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S1. Schematic of the plasma device

Figure S1. Various pathways for plasma-based nitrogen fixation with a focus on the different possible hydrogen sources. The current industrial process is shown as a reference in blue. Each full line represents a possible pathway towards basic fertilizer chemicals.

S2. Schematic of the plasma device
FTIR analysis

Absorbance spectra measured by Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy revealed the presence of several vibrational transitions which correspond to NO, NO₂, N₂O, NH₃, and HNO₂ species. The Bruker system (with the OPUS gas analysis software) was factory-calibrated for NO, NO₂, N₂O, O₃ and N₂O₅. The remaining peaks were identified using the HITRAN database.¹ Their concentrations were determined by measuring a reference signal from the gas mixture with a known concentration of the species of interest and via Beer’s law as follows²:

\[
    n_j = \frac{\ln\left(\frac{I(v)}{I_0(v)}\right)}{\sigma_j(v) \cdot L} \times \left(\frac{10^{12}}{\pi}\right)
    \quad (S1)
\]

where \( \ln\left(\frac{I(v)}{I_0(v)}\right) \) is the measured absorbance \( A(v) \) as a function of wavenumber \( v \), \( \sigma_j(v) \) is the absorption cross-section of species \( j \) as a function of \( v \) [in cm² molecule⁻¹], and \( L \) is the length of the absorbance pathway [in cm]. The last term in the brackets performs the unit conversion from (cm⁻³) to (ppm), where \( n \) is the gas density at 323 Kelvin (the temperature in the gas cell). This method is commonly used in gas analysis using FTIR.³⁻⁵ Though for NO, NO, NO₂ and N₂O the concentration was determined through both Beer’s law and the Bruker system, all concentrations reported are determined using Beer’s law, for consistency.

Figure S1 shows the theoretical absorbance peaks for NO, NO₂, N₂O, NH₃, HNO₃, HNO₂ and O₃. Species present in detectable quantities were NO, NO₂, NH₃ and HNO₂, though not at all conditions. The concentration of N₂O was <2 ppm for all conditions measured. HNO₃ was not detected at any of the examined conditions, as well as O₃ due to the relatively high gas temperature of the afterglow.
Figure S3. (a) Overview of absorption bands from NO, NO₂, N₂O, HNO₃, HNO₂, NH₃ and O₃. (b) HNO₂ and HNO₃ bands in the 3400 – 3800 cm⁻¹ region. (c) HNO₂, HNO₃, NO and NO₂ bands in the 1550 – 1850 cm⁻¹ region. (d) HNO₂ and HNO₃ bands in the 1100 - 1500 cm⁻¹ region. (e) HNO₂ and HNO₃ bands in the 700 - 1100 cm⁻¹ region. All simulated spectra have been taken from the HITRAN database¹, except for HNO₂ and the HNO₃ region 3700 – 3800 cm⁻¹ annotated with dashed lines, which were digitized from Pipa et al.⁶ based on literature values.⁷,⁸

S4. Experimental setups of OES

Figure S4. Basic gas analysis experimental setup as explained in the main text. (a) OES setup axial to the jet. (b) OES setup perpendicular to the afterglow using 10 fibers for spatially resolved measurements (1-10 mm from the nozzle).

S5. Optical emission spectroscopy

NH(A³Π–X³Σ) can be detected at 336.00 nm; there are no major interferences in this region.
The main pathway for production of NH($A^3\Pi$–$X^3\Sigma$) is through NH$_3$. It is commonly accepted that NH($A^3\Pi$–$X^3\Sigma$) is a good indication of the NH$_3$ density.

\[ \text{NH}_3 + e \rightarrow \text{NH}(A^3\Pi) + \text{H}_2 + e \quad \text{k(}\sigma\text{)}^{10} \quad \text{(RS1)} \]

The NO ($A^2\Sigma^+–B^2\Pi$) transition was detected at 226.94 nm. The NO ($B^2\Pi–X^2\Pi$) transition (around 340 nm$^{11}$) was only observed in the afterglow. Both NO($A^2\Sigma^+$) and NO($B^2\Pi$) states are formed mainly through:

\[ e + \text{NO} \rightarrow e + \text{NO}(A^2\Sigma^+) \quad \text{k(}\sigma\text{)}^{12} \quad \text{(RS2)} \]
\[ e + \text{NO} \rightarrow e + \text{NO}(B^2\Pi) \quad \text{k(}\sigma\text{)}^{12} \quad \text{(RS3)} \]

In order to correlate intensities of excited species measured in OES to ground state densities and to compare different bands with each other, a number of corrections and approximations have to be considered as follows:

1. Quenching of excited states is taken into account.
2. The measured intensities are corrected for the spectrometer sensitivity and fibre optics transparency.
3. The signals are corrected to take into account the difference in excitation probabilities associated with the different transitions used. This means the emission of the excited states can be linked to the emission of the ground state.

These corrections have been made under the assumptions of the corona model approximation (explained in sections S5.1-S5.3 below).

S5.1. Correction for quenching by H$_2$O, O$_2$ and N$_2$

Quenching reduces the fraction of the state that can be observed through photon emission$^{13}$ and collisional quenching reduces the effective branching ratio of a spontaneous transition $i\rightarrow k$. Following Hartinger et al.$^{14}$, the quenching of the excited species can be expressed as shown in eq. S1. Here $q$ represents the fraction of the excited species that is present after quenching.

\[ q = \frac{A}{A + Q}, \text{where } Q = \sum n_i v_{ri} \sigma_i \quad \text{(S2)} \]

$A$ Einstein transition coefficient (s$^{-1}$)

$Q$ effective quenching rate (s$^{-1}$)

$n_i$ number density of the quenching partner $i$ (cm$^{-3}$)

$v_{ri}$ relative velocity (cm/s)

$\sigma_i$ cross section (cm$^2$)

In case quenching coefficients instead of cross sections are given, $Q$ is expressed as follows:

\[ Q = \sum n_i k_{iq} \quad \text{(S3)} \]

$k_{iq}$ quenching coefficient (cm$^3$/s)
The Einstein transition coefficient denotes the total spontaneous emission rate of the upper level, which is equal to its reciprocal lifetime. For NO(A\(^2\Sigma^+\)–\(^2\Pi\)) A is taken from LIFBASE\(^\text{"15"}\). For NH(A\(^3\Pi\)–X\(^3\Sigma\)) A is taken from Zhou et al.\(^\text{"16"}\). The values are reported in the summary Table S1. Q is a sum over all possible quenchers, taking into account their density.

The relative speed of the quencher to the quenched molecule is calculated as follows:

\[
\nu_{rel} = \frac{8kT}{\pi \mu} 
\]

with \( \mu = \frac{1}{m_1 + \frac{1}{m_2}} = \frac{m_1m_2}{m_1 + m_2} \) in (g/particle) \( \text{(S4)} \)

Meaning \( m_i = \frac{1}{M_i N_A} \) \( \text{(S5)} \)

With:

\[
k = 1.380649 \times 10^{-16} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g/(s}^2 \text{ K)}
\]

\( \nu_{rel} \) expressed in cm/s.

This also means that

\[
k_{iq} = \sigma_i \nu_{rel} \text{  } \text{(S7)}
\]

For both the quenching coefficients and cross-section there are a wide range of values found in literature. In this work the Q values from three sources were calculated and their average was used as the quenching coefficient. The three sets of constants are shown in Table S2.

With q known, the signal corrected for quenching is calculated using eq. 10:

\[
I_{\text{measured}} = I_{\text{original}} \cdot q \text{  } \text{(S8)}
\]

\( q \) fraction of the signal that is visible after quenching

\( I_{\text{measured}} \) measured signal

\( I_{\text{original}} \) the signal without quenching

**Table S1.** Einstein transitions coefficients of NH(A\(^3\Pi\)–X\(^3\Sigma\)) and NO(A\(^2\Sigma^+\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Einstein transition coefficient A (1/s)</th>
<th>( \text{NO(A}^2\Sigma^+)–(^2\Pi) )</th>
<th>( \text{NH(A}^3\Pi)–X(^3\Sigma) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{NO(A}^2\Sigma^+)–(^2\Pi) )</td>
<td>( 9.8 \times 10^5 ) ( \text{17} )</td>
<td>( 1.39 \times 10^6 ) ( \text{16} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table S2.** The cross sections and rate coefficients for NH(A\(^3\Pi\)) and NO(A\(^2\Sigma^+\)) quenching by \( \text{N}_2, \text{O}_2 \) and \( \text{H}_2\text{O} \) as collisional quenchers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quencher</th>
<th>Cross section (NH(A(^3\Pi)) (cm(^2))</th>
<th>Rate coefficient (NO(A(^2\Sigma^+)) (cm(^3)/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set A</td>
<td>Set B</td>
<td>Set C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\s7
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N₂</td>
<td>0.1 × 10⁻¹⁶</td>
<td>0.0061 × 10⁻¹⁶</td>
<td>0.00047 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>0.00065 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>0.00074 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1.5 × 10⁻¹⁶</td>
<td>4.3 × 10⁻¹⁶</td>
<td>1.47 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1.46 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1.59 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>1.5 × 10⁻¹⁶</td>
<td>9.8 × 10⁻¹⁶</td>
<td>9.8 × 10⁻¹⁶</td>
<td>7.71 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>7.8 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
<td>7.58 × 10⁻¹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S5.2 Correction for sensitivity

The difference in light collection at different wavelengths was measured and used to correct the NH(A³Π – X³Σ) and NO(A²Σ⁺ – Π) band intensities. As a light source, a Hamamatsu D2 model L7293 lamp was used with a C9598 power supply.

S5.3 Correction for excitation probability

The correction for the excitation probability can be applied under the approximation that the systems behaves as assumed in the corona model. The corona approximation is a simplified approach to population densities in nonequilibrium plasmas. It assumes an equilibrium where transition upwards for ionization and excitation occurs solely through electron impact, and the transitions downwards only occurs through spontaneous emission and radiative decay. As we are working at atmospheric pressure and our averaged temperature is low, this means we do not take into account collisional recombination, 3-body recombination, step-wise excitation, charge exchange, and V-V and V-T processes.

Direct electron impact excitation requires electrons with an energy above 5.48 eV and 3.68 eV, for NO(A²Σ⁺ – 2Π) and NH(A³Π – X³Σ), respectively. The corresponding excitation probability will be different by the following factor (eq. 11):

\[
P(\text{NO}) = \frac{P(\text{NH})}{P(\text{NO})} = \frac{n_e > 5.48 \text{eV}}{n_e > 3.68 \text{eV}} \times \frac{\exp \left( \frac{E_{\text{NH}}}{k_b T_e} \right)}{\exp \left( \frac{E_{\text{NO}}}{k_b T_e} \right)} = 0.17 \times \frac{n_e > 5.48 \text{eV}}{n_e > 3.68 \text{eV}}
\]

\(P\) probability of electron impact excitation

\(n_e\) electron density

\(T_e\) electron temperature

\(k_b\) Boltzmann constant

The ratio of the density of electrons with the required energy for the excitation to NO(A²Σ⁺) and NH(A³Π) can be presented by the fraction of electrons assuming a Maxwell-Boltzmann energy distribution, which results in an excitation factor of 0.0331 for NO(A²Σ⁺) excitation compared to NH(A³Π). It has to be noted that the considered corona-model corrected for quenching processes is valid for low ionization degree plasmas with only electron impact excitation mechanisms. Additional excitation processes can lead to overestimation of the excited states density in the corona model. However, a model including a complete set of population processes would require a collisional-radiative model which is not yet available in literature for mixtures such as used in our work.
S6. NOx formation in (humid) N2 and air

This is a discussion based on the NO and NO2 trends presented in Figure 2 of the manuscript. Describing the detailed reaction mechanisms for HNOx, NO, NO2 and NH3, as well as their interplay, requires dedicated computational studies based on a chemical kinetics model, which can take into account large reaction sets, while incorporating the plasma parameters (e.g., power density) as input. We did this for a much simpler chemical system consisting only of dry air24, where we discussed how reverse reactions of the Zeldovich mechanism can be suppressed and the vibrational nonequilibrium can be promoted through the use of pulsed power and resulting pulsed temperature. A complete computational model with added H2O would be much more complex, and was outside the scope of the present work. However, based on our general insights obtained from our other models, data from literature, and our present experimental data, we can hypothesize the following mechanisms.

In brief, in humid N2 the dominating mechanism for NO and NO2 formation is the extended Zeldovich mechanism (see RS1 in Table S3), as discussed by Gromov et al.25, because H2O is the sole oxygen source. However, the concentrations of NO and NO2 were below 1 ppm for the whole range of used H2O content (<1-100% relative humidity)), likely because all NOx reacted further to form HNO2, as seen in Figure 2a and 2b.

On the other hand, in humid air where O2 is readily available, the NOx concentration is not only dramatically higher than in humid N2 (where NOx concentration was <1 ppm), but is up to 4 times higher than the HNO2 concentration (e.g., 69 ppm HNO2, 254 ppm NOx at 50% relative humidity and 2 L/min; Figure 2d). In this scenario, NOx formation is guided by both the traditional non-thermal (RS2 and RS3) and the extended Zeldovich mechanisms (RS1) shown in Table S3.

Table S3. (Extended) Zeldovich reactions, their corresponding reaction rate coefficients and relevant temperature ranges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Rate coefficients a</th>
<th>Temperature range</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N + OH → NO + H</td>
<td>4.7 × 10^{-17}</td>
<td>300–2500 K</td>
<td>RS1 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2 + N → NO + O</td>
<td>4.47 × 10^{-12} × e^{-27188/RT}</td>
<td>298–5000 K</td>
<td>RS2 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2 + O → NO + N</td>
<td>3.01 × 10^{-10} × e^{-318000/RT}</td>
<td>1400–4000 K</td>
<td>RS3 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Unit: cm³/(molecules s) for two-body reactions, and cm⁶/(molecules² s) for three-body reactions. T is the gas temperature.

S7. OES spectra recorded perpendicular to the plasma effluent

Table S4. Overview of the waterfall plot conditions and their respective Figure numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>Flow rate (Slm)</th>
<th>Air</th>
<th>Flow rate (Slm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative humidity at 20°C (%)</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>Flow rate (Slm)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative humidity at 20°C (%)</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure S4.</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S5. Emission spectra (334–340 nm) as a function of the distance from the jet nozzle (1–10 mm). The full list of the experimental conditions (Figures S5a – S5t) is shown in Table S3 above.
S8. Energy consumption and production rate
Using the plasma power \( P \) and the total (H)NO\(_x\) concentration, the EC was calculated according to eq. 12. The EC is expressed in MJ/(mol N), where mol N is the amount of nitrogen fixed. The power was close to constant for all conditions, as discussed in detail elsewhere\(^{24,27} \), hence in the first approximation the same plug power (1.04 W) was used for all conditions.

\[
EC \left(\frac{MJ}{mol N}\right) = \frac{P(W)}{mol \text{ of (H)NO}_x \text{ produced per second} \left(\frac{mol}{s}\right)} \times \frac{1}{10^6 \left(\frac{J}{MJ}\right)} = P(W) \times 10^6 \times 60 \left(\frac{s}{\text{min}}\right) \times 22.4 \left(\frac{L}{mol}\right) \\
(C_{\text{HNO}_2} + C_{\text{NO}_2} + C_{\text{NO}} + C_{\text{NH}_3}) \text{ (ppm)} \times \text{Flowrate} \left(\frac{L}{\text{min}}\right) \times 10^6 \left(\frac{J}{MJ}\right) \tag{S10}
\]

The detailed methodology of energy consumption calculations is given in our previous work.\(^{24} \) It has to be emphasized here that for clarity of the results we only report the total energy consumption, which can be drastically improved by optimization of the power supply system. As shown in our previous results, both experimentally and numerically, the plasma power
which is used to support the sustaining of the discharge, can be a factor of magnitude lower than the total power. The engineering challenge is to design a power system where power efficiency is optimized which is however out of the scope of our current research. Note that the values of the plasma EC look much better, i.e., with values of 0.42 MJ/(mol N fixed)\textsuperscript{24}, but they don’t account for the power supply efficiency, and for real application, the total EC should be considered.

As seen from the data, even the lowest EC we observed is still ca. 4 times higher than the EC of Haber-Bosch, which is 0.48 MJ/(mol N). Nonetheless, plasma has the advantage of being able to use renewable electricity, because of its fast switch on/off capacity, and is therefore promising for distributed fertilizer production. We infer that plasma processes should be used as an auxiliary technology, rather than substituting the current industrial state-of-the-art entirely.

### Table S5. Average energy consumption (EC) of nitrogen fixation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow rate (L/min)</th>
<th>Relative Humidity (%)</th>
<th>EC (MJ/(mol N fixed))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>N\textsubscript{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The production rate (PR) of the various products (x), and the conversion of N\textsubscript{2} in our system was calculated as shown in eq. 13 and 14:

$$ PR_x\left(\frac{mg}{h}\right) = \frac{C_x \text{ (ppm)} \times \text{Flow rate} \left(\frac{L}{min}\right) \times 60 \left(\frac{min}{h}\right) \times M_x \left(\frac{g}{mol}\right)}{22.4 \left(\frac{L}{mol}\right) \times 10^3} $$ (S11)

$$ N_2 \text{ conversion} \% = \frac{(C_{HNO2} + C_{NO2} + C_{NO} + C_{NH3}) \text{ (ppm)}}{N_2 \text{ fraction in the feed gas} \text{ (ppm)} \times 2} \times 100\% $$ (S12)
Table S6. Average production rate (PR) of the products of nitrogen fixation, and the conversion of N₂.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Rate (L/min)</th>
<th>Relative Humidity (%)</th>
<th>PR (mg/h)</th>
<th>N₂ conversion (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>N₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO₂</td>
<td>NH₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We note that the EC and PR values shown are not compensated for the losses due to the NH₄NO₂ decomposition and NH₄NO₃ precipitation because the experiments with the alkaline washer were not performed for every condition used.
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