

Interactive  
Comment

***Interactive comment on* “Laboratory study on new particle formation from the reaction OH + SO<sub>2</sub>: influence of experimental conditions, H<sub>2</sub>O vapour, NH<sub>3</sub> and the amine tert-butylamine on the overall process” by T. Berndt et al.**

**T. Berndt et al.**

berndt@tropos.de

Received and published: 15 June 2010

The authors thank this reviewer for the constructive comments.

Referee 1:

Specific (major) comments: 1.) The authors explain the apparent discrepancy between lab and atmospheric measurements with the counting efficiency of the particle detectors and the limited residence time of the experiments (and not with the possible role of HSO<sub>5</sub> products in the nucleation process as suggested before). If this is the case, what

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

is the explanation for the suppression of the particle formation with addition of NO as presented in Berndt et al (2008)? The particle formation for constant SA was reduced by 3 orders of magnitude by addition of nitrogen oxide ( $\text{NO} = 3.1 \times 10^{12} \text{ molecule cm}^{-3}$ ). This effect is much larger than the effect related to the addition of  $\text{NH}_3$  presented here (one order of magnitude) and needs clearly more attention in the current manuscript! Further, how reliable is the calculation of the sulfuric acid concentration in the nucleation zone of the flow reactor? In a recent paper by Sorokin (ACP 2010) other channels for the formation of sulfuric acid from the UV light induced  $\text{SO}_2$  oxidation have been presented. In addition there exists a discrepancy between measured and calculated sulfuric acid concentration (Fig 1 and the cited Figs S1 (Sipila, Berndt et al.)) and between the theoretical and measured wall loss of sulfuric acid (Fig S3 (Sipila, Berndt et al.)). Together with the (so far) unexplained  $\text{NO}_x$  dependency mentioned above this could point to a systematic uncertainty in the data! P 6458 line 10-26: In this respect the discussion on the deviation between the measured and modeled  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  concentration needs a significant improvement! Previously a second order loss process was suggested to explain this deviation ( $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  dimer formation as observed in the CIMS, (Sipila, Berndt et al.))? From the discussion here, it is not clear if the loss is first or second order and/or if the discrepancy could be simply explained by aerosol formation? Since the particle size distribution was measured and hence the aerosol mass is known this needs to be quantified! P6458, line 16: reformulate and clarify the sentence! "This step has to be of an order higher than 1". P 6458 line 23-26: the paragraph could be omitted since it is simply a repetition of text above P6457 line 2: For each experiment the effective photolysis rate was adjusted to fit the measured  $\text{O}_3$  decay. Why? (Instability of the UV-lamps or could this point to an uncertainty in the assumed reaction mechanism?) P6454 line 1: How are the measurements performed in case of lowest flow rates? The total sample flow of the CIMS + 3 CPC +  $\text{O}_3/\text{SO}_2$  analyzer is certainly higher than 3.3 or 11 L/min!?

Reply: In Berndt et al., ACP 2008, the old idea dating from the eighties was discussed that  $\text{HSO}_5$  as an intermediate from OH initiated  $\text{SO}_2$  oxidation could trigger new par-

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

Interactive  
Comment

ticle formation. The experimental finding that high NO concentrations can suppress nucleation was taken as an argument supporting the potential role of HSO<sub>5</sub>. Recently, experiments using high efficiency particle counters with simultaneous H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> measurements showed that there exists no clear discrepancy between a point H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> source (liquid) and continuous H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> formation via OH+SO<sub>2</sub> pushing back the importance of HSO<sub>5</sub> for nucleation. The critical points are obviously the different profiles in the tube in connection with significant wall losses and the efficiency of the growth process, cf. Sipilä et al., Science 2010. It remains speculative what's the reason for the observed NO effect is. Unfortunately, in these experiments H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> was not measured directly, the acid was determined from titrated OH and known concentrations of SO<sub>2</sub>. The paper by Sorokin, ACP 2010, deals with possible, additional pathways for H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> caused by UV irradiation as used in the photolysis experiments. A couple of photo-induced reactions are discussed, but their relevance for the resulting H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> concentration is highly uncertain. If correctly understood, the final conclusion of this paper is that additional H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> arising from excited O<sub>2</sub> cannot represent more than the "normal" H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> concentration produced via OH+SO<sub>2</sub>. The good agreement between measured H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and modelled H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> (using OH chemistry) at the output of the flow tube supports the fact that OH chemistry is dominating. Differences at higher H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> concentrations can be explained by cluster/particle formation consuming H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. From our view point, generally, the agreement between the H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> measurements and the results of modelling do not point at other, significant H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> sources not accounted for in the model (beyond the stated uncertainty for H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>). Starting for H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> concentrations of (3-5) 10<sup>(7)</sup> cm<sup>(-3)</sup> the measurements show lower concentrations as expected from the model. That's the range where cluster/particle formation becomes important representing a significant sink for H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> beside the wall loss. Initially, the curvature can be described by a 2nd order process. With further increasing H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> concentration, the H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>-consuming processes gain importance and the overall process seems to have an order higher than 2. That's why it was stated "higher than 1". This topic will be explained more in detail. The daily measurement of O<sub>3</sub> photolysis rate is merely

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

a check for the performance of the OH production. As a result we found that the UV lamps are really stable! CI-MS measurements were possible only for a total flow of 1 l/min. or higher. If the needed gas flow by the analyzers was higher than the carrier flow, the analyzers were connected to the tube one-by-one. We applied no dilution techniques.

Referee 1:

2.) The quality of the gas phase measurements of ammonia as well as organics using GC and PTRMS are not convincing. More details of the measurements are needed! P6453 line 13: “stated” detection limit. The real detection limit might differ significantly from a detection limit “stated” in the manufactures manual. Wasn’t the instrument properly calibrated and characterized? P6459 line 25: “high sensitivity” PTRMS: Details of the measurements are unclear e.g. the sensitivity/ limit of the detection. As I understood, only carrier measurements were performed. However a major source of contamination might be the water (see below) and/or O<sub>3</sub> generator. Thus measurements should be performed at different humidity’s, O<sub>3</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub> and CO concentrations. For a proper setup of the “high sensitivity” PTRMS operation please see (de Gouw and Warneke 2007). In my point of view the comparison of the carrier gas with a zero air generator (which was obviously not properly working) is nonsense (as described in (Sipila, Berndt et al.)).

Reply: The performance of TGA 310, OMNISENS, was controlled using a NIST NH<sub>3</sub> standard. Simultaneously, NH<sub>3</sub> concentrations were measured by long-path UV absorption confirming the certification of the standard. There were no indications that the TGA 310 was out of range of factory settings. The detection limit of on-line GC-FID with a cryo-enrichment was determined using known concentrations of 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene (C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>12</sub>) and furan (C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>4</sub>O). PTR-MS measurements have been done using the pure carrier gas as well as in the presence of H<sub>2</sub>O and the trace gases. There were no clear hints for the occurrence of organic contamination. Therefore, a limit for organics of a few 10(9) cm<sup>-3</sup> should be a conservative value.

Referee 1:

3.) Section 3.5.2 and Fig 7: Particle growth. This section needs more explanation. In a recent paper from Kulmala's group (Nieminen et al., 2010) the theory of particle growth from condensation of H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> at different relative humidity's is discussed. While the particle growth at 22% seems to be in accordance with the theory the growth at higher humidity's is much larger than expected from the theory. This points towards the presence of additional condensing vapors at high humidity's and needs to be clarified.

Reply: We agree that water alone is possibly not enough to explain the behavior found. The observed enhancement of growth is more than expected assuming collision limited growth by H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> with a few co-condensing water molecules per H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> molecule. Explanation for this strong enhancement is still unclear and we cannot exclude the possibility that additional condensing vapors were present in the humidified gas. This point will be discussed in the revised manuscript also with respect to the r.h. dependence of nucleation.

Referee 1:

4.) 3.6.1 Ammonia: The results are only discussed with respect to previous lab experiments. I'm a bit surprised that the discrepancy between the new results and theoretical considerations of binary H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>/H<sub>2</sub>O and ternary H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>-H<sub>2</sub>O-NH<sub>3</sub> are not mentioned at all in the manuscript. Especially the fact that existing ternary nucleation theories predict the highest sensitivity to changes in ammonia at concentration levels of a few ppt (e.g Merikanto et al., 2007). In a study by Zhang (Zhang, Wang et al. 2009) no enhancement of the particle growth due to ammonia was observed. This was explained with the larger density of ammonium sulphate compared to sulphuric acid and thus "its formation does not necessarily contribute to a net increase in the particle size". This discrepancy should be discussed in the manuscript.

Reply: In Introduction the clearly different predictions from theoretical considerations regarding ternary H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>/H<sub>2</sub>O/NH<sub>3</sub> nucleation are given. "... theoretical studies pro-

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

posed that atmospheric mixing ratios of NH<sub>3</sub> at pptv-level can stabilize the critical cluster (Coffman and Hegg, 1995, Korhonen et al., 1999). ... . More recently, a re-evaluation at theoretical level shows that even a mixing ratio of 1 - 10 ppbv NH<sub>3</sub> is not able to trigger nucleation at 295 K unless the H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> concentration accounts for at least 109 molecule cm<sup>-3</sup> (Merikanto et al., 2007).” In the discussion of the results we focussed on a comparison with other experimental work, especially with Benson, et al. 2009. We agree with the referee, that also in this section a comparison with theoretical studies should be dealt with. It should be noted that our experimental findings are closer to predictions by Merikanto et al., 2007, than in earlier work. In the revised version this topic will be discussed. Zhang et al., PNAS 2009, studied the process of particle growth of produced 3 – 30 nm particles in the presence of 3 x 10<sup>(14)</sup> cm<sup>(-3)</sup> of NH<sub>3</sub> by means of a T-DMA. In our study we observed in a nucleation/growth experiment an overall enhancing effect of NH<sub>3</sub>. Nothing changed in the text.

Referee 1:

5.) 3.6.2 Amines: The results are clearly preliminary. But if presented, at least the effect on the cluster composition (number of H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and amines per cluster) should be discussed. Further the discussion of the nucleation enhancement of amines should be extended. It was stated that: “the enhancing effect for nucleation and particle growth was found to be much stronger.” Please give some numbers (enhancement factors).

Reply: The referee is right that this interesting topic deserves closer attention. Therefore, in addition to the data presented up to now, we will show in the revised manuscript also data for r.h. = 13%. In a new figure showing particle number vs. amine(NH<sub>3</sub>) concentration, the enhancing effects of tert-butylamine and NH<sub>3</sub> are compared. The figure also gives a good impression concerning the magnitude of the enhancement factors. In the text this topic will be discussed more in detail.

Technical corrections: In the revised manuscript the typos will be eliminated and an additional reference will be included according to referee’s suggestions.

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

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

