



Supplement of

A transition of atmospheric emissions of particles and gases from on-road heavy-duty trucks

Liyuan Zhou et al.

Correspondence to: Åsa M. Hallquist (asa.hallquist@ivl.se) and Chak K. Chan (chak.k.chan@cityu.edu.hk)

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



Fig. S1. Relationship between EF_{PN} measured by CPC and EEPS.



4 Fig. S2. Size-dependent ammonium sulfate concentrations measured by bypass EEPS and TD line EEPS and corresponding

5 correction factors.

3



6

7 Fig. S3. Relationship between EF_{BC} measured by the Aethalometer and $EF_{non-volatile PM}$ measured by the EEPS in the TD line

8 (unity density of particles was assumed).



Fig. S4. Relationship between EF_{NOx} and EF_{NO} (NO₂ equivalents) measured by the gas analyzers and RSD.



11

12 Fig. S5. (a) Composition of all 556 HDTs trucks and (b) 330 Swedish HDTs with valid Euro type information.



13

Fig. S6. Average pollutant emission factors of PM, PN, non-volatile PN and NO_x for each HDT against the individual plume
measurements of the corresponding HDT.



17Fig. S7. (a) EF_{BC+BrC} for Euro III to Euro VI HDTs. Non-detectable pollutant emission signals for captured plumes have been18replaced by EF_{min} . For box-and-whisker plots, the top and bottom line of the box are 75th and 25th percentiles of the data, the

19 red line inside the box is the median, and the top and bottom whiskers are 90th and 10th percentiles and (b) scatter plot of

 $\label{eq:expansion} 20 \qquad EF_{BC+BrC} \text{ and } EF_{BC} \text{ for Euro III to Euro VI HDTs.}$

16



21

Fig. S8. (a) EF_{NOx} , (b) EF_{NO2}/EF_{NOx} , (c) EF_{CO} , and (d) EF_{HC} for Euro III to Euro VI and non-Swedish HDTs. Non-detectable pollutant emission signals for captured plumes have been replaced by EF_{min} . For box-and-whisker plots, the top and the bottom line of the box are 75th and 25th percentiles of the data, the red line inside the box is the median, and the top and bottom whiskers are 90th and 10th percentiles. Note that the comparison with the emission standard is only indicative as they are based on test cycle performance.



27

Fig. S9. (a) EF_{PM} , (b) EF_{PN} , (c) EF_{BC} and (d) EF_{NOx} for Euro V HDTs and (e) EF_{PM} , (f) EF_{PN} , (g) EF_{BC} and (h) EF_{NOx} for Euro VI HDTs with respect to manufacturers: M1, M2, M3, M4 and M5. For an individual HDT with multiple passages, an average has been calculated and the error given is the standard deviation (1 σ). The red solid lines represent the median EFs for the different engine manufacturers. Kruskal–Wallis test shows no significant manufacturer difference in EF_{PM} , EF_{PN} , EF_{BC} and EF_{NOx} for Euro V HDTs, whereas a significant difference was observed between M2 and M5 in EF_{BC} of Euro VI HDTs (*p*=0.016).





Fig. S10. Average EF_{PN} and EF_{PM} fraction remaining of the total particle, nucleation mode, and accumulation mode particle
of Euro III-VI HDTs, error bars represent the standard deviation (1σ).





Fig. S11. Approximation of contributions of pollutants emitted from Swedish HDVs in each Euro class to the total (a) PM,

39 (b) PN, (c) BC and (d) NOx emissions (by adopting median EFs).