



Supplement of

Influence of the vapor wall loss on the degradation rate constants in chamber experiments of levoglucosan and other biomass burning markers

Amelie Bertrand et al.

Correspondence to: Nicolas Marchand (nicolas.marchand@univ-amu.fr)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC BY 4.0 License.



Figure S1. Example of the monomodal distribution of the aerosol (number concentration (top) and mass concentration (bottom) (Experiment 1).



Figure S2: Exponential fit of the decay of BC applied in order to retrieve a constant particle wall loss rate.



Figure S3. Wall loss correction of the normalized levoglucosan signal (modeled from experimental data set) using a constant rate $(0.0047 \text{ min}^{-1})$ and time dependent rate (averaged from all the experiments and based on the fitting of the logarithmic form of the decay on a 30 minutes time interval).



Figure S4: Calculate condensation sink k_{sink} (s⁻¹) with an accommodation coefficient α of 0.1.



Figure S5: Influence of the factors on the model in the case of levoglucosan – mean effect plots for RMSE.



Figure S6: Comparison of our results for the saturation vapor concentration C^* and vapor wall loss rate $k_{wall/g}$ to those by Ye et al. (2015).



Figure S7: Observed and modeled evolution during aging of the particulate-phase concentration corrected for wall loss (and normalized to the initial concentration) of several BBOA markers. The colored markers are the TAG-AMS measurements, the solid black line represents the best fit, and the grey area is all the individual solutions with a RMSE < 15 %. Only one replicate is shown for each compounds (exp. 5 for 3-guaiacyl propanol, exp.6 for acetosyringone and mannosan, and exp.2 for conyferyl aldehyde.)