3.3 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-8456/T) & 300-2500 & \text{CEC, 1992}^6 & (f)
\end{array}
\]

**Comments**

(a) The concentration growth of OH radicals was measured in rich shock-heated \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\)-Ar mixtures by cw laser absorption spectroscopy.
(b) Shock tube study. OH was detected by OH laser absorption. Additional H atom production was measured with ARAS. Combination of these results with those of Pirraglia et al.\(^5\) gives \(k = 5.84 \cdot 10^{-14} T^{-0.5} \exp(-8580/T) \ \text{cm}^3\ \text{molecule}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}\).
(c) A shock tube/laser absorption/detailed modelling study. Total pressure 1.57–3.43 atm. \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\) was diluted in Argon. The reaction progress was measured in situ by state-selective laser absorption of OH radicals.
(d) Laser photolysis/shock tube study. H- or D-atom detection by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy (ARAS). Total density during shock in range (1.668–3.364) \(\cdot 10^{18}\) cm\(^{-3}\).
(e) Tunable laser/flash absorption technique used to monitor OH in shock heated \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\)-Ar or Kr mixtures. Results were combined with previous measurements\(^4,5\) to give the expression \(k = 1.62 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-7474/T) \ \text{cm}^3\ \text{molecule}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}\) over range 960–5300 K.
(f) Based on earlier evaluation of Baulch et al.\(^7\) and results of Frank and Just\(^8\) and Pirraglia et al.\(^5\).

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 1.62 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-7474/T) \ \text{over range 300–5000 K.} \]

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.2 \ \text{at 300 K rising to } \pm 0.5 \ \text{at 5000 K.} \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The expression derived by Du and Hessler\(^7\) is preferred. It lies within the error limits of the previous CEC recommendations\(^6\) but incorporates the new results of Fujii and Shin\(^1\), Masten et al.\(^2\) and Shin and Michael\(^4\) and extends the temperature range.

References to earlier results shown on the graph may be found in CEC, 1992\(^6\).

**References**

6. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ H + O_2 \rightarrow OH + O \]

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Bowman 1974
- Kochubei and Moin 1973
- Schott 1973
- Chiang and Skinner 1979
- Biordi et al. 1976
- Aseyan and Namoredze 1977
- Frank and Just 1985
- Brabbs et al. 1971
- Basevich and Vedeneev 1985
- Furs and Shin 1986
- Jachimowski and Houghton 1970
- Klemm et al. 1983
- Shin and Michael 1991
- Du and Hessler 1992
- This Evaluation 1993
BAULCH ET AL.

H + O₂ (+ M) → HO₂ (+ M)

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H_{298} = -208 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S_{298} = -90.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_P = 6.9 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-2400/T) \text{ atm}^{-1} \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/\text{K} )</th>
<th>( p/\text{Torr} )</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.99 \times 10^{-32}</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>100-243</td>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>Hanning-Lee et al., 1991¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.95 \times 10^{-32}</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>100-243</td>
<td>N₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 \times 10^{-32}</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>100-243</td>
<td>N₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviews and Evaluations**

- 1.8 \times 10^{-30} \text{cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}
- 1.7 \times 10^{-30} \text{cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}
- 3.9 \times 10^{-30} \text{cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}
- 5.8 \times 10^{-30} \text{cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}

\( k = 1.7 \times 10^{-30} T^{-0.8} \text{ cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \) over range 300–2000 K for \( M = \text{Ar} \).

\( k = 5.8 \times 10^{-30} T^{-0.8} \text{ cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \) over range 300–2000 K for \( M = \text{H}_2 \).

\( k = 3.9 \times 10^{-30} T^{-0.8} \text{ cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \) over range 300–2000 K for \( M = \text{N}_2 \).

**Comments**

(a) Flow reactor; H generated by microwave discharge or by thermal decomposition on a W filament. [H] by resonance absorption, [OH] by resonance fluorescence.

(b) Based on evaluations by the CODATA¹ and NASA² Groups.

(c) See comments on Preferred Values.

**Preferred Values**

\( k = 1.7 \times 10^{-30} T^{-0.8} \text{ cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \) over range 300–2000 K for \( M = \text{Ar} \).

\( k = 5.8 \times 10^{-30} T^{-0.8} \text{ cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \) over range 300–2000 K for \( M = \text{H}_2 \).

\( k = 3.9 \times 10^{-30} T^{-0.8} \text{ cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \) over range 300–2000 K for \( M = \text{N}_2 \).

**Reliability**

\( \Delta \log k = \pm 0.5 \) over range 300–2000 K.

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The recommendations are unchanged from our previous evaluation which were based largely on the recommendations of Baulch et al.⁶ The new data of Hanning-Lee et al.¹ are in agreement within the error limits.

**References**

³CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

H + NO → OH + N

Thermodynamic Data

\( \Delta H_{298} = 203.1 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \)
\( \Delta S_{298} = 11.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \)
\( K_p = 24.4 \cdot T^{-0.25} \exp(-24560/T) \)

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/\text{K} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.76 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-23940/T)</td>
<td>2530–3020</td>
<td>Bradley and Craggs, 1975⁵</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.28 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-24560/T)</td>
<td>2200–2550</td>
<td>Duxbury and Pratt, 1975⁵</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.32 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-24510/T)</td>
<td>2400–3500</td>
<td>Ando and Asaba, 1976⁵</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.71 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-25410/T)</td>
<td>2400–4200</td>
<td>Flower et al., 1977⁴</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.89 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-24760/T)</td>
<td>1750–2040</td>
<td>McCullough et al., 1977⁵</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

2.82 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-24560/T) | 1750–2000 | Hanson and Salimian, 1984⁶ | (f) |

Comments

(a) Shock tube study with fluorescence detection of NO at 226 nm and OH at 306.4 nm. Computer simulation of concentration profiles used to derive rate constant.
(b) Shock tube study using highly diluted \( \text{H}_2/\text{NO}/\text{Ar} \) mixtures with monitoring of NO, OH, NH₃, and NH in absorption. Computer modelling of [OH] and [NO] profiles used to derive rate constant.
(c) Reanalysis of the data of Koshi et al.⁷, who carried out a shock tube study on NO/\( \text{H}_2/\text{Ar} \) mixtures, monitoring [O] by NO/O chemiluminescence at 650 nm and [NO] in emission at 5.22 μm.
(d) Shock tube study of NO/\( \text{H}_2/ \)inert gas mixtures. IR emission from NO and \( \text{H}_2 \text{O} \) at 5.3 and 6.3 μm monitored. Comparison of computed with experimental profiles used to derive \( k \).
(e) Dilute mixtures of NO/\( \text{H}_2/\text{Ar} \) passed through alumina packed flow reactor heated to temperatures in the range 1750–2040. Fractional decomposition of NO monitored as a function of flow rate using chemiluminescence detection.
(f) Based on Duxbury and Pratt⁵, Flower et al.⁴, McCullough et al.⁵.

Preferred Values

\[ k = 3.6 \cdot 10^{-10} \exp(-24910/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \] over the range 1500–4500 K.

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.5. \]
BAULCH ET AL.

H + NO → OH + N

T/K

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Bradley and Craggs 1975
- Duxbury an Pratt 1975
- Ando and Asaba 1976
- Flower et al 1977
- McCullough et al 1977
- This Evaluation 1993

Log(k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹) vs. 10⁻³ T⁻¹ / K⁻¹
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

H + CO (+ M) → HCO (+ M)

Thermodynamic data

ΔH°298 = -63.9 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS°298 = -20.9 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹
Kp = 1.5·10⁻77 exp(+7560/T) atm⁻¹

Rate Coefficient Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm⁻³</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>(1.9-5.2)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>(0.7-4.5)·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>(1.6-8.1)·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>(3.4-19)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>(3.3-19)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>(3.2·19)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773</td>
<td>(1.8-19)·10⁻⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298-373</td>
<td>(0.7-4.5)·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>(0.6-1.7)·10⁻⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>(7.0-7.9)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>2.5·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>(2.5-7.4)·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>2.5·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298-773</td>
<td>(0.7-4.5)·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-3000</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298-373</td>
<td>(7.0-7.9)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>2.5·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>(2.5-7.4)·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>2.5·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-3000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exp(-1856/T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

k₀ = [Ar]1.6·10⁻⁷ exp(-711) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ over range 300-2500 K.

Comments

(a) H atoms generated by pulse radiolysis of H₂ detected by Lyman-α spectroscopy and diffusion of H atoms to the wall taken into account.
(b) Fast-flow study. H atoms were generated by a hot tungsten wire or by a high-pressure microwave discharge and detected by ESR.
(c) H atoms formed by mercury photosensitization of H₂ and monitored by Lyman-α absorption spectroscopy. Steady state conditions and decay of H after the end of the light pulse.
(d) Thermal reaction of H₂/CO/O₂ mixtures. Study of the second explosion limit in KCl and CsCl coated vessels.
(e) Pulse radiolysis of H₂. H monitored by Lyman-α spectroscopy. An activation energy of E₂ = 2.0±0.4 kcal mol⁻¹ was determined. The value of the pre-exponential factor given here is based on the k₀ data from Ref. 1.
(f) Discharge flow stirred reaction study of O₂/He-CO-N₂ (or Ar) mixtures. The experiments were conducted over the ranges 90 ≤ [CO]/[O] ≤ 950 and 0.2 ≤ [H]/[O] ≤ 3.
(g) Flash photolysis of H₂O vapour in the presence of CO. HCO monitored by UV absorption at 230 nm. The competing reaction H + HCO → H₂ + CO is significant during the formation of HCO. From the amount of H₂O photodissociated (using the H₂O + CH₃ system as an actinometer) and a computer modelling of the formation and decay rates of HCO values of k were obtained.
(h) Reliability

Preferred Values

k₀ = [Ar]5.3·10⁻⁴ exp(-370/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ over range 300-2500 K.

Reliability

Δlog k₀ = ±0.5 for M = Ar over range 300-2500 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

The absolute values of k₀ close to room temperature and the temperature dependence of k₀ remain considerably uncertain. Most previous evaluations of the temperature dependence have been based on the reverse dissociation reaction. Here, we have converted the recommended k₀ values for the dissociation reaction to recombination using the calculated equi-
librium constant as given above. The preferred values of $k_o$ are consistent with an average energy transferred per collision of 20 $\text{[T/300]} \text{ cm}^{-1}$. Figure 1 shows the temperature dependence of $k_o$ from several sources together with our recommendation.

References


\[ H + \text{CO} + M \rightarrow \text{HCO} + M \]
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

HCO (+ M) \rightarrow H + CO (+ M)

Thermodynamic data

\[ \Delta H_{298}^\circ = 63.9 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^\circ = 209.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ k_p = 6.6 \times 10^7 \text{ atm}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \exp(-7560/T) \text{ atm} \]

Rate Coefficient Measurements

Reviews and Evaluations

(a) Shock tube study of the thermal dissociation of H3CO. The reactant was monitored by UV absorption at 366 nm and by IR emission at 3.5 μm.

(b) Shock tube study of CH2O mixtures in Ar. The reaction was followed by IR emission from CO, CO2 and H2O and by the laser schlieren method. Modelling with 14 reactions.

(c) Pyrolysis of 0.1%, 0.5% and 1% CH3O in Ar. CH3O monitored by IR emission at 3.5 μm behind reflected shocks.

(d) Thermal decomposition of HCO in a molecular beam. Kinetics followed by mass spectrometry.

(e) HCO radicals were generated by 308 nm photodissociation of CH3CHO in a heatable tubular quartz reactor. The [HCO] decay was monitored using a photoionization mass spectrometer. The rates were measured from 637 K to 832 K and extrapolated from 300 K to 3000 K using an RRKM model adapted to treat the extremely sparse density of vibrational states of HCO.

(f) Thermal decomposition of methanol studied by laser schlieren densitometry and dynamic mass spectrometry. Modelling with a mechanism of 28 reactions.

(g) Numerical analysis of C3H2O2 flames measured previously. The analysis includes rich and lean C2H2 flames and rich C3H2 flames with added CO or H2.

(h) Review of literature rate data.

(i) Data evaluation. The recommended value is based on rate data for the reverse process.

Prefered Values

Are evaluated. The recommended value is based on rate data for the reverse process.

Reliability

\[ \log k_e = \pm 0.5 \text{ for } M = \text{Ar over range 600–2500 K.} \]

Comments on Preferred Values

All available measurements have been done in the low pressure region. The present recommended values for \( k_e \) are based on a theoretical analysis of the data of Refs. 1, 3 and 5. In order to reproduce the absolute values and the temperature dependence of \( k_e \), an average energy transferred per collision of \(-\Delta E_e = 20 [77/300] \text{ cm}^{-1}\) was employed. In this way collisional efficiencies between 0.065 to 0.050 between 600 K and 2500 K were obtained. The figure shows the given experimental data together with the data of recent compilations and the recommended expression for \( k_e \).

References

HCO + M → H - CO - M

\[
\log[k_0 / (\text{cm}^3\text{molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1})]
\]

T/K

2000

1000
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10^3T^{-1}/K^{-1}

- X - Schrecker and Just 1969
- - Dean et al 1979
- - Warnatz 1984
- - Tsang and Hampson 1986
- - Timonen et al 1987
- - Cribb et al 1992
- This Evaluation 1993
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ H + CH_3 (+ M) \rightarrow CH_4 (+ M) \]

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H_{298}^\circ = -439 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S_{298}^\circ = -123 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_p = 1.76 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-52700/T) \text{ atm}^{-1} \]

---

### Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>Temperature Range</th>
<th>Rate Coefficient</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rate Coefficient Measurements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pressure Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[He] (3.2 \times 10^{-29})</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>((4.8-76.6) \times 10^{17})</td>
<td>Brouard et al., 1985(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[He] (4.0 \times 10^{-29})</td>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>((4.8-163.5) \times 10^{17})</td>
<td>Brouard et al., 1985(^2)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Fall-off Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>((5.2-10.0) \times 10^{9}) (Ar)</td>
<td>Brown et al., 1966(^3)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>(2.2 \times 10^{10}) (He)</td>
<td>Dodonov et al., 1969(^4)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>(2.7 \times 10^{10}) (Ar)</td>
<td>Halstead et al., 1970(^5)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 \times 10^{-13}</td>
<td>303-603</td>
<td>(2.0 \times 10^{10}) (H(_3))</td>
<td>Teng and Jones, 1972(^6)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>(2.4 \times 10^{10}) (He)</td>
<td>Michael et al., 1973(^7)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>81.0 \times 10^{9})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 \times 10^{-13}</td>
<td>503-753</td>
<td>(1.3 \times 10^{10}) (Ar)</td>
<td>Camilleri et al., 1974(^8)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>(2.0 \times 10^{10}) (He)</td>
<td>Pratt and Veltmann, 1974(^9)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>(4.9 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td>Pratt and Veltmann, 1976(^10)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>(2.4 \times 10^{10}) (He)</td>
<td>Pratt and Veltmann, 1976(^10)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>(1.5 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td>Pratt and Veltmann, 1976(^10)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.53 \times 10^{-10}</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>(0.94 \times 10^{10}) (C(_2)H(_4))</td>
<td>Cheng and Yeh, 1977(^11)</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 \times 10^{-10}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.1 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 \times 10^{-10}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.4 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 \times 10^{-10}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(25.1 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 \times 10^{-10}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(72.1 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>640-818</td>
<td>(9.8 \times 10^{10}) (Ar)</td>
<td>Sepebrad et al., 1979(^11)</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(18.5 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-10}</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>(2.5 \times 10^{10}) (N(_2), H(_2))</td>
<td>Sworski et al., 1980(^12)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.52 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>(4.8 \times 10^{10}) (He)</td>
<td>Brouard et al., 1983(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.86 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.6 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.44 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(19.3 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.31 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(38.5 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.75 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(76.7 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.26 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>(8.1 \times 10^{9}) (He)</td>
<td>Brouard et al., 1985(^2)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.52 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.6 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.36 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.3 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9.8 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16.5 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>(6.1 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.52 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.2 \times 10^{11})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.44 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.4 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.4 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(14.7 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>(1.7 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.78 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.9 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.18 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11.4 \times 10^{10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High Pressure Range**

\[ 1.5 \times 10^{-10} \]

\[ 3.5 \times 10^{-10} \]

\[ 4.7 \times 10^{-10} \]

\[ 4.7 \times 10^{-10} \]

\[ 300 \]

\[ (1.6-32.2) \times 10^{10}\] (Ar, SF\(_6\)) | Patrick et al., 1980\(^14\) | (l) |

\[ 504 \]

\[ (4.8-76.7) \times 10^{10}\] (He) | Brouard et al., 1985\(^1\) | (a) |

\[ 300 \]

\[ (8.1-16.4) \times 10^{10}\] (He) | Brouard and Pilling, 1986\(^15\) | (a) |

\[ 300-600 \]

\[ (8.1-16.4) \times 10^{10}\] (He) | Brouard et al., 1989\(^2\) | (a) |
**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm² molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm⁻³</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviews and Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_1 ) = [Ar] 2.2·10⁻²⁷ T³</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warnatz, 1984</td>
<td>(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_2 ) = 1.0·10⁻⁷ T⁻¹</td>
<td>300-1100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_3 ) = 2.0·10⁻⁷ T⁻⁴</td>
<td>300-1100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steward et al., 1989</td>
<td>(o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_4 ) = 4.23·10⁻⁶ T⁻⁴</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsang, 1989</td>
<td>(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_5 ) = 2.0·10⁻⁷ T⁻¹</td>
<td>300-1100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cobes and Troe, 1990</td>
<td>(q)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_6 ) = [He]6.2·10⁻²⁶ (T/300)⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEC, 1992</td>
<td>(r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_7 ) = [C₂H₆]3.0·10⁻²⁹ (T/200)⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F_i(\text{He}) ) = \exp(-0.45·T/3230)</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F_i(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6) ) = \exp(-0.34·T/3035)</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_8 ) = 3.5·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_9 ) = [He]6.2·10⁻²⁶ (T/300)⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{10} ) = [Ar]6.0·10⁻²⁹ (T/700)⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{11} ) = [C₂H₆]3.0·10⁻²⁹ (T/300)⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F_i(\text{He},\text{Ar}) ) = (-0.45·T/3231)</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F_i(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6) ) = \exp(-0.34·T/3035)</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) 193 nm photolysis of acetone, [CH₃] and [H] by time-resolved UV absorption and resonance fluorescence respectively. [CH₃] >> [H]. \( k_c \) by RRKM/master equation fit.

(b) Discharge flow study of H + C₂H₆ system. CH₃ generated by H + C₂H₆ → 2CH₃, ESR detection of H.

(c) Mass spectrometric study of species distribution in diffusion cloud; CH₃ generated from H + C₂H₆, H + C₂H₆, H generated in discharge.

(d) Discharge flow study of H + C₂H₆ system; used GC analysis of CH₃, C₂H₆, C₂H₅, and C₂H₄.

(e) Discharge flow study of H + C₂H₆ system; products analysed by GC and simulated by numerical integration.


(g) Discharge flow study of H + C₂H₆ system. GC detection of CH₃, C₂H₅, C₂H₄, and C₂H₂. Rate coefficients from fitting the reaction scheme using numerical integration. Assumed \( k_c \) independent of temperature.

(h) Discharge flow study of H + C₂H₆ system. Products detected by mass spectrometry. Rate coefficients by fitting 7 reaction scheme using numerical integration.

(i) Steady-state Hg photosensitisation of C₂H₅. Products detected by mass spectrometry. \( k_c \) by Lindemann plot.

(j) Discharge flow study of H + C₂H₆ system. Products detected by gas chromatography. Rate coefficients from numerical integration of 14 reaction scheme.

(k) 160 nm photolysis of H₂O/CH₃ mixtures. CH₃ detected as function of time at 216 nm. Rate coefficient determined by fitting to 11 reaction scheme with H₂ and N₂ diluent.

(l) Flash photolysis of azomethane/ethene mixtures. Products analysed by gas chromatography. Rate coefficient determined by numerical integration of 9 reaction scheme, but probably low because (i) reaction (1) competes primarily with CH₃ + CH₄, and low rate coefficient was used for CH₃ recombination, (ii) H + azomethane was neglected. \( k_c \) by RRKM fit.

(m) Review of literature prior to 1980.

(n) The results of Cheng et al., Sworski et al., and Patrick et al. have been combined with the reverse rate determination of Chen et al. to derive the recommended expression. A tabulation of \( \log k/k_c \) over the temperature range 300-2500 K from RRKM calculations is also given.

(o) Single-channel hindered Gorin model RRKM calculations of the CH₃ decomposition with a fit to experimental results. Conversion to \( k_c \) via the equilibrium constant.

(p) The results of Cheng et al., Sworski et al., and Patrick et al. have been combined with the reverse rate determination of Chen et al. to derive the recommended expression.

(q) Theoretical calculation based on \( k_c \) calculations from Ref. 22, the representation of fall-off curves from Ref. 23, and the \( k_c \) treatment from Ref. 24. Collision efficiencies \( \beta_c \) at 300 K of 0.07 for M = He and of 0.15 for M = C₂H₆ point to particularly inefficient energy transfer for which \( \Delta E \) values may increase proportional to the temperature. Therefore, the temperature coefficient of \( k_c \) at \( T < 1000 \) K was chosen as in the strong collision limit, i.e. assuming \( \beta_c \) to be temperature independent. The temperature coefficient of \( k_c \) was derived from SACM-modified PST calculations of Ref. 24 which also predicts the absolute value of \( k_c \) to be as recommended. The broadening factors contain a considerable weak collision contribution, strong collision broadening factors being given by \( F_c \) = \exp(-0.09·T/3320).

(r) See Comments on Preferred Values.
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

Preferred Values

\[ k_0 = [\text{He}] 6.2 \times 10^{-29} \ (T/300)^{-1.8} \ \text{cm}^3 \ \text{molecule}^{-1} \ \text{s}^{-1} \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]
\[ k_0 = [\text{Ar}] 6.0 \times 10^{-29} \ (T/300)^{-1.8} \ \text{cm}^3 \ \text{molecule}^{-1} \ \text{s}^{-1} \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]
\[ k_0 = [\text{C}_2\text{H}_6] 3.0 \times 10^{-18} \ (T/300)^{-1.8} \ \text{cm}^3 \ \text{molecule}^{-1} \ \text{s}^{-1} \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]
\[ k_0 = 3.5 \times 10^{-10} \ \text{cm}^3 \ \text{molecule}^{-1} \ \text{s}^{-1} \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]
\[ F_e = 0.63 \exp(-T/3315) + 0.37 \exp(-T/61) \ \text{for} \ M = \text{He}, \text{Ar} \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]
\[ F_e = 0.71 \exp(-T/3079) + 0.29 \exp(-T/54) \ \text{for} \ M = \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_0 = \pm 0.3 \ \text{for} \ M = \text{He} \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]
\[ \Delta \log k_0 = \pm 0.5 \ \text{for} \ M = \text{Ar}, \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]
\[ \Delta \log k_0 = \pm 0.3 \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]
\[ \Delta F_e = \pm 0.1 \ \text{over range 300--1000 K.} \]

Comments on Preferred Values

No measurements for this reaction have been reported since our previous compilation\(^2\). Therefore, the preferred values for \(k_0\) and \(k_0\) of Ref. 25 remain unaltered, but the format of the \(F_e\) has been modified. In Fig. 1 representative fall-off curves are shown. Recombination and dissociation rate data are related via the above given equilibrium constant.

References

EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

CH_4 (+ M) \rightarrow CH_3 + H (+ M)

Thermodynamic data
\[ \Delta H_{298} = 439 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298} = 123 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 5.68 \times 10^{7/2} \exp(-52700/T) \text{ atm} \]

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k / \text{s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T / K )</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm(^{-3} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Pressure Range

\[ [\text{Ar}] 3.3 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-44800/T) \]
\[ 1850-2500 \]
\[ (3.3-90.0) \times 10^{-9} \]
\[ \text{Hartig et al., 1971} \]
\[ \text{(a)} \]

\[ [\text{Ar}] 6.3 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-49400/T) \]
\[ 1726-2134 \]
\[ 3 \times 10^{-9} \]
\[ \text{Klemm et al., 1992} \]
\[ \text{(b)} \]

\[ [\text{Ar}] 7.5 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-46770/T) \]
\[ 1794-2326 \]
\[ (2.1-15) \times 10^{-8} \]
\[ \text{Davidson et al., 1992} \]
\[ \text{(c)} \]

\[ [\text{Ar}, \text{Kr}] 3.2 \times 10^{4} T^{-4/96} \exp(-59084/T) \]
\[ 1600-4200 \]
\[ (6.5-18) \times 10^{-7} \]
\[ \text{Kiefer and Kumar, 1993} \]
\[ \text{(d)} \]

Intermediate Fall-Off Range

\[ 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-48300/T) \]
\[ 1850-2500 \]
\[ 3.3 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Hartig et al., 1971} \]
\[ \text{(a)} \]

\[ 4.0 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-50800/T) \]
\[ 1750-2575 \]
\[ 9.0 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Dean and Kistiakowsky, 1971} \]
\[ \text{(e)} \]

\[ 4.0 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-48300/T) \]
\[ 1850-2500 \]
\[ 3.3 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Dean and Kistiakowsky, 1971} \]
\[ \text{(e)} \]

\[ 4.7 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-49500/T) \]
\[ 1700-2300 \]
\[ 6.0 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Roth and Just, 1975} \]
\[ \text{(g)} \]

\[ 2.3 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-32500/T) \]
\[ 2000-2700 \]
\[ 6.0 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Gardiner et al., 1975} \]
\[ \text{(i)} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k / \text{s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T / K )</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm(^{-3} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intermediate Fall-Off Range

\[ 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-48300/T) \]
\[ 1850-2500 \]
\[ 3.3 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Hartig et al., 1971} \]
\[ \text{(a)} \]

\[ 4.0 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-50800/T) \]
\[ 1750-2575 \]
\[ 9.0 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Dean and Kistiakowsky, 1971} \]
\[ \text{(e)} \]

\[ 4.0 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-48300/T) \]
\[ 1850-2500 \]
\[ 3.3 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Dean and Kistiakowsky, 1971} \]
\[ \text{(e)} \]

\[ 4.7 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-49500/T) \]
\[ 1700-2300 \]
\[ 6.0 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Roth and Just, 1975} \]
\[ \text{(g)} \]

\[ 2.3 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-32500/T) \]
\[ 2000-2700 \]
\[ 6.0 \times 10^{-9} (\text{Ar}) \]
\[ \text{Gardiner et al., 1975} \]
\[ \text{(i)} \]
BAULCH ET AL.

$\text{CH}_4 (+ \text{M}) \rightarrow \text{CH}_3 + \text{H} (+ \text{M})$ — Continued

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$[\text{M}]$</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $3.63 \times 10^{-3}$ | 1.3$\times 10^{20}$ | Hartig et al., 1971
| $4.20 \times 10^{-3}$ | $3.2 \times 10^{20}$ | (a) |
| $6.03 \times 10^{-3}$ | $3.2 \times 10^{20}$ | Chen et al., 1975
| $8.50 \times 10^{-3}$ | $3.2 \times 10^{20}$ | (j) |
| $1.20 \times 10^{-4}$ | $3.2 \times 10^{20}$ | Barnes, Pratt, and Wood, 1989

High Pressure Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k_0$</th>
<th>$T$</th>
<th>$[\text{M}]$</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $2.0 \times 10^{9} \exp(-52300/T)$ | $1.3-90.0 \times 10^{10}(\text{Ar})$ | Benson and O’Neal, 1970
| $1.0 \times 10^{9} \exp(-50000/T)$ | $1500-3000$ | Warnatz, 1984
| $3.7 \times 10^{10} \exp(-52000/T)$ | $200-2500$ | Tsang and Hampson, 1986
| $3.7 \times 10^{10} \exp(-52782/T)$ | $300-2500$ | Stewart et al., 1989
| $[\text{Ar}] 7.5 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-45700/T)$ | $1000-3000$ | Cobos and Troe, 1990
| $[\text{CH}_2] 4.0 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-45000/T)$ | $1000-3000$ | (q) |
| $2.4 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-52800/T)$ | $1000-3000$ | (r) |
| $F_2(\text{Ar}) = \exp(-0.45 T/3230)$ | $1000-3000$ | Cobos and Troe, 1992
| $F_2(\text{CH}_3) = \exp(-0.37 T/2210)$ | $1000-3000$ | (t) |
| $k_0$ | $[\text{Ar}] 1.2 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-470000/T)$ | $1000-3000$ | CEC, 1992
| $k_0$ | $[\text{CH}_2] 4.0 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-48100/T)$ | $1000-2000$ | (u) |
| $k_0$ | $2.4 \times 10^{-9} \exp(-528000/T)$ | $1000-3000$ | (v) |
| $F_2(\text{Ar}) = \exp(-0.45 T/3231)$ | $1000-3000$ | (w) |
| $F_2(\text{CH}_3) = \exp(-0.37 T/2210)$ | $1700-5000$ | Cobos and Troe, 1992
| $k_0$ | $[\text{Ar}] 7.8 \times 10^{-2} \exp(-59200/T)$ | $1000-3000$ | (x) |
| $F_2(\text{Ar}) = \exp(-T/1350)$ | $1700-5000$ | (y) |
| $+ \exp(-7834/T)$ | | | |
| $k_0$ | $2.46 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-52800/T)$ | $1000-5000$ | |

Comments

(a) Shock wave study of CH$_4$/Ar mixtures. The reaction was followed by infrared emission of CH$_4$ and by infrared emission and ultraviolet absorption of the formed species.
(b) Shock tube study of the pyrolysis of CH$_4$. H atoms monitored directly using atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy. Absolute H concentration determined using calibration by N$_2$/H$_2$/Ar mixtures. Modelling with 17 reactions. RRKM and master equation calculations.
(c) Study of the decomposition of CH$_4$ in reflected shock waves. CH$_3$ concentrations detected by narrow-line-width laser absorption at 216.6 nm. Reaction mechanism with 38 reactions.
(d) Study of the pyrolysis of CH$_4$ in incident shock waves with the laser-schlieren technique. Measurements in mixtures of 2% CH$_4$/Kr, 2% CH$_4$/Ar and 0.5% CH$_4$/Ar at pressures of 230–660 Torr have been done between 2800–4300 K. RRKM analysis of data between 1600–4200 K.
(e) Shock wave study of CH$_4$/O$_2$/CO/Ar mixtures. The reaction was followed by measuring infrared emissions from CO and O$_2$.
(f) The CH$_4$ pyrolysis was investigated by a shock waves technique.
(g) Shock wave study of CH$_4$/Ne mixtures. The reaction was analysed by time-of-flight mass spectrometry.
(h) Direct measurements of the time dependent H atom concentrations during the pyrolysis of CH$_4$/Ar mixtures using shock waves technique.
(i) Pyrolysis of CH$_4$ in shock waves. The reaction was followed by time-of-flight mass spectrometry, infrared laser absorption, and laser schlieren technique.
(j) Pyrolysis of CH$_4$ in a static system. Initial rates based on analysis of H$_2$, C$_2$H$_6$, and C$_2$H$_4$. $k_0$ values extrapolated with RRKM theory.
(k) Shock waves study of CH$_4$/O$_2$/Ar mixtures. Reaction followed by absorption measurements of OH and by emission from the chemiluminescent reaction O + CO.
(l) Shock waves study of CH$_4$ pyrolysis. The reaction was followed monitoring the CH$_4$ emission and absorption at 3.392 μm.
(m) Shock waves measurements of CH$_4$/Ar mixtures. Modelling of 12 reactions.
(n) Pyrolysis of CH$_4$ at very early stages (0.003–0.05% reaction) in a quartz-lined flow reactor. Reactant and products (ethane, ethylene, acetylene, and propylene) detected by gas chromatography.
(o) Review of literature previous to 1966.
(p) Review of literature previous to 1980.
(q) The \( k_\alpha \) recommended is based on the Hartig et al.\(^1\) results scaled up by a factor 3.
(r) Single-channel hindered Gorin model RRKM calculations of the CH\(_4\) decomposition with a fit to experimental results.
(s) The experiments by Hartig et al.\(^1\) have been re-evaluated taking into account the increasing amount of IR emissions from species other than CH\(_4\) as documented in Ref. 1. These corrections become most pronounced in the high pressure experiments. The theoretical calculations were done using the \( k_\alpha \) formalism from Ref. 20, fall-off expression from Ref. 21 and SACM-modified PST calculations from Ref. 22 which lead to a nearly temperature independent value of \( k_\alpha \) for the reverse recombination H + CH\(_3\) \( \rightarrow \) CH\(_4\) of 3.5·10\(^{-10}\) cm\(^3\) molecule\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\) for the reverse association reaction. Figures 1 and 2 show the temperature dependence of \( k_\alpha \) and \( k_\alpha \) respectively. Figure 3 shows a set of fall-off curves over the range 300–4300 K for the recombination H + CH\(_3\) \( \rightarrow \) CH\(_4\). The high temperature dissociation rate coefficients were converted to recombination rate coefficients with the \( k_\alpha \) given above. Finally, in Fig. 4 dissociation fall-off curves for M = CH\(_4\) are depicted.

References

23. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
$\text{CH}_4 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{CH}_3 + \text{M}$

**Fig. 1**

- **Warnatz 1984**
- **This Evaluation 1000 - 1700 K 1993**
- **This Evaluation 1700 - 5000 K 1993**

Log$_{10}$[$k_0$ (cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$)] vs. $10^3T^{-1/2}$K$^{-1}$

Temperature range: 1000 - 2000 K
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

$\text{CH}_4 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{CH}_3 + \text{M}$

Fig. 2

- Warnatz 1984
- Tsang and Hampson 1986 and Stewart et al 1989
- This Evaluation 1993
Fig. 3

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Cheng and Yeh (M=C_2H_6) 308 K 1977
- Brouard et al (M=He) 601 K 1989
- Barnes et al (M=Ar) 1098 K 1989
- Cobos and Troe (M=Ar) 2200 K 1990
- Davidson et al (M=Ar) 2144 K 1992
- Davidson et al (M=Ar) 2244 K 1992
- Kieler and Kumaran (M=Kr) 2878 K 1992
- Kieler and Kumaran (M=Kr) 3550 K 1992
- Kieler and Kumaran (M=Kr) 4254 K 1992

---

CH_4 + M → H + CH_3 + M
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

$CH_4 + M \rightarrow H + CH_3 + M$

Fig. 4

**EXPERIMENTAL DATA**

- △ △ △ Chen et al 1975
- ■ ■ ■ Barnes et al 1984
- --- This Evaluation 1993

Log($k$/s$^{-1}$) vs. Log($[CH_4]/$molecule cm$^{-3}$)

Key temperatures:
- 1148 K
- 1123 K
- 1103 K
- 1098 K
- 1073 K
- 1068 K
- 1038 K
- 995 K

Log($[CH_4]/$molecule cm$^{-3}$) range: 17 to 21
**H + HCHO → H2 + HCO**

**Thermodynamic data**

\[ \Delta H^{\circ}_{298} = -58.5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S^{\circ}_{298} = 21.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_p = 3.8 \times 10^7 T^{-0.4} \exp(+6730/T) \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 3.7 \times 10^{-12} )</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>Baldwin and Cowe, 1962</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 2.2 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1892/T) )</td>
<td>297-652</td>
<td>Westenberg and deHaas, 1972</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 5.4 \times 10^{-14} )</td>
<td>264-479</td>
<td>Ridley et al., 1972</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.3 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1847/T) )</td>
<td>1700-2500</td>
<td>Klemm, 1979*</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.2 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>1470-1570</td>
<td>Dean, Johnston, and Steiner, 1980</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 4.8 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1879/T) )</td>
<td>1180-1690</td>
<td>Vandooren et al., 1986</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.8 \times 10^{-14} T^{10} \exp(-1650/T) )</td>
<td>300-2200</td>
<td>Choudhury and Lin, 1989</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviews and Evaluations**

| \( 3.8 \times 10^{-14} T^{10} \exp(-1650/T) \) | 300-2200 | CEC, 1992*                | (h)      |

**Comments**

(a) Inhibition of \( \text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 \) reaction at the second limit by HCHO.

(b) Microwave discharge \( \text{H}_2/\text{He} \); behaviour of H atoms in the presence of excess HCHO determined by ESR.

(c) Pulsed vacuum UV photolysis of HCHO; behaviour of H atoms in the presence of excess HCHO determined by Lyman \( \alpha \) resonance fluorescence.

(d) Flash photolysis; resonance fluorescence detection of H atoms.

(e) HCHO/O\( _2 \)/Ar and HCHO/N\( _2 \)/Ar mixtures investigated in reflected shock waves; HCHO detected by IR emission.

(f) Molecular beam mass spectrometric measurements in a lean HCHO-oxygen flame. \( k \) derived from kinetic analysis of flame chemistry.

(g) Shock wave pyrolysis of methyl nitrate/1,3,5-trioxane mixtures; CO production by time resolved resonance absorption. \( k \) determined by kinetic modelling and was sensitive primarily to the values of \( k(\text{H} + \text{HCO}) = 1.2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) and \( k(\text{HCO} + \text{M}) = 3.16 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-8566/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \).

(h) Based on the data of Ridley et al.*, Klemm*, and Dean et al.*

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 2.1 \times 10^{-16} T^{0.6} \exp(-1090/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \] over range 300-1700 K.

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.3 \text{ at } 1700 \text{ K reducing to } \pm 0.1 \text{ at } 300 \text{ K}. \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The preferred value is the expression derived by Choudhury and Lin* from a non-linear least squares analysis of their recent high temperature data and of the low temperature data of Baldwin and Cowe*, Westenberg and deHaas*, Ridley et al.* and Klemm*. The data of Choudhury and Lin appear to be more reliable than the earlier high temperature data of Schecher and Jost* and Dean et al.*

**References**

8. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

$H + HCHO \rightarrow H_2 + HCO$

**Experimentally**
- Schecke and Jost 1969
- Westenberg and DeHaas 1972
- Ridley et al. 1974
- Klemm 1979
- Dean et al. 1980
- This Evaluation 1993

**Diagram Details**
- Logarithmic scale for reaction rate constant $k$ in units of $\text{cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$.
- Linear scale for temperature $T$ in Kelvin (K).
- Temperature range from 2000 K to 250 K.
- Reaction rate constant plotted against $10^3 T^{-1} / \text{K}^{-1}$. 

**Experimental Data Points**
- Various authors' data points indicated by different markers and line styles.
Thermodynamic data
\[ \Delta H_{298} = -150 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298} = -86.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 1.8 \times 10^{-5} \exp(+17830/T) \text{ atm}^{-1} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Pressure Range</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[He] ( 1.4 \times 10^{-20} \exp(-569/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 285-504 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (8-140) \times 10^{-17} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightfoot and Pilling, 1987^{11}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Intermediate Fall-Off Range** |
| \( 3.2 \times 10^{-13} \) |
| \( 300 \) |
| \( 1.6 \times 10^{-10} \) (He) |
| Braun and Lenzi, 1967^{2} |
| (b) |

| **High Pressure Range** |
| \( 1.0 \times 10^{-12} \) |
| \( 300 \) |
| \( 1.6-29 \times 10^{-10} \) (N\(_2\)) |
| Braun and Lenzi, 1967^{2} |
| (b) |

**References**

1. Lightfoot and Pilling, 1987^{11}
2. Braun and Lenzi, 1967^{2}
3. Kurylo, Peterson, and Braun, 1970^{5}
4. Baur, 1970^{4}
5. Teng and Jones, 1972^{2}
6. Michael, Osborne, and Suess, 1973^{6}
7. Brouard, Lightfoot, and Pilling, 1986^{8}
8. Hanning-Lee et al., 1993^{9}
9. Ellul et al., 1993^{22}
10. Kerr and Parsonage, 1972^{19}
11. Wamatz, 1984^{20}
12. Tsang and Hampson, 1986^{31}
13. Feng et al., 1993^{12}
14. Oka and Cvetanovic, 1979^{16}
15. Sugawara, Okazaki, and Satu, 1981^{17}
16. Ellul et al., 1981^{18}
17. Lightfoot and Pilling, 1987^{1}
18. Kerr and Parsonage, 1972^{19}
19. Wamatz, 1984^{20}
20. Tsang and Hampson, 1986^{31}
21. Feng et al., 1993^{12}

**Comments**

(a)
Comments

(a) Laser flash photolysis–resonance fluorescence study of the reaction H + C₂H₄, H atoms were generated by photolysis of N₂O at 193 nm in the presence of H₂ and monitored by resonance fluorescence.

(b) Flash photolysis of C₂H₄ detection via Lyman-α absorption of H atoms. High pressure extrapolation to gas densities greater than 2.4·10¹⁵ molecule cm⁻³.

(c) Vacuum UV flash photolysis of C₂H₄. Analysis of H atom concentration by resonance fluorescence and absorption of Lyman-α radiation at 121.6 nm. Extrapolation to the high pressure limit via Lindemann plots.

(d) Three different experimental techniques were employed: (a) discharge flow system with Lyman-α absorption detection of H atoms; (b) reactive Lyman-α photometric experiments with H atoms generated from Hg-photosensitized decomposition of H₂; (c) discharge flow system with time-of-flight mass spectrometry.

(e) H atoms generated in a Wood-Bonhoeffer discharge; products C₃H₆, C₂H₂, n-C₄H₁₀ and CH₄ determined by GC.

(f) Time-resolved Lyman-α absorption; H produced by Hg photosensitization of H₂.

(g) Discharge flow system; product analysis by MS.

(h) ArF excimer laser flash photolysis of C₂H₄ with detection of H atoms by Lyman-α resonance fluorescence. The approach to the H + C₂H₄ = C₂H₃ equilibrium was directly observed.

(i) Direct measurements of the approach to the H + C₂H₄ larmorally C₂H₃ equilibrium. H atoms formed by photolysis at 193 nm of C₂H₄-He mixtures and detected by time-resolved resonance fluorescence. Master equation analysis of data.

(j) Pulse radiolysis of H₂ with direct observation of H atoms by Lyman-α absorption spectroscopy.

(k) See comment (i).

(l) Photolysis of HI in the presence of C₂H₄ rate coefficients determined relative to the reaction H + HI → H₂ + I for which a value k = 2.0·10⁻¹¹ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ was employed.

(m) Pulse radiolysis of H₂ with Lyman-α detection of H₂.

(n) Flash photolysis–resonance fluorescence measurements. Photolysis of C₂H₄ at λ≥110 nm and detection of H atoms by resonance fluorescence in Ar diluent.

(o) Pulse radiolysis of H₂ with detection of H atoms by Lyman-α absorption.

(p) Irradiation of Hg/NO/H₂/C₂H₄ mixtures with modulated light at 253.7 nm in a flow system. Measurements of the luminescence of HNO (λ⁺).

(q) Pulse radiolysis of H₂; resonance absorption detection of H.

(r) Pulsed Hg-sensitized photolysis of H₂; resonance absorption detection of H.

(s) Review of literature up to 1970.

(t) Review of literature prior to 1980.

(u) The recommended values were obtained by combination of the room temperature rate coefficients with results of the reverse dissociation reaction at higher temperatures. A tabulation of log k/k₀ over the temperature range 300–2500 K from RRKM calculation is also given.

(v) Expression based on the results of Refs. 1 and 9 and transition state model calculations.

Preferred Values

\[ k_\alpha = 6.6·10^{-15}T^{0.28}\exp(-650/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range } 200–1100 \text{ K}. \]
\[ k_\alpha = [\text{He}]1.3·10^{-2}\exp(-380/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range } 300–800 \text{ K}. \]
\[ k_\alpha = [\text{N}_2] 7.7·10^{-3}\exp(-380/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range } 300–800 \text{ K}. \]

\[ F_\alpha = 0.24\exp(-T/40) + 0.76\exp(-T/1025) \text{ for } M = \text{He} \text{ and N}_2 \text{ over range } 300–800 \text{ K}. \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_\alpha = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range } 200–1100 \text{ K}. \]
\[ \Delta \log k_\alpha = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range } 300–800 \text{ K}. \]
\[ \Delta F_\alpha = \pm 0.1 \text{ over range } 300–800 \text{ K}. \]

Comments on Preferred Values

This reaction has been extensively studied at low temperatures. The k₀ value at 300 K is well established. The average of all experimental measurements is (1.2 ± 0.3)·10⁻¹² cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹. The analysis of the reaction is based on theoretical fall-off curves and strong collision low pressure rate coefficients which were calculated using a reaction threshold of 154.78 kJ mol⁻¹. From this analysis the above recommended limiting rate coefficients were derived. The temperature dependence of k₀ and kα is depicted in Figs. 1 and 2. The resulting collision efficiencies for M = He are approximately independent of temperature, β₀ = 0.07, over the range 300–800 K. This finding is consistent with a temperature dependence of −<ΔE> of about T⁻⁰.₃ in good agreement with recent results. Figure 3 shows the room temperature data from Kurylo et al. and data at higher temperatures by Pilling and co-workers. At atmospheric pressure and 300 K the reaction is very close to the high pressure limit, i.e. k/k₀ = 0.9, while at 800 K it is in the fall-off regime. The recombinant and the dissociation rate coefficients are related via the equilibrium constant given above. The expression for k₀ for M = N₂ is based on the early work of Braun and Lenzi which requires confirmation.

References


\[ H + CH_4 + M \rightarrow C_2H_6 + M \]

**Fig. 1**

This Evaluation (M=He) 1993
Fig. 2

EXPERIMENTAL DATA AND ASSESSMENTS

- Kerr and Parsonage 1972
- Lee et al 1978
- Sugawara et al 1981
- Wamatz 1984
- Tsang and Hampson 1986
- Lightfoot and Pilling 1987
- This Evaluation 1993
H + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + M \rightarrow C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} + M

Fig. 3

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- ○ Kurylo et al 300 K 1970
- ● Lightfoot and Pilling 285 K 1987
- ■ Lightfoot and Pilling 400 K 1987
- ▲ Lightfoot and Pilling 511 K 1987
- △ Lightfoot and Pilling 604 K 1987
- ▣ Hanning-Lee et al 1992
- - - - This Evaluation 1993

Log([He]/molecule cm\textsuperscript{-3}) vs Log([He]/molecule cm\textsuperscript{-3})
### Thermodynamic data

\[
\Delta H_{\text{m}} = 150 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S_{\text{m}} = 86.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p = 5.6 \cdot 10^7 \exp(-17830/T) \text{ atm.}
\]

### Rate Coefficient Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>([k] \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>([M] \text{ molecule cm}^{-3} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Pressure Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{C}_2\text{H}_6] ) (3.0 \cdot 10^{-5} \exp(-16300/T))</td>
<td>823-913</td>
<td>((4.4-68) \cdot 10^{-17})</td>
<td>Lin and Back, 1966&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{C}_2\text{H}_6] ) (1.1 \cdot 10^{-5} \exp(-16000/T))</td>
<td>673-773</td>
<td>((0.52-120) \cdot 10^{-17})</td>
<td>Loucks and Laidler, 1967&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Ar}] ) (1.7 \cdot 10^{-6} \exp(-15100/T))</td>
<td>900-1350 &amp; ((2.7-180) \cdot 10^{-18})</td>
<td>Glänzer and Troe, 1973&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{C}_2\text{H}_6] ) (8.3 \cdot 10^{-15})</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>((1.1-27.2) \cdot 10^{-17})</td>
<td>Pacey and Wimalasena, 1984&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{C}_2\text{H}_6] ) (3.3 \cdot 10^{-16} \exp(-17560/T))</td>
<td>793-813</td>
<td>((0.12-37) \cdot 10^{-17})</td>
<td>Simon, Foucaut and Scacchi, 1988&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Fall-Off Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.4 \cdot 10^{14} \exp(-19800/T))</td>
<td>673-773</td>
<td>(7 \cdot 10^{-9} (\text{C}_2\text{H}_6))</td>
<td>Bywater and Steacie, 1951&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.2 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>822.7</td>
<td>(1.9 \cdot 10^{-8} (\text{C}_2\text{H}_6))</td>
<td>Lin and Back, 1966&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.8 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>857.7</td>
<td>(6.9 \cdot 10^{-9})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.0 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>(3.1 \cdot 10^{-9})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.8 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>(3.8 \cdot 10^{-10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.7 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>793-813</td>
<td>(7.2 \cdot 10^{-10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.2 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>(7.6 \cdot 10^{-10} (\text{C}_2\text{H}_6))</td>
<td>Loucks and Laidler, 1967&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>(5.6 \cdot 10^{-10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.8)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(3.2 \cdot 10^{-10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.8)</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>(5.5 \cdot 10^{-10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.7)</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>(2.7 \cdot 10^{-10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.4 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>(9.1 \cdot 10^{-10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.3 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>(4.4 \cdot 10^{-10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.9 \cdot 10^4)</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>(3.6 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.7 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>(7.7 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.7 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>(1.1 \cdot 10^{-7} (\text{C}_2\text{H}_6))</td>
<td>Pacey and Wimalasena, 1984&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.5 \cdot 10^3)</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>(6.6 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.6 \cdot 10^4)</td>
<td>1200-1700</td>
<td>((1.0-25) \cdot 10^{-7} (\text{C}_2\text{H}_6))</td>
<td>Hidaka &lt;i&gt;et al.&lt;/i&gt;, 1985&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0 \cdot 10^3)</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>(1.4 \cdot 10^{-6} (\text{Ar}))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.7 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>(1.6 \cdot 10^{-7} (\text{C}_2\text{H}_6))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.7 \cdot 10^2)</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>(13 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.2 \cdot 10^3)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>(1.2 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.3 \cdot 10^3)</td>
<td>872.5</td>
<td>(8.8 \cdot 10^{-9})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.9 \cdot 10^4)</td>
<td>872.5</td>
<td>(8.3 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.3 \cdot 10^3)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>(12 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.7 \cdot 10^3)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>(100 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.3 \cdot 10^3)</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>(99 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.6 \cdot 10^3)</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>(2.5 \cdot 10^{-9} (\text{He}))</td>
<td>Brouard, Lightfoot, and Pilling, 1986&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.62 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>(2.4 \cdot 10^{-8})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.62 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>(2.3 \cdot 10^{-8})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.28 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>(3.7 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.01 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>(37 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.72 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>(1.2 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.63 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>(3.6 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.54 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>(36 \cdot 10^{-7})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.26 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>(7.1 \cdot 10^{-8})</td>
<td>Feng &lt;i&gt;et al.&lt;/i&gt;, 1992&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.27 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>(4.2 \cdot 10^{-8})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.49 \cdot 10^5)</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>(15.8 \cdot 10^{-8})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C₂H₆ (+ M) → C₂H₄ + H (+ M) — Continued

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm⁻³</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹⁰ exp(-20130/T)</td>
<td>693–803</td>
<td>(1.8–21)·10⁻¹⁵ (n-butane)</td>
<td>Purnell and Quinn, 1962¹⁴</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8·10⁻¹⁰ exp(-19120/T)</td>
<td>822.7–913</td>
<td>(3.8–69)·10⁻¹⁵ (C₂H₆)</td>
<td>Lin and Back, 1966¹³</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7·10⁻¹⁰ exp(-20380/T)</td>
<td>673–773</td>
<td>(0.52–120)·10⁻¹⁵ (C₂H₆)</td>
<td>Loucks and Laidler, 1967¹⁴</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3·10⁻¹⁰ exp(-20130/T)</td>
<td>900–1350</td>
<td>(2.7–180)·10⁻¹⁵ (Ar)</td>
<td>Glaser and Troe, 1973³</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2·10⁻¹⁰ exp(-21050/T)</td>
<td>941–1073</td>
<td>6.0·10⁻⁸ (Ar)</td>
<td>Pratt and Rogers, 1975¹⁵</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7·10⁻⁵</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>(1.1–27.2)·10⁻⁵ (C₂H₆)</td>
<td>Pacey and Wimalasena, 1984⁶</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9·10⁻¹⁰ exp(-19120/T)</td>
<td>841–913</td>
<td>(0.9–110)·10⁻⁷ (C₂H₆)</td>
<td>Trenwith, 1986¹⁰</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6·10⁻⁹ exp(-19120/T)</td>
<td>793–813</td>
<td>(0.12–37)·10⁻⁷ (C₂H₆)</td>
<td>Simon, Foucast, and Scacchi, 1986⁷</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Pyrolysis of C₂H₆ in a conventional static system. Measurements of the rate of production of CH₄ and C₂H₄. Rate coefficients measured relative to the reaction C₂H₆ + C₂H₅ → C₂H₃ for which a value of k = 3.3·10⁻¹¹ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ was employed. Mechanism with six reactions. Limiting rate coefficients obtained by extrapolation using the method of Ref. 3.

(b) The mercury-photosensitized decomposition of C₂H₆ in a static system was used to generate C₂H₃ radicals. Products measured by volumetry and gas chromatography. Mechanism with four reactions. Rate coefficients measured relative to C₂H₅ + C₂H₅ → C₂H₃ for which a value of k = 3.3·10⁻¹¹ cm³ molecule⁻¹ cm⁻¹ was employed. Extrapolation towards the limiting rate coefficients employing Lindemann plots.

(c) Shock wave study of the thermal decomposition of C₂H₅NO₂. From the concentration profiles of C₂H₅NO₂ and the product NO₂ the subsequent C₂H₃ decomposition was analysed.

(d) Pyrolysis of C₂H₆ in a flow system. The products CH₄ and C₂H₄ were measured by gas chromatography. Steady-state approximation for a mechanism with nine reactions. Extrapolation based on Ref. 7.

(e) Pyrolysis of C₂H₆ in a static system. The main products were CH₄ and C₂H₄ and were analysed by gas chromatography. Analysis of literature values employing the RRKM and Troe models.

(f) Mercury-photosensitized decomposition of C₂H₆. Analysis of CH₄ and H₂.

(g) Pyrolysis of C₂H₆ behind shock waves. Monitoring of C₂H₆, C₂H₅ and CH₄ concentrations by absorption spectroscopy.

(h) Thermal decomposition of C₂H₆. The concentrations of CH₄ and C₂H₃ determined by gas chromatography. Rate coefficients derived from CH₄ and C₂H₃ yields on the basis of a mechanism with five reactions.

(i) ArF excimer flash photolysis of C₂H₆ with detection of H atoms by Lyman-α resonance fluorescence. The approach to the H + C₂H₆ ↔ C₂H₅ equilibrium was directly observed.

(j) Thermal decomposition of C₂H₆ monitored by using photoionization mass spectrometry. C₂H₅ radicals generated by 193 nm laser photolysis of 3-pentanone. Weak collision effects studied using modified strong collision and master equation analysis.

(k) Pyrolysis of n-butane. The reaction rates were measured by analysing chromatographically the products after short residence times. Extrapolation of the limiting high pressure rate coefficients using the method of Ref. 3.

(l) Pyrolysis of C₂H₆ in a wall-less reactor. Analysis performed by gas chromatography. Mechanism with seven reactions.

(m) Review of literature data.

(n) The recommended values were obtained by combination of the room temperature rate coefficients for the recombination reaction with studies of the dissociation reaction at higher temperatures.

Preferred Values

\[ k_o = 8.2·10^{12} \exp(-20070/T) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range } 700–1100 \text{ K}. \]
\[ k_o = [C_2H_6]1.7·10^6 \exp(-16800/T) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range } 700–900 \text{ K}. \]
\[ F_e = 0.25 \exp(-T/97) + 0.75 \exp(-T/1379) \text{ for } M = C_2H_6 \text{ over range } 700–1000 \text{ K}. \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_o = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range } 700–1100 \text{ K}. \]
\[ \Delta \log k_o = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range } 700–900 \text{ K}. \]
\[ \Delta F_e = \pm 0.1 \text{ over range } 700–1100 \text{ K}. \]
Comments on Preferred Values

Several studies of the temperature and the pressure dependencies of this reaction have been published. We have selected the experimental measurements of Refs. 4, 6, 8 and 13 to analyse this reaction. Theoretical fall-off curves\(^{18}\) were fitted to these data and the resulting \(k_0\) values were analysed using the low pressure unimolecular rate theory from Refs. 18 and 19 employing a reaction threshold of 154.78 \(\text{kJ mol}^{-1}\). Figures 1 and 2 compare our recommended values of \(\text{leo}\) and \(k_0\), with those reported in previous recommendations. Collisional efficiencies of about 0.14 for \(M = \text{C}_2\text{H}_6\) between 700 and 800 K were derived, which are consistent with an average energy transferred per collision of \(-\langle\Delta E\rangle = 150\) to 210 \(\text{cm}^{-1}\). Similarly, from the experiments of Ref. 13 a value of \(-\langle\Delta E\rangle = 13\) \(\text{cm}^{-1}\) for \(M = \text{Ar}\) was obtained. Figure 3 shows the fall-off curves constructed in this evaluation. The dissociation and recombination rate coefficients are related via the equilibrium constant given above\(^{13}\).

References

Fig. 2

\[ \text{Log}(k_z / \text{s}^{-1}) \]

- Wornitz 1984
- Tsang and Hampson 1986
- This Evaluation 1993

\[ T / \text{K} \]

\[ 2000 \quad 1000 \quad 500 \]

\[ 9.0 \quad 7.0 \quad 5.0 \quad 3.0 \quad 1.0 \quad -1.0 \quad -3.0 \quad -5.0 \]

\[ 10^3 T^{-1} / \text{K}^{-1} \]

\[ 0.5 \quad 1.0 \quad 1.5 \quad 2.0 \]
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + M \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + M \]

**Fig. 3**

**EXPERIMENTAL DATA**
- Loucks and Laidler (\(\text{M} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_6\)) 703 K 1967
- Pacey and Wimalasena (\(\text{M} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_6\)) 902 K 1984
- Simon et al. (\(\text{M} = \text{C}_2\text{H}_6\)) 813 K 1988
- Feng et al. (\(\text{M} = \text{He}\)) 930 K 1992
- This Evaluation 1993
**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H_{298}^{\ddagger} = -368.0 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S_{298}^{\ddagger} = -110.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_p = 1.8 \times 10^{-2} \text{mg}^{-1/2} \exp\left(\frac{44028}{T}\right) \text{ atm}^{-1} \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k / \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/K )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 ( \times 10^{-10} ) to 1.3 ( \times 10^{-9} )</td>
<td>1450–1900</td>
<td>Brouwer et al., 1988 (^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 ( \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Bartels et al., 1989 (^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 ( \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Ackermann et al., 1990 (^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 ( \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>1300–1650</td>
<td></td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) The thermal decomposition of toluene has been reinvestigated in shock wave experiments. The absorption signals of toluene, benzyl, and assumed benzyl fragments were monitored. The rate coefficient was determined from modelling studies.

(b) The reaction of benzyl radicals with H and O atoms were studied in a flow reactor at room temperature and at pressures around 1 mbar. Molecular beam sampling and mass spectrometric detection were applied. The rate for the recombination was measured with reference to the reaction of methyl radicals with deuterium atoms.

(c) Reaction rate measured using: (1) pulse radiolysis of Ar/toluene mixtures at 1 bar pressure; \([\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3] \) monitored by light absorption at 305.3 nm, (2) flash photolysis and pulsed laser photolysis of Ar/toluene mixtures; \([\text{H}] \) monitored by resonance absorption. Results from the different techniques in good agreement.

(d) Shock tube study on \( \text{Ar}/\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3/\text{D}_2 \) mixtures, \([\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3] \) monitored by light absorption at 260 nm. No temperature dependence of \( k \) could be detected.

**Preferred Values**

\( k_\circ = 4.3 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \) over the range 300–2000 K.

**Reliability**

\( \Delta \log k_\circ = \pm 0.2 \) at room temperature rising to \( \pm 0.5 \) at 2000 K.

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The available data at 300 K\(^1,2,3\) are in good agreement. At higher temperatures the results of Ackermann \( et \) \( al. \)\(^3\) are accepted rather than those from the less direct study of Brouwer \( et \) \( al. \)\(^1\). As might be expected for such a fast recombination reaction there is no evidence for a significant temperature dependence of the rate constant.

**References**


EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ 
\begin{align*}
H + C_6H_5CH_3 & \rightarrow H_2 + C_6H_5CH_2 \quad (1) \\
& \rightarrow H_2 + C_6H_5CH_3 \\ & \rightarrow CH_3 + C_6H_5 \\
H + C_6H_5CH_3 (+ M) & \rightarrow C_6H_5CH_3 (+ M) \quad (4)
\end{align*}
\]

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta H_{298}^{0}(1) &= -68.5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S_{298}^{0}(1) &= 12.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p(1) &= 2.4 \times 10^{11} \exp(8060/T) \\
\Delta H_{298}^{0}(2) &= 37.5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S_{298}^{0}(2) &= 12.1 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p(2) &= 2.5 \times 10^{13} \exp(-4630/T)
\end{align*}
\]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

\[
k(0) = k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k_1 = 3.3 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-755/T))</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>Benson and Shaw, 1967</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2 = 1.7 \times 10^{-13})</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Sauer and Ward, 1967a</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_3 = 1.4 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-4630/T))</td>
<td>863-963</td>
<td>McRae, Oganesyan, and Nalbandyan, 1972a</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_4 = 8.5 \times 10^{-14})</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>Knuff and Buehler, 1975a</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_5 = 8.3 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1864/T))</td>
<td>1500-1800</td>
<td>Atoh, Duran, and Ture, 1983a</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_6 = 1.3 \times 10^{-24} \exp(-171/T))</td>
<td>600-1700</td>
<td>Rao and Skinner, 1984</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_7 = 5.4 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-754/T))</td>
<td>1600-2150</td>
<td>Pamidimukkala and Kern, 1985</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_8 = 5.4 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-9561/T))</td>
<td>1600-2150</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_9 = 2.1 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-1862/T))</td>
<td>1600-2150</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_{10} = 1.8 \times 10^{-37} \exp(-1183/T))</td>
<td>950-1100</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_{11} = 1.1 \times 10^{-21} \exp(-377/T))</td>
<td>950-1100</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_{12} = 7.3 \times 10^{-24} \exp(-1057/T))</td>
<td>1300-1800</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_{13} = 9.7 \times 10^{-13})</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_{14} = 5.0 \times 10^{-13})</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_{15} = 4.2 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-8052/T))</td>
<td>1600-2100</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_{16} = 8.3 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-6290/T))</td>
<td>1380-1700</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_{17} = 2.1 \times 10^{-9} \exp(-7460/T))</td>
<td>1300-1700</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>(q)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Static system. Detection by gas chromatography and mass spectrometry. Rate expression for channel (3) deduced by comparison with H addition to benzene.

(b) Pulse radiolysis with product analysis by gas chromatography. Transient species were monitored as function of time by absorption in the wavelength range 260-340 nm. A k-value for reaction (4) at room temperature was deduced.

(c) Evaluation of a k-expression for channel (1) from a flow reactor study.

(d) Flow flow reactor with product analysis by mass spectrometry. H atoms produced in microwave discharge. Rate expression evaluated for the reaction (assumed to be channel (4)).

(e) Shock tube study with toluene/Ar mixtures. Toluene and benzyl were monitored as function of time by absorption in the 200-350 nm range. A rate expression for channel (1) was derived on the assumption that the benzyl radical exhibits sufficient thermal stability.

(f) Shock tube study with initial mixtures of toluene-d/Ar and neopentane/toluene-d/Ar. D and H atoms were monitored as function of time by ARAS. Investigation covered a temperature range from 1200-1460 K for toluene and from 1410-1730 K for toluene experiments. Together with unpublished results of Ravishankara and Nicovich, a non Arrhenius expression for T = 600-1700 K was deduced for channel (1).

(g) Shock tube study with mixtures of toluene and ethylbenzene. Products were monitored as function of time by time-of-flight mass spectrometry. The rate expression for formation of benzyl radicals and hydrogen (channel (1)) was evaluated using data of Ref. 6. Rate expressions for the formation of methyl phenyl radicals and hydrogen (channel (2)) and of benzene and methyl radicals (channel (3)) are deduced.

(h) Single pulse shock tube. The source of H atoms was the thermal decay of small quantities of hexamethylethane. The k-values have been derived on the basis of the competing process H + CH₃ -> CH₂ + H with \(k = 2.2 \times 10^{-20} \exp(-4045/T)\) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹. Rate ex-
pressions for the formation of benzene and methyl radicals (channel (3)) and of benzyl radicals and hydrogen (channel (1)) were obtained.

(i) Shock tube study on high temperature pyrolysis of ethyl-benzene with the laser schlieren technique.

(ii) Small amounts of toluene (0.05–0.5%) added to slowly reacting mixtures of hydrogen and oxygen at 773 K. Under the experimental conditions the H₂ + O₂ system provides a reproducible source of H, O, and OH radicals. The measurements of the relative consumption of H₂ and of the additive permits the evaluation of rate constants for the reaction of H, O, and OH with toluene.

(k) Two independent shock tube techniques (time-of-flight mass spectrometry and laser schlieren densitometry) were used to investigate the high temperature pyrolysis of toluene in mixtures with Kr and Ne, respectively. A rate coefficient for the formation of methyl phenyl (channel (2)) was obtained.

(l) Shock tube study with very low initial concentrations of toluene in Ar. Hydrogen atom formation is monitored by ARAS. The measured H profiles were sensitive to k₁ in the later stage of observation time. A rate constant expression for channel (1) was deduced which is slightly smaller than that of Rao and Skinner.

(m) Study using reflected shock waves with the pyrolysis of ethyl iodide as a hydrogen atom source. Toluene and ethyl iodide mole fractions covered range 100–200 ppm. Temperature range, 1300–1700 K. Absorption signals at 260 nm recorded. At this wavelength the absorption coefficient of benzyl radicals exceeds that of toluene by a factor of 100, allowing very small conversions of toluene to benzyl to be detected. Together with the data of Ref. 8 and unpublished results of Ravishankara and Nicovich, the authors derive an Arrhenius expression for channel (1) for the temperature range 600–1800 K.

(ii) See Comments on Preferred Values.

Preferred Values

\[ k₁ = 6.6 \times 10^{-22} T^{0.44} \exp (-1570/T) \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 600–2500 K.} \]

\[ k₃ = 9.6 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-4070/T) \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 770–1100 K.} \]

\[ k₄ = 1.2 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at 298 K.} \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k₁ = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 600–2500 K.} \]

\[ \Delta \log k₃ = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 770–1100 K.} \]

\[ \Delta \log k₄ = \pm 0.2 \text{ at 298 K.} \]

Comments on Preferred Values

An expression for \( k₃ \) has been derived but the other recommendations are unchanged from our previous evaluation.

Most of the available measurements give evidence for the product channel (1) leading to benzyl radicals and molecular hydrogen. Only a few experiments permit a discrimination between the channels at elevated temperatures. Therefore, for the majority of the studies, the different product pathways have been deduced not by direct measurement of product distribution and concentration but by modelling with the aid of plausible reaction systems. To reconcile the few room temperature data with the rate constant values at elevated temperatures, it has to be assumed that a change in the reaction mechanism occurs, possibly from channel (4) at room temperature to channel (1) dominating at temperatures above 1000 K. In the range between room temperature and 1000 K channel (3) appears to be significant. Channel (2) would only be expected to be important at elevated temperatures (> 2560 K) and there are insufficient data available to recommend an expression for \( k₂ \). For the addition reaction (4) it is only possible to evaluate a room temperature value. Furthermore the data are insufficient to justify recommendation of a rate expression for the overall H-consuming reaction over the whole temperature range.

References

EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

**OH + HO₂ → H₂O + O₂**

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H_{298}^{\text{f}} = -291 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S_{298}^{\text{f}} = -18.8 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_p = 0.517 T^{-0.25} \exp(+35000/T) \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k / \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T \text{/K} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8·10(^{-11}) ( \exp(+250/T) )</td>
<td>254–382</td>
<td>Keyser, 1988(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0·10(^{-11})</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Schwab et al., 1989(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.98·10(^{-11})</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Hippler, Troe and Willner, 1990(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8·10(^{-11}) ( \exp(+250/T) )</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^4)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8·10(^{-11}) ( \exp(+250/T) )</td>
<td>250–400</td>
<td>IUPAC, 1992(^2)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Discharge flow study with [OH] measured by resonance fluorescence and [HO₂] via conversion to OH with NO. NO₂ used to remove O and H atoms. Total pressure, 1 Torr. The author concludes little or no pressure dependence of \( k \) over the range 1–1000 Torr, because of the good agreement with measurements at 1 atm.

(b) Discharge flow reactor with laser magnetic resonance and resonance fluorescence detection. Decay of [OH] in excess HO₂ under pseudo first order conditions at a pressure of 2 Torr.

(c) Shock wave study in (CH₃O)₂/O₂/Ar mixtures and in H₂O₂/Ar mixtures. [HO₂] and [H₂O₂] monitored by UV absorption in reflected shock waves. [OH] profiles measured behind incident waves. Later reanalysis\(^6\) of the results from this study gives \( k = 3.3·10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \) over the range 950–1250 K.

(d) See Comments on Preferred Values.

(e) Accepts expression of Keyser\(^1\).

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 4.8·10^{-11}\exp(+250/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{ over range 300–2000 K.} \]

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.2 \text{ at } 300 \text{ K rising to } \pm 0.5 \text{ at } 2000 \text{ K.} \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The expression of Keyser\(^1\) was accepted as our previous recommendation which is unchanged here.

The new experimental results of Schwab et al.\(^2\) at low temperatures are in good agreement and the higher temperature studies of Hippler and Troe\(^3\) are also compatible with the extrapolation of the Keyser expression. Gonzales et al.\(^7\) have carried out a theoretical study of the reaction. By combining their calculated temperature dependence with the mean of the experimental values at 298 K they derive the expression \( k = 7.1·10^{-11} (T/300)^{-0.25} \exp(113/R T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \) which agrees closely with our preferred expression.

**References**

4. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
5. IUPAC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
OH + HO₂ → H₂O + O₂

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Troe 1969
- Friswell and Sutton 1972
- Hochanadel et al. 1972
- Day et al. 1973
- Peeters and Mahnken 1973
- DeMore and Tschuikow-Roux 1974
- Hack et al. 1975
- Burrows et al. 1977
- Hack et al. 1978
- Cheng and Kaufman 1978
- Burrows et al. 1979
- Li et al. 1980
- Hochanadel et al. 1980
- Cox et al. 1981
- Kurylo et al. 1981
- Sridharan et al. 1981
- Thrush and Wilkinson 1981
- Keyser 1981
- Braun et al. 1982
- DeMore et al. 1982
- Temps and Wagner 1982
- Rosenthal et al. 1985
- Sridharan et al. 1984
- Schwab et al. 1989
- Dixon-Lewis and Rhodes 1975
- DeMore 1979
- Burrows et al. 1981
- Keyser 1988
- Goodings and Hayhurst 1988
- Hippler and Troe 1992
- This Evaluation 1993
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

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

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta H_{\text{f}0} &= -134 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S_{\text{f}0} &= 1.23 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p &= 63.7 T^{-0.61}\exp(+16000/T)
\end{align*}
\]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.98 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Hippler, Troe and Willner, 1990(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.66 \times 10^{-12} + 9.63 \times 10^{-7}\exp(-4810/T)</td>
<td>250-1250</td>
<td>Hippler and Troe, 1992(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 \times 10^{-11}\exp(-670/T)</td>
<td>300-1100</td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 \times 10^{-12}\exp(-160/T)</td>
<td>240-460</td>
<td>IUPAC, 1992(^4)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Shock wave study in (CH\(_3\)O)\(_2\)/O\(_2\)/Ar mixtures and in H\(_2\)O\(_2\)/Ar mixtures. [HO\(_2\)] and [H\(_2\)O\(_2\)] by UV absorption in reflected shock waves. [OH] profiles measured behind incident waves.

(b) Shock tube study in H\(_2\)O/Ar mixtures. Techniques similar to previous study (comment (a)).

(c) See Comments on Preferred Values.

(d) Accepts the expression obtained by Kurylo et al.\(^5\).

**Preferred Values**

\[
k = 1.3 \times 10^{-11}\exp(-670/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 300–1000 K.}
\]

**Reliability**

\[
\Delta \log k = \pm 0.2 \text{ at 300 K rising to } \pm 0.5 \text{ at 1000 K.}
\]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The low temperature studies on this reaction indicate a very small temperature coefficient for the rate constant, as reflected in the IUPAC preferred value for the range 240–460 K. Measurements at higher temperatures (>1000 K) show considerable scatter but in general indicate higher values for \(k\) than are obtained by extrapolation from the low temperature data. Recent work by Hippler and Troe suggests that this is due to a very rapid increase in the temperature coefficient of \(k\) above about 800 K.

Our previous recommendation was a compromise, attempting to represent these differences in behaviour of \(k\) at low and high temperatures by a simple expression. Until the behaviour observed by Hippler and Troe is confirmed, we retain this preferred expression but in recognition of its limitations we increase the error limits at high temperatures and continue to limit our recommendations to temperature less than 1000 K.

**References**

\(^3\)CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
\(^4\)IUPAC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
OH + CH₃ → H + CH₂OH
(1)
→ H + CH₂O
(2)
→ H₂ + HCHO
(3)
→ H₂O + CH₃
(4)
OH + CH₃ (M) → CH₃OH (M)
(5)

Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_{298}^\circ(1) = 16.1 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^\circ(1) = -16.7 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(1) = 1.50 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-15.1/k_{\text{B}}T) \]
\[ \Delta H_{298}^\circ(2) = 49.6 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^\circ(2) = -34.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(2) = 3.73 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-5470/k_{\text{B}}T) \]
\[ \Delta H_{298}^\circ(3) = -300.9 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^\circ(3) = -28.4 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(3) = 7.94 \times 10^{-40} \exp(36300/k_{\text{B}}T) \]
\[ \Delta H_{298}^\circ(4) = -1.8 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^\circ(4) = -0.2 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(4) = 26.7 \exp(47/k_{\text{B}}T) \]

Rate Coefficient Data \((k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 + k_5)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/\text{K})</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k_1 = 3.3 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-13800/k_{\text{B}}T))</td>
<td>1700–2300</td>
<td>Bhaskaran, Frank, and Just, 1979</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_1) or (k_2 = 1.5 \times 10^{-9} \exp(-7800/k_{\text{B}}T))</td>
<td>1850–2500</td>
<td>Roth and Just, 1984</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_1 \leq 5 \times 10^{-11})</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Oser et al., 1992</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_4 = 1.2 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-1400/k_{\text{B}}T))</td>
<td>300–480</td>
<td>Oser et al., 1992</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_5 = (\text{see next data sheet}))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

\(9 \times 10^{-11}\)
300–2500
Tsang and Hampson, 1986
(e)

\(6 \times 10^{-11}\)
300–2000
CEC, 1992
(f)

Comments

(a) Shock tube decomposition of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\_\text{O}_2\) mixtures with direct detection of H and O by atomic resonance absorption spectrometry. \(k_1\) derived from a computer simulation of the experimental [H] and [O] profiles. It was suggested that channel (2) proceeds via the sequence \(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3 \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{O}\) and \(\text{CH}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{HCHO} + \text{H}_2\), i.e. overall reaction \(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3 \rightarrow 2\text{H} + \text{CH}_2\text{O}\).

(b) Similar study to that of Bhaskaran et al.\(^1\) (see comment (a)) with \(\text{CH}_2\text{O}\) mixtures.

(c) Fast-flow Teflon reactor; \(\text{CH}_3\) from \(\text{F} + \text{CH}_4\) and OH from \(\text{H} + \text{NO}_2\); \(k_4\) data derived for computer modelling of \(\text{CH}_3\) and OH profiles measured by mass spectrometry. Data for \(k_4\) derived from measurements of products, \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) relative to \(\text{CH}_2\text{O}\).

(d) Experimental system similar to note (c) but with \(k_4\) derived from measurements of products, \(\text{HDO}\) relative to \(\text{CH}_3\text{OD}\), in experiments with OD replacing OH.

(e) Based on data of Bhaskaran et al.\(^1\), Roth and Just\(^2\), and Sworski et al.\(^7\).

(f) Based on data of Bhaskaran et al.\(^1\), and Roth and Just\(^2\).

Preferred Values

\(k_4 = 1.2 \times 10^{-9}(-1400/k_{\text{B}}T) \text{ cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}\) over range 300–1000 K.

Reliability

\(\Delta \log k_4 = \pm 0.5\) over range 300–1000 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

We recommend the data of Oser et al.\(^4\) for channel (4), based on their product formation study of the yields of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\). It should be noted, however, that the recommended value of \(k_4\) is not consistent with the rate coefficient of the reverse reaction, \(k_{-4} = (1-2) \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}\), based on direct measurements\(^5\) of \(\text{CH}_2\text{O}\) and OH. A reconciliation of these results is possible if \(\Delta H^o_\text{z}(4)\) is wrong, which seems most likely to be due to an error in the presently accepted value of \(\Delta H^o_\text{z}(\text{CH}_2\text{CO})\).

The need remains for more experimental work on the branching ratio of the \(\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3\) reaction, particularly at higher temperatures.

References


\(^6\)CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).


EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3 &\rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{M} \quad (1) \\
\text{OH} + \text{CH}_3 &\rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H} \quad (2) \\
&\rightarrow \text{CH}_3\text{O} + \text{H} \quad (3) \\
&\rightarrow \text{HCHO} + \text{H}_2 \quad (4) \\
&\rightarrow \text{CH}_2^* + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad (5)
\end{align*}
\]

*Thermodynamic Data*
\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta H_{298}^o &= -386.5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S_{298}^o &= -137.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p &= 1.26\times10^{-7}T^{-0.28}\exp(+46700/T) \text{ atm}^{-1}
\end{align*}
\]

Rate Coefficient Data \((k = k_o)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k_o/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/K)</th>
<th>([M]/\text{molecule cm}^{-3})</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Pressure Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="3.5%C2%B11">He</a>×10^{-27}</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>(7.2–150)×10^{15}</td>
<td>Oser et al., 1992</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="1%C2%B11">He</a>×10^{-27}</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>(1.6–14)×10^{16}</td>
<td>Oser et al., 1992</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Fall-off Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4×10^{-11}</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>5.7×10^{10}(\text{Ar})</td>
<td>Bott and Cohen, 1991</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0×10^{-11}</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7.2×10^{10}(\text{He})</td>
<td>Oser et al., 1992</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2×10^{-11}</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2.5×10^{10}(\text{Ar-SF}_6)</td>
<td>Anastasi et al., 1991</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0×10^{-11}</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>(2.9–24)×10^{9}(\text{He})</td>
<td>Hughes et al., 1992</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2×10^{-11}</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>(2.5–230)×10^{9}(\text{He})</td>
<td>Hughes et al., 1992</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2×10^{-11}</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2.5×10^{10}(\text{Ar-SF}_6)</td>
<td>Anastasi et al., 1991</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4×10^{-11}</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1.6×10^{10}(\text{He})</td>
<td>Oser et al., 1992</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Pressure Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3×10^{-11}</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2.5×10^{10}(\text{N}_2, \text{H}_2)</td>
<td>Sworski et al., 1980</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4×10^{-11}</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2.5×10^{10}(\text{Ar-SF}_6)</td>
<td>Anastasi et al., 1991</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6×10^{-11}</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>(2.5–230)×10^{9}(\text{He})</td>
<td>Hughes et al., 1992</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviews and Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0×10^{-11}</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>(2.9–24)×10^{9}(\text{N}_2)</td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9×10^{-11}(T/298)^{-0.4}\exp(-5874T/2700)</td>
<td>600–2500</td>
<td>(2.9–12)×10^{9}(\text{N}_2)</td>
<td>Dean and Westmoreland, 1987</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>9×10^{-12} &amp; 300</td>
<td>Jordan et al., 1991</td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_o = 1.7\times10^{-10})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_o = 2.9\times10^{-10})</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Flow system study. \(\text{CH}_2\) generated by the reactions \(\text{CH}_2 + \text{F} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3 + \text{HF}\) and \(\text{OH}\) by the reaction \(\text{H} + \text{NO}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{OH}\). The \(\text{CH}_3\) radicals were calibrated using the reaction \(\text{CH}_3 + \text{NO}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{NO}\), while the \(\text{OH}\) radicals were calibrated by using an excess of \(\text{CH}_3\text{CHO}\) as scavenger. Both radicals were detected using a time-of-flight mass spectrometer. Mechanism with 15 reactions. Fall-off curves constructed using \(k_o = 9.3\times10^{-11} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}\) and \(F_r = 0.6\).

(b) See comment (a).

(c) Shock tube study of t-butyl hydroperoxide (generation of \(\text{OH}\)) and t-butyperoxide (generation of \(\text{CH}_3\)) mixtures. \(\text{OH}\) radicals monitored by UV absorption at 309 nm. Mechanism with 6 reactions. A formation yield of \(\text{CH}_3\text{OH}\) of 0.75 was found.

(d) Flash photolysis of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) vapour in \(\text{CH}_4\). \(\text{CH}_3\) radicals generated by reaction of \(\text{OH}\) with \(\text{CH}_4\). The \(\text{CH}_3\) concentrations were monitored by absorption at 216 nm. Modelling with 11 reactions. Total rate coefficients given.

(e) Pulse radiolysis of mixtures of \(\text{CH}_4/\text{H}_2\text{O}\) in the presence of \(\text{Ar} (940 \text{ Torr})\) and \(\text{SF}_6\) (30 Torr). The reactants \(\text{CH}_3\) and \(\text{OH}\) were generated by the reactions of \(\text{F}\) atoms with \(\text{CH}_4\) and with \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) respectively. \(\text{CH}_3\) radicals monitored by UV absorption at 216.4 nm.

(f) \(\text{CH}_3\) and \(\text{OH}\) radicals formed by \(193 \text{ nm–photolysis of acetone-nitrile acid mixtures diluted in He}\). The \(\text{CH}_3\) was monitored by absorption spectroscopy and \(\text{OH}\) by LIF measurements in a pump/probe mode. In all conditions \([\text{CH}_3] \gg [\text{OH}]\). The data were modelled together with those of Ref. 3 using a master equation/inverse Laplace transform procedure.

(g) Literature review. The given value is for the total reaction in the pressure independent regime.

(h) Theoretical analysis using the QRRK model.

(i) Variational transition state theory calculations with a sinusoidal rotor model.

**Preferred Values**

\(k_o = 1.0\times10^{-10} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}\) over range 300–2000 K.

\(k_o = [\text{He}]2.3\times10^{-27} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}\) at 300 K.

\(k_o = [\text{Ar}]1.1\times10^{-28} (T/1000)^{-0.3} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}\) over range 1000–2000 K.

\(F_r = 0.18 \exp(-T/200) + 0.82 \exp(-T/1438)\) for \(M = \text{Ar}\) over range 1000–2000 K.
Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_a = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 300–2000 K.} \]
\[ \Delta \log k_o = \pm 0.3 \text{ for } M = \text{He at 300 K.} \]
\[ \Delta \log k_o = \pm 0.5 \text{ for } M = \text{Ar over range 1000–2000 K.} \]
\[ \Delta F_c = \pm 0.1 \text{ over range 1000–2000 K.} \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The available database is still limited and more measurements are needed. Figure 1 shows the recent values of Refs. 1–3, 5 and 6 and the high temperature value of Bott and Cohen. The fit to the room temperature values leads to a collisional efficiency \( \beta_c = 0.32 \). The preferred \( k'' \) is consistent with SACM estimates following Ref. 12. As Fig. 1 shows, the rate coefficients measured at 480 K are notably higher when they are compared with an estimation of the fall-off curve using a temperature independent \( \langle \Delta E \rangle = 160 \text{ cm}^{-1} \) (as determined from the above \( \beta_c \) value at 300 K). More measurements at higher temperatures are necessary. The \( k_o \) values for \( M = \text{Ar} \) were estimated from the corresponding reverse dissociation process via \( K_c \). The importance of the other reaction channels is still unknown.

References

EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[
\text{CH}_3\text{OH} \rightarrow \text{CH}_3 + \text{OH} \quad (1) \\
\rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{OH} + \text{H} \quad (2) \\
\rightarrow ' \text{CH}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{M} \quad (3)
\]

**Thermodynamic data**

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta H^{\text{sw}}(1) &= 386.5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S^\text{sw}(1) &= 137.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p(1) &= 7.94 \times 10^{16} \exp(-46700/T) \text{ atm.} \\
\Delta H^{\text{sw}}(2) &= 401.9 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S^\text{sw}(2) &= 121.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \\
K_p(2) &= 1.19 \times 10^{19} T^{0.35} \exp(-5220/T) \text{ atm.}
\end{align*}
\]

**Rate Coefficient Measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Data ( (k = k_1) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( t/s^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Pressure Range</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{Ar}]6.6 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-34200/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{Ar}]3.3 \times 10^{-9} \exp(-34400/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{Ar}]5.5 \times 10^{-9} \exp(-33213/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Fall-Off Range</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 2.1 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-45790/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6.4 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-34730/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1.3 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-35730/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-37280/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.5 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-37770/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 8.7 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-38250/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.1 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 4.1 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 4.0 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.4 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1.6 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 4.9 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 2.3 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1.1 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.7 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 7.9 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-45290/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 6.6 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1.2 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-45295/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Pressure Range</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 9.4 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-45220/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta H^{\text{sw}}(3) = 384.7 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta S^\text{sw}(3) = 137.7 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_p(3) = 2.12 \times 10^{18} \exp(-46700/T) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviews and Evaluations**

\( k_0 = [\text{Ar}]3.3 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-34400/T) \)

1. Warnatz, 1989
2. Spindler and Wagner, 1982
3. Hidaka et al., 1989
4. Aranowitz, Naegeli, and Glassman, 1977
5. Westbrook and Dryer, 1979
6. Cathomen, Bocinier, and James, 1979
7. Tsubi and Hashimoto, 1981
8. Cribb, Dove, and Yamazaki, 1985
10. Cribb, Dove, and Yamazaki, 1992
11. Warnatz, 1989

**Comments**

(a)...

(k)...

(m)
Comments

(a) Oxidation of methanol behind shock waves. The concentrations of O, OH, H₂O and CO were measured using spectroscopic techniques. Mechanism with 19 reactions.

(b) Study of the methanol pyrolysis behind reflected shock waves in Ar. The concentration of CH₃ and OH were monitored by absorption at 216 and 308 nm respectively. High and low pressure rate coefficients obtained by extrapolation of the fall-off curves. Channel (1) contributes about 75% and channel (2) about 25% to the total rate.

(c) Thermal decomposition of methanol behind reflected shock waves. IR laser kinetic spectroscopy, and GC analysis of reaction products. Mechanism with 26 reactions.

(d) Pyrolysis of methanol in an adiabatic turbulent flow reactor. Mechanism with 19 steps.

(e) Mechanism for the oxidation of methanol with 89 elementary reactions.


(g) Shock tube study of the thermal oxidation of methanol-oxygen mixtures highly diluted with Ar. Mechanism with 57 steps.

(h) Pyrolysis of methanol studied by the laser schlieren method in incident shock waves and by dynamic spectrometry in reflected shock waves. The reaction occurs by both channels with $k_1/k = 0.8$.

(i) Shock wave study of t-butyl hydroperoxide (generation of HO) and t-butylperoxide (generation of CH₃) mixtures. HO concentration monitored by UV absorption at 309 nm. Mechanism with six reactions. In the present work, the resulting recombination rate data have been transformed to dissociation data via the given equilibrium constant.

(j) Pyrolysis of methanol studied by laser schlieren densitometry and dynamic mass spectrometry. Modelling with a mechanism of 28 reactions.

(k) Data evaluation.

(l) Data evaluation and construction of RRKM fall-off curves.

(m) Evaluation of static, flow and shock tube experiments. Mechanism with 66 reactions.

Preferred Values

\[ k_0 = 1.7 \times 10^{16} \exp(\frac{-45740}{T}) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 1000–2000 K}. \]

\[ k_0 = [\text{Ar}] \times 1.1 \times 10^{-7} \exp(\frac{-33080}{T}) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 1000–2000 K}. \]

\[ F_\ell = 0.18 \exp(\frac{-T}{200}) + 0.82 \exp(\frac{-T}{1438}) \text{ for } M = \text{Ar over range 1000–2000 K}. \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_0 = \pm 0.5 \text{ over range 1000–2000 K}. \]

\[ \Delta \log k_0 = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 1000–2000 K}. \]

\[ \Delta F_\ell = \pm 0.1 \text{ over range 1000–2000 K}. \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The recommended values are mainly based on the theoretical analysis of the rate data from Ref. 2 in terms of unimolecular rate theory\(^{14-16}\). The modelling leads to the almost temperature independent value $k_0$ of $7.0 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ between 300–2000 K for the reverse recombination reaction in good agreement with recent data by Sworski et al.\(^{17}\) and Anastasi et al.\(^{18}\). Therefore, because the available experiments are far away from the high pressure regime, we derived the recommended $k_0$ using a recombination coefficient of $k_\alpha = 1.0 \times 10^{-15} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and the given equilibrium constant. Figure 1 shows the temperature dependence of $k_0$ in comparison with the values recommended by Warnatz\(^{1}\). Figure 2 shows that the recommended $k_0$ agrees with previous compilations. The value of Tsang\(^{17}\) and Norton and Dryer\(^{19}\) are virtually the same as the recommended values and thus, for simplicity, are omitted from Figure 2. Figure 3 shows fall-off curves derived from the preferred $k_0$ and $k_\alpha$ values. The resulting collision efficiencies range from 0.1 to 0.05 over the range 1600–2000 K. The curves also fit the oldest data of Cribb\(^{9}\) very well and are in good agreement with the recombination data measured by Bott and Cohen\(^{8}\) after conversion to dissociation rates. However, the more recent experiments by Cribb et al.\(^{10}\) yield rate coefficients 2–3 times higher than those reported here at Ar gas density of $1 \times 10^{18}$ molecules cm$^{-3}$. According to Refs. 2, 8 and 10, the rate coefficient for channel (2) is markedly lower than that of reaction (1). The importance of channel (3) is still unknown.

References

EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

CH$_3$OH + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$ + OH + M

Fig. 1
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CH$_3$OH + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_3$ + OH + M

Fig. 2
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Fig. 3

CH\textsubscript{3}OH + M → CH\textsubscript{3} + OH + M

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Spindler and Wagner 1600 K 1982
- Spindler and Wagner 1800 K 1982
- Spindler and Wagner 2000 K 1982
- Cribb et al 1800 K 1985
- Cribb et al 2000 K 1985
- Bott and Cohen 1200 K 1991
- Cribb et al 1800 K 1992
- Cribb et al 2000 K 1992

This Evaluation 1993
\[ \text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{C}_2\text{H} \quad (1) \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{CO} + \text{H} \quad (2) \]
\[ \text{OH} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 (+ \text{M}) \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_2\text{OH} (+ \text{M}) \quad (3) \]

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H_{298}^{\text{f}}(1) = 53.1 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^{\text{f}}(1) = 11.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(1) = 8.17 \times 10^{-6} \exp(-6650/T) \]

\[ \Delta H_{298}^{\text{f}}(2) = -99.6 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^{\text{f}}(2) = -28.1 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(2) = 5.64 \times 10^{-4} T^{0.57} \exp(+12240/T) \]

**Rate Coefficient Data** \((k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/\text{K})</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.53 \times 10^{-12})</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Kaiser, 1990(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_1 = 4.9 \times 10^{-14} T^2 \exp(-3600/T))</td>
<td>1100-1350</td>
<td>Atkinson, 1989(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-6500/T))</td>
<td>1000-2000</td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Flame study with computer simulation of OH radical profile.

(b) Based on results of Smith et al.\(^4\).

(c) See Comments on Preferred Values.

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 1.0 \times 10^{-16} \exp(-6500/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 1000-2000 K.} \]

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.1 \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The recommendations from our previous evaluation\(^1\), which were based on the measurements of Smith et al.\(^4\) and Fenimore and Jones\(^5\) are unchanged. The recent study of Kaiser\(^1\) is in good agreement.

At temperatures greater than 1100 K channels (1) and (2) predominate but below 1100 K, at atmospheric pressure, channel (3) becomes significant and the rate constant becomes pressure dependent. Parameters for calculating \(k_3\) are given in Ref. 7. Miller and Melius\(^6\) performed statistical calculations of rate constants based on a BAC-MP4 surface. They concluded that channel (1) is the major high temperature process and is a factor of \(5-10\) faster than other channels. They calculate that the second most significant channel leads to formation of \(\text{HOC}_2\text{H} + \text{H}\), a process which is \(\approx 8\) kJ mol\(^{-1}\) less endothermic than channel (1). Their calculations could be used as a rough guide of channel efficiencies.

**References**

3. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
7. IUPAC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{OH} + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3 & \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{C}_6\text{H}_6\text{CH}_2 & (1) \\
& \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3 & (2) \\
\text{OH} + \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3 (+ \text{M}) & \rightarrow \text{C}_6\text{H}_5(\text{OH})\text{CH}_3 (+ \text{M}) & (3)
\end{align*}
\]

Thermodynamic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \Delta H_f^\ominus(1) )</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>( \Delta S_f^\ominus(1) )</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>( k_p(1) )</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-130.8 \text{kJ mol}^{-1})</td>
<td>(-1.4 \text{J K}^{-1} \text{mol}^{-1})</td>
<td>(3.2 \times 10^{-11} \times T^{329} \exp(+15730/T))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rate Coefficient Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k )</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>( T \text{K} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( k_1 )</td>
<td>(5.0 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-453/T))</td>
<td>380-473</td>
<td>Perry, Atkinson, and Pitts, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_2 )</td>
<td>(3.2 \times 10^{-12} \exp(+805/T))</td>
<td>296-325</td>
<td>McLain, Jachimowski, and Wilson, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_3 )</td>
<td>(1.7 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-1510/T))</td>
<td>1700-2800</td>
<td>Tully et al., 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_4 )</td>
<td>(2.1 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-1300/T))</td>
<td>500-1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_5 )</td>
<td>(3.8 \times 10^{-12} \exp(+180/T))</td>
<td>213-298</td>
<td>Ohta and Ohyama, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_6 )</td>
<td>(6.4 \times 10^{-12} \exp(+180/T))</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Edney, Kleindienst, and Corse, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_7 )</td>
<td>(5.4 \times 10^{-12} \exp(+1300/T))</td>
<td>296-353</td>
<td>Baldwin, Scott, and Walker, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_8 )</td>
<td>(4.8 \times 10^{-11} \exp(+1300/T))</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>Bourmada et al., 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_9 )</td>
<td>(4.6 \times 10^{-11} \exp(+760/T))</td>
<td>298-353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Flash photolysis–resonance fluorescence technique at total pressures around 10 Torr. The addition channel (2) is the dominant reaction pathway for temperatures below 325 K. The H abstraction reaction (1) was found to be the dominant reaction pathway for temperatures above 380 K.

(b) Incident shock wave investigation of the oxidation mechanism of \( \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{O}_2/\text{Ar} \) and \( \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_2/\text{O}_2/\text{Ar} \) mixtures by monitoring UV and IR emission of CO, CO\(_2\), and the product concentrations [O], [CO]. Arrhenius expression for the products \( \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{O} \) (channel (1)) was estimated by comparison with data for benzene.

(c) Flash photolysis–resonance fluorescence technique. OH reactions with benzene, toluene, and selectively deuterated toluenes were studied in the temperature range 213 to 1150 K. The results indicate that the addition channel (2) is the dominant reaction pathway below 300 K and that the side-chain hydrogen abstraction channel (1) is the dominant reaction routes at higher temperatures. The rate expression for channel (1) was estimated.

(d) Hexane was used as a reference compound. Photolysis of \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) was the source of OH. Rate coefficient for OH consumption by (channel (3)) was evaluated at atmospheric pressure.

(e) Rate constant value for reaction (3) derived by using a relative rate technique. Photolysis of methyl nitrite was the source of OH.

(f) Small amounts of toluene (0.05–0.5%) were added to slowly reacting mixtures of \( \text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 \) at 773 K. Under the experimental conditions the hydrogen/oxygen system provides a reproducible source of radicals such as H, O, and OH. Measurement of the relative consumption of the additive and molecular hydrogen permits the evaluation of the rate constants for the reaction of H, O, and OH with the toluene.

(g) Discharge flow study with OH detection by resonance fluorescence. He used as carrier gas. Measurements performed at 298 and 353 K in the fall-off pressure range between 0.5 and 9.8 Torr. Authors derived from their measurements \( k_8 \) and \( k_9 \) using Troe’s formalism with \( F_e = 0.6 \). The rate constant expressions are given here in Arrhenius form.

(h) Low temperature recommendations based on data from Refs. 1, 3, and 10. High temperature recommendations based on data from Refs. 1 and 3.

(i) See Comments on Preferred Values.

Preferred Values

\[ k_1 = 8.6 \times 10^{-15} T \exp(-440/T) \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 400–1200 K.} \]

Reliability

\[ \log k_1 = \pm 0.5 \text{ at 400 K reducing to } \pm 0.3 \text{ at 1200 K.} \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The recommendations are unchanged from our previous evaluation. The recent study of Bourmada et al. is in agreement with the previous studies which indicate that the dominant reaction pathway at and below room temperature is the addition of the OH radical (channel (3)). Side-chain hydrogen abstraction seems to be the main reaction at higher tempera-
tures (channel (1)). The new data are considered reliable, but owing to the pressure dependence of reaction (3) a rate expression is not recommended for that channel. For channel (1) the indirect data of Ref. 2 have not been considered in deriving the rate constant expression and the recommendation for channel (1) is only made for an intermediate temperature range of about 800 degrees.

References


References on Preferred Values

Only relative rate determinations at room temperature appear to have been carried out for this reaction. The room temperature data agree well and the techniques used have proved reliable for other reactions for which direct measurements are available. The preferred value follows the recommendation of Atkinson which is the simple mean of the two determinations. At room temperature it is apparent that the reaction proceeds entirely (>90%) by abstraction of the benzylic H-atom; this is expected to be the dominant process up to at least 1000 K. Data for reactions of OH with other aldehydes suggest that the temperature coefficient of k will be small.

References

EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

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

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H_{\text{f}} = -165.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{\text{f}} = -20.5 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_P = 8.1 \times 10^{-32} \text{ exp}(+19800/T) \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-6030/T) + 2.2 \times 10^{-12} \exp(+820/T))</td>
<td>300–1100</td>
<td>Hippler, Troe and Willner, 1990(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-775/T) 2.2 \times 10^{-13} \exp(600/T))</td>
<td>550–1250</td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(550–850)</td>
<td>IUPAC, 1992(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Shock tube studies between 750 and 1120 K. Two different \(\text{HO}_2\) sources were used, the thermal dissociation of \(\text{CH}_3\text{O}_2\text{CH}_3\) in the presence of excess \(\text{O}_2\), and the thermal dissociation of \(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\). The rate constant expression was obtained by combination with low temperature data which are reviewed fully in the IUPAC compilation\(^3\). The new data are also in excellent agreement with Troe’s original shock tube data point obtained in 1969. However, particularly at the higher temperatures, the data are sensitive to \(k(\text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2)\) in a relatively complex interpretation.

(b) Based on data obtained by Lightfoot, Veyret and Lesclaux\(^5\) between 298 and 777 K, which showed some evidence of a minimum at about 700 K, and on Troe’s single shock tube point at about 1100 K.

(c) Accepts expression of Kircher and Sander\(^6\).

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 7.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-6030/T) + 2.2 \times 10^{-12} \exp(+820/T) \] between 550 and 1250 K.
\[ k = 7.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-6030/T) \] between 850 and 1250 K.

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.15 \] between 550–800 K, rising to \(\pm 0.4\) at 1250 K.

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The expression given by Hippler, Troe and Willner\(^1\) is accepted between 550 and 1250 K, over the range where \(k\) appears to be independent of pressure\(^2\). The new data confirm the existence of a deep minimum in the range 700–750 K, and are in excellent agreement with Troe’s original data point at 1100 K. A theoretical estimate of \(k\) by Patrick, Golden and Barker\(^7\) predicts a minimum in the value of \(k\) but at the slightly higher temperature of 1000 K. The experimentally observed increase in \(k\) above 800 K is unusually marked and, although theoretically possible, confirmation of the observation both for this reaction and related reactions would be helpful. Fortunately at temperatures above 1250 K, the role of \(\text{HO}_2\) radicals in combustion becomes less important. Below 550 K, \(k\) becomes pressure dependent and is particularly sensitive to polar gases such as \(\text{H}_2\text{O}\) and \(\text{NH}_3\). Between 550 and 850 K, use of the bi-exponential expression is necessary. However, between 850 and 1200 K, use of the recommended single exponential expression is sufficiently accurate. Full details of the low temperature data are given in the IUPAC compilation\(^3\).

**References**

2. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
3. IUPAC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
HO₂ + HO₂ → H₂O₂ + O₂

T/K

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Troe 1969
- Hochanadel et al. 1972
- Li et al. 1979
- Takacs and Howard 1986
- Peukert and Johnston 1972
- Vardanyan et al. 1974
- Hamilton and Li 1977
- Graham et al. 1979
- Burrows et al. 1979
- Hochanadel et al. 1980
- Thrush and Tyndall 1982
- Thrush and Tyndall 1982
- Patrick and Pilling 1982
- DeMore 1982
- Sander et al. 1982
- Simonsdottir and Heicklen 1982
- Sander et al. 1982
- Sander 1984
- Takacs and Howard 1984
- Catell and Cox 1986
- McAdam et al. 1987
- Andersson et al. 1988
- Lightfoot et al. 1988
- Baldwin et al. 1984
- Cox and Burrows 1979
- This Evaluation 1993
Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_f(298) = -382.8 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S_f(298) = 114.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ k_F(2) = 1.3 \times 10^{-5} \exp(45140/T) \text{ atm.} \]

**Rate Coefficient Data** \((k = k_1 + k_2)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k = 4.8 \times 10^{-12})</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Moortgat et al., 1989(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_1 = 3.5 \times 10^{-12})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k = 4.4 \times 10^{-13} \exp(780/T))</td>
<td>248-573</td>
<td>Lightfoot, Veyret, and Lesclaux, 1990(^2)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k = 2.9 \times 10^{-13} \exp(962/T))</td>
<td>248-678</td>
<td>Lightfoot et al., 1991(^3)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Branching Ratio Measurements**

\[ k/k = 0.92 \text{ [700 Torr]} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Wallington and Japar, 1990(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Wallington, 1991(^5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviews and Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k = 3.9 \times 10^{-13} \exp(800/T))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k = 3.8 \times 10^{-13} \exp(780/T))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k = 5.6 \times 10^{-13} \exp(640/T))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k = 4.1 \times 10^{-13} \exp(790/T))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Rate coefficient determinations made prior to 1989 have not been listed explicitly. The measurements can be found in references (10-17) and these have been reviewed in earlier evaluations\(^6,7\).

(b) Modulated photolysis of CH\(_3\)CHO/O\(_2\)/N\(_2\) mixtures at atmospheric pressure with long pathlength UV and FTIR absorption detection. Composite absorptions due to CH\(_2\)O and H\(_2\)O recorded at 220 and 250 nm. The waveforms were analysed simultaneously with an assumed reaction scheme. The absorption cross-sections used were for CH\(_2\)O, \(\sigma_{250} [\text{CH}_2\text{O}] = 4.16 \times 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}\), \(\sigma_{220} [\text{O}_2] = 0.81\) and for H\(_2\)O, \(\sigma_{220} [\text{H}_2\text{O}] = 4.0 \times 10^{-18} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}\). \(k_1\) was determined by simulating the growth of [CH\(_3\)OOH] and the concentration of other products with an assumed reaction scheme.

(c) Growth of CH\(_3\)OOH compared to loss of CH\(_3\) following the photolysis of F\(_2)/\text{CH}_2/\text{H}_2/\text{air} mixtures using long pathlength FTIR spectroscopy\(^4\). Conditions arranged so that CH\(_2\)O reacted predominantly with H\(_2\)O. Complications due to secondary chemistry were mainly avoided by using F\(_2\). The yield of CH\(_3\)OOH appeared independent of pressure between 15 and 700 Torr although corrections due to CH\(_3\)F formation were made at the lowest pressures\(^5\).

(d) The preferred value at 298 K is a mean of the rate parameters derived by Cox and Tyndall\(^1\), McAdam et al.\(^1\), Kurylo and Wallington\(^1\) (as amended in Daguat et al.\(^1\)), Jenkin et al.\(^1\), Moortgat et al.\(^1\) and Lightfoot et al.\(^1\). The temperature coefficient was obtained as a rounded-off average of the three temperature-dependent studies\(^2,11,17\) with the A-factor adjusted to give the recommended value of \(k_{298}\).

(e) The recommended rate coefficient at 298 K is the mean of those reported by Daguat et al.\(^1\), Jenkin et al.\(^1\), Moortgat et al.\(^1\), Lightfoot et al.\(^1\) and Cox and Tyndall\(^1\). The temperature coefficient is taken from Lightfoot et al.\(^2\) and the A-factor adjusted to give the preferred value of \(k\) at 298 K.

(f) Based on a single Arrhenius fit of all the available kinetic data excluding the determination by Kan et al.\(^1\). Both values reported by Jenkin et al.\(^1\) and Moortgat et al.\(^1\) were included. The reaction was assumed to give only CH\(_3\)OOH and O\(_2\) as reported by Wallington and Japar\(^4\).

(g) The preferred value at 298 K is a simple mean of the rate parameters derived by Cox and Tyndall\(^1\), Jenkin et al.\(^1\), Moortgat et al.\(^1\), and Lightfoot et al.\(^2\), which excludes the low values reported by Kurylo et al.\(^1\) and Kan et al.\(^1\). The temperature coefficient was obtained as a rounded-off average of the three latest temperature-
dependent studies (Dagaut et al., Lightfoot et al. and Lightfoot et al.), with the $A$-factor adjusted to give the recommended value of $k_{298}$.

The recent work of Wallington and Japar, and Wallington suggests that the only product channel is that leading to the formation of CH$_3$OOH and O$_2$.

**Preferred Value**

$$k = 4.1 \times 10^{-13} \exp(790/T)$$

over the range 298–700 K.

$$k/dk = 1.0 \pm 0.1$$

over the range 298–700 K.

**Reliability**

$\Delta \log k = \pm 0.1$ at 298 K increasing to $\pm 0.3$ at 700 K.

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The independent reviews undertaken by Wallington et al. and Lightfoot et al. have critically evaluated all the kinetic and mechanistic data available on this reaction. The preferred value is that given by Lightfoot et al. due to the incorporation of the more extensive high temperature data from the Bordeaux group in the recommendation made by Lightfoot et al.. Wallington et al. included the kinetic measurements of Kurylo et al. in their Arrhenius analysis which gives a value of the rate constant significantly lower at 298 K than all the other direct measurements. The temperature dependence reported by Kurylo and co-workers (Dagaut et al.) is, however, in very good agreement with the other recent temperature dependent studies, suggesting a possible systematic error in their absolute $k$ values. The latest IUPAC evaluation does not include the recent study by the Bordeaux group, and, for that reason, differs slightly from the present evaluation.

The recent studies of Wallington and Japar and Wallington indicate that channel (1) is the major reaction pathway and this should be assumed for modelling purposes. Further support for this is provided by Lightfoot et al. who could only interpret their high temperature data if the reaction was assumed to give mainly CH$_3$OOH and O$_2$.

**References**

7. IUPAC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{H}_2 \text{O}_2 + \text{CH}_3\text{O}_2 & \rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{OOH} + \text{O}_2 \\
& \rightarrow \text{HCHO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{O}_2
\end{align*}
\]

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Moortgat et al 1989
- Moortgat et al 1989 (k_1)
- Lightfoot Veyret and Lesclaux 1990
- Lightfoot et al 1991
- This Evaluation 1993
Rate Coefficient Measurements

(a) Studies of the relative rate of consumption of \( \text{H}_2 \) and toluene when traces of toluene were added to slowly reacting mixtures of \( \text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 \) at 773 K. Interpretation of results gave \((k_1 + k_2)/k_3)^{1/2} = 6.5 \times 10^{-10} \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \), \( k_3 = 3.1 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-775/T) \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \) for \( \text{HO}_2 + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{O}_2 \) (see present recommended value).

Preferred Values

\[
k_1 = 6.6 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-7080/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{ over range 600–1000 K.}
\]
\[
k_2 = 9 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-14500/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{ over range 600–1000 K.}
\]

Reliability

\( \Delta \log k_1 = \pm 0.3 \) at 750 K rising to \( \pm 0.5 \) at 600 K and 1000 K.

\( \Delta \log k_2 = \pm 1.0 \)

Comments on Preferred Values

The value at 773 K is the only experimental determination of \((k_1 + k_3)\). The value of \((k_1 + k_3)/k_3)^{1/2} \) is reliable, where \( k_3 \) refers to the reaction \( \text{HO}_2 + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{O}_2 \), and any error in \( k_3 \) is reduced by 50% in calculating \((k_1 + k_3)\). On thermochemical grounds \( k_2 \approx 0.001 k_1 \) at 773 K. The preferred values of \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) are based on the \( A \) factor for \( \text{HO}_2 + (\text{CH}_3)_2\text{CC(CH}_3)_2 \) (per C–H bond) with a reduction in a factor of 8 (per C–H bond) due to loss of entropy of activation from increased electron delocalization in the emerging \( \text{C}_8\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3 \) radical. If \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) obey the non-Arrhenius equation \( AT^n \exp(-E/RT) \) with \( n \) likely to be between 2 and 3, then extrapolation will lead to low values of \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) above 1000 K.

References


Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k \text{ (cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}) )</th>
<th>( T \text{ (K)} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0 \times 10^{-16}</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>Baldwin, Scott, and Walker, 1992(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Studies of the relative rate of consumption of \( \text{H}_2 + \text{ethyl benzene} \) when traces of ethyl benzene were added to slowly reacting mixtures of \( \text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 \) at 773 K. Interpretation of results gave \((k_1 + k_2 + k_3)/k_3)^{1/2} = 2.8 \times 10^{-9} \text{ (cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1})^{1/2} \), \( k_3 = 3.1 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-775/T) \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \) for \( \text{HO}_2 + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{O}_2 \) (see present recommended value).

Preferred Values

\[
k_1 = 4.4 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-5680/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{ between 600 and 1000 K.}
\]
\[
k_2 = 5.3 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-9760/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{ between 600 and 1000 K.}
\]

Reliability

\( \Delta \log k_1 = \pm 0.3 \) at 750 K rising to \( \pm 0.5 \) at 600 K and 1000 K.

\( \Delta \log k_2 = \pm 0.5 \)

\( \Delta \log k_3 = \pm 1.0 \)

Comments on Preferred Values

The value at 773 K is the only experimental determination of \((k_1 + k_3)\). The value of \((k_1 + k_2 + k_3)/k_3)^{1/2} \) is reliable, where \( k_3 \) refers to the reaction \( \text{HO}_2 + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{O}_2 \), and any error in \( k_3 \) is reduced by 50% in calculating \((k_1 + k_2 + k_3)\).

The value at 773 K is the only experimental determination of \((k_1 + k_3)\). The value of \((k_1 + k_2 + k_3)/k_3)^{1/2} \) is reliable, where \( k_3 \) refers to the reaction \( \text{HO}_2 + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 + \text{O}_2 \), and any error in \( k_3 \) is reduced by 50% in calculating \((k_1 + k_2 + k_3)\). On thermochemical grounds \( k_2 \approx 0.00025 k_1 \) at 773 K. Assuming \( k_2 = 0.5 k (\text{HO}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_6) \), then with \( k_1 + k_3 = 3.0 \times 10^{-16} \) and...
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ k(\text{HO}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_6) = 3.5 \times 10^{-17} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at } 773 \text{ K}. \]

The preferred values of \( k \) are based on the \( A \) factor for \( \text{HO}_2 + (\text{CH}_3)_2\text{CC(CH}_3)_3 \) (per C–H bond) with a reduction in \( A \) by a factor of 8 (per C–H bond) due to loss of entropy of activation from increased electron delocalization in the emerging \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_5\text{CHCH}_3 \) radical. If \( k_1, k_2 \) and \( k_3 \) obey the non-Arrhenius equation \( k = A T^n \exp(-E/RT) \) with \( n \) likely to be between 2 and 3, then extrapolation will lead to low values of \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) above 1000 K.

\[ N + O_2 \rightarrow \text{NO} + O \]

\[ \Delta H_{298} = -133 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298} = 13.4 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_P = 13.21 T^{303} \exp(+15930T) \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k )/cm(^3) molecule(^{-1}) s(^{-1})</th>
<th>( T )/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-3100T))</td>
<td>390–520</td>
<td>Kasiakowsky and Volpi, 1957(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 \times 10^{-12})</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>Kaufman and Decker, 1959(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.4 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-3600T))</td>
<td>412–755</td>
<td>Clyne and Thraus, 1961(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.3 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-3500T))</td>
<td>453–603</td>
<td>Vistarrana and Winkler, 1967(^4)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.3 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-4000T))</td>
<td>300–910</td>
<td>Wilson, 1967(^5)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.5 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-3200T))</td>
<td>280–333</td>
<td>Becker, Groth, and Kley, 1969(^6)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.08 \times 10^{-8})</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>Clarke and Wayne, 1970(^7)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.5 \times 10^{-10})</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Westenberg, Roscoe, and de Haas, 1970(^8)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.6 \times 10^{-11})</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>Livesey, Roberts, and Williams, 1971(^9)</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.2 \times 10^{-11})</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Winkler et al., 1986(^10)</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.8 \times 10^{-11})</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Barnett, Marston and Wayne, 1987(^11)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) N atoms produced in a discharge reacted with O\(_2\) in a low pressure stirred flow reactor. \( k \) determined from the reduction in the steady-state concentration of N atoms detected by mass spectrometry upon addition of various amounts of O\(_2\).

(b) Oxygen-sensitized decay of NO observed in static reactor using UV spectrophotometric detection of NO\(_2\). \( k \) calculated from the ratio \( k(N + O_2)/k(N + NO) = 0.07 \) measured at 1575 K and the N + NO rate coefficient at this temperature recommended in this evaluation.

(c) Discharge flow study. \( k \) derived directly from the first-order decay of N atoms in the presence of excess O\(_2\). \([N]\) measured along the tube by end-point titration with NO.

(d) Discharge flow study. \( k \) determined by measuring [O] and [N] at points along the tube. Total [O], including that produced by reaction was measured by titration with excess NO\(_2\) downstream of conversion of unreacted N atoms to O by end-point titration with NO.

(e) Direct measurement of \( k \) using discharge flow method with detection of N atoms by electron spin resonance under pseudo-first-order conditions with O\(_2\) in excess.

(f) Static system with nitrogen discharge at low total pressure (10\(^{-4}\) - 10\(^{-1}\) Torr) in a stainless steel vessel. \( k \) determined from the decay of the intensity of the first positive bands of the N-atom recombination afterglow emission in the presence of O\(_2\).

(g) Discharge flow study with [O\(_2\)] \(\gg\) [N]. \( k \) determined by measuring [N] at points along tube by adding excess NO and measuring \( \Delta[NO] \) from change in photoionization current when discharge turned off.

(h) Direct measurement of \( k \) using discharge flow method with [O\(_2\)] \(\gg\) [N] and detection of N atoms by electron spin resonance.

(i) NO concentration profile measured by probe sampling and chemical analysis in the burned gas of an atmospheric pressure premixed propane-oxygen flame to which N\(_2\) had been added. Single value of \( k \) at the mean flame temperature was obtained by fitting to a simple mecha-
nism which was more sensitive to $k$ for O + N$_2$ reaction than for N + O$_2$. $k$ is misquoted in abstract of the original reference.

(j) Vibrational state distribution of NO product measured using saturated multi-photon ionization in a discharge flow system. The ratio $k/k(N + NO)$ obtained for NO in specific vibrational states from the slope of the variation of the steady-state [NO(v)] with [O$_2$]. About 34% of the available exothermicity appears in vibrational levels up to v = 7. Using the recommended 298 K value$^{13}$ of $k(N + NO) = 3.4 \times 10^{-11} \text{cm}^3 \text{molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ gives the value of $k = \Sigma k(v)$ quoted.

(k) Direct measurement of $k$ using discharge flow method with [O$_2$] >> [N]. Decay of [N] along tube measured by monitoring intensity of the emission of the first positive band of N$_2$ resulting from the recombination of N atoms.

(l) Evaluation of data measured up to 1971. Recommended expression gives best fit to high and low temperature data.

(m) Recommendation derived from least squares fit to the data of references (1,5,6,7,8,10 and 11).

(n) Review of measurements of $k$ for forward and reverse reaction. Recommended expression derived by combining low temperature data of references (3,4,6–8) with equilibrium constant and the value of $k$ for reverse reaction at high temperatures recommended by Hanson and Salimian$^{17}$, and assuming pre-exponential temperature exponent $n = 1.0$.

(o) Previous CODATA recommendation$^{16}$, based on mean of 298 K data in references (3,5–8) and activation energy of Becker et al.$^6$, unchanged because of good agreement with recent studies of Winkler et al.$^{10}$, and Barnett et al.$^{11}$.

Preferred Value

$k = 1.5 \times 10^{-14}T \exp(-3270/T) \text{cm}^3 \text{molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}$ over the range 298–5000 K.

Reliability

Δlog $k = \pm 0.12$ over the range 298–1000 K rising to ±0.3 over the range 1000–5000 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

The recommended expression of Cohen$^{14}$ is adopted here, with the same uncertainty limits. This not only gives a good fit to the low temperature data, but also to the less well-determined high temperature measurements and is consistent with the rate of the reverse reaction.

References

15. IUPAC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
16. CODATA, 1980 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ \text{N} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{O} \]

\[ \text{T/K} \]

**EXPERIMENTAL DATA**
- Kistiakowsky and Volpi 1957
- Kaufman and Decker 1959
- Clyne and Thrush 1961
- Vlastaras and Winkler 1967
- Wilson 1967
- Becker Groth and Kley 1969
- Clarke and Wayne 1970
- Westenberg Roscoe and de Haas 1970
- Livesey Roberts and Williams 1971
- Winkler et al 1986
- Barnett Marston and Wayne 1987
- **This Evaluation 1993**

The graph shows the relationship between the logarithm of the rate constant (\( \log(k/\text{cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}) \)) and the inverse temperature (\( 10^3 T^{-1}/K^{-1} \)). The experimental data from various sources is plotted on the graph, highlighting the evaluated kinetic data for combustion modelling.
Thermodynamic Data
\CEL{\Delta H_{298} = -203.1 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}}
\CEL{\Delta S_{298} = -11.6 \text{ J m}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1} \text{mol}^{-1}}
K_p = 4.1 \times 10^{-7} \text{exp}(+24555/\text{T})

Rate Coefficient Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>Campbell and Thrush, 1968(^\text{a})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-790\text{T})</td>
<td>1500-2380</td>
<td>Haynes, 1977(^\text{b})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Howard and Smith, 1980(^\text{c})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21 \times 10^{-10}\exp(-623)</td>
<td>250-515</td>
<td>Howard and Smith, 1981(^\text{d})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-790\text{T})</td>
<td>1790-2200</td>
<td>Morley, 1981(^\text{i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Brune, Schwab and Anderson, 1983(^\text{e})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7 \times 10^{-10}</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>Bowman, 1975(^\text{f})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>Miller \text{et al.}, 1984(^\text{g})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 \times 10^{-11} \exp(+85/\text{T})</td>
<td>250-500</td>
<td>IUPAC, 1992(^\text{h})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) The ratio k/k(O + OH) = 1.4 was determined by measuring the catalytic removal of N and O atoms followed photometrically when NO and H\(_2\) were added to a flow of N\(_2\) molecules produced in a discharge. Use of the recommended value\(^\text{10}\) for k(O+OH) = 3.0 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} leads to the value of k quoted.

(b) Concentration profiles of HCN, NO and total NH\(_x\) species (x = 0-3) measured in the burned gases of premixed, fuel-rich ethylene- and acetylene-air flame systems seeded with NH\(_3\), pyridine or NO\(_2\), using a probe sampling method. N + O and N + NO identified as the NO forming and removing reactions. The rate k(N + OH)/k(N + NO) = 1.0, independent of temperature was determined from analysis of the NO profiles, assuming reactions of the NH\(_x\) species to be internally equilibrated. Use of the recommended value for k(N + NO) from this evaluation gives the value of k quoted.

(c) Discharge flow system used to generate steady-state concentration of N\(_2\) molecules; OH radicals formed by flash photolysis of H\(_2\)O and their decay monitored by resonance fluorescence under pseudo-first-order conditions with [N] \gg [OH]; [N] determined by end-point titration with NO.

(d) The ratio k(N + OH)/k(N + NO) = 1 estimated from profiles of NO detected by laser-induced fluorescence in H\(_2\) flames seeded with nitrogen compounds. Use of the recommended value for k(N + NO) from this evaluation gives the value of k quoted.

(e) Rate coefficient derived by combining the low temperature measurements of Campbell and Thrush\(^\text{1}\) with the equilibrium constant and high temperature measurements of k for the reverse reaction\(^\text{11-13}\).

(g) Value of k derived for modelling NO formation in combustion systems by combining low temperature measurements of Howard and Smith\(^\text{4}\) with shock tube measurements of the reverse rate of Flower \text{et al.}\(^\text{14}\). The authors point out that extrapolation of the expression of Howard and Smith to high temperatures produced values of k much lower than calculated from the reverse rate data.

(h) Recommendation unchanged from earlier CODATA evaluation\(^\text{15}\) which was based on the data of Howard and Smith\(^\text{4}\).

Preferred Value

k = 4.7 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} over the range 300-2500 K.

Reliability

\CEL{\Delta \log k = \pm 0.1 \text{ at 300 K rising to } \pm 0.3 \text{ at 2500 K}}

Comments on Preferred Values

The only direct measurements of k are at low temperature (250-500 K). The data are in good agreement, but are sufficiently scattered to make it impossible to discern any temperature dependence of k. The preferred value is the mean of all the low temperature measurements\(^\text{13,45}\) and falls within the range of values of k calculated from the ratio k/k(N + NO) reported in the two flame studies\(^\text{22}\). The inconsistency between the measured values of k and the higher value calculated from the equilibrium constant and data for the reverse reaction still needs to be resolved.

References

EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

6C. Morley, 18th Symp. (Int.) Comb. 23 (1981).
10IUPAC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
11CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
16CODATA, 1982 (see references in Introduction).

\[ N + OH \rightarrow NO + H \]

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- ○ Campbell and Thrush 1968
- Haynes 1977
- ○ Howard and Smith 1980
- □ Howard and Smith 1981
- □ Morley 1981
- □ Brune Schwab and Anderson 1983
- □ This Evaluation 1993

Log(k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹)

10⁴ T⁻¹/K⁻¹
**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H^{\text{fm}} = -313.5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S^{\text{fm}} = -11.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_p = 0.517^{+0.003}_{-0.002} \exp(37690/T) \]

**Rate Coefficient Measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/\text{K} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 5.4 \times 10^{-14} \times T \exp(230/T) )</td>
<td>476-755</td>
<td>Clyne and Thrush, 1961</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1.7 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Herron, 1961</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 2.2 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Phillips and Schiff, 1962</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1.8 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>~350</td>
<td>Takezaki and Mori, 1967</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Lin, Parkes, and Kaufman, 1970</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 8.2 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-410/T) )</td>
<td>298-670</td>
<td>Clyne and McDermid, 1975</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.4 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>196-400</td>
<td>Lee, et al., 1978</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 4.5 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Hussain and Slater, 1980</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.4 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Cheah and Clyne, 1980</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1.9 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Sugawara, Ishikawa, and Sato, 1980</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 2.2 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>1600-2300</td>
<td>Koshi, et al., 1990</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 7.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-787/T) )</td>
<td>1400-3500</td>
<td>Davidson and Hanson, 1990</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 2.4 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Jeoung, Cho, and Benson, 1991</td>
<td>(m)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Discharge flow study. Large excess of \( \text{O}_2 \) added to flow of \( \text{N} \) atoms produced residual \( \text{[NO]} \) in the effluent gas determined by \( \text{NO} + \text{O} \) afterflow intensity. Variation of residual \( \text{[NO]} \) with \( \text{[O}_2 \) gave the ratio \( k(\text{N} + \text{O}_2)/k(\text{N} + \text{NO}) = 0.28 \exp(-3500/T) \). Use of the preferred value for \( k(\text{N} + \text{O}_2) \) from this evaluation gives the value of \( k \) quoted.

(b) Discharge flow study with mass spectrometric detection of \( \text{N} \) and isotopically labelled \( \text{NO} \) and \( \text{N}_2 \), \( k \) determined from analysis of concentration-time profiles.

(c) Discharge flow study, with mass spectrometric detection of \( \text{NO} \). \( k \) determined from consumption of \( \text{NO} \) when added to flow of \( \text{N} \) atoms.

(d) Pulsed \( \text{N} \), discharge flow study with time-of-flight mass spectrometric detection of \( \text{N} \) and \( \text{NO} \).

(e) Discharge flow study. \( \text{N} \) atoms detected by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy calibrated by chemical titration with \( \text{NO} \). Variation of measured absorption with \( \text{[NO]} \) at fixed reaction time gave \( k \).

(f) Direct measurement of \( k \) using the discharge flow method with detection of \( \text{N} \) atoms by mass spectrometry under pseudo-first-order conditions, \([\text{NO}] \gg [\text{N}] \).

(g) Direct determination of \( k \) using two different techniques, both under pseudo-first-order conditions with \([\text{NO}] \gg [\text{N}] \) and detection of \( \text{N} \) atoms by atomic resonance fluor­

ence. A discharge flow study \((p = 1-2 \text{ Torr He}) \) gave \( k = 2.7 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \); a flash photolysis study \((p = 20-700 \text{ Torr He}) \) gave \( k = 4.0 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \). No temperature or pressure dependence of \( k \) could be claimed with certainty because of scatter in the data nor could any other cause of the discrepancy be identified, so the mean value of the two determinations was reported with 25% error limits.

(h) Direct measurement of \( k \) by VUV flash photolysis of \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) in the presence of \( \text{N}_2 \) and \( \text{NO} \) and time-resolved atomic resonance fluorescence detection of \( \text{N} \) atoms, using \([\text{NO}] \gg [\text{N}] \).

(i) Direct measurement of \( k \) using discharge-flow method with atomic resonance fluorescence detection of \( \text{N} \) atoms in excess \( \text{NO} \).

(j) Direct measurement of \( k \) by pulsed radiolysis of \( \text{N}_2 \) to generate \( \text{N} \) atoms in the presence of excess \( \text{NO} \). Pseudo-first-order decay of \([\text{N}] \) followed by time-resolved atomic resonance absorption.

(k) Direct measurement of \( k \) using shock tube technique. \( \text{N} \) atoms generated behind reflected shock waves by \( 193 \text{ nm} \) laser photolysis of \( \text{NO} \) and first-order decay of \([\text{N}] \) followed by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy. No temperature dependence of \( k \) was observed.

(l) Direct measurement of \( k \) using shock tube technique. \( \text{N} \) atoms generated by \( 193 \text{ nm} \) laser photolysis of shock heated \( \text{NO} \) in \( \text{Ar} \) and \([\text{N}] \) decay followed under first-order conditions by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy. Uncertainty in \( k \) estimated to be \( \pm 20\% \) at \( 1400 \text{ K} \) to \( \pm 10\% \) at \( 3500 \text{ K} \).

(m) \( \text{N} \) atoms produced by a microwave discharge, reacted with \( \text{NO} \) in a very low pressure reactor and detected by mass spectrometry. \( k \) derived from the variation of the
steady-state concentration of N with the steady-state concentration of NO in the reactor.

(n) Evaluation of data measured before 1973. Temperature independent value of $k$ recommended based on the mean of the measurements of Phillips and Schiff$^3$ and Lin et al.$^5$.

(o) Expression derived for the purpose of modelling NO in combustion to obtain consistency between the rate coefficients for the reaction in the forward and reverse directions and the equilibrium constant. The low temperature recommendation of Baulch et al.$^{14}$ for the forward reaction was combined with the values calculated from the high temperature measurements of the reverse reaction by Monat et al.$^{19}$ and the equilibrium constant to derive $k$.

(p) Recommendation unchanged from earlier CODATA$^{20}$ evaluation which was based on the mean of the measurements reported in Refs. 6-10. Uncertainty estimated as $\Delta \log k = \pm 0.15$ at 298 K.

(q) Recommendation based on low temperature results of Lee et al.$^7$.

(r) Recommended expression for $k$ is a fit to the combined data sets of Refs. 6, 7, 8 and 12 for the reaction in the forward direction and Monat et al.$^{19}$ and Thielen and Roth$^{21}$ for the reverse reaction.

Prefered Value

\[
k = 7.1 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-790/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the range 1400–4000 K.}
\]

Reliability

\[
\Delta \log k = \pm 0.2 \text{ over the range 1400–4000 K.}
\]

Comments on Preferred Values

There is quite considerable scatter in the measurements of $k$ even at room temperature, where there are numerous measurements, and uncertainty as to whether or not $k$ is temperature dependent. The only two high temperature studies, which used very similar shock tube methods, have also yielded conflicting results. The data of Koshi et al.$^{11}$ suggest that the rate constant is temperature independent. The very detailed study of Davidson and Hanson$^{12}$ over a large temperature range suggest a small positive temperature dependence in agreement with the low temperature data of Clyne and McDermid$^6$. Extrapolation of the Arrhenius expression of Davidson and Hanson$^{12}$ cannot accommodate the low temperature data. However, the data of Davidson and Hanson are entirely consistent with the equilibrium constant and the recommended rate of the reverse reaction which is based on measurements made in the same laboratory over the same temperature range. The data of Davidson and Hanson$^{12}$ are considered to be the most reliable at high temperatures and their expression is taken for the preferred value of $k$ over the stated temperature range. More data are required at intermediate temperatures to establish the temperature dependence of $k$ down to 300 K.

References

17. NASA, 1990 (see references in Introduction).
20. CODATA, 1982 (see references in Introduction).
\[ \text{N} + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{O} \]

**EXPERIMENTAL DATA**

- Clyne and Thrush
- Herron 1961
- Phillips and Schiff 1962
- Takesaki and Mori 1967
- Lin Parkes and Kaufman 1970
- Clyne and Mc Dermid 1975
- Lee Michael Payne and Stief 1978
- Husain and Slater 1980
- Cheah and Clyne 1980
- Sugawara Ishikawa and Sato 1980
- Koshi et al 1990
- Davidson and Hanson 1990
- Jeoung Choo and Benson 1991
- This Evaluation 1993
\[ \text{NH} + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{OH} \quad (1) \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{NO}_2 + \text{H} \quad (2) \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{HNO} + \text{O} \quad (3) \]

Thermodynamic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\Delta H^\circ (1)$</th>
<th>$\Delta S^\circ (1)$</th>
<th>$K_p(1)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$-227 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$8.05 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$8.27 \times 10^{-15} \exp(-27200/T)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta H^\circ (2) = -105 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\Delta S^\circ (2) = -31.7 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$2.22 \times 10^{-46} \exp(+12900/T)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $\Delta H^\circ (3) = -7.73 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ | $\Delta S^\circ (3) = -4.65 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}$ | $9.64 \times 10^{-13}$ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k_1$</th>
<th>$k_2$</th>
<th>$k_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\text{T/K}$</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rate Coefficient Measurements |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| $2.5 \times 10^{-15}$ | 296 | Zetzsch and Hansen, 1978$^1$ (a) |
| $<3.32 \times 10^{-14}$ | 300 | Pagsberg et al., 1979$^2$ (b) |
| $1.26 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-770/T)$ | 268–543 | Hack, Kurucz, and Wagner, 1985$^3$ (c) |
| $k_2 = 7.47 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-5000/T)$ | 1523–2254 | Bain et al., 1986$^4$ (d) |
| $5.81 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-8600/T)$ | 2200–3270 | Mertens et al., 1991$^5$ (e) |
| $1.26 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-770/T)$ | 270–550 | Hanson and Salimian, 1984$^6$ (f) |
| | | CEC, 1992$^7$ (g) |

Reviews and Evaluations

Comments

(a) Flash photolysis study. NH generated by photolysis of NH$_3$/O$_2$/He mixtures. [NH] monitored by resonance fluorescence. No effect of changes in total pressure observed.


(c) Discharge flow system. NH produced by the sequence F + NH$_3$ → NH$_2$ + HF, NH$_2$ + F → NH + HF, [O] and [H] monitored by resonance fluorescence and [NH] and [OH] by laser induced fluorescence. Reaction NH + O$_2$(1$^\Delta g$) → products, also studied; $k \approx (1 \pm 2) \times 10^{-17} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ obtained.

(d) Ammonia-oxygen flame study with molecular beam sampling coupled to a mass spectrometer. Results fitted to a complex mechanism, for NO formation, involving numerous assumptions.

(e) Shock tube study. NH produced by the thermal dissociation of HNCO. Time histories of NH (X$^2\Sigma$) and OH(X$^2\Pi$) measure behind the shock waves by cw laser absorption at 336 nm and 307 nm, respectively. Results fitted to a large reaction mechanism.

(f) Review of all data to 1984; no expression recommended.

(g) Review of all data to 1991; recommendation based on study of Hack et al.$^5$.

Preferred Values

\[ (k_1 + k_2) = 1.3 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-770/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 270–550 K.} \]
\[ k_3 = 6.5 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-9000/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 2200–3500 K.} \]

Reliability

$\Delta \log(k_1 + k_2) = \pm 0.25$ over range 270–550 K.

$\Delta \log k_3 = \pm 0.5$ over range 2200–3500 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

There are two sets of measurements at high temperatures which differ considerably in their values of $k$. The more direct study of Mertens et al.$^5$ is preferred but we assign substantial error limits.

At low temperatures the values of Zetzsch and Hansen$^1$ and Hack et al.$^5$ are in good agreement. These are the basis of our previous recommendations. It was recognized in our previous evaluation that there could be an appreciable increase in $E/R$ at higher temperatures because of changes in the relative importance of the different reaction channels. The results of Mertens et al.$^5$ are in agreement with this expectation.

The measurements of Hack et al.$^5$ indicate that reaction (1) is the predominant channel at low temperatures but at high temperatures the calculations of Melius and Binkley$^7$ suggest that channel (3) will be more important than (1) and (2). By extrapolating the expression of Hack et al.$^5$ for $k = k_1 + k_2$ at low temperatures and subtracting from the measured high temperature values of $k$, Mertens et al.$^5$ derived the expression $k = 6.5 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-9000/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$, which is recommended for the range 2200–3500 K. A recent theoretical study by Miller and Melius$^9$ suggests that channel (3) may be predominant down to 1500 K.

Measurements in the range 300–2000 K are needed to characterize the curvature in the Arrhenius plot.

The thermodynamic data should be used with caution. There are significant uncertainties associated with the data on NH.
NH + NO → H + N₂O (1)
→ HN₂ + O (2)
→ N₂ + OH (3)

**Rate Coefficient Data (k = k₁ + k₂ + k₃)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8·10⁻¹¹</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Cox, Nelson, and McDonald, 1985¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.78·10⁻¹¹</td>
<td>269-373</td>
<td>Harrison, Whyte, and Phillips, 1986²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8·10⁻¹⁰exp(-6400/T)</td>
<td>2220-3350</td>
<td>Mertens et al., 1991³</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k₁ = 3.3·10⁻¹²</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Vandooren et al., 1991⁴</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k₂ = 2.0·10⁻¹¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k₃ = 1.4·10⁻¹¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**


**Comments**

(a) Pulsed laser photolysis of N₂H₄/He/NO mixtures at 266 nm in flowing system. [NH] decay monitored by laser induced fluorescence at 304.85 nm.
(b) Pulsed laser photolysis of N₂H₄/Ar/NO mixtures at 248 nm in flowing system. [NH] decay monitored by laser induced fluorescence at 336 nm. He, N₂, and N₂O also used as carrier gases give same result.
(c) Shock tube study. NH produced by the thermal dissociation of HNCO. Time histories of NH (XΣ) and OH (XΠ) measured behind the shock waves by cw laser absorption at 336 nm and 307 nm, respectively. Results fitted to a large reaction mechanism.
(d) Ammonia oxygen flame study, with fitting to a complex mechanism. Two values of k, given corresponding to different values for the rate constant of the NH₂ + NO reaction to which the measurements are sensitive at 2000 K. Our evaluation of the NH₂ + NO rate data favours the value of k₃(NH₂ + NO) = 2.0·10⁻¹¹ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹.
(e) Review of data to 1985; no recommendation.
(f) Recommendations made for low temperatures only; see Comments on Preferred Values.

**Preferred Values**

k = 5.0·10⁻¹¹ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ over the range 270-380 K.

k = 2.8·10⁻¹⁰ exp(-6400/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ over range 2220-3350 K.

**Reliability**

Δlnk = ±0.2 over the range 270-380 K.

Δlnk = ±0.5 over the range 2220-3350 K.

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The recent study of Mertens et al.¹ is the first direct measurement of k at high temperatures. The previous work of Nip⁴, Roos et al.,⁵, Peterson°, and Morley¹⁰ all involved indirect techniques and gave scattered values much lower than those of Mertens et al.,³ which are preferred in this high temperature regime. The single value of Vandooren et al.² at 2000 K is in agreement with the results of Mertens et al.,³.

At low temperatures there is excellent agreement between all of the available studies¹,²,¹¹,¹²; our preferred value is based on all of them and is unchanged from our previous evaluation⁴. In the only temperature dependent study² at low temper-
No variation of $k$ with temperature could be detected over the range 269–373 K. However, the high temperature results give values of $k$ equal to or slightly less than the values found at ambient temperatures. A value of $EIR$ of $-520$ K is required for the low temperature values to extrapolate to the values obtained by Mertens et al.\textsuperscript{3} at high temperatures.

By monitoring OH production, Mertens et al.\textsuperscript{3} were also able to show that over the range 2940–3040 K channel (3) contributes to the extent of $(0.19 \pm 0.10)$ of the total $k$. This is in accord with calculations made by Miller and Melius\textsuperscript{13} which suggest that channel (1) is likely to predominate up to 3500 K, and at high temperatures there is a contribution from both channels (2) and (3). It is suggested that the contribution from channel (3), explains the small positive temperature coefficient found by Mertens et al.\textsuperscript{3}.

More work is required, particularly in the 300–2000 K temperature range to establish the temperature dependence. Provisionally, we make separate recommendations for the two temperature ranges with substantial error limits in the case of the high temperature values.

The thermodynamic data should be used with caution. There are significant uncertainties associated with the data on NH.

References

\textsuperscript{6}CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
\textsuperscript{7}W.S. Nip, Ph.D. Thesis, U. of Toronto (1974), reported in Ref. 3.
\textsuperscript{9}R.C. Petersen, Ph.D. Thesis, Purdue University (1981), reported in Ref. 3.
\textsuperscript{10}C. Morley, 18th Symp. (Int.) Combust. 23 (1981).
BAULCH ET AL.

NH + NO → H + N₂O
→ HN₂ + O
→ N₂ + OH

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- - - Roose et al 1981
O Hansen et al 1978
▼ Gordon et al 1971
□ Cox et al 1985
△ Harrison et al 1986
----- Nip 1974
-------- Petersen 1981
- - - - - Vandooren 1991
● Mertens et al 1991
- - - - - - This Evaluation 1993
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ \text{NH}_3 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{NH}_2 + \text{H} + \text{M} \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

\[ \rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{H}_2 + \text{M} \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

**Thermoaynamic data**

\[ \Delta H^\circ_\text{f}(1) = 456.0 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S^\circ_\text{f}(1) = 116.5 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_p(1) = 1.5 \times 10^7 \exp(-54310/T) \text{ atm} \]

\[ \Delta H^\circ_\text{f}(2) = 402.2 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S^\circ_\text{f}(2) = 119.0 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_p(2) = 2.0 \times 10^7 \exp(-48090/T) \text{ atm} \]

**Rate Coefficient Measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/s (^{-1})</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm(^{-2})</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Ar}]2.2 \times 10^7 \exp(-40000/T))</td>
<td>2100-2900</td>
<td>((7.2-60) \times 10^4)</td>
<td>Michel and Wagner, 1965 (^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Ar}]4.2 \times 10^6 \exp(-45800/T))</td>
<td>2100-2900</td>
<td>((7.2-60) \times 10^4)</td>
<td>Hentzki, 1966 (^5)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Ar}]3.8 \times 10^6 \exp(-53800/T))</td>
<td>2200-3000</td>
<td>((7.2-60) \times 10^4)</td>
<td>Takeyanana and Miyama, 1966 (^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Ar}]6.6 \times 10^5 \exp(-41870/T))</td>
<td>2200-3450</td>
<td>((7.2-60) \times 10^4)</td>
<td>Bradley, Butlin, and Lewis, 1967 (^4)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Ar}]9.6 \times 10^4 \exp(-38748/T))</td>
<td>2000-3000</td>
<td>((7.2-60) \times 10^4)</td>
<td>Genich, Zhitomir, and Manella, 1975 (^9)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Kr}]1.2 \times 10^5 \exp(-45790/T))</td>
<td>2500-3000</td>
<td>((7.2-60) \times 10^4)</td>
<td>Dove and Nip, 1976 (^6)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Ar}]4.2 \times 10^4 \exp(-47200/T))</td>
<td>2200-3450</td>
<td>((7.2-60) \times 10^4)</td>
<td>Rase, Harligh, and Kuigei, 1980 (^7)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Ar}]6.6 \times 10^3 \exp(-47270/T))</td>
<td>2200-3300</td>
<td>((7.2-60) \times 10^4)</td>
<td>Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 (^8)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{Ar}]3.0 \times 10^3 \exp(-46350/T))</td>
<td>1740-3050</td>
<td>((7.2-60) \times 10^4)</td>
<td>Yumura and Asaba, 1981 (^9)</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intermediate Fall-Off Range**

\[ \exp(-45592/T) \]

| T=2050-3070 | (3.0-5.4) \times 10^4 \exp(-4592/T) | Yumura et al., 1980 \(^{10}\) | (j) |
| 2.1 \times 10^4 | 1.1 \times 10^4 | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |
| 2.2 \times 10^4 | 1.1 \times 10^4 | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |
| 1.1 \times 10^4 | 1.1 \times 10^4 | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |
| 3.0 \times 10^4 | 1.1 \times 10^4 | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |
| 1.4 \times 10^4 | 1.1 \times 10^4 | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |
| 7.2 \times 10^4 | 1.1 \times 10^4 | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |
| 6.4 \times 10^4 | 1.1 \times 10^4 | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |
| 4.0 \times 10^4 | 1.1 \times 10^4 | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |
| 1.0 \times 10^4 | 1.1 \times 10^4 | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |

**High Pressure Range**

\[ \exp(-54240/T) \]

| 2200-3300 | \exp(-54240/T) | Holzrichter and Wagner, 1981 \(^8\) | (h) |

**Reviews and Evaluations**

\[ k_1 = [\text{Ar}]3.0 \times 10^4 \exp(-42400/T) \]

\[ k_2 = [\text{Ar}]4.2 \times 10^4 \exp(-47200/T) \]

\[ k_3 = [\text{Ar}]3.7 \times 10^4 \exp(-47040/T) \]

**Comments**

(a) Shock tube study. Decay of [NH] monitored by UV absorption at 230-250 nm. Results indicate that the decomposition of NH is unimolecular. No conclusion was given on the mechanism.

(b) Shock tube study of NH dissociation using UV absorption technique to monitor [NH] at 230 nm and [NH] at 336 nm. Induction period at lower temperatures.

(c) Shock tube study of NH decay in NH/Ar mixtures. Decay of [NH] behind reflected shock monitored at 224.5 nm. Induction period observed at T<2400 K. Rate coefficients derived from the initial decay rates at higher temperatures. Pressures not quoted, probably several atmospheres.

(d) Shock tube study. Decay of NH monitored by IR emission at 3 mm. Rate coefficients obtained from initial decay rates.

(e) Pyrolysis of NH in shock waves. [NH] monitored by UV absorption at 220 nm.

(f) Pyrolysis of NH in shock waves. Mass spectrometric analysis during the reaction. Concentration profiles of NH, NH, NH, and N measured. Rate coefficient extracted from a computer simulation with 10 reactions.

(g) Shock tube study. Rate coefficients measured behind incident shocks. IR emission of the species NH, NH, and NH was monitored.

(h) Study of NH decomposition behind incident and reflected shocks in (7.5-880) \times 10^7 molecule cm\(^{-2}\) of Ar. The rate coefficients were obtained from the initial slope of the [NH] decay as monitored by UV absorption.

(i) Shock tube study. H-atom generation monitored behind incident shocks using atomic resonance absorption at 121.6 nm. Mechanism with correction for boundary layer and wall absorption effects.

(j) Pyrolysis of NH in shock waves. H atoms monitored by Lyman-\(\alpha\) absorption at 121.5 nm.

(k) Evaluation of the literature up to 1971

(l) Evaluation of the literature up to 1981.
(m) Re-evaluation of the data of Refs. 6, 8, 9 and 14 using a value of \(1.14 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-13216/RT)\ cm^3\ molecule^{-1}\ s^{-1}\) for the reaction \(\text{NH}_3 + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{NH}_2 + \text{H}_2\) in the simulation of the pyrolysis of \(\text{NH}_3\).

Preferred Values

\[
k_a = 8.3 \times 10^{15} \exp(-55170/T)\ s^{-1}\ \text{over range 2000–3000 K.}
\]

\[
k_0 = [\text{Ar}] 7.4 \times 10^{-3} \exp(-41560/T)\ s^{-1}\ \text{over range 2000–3000 K.}
\]

\[
F_e = 0.58 \exp(-T/4581) + 0.42 \exp(-T/102)\ \text{for} \ M = \text{Ar}\ \text{over range 2000–3000 K.}
\]

Reliability

\[
\Delta \log k_a = \pm 0.4\ \text{over range 2000–3000 K.}
\]

\[
\Delta \log k_0 = \pm 0.3\ \text{over range 2000–3000 K.}
\]

\[
\Delta F_e = \pm 0.1\ \text{for} \ M = \text{Ar}\ \text{over range 2000–3000 K.}
\]

Comments on Preferred Values

The available experimental data are far away from the limiting high pressure rate coefficients. The preferred values of \(k_a\) are based on an SACM analysis for the reverse recombination process\(^{16}\) and the evaluated equilibrium constant. We have chosen the data from Refs. 2, 6 and 8 to fit theoretical fall-off curves\(^17\). This procedure leads to collisional efficiencies of about 0.05 when the extrapolated \(k_a\) values are compared with the strong collision limiting low pressure rate coefficients\(^{17,18}\) evaluated here. In Figs. 1 and 2, the temperature dependence of \(k_a\) and \(k_0\) is presented. Figure 3 shows the calculated fall-off curves and selected experimental dissociation rate coefficients.

The rate coefficients for the spin-forbidden reaction (2) are about a factor of 40 lower than those of reaction (1)\(^6,12\).

References

\[ \text{NH}_3 + M \rightarrow \text{NH}_2 + H + M \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{H}_2 + M \]

**Fig. 1**

- **Baulch et al. 1973**
- **Hanson and Salimian 1984**
- **This Evaluation 1993**
BAULCH ET AL.

$\text{NH}_3 + M \rightarrow \text{NH}_2 + \text{H} + M$

$\rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{H}_2 + M$

Fig. 2

Fig. 3

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

Michael and Wagner (AAN) 2900 K 1965
Hemps (AAN) 2700 K 1966
Dove and Nes (AAN) 2400 K 1979
Dove and Nes (MKG) 2700 K 1979
Dove and Nes (AAN) 2200 K 1979
Hofzoller and Wagner (AAN) 2400 K 1981
Hofzoller and Wagner (AAN) 2700 K 1981
Hofzoller and Wagner (AAN) 2400 K 1981
Yamura and Okada (AAN) 2400 K 1981
This Evaluation max 1993
**EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING**  

**C + N₂ → CN + N**

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[\Delta H^\circ_f = 190 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}\]

\[\Delta S^\circ_f = 6.2 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}\]

\[K_p = 0.58 T^{0.17} \exp(-22890/T)\]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/\text{K})</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7.5 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-22000/T))</td>
<td>2350–3290</td>
<td>Lindackers, Burmeister, and Roth, 1990¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-23160/T))</td>
<td>2660–4660</td>
<td>Dean, Hanson and Bowman, 1990²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Shock tube study. C atoms generated by pyrolysis of CH₄ or C₂H₆ in Ar and detected behind reflected shock wave by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy (ARAS). Analysis of perturbations to [C] on addition of N₂ gave \(k\). N atoms also detected by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy. The A-factor is misquoted in abstract of original reference.

(b) Shock tube study. C atoms generated by pyrolysis of C₃O₂ in Ar and N₂ and decay of [C] followed behind reflected shock wave under first-order conditions by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy.

**Preferred Value**

\[k = 8.7 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-22600/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}\] over the range 2000–5000 K.

**Reliability**

\(\Delta \log k = \pm 0.2\) over the range 2000–5000 K.

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The two direct measurements of \(k\) using very similar shock tube techniques, are in excellent agreement. The preferred value is derived from averaging the Arrhenius parameters of each expression. It lies well within the broad range of values calculated from the equilibrium constant and indirect measurements of the reverse rate coefficient, which differ by over an order of magnitude.

**References**

¹D. Lindackers, M. Burmeister, and P. Roth, 23rd Symp. (Int.) Comb., 251 (1990).
Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_{298}^{\circ} = -122.6 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^{\circ} = -51.7 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \text{Rate Coefficient Measurements} \]

\[ k = 1.94 \times 10^{-16} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at 19.4 K.} \]

\[ \Delta k = 0.3 \text{ at 300 K.} \]
\[ \Delta k = 0.3 \text{ over the range 1500–4050 K.} \]
\[ \Delta k/k = \Delta k_2/k = \pm 0.25. \]

Comments

(a) Single shot flash photolysis of \( \text{C}_2\text{O}_2 \). [C] monitored by light absorption in the 166 nm region and photographic plate photometry. Total pressure 150 Torr.

(b) Single shot flash photolysis of \( \text{C}_2\text{O}_2 \). [C] monitored by resonance absorption at 166 nm. Total pressure 53 Torr and 527 Torr. No pressure dependence of \( k \) observed.

(c) Repetitive flash photolysis of \( \text{C}_2\text{O}_2 \). [C] monitored by resonance absorption at 166 nm with signal averaging. Total pressure 27 Torr.

(d) Pulsed laser photolysis at 248 nm of slowly flowing \( \text{CH}_2\text{Br}_2/\text{He} \) mixtures. [C] monitored by two-photon LIF at 143.5 nm. Total pressure 2 Torr.

(e) Shock tube study. C atoms produced by pyrolysis of \( \text{C}_2\text{O}_2 \) in \( \text{C}_2\text{O}_2/\text{Ar} \) mixtures at temperatures 2435–3737 K, and by laser photolysis at 193 nm of \( \text{C}_2\text{O}_2/\text{Ar} \) mixtures in temperature range 1576–1940 K. [C] monitored by ARAS at 156.1 nm. Possible reaction products, CN, N, O, were studied using laser absorption or ARAS. Computer modelling of large reaction scheme shows [CN] profile particularly sensitive to branching ratio.

(f) Fast flow reactor; C atoms produced by discharge in \( \text{CO}/\text{He} \) mixtures. [C] monitored by detection of chemiluminescence from \( \text{C} + \text{OCS} \) reaction.

Preferred Values

\[ k = 2.5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at 300 K.} \]
\[ k = 8.0 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the range 1500–4050 K.} \]
\[ k/k = 0.40; k/k = 0.60 \text{ over the range 2400–4050 K.} \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.3 \text{ at 300 K.} \]
\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.3 \text{ over the range 1500–4050 K.} \]
\[ \Delta k/k = \Delta k_2/k = \pm 0.25. \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The measured values of \( k \) at low temperatures range over a factor of 7. It has been suggested \( \) that in the earlier studies, by flash photolysis, this scatter might be due to the high photolysis flash intensities used. The trend in values of \( k \) with time as detection methods improved and lower flash intensities could be employed is in accord with this. The most recent study, employing pulsed laser photolysis, has produced the lowest value of \( k \) yet obtained.

The alternative explanation involves pressure dependence of \( k \) but in the sole investigation of pressure effects Braun et al.\(^1\) found no evidence for them. In a recent discharge flow study Dorthe et al.\(^6\) also obtain a low value of \( k \), identical with that of Becker et al.\(^4\), if the usual plug flow assumptions were made, but 65% higher on making corrections for the flow pattern in their flow tube. Our recommendations at 300 K are based on the work of Becker et al.\(^1\) and Dorthe et al.\(^6\).

At high temperatures (1550–4050 K) there is only one study, by Dean et al.\(^7\). The work seems sound and their results are accepted with slightly enhanced error limits until confirmed by other studies. More studies are required to establish the temperature dependence of \( k \) between 300 and 1500 K.

The only investigation of the branching ratio is in the high temperature work of Dean et al.\(^5\) which is accepted as the basis of our recommendations.

References

Thermodynamic Data

\[
\Delta H_{298}^\circ = 13.6 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}
\]

\[
\Delta S_{298}^\circ = 19.5 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}
\]

\[
K_p(1) = 5.0 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-1420/T)
\]

Rate Coefficient Data \((k = k_1 + k_2)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k / \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T / \text{K})</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7.1 \times 10^{-14})</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Braun, McNesby, and Bass, 1967(^a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.01 \times 10^{-12})</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Bosnali and Pemer, 1971(^b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.3 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-5540/T))</td>
<td>1500-1900</td>
<td>Blauwens, Smets, and Peeters, 1977(^c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.3 \times 10^{-13})</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Butler et al., 1980(^d)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2 = 2.6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})</td>
<td>297-675</td>
<td>Berman and Lin, 1983(^e)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.1 \times 10^{-14})</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Duncanson and Guillory, 1983(^f)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-6840/T))</td>
<td>1700-2200</td>
<td>Matsui and Yuuki, 1984(^g)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.0 \times 10^{-14})</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Becker, Engelhardt, and Wiesen, 1989(^h)</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.0 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-7000/T))</td>
<td>2652-2859</td>
<td>Lindackers, Burmeister, and Roth, 1990(^i)</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.3 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-11000/T))</td>
<td>2500-3820</td>
<td>Dean, Hanson, and Bowman, 1990(^j)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.58 \times 10^{-12} \exp(1150/T)) at 20 Torr Ar</td>
<td>301-894</td>
<td>Becker et al., 1992(^k)</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Flash photolysis of CH₄. [CH] monitored by flash absorption using photographic recording. Pressures 1—40 Torr.
(b) Pulse radiolysis of CH₄. [CH] monitored by absorption spectroscopy. Pressure not given but likely to be approximately 1 atm.
(c) Flat, nitrogen diluted, flames of C₂H₆, C₂H₅, or CH₄ burning in O₂ studied at pressures in range 18—43 Torr. Concentration profiles of NO, O₂, OH, H, CH, CH₂, C₂H₅, C₂H₆, and C measured by molecular beam sampling and mass spectrometry. Concentration of both CH and CH₂ shown to correlate with prompt NO. Results can be interpreted in terms of CH + N₂ reaction or CH⁺ + N₂ reaction.
(d) Pulsed laser photolysis at 193 nm of slowly flowing mixtures of CHBr₃/Ar/N₂. CH produced by multiphoton absorption by CHBr₃ and [CH] monitored by LIF near 430 nm. Total pressure 30—100 Torr.
(e) CH produced by pulsed CO₂ laser multiphoton dissociation of CH₃NH₂, CH₂CN, or c-C₃H₅CH₃ [CH] monitored by LIF. Slowly flowing mixtures of source gas and N₂ in Ar buffer gas used at total pressures over range 1—80 Torr. Limiting \(k_1\) and \(k_{\text{limit}}\) values obtained using simple Linde mann model.
(f) Pulsed laser photolysis at 266 nm of slowly flowing mixtures of CHBr₃/Ar/N₂. [CH] monitored by LIF at 429.8 nm. Total pressure varied over range 25—787 Torr at 297 K, and temperature varied over range 297—675 K at 100 Torr total pressure.
(g) CH produced by pulsed CO₂ laser multiphoton dissociation of CH₃OH. [CH] monitored by LIF at 430.0 nm. Ar (10 Torr) used as buffer gas.
(h) Study of premixed, flat CH₄/air flames by light absorption, by saturation ion current measurements, and by microwave probe sample extraction and analysis for total hydrocarbons and NO. Total pressure, 760 Torr.
(i) Pulsed laser photolysis at 248 nm of slowly flowing CH₃Br/Ar/N₂ and CHClBr/Ar/N₂ mixtures. [CH] monitored by LIF at 430 nm. Total pressure, 2 Torr.
(j) Technique as in (i) but total pressure 20 Torr.
(k) Reflected shock waves in CH₃Br/N₂ mixtures at pressures 1.5—1.79 bar. [N] profiles monitored by atomic resonance absorption. [N] profiles fitted by computer simulation of reaction scheme. Fitting shown to be sensitive to \(k\).
(l) Shock tube studies on CH₃N/Ar and CH₃H/Ar/N₂ mixtures at pressures 0.62—1.02 atm. [CH] profile monitored by laser absorption at 431.131 nm. [N] profile monitored in some experiments by atomic resonance absorption. [CH] profiles fitted using computer simulation of reaction scheme; fitting shown to be sensitive to \(k\).

Preferred Value

\[
k = 2.6 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-9030/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}
\]

over the range 2000—4000 K at \(p < 760\) Torr.

Reliability

\[
\Delta \log k = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 2000—4000 K at } p < 760 \text{ Torr.}
\]

Comments on Preferred Values

Since this reaction was first suggested as a source of 'prompt' NO in flames its kinetics have been the subject of a number of studies. At low temperatures the rate constant has been shown to be pressure dependent and to have a negative temperature coefficient. The effects of pressure are allowed for the measured values of the rate constant are in good agreement.
The pressure dependence of $k$ has been investigated by Wagal et al.\textsuperscript{5} and by Berman and Lin\textsuperscript{6}. The mechanism proposed for the reaction is

\[ \text{CH} + \text{N}_2 \leftrightarrow \text{CHN}_2^* \rightarrow \text{HCN} + \text{N} \]

The effects of pressure on $k$ and the negative temperature coefficient at low temperatures are accounted for by competition between collisional stabilization of the energized CHN$_2^*$ adduct and decomposition back to CH + N$_2$. This competition has been modelled by Wagal et al.\textsuperscript{5} using a simple Lindemann treatment and by Berman and Lin\textsuperscript{6} who used RRKM theory. The experimental results were obtained under conditions far removed from the high pressure limit of $k$ and much closer to the low pressure limit. Not surprisingly, therefore, the two different treatments give values of $k_0$ in good agreement but there are very large differences in the values of $k_0$. At sufficiently high temperatures the rate constant has a positive temperature coefficient and appears to be independent of pressure\textsuperscript{3,8}. Path $b$ is included in the above mechanism to account for this. At high temperatures, path $b$ becomes more important than the decomposition of the adduct back to CH + N$_2$ and any pressure effect would be due to competition between $b$ and $c$ until, at sufficiently high temperatures, $b$ dominates completely and $k$ becomes pressure independent. From the modelling studies of Berman and Lin\textsuperscript{6} and Lindackers et al.\textsuperscript{10} it seems that adduct formation will dominate at low temperatures and will contribute to the overall rate constant at $T<2000$ K and $p<760$ Torr. This transition temperature region will move to higher values of $T$ at higher pressures.

There are high temperature values of $k$ based on both flame\textsuperscript{3,8} and shock tube studies\textsuperscript{10,11}. They exhibit considerable differences both in the absolute values of $k$ and its temperature coefficient. The flame studies were performed at lower temperatures and hence may have some contribution from adduct stabilization, channel 2. The slightly lower values of $E/R$ obtained in these studies may be evidence of this. Our recommendations, therefore, are based on the shock tube work of Lindackers et al.\textsuperscript{10} and Dean et al.\textsuperscript{11}. These give significantly different values of $E/R$, probably more than can be explained by contributions from adduct formation at the temperatures and pressures employed. For the temperature coefficient, we take a mean value of $E/R$ from these two studies and the pre-exponential factor is based on this value of $E/R$ and the virtually identical value of $k$ at 2000 K given by the expression of Dean et al.\textsuperscript{11} and Lindackers et al.\textsuperscript{10}. Our recommendations are limited to high temperatures and pressures where channel 1 is expected to be dominant. Some direct confirmation that the products of the reaction at high temperatures are HCN + N comes from the work of Dean et al.\textsuperscript{11} where the [N] profile was measured and modelled satisfactorily.

References

\textsuperscript{1}W. Braun, J.R. McNesty, and A.M. Bass, J. Chem. Phys. 46, 2071 (1967).
CH + N₂ → HCN + N
CH + N₂ (+M) → CHN₀ (+M)

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

○ Braun et al 1967
▽ Bosnali and Perner 1971
---- Blauwens et al 1977
□ Butler et al 1980
△ Burman and Lin 1983 (100 Torr Ar)
▼ Duncanson and Guillory 1983
- Matsui and Yuuki 1985
▲ Becker et al 1989
♦ Becker et al 1992 (20 Torr Ar)
- Lindackers et al 1992
- - Lindackers et al 1992
- - This Evaluation 1993

Log(k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹)

10⁴ T⁻¹/K⁻¹
Thermodynamic Data

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta H^\circ_{f}^{\text{(1)}} &= -438.5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S^\circ_{f}^{\text{(1)}} &= -3.6 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{mol}^{-1} \\
K_p(1) &= 1.2 \times 10^{28} \exp(-52620/T) \\
\Delta H^\circ_{f}^{\text{(2)}} &= -210.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S^\circ_{f}^{\text{(2)}} &= -7.5 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{mol}^{-1} \\
K_p(2) &= 3.0 \times 10^{50} \exp(+25160/T) \\
\Delta H^\circ_{f}^{\text{(3)}} &= -300.1 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \\
\Delta S^\circ_{f}^{\text{(3)}} &= -30.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{mol}^{-1} \\
K_p(3) &= 6.9 \times 10^{-2} \exp(+35400/T)
\end{align*}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Data ( (k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 \times 10^{-10}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 \times 10^{-10}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-10}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 \times 10^{-10}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.66 \times 10^{-10}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Pulsed laser photolysis at 193 nm of slowly flowing mixtures of CHBr/Ar/NO at pressures of 100 Torr. CH produced by multiphoton absorption by CHBr and [CH] monitored by LIF near 430 nm.

(b) Pulsed laser photolysis at 266 nm of slowly flowing mixtures of CHBr/Ar/NO at pressures of 100 Torr. [CH] monitored by LIF in 430 nm region.

(c) CH produced by multiphoton pulsed laser dissociation (CO2 laser) of CH3NH2, CH3CN or C2H2. [CH] monitored by LIF. Slowly flowing mixtures of source gas with Ar and NO at total pressures of approximately 5 Torr.

(d) Pulsed laser photolysis at 266 nm of slowly flowing mixtures of CHBr/Ar/NO at 21 Torr. Emissions from excited states of CH and from NO observed. NO emission monitored at 336.2 nm used to obtain \( k \).

(e) Shock tube study. Pyrolysis of C2H4/NO/Ar or CH3/NO/Ar mixtures. CH, NH and OH detected by narrow-line laser absorption. [CH] profile in presence and absence of NO compared. \( k \) derived by fitting [CH] profiles using large reaction mechanism. Checks carried out to show [CH] profile sensitive to \( k \).

Preferred Values

\[
k = 2.0 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the range 300-4000 K.}
\]

Reliability

\[
\Delta \log k = \pm 0.25 \text{ over the range 300-4000 K.}
\]

Comments on Preferred Values

The studies at low temperatures\(^1\)\(^-\)\(^6\) are in good agreement. All of them have used the pulsed laser photolysis of slowly flowing gas mixtures but with a variety of CH sources. There is agreement between results whether obtained by monitoring NH production or from measuring [CH] decay.

In the only high temperature study\(^7\), the value of \( k \) obtained agrees well with the low temperature measurements. There are no published measurements in the intermediate temperature range but unpublished results of Casleton and Morgan-town are quoted in Ref. 7 as giving \( k = 1.5 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) over the range 300-1500 K. As might be expected from such a fast reaction there is no evidence for an appreciable temperature coefficient for \( k \).

As well as the three listed, there are a number of other possible exothermic reaction channels leading to H + NCO, N + HCO, H + CNO. Objections to all of these have been raised\(^8\) and the only experimental study\(^7\) has been aimed at seeking products from channels 1, 2 or 3. From the yield of NH it was concluded that channel 1 contributes less than 10% to \( k \) and measurements of the OH yield suggested that channel 2 was also a minor contributor (certainly less than 30% and likely to be less than 10%). Attempts to confirm the predominance of channel 3 by measuring O atom profiles was hindered by interfering reactions and experimental difficulties in the detection method. The assumption that reaction 3 is the main pathway therefore requires confirmation and no recommendation is made for the branching ratios.
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\[\text{CH + NO} \rightarrow \text{CO + NH} \quad \text{(1)}\]
\[\rightarrow \text{CN + OH} \quad \text{(2)}\]
\[\rightarrow \text{HCN + O} \quad \text{(3)}\]
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\( ^1 \text{CH}_2 + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{Products} \)

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/\text{K} )</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4( \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Laufer and Bass, 1974(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6( \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Langford, Petek, and Moore, 1983(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.65( \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>295-431</td>
<td>Biggs et al., 1991(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.63( \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>296-645</td>
<td>Hancock and Heal, 1992(^4)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Flash photolysis of ketene with product analysis by G.C.
Rate constants obtained from the decrease in yield of \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 \) with increasing amounts of NO.
(b) \( ^1 \text{CH}_2 \) produced from the photolysis of ketene at 308 nm.
\( [\text{CH}_2] \) monitored in absorption between 590 and 610 nm.
(c) Laser flash photolysis of ketene at 308 nm.
\( [\text{CH}_2] \) monitored using cw resonance absorption at 590.5 nm.
(d) As in (c) but quartz cell used instead of stainless steel.

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 1.6 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \] over range 290–650 K.

**Reliability**

\( \Delta \log k = \pm 0.2 \) over range 290–650 K.

\( ^1 \text{CH}_2 + \text{H}_2 \text{(M)} \rightarrow \text{C}_3\text{H}_6 \text{(M)} \quad (1) \)

\( \rightarrow ^2 \text{CH}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \quad (2) \)

**Thermodynamic Data**

\( \Delta H^\circ_{298} (1) = -457 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \)
\( \Delta S^\circ_{298} (1) = 150 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \)
\( K_p(1) = 25.7 \text{ T}^{0.02} \exp(+55400/T) \text{ atm}^{-1} \)

\( \Delta H^\circ_{298} (2) = -37.7 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \)
\( \Delta S^\circ_{298} (2) = 6.8 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \)
\( K_p(2) = 2.17 \text{ mol}^{0.02} \exp(+4520/T) \)

**Rate Coefficient Data \((k = k_1 + k_2)\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/\text{K} )</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 ( \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Langford, Petek, and Moore, 1983(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_1 = 2.1 \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Canosa-Mas, Frey, and Walsh, 1985(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_2/k = 0.13 )</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Bohland, Temps, and Wagner, 1985(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 ( \times 10^{-10} )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Hack et al., 1989(^4)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_2/k = 0.2 )</td>
<td>298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_2/k = 0.13 )</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^5)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviews and Evaluations**

1.5 \( \times 10^{-10} \)

**Comments on Preferred Values**

All of the available data are in good agreement. By comparing the temperature coefficient of physical quenching (e.g.
with Ar) with the lack of any such effect on \( k \) of varying [NO],
Hancock and Heal\(^4\) conclude that reactive quenching must be important and perhaps be the predominant means of \( ^1 \text{CH}_2 \)
removal.

**References**

Comments

(a) Excimer laser flash photolysis of ketene (308 nm) followed by time resolved detection of \(^1\text{CH}_2\) by cw dye laser absorption.

(b) Excimer laser flash photolysis of ketene (308 nm) in the presence of Ar and C\(_2\text{H}_4\). Products detected by GC. Pressure approximately 400 Torr. Product distribution simulated by numerical integration. Assumed same rate coefficient for \(^1\text{CH}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) and \(^1\text{CH}_2 + \text{H}_2\text{CO}\).

(c) Excimer laser flash photolysis of ketene (308 nm). LMR detection of \(^1\text{CH}_2\). Assumed zero triplet quantum yield at 308 nm. The \(k_2/k\) value represents an upper limit.

(d) Pulsed laser photolysis of ketene, with LIF monitoring of \(^1\text{CH}_2\) and LMR monitoring of \(^1\text{CH}_2\).

(e) Value of Langford et al.\(^1\) accepted.

Preferred Values

\[
k = 2.0 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range } 300-1000 \text{ K.}
\]

\[
k_2/k = 0.2.
\]

\(^3\text{CH}_2 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{OH} + \text{H} \quad (1)
\]
\[
\rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + \text{H}_2 \quad (2)
\]
\[
\rightarrow \text{CO} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \quad (3)
\]
\[
\rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{O} + \text{O} \quad (4)
\]
\[
\rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + 2\text{H} \quad (5)
\]

Thermodynamic Data

\[
\Delta H^\circ_\text{f} (1) = -241 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}
\]
\[
\Delta S^\circ_\text{f} (1) = 95.2 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}
\]
\[
Kp(1) = 1.15 \cdot 10^{7} \text{ exp}(+29000/T) \text{ atm.}
\]

\[
\Delta H^\circ_\text{f} (3) = -739 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}
\]
\[
\Delta S^\circ_\text{f} (3) = -14.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}
\]
\[
Kp(3) = 4.14 \cdot 10^{7} \text{ exp}(+88880/T)
\]

\[
\Delta H^\circ_\text{f} (5) = -345 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}
\]
\[
\Delta S^\circ_\text{f} (5) = 42.4 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1}
\]
\[
Kp(5) = 4.87 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{ exp}(+42000/T) \text{ atm.}
\]

Rate Coefficient Data \((k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 + k_5)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/K)</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.24 \cdot 10^{-12}</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Darwin et al., 1989(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 \cdot 10^{-11} \text{ exp}(-750/T)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>CRC, 1990(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Laser flash kinetic spectrometric study with photolysis of ketene at 351 nm used as the source of \(^3\text{CH}_2\) which was detected at 883.3 cm\(^{-1}\) by cw diode laser absorption.

(b) Review of all studies up to 1989. Recommended EIR based on Ref. 3 and combined with the room temperature measurement of Bohland et al.\(^4\) to give A factor.

Preferred Values

\[
k = 4.1 \cdot 10^{-11} \text{ exp}(-750/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range } 300-1000 \text{ K.}
\]

Reliability

\[
\Delta \log k = \pm 0.5 \text{ at } 1000 \text{ K reducing to } \pm 0.1 \text{ at } 300 \text{ K.}
\]

References

5. CRC, 1990 (see references in Introduction).
Comments on Preferred Values

The direct measurement of Darwin et al. confirms that of Bohland et al. This value has been adopted together with the temperature dependence of Vinckier and Debruyn. The limited information on the channel efficiencies was discussed in the previous evaluation.

References

2. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).

CH₃ + CO (+ M) → CH₂CO (+ M)

Thermodynamic data

ΔH°₂⁰ = -45.1 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS°₂⁰ = -125.4 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹
KP = 2.2·10⁻¹² T⁻¹ exp(5170/T) atm⁻¹

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm⁻³</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Pressure Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[CO] 5.7·10⁻³⁶</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>(3-24)·10¹⁴</td>
<td>Anastasi and Maw, 1982¹ (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[CO] 1.0·10⁻²⁶</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>(2.4-7.2)·10¹⁸</td>
<td>Kerr and Calvert, 1965² (b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Fall-Off Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>2.9·10¹⁸</td>
<td>Watkins and Word, 1979³ (c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>3.2·10¹⁹(CO)</td>
<td>Parkes, 1981⁴ (d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>3.0·10¹⁹</td>
<td>Anastasi and Maw, 1982¹ (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>3.6·10¹⁹</td>
<td>(CH₃CO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>1.6·10¹⁹</td>
<td>(CH₃N₂CO, SF₆)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>2.4·10¹⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>3.0·10¹⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>2.1·10¹⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Pressure Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.64·10⁻¹³exp(-3010/T)</td>
<td>260-413</td>
<td>(1.8·10¹⁰-CO)</td>
<td>Watkins and Word, 1974¹ (c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6·10⁻⁷</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td>Parkes, 1981⁴ (d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>(3-24)·10¹⁹(CO)</td>
<td>Anastasi and Maw, 1982¹ (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₜ = (N₂)4·10⁻⁴⁰exp(-5490/T)</td>
<td>300-1700</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986⁵ (e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₜ = 7.64·10⁻¹³exp(-3073/T)</td>
<td>260-507</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bencsura et al., 1992⁶ (f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Molecular modulation technique; photolysis of azomethane/CO mixtures. UV absorption detection of CH₃ and CH₂CO.
(b) Photolysis of azomethane at 366 nm in the presence of CO and CH₂CHO.
(c) Photolysis of azomethane in the presence of CO and SF₆. Product analysis by gas chromatography. Rate coefficients determined relative to the rate coefficient of the reaction CH₃ + CH₃ for which a value of 3.65·10⁻¹¹ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹, independent of temperature was used.
(d) Lindemann-Hinselwood extrapolation used to obtain kₜ.
(e) Based on data of references 1, 3 and 4 and an RRKM treatment.
(f) Study of the pyrolysis of CH₂CO. CH₂CO generated by photolysis of 2-butanone and detected by mass spectrometry. kₜ was theoretically estimated.
Preferred Values

$k_\alpha = 8.4 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-3455/T) \text{ s}^{-1}$ over range 300–500 K.

$k_c = [\text{He}] 3.0 \times 10^{-34} \exp(-1910/T) \text{ s}^{-1}$ over range 400–

$500 \text{ K}.

$k_\sigma = [\text{N}_2] 4.2 \times 10^{-36} \text{ s}^{-1}$ over range 300–350 K.

$F_\alpha = 0.5$ for $M = \text{He}$ over range 400–500 K.

$F_\epsilon = 0.6$ for $M = \text{N}_2$ over range 300–350 K.

Reliability

$\Delta \log k_\alpha = \pm 0.5$ over range 300–500 K.

$\Delta \log k_\sigma = \pm 0.2$ for $M = \text{He}$ over range 400–500 K.

$\Delta \log k_c = \pm 0.5$ for $M = \text{N}_2$ over range 300–350 K.

$\Delta F_\epsilon = \pm 0.1$ for $M = \text{He}$ over range 400–500 K.

$\Delta F_\alpha = \pm 0.1$ for $M = \text{N}_2$ over range 300–350 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

The preferred rate coefficients $k_\alpha$ and $k_c$ were derived from
the preferred dissociation rate coefficients and $K_c$. The value

of $K_c$ of Bencsura et al. was adopted. In deriving the expressions for $k_\alpha$ the values of $k_\sigma(M = \text{N}_2)$ were assumed to be
equal to $k_\sigma(M = \text{CO})$. Figures 1 and 2 show the temperature dependence of the limiting rate coefficients. The analysis of
the $k_\alpha$ values with the theory of Ref. 7 yields a $\beta_\alpha = 0.11$ at
420 K and 0.093 at 500 K for $M = \text{He}$. Experimental and fitted
fall-off curves are depicted in Fig. 3. More direct determinations of the kinetics of this reaction are required.

References


EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

CH₃ + CO + M → CH₃CO + M

Fig. 2

Tsang and Hampson (NH₃+H₂) 1986
This Evaluation (NH₂H₂) 1992

Fig. 3

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

Petek 250 & 1991
Aristusa 3685 & 1992
Arizuna and Noe 343 & 1992
This Evaluation 1999
CH₃CO (M) → CH₃ + CO (M)

**Thermodynamic data**

ΔH°ₚ = 45.1 kJ mol⁻¹

ΔS°ₚ = 125.4 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹

Kₚ = 4.5·10⁻⁷ exp(-5170/T) atm.

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm⁻³</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Pressure Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[CO]3.1·10⁻¹¹</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>(3-21)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td>Anastasi and Maw, 1982¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[He]6.7·10⁻⁸ exp(-6921/T)</td>
<td>420-500</td>
<td>(3-18)·10⁻⁹</td>
<td>Bencsura et al., 1992²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Fall-Off Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>325.7</td>
<td>1.8·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td>Frey and Vinall, 1973³</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0·10⁻⁸</td>
<td>506.7</td>
<td>6.6·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td>Szirovicza and Walsh, 1979⁴</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.1·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td>136·10⁻¹⁷</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1.1·10⁻⁹ (CO)</td>
<td>Anastasi and Maw, 1982¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>0.3·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>6.8·10⁻⁹ (Ar)</td>
<td>Baldwin et al., 1987⁵</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>20·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>49·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.06·10⁻⁸</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>6.0·10⁻⁹ (He)</td>
<td>Bencsura et al., 1992²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.62·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td>18·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31·10⁻⁸</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>6.0·10⁻⁹ (He)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.55·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td>18·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.98·10⁻⁸</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.0·10⁻⁹ (He)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.88·10⁻⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0·10⁻⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Pressure Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6·10⁻⁸ exp(-8660/T)</td>
<td>260-413</td>
<td>(1.8-8)·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>Watkins and Word, 1974⁶</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>(3-21)·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>Anastasi and Maw, 1982¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0·10⁻⁸ exp(-8806/T)</td>
<td>352-478</td>
<td>(6.5-69)·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>Baldwin et al., 1987⁷</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviews and Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₙ = [CO] 2.0·10⁻⁷ exp(-6302/T)</td>
<td>300-500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warnatz, 1984⁷</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₙ = 3.0·10⁻⁷ exp(-8420/T)</td>
<td>300-500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986⁸</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₙ = [N₂] 1.4·10⁻⁶ exp(-346)</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kₙ = 2.5·10⁻³ exp(-8244/T)</td>
<td>260-507</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bencsura et al., 1992²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Modulated photolysis of azomethane in the presence of excess of CO; CH₃ and CH₃CO detected by molecular modulation-UV absorption at 216 and 223 nm respectively. An empirical procedure based on Kassel integrals was used to evaluate kₙ from the measurements at 343 K.

(b) Laser photolysis of 2-butanone at 248 nm was used to generate CH₃CO radicals. Decay monitored by time-resolved mass spectrometry. Theoretical analysis using a master equation formalism. The experiments were fitted using a threshold energy of 65.3 kJ mol⁻¹. kₙ was theoretically evaluated.

(c) Photolysis of 3,3-dimethylbutan-2-one at 313 nm. Analysis of the products by gas chromatography. Mechanism with 15 reactions. Rate coefficients determined relative to the reaction CH₃CO + CH₃CO → CH₃COOCOCH₃ for which a value 3.7·10⁻¹ⁱ cm² molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ was assumed.

(d) CH₃CO formed as secondary product of the reactions of HI with ketene at 498–525 K. Products detected by chromatography. RRKM analysis of the thermal decomposition of CH₃CO.

(e) Photolysis of methyl cyclobutyl ketone at 313 nm (steady state) and 308 nm (laser photolysis) in Ar. Product analysis by gas chromatography. kₙ obtained by modelling of the mechanism and RRKM theory using step sizes for deactivation of 250 cm⁻¹. Rate coefficients depend on k(CH₃ + CH₃) and also k(CH₃CO + CH₃CO) for which values from Ref. 1 were used.
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

(f) Photolysis of azomethane in the presence of CO diluted in SF₆; product analysis by gas chromatography. The value of $k$ depends on the values of the rate coefficients for the reactions CH₃ + CH₃ and CH₃ + CH₃CO. Short Linde­mann Hinshe­lwood extrapolation used to obtain $k_w$.

(g) Review of literature prior to 1980.

(h) RRKM treatment of data in Refs. 1 and 5 using a step size of 450 cm⁻¹.

Preferred Values

$k_w = 2.8 \cdot 10^{13} \exp(-8630/T) \text{ s}^{-1}$ over range 300–500 K.

$k_o = [\text{He}] \cdot 1.0 \cdot 10^{8} \exp(-7080/T) \text{ s}^{-1}$ over range 400–500 K.

$k_o = [\text{Ar}] \cdot 7.0 \cdot 10^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ at 353 K.

$F_e = 0.5$ for M = He over range 400–500 K.

Reliability

$\Delta \log k_w = \pm 0.5$ over range 300–500 K.

$\Delta \log k_o = \pm 0.2$ for M = He over range 400–500 K.

$\Delta \log k_0 = \pm 0.4$ for M = Ar at 353 K.

$\Delta F_e = \pm 0.1$ over range 400–500 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

The value adopted is based on the results of Refs. 1, 5 and 6. In order to reconcile the dissociation and the recombination results we have taken for $k_w$ a value two times greater than the average value of the results from these references. The preferred $k_w$ values for M = He were derived from the fit to the data of Bencsura et al.². Figures 1 and 2 show the temperature dependence of the $k_w$ and $k_o$ together with values from previous compilations. The equilibrium constant given above was evaluated using recent thermodynamic values for the CH₃CO radical²⁹. Figure 3 shows the fall-off curves constructed with the recommended $k_w$ and $k_o$ values and the experimental data. An analysis of the $k_o$ values in terms of the unimolecular rate theory from Ref. 11 and a threshold energy of $E_0 = 65.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ ² leads to collisional efficiencies for M = He of 0.11 and 0.093 at 420 K and 500 K respectively. These values are consistent with an average energy transferred per collision of 60 cm⁻¹.

References


BAULCH ET AL.

CH₂CO + M → CH₂ + CO + M

\[ T/K \]

---

**Fig. 1**

- \(-\) Wamatz 1984
- \(\times\) Bencsura et al 1992
- \(\times\) This Evaluation 1993

\[ \log(k_{col} / s^{-1}) \]

\[ 10^3 T^{-1} / K^{-1} \]
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$\text{CH}_3\text{CO} + M \rightarrow \text{CH}_3 + \text{CO} + M$

**Fig. 2**

- Wamatz (unpublished) 1994
- Tsang and Hampson (WPN) 1988
- This Evaluation (MMH) 1993

**Fig. 3**

EXPERIMENTAL DATA
- Benczúr et al. (MMH) 420 K 1992
- Benczúr et al. (MMH) 440 K 1992
- Benczúr et al. (MMH) 460 K 1992
- Benczúr et al. (MMH) 480 K 1992
- Benczúr et al. (MMH) 500 K 1992

This Evaluation 1993
**Thermodynamic data**

\[ \Delta H_{\text{fus}} = -375 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{\text{fus}} = -159 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 2.41 \times 10^{-16} \exp(+45700/T) \text{ atm}^{-1} \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/\text{K} )</th>
<th>( [\text{M}]/\text{molecule cm}^{-3} )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>250–450</td>
<td>(3.2–29.4) \times 10^{16} (N_2)</td>
<td>Parkes et al., 1976</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1.6 \times 10^{16} (N_2)</td>
<td>Callear and Metcalfe, 1976</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>6.4 \times 10^{11} (He)</td>
<td>Van den Berg, 1976</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1.2 \times 10^{15} (Ar)</td>
<td>Glänzer et al., 1976, 1977</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1.5 \times 10^9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>6.0 \times 10^9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1.2 \times 10^9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>2.5 \times 10^{19} (N_2)</td>
<td>Hochschild et al., 1977</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>640–818</td>
<td>1.0 \times 10^{17} (Ar)</td>
<td>Sepehrad et al., 1979</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1700–1800</td>
<td>1.4 \times 10^{17} (Ar)</td>
<td>Zaslavko and Smirnov, 1979</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>1.6 \times 10^{17} (n-pentane)</td>
<td>Adachi et al., 1980</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>4.7 \times 10^{17} (n-pentane)</td>
<td>Pacey and Wimalasena, 1980</td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>5.4 \times 10^7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>3.9 \times 10^8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2.5 \times 10^{19} (Ar)</td>
<td>Hippler et al., 1984</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2.5 \times 10^{19}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>5.2 \times 10^{19}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>2.8 \times 10^{19} (N_2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>2.5 \times 10^{19}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>2.5 \times 10^{19}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>5.0 \times 10^{19}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>1.6 \times 10^{18} (Ar)</td>
<td>Macpherson et al., 1985</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1.3 \times 10^8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1.6 \times 10^8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>8.4 \times 10^7 (Ar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1.1 \times 10^8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>6.6 \times 10^8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1.3 \times 10^{17} (N_2)</td>
<td>Arthur, 1986</td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>2.7 \times 10^8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1.8 \times 10^9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>373–463</td>
<td>6.3 \times 10^{15} (N_2)</td>
<td>Arthur and Biordi, 1986</td>
<td>(m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>3.8 \times 10^{10} (Ar)</td>
<td>Slagle et al., 1985</td>
<td>(n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>3.4 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>4.0 \times 10^{10} (Ar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>7.9 \times 10^{9}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>6.4 \times 10^8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.65 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4.15 \times 10^{17} (Ar)</td>
<td>Walter et al., 1990</td>
<td>(o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.86 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>4.79 \times 10^{18}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1.94 \times 10^{19}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4.7 \times 10^{17} (Ar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>2.4 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>6.95 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>6.9 \times 10^{10} (Ar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>3.69 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>7.46 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>6.2 \times 10^{14} (Ar)</td>
<td>Hwang et al., 1990</td>
<td>(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{16} (Ar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>3.3 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>6.4 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>5.0 \times 10^{10} (Ar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>4.1 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>6.5 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{10} (Ar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>1.0 \times 10^{10}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ \text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_3 (+ M) \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 (+ M) \] — Continued

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k/\text{cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T/K )</th>
<th>([M]/\text{molecule cm}^{-3})</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Pressure Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 5.8 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>((2.5-523) \times 10^{10} (\text{Ar}))</td>
<td>Hippler et al., 1984(^{10})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviews and Evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 5.1 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quack and Troe, 1977(^{17})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 4.8 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baulch and Duxbury, 1980(^{29})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 4 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>250-420</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warnatz, 1984(^{26})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 6 \times 10^{-13} \times e^{-329/T} )</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986(^{25})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 1.7 \times 10^{-7} T^{-1.74} \times e^{-320/T} )</td>
<td>250-1400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wagner and Wardlaw, 1988(^{22})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 0.38 \times e^{-773} + 0.62 \times e^{-T/1180} )</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 6 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>300-1400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Troe, 1989(^{21})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 1.7 \times 10^{-7} T^{-1.74} \times e^{-320/T} )</td>
<td>200-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsang, 1989(^{24})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 0.153 \times 10^{-8} T^{-1.74} \times e^{-320/T} )</td>
<td>200-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walsh et al., 1990(^{15})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 0.593 \times e^{-773} + 0.405 \times e^{-T/69.6} )</td>
<td>200-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 1.91 \times 10^{-7} T^{-0.6} )</td>
<td>1200-1600</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hwang et al., 1990(^{16})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 6.0 \times 10^{-11} )</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^{21})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_a = 0.38 \times e^{-773} + 0.62 \times e^{-T/1180} )</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Molecular modulation spectroscopy, CH(_3) detection at 216 nm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Flash photolysis of HgMe(_2), ( k = 4.9 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1} ) for 2 CD(_3) + M \rightarrow C(_2)D(_6) + M; CH(_3) detection at 216 nm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Flash photolysis of HgMe(_2), CH(_3) detection at 216 nm, pressure dependence between 3 and 30 Torr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Shock wave pyrolysis study of azomethane at 1200-1500 K, CH(_3) detection at 216 nm, fall-off curve between 170 and 1700 K; rate coefficients for 2 CD(_3) + Ar \rightarrow C(_2)D(_6) + Ar identical to those for methyl recombination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Flash photolysis of azomethane, CH(_3) detection at 216 nm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Discharge-flow study of the reaction II + CI(_4), modelling of the mechanism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Shock wave pyrolysis study of tetramethyl tin, CH(_3) detection at 216 nm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Flash photolysis of azomethane, CH(_3) detection at 216 nm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Flow pyrolysis of neo-pentane, study of the induction period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Excimer laser flash photolysis of azomethane at 193 nm, CH(_3) detection at 216 nm, onset of diffusion control seen in high pressure N(_2). Results for Ar shown in Fig. 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) Excimer laser flash photolysis of azomethane at 193 nm, CH(_3) detection at 216 nm, temperature dependence between 296 and 577 K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(l) Molecular modulation spectroscopy, CH(_3) detection at 216 nm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m) Rotating sector measurements based on acetone photolysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n) Excimer laser flash photolysis of acetone at 193 nm, analysis by photoionization mass spectrometry at low pressures and by absorption spectroscopy at higher pressures. Results shown in Fig. 1. Experiments also with M = He from 296 to 810 K. Fall-off curves with M = Ar for many temperatures between 296 and 906 K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(o) The CH(_3) radicals were generated by 193 nm laser photolysis of acetone at 200 K and by the reaction F + CH(_4) \rightarrow HF + CH(_3) at 300 and 408 K. At lower temperatures the CH(_3) radicals were monitored by their UV absorption at 216.36 nm, while at 300 K and 408 K they were detected at 216.5 nm by UV absorption spectroscopy. Computer simulation of a mechanism with seven reactions. The values given for the intermediate fall-off range are average values taken from Table 1 of this work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p) Reflected shock wave study. CH(_3) absorption coefficients calibrated via dissociation of azomethane and monitored at 216.5 nm by UV absorption spectroscopy. Computer simulation of a mechanism with seven reactions. The values given for the intermediate fall-off range are average values taken from Table 1 of this work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q) Statistical adiabatic channel modelling. Value for 300 K fitted to the experiments, value for 1300 K calculated on the basis of this fit. Evaluation of earlier work in Ref. 18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(r) Systemic evaluation of earlier work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(s) Data evaluation and simplified fall-off construction.
(t) Construction of fall-off curves over the range 300–2500 K.
(u) Modelling with variational transition state theory, RRKM theory, and including weak collision effects. Based on experimental data from Refs. 4, 10, 11, and 14 with constant $k_{esc}$ as suggested by the statistical adiabatic channel model from Ref. 15.
(v) Modelling of experimental data from Refs. 4, 10, 11 and 14 up to 1000 K and the new experiments over the range 300–2000 K.
(w) See comment (t).
(x) See Comments on Preferred Values.

Preferred Values

$$k_o = 6.0 \times 10^{-11} \text{cm}^3 \text{molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{over range 300–2000 K.}$$

$$k_o = [\text{Ar}]3.5 \times 10^{-10} \text{cm}^3 \text{molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{over range 300–2000 K.}$$

$$F_c = 0.38 \exp(-T/73) + 0.62 \exp(-T/1180) \text{over range 300–2000 K.}$$

Reliability

$$\Delta \log k_o = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 300–2000 K.}$$

$$\Delta \log k_o = \pm 0.3 \text{ for } M = \text{Ar over range 300–2000 K.}$$

$$\Delta F_c = \pm 0.1 \text{ for } M = \text{Ar over range 300–2000 K.}$$

Comments on Preferred Values

The recommended values are based mainly in the extensive sets of data from Refs. 4, 10, 11 and 14 up to 1000 K and the new experiments over the range 200–400 K from Ref. 15 which essentially agree with previous measurements. Recent experiments over the range 1200–1400 K again suggest a negative temperature coefficient of $k_o$ which is of the order $k_o \propto T^{-n\alpha}$. However, these new data are inconsistent with the results from Ref. 4 although the same technique was applied. The difference of the rate coefficients (about a factor of 2) is due to different CH$_3$ absorption coefficients. Because the uncertainty of the high pressure shock wave experiments is probably larger than that of the low pressure shock wave experiments, we prefer the data of Ref. 4 and retain the interpretation of Ref. 25 based on the analysis of Ref. 22. Nevertheless, the question of the temperature coefficient of $k_o$ at high temperatures remains open ($k_o \propto T^\alpha$ with about $0 < \alpha < 0.6$). Figure 1 shows fall-off curves between 200–1600 K. The recommended values are consistent with those of the dissociation reaction via the equilibrium constant given above. For $M = \text{N}_2$ expressions identical with those for $M = \text{Ar}$ may be assumed.

References

25. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[
\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_3 + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + \text{M}
\]

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Glänzer et al. 1350 K 1976, 1977
- Hoppler et al. 300K 1984
- Slagle et al. 300 K 1988
- Slagle et al. 300 K 1988 and Meckeser et al. 1985
- Slagle et al. 906 K 1988
- Slagle et al. 906 K 1988 and Meckeser et al. 1985
- Slagle et al. 577 K 1988
- Slagle et al. 577 K 1988 and Meckeser et al. 1985
- Walter et al. 200 K 1990
- Walter et al. 300 K 1990
- Hwang et al. 1194 K 1990
- Hwang et al. 1411 K 1990
- This Evaluation 1993
**Thermodynamic data**

\[ \Delta H_{\text{ens}} = 375 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S_{\text{ens}} = 159 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_p = 4.15 \times 10^{16} \exp\left(-\frac{45700}{T}\right) \text{ atm.} \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k \text{ s}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( T / K )</th>
<th>([M]/\text{molecule cm}^{-3})</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Fall-Off Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 \times 10^{-7}</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>7.9 \times 10^{14} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td>Lin and Back, 1966^1</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 \times 10^{-7}</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>7.0 \times 10^{15} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 \times 10^{-8}</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>4.9 \times 10^{16} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 \times 10^{-8}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9 \times 10^{-8}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 \times 10^{-7}</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>7.6 \times 10^{15} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td>Trenwith, 1966, 1967, 1979^2</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 \times 10^{-7}</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>3.2 \times 10^{16} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 \times 10^{-7}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-6}</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>3.4 \times 10^{17} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 \times 10^{-6}</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1.2 \times 10^{16} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td>Seacchi et al., 1971^3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 \times 10^{-4}</td>
<td>1400-2200</td>
<td>5.0 \times 10^{11} (Ar)</td>
<td>Izod et al., 1971^4</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 \times 10^{-5}</td>
<td>1240-1500</td>
<td>3.0 \times 10^{13} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td>Clark and Quinn, 1976^5</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 \times 10^{-6}</td>
<td>1300-2500</td>
<td>3.0 \times 10^{17} (Ar)</td>
<td>Olson et al., 1973^6</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 \times 10^{-7}</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>7.6 \times 10^{14} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-7}</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>2.1 \times 10^{15} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 \times 10^{-7}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-8}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 \times 10^{-8}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 \times 10^{-8}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 \times 10^{-8}</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>5.2 \times 10^{14} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 \times 10^{-8}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 \times 10^{-8}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 \times 10^{-9}</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>5.4 \times 10^{13} (Ar)</td>
<td>Cao and Back, 1984^10</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 \times 10^{-9}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 \times 10^{-9}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 \times 10^{-9}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 \times 10^{-9}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 \times 10^{-9}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 \times 10^{-9}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Pressure Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 \times 10^{-6} \exp\left(-\frac{45040}{T}\right)</td>
<td>1200-1430</td>
<td>(9-33) \times 10^{14}</td>
<td>Burcat et al., 1977</td>
<td>(k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 \times 10^{-6} \exp\left(-\frac{44700}{T}\right)</td>
<td>840-913</td>
<td>(3.4-77.6) \times 10^{10} (C_2H_6)</td>
<td>Trenwith, 1979^2</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

C₂H₆ (+ M) → CH₄ + CH₃ (+ M)

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th></th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>([M]/molecule cm⁻³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

\( k_0 = 2.4·10^{-6} \exp(-44010/T) \) \( k_0 = [\text{Ar}] 1.7·10^{-6} \exp(-34280/T) \)

750-1500

800-2500

750-2000

300-1400

300-1400

300-2000

300-2000

300-2000

800-1000

300-2000

800-1000

Baulch and Duxbury, 1980²

Warnatz, 1984³

Tsang and Hampson, 1986⁴

Tsang, 1989⁵

CEC, 1992⁶

Comments

(a) Static reactor, dissociation of pure ethane with measurement of the rate of production of methane and butane. Extrapolation to the high pressure limit and comparison with earlier work.

(b) Ethane dissociation studied in static reactor. Product analysis by gas chromatography. Extrapolation to the high pressure limit. Relative efficiencies of different bath gases: \( k_0(\text{M})/k_0(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6) = 0.25 (\text{N}_2), 0.33 (\text{O}_2), 0.17 (\text{He}), 0.18 (\text{Ne}), 0.26 (\text{Ar}), 0.30 (\text{Kr}), 0.88 (\text{H}_2\text{O}) \).

(c) Pyrolysis of ethane in static reactor. Analysis of initiation of the reaction using manometric and gas chromatographic measurements.

(d) Pyrolysis of CO/O₂/ethane/azomethane/Ar mixtures in a shock tube. The reaction was followed by measuring emission from CO and CO₂. Modelling with 8 reactions.

(e) Static reactor study of dissociation in pure ethane. Gas chromatographic analysis of reaction products.

(f) Shock tube study of ethane dissociation in Ar using laser-absorption and laser-schlieren measurements. Modelling mechanism. Data near 1300 K are markedly lower than recombination results and shock wave results from Ref. 7. Better agreement with Ref. 7 at higher temperatures. Extrapolation to the high pressure limit uncertain due to fall-off effects.

(g) Shock tube study of ethane decomposition in Ar measuring H atom concentrations from CH₃ + C₂H₆ → CH₄ + C₂H₅, C₂H₅ → C₂H₄ + H sequence.

(h) Ethane pyrolysis in static reactor with gas chromatographic analysis. Enhanced hydrogen recombination at activated vessel surface. Results in good agreement with Ref. 2.

(i) Ethane pyrolysis in a flow system with gas chromatographic product analysis. Evaluation of induction periods.

(j) Pyrolysis of ethane in static reactor. Product analysis by gas chromatography. Collision efficiencies of Xe and H₂ relative to C₂H₆ have been measured.

(k) Single-pulse shock tube study of ethane dissociation in Ar, measurement of methane production rate. Analysis of earlier shock tube work, extrapolation to the high pressure limit. Data neglected in later work by one of the authors.

(l) Complete review of earlier literature.

(m) Data evaluation and simplified fall-off construction.

(n) Data evaluation and construction of RRKM fall-off curves.

(o) See comment (n).


Preferred Values

\( k_0 = 1.8·10^{21} T^{-1.24} \exp(-45700/T) \) s⁻¹ over range 300-2000 K.

\( k_0 = [\text{Ar}] 1.1·10^{27} T^{-8.25} \exp(-47090/T) \) s⁻¹ over range 300-2000 K.

\( k_0 = [\text{N}_2] 1.1·10^{27} T^{-8.25} \exp(-47090/T) \) s⁻¹ over range 300-2000 K.

\( k_0 = [\text{C}_2\text{H}_6] 4.5·10^{-2} \exp(-41930/T) \) s⁻¹ over range 800-1000 K.

\( F_c = 0.38 \exp(-T/773) + 0.62 \exp(-T/1180) \) for \( M = \text{Ar} \) and \( M = \text{N}_2 \) over range 300-2000 K.

\( F_c = 0.54 \exp(-T/1250) \) for \( M = \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) over range 800-1000 K.

Reliability

\( \Delta \log k_0 = ±0.3 \) over range 300-2000 K.

\( \Delta \log k_0 = ±0.5 \) for \( M = \text{Ar} \) and \( M = \text{N}_2 \) over range 300-2000 K.

\( \Delta \log k_0 = ±0.5 \) for \( M = \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) over range 800-1000 K.

\( \Delta F_c = ±0.1 \) for \( M = \text{Ar} \) over range 300-2000 K.

\( \Delta F_c = ±0.1 \) for \( M = \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \) over range 800-1000 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

The preferred values for \( k_0 \) and \( k_0 \) (for \( M = \text{Ar} \)) have been derived from the recommended rate coefficients of the reverse reaction 2CH₃ + M → C₂H₆ + M from this evaluation and the expression given for the equilibrium constant. They are based on the combined evaluation of dissociation and recombination data given in the review of Ref. 17 which assumes a nearly temperature independent rate coefficient \( k_0 \) for the reverse reaction 2CH₃ + M → C₂H₆ + M.
recombination over the range 300–2000 K. For $M = N_2$ an
expression for $k_0$ identical with that for $M = Ar$ is assumed. In
Figs. 1 and 2 the dependence on temperature of the recom-
mended $k_0$ and $k_s$ is shown together with the values recom-
mended in previous compilations. Figure 3 shows fall-off
curves for experiments performed near 1000 K. Theoretical
fall-off curves based on the preferred values are depicted in
Fig. 4. The expressions for $k_0$ and $F_c$ also follow from the
combination of experimental and theoretical data analysed in
Ref. 17. The preferred values obtained in this way are in good
agreement with the available dissociation experiments and
measurements performed at lower temperatures for the re-
verse association of CH$_3$ radicals. They are not influenced by
the numerous mechanistic complications of the high tempera-
ture shock tube studies of this dissociation.

References

(1971).
(1971).
5, 345 (1973).
16. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 + M \rightarrow \text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_3 + M \]

Fig. 2

EVALUATIONS
- This Evaluation 1993
- Tsang and Naumenko 1990
- Pinnock 1984
- Tsang 1993
- Tsang and Baehr 1989
- Tsang 1989
- This Evaluation 1992

Fig. 3

Experimental Data
- This Evaluation 1993
- Tsang and Naumenko 1990
- Tsang 1993
- Tsang and Baehr 1989
- This Evaluation 1992
- This Evaluation 1992

\[ \log([M] \text{molecule cm}^{-3}) \]
Fig. 4
This Evaluation (M=Ar/1993

\[ \text{Log}(k_{\text{obs}}) \]

\[ \text{Log}([M]/\text{molecule cm}^{-3}) \]

\[ \begin{align*}
800 \text{ K} & : -1.0 \\
1000 \text{ K} & : -2.0 \\
1500 \text{ K} & : -3.0 \\
2000 \text{ K} & : -3.0 \\
2500 \text{ K} & : -3.0
\end{align*} \]
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\( \text{CH}_3 + \text{HCHO} \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{HCO} \)

**Thermodynamic data**

\( \Delta H_{298} = -61.2 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \)
\( \Delta S_{298} = -20.7 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \)

\( K_p = 2.1 \times 10^{-2} \exp(7360/T) \)

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>( T/K )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 4.2 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-11600/T) )</td>
<td>1170–1630</td>
<td>Choudhury, Sanders, and Lin, 1989(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 9.2 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-2950/T) )</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 3.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-3610/T) )</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Shock tube study of decomposition of \( t \)-butyl hydroperoxide/trioxane mixtures to generate \( \text{CH}_3 \) and \( \text{HCHO} \), with kinetic modelling of observed \( \text{CO} \) formation. The expression: \( 1.48 \times 10^{-36} T^{1.4} \exp(-483/T) \) cm\(^3\) molecule\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\) was calculated using transition state theory with quantum mechanical tunnelling correction, which gave a good description of all reliable data in the temperature range 300–2000 K.

(b) Based on data of Held et al.\(^4\), Manthorne and Pacey\(^5\), Anastasi\(^6\) and the low temperature data evaluation of Kerr and Parsonage\(^7\).

(c) Based on data in Refs. 4, 5, 6, 7 and in Selby\(^8\).

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 1.29 \times 10^{-31} T^{1.1} \exp(-990/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 300–2000 K.} \]

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.2 \text{ over range.} \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The new results provide a significant extension in the temperature range and confirm earlier indications that this reaction exhibits non-Arrhenius behaviour. Curvature in the Arrhenius plot is not so dramatic as suggested by the high temperature data of Aronowitz and Naegeli\(^9\) and Hsu and Lin\(^10\), which was not included in previous evaluations due to the uncertainty arising from the complex chemistry of the reaction systems employed. Reference to the Arrhenius plot shows that the new data are consistent with the lower temperature data of Held et al.\(^4\), Manthorne and Pacey\(^5\) and the evaluation of Kerr and Parsonage\(^7\), but not the data reported by Anastasi\(^6\). Choudhury et al.\(^11\) have re-analysed the data of Anastasi, which was obtained using the direct molecular modulation technique, taking account of additional \( \text{CH}_3 \) radical loss processes. The reworked rate constants are much more consistent with the data at higher and lower temperatures. The recommended expression is a best fit to the data of Choudhury et al.\(^1\), the reworked data from Anastasi, together with those at lower temperatures from Refs. 4, 5, and 7.

**References**

3. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
CH$_3$ + HCHO $\rightarrow$ CH$_4$ + HCO

**Experimental Data**

- Kutske et al. 1959
- Manthorne and Pacey
- Selby 1978
- Anastasi 1983
- Held et al. 1977
- This Evaluation 1993
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

CH₃ + C₂H₅ (M) → C₂H₆ (M)  \hspace{1cm} (1)
CH₃ + C₂H₆ → CH₄ + C₂H₄  \hspace{1cm} (2)

Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H^\circ_\text{vap}(1) = -367 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S^\circ_\text{vap}(1) = -175 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(1) = 4.4 \times 10^{-13} \text{ exp}(+44700/T) \text{ atm}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta H^\circ_\text{vap}(2) = -285 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S^\circ_\text{vap}(2) = -40.5 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(2) = 3.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{ exp}(+34500/T) \text{ atm}^{-1} \]

Rate Coefficient Data

\[ k / \text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm⁻³</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>4.3 \times 10^{-6} (H₂)</td>
<td>Pagsberg, Ratajczak, and Sillese, 1992¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.2 \times 10^{10} (Ar)</td>
<td>Garland and Bayes, 1990²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k_o )</th>
<th>Intermediate Fall-off Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>3.3 \times 10^{-10}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 \times 10^{-11} (7/300)⁻⁰·⁵</td>
<td>300-2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 \times 10^{-11} (7/300)⁻²</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>300-800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_o/k_1 )</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Pulse radiolysis of H₂/C₃H₄ mixtures. CH₃ monitored by IR absorption at the Q(3,3) line of the 0 → 1 vibrational transition at 606.12 cm⁻¹. A value \( k_2/(k_1 + k_2) = 0.5 \) was estimated by gas chromatographic analysis.

(b) Co-photolysis of acetone (1–35 mTorr.) and 3-pentanone (5 mTorr.). CH₃ and [C₂H₅] decays monitored by photoionization mass spectrometry using the resonance lines of 121.6 nm and 147 nm. Computer modelling of the concentration profiles of the two radicals. Rate coefficient assumed in the high pressure limit.

(c) Review of literature data. Recommended value based on results of Ref. 4.

(d) Evaluated from the rate coefficients of CH₃ and C₂H₅ self-recombination reactions and the cross combination ratio.

(e) Derived from results of Parkes and Quinn⁷ for C₂H₅ self-recombination over the range 300–800 K and the geometrical mean rule of cross combination ratios.

(f) Accepts the recent value of \( k_o \) of Anastasi and Arthur⁹ at 308 K.

Preferred Values

\[ k_o(1) = 5.6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 300–2000 K.} \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_o(1) = \pm 0.3 \text{ over the range 300–2000 K.} \]

References

⁸CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
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Thermodynamic data

ΔHf,298 = 367 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔSf,298 = 175 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹
KP = 2.3·10⁶ T⁻⁰·⁰⁸ exp(−44700/T) atm.

Rate Coefficient Measurements

Intermediate Fall-Off Range

$k_n = 5.6·10^4 exp(−41300/T)$

$900$ to $1200$

$1·10^4$(Ar)

Lifshitz and Frenklach, 1975¹

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

(e)

(f)

(g)

(h)

(i)

(j)

(k)

(1)

(m)

Comments

(a) Shock wave study using mixtures of 0.4-1.6% C₃H₈ in Ar. Mechanism with reactions discussed.

(b) Modelling of the C₃H₈ pyrolysis based on results of Leathard and Purnell³.

(c) Pyrolysis of C₃H₈ with chromatographic analysis of products. The major primary products are methane, ethylene, hydrogen and propene. Modelling of reaction.

(d) Pyrolysis of C₃H₈ in Ar studied in a single-pulse shock tube. Analysis of products by gas chromatography.

(e) Early stages of the pyrolysis of C₃H₈ studied by a wall-less reactor technique. Measurements of the rates of formation of methane, ethene and propene.

(f) Thermal decomposition of C₃H₈ in a shock tube coupled to IR laser absorption spectroscopy. Modelling with a 44-reaction mechanism.

(g) Pyrolysis of C₃H₈-Ar mixtures behind reflected shock waves. H atoms monitoring by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy.

(h) Thermal decomposition of C₃H₈ in a continuous jet-stirred reactor. Reaction products measured by gas chromatography.

(i) Turbulent flow reactor study of C₃H₈ pyrolysis. The kinetics are described by a 34-reaction mechanism.

(j) Shock wave study using mixtures of 5% C₃H₈ in Ar and N₂. Analysis by IR laser absorption kinetic spectroscopy.

(k) Pyrolysis of C₃H₈ in a static reactor. Products analysed by GC.

(l) Pyrolysis of C₃H₈ studied in incident shock waves with the laser-schlieren technique. Mechanism with 30 reactions.

(m) Thermal decomposition of C₃H₈ studied in reflected shock waves monitoring absorption-time profiles at 3.39 μm due to C₂H₆, C₂H₂, C₂H₃ and CH₄.

(n) Estimation based on the geometrical mean rule and thermochemical parameters.

(o) Review of literature.

(p) Review of literature data.

(q) Review of literature data. The recommended value is based on the high pressure limiting rate coefficient for the recombination CH₃ + C₂H₅ → C₃H₈ (4.7·10⁻⁴⁴ (T/300)⁻⁰·⁵ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹) and the equilibrium constant tabulated here.

(r) Based on the results of Parkes and Quinn²¹ for the reaction C₂H₅ + C₂H₅ → n-C₄H₁₀ and the geometrical mean rule.
Preferred Values

\[ k_x = 1.1 \times 10^{17} \exp(-42470/T) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 700–2000 K.} \]
\[ k_o = [\text{Ar}] 1.3 \times 10^{-5} \exp(-32700/T) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 700–2000 K.} \]
\[ F_e = 0.24 \exp(-T/1946) + 0.76 \exp(-T/38) \text{ for M = Ar over range 700–2000 K.} \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_x = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 700–2000 K.} \]
\[ \Delta \log k_o = \pm 0.5 \text{ for M = Ar over range 700–2000 K.} \]
\[ \Delta F_e = \pm 0.2 \text{ over range 700–2000 K.} \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The preferred values are based on theoretical modelling\textsuperscript{22–24} which is required to reconcile the largely scattered data. These calculations predict for the high pressure rate coefficient of the reverse recombination process a value 5.6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{ over the range 300–2000 K. The value at 300 K is in good agreement with recent direct determinations}\textsuperscript{25,26}. The preferred dissociation rate coefficient \( k_e \) is obtained via detailed balance. The recommended \( k_e \) was estimated using an average energy transferred per collision of 120 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ which leads to collisional efficiencies of 0.12–0.18 between 700–2000 K. In Figs. 1 and 2 the temperature dependence of \( k_x \) and \( k_o \) is shown. Figure 3 shows theoretical fall-off curves and selected experimental rate coefficients. At 1250 K there is considerable scatter in the results.

C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} + M \rightarrow CH\textsubscript{3} + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5} + M

References

DAULCH ET AL.

$C_3H_6 + M \rightarrow CH_3 + C_2H_6 + M$

Fig. 2

![Graph showing the rate constant as a function of temperature.]

Fig. 3

**Experimental Data**
- Libolic and Frenkel (M=Ar) 1250 K 1975
- Stedley (M=Ar) 1250 K 1978
- Chang and Sillner (M=Ar) 1250 K 1991
- Jusale et al. (M=H) 1250 K 1991
- Stedley et al. (M=Ar) 1250 K 1992
- A. Adami and Varri (M=Ar) 1250 K 1993
- Haddi et al. (M=Ar) 1250 K 1998
- This Evaluation (M=Ar) 1993

**Experimental Data**
- 2500 K
- 2000 K
- 1500 K
- 1250 K
- 1000 K
- 800 K

Log([M]/molecule cm$^{-3}$)
Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_{298}^{\circ}(1) = 377 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^{\circ}(1) = 121 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ k_p(1) = 1.19 \times 10^{10} T^{-8.87} \exp(-4500/T) \text{ atm.} \]

\[ \Delta H_{298}^{\circ}(2) = 5.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^{\circ}(2) = 109.3 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ k_p(2) = 1.36 \times 10^{10} T^{-5.97} \exp(-895/T) \text{ atm.} \]

Rate Coefficient Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Data ( k = k_1 + k_0 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-36300/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_1.7 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-17700/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-35600/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-43800/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-40800/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-48600/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-14600/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-37700/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-39200/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-39200/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-39200/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-39200/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-39200/T) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [\text{M}]_0 \times 10^{-8} \exp(-39200/T) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Shock tube study of thermal decomposition of HCHO. Analysis by UV and IR absorption.

(b) Thermal decomposition of HCHO in a flame. Mass spectrometric analysis.

(c) Thermal decomposition of HCHO in a flow reactor. GC chromatographic analysis.

(d) Shock tube study of HCHO decomposition. Analysis by resonance absorption.

(e) HCHO decay behind reflected shock wave monitored by IR emission.

(f) HCHO/O\(_2\)/Ar and HCHO/N\(_2\)/Ar mixtures investigated behind reflected shock waves; HCHO detected by IR emission. M = Ar.

(g) Thermal decomposition of HCHO in a flame. Mass spectrometric analysis.

(h) Thermal decomposition of HCHO behind reflected shock waves. HCHO decay and CO production determined by IR emission. H atom production measured by ARAS. M = Ar. Channel (2) appeared to have a smaller rate under the experimental conditions.

(i) Shock tube study of thermal decomposition of HCHO. Analysis by cwCO laser absorption to follow HCHO decay and CO production. Measurements performed between 1750–2220 K and total gas density from 1.28 \( \times \) 10\(^8\) to 1.32 \( \times \) 10\(^9\) molecule cm\(^{-3}\) (0.05–2% of H\(_2\)CO).

(j) Thermal decomposition of HCHO behind reflected shock wave. H atom production measured by ARAS. M = Ar.

(k) Shock tube study of the pyrolysis of HCHO. The HCHO was generated by the thermal dissociation of its cyclic trimer, 1,3,5-trioxane. RRKM analysis based on \textit{ab initio} potential energy surface. The simulations shows that reaction (2) is 2–3 times faster than reaction (1) between 2000–3000 K.

(l) Based on the shock tube data of Schecker and Jost \(^1\), Bhaskaran et al. \(^4\), and Dean et al. \(^6\).

(m) Theoretical calculation of \( k_o \) in Ar using RRKM theory.

(n) Critical evaluation of gas phase chemical reactions for use in modelling combustion processes.

Preferred Values

\[ k_o(1) = [\text{Ar}]2.7 \times 10^{12} T^{-5.54} \exp(-48660/T) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 1700–3200 K.} \]

\[ k_o(2)/k_o(1) = 2.5 \text{ over range 2000–3000 K.} \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log(k_o(2)/k_o(1)) = \pm 0.5 \text{ over range 2000–3000 K.} \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The reaction in second order under all conditions relevant to combustion. Recent shock wave studies are in conflict. The results of Buxton and Simpson \(^8\) are in good agreement with...
those of Dean et al.\textsuperscript{6} and Saito et al.\textsuperscript{8} indicating that channel (2) is unimportant near 2000 K. However, Rimpel and Just\textsuperscript{10} and more recently Irdam et al.\textsuperscript{11} suggest that reaction (2) predominates over reaction (1). In fact, from Ref. 11 a \( k_2(2) \approx (2-3)k_1(1) \) has been found. We have revised the preferred values for \( k_1(1) \), and the recommended value corresponds to Ref. 11. On the other hand, even though the value of the branching ratio is unclear, we have selected a \( k_2(2)/k_1(1) \) value similar to that given in Ref. 11.

References
\textsuperscript{2}J. Peeters and G. Mahnen, 14th Symp. (Int.) Combust. 133 (1973).
\textsuperscript{6}A.M. Dean, R.L. Johnson, and D.C. Steiner, Comb. Flame 37, 41 (1980).
\textsuperscript{7}J. Vandooren and P.J. Van Tiggelen, 18th Symp. (Int.) Combust., 473 (1981).
\textsuperscript{10}G. Rimpel and Th. Just, manuscript in preparation (1989).
\textsuperscript{14}CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
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EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

CH₃O (+ M) → HCHO + H (+ M)

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H^\circ_{298} = 85.8 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S^\circ_{298} = 103 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 6.67 \times 10^4 \exp(-10300/T) \text{ atm.} \]

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rate Coefficient Measurements**

9.05 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-6794/T) \ ([M = \text{Ar or He}])

550–1660 | Choudhury et al., 1990 \(^2\) | (a) |

3.16 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-15400/T)

300–1000 | CEC, 1992 \(^4\) | (b) |

**Comments**

(a) Pyrolysis of CH₃ONO in static system (550–770 K) with product analysis (CO, HCHO and CH₃OH) by FTIR spectroscopy, and in shock tube (1000–1660 K) with product analysis (CO and NO) by laser absorption spectroscopy. Rate constants obtained from kinetic modelling of the product yields, and compared with theoretical RRKM calculations.

(b) Based on \(k_o\) from Batt \(^3\) and RRKM calculations carried out by Tsang and Hampson \(^4\).

**Preferred Value**

\[ k_o = 9.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-6790/T) \text{ cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over the range 300–1700 K.} \]

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k_o = \pm 0.3 \text{ over the range 300–1700 K.} \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

Under practically all conditions in combustion systems, the reaction is in the second-order region. The recent experimental measurements of \(k_o\) are the first reported for this reaction. The values are substantially higher than the previous theoretical estimates of Greenhill et al. \(^5\) and Tsang and Hampson \(^4\) (e.g. a factor of 150 at 555 K and a factor of 2 at 1250 K). The experimental data provide the basis for the recommended values.

**References**

\(^2\) CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H^\circ_{298} (1) = -122.0 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S^\circ_{298} (1) = 14.1 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p (1) = 4.63T^{0.5}\exp(+14500/T) \]
\[ \Delta H^\circ_{298} (2) = -33.4 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S^\circ_{298} (2) = 17.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p (2) = 4.02\times10^3\exp(+3900/T) \]
\[ \Delta H^\circ_{298} (3) = 85.8 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S^\circ_{298} (3) = 104.7 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p (3) = 6.67 \times 10^4 \exp(-10300/T) \text{ atm.} \]

**Rate Coefficient Data (k = k₁ + k₂ + k₃)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3\text{ molecule}^{-1}\text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Rate Coefficient Measurements**

7.28 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-973/T)

298–973 | Wantuck et al., 1987 \(^1\) | (a) |

7.2 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-1080/T)

298–610 | IUPAC, 1992 \(^1\) | (b) |

3.9 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-900/T)

200–300 | NASA, 1992 \(^1\) | (c) |

6.7 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-1070/T)

300–1000 | CEC, 1992 \(^1\) | (d) |
Comments

(a) Laser photolysis of CN\textsubscript{3}ONO or CH\textsubscript{3}OH at 193 nm; CH\textsubscript{3}O monitored by LIF. Pseudo first order conditions with excess O\textsubscript{2}. Non Arrhenius behaviour observed over the whole temperature range. Their own data together with those of Gutman et al.\textsuperscript{5} and Lorenz et al.\textsuperscript{5} were well described by a bi-exponential expression:

\[ k = 1.5 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-6028/T) + 3.6 \times 10^{-14} \exp(-880/T) \] cm\textsuperscript{3} molecule\textsuperscript{-1} s\textsuperscript{-1}.

(b) Based on data of Gutman et al.,\textsuperscript{5} Lorenz et al.,\textsuperscript{5} and Wantuck et al.\textsuperscript{l},

(c) Based on data of Lorenz et al.\textsuperscript{5}.

(d) Based on data of Gutman et al.,\textsuperscript{5} Lorenz et al.\textsuperscript{5}.

Preferred Values

\[ k_1 = 3.6 \times 10^{-14} \exp(-880/T) \] cm\textsuperscript{3} molecule\textsuperscript{-1} s\textsuperscript{-1} over range 300–1000 K.

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_1 = \pm 0.1 \] at 500 K rising to \[ \pm 0.3 \] at 300 K and 1000 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

The new data from Wantuck et al.\textsuperscript{l} extend the temperature range for which direct measurements of \( k \) are available up to 1000 K. The agreement with earlier direct rate measurements in the overlapping temperature range is good. The temperature dependence in the new study is non-Arrhenius over the whole range covered and suggests an increasing contribution, at the higher temperatures, of additional channels: CH\textsubscript{3}O + O\textsubscript{2} \( \rightarrow \) CH\textsubscript{2}O + O\textsubscript{2} (2) and CH\textsubscript{3}O + O\textsubscript{2} \( \rightarrow \) HCHO + H + O\textsubscript{2} (3) for methoxy radical removal by O\textsubscript{2}. The double exponential expression given by Wantuck et al.\textsuperscript{l}, was obtained by fitting the data from the three direct studies\textsuperscript{1,5,6}, and is applicable for the overall reaction up to 1000 K. The component with the larger \( E/R \) of 6028 K is remarkably similar to the expression recommended in this evaluation for the decomposition reaction: CH\textsubscript{3}O + M \( \rightarrow \) HCHO + H + M (M = Ar or He, \( k = 9.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-6790/T) \) cm\textsuperscript{3} molecule\textsuperscript{-1} s\textsuperscript{-1}), and therefore may be provisionally assigned to channel (3).

The recommendation for channel (1) is the low \( E/R \) component of the bi-exponential expression of Wantuck et al.;\textsuperscript{l} it is not significantly different from that recommended by NASA\textsuperscript{3} for this reaction in the low temperature range.

References

4CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).

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

Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_{298}^\circ = -88.3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^\circ = -3.8 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 11.5T^{-0.47} \exp(+10570/T) \]

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( k )/cm\textsuperscript{3} molecule\textsuperscript{-1} s\textsuperscript{-1}</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td>( 1.7 \times 10^{-13} )</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Miyoshi, Matsui, and Washida, 1990\textsuperscript{3}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 \times 10^{-13} \exp(-3600/T)</td>
<td>300–2000</td>
<td>Warnatz, 1984\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>NASA, 1992\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-1.2 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-1800/T))</td>
<td>300–1200</td>
<td>CEC, 1992\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>IUPAC, 1992\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments

(a) Laser flash photolysis of CH$_3$COCH$_2$0H with decay of CH$_2$0H monitored by photoionization MS.
(b) Based on high-temperature data from shock-tube and other studies.
(c) Average of data of Grotheer et al.$^6$, Döbê et al.$^7$, and Payne et al.$^8$.
(d) See Comments on Preferred Values.
(e) Average of room temperature data of Grotheer et al.$^6$, Nesbitt et al.$^9$, Pagsberg et al.$^{10}$, Miyoshi et al.$^1$, Grotheer et al.$^{11}$, Döbê et al.$^7$, and Payne et al.$^8$.

Preferred Value

$$k = 2.6 \times 10^{-9} T^{-1} + 1.2 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-1800/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 300-1200 K.}$$

Reliability

$\Delta \log k = \pm 0.1 \text{ at 300 K increasing to } \pm 0.3 \text{ at 1200 K.}$

Comments on Preferred Values

The results of Miyoshi et al.$^1$ have become available since our previous evaluation$^5$, and are in good agreement with the other most recent room temperature measurements$^6-11$. Our previous recommendation$^5$, based on an average room temperature rate coefficient$^6-11$, and the temperature dependences observed by Vandooren and van Tiggelen$^{12}$ and by Grotheer et al.$^4$, remains unaltered.

As previously pointed out$^4$, it is difficult to reconcile the data of Nesbitt et al.$^9$, over the temperature range 215–250 K, with the recommended high temperature data. More work is needed to confirm the temperature dependence of this reaction.

References

$^4$CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
$^5$IUPAC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
$^{12}$J. Vandooren and P.J. van Tiggelen, 18th Symp. (Int.) Combust., 437 (1980).
CH$_3$O$_2$ + CH$_3$O$_2$ → CH$_3$O + CH$_3$O + O$_2$  
→ CH$_3$OH + HCHO + O$_2$  
→ CH$_3$OOCCH$_3$ + O$_2$

**Rate Coefficient Measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$ (cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$T$ (K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k_1$ = 3.6·10$^{-13}$</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Simon, Schneider, and Moortgat, 1990$^i$</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_2$ = 1.3·10$^{-13}$ exp(365/T)</td>
<td>248-573</td>
<td>Lightfoot, Veyret, and Lesclaux, 1990$^j$</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_3$ = 1.3·10$^{-13}$ exp(297/T) at 11 Torr</td>
<td>268-350</td>
<td>Jenkin and Cox, 1991$^k$</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_4$ = 8.9·10$^{-14}$ exp(424/T) at 760 Torr</td>
<td>248-650</td>
<td>Lightfoot et al., 1991$^l$</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_5$ = 1.0·10$^{-13}$ exp(416/T)</td>
<td>248-650</td>
<td></td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Branching Ratio Measurements**

| $k_6$ = 7.5·exp(-760/T) | 376-430 | Ballod et al., 1989$^m$ | (a) |
| $k_7$ = (k$_8$ + k$_9$) = 45 exp(-1470/T) | 388-573 | Lightfoot, Veyret, and Lesclaux, 1990$^n$ | (b) |
| $k_8$ = (k$_9$ + k$_{10}$) = 19 exp(-1131/T) | 223-333 | Horie, Crowley, and Moortgat, 1990$^o$ | (c) |

**Reviews and Evaluations**

| $k$ = 2·10$^{-13}$ exp(900/T) | 200-400 | NASA, 1992$^p$ | (a) |
| $k_6$ = 0.35; $k_7$ = 0.55; $k_8$ = 0.10 | 298 | IUPAC, 1992$^q$ | (b) |
| $k_9$ = 1·10$^{-13}$ exp(365/T) | 200-400 | Wallington, Dagaut, and Kurylo, 1992$^r$ | (c) |
| $k_{10}$ = 9·2·10$^{-14}$ exp(390/T) | 250-600 | | (d) |
| $k_{11}$ = (k$_{12}$ + k$_{13}$) = 37.3 exp(-1350/T) | 248-650 | Lightfoot et al., 1992$^s$ | (e) |
| $k_{12}$ = 9·1·10$^{-14}$ exp(416/T) | 248-650 | | (f) |
| $k_{13}$ = (k$_{14}$ + k$_{15}$) = 25 exp(-1165/T) | 228-573 | | (g) |

**Comments**

(a) Studies on this reaction undertaken prior to 1989 (references 11-26) are not listed explicitly but have been discussed previously in the NASA$^7$ and IUPAC$^8$ evaluations and in the recent reviews of peroxy radical chemistry$^9,10$.

(b) Molecular modulation study of the broad-band photolysis (280~370 nm) of Cl$_2$/CH$_3$O$_2$ mixtures. The UV absorption spectrum of CH$_3$O$_2$ was recorded between 220 and 270 nm and calibrated by determining the temperature of loss of Cl$_2$. Numerical analysis of individual waveforms between 230 and 260 nm was undertaken with an assumed mechanism, and the branching ratios taken from the study of Niki et al.$^{19}$.

(c) Flash photolysis of Cl$_2$/CH$_3$/O$_2$/N$_2$ mixtures with UV absorption detection between 210 and 260 nm. Composite transient absorption profiles due to CH$_3$O$_2$ and HO$_2$ analysed using UV absorption cross-sections taken from McAdam et al.$^{22}$. Absorption cross-sections used (in units of 10$^{-18}$ cm$^2$ molecule$^{-1}$) - CH$_3$O$_2$; $\sigma_{210} = 2.5$, $\sigma_{240} = 4.8$, $\sigma_{260} = 3.6$; HO$_2$; $\sigma_{310} = 5.3$, $\sigma_{320} = 1.8$; $\sigma_{320} = 0.3$. At higher temperatures, pairs of composite waveforms were analysed simultaneously.

(d) Molecular modulation study of the 254 nm photolysis of CH$_3$O/O$_2$/N$_2$ mixture with UV absorption detection. UV absorption spectrum of CH$_3$O$_2$ recorded between 210 and 320 nm but presence of a second absorber, tentatively assigned to CH$_3$OOI, observed at longer wavelengths. MM waveforms recorded between 210 and 240 were consistent with those obtained from Cl$_2$/CH$_3$/O$_2$ system. Difficulties were apparent in using photolysis rate of CH$_3$I to calibrate absorption spectrum of CH$_3$O$_2$. Only the ratio $k/\sigma$ given but rate parameters have been derived using the UV absorption spectrum and temperature branching ratios recommended by Lightfoot et al.$^{10}$.

(e) Flash photolysis of O$_2$/CH$_3$/CH$_3$OH mixtures between 600 and 719 K with UV absorption detection. The earlier data of Lightfoot et al.$^7$ were reanalysed using temperature dependent absorption cross-sections$^{26}$ and combined with the results of this study.

(f) Thermal decomposition of static mixtures of di-t-butylperoxide and O$_2$ used to study branching ratios of CH$_3$O$_2$ over the temperature range 376~430 K. Chromatographic analysis used for acetone and methanol. HCHO converted into a complex with chromotropic acid and detected spectrophotometrically. Iodometric analysis used for CH$_3$OOH. Arrhenius fit to experimental data undertaken with their preferred value of the branching ratio, ($k_3/k_2 = 0.6$) at 298 K.

(g) Continuous photolysis of Cl$_2$/CH$_3$/O$_2$ mixtures with molecular beam deposition onto a cold finger at 50 K before cooling to 5 K. FTIR spectroscopy used to identify products and quantify yields.

(h) The NASA evaluation used an averaged value of the cross-section at 250 nm of 4.0·10$^{-18}$ cm$^2$ molecule$^{-1}$. This cross-section was used to obtain $k$ from a weighted average of values of $k/\sigma$ from the studies of Cox and Ty-
The IUPAC evaluation noted that the studies of Simon et al.\(^2\) into the elementary rate constant. The studies of Sander and Watson\(^20\), Kurylo and Wallington\(^22\), Lightfoot et al.\(^2\), and Jenkin and Cox\(^3\) gave values of \(k/\sigma\) (250 nm) which were in excellent agreement. The branching ratio was taken from the low temperature study of Irie et al.\(^2\) as the experimental conditions were the most relevant for atmospheric modelling purposes. This branching ratio was used to give the overall elementary rate constant. The \(E/R\) value was taken from the study of Lightfoot et al.\(^2\) because of the wide temperature range covered in that work.

Wallington et al.\(^7\) have used their recommended spectrum for CH\(_2\)O \((\sigma_{240}=4.42\times10^{-18}\ \text{cm}^2\ \text{molecule}^{-1})\) to deduce rate parameters from the observed \(k/\sigma\) values. They derived \(k_{\text{obs}}=4.6\times10^{-15}\ \text{cm}^3\ \text{molecule}^{-1}\ \text{s}^{-1}\) (omitting the Sander and Watson kinetic data obtained at 270 nm\(^19\)). A single unweighted Arrhenius fit of the kinetic data obtained by Sander and Watson\(^20\), Kurylo and Wallington\(^22\), Jenkin and Cox\(^3\), Lightfoot et al.\(^2\) and the unpublished work of Anastasi et al.\(^25\) gave \(k_{\text{obs}}=2.5\times10^{-12}\ \text{exp}(180/T)\).

Wallington et al.\(^7\) noted the good agreement between the different studies of the branching ratios at room temperature and recommend \(k_1/k=0.35, k_2/k=0.58\) and \(k_3/k=0.07\) which is based on an average of the studies of Parkes\(^22\), Weaver et al.\(^11\), Kan et al.\(^19\), Niki et al.\(^19\) and Irie et al.\(^2\). A linear regression analysis of all the data except the 388 K data point of Lightfoot et al.\(^2\) was undertaken in which either \(\alpha = -k_1/k\) or \(\log_\beta [\beta = k_1/(k_2+k_3)]\) was plotted against the inverse of the absolute temperature. The expressions derived were

\[
\alpha = 1.24 - \frac{280}{T} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = 37.3 \exp(-1350/T)
\]

Lightfoot et al.\(^10\) have recommended a UV absorption spectrum for CH\(_3\)O\(_2\) based on an average of the measurements of Jenkin et al.\(^24\), Moortgat et al.\(^26\), Simon et al.\(^1\), Jenkin and Cox\(^3\), Dagaut and Kurylo\(^7\), and Lightfoot and Jemi-Alade\(^28\). The spectrum was normalised to a value of 4.58\times10^{-18}\ cm^2\ molecule^{-1} at 240 nm based on the above studies but excluding the relative spectra reported by Jenkin and Cox\(^3\), and Lightfoot and Jemi-Alade\(^28\). The spectrum was used to scale the \(k/\sigma\) reported in the different kinetics studies to give \(k_{\text{obs}}=4.9\times10^{-13}\ \text{cm}^3\ \text{molecule}^{-1}\ \text{s}^{-1}\). The branching ratio data were analysed simultaneously to give the temperature dependent expression \(\beta = 25 \exp(-1165/T)\) which was used to derive \(k_{\text{obs}}\) as 3.7\times10^{-13}\ cm^3\ molecule^{-1}\ s^{-1}. The temperature dependent branching ratio was used to convert the observed rate constant into the elementary rate constant. The studies of Sander and Watson\(^20\), Kurylo and Wallington\(^22\), Lightfoot et al.\(^2\), Jenkin and Cox\(^3\), all give \(E/R\) values which lay between -365 and -481 K. The low pressure study of Jenkin and Cox\(^3\) gave a slightly lower value of -297 for \(E/R\) which was significant at the 1σ level. Lightfoot et al.\(^10\) took the \(E/R\) value derived by Lightfoot et al.\(^2\) and combined this with the value \(k_{\text{obs}}=3.7\times10^{-13}\ \text{cm}^2\ \text{molecule}^{-1}\ \text{s}^{-1}\) to give their recommended expression.

**Preferred Values**

\[
k = 9.1\times10^{-14}\ \text{exp}(420/T) \quad \text{over the range 298–700 K.}
\]

\[
k_1/k = 25 \exp(-1170/T); \quad k_3 = 0 \quad \text{over the range 298–700 K.}
\]

**Reliability**

\[
\Delta \log k = \pm 0.1 \quad \text{at 298 K increasing to} \quad \pm 0.3 \quad \text{at 700 K.}
\]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

Experimental determinations of the rate constants for the CH\(_3\)O\(_2\) + CH\(_2\)O reaction are usually carried out by monitoring the decrease in concentration of CH\(_3\)O\(_2\), leading to the rate law

\[
\frac{d[\text{CH}_3\text{O}_2]}{dt} = -2k_{\text{obs}}[\text{CH}_3\text{O}_2]^2
\]

The rate constant, \(k_{\text{obs}}\), defined by this equation is only identical with \(k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3\) when the experiments are carried out in the absence of \(O_2\). For experiments performed in the presence of \(O_2\), \(k_{\text{obs}}\) is related to \(k\) by \(k_{\text{obs}} = k(1 + \alpha)\) where \(\alpha\) is the branching ratio for channel 1 i.e. \(\alpha = k_1/k\). This arises because the CH\(_2\)O formed via channel 1 reacts rapidly with \(O_2\) to form \(H\_2O\). The reaction of \(H\_2O\) with CH\(_3\)O\(_2\) is about 20 times faster at room temperature than the self-reaction of CH\(_3\)O\(_2\) so that a second CH\(_2\)O is rapidly lost on the time scale of the CH\(_3\)O\(_2\) decay. Under such experimental conditions it is therefore necessary to have values of \(\alpha\) to derive values of \(k\).

Most studies have monitored CH\(_3\)O\(_2\) by UV absorption and the derivation of accurate values of \(k\) is critically dependent on the quality of the data on the UV absorption cross-sections. Wallington et al.\(^4\) and Lightfoot et al.\(^16\) have independently undertaken a critical appraisal of the available literature on the UV absorption spectrum of CH\(_3\)O\(_2\) and the kinetic and mechanistic data on the self-reaction of CH\(_3\)O\(_2\). The kinetic parameters are very dependent on the absorption cross-sections chosen for CH\(_3\)O\(_2\) and differences in rate parameters between studies reflect, in part, the different values used for the absorption cross-sections. The two reviews recommend cross-sections at 240 nm of 4.42\times10^{-18}\ cm^2\ molecule^{-1} (Wallington et al.\(^1\)) and 4.58\times10^{-18}\ cm^2\ molecule^{-1} (Lightfoot et al.\(^16\)). The recommended rate expressions in the two reviews give similar values over the temperature range of the experimental data. The expression of Lightfoot et al.\(^16\) utilizes new data generated by the Bordeaux group\(^4\) which extends the temperature range of the kinetic measurements to higher temperatures (up to 650 K). The expressions derived by Lightfoot et al.\(^16\) for the overall rate constant and for the branching ratios are the preferred choice of this recommendation due to the inclusion of rate parameters measured at the higher temperatures. The most recent IUPAC evaluation does not in-
clude the new measurements of Lightfoot et al. and, for that reason, differs slightly from the present evaluation. There is some disagreement over the exact magnitude of the value for the branching ratio for channel (3). The latest studies suggest that the channel is minor ($k/k_1 < 0.05$) and for practical applications can be set to zero.

References

8. IUPAC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

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

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

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

---

**EXPERIMENTAL DATA**

- Simon Schneider and Moortgat 1990
- Lightfoot Veyret and Lesciaux 1990
- Jenkin and Cox (11 Torr) 1991
- Jenkin and Cox (786 Torr) 1991
- Lightfoot et al 1991
- This Evaluation 1993
CH$_2$OOH (+ M) $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$O + OH (+ M)

**Thermodynamic data**

$\Delta H^\circ_{298} = 195$ kJ mol$^{-1}$

**Rate Coefficient Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k$/s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.3 \times 10^3 \exp(-21300/T)$</td>
<td>600-719</td>
<td>Lightfoot, Roussel, and Lesclaux, 1991$^1$</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_o = 4.0 \times 10^3 \exp(-21600/T)$</td>
<td>450-1000</td>
<td>CEC, 1992$^2$</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) UV absorption measurements of the kinetics of CH$_3$O$_2$ and HO$_2$ in the flash photolysis of O$_2$-CH$_2$-CH$_3$OH mixtures. CH$_3$OOH formed in situ by reaction of CH$_3$O$_2$ and HO$_2$ with decay by thermal decomposition, reforming the precursor radicals by subsequent reactions of CH$_3$O and OH. $k_3$ obtained by fitting time dependent absorption at 210 nm and 240 nm up to 1000 ms. Pressure = 1 atm.

(b) Based on thermochemistry together with an assumed temperature independent value for the rate constant of the reverse reaction.

**Preferred Values**

$k = 6.1 \times 10^4 \exp(-21300/T)$ s$^{-1}$ over range 500-800 K and 1 atm. pressure.

**Reliability**

$\Delta \log k = \pm 0.2$ at 600 K increasing to $\pm 0.5$ at ends of range.

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The new measurements of the kinetics of this reaction overcome the main difficulties encountered in all the previous experimental measurements of the rate constants, i.e. interference by heterogeneous decomposition on the reactor walls. Thus both Kirk$^3$ and Kaiser et al.$^4$ measured much higher values, particularly at low temperatures, which gave unreasonably low Arrhenius parameters, incompatible with the thermochemistry.

The most recent thermochemical data$^5$ for D(CH$_3$-OOH) gives $\Delta H^\circ = 195$ kJ mol$^{-1}$, which is approximately 12 kJ mol$^{-1}$ greater than the value obtained by group methods. The new values are consistent with the new experimental values only if the reaction was in the fall-off region. A good fit to the experimental data was obtained by Lightfoot et al.$^1$ by RRKM analysis using $k_o = 3.1 \times 10^3 \exp(-22900/T)$ s$^{-1}$, and a collision efficiency of 0.35. However, the derived $A$ factor corresponds to an unreasonably high rate for the reverse association reaction. Alternatively, if the measured values are at the high pressure limit at 1 atm., they can be modelled with a reasonable $A$ factor, but only with a lower $\Delta H^\circ$. Until the degree of fall-off is established, this problem cannot be resolved and a recommendation cannot be given for $k_o$. The preferred expression for $k$ is that given by Lightfoot et al.$^1$, and applies to 1 atm pressure and a limited temperature range.

**References**

2. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
**EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING**

**CN + O₂ → NCO + O**

### Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta h_{298}^{\circ} = -26.6 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta s_{298}^{\circ} = -14.5 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ k_p = 3.44 \times 10^{-11} \exp(3500/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ at 298 K} \]

### Rate Coefficient Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.16 × 10⁻¹⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24 × 10⁻¹⁻¹ exp(200/T)</td>
<td>1928–3100</td>
<td>Burmeister <em>et al.</em>, 1988²</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 × 10⁻¹⁻¹ exp(220/T)</td>
<td>294–1000</td>
<td>Durant and Tully, 1989²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 × 10⁻¹⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 × 10⁻¹⁺¹ exp(220/T)</td>
<td>292–1565</td>
<td>Atakan <em>et al.</em>, 1989²</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 × 10⁻¹⁺¹ exp(250/T)</td>
<td>1550–4500</td>
<td>Davidson <em>et al.</em>, 1991⁴</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.66 × 10⁻¹⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reviews and Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 × 10⁻¹⁺¹ exp(205/T)</td>
<td>290–760</td>
<td>IUPAC, 1992²</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 × 10⁻¹⁺¹ exp(205/T)</td>
<td>298–2500</td>
<td>CEC, 1992⁵</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

(a) Shock tube study. CN generated from C₂N₂/O₂/Ar and BrCN/O₂/Ar mixtures. [N] and [O] in post shock zone monitored by ARAS. [N] and [O] temporal profiles fitted to complex reaction mechanism; fit shown to be sensitive to k.

(b) Pulsed laser photolysis at 193 nm of flowing C₂N₂/O₂/He or CICN/O₂/He mixtures. Pressures 100–400 Torr. [CN] and [NCO] monitored by LIF.

(c) Pulsed laser photolysis at 193 nm of flowing C₂N₂/O₂/N₂ mixtures. Pressures 3–50 Torr. [CN] monitored by LIF. CN (v = 1) also studied.

(d) Pulsed laser photolysis at 193 nm of flowing C₂N₂/O₂/Ar mixtures at p = 3 Torr. [CN] monitored by LIF.

(e) As in (d). Pressures 5–50 Torr.

(f) Shock tube study. In one series of experiments C₂N₂/O₂/Ar mixture were shock heated in temperature range 2700–3800 K at pressures 0.62–1.05 atm. In other experiments C₂N₂/O₂/Ar mixtures were shock heated in range 1550–1950 K and pressures 1.19–1.57 atm. with CN generated by 193 nm photolysis pulse. In all cases [CN] monitored by laser absorption spectroscopy.

(g) Based on the temperature coefficient of k over a wide temperature range. The reaction has an alternative, highly exothermic channel, giving CO + NO \((\Delta H_{298}^{°} = -455 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1})\). There is experimental evidence to suggest that it is unimportant both at high and low temperatures.

(h) See Comments on Preferred Value.

### Preferred Value

\[ k = 1.2 \times 10^{-11} \exp(210/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 290–4500 K.} \]

### Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.15 \text{ over range 290–4500 K.} \]

### Comments on Preferred Values

The recent measurements are all in excellent agreement with the recommendations in our previous evaluation which are changed only slightly. Only measurements since 1988 are tabulated. Earlier results are in good agreement on the temperature coefficient of k over a wide temperature range.

### References

8. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
BAULCH ET AL.

CN + O₂ → NCO + O

Experimental data:
- Burmiester et al. 1988
- Atakan et al. 1989
- Durant and Tully 1989
- Jensen et al. 1990
- Davidson et al. 1991
- Balla and Casleton 1991
- This Evaluation 1993

Log (k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹)

10³ T⁻¹ / K⁻¹
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

CN + H₂ → HCN + H

Thermodynamic Data
ΔH_data = -82.0 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS_data = -16.7 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹
KP = 7.5·10⁻11 exp(+10170/T)

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k / cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;3·10⁻¹³</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>Boden and Thrush, 1967¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹⁶ exp(-2670/T)</td>
<td>275-398</td>
<td>Albers et al., 1974²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹⁶ exp(-2670/T)</td>
<td>259-396</td>
<td>Schacke, Wagner, and Wolfrum, 1977³</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4·10⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Li, Sayah, and Jackson, 1984⁴</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9·10⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>Lichtin and Lin, 1985⁵</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>2700-3500</td>
<td>Szekely, Hanson, and Bowman, 1983⁶</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0·10⁻¹⁵ exp(-4000/T)</td>
<td>2050-3160</td>
<td>Natarajan and Roth, 1986⁷</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45·10⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>de Juan et al., 1987⁸</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6·10⁻¹⁴</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Balla and Pasternack, 1987⁹</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4·10⁻¹⁰(T/298)¹⁰ exp(-1340/T)</td>
<td>295-768</td>
<td>Sims and Smith, 1988¹⁰</td>
<td>(j)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1·10⁻²⁹·2³ exp(-1119/T)</td>
<td>294-1000</td>
<td>Atakan et al., 1989¹¹</td>
<td>(K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23·10⁻¹² exp(-756/T)</td>
<td>209-740</td>
<td>Sun et al., 1990¹²</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations
1.1·10⁻¹⁵ exp(-2700/T) 300-1000 | Baulch et al., 1981¹³ | (m) |

Comments

(a) Discharge flow study. CN produced by reaction of O atoms with cyanogen. [CN] monitored by absorption between 387.6 and 388.6 nm.
(b) Flash photolysis, discharge flow study with photolysis of C₂N₂ (≈ 165 nm). CN detected in absorption at 388.3 nm.
(c) Flash photolysis of C₂N₂/H₂ mixtures. [CN] monitored by kinetic absorption spectroscopy.
(d) Pulsed laser photolysis of C₂N₂/Ar/H₂ mixtures at 193 nm. [CN] monitored by LIF.
(e) CN generated by pulsed laser photolysis of ICN at 266 nm. [CN] monitored by LIF of CN (A ← X) and CN (B ← X) transitions.
(f) Shock tube study on mixtures of C₂N₂/H₂/Ar. [CN] monitored by broad-band absorption spectroscopy.
(g) Shock tube study of C₂N₂/H₂/Ar mixtures, with ARAS monitoring of H atom concentrations.
(h) Pulsed laser photolysis of NCNO at 572 nm. [CN] monitored by LIF at 388 nm.
(i) Pulsed laser photolysis of C₂N₂ at 193 nm. [CN] and [HCN] monitored by diode laser absorption.
(j) Pulsed laser photolysis of NCNO at 532 nm; LIF monitoring of [CN].
(k) Pulsed laser photolysis of C₂N₂ at 193 nm. LIF monitoring of [CN] at 386.871 nm and 386.887 nm.
(l) Pulsed laser photolysis of ICN at 248 nm; LIF monitoring of [CN] at 388 nm.
(m) Evaluation of data to 1980.

Reliability
Δlog⁰ = ±0.2 at 300 K rising to ±0.5 at 3500 K.

Comments on Preferred Values
There is very good agreement among the most recent studies of this reaction over a wide temperature range. The older, discharge flow studies¹⁻², in general give low values for k and are not used in deriving the recommended expression, which is based on the data of Refs. 3–12.

References


Preferred Value

k = 3.2·10⁻¹² exp(-820/T) over the range 200–3500 K.
BAULCH ET AL.

CN + H₂ → HCN + H

EXPERIMENTAL DATA
- Boden and Thrush 1987
- Albers et al 1974
- Schacke et al 1977
- Szekely et al 1983
- LJ et al 1984
- Lichtin et al 1985
- Natarajan and Roth 1986
- Bella and Fastnack 1987
- De Juan et al 1987
- Sims and Smith 1988
- Atakan et al 1989
- Sun et al 1990
- This Evaluation 1993
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

CN + CH₄ → HCN + CH₃

Thermodynamic Data

ΔH°₂₉₈ = −79.4 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS°₂₉₈ = −7.18 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹

Kₚ = 9.79·10⁻²⁺₇₉₅ exp(+9570/T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coefficient Measurements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0·10⁻¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1·10⁻¹² CN(v = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6·10⁻¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3·10⁻¹³ CN(v = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1·10⁻¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8·10⁻¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6·10⁻¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4·10⁻¹³ CN(v = 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.07·10⁻¹² exp(78/T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹² exp(220/T)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

1.5·10⁻¹¹ exp(−940/T) | 260–400 | |

Comments

(a) Flash photolysis of CH₄(0.037–0.4 Torr)/C₂H₂(0.05–0.2 Torr)/He mixtures. Total pressure 4–5 Torr, in a flowing system. [CN] monitored by kinetic absorption spectroscopy at 388 nm.

(b) Pulsed laser photolysis of C₂H₂/Ar/CH₄ mixtures. [CN, v = 0, v = 1] monitored as a function of time by laser induced fluorescence.

(c) Pulsed laser photolysis of ICN/CH₄/Ar mixtures in flowing system. [CN] monitored as a function of time at 388 nm by laser induced fluorescence.

(d) Laser photolysis of C₂H₂(0.05–0.3 Torr)/CH₄(0–0.15 Torr) mixtures with He, N₂ or Ar bath gas. Total pressures 1–200 Torr. [CN] decay and HCN formation, monitored by diode laser absorption spectroscopy at 2015.22 cm⁻¹ and 3280.987 cm⁻¹ respectively.

(e) Flash photolysis of flowing mixtures of C₂H₂/Ar/CH₄. [CN] monitored by LIF. Total pressure, 20 Torr.

(f) Pulsed laser photolysis at 193 nm of flowing mixtures of C₂H₂/Ar/CH₄. [CN] monitored by LIF. Total pressure, 5–30 Torr.

(g) Method as in (f). No pressure dependence of rate constant in range 2–38 Torr.

(h) Method as in (f). Pressure range 5–60 Torr.

Preferred Value

k = 1.5·10⁻¹⁹ exp(150/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ over range 290–1500 K.

Reliability

Δlogk = ±0.3 over range 290 to 1500 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

Until the two recent studies of Balla et al.⁸ and Atakan and Wolfrum¹¹ the available data had been restricted to low temperatures (<400 K). These studies have extended the data to 1500 K and are in good agreement over the whole temperature range. The preferred values are based on the two expressions for k derived by Balla et al.⁸ and Atakan and Wolfrum¹¹.

Other exothermic reaction channels are possible but a search by Balla et al.⁸ for alternative products found none; the formation of HCN + CH₄ appears to be the only pathway. The reaction is believed to occur by initial addition rather than by direct abstraction but no evidence has been found for any pressure dependence of k.

The rate of the reaction is increased by vibrational excitation of the CN and there have been a number of measurements of k(v = 1) which are in good agreement¹²⁶.

References

$\text{CN + CH}_4 \rightarrow \text{HCN + CH}_3$

**Experimental Data**

- Bullock and Cooper 1971
- Bullock and Cooper 1972
- Schacke et al. 1977
- Li et al. 1984
- Lichtin and Lin 1985
- Balla and Pasternaek 1987
- Anastasi and Hancock 1988
- Sayah 1988
- Atakan and Wolfrum 1991
- Balla et al. 1991

---

**Diagram Details**

- Log (k/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$) vs. $10^3 T^{-1}/K^{-1}$

---
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EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

\[ \text{NCO} + \text{NO} \rightarrow \text{N}_2\text{O} + \text{CO} \] \hspace{1cm} (1)
\[ \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{CO}_2 \] \hspace{1cm} (2)
\[ \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{CO} + \text{O} \] \hspace{1cm} (3)

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H_f^{\text{meas}}(1) = -278 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_f^{\text{meas}}(1) = -25.4 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(1) = 0.164 T^{303} \exp(33400/T) \]

\[ \Delta H_f^{\text{meas}}(2) = -643 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_f^{\text{meas}}(2) = -37.5 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(2) = 7.22 \cdot 10^{-7} T^{7.22} \exp(+73700/T) \]

\[ \Delta H_f^{\text{meas}}(3) = -111 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_f^{\text{meas}}(3) = 107 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(3) = 2.96 \cdot 10^{-7} T^{2.96} \exp(+13100/T) \text{ atm} \]

**Rate Coefficient Data** \( k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3 \)

\[ k \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( T/K )</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.66 \cdot 10^{-12}</td>
<td>Fifer and Holmes, 1982(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.69 \cdot 10^{-11} \exp(197/T)</td>
<td>Perry, 1985(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 \cdot 10^{-11}</td>
<td>Hancock and McKendrick, 1986(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 \cdot 10^{-7} T^{1.55} \exp(-260/T)</td>
<td>Atakan and Wolfrum, 1991(^4)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 \cdot 10^{-12}</td>
<td>Mertens et al., 1992(^5)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 \cdot 10^{-11} \exp(200/T)</td>
<td>CEC, 1992(^6)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Shock tube study of HCN/NO\(/\text{Ar} \) mixtures. [NO\(_2\)] monitored by absorption at 450 nm, [NO\(^+\)], [OH\(^-\)], and [NO\(_{\text{phos}}\)] monitored by emission at 237, 307, and 427.5 nm respectively. Value of \( k \) obtained is only an estimate from computer modelling of a 23 reaction mechanism.

(b) Flowing system. NCO produced by pulsed laser photolysis of HCN/Ar/NO mixtures. Decay of [NCO] monitored using laser induced fluorescence at 416.8 nm.

(c) NCO produced by infra-red multiphoton dissociation of phenyl isocyanate. Decay of [NCO] in large excess of NO monitored by laser induced fluorescence at 438.48 nm. This work supersedes earlier similar studies in which vibrational excitation of NCO may have influenced results.

(d) Pulsed laser photolysis of (CN)/O\(/\text{Ar} \) mixtures at 193 nm. NCO produced by rapid reaction of photolytically generated CN with O\(_2\). [NCO] monitored by LIF.

(e) Shock tube study of HNCO/N\(_2\)/Ar mixtures. [NCO] monitored by absorption at 440.79 nm. \( k \) derived by fitting [NCO] profile to reaction scheme. Profile shown to be sensitive to value of \( k \).

(f) Based on data of Perry\(^2\) and of Hancock and McKendrick\(^3\).

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 2.3 \cdot 10^{-6} T^{1.72} \exp(-380/T) \text{ over the range 290-3000 K.} \]

**Reliability**

\[ \Delta \log k = \pm 0.25 \text{ over the range 290-3000 K.} \]

**Comments on Preferred Values**

The studies of Atakan and Wolfrum\(^4\) and Mertens et al.\(^5\) considerably extend the temperature range over which data are available. At low temperatures Atakan and Wolfrum\(^4\) obtain values in good agreement with those of Perry\(^2\) and Hancock and McKendrick\(^3\). An extrapolation of the expression for \( k \) given by Atakan and Wolfrum\(^4\) to higher temperatures allows comparison with the high temperature data of Fifer and Homes\(^1\) and of Mertens et al.\(^5\). The agreement with the results of Mertens et al.\(^4\) is excellent. Fifer and Homes\(^1\) obtained only an approximate value of \( k \) from their shock tube study; their data are a factor of 3-4 lower than obtained from Atakan and Wolfrum's expression.

Mertens et al.\(^5\) have combined the results in Refs. 2-5 to derive the expression which is recommended in the present evaluation.

The only information about branching ratios is indirect and limited to low temperatures. Hancock and McKendrick\(^3\) observe no NO + O chemiluminescence in their experiments suggesting an absence of channel (3). Atakan and Wolfrum\(^4\) quote unpublished work of Hancock et al. in which infra-red chemiluminescence from the reaction products were studied. Vibrationally excited CO and N\(_2\)O were observed but not CO\(_2\). Mertens et al.\(^5\) report results of Cooper and Her schberger, in press, which indicate that at room temperatures both channels (1) and (2) are important. The substantial curvature in the Arrhenius plot may indicate a change in mechanism as the temperature is increased and further studies at high temperature to investigate this possibility are clearly desirable.

**Preferred Values**

\[ k = 2.3 \cdot 10^{-6} T^{1.72} \exp(-380/T) \text{ over the range 290-3000 K.} \]
References


NCO + NO \rightarrow N_2O + CO
\rightarrow N_2 + CO_2
\rightarrow N_2 + CO + O

EXPERIMENTAL DATA
- Fifer and Holmes 1982
- Perry 1985
- Hancock and McKendrick 1986
- Atakan and Wolfrum 1991
\n Mertens et al 1992
- This Evaluation 1993
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

C₂H + H₂ → C₂H₂ + H

Thermodynamic Data
ΔH_{f}^{0} = -116 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS_{f}^{0} = -22.5 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹
K_p = 1.38·10⁻⁴ exp(14300/T)

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4·10⁻¹³</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Lander et al., 1990¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8·10⁻¹³ exp(−1090/T)</td>
<td>298–438</td>
<td>Koshi et al., 1992²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1·10⁻¹³</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Koshi, Nishida, and Matsui, 1992²</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1·10⁻¹³</td>
<td>298–438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5·10⁻¹³ exp(−1564/T)</td>
<td>300–3000</td>
<td>Warnatz, 1984⁴</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9·10⁻¹³ exp(−1443/T)</td>
<td>300–2800</td>
<td>Gardiner et al., 1985⁵</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8·10⁻¹³ exp(−1455/T)</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986⁶</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5·10⁻¹³ exp(−1564/T)</td>
<td>300–2500</td>
<td>CEC, 1992⁷</td>
<td>(g)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Pulsed laser photolysis of CF₂C₂H at 193 nm. Transient [C₂H] monitored by diode IR laser absorption in presence of a large excess of H₂. No pressure dependence of the decay rate found.

(b) Relative rate measurement. Pulsed ArF laser photolysis of C₂H₂/H₂ mixtures to generate C₂H and H. Formation of C₂H₂ by the reaction C₂H + C₂H₂ → C₂H₂ + H monitored by time-resolved mass spectrometry. Yield of C₂H₂ as a function of [H₂] gives k/k₁ where k₁ refers to the reaction of C₂H with C₂H₂ to give C₂H₂. Value of k₁ = 1.5·10⁻¹⁰ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ used, obtained from a shock tube study in the same laboratory².

(c) Pulsed ArF laser photolysis of C₂H₂/H₂ mixtures. Reaction monitored by LIF detection of H and by time-resolved mass spectrometric detection of C₂H₂ in separate experiments. The former gives k = (7.1 ± 1.1)·10⁻¹² cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹.

(d) Review of literature to 1986.

(e) Re-analysis of data from shock tube studies of Koike and Morinaga² and of Tanzawa and Gardiner⁴.

(f) Accepts expression of Brown and Laufer¹⁰ derived from value of k at 300 K from Laufer and Bass¹¹ together with BEBO calculation of temperature coefficient.

(g) Expression derived by Warnatz⁴ accepted.

Reliability
Δlogk = ±0.3 at 300 K rising to ±0.5 at 2500 K.

Comments on Preferred Values
The expression obtained by Koshi et al.,² is adopted. This is significantly different from our previously recommended expression at low temperatures. Although the expression is based on low temperature results, when extrapolated it agrees well with the existing high temperature studies.

References
⁷CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
BAULCH ET AL.

$\text{C}_2\text{H} + \text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{H}$

**EXPERIMENTAL DATA**

- ○ Lange and Wagner 1975
- ▽ Lanfer and Bass 1979
- —— Tanzawa and Gardiner 1980
- □ Renlund et al 1981
- ——— Koike and Morinaga 1981
- ○ Okabe 1981
- ——— Kiefer et al 1983
- • Stephens et al 1987
- ▼ Koshi et al 1992
- ——— This Evaluation 1993 (Koshi et al 1992)
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

C₂H + CH₄ → Products

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8·10⁻¹²</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Renlund et al., 1981¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2·10⁻¹²</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Laufer, 1981²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2·10⁻¹²</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Okabe, 1981³</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0·10⁻¹²</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Lander et al., 1990⁴</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0·10⁻¹² exp(−250/T)</td>
<td>300-2500</td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986⁵</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0·10⁻¹²</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>CEC, 1992⁶</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Flash photolysis of C₂H₂, C₂HBr, or C₂HCO at 193 nm, or of C₂HCO at 953 cm⁻¹. CH(A2∆) from C₂H + O₂ reaction monitored by chemiluminescence at 432.6 nm, with and without added CH₄. [CO₂] monitored by chemiluminescence at 2300 cm⁻¹. Total pressures 200-800 m Torr Ar or He.

(b) VUV flash photolysis of C₂HCF₃. Gas chromatographic sampling of products [C₂H] monitored by absorption spectroscopy at 152 nm. k independent of pressure between 20 and 700 Torr.

(c) Relative rate study photolysis of C₂H₂/CH₄ mixtures at 147 nm. [C₂H₂], [C₂H₄], and [C₂H₃] measured by absorption spectroscopy at 165 nm, 174.4 nm, and 151.9 nm, respectively. Relative rates $k_{C_2H} / k_{CH_4}$, $k_{C_2H} = 0.032$. k given in Table based on $k_{C_2H}$, $c_{CH_4} = 1.0·10^{-10}$ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ (this review).

(d) Pulsed laser photolysis at 193 nm of CF₃C₂H to produce C₂H. [C₂H] monitored by IR diode laser absorption in presence of large excess of CH₄. No pressure dependence of k found (8-70 Torr He).

(e) Accepts expression of Brown and Laufer² derived from value of k at 300 K from Laufer³ together with BEBO calculation of temperature coefficient.

(f) Based on Refs. 1–3.

Preferred Values

$k = 3.0·10⁻¹²$ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ at 298 K.

Reliability

$Δ\log k = ±0.5$ at 298 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

The recent measurements of Lander et al.⁴ are the most direct to date and given a value of k in good agreement with the relative rate measurement of Okabe³. Our recommendations are based on these results but with fairly wide error limits.

References

⁶CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_{298}^\circ = -99.1 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta S_{298}^\circ = -61.1 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p = 4.73 \times 10^{-7} T^{1.64} \exp(+12640/T) \]

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Coefficient Measurements</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5 \times 10^{-12}</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>Laufer, 1981(^1)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Okabe, 1983(^2)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 \times 10^{-11}</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Lander et al., 1990(^3)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

| 6.5 \times 10^{-12} | 300-2500 | Tsang and Hampson, 1986\(^4\) | (d)      |
| --- | --- | CEC, 1992\(^5\) | (e)      |

Comments

(a) VUV flash photolysis of CF\(_3\)C\(_2\)H. Gas chromatographic sampling of products. [C\(_2\)H] monitored by absorption spectroscopy at 152 nm. No pressure dependence of \(k\) found (20-700 Torr He).

(b) Relative rate study. Photolysis of C\(_2\)H\(_2\)/C\(_2\)H\(_6\) mixtures at 147 nm. [C\(_2\)H], [C\(_2\)H\(_3\)] and [C\(_2\)H\(_4\)] measured by sampling and absorption spectroscopy at 165 nm, 174.4 nm, and 151.9 nm respectively. \(k(C_2H+CH_2)/k(C_2H+C_2H_2) = 0.240\) obtained. \(k(C_2H+C_2H_2) = 1.0 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}\) (this review) used to obtain tabulated value of \(k\).

(c) Pulsed laser photolysis at 193 nm of CF\(_3\)C\(_2\)H to produce C\(_2\)H. [C\(_2\)H] monitored by IR diode laser absorption in presence of large excess of C\(_2\)H\(_6\). Small pressure dependence of \(k\) observed over range 8-70 Torr He.

(d) Accepts analysis of Brown and Laufer\(^6\) who derived their result from the value of \(k\) at 300 K from Laufer\(^1\) together with a BEBO calculation indicating a negligible temperature coefficient for \(k\).

(e) No recommendation made.

Preferred Values

No recommendation.

Comments on Preferred Values

The recent measurements of Lander et al.\(^3\) are the most direct study of this reaction but, although a value of \(k\) in reasonable agreement with the relative rate values of Okabe\(^2\), is obtained, Lander et al.\(^3\) also observed a significant pressure effect which could indicate complexities in the mechanism. The reaction requires more detailed study before recommendations for \(k\) can be made.

References

\(^5\)CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

C₂H + C₂H₂ → C₂H₂ + H

Thermodynamic Data

ΔH°₂₉₈ = −102 kJ mol⁻¹
ΔS°₂₉₈ = −43.5 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹

Kp = 4.66·10⁻⁶ exp(+(126000/T))

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Shin and Michael, 1991¹</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1236–1475</td>
<td>Koshi, Nishida and Matsu, 1992²</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>Koshi et al., 1992³</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>2177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

4.0·10⁻¹¹          | 300–2500 | Tsang and Hampson, 1986⁴ | (d)  |
5·10⁻¹¹           | 300–2700 | CEC, 1992⁵               | (e)  |

Comments

(a) Pulsed laser (193 nm) photolysis of C₂H₂/He mixtures. [H] monitored by atomic resonance absorption. High temperature experiments carried out by pulsed photolysis of shock heated C₂H₂/He mixtures. Scatter on results is such that they can be interpreted as k temperature independent over temperature range or represented by the expression

k = 3.02·10⁻¹⁶ exp(−235/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹.

(b) Pulsed ArF laser photolysis of C₂H₂. Reaction monitored by LIF detection of H and by time-resolved mass spectrometric detection of C₂H₂ in separate experiments. The former gives k = (1.6±0.1)·10⁻¹⁰ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ and the latter, k = (1.4±0.1)·10⁻¹⁰ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹.

(c) Measurements in the range 298–438 were carried out by pulsed laser photolysis with time-resolved mass spectrometric detection of C₄H₆ (see comment (b)). For experiments at higher temperatures shock heating of C₂H₂/Ar mixtures was employed with pulsed ArF laser photolysis of the heated mixture behind the reflected shock wave. [H] was monitored by ARAS.

(d) Mean of the values of Refs. 8 and 9.

(e) Based on Refs. 6–9.

Preferred Values

k = 1.5·10⁻¹⁰ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ over the range 300–2700 K.

Reliability

Δlogk = ±0.2 at 298 K rising to ±0.5 at 2700 K.

Comments on Preferred Values

There are now several low temperature studies of this reaction which are in very good agreement¹,²,³,⁶. The measurements at high temperature are more scattered¹,²,⁷ but together with the low temperature data they indicate a very small temperature coefficient for the rate constant, as would be expected for such a fast reaction. The recommendations are based on the low temperature results of Stephens et al.⁶, Shin and Michael¹, and Koshi et al.²,³ and the rate constant is taken to be temperature independent but substantial error limits are assigned at high temperatures.

References

⁵CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
BAULCH ET AL.

C_2H + C_2H_2 \rightarrow C_4H_2 + H

EXPERIMENTAL DATA

- Shin and Michael 1991
- Shin and Michael 1991
- Koshi et al 1992
- Koshi et al 1992
- This Evaluation 1993
EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

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

**Thermodynamic Data**

\[ \Delta H_{\text{f}}(1) = -49.0 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ \Delta H_{\text{f}}(2) = -358.6 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]
\[ K_p(1) = 1.69 \times 10^{-2} \exp(5940/T) \]
\[ K_p(2) = 23.17 \exp(-43000/T) \]

**Rate Coefficient Data** \((k = k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/K)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k_1 = 1.7 \times 10^{-12})</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>Cooke and Williams, 1971</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2 = 6.6 \times 10^{-12} \exp(125/T))</td>
<td>291-602</td>
<td>Slagle et al., 1984</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_3 = 1.0 \times 10^{-11})</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Park, Heaven, and Gutman, 1984</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_4 = 1.0 \times 10^{-11})</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Krueger and Weitz, 1988</td>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k = 2.5 \times 10^{-12})</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Munk et al., 1987</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k = 6.7 \times 10^{-12})</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>Fahr and Lauffer, 1988</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Shock tube study of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4, \text{CH}_4 + \text{O}_2\) mixtures. Based on simulation of reaction mechanism.

(b) Excimer laser flash photolysis (193 nm)-photoionization mass spectrometry at 0.76-3.60 Torr. Monitored \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_3, \text{CHO}, \text{H}_2\text{CO}\). No signals corresponding to products of channel (1), therefore, \(k_1 < k_2\). Similar conclusion by Baldwin and Walker.

(c) Excimer laser flash photolysis (193 nm)-photoionization mass spectrometry at 0.4-4.0 Torr.

(d) Excimer laser flash photolysis (248 nm), diode laser spectroscopy on \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) in \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\text{HCl}/\text{O}_2\) mixtures at 7 Torr. The effect of \(\text{O}_2\) on the rate of growth of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\) generated in the \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{HCl}\) reaction, was used to determine \(k\).

(e) Pulse radiolysis with a variety of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) precursors, pressure \(\approx 1\) atm. Monitored disappearance of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\) and the build-up of a long lived product at 230 and 270 nm. Latter ascribed to a product \(X\) of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{O}_2\), presumed to be \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\); the rate coefficient was deduced from the product build up.

(f) Spectroscopic study with vacuum UV photolysis of \(\text{Sn(}\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{) or Hg(}\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text){)}_2\), monitoring the decay of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\) at 164.7 and 168.3 nm by absorption spectroscopy. Total pressure 400 Torr.

(g) Based on Park et al.³.

**Preferred Values**

\(k = 9.0 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}\) over range 300-2000 K.

**Reliability**

\(\Delta \log k = \pm 0.3 \) over range 300-600 K; \(\pm 0.5 \) over range 600-2000 K.

**Comments on Preferred Values**

There is excellent agreement between the low pressure studies of Slagle et al.⁵ and Krueger and Weitz⁶. The higher pressure measurements of Fahr and Lauffer⁴ are in reasonable agreement and clearly do not confirm the significant decrease in \(k\) with pressure suggested by the measurements of Munk et al.³ who obtained their data by observing the rate of growth of an absorption feature attributed to \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\text{O}_2\).

The available experimental data are in agreement that channel (2) dominates, at \(T < 1000\) K. Flame modelling, however, suggests that channel (1) becomes more significant at higher temperatures⁹.

**References**

7. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
Rate Coefficient Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/s⁻¹</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>[M]/molecule cm⁻³</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Low Pressure Range**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Ar]2.95·10⁻⁷exp(−39000/T)</td>
<td>1675-2210</td>
<td>(2.5-32)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td>Roth and Just, 1973¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ar]4.3·10⁻⁷exp(−39900/T)</td>
<td>1700-2200</td>
<td>(6-18)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td>Just, Roth and Damm, 1976²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ar]4.9·10⁻⁷exp(−40887/T)</td>
<td>2000-2540</td>
<td>(1.1-3.3)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td>Tanzawa and Gardiner, 1980⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Kr]2.5·10⁻⁸exp(−27900/T)</td>
<td>2300-3200</td>
<td>(7-32)·10⁻⁸</td>
<td>Kieter et al., 1983⁹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intermediate Fall-Off Range**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1.2·10²⁹(Ar)</td>
<td>Skinner and Sokoloski, 1960⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2·10⁻¹²</td>
<td>1423</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.52·10⁻¹²</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6·10⁻¹⁵</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2.5·10²⁹(M)</td>
<td>Leroux and Mathieu, 1961⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2450</td>
<td>2.5·10²⁹(C₂H₄)</td>
<td>Towell and Martin, 1961⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4·10⁻²⁴</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>(1.6-2.3)·10²⁸(Ar)</td>
<td>Kozlov and Knorre, 1962, 1963⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5·10⁻¹⁲</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0·10⁻¹⁸</td>
<td>1530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>(7.3-52)·10²³(Ne)</td>
<td>Gay et al., 1966¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>2170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>8.3·10²⁹(Ar)</td>
<td>Homer and Kistiakowsky, 1967¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0·10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>2260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviews and Evaluations**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k₁(1) = [Ar]4.3·10⁻⁷exp(−3930/T)</td>
<td>1500-2500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Warnatz, 1989¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k₂(2) = [Ar]4.3·10⁻⁷exp(−48590/T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k₃(1) = 7.9·10⁻⁷²⁰exp(−44670/T)</td>
<td>1100-2500</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsang and Hampson, 1986¹³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

(a) Shock tube study of C₂H₄ (0.1-1%)/Ar mixtures in reflected shocks. [C₂H₄] and [C₂H₃] followed simultaneously by IR emissions at 3.0 and 3.35 μm respectively. Emission profiles corrected for interference between emission bands. C₂H₄ decay found to proceed in two distinct phases: an initial phase of second order for which the rate coefficient was given as indicated above, and a later phase for which the best interpretation was given by an order of 0.6 in [Ar] with rate coefficient k = 2.85·10⁻⁷²⁰exp(−26570/T) cm³ molecule⁻⁰·₆ s⁻¹ was obtained for reaction 2.

(b) Shock tube study C₂H₄ (20-800 ppm)/Ar mixtures in reflected shocks. [H] followed by atomic resonance absorption at 121.5 nm calibrated by H₂ dissociation in H₂/Ar mixtures. [C₂H₃] followed by absorption at 100.8 nm. H absorption corrected for C₂H₄ and C₂H₃ contribution. The results of this work and those of Ref. 1 led the authors to conclude that there were two pathways for C₂H₄ dissociation. Both sets of data were analysed to give k₁ (which was used in the analysis to obtain k₂). The analysis of C₃H₄ decomposition showed a strong influence of diluent on channel (2) but only weak effects on channel (1). The expression k₂ = 6.3·10⁻⁷²⁰exp(−49400/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ was obtained for reaction 2.

(c) Shock tube study of incident shock waves in C₂H₄ (2.5, 5 and 10%)/Ar mixtures. Analysis by laser schlieren technique. Data analysis by computer modelling of a 14 reaction mechanism. k₁ was obtained by optimization of the model to fit initial deflection of laser beam. k₂ taken from Ref. 2 multiplied by 1.2 to improve fit to laser schlieren data.

(d) Shock tube study of 3% C₂H₄/Kr mixtures. Laser schlieren technique. Initial dissociation of C₂H₄ was clearly resolved over the range 2300-3200 K. Rate coefficients for both dissociation channels were derived from the initial gradients and the location of the C₂H₂ gradient maximum. For reaction 2 the following value was obtained: k₂ = 2.3·10⁻⁷²⁰exp(−41180/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹. AnRRKM calculation using E₀ = ΔH°₂ = 355.6±8.4 kJ
mol\(^{-1}\) for channel (1) give a good fit to the data of Refs. 1, 3 and 4.

(c) Shock tube study of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) (0.466–6%) in Ar. Analysis for \(\text{H}_2\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\), and \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\) by gas chromatography.

(f) Flame study. \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2/\text{O}_2\) flames at 1 atm with \([\text{CH}_3]/[\text{O}_2] \) ratios from 1.75 to 2.07. Products quenched and analyzed for \(\text{CH}_4\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\), \(\text{C}\), \(\text{CO}\) and higher hydrocarbons.

(g) Flow system, \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) passed through ceramic reactor tube; products analyzed by mass spectrometry. Production of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\) and \(\text{C}_4\) hydrocarbons found to be first and second order respectively.

(h) Shock tube study of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) (0.2% and 5%)/Ar mixtures in reflected shocks. Reaction products sampled and analyzed for \(\text{H}_2\), \(\text{CH}_4\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\), and \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\) by gas chromatography. \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) decomposition rate found to be independent of pressure. Conversion to \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\) increases with increasing temperature.

(i) Shock tube study of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) (0.5–3%)/Ne mixtures in reflected shocks, products sampled by mass spectrometry of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\) and \(\text{H}_2\) which were the only products observed. \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) decay is first order in \([\text{C}_2\text{H}_4]\) and of order 1/2 in \([\text{Ne}]\),

(j) Flow system study of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) (8.13–14.9%)/Ar mixtures. Products \(\text{CH}_4\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_6\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\), \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2\) monitored by gas chromatography.

(k) Data evaluation.

(l) Data evaluation and construction of RRKM fall-off curves.

### Preferred Values

\[ k_1(1) = [\text{Ar}, \text{Kr}] 5.8 \times 10^{-5} \exp(-36000/T) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 1500–3200 K.} \]

\[ k_2(2) = [\text{Ar}] 4.3 \times 10^{-7} \exp(-48600/T) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range 1500–3200 K.} \]

### Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_1(1) = \pm 0.3 \text{ over range 1500–3200 K.} \]

\[ \Delta \log k_2(2) = \pm 0.5 \text{ over range 1500–3200 K.} \]

### Comments on Preferred Values

The thermal decomposition of \(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4\) apparently is dominated by the 1,1 elimination channel to form singlet vinylidene (\(\text{C} = \text{CH}_2\)) which immediately isomerizes to acetylene. All experiments reported are in the fall-off region close to the low pressure limit. Figure 1 gives Arrhenius plots of \(k_1\) from Refs. 1–4. The agreement among the rate coefficients is quite satisfactory, thus, we have chosen an average \(k_2\) as the preferred value. A theoretical analysis\(^1\) of these rate coefficients using a recent determination of the reaction barrier by Kiefer \textit{et al.} \(^{35}\), 355.6 kJ mol\(^{-1}\), leads to collisional efficiencies \(\beta\) ranging from 0.002 to 0.004 between 1700 to 3200 K. However, employing a value of \(\Delta H^\circ = 368.2 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}\) an almost constant \(\beta = 0.006\) is obtained over the same temperature range. The experiments provide no information about the high pressure rate coefficient. The second channel (2) is expected to depend strongly on the bath gas\(^1\).

### References

7. P.J. Letroux and P.M. Mathieu, Comb. Flame 6, 253 (1962).
BAULCH ET AL.

\[ \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + M \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{H}_2 + M \]
\[ \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_3 + \text{H} + M \]

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{graph.png}
\caption{Graph showing the reaction rates as a function of temperature.}
\end{figure}
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EVALUATED KINETIC DATA FOR COMBUSTION MODELLING

C_2H_2OOH (+ M) → C_2H_6O + OH (+ M)

Thermodynamic data
ΔH^-98 = 180 kJ mol^-1

Rate Coefficient Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>k/s^-1</th>
<th>T/K</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate Coefficient Measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5·10^9 exp(-19000/T) (M = C_4H_6)</td>
<td>553-653</td>
<td>Kirk and Knox, 1960^1</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews and Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2·10^9 exp(-21600/T)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benson and O'Neal, 1970^2</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0·10^9 exp(-21600/T)</td>
<td>400-1000</td>
<td>CEC, 1992^3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

(a) Pyrolysis of C_2H_2OOH in benzene carrier gas flow system (553–653 K) at total pressure of 10–20 Torr. Analysis of the amount of peroxide consumed and phenyl product allowed distinction between homogeneous and heterogeneous components; expression given is for homogeneous reaction.

(b) Based on data of Kirk and Knox^1 and transition state calculation.

(c) Based on analogy with the estimated high pressure limit for decomposition of methyl hydroperoxide.

Preferred Values

k_∞ = 4.0·10^15 exp(-21600/T) s^-1 over range 400–800 K.

Reliability

Δlogk = ±0.3

Comments on Preferred Values

The cited experimental measurements are the only reported for this reaction, and were overlooked in the previous CEC evaluation^3. The Arrhenius parameters are substantially lower than measured recently for CH_3OOH decomposition^4, although the rate coefficient values at 650 K are comparable. There is a strong possibility that the reaction is in the fall-off region at the low pressures used which would account for the low A factor. The uncertainties do not allow a firm recommendation but the expression recommended previously for k_∞ is consistent with the data.

References

^3 CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).


Thermodynamic Data

\[ \Delta H_{f,298}^{(1)} = 365.9 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ \Delta S_{f,298}^{(1)} = 110.9 \text{ J K}^{-1} \text{ mol}^{-1} \]

\[ K_p(1) = 5.6 \times 10^{-40} \exp (-44030/T) \text{ atm} \]

Rate Coefficient Data \((k = k_1 + k_2)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(k/\text{s}^{-1})</th>
<th>(T/\text{K})</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k_1)</td>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-5} \exp (-38900/T)</td>
<td>1011-1138</td>
<td>Swarc, 1948(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_1)</td>
<td>2.5 \times 10^{-5} \exp (-37091/T)</td>
<td>1011-1122</td>
<td>Takahashi, 1960(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_1)</td>
<td>1.3 \times 10^{-6} \exp (-52340/T)</td>
<td>1185-1206</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>6.3 \times 10^{-6} \exp (-42778/T)</td>
<td>913-1143</td>
<td>Price, 1962(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>3.4 \times 10^{-6} \exp (-40262/T)</td>
<td>1073-1373</td>
<td>Errede and DeMaria, 1964(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>5.2 \times 10^{-7} \exp (-44757/T)</td>
<td>920-970</td>
<td>Brooks, Cummings, and Peacock, 1971(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>1.7 \times 10^{-7} \exp (-41268/T)</td>
<td>1410-1730</td>
<td>Rao and Skinner, 1984(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>2.0 \times 10^{-8} \exp (-44393/T)</td>
<td>1500-1900</td>
<td>Mueller-Markgraf and Troe, 1986(^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>8.1 \times 10^{-9} \exp (-36534/T)</td>
<td>1300-1800</td>
<td>Mizera and Kiefer, 1986(^8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>4.0 \times 10^{-10} \exp (-45291/T)</td>
<td>1300-1800</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>8.9 \times 10^{-12} \exp (-36534/T)</td>
<td>1600-2100</td>
<td>Pamidimukkala et al., 1987(^9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>2.8 \times 10^{-13} \exp (-44730/T)</td>
<td>1450-1900</td>
<td>Brouwer, Mueller-Markgraf, and Troe, 1988(^10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k_2)</td>
<td>3.6 \times 10^{-14} \exp (-45000/T)</td>
<td>1380-1700</td>
<td>Braun-Unkhoff, Frank, and Just, 1989(^11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k^*)</td>
<td>1.1 \times 10^{-15} \exp (-43300/T)</td>
<td>1250-1500</td>
<td>Hippler, Reis, and Troe, 1990(^12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k^*)</td>
<td>6.3 \times 10^{-17} \exp (-45465/T)</td>
<td>1200-1500</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviews and Evaluations

| \(k_1\) | 3.2 \times 10^{-9} \exp (-44393/T) | 920-1140 | Benson and O'Neal, 1970\(^11\) |
| \(k_1\) | 2.7 \times 10^{-10} \exp (-41722/T) | 1050-1600 | Rao and Skinner, 1984\(^6\) |
| \(k_1\) | 3.1 \times 10^{-10} \exp (-44890/T) | 920-2200 | CEC, 1992\(^13\) |

Comments

(a) Pyrolysis of toluene and xylene in a flow system at pressure between 3 and 20 mbar.

(b) Flow system with mass spectrometric analysis. It was concluded that the curvature of the Arrhenius plot for channel (1) was caused mainly by competitive reactions.

(c) The flow system study (pressure 8–28 mbar) revealed that the toluene decay was strongly surface controlled at temperatures below 1000 K. The reported Arrhenius parameters for reaction (1) were derived from the isolated homogeneous reaction.

(d) Flow system study. Rate coefficient parameters for reaction (2) were deduced from the rate of benzene formation during the decomposition of xylene between 1070 and 1370 K. Due to the indirect method which was used in this study, the results were criticized by Benson and O'Neal\(^11\) who suggested that the pre-exponential factor and the activation energy obtained seem unlikely for this reaction.

(e) Pyrolysis of toluene/nitrogen mixtures in a static system at total pressures below 300 mbar \((P_{\text{tot}} < 30 \text{ mbar})\). Stable compounds analysed by gas chromatography.

(f) Shock tube study with initial mixtures of toluene-d/Ar and neopentane/toluene-d/Ar mixtures. D and H atoms are monitored as function of time by ARAS. Investigation covered a temperature range from 1200–1460 K for neopentane/toluene, and from 1410–1730 K for toluene experiments at total pressures of about 3 bar. The authors recommend an isotope correction factor of 1.5 for the evaluation of \(k_0\) of channel (1). The estimated uncertainty for \(k_{1a}, k_{1b}\) is about \(\log k = \pm 0.2\).

(g) In an earlier shock tube study on toluene decomposition using light absorption by toluene and benzyl in the 200–350 nm range\(^12\) rate constants were derived on the assumption that the benzyl radical exhibits sufficient thermal stability. The measurements were reinterpreted and superseded by experimental results on benzyl decomposition\(^9\). These experiments indicate an unexpectedly low thermal stability of the benzyl radical. With these results, from a reinterpretation of the experiments of Ref. 12 rate coefficients for channel (1) were derived for the density range \((1–3) \times 10^{-3} \text{ mol cm}^{-3}\). The given Arrhenius expression in the present table corresponds to \(1.05 \times 10^{-5} \text{ mol cm}^{-3}\).

(h) Shock tube study on high temperature pyrolysis of ethylbenzene with the laser schlieren technique. Rate expressions for channels (1) and (2) have been included in the reaction system by the authors and originate from their unpublished LS measurements of toluene pyrolysis.

(i) Two independent shock tube techniques (time-of-flight mass spectroscopy and laser schlieren densitometry) were used to investigate the high temperature pyrolysis of toluene in mixtures with Kr and Ne, respectively. A rate coefficient for the formation of methyl and phenyl (channel (2)) was deduced at total pressures around 0.5 bar. A
high pressure limiting rate coefficient of $1.2 \times 10^{10} \exp (-47505/T)$ s$^{-1}$ has also been calculated for reaction pathway (2).

(j) The thermal decomposition of toluene has been re-investigated in shock waves detecting toluene, benzyl, and benzyl fragment concentrations by UV absorption spectrometry. The results give evidence for toluene dissociation predominantly to benzyl radicals and H atoms (channel (1)). The derived thermally averaged rate coefficient for channel (1) is consistent with specific rate constants $k(E,J)$ from laser excitation experiments.

(k) Decomposition of toluene and nitrosobenzene highly diluted in argon behind reflected shock waves. The hydrogen atom formation was followed by ARAS. Nitrosobenzene served as thermal source of phenyl radicals in the separate study of the phenyl decomposition mechanism. The results for phenyl dissociation indicated that the main product channel is the H atom abstraction channel (1) and that the rate coefficient for channel (2) should not exceed 0.2-$k_x$. The rate expression for channel (1) is in excellent agreement with the results of Brouwer et al.$^{10}$

(l) Thermal dissociation of high concentrations of toluene studied in reflected shock waves. Absorption signals mostly at 260 nm, were recorded (see also Ref. 10). At this wavelength the absorption coefficient of the benzyl radical exceeds that of toluene by a factor of 100, and very small conversions of toluene to benzyl can be detected. Density range 3$\times$10$^{-6}$–2$\times$10$^{-4}$ mol cm$^{-3}$. No dependence of the measured rate constant on total pressure observed. Allowing for the presence of some fall off in the data of Ref. 13, the authors evaluate from the present work and that of Ref. 13 a high pressure limiting rate constant for channel (1).

(m) Re-evaluation of earlier flow system results in the pressure range 2–22 Torr. The preferred parameters for reaction pathway (1) are obtained by accepting the rate constant of Ref. 6 and scaling the parameters to fit the thermodynamic enthalpy.

(n) See comment (f). The limiting high pressure rate constant for toluene decomposition (channel (1)) is derived from RRKM calculations and $k_0 = 1.5 - k_0$.

(o) See Comments on Preferred Values.

Preferred Values

\[ k_1 = 3.1 \times 10^{14} \exp (-44890/T) \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ over range } 920–2200 \text{ K}. \]

Reliability

\[ \Delta \log k_1 = \pm 0.5 \text{ at } 2200 \text{ K reducing to } \pm 0.3 \text{ at } 900 \text{ K}. \]

Comments on Preferred Values

The recommendations are unchanged from our previous evaluation.$^{15}$ A large variety of studies on toluene pyrolysis exist in the lower temperature range, up to approximately 1000 K, but most of these studies were conducted under experimental conditions in which bimolecular reactions of toluene leading to dibenzyl and other compounds dominate. The investigation of unimolecular decomposition of toluene becomes less difficult at temperatures above 900 K. Most of the available data give evidence for the product channel (1) leading to benzyl radicals and hydrogen atoms. From some of the experiments, in conjunction with the calculated limiting high pressure rate coefficient, it can be deduced that the recommended Arrhenius expression, covering a density range of about (1–5)$\times$10$^{-3}$ mol cm$^{-3}$, is very close to the high pressure limit.

The experimental data for the second decomposition channel leading to phenyl and methyl radicals (channel (2)) are insufficient to permit recommendation of a rate expression. Thermochemical arguments together with the findings of some of the authors give evidence that the rate for this channel should not exceed 10 to 20% of the rate for channel (1) for $T \leq 2000$ K.

References

15. CEC, 1992 (see references in Introduction).
Table 1. Evaluated rate data for some reactions of ethyl, i-propyl, and t-butyl radicals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>$\pm$ Δ log $k$</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethyl Radicals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_5$ + M → C$_2$H$_4$ + H + M</td>
<td>$k'' = 8.2 \times 10^{-5}$exp$(-2000T)$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>700-1100</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k'' = [C_2H_11]7.1 \times 10^{-6}$exp$(-16800T)$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>700-900</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{1}(C_2H_5) = 0.25exp(-T/770)+0.75exp(-T/-470)$</td>
<td>700-1000</td>
<td>$\Delta H_{f} = -0.1$</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_5$ + O$_2$ → C$_2$H$_4$ + HO$_2$</td>
<td>1.7$ \times 10^{-10}$exp$(-1000T)$</td>
<td>600-1200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_5$ + H$_2$ → C$_3$H$_6$ + H &amp; H</td>
<td>5.1$ \times 10^{-38}$exp$(-4250T)$</td>
<td>700-1200</td>
<td>0.2 at 700 K rising to 0.6 at 1200 K</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_5$ + CH$_3$ → C$_3$H$_4$ + CH$_3$</td>
<td>1.9$ \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>300-800</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k'' = 5.6 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-800</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_5$ + C$_2$H$_5$ → C$_3$H$_5$ + C$_2$H$_4$</td>
<td>5.6$ \times 10^{-18}$exp$(-3520T)$</td>
<td>300-500</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_5$ + C$_3$H$_5$ → n-C$<em>8$H$</em>{10}$</td>
<td>1.8$ \times 10^{-8}$exp$(-3670T)$</td>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_5$ + C$_3$H$_5$ → n-C$<em>8$H$</em>{10}$</td>
<td>$k'' = 1.9 \times 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_5$ + C$_2$H$_5$CO → C$_3$H$_5$ + C$_2$H$_4$CO</td>
<td>2.9$ \times 10^{-12}$exp$(-3650T)$</td>
<td>300-700</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_2$H$_5$ + C$_3$H$_5$ → CH$_2$=C-H + C$_3$H$_5$</td>
<td>1.6$ \times 10^{-12}$exp$(-660T)$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ C$_2$H$_5$ + C$_2$H$_5$</td>
<td>4.3$ \times 10^{-13}$exp$(-660T)$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ CH$_2$CH$_2$CH(CICH)$_2$</td>
<td>$k'' = 3.3 \times 10^{-13}$exp$(-660T)$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i-Propyl Radicals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H$_7$ + M → C$_2$H$_5$ + H + M</td>
<td>$k'' = 8.76 \times 10^{-26}$exp$(-17800T)$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>170-1000</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$k'' = [H]3.56 \times 10^{-26}$exp$(-14200T)$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>750-330</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F_{1}(He) = 0.33$</td>
<td>750-330</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H$_7$ + O$_2$ → C$_2$H$_5$ + HO$_2$</td>
<td>$k'' = 3.3 \times 10^{-14}$exp$(-1290T)$</td>
<td>600-800</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H$_7$ + H$_2$ → C$_2$H$_5$ + H &amp; H</td>
<td>$k'' = 1.3 \times 10^{-14}$exp$(-4300T)$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H$_7$ + C$_2$H$_5$ → (C$_2$H)$_2$CH=CH-C</td>
<td>$k'' = 5.3 \times 10^{-14}$exp$(-3470T)$</td>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H$_7$ + C$_2$H$_5$ → (C$_2$H)$_2$CH=CHCCH$_2$</td>
<td>$k'' = 7.5 \times 10^{-14}$exp$(-3470T)$</td>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H$_7$ + i-C$_3$H$_7$ → C$_2$H$_5$</td>
<td>$k'' = 6.8 \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.1 at 300 K rising to 0.3 at 1000 K</td>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ C$_2$H$_5$ + C$_2$H$_5$</td>
<td>4.2$ \times 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.1 at 300 K rising to 0.5 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-C$_3$H$_7$ + i-C$_3$H$_7$CHO → C$_2$H$_5$ + (C$_2$H)$_2$CHO</td>
<td>$k'' = 6.6 \times 10^{-14}$exp$(-3170T)$</td>
<td>300-650</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>B7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ C$_2$H$_5$ + (CH$_2$)$_2$CHO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ C$_2$H$_5$ + CH$_2$CH(C$_2$H)$_2$CHO</td>
<td>$k'' = 5.3 \times 10^{-14}$exp$(-4780T)$</td>
<td>500-550</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t-Butyl Radicals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-C$_4$H$_9$ + M → t-C$_4$H$_9$ + H + M</td>
<td>$k'' = 8.3 \times 10^{-13}$exp$(-1920T)$s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>300-800</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-C$_4$H$_9$ + O$_2$ → i-C$_4$H$_9$ + HO$_2$</td>
<td>5$ \times 10^{-13}$exp$(-3115T)$</td>
<td>600-800</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-C$_4$H$_9$ + H$_2$ → t-C$_4$H$_9$ + H &amp; H</td>
<td>3.1$ \times 10^{-28}$exp$(-4500T)$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-C$_4$H$_9$ + C$_2$H$_5$ → (C$_2$H)$_2$CH=CH-C</td>
<td>1.2$ \times 10^{-13}$exp$(-4320T)$</td>
<td>300-500</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-C$_4$H$_9$ + C$_2$H$_5$ → (C$_2$H)$_2$CH=CHCCH$_2$</td>
<td>3.3$ \times 10^{-14}$exp$(-4020T)$</td>
<td>300-550</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-C$_4$H$_9$ + t-C$_4$H$_9$ → C$<em>9$H$</em>{18}$</td>
<td>$k'' = 5.2 \times 10^{-8}$ T$^{-1.3}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.15 at 300 K rising to 0.3 at 1000 K</td>
<td>C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→ t-C$_4$H$_9$ + t-C$_4$H$_9$</td>
<td>1.2$ \times 10^{-3}$ T$^{-1.3}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.15 at 300 K rising to 0.5 at 1000 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>$k$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>$T$/K</td>
<td>± Δ log $k$</td>
<td>Note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$-C$_4$H$_9$ + $i$-C$_4$H$_7$CHO → $i$-C$_4$H$_9$ + $t$-C$_4$H$_9$CO</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-3200/T)$</td>
<td>300-700</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$i$-C$_4$H$_9$ + $CH_2C(\text{CH}_3)_2$CHO</td>
<td>$3.9 \times 10^{-14} \exp(-5540/T)$</td>
<td>500-700</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. C₂H₅ + M. See separate data sheet for a discussion of this reaction.

B. C₂H₅ + O₂. See separate data sheet for a discussion of this reaction.

C. C₂H₅ + H₂. The available literature data have recently been reviewed by Tsang, and we have adopted his recommendation here.

D. C₂H₅ + CH₃. See separate data sheet for the reaction CH₃ + C₂H₅.

E. C₂H₅ + C₂H₅. For the addition reaction we have recommended the rate expression given by Kerr and Parsonage, with adjustment to allow for the change in k of the reference reaction, k(C₂H₅ + C₂H₅ → n-C₃H₁ₐ₈) = 1.9·10⁻¹⁰ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ (see Note A7).

F. C₂H₅ + C₂H₆. For the addition reaction we have recommended the rate expression given by Kerr and Parsonage, with adjustment to allow for the change in k of the reference reaction, k(C₂H₅ + C₂H₆ → n-C₃H₁₉) = 1.9·10⁻¹⁰ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ (see Note A7).

G. C₂H₅ + C₂H₆. See separate data sheet for a discussion of this reaction.

H. C₂H₅ + C₂H₆CHO. The available literature data have been evaluated by McAdam and Walker and we have adopted their recommendation, with adjustment to allow for the change in k of the reference reaction, k(C₂H₅ + C₂H₆CHO → C₃H₆ + C₂H₅O) = 2.57·10⁻³ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ (see Note A7).

I. Only disproportionation/combination ratios are available for this reaction. We accept Tsang's recommendations for the various paths and the RRKM calculations for fall-off.

J. i-C₃H₇ + M. Taken from the recent direct study of Seakins et al. using laser flash photolysis coupled with photoinisation mass spectrometry; rate expressions derived from a transition state model including literature data for the forward and reverse reactions.

K. i-C₃H₇ + O₂. Calculated from the ratio k(i-C₃H₇ + i-C₃H₇CHO → C₃H₆ + C₂H₅O)/k(i-C₃H₇ + O → C₃H₆ + HO₂) = 2.57 exp (−4580/T), as determined by Ghati and Walker over the temperature range 653–773 K, from measurements of the yields of C₃H₆ and C₂H₅O in the oxidation of i-C₃H₇CHO. Recommended k based on k(i-C₃H₇ + i-C₃H₇CHO → C₃H₆ + C₂H₅O) = 8.47·10⁻¹⁴ exp (−3290/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹, as calculated for the temperature range 653–773 K from the data of Kerr and Trotman-Dickenson (see Note B7).

L. i-C₃H₇ + H₂. The only experimental data for this reaction were measured at 713 K, where the ratio k(i-C₃H₇ + O₂ → C₃H₆ + HO₂)/k(i-C₃H₇ + H₂ → C₃H₆ + H) = 3.06·10³ has been determined by Baldwin et al. from measurements of the yields of C₃H₆ and C₃H₆ in the oxidation of i-C₃H₇CHO in the presence of added H₂. This yields k = 6.5·10⁻¹⁵ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ based on k(i-C₃H₇ + O₂ → C₃H₆ + HO₂) = 2.0·10⁻¹⁷ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ at 713 K (see Note B2). To obtain a temperature dependence of k, we have taken the recommendation of Tsang, k = 5.8·10⁻²²T¹·²⁸exp(−4363/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ (based on his evaluated data for the reverse reaction and the equilibrium constant) and adjusted the pre-exponential factor to fit the above value of k at 713 K.
reliable data for the reverse reaction \( k(H + i-C_4H_{10}) \) together with thermochemical data which now appears to be established.

**C4.** 
\( t-C_4H_2 + C_2H_4 \). We have accepted the evaluation of Kerr and Parsonage\(^4\) on the addition reaction, with adjustment of the rate coefficient of the reference reaction, \( k(t-C_4H_2 + t-C_4H_2 \rightarrow C_4H_{10}) = 2.7 \times 10^{-12} (T/300)^{-1.73} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) (see Note C6).

**C5.** 
\( t-C_4H_2 + C_2H_4 \). We have accepted the evaluation of Kerr and Parsonage\(^4\) on the addition reaction, with adjustment of the rate coefficient of the reference reaction, \( k(t-C_4H_2 + t-C_4H_2 \rightarrow C_4H_{10}) = 2.7 \times 10^{-12} (T/300)^{-1.73} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) (see Note C6).

**C6.** 
\( t-C_4H_2 + t-C_4H_2 \). There is good agreement on the room temperature rate coefficient of the combination reaction \( k_c \), as measured by molecular modulation studies. The preferred data are from the evaluation of all the experimental data by Arthur\(^{20}\), which differs slightly from the recommendation of Tsang\(^2\), based on the earlier data of Parkes and Quinn\(^{12}\). The rate coefficient of the disproportionation reaction \( k_d \) has been calculated from the ratio \( k_d/k_c = 2.3 \) at room temperature\(^{20}\).

**C7.** 
\( t-C_4H_2 + t-C_3H_4CHO \). The preferred data are from the study of Birrell and Trotman-Dickenson\(^{21}\), with allowance for the change in the \( k \) of the reference reaction, \( k(t-C_4H_2 + t-C_3H_4 \rightarrow C_4H_{10}) = 2.7 \times 10^{-12} (T/300)^{-1.73} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) (see Note C6). For the reaction \( t-C_4H_2 + t-C_3H_4CHO \rightarrow i-C_4H_{10} + t-C_3H_4CHO \), the data of Birrell and Trotman-Dickenson\(^{21}\) yield the value \( k = 1.9 \times 10^{-11} \exp(-2540/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \), which would appear to be a serious underestimation of the Arrhenius parameters, in relation to data for analogous reactions, \( R + RCHO \rightarrow RH + RCO \). Accordingly, we have calculated the preferred rate equation from the experimental value of \( k \) at 550 K and an assumed value of \( A = 1.0 \times 10^{-14} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \).

**References**

### Table 2. Evaluated rate data for some reactions of allyl radicals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>$k^r$/cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/K</th>
<th>$\pm \Delta \log k$</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + M $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$=C-CH$_2$ + H + M</td>
<td>$k^r = 1.5 \cdot 10^{-17} T^{0.38} \exp(-30050/T) s^{-1}$</td>
<td>800-1500</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + O$_2$ $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$=C-CH$_2$ + HO$_2$</td>
<td>$1.7 \cdot 10^{-17} \exp(-11400/T)$</td>
<td>600-1200</td>
<td>0.3 at 600 rising to</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ CO + products</td>
<td>$7.6 \cdot 10^{-12} \exp(-9450/T)$</td>
<td>600-1200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + H$_2$ $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_6$ + H</td>
<td>$1.8 \cdot 10^{-26} \exp(-9550/T)$</td>
<td>300-1100</td>
<td>0.7 at 300 K reducing to</td>
<td>A4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + CH$_4$ $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + CH$_4$</td>
<td>$6.6 \cdot 10^{-23} \exp(-11670/T)$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>A5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + CH$_4$ $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + CH$_3$</td>
<td>$3.9 \cdot 10^{-22} \exp(-9990/T)$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>0.4 over the range 600 to</td>
<td>A6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + CH$_3$CH$_3$ (a)</td>
<td>$3.9 \cdot 10^{-23} \exp(-9990/T)$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>1000 K rising to 0.7 at other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_7$ + CH$_3$CH$_3$ (b)</td>
<td>$1.3 \cdot 10^{-22} \exp(-8660/T)$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>temperatures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + i-C$_4$H$_9$ $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + (CH$_3$)$_2$CCH$_2$ (a)</td>
<td>$5.9 \cdot 10^{-22} \exp(-9990/T)$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>0.4 over the range 600 to</td>
<td>A7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_7$ + (CH$_3$)$_2$C (b)</td>
<td>$0.7 \cdot 10^{-22} \exp(-7800/T)$</td>
<td>300-1200</td>
<td>1000 K rising to 0.7 at other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + HCHO $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + HCO</td>
<td>$1.2 \cdot 10^{-19} \exp(-9155/T)$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>A8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + C$_2$H$_5$CH$_3$ $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + C$_2$H$_5$CH$_3$</td>
<td>$3.3 \cdot 10^{-18} \exp(-8660/T)$</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>A9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + C$_2$H$_5$ $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + C$_2$H$_5$ (a)</td>
<td>$6.6 \cdot 10^{-23} \exp(-13120/T)$</td>
<td>600-1200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>A10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ c-C$_2$H$_5$ + i-C$_4$H$_9$ (b)</td>
<td>$1.0 \cdot 10^{-13} \exp(-9620/T)$</td>
<td>600-1200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>A11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + 2-C$_3$H$_4$ $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + CH$_3$CH$_2$CHCH$_3$ (a)</td>
<td>$6.6 \cdot 10^{-17} \exp(-8180/T)$</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + CH$_2$C=CHCH$_3$ (b)</td>
<td>$3.3 \cdot 10^{-23} \exp(-12160/T)$</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ CH$_2$CHCH$_2$CH(CH$_3$)CH$_2$ (c)</td>
<td>$k^r = 1.0 \cdot 10^{-16} \exp(-9260/T)$</td>
<td>600-1200</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + H $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ (a)</td>
<td>$(k^r + k_1) = 2.8 \cdot 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.2 at 300 K rising to</td>
<td>A12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + CH$_3$ (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 at 1000 K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + H (c)</td>
<td>$k_1 = 3 \cdot 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>A13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + O $\rightarrow$ H + CH$_2$=CHCHO (a)</td>
<td>$3.0 \cdot 10^{-10}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.5 over the range 300 to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + HCHO (b)</td>
<td>$&lt;3 \cdot 10^{-11}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>600 K and 0.4 over the range 600 to 1000 K.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + OH $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + H$_2$O (a)</td>
<td>$k_1 = 1.0 \cdot 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>A14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ CH$_2$=CHCH$_2$OH (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ CH$_2$ = CHCHO + 2H (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + HO$_2$ $\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + O$_2$ (a)</td>
<td>$4.4 \cdot 10^{-12}$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.3 over the range 600 to</td>
<td>A15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ CO + products (b)</td>
<td>$1.1 \cdot 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>500-900</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ CH$_2$ = CH = C-CH$_2$ (a)</td>
<td>$3.5 \cdot 10^{-13}$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>A16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$CH=CH$_2$ (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + CH$_3$O$_2$ $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$=C-CH$_2$ + CH$_3$O</td>
<td>$k_1 = 1.7 \cdot 10^{-11} T^{0.30} \exp(66/T)$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>A17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + C$_2$H$_5$O $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$=C-CH$_2$ + C$_2$H$_5$O</td>
<td>$2.0 \cdot 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>A18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + C$_2$H$_5$ $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$=C-CH$_2$ + C$_2$H$_5$ (a)</td>
<td>$1.6 \cdot 10^{-12} \exp(66/T)$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + C$_2$H$_5$ (b)</td>
<td>$4.3 \cdot 10^{-11} \exp(66/T)$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ CH$_3$CH$_2$CH=CH$_2$ (c)</td>
<td>$k_1 = 3.3 \cdot 10^{-11} \exp(66/T)$</td>
<td>500-1200</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C$_5$H$_7$ + C$_3$H$_7$ $\rightarrow$ CH$_2$=CHCH$_2$CH=CH$_2$ (a)</td>
<td>$k_1 = 1.7 \cdot 10^{-11} \exp(132/T)$</td>
<td>300-600</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>A19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + CH$_2$=CHCH$_2$ (b)</td>
<td>$k_1 = 2.0 \cdot 10^{-11}$</td>
<td>600-1000</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$ C$_5$H$_8$ + CH$_2$=CH$_2$ (b)</td>
<td>$k_1 = 1.0 \cdot 10^{-11} \exp(132/T)$</td>
<td>300-1000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A1. C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2} + M. Tsang and Walker\textsuperscript{1} obtained the high pressure value \( k^\circ = 40 \pm 10 \text{ s}^{-1} \) at 1080 K from single pulse shock tube studies of 1,7-octadiene decomposition. Combination with low-temperature data on H atom addition to allene to form allyl gave the recommended expression for \( k^\circ \). No other high temperature data are available, but Walker\textsuperscript{2} recommended \( k^\circ = 10^{-46}\exp(-31270/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \), based on thermochemical estimates, which gives \( k^\circ = 27 \pm 1 \text{ s}^{-1} \) at 1080 K in excellent agreement with Tsang's experimental value. Tsang\textsuperscript{2} gives data for fall-off effects in his review.

A2. C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + O\textsubscript{2}. Walker et al.\textsuperscript{4,6} used the decomposition of 4,4-dimethylpent-1-ene in the presence of O\textsubscript{2} and the direct oxidation of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} to study the reactions of allyl radicals with O\textsubscript{2} between 673 and 773 K. Analysis of allene and CO was used to monitor the reactions. All the reactions have a high energy barrier. Rate constants determined as \( k/k^\circ \) where \( k = 1.69 \times 10^{-11}\exp(132/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) for the recombination of allyl radicals. Reactions to give CO probably involve the formation of a cyclic peroxy intermediate, so that alternative pathways may occur outside the temperature range studied. Walker and Stothard\textsuperscript{6} found evidence for a radical branching reaction (C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + O\textsubscript{2} \rightarrow 2 radicals + products) and give \( k = 2.7 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-8720/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \). Formation of allylperoxy radicals will not be important under combustion conditions.

A3. C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + H\textsubscript{2}. This rate constant has not been measured experimentally. We accept Tsang's\textsuperscript{3} recommendation which is based on a thermochemical calculation involving

\[
k = 2.87 \times 10^{-19}T^{2.5} \exp(-1255/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}
\]

for the reverse reaction, which is itself based on the experimental value for \( k(\text{H} + 2-\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CH}_2\text{CHCH}_2\text{H}) \).

A4. C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + CH\textsubscript{4}. No experimental data are available. We accept Tsang's\textsuperscript{3} recommendation which is based on a thermochemical calculation with \( k(\text{CH}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \rightarrow \text{CH}_4 + \text{CH}_2\text{CHCH}_2\text{H}) = 3.7 \times 10^{-23}T^{3.5} \exp(-2860/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \).

A5. C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}. No experimental data are available. We accept Tsang's\textsuperscript{3} recommendation which is based on a thermochemical calculation with \( k(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{CH}_2\text{CHCH}_2\text{H}) = 3.7 \times 10^{-23}T^{3.5} \exp(-3340/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \). This rate constant has not been measured. A simple check supports the validity of the data on allyl + CH\textsubscript{4} and allyl + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}. At 750 K, \( k(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4)/k(\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}_4) = 29 \) compared with \( k(\text{HO}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4)/k(\text{HO}_2 + \text{CH}_4) = 23 \) from Walker's\textsuperscript{5,6} experimental HO\textsubscript{2} data. As the allyl reactions are only about 10 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1} more endothermic than the HO\textsubscript{2} reactions, the allyl ratio should be marginally higher than the HO\textsubscript{2} value as observed.

A6. C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}. No experimental data are available. We accept Tsang's\textsuperscript{3} recommendation for abstraction at a primary position (equal to \( k(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4) \), see A5). For abstraction at the secondary position, Tsang recommends the same A factor (per C—H bond) and a reduction in activation energy of 7 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1}. However, at 750 K, \( k(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{CH}_3\text{CHCH}_3 \rightarrow \text{CH}_2\text{CHCH}_2\text{H})/k(\text{C}_2\text{H}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4) = 1.0 \) compared with the analogous HO\textsubscript{2} reaction ratio = 1.7 which arises\textsuperscript{5,6} from the fact that the allyl reactions are about 10 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1} more endothermic than the equivalent HO\textsubscript{2} reactions. A difference of 11 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1} in the allyl activation energies is therefore recommended giving \( k = 1.3 \times 10^{-27}T^{3.5} \exp(-8660/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) for abstraction by allyl at the secondary C—H positions.

A7. C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + i-C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8}. No experimental data are available. The expression for primary abstraction is the same as for allyl + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} with allowance for path degeneracy (i.e. 3/2(\text{for allyl} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4)). The expression for attack at the tertiary position is derived by comparison with HO\textsubscript{2} data\textsuperscript{9,10} (see A6) and we recommend

\[
k = 0.7 \times 10^{-27}T^{3.5} \exp(-7800/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}.
\]

C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + HCHO. No experimental data are available. Tsang\textsuperscript{3} gives \( k = 2.4 \times 10^{-10}T^{3.5} \exp(-9154/T) \), calculated thermochemically from an estimate of the reverse reaction. In combination with the recommended value for \( k(\text{allyl} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4) \), then \( k/k(\text{allyl} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4) = 84 \) at 770 K compared with \( k(\text{HO}_2 + \text{HCHO})/k(\text{HO}_2 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4) = 29 \) from Walker's HO\textsubscript{2} data\textsuperscript{9,10}. The difference in the ratios is a little larger than expected (see A6) and we recommend a reduction in Tsang's A factor for allyl + HCHO by a factor of 2.

A9. C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + i-C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8}. Log(\( k/k_\circ \)) = -0.55 - 3760/T was obtained by Throssell\textsuperscript{2} from the measurement of propene and but-1-ene in the decomposition of 4-phenylbut-1-ene and hexa-1,5-diene between 850 and 950 K, where reaction (1) is \( \text{CH}_3 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \rightarrow \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \). A value of \( k_\circ = 2.3 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) is used to calculate \( k \), which at 725 K is a factor of 10 higher than the only other experimental value of \( 6.6 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) obtained by Louw\textsuperscript{13} from studies of the decomposition of diallyloxalate, as a source of allyl radicals, in the presence of toluene. We consider the value used for \( k_\circ \) to be slightly high and reduce Throssell's A factor by a factor of 2, leading to the recommended value of \( k \).

Use of this and the recommended data for allyl + HCHO (see A8) gives \( k(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{HCHO})/k(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{CH}_3) = 6 \) at 770 K compared with the analogous HO\textsubscript{2} ratio from Walker's data\textsuperscript{9,10} equal to 10, comparable values being expected from the similar thermochemistry involved (see A5 and A6 above).

C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{2}. There are no experimental data for the addition and abstraction paths. The recommended expression for abstraction is based on \( k(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + \text{C}_2\text{H}_2) \) with an increase of 12 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1} in the activation energy on thermochemical grounds. For the addition path which will be reversed at combustion temperatures, the recommendation is based\textsuperscript{14} on the A factors.
for addition of C₃H₅, n-C₃H₅ and i-C₃H₇ to C₂H₄ (A = 1·10⁻¹¹ cm² molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹) and an increase in the activation energy (E = 30 kJ mol⁻¹) by 50 kJ mol⁻¹, the delocalization energy of allyl radicals. Tsang reports evidence at 1100 K that the decomposition of 4-pentenyl radicals leads to 2.5% conversion to cyclopentene. It is possible, therefore, that addition of allyl to C₂H₄ may lead to cyclopentene through the sequence C₂H₅ + C₂H₄ → 4-pentenyl → cyclopentyl → cyclopentene + H.

A11. C₃H₅ + 2-C₂H₄. No experimental data are available for any path. The recommended value for abstraction at the allyl position is based on k(C₂H₄ + C₂H₅CH₃) with adjustments due to path degeneracy (3 to 6) and to a slight weakening of the C—H bond in 2-C₂H₄ (ca. 6 kJ mol⁻¹). For the alternative abstraction, the recommendation is based on k(C₂H₄ + C₂H₅) with adjustments for path degeneracy (4 to 2) and for the weaker C—H bond (E lower by 12 kJ mol⁻¹). The recommended expression for abstraction is based on kinetic data for allyl + alkene with E increased by 50 kJ mol⁻¹ delocalization energy.

A12. C₃H₅ + H. The only experimental data were obtained by Hanning-Lee and Pilling who used laser flash photolysis of hexa-1,5-diene at 291 K, measuring [H] and [C₃H₅] by resonance fluorescence and absorption spectroscopy, respectively. The rate coefficient showed no significant variation between 100 and 400 Torr. The value is consistent with an estimate by Tsang, who has calculated fall-off values for kₐ(kₐ + k₁). Allera and Shaw estimate kₐ(kₐ + k₁ + k₂) = 0.1, used as the basis of the recommended value of kₑ. Negligible temperature coefficient is expected between 300 and 1000 K.

A13. C₃H₅ + O. Studied directly by Pilling et al. between 300 and 600 K using laser flash photolysis and detection firstly by photo-ionization mass spectrometry and secondly by absorption spectroscopy and resonance fluorescence for C₃H₅ and O, respectively. The mass spectrometry results suggest a slight decrease in k with temperature (2.3·10⁻¹⁰ exp(120/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹), but no such trend is observed from absorption spectroscopy. The only detectable product by mass spectrometry was acrolein suggesting that the major channel is O + C₃H₅ → C₃H₄O + H. In particular, no C₃H₆ or HCHO was observed and k₉ < 3·10⁻¹¹ is recommended.

A14. C₃H₅ + OH. There are no experimental data. Tsang recommends kₑ = 1·10⁻¹¹ for the abstraction process (based on comparable reactions) and (kₐ + k₉) = 2.5·10⁻¹¹ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ for the high pressure limit for the addition channel. Tsang has carried out RRKM calculations for the fall-off effects which are unimportant below about 1200 K.

A15. C₃H₅ + HO₂. There is only one, indirect, study. Measurement of propene and CO yields in the decomposition of 4,4-dimethylpent-1-ene in the presence of O₂ gives k₉/kₓ = 0.38 ± 0.10 between 670 and 750 K, and further studies with added propene gives kₓ [C₂H₅] is determined from the rate of formation of hexa-1,5-diene and [HO₂] from the rate of formation of propene oxide in the reaction HO₂ + C₂H₅ → C₂H₆O + OH (k is accurately known). Small corrections are made for the formation of propene in the molecular decomposition of 4,4-dimethylpent-1-ene. Original values modified first by use of the value of k₉ for allyl recombination recommended in this table and, secondly, (5%) for the formation of CO in the reaction C₂H₅ + O₂. The mechanism of (b) almost certainly involves addition followed by rapid loss of OH and further decomposition to form HCHO + C₂H₅ radicals which react uniquely with O₂ under the conditions used to form CO. Other paths including formation of acrolein may be possible.

A16. C₃H₅ + CH₃. There are no experimental data. Tsang recommends kₑ = 1.69·10⁻¹⁰ exp(66/T) cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ based on use of the cross-combination rule with data for CH₃ radical combination and C₂H₅ recombination (recommended value used). At 1000 K, kₑ = 1.75·10⁻¹¹ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ in satisfactory agreement with 2.3·10⁻¹¹ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ calculated thermochemically by Throssell from the kinetics of but-1-ene homolysis into C₂H₅ and CH₃ radicals. Tsang has carried out RRKM calculations for the fall-off in kₑ. Based on data for the disproportion/combination ratio of methylallyl + CH₃ (= 0.02), kₑ = 3·10⁻¹³ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ is recommended for the disproportionation path.

A17. C₃H₅ + CH₂O₂. There are no experimental data or suggested mechanisms for this reaction. The main path almost certainly involves combination followed by rapid loss of CH₂O radicals to give CH₂=CHCH₂O radicals which will undergo homolysis and react with O₂ to give a variety of products such as CO, HCHO and acrolein. A value of k = 2·10⁻¹⁰ cm³ molecule⁻¹ s⁻¹ is recommended for the overall reaction, based on the specific rate constant for CO formation in the reaction C₂H₅ + HO₂ (see recommendation).

A18. C₃H₅ + C₂H₅. Only disproportionation/combination ratios are available for this reaction. We accept Tsang's recommendations for the various paths and the RRKM calculations for fall-off.

A19. C₃H₅ + C₂H₆. The only direct high pressure study was carried out by Tulloch et al. who used laser flash photolysis coupled with absorption spectroscopy to measure [C₃H₅]. The absorption coefficient was assumed independent of temperature. Mixtures of hexa-1,5-diene (1 Torr) and argon (up to 250 Torr) gave the high pressure limit kₑ. Other studies (see Tsang's) were either indirect or involved low pressure pyrolysis with extensive extrapolation to high pressure. The values obtained by Tulloch et al. show a slight negative temperature coefficient between 300 and 600 K. Above 600 K, there is some evidence of a slight increase in kₑ and in consequence, between 600 and 1000 K in the absence of independent evidence, a temperature independent
value is recommended. Fall-off becomes important in combustion above about 1200 K. James and Kambanis\textsuperscript{21} give $k_0/k_a = 0.008$ between 400 and 460 K, but Tsang and Walker\textsuperscript{4} found a value below 0.005 above 1000 K. A value of $k_b = 1.0 \times 10^{-3} \exp(132/T)$ is recommended.

References

\textsuperscript{1}W. Tsang and J.A. Walker, private communication.