

HARVARD LIBRARY Office for Scholarly Communication

# Hydrogen peroxide, organic hydroperoxide, and formaldehyde as primary pollutants from biomass burning

DIGITAL ACCESS TO

DASH.HARVARD.EDU

SCHOLARSHIP AT HARVARD

CORE

# The Harvard community has made this article openly available. <u>Please share</u> how this access benefits you. Your story matters

| Citation          | Lee, Meehye, Brian G. Heikes, Daniel J. Jacob, Glen Sachse,<br>and Bruce Anderson. 1997. "Hydrogen Peroxide, Organic<br>Hydroperoxide, and Formaldehyde as Primary Pollutants from<br>Biomass Burning." Journal of Geophysical Research 102 (D1): 1301.<br>doi:10.1029/96jd01709. |
|-------------------|---|
| Published Version | doi:10.1029/96JD01709   |
| Citable link      | http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:14121819   |
| Terms of Use      | This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH<br>repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions<br>applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at http://<br>nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-<br>use#LAA           |

#### Hydrogen peroxide, organic hydroperoxide, and formaldehyde as primary pollutants from biomass burning

#### Meehye Lee and Brian G. Heikes

Center for Atmospheric Chemistry Study, Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island Narragansett

#### Daniel J. Jacob

Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

#### Glen Sachse and Bruce Anderson

NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia

Abstract. Hydrogen peroxide, organic hydroperoxide species, and formaldehyde were found to be enhanced within biomass burning plumes during the Transport and Atmospheric Chemistry near the Equator - Atlantic (TRACE A) experiment. This enhancement could have resulted from direct emission by the fires or by secondary photochemical production. In this study, direct production of hydroperoxide and formaldehyde from biomass burning is proposed and examined through comparisons of hydroperoxide and formaldehyde measurements, obtained from three fire flights in TRACE A, with model estimates, with other measurement data, and with results from fire experiments at the University of Rhode Island (URI). For highest concentrations of hydroperoxide and formaldehyde, model predictions fall short of those observed, and an additional source is required.  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  were noted to increase with CO and were significantly correlated with other measured species known to be produced from biomass burning. The enhancements of  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  relative to CO were different between flights in which the relative enhancements of CO to CO2 were also different. The enhancement ratio of  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  relative to CO was 1-5x10<sup>-2</sup> and 2-4x10<sup>-3</sup>, respectively. CH<sub>2</sub>O was correlated with ČO. The enhancement ratios of CH<sub>2</sub>O were determined in relation to both CO and CO<sub>2</sub> for three flights and were 7-19x10<sup>-3</sup> and  $3-5x10^{-4}$ , respectively. The correlations of CH<sub>2</sub>O with other measured combustion species were more significant than those of  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$ . To determine whether hydroperoxide and formaldehyde can be directly produced from biomass burning, simple biomass fire experiments were performed at URI. These species were observed to be clearly elevated in test biomass fires. These experiments present unequivocal evidence for the direct production of hydrogen peroxide and formaldehyde from biomass burning. The results from both TRACE A and our fire experiments also fit possible mechanisms of direct formation of hydroperoxide and formaldehyde in combustion processes. The atmospheric implication of the direct production of these species from biomass burning is their contribution to odd-hydrogen radical production, thereby affecting the oxidizing capacity of the atmosphere before  $O_3$  would be photochemically developed. In TRACE A, odd-hydrogen radical production from the direct source of these species is estimated to be near 30% of the total radical production.

#### 1. Introduction

Biomass burning is recognized as one of the most important biogeochemical processes with significant impacts on the atmosphere. During biomass burning, a wide range of trace gases including CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, CH<sub>4</sub>, NMHC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O are released into the atmosphere [*Crutzen and Andreae*, 1990; *Andreae*, 1993]. CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and CH<sub>4</sub> are known greenhouse gases contributing to climate change [*Mitchell*, 1989]. Halogen gases such as CH<sub>3</sub>Cl and CH<sub>3</sub>Br produced by biomass burning may have influence on stratospheric ozone chemistry [*Manö and Andreae*, 1994; *Cicerone*, 1994]. Photochemical reactions between emitted

Copyright 1997 by the American Geophysical Union.

Paper number 96JD01709. 0148-0227/97/96JD-01709\$09.00 hydrocarbons and  $NO_x$  lead to net ozone production. Ozone produces OH in humid air, and CO and CH<sub>4</sub> consume OH in the remote atmosphere; therefore biomass burning can affect OH concentrations, atmospheric oxidant concentrations, and the rate of oxidation of reduced compounds [Rodriguez et al., 1991]. Hence biomass burning is believed to play an important role in global change [Levine, 1991; International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), 1994].

During the Transport and Atmospheric Chemistry near the Equator - Atlantic (TRACE A) experiment [e.g., Fishman et al., 1994], hydrogen peroxide ( $H_2O_2$ ), organic hydroperoxides (i.e., CH<sub>3</sub>OOH, HOCH<sub>2</sub>OOH, CH<sub>3</sub>CH(OH)OOH, and CH<sub>3</sub>C(O)OOH) and formaldehyde (CH<sub>2</sub>O) concentrations were extremely high in and near biomass burning plumes [Lee et al., 1996]. In the Pacific Exploratory Mission - West, Phase A (PEM-West A) experiment, the highest concentrations of  $H_2O_2$  and CH<sub>3</sub>OOH were observed over the Celbes Sea in air believed to be impacted

by fire emissions [Heikes et al., 1996a]. Further, the highest  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_2O$  concentrations measured in the Mauna Loa Observatory Photochemistry Experiment (MLOPEX) were thought to be associated with fire emissions [Heikes, 1992]. These results led us to consider biomass burning as a direct source of  $H_2O_2$ , organic hydroperoxide, and  $CH_2O$ .

Hydrogen peroxide and methyl hydroperoxide are normally thought of as secondary photochemical products acting as reservoirs of odd-hydrogen radicals (e.g., OH, HO<sub>2</sub>, and CH<sub>3</sub>OO). Together with formaldehyde, which is a source of odd-hydrogen radicals, they are also precursors of odd-oxygen (e.g., O3, O, and NO<sub>2</sub>) [Logan et al., 1981; Kleinman, 1986, 1991]. Both oddhydrogen and odd-oxygen families are important oxidizing species that determine the distribution and abundance of reactive trace gases in the atmosphere and vice versa [National Academy of Sciences (NAS), 1984]. If H2O2, organic hydroperoxide, and CH<sub>2</sub>O are directly produced from biomass burning, then their photolysis would enhance radical production near the fire and would affect the oxidizing capacity of the atmosphere [Thompson, 1992]. The TRACE A measurements indicate the potential for their direct production from biomass burning and the need to investigate the degree and extent to which biomass fires affect H2O2, organic hydroperoxide, and formaldehyde and consequently may affect atmospheric oxidants. In this paper we hypothesize the direct production of hydroperoxide and formaldehyde from biomass burning and test this hypothesis with data obtained from three fire flights during TRACE A (flights 6 and 7 over Brazil and flight 10 over Africa) and a limited number of test biomass burns performed at the University of Rhode Island (URI) Bay campus.

#### 2. Observed Hydroperoxide and Formaldehyde in TRACE A

We measured H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and organic hydroperoxide species with high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) system mounted in the NASA DC-8 aircraft during TRACE A. The details about the measurement scheme are supplied by *Lee et al.* [1995]. Formaldehyde was measured during TRACE A by using the method of *Lazrus et al.* [1988] as implemented by *Heikes* [1992] and *Heikes et al.* [1996b]. TRACE A was conducted in September-October 1992. Its primary objective was to investigate the cause of a seasonal tropospheric ozone maximum over the South Atlantic observed when biomass burning is the most prevalent in South America and Africa [*Fishman*, 1994; *Fishman et al.*, 1996]. A comprehensive set of chemical and meteorological data was obtained during 17 flights over the South Atlantic, Brazil, and southern Africa, including several flights within and downwind of fire plumes [*Fishman et al.*, 1996].

Three of 17 flights were made specifically to collect air samples over the biomass burning source regions.  $H_2O_2$ , CH<sub>3</sub>OOH, and CH<sub>2</sub>O concentrations were elevated in and near burning plumes and observed up to 10 ppbv, 2 ppbv, and 5 ppbv, respectively. These are extremely high values for H2O2 compared with those from undisturbed background conditions and from theoretical model values, although the CH2O levels are comparable to those observed in urban environments. CH<sub>3</sub>OOH was only slightly enhanced in the plumes, and other organic such as hydroxymethyl hydroperoxide hydroperoxides (HOCH<sub>2</sub>OOH: HMHP) and 1-hydroxyethyl hydroperoxide (CH<sub>3</sub>CH(OH)OOH: 1-HEHP) were sporadically detected during flights 6 and 10. Additional results related to H2O2, CH3OOH, and CH<sub>2</sub>O from this experiment can be found elsewhere [e.g., Jacob et al., 1996; Heikes et al., 1996c; Lee et al., 1996].

#### 3. Test of Hypothesis

## 3.1. Comparison of Observed Data With Photochemical Model Result

Figure 1 shows the observed concentrations of  $H_2O_2$ , CH<sub>3</sub>OOH, and CH<sub>2</sub>O versus their model values for the three flights near fires: flights 6, 7, and 10. A merged data set indexed



Figure 1. Observed concentrations of  $H_2O_2$ ,  $CH_3OOH$ , and  $CH_2O$  compared with those predicted in the model for three flights (flights 6 and 7 over Brazil and flight 10 over Africa) in TRACE A. The x axis is the observed concentrations, and the y axis is those predicted from photochemical model: (a)  $H_2O_2$ , (b)  $CH_3OOH$ , and (c)  $CH_2O$ . Solid lines indicate a one-to-one ratio between observed concentrations and model values.

to hydroperoxide data [Jacob et al., 1996] was used in this analysis. The lines indicate a one-to-one ratio between observed and predicted values. Below 5000 pptv of  $H_2O_2$  and 1000 pptv of CH<sub>3</sub>OOH these species appear to be near photochemical equilibrium. Above these observed concentrations, however, model values remain nearly constant, leading to greater differences between the two results at higher concentrations. This finding implies that photochemical production is insufficient to support the observed high concentrations of H2O2 and an additional source is needed. Although the case for CH<sub>3</sub>OOH is visually weaker, Figure 1b suggests CH3OOH may also require an additional source above 1000 pptv. The higher concentrations of CH<sub>2</sub>O above 2000 pptv are not displayed in Figure 1c because of the lack of overlap between model and observed data due to the absence of other key chemical parameters needed by the model. However, there is a tendency for theoretical values to fall short of those observed, and an additional source would be necessary.

The observed hydroperoxide and formaldehyde data can be compared with those calculated from a photochemical point model. In general, agreement between observed and predicted results lies within the uncertainties of the measurement and the model calculation [Davis et al., 1996; Jacob et al., 1996]. However, a divergence between model and measurements was noted when high concentrations were observed immediately over biomass burning regions with observed values substantially higher than those predicted. Low model values suggest either missing sources or an overestimate of the sink for these species in fire plumes. An overestimate does not seem plausible, since the deposition of both hydroperoxide and formaldehyde, which is an important removal process for these species, was not included in the model. Further, reduction of OH and photolysis, the primary photochemical sinks for these species, also reduces their production with the resulting concentrations of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>3</sub>OOH, and CH<sub>2</sub>O being little changed. Consequently, additional sources are needed to resolve the deviations between model and observed data over biomass fire source regions.

Direct production in biomass fires could cause the increased concentrations of these species in and near plumes. This possibility was not considered in the model. However, there may be short-lived hydrocarbons produced from biomass fires which were not measured during the experiment and which would have been oxidized prior to sampling of the plume by the aircraft. Peroxides might have been enhanced by photochemical reactions involving these hydrocarbons. This theory was also not taken into account in the model. Thus we could not exclusively rule out secondary photochemical production as an additional source for these species.

### 3.2. Correlation of Hydroperoxide and Formaldehyde With Other Measured Species

CO and CO<sub>2</sub> are often used to characterize biomass fires and to estimate the emissions of other species [Levine et al., 1991; Lobert et al., 1991]. If H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>3</sub>OOH, and CH<sub>2</sub>O are directly produced, then they should be significantly correlated with them. The emission of a species X can be related to the emission of CO<sub>2</sub> through an emission ratio, ER, defined by

$$ER(X) = \frac{\Delta X}{\Delta CO_2}$$

where  $\Delta X$  is the excess concentration of species X produced by biomass burning over background and  $\Delta CO_2$  is the excess concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> produced by biomass burning over background. Since the emissions of gases are dependent on the stage of burning (flaming or smoldering), CO is also used as a reference gas in calculating emission ratios,  $ER' = \Delta X/\Delta CO$  [Lobert et al., 1991]. There are no data for the direct emission of hydroperoxides from biomass burning. For CH<sub>2</sub>O, Griffith et al. [1991] made measurements in several prescribed fires and calculated the emission ratio of CH<sub>2</sub>O relative to CO<sub>2</sub>. From ambient measurements of hydroperoxide, formaldehyde, CO, and CO<sub>2</sub> in TRACE A, emission ratio could not be determined, because measurements were not confined to fire plumes. In this study the enhancement ratio derived from the slope of the linear regression between the target species and either CO or CO<sub>2</sub> was



Figure 2. Plot of CO versus  $CO_2$  for each flight. Solid lines are linear fitting between CO and  $CO_2$ , and the slope of the line corresponds to the enhancement ratio of CO relative to  $CO_2$ . Data below 5 km were included in this analysis through Figure 5.

| Figure <sup>a</sup> | Species  | r <sup>2 b</sup> | p °                 | N <sup>d</sup> | Slope <sup>e</sup>            |
|---------------------|--|------------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|
|                     |  | Flight 6         |                     |                |                               |
| 2                   | CO versus CO <sub>2</sub>                                | 0.9056           | 3*10 <sup>-14</sup> | 27             | 3.1*10 <sup>-2</sup>          |
| 3                   | H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> versus CO                  | 0.5004           | 4*10 <sup>-5</sup>  | 27             | 1.4*10 <sup>-2</sup>          |
| 3                   | CH <sub>3</sub> OOH versus CO                            | 0.3200           | 2*10 <sup>-3</sup>  | 27             | 2.1*10 <sup>-3</sup>          |
| 3                   | CH <sub>2</sub> O versus CO                              | 0.8808           | 6*10 <sup>-5</sup>  | 10             | 8.8*10 <sup>-3</sup>          |
| 5                   | CH <sub>2</sub> O versus CO <sub>2</sub>                 | 0.9031           | 3*10 <sup>-5</sup>  | 10             | 3.1*10 <sup>-4</sup>          |
| 4                   | H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> versus CH <sub>3</sub> OOH | 0.4683           | 8*10 <sup>-5</sup>  | 27             | 3.7                           |
|                     |  | Flight 7         |                     |                |                               |
| 2                   | CO versus CO <sub>2</sub>                                | 0.8487           | 2*10 <sup>-13</sup> | 31             | 1.4*10 <sup>-2</sup>          |
| 3                   | H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> versus CO                  | 0.2765           | 2*10 <sup>-3</sup>  | 31             | 4.6*10 <sup>-2</sup>          |
| 3                   | CH <sub>3</sub> OOH versus CO                            | 0.1665           | 2*10 <sup>-2</sup>  | 31             | 4.0*10 <sup>-3</sup>          |
| 3                   | CH <sub>2</sub> O versus CO                              | 0.8834           | 7*10 <sup>-9</sup>  | 18             | 1.9*10 <sup>-2</sup>          |
| 5                   | CH <sub>2</sub> O versus CO <sub>2</sub>                 | 0.5940           | 2*10 <sup>-4</sup>  | 18             | 4.1*10 <sup>-4</sup>          |
| 4                   | H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> versus CH <sub>3</sub> OOH | 0.7499           | 2*10 <sup>-10</sup> | 32             | 7.6                           |
|                     |  | Flight 10        |                     |                |                               |
| 2                   | CO versus CO <sub>2</sub>                                | 0.9314           | 4*10 <sup>-13</sup> | 22             | 6.7*10 <sup>-2</sup>          |
| 3                   | $H_2O_2$ versus $CO$                                     | 0.8094           | 2*10 <sup>-9</sup>  | 24             | 1.1*10 <sup>-2</sup>          |
| 3                   | CH <sub>3</sub> OOH versus CO                            | 0.6884           | 5*10 <sup>-7</sup>  | 24             | 2.2*10 <sup>-3</sup>          |
| 3                   | CH <sub>2</sub> O versus CO                              | 0.8541           | 2*10 <sup>-5</sup>  | 12             | 7.0*10 <sup>-3</sup>          |
| 5                   | CH <sub>2</sub> O versus CO <sub>2</sub>                 | 0.7038           | 3*10 <sup>-4</sup>  | 13             | 4.7 <b>*</b> 10 <sup>-4</sup> |
| 4                   | H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> versus CH <sub>3</sub> OOH | 0.9581           | 0                   | 25             | 4.3                           |

Table 1. Summary of Linear Regression

<sup>a</sup> Corresponding figure.

<sup>b</sup> Correlation coefficient of linear regression.

<sup>c</sup> Linear correlation is significant at any confidence level greater than this p value.

<sup>a</sup> Number of samples included.

<sup>e</sup> Enhancement ratio of species relative to CO or CO<sub>2</sub>.

used to estimate fire production of species X per unit CO or CO<sub>2</sub>. Data below 5 km were included in this analysis.

CO is plotted versus  $CO_2$  for each flight (Figure 2). There is a significant linear correlation between CO and CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations, and the slope of the linear regression corresponds to the enhancement ratio of CO relative to CO2. Correlation coefficients, their significance, and enhancement ratios are listed in Table 1 for flights 6, 7, and 10. The enhancement ratio of CO is different for each flight. It is the lowest in flight 7 and the highest in flight 10. This finding implies that the quality of the fires sampled by each flight is different: a low ratio indicates high temperature and more oxygen availability, and a high ratio indicates low temperature and less oxygen availability [Hegg et al., 1990; Lobert et al., 1991]. Because of indicated fire variability, all correlations between measured species were made separately for each flight. CO was used as the combustion reference for the enhancement ratios of hydroperoxide and formaldehyde, because the enhancement signal of CO from biomass burning is stronger in relation to its background concentrations, whereas that of  $CO_2$  is weaker in relation to its background level.

**3.2.1.** Hydroperoxide.  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  concentrations from the three flights are plotted versus CO in Figure 3. It can be seen that the concentrations of  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  increase with increasing CO concentration. Interpretation of  $H_2O_2$  versus CO can be confounded by  $H_2O$ , because much of  $H_2O_2$  variance has been explained in terms of  $H_2O$  [Luria et al., 1989; Tremmel et al., 1993]. These two hydroperoxides are also significantly correlated within the subset of fire data for each flight (Figure 4). Table 1 lists the  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  enhancement ratio for each flight. The  $H_2O_2$  to CO enhancement ratio was  $1-5x10^{-2}$ , and that for  $CH_3OOH$  was  $2-4x10^{-3}$ . Both  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  are highly enhanced relative to CO in flight 7 compared to the other

two flights, and the relative enhancement of  $H_2O_2$  to  $CH_3OOH$ ( $\Delta H_2O_2/\Delta CH_3OOH$ ) is also the highest in flight 7, about twice that of flight 6 or 10 (Table 1). Also, it should be noted that organic hydroperoxides such as HMHP and 1-HEHP were detected in plumes from flights 6 and 10 but not in flight 7. From these observations the production of hydroperoxide appears to be subject to fire conditions.

The different enhancement ratios of CO to  $CO_2$  could be a clue for different enhancements of hydroperoxides between flights. This ratio is a proxy for fire temperature with a low ratio indicating high temperature [Lobert et al., 1991]. This ratio is lowest in flight 7, so the fire plumes in flight 7 should be hottest. Because the enhancement of CO is greatest in flight 10 and because the concentrations of aerosol and CH<sub>3</sub>COOH, which are known to be produced from smoldering fires [Andreae, 1993], also increased with those of CO (not shown), flight 10 has the most consistent smoldering fire signature of the three flights. It is likely that the production of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> is more favorable than that of organic hydroperoxide at high temperature, as discussed below.

 $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  are correlated with  $CH_3Cl$ , aerosol,  $C_2H_2$ , HCOOH,  $CH_3COOH$ , and HNO<sub>3</sub>. These species are all indicators of biomass burning [*Crutzen and Andreae*, 1990; *Radke et al.*, 1991; *Helas et al.*, 1992; *Andreae*, 1993].

**3.2.2.** CH<sub>2</sub>O. Figure 3 and Table 1 show CH<sub>2</sub>O to be correlated with CO. CH<sub>2</sub>O concentrations linearly increase with CO concentrations, and the correlation coefficients approach the significance level of those found between CO and CO<sub>2</sub>. The CH<sub>2</sub>O to CO enhancement ratio ranged from  $7x10^{-3}$  to  $19x10^{-3}$  and is the greatest for flight 7.

Griffith et al. [1991] determined the emission ratio of  $CH_2O$  relative to  $CO_2$  in four biomass fires. Their values were 1.9- $2.3 \times 10^{-3}$  and remained constant during the course of the fires.



Figure 3. Plots of (a)  $H_2O_2$ , (b) CH<sub>3</sub>OOH, and (c) CH<sub>2</sub>O versus CO for each flight. The slope of the solid line is the enhancement ratio of these species relative to CO.

For comparison,  $\Delta CH_2O/\Delta CO_2$  was also calculated for each flight. These values were  $3.1-4.7 \times 10^{-4}$  (Table 1 and Figure 5), lower than those of *Griffith et al.* [1991]. Our CO enhancement ratios to  $CO_2$  ( $1.4-6.7 \times 10^{-2}$ ) were also lower than those of *Griffith et al.* [1991] (0.14-0.2). The correlation of CH<sub>2</sub>O with other species such as CH<sub>3</sub>Cl and aerosol were more significant than those for H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>3</sub>OOH.

This analysis provided convincing evidence for the direct production of CH<sub>2</sub>O from fires. For hydroperoxide, however, secondary photochemical production through short-lived hydrocarbons seems to remain as a possible alternative to direct production.

#### 3.3. Fire Experiment

To determine whether hydrogen peroxide, organic hydroperoxide species, and formaldehyde are directly produced from biomass burning, three sets of simple burning experiments were performed at the URI Bay campus in the summer of 1995. The emissions from 13 fires using charcoal, straw, or wood as fuel were sampled for  $H_2O_2$ , organic hydroperoxide, and  $CH_2O$ . The methods employed were the same as those used in TRACE A. The results are shown in Table 2. Direct  $CH_2O$  production by fire was always observed.  $H_2O_2$  production observed during the fires was more variable than  $CH_2O$  production.  $CH_3OOH$ 



showed the least and most various production by fires. High concentrations of organic hydroperoxides such as hydroxymethyl hydroperoxide, ethyl hydroperoxide, peroxyacetic acid, and 1hydroxyethyl hydroperoxide were sporadically observed during burning. The maximum concentrations of CH2O, H2O2, and organic hydroperoxide species were not observed simultaneously in time during the course of a fire. Qualitatively, the CH2O maximum was >10 times that of  $H_2O_2$  and >50 times that of CH<sub>3</sub>OOH.  $H_2O_2$  maximum was >5 times that of CH<sub>3</sub>OOH. The results of the charcoal, straw, and wood fires clearly demonstrate the direct production of H2O2, organic hydroperoxides, and CH2O from biomass burning. A CO instrument problem precluded our calculation of emission ratios, and these must be left for future experiments. Extreme care must be exercised in such experiments to prevent condensation in the sample lines from the production of water by fire.

#### 4. Mechanisms for the Direct Formation of Hydroperoxide and Formaldehyde **From Biomass Burning**

In combustion processes, hydroperoxides can be produced by the following reactions [Barnard and Bradley, 1984; Gardiner, 1984; Hucknall, 1985; Lewis and von Elbe, 1987]:

- (R1)  $RH + O_2 \rightarrow R + HO_2$
- $RH \rightarrow R + H$ (R2)
- (R3)
- $\begin{array}{l} R + O_2 \rightarrow RO_2 \\ R + O_2 \rightarrow Alkene + HO_2 \end{array}$ (R4)



Figure 4. Linear regression between  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  for each flight.



Figure 5. Plot of  $CH_2O$  versus  $CO_2$  for each flight. The slope of the solid line is the enhancement ratio of  $CH_2O$  relative to  $CO_2$ .

| (R5)         | $HO_2$ | $+ RH \rightarrow$ | $H_2O_2 + R$ |   |
|--------------|--------|--------------------|--------------|---|
| A 100 A 10 A |        |                    |              | - |

- $(\mathbf{R6}) \qquad \mathbf{HO}_2 + \mathbf{HO}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_2\mathbf{O}_2 + \mathbf{O}_2$
- (R7)  $HO_2 + CH_2O \rightarrow H_2O_2 + CHO$
- (R8)  $H_2 \bar{O_2} \rightarrow 2 \bar{O} H$
- (R9)  $R\tilde{O}_2 + R'H \rightarrow ROOH + R'$
- $(R10) \qquad RO_2 + HO_2 \rightarrow ROOH + O_2$
- $(R11) \qquad ROOH \rightarrow RO + OH$
- (R12) RCH=R'CH +  $O_2 \rightarrow RCOH + R'COH$
- (R13)  $\operatorname{RCH}_2\operatorname{O} + \operatorname{O}_2 \to \operatorname{RCOH} + \operatorname{HO}_2$

where RH is alkane, R is alkyl radical, RO is alkoxy radical, and  $RO_2$  is alkyl peroxy radical. These are examples which only include simple alkane chemistry. At high temperatures over

200°C, the backward reaction of (R3) is more favorable than the forward reaction. The organic hydroperoxide formed through (R9) and (R10) is also more prone to thermal decomposition through (R11) at high temperature. Therefore organic hydroperoxides can be an important intermediate only at lower temperature ( $T < 200^{\circ}$ C). As temperature increases, (R4) is more important than (R3), producing HO<sub>2</sub> radicals and leading to the formation of  $H_2O_2$  by (R5) and (R6). The decomposition of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> by (R8) occurs at temperatures above 400°C. At temperatures higher than 500°C, CH<sub>2</sub>O can react with HO<sub>2</sub> and produce  $H_2O_2$ . Therefore  $H_2O_2$  has a greater probability for formation and a lower probability for decomposition than organic hydroperoxides at higher temperatures. Consequently, more  $H_2O_2$ than CH<sub>2</sub>OOH would be expected in high-temperature fires. The observed trend of hydroperoxide enhancement in TRACE A and our fire experiments fits this expectation.

There are multiple paths leading to  $CH_2O$  formation during combustion processes (e.g., (R12) and (R13)), and  $CH_2O$  formation occurs over a wide range of fire temperature [Barnard and Bradley, 1984; Gardiner, 1984; Hucknall, 1985; Lewis and von Elbe, 1987]. Hence  $CH_2O$  is apt to be formed with less depedence on fire quality than hydroperoxides. This finding is consistent with observed data from both TRACE A and our fire experiments.

#### 5. Atmospheric Implication

Hydroperoxides are reservoirs of odd-hydrogen radicals by their formation and subsequent photolysis. Their removal by wet and dry deposition and reaction with OH is a significant radical sink in the troposphere [Logan et al., 1981; Kleinman, 1986]. If these species are produced directly through processes other than photochemical reactions, however, they can contribute as a direct source of radicals. This study presents evidence for a direct source of hydroperoxide and formaldehyde from biomass burning. The production of odd-hydrogen radicals from the direct source of these species can be estimated from the enhancement ratios relative to CO, CO enhancements, and photolysis rates of  $H_2O_2$ , CH<sub>3</sub>OOH, and CH<sub>2</sub>O. For three fire flights, approximately 30% of the total odd-hydrogen radical production in the lower troposphere near fires may be due to their direct emission.

Since odd-hydrogen radicals are indispensable to make new odd-oxygen radicals, the direct production of these species can affect ozone and the odd-oxygen cycle. The effect of enhanced hydroperoxide and formaldehyde due to biomass burning in TRACE A is to increase odd-hydrogen and odd-oxygen radicals and thus increase the oxidation capacity of the atmosphere [Lee et al., 1996]. The extent and mechanism of their direct production need to be critically determined through additional laboratory experiments before the global consequence of biomass burning can be evaluated.

#### 6. Conclusion

In TRACE A, hydroperoxide and formaldehyde were highly elevated in and near biomass fires. These high concentrations were not explained by photochemical production alone and suggested that an additional source was required. This tendency is clear for  $H_2O_2$  and relatively less clear for both  $CH_3OOH$  and  $CH_2O$ . The correlations of  $CH_2O$  with CO are excellent, providing strong evidence for the direct production of  $CH_2O$  from biomass burning.  $H_2O_2$  and  $CH_3OOH$  are moderately correlated with CO. The enhancement ratio relative to CO was  $1-5x10^{-2}$ ,  $2-4x10^{-3}$ , and  $7-17x10^{-3}$  for  $H_2O_2$ ,  $CH_3OOH$ , and  $CH_2O$ , respectively. From simple fire experiments using charcoal, straw, and wood as fuel, these species were observed to be highly enhanced in comparison with ambient levels. These experiments support

| Fuel     | Number of   | CH <sub>2</sub> O                  |   | H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> |                                  | СН <sub>3</sub> ООН   |                                  | Other ROOH <sup>a</sup>          |
|----------|-------------|------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|          | Experiments | Number<br>of<br>Fires <sup>b</sup> | Maximum<br>Concentration<br>ppbv <sup>c</sup> | Number<br>of<br>Fires         | Maximum<br>Concentration<br>ppbv | Number<br>of<br>Fires | Maximum<br>Concentration<br>ppbv | Observed Species<br>During Fires |
| Charcoal | 7           | 6                                  | 600   | 4                             | 50                               | 4                     | 11                               | HMHP, EHP, U                     |
| Straw    | 2           | 2                                  | 700   | 2                             | 32                               | 2                     | 6.3                              | PAA, 1-HEHP, U                   |
| Wood     | 4           | 4                                  | 650   | 2                             | 55                               | 3                     | 2.4                              | PAA, EHP, 1-HEHP                 |

Table 2. Fire Experiments at the University of Rhode Island Bay Campus

Experiments were preformed at the University of Rhode Island Bay Campus in July-August 1995.

<sup>a</sup> HMHP, hydroxymethyl hydroperoxide; EHP, ethyl hydroperoxide; PAA, peroxyacetic acid; 1-HEHP, 1-hydroxyethyl hydroperoxide; and U, unidentified peroxide.

<sup>b</sup> Number of fire experiments in which elevated concentrations (at least 3 times higher than ambient levels) of each species were observed. <sup>c</sup> Maximum concentrations observed during fires.

the hypothesis that hydroperoxide and formaldehyde are directly produced from biomass fires. The data obtained from TRACE A and fire experiments also comply with possible mechanisms for direct production of hydroperoxide and formaldehyde during combustion processes. In TRACE A the photolysis of these species produced from fires accounted for about 30% of the total radical production, which is to be a direct source of odd-hydrogen radicals in the troposphere. Thus further study needs to be carried out to determine the mechanism of production and emission factors of these species.

Acknowledgments. The TRACE A experiment was supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration through the Global Tropospheric Experiment program. The authors thank all participants in TRACE A for their support and help. M.L. and B.G.H. specially thank Kara Nakata for her work in fire experiments performed in the URI Bay campus through the Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship in Oceanography sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

#### References

- Andreae, M. A., The influence of tropical biomass burning on climate and the atmospheric environment, in *Biogeochemistry of Global Change*, edited by R. S. Oremland, pp. 113-150, Chapman and Hall, New York, 1993.
- Barnard, J. A., and J. N. Bradley, *Flame and Combustion*, 2nd ed., 380 pp., Chapman and Hall, New York, 1984.
- Cicerone, R. J., Fire, atmospheric chemistry, and the ozone layer, Science, 263, 1243-1245, 1994.
- Crutzen, P. J., and M. O. Andreae, Biomass burning in the tropics: Impact on atmospheric chemistry and biogeochemical cycles, *Science*, 250, 1669-1678, 1990.
- Davis, D. D., et al., Assessment of ozone photochemistry in the western North Pacific as inferred from PEM-West A observations during the fall 1991, J. Geophys. Res., 101, 2111-2134, 1996.
- Fishman, J., Experiment probes elevated ozone levels over the tropical South Atlantic Ocean, *Eos Trans. AGU, 33, 380, 1994.*
- Fishman, J., J. M. Hoell Jr., R. D. Bendura, V. W. J. H. Kirchhoff, and R. J. McNeal Jr., NASA GTE TRACE A experiment (September-October 1992): Overview, J. Geophys. Res., in press, 1996.
- Gardiner, W. C., Jr., Combustion Chemistry, 509 pp., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.
- Griffith, D. W. T., W. G. Mankin, M. T. Coffey, D. E. Ward, and A. Riebau, FTIR remote sensing of biomass burning emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, CH<sub>4</sub>, CH<sub>2</sub>O, NO, NO<sub>2</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O, in *Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric, Climatic and Biospheric Implications*, edited by J. S. Levine, pp. 3-21, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1991.
- Hegg, D. A., L. A. Radke, P. V. Hobbs, R. A. Rasmussen, and P. J. Riggan, Emission of some trace gases from biomass burning, J. Geophys. Res., 95, 5669-5675, 1990.
- Heikes, B. G., Formaldehyde and hydroperoxides at Mauna Loa Observatory, J. Geophys. Res., 97, 18001-18013, 1992.
- Heikes, B. G., M. Lee, J. Bradshaw, S. Sandholm, D. D. Davis, W. Chameides, H. Rodriguez, S. Liu, and S. McKeen, Hydrogen peroxide

and methyl hydroperoxide distributions related to ozone and odd hydrogen over the North Pacific in the fall of 1991, J. Geophys. Res., 101, 1891-1905, 1996a.

- Heikes, B. G., et al., Formaldehyde methods comparison in the remote lower troposphere during Mauna Loa Photochemistry Experiment 2, J. Geophys. Res., 101, 14741-14755, 1996b.
- Heikes, B. G., M. Lee, D. J. Jacob, R. Talbot, J. Bradshaw, H. Singh, D. Blake, B. Anderson, H. Fuelberg, and A. M. Thompson, Ozone, hydroperoxides, oxides of nitrogen, and hydrocarbon budgets in the marine boundary layer over the South Atlantic, J. Geophys. Res., in press, 1996c.
- Helas, G., H. Bingemer, and M. O. Andreae, Organic acid over Africa: Results from DECAFE 88, J. Geophys. Res., 97, 6187-6193, 1992.
- Hucknall, D.J., Chemistry of Hydrocarbon Combustion, 415 pp., Chapman and Hall, New York, 1985.
- International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), International Global Atmospheric Chemistry (IGAC) Project: The Operational Plan, International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) Rep. 32, 134 pp., Stockholm, 1994.
- Jacob, D. J., et al., Origin of ozone and NO<sub>x</sub> in the tropical troposphere: A photochemical analysis of aircraft observations over the South Atlantic basin, J. Geophys. Res., in press, 1996.
- Kleinman, L. I., Photochemical formation of peroxides in the boundary layer, J. Geophys. Res., 91, 10889-10904, 1986.
- Kleinman, L. I., Seasonal dependence of boundary layer peroxide concentrations: The low and the high NO<sub>x</sub> regimes, J. Geophys. Res., 96, 20721-20733, 1991.
- Lazrus, A. L., K. L. Fong, and J. A. Lind, Automated fluorometric determination of formaldehyde in air, Anal. Chem., 60, 1074-1078, 1988.
- Lee, M., B. C. Noone, D. O'Sullivan, and B. G. Heikes, Method for the collection and HPLC analysis of hydrogen peroxide and C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub> hydroperoxides in the atmosphere, J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol., 12, 1060-1070, 1995.
- Lee, M., B. G. Heikes, and D. J. Jacob, Enhancements of hydroperoxides and formaldehyde in biomass burning impacted air and their effect on atmospheric oxidant cycles, J. Geophys. Res., in press, 1996.
- Levine, J. S. (Ed.), Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric, Climatic and Biospheric Implications, 569 pp., MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1991.
- Levine, J. S., W. R. Cofer III, E. L. Winstead, R. P. Rhinehart, D. R. Cahoon Jr., D. I. Seacher, S. Sebacher, and B. J. Stocks, Biomass burning: Combustion emissions, satellite imagery, and biogenic emissions, in *Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric, Climatic and Biospheric Implications*, edited by J. S. Levine, pp. 264-271, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1991.
- Lewis, B., and G. von Elbe, Combustion, Flames and Explosion of Gases, 3rd ed., Academic, San Diego, Calif., 1987.
- Lobert, J. M., D. H. Scharffe, W. M. Hao, T. A. Kuhlbusch, R. Seuwen, P. Warneck, and P. J. Crutzen, Experimental evaluation of biomass burning emissions: Nitrogen and carbon containing compounds, in *Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric, Climatic and Biospheric Implications*, edited by J. S. Levine, pp. 289-304, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1991.
  Logan, J. A., M. J. Prather, S. C. Wofsy, and M. B. McElroy, Tropo-
- Logan, J. A., M. J. Prather, S. C. Wofsy, and M. B. McElroy, Tropospheric chemistry : A global perspective, J. Geophys. Res., 86, 7210-7254, 1981.

- Luria, M., C. C. Van Valin, J. F. Boatman, and J. D. Ray, The relationship between ozone and hydrogen peroxide: Field observation and model evaluation, in *Ozone in the Atmosphere*, edited by R. D. Bojkov and P. Fabian, pp. 471-476, A. Deepak, Hampton, Va., 1989.
- Manö, S., and M. A. Andreae, Emission of methyl bromide from biomass burning, Science, 263, 1255-1256, 1994.
- Mitchell, J. F., The "greenhouse effect" and climate change, Rev. Geophys., 27, 115-139, 1989.
- National Academy of Sciences (NAS), Global Tropospheric Chemistry: A Plan for Action, 194 pp., National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington, D. C., 1984.
- Radke, L. F., D. A. Hegg, P. V. Hobbs, J. D. Nance, J. H. Lyons, K. K. Laursen, R. E. Weiss, P. J. Riggan, and D. E. Ward, Particulate and trace gas emissions from large biomass fires in North America, in Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric, Climatic and Biospheric Implications, edited by J. S. Levine, pp. 209-224, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1991.
- Rodriguez, J. M., M. K. W. Ko, N. D. Sze, and C. W. Heisey, Impact of biomass burning on tropospheric CO and OH: A two-dimensional study, in *Global Biomass Burning: Atmospheric, Climatic and Biospheric Implications*, edited by J. S. Levine, pp. 351-359, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1991.

- Thompson, A. M., The oxidizing capacity of the Earth's atmosphere: Probable past and future changes, *Science*, 256, 1157-1165, 1992.
  Tremmel, H. G., W. Junkermann, F. Slemr, and U. Platt, On the distri-
- Iremmel, H. G., W. Junkermann, F. Slemr, and U. Platt, On the distribution of hydrogen peroxide in the lower troposphere over the northeastern United States during late summer 1988, J. Geophys. Res., 98, 1083-1099, 1993.

B. G. Heikes and M. Lee, Center for Atmospheric Chemistry Study, Graduate School of Oceanography, Narragansett, RI 02882. (e-mail: zagar@notos.gso.uri.edu; meehye@notos.gso.uri.edu)

D. J. Jacob, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138. (e-mail: djj@io.harvard.edu)

(Received January 3, 1996; revised May 18, 1996; accepted May 28, 1996.)

B. Anderson and G. Sachse, NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA 23665. (e-mail: b.e.anderson@larc.nasa.gov; g.w.sachse@ larc.nasa.gov)