



*Supplement of*

**A comparative study to reveal the influence of typhoons on the transport, production and accumulation of O<sub>3</sub> in the Pearl River Delta, China**

**Kun Qu et al.**

*Correspondence to:* Xuesong Wang (xswang@pku.edu.cn) and Yuanhang Zhang (yhzhang@pku.edu.cn)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

## **S1. Evaluation of WRF and CMAQ modelling results within the PRD**

The WRF-modelling results of air temperature, relative humidity (RH), zonal and meridional wind speeds in the PRD were evaluated based on the same-period routine monitoring datasets collected in 29 national meteorological sites (Fig. S1a). Statistics listed in Table S5 indicate low biases and high correlations between the modelled and observational series of air temperature and RH. Wind speeds in two directions were overall overestimated by 0.6–0.8 m/s, but it was normally found in the PRD modelling studies (Chen et al, 2018; Deng et al, 2018; Tse et al, 2018; Yuan et al, 2018). Low modelling resolution, as well as coarse descriptions of surface features might contribute to these biases. High R values ( $>0.8$ ) of wind speeds, especially meridional wind speeds, suggest that the model was capable of describing the variation of wind fields within the PRD. Acceptable performance in the WRF modelling ensures the validity of the meteorological inputs for the CMAQ modelling.

The comparisons of observational and modelling mean  $O_3$  MDA8 and daily  $NO_2$  concentrations in 18 sites of the Guangzhou-Hong Kong-Macao regional monitoring network (Fig. S1b) in the two represented months are shown in Fig. S11a–d. High FAC2 and R, low NMB indicate good performance in the modelling of these two species. We also evaluated the performance of the daily mixing ratios of non-methane hydrocarbons (NMHCs) based on the GC/MS measurements in five representative sites within the PRD (Zhudong, Modiesha, Heshan Supersite, Xijiao and Daxuecheng, locations shown in Fig. S1b), which is overall satisfying, as well (Fig. S11e–f). Note that the notable overestimations of  $NO_2$  and NMHCs levels can be found during 11–13 July, when the PRD was under the influence of heavy rainfall. Since these days were classified as clean days and were excluded in comparisons, it did not affect the final conclusions.

As shown in Fig. S6, there is no significant difference between the modelling performance of meteorological parameters and pollutant concentrations in the typhoon-induced and no-typhoon scenarios, ensuring the validity of comparisons using WRF and CMAQ.

## S2. Tables

**Table S1.** Information on the O<sub>3</sub> pollution days in October, 2014–2018.

Date	Number of Days	Classification	Weather systems
October 2–3, 2014	2	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Phanfone
October 5, 2014	1	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Phanfone & Vongfong
October 7–11, 2014	5	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Vongfong
October 14–16, 2015	3	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Koppu & Champi
October 21, 2015	1	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Champi
October 4, 2016	1	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Chaba & Aere
October 14, 2016	1	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Sarika
October 11, 2017	1	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Khanum
October 18, 2017	1	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Lan
October 22, 2017	1	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Lan & Saola
October 25–29, 2017	5	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Saola
October 1–3, 2018	5	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Kong-rey
October 5–6, 2018			
October 27–29, 2018	3	Autumn, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Yutu
October 17–19, 2015	3	Autumn, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Koppu & Champi
October 5–6, 2016	2	Autumn, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Chaba & Aere
October 10, 2016	1	Autumn, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Aere & Songda
October 20, 2016	1	Autumn, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Haima
October 12–13, 2017	2	Autumn, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Khanum
October 4, 2018	1	Autumn, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Kong-rey
October 1, 2014	1	Autumn, far typhoon-induced	The typhoon Phanfone
October 6, 2014	1	Autumn, far typhoon-induced	The typhoon Phanfone & Vongfong
October 13, 2015	1	Autumn, far typhoon-induced	The typhoon Koppu & Champi
October 22–25, 2015	4	Autumn, far typhoon-induced	The typhoon Champi
October 23–24, 2017	2	Autumn, far typhoon-induced	The typhoon Lan & Saola
October 14–21, 2014	8	Autumn, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
October 15–31, 2014	7	Autumn, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
October 9, 2015	1	Autumn, no-typhoon	Continental cold high
October 28, 2015	1	Autumn, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
October 27–28, 2016	2	Autumn, no-typhoon	Foreside of a cold front
October 31, 2016	1	Autumn, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
October 6–8, 2017	3	Autumn, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
October 30–31, 2017	2	Autumn, no-typhoon	Sea high
October 7–9, 2018	3	Autumn, no-typhoon	Foreside of a cold front
October 12, 2018	1	Autumn, no-typhoon	Sea high

**Table S2.** Information on the O<sub>3</sub> pollution days in July, 2014–2018.

Date	Number of Days	Classification	Weather systems
July 6–9, 2014	4	Summer, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Neoguri
July 16–17, 2014	2	Summer, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Rammasun
July 21–25, 2014	5	Summer, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Matmo
July 29–31, 2014	3	Summer, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Nakri & Halong
July 11–12, 2015	2	Summer, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Chan-hom & Nangka
July 7–8, 2016	2	Summer, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Nepartak
July 30–31, 2016	2	Summer, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Nida
July 25–27, 2017	3	Summer, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Nesat & Noru
July 10, 2018	1	Summer, typhoon-induced	The typhoon Maria
July 9, 2016	1	Summer, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Nepartak
July 22, 2017	1	Summer, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Roke
July 28–31, 2017	4	Summer, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Nesat, Noru & Haitang
July 11, 2018	1	Summer, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Maria
July 17, 2018	1	Summer, close typhoon-induced	The typhoon Son-tinh
July 13–16, 2015	4	Summer, far typhoon-induced	The typhoon Nangka
July 8, 2018	1	Summer, far typhoon-induced	The typhoon Maria
July 28–29, 2018	2	Summer, far typhoon-induced	The typhoon Jongdari
July 10, 2016	1	\	The typhoon Nepartak*
July 12, 2018	1	\	The typhoon Maria**
July 19–22, 2018	4	\	The typhoon Son-tinh & Ampil**
July 28, 2014	1	Summer, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
July 31, 2015	1	Summer, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
July 22–26, 2016	5	Summer, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
July 29, 2016	1	Summer, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
July 13, 2017	1	Summer, no-typhoon	Subtropical high
July 20, 2017	1	Summer, no-typhoon	Subtropical high

\* No typhoon record at 14:00 LT.

\*\* Typhoons located to the west of the PRD.

**Table S3.** The numbers, proportions of O<sub>3</sub> pollution days, and O<sub>3</sub> concentrations in each month.

Parameters	October 2014	October 2015	October 2016	October 2017	October 2018	July 2014	July 2015	July 2016	July 2017	July 2018
Number of O <sub>3</sub> pollution days	25	14	9	17	13	15	7	12	10	11
With typhoons	10	12	6	12	9	14	6	6	8	11
Typhoon-induced days	8	4	2	8	8	14	2	4	3	5
Without typhoons (no-typhoon days)	15	2	3	5	4	1	1	6	2	0
Mean PRD-max O <sub>3</sub> MDA8 (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )										
Typhoon-induced days	199.4	221.2	149.9	200.1	200.7	209.4	184.1	246.3	202.9	171.6
No-typhoon days	190.7	174.7	167.6	189.4	211.4	220.0	140.4	206.0	140.9	/
Mean PRD-max O <sub>3</sub> MDA1 (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )										
Typhoon-induced days	230.1	261.5	207.0	239.1	230.1	272.4	213.5	302.5	242.3	220.8
No-typhoon days	234.5	219.0	220.0	219.6	250.0	253.0	240.0	256.5	216.5	/

**Table S4.** The numbers (percentages) of O<sub>3</sub> pollution days corresponding to different weathers in Guangzhou in four scenarios (data source: tianqihoubao (historical weather records), <http://www.tianqihoubao.com/lishi/guangzhou.html>).

Weathers	Oct. 2014–2018 Typhoon-induced	Oct. 2014–2018 No-typhoon	July 2014–2018 Typhoon-induced	July 2014–2018 No-typhoon
Sunny	31 (63%)	12 (41%)	13 (29%)	2 (20%)
Cloudy	16 (33%)	17 (59%)	18 (40%)	4 (40%)
Overcast	2 (4%)	/	/	/
Shower	/	/	/	1 (2%)
Thunder-shower	/	/	12 (27%)	3 (30%)
Light/Moderate Rain	/	/	1 (2%)	/
Heavy Rain	/	/	1 (2%)	/

**Table S5.** Statistics of the WRF modelling performance of air temperature, RH, zonal and meridional wind speeds in October 2015 and July 2016.

Parameters	Statistics	October 2015	July 2016
Air Temperature	MB* (K)	-0.46	0.03
	RMSE** (K)	0.86	1.27
	R***	0.98	0.90
Relative Humidity	MB (%)	-3.13	-5.29
	RMSE (%)	5.01	8.11
	R	0.96	0.90
Zonal Wind Speed	MB (m/s)	-0.72	-0.17
	RMSE (m/s)	0.82	0.74
	R	0.78	0.89
Meridional Wind Speed	MB (m/s)	-0.62	0.77
	RMSE (m/s)	1.05	1.11
	R	0.93	0.91

\* MB, mean bias.

\*\* RMSE, root-mean-square error.

\*\*\* R, correlation factor.

**Table S6.** The modelling performance statistics of meteorological parameters and pollutant concentrations on the typhoon-induced and no-typhoon days of two represented months.


Parameters	Statistics	Typhoon-induced, Oct. 2015	No-typhoon, Oct. 2015	Typhoon-induced, July 2016	No-typhoon, July 2016
Air Temperature	MB* (K)	-0.51	-0.24	0.52	-0.66
	RMSE** (K)	2.16	1.70	2.45	1.92
Relative Humidity	MB (%)	-5.33	-3.43	-6.85	-2.83
	RMSE (%)	14.45	10.58	14.31	11.27
Wind Speed	MB (m/s)	0.52	0.61	0.09	0.15
	RMSE (m/s)	1.21	1.18	1.23	1.04
O <sub>3</sub> MDA8	MB (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	8.5	19.1	12.6	16.0
	NMB***	0.05	0.15	0.08	0.12
NO <sub>2</sub>	MB (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	-16.1	-12.3	-5.4	4.1
	NMB	-0.35	-0.28	-0.17	0.21
NMHCs	MB (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )	-5.0	-3.7	-4.9	-5.0
	NMB	-0.20	-0.14	-0.33	-0.31

\* MB, mean bias.

\*\* RMSE, root-mean-square error.

\*\*\* NMB, normalized mean bias.


### S3. Figures




**Figure S1.** (a) The spatial distribution of 29 national meteorological sites within the PRD: 1. Conghua; 2. Huadu; 3. Zengcheng; 4. Huangpu; 5. Panyu; 6. Shenzhen; 7. Zhuhai; 8. Doumen; 9. Sanshui; 10. Nanhai; 11. Shunde; 12. Heshan; 13. Xinhui; 14. Kaiping; 15. Enping; 16. Taishan; 17. Shangchuandao; 18. Huaiji; 19. Guangning; 20. Fengkai; 21. Sihui; 22. Deqing; 23. Gaoyao; 24. Longmen; 25. Boluo; 26. Huiyang; 27. Huidong; 28. Dongguan; 29. Zhongshan.

(b) The spatial distribution of the sites of the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao regional monitoring network (the site a–r) and the GC/MS measurements (the site c, d, l, o, s): a. Luhui; b. Tianhu; c. Zhudong; d. Modiesha; e. Wanqingsha; f. Liyuan; g. Tangjia; h. Huijingcheng; i. Jinjuju; j. Donghu; k. Duanfen; l. Heshan Supersite; m. Chengzhongzizhan; n. Xiapu; o. Xijiao; p. Jinguowan; q. Nanchengyuanling; r. Zimaling; s. Daxuecheng.







**Figure S2.** The tracks of typhoons related to O<sub>3</sub> pollution in the PRD in October, 2014–2018. The 4-digit identification numbers of all typhoons are also shown in plot.




**Figure S3.** The tracks of typhoons related to O<sub>3</sub> pollution in the PRD in July, 2014–2018. The 4-digit identification numbers of all typhoons are also shown in plot.



**Figure S4.** Geographical information used in this study: (1) the matrix of starting points (green) and the boarder of the PRD (yellow) in the calculation of APRTs; (2) the cross section was made along the orange line (from 26.0°N to 20.0°N along the 113.2°E longitude line).




**Figure S5.** Wind roses at 14:00 LT in four scenarios: (a) autumn, typhoon-induced; (b) autumn, no-typhoon; (c) summer, typhoon-induced; (d) summer, no-typhoon. The routine monitoring data collected in 29 meteorological sites within the PRD were used.




**Figure S6.** Relative humidity (%) and wind fields at the height of (a–d) 850 hPa, (e–h) 700 hPa, and (i–l) 500 hPa at 14:00 LT for the four scenarios: (a, e, i) autumn, typhoon-induced; (b, f, j) autumn, no-typhoon; (c, g, k) summer, typhoon-induced; and (d, h, l) summer, no-typhoon. The black triangle in each plot indicates the PRD. The gridded areas indicate that vertical wind speed is less than 0, or downdrafts occur.







**Figure S7.** The spatial distributions of APRTs in the PRD for the close typhoon-scenarios of (a) autumn and (b) summer.




**Figure S8.** The cross section of mean vertical wind field at 14:00 LT for the close typhoon-induced scenario of (a) autumn and (b) summer. Cross sections are made from 26.0°N to 20.0°N along the 113.2°E longitude line (Fig. S4). The vectors indicate meridional wind speed (m/s) and vertical wind speed (cm/s), and the contours indicate vertical wind speed (cm/s).



**Figure S9.** The spatial distributions of APRTs in the PRD on the representative O<sub>3</sub> pollution days: (a) the typhoon-induced days in October 2015 (14–16 and 21 October 2015); (b) the no-typhoon days in October 2015 (28 October and 3–5 November 2015); (c) the typhoon-induced days in July 2016 (7–8 and 30–31 July 2016); and (d) the no-typhoon days in July 2016 (22–26 and 29 July 2016).



**Figure S10.** The average local contributions (in percentage, %) to daytime (9:00–17:00 LT) O<sub>3</sub> and wind vectors (at 14:00 LT) on the representative O<sub>3</sub> pollution days: (a) the typhoon-induced days in October 2015 (14–16 and 21 October 2015); (b) the no-typhoon days in October 2015 (28 October and 3–5 November 2015); (c) the typhoon-induced days in July 2016 (7–8 and 30–31 July 2016); and (d) the no-typhoon days in July 2016 (22–26 and 29 July 2016). Three representative sites in the PRD are shown as black circles in the plots: XJ, Xijiao; MDS, Modiesha; DF, Duanfen.



**Figure S11.** Comparisons between the observed and modelled mean O<sub>3</sub> MDA8, daily NO<sub>2</sub> and NMHCs concentrations in the PRD. The lengths of error bars indicate the corresponding standard deviations. FAC2, the fraction of predictions within a factor of two; MB, mean bias; NMB, normalized mean bias; R, correlation factor.

#### S4. References (of the Supplement)

- Chen, X., Liu, Y., Lai, A., Han, S., Fan, Q., Wang, X., Ling, Z., Huang, F., and Fan, S.: Factors dominating 3-dimensional ozone distribution during high tropospheric ozone period, *Environ. Pollut.*, 232, 55–64, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.09.017>, 2018.
- Deng, T., Chen, Y., Wan, Q., Zhang, Y., Deng, X., Huang, Y., Dai, G., and Li, F.: Comparative evaluation of the impact of GRAPES and MM5 meteorology on CMAQ prediction over Pearl River Delta, China, *Particuology*, 40, 88–97, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.partic.2017.10.005>, 2018.
- Tse, J. W. P., Yeung, P. S., Fung, J. C.-H., Ren, C., Wang, R., Wong, M. M.-F., and Cai, M.: Investigation of the meteorological effects of urbanization in recent decades: A case study of major cities in Pearl River Delta, *Urban Climate*, 26, 174–187, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2018.08.007>, 2018.
- Yuan, J., Ling, Z., Wang, Z., Lu, X., Fan, S., He, Z., Guo, H., Wang, X., and Wang, N.: PAN–Precursor Relationship and Process Analysis of PAN Variations in the Pearl River Delta Region, *Atmosphere*, 9, 372, <https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos9100372>, 2018.