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A Research Machine

My first introduction to the proton transfer reaction mass spectrometer manufactured by Kore Technology Ltd. was at the premises of Smiths Industries in Watford. This was the instrument which the Molecular Physics group at the University of Birmingham was to have on permanent loan. From the description of Smith's attempts to use it, it occurred to me that it was going to take at least six months to get this working satisfactorily. In the event, it took about a year from delivery to get accurate and useful data.

Had the instrument been fully working, I would not have learned nearly so much about its intricacies and it would have seemed much more of a 'black box'. However, the process of discovering the instrument’s features, as well as being able to see its separate functional units, gave a much better feel for how it works: I compare this with the Ionicon Analytik GmbH PTR-Quad-MS in our laboratory which is contained in a washing-machine-sized metal housing from which no conceptual model can be assembled and expertise in its use was already available.

I found the PTR-TOF-MS by turns frustrating, challenging and, occasionally, a joy to work with; for example, my delight on seeing, for the very first time, the pattern presented by the isotopes of chlorine in trichlorobenzene. And then the surprise in seeing an unexpected spectrum from a dichlorobenzene sample only to realise that I had used a deuterated version of the chemical instead of the usual non-deuterated version. Both of these examples are illustrated below.

**Delight:** The spectrum of trichlorobenzene extracted from a calibration gas spectrum at $E/N = 140$ Td, TCB is present at 100 ppbV ±10%. (parts per billion by volume)

**Surprise:** Seeing the spectrum on the left instead of the expected outline on the right. The mass spec. never lies!!
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Abstract

This work concerns a proton transfer reaction time-of-flight mass spectrometer, PTR-TOF-MS, a bespoke model manufactured by Kore Technology Ltd. for Smiths Detection. This instrument achieves 'soft' ionization of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) by proton transfer from protonated water vapour in a reaction chamber at 1 mbar (= 100 Pa). The resulting ions are separated by mass in a field-free time-of-flight tube prior to detection by a multi-channel plate. The instrument was modified to facilitate direct determination of the electric field in the reaction chamber.

Sensitivity measurements determined a value of 4-6 counts per second per parts per billion by volume (ncps ppbv⁻¹) normalised to 10⁶ H₃O⁺. The calibration gas mixture used in this investigation consisted of 14 compounds, (alkylbenzenes and chlorobenzenes) spanning an m/z range of 78 to 180. Each of these was separately investigated over E/N = 90 to 245 Td to establish fragmentation behaviour and possible interfering contributions. For example, several of the alkylbenzenes fragmented to product ions occurring at m/z 79, the same value as that of protonated benzene. Most of this occurred at the higher E/N values with ethylbenzene a notable exception. The isobaric compounds ethyl benzene and the xylenes exhibit very different fragmentation patterns so enabling differentiation of these two compounds. However, it is not possible to distinguish the individual xylene isomers using this method.

Benchmarking was continued using the hexenol compounds cis-3-, cis-2-, trans-3- and trans-2-hexen-1-ols. This work demonstrated that the same four product ions are seen for all of the hexenol isomers at m/z 39 (C₂H₃⁺), 41 (C₃H₅⁺), 55 (C₄H₇⁺) and 83 (C₆H₁₁⁺) when reacted with H₃O⁺ in a PTR-TOF-MS. A characteristic peak at m/z 99 was seen in trans-2-hexen-l-ol and cis-2-hexen-l-ol at low E/N values (< 140 Td) when the protonated parent ion, m/z 101, is absent. In trans-3-hexen-l-ol and cis-3-hexen-l-ol the MH⁺ ion at m/z 101 is seen at these lower E/N values but there is no product ion at m/z 99. This suggests a possible method for distinguishing between the 2- and 3-hexenols. It may also be possible to further identify the individual isomers from the differences in the percentage yield of these product ions.
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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Branching ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTEX</td>
<td>Benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene and xylenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Chlorobenzene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>Collisional induced dissociation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMS</td>
<td>Chemical ionization mass spectrometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cps</td>
<td>Counts per second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCB</td>
<td>Dichlorobenzene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Drift tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVM</td>
<td>Digital voltmeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Electron impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA-SIFT</td>
<td>Flowing afterglow-SIFT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA-TMS</td>
<td>Flowing afterglow-tandem mass spectrometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-MS</td>
<td>Gas chromatography mass spectrometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>Glow discharge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Hydrocarbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPLC</td>
<td>High-performance liquid chromatography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV</td>
<td>High voltage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-</td>
<td>meta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mbar</td>
<td>millibar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>Micro-channel plate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Mass spectrometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncps</td>
<td>Normalised counts per second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-</td>
<td>ortho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-</td>
<td>para</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Proton affinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>Pascal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID</td>
<td>Product ion distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppbv</td>
<td>Parts per billion by volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pptv</td>
<td>Parts per trillion by volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTFE</td>
<td>Polytetrafluoroethylene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR</td>
<td>Proton transfer reaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Source drift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIFT</td>
<td>Selected ion flow tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Standard temperature and pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCB</td>
<td>Trichlorobenzene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOF</td>
<td>Time of flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>Volatile organic compound</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1 Introduction
1.1 Background

Analytical science seeks to investigate the chemical composition and structure of materials in many fields of endeavour. It encompasses the development of new methods and tools, and the analysis and interpretation of data produced. One of the tools with a significant role in this field is the mass spectrometer, an instrument which ionises a substance, generally in gaseous form, and then separates these ions according to their mass-to-charge ratio ($m/z$). The ions reach a detector and are processed into a spectrum from which identification can be made and structure inferred. There are different techniques for ionising the analyte, e.g. electron impact and chemical ionisation.

The basis of this thesis is the use of a proton transfer reaction - time of flight - mass spectrometer (PTR-TOF-MS), specifically an instrument manufactured by Kore Technology Limited, Ely, UK. PTR-based instruments have been in use since the mid-1990s. There are currently more than 150 operational instruments (Jordan 2009): the majority of these have been manufactured by Ionicon Analytik GmbH, a spin-off company from the Institute of Ion Physics, University of Innsbruck whence the technology originated. Kore instruments are manufactured on a bespoke basis and they are considered to be primarily research tools. Currently, there are approximately 15 Kore PTR-TOF instruments in use. (Kore Technology 2013)

PTR-MS instruments are best used wherever there is a need for the real-time detection and monitoring of trace chemicals in environments (volatile organic compounds or VOCs) where there are many complicating factors, for example, atmospheric pollution or the detection of explosives or drugs. The instrument offers many of the essential characteristics for this type of work: high sensitivity, reduced sample preparation, accuracy and fast response and recovery times.

The research undertaken here aims to exemplify and demonstrate the capabilities of the more unusual Kore time of flight instrument. Consequently, diverse areas have been investigated: food sciences, with a proof-of-principle study of the ageing of pears; environmental studies,
examining the four isomers of hexenol; a detailed investigation into the sensitivity of the instrument which resulted in outcomes with applications in atmospheric chemistry; and a foray into biosciences, looking at quorum-signalling chemicals from bacteria.

1.2 Applications of PTR-TOF-MS Instruments

Prior to the advent of the proton transfer reaction mass spectrometer, the conventional method of identifying VOCs was gas chromatography–mass spectrometry, (GC-MS), or high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC-MS). The advantages of PTR technology over these and other VOC detection methods are:

- It produces a simpler mass spectrum as a result of the lower energy interactions involved in proton transfer as compared with electron ionisation mass spectrometry.

- Reduced sample preparation is required, unlike GC-MS, so simplifying and speeding up the detection process.

- Limit of detection is in the range of parts per trillion by volume (pptv).

- None of the components of air reacts in the instrument, so air can be used as a carrier gas

PTR-MS instruments have consequently become frequently used by many research groups in such diverse applications as medicine: detecting acetonitrile in smokers’ breath (Jordan 1995, Lirk 2003); food: detection of meat spoilage (Mayr 2003, Nhu-Thuc Phan 2012, Heenan 2012); environmental studies: detecting chemicals in typical homes (Jordan 1995), measurement of atmospheric dimethyl sulphide and benzene (Hayward 2002, Inomata 2008, Holzinger 2010), biosciences (Cresp 2011), and security (Mayhew 2010, Agarwal 2011, Whyte 2007). An extended review of additional applications of PTR instruments can be found in Blake et al.’s review (2009) and an up-to-date literature review is available in Ellis and Mayhew 2014.

Until recently, all research studies used a quadrupole mass analyser. Lately, PTR instruments with a time of flight analyser (TOF) have been used (Heenan 2012).
1.3 Development of PTR Instruments

Proton transfer reaction is a method of converting an analyte into positively charged ions by the transfer of a proton so that the sample molecules remain intact for subsequent detection. It is derived from ‘soft’ or chemical ionisation mass spectrometry, (CIMS) introduced by Munson and Field over 40 years ago (Munson 1966) when ion-molecule reaction kinetics were studied by injecting ions into an inert buffer gas that contained a small amount of neutral reactant. This method achieved reactions at thermal or near-thermal collision energies (Fehsenfeld, F. C. et al. 1966) but was found to be unsuitable for complex molecular ions: the lack of any ion selection prior to reaction could produce a variety of secondary ions in the discharge source leading to severe complications in the product analysis. This significant problem led to the introduction of the selected ion flow tube (SIFT) technique (Adams and Smith 1976). It was this early work with SIFT that produced most of the kinetic data that guides PTR-MS work today.

In 1993, Lindinger et al. (1993) used an ion/molecule-reaction mass spectrometer which exploited CIMS and proved to be the forerunner of today’s PTR-MS. The following year they analysed trace organic gases in air (Lagg et al. 1994) using a mass-selected H3O+ (hydronium) source with a flow drift tube, which combines ion transport by carrier gas (flow tube) and electric field (drift tube). As well as providing a means of ion transport, the electric field also increases the average collision velocity of an ion with the buffer gas thereby reducing the clustering of the hydrated hydronium ions H3O+(H2O)n, n = 1,2,3.

This team in Innsbruck continued to develop the approach to producing protonated species, making two further significant changes (Hansel et al. 1995): first, using concepts and methods developed in the 1950’s (Little and von Engel 1954), they used a hollow-cathode discharge source that could generate H3O+ with high efficiency (> 99.5%) without any need for a mass filter. The second innovation was to replace the flow tube with a relatively short drift tube: instead of using a carrier gas to transport VOCs along the tube, the analyte sample was
directly injected into the drift tube and the unreactive components of the air (N₂, O₂, etc.) served as thermalizing agents.

The PTR-MS has distinct advantages over its predecessor, the SIFT-MS: it is a simpler instrument to operate, there being no necessity to select the reagent ion and its main benefit is its improved detection sensitivity of around two orders of magnitude. SIFT-MS has the advantage of being able to select which ions enter the reaction region, theoretically providing a greater range of possible reagent ions. In practice, however, the reagent ions used tend to be the same as those found in the PTR-MS: NO⁺, O₂⁺ and H₃O⁺. The SIFT's great contribution to the field is its ability to work at thermal energies and so measure absolute rate coefficients. The PTR-MS works at higher energies as result of the electric field in the drift tube but generally there is no need to measure absolute rate coefficients for exothermic H₃O⁺ reactions which always occur at the collisional rate, a barrier-less transition. All of the preceding attributes, higher sensitivity, simpler use plus the relatively compact size, have led to a substantial increase in interest in the technique over the past decade (Blake et al. 2009).

Most of the work with PTR techniques has used quadrupole spectrometry. These instruments have several disadvantages in comparison with the time of flight detection method as shown in Table 1.1. The PTR ionisation processes require a protonated reagent which reacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1: Comparison of features PTR-Quad-MS and PTR-TOF-MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass resolution (m/Δm)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mass range</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speed of detection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensitivity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>m/z detection</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

exothermically with the trace gas of interest. The reaction, however, has a low exothermicity, generally resulting in non-dissociative interactions because there is little excess energy
available to fragment the sample gas. This method generally produces simplified spectra and so enables the analysis of complex gas mixtures, in contrast to electron impact ionisation where higher collision energies produce complicated and often impenetrable results.

A complete description of the PTR-MS development and comparisons with the SIFT-MS and PTR-Quad can be found in Ellis and Mayhew 2014.

The work with this PTR-TOF-MS instrument has mostly used protonated water, $H_3O^+$ (hydronium) as the reagent, produced by a plasma discharge in a hollow cathode. Sample molecules, $M$, react with the hydronium in the following way:

$$H_3O^+ + M \rightarrow MH^+ + H_2O$$

This will only occur if $M$ has a higher proton affinity than that of water (691 kJ mol$^{-1}$, where 96.5 kJ mol$^{-1} = 1$ eV)\(^1\). Generally, most organic compounds have a proton affinity greater than that of water, unlike the main components of air which can therefore be used as the buffer gas for such samples. See §2.1, Table 2.1 for proton affinities for some common chemicals. The positively charged sample molecules can then be analysed, for example, using a quadrupole filter or a time of flight tube.

It is possible to calculate the concentration of molecules in the sample, $[M]$, by measuring the ion counts for $[H_3O^+]$ and $[MH^+]$ and using the following equation:

$$[M] = \frac{1}{kt} \frac{[MH^+]}{[H_3O^+]}$$

where: $k = \text{rate coefficient for PTR}$

$t = \text{average time in drift tube (reaction chamber)}$

This equation holds only if the sample gas concentration is very high compared with the density of $H_3O^+$. In practice this means that the number of counts of the reagent ions must not change by more than one or two percent on the introduction of the sample i.e. $MH^+ \ll H_3O^+$ (Hayward et al. 2002).

\(^1\) http://users.mccammon.ucsd.edu/~blu/Research-Handbook/physical-constant.html Accessed 16/05/2013
A detailed description of the PTR-TOF-MS is given in Chapter 2.

1.4 Areas Investigated

1.1.1 Sensitivity
This was an obvious area of investigation for this relatively unusual instrument. The Molecular Physics department at the University of Birmingham has close links with the team using Ionicon’s PTR-MS instruments at the University of Innsbruck (Ionicon Analytik). Hence a comparison of functionality between the instruments used and this Kore Technology manufactured instrument was of interest. The calibration gas used consisted of 14 compounds, (alkylbenzenes and chlorobenzenes) spanning a mass range of 78 to 180.

1.1.2 Benchmarking with Hexenols
The 2010 paper from Demarcke et al. examined two of the four hexenol isomers in a PTR-MS quad. This prompted the investigation of all of the four hexenol isomers.
Chapter 2 The Kore Proton Transfer Reaction Time of Flight Mass Spectrometer

"There are too many degrees of freedom for optimisation to proceed simply by working round the whole set of parameters ... A fairly clear mental model of what is happening inside the system is very useful."

From “An update on our thinking regarding the operation of Kore PTR-TOF-MS”

Kore Technology Ltd. January 2006
2.1 Introduction

Proton transfer reaction mass spectrometry was developed to detect very low concentrations of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in various environments by Lindinger et al. in the mid-1990s at the University of Innsbruck. The technique is comprehensively documented in the literature, from the original paper by Hansel et al. (1995) to that in the review by Blake et al. (2009) and textbook by Ellis and Mayhew (2013). In brief, a proton transfer reaction produces a positively charged ion for subsequent detection in a mass spectrometer, a process which involves exothermic proton transfer between the VOC molecules and H$_3$O$^+$ ions, providing that the VOC has a higher proton affinity than that of water. This is a form of chemical ionisation mass spectrometry, (CIIMS) introduced by Munson and Field over 40 years ago (Munson 1966). Protonated water, H$_3$O$^+$ (hydronium), is produced by a plasma discharge in a hollow cathode. Within the hollow cathode, electron ionisation produces O$^+$, H$^+$, H$_2$O$^+$, OH$^+$ and H$_2$O$^*$. These ions all react with H$_2$O ultimately producing H$_3$O$^+$ (hydronium). There are other methods of producing an ionised reagent, such as a plane electrode dc discharge source (Inomata (2006)) and a radioactive ion source (Hanson et al. (2003)).

H$_3$O$^+$ ions enter a drift tube reactor where they mix with a constant flow of the sample gas at viscous flow pressures of 1-2 mbar. A very small proportion of the contents of the drift tube is sampled through an orifice (400 µm) at the end of the drift tube. These ions are then steered towards the time of flight tube where they travel in a field-free region, arriving at the detector in a sequence dependent on their mass, the lighter molecules arriving before heavier ones. The resulting spectra for the PTR-TOF show counts per second plotted against $m/z$, where $m =$ mass and $z =$ charge. The charge always corresponds to $z = 1$ for this ionisation method.

The energy of this reaction is “soft” meaning that fragmentation of the protonated parent ions is minimized. Generally this produces a less complex mass spectrum as compared with that produced by the more standard technique of creating ions through electron impact which substantially fragments the parent molecular species.
The proton affinity (PA) of water is 691 kJ mol\(^{-1}\) and transfer of the proton from H\(_3\)O\(^+\) occurs only if the analyte has a higher PA than this. Conveniently, many organic species fulfil this criterion whereas the main constituents of air, such as nitrogen, oxygen and carbon dioxide, do not (Table 2.1). Air can therefore act as the buffer gas for the analysis of mixed samples.

### Table 2.1: Proton affinities (PAs) of some common chemicals (NIST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecule</th>
<th>PA /kJ mol(^{-1})</th>
<th>PA /eV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O(_2)</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(_2)</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO(_2)</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methane</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethane</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetylene</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H(_2)O</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H(_2)O(_2))</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetone</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compounds with PA < PA of water do not react with H\(_3\)O\(^+\) in the PTR-MS.

PTR-MS can detect trace gases to parts per trillion by volume (pptv) in seconds. The TOF-MS can achieve a higher mass resolution than the Quad-MS and obtains spectra across the full mass range more quickly. Advantages of the PTR-TOF-MS are primarily its fast response time, high sensitivity and the need for little or no sample preparation.

### 2.2 Instrument Description

The PTR-TOF-MS is a complex instrument consisting of the following systems:

- Hardware - ion source, PTR chamber, TOF source and flight tube, reflectron, detector
- Electronics – control units for hardware
- Heating elements and controls for the inlet and source areas
Vacuum systems for the ion source, source drift and PTR chamber (all at around 1 mbar), transfer section (10\(^{-4}\) mbar) and TOF tube (10\(^{-7}\) mbar), flow rate ~ 100-200 mL/min.

Software in two parts:
  - GRAMS/AI software that is responsible for data acquisition used for producing the spectra
  - A software interface written by Kore through which experimental details are input: mass range, how spectra will be displayed, filenames, calibration, etc.

There are two options for collecting data:

**Single Spectrum**
Data are collected for a set time and a single spectrum is displayed showing the total counts at each \(m/z\) value for the requested mass range. An example of this type of collection is shown in Figure 2.5.

**Time series**
With this method, data are collected, also for a set time but now there is one spectrum for each time interval e.g. for each second. At the end of the collection time a spectrum can be viewed for each time interval as well as a view of the total ion counts’ progression over the whole collection period. It is also possible to see a time progression for any of the \(m/z\) values. An example of this type of collection is shown in Figure 6.15 showing a total ion count for indole for a collection time of 780 s.

The instrument is shown in Figure 2.1 as delivered. It can be divided into four main functional or pressurised sections as shown in the schematic diagram in Figure 2.2.
Figure 2.1: PTR-TOF-MS as delivered

Figure 2.2: PTR-TOF-MS schematic

1. Hollow cathode and source drift at ~1-6 mbar for production of reagent ions H$_3$O$^+$. 
2. Reaction chamber at ~1-2 mbar with viscous flow resulting in many ion/molecule reactions
3. Transfer chamber and optics at ~10$^{-7}$ mbar with no ion/ion reactions
4. Time of flight source, steering section and tube with reflection to improve mass resolution at ~10$^{-7}$ mbar.
2.2.1 Hollow Cathode and Source Drift

Figure 2.3 shows the hollow cathode (glow discharge GD or plasma discharge, historically) and source drift region (SD). This section produces the primary beam of H$_3$O$^+$ ions from the water vapour entering the system through the 'Reagent gas' inlet. Inside the glow discharge hollow cathode (aluminium), a plasma forms that typically operates at 1 to 5 mbar and 400-500 V ultimately producing H$_3$O$^+$ (hydronium) among other ions. These ions move into a short source drift section and then into the PTR reaction chamber or drift tube (DT).

Ideally, H$_3$O$^+$ would be the only ion produced in the hollow cathode region. However, there is some back flow of air from the DT into the hollow cathode, and other species are present, primarily NO$^-$ and O$_2^+$, which do not react with H$_2$O (Blake et al. 2009).

2.2.2 PTR Chamber or Drift Tube

The proton transfer reaction cell (PTR or drift tube, DT) is shown schematically in Figure 2.4. The pressure in this section is ~ 1–2 mbar which results in viscous flow conditions so that there are many collisions between the protonated reagent ions and the neutral analyte molecules, M.

There is an electric field, $E$, along the length of the PTR cell which removes the need for a fast moving carrier gas and therefore powerful pumps, as required for SIFT instrumentation (Blake et al. 2009). Changes in $E$ and the pressure (or temperature) determine the collisional
energy conditions and the population of reagent ion clusters. Both of these concepts are described in the following section.

![Figure 2.4: Schematic of PTR assembly](image)

**Figure 2.4:** Schematic of PTR assembly  
GD = Glow discharge or hollow cathode  
SD = Source drift region  
PTR = Reaction chamber or drift tube (DT)  
(Courtesy of Kore Technology Ltd. manual Z-5851-M)

### 2.2.2.1 Water Clusters and Collisional Energy Conditions

Protonated water clusters, \((\text{H}_3\text{O}^+)(\text{H}_2\text{O})_n\) \(n = 0, 1, 2, 3\), can form in the PTR drift tube if the collision energies are sufficiently low. They break up when the clusters have a higher kinetic energy resulting from acceleration in high electric field, \(E\), or a longer mean free path due to a reduced particle density, \(N\), or both. This process is known as collisional induced dissociation (CID). The ratio \(E/N\) is used to measure the collisional energy conditions. Figure 2.5a shows spectra taken in laboratory air at two different \(E/N\) values, 140 and 200 Td. Figure 2.4b shows the peak at \(m/z\) 21, the \(^{18}\text{O}\) isotope for \(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\) in more detail. The peaks at \(m/z\) 19 are not representative of how much \(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\) there is in the instrument as this peak has been suppressed (see §2.3.2). Figure 2.5 shows how the
proportions of each of the water clusters, \((\text{H}_2\text{O}^+)\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})_n, \ n = 0, 1, 2, 3\) is depends on this \(E/N\) which has the SI units \(\text{V m}^2\) but is generally given the unit Td, Townsend, where 1 Td = \(10^{21} \text{ V m}^2\).

Peaks for Water Clusters in Laboratory Air for \(E/N = 140\) and 200 Td

![Peaks for Water Clusters in Laboratory Air for E/N = 140 and 200 Td](image)

Peaks for \(m/z\) 19 and 21 in Laboratory Air for \(E/N = 140\) and 200 Td

![Peaks for m/z 19 and 21 in Laboratory Air for E/N = 140 and 200 Td](image)

**Figure 2.5:** Protonated water clusters in the PTR-TOF-MS

a) shows variation in \(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\) (\(m/z\) 19), \(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})\) (\(m/z\) 37), \(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})_2\) (\(m/z\) 55) at \(E/N=140\) and 200 Td where \(E =\) electric field and \(N =\) gas number density which is temperature and pressure dependent.

b) shows enlarged peaks at \(m/z\) 21, protonated \(^{16}\text{O}\) isotope of \(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\). The peaks at \(m/z\) 19 are not representative of how much \(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\) there is in the instrument as this peak has been suppressed.
In the PTR-TOF-MS there is only ~30% $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$, $m/z$ 19, at lower $E/N$ values (< 110 Td), the most abundant ions being ($\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$).($\text{H}_2\text{O}$), $m/z$ 37. There is a small but significant amount of $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$.($\text{H}_2\text{O}$)$_2$, $m/z$ 55, and < 5% of $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$.($\text{H}_2\text{O}$)$_3$, $m/z$ 73, both of which fragment quite quickly with increasing collisional energy, contributing to the $m/z$ 37 peak. As $E/N$ increases, $m/z$ 37 reduces and $m/z$ 19 increases.

In general, the analyte, M, reacts with $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ as follows:

$$\text{H}_3\text{O}^+ + M \rightarrow \text{MH}^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O}$$  \[E1\]

Hence to ensure good sensitivity, it is recommended that optimal operating conditions exist when the $m/z$ 37 to $m/z$ 19 ratio is 10% to 15% As can be seen in Figure 2.6 this condition occurs in the PTR-TOF-MS at $E/N \approx 145$ Td. Figure 2.7 shows the same water-cluster/energy dependence in the PTR-MS Quad instrument. The graphs show that the drift tube of this instrument has a much drier environment than that of the Kore instrument, with its optimal conditions occurring at $E/N \approx 115$ Td, a much lower amount of $m/z$ 55 and no $m/z$ 73 at all.

---

**Figure 2.6:** Branching ratios for protonated water clusters in the PTR-TOF-MS showing variation in $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+ (m/z$ 19), $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$.($\text{H}_2\text{O}$) ($m/z$ 37), $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$.($\text{H}_2\text{O}$)$_2$ ($m/z$ 55), and $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$.($\text{H}_2\text{O}$)$_3$ ($m/z$ 73) with changing $E/N$ where $E =$ electric field and $N =$ gas number density which is temperature and pressure dependent.
The analyte may also react with any water clusters in a ligand-switching reaction shown in equation E2:

\[ \text{H}_3\text{O}^+ . \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{M} \rightarrow \text{H}_3\text{O}^+.\text{M} + \text{H}_2\text{O} \]  \[\text{E2}\]

This channel is available when M has a proton affinity > PA (H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}) and < PA (H\textsubscript{2}O)\textsuperscript{}\textsuperscript{} and a dipole moment. There are also compounds with proton affinities greater than that of (H\textsubscript{2}O)\textsubscript{2}, (PA = 808 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1}), which react with both H\textsubscript{3}O\textsuperscript{+} and (H\textsubscript{3}O\textsuperscript{+}).(H\textsubscript{2}O) (de Gouw et al. 2004, Blake et al. 2004) in which case the presence of \(m/z\) 37 is not so critical and lower energy conditions can be utilised, e.g. for acetone (PA = 812 kJ mol\textsuperscript{-1}) (Table 2.1). The reaction E1 can proceed as either dissociative or non-dissociative proton transfer. Reactions of the latter type are found to exist when the Gibbs free energy is less than -20.26 kJ/mol to -41.49 kJ/mol (Bouchoux et al. 1996, Bohme et al 1980, House 2008).

There are other conflicting conditions that must also be considered, viz. the amount of O\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{+} and the impact of \(E/N\) on the fragmentation of the analyte ions and the reaction time. A higher \(E/N\), i.e. higher collisional energy, not only breaks up protonated water clusters but may also lead to fragmentation of the protonated parent molecules. To limit analyte fragmentation, the PTR-TOF-MS is generally operated at \(E/N = 140-145\) Td. It is also advisable to maintain the ratio of O\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{+} to \(m/z\) 19 to < 2% to minimise electron transfer.
reactions with the analyte by ensuring a sufficiently high pressure in the glow discharge region. Exceeding these conditions, a higher \( E/N \) and more \( \text{O}_2^+ \), would result in a more complicated mass spectrum.

### 2.2.2.2 Determining the Electric Field

The magnitude of the electric field, \( E \), is:

\[
E = \frac{V}{L}
\]

Where \( V \) = operating voltage across the drift tube and \( L \) = length of the tube.

Figure 2.8 shows the positions of the three electrodes in the PTR drift tube: at the entrance to the drift tube (reactor entry), on plate 26 and at the drift tube exit (reactor exit). The original reason for having the intermediate electrode at plate 26 was to enable a higher \( E/N \) value in this last section of the DT which would break up protonated water clusters. However, this could also lead to the fragmentation of the protonated parent ions. Consequently, it was decided to set these three voltages so that the plate 26 voltage effectively becomes "invisible" to the ions in the DT, i.e. the electric field is constant throughout its length:
The key voltage that ensures that there is a constant $E$ throughout the drift tube is:

$$E = \frac{(V_2 - V_1)}{d_1} = \frac{(V_3 - V_2)}{d_2} = \frac{(V_3 - V_1)}{(d_1 + d_2)} \quad [E3]$$

Where:

- $V_1 =$ Reactor entry voltage
- $V_2 =$ Plate 26 voltage
- $V_3 =$ Reactor exit voltage
- $d_1 =$ Distance from reactor entry to plate 26 (9.1 cm)
- $d_2 =$ Distance from reactor exit to plate 26 (1.1 cm)

A spread-sheet calculates the voltages to be applied to ensure that $V_2$ has a value such that the electric field is constant and also calculates a specific $E/N$ value.

**Determining Gas Number Density, $N$**

The gas number density, $N$, is dependent on the temperature and pressure in the drift tube in accordance with:

$$N = \frac{N_A \times T_0 \times P_2}{V_0 \times T_1 \times P_0} \quad [E5]$$

Where:

- $N_A =$ Avogadro’s number, $(6.022 \times 10^{23}$ mol$^{-1})$
- $P_2 =$ Pressure in DT as measured by the pressure meter (millibar, mbar)
- $T_1 =$ DT operating temperature (K)
- $T_0 =$ Standard temperature, 273.15 K
- $V_0 =$ Standard molar volume, 22414 cm$^3$ mol$^{-1}$ of an ideal gas at STP
- $P_0 =$ Standard atmospheric pressure, 1013.25 mbar

The drift tube is heated by a single heater in the oven casing and the heat is distributed by a fan. A thermocouple on the drift tube itself measures and controls the temperature.
The pressure is measured by a CTR Leybold capacitance manometer gauge, replacing the less accurate Pirani APGX Edwards gauge. There is generally a temperature differential between the DT and the gauge, the DT being at an elevated temperature and the gauge at room temperature (Figure 2.9). The DT maintains a constant pressure as a result of pumping and the introduction of air via the analyte inlet line.

\[ P_1 = n_1 k T_1 \]

**Figure 2.9:** Schematic of drift tube and pressure gauge

- \( T \) = temp. [K]; \( n \) = molecule density (no. of molecules m\(^{-3}\)); \( P \) = pressure [mbar]; \( k \) = Boltzmann’s constant

In general, the temperature, \( T_1 \), used in [E5] is the temperature in the drift tube. However, the system containing the DT and its pressure gauge can be regarded as being a steady state rather than equilibrium environment. This is because energy is being input to maintain the difference in temperature and, therefore, a different number of molecules in each part of this system. From the kinetic theory of gases, the net flux of molecules per unit area of the orifices connecting two chambers is zero (Gombosi, T.E 1994):

\[ \frac{1}{4} n_1 \bar{\varepsilon}_1 - \frac{1}{4} n_2 \bar{\varepsilon}_2 = 0 \]  

Where \( \bar{\varepsilon} \) (mean speed) \( \propto \sqrt{T} \), \( T \) = temperature

\[ \therefore n_1 = n_2 \frac{\sqrt{T_2}}{\sqrt{T_1}} \]

\[ n_2 = \frac{P_2}{k T_2} \]

\[ \therefore n_1 = \frac{P_2}{k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T_1 T_2}} \]  

\[ [E7] \]
where:

Drift tube variables:  
\[ n_1 = \text{number of molecules (m}^3\text{)} \]
\[ T_1 = \text{temperature (K)} \]
\[ P_1 = \text{pressure (mbar)} \]

Gauge variables:  
\[ n_2 = \text{number of molecules (m}^3\text{)} \]
\[ T_2 = \text{temperature (K)} \]
\[ P_2 = \text{pressure (mbar)} \]

Calculating \( E/N \)

The calculation of \( E/N \) is now straightforward. Table 2.2 shows a comparison of values for \( E/N \) using \( T = \sqrt{\frac{T_1 T_2}{T_1 + T_2}} \) and only the DT temperature, \( T_1 \), for the same pressure and voltage settings. The difference in \( E/N \) is \( \sim 6\% \) with \( E/N \) being over-estimated when only the DT temperature is used in the calculation.

It should be noted that when these temperatures are equal, \( T_1 = T_2 = T, \sqrt{\frac{T_1 T_2}{T_1 + T_2}} = T \).

### Table 2.2: Comparison of \( E/N \) values using \( T = \sqrt{\frac{T_1 T_2}{T_1 + T_2}} \) and \( T = T_1 \);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( E/N ) Td</th>
<th>( T = \sqrt{\frac{T_1 T_2}{T_1 + T_2}} )</th>
<th>( T = T_1 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collisional Energy Equivalence in eV and Effective Ion Temperature K

The expression for the total kinetic energy of an ion in a drift tube in the laboratory frame was developed by Wannier (1951) and McFarland (1973) and can be written as:

\[
KE_{\text{ion}} = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 + \frac{1}{2}Mv^2 + \frac{3}{2}k_bT
\]

\[
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \downarrow
\]

Drift energy \quad Random field energy \quad Thermal energy

(Revercomb 1975)

where

\[m = \text{mass of the ion (kg)}; \quad M = \text{mass of the buffer gas (kg)}\]

\[v = \text{drift velocity of the ion (m s}^{-1}\text{)} \quad T = \text{drift tube temperature (K)}\]

\[k_b = \text{Boltzmann’s constant} = 1.3806488 \times 10^{-23} \text{ m}^2 \text{ kg s}^{-2} \text{ K}^{-1}\]

Typically, the thermal energy in PTR-MS instruments is small compared to the total kinetic energy of the ion, \(\sim 0.25 \text{ eV} \) (Cappellin 2010). However, in terms of energy available for a reaction, the centre-of-mass kinetic energy must be used which is shown in equation [E9] (McFarland 1973).

\[
KE_{\text{cm}} = \frac{3}{2}k_bT + \left(\frac{m_N}{m_N + m_i}\right)\left(KE_{\text{ion}} - \frac{3}{2}k_bT\right)
\]

where \(m_N = \text{mass of the neutral molecule}\).

From this the effective temperature for ion collisions can be determined:

\[
T_{\text{eff}} = T + \left(\frac{v^2}{3k_b}\right)\left[\frac{m_N(m + M)}{m + m_N}\right]
\]

This \(T_{\text{eff}}\) should be used for calculating reaction rate coefficients. Although rate coefficients have not been used in this thesis, the above has been included for completeness. However, collisional energies must be taken into consideration in the fragmentation studies in later chapters and values for these are provided in Table 2.3.


Table 2.3: Energy [eV] and effective temperature [T_{eff}] for E/N [Td]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E/N /Td</th>
<th>Energy /eV</th>
<th>T_{eff} /K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>1054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>1781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>2066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>2372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td>2699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>3046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>3415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>3805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>4216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>4649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>5102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>5576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>6072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td>6588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3 Transfer Chamber and TOF Source

The analyte ions and fragments leave the DT through a 400 μm diameter aperture and enter the transfer optics chamber (Figures 2.10 and 2.11). The diameter of the drift tube is 7.2 cm. Assuming that the whole of the DT is filled with ions, then only 0.06% of the ions move into the transfer optics chamber. The ion swarm is possibly more centrally concentrated so it may be that not such a large fraction is lost at this stage. The transfer chamber is pumped by a 255 L/s turbo pump which produces a pressure of ~ 10^{-4} mbar representing a reduction of four orders of magnitude compared with the reaction chamber and hence a change from viscous to molecular flow for the ions.

The transfer section holds an extraction electrode and two lensing regions, and determines how much of the ion swarm coming from the reaction chamber is transferred to the TOF-MS.
There are two extreme conditions for this, providing either maximum sensitivity or maximum mass resolution. These conditions are described below.

The ion beam leaving the reaction chamber is attracted into the transfer section by the setting of the control called $T_{\text{extract}}$ (Transfer extract) and is focussed by the control called $T_{\text{_lens}}$.

**Figure 2.10:** PTR-TOF-MS showing the transfer optics and TOF Source regions (Adapted from Kore Technology Ltd. Manual Z-5851-M)

**Figure 2.11:** Transfer optics chamber (Courtesy of Kore Technology Ltd., Manual Z-5851-M)
(Transfer lens). The ions then move into the TOF source, where they travel orthogonally to the direction of the detector and are extracted at regular intervals by the TOF source extractor plate: they emerge at a slight angle to the horizontal and are accelerated to the full TOF-MS potential of $\sim 2 \text{ kV}$.

In the source the ion beam moves between two charged plates which produce a potential gradient (Figure 2.12). This results in ions at different locations having different energies as they move into the TOF tube and produces a spread of energies within each $m/z$ value, leading to a broadening in the mass peak. The amount of broadening depends on the width of the beam: the narrower the beam, the smaller this is but fewer ions are collected and the sensitivity is reduced.

Alternatively, the beam can be unfocussed to increase the number of ions collected and so increase sensitivity. It is, of course, feasible to create a compromise situation for sensitivity and mass resolution.

### 2.2.4 Flight Tube and Reflectron

Finally the pulsed ions enter the field-free region of the TOF-MS at a pressure of $\sim 10^{-7} \text{ mbar}$, pumped with a 70 L/s turbo pump, where they separate according to their masses they are...
focused and reflected in an ion mirror (reflectron) as they move to the detector, a dual micro-channel plate (MCP) type electron multiplier, where their times of arrival are recorded.

The reflectron was developed by Mamyrin (1973) and focuses ions of differing kinetic energy. As the pulse of ions travel down the field free time of flight tube, it spreads into groups of ions with the same mass with an energy spread within each group. This is because the acceleration given to each ion depends on its position at the time of experiencing the impulse into the time of flight tube. So, as each mass group arrives at the reflectron, the more energetic ions travel further into it, so taking a slightly longer path to the detector. The less energetic ions of the same mass travel a shorter distance into the reflectron, taking a shorter path overall to the detector (Figure 2.13).

A clear exposition of the workings of the reflectron is given at Jordan TOF Products (Jordan TOF²). The more energetic ions are the most difficult to control and, when included in the measurements, tend to result in a lower resolution with more spreading of the peak. The central electrode of the reflectron can be adjusted so that the most energetic ions hit the back of the reflectron and are lost to the signal, so the reflectron then operates as a low-pass energy filter, resulting in an improvement in resolution.

The time of arrival at the detector of a protonated molecule of mass $m$ is proportional to $\sqrt{m}$

$$E = \frac{1}{2}mv^2$$  \[E9\]

since every ion is given the same amount of energy, $E$:

$$E = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 = \frac{m l^2}{2t^2}$$

where $m =$ mass and $v =$ velocity

If the length of the field free tube = $l$ and the time to traverse this = $t$, equation [E9] becomes:

$$E = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 = \frac{m l^2}{2t^2}$$

Hence:

$$t = \frac{lm^{1/2}}{(2E)^{1/2}}$$

$$t = Cm^{1/2} \quad \text{where} \quad C = \frac{l}{(2E)^{1/2}} \quad \text{[E11]}$$

Software then converts the times of arrival at the detector into masses to produce a spectrum of number of counts against $m/z$.

### 2.2.5 Operating Conditions

Table 2.4 shows the temperatures, ion counts and ratios for normal operating conditions used in the studies presented in this thesis. Pressures are shown when the PTR-TOF is in use (under load) and when running but inactive (no load).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Under Load</th>
<th>No Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTR Temperature</td>
<td>333 K</td>
<td>333 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR Pressure</td>
<td>$\approx 1.00$ mbar</td>
<td>$\approx 0.04$ mbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD Pressure</td>
<td>$\approx 1.30$ mbar</td>
<td>$\approx 0.03$ mbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMX pressure (TOF tube)</td>
<td>$7.0 \times 10^{-7}$ mbar</td>
<td>$\approx 6 \times 10^{-9}$ mbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRG pressure (Transfer section)</td>
<td>$7.0 \times 10^{-5}$ mbar</td>
<td>$\approx 2.3 \times 10^{-6}$ mbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow rate into PTR</td>
<td>100 ml min$^{-1}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E/N$</td>
<td>$\approx 144$ Td</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{CE}$</td>
<td>354 V</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{PTR}$</td>
<td>48.9 V</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{MS}$</td>
<td>9.7 V</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ion counts at 60°C</td>
<td>$\approx 20,000$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m/z$ 21 counts at 60°C</td>
<td>$\approx 450 - 560$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio $m/z$ 37: $m/z$ 19</td>
<td>$&lt; 5%$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio $m/z$ 32: ($m/z$ 19+ $m/z$ 37)</td>
<td>$&lt; 4%$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2.3 Optimisation of the Instrument

2.3.1 Modifications

The instrument required several modifications before being fit for purpose.

2.3.1.1 Measuring and Monitoring $E/N$

To determine the electric field, $E$, in the drift tube, it is necessary to measure the voltages at three points in the tube: at the entrance, at Plate 26, part way down the tube and at the exit (see §2.2.2.2 for further details). However, none of the three voltages could be measured on the delivered instrument until a digital voltmeter (DVM) and control unit were added (Figure 2.14).

![Figure 2.14: Modifications to the PTR-TOF-MS Kore instrument.](image)

In order to calculate and monitor $E/N$, it is necessary to know the pressure and temperature in the drift tube. A reliable thermocouple already existed but a more accurate pressure gauge was added. The method for calculating $E/N$ is given in §2.2.2.2. To alter $E/N$, the pressure in the drift tube is held constant, thus keeping $N$, the gas number density constant, and the voltages across the drift tube are varied.
2.3.1.2 Isolating the Water Container

The original isolating tap for the water chamber had been removed by Smiths. Reinstating this enabled venting only of this container, and not the whole instrument, when more water is required (Figure 2.15).

![Isolating tap](image)

**Figure 2.15:** Isolating tap for water chamber

2.3.2 Eliminating Reagent Ions at the Detector

After ions have been reflected by the reflectron, there is a component referred to as a blanking pulser (see Figure 2.10) which is designed to prevent H$_2$O$^-$ ions (m/z 19) reaching and damaging the detector. The blanking pulser consists of two plates, one permanently connected at the field free region potential and the other pulsed such that all ions passing through the plates when the pulse occurs are diverted away from the path of the detector. The time at which this pulse occurs is controlled by a delay potentiometer.

The graph in Figure 2.16 shows the average counts for a collection time of 10 s for m/z 19 and m/z 21 as the delay setting is varied as measured on the potentiometer (range 1–10). This clearly shows how ions at m/z 19 are prevented from reaching the detector as the delay potentiometer moves from 6.0 to 6.4 and that the optimal setting for these ions, i.e. the minimum level detected, is when the delay setting is ~ 6.1 to 6.2. As the delay setting is increased, ions at m/z 21 are diverted from the detector, with a minimum number reaching the detector when the blanking pulser is set at a delay of 6.4 to 6.6.
Counts vs Delay Settings

Figure 2.16: H$_3$O$^+$ (m/z 19) and isotope H$_3^{18}$O$^+$ (m/z 21) signal change on varying the blanking pulser delay potentiometer setting. The points show an average of two sets of data.

The m/z 19 results show some unexpected data at delay settings 5.9 and 6.5: the number of counts increase as the delay setting moves from 5.8 to 5.9 and then the number of counts reduce as the delay setting moves from 6.5 to 6.6. When displayed on a linear scale (Figure 2.17), the change in counts seen at these delay settings is ~ 100% and the reason for this is shown in the spectra in Figures 2.18a), b), c) and d): at a delay setting where there is no blanking for m/z 19, the detector becomes saturated due to dead-time issues and the peak has the shape shown in Figure 2.17a) at potentiometer delay setting = 5.8, and in Figure 2.17d), potentiometer delay setting 6.6. These spectra show the typical saturated shape of a double peak with many ions missing from the signal. As the delay setting is changed and blanking becomes effective, more of the m/z 19 ions can initially be detected, so increasing the number of detected counts. The peak shape assumes its more regular shape (Figure 2.17b) for potentiometer delay setting 5.9 and Figure 2.17c) for potentiometer delay setting 6.5.
These changes for \( m/z \) 19 at the cusps of the blanking effects are interesting but unimportant as the instrument is only operated in the range 6.1 to 6.2, the actual signal being calculated from the \(^{18}\text{O}\) isotope at \( m/z \) 21.

\[ m/z \text{ 19 vs Delay Settings} \]

\[ \text{Counts/10s} \]

\[ \text{Delay Settings} \]

**Figure 2.17:** \( m/z \) 19 signal as the potentiometer called delay varies. Points a) to d) refer to the spectra in Figure 2.18 below. Increased (up) and decreased (down) measurements are shown.

\[ \text{Figure 2.18:} \text{ } m/z \text{ } 19 \text{ peaks at the delay settings 5.8 (a), 5.9 (b), 6.5 (c) and 6.6 (d) as shown in Figure 2.17.} \]
However, as Figure 2.19 shows, there is a similar, but smaller, increase for \( m/z \) 21 between delay settings 5.9, counts = 589, to 6.2, counts = 751. The graph shows a linear increase in these counts, both when measurements were taken as the delay setting was increased (up) and then decreased (down). This increase cannot be accounted for in the same way as for \( m/z \) 19 above, as at no time is the signal at the detector saturated for \( m/z \) 21 ions.

Also, since the counts vary according to Poisson statistics, the variation at delay 5.9 for counts 581 (down measurements) is expected to be \( \sqrt{581} = \pm 24.1 \). The actual variation seen is \( \sim 54 \) (635-581 Table 2.5). Consequently, the differences observed here are considered to be real as they fall outside of these statistical fluctuations and, taken over the delay range of 5.9 to 6.2, amounts to a \( \sim 27\% \) difference.

This implies that for a delay setting of 6.2, which is optimal for removing \( \text{H}_3\text{O}^+ \) ions from the detector, the corresponding isotope count at \( m/z \) 21 would appear to be approximately 27%
higher than that found for a delay setting of $\leq 5.9$. It would therefore appear that, as the blanking effect moves the $m/z$ 19 ions away from the detector, the initial effect is to increase the number of $m/z$ 21 ions reaching the detector. This same effect of optimising the $m/z$ 21 signal can be achieved by using the X deflector steering plates which also deflect the ion beam towards the detector. A query to Kore Technology regarding this issue resulted in the advice always to optimise $m/z$ 21 with the X deflectors whenever the delay setting is changed. Points X and Y in Figures 2.17 and 2.19 respectively represent an anomaly in the workings of the PTR-TOF. They have not been further investigated.

**Oxygen**

A short test using oxygen as the primary ion ($O_2^+$) showed that blocking of the $m/z$ 32 signal occurs at a delay setting of $\sim 6.9$ and that the $m/z$ 34 signal was also depleted.

### 2.4 Experimental Methods

#### 2.4.1 Preventing Dilution of VOCs from Biological Sources

The headspace above a biological sample can sometimes be required not to become diluted by a carrier gas. A method of overcoming this dilution problem is to have a small expandable

![Inlet to PTR Connected to bag and open to laboratory air](image)

**Figure 2.20:** Equipment with an expansion Nalophan® bag to prevent sample VOC dilution
‘bag’ within the sample container which is open to the laboratory air such that it can expand and replace the volume left by the evacuated headspace gases (Figure 2.20). The apparatus here consists of a 500 mL Schott glass bottle with a four-way polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE [Teflon]) bottle cap and flexible PTFE tubes and fittings. Two of the cap openings (in red) are permanently closed. Inside the bottle is a small Nalophan® bag made from poly-(ethylene terephthalate) film and closed with cable ties, connected to laboratory air through a PTFE tube. The other tube is connected to the PTR. Nalophan® was selected as it is frequently used in SIFT and GC-MS VOC detection, albeit for sample storage rather than for the purpose described here (Turner 2013, Beghi and Guillot 2008). This apparatus was trialled during proof of concept work involving the ageing of pears.

2.4.2 Heated Inlet Line

Some molecules and ions take a long time to reach a constant flow through the instrument and are referred to as being ‘sticky’. Such conditions were encountered in the calibration gas (Chapter 3) and in the proof of concept works: detecting indole and when examining the ageing of pears. One way of overcoming this problem is to heat the inlet line into the PTR-MS by wrapping heating tape around the inlet line. Examples are shown in Figures 2.21 and 2.22.

![Heated Inlet Line](image)

**Figure 2.21:** Calibration gas canister with heating tapes
2.4.3 Methods of Introducing Samples into the PTR-MS

Different apparatus was used depending on the type of sample being investigated e.g. solid indole, liquid hexenols, pears or a bacterial medium. The container for pears is shown in Figure 2.22, a motorised syringe used for the hexenols is shown in Figure 2.23 and the container used for indole and the alkyl and chloro- benzenes is shown in Figure 2.24.
2.5 Data Considerations

2.5.1 Ion Detection, Counting and Errors

The device for detecting ions used in this Kore instrument is a dual micro-channel plate (MCP) type electron multiplying detector (Burle Long-Life™ channel plate). It is also worth noting that secondary electron emission at each dynode is a statistical process, and, at the level of individual ions, the output current from the detector for each incoming ion event follows a Poisson distribution. Hence errors in the number of counts, \( N \), at any \( m/z \) is \( \pm \sqrt{N} \).

2.5.2 Calculating Counts for Water Clusters \( \text{H}_3\text{O}^+, (\text{H}_2\text{O})_n, n = 0, 1 \)

The reagent ions used throughout the investigations presented in this thesis was \( \text{H}_3\text{O}^+ \) and it is important to know its intensity (counts per second). However, this spectral peak is always saturated, or hardly present at all if the delay setting has been used (§2.5.5). It is therefore necessary to calculate the intensity from the \( \text{H}_3^{18}\text{O}^+ \) isotope peak at \( m/z \) 21, (abundance of the \( ^{18}\text{O} \) isotope is 0.205(14) %) (NIST):

\[
[\text{H}_3\text{O}^+] = [\text{H}_3^{18}\text{O}^+] \times 487
\]

Similarly for the first water dimer at \( m/z \) 37, \( \text{H}_3\text{O}^+, (\text{H}_2\text{O}) \) for low \( E/N \) values it is necessary to use the \( ^{18}\text{O} \) isotope at \( m/z \) 39:
where:

The division by 2 is a consequence of there being two oxygen atoms in this cluster.

\[ [37] = \frac{[39] \times 487}{2} \]

**2.5.3 Fragments at \( m/z \ 39 \)**

Product ion fragments frequently occur at \( m/z \ 39 \) e.g. Chapter 3. This is the same peak at which the \(^{18}\)O isotope (abundance 0.205\%) of the first water dimer, \( \text{H}_3\text{O}^-\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \) \( (m/z \ 37) \), appears. The method used to estimate these counts is to calculate the \(^{18}\)O isotope counts expected from \( m/z \ 37 \) and subtract this from the actual counts at \( m/z \ 39 \):

\[
[Counts]_{prod} = [Counts]_{39} - \frac{[Counts]_{37} \times 2}{487}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( m/z \ 39 ) product ion counts</th>
<th>( m/z \ 39 ) total counts</th>
<th>( m/z \ 39 ) (^{18})O isotope counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Counts]_{39}</td>
<td>[Counts]_{37} \times 2</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dead-time issues prevent the detector from registering all of the ions at this \( m/z \). Consequently, this method is only reliable for \( E/N \) values > 140 Td as the \( m/z \ 37 \) signal is saturated at values lower than this.

**2.5.4 Normalising Ion Counts**

Different investigations often require different ways of handling data. For example, calculation of branching ratios uses values for one \( m/z \) as a percentage of the total counts for all the \( m/z \) values being considered. In this case, the raw counts can be used. If, however, a comparison of raw counts is required, then these counts must be normalised generally to \( 10^6 \) counts at \( m/z \ 19 \) as the analyte signal is dependent on this signal:

\[
[M^+] = \frac{[M^+] \times 10^6}{[H_3O^+]} \]
where:

\[ [M^+] = \text{Number of normalised counts for an } m/z \]
\[ [M^+ \] = \text{Number of un-normalised counts for the } m/z \]
\[ [H_3O^+] = \text{Number of counts at } m/z 19 \]

The denominator can change, depending on the proton affinity of the compound – if the PA is close to that of the first water dimer, \((H_2O)_2\), \(PA = 808 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}\), then the sum of the counts at \(m/z 19\) and \(m/z 37\) is used.

### 2.5.5 Reproducibility of Data

A convenient method of checking for the reproducibility of data is to take measurements as \(E/N\) is increased and then decreased. These two sets of readings are referred as ‘up’ and ‘down’ in the text. It was not always possible or necessary to take reading in this way e.g. for pears, readings were taken for one \(E/N\) value only. Where possible, three readings at each \(E/N\) value were taken as a means of eliminating possible rogue values. An average of these readings was used.

### 2.6 Summary

This chapter provides a description of the hardware, some operating characteristics and enhancements to the Kore PTR-TOF-MS instrument. There were several faults to correct before being able to use it, not least of which was the ability to detect voltages in the reaction chamber in order to calculate the energy conditions therein. This having been done, the following chapters describe the areas of investigation undertaken to prove that satisfactory results could be achieved when compared with other such instruments.
Chapter 3 - Characterising the PTR-TOF-MS


3.1 Background

As mentioned in Chapter 1, there are only a small number of Kore PTR-TOF-MS instruments in use and there are no detailed accounts for the determination of such instruments’ sensitivity - the total number of a protonated parent ions and fragments resulting from ion-molecule and collision-induced dissociation (CID) reactions per integration time per parts per billion by volume (ppbv), normalised to $10^6$ reagent ions. In view of this, a detailed study of the sensitivity of this PTR-TOF-MS was made using a standard calibration gas (Restek, Scott/Air Liquide TO-14A Aromatics Mix) chosen for its wide range of VOCs and molecular weights. The constituents of this calibration gas are detailed in

Table 3.1: Details of the gas used to calibrate the sensitivity of the Kore PTR-TOF-MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Molecular Formula</th>
<th>Protonated Mass [amu]</th>
<th>Proton Affinity (PA) kJ mol$^{-1}$</th>
<th>ppbV$^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>C$_6$H$_6$</td>
<td>79.05</td>
<td>750.4$^d$</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>C$_7$H$_8$</td>
<td>93.07</td>
<td>784.0$^d$</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styrene</td>
<td>C$_8$H$_6$</td>
<td>105.07</td>
<td>839.5$^e$</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-Xylene (1,3-Dimethylbenzene)</td>
<td>C$<em>8$H$</em>{10}$</td>
<td>107.09</td>
<td>812.1$^e$</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-Xylene (1,2-Dimethylbenzene)</td>
<td>C$<em>8$H$</em>{10}$</td>
<td>107.09</td>
<td>796.0$^e$</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-Xylene (1,4-Dimethylbenzene)</td>
<td>C$<em>8$H$</em>{10}$</td>
<td>107.09</td>
<td>794.40$^d$</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td>C$<em>9$H$</em>{12}$</td>
<td>107.09</td>
<td>788.00$^e$</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorobenzene</td>
<td>C$_6$H$_5$Cl</td>
<td>113.02</td>
<td>753.1$^c$</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene</td>
<td>C$<em>9$H$</em>{12}$</td>
<td>121.10</td>
<td>826.36$^d$</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene</td>
<td>C$<em>9$H$</em>{12}$</td>
<td>121.10</td>
<td>836.2$^e$</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>C$<em>8$H$</em>{12}$Cl</td>
<td>146.98</td>
<td>711.3$^d$</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>C$<em>8$H$</em>{12}$Cl</td>
<td>146.98</td>
<td>730.96$^e$</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,4-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>C$<em>8$H$</em>{12}$Cl</td>
<td>146.98</td>
<td>701.67$^e$</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene</td>
<td>C$<em>8$H$</em>{12}$Cl</td>
<td>180.94</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$For the atomic masses the major isotopes of carbon and chlorine were used, i.e. $^{12}$C and $^{35}$Cl (actual to 2 decimal places 34.97).

$^b$ppbV supplied by manufacturers accurate to ±10%

Sources for PA:

= http://webbook.nist.gov/chemistry/pa-ser.html (Accessed 03/05/2012);

$^d$ = Hunter and Lias (1998);$^e$ = Borisov and Garrett (1998);

= Stone, Li and Turner (1986)

Table 3.1.

It is normally assumed that proton transfer reactions are non-dissociative with fewer species being produced than those for electron impact spectrometry. However, other investigations (e.g. Sulzer, 2012; Demarcke, 2009; Shen, 2012) and this present one show that this is not always the case: higher energy conditions in the reaction chamber can result in ions undergoing not just dissociation as a result of
excess energy after protonation, but also collision-induced dissociation. These mechanisms impact on a sensitivity investigation such as this, where a wide range of energy conditions are to be used: it is therefore essential to know how the individual species behave over the energy range in order to be able correctly to assign mass peaks to their correct VOC.

An example of fragmentation as a function of $E/N$ is shown in Figure 3.1 which shows the % branching ratios (often referred to as product ion distribution PID) of species from protonated ethylbenzene. A significant product ion occurs at $m/z$ 79 which, in a mixture of VOCs, could be taken to be protonated benzene, (also $m/z$ 79) for $E/N$ values as low as 120 Td. This would result in an overestimation of the benzene concentration in a complex chemical environment such as the atmosphere where other VOCs also fragment to an ion with $m/z$ 79. Consequently, to ensure an accurate signal for each of the calibration gas compounds, the fragmentation and product ion distribution of the 14 compounds were investigated as a function of $E/N$ before studying this calibration gas.

These compounds separate into two groups: aromatic hydrocarbons (alkylbenzenes) Figure 3.2 and chlorobenzenes Figure 3.3.
All of the alkylbenzene components of this calibration gas are found in the atmosphere of industrial environments (Table 3.2). These are the so-called BTEX chemicals (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, trimethylbenzenes and xylenes) which are mainly attributable to traffic and the burning of fossil fuels (Buczynska 2009, Lin 2011, EUGRIS): 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene has been shown to be the most active
Table 3.2: Compounds and *fragments identified by PTR-MS in ambient air (Blake 2009 adapted from de Gouw and Warneke 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m/z</th>
<th>Compound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>HCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>HCHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Methanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Acetonitrile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Acetaldehyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Formic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Acrylonitrile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Butenes, methyl tert-butyl ether, butanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Acetone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Acetic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Dimethylsulfide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Isoprene, furan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Methyl vinyl ketone, methacrolein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Methyl ethyl ketone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Hydroxy acetone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Peroxy acetyl nitrate (PAN)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Benzene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Monoterpenes, hexenal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Hexenol, hexanal*, hexenylacetate methylfuran, isoprene hydroxyl carbonyls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Ethyl vinyl ketone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>2-methyl-3-buten-2-ol C₅ carbonyl, methacrylic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>peroxypropionyl nitrate (PPN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Toluene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>2-vinylfuran phenol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99*</td>
<td>Hexanal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Isoprene hydroperoxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>peroxyacryl nitric anhydride (MPAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Styrene, peroxyisobutyric nitric anhydride (PiBN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>C₈ aromatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Heptanal*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>C₉ aromatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Octanal naphthalene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>C₁₀ aromatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Monoterpenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Nopinone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Nonanal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>C₁₁ aromatics methylchavicol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Pinonaldehyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>C₁₃ aromatics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

pollutant in the production of ozone in the atmosphere (Derwent 2000). Benzene, toluene, styrene and...
xylene are used in the manufacturing of new materials and consequently are also commonly found in indoor environments (Lee 2005).

The following chlorobenzene compounds were investigated here:

- Chlorobenzene, C₆H₅Cl, (Figure 3.3a,) has one hydrogen atom replaced in benzene by a chlorine atom and has a molecular weight (m.w.) of 112.01 amu, with a protonated m.w. of 113.02 amu

- Dichlorobenzene, C₆H₄Cl₂, (Figure 3.3b), has two chlorine atoms which replace two of the hydrogen atoms on the benzene ring. There are three isomers, o-, m-, and p-dichlorobenzene, each denoting a different arrangement of the Cl atoms: 'o' denotes Cl atoms in positions 1 and 2; 'm' denotes Cl atoms in position 1 and 3 (Fig 3.3bi) and 'p' denotes Cl atoms in positions 1 and 4 (Fig 3.3bii).

- Trichlorobenzene, C₆H₃Cl₃, (Figure 3.3c), has three chlorine atoms which replace three of the hydrogen atoms on the carbon ring in benzene. The one used here is 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene.

![Molecular structures for the chlorinated compounds](image)

All sources of chlorobenzenes in the environment are man-made, being used, for example, as pesticide carriers, in air fresheners, and in the synthesis of other organic chemicals (Malcolm 2004). It follows, therefore, that investigation of these individual compounds is likely to be of interest to the environmental science community.
This work extends the comprehensive measurements of VOCs in the atmosphere taken by de Gouw and Warneke, 2007, where a quadrupole PTR-MS was used.

### 3.2 Experimental Procedures

The experimental work for the sensitivity measurements is divided into two sections: study of the individual chemicals comprising the calibration and then an investigation of the calibration gas itself.

Initially, the individual chemicals were studied for the reasons mentioned above, i.e. to determine each one’s fragmentation behaviour and product ion distribution over a wide $E/N$ range so that a more accurate measure could be made when the mixture of VOCs was subsequently examined in the calibration gas.

All the chemicals for this investigation were purchased from Sigma Aldrich with purities shown in Table 3.3.

Two filters were attached to the inlet tube through which buffer air was drawn from the laboratory: a hydrocarbon (HC) filter (Supelpure HC, Supelco, Bellefonte, PA.) to reduce environmental influences and a moisture filter (Big Moisture Trap, Supelco) to reduce moisture from the incoming airflow. The range of voltages that can be applied to the drift tube (DT) enables an $E/N$ range of 90 Td to 250 Td (Table 3.4). $E/N$ was altered by varying the potentials at the entry to the drift tube (Collision Energy) and on the intermediate terminal (PTR Lens).

Conditions in the DT were pressure = 0.81 mbar and temperature = 333 K.

### Table 3.3: Purities for compounds in calibration gas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Purity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benzene</td>
<td>&gt; 99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toluene</td>
<td>&gt; 99.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styrene</td>
<td>&gt; 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m-Xylene (1,3-Dimethylbenzene)</td>
<td>99+%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o-Xylene (1,2-Dimethylbenzene)</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-Xylene (1,4-Dimethylbenzene)</td>
<td>99+%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylbenzene</td>
<td>≥ 99.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorobenzene</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,3-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,4-Dichlorobenzene</td>
<td>≥ 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene</td>
<td>≥ 99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4: Drift tube voltages for $E/N$ range used for individual compound investigation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E/N$ Td</th>
<th>Drift Tube Voltage /V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1 Individual Compounds

Two spectra were acquired for $E/N = 90$ Td to 240 Td in steps of 10 Td. A final reading was taken at 245 Td because the 250 Td reading was not always reliable: the hollow cathode worked only intermittently.

$E/N$ was increased (up) and then decreased (down), to ensure reproducibility. The same method for introducing the sample into the PTR-TOF-MS was used for each liquid phase compound. Only one, 1,4-dichlorobenzene, was a solid. The vapour pressures of these volatile aromatic compounds are very high and the major issue was to ensure that the reagent ion signal was not significantly reduced by the introduction of the sample which led to the signal being monitored before taking measurements. To achieve this, for the liquid compounds a 1 mL syringe was used to transfer one drop of liquid into a small glass vessel which was then filled with cotton wool to help reduce the flow of analyte into the instrument.

§3.3 describes the alkylbenzenes and §3.4 the chlorobenzenes. The following data are presented for each compound:
• A mass spectrum comparing two \( E/N \) values, 140 Td and 245 Td showing non-normalised counts. Mass spectra are taken from one series of data, generally as \( E/N \) was increased.

• \% Branching ratios (BR \%) 
  This describes compound fragmentation as \( E/N \) is varied: the signals for the protonated parent ion and each product ion are shown as percentages of the sum of all products. Product ions with low percentages are expanded in a second BR. The branching ratios are an average of data taken as \( E/N \) was increased and then decreased.

3.2.2 Calibration Gas

The \( E/N \) range was 100 Td to 240 Td using steps of 20 Td. The calibration gas container was heated to 60°C, DT temperature was 60°C and the inlet line was heated to 70°C. The gas was studied using two different techniques:

• Varying \( E/N \) with the drift tube pressure held constant at 0.8 mbar.
  Three sets of data were taken, i) an ‘up’ run \((E/N = 100\ Td\ to\ 240\ Td)\); ii) a ‘down’ run \((E/N = 240\ Td\ to\ 100\ Td)\); iii) a second ‘up’ run. The first two sets were taken consecutively; the third set was started 4020 s after the ‘down’ run. Although the system had been allowed to equilibriate before starting to take measurements, the first two sets of data showed particularly low signals for trichlorobenzene at \( m/z \) 181, a seemingly very ‘sticky’ molecule which took a long time to detect in the instrument. Both of these sets of readings were subsequently discarded.

• Varying the pressure at constant \( E/N = 140 \) Td.
  Two sets of data were taken, the first varying the drift tube pressure from 0.8 mbar to 1.32 mbar, and the second reducing the drift tube pressure back to 0.8 mbar to ensure reproducibility of the data. \( E/N \) was held at 140 Td for both of these sets of measurements.
3.3 Alkylbenzenes

Results for the alkylbenzene compounds are given in §3.3.1 and a discussion of the data can be found in §3.3.2.

3.3.1 Results

Spectra and branching ratios are show for fragments and protonated parent ions for each compound.

3.3.1.1 Benzene C₆H₆

Benzene was investigated over the $E/N$ range 90 Td to 248 Td and mass spectra at two of these values, 140 Td and 245 Td, are shown in Figure 3.4. The protonated parent peak at

\[ m/z \text{ 79} \]

is the major signal at both of these energies. The product ion distribution or branching ratios describe the fragmentation of benzene over the full $E/N$ range (Figure 3.5).

Figure 3.4: Mass spectra for benzene at $E/N = 140$ Td and 245 Td

a) peaks for protonated benzene at $m/z$ 79 and b) fragments at $m/z$ 50 and 51.
This shows that the protonated benzene ion $\text{C}_6\text{H}_7^+$, $m/z$ 79, starts to fragment at $E/N > 180$ Td, losing $\text{H}_2$ to form the fragment at $m/z$ 77, $\text{C}_6\text{H}_4^+$. As the energy increases, fragmentation continues with $m/z$ 79 decreasing and $m/z$ 77 increasing. At ~200 Td, product ions at $m/z$ 39, 50 and 51 appear, $\text{C}_3\text{H}_3^+$, $\text{C}_4\text{H}_2^+$ and $\text{C}_4\text{H}_3^+$ respectively.

![Benzene plot](image)

**Figure 3.5: Branching ratios for benzene**

b) shows minor products in greater detail
3.3.1.2 Toluene $C_6H_5CH_3$

A comparison of mass spectra for toluene at $E/N = 140$ Td and $E/N = 250$ Td are shown in Figure 3.6:

**Figure 3.6:** Mass spectra for toluene at $E/N = 140$ Td and 250 Td

a) shows peaks for protonated toluene at $m/z$ 91 and a fragment at $m/z$ 77. b) shows fragments at $m/z$ 50 and 51.

Figure 3.6. At $E/N = 250$ Td the protonated toluene signal at $m/z$ 93 ($C_6H_5CH_3H^+$) is less than that of the product ion at $m/z$ 91. It can also be seen that, even at high $E/N$, there is no product ion at $m/z$ 79, although a signal at $m/z$ 77 is observed. The fragmentation behaviour of toluene is shown in the branching ratio diagrams (Figure 3.7) as $E/N$ is varied from 90 Td to 250 Td. Toluene starts to fragment at $E/N = 150$ Td, losing $H_2$ to form the product ion at $m/z$ 91, $C_7H_7^+$. This is a commonly found fragment ion called the tropylium cation. (See
Figure 3.7: Branching ratios for toluene
b) shows minor products in greater detail
§3.3.2 for further information.) At $E/N \approx 170$ Td, $m/z$ 77 appears, $C_7H_5^+$, with $m/z$ 51
($C_6H_3^+$) following at 200 Td. Product ions at $m/z$ 39, ($C_3H_3^+$), $m/z$ 50 and $m/z$ 65 occur as
$E/N$ increases $> 210$ Td.
3.3.1.3 Styrene C₆H₅CH₂CH

A comparison of mass spectra for styrene at $E/N = 140$ Td and $E/N = 250$ Td are shown in Figure 3.8. Unlike toluene, styrene fragments to a product ion at $m/z$ 79, as well as an ion at $m/z$ 77. The presence of $m/z$ 79 in this spectrum is important when considering the calibration gas and sensitivity calculations, as an adjustment for these counts must be made in order to obtain an accurate value for the benzene content of the gas.

![Styrene Protonated Parent and Product Ion](chart-a)

![Styrene Product Ions](chart-b)

Figure 3.8: Mass spectra for styrene at $E/N = 140$ Td and 250 Td. a) shows peaks for protonated styrene at $m/z$ 105 and a fragment at $m/z$ 103. b) shows fragments at $m/z$ 77 and 79.
The fragmentation behaviour of styrene is shown in the branching ratio diagrams (Figure 3.9) as \( E/N \) is varied from 90 Td to 250 Td. Styrene starts to fragment at \( E/N = 170 \) Td, where the product ions at \( m/z \) 77, 79 and 103 appear. Product ions at \( m/z \) 51, \( \text{C}_4\text{H}_3^+ \) and \( m/z \) 50, \( \text{C}_4\text{H}_2^+ \), appear at \( E/N > 220 \) Td.

**Figure 3.9:** Branching ratios for styrene

b) shows minor products in greater detail
3.3.1.5 Xylenes C₆H₄(CH₃)

Figure 3.12a) and b) show the mass spectra at $E/N = 140$ Td and 245 Td for $p$-xylene, taken to exemplify all three xylenes. (The molecular structures of the xylenes can be found in Figure 3.2.)

The branching ratio graph, Figure 3.12a) shows that $p$-xylene starts to fragment at $E/N = 140$ Td, where $m/z$ 105, C₆H₉⁺ appears. However, this small amount of $m/z$ 105 cannot be seen in the mass spectrum for $E/N = 140$ Td. Although the xylenes are isobaric with ethylbenzene,
their fragmentation patterns are very different, with the xylenes showing few product ions until \( E/N = 160 - 180 \) Td. A comparison of these compounds is developed in §3.3.2.1. At \( E/N \approx 160 \) Td, the product ion \( m/z 91, \text{C}_7\text{H}_7^+ \) appears: this is the major fragment for all the xylenes for \( E/N \) values greater than 225 Td.

**Figure 3.13:** Branching ratios for \( p \)-xylene

b) shows minor products in greater detail
Branching ratios for $m$- and $o$-xylene are shown in Figure 3.14 and 3.15. The branching ratios for all three isomers are so similar that it is not possible to differentiate between them using this method.

**m-Xylene**

**m-Xylene Fragments < 14%**

Figure 3.14: Branching ratios for $m$-xylene
b) shows minor products in greater detail
Figure 3.15: Branching ratios for o-xylene
b) shows minor products in greater detail
3.3.1.6 Trimethylbenzenes C₆H₃(CH₃)₃

Figure 3.16a) and b) show the mass spectra at $E/N = 140$ Td and $245$ Td for 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, taken to exemplify both of the trimethylbenzenes studied here. (The molecular structures of the trimethylbenzenes can be found in Figure 3.2) Figures 3.17 and

![Mass spectrum of 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene at 140 Td](image)

![Mass spectrum of 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene at 245 Td](image)

Figure 3.16: Mass spectra for 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene at a) $E/N = 140$ Td and b) $245$ Td

3.18 show the branching ratios for the two trimethylbenzene isomers as $E/N$ is varied from $90$ Td to $245$ Td. It can be seen that trimethylbenzene starts to fragment at $E/N = 160$ Td, where $m/z$ 105, $C_6H_7^+$ and $m/z$ 119 (loss of $H_2$) appear. For 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, $m/z$ 119
does not appear until $E/N = 170$ Td. At 190 Td, the fragments $m/z$ 91, $C_7H_7^+$, and $m/z$ 77, $C_6H_5^+$, occur.

a) 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene

![Graph showing branching ratios for 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene.]

b) 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene Product Ions < 12%

![Graph showing branching ratios for minor products in 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene.]

Figure 3.17: Branching ratios for 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene
b) shows minor products in greater detail
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Figure 3.18: Branching ratios for 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene
b) shows minor products in greater detail
3.3.2 Discussion

The branching ratios show that most of these compounds do not fragment significantly until \( E/N > 150 \) Td, the main exception being ethylbenzene which produces ~ 10% m/z 79 at \( E/N = 120 \) Td. The m/z, proposed formula and percentage of each product ion for each compound are shown in Table 3.5 at 140 Td and at 245 Td, the highest value used here.

These data show that, at sufficiently high energy values, all of the alkylbenzene compounds tested fragment to produce ions at:

- m/z 51 and 77;
- m/z 79 except toluene;
- m/z 39 except styrene and the trimethylbenzenes.

From this it can be seen that benzene appears to be the most stable of these compounds retaining 50% of the parent ion at 245 Td. This is a direct result of the resonance structure of the electrons and bonding in the benzene ring (Cooper 1986). Ethylbenzene is the least stable with only 9% of the parent ion remaining at 245 Td. It is also interesting to note that none of the compounds fragment to a product ion at m/z 93 where protonated toluene is found. This may be of interest for environmental science considerations (see §3.3.2.1).

All of the compounds except toluene have a product ion at m/z 79, the same m/z value as protonated benzene.
Table 3.5: Percentage product ions found at $E/N = 140$ Td and 245 Td.
Shaded cells represent MH$^+$ values: $m/z$ 79 = benzene, $m/z$ 93 = toluene, $m/z$ 105 = styrene, $m/z$ 107 = ethylbenzene (EthylB) and xylenes, and $m/z$ 121 = trimethylbenzenes (TriMB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E/N Td</th>
<th>Benzene</th>
<th>Toluene</th>
<th>Styrene</th>
<th>EthylB</th>
<th>o-Xylene</th>
<th>m-Xylene</th>
<th>p-Xylene</th>
<th>1,2,4-TriMB</th>
<th>1,3,5-TriMB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m/z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>- 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>- 7</td>
<td>- 8</td>
<td>- 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>- 3</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>- 7</td>
<td>- 11</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>- 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 3</td>
<td>- 3</td>
<td>- 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>- 15</td>
<td>- 22</td>
<td>- 27</td>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>- 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>- 12</td>
<td>- 12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>- 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>- 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$CH$_{3}$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>- 25</td>
<td>- 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>C$<em>{6}$H$</em>{5}$(CH$<em>{3}$)$</em>{3}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Product ions at \( m/z \) 39, 50, 51 and 77 normally appear in the electron impact (EI) spectra of all alkylbenzenes (Budzikiewicz et al. 1967). A product ion at \( m/z \) 51 (\( \text{C}_4\text{H}_3^+ \)) can be produced by \( m/z \) 79 as a result of its losing ethylene, \( \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 \); \( m/z \) 77 can lose \( \text{C}_3\text{H}_2 \) to form the simplest aromatic species, \( \text{C}_3\text{H}_3^+ \) (\( m/z \) 39), the cyclopropenyl ion (Breslow and Groves 1970).

### \( m/z \) 91 Tropylium ion

The tropylium cation, \( \text{C}_7\text{H}_7^+ \), is a well-recognised species in alkylbenzene EI mass spectra: its production from ionised or protonated toluene is one of the most investigated processes in gas-phase ion chemistry (Chiavarino et al. 2012, Lifshitz 1994). It is not surprising, therefore, to see this appearing in the PTR spectra for all of the alkylbenzenes here except for benzene (\( \text{MH}^+ \) \( m/z \) 79) which has an \( m/z \) too low to form a product ion at \( m/z \) 91, and styrene, where \( m/z \) 91 starts to appear only at the highest \( E/N \) values and then reaches a maximum of ~ 0.2%. However, \( m/z \) 91 does not coincide with the \( \text{MH}^+ \) peaks of any of the calibration gas compounds so is of no further interest except to describe, briefly, how it is formed:

- **From toluene** \( \text{C}_8\text{H}_8\text{CH}_3\text{H}^+ \) \( m/z \) 93

  Loss of 2 amu \( \text{H}_2 \):

  \[
  \text{C}_7\text{H}_9^+ \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{C}_7\text{H}_7^+ + \text{H}_2
  \]

  \( m/z \) 93 \quad \rightarrow \quad m/z 91

- **From ethylbenzene and xylenes** \( \text{C}_8\text{H}_{11}^+ \) \( m/z \) 107

  Loss of 16 amu \( \text{CH}_4 \):

  \[
  \text{C}_8\text{H}_{11}^+ \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{C}_7\text{H}_7^+ + \text{CH}_4
  \]

  \( m/z \) 107 \quad \rightarrow \quad m/z 91
• From trimethylbenzenes $C_9H_{13}^+$ $m/z$ 121

Loss of 30 amu $C_2H_6$

$$C_9H_{13}^+ \rightarrow C_9H_7^+ + C_2H_6$$

$m/z$ 121 $m/z$ 91

3.3.2.1 Comparison of the Isomeric Compounds Ethylbenzene and Xylenes ($C_8H_{10}$)

The $E/N$ investigation of individual compounds of the calibration gas demonstrates how fragmentation behaviour over a wide range of $E/N$ values can be used to discriminate

Figure 3.19: Fragmentation behaviour with changes in $E/N$

a) ethylbenzene: the largest product ion is $m/z$ 79 appearing at $E/N = 110$ Td; b) $m$-xylene: the largest product ion is $m/z$ 91, with $m/z$ 105 (styrene) appearing at $E/N = 140$ Td
between isomeric compounds (Figure 3.19, repeats of Figs 3.11 and 3.14). Even at ‘normal’ operating $E/N$ values (i.e. 140 Td) there are noticeable differences with ethylbenzene which is reduced by almost 40% to produce $m/z$ 79. The branching ratio graphs above show that one of xylene’s product ions, $m/z$ 105, appears at $E/N = 140$ Td. Ethylbenzene does not give a product ion at $m/z$ 105, so a peak at $m/z$ 105 from a gas mixture with a peak at $m/z$ 107 would indicate the presence of xylene, providing that no styrene was initially present in the mixture. This could be checked at $E/N < 140$ Td and if no peak at $m/z$ 105 were present, then sampling the gas mixture at $140$ Td $\geq E/N \leq 165$ Td might provide data to give an estimate of the relative quantities of xylene and ethylbenzene. (Note: trimethylbenzene also produces an ion at $m/z$ 105 at $E/N \geq 170$ Td.)

As a proof of concept, an analysis using known values from the calibration gas (described in §3.2.2) is shown below. Consider a sample of gas mixture tested at 120 Td and 140 Td which produced the data shown in Figure 3.20.

![Sample at 120 Td](image1)

![Sample at 140 Td](image2)

**Figure 3.20:** Samples of gas mixture at $E/N = 120$ Td and 140 Td

Branching ratios show that neither styrene ($m/z$ 105) (Figure 3.9) nor xylene ($m/z$ 107)
(Figure 3.13) breaks up at 120 Td, so, at this $E/N$ there is 100% of each species with no contribution being made to styrene from the xylenes. At 140 Td, there is still 100% of styrene but the xylenes have fragmented to yield an average of 2% product ions at $m/z$ 105 (Table 3.6). A difference in normalised counts is therefore expected at $m/z$ 105 at the two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E/N$ /Td</th>
<th>$m/z$ 105</th>
<th>$m/z$ 107</th>
<th>$m/z$ 107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Styrene</td>
<td>Xylenes</td>
<td>EthylB*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Values for ethylbenzene are given for comparison but there is no contribution from this to $m/z$ 105.

$E/N$ values: some of this difference is due to a reduction in counts because of the decrease in reaction time in the drift tube and an increase from the contribution from the xylenes. The overall increase is 1483 non-normalised counts representing the 2% contribution from the xylenes.

The values for this example have been taken from those for the calibration gas where the actual contribution from the xylenes to $m/z$ 105 is 680 non-normalised counts at 140 Td. The calculated (reverse) value results in a total xylene count of 92663, which is 41029 counts more than actually detected at $m/z$ 107.

In an environment with no background peak at $m/z$ 105, the relative amounts of ethylbenzene and xylenes could be found more accurately as it would be possible to work at just one $E/N$ value and so avoid the inherent problems encountered by comparing values at different $E/N$s. However, this is generally not the case – styrene is produced by exhaust fumes and so is commonly found in the atmosphere, outdoors in concentrations of 0.06-4.6 ppb and indoors 0.07-11.5 ppb (ToxGuide for Styrene). It is therefore necessary to have a method of identifying the extra counts contributed from xylene and, from the foregoing example, this does not seem to be possible. Further work in this area is not, however, ruled out since at least one author (Karl et al. 2001) considers that it would be possible to reconstruct the original concentration providing one distinct ion can be identified.
3.4 Chlorobenzenes and Calibration Gas

Results and discussions are set out in the following sections. Results for the calibration gas itself are included here for completeness and in particular to enable the further discussion of product ions at \( m/z \) 95 and \( m/z \) 129.

3.4.1 Results

Branching ratios and spectra for fragments and protonated parent ions are given for each compound.

3.4.1.1 Chlorobenzene C₆H₅Cl

Figure 3.21a) shows mass spectra for chlorobenzene and product ions at \( E/N = 140 \) Td, 210 Td and 245 Td. The peak at \( m/z \) 55 for 140 Td is the water trimer: this ceases to exist at the higher \( E/N \) values. Product ions occur at \( m/z \) 39, 50, 51, 77 and 95 and the protonated parent, \( \text{MH}^+ \), at \( m/z \) 113. The signal at \( m/z \) 39 is not included in the mass spectra as its very large signal at lower \( E/N \) values would overwhelm the other peaks shown here.
Figure 3.21b) shows a magnified mass spectrum at 245 Td. This shows more clearly how the signal at \( m/z \) 77 is greater than that of the protonated parent ion at \( m/z \) 113.

Branching ratio curves in Fig 3.22 show the behaviour of the product ions over the whole \( E/N \) range.
Figure 3.22: Branching ratios for chlorobenzene

None of the fragments at $m/z < 113$, viz. $m/z$ 39, 50 and 51 contain a Cl atom and can, in fact, be compared with the fragments from benzene itself (Table 3.5). This seems to suggest that fragmentation occurs by the loss of the Cl atom. One might expect to see the chlorine atom in a product ion but this has not been found, not even at $m/z$ 49, $\text{CH}_2\text{Cl}^+$ (Figure 3.23).
Figure 3.23: Spectra of chlorobenzene at $E/N=130$ Td and 245 Td showing no signal at $m/z$ 49.

Peaks for the protonated ion and isotopes of chlorobenzene, C$_6$H$_5$Cl, are shown in Figure 3.24: they occur at $m/z$ 113 (C$_6$H$_5$ClH$^+$), $m/z$ 114 (C$_6$H$_5$ClH$^+$), $m/z$ 115 (C$_6$H$_5$ClH$^+$), and $m/z$ 116 (C$_6$H$_5$ClH$^+$). The peaks at $m/z$ 113 and $m/z$ 115 represent the $^{37}$Cl bearing ions. The separation of 2 amu arises because the two isotopes of chlorine have atomic masses of 35 amu and 37 amu, The relative abundance of these isotopes is approximately 3:1 ($^{35}$Cl:$^{37}$Cl).
and these proportions can be seen in the relative heights of the peaks at $m/z$ 113 (~700 counts) and $m/z$ 115 (~210 counts) which gives a proportion of 100:30. The integrated counts under the peak is, in fact, a more appropriate basis for the ratio, giving $13416:4149 = 100:31$.

Further discussion of the product ions from chlorobenzene is given in §3.4.2.

### 3.4.1.2 Dichlorobenzenes $C_6H_4Cl_2$

Figures 3.25a) and b) show the mass spectra at $E/N = 140$ Td and 245 Td for $m$-dichlorobenzene, taken to exemplify the three dichlorobenzenes. (Structures for the isomers can be found in Figure 3.3b, bi and bii.)

![m-Dichlorobenzene 140 Td](image1)

![m-Dichlorobenzene 245 Td](image2)

**Figure 3.25:** Mass spectra for $m$-dichlorobenzene at a) $E/N = 140$ Td and b) 245 Td
Figures 3.26, 3.27 and 3.28 show the branching ratios for the three dichlorobenzene isomers as $E/N$ is varied from 90 Td to 245 Td. It can be seen that $m/z$ 111, $C_6H_5Cl^+$ is the first fragment to appear at $E/N = 170$ Td for all three isomers. Peaks at $m/z$ 50, 51, 53 and 99 contribute 2% or less to the branching ratios and, since they have no bearing on the calibration gas constituents, have not been given any further consideration.

**Figure 3.26:** Branching ratios for $m$-dichlorobenzene
Chapter 3: Sensitivity Measurements

Figure 3.27: Branching ratios for o-dichlorobenzene

---

**Figure 3.27**: Branching ratios for o-dichlorobenzene
Figure 3.28: Branching ratios for $p$-dichlorobenzene
Protonated *p*-Dichlorobenzene at *m/z* 147 (1,4-*C₆H₄Cl₂H⁺)

Figure 3.29 shows an expanded spectrum for the protonated parent ion in 1,4-*C₆H₄Cl₂⁺, (*p*-dichlorobenzene) with the MH⁺ peak at *m/z* 147. The series of peaks shows the characteristic pattern of a chlorine compound containing two chlorine atoms: three peaks relating to the chlorine isotopes: MH⁺, MH⁺ + 2 and MH⁺ + 4. These arise because of the three possible combinations of the isotopes occurring on each of the two chlorine atoms where the probability of finding a ³⁵Cl atom is 0.75 and the probability of finding a ³⁷Cl is 0.25 (Table 3.7). The ratio of the three possible combinations is 9 : 6 : 1, very close to the ratio for the peaks seen at MH⁺, MH⁺ + 2 and MH⁺ + 4 in Figure 3.29 above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isotope Combination</th>
<th>Probability 0.75 for ³⁵Cl 0.25 for ³⁷Cl</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Peak Counts</th>
<th>Peak Counts Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>C₆H₄³⁵Cl²⁵Cl</em></td>
<td>¾ × ¾ = 9/16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>233909</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C₆H₄³⁵Cl³⁷Cl</em></td>
<td>(¾ × ¼) × 2 = 6/16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>155032</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C₆H₄³⁷Cl²⁵Cl</em></td>
<td>(¼ × ¾)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26595</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C₆H₄³⁷Cl³⁷Cl</em></td>
<td>(¼ × ¼)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further discussion of product ions found in the dichlorobenzenes can be found in §3.4.2.
3.4.1.3 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene $C_6H_3Cl_3$

Figure 3.30a) and b) show the mass spectra at $E/N = 140$ Td and 245 Td for 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene. (See Figure 3.3 for the molecular structure.)

The spectrum in Figure 3.30a) at $E/N = 140$ Td shows a peak at $m/z$ 147. This is, in fact, due to the presence of a dichlorobenzene impurity shown in the enlargement in this figure. However, the peaks in Figure 3.30b at $m/z$ 146, 148 and 150 at $E/N = 245$ Td are the result of $MH^+$ losing a Cl atom.
Figure 3.31 shows the branching ratios for 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene as $E/N$ is varied from 90 Td to 245 Td. Here it is clearly shown that 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene starts to fragment at 170 Td, losing Cl to produce $\text{C}_6\text{H}_3\text{C}_3\text{H}^+$ at $m/z$ 146.

![Graph showing branching ratios for 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene](image)

**Figure 3.31**: Branching ratios for 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene

**Protonated 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene at $m/z$ 181 ($\text{C}_6\text{H}_3\text{Cl}_3$)**

Figure 3.32 shows a spectrum of the protonated parent peaks for 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene with the $\text{MH}^+$ peak at $m/z$ 181. These peaks show the characteristic pattern of a compound containing three chlorine atoms. There are now four peaks relating to the chlorine isotopes: $\text{MH}^+ (m/z 181)$, $\text{MH}^+ + 2 (m/z 183)$, $\text{MH}^+ + 4 (m/z 185)$ and $\text{MH}^+ + 6 (m/z 187)$. These arise because of the possible combinations of the two isotopes.
The abundance of $^{37}\text{Cl}:^{35}\text{Cl}$ is 33%, i.e. the number of counts for $^{37}\text{Cl}$ is one third of that of the counts for $^{35}\text{Cl}$ (see Figure 3.24). Consequently the probability of finding a $^{37}\text{Cl}$ is one in four, i.e. 25%. However this probability is not exactly 25%, but is 24.24% (Hitzfield et al. 2011). If the ratio were exactly 25%, then the first and second peaks in this spectrum would have identical heights, but this is not the case, as can be seen in Figure 3.28. Ratios for both 25% and 24.24% probabilities are shown in Table 3.8.

![Figure 3.32: Spectrum of MH$^+$ at m/z 181 in 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene](image)

Further discussion of product ions found in 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene can be found in §3.4.2.1
Table 3.8: Comparison of isotope distributions for three Cl atoms with 25% and 24.24% probability for $^{37}\text{Cl}$

Data from the spectrum in Fig 3.27 are closer to the 24.24% values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m/z$</th>
<th>Isotope Combination</th>
<th>Probability $^{37}\text{Cl}=0.25$  $^{35}\text{Cl}=0.75$</th>
<th>% Theory</th>
<th>Probability $^{37}\text{Cl}=0.2424$  $^{35}\text{Cl}=0.7576$</th>
<th>% Theory</th>
<th>Peak Counts</th>
<th>% Exper.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>$\text{C}_6\text{H}_3^{35}\text{Cl}^{35}\text{Cl}^{35}\text{Cl}$</td>
<td>$\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4} = 27/64$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$(0.7576)^3 = 0.4348$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68934</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>$\text{C}_6\text{H}_3^{35}\text{Cl}^{37}\text{Cl}^{35}\text{Cl}^{35}\text{Cl}$</td>
<td>$(\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4}) \times 3 = 27/64$</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$(0.7576 \times 0.7576 \times 0.2424) \times 3 = 0.4174$</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>63104</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{C}_6\text{H}_3^{37}\text{Cl}^{35}\text{Cl}^{35}\text{Cl}^{35}\text{Cl}$</td>
<td>$(\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4}) \times 3 = 9/64$</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$(0.7576 \times 0.2424 \times 0.2424) \times 3 = 0.1335$</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>20717</td>
<td>30.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>$\text{C}_6\text{H}_3^{35}\text{Cl}^{37}\text{Cl}^{37}\text{Cl}^{37}\text{Cl}$</td>
<td>$(\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4}) \times 1/64$</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>$(0.2424)^3 = 0.0142$</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>$\text{C}_6\text{H}_3^{37}\text{Cl}^{37}\text{Cl}^{37}\text{Cl}$</td>
<td>$(\frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4} \times \frac{3}{4}) = 1/64$</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>$(0.2424)^3 = 0.0142$</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2241</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.1.4 Calibration Gas

Figure 3.33 shows the spectrum for the calibration gas, at $E/N = 200$ Td. The integration time was 60 s. The protonated parent ions decreased at higher $E/N$, whilst $m/z$ 51, 75, 77, 91, 95, 103, 111 and 129 all appear as predicted by the previous study of fragmentation of the compounds. (The peak at $m/z$ 169 is 1,3-dinitrobenzene, (m.w. = 168.017 amu, protonated m.w. = 169.024 amu), still resident in the reaction chamber nine days after colleagues had been investigating this.)

![Calibration Gas 200 Td](image)

**Figure 3.33: Calibration gas spectrum at $E/N = 200$ Td**
3.4.2 Discussion

Table 3.9 shows the percentage of MH\(^+\) and product ions assigned to the five chlorobenzene compounds at \(E/N =140\) Td and 245 Td. Trichlorobenzene appears to be the most stable, having 61\% of MH\(^+\) remaining at \(E/N = 245\) Td. As can be seen from the branching ratios, the percentage of a species at intermediate \(E/N\) values can be more, or less, than that found at \(E/N = 245\) Td.

Table 3.9: Percentage product ions of chlorobenzenes at \(E/N = 140\) Td and 245 Td. Shaded rows are the MH\(^+\) \(m/z\) values: 113 = chlorobenzene (CB) 147 = dichlorobenzenes (DCB) and 181 = 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene (TCB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(m/z)</th>
<th>Proposed Formula</th>
<th>CB (C_{n}H_{3}Cl^{+})</th>
<th>o-DCB (1,2-C_{n}H_{4}Cl_{2})</th>
<th>m-DCB (1,3-C_{n}H_{4}Cl_{2})</th>
<th>p-DCB (1,4-C_{n}H_{4}Cl_{2})</th>
<th>1,2,4-TCB (C_{6}H_{3}Cl_{3})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>(C_{3}H_{3}^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>(C_{4}H_{2}^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>(C_{3}H_{3}^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>(C_{3}H_{5}^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>(C_{4}H_{3}^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>(C_{5}H_{3}^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>(C_{5}H_{3}^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>(C_{6}H_{5}Cl^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>(C_{6}H_{5}Cl^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>(C_{6}H_{6}Cl^{+})</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>(C_{6}H_{4}Cl_{2}^{+})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>(C_{6}H_{4}Cl_{2}^{+})</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>(C_{6}H_{4}Cl_{3}^{+})</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spectra of chlorine-containing compounds are generally easy to identify as they always display at least two peaks separated by 2 amu in height ratios that relate to the relative abundance of the isotopes and the number of chlorine atoms in the compound. However,
peaks in these mono- di- and tri-chlorobenzene spectra proved to be much more difficult to assign than those of the alkylbenzenes. The next section analyses the product ions and fragmentation behaviour of these compounds and explains how some unlikely peaks at $m/z$ 94/95 and $m/z$ 128/129 were identified.

3.4.2.1 Product Ion Analysis

$m/z$ 129 in Dichlorobenzenes

An unexpected peak appeared in the dichlorobenzenes at $m/z$ 129 which is 18 amu less than the MH$^+$ peak at $m/z$ 147. The isotope peaks of the species at $m/z$ 129 have the characteristics of a single chlorinated ion, with two peaks separated by 2 amu in the ratio of 3:1 (Figure 3.34). However, $m/z$ 129 cannot be a product ion of MH$^+$ at $m/z$ 147, a loss of 18 amu representing a loss of one carbon and six hydrogen atoms. Since the protonated molecule only has four hydrogen atoms, this is clearly an impossible fragmentation pathway.

![Figure 3.34: p-Dichlorobenzene spectrum with m/z129 peak magnified](image)

**Figure 3.34:** p-Dichlorobenzene spectrum with $m/z$ 129 peak magnified

![Figure 3.35: Branching ratios for p-dichlorobenzene including m/z 129 and m/z 94.](image)

**Figure 3.35:** Branching ratios for p-dichlorobenzene including $m/z$ 129 and $m/z$ 94.
The branching ratios for \( p \)-dichlorobenzene, including \( m/z \) 129, are shown in Figure 3.35.

The peak seen in the PTR-MS was at \( m/z \) 129.00: a NIST molecular weight search suggested protonated monochlorophenol, \((C_6H_5ClO)^+\), as the most likely compound, m.w. 129.01 amu (neutral m.w. 128.00 amu). Monochlorophenol is a common pollutant in the environment, being widely used in manufacturing processes (El-Sayed et al. 2009). The peak at \( m/z \) 94 is included in Figure 3.35 as this may have the same origin as \( m/z \) 95 in chlorobenzene (see Figure 3.42).

It was not possible to identify this fragment initially. A conclusion was reached but only after extensive work which is described in §3.4.2.1.

**\( m/z \) 128 and \( m/z \) 163 in 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene**

This compound displayed a species at \( m/z \) 128, with peaks similar to the dichlorobenzenes' \( m/z \) 129 peak, and a new compound at \( m/z \) 163 (Figure 3.36), possibly a protonated dichlorophenol (DCP), \( C_6H_5Cl_2O^+ \), m.w. 162.97 amu (neutral \( C_6H_5Cl_2O \) m.w. 161.96 amu).

![Figure 3.36: 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene (TCB) at \( E/N = 210 \) Td](image)

**Figure 3.36: 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene (TCB) at \( E/N = 210 \) Td with magnifications of \( m/z \) 128 and \( m/z \) 163.**
Figure 3.37: Branching ratios for trichlorobenzene (TCB) showing m/z 128 and m/z 163.

The isotope peaks at m/z 163 are characteristic of a compound with two Cl atoms and those at m/z 128 show one Cl atom. The behaviour of the m/z 128 branching ratio (Figure 3.37) is similar to that of m/z 129 in dichlorobenzene (Figure 3.35) and m/z 95 in chlorobenzene (Figure 3.42), although it does not show an actual maximum but appears to be levelling out at $E/N \sim 245$ Td.
Fragments in the Calibration Gas: $m/z$ 129 and $m/z$ 94

The 'unexpected' peak at $m/z$ 129 appears in the calibration gas spectrum (Figure 3.38) along with evidence of a contribution to $m/z$ 94, the $^{13}$C peak for toluene (see §3.4.1).

Figure 3.38: Calibration gas at $E/N = 200$ Td with an enlargement of $m/z$ 129
**m/z 111 C₆H₃Cl⁺**

This product ion only occurs in the dichlorobenzenes and a spectrum demonstrates that it has one chlorine atom (Figure 3.39) where the counts for m/z 111 and m/z 113 are 39807 and 13041 respectively, giving a ratio of 3.05:1. This ion is therefore the result of the loss of HCl from the parent ion at m/z 147:

\[
\begin{align*}
C_6H_4Cl_2H^+ & \rightarrow C_6H_4Cl^+ + HCl \\
m/z 147 & \rightarrow m/z 111
\end{align*}
\]

**m/z 109 C₆H₂Cl⁺**

This product ion occurs in trichlorobenzene (Figure 3.40). It has only one chlorine atom although the size of the peak at m/z 111 is rather large. This is probably due to the loss of HCl from the dichlorobenzene impurity at m/z 147.
The m/z 109 product ion is the result of the loss of H₂Cl from the product ion at m/z 146:

\[
\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{Cl}^+ \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{C}_6\text{H}_4^+ \; + \; \text{H}_2\text{Cl}
\]

m/z 95 in Chlorobenzene

The protonated parent ion, MH⁺, for chlorobenzene (C₆H₅ClH⁺) occurs at m/z 113. The peak at m/z 95.05 is 18 amu less than the MH⁺ peak (Figure 3.41) representing a loss of one carbon and six hydrogen atoms. This would leave a product ion of C₅Cl⁺. However, it is clear from the peak pattern (Figure 3.41b) that this fragment does not contain any chlorine atoms as there is no peak at m/z 97 representing the ³⁷Cl isotope. It is therefore very unlikely that this product ion originated from the fragmentation of m/z 113.

A NIST molecular weight search suggests that m/z 95.06 is most likely to be protonated phenol, C₆H₆OH⁺, molecular weight = 95.049 amu (94.042 amu neutral). The ¹³C isotope
counts at m/z 96 are 6% of the counts at m/z 95 which accords well with six carbon atoms (expected 6.6%) and the peak amu is at 95.05 amu. The peak at m/z 97 is much more than would be expected for the $^{18}\text{O}$ isotope, being 5% of the m/z 95 counts, where only 0.4% is expected so an accurate identification for phenol cannot be made using this isotope. Figure 3.42 shows the branching ratios for chlorobenzene where m/z 95 is included: this is similar in shape to that found for m/z 129 in the dichlorobenzenes (Figure 3.35).

$m/z\ 75\ \text{C}_8\text{H}_3^+$

This product ion is found in the dichlorobenzene spectrum and has no chlorine atoms (Figure 3.43).

It appears to be the result of the loss of HCl from the fragment ion at m/z 111:
Figure 3.44 shows spectra of $m/z$ 73 in 1,2,4-trichlorobenzene for a) $E/N = 210$ Td, b) $E/N = 230$ Td and c) $E/N = 245$ Td. It is not clear what the composition of this ion is: in Figure 3.44a) and b), there appears to be one Cl atom. However, the single Cl isotope pattern has disappeared at $E/N = 245$ Td (Figure 3.44c). This suggests a possible composition of $C_3H_2Cl^+$, molecular weight 72.984 amu produced as a result of $m/z$ 146, $C_6H_4Cl^+$, splitting into two ions of $C_3H_2Cl^+$:

$$C_6H_4Cl^+ \rightarrow C_3H_2Cl^+ + C_3H_2Cl^+$$

$m/z$ 146
However, this does not explain the pattern seen at $E/N = 245$ Td.

$m/z$ 65

This product ion appears in the dichlorobenzenes as shown in Figure 3.45 for $p$-dichlorobenzene. It is most likely to be produced from $m/z$ 94. Possible formulae are $C_4OH^+$

![Figure 3.45: Spectrum of $m/z$ 65](image)

(m.w. = 65.003 amu) or $C_3H_5^+$ (m.w. = 65.04 amu). The maximum $m/z$ values for this peak are shown in Table 3.10 and the $^{13}$C isotope peak at $m/z$ 66 in Figure 3.53 is 6% of the peak counts at $m/z$ 65 (expected ratio of 5.5% for 5 carbon atoms).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Peak $m/z$</th>
<th>$E/N$/Td</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p$-DBC (wet)</td>
<td>65.01</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m/z$ 94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$-DBC (wet)</td>
<td>65.02</td>
<td>220/245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$-DCB</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>190/220/245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$o$-DCB</td>
<td>65.07</td>
<td>190/220/245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$-DBC (dry)</td>
<td>65.03</td>
<td>170/190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$-DBC (dry)</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>220/245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these data, it can be inferred that this peak represents the $C_3H_5^+$ ion, resulting from the following reaction:
\( m/z \, 39 \, C_3H_3^+ \)

This product ion appears in the spectra of the chloro- and dichlorobenzenes. The peak at \( m/z \, 39 \) in the PTR spectrum is generally larger than that expected solely as a result of fragmentation of \( MH^+ \) since it is always present as the isotope of the first water dimer at \( m/z \, 37, \, H_3O^+(H_2O) \).

Figure 3.46 shows the \( m/z \, 39 \) peak to be bigger than that expected for the \( m/z \, 37 \) peak: the presence of \( m/z \, 37 \) has been compensated for as explained in §2.4.3. In chlorobenzene, it seems most likely that \( m/z \, 39 \) is produced by the loss of \( C_3H_2 \) from \( m/z \, 77 \) to form \( C_3H_3^+ \) (\( m/z \, 39 \)), the cyclopropenyl ion.

\[
\begin{align*}
C_6H_6^+ & \quad \rightarrow \quad C_3H_3^+ + C_3H_2 \\
\text{m/z 77} & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{m/z 39}
\end{align*}
\]

In the dichlorobenzenes it is possible that this is formed by fragmentation of \( m/z \, 111 \) which loses \( C_3HCl \):

\[
\begin{align*}
C_6H_4Cl^+ & \quad \rightarrow \quad C_3H_5^+ + C_3HCl \\
\text{m/z 111} & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{m/z 39}
\end{align*}
\]

### 3.4.2.1 Identifying Product Ion Fragments \( m/z \, 95 \) and 128/9

The procedure adopted to identify the origins and structures of fragments at \( m/z \, 95 \), 128 and 129 beyond all reasonable doubt was firstly, to consider if they were impurities: the purity of
all of the chlorobenzene chemicals was specified as > 99% (Table 3.3). However, the PTR-TOF-MS is able to detect impurities in the sample (~1%), especially if the vapour pressure of such an impurity is 100 times that of the compound under investigation. In these circumstances, they would have the same concentration in the drift tube, sufficient to present uncertainties when examining the fragmentation patterns of each of these compounds. Then, if found not to be impurities, to investigate if they could result from secondary reactions and finally if they might be clusters of recognised fragments with water. These lines of enquiry are described below.

**Impurities**

If these peaks actually represent impurities, there should be a signal at lower $E/N$ values which would reduce with increasing $E/N$ instead of increasing, as found here. Normalised counts for $m/z$ 95 in chlorobenzene and $m/z$ 129 in $p$-dichlorobenzene are shown in Figures 3.47 and 3.48.

![Chlorobenzene m/z 95](image)

**Figure 3.47:** $m/z$ 95 counts normalized to $10^6$ H$_2$O$^+$ counts
Figure 3.48: m/z 129 counts normalised to $10^6 (\text{H}_3\text{O}^+ + \text{H}_3\text{O}^+.\text{H}_2\text{O})$

The shape of the curve warranted further investigation – if this were an impurity, there would have been more of it present at lower $E/N$ values and it was necessary to check how phenol itself behaved in a changing $E/N$ scenario. The curve in Figure 3.49 was obtained for normalised counts of phenol at m/z 95: the MH$^+$ counts decreased as $E/N$ was increased. So it seems unlikely that the species at m/z 95 is an impurity in chlorobenzene and the calibration gas.

Figure 3.49: Graph of normalized counts for phenol.

Also, for completeness, the vapour pressures for each of the monochlorophenol isomers are given in Table 3.11. The vapour pressure of $p$-DCB is 234.7 Pa @ 275 K ((ATSDR) 1998) which is of the same order of magnitude as two of the monochlorophenols, indicating that if
Table 3.11: Vapour pressures of the three monochlorophenol isomers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2-MCP ortho</th>
<th>3-MCP meta</th>
<th>4-MCP para</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vapour pressure</td>
<td>139 Pa at 25 °C</td>
<td>125 hPa at 25 °C</td>
<td>51 Pa at 25 °C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

these peaks represent the phenols, then it would be possible for them to be detected in the PTR-TOF.

By way of comparison with the behaviour of \( m/z \) 95, the peak at \( m/z \) 46 was similarly investigated. With only C, H and Cl atoms available, it is difficult to find a composition for this ion, as well as being problematical to see how it could be formed from any of the major species. A branching ratio graph including this ion is shown in Fig 3.50 and displays the behaviour of an impurity, appearing as it does at all \( E/N \) values. It is not clear why there is a sudden increase in both this ion and \( m/z \) 50 after \( E/N = 230 \) Td.

![Chlorobenzene with m/z 46](image-url)

**Figure 3.50: Branching ratios for chlorobenzene with m/z 46**

The main piece of evidence leading to the conclusion that these fragments are not impurities is the appearance of both \( m/z \) 94 and \( m/z \) 128 in the calibration gas as mentioned above.

**Secondary Reactions**

Having ascertained that a possible compound for \( m/z \) 95 in chlorobenzene could be phenol, and that for \( m/z \) 129 in dichlorobenzene could be chlorophenol, the possibility presented itself of a pattern emerging whereby one chlorine atom was being replaced by an OH group.

These may be regarded as secondary reactions:
\[ \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{Cl}^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{OH}^+ + \text{HCl} \]

Chlorobenzene

\[ \text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{Cl}_2^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{ClOH}^+ + \text{HCl} \]

Dichlorobenzene

However, calculations of the enthalpy, \( \Delta H \), for these reactions show that both have positive \( \Delta H \)s: for the chlorobenzene reaction, \( \Delta H = 62.8 \text{ kJ/mol} \) (0.65 eV) and for the dichlorobenzene reaction \( \Delta H = 692.54 \text{ kJ/mol} \) (7.2 eV) (see Appendix 1). These results confirm that neither of these reactions can occur spontaneously.

Clusters with \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \)

"When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth."

*Sherlock Holmes: The Sign of Four* (1890) Arthur Conan Doyle

The branching ratios graph for \( p \)-dichlorobenzene including \( m/z \) 129 and \( m/z \) 94 is shown in Figure 3.35 and is repeated here as Figure 3.51.

**Figure 3.51: Branching ratios for \( p \)-DCB highlighting \( m/z \) 94 and \( m/z \) 129**

Considering just the \( m/z \) 129 signal in \( p \)-dichlorobenzene, a further investigation examined \( p \)-dichlorobenzene in more humid conditions (see Figure 3.52), passing the buffer gas (laboratory air) through water at room temperature. This revealed a moisture dependence,
with the $m/z$ 129 peak yield value being $\sim 20\%$ higher in these more humid conditions. There was also a shift in the peak towards a higher $E/N$ value from 200 to $\sim 210$ Td.

![Branching ratios of $m/z$ 129 in p-DCB](image)

**Figure 3.52**: Comparison of $m/z$ 129 branching ratios in wet and dry conditions

**Using $O_2^+$ as reagent gas**

By way of further confirmation regarding humidity, an $E/N$ investigation of $p$-dichlorobenzene was carried out using oxygen as the reagent ion ($O_2^+$) to reduce humidity effects. The parent ion resulting from non-dissociative electron charge transfer with oxygen ($O_2^+$) appears at $m/z$ 146 as can be seen in Figure 3.53. Peaks for the other product ions, $m/z$ 111, $m/z$ 75 and $m/z$ 50, all appear at the same values as in the samples using $H_3O^+$. In these conditions, $m/z$ 111 is the result of the loss of a Cl atom. There is no product ion at $m/z$ 129.

![p-Dichlorobenzene in Oxygen 245 Td](image)

**Figure 3.53**: Spectrum of $p$-dichlorobenzene in oxygen
but there are peaks at \( m/z \) 99 and \( m/z \) 85 as can be seen in Figure 3.54.

![Figure 3.54: Spectrum of \( p \)-dichlorobenzene product ions \( m/z \) 85 and \( m/z \) 99](image)

Branching ratios for \( p \)-Dichlorobenzene in \( O_2^+ \) are shown in Figure 3.55.

![Figure 3.55: Branching ratios of \( p \)-dichlorobenzene in oxygen (\( O_2^+ \))](image)

**Conclusion**

Having concluded that \( m/z \) 129 could neither have come from the dissociation of \( m/z \) 147 nor from a secondary reaction and that it has one chlorine atom, as can be seen in Figure 3.56, it would appear that the only explanation remaining is that it is a cluster of \( m/z \) 111 (\( C_6H_3Cl^+ \)) with an \( H_2O \) molecule. This structure (\( C_6H_3Cl^+ \).\( H_2O \)) is surprising as such a construct would seem to be most unlikely to form at such high \( E/N \) values. Further investigation is warranted here.
3.5 Sensitivity Results

The calibration gas was studied using two different procedures as described in §3.2.2: varying $E/N$ holding the DT pressure constant, and holding $E/N$ constant and varying the DT pressure. The data from the foregoing work was used to apply fragmentation coefficients where compounds fragment, producing an ion at an $m/z$ value of another compound’s $MH^+$. This is described in more detail in the following section.

3.5.1 Fragmentation Correction

Product ions from fragmentation processes contribute signal to other compounds’ $MH^+$ peaks. For example, styrene, $m/z$ 105, ethylbenzene and the xylenes, $m/z$ 107, and trimethylbenzene, $m/z$ 121, all yield product ions at $m/z$ 79, the $m/z$ where the protonated benzene parent ion is found (Table 3.12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$m/z$</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>107</th>
<th>121</th>
<th>147</th>
<th>181</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xylenes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethylb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.12: Compounds that contribute signal to other peaks:

$m/z$ 105, 107 and 121 contribute to $m/z$ 79; $m/z$ 107 (xylenes) and $m/z$ 121 contribute to $m/z$ 105; $m/z$ 147 contributes to $m/z$ 113; $m/z$ 181 contributes to $m/z$ 147.

In order to account for these contributions the following formula was applied at each $E/N$:

$$[C^{corr}] = [C^{MH^+}] - \sum_{i=1}^{n} F_i \times C_i$$

Where

$C^{corr} = \text{number of counts for } MH^+ \text{ corrected for product ion contributions;}$

$C^{MH^+} = \text{actual number of counts for } MH^+;$

$C_i = \text{corrected number of counts for the contributing compound;}$
$F_i$ = fragmentation coefficient of the contributing compound.

A series of such calculations were executed working from the highest to lowest m/z values.

The fragmentation coefficient is the ratio of the percentages of product ion to its remaining

Table 3.13: Branching ratio data extract for ethylbenzene
Showing % ions at m/z 79, 91 and 107 at E/N = 140, 150 and 160 Td

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E/N Td</th>
<th>m/z 79</th>
<th>m/z 91</th>
<th>m/z 107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.14: Non-normalised counts from calibration gas at E/N = 140 Td
Isotopes and the M$^+$ peaks are included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E/N Td</th>
<th>m/z 79</th>
<th>m/z 93</th>
<th>m/z 105</th>
<th>m/z 107 (Xylenes)</th>
<th>m/z 107 (EB)</th>
<th>m/z 113</th>
<th>m/z 121</th>
<th>m/z 147</th>
<th>m/z 181</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>15374</td>
<td>11905</td>
<td>13424</td>
<td>42547</td>
<td>9087</td>
<td>13834</td>
<td>27372</td>
<td>34382</td>
<td>9972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MH$^+$ at a given E/N. These percentages are taken from the data used to plot the branching ratio curves. An extract of this data is shown in Table 3.13 for ethylbenzene. From this and Table 3.14 it can be seen that the adjusted counts for m/z 79 at E/N = 140 Td are:

$$C_{corr} = 15374 - \frac{37}{63} \times 9087 = 10053$$

$C_i$ is described as being ‘corrected’ as it may itself have received a contribution from another compound’s product ion. For example, at E/N = 200 Td, styrene (m/z 105) fragments to yield a product ion at m/z 79 but has itself gained contributions from the di- and trimethylbenzenes (m/z 107 and m/z 121). All isotopes were included in these calculations as well as any signal at M$^+$ appearing as a result of non-dissociative charge transfer from the oxygen present in the system.

Initially, m/z 93 produced an unfeasibly high result at high E/N values. As can be seen in the foregoing, the dichlorobenzenes (m/z 147) fragment to yield a product ion at m/z 94 which had to be excluded from the calculations. This was resolved by calculating the isotope counts at m/z 94 directly from the counts at m/z 93, considered to be purely attributable to protonated toluene:
Ethylbenzene and the xylenes at m/z 107 are isobaric: the known ppbv ratio for these compounds was used to assign the counts at m/z 107 to each of these compounds.

Having found the counts for each m/z at a specific E/N value, these counts were then normalised to $10^6 \text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ or $10^6 (\text{H}_3\text{O}^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O})$, depending on the compound’s proton affinity and previously established information regarding the specific behaviour of, for example, benzene and toluene (Hayward 2002). It was not possible to ascertain the proton affinity for trichlorobenzene, so it was assumed that it would have a PA similar to that of the other chlorobenzenes and so was normalised only to m/z 19.

3.5.1.1 Varying E/N at Constant Pressure

Figure 3.56 shows two spectra for the calibration gas, the red line $E/N = 140 \text{Td}$ and the black line is the spectrum for $E/N = 240 \text{Td}$. The integration time was 60 s in both cases. In all cases, the protonated parent ion decreased at higher $E/N$, whilst m/z 50, 51, 75, 77, 91, 103, and 111 all appear as predicted by the previous study of fragmentation of the compounds, along with a peak at m/z 169, 1,3-dinitrobenzene, (m.w. = 168.017 amu, protonated m.w. = 169.024 amu), still resident in the reaction chamber nine days after colleagues had been investigating this.
Figure 3.56: Calibration gas spectra at $E/N$ values 140 Td and 240 Td.
Sensitivities for the calibration gas compounds over a range of $E/N$ values are shown in Figure 3.57 and the data are given in Table 3.15. Figure 3.57a shows the sensitivity without accounting for fragmentation, and Figure 3.57b includes the fragmentation. These show that ignoring the fragmentation of compounds and their contribution to other peaks distorts the results by exaggerating sensitivities, primarily in the compounds most susceptible to fragmentation e.g. ethylbenzene/xylenes, and compounds that receive product ions from several other species.

Table 3.15: Data for sensitivity with fragmentation in Figure 3.56b
Values are normalised counts per second

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E/N$ [Td]</th>
<th>m/z 79</th>
<th>m/z 93</th>
<th>m/z 105</th>
<th>m/z 107</th>
<th>m/z 113</th>
<th>m/z 121</th>
<th>m/z 147</th>
<th>m/z 181</th>
<th>$\text{H}_2\text{O}^+$ (counts/s)</th>
<th>$\text{H}_2\text{O}.\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ (counts/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,198,507</td>
<td>3,951,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,507,890</td>
<td>4,125,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,194,916</td>
<td>3,193,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,649,534</td>
<td>2,025,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,912,652</td>
<td>1,178,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42,464,939</td>
<td>697,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47,707,494</td>
<td>426,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52,084,163</td>
<td>297,105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.57: Sensitivity for calibration gas, $E/N = 120 - 240$ Td at constant pressure = 0.8 mbar where 'Up' refers to results as $E/N$ was increased.

a) no fragmentation correction coefficients applied; b) fragmentation correction coefficients applied.

$(19)$ = counts normalised to $10^6 \text{H}_2\text{O}^+$

$(19+37)$ = counts normalised to $10^6 (\text{H}_2\text{O}^+ \text{H}_2\text{O}^+ (\text{H}_2\text{O}))$

The results for benzene and ethylbenzene/xylenes are shown separately in Figures 3.58a) and b). For benzene, the graph shows the over-estimation in the sensitivity results if fragmentation is not taken into account in this type of complex chemical mixture. This is to be expected for most compounds at high $E/N$ values, but for benzene it can be seen that even at 140 Td there is a 50% over-estimation resulting from the fragmentation of ethylbenzene contributing a product ion at $m/\ell 79.$
Figure 3.58: Sensitivity a) with and b) without fragments for a) benzene and b) ethylbenzene/xylenes

Figure 3.58b shows that there is an under-estimation in sensitivity.

It can be seen that the general trend is for the sensitivity to reduce as \( E/N \) increases. This increases the velocity of \( H_3O^+ \) ions as they traverse the reaction chamber resulting in a reduction in reaction time: reaction time is inversely proportional to \( E/N \).

3.5.1.2 Varying Pressure with Constant \( E/N \)

Figures 3.59a) and b) show the sensitivity behaviour with and without fragment correction as the drift tube pressure is varied from 0.8 mbar to 1.32 mbar, and \( E/N \) is held at a constant 140 Td by adjusting the relevant voltages. This value of \( E/N \) was chosen as this is the most frequently used value in work undertaken here. The only compound to vary as a result of these changes is benzene (\( m/z \) 79). This displays a sensitivity where fragmentation is not accounted for (~7–12 ncpb ppbv\(^{-1}\)) higher than with fragmentation (~4–7 ncpb ppbv\(^{-1}\)) both values normalised to \( 10^6 \) \( H_3O^+ \). This is the result of ethylbenzene fragmenting at \( E/N = 140 \) Td to yield product ions at \( m/z \) 79. The effect on ethylbenzene sensitivity results is masked because it is included with the xylenes at \( m/z \) 107.
Figure 3.59: Sensitivity for calibration gas, pressure 0.8 – 1.32 mbar at constant $E/N = 140$ Td. a) has no fragmentation correction; b) applies fragmentation correction. Note that benzene ($m/z$ 79) moves from second lowest position with fragments to almost the highest position without fragments.
3.5.2 Toluene:Benzene Sensitivity Ratio – Comparison with Theory

In order to check the ‘validity’ of the data, the sensitivity ratio for benzene and toluene was calculated. The expected ratio of sensitivity for toluene:benzene = 1.2 ± 0.3 (Warneke et al. 2001). This is calculated from the rate coefficients in \( H_3O^+ \) for benzene \((1.9 \pm 0.4 \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^3/\text{mol/s})\) and toluene \((2.2 \pm 0.4 \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^3/\text{mol/s})\).

Figure 3.60 shows the results for this sensitivity ratio over the \( E/N \) range 100 Td – 240 Td: it falls within the expected values for \( E/N = 120 \text{ Td} \) to 220 Td. The upper curve is corrected for fragmentation; the lower curve has no fragmentation correction. It is not surprising that these graphs are so different, as benzene is particularly affected by contributions from other compounds.

![Sensitivity Ratio Toluene:Benzene](image)

Figure 3.60: Graph showing the ratio of sensitivities for toluene:benzene
3.6 Further Discussion

3.6.1 Variation in Spectra in p-Dichlorobenzene as $E/N$ Increases

An unexpected pattern of spectra was observed for the protonated parent ion during an $E/N$ investigation of deuterated p-dichlorobenzene, (m/z 151) (Figure 3.61). At $E/N = 90$ Td, the

![Figure 3.61: Deuterated p-dichlorobenzene spectra with changing $E/N$](image)

![Figure 3.62: p-Dichlorobenzene spectra with changing $E/N$](image)
mass spectrum looks very similar to non-deuterated \( p \)-dichlorobenzene (Figure 3.62a). As \( E/N \) increases, however, the deuterated species becomes much more complex with \( MH^+ \) and isotope peaks appearing at varying \( m/z \) values.

The series of spectra for non-deuterated \( p \)-dichlorobenzene as \( E/N \) varies shows the normal behaviour for isotope ratios (Figure 3.62). However, inspection of the \( ^{13}\)C isotope peak at \( m/z \) 148 shows a much higher signal than expected. This is related to the peak at \( m/z \) 146 produced by non-dissociative charge transfer with oxygen in the system. Not all peaks display this non-dissociative charge transfer peak as can be seen in Figure 3.63 where \( m/z \) 94 displays a peak at \( m/z \) 93, but \( m/z \) 99 has no peak at \( m/z \) 98. Where such peaks appear, the signal has been included in the counts for the \( MH^+ \) peak.

The \( m/z \) 146 \( M^+ \) peak has a \( ^{37}\)Cl isotope peak at \( m/z \) 148. Consequently, the peak at \( m/z \) 148 consists of the sum of the \( ^{13}\)C isotope for \( MH^+ \) plus the \( ^{37}\)Cl isotope peak for \( M^+ \). It should be noted that \( M^+ \) has a \( ^{13}\)C isotope at \( m/z \) 147 which also must be removed from the \( MH^+ \) signal (Table 3.16). This shows that the ratio of the actual counts for the peaks at \( m/z \) 147 and \( m/z \) 148:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( m/z ) 148:147</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( m/z ) 146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( m/z ) 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.16: Actual and adjusted counts in \( p \)-dichlorobenzene at 230 Td for peaks at \( m/z \) 146 to \( m/z \) 148
148 before any adjustments are made is 19.32%. After removing the $^{13}$C isotope counts for the peak at $M^+$ from the counts at $m/z$ 147, and also removing the $^{37}$Cl isotope counts at $m/z$ 148 for $M^+$, the ratio of the adjusted peaks $m/z$ 147 and $m/z$ 148 becomes 6.8%, very close to the expected 6.6% for the six carbon atoms in $\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{Cl}_2^+$.

### 3.6.2 Anomalies for $m/z$ 85 and $m/z$ 87

These product ions appear in the dichlorobenzenes and their spectra change as $E/N$ changes (see Figure 3.64). If the spectrum is examined at $E/N = 240$ Td there appears to be an ion at $m/z$ 85 with two chlorine atoms; if inspected at $E/N = 190$ Td, there seems to be an ion at $m/z$ 87 with one chlorine atom. These product ions make only a very small contribution to the whole branching ratio picture and so have been excluded from the BR graph.
3.6.3 PTR-MS vs. Electron Impact Mass Spectra

Results for the highest $E/N$ values become similar to those found in electron impact (EI) spectra: a comparison of both mass spectra shows that many product ions occur at the same $m/z$, apart from $M^+$ which appears, as expected, at $(m+1)/z$ in the PTR spectrum (Figure 3.65).

This result is surprising considering the very different energy conditions in the two processes:

For EI ionisation the following reaction takes place:

$$e^- + M \rightarrow (M')^* + 2e^-$$

where $M = $ analyte, $e^- = $ electron and * represents an excited species.

Figure 3.65: Spectra for chlorobenzene
for a) electron impact and b) PTR showing relative intensities

EI takes place at $\sim70$ eV and proton transfer at energies of $\sim2$eV.

The two different types of reactions can be described in the following way.
(M')* may then fragment, either sequentially or in parallel, into (A+)*, B+, C+, etc.:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(M')^* \\
\downarrow \quad (A')^* \\
\downarrow \quad B^+ \\
\downarrow \quad C^+
\end{array}
\]

The parent peak and fragments appear at \( m/z \), where \( m \) = molecular weight and \( z \) = charge.

For proton transfer reactions, the following reaction occurs:

\[
\text{H}_3\text{O}^+ + M \rightarrow (\text{MH}^+)^* + \text{H}_2\text{O}
\]

In this case, the parent peak appears at \((m+1)/z\). If sufficient energy is available after protonation, \((\text{MH}^+)^*\) can fragment further:

\[
(\text{MH}^+)^* \rightarrow A^+ + \text{B (e.g. H}_2\text{)},
\]

The surplus collisional energy can then result in \( A^+ \) fragmenting in the same way as that observed in El, resulting in fragments appearing at \( m/z \), rather than the protonated \((m+1)/z\) normally seen in PTR-MS.

### 3.7 Conclusion

Sensitivity measurements for \( E/N = 90 \) Td to 245 Td and \( m/z = 79 \) to 181 found a value of 4-6 ncp s ppbv\(^{-1}\) normalised to \( 10^6 \) \( \text{H}_3\text{O}^+ \). Each of the 14 compounds in the calibration gas used here was separately investigated over the same \( E/N \) range to establish fragmentation behaviour and possible interfering contributions. Several were found to have product ions occurring at \( m/z \) 79, mostly occurring at higher energy levels (\( E/N > 160 \) to 170 Td). Ethylbenzene was a notable exception: it is reduced by ~ 40% at \( E/N = 140 \) Td producing \( m/z \) 79. Other effects became apparent on closer inspection of these data: an unlikely cluster formed in the dichlorobenzenes at \( m/z \) 129 appears to be formed by a product ion at \( m/z \) 111 (\( \text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{Cl}^+ \)) associating with a molecule of water, \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \). This is especially puzzling as it only appears at higher \( E/N \) values, reaching a peak at ~ 200 Td. The isomeric compounds ethyl benzene and xylenes produce very different fragmentation patterns in a wide energy range, so enabling
their possible differentiation, although the individual xylene isomers cannot be distinguished using this method.
Chapter 4 – Hexenols

"[The] structural theory is of extreme simplicity.... this theory has always proved capable of providing a different structure for every different compound ... there are never more isomeric forms than the theory permits."

Nevil Vincent Sidgwick

Presidential Address to the Chemical Society (16 Apr 1936),

*Journal of the Chemical Society* (1936),
4.1 Introduction

The C₆ unsaturated alcohols (hexenols) form part of the hexenal family, a series of volatile compounds whose characteristic odour is that of cut grass. This work examines the effect of energy changes in the PTR-TOF-MS on all four of the hexen-l-ol isomers, cis-2-hexen-l-ol, trans-2-hexen-l-ol, cis-3-hexen-l-ol (‘leaf alcohol’) and trans-3-hexen-l-ol (hereafter referred to as cis-2, trans-2, cis-3 and trans-3).

These species are found in the atmosphere, being produced by the leaves of many plants during the course of wounding, drying and pathogen attack. In this latter case, cis-3 is found as a signalling chemical to trigger defence responses (Heiden 2003, Hatanaka 1993, Farag 2005 and Laothawornkitkul 2009). Investigations in the 1950s and ‘60s showed that the presence in the atmosphere of small amounts of these and other biogenic VOCs contribute to ozone formation (Fall 1999a). These examples illustrate the interdisciplinary nature of investigations involving these VOCs and are of interest to atmospheric chemists with respect to modelling regional and global VOC emissions (e.g. Guenther 1999), botanists regarding VOC roles in plant biology and ecology, and entomologists are concerned with VOCs as signalling agents (reviewed by Laothawornkitkul 2009).

Studies of hexenols also appear in other application areas involving complex chemical environments, such as flavour analysis (Aharoni 2000, Buhr 2002) and fragrance synthesis (Froissard 2011 and Ibdah 2011). It is particularly important to be able to identify the full range of active components in flavour analysis where efforts have been made to relate molecular structure to aroma since at least 1971 (Bedoukian 1971, Blake 2009).

Various techniques have been used to examine these compounds, viz. GC-MS for cis-3 (Heiden et al. 2003), selected ion flow tube-MS (SIFT-MS) studies of cis-2 and the 3-hexen-1-ols (Schoon et al. 2007), FA-SIFT-MS experiments with cis-3 and trans-2 (Dhooghe et al. 2009) and all four isomers (Dhooghe et al. 2012), and, most pertinently for this study, proton transfer reaction mass spectrometry: Demarcke 2010 (cis-2 and trans-3), Buhr 2002 (cis-3) and Fall et al. 1999b (trans-2 and 3-hexen-1-ols).
There has been much interest of late in studying how changing the collisional energy conditions within the reaction chamber of a PTR-MS influences the product ion branching ratios (Brown et al. 2010, Demarcke 2010, Ennis et al. 2005). This work advances that of previous researchers (Fall et al. 1999b, Demarcke et al. 2010) by studying all four of the hexenol isomers over a wider $E/N$ range on a PTR time of flight instrument. Fall et al. examined the fragmentation patterns of the cis-3, trans-3 and trans-2 isomers in a quadrupole PTR-MS instrument. The $E/N$ at which this was carried out was not specified but is considered most likely to be 120 Td. These results are summarised in Table 4.1. Demarcke et al.’s work also used a quad PTR-MS and covers the $E/N$ range of 80 Td to 140 Td for cis-3 and trans-2.

Details of this work are also given in § 4.4.

Table 4.1: Research to date for hexen-1-ols

Analysed by author, instrument and buffer gas for SIFTS, the product ions detected ($m/z$) and which isomers were inspected. Not all of the product ions were found for all of the isomers listed for an author.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Done By</th>
<th>Instrument (Buffer gas)</th>
<th>$m/z$</th>
<th>Hexenol(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall et al. (1999b)</td>
<td>PTR-MS quad</td>
<td>55 ($C_6H_7^+$), 69 ($C_5H_6^+$)*, 83 ($C_6H_7^+$), 101 ($C_6H_2OH^+$)</td>
<td>Cis-2, trans-3 and trans-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhr et al. (2002)</td>
<td>PTR-MS quad</td>
<td>55, 83, 84 ($C_5H_5^+$)*</td>
<td>Cis-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demarcke et al. (2010)</td>
<td>PTR-MS quad</td>
<td>39 ($C_5H_3^+$), 41 ($C_4H_4^+$), 55, 83, 101, 119</td>
<td>Cis-3 and trans-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer et al. (2003)</td>
<td>FA-SIFT (He)</td>
<td>67 ($C_6H_11^+$)<em>, 69 ($C_5H_5^+$)</em>, 81 ($C_6H_5^+$)*, 83, 99 ($C_6H_2OH^+$ or $C_7H_{15}^+$), 101</td>
<td>Cis-2, trans-3 and trans-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoon et al. (2007)</td>
<td>SIFT (He)</td>
<td>83, 99, 101</td>
<td>Cis-2, cis-3, trans-2 and trans-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhooghe et al. (2009)</td>
<td>FA-SIFT (Ar)</td>
<td>83, 101, 119 ($C_6H_{12}OH^+(H_2O)$), 137 ($C_6H_{12}OH^+(H_2O)<em>2$), 155 ($C_6H</em>{12}OH^+(H_2O)_3$)*</td>
<td>Cis-3 and trans-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhooghe et al. (2012)</td>
<td>FA-TMS (Ar)</td>
<td>29 ($C_3H_5^+$)<em>, 31 ($C_3H_7^+$)</em>, 41†, 43 ($C_4H_7^+$), 53 ($C_6H_5^+$), 55, 83</td>
<td>Cis-2, cis-3, trans-2 and trans-3. (Data from CID of $m/z$ 83)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*= Product ions not seen in this work
†= Product ions only seen at energies $> 2eV$
*= Could be the isotope for $m/z$ 83
4.2 Experimental

4.2.1 The Hexenol Isomers $C_6H_{11}OH$

Hexenol has the molecular formula $C_6H_{11}OH$. The structures of the four isomers investigated in this PTR-MS study are shown in Figures 4.1a) to d).

![Diagram of hexenol isomers]

**Figure 4.1:** Schematic structures of the four hexen-1-ol isomers:
- a) Trans-2-hexen-1-ol ($E$-2-hexen-1-ol);
- b) Trans-3-hexen-1-ol ($E$-3-hexen-1-ol);
- c) Cis-2-hexen-1-ol ($Z$-2-hexen-1-ol);
- d) Cis-3-hexen-1-ol ($Z$-3-hexen-1-ol)

The trans-hexenols have the substituent groups on differing sides of the carbon chain, whereas in the cis-hexenols, these groups are on the same side of the C chain.

Chemicals were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (purities $\geq 99\%$) and used with no further purification.
4.2.2 Set-up

A syringe and syringe drive were used to introduce each sample into the reaction chamber of the PTR-TOF-MS which was held at a temperature of 303±1 K and a pressure of 1.0 mbar. 1 mL of sample was deposited onto cotton wool inside the syringe (Figure 4.2). This was then filled with filtered lab air (Agilent HC trap HT200-4) and the syringe needle was inserted into a septum connected to a ¼ in Teflon tube through which filtered laboratory air was flowing. The Teflon tube was connected to the PTR-TOF-MS inlet needle valve using Swagelok connectors. No further changes were made, for example to reduce humidity, in an attempt to replicate normal operational conditions when field analysis for such chemicals is performed. Fifteen $E/N$ settings were used, from 100 Td to 170 Td in steps of 5 Td. Three spectra were taken at each $E/N$ value both without (background) and with the analyte. A separate set of identical equipment was used for each chemical.

4.2.3 Data Analysis

4.2.3.1 Background Measurement Correction

Measurements with filtered laboratory air were taken over the same $E/N$ range before each isomer was studied. The data for each background $m/z$ were subtracted from the analyte $m/z$ values.
4.2.3.2 Product Ions Investigated

The product ions investigated here are primarily taken from the work of various authors on the hexenols (Table 4.1). This work sees *m/z* 117 which is not mentioned in any of the foregoing research. As it is always seen in conjunction with *m/z* 99 it is presumed to be its hydrate, C₆H₉OH⁺(H₂O).

4.2.3.3 Product Ions at *m/z* 39 and *m/z* 55

Issues arise when determining product ions at *m/z* 39 (C₃H₃⁺ mass 39.0229 amu) and *m/z* 55 (C₄H₇⁺ mass 55.0542 amu): with pure water vapour alone in the drift tube, the protonated water dimer's ¹⁸O isotope is always present at *m/z* 39 (39.0327 amu) and the protonated water trimer itself is found at *m/z* 55 (55.039 amu) (see §2.2.2.1). The resolution of the instrument is insufficient to distinguish such small differences in mass (0.0107 amu for the *m/z* 37 product ions and 0.0152 amu for those at *m/z* 55). Methods for dealing with these difficulties are explained below.

- *m/z* 39 Product ion C₃H₃⁺

  The method used to estimate the product ion counts at *m/z* 39 is the same as that used in Chapter 3 for the alkyl benzenes: the ¹⁸O isotope counts expected from the water dimer, H₂O⁺(H₂O) at *m/z* 37 are calculated and subtracted from the actual counts at *m/z* 39. This is satisfactory for *E/N* values > 140 Td and accounts for the *m/z* 39 branching ratios starting at *E/N* ≥ 140 Td.
• $m/z$ 55 Product ion $C_4H_7^+$

This $m/z$ is slightly easier to deal with than counts at $m/z$ 39, since the water trimer signal at $m/z$ 55 completely disappears as $E/N$ becomes greater than ~ 120 Td, based on investigations using only purified air in the drift tube (see §2.2.2.1).

The signal at $m/z$ 56, the $^{13}$C isotope of $C_4H_7^+$ was used to determine the signal at $m/z$ 55 for this product ion, representing 4.4% of the product ion's signal at $m/z$ 55. With no analyte (i.e. background counts for just air), the protonated water trimer produces a signal at $m/z$ 56 of 0.2% of the signal at $m/z$ 55, representing the $^2$H isotope. These counts were subtracted from the analyte counts at $m/z$ 56 and the result was divided by 0.044 to calculate the total expected counts resulting from the fragment $C_4H_7^+$.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 2-Hexen-1-ols

4.3.1.1 Trans-2-hexen-1-ol

Figure 4.3 shows spectra for trans-2 at (a) $E/N = 115$ Td and (b) 170 Td. The $(M-TyFr)$ product ion at $m/z$ 99 and its hydrate at $m/z$ 117 can be seen in Figure 4.3a). There is a very small signal at $m/z$ 101, at 115 Td which may be the protonated parent. The peak at $m/z$ 55 for $E/N = 115$ Td contains a significant amount of the protonated water trimer, $H_3O^+.(H_2O)_2$. However, at 170 Td, the contribution from this has almost completely disappeared, based on investigations using only purified air in the drift tube, leaving only the signal from the product ion $C_4H_7^+$. This applies to all of the isomers.
Figures 4.4a) and b) illustrate the product ion ratio percentages (branching ratios) for *trans*-2 over the full range of *E/N* values from 100 Td to 170 Td. Figure 4.4a) shows the major product ions; Figure 4.4b) displays minor product ions at the lower branching ratio percentages of < 12%.
Demarcke et al. 2010 and Fall et al. 1999b) investigated trans-2 on a PTR-MS (quad), with Demarcke varying $E/N$ from 80 Td to 140 Td. Percentage fragmentations for Fall and Demarcke's results for trans-2 at $E/N$ 120 Td are given in Table 4.2 along with those from this work. The Demarcke values are estimated from the product ion distribution graphs in their paper.

In order to enable a comparison of results from this work with those of the above two authors, values are given for $E/N = 140$ Td, the setting regularly used on this PTR-TOF-MS instrument as the standard where the ratio of $m/z$ 19:$m/z$ 37 < 10%. (For further information, see Chapter 2.)
These results are largely in agreement with those found by Demarcke et al. 2010. The main

**Table 4.2: Comparison of branching ratios (BR%) for trans-2**
by Fall et al. (1999b), Demarcke et al. (2010) and this work.
Demarcke’s data estimated from their product ion distributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m/z</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>69</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>101</th>
<th>117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demarcke et al.*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall et al.†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work*</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E/N = 120 Td has been used to enable comparison with Fall 1999b.
† No E/N value reported
* E/N = 140 Td for comparative moisture levels

difference is the product ion at m/z 99 which is found in this work but is not mentioned at all by Demarcke.

*Trans*-2 has also been investigated in FA-SIFT instruments by Dhooghe et al. 2009 and Custer et al. 2003. The latter study finds major product ions at m/z 83 and 55, and minor ions at m/z 101, 99 and 95. No further details are given, except that the minor product ions are present at less than half the intensity of the major product ions. Dhooghe et al. 2009 react *trans*-2 with H$_2$O$^+$.H$_2$O$_n$ for n = 0 to 3. Their results are given in Table 4.3. Of the

**Table 4.3: Summary of FA-SIFT results for trans-2 from Dhooghe et al. (2009)**
Reactions with *trans*-2 showing % yield of product ions and the mechanisms by which they form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Product ion m/z</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$O$^+$</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Proton transfer with loss of H$_2$O: M + H$_2$O$^+$ → C$<em>6$H$</em>{11}$$^+$ + 2H$_2$O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$O$^+$.H$_2$O</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td>Dissociative proton transfer: M + H$_2$O$^+$.H$_2$O → C$<em>6$H$</em>{11}$$^+$ + 3H$_2$O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_2$O$^+$.H$_2$O$_2$</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-dissociative proton transfer: M + H$_2$O$^+$.H$_2$O$_2$ → MH$^+$ + 3H$_2$O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ligand switching with loss of H$_2$O: M + H$_2$O$^+$.H$_2$O$_2$ → MH$^+$.(H$_2$O)$_2$ + 2H$_2$O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ligand switching: M + H$_2$O$^+$.H$_2$O$_2$ → MH$^+$.(H$_2$O)$_2$ + H$_2$O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M = Parent molecule C$_6$H$_{11}$OH
N = No data given

ions described by Dhooghe, this work only finds m/z 83 and Dhooghe does not find m/z 99.
4.3.1.2 *Cis*-2-hexen-1-ol

Figure 4.5 shows spectra for *cis*-2 at a) \( E/N = 115 \) Td and b) 170 Td. As found for the *trans-*

2 fragmentation, there is a very small protonated parent signal, \( m/z \) 101 at 115 Td. The (M-H)\(^+\) product ion at \( m/z \) 99 can be seen in Figure 4.5a) and the hydrate signal at \( m/z \) 117 is also discernible but has disappeared completely at \( E/N = 170 \) Td.

---

**Figure 4.5:** Spectra for *cis*-2 at a) 115 Td and b) 170 Td. The product ion at \( m/z \) 99 is seen in a) with its hydrate at \( m/z \) 117 but these have mostly disappeared at \( E/N \) 170 Td in b); \( m/z \) 41 is absent at lower \( E/N \) values.
The product ions found over the full energy range for \textit{cis}-2 are \textit{m}/\textit{z} 99, 83, 55, 41 and 39 and the branching ratios for the major product ions are shown in Figure 4.6a). Figure 4.6b) shows the minor product ions with branching ratios < 10%.

![Cis-2-hexen-1-ol Major Product Ions](image1)

![Cis-2-hexen-1-ol Minor Product Ions < 10%](image2)

**Figure 4.6:** Branching ratios for \textit{cis}-2.
Product ions in a) and b) are shown at different scales of BR percentages. No protonated parent ion (\textit{m}/\textit{z} 101) appears.

There is very little work reported in the literature concerning \textit{cis}-2. Two groups report on all four isomers: a FA-TMS study (Dhooghe \textit{et al.} 2012) which looks only at the CID of the \textit{m}/\textit{z} 83 product ion and the SIFT work of Schoon \textit{et al.} 2007. This is the only group to report \textit{m}/\textit{z} 99 as a product ion for either of the 2-hexen-1-ols and consider it to be (M-H)\textsuperscript{+} being a product of the reaction with H\textsubscript{3}O\textsuperscript{+} with a 3% reaction channel. The current work finds \approx 5% branching ratio at the lowest energy, 100 Td, which compares favourably with
that result, bearing in mind that the SIFT work is at thermal energies (~ 300 K) and so ions are less likely to fragment in that system. (Table 2.3, Chapter 2 shows that 100 Td in this PTR-TOF-MS is equivalent to 1054 K, approximately three times greater than in the SIFT.)

4.3.2 3-Hexen-1-ols

4.3.2.1 Trans-3-hexen-1-ol

Figure 4.7a) and b) show spectra for trans-3 at $E/N = 115$ Td and 170 Td. Peaks at $m/z$ 83 and $m/z$ 55 occur in differing ratios at the two $E/N$ values. The protonated parent signal at $m/z$ 101 is easily visible at $E/N = 115$ Td but has almost disappeared at $E/N = 170$ Td. The large peaks at $m/z$ 59 are most likely to be protonated acetone ($CH_3COCH_3H^+$), an impurity,
as the signal at this peak value remains fairly constant throughout the collisional energy range. Fall et al. 1999b report a large percentage of \( m/z \, 59 \) (20%) for this compound, (Table 4.3), commented on by Dhooghe et al. 2012 who also consider this to be an acetone impurity.

The branching ratios for \textit{trans}-3 over the full range of \( E/N \) values are shown for the major product ions in Figure 4.8a) and enhanced for the minor product ions at branching ratios < 12% in Figure 4.8b).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure4.8.png}
\caption{Branching ratios for \textit{trans}-3. Product ions in a) and b) are shown at different scales of BR percentages. The protonated parent is seen at \( m/z \, 101 \) and the first water monomer at \( m/z \, 119 \).

The protonated parent ion, \( m/z \, 101 \), is clearly visible (\sim 18\% at \( E/N = 100 \) Td) along with its associated water monomer, \( \text{C}_6\text{H}_{12}\text{OH}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \) at \( m/z \, 119 \). In their SIFT work on \textit{trans}-3}
reactions with H$_3$O$^+$, Schoon et al. 2007 find a reaction channel of $< 6\%$ for m/z 101 and 93\% for m/z 83. We find $\sim 60\%$ at the lowest energy for m/z 83.

4.3.2.2 Cis-3-hexen-1-ol

Figure 4.9 shows spectra for cis-3 at E/N = 115 Td (a) and E/N = 170 Td (b). The protonated parent ion at m/z 101 and its hydrate at m/z 119 can be seen for E/N = 115 Td but it has virtually disappeared at E/N = 170 Td and, as expected, no m/z 119 is observed. A small but significant peak for m/z 41 can be seen in Figure 4.9b) and Figure 4.9b) confirms this.

The product ion distribution for the whole E/N range is shown in Figures 4.10a) and b): Figure 4.10a) shows the major product ions and Figure 4.10b) amplifies the scale for the product ions with BRs $< 14\%$ where the protonated parent’s hydrates can be seen.
Demarcke et al. 2010 and Fall et al. 1999b investigated cis-3 on a PTR-QUAD-MS, with Demarcke varying $E/N$ from 80 Td to 140 Td. Their results for cis-3 percentage fragmentations at $E/N$ 120 Td are shown in Table 4.4 along with those from this work at $E/N = 140$ Td for the same reasons as stated for trans-2 in §4.3.2.1.. The Demarcke values are estimated from product ion distributions in their paper (2010).
Table 4.4: Comparison of branching ratios (BR%) for cis-3 by Fall et al. (1999b) and Demarcke et al. (2010) and this work. Demarcke’s data estimated from their product ion distributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cis-3</th>
<th>m/z</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demarcke et al.*</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall et al.†</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work*</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*E/N = 120 Td data to enable comparison with Fall 1999b.
†No E/N value reported
*E/N = 140 Td for comparative moisture levels

These results are largely in agreement with those found by Demarcke et al. 2010. The main difference is the product ion at m/z 59 in Fall’s work which is not found in this work and is again, as mentioned in §4.3.2.3 Trans-3, an acetone impurity.

Cis-3 has also been investigated in a SIFT instrument by Dhooghe et al. 2009 and in a FA-SIFT by Custer et al. 2003. The latter study was primarily interested in negative ion (OH') reactions, but presents data from reactions with H3O+ for comparison. For cis-3 they find only one major product ion at m/z 83 and the three minor ions m/z 101, 99 and 67. No further details are given, except that the minor product ions are present at less than half the intensity of the major product ions.

Reactions in the SIFT with cis-3 and H3O+. (H2O)n for n = 0 to 3 carried out by Dhooghe et al. 2009 are presented in Table 4.5. This shows how cis-3 fragments when reacted with each reagent ion, H3O+, H3O+. (H2O), H3O+. (H2O)2 and H3O+. (H2O)3. Taking m/z 83 as an example, the table shows that 95% of the parent molecule reacts with H3O+ (m/z 19) in a
non-dissociative proton transfer and the loss of H₂O to form m/z 83. The parent ion also reacts with H₃O⁺.(H₂O) (m/z 37) but with only a 12% yield of m/z 83.

The inference from this is that, in the PTR-TOF-MS at low E/N, where there is more H₃O⁺.(H₂O) than H₃O⁺, less m/z 83 will be seen than at higher energy values. Figure 4.11 shows the branching ratios for water dimers in the cis-3 data as E/N is increased and is introduced to demonstrate how the water dimer ratios have affected the product ion percentages and behaviour vis à vis the values in Table 4.5. In Figure 4.11 it can be seen that the proportion of H₃O⁺ increases from a very low level (~ 8%) at low E/N to become the dominant species at E/N ≥ 120 Td. It also shows that the water trimer, H₃O⁺.(H₂O)₂, m/z 55, is present for E/N = 100 Td to 130 Td and that H₃O⁺.(H₂O)₃, m/z 73, is only just discernible for the two lowest E/N values. Note that the contribution from the cis-3 product ion at m/z 55 has been deducted to give the values shown here.

To demonstrate how product ions m/z 83, 101, 119 and 137 are affected by these levels of water cluster ions, their branching ratios are superimposed on the water clusters graph in Figure 4.12. Equations for the reactions described below can be found in Table 4.3.
Looking at each product ion in turn and starting with $m/z$ 83, it can be seen from Table 4.5 that this is mostly produced by a reaction of $m/z$ 101 with $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ (95%) by dissociative proton transfer. However, at $E/N < 115$ Td there is very little $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ but the significant amount of $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})$ gives rise to most of the $m/z$ 83 and this latter continues to rise as $E/N$ is increased and the proportions of $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ and $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})$ change with an overall increase in their sum total. This increase in $m/z$ 83 appears to follow $(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+ + \text{H}_3\text{O}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O}))$ until $E/N = 125$ Td when the collisional energy is sufficient to fragment $m/z$ 83 quite significantly to produce $m/z$ 55 as can be seen in Figure 4.10a.

The signal at $m/z$ 101 is a result of non-dissociative protonation of the parent molecule with $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+(4\%)$ and $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})(33\%)$ (Table 4.5). As so much more of the protonated parent molecule is produced by reacting with $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})$, it is not surprising to see the branching ratio for $m/z$ 101 follow this as it reduces.

The product ion at $m/z$ 119 results from ligand switching of M with $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})$ and $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\cdot(\text{H}_2\text{O})_2$. In the SIFT the percentages of $m/z$ 83, 101 and 119 are 12%, 33%, 55%. In the PTR-MS instrument used here, there is much less $m/z$ 119 than either of the other two product ions for all $E/N$ values. This is most likely because the higher collision energies in
the PTR cause fragmentation of this hydrated protonated parent ion. It can also be seen that
the ratio of $m/z$ 119 follows the line of the water trimer: Dhooghe et al. indicate that $m/z$
119 is seen as a result of a ligand switching reaction with $H_3O^+(H_2O)_2$ and the subsequent
elimination of $H_2O$ but no data are available for their percentage yield.
Finally, $m/z$ 137, the protonated parent water dimer, is the product of reactions with both
$H_3O^+(H_2O)_2$ and $H_2O^+(H_2O)_3$. However the contributions from each reagent ion are not
provided (Table 4.5). It would appear from Figure 4.12 that all of the signal for $m/z$ 137 is a
result of a ligand switching reaction and a loss of $H_2O$ with $H_3O^+(H_2O)_3$.
No signal was observed at $m/z$ 155 in this work.

4.4 Summary and Discussion
The graphs in Figure 4.13 and 4.14 summarise the fragmentation behaviour described above by
showing the branching ratios for the isomers analysed by product ion. Figures 4.13a) to d) show
graphs for $m/z$ 39, 41, 55 and 83. All isomers produce these ions over the $E/N$ range used here
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**Figure 4.13:** Branching ratios for isomers grouped by product ions
a) $m/z$ 39, b) $m/z$ 41, c) $m/z$ 55 and d) $m/z$ 83. Fragmentation behaviour appears to be related to the position of the C=C bond for all product ions except for $m/z$ 41.
and there is some evidence that the branching ratios depend on the position of the C=C bond (also see Schoon et al. 2007). For example, in Figures 4.14a) to d), m/z 99 and 117 are only seen for the 2-hexen-1-ols, and m/z 101 and 119 for the 3-hexen-1-ols. Several hydrated ions are observed, m/z 117, m/z 119, and m/z 137 which can be seen in the low percentage branching ratio graph for cis-3 (Figure 4.10b).

![Graphs of branching ratios for different m/z values](image)

Figure 4.14: Branching ratios for a) m/z 99, b) m/z 117, c) m/z 101 and d) m/z 119

These graphs further demonstrate the effect of the C=C position in the molecule.

Dhooghe et al. 2012 have further investigated all four isomers in a flowing afterglow tandem MS (FA-TMS) using argon as the carrier gas, examining the m/z 83 product ion resulting from their reaction with H$_3$O$^+$. As that instrument operates at higher energies than the PTR-MS, only the results for the lowest energy, below 1.8 eV, are quoted in this work. At these energies, identical fragmentation patterns were found for all four isomers, producing ions at m/z 55 (C$_4$H$_7^+$, ≈ 90%) and m/z 41 (C$_3$H$_5^+$, ≈ 10%) (Figure 4.15):
The FA-TMS study found other product ions at higher collision energies, viz. \( m/z \) 29 (C\(_2\)H\(_5^+\)), 31 (C\(_3\)H\(_7^+\)), 41 (C\(_3\)H\(_7^+\)) and 43 (C\(_3\)Hp\(^+\)). Only \( m/z \) 41 is seen in this work.

A table of energies in eV and corresponding \( E/N \) values used on the PTR-TOF-MS can be found in Table 2.3, §2.2.2.2. The maximum energy used in this work is 0.394 eV.

Table 4.6 illustrates how all four isomers fragment in the PTR-TOF-MS. A pattern is immediately apparent here: all four isomers produce ions at \( m/z \) 39, 41, 55 and 83 but differences become apparent at \( m/z \) values > 83. As noted earlier, the protonated parent ion at \( m/z \) 101 is absent for the 2-hexenols but present for both of the 3-hexenols. The 2-hexenols produce \( m/z \) 99; this is also found by Schoon 2007 where it is described as a result of a minor 3\% reaction channel when cis-2 reacts with H\(_3\)O\(^+\) in their SIFT instrument, having the structure (M-H\(^+\)).

The difference regarding the absence of the protonated parent in the 2-hexenols is in agreement with the work by Demarcke 2010 and Schoon 2007. Because Demarcke only examined one each of the (2) and (3) isomers, there is no reference with which to compare the relative BRs within each of the \( m/z \) 99 and 101 product ions. A summary of this work is given in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7: Summary of branching ratios (BR%) for \( E/N = 80-140 \) Td. (Demarcke et al. 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( m/z )</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>101</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>137</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trans-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y+</td>
<td>Y+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cis-3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y+</td>
<td>Y+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^+\) = SIFT experiments (Schoon et al. 2007)

Figure 4.16a, (repeat of Figure 4.14c), and Table 4.8 show that there is more cis-3 MH\(^+\) (\( m/z 101 \)) at a specific \( E/N \) value than appears in the trans-3 species for \( E/N < 140 \) Td, e.g. Table 4.8

Table 4.8: Comparison of BR %s for \( m/z 101 \) for cis-3 and trans-3, \( E/N = 100 \) Td – 140 Td

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( E/N )</th>
<th>Cis-3 %</th>
<th>Trans-3 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.16: Branching ratios for a) \( m/z 101 \) and b) \( m/z 119 \) for cis-3 and trans-3.

demonstrates that at \( E/N = 110 \) Td there is a 21% yield for cis-3 and a 15% yield for trans-3.

Figure 4.14a) shows that there is more \( m/z 99 \) from the trans-2 isomer at all \( E/N \) values than for cis-2. This leads to the conclusion that whichever product ions are present at \( m/z > 83 \) depends on the position of the C≡C bond: the 2-hexen-1-ols fragment to \( m/z 99 \) but no MH\(^+\) is seen. The 3-hexen-1-ols produce the protonated parent at \( m/z 101 \) but no \( m/z 99 \). This would then seem to be related to the positioning of the proton within the molecule and the subsequent fragmentation of the excited protonated molecule. It would be helpful to have the proton affinities for these individual configurations but, at present, they are not available.
The existence of fragmentation differences may help to identify these isomers in a mixture where other interfering compounds are absent. Examples of such compounds are given in Table 4.9 with a breakdown of their reported product ions and % values on reaction with $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ in both the SIFT and PTR-MS (extracted from Dhooghe 2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>$\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ Product Ion</th>
<th>SIFT 1</th>
<th>PTR-MS 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Hexanal</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Cis-3-hexenyl acetate</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Trans-2-hexenyl acetate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Španěl et al. 1997, 2 = Fall et al. 1999b

A possible method is presented as a flow chart in Figure 4.17 where the identification of a C₆ alcohol is determined initially by detecting peaks at m/z 39, 41, 55 and 83 at E/N $\geq$ 160 Td. It would then be necessary to reduce E/N to less than 115 Td to detect either m/z 101 or m/z 99. If m/z 101 is detected at this E/N value then either the cis-3 or trans-3 isomers are present with the percentage yield giving an indication of which configuration it is. Similarly, if m/z 99 is detected this would indicate the presence of the 2-hexen-1-ol configurations, the percentage yield again enabling identification.
Following an \( E/N \) study and calculation of BRs, it may be possible to identify a hexenol isomer from a mixture, depending on the absence of other species which could contribute to the peaks found here.
4.5 Conclusion

This work has shown that the same four product ions are seen for all of the hexenol isomers, \( m/z \) 83, 55, 41 and 39 when reacted with \( \text{H}_3\text{O}^+ \) in a PTR-TOF-MS. These results compare favourably with those of other groups working on both SIFT-MS and PTR-MS. However, this work finds that where the protonated parent ion, \( m/z \) 101 is absent, \( m/z \) 99 becomes apparent but this is not mentioned in any other study. It is this aspect of the hexenols’ behaviour that has led to the possibility of discriminating between the 2-hexenols and the 3-hexenols. It may also be possible to identify the cis- and trans- isomers. However, both product ions involved in this procedure are minor contributors to the branching ratios, and so the instrument’s sensitivity will limit the success of this method.
5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the major findings and practical developments described in the foregoing chapters. Practical innovations, both hardware and methodology, are discussed in the light of their necessity for improving measurements and how they have led to permanent instrument development.

The results of experimentation are discussed with regard to their importance in the light of their contribution to advances in the field of Proton Transfer Reaction Mass Spectrometry and possible further applications in specific areas.

5.2 Instrument Development

A primary requirement for analytical use of the PTR-TOF-MS instrument is knowledge and control of the reduced electric field, which is the ratio of the electric field strength (E) to the buffer gas number density (N), E/N, that characterises the collisional energy of reagent ions with neutrals and the product ions with the buffer gas, and hence the degree of fragmentation. This ratio can be determined from the temperature and pressure of the drift tube and the voltage drop across the drift tube. The only accurately measurable parameter on the original 'as received' instrument was the temperature ($\S 2.3$ Optimisation of the Instrument): there was no readily available method for measuring the voltage drop and the pressure gauge was not sufficiently sensitive. Thus it was necessary to install real-time accurate monitoring of the voltage applied across the reaction chamber and the absolute pressure of the reactant gas inside it.

The manufacturers (Kore) had suggested a method for measuring these voltages without actually attaching a permanent voltmeter. This involved measuring the voltages and calibrating the relevant potentiometers accordingly. This assumes a linear relationship between the potentiometer scale and the change in voltage – an assumption found to be invalid. Instead a digital voltmeter was added for the measurement of the voltages at the relevant electrodes: at the entrance and exit of the chamber and on a plate, 9 cm from the entrance of the chamber. The original reason for this inner electrode (plate 26) was to create a
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short region of much higher energy, \(E/N\), referred to as a collision-induced dissociation (CID) region (Blake et al. 2009) as the ions left the reaction chamber in order to break up any water clusters and so simplify the mass spectrum. The main disadvantage of using this method is that the VOC concentrations were underestimated as humidity increased: it was found that an elevated \(E/N\) in the CID region relative to the rest of the drift tube led to an overestimate of the amount of \(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+\), which included contributions from fragmented \(\text{H}_3\text{O}^+(\text{H}_2\text{O})_n\) ions (Wameke et al. 2005). It is also not clear if and how an \(E/N\) measurement could have been established, so making any results difficult to compare with those of other groups. It was for these reasons that, having the capability to set voltages on all three electrodes, they were deployed such that the inner electrode was invisible to the ions in the reaction chamber.

A Pirani pressure gauge was originally used to measure the pressure in the reaction chamber using the principle that the heat conduction of a gas depends on its pressure. The sensitivity of this type of gauge is dependent on the surface condition of the filament and inaccurate readings can be caused by the presence of organic vapours. (Harris 1997). A Pirani gauge is not absolute and in operation it was insufficiently sensitive. It was therefore replaced by a capacitance gauge which measures absolute pressure by sensing the deflection of a diaphragm between the sample volume and a sealed reference volume. The deflection is caused by forces due to a pressure differential which changes the capacitance between an electrode on the diaphragm and a rigid reference (Harris 1997). This gauge performed much better, both in response time, sensitivity and level of accuracy.

Both of these innovative, yet simple enhancements have had a direct benefit for other users in the field by improving the operational control of PTR-TOF-MS instruments now being offered by the manufacturer (Kore).

5.3 Calibration and Benchmarking

Characterising the instrument was essential for future studies relating to sensitivity and mass transmission dependencies, both of which are important for concentration determinations and
comparison of results with those of other instruments. In this study, a calibration gas comprising of 14 aromatic compounds was used to obtain the sensitivity measurements for a wide range of \( m/z \) values (79 to 181) and produced a value of 4-6 ncp/s ppbv\(^{-1}\) normalised to \( 10^{6} \) H\(_3\)O\(^{+}\) (Chapter 3). Each of the constituents of the calibration gas (§3.2.2 *Calibration Gas*) was separately investigated over a wide \( E/N \) range in order to determine the behaviour of the reactions with H\(_3\)O\(^{+}\). Significantly, results showed that product ions other than the protonated parent must be accounted for when a complex chemical mixture is subjected to analysis, otherwise the concentrations will be incorrectly determined. For example, if a fragment ion contributes to an \( m/z \) corresponding to a protonated parent of interest, then the concentration for the corresponding neutral will be overestimated if that contribution is not taken into account. Conversely, suppose the reaction of H\(_3\)O\(^{+}\) with a molecule, M, were to lead to the protonated parent and a fragment channel, with no contribution from other ions at the corresponding \( m/z \). Then, if the product ion corresponding to that channel is not taken into account, [M] will be underestimated. Thus the calculation of concentrations using PTR-MS is not as easy as proposed in some review articles e.g. Blake *et al.* 2009. This problem has been highlighted in the book by Ellis and Mayhew (Ellis 2014), but as yet few studies have been undertaken. The investigations in this thesis have illustrated how this issue can be addressed. Hence, the aromatic VOCs study has enhanced our knowledge of not only how \( E/N \) can be used to change fragmentation patterns in order to improve selectivity but also how these patterns can be used to aid in the determination of neutral concentrations. The determination of absolute concentrations is crucial for many environments including in particular the environmental and food sciences (Ellis 2014).

### 5.4 Techniques and Methodologies

During the course of pilot studies for pears and bacterial samples not reported in this thesis, it was recognised that it would be advantageous if the headspace for these types of samples could remain undiluted, not only whilst the VOCs were being introduced into the PTR-TOF-MS but also for the duration of the whole investigation, in one case being over 27 days. A
simple technique was devised whereby a small Nalophan® expansion bag was included inside the sample container (§2.4.1 Preventing Dilution of VOCs from Biological Sources). This was arranged such that the bag could expand and replace the extracted headspace VOCs without diluting the volatiles. It should be noted that Nalophan® produces its own background VOCs: isopropanol (protonated at m/z 61), ethyl acetate (protonated at m/z 89) and toluene (protonated at m/z 93) (Fortune 2012). These VOCs can be mostly removed by placing the bags in an odour free environment for a period of time (Miller 2008). However, the Nalophan® used for the indole trials retained indole for some considerable time, long after the investigations ended. This suggests that new bags should be used for each separate trial. Another issue to consider is the permeability of the material of the expansion chamber and its connections in order to limit the leakage of VOCs and air. The concept is viable as the technique can be used for any system to maintain constant sample concentrations. Further work is required to establish a reliable container of this type, investigating the use of different materials and types of closures.

5.5 Application to Non-aromatic Organic Compounds

Results of the study of the four hexen-1-ol isomers, cis-2-hexen-1-ol, cis-3-hexen-1-ol, trans-2-hexen-1-ol and trans-3-hexen-1-ol, compared favourably with the findings of other groups working on both SIFT-MS and PTR-MS: the same four product ions were found for all of the isomers, viz. those at m/z 83, 55, 41 and 39 when reacted with H3O+ in a PTR-TOF-MS. None of these represent the protonated parent ion, m/z 101, which is only detected in the cis-3- and trans-3-hexen-1-ols. This work finds that either the protonated parent ion, m/z 101, (from the 3-hexen-1-ols) or the fragment at m/z 99 (from the 2-hexen-1-ols) is present in the spectrum. It should be noted that m/z 99 is a product ion which is not mentioned in any other study. The conclusion drawn from this is that the fragmentation of the excited, protonated molecule depends on the position of the C=C bond and is related to the positioning of the proton. These observations lead to a possible method for discriminating between the 2- and 3-hexenols with
a smaller likelihood of differentiating between the \textit{cis}- and \textit{trans}- isomers themselves. Both of
these are dependent on the instrument’s sensitivity as the ions at \( m/z \) 99 and 101 form minor
contributions to the fragmentation patterns observed (\( m/z \) 99 occurs at \( 7 \% \pm 3 \% \) at \( E/N < 140 \) Td and \( m/z \) 101 occurs at \( 15 \% \pm 5 \% \) at \( E/N < 130 \) Td). The approach of varying \( E/N \)
adds to work already done in this field and provides a possible way forward for further work
as mentioned above.

5.6 Application to Aromatic Compounds

Trichlorobenzene (Chapter 3) and pilot studies with indole revealed issues with certain
molecules which took tens of minutes to reach a constant concentration in the reaction
chamber of the instrument. Such compounds are often referred to as ‘sticky’ and, if not
corrected for, this will lead to lowered sensitivities, increase reaction times and result in traces
of the compounds remaining in the instrument for extended periods of time. The traditional
method for dealing with this was used, \textit{viz.} to heat the inlet lines and reaction chamber to
avoid condensation (Mikoviny 2010).

The \( E/N \) investigations of individual alkylbenzenes and chlorobenzenes (Chapter 3) and
hexen-1-ols, (Chapter 4), provided a possible method of discriminating between isobaric
compounds, i.e. those with the same molecular mass, by examining fragmentation patterns of
VOCs to determine if they vary in a systematic manner within the operating parameters of the
PTR-MS system. The fragmentation patterns are represented on branching ratio diagrams
which show the relative percentages of product ion channels vs \( E/N \) values. In particular,
branching ratios for ethylbenzene and the xylenes show very different fragmentation patterns
when examined by changing the energy conditions in the reaction chamber: ethylbenzene
starts to fragment at significantly lower \( E/N \) values than the xylenes (§3.3.2.1 \textit{Comparison of}
the Isomeric Compounds Ethylbenzene and Xylenes). This illustrates how the selectivity of
PTR-MS can be significantly enhanced, changing what is essentially a one-dimensional
instrument into a multidimensional one.
The application of this method to a real, complex sample was explored by examining results for ethylbenzene and xylene using the calibration gas as if nothing were known about its contents (§3.2.2 Calibration Gas). Some progress was made to this end by looking at the difference in counts as \( E/N \) was varied and this difference used to estimate the amount of xylene present (§3.3.2.1 Comparison of the Isomeric Compounds Ethylbenzene and Xylenes). The counts resulting from this method were found to be a factor of 2 too high when compared with the known counts of xylene in the calibration gas. Further work in this area is desirable as these VOCs are important environmental compounds and it is important to be able to distinguish them in real situations (Karl et al. 2001).

The study of chlorobenzenes (Chapter 3) revealed some unanticipated effects: an unlikely cluster in the dichlorobenzenes at \( m/z \) 129 formed as \( E/N \) was varied. Extensive investigation of the \( m/z \) 129 peak revealed that its sole provenance could only have been as a result of an association of the product ion at \( m/z \) 111 (\( C_6H_3Cl^+ \)) with an \( H_2O \) molecule (§3.4.2.1 Product Ion Analysis).

Unexpected patterns were observed in spectra for several of the chlorobenzene compounds as \( E/N \) was increased: specifically for \( p \)-dichlorobenzene (\( m/z \) 147), all spectra displayed a much higher signal than expected at \( m/z \) 148, the \( ^{13}C \) isotope peak. It is considered that this is related to the peak at \( m/z \) 146 produced by non-dissociative charge transfer with the \( O_2^+ \) impurity in the system (§3.6.1 Variation in Spectra in \( p \)-Dichlorobenzene as \( E/N \) Increases).

Not all peaks display this non-dissociative charge transfer peak: \( m/z \) 94 displays a peak at \( m/z \) 93, but \( m/z \) 99 has no peak at \( m/z \) 98. These non-dissociative peaks are not mentioned elsewhere in the literature but should be taken into account when quantitative measurements are required.

Product ions at \( m/z \) 85 and \( m/z \) 87 appear in the dichlorobenzenes and their relative intensities change as \( E/N \) changes (§3.6.2 Anomalies for \( m/z \) 85 and \( m/z \) 87): at \( E/N = 240 \) Td there is an ion at \( m/z \) 85 which appears to have two chlorine atoms; at \( E/N = 190 \) Td, the ion at \( m/z \) 87 appears to have one chlorine atom based on the intensities of \( m/z \) 87 and 89. It is not clear
why these apparent anomalies occurred and they warrant further investigation, perhaps being examined with $\text{O}_2^+$ as the analyte gas.

5.7 Summary

The investigations here examined known VOCs and their behaviours under differing energy conditions. This was found to be helpful when discriminating between isobaric and isomeric compounds. It has presented a new, cogent exposition of the problems to avoid when investigating a complex environment a) for calibrating the instrument and b) in a real world situation such as is found in the environmental sciences.
Chapter 6 - Conclusion and Further Work
6.1 Conclusion

After making the necessary modifications to the PTR-TOF MS (Kore Technologies Ltd. Ely) it proved to be a sensitive and reliable instrument. Sensitivity measurements produced a value of 4-6 ncps ppbv⁻¹ normalised to $10^6 \text{H}_2\text{O}^+$ with results showing that it was essential to account for fragmentation in a complex chemical mixture. It has been shown here that failure to take this into account leads to an erroneous sensitivity, the true value being less.

Varying $E/N$ was used as a technique to examine the fragmentation behaviours of VOCs and, in so doing, revealed a method for discriminating isobaric (ethylbenzene and xylenes) and isomeric (hexen-1-ols) compounds, all important constituents in the environmental sciences. This work gives further weight to those few studies already performed and requires further investigation to refine the experimental and analytical processes. A peak at $m/z$ 99, a product ion which is not mentioned in any other study, was seen only in the absence of the protonated parent ion, $m/z$ 101. This suggests that the presence of one or other peaks ($m/z$ 99 or 101) depends on the position of the C=C bond and may be related to the positioning of the proton within the molecule and its subsequent fragmentation. This suggests a likely avenue for identification of the individual isomers within the hexen-1-ols. Results for fragmentation channels with $m/z$ values < 99 compared favourably with those of other groups that had used both SIFT-MS and PTR-MS to study these VOCs.

6.2 Further Work

Likely areas for future work are in the analysis of food stuffs (e.g. fruit ripening) and other bio-matter (e.g. bacteria, especially in the pressing and topical arena of antibiotic resistance and plasmids).
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Appendix 1 - Thermodynamics for Reactions in Chapter 3
A1 I Thermodynamic Considerations for Reactions

Formation of m/z 95, protonated phenol

Table A1.1: Gas phase thermochemistry constants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound/species</th>
<th>Proton Affinity kJ/mol</th>
<th>Heat of formation ΔH°f gas kJ/mol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chlorobenzene (CB) C₆H₅Cl</td>
<td>753.1ᵃ</td>
<td>54.42ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorobenzene prot (CBH⁺)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1258.95 (calc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₆H₆Cl⁺</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water H₂O</td>
<td>691ᵃ</td>
<td>-241.83ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenol C₆H₅OH</td>
<td>817.3ᵃ</td>
<td>-96.44ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenol prot (PhenolH⁺) C₆H₅OH⁺</td>
<td></td>
<td>1172.33 (calc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-92.31ᵃ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To calculate the enthalpy, ΔH, for the reaction:

C₆H₅ClH⁺ + H₂O → C₆H₅OHH⁺ + HCl

ΔH = Σ(Heat of formation products) − Σ(Heat of formation reactants)

Delta H = ΔHf(PhenolH⁺) + ΔHf(HCl) − ΔHf(CBH⁺) − ΔHf(H₂O)  (1)

Unknowns are ΔHf(PhenolH⁺) and ΔHf(CBH⁺):

ΔH(PhenolH⁺) is formed in the protonation reaction:

C₆H₅OH + H⁺ → C₆H₅OHH⁺

where the proton affinity of phenol, PA(Phenol):

PA(Phenol) = ΔHf(PhenolH⁺) − ΔHf(Phenol) − ΔHf(H⁺)

ΔHf(PhenolH⁺) = PA(Phenol) + ΔHf(Phenol) + ΔHf(H⁺)

Similarly, for ΔHf(CBH⁺):

ΔHf(CBH⁺) = PA(CB) + ΔHf(CB) + ΔHf(H⁺)

Substituting for both of these unknowns into (1):

ΔH = PA(Phenol) + ΔHf(Phenol) + ΔHf(H⁺) + ΔHf(HCl) − (PA(CB) + ΔHf(CB) + ΔHf(H⁺)) − ΔHf(H₂O)

⇒ ΔH = (PA(Phenol) − PA(CB)) + (ΔHf(Phenol) − ΔHf(CB)) + ΔHf(HCl) − ΔHf(H₂O)
Substituting values from the above table:

\[ \Delta H = 62.8 \text{ kJ/mol} \]

**Formation of \( m/z \) 129, protonated dichlorophenol**

Table A1.2: Gas phase thermochemistry constants:

\[ ^a = \text{NIST}; \ ^b = \text{Basheer (2006)}; \ ^c = \text{Zhu (2003)} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound/species</th>
<th>Proton Affinity ( \text{kJ/mol} )</th>
<th>Heat of formation ( \Delta H^\text{gas} ) ( \text{kJ/mol} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,4-Dichlorobenzene ( \text{(DCB)} ) ( \text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{Cl}_2 )</td>
<td>701.67(^a)</td>
<td>24.6(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water ( \text{H}_2\text{O} )</td>
<td>691(^a)</td>
<td>-241.83(^a) - (-469)(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorophenol ( \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{Cl}_0\text{OH} )</td>
<td>1422.59(^b)</td>
<td>-131.9 (2-chlorophen)(^c) -153.3 (3-chlorophen)(^c) -145.8 (4-chlorophen)(^c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCl</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-92.31(^a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{C}_6\text{H}_4\text{Cl}_2\text{H}^+ + \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{ClOHH}^+ + \text{HCl} \]

To calculate the enthalpy, \( \Delta H \), for the above reaction:

\[ \Delta H = \Sigma(\text{Heat of formation products}) - \Sigma(\text{Heat of formation reactants}) \]

\[ \Delta H = \Delta H_f(\text{ChlPhenH}^+) + \Delta H_f(\text{HCl}) - \Delta H_f(\text{DCBH}^+) - \Delta H_f(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \quad (2) \]

By comparison with the phenol calculation, this can be seen to be equivalent to:

\[ \Delta H = (\text{PA(ChlPhenol)} - \text{PA(DCB)}) + (\Delta H_f(\text{ChlPhenol}) - \Delta H_f(\text{DCB})) + \Delta H_f(\text{HCl}) - \Delta H_f(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \]

Substituting values from the above table, using \( \Delta H^\theta \) for 2-chlorophenol:

\[ \rightarrow \Delta H = 713.94 \text{ kJ/mol} \]

Substituting values from the above table, using \( \Delta H^\theta \) for 4-chlorophenol:

\[ \rightarrow \Delta H = 700.04 \text{ kJ/mol} \]

Substituting values from the above table, using \( \Delta H^\theta \) for 3-chlorophenol:

\[ \rightarrow \Delta H = 692.54 \text{ kJ/mol} \]