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ABSTRACT: Due to the unique properties of plasma technology, its use in gas conversion applications is gaining significant interest around the globe. Plasma-based CO₂ and CH₄ conversion have become major research areas. Many investigations have already been performed regarding the single component gases, i.e. CO₂ splitting and CH₄ reforming, as well as for two component mixtures, i.e. dry reforming of methane (CO₂/CH₄), partial oxidation of methane (CH₄/O₂), artificial photosynthesis (CO₂/H₂O), CO₂ hydrogenation (CO₂/H₂), and even first steps towards the influence of N₂ impurities have been taken, i.e. CO₂/N₂ and CH₄/N₂. In this feature article we briefly discuss the advances made in literature for these different steps from a plasma chemistry modeling point of view. Subsequently, we present a comprehensive plasma chemistry set, combining the knowledge gathered in this field so far, and supported with extensive experimental data. This set can be used for chemical kinetics plasma modeling for all possible combinations of CO₂, CH₄, N₂, O₂ and H₂O, to investigate the bigger picture of the underlying plasmachemical pathways for these mixtures in a dielectric barrier discharge plasma. This is extremely valuable for the optimization of existing plasma-based CO₂ conversion and CH₄ reforming processes, as well as for investigating the influence of N₂, O₂ and H₂O on these processes, and even to support plasma-based multi-reforming processes.
1. INTRODUCTION: PLASMA TECHNOLOGY

Today—more than ever—plasma technology lies at the base of modern technology, as the entire microelectronics industry relies on plasma-surface interactions. These interactions make it possible for scientists to extend Moore’s law by providing the current nanometer resolution of microprocessors.

In general, plasma consists of various types of ions (both positive and negative), electrons and a large variety of neutral species, i.e. different types of atoms, molecules, radicals and excited species. This makes plasma a highly reactive—but complex—chemical cocktail, which is of interest to many potential applications.

Plasma is often referred to as the ‘fourth state of matter’. Indeed, upon increasing energy input, matter transforms in the sequence: solid, liquid, (neutral) gas and finally ionized gas or plasma. Although plasma might not be so widely known as the other three states of matter, 99 % of the visible universe is actually in plasma state, mainly as stars (including our Sun) and interstellar matter. Furthermore, natural plasmas also occur on Earth, in the form of most natural occurring weather phenomena which emit light, e.g. lightning, auroras (Borealis and Australis), Saint Elmo’s fire, and red sprites.

Beside natural plasmas, two main groups of man-made plasmas are distinguished, i.e. high temperature or fusion plasmas and low temperature plasmas or gas discharges. The latter group can be further subdivided based on whether or not the plasma is in thermal equilibrium. Due to the multitude in different types of species, which can all have different temperatures and degrees of freedom, plasma can exhibit—and is defined by—multiple temperatures, e.g., gas temperature, electron temperature, ion temperature, vibrational temperature, rotational temperature. When—in a localized area—these temperatures are the same, the plasma is said to be in ‘local thermodynamic equilibrium’ (LTE), and mostly called a ‘thermal plasma’. In the other case, the plasma is said to be in ‘non-local thermodynamic equilibrium’ (non-LTE), and mostly called a ‘non-thermal plasma’.

One of the main reasons why low temperature (non-LTE) plasmas have such a large potential for a wide variety of applications, is their capability of producing a reactive chemical environment while staying at room temperature. This is possible due to most of the energy being directed into the electrons, leading to a much higher electron temperature ($T_e$), compared to the gas temperature ($T_g$). Subsequently, these highly energetic electrons can activate the gas and initiate reactions by electron impact collisions, rather than the classical form of energy used in industry, i.e. heat.

Applications range from materials science (e.g., coating deposition, surface modification, nanotechnology, and chip manufacturing, as mentioned above) over lighting, lasers, plasma displays (as plasma emits light due to the presence of many excited species), to analytical chemistry, thrusters, as well as environmental, energy and medical applications (e.g., sterilization, wound healing and even cancer treatment). Environmental and energy applications include, among others, air pollution control, nitrogen fixation from the air to form ammonia and nitric oxides, hydrocarbon reforming and CO$_2$ conversion into value-added chemicals and fuels. These applications often use a combination of plasma with catalysts, yielding plasma catalysis.

To improve these applications, a good knowledge of the underlying plasma processes is indispensable. The
latter can be obtained by experiments and computer modeling. As detailed measurements inside the plasma are not always straightforward, modeling can indeed be of great value. This feature article will focus on the continuous research efforts in modeling the plasma chemistry for the growing application of low temperature (non-LTE) plasmas used for CO$_2$ conversion and CH$_4$ reforming, as well as combinations with other gases, and highlight the contributions of the PLASMANT research group in this field. Based on the gained knowledge so far, and an extensive set of experiments carried out for various gas mixtures and mixing ratios, a new comprehensive plasma chemistry model is presented that can be used to describe the underlying mechanisms of CO$_2$ and CH$_4$ conversion, also in the presence of N$_2$, O$_2$ and H$_2$O.

2. PLASMA CHEMISTRY MODELING FOR CO$_2$ CONVERSION AND CH$_4$ REFORMING

Interest in the application of plasma technology for CO$_2$ conversion and CH$_4$ reforming has been growing rapidly. Due to the adverse effects of climate change on our society, the conversion of these gases into value-added chemicals and fuels is considered as one of the great challenges of the 21st century. Successfully converting the greenhouse gas CO$_2$ would be interesting from both an economic and ecological perspective. This would lead to the successful generation of an artificial closed carbon loop, which fits into the ‘cradle-to-cradle’ concept, i.e., upcycling waste material into new feedstock. Additionally, with the increase of biogas, landfill gas and hydrogenation of CO$_2$ to CH$_4$, the straightforward reforming of CH$_4$ into liquid products would be beneficial, because the energy density of liquid fuel is much higher and it is easier to transport.

As outlined in an extensive recent review on the use of plasma technology for CO$_2$ conversion: “Plasmas possess some important advantages over other (novel) technologies for the conversion of CO$_2$ and CH$_4$: (i) they can operate at room temperature using any source of (renewable) electricity, (ii) they have a large flexibility in terms of the feeds that need to be processed, (iii) they provide an extremely flexible ‘turnkey’ process, which allows for the efficient storage of energy, peak shaving and grid stabilization, (iv) the reactors have low investment and operating costs, (v) they have a simple scalability both in size and applicability, and (vi) last but not least, the technology does not rely on rare earth materials—making it rather unique at this point. This unprecedented combination of features gives plasmachemical conversion a very high overall flexibility, making it an extremely useful and valuable technology for CCU.”

To improve this application, several research groups developed models for chemical kinetics simulations, to better understand the underlying mechanisms, and a brief literature overview will be given below. This development can be subdivided in three main stages: (1) modeling single component molecular gases, i.e. plasma-based CO$_2$ splitting and CH$_4$ reforming; (2) investigating common two component mixtures, i.e. dry reforming of methane (CO$_2$/CH$_4$), partial oxidation of methane (CH$_4$/O$_2$), artificial photosynthesis (CO$_2$/H$_2$O) and CO$_2$ hydrogenation (CO$_2$/H$_2$); (3) moving towards more realistic gas mixtures by investigating the effect of N$_2$ both as admixture and impurity, i.e. CO$_2$/N$_2$ and CH$_4$/N$_2$. The following subsections will be divided according to these three stages.

The knowledge obtained during these different stages is now combined into one comprehensive chemical kinetics plasma model for use in low temperature (non-LTE) plasmas, presented for the first time in this feature
article. Therefore, in the following subsections, we will each time compare the CO\textsubscript{2} and/or CH\textsubscript{4} conversion, calculated with this new model, with our previous (published) experimental data, in order to step-by-step validate the individual chemistry sets. This validation will be performed for a dielectric barrier discharge (DBD) plasma, as the chemistry model presented in this feature article is specifically developed for this type of plasma. A DBD plasma is created by applying a potential difference between two electrodes, of which at least one is covered by a dielectric barrier. For CO\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4} conversion applications, a tubular DBD reactor is most often used,\textsuperscript{11} consisting of an inner electrode surrounded by a dielectric tube, covered by an outer electrode (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Schematic diagram of a dielectric barrier discharge (DBD).](image)

Subsequently, in section 3 we will present this new comprehensive chemical kinetics plasma model for use in low temperature (non-LTE) plasmas. The applications of this extensive model are broad. They can range from very specific investigations, like the effect of CH\textsubscript{4} on NO\textsubscript{x} mitigation for CO\textsubscript{2}/N\textsubscript{2} plasmas, to realistic industrial gas mixtures for dry reforming of methane by inclusion of N\textsubscript{2}, as well as unravelling the possibilities for plasma-based multi-reforming processes. Furthermore, this chemistry set can also be used as a foundation to build a comprehensive computational data set in the field of plasma-assisted combustion.\textsuperscript{25-26} Finally, certain data from this set could even be used for exotic models, like planetary atmosphere and spacecraft re-entry modeling.\textsuperscript{27-28}

### 2.1 Single Component Molecular Gases

With the breakthrough of sufficient—and continuously increasing—computational power available to researchers, plasmachemical modeling efforts could expand from simple noble gases towards reactive molecular gases.

In the past 10 years many different plasmachemical kinetic models have been developed for pure CO\textsubscript{2} splitting in various kinds of plasmas.\textsuperscript{9,20-49} Several of these models have been developed in the research group...
Furthermore, there is also interest in pure CH$_4$ reforming, also known as ‘the pyrolysis of methane’, used to synthesize higher hydrocarbons. Few models exist in literature, of which one has been developed in the research group PLASMANT. 

Figure 2 illustrates a comparison of the calculated CO$_2$ conversion, using our new comprehensive model (see section 3), with measured values for a pure CO$_2$ DBD plasma, at a fixed plasma power of 40 W and varying the gas flow rate to yield different values of the specific energy input (SEI). The CO$_2$ conversion is mainly caused by electron impact dissociation at these conditions (see below and ref. (29)). The conversion gradually increases with rising SEI, both in the experiments and calculation results, which is logical as more energy is put into the system. Above 25 eV/molecule, the model does not show saturation yet, although it is observed in the experimental data. However, as described in the review of Snoeckx and Bogaerts, these higher SEI values are not attractive, because of very low energy efficiency. The recommended SEI range is in the order of 0.1 to 5 eV/molecule. Therefore, we may conclude that the agreement between model and experiments is good, especially in the SEI region of most practical interest.

![Figure 2](image)

Figure 2. Comparison of the calculated CO$_2$ conversion, as obtained from our new comprehensive plasma chemistry model, with measured data adopted from ref. 29, as a function of SEI, at a fixed plasma power of 40 W and varying gas flow rate.

2.2 Two Component Mixtures

With even more computing power and the successful development of models for simulating single component molecular gases, as described above, the combination of these models into two component reactive mixtures was the logical—albeit not always easy—next step.

2.2.1 Dry Reforming and Partial Oxidation Of Methane

The combined conversion of CO$_2$ and CH$_4$, also known as ‘dry reforming of methane’ (DRM) has been extensively studied, and a variety of models have been developed in literature. Again, several of these models have been developed within the research group PLASMANT. Besides CO$_2$, another—stronger—oxidant used to reform CH$_4$ is O$_2$, and this combination is known as ‘partial oxidation of methane’ (POX).
Several modeling investigations exist in literature, including one from our group PLASMANT. Although this process leads to higher CH₄ conversions than DRM, its strong oxidative character causes a total oxidation of CH₄, producing CO₂, and is therefore of less interest.

Figure 3 illustrates the calculated absolute conversions of CH₄ and CO₂ in plasma-based DRM as a function of discharge power using our new comprehensive model (see section 3), in comparison with experimental values obtained from Ref. (63), for a DBD in a 1:1 CO₂/CH₄ mixture at a total flow rate of 50 sccm. The CH₄ and CO₂ conversions both increase with discharge power, which is again logical, and the CH₄ conversion is about a factor 1.5 higher than the CO₂ conversion. Very good agreement is reached between calculated and experimental conversions.

![Figure 3](image)

**Figure 3.** Comparison of the calculated absolute conversion of CO₂ and CH₄, as obtained from our new comprehensive plasma chemistry model, with measured data adopted from ref. (63), in a 1:1 CO₂/CH₄ mixture at a total flow rate of 50 sccm, as a function of discharge power.

2.2.2 Artificial Photosynthesis and CO₂ Hydrogenation

Research towards CO₂ conversion in the presence of H₂O (artificial photosynthesis) and H₂ (CO₂ hydrogenation) is quite limited and to our knowledge the only models available are developed within the research group PLASMANT. In figure 4, the calculated absolute CO₂ and H₂O conversions, as obtained from our new plasma chemistry model, are compared with experimental data for a DBD, as a function of water vapor content for a total gas flow rate of 600 mL/min at 323 K for a SEI value of 1.1 eV/molecule. Both the experimental and calculated absolute H₂O conversions show a slightly decreasing trend with increasing water vapor content, although the drop is more pronounced in the simulation results. This is probably due to some more complex processes taking place in the experiments as a result of water vapor, which could not be easily accounted for in the 0D plasma chemistry model. Indeed, the model does not take into account some physical effects, such as condensation and nebulization. Furthermore, water cluster ions and surface processes, which might be important in a water discharge, are not yet taken into account in our current model.
The experiments also show a slight drop in CO₂ conversion with increasing water content. As explained in Ref. (73), this may result from destabilization of the discharge induced by the presence of water. This trend is also not captured by the simulation, but the agreement is still reasonable, because both simulations and experiments show that the addition of water vapor into CO₂ only exerts a weak influence on the CO₂ conversion.

![Image](image.png)

**Figure 4.** Comparison of the calculated absolute conversion of CO₂ and H₂O, as obtained from our new comprehensive plasma chemistry model, with measured data adopted from ref. (73), in a CO₂/H₂O mixture, as a function of water vapor content, for a SEI of 1.1 eV/molecule and a total flow rate of 600 mL/min at 323 K.

### 2.3 Effect of N₂ as Impurity and Admixture

The modeling studies in the above two sections—and their experimental counterparts—are limited to high purity gases, hence without the presence of impurities. However, in the real world—for which we are trying to design industrial applications—this will never be the case. N₂ will always be an important impurity or even admixture. This must be taken into account in modeling, since it is known that N₂ can influence the plasma physics, and moreover, N₂ has metastable states, which could influence the plasma chemistry. As a result, the next step in plasma chemistry modeling must be the inclusion of these real world impurities into existing models.

#### 2.3.1 Effect of N₂ on CH₄ Reforming

Few modeling studies exist in literature regarding the addition of N₂ to the CH₄ reforming process, but to our knowledge, the research group PLASMANT was the only one focusing on both the impurity and admixture level.

The values for the absolute conversion of CH₄, calculated with our new plasma chemistry model, are plotted versus N₂ content in figure 5, showing a good agreement with measured results, obtained in a DBD, for a residence time of 2.2 s and a SEI of 1.5 eV/molecule. Upon addition of N₂, the absolute CH₄ conversion first remains more or less constant or even slightly decreases, and subsequently it increases. This trend results from the interplay of several effects, i.e. the decreasing electron density with increasing N₂ content and the lower reaction rate constants for several three-body reactions with N₂ compared to CH₄ as third body cause a drop in absolute CH₄ conversion, but on the other hand N₂ can also enhance the absolute CH₄ conversion, due
to the dissociation of CH₄ upon collision with N₂ metastable molecules.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 5.** Comparison of the calculated absolute CH₄ conversion, as obtained from our new comprehensive plasma chemistry model, with measured data adopted from ref. (81), in a CH₄/N₂ mixture as a function of N₂ content, for a residence time of 2.2 s and a SEI of 1.5 eV/molecule.

### 2.3.2 Effect of N₂ on CO₂ Splitting

Investigating the influence of N₂ present during the conversion of CO₂ is of vital importance, since most CO₂ effluent gases contain large fractions of N₂, and the combined presence of N- and O-species is bound to lead to the formation of unwanted NOₓ byproducts. The only modeling studies performed here are from the research group PLASMANT. ⁸²-⁸³

![Graph](image)

**Figure 6.** Comparison of the calculated absolute CO₂ conversion, as obtained from our new comprehensive plasma chemistry model, with measured data adopted from ref. (83), in a CO₂/N₂ mixture as a function of N₂ content, for a residence time of 0.73 s and a SEI of 3.0 eV/molecule.

Figure 6 illustrates the absolute CO₂ conversion, calculated with the new plasma chemistry model, in comparison with our previous experimental data, ⁸³ in a CO₂/N₂ mixture as a function of the N₂ content, for a
residence time of 0.73 s and a SEI of 3.0 eV/molecule, showing again a very good agreement. The absolute CO₂ conversion increases more or less exponentially with rising N₂ fraction, both in the experiments and the calculations. This indicates that N₂ has a beneficial effect on CO₂ splitting, due to the dissociation of CO₂ upon collision with N₂ metastable molecules (mainly N₂(A³Σu⁺)).

3. COMPREHENSIVE CHEMICAL KINETICS PLASMA MODEL

It is clear from the previous section that the new plasma chemistry model provides good agreement with our previous (published) experimental data for pure CO₂, as well as binary mixtures (CO₂/CH₄, CO₂/H₂O, CH₄/N₂ and CO₂/N₂), which serves as an important first validation. In this section we will present for the first time the combination of all these chemistry models, and validate it against new experimental data in multi-component mixtures. The temperature-controlled coaxial DBD reactor used for these new experiments has been introduced in previous work. This new comprehensive chemistry model can be used to investigate any desired multi-component mixture, containing CO₂, CH₄, N₂, O₂ and H₂O in its feed. We will start by giving a brief explanation of the model, as well as an overview of the included plasma chemistry and how it was developed. Subsequently we will look into the results of some multi-component mixtures, i.e. CO₂/CH₄/N₂; CO₂/CH₄/N₂/O₂; and CO₂/CH₄/N₂/H₂O. For these mixtures we will compare the calculated and measured conversions of CO₂ and CH₄, and the product selectivities, at various gas mixing ratios, for the purpose of validation. Indeed, the present (experimental) results were not optimized; they were only obtained at a fixed condition of flow rate and power, so not focusing on the highest conversion or product selectivities, but they only serve to validate the new chemical kinetics model. Finally, we will discuss in detail the underlying chemistry as predicted by the model, in order to explain the observed trends in conversion and product selectivities.

3.1 Plasma Chemistry Model

There exist different types of models for non-LTE plasmas, but the most straightforward approach to model a detailed plasma chemistry is a 0D chemical kinetics model, also called global model. It is based on solving balance equations for the densities of the various plasma species (i.e., various types of molecules, radicals, atoms, ions, excited species, and the electrons), based on production and loss terms, as defined by chemical reactions. Details of the model that is used here to describe the plasma chemistry of CO₂ and CH₄ conversion in the multi-component mixtures are presented in the Supporting Information.

As indicated in section 2, within the PLASMANT group several different plasma chemistry models have been developed in the past 5 to 10 years, not only for gas conversion applications, but also for other reactive gas mixtures. The most important chemistries used here for developing our new comprehensive plasma chemistry model for a DBD plasma, are (i) the pure CO₂ chemistry model of Aerts et al.; (ii) a model containing the H₂O/O₂ chemistry by van Gaens et al.; (iii) the interaction of CO₂ and CH₄ in the DRM process developed by De Bie et al. and Snoeckx et al.; (iv) a chemistry set describing the interaction between CO₂ and H₂O in the work of Snoeckx et al.; (v) a model containing the CH₄/N₂ chemistry by Snoeckx et al.; and finally (vi) chemistry models describing the interaction in CO₂/N₂ plasmas by Heijkers et al. and Snoeckx et al. All these different chemistry models were developed and used to investigate specific problems in
combination with experiments for pure CO₂ splitting, in humid air, for dry reforming of methane, artificial photosynthesis, and the influence of N₂ on CH₄ reforming and on pure CO₂ splitting, respectively. In this section we combine all this knowledge from previous research on the different single component, two component and impurity mixtures, to arrive at a new comprehensive chemistry model, which can be used to investigate any desired multi-component mixture containing CO₂, CH₄, N₂, O₂ and H₂O in its feed. To achieve this, the chemistry from the above mentioned models was adopted, adapted and expanded with additional reactions. This led to a model containing 137 species as listed in Table 1. Note that the model does not include vibrationally excited molecules, in contrast to other models developed within PLASMANT. In microwave (MW) or gliding arc (GA) discharges, however, the plasma chemistry model presented here is applied to a DBD plasma (see Section 2 and Figure 1), where vibrationally excited molecules, in contrast to other models developed within PLASMANT. Indeed, the plasma led to a model containing 137 species as listed in Table 1. Note that the model does not include vibrationally excited species are of minor importance. In microwave (MW) or gliding arc (GA) discharges, however, vibrationally excited species are very important, and thus, the model would have to be extended to these species, to account for their role in the conversion mechanisms (see Conclusions and Outlook).

These 137 species react with each other through 355 electron impact reactions, 631 ion reactions, and 743 neutral reactions. The full list of all these reactions can be found in the Supporting Information, together with their corresponding rate coefficients and the references where these data were adopted from. The model itself is based on solving balance equations for all species densities, with production and loss terms defined by chemical reactions, as explained in the Supporting Information. In addition, a Boltzmann equation is used to calculate the rate coefficients of all the electron impact reactions. The processes included in this Boltzmann equation are elastic collisions, electron impact vibrational excitation/de-excitation, electronic excitation/de-excitation (both dissociative and non-dissociative), electron attachment, as well as electron impact ionization of various important species (see table S1 in the Supporting Information).

As validation of this newly developed chemistry set, we compared the calculated conversions with measured values for different gas mixtures obtained from our earlier work; see figures 2-6 above. These simulations were performed for exactly the same operating conditions as in the experiments. Furthermore, additional experiments were performed for the new multi-component mixture containing CO₂, CH₄, N₂, O₂ and H₂O, for extra validation of the new model, which will be presented below. For more details of the model and the additional experiments, as well as the definitions of gas conversion and product selectivities, we refer to the Supporting Information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecules</th>
<th>Charged species</th>
<th>Radicals</th>
<th>Excited species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C₃H₈, C₃H₆, C₂H₆, C₂H₄,</td>
<td>C₂H₅⁺, C₂H₅⁺, C₂H₄⁺,</td>
<td>C₄H₂, C₃H₇, C₃H₅,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂H₂, CH₄</td>
<td>C₂H₂⁺, C₂H₂⁺, C₂H₂⁺,</td>
<td>C₄H₂, C₃H₂, C₂H₂,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C₂H₂⁺, C₂H₂⁺, CH⁺, CH⁺</td>
<td>CH₃, CH₂, CH</td>
<td>CO₂(E1), CO₂(E2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂, CO</td>
<td>CO₂⁺, CO⁺, CO₅⁺, CO₄⁻,</td>
<td>C₂O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO₄⁺, C₂O₄⁺, C₂O₃⁺, C₂O₂⁺</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂N₂</td>
<td></td>
<td>CN, NCN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O, H₂O₂</td>
<td>H₂O⁺, H₂O⁺, OH⁺, OH⁻</td>
<td>HO₂, OH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂H₄, NH₃, N₂H₂</td>
<td>NH⁺, NH⁺, NH⁺, NH⁺</td>
<td>NH₂, NH, N₂H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Overview of the species included in the model
3.2 Plasma Conversion and Product Selectivity

3.2.1 CO₂/CH₄/N₂ Mixture: Varying CO₂ and N₂ Content

Effluent gas flows from industrial and Carbon Capture Sequestration/Utilization/Recycling (CCS/U/R) often contain impurities, of which in most cases N₂ is the main component. Therefore, it is of interest to study the CO₂ and CH₄ conversion in the presence of N₂. Figure 7 shows the measured and calculated absolute CO₂ and CH₄ conversions (a) and the product selectivities (b) plotted as a function of the CO₂ (and N₂) content in a CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture, keeping the CH₄ content fixed at 10%.

At all the gas mixing ratios investigated, the CH₄ conversion is much higher than the CO₂ conversion. This can be explained because the rate of electron impact dissociation of CH₄ is higher than that of CO₂, due to the lower C-H bond dissociation energy. Although there is some small deviation in the exact trend with increasing CO₂ content, in general the calculated values show reasonable agreement with the experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N₂O, N₂O₃, N₂O₄, N₂O₅</th>
<th>NO⁺, N₂O⁺, NO₂⁺, NO⁻, N₂O⁻, NO₂⁻, NO₃⁻, O₂⁻N₂</th>
<th>N₂H₃</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH₃CO, CH₃OH, CH₃CHO, CH₂OH, C₂H₅OH, C₂H₅OOH, CH₂O</td>
<td>CHO, CH₂OH, CH₃O, CH₃O₂, C₂HO, CH₃CO, CH₂CHO, C₂H₅O, C₂H₅O₂</td>
<td>H₂CN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCN</td>
<td>C₂⁺, C⁺</td>
<td>ONCN, NCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>N₂⁺, N⁺, N⁺, N⁺</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂</td>
<td>H⁺⁺, H⁺, H⁻, H⁺⁺</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₃, O₂</td>
<td>O⁻, O₄⁻, O⁻⁺, O₂⁻, O₂⁺, O⁻, O⁻</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| e⁻ | | |
Figure 7. Comparison of the calculated and measured conversion of CH$_4$ and CO$_2$ (a), and selectivities of the most important products (b), in a CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ mixture, as a function of the CO$_2$ (and N$_2$) content, for a fixed total flow rate of 200 ml/min and plasma power of 10 W, corresponding to an SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The CH$_4$ content was fixed at 10 %, with the remainder being CO$_2$ and N$_2$.

The CO$_2$/CH$_4$ ratio has an important influence on the product selectivities, as is clear from figure 7(b). At low CO$_2$/CH$_4$ ratio (CO$_2$ content of 5%), the selectivities of the hydrocarbons (mainly C$_2$H$_6$) are comparable or even slightly higher than that of CO. With increasing CO$_2$/CH$_4$ ratio, the selectivities of the hydrocarbons and H$_2$ steadily decrease, while the CO selectivity increases, which is logical as CO is the major product of CO$_2$ splitting, while the hydrocarbons and H$_2$ originate from CH$_4$ dissociation. Increasing the CO$_2$/CH$_4$ ratio from 0.5 to 4 yields a drop in the H$_2$/CO ratio from 2.45 to 0.42. These results show that the H$_2$/CO ratio can be varied in a wide range, simply controlled by the inlet gas mixing ratio. This is an advantage compared to classical processes, including steam reforming, partial oxidation, and CO$_2$ reforming, which typically produce syngas with H$_2$/CO molar ratios of >3, <2, and <1, respectively. Finally, we conclude from figure 7(b) that the calculated selectivities are in good agreement with the experiments.

3.2.2 CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ Mixture: Varying N$_2$ Content
Figure 8. Comparison of the calculated and measured conversion of CH4 and CO2 (a), and selectivities of the most important products (b), in a CO2/CH4/N2 mixture, as a function of the N2 content, for a fixed 1:1 CO2/CH4 ratio, a fixed total flow rate of 200 ml/min and a corresponding SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule.

Figure 8 illustrate the effect of N2 content on the experimental and calculated absolute CO2 and CH4 conversions (a) as well as on the product selectivities (b) keeping the CO2/CH4 ratio fixed at 1. Again good agreement is reached between calculated and measured results, especially for the conversions. Figure 8(a) shows that increasing the N2 content leads to a higher absolute conversion for both CO2 and CH4, both in the experimental and simulation results. This is mainly caused by the increasing role of the N2 metastable states in the dissociation of both CO2 and CH4, as will be discussed in more detail in section 3.3.

In our previous work, we investigated the effect of N2 for both pure CH4 and pure CO2 splitting and in both cases the presence of N2 led to unwanted effects, i.e. soot deposition and NOx production, respectively. However, when combining both gases into the current CO2/CH4/N2 mixture, no excessive soot deposition or NOx production is observed. This can be explained by the chemical kinetics model. Indeed, the O-species, which react with N-species to form NOx in the CO2/N2 mixture, form H2O in the presence of a hydrogen source due to the faster rates of the latter reactions. Vice versa, the O-species prevent the occurrence of soot deposition by oxidation of the carbon containing species.

The major products in this CO2/CH4/N2 mixture are again CO, H2, C2H6 and C3H8. The measured and calculated selectivities show only a weak dependence on the N2 content within the investigated range, except
for the calculated H\textsubscript{2} selectivity, which clearly rises upon rising N\textsubscript{2} content, while the measured values show only a very weak increase. The calculated CO, H\textsubscript{2} and C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} selectivities are somewhat higher than the experimental values, which might be attributed to the limitation of the 0D model, neglecting transport and surface reactions. The latter may become important in some conditions. In contrast, excellent agreement between calculations and experiments is reached for the C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8} selectivity. In general, we consider the agreement between calculated and measured selectivities as fairly good, in view of the complex chemistry and the limitations of the 0D model.

It is worth to mention that, although the CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4} ratio is kept constant, the experimental and calculated syngas (H\textsubscript{2}/CO) ratio slightly rises upon increasing N\textsubscript{2} content, i.e. from 1.16 to 1.40 in the experiments and from 0.97 to 1.96 in the calculated values, as can be deduced from the rising H\textsubscript{2} selectivities and the decreasing CO selectivities in figure 8 (b). The reason for the latter will be explained in section 3.3 below.

### 3.2.3 CO\textsubscript{2}/CH\textsubscript{4}/N\textsubscript{2}/O\textsubscript{2} Mixture: Varying O\textsubscript{2} (and N\textsubscript{2}) Content

In literature, POX is widely used because O\textsubscript{2} is very effective for low-temperature plasma activation of methane. However, a possible drawback of POX is an excessive oxidation, resulting in the formation of CO\textsubscript{2}. The use of CO\textsubscript{2} as a milder oxidant with a little addition of O\textsubscript{2} may combine the advantages of DRM and POX and have a positive influence on the products formed. Therefore, we also investigate the influence of O\textsubscript{2} addition on the CO\textsubscript{2} and CH\textsubscript{4} conversions, as well as on the product selectivities, as presented in figures 9 (a) and 9 (b), respectively.

The addition of O\textsubscript{2} leads to a higher CH\textsubscript{4} conversion while the CO\textsubscript{2} conversion decreases. Indeed, POX becomes the dominant process over DRM. As a result, part of the converted CH\textsubscript{4} is oxidized towards CO and CO\textsubscript{2}, which explains the lower CO\textsubscript{2} conversion. The calculated CH\textsubscript{4} conversion is in good agreement with experiments, but there is some discrepancy for the CO\textsubscript{2} and O\textsubscript{2} conversion. This might be attributed to the occurrence of carbon deposition on the surface of the DBD reactor, which will be oxidized to CO and CO\textsubscript{2} by O-species. Since the model does not take surface reactions into account, this process is neglected, which could explain the somewhat higher CO\textsubscript{2} conversion in the model than in the experiments. Furthermore, this may also explain the deviation in the calculated and measured O\textsubscript{2} conversion and the underestimated CO selectivity (see figure 9 (b). However, we consider the agreement still as satisfactory, in view of the complex chemistry and limitations of the model.
Figure 9. Comparison of the calculated and measured conversions of CH₄, CO₂ and O₂ (a), and selectivities of the most important products (b), in a CO₂/CH₄/N₂/O₂ mixture, as a function of the O₂ (and N₂) content, for a 1:1 CO₂/CH₄ ratio, a fixed total flow rate of 200 ml/min and a corresponding SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The CO₂ and CH₄ content were both 10 %, with the remainder being O₂ and N₂.

Both the experiments and calculations show that the addition of O₂ rapidly decreases the selectivities of the hydrocarbons (mainly C₂H₆ and C₃H₈) and H₂, because of their oxidation into CO and H₂O. Indeed, the CO selectivity rises dramatically for the same reason. This also leads to a significant drop in the syngas ratio upon increasing O₂ content from 0 to 8 %, i.e. from 1.23 to 0.17 in the experiments, and from 1.34 to 0.25 in the calculations. Again, with some exceptions as explained above, quite good agreement is reached between the calculations and experiments.

3.2.4 CO₂/CH₄/N₂/H₂O Mixture: Varying H₂O (and N₂) Content

An interesting co-reactant and hydrogen source for the conversion of CO₂ is H₂O. It is the most ubiquitous and cheapest hydrogen source available, especially compared to CH₄ and H₂. In addition, the combined conversion of CO₂ and H₂O to produce value-added products using renewable energy would successfully mimic the natural photosynthesis process. Our previous study, however, revealed that this process is not an interesting one to pursue by means of plasma technology, due to a severe drop in CO₂ conversion and energy efficiency when adding H₂O. This was mainly attributed to the recombination of CO with OH into CO₂, as well as the recombination of H atoms with O atoms into OH and subsequently H₂O.
However, from figure 10 (a), it becomes clear that the combined conversion of CH₄ and CO₂ remains almost unchanged upon addition of H₂O. Hence, the presence of CH₄ seems to counteract the negative effect of H₂O addition, because the H atoms originating from CH₄ dissociation can recombine with the OH radicals, and thus suppress their negative effect, as there will be less OH available for the back reaction from CO to CO₂. Furthermore, the syngas ratio increases (from 1.35 to 1.65 in the experiments, and from 1.34 to 1.50 in the model) upon increasing H₂O content from 0 to 8 %, which means that the added H₂O is successfully converted into H₂ as well, and the formation of H₂O from O and H atoms is limited due to Le Chatelier’s principle. Figure 10 (b) shows that the selectivities of both H₂ and CO slightly increase with rising H₂O content, indicating that H₂O addition is beneficial for the production of syngas. Again, in general good agreement is obtained between the experimental and calculated selectivities of the most important products as a function of the H₂O content.
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**Figure 10.** Comparison of the calculated and measured conversion of CH₄ and CO₂ (a), and selectivities of the most important products (b), in a CO₂/CH₄/N₂/H₂O mixture, as a function of the H₂O (and N₂) content, for a 1:1 CO₂/CH₄ ratio, a fixed total flow rate of 200 ml/min and a corresponding SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The CO₂ and CH₄ content were both 10 %, with the remainder being H₂O and N₂.

### 3.3 Underlying Mechanisms of Plasma-based CO₂ and CH₄ Conversion

As the agreement between calculated and measured conversions and product selectivities is quite good, in a wide range of gas mixtures and mixing ratios, we can conclude that our chemical kinetics model can provide
a realistic picture of the plasma chemistry of the DBD reactor for the multi-component mixtures containing CO2, CH4, N2, O2 and H2O in its feed. Thus, we can now discuss in more detail the underlying plasma chemistry, as predicted by the model, for both the CO2 and CH4 conversion, as well as for the formation of CO, H2, C2H6 and C3H8 in the presence of N2. Similar results, but for the effect of O2 and H2O addition, are presented in the SI. This is the most powerful aspect of plasma chemistry modeling. Indeed, a detailed analysis of the reaction pathways allows us to gain a better insight in the underlying chemical reactions and in the overall process. This in turn can help to optimize existing processes, overcome ongoing problems, find new research areas and advance the steps towards a future industrial application of plasma-based gas conversion processes.

### 3.3.1 CO2 Conversion

#### Table 2. Dominant CO2 loss and formation reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Loss reaction</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Formation reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>CO2 + e → e + CO + O</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>CO + C2O3+ + M → CO2 + C2O2+ + M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>CO2 + N2(λ3Σu) → N2 + CO + O</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>CO + C2O4+ + M → CO2 + C2O3+ + M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>CO2 + N2(B3Πg) → N2 + CO + O</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>O + CH3CO → CO2 + CH3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>CO + OH → CO2 + H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F5</td>
<td>CO3+ + C2O4+ → CO2 + O + CO + CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F6</td>
<td>CH4 + CO2+ → CO2 + CH4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F7</td>
<td>CO3+ + H3O+ → CO2 + H2O + H + O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F8</td>
<td>e + CO4+ → CO2 + O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F9</td>
<td>CH2 + O2 → CO2 + H + H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 11. Relative contributions of the main processes leading to CO$_2$ loss (a) and formation (b) for a CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ mixture, as a function of the CO$_2$ (and N$_2$) content. The total flow rate is fixed at 200 ml/min and the plasma power is 10 W, corresponding to an SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The CH$_4$ content was fixed at 10 %, with the remainder being CO$_2$ and N$_2$.

Table 2 lists the most important loss (L1-L3) and formation (F1-F9) processes for CO$_2$, and figure 11 shows their relative contributions for a CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ mixture. The CH$_4$ content was fixed at 10 %, with the remainder being CO$_2$ and N$_2$. In the SI, we present similar results for a CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ mixture at fixed CO$_2$/CH$_4$ ratio, as well as upon addition of O$_2$ or H$_2$O.

In the absence of O$_2$ and H$_2$O (figure 11) and at high CO$_2$ content (and thus low N$_2$ content), the most important dissociation reaction of CO$_2$, at the present DBD conditions, is electron impact dissociation (L1) into CO and O, while at low CO$_2$ content (and high N$_2$ content), the dissociation reaction with metastable N$_2$ ($A^3\Sigma^+_{u}$) molecules (L2) is dominant, yielding the same splitting products (CO and O). The reaction with metastable N$_2$ ($B^3\Pi_g$) molecules (L3) also has a non-negligible contribution to the dissociation of CO$_2$. Upon higher N$_2$ contents (lower CO$_2$ contents), the electron energy is gradually being used for N$_2$ excitation instead of CO$_2$ dissociation, explaining the drop in the relative contribution of electron impact dissociation and the corresponding increase in the relative contribution of dissociation by N$_2$ metastable molecules, which provides an alternative dissociation mechanism for CO$_2$. The same behavior can be seen in the CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ mixture with fixed (1:1) CO$_2$/CH$_4$ ratio (see figure S1 (a) in the SI) and in the presence of O$_2$ (figure S2 (a)) as well as in the presence of H$_2$O (figure S3 (a) in the SI). Thus, at high N$_2$ content, the major loss process of CO$_2$ is due
to N₂ metastable states (reactions L2 and L3) and this explains why the presence of N₂ enhances the CO₂ conversion (see figure 8 in section 3.2.2).

If we take a look at the CO₂ formation in the CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture, the most significant processes are the ones between CO and the positive ions C₂O²⁺ and C₂O₄⁺, through three-body reactions (F1, F2) as well as the neutral reactions between O atoms and CH₃CO molecules (F3); see figure 11 (b) as well as figure S1 (b) in the SI. A similar conclusion can be obtained for the addition of H₂O (figure S3 (b) in the SI).

With the addition of O₂, the behavior is a bit different. Indeed, the CO₂/CH₄/O₂ mixture gives rise to a high concentration of OH radicals. As a result, the reaction between CO and OH, leading to CO₂ and H atoms, becomes the dominant CO₂ formation process at O₂ contents above 5% (see figure S2 (b): F4). This explains why the addition of O₂ leads to a decrease in CO₂ conversion as indicated in figure 9 in section 3.2.3. This was also the case in our previous study for a CO₂/H₂O mixture, and resulted in a drop in CO₂ conversion upon H₂O addition. 73 In the CO₂/CH₄/N₂/H₂O mixture, however, the addition of H₂O does not cause a drop in absolute CO₂ conversion, as presented in figure 10 above, because the presence of CH₄, and thus H atoms, counteracts the negative effect of the OH radicals, as explained in section 3.2.4 above.

Besides the recombination between CO and OH (F4), electron recombination with CO₄⁺ (F8) and the reaction between O₂ and CH₂ (F9), which are quasi negligible for CO₂ production in the other gas mixtures, also become important upon addition of O₂ (figure S2 (b)). Other reactions involving ions (F5, F6, and F7) can also contribute to the CO₂ formation, but with a relative contribution no more than 10%.

Finally, it is important to realize that the total formation rate of CO₂ is much smaller (no more than 10%) than the total CO₂ loss rate for a CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture, as well as a CO₂/CH₄/N₂/H₂O mixture, so the formation processes only have a minor contribution to the net CO₂ conversion at these conditions. However, the addition of O₂ enhances the formation of CO₂. With the addition of 8% O₂, the total CO₂ formation rate reaches 41% of the total CO₂ loss rate.

### 3.3.2 CH₄ Conversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Loss reaction</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Formation reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>CH₄ + e → e + CH₃ + H</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>CH₃ + H + M → CH₄ + M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>CH₄ + CH → C₂H₄ + H</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>e + C₃H₈ → CH₄ + e + C₂H₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>CH₄ + N₂(a'Σ⁺) → N₂ + C + 2H₂</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>CH₅⁺ + H₂O → CH₄ + H₃O⁺</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>CH₄ + N₂(A³Σ⁺) → N₂ + CH₃ + H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>CH₄ + N₂(a'Σ⁻) → N₂ + CH₃ + H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>CH₄ + N₂(a'Σ⁻) → N₂ + CH₂ + H₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>CH₄ + O → CH₃ + OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 lists the most important loss (L1-L8) and formation (F1-F3) processes for CH₄ and in figure 12 the relative contributions of these processes are plotted as a function of CO₂ (and N₂) content in the CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture, at fixed CH₄ content of 10 %, with the remainder being CO₂ and N₂. The results in the CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture with fixed CO₂/CH₄ ratio, as well as upon addition of O₂ or H₂O, are presented in figures S4-S6 of the SI.

It is clear from figure 12 that the dominant loss reactions change with increasing CO₂ content (N₂ content). Electron impact dissociation of CH₄ (L1) is always an important loss process at the present DBD conditions. It shows little dependence on the CO₂ content in figure 12. The reaction between CH and CH₄ leading to C₂H₄ and H (L2) is also relatively important for CH₄ dissociation at low CO₂ content. The same applies for the reactions with N₂ metastable singlet and triplet states (reactions L3-L6, and especially L4).

Figure 12 shows that the dissociation process of CH₄ by metastable nitrogen molecules (L3+L4+L5+L6)
could be more important than the direct electron impact processes (L1). The rate coefficients of these processes are subject to some uncertainties, and this will affect the exact values of the relative contributions of these processes, predicted by the model. Nevertheless, we expect the general trends to be valid. Indeed, similar conclusions were made in literature, using the same reaction rate coefficients as in our work for the reactions with N2 metastable singlet and triplet states (reactions L3-L6), and good agreement was reached with experiments, regardless of the conditions.

With increasing CO2 content, the reactions between CH4 and O atoms or OH radicals (L7 and L8) become increasingly important, and their relative contribution towards CH4 loss even exceeds the contribution of electron impact dissociation (L1) at the highest CO2 contents (and lowest N2 contents) investigated. It should be noted that electron impact vibrational excitation of CH4 is also important as loss process for the CH4 ground state molecules, but this process is only taken into account in our model as energy loss for the electrons, and not as a chemical loss process for CH4, because the vibrationally excited species are not considered separately in our model. Indeed, electron impact vibrational excitation mainly takes place in the lower electron energy range, and thus it is of lower importance when the reduced electric field (i.e., ratio of electric field over gas density) is quite high, such as in a DBD plasma.

In the CO2/CH4/N2 mixture with fixed 1:1 CO2/CH4 ratio, a similar behavior is observed (see figure S4 (a) in the SI), except that the relative contribution of electron impact dissociation clearly drops upon increasing N2 content, because of the drop in CH4 content. With high N2 content, the dissociation of CH4 due to collisions with N2 metastable states (reactions L3–L6) becomes most important, explaining why the presence of N2 enhances the CH4 conversion (see figure 8 in section 3.2.2).

Upon addition of O2 to the mixture, the loss reaction of CH4 with OH radicals (L8) is dominant (figure S5 (a) in SI). Its relative contribution gradually increases with higher O2 contents, because the concentration of produced OH radicals rises during both the microdischarge filaments and afterglow stages of the DBD. The same applies, to a lower extent, for the loss reaction upon collision with O atoms (L7). This explains why the CH4 conversion rises drastically upon increasing O2 content (see figure 9 in section 3.2.3).

H2O addition has no significant effect on the relative contributions of the various loss processes, except that the reaction with N2 metastable triplet states \( N_2(A^3\Sigma_u^+) \) (L4) drops and the reaction with OH radicals (L8) rises (see figure S6 (a) in the SI), due to a decreasing concentration of \( N_2(A^3\Sigma_u^+) \) and increasing concentration of OH radicals, respectively.

If we take a look at the formation processes, the three-body recombination of CH3 radicals with H atoms (F1) is the dominant formation process at all the investigated conditions (see figure 12 (b), as well as figures S4 (b), S5 (b) and S6 (b) in the SI). Other reactions, such as electron impact dissociation of \( C_3H_8 \) into CH4 (F2) and charge transfer between \( H_2O \) and \( CH_5^+ \) (F3), have relative contributions of less than 5% to the CH4 formation.

If we compare the total formation rate with the total loss rate of CH4, we can conclude that the total formation rate is relatively large (up to 40%) compared to the total CH4 loss rate, at least without O2 addition.
Hence, this behavior is different from the CO₂ loss and formation rates, as mentioned above. The reason is that the three-body recombination of CH₃ radicals with H atoms is very important outside the microdischarge filaments in the DBD reactor (see SI for more details on how the microdischarge filaments in the DBD are treated: they are treated as afterglow in between discharge pulses). A similar behavior was reported by Snoeckx et al.⁶³ However, upon O₂ addition, the formation processes have a decreasing contribution to the net CH₄ conversion (formation rate no more than 10% of the total CH₄ loss rate with 8% O₂ addition), explaining again why the CH₄ conversion drastically rises upon O₂ addition (see figure 9).

3.3.3 CO Production

Table 4. Dominant CO formation and loss reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Formation reaction</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Loss reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>e + CO₂ → CO + e + O</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>CO + C₂O₂⁺ + M → C₂O₂ + CO₂ + M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>N₂(A³Σ⁺) + CO₂ → CO + N₂ + O</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>CO + C₂O₂⁺ + M → C₂O₂ + CO₂ + M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>CH₂O + O → CO + OH + H</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>CO + N → CN + O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>N₂(B³Π₆) + CO₂ → CO + N₂ + O</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>CO + CH + N₂ → C₂HO + N₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>H + CHO → CO + H₂</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>CO + H + M → CHO + M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>CO + OH → CO₂ + H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>CO + O(1D) → CO₂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13. Relative contributions of the main processes leading to CO formation (a) and loss (b) for a CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ mixture, as a function of the CO$_2$ (and N$_2$) content. The total flow rate is fixed at 200 ml/min and the plasma power is 10 W, corresponding to an SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The CH$_4$ content was fixed at 10 %, with the remainder being CO$_2$ and N$_2$.

As CO is the major product of the CO$_2$ conversion, with a selectivity of about 30–100 % (see figures 7-10 above), we present here the dominant reaction pathways for the formation and loss of CO, to obtain a better understanding of the influence of the CO$_2$/CH$_4$ ratio, the N$_2$ content, and the addition of O$_2$ or H$_2$O on the CO yield. Table 4 lists the most important formation (F1-F5) and loss (L1-L7) processes for CO. Their relative contributions in the CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ mixture are plotted in figure 13, as a function of the CO$_2$ (and N$_2$) content. The corresponding results at fixed CO$_2$/CH$_4$ ratio, as well as upon addition of O$_2$ or H$_2$O, are presented in figures S7-S9 of the SI.

Electron impact dissociation of CO$_2$ (F1), as well as dissociation of CO$_2$ upon collision with N$_2$ metastable singlet and triplet states (F2 and F4), are the dominant formation processes of CO, at all conditions investigated (see figure 13 (a), and figures S7 (a) and S9 (a) in the SI), except upon addition of O$_2$. Furthermore, the reaction between CH$_2$O and O, leading to CO, OH and H (F3), also plays a quite important role, and this process even becomes the prime source of CO when O$_2$ is added (see figure S8 (a) in the SI). This additional channel for CO production explains why the addition of O$_2$ leads to a drastic increase in CO selectivity (see figure 9).

As far as the loss of CO is concerned, the three-body reactions between CO and the positive ions C$_2$O$_3^+$
and \( \text{C}_2\text{O}_4^+ \) (L1, L2) are dominant at all conditions (see figure 13 (b), and figures S7 (b) and S9 (b) in the SI), except upon addition of \( \text{O}_2 \). These two reactions are also the most important for \( \text{CO}_2 \) formation (see section 3.3.1 above). Upon addition of \( \text{O}_2 \), however, the reaction of \( \text{CO} \) with \( \text{OH} \) becomes the most important route towards \( \text{CO} \) loss (L6, in figure S8 (b)), which is also the dominant process of \( \text{CO}_2 \) formation under these conditions.

Besides the \( \text{CO} \) loss reactions towards \( \text{CO}_2 \) formation (L1, L2, L6, L7), other loss channels include the reaction of \( \text{CO} \) with \( \text{N} \), leading to \( \text{CN} \) and \( \text{O} \) (L3), the reaction with \( \text{CH} \), leading to \( \text{C}_2\text{HO} \) (L4), and the reaction with \( \text{H} \), producing \( \text{CHO} \) (L5), which have relative contributions up to 20 % at the conditions investigated.

Finally, it is important to realize that the total loss rate of \( \text{CO} \) is much smaller (no more than 6 %) than the total \( \text{CO} \) formation rate for all gas mixtures and mixing ratios investigated, so the loss processes only have a minor contribution to the net \( \text{CO} \) formation at these conditions.

### 3.3.4 \( \text{H}_2 \) Production

**Table 5.** Dominant \( \text{H}_2 \) formation and loss reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Formation reaction</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Loss reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>( \text{N}_2(a'\Sigma_u^-) + \text{CH}_4 \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2 + \text{N}_2 + \text{C} )</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>( \text{H}_2 + \text{C} \rightarrow \text{CH} + \text{H} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>( \text{H}_2\text{CN} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{HCN} )</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>( \text{H}_2 + \text{OH} \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{H} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>( \text{N}_2(a'\Sigma_u^-) + \text{CH}_4 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{N}_2 + \text{CH}_2 )</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>( \text{H}_2 + \text{e} \rightarrow \text{e} + \text{H} + \text{H} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>( \text{e} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{e} + \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 )</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>( \text{H}_2 + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{OH} + \text{H} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>( \text{CH}_2 + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CH} )</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>( \text{H}_2 + \text{N}(2\text{P}) \rightarrow \text{NH} + \text{H} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>( \text{CH}_3\text{OH} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CH}_2\text{OH} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>( \text{CHO} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CO} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>( \text{CH}_3\text{OH} + \text{H} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CH}_3\text{O} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>( \text{CH}_3 + \text{O} \rightarrow \text{H}_2 + \text{CO} + \text{H} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14. Relative contributions of the main processes leading to H₂ formation (a) and loss (b) for a CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture, as a function of the CO₂ (and N₂) content. The total flow rate is fixed at 200 ml/min and the plasma power is 10 W, corresponding to an SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The CH₄ content was fixed at 10 %, with the remainder being CO₂ and N₂.

H₂ is also a significant product, due to the CH₄ conversion, with a selectivity of about 10–50 % (see figures 7-10 above). Table 5 lists the most important formation (F1-F9) and loss (L1-L5) processes for H₂ and figure 14 illustrates the relative contributions of these processes for the CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture at constant CH₄ content. The results for the other conditions can be found in figures S10 - S12 in the SI.

The most important production process at all conditions investigated is the reaction of CH₄ with N₂(a’Σ_u⁻), metastable singlet states, producing C atoms and two H₂ molecules (F1). This reaction of course becomes increasingly important with increasing N₂ content. Furthermore, electron impact dissociation of C₂H₆ (F4) is an important formation process at lower N₂ content (see especially figure S10 (a)). The reaction of CH₄ with N₂(a’Σ_u⁻) towards the production of CH₂ radicals and one H₂ molecule (F3) also contributes to the H₂ production to some extent, as well as the reaction of H₂CN, CH₂ radicals, CHO and CH₃OH with H (reactions F2, F5-F8) and the reaction of CH₃ with O atoms (F9), depending on the conditions.

The dominant loss process is the reaction of H₂ with a C atom producing a CH radical and a H atom (L1) at all gas mixing ratios (see figure 14 (b), and figures S10 (b) and S12 (b) of the SI), except upon addition of O₂ (see figure S11 (b) in the SI). The relative contribution of this reaction, however, rapidly drops with increasing
CO₂ content, because the C atom density decreases due to reaction with O-containing species, such as OH and O₂, which are directly or indirectly formed from CO₂. This also explains why the loss reaction with OH radicals (L2) becomes gradually more important upon rising CO₂ content (see figure 14 (b)). The latter reaction is also dominant upon addition of O₂ (see figure S11 (b) of the SI), for the same reason. The increasing role of reaction L2 in the loss of H₂ also explains why the selectivity of H₂ decreases upon addition of either CO₂ or O₂ (see figures 7 and 9 above). Other reactions, including electron impact dissociation of H₂ (L3), oxidization of H₂ by O atoms generating OH and H (L4), and the reaction of H₂ with excited N atoms towards NH (L5), can also contribute to H₂ loss, but their relative contributions do not exceed 20% at the conditions investigated.

Finally, the total loss rate of H₂ ranges from 13 % to 24 % of the total H₂ formation rate for all gas mixtures and mixing ratios investigated, so the loss processes have a non-negligible contribution to the net H₂ formation at these conditions. Especially O₂ addition enhances the total loss rate of H₂ via reaction L2, as mentioned above.

3.3.5 C₂H₆ Production

Table 6. Dominant C₂H₆ formation and loss reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Formation reaction</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Loss reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>CH₃ + CH₃ + M → C₂H₆ + M</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>C₂H₆ + e → e + C₂H₄ + H₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>C₂H₅ + H + M → C₂H₆ + M</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>C₂H₆ + OH → C₂H₅ + H₂O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>C₂H₅ + CH₃O → C₂H₆ + CH₂O</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>C₂H₆ + O → C₂H₅ + OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>C₂H₅ + CHO → C₂H₆ + CO</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>C₂H₆ + N₂(a′Σ_u) → N₂ + C₂H₄ + H₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>C₂H₅ + C₂H₅ → C₂H₆ + C₂H₄</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>C₂H₆ + N₂(A³Σ_u⁺) → N₂ + C₂H₄ + H₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>C₂H₆ + e → e + C₂H₅ + H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>C₂H₆ + CH₂ → C₃H₈</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Figure 15. Relative contributions of the main processes leading to C$_2$H$_6$ formation (a) and loss (b) for a CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ mixture, as a function of the CO$_2$ (and N$_2$) content. The total flow rate is fixed at 200 ml/min and the plasma power is 10 W, corresponding to an SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The CH$_4$ content was fixed at 10 %, with the remainder being CO$_2$ and N$_2$.

Table 6 lists the most important formation (F1-F5) and loss (L1-L7) processes for C$_2$H$_6$. In figure 15, the relative contributions of these processes are plotted for a CO$_2$/CH$_4$/N$_2$ mixture at fixed CH$_4$ content. The results at the other conditions are given in figures S13-S15 of the SI.

The dominant formation channel for C$_2$H$_6$ in all gas mixtures is three-body recombination of two CH$_3$ radicals (F1), contributing for more than 60 % to the C$_2$H$_6$ formation, and even up to 95 % upon addition of O$_2$. Upon addition of CO$_2$ and O$_2$, the CH$_3$ radicals are consumed by other competitive channels involving oxygen containing species, and this explains why the C$_2$H$_6$ selectivity gradually decreases with the addition of CO$_2$ and O$_2$ (see figures 7 and 9). The second most important reaction is three-body recombination of C$_2$H$_5$ with H (F2), while the other recombination reactions of C$_2$H$_5$ with CH$_3$O, CHO and C$_2$H$_5$ (F3-F5) are of minor importance.

The dominant loss reaction for C$_2$H$_6$ at nearly all conditions investigated is electron impact dissociation into C$_2$H$_4$ and H$_2$ (L1). The reaction of C$_2$H$_6$ with OH or O towards the production of C$_2$H$_5$ (L2-L3) is also relatively important; see especially figure S13 (b) and figure S14 (b). Indeed, upon addition of O$_2$, L2 even becomes dominant (see figure S14 (b)). Finally, the dissociation of C$_2$H$_6$ upon collision with N$_2$ metastable molecules (both N$_2$($a'$-Sigma$_u^-$) and (N$_2$A$^3$Sigma$_u^+$)) (L4 and L5) becomes gradually more important upon rising N$_2$. 
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content, as expected. This explains why the C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} selectivity slightly decreases upon increasing N\textsubscript{2} content in figure 8.

Finally, the total loss rate of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} is 42 to 60 % of the total C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} formation rate for all gas mixtures and mixing ratios investigated, so the loss processes have a quite large contribution to the net C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} formation at these conditions. Like for H\textsubscript{2}, increasing the O\textsubscript{2} content enhances the total loss rate of C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6}.

### 3.3.6 C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8} Production

**Table 7.** Dominant C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8} formation and loss reactions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Formation reaction</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Loss reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>CH\textsubscript{3} + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5} + M → C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8} + M</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8} + e → e + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} + H\textsubscript{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{6} + CH\textsubscript{2} → C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8}</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8} + e → e + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{4} + CH\textsubscript{4}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{7} + H → C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8}</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8} + e → e + C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{7} + H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16.** Relative contributions of the main processes leading to C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8} formation (a) and loss (b) as a function of the CO\textsubscript{2} (and N\textsubscript{2}) content, for a fixed total flow rate of 200 ml/min and plasma power of 10 W, corresponding to an SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The CH\textsubscript{4} content was fixed at 10 %, with the remainder being CO\textsubscript{2} and N\textsubscript{2}.

Table 7 lists the most important formation (F1-F3) and loss (L1-L3) processes for C\textsubscript{3}H\textsubscript{8}, while the relative
contributions of these processes for a CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture at constant CH₄ content are plotted in figure 16. The results for the other gas mixtures are again presented in the SI (figures S16-S18).

Three-body recombination of C₂H₅ and CH₃ radicals (F1) is the most important formation process. It contributes above 70% at all conditions investigated, and even up to 90% upon addition of O₂ (figure S17 (a)). Finally, the loss of C₃H₈ occurs almost entirely through electron impact dissociation (L1-L3 in decreasing order of importance) at all conditions investigated.

Finally, our calculations reveal that the loss of C₃H₈ is quite significant compared to their production, because the total loss rate takes up around 38 to 46% of the total formation rate.

3.3.7 General Overview of the Reaction Pathways

Figure 17. Schematic overview of the dominant reaction pathways for the conversion of CH₄ and CO₂, as well as N₂, in a 1:1:8 CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture, for a fixed total flow rate of 200 ml/min and plasma power of 10 W, corresponding to an SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The thickness of the arrow lines is linearly proportional to the rate of the net reactions. The most important molecules are indicated with a solid line frame, the molecules formed with lower densities are written in a frame with dashed lines, while the radicals are not written in a frame.

From the above detailed analysis of the dominant loss and formation reactions for CH₄, CO₂ and the major products, we can compose a general picture of the dominant reaction pathways in the plasma. This is summarized in figure 17 for a 1:1:8 CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture, at a fixed total flow rate of 200 ml/min and plasma power of 10 W, corresponding to an SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule.

The conversion process, at the present DBD conditions, starts with electron impact dissociation of CH₄,
forming CH₃ radicals. Meanwhile, electron impact excitation of N₂ produces metastable singlet and triplet states, which also promote the dissociation of CH₄ towards CH₃, CH₂, CH radicals and C atoms. The CH₃ radicals will recombine toward higher hydrocarbons, i.e., mainly C₂H₆ and C₃H₈. Moreover, the recombination between CH₄ and CH produces unsaturated hydrocarbons, i.e. mainly C₂H₄. The latter can recombine with H atoms into C₂H₅ radicals, which further produce other hydrocarbons, such as C₂H₆ and C₁H₈, as well as CH₃ radicals. Furthermore, dissociation of CH₄ and the higher hydrocarbons by electron impact and by collisions with N₂ metastable states yields the formation of H₂.

At the same time, electron impact collisions with N₂ also yield splitting of N₂ into N atoms, which can react with CH₃ radicals to generate H₂CN. The latter are not stable and quickly transform into hydrogen cyanide (HCN) upon impact with N or H atoms. At 80 % N₂ content, our simulation shows that HCN is the most abundant N-containing end product (around 1600 ppm). This indicates that the presence—even in high concentrations—of N₂ does not result in a significant production of N-containing species. This is in qualitative agreement with our experiments, since no N-containing species were detected.

Electron impact dissociation and dissociation upon impact with N₂ metastable states also contribute to the conversion of CO₂ into CO and O. Moreover, the CH₃ radicals, formed by CH₄ dissociation, react with O atoms, to form CH₂O (formaldehyde) and CH₃O radicals. The latter can subsequently be converted into CH₂O as well. Furthermore, the O atoms can react with CH₂O or CH₄ to produce OH radicals, which can further react with CH₃ radicals into CH₃OH (methanol), albeit to a lower extent. The OH radicals also react further into H₂O. Finally, the O atoms, created from CO₂ conversion, initiate the formation of other oxygenates, like acetaldehyde (CH₃CHO). However, this reaction path is not so important, because of the limited formation of O radicals.

In order of decreasing importance, H₂, CO, C₂H₆, H₂O, as well as the hydrogen cyanide (HCN) are the main end products (with molar fractions of 0.80 %, 0.60 %, 0.20 %, 0.19 % and 0.16 %, respectively) in a 1:1:8 CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture. The fraction of other oxygenates (CH₂O, CH₃OH, etc.) as well as C₃H₈ in the end products is lower than 0.1 %, hence their yields are of minor importance. Note that HCN was not detected in our experiments, although the calculations predict a higher concentration than for C₃H₈. This is because thermal conductivity detectors (TCD) and a flame-ionization detector (FID) were used to detect the products. These detectors are more sensitive and hence have a much lower detection limit for C₃H₈ compared to HCN. Moreover, the yield of water (H₂O) was not calculated in the experiments, since GC measurements are not suitable to deliver quantitative data about H₂O.

Our earlier study showed that the presence of N₂ during CO₂ splitting leads to the formation of N₂O and several NOₓ compounds, with concentrations in the range of several 100 ppm. These concentrations are too low to be considered useful for nitrogen fixation but will give rise to several environmental problems. N₂O is an even more potent greenhouse gas than CO₂, with a global warming potential (GWP) of 298 CO₂-equivalent, while NO and NO₂ are responsible for acid rain and the formation of ozone and a wide variety of toxic products. However, our calculations predict that with the addition of CH₄, the production of NOₓ compounds upon reaction between N- and O-species is prohibited, because of the faster reaction between O- and H-species, as explained in section 3.2 above. Therefore, no NOₓ compounds are plotted in figure 17. This
result is very important, as it indicates that DRM in a real gas effluent, containing significant amounts of \( \text{N}_2 \), would not cause problems of \( \text{NO}_x \) formation, that are present in \( \text{CO}_2 \) splitting upon addition of \( \text{N}_2 \).

**Figure 18.** Schematic overview of the dominant reaction pathways for the conversion of \( \text{CH}_4, \text{CO}_2, \text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{N}_2 \) in a 10:10:78:2 \( \text{CO}_2/\text{CH}_4/\text{N}_2/\text{O}_2 \) mixture, for a fixed total flow rate of 200 ml/min and plasma power of 10 W, corresponding to an SEI of 0.76 eV/molecule. The thickness of the arrow lines is linearly proportional to the rate of the net reactions. The most important molecules are indicated with a solid line frame, the molecules formed with lower densities are written in a frame with dashed lines, while the radicals are not written in a frame.

From the analysis of the dominant loss and formation processes in sections 3.3.1-3.3.6 above, it became clear that the addition of water does not change the plasma chemistry to a large extent, because of its limited influence on the \( \text{CH}_4 \) and \( \text{CO}_2 \) conversion (see also figure 10 above). Hence, the dominant reaction pathways in a \( \text{CO}_2/\text{CH}_4/\text{N}_2/\text{H}_2\text{O} \) mixture are also well represented by figure 17.

For the \( \text{CO}_2/\text{CH}_4/\text{N}_2/\text{O}_2 \) mixture, on the other hand, the situation is different, because \( \text{O}_2 \) addition affects the dominant loss and formation reactions, as was clear from sections 3.3.1-3.3.6 above. Therefore, we plot in figure 18 the dominant reaction pathways for the conversion of \( \text{CH}_4, \text{CO}_2, \text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{N}_2 \) in a 10:10:78:2 \( \text{CO}_2/\text{CH}_4/\text{N}_2/\text{O}_2 \) mixture. Again, electron impact dissociation of \( \text{CH}_4 \) and dissociation upon impact with \( \text{N}_2 \) metastable singlet and triplet states results in the formation of \( \text{CH}_3 \) radicals. The latter can again recombine into hydrocarbons, such as ethane (\( \text{C}_2\text{H}_6 \)), but the production of higher hydrocarbons through \( \text{CH}_3 \) recombination is reduced due to the increased recombination rate between \( \text{CH}_3 \) and \( \text{O}_2 \) or \( \text{OH} \) radicals, which are more abundant in case of \( \text{O}_2 \) addition, yielding methanol (\( \text{CH}_3\text{OH} \)) formation. Moreover, the recombination of \( \text{CH}_3 \)
radicals and O₂ molecules into CH₃O₂ radicals, which further form CH₃O, also becomes important. The CH₃O radicals also yield the formation of formaldehyde (CH₂O) and methanol (CH₃OH). However, methanol (CH₃OH) can quickly react back into CH₃O radicals through the reverse reactions with O, H or OH radicals at a somewhat larger rate, so our model reveals a net conversion from methanol (CH₃OH) to formaldehyde (CH₂O).

In addition, methanol (CH₃OH) can react further into formaldehyde (CH₂O) through the CH₂OH radicals, and formaldehyde (CH₂O) can further be converted into CO, either directly upon reaction with O atoms or indirectly through the CHO radicals. Furthermore, the reaction of formaldehyde (CH₂O) with O atoms also produces OH radicals. The O₂ molecules are converted into HO₂ radicals, O atoms and CO, as well as formaldehyde (CH₂O). It is worth to mention that most of the O₂ conversion proceeds through collisions between neutral species. For instance, O₂ dissociation upon impact with N₂ metastable states contributes for about 15%, showing the important role of N₂, while electron impact dissociation contributes for only 3-4%.

CO can be further oxidized into CO₂ upon reaction with OH radicals. Furthermore, also the CH₃ radicals can be oxidized into CO₂. These reactions are obviously undesired. The O atoms are also converted into CH₃O and OH radicals, which can again form water. The production of H₂CN upon impact between N and CH₃ radicals is prohibited, due to competition with other reactions that consume CH₃ radicals upon addition of O₂. As a result, the concentration of HCN in the mixture is greatly reduced.

The most important products in a 10:10:78:2 CO₂/CH₄/N₂/O₂ mixture, as predicted by our model, are (in order of decreasing importance) H₂O, CO, H₂, ethane (C₂H₆), methanol (CH₃OH) and hydrogen cyanide (HCN), with molar fractions of 1.60 %, 1.30 %, 0.78 %, 0.13 %, 0.10 %, and 0.094 %, respectively. Note that methanol (CH₃OH) was not detected in our experiments, because its concentration approaches the detection limit. In contrast, C₃H₈ species were detected in spite of their lower concentration because of a much lower detection limit.

The comparison of figures 17 and 18 clearly shows that O₂ addition has a dramatic effect on the plasma chemistry of CO₂ and CH₄ conversion, as was also clear from section 3.2 and sections 3.3.1-3.3.6 above (cf. figure 9 and figures S2, S5, S8, S11, S14 and S17 of the SI). A similar behavior was reported by De Bie et al., when comparing the plasma chemistry of DRM (CH₄/CO₂) and POX (CH₄/O₂). Indeed, both investigations indicate that mixtures with CO₂ favor the formation of H₂, while the production of H₂O is greatly promoted upon addition of O₂. CO is formed at high density in both gas mixtures. Note that adding O₂ can effectively promote the conversion of CH₄ (see figure 9). However, also a significant amount of undesired CO₂ is formed and thus the net conversion of CO₂ is greatly reduced. Our pathway analysis shows how plasma chemistry modeling can help to obtain better insight, and this is very valuable to optimize the process. For example, the different pathways revealed by our model can help to determine the most suitable feed gas ratio to obtain the highest yield and/or selectivity of desired products.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

Chemical kinetics modeling has proven to be very useful to study the plasma-based conversion of CO₂ and CH₄. In recent years, plasma chemistry models have been developed in a stepwise manner. First models consisted of single component molecular gases, i.e. to study CO₂ splitting and CH₄ reforming. In a next step,
multi-component mixtures were studied, i.e. DRM, POX, artificial photosynthesis, and CO₂ hydrogenation. Subsequently, the effect of N₂ as impurity and admixture on the CO₂ splitting and CH₄ reforming process was investigated, to better approach real effluent gases.

Combining the knowledge gathered in this field so far, we presented here a new comprehensive plasma chemistry set, that can be used for zero-dimensional modeling of the chemical kinetics in low temperature plasmas, for all possible combinations of CO₂, CH₄, N₂, O₂ and H₂O, for a wide variety of applications. It will be useful, for instance, for CO₂ conversion studies in the presence of both CH₄ and N₂, as well as for unravelling the possibilities of plasma-based multi-reforming processes. Furthermore, also in other fields, such as (plasma-assisted) combustion and even more exotic applications, like planetary atmosphere and spacecraft re-entry modeling, this chemistry set could also be used as a foundation to build a comprehensive computational data set.

This comprehensive model was first validated by comparing the calculated CO₂ (and CH₄) conversion for pure CO₂, as well as CO₂/CH₄, CO₂/N₂, CH₄/N₂ and CO₂/H₂O gas mixtures, with experimental data from our earlier work. Subsequently, a more extensive validation was performed by a combined calculation and experimental study, investigating the conversion of CH₄ and CO₂, as well as the selectivity of the major products, in a CO₂/CH₄/N₂ mixture, for varying CO₂/CH₄ ratios and N₂ contents, as well as upon O₂ and H₂O addition. Good agreement was reached with the experimental data, indicating that the chemical kinetics model sufficiently captures the underlying plasma chemistry for these processes.

The presence of N₂ in a CO₂/CH₄ gas mixture clearly enhances the absolute CO₂ and CH₄ conversion, due to dissociation of CO₂ and CH₄ upon collision with nitrogen metastable molecules (mainly N₂(a'Σ_u⁻) and N₂(a'Σ_u⁺)), and it also yields a slight increase in the syngas (H₂/CO) ratio. This is because the N₂ metastable molecules contribute more to the dissociation of CH₄, yielding H₂, due to the higher dissociation rate than that of CO₂. Moreover, at a fixed CH₄ content of 10 %, increasing the CO₂/CH₄ mixing ratio from 0.5 to 4, by modifying the N₂ content, yields a drop in the H₂/CO ratio from 2.45 to 0.42. These results show that we can exert great control over the H₂/CO ratio by changing the mixing ratio.

Although the addition of O₂ is also beneficial for the CH₄ conversion, due to a shift towards POX over DRM, it is accompanied by a severe drop in CO₂ conversion and syngas ratio. Furthermore, a large fraction of the converted CH₄ is transformed into H₂O rather than value-added products.

The addition of H₂O had virtually no effect on the CH₄ and CO₂ conversion. This is interesting, because in a pure CO₂/H₂O mixture, H₂O addition leads to a drop in CO₂ conversion. The reason is that the H atoms, originating from CH₄ dissociation, react with the OH radicals, so that the latter do not recombine with CO into CO₂, which is the limiting process in the CO₂/H₂O mixture. Additionally, the syngas ratio increases due to the effective conversion of H₂O into H₂.

Although this new chemical kinetics model already yields good agreement with experimental data for various gas mixtures and a wide range of mixing ratios, we should remain cautious when using its results—this is true for any model. The chemistry set contains 1729 reactions, each with its corresponding cross section or rate coefficient, which are subject to certain uncertainties. The latter will of course be reflected in the results.
A crucial next step in the field of plasma chemistry modeling should consist of performing a detailed uncertainty analysis and sensitivity studies. By doing so, the impact of these uncertainties on the model predictions can be revealed, and the accuracy of the model can be determined. Such an analysis was presented already for less complicated mixtures, i.e. by Turner for a He/O₂ mixture,⁹⁵-⁹⁷ and in our group for a CO₂ plasma.³⁸ Although this will be a huge amount of work, we will continue along these lines, since it is indispensable to fully explore the predictive character of such a model.

Additionally, the model presented here mainly applies to a DBD plasma reactor, which has been mostly used for gas conversion studies up to now. However, other types of plasmas are also gaining increasing interest, like microwave plasmas and gliding arc discharges.¹¹ They operate at somewhat different conditions, such as lower reduced electric field (i.e., ratio of electric field over gas density) around 50 – 100 Td. At these conditions, the electron temperature is in the order of 1 eV, which is most suitable for vibrational excitation. The low vibrational levels will gradually populate higher vibrational levels by vibration-vibration collisions (so-called VV relaxation), and the highest vibrational levels will easily dissociate. Hence, this process of vibrational ladder climbing leading to dissociation is the most energy-efficient process for CO₂ dissociation. This explains why CO₂ dissociation is quite energy efficient in microwave and gliding arc discharges.⁴,¹¹ These processes are not considered in detail in the model presented here, as they are of minor importance in a DBD. However, a detailed model for the CO₂ vibrational kinetics has already been developed within the group PLASMANT,³⁴-³⁵ as well as models for CO₂/N₂ and N₂/O₂ mixtures, accounting in detail for the vibrational kinetics of CO₂, N₂ and O₂.⁶,⁸² In the future, it would be useful to extend this newly developed model for the CO₂/CH₄/N₂/O₂/H₂O mixture with the vibrational kinetics of the various molecules, so that this model becomes applicable to other plasma types as well. This is not only true for the CO₂ vibrational levels, but the N₂ vibrational levels can also be important for CO₂ (and maybe CH₄) dissociation.⁸² Furthermore, when the CO₂ conversion is significant, the CO vibrational kinetics should be considered as well, in relation with the formation of C and O atoms.⁹⁸ Again, adding the vibrational levels of all these molecules will require major efforts, in view of the possible coupling between all these vibrational levels, and keeping in mind uncertainties in all rate coefficients,⁹⁵-⁹⁷ and the approximations that need to be made.¹⁵-¹⁶

This combined computational and experimental study reveals that the major products formed by mixtures of CO₂, CH₄, N₂, O₂ and H₂O are syngas and some higher hydrocarbons (mainly C₂H₆ and C₃H₈), as well as H₂O, while the concentrations of oxygenates like methanol, formic acid, formaldehyde, as well as hydrogen cyanide, are almost negligible. Hence, to increase the product selectivity of future plasma-based reforming processes, preferably to these oxygenates, combinations with a catalyst or membranes will be necessary. This brings us to another future necessity in the field of plasma chemistry modeling, i.e., the need to extend these models with surface reactions, as recently done for NH₃ synthesis by Hong et al.⁹⁹ This step would make it possible for 0D plasma chemistry models to account for plasma catalysis, and thus to make it possible to predict the requirements of the underlying plasmachemical pathways to selectively produce the desired value-added compounds. This stresses the power that lies within this type of modeling studies, i.e. to unravel the underlying chemical pathways to obtain a better understanding of the chemistry taking place, which in turn allows to predict whether new conditions could be more promising, and help to point experiments in the right direction.
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