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Abstract

The reaction \( \text{O}(^3\Pi) + \text{N}_2\text{O} \) is important to models of \( \text{NO}_x \) pollutant and propellant chemistry and to the understanding of the thermal decomposition of \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \), which has historically played a key role in the development of unimolecular reaction theory. The reaction has two important product channels: \( \text{O} + \text{N}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{NO} \) (\( \Delta H_0 = -36 \) kcal/mol) (R1); \( \text{O} + \text{N}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{O}_2 + \text{N}_2 \) (\( \Delta H_0 = -79 \) kcal/mol) (R2). Rate coefficients of these reactions have been the subject of several reviews. However, clear reasons why many of the evaluated, nonretained data differ from recommendations have not previously been known. There has been a great deal of controversy over the rate coefficients, particularly for reaction R2. Here, the relevant data are critically evaluated using detailed chemical modeling as an important tool. The results explain many of the discrepancies. Some of the data of central importance in earlier evaluations are shown to be incorrect. Additionally, some important features of the global behavior of the mixtures studied, which had previously not been understood, are explained, and the possible effects of hypothetical \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) contamination on \( \text{N}_2\text{O} \) shock tube studies were quantitatively investigated. It is shown that the bulk of the rate coefficient results remaining after the evaluations can be combined with the intermediate temperature results for \( k_{\text{tot}} = k_1 + k_2 \) from FGFAM (Fontijn, A.; Goumri, A.; Fernandez, A.; Anderson, W. R.; Meagher, N. E., \textit{J. Phys. Chem.}, preceding paper in this issue) to obtain fitted recommendations: \( k_1 = 1.52 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-13 \, 930/T) \) cm\(^3\) molecule\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\) (1370–4080 K); \( k_2 = 6.13 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-8,020/T) \) cm\(^3\) molecule\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\) (1075–3340 K). Until recently, it was believed rate coefficients of the two product channels were approximately equal over a very wide temperature range. In contrast, the present study has led to the conclusion that reaction R2 dominates below, and reaction R1 above, 1840 K.
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The reaction O(3P) + N2O is important to models of NOx, pollutant and propellant chemistry and to the understanding of the thermal decomposition of N2O, which has historically played a key role in the development of unimolecular reaction theory. The reaction has two important product channels: O + N2O → NO + NO (ΔH° = −36 kcal/mol) (R1); O + N2O → O2 + N2 (ΔH° = −79 kcal/mol) (R2). Rate coefficients of these reactions have been the subject of several reviews. However, clear reasons why many of the evaluated, unretained data differ from recommendations have not previously been known. There has been a great deal of controversy over the rate coefficients, particularly for reaction R2. Here, the relevant data are critically evaluated using detailed chemical modeling as an important tool. The results explain many of the discrepancies. Some of the data of central importance in earlier evaluations are shown to be incorrect. Additionally, some important features of the global behavior of the mixtures studied, which had previously not been understood, are explained, and the possible effects of hypothetical H2O contamination on N2O shock tube studies was quantitatively investigated. It is shown that the bulk of the rate coefficient results remaining after the evaluations can be combined with the intermediate temperature results for kret = k1 + k2 from FGFAM (Fontijn, A.; Gommi, A.; Fernandez, A.; Anderson, W. R.; Meagher, N. E. J. Phys. Chem., preceding paper in this issue) to obtain fitted recommendations: k1 = 1.52 × 10−10 exp(−13 930/T) cm3 molecule−1 s−1 (1370–4080 K); k2 = 6.13 × 10−15 exp(−8 020/T) cm3 molecule−1 s−1 (1075–3340 K). Until recently, it was believed rate coefficients of the two product channels were approximately equal over a very wide temperature range. In contrast, the present study has led to the conclusion that reaction R2 dominates below, and reaction R1 above, 1840 K.

I. Introduction

The thermal decomposition and reactions of N2O have been the subject of much study because of their importance in propellant and NOx pollutant chemistry. The possibility of using the unimolecular reaction of N2O as a source of O atoms for kinetics studies or as a test case for unimolecular reaction theories has also heightened interest in the reactions of N2O. Both the thermal decomposition and combustion of N2O depend heavily on its reaction with O atoms. The reaction is the subject of this two-part series of papers. Reasons for interest in this reaction and relevant references are presented in more detail in the introduction of the first paper in this series (FGFAM; preceding paper in this issue).1 In FGFAM, the first measurements of the total rate coefficients at intermediate temperatures (~1100 K) are presented. In the present paper, the voluminous literature on the reaction is critically evaluated, the data are interpreted in terms of the product channels, and rate coefficient expressions obtained from the selected data are presented.

The reaction of N2O with O atoms has two important product channels:

\[ \text{O} + \text{N}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{NO} + \text{NO} \quad \Delta H^\circ = -36 \text{ kcal/mol (R1)} \]

\[ \text{O} + \text{N}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{O}_2 + \text{N}_2 \quad \Delta H^\circ = -79 \text{ kcal/mol (R2)} \]

These have been the subject of several reviews [e.g., ref 2 (BDH73), ref 3 (HS95), ref 4 (TH91), and ref 5]. Recommendations of the reviews are discussed in more detail in the Introduction of FGFAM. Briefly, early works led to a conclusion in the first review, BDH73, that the two product channels have nearly equal rate coefficients with activation energies of about 28 kcal/mol. However, a recent shock tube study5 (DDCH92) has created some controversy. Although the authors of DDCH92 suggest no major changes are needed for k1, they conclude the k2 expression is very different than previously thought. In particular, they conclude that although the rate coefficients for the two channels have nearly the same magnitude at ~2000 K, the Ea of k2 is much smaller than previously thought; that is, k2 was observed to be considerably smaller than k1 above ~2000 K and larger than k1 below ~2000 K. In addition to this discrepancy, results in the literature for the rate coefficients exhibit a wide spread of values. Also, modeling studies, reported herein, have shown that some of the results on which the authors of BDH73 placed heavy reliance for k1 are invalid. The BDH73 k1 expression has been used, either directly or indirectly, as part of the data fitted in later critical evaluations to obtain recommendations. For these reasons, it was decided that a thorough reassessment of the relevant literature was needed.

In the present work, detailed chemical computations were made to assess the quality of results in the prior studies. The techniques used, assumed chemical mechanisms, and criteria for acceptance or rejection of a given result are discussed in section II. In section III, evaluations of the literature data are presented. Finally in section IV, fitting of the retained data and discussion of the results are presented. The major finding is that the authors of DDCH92 were essentially correct in suggesting that k2 is smaller above ~2000 K and larger below...
~2000 K than previously believed. Combination of the retained data from the literature with the intermediate temperature data for $k_{\text{ext}} = k_1 + k_2$ from FGFAM leads to recommended expressions for both $k_1(T)$ and $k_2(T)$.

II. Computations and Assessment Procedures

II.a. Methods and Mechanism. Simulations of experimental data were performed using the time-dependent homogeneous reactor code SENKIN\(^7\) (version 3.0) and one-dimensional premixed laminar flame code PREMIX\(^8\) (version 2.55) from Sandia National Laboratories. These codes utilize the CHEMKIN-II mechanism interpreter (version 3.6) and library (version 4.9) of chemistry-oriented subroutines.\(^9\) The CHEMKIN-II code was modified at the U.S. Army Research Laboratory (ARL) to permit the use of the falloff forms for pressure-dependent rate coefficients from the critical review of TH91. First-order sensitivities of species concentrations and, if computed, temperature to assumed rate constants $A$ factors are obtained as an output of SENKIN and PREMIX. A postprocessor code,\(^10\) written at ARL, was essential for computing elementary reaction rates, logarithmically normalizing the sensitivities to maximum mole fractions (see, e.g., ref 11), investigating important global chemical effects such as steady-state conditions for species and partial equilibrium for elementary reaction steps, and sorting this information.

SENKIN was used to model the shock tube, static reactor, and flow reactor experiments. Most of the static reactor and flow reactor studies utilized conditions that allow employment of SENKIN's simplest problem type, constant temperature and pressure. Some of the shock experiments used high reactant concentrations that require consideration of heat released during the reaction raising the temperature. For these, either the constant-pressure, adiabatic or constant-volume, adiabatic problem types could be used; it was typically found that the difference in results for either of these was not large. PREMIX was utilized to model the flame experiments. The thermal diffusion effect was included, and the multicomponent gas transport option was chosen, resulting in the highest level of transport theory allowed by the code. The user may choose to have CHEMKIN-based codes automatically account for reverse reactions by using thermodynamic data to compute reverse kinetic parameters. This feature was always used. Thermodynamic and transport property data were obtained from the respective Sandia databases,\(^12\)-\(^13\) except that some updates to the thermodynamics database from recent works were utilized.\(^14\),\(^15\) Of particular importance is the use of thermodynamic data of McBride et al.\(^15\),\(^16\) for NO. The heat of formation recommended is 0.2 kcal/mol larger than in refs 12 and 17. Though at first glance a difference this small appears trivial, the difference in reversed rate coefficients for reaction R1 is 30% at 1000 K because NO appears as a product twice. These data were also used for reversing rate coefficients for reaction R1 from the nitric oxide studies prior to including them in fits (−R indicates the reverse of reaction R).

The mechanism used for modeling the majority of the experimental data is presented in Table 1. The first 18 of the 23 reactions in this mechanism are the subset of reactions of N- and O-containing species from the detailed mechanism used in modeling propellant dark zone chemistry, described further in FGFAM, which has been developed at ARL.\(^18\) The last five reactions, which are insignificant for dark zone modeling, were added for completeness. None of reactions R16–R23 are significant for any of the conditions encountered in the present study; however, note that rate coefficient expressions for reactions R16–R18 and R21–R23 are subject to considerable error. $k_1$ and, especially, $k_2$ were varied for testing purposes; for example, both values suggested in HS85 and preliminary values close to the final recommendations of the present study were tried, especially if $k_2$ was sensitive. (Situation where $k_2$ was found to be sensitive vary were curiously seldom encountered for readily measured quantities; this is one of the main difficulties in determining $k_2$ accurately.) A much larger version of the mechanism, discussed in more detail in FGFAM, was used for testing the possible effects of H$_2$O contamination for both shock tube and HTP reactor experiments, and for modeling experiments utilizing H$_2$/N$_2$/O mixtures. This mechanism is too extensive to present in its entirety, but rate coefficients for some of the key reactions encountered are given in Table 2 of FGFAM. A few other important reactions will be mentioned as needed.

II.b. Evaluation Criteria. In evaluating the earlier works, several factors that could result in systematic errors were thoroughly investigated. First, the mechanism used by the original authors in analyzing their experimental data was examined. Evaluations were conducted to verify that the mechanisms used included all important ancillary reactions, with accurate rate coefficients, for the conditions of the studies. This was done primarily by comparing simulations run with the present 23 reaction mechanism to simulations run with the authors' published mechanisms used in their data analysis. Results for each were also compared to the published raw data, especially where exemplary cases were given. Second, any additional assumptions made in using the authors' given mechanism were assessed for validity. Third, when a study resulted in measurements of rate coefficients for reactions in addition to $k_1$ and $k_2$, these were checked for consistency with results from other groups. The stated purity of reagents and/or whether reactant purification was performed were included as additional criteria used in the assessment of data quality. It is worth noting that the results for $k_{\text{ext}}$ presented in FGFAM were subjected to the same or more intense scrutiny as all the other studies.\(^1\)

Temperature ranges given for the published rate coefficient expression for each publication were thoroughly assessed. In the simulations, it was discovered in some instances that the experimental parameter observed was not highly sensitive to the measured rate coefficient throughout the cited temperature range, and the range used in fitting the data for the final recommendations was adjusted accordingly. Also checked, when presented, was whether the temperature range stated in the publication matched the data taken (e.g., as shown in the tables or figures). In some cases the temperature range given for the expression vastly exceeded the temperature range of the experiments.

Additionally, some representative conditions were used to model the possible effects of H$_2$O contamination in the reaction mixture and of the presence of hydrogen-containing species in the mixture on experimental results where these factors seemed of concern. Possible detrimental effects of H$_2$O as contaminant were suggested\(^27\) in relation to shock tube experiments on N$_2$/H$_2$/O inert gas mixtures. This possibility was examined quantitatively. Also, the experiments performed with a source of atomic hydrogen purposely included in the reaction mixture, e.g., mixtures of H$_2$/N$_2$/O were evaluated in detail, and the effects of the H atom species on the data analysis were investigated.

The results of examination of literature data are presented in section III. Section III is divided into several subsections, including five for experiments in major categories. At the beginning of those five subsections, some introductory material is presented. Then, very brief synopses of the studies performed,
TABLE 1: Mechanism Used in the Modeling of Mixtures of Species Composed of N and O Atoms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>reaction</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Ea/R</th>
<th>ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>O + N2O → NO + NO</td>
<td>see the text</td>
<td>see the text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>O + N2O → O2 + N2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>N2O (M) → N2 + O (M)</td>
<td>k0</td>
<td>9.91E-10</td>
<td>28510</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kl</td>
<td>1.26E+12</td>
<td>31510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

efficiencies, η: \( \eta / N_2 \), 1.0/ \( / Ar 0.67/N_20 \), 5.0/ from ref 2
\( / O_2 0.82/ \) from ref 20

| R4  | N + NO → N2 + O | 5.43E-12 | 0.30 | 0 | 21 |
| R5  | O + NO → N + O2 | 6.31E-15 | 1.00 | 20820 | 3, 4 |
| R6  | NO + M → N + O + M | 2.40E-09 | 0.00 | 74700 | 4 |

efficiencies, η: \( \eta / N_2 \), 1.0/ \( / Ar 0.75/He 0.35/N_20 \), 2.2/ from ref 2, reverse reaction

| R7  | NO2 (M) → NO + O (M) | k0 | 4.10E+04 | -3.37 | 37644 | 4 |
|     |                     | kl | 7.60E+18 | -1.27 | 36883 | |

* Units are cm³, molecule, s, K. The parameters A, n, and Ea/R are for rate coefficient expressions in the form \( k = A \exp(-Ea/RT) \). For reactions involving a collider, M, the effective concentration of M is given by \( C_{eff} = \frac{[M]}{[M]_{eff}} = \frac{1}{1+\left(\log (k_{cl})\right)^2} \). For reaction R1, the simple Lindemann form, \( F = \frac{1}{L} \), is used. For reaction R7, \( F = \frac{1}{L} \), is used. For reaction R22, see also the discussion in BDH47. From modeling results using these rate coefficients, the reactions appear to be unimportant for the present conditions.

There have been many experimental studies on NO + NO reactions. General Comments and Products

The present study is concerned with the products of the elementary NO + NO reaction. There have been many experimental studies on NO gas mixtures which resulted in kinetic measurements for the elementary NO + NO reaction. These include static reactor, flow reactor, and shock tube experiments (see the following subsections). There is a large spread in results for k1; see Figure 1. In Figure 1, the reaction NO + NO is assumed to yield primarily O + N2O, independent of the authors assuming this or the O2 + N2 channel dominates. Note also the results from refs 29 and 31 have been divided by the stoichiometric factor of 2 to bring them into conformity with the modern convention; that is, the rate of depletion of [NO] by reaction -R1 is \( -2k_1[NO] \). In the following subsections, studies at high NO concentration and then dilute studies are considered. It will be shown that the results of four studies, refs 29 and 35-37, should be retained. As can be seen in Figure 1, these are described very well with a straight-line Arrhenius expression. Prior to leaving the present subsection, however, the products of the elementary NO + NO reaction are discussed.

Most studies since the early 1970s have assumed the products of the elementary reaction NO + NO are O + N2O; that is, the main reaction is -R1. The authors of both HS85 and TH91 tacitly assume this (in HS85, see the discussion on the reaction in the +R1 direction). However, in the 1950s, there was considerable controversy over whether the main product channel

their results, and reasons for acceptance or rejection are given, either in tables or text. More detailed discussions defending the choices then follow because the short descriptions may seem unconvincing or cryptic. However, some of the reasoning is involved, and the presentation is correspondingly lengthy. The majority of readers may be satisfied with the short comments and can proceed at these points to the following sections.

### III. Evaluation of Literature Data

In this section we evaluate literature data pertaining to the title reaction obtained under a wide variety of conditions. The new intermediate temperature results of FGFAM have already been compared to those of recent studies at similar temperatures in FGFAM. Due to the direct nature of the FGFAM measurements, it is felt that the best available in that range for kaa
( or k2 ), which dominates the reaction at intermediate temperatures; see later). The other measurements will not be considered further here.

#### IIIa. Studies Containing NO in the Initial Reaction Mixture. General Comments and Products of NO + NO Reaction

There have been many experimental studies on NO gas mixtures which resulted in kinetic measurements for the elementary NO + NO reaction.28-37 The studies currently available on NO utilized pure NO, or mixtures of NO with inert gas, O2, N2, or N2O. These include static reactor, flow reactor, and shock tube experiments (see the following subsections). There is a large spread in results for k1; see Figure 1. In Figure 1, the reaction NO + NO is assumed to yield primarily O + N2O, independent of the authors assuming this or the O2 + N2 channel dominates. Note also the results from refs 28-31 have been divided by the stoichiometric factor of 2 to bring them into conformity with the modern convention; that is, the rate of depletion of [NO] by reaction -R1 is -2k1[NO]. In the following subsections, studies at high NO concentration and then dilute studies are considered. It will be shown that the results of four studies, refs 29 and 35-37, should be retained. As can be seen in Figure 1, these are described very well with a straight-line Arrhenius expression. Prior to leaving the present subsection, however, the products of the elementary NO + NO reaction are discussed.

Most studies since the early 1970s have assumed the products of the elementary reaction NO + NO are O + N2O; that is, the main reaction is -R1. The authors of both HS85 and TH91 tacitly assume this (in HS85, see the discussion on the reaction in the +R1 direction). However, in the 1950s, there was considerable controversy over whether the main product channel
Figure 1. Arrhenius plot of rate coefficients for $k_{11}$. The four results selected as best and utilized in making the present recommendations have solid symbols with white plus signs at the ends of their temperature ranges. Note that the line of the best fit to these four data sets is not the final recommendation of this work; it is presented to demonstrate the agreement of the four retained data sets over a wide temperature range. Key:

- Myerson, $\cdots \bigotimes$ Trung, et al., $\cdots \triangleleft$ Camac and Feinberg, $\bigtriangleup \triangleleft$ Freedman and Daiber, $\bigotimes$ Thilten and Roth, $\Delta \cdots \Delta$ Koshi and Asaba, $\bigtriangledown \bigtriangledown$ McCullough, et al., $\bigcirc \cdots \bigcirc$ Yuan, et al., $\bigtriangleleft \bigtriangleleft$ Wise and Frech, $\bigstar$ Kaufman, et al., $\square \cdots \square$ least-squares fit to the four retained data sets.

is $O + N_2O$, or whether the reaction is instead

$$\text{NO} + \text{NO} \rightarrow O_2 + N_2 \quad \Delta H_0 = -44 \text{ kcal/mol} \; (R24)$$

See, e.g., the discussion in BDH73, p 254. The debate subsided in the 1960s to agreement that $O + N_2O$ is likely the main product channel. Noteworthy in this regard were the change in position by Kaufman, who had originally favored reaction R24 (see the synopsis in BDH73), and the observation by Camac and Feinberg of traces of $N_2O$ and $O$ atoms during shock tube studies on NO mixtures. In the present work, pertinent studies which utilized mixtures of either NO or $N_2O$ were examined to find the most reliable rate coefficients for reactions R1 and $-R1$. Then, assuming the main products of the NO + NO reaction to be $O + N_2O$, the results for reaction $-R1$ were reversed using the thermodynamics. Agreement for the rate coefficients from these studies over a broad temperature range was found (see the Arrhenius diagram for reaction R1 presented later). This result would be highly unlikely if the product channel $O_2 + N_2$ plays a significant role. In addition, reaction R24 must proceed through a four-center transition state. This seems much less probable than reaction $-R1$, which can occur by a simple abstraction. A final supporting point is that recent ab initio calculations have yielded a preliminary barrier height for reaction R1 of 28 kcal/mol, which corresponds to 64 kcal/mol for the reverse reaction. This agrees well with activation energies of the best results for both reactions R1 and $-R1$ (see later). On this basis, it seems highly likely the only important products are indeed $O + N_2O$. This assumption is made, allowing use of the NO experimental results in formulating recommendations.
Kinetics of the O(3P) + N₂O Reaction

However, before leaving the issue of products of NO + NO, it must be admitted that available works do not completely rule out the unlikely possibility that k₋₁ and k₂₄ have similar magnitudes. Attempts were made to find a computed species concentration which could firmly resolve this issue by comparison with available measurements. Two sets of computations were performed across a range of conditions corresponding to the experiments on NO from the literature. The first used an assumption that O + N₂O is the only product channel; the second used the assumption that the products are evenly divided between the U + N₂O and O₂ + N₂ channels. Each case used the same total rate coefficient for NO + N₂O; a value was chosen which is fairly close to the reverse of the final result for k₁ recommended in the present study. The results indicated that it would be very difficult experimentally to differentiate between these two cases for any experimental conditions from the literature. This is especially true of the majority species NO, O₂, and N₂, because O and N₂O formed in reaction -R₁ are typically rapidly converted to the final products O₂ and N₂. Thus, predicted majority species profiles for the two cases look nearly identical. The problem is also true for the trace species, O and N₂, because their respective concentration vs time profiles predicted using the two mechanisms are approximate multiples, with ratios reflecting the assumed product ratio for the second mechanism.

To differentiate experimentally between reactions -R₁ and R₂₄ would require an absolute measurement of [O] or [N₂O], which is currently unavailable; such a measurement would be quite difficult and probably subject to debate. In addition, the modeling results for [O] and [N₂O] also depend strongly on other rate coefficients in the mechanism, e.g., k₅ and k₁₆. It seems likely the only way of resolving this issue is through ab initio calculations on reaction R₂₄. Such calculations are presently unavailable. At present, it seems quite unlikely reaction R₂₄ plays a significant role. Therefore, its contribution is ignored.

**Studies at High NO Concentration.** Four groups have performed kinetic studies on NO at high concentration.²⁸⁻⁻³⁰,³⁹ Pressures used were ~0.1–1.0 atm and temperatures ~900 to 2100 K. In some of the works, NO was studied in pure form; also included were mixtures with O₂, N₂, NO, He, or CO₂. The most important of these for the present purposes are the studies on pure NO and NO/O₂ mixtures. Calculations using the mechanism in Table 1 indicate that, for representative conditions used by these authors, the overall reaction is initiated by reaction -R₁. When O₂ is present and the temperature is high enough, there are also important contributions from reactions R₄ and R₅; additionally, the reverses of these reactions can be important for some conditions. At somewhat higher temperatures, even if pure NO is used, O₂ formed early during the decomposition can also lead to contributions by these reactions.

It was assumed in refs 28 and 29 that O and O₂ are equilibrated according to the reaction O + O = O₂, which was shown to fit the observed effect of O₂ addition on NO depletion rates. There was some debate in refs 28 and 29 over whether the O/O₂ equilibration could be due to reaction R₉, with Kaufman and co-workers contending that reaction R₉ is far too slow. The present computations, performed at representative conditions and using the mechanism in Table 1, indicate that although reaction R₉ indeed is equilibrated, its rate is far slower than those of other reactions at these intermediate temperatures. Therefore, reaction R₉ is not responsible for the O/O₂ equilibration, confirming arguments in ref 29. The calculations also show that the rates of reactions R₇ and R₈ are 2–3 orders of magnitude faster than those of any other reactions, in both directions, leading to their partial equilibration during the overall reaction. Note that the sum of reactions -R₇ and R₈ is O + O = O₂. Therefore, these reactions, rather than reaction R₉, are responsible for the O/O₂ equilibrium. The computations indicate N₂O formed in reaction -R₁ is rapidly converted to N₂ via reactions R₁₀ and R₃, the former being favored at lower temperatures, the latter at higher temperatures. NO₂ formed in reaction R₁₀ never builds up to high concentration because of rapid conversion back to NO via reaction R₇ or R₈. The role of reactions R₄ and R₅ in NO conversion at high enough T and [O₂] is very important and cannot be disregarded in the data analysis. Addition of small amounts of O₂ to NO causes an increase in the NO conversion rate due to O atoms from the O/O₂ equilibrium initiating the R₅, R₄ reaction sequence. However, at high enough concentration of O₂, reaction -R₅ becomes important, retarding the NO conversion rate. The result is a maximum in the NO conversion rate vs [O₂] plots.

A synopsis of the four studies at high NO concentration, with brief reasons for acceptance or rejection of results presented in the footnotes, is given in Table 2. Details regarding these points form the remainder of this subsection.

In the study of Kaufman and co-workers, which is retained, NO decomposition was followed in static quartz reactors of varying size (i.e., varying surface-to-volume ratio)³⁰a and in static porcelain reactors.²⁸b Pure NO and NO mixtures with N₂, O₂, N₂O, or He were studied from 1170 to 1690 K. The determination of the extent of reaction involved extraction of a sample, conversion of NO or O₂ in the sample to higher nitrogen oxides via reaction with other gases, and spectrophotometric analysis. The authors excluded data below 1370 K for extraction of rate coefficients because of the observation of heterogeneous effects. Very careful purification procedures were used, especially for NO.

The values of k₋₁ from the studies were derived from the runs on pure NO. Rate coefficients for k₋₁ were first obtained in ref 29a from measurements on pure NO in the range 1370–1530 K. In this range, the effects of the O₂ catalysis mentioned above could be eliminated. k₋₁ values were obtained using the initial [NO] depletion rates; this approach avoided the oxygen catalysis effects of O₂ formed during the reaction at the highest temperatures. Reference 29b focuses primarily on the added O₂ effects. It was mentioned that, above 1530 K, even for pure

---

**TABLE 2: Synopsis of Studies on NO at High Concentration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>source</th>
<th>method</th>
<th>temp (K)</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman and co-workers²⁹</td>
<td>static reactor</td>
<td>1170–1690</td>
<td>retained; a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetter³⁰</td>
<td>flow reactor</td>
<td>1180–1912</td>
<td>discarded; b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise and Frech²⁸</td>
<td>static reactor</td>
<td>872–1275</td>
<td>discarded; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuan et al.³⁰</td>
<td>static reactor</td>
<td>973–2087</td>
<td>discarded; d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The authors' measured k₋₁ and k₅. Assumptions made regarding the mechanism, especially the O/O₂ equilibrium, are shown herein to be correct. The final result is taken from ref 29b. Some later workers have misunderstood the proper temperature range for k₋₁. The author did not consider k₋₁ in the analysis, so k₋₁ values did not result directly. The purity of the reagents was not high. Total concentrations, temperatures, and pressures of the mixtures are inconsistent. The method for conversion of NO₂ to NO within the reactor has been criticized in ref 25. k₋₁ values later resulted from the reanalysis in ref 28. The authors' own experimental work yielded no results for k₋₁ because of heterogeneous reactions. They reanalyzed the ref 39 data, obtaining k₋₁ values. Besides the problems with the ref 39 data (see the preceding footnote and/or text), the authors ignored reaction -R₅. This reaction is important for mixtures with high [O₂], as in ref 39. The authors ignored contributions of reactions R₄ and R₅, and their reverses, invalidating their results for k₋₁.
NO, the observed reaction rates are above those computed on the basis of extrapolation of the rate coefficient expression from the prior work. The result was presumably due to O2 catalysis; the O2 was formed during the reaction. The work then goes on to explain the catalysis effect quantitatively, documenting measurements at temperatures from 1575 to 1690 K with added O2. However, 30 new runs with pure NO were reported in ref 29b, made in roughly the same temperature range as the earlier study. A new rate coefficient expression is reported, which is slightly lower than that in ref 29a and is apparently from the combined studies. Extrapolated values from this $k_1$ expression were then used in the analysis of results from the runs on the NO/O2 mixtures to obtain $k_3$ values for ~1500–1700 K. The $k_1$ expression does not extend to this higher temperature range, as some later authors have misinterpreted. The expression mentioned in ref 29b, $k = 2.0 \times 10^{-12} \text{ exp}(-32 \times 100 \text{ K/K})$, 1370–1530 K, is taken as the final result of Kaufman and co-workers and used in formulating the present recommendations.

In the study of Vetter,39 which is discarded, quartz and ceramic flow reactors were used. Mixtures of NO/O2 were made by flowing pure NO2 into the reactor and allowing reaction R13 to equilibrate between the reactants, or by making NO from the reaction of NaN3 with solutions of H2SO4. It should be noted that Kaufman and co-workers29b have criticized this and earlier flow system studies which relied on NO2 conversion on the basis that the conversion may not have been rapid compared to residence times in the reactors. The issue is impossible to evaluate because residence times were not specified. The extent of NO conversion to N2 for conditions with a small extent of reaction was determined from measurements of the concentrations of NO and N2 exiting the reactor. O2 from a steel cylinder was used in most, if not all, of the mixtures (it is unclear for which runs) and, for some, N2 from a steel cylinder. Although some care was taken to purify the NO and NO2 used, it is felt the method for NO (passage through a dry ice cooled tube) may not have removed all traces of H2O from the H2SO4 solution. Also, the O2 and N2 were not of particularly high purity, which is a cause of great concern. Another difficulty is that the total quoted concentrations of NO and O2 in Table 1, ref 39a, for the various runs do not coincide with the given temperatures and pressures. The discrepancy in some cases is up to 40% in pressure computed from the total NO + O2 concentration and temperature as opposed to the measured pressure given in the table. The sketchy discussion does not clarify these discrepancies. It should be noted that the author, who may have misunderstood the discrepancies, did not include the elementary NO + NO reaction in his analysis, so no $k_{-1}$ or $k_3$ rate coefficient values resulted directly from the study. For these reasons, it is concluded that the data of Vetter cannot be used.

In the work of Wise and Frech,38 which is also discarded, a static reactor was used to study pure NO and mixtures of NO with N2, O2, or N2O from 872 to 1275 K. Surface-to-volume ratio studies indicated that there are contributions from a heterogeneous reaction over nearly the entire temperature range of the authors’ experimental studies. It appears this might be true even at the highest temperature used. Consequently, those results cannot be used to obtain $k_{-1}$, and the authors did not claim success in doing so. Along with their own data, Wise and Frech reanalyzed the data of Vetter, taking into account reactions R1, R4, and R5 and the O/O2 equilibrium, resulting in values for $k_{-1}$ at four temperatures. In addition to the problems mentioned in Vetter’s data above, Wise and Frech ignored reaction $-R_5$, which Kaufman and co-workers’ later work shows can be important for mixtures such as Vetter’s, which involved large [O2]. The use of Vetter’s data and failure to take reaction $-R_5$ into account can lead to serious systematic error. It should be noted that the authors of BDH73 retained the results of Wise and Frech’s reanalysis of Vetter’s data in making a final recommendation.

Yuan et al.,30 in another work which is discarded, studied pure NO and mixtures of NO with N2, CO2, or He from 973 to 2087 K. At ~1570 K, there is a pronounced change of slope in the Arrhenius plot of the observed second-order NO depletion rate coefficients, leading to the conclusion that the reaction was heterogeneous at lower temperatures. The results were analyzed assuming that only reaction $-R_1$ occurs. This procedure is erroneous for the experiments for which the authors concluded surface effects were unimportant. Yuan et al.’s omission of the effects of reactions R4 and R5 probably accounts for the fact that $k_{-1}$ from this study is a factor of ~10 larger than the selected values (see Figure 1). Results were not presented in enough detail to permit reanalysis.

**Table 3: Synopsis of Studies on NO Diluted in Inert Gases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>source</th>
<th>method</th>
<th>temp (K)</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCullough et al.35</td>
<td>flow reactor</td>
<td>1750–2100</td>
<td>retained; a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koshi and Asahina36</td>
<td>shock tube</td>
<td>2700–3500</td>
<td>retained; a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theilen and Roth37</td>
<td>shock tube</td>
<td>2400–6200</td>
<td>retained; a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedman and Damer31</td>
<td>shock tube</td>
<td>3000–4300</td>
<td>discarded; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camac and Feinberg33</td>
<td>shock tube</td>
<td>1610–4625</td>
<td>discarded; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trung et al.34</td>
<td>shock tube</td>
<td>2700–4700</td>
<td>discarded; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myerson35</td>
<td>shock tube</td>
<td>2600–6300</td>
<td>discarded; d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All important reactions were considered. The proper temperature range to use with the results is 2400–3450 K. Sensitivity to $k_{-1}$ is seriously reduced at higher temperatures. Criticized in ref 36 for failure to consider reactions R4 and R5, and for neglect of boundary layer effects. We concur that reactions R4 and R5 are substantial. This may be the primary reason for the discrepancy of these works with the retained results. Disagreement with the other works resulting in $k_{-1}$ is serious. Reactions R7, R8, and R9, which were neglected, can have substantial effects. Also, sensitivity to reaction $-R_1$ is greatly reduced at the highest temperatures used.*
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The flow reactor study of McCullough et al., which is retained, utilized mixtures of 0.01–5% NO in Ar and obtained measurements in the range 1750–2100 K for \( k_1 \). [NO] was measured via chemiluminescence. The results were restricted to the upper end of the temperature range used and the higher concentrations, where surface effects were determined to be negligible. The authors used a nine-reaction mechanism for data analysis. The present simulations using the Table 1 mechanism indicate all important ancillary reactions were considered.

Koshi and Asaba performed incident shock measurements over the range 2700–3500 K using mixtures of 2–20% NO in Ar. Species measured included NO and O atoms. The authors point out that careful attention was paid to boundary layer effects in the analysis; they mention in earlier work they missed these effects as well as some key reactions. The data were analyzed using a nine-reaction mechanism. Simulations were performed with this mechanism and compared to those using the mechanism in Table 1. The results indicate all important reactions were included. The final result is retained for the present recommendations.

Thielen and Roth used reflected shocks to study 0.001–1.0% NO mixtures in Ar over the 2400–6200 K temperature range. O atom and N atom concentrations were followed by atomic resonance absorption spectroscopy. Data were analyzed using an eight-reaction mechanism. Contrary to the authors’ comment that they used Myerson’s mechanism, their mechanism is more detailed than that of Myerson. Comparisons of simulations using Thielen and Roth’s mechanism to that in Table 1 indicate all important reactions were considered. The authors were aware that, at lower concentrations used in their study, the main initiation step is reaction R6. Sensitivity to reaction \(-R_1\) is lost under those conditions, as confirmed in the present simulations. The data under these conditions were used to obtain \( k_6 \) results. For determination of \( k_1 \), therefore, the data from O atom measurements and experiments with NO concentrations above 0.0025% were used.

The text of the paper makes it sound as though the \( k_1 \) expression obtained is valid for the entire temperature range of the study (see, e.g., the Abstract). However, the present simulations at the highest temperatures used indicate that, even for the highest concentrations, sensitivity to reaction \(-R_1\) is lost, reaction R6 becoming much more important. The presentation was detailed enough concerning the conditions that in the present study the proper upper limit for \( k_1 \) values from this work could be estimated as no higher than 3850 K. The authors may have been aware of this restriction, because the Arrhenius plot of their result only extends to 3450 K. The expression, with range restricted to 2400–3450 K, is plotted in Figure 1. As can be seen, it agrees extremely well with the result of Koshi and Asaba. (Thielen and Roth’s conclusion that their work disagreed with the Asaba group’s result was based on comparison with the earlier result, which has been superseded.) The result is retained and used in the present fit to obtain final recommendations.

Three shock tube studies on dilute NO mixtures from refs 31, 32, and 34, which are discarded, are discussed next. These works have previously been criticized by Koshi and Asaba for failure to take into account reactions such as R4 and R5, which consume much of the available NO under these conditions, and neglect of boundary layer effects. The present simulations confirm that the neglect of reactions R4 and R5 in these studies indeed is a serious systematic error; this may be the primary reason the results from those studies are of a factor of 10 larger than those selected as best (see Figure 1).

The authors determined rate coefficients for \( k_1 \) and \( k_6 \) using a simultaneous fitting procedure. As can be seen in Figure 1, the \( k_1 \) expression from this study has a much smaller slope than all the others. The activation energy to which this corresponds, 29 kcal/mol, is 7 kcal/mol less than the reaction endothermicity. For these reasons, the results have, as in prior reviews, been discarded. However, plausible reasons for the discrepancy have not previously been advanced. Sketchy information was presented regarding the pressures used, but some simulations were nonetheless performed and compared to results with the author’s six-reaction mechanism. The results indicate that, depending on the concentrations, reactions R7, R8, and R9, which were neglected, can have substantial effects on the O atom profiles. These mechanism errors are probably the primary reason for the discrepancy. Also, at high enough temperatures and depending on the mixture ratio, the sensitivity of the results to reaction \(-R_1\) can be seriously reduced (see the preceding discussion of the Thielen and Roth experiments). This factor could also influence the results.

III.b. Studies Containing N2O in the Initial Reaction Mixture. Studies pertaining to the title reactions which utilized N2O in the initial reaction mixtures will be discussed in the following three subsections. These are, respectively, works on H2/N2O mixtures, on N2O at high concentration, and on N2O diluted in inert gases. It should be mentioned that there are several works related to the title reaction which will not be further discussed here. These early studies have been criticized and discounted in BDH73; see the discussion there regarding reaction R1.

Studies on H2/N2O Mixtures. There have been studies by several groups on H2/N2O mixtures which resulted in measurements relating to the title reaction. These include shock tube and flame experiments. Prior to discussing the individual works, a short synopsis of rate coefficient expressions for the most sensitive H/N/O reactions used for the simulations is presented in Table 4. One reaction is worthy of special comment. It has only recently been realized that

\[
H + N_2O \rightarrow NH + NO \quad \Delta H_0 = 35 \text{ kcal/mol} \quad (-R26)
\]

has a rate coefficient expression several orders of magnitude larger than that which had been appreciated prior to about 1990 (note the reaction is written in the reverse direction in Table 4, so it will be denoted by \(-R26\) in this text). The evidence for this point from several recent studies is quite strong. As will be seen, the reaction plays a major role in NO formation during reaction

---

**TABLE 4: Some of the Most Sensitive Reactions Used in Modeling of the Experiments Which Involved H2/N2O Mixtures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>reaction</th>
<th>( A )</th>
<th>( E/J )</th>
<th>ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R25</td>
<td>( H + N_2O \rightarrow N_2 + OH )</td>
<td>3.70E-10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8 430^*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R26</td>
<td>( NH + NO \rightarrow H + N_2O )</td>
<td>5.81E-10</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>6 50, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R27</td>
<td>( N + NO \rightarrow N_2 + O )</td>
<td>5.43E-12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R28</td>
<td>( NO + H \rightarrow N + OH )</td>
<td>2.32E-10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R29</td>
<td>( OH + H_2 \rightarrow H_2O + H )</td>
<td>3.95E-16</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R30</td>
<td>( NH + O \rightarrow NO + H )</td>
<td>9.12E-11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R31</td>
<td>( H + O_2 \rightarrow O + OH )</td>
<td>3.84E-08</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>8 590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Units are \( \text{cm}^3 \cdot \text{mole}^{-1} \cdot \text{s} \), molecule, s, K. The parameters \( A, n \), and \( E/J \) are for rate coefficient expressions in the form \( k = AT^a \exp(-E/JRT) \). For reaction R25, the rate coefficient is computed as the sum of the two exponential expressions.
of H2/N2O mixtures. Since reaction -R26 has not been taken into account in any of the existing H2/N2O mixture studies pertaining to the title reaction, their results have been misinterpreted. k1 results from these studies must therefore be discarded. Comparison of the present modeling results to the data from these studies shows excellent agreement is obtained using the detailed H/N/O mechanism. Details regarding these points form the remainder of this subsection.

Two groups have studied H2/N2O mixtures and reported rate coefficient measurements for reaction R1 using shock tubes.46-47 The studies were performed using very similar methods and conditions, so only the results of the first of these, by Henrici and Bauer,46 will be discussed in detail. The results of both studies for k1 are about a factor of 10 larger than commonly accepted2-5 The reason for this discrepancy has not previously been understood.

Henrici and Bauer performed measurements leading to k1 using mixtures of 1% H2 and 1-3% N2O in Ar for the temperature range 1700-2600 K. Profiles of OH and NO were measured. The result attributed to reaction R1 was obtained primarily from the NO measurements. [NO] was observed to increase rapidly after passage of the shocks and settle at a plateau level. The ratio of [NO] in the plateau level to initial [N2O] was one of the key data sets produced. Rate coefficients attributed to reaction R1 were obtained by modeling this ratio using a mechanism of 14 reactions. The H + N2O → NH + NO reaction was not included (nor was it included in ref 47).

Simulations of these data were performed in the present study using our large H/N/O mechanism. The values of k1 and k2 expressions were set equal to the final recommendations of the present study; it should be noted that this k1 expression differs only modestly from the prior recommendations.2-5 The results, shown in Figure 2, are not sensitive to k2. Also, the results are not at all sensitive to the assumed density (from which one calculates the initial pressure for simulations) within the given range of values; this is important, because these data were not specified for the individual points. As can be seen, the agreement of the model with Henrici and Bauer’s experiment is excellent toward the highest temperatures studied. The modeled [NO] may be slightly low at the lowest temperatures studied, but the agreement is still reasonable.

The important aspect of the simulations is that detailed analysis shows breakage of the N–N bond in N2O (which is what can ultimately lead to NO formation rather than the unreactive equilibrium product N2) is primarily due to reaction -R26 under these conditions. The final [NO] is complicated by the subsequent fate of NH thus formed. For example, NH can undergo reaction R30, resulting in formation of additional NO. Alternatively, NH can undergo reaction with OH via NH + OH → N + H2O; the N atoms thus formed then react primarily in reaction R27, which not only converts the NH to N2, but removes an NO molecule in the process. Reaction with O2 by NH + O2 → HNO + O, resulting in more NO being formed via HNO + (H, OH) → NO + (H2, H2O), is another possibility.

Sensitivity analysis reveals that, at 2000 K and 1% N2O, the [NO] is most sensitive to reactions R25–R31 in decreasing order as given in Table 4. There is also a modest sensitivity to reaction R3, which falls between reactions R30 and R31. Reaction R1 is less sensitive than any of these, and reaction R2 is considerably below reaction R1. If instead of the present recommendation for k1 the expression of Henrici and Bauer is substituted into the current large mechanism, the results do not agree well with experiment (not shown). Results for the 1% N2O mixtures agree well, but for the 2% and 3% mixtures the predicted plateau [NO] to initial [N2O] ratios are high by factors of 1.5 and 2 or more, respectively, compared to the experimental results in Figure 2, across the entire temperature range. Since experiments of refs 46 and 47 were performed under similar conditions, these comments apply equally to each. The conclusion of the present study is that reaction -R26 and later complex NH reactions are the major source of NO in these shock tube studies rather than reaction R1, as was assumed by the authors. Their results for the title reaction are therefore discarded.

Fenimore and Innes48 performed experiments on several lean, low-pressure, burner-stabilized H2/N2O/O2/H2O flames from which they inferred values for k1. Temperature and stable species profiles through the flames were determined by thermocouple and quartz sampling-probe mass spectrometric measurements, respectively. O atom profiles were determined by a technique which involved isotopic labeling of a fraction of the H2O and equilibrium assumptions, applicable to the burn gases, for several reactions of the H/O system. The flames reached final temperatures of about 1500–2000 K. The k1 measurements were derived from the combined temperature, N2O, O atom, and NO profiles.

Results detailed in ref 48 for two exemplary flames were modeled in the present work using the large reaction set described earlier, with the best final values (see later) for k1 and k2 expressions. The computed species profiles are only modestly sensitive to changes in the k2 expression as compared to using that of HS85. The measured temperature profiles were used as fixed input parameters in the calculations; this procedure is commonly required because heat loss processes cannot be accurately modeled.

A comparison of experimental and computed profiles for the stable species in the 1800 K flame (Figure 1 of ref 48) is shown in Figure 3. As can be seen, the agreement is excellent. The agreement is within a factor of 2 for the O atom profiles (not shown); this is quite good for such work, especially considering
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Figure 3. Comparison of computed and experimental mole fractions for the \(H_2/N_2O/O_2/H_2O\) exemplary flame in Figure 1 of Fenimore and Jones.\(^{48}\) Points: data from ref 48. Curves: model, present work.

the assumptions which had to be made in measuring the O atoms. The detailed analysis of reaction rates indicates that NO is not solely formed in reaction R1, as the authors of ref 48 assumed. The \(H + N_2O \rightarrow NH + NO\) reaction directly contributes approximately 20% of the NO formed. Ultimately NH also contributes to NO formation by reaction R30. However, there are competing pathways for the NH which can result in its ultimate conversion to \(N_2\) instead, so the situation is complex. (More details concerning the competing pathways under qualitatively similar situations for \(H_2/N_2O\) flames may be found in refs 11 and 56.) Not surprisingly, the computed [NO] sensitivities for reactions R1 and \(-R26\) indicate both are very important. If reaction \(-R26\) and the other reactions neglected in ref 48 could be taken into account in a reanalysis of the data, the results for \(k_1\) from this work would undoubtedly be significantly altered. However, this cannot be done because results for most of the flames were not presented in sufficient detail. It seems unlikely that precision limits of the result would approach others already available in the relevant temperature range. The necessary error propagation related to precision limits of the ancillary reactions’ rate coefficients and of the measured temperature profiles would probably lead to error limits in \(k_1\) values of a factor of 2 or 3. Instead, the resulting agreement of the experiment and model is viewed as a satisfactory cross check on our current best understanding of \(H_2/N_2O\) kinetics. The \(k_1\) measurements from the work are not used in formulating the present recommendations. It should be noted that Fenimore and Jones’ \(k_1\) expression was used as the final recommendation of BDH73. The authors of BDH73 evidently were impressed with the obvious care and ingenuity of the work, and the fact that the \(k_1\) expression was in excellent agreement with other results highly regarded at that time. However, the present work has revealed the latter finding is fortuitous.

Study at High \(N_2O\) Concentration. The experiments on pure \(N_2O\) or \(N_2O\) mixed with several other reactants performed in static quartz reactors by Kaufman, Gerri, and Bowman\(^{27}\) also have to be discarded. The most important of these for the present purposes were with pure \(N_2O\). In the following subsection, detailed reasons for rejection of the results are given. Briefly, there are three major concerns: wall reactions, thermal equilibration at early times, and the fact that simulations show that reactions \(-R7\) and \(R8\), which were assumed to be negligible, have substantial effects. Details regarding these points form the remainder of this subsection.

The experiments of ref 57 covered a temperature range of \(876-1030\) K, with pressures from 0.013 to 0.92 atm. The \([N_2O]\) was followed by manometric methods. The [NO] was measured by the laborious procedure of stopping the reaction by expansion of the gas mixture into an evacuated absorption cell and then using spectrometric methods, the time evolution apparently being determined by repeated experiments of varying duration. The typical durations of the experiments were described as “20 s to several minutes”. Experiments with “Vycor chips” added to the reaction vessel indicated unequivocally that wall reactions were affecting the observations.

Despite the wall reaction problem, the authors believed that they were able to properly analyze the data and obtain results bearing on the title reaction with a simple mechanism. This mechanism consisted of one-directional reactions R1, R2, R3, and \(-R7\), the postulated reaction

\[
NO_2 + N_2O \rightarrow N_2 + O_2 + NO \quad \Delta H_0 = -6 \text{ kcal/mol} \tag{R32}
\]

and the reaction of O atoms at the wall, which was assumed to be first order, i.e., \(O \rightarrow (1/2)O_2\) at the wall. It was shown that at early times, where [NO] is small so that reactions \(-R7\) and R32 supposedly could be ignored, this mechanism leads to a simple steady state relation which defines [O] (eq “a” of ref 57). This relation was used to derive a simple equation relating the measured [\(N_2O\)], the measured ratio of initial rates of formation of NO to depletion of \(N_2O\), the unknown ratio \(ky/k_1\), and the unknown ratio of the wall reaction rate coefficient to \(k_1\) (eq “b” of ref 57). By performing measurements at three pressures for each of the four temperatures used, the authors obtained an overdetermined set of three equations in the two unknown rate coefficient ratios at each temperature. Apparently, two were then used to obtain the unknown ratios with the third as a consistency check.

An elementary evaluation performed in the present work using the measured quantities (Table 1, ref 57) and resultant rate coefficient ratios (Table 7, ref 57) from Kaufman et al. reveals the results are indeed internally consistent. The ratios found for \(ky/k_1\) ranged from 0.67 to 0.47 between 876 and 1031 K, respectively; that is, the study concluded that the NO + NO channel occurs about twice as rapidly as the \(O_2 + N_2\) channel near 1000 K. The authors then estimated the absolute value of \(k_1\) by combining the ratio derived for \(k_1\) to the wall rate coefficient with an estimate of the absolute wall rate coefficient using collision theory. The absolute value of \(k_1\) derived in this way can only be regarded as very approximate, and therefore will not be given further consideration. The \(ky/k_1\) ratios are of more concern. The authors of BDH73 concluded that the ratio data were “probably of limited accuracy with an error limit of perhaps a factor of 2”. These findings of \(ky/k_1\) ratios near unity at \(\sim 1000\) K, coupled with other workers’ similar results at higher temperatures, apparently have much to do with the BDH73 conclusion that \(k_1/k_2\) is close to 1.0 over a wide temperature range.

Simulations of the Kaufman et al. experiments were performed in the present study to gain qualitative insights. The calculations were done using the mechanism of Table 1. The wall reaction had to be ignored because no simple way to include it in the SENKIN code is apparent. It is not clear what rate coefficient should be used in any case. Though reaction R32
appear plausible, to our knowledge no other studies have required the reaction; we find no clear reason to invoke it.

The simulations were tried with both the HS85 values and the final results of the present study for \( k_1 \) and \( k_3 \). The results indicate reaction rates of reactions \(-R7\) and \( R8 \) are similar to those of the other fastest reactions involving O atoms (\( R1-R3 \)), even at early times. Thus, the steady-state relation presumed in ref 57 for O atoms is drawn into question. Kaufman et al. pointed out in this early study, when \( k_s \) was unknown, that if \( R8 \) was unimportant, and postulated that reaction This decrease was not observed, so they concluded that reaction

### TABLE 5: Synopsis of Measured Quantities in \( N_2O/\text{Inert Gas} \) Mixture Shock Tube Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>source</th>
<th>species measured</th>
<th>method(s)</th>
<th>inferred data</th>
<th>temp range (K)</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monat et al.</td>
<td>( N_2O, NO )</td>
<td>IRE</td>
<td>( k_1, k_3 )</td>
<td>2380-4080</td>
<td>retained; b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDCH92</td>
<td>( NO, O_2 )</td>
<td>UVA</td>
<td>( k_1, k_3 )</td>
<td>1680-3340</td>
<td>retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipke et al.</td>
<td>( N_2O, NO, O_2, N_2 )</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>( k_1/k_2, k_3 )</td>
<td>1300-1950</td>
<td>discarded; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutman et al.</td>
<td>( N_2O, O_2, N_2, NO, O )</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>( k_1/k_2, k_3 )</td>
<td>1800-3500</td>
<td>discarded; d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Dov9a</td>
<td>( N_2O, O_2, N_2, NO, O )</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>( k_1/k_2, k_3 )</td>
<td>1800-2800</td>
<td>discarded; d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dove et al.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>( k_{tot}, k_3 )</td>
<td>2160-3590</td>
<td>discarded; e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nie6c</td>
<td>( N_2O, O_2, N_2, NO )</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>( k_{tot}, k_3 )</td>
<td>2000-3250</td>
<td>discarded; d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaslonko et al.</td>
<td>( N_2O, NO, O )</td>
<td>UVA, CHML</td>
<td>( k_{tot}, k_3 )</td>
<td>1680-2500</td>
<td>( k_t ) and ( k_{tot} ) retained; f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulzmann et al.</td>
<td>( N_2O, NO )</td>
<td>IRE, UVA</td>
<td>( k_{tot}, k_3 )</td>
<td>1856-2560</td>
<td>( k_t ) and ( k_{tot} ) retained; f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuev and Starikovski27</td>
<td>( N_2O, NO, NO_2 )</td>
<td>IRE, 17A</td>
<td>( k_{tot}, k_3 )</td>
<td>1795-3300</td>
<td>discarded; g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solokhin60</td>
<td>( N_2O )</td>
<td>IRE</td>
<td>( k_{tot}, k_3 )</td>
<td>1640-3100</td>
<td>retained; h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baber and Dean6a</td>
<td>( N_2O, O )</td>
<td>IRE, CHML</td>
<td>( k_{tot}, k_3 )</td>
<td>1850-2535</td>
<td>discarded; i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean6m</td>
<td>( N_2O )</td>
<td>IRE</td>
<td>( k_{tot}, k_3 )</td>
<td>1930-3075</td>
<td>discarded; i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean and Steiner6c</td>
<td>( N_2O, O )</td>
<td>IRE, CHML</td>
<td>( k_{tot}, k_3 )</td>
<td>2100-3300</td>
<td>discarded; i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* MS = mass spectrometry; LS = laser schlieren; IRE = infrared emission; GC = quenched sample gas chromatography; CHML = CO + O chemiluminescence for O-atoms; UVA = ultraviolet absorption.  

The group’s final result for \( k_s \) is given in ref 64b. The correct temperature range for this result is given in HS85. The reagents used were of poor purity. \( k_s \) is inconsistent with the HS85 recommendation. Discrepancies in \( k_s \) results from these reflected shock studies with established results in HS85 lead to concern the temperatures may have been systematically affected by the sampling technique. Therefore, except for the notion that \( k_s \equiv k_3 \) at very roughly 2000 K, these results are discarded.  

Results for \( k_s \) compare well with those of HS85, but the Arrhenius plot for \( k_s \) shows unusual curvature. \( k_{tot} \) is therefore discarded.  

The LS, incident shock technique used was very different from the methods of refs 59a,c. Results of the various N2O/inert gas shock tube studies are only sensitive to the end of that range. Pressures generally were about 0.5-4.0 atm, though one study used pressures to 23 atm. Most of the studies utilized measurement of \([NO] \) and a few measured \([O] \) by including CO in the mixtures and following chemiluminescence of the reaction \( CO + O \rightarrow CO_2 \). Only a few included measurements of \([O_2] \). As will be discussed, measurements of \([O_2] \) are particularly important in the determination of \( k_s \). Of the measured results, the following are retained in formulating recommendations for reasons discussed below: \( k_{tot} \) from Solokhin;60 \( k_1 \) and \( k_{tot} \) from Zaslonko et al.;63 \( k_1 \) and \( k_{tot} \) from Monat et al.;64 \( k_1 \) and \( k_{tot} \) from Sulzmann et al.;65 \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) from DDCH92. Some of the mass spectrometric studies58,59a,c indicate that \( k_s \equiv k_3 \) at, very roughly, 2000 K. This point was noticed in HS85 and influences both HS85 and the present recommendations. As will be seen, there is some doubt about the precision of the measured temperatures in those studies, which conclude that \( k_s \equiv k_3 \) over a broad temperature range. A synopsis of measured quantities and temperature ranges is given in Table 5. Brief reasons for our choices among the various results are given in the footnote. Details regarding the choices form the remainder of this subsection.

Though more recent studies have generally considered most of the reactions given in Table 1, the analyses of some of the earliest ones only considered reactions \( R1-R3 \). Representative calculations in the present work, with 5% mixtures of \( N_2O \) in Ar across the range of conditions used, generally indicate use of only reactions \( R1-R3 \) in reasonable. Future workers should also consider the possible importance of the other reactions, especially \(-R7, R8, R10\), as a route to \( O_2 \) formation at higher \( N_2O \) concentrations and pressures. Under the conditions generally used in the studies, the overall reaction is initiated by reaction \( R3 \). O atoms are kept in the steady state by reactions \( R1, R2, \) and \( R3 \). The \( N_2O \) is converted to \( N_2, O_2, \) and \( NO \); concentrations of the latter three species remain at plateau levels on the time scale of shock tube experiments because the reactions converting \( NO \) to the equilibrium products \( N_2 \) and \( O_2 \) are not significant under these conditions.

**Studies on \( N_2O \) Diluted in Inert Gases.** There have been studies by 10 groups that are pertinent to the title reaction which utilized mixtures of \( N_2O \) in inert gases.5,27,58-65 All used shock tubes. Most used Ar as the inert diluent, though some used Kr or He. Occasionally other more reactive diluents were tried for comparison to the inert gas mixtures. Concentrations of \( N_2O \) were generally in the 0.5-5% range, with most toward the lower end of that range. Pressures generally were about 0.5-4.0 atm, though one study used pressures to 23 atm. Most of the studies utilized measurement of \([N_2O] \) as an important diagnosis. Many also included measurements of \([NO] \), and a few measured \([O] \)
Kinetics of the O(\(\text{P}\)) + N\(_2\)O Reaction

Rate coefficient results for combinations of \(k_1, k_2, k_3\), the sum \(k_1 + k_2 = k_{\text{tot}}\), or the ratio \(k_1/k_2\) have been extracted from the shapes of the various species profiles during the conversion time and/or the plateau levels (see Table 5). The slope of the \(k_1\) Arrhenius plots has been fairly well-established in the works. Values of \(k_3\) have been extracted in these and other studies (see reviews in refs 2-4, also refs 19, 66, and 67) and are well-established. There is disagreement by about a factor of 2 in the absolute values of \(k_1\) from two sets of studies (see, e.g., HS85). The \(k_2\) expressions are much more controversial.

The HS85 low-pressure \(k_3\) recommendation is well-representative of recent results. \(k_3\) rate coefficient expressions were a result of most, but not all, of the studies in Table 5. Comparison of \(k_3\) values from these cases vs the HS85 recommendation is used as a check on consistency. In the data analysis of some of the studies, the \(k_3\) expression was a fixed input parameter. The values used in this manner were examined, and there appear to be no problems resulting from the expressions utilized.

In the HS85 review, it was pointed out that the studies then available yield a strong indication that \(k_1 - k_2\) at about 2000 K. All but one of the pertinent studies\(^1\) since HS85 agree with this conclusion. Reference 27 is discussed later. First, a key point discovered by Monat et al.\(^{64}\) is presented. In that work, profiles of \([\text{N}_2\text{O}]\) and \([\text{NO}]\) were measured spectroscopically. In the modeling, Monat et al. discovered the computed profiles were primarily sensitive to \(k_1\) and \(k_3\); they were much less sensitive to \(k_2\). Therefore, the \(k_2\) expression from BDCH73 was used as an assumed parameter in the analysis, and only \(k_1\) and \(k_3\) values were extracted.

Computations in the present work, with the mechanism of Table 1 and either our final recommendations or the HS85 expressions for \(k_1\) and \(k_2\), confirm the NO sensitivity behavior. For example, for 2% mixtures of \(\text{N}_2\text{O}\) in \(\text{Ar}\) with an initial temperature of 3000 K, a change by a factor of 3 in assumed \(k_2\) value produced only a \(\sim\)15% change in the NO plateau level, which is probably similar to error limits in measured \([\text{NO}]\). The sensitivity of \([\text{NO}]\) to \(k_1\) and \(k_3\) is much higher. For the \(\text{O}_2\) profile, the situation regarding \(k_1\) and \(k_2\) is reversed; the computed profile is very sensitive to \(k_2\) and \(k_3\) and much less sensitive to \(k_1\). An examination of all the computed sensitivities shows that it is difficult to find a species other than \(\text{O}_2\) which is very sensitive to \(k_2\); presumably \(\text{N}_2\), though produced in reaction R2, is much less sensitive because it is also produced in reaction R3. Thus, it is concluded that for inferring \(k_3\), those studies which have not involved measurements of \(\text{O}_2\) are inherently less reliable than those which have. The same relative ordering of NO and \(\text{O}_2\) sensitivities to \(k_1, k_2, k_3\) was also noted in DDCH92.

In DDCH92, NO and \(\text{O}_2\) profiles were measured using laser absorption techniques. The results for \(\text{O}_2\) profiles were first fitted using the \(\text{N}/\text{O}\) mechanism from HS85 but varying \(k_2\) to obtain a fit. The \(k_2\) expression thus obtained was then used with the NO profiles but varying \(k_1\). Iteration could have been performed to optimize the \(k_1\) and \(k_2\) values, but proved unnecessary because the \(k_1\) results matched the HS85 expression within error limits on the first trial. The results indicate \(k_1\) predominates at high and \(k_2\) at low temperature. The \(k_1\) and \(k_2\) expressions from DDCH92 are equal at 2050 K, in agreement with the observation from HS85. The Monat et al. \(k_1\) and DDCH92 \(k_2\) and \(k_3\) results are therefore believed to be among the most reliable and are retained for fitting. The final result of the Monat et al. study for \(k_1\) is found in ref 64b; the proper temperature range to use with that expression is found in HS85.

\[k(\text{N}_2\text{O} + M = \text{N}_2 + \text{O} + M), \text{cm}^3\text{molecule}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}\]

\[10^{-13}, (1/T) \times 10^4, \text{K}^{-1}\]

Figure 4. Arrhenius plot of results from several sources for the rate coefficient of \(\text{N}_2\text{O} + M \rightarrow \text{N}_2 + \text{O} + M\). Key: \(\square\) Gutman, et al., Ar;\(^{34}\) \(\bigstar\) Nip, Kr;\(^{56}\) \(\bigcirc\) Barton and Dove, Kr;\(^{59}\) \(\triangle\) Lipkea, et al., Kr;\(^{41}\) HS85, Ar;\(^{27}\)

Turn to the other studies. The study of Lipkea et al.\(^{61}\) used mixtures of 2% \(\text{N}_2\text{O}\) in Kr with stated purities of only 98% and 99.7%, respectively. The \(\text{N}_2\text{O}\) was tested by gas chromatography for impurities which were found to consist primarily of "air", NO, and \(\text{N}_2\text{O}\). These purity levels are low, and no attempt was made to increase them. In addition, results from the work for \(k_3\) are not consistent with now well-established results such as in HS85 (see Figure 4). The HS85 \(k_3\) recommendation is for Ar, rather than Kr, as collider, but this difference cannot account for the pronounced discrepancy in slopes. The possibility that the conditions used may have placed reaction R3 in falloff was checked during the present work using recent results on \(k_3\) from ref 19. The conditions were in the low-pressure limit, so comparison with the HS85 \(k_3\) is reasonable. Supply gases of similarly poor purity levels were used by Milks and Matula.\(^{61b}\) For these reasons, those results were discarded.

In the mass spectrometric studies,\(^{58,59a}\) \(k_1/k_2\) was derived from the \(\text{NO}/\text{O}_2\) concentration ratios. The experiments involved end wall sampling; hence, reflected shocks were used. In principle, these results should yield a fairly direct indication of \(k_1/k_2\). The results from each study indicate this ratio is approximately unity for wide temperature ranges, in contrast to the result of DDCH92 (1800–2500 K from ref 58; 1960–2800 K from ref 59a). However, comparison of the results for \(k_3\) from the two studies with the HS85 expression shows they do not agree well. Plots of low-pressure limit \(k_3\) from refs 58 and 59a are compared to the HS85 recommendation in Figure 4. The \(k_3\) results from refs 58 and 59a exhibit a much smaller slope than those of currently
accepted expressions. The possibility that reaction R3 is in falloff under the conditions used for refs 58 and 59a was checked using k3 results from ref 19. The conditions for both are in the low-pressure regime, so comparison with the HS85 low-pressure expression is proper. One notes the results in ref 59b for k3 agree well with other studies and were used by the authors of HS85 in making their k3 recommendation. However, these were obtained via a laser schlieren study on incident shocks, a technique very different from the mass spectrometric methods in ref 59a. The authors of BDH73 have suggested that the k3 results of ref 58 are low toward the higher temperatures reported because of gas cooling by the end plate (mass spectrometer sampling region) and an incorrect understanding of the stoichiometry for the conditions used. Perhaps similar problems affect ref 59a. The idea that k1/k2 is near unity at, very roughly, 2000 K is strongly supported by the directly measured [NO]/[O2] ratios in these studies. The suggestion that end plate cooling has affected the results places the temperatures specified for these ratio data in question.

The results from Nip’s thesis work69c using the mass spectrometer were obtained with techniques similar to those of ref 59a (presumably using the identical equipment). The results were k1 = 2.0 \times 10^{-11} \text{exp}(−101800K/T) \text{cm}^3 \text{molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} and k2 = 1.6 \times 10^{-10} \text{exp}(−163400K/T) \text{cm}^3 \text{molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} (2000−3250 K). The corresponding k1/k2 ratio exhibits a downward trend vs increasing temperature, which disagrees with all other studies, and the k1 and k2 values imply a k30 results a factor of 2 lower than the results selected as best in the present work. Nip also measured k3 = 5.0 \times 10^{-11} \text{exp}(−249800K/T) \text{cm}^3 \text{molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} (2000−3250 K). Although this result has a slope similar to that of the HS85 expression, it is about a factor of 3 smaller (see Figure 4). Pressures used were 0.4−0.7 atm, which places reaction R3 in the low-pressure regime. Note that Nip used Kr for the diluent gas, whereas the HS85 expression is for Ar. Typically in unimolecular reactions, Kr has an efficiency similar to that of Ar; a factor of 3 lower is quite unexpected. Indeed, the measurements of Endo et al.88 which were also in the low-pressure regime, yielded a Kr/Ar efficiency ratio of 0.79 at 2000 K. (Note Endo et al.’s results for k3,Ar were among those selected for the HS85 k3 recommendation.) One notes the fitting procedure used in HS85 gives Nip’s k1 and k2 results little weight. The data of ref 59b for k30 exhibit an unusual curvature compared to other works (see their Figure 3 and also HS85 reviews of k1 and k2). For these reasons, except for the result that k1 = k2 somewhere in the vicinity of 2000 K, none of the data of refs 58 or 59 were retained.

Two studies in which [N2O] and [NO] were measured utilized complex analytical algebraic techniques to extract k30 and k1/k2 values.63,65 The result from Sulzmann et al.63 is k1/k2 = 0.92 ± 0.08 across the 1685−2560 K region. This would not agree well with DDCH92 or the present recommendations (see later). However, the error limit reported in that work appears to be too small. Results for most of the individual points (see their Figure 3) have much larger error limits than the final result indicates. The small reported error limit in k1/k2 appears to be the result of averaging the 10 individual points, which may serendipitously coincide well, and of the usage of the standard deviation of the average as the error limit. The k1/k30 ratio of the present recommendations, given later, compares well with most of the points of ref 65 (not shown) when their individual error limits are considered. The ratio result of Zaslonko et al.63 is k1/k2 = 5.4 \text{exp}(−403000K/T) (1700−2500 K). The result is the earliest found which indicates a strong upward trend in k1/k2 ratio with temperature. However, as mentioned earlier, studies on N2O/inert gas mixtures confined to N2O and NO measurements are not very sensitive to k2; furthermore, solution of the simultaneous equations in k30 and k1/k2 must ultimately involve differencing of two quantities of similar magnitude (k1 or k2 from k30). Due to this fact, studies which utilized direct [O2] measurements to derive k3 are to be preferred. References 63 and 65 provide an indication that k2 has roughly the same magnitude as k1 at high temperatures, but k2 cannot be determined much more precisely than this by the methods used. Therefore, only the k30 and k1 values from refs 63 and 65 were retained for the present fits.

The study of Zuev and Starikovskii27 is at variance with all the other studies in which k3 was measured. Though the k1 expression from that work agrees well with the HS85 recommendation, an upper limit for k2 of 0.03k1 (1750−3300 K) was obtained. All the other k2 results63,58,59a,63,65 are much larger than this upper limit. Zuev and Starikovskii27 measured [N2O], [NO], [N2O], and emission attributed to NO + O and analyzed their data with a detailed chemical model. They also attempted to measure [O2], but were unsuccessful due to low signal levels. Their studies utilized mixtures of 3% N2O in Ar with pressures from 2.5 to 23 atm. The higher pressures used are much larger than in any of the other studies. At the higher pressures used, reactions −R7 and R8 become important, complicating the data analysis.

In addition to studying N2O/Ar mixtures, Zuev and Starikovskii also performed experiments with H2/N2O/Ar mixtures, investigating the effects of hydrogenous species. The experimental and modeling results led to the conclusion that N2O/inert gas mixture chemistry is very sensitive to traces of H2O. Further, they suggested all the other studies may be incorrect regarding k2 because of H2O contamination. If H2O is present, the reactions O + OH → O2 + H and H + N2O → OH + N2 can speed NaO conversion, leading to O2 formation. The sum of these reactions, O + N2O → O2 + N2, could kinetically mimic reaction R2.

Zuev and Starikovskii’s result that k2 is very small and suggestion that the presence of H2O is responsible for the much larger values from all other shock tube studies in which k2 was measured has been investigated computationally in the present work. The present results prove that it is highly unlikely that H2O is the cause of this major difference in reported k2 values. The exact cause of the discrepancy is unclear, but the predominance of larger values from the other works precludes inclusion of Zuev and Starikovskii’s results in formulating the final recommendation.

The [H2O] necessary to have a significant effect was first estimated. An exemplary result is shown in Figure 5. Here, a mixture of 2% N2O in Ar, constant pressure 2.0 atm, initial temperature 2000 K, and adiabatic conditions were assumed, and the large detailed mechanism described earlier was used. In Figure 5A, there was no H2O in the mixture and the final k1 and k2 values of the present study were used. As will be seen, near 2000 K these have k1 and k2 approximately equal; they are similar to the HS85 recommendations for this temperature. That is, the mechanism being used for Figure 5A with no H2O present in the modeling mixture leads to species profiles representative of those actually observed in most of the experiments of workers other than ref 27, because at ~2000 K these k1 and k2 values are very similar to the results of the other experiments. Assuming Zuev and Starikovskii are correct, the k2 expression used to produce Figure 5A is incorrect; rather, their k2 value suggests removal of reaction R2 is more appropriate. The reaction was therefore removed and the
In DDCH92, the quoted outgassing rate was $16 \times 10^{-6}$ Torr/min; combining this with an assumed (abnormally long) 5 min delay and typical preshock pressure of ~30 Torr, the maximum H$_2$O levels could not exceed a few parts per million. Computations performed in the present study for typical conditions in the shock experiments show that, for example, 2 ppm H$_2$O contaminant would have a negligible effect on experimental profiles. The amount required to have a significant effect on the results is much larger than for conditions used in the FGFAF study. The typically higher shock temperatures lead to larger R1 and R2 reaction rates with which the hypothetical homogeneous species reactions must compete. These procedures to avoid H$_2$O contamination employed by the Davidson/Hanson group have been generally known in the shock tube community at least since the early 1970s. Though not frequently discussed in shock tube papers, it is suspected few, if any, of the other works have been seriously affected by this suggested factor. Therefore, the preponderance of evidence seems to indicate the results of ref 27 regarding $k_2$ are incorrect, and they are discarded. Perhaps the complications due to the increased importance of reactions $-R7$ and $R8$ at the higher pressures of that study are responsible for the discrepancy.

Further insight into selection among the studies may be obtained from an Arrhenius plot of $k_{tot}$ presented in Figure 6. In Figure 6, $k_{tot}$ expressions are plotted. These were taken from sources in which both $k_1$ and $k_2$ or $k_{tot}$ were measured, i.e., refs 6, 27, 60, 62c, 63, and 65. It should be noted that ref 60 contains individual expressions for $k_1$ and $k_2$. However, these were apparently obtained by making the assumption that $k_1 = k_2$. The author is not clear about this point. Only [N$_2$O] was measured in that work. In the absence of other species profiles, such as NO and O$_2$, independent $k_1$ and $k_2$ data cannot be derived. A similar assumption, clearly stated, was used in ref 62. Thus, the main result pertinent to the present study from refs 60 and 62 is $k_{tot}$.

As can be seen in Figure 6, most of the $k_{tot}$ expressions have similar slopes. However, they are divided into two groups whose absolute values are separated by approximately a factor of 2. The result of DDCH92 has a slightly smaller slope than the others, but covers a shorter temperature range than usual. At the highest temperatures used in that study, the DDCH92 result agrees within error limits with either of the two sets of results shown. However, at the lowest temperatures used, the DDCH92 data clearly agree best with the higher $k_{tot}$ set; thus, it belongs with that set. No clear reason could be found why the two sets of results differ from each other.

The choice of which set to use in fitting is influenced by the $k_1$ data from the four studies on NO mixtures previously selected as most reliable. 29-35,37 Data on $k_1$ from these studies were fitted, and the result was reversed to obtain a $k_1$ estimate. The expression obtained is also shown in Figure 6. If one assumes $k_1 = k_2$ at about 2000 K, i.e., $1/T = 5 \times 10^{-4}$ K$^{-1}$, then $k_1$ from the NO studies should be a factor of 2 below $k_{tot}$ at this point. As can be seen in Figure 6, the $k_1$ from these studies is a factor of 2 below the higher set of $k_{tot}$ results in Figure 6 at $1/T = 5 \times 10^{-4}$ K$^{-1}$. In addition, toward higher temperatures the $k_1$ expression lies below the higher set of $k_{tot}$ values, but above the lower set. Obviously, concluding that $k_1$ is larger than $k_{tot}$ cannot be logical (though the issue of error limits could make this feasible). Therefore, on the basis of comparison of $k_{tot}$ values to the $k_1$ data from NO studies, the set having larger values in Figure 6, i.e., from DDCH92 and refs 60, 63, and 65, is selected. The temperature range to use with the expression of ref 60 was obtained by examination of data given in the
IV. Recommendations and Discussion

A synopsis of the data chosen for fitting by the reasoning of the earlier sections is given in Table 6. The expressions for $k_{-1}$ from each of the four studies shown were first reversed to obtain $k_1$ values, and the individual results were then included in the fitted data set. The $k_1$, $k_2$, and $k_{tot}$ expressions given were fitted to the equations

$$k_1 = A_1 \exp(-E_{a1}/RT) \quad (1)$$

$$k_2 = A_2 \exp(-E_{a2}/RT) \quad (2)$$

$$k_{tot} = k_1 + k_2 \quad (3)$$

where $A_i$ and $E_{a_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, represent the Arrhenius $A$ factors and activation energies, respectively. An attempt was made to fit the data to a six-parameter form, that is, including $T^m$ curvature factors in the $k_1$ and $k_2$ expressions. However, this approach yielded unrealistic results which will not be further discussed. All the data were fitted simultaneously using the multiparameter, nonlinear least-squares routine of Kotlar et al.\(^7\)

The fitted data were weighted according to error limits given in the studies (see Table 6). For the FGFAM data, the individual points were used. For the other sources, the given expressions were used. In order that each group's result is given proper weights for equal temperature intervals, points were calculated using the given expressions at intervals equal to the average spacing used in the FGFAM experiments. The fitted recommendations are

$$k_1 = 1.52 \times 10^{-10} \exp(-13930/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \quad (1370-4080 \text{ K}) \quad (4)$$

$$k_2 = 6.13 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-8020/T) \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \quad (1075-3340 \text{ K}) \quad (5)$$

The fitted expressions are compared to the retained data in Figures 7–9. The comparison of the fitted expressions to the data is quite satisfactory. In Figure 8, note that $k_1$ data from studies on the reaction in both the reverse and forward directions agree very well. This is a strong indication that the assumption that the major products of the NO + NO reaction are $O + N_2O$ is correct.

The temperature ranges for the recommended $k_1$ and $k_2$ expressions differ. This result is due to the fact that data which primarily affect one of the fitted expressions at the end of a
Figure 7. Arrhenius plot of selected results and recommendation for $k_{\text{fit}} = k_1 + k_2$. The portion of the line for the recommendation that is dashed with an open symbol represents extrapolation beyond the recommended temperature range. Key: ● Solounkin, et al.; □ Zaslonko, et al.; ○ FGFAM; — recommendation for $k_{\text{fit}}$ from the fit of retained data.

of the present recommended $k_1$ expression is 27.7 kcal/mol, which compares quite favorably to the ab initio barrier. The computed barrier for reaction R2 on the triplet reaction surface is much higher, indicating the reaction does not proceed on this surface. Lin and co-workers speculate that the reaction takes place via a crossing of the triplet and lowest singlet [i.e., O(1D) + N$_2$O] surfaces and have started searching for the intersection point(s). We note the recommended $k_2$ expression has an A factor which seems somewhat small for a reaction which appears to be a simple atom abstraction. If Lin and co-workers are correct that reaction R2 takes place via surface crossing, this could explain the small A factor.

None of the earlier $k_1$ recommendations differ strongly from the present result. HS85 is the most recent of these which involved selection of best data sets from the literature and fitting over those chosen. The present result is ~30% lower at 1000 K and ~15% higher at 4000 K than the HS85 result. The recommended $k_2$ expressions from the reviews all yield values very similar to $k_1$ over a wide temperature range, except for ref 5, which simply recommended the DDCH92 expressions. The
present \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) expressions are quite different from each other: \( k_2 \) is larger than \( k_1 \) at low temperatures and smaller at high temperatures. Extrapolation of the present recommendation for \( k_1 \) yields \( k_2/k_1 \) = 9 at 1100 K. Since \( k_2 \) at the temperatures of the FGFAM study is dominated by \( k_2 \), direct comparison to the DDCH92 study, as in Figure 9, is reasonable; the \( k_2 \) curve is only slightly below the \( k_2 \) curve at the FGFAM temperatures.

The recommended \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) expressions are equal at 1840 K. Thus, they fit the criterion mentioned earlier that most available data on the title reaction indicate the \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) expressions are equal at roughly 2000 K. The ratio \( k_2/k_1 \) is 0.67 at 1635 K and 1.5 at 2110 K. Thus, this ratio is fairly close to 1.0 over a wide temperature range in the region of shock tube studies. This fact, coupled with the possibly high estimate of temperatures in the mass spectrometer shock tube studies\(^5\)\(^8\)\(^9\) and the results of ref 57, which are herein questioned, may be largely responsible for earlier recommendations that \( k_1 = k_2 \) over a much wider temperature range. The present results indicate that the earlier conclusion is erroneous.

V. Conclusion

An evaluation of the literature pertaining to the title reaction was performed, resulting in recommendations for its two major channels over wide temperature ranges. The evaluation process used detailed chemical modeling with recent information on important ancillary reactions and thermodynamics. There has been a wide spread in results concerning reactions k1, k2, and -R1. Serious mechanistic interpretation errors were newly identified in the present work in regard to several relevant studies, which have previously clouded the issue of the correct rate coefficient expressions. In particular, the assumption that
Temperature, K

\[ k_2(O+N_2=O=N_2+O_2), \text{cm}^3 \text{molecule}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \]

\[ (1/T) \times 10^4, \text{K}^{-1} \]

Figure 9. Arrhenius plot of selected results and recommendation for \( k_2 \). \( k_\text{F} \) results from the FGFAM study\(^1\) are also shown for comparison. At the temperature of the FGFAM study, \( k_2 \) accounts for approximately 90% of \( k_\text{F} \). The portions of the line for the recommendation for \( k_2 \) that are dashed with an open symbol represent extrapolation beyond the recommended temperature range. Key: ▼ DDCH92, O FGFAM\(^1\)

reaction R1 is the only source of NO in the burnt gases of the H\(_2\)/N\(_2\)O/O\(_2\)/H\(_2\)O flames studied by Fenimore and Jones\(^8\) has been shown to be incorrect. This result is the central choice of the BDH73 recommendation, which affects most later recommendations. The results of Koshi and Asaba\(^36\) regarding mechanistic errors in three other studies were confirmed. The present work demonstrates clear reasons why a number of results must be discarded. Results from the bulk of the remaining studies were fitted, and recommendations for \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) expressions were given. The most important point of these recommendations is that the \( O_2 + N_2 \) channel dominates the title reaction below \( \sim 1600 \) K and the NO + NO channel dominates above \( \sim 2100 \) K.

The study of Zuev and Starikovskii\(^27\) served to focus our attention on possible effects of H\(_2\)O contamination on measurements relating to the title reaction. The modeling results yielded quantitative estimates of the amounts of H\(_2\)O necessary to strongly affect intermediate temperature results, such as reported in FGFAM, and also at higher temperature conditions typical of the shock tube experiments on N\(_2\)/O\(_2\)/inert gas mixtures, as discussed herein. The results indicate H\(_2\)O contamination is unlikely to have caused significant problems for those studies. However, future workers should be aware of the potential difficulties this effect could pose in studying this chemical system.

Finally, it would be very helpful to have further ab initio calculations on this reaction. Only preliminary results\(^38\) are currently available. In addition to calculations on reactions R1 and R2, estimates to confirm whether the only significant products of the NO + NO reaction are indeed O + N\(_2\)O, as seems likely and was assumed, are desirable.
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is 715-2200 K. Estimated error limits are a factor of 2 at 715 K, increasing of a recent ab initio calculation, 23 but the experimental result is from 3 to because the reaction is not rate limiting for the current conditions of interest, (25) McCullough, R. W.; Kruger, C. H.; and Hanson, R. K. Combust. Sci. Technol. 1977, 15, 213.


Lin, M. C. Private communication.


(24) Thome, W. C., Reactions In Gas-Phase Combustion Chemistry; Springer, New York, 1985; Chapter 6.

(22) Anderson's current recommendation for the rate coefficient of reaction R5. Tsang and Herron accept the result of ref 3; the correct expression from ref 3 is given in the present Table 1.


(4) Tsang, W.; Herron, J. T. J. Phys. Ref. Data 1991, 20, 609. Note that in Tsang and Herron there is a transcription error regarding the rate coefficient of reaction R5. Tsang and Herron accept the result of ref 3; the correct expression from ref 3 is given in the present Table 1.
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Until recently, it was believed rate coefficients of the two product channels were approximately equal over a very wide temperature range. In contrast, the present study has led to the conclusion that reaction R2 dominates below, and reaction R1 above, 1840 K.
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