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Abstract: Application of the laser photolysis–laser-induced fluorescence method to the reaction \( \text{NH}_2 + \text{SO}_2 \) in argon bath gas yields pressure-dependent, third-order kinetics which may be summarized as

\[
k = (1.49 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-31} \left( \frac{T}{298 \text{ K}} \right)^{-0.83} \text{ cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}
\]

over 292–555 K, where the uncertainty is the 95% confidence interval and includes possible systematic errors. The quenching of vibrationally excited \( \text{NH}_2 \) is consistent with a high-pressure limit for \( \text{NH}_2 + \text{SO}_2 \) of \((1.62 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molecule}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}\) over the temperature range 295–505 K, where again the 95% confidence interval is shown. \textit{Ab initio} analysis yields a \( \text{H}_2\text{N–SO}_2 \) dissociation enthalpy of 73.5 kJ mol\(^{-1}\), and comparison with RRKM theory and the exponential down model for energy transfer yields \( \langle \Delta E \rangle_{\text{down}} = 350 \text{ cm}^{-1} \) for Ar at room temperature.
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1 Introduction

The interactions between nitrogen and sulfur chemistry in combustion is a field with major uncertainty [1], as it was thirty years ago [2]. Kinetic modeling calcula-
tions on the effects of sulfur species on nitrogen conversion to nitrogen oxides are qualitative at best. Premixed flame experiments [3–7] indicate that the NO yield is the result of a complex competition between S/N mechanisms that promote NO formation, inhibit NO formation, and reduce NO already formed, but details of the interactions remain unclear.

Key steps in the sulfur/nitrogen interactions include reaction of amino radicals with sulfur species, and the dominant form is sulfur dioxide. During combustion, fuel-bound nitrogen is mostly converted through the radical species N, NH and NH₂ [8]. The presence of SO₂ affects the oxidation selectivity towards the products NO and N₂ [1]. Also, the selective non-catalytic reduction of NO (SNCR) by NH₃ is sensitive towards the concentration of SO₂ [9–12], which is in part due to the influence of SO₂ on the general pool of radicals such as OH, H and O, but NHₓ + SO₂ reactions may also contribute.

The reaction of NH₂ with SO₂ has been studied one time previously, by Ioffe et al. [13], who observed a pressure dependence which suggests the mechanism is adduct formation

\[
\text{NH}_2 + \text{SO}_2 + M \rightarrow \text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2 + M \quad (1)
\]

This is analogous to OH addition to SO₂ [14]:

\[
\text{OH} + \text{SO}_2 + M \rightarrow \text{HOSO}_2 + M \quad (2)
\]

which in a second step can lead to SO₃ formation by H-atom abstraction from HOSO₂ by O₂ [15]. In light of the impact of sulfur on nitrogen chemistry in flames, the analogous abstraction from NH₂SO₂ to yield HNSO₂ is of interest. The latter molecule is isoelectronic with SO₃. We speculate that if it dissociates to NH + SO₂, then reaction (1) initiates a cycle where SO₂ catalyzes NH₂ + O₂ → NH + HO₂, a process which is extremely slow as a direct step [16]. In the present work we conduct new experiments on reaction (1) and argue for a modification of the presently accepted kinetics, and show that the results are consistent with RRKM analysis based on an \textit{ab initio} potential energy surface. We also make predictions of the thermochemistry of HNSO₂.

2 Experimental method

Ammonia (MG Industries, 99.99%) and sulfur dioxide (MG Industries, 99.8%) were purified by repeated trapping at 77 K, degassing and warming. Argon ((99.995%, Air Liquide and Big Three) was used directly from the cylinder. We applied the laser photolysis–laser-induced fluorescence (LP-LIF) technique to reaction (1). Details of the stainless steel reaction cell and its use in NH₂ chemistry
The reaction kinetics of amino radicals with sulfur dioxide have been provided previously [17, 18]. Briefly, dilute mixtures of NH₃ and SO₂ were prepared in a large excess of Ar bath gas. NH₂ is formed by 193 pulsed excimer laser photolysis of the NH₃ precursor, and monitored as a function of time t by LIF at 570.3 nm, which corresponds to excitation of the A²A₁ state from ground state X²B₁ NH₂. In a few experiments LIF at 531.8 nm was used to follow the kinetics of vibrationally excited (0,1,0) NH₂ [17]. Low photolysis pulse energies F were employed to minimize photolysis of SO₂.

Following the pulsed generation of NH₂, the LIF signal Iᵣ was captured in a boxcar integrator (Stanford Research Systems SR250) and observed to follow an exponential decay with a decay constant kₚₛ₁ back to a constant background B arising from scattered light from the excitation beam:

\[ Iᵣ = A \exp(-kₚₛ₁t) + B \]  (3)

B does not change with time and was checked carefully by measurements before the probe beam was triggered, and by measurements without the photolysis beam or in the absence of photolytic precursor. An example decay is shown in Figure 1, and is interpreted in terms of the scheme

\[ \text{NH}_2 + \text{SO}_2 \xrightarrow{k₁} \text{products} \]  (4)

\[ \text{NH}_2 \xrightarrow{k'} \text{loss} \]  (5)

k' is the effectively first-order loss rate of NH₂ via processes which do not depend on [SO₂], such as diffusion out of the reaction zone that is defined by the intersection of the photolysis and probe beams. The expected rate equation is

\[ \frac{d[\text{NH}_2]}{dt} = -k₁[\text{NH}_2][\text{SO}_2] - k'[\text{NH}_2] \]  (6)

Figure 1: Integrated LIF signal excited at 570.3 nm (0.3 mJ energy) vs. time delay after 193 nm photolysis laser pulse (0.5 mJ), at 412 K, 15 mbar total pressure and [SO₂] = 1.4 × 10¹⁵ molecule cm⁻³. The curve is an exponential fit (see text).
Under the pseudo-first-order condition we employ, $[\text{SO}_2] \gg [\text{NH}_2]$, $[\text{SO}_2]$ is effectively constant so we may write

$$d[\text{NH}_2]/dt = -k_{ps1}[\text{NH}_2]$$

The pseudo-first-order rate constant $k_{ps1}$ is obtained from non-linear least-squares fitting of $I_f$ to the form of Equation (3). The effective second-order rate constant $k_1$ and its statistical uncertainty is obtained from a plot of $k_{ps1}$ vs $[\text{SO}_2]$, with 6 different values of $[\text{SO}_2]$ from 0 to $[\text{SO}_2]_{max}$, as shown in Figure 2. The intercept corresponds to $k'$. 

3 Results

Table 1 lists 25 determinations of $k_1$. These are plotted as a function of $[\text{Ar}]$ in Figure 3. It may be seen that there is linear dependence, and the slopes at each temperature define third-order rate constants $k_{1,0}$ when the effective second-order rate constant is

$$k_1 = k_{1,0}[\text{Ar}]$$

The $k_{1,0}$ data over 292–555 K are listed in Table 2, from linear plots constrained to pass through the origin, or, for temperatures where there is only a single measurement, from $k_1/[\text{Ar}]$. Purely statistical uncertainties are also summarized in Table 2. Figure 3 shows that results with different initial radical concentrations, controlled by the photolysis energy $F$ and the concentrations of NH$_3$ and SO$_2$, lie on the same trends. Table 2 lists these concentrations as well as the initial
Table 1: Summary of measurements of the effective second-order rate constant $k_1$ for SO$_2$ reaction with NH$_2$ in its ground and a vibrationally-excited (0,1,0) state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$, K</th>
<th>$\tau_{res}$, s</th>
<th>$F^a$, mJ</th>
<th>$F^b$, mJ</th>
<th>$P$, mbar</th>
<th>[SO$<em>2$]$</em>{max}$, $10^{15}$ cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>[O]$_{0,max}$, $10^{17}$ molecule cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>[Ar], $10^{15}$ molecule cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>[NH$_2$], $10^{12}$ molecule cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>[NH$<em>2$]$</em>{0}$, $10^{14}$ cm$^{-3}$ molecule$^{-2}$</th>
<th>$k_1 \pm \sigma$, s$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.77 $\pm$ 0.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>3.86 $\pm$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.27 $\pm$ 0.13</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>4.06 $\pm$ 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.72 $\pm$ 0.11</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>8.45 $\pm$ 0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.77 $\pm$ 0.11</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>4.60 $\pm$ 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.38 $\pm$ 0.06</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.35 $\pm$ 0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.45 $\pm$ 0.10</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>7.36 $\pm$ 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.10 $\pm$ 0.08</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.65 $\pm$ 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.72 $\pm$ 0.07</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>5.60 $\pm$ 0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.68 $\pm$ 0.07</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4.75 $\pm$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.03 $\pm$ 0.08</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.99 $\pm$ 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.59 $\pm$ 0.06</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.98 $\pm$ 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.29 $\pm$ 0.05</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.90 $\pm$ 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.38 $\pm$ 0.06</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.13 $\pm$ 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.79 $\pm$ 0.07</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.20 $\pm$ 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.45 $\pm$ 0.06</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.22 $\pm$ 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.11 $\pm$ 0.04</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.31 $\pm$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.74 $\pm$ 0.07</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.10 $\pm$ 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.18 $\pm$ 0.05</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.69 $\pm$ 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.00 $\pm$ 0.04</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.01 $\pm$ 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.66 $\pm$ 0.07</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.29 $\pm$ 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.97 $\pm$ 0.04</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.36 $\pm$ 0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.10 $\pm$ 0.04</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>3.21 $\pm$ 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.30 $\pm$ 0.05</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.01 $\pm$ 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.05 $\pm$ 0.04</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.45 $\pm$ 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.92 $\pm$ 0.08</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.08 $\pm$ 0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lack of variation of $k_1$ with radical concentration is an indication that secondary chemistry, including for example fast consumption of NH$_2$ by O atoms from SO$_2$ photolysis, is not significant and that reaction (1) has been successfully isolated from interfering chemistry. The experimental $k_{1,0}$ data are plotted.
Table 1: Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$, K</th>
<th>$\tau_{res}$, s</th>
<th>$F^a$, mJ</th>
<th>$E^b$, mJ</th>
<th>$P$, mbar</th>
<th>$[SO_2]_{max}$, $10^{15}$ cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>$[O_3]_{max}$, $10^{12}$ cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>$[Ar]$, $10^{17}$ molecule cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>$[NH_3]$, $10^{15}$ molecule cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>$[NH_2]_0$, $10^{12}$ molecule cm$^{-3}$</th>
<th>$k_1 \pm \sigma$, $10^{-14}$ cm$^{-3}$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.64 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1750 ± 250$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.65 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1650 ± 210$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1590 ± 170$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.62 ± 0.02</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1710 ± 220$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1480 ± 240$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1650 ± 160$^c$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Pulse energy for 193 nm photolysis of NH$_3$.
$^b$ Pulse energy of dye laser used to excite LIF from NH$_3$.
$^c$ Removal rate constant for vibrationally-excited NH$_2$.

Figure 3: Dependence of effective second-order NH$_2$ + SO$_2$ rate constants on Ar density. Solid circles, 292 K; open diamond, 351 K; solid triangles, 411 K; open triangle, 478 K; solid squares, 512 K; solid diamonds, 555 K. The solid lines are linear fits through the origin. The dashed line is an RRKM calculation for 292 K (see text).

on Figure 4 and may be summarized by the expression $(1.49 \pm 0.15) \times 10^{-31} (T/298$ K$)^{-0.83}$ cm$^6$ molecule$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ over 292–555 K. The uncertainty shown is the 95% confidence interval which also includes an allowance for possible systematic errors.

Table 1 also lists the results of 7 experiments where the bimolecular removal rate constant of vibrationally excited NH$_2$ was determined. No significant trend with temperature is noted and these results may be summarized as $(1.62 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-11}$ cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$ over the temperature range 295–505 K, where the uncertainty is the 95% confidence interval.
Table 2: Low-pressure limit rate constant $k_{1,0}$ measured for $\text{NH}_2 + \text{SO}_2 + \text{Ar}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T/K$</th>
<th>$k_{1,0} \times 10^{-31} \text{ cm}^6 \text{ molecule}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \pm 2\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>$1.48 \pm 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>$1.51 \pm 0.16$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>$1.14 \pm 0.05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>$1.11 \pm 0.16$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>528</td>
<td>$1.04 \pm 0.06$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>$0.71 \pm 0.10$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Dependence of the low-pressure limit $k_{1,0}$ for $\text{NH}_2 + \text{SO}_2 + \text{Ar}$ on temperature (log-log plot).

4 Discussion

Our observed $k_{1,0}$ may be interpreted as the low-pressure limiting behavior of the energy transfer mechanism:

\[ \text{NH}_2 + \text{SO}_2 \xrightarrow{k_a} \text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2^* \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

\[ \text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2^* \xrightarrow{k_a} \text{NH}_2 + \text{SO}_2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (10)

\[ \text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2^* + \text{Ar} \xrightarrow{k_b} \text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2 + \text{Ar} \]  \hspace{1cm} (11)

Reaction (9) is the initial capture of $\text{NH}_2$ by $\text{SO}_2$ to yield a vibrationally excited intermediate, denoted by $^*$. There is competition between redissociation of this excited adduct (step 10) and collisional stabilization via energy transfer to the Ar bath gas (step 11). At the low-pressure limit $[\text{Ar}] \rightarrow 0$, step 11 is rate limiting and
with $[\text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2^+]$ in steady state, we may write

$$
\frac{d[\text{NH}_2]}{dt} = -k_b(k_a/k_a)[\text{Ar}][\text{NH}_2][\text{SO}_2] = -k_{1,0}[\text{Ar}][\text{NH}_2][\text{SO}_2] \quad (12)
$$

At the high-pressure limit $[\text{Ar}] \to \infty$, step 9 becomes rate limiting and

$$
\frac{d[\text{NH}_2]}{dt} = -k_a[\text{NH}_2][\text{SO}_2] = -k_{1,\infty}[\text{NH}_2][\text{SO}_2] \quad (13)
$$

The slightly negative temperature dependence of $k_{1,0}$ is consistent with expectations for an addition reaction with no barrier, and where the efficiency of collisional transfer to the bath gas decreases with increasing temperature. Luther and Troe have noted that third-order addition rate constants may often be expressed in the form $AT^n$. The particular dependence of reaction (1), proportional to $T^{-0.83}$, is in line with other reactions [21]. The magnitude of $k_{1,0}$ is similar to that determined for the analogous reaction (2), and there is accord at room temperature with $k_{2,0} (M = \text{Ar})$ to within 10% [22].

We have explored the potential energy surface for reaction (1) using the CBS-QB3 level of theory as implemented in the Gaussian09 program suite [23]. This is a composite method where geometries and frequencies are obtained with B3LYP/6-311G(2d,d,p) density functional theory, followed by a series of single-point calculations to yield an energy that approximates the coupled-cluster CCSD(T) result with an infinite basis set [24]. Relative enthalpies at 0 K (which include zero-point vibrational energy terms) are drawn in Figure 4. An unfavorable path is attack of $\text{NH}_2$ at an $\text{O}$ atom of $\text{SO}_2$, while attack at the $\text{S}$ atom can proceed with no barrier. Two structures of $\text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2$ are characterized and displayed in Figure 5. The structure denoted IM1 has the $\text{N}–\text{H}$ bonds staggered with respect to the $\text{S}–\text{O}$ bonds, and is about 8 kJ mol$^{-1}$ more stable than an alternative geometry where the $\text{N}–\text{H}$ and $\text{S}–\text{O}$ bonds are eclipsed. The conformers may isomerize via torsion about the $\text{S}–\text{N}$ bond. The barrier to this interconversion is much less than the energy available to the newly formed adducts, so we expect these two isomers to be formed in equilibrium, and in the RRKM treatment below this interconversion was treated as a hindered rotation.

We then focused on the reactants and adduct conformers more rigorously, using methods implemented in the Molpro program suite [25]. The geometry and vibrational frequencies were refined with spin-unrestricted CCSD(T) theory with spin-restricted wavefunctions using the aug-cc-pV(T+d)Z basis set, followed by a single-point CCSD(T)/aug-cc-pV(Q+d)Z and CCSD(T)/aug-cc-pV(5+d)Z calculations, to extrapolate the energy to the infinite basis set limit. This energy was corrected for several additional effects. The pwVTZ basis set was used to quantify the influence of scalar relativity as the sum of mass-velocity and Darwin terms at the CCSD level, and the same basis set was used to correct for core-valence
Figure 5: Computed potential energy diagram for NH$_2$ + SO$_2$ showing relative 0 K enthalpies derived via the CBS-QB3 method. CCSD(T(Q))/CBS data shown in parentheses (see text). Structures for IM-5 and IM-6, rotational conformers of IM-4, have been omitted for clarity.

electron correlation at the CCSD(T) level. A term for zero-point vibrational energy was estimated by scaling the harmonic frequencies by a factor of 0.95. Finally a correction for higher level electron correlation was defined as the difference between CCSD(T) and CCSDT(Q) energies with the cc-pVDZ basis set. The results of the calculations are summarized in the supplementary material.

An important piece of information from this ab initio work is the H$_2$N–SO$_2$ bond dissociation enthalpy at 0 K of 73.5 kJ mol$^{-1}$ for the more stable, staggered, isomer. This is about 40 kJ mol$^{-1}$ less strongly bound than HO–SO$_2$. We employ our computed bond strength, along with the CCSD(T) moments of inertia and frequencies, to evaluate a theoretical $k_{1,0}$ via RRKM theory, as implemented within the MultiWell program [26]. There is one adjustable parameter in these kinetic calculations, the average energy transferred from the excited adduct per deactivating collision with Ar bath gas atoms, $\langle \Delta E \rangle_{\text{down}}$. Because [Ar] is two orders of magnitude larger than [NH$_3$] in our work, the role of stabilizing collisions with NH$_3$ is negligible. Figure 3 shows the good agreement with experiment obtained with the choice of $\langle \Delta E \rangle_{\text{down}} = 350$ cm$^{-1}$ and the exponential model for energy transfer. This value of $\langle \Delta E \rangle_{\text{down}}$ corresponds [27] to an overall average energy transferred in all up and down transitions $\langle \Delta E \rangle$ of about −2.4 kJ mol$^{-1}$ at 298 K, and
a collisional efficiency $\beta_c = 0.4$, which are typical for unimolecular reactions in Ar bath gas as summarized by Troe [28]. Thus our observations at the low-pressure limit may be rationalized in terms of the PES.

Determination of $k_{1,\infty}$ requires measurements at higher pressures than the 9–25 mbar range we used. In fact, via RRKM theory we estimate fall-off effects to become important above $\sim 10$ bar at room temperature. However, $[\text{Ar}]$ is limited in our LIF experiments because high densities of Ar quench the fluorescence of NH$_2$. Inspection of Figure 4 indicates no significant falloff behavior with $k_1$ up to $\sim 10^{-13}$ cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$, so $k_{1,\infty}$ must be at least equal to this and is probably greater than $10^{-12}$ cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$.

For a more quantitative evaluation, we estimate $k_{1,\infty}$ via the removal rate of vibrationally excited NH$_2^*$. As proposed by Smith and coworkers [29], randomization of energy within the initial adduct means that even if it reassociates rapidly, the rate of loss of NH$_2^*$ might be similar to the ground state NH$_2$ capture rate. In the case of reaction (2), Blitz et al. made detailed RRKM arguments as to why intramolecular vibrational energy redistribution (IVR) is likely to be complete [14] in HOSO$_2$, and so this seems plausible for H$_2$NSO$_2$ also. On this basis and using the data in Table 1, we estimate $k_{1,\infty} = 1.6 \times 10^{-11}$ cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$. This lies between the hard-sphere collision rate of $\sim 10^{-10}$ cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$ and the high-pressure limit observed for reaction (2), of around $2 \times 10^{-12}$ cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$. It should be noted that notwithstanding the analysis of the HOSO$_2$ analog [14], there can be situations where excess vibrational energy in an initially excited reactant can be lost collisionally via non-reactive relaxation instead [30], which would mean the estimate of $k_{1,\infty}$ is too high. Our value is therefore strictly an upper limit.

Our results for reaction (1) may be contrasted with the only prior study, by Ioffe et al. [13]. They employed intra-cavity laser absorption by NH$_2$. They obtained $k_{1,0}$ at 298 K for M = N$_2$ and NH$_3$ of $(3.2 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-32}$ cm$^6$ molecule$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and $(2.1 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-31}$ cm$^6$ molecule$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, respectively. They also obtained $k_{1,\infty} = (1.5 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-13} (T/298 \text{ K})^{-1.3\pm0.3}$ cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$ over 298–363 K. The results for M = N$_2$ should be broadly similar to those for M = Ar while the high-pressure limit is of course independent of the nature of the bath gas. However, these rate constants are smaller than ours by factors of $\sim 5$ and $\sim 100$, respectively. They adjusted the adduct binding energy so as to match RRKM calculations to their experiments, and obtained $105 \pm 8$ kJ mol$^{-1}$. This value is significantly too high, by ca. 30 kJ mol$^{-1}$ when compared to our high-level ab initio analysis.

We now speculate about possible chemistry at higher temperatures. Table 3 shows reaction enthalpies computed for 298 K via the CBS-QB3 method, and for reaction (2) analogs from experimental data [14, 31]. In HOSO$_2$, abstraction of H by O$_2$ is slightly exothermic and has a small activation energy of $\sim 3$ kJ mol$^{-1}$ [15]. The analogous N–H bond in NH$_2$SO$_2$ is seen to be much stronger than the O–H
Table 3: Reaction enthalpies at 298 K.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>reaction</th>
<th>CBS-QB3 $\Delta_r H_{298}$/kJ mol$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Experimental$^a$ $\Delta_r H_{298}$/kJ mol$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2 \rightarrow \text{SO}_2 + \text{NH}_2$</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>HOSO$_2 \rightarrow \text{SO}_2 + \text{OH}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2 \rightarrow \text{SO}_2\text{NH} + \text{H}$</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>HOSO$_2 \rightarrow \text{SO}_3 + \text{H}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{NH}_2\text{SO}_2 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{SO}_2\text{NH} + \text{HO}_2$</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>HOSO$_2 + \text{O}_2 \rightarrow \text{SO}_3 + \text{HO}_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{HNSO}_2 \rightarrow \text{SO}_2 + \text{NH}$</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>$\text{SO}_3 \rightarrow \text{SO}_2 + \text{O}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ refs [14, 31]

bond in HOSO$_2$, so that HO$_2$ formation by reaction with O$_2$ is 49 kJ mol$^{-1}$ endothermic. We therefore expect an activation energy $E_a$ comparable to or higher than the endothermicity which makes the abstraction by oxygen fairly slow. This effect is partly offset by the high [O$_2$] expected in many combustion contexts. For a rough estimate we set $E_a = 50$ kJ mol$^{-1}$ and use a pre-exponential factor $A = 1 \times 10^{-12}$ cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$ chosen by analogy with O$_2 +$ HOSO$_2$ [15]. At, say, 1000 K, these parameters imply a rate constant of $\sim 2 \times 10^{-15}$ cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$ and, in 1 bar of air, a lifetime for NH$_2$SO$_2$ of 0.3 ms.

The product of such abstraction is HNSO$_2$. It may be seen to be less stable than the isoelectronic analog SO$_3$, with a S–N bond dissociation enthalpy 135 kJ mol$^{-1}$ less than for S–O in SO$_3$. Thus dissociation of HNSO$_2$ is likely to be much faster than for SO$_3$. The CBS-QB3 value for the HN–SO$_2$ bond dissociation enthalpy at 298 K is 213 kJ mol$^{-1}$, which compares well with a CCSD(T)/CBS calculation by Méndez et al. that yielded 215 kJ mol$^{-1}$ [32].

5 Conclusions

The present results extend the temperature range over which NH$_2$ + SO$_2$ has been studied, and suggest it is significantly faster than previously thought. The high-pressure limit is estimated from the removal rate of vibrationally excited NH$_2$. The results are consistent with an ab initio potential energy surface, which indicates that abstraction of H atoms from the adduct by O$_2$ is moderately endothermic, and that the resulting HNSO$_2$ species, isoelectronic with SO$_3$, could dissociate to NH + SO$_2$, leading to a cycle where NH$_2$ oxidation is catalyzed by SO$_2$. 
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