

## ***Interactive comment on “Water content of aged aerosol” by G. J. Engelhart et al.***

**G. J. Engelhart et al.**

spyros@chemeng.upatras.gr

Received and published: 30 December 2010

**1.** *This paper presents measurements of aerosol water content from a dry-ambient aerosol size spectrometer (DAASS) and a quadrupole aerosol mass spectrometer (AMS) and shows comparisons of that data with EAIM-II model output. This appears to be a unique data set where the aerosol is acidic and does not completely dry as shown by the DAASS data. It is expected to have water loss as a function of decreasing relative humidity, as the particles are dried in the AMS sampling line and inlet. Yet, the particles apparently did not "completely dry" in the AMS. This is different from the pure ammonium sulfate particles in the laboratory which were completely dry after crystallization below the ERH. Hence, in the present study there is a linear relationship for this data between AMS particulate water and EAIM-II water. While the AMS can indicate relative changes in m/z 18 as a function of water content in the aerosol (and air), much or all particulate water is lost in the AMS sampling inlet and so the measured water*

C11784

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



content is not reflective of the actual amount in ambient aerosols (Matthew et al., AST, 2008). Additional laboratory experiments not described in that paper demonstrated that the amount of water lost was size dependent, with smaller particles losing more water than larger particles.

Prof. Jimenez's comment about potentially a higher RIE for water is very relevant and may be the reason for the apparent inconsistency between the "right" amount of water detected in the particles and the fact that much of the water should evaporate in the AMS inlet.

The behavior of ambient particles appears to be different than that of the laboratory ammonium sulfate tests. Water remains in these particles as they are passing through the AMS inlet. This water appears to be related to the actual water content of the particles and the relationship probably remained relatively constant during the FAME-08 study. Our explanation (discussed also in our response to the comment of Dr. Jimenez and Comment 2 of Reviewer 2) is that the evaporated fraction remained relatively constant during the study and that it was approximately equal to the inverse of the RIE of water. The constant evaporated fraction may be due to the conditions during FAME-08 (e.g., relatively constant size distribution). Even if a lot of additional work is needed both to understand and to extend these results to other cases, our study shows the potential of obtaining useful information about the aerosol water concentration from AMS measurements. We have reinforced this point in the text.

2. Another potential explanation for this discrepancy is mentioned at the bottom of page 21666: "it is possible that the standard fragmentation table employed in this analysis slightly underestimates the water ion signal arising from fragmentation of either hydrated inorganic or oxygenated organic compounds." Acidic sulfate is the largest component of the submicron aerosol in this field study and it can have a significant contribution to  $m/z$  18 due to the retention of water under lower RH by particles, as indicated by the DAASS measurements. However, when sulfate particles are analyzed

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



by the AMS, there is also signal from  $m/z$  18 due to dehydration of sulfuric acid. This effect is included in the fragmentation table. However, the actual relative contribution of  $m/z$  18 to the sulfate fragmentation pattern can be higher than the table value due to variations in the performance of the mass spectrometer, such as more efficient transmission of small ions compared to large ions. Differences in ion transmission efficiency at a function of  $m/z$  can be higher when using a quadrupole with 8 mm rods instead of 16 mm rods (the former transmits larger ions less efficiently) or by different electron multiplier detector voltages (where higher voltages can lead to higher transmission of smaller ions in the 90-degree turn between the exit of the quadrupole and the multiplier). Note that if the default ratio is used in the calculation of sulfate with the default RIE for sulfate, the correct sulfate mass loading will be calculated. However, any additional signal at  $m/z$  18 will affect the calculation of particulate water. To accurately account for the  $m/z$  18 from sulfate in the fragmentation table for this data set, the fragmentation pattern of sulfate must be measured from the difference spectra using dry particles at the same conditions of the field project.

In the absence of doing laboratory calibrations, the spectra from the driest conditions of the field study could potentially be useful. The intercept of 0.74 for Fig. 6 indicates that for this sulfate mass loading the contribution of sulfate to the  $m/z$  18 signal is significant. The ratio of the  $m/z$  18 to  $m/z$  (48+64) in the AMS mass spectra for the lowest DAASS water concentration should be input into the fragmentation table (as  $\text{frag-SO}_3[18]=\text{ratio}*\text{frag-sulphate}[48]$ ,  $\text{ratio}*\text{frag-sulphate}[64]$ ) and then the particulate water can be recalculated (but not the sulfate mass loadings because the RIE-SO<sub>4</sub> would need to be adjusted for the different fragmentation pattern). It appears that this ratio could be as high as 1.3 for this data, whereas it is 0.67 in the fragmentation table. With the new water calculation, the intercept with the DAASS data in Fig. 6 should be zero.

Unfortunately, the Q-AMS instrument used during the FAME-08 study was on loan from the Paul Scherrer Institute and has since been upgraded to a HR-ToF AMS making

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

these laboratory tests impossible on the instrument in question.

Following the second suggestion we looked at the ratio of m/z (18/(48+64)) for the FAME-08 periods when the relative humidity was less than 20 percent. As Dr. Middlebrook estimated, this value was close to 1.3. The water time series was then recalculated using this ratio and the result was that the estimated aerosol water concentration was negative 74 percent of the time and the average water concentration was also negative. This is probably due to the fact that there is water in the particles even at this low RH. This suggests that the use of the factor is problematic. This retention of water at low RH by the FAME-08 particles is consistent with the behavior of FAME-08 particles observed by the DAASS (please see Figures 4 and 8). Since the results with the 1.3 factor are clearly not acceptable we retained the use of the default 0.67 fragmentation value.

Another potential explanation of the small but non-zero intercept of 0.74 of Fig. 6 is that the DAASS measurements for aerosol water were biased a little low. This is consistent with Figure 7 (the DAASS measurements are lower than the predicted ones) for the low values. This small bias could be due for example to a delay in the evaporation of the water in the particles in the DAASS due to some unexpected resistances to mass transfer.

*3. The correlation of AMS particulate water with the EAIM-II model (shown in Figure 9 and Equation 10) is surprising and it implies the (fraction of water evaporating)x(RIE-water)=1. However, it gives the impression that the measured AMS particulate water is the same as what is modeled using EAIM-II and that aerosol water content can be quantitatively measured with the AMS. Furthermore, if RIE-water is truly 1, then there would not be any evaporation. This can easily be misinterpreted by a reader as the AMS being an accurate detector for particulate water, if all the careful wording in the text is not read or understood. It is interesting that for this dataset the water from the AMS is linearly correlated with the amount measured by the DAASS and the*

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



*predicted amount from EAII-II. Possibly the fraction of particle water that evaporated was constant if the mass distribution and composition were fairly constant. Perhaps the best way to convey the relationship of the AMS water content to the other data would be to replot the AMS particulate water in "nitrate-equivalent mass" units vs the DAASS (Fig 6) and predicted EAII-II water (replacing Fig 9). Then the slope of the second plot indicates the combined fraction evaporated and RIE-water which at this point cannot be separated. Or there could be various lines w/ RIE-water = 1, 2, and 4 that would have slopes indicating how much of the water is evaporating.*

*Unfortunately, the drying of the aerosol in the AMS sampling inlet, the high acidic sulfate content of this aerosol, and the potentially high contribution of sulfate to m/z 18 all combined to make the interpretation of the AMS data from this field project difficult for particulate water. Understanding how the sulfate fragmentation pattern and RIE-water can vary has been an ongoing subject among some AMS users, yet these details have not been relevant for the determination of sulfate mass. Since both effects only affect particulate water, which is known to partially or completely evaporate in the AMS inlet, there has been limited detailed study of these topics. With the additional complication of the water loss being size dependent, it is very surprising that the AMS particulate water would have a linear relationship with the expected water content. If all of these effects can be convincingly quantified, the AMS could turn out to be useful for understanding the water content of ambient aerosols, at least under some conditions.*

We do agree with the comment and we have strongly reinforced in the revised paper the important point that our results are consistent with [Water fraction evaporated] \* [RIE(water)]=1. As mentioned in our response to Comment 1 and also other comments, the relatively constant fraction of water that evaporated during the study could be partially due to the relatively constant shape of the aerosol size distribution during FAME-08. In the interest of keeping the paper friendly for a non-AMS trained audience we have opted not to include a plot of the AMS particulate water as nitrate-equivalent mass in the revised paper. We prefer to make this point explicitly.

ACPD

10, C11784–C11789,  
2010

---

Interactive  
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



Interactive  
Comment

It is important to note that the analysis of particulate water with the AMS is clearly complex. Our measurements suggest that there is hope in extending the use of the AMS (if the aerosol is not dried) to the measurement of aerosol water concentrations. At least for the conditions of this field study the AMS provided valuable information. We hope that this paper will motivate additional work both in the laboratory and in the field to pursue an issue that has been considered a lost cause. We have summarized this discussion in the end of the revised paper.

---

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 10, 21653, 2010.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)