



PCCP

**Gas-Phase Formation of Silicon Monoxide via Non-Adiabatic
Reaction Dynamics and its Role as a Building Block of
Interstellar Silicates**

Journal:	<i>Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics</i>
Manuscript ID	CP-ART-05-2022-002188.R1
Article Type:	Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Jul-2022
Complete List of Authors:	He, Chao; University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Department of Chemistry Luo, Yuheng; University of Hawai'i at Manoa Doddipatla, Srinivas; University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Department of Chemistry Yang, Zhenghai; University of Hawai'i at Manoa Millar, Tom; Queen's University Belfast, School of Mathematics and Physics Sun, Rui; University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Chemistry Kaiser, Ralf; University of Hawaii,

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Gas-Phase Formation of Silicon Monoxide via Non-Adiabatic Reaction Dynamics and its Role as a Building Block of Interstellar Silicates

Chao He,¹ Yuheng Luo,¹ Srinivas Doddipatla,¹ Zhenghai Yang,¹ Tom J. Millar,² Rui Sun*¹,
Ralf I. Kaiser*¹

¹*Department of Chemistry, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

²*School of Mathematics and Physics, Queen's University Belfast, University Road, Belfast BT7 1NN, UK*

Correspondence to: ralfk@hawaii.edu and ruisun@hawaii.edu

◇ These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

Silicon monoxide (SiO) is classified as a key precursor and fundamental molecular building block to interstellar silicate nanoparticles, which play an essential role in the synthesis of molecular building blocks connected to the *Origins of Life*. In the cold interstellar medium, silicon monoxide is of critical importance in initiating a series of elementary chemical reactions leading to larger silicon oxides and eventually to silicates. To date, the fundamental formation mechanisms and chemical dynamics leading to gas phase silicon monoxide have remained largely elusive. Here, through a concerted effort between crossed molecular beam experiments and electronic structure calculations, it is revealed that instead of forming highly-stable silicon dioxide (SiO₂), silicon monoxide can be formed via a barrierless, exoergic, single-collision event between ground state molecular oxygen and atomic silicon involving non-adiabatic reaction dynamics through involving various intersystem crossings. Our research affords persuasive evidence for a likely source of highly rovibrationally excited silicon monoxide in cold molecular clouds thus initiating the complex chain of exoergic reactions leading ultimately to a population of silicates at low temperatures in our Galaxy.

Introduction


Nearly a century after the very first discovery of the silicon monoxide molecule (SiO ; $X^1\Sigma^+$) in 1886 by Mabery as a product of the reduction of silicon dioxide (SiO_2) by charcoal,¹ silicon monoxide (SiO) has been classified as a key precursor and fundamental molecular building block to interstellar silicate dust – nanoparticles comprising predominantly of olivine-type ($(\text{Mg,Fe})_2\text{SiO}_4$) refractory minerals.²⁻⁵ These nanoparticles have been linked to the prebiotic evolution of the interstellar medium (ISM) through the synthesis of molecular precursors to life such as sugars^{6, 7} and amino acids^{8, 9} on their ice-coated surfaces in cold molecular clouds by ionizing radiation.¹⁰ These silicates also play a central role in star formation and in the origin of Solar Systems including our own by controlling the radiation balance, providing catalytic surfaces for, e.g., formation of molecular hydrogen,^{11, 12} and acting as a molecular feedstock for biorelevant molecules connected to the origins of life.² Therefore, unraveling the origin of interstellar silicates is of vital significance to the astrochemistry, astrobiology, and astrophysics communities to understand the fundamental processes that create a visible galaxy including our own. This knowledge is further essential to decipher the impending ‘life-time-paradox’ since interstellar grains are believed to be faster destroyed through sputtering and interstellar shocks^{4, 13} than generated during the late stage of stellar evolution in circumstellar envelopes of oxygen rich Asymptotic Giant Branch (AGB) stars.^{3, 14-19} The inconsistency between the formation rates of a few 10^9 years in circumstellar envelopes²⁰ and the destruction timescales of only some 10^8 years once injected by the stellar wind into the interstellar medium^{21, 22} suggests that interstellar silicates should not exist. This discrepancy might be eventually solved through a critical understanding of the complex sets of elementary reactions, which lead to these nanoparticles, commencing with the simplest molecular building block of interstellar silicates – the silicon monoxide molecule (SiO ; $X^1\Sigma^+$) – in circumstellar environments.^{14, 23-25} However, Zhukovska et al.²⁶ and Draine²⁷ concluded that fractions of only a few percent of the interstellar silicates originate from circumstellar envelopes with hitherto rapid molecular mass growth processes operating in the low temperature interstellar (10 K) as opposed to the hot circumstellar medium of a few 1,000 K.^{28, 29}

However, the underlying chemical dynamics and intimate reaction mechanisms leading even to the simplest precursor of silicate grains – silicon monoxide (SiO ; $X^1\Sigma^+$) – in deep space are not well understood, although this the most abundant, silicon- and oxygen-bearing interstellar

molecule contributing up to 85 % of the cosmic silicon budget³⁰⁻³⁷. Martin et al., Husain et al., and Le Picard et al. revealed rapid kinetics of the reaction of ground state atomic silicon ($\text{Si}(^3\text{P})$) with molecular oxygen (O_2 , $X^3\Sigma_g^-$) down to temperatures as low as 15 K with rate constants up to $3 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ exploiting the CRESU (Cinétique de Réaction en Écoulement Supersonique Uniforme) apparatus³⁸⁻⁴¹ albeit without an experimental identification of the reaction products or elucidation of the interplay between the triplet (reaction (1a)) versus singlet surfaces (reaction 1b)). Pioneering computational studies focused on the entrance channel of the singlet surface accessed through colinear and perpendicular approaches of atomic silicon to molecular oxygen, but without comprehensive searches of the intermediates involved⁴². A follow-up work tackled both the singlet and triplet surfaces, but with key reaction intermediates left out and conical intersections unexplored⁴³. Two quasiclassical trajectory studies of the bimolecular collision between silicon and molecular oxygen system explored solely the ground state singlet surface and proposed a direct abstraction at low collision energy (backward scattering) and indirect reaction mechanism through insertion prevailing at high collision energies (forward-backward scattering)⁴⁴. A molecular beams study of ground state silicon with molecular oxygen determined the vibrational state distribution of silicon monoxide (SiO ; $X^1\Sigma^+$) reaching a distribution maximum at $v = 4$ ⁴⁵. Based on the identification of ground state atomic oxygen and a significant population up to $v = 8$, the authors inferred a foremost abstraction mechanism. However, the aforementioned studies did not fully appreciate the complexity of the silicon – molecular oxygen system with key reaction intermediates, conical intersections, excited state dynamics, and non-adiabatic dynamics inadequately explored. Therefore, an understanding of the chemical dynamics of the silicon – molecular oxygen system along with critical implication to interstellar silicate nano particles are still in its infancy both from the experimental and computational level.

Here, we reveal the first comprehensive results of a crossed molecular beam study merged with electronic structure calculations on the triplet and singlet surfaces of the elementary reaction of ground state atomic silicon ($\text{Si}(^3\text{P})$) with molecular oxygen ($^{18}\text{O}_2$, $X^3\Sigma_g^-$) leading to the predominant formation of silicon monoxide (Si^{18}O ; $X^1\Sigma^+$) and triplet atomic oxygen ($^{18}\text{O}(^3\text{P})$) via indirect scattering dynamics. The reaction between atomic silicon ($\text{Si}(^3\text{P})$) and molecular oxygen ($^{18}\text{O}_2$, $X^3\Sigma_g^-$) proceeds barrierlessly on the ground state singlet surface involving an

unconventional cyclic intermediate, but it experiences an entrance barrier prior to the formation of an acyclic triplet Si^{18}O_2 reaction intermediate. Numerous intersystem crossings (ISCs) between the singlet and triplet manifold and hence non-adiabatic reaction dynamics are inferred. High level electronic structure calculations on the energies, structures, spin-orbit coupling, and conical intersections along the reaction pathways complement the molecular beams studies to reveal fundamental insights into the underlying reaction dynamics on ground and excited state surfaces and the intimate bond-breaking and bond-formation processes along with isomerization processes of highly reactive (ring strained) intermediates. This system is also of fundamental significance to the reaction dynamics community as a benchmark of triatomic systems such as the reactions of hydrogen (H , ^2S)⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸, chlorine, (Cl , ^2P)⁴⁹⁻⁵³, fluorine (F , ^2P)⁵⁴⁻⁵⁸, carbon (C , ^1D)^{59,60}, nitrogen (N , ^2D)⁶¹⁻⁶⁴, oxygen (O , ^1D)^{65,66}, and sulfur (S , $^3\text{P}/^1\text{D}$)⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹ atoms with molecular hydrogen (H_2 , $\text{X}^1\Sigma_g^+$). However, the reaction dynamics of triatomic systems involving the ‘heavy’ main group XIV element silicon have been elusive until now. Our study represents a proxy for the reaction of molecular oxygen (O_2 , $\text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-$) yielding silicon monoxide (SiO ; $\text{X}^1\Sigma^+$) via a single collision event in the gas-phase. In cold molecular clouds, the reaction of atomic silicon with molecular oxygen initiates the formation of the very first silicon – oxygen bond and offers a viable pathway to silicon monoxide (SiO ; $\text{X}^1\Sigma^+$) thus initiating the complex chain of exoergic reactions leading ultimately to a population of silicates at low temperatures in our Galaxy.



Methods

Experimental procedures. The bimolecular reaction of ground state atomic silicon (Si ; ^3P) with oxygen-18 ($^{18}\text{O}_2$; $\text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-$) was carried out under single-collision conditions utilizing a universal crossed molecular beams machine.⁷⁰ In the primary source chamber, a pulsed supersonic beam of ground state silicon atoms was prepared *in situ* via ablation of silicon from a rotating silicon rod at 266 nm (Nd:YAG laser; 5 ± 1 mJ per pulse; 30 Hz)⁷¹ and entraining the ablated atoms in neon gas (Ne; 99.999%; Specialty Gases of America) with a backing pressure of 4 atm. The neon-seeded silicon beam was skimmed and velocity-selected by a four-slot chopper wheel resulting in a peak velocity (v_p) of 952 ± 15 m s⁻¹ and speed ratio (S) of 6.1 ± 0.6 (Table S1). Laser-

induced fluorescence interrogation of neon-seeded silicon beam revealed that all silicon atoms are populated in their electronic ground state (3P).⁷² In the secondary source chamber, the supersonic beam of oxygen-18 ($^{18}O_2$, $\geq 99.9\%$; Linde Electronics and Specialty Gases), which was characterized with $v_p = 760 \pm 20 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ and $S = 13.8 \pm 1.0$ (Table S1), crossed perpendicularly with the primary beam silicon atoms in the interaction region yielding a collision energy (E_C) of $(11.9 \pm 3.0) \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ and a center of mass angle (Θ_{CM}) of $(46.5 \pm 1.2)^\circ$. The neutral reaction products entering the detector were ionized by electron impact ionizer (80 eV, 2.0 mA),⁷³ then filtered according to the mass-to-charge ratio (m/z) utilizing a quadrupole mass spectrometer (QMS, Extrel, QC 150), and eventually recorded by a Daly-type ion counter.⁷⁴ The detector is housed within a triply differentially pumped and rotatable chamber that allows the collection of angularly-resolved time-of-flight (TOF) spectra in the plane defined by both reactant beams. To obtain the information on the reaction dynamics, a forward-convolution method was used to transform the laboratory frame (LAB) data into the center of mass frame (CM),^{75, 76} which represents an iterative method whereby user-defined CM translational energy $P(E_T)$ and angular $T(\theta)$ flux distributions are varied iteratively until a best fit of the laboratory-frame TOF spectra and angular distributions are achieved. These functions comprise the reactive differential cross-section $I(\theta, u)$, which is taken to be separable into its CM scattering angle θ and CM velocity u components, $I(u, \theta) \sim P(u) \times T(\theta)$. The error ranges of the $P(E_T)$ and $T(\theta)$ functions are determined within the 1σ limits of the corresponding laboratory angular distribution and beam parameters (beam spreads, beam velocities) while maintaining a good fit of the laboratory TOF spectra.

Potential Energy Profile of Reaction $Si(^3P) + O_2(X^3\Sigma_g^-)$. All calculations are carried out with quantum chemistry software MOLPRO.⁷⁷ The intermediates, transition states, and products involved in the bimolecular collision of $Si(^3P)$ and $O_2(X^3\Sigma_g^-)$ are characterized at their corresponding ground singlet as well as ground triplet electronic state in order to probe the possible intersystem crossing (ISC). The geometries of the reactants, intermediates, transition states, and products are optimized with complete active space self-consistent field (CASSCF)⁷⁸ method with full valence active space (FVAS) and the def2-TZVP⁷⁹ basis set. 12 orbitals (e.g., for separated reactants, these orbitals include one 2s and three 2p of each O atom, one 3s and three 3p of Si atom) are included in the active space which hosts 16 valence electrons. The

number of harmonic vibrational frequencies is used to verify the identity of an intermediate *vs.* a transition state. It is interesting to note for **i4**, CASSCF(16, 12) unexpectedly shows three imaginary frequencies with a structure of $D_{\infty h}$ symmetry, while CASSCF with a smaller active space and less electrons (10, 9) converges to the same geometry with zero imaginary frequency. For a more reliable characterization of the potential energy profile of the reaction, the single-point energy of the CASSCF-optimized structures is further refined with the multireference configuration interaction (MRCI)⁸⁰ based off the CASSCF wave functions, as MRCI has been proven to be accurate in modeling the potential energy of similar systems⁴² with multireference character. The validity of the CASSCF(16, 12)/def2-TZVP and MRCI/def2-TZVP is confirmed by comparing their heat of reaction for both products ($\text{SiO}(X^1\Sigma^+) + \text{O}(^3\text{P})$ and $\text{SiO}(X^1\Sigma^+) + \text{O}(^1\text{D})$) with experiments.

Singlet and Triplet Intersections and Spin-orbit Coupling. The potential energy surface (PES) of ground singlet and triplet electronic states are scanned in relevant regions of the phase space to investigate possible singlet/triplet intersections. MRCI/def2-TZVP method with state-average (three lowest state, see below) CASSCF wavefunction is employed for this purpose. These regions are identified based on the potential energy profile, in which singlet and triplet surface cross. Specifically,

1. The geometry space in the vicinity of **i3** (triplet) and **TS14** (singlet), both of which possess C_{2v} symmetry. The geometries are prepared by scanning the (two identical) Si-O bonds from 150 to 190 pm with an increment of 10 pm as well as the O-Si-O bond angle from 72.5 to 120.0° with an increment of 2.5°. A total of 100 geometries are generated, whose potential energy of the lowest singlet state 1A_1 and two lowest triplet states 3B_1 and 3B_2 are calculated.
2. The geometry space near **i5** (singlet) and **TS2p** (triplet), both of which possess C_s symmetry. To limit the degrees of freedom of the geometry scan, the Si-O bond length is fixed to be 152 pm (identical to the Si-O bond length of **i5**). The O-O bond length is scanned from 150 pm to 240 pm with an increment of 10 angstrom and the Si-O-O bond angle is scanned from 107.5° to 180.0° with an increment of 2.5°. A total of 300 geometries are generated, whose potential energy of the lowest singlet state ($^1A'$) and two lowest triplet states ($^3A'$ and $^3A''$) are computed.
3. The geometry space near **i4** (singlet) and **TS3p** (triplet), both of which possess C_s symmetry. To limit the degrees of freedom of the geometry scan, one Si-O bond length is fixed to be 151

pm (identical to the Si-O bond length of **i4**). The other Si-O bond is gradually stretched from 150 to 240 pm with an increment of 10 pm and the O-Si-O bond angle varies between 107.5° to 180.0° with an increment of 2.5° . A total of 300 geometries are generated, whose potential energy of the lowest singlet state ($^1A'$) and two lowest triplet states ($^3A'$ and $^3A''$) are computed.

The PES is generated from potential energies of discrete geometries with basis spline (B-Spline)⁸¹ function in Python3.8⁸² and the seam is defined as where the singlet and triplet PESs cross one other. To estimate the probability of ISC between these two states, spin-orbital coupling (SOC) calculations are also performed at the seam with the Breit-Pauli (BP) spin-orbit operator^{80, 83} implemented with MOLPRO. The error associated with the SOC calculation from BP is usually smaller than 1 cm^{-1} ⁷⁷.

Results & Discussion

Crossed Molecular Beams Studies – Laboratory Frame. Reactive scattering signal for the bimolecular reaction of the atomic silicon (Si; 3P) with molecular oxygen ($^{18}\text{O}_2$; $X^3\Sigma_g^-$) was only observed at mass-to-charge ratios (m/z) of 46 ($^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O}^+$). No adduct at $m/z = 64$ ($^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O}_2$) was detectable. The reactive scattering signal monitored at $m/z = 46$ ($^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O}^+$) alone suggests an open reaction channel leading to silicon monoxide ($^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O}$; 46 amu; hereafter: SiO) along with an oxygen atom (O; 18 amu), i.e., the presence of a silicon atom versus atomic oxygen exchange channel (reaction (1a/b)). The corresponding TOF spectra and the laboratory angular distribution (LAD) were collected at $m/z = 46$ (Figure 1). The LAD is rather broad and spans the complete range of the detector spread from at least 9.25° to 66.25° .

Crossed Molecular Beams Studies – Center-of-Mass Frame. The laboratory data alone offer explicit evidence on the gas phase formation of silicon monoxide (SiO, $X^1\Sigma^+$) along with atomic oxygen under single collision conditions. However, the prime directive of our studies is not only to unravel the nascent reaction product formed, but also to reveal the underlying reaction mechanism(s) along with the potential involvement of excited state surfaces, ISC, and non-adiabatic reaction dynamics. This requires a transformation of the laboratory data (TOF, LAD) into the center-of-mass reference frame resulting in the center-of-mass translational energy $P(E_T)$ and angular $T(\theta)$ flux distribution (Figure 2).

Single channel fit: Within our error limits, the TOFs and LAD at $m/z = 46$ (Figure 1) could be replicated through a single channel fit corresponding to the reaction $^{28}\text{Si} (^3\text{P}; 28 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O}_2 (\text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-; 36 \text{ amu}) \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O} (\text{X}^1\Sigma^+; 46 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O} (^3\text{P}; 18 \text{ amu})$ (reaction (1a)) (Figure 1 (top)). The resulting CM translational energy distribution $P(E_T)$ terminates at $322 \pm 17 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ (Figure 2A); this energy represents the maximum translational energy (E_{max}) release for those species formed without rovibrational or electronic excitation. Considering the principle of energy conservation, the maximum translational energy (E_{max}), collision energy (E_C), and the reaction energy ($\Delta_r G$) are connected via $E_{\text{max}} = E_C - \Delta_r G$ for those products born without internal excitation. Consequently, reaction (1a) is exoergic by $310 \pm 17 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$. Further, the $P(E_T)$ distribution peaks at $39 \pm 2 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ suggesting a tight exit transition state yielding the silicon monoxide molecule plus atomic oxygen from SiO_2 reaction intermediate(s).⁸⁴ The average translational energy of the products was derived to be $80 \pm 4 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$; this means that only $25 \pm 1 \%$ of the maximum available energy is channeled into the translational degrees of freedom of the products. Additional information on the reaction dynamics can be collected by inspecting the center-of-mass angular flux distribution $T(\theta)$ (Figure 2B). First, the $T(\theta)$ is forward-backward symmetric and depicts flux over the complete angular range from 0° to 180° ; this proposes indirect scattering dynamics via complex formation and hence the existence of bound triatomic intermediate(s). The distribution minimum at 90° proposes geometrical limitations and an emission of the oxygen atom nearly perpendicularly to the total angular momentum vector within the rotational plane of the fragmenting complex(es)⁸⁵.

Two channels fit: Each TOF spectrum (Figure 1 (right)) is rather broad and spread over up to $500 \mu\text{s}$. All TOFs reveal a fast component at $200\text{--}300 \mu\text{s}$. However, at lower laboratory angles especially at 22.25° and 28.25° , a slower component is also evident at about $470 \mu\text{s}$. These findings indicate that more than one reaction channel might be involved (Table S2). The fast peak of the TOFs could be replicated exceptionally well with the reaction $^{28}\text{Si} (^3\text{P}; 28 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O}_2 (\text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-; 36 \text{ amu}) \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O} (\text{X}^1\Sigma^+; 46 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O} (^3\text{P}; 18 \text{ amu})$ (reaction (1a)); the slower peak can only be accounted for by introducing a second channel $^{28}\text{Si} (^3\text{P}; 28 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O}_2 (\text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-; 36 \text{ amu}) \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O} (\text{X}^1\Sigma^+; 46 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O} (^1\text{D}; 18 \text{ amu})$ (reaction (1b)). Therefore, we evaluated objectively a two-channel incorporating reactions (1a) and (1b) (Figure 1 (bottom)). This two-channel fit could also reproduce the laboratory data with branching ratios of $85 \pm 5\%$ and $15 \pm 2\%$

for reaction (1a) and (1b), respectively. This finding suggests that to a minor amount, up to $15 \pm 2\%$ of the reaction products might lead to the production of electronically excited oxygen atoms ($^{18}\text{O}(^1\text{D})$). It should be noted that a one-channel fit involving only reaction (1b) could not fit the laboratory data with TOF spectra being too slow and the LAB distribution too narrow (Figure S1). The corresponding center-of-mass functions of channel (1b) are displayed in Figure 2D and 2E revealing a maximum translational energy (E_{max}) of $111 \pm 13 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ and hence a reaction energy of $-99 \pm 13 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$. The difference in reaction energies of reaction (1a) and (1b) of $211 \pm 30 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ matches nicely the triplet – singlet gap of atomic oxygen of 190 kJ mol^{-1} . Further, the $P(E_{\text{T}})$ distribution maximum located at $14 \pm 2 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ suggests a rather loose exit transition state from the decomposing SiO_2 intermediate(s) to the final products. This loose transition state for reaction (1b) is rather distinct from the rather tight exit transition state for reaction (1a). The average translational energy for channel (1b) of the products was deduced to be $28 \pm 3 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ indicating that $25 \pm 3\%$ of the available energy is disposed into the translational degrees of freedom of the products. Finally, the $T(\theta)$ portrays a forward scattering with an intensity ratio $I(0^\circ)/I(180^\circ)$ of about $(1.9 \pm 0.8) : 1.0$. These data suggest that the existence of at least one pathway involves an osculating complex, where a complex formation takes place, but the lifetime of the complex is too low to allow multiple rotations to complete^{85, 86}.

Triplet and Singlet Potential Energy Surface (PES): The intimate chemical dynamics of the reaction of atomic silicon ($\text{Si}; ^3\text{P}$) with molecular oxygen ($\text{O}_2; \text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-$) can be unraveled by merging the laboratory data with electronic structure calculations conducted at the MRCI/def2-TZVP//CASSCF(16, 12)/def2-TZVP level of theory (Figure 3)⁷⁸⁻⁸⁰. We note that reaction pathways that are energetically inaccessible under our experimental conditions are not included; for example, the products of the first excited triplet state of silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}(a^3\Sigma^+) + \text{O}(^3\text{P}); \text{SiO}(a^3\Sigma^+) + \text{O}(^1\text{D})$) are 100 kJ mol^{-1} and 295 kJ mol^{-1} above the total energy of the separated reactants, respectively, and hence energetically not accessible at the collision energy of 11.9 kJ mol^{-1} . The electronic structure calculations reveal the existence of two atomic oxygen loss channels: silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; \text{X}^1\Sigma^+$) plus ground state atomic oxygen (**p1**, $\text{O}(^3\text{P})$, $\Delta_r G = -303 \pm 5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$; reaction (1a)) and electronically excited singlet oxygen (**p2**, $\text{O}(^1\text{D})$, $\Delta_r G = -107 \pm 5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$; reaction (1b)) at the MRCI/def2-TZVP//CASSCF/def2-TZVP level. The computed reaction energy of **p1** and **p2** agree exceptionally well with the reaction exoergicity of $301 \pm 8 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$ and 112 kJ mol^{-1} derived from the standard enthalpies of formations extracted

from NIST⁸⁷⁻⁸⁹. As demonstrated through the aforementioned two channel fit, a comparison of the computed reaction energies (**p1**, $\Delta_r G = -303 \pm 5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$; **p2**, $\Delta_r G = -107 \pm 5 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$) with the experimentally derived value from the crossed beam study ($\Delta_r G = -310 \pm 17 \text{ kJ mol}^{-1}$) suggests that at least silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) plus ground state atomic oxygen ($\text{O}(^3\text{P})$) (**p1**) is formed. The channel to **p2** might be masked in the low-energy part of the center-of-mass translational energy distribution with a fraction of $15 \pm 2\%$. We note that it is necessary to employ high-level multireference method such as MRCI, as the reaction energy computed from lower-level method such as CASSCF/def2-TZVP is not accurate, yielding -384 kJ mol^{-1} and -174 kJ mol^{-1} for reaction (1a) and (1b), respectively. Similarly, single reference methods, even at the couple cluster level with complete basis set such as CCSD(T)/CBS^{90, 91}, do not accurately represent reaction energy of the singlet channel, for example, **p2** is predicted to be -90 kJ mol^{-1} for CBS extrapolated from triple-zeta, quadruple-zeta, and quintuple-zeta basis sets (Table S3). Therefore, MRCI/def2-TZVP//CASSCF/def2-TZVP is employed for characterizing the potential energy surface depicted in Figure 3.

To sum up, our data reveal the dominant formation of silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) along with ground state atomic oxygen ($\text{O}(^3\text{P})$) under single collision conditions in the gas phase with smaller fractions of the reactive scattering signal possibly originating from the singlet surface ($\text{O}(^1\text{D})$). But what is(are) the dominating reaction mechanisms? Accounting for the $^3\text{P}_j$ and $^3\Sigma_g^-$ electronic ground states of the silicon atom and of molecular oxygen, respectively, together with the $X^1\Sigma^+$ and $^1\text{D}/^3\text{P}$ electronic states of the silicon monoxide and atomic oxygen, both the triplet and singlet surfaces have to be explored. As shown in Figure 3, our computations located three singlet (**i1**, **i4**, **i5**) and two triplet (**i2**, **i3**) SiO_2 intermediates. The reaction can be initiated via a barrierless addition of ground-state silicon ($\text{Si}, ^3\text{P}$) to the one of the oxygen atoms of molecular oxygen molecule forming a linear singlet ($\text{SiOO}, \text{i5}, C_{\infty v}, X^1\Sigma^+$) collision complex. However, a similar addition on the triplet surface has to overcome a barrier ($\text{SiOO}, \text{TSr2}, C_s, X^3A''$) of 66 kJ mol^{-1} before forming a bent triplet ($\text{SiOO}, \text{i2}, C_s, X^3A''$) collision complex, thus this entrance channel is not accessible under our experimental condition at a collision energy of only 11.9 kJ mol^{-1} . It is important to note that there was no entrance barrier reported in previous work⁴³ with a smaller basis set, but we found **TSr2** by saddle point optimization without any geometrical constraint. **TSr2** has been confirmed by vibrational frequency and intrinsic reaction coordinate (IRC) calculations (Figure S2).⁹²⁻⁹⁴ Nonetheless, *if* **i2** could be formed (e.g., from ISC), it can

emit an oxygen atom from the terminal position after overcoming a loose transition state (**TS2p**) to form silicon monoxide (SiO , $C_{\infty v}$, $X^1\Sigma^+$) along with ground state atomic oxygen (**p1**, $\text{O}(^3\text{P})$). The same products can be formed from another triplet intermediate, **i3** (OSiO , **i3**, C_{2v} , X^3B_2), which can undergo unimolecular decomposition via transition state **TS3p**. On the singlet surface, intermediate **i1** (OSiO , C_{2v} , X^1A_1) can be formed barrierlessly in one-step from the reactants in nearly zero impact parameter collisions; this intermediate then ring opens to silicon dioxide **i4** (OSiO , $D_{\infty h}$, $X^1\Sigma_g^+$) via a transition state lying 68 kJ mol^{-1} above **i1** following C_{2v} symmetry. Linear singlet silicon dioxide **i4** represents the global minimum of the potential energy surface. Intermediate **i1** (OSiO , C_{2v} , 1A_1) could also isomerize to **i5** (SiOO , $C_{\infty v}$, $X^1\Sigma^+$), which could also be formed barrierlessly in one-step from the collision between reactants. The product silicon monoxide (SiO ; $X^1\Sigma^+$) along with electronically excited singlet oxygen (**p2**, $\text{O}(^1\text{D})$) can be formed via emission of an atomic oxygen in **i1**, **i4**, and **i5**.

Intersystem Crossing. To gauge the role of intersystem crossing (ISC) between the triplet and singlet surfaces, the computations were expanded to identify minima on the seam-of-crossings (MSX). ISC is likely observable in the geometrical spaces where their singlet and triplet electronic states are close in energy and have strong spin-orbit coupling (SOC)⁹⁵. To identify potential geometrical regions that are the most relevant to ISC, the vertical excitation energies of the intermediates and transition states identified in Figure 3 are computed (Table S4). According to Table S4, three regions most relevant to the ISC are identified, whose corresponding PESs and SOCs are scanned and depicted in Figure 4. First, the singlet energy **i1** is lower than the energy of its triplet state by 246 kJ mol^{-1} . The singlet *versus* triplet energy is reversed for the transition state (**TS14**) connecting **i1** and **i4** on the singlet surface, whose singlet energy is 33 kJ mol^{-1} higher than the triplet. Interestingly, a geometrically alike structure, **i3**, is optimized on the triplet surface, where its singlet energy is 49 kJ mol^{-1} lower. All this evidence suggests that the singlet and the triplet surfaces cross one another when **i1** ring opens and silicon formally inserts into the O-O bond. Since all three structures (**i1**, **TS14**, and **i3**) possess C_{2v} symmetry, the C_{2v} geometries are employed for the energy scan to reduce the number of calculations. As shown in Figure 4a, two seams primarily defined by the O-Si-O angle are identified. The first seam holds an O-Si-O angle of close to 80° , indicating the ISC *could* take place in the process of **i1** ($\angle(\text{O-Si-O}) = 58^\circ$) crossing the barrier **TS14** ($\angle(\text{O-Si-O}) = 97^\circ$). The second seam possesses an O-Si-O angle between 105 and 120° , indicating that the ISC *could* take place after the transition state **TS14**

before forming the linear intermediate **i4** ($\angle(\text{O-Si-O}) = 180^\circ$). Minimum energy crossing points (MSX) optimization without any geometry constraint were also performed at the CASSCF/def2-TZVP level using a Lagrange multiplier to impose a constraint of equal energy upon the two states ⁹⁶. The geometrical parameters of **MSX-a1** (Table S5) are close **TS14** with a 10° smaller O-Si-O angle, while the geometrical parameters of **MSX-a2** are close to **i3** with an O-Si-O angle smaller by 6° . In order to assess the probability of ISC, the SOC is scanned with the orbitals calculated with MRCI/def2-TZVP and depicted in Figure 4b. The SOC values are 0.02, 46.51, 24.96, and 43.45 cm^{-1} for **TS14**, **i3**, **MSX-a1**, and **MSX-a2**, respectively, indicating that once **i1** forms on the singlet surface, it *could* cross to the triplet surface before or after crossing **TS14** to form **i3** or remains on the singlet surface to form **i4**.

Second, the singlet energy of **i5** ($\angle(\text{Si-O-O}) = 180^\circ$) is 218 kJ mol^{-1} lower than its triplet energy. This energy difference becomes smaller as the Si-O-O angle bends, e.g., only 50 kJ mol^{-1} for the intermediate on the triplet surface, **i2** ($\angle(\text{Si-O-O}) = 110^\circ$). Considering that the singlet product is higher in energy than its triplet counterpart, which geometrically is a result of stretching the O-O distance in structures like **i5** and **i2**, ISC *could* take place. As shown in Figure 4c, the energy difference between the singlet and the triplet surfaces are very sensitive to the O-O distance. One seam is identified between these two surfaces with a Si-O distance of 170 pm. The SOC of this geometrical space is computed (Figure 4d) and is rather consistent (60-61 cm^{-1}) along the seam. **MSX-b** is identified and its geometry is visualized in Table S5. Intermediate **i5** could encounter the seam as the O-O bond length increases, transits to the triplet surface, and forms the triplet products silicon monoxide (SiO , $C_{\infty v}$, $X^1\Sigma^+$) along with ground state atomic oxygen (**p1**, $\text{O}(^3\text{P})$) with the seam only residing about 67 kJ mol^{-1} above **i5**, as compared to 76 kJ mol^{-1} to form silicon monoxide (SiO , $C_{\infty v}$, $X^1\Sigma^+$) along with excited state atomic oxygen (**p2**, $\text{O}(^1\text{D})$)

Third, ISC *could* take place in an alternative exit channel. This can be seen by considering the stretch of the Si-O distance in **i4** on the singlet surface and of **i3** on the triplet surface, leading to the products with the triplet surface being lower in energy than the singlet surface (Figure 3). Note for both **i4** and **i3**, their singlet energy is lower than the triplet energy by 499 and 49 kJ mol^{-1} , respectively. Therefore, both the singlet and triplet surfaces are scanned for the relevant geometrical space (Figure 4e). Similar to the previous case, the energy difference between these

two surfaces is sensitive to the Si-O distance and the O-Si-O angle as the seam is found to start at 200 pm and 110° and ends at 200 pm and 180° . **MSX-c** is identified and its geometry is presented in Table S5. The seam possesses a relative stable SOC of $59\text{-}60\text{ cm}^{-1}$ (Figure 4f). The position of the seam indicates that the oscillation of **i4** on the singlet surface could lead to ISC to the triplet surface and eventually dissociate to silicon monoxide (SiO , $C_{\infty v}$, $X^1\Sigma^+$) along with ground state triplet atomic oxygen (**p1**, $O(^3P)$). This process is much more favorable in energy as the seam is about 352 kJ mol^{-1} above **i4**, as compared to 543 kJ mol^{-1} for the singlet products silicon monoxide (SiO , $C_{\infty v}$, $X^1\Sigma^+$) plus excited state atomic oxygen (**p2**, $O(^1D)$).

Overall, although both the singlet and triplet channels are energetically allowed for the bimolecular reaction of ground state silicon atoms with molecular oxygen, under the experimental conditions, the triplet channel to silicon monoxide (SiO , $C_{\infty v}$, $X^1\Sigma^+$) along with ground state triplet atomic oxygen (**p1**, $O(^3P)$) is predicted to be the dominant product following the pathway **i1** \rightarrow **MSX-a1/2** \rightarrow **i3** \rightarrow **TS3p** \rightarrow **p1** and **i5** \rightarrow **MSX-b** \rightarrow **p1**. The favored mechanism to the singlet products follows **i5** \rightarrow **p2**.

Reaction Pathways. A combination of the experimental data with the computational results assists in narrowing down the proposed pathways. The distribution maximum of the center-of-mass translational energy distribution of about 40 kJ mol^{-1} proposes a tight exit transition state leading to silicon monoxide (SiO ; $X^1\Sigma^+$) plus ground state atomic oxygen (**p1**, $O(^3P)$) – the dominant exit channel with fractions of at least $85 \pm 5\%$. The exit barrier of the unimolecular decomposition of **i4** of only 5 kJ mol^{-1} would result in a center-of-mass translational distribution peaking close to zero translational energy; therefore, this pathway can be excluded. The unimolecular decomposition of intermediates **i3**, and **i5** via an exit transition state located 32 and 187 kJ mol^{-1} above the energy of the separated products can account for the experimentally observed ‘off-zero’ peaking of the center-of-mass translational distribution leading to the triplet products to silicon monoxide (SiO ; $X^1\Sigma^+$) plus ground state atomic oxygen (**p1**, $O(^3P)$). However, compared with the experimental determined peaking value of 40 kJ mol^{-1} of the center-of-mass translational energy distribution, the favored pathway would be **i3** \rightarrow **TS3p** \rightarrow **p1** (32 kJ mol^{-1}), other than **i5** \rightarrow **MSX-b** \rightarrow **p1** (187 kJ mol^{-1}). The pathway **i5** \rightarrow **MSX-b** \rightarrow **p1** can be ruled out at the present stage. Therefore, the reaction path **i1** \rightarrow **MSX-a1/2** \rightarrow **i3** \rightarrow **TS3p** \rightarrow **p1** correlate nicely with the experimental results, which was also predicted from the

computational investigation of the surfaces. Further, the center-of-mass angular distribution features a minimum at 90° ; this finding documents a decomposition of the SiO_2 intermediate in which the oxygen atom is eliminated nearly perpendicularly to the total angular momentum vector within the rotation plane of the fragmenting complex. The computed geometry of **TS3p** to **p1** plus ground state atomic oxygen can explain the in-plane scattering dynamics with atomic oxygen emitted within the plane of the decomposing complex.

Astrochemical Implication. Our study explicitly identifies silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) – the fundamental molecular building block to a low temperature population of interstellar silicates formed in cold molecular clouds. The largest fractional abundances of silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) in star forming regions of up to a few 10^{-6} with respect to molecular hydrogen such as in the circumstellar envelopes (CSEs) around Asymptotic Giant Branch (AGB) stars⁹⁷ contrasts extremely low abundances in cold molecular clouds like TMC-1 and L183 of a few 10^{-12} . Here, upon formation, silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) can rapidly deplete on interstellar grains thus facilitating molecular mass growth of interstellar grains even at temperatures as low as 10 K. Indeed, silicate grains may form in the interstellar medium at cryogenic temperatures through the oligomerization of silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$)³⁰⁻³⁶. The explicit identification of silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) in the present work therefore removes one of the key uncertainties in astrochemical models. In shocked regions, the ice can be removed to (partially) recycle silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) back into the gas phase. Where shocks are strong enough to destroy the grain core as well, then the silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) gas phase abundance can be quite large up to 10 % of the cosmic silicon. Note that alternative gas-phase pathways to silicon monoxide exist, such as the experimentally unexplored reaction of ground state silicon atoms with the hydroxyl radical (OH), which may also lead to silicon monoxide⁹⁸. However, in the cold gas, fractional abundances of the hydroxyl radical (OH) are a factor of $10^2 - 10^3$ lower than for molecular oxygen (O_2) with Herschel observations proposing fractional abundances of up to 10^{-4} ⁹⁹⁻¹⁰¹. This abundance agrees well with an oxygen to water ratio of 0.038 recently detected in comet 67P/Churyumov–Gerasimenko¹⁰² with Taquet et al. arguing that the high abundance of oxygen present in 67P is of interstellar origin.¹⁰³

Conclusions

Combining crossed molecular beams experiments with electronic structure calculations, this work affords compelling evidence on the dominant formation of silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) along with ground state atomic oxygen ($\text{O}(^3\text{P})$) via non-adiabatic reaction dynamics through the bimolecular neutral – neutral reaction of ground state silicon atoms with molecular oxygen under gas-phase single-collision conditions prevailing in cold molecular clouds such as the Taurus Molecular Cloud-1. The dominating reaction mechanism commences on the singlet manifold and involves the barrierless addition of atomic silicon to the oxygen molecule forming cyclic silicon dioxide intermediate (**i1**), which then isomerizes while experiencing ISC to the triplet surface via ring opening to an acyclic triplet silicon dioxide (**i3**); the latter undergoes unimolecular decomposition via a tight exit transition state with the oxygen atom emitted within the rotational plane of the decomposing complex yielding silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) along with ground state atomic oxygen ($\text{O}(^3\text{P})$). With only $25 \pm 1\%$ of the total available energy released into the translational degrees of freedom, the internal energy may populate up to 22 vibrational levels in silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) at most. *First*, it is important to address the barrierless character of the entrance channel on the singlet surface. The addition of the silicon atom to the π electronic system of molecular oxygen has no barrier since it involves an association of two reactants, which each have both two unpaired electrons thus creating two new silicon-oxygen bonds in the C_{2v} symmetric singlet silicon dioxide. This entrance-barrierless feature of this reaction is also supported through kinetics studies by Martin et al., Husain et al., and Le Picard et al. down to temperatures as low as 15 K³⁸⁻⁴¹. The absence of any barrier represents a crucial prerequisite for the reaction of atomic silicon with molecular oxygen to form silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) in cold molecular clouds with typical temperatures as low as 10 K. *Second*, the dissociation of triplet **i3** ($\text{OSiO}, C_{2v}, X^3B_2$) to silicon monoxide ($\text{SiO}; X^1\Sigma^+$) plus ground state atomic oxygen ($\text{O}(^3\text{P})$) can be compared to the unimolecular decomposition of the isovalent carbon dioxide (CO_2) system. Previous studies of these systems revealed that the dominant photodissociation pathways of carbon dioxide following 157 nm are the $\text{O}(^3\text{P})$ and $\text{O}(^1\text{D})$ channels with a branching ratio of the spin-forbidden $\text{O}(^3\text{P})$ channel ranging from 6 to 12%¹⁰⁴⁻¹⁰⁷. However, whereas the nonadiabatic dynamics in the triplet exit channel for carbon dioxide (CO_2) represent only a minor channel, the heavy atom effect *may* promote ISC as a predominant, if not an exclusive channel for the dynamics of the ground state silicon – molecular oxygen system; recall that the inclusion of heavy atoms like silicon in the molecular structure enhances the spin-orbit

coupling between singlet and triplet states. *Third*, at a collision energy of 11.9 ± 3.0 kJ mol⁻¹, our findings propose dominant indirect scattering dynamics leading to silicon monoxide (SiO; X¹Σ⁺) plus ground state atomic oxygen (O(³P)). This contradicts previous quasiclassical trajectory (QCT) studies, which propose prevailing backward scattering (70 %) and complex forming (30 %) dynamics^{44, 108}. This apparent mismatch can be rationalized by realizing that the QCT studies were conducted on the analytical ground ¹A' surface and did not consider conical intersections and hence the ISC is absent.

Overall, the bimolecular elementary reaction of ground state silicon atoms with molecular oxygen provides a single collision event forming silicon monoxide (SiO; X¹Σ⁺) along with ground state atomic oxygen (O(³P)) through non-adiabatic reaction dynamics. In the cold interstellar medium, silicon monoxide (SiO; X¹Σ⁺) may either deplete on interstellar grains thus leading to silicon oxide clusters in barrierless reactions³⁰, or alternatively, if sufficient hydroxyl radicals are available for reaction, silicon monoxide (SiO; X¹Σ⁺) could react barrierlessly with the hydroxyl radical (OH) forming silicon dioxide (SiO₂; X¹Σ_g⁺) plus atomic hydrogen in an exoergic reaction¹⁰⁹. The capability of barrierless, exoergic reactions between silicon monoxide and silicon dioxide enhanced the critical role of silicon monoxide in the formation of larger silicon oxides (Si₂O₅, Si₃O₅) suggesting that the silicon – molecular oxygen system may play a central role in initiating the complex set of elementary reactions leading ultimately to a population of silicates in the low temperature interstellar medium. Since interstellar dust such as silicate grains (have) play(ed) a fundamental role in the formation of Solar Systems including our own and ice-coated grains provide essential molecular factories for an abiotic formation of biorelevant molecules like sugars and amino acids⁶⁻⁹, the untangling of the reaction mechanisms from the fundamental, microscopic point of view is essential how we reflect on our Origins.

Acknowledgements: The experimental studies were supported by the US National Science Foundation (NSF) under award CHE-1360658. We thank the Information Technology Service (ITS) Cyberinfrastructure from the University of Hawai'i at Manoa for the computational resources.

Supplementary information: Table S1 – S5, Figure S1 – S2

Competing Interest: The authors declare no competing interest.

References:

1. C. F. Mabery, *J. Franklin Inst.*, 1886, **122**, 271-274.
2. L. M. Ziurys, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2006, **103**, 12274-12279.
3. T. P. M. Goumans and S. T. Bromley, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 2012, **420**, 3344-3349.
4. T. Henning, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, 2010, **48**, 21-46.
5. A. P. Jones and J. A. Nuth III, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2011, **530**, A44.
6. R. Larralde, M. P. Robertson and S. L. Miller, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 1995, **92**, 8158-8160.
7. C. Meinert, I. Myrgorodska, P. De Marcellus, T. Buhse, L. Nahon, S. V. Hoffmann, L. L. S. d'Hendecourt and U. J. Meierhenrich, *Science*, 2016, **352**, 208-212.
8. G. M. Muñoz Caro, U. J. Meierhenrich, W. A. Schutte, B. Barbier, A. Arcones Segovia, H. Rosenbauer, W. H.-P. Thiemann, A. Brack and J. M. Greenberg, *Nature*, 2002, **416**, 403-406.
9. A. K. Cobb and R. E. Pudritz, *Astrophys. J.*, 2014, **783**, 140.
10. V. Wakelam, I. W. M. Smith, E. Herbst, J. Troe, W. Geppert, H. Linnartz, K. Öberg, E. Roueff, M. Agúndez, P. Pernot, H. M. Cuppen, J. C. Loison and D. Talbi, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 2010, **156**, 13-72.
11. N. G. Holm, C. Oze, O. Mousis, J. H. Waite and A. Guilbert-Lepoutre, *Astrobiology*, 2015, **15**, 587-600.
12. G. Vidali, J. Roser, G. Manicó, V. Pirronello, H. B. Perets and O. Biham, *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.*, 2005, **6**, 36.
13. P. Ehrenfreund and S. B. Charnley, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, 2000, **38**, 427-483.
14. H.-P. Gail and E. Sedlmayr, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 1999, **347**, 594-616.
15. A. C. Reber, P. A. Clayborne, J. U. Reveles, S. N. Khanna, A. W. Castleman and A. Ali, *Nano Lett.*, 2006, **6**, 1190-1195.
16. A. C. Reber, S. Paranthaman, P. A. Clayborne, S. N. Khanna and A. W. Castleman Jr, *ACS nano*, 2008, **2**, 1729-1737.
17. D. Gobrecht, I. Cherchneff, A. Sarangi, J. M. C. Plane and S. T. Bromley, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2016, **585**, A6.
18. H.-P. Gail, S. Wetzel, A. Pucci and A. Tamanai, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2013, **555**, A119.
19. H.-P. Gail, M. Scholz and A. Pucci, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2016, **591**, A17.
20. A. P. Jones, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 2001, **359**, 1961-1972.
21. A. P. Jones, A. G. G. M. Tielens, D. J. Hollenbach and C. F. McKee, *Astrophys. J.*, 1994, **433**, 797-810.
22. A. P. Jones, A. G. G. M. Tielens and D. J. Hollenbach, *Astrophys. J.*, 1996, **469**, 740-764.
23. S. Zhukovska, C. Dobbs, E. B. Jenkins and R. S. Klessen, *Astrophys. J.*, 2016, **831**, 147.
24. M. J. Michałowski, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2015, **577**, A80.
25. R. McKinnon, P. Torrey and M. Vogelsberger, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 2016, **457**, 3775-3800.
26. S. Zhukovska, H.-P. Gail and M. Tieloff, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2008, **479**, 453-480.
27. B. T. Draine, *arXiv:0903.1658*, 2009.
28. F. J. Molster, I. Yamamura, L. B. F. M. Waters, A. G. G. M. Tielens, T. de Graauw, T. De Jong, A. De Koter, K. Malfait, M. E. Van den Ancker, H. Van Winckel, V. R. H. M and C. Waelkens, *Nature*, 1999, **401**, 563-565.
29. S. Höfner and H. Olofsson, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.*, 2018, **26**, 1-92.
30. S. A. Krasnokutski, G. Rouillé, C. Jäger, F. Huysken, S. Zhukovska and T. Henning, *Astrophys. J.*, 2014, **782**, 15.
31. J. S. Anderson, J. S. Ogden and M. J. Ricks, *Chem. Commun. (London)*, 1968, 1585-1586.
32. J. W. Hastie, R. H. Hauge and J. L. Margrave, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 1969, **3**, 601-606.
33. J. S. Anderson and J. S. Ogden, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1969, **51**, 4189-4196.
34. R. K. Khanna, D. D. Stranz and B. Donn, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1981, **74**, 2108-2115.

35. W. C. Lu, C. Z. Wang and K. M. Ho, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 2003, **378**, 225-231.
36. P. V. Avramov, I. Adamovic, K.-M. Ho, C. Z. Wang, W. C. Lu and M. S. Gordon, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2005, **109**, 6294-6302.
37. E. F. van Dishoeck, *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, 2004, **42**, 119-167.
38. J. C. G. Martín and J. M. C. Plane, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2011, **13**, 3764-3774.
39. S. D. Le Picard, A. Canosa, D. Reignier and T. Stoecklin, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2002, **4**, 3659-3664.
40. D. Husain and P. E. Norris, *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans. 2*, 1978, **74**, 93-105.
41. S. D. Le Picard, A. Canosa, G. Pineau des Forêts, C. Rebrion-Rowe and B. R. Rowe, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2001, **372**, 1064-1070.
42. F. Dayou and A. Spielfiedel, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2003, **119**, 4237-4250.
43. I. Adamovic and M. S. Gordon, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2004, **108**, 8395-8399.
44. F. Dayou, W.-Ü. L. Tchang-Brillet and M. Monnerville, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **123**, 084306.
45. R. Yamashiro, Y. Matsumoto and K. Honma, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2008, **128**, 084308.
46. D. Yuan, S. Yu, W. Chen, J. Sang, C. Luo, T. Wang, X. Xu, P. Casavecchia, X. Wang, Z. Sun, D. H. Zhang and X. Yang, *Nat. Chem.*, 2018, **10**, 653-658.
47. D. Yuan, W. Chen, C. Luo, Y. Tan, S. Li, Y. Huang, Z. Sun, X. Yang and X. Wang, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, 2020, **11**, 1222-1227.
48. D. Yuan, Y. Huang, W. Chen, H. Zhao, S. Yu, C. Luo, Y. Tan, S. Wang, X. Wang, Z. Sun and X. Yang, *Nat. Commun.*, 2020, **11**, 3640.
49. N. Balucani, D. Skouteris, G. Capozza, E. Segoloni, P. Casavecchia, M. H. Alexander, G. Capecchi and H.-J. Werner, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2004, **6**, 5007-5017.
50. D. Skouteris, H.-J. Werner, F. J. Aoiz, L. Bañares, J. F. Castillo, M. Menéndez, N. Balucani, L. Cartechini and P. Casavecchia, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2001, **114**, 10662-10672.
51. T. Yang, J. Chen, L. Huang, T. Wang, C. Xiao, Z. Sun, D. Dai, X. Yang and D. H. Zhang, *Science*, 2015, **347**, 60-63.
52. Y. Xie, Y. Wang, W. Wang, D. Dai, Z. Sun, C. Xiao and X. Yang, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2020, **124**, 1266-1271.
53. Y.-r. Xie, Y.-f. Wang, W. Wang, T. Wang, D.-x. Dai, C.-l. Xiao and X.-m. Yang, *Chin. J. Chem. Phys.*, 2020, **33**, 135-138.
54. S.-H. Lee, F. Dong and K. Liu, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2006, **125**, 133106.
55. T. Wang, J. Chen, T. Yang, C. Xiao, Z. Sun, L. Huang, D. Dai, X. Yang and D. H. Zhang, *Science*, 2013, **342**, 1499-1502.
56. T. Yang, L. Huang, T. Wang, C. Xiao, Y. Xie, Z. Sun, D. Dai, M. Chen, D. Zhang and X. Yang, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2015, **119**, 12284-12290.
57. T.-g. Yang, L. Huang, Y.-r. Xie, T. Wang, C.-l. Xiao, Z.-g. Sun, D.-x. Dai, D. H. Zhang and X.-m. Yang, *Chin. J. Chem. Phys.*, 2015, **28**, 471.
58. L. Huang, Y.-r. Xie, T.-g. Yang, T. Wang, D.-x. Dai, C.-l. Xiao and X.-m. Yang, *Chin. J. Chem. Phys.*, 2019, **32**, 72-76.
59. N. Balucani, P. Casavecchia, F. Aoiz, L. Bañares, J.-M. Launay, B. Bussery-Honvault and P. Honvault, *Mol. Phys.*, 2010, **108**, 373-380.
60. N. Balucani, G. Capozza, E. Segoloni, A. Russo, R. Bobbenkamp, P. Casavecchia, T. Gonzalez-Lezana, E. J. Rackham, L. Bañares and F. J. Aoiz, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **122**, 234309.
61. L. A. Pederson, G. C. Schatz, T.-S. Ho, T. Hollebeek, H. Rabitz, L. B. Harding and G. Lendvay, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1999, **110**, 9091-9100.
62. N. Balucani, M. Alagia, L. Cartechini, P. Casavecchia, G. G. Volpi, L. A. Pederson and G. C. Schatz, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2001, **105**, 2414-2422.

63. N. Balucani, L. Cartechini, G. Capozza, E. Segoloni, P. Casavecchia, G. G. Volpi, F. J. Aoiz, L. Bañares, P. Honvault and J.-M. Launay, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 2002, **89**, 013201.
64. N. Balucani, P. Casavecchia, L. Banares, F. J. Aoiz, T. Gonzalez-Lezana, P. Honvault and J.-M. Launay, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2006, **110**, 817-829.
65. X. Liu, J. J. Lin, S. Harich, G. C. Schatz and X. Yang, *Science*, 2000, **289**, 1536-1538.
66. N. Balucani, P. Casavecchia, F. J. Aoiz, L. Banares, J. F. Castillo and V. J. Herrero, *Mol. Phys.*, 2005, **103**, 1703-1714.
67. S.-H. Lee and K. Liu, *Appl. Phys. B*, 2000, **71**, 627-633.
68. B. Maiti, G. C. Schatz and G. Lendvay, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2004, **108**, 8772-8781.
69. H. Yang, K.-L. Han, G. C. Schatz, S.-H. Lee, K. Liu, S. C. Smith and M. Hankel, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2009, **11**, 11587-11595.
70. R. I. Kaiser, P. Maksyutenko, C. Ennis, F. Zhang, X. Gu, S. P. Krishtal, A. M. Mebel, O. Kostko and M. Ahmed, *Faraday Discuss.*, 2010, **147**, 429-478.
71. A. M. Thomas, B. B. Dangi, T. Yang, R. I. Kaiser, B.-J. Sun, T.-J. Chou and A. H. H. Chang, *Chem. Phys.*, 2019, **520**, 70-80.
72. A. M. Thomas, B. B. Dangi, T. Yang, R. I. Kaiser, L. Lin, T.-J. Chou and A. H. H. Chang, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, 2018, **9**, 3340-3347.
73. G. O. Brink, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 1966, **37**, 857-860.
74. N. R. Daly, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 1960, **31**, 264-267.
75. P. S. Weiss, Ph. D. Dissertation Thesis, University of California, 1986.
76. M. F. Vernon, Ph. D. Dissertation Thesis, University of California, 1983.
77. H.-J. Werner, P. J. Knowles, G. Knizia, F. R. Manby, M. Schütz, P. Celani, W. Györfy, D. Kats, T. Korona, R. Lindh, A. Mitrushenkov, G. Rauhut, K. R. Shamasundar, T. B. Adler, R. D. Amos, A. Bernhardsson, A. Berning, D. L. Cooper, J. O. Deegan, A. J. Dobbyn, F. Eckert, E. Goll, C. Hampel, A. Hesselmann, G. Hetzer, T. Hrenar, G. Jansen, C. Köppl, Y. Liu, A. W. Lloyd, R. A. Mata, A. J. May, S. J. McNicholas, W. Meyer, M. E. Mura, A. Nicklass, D. P. O'Neill, P. Palmieri, D. Peng, K. Pflüger, R. Pitzer, M. Reiher, T. Shiozaki, H. Stoll, A. J. Stone, R. Tarroni, T. Thorsteinsson, M. Wang and M. Welborn, *MOLPRO, Version 2019.2, A Package of Ab Initio Programs*, University of Cardiff, Cardiff, UK, 2019; <http://www.molpro.net>.
78. B. O. Roos, P. R. Taylor and P. E. M. Sigbahn, *Chem. Phys.*, 1980, **48**, 157-173.
79. F. Weigend and R. Ahlrichs, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2005, **7**, 3297-3305.
80. H.-J. Werner and P. J. Knowles, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1988, **89**, 5803-5814.
81. H. Prautzsch, W. Boehm and M. Paluszny, *Bézier and B-spline techniques*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1 edn., 2002.
82. G. Van Rossum and F. L. Drake Jr, *Python 3 reference manual*, CreateSpace: Scotts Valley, CA, 2019.
83. P. J. Knowles and H.-J. Werner, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 1988, **145**, 514-522.
84. R. D. Levine, *Molecular Reaction Dynamics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005.
85. W. B. Miller, S. A. Safron and D. R. Herschbach, *Discuss. Faraday Soc.*, 1967, **44**, 108-122.
86. J. M. Ribeiro and A. M. Mebel, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2017, **19**, 14543-14554.
87. M. W. Chase Jr, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data, Monograph*, 1998, **9**.
88. S. Yamauchi, *CODATA key values for thermodynamics*, Hemisphere Pub, 1976.
89. B. R. Lewis, L. Berzins, J. H. Carver and S. T. Gibson, *J. Quant. Spectrosc. Radiat. Transfer*, 1985, **33**, 627-643.
90. K. Raghavachari, G. W. Trucks, J. A. Pople and M. Head-Gordon, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 1989, **157**, 479-483.
91. A. J. C. Varandas, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2000, **113**, 8880-8887.
92. K. Fukui, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1970, **74**, 4161-4163.

93. S. Maeda, Y. Harabuchi, Y. Ono, T. Taketsugu and K. Morokuma, *Int. J. Quantum Chem.*, 2015, **115**, 258-269.
94. J. Ischtwan and M. A. Collins, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1988, **89**, 2881-2885.
95. R. R. Zaari and S. A. Varganov, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 2015, **119**, 1332-1338.
96. A. Farazdel and M. Dupuis, *J. Comput. Chem.*, 1991, **12**, 276-282.
97. D. G. Delgado, H. Olofsson, F. Kerschbaum, F. L. Schöier, M. Lindqvist and M. A. T. Groenewegen, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2003, **411**, 123-147.
98. M. D. Allendorf, C. F. Melius, P. Ho and M. R. Zachariah, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1995, **99**, 15285-15293.
99. J.-H. Chen, P. F. Goldsmith, S. Viti, R. Snell, D. C. Lis, A. Benz, E. Bergin, J. Black, P. Caselli, P. Encrenaz, E. Falgarone, J. R. Goicoechea, Å. Hjalmarson, D. Hollenbach, M. Kaufman, G. Melnick, D. Neufeld, L. Pagani, Floris van der Tak, E. van Dishoeck and U. A. Yildiz, *Astrophys. J.*, 2014, **793**, 111.
100. S. Weinreb, A. H. Barrett, M. L. Meeks and J. C. Henry, *Nature*, 1963, **200**, 829-831.
101. J. Harju, A. Winnberg and J. G. A. Wouterloot, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 2000, **353**, 1065-1073.
102. A. Bieler, K. Altwegg, H. Balsiger, A. Bar-Nun, J.-J. Berthelier, P. Bochslers, C. Briois, U. Calmonte, M. Combi, J. De Keyser, E. F. van Dishoeck, B. Fiethe, S. A. Fuselier, S. Gasc, T. I. Gombosi, K. C. Hansen, M. Hässig, A. Jäckel, E. Kopp, A. Korth, L. L. Roy, U. Mall, R. Maggiolo, B. Marty, O. Mousis, T. Owen, H. Rème, M. Rubin, T. Sémon, C.-Y. Tzou, J. H. Waite, C. Walsh and P. Wurz, *Nature*, 2015, **526**, 678-681.
103. V. Taquet, K. Furuya, C. Walsh and E. F. van Dishoeck, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 2016, **462**, S99-S115.
104. Y. F. Zhu and R. J. Gordon, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1990, **92**, 2897-2901.
105. A. Stolow and Y. T. Lee, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1993, **98**, 2066-2076.
106. J. A. Schmidt, M. S. Johnson and R. Schinke, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2013, **110**, 17691-17696.
107. Z. Chen, F. Liu, B. Jiang, X. Yang and D. H. Parker, *J. Phys. Chem. Lett.*, 2010, **1**, 1861-1865.
108. F. Dayou, P. Larrégaray, L. Bonnet, J.-C. Rayez, P. N. Arenas and T. González-Lezana, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2008, **128**, 174307.
109. T. Yang, A. M. Thomas, B. B. Dangi, R. I. Kaiser, A. M. Mebel and T. J. Millar, *Nat. Commun.*, 2018, **9**, 774.




Figure 1. Laboratory angular distribution (left) and time-of-flight (TOF) spectra (right) recorded at $m/z = 46$ for the reaction of the silicon atom ($\text{Si}; ^3\text{P}$) with molecular oxygen ($^{18}\text{O}_2; \text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-$). The data were fit with a single channel (top), and with two channels (bottom): i) $^{28}\text{Si} (^3\text{P}; 28 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O}_2 (\text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-; 36 \text{ amu}) \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O} (\text{X}^1\Sigma^+; 46 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O} (^3\text{P}; 18 \text{ amu})$ (green), ii) $^{28}\text{Si} (^3\text{P}; 28 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O}_2 (\text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-; 36 \text{ amu}) \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O} (\text{X}^1\Sigma^+; 46 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O} (^1\text{D}; 18 \text{ amu})$ (blue). CM represents the center-of-mass angle, and 0° and 90° define the directions of the silicon atom and molecular oxygen beams, respectively. The black circles depict the experimental data, colored lines the fits (red corresponding to the total fit), and error bars the 1σ standard deviation.




Figure 2. CM translational energy flux distribution (A and D), CM angular flux distribution (B and E), and the top view of the flux contour map (C and F) for the reaction of ground state atomic silicon ($^{28}\text{Si}; ^3\text{P}$) and molecular oxygen ($^{18}\text{O}_2; \text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-$). (A), (B), and (C) are corresponding to the reaction of $^{28}\text{Si} (^3\text{P}; 28 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O}_2 (\text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-; 36 \text{ amu}) \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O} (\text{X}^1\Sigma^+; 46 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O} (^3\text{P}; 18 \text{ amu})$. (D), (E), and (F) are responsible for the reaction of $^{28}\text{Si} (^3\text{P}; 28 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O}_2 (\text{X}^3\Sigma_g^-; 36 \text{ amu}) \rightarrow ^{28}\text{Si}^{18}\text{O} (\text{X}^1\Sigma^+; 46 \text{ amu}) + ^{18}\text{O} (^1\text{D}; 18 \text{ amu})$. Shaded areas indicate the acceptable upper and lower error limits, while the red solid lines define the best fits. The flux contour map represents the flux intensity of the reactively scattered heavy products as a function of the CM scattering angle (θ) and product velocity (u). The color bar manifests the flux gradient from high (H) intensity to low (L) intensity. Colors of the atoms: silicon, purple; oxygen, red.




Figure 4. Singlet and triplet intersections (top column) and spin-orbit coupling (SOC, bottom column). The energies (kJ mol⁻¹) and SOC (cm⁻¹) are scanned using the MRCI/def2-TZVP method. The singlet and triplet PESs are shown in a solid and dashed grid, respectively. The seam where the singlet and triplet surface cross is marked with a transparent ribbon. TS: transition state; r = reactants; p = products.