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Abstract

A theoretical study on the HSO$_2$ molecular system is presented in this thesis: starting from the construction of a global potential energy surface for its ground electronic state, to dynamical studies of collisions taking place on it. The double many-body expansion (DMBE) method is employed in the construction of such six-dimensional function. The topology of the new surface is characterized in detail. A comparison between the properties of the stationary points obtained here with those reported in the literature is given, new structures are also characterized. Three bi-molecular reactions are then studied using quasi-classical trajectories method and the new potential. For the first time these reactions are studied in their full dimensionality. Main attributes of these molecular collisions are discussed and compared with available information in the literature.
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Sulfur has been known since the beginning of history. It occurs uncombined in nature, and it is a major global pollutant when oxidized to sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$). Sulfur compounds are used extensively in the modern industrialized world [1]. Hydrogen sulfide (H$_2$S) and organic sulfides are found in a variety of feedstocks and crude oil. Other anthropogenic sources of sulfur include: (i) industrial gas streams (ii) natural and refinery gases which contain sulfur as mercaptans (also named thiols: any organic compound containing the group SH bonded to a carbon atom like thiophene C$_4$H$_4$S) and carbonyl sulfide (COS); (iii) synthesis gases (CO + H$_2$) containing sulfur as COS and carbon disulphide (CS$_2$); and (iv) emissions from vehicle exhausts [1, 2].

There are also substantial natural reserves of sulfur, the most important of which are biogenic sources, sea spray and volcanoes. The biogenic sources originate from bacterial reduction of sediments to H$_2$S in the sea and release of dimethyl sulfide ((CH$_3$)$_2$S) from sea organisms. Volcanoes are the main natural source of SO$_2$ [1].

Other species found in the atmosphere include H$_2$S, (CH$_3$)$_2$S, dimethyl disulphide ((CH$_3$)$_2$S$_2$), COS and CS$_2$. H$_2$S, (CH$_3$)$_2$S and (CH$_3$)$_2$S$_2$ are rapidly oxidized to SO$_2$, remaining only a few days in the atmosphere. COS and CS$_2$ are much longer lived species also found in the troposphere [3]. In the atmosphere, H$_2$S, COS and CS$_2$ react with hydroxide radicals to form mercapto radicals (HS) [3]:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \text{OH} + \text{CS}_2 & \rightarrow \text{COS} + \text{HS} \\
    \text{OH} + \text{COS} & \rightarrow \text{CO}_2 + \text{HS} \\
    \text{OH} + \text{H}_2\text{S} & \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{HS}
\end{align*}
\]

Hydroxyl (OH) radical comes into the atmosphere from different sources [2, 4, 5].
HS may also be formed by photo-dissociation of H$_2$S in the troposphere [3, 6]. Oxidation of HS radicals take place involving species such as hydroxysulfiny1 (HSO$_2$) [2, 3]. The latter is also associated to reactions taking place during combustion process [7, 8]. There, sulfur molecular systems act as oxidation inhibitors of the fuel. Properties of HSO$_2$ radicals have been reported in the literature [9–19], while chemical reactions, taking place on its ground state potential energy surface had also been studied [8, 9, 15, 18, 20–26].

In the literature however, a potential energy surface (PES) for the title system, describing all its possible configurations, has not been reported previously. To carry out molecular dynamics studies to get information on the mechanism and properties of the products at the same time, a global potential energy surface is needed [27, 28]. Being a tetratomic system with six internuclear distances, 33 electrons and also containing an element of the third row of the periodic table, ab initio calculations of the electronic energies are quite demanding.

The construction of such a PES for further use in modeling molecular collisions is the principal aim of this thesis.

This thesis is organized as follows: Part I deals with potential energy surfaces, presenting a theoretical background in chapter 1 and reporting a global PES of HSO$_2$ in chapter 2. Part II refers to molecular dynamics, with a theoretical introduction in chapter 3. Three reactions that have been studied using the new PES are presented in chapters 4, 5 and 6. Finally the main achievements are summarized and further possible applications are outlined.
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Part I

Potential energy Surfaces
Chapter 1

Theoretical Framework

The potential energy surface (PES) concept is a cornerstone in theoretical studies of chemical processes [1–4]. Its definition comes from applying quantum mechanics to a molecular system within the Born-Oppenheimer approximation [5]. These functions are needed for any (quantum or classical) dynamical study of molecules, including rate constants of chemical reactions, molecular beam scattering cross sections and ro-vibrational spectroscopy [2, 3]. Detailed discussions on potential energy surfaces may be found elsewhere [1, 4, 6–8]; in the following, main ideas related to molecular PES are briefly reviewed. First the origin of its concept is introduced, and then ideas leading to its construction, representation and characterization will be discussed.

1.1 Born-Oppenheimer Approximation

From a quantum mechanical description of matter [7], motion of atomic particles is governed by the Schrödinger equation, with the stationary form:

\[ \hat{H} \Psi = E \Psi \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.1)

being \( \hat{H} \) the Hamiltonian operator of the studied system, \( \Psi \) the wave function and \( E \) the energy of the system. Atomic units [9] will be used in this chapter.

For a general molecular system consisting of electrons and nuclei, the Hamiltonian can be written as:

\[ \hat{H}(r, R) = \hat{T}_N(R) + \hat{H}_e(r, R) \]  \hspace{1cm} (1.2)
where $\hat{T}_N$ represents nuclear kinetic operator, $\hat{H}_e$ is the electronic Hamiltonian, $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ are the electron and nuclear coordinates respectively. The electronic Hamiltonian, depending also on nuclear coordinates, can be written as:

$$\hat{H}_e = \hat{T}_e + V_{ee} + V_{eN} + V_{NN}$$

(1.3)

being $\hat{T}_e$ the electrons kinetic energy operator, $V_{ee}$ includes all the electron-electron interactions, $V_{eN}$ stands for electron-nucleus interactions and $V_{NN}$ includes all nuclei-nuclei interactions. For a system with $N$ nuclei and $n_e$ electrons, the above presented terms are given by:

$$\hat{T}_N = -\sum_k^N \left( \frac{1}{2M_k} \right) \nabla_k^2, \quad \hat{T}_e = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_i^N \nabla_i^2$$

(1.4)

$$V_{ee} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}^{n_e} \frac{1}{r_{ij}}, \quad V_{eN} = -\sum_k^N \sum_i^{n_e} \frac{Z_k}{|\mathbf{R}_k - \mathbf{r}_i|}, \quad V_{NN} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \neq k'}^N \frac{Z_k Z_{k'}}{R_{kk'}}$$

(1.5)

where $M_k$ and $Z_k$ are the mass and charge number of the $k$th nucleus respectively, $r_{ij} = |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|$, and $R_{kk'} = |\mathbf{R}_k - \mathbf{R}_{k'}|$

If all nuclei were fixed in the space, the motion of the electrons would be governed by the equation:

$$\hat{H}_e(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}) \Phi_n(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R}) = \varepsilon_n(\mathbf{R}) \Phi_n(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R})$$

(1.6)

where $\Phi_n(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R})$ and $\varepsilon_n(\mathbf{R})$ are the adiabatic eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of the electronic Hamiltonian (1.3) parametrically depending on $\mathbf{R}$, for a given $n$ electronic state. Since adiabatic eigenfunctions are a complete basis set, the molecular wave function $\Psi(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R})$, fulfilling the whole system stationary Schrödinger equation:

$$\hat{H}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}) \Psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}) = E \Psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}),$$

(1.7)

can be expanded as [10]:

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{R}) = \sum_n \chi_n(\mathbf{R}) \Phi_n(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{R})$$

(1.8)
where $\chi_n(R)$ is the nuclear wave function in the adiabatic representation. Substituting (1.8) into (1.7) and integrating over the electronic coordinates, the following coupled equations are obtained:

$$[\hat{T}(R) + \varepsilon_m(R)] \chi_m(R) + \sum_n \hat{\Lambda}_{mn}(R) \chi_n(R) = E \chi_m(R) \quad (1.9)$$

being $\hat{\Lambda}_{mn}$ the elements of the coupling matrix operator $\hat{\Lambda}$ given by:

$$\hat{\Lambda}_{mn} = -\sum_i \frac{1}{M_i} \left( A^{(i)}_{mn} \frac{\partial}{\partial R_i} + \frac{1}{2} B^{(i)}_{mn} \right) \quad (1.10)$$

where the elements of matrices $A^{(i)}$ and $B^{(i)}$ are:

$$A^{(i)}_{mn} = \int \Phi^*_m \frac{\partial}{\partial R_i} \Phi_n d^3r, \quad B^{(i)}_{mn} = \int \Phi^*_m \frac{\partial^2}{\partial R_i^2} \Phi_n d^3r \quad (1.11)$$

In order to solve the coupled equations (1.9), off-diagonal coupling terms $\hat{\Lambda}_{mn}$ ($m \neq n$) are often disregarded. This idea is justified by the fact that nuclear mass is much larger than the mass of the electrons; it is called adiabatic approximation [10].

If non-adiabatic coupling is neglected, which is equivalent to keep only one term in the expansion (1.8), the wave function becomes:

$$\Psi(r, R) = \chi_n(R) \Phi_n(r; R). \quad (1.12)$$

The adiabatic approximation for nuclear wave function assumes the form:

$$\hat{H}^\text{ad}_n \chi_n(R) = E \chi_n(R) \quad (1.13)$$

where the nuclear adiabatic Hamiltonian is given by:

$$\hat{H}^\text{ad}_n = \hat{T}_N + \varepsilon_n(R) + \hat{\Lambda}_{nn}(R) \quad (1.14)$$

In most situations involving molecular species, the dependence of $\hat{\Lambda}_{nn}(R)$ on nuclear coordinates $R$ is relatively weak compared to that of the adiabatic potential $\varepsilon_n(R)$. Thus, the term $\hat{\Lambda}_{nn}(R)$ is often neglected in the adiabatic approximation and the Born-Oppenheimer approximation (BOA) [5] is then obtained:

$$[\hat{T}_N + V_n(R)] \chi_n(R) = E \chi_n(R) \quad (1.15)$$
where \( \varepsilon_n(R) \) was replaced by \( V_n(R) \), to remark that the electronic energy becomes an interaction potential in the nuclear problem. Hence, in the adiabatic BOA, a complete separation of electronic and nuclear motion is achieved; one first solves the electronic problem getting the eigenvalues \( \varepsilon_n(R) \) at a given \( R \) and defined electronic state characterized by the quantum number \( n \), then solves the nuclear dynamics using such \( V_n(R) \) as the interaction potential for nuclei. Thus, \( V_n(R) \) is a potential energy surface on which atomic nuclei of the molecular system move.

1.2 **Ab initio** calculations

For a molecular system consisting of \( n_e \) electrons and \( N \) nuclei, the electronic Hamiltonian for a fixed nuclear configuration can be written as:

\[
\hat{H}_e = \sum_{i}^{n_e} \hat{h}(i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{r_{ij}}
\]  

(1.16)

where the second term represents the electron-electron interaction \( V_{ee} \) and the one electron Hamiltonian is given by:

\[
\hat{h}(i) = -\frac{1}{2} \nabla_i^2 + \sum_{k}^{N} \frac{Z_k}{R_{ik}}
\]  

(1.17)

\( R_{ik} = |r_i - R_k| \) and \( r_{ij} \) have the same meaning as in previous section. Thus, equation (1.6) becomes:

\[
\left( \sum_{i}^{n} \hat{h}(i) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right) \Phi_n(r) = \varepsilon_n \Phi_n(r)
\]  

(1.18)

where dependence of \( \hat{h}(i) \), \( \varepsilon_n \) and \( \Phi_n \) on \( R \) has been omitted for clarity and nuclear-nuclear interactions have been excluded.

To obtain the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of the equation (1.18) is usually called *ab initio* calculations. This task is, at present times, exactly feasible only for hydrogen-like systems. Thus, usually further approximations are needed.

1.2.1 **Hartree-Fock approximation**

When calculating the ground state energy of a molecular system, the use of variational methods is convenient [7]. In that case, the wave function can be
determined by finding the extremal of the functional:

\[ J = \int \Phi^* \hat{H} \Phi d\tau \]  
\hspace{1cm} (1.19)

where \( \Phi \) is assumed to be normalized:

\[ \int \Phi^* \Phi d\tau = 1 \]  
\hspace{1cm} (1.20)

The success of the variational method depends on the choice of the trial function. It is possible to construct the system wave function as the simple product of different electrons wave functions:

\[ \Phi = \psi_1(1)\psi_2(2) \cdots \psi_n(n) \]  
\hspace{1cm} (1.21)

Such a selection correspond to the assumption that electrons move independently. Substituting (1.21) into (1.19), with \( \hat{H} \) given by (1.16) it is obtained:

\[ J = \sum_i \int \psi_i^* \hat{h}(i) \psi_i d^3r_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} \int \psi_i^* \psi_j^* \left( \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right) \psi_i \psi_j d^3r_i d^3r_j \]  
\hspace{1cm} (1.22)

the wave function of the ground state is then obtained by the solution of the variational problem:

\[ \delta J = \delta \int \Phi^* \hat{H} \Phi d\tau = \sum_i \int \delta \psi_i^* \{ \hat{h}(i) + \sum_{j \neq i} \int \psi_j^* \left( \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right) \psi_j d^3r_j \} \psi_i d^3r_i = 0 \]  
\hspace{1cm} (1.23)

the orthonormal character of the \( \psi_i \) functions allows to introduce the Lagrangian multipliers \( \epsilon_i \):

\[ \delta J = \sum_i \int \delta \psi_i^* \{ \hat{h}(i) + \sum_{j \neq i} \int \psi_j^* \left( \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right) \psi_j d^3r_j - \epsilon_i \} \psi_i d^3r_i = 0 \]  
\hspace{1cm} (1.24)

as the \( \delta \psi_i \) are linearly independent, it is then obtained:

\[ \left[ \hat{h}(i) + \sum_{j \neq i} \int \psi_j^* \left( \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right) \psi_j d^3r_j - \epsilon_i \right] \psi_i = 0 \hspace{0.5cm} i = 1, 2, \cdots, N \]  
\hspace{1cm} (1.25)

The set of equations (1.25) for determination of single electron wave functions \( \psi_i \) and energies \( \epsilon_i \) was first proposed by Hartree [11] on the basis of the average
field produced by the electrons. Fock [12] obtained such equations by using a variational principle as here presented.

To solve equations set (1.25) Hartree applied the method of successive approximations. As zeroth approximation he used the hydrogen-like functions \( \psi_i^{(0)} \) and then evaluate the sum:

\[
V_i^{(0)} = \sum_{j \neq i} \int \psi_j^{(0)*} \left( \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right) \psi_j^{(0)} \, d^3r_j
\]  

(1.26)

which is the average Coulomb interaction energy of the \( i \)th electron when interacting with all other electrons whose states are given by \( \psi_j^{(0)} \). Substituting \( V_i^{(0)} \) in (1.25) is possible to determine the functions \( \psi_i^{(1)} \) in the first order approximation:

\[
\left[ \hat{h}(i) + V_i^{(0)} - \epsilon_i \right] \psi_i^{(1)} = 0
\]  

(1.27)

then, assuming each electron in an state given by \( \psi_i^{(1)} \) the new potential \( V_i^{(1)} \) is obtained:

\[
V_i^{(1)} = \sum_{j \neq i} \int \psi_j^{(1)*} \left( \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right) \psi_j^{(1)} \, d^3r_j
\]  

(1.28)

which can be used to evaluate the wave function:

\[
\left[ \hat{h}(i) + V_i^{(1)} - \epsilon_i \right] \psi_i^{(2)} = 0
\]  

(1.29)

if the process converges, it can be continued until obtain a potential energy:

\[
V_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \int \psi_j^* \left( \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right) \psi_j \, d^3r_j
\]  

(1.30)

which, by substitution in the set of equations:

\[
\left[ \hat{h}(i) + V_i - \epsilon_i \right] \psi_i = 0
\]  

(1.31)

will lead to almost the same wave functions \( \psi_i \) than the used to evaluate the potential energy (1.30). The potential energy so obtained is called self consistent Hartree field.

The above approximation is based upon representation of the system’s wave function as a product (1.21) of single electron wave functions. However such a choice does not account the fermionic character of the electrons. A proper
wave function of electrons set must be antisymmetric. A self consistent field (SCF) which correctly account the symmetry of the electronic wave function was obtained by Fock [12]. In Fock’s method the trial function is constructed by means of the Slater determinant:

\[
\Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \begin{vmatrix}
\psi_1(1) & \psi_1(2) & \cdots & \psi_1(N) \\
\psi_2(1) & \psi_2(2) & \cdots & \psi_2(N) \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\psi_N(1) & \psi_N(2) & \cdots & \psi_N(N)
\end{vmatrix}
\]

(1.32)

which can be expressed as:

\[
\Phi = \hat{A}[\psi_1(1)\psi_2(2)\cdots\psi_n(n)],
\]

(1.33)

where the anti-symmetrization operator \(\hat{A}\) is given by:

\[
\hat{A} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \sum_{k=1}^{n!} (-1)^k \hat{P}
\]

where \(\hat{P}\) is the bi-particular permutation operator, \(\hat{A}\) fulfill the following relationships:

\[
\hat{A}^2 = \sqrt{n!} \hat{A}, \quad \hat{A}^\dagger = \hat{A}, \quad \hat{A}\left(\frac{1}{r_{ij}}\right) = \left(\frac{1}{r_{ij}}\right) \hat{A}, \quad \hat{A}^\dagger \hat{h}(i) = \hat{h}(i) \hat{A}
\]

(1.34)

with the trial function (1.32) the equation (1.22) becomes:

\[
J = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \sum_i \int \hat{A}^\dagger[\psi_1(1)\psi_2(2)\cdots\psi_n(n)]^\ast \hat{h}(i) \hat{A}[\psi_1(1)\psi_2(2)\cdots\psi_n(n)] d\tau + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \sum_{i\neq j} \int \hat{A}^\dagger[\psi_1(1)\psi_2(2)\cdots\psi_n(n)]^\ast \left(\frac{1}{r_{ij}}\right) \hat{A}[\psi_1(1)\psi_2(2)\cdots\psi_n(n)] d\tau}_{I_1}
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \sum_i \int \hat{A}^\dagger[\psi_1(1)\psi_2(2)\cdots\psi_n(n)]^\ast \hat{h}(i) \hat{A}[\psi_1(1)\psi_2(2)\cdots\psi_n(n)] d\tau + \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n!}} \sum_{i\neq j} \int \hat{A}^\dagger[\psi_1(1)\psi_2(2)\cdots\psi_n(n)]^\ast \left(\frac{1}{r_{ij}}\right) \hat{A}[\psi_1(1)\psi_2(2)\cdots\psi_n(n)] d\tau}_{I_2}
\]

using the properties (1.34) and bearing in mind that \(\int \psi_i(i) \psi_j(i) d^3r_i = \delta_i^j\), \(I_1\) and \(I_2\) becomes:

\[
I_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n_e} \int \psi_i(i) \hat{h}(i) \psi_i(i) d^3r_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n_e} \epsilon_i^{HF}
\]

(1.35)
\[ I_2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j}^{n_e} \left[ \int \psi_i(i)\psi_j(j)^* \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \psi_i(i)\psi_j(j) d^3 r_i d^3 r_j - \int \psi_i(i)\psi_j(j)^* \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \psi_i(j)\psi_j(i) d^3 r_i d^3 r_j \right] \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j}^{n_e} \left[ J_{ij} - K_{ij} \right] \]

then, the Hartree-Fock energy becomes:
\[ E_{HF} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_e} \epsilon_{i}^{HF} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j}^{n_e} \left[ J_{ij} - K_{ij} \right] \tag{1.36} \]

The first term in equation (1.36) is just the sum of the mean values of the monoparticles energies. The second term contains two parts: \( J_{ij} \) represents the electrostatic interaction of two electrons in states \( i \) and \( j \), while \( K_{ij} \) is the so called Hartree-Fock exchange energy, having no analogue in the classical physics. It is a consequence of the fermionic character of the electrons. To calculate the Hartree-Fock energy, the wave functions \( \psi_i \) (usually called orbitals) are needed, thus, a similar iterative method as previously described for Hartree approximation is used.

### 1.2.2 Post Hartree-Fock methods

Although HF calculations give very useful and even accurate results for quantities like equilibrium geometries of the molecules, the HF approach is a very approximate method to solve electronic problems [13]. The HF method, essentially, is a mean field approximation in which each electron move under the influence of the mean interaction due to all other electrons. As a result, it neglects the instantaneous or correlated motions of the electrons. It is useful to define the difference between the exact energy \( E_{exact} \) of the electronic system and the HF as the electronic correlation energy:
\[ E_{corr} = E_{exact} - E_{HF} \tag{1.37} \]

Even when the HF energy represents the major part of the total energy, usually around 95 to 99 %, correlation energy [13] is very significant in most chemical
problems (molecular collisions, properties calculations, etc.): interest is not in the absolute value of the energy but in the differences between values for given configurations. Such a difference (e.g. between two vibrational levels of a diatom) can be of the same order than $E_{\text{corr}}$. Thus, these “small” contributions may be significant [14].

In order to recover the correlation energy it is necessary to go beyond the HF approximation. The general approach for the electronic correlation energy calculation is to include more than one Slater determinant in the expansion of the electronic wave function.

$$\Phi = \sum_k c_k D_k$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.38)

where $D_0$ is the Slater determinant for the ground state wave function, composed of the $N$ lowest molecular orbitals and $D_k(k > 0)$ are Slater determinants with one or more electrons in excited orbitals. This approach is called configuration interaction or CI [14]. Configuration interaction calculations are classified by the number of excitations used to make each determinant. If only one electron has been moved for each determinant, it is called a configuration interaction single-excitation (CIS) [15] calculation. CIS calculations give an approximation to the excited states of the molecule, but do not change the ground state energy. Single-and double-excitation (CISD) [15] calculations yield a ground-state energy that has been corrected for correlation. Triple-excitation (CISDT) [15] and quadruple-excitation (CISDTQ) [15] calculations are done only when very-high-accuracy results are desired. The configuration interaction calculation with all possible excitations is called a full CI (FCI). The full CI calculation using an infinitely large basis set will give an exact quantum mechanical result. However, full CI calculations are very rarely done due to the immense amount of computer power required. Thus, accurate calculation of correlation energy for electrons in a molecular system is a very difficult task and further methods and/or truncation of the CI expansion are needed. Some type of calculations begins with a HF approximation and are then corrected to include electronic correlation.

Some of these methods [16] are Møller-Plesset perturbation theory (MPn, where n is the order of correction), the generalized valence bond (GVB) method, multiconfigurational self-consistent field (MCSCF), and coupled cluster theory.
As a group, these are referred to as correlated calculation methods. In the following some of them will be introduced.

**1.2.2.1 Multiconfigurational self consistent field method**

The multiconfigurational self consistent field (MCSCF) [15] wave function is a truncation of the CI expansion (1.38) in which both factors of the expansion, the coefficient and the molecular orbitals of the configurations, are variationally optimized. The molecular orbital is optimized by means of the coefficients of the basis set (see section 1.4) in which it is expanded. Simultaneous optimization of orbitals and coefficients is a difficult task, as it is needed to account the two sets of parameters defining the wave function. Then, a compromise appears between generation of a configuration space sufficiently flexible to describe the molecular system and the number of variables to be computationally tractable.

The MCSCF wave function is well suited to study systems involving degenerate or nearly degenerate configurations, where the static correlation is important [15]. These situations are usually encountered in the description of reaction process where chemical bonds are being broken, but also in ground-state molecular systems at the equilibrium geometry.

An approach to select the MCSCF configurations is to partition the molecular orbital space into three subspaces, containing inactive, active and virtual (or unoccupied) orbitals respectively [17]. Typically, the core orbitals of the system are treated as inactive and the valence orbitals as active. Thus, the complete active space (CAS) consists in all configurations obtained by distributing the valence electrons in all possible ways in the active orbitals, keeping the core orbitals doubled occupied in all configurations. This is referred to as full valence complete active space (FVCAS) [17]. FVCAS method is implemented in MOLPRO [18], an *ab initio* package used to study the title molecular system of this work.

Since the configuration expansion that can be managed within the framework of CASSCF theory corresponds to small active spaces, it is in general impossible to recover the dynamical correlation by MCSCF wave functions. For high accuracy and treatment of dynamical correlation, additional calculations must be carried out based on the initial MCSCF description.
1.2.2.2 Perturbation Methods

In order to apply perturbation theory [7] to the calculation of the correlation energy, the unperturbed Hamiltonian must be selected. The most common choice is to take this as a sum over Fock operators [16], leading to Møller Plesset (MP) Perturbation theory [19]. In this way, the electron repulsion is counted twice. This choice is not consistent with the assumption that perturbation should be small when compared with $\hat{H}_0$ [7]. However, it does fulfill the requirement that solutions of the unperturbed Schrödinger equation should be known.

$$\hat{H}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{F}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \hat{h}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\hat{J}_{ij} - \hat{K}_{ij}) \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.39)

Subtracting the unperturbed Hamiltonian from the total one, the perturbation becomes:

$$\hat{W} = \hat{H} - \hat{H}_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{h}_i + V_{ee} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \hat{h}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\hat{J}_{ij} - \hat{K}_{ij}) \right) = V_{ee} - 2\langle V_{ee} \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.40)

Thus, the Hartree-Fock energy (1.36) is recovered only in the first order of the perturbation:

$$\text{MP1} = \text{MP0} + E(\text{MP1}) = E(\text{HF})$$  \hspace{1cm} (1.41)

electron correlation energy starts at order 2 with this choice.

One can go further to higher orders of perturbations MP3, MP4 and so on. In the ideal case the HF, MP2, MP3 and MP4 results show a monotonic convergence towards a limiting value, with the corrections being of the same sign and numerically smaller as the order of the perturbation increases. Unfortunately this is not the typical behavior. Even in systems where the reference is well described by a single determinant, oscillations in a given property as a function of perturbation order are often observed [20].

In practice only low orders of perturbation theory can be carried out and it is often observed that HF and MP2 results differs considerably, the MP3 moves back towards the HF and the MP4 moves away again. In despite of such a behavior MP offers a cheaper method to account the electronic correlation energy, compared with other approximations [16]. Besides, perturbation methods are size extensive \textit{i.e.} the calculated energy of two fragments placed infinitely farther away is the
same than the sum of the energies of each fragment [15], a significant advantage compared to variational methods.

Perturbation methods can also be used with multireference functions. This is the case of CASPTn [15, 21–23] in which perturbation theory calculations (of \( n \)-th-order) are carried out using CASSCF wave function as zeroth order approximation.

A difficulty of this method is that the CASSCF wave function is not an eigenfunction of the non-perturbed Hamiltonian (1.39). Then, \( \hat{H}_0 \) must be redefined to restore the eigenfunction property. A solution, first proposed by Andersson et al. [22] was to project the \( \hat{H}_0 \) operator onto the space of configuration interaction functions. This is done with help of projection operators: \( \hat{P}_o \) projecting onto the reference wave function space (\( V_0 \)), \( \hat{P}_K \) project onto an space \( V_K \), defined by the orthogonal complement to \( V_0 \) in the restricted subspace used to generate the CAS wave function, \( \hat{P}_{SD} \) project onto the space \( V_{SD} \), spanned by all single and double replacement states generated from \( V_0 \) and \( \hat{P}_{TQ} \) projecting onto the space \( V_{TQ} \), the space containing all higher order excitations not included in the previously mentioned spaces. Thus, the unperturbed Hamiltonian can be written:

\[
\hat{H}_0^{\text{CASPT}} = \hat{P}_o \hat{F} \hat{P}_o + \hat{P}_K \hat{F} \hat{P}_K + \hat{P}_{SD} \hat{F} \hat{P}_{SD} + \hat{P}_{TQ} \hat{F} \hat{P}_{TQ}
\]  

(1.42)

where \( \hat{F} \) is the CASSCF Fock operator [22]. With this idea and a rather complicated mathematical formalism, a significant part of the correlation energy can be recovered in CASPT2 energy.

The CASPT approach is almost size extensive [15]. For a CASSCF reference wave function dominated by a single determinant, the contributions to the energy from the terms that are not size-extensive is expected to be small, while for a wave function in which several determinants have large weights, larger non-separable contribution is expected.

The importance of CASPT lies in the fact that, it represents the only generally applicable method for the \textit{ab initio} calculation of dynamical correlation effects of open and closed-shell multiconfigurational electronic systems [15].
1.3 Other methods

When studying molecular structure, either to obtain a potential energy surface or to calculate molecular properties, different methods, besides those presented in the previous section are also used. We can hardly select one of them as a better one, in such a case, it would be only to deal with certain problem or system. In the following some of them are very briefly presented.

The Gaussian theories (Gn), developed in the 1980’s [24] have shown great utility in calculating accurate energies [25]. In these theories energy is composite, assembled from a variety of different quantum methods, using basis sets of different sophistication to yield effective energies at high level and large basis sets. The means by which this is achieved may be illustrated with the equation:

\[ E(\text{Gn}) = E[\text{MP2/SP}] + \Delta E(+) + \Delta E(2df,p) + \Delta E(\text{QCI}) + \Delta E(\text{MP2/large}) + E(\text{HLC}) \]

where each term represents the corresponding contribution to the energy at the specific level, \( E(\text{HLC}) \) stands for the “higher level correction” depending [24] on the number of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) (spin up and down) valence electrons.

In Gaussian theories the accuracy can be extremely good for systems similar to those for which they were parametrized, the ground state of organic molecules. However, for other systems, such as transition structures or clusters, these methods often are less accurate than some less computationally intensive ab initio methods [13].

The premise behind Density Functional Theories (DFT) is that the ground state electronic energy is completely determined by the electron density \( \rho \) instead of the wave function [16]. There exists a one-to-one correspondence between the electron density of a system, and the energy. The origin of this theory comes from a theorem by Hohenberg and Kohn [26] proving the above statement. A wave function for an \( n_e \)-electron system contains \( 3n_e \) coordinates, whereas the electron density is the square of the wave-function integrated over \( n_e - 1 \) electron coordinates and depends just on three coordinates independently on the size of the system. The “only” problem is that although it has been proven that each different density yields a different ground state energy, the functional connecting
these two quantities is not known. The goal of DFT is to design functionals connecting the electron density with energy.

Perdew and Wang [27] reported its PW86, while Becke [28] presents a widely used correction (B88) to this one. Lee, Yang and Parr [29] proposed the LYP functional, also very used in the literature while the Becke’s gradient-correlated exchange correlation density functional B3LYP [29, 30] is perhaps, the most popular. Weak interactions due to dispersion (van der Waals type) are poorly described by the so far used functionals [16]. Hydrogen bonding, however, is mainly electrostatic, which is reasonably well accounted by DFT methods. At the present, such methods are not well suited for excited states of the same symmetry as the ground state. The absence of a wave function makes it difficult to ensure orthogonality between the ground and excited states [16].

Multireference Perturbation theory (MRMP2) is another way of accounting electronic correlation using multireference wave functions and the Møller-Plesset Perturbation theory [31, 32]. Basically the idea is similar to picture presented in CASPT methods. The MR-MP2 is based upon applying the generalized Independent electron-pair approximation (IEPA) [33], consisting in approximating the total correlation energy as a sum of pair contributions, independently calculated, to an MCSCF reference function. The use of IEPA for the study of dynamical correlation, warrant a rapid convergence of the perturbation series. However, perturbation series either show very slow convergence or divergence at intermediate and large internuclear distances.

1.4 Basis sets

One of the approximations inherent to all essentially ab initio methods is the introduction of a basis set [16]. To expand the unknown function, such as a molecular orbital, in a set of known functions is not an approximation, if the basis set is complete. However, a complete basis means that an infinite number of functions must be used, which is impossible in practical calculations. The smaller the basis set, the poorer the representation. The type of basis functions used has also influence on the accuracy. The better a single basis function is able to reproduce the unknown function, the fewer basis functions are necessary to
achieve a given level of accuracy. In this section brief ideas on the types of basis sets are given.

There are two types of basis functions (also called Atomic Orbitals, AO, even when they are not in general, solutions of the Schrödinger equation) used in electronic structure calculations: Slater Type Orbitals (STOs) and Gaussian type Orbitals (GTOs). Slater type orbitals [34] are the solutions of the Schrödinger equation for the hydrogen atom. The electron integrals of these functions can not be solved analytically. Thus, STOs are only used for atomic and diatomic systems where high accuracy is needed. When using GTOs [35] more functions are needed to represent the orbitals, however, electronic integrals can be analytically performed, which is faster than numerical integration of the STOs.

Once the type of function (STO or GTO) is selected, the next step is to choose of the number of functions to be used. The smallest number of functions possible, to contain all the electrons in a neutral atom, is called minimum basis set. Thus, for hydrogen (and helium) it means a single s-function, for the first row elements of the periodic table it requires two s-functions (1s, 2s) and one set of p-functions (2px, 2py, 2pz) and so on. The next improvement is to double all basis functions, producing a double zeta (DZ) type basis. Then, a DZ basis employs two s-functions for hydrogen (1s and 1s'), four s and two p-functions for the elements on the first row, and so on. One can also go further to Triple Zeta (TZ), Quadruple Zeta (QZ) and Quintuple Zeta (5Z). In actual calculations doubling the number of core orbitals would rarely be considered. Often the valence functions are doubled, producing a VDZ basis set.

The differences in the electron distributions along a bond and in the perpendicular direction, led to the introduction of polarization functions in basis sets. Adding a single set of polarization functions (p-function hydrogen atoms and d-functions on heavy atoms) to the DZ basis, forms a Double Zeta plus Polarization (DZP) basis set.

The fact that many basis sets go into describing the energetically important, but chemically unimportant core electrons is the foundation for contracted basis sets. An energy optimized basis set which gives a good description of the outer part of the wave function is required to be very large. However, contracted basis sets can lead to better description of the outer part with a smaller number of
functions. A contracted basis set is obtained by combining the full basis set functions, known as primitive GTOs, into a smaller set of functions by forming fixed linear combinations. The resulting functions are called contracted GTOs.

An attempt to a better description of the wave function far from the nucleus is done by the introduction of diffuse functions, basis functions with small exponents. Diffuse functions are needed to describe interactions at long distances or whenever loosely bound electrons are present. Basis sets with diffuse functions are called augmented basis sets.

There is a family of correlation consistent basis sets (aug-cc-pVXZ, X=D,T,Q,5) created by Dunning and coworkers [36, 37]. The “aug” denotes an augmented basis. The “cc” denotes that this is a correlation-consistent basis, meaning that the functions were optimized for best performance with correlated calculations. The “p” denotes that polarization functions are included on all atoms. The “VXZ” stands for valence X (double, triple...) zeta. These sets have become popular for high-accuracy correlated calculations.

Commonly, basis sets are implemented in \textit{ab initio} packages for electronic structure calculations. However, when selecting a basis set, some of the above presented details should be accounted for, as well as the accuracy desired for the calculation, bearing in mind the computing power available.

### 1.5 Representing a Potential Energy Surface

Results from \textit{ab initio} electronic structure calculations are given mostly in form of tables of energy values for special geometries. Even when such a calculations might also provide the first and second derivatives, a full analytic or numerical representation of the potential energy is commonly needed [3, 38].

For spectroscopy studies, only relatively small regions around some particular configurations are needed to be explored. Extended areas, however, are required for dynamical calculations [2]. In both cases one has a given set of data (inter-atomic distances, internal coordinates, etc. and the corresponding potential energy values) wishing to be condensed by fitting into a model describing the potential energy surface that depends on adjustable parameters.

For local approximations, interpolating functions (splines), polynomial or ra-
tional expansions are frequently used. Functional forms that are special and simulate the topography of the PES (e.g. Morse functions, many-body expansions) are used for local and global interpolations [38, 39].

In global methods, the function depends upon the entire set of data, whereas in local methods a restricted number of data values is used. The interpolating functions can cover exactly or approximately the given data points. In some applications, the PES is searched only along the intrinsic reaction coordinate, from the transition state to the product and/or to the reactant configuration [39].

A successful representation of a global PES for dynamical calculations should satisfy certain criteria, as discussed by Wright and Gray [40] and remarked by Varandas [3]:

1. “It should accurately characterize the asymptotic reactant and product molecules (or more generally any fragment of the full system).”

2. “It should have correct symmetry properties of the system.”

3. “It should represent the true potential energy surface in interaction regions for which experimental or non-empirical theoretical data are available (including, in principle, the very short-range and long-range regions associated with various asymptotic channels [39]).”

4. “It should behave in a physically reasonable manner in those parts of the interaction region for which no experimental or theoretical data are available.”

5. “It should smoothly connect the asymptotic and interaction region in a physically reasonable way.”

6. “The function and its derivatives should have as simple an algebraic form as possible consistent with the desired quality of the fit.”

7. “It should require as small a number of data points as possible to achieve an accurate fit.”

8. “It should converge to the true surface as more data become available.”
9. “It should indicate where it is most meaningful to compute the data points.”

10. “It should have a minimal amount of *ad hoc* or ‘patched up character’.”

Criteria from 1 to 5 must be obeyed in order to obtain reasonable results in subsequent calculations using the function. Criteria from 6 to 10 are desirable for practical reasons. Finding a function that meets these criteria requires skill and experience, and considerable amount of patience [13].

The aim of this thesis is to construct a potential energy surface to be used for dynamical calculations. Thus, a global representation is needed, bearing in mind the above mentioned conditions for the obtained function. For such a purpose the double many-body expansion method was used.

### 1.5.1 The double many-body expansion method

Starting from the work of London, Eyring, Polanyi and Sato (LEPS) [41] and the “diatomics in molecules” (DIM) method [42] a many-body expansion (MBE) was developed by Murrell and co-workers [1]. The essential idea of the MBE method is to describe the total interaction of the polyatomic system by adding all the many-body interactions of each fragment.

The many-body expansion for a single-valued potential energy surface of an n-atomic system is written as follows [43]:

\[
V_{ABC...N}(\mathbf{R}) = \sum V_A^{(1)} + \sum V_{AB}^{(2)}(R_{AB}) + \sum V_{ABC}^{(3)}(R_{AB}, R_{AC}, R_{BC}) + \cdots + V_{ABC...N}^{(n)}(\mathbf{R})
\]

Summation indicates addition of all terms of the corresponding m-body fragments (1 ≤ m ≤ n). \(V_A^{(1)}\) is the energy of the atom A in the state which is produced by adiabatically removing this atom from the cluster. \(\sum V_A^{(1)}\) is the sum of all the one-body terms. If the reference energy is taken as the energy of all the atoms in their ground states, then \(V_A^{(1)}\) will be different from zero if, on dissociation, atom A is in an excited state. \(V_{AB}^{(2)}(R_{AB})\) is a two-body energy term, depending on the distance separating the two atoms, and which goes to zero as \(R_{AB}\) tends to infinity. \(V_{ABC}^{(3)}(R_{AB}, R_{AC}, R_{BC})\) is a three-body energy which depends on the three distances of the triangle ABC. All of these three-body terms, should be zero
if one of the atoms is removed away from the other two. The last term in the expansion \( V_{ABC...N}^{(n)}(\mathbf{R}) \) is the \( n \)-body energy. Such a term will become zero if any of the atoms is moved to infinity. It depends, as the total potential function, on the \( 3N - 6 \) internal coordinates (inter-atomic distances).

Thus far, there seems to be no simplification of the problem, once to get the full potential, a function depending on the whole set of variables is required. However, when there is a rapid convergence of the series or exist simple functional forms for high-order terms of the expansion such a representation becomes attractive. As a matter of fact, in all tetratomic system studied by this means (see Ref. 1 and references therein) the main features of the surface appear to be contained in the two- and three-body energy terms, and the four-body term can be regarded as fine tuning to give a desired chemical accuracy.

Even though there is no rapid convergence in the many-body expansion, the potential is designed to satisfy all dissociation limits, and it also provides a strategy for building up larger polyatomic systems.

MBE method is proposed to provide an analytical representation of potential energy surfaces for all possible configurations of the system. Then, its functional form must properly reproduce all the regions, from short range interactions to long range ones. However, the method fails in keeping only one function to reproduce both ranges. Thus, the idea of splitting each many-body terms into two parts arise. In such spirit Varandas [4, 39, 44, 45] extended the many-body expansion to the double many-body expansion (DMBE) in which each many-body term is split into two parts: one accounting for the long range or dynamical correlation energy and the other describing the short range or extended-Hartree-Fock energies.

In DMBE method, the extended-Hartree-Fock energy is essentially built up by the first-order exchange and electrostatic energy contributions, together with the second-order induction energy [39]. In turn, dynamical correlation energy includes all cases of double and multiple excitations in one of the atoms (intraatomic correlation) as well as single and multiple excitations in more than one atom (interatomic correlation and intra-inter coupling terms) [39].

The advantage of the DMBE model over other representations lies on the possibility to describe the region in the short range, of large interest when comparing with spectroscopic results, with accurate polynomial representation while long
range interactions, of interest for dynamics calculations, are phenomenologically described by multipolar expansions [46, 47]. Furthermore, and also significant, is the fact that once DMBE is a many-body expansion, each n-body energy terms, once deduced, can be used in all the polyatomics in which such n-body systems are contained.

In a series of papers Varandas and co-workers [39, 44, 46–49] presented general expressions for n-body dynamics correlation energy term, to reproduce the proper asymptotic behavior of the potential energy surface. Extended Hartree-Fock approximate correlation energy for two- and three-body interactions (EHFACE2 and EHFACE3) have also been proposed [46] while EHFACE2U was introduced to properly represent the united atom limit for diatoms [47].

The DMBE method has been successfully applied to numerous triatomic systems, particularly to those of interest in this thesis [50–52], tetratomic [53, 54] and larger polyatomic systems [55, 56]. With such a preceding experience, and the extensive use of these DMBE PESs for dynamical calculations (Ref. 2 and references therein), we believe DMBE offers a reliable method to construct a global potential energy surfaces for the HSO$_2$ molecular system.

### 1.6 Properties of potential energy functions

Once a potential energy function (PES) has been properly represented, it must be analyzed to determine information about the chemical system. The PES is the most complete description of all the conformers, isomers, and energetically accessible motions of a system [1, 16]. Minima on this surface correspond to optimized geometries, any movement away from a minimum gives a configuration with higher energy. The lowest-energy minimum is called the global minimum. There can be many local minima, such as higher-energy conformers or isomers. The transition structure between the reactants and products of a reaction, or the highest energy configuration between them, is a saddle point on this surface. A PES can be used to find both saddle points and reaction coordinates, and, as done in this work, to subsequently study reaction dynamics. The vibrational properties of the molecular system can also be obtained from the PES [16].

Let us represent the potential energy function as $f(x)$ depending on a set of
variables \( \mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_N) \). Optimization is a general term for finding stationary points of a function \textit{i.e.} points where all the first derivatives are zero. Stationary points condition can be written in terms of the gradient \( \mathbf{g} \), a vector formed by the first order derivatives of \( f \), and the Hessian \( \mathbf{H} \), a symmetric matrix with the second derivatives as elements. By means of orthogonal transformations \[57\] the matrix \( \mathbf{H} \) can be diagonalized, becoming in \( \mathbf{H}' \). When all the diagonal elements of \( \mathbf{H}' \) are positive, the stationary point correspond to a minimum configuration, \textit{i.e.} if:

\[
\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_0) = 0, \quad \mathbf{H}'_{ii}(\mathbf{x}_0) > 0, \tag{1.43}
\]

at given \( \mathbf{x}_0 \) the function will reach a local minimum. If the function value at this point is the smallest one of all the minima, then \( \mathbf{x}_0 \) stands for the global minimum configuration. When one of diagonal elements of \( \mathbf{H}' \) is negative, then the configuration \( \mathbf{x}_0 \) correspond to a saddle point.

Hessian, once diagonalized gives not only a condition to define whether a configuration is a minimum or a saddle point, but also the normal modes frequencies, whose values are proportional to the square root of the diagonal elements. Therefore, a saddle point will be an stationary point with an imaginary frequency. Such an imaginary frequency will characterize the coordinate connecting the two minima. Stationary points also exist which have more than one imaginary frequency. However, in general these do not have any special meaning.

To find those configurations corresponding to minima and saddle points, optimization techniques are required \[58\]. In the optimization of the PES presented in this thesis a package \[59\] available at the Coimbra Theoretical & Computational Chemistry group was used. This code uses a mixture of optimization methods, and it has been specifically designed for potential energy functions of molecular systems, once the function has been given.

The dissociation products of a polyatomic system correspond to regions at infinity where the potential energy surface is flat in one or more dimensions. Thus, gradient of the PES is zero. The asymptotic regions can be referred as valleys. The slope of the valley gradually changes when the atoms approach each other. If they moves towards a saddle point the slope will be positive while a negative value indicate the approximation towards a minimum.
The term path is used to name the curve (hyper-curve, to denote its multidimensional character) defined by the energy function where the coordinates change from one configuration to another. Thus a reaction path is a path leading from the reactants valley to the products configuration. A minimum-energy reaction path follows the optimum way, it means, of all the possible paths, that corresponding to the steepest descent from saddle point to both products and reactants limits [60]. The saddle point is the maximum energy configuration in the minimum-energy reaction path.

Due to the current level of constantly increasing computing power, construction of potential energy surfaces might produce a feeling of an obsolete idea. An strong temptation comes from the desire to carry direct or on the fly dynamics i.e. obtain \textit{ab initio} energies, gradients and force constants once required for a given configuration of the trajectory [61, 62], therefore, with no need of a function representation. Besides, by using large computational facilities to think in a very dense grid of \textit{ab initio} points instead of a continuous function could be the trend [63]. However, it should be kept in mind that \textit{ab initio} calculations are not the exact solution of the Schrödinger equation neither within the Born-Oppenheimer approximation. Actually, as was mentioned in previous sections, a large number of approximations was used for such a goal. Thus, even at the \textit{state of the art} level of theory one might eventually get inappropriate solutions for the real problem. On the other hand, representations of PESs through functions provides a global view [2]; besides, once the selected method to represent the interaction comes with real physical meaning, it is possible to guarantee appropriate behavior in the range or regions were \textit{ab initio} calculations could fail [39]. Furthermore, and as final words on this topic, a function representing a PES can be further corrected with experimental evidences [56] and, as in DMBE method, such a function may be used in the representation of larger systems. While, for example, in one on-the-fly-trajectory, once it is finished the calculated electronic energies can hardly be used for other studies.
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Abstract

A global potential energy surface is reported for the ground electronic state of HSO₂ by using the double many-body expansion (DMBE) method. It employs realistic DMBE functions previously reported from accurate ab initio calculations (in some cases, fine tuned to spectroscopic data) for the triatomic fragments, and four-body energy terms that were modelled by fitting novel ab initio FVCAS/AVTZ calculations for the tetratomic system. In some cases, FVCAS/AVDZ energies have been employed after being scaled to FVCAS/AVTZ ones. To assess the role of the dynamical correlation, exploratory single-point Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbations calculations have also been conducted at one stationary point. All reported calculations are compared with previous ab initio results for the title system. The potential energy surface predicts HOSO to be the most stable configuration, in good agreement with other theoretical data available in the literature. In turn, the HSO₂ isomer with H bonded to S is described as a local minimum, which is stable with respect to the H + SO₂ dissociation asymptote.
1 Introduction

Sulfur has long been recognized as a major contaminant in the atmosphere. It comes both from natural and anthropogenic sources, having significant implications in environmental issues such as acid rain, air pollution, and global climate changes. Although a significant part of sulfur containing molecules reacts with water in the troposphere and eventually precipitates as sulfur aerosols, some (such as COS) may reach the stratosphere and have implications in the ozone budget. Among the sulfur compounds, the HSO$_2$ isomers are supposed to play an important role in atmospheric and combustion chemistry. In particular, the HSO$_2$ adduct is thought to be responsible for the catalytic removal of atomic hydrogen in flames through the following reactions:

\[
\begin{align*}
H + SO_2 + M &\rightarrow HSO_2 + M \\
HSO_2 + H &\rightarrow SO_2 + H_2
\end{align*}
\]

In turn, the thylperoxyl radical (HSOO) has been pointed out to play a role in the atmosphere via oxidation of sulfur species, including the action as a sink of SH through the addition reaction:

\[
SH + O_2 + M \rightarrow HSOO + M
\]

Table 1 compiles the energetics of all exothermic processes that may occur on the title potential energy surface, as extracted from experimental sources quoted in cited references.

Despite some theoretical studies of the HSO$_2$ isomers using \textit{ab initio} MO calculations and DFT theory, no global potential energy surface has thus far been reported for the electronic ground state of HSO$_2$. Such a scarcity of electronic structure calculations on the full six-dimensional configuration space of HSO$_2$ has prompted us to model a global potential energy surface for the title species by using double many-body expansion (DMBE) theory. This approach has been successfully applied to a wealth of triatomic systems (including all ground-state triatomic fragments of HSO$_2$, namely, HO$_2$, SO$_2$, and HSO$_2$) as well as tetratomic (O$_4$ and HO$_3$) and even larger polyatomic (HO$_4$ and HO$_5$) systems. Of course, an alternative to the use of a global potential energy surface,
Table 1. Energetics of the exothermic processes occurring on the ground-state HSO$_2$ potential energy surface$^a$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>classical exothermicity$^b$ (kcal mol$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Refs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS + O$_2$ → H + SO$_2$</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>24,42,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS + O$_2$ → OH + SO</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24,42,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH + SO → H + SO$_2$</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>24,43,24,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + SOO → S + HO$_2$</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>22,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + SOO → HS + O$_2$</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>23,24,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + SOO → OH + SO</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>23,24,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H + SOO → H + SO$_2$</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O + HSO → HS + O$_2$</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>24,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O + HSO → OH + SO</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>24,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O + HSO → H + SO$_2$</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>24,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S + HO$_2$ → O + HSO</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>22,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S + HO$_2$ → HS + O$_2$</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>22,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S + HO$_2$ → OH + SO</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>22,43,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S + HO$_2$ → H + SO$_2$</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>22,23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Except where indicated in the original papers, the reported energies are mostly experimental, and are reproduced by the DMBE potential energy surface of the present work.

$^b$The quantum mechanical zero-point energy of the reactants and products is not taken into account.
would be to carry out dynamics studies where the latter is calculated on the fly (for a review see, e.g., Ref. 30). Although the potential energy surface generated from such calculations could eventually be employed for further dynamics studies, it is hard to anticipate whether a sufficiently accurate function can be generated via such a scheme. There are two major reasons for our worry. First, if the electronic structure calculations were done purely \textit{ab initio} (for a semi-empirical, yet expensive, scheme based on the scaling of the dynamical correlation energy, see Ref. 31), this would in principle require an awful amount of computational time to achieve sufficient accuracy for the dynamics studies, as it involves many electrons with a second-row sulfur atom. Second, as discussed later, the reaction path may evolve through the HOSO deep chemical well (with a well depth of about 70 kcal mol\(^{-1}\)) and hence exploratory dynamics calculations have shown that the trajectories generating the potential energy surface might involve typically \(10^5\) solutions of the electronic Schrödinger equation (to calculate the energy, gradients, and eventually force constants) per trajectory for proper conservation of the total energy and angular momentum. Thus, the DMBE approach definitely stands as a viable one, particularly having in mind its fair predictive character when the cluster expansion is truncated at the three-body energy terms for which realistic DMBE functions have already been reported (see section 3.1).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the results of new \textit{ab initio} calculations carried out for HSO\(_2\), while the DMBE methodology is discussed and applied in section 3 by focusing on the title system. The characterization of the most relevant stationary points of the novel HSO\(_2\) DMBE potential energy surface is then presented in section 4. Section 5 gathers the major conclusions.

## 2 \textit{Ab initio} calculations

The results of \textit{ab initio} calculations\(^4\textsuperscript{–12}\) for ground state HSO\(_2\) differ across the various studies reported in literature. In order to get further information, we have performed our own \textit{ab initio} calculations at the FVCAS (full valence complete active space) level aiming at characterizing the most relevant stationary points of the electronic ground state of HSO\(_2\). The aug-cc-pVDZ (AVDZ) and aug-cc-pVTZ (AVTZ) basis sets of Dunning\(^32,\textsuperscript{33}\) have been employed on the framework
of the MOLPRO\textsuperscript{34} code. We are aware that the choice of such basis sets may be problematic when second-row atoms are involved. In fact, it has been argued\textsuperscript{35, 36} that the original Dunning’s\textsuperscript{32, 33} correlation consistent basis sets for the third row elements lack proper core polarization functions to be reliable. Although schemes\textsuperscript{35, 36} have been suggested to overcome such a limitation, the calculations would still be rather expensive and hence such basis sets have not been employed here. In fact, calculations on the tetratomic have been mostly used to calibrate the saddle point for the reaction \( \text{H} + \text{SO}_2 \leftrightarrow \text{HOSO} \), for which our AVDZ calculations scaled to AVTZ ones have shown a satisfactory agreement with the best attributes reported in the literature.\textsuperscript{8, 10} In fact, such an agreement will be shown later to be extensive to all characterized stationary points when compared with a wealth of theoretical data from other sources. As starting guesses for the geometry optimizations, we have employed the results reported by Goumri \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{10} from MP2 calculations. Following a recommendation in the MOLPRO manual, the rational functional approach has been used as the search algorithm for the minima, while the quadratic steepest descent method has been employed for transition state optimizations. To obtain the dissociation energy, we have calculated the energy of \( \text{H} + \text{SO}_2 \) by keeping \( \text{SO}_2 \) frozen at its optimum FVCAS/AVTZ geometry while moving away the hydrogen atom until convergence was reached (see Table 2). Due to computational limitations, and because the final results will hopefully not differ drastically, we have characterized the transition states only at the FVCAS/AVDZ level. The Z-matrix format for geometries has been used throughout the calculations.

Table 2 collects the \textit{ab initio} results from the present work. Considering that there has not been a review of the results appeared recently in the literature, we compile the available theoretical properties in two tables, including (for completeness) our results: Unfortunately, only the geometries and absolute energies are compiled in most cases, which may prevent a realistic judgment of the relevant energetics. Table 3 gathers the reported minima, and Table 4 the transition states. In turn, Figure 1 defines the various coordinates: from left to right, \( \gamma \) is the dihedral angle formed by the planes defined by \( \text{OSO} \) and \( \text{HOS} \), \( \text{OSO} \) and \( \text{HSO} \), and \( \text{SOO} \) and \( \text{HSO} \). As seen from Table 2, the global minimum is predicted to have a \textit{cis}-HOSO structure. Note that the calculated S–O and O–H bond
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>$R_1/a_0$</th>
<th>$R_2/a_0$</th>
<th>$R_3/a_0$</th>
<th>$\alpha/\text{deg}$</th>
<th>$\beta/\text{deg}$</th>
<th>$\gamma/\text{deg}$</th>
<th>$E/E_h$</th>
<th>$\Delta E$</th>
<th>frequencies/cm$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOSO (FVCAS/AVDZ), min.</td>
<td>2.861</td>
<td>3.137</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$-547.91646579$</td>
<td>3897</td>
<td>1744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSO (FVCAS/AVTZ), min.</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>3.055</td>
<td>1.790</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>$-547.98517652$</td>
<td>-43.1$^a$</td>
<td>4074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO$_2$(FVCAS/AVDZ), min.</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>$-547.85381505$</td>
<td>39.3$^a$</td>
<td>2329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO$_2$(FVCAS/AVTZ), min.</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>2.589</td>
<td>123.1</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>123.7</td>
<td>$-547.93165522$</td>
<td>-6.0$^c$</td>
<td>2370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSOO(FVCAS/AVTZ), min.</td>
<td>2.517</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>2.551</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>$-547.87753994$</td>
<td>67.5$^b$</td>
<td>2833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSOO $\rightleftharpoons$ H + SO$_2$(FVCAS/AVDZ), TS$_1$</td>
<td>2.834</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>$-547.82524579$</td>
<td>57.2$^a$</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSOO $\rightleftharpoons$ H + SO$_2$(FVCAS/AVTZ), TS$_1$</td>
<td>2.834</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>$-547.82524579$</td>
<td>57.2$^a$</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSOO $\rightleftharpoons$ H + SO$_2$(FVCAS/AVDZ), TS$_1$</td>
<td>2.834</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>$-547.82524579$</td>
<td>57.2$^a$</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSOO $\rightleftharpoons$ H + SO$_2$(CASPT2/AVDZ), TS$_1$</td>
<td>2.834</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>$-547.82524579$</td>
<td>57.2$^a$</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSOO $\rightleftharpoons$ H + SO$_2$(CASPT2/AVTZ), TS$_1$</td>
<td>2.834</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>$-547.82524579$</td>
<td>57.2$^a$</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSOO $\rightleftharpoons$ HSO$_2$(FVCAS/AVDZ), TS$_2$</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>3.165</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>$-547.88598339$</td>
<td>62.2$^b$</td>
<td>2058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to the AVDZ global minimum. $^b$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to AVTZ global minimum. $^c$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to the H + SO$_2$ AVTZ asymptote (E = $-547.92217966$ E$_h$). $^d$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to AVDZ H + SO$_2$ asymptote (E = $-547.8199366$ E$_h$). $^e$Energy calculated with at the geometry optimized using FVCAS/AVDZ. $^f$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to the CASPT2/AVDZ H + SO$_2$ asymptote (E = $-548.2679272$ E$_h$). $^g$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to the CASPT2/AVTZ H + SO$_2$ asymptote (E = $-548.46365757$ E$_h$).
distances are found to be in good agreement (within 3% or so) with those reported by Qi et al.\textsuperscript{8} from MP2/6-311G** calculations. In addition, the well depth of the FVCAS/AVTZ global minimum (referred to the H + SO$_2$ dissociation asymptote) is predicted to be 37.8 kcal mol$^{-1}$, a value that lies close to the DFT estimate\textsuperscript{13} of $\Delta_f H^o = (-42.6 \pm 2)$ kcal mol$^{-1}$ for the reaction

$$\text{HOSO} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{SO}_2 \quad (4)$$

Two local minimum with H bound to S are also predicted (see the third and fourth entries of Table 2). Of these, the HSO$_2$ isomer has been previously reported\textsuperscript{4–6, 8, 10, 12} as being a stable species with respect to the dissociation asymptote in reaction (4), although there are important differences in the reported relative energies. The optimum geometry of this isomer is found to lie only 4.2 kcal mol$^{-1}$ below the H + SO$_2$ dissociation limit. It corresponds to an almost undisturbed SO$_2$ molecule with a hydrogen bound to sulfur such as to form a structure with $C_{2v}$ symmetry. The other isomer reported in the fifth entry of Table 2 corresponds to a HSOO structure. This has also been previously reported in the literature,\textsuperscript{5, 37} and judged to be a possible sink of SH in the atmosphere via reaction (3). Note that the H + SO$_2$ recombination process to form HOSO has to overcome an energy barrier (transition state TS$_1$) of 7.9–17.4 kcal mol$^{-1}$. Such a result agrees with the commonly accepted fact\textsuperscript{12} that the reverse of reaction (4) is a highly energetic process. Similarly, the transition state (TS$_2$) for the isomerization reaction HOSO $\rightleftharpoons$ HSOO (see tenth entry of Table 2) shows a barrier height of 62.2 kcal mol$^{-1}$, also in agreement with experiment.\textsuperscript{12}

Except for the global minimum calculated at the FVCAS/AVDZ level, the harmonic frequencies of all reported stationary points have been computed using the program FREQUENCIES implemented in MOLPRO. For the former, they have been determined by fitting a grid of 972 \textit{ab initio} points to a complete cubic polynomial. We emphasize that geometry optimizations of saddle points are carried out only at the FVCAS/AVDZ level. To show that such saddle points are actual transition states, we depict in Figure 2 the vibrational normal modes associated with the corresponding imaginary frequencies. Despite the good agreement with previously reported values in the literature, a higher level of \textit{ab initio} calculations including dynamical correlation will naturally be required for additional accu-
Table 3. Properties of *ab initio* minima reported in the literature for HSO₂.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>$R_1/a_0$</th>
<th>$R_2/a_0$</th>
<th>$R_3/a_0$</th>
<th>$\alpha$/deg</th>
<th>$\beta$/deg</th>
<th>$\gamma$/deg</th>
<th>$E/E_h$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOSO</td>
<td>2.765</td>
<td>3.054</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td>112.4</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>$-547.8133$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>3.127</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$-548.3392$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.774</td>
<td>3.067</td>
<td>1.801</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>$-547.8133$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.801</td>
<td>3.139</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>109.8</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$-548.3392$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.853</td>
<td>3.069</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>$-545.0903$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>3.141</td>
<td>1.892</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$-545.4553$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.772</td>
<td>3.069</td>
<td>1.799</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-547.8133$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>109.6</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-547.8133$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>3.154</td>
<td>1.833</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$-548.4601$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.861</td>
<td>3.137</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$-547.916466$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>3.055</td>
<td>1.790</td>
<td>108.6</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>$-547.985177$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO₂</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>2.706</td>
<td>2.557</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>126.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-547.7546$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>125.3</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-548.2933$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.719</td>
<td>2.719</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-545.0213$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-545.4125$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>125.1</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-547.916466$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>2.734</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$-547.916466$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>2.615</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$-547.916466$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.784</td>
<td>2.784</td>
<td>2.593</td>
<td>124.4</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>122.0</td>
<td>$-548.418867$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>$-547.853815$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>2.589</td>
<td>123.1</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>123.7</td>
<td>$-547.931665$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSOO</td>
<td>2.506</td>
<td>3.177</td>
<td>2.476</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>$-547.8133$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.534</td>
<td>3.281</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>110.7</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>$-547.8133$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>2.481</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>$-547.8133$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.517</td>
<td>3.280</td>
<td>2.551</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>112.3</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>$-547.8133$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gauche</td>
<td>2.530</td>
<td>3.275</td>
<td>2.457</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>$-548.36285$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>3.315</td>
<td>2.425</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>178.0</td>
<td>$-548.36134$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* This work.
Table 4. Properties of \textit{ab initio} transition states reported in literature for HSO$_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>$R_1/a_0$</th>
<th>$R_2/a_0$</th>
<th>$R_3/a_0$</th>
<th>$\alpha$/$\text{deg}$</th>
<th>$\beta$/$\text{deg}$</th>
<th>$\gamma$/$\text{deg}$</th>
<th>$E/E_h$</th>
<th>Calculation level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H + SO$_2 \rightleftharpoons$ HOSO</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>2.729</td>
<td>2.819</td>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>$-548.2440$</td>
<td>MP2/6-311G$^{**8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.723</td>
<td>2.772</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>120.5</td>
<td>124.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>$-545.3616$</td>
<td>MP2/3-21G$^{*3}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.723</td>
<td>2.797</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.748</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>3.042</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>QCISD/6-311G(d,p)$^{10}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.834</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>2.959</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>$-547.894447$</td>
<td>FVCAS/AVTZ$^a$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSO $\rightleftharpoons$ HSO$_2$</td>
<td>2.702</td>
<td>3.002</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>$-547.7100$</td>
<td>HF/6-311G$^{**8}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>2.969</td>
<td>2.695</td>
<td>117.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>$-548.2409$</td>
<td>MP2/6-311G$^{**8}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.717</td>
<td>3.020</td>
<td>2.553</td>
<td>114.0</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>HF/6-31G$^5$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.736</td>
<td>3.069</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>113.8</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>$-544.9725$</td>
<td>HF/3-21G$^3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.799</td>
<td>3.078</td>
<td>2.630</td>
<td>118.1</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>$-545.3579$</td>
<td>MP2/3-21G$^3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.780</td>
<td>2.993</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>118.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MP2/6-31G(d)$^{10}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>3.165</td>
<td>2.809</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>$-547.885984$</td>
<td>FVCAS/AVTZ$^a$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS + O$_2 \rightleftharpoons$ HSOO</td>
<td>2.239</td>
<td>4.382</td>
<td>2.513</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>$-548.39245$</td>
<td>MRMP2(9,10)/cc-pVTZ$^{37}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$This work.
Figure 1. Coordinates used to describe the stationary points of HSO$_2$ potential energy surface: HO$S_2$, H$S$O$_2$, HSOO, and HOOS geometries.

accuracy. For example, perturbation calculations using the CAS wave function (i.e., CASPT2 with AVXZ, X = 2, 3) have been found$^{38}$ to give good results for SO$_2$, and hence such an approach may be recommendable for the title system. Since such data is here used only to characterize the stationary points, we believe that the current level of theory may have no serious implications on the quality of the global DMBE potential energy surface reported in the present work.

3 The double many body expansion formalism

The DMBE method has been reviewed in detail elsewhere,$^{19–21}$ and hence we review only the basic details. It has also been used to construct the potential energy surfaces of all triatomic fragments of relevance in the present work,$^{22–24}$ with the reader being referred to the original papers for details. In DMBE theory, the energy is partitioned into its dynamical correlation ($dc$) and extended Hartree-Fock (EHF) components, with each term being developed as a cluster (many-body) expansion. For a N-atom system, a single-sheeted potential energy surface assumes the form:

$$V(R^N) = \sum_{n=2}^{N} \sum_{R^n \subset R^N} \left[ V_{EHF}^{(n)}(R^n) + V_{dc}^{(n)}(R^n) \right]$$

where

$$V_x(R^N) = \sum_{\alpha \beta} V_x^{(2)}(R^2) + \sum_{\alpha \beta \gamma} V_x^{(3)}(R^3) + \sum_{\alpha \beta \gamma \rho} V_x^{(4)}(R^4) \ldots \ x = EHF, dc$$

In Eq. (5), $R^n$ specifies any set of $n(n-1)/2$ interatomic distances referring to $n$-atoms while, in Eq. (6), $V_x^{(2)}$, $V_x^{(3)}$ and $V_x^{(4)}$ are two-, three-, and four-body terms
**Figure 2.** Geometry of *ab initio* saddle points TS$_1$ and TS$_2$. The arrows indicate the force constants associated with the imaginary frequencies.

of the $x$-energy component, respectively; $\mathbf{R}^N$ denotes the full set of interatomic coordinates $\mathbf{R}^N \equiv R_1, R_2, ..., R_{N(N-1)/2}$. Note that the summations over $\alpha\beta$ and $\alpha\beta\gamma$ imply all diatomic and triatomic fragments, and so on. In the following, we focus on the two and three-body energy terms used to construct the HSO$_2$ DMBE potential energy surface.

The two-body EHF energy assumes the form:

$$V^{(2)}_{\text{EHF}}(\mathbf{R}) = DR^{-1} \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_ir^i\right) \exp(-\gamma(r)r) + \chi_{\text{exc}}(R)V^{\text{asym}}_{\text{exc}}(R)$$

where

$$V^{\text{asym}}_{\text{exc}}(R) = -\tilde{A}R\tilde{\alpha}(1 + \tilde{a}_1R + \tilde{a}_2R^2) \exp(-\tilde{\gamma}R),$$

is the asymptotic exchange energy, and $\chi_{\text{exc}}(R)$ a convenient damping function to account for charge overlap effects (this is usually expressed as the dispersion damping function $\chi_n$ for the lowest $n$-th power in the dynamical correlation expansion; see later): $\tilde{A}$, $\tilde{a}_i$ ($i = 0 - 2$), $\tilde{\alpha}$, and $\tilde{\gamma}$ are usually taken as *a priori* theoretical parameters. In turn, the range determining exponent in the short-range contribution is expressed as

$$\gamma = \gamma_0[1 + \gamma_1 \tanh(\gamma_2r)]$$

where $r = R - R_e$ is the displacement coordinate from the equilibrium diatomic geometry, and $\gamma_i$ ($i = 0 - 2$) are coefficients to be determined to fulfill specific
requirements.\textsuperscript{39}

The two-body dynamical correlation is in turn written as:

\[ V_{dc}^{(2)}(R) = -\sum_n C_n \chi_n(R) R^{-n} \]  \hspace{1cm} (10)

with the associated damping functions \( \chi_n \) assuming the form

\[ \chi_n(R) = \left[ 1 - \exp \left( -A_n \frac{R}{\rho} - B_n \frac{R^2}{\rho^2} \right) \right]^n \]  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where \( A_n = \alpha_0 n^{-\alpha_1} \) and \( B_n = \beta_0 \exp(-\beta_1 n) \) are auxiliary functions defined by the following dimensionless universal parameters: \( \alpha_0 = 16.36606, \alpha_1 = 0.70172, \beta_0 = 17.19338, \beta_1 = 0.09574 \). Moreover, for a given pair of atoms XY, one has \( \rho = 5.5 + 1.25 \left( \langle r^2_X \rangle^{1/2} + \langle r^2_Y \rangle^{1/2} \right) \). The remaining coefficients appearing in Eqs. (7)-(11), including the expectation values of the squared radii \( \langle r^2_X \rangle \) of the outermost electrons in atom X used to define\textsuperscript{40} \( R_0 \) [and, eventually, the order of the exchange damping function in Eq. (7)], are chosen to reproduce available theoretical and experimental data in the diatomic. When available, the long-range (electrostatic and induction) components of the extended Hartree-Fock energy, are also modelled\textsuperscript{19–21} using a formalism similar to that employed for the dynamical correlation.

To represent the three-body dynamical correlation and electrostatic energies, we use the general form:\textsuperscript{41}

\[ V_{ele}^{(3)}(R^3) = \sum_i \sum_n f_i(R^3) C_n^{(i)}(R_i, \theta_i) \chi_n(r_i) r_i^{-n} \]  \hspace{1cm} (12)

where \( i \) labels the I – JK channel, and \( (r_i, R_i, \theta_i) \) are the corresponding Jacobi coordinates. In turn, \( C_n^{(i)}(R_i, \theta_i) \) are long range coefficients, which assume the values \( n = 4, 5 \), respectively for the dipole-quadrupole and quadrupole-quadrupole interactions. For \( n = 6, 8, \) and \( 10, \) \( C_n^{(i)}(R_i, \theta_i) \) represent atom-diatom dispersion coefficients. As already noted, \( \chi_n \) are damping functions defined in Eq. (11) for each specific value of \( n \), while the switching functions \( f_i \) assume the form:

\[ f_i(R^3) = \frac{1}{2} \{ 1 - \tanh[\xi(\eta s_i - s_j - s_k)] \} \]  \hspace{1cm} (13)
where $s_i = R_i - R_i^{ref}$ ($i = 1 - 3$) is the displacement from a reference geometry. Finally, the three-body extended Hartree-Fock energy assumes the form:

$$V_{EHF}^{(3)}(R^3) = \sum_{i}^n P_i^{(3)}(R^3) T_i^{(3)}(R^3)$$

(14)

where $P_i^{(3)}$ is a three-body polynomial, $T_i^{(3)}$ a range-determining function, and $n$ the number of distributed $^{24}$ three-body polynomials used for the fit (the number and degree of such polynomials depend on the fitting requirements that were actually imposed on modelling the various triatomic systems).

### 3.1 Two-body and three-body energy terms in HSO$_2$

Using for the coefficients in Eq. (7) to Eq. (14) the numerical data reported in the literature,$^{22-24, 42, 43}$ one may write a two plus three-body DMBE potential energy surface for the ground state of HSO$_2$ as:

$$V(R^4) = \sum_{i=1}^6 V^{(2)}(R_i^2) + \sum_{j=1}^4 V^{(3)}(R_j^3)$$

(15)

where $R_i^2 \equiv R_i$ is the interatomic distance of the $i$-th diatomic pair, and $R_j^3$ denotes a collective variable of the three bond distances which specify the geometry of the $j$-th triatomic fragment.

As pointed out elsewhere,$^{41}$ due to an overcounting of the two-body dynamical correlation energy, each $V_{dc}^{(2)}(R^2_i)$ term in the DMBE potential energy surfaces of HSO$^{24}$ and SO$_2^{23}$ has been multiplied by a switching function like Eq. (13), which transforms such contributions into three-body like ones. Thus, an extra three-body energy term should be added to Eq. (15). Taking into account the properties of $f_i(R)$, such an additional term may be written as follows:

$$V_{add}^{(3)} = \sum_{i=1}^9 V_{dc}^{(2)}(R_i^2) \left[ f_i(R_i^3) - 1 \right]$$

(16)

which, when taken into account, reproduces all the asymptotic limits of the tetratomic potential energy surface (i.e., if one of the atoms is placed far away from the remaining triatomic, the resulting potential energy surface matches exactly that of the triatomic fragment). We should note that such considerations
do not apply to the HO\textsubscript{2} DMBE potential energy surface, which has been constructed using an earlier formalism. A final remark to point out that the diatomic potentials (OH and O\textsubscript{2}) originally employed in HO\textsubscript{2} are somewhat simpler (and hence somewhat less accurate) than those used for HSO and SO\textsubscript{2} (see Tables 1 and 2 of Ref. 24, and Table 1 of Ref. 38). For consistency, we have replaced them by corresponding updated diatomic curves.\textsuperscript{44} As shown in Table 5, such an update does not affect significantly the attributes of the HO\textsubscript{2} potential energy surface in comparison with those of the original form.

### 3.2 Four-body electrostatic energy term

To represent the four-body electrostatic energy, we have generalized the form\textsuperscript{41} employed for the three-body energy in Eq. (12) by using the expression:

\[
V_{\text{ele}}^{(4)}(\mathbf{R}_4) = \sum_i \sum_{n=3,4,5} f_i(\mathbf{R}_4) C_n^{(i)}(R_i, R_{i+3}, \theta_i, \theta_{i+3}, \phi_i) \chi_n(r_i) r_i^{-n} \tag{17}
\]

where \(\mathbf{R}_4\) is now a collective variable for the six distances defining the tetratomic. Thus, \((r_i, \theta, \phi)\) are the intermolecular coordinates illustrated in Figure 3, while \(f_i(\mathbf{R}_4)\) are switching functions similar to those in Eq. (13) but expressed in terms of the generalized coordinates \(S_i = s_i + s_{i+3}\),

\[
f_i(\mathbf{R}_4) = \frac{1}{2} \{1 - \tanh[\beta(\eta S_i - S_j - S_k)]\} \tag{18}
\]

with \(s_i = R_i - R_i^{\text{ref}}\) being the displacement coordinate from the equilibrium distance in the \(i\)-th diatomic fragment, \(R_i^{\text{ref}}\); corresponding definitions apply to the indexes \(j\) and \(k\). The values of the \(\beta\) and \(\eta\) parameters are chosen from the requirement that \(f_i(\mathbf{R}_4)\) must vanish when one of the atoms is placed infinitely far apart from the remaining triatomic. Moreover, it must be equal to unit at the diatom-diatom dissociation limit; for the equilibrium distances of all diatomics, see Table 7. In turn, \(\chi_n(r_i)\) are the damping functions defined in Eq. (11), while \(R_0\) is here calculated from \(R_0 = 2 \left(\langle r_{AB}^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} + \langle r_{CD}^2 \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\), where \(\langle r_{X_1X_2}^2 \rangle\) is the expectation value of the squared radius for the outermost electrons in the united atom that originates from the coalescing diatomic \(X_1X_2\) when the internuclear separation approaches zero.

To represent the electrostatic long range coefficients as a function of the inter-
Table 5. Attributes of HO$_2$ DMBE potential energy surface\textsuperscript{22} before and after replacing the diatomic potentials with their updated versions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>DMBE-IV</th>
<th>DMBE-IV-modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Minimum</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>2.5143</td>
<td>2.5206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>1.8345</td>
<td>1.8315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>3.4590</td>
<td>3.4516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>−0.2790</td>
<td>−0.2786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_1$</td>
<td>1100.38</td>
<td>1071.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_2$</td>
<td>1352.94</td>
<td>1320.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_3$</td>
<td>3484.28</td>
<td>3479.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle point for HO$_2$ isomerization</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>2.8062</td>
<td>2.8069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>2.2715</td>
<td>2.2758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>2.2715</td>
<td>2.2758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>−0.2141</td>
<td>−0.2157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_1$</td>
<td>2235.8i</td>
<td>2217.9i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_2$</td>
<td>925.62</td>
<td>962.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_3$</td>
<td>2719.46</td>
<td>2726.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>van der Waals</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>2.2819</td>
<td>2.2820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H· · ·O$_2$ structure</td>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>9.8289</td>
<td>9.4606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>7.5470</td>
<td>7.1786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>−0.1916</td>
<td>−0.1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_1$</td>
<td>4.74i</td>
<td>8.78i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_2$</td>
<td>40.42</td>
<td>59.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_3$</td>
<td>1576.21</td>
<td>1542.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen-bond</td>
<td>$R_1$</td>
<td>5.6632</td>
<td>5.7511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH· · ·O structure</td>
<td>$R_2$</td>
<td>3.8211</td>
<td>3.9084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R_3$</td>
<td>1.8421</td>
<td>1.8427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E$</td>
<td>−0.1738</td>
<td>−0.1728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_1$</td>
<td>237.83</td>
<td>247.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_2$</td>
<td>156.59</td>
<td>117.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\omega_3$</td>
<td>3694.92</td>
<td>3671.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. Intermolecular coordinates used to define four-body electrostatic energy term.

molecular coordinates (Figure 3), we use the well established forms:45

\[ C_3 = -\mu_{AB}(R_{AB})\mu_{CD}(R_{CD})(2 \cos \theta_a \cos \theta_b - \sin \theta_a \sin \theta_b \cos \phi) \] (19)

\[ C_4 = \frac{3}{4}\{\mu_{AB}(R_{AB})\Theta_{CD}(R_{CD})[\cos \theta_a(3 \cos^2 \theta_b - 1) - 2 \sin \theta_a \sin \theta_b \cos \theta_b \cos \phi]\} - \mu_{CD}(R_{CD})\Theta_{AB}(R_{AB})[\cos \theta_b(3 \cos^2 \theta_a - 1) - 2 \sin \theta_a \sin \theta_b \cos \theta_a \cos \phi]\} (20)

\[ C_5 = \frac{3}{16}\Theta_{AB}(R_{AB})\Theta_{CD}(R_{CD})[1 - 5 \cos^2 \theta_a - 5 \cos^2 \theta_b - 15 \cos^2 \theta_a \cos^2 \theta_b + 2(\cos \theta_a \cos \theta_b - \sin \theta_a \sin \theta_b \cos \phi)^2] \] (21)

where \( \mu(R_{X_1X_2}) \) and \( \Theta(R_{X_1X_2}) \) are the permanent dipolar and quadrupolar electric moments of the \( X_1X_2 \) pair as a function of diatomic distance \( R_{X_1X_2} \). To express the angles in terms of the more convenient set of bond distances, we have used approximate expressions reported elsewhere:27

\[ \cos \theta_a \approx \frac{R_{BD} + R_{BC} - R_{AC} - R_{AD}}{2R_{AB}} \] (22)

\[ \cos \theta_b \approx \frac{R_{BD} + R_{AD} - R_{AC} - R_{BC}}{2R_{CD}} \] (23)

\[ \sin \theta_a \sin \theta_b \cos \phi \approx \frac{(R_{BD} - R_{BC} + R_{AC} - R_{AD})(R_{AD} + R_{AC})}{2R_{AB}R_{CD}} \] (24)

Note that this should not have significant implications in the least-squares fit used in the calibration procedure (see later), as this is done subsequently to the
replacement of the trigonometric functions. A final remark to point out that the quadrupole moments are specified using the convention of Hirschfelder et al.:\(^{46}\)

\[
\Theta = \Theta_{zz} = \sum_i e_i (3z_i^2 - r_i^2 \delta_{\alpha \beta})
\]  

(25)

This is a relevant issue, since the potential energy surfaces of SO\(_2\)^{23} and HSO\(^{24}\) have followed the Buckingham\(^{45}\) convention which includes a multiplicative factor of 1/2. The four-body electrostatic energy calculated from Eq. (17) is illustrated in panels (a) of Figures 4-7, which show an atom moving around the remaining triatomic. The most salient feature from such plots is possibly the fact that the electrostatic energy may change sign with the geometrical arrangement of the four atoms, and hence can play a significant role especially at low energies. Also shown is the fact that \(V_{\text{ele}}^{(4)}(\mathbf{R}^4)\) vanishes when one atom is removed to infinitely far away from the remaining triatomic fragment.

### 3.3 Four-body extended Hartree-Fock energy term

As a first step in the construction of the four-body extended Hartree-Fock energy term \(V_{\text{EHF}}^{(4)}\), we have first analyzed the features of the potential energy surface that is obtained by using only the two-body, three-body and four-body electrostatic terms (hereafter referred to as 2 + 3 + 4\(_{\text{ele}}\) DMBE potential energy surface). By comparing the 2 + 3 + 4\(_{\text{ele}}\) DMBE potential energy surface so obtained with the theoretical results reported in the literature and our own \(ab\ initio\) calculations, we have established the major differences that require being corrected. They are a too deep well predicted by the 2+3+4\(_{\text{ele}}\) DMBE potential energy surface for the HSO\(_2\) isomer [see Figure 4(b) and properties of HSO\(_2\) in Table 3 at different levels of calculation], the absence of a barrier for formation of HOSO from H + SO\(_2\) [see Figure 8(a)], and a too deep minimum obtained when SH approaches O\(_2\) to form a HSOO structure [see Figure 9(a)]. Thus, we have found satisfactory to employ simple local four-body EHFA forms that could bring the final DMBE surface into agreement with such \(ab\ initio\) data (namely, at the regions close to the \(T\text{S}_1\) transition state and local minima of HSOO and HSO\(_2\)). These functions are further required to die-off quickly as one moves away from the regions surrounding such stationary points. One should note that the geometry of the HSO\(_2\) isomer
Figure 4. Contour plot for H moving coplanarly around a partially relaxed SO$_2$. Panel (a) shows the four-body electrostatic energy term, with contours starting at $-0.01 \text{E}_h$, equally spaced by $0.003 \text{E}_h$. The dashed contour indicates the zero of energy. Shown in panel (b) is the potential energy surface including only the four-body electrostatic energy terms, while panel (c) shows the full DMBE surface. Contours in panels (b) and (c) start at $-0.4770 \text{E}_h$, and are equally spaced by $0.017 \text{E}_h$. The dashed contours shown in panels (b) and (c) indicate the H + SO$_2$ dissociation limit ($-0.4132 \text{E}_h$). Note that, except in the case of the electrostatic energy where such contours correspond to the change of sign of this energy contribution, they refer in these and subsequent plots to the indicated energies which are quoted to four significant figures. Thus, they may differ by as much as 0.1 mE$_h$ from the true asymptote; apparent barriers should therefore be checked against Figure 11, and the text.
Figure 5. Contour plot for O moving coplanarly around a partially relaxed HSO molecule. Panel (a) shows the four-body electrostatic energy term, with contours starting at $-0.031 \text{E}_h$, equally spaced by $0.005 \text{E}_h$. The dashed contour indicates the zero of energy. Panel (b) shows the full DMBE potential energy surface; contours start at $-0.4420 \text{E}_h$, and are equally spaced by $0.017 \text{E}_h$. The dashed contour in panel (b) indicates the HSO dissociation limit ($-0.2962 \text{E}_h$).

Figure 6. Contour plot for O moving coplanarly around a partially relaxed HOS molecule. Panel (a) shows the four-body electrostatic energy term, with contours starting at $-0.037 \text{E}_h$, equally spaced by $0.005 \text{E}_h$. The dashed contour indicates the zero of energy. Panel (b) shows the full DMBE potential energy surface; contours start at $-0.4600 \text{E}_h$, and are equally spaced by $0.017 \text{E}_h$. The dashed contour in panel (b) indicates the HOS dissociation limit ($-0.2947 \text{E}_h$).
Figure 7. Contour plot for S moving coplanarly around a partially relaxed HO$_2$ molecule. Panel (a) shows the four-body electrostatic energy term, with contours starting at $-0.026\ E_h$, equally spaced by $0.008\ E_h$. The dashed contour indicates the zero of energy. Panel (b) shows the full DMBE potential energy surface; contours start at $-0.3560\ E_h$, and are equally spaced by $0.017\ E_h$. The dashed contour in panel (b) indicates the HO$_2$ dissociation limit ($-0.2986\ E_h$).

lies, in the $2 + 3 + 4_{\text{ele}}$ DMBE potential energy surface, very close to that of the TS$_2$ transition state for the isomerization process HOSO $\Leftrightarrow$ HSO$_2$. Thus, the local function to be added at the HSO$_2$ geometry should not significantly affect the energy of this transition state. Moreover, the \textit{ab initio} calculations (see Table 2) and the $2 + 3 + 4_{\text{ele}}$ DMBE potential energy surface predict the energy of the above mentioned transition state to lie below the energy of OH + SO, allowing the isomerization process HOSO $\Leftrightarrow$ HSO$_2$ to take place without any translational energy requirements in OH + SO collisions. Thus, an additional constraint in choosing the necessary correction term is that such a TS should be kept below the energy of OH + SO isolated reactants. A convenient four-body EHF energy term that satisfy the above requirements is

$$V_{\text{EHF}}^{(4)} = V_S^{(4)} + V_T^{(4)} + P^{(4)}T^{(4)}$$

(26)
**Figure 8.** Contour plot for the channel OH+SO ⇌ HOSO ⇌ H+SO₂. Contours start at $-0.4831 \text{ E}_h$, and are equally spaced by 0.017 \text{ E}_h. The SO distance, $\alpha$, $\beta$, and dihedral angles are partially relaxed. Indicated by the dashed line is the H + SO₂ dissociation energy ($-0.4132 \text{ E}_h$). Panel (a) shows the 2 + 3 + 4\text{e}_\text{cle} DMBE surface, while panel (b) shows the full DMBE potential energy surface.

**Figure 9.** Contour plot for the channel HS+O₂ ⇌ HSOO ⇌ HSO+O. Contours start at $-0.3350 \text{ E}_h$, being equally spaced by 0.01 \text{ E}_h. The HS distance, $\alpha$, $\beta$ and dihedral angles are partially relaxed. Indicated by the dashed line is the HS + O₂ dissociation energy ($-0.3307 \text{ E}_h$). Panel (a) shows the 2 + 3 + 4\text{e}_\text{cle} DMBE surface, while panel (b) refers to the full DMBE potential energy surface.
where $V_S^{(4)}$ and $V_T^{(4)}$ are four-body Gaussian-type functions defined by

$$V_S^{(4)} = C_0^S \exp[-\sum_{i=1}^{6} C_i^S (R_i - R_i^{S,ref})^2]$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)$$

$$V_T^{(4)} = C_0^T \exp[-\sum_{i=1}^{6} C_i^T (R_i - R_i^{T,ref})^2]$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)$$

In turn, $P^{(4)}$ is a 2nd-order polynomial,

$$P^{(4)} = a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{6} a_i (X_i - X_i^{ref}) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{6} b_i b_j (X_i - X_i^{ref})(X_j - X_j^{ref})$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)$$

and $T^{(4)}$ is a range-determining factor also chosen to be of the Gaussian-type:

$$T^{(4)} = \exp \left[ -\sum_{i=1}^{6} g_i (X_i - X_i^{ref})^2 \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)$$

where $R_i^{S,ref}$ and $R_i^{T,ref}$ are respectively the geometries of the HSO$_2$ and HSOO minima in the $2 + 3 + 4$ ele DMBE potential energy surface; see Table 7. The coefficients $C_i^S$, $C_i^T$ ($i = 0 - 6$) in Eqs. (27) and (28) have been calculated using a trial and error procedure by imposing the conditions discussed in the previous paragraph. Their numerical values are reported in Table 6. Note that $\{X_i\}$ is a set of valence-bond type coordinates: three distances, two planar angles, and one dihedral angle (expressed in radians), all calculated for each set of the six interatomic distances; see Figure 1. Note further that $\{X_i^{ref}\}$ is a reference geometry (Table 7), namely the $ab$ initio geometry of TS$_1$. Finally, the linear coefficients appearing in Eq. (29) have been calibrated from a least-squares fitting procedure to our own $ab$ initio points. Specifically, a grid of 945 $ab$ initio energies referring to geometries in the vicinity of the transition state TS$_1$ has been employed. Note that such points (calculated at FVCAS/AVDZ level, and subsequently scaled to simulate AVTZ results) have been referred to the $ab$ initio $H + SO_2$ dissociation energy. It was the difference between such values and those calculated using the $2 + 3 + 4$ ele DMBE potential energy surface (also referred to its own $H + SO_2$ dissociation energy) that were actually fitted to the above mentioned four-body EHF-type functions. The $g_i$ parameters in Eq. (30) have themselves been chosen via a trial and error procedure. Table 6 summarizes the linear coefficients so
obtained, while the nonlinear $g_i$ appear in Table 7. Finally, we recall that the
\textit{ab initio} calculations used for the calibration procedure may suffer from several
deficiencies, namely due to employing a relatively modest basis set and missing
the dynamical correlation (see later). Despite such limitations, they are believed
to be accurate enough to reliably define the shape of the potential energy surface
in the vicinity of the transition state. Thus, we have obtained two variants
of the complete DMBE potential energy surface. One, shows a barrier height
of 17.4 kcal mol$^{-1}$ for the transition state of the reaction HOSO $\rightleftharpoons$ H $\cdots$ OSO, as
predicted from our own FVCAS/AVTZ calculations. In the other, we have down-
scaled the barrier height to about a half of that value (9.1 kcal mol$^{-1}$) such as to
reproduce the estimate of Goumri \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{10} from G2 calculations. Unless specified
otherwise, it is to this surface that we refer in the remaining of this work.

4 Characterization of DMBE potential energy surface

Figure 11 shows a schematic diagram of the energetics of the title system accord-
ing to the DMBE potential energy surface reported in the present work, while
Table 8 summarizes the properties of its major stationary points; for the coor-
dinates, see Figure 1. Several views of the potential energy surface for an atom
moving coplanarly around a partially relaxed triatomic are displayed in Figures 4-
7. Also shown are two-dimensional contour plots for the most relevant reactions
that may occur on the title potential energy surface; Figures 8-10. Note that
minima and saddle points in these views may not necessarily correspond to such
attributes in the full configuration space of the tetratomic. Ball and stick draw-
ings of the most relevant stationary points are shown in Figures 12 and 13. These
structures will be discussed in the following.

Global minimum

This corresponds to a staggered HOSO configuration, with the hydrogen atom
connected to one of the oxygen atoms of SO$_2$; its attributes are summarized in the
first entry of Table 8. Although \textit{ab initio} calculations at the Hartree-Fock (HF)
level using 6-311G**\textsuperscript{8}, 6-31G**\textsuperscript{5} and 3-21G**\textsuperscript{3} basis sets report a global minimum
Table 6. Coefficients in four-body extended Hartree-Fock energy defined in Eqs. (27)-(30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$C^S_0$</th>
<th>$C^T_0$</th>
<th>$a_0$</th>
<th>$b_{11}$</th>
<th>$b_{23}$</th>
<th>$b_{36}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03217616</td>
<td>0.44635187</td>
<td>0.26529542</td>
<td>-0.00364268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00051323</td>
<td>-0.05997085</td>
<td>0.11395901</td>
<td>0.34579546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.00021041</td>
<td>0.08443367</td>
<td>0.07185930</td>
<td>-0.01833119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.00034408</td>
<td>0.08828140</td>
<td>0.00002378</td>
<td>-0.00142153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00015197</td>
<td>0.02477545</td>
<td>-0.00938667</td>
<td>0.18064411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00120912</td>
<td>0.00228627</td>
<td>-0.07207120</td>
<td>-0.01020253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.00027423</td>
<td>0.25454764</td>
<td>-0.03282833</td>
<td>0.04777738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Parameters and reference geometries used in four-body switching functions of Eq. (18) (first column), and four-body EHF term of Eqs. (27)-(30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( R_{SO}^{ref} )</td>
<td>2.7988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_{SH}^{ref} )</td>
<td>2.5334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_{O0}^{ref} )</td>
<td>2.2818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_{OH}^{ref} )</td>
<td>1.8344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \eta )</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta )</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ g_1 = 3.0 \quad g_2 = 3.0 \quad g_3 = 3.0 \quad g_4 = 3.0 \quad g_5 = 3.0 \quad g_6 = 1.0 \]

\[ X_{1}^{ref} = 2.83405 \quad X_{2}^{ref} = 2.91075 \quad X_{3}^{ref} = 2.95889 \quad X_{4}^{ref} = 115.52^\circ \quad X_{5}^{ref} = 117.71^\circ \quad X_{6}^{ref} = 78.952^\circ \]

Figure 10. Contour plot of the full HSO\(_2\) DMBE potential energy surface for the channel O + SOH ⇌ HOSO ⇌ OH + SO. Contours start at \(-0.4830\) E\(_h\), being equally spaced by \(0.017\) E\(_h\). The OH distance, \(\alpha\), \(\beta\), and dihedral angles have been partially relaxed. Indicated by the dashed line is the O + HOS dissociation energy \((-0.2947\) E\(_h\)). The corresponding plot for the 2 + 3 + 4\(_{ele}\) DMBE potential energy surface is nearly indistinguishable, and hence is not shown.
with a similar configuration, correlated Møller-Plesset (MP2) calculations using 6-311G**, 6-31G** and 3-21G** basis sets predicted a planar structure. Similarly to these, our own \textit{ab initio} calculations predict a planar HOSO geometry as indicated in Table 2. Unfortunately, to our knowledge, there is no experimental evidence concerning the structure of such a species. However, all such studies agree on the fact that this HOSO structure should be the global minimum of the title potential energy surface. We emphasize that the well depth of such a minimum is predicted to be 44.2 \textit{kcal mol}^{-1} (relative to the H + SO$_2$ dissociation limit) in excellent agreement with the DFT calculations of Denis and Ventura.$^{13}$ In turn, we predict the OH stretching frequency in the DMBE HOSO minimum to be 3710 cm$^{-1}$ while Isoniemi \textit{et al.}$^{12}$ report a value of 3554 cm$^{-1}$ from spectroscopic measurements in an argon matrix. Indeed, the same work reports two other stretching frequencies for this isomer, which differ by less than 15\% from the DMBE values here reported. Such differences are acceptable in view of the anharmonicity of the potential energy surface and sensitivity of the force constants to numerical determination from a set of discrete points.

**HSO$_2$ isomer**

The attributes of the corresponding local minimum, referred to as HSO$_2$ (with $C_{2v}$ symmetry), are given in the second entry of Table 8. As panels (b) and (c) of Figure 4 clearly show, both the DMBE 2 + 3 + 4$_{ele}$ and DMBE potential energy surfaces predict this structure to be stable with respect to the H + SO$_2$ dissociation asymptote. However, by inclusion of the four-body EHF energy term in the full DMBE potential energy surface, its well depth has been decreased such as to lie 21.9 \textit{kcal mol}^{-1} below the H + SO$_2$ dissociation limit at a geometry close to our \textit{ab initio} prediction.

**HSOO isomer**

Shown in the third entry of Table 8 are the geometric and energetic properties of the HSOO minimum, which are very similar to those recently reported by Resende \textit{et al.}$^{37}$ As noted above, such an isomer is possibly related to the sink of SH via the three-body recombination reaction (3). The contour plot in panel
Figure 11. Energetics of full HSO$_2$ DMBE potential energy surface. For ball and stick three-dimensional views of the various structures, see Figures 12 and 13. Shown by the dotted line is the path based on the FVCAS/AVDZ scaled to FVCAS/AVTZ calculations from the present work, while the interrupted solid line shows the barrier-free path connecting O+SOH to the deep HOSO minimum.
Figure 12. Ball and stick drawings of the structures associated to minima in the HSO$_2$ DMBE potential energy surface.
(b) of Figure 9 shows that such a structure is the intermediate for the reactions
\[ \text{HS} + \text{O}_2 \rightleftharpoons \text{HSO} + \text{O}. \]

**HSO \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{O} van der Waals minimum**

When the terminal oxygen in HSO is attacked by another oxygen atom, an intermediate HSO \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{O} van der Waals species may be formed (such weakly bound species are heretofore indicated by the usual triple dot notation). Its properties are collected in the fourth entry of Table 8, while the contour plot of Figure 9 shows such a process to be barrier free.

**H \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{OSO} van der Waals minimum**

The fifth entry of Table 8 summarizes the properties of this van der Waals species, also shown in panel (a) of Figure 8. Note that it has an energy below the dissociation limit H + SO$_2$, which arises already at the 2 + 3 + 4$_{\text{ele}}$ body level of the DMBE potential energy surface. Panel (c) of Figure 4 shows the position of such a minimum.

**O \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{SOH}, \text{S} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{OOH}, and \text{SO} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{OH} van der Waals minima**

Three van der Waals type minima correlate with the O + SOH asymptote, being their attributes summarized on the sixth to eighth entries of Table 8. The former two minima correspond to T-shaped structures with the O (S) atom attacking the middle atom of HOS (HOO), as one might anticipate from the interaction between their permanent electric moments: atomic quadrupoles and triatomic dipoles. The third of those minima involves two interacting diatomic species having permanent electric dipole moments, namely SO and OH. In all cases, the well depths have several kcal mol$^{-1}$ with respect to the appropriate asymptote. To our knowledge, no accurate \textit{ab initio} data or empirical information is available that might allow an assessment on the reliability of such predictions.

**Transition state for the reactions HOSO \rightleftharpoons H \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{OSO}, TS$_1$**

As observed from panel (a) of Figure 8, there is only a small energy barrier of about 2 kcal mol$^{-1}$ for the H + SO$_2$ reaction to occur in the 2 + 3 + 4$_{\text{ele}}$ DMBE
Table 8. Properties of stationary points of the full DMBE potential energy surface of HSO$_2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>$R_1/\text{a}_0$</th>
<th>$R_2/\text{a}_0$</th>
<th>$R_3/\text{a}_0$</th>
<th>$\alpha/\text{deg}$</th>
<th>$\beta/\text{deg}$</th>
<th>$\gamma/\text{deg}$</th>
<th>$E/E_h$</th>
<th>$\Delta E$</th>
<th>Frequencies/cm$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOSO, min.</td>
<td>2.742</td>
<td>3.027</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>119.9</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>-0.4837</td>
<td>-44.2$^a$</td>
<td>445 686 852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO$_2$, min.</td>
<td>2.716</td>
<td>2.716</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>131.1</td>
<td>-0.4882</td>
<td>22.3$^b$</td>
<td>381 668 1013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSOO, min.</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>2.662</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>-0.3293</td>
<td>96.9$^b$</td>
<td>347 484 652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO$\cdot\cdot\cdot$O, min.</td>
<td>3.988</td>
<td>2.881</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>-0.3274</td>
<td>2.1$^c$</td>
<td>129 302 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$\cdot\cdot\cdot$OSO, min.</td>
<td>2.727</td>
<td>2.680</td>
<td>3.598</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>-0.4181</td>
<td>-3.1$^a$</td>
<td>368 616 871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOS+O$\cdot\cdot\cdot$O, min.</td>
<td>6.221</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>1.925</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>102.2</td>
<td>-0.3124</td>
<td>-10.2$^d$</td>
<td>192 268 612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOO$\cdot\cdot\cdot$S, min.</td>
<td>5.300</td>
<td>2.504</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>-0.2980</td>
<td>-12.2$^e$</td>
<td>217 250 854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$\cdot\cdot\cdot$OH, min.</td>
<td>2.865</td>
<td>4.691</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>114.1</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>-0.3847</td>
<td>9.7$^f$</td>
<td>82 166 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$\cdot\cdot\cdot$OSO $\rightleftharpoons$ HOSO, TS$_1$</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>2.987</td>
<td>116.6</td>
<td>119.2</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>-0.3987</td>
<td>9.1$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>588 768 1372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSO $\rightleftharpoons$ HSO$_2$, TS$_2$</td>
<td>2.762</td>
<td>2.962</td>
<td>2.887</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>-0.3697</td>
<td>71.5$^b$</td>
<td>209 731 1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS + O$_2$ $\rightleftharpoons$ HSOO, TS$_3$</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>4.246</td>
<td>2.638</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>-0.3179</td>
<td>8.0$^c$</td>
<td>144 439 841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO$\cdot\cdot\cdot$O $\rightleftharpoons$ HSO$_2$, TS$_4$</td>
<td>4.236</td>
<td>2.819</td>
<td>2.581</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>-0.3159</td>
<td>83.0$^b$</td>
<td>433 574 947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSO$\cdot\cdot\cdot$O $\rightleftharpoons$ HSOO, TS$_5$</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>2.615</td>
<td>112.1</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>-0.3159</td>
<td>7.2$^d$</td>
<td>1018 2555 3221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOS$\cdot\cdot\cdot$O $\rightleftharpoons$ HOO$\cdot\cdot\cdot$S, TS$_6$</td>
<td>5.948</td>
<td>3.196</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>-0.2810</td>
<td>19.7$^b$</td>
<td>399 332 1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOO$\cdot\cdot\cdot$S $\rightleftharpoons$ SO$\cdot\cdot\cdot$OH, TS$_7$</td>
<td>4.092</td>
<td>2.479</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>-0.2875</td>
<td>6.0$^b$</td>
<td>370 761 993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to H+SO$_2$ ($-0.4132$ E$_h$). $^b$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to global minimum HOSO. $^c$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to HS + O$_2$ ($-0.3307$ E$_h$). $^d$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to HOS + O ($-0.2947$ E$_h$). $^e$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to HO$_2$ + S ($-0.2786$ E$_h$). $^f$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to OH + SO ($-0.3692$ E$_h$). $^g$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to local minimum HSO$_2$. $^h$If the energy calculated in this work is used (see dotted line in Figure 11), one gets from left to right in the above units: 2.772, 2.849, 2.972, 116.7, 119.5, 76.4, -0.3837, 18.5, 455, 712, 1251, 1368, 1816, and 3049. $^i$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to local minimum HSO$_2$. $^j$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to local minimum HSOO. $^k$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to local minimum HOS$\cdot\cdot\cdot$O. $^l$Energy in kcal mol$^{-1}$ referred to local minimum HOO$\cdot\cdot\cdot$S.
Figure 13. Ball and stick drawings of the structures associated to saddle points (of index 1, i.e., a single imaginary frequency) in the HSO₂ DMBE potential energy surface.
potential energy surface, being such a barrier located at large H – O distances. The addition of the four-body EHF energy term has transformed this low-barrier process for formation of HOSO into a high-barrier one. In fact, the full DMBE potential energy surface is shown in panel (b) of Figure 8 to have a barrier of 9.1 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) lying at somewhat shorter H – O separations; see also the ninth entry of Table 8 where the properties of the TS\(_1\) transition state are collected. Recall that the barrier height predicted from our FVCAS/AVTZ calculations is 17.4 kcal mol\(^{-1}\). Note also that no particularly good experimental data relating to TS\(_1\) is available in the literature. Indeed, a comparison of the temperature and pressure dependences with master equation calculations seem to suggest an increase of the energy of this transition state from 2.1 – 3.2 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) relative to the above estimate based on the G2 calculations of Goumri \textit{et al.},\(^{10}\) thus narrowing slightly the gap relative to our own \textit{ab initio} FVCAS/AVTZ prediction for this attribute. Of course, the FVCAS calculations lack an account for the dynamical correlation, and hence one wonders about the effect of the latter on such a value. With a view to explore this issue we have conducted exploratory single-point Rayleigh-Schrödinger perturbation-theory calculations from the FVCAS reference wave function (CASPT2) at this stationary point. We have obtained barrier heights of 7.9 and 9.2 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) with the AVDZ and AVTZ basis sets (respectively), which compare well with the G2 estimate\(^{10}\) of 9.1 kcal mol\(^{-1}\). Since our CASPT2 estimates may still be considered to be preliminary, we have found no reason to alter the two values here considered for the modelling procedure, although this may trivially be done by fine tuning \(a_0\) in Eq. (29) such as to reproduce any accurate information that becomes available. An additional remark to note that panel (b) of Figure 8 also shows that the HOSO formation from OH + SO is an essentially barrier free process, and hence is likely to be controlled by the leading long range forces associated to the permanent electric moments of the reactants.

**Transition state connecting HSO\(_2\) to HOSO, TS\(_2\)**

The properties of the transition state for the isomerization process HSO\(_2\) ⇌ HOSO are reported in the tenth entry of Table 8. Clearly, such an isomerization implies important structural transformations, as manifested by the high energy
barrier that must be overcome for such a reaction to occur. All \textit{ab initio} calculations available in the literature agree with such an expectation, and so does the DMBE potential energy surface here reported. Specifically, it predicts a barrier height for the forward process of 49.2 kcal mol\(^{-1}\), while for the reverse process is 71.5 kcal mol\(^{-1}\). Note that HSO\(_2\) lies 22.3 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) above HOSO.

\textbf{Transition state for the reaction HS + O\(_2\) \(\rightleftharpoons\) HSOO, TS\(_3\)}

The addition of SH and O\(_2\) to form HSOO is seen to involve a 8.0 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) energy barrier (TS\(_3\)), whose properties are collected in the eleventh entry of Table 8. Although Resende \textit{et al.}\(^{37}\) predict a barrier of 12.3 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) for this process from their multireference (MRMP2) calculations, the geometries of the corresponding transition state (referred to as\(^{37}\) TS\(_1\)) are (except for the low-frequency torsional modes) similar to the one here reported. Note that, for the reaction OH + O\(_2\) \(\rightleftharpoons\) HO\(_3\), the equivalent barrier height has been predicted to lie between 1.4 and 3.9 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) (see Ref. 48, and references therein).

\textbf{Transition state connecting HSO \cdots O to HSO\(_2\), TS\(_4\)}

According to the diagram in Figure 11, we may distinguish two regions in the HSO\(_2\) potential energy surface: an upper-energy region including the HS + O\(_2\) channel, the HSOO structures, and the HSO + O dissociation channel; a lower-energy region including the two more stables isomers HOSO and HSO\(_2\), as well as the dissociation channels OH + SO and H + SO\(_2\). Such regions are connected via the transition state TS\(_4\) for the isomerization process HSO \cdots O \(\rightleftharpoons\) HSO\(_2\). The corresponding attributes are summarized in entry twelve of Table 8. As shown, the barrier for the direct isomerization process is of 7.2 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) and for the reverse one 83.0 kcal mol\(^{-1}\). To our knowledge, no \textit{ab initio} data concerning this process has been reported thus far. Yet, in Figure 1 of their paper, Goumri \textit{et al.}\(^{10}\) suggest from their schematic drawing a simple connection between HSO + O and HSO\(_2\). Clearly, our DMBE potential energy surface shows such a transition state to naturally link HSO \cdots O to HSO\(_2\).
Transition state connecting HSO· · · O to HSOO, TS$_5$

The thirteenth entry of Table 8 gathers the properties of the transition state connecting the HSO· · · O and HSOO isomers, which is graphically illustrated in Figure 9. The energy of this TS$_5$ is nearly the same as for TS$_4$. Thus, in the absence of further information, one may conjecture that both competing processes are likely to occur with an equal frequency.

Transition states connecting O· · · HOS, S· · · HOO, and SO· · · OH: TS$_6$ and TS$_7$

The attributes of these transition states are given on the last two entries of Table 8. The transition state TS$_6$ connects the O· · · HOS and S· · · HOO van der Waals minima, and lies 10.7 kcal mol$^{-1}$ (19.7 kcal mol$^{-1}$) above the latter (former). In turn, TS$_7$ connects the S· · · HOO and SO· · · OH van der Waals minima, being 6.6 kcal mol$^{-1}$ above the former. Of them, TS$_6$ is expected to be the determinant transition state for the reaction O + SOH $\rightarrow$ OH + SO, with a classical barrier height of about 8.6 kcal mol$^{-1}$. Note that the reaction O + SOH $\rightarrow$ S + HO$_2$ is slightly endothermic, with a classical endothermicity of about 10.14 kcal mol$^{-1}$, i.e., the products channel lies 1.51 kcal mol$^{-1}$ above TS$_6$. We further note that the reaction O + SOH $\rightarrow$ OH + SO may evolve through the deep HOSO minimum, a rather exothermic process that involves no reaction barrier. The relevant DMBE contour plot for this reaction is shown in Figure 10; the corresponding plot for the $2 + 3 + 4_{ae}$ DMBE potential energy surface is omitted, since this is essentially indistinguishable from the former. Note that, similarly to the associated van der Waals minima, no ab initio or empirical information exists that may allow an assessment of the accuracy of the above saddle points. A final remark to observe that HOS + O asymptote lies less than 1 kcal mol$^{-1}$ above the HSO + O one. Thus, although one might intuitively think that both could be connected to the HS + O$_2$ and OH + SO asymptotes, this turns out to be possible only in the case of HSO + O. For HOS + O to evolve to HS + O$_2$, one requires in principle that the isomerization HOS $\leftrightarrow$ HSO will firstly occur, which involves an energy of 45.7 kcal mol$^{-1}$.$^{24}$
5 Conclusions

A singled-sheeted DMBE potential energy surface has been reported for the ground electronic state of HSO\textsubscript{2}, partly based on FVCAS/AVDZ(AVTZ) calculations for the tetratomic also reported in the present work. These have been shown to be in fair agreement with previously reported \textit{ab initio} results. The attributes of the most relevant stationary points have also been presented. As in previous studies, the most stable isomer is predicted to have a HOSO structure, while the HSO\textsubscript{2} isomer (having the hydrogen and middle sulfur atoms connected) corresponds to a local minimum. It has further been shown that the global minimum can be reached from the H + SO\textsubscript{2} reactants by overcoming an energy barrier that is likely to be of the order of 9 kcal mol\textsuperscript{-1} (the value actually used for the DMBE calibration procedure). An HSOO isomer has additionally been found and characterized, as well as the paths connecting this minimum to other structures. Furthermore, a barrier of 8 kcal mol\textsuperscript{-1} has been predicted to separate such a minimum from the SH + O\textsubscript{2} asymptote. Finally, our results suggest that a high energy is required for the isomerization reaction HSO\textsubscript{2} ⇀↽ HOSO to occur. Of course, the accuracy limitations encountered in the theoretical work and the topological intricacies of the potential energy surface leave it clear that the HSO\textsubscript{2} DMBE potential energy surface from the present work may not be definite. This can only be answered through dynamics studies of the various chemical reactions occurring in it.
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Part II
Molecular Dynamics
Chapter 3

Theoretical Framework

Once the electronic problem is solved, resulting in an appropriate representation of the potential energy function as referred in the previous part, a chemical reaction may be understood as the motion of atomic nuclei through such a potential. Thus, classical or quantum mechanical methods can be used to characterize the chemical reaction. For the study of reactions presented in this thesis a quasiclassical trajectory (QCT) method [1–4] was used. The basis of QCT as well as some features of molecular reaction dynamics are briefly reviewed in this chapter.

3.1 Classical Trajectories

Classical trajectories are the limits of high particle masses and high energies of quantum-mechanical scattering process [1, 5]. They are used when dealing with a molecular process in all the complexity and reality. They provide a feasible connection between experimental observations and the interaction potential of the atoms. When using classical trajectories one question arises: are chemical reactions close to classical simplicity or do they require the detailed attention of quantum considerations? The answer is that we usually think of these processes as classical ones, with quantum corrections required under certain conditions [6]. A qualitative argument is that de Broglie wavelength are short enough and that so far has not been shown that tunneling corrections are very important to classical interpretations [1]. Besides, as remarked in a series of works by Karplus et al. [3, 7, 8], in a classical and quantum treatment of the same molecular system, no significant differences have been obtained. Of course, some discrepancies might
appear for low translational energy processes when quantum effects are expected to be significant [1].

In a classical trajectory study the motions of the individual atoms are simulated by solving classical equations of motion, usually in the form of Hamilton’s equations [9]:

\[
\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i} = -\frac{dp_i}{dt}, \quad \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i} = \frac{dq_i}{dt} \tag{3.1}
\]

where the Hamiltonian function of the system, \( H \), is the sum of the kinetic \( T(p, q) \) and potential \( V(q) \) energies:

\[
H = T(p, q) + V(q) \tag{3.2}
\]

The potential energy function \( V(q) \) is the already mentioned potential energy surface. Hamilton’s equations (3.1) are solved numerically and numerous algorithms have been developed for this task [1]. When a set of trajectories is completed, the final values of momenta and coordinates are transformed into quantities, like reaction rate constant, which may be compared with experiment.

A significant aspect of a trajectory simulation is the choice of the initial coordinates and momenta. These initial conditions are chosen such that results from an ensemble of trajectories may be compared with experiment and theory and be used for predictions about the system’s molecular dynamics. Monte Carlo methods are commonly used [2–4] for sampling appropriate distributions of initial values of coordinates and momenta.

In the molecular collisions studied in this thesis, the VENUS [10] code was utilized. Such a package uses Monte Carlo method for selecting initial conditions of the reactants. Integration of the classical equations of motions is carried out in a combination of fourth-order Runge-Kutta and sixth-order Adams Multon algorithms [1]. Some details are presented in the following.

### 3.1.1 Quasiclassical model for bi-molecular reactions

As was mentioned in preceding paragraphs, a dynamical study of a molecular collision can be carried out by means of classical equations. However, once configurations of the separated reagents are described by their vibrational and rotational (ro-vibrational) quantum states, initial conditions of the collision should be
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generated accounting for them. This is the idea of quasiclassical trajectories [7]:
to solve classical equations of motion considering the initial conditions of the re-
actants according to their quantum states. Similarly, the states of the product
molecules can be assigned by determining the quantum numbers describing the
best their ro-vibrational motion.

In order to introduce some basic concepts of collisions, let us consider two
reactant molecules A and B. The reactants approach with a relative velocity
$v_{rel}$ (with module $v_{rel}$), which may be oriented such that the reactants approach
head-on (along a line connecting the center of masses) or with a glancing blow
collision. The difference between these two encounters is quantified by the impact
parameter of the collision $b$, which is defined as the distance of closest approach
of the reactants in the absence of any interactions between them. Thus, head-on
collision occurs when $b = 0$, and $b > 0$ stands for oblique direction or glancing
blow collision. The maximum value of $b$ which leads to reaction is called max-
imum impact parameter, $b_{max}$. Beyond $b_{max}$ the collisions are so glancing that
probability of reaction is vanishingly small.

A measure of the effective collision area is given by the cross section. The
cross section for the reaction between A and B to form products:

$$A + B \rightarrow \text{products}$$

may be given as a function of the A + B relative translational energy $E_{tr}$ and
the ro-vibrational energy levels of both species [11]. A reactive cross section may
be expressed as: $\sigma_R = \sigma_R(E_{tr}, v, J)$ where $v$ and $J$ denotes the vibrational and
rotational quantum numbers of the reactants respectively. It is usually referred
to as specific reactive cross section to remark that it comes from an specific or
fixed ro-vibrational configuration of the reactants [12, 13]. If specific values are
not selected but a distribution of values is used according to some temperature-
dependent function, the reactive cross section becomes:

$$\sigma_r(E_{tr}, T) = \sum_v \sum_J \sigma_R(E_{tr}, v, J) P_v(T) P_J(T)$$

where $P_v(T)$ and $P_J(T)$ are population distributions of the vibrational and rota-
tional quantum numbers of the reactants respectively. $T$ is the temperature and
both summations run over all the quantum numbers.
Multiplying $\sigma(E_{tr}; T)$ by the relative velocity $v_{rel}$ and integrating over the Boltzmann distribution one gets the bi-molecular thermal rates constant:

$$k(T) = \int_0^\infty v_{rel}\sigma(E_{tr}; T)\mathcal{P}_B(v_{rel}; T)dv_{rel}$$

(3.5)

or if it is written in terms of relative translational energy:

$$k(T) = \left(\frac{8k_BT}{\pi\mu}\right)^{1/2} \int_0^\infty \sigma(E_{tr}; T)\frac{E_{tr}}{(k_BT)^2}e^{-E_{tr}/k_BT}dE_{tr}$$

(3.6)

where $\mu$ is the reduced mass of the system, and $k_B$ the Boltzmann constant.

When a batch of $N_T$ trajectories are calculated and $N_r$ of them were reactive, the reaction cross section (whether for specific ro-vibrational levels or not) may be calculated as [3]:

$$\sigma_r = \frac{N_r}{N_T}\pi b_{max}^2$$

(3.7)

being $b_{max}$ the largest impact parameter that leads to reaction.

### 3.1.2 Initial conditions

For the molecular collisions studied in this thesis, the VENUS [10] code was used. A brief survey of the procedure to select initial conditions for bi-molecular reaction (3.3) trajectories [4], using Monte Carlo sampling as implemented in VENUS package, will be given in the following.

Choosing initial Cartesian coordinates and momenta for a symmetric top polyatomic reactant follows in part a procedure for normal modes sampling [14], the components of the angular momentum are found from:

$$j = \sqrt{J(J+1)}\hbar$$

$$j_z = K\hbar$$

$$j_x = (j^2 - j_z^2)^{1/2}\sin 2\pi R$$

$$j_y = (j^2 - j_z^2)^{1/2}\cos 2\pi R$$

(3.8)

where $R$ is a random number, $J$ and $K$ are the rotational quantum numbers, $\hbar$ is the Planck constant. When calculating thermally averaged cross-sections...
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It is sufficiently accurate to sample \( j \) and \( j_z \) from their classical Boltzmann distributions [15]:

\[
P(j_z) = e^{(-j_z^2/2I_z k_B T)} \quad 0 \leq j_z \leq \infty \quad (3.9)
\]

\[
P(j) = j e^{(-j^2/2I_z k_B T)} \quad j_z \leq j \leq \infty \quad (3.10)
\]

The von Neumann rejection method [16] is used to sample \( j_z \) from \( P(j_z) \), while \( j \) is sampled by the cumulative distribution formula [15]:

\[
j = [j_z^2 - 2I_x k_B T \ln(1 - \frac{1}{R})]^{1/2} \quad (3.11)
\]

The components \( j_x \) and \( j \) are found from equation (3.8). The vibrational quantum number \( v_A \) of the reactant is fixed when calculating the state specific cross-section. However, to calculate \( \sigma_r(E_{\text{tr}}; T) \) each vibrational quantum number is selected from its quantum probability distribution:

\[
P(v_i) = \frac{1}{Q_i} e^{[-(v_i+1/2)h\omega_i/k_B T]} \quad (3.12)
\]

This distribution may be sampled by the rejection method [16] or by cumulative distribution function:

\[
\sum_{v_i=0}^{v_i} \frac{e^{[-(v_i+1/2)h\omega_i/k_B T]}}{Q_i} = R \quad (3.13)
\]

where \( R \) is a random number and \( Q_i \) the partition function.

The next step is to transform the rotational angular momentum and its components and the vibrational quantum numbers for the polyatomic reactant \( A \) to Cartesian coordinates and momenta. The energies for the individual normal modes are given by:

\[
E_i = \frac{P_i^2 + \omega_i^2 Q_i^2}{2} \quad (3.14)
\]

which are then transformed to normal mode coordinates and momenta by means of:

\[
Q_i = [(2E_i)^{1/2}/\omega_i] \cos(2\pi R_i) \quad \text{and} \quad P_i = -(2E_i)^{1/2} \sin(2\pi R_i) \quad (3.15)
\]

The normal mode coordinates and momenta \( \mathbf{Q} \) and \( \mathbf{P} \) and the rotational angular momentum are then transformed to Cartesian coordinates and momenta in the center-of-mass frame of reactant \( A \), by the following procedure:
• The \( \mathbf{Q} \) and \( \mathbf{P} \) are transformed to Cartesian coordinates \( \mathbf{q} \) and momenta for \( N \) atoms using the normal mode eigenvector \( \mathbf{L} \) [17]:

\[
\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}_0 + M^{-1/2}\mathbf{LQ} \\
\mathbf{p} = M^{1/2}\mathbf{LP}
\]  

(3.16)

where \( \mathbf{q}_0 \) is a vector of the equilibrium coordinates and \( M \) is a diagonal matrix whose elements are the atomic masses. Since normal modes are approximate for finite displacements [17], a spurious angular momentum \( j_s \) arises following this transformation [18, 19].

• The spurious angular momentum is found from:

\[
j_s = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{r}_i \times m_i \dot{\mathbf{r}}_i
\]

(3.17)

where \( m_i \) is the mass of the \( i \)th atom and \( \mathbf{r}_i \) its position vector. The desired angular momentum \( j_0 \) is added to the molecule by forming the vector

\[
\mathbf{j} = j_0 - j_s
\]

(3.18)

and adding the rotational velocity \( \mathbf{\omega} \times \mathbf{r}_i \) to each atom, where:

\[
\mathbf{\omega} = \mathbf{I}^{-1}\mathbf{j}
\]

(3.19)

and \( \mathbf{I}^{-1} \) is the inverse of inertia tensor [9].

• The actual internal energy \( E \) for the Cartesian coordinates and momenta, chosen from two previous steps, is calculated using the correct Hamiltonian and compared with the intended (provided) energy \( E^0 \). If they do not agree within some acceptance criterion, the Cartesian coordinates and momenta are scaled according to:

\[
q'_i = q_i^0 + (q_i - q_i^0)(E^0/E)^{1/2} \\
p'_i = p_i(E^0/E)^{1/2}
\]

(3.20)

any spurious center-of-mass translational energy is subtracted from the molecule and the procedure loops back to the second step.
The above Cartesian coordinates selected for the polyatomic are then randomly rotated through Euler’s angles [20] to give a random orientation:

\[ \mathbf{q} = R(\theta, \phi, \chi)\mathbf{q}^0 \quad \dot{\mathbf{q}} = R(\theta, \phi, \chi)\dot{\mathbf{q}}^0 \] (3.21)
a dot above a quantity represent its time derivative, \( \mathbf{q}^0 \) and \( \dot{\mathbf{q}}^0 \) are vectors of the Cartesian coordinates and velocities selected above and \( R(\theta, \phi, \chi) \) is the Euler rotation matrix. The angles \( \theta, \phi, \chi \) are randomly chosen according to:

\[ \cos \theta = 2R_1 - 1, \ \phi = 2\pi R_2, \ \chi = 2\pi R_3 \] (3.22)

where \( R_1, R_2 \) and \( R_3 \) are three different random numbers.

Since the polyatomic reactant A has a random orientation in the space-fixed coordinates frame, the atom B may be placed in the \( yz \) plane without loss of generality. The \( x, y, z \) coordinates of B are then:

\[ x = 0, \ y = b, \ z = (s^2 - b^2)^{1/2} \] (3.23)

where \( s \) is the initial separation between both reactants centers of mass, and \( b \) the impact parameter.

The \( A + B \) relative velocity \( v_{rel} \) is now added along the \( z \)-axis with restraint that the \( A+B \) center of mass remains at rest. The space fixed Cartesian momenta are then:

\[ \mathbf{P} = M(\dot{\mathbf{q}} - \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{rel}) \] (3.24)

the elements of the relative velocity \( \dot{\mathbf{q}}_{rel} \) are zero for \( x \) and \( y \) components and equal \([m_A/(m_A + m_B)]v_{rel}\) for the \( z \) component of each atom of B and equal to \([-m_B/(m_A + m_B)]v_{rel}\) for the \( z \) component of each atom of A. Thus, the initial configuration is already determined.

### 3.1.3 Product properties

In classical calculations, a trajectory is ended once provided conditions of product formation are accomplished (see table 1 of Chapter 4, as example). Then, the resulting information is collected in terms of the whole set of coordinates and linear momenta of all the atoms. These variables must be transformed into those of physical interest [4].
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In the chemical reaction:

$$A + B \rightarrow C + D \quad (3.25)$$

the properties with interest are commonly: the C + D relative translational energy, the C and D vibrational and rotational energies and the scattering angle between the initial A + B and the final C + D relative velocity vectors. These properties are calculated from space-fixed Cartesian coordinates and momenta at the termination of a classical trajectory. The procedures here described are incorporated in the general chemical dynamics program VENUS [10] used to calculate the trajectories for the reactions studied in this thesis.

### 3.1.3.1 Relative velocity and translational energy

The product relative velocity is the difference between the velocities of the centers of mass of C and D. For example for the $x$ component of the center of mass position and velocity of product D is given by:

$$X_D = \sum_{i=1}^{n_D} m_i x_i / M_D, \quad \dot{X}_D = \sum_{i=1}^{n_D} m_i \dot{x}_i / M_D \quad (3.26)$$

where the sum is over $n_D$, the number of atoms in D, $m_i$ are the masses and $x_i$ are the $x$ coordinates of the atoms. $M_D$ is the mass of D, upper case variables identify the center of mass position and velocity. The product relative velocity is the time derivative of the relative coordinate:

$$R = R_D - R_C$$

$$= (X_D - X_C)\mathbf{i} + (Y_D - Y_C)\mathbf{j} + (Z_D - Z_C)\mathbf{k} \quad (3.27)$$

$$= \dot{R}_x \mathbf{i} + \dot{R}_y \mathbf{j} + \dot{R}_z \mathbf{k}$$

$$\dot{R} = \dot{R}_x \mathbf{i} + \dot{R}_y \mathbf{j} + \dot{R}_z \mathbf{k}$$

where $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}$ are the unitary vectors in the $x,y,z$ directions respectively. The product translational energy is:

$$E_{rel} = \frac{\mu_{CD} \dot{R} \cdot \dot{R}}{2} \quad (3.28)$$
where $\mu_{CD} = M_CM_D/(M_C + M_D)$ is the CD reduced mass. $E_{\text{rel}}$ may also be written as the sum of the relative translational energy along the line of centers $\text{C} - \text{D}$ and the energy of the orbital (angular) motion:

$$E_{\text{rel}} = \frac{\mu_{CD}\dot{R}^2}{2} + \frac{l^2}{2\mu_{CD}R^2} \quad (3.29)$$

being $\dot{R}$ the module of the velocity along line of centers (radial velocity), and $R$ the distance between them:

$$R = (\mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{R})^{1/2}, \quad \dot{R} = \frac{R_x \dot{R}_x + R_y \dot{R}_y + R_z \dot{R}_z}{R} \quad (3.30)$$

$l$ is the orbital angular momentum (and $l$ its module):

$$l = \mu_{CD}\mathbf{R} \times \dot{\mathbf{R}} = l_x\mathbf{i} + l_y\mathbf{j} + l_z\mathbf{k} \quad (3.31)$$

### 3.1.3.2 Velocity scattering angle

The velocity scattering angle $\theta_v$ is the angle between the relative velocity vector for the reactants $\dot{\mathbf{R}}^0$ and the product’s relative velocity vector $\dot{\mathbf{R}}$, given by:

$$\theta_v = \cos^{-1}\left(\frac{\dot{\mathbf{R}} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{R}}^0}{R\dot{\mathbf{R}}^0}\right) \quad (3.32)$$

### 3.1.3.3 Internal energy

To calculate the internal rotational and vibrational energy of the products requires the coordinates and velocities of each atom of the molecule in the center of mass frame of the molecule:

$$x'_i = x_i - X_D, \quad \dot{x}'_i = \dot{x}_i - \dot{X}_D, \quad i = 1, n_D \quad (3.33)$$

the internal energy of D is:

$$E_D = T_D + V_D \quad (3.34)$$

where $T_D$ and $V_D$ are the kinetic and vibrational energies of D respectively. $V_D$ is determined from the potential energy function and $T_D$ is given by:

$$T_D = \sum_{i=1}^{n_D} m_i(\dot{x}_i^2 + \dot{y}_i^2 + \dot{z}_i^2) \quad (3.35)$$
3.1.3.4 Rotational angular momentum

The rotational angular momentum $j$ of the product molecule D is the sum of the angular momentum $j_i$ of the individual atoms of D relative to its center of mass:

$$j_D = \sum_{i=1}^{n_D} j_i = j_x i + j_y j + j_z k \quad (3.36)$$

the atomic angular momentum is given by:

$$j_i = m_i \dot{r}_i \times \dot{r}_i' \quad (3.37)$$

The total angular momentum of the C + D products is the vector sum:

$$\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{l} + j_C + j_D \quad (3.38)$$

3.1.3.5 Rotational and vibrational energies

If the product correspond to a diatomic species, same procedure as previously described in equations (3.28-3.31) can be used. The internal energy $T_D$ of a diatomic molecule 1-2, can be written:

$$T_D = \frac{\mu_{12} r^2}{2} + \frac{j^2}{2\mu_{12} r^2} \quad (3.39)$$

where $\mu_{12}$ is the reduced mass of D, $r$ is the 1-2 bond length. Similar expressions than (3.28-3.31) are used for $\dot{r}$ and $\ddot{r}$. The rotational quantum number $J$ for D is found from the expression:

$$j = \sqrt{J(J+1)} \hbar \quad (3.40)$$

Since calculation is classical, non-integer values are obtained for $J$; then, rounding is often used.

The vibrational quantum number is obtained with help of semi-classical quantization condition [21, p71]:

$$\oint p_r dr = (n + \frac{1}{2})2\pi \hbar \quad (3.41)$$

where the momentum $p_r = \mu \dot{r}$ and the cyclic integral denotes integration over one orbit. From the equations (3.34) and (3.39) $p_r$ is given by:

$$p_r = \left[2\mu_{12} \left( E_D - \frac{j^2}{2\mu_{12} r^2} - V_D(r) \right) \right]^{1/2} \quad (3.42)$$
as for $J$, non-integer values of $n$ are often obtained.

If $D$ is a polyatomic species it is not a simple to calculate rotational and vibrational quantum numbers [4]. Semi-classical quantization can be used as in case of diatomic molecules, presented above. However, mostly because of the multidimensional character, such a task is tedious. As a result most of the semi-classical quantization has been limited to triatomics. So far, there is not a general form to calculate both rotational and vibrational quantum numbers from its Cartesian coordinates [4].

It is always possible to calculate the average vibrational and rotational energies of a polyatomic product:

$$E_D = \langle E_{D}^{\text{vib}} \rangle + \langle E_{D}^{\text{rot}} \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.43)

Because of the ro-vibrational coupling the vibrational and rotational energies of $D$, $E_{D}^{\text{vib}}$ and $E_{D}^{\text{rot}}$, will fluctuate as the molecule vibrates. An instantaneous rotational energy for $D$ may be calculated from:

$$E_{D}^{\text{rot}} = \frac{1}{2} \omega_D \cdot j_D$$  \hspace{1cm} (3.44)

$j_D$ has been defined in Eqn. 3.36 and $\omega_D$, the angular velocity of $D$, can be determined from equation (3.19).

The average rotational energy is computed by averaging over the longest vibrational period of the product. Then, by means of equation (3.44), the average vibrational energy can also be obtained.

### 3.2 Excitation functions and rate constant

Molecular beam experiments provide high initial collision energy resolution [22]. That is why they are often employed to measure the translational energy dependence of the reaction cross section (excitation function). Much of the interesting information about an elementary chemical reaction can be summarized in such a function [23]. Besides, it is also needed to calculate the rate constant for specific ro-vibrational states of the reactants. Once its value is obtained for a given translational energy, some models are used to represent it.
3.2.1 Reaction with barrier

Based on the fitting of available data, LeRoy [23] proposed some particular models:

**Class I reactions**

\[
\sigma(E_{tr}) = \begin{cases} 
C(E_{tr} - E_{th}^{tr})^n e^{-m(E_{tr} - E_{th}^{tr})} & E_{tr} \geq E_{th}^{tr} \\
0 & E_{tr} < 0 
\end{cases}
\] (3.45)

where \(m, n \geq 0\). Those functions increase from 0 at \(E_{tr} = E_{th}^{tr}\), the exponential term causes the excitation function to pass through a maximum as the energy increase. Such a dependence describe properly the excitation functions for neutral-neutral reactions. The reaction presented in chapter 5 of this thesis properly fit to this model.

By substituting (3.45) into (3.6), an analytical expression for the rate constant is obtained:

\[
k(T) = C \left( \frac{8k_B T}{\pi \mu} \right)^{1/2} \frac{(k_B T)^n e^{-E_{th}^{tr}/k_B T}}{(1 + mk_B T)^{n+2}} \times \\
\times \left[ \Gamma(n + 2) + \Gamma(n + 1) \frac{(1 + mk_B T)E_{th}^{tr}}{k_B T} \right]
\] (3.46)

where \(\Gamma\) is the Gamma function, see appendix.

**Class II reactions**

\[
\sigma(E_{tr}) = \begin{cases} 
C(E_{tr} - E_{th}^{tr})^n e^{-m(E_{tr} - E_{th}^{tr})} & E_{tr} \geq E_{th}^{tr} \\
0 & E_{tr} < 0 
\end{cases}
\] (3.47)

these functions are very similar to the previous one, however they include the excitation function for the collision of hard spheres which requires a critical energy \(E_{th}^{tr}[22]\). This excitation function yields to a rate constant:

\[
k(T) = C \left( \frac{8k_B T}{\pi \mu} \right)^{1/2} \frac{(k_B T)^{n-1} \Gamma(n + 1) e^{-E_{th}^{tr}/k_B T}}{(1 + mk_B T)^{n+1}}
\] (3.48)

**Class III reactions**

\[
\sigma(E_{tr}) = \begin{cases} 
C E_{tr}^n & E_{tr} \geq E_{th}^{tr} \\
0 & E_{tr} < 0 
\end{cases}
\] (3.49)
This type of functions applies for collisions between low energy ions and polarizable molecules [23]. For these functions, the rate constant becomes:

\[ k(T) = C \left( \frac{8 k_B T}{\pi \mu} \right)^{1/2} (k_B T)^n [\Gamma(n + 2) - P(n + 2, E_{tr}^{th}/k_B T)] \]  

(3.50)

being \( P \) the incomplete Gamma function, see appendix.

### 3.2.2 Barrier-free reactions

In the collision of two particles (with masses \( m_1 \) and \( m_2 \)) interacting along the centers of mass line, the two-body problem can be simplified into a one-body problem. There, a particle of mass \( \mu = m_1 m_2 / (m_1 + m_2) \) moves under the influence of an effective potential \( (V_{\text{eff}}) \) given by the sum of the interaction between both particles and a centrifugal potential [9].

For reactions which proceed through an attractive potential energy surface, without a barrier (capture-like), the centrifugal barrier on the effective potential \( V_{\text{eff}} \) may still prevent reaction. To obtain a simple model of such a kind of collision, structureless reactants will be assumed. Considering also a long-range attractive potential in the form:

\[ V(R) = -\frac{C_n}{R^n} \]  

(3.51)

where \( C_n \) and \( n \) are parameters depending on the interaction type, with \( n=3 \) when there are dipole-dipole like, \( n=4 \) for quadrupole-dipole and so on [24, 25]. The distance between reactants is represented by \( R \). Of course the above assumption is a large simplification of the problem as in real collisions we deal with reactants having different electric multipoles and also their values can change as the reaction proceeds. However, these effects are supposed to be included in the values on \( n \) and \( C_n \) with some intermediate values, not corresponding exactly to any specific multipole interaction, but to a mixture of them.

The effective potential becomes:

\[ V_{\text{eff}}(R) = E_{\text{tr}} b^2 \frac{b^2}{R^2} - \frac{C_n}{R^n} \]  

(3.52)

where \( b \) is the impact parameter. \( V_{\text{eff}}(R) \) has a maximum value at \( R = R_0 \):

\[ R_0 = \left( \frac{nC_n}{2 E_{\text{tr}} b^2} \right)^{1/(n-2)} \]  

(3.53)
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Figure 1. Distance vs. time plot for a typical trajectory of the reaction OH + SO → H + SO₂, for low translational energies of the reactants.

With the condition that the translational energy must equal the maximum value of the effective potential for \( b = b_{\text{max}} \), the excitation function then becomes:

\[
\sigma(E_{\text{tr}}) = \pi b_{\text{max}}^2 = n\pi(n - 2)^{(2-n)/n} \left( \frac{C_n}{2E_{\text{tr}}} \right)^{2/n}
\] (3.54)

By substituting the previous expression into Eq. (3.6), the rate constant is obtained as:

\[
k(T) = 2n\pi(n - 2)^{(2-n)/n} \left( \frac{2}{\pi\mu} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{C_n}{2} \right)^{2/n} \Gamma \left( \frac{2n - 2}{n} \right) (k_B T)^{(n-4)/2n}
\] (3.55)

Even when this result was obtained for a simplified model of interaction, it fits particularly well the radical-radical reactions [26]. Molecular collisions OH + SO and S + HO₂ presented respectively in chapters 4 and 6 of this thesis are properly described by such a model; though further corrections are needed in the former to account for recrossing effects.
3.3 Complex formation

An important information one gets from quasi-classical trajectories is the reaction mechanism. Very useful are the distances vs time plots such as shows in Figures 1 and 2. By means of such a kind of plot, and with the knowledge of the topology of the PES, it is possible to describe the intermediate species or structures formed in the path from reactants to products (in the general sense products may also be recoiled reactants, as in inelastic scattering). However, a detailed check of all the plots produced by each of the computed trajectory is a cumbersome task. What it is actually done is to choose a certain number of trajectories and define a criterion to identify whether such structure is formed or not, and implement it in the code used for computing trajectories. Such a criteria should be carefully tested in a significant number of trajectories.

For example, by checking 100 trajectories at $E_{tr} = 0.6$ and $E_{tr} = 20.0$ kcal mol$^{-1}$ of the reaction OH + SO (see chapter 4) in detail, we verify that OH bond length remains shorter than the HS bond length. This observation led to the conclusion
that there is no formation of an HSO$_2$ conformer in the $C_{2v}$ structure with the H atom bonded to the S atom. HOSO with hydrogen bonded to one of the oxygen atoms is formed instead. The selected criterion can also provide life-times of the formed complex. Usually geometry conditions are used to define it (distances between atoms, comparison between them, etc.) but energetic conditions may be used as well.

When a trajectory enters into a configuration corresponding to a complex and returns back to the reactants it is said a recrossing has occurred [26]. This effect is common in reactions with a deep well in the interaction potential, corresponding to the complex, followed by a barrier which must be overcame for continuing the way to the products. For these cases, it is particularly important to detect whether or not the complex was formed during the trajectory. We may need to account for recrossing effects as a correction in the rate constant or in the excitation function [26]. Thus, the probability of a recrossing needs to be known. In the study of the reaction OH + SO presented in chapter 4 of this thesis, a correction to the capture excitation function is done to account for such effect.

3.4 Electronic degeneracy factor

Degeneracy of the electronic states in a molecular systems were not included in the picture presented so far, of the nuclei moving on a potential energy surface. The results of having different electronic states have a quantitative effect when studying molecular collisions. As early as 1936, it was pointed out by Rabinowich [27], that theoretically calculated rate constants differ in a factor from experimental results. This factor depends upon the electronic degeneracy of the involved species. Bunker and Davidson [28, 29] remarked the role of such a factor. In the work of Truhlar [30] the proper inclusion of the electronic degeneracy was presented while Muckerman and Newton [31] pointed out its dependence on temperature. Main ideas of the degeneracy factor are briefly presented in the following.

In some collision processes (e.g. He+Ne) both collision partners have the same degeneracy $g$ ($g = 2$). It is a good approximation to consider that internuclear motion is governed by one potential energy surface, corresponding to the lowest
energy (degenerate or not) electronic state of the system. For most collision problems one must consider more than one electronic state: e.g. $^3P_{3/2}$ has $g = 4$ so the collision partners in I + I have $g = 16$. However, the ground state of $I_2$ is non-degenerate. Coupling between the 16 states of $I_2$ is expected at large internuclear distances where the states are nearly degenerate. In the absence of a detailed treatment of this non-adiabatic coupling it is reasonable to use BOA at all internuclear distances. In this approximation each collision occurs on one potential energy surface, but only $1/16$ of the collisions occurs in the ground state surface [30].

Thus, when comparing rate constants with experimental values a factor:

$$g_e = \frac{g_{\text{comp}}}{g_{\text{react1}} g_{\text{react2}}}$$

(3.56)

should be included. The numerator denotes the degeneracy of the whole molecular system and the denominator accounts for the degeneracies of the reactants. Note that these factors must include the dependence on temperature of spin orbit splitting.

Molecular system studied in this thesis is HSO$_2(^2\Lambda)$, a doublet. When studying molecular collision e.g. OH($^2\Pi$) + SO($^3\Sigma$), $g_e$ assumes the form:

$$g_e(T) = \frac{2}{3(2[1 + \exp(-205/T)])}$$

(3.57)

the two pi ($\Pi$) levels of OH split into two double-fold levels when spin-orbit interaction (first order) is considered, there is an energy gap of 205 K between them [32]. As the three degenerate states of SO are sigma ($\Sigma$) states they remain the same as spin-orbit coupling is accounted. In the same way, in all dynamics studies carried out in this work, such a factor was included.

### 3.5 Quantum corrections to classical calculations

Even when classical calculations may provide an appropriate description of molecular collisions, quantum nature of the molecular world should be preserved. Thus, some behaviors in the classical calculations must be corrected.

The so-called tunnel effect is a direct consequence from quantum mechanics [21], when a particle is passing through a potential energy barrier. Of course,
classical calculations do not account for such effect. Some attempts have been made to include tunneling in classical calculations (see Ref. [33] and references therein). In molecular collisions studied in this work, tunneling effects will not be considered.

An important error uprising from classical calculations are the “sub-threshold” reactive trajectories appearing in some reactions for translational energies below the quantum threshold [34]. This fact could be significant, especially for barrier-type reactions, where the threshold energy dictates the magnitude and the slope of the rate constant. In the reactions presented here it was followed the idea of Varandas and collaborators [35] to circumvent this problem. There, the authors calculated trajectories for translational energies above the energy threshold, whose value is fixed to the conventional transition state enthalpy.

Classical calculations does not forbid molecular systems to have vibrational energy below the lowest value given by quantum calculations. This is usually referred as zero-point energy (ZPE) leakage. To account for ZPE leakage of classical calculations several strategies have been proposed [36–41]. In the quasiclassical study of the reactions presented in this thesis the following methods were used:

- **IEQMT** [39]. Internal Energy Quantum Mechanics Threshold. Each product is demanded to have an internal energy larger than its corresponding ZPE.

- **VEQMT** [40]. Vibrational Energy Quantum Mechanical Threshold. The vibrational energy of each product must be larger than its corresponding ZPE.

- **VEQMT_C** [41]. Vibrational Energy Quantum Mechanical Threshold of the Complex. The vibrational energy of the complex, just before dissociation, must be larger than the sum of the ZPE energies of the formed products.

It must be noted, as a final remark on this chapter, that although quantum mechanics should be used for the exact treatment of the dynamics of molecular systems, classical methods are affordable means to obtain cross sections for the majority of systems of chemical interest. This is valid for large polyatomics as much as small systems containing heavy atoms.
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Abstract

We report a quasiclassical trajectory study of the title reaction using a recently reported double many-body expansion potential energy surface for ground state HSO$_2$. Two methods that aim to account for zero point energy leakage are used. A capture-type behavior is predicted, with recrossing effects manifesting mainly at high translational energies. Reaction cross sections and a comparison of the calculated rate constant with available literature data are also reported.
1 Introduction

The SO radical plays a significant role in combustion chemistry [1], while tropospheric oxidation of sulfur is driven by hydroperoxyl radicals [2]. In particular, the reaction

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

(1)

has been much studied, both theoretically and experimentally [3–10]. Although some of these works have suggested mechanisms [7, 8], they have all been based on studies using partial information about the HSO\(_2\) system. Our aim here is to report a dynamics and kinetics study of reaction (1) using a single-sheeted (global) double many-body expansion (DMBE) potential energy surface recently reported [11] for HSO\(_2\), hoping to clarify how the reaction proceeds. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 surveys briefly the potential energy surface, while the technicalities of the computational method are addressed in section 3. The results and discussion are in section 4, and the conclusions in section 5.

2 Potential Energy Surface

All calculations employed the six-dimensional double many-body expansion potential energy surface for the electronic ground state of HSO\(_2\). Since this has already been described in detail elsewhere [11], we focus on its major topographical features which are of relevance for the title reaction. Figure 1 depicts schematically its energetics, as predicted from the HSO\(_2\) DMBE potential energy surface. As it is shown in this diagram, the title reaction can proceed via one or two intermediate structures: HOSO and/or HSO\(_2\). Figure 2 shows a perspective view of the HSO\(_2\) potential energy surface for regions of configuration space with relevance for the title reaction: the \(x\)-axis stands for the O–H distance relating to the hydrogen and oxygen atoms in the hydroxyl radical, while the \(y\)-axis indicates the distance between sulfur in SO and oxygen in OH. Note that \(\angle\text{OSO}, \angle\text{SOH}\), and the dihedral angle, as well as the SO distance, are partially relaxed in this plot.
Figure 1. Energetics of the single-sheeted DMBE potential energy surface [11] for HSO₂.

Figure 2. 3D perspective view of the OH + SO → H + SO₂ channel of the HSO₂ DMBE potential energy surface [11]. Energy is in Eₜ, with contours starting at −0.4800 Eₜ, equally spaced by 0.01 Eₜ.
3 Computational procedure

To run the quasi-classical trajectories, we have utilized an adapted version of the VENUS96 [12] code which accommodates the HSO$_2$ DMBE potential energy surface. Calculations have done for diatom-diatom translational energies in the range $0.2 \leq E_{tr}/\text{kcal mol}^{-1} \leq 19.9$. In all cases the vibrational and rotational quantum numbers of the reactants have been fixed at the ground level. This implies $v_{OH} = v_{SO} = 0$ for the vibrational quantum numbers, while the rotational quantum numbers are $j_{OH} = 1$ and $j_{SO} = 0$ assuming [13] that OH fits Hund’s rule case b) (according, the smallest $N'$ value should be $N' = 1, 2, \ldots$; for consistency, we use $j$ instead of $N'$ in this work). Of course, a thermalized rotational-vibrational distribution would be necessary if one seeks a comparison with thermal rate coefficients. We focus here more on dynamical issues for specific initial states and translational energies, leaving a direct thermalized calculation of the rate constant for future consideration.

The step size used for numerical integration is $2.5 \times 10^{-16} \text{s}$, which warrants conservation of the total energy to better than 1 part in $10^3$. The reactant diatomic molecules were initially separated by 9 Å, a value considered sufficiently large to make the interaction energy essentially negligible. The procedure employed to assign reactive channels has been described elsewhere [14]. There are 14 possible arrangement channels if we do not distinguish those leading to isomers of a given species. Table 1 collects their assignments according to the geometries of the four-atom species (channel 1 identifies the reactants). In turn, the maximum impact parameter ($b_{\text{max}}$) has been found by running batches of 100 trajectories at fixed values, with $b_{\text{max}}$ being diminished until reaction (this implies an exit channel distinct from # 1) takes place. Such a procedure allows to determine $b_{\text{max}}$ within $\pm 0.1$ Å. For a given translational energy, batches of trajectories have then been run, and the reactive cross section calculated as $\sigma_r(E_{tr}) = \pi b_{\text{max}}^2 P_r$, with the associated 68 % uncertainties being $\Delta \sigma_r(E_{tr}) = \sigma_r [(N_T - N_r) / N_T N_r]^{1/2}$; $N_r$ is the number of reactive trajectories in a total of $N_T$, and $P_r = N_r / N_T$ the reaction probability. From this, and assuming a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution over the translational energy ($E_{tr}$), the specific thermal rate coefficient is obtained as

$$k(T) = g_v(T) \left( \frac{2}{k_B T} \right)^{3/2} \left( \frac{1}{\pi \mu} \right)^{1/2} \int_0^\infty E_{tr} \sigma_r(E_{tr}) \exp \left( -\frac{E_{tr}}{k_B T} \right) dE_{tr}$$

(2)
Table 1. Assignment of reaction channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Products</th>
<th>(R_1/\text{Å})</th>
<th>(R_2/\text{Å})</th>
<th>(R_3/\text{Å})</th>
<th>(R_4/\text{Å})</th>
<th>(R_5/\text{Å})</th>
<th>(R_6/\text{Å})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(O_a + \text{HSO}_b)</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(O_b + \text{SO}_a)</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(\text{HS} + \text{O}_2)</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(\text{H} + \text{SO}_2)</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>2.470</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(O_a + \text{HSO}_b)</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>2.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(O_b + \text{HSO}_a)</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.386</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>2.374</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(\text{S} + \text{HO}_2)</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>1.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(O_a + \text{H} + \text{SO}_b)</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(\text{S} + \text{O}_b + \text{HO}_a)</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(O_b + \text{H} + \text{SO}_a)</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(\text{S} + \text{O}_a + \text{HO}_b)</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(\text{S} + \text{H} + \text{O}_2)</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(O_a + \text{O}_b + \text{HS})</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(\text{S} + \text{O}_a + \text{O}_b + \text{H})</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where \(T\) is the temperature, and \(g_e(T)\) the electronic degeneracy factor which assumes [15, 16] the form:

\[
g_e(T) = \frac{1}{3[1 + \exp(-205/T)]} \tag{3}
\]

Note that \(\text{OH}(^2\Pi)\) splits into two double-fold degenerate states [\(\text{OH}(^2\Pi_{1/2})\) and \(\text{OH}(^2\Pi_{3/2})\)] when first-order spin-orbit interaction is considered, with 205 K being the energy difference between them [17]. In turn, \(\text{SO}(^3\Sigma)\) is a triplet, while the complex is a doublet.

To monitor complex formation, we have first studied in detail 100 trajectories at translational energies of 0.596 and 19.87 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) (respectively, 300 and 10000 K). From the analysis of time vs bond-distance plots (not shown for brevity), a geometric criterion has been set to define whether complex formation has occurred. According to such a criterion, complex formation is defined by means of only two bond-lengths: one ensuring that the incoming hydroxyl is bonded to sulfur, the other checking whether the H atom is part of the four-body moiety or, instead, far away forming \(\text{H} + \text{SO}_2\) products. A complex is then any
arrangement of the four atoms where the HS and SOₐ distances become shorter than 1.3 times their values at the global minimum. Such a definition leads to complex lifetimes that agree well with those obtained from inspection of the above referred bond distance vs time plots. Indeed, we find such a procedure to be sufficiently rigorous to avoid the cumbersome observation of the bond distance vs time plots for all trajectories that have been run, although checks have been performed here and there to warrant the accuracy of the method during mass production of the trajectory results. We note at this stage that in no single case has HSO₂ been formed. The same applies to the oxygen interchange process HOₐ + SOₐ → HOₐ + SOₐ, as in no case it has been observed.

A well known problem of classical trajectories is the so-called zero-point energy leakage. Both 'active' and 'non-active' methods have been suggested (Ref. 18, and references therein) to overcome it in an approximate manner. In the active methods, a constraint is introduced to prevent the trajectories from entering the region of phase space which allows vibrational modes to have less than its ZPE. Instead, in the non-active ones, trajectories leading to aphysical products (with vibrational/internal energies below a given threshold) are thrown out and replaced [13] by running novel trajectories. The perturbed statistics may eventually be corrected \textit{a posteriori} [19]. Thus, no trajectory calculations, besides those run in the traditional QCT method are eventually required when using a non-active method. Clearly, the above mentioned schemes are not free from ambiguity, and we use only two simple non-active methods in this work, namely VEQMTₜ [20] and IEQMT [21]. The former demands that the total vibrational energy of the products is larger than the sum of their ZPEs [20] while the latter, less restrictive, requires that the total internal energy of each molecular product is larger than the corresponding ZPE [21].

4 Results and discussion

According to Figures 1 and 2, the title reaction takes place without a potential barrier. Computational difficulties arise as a significant number of trajectories (around 10\%) falls into the deep well of the potential energy surface and remains there up to $4 \times 10^5$ steps, thus leading to convergence problems. This is especially
critical at low collisional energies as this leads to a drastic increase in computational cost.

Table 2 summarizes the trajectory calculations, with non-converged trajectories removed from the total number run, \( N_T \). \( N_c \) is the number of complex-forming trajectories, and \( N_r \) the number of trajectories leading to \( \text{SO}_2 + \text{H} \) formation. This is a subset of \( N_c \), while \( N_{\text{rec}} \) is the number of recrossing trajectories (those that form a complex but subsequently re-dissociate back to reactants). Once the complex is formed (note that most are long lived), vibrational energy of OH is transferred to other modes. Thus, when the trajectory dissociates back to reactants, it often does so by loosing vibrational energy with respect to its original value, in this case the ground-state vibrational energy. In fact, only for high translational energies, does OH keep its vibrational energy above ZPE. As a result, nearly all recrossing trajectories in the low-translational energy regime suffer from ZPE-leakage. Disregarding such trajectories from the final statistics may imply that reactivity will likely be overestimated with respect to the traditional QCT value as the statistics of the reactive trajectories gets improved with respect to the non-reactive one. This is illustrated in Table 2, where the results from the VEQMT\(_C\) and IEQMT methods are compared with those of traditional QCT. We emphasize that all trajectories not fulfilling the threshold conditions imposed by such methods are simply discarded, with no attempt being made to improve the statistics \textit{a posteriori} [19]. As expected, the IEQMT results lie between QCT and VEQMT\(_C\). To give reasonable lower and upper limits of reactivity one then needs to consider only the QCT and VEQMT\(_C\) methods. Thus, we focus heretofore only on these two approaches. In the absence of a potential energy barrier, the tittle reaction should be controlled at low energies by long-range interactions associated to the permanent electric moments of the reactants. The reactive cross section may then be expressed by multiplying the capture cross section [22, 23] by a factor \( F_{\text{rec}}(E_{\text{tr}}) \) that accounts for recrossing effects:

\[
\sigma(E_{\text{tr}}) = n\pi(n - 2)^{(2-n)/n}(\frac{C_n}{2E_{\text{tr}}})^{2/n} F_{\text{rec}}(E_{\text{tr}})
\]

Note that \( F_{\text{rec}} \) depends on the translational energy, as opposed to Refs. 22, 23 where the correction for recrossing appears in the rate constant and hence is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E_{tr}$</th>
<th>$E_{tr}$</th>
<th>$b_{max}$</th>
<th>QCT</th>
<th>VEQMT$_{C}$</th>
<th>IEQMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>kcal mol$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Å</td>
<td>$N_T$</td>
<td>$N_{com}$</td>
<td>$N_{rec}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1624</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1742</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1.987</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>5.962</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>9.936</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>19.872</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>1158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. A summary of the trajectories calculations.
Figure 3. Reaction cross section vs translational energy for QCT and VEQMT\(_C\) results. The arrow indicates the step introduced in the recrossing function in Eq. (5) at \(E_{\text{tr}} = E_{\text{th\,tr}}\), which is shown graphically in the insert.

written as a function of temperature. We have found convenient the form:

\[
F_{\text{rec}}(E_{\text{tr}}) = \begin{cases} 
1 & E_{\text{tr}} < E_{\text{th\,tr}} \\
\exp[-\alpha(E_{\text{tr}} - E_{\text{th\,tr}})] & E_{\text{tr}} \geq E_{\text{th\,tr}}
\end{cases}
\]  

(5)

as it mimics well the recrossing data shown in Table 2. Note that \(E_{\text{th\,tr}}\) can be regarded as a threshold energy for recrossing under the requirements of a given method. As expected, \(E_{\text{th\,tr}}\) vanishes (or lies close to zero) in the traditional QCT method. The calculated reactive cross sections are shown in Figure 3, jointly with the results of the fits based on Eqs. (4) and (5). Note the expected bump in the VEQMT\(_C\) curve due to the use of a non-vanishing threshold energy in Eq. (5).

After substitution of Eq. (4) in Eq. (2) and integration, one gets:

\[
k(T) = k_{\text{cap}}(T) \left[ P \left( \frac{2(n-1)}{n}, \frac{E_{\text{th\,tr}}}{k_B T} \right) + \exp \left( \frac{E_{\text{th\,tr}}}{k_B T_0} \right) \left( \frac{T_0}{T_0 + T} \right)^{\frac{2(n-1)}{n}} \times \\
x Q \left( \frac{2(n-1)}{n}, \frac{E_{\text{th\,tr}}}{k_B T} \right) \right]
\]  

(6)
Table 3. Rate constants for the title reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$k(T)/10^{-11}$ cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T$/$K$</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3 ± 1.7</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>literature review [10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 ± 1.6</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>discharge flow [8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 ± 1.5</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>electron spin resonance [6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 ± 3.0</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>literature review [5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6 ± 3.2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>literature review [4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6 ± 5.0</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>chemiluminescence [3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4 − 15.4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>this work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where $T_0 = 1/(\alpha k_B)$,

$$k_{cap}(T) = 2n\pi g_e(T)(n-2)^{(2-n)/n}\left(\frac{2}{\pi\mu}\right)^{1/2}\left(\frac{C_n}{2}\right)^{2/n} \Gamma \left[\frac{2(n-1)}{n}\right](k_B T)^{(n-4)/2n} \quad (7)$$

and $P$ and $Q$ stand for the incomplete gamma function and its complement (respectively), while $\Gamma$ is the Gamma function. Figure 4 shows a plot with rate constants reported in literature and both the lower and upper limits that have been calculated in this work. The two delimit a shaded area that should bound a realistic estimate of the quasi-classical rate constant. In turn, Table 3 compares the values calculated for room temperature. Note that we have used the high-temperature limit [24, 25] of the electronic degeneracy factor ($g_e = 1/6$) such as to get the 'pure' dependence of the rate constant on temperature [i.e., without including the dependence due to $g_e(T)$]. Clearly, our results agree well with the limited experimental values reported in the literature [3–6, 10]. We now address the work by Blitz et al. [8]. Their rate constants were measured for OH + SO over the temperature range 295 − 703 K, and measured at pressures of 100 Torr. Because it agrees at room temperature with the values reported by Jordain et al. [6] and Fair et al. [3] which have been obtained at low pressures (∼ 1 Torr), this led those authors [8] to suggest that the title reaction can be treated as pressure-independent. However, because pressure effects are likely to increase the complex lifetime due to the presence of third-bodies, we may argue that an increasing pressure will result on an increasing recrossing probability, thus diminishing reactivity as predicted from our calculations. In fact, for high
temperatures, our results show significant differences from those of Blitz et al. [8] which show a sudden drop with temperature. Such a “sudden-drop” in $k(T)$ has also been observed by Sander et al. [10], who have referred to it as ‘a non-expected behavior for temperatures above 500 K’. We further remark that Blitz et al. [8] relied on the assumption [7] that isomerization HOSO $\rightarrow$ HSO$_2$ is needed for the title reaction to take place. As noted above, direct processes HO + SO $\rightarrow$ H + SO$_2$ without isomerization to HSO$_2$, are the only ones observed in the present study. Figure 4 depicts the temperature dependence recommended by Sander et al. [10] based on the temperature data of Blitz et al. [8] for the range 295 – 453 K, as well as their suggested error bars which are indicated by the shaded area. Also shown is the rate constant proposed by Alzueta et al. [9], which has been derived from a
fit to the Blitz et al. [8] data. The salient feature is the good agreement between the results from the present work and the measurement of Fair et al. [3] for room temperature, as well as with other experimental values or recommendations for the same temperature [4–6, 10]. They predict a small $T$-dependence which is best seen in a (non-logarithmic) plot of $k(T)$ vs $T$: a modest initial increase before stabilization at high temperatures. Thus, both the VEQMT$_C$ and QCT curves show maxima, but they occur at higher temperatures (respectively $\sim 1400$ and $\sim 100$ K) than predicted by quantum capture rate constant calculations [24, 25]. In an attempt to clarify this behavior, we have fitted the energy along the minimum energy path (for diatom-diatom separations $2.4 \leq R/\text{Å} \leq 4.8$) to a simple isotropic long-range $C_nR^{-n}$ form and calculated the rate constant using classical capture theory [22]. We observe the following: a) the optimum power in the long-range potential is found to be $n = 5.9$ ($C_n = -7.3 \text{E}_h\text{Å}^n$), which is due to probing various arrangements of the interacting permanent electrostatic (i.e., dipole-dipole, dipole-quadrupole, and quadrupole-quadrupole) moments along such a path of the DMBE potential energy surface [11], as well as to having additional long-range contributions included in the latter; b) the calculated rate constant at room temperature is predicted to be $5.3 \times 10^{-11} \text{cm}^3\text{s}^{-1}$, which is somewhat smaller than Clary’s recommended [24] value of $8.0 \times 10^{-11} \text{cm}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ obtained using the adiabatic capture global centrifugal sudden approximation, although it lies closer to their reported result of $6.5 \times 10^{-11} \text{cm}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ obtained with the adiabatic capture infinite order sudden approximation [24]; c) no maximum arises in the classical capture rate constant, which is predicted to increase with temperature as expected for a power law larger than $n = 4$. This result suggests that the maximum arising in the curves of Ref. 25 at very low temperatures can be ascribed to changing from a fixed orientation of the permanent moments at low temperatures to a rotationally-averaged regime with increasing temperature. However, such a mechanism conflicts with the prediction from DMBE which shows significant angle-scrambling (besides dispersion interactions) in the minimum energy path itself. Such an averaging process becomes even more prominent if one recalls that OH in its ground state has already one quantum of rotational energy. Indeed, movies of $\text{OH}(v_{\text{OH}} = 0, j_{\text{OH}} = 1) + \text{SO}(v_{\text{SO}} = 0, j_{\text{SO}} = 0)$ trajectories show a quick sampling of all diatom-diatom interaction angles. Finally, we emphasize
that a full comparison with experiment requires a thermalized distribution of initial reactant states. Although the above arguments suggest that the general trends are likely to be maintained, calculations are required to confirm such an assertion and to assess the role of excited vibrational states, especially at high temperatures.

5 Conclusions

The reaction \( \text{OH} + \text{SO} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{SO}_2 \) has been theoretically studied over a range of translational energies. No formation of \( \text{HSO}_2 \) has occurred, thus predicting reaction to proceed via an \( \text{HOSO} \) intermediate. Cross sections have been calculated and fitted to a two-step model based on capture-recrossing. Such a model offers an analytic expression for the rate constant which, for the title reaction, predicts only a slight dependence on temperature. The calculated state-specific rate constant is predicted in fair agreement with experimental data reported in the literature for room temperature.
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Abstract

We report a quasi-classical trajectory study of the title reaction using a double many-body expansion potential energy surface for ground state HSO$_2$. Calculations for specific low ro-vibrational states of the reactants, as well as thermalized reactants, have been performed. The calculated cross sections indicate a barrier-type mechanism, and nearly thermalized product distributions. Both HOSO and HSO$_2$ isomers are formed during the collisional process, although with quite different incidences. The rate constant is found to be enhanced by adding internal energy to the reactants, with the thermalized result being in good agreement with existing experimental data.
1 Introduction

Sulfur dioxide is well known as an important atmospheric pollutant [1], while catalytic recombination of H atoms in SO$_2$ doped flames is considered to be responsible for radical sink in fuel-rich flames [2]. Considerable work has been devoted to study the reaction of SO$_2$ with atomic hydrogen, both experimentally and theoretically. By measuring the thermal profiles of H atoms behind the reflected shock of C$_2$H$_5$I/SO$_2$/Ar mixtures, Murakami et al. [3] have studied the reaction

$$\text{H} + \text{SO}_2 \rightarrow \text{products} \quad (1)$$

and reported for the rate constant the value $k = \exp(-66.1 \text{kJ mol}^{-1}/RT) \times 10^{-11} \text{cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$. Such a result has been obtained under the assumption it yields only OH + SO above 1000 K, being therefore valid for the temperature range of $1400 \leq T/K \leq 2200$. In turn, Goumri et al. [4] have employed RRKM theory to study the reaction (1) for formation of an adduct as well as the isomerization process. Additionally, Fair and Thrush [5] studied complex formation in an experimental frame using an Ar bath. More recently, Blitz et al. [6] reported a master equation for the H+SO$_2$ reaction, with the derived rate coefficients relying heavily on measurements of the reverse OH + SO reaction that had previously been analyzed [7]. Their reported low pressure limit rate constant for the title reaction is $k(T) = 4.51 (T/300)^{-2.3} \exp(-15582/T) \times 10^{-8} \text{cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$. In turn, Morris et al. [8] have carried out ab initio calculations on properties of the intermediate structures for the title reaction, while in another publication [9] they reported an observation of time-resolved IR emission from ro-vibrational excited OH that is produced when reacting 'hot' hydrogen atoms (58 kcal mol$^{-1}$ of average effective initial translational energy) with vibrationally excited SO$_2$. A quasi-triatomic approximation has then been utilized to describe the HSO$_2$ potential energy surface where quasi-classical trajectory (QCT) calculations have been performed [9]. Their calculations have shown a “statistical but non-Boltzmann vibrational distribution of OH” when vibrational excitations as high as $v=11–13$ are deposited into the non-frozen SO bond of SO$_2$. A rather more pronounced non-statistical behavior has been observed both experimentally [10–12] and theoretically [13–15] for the analogous reaction H + O$_3$ → OH($v$) + O$_2$, which is exothermic by about
Although the reduced-dimensionality QCT results of Morris et al. [9] tend to support their experimental observations for the title reaction, they are clearly not definitive due to the simplistic nature of the employed potential energy surface. Recently, we have reported a full-dimensional single-sheeted potential energy surface [16] of the double many-body expansion [17] (DMBE) type for the ground electronic state of HSO₂, which will be here employed. The major aim of the present work will be to elucidate the mechanism the H + SO₂ reaction, and study the influence of the internal energy of the reactants (at moderate regimes of excitation) in the rate constant over a wide range of temperatures. Thus, we will not address the vibrational issue raised by Morris et al. [9] in the present work.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 addresses briefly the main aspects of the potential energy surface, while the details of the computational methods are presented in section 3. The results are reported and discussed in section 4, and the conclusions gathered in section 5.

2 Potential energy surface

All calculations reported in this work have employed the six-dimensional (6D) single-sheeted DMBE potential energy surface [16] for ground state HSO₂. It uses in its definition DMBE functions previously reported for the diatomic and triatomic fragments (Ref. 16, and references therein) and four-body energy terms that have been calibrated from correlated CASPT2/FVCAS/AVXZ (X = 2, 3) calculations. For brevity, only some major topographical features of interest for the title reaction are described, with the readers being referred to the original papers for details. Such a DMBE form has recently been employed [18] in a QCT study of the OH + SO → H + SO₂ reaction, with the results showing good agreement with the available experimental data. Figure 1 illustrates the minimum energy path for title reaction, assuming as intermediate the stable HOSO species. As shown, the reaction is endothermic by 27.6 kcal mol⁻¹, with a potential well of −3.1 kcal mol⁻¹ and a barrier of 9.1 kcal mol⁻¹ preceding the deep well (−49.2 kcal mol⁻¹) associated to the HOSO intermediate; all energies are measured with respect to the H + SO₂ asymptote. As it will be discussed,
there is also a possibility of forming a HSO₂ intermediate, but its likelihood is rather small.

3 Computational procedures

All calculations used the QCT method as implemented in the VENUS96 [19] code, which have been suitably modified to accommodate the HSO₂ DMBE potential energy surface. For the numerical integrations, a step size of $2.5 \times 10^{-16}$ s has been utilized, warranting the conservation of total energy to better than 1 part in $10^3$. The procedure employed to assign the various reactive channels has been described elsewhere [20]. As for the OH + SO reaction [18], there will be 14 possible channels since we do not consider as distinct those corresponding to isomers of a given species.

Two types of calculations have been here performed. First, we have studied the role of the reactants internal energy by performing calculations for specific ro-vibrational combinations of the reactants (SO₂). To directly calculate the rate
constant, we have then carried out calculations using thermalized reactants. Details of both such studies are given in the following.

The specific ro-vibrational calculations have covered translational energies over the range \(31.0 \leq E_{\text{tr}}/\text{kcal mol}^{-1} \leq 55.0\). In turn, the translational energies were selected such as to exceed the classical threshold for reaction as dictated by the energetics of the DMBE potential energy surface, but below the minimum energy required to open other channels \([16]\). Two specific cases have been considered. First, sulfur dioxide has been prepared in its ground vibrational state \([21]\) \(v_1 = 0, v_2 = 0, v_3 = 0\), with the rotational energy around each principal axis of inertia \([19]\) being \(RT_{\text{rot}}/2\). The rotational temperature has then been fixed at \(T_{\text{rot}} = 300\) K, as indicated heretofore by writing \(\text{SO}_2(v = 0, T_{\text{rot}} = 300\) K), where \(v = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}\) denotes the set of quantum numbers for the triatomic vibrational modes. Second, the triatomic molecule has been considered vibrationally excited, with one quantum of excitation in each normal mode \((v_1 = 1, v_2 = 1, v_3 = 1)\) and the rotational temperature set at 1800 K, as denoted by \(\text{SO}_2(v = 1, T_{\text{rot}} = 1800\) K). Thus, the first case considers the title reaction without any extra internal energy, while in the latter we choose both the vibrational and rotational energies to have the same order of magnitude (the rotational and vibrational temperatures correspond to the average temperature for the range \(1400 \leq T/\text{K} \leq 2200\) here considered).

Batches of 100 trajectories per collisional energy have been run to determine the maximum impact parameter \((b_{\text{max}})\) that leads to reaction. For a given translational energy, the reactive cross section has been calculated by using \(\sigma_r = \pi b_{\text{max}}^2 P_r\), with the associated 68% uncertainties being \(\Delta\sigma_r = \sigma_r[(N_T-N_r)/(N_T N_r)]^{1/2};\ N_r\) is the number of reactive trajectories in a total of \(N_T\), and \(P_r = N_r/N_T\) the reaction probability. From the reactive cross section and assuming a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution over the translational energy, the specific thermal rate coefficient assumes the form

\[
k(T; v, T_{\text{rot}}) = g_e(T) \left(\frac{2}{k_B T}\right)^{3/2} \left(\frac{1}{\pi \mu}\right)^{1/2} \int_0^\infty E_{\text{tr}} \sigma(E_{\text{tr}}; v, T_{\text{rot}}) \exp(-E_{\text{tr}}/k_B T) dE_{\text{tr}} \quad (2)
\]

where \(T\) is the temperature, \(k_B\) the Boltzmann constant, \(\mu\) the reactants reduced mass, and \(g_e\) a factor that accounts for the electronic degeneracy \([22, 23]\). Since \(\text{H}\) is a doublet \(({}^2S)\), \(\text{SO}_2\) is a singlet \(({}^1\Sigma^+ A')\), and the tetratomic is a doublet, one
has \( g_e = 1 \).

To monitor complex formation, we have first studied in detail 100 trajectories at 32.0 and 55.0 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) of translational energy with \( \text{SO}_2(\mathbf{v} = 0, \ T_{\text{rot}} = 300 \text{ K}) \). Traditional ‘distance vs time’ plots have then been carefully examined for many reactive trajectories. From such plots, we have concluded that both HOSO and HSO\(_2\) structures are formed during the collisional event. Since it is unpractical to examine all such plots, we require a definition of intermediate complex that may operate without being so time consuming. Following previous work, and taking into account the energetics of the HSO\(_2\) DMBE potential energy surface [16], we have defined complex as any configuration of the four-body system in which the SH distance is smaller than 1.3 times its value at the HSO\(_2\) equilibrium geometry. If any of the OH distances is smaller than \( R_{\text{SH}} \), the HOSO adduct is considered to have been formed, otherwise the complex will be considered to correspond to an HSO\(_2\) configuration. To assess the merits of such a definition, we have then compared the lifetimes of a large set the intermediates so assigned with the results obtained by viewing the corresponding ‘distance vs time’ plots. In all cases, we have found our “blind” procedure to be sufficiently accurate to be used in the present calculations.

A well known problem in classical molecular dynamics is the so-called zero-point energy leakage (Ref. 24 and references therein). To approximately account for this problem, we have followed our previous work [18] by considering the VEQMT\(_C\) [25] method. According to this method, only the trajectories leading to total vibrational energies of the products larger than the sum of their separated ZPEs are considered for the final statistical analysis.

For the thermalized calculations, the collisional energy has been selected from a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution by using the cumulative function

\[
G(E_{\text{tr}}) = \left( \frac{1}{k_B T} \right)^2 \int_0^{E_{\text{tr}}} E'_{\text{tr}} \exp\left(-E'_{\text{tr}}/k_B T\right) dE'_{\text{tr}}
\]

where \( E_{\text{tr}} \) is chosen randomly for each trajectory by solving the equation \( G(E_{\text{tr}}) - \xi = 0; \xi \) is a random number. In turn, the vibrational quantum numbers \( \mathbf{v} \) of \( \text{SO}_2 \) were sampled by using a cumulative distribution function of the form

\[
C(E_{\mathbf{v}}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\mathbf{v}} P(n)
\]
where the probability $P(n)$ is chosen from a Boltzmann distribution, and the dependence of the vibrational energy ($E_v$) on the vibrational quantum numbers of SO$_2$ has been reported elsewhere [21]. The selected vibrational states are obtained from the requirement that $C(E_v) \geq \xi$. To complete the specification of the initial internal energy, the standard thermal distribution is assumed for the rotational energy [19] by considering the reactant triatomic as a symmetric top. With the maximum impact parameter being optimized as described above, the thermalized rate constant assumes now the form

$$k(T) = g_e(T) \left( \frac{8k_BT}{\pi\mu} \right)^{1/2} \pi b_{max}^2 \frac{N_r}{N_T}$$

where all symbols have the usual meaning (see above), and the associated uncertainty is given by the corresponding analog of the expression used for the cross section. Batches of $3 \times 10^5$ trajectories have then been run at temperatures of $T = 1400, 1800,$ and $2200$ K to cover the range of experimental values reported in literature for the title reaction. To save computer time, trajectories with total energies below the classical threshold ($E_T \leq 30.11$ kcal mol$^{-1}$) have not been integrated, although the original distributions have been preserved by counting such non-integrated trajectories as non-reactive.

4 Results and discussion

Tables 1 and 2 collect the results of the vibrationally-specific calculations carried out in the present work, both using the QCT and VEQMT$_C$ methods. Average lifetimes of both complexes are also reported. As shown, the HSO$_2$ lifetimes are in all cases found to be much smaller than the HOSO ones: $\langle \tau_{\text{HOSO}} \rangle \gg \langle \tau_{\text{HSO}_2} \rangle$. Actually, most reactive trajectories do not form HSO$_2$ while, for the ones that form, the lifetime of the HOSO complex has a value larger than the average lifetime of all formed complexes. The title reaction is therefore more likely to occur by direct attack of the hydrogen atom to one of the terminal oxygen atoms in SO$_2$: formation of an HSO$_2$ intermediate may take place but it rapidly decomposes back to reactants or forms HOSO. Notice that the optimized maximum impact parameters have values around 2 Å, the value used by Morris et al. [9] in
their reduced-dimensionality QCT calculations. In fact, a similar value has been utilized in our thermalized calculations.

The calculated cross sections for specifically prepared reactants can be modeled by the following barrier-type excitation function [26]:

$$\sigma_r = C(E_{tr} - E_{tr}^{th})^n \exp[-m(E_{tr} - E_{tr}^{th})]$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where \(C\), \(n\), and \(m\) are least-squares parameters and \(E_{tr}^{th}\) is the translational energy threshold. As it has been pointed out elsewhere [24], the value of \(E_{tr}^{th}\) dictates the slope of the calculated rate constant and is hard to determine at the QCT level due to ZPE leakage. Following Ref. 24, for \(H + SO_2(v = 0, T_{rot} = 300 \text{ K})\) we have then fixed its value at the energy difference between products and reactants once the zero-point energies are accounted for, yielding \(E_{tr}^{th} = 30.11 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}\). As expected, such a value may decrease when internal energy is added to reactants; thus, for \(H + SO_2(v = 1, T_{rot} = 1800 \text{ K})\), the actual threshold energy has been obtained from a fit to the calculated cross sections by using the above mentioned estimate as starting guess. Figure 2 shows the fitted excitation functions so obtained. Also indicated in the plot is the classical energy threshold which, as expected, decreases slightly with increasing ro-vibrational excitation of the reactants. Cross sections for different vibrational excitations of \(SO_2\) obtained by Morris et al. [9], when they use an entrance channel barrier of 13.6 kcal mol\(^{-1}\), are found to have the same order of magnitude of those here reported. Figure 3 shows the OH product vibrational and rotational distributions for the title reaction under the initial conditions considered in the present work. The general pattern is the formation of vibrationally cold OH radicals, as could be expected from nearly thermalized (at relatively low temperatures) vibrational-rotational distributions. This is observed even for the two state-specific cases that have been here considered. This is better illustrated by comparing the actual calculated distributions to the fitted Boltzmann distributions that are shown by the solid lines in Figure 3. From such fits, we obtain as rotational temperatures \(T_{rot} = 4332, 7444, \text{ and } 888 \text{ K}\), respectively for \(H + SO_2(v = 0, T_{rot} = 300 \text{ K})\), \(H + SO_2(v = 1, T_{rot} = 1800 \text{ K})\), and thermalized \(H + SO_2\). However, it is also seen that even a democratic vibrational
Table 1. Summary of trajectories calculations for the H + SO$_2$(v = 0, $T_{\text{rot}} = 300$ K) reaction.$^a$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E_{\text{tr}}$</th>
<th>$b_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>QCT</th>
<th>VEQMT$_C$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$N_T$</td>
<td>$N_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Energies are in kcal mol$^{-1}$, distances in Å, and times in units of $10^{-14}$ s.
Table 2. Summary of trajectories calculations for the H + SO$_2$(v = 1, $T_{\text{rot}}$ = 1800 K) reaction.$^{a)}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E_{\text{tr}}$</th>
<th>$b_{\text{max}}$</th>
<th>QCT</th>
<th>VEQMT$_C$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$N_T$</td>
<td>$N_c$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{a)}$Energies are in kcal mol$^{-1}$, distances in Å, and times in units of $10^{-14}$ s.
excitation of the reactants with one quantum of vibrational excitation into each mode leads to significant deposition of vibrational energy into the newly formed OH bond. The above results may be rationalized from the fact that the reaction is endothermic and has a deep potential well due to the HO SO intermediate which is sampled by most reactive trajectories. Thus, some energy randomization is expected to occur before the products are formed. In fact, the fractions of energy released in the products is shown to vary little with the three sets of chosen initial conditions, although as shown by the fitted curves the distribution is somewhat closer to a Boltzmann one in the case of initially thermalized reactants. The above results contrast with those for the reaction H + O$_3$ → OH + O$_2$ which is highly exothermic and has no deep potential well along the minimum energy path [10–15]. In this case, the formed OH is characterized by an inverted vibrational distribution, which some experiments suggest to peak at quantum numbers as high as $v_{OH} = 9$. Of course, the results observed for the title reaction may change drastically if further vibrational excitation is put into one of the SO
bonds of SO$_2$. Such a study is currently in progress and will be hopefully reported elsewhere. By substituting Eq. (6) into Eq. (2) and integrating, one gets

\[
k(T; v, T_{\text{rot}}) = g_e(T) C \left( \frac{8k_B T}{\pi \mu} \right)^{1/2} \frac{(k_B T)^n \exp(-E_{\text{th}}^*/k_B T)}{(1 + mk_B T)^{n+2}} \times \\
\times \left[ \Gamma(n + 2) + \Gamma(n + 1) \frac{(1 + mk_B T)E_{\text{th}}^*}{k_B T} \right]
\]

where $\Gamma$ is the Gamma function. Figure 4 shows the calculated rate constants for the title reaction. Indicated by the shaded areas are the intervals where the most likely values of the calculated specific rate constants should lie: following previous work [18, 24], the upper and lower limits are defined by QCT (solid line) and VEQMT$_C$ (dashed line) results. Note that the dark-filled area stands for H + SO$_2$($v=0, T_{\text{rot}}=300$ K), while the light-filled one refers to H + SO$_2$($v=1, T_{\text{rot}}=1800$ K). In turn, the hashed area indicates the region where the optimum thermalized QCT results are likely to fall, with the open rhombuses indicating the actually calculated QCT values (and corresponding error bars) and the solid line a linear fit to such points. Note further that, for the thermalized calculations, there was a number of trajectories that have not been integrated, and hence the VEQMT$_C$ rate constant could not be rigorously calculated. To obtain an estimate of it, we have assumed that the ratio of QCT and VEQMT$_C$ results

\[
\frac{k_{\text{QCT}}(T; v, T_{\text{rot}})}{k_{\text{VEQMT}}(T; v, T_{\text{rot}})} \approx \frac{Q_{\text{QCT}}(T; v, T_{\text{rot}})}{Q_{\text{VEQMT}}(T; v, T_{\text{rot}})}
\]

where $Q$ is the partition function.
Figure 4. Rate constant as a function of temperature for the title reaction. The light shaded area denotes the specific rate coefficient for \( H + SO_2(v = 0, T_{\text{rot}} = 300 \text{ K}) \) reactants, while the dark shaded one is for \( H + SO_2(v = 1, T_{\text{rot}} = 1800 \text{ K}) \). The hashed area refers to the thermalized results, with the open rhombuses indicating the actually calculated values. The solid lines represent the QCT calculations, and the dashed line the VEQMT\(_C\) ones. The solid dots indicate the experimental results of Murakami et al. [3], while the dotted line represents their recommended values. Shown by the dash-dot line is the low pressure limit of the rate constant given by Blitz et al. [6].
Table 3. Rate constants for the title reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>$k(T) \times 10^{14}/\text{cm}^3\text{s}^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCT/VEQMT$_C$, SO$<em>2$($v=0, T</em>{\text{rot}}=300 \text{ K}$)$^a)$</td>
<td>0.2 – 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCT/VEQMT$_C$, SO$<em>2$($v=1, T</em>{\text{rot}}=1800 \text{ K}$)$^a)$</td>
<td>0.4 – 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCT/VEQMT$_C$, thermalized$^a)$</td>
<td>2.3 – 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master equation [6]</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exp. [3]</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a)$This work.

should approximately mimic those obtained with SO$_2$($v=1, T_{\text{rot}}=1800 \text{ K}$). Finally, the circles indicate the results of Murakami et al. [3], while the dotted line is their reported fit to such points. In turn, the low pressure limit of the rate constant for the title reaction reported by Blitz et al. [6] is shown by the dash-dot line. As Figure 4 and Table 3 show, the specific rate constant calculations reported in this work underestimate reactivity when comparing with the existing experimental values. This suggests that the inclusion of internal energy into the reactants may play a significant role. This by no means implies that the near-Boltzmann distributions observed for both OH and SO will drastically change. A similar finding has been reported in the quasi-classical trajectory calculations by Morris et al. [9], although a more detailed study will be required to pinpoint the differences. Our calculations have also indicated that thermalization is essential to get a rate constant in good agreement with experiment: the thermalized rate coefficient shows significant differences with respect to the vibrationally-specific calculations carried out in the present work. Finally, we observe by extrapolating to the low temperature regimes that the rate coefficients become negligibly small for temperatures below 500 K, in qualitative agreement with previous findings [8, 27]. In summary, the present calculations show good agreement with those reported in the literature, as indeed have shown the ones [18] for the reaction OH + SO $\rightarrow$ H + SO$_2$. Thus, both sets of results corroborate the reliability of the HSO$_2$ DMBE potential energy surface to describe the collision processes occurring in it.
5 Conclusion

We have reported a theoretical study of the $\text{H} + \text{SO}_2$ reaction. While both HSO$_2$ and HOSO complexes were predicted to be formed during the reaction process, the HOSO species is predicted to be by far the most likely intermediate to be formed. We have also shown from state-specific rate constant calculations that the addition of internal energy to the reactants may considerably enhance reactivity. Thermalized calculations of the rate constant have also been carried out, and shown to yield values in good agreement with the available experimental estimates.
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Abstract

We report a quasi-classical trajectory study of the S + HO₂ reaction using a previously reported global potential energy surface for the ground electronic state of HSO₂. Zero-point energy leakage is approximately accounted for by using the vibrational energy quantum mechanical threshold method. Calculations are carried out both for specific ro-vibrational states of the reactants and thermalized ones, with rate constants being reported as a function of temperature. The results suggest that the title reaction is capture-type, with OH and SO showing as the most favorable products. The internal energy distribution of such products and the reaction mechanism are also investigated.
1 Introduction

Sulfur is an important element when studying atmospheric chemistry [1]. In turn, the mercapto radical (HS) has been observed in interstellar space [2], while sulfur compounds are also known to play an important role in combustion chemistry [3]. However, due to the large number of electrons involved, high level theoretical studies involving sulfur atoms are somewhat limited due to being computationally too expensive. In previous works of this series [4, 5], we have reported full dynamics studies involving the title sulfur-containing species by using a global double many-body expansion (DMBE [6, 7]) potential energy surface reported elsewhere [8]. All those studies have employed the quasi-classical trajectory (QCT) method, a technique that will be also adopted in the current study. In fact, the good agreement previously achieved when comparing our predictions with available experimental results suggests that both the HSO$_2$ DMBE potential energy surface and the dynamics approach should be reliable for our purposes in this work.

Although the title reaction should play a role whenever sulfur atoms (the ground electronic state of atomic sulfur is implied heretofore) are present in the atmosphere, no dynamics study of it has yet been reported in the open literature. Our aim in the present work is to extend the series of previous studies to the reaction

$$\text{S} + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{products}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

by using the QCT and the above mentioned DMBE potential energy surface. Thus, we will ignore both quantum effects (except for those related with the reactant triatomic molecular whose initial state is mimicked as closely as possible) and non-adiabaticity. Given the large masses of the reactant species and the fact that the ground ($^3P$) and first-excited ($^1D$) electronic states are separated by more than 25 kcal mol$^{-1}$ [9], we can hardly judge such effects to have any crucial role for the rate constant calculations carried out in the present work. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the potential energy surface, while the utilized computational methods are described in section 3. The results will be presented and discussed in section 4, and the major conclusions gathered in section 5.
Figure 1. Minimum energy path for the reaction $S + HO_2 \rightarrow OH + SO$ according to the potential energy surface used in this work.

2 Potential energy surface

All calculations here performed have employed our six-dimensional DMBE potential energy surface published elsewhere [8] for the electronic ground state of HSO$_2$. It employs previously reported forms of the same type for the diatomic and triatomic fragments (Ref. 8, and references therein), and four-body energy terms that were parametrized to mimic CASPT2/FVCAS/AVXZ ($X = D, T$) calculations for the tetratomic system. In this section, we illustrate its major features that are of interest for the title reaction.

Figure 1 displays the minimum energy path (MEP) for the formation of OH+SO from S+HO$_2$, while Figure 2 represents the MEP for HOS formation. Other products are allowed for such reactants but the illustrated here are the most favored ones. According to energetics of the surface (see Table 1 and Figure 11 of the Ref. 8), the H + SO$_2$ channel lies 84.4 kcal mol$^{-1}$ bellow the reactants$^1$.

$^1$Energies in this paragraph do not include the zero-point energy (ZPE).
Figures 1 and 2 also show a common four-body intermediate structure, HOO ··· S. The relative large well depth of this adduct (12.2 kcal mol$^{-1}$) is directly linked to the two attractive SO interactions (5.1 and 7.1 kcal mol$^{-1}$), since the repulsive three-body contributions involving the sulfur atom, as well as four-body ones, are irrelevant for such an arrangement. Although such a species could in principle be isolated, coming from S + HO$_2$ yields an extra energy of 5.6 kcal mol$^{-1}$ that must be removed from the moiety such as to allow stabilization and avoid decaying into other species. To our knowledge, no evidence has yet been reported about its existence.

### 3 Computational procedures

To run the trajectories we have utilized an adapted version of the VENUS [10] code which accommodates the HSO$_2$ DMBE potential energy surface [8]. The step size used for the numerical integrations was 2.5 × 10$^{-16}$ s, warranting a
conservation of the total energy to better than 2 parts in $10^4$. Two types of calculations have been carried out. First, we have run trajectories for fixed ro-vibrational combinations of the reactants (HO$_2$) such as to provide a detailed understanding of the reaction mechanism. Then, thermalized calculations have been performed to directly assert the rate constant.

The calculations for specific ro-vibrational states have been carried out for translational energies over the range $0.2 \leq E_{tr}/\text{kcal mol}^{-1} \leq 10.0$, with the hydroperoxyl radical kept in its ground vibrational state \[v_1 = 0, v_2 = 0, v_3 = 0,\] and the rotational energy for each principal axis fixed at $RT/2$ with $T=300 \text{ K}$.

Following the usual practice, batches of 100 trajectories per collisional energy have been run to determine the maximum impact parameter ($b_{\text{max}}$) that leads to reaction. For a given translational energy, reactive cross section were then calculated from

$$\sigma_r = \pi b_{\text{max}}^2 P_r$$

and the associated 68% uncertainties from

$$\Delta \sigma_r = \sigma_r \left[ \frac{(N_T - N_r)}{N_T N_r} \right]^{1/2},$$

where $N_r$ is the number of reactive trajectories in a total of $N_T$, $P_r = N_r/N_T$ is the reactive probability, and $b_{\text{max}}$ the maximum impact parameter.

From the reactive cross section assuming a Maxwell-Boltzmann’s distribution over the translational energy ($E_{tr}$), the specific thermal rate coefficient is obtained as

$$k(T) = g_e(T) \left( \frac{2}{k_B T} \right)^{3/2} \left( \frac{1}{\pi \mu} \right)^{1/2} \int_0^{\infty} E_{tr} \sigma(E_{tr}) \exp \left( -\frac{E_{tr}}{k_B T} \right) dE_{tr} \quad (2)$$

where $T$ is the temperature, $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant, $\mu$ the reactants reduced mass, and

$$g_e(T) = 1 \div \left[ 5 + 3 \exp(-570/T) + \exp(-825/T) \right] \quad (3)$$

accounts in the usual way \[12, 13\] for the electronic degeneracies of the reactants [S($^3P$) + HO$_2$(2$^2A''$)] and the fact that DMBE potential energy surface refers to a doublet. The atomic levels of sulfur have been taken from the NIST database \[14\].

We now address the problem of ZPE leakage, which is well known in QCT theory. Both 'active' and 'non-active' methods have been suggested (Ref. 15, and references therein) to account for it in an approximate manner. In the non-active methods such as the one \[16\] here utilized, trajectories leading to aphysical products (with vibrational/internal energies below a given threshold) are thrown out...
and eventually replaced [17] by running novel trajectories. The perturbed statistics may then be corrected \textit{a posteriori} [18]. Thus, no trajectory calculations, besides those run in the traditional QCT method are required. Specifically, in VEQMT$_C$ [16] we consider as physical only the outcomes where the total vibrational energy is larger than the sum of their ZPEs [16], an approach that has also been employed in previous work [4]. Clearly, VEQMT$_C$ [16] and other similar methods (including active ones [15], where a constraint is introduced to prevent the trajectories from entering the region of phase space which allows vibrational modes to have less than its ZPE) will not be free from ambiguity, an issue that will not be addressed any further in the present work. Suffice it to say that accounting for ZPE tends to enhance reactivity for the title reaction (see later).

The second series of calculations refers to thermalized ones. The collisional energy is then selected from a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution by using the cumulative function:

$$G(E_{tr}) = \left( \frac{1}{k_B T} \right)^2 \int_0^{E_{tr}} E_{tr}' \exp\left( -\frac{E_{tr}'}{k_B T} \right) dE_{tr}'$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $E_{tr}$ is chosen randomly for each trajectory by solving the equation $G(E_{tr}) - \xi = 0$, where $\xi (0 \leq \xi \leq 1)$ is a random number. In turn, as in Ref. 5, the vibrational quantum numbers $v = v_1, v_2, v_3$ of the HO$_2$ were sampled by using the cumulative distribution function

$$C(E_v) = \sum_{n=0}^{v} P(n)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where $P(n)$ has been chosen to be the Boltzmann distribution. With the dependence of the vibrational energy $(E_v)$ on the quantum number of HO$_2$ being reported elsewhere [19], the specification of the initial internal energy is completed by specifying a standard thermal distribution for the rotational energy [10] (for this, we considered the reactants triatom as a symmetric top). After optimizing the maximum impact parameter as described above, the thermalized rate constant is calculated from

$$k(T) = g_e(T) \left( \frac{8k_B T}{\pi \mu} \right)^{1/2} \frac{\pi b_{max}^2 N_r}{N_T}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where all symbols have the meaning assigned in preceding paragraphs. Similarly, the associated uncertainty has been calculated using an analogue of the
expression used above for the cross section. For production, batches of 5000 trajectories were judged sufficient for the thermalized calculations (at $T = 300, 1000$ and $1500$ K), while batches of 2000 trajectories were run at each translational energy for specific calculations.

The procedure used to assign the reaction products is the same as in previous studies [20]. Although there are 14 possible channels in an atom+triatom collisional process (the various isomers of a given species are assumed indistinguishable), we note that according to the energetics of the potential energy surface [8] there is no direct connection between the reactants and the HSO $+$ O channel. This issue has been checked in detail by running two batches of 100 trajectories for specific calculations at translational energies of 0.2 and 10.0 kcal mol$^{-1}$. In both cases, formation of HSO has not been observed, with HOS being formed instead. Note that HOS refers to a structure with a central oxygen atom bonded to sulfur and hydrogen. This isomer differs therefore from HSO in that the central atom in the latter is sulfur: such a structure corresponds to the global minimum [21], with an energy difference of 0.9 kcal mol$^{-1}$ separating those two species. Accordingly, we have modified the assignment of channels 5 and 6 used in our previous work [4] such as to identify the corresponding HOS $+$ O ones.

### 4 Results and discussion

Table 1 collects the results of the specific calculations, both of pure QCT and VEQMT$_C$ types. All symbols have the meaning assigned above, with $N_T$ indicating the total number of trajectories run in each method, and $N_r = \sum_x N_x^r$ the total number of reactive ones. Headings of other columns specify the number of reactive trajectories for the corresponding $x$ products. As seen, the OH and SO products are by far the most formed ones, followed by HOS and O in a 5:1 ratio. For completeness, we show also SO$_2$ formation, even if being an almost negligible process.

The results for thermalized calculations are similarly presented in Table 2. There, the total number of trajectories for QCT is reported to recall that some of the
Table 1. Results of specific trajectories calculations for \( a \) \( S + HO_2 \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( E_{tr} / \text{kcal mol}^{-1} )</th>
<th>( b_{\text{max}} / \text{Å} )</th>
<th>( \sum_x N_t^x )</th>
<th>( x = H + SO_2 )</th>
<th>( OH + SO )</th>
<th>( O + HOS )</th>
<th>( N_T )</th>
<th>( \sum_x N_t^x )</th>
<th>( x = H + SO_2 )</th>
<th>( OH + SO )</th>
<th>( O + HOS )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( a \) The total number of trajectories in QCT is \( N_T = 2000 \) in for all translational energies.*
5000 trajectories run did not converge, \textit{i.e.}, have not led to any of the possible products after \(4 \times 10^5\) iterations. This has also occurred in previous work \cite{4}, when some of the trajectories were captured into the deep well associated to the HOSO species and persisted there until a pre-specified maximum number of iterations were reached.

When the VEQMT\(_C\) criterion is utilized, a considerable number of non-reactive trajectories is disregarded, leading to an increase of the reactive probability with respect to QCT. This may be explained as due to the relatively high value of the ZPE in HO\(_2\). In fact, during the collisional process, the vibrational energy of the HO\(_2\) is partially transferred to translation of the system and therefore many of the non-reactive HO\(_2\) molecules will be left behind with a vibrational energy below its starting ZPE value.

The ro-vibrational distributions of the OH and SO products are shown in Figure 3. The left and central panels refer to the results of specific calculations for translational energies of \(E_\text{tr} = 0.2\) and \(E_\text{tr} = 10.0\) kcal mol\(^{-1}\). In turn, the right-hand-side panels show the results obtained for the thermalized calculations at \(T = 300\) K. Note that the bottom plots refer to rotational distributions, while the upper ones are for the vibrational populations. The notable feature from this Figure is, perhaps, the fact that a high rotational energy content is deposited in the newly formed SO. This has been rationalized from a detailed study of the atomic rearrangements along reactive trajectories. To produce OH and SO, we first observe that the sulfur atom attacks the terminal oxygen atom in HO\(_2\). Once the sulfur atoms gets attached to the oxygen one, they start to describe a rotation-like motion around the axis defined by the OH bond. Such a process corresponds to falling into the minimum of the energy path illustrated in Figure 1. As the SO bond gets shorter and the two oxygen atoms get separated, the sulfur atom maintains this revolving motion with the SO pair separating away with a relatively high content of rotational excitation. Meanwhile, the OH bond remains almost as a spectator, keeping its ro-vibrational distribution as originally was in HO\(_2\). Similar results have been observed for the reaction O + HO\(_2\) when O\(_2\) is formed \cite{22} with a high rotational temperature.
Table 2. Results of thermalized calculations for the title reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T/ K$</th>
<th>$b_{\text{max}}/ \AA$</th>
<th>$N_T$</th>
<th>$\sum_{x} N_{r}^x$</th>
<th>$x = H + SO_2$</th>
<th>$OH + SO$</th>
<th>$O + HOS$</th>
<th>$N_T$</th>
<th>$\sum_{x} N_{r}^x$</th>
<th>$x = H + SO_2$</th>
<th>$OH + SO$</th>
<th>$O + HOS$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2536</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4999</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3369</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4996</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4001</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the thermalized calculations at $T = 1500$ K, part of the vibrational energy is initially deposited into the OH vibrational mode, with this bond showing no longer a spectator behavior. As a result, the HS + O\(_2\) channel opens: 6 trajectories in a total of 4996. Such a process occurs via an isomerization of HOO into H ··· OO (see Table 5 of Ref. 8) and continues with the capture of the quasi-free hydrogen atom by the sulfur one. As expected from this analysis, the H + S + O\(_2\) products are also obtained under such conditions, with almost three times more occurrences (17 trajectories) than the diatom-diatom process referred to above. Of course, both processes are statistically negligible when compared with formation of OH + SO (493 trajectories).

Figure 4 shows the predicted excitation functions for the specific calculations. Total reactive and OH + SO formation cross sections are displayed. In turn, the insert shows the corresponding reactive cross section for H + SO\(_2\) formation. As already noted in previous paragraphs, the QCT results are smaller than the VEQMT\(_C\) ones, as the latter lead to a higher reactivity. According to the above results and the shape of the potential energy surface (a representative view is the minimum energy paths shown in Figures 1 and 2, the title reaction is largely controlled by long-range interactions, mainly associated to the permanent electric...
quadrupole of sulfur and the multipoles of HO$_2$. Thus, the total reactive cross section and corresponding results for specific channel may be approximated by means of the capture cross section [23]

$$\sigma(E_{tr}) = n\pi(n-2)^{(2-n)/n} \left( \frac{C_n}{2E_{tr}} \right)^{2/n}$$

(7)

where $C_n$ and $n$ are coefficients to be fitted. The calculated values are shown in Figure 4, with the lines indicating the best fits obtained using Eq. (7). For QCT, $n = 3.432$ and $C_n = 6.083$, while $n = 2.805$ and $C_n = 20.977$ for the VEQMT$_C$ results. Note that the dominant long-range energies arise from the permanent electric quadrupole moment of the S atom and the electric permanent dipole and quadrupole moments of HO$_2$. Thus, one would formally expect a $V \sim R^{-n}$ dependence. However, due to dispersion (from two- and three-body terms) as well as other attractive forces of short-range type, such a dependence turns out to be somewhat stronger as indicated above.

By substituting Eq. (7) in Eq. (2) and performing the integration, one gets
the following analytical expression for the specific rate constant as a function of temperature:

\[ k(T) = 2n\pi g_e(T)(n - 2)\frac{2-n}{n} \left( \frac{2}{\pi\mu} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{C_n}{2} \right)^{\frac{2}{n}} \Gamma \left( \frac{2n - 2}{n} \right) \left( k_B T \right)^{(n-4)/2n} \]  

(8)

where \( \Gamma(\ldots) \) is the gamma function. Since OH + SO have already been identified to be the main products, only the rate constants accounting for its formation will be presented. In fact, other products have rate constants a few orders of magnitude smaller (\( k^{\text{others}} \ll k^{\text{OH+SO}} \)), with the total rate coefficient differing therefore very little from the one for OH + SO formation. Figure 5 shows the specific QCT and VEQMT\(_C\) rate constants calculated in the present work. As expected from the corresponding cross sections in Figure 4, the VEQMT\(_C\) curves lie above the QCT ones. The interval defined by the former curves is light shadowed, with the expected value of \( k(T) \) resulting from them being expected to lie somewhere between the upper and lower limits so defined. The dark shadowed region identifies the corresponding results for the thermalized calculations, according to Eq. (6) and Table 2.

Circles and squares denote the actually calculated values, while solid line stands for the QCT results as fitted to the Arrhenius-type form \( k(T) = AT^n \exp(-mT) \), and the dashed line to the corresponding fit for the VEQMT\(_C\) results. Note that the temperature dependence is similar for both calculations. However, the thermalized rate constants are in average five times larger than the specific ones, with the discrepancy becoming more significant as the temperature rises. As noted above, this is due to the inclusion of vibrational excitation on the thermalized reactants, thus leading to an increase in reactivity. Because the rotational and vibrational energy of the reactants is properly sampled according to the temperature in the thermalized calculations, our recommended values lie inside the darker region.

Finally, we note that the rate constant obtained in this work for the reaction \( \text{S} + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{O}_2 \) is \( k(T) = 9.4 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3\text{s}^{-1} \) at \( T = 300 \text{ K} \), a value quite similar to the one reported [22] for the reaction \( \text{O} + \text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{SO} \), namely \( k(T) = 7.8 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3\text{s}^{-1} \) at the same temperature. More specifically, our recommended value expressed in Arrhenius form lies between \( k(T) = 41.47T^{0.336}e^{(245.2/T)} \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3\text{s}^{-1} \) and \( k(T) = 1045.85T^{-0.069}e^{(172.1/T)} \times 10^{-13} \text{ cm}^3\text{s}^{-1} \), with \( T \) in kelvin.
Figure 5. Rate constants for the S + HO$_2$ → OH + SO reaction. The light shaded region corresponds to specific ro-vibrational states of the reactants while dark shaded area represents the thermalized results. The dashed lines refer to the pure QCT results while the solid ones refer to the VEQMT$_C$ ones. For the thermalized results, the lines indicate Arrhenius-like functions fitted to rate coefficients obtained by QCT and VEQMT$_C$, whose actually calculated values are indicated by open circles and solid dots, respectively.
The above agreement should not be surprising as O + HO\textsubscript{2} and S + HO\textsubscript{2} have similar bonding characteristics, with a minimum energy path controlled by long range forces. Indeed, both reaction rate coefficients show a similar dependence on temperature.

5 Conclusions

The S + HO\textsubscript{2} reaction has been studied using two variants of the QCT method. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study of the dynamics and kinetics of such a reaction. The process has been shown to be dominated by long range forces, thus manifesting a capture-type behavior. OH + SO has been predicted to be the most formed products channel, although SO\textsubscript{2} and HOS were also formed but with significantly smaller occurrences. Formation of HSO has not been observed. When ZPE leakage is accounted for by the VEQ\textsubscript{MT}\textsubscript{C} method, reactivity is favored leading to reactive rate constants larger than in the pure QCT calculations. Calculations using both reactants prepared in specific ro-vibrational states and thermalized ones have been carried out, with larger values of the rate constant predicted for the latter. This is attributed to the fact that vibrationally excited reactants are allowed to occur when preparing the reactants initial states. In both calculations, the formed SO is predicted to be vibrationally hot, similarly to what has been observed [22] for the reaction O + HO\textsubscript{2} → OH + O\textsubscript{2}. The calculated rate coefficient is predicted to assume a nearly constant value of \( k(T) = 9.4 \times 10^{-11} \text{ cm}^3\text{s}^{-1} \) for temperatures in the range of \( T = 200 - 1600 \text{ K} \).
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Final remarks

In this thesis a theoretical study on the HSO$_2$ molecular system was carried out. The first global single-valued potential energy surface for the ground electronic state of this radical was built and characterized in detail. Double many-body expansion (DMBE) has been used for this achievement. The properties obtained for minimum and transition state configurations agree with those reported in literature. Apart from this, this surface provides new insights in the topology of the interaction potential for the title four-body system.

Quasiclassical dynamical studies employing the six dimensional function constructed here, were also carried out. Three bi-molecular collisions, with relevance in atmospheric and combustion chemistry, have been examined in detail, yielding information on reaction mechanisms, cross sections, rate coefficients and product properties. There is a general agreement between the rate constants reported here and the available experimental data. Predictions have also been made for a reaction not studied before. The results obtained in this thesis can be used in models of the atmospheric sulfur cycle.

The new potential energy surface gives a good description of the HSO$_2$ molecular system. It can be further used to study other reactive processes and the possible effects of the ro-vibrational energies of the reactants. Finally it may enable the construction of larger polyatomic DMBE potential energy surfaces in which HSO$_2$ is contained, most importantly that of HSO$_3$ which would be used in modeling the reaction HS + O$_3$ with large interest in atmospheric chemistry.
Mathematical appendices
A Changing distances to bond coordinates

The potential energy surface of the title system is a function of the six distances between the four atoms $\{R_i\}$, $i = 1, 6$. Numbering the atoms 1-4, the distances are labeled in the usual form: $R_1$ is the distance 1-2, $R_2$ the distance 1-3, $R_3$ 1-4, $R_4$ 2-3, $R_5$ 2-4 and $R_6$ 3-4. However, in the PES reported in this thesis, we include four body energy terms which depends on the valence bond coordinates $\{r_j, \alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$. Thus a transformation from distances to bond coordinates is needed. This transformation must not contain singularities.

Firstly Cartesian coordinates $\{X_{ij}\}$ of the four atoms were calculated as a function of the $\{R_i\}$, in $X_{ij}$ the $i$-index labels the atom, while $j = 1, 2, 3$ represents the Cartesian component. Then, bond coordinates $\{r_j, \alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ are represented by means of the $X_{ij}$ according to the given bonding connections. Cartesian coordinates were calculated as follows: the first atom (1) is placed at the origin, the second (2) is placed along the $x$ axis, the third (3) is placed in the $xy$ plane, the position of the remaining one will be uniquely determined by the distances to the previous three. Figure 1 illustrates this process; then, Cartesian coordinates are given by:

\[
X_{11} = 0, \ X_{12} = 0, \ X_{13} = 0 \quad (A\ 1)
\]

\[
X_{21} = R_1, \ X_{22} = 0, \ X_{23} = 0 \quad (A\ 2)
\]

\[
X_{31} = R_2 \cos \rho, \ X_{32} = R_2 \sin \rho, \ X_{33} = 0 \quad (A\ 3)
\]

\[
X_{41} = \frac{R_3^2 - R_5^2 + R_4^2}{2R_1} \quad (A\ 4)
\]

\[
X_{42} = \frac{R_3^2 + R_2^2 - R_6^2 - 2X_{41}X_{31}}{2X_{32}} \quad (A\ 5)
\]

\[
X_{43} = \sqrt{R_3^2 - X_{41} - X_{42}} \quad (A\ 6)
\]

being

\[
\cos \rho = \frac{R_1^2 + R_2^2 - R_4^2}{2R_1R_2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sin \rho = \sqrt{1 - \cos^2 \rho} \quad (A\ 7)
\]

We call bonding connectivity to the way atoms are connected one to each other, hence bonding coordinates for a given connectivity $I_1-I_2-I_3-I_4$ ($I_k = 1, 4 \ I_i \neq I_j$ for
Figure 1. A simple way to calculate Cartesian coordinates as a function of distances

\( j \neq i \) are \( r_1 = \text{distance } I_1-I_2 \), \( r_2 = \text{distance } I_2-I_3 \), \( r_3 = \text{distance } I_3-I_4 \), \( \alpha = \text{ang } I_1I_2I_3 \), \( \beta = \text{ang } I_2I_3I_4 \) and \( \gamma = \text{dihedral angle between planes } I_1I_2I_3 \) and \( I_2I_3I_4 \). It may be illustrated by means of the Z-matrix:

\[
\text{Zmat} = \{ I_1; \\
I_2, I_1, r_1; \\
I_3, I_2, r_2, I_1, \alpha; \\
I_4, I_3, r_3, I_2, \beta, I_1, \gamma \}
\]

We consider a maximum of two connections per atom, which is the case we are interested in. The resulting valence bond coordinates will depend on such connectivity order. Let us represent the position vector of the \( i^{th} \) atom with \( \mathbf{\hat{R}}_i \), \( \mathbf{\hat{R}}_i = (X_{i1}, X_{i2}, X_{i3}) \); then, the valence bond coordinates can be calculated as follow:

\[
r_1 = \sqrt{(\mathbf{\hat{R}}_{I_1} - \mathbf{\hat{R}}_{I_2}) \cdot (\mathbf{\hat{R}}_{I_1} - \mathbf{\hat{R}}_{I_2})} \quad (A8)
\]

\[
r_2 = \sqrt{(\mathbf{\hat{R}}_{I_2} - \mathbf{\hat{R}}_{I_3}) \cdot (\mathbf{\hat{R}}_{I_2} - \mathbf{\hat{R}}_{I_3})} \quad (A9)
\]
\[ r_2 = \sqrt{(\mathbf{R}_{I_3} - \mathbf{R}_{I_4}) \cdot (\mathbf{R}_{I_3} - \mathbf{R}_{I_4})} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A 10)

and the angles:

\[ \cos \alpha = \frac{(\mathbf{R}_{I_1} - \mathbf{R}_{I_2}) \cdot (\mathbf{R}_{I_3} - \mathbf{R}_{I_2})}{r_1 r_2} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A 11)

\[ \cos \beta = \frac{(\mathbf{R}'_{I_2} - \mathbf{R}'_{I_3}) \cdot (\mathbf{R}'_{I_4} - \mathbf{R}'_{I_3})}{r_2 r_3} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A 12)

for the dihedral angle we first define two auxiliary vectors:

\[ \mathbf{a}_1 \equiv (\mathbf{R}_{I_1} - \mathbf{R}_{I_2}) \times (\mathbf{R}_{I_3} - \mathbf{R}_{I_2}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (A 13)

and

\[ \mathbf{a}_2 \equiv (\mathbf{R}_{I_2} - \mathbf{R}_{I_3}) \times (\mathbf{R}_{I_4} - \mathbf{R}_{I_3}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (A 14)

then

\[ \cos \gamma = \frac{\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \mathbf{a}_2}{|a_1||a_2|} \]  \hspace{1cm} (A 15)

The above procedure is implemented in the HSO$_2$ potential energy surface code with some corrections to avoid numerical indeterminations.
B  Changing bond coordinates to distances

*Ab initio* calculations carried in this thesis uses Z-matrix geometry representation, hence, bond coordinates were used. However in fitting process we need interatomic distances, thus a transformation from bond coordinates \{r_j, \alpha, \beta, \gamma\} to distances \{R_i\} is needed. As in the previous appendix cartesian coordinates \{X_{ij}\} are used as intermediary set.

With a given bonding connectivity order \(I_1I_2I_3I_4\), the procedure is as follow: The atom \(I_2\) is placed in the origin, the atom \(I_3\) along the \(x\) axis, the \(I_4\) in the \(xy\) plane, while the \(I_1\) atom has a well defined cartesian coordinates as a function of the remaining three. Thus cartesian coordinates can be written:

\[
\begin{align*}
X_{I_11} &= r_1 \cos \alpha \\
X_{I_12} &= r_1 \sin \alpha \cos \gamma \\
X_{I_13} &= -r_1 \sin \alpha \sin \gamma \\
X_{I_21} &= X_{I_22} = X_{I_23} = 0 \\
X_{I_31} &= r_2 \\
X_{I_32} &= X_{I_33} = X_{I_43} = 0 \\
X_{I_41} &= r_2 - r_3 \cos \beta \\
X_{I_42} &= r_3 \sin \beta
\end{align*}
\]

Once cartesian coordinates are obtained distances can be calculated according to the definition given in the previous appendix for \{R_i\}.
C Gamma Function

The **Gamma function** is defined\(^2\) by the integral

\[
\Gamma(z) \equiv \int_{0}^{\infty} t^{z-1} e^{-t} dt \quad (C\ 1)
\]

When the argument \(z\) is an integer, the Gamma function can be written in the form of a factorial function:

\[
\Gamma(n + 1) = n! \quad (C\ 2)
\]

Gamma function satisfies recurrence relation:

\[
\Gamma(z + 1) = z\Gamma(z) \quad (C\ 3)
\]

The natural logarithm of the Gamma function is implemented in the *gammln* function from Numerical recipes.

The **Incomplete Gamma Function** is defined by:

\[
P(a, x) \equiv \frac{\gamma(a, x)}{\Gamma(a)} \equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma(a)} \int_{0}^{x} t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt, \ (a > 0) \quad (C\ 4)
\]

It has the limiting values

\[
P(a, 0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad P(a, \infty) = 1 \quad (C\ 5)
\]

The **complement** \(Q(a, x)\) is:

\[
Q(a, x) \equiv 1 - P(a, x) \equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma(a)} \int_{x}^{\infty} t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt, \ (a > 0) \quad (C\ 6)
\]

Functions *gammp* and *gammq* from Numerical recipes provides \(P\) and \(Q\) functions respectively.

\(^2\)All definitions and properties from “Numerical Recipes in Fortran ’77”