High-resolution cavity ringdown spectroscopy of the jet-cooled propyl peroxy radical C₃H₇O₂
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We have obtained high resolution, partially rotationally resolved, jet-cooled cavity ringdown spectra of the origin band of the $\tilde{A} \leftarrow \tilde{X}$ electronic transition of two of the five conformers (G₁G₂ and G₁T₂) of the normal propyl peroxy radical, C₃H₇O₂, as well as the G conformer of the iso-propyl peroxy radical isomer. This transition, located in the near infrared, was studied using a narrow band laser source ($\leq$250 MHz) and a supersonic slit-jet expansion coupled with an electric discharge allowing us to obtain rotational temperatures of about 15 K. All three spectra have been successfully fitted using an evolutionary algorithm approach with a Hamiltonian including rotational and spin-rotational terms. Excellent agreement with the experimental spectra was obtained by fitting seven molecular parameters in each of the ground and the first excited electronic states as well as the band origin of the electronic transition. These parameters are compared with the results from electronic structure calculations. This analysis confirms unambiguously the previous room-temperature conformer assignments that were based upon quantum chemistry calculations.

1. Introduction

For decades, peroxy radicals (RO₂) have been known to be key intermediates in atmospheric chemistry as well as in low temperature combustion, and their role has been discussed in several overview articles. The ability to monitor the presence as well as the concentration of these key radicals would lead to a better understanding of the chemistry of gas phase reactions involving such reactive species. Due to the stringent demands for sensitivity and selectivity, the diagnostic technique of choice is likely spectroscopic for whose application a prerequisite is well understood spectra.

Typically, peroxy radicals have been routinely followed in kinetic studies by monitoring their very strong $\tilde{A} \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ electronic transition which lies in the UV, centered near 240 nm. However, this transition is not suitable for high-resolution studies due to the repulsive nature of the $\tilde{B}$ state, resulting in a broad, structureless spectrum. Moreover this transition lacks selectivity for the R group in the peroxy radical, RO₂, and eliminates the possibility of resolving vibrational, rotational, and fine structure. Therefore, we have shifted the high-resolution spectroscopic interest to the intrinsically sharp and well structured but much weaker $\tilde{A} \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ transition located in the near-infrared (NIR), which was first observed by Hunziker and Wendt.

Our group has studied open-chain alkyl peroxy radicals ranging from methyl peroxy (R = CH₃) to pentyl peroxy (R = C₅H₁₁) using room temperature cavity ringdown spectroscopy (CRDS). We demonstrated the convenience of the NIR electronic transition as a species selective, as well as an isomer and even conformer specific, diagnostic technique. However, due to the population of rotational levels under room temperature conditions as well as the overlap of different conformer transitions in the larger alkyl peroxy radicals, high precision spectroscopic parameters, such as rotational and spin-rotational constants, which are highly useful for benchmarking quantum chemistry calculations, cannot be extracted from these spectra.

Other groups have also studied the smaller gas-phase peroxy radicals such as methyl and ethyl peroxy by a variety of techniques, including negative-ion photoelectron spectroscopy, photionization, cw-CRDS in the NIR and NIR absorption detected by time-of-flight mass spectroscopy, but have similarly failed to obtain high precision molecular parameters characterizing the rotational and spin-rotational structure.

We recently developed an experimental apparatus that allows us to combine a high-resolution laser source with a slit-jet-cooled CRDS setup, and have successfully used it to record the rotationally resolved $\tilde{A} \rightarrow \tilde{X}$ spectrum near 1.35 µm transition of the perdeuterated methyl peroxy radical, CD₃O₂, as well as the two conformers of the proteo and deutero isotopologues of the G and T conformers of the ethyl peroxy radical. The experimental spectra have been modeled using a Hamiltonian that includes the rigid body rotation of an asymmetric top and the spin-rotation interaction. In the case of the CD₃O₂ spectrum, a least squares fitting procedure was used to simulate the well resolved spectrum. On the other hand, due to the incompletely resolved structure, an evolutionary algorithm (EA) approach was used to analyze and simulate the C₂H₅O₂ spectra. For both methyl and ethyl...
peroxy, the studies resulted in the high precision determination of 15 molecular parameters characterizing the $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{X}$ electronic states.

Our recent CRDS studies of the C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$ radical under room-temperature conditions$^{14}$ directly identified 5 conformers of the n-propyl peroxy radical (G$_1$G$_2$, G$_1$T$_2$, T$_2$G$_2$, T$_1$T$_2$ and G$_1$G$_3$) and both conformers of the iso-propyl peroxy radical (G and T). However, the conformer assignments were based only upon high level electronic structure calculations$^{15}$ and spectral congestion caused significant overlap between conformer bands and prevented resolving rotational constants or spin-rotation structure in the spectra.

This paper extends our previous work to obtain and analyze the $\tilde{A}$-X spectra for several conformers and isomers of the propyl peroxy radical under jet-cooled conditions with a narrow band laser source. As in the ethyl peroxy study, we have found it of use to analyze and fit these spectra using the EA approach due to the partially resolved nature of the experimental spectra. Our analysis produces a set of high precision molecular parameters characterizing the $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{X}$ states which we compare with the results of electronic structure calculations for these radicals.

2. Experimental

Our high-resolution CRDS experimental setup has been described in previous papers$^{26,27}$ so we will only give a brief summary of the aspects that are particularly relevant to this work. The 1.3 $\mu$m NIR radiation was obtained from the first Stokes of the stimulated Raman scattering (SRS) created by focusing the output of a pulsed (20 Hz), nearly Fourier-transform-limited (15 ns pulses), tunable, high energy ($\leq$100 mJ/pulse) Ti:Sapphire (Ti:Sa) laser source$^{25}$ into a stainless steel (1 m long) cell pressurized with typically 10 atm of H$_2$. The bandwidth of the NIR SRS radiation, due to pressure broadening, is estimated to be of the order of $\sim$200 MHz (FWHM), resulting, when combined with the residual Doppler broadening in the slit-jet expansion, in an instrumental linewidth of $\sim$250 MHz in the 1.3 $\mu$m region of the electromagnetic spectrum. The pulsed NIR radiation ($\sim$1 mJ) is coupled into the CRDS cavity, which consists of two high reflectivity mirrors (Advanced Thin Films, Colorado, USA, with reflectivity $>99.999\%$) mounted on the arms of an evacuated chamber (0.67 m long). The mirrors are purged by a flow of inert gas argon to prevent a deposit from the reactive species onto the mirror surface.

The propyl peroxy radicals, C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$, are produced by expanding a mixture of $\sim$1% 1-propyl iodide (for the n-C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$) or 2-propyl iodide (for the iso-C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$) and $\sim$10% oxygen (O$_2$) in first run neon (75% Ne, 25% He) through a slit-jet (1 mm $\times$ 5 cm) nozzle (opening time 1 ms) and a pulsed discharge (10 Hz, 9 mm plasma channel length, 1 mm spacing between the electrodes). A high voltage is applied to the two stainless steel electrodes for 1 mm spacing between the electrodes. A high voltage is applied to the two stainless steel electrodes for $\sim$200 $\mu$s during the gas pulse, resulting in plasma currents of $\sim$300–400 mA. The precursor gas mixture is prepared by bubbling $\sim$500 Torr of an O$_2$ and Ne gas mixture through a sample bomb containing C$_3$H$_7$I at $-45^\circ$C.

The SRS radiation beam is used to probe the cooled supersonic gas expansion 10 mm downstream from the throat of the expansion where the radical concentration is estimated to be $\sim$5 $\times$ 10$^{12}$ molecules cm$^{-3}$.$^{27}$ Light emanating from the rear high reflector was detected by an InGaAs detector whose output was coupled to a 12-bit acquisition card in a computer running a LabView program created for the apparatus. Ringdown times of up to 250 $\mu$s and an experimental sensitivity of 0.02 ppm/pass (corresponding to a noise equivalent absorption of 4.5 ppb Hz$^{-1/2}$) have been achieved using our best mirror set.

The spectra were recorded using frequency scans of $\sim$10 GHz segments with a frequency step size of 50 MHz with 4 laser shots averaged at each frequency point. Each segment is linearized using a simultaneously recorded Fabry-Perot etalon trace (FSR $\approx$1 GHz). Absolute calibration was achieved by using the residual water absorption present in our vacuum chamber and by matching the lines with the water transitions reported in the HITRAN database.$^{29}$

3. Theory

All the spectra of the propyl peroxy radical that have been recorded involve the 0$^0_0$ band of the $\tilde{A}$-X electronic transition. Due to the fact that the radical is in a doublet state we expect both an observable rotational and spin-rotation structure in the spectra, but we expect hyperfine splittings to be unresolvable. Hence, the structure of each vibronic level is described by a Hamiltonian, $\mathcal{H}_T$,

$$\mathcal{H}_T = \mathcal{H}_{\text{Rot}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{SR}} + T_0(l)$$

where $T_0(l)$ is the energy of the vibronic state (vibrationless level of $\tilde{A}$ or $\tilde{X}$ electronic state) with $i = \tilde{A}$ or $\tilde{X}$ and $T_0(\tilde{X})$ is taken as zero.

We can express the rotational Hamiltonian, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Rot}}$, in the principal axis system as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{Rot}} = AN_a^2 + BN_b^2 + CN_c^2$$

where $A$, $B$ and $C$ denote, by convention, the rotational constants of the radical. The matrix elements of the rotational Hamiltonian, $\mathcal{H}_{\text{Rot}}$, are well-known.$^{30,31}$

The spin-rotation Hamiltonian has long been studied and derived by many authors$^{30,32-36}$ and can be written as,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{SR}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \varepsilon_{\alpha \beta}(N_\alpha S_\beta + S_\alpha N_\beta)$$

where $\varepsilon_{\alpha \beta}$ represents the different components of the spin-rotation tensor expressed in the same principal axis system. It has been shown by several authors$^{32,37,38}$ that the components of the spin rotation tensor, $\varepsilon_{\alpha \beta}$ have first and second order contributions and the latter dominates.

In principle the spin-rotation tensor contains nine parameters. Brown and Sears have shown$^{37}$ that for molecules with C$_1$ point group symmetry, which is the point group symmetry of the observed radical spectra (see below for details), only six out of nine parameters could be determined independently from an experimental spectrum, and only
angular momentum, \( S \), which the rotational angular momentum, \( \theta \), and the two angles, \( \theta \) and \( \phi \), describing the orientation of the electric dipole moment, \( \mu \), with respect to the principal axis system.

During the initial step of the fit, values for all the parameters are randomly set between the upper and lower limits input by the user. The next generation of chromosomes is generated from the selected best parent(s), which are determined by their fitness function using an evolution strategy (ES) with mutative step size control. The number of individuals in a generation and the number of parents used to generate the next generation is determined by the choice of the algorithm and is discussed in detail in references 41–44.

The quality of the agreement between an experimental spectrum and its simulation is measured by a fitness function, \( F_{\text{fit}} \):

\[
F_{\text{fit}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{l} w(r) \sum_{i=1}^{N} f(i) g(i + r)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{l} w(r) \sum_{i=1}^{N} f(i) f(i + r)}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{l} w(r) \sum_{i=1}^{N} g(i) g(i + r)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{l} w(r) \sum_{i=1}^{N} g(i) g(i + r)}}
\]

(8)

The function \( w(r) \) is called the overlap function which controls the sensitivity of the fitness function for a shift of the experimental and simulated spectra relative to each other. A more detailed explanation of the choice of \( w(r) \) and \( l \) is given in a previous paper.28

If one wants to look at both spectra as vectors of dimension \( N \) (where \( N \) denotes the frequency points), then the numerator of \( F_{\text{fit}} \) is a weighted dot product of these vectors and the denominator is simply a normalization factor, i.e.

\[
F_{\text{fit}} = \frac{\langle f, g \rangle}{\|f\| \|g\|}
\]

(9)

In this expression, \( f \) represents the experimental spectrum while \( g \) represents the simulated spectrum.

The EA is very suitable for parallel computation. The calculations were performed on a Linux cluster at Nijmegen based on SUN Fire X4100 and X4150 machines. Typically 32 CPUs were used. Convergence occurs in approximately 300 generations corresponding to a wall clock time of about 35 min. The choice of the number of generations has been discussed in a previous paper.28 In order to achieve fast convergence, a wise choice for the initial ranges of the different parameters in \( \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{T}} \) is needed. We have found, and see below, that if one wants to obtain an excellent first estimate of the rotational constants for both \( X \) and \( A \) states that good agreement between experiment and theory is obtained with output from an MP2(FULL)/6-31g(d) method and basis set. Therefore we used the molecular parameters from this calculation and set a search range of \( \pm 0.25\% \) as a starting point. The same procedure was done iteratively until convergence was obtained. To avoid any error in the fitting procedure (i.e., converging to a local minimum) several steps have been performed. For all the optimized geometries of every conformation and isomer of the propyl peroxy radical, a frequency calculation has been performed to ensure that the
geometry calculated was indeed the global minimum of the given conformation or isomer \textit{(i.e.} no imaginary frequencies). Also we performed several fits with initial guesses up to 50\% away from the calculated rotational constants. We observed a convergence to the fit values presented in this study. This was done to confirm that our fits were converging to the global minimum and not to any other possible local minimum. For the spin-rotation constants we used the procedure described in the next section to estimate their values and assumed a search range of predicted value times $10^{\pm 1}$.

5. Electronic structure, calculations and molecular parameter estimation

Both to obtain initial estimates for the molecular parameters and ultimately to benchmark experimental quantum chemistry calculations, we have performed a set of calculations for both electronic states of the radicals using various electronic structure methods and basis sets. Using the Gaussian 03 software package,\textsuperscript{46} we computed the global minima for each observed conformation and isomer of the propyl peroxy radical for both ground, $X\tilde{g}$, and first excited, $A\tilde{g}$, electronic states, under the assumption that the observed spectra are in agreement with the previous room temperature conformer assignments.\textsuperscript{15} The methods and basis sets include the density functional theory (DFT) method (B3LYP) with a 6-31+g(d) basis set which represents a fairly inexpensive calculation. We also used a full second order Møller–Plesset perturbation calculation (MP2 (FULL)) with a 6-31g(d) basis set. The final method used was the coupled cluster singlet and doublet, CCSD, with a 6-31g+d basis set. This is a somewhat more computationally expensive method and would be of considerable interest to benchmark. For the components of the dipole moments, we turned to a configuration interaction singles, CIS, method with a 6-31g+d (d) basis. We performed the calculation at the optimized $X\tilde{g}$ state geometries found by each the CCSD, B3LYP, and MP2 methods. It has to be noted that all the corresponding rotational constants have been calculated for the equilibrium geometry and not for the experimentally observed vibrationless level. However, since zero-point corrections for rotational constants are typically less than a few tenths of a percent, this only mildly affects comparison between the calculated and observed values. Table 1–4 summarize the rotational constants and $T_{\text{rot}}$ values calculated via the different electronic structure calculations.

In order to predict the values of the spin-rotational constants, we employ a semi-empirical approach described previously.\textsuperscript{47} The basic physical requirement for this approach is that the electronic transition is localized on a given chromophore with common electronic structure for all the family members. Hence, the change of size of the carbon chain linked to this chromophore and its orientation will simply re-orient the principal inertial axes and change the values of tensor components expressed along them but leave unchanged the spin-rotational tensor components expressed in a local axis system tied to the chromophore.

A convenient local frame for the peroxy radicals has the $z$ axis along the O$_2$ bond with $x$ and $y$ coinciding with the p orbitals perpendicular to it. If $U$ is the unitary transformation relating the local and principal axes system then\textsuperscript{28}

$$\tilde{\mu}_S = I_S^{-1}U_S^{-1}U_{RUR}^\dagger U_R U_{R}^{-1}U_S$$

(10)

where $\tilde{\mu}_S$ is the spin-rotation tensor of the molecule of interest expressed in its principal axis system. Both the $I$ and the $U$ matrices are dependent solely upon the geometry of the molecule and hence can be calculated from the optimized geometry of the electronic structure calculation. We use the spin-rotation tensor, $\tilde{\mu}_R$, experimentally determined for CD$_3$O$_2$, as the reference molecule, to calculate $\tilde{\mu}_S$ for C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$.

6. Experimental results

The propyl peroxy radical is the smallest alkyl peroxy that not only possesses multiple conformers, but also two different isomers. We first consider 1-propyl peroxy and then 2-propyl peroxy.

6.1 The 1-propyl peroxy radical

As mentioned previously, 1-propyl peroxy radical has 5 different conformers, see Fig. 1, that are expected to be populated under room temperature conditions; however, under jet cooled conditions ($T_R \approx 15$ K, $k_BT_R \approx 10$ cm$^{-1}$), this would not be the case assuming equilibrium exists between the rotational and conformation degrees of freedom. Tarczay \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{15} calculated the ground state relative energy of all these conformers and assuming equilibrium only two conformers would be significantly populated, \textit{i.e.} the most stable G$_1$G$_2$ conformer and the G$_1$T$_2$ conformer which lies only 27 cm$^{-1}$ above the G$_1$G$_2$. The other 3 conformers are located more than \textasciitilde100 cm$^{-1}$ above G$_1$G$_2$ and hence are not expected to be observed. There is evidence from other works on jet-cooled radicals that equilibrium in the conformer degree of freedom is probably not completely reached. Nonetheless, conformations with energies well above $k_BT_R$ are usually not observed.\textsuperscript{46} Indeed, we have been able to record resolved spectra for two sub-bands of the $A-X$ transition. The strongest band lies quite close to the unresolved contour assigned to the G$_1$G$_2$ conformer in the room-temperature spectrum, while the other band is close to the putative G$_1$T$_2$ assignment. We therefore take these assignments as our starting point recognizing that their confirmation or not will depend upon the qualitative agreement or disagreement between the rotation constants determined experimentally and those from electronic structure calculations.

6.1.1 The G$_1$G$_2$ conformer of n-C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$. We were able to record the spectra of the putative G$_1$G$_2$ conformer with a good signal to noise ratio (S/N $\approx 25$ for the strongest spectral features). As Fig. 2 shows, the band spread over about 10 cm$^{-1}$ and appears to be relatively highly congested due to the population of many rotational as well as spin rotational levels even at 15 K. This congestion renders assignments of individual spectral features to unique quantum-state defined transitions nearly impossible. Due to this inability to assign individual lines, the use of the LSF method to simulate the experimental spectrum is inappropriate. We therefore used the EA approach, whose description can be found in section 4.1, to simulate the spectrum and determine the most accurate
values for the molecular parameters contained in $\mathcal{H}_T$ (eqn (1)) for both ground and first excited electronic states. The resulting constants are summarized in Table 1. The converged result of the EA not only produces the best values for the fitted constants but at the same time assigns quantum numbers for individual transitions. This allows a classical least-squares fit using the assigned frequencies. In Meerts and Schmitt,40 this is called an assigned fit, and the definitions of the statistical errors and correlation coefficients are discussed in Appendix B of that paper. The errors reported in Table 1 are based on a 0.01 cm$^{-1}$ uncertainty in the experimental line positions. The best agreement between the experimental spectrum and the fit was obtain with a rotational temperature of 15 K and a Voigt profile with a fixed Gaussian component of 250 MHz$^{-1}$ and 1450 MHz Lorentzian width. The nature of such a large Lorentzian component of the linewidth is presently being studied and will be discussed in later reports.

The components of the transition dipole along the principal axes given in Table 1 are determined from the fit values of $\theta$ and $\phi$ using the relationships,

$$\begin{align*}
\mu_a &= \mu \sin \phi \cos \theta \\
\mu_b &= \mu \sin \phi \sin \theta \\
\mu_c &= \mu \cos \phi
\end{align*}$$

Fig. 2 shows both the overall spectrum (bottom) as well as a portion (top) of the resulting simulation and experimental trace. It appears obvious that the simulation and the experimental spectra are virtually identical. Table 1 shows that...
all 15 molecular parameters incorporated in $\mathcal{H}_\lambda$ for the $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{X}$ states are well determined.

Rather striking is the fact that the experimental precision of the parameters for the G1G2 conformer of propyl peroxy is very comparable to that which we previously reported for CD$_2$O and C$_2$H$_4$O$_2$. While this result is counterintuitive, we expect the high precision obtained in this spectral fit to be attributable to the fact that the EA approach uses both the (somewhat less precise) frequencies for the propyl peroxy transitions and the intensity information contained in the C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$ spectrum, while the LSF method used only the transition frequency information for CD$_2$O. Since CRDS is an absorption-based technique, even absolute intensities are reliable, and the EA approach is ideal for even highly congested CRDS spectra.

Once we have the experimental results of Table 1 we can use them to benchmark the results of various electronic structure calculations that are also given in Table 1. It appears that the MP2(FULL) method with a 6-31g(d) basis set reproduces extremely well the rotational constants for both the $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{X}$ states (within 0.4%) which is consistent with the observations made in our study of the ethyl peroxy radical. As expected, the CCSD method also reproduces the rotational constants well but not as well as the MP2(FULL) method, the geometry optimization step of the G2 compound method. Finally, the DFT method provides the least precise rotational constants.

Having found that MP2(FULL) provides an economical method to calculate accurate rotational constants, we have used it to calculate them for all 7 conformers of the two propyl peroxy isomers. These results are shown in Table 2. Comparison of these values with the experimental rotational constants of Table 1 confirms unambiguously the assignment of the analyzed sub-band to the G1G2 conformer of 1-propyl peroxy.

If one looks at the different components of the spin-rotation tensor, we can easily see from Table 1 that these constants are generally in good agreement with the predictions made using the semi-empirical method described in section 5. As for the rotational constants, the MP2(FULL) method provides the most accurate estimate. The discrepancy among the calculated values is fairly easy to understand. Since the prediction of the spin-rotation tensor depends upon the optimized geometry of the molecule, it becomes obvious that the MP2(FULL) geometry would provide the best estimate of the spin-rotation constants while the B3LYP will provide the lowest performance, just as we found for the rotational constants.

As Table 1 shows we actually only used the real part of the spin-rotation tensor for the $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{X}$ states. This was validated by using our SpecView program which can handle complex matrices.
at our resolution, is not significant. This approximation is further confirmed by comparing simulations including, or not, the two extra imaginary components of the spin-rotation tensor.

Since the $G_1G_2$ conformer of the propyl peroxy radical has $C_1$ symmetry, non-vanishing components of the transition dipole moment lie along all three axes, $a$, $b$ and $c$. The calculated and experimental results can be found in Table 1. One can observe a somewhat larger discrepancy between experiment and calculations for the relative components of the transition dipole than for the $A$ and $X$ state parameters. However, it is well known that transition dipoles are difficult to calculate and even more so for the intrinsically weak $A-X$ transition. The fairly significant variation of the calculated dipoles using the three different optimized geometries supports this supposition.

6.1.2 The $G_1T_2$ conformer of n-C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$. As mentioned previously, the $G_1T_2$ conformer of the n-propyl peroxy is estimated to be located about 27 cm$^{-1}$ above the $G_1G_2$ conformer and a sub-band is observed near to the location of the unresolved band in the room-temperature spectra that is assigned to the $G_1T_2$ conformer (as shown in Fig. 3). The spectrum spreads over $\approx 10$ cm$^{-1}$ with a signal to noise ratio of about 20:1 for the strongest bands. We have performed a similar analysis on this band as the one for the band of the $G_1G_2$ conformer. The parameters resulting from the EA analysis of this sub-band are given in Table 3. The rotational temperature has been fitted to be $\approx 18$ K ($k_BT_R = 12.51$ cm$^{-1}$).

It is clear that the simulation is in perfect agreement with the experimental spectrum. By comparing the experimental molecular parameters with the calculated and predicted ones in Table 3, we came to the same conclusion as for the $G_1G_2$ conformer, i.e. that the MP2(FULL) is suitable to make the best predictions for molecular parameters and that the B3LYP method gives the poorest agreement of the three methods employed. By comparing the calculated rotational constants in Table 2 with the experimental values in Table 3, it is clear that the assignment of this band to the $G_1T_2$ conformer is correct.

It is of interest to compare the present highly accurate values of $T_{00} = 7501.2532(3)$ and 7576.2469(4) cm$^{-1}$ for the $G_1G_2$ and $G_1T_2$ conformers, respectively, with the values of 7508(2) and 7569(2) cm$^{-1}$ from the room-temperature spectra.$^{14,20}$ It is somewhat surprising to see discrepancies significantly beyond the estimated experimental measurement error in the room-temperature experiments. This result is particularly striking since our recently reported $T_{00}$ values from jet-cooled spectra agreed to well within the room-temperature experimental error for CD$_2$O$_2$. $^{27}$ and both the $G$ and $T$ conformers of ethyl peroxy. $^{28}$ However, in these cases, the room-temperature bands, while unresolved, were isolated. In the case of the $G_1G_2$ and GT$ _2$ conformers of 1-propyl peroxy, the room-temperature bands are significantly overlapped and this may well explain the discrepancies.

It also is interesting to compare the present experimental results with the calculated excitation energy, $T_{00}$, for the electronic structure methods which are summarized in Table 1 and 3. The energy separation for the MP2(FULL) was obtained by calculating both electronic states using the G2 compound method which already contains the ZPE correction as well as several higher order energy correction terms. The energies obtained for the CCSD and B3LYP energies have been corrected by the ZPE correction under the harmonic oscillator approximation. In the former case, an average of the B3LYP and G2 ZPE (which differ by $\approx 10$ cm$^{-1}$) energies was used. It is no surprise that the MP2(FULL) calculation is the most accurate one as pointed out by Sharp et al.$^{20}$ On the other hand, it is surprising that the CCSD calculation is less accurate than the DFT one since its global minimum structure of the radical appears to be more accurate than the B3LYP-DFT calculation.

6.2 The G conformer of the 2-propyl peroxy radical isomer

The 2-propyl peroxy isomer is known to have only 2 conformers, as show in Fig. 1. It has been calculated$^{15}$ that the G conformer is the most stable and that the T conformer lies about 149 cm$^{-1}$ higher. So it is likely that under jet-cooled conditions, one should only observe the G conformer. The only band observed for isopropyl peroxy is illustrated in Fig. 4. The signal to noise ratio appears to be excellent in this spectrum (more than 120:1 for the strongest feature) and the spectrum spreads over $\approx 10$ cm$^{-1}$. However, the experimental spectrum of the iso-propyl peroxy isomer exhibits less well resolved rotational and spin-rotational structures than does the n-propyl peroxy isomer, which makes the EA approach even more important for analyzing the former spectra.

We have employed the same approach as described above for the analysis of 1-propyl isomer. The results are summarized in Table 4 and Fig. 4. The rotational temperature was found to be 13.3 K ($k_BT_R = 9.24$ cm$^{-1}$). When looking at the top insert of Fig. 4, one can see that discrepancies between the simulation and the experimental spectrum are essentially non-existent. Moreover, there is extremely good agreement between the fitted molecular parameters and the calculated and predicted ones using the MP2(FULL) method.

Comparison between the experimental rotational constants in Table 4 and the calculated ones in Table 2 confirm the room-temperature assignment of this band to the G conformer of isopropyl peroxy. The highly accurate value of $T_{00} = 7568.0950(2)$ agrees well with the room-temperature value$^{14,20}$ of 7567(2) given the latter's experimental error. The good agreement here, compared to the poorer agreement for the n-propyl peroxy conformers, likely reflects the fact that while the room-temperature band is unresolved, it is isolated for the isopropyl peroxy isomer. Referring to Table 4, we see that the G2 calculation using the MP2(FULL) result, is by far the closest to experiment.

7. Conclusion

We have successfully recorded the partially rotationally resolved spectra of several isomers and conformers of the peroxy radical, C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$, i.e. the $G_1G_2$ and $G_1T_2$ conformers of the n-propyl peroxy and the G conformer of iso-propyl peroxy. We have used an EA approach to analyze the observed spectra. This approach allowed us to obtain an excellent match between the simulated and the experimental
spectra producing a set of molecular parameters characterizing the $\tilde{X}$ and $\tilde{A}$ states of the radicals.

We have confirmed the conformer room-temperature assignments previously made by Tarczay et al.\textsuperscript{15} which were made entirely based upon electronic structure calculations. Obtaining molecular parameters characterizing these radicals in both electronic states allowed us to benchmark quantum chemistry calculations by several different methods and basis

---

**Table 3** Molecular parameters of G$_1$T$_2$ conformer of n-C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$ radical from the experimental spectrum and from the indicated electronic structure calculations (see text for details). The calculated $T_{00}$ have been corrected by the scaled\textsuperscript{39} ZPE correction under the harmonic oscillator assumption. The numbers in square brackets represent the percentage of error of the predicted constant with respect to the fitted results. The calculated and predicted constants are for the equilibrium geometry. The components of the transition moment are computed using the CIS method using the optimized geometries indicated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Const., cm$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Fit$^a$</th>
<th>MP2(FULL)/6-31+g(d)</th>
<th>CCSD/6-31+g(d)</th>
<th>B3LYP/6-31+g(d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A''^1$</td>
<td>0.50544 (4)</td>
<td>0.50935 [-0.774 (8)]</td>
<td>0.50192 [0.696 (8)]</td>
<td>0.51277 [-1.450 (8)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B''^1$</td>
<td>0.08389 (2)</td>
<td>0.08420 [-0.370 (24)]</td>
<td>0.08345 [0.524 (24)]</td>
<td>0.08185 [2.432 (24)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C''^1$</td>
<td>0.07905 (2)</td>
<td>0.07925 [-0.253 (25)]</td>
<td>0.07843 [0.784 (25)]</td>
<td>0.07745 [2.024 (25)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{e}_{aa}''^1 = -(a_0 + 2a)^''$</td>
<td>-0.0106 (7)</td>
<td>-0.0118 (15) [-11. (7)]</td>
<td>-0.0117 (15) [-10. (7)]</td>
<td>-0.0125 (15) [-18. (7)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{e}_{ab}''^1 = (a + b - a_0)^''$</td>
<td>-0.0037 (3)</td>
<td>-0.0035 (14) [5. (8)]</td>
<td>-0.0035 (14) [5. (8)]</td>
<td>-0.0032 (14) [14. (8)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{e}_{bc}''^1 = (a - b - a_0)^''$</td>
<td>-0.0025 (3)</td>
<td>-0.0016 (15) [36. (12)]</td>
<td>-0.0016 (15) [36. (12)]</td>
<td>-0.0017 (15) [36. (12)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1/2)$\tilde{e}<em>{aa}''^1 + \tilde{e}</em>{bb}''^1 = d''$</td>
<td>-0.0021 (33)</td>
<td>-0.0049 (22) [-133. (157)]</td>
<td>-0.0049 (22) [-133. (157)]</td>
<td>-0.0053 (22) [-152. (157)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1/2)$\tilde{e}<em>{ab}''^1 + \tilde{e}</em>{bc}''^1 = c''$</td>
<td>-0.00020</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1/2)$\tilde{e}<em>{aa}''^1 + \tilde{e}</em>{bb}''^1 = e''$</td>
<td>-0.0006</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A^1$</td>
<td>0.47968 (4)</td>
<td>0.48144 [-0.367 (8)]</td>
<td>0.47526 [0.921 (8)]</td>
<td>0.48692 [-1.509 (8)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B^1$</td>
<td>0.08518 (2)</td>
<td>0.08538 [-0.235 (23)]</td>
<td>0.08453 [0.763 (23)]</td>
<td>0.08306 [2.489 (23)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C^1$</td>
<td>0.07899 (2)</td>
<td>0.07931 [-0.405 (25)]</td>
<td>0.07838 [0.772 (25)]</td>
<td>0.07723 [2.228 (25)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{e}_{aa}^1 = -(a_0 + 2a)^1$</td>
<td>-0.0104 (7)</td>
<td>-0.0135 (15) [-10. (7)]</td>
<td>-0.0117 (15) [-10. (7)]</td>
<td>-0.0125 (15) [-18. (7)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{e}_{ab}^1 = (a + b - a_0)^1$</td>
<td>-0.0037 (3)</td>
<td>-0.0035 (14) [5. (8)]</td>
<td>-0.0035 (14) [5. (8)]</td>
<td>-0.0032 (14) [14. (8)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tilde{e}_{bc}^1 = (a - b - a_0)^1$</td>
<td>-0.0025 (3)</td>
<td>-0.0016 (15) [36. (12)]</td>
<td>-0.0016 (15) [36. (12)]</td>
<td>-0.0017 (15) [36. (12)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1/2)$\tilde{e}<em>{aa}^1 + \tilde{e}</em>{bb}^1 = d^1$</td>
<td>-0.0021 (33)</td>
<td>-0.0049 (22) [-133. (157)]</td>
<td>-0.0049 (22) [-133. (157)]</td>
<td>-0.0053 (22) [-152. (157)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1/2)$\tilde{e}<em>{ab}^1 + \tilde{e}</em>{bc}^1 = c^1$</td>
<td>-0.00020</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
<td>0.00020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1/2)$\tilde{e}<em>{aa}^1 + \tilde{e}</em>{bb}^1 = e^1$</td>
<td>-0.0006</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>\mu_a</td>
<td>\mu_b</td>
<td>^b$</td>
<td>0.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>\mu_c</td>
<td>\mu_f</td>
<td>^b$</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_{00}$</td>
<td>7576.2469 (4)</td>
<td>7566.8709 [0.12]</td>
<td>7099.6110 [6.29]</td>
<td>7655.9997 [1.05]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Fit temperature of 17.9 K. $^b$ Determined from fit values of $\theta = 36.3^\circ$, $\phi = 60.2^\circ$.\footnote{The calculated $T_{00}$ have been corrected by the scaled\textsuperscript{39} ZPE correction under the harmonic oscillator assumption. The numbers in square brackets represent the percentage of error of the predicted constant with respect to the fitted results. The calculated and predicted constants are for the equilibrium geometry. The components of the transition moment are computed using the CIS method using the optimized geometries indicated.}

---

Fig. 3 Experimental and simulated spectra of the G$_1$T$_2$ conformer of the n-C$_3$H$_7$O$_2$ radical. The upper panel shows an enlargement of a 4 cm$^{-1}$ section of the lower panel. In each panel, the top red trace is the simulated spectrum, using the fitted constants in Table 3, shifted upward by 0.2 PPMP while the bottom blue trace is the experimental spectrum. Axis conventions are the same as Fig. 2.
sets. We also demonstrated that by following the formalism of Brown, Sears and Watson\textsuperscript{38} and extended by Tarczay \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{47} one is able to predict the different components of the spin-rotation tensors rather well. Finally, this work confirms the effectiveness of using an EA approach to simulate spectra with varying degrees of resolution.

Fig. 4 Experimental and simulated spectra of the G conformer of the iso-C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{7}O\textsubscript{2} radical. The upper panel shows an enlargement of a 4 cm\textsuperscript{−1} section of the lower panel. In each panel, the top red trace is the simulated spectrum, using the fitted constants in Table 4, shifted upward by 1 PPMP while the bottom magenta trace is the experimental spectrum. Axis conventions are the same as Fig. 2.

Table 4 Molecular parameters of the G conformer of iso-C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{7}O\textsubscript{2} radical from the experimental spectrum and from the indicated electronic structure calculations (see text for details). The calculated \( T_{\text{fit}} \) have been corrected by the scaled\textsuperscript{49} ZPE correction under the harmonic oscillator assumption. The numbers in square brackets represent the percentage of error of the predicted constant with respect to the fitted results. The calculated and predicted constants are for the equilibrium geometry. The components of the transition moment are computed using the CIS method using the optimized geometries indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Const./cm\textsuperscript{−1}</th>
<th>( T_{\text{fit}} )</th>
<th>MP2(FULL)\textsubscript{6-31+g(d)}</th>
<th>CCSD\textsubscript{6-31+g(d)}</th>
<th>B3LYP\textsubscript{6-31+g(d)}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( A' )</td>
<td>0.26527 (4)</td>
<td>0.26572 [−0.170 (15)]</td>
<td>0.26340 [0.705 (15)]</td>
<td>0.26162 [1.376 (15)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B' )</td>
<td>0.13692 (5)</td>
<td>0.13718 [−0.190 (22)]</td>
<td>0.13530 [1.183 (22)]</td>
<td>0.13408 [2.074 (22)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C' )</td>
<td>0.09916 (4)</td>
<td>0.09979 [−0.635 (40)]</td>
<td>0.09860 [0.565 (40)]</td>
<td>0.09772 [1.452 (40)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{00}^{y'} = -(a_{0} + 2a)^{y'} )</td>
<td>−0.0139 (7)</td>
<td>−0.0135 [15] [3. (5)]</td>
<td>−0.0134 [15] [4. (3)]</td>
<td>−0.0133 [15] [4.317 (5)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{0a}^{y'} = (a + b - a_{0})^{y'} )</td>
<td>−0.0013 (5)</td>
<td>−0.0024 [14] [−34. (38)]</td>
<td>−0.0023 [14] [−37. (38)]</td>
<td>−0.0021 [14] [−62. (38)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{aa}^{y'} = (a - b - a_{0})^{y'} )</td>
<td>−0.0012 (7)</td>
<td>−0.0017 [15] [−42. (58)]</td>
<td>−0.0017 [15] [−42. (58)]</td>
<td>−0.0018 [15] [−50. (58)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (1/2)(\varepsilon_{ab} + \varepsilon_{ba})^{y'} = B_{y}^{r} )</td>
<td>0.0128 (19)</td>
<td>0.0029 [22] [77. (15)]</td>
<td>0.0028 [22] [78. (15)]</td>
<td>0.0027 [22] [79. (15)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (1/2)(\varepsilon_{ac} + \varepsilon_{ca})^{y'} = C_{y}^{r} )</td>
<td>−0.0019</td>
<td>−0.0019</td>
<td>−0.0019</td>
<td>−0.0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (1/2)(\varepsilon_{bc} + \varepsilon_{cb})^{y'} = D_{y}^{r} )</td>
<td>−0.0025</td>
<td>−0.0025</td>
<td>−0.0025</td>
<td>−0.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A' )</td>
<td>0.26406 (4)</td>
<td>0.26403 [0.011 (15)]</td>
<td>0.26241 [0.625 (15)]</td>
<td>0.26142 [1.000 (15)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B' )</td>
<td>0.13710 (3)</td>
<td>0.13729 [−0.139 (22)]</td>
<td>0.13519 [1.393 (22)]</td>
<td>0.13399 [2.268 (22)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C' )</td>
<td>0.09912 (4)</td>
<td>0.09961 [−0.494 (40)]</td>
<td>0.09827 [0.858 (40)]</td>
<td>0.09723 [1.907 (40)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{00}^{x} = -(a_{0} + 2a)^{x} )</td>
<td>0.0172 (7)</td>
<td>0.0184 [15] [−7. (4)]</td>
<td>0.0184 [15] [−7. (4)]</td>
<td>0.0185 [15] [−8. (4)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{0a}^{x} = (a + b - a_{0})^{x} )</td>
<td>0.0013 (5)</td>
<td>0.0010 [14] [23. (38)]</td>
<td>0.0010 [14] [23. (38)]</td>
<td>0.0010 [14] [23. (38)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon_{aa}^{x} = (a - b - a_{0})^{x} )</td>
<td>0.0004 (7)</td>
<td>0.0003 [15] [25. (175)]</td>
<td>0.0003 [15] [25. (175)]</td>
<td>0.0002 [15] [50. (175)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (1/2)(\varepsilon_{ab} + \varepsilon_{ba})^{x} = B_{x}^{r} )</td>
<td>−0.0018 (50)</td>
<td>−0.0031 [22] [−72. (276)]</td>
<td>−0.0030 [22] [−67. (276)]</td>
<td>−0.0030 [22] [267 (276)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (1/2)(\varepsilon_{ac} + \varepsilon_{ca})^{x} = C_{x}^{r} )</td>
<td>−0.0018</td>
<td>−0.0018</td>
<td>−0.0018</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( (1/2)(\varepsilon_{bc} + \varepsilon_{cb})^{x} = D_{x}^{r} )</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mu_{x}/\mu^{d} )</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( T_{\text{fit}} )</td>
<td>7568.0950 (4)</td>
<td>7566.2345 [0.02]</td>
<td>7124.1834 [5.87]</td>
<td>7662.2373 [1.24]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( a \) Fit temperature of 13.3 K. \( b \) Determined from fit values of \( \theta = 1.4^{\circ}, \phi = 48.8^{\circ} \).
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