



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *OH Production from the Photolysis of Isoprene-derived Peroxy Radicals: Cross-sections, quantum yields and atmospheric implications*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/109481/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Hansen, RF, Lewis, TR, Graham, L et al. (4 more authors) (2017) OH Production from the Photolysis of Isoprene-derived Peroxy Radicals: Cross-sections, quantum yields and atmospheric implications. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 19 (3). pp. 2332-2345.  
ISSN 1463-9076

<https://doi.org/10.1039/C6CP06718B>

---

© the Owner Societies 2017. This is an author produced version of a paper published in *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# PCCP

Accepted Manuscript

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: R. Hansen, T. R. Lewis, L. Graham, L. K. Whalley, P. Seakins, D. E. Heard and M. Blitz, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2016, DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B.



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the [author guidelines](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the ethical guidelines, outlined in our [author and reviewer resource centre](#), still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

# OH Production from the Photolysis of Isoprene-derived Peroxy Radicals: Cross-sections, quantum yields and atmospheric implications

Robert F. Hansen<sup>1</sup>, Tom R. Lewis<sup>1</sup>, Lee Graham<sup>1</sup>, Lisa K. Whalley<sup>1,2</sup>, Paul W. Seakins<sup>1,2</sup>, Dwayne E. Heard<sup>1,2</sup>, Mark A. Blitz<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Chemistry, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

<sup>2</sup> National Centre for Atmospheric Science, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

## Abstract

In environments with high concentrations of biogenic volatile organic compounds and low concentrations of nitrogen oxides ( $\text{NO}_x = \text{NO} + \text{NO}_2$ ), significant discrepancies have been found between measured and modeled concentrations of hydroxyl radical (OH). The photolysis of peroxy radicals from isoprene ( $\text{HO-Iso-O}_2$ ) in the near ultraviolet represents a potential source of OH in these environments, yet has not been considered in atmospheric models. This paper presents measurements of the absorption cross-sections for OH formation ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ ) from the photolysis of  $\text{HO-Iso-O}_2$  at wavelengths from 310–362.5 nm via direct observation by laser-induced fluorescence of the additional OH produced following laser photolysis of  $\text{HO-Iso-O}_2$ . Values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  for  $\text{HO-Iso-O}_2$  ranged from  $(6.0 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-20}$   $\text{cm}^2 \text{molecule}^{-1}$  at 310 nm to  $(0.5 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-20}$   $\text{cm}^2 \text{molecule}^{-1}$  at 362.5 nm. OH photodissociation yields from  $\text{HO-Iso-O}_2$  photolysis,  $\phi_{\text{OH},\text{RO}_2}$ , were determined via comparison of the measured values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  to the total absorption cross-sections for  $\text{HO-Iso-O}_2$  ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ ), which were obtained using a newly-constructed spectrometer.  $\phi_{\text{OH},\text{RO}_2}$  was determined to be  $0.13 \pm 0.037$  at wavelengths from 310–362.5 nm. To determine the impact of  $\text{HO-Iso-O}_2$  photolysis on atmospheric OH concentrations, a modeling case-study for a high-isoprene, low- $\text{NO}_x$  environment (namely, the 2008 Oxidant and Particle Photochemical Processes above a South-East Asian Tropical Rainforest (OP-3) field campaign, conducted in Borneo) was undertaken using the detailed Master Chemical Mechanism. The model

calculated that the inclusion of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> photolysis in the model had increased the OH View Article Online  
concentration by only 1% on average from 10:00–16:00 local time. Thus, HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>

DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B

photolysis alone is insufficient to resolve the discrepancy seen between measured OH concentrations and those predicted by atmospheric chemistry models in such environments.

## 1. Introduction

Photo-oxidation in the troposphere is a highly complex process and is initiated by short-lived radical species. In the daytime, the dominant radical species is the hydroxyl radical, OH. OH controls the lifetime of the majority of trace gases that are emitted into the atmospheric via anthropogenic or natural processes, for example the greenhouse gas methane. Many of the secondary products produced by atmospheric photo-oxidation of trace gases are harmful to humans and ecosystems. These products include O<sub>3</sub>, NO<sub>2</sub>, inorganic and organic acids, and multifunctional species. Products of lower volatility partition to the aerosol phase, forming secondary organic aerosol, which can also affect climate and human health. Owing to its short lifetime in the atmosphere, typically less than 1 second, OH is an ideal target for numerical models in order to test the accuracy of embedded chemical mechanisms.<sup>1</sup> The steady-state abundance of atmospheric OH is determined by the balance of its chemical production and loss and does not depend on its transport into and out of the volume being measured. There are now many examples of comparisons between modelled and field measured OH, which are listed in the review by Stone et al.<sup>1</sup> There has been relatively good agreement (within model and measurement uncertainties) between modeled and measured OH concentrations in urban environments where ambient mixing ratios of both volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and NO<sub>x</sub> are high.<sup>2–5</sup>

However, models have been less successful in calculating OH concentrations, measured either on the ground or from aircraft, in and above low-NO<sub>x</sub> environments

Published on 12 December 2016. Downloaded by University of Leeds on 12/12/2016 13:13:16.

influenced by biogenic VOCs.<sup>6-13</sup> Models tend to underpredict OH in these environments with the level of discrepancy varying from study to study<sup>14</sup>, and in general increasing significantly with the concentration of isoprene.<sup>10</sup> Isoprene is a compound of particular importance, as it is emitted by many plant species, and with an emission rate of ~570 Tg yr<sup>-1</sup>, isoprene represents the largest single emission of a non-methane VOC worldwide.<sup>15, 16</sup> In tropical rainforests, where ambient mixing ratios of isoprene are high (> 1 ppbv) and ambient mixing ratios of NO<sub>x</sub> are low (< 1 ppbv), models have underpredicted OH by up to a factor of 10.<sup>8, 12, 13</sup> Tropical rainforests are important examples of high-VOC, low-NO<sub>x</sub> environments, as model simulations<sup>17</sup> show that a large fraction of methane can be removed in the lower and free troposphere at tropical latitudes. Enhanced measured-to-modeled OH has also been observed in more anthropogenically influenced environments, such as the Pearl River Delta in China, where there is a biogenic influence from isoprene and ambient mixing ratios of NO<sub>x</sub> are low (~0.2 ppbv) at certain times of the day.<sup>10</sup> Hofzumahaus et al.<sup>7</sup> show that the modeled OH concentrations can agree with the measured OH concentrations when an additional pathway for the recycling of HO<sub>2</sub> to OH is added to the model. The mechanism for this pathway, however, is still unclear.

A potential explanation for the higher measured than modeled OH levels is the presence of an interference in the OH measurements for environments influenced by biogenic emissions, which were first reported by Mao et al. for a laser-induced fluorescence (LIF) instrument<sup>11</sup>, and subsequently by Novelli et al.<sup>18, 19</sup> The source of this artificially-generated OH, which is thought to originate from the decomposition of species within the sampling assembly/fluorescence cell, is still under investigation<sup>18-20</sup>, with the magnitude of the interference from artificially-generated OH likely to vary with instrument design.<sup>1</sup> For the Forschungszentrum Jülich LIF instrument, extensive investigation of potential interferences for the detection of OH did not show any significant interferences for atmospheric

concentrations of reactants during ozonolysis experiments<sup>21</sup>, with a similar conclusion. [View Article Online](#)  
DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B

reached for the Leeds ground-based instrument, providing evidence that unknown sources of OH production exist in some environments.

In recent years, much effort has gone into the identification of potential sources of this missing OH in low-NO<sub>x</sub> environments. Given the dependence of the magnitude of missing OH on isoprene concentrations, it has been suggested that organic peroxy radicals (RO<sub>2</sub>) from isoprene (HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>), which are generated from the reaction of isoprene (C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>8</sub>) with OH in the presence of O<sub>2</sub>,



could be a source of OH.

One potential OH production pathway involves RO<sub>2</sub> reactions that can recycle OH. At low levels of NO<sub>x</sub>, removal of RO<sub>2</sub> by reaction with NO is minimal, and the main RO<sub>2</sub> removal mechanism was previously thought to be reaction with HO<sub>2</sub> to form peroxides. Reactions of RO<sub>2</sub> with HO<sub>2</sub> that directly produce OH have been proposed as a source of OH.<sup>9, 22, 23</sup> For example, the reaction of the acetylperoxy radical (CH<sub>3</sub>C(O)O<sub>2</sub>) with HO<sub>2</sub> has an OH yield of approximately 0.5.<sup>24, 25</sup> Though there is potential for significant OH production through this pathway, it cannot explain the OH in isoprene-rich environments, as the yield of OH for the reaction of isoprene RO<sub>2</sub> with HO<sub>2</sub> has been determined to be less than 0.06.<sup>22</sup> Another suggested pathway consists of consecutive reactions of HO<sub>2</sub> and OH with RO<sub>2</sub> to reform OH and an epoxide.<sup>26</sup> The additional formation of OH, however, is counterbalanced by the loss of OH through reaction with stable products. Therefore, the net OH yield from epoxide formation is small.

Unimolecular reactions of RO<sub>2</sub> comprise a third possible pathway to OH formation from HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>. Peeters and co-workers<sup>27</sup>, using ab initio theoretical methods, have

suggested a mechanism (the Leuven Isoprene Mechanism, LIM0) involving isomerization of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> on a fast timescale via H-atom shifts to form a hydroperoxyaldehyde (HPALD), which photolyzes to produce OH. However, Crounse et al.<sup>28</sup> measured the bulk isomerization rate of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> to HPALD. The value of the bulk isomerization rate to HPALD that these authors calculated from the parameters of Peeters et al.<sup>27</sup> was 50 times less than the measured isomerization rate. In a follow-up study by Wolfe et al.<sup>29</sup>, a similar C<sub>6</sub> HPALD species was synthesized and photolyzed in an atmospheric chamber, and the OH yield was determined indirectly together with the rate of photolysis of the HPALD. A box model combining the results of these two experiments under atmospheric conditions calculated an increase in [OH] between 5 – 16%; this is too small to explain the higher than modelled OH from field campaigns in forested region.<sup>29</sup> Peeters and co-workers<sup>30</sup> subsequently refined several theoretical parameters, such as barrier heights to RO<sub>2</sub> isomerization, and their new upgraded mechanism LIM1 (Leuven Isoprene Mechanism, v. 1) predicted lower rates of isoprene RO<sub>2</sub> isomerizations, which was consistent with a recent study of isoprene oxidation in the SAPHIR chamber at Forschungszentrum Jülich.<sup>31</sup>

One possibility that has not been greatly explored is the production of OH from the photolysis of organic peroxy radicals (RO<sub>2</sub>).



In a modeling study, Frost et al.<sup>32</sup> have shown that the near-infrared photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub> to produce OH via the first excited (A) state is thermodynamically accessible. Results of photochemical box model simulations, based on a range of estimated RO<sub>2</sub> absorption cross-sections in the near-infrared and constrained to realistic ambient conditions, suggest that the near-infrared photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub> has the potential to be a significant source of OH in the troposphere. There is experimental evidence of OH production from the ultraviolet photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub> via the second excited (B) state. Kassner et al.<sup>33</sup> and Hartmann et al.<sup>34</sup>

observed the production of excited-state ( $A^2\Sigma^+$ ) OH from the ultraviolet photolysis of  $\text{CH}_3\text{O}_2$ ,<sup>34</sup> but did not quantify the OH that was produced. There is the possibility that other organic peroxy radicals could photolyze to produce OH. Significant (i.e., greater than  $10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$ ) absorption cross-sections have been measured for some organic peroxy radicals at wavelengths above 300 nm. One of these is the acetylperoxy ( $\text{CH}_3\text{C(O)CH}_2\text{O}_2$ ) radical, which exhibits total absorption cross-sections greater than  $5 \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  above 300 nm.<sup>35, 36</sup> The wavelength region from 300 to 350 nm is of particular importance for  $\text{RO}_2$  photolysis in the troposphere, as solar actinic flux in the troposphere is rapidly increasing in this region.<sup>37</sup> However, few measurements of  $\text{RO}_2$  total absorption cross-sections and photodissociation quantum yields of OH at wavelengths greater than 300 nm have been reported in the literature.

In this study, we investigate the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>, focusing on wavelengths above 300 nm. A tunable dye laser was used to photolyze HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> at wavelengths from 310 to 362.5 nm. The production of OH was observed from the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> at these wavelengths and quantified as absorption cross-sections, weighted to the OH quantum yield. Photodissociation quantum yields of OH were determined through comparison of the absorption cross-section for OH production to the total absorption cross-section for RO<sub>2</sub> measured with a novel multipass absorption apparatus. We investigate the potential impact of OH production from the near-UV photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> on ambient OH concentrations through a modeling study of the OP-3 campaign in Borneo.

## 2. Experimental

### 2.1 RO<sub>2</sub> Photolysis Experiments

The apparatus used for the photolysis experiments is based on the pulsed flash-photolysis/laser-induced fluorescence (PLP-LIF) technique. The design of this apparatus is

similar to one described previously.<sup>38, 39</sup> The main difference is the use of an additional high-energy dye laser to photolyze RO<sub>2</sub> that is typically fired one to two microseconds before the OH probe laser.




Figure 1. Diagram of the apparatus used for the RO<sub>2</sub> photolysis experiments. The H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> source (see text) is indicated by the blue circle. CPM stands for channel photomultiplier.

The apparatus used in this study, shown in Figure 1, consisted of a stainless steel reactor (total volume:  $\sim 1000 \text{ cm}^3$ ) and three lasers: a high-energy initiation laser (grey) to indirectly generate RO<sub>2</sub>, a low-energy probe laser (purple) to probe OH, and a tunable photolysis laser (green) to dissociate the RO<sub>2</sub>. The reactor consisted of a 10-way stainless steel cross with four horizontal axes. Reactants were introduced into the reactor through mass flow controllers (MKS Instruments; Brooks Instrument) and entered the reactor via a stainless steel mixing manifold after passing through a bubbler containing H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. A rotary pump (Edwards RV 5), attached to a port on the reactor, pulled gas through the reactor at a rate of approximately 300 standard  $\text{cm}^3 \text{ min}^{-1}$ . The pressure in the reactor (typically  $\sim 30$  Torr) was monitored by a capacitance manometer (MKS Baratron, 0–1000 Torr) attached at the entrance of the reactor. Laser radiation was directed into the reactor through three of the

horizontal axes; a channel photomultiplier (CPM) was located perpendicular to the plane of the laser axes to detect fluorescence.

$\text{RO}_2$  radicals were produced in the reaction cell via the reaction of a target compound with OH. For this study, isoprene and propane were used. Isoprene (Sigma Aldrich, 99.99%) was used without further purification and diluted with nitrogen (BOC, 99.999%), helium (BOC, commercial purity, 99.999%), or argon (BOC, Pureshield, 99.998%), into a 5-L glass bulb. Propane (Air Liquide, 99.9%) was introduced directly from a cylinder without any further purification or dilution. Nitrogen, argon, or helium were added to the reaction mixture to maintain the pressure in the reaction cell at approximately 30–50 Torr. Oxygen (BOC, 99.999%; concentration:  $0.5\text{--}1 \times 10^{17}$  molecule  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ) was also added to the reaction mixture to form  $\text{RO}_2$  radicals. Hydrogen peroxide ( $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ ) (Sigma-Aldrich, 50% w/w in  $\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) was used as the OH precursor for these experiments.  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  can be lost to the walls of the manifold and tubing. Therefore, it was necessary to introduce  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  by passing the reaction mixture through a bubbler immediately upstream of the reactor (blue circle in Fig. 1) in order to ensure a sufficiently high concentration (on the order of  $10^{15}$  molecule  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ) of  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$ .  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  was photolyzed using 248 nm radiation from the initiation laser (Lambda Physik LPX 200 Excimer laser operating with KrF, 10 Hz pulse repetition frequency (PRF), energy 50–200 mJ  $\text{pulse}^{-1}$   $\text{cm}^{-2}$ , beam dimensions: 25 mm × 10 mm) to generate OH radicals.



The initial concentrations of OH ranged from  $0.1\text{--}1 \times 10^{14}$  radicals  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ .

The target  $\text{RO}_2$  was formed via reaction of the OH with the reagent RH (isoprene or propane) in the presence of  $\text{O}_2$ ,



where the concentration of RH was sufficiently high that the predominant reaction of OH was with RH (Reaction R5) and not with H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (Reaction R7).



OH can also be removed through reaction with itself. However, as concentrations of OH in the reactor are approximately 1000 times less than those of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, the removal of OH through self-reaction will be much slower than reaction R7.

To determine the relative concentrations of the target reagent and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, as well as the timescales for the respective reactions with OH, the pseudo first-order rate constants for the reactions of OH with the chosen reagent and H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> ( $k_5[\text{RH}]$  and  $k_7[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$ , respectively) were measured daily. The values of these rate constants were determined via two-laser flash-photolysis kinetics experiments using only the initiation and probe lasers. In these experiments, the OH loss followed first-order kinetics, as shown by Equation 1,

$$[\text{OH}] = [\text{OH}]_0 \exp(-k_{\text{obs}} t) \quad (1)$$

where  $k_{\text{obs}}$  is the observed pseudo first-order rate constant. Experiments were carried out daily in order to determine that the  $k_{\text{obs}}$  for the target VOC ( $k_5[\text{RH}]$ ) was at least 10 times greater than  $k_{\text{obs}}$  for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> ( $k_7[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]$ ); the timescales of these experiments typically ranged from 50–1000 μs.

Typical values for  $k_{\text{obs}}$  for reaction R5 under the experimental conditions for this study were greater than  $5 \times 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}$  for propane. In the case of isoprene, the measured values of  $k_{\text{obs}}$  for reaction R5 were greater than  $10^5 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . The corresponding values of  $k_{\text{obs}}$  for reaction R7 were typically  $1\text{--}2 \times 10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . Under these conditions, more than 80% of the OH was converted to RO<sub>2</sub> (90% for isoprene), ensuring that HO<sub>2</sub> production in the reaction cell was minimized.

Once RO<sub>2</sub> was formed in the cell, it was lost slowly (with a lifetime on the order of 10–20 ms). The loss of RO<sub>2</sub> is likely the combination of several loss processes, including the

Published on 12 December 2016. Downloaded by University of Leeds on 12/12/2016 13:13:16.  
 diffusive loss of the RO<sub>2</sub> from the reaction volume (Reaction R8), the self-reaction of RO<sub>2</sub><sup>New Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B</sup> (Reaction R9), and the reaction of RO<sub>2</sub> with HO<sub>2</sub> (Reaction R10).



If some RO<sub>2</sub> were lost via diffusion (reaction R8), a solution to reaction R9 would take this into account. It is noted that even if some HO<sub>2</sub> is produced via reaction R7, as well as other processes (e.g., Reaction R9 or isomerization of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>) it will not be an interference in this system. This is because the total absorption cross-sections for HO<sub>2</sub> ( $\sigma_{\text{HO}2}$ ) are not significant above 300 nm<sup>35, 40</sup>; that is,  $\sigma_{\text{HO}2}$  is smaller than  $10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  at 300 nm. Furthermore, no additional OH was observed when the photolysis laser was fired with only H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> present in the reaction cell.

In these experiments, the delay between the initiation and probe lasers was varied using a custom-built digital timing card, operated by software written in-house using the LabVIEW (National Instruments) environment. By varying the delay between the initiation and probe lasers, the time resolved OH decay could be measured. All timings were referenced to t = 0, which coincided with the firing of the initiation laser. To measure the OH generated from photolysis of the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the absence of RO<sub>2</sub> and to account for background signal from the detector, the probe laser was fired 25–50 times at different delays prior to t = 0.

The OH probe laser consisted of a Nd:YAG-pumped (Continuum Precision II) dye laser (Sirah PRSC-DA-24, 10 Hz PRF, energy < 0.1 mJ pulse<sup>-1</sup>, 3 mm beam diameter, DCM Special). The pulse energy of the probe laser was kept low (< 1 mJ pulse<sup>-1</sup>, typically ~ 0.1 mJ pulse<sup>-1</sup>) to minimize additional OH generation from probe-induced photolysis of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. To

excite OH, the dye laser was tuned to be on resonance with the Q<sub>1</sub>(2) rotational line of the A<sup>2</sup>Σ ( $v' = 0$ ) ← X<sup>2</sup>Π ( $v'' = 0$ ) transition of OH at a wavelength of approximately 308 nm.

The resulting fluorescence of OH at 308 nm was detected by the CPM; the output was then integrated and recorded by a digital oscilloscope (LeCroy LT 372) and transmitted to a computer for further analysis. For the two-laser kinetics experiments described above, the gain on the CPM was kept low to avoid saturation at early times following the firing of the initiation laser.

Each measurement of the RO<sub>2</sub> absorption cross-section for OH production ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ ), as shown in Figure 2, consisted of a two-laser experiment (black circles) and a three-laser experiment (blue squares), which were conducted back-to-back. In order to observe the OH signal from RO<sub>2</sub> photolysis, which was typically 10–100 times smaller than that from H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> photolysis, the gain on the CPM was increased. The CPM gain was increased by the same amount for both the two- and three-laser experiments such that both experiments were conducted at the exact same CPM operating conditions. The increased gain led to an overload of the CPM when OH concentrations in the reaction cell were high ( $t < 500 \mu\text{s}$ ). For some experiments where the initiation laser fluence was high ( $\sim 10^{17} \text{ photons cm}^{-2} \text{ pulse}^{-1}$ ), this overload was especially apparent. It is unclear if this overload was simply a result of the high OH concentration, or if it was related to an overload recovery problem of the CPM. If the former explanation were true, it would be possible to account for this overload by subtraction of the 2-laser OH signal from the 3-laser OH signal. However, the effects of the CPM overload were not reproducible, which tends to suggest that there were overload recovery issues with the CPM. For this reason, and to ensure consistency in the analysis, data points from reaction times less than 500 μs were not included in the analysis for the determination of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ . Typical timescales for the two-laser and three-laser experiments were 2–5 ms, though some experiments were performed over timescales of 20 ms.




Figure 2. Example of traces from a two-laser (black circles) and a three-laser (blue squares) experiment at photolysis wavelengths of 320 nm (panel a) and 360 nm (panel b) for HO-Iso- $\text{O}_2$ . The values of  $\text{OH}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}$  and  $\text{OH}_{\text{RO}_2}$  determined from the measured decays are indicated. The fit uses measurements at  $t > 500 \mu\text{s}$ . The vertical dashed line is  $t = 0$ , where the pre-trigger ( $t < 0$ ) points, in which only  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  is present in the reaction volume and able to generate OH, and the post-trigger ( $t > 0$ ) points, in which both  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  and  $\text{RO}_2$  are present and able to generate OH. The red curves indicate extrapolation of the OH signal (for  $t > 500 \mu\text{s}$ )

to  $t = 0$ , as described in the text. Note the break in the scale of the y-axis. In panel a, a portion of a similar two-laser experiment with a timescale of 2 ms is shown as an inset to demonstrate the timescale of removal of OH by isoprene (see text for details).

For the first of the two experiments, (Fig. 2, black circles), only the initiation and probe lasers were fired. For the second experiment, (Fig. 2, blue squares), the dye laser for RO<sub>2</sub> photolysis was typically fired 1–2  $\mu$ s before each firing of the probe laser. The photolysis laser was a Nd:YAG-pumped (Litron LPY 664-10) tunable dye laser (Sirah CSTR-G-24, energy 1–10 mJ pulse<sup>-1</sup>, 10 Hz PRF, 5 mm beam diameter, DCM or pyridine 1) whose output was then doubled by a potassium dihydrogen phosphate (KDP) doubling crystal to generate ultraviolet radiation with wavelengths from 310 – 362.5 nm. This wavelength range was chosen to represent the region where solar actinic flux in the troposphere is rapidly increasing but where there is potentially still significant absorption by RO<sub>2</sub>. Given that the rate of OH loss is the same for OH produced by photolysis of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and RO<sub>2</sub>, variation of the delay between the photolysis and probe lasers should have no impact on the measured value of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ . This has been confirmed experimentally with measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  made at photolysis-probe delays fixed from 1–10  $\mu$ s, which showed no significant dependence of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  on the magnitude of the delay over this timescale.

For the time points prior to  $t = 0$  in the three-laser experiment, the increase in OH signal (relative to the two-laser experiment) represents the OH generated from the photolysis of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> by the photolysis laser (i.e., OH<sub>H2O2</sub>). The increase in OH signal above this baseline after  $t = 0$  represents the smaller amounts of OH produced from the photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub> by the photolysis dye laser (i.e., OH<sub>RO2</sub>). There is the possibility of additional photolysis of the RO<sub>2</sub> from the output of the probe laser. However, the energy of the probe laser (< 1 mJ pulse<sup>-1</sup>, Fig. 1) is so low in these experiments that photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub> by this laser is minimal. Indeed,

analysis of the two-laser traces in Fig. 2 shows that the OH signal effectively decreases to the pre-trigger baseline by  $t = 50 \mu\text{s}$  under typical conditions in this study. The removal of OH via reaction with isoprene can be clearly seen in the inset of Fig. 2a. RO<sub>2</sub> is produced on this timescale; thus, the 2-laser experiment shows that any OH from probe-induced photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub>, once RO<sub>2</sub> is generated, is not important. The data for the inset are taken from an experiment conducted on a shorter timescale, as there are more OH measurements at short times (i.e.,  $t < 50 \mu\text{s}$ ). As mentioned previously, the RO<sub>2</sub> generated via Reactions R5 and R6 is gradually removed through self-reaction and pump-out from the reaction volume; this decay of RO<sub>2</sub> can be seen in the OH signal. The OH signal serves as a proxy for RO<sub>2</sub>, in this case HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>. This proxy behavior is evident at long reaction times ( $t > 0.5 \text{ ms}$ ), as OH is a product of the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>. The relationship between the OH signals from photolysis of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (OH<sub>H2O2</sub>) and RO<sub>2</sub> (OH<sub>RO2</sub>) is given as Equation 2.

$$\frac{\text{OH}_{\text{RO}_2}}{\text{OH}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}} = \frac{[\text{RO}_2]_0 \times [\text{hv}]_\lambda \sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \lambda} \phi_{\text{RO}_2, \lambda}}{[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \times [\text{hv}]_\lambda \sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, \lambda} \phi_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, \lambda}} = \frac{[\text{hv}]_{248} [\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, 248\text{nm}} \phi_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, 248\text{nm}} \times [\text{hv}]_\lambda \sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \lambda} \phi_{\text{RO}_2, \lambda}}{[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2] \times [\text{hv}]_\lambda \sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, \lambda} \phi_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, \lambda}} \quad (2)$$

$$= \frac{[\text{hv}]_{248} \sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, 248} \sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \lambda} \phi_{\text{RO}_2, \lambda}}{\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, \lambda}}$$

It is noted that the initial RO<sub>2</sub> concentration is equal to the initial OH concentration from the photolysis of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> by the initiation laser at  $t = 0$ , assuming no reaction of OH with H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>. The quantity  $[\text{hv}]_{248}$  represents the fluence (in photons cm<sup>-2</sup>) of the 248 nm initiation laser, whereas  $[\text{hv}]_\lambda$  represents the fluence of the photolysis laser at the respective wavelength  $\lambda$ . Note that  $[\text{hv}]_\lambda$  is present in the numerator and denominator of Eq. 2, and therefore cancels out of the expression shown in the top line of Eq. 2. The quantity  $\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, \lambda}$  represents the total absorption cross-section of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> at the wavelength  $\lambda$ , and the quantity  $\phi_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, \lambda}$  represents the OH quantum yield from the photolysis of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> at the wavelength  $\lambda$ . Likewise,  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \lambda}$  and  $\phi_{\text{RO}_2, \lambda}$  represent the total absorption cross-section and OH quantum yield, respectively, from the photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub> at the wavelength  $\lambda$ . Values for  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \lambda}$  were measured in the absorption

experiments described in Section 2.2. To determine values of  $\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}$  for the photolysis wavelengths used for these experiments, the approach described by Kahan et al.<sup>41</sup> was used, which incorporates the  $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  total absorption cross-sections recommended by Sander et al.<sup>42</sup> A full description of the procedure for the determination of values of  $\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2,\lambda}$  for this study is presented in Section S1 of the Supplement, and the values of  $\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}$  used for the determination of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  are presented in Table S1. Following the recommendation of Burkholder et al.<sup>35</sup>,  $\phi_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}$  is assumed to be 2 for wavelengths greater than 230 nm, which means that  $\phi_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2,248}$  is equal to  $\phi_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2,\lambda}$ , which leads the  $\phi_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}$  terms to cancel out in the fractional expression shown in the top line of Eq. 2. Values for  $[\text{hv}]_{248}$  were calculated from measurements of the energy for the initiation laser pulse made with an energy meter (Molelectron JMAX 11). These measurements were normalized to the cross-sectional area of the detector head (approximately 1 cm<sup>2</sup>) and the measured transmission of the excimer beam through the front window to the center of the reaction cell ( $\geq 90\%$ ). Measurements of the initiation laser energy were performed 2–4 times per day. The initiation laser was aligned such that the center of the beam was located in the center of the reaction cell. The photolysis and probe lasers were also aligned to intersect in the center of the photolysis laser beam. From Table 1, the average uncertainty in the measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  is typically 30–40%; this uncertainty is most likely due to the difficulties in aligning the three laser beams rather than inhomogeneities in the initiation laser beam.

The OH produced by the photolysis of the precursor ( $\text{OH}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}$ ) over the range 310–362.5 nm was determined by subtraction of the pre-trigger baseline (i.e. the average of the points with  $t < 0$ ) of the three-laser experiment from that of the two-laser experiment (Fig. 2). The OH from  $\text{RO}_2$  ( $\text{OH}_{\text{RO}_2}$ ) was determined by extrapolation of the OH decay after 500  $\mu\text{s}$  back to  $t = 0$ . The self-reaction of  $\text{RO}_2$  (Reaction R9) was assumed to have a greater impact to  $\text{RO}_2$  loss than physical removal from the reaction volume. The first-order rate of diffusion

of OH under the conditions of this experiment will typically be less than  $50\text{ s}^{-1}$ . A second-order kinetic model (Equation 3), consistent with the self-reaction of RO<sub>2</sub> (Reaction R9) or

[View Article Online](#)  
DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B

the reaction of RO<sub>2</sub> with HO<sub>2</sub> (Reaction R10), was fit to this portion of the OH decay for the extrapolation to t = 0 (red curve in Fig. 2). The value of [OH]<sub>0</sub> is used in Eq. 3 for OH<sub>RO2</sub>.

$$[\text{OH}] = \left( k_{\text{obs}}t + \frac{1}{[\text{OH}]_0} \right)^{-1} \quad (3)$$

As the removal of RO<sub>2</sub> is slow (RO<sub>2</sub> lifetime > 10–20 ms) compared to the initial removal of OH (which is typically completed by 50 μs), the fit used for extrapolation should not make a significant difference in the determination of [OH]<sub>0</sub>. The fact that the extrapolations at 320 nm (Fig. 2a) and 360 nm (Fig. 2b) both capture [OH]<sub>0</sub> suggests that this method of fitting is robust.

In this way, Equation 2 allowed for the determination of the cross-section for RO<sub>2</sub> photolysis to OH without needing to know the concentration of the RO<sub>2</sub> in the reaction volume.

The quantity σ<sub>RO<sub>2</sub>,OH</sub>(λ), which is defined as the product of σ<sub>RO<sub>2</sub></sub>(λ) and φ<sub>RO<sub>2</sub></sub>(λ), provides an absolute measure of the OH production from the photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub> and is the quantity obtained from Eq. 1. Values of σ<sub>RO<sub>2</sub>,OH</sub>(λ) are required for calculating the OH production from RO<sub>2</sub> photolysis in an atmospheric model. Rearrangement of Equation 2 yields Equation 4,

$$\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}(\lambda) = \sigma_{\text{RO}_2}(\lambda)\phi_{\text{OH},\text{RO}_2}(\lambda) = \left( \frac{\text{OH}_{\text{RO}_2}}{\text{OH}_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}} \right) \left( \frac{\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2,\lambda}}{\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2,248\text{nm}}} \right) \left( \frac{1}{[\text{hv}]_{248}} \right) \quad (4)$$

which was used to calculate σ<sub>RO<sub>2</sub>,OH</sub>(λ) from measurements of OH<sub>RO<sub>2</sub></sub> and OH<sub>H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub></sub> over the wavelength range considered in this study.

## 2.2 RO<sub>2</sub> Total Absorption Cross-Section Measurements


Total RO<sub>2</sub> absorption cross-sections ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ ) were measured with a multiplexing

View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B

multipass UV-visible absorption spectrometer incorporating laser flash photolysis. Some details about this apparatus have been provided previously by Lewis et al.<sup>43</sup>, and a complete description will be provided in a future publication (T. R. Lewis, unpublished work). We provide a brief description of the apparatus and the methodology for determination of RO<sub>2</sub> absorption cross-sections here. The spectrometer consists of a 1.5 m cylindrical reactor maintained at a pressure of 50–350 Torr of nitrogen bath gas for these experiments. The output from a continuous broadband laser-driven light source (Energetiq EQ-99X) was multipassed through the volume of the reactor 13 times. This probe beam was aligned to maximize overlap with the 248 nm output from a KrF excimer laser (Lambda Physik Compex), which was directed through the center of the reaction cell. After passing through the reaction cell, the probe beam was directed through an optical fiber into a spectrograph (Horiba CP140, f/2.5, spectral resolution: 1.5 nm) optimized for the wavelength range of 250–850 nm. This setup permitted the simultaneous measurement of absorption at all wavelengths over this wavelength range. The output from the spectrograph was then measured by a CCD sensor consisting of a 64 × 1044-pixel array (Hamamatsu S7030-1006 FFT). The signals from the CCD sensor were recorded at intervals of 1 ms; each retrieval from the CCD comprised a time point. The data from the CCD sensor were then transferred via a hardware interface to a computer, in which the data were then processed using custom software written in the LabVIEW (National Instruments) environment.

For measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ , RO<sub>2</sub> radicals were generated in the multipass spectrometer by the reaction of a target compound with photolytically-generated OH in the presence of O<sub>2</sub>. The target compounds are the same as those used for the measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  (Reactions R4-R6). Before the start of each experiment, the absorbance of the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the reactor was recorded, and from this absorbance measurement, the concentration of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> was determined.

The excimer laser (typical energy: 100–150 mJ pulse<sup>-1</sup>) was fired at a rate of 0.1–0.3 Hz to photolyze H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> (Sigma-Aldrich, 50% w/w in H<sub>2</sub>O), generating OH within the reaction cell (typical OH concentrations: 3–10 × 10<sup>13</sup> radicals cm<sup>-3</sup>). This pulse repetition rate was chosen to allow sufficient processing time for the output spectra and to allow the reactor to be replenished, in order to minimize multiple photolysis of the reaction mixture. The OH then reacts with a target compound in the presence of O<sub>2</sub> (typical concentrations: 2–3 × 10<sup>17</sup> molecules cm<sup>-3</sup>) to produce the desired RO<sub>2</sub> species within < 100 μs, as for the RO<sub>2</sub> photolysis experiments. The absorption of the broadband light by the RO<sub>2</sub> radicals was measured at 1 ms intervals over the 1-second time period following the excimer laser pulse. Baseline measurements of the intensity of the probe light (I<sub>0</sub>) were made before each firing of the excimer laser and consisted of averages of up to 1000 measurements. The custom software processed the CCD sensor data to generate profiles of absorbance as a function of wavelength and time. The traces at each wavelength were extrapolated to determine the absorbance A at t = 0, A<sub>0</sub> (i.e., immediately after firing the excimer laser). The RO<sub>2</sub> concentration was calculated from the OH concentration at t = 0, assuming 1:1 stoichiometry for the reaction of the target compound with OH (Reaction R5). The effective path length (1000 ± 75 cm) of the apparatus was determined experimentally via absorption measurements of NO<sub>2</sub> following the photolysis of a known amount of isopropyl nitrate (i-C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O–NO<sub>2</sub>) with a measured photolysis energy:



The NO<sub>2</sub> absorption cross-sections are well known in the literature<sup>44</sup>, and the NO<sub>2</sub> yield from R11 has been previously estimated to be unity, based on trends for analogous compounds.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>46</sup> The measured fluence [hν]<sub>248</sub> of the 248 nm photolysis laser allows the concentration of NO<sub>2</sub> to be determined via Equation 5:

$$[\text{NO}_2] = [\text{i-C}_3\text{H}_7\text{O} - \text{NO}_2] \sigma_{\text{i-C}_3\text{H}_7\text{O}-\text{NO}_2(248\text{nm})} [\text{h}\nu]_{248} \quad (5)$$

The experimentally measured  $A_0(\lambda)$  of NO<sub>2</sub> generated photolytically via reaction R11 allowed the effective path length l inside the cell to be determined via the Beer-Lambert expression:

$$l = \frac{A_0(\lambda)}{[\text{NO}_2]} \sigma_{\text{NO}_2}(\lambda) \quad (6)$$

The uncertainty on the measurement of l, most of which originates from uncertainty on the photolysis laser fluence [hv]<sub>248</sub> within the reactor, was approximately 14%. The measured absorbance and path length were then used in the Beer-Lambert expression (Eq. 7) to determine  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  for each wavelength:

$$A_0(\lambda) = -\ln\left(\frac{I(\lambda)}{I_0(\lambda)}\right) = \sigma_{\text{RO}_2}(\lambda)[\text{RO}_2]_0 l \quad (7)$$

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Measurements of $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \text{OH}}$

The measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \text{OH}}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> as a function of wavelength are presented in Figure 3 and tabulated in Table 1.




Figure 3. Measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ , at wavelengths from 310–362.5 nm, for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>.

Error bars represent the  $1\sigma$  uncertainty of the datasets at each wavelength for  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ , as described in the text. The estimated upper limit of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  for RO<sub>2</sub> derived from propane, which was only determined at 315 nm, is indicated by the red circle. The dashed line indicates the lower limit of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  that can be measured with this apparatus, as described in the main text.

As shown in Fig. 3, values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> range from  $(6.0 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2 \text{molecule}^{-1}$  at 310 nm to  $(0.50 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2 \text{molecule}^{-1}$  at 362.5 nm. The estimated  $1\sigma$  uncertainty on the measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>, derived from a propagation of uncertainties on the H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> cross-sections (estimated at 15%), fits for extrapolations to obtain OH<sub>RO<sub>2</sub></sub>(10–40%), and measurements of initiation laser energy (10%), is approximately 30–40%.

In contrast to HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>, no significant OH production was seen for RO<sub>2</sub> derived from propane (C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O<sub>2</sub>) at 315 nm. Given the absorption spectrum of C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O<sub>2</sub><sup>47, 48</sup>, in which the total absorption cross-section steadily decreases at wavelengths above 250 nm, a greater likelihood for photolysis, and consequently OH production, would be expected at shorter wavelengths. As no significant OH production was observed from the photolysis at 315 nm, it was assumed that there would be no OH production from the photolysis of propane RO<sub>2</sub> at wavelengths greater than 315 nm. From the noise ( $1\sigma$ ) on the baseline for the three-laser experiments with C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O<sub>2</sub> at 315 nm, an upper limit for  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}$  for C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O<sub>2</sub> of  $1.0 \times 10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  is estimated at this wavelength; this is shown as the red circle on Fig. 3.

The lower limit of  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}$  that can be measured in this system is when OH<sub>RO2</sub> is less than or equal to the standard deviation ( $1\sigma$ ) in OH<sub>H2O2</sub>. This means that the lower limit for  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}$  is dependent on wavelength and at a single wavelength is dependent on the energy of the excimer laser, which varied between 50 – 200 mJ cm<sup>-2</sup> pulse<sup>-1</sup>. There was OH<sub>H2O2</sub> signal present in all experiments, even at the longest wavelength. The quality of the OH data was to some extent dependent on the bath gas used, so that the limit of  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}$  was lower when helium and argon were used as the bath gas. Using typical datasets, we have calculated a lower limit of  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}$  as a function of wavelength; this is indicated by the dashed line in Figure 3. The fact that the value of  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}$  from the photolysis of C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O<sub>2</sub> is at the lower limit means that it is not significant, and could readily be zero.

The values of  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}(\lambda)$  should be independent of the photolysis laser energy, assuming the photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub> is a single-photon process, as  $[hv]_\lambda$  cancels in Eq. 1. To test this independence, measurements of  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}(\lambda)$  were made at various probe laser energies in the range 1–7 mJ pulse<sup>-1</sup>. As shown in Figure S2, the values of  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}(\lambda)$  measured for RO<sub>2</sub> derived from ethylene show no significant variation (within measurement uncertainty) with

photolysis laser energy. Similarly, there appears to be no significant variation of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  with changes in the delay between the photolysis and probe lasers (1–10  $\mu\text{s}$ ) or the PRF of the lasers (1–10 Hz).

Total absorption cross-sections for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ ) were also measured. Values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> at wavelengths from 300 to 400 nm are plotted in Fig. 4 and tabulated in Table 1.




Figure 4. Total absorption cross-sections for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ ; black line) and absorption cross-sections for OH production ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ ; black squares) for wavelengths from 300 to 400 nm. The inset shows an expanded view of measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  for wavelengths from 370–400 nm. Error bars represent  $1\sigma$  precision for  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  and the  $1\sigma$  uncertainty of the data points at each wavelength for  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ .

Table 1. Values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> for each wavelength shown in Fig. 3. [View Article Online](#)  
DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B

Fig. 4. The stated errors for average  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  represent  $1\sigma$  uncertainties for the values at each wavelength; the stated errors for average  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  represent the  $1\sigma$  standard deviation on the calculated values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  at each wavelength.

Wavelength (nm)	Average $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ ( $10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2$ molecule $^{-1}$ )	$\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ ( $10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$ )	Number of measurements used to determine average $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ (N <sub>2</sub> , He, Ar) <sup>a</sup>	$\phi_{\text{OH},\text{RO}_2}$
	Avg $\pm$ SD <sup>b</sup>	Fit <sup>c</sup>		
<b>310</b>	$6.0 \pm 1.62$	$52 \pm 11$	52.2	$0.12 \pm 0.04^{\text{d}}$
<b>315</b>	$4.7 \pm 1.3$	$42 \pm 8.1$	42.2	$0.11 \pm 0.04$
<b>320</b>	$4.5 \pm 1.4$	$33 \pm 6.5$	33.9	$0.13 \pm 0.05$
<b>325</b>	$3.4 \pm 0.98$	$26 \pm 5.0$	27.1	$0.12 \pm 0.04$
<b>330</b>	$2.1 \pm 0.84$	$21 \pm 4.3$	21.4	$0.10 \pm 0.04$
<b>340</b>	$1.2 \pm 0.39$	$13 \pm 2.8$	13.2	$0.088 \pm 0.03$
<b>345</b>	$1.0 \pm 0.33$	$10 \pm 2.0$	10.2	$0.10 \pm 0.04$
<b>350</b>	$1.0 \pm 0.39$	$7.6 \pm 1.4$	7.85	$0.14 \pm 0.06$
<b>355</b>	$1.1 \pm 0.43$	$6.2 \pm 1.3$	5.99	$0.18 \pm 0.08$
<b>357.5</b>	$0.93 \pm 0.37$	$5.36 \pm$ 1.3	5.21	$0.17 \pm 0.08$
<b>360</b>	$0.92 \pm 0.40$	$4.4 \pm 1.0$	4.53	$0.21 \pm 0.1$
<b>362.5</b>	$0.50 \pm 0.15$	$3.7 \pm 1.1$	3.92	$0.13 \pm 0.06$

<sup>a</sup>Values in brackets indicate number of points measured in N<sub>2</sub>, He, and Ar bath gases,

respectively (see text);<sup>b</sup>Average and  $1\sigma$  standard deviation of 8 individual measurements;

<sup>c</sup>Values from fit of a modified Gaussian function (described in Sect. 3.2) to measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ ; <sup>d</sup>Uncertainty propagated from the errors ( $1\sigma$ ) on  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  stated in this table.

One advantage of the multipass absorption apparatus is its ability to measure, with reasonable accuracy, total absorption cross-sections as low as  $10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  at wavelengths greater than 300 nm. These values are 1–2 orders of magnitude lower than absorption cross-section measurements for organic peroxy radicals reported in the literature. The difficulty of reliably measuring peroxy radical total absorption cross-sections less than  $10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  with traditional absorption measurement techniques may explain the lack of cross-section data for most RO<sub>2</sub> radicals at wavelengths greater than 300 nm. The uncertainty on the measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  is expressed by the errors in Table 2. These

represent the standard deviation ( $1\sigma$ ) on the values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  calculated from Eq. 7. It must be View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B

noted that the relative uncertainty on  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  increases at wavelengths above than 350 nm due to the increased influence of the noise on the absorption signal, though the relative uncertainty at 362.5 nm is approximately 20%.

The values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  at 300–310 nm are slightly larger than those reported for other similar alkyl RO<sub>2</sub> species at these wavelengths. The value for  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> is  $(7.8 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  at 300 nm (Fig. 4), while the corresponding values at 300 nm for other RO<sub>2</sub> are  $(4.4 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  for ethylperoxy<sup>49</sup> and  $(6.1 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  for vinylperoxy.<sup>50</sup> The total absorption cross-sections for hydroxy-substituted alkylperoxy radicals reported at 300–310 nm are slightly larger than those for the ethylperoxy and vinylperoxy radicals, with values of  $(7.7 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  for 2-hydroxyethylperoxy<sup>48</sup> and  $(8.0 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  for 2-hydroxy-2-methyl-1-propylperoxy<sup>51</sup> at 300 nm. Given the similarity in functionality between these peroxy radicals and HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>, it would be expected that the magnitude of the total absorption cross-sections would be similar. The lack of absorption cross-section data for most RO<sub>2</sub> species reported above 300 nm makes it difficult to make more definitive comparisons between the results of this work and values reported in the literature. It must also be noted that, as shown in Fig. 4, the values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> are consistently higher than those for  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \text{OH}}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> at all wavelengths considered in this study.

This behavior of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \text{OH}}$  relative to  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  is reflected in the OH photodissocation quantum yield for RO<sub>2</sub> ( $\phi_{\text{OH}, \text{RO}_2}$ ). To determine  $\phi_{\text{OH}, \text{RO}_2}$ , the measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \text{OH}}$  were divided by the measurements of the total absorption cross-section ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ ) of isoprene RO<sub>2</sub> taken at the same wavelengths as the measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \text{OH}}$ , which can be determined by

dividing  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  by  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ , as implied by Equation 4. Values for  $\phi_{\text{OH},\text{RO}_2}$  at wavelengths from 310 to 362.5 nm are plotted in Fig. 5 and tabulated in Table 1.





Figure 5. OH yields from isoprene RO<sub>2</sub> photolysis ( $\phi_{\text{OH},\text{RO}_2}$ ) as a function of wavelength (black squares). Error bars represent the propagation of the  $1\sigma$  uncertainty of the  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  measurements at each wavelength and the  $1\sigma$  standard deviation on the  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$  measurements at each wavelength.


The value of  $\phi_{\text{OH},\text{RO}_2}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> is, on average,  $0.13 \pm 0.037$  at wavelengths from 310 to 362.5 nm (Fig. 5). The OH yield is slightly larger (0.17 to 0.20) at wavelengths from 355 to 360 nm, though this is not significantly different, within uncertainty, to the other values. The finding that the quantum yield is considerably less than unity suggests that other dissociation channels are active in the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>. The limited time (on the

order of 1–10  $\mu\text{s}$ ) between the photolysis and probe pulses suggests that the process which leads to photolytic production of OH must be sufficiently fast to occur on this timescale.

The most likely mechanism for OH formation from the UV photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> is analogous to the mechanism proposed by Hartmann et al.<sup>34</sup> for ground-state OH ( $X^2\Pi$ ) formed from the photolysis of CH<sub>3</sub>O<sub>2</sub> at 248 nm. This mechanism consists of two pathways. The first involves the direct photolysis of the O–O bond of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> to produce an alkoxy radical and an O atom:



The second photolysis channel (Reaction R12) produces OH directly. This channel involves the isomerization of the excited HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> to a QOOH species ( $\cdot\text{Iso}-\text{OOH}$ ), which then decomposes to form HO-Iso-O and ground-state (OH):



Of the two reactions yielding an oxygen atom (Reactions 12a and 12b), only reaction R12a has a potential pathway to OH formation via secondary reactions: O(<sup>1</sup>D) reacts rapidly with VOCs ( $k_{\text{O1D+RH}} > 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ; e.g. Blitz et al.<sup>52</sup>) to produce OH. To test for the occurrence of this process,  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  was measured in three different bath gases: nitrogen, helium (BOC, commercial purity, 99.999%), and argon (BOC, Pureshield, 99.998%). The respective bimolecular rate constants of these gases for reaction with O(<sup>1</sup>D) are  $3.1 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $< 1 \times 10^{-15} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , and  $< 8 \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ .<sup>52-55</sup> Thus, if O(<sup>1</sup>D) were involved in the production of OH, there would be differences in the values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  for each bath gas. These experiments were conducted at 30–50 Torr, resulting in typical concentrations of N<sub>2</sub>, He, Ar of approximately  $10^{18} \text{ molecule cm}^{-3}$ . At this concentration, O(<sup>1</sup>D) has a lifetime ranging from 0.03  $\mu\text{s}$  in nitrogen to 1000  $\mu\text{s}$  in helium.

However, no significant difference, greater than the measurement uncertainty, was observed between values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> measured for all three bath gases, N<sub>2</sub>, He and Ar, at 345 nm. The average values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  at 345 nm ( $\pm 1\sigma$  measurement uncertainty) are  $(7.03 \pm 2.3) \times 10^{-21} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  for N<sub>2</sub>,  $(11.4 \pm 3.7) \times 10^{-21} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  for He, and  $(12.2 \pm 4.0) \times 10^{-21} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ molecule}^{-1}$  for Ar. This independence of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  on bath gas suggests that there is no contribution to OH production from the reaction O(<sup>1</sup>D) with isoprene. This is likely explained by the thermochemistry of Reaction R11a. If the thermochemistry of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> is similar to that of HO<sub>2</sub>, i.e., HO<sub>2</sub> → OH + O(<sup>1</sup>D) has a threshold wavelength of 259 nm<sup>35</sup>, then Reaction R11a would not occur above 300 nm. Reaction R11b, however, is a possible channel above 300 nm (with a threshold wavelength of 438 nm<sup>35</sup>), and therefore the formation of O(<sup>3</sup>P) cannot be ruled out. Photodissociation of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> via Reaction R11b would also yield an alkoxy radical (HO-Iso-O). According to the Master Chemical Mechanism<sup>56</sup>, HO-Iso-O decomposes quickly to form stable products (MVK/MACR, HCHO) and HO<sub>2</sub>, neither of which would be detected by laser-induced fluorescence at 308 nm. Overall, the observed OH from HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> photolysis is consistent with the direct isomerization channel, Reaction R11c.

There is the possibility that the direct isomerization (reaction R12c) produces OH in higher vibrational states (i.e.,  $v > 0$ ) due to the excess energy in the UV photons. While we did not attempt to directly detect OH ( $v = 1$ ), if vibrationally-excited OH played a significant role, it would have been detected indirectly by quenching to the ground state by H<sub>2</sub>O. H<sub>2</sub>O is an efficient quencher of OH ( $v = 1$ ) via reaction R13, with a rate constant<sup>57</sup> of  $1.3 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ .



The H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> solution used in these experiments contains H<sub>2</sub>O, and in the gas-phase, concentrations of H<sub>2</sub>O are much greater than concentrations of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and it is estimated that in the reactor, the concentration of H<sub>2</sub>O is greater than  $1 \times 10^{16} \text{ molecules cm}^{-3}$ . This translates

to an OH ( $v = 1$ ) lifetime of approximately 6–7  $\mu$ s. Therefore, if OH ( $v = 1$ ) were formed in significant amounts, efficient relaxation by H<sub>2</sub>O means that OH ( $v = 1$ ) should have been detected as OH ( $v = 0$ ) as the delay between the dye photolysis and probe lasers was increased. As no change in  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2, \text{OH}}$  was observed as the delay time between the photolysis and probe lasers was increased from 1–10  $\mu$ s, this implies the measured values represent the total amount of OH formed from R12c.

From Figure 5, it can be seen that the OH yield from HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> photolysis is low, approximately 10%, on average, at wavelengths from 310–362.5 nm. In the following section, we consider if this low yield is related to the fact that OH arises from the photolysis of specific isomers of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>. There are six separate isomers<sup>30, 56</sup> of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>, all of which are shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6. Isomers of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>, after Peeters et al.<sup>30</sup> The nomenclature in bold type within parentheses corresponds to that used in the MCM v 3.3.1.<sup>56</sup> Isomers are classified according

to the number of atoms  $\beta$  to the carbon atom bonded to the  $-OO$  group, as described in the main text. These classifications (PRIMARY, SECONDARY, TERTIARY) are shown on the right-hand side of the figure. In addition, the isomers that produce  $HO_2$  and OH are indicated.

Peeters et al.<sup>30</sup> proposed that OH is thermally generated from HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> in the ground electronic state through a further isomerization of the  $\beta$ -HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> isomers that proceeds through a 6-membered transition state, as shown in Fig. 7. This isomerization (also referred to as a 1,5-H shift) produces an hydroperoxy/alkoxy radical, which rapidly decomposes to form OH and stable products, which include formaldehyde and methyl vinyl ketone or methacrolein (depending on the structure of the  $\beta$ -HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> isomer), as shown in Fig. 7. These thermal OH channels only occur for the secondary and tertiary radicals (shown in Fig. 6). The isomerization scheme in Figure 7 is formally similar to the photolysis scheme given in Reaction R11c.




Figure 7. Schematic representation of mechanism proposed by Peeters et al.<sup>27, 30</sup> for the 1,5-shift isomerizations of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> in its ground electronic state. Nomenclature is taken from Peeters et al.<sup>30</sup>

If these thermally-active OH channels remain active OH channels upon excitation with UV light, then by looking at the species populations of the isomers, it can be gauged if the production and photodissociation yield of OH is related to a specific isomer. UV radiation with a wavelength of 320 nm corresponds to an energy of 374 kJ mol<sup>-1</sup>, which is well in excess

of the activation barriers calculated for the 1,5-H shift ( $88\text{--}89 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ ) isomerization channels

[View Article Online](#)  
DOI: 10.1039/C5CP06718B

by Peeters et al.<sup>30</sup> The distribution of the HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> isomers can be predicted with the LIM1 mechanism. Model simulations of the OH-isoprene system in Kintecus<sup>58</sup> using the LIM1 mechanism<sup>30</sup> constrained to the conditions of this study, predict distributions of the HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> isomer classes that are shown as Figure 8.




Figure 8. Time evolution of the primary (black squares), secondary (red circles), and tertiary (blue triangles) classes of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> isomers under typical conditions of this study, as predicted by the LIM1<sup>30</sup> mechanism. Nomenclature in the legend follows that of Peeters et al.<sup>30</sup> Also note the break in the horizontal axis from 0.5 to 4.5 ms.

Over the timescale of our experiments the isomer distribution remain relatively unchanged where the tertiary and secondary HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> are about 70% of the total population. This implies that these isomers do not exclusively produce OH upon UV excitation, hence OH

is only a minor channel and similar to the values given in Figure 5. This conclusion assumes that each isomer is contributing evenly to the absorption spectrum in Figure 4. An examination of the kinetics at different wavelengths, shown in Figure 9, challenges this assumption.




Figure 9. Time-resolved traces of total HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> absorption at wavelengths of 280 nm (black), 300 nm (red), 320 nm (blue), 340 nm (magenta), and 360 nm (green), as measured by the multipass absorption apparatus. Note the logarithmic scale on the y-axis.

From Figure 9, it can be observed at 280 nm that there is fast removal, but at the higher wavelengths ( $\lambda > 300$  nm), the removal rate is progressively slower, such that by 360 nm there is essentially no significant removal of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>. The self-reaction of the tertiary HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> radicals is very slow, with a rate constant (derived by Jenkin et al.<sup>59</sup>) of  $6.9 \times 10^{-14} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . However, the corresponding rate constants for the self-reaction of the primary and secondary HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> radicals are approximately two orders of magnitude faster ( $\sim 4 \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ).<sup>59</sup> Therefore, it is clear that at long wavelengths ( $\lambda > 340$  nm) the absorption spectrum is mainly from the tertiary HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> isomer. More details on the isomer-specific kinetics of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> will be given in a future publication. Overall, an analysis of

RO<sub>2</sub> kinetics as a function of wavelength implies that, at wavelengths greater than 340 nm, all View Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/C9CP06718B

the observed OH is from tertiary HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> photolysis, and the photodissociation quantum yield of this tertiary HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> isomer is approximately 10%.

The possibility also exists that excited HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub><sup>\*</sup>, produced from the interaction of UV photons with HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>, can be directly quenched via collisions to yield ground-state HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>. However, the lack of pressure dependence of  $\sigma_{OH,RO_2}$ , between 30–300 Torr, suggests that the direct quenching of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub><sup>\*</sup> is not competitive with dissociation in this system.

There are many possible reasons to explain the small OH yields from HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> photolysis. The above argument using the Peeters et al.<sup>30</sup> reaction surfaces assumes dissociation on the ground-state when, in fact, the UV light is exciting the RO<sub>2</sub> to its second excited (B) state, from which it may dissociate. Therefore, the mechanism for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> is uncertain. Overall, the production of OH is a minor photodissociation channel for all the isomers, and the major channel is most likely the formation of OH-Iso-O and O(<sup>3</sup>P) (Reaction R11b).

### 3.2 Modeling case study

To assess the impact of the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> on modeled OH concentrations, the measurements of  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}$  were applied to a field case study of the Oxidant and Photochemical Processes above a Southeast Asian tropical rainforest (OP-3) campaign, which took place at Danum Valley in the Sabah province of Malaysian Borneo.<sup>13</sup> The site at which OH radical concentrations were measured for the OP-3 campaign was dominated by isoprene, which exhibited average daytime mixing ratios of 1–5 ppbv.<sup>13</sup> HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> is also the predominant RO<sub>2</sub> species, comprising, at most, approximately half of the total RO<sub>2</sub> concentration for OP-3, as calculated by the model.

For this case study, a zero-dimensional box model was used. This model was based on a subset of the chemistry scheme of the Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM) v. 3.2<sup>60, 61</sup> and constrained to measurements made during the OP-3 campaign. Complete details of the kinetic and photochemical data used in the mechanism are available at the MCM website (<http://mcm.leeds.ac.uk/MCM/home>). Diurnal average measurements of trace gas concentrations (NO, NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, CO, H<sub>2</sub>O, methane, isoprene,  $\alpha$ -pinene, limonene, methacrolein, methyl vinyl ketone, ethane, propene, acetylene and C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>6</sub> alkanes), ambient temperature, ambient pressure and  $j(O^1D)$  were used to constrain the model. A constant H<sub>2</sub> mixing ratio of 520 pptv was assumed. Values of the model constraints were updated at 15-minute intervals. To prevent the buildup of non-constrained, model-generated species, an additional first-order loss with a rate of  $1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$  was introduced in the model; this is equivalent to a deposition velocity of 1 cm s<sup>-1</sup> in a 1000 m boundary layer. Photolysis rates, other than  $j(O^1D)$ , which was measured, were calculated based on a two-stream scattering model<sup>58</sup> that assumes clear-sky conditions. The photolysis rate of RO<sub>2</sub>,  $j(RO_2)$ , was calculated with an actinic flux appropriate for the campaign location and time of year, determined using the TUV model (available at <https://www2.acom.ucar.edu/modeling/tropospheric-ultraviolet-and-visible-tuv-radiation-model>). This actinic flux (I) was then used with measured values of  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}$  to calculate rates for the photolysis for RO<sub>2</sub> yielding OH via Equation 8.

$$j(RO_2) = \int_{\lambda_2}^{\lambda_1} I(\lambda) \sigma_{RO_2}(\lambda) \phi_{OH}(\lambda) d\lambda = \int_{\lambda_2}^{\lambda_1} I(\lambda) \sigma_{RO_2,OH}(\lambda) d\lambda \quad (8)$$

As mentioned previously, the quantity  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}(\lambda)$  is the product of the total RO<sub>2</sub> absorption cross section  $\sigma_{RO_2}(\lambda)$  and the quantum yield for OH  $\phi_{OH,RO_2}(\lambda)$  at the wavelength of interest, and is one of the measured quantities in this work. This makes it possible to use  $\sigma_{RO_2,OH}(\lambda)$  to directly calculate a rate  $j(RO_2)$  for the photolysis of RO<sub>2</sub> yielding OH without the need to know  $\sigma_{RO_2}(\lambda)$  or  $\phi_{OH}(\lambda)$  for the RO<sub>2</sub> species. However, a continuous

representation of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}(\lambda)$  is needed to calculate the photolysis rate for the entirety of the wavelength range of the solar flux, whereas only a subset is measured here. To obtain

[View Article Online](#)  
DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B

$\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}(\lambda)$  as a function of wavelength, a modified Gaussian model, based on a Gram-Charlier series<sup>62</sup> was fit to measurements of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}(\lambda)$ . The functional form of the model fit is given as Equation 9, and values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}(\lambda)$  derived from this fit are included in Table 1.

$$\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}(\lambda) = \frac{4.05 \times 10^{-19}}{(76.8) \times \sqrt{2\pi}} e^{\frac{-z^2}{2}} \left( 1 + 1296.67(z^3 - 3z) + 1330.54(z^4 - 6z^3 + 3) \right); \quad (9)$$

$$z = \frac{\lambda - 45.02}{76.8}$$

Values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}(\lambda)$  determined from Eq. 9 were then multiplied by the average value of  $\phi_{\text{OH},\text{RO}_2}$  from this study to derive values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}(\lambda)$ . This approach takes advantage of the high wavelength resolution of the plot of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}(\lambda)$  as a function of wavelength.

Under cloudy conditions, calculated photolysis rates were scaled to the ratio of observed  $j(\text{O}^1\text{D})$  to clear-sky (i.e., calculated)  $j(\text{O}^1\text{D})$ . The simultaneous rate equations within the mechanism were solved with the FACSIMILE integrator.<sup>63</sup> The model was allowed to run to steady state (~ 7 days) to allow any unmeasured intermediate species, e.g. unmeasured carbonyls and peroxides, to reach steady state conditions. The OH concentrations from the model were then compared to those measured during the OP-3 campaign. Further details on the modeling for OP-3 are provided by Whalley et al.<sup>13</sup>

Two scenarios were considered in this case study. The first scenario was a base case employing chemistry from MCM v. 3.2 and constrained to diurnal averages from the OP-3 campaign, as described above and by Whalley et al.<sup>13</sup> In the second scenario (denoted as OHexp), the production OH from the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> was added to the base case. Diurnal average photolysis rates for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> were approximately  $2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$  over the time period of 10:00–14:00 LT (local time). Results from both model scenarios are presented in Figure 10.




Figure 10. Modeled diurnal average OH concentrations for the base (black) and OHexp (orange) cases, calculated at 15-minute intervals. The inset shows, for clarity, an expanded view of the area contained within the blue box from 11:15–12:30 LT.

The increase in modeled OH concentration from the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> is on average 1.0% above the base case averaged between 10:00–16:00 LT. It is noted that only the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> was considered in this study, and the photolysis of other RO<sub>2</sub> species may also yield OH. However, as mentioned previously, HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> radicals dominated the total daytime concentrations of RO<sub>2</sub> during the OP-3 campaign, accounting for close to half of the total RO<sub>2</sub> predicted around noon local time ( $[\text{HO-Iso-O}_2] = 4.2 \times 10^8$  radicals  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ , total  $[\text{RO}_2] = 1 \times 10^9$  radicals  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ); thus, inclusion of photolysis of other RO<sub>2</sub> species in the model will likely only result in a modest change in [OH] and will not resolve the discrepancy between modelled and observed OH in this environment.

#### 4. Conclusions

Production of OH has been observed from the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> in the near ultraviolet at wavelengths from 310–362.5 nm. Production of OH from the photolysis C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>7</sub>O<sub>2</sub>

[View Article Online](#)  
DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B

could not be observed at 315 nm. The total absorption cross-sections ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ ) and cross-sections for OH production ( $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$ ) for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> are reported for this wavelength range. Values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> range from  $6.03 - 0.50 \times 10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2$  at wavelengths from 310–362.5 nm, as compared to  $74 - 5.3 \times 10^{-20} \text{ cm}^2$  for the corresponding  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ . OH yields from the photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub>, determined from comparison of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  and  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2}$ , range from 0.08 to 0.15, and are, on average, 0.095 for wavelengths from 310–362.5 nm. It is most likely that O(<sup>3</sup>P) + HO-Iso-O is the major channel, as the measured values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  are independent of bath gas, ruling out the corresponding O(<sup>1</sup>D) channel. Atmospheric box model simulations using the values of  $\sigma_{\text{RO}_2,\text{OH}}$  for HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> measured in this study have shown that near-UV photolysis of HO-Iso-O<sub>2</sub> is a minor source, 1%, of OH under the ambient conditions encountered during the 2008 OP-3 campaign in Borneo. This increase is far less than that necessary (~ 500–1000%) to match the OH measurements from the OP-3 campaign and is therefore insufficient to explain the ambient OH concentrations measured during this campaign.

## Acknowledgements

This work was funded by a grant from the Natural Environment Research Council (NERC, grant NE/K005820/1), and support is also acknowledged from the National Centre for Atmospheric Science, which is funded by NERC.

## References

1. D. Stone, L. K. Whalley and D. E. Heard, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2012, **41**, 6348–6404.
2. D. E. Heard, L. J. Carpenter, D. J. Creasey, J. R. Hopkins, J. D. Lee, A. C. Lewis, M. J. Pilling, P. W. Seakins, N. Carslaw and K. M. Emmerson, Geophys. Res. Lett., 2004, **31**.

3. Y. Kanaya, R. Cao, S. Kato, Y. Miyakawa, Y. Kajii, H. Tanimoto, Y. Yokouchi, M. Mochida, K. Kawamura and H. Akimoto, *J. Geophys. Res. [Atmos.]*, 2007, **112**, D11308.
4. D. Mihelcic, F. Holland, A. Hofzumahaus, L. Hoppe, S. Konrad, P. Müsgen, H.-W. Pätz, H.-J. Schäfer, T. Schmitz, A. Volz-Thomas, K. Bächmann, S. Schlomski, U. Platt, A. Geyer, B. Aliche and G. K. Moortgat, *J. Geophys. Res. [Atmos.]*, 2003, **108**, 8254.
5. T. R. Shirley, W. H. Brune, X. Ren, J. Mao, R. Lesher, B. Cardenas, R. Volkamer, L. T. Molina, M. J. Molina, B. Lamb, E. Velasco, T. Jobson and M. Alexander, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2006, **6**, 2753-2765.
6. N. Carslaw, D. J. Creasey, D. Harrison, D. E. Heard, M. C. Hunter, P. J. Jacobs, M. E. Jenkin, J. D. Lee, A. C. Lewis, M. J. Pilling, S. M. Saunders and P. W. Seakins, *Atmos. Environ.*, 2001, **35**, 4725-4737.
7. A. Hofzumahaus, F. Rohrer, K. Lu, B. Bohn, T. Brauers, C.-C. Chang, H. Fuchs, F. Holland, K. Kita, Y. Kondo, X. Li, S. Lou, M. Shao, L. Zeng, A. Wahner and Y. Zhang, *Science*, 2009, **324**, 1702-1704.
8. D. Kubistin, H. Harder, M. Martinez, M. Rudolf, R. Sander, H. Bozem, G. Eerdeken, H. Fischer, C. Gurk, T. Klüpfel, R. Königstedt, U. Parchatka, C. L. Schiller, A. Stickler, D. Taraborrelli, J. Williams and J. Lelieveld, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **10**, 9705-9728.
9. J. Lelieveld, T. M. Butler, J. N. Crowley, T. J. Dillon, H. Fischer, L. Ganzeveld, H. Harder, M. G. Lawrence, M. Martinez, D. Taraborrelli and J. Williams, *Nature*, 2008, **452**, 737-740.
10. K. D. Lu, F. Rohrer, F. Holland, H. Fuchs, B. Bohn, T. Brauers, C. C. Chang, R. Haeseler, M. Hu, K. Kita, Y. Kondo, X. Li, S. R. Lou, S. Nehr, M. Shao, L. M. Zeng, A. Wahner, Y. H. Zhang and A. Hofzumahaus, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 2012, **12**, 1541-1569.
11. J. Mao, X. Ren, L. Zhang, D. M. Van Duin, R. C. Cohen, J.-H. Park, A. H. Goldstein, F. Paulot, M. R. Beaver, J. D. Crouse, P. O. Wennberg, J. P. DiGangi, S. B. Henry, F. N. Keutsch, C. Park, G. W. Schade, G. M. Wolfe, J. A. Thornton and W. H. Brune, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2012, **12**, 8009-8020.
12. D. Stone, M. J. Evans, P. M. Edwards, R. Commane, T. Ingham, A. R. Rickard, D. M. Brookes, J. Hopkins, R. J. Leigh, A. C. Lewis, P. S. Monks, D. Oram, C. E. Reeves, D. Stewart and D. E. Heard, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **11**, 6749-6771.
13. L. K. Whalley, P. M. Edwards, K. L. Furneaux, A. Goddard, T. Ingham, M. J. Evans, D. Stone, J. R. Hopkins, C. E. Jones, A. Karunaharan, J. D. Lee, A. C. Lewis, P. S. Monks, S. J. Moller and D. E. Heard, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **11**, 7223-7233.
14. F. Rohrer, K. Lu, A. Hofzumahaus, B. Bohn, T. Brauers, C.-C. Chang, H. Fuchs, R. Häeseler, F. Holland, M. Hu, K. Kita, Y. Kondo, X. Li, S. Lou, A. Oebel, M. Shao, L. Zeng, T. Zhu, Y. Zhang and A. Wahner, *Nat. Geosci.*, 2014, **7**, 559-563.
15. A. Guenther, C. N. Hewitt, D. Erickson, R. Fall, C. Geron, T. Graedel, P. Harley, L. Klinger, M. Lerdau, W. A. McKay, T. Pierce, B. Scholes, R. Steinbrecher, R. Tallamraju, J. Taylor and P. Zimmerman, *J. Geophys. Res. [Atmos.]*, 1995, **100**, 8873-8892.
16. A. Guenther, T. Karl, P. Harley, C. Wiedinmeyer, P. I. Palmer and C. Geron, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2006, **6**, 3181-3210.
17. W. J. Bloss, M. J. Evans, J. D. Lee, R. Sommariva, D. E. Heard and M. J. Pilling, *Faraday Discuss.*, 2005, **130**, 425-436.

New Article Online  
DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B

- Published on 12 December 2016. Downloaded by University of Leeds on 12/12/2016 13:13:16.
18. A. Novelli, K. Hens, C. Tatum Ernest, D. Kubistin, E. Regelin, T. Elste, C. Plass-Dülmer, M. Martinez, J. Lelieveld and H. Harder, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 2014, **7**, 3413-3430. [View Article Online](#) DOI: 10.1039/C6CP06718B
19. A. Novelli, K. Hens, C. Tatum Ernest, M. Martinez, A. C. Nölscher, V. Sinha, P. Paasonen, T. Petäjä, M. Sipilä, T. Elste, C. Plass-Dülmer, G. J. Phillips, D. Kubistin, J. Williams, L. Vereecken, J. Lelieveld and H. Harder, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 2016, DOI: 10.5194/acp-2016-919.
20. A. Novelli, L. Vereecken, J. Lelieveld and H. Harder, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2014, **16**, 19941-19951.
21. H. Fuchs, Z. Tan, A. Hofzumahaus, S. Broch, H.-P. Dorn, F. Holland, C. Künstler, S. Gomm, F. Rohrer, S. Schrade, R. Tillman and A. Wahner, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 2016, **9**, 1431-1447.
22. T. J. Dillon and J. N. Crowley, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2008, **8**, 4877-4889.
23. J. J. Orlando and G. S. Tyndall, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2012, **41**, 6294-6317.
24. C. B. M. Groß, T. J. Dillon, G. Schuster, J. Lelieveld and J. N. Crowley, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2014, **118**, 974-985.
25. F. A. F. Winiberg, T. J. Dillon, S. C. Orr, C. B. M. Groß, I. Bejan, C. A. Brumby, M. J. Evans, S. C. Smith, D. E. Heard and P. W. Seakins, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2016, **16**, 4023-4042.
26. F. Paulot, J. D. Crounse, H. G. Kjaergaard, A. Kürten, J. M. St. Clair, J. H. Seinfeld and P. O. Wennberg, *Science*, 2009, **325**, 730-733.
27. J. Peeters, T. L. Nguyen and L. Vereecken, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2009, **11**, 5935-5939.
28. J. D. Crounse, F. Paulot, H. G. Kjaergaard and P. O. Wennberg, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **13**, 13607-13613.
29. G. M. Wolfe, J. D. Crounse, J. D. Parrish, J. M. St. Clair, M. R. Beaver, F. Paulot, T. P. Yoon, P. O. Wennberg and F. N. Keutsch, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*, 2012, **14**, 7276-7286.
30. J. Peeters, J.-F. Müller, T. Stavrakou and V. S. Nguyen, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2014, **118**, 8625-8643.
31. H. Fuchs, A. Hofzumahaus, F. Rohrer, B. Bohn, T. Brauers, H.-P. Dorn, R. Haeseler, F. Holland, M. Kaminski, X. Li, K. Lu, S. Nehr, R. Tillman, R. Wegener and A. Wahner, *Nat. Geosci.*, 2013, **6**, 1023-1026.
32. G. J. Frost, G. B. Ellison and V. Vaida, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 1999, **103**, 10169-10178.
33. C. Kassner, P. Heinrich, F. Stuhl, S. Couris and S. Haritakis, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 1993, **208**, 27-31.
34. D. Hartmann, J. Karthäuser and R. Zellner, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1990, **94**, 2963-2966.
35. J. B. Burkholder, S. P. Sander, J. Abbatt, J. R. Barker, R. E. Huie, C. E. Kolb, M. J. Kurylo, V. L. Orkin, D. M. Wilmouth and P. H. Wine, *Chemical Kinetics and Photochemical Data for Use in Atmospheric Studies, Evaluation No. 18*, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, CA, 2015.
36. R. A. Cox, J. Munk, O. J. Nielsen, P. Pagsberg and E. Ratajczak, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 1990, **173**, 206-210.
37. W. B. DeMore, S. P. Sander, D. M. Golden, R. F. Hampson, M. J. Kurylo, C. J. Howard, A. R. Ravishankara, C. E. Kolb and M. J. Molina, *Chemical Kinetics and Photochemical Data for Use in Stratospheric Modeling, Evaluation Number 12*, Report JPL Publication 97-4, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, 1997.
38. L. Onel, M. A. Blitz and P. W. Seakins, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, 2012, **3**, 853-856.

39. L. Onel, L. Thonger, M. A. Blitz, P. W. Seakins, A. J. C. Bunkan, M. Solimannejad and C. J. Nielsen, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2013, **117**, 10736-10745.
40. G. S. Tyndall, R. A. Cox, C. Granier, R. Lesclaux, G. K. Moortgat, M. J. Pilling, A. R. Ravishankara and T. J. Wallington, *J. Geophys. Res. [Atmos.]*, 2001, **106**, 12157-12182.
41. T. F. Kahan, R. A. Washenfelder, V. Vaida and S. S. Brown, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2012, **116**, 5941-5947.
42. S. P. Sander, J. Abbatt, J. B. Barker, J. B. Burkholder, R. R. Freidl, D. M. Golden, R. E. Huie, C. E. Kolb, M. J. Kurylo, G. K. Moortgat, V. L. Orkin and P. H. Wine, Chemical Kinetics and Photochemical Data for Use in Atmospheric Studies, Evaluation No. 17, JPL Publication 10-6, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, CA, 2011.
43. T. R. Lewis, M. A. Blitz, D. E. Heard and P. W. Seakins, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, **17**, 4859-4863.
44. A. C. Vandaele, C. Hermans, P. C. Simon, M. Carleer, R. Colin, S. Fally, M. F. Mérienne, A. Jenouvrier and B. Coquart, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer*, 1998, **59**, 171-184.
45. R. Atkinson, D. L. Baulch, R. A. Cox, J. N. Crowley, R. F. Hampson, R. G. Hynes, M. E. Jenkin, M. J. Rossi and J. Troe, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2006, **6**, 3625-4055.
46. W. T. Luke, R. R. Dickerson and L. J. Nunnermacker, *J. Geophys. Res. [Atmos.]*, 1989, **94**, 14905-14921.
47. H. Adachi and N. Basco, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 1982, **14**, 1125-1137.
48. P. D. Lightfoot, R. A. Cox, J. N. Crowley, M. Destriau, G. D. Hayman, M. E. Jenkin, G. K. Moortgat and F. Zabel, *Atmos. Environ.*, 1992, **26A**, 1805-1961.
49. M. M. Maricq and T. J. Wallington, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1992, **96**, 986-992.
50. A. Fahr, A. H. Laufer, M. Krauss and R. Osman, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 1997, **101**, 4879-4886.
51. S. Langer, E. Ljungström, J. Sehested and O. J. Nielsen, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 1994, **226**, 165-170.
52. M. A. Blitz, T. J. Dillon, D. E. Heard, M. J. Pilling and I. D. Trought, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **6**, 2162-2171.
53. E. J. Dunlea and A. R. Ravishankara, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **6**, 2152-2161.
54. A. R. Ravishankara, E. J. Dunlea, M. A. Blitz, T. J. Dillon, D. E. Heard, M. J. Pilling, R. S. Streckowski, J. M. Nicovich and P. H. Wine, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 2002, **29**.
55. J. Shi and J. R. Barker, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 1990, **22**, 1283-1301.
56. M. E. Jenkin, J. C. Young and A. R. Rickard, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 2015, **15**, 9709-9766.
57. G. A. Raiche, J. B. Jeffries, K. J. Rensberger and D. R. Crosley, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1990, **92**, 7258-7263.
58. J. C. Ianni, KINTECUS, Windows Version 2.80, 2002, <http://www.kintecus.com>.
59. M. E. Jenkin, A. A. Boyd and R. Lesclaux, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 1998, **29**, 267-298.
60. M. E. Jenkin, S. M. Saunders and M. J. Pilling, *Atmos. Environ.*, 1997, **31**, 81-104.
61. S. M. Saunders, M. E. Jenkin, R. G. Derwent and M. J. Pilling, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2003, **3**, 161-180.
62. V. B. Di Marco and G. G. Bombi, *J. Chromatogr. A*, 2001, **931**, 1-30.
63. A. R. Curtis and W. P. Sweetenham, FACSIMILE release H user's manual. AERE Report R11771 (HMSO), London, 1987.