



Supplement of

Photochemical ageing of aerosols contributes significantly to the production of atmospheric formic acid

Yifan Jiang et al.

Correspondence to: Tao Wang (tao.wang@polyu.edu.hk)

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

- **1** Table of contents
- 2
- 3 Text S1. Sampling of aerosol filters.
- 4 Text S2. The determination of $J_{NO_3(aq)}$ and $J_{O_3 \rightarrow O^1D}$ in the chamber and ambient air.
- 5 Text S3. Additional setting information on the box model simulation.
- 6 Text S4. Additional laboratory experiments.
- 7 Text S5. Evaluation methods of HCOOH production from photochemical aging of
- 8 aerosols using the Atmospheric Tomography Mission (ATom) data.
- 9
- 10 **Figure S1.** The location of the observation site, Cape D'Aguilar.
- 11 **Figure S2.** The variation of HCOOH sensitivity with RH.
- 12 Figure S3. The backward trajectories of different kinds of air masses during the field
- 13 campaign.
- 14 **Figure S4.** The schematic diagram of the photochemical aging experiment.
- 15 Figure S5. The sources of CH₂OO in the modified case on averaged diurnal profile
- 16 during the whole campaign.
- 17 Figure S6. The sensitivity test of deposition velocity on averaged diurnal profile during
- 18 the whole campaign in Scenario 4.
- Figure S7. The model results of the simulation of two weeks using bimodal physicalloss rates.
- Figure S8. Comparison of simulated HCOOH concentration on 28 September using
 measured and simulated OVOCs values.
- Figure S9. Additional laboratory experiments show that HCOOH was produced by nitrate rather than HONO.
- 25
- 26 **Table S1.** The instruments and measured species or parameters in the field campaign.
- 27 **Table S2.** Summary of the PM_{2.5} sampling information.

28 **Text S1.** Sampling of aerosol filters.

We collected ambient aerosols at Cape D'Aguilar Super Site in Autumn for 29 photochemical aging experiments. The PM_{2.5} samples were collected on quartz-fiber 30 31 filters (8 \times 10 inches) using a PUF-1000 high-volume sampler with a flow rate of 999 32 Lpm in 2020. All samplings were performed from 11:00 am local time (LT) to 10:00 33 am LT of the next day. The filters were pre-fired at 900 °C for 4 hours to remove organic 34 artifacts and stored in a freezer at -20 °C. Fractions with a given surface area from one 35 randomized-chosen filter were used to perform the photochemical experiments or other 36 analyses.

37

38 Text S2. The determination of $J_{NO_3(aq)}$ and $J_{O_3 \rightarrow O^1D}$ in the chamber and ambient air.

39 The $J_{NO_3(aq)}$ and $J_{O_3 \rightarrow O^1D}$ in the chamber was calculated by (Eq. (1)),

40

 $J = \int q(\lambda)\sigma(\lambda)I(\lambda)d\lambda \qquad (1)$

where $q(\lambda)$ is the quantum yield at wavelength λ (nm); $\sigma(\lambda)$ is the cross-section at 41 42 wavelength λ ; I(λ) is the flux of xenon lamp at wavelength λ and was calculated by 43 converting the irradiation energy spectra of the lamp (Fig. 4d) to photon flux based on 44 Planck's equation. The $q(\lambda)$ and $\sigma(\lambda)$ of aqueous nitrate at 298 K were derived from 45 (Chu and Anastasio, 2003). The q(λ) and $\sigma(\lambda)$ of O₃ generating O¹D were adopted from 46 the recommended value from IUPAC under 298 K (https://uv-vis-spectral-atlasmainz.org/uvvis/index.html). The $J_{NO_3(aq)}$ and $J_{O_3 \rightarrow O^1D}$ in the ambient was calculated 47 Tropospheric Ultraviolet and Visible (TUV) radiation 48 model by the 49 (https://www.acom.ucar.edu/Models/TUV/Interactive TUV/) under clear sky 50 conditions and then scaled to the field-measured jNO₂.

51

52 **Text S3.** Additional setting information on the box model simulation.

53 The data of trace gases (including O₃, NO, NO₂, CO and SO₂) and data obtained by 54 ToF-CIMS (including HONO and N₂O₅) were averaged to one-hour resolution. For 55 missing values of VOCs species, linear interpolations were applied. The missing J_{NO2} 56 data was filled in using the data calculated by the Tropospheric Ultraviolet and Visible 57 (TUV) Radiation Model (https://www2.acom.ucar.edu/modeling/tropospheric-58 ultraviolet-and-visible-tuv-radiation-model) and then scaled using measured J_{NO2}. 59 Since the OVOCs data was not available during most of the modelling period, we run 60 the model using measured VOCs concentration for three replicates to stabilise the 61 intermediate species it generated and assumed the output concentrations of OVOCs 62 were equal to the ambient values. We compared the simulated HCOOH concentration 63 on 28 September where the ambient measured OVOCs data was available using 64 modelled and measured values (Fig. S8). The uncertainty caused by using modelled 65 OVOCs values is negligible. The methane concentration was assumed to remain 66 constant (2000 ppb; Peng et al., 2022), due to a lack of measurement data. The variable "ModelOptions.EndPointsOnly" was set to "1" because we only want the last point of 67 68 each step. The "ModelOptions.LinkSteps" were set to "1" so that non-constrained 69 species are carried over between steps. The variable "ModelOptions.IntTime" was set 70 to "3600" meaning that the integration time for each step was 3600s. No family 71 conservation was used. Readers are referred to a F0AM description paper for more 72 information (Wolfe et al., 2016).

73 The biogenic emissions of HCOOH were calculated using the exponential 74 temperature dependence algorithm of the Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols 75 from Nature version 2.1 (MEGAN v2.1) (Guenther et al., 2012), as shown in (Eq. (2)). $E = \varepsilon \mathrm{LAI} \gamma_P \gamma_T \quad (2)$

76

77 where E is the biogenic emission of HCOOH ($\mu g m^{-2} h^{-1}$); ϵ is the emission factor under standard environmental conditions (30 µg m⁻² h⁻¹, Paulot et al. 2011); LAI is the leaf 78 area index (3.65 m² m⁻², Myneni et al., 2021); γ_P and γ_T are the emission activity factors 79 80 accounting for variability in light and temperature. In particular, γ_P was calculated using 81 the PCEEA algorithm described by Guenther et al. (2006) and γ_T was calculated following Paulot et al. (2011). 82

83

84 Text S4. Additional laboratory experiments.

85 Since HONO and HCOOH were simultaneously observed during the photochemical 86 aging process, it is possible that HCOOH was produced from the heterogeneous 87 reactions between gas-phase OH radicals and particles. To check this possibility, an 88 experiment was conducted as follows (Fig. S9). 4 Lpm HONO-containing air (78% RH, 89 7.2 ppb HONO, balanced with zero air) was injected into the chamber. The solution 90 was prepared with 0.15 wt.% HCHO but without adding NaNO₃. The pH of the solution 91 was also adjusted to 2.7 using sulfuric acid. The background HCOOH concentration 92 was determined as 308.9 ppt when illuminating the chamber without the solution. After 93 adding the solution, the HCOOH concentration increased to 428.8 ppt. After 94 normalizing the HONO concentration in this experiment to that in the previous solution 95 experiments containing NaNO₃ (0.77 ppb HONO, 0.62 ppb HCOOH) (Fig. 4c), the 96 increased HCOOH concentration is 12.8 ppt, which is negligible. The conclusion is the 97 same when compared with the filter irradiation experiments (4.1 ppb HONO, 5.6 ppb 98 HCOOH). Therefore, the HONO photolysis contributes little to HCOOH production.

99

Text S5. Evaluation methods of HCOOH production from photochemical aging of 100 101 aerosols using the Atmospheric Tomography Mission (ATom) data.

102 We first assessed the production of HCOOH from aerosols over the Pacific as an 103 illustrative case of the remote marine boundary layer. The selected observation data

104 were obtained within the Pacific Ocean with sampling heights below 5 km. The mean values of mass concentration of PM₁, the surface area density of PM₁, the photolysis 105 frequency of NO₂ and the mixing ratio of O₃ were 1 μ g cm⁻³, 26 μ m² cm⁻³, 0.01 s⁻¹ and 106 24.2 ppb, respectively. The calculated mean production rate of HCOOH from aerosols 107 $(P_{HCOOH-a})$ was 6.6 ppt h⁻¹. Considering that the proportion of nitrate in PM₁ was only 108 3%, which is significantly lower than that at our site (24.3%), the actual P_{HCOOH-a} is 109 110 expected to be even lower. The small P_{HCOOH-a} in the remote marine atmosphere is reasonable given the low concentration of HCOOH observed over the Pacific (mean: 111 10.5 ppt; maximum: 85.6 ppt). In addition, a previous study showed small discrepancy 112 between observed and modeled results in remote clean air masses in remote clean air 113 114 masses (Chen et al., 2021).

115

116 We also assessed the HCOOH production when the remote marine boundary layer is 117 affected by fire plumes by selecting data obtained at heights below 5 km and HCOOH 118 concentrations higher than 1 ppb. The mean values of the mass concentration of PM₁, the surface area density of PM₁, the photolysis frequency of NO₂ and the mixing ratio 119 of O_3 were 4.9 µg cm⁻³, 92.6 µm² cm⁻³, 0.011 s⁻¹ and 45.5 ppb, respectively. The 120 resulting P_{HCOOH-a} was 84.5 ppt h⁻¹, significantly higher than that observed in remote 121 marine atmosphere. After consideration of the low proportion of nitrate in PM_1 (5.1%), 122 $P_{HCOOH-a}$ was 17.7 ppt h⁻¹ assuming a positive linear correlation between $P_{HCOOH-a}$ and 123 nitrate concentration. This corresponds to a rate of 2390%/year that organic aerosol 124 125 (OA) mass $(3 \mu \text{g cm}^{-3})$ is photochemically converted to HCOOH, which is equivalent 126 to a carbon-based HCOOH yield of \sim 3.8–38% over 1–10 days of aging, close to that 127 required to account for the ATom observations (16–37%) in aged fire air masses (Chen 128 et al., 2021).

129 Supplementary figures



130

Figure S1. The location of the observation site, Cape D'Aguilar. (a) The location of
Hong Kong in South China. (b) The field observation site in Hong Kong Island. The

- 133 source is from Esri, Maxar, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA,
- 134 USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community.



Figure S2. The variation of HCOOH sensitivity with RH.





Figure S3. The backward trajectories of different kinds of air masses during the field campaign including 24-h backward trajectories of (a) the marine air masses occurred during 16–26 August and 11–23 September except 12, 15, and 16 September, (b) the haze period occurred from 24 September to 2 October and (c) the coastal air masses occurred during 4–31 October. The colour of the line deepens over time.







145

143

146 Figure S5. The sources of CH₂OO in the modified case on averaged diurnal profile

147 during the whole campaign.





149 Figure S6. The sensitivity test of deposition velocity on averaged diurnal profile during150 the whole campaign in Scenario 4.



151

152 Figure S7. The model results of the simulation of two weeks using bimodal physical153 loss rates.





Figure S8. Comparison of simulated HCOOH concentration on 28 September using
measured and simulated OVOCs values.



157

158 Figure S9. Additional laboratory experiments show that HCOOH was produced by 159 nitrate rather than HONO.

161 Supplementary tables

Spacias	Instruments	Time
species	Instruments	resolution
HCOOH, HONO, N ₂ O ₅	Iodide-ToF-CIMS, Aerodyne Inc.	1 s
O ₃	O ₃ analyzer, model 49i, Thermo Scientific	1 min
NO, NO ₂	NOx analyzer, model 42i-TLwithphotolyticconverter,ThermoScientific	1 min
СО	CO analyzer, model T300U, Teledyne	1 min
SO_2	SO ₂ analyzer, model T100U, Teledyne	1 min
jNO ₂	Filter Radiometer, Metcon	1 min
VOCs	GC-MS/FID, Chromatotec Group	1 h
OVOCs	Carbonyl sampler, model 8000-2, ATEC HPLC	3 h
Particle number size distribution	Scanning mobility particle sizer, TSI	5 min
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	MARGA	1 h

Table S1. The instruments and measured species or parameters in the field campaign.

Table S2. Summary of the PM_{2.5} sampling information.

•		1 0		
Date	RH	Size (cm ²)	Aerosol	Dry-state
			loading	Surface area
			(mg)	density
2020.10.07	72.34	51.6	3.33	192.52
2020.10.08	68.39	53.4	3.55	195.89
2020.10.26	78.85	53.4	4.28	119.86
2020.11.02	65.68	56.1	5.55	251.79

2020.11.03	69.82	52.51	4.40	233.81
2020.11.04	58.30	55.35	2.77	170.15
2020.11.05	76.32	53.352	1.95	134.89

166 **Reference**

165

- 167 Chu, L. and Anastasio, C.: Quantum Yields of Hydroxyl Radical and Nitrogen Dioxide
- from the Photolysis of Nitrate on Ice, Journal of Physical Chemistry A, 107, 9594–9602,
 https://doi.org/10.1021/jp0349132, 2003.
- 170 Guenther, A., Karl, T., Harley, P., Wiedinmyer, C., Palmer, P. I., and Geron, C.:
- 171 Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Estimates of global terrestrial isoprene emissions
- 172 using MEGAN (Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature), Atmos.
- 173 Chem. Phys, 6, 3181–3210, 2006.
- 174 Guenther, A. B., Jiang, X., Heald, C. L., Sakulyanontvittaya, T., Duhl, T., Emmons, L.
- 175 K., and Wang, X.: The Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature version
- 176 2.1 (MEGAN2.1): an extended and updated framework for modeling biogenic
- 177 emissions, Geosci. Model Dev, 5, 1471–1492, https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-1471178 2012, 2012.
- 179 Paulot, F., Wunch, D., Crounse, J. D., Toon, G. C., Millet, D. B., Decarlo, P. F.,
- 180 Vigouroux, C., Deutscher, N. M., Abad, G. G., Notholt, J., Warneke, T., Hannigan, J.
- 181 W., Warneke, C., De Gouw, J. A., Dunlea, E. J., De Mazière, M., Griffith, D. W. T.,
- 182 Bernath, P., Jimenez, J. L., and Wennberg, P. O.: Importance of secondary sources in
- the atmospheric budgets of formic and acetic acids, Atmos Chem Phys, 11, 1989–2013,
- 184 https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-1989-2011, 2011.
- 185 Peng, X., Wang, T., Wang, W., Ravishankara, A. R., George, C., Xia, M., Cai, M., Li,
- 186 Q., Salvador, C. M., Lau, C., Lyu, X., Poon, C. N., Mellouki, A., Mu, Y., Hallquist, M.,
- 187 Saiz-Lopez, A., Guo, H., Herrmann, H., Yu, C., Dai, J., Wang, Y., Wang, X., Yu, A.,
- 188 Leung, K., Lee, S., and Chen, J.: Photodissociation of particulate nitrate as a source of
- 189 daytime tropospheric Cl2, Nat Commun, 13, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-
- 190 28383-9, 2022.
- 191 Wolfe, G. M., Marvin, M. R., Roberts, S. J., Travis, K. R., and Liao, J.: The framework
- 192 for 0-D atmospheric modeling (F0AM) v3.1, Geosci Model Dev, 9, 3309-3319,
- 193 https://doi.org/10.5194/GMD-9-3309-2016, 2016.