

## **Response\_acpd-15-C10529-2015:**

We thank the referee for the constructive critical review, our response and changes are listed as follows:

### **General comments:**

1. Throughout, PTR-MS (and PTR-ToF-MS) measurements of MVK and methacrolein (MACR) are used. There is a known interference in the MVK+MACR detection caused by ISOPOOH (Rivera-Rios et al., 2014). This could especially impact the observed diurnal cycle in Fig. 5h, given the timing of ISOPOOH growth shown in Fig. 8. Has this interference been accounted for (I don't see any mention in the text). If not, it should at least be discussed, but better yet would be to present a range for the measurements, with different assumptions about how strong the interference is.

Response:

This is a very good comment, thanks for pointing this out. To evaluate the interference of ISOPOOH on MVK+MACR, we carried out laboratory experiment to quantify its conversion rate. See Supplement Sect. 2 for detailed descriptions. We added a discussion about the interference of ISOPOOH on MVK+MACR in Sect. 5.

Changes:

Line 325-370 are added.

2. There is some focus in the text and the analysis on O<sub>3</sub>, but this comes as a bit of a shock because it is not mentioned in the title, abstract, introduction, or conclusions. Why not? If the ozone budget analysis stays in the paper, it should at least be mentioned in the abstract, introduction and conclusions. Ideally, it would be nice if its inclusion were more closely tied to the isoprene work. As it stands now, the relevant text/figure just seem unrelated to the rest of the paper but nonetheless interesting).

Response:

Discussions on ozone analysis are added to the abstract, introduction, and conclusion.

Changes:

Line 15, 654 are added.

3. NO<sub>x</sub> flux and ISOPN yields. The different values used (NO<sub>x</sub> flux 5-30, yield 6-12%) represent a very large range, and there needs to be more discussion of this in the text. In particular, I think Fig. S8 should be brought into the main text, and also made easier to read/interpret (i.e., how about solid/dashed/dotted to represent one parameter and colors to represent the other). The figure neatly shows that for most species (exception ISOPN), the choice of parameter has a smaller impact on the simulation than the existing measurement uncertainty. For ISOPN, a more nuanced discussion is also needed. The ISOPN yield used here is on the extreme low end of the range found by Xiong et al. (2015), and much lower than used in the GEOS-Chem simulation that theoretically provides the basis for this model(Mao et al., 2013). Both Xiong et al. (2015) and Wolfe et al. (2015) found an extra ISOPN sink was needed (although disagree on what that might be). A higher yield(and possible extra sink) here would make this work more consistent with the recent literature. I also think it would make this work more self consistent – if the simulation is overestimating peak NO at 7am, surely ISOPN should also be overestimated at the same time – as seen in the simulations run with 9-12% yield.

Response:

We merged Figure S8 to Figure 5 as suggested. We also added comparison of HCHO to Figure 5, which is recommended by the other reviewer. We didn't use different color/line style combination to distinguish the sensitivity analyses results because most of the lines are very close with each other, doing so will make it harder to tell the lines from each other.

**Specific comments:**

1.

31625, final paragraph: These details about terminology don't seem relevant to the introduction. To some extent, NO:HO<sub>2</sub> is just another metric with arbitrary "low" and "high" values (beyond the "balanced situation at 1). Where do you draw the line? I understand why this is a more useful metric, but I don't think it's clear or relevant yet at this stage in the paper, and I suggest moving this discussion to the section where it is actually used (6.4). Also, I don't understand what is meant by the sentence "Second, HO<sub>2</sub>, RO<sub>2</sub>, ... are not explicitly represented..." You mean, just in the nomenclature? They are still influencing what happens in different regimes.

Response/Changes:

We moved this discussion to Sect. 6.4. In “Second, HO<sub>2</sub>, RO<sub>2</sub>, ... are not explicitly represented...”, we mean in the nomenclature. We deleted this sentence due to its ambiguity nature.

2.

31629, 23-25: As written this is somewhat misleading because Fig. S1 only shows profiles for 1 day. If this day is representative of other days this should be mentioned at least in the figure caption.

Response/Changes:

We added vertical profiles collected on 2013-6-4, 2013-6-12, and 2013-6-13 to Figure S1. The data show that the CBL was well-mixed during these sampling days. These vertical profiles are representative of the other days during this study and this is added in the figure caption.

3.

31630, 18-19: Derived from where? From observations or from an external model?

Response:

Large-scale meteorological forcings were estimated based on both observation and reanalysis models.

Changes:

None.

4.

31630, 19: What is meant by “species segregation” here?

Response:

The mixed-layer model used in this study assumes the CBL is well mixed. However, in reality, the turbulent mixing may not be able to mix the emitted VOC species uniformly inside the CBL. This may create sub-region where the VOC species are non-uniformly distributed.

Changes:

None.

5.

31631, 1-5: This is one place where more information is needed to understand what was done. Looking at Fig. S2, it's clear why the 7th wasn't included, but less clear what is wrong with the 9th. What does "consistency of O<sub>3</sub>-NO<sub>x</sub>-VOC diurnal profiles" mean, and how was that determined? How much tolerance was allowed?

Response:

We updated Figure S2 and added O<sub>3</sub> mixing ratio profiles. We added specific metrics which we used to choose the sampling days used in this study.

Changes:

Line 240-244.

6.

31632, 2: "depending on different conditions" is too vague – what were the most important factors influencing this?

Response:

We revised this and added detailed factors (meteorological condition, e.g., rain) to the main text.



Changes:

Line 266.

7.

31632, 7-22: NO<sub>x</sub> flux is assumed to be entirely from soil. Is there no influence from nearby anthropogenic areas? Could anthropogenic sources help explain why you need a larger NO<sub>x</sub> flux later on when you included more detailed chemistry?

Response:

In this study the sampling area is under fair anthropogenic influence. In the prescribed NO<sub>x</sub> flux, source is not simulated explicitly. The higher NO<sub>x</sub> flux used in the complex scheme could be partly attributed to anthropogenic source.

Changes:

None.

8.

31632, 24 – 31633, 7: This paragraph starts by saying \*both\* chemical schemes are a subset from MOZART, but then goes on to say the second one is actually from GEOSChem (which is a separate model) – that first statement needs to be removed.

Response:

The O<sub>3</sub>-NO<sub>x</sub>-HO<sub>x</sub> chemistry in both chemical schemes are obtained from the MOZART chemistry module. In the complex scheme, we extended its chemistry with a subset from the GEOS-Chem (isoprene chemistry). So the complex scheme is a combination of a subset of MOZART (O<sub>3</sub>-NO<sub>x</sub>-HO<sub>x</sub> chemistry) and a subset of GEOS-Chem (updated isoprene chemistry).

Changes:

Line 289, 294.

9.

31633, 10-16: Is this meant to be a list of things that characterise the complex scheme in GEOS-Chem v9-02, or things that are different between this implementation and the version in GEOS-Chem? If the former, 3 isn't right, because Mao et al. (2013) do include isoprene + NO<sub>3</sub> reaction. If the latter, this should be rewritten to clarify what is meant here.

Response:

Here item 1, 2 are the same as in GEOS-Chem; item 3, and 4 are different from GEOS-Chem.

Changes:

Line 300-305.

10.

31633, 25-26: Rather than R09, etc. it would be much clearer to list the actual species (especially since this table is in the SI, not in the main text!).

Response:

We added the three species involved in the photolysis reactions to the main text.

Changes:

Line 313-314.

11.

31633, 26: I don't understand the reference to Fig. S6 here – S6 only shows O<sub>3</sub>, which is not one of the species outside the 20% range.

Response:

This is a typo here. “Figure S6” should be in “The relationship between solar zenith angle (sza) and photolysis rates (j) are obtained by performing curve fitting to an empirical function  $j = a \times \exp(b / \cos(\text{sza}))$ , where a and b are two parameters obtained through curve fitting (Table S4 and Figure S6).” to show an example of the curve fitting result.

Changes:

We moved the reference to “Figure S6” to the sentence shown above.

12.

Section 4: Seems like this belongs right after the Experimental section (so it would be 2. Experimental, 3. Data Processing, 4. Mixed Layer Chemistry Model)

Response:

We moved the Data processing to Section 3 as recommended.

13.

31636, 18-19: Need to clarify that these profiles are from a different date and location! There are various things that could influence the changes seen in these profiles besides just the time difference. While the time difference is a compelling factor, it is highly misleading to imply (as is done in the text) that this is only showing diurnal variation. I think this point should also be made in the caption to Fig. 5.

Response:

We added clarifications about the fact that these profiles are from different days and different locations.

Changes:

Line 394-397. Page 30 Figure 5.

14.

31636, 24-26: Presumably this is the combination of the mixing (mentioned) and OH oxidation (not mentioned)?

Response/Changes:

We added OH oxidation as a factor to the text at Line 394.

15.

31637, 19-21: Another place where it is not clear what was actually done. How were these variables adjusted? Was it ad hoc to get the best fit to BLH growth rate? Given Table 2 shows an observed value for the BL potential temperature, can I assume it's actually just the FT potential temperature that was adjusted?

Response:

BL potential temperature is obtained from measurement. FT potential temperature was adjusted to get the best fit of BLH.

Changes:

None.

16.

31639, 9: "faster photolysis rates" than what? How much faster? How small was the impact?

Response:

We added the photolysis rates for MVKN and MARCN in the text. We also added the change in different photolysis rates of MVKN and MARCN.

Line 464-466.

17.

31641, 16-20: Another place where more detail is needed. Are these using observed or modeled values? How are Sprod and Sloss calculated? What is S's versus S'h? This is an important result so needs more basis.

Response:

We re-write the eqn 1 to make it easier to understand.

Changes:

Line 534-540.

18.

31642, 1: How is the 6% loss to ozone calculated? Is this from the model?

Response:

This result is obtained from the model output.

Changes:

None.

19.

31642, 28: If the chemistry term is mainly controlled by O<sub>3</sub> photolysis, why is it net positive? What is the role of isoprene chemistry in this (nominally the topic of the paper)?

Response:

(1) There is a typo here, the chemistry term is mainly controlled by photolysis of the O<sub>3</sub>-NO<sub>x</sub> system. Positive O<sub>3</sub> is sustained by the photolysis of NO<sub>2</sub>.

(2) As stated in the previous comment, ozonolysis of isoprene plays a small part (6%) as compared with OH. O<sub>3</sub> mainly affect isoprene chemistry indirectly through the O<sub>3</sub>-NO<sub>x</sub>-HO<sub>x</sub> system, where NO<sub>x</sub> and HO<sub>x</sub> have more impact on the isoprene concentration.

Changes:

Line 568.

20.

31643, 2-3: Does the inverse relationship between deposition & chemistry simply reflect the fact that if more is produced near the surface, more will be deposited?

Response:

According to the deposition term  $V_d \langle S \rangle$  in the updated version of eqn 1, higher  $\langle S \rangle$  will induce higher deposition. However, production rate is not linearly correlated with the mixing ratio (turbulent mixing also play a part in affecting the variation of mixing ratio).

Changes:

None.

21.

31643, 10-14: For this discussion it would be really useful to refer to the diurnal cycle in Fig. 8. It would also be useful if the NO:HO<sub>2</sub> line in Fig. 8 was on a log scale.

Response:

We added reference of Figure 8 to this part. We changed the x-axis of Figure 8 to log-scale. However, we think changing to log-scale will make it harder to interpret since all other three

variables are still in linear-scale. We will leave this to editor/reviewer to decide which version is better.

22.

31643, 22-23 & Fig. 7: Another place where more detail is needed. How is Fig. 7 calculated? Is this based on the diurnal cycle plots, pulling out values at appropriate ratios (and if so, with what temporal resolution?)? Or is this several runs of the model, at different fixed NO:HO<sub>2</sub> ratios? Or something else? On the figure, the x-axis should be clearly marked as starting at 1 (it looks like 0 which begs the question as to why there is any NO contribution at all). It would be nice to see a zoomed in version from e.g. 0-10, since this is where the behavior is actually changing.

Response:

Figure 7 is obtained from the output of a single model run of the MXLCH with complex scheme (Yield<sub>ISOPN</sub>=6%, F<sub>NOx</sub>=+/-30 ppbv m s<sup>-1</sup>).

Changes:

We added detailed description of the data source in the caption of Figure 7. x-axis is changed to log-scale to make it easier to read.

23.

31644, 1: Why is CH<sub>3</sub>(O)OO the dominant candidate? Is that just an output from the model, or something expected from literature?

Response:

There is a typo in the manuscript as pointed out by the other reviewer. CH<sub>3</sub>(O)OO should be CH<sub>3</sub>C(O)OO for acetyl peroxy radical. This result is based on the model output. There is still large uncertainty in the RO<sub>2</sub> channel as the fate of ISOP<sub>2</sub>OO in the literature.

24.

31644, 6-7: Biggest difference is in the role of isomerisation. Are they both using the same isomerisation rate from Crounse? Should be specified.

Response:

Both study used the isomerization rate coefficient from Crounse et al, 2011.

Changes:

We added the reference to the isomerization rate coefficient in the text at Line 607-608.

25.

31644, 10-24: What is the dependence in this paragraph of the results on the choice of yield? Would a higher yield (see earlier comments) change the results?

Response:

Sensitivity simulations on two other different ISOPN yields at 9 and 12% overestimate the ISOPN mixing ratios by 30 and 70 %, respectively at 10:00 CST (Figure 5f).

26.

31645, 22-24: This is true for isoprene, but not for monoterpenes (which are included in this sentence) – at least not consistent with the monoterpenes profile in Fig. 3.

Response:

Vertical profile of monoterpenes in Figure 3 during 10:06 CST show a mixing ratio of 0.50 ppbv near the surface, and 0.20 ppbv near the top of the CBL. We think this should be qualified as a gradient. The x-scale in Figure 3c does make the gradient seem insignificant, we added the mixing ratios listed above to the text in Sect. 5 to make it clear.



Changes:

We added the mixing ratios of monoterpenes during 10:06 CST in Sect. 5.

27.

Acknowledgements: Seems like a lot of the modeling relies on mechanisms made publicly available by the GEOS-Chem and MOZART groups – worth an acknowledgement perhaps?

Response:

We agree with the reviewer and added the acknowledgement as suggested.

28.

Fig. 5: Need to make it clear that the “diurnal” variation measured from the WASP system represents different days / flights. I know this is stated elsewhere, but it needs to be made explicit here for those who don’t do a careful reading. I don’t think it’s a problem, but there are other things besides diurnal variation going on for those species and readers need to be aware of that.

Response:

We agree with the reviewer and made changes accordingly.

Changes:

We added to the caption of Figure 5 with the information saying that the WASP data are from different days/RFs.

#### **Technical corrections**

Response:

Corrected as suggested.

## Response\_acpd-15-C11186-2016:

We thank the referee for the constructive critical review, our responses and changes are listed as follows:

### General comments:

1. Figure 3 suggests strong gradient of isoprene at noontime, from 4 ppbv at 200 m to 1 ppbv at 1200 m. While the MXLCH model agrees well with averaged values from WASP system and NCAR C-130 aircraft (Figure 5), the comparison for ISOPN, NO<sub>x</sub>, and OH is in fact between surface observations on the tower and modeled bulk values within the whole CBL. I would expect some difference between surface observations and modeled bulk values for these species. Some caveats should be given here on comparing these species.

### Response:

We are aware of the fact that when comparing ground-based measurement with the model bulk values, one should expect to see some difference. The difference, however, depends on the chemical lifetime of the species as well as the turbulent mixing time scale. For species with chemical lifetime comparable to turbulent mixing time scale (e.g., O<sub>3</sub>), aircraft observations are within the uncertainty range of ground-based observation (Figure 5a). For species with shorter chemical lifetime (e.g., NO<sub>x</sub>, HO<sub>x</sub>), there are larger deviations between ground-based and aircraft observations. The MXLCH output using the complex chemical scheme agrees better with the aircraft observation for NO<sub>2</sub> (Figure 5c). Ground-based observation of OH concentration show large variations due to its short lifetime inside the CBL. Model output agrees well with the observation during noontime, relatively large deviation still exists during early morning. For ISOPN, please see the response in the next comment.

### Changes:

Line 434-436. We added a sentence to stress the fact that ground-based observations are used in comparison with the model bulk output.

2. I am impressed by the good agreement between observed and modeled ISOPN. But I think the authors should provide more details on this comparison.

For observations, what is the observed ISOPN? Does it include all daytime C5 hydroxyl isoprene nitrates? Or just some isomers? Is there any nighttime isoprene nitrates being measured here?

For model, the authors show a short lifetime of ISOPN, but it seems to me that it is mainly due to a fast ozonolysis rate, which has been suggested to be much slower from recent lab data. How would that impact their results? There has been discussion on hydrolysis of ISOPN. Did the authors see any evidence of that? How would change their results?

Response:

The good agreement of ISOPN between observation and model outputs is obtained by picking the best fit out of a series of sensitivity runs (Figure 5). The original sensitivity analysis results were shown in Figure S8 in the supplement material. We have merged Figure S8 to Figure 5 in the main text, and expanded the discussion on this per the suggestion of the other referee. The ISOPN concentration show very large variations depending on the ISOPN yield (6 to 9%) and NO<sub>x</sub> fluxes (5 to 30 pptv m s<sup>-1</sup>).

For observations, 4,3- ISOPN and 1,4- ISOPN (a mixture of trans- and cis-1,4- ISOPN) were used to calibrate the CIMS. A diurnal average of the changing ISOPN isomer distribution (Fig. S9, obtained from Xiong et al., 2015) was estimated and applied to calibrate ISOPN data for each individual day.




Figure S9. Simulated diurnal IN isomer distribution during SOAS.

For model, applying updated ozonolysis rate for  $\delta$ -ISOPN ( $2.8 \times 10^{-17} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molec.}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) and  $\beta$ -ISOPN ( $3.8 \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molec.}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) (Lee et al., 2014) will cause the model to overestimate ISOPN concentration by 27-56% during 12:00-16:00 CST with  $\text{Yield}_{\text{ISOPN}}=6\%$  and  $F_{\text{NOx}}=30 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$ . Aerosol-gas phase chemistry is not implemented in MXLCH, thus we are unable to quantify the influence of hydrolysis on ISOPN. Since ISOPN hydrolysis removes NO<sub>x</sub> from the CBL, we would expect a decrease of NO<sub>x</sub> concentration if this process was implemented.

Changes:

Line 516-519. The discussions above are added to the main text.

3. It seems to me that comparison of HCHO should be included in Figure 5, if possible. Also I don't see observed HO<sub>2</sub> in Figure 5. It would make sense to make sure that modeled HO<sub>2</sub> is in the right range, before the discussion of NO:HO<sub>2</sub> in the following sections.

Response:

We added HCHO data to the discussion.

HO<sub>2</sub> measurements during our selected study time period are not available due to instrument interference. HO<sub>2</sub> concentration measured on 2013-06-25 (with similar meteorological conditions as the selected days) is  $\sim 1.0 \times 10^9$  molec. cm<sup>-3</sup>. The HO<sub>2</sub> concentration from the MXLCH complex scheme is  $\sim 7.0 \times 10^8$  molec. cm<sup>-3</sup> during the same time period, which is 30% less than the observation.

Changes:

Line 480-481. We added the HO<sub>2</sub> comparison to the main text.

4. In Equation 1, what is the role of advection here? Given the lifetime of ozone, I would expect advection plays a role in its budget. This should be discussed and quantified in the text.

Response:

Advection is not implemented for chemical species in MXLCH. This may be added in future versions to account for the impact from advection process.

Changes:

None.

**Minor comments:**

1. Page 31624 Line 11: "Six isomeric hydroxyl-substituted isoprene peroxy radicals (HOC<sub>5</sub>H<sub>8</sub>OO; ISOPOO) are then produced." There are minor channels that not considered in current mechanisms. I wouldn't use six here.

Response:

Line 33. We updated the number of pathways to eight according to Orlando et al., 2012.

2. "model outputs generally agree with observations of OH concentration during noontime (Shirley et al., 2006; Hofzumahaus et al., 2009)." Please read the cited papers and check your statement.

Response:

We changed the text to "model outputs generally agree with observations of OH concentration during noontime (Shirley et al., 2006)."

3. Page 31641, Line 4: "The ISOPN yield in the complex scheme is set at 6 %, which is within the range of the results from the chamber experiments (93%) carried out at the SEARCH site (Xiong et al., 2015)." But it appears that the authors use 12% in Table S3. Please clarify this.

Response:

Thanks for pointing this one out. As suggested by the other referee, we decide to expand the discussion on the sensitivity analysis under different ISOPN yields in the main text. Thus we decide to keep the 12% ISOPN yield in Table S3. We added a note in Table S3 to indicate that the stoichiometric coefficient in the reaction equation is for 12% ISOPN yield.

4. Figure 7, it should be "CH<sub>3</sub>C(O)OO" not "CH<sub>3</sub>(O)OO".

Response:

Thanks a lot for pointing this one out. We corrected this in the main text and Figure legend.

5. Page 31645, Line 4, "One possible explanation of the large discrepancy between model output and observation is the partitioning of ISOP<sub>2</sub>OOH to aerosol phase due to its lower vapour pressure and potentially high condensed phase reactivity (Rivera-Rios et al., 2014)." It seems very unlikely that this discrepancy is due to the partitioning.

Response:

Line 631-632. We revised this in the main text.

## References

Lance Lee, Alex P. Teng, Paul O. Wennberg, John D. Crounse, and Ronald C. Cohen: On Rates and Mechanisms of OH and O<sub>3</sub> Reactions with Isoprene-Derived Hydroxy Nitrates, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A* 2014 118 (9), 1622-1637, DOI: 10.1021/jp4107603

Orlando, J. J., and Tyndall, G. S.: Laboratory studies of organic peroxy radical chemistry: an overview with emphasis on recent issues of atmospheric significance, *Chemical Society Reviews*, 41, 6294-6317, 2012.

Xiong, F., McAvey, K. M., Pratt, K. A., Groff, C. J., Hostetler, M. A., Lipton, M. A., Starn, T. K., Seeley, J. V., Bertman, S. B., Teng, A. P., Crounse, J. D., Nguyen, T. B., Wennberg, P. O., Misztal, P. K., Goldstein, A. H., Guenther, A. B., Koss, A. R., Olson, K. F., de Gouw, J. A., Baumann, K., Edgerton, E. S., Feiner, P. A., Zhang, L., Miller, D. O., Brune, W. H., and Shepson, P. B.: Observation of isoprene hydroxynitrates in the southeastern United States and implications for the fate of NO<sub>x</sub>, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 11257-11272, doi:10.5194/acp-15-11257-2015, 2015.

# Understanding isoprene photo-oxidation using observations and modelling over a subtropical forest in the Southeast US

L. Su<sup>1</sup>, E. G. Patton<sup>2</sup>, J. Vilà-Guerau de Arellano<sup>3</sup>, A. B. Guenther<sup>4</sup>, L. Kaser<sup>5</sup>, B. Yuan<sup>6,7</sup>, F. Xiong<sup>8</sup>, P. B. Shepson<sup>8,9</sup>, L. Zhang<sup>10</sup>, D. O. Miller<sup>10</sup>, W. H. Brune<sup>10</sup>, K. Baumann<sup>11</sup>, E. Edgerton<sup>11</sup>, A. Weinheimer<sup>5</sup>, P. K. Misztal<sup>12</sup>, J.-H. Park<sup>13</sup>, A. H. Goldstein<sup>12,14</sup>, K. M. Skog<sup>15</sup>, F. N. Keutsch<sup>16,17</sup>, and J. E. Mak<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, USA

<sup>2</sup>Mesoscale and Microscale Meteorology Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA

<sup>3</sup>Meteorology and Air Quality Section, Wageningen University and Research Center, Wageningen, the Netherlands

<sup>4</sup>Department of Earth System Science, University of California, Irvine, CA

<sup>5</sup>Atmospheric Chemistry Observations & Modeling Laboratory, National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO, USA

<sup>6</sup>Earth System Research Laboratory, Chemical Sciences Division, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Boulder, CO, USA

<sup>7</sup>Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO, USA

<sup>8</sup>Department of Chemistry, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA

<sup>9</sup>Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, USA

<sup>10</sup>Department of Meteorology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA

<sup>11</sup>Atmospheric Research and Analysis Inc., Cary, NC, USA

<sup>12</sup>Department of Environmental Science, Policy, & Management, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

<sup>13</sup>Climate and Air Quality Research Department, National Institute of Environmental Research, Incheon, Republic of Korea

<sup>14</sup>Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

<sup>15</sup>Department of Chemistry, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA

<sup>16</sup>School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

<sup>17</sup>Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

*Correspondence to:* J. E. Mak (john.mak@stonybrook.edu)

**Abstract.** The emission, dispersion and photochemistry of isoprene (C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>8</sub>) and related chemical species in the convective boundary layer (CBL) during sunlit daytime was studied over a mixed forest in the Southeast United States by combining ground-based and aircraft observations. Fluxes of isoprene and monoterpenes were quantified at the top of the forest canopy using a high resolution Proton Transfer Reaction Time of Flight Mass Spectrometer (PTR-TOF-MS). Snapshot (~2 min sampling



duration) vertical profiles of isoprene, methyl vinyl ketone (MVK) + methacrolein (MACR), and monoterpenes were collected from aircraft every hour in the CBL (100–1000 m). Both ground-based and airborne collected volatile organic compound (VOC) data are used to constrain the initial conditions of a mixed layer chemistry model (MXLCH), which is applied to examine the chemical evolution of the  $O_3$ - $NO_x$ - $HO_x$ -VOC system and how it is affected by boundary layer dynamics in the CBL. The chemical loss rate of isoprene ( $\sim 1$  h) is similar to the turbulent mixing time scale (0.1–0.5 h), which indicates that isoprene concentrations are equally dependent on both photo-oxidation and boundary layer dynamics. Analysis of a model-derived concentration budget suggests that diurnal evolution of isoprene inside the CBL is mainly controlled by surface emissions and chemical loss; [the diurnal evolution of  \$O\_3\$  is dominated by entrainment](#). The NO to  $HO_2$  ratio ( $NO:HO_2$ ) is used as an indicator of anthropogenic impact on the CBL chemical composition, and spans a wide range (1–163). The fate of hydroxyl-substituted isoprene peroxy radical ( $HOC_5H_8OO\cdot$ ; ISOPOO) is strongly affected by  $NO:HO_2$ , shifting from NO-dominant to NO- $HO_2$ -balanced condition from early morning to noontime. This chemical regime change is reflected in the diurnal evolution of isoprene hydroxynitrates (ISOPN) and isoprene hydroxy hydroperoxides (ISOPOOH).

## 1 Introduction

Isoprene ( $C_5H_8$ ) from biogenic emissions is the most abundant non-methane volatile organic compound (VOC) in the atmosphere (Guenther et al., 1995). Once emitted, the distribution of isoprene within the convective CBL is controlled via both photochemical oxidation and turbulent mixing. VOC emissions from forests have been studied extensively for more than 20 years (Guenther et al., 1991). More recent work has expanded the focus from emissions to impacts on regional forest chemistry (Kim et al., 2010; Karl et al., 2013; Park et al., 2013). These advances have exposed large uncertainties and unknown mechanisms in both chemistry and dynamics.

Isoprene chemistry over tropical forests has also been studied due to its influence on tropospheric chemistry through high emission (Karl et al., 2007) and proposed impact on OH recycling mechanisms under low- $NO_x$  condition ( $NO_x \equiv NO + NO_2$ ) (Lelieveld et al., 2008; Whalley et al., 2011). Isoprene oxidation is usually initiated by addition of an OH to one of the  $C=C$  double bonds followed by fast reaction with  $O_2$ . ~~Six-Eight~~ isomeric hydroxyl-substituted isoprene peroxy radicals ( $HOC_5H_8OO\cdot$ ; ISOPOO) are then produced ([Orlando and Tyndall, 2012](#)). Large uncertainties arise in the subsequent reactions of ISOPOO radicals ([Orlando and Tyndall, 2012](#)). In pristine tropical forest areas, the  $HO_2$  pathway likely dominates (Paulot et al., 2009). Other reactions include self- and cross-reactions with organic peroxy radicals ( $RO_2$ ) and unimolecular isomerization (Peeters and Muller, 2010; Crounse et al., 2011).

Under NO-dominant conditions, ISOPOO mainly reacts with NO to produce  $NO_2$ , methyl vinyl ketone (MVK), and methacrolein (MACR). In urban environments where anthropogenic emissions

of  $\text{NO}_x$  and non methane hydrocarbons (NMHC) are high, model outputs generally agree with observations of OH concentration during noontime (Shirley et al., 2006; Hofzumahaus et al., 2009) (Shirley et al., 2006).

However, for urban environments where  $\text{NO}_x$  mixing ratios vary by several orders of magnitude, model simulation outputs still underestimate the observed OH under low  $\text{NO}$  mixing ratios (< 1 ppbv) (Hofzumahaus et al., 2009; Lu et al., 2012). As a result, additional information on  $\text{HO}_2 \rightarrow \text{OH}$  recycling process is needed to bridge the gap between model outputs and observations.

~~The term “low” can introduce ambiguity when interpreting ISOPRO chemistry (Liu et al., 2013). First, the definition for the threshold of “low” is usually arbitrarily based either on instrument performance or other standards during different laboratory or field experiments. For example,  $\text{NO}$  mixing ratios below 50 (Lelieveld et al., 2008), 150 (Xie et al., 2013), and 200 (Lu et al., 2012) have all been used to indicate “low” conditions. Second, , and their contribution to the fate of ISOPRO radicals are not explicitly represented in the context of low condition. It has been suggested that “dominant” or “dominant” should be used instead when applying laboratory condition to the atmospheric condition (Liu et al., 2013; Wennberg, 2013). In this study, we use the ratio of to (:) to indicate the anthropogenic influence on ambient air composition and discuss the effect on ISOPRO chemistry under different : values.~~

While large efforts have been dedicated to the study of reactive VOC chemistry, the temporal and spatial variation of those species in the convective CBL is also affected by the boundary layer dynamics (Kristensen et al., 2010). Regional model simulations are carried out to study the interplay between chemistry and dynamics. Depending on the complexity levels of dynamics representation, models can range from the simple 0-dimension box model without accounting for the fluid dynamics (van Stratum et al., 2012), mixed-layer model (extending 0-dimension model by including the main dynamic processes of the CBL) (de Arellano et al., 2011), 1-dimensional transport model (Gao et al., 1993; Kristensen et al., 2010), to complex large eddy simulation (LES) (Patton et al., 2001). Box models are easy to implement but they are unable to incorporate the influence of the dynamical processes controlling the atmospheric boundary layer’s diurnal evolution. LES resolves the turbulence and associated organized structures, but is computationally expensive, especially when coupled with complex chemical schemes. The mixed-layer model represents a useful compromise between a box model and an LES, it is suitable to study both the boundary layer dynamics and  $\text{O}_3$ - $\text{NO}_x$ - $\text{HO}_x$ -VOC chemistry within the measurement scale of this study, while still maintaining the simplicity of a 0-dimension model ( $\text{HO}_x \rightleftharpoons \text{HO}_2 + \text{OH}$ ) (de Arellano et al., 2011).

The Southeast Atmosphere Study (SAS) campaign was carried out during summer 2013 in Alabama. The campaign included comprehensive observations of VOCs and other trace gases (e.g.,  $\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{NO}_x$ , and  $\text{HO}_x$ ) from airborne and ground-based platforms (Hidy et al., 2014). In this study, we investigated the photochemistry of isoprene based on both ground-based and airborne observations during the SAS campaign. The experiment layout is shown in Figure 1, which also includes a schematic of the important processes controlling the diurnal evolution of chemical species in the

boundary layer. During the campaign, vertical profiles of VOCs were quantified with airborne sampling and subsequent measurements by using a Proton Transfer Reaction Time of Flight Mass Spectrometer (PTR-TOF-MS). Ground-based eddy covariance (EC) was used to measure VOC fluxes on a tower above the forest canopy. A mixed-layer chemistry model was used to study how different processes (entrainment, boundary layer dynamics, surface emission, deposition, chemical production and loss) control the evolution of trace gases inside the CBL. SAS observations are used to impose the early morning initial conditions and the surface/free tropospheric boundary conditions. We discuss isoprene photochemistry by focusing on the fate of ISOPOO radicals under different NO:HO<sub>2</sub> values.

## 2 Experimental

### 2.1 Field sites

The SAS field campaign was carried out during the summer of 2013 (from 06-01 to 07-15) in central Alabama. There were two ground-based sampling sites: one near Marion, AL, at the Alabama Aquatic Biodiversity Centre (32°41'40" N, 87°14'55" W; hereafter as the AABC site), and the other one was located near Centreville, AL, which is part of the South-Eastern Aerosol Research and Characterization network (32°54'12" N, 87°15'0" W; hereafter as the SEARCH site), situated about 24 km to the north-northwest of the AABC site (Figure 2). The two sampling sites were located inside mixed forest canopies. The tower based observations described in this manuscript are focused on the AABC site where the average canopy height was ~35 m. Eight 100-m step transects conducted in the footprint of the AABC flux tower showed that the forest was composed of 26% *Liquidambar styraciflua* (sweetgum), 21% *Nyssa species* (Tupelos), 16% *Pinus species* (Pines), 14% *Quercus* sp. (Oaks), 11% *Liriodendron* sp. (Tulip-poplars), 9% *Taxodium* sp. (Baldcypress) and 3% *Ostrya* sp. (Hophornbeams).

### 2.2 Air sample collection

Two sets of sampling systems were implemented simultaneously during the SAS campaign. Vertical profiles of air above the forest canopy and inside the CBL (100–1000 m above mean sea level (m.a.s.l.)) were collected by using the Whole Air Sample Profiler (WASP) system installed on a model Long-EZ research airplane (hereafter: Long-EZ) (Mak et al., 2013). The WASP system is integrated with a meteorological data monitoring system (the Aircraft-Integrated Meteorological Measurement System (AIMMS-20), Aventech Research Inc.), which was used to measure the ambient temperature, relative humidity (RH), GPS altitude, latitude, longitude, and 3-D wind components. In brief, the WASP system includes a 150 m coiled tubing, which is used to collect the ambient air sample during the aircraft's ascending phase. The altitude of the air samples collected inside the tubing is "marked" by injecting tracer gas (propene, C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>6</sub>) into the air stream at a preset frequency.

For detailed description of the principle of the WASP system refer to [SeeSect. 4.2](#) and (Mak et al., 2013). Flights were carried out during the day (10:00–17:00 Central Standard Time (CST)) when intensive photo-oxidation and turbulent mixing occurred. The time interval for sample collection was  
115 ~2 min (Table 1). The aircraft usually started sampling from ~100 m above the ground level and stopped at ~1000 m (cf. [SeeSect. 5](#)). After each research flight (RF), the WASP tubing was sealed and transported to the AABC site in 30 min, where the air samples inside the tubing were analysed by a high resolution Proton Transfer Reaction Time of Flight Mass Spectrometer (PTR-TOF-MS 8000, Ionicon Analytik GmbH, Austria). A total of 14 RFs were carried out (5 over the SEARCH  
120 site and 9 over the AABC site; Table 1) between 2013-06-01 and 2013-06-13.

VOC eddy covariance (EC) fluxes were measured from the top of the forest canopy at the AABC site between 2013-06-01 and 2013-07-14 using the same PTR-TOF-MS. A 3/8 inch outer diameter (OD) perfluoro alkoxy (PFA) tubing (~50 m length, not heated) was mounted from the top of the flux tower (44 m) to the field laboratory trailer on the ground level. Sample air flow was ~30 liter  
125 per minute (LPM), an aliquot of which was diverted to the PTR-TOF-MS.

### 2.3 Instrumentation

The PTR-TOF-MS was used for two different measurement purposes during the SAS campaign: (1) quantification of the vertical profiles of speciated VOC mixing ratios above the ground-based sites by measuring air samples collected from the WASP system, (2) measurements of air samples  
130 through the EC inlet on top of the AABC flux tower, which are used for subsequent calculation of VOC fluxes. The two measurements overlapped between 06-01 and 06-13. For the overlapping period, an average of 4 WASP samples were measured each day and each sample took ~15 min to analyse. During the gap between two WASP sampling periods, the PTR-TOF-MS was connected to the EC line.

The basic principle of PTR-TOF-MS was described in Jordan et al. (2009) and Graus et al. (2010). During the campaign, the PTR-TOF-MS was operated under  $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$  mode, which uses hydronium ions ( $\text{H}_3\text{O}^+$ ) as the primary reagent ions to ionize VOCs species. The ionization conditions in the drift tube were controlled by setting the drift voltage to 575 V, drift temperature to 70 °C and drift pressure to 2.3 mbar, resulting in an E/N value of about 120 Td (with E being the electric field  
140 strength, and N the gas number density; 1 Td =  $10^{-17}$  V cm<sup>2</sup>). The integration time was set to 1 s and 0.1 s for WASP and EC measurements, respectively. A 1/16 inch OD capillary PEEK inlet (~1 m length) heated to 70 °C was used as a transfer line. For analyses of the WASP samples, the flow rate was set at 500 standard cubic centimeters per minute (sccm). The transfer line was connected to an unheated 1/8 inch OD PFA tubing (1 m length), which was connected to the WASP system  
145 outlet. For EC samples, the transfer line was connected to the EC line through an unheated 1/8 inch OD PFA tubing (10 cm length). Standard gas calibrations were performed daily by using a custom built dynamic dilution system. Zero air was produced by pumping ambient air outside of the

trailer through a catalytic convertor heated to 400 °C (Platinum on Quartz Wool, Shimadzu Scientific Instrument Inc.). Gravimetrically prepared standard gas (Apel & Reimer) was dynamically diluted  
150 by the zero air and analysed using the PTR-TOF-MS. Diiodomethane ( $\text{CH}_2\text{I}_2$ , Sigma-Aldrich, USA) was added as an external mass scale calibration source (shown as a fragment  $\text{CH}_2\text{I}^+$  at exact  $m/z = 140.920$  in the spectrum) through headspace permeation. Diiodomethane was stored inside a 1/4 inch OD glass tubing ( $\sim 5$  cm length) with one end melted and sealed. The other end of the glass tubing was connected to the PTR-TOF-MS sampling inlet through a 1/16 inch OD capillary PEEK  
155 tubing ( $\sim 2$  cm length) and a reducing union.

## 2.4 Other measurements

A suite of additional observations were used to constrain the initial and boundary conditions of the MXLCH model. Airborne measurements of isoprene, MVK+MACR, monoterpenes, other trace gases ( $\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{NO}_x$ ), photolysis rates, and meteorological data (potential temperature and relative humidity) were collected on 2013-06-12 using the NCAR C-130 aircraft (hereafter: C-130). Ground-based observations from the SEARCH site include trace gas concentrations ( $\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{NO}_x$ ,  $\text{HO}_x$ ,  $\text{HCHO}$ ) and boundary layer height measurements. 3-D wind components (at 20 Hz) measured at the top of the AABC flux tower were used for eddy covariance calculations. A list of the observed parameters and the corresponding measurement methods and uncertainties are summarized in Table S1.

## 165 3 Data processing

### 3.1 PTR-TOF-MS data processing

The PTR-TOF-MS is capable of recording a full mass scan range (1–300  $m/z$  in this study) with high mass resolution and time resolution while still maintaining sufficient sensitivity. However, such a setup can produce data files of a significant size. For processing the data generated by the  
170 PTR-TOF-MS, we developed a customized toolbox (Time-of-Flight Interpreting moDule, ToFIND), which is implemented in MATLAB (R2013b, MathWorks Inc., USA). The main routine consists of four subroutines (cf. Supplement Sect. 1 for detailed descriptions):

a. Peak shape fitting: the signals generated by the PTR-TOF-MS are featured with asymmetric peak shape. A fast fitting algorithm optimized for this application is implemented and used by the  
175 following three subroutines.

b. Time-of-flight to  $m/z$  conversion: parameters are calculated for each cycle to convert the time-of-flight to corresponding  $m/z$ .

c. Peak detection: the high mass resolving power of PTR-TOF-MS enables detection of multiple peaks co-existing in one nominal  $m/z$ . A peak detection algorithm is implemented to automatically  
180 find those co-existing peaks.

d. Signal integration: the left and right bounds for each peak are defined and the signals within the two bounds are summed.

The data output from the ToFIND toolbox (in unit of counts per second (cps)) is then normalized and corrected for duty cycle (resulting in unit of normalized cps (ncps)) (Cappellin et al., 2012).

The sensitivities for the target VOCs are calculated by using the standard gas calibration system as described above (cf. Sect. 2.3). The sensitivities (mean  $\pm$  1 standard deviation) during the whole campaign period for isoprene, MVK+MACR, and monoterpenes are  $8.27 \pm 0.28$ ,  $13.63 \pm 1.44$ , and  $9.22 \pm 0.91$  ncps ppbv<sup>-1</sup>, respectively (cf. Figure S7). The instrumental uncertainties for these 3 VOCs are estimated to be 20% during this campaign.

### 3.2 WASP data processing

WASP samples were analysed by using the PTR-TOF-MS system and the mixing ratios of target VOC species were calculated by using the method described above. The dataset for each RF contains the mixing ratios of the VOC species aligned with the concurrent raw signal intensities of the tracer gas (C<sub>3</sub>H<sub>6</sub>, propene) (Mak et al., 2013). The injection pulses of the tracer gas were recorded separately and integrated into the AIMMS-20 output data. In order to reconstruct the altitude of the VOC mixing ratios, the injection pulse signals were aligned with the corresponding propene peak centers. The time resolution of the GPS altitude data and injection pulses are 0.2 s and 10 s, respectively. As a result there are a constant of 50 GPS altitude data points within two adjacent injection pulses. The time resolution for the VOCs data measured by the PTR-TOF-MS is constant at 1 s. However, the number of VOCs data points between two tracer gas peaks are determined by a few factors including the PTR-TOF-MS inlet flow rate (500 sccm), the difference of tubing inner diameters (ID) between the PTR-TOF-MS inlet and the WASP coiled tube, and the diffusion of the tracer gas inside the WASP coiled tube during the transportation time period. Thus the number of VOC data points between two tracer gas peaks is not constant (usually between 42 and 48). To resolve this problem, the GPS altitude data between two adjacent injection pulses were interpolated to generate the same number of data points as the VOC data between two propene peak centers. Then each VOCs data point was assigned a corresponding GPS altitude and the updated dataset for each RF contains the mixing ratios of the VOC species aligned with the corresponding GPS altitude.

## 4 Mixed layer chemistry model

In this study we focus on the convective atmospheric boundary layer observed during the daytime. The vertical profiles of potential temperature and specific humidity (Figure S1) show that the CBL was characterized by well-mixed profiles of these observed dynamic variables. It is therefore reasonable to employ mixed-layer theory to predict the boundary layer's dynamical evolution and most-

importantly the boundary layer height. The mixed-layer model we use is called MXLCH; MXLCH is a zero-dimensional spatial model which is described in detail elsewhere (de Arellano et al., 2011; van Stratum et al., 2012)(de Arellano et al., 2012). The source code of MXLCH can be accessed at <https://github.com/classmodel/mxlch>. In brief, MXLCH is based on the following assumptions:

(1). In daytime CBL, the quantities (e.g., potential temperature, specific humidity, trace gas mixing ratios) are perfectly mixed due to strong turbulent mixing and there is only one bulk value for each quantity throughout the CBL. In addition, the CBL growth depends on the conditions at the entrainment zone and at the free troposphere (FT).

(2). The CBL height growth is driven by the surface sensible heat and latent heat fluxes. These two variables were prescribed in the model based on observations.

(3). The CBL and the FT are separated by an infinitesimally thin inversion layer. Through this layer there is an entrainment flux that exchanges state variables and reactants following the CBL dynamics.

(4). Large-scale meteorological forcings (e.g., subsidence, and advection of heat and moisture) are prescribed to the model as external forcings.

(5). MXLCH neglects species segregation that could modify chemical reaction rates. (Ouwensloot et al., 2011).

In what follows, we use MXLCH to model the evolution of the CBL and trace-gas chemistry during SAS toward further understanding of the processes controlling photochemistry inside the CBL.

#### 4.1 Boundary layer meteorology

The meteorological conditions in MXLCH are constrained by the available observations. To reduce the uncertainties introduced from daily variations, averaged values of the variables (both meteorological data and  $\text{O}_3$ - $\text{NO}_x$ - $\text{HO}_x$  concentrations) from selected days (June 5, 6, 8, 10–13) were calculated and used as the constraints of the initial boundary conditions in MXLCH (Table 2). The selected days were chosen based on: (1) low-cloud coverage (indicated by photosynthetically active radiation (PAR); cf. Figure S2), (2) consistency of  $\text{O}_3$  diurnal profiles, and (3) data availability. Averaged diurnal profiles for PAR and  $\text{O}_3$  are obtained based on the data between 2013-06-01 and 2013-06-14 (Figure S2). Days with data deviate from the averaged values for more than 30% in PAR or  $\text{O}_3$  profiles are discarded. Days when WASP samples are not available are also neglected. The apparent sunrise and sunset occurred at 04:41 and 18:57 CST, respectively, during the study period (2013-6-1 to 2013-6-13) (<http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/grad/solcalc/>). The averaged sensible and latent heat fluxes were significantly above zero during 06:00–16:30 CST and 06:00–18:00 CST (cf. Figure S3), respectively. In this study, we focus on analysing the processes under unstable CBL conditions driven primarily by the sensible heat flux. Hence 06:00–16:30 CST is chosen as the model simulation time interval. During the studied time period, the wind directions at the AABC site were

mainly from the ~~South-East~~southeast, with wind speed below  $2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  for most of the time (Figure S4).

## 4.2 BVOC fluxes

Isoprene and monoterpenes were the two dominant VOC emissions observed at the top of the forest canopy. MXLCH simulations use imposed emissions of these two VOCs species by the observed EC flux data at the AABC flux tower. The EC data from selected days (listed in [See Sect. 3.1](#)) were averaged to produce a single diurnal flux evolution, where a sinusoidal function was fit to the observed VOC flux temporal evolution taking sampling time as the independent variable (cf. Figure S5 and Table 3).

## 4.3 $\text{NO}_x$ fluxes

The forest–atmosphere exchange of  $\text{NO}_x$  affects the oxidative capacity of the CBL through reactions involved in the  $\text{O}_3$ – $\text{NO}_x$ – $\text{HO}_x$ –VOC system. The study of forest–atmosphere  $\text{NO}_x$  exchange during daytime is challenging due to the fast conversion between NO and  $\text{NO}_2$  within canopy in the presence of  $\text{O}_3$ . Direct measurements using the eddy covariance technique at a site in the Sierra Nevada mountains in California (2009-06 to 2009-07) show a midday  $\text{NO}_x$  flux on the order of 1 to 20 pptv  $\text{m s}^{-1}$ , depending on ~~different conditions~~meteorological conditions such as rain (Min et al., 2014).  $\text{NO}_x$  fluxes were downward during 06:00–09:00 and upward during 09:00–15:00 local time.  $\text{NO}_x$  eddy covariance fluxes reported in northern Michigan (2012-07 to 2012-08) show mean NO and  $\text{NO}_2$  flux peak values of  $-4.0 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$  (downward) and  $4.8 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$  (upward), respectively (Geddes and Murphy, 2014).

$\text{NO}_x$  eddy covariance flux observations are not available during the SAS campaign. Using the soil temperature (at 4.4 cm depth) measured at the AABC flux tower, the soil NO flux (mean  $\pm 1$  standard deviation) is estimated to be  $38.4 \pm 5.0 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$  during the sampling period (06-01 to 06-13) following the parameterization of Thornton et al. (1997). This algorithm is based on pasture land cover type and the calculated NO flux should be regarded as an upper bound since soil NO flux under forest land cover is lower (Thornton et al., 1997). In MXLCH,  $\text{NO}_x$  flux is prescribed with similar patterns as the observations listed above. NO has downward flux during early morning (06:00–08:00 CST), while  $\text{NO}_2$  shows upward flux during 06:00–16:30 CST, with the same pattern as sensible heat flux. To assess the effect of different  $\text{NO}_x$  flux levels on the CBL photochemistry, we carry out sensitivity simulations with three different  $\text{NO}_x$  flux levels. In the base case, NO and  $\text{NO}_2$  have minimum and maximum fluxes at  $-5$  and  $5 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$ , respectively (denoted as  $F_{\text{NO}_x} = \pm 5 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$ ). The minimum or maximum flux value is used to produce a flux profile the same way as the BVOCs flux described above. The other two  $\text{NO}_x$  flux levels are  $F_{\text{NO}_x} = \pm 15 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$ , and  $\pm 30 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$ . The sensitivity simulation results are discussed in [See Sect. 6.2](#).



## 285 4.4 Chemistry

Two chemistry schemes are coupled separately to MXLCH. In both chemical schemes, the general chemistry involving  $O_3$ - $NO_x$ - $HO_x$  system is obtained as a subset from Model for Ozone and Related Chemical Tracers (MOZART, version 4) (Emmons et al., 2010). The first chemistry scheme ~~includes~~ is extended with a highly-reduced version of MOZART chemical mechanism involving reactive  
290 VOC species (Table 4, hereafter referred to as reduced scheme) (de Arellano et al., 2011). In the reduced scheme: (1) MVK and MACR are lumped together and considered as one compound, (2) no isoprene nitrate chemistry is implemented, ISOPOO + NO channel recycles NO with 100% yield of  $NO_2$ , (3) no isomerization channel is implemented for ISOPOO radicals, (4) monoterpene oxidation products do not proceed to further reactions. The second chemistry scheme is extended with a subset  
295 from GEOS-Chem v9-02 chemical scheme (Mao et al., 2013), which implements updated isoprene oxidation chemistry (Paulot et al., 2009; Peeters et al., 2009; Peeters and Muller, 2010; Crounse et al., 2011) (cf. Table S2 and S3, hereafter referred to as the complex scheme). In the complex scheme: (1) the reaction rate of ISOPOO radicals through  $HO_2$  channel is updated to take into account of the size effect of the molecule, (2) the isomerization rate of ISOPOO radicals derived by Crounse et al.  
300 (2011) is used, (3) nighttime isoprene chemistry is not implemented ~~, which in this study, this~~ mainly involves reactions with  $NO_3$  radicals, (4) only the first generation isoprene hydroxynitrates (ISOPN =  $\beta$ -hydroxy isoprene nitrate +  $\delta$ -hydroxy isoprene nitrate) are discussed in this study, sensitivity analyses were carried out with varied ISOPN yields (6, 9, and 12%) in the reaction ISOPOO + NO and the results are discussed in Sect. 6.2. In the complex scheme (3) and (4) are different from the  
305 GEOS-Chem.

Photolysis rates in the complex scheme are calculated using the NCAR Tropospheric Ultraviolet and Visible (TUV) Radiation Model. The relationship between solar zenith angle ( $sza$ ) and photolysis rates ( $j$ ) are obtained by performing curve fitting to an empirical function  $j = a \times \exp(b/\cos(sza))$ , where  $a$  and  $b$  are two parameters obtained through curve fitting (Table S4 and Figure S6). Aircraft  
310 observations of photolysis rates (from the NCAR C-130 aircraft) over the two ground sites are available during 2013-06-14 around noontime. The comparisons between TUV outputs and NCAR C-130 observations show that the differences between the two datasets with respect to the observations are within  $\pm 20\%$  except for three reactions involving the photolysis of  $HNO_2$ ,  $CH_3COCH_3$ , and  $CH_3CO(OONO_2)$  (R09, R19, and R27; cf. Table S4), which range from  $\pm 47\%$  to  $\pm 53\%$  (cf. Table  
315 ~~S4~~ and Figure S6).

## 5 ~~Data processing~~ Observation results

### 5.1 ~~PTR-TOF-MS data processing~~

The PTR-TOF-MS is capable of recording a full mass scan range (1–300 m/z in this study) with high mass resolution and time resolution while still maintaining sufficient sensitivity. However, such a setup can produce data files of a significant size. For processing the data generated by the PTR-TOF-MS, we developed a customized toolbox (Time-of-Flight Interpreting moDule, ToFIND), which is implemented in MATLAB (R2013b, MathWorks Inc., USA). The main routine consists of four subroutines (cf. Supplement Sec. A summary of the spatial and temporal coverage for all RFs, together with the corresponding meteorological data is shown in Table 1. Selected vertical profiles of isoprene, MVK+MACR, and monoterpenes are shown in Figure 3. Recent laboratory experiment show that a significant fraction (44%) of 1 for detailed descriptions):-

a. Peak shape fitting: the signals generated by the PTR-TOF-MS are featured with asymmetric peak shape. A fast fitting algorithm optimized for this application is implemented and used by the following three subroutines:-

b. Time-of-flight to 2-ISOPROOH is converted to  $C_4H_7O^+$  (same m/z conversion: parameters are calculated for each cycle to convert the time-of-flight to corresponding m/z:-

c. Peak detection: the high mass resolving power of as MVK+MACR in PTR-quadrupole-MS (Rivera-Rios et al., 2014). To evaluate the interference of ISOPROOH on MVK+MACR, laboratory experiment was carried out with the same PTR-TOF-MS enables detection of multiple peaks co-existing in one nominal m/z. A peak detection algorithm is implemented to automatically find those co-existing peaks:-

d. Signal integration: the left and right bounds for each peak are defined and the signals within the two bounds are summed up:-

The data output from the ToFIND toolbox (in unit of counts per second (cps)) is then normalized and corrected for duty cycle (resulting in unit of normalized cps (ncps)) (Cappellin et al., 2012). The sensitivities for the target VOCs are calculated by using the standard gas calibration system as described above (cf. Sec. 2.3). The sensitivities (mean  $\pm$  used during the SAS campaign. The conversion rate of 1 standard deviation) during the whole campaign period for isoprene, MVK+MACR, and monoterpenes are  $8.27 \pm 0.28$ ,  $13.63 \pm 1.44$ , and  $9.22 \pm 0.91$ , respectively (cf. Figure S7). The instrumental uncertainties for these 3 VOCs are estimated to be 20% during this campaign:-

## 5.1 WASP data processing

WASP samples were analysed by using the PTR-TOF-MS system and the mixing ratios of target VOC species were calculated by using the method described above. The dataset for each RF contains the mixing ratios of the VOC species aligned with the concurrent raw signal intensities of the tracer gas (, propene) (Mak et al., 2013). The injection pulses of the tracer gas were recorded separately and integrated into the AIMMS-20 output data. In order to reconstruct the altitude of the VOC mixing ratios, the injection pulse signals were aligned with the corresponding propene peak centers. The time resolution of the GPS altitude data and injection pulses are 0.2 s and 10 s, respectively.

2-ISOPPOOH to  $C_4H_7O^+$  is estimated to be  $14^{+14}_{-6}\%$  (cf. Supplement Sect. 2), which is lower than reported by Rivera-Rios et al. (2014). This indicates that the conversion rate may vary under different sampling setup and instrument configurations. It should be noted that the reported MVK+MACR mixing ratios measured with the WASP system are not corrected for the ISOPPOOH interference due to the lack of concurrent ISOPPOOH measurement. As a result, there are a constant of 50 GPS altitude data points within two adjacent injection pulses. The time resolution for the VOCs data measured by the PTR-TOF-MS is constant at 1 s. However, the number of VOCs data points between two tracer gas peaks are determined by a few factors including the PTR-TOF-MS inlet flow rate (500 sccm), the difference of tubing inner diameters (ID) between the PTR-TOF-MS inlet and the WASP coiled tube, and the diffusion of the tracer gas inside the WASP coiled tube during the transportation time period. Thus the number of VOC data points between two tracer gas peaks is not constant (usually between 42 and 48). To resolve this problem, the GPS altitude data between two adjacent injection pulses were interpolated to generate the same number of data points as the VOC data between two propene peak centers. Then each VOCs data point was assigned a corresponding GPS altitude and the updated dataset for each RF contains the mixing ratios of the VOC species aligned with the corresponding GPS altitude. The uncertainty of MVK+MACR mixing ratios is estimated to be within 30% when accounting for the ISOPPOOH interference.

## 6 Observation results

A summary of the spatial and temporal coverage for all RFs, together with the corresponding meteorological data is shown in Table 1. Selected vertical profiles of isoprene, MVK+MACR, and monoterpenes are shown in Figure 3. During early morning (06:55 CST), the averaged mixing ratio of isoprene throughout the vertical profile was 0.60 ppbv, with slightly higher values towards the top and bottom of the profile. The low mixing ratio of isoprene above the canopy during this early time is caused by (1) lack of solar radiation to fuel the biological production of isoprene, and (2) limited vertical turbulent mixing during the early morning hours due to stratification. The slightly higher isoprene in the residual layer at 1000 m might reflect the residual isoprene left from the previous day and preserved during the night due to the absence of photo-oxidation. The absence of photo-oxidation may also lead to the higher mixing ratios of MVK+MACR at 800–1000 m (Figure 3b). The mixing ratios of monoterpenes within the nocturnal boundary layer ( $> 1.00$  ppbv) were significantly higher than in the residual layer ( $\sim 0.30$  ppbv) (Figure 3c). These high monoterpene mixing ratios near the surface primarily result from night time emissions which are trapped within the shallow nocturnal boundary layer and lower chemical loss rates.

The vertical profiles of VOC species changed dramatically in air samples collected at 10:06 CST. The mixing ratios of isoprene developed a consistent gradient within the well-mixed CBL, with higher values right above the forest canopy and lower values near the top of the CBL. The mixing

ratios of MVK+MACR were relatively uniform throughout the CBL. The different vertical profiles  
390 between isoprene and MVK+MACR result from their different chemical lifetime ~~scale~~ relative to  
the turbulent mixing time scales (cf. [See Sect. 6.2](#)). The sharp gradient of monoterpenes near the top  
of the CBL (at 350 m) during early morning (Figure 3c) is significantly reduced (0.50 ppbv near the  
ground and 0.20 ppbv near the CBL top) due to enhanced vertical turbulent mixing ~~and increased~~  
OH concentration. It should be noted that the two different set of profiles were measured on different  
395 days and over different sampling sites (Figure 3). Though we focus the discussion on sampling time  
during the day, other factors such as meteorology, sampling location could play important part in the  
VOCs vertical distribution.

One of the main goals of this study is to analyse different processes affecting the diurnal variation  
of the VOC species within the CBL. To achieve this, the boundary layer height (BLH) during each  
400 WASP RF was obtained from ground-based observations (Figure 4c), and the mixing ratios within  
the BLH during the RF for each selected VOC species were averaged to produce a representative  
mixing ratio of this selected VOC species (Figure 5g–i). Only one RF was carried out to investigate  
the VOC mixing ratios in early morning (at 06:55 CST). The rest of the RFs span over the convec-  
tive daytime (10:00–16:00 CST). The evolution of VOC species inside the CBL in the context of  
405 surface emissions, other chemical species (e.g.,  $O_3$ ,  $NO_x$ , and  $HO_x$ ), and boundary layer dynamics  
is discussed in ~~details in Sect~~ detail in Sect. 6.2.

## 6 Model results and discussion

### 6.1 Boundary layer dynamics

MXLCH's ability to reproduce the boundary layer dynamics is essential for predicting the evolution  
410 of chemical species. The most important parameter is the BLH, which affects entrainment and turbu-  
lent mixing of chemical species inside the CBL. The model outputs of potential temperature, specific  
humidity, and BLH are shown in Figure 4. The BLH growth is driven by sensible (H) and latent (LE)  
heat flux (parameterized based on observations; Figure S3), and is regulated by subsidence and ad-  
vection. The observations from the ceilometer and sounding system at the SEARCH site indicate a  
415 CBL growth rate of about  $280 \text{ m h}^{-1}$  during 07:00–10:00 CST and  $80 \text{ m h}^{-1}$  during 11:00–16:00  
CST. A similar BLH growth rate is achieved with MXLCH (Figure 4c) by adjusting the subsidence  
rate and the initial potential temperature difference between the CBL and FT (Table 2). The BLH  
estimated from sounding data at 09:00 and 15:00 CST agree well with the model output (Figure 4c).  
Due to the small potential temperature jump between the CBL and FT, the entrainment of relatively  
420 warmer air from the FT and surface heat flux is not sufficient to explain the evolution of potential  
temperature inside the CBL. Advection of relatively warm air is introduced into the system to match  
the MXLCH output with the observations on top of the AABC flux tower. The specific humidity  
starts to increase from the beginning of the model simulation due to the turbulent flux of humid air

(Figure S3), reaching a maximum value of  $18.7 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  at 8:20 CST, and then gradually drops to  $17.0 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$  at around 15:00 CST; this diurnal variation results from the entrainment of relatively dry air from the FT into the CBL. The averaged potential temperature measured from the NCAR C-130 aircraft on June 12 agrees well with both ground-based observations and model outputs. The averaged specific humidity from the NCAR C-130 aircraft, with a large variability, is smaller than ground observations. In general, the MXLCH satisfactorily represents the boundary layer dynamics during the simulation time period of the day (06:00–16:30 CST), which gives us confidence to carry out further analyses on the two chemistry schemes.

## 6.2 Diurnal variation of chemical species

Comparisons between the two chemistry schemes together with the ground and airborne observations are shown in Figure 5. Before we start, it should be noted that ground-based observations ( $\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{NO}_x$ ,  $\text{HO}_x$ ,  $\text{HCHO}$ , ISOPN) are included in the comparison with the model bulk output in Figure 5. This assumes the ground-based measurements are representative of the averaged concentrations inside the CBL, which may not apply for certain species with short chemical lifetime ( $< 1 \text{ h}$ ). In the complex scheme sensitivity analyses, best agreement between observation and model output is achieved with  $F_{\text{NO}_x} = \pm 30 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$  and ISOPN yield of 6% (Figure 5). In the discussion that follows, the complex scheme output refers to this best agreement configuration unless otherwise stated explicitly.

The diurnal evolution of the  $\text{O}_3$ - $\text{NO}_x$  system from observations was divided into two phases. During 06:00–12:00 CST,  $\text{NO}_2$  mixing ratios in the CBL showed a steep decrease with a rate of  $-100 \text{ pptv h}^{-1}$ , which is mainly caused by photolysis. This is accompanied with a rapid increase of  $\text{O}_3$  ( $3 \text{ ppbv h}^{-1}$ ).  $\text{NO}$  mixing ratios reached a peak value at 200 pptv during 06:00–08:00 CST and gradually decreased to 30 pptv after 12:00 CST. During 12:00–16:00 CST,  $\text{O}_3$ ,  $\text{NO}$  and  $\text{NO}_2$  mixing ratios stayed relatively stable at 30 ppbv, 30 pptv, and 200 pptv, respectively. Airborne  $\text{O}_3$  and  $\text{NO}_x$  mixing ratios (from NCAR C-130) were on the upper and lower bound of the ground-based observations, respectively.  $\text{O}_3$  mixing ratios in both chemistry schemes fall within the uncertainty of the observations (Figure 5a).  $\text{O}_3$  mixing ratios in the reduced scheme are 5 ppbv higher than the complex scheme during 12:00–16:30 CST, which correlates to its higher  $\text{NO}_2$  mixing ratios.  $\text{NO}$  mixing ratios in the reduced scheme are overestimated throughout the whole simulation time period (Figure 5b). One possible cause is that isoprene nitrate chemistry is not implemented in the reduced scheme, and the ISOPNO +  $\text{NO}$  pathway recycles  $\text{NO}$  with 100% yield of  $\text{NO}_2$ , which maintains the elevated  $\text{NO}$  mixing ratios through photolysis during sunlit daytime. By implementing updated isoprene nitrate chemical mechanisms, the complex scheme agrees better with the observed  $\text{NO}$  mixing ratios (Figure 5b). ~~It should be noted that flux prescribed in the complex scheme ( $F_{\text{NO}_x} = \pm 30$ ) is different from the reduced scheme ( $F_{\text{NO}_x} = \pm 5$ ) (Table 3).~~ Applying the base  $\text{NO}_x$  flux ( $F_{\text{NO}_x} = \pm 5 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$ ) in the complex scheme will reduce the  $\text{NO}_x$  mixing ratios to below 80 pptv after 12:00 CST (Figure

S8), which is less than half of the observed NO<sub>2</sub> mixing ratio (200 pptv). The photochemical cascade will bring down the O<sub>3</sub> and OH radicals, leading to higher isoprene mixing ratios than observations during 10:00–16:00 CST (Figure S8). Applying faster photolysis rates of second generation isoprene nitrate products (~~mainly~~ methyl vinyl ketone nitrate (MVKN)  $5.6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , and methacrolein nitrate (MACRN) ~~)(Muller et al., 2014)~~  $3.5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$  as compared to  $9.1 \times 10^{-7} \text{ s}^{-1}$  used for both  
compounds in the complex scheme (Muller et al., 2014) does not bring up the NO<sub>2</sub> mixing ratio significantly (change is less than 5%, data not shown). Thus in the complex scheme higher NO<sub>2</sub> flux (30 pptv m s<sup>-1</sup>) during noontime is necessary to maintain the NO<sub>2</sub> level ~~at~~in the presence of isoprene nitrate chemistry.

The reduced scheme overestimates OH radical concentration by 50% during noontime, though it is still within the uncertainty of the observations. In the complex scheme, modelled OH radical concentrations generally agree well with the observations, except during the early morning (06:00–08:00 CST) when the model output is slightly higher than the observations (Figure 5d). The higher OH radicals are mainly produced through the NO + HO<sub>2</sub> reaction, as fuelled by the NO peak during the same time period. On the other hand, HO<sub>2</sub> radicals in the complex scheme are higher than in the reduced scheme during 06:00–09:00 CST, which are mainly produced through RO<sub>2</sub> + NO pathways implemented in the complex scheme. Certain HO<sub>2</sub> loss processes that are not included in this study such as heterogeneous uptake onto aerosol particles (Whalley et al., 2010; Lu et al., 2012) may reduce the HO<sub>2</sub> concentration and subsequently OH radical concentration. HO<sub>2</sub> measurements during selected study time period are not available due to instrument interference. HO<sub>2</sub> concentration measured on  
2013-06-25 (with similar meteorological conditions as the selected days) is  $1.0 \times 10^9 \text{ molec. cm}^{-3}$  during 12:00 CST, higher than both chemical scheme outputs ( $7.0 \times 10^8 \text{ molec. cm}^{-3}$ ).

The mixing ratio of isoprene was less than 1.00 ppbv in the early morning (Figure 5g). During sunlit daytime (10:00–16:00 CST), the mixing ratios of isoprene within the CBL varied between 1.50 and 4.00 ppbv, with lower mixing ratios during the noontime (13:00 CST). This mirrored the higher mixing ratios of OH radicals during the same time period (Figure 5d), indicating that the abundance of isoprene in the CBL is mainly controlled by photo-oxidation by OH radicals. As the first generation photo-oxidation product, the mixing ratios of MVK+MACR loosely followed isoprene, with lower values during the early morning and similar mixing ratio range during daytime. The variation of isoprene within each WASP RF was larger than MVK+MACR during the daytime, which is reflected in the standard deviations. This is due to the relatively large gradient of isoprene vertical profiles (Figure 3a). The large variability in isoprene vertical profile can be attributed to its relatively short chemical lifetime during noontime (1 h), in contrast to MVK+MACR (10 h). The chemical lifetime of isoprene is closer to the turbulent mixing time scale (0.1–0.5 h). Another factor could be the land surface heterogeneity (cf. Figure 2), which can cause large variability in isoprene vertical profiles through the effect of induced secondary circulations (Ouwensloot et al., 2011). The mixing ratios of monoterpenes showed higher values (1.10 ppbv) during the early morning (cf. See Sect. 5)

while during 10:00–16:00 CST, ~~its~~their mixing ratios fell between 0.20 and 0.60 ppbv with slightly lower values during noontime. VOC mixing ratios measured from the NCAR C-130 aircraft agree well with the WASP RF (Figure 5g–i).

For the model outputs, the lowest isoprene concentration between 12:00 and 16:00 CST occurs at 14:00 CST in the complex scheme, which is 1 h later than that predicted by the reduced scheme and that observed (at 13:00 CST). One possible explanation to this difference is that the peak value of the OH radical concentrations in the complex scheme is delayed as compared with the reduced scheme during the noontime. As for MVK+MACR, both chemical schemes produce results within the range of observations. Both schemes represent the lower bound of the observed monoterpenes during 10:00–16:00 CST. The mixing ratios of isoprene, MVK+MACR and monoterpenes are lower in the reduced scheme, which is caused by its higher OH radical concentrations. Isoprene mixing ratio is most sensitive due to its high reactivity with OH radicals ( $k_{\text{C}_5\text{H}_8+\text{OH}} = 1.0 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molec.}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ).

The mixing ratios of observed ISOPN ~~showed~~show a peak value of 90 pptv at 10:00 CST, then gradually decreased to 60 pptv at 14:00 CST and remained relatively stable during 14:00–16:00 CST. The model outputs of ISOPN from the complex scheme generally agree with the observed data. The ISOPN yield in the complex scheme is set at 6%, which is within the range of the results from the chamber experiments ( $9^{+4}_{-3}\%$ ) carried out at the SEARCH site (Xiong et al., 2015). Sensitivity simulations on two other different ISOPN yields at 9% and 12% overestimate the ISOPN mixing ratios by 30% and 70%, respectively at 10:00 CST (Figure ~~S8~~–5f). Applying updated ozonolysis rate for  $\delta$ -ISOPN ( $2.8 \times 10^{-17} \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ molec.}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) and  $\beta$ -ISOPN ( $3.8 \times 10^{-19} \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ molec.}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) (Lee et al., 2014) will cause the model to overestimate ISOPN concentration by 27–56% during 12:00–16:00 CST with ISOPN yield of 6% and  $F_{\text{NO}_x} = \pm 30 \text{ pptv m s}^{-1}$ .

The reduced scheme overestimates formaldehyde (HCHO) concentration by 37% at 10:00 CST. The difference between the two diminishes towards the late afternoon. The HCHO mixing ratio from the complex scheme output generally agrees with the observations throughout the simulation time period.

MXLCH reproduces the evolution of major chemical species within the CBL reasonably well, which provides confidence to carry out further analysis on the individual processes controlling the evolution of those compounds in the CBL. In [See Sect. 6.3](#) we discuss the influence of boundary layer dynamics and photochemistry on the evolution of  $\text{O}_3$  and isoprene. In [See Sect. 6.4](#) we focus on interpretation of the isoprene photochemistry under different  $\text{NO}:\text{HO}_2$  ratios.

### 6.3 Budget analysis of ozone and isoprene

Applying Based on the output from the complex scheme, we applied a bulk budget analysis of  $\text{O}_3$  and isoprene to differentiate the impact of emission/deposition, entrainment, and chemical production/loss yields:



$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \langle S \rangle}{\partial t} &= \underbrace{\frac{\overbrace{w' S'_s}^{\text{Emission/Deposition}}}{h} - \frac{\overbrace{w' S'_h}^{\text{Entrainment}}}{h}}_{\text{dynamics}} + \underbrace{\overbrace{S_{\text{prod}}}^{\text{Chemical production}} - \overbrace{S_{\text{loss}}}^{\text{Chemical loss}}}_{\text{chemistry}} \\
\frac{\partial \langle S \rangle}{\partial t} &= \underbrace{\frac{F_S}{h} \sin\left(\frac{\pi t}{t_d}\right) - \frac{V_d \langle S \rangle}{h} + \frac{w_e \Delta S}{h}}_{\text{dynamics}} + \underbrace{\sum_i k_i \langle P1 \rangle \langle P2 \rangle - \sum_j k_j \langle S \rangle \langle Ox_j \rangle - J \langle S \rangle}_{\text{chemistry}} \quad (1)
\end{aligned}$$

535 where  $\langle S \rangle$  is the mixed-layer mixing ratio of chemical species  $S$  (ppbv);  $h$  is the BLH (mm);  
 $t$  is time (s);  $F_S$  is the maximum flux of  $S$  (ppbv m s<sup>-1</sup>);  $t_d$  is the time length during which the heat  
 flux is positive (s);  $V_d$  is the deposition velocity (cm s<sup>-1</sup>);  $w_e$  is the entrainment velocity (m s<sup>-1</sup>);  
 $k$  is the reaction rate coefficient (cm<sup>3</sup> molec.<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>);  $\langle P1 \rangle$  and  $\langle P2 \rangle$  are the mixing ratio of the  
 parent species (ppbv);  $\langle Ox \rangle$  is the mixed-layer mixing ratio of oxidants (ppbv);  $J$  is photolysis rate  
 540 coefficient (s<sup>-1</sup>).

The total tendency of isoprene is largely controlled by emission and chemical loss. The emission  
 tendency peaks at 08:50 CST, while the isoprene flux data peaks at 12:00 CST (Figure S5). This  
 difference is caused by the BLH evolution (Eqn 1). The chemical loss of isoprene is dominated by  
 OH oxidation, with a small fraction (6% of OH pathway) contributed by ozonolysis. As a result,  
 545 the chemical tendency closely follows the variation of OH radicals, reaching a minimum during  
 noontime. Since there is no chemical production of isoprene inside the CBL, chemistry acts as an  
 isoprene loss throughout the whole model run. Entrainment acts as a dilution effect for isoprene  
 since there is no isoprene in the FT; the minimum value in the entrainment tendency of isoprene  
 at 09:00 CST therefore results from the rapid CBL growth and relatively shallow boundary layer  
 550 (Figure 4c) during this time period. During the early morning (06:00–10:00 CST), the total tendency  
 of isoprene remains positive, reaching a peak value of 1.5 ppbv h<sup>-1</sup> at 07:50 CST, which is caused  
 by a combination of (1) increase of biogenic emission from forest canopy with an increase in ambient  
 temperature and PAR (Guenther et al., 1995), (2) the relatively shallow boundary layer, and (3) the  
 chemical loss due to OH oxidation is still low due to the low OH production inside the CBL. As  
 555 a result, the emission term dominates the total tendency during this time period. During 10:00–  
 15:00 CST, the total tendency is mainly controlled by the chemical loss. The high OH concentration  
 induces fast chemical loss rate of isoprene (with a maximum of –2.6 ppbv h<sup>-1</sup>), bringing the total  
 tendency to below zero during this time period.

Different from isoprene, entrainment primarily controls the total tendency of O<sub>3</sub> (Figure 6b).  
 560 The entrainment tendency is affected by entrainment velocity, mixing ratio difference between the  
 FT and CBL, and the BLH (Eqn 1). During the early period of the simulation (at 06:00 CST),



the entrainment tendency of  $O_3$  experiences a rapid increase and reaches a peak value at 09:00 CST. This is caused by the interplay of: (1) rapid growth of the BLH during the morning transition, (2) large  $O_3$  jump across the morning inversion layer (Table 3), and (3) a shallow BLH (Figure 4c). After this time, the  $O_3$  entrainment tendency decreases due to the decrease of entrainment velocity, reduced  $O_3$  jump at the inversion layer, and the increase of the BLH. The second most important term controlling  $O_3$  concentrations in the CBL is chemical production and loss, which is mainly controlled by the photolysis ~~rate-of-of~~  $O_3$ - $NO_x$  system. The early morning peak value (at 08:30 CST) is due to the low photolysis rate caused by the large solar zenith angle. During noontime, increased  $O_3$  photolysis induces a decrease in the chemical tendency, although the net value is still positive. The surface deposition tendency of  $O_3$  is of comparable magnitude as the chemical tendency. The total  $O_3$  tendency remains positive during 07:00–13:00 CST, reaching a peak value at 09:00 CST.

#### 6.4 Photochemistry under different $NO:HO_2$

In [See Sect. 6.2](#), the model results show a wide range  $NO$  and  $HO_2$  mixing ratios across the diurnal cycle (Figure 5), which have varied impacts on the photochemistry inside the CBL. The term “low- $NO_x$ ” can introduce ambiguity when interpreting ISOPOO chemistry (Liu et al., 2013). The definition for the threshold of “low- $NO_x$ ” is usually arbitrarily based either on instrument performance or other standards during different laboratory or field experiments. For example,  $NO$  mixing ratios below 50 pptv (Lelieveld et al., 2008), 150 pptv (Xie et al., 2013), and 200 pptv (Lu et al., 2012) have all been used to indicate “low- $NO_x$ ” conditions. It has been suggested that “ $NO$ -dominant” or “ $HO_2$ -dominant” should be used instead when applying laboratory condition to the atmospheric condition (Liu et al., 2013; Wennberg, 2013). Here we use the ratio of  $NO$  to  $HO_2$  ( $NO:HO_2$ , both in units of ppbv) ~~as an indicator of the “cleanliness” of the CBL to indicate the anthropogenic influence on ambient air composition~~ and analyse the fate of isoprene and its photo-oxidization products under periods with different  $NO:HO_2$  ratios. During the model simulation period (06:00–16:30 CST),  $NO$  and  $HO_2$  concentrations vary in the range of 0.028–0.28 ppbv and 0.0018–0.030 ppbv, respectively (Figure 8). The resulting  $NO:HO_2$  ratio ranges from  $NO$ -dominant ( $NO:HO_2 = 163$ ) to  $NO$ - $HO_2$ -balanced ( $NO:HO_2 = 1$ ) air conditions. Reaction with  $OH$  radicals is the major sink of isoprene due to its fast reaction rate with  $OH$  radicals under the observed meteorological conditions ( $k_{C_5H_8+OH} = 1.0 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ molec.}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). Once emitted into the CBL, isoprene is rapidly oxidized through  $OH$  radical addition and subsequent reaction with  $O_2$ , producing a series of isomeric hydroxyl-substituted alkyl peroxy radicals ( $HOC_5H_8OO\cdot$ ; ISOPOO). ISOPOO radicals go through several different pathways including reactions with  $NO$ ,  $HO_2$ ,  $RO_2$ , as well as isomerization (Table S3). The branching ratio of each pathway is strongly affected by  $NO$  and  $HO_2$  mixing ratios.

The contribution from each reaction pathway listed above is plotted as a function of  $NO:HO_2$  and the results are shown in Figure 7. The  $NO$  pathway represents the major sink of ISOPOO radicals

(> 85%) under a wide range of NO:HO<sub>2</sub> (20–163). After NO:HO<sub>2</sub> falls below 20, the contribution from HO<sub>2</sub> pathway increases dramatically and reaches 54% at NO:HO<sub>2</sub>=1, while NO, isomerization, and CH<sub>3</sub>(O)OO· pathway constitutes 31%, 11%, and 3%, respectively. For the RO<sub>2</sub> pathway, CH<sub>3</sub>(O)OO· radical is the dominant candidate, and yet its contribution is negligible compared to the other reaction pathways throughout the whole NO:HO<sub>2</sub> range. The share of the NO pathway reaches 93% under large NO:HO<sub>2</sub>, while HO<sub>2</sub> and isomerization each contributes 3% and 4%, respectively. With a box model simulation using MCM v3.2 constrained by chamber experiments, Liu et al. (2013) calculated the contributions from NO, HO<sub>2</sub>, and isomerization pathways to be 93%, 6%, and 0.9% under NO:HO<sub>2</sub> = 32. These results generally agree with this study under the same NO:HO<sub>2</sub> value (88%, 7%, and 4%, respectively). Both studies used the isomerization rate coefficient from Crounse et al. (2011). The low end of NO:HO<sub>2</sub> in Liu et al. (2013) (< 1) is out of the range of our model results.

ISOPN and ISOPOOH are the two tracers of isoprene photo-oxidation under NO- and HO<sub>2</sub>-dominant conditions. The diurnal evolution of these two compounds together with NO:HO<sub>2</sub> and isoprene mixing ratios are shown in Figure 8. The rapid increase of ISOPN mixing ratios (0.032 ppbv h<sup>-1</sup>) during 06:00–09:00 CST coincides with the NO peak during the same time period (0.10–0.28 ppbv, Figure 5b). The NO:HO<sub>2</sub> ratio spans a large range (5–160) during this time period, which corresponds to 66%–93% sink of ISOPOO radicals through the NO pathway (Figure 7). Under this NO-dominant air condition, the ISOPN mixing ratios are mainly constrained by the availability of isoprene during this time period, which is reflected by the high correlation between these two species. After 09:00 CST, the NO:HO<sub>2</sub> falls below 5 and stays at ~1 during 12:00–16:00 CST. The ISOPN mixing ratios start to decrease even though the isoprene (3–4 ppbv) is still abundant in the CBL. This is due to the shift from NO-dominant to NO-HO<sub>2</sub>-balanced conditions, and ISOPN production becomes constrained by NO availability. Meanwhile, ISOPN is relatively short lived (chemical lifetime 2 h) under the OH radical concentration of  $\sim 1.5 \times 10^6$  molec. cm<sup>-3</sup>.

The mixing ratio of ISOPOOH shows reversed correlation with NO:HO<sub>2</sub>. Its mixing ratio starts to rise after 07:00 CST and reaches 1.5 ppbv at 16:00 CST. The higher mixing ratio of ISOPOOH during the end of the model simulation is a result of (1) sufficient isoprene and HO<sub>2</sub> radicals, and (2) longer chemical life time of ISOPOOH (5 h) due to reduced OH radicals in the CBL. The peak value of ISOPOOH mixing ratio predicted by MXLCH (1.5 ppbv) is significantly higher than ground-based observations at the SEARCH site (0.40 ppbv, measured on 2013-06-08) (Nguyen et al., 2015). The dry deposition velocity of ISOPOOH in MXLCH is set to 2.5 cm s<sup>-1</sup>, which is adopted from the same ground-based observation at the SEARCH site (Nguyen et al., 2015). One possible explanation of the large discrepancy between model output and observation is the some missing chemical sink paths of ISOPOOH in the complex scheme. Another explanation, although less possible, is the partitioning of ISOPOOH to aerosol phase due to its lower ~~vapour~~-vapor pressure and potentially high condensed phase reactivity (Rivera-Rios et al., 2014). ~~Unfortunately the~~ The aerosol-gas phase

chemistry is not implemented in this study for simplicity. Future work should incorporate an aerosol phase module into MXLCH. Despite the higher ISOPOOH mixing ratios from MXLCH, the averaged value of ISOPOOH/ISOPN values from MXLCH (13; both species are in units of ppbv) is within the range of the GEOS-Chem model outputs for time period of 2013-08 over the Southeast US (5–15) (Kim et al., 2015).

## 7 Conclusions

The WASP system enabled us to quantify the vertical profiles of VOC species inside the CBL at high temporal (hourly) resolution. Before sunrise, isoprene and MVK+MACR exhibit lower mixing ratios ( $< 1.00$  ppbv) within and above the CBL. This is due to the absence of solar radiation, which drives biological isoprene production, and convective turbulent mixing. Monoterpenes, on the other hand, have a large contrast in mixing ratios within and above the CBL in early morning. This is largely attributed to night-time emissions and lack of vertical turbulent mixing, trapping the monoterpenes within the nocturnal boundary layer's limited depth. During sunlit noontime, observed vertical profiles of isoprene and monoterpenes reveal a vertical gradient within the CBL, with higher mixing ratios near the forest canopy and low values towards the top of the CBL.

The MXLCH model generally reproduces the boundary layer's diurnal evolution (e.g., BLH growth, potential temperature, and specific humidity). Accurate modelling of BLH is essential for investigating trace gas photochemistry in that the FT-CBL exchange plays an important role in regulating the vertical distribution and evolution of trace gas species in the CBL through entrainment.

Budget analyses show that the diurnal evolution of  $O_3$  is mainly controlled by entrainment. Isoprene photochemistry is strongly influenced by  $NO:HO_2$  values. This is reflected through the fate of ISOPOO radicals, which shift from a NO-dominant pathway (with a contribution of 93%) to a NO- $HO_2$ -balanced pathway (with a contribution of 54%) from early morning ( $NO:HO_2 = 163$ ) to noontime ( $NO:HO_2 = 1$ ). As a result, ISOPN and ISOPOOH show peaks during 09:00 CST and 16:00 CST, respectively. ISOPN production is constrained by isoprene before 09:00 CST. The mixing ratio of ISOPN decreases after 09:00 CST due to its short lifetime (2 h) and limited NO availability. ISOPOOH is inversely correlated with  $NO:HO_2$ . Model outputs significantly overestimate ISOPOOH mixing ratios in the late afternoon when comparing with ground-based observation, with implications for gas-to-aerosol-partitioning-missing sinks of ISOPOOH.

*Acknowledgements.* We thank the organizers of the SAS and FIXCIT study. We especially thank Andrew A. Turnipseed for providing VOC standard gas during the campaign and Bill B. Hansen from Vaiden Field Airport for logistics. We would like to acknowledge operational, technical and scientific support provided by NCAR's Earth Observing Laboratory, sponsored by the National Science Foundation. We thank the GEOS-Chem and MOZART model community. M. Dorris helped with the formaldehyde measurement. This study is supported by US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) STAR program grant 1110369, NSF atmospheric chemistry

670 program, and UltraPure Air, LLC. E. G. Patton was supported by NCAR's Bio-hydro-atmosphere interactions of Energy, Aerosols, Carbon, ~~H<sub>2</sub>O~~H<sub>2</sub>O, Organics and Nitrogen (BEACHON) project.

## References


- Cappellin, L., Karl, T., Probst, M., Ismailova, O., Winkler, P. M., Soukoulis, C., Aprea, E., Mark, T. D., Gasperi, F., and Biasioli, F.: On Quantitative Determination of Volatile Organic Compound Concentrations Using Proton Transfer Reaction Time-of-Flight Mass Spectrometry, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 46, 2283–2290, 2012.
- 675 Crounse, J. D., Paulot, F., Kjaergaard, H. G., and Wennberg, P. O.: Peroxy radical isomerization in the oxidation of isoprene, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 13 607–13 613, doi:10.1039/C1cp21330j, 2011.
- de Arellano, J. V. G., Patton, E. G., Karl, T., van den Dries, K., Barth, M. C., and Orlando, J. J.: The role of boundary layer dynamics on the diurnal evolution of isoprene and the hydroxyl radical over tropical forests, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 116, doi:10.1029/2010JD014857, 2011.
- 680 de Arellano, J. V. G., van Heerwaarden, C. C., van Stratum, B. J. H., and van den Dries, K.: *Atmospheric Boundary Layer: Integrating air chemistry and land interactions*, Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Emmons, L. K., Walters, S., Hess, P. G., Lamarque, J. F., Pfister, G. G., Fillmore, D., Granier, C., Guenther, A., Kinnison, D., Laepple, T., Orlando, J., Tie, X., Tyndall, G., Wiedinmyer, C., Baughcum, S. L., and Kloster, S.: Description and evaluation of the Model for Ozone and Related chemical Tracers, version 4 (MOZART-4), *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 3, 43–67, 2010.
- 685 Gao, W., Wesely, M. L., and Doskey, P. V.: Numerical Modeling of the Turbulent-Diffusion and Chemistry of Nox, O<sub>3</sub>, Isoprene, and Other Reactive Trace Gases in and above a Forest Canopy, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 98, 18 339–18 353, 1993.
- 690 Geddes, J. A. and Murphy, J. G.: Observations of reactive nitrogen oxide fluxes by eddy covariance above two midlatitude North American mixed hardwood forests, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 2939–2957, doi:10.5194/acp-14-2939-2014, 2014.
- Graus, M., Muller, M., and Hansel, A.: High Resolution PTR-TOF: Quantification and Formula Confirmation of VOC in Real Time, *J. Am. Soc. Mass. Spectr.*, 21, 1037–1044, 2010.
- 695 Guenther, A., Hewitt, C. N., Erickson, D., Fall, R., Geron, C., Graedel, T., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Lerdau, M., Mckay, W. A., Pierce, T., Scholes, B., Steinbrecher, R., Tallamraju, R., Taylor, J., and Zimmerman, P.: A Global-Model of Natural Volatile Organic-Compound Emissions, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 100, 8873–8892, 1995.
- Guenther, A. B., Monson, R. K., and Fall, R.: Isoprene and Monoterpene Emission Rate Variability - Observations with Eucalyptus and Emission Rate Algorithm Development, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 96, 10 799–10 808, 1991.
- 700 Hidy, G. M., Blanchard, C. L., Baumann, K., Edgerton, E., Tanenbaum, S., Shaw, S., Knipping, E., Tombach, I., Jansen, J., and Walters, J.: Chemical climatology of the southeastern United States, 1999–2013, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 11 893–11 914, doi:10.5194/acp-14-11893-2014, 2014.
- 705 Hofzumahaus, A., Rohrer, F., Lu, K. D., Bohn, B., Brauers, T., Chang, C. C., Fuchs, H., Holland, F., Kita, K., Kondo, Y., Li, X., Lou, S. R., Shao, M., Zeng, L. M., Wahner, A., and Zhang, Y. H.: Amplified Trace Gas Removal in the Troposphere, *Science*, 324, 1702–1704, 2009.
- Jordan, A., Haidacher, S., Hanel, G., Hartungen, E., Mark, L., Seehauser, H., Schottkowsky, R., Sulzer, P., and Mark, T. D.: A high resolution and high sensitivity proton-transfer-reaction time-of-flight mass spectrometer (PTR-TOF-MS), *Int. J. Mass. Spectrom.*, 286, 122–128, 2009.
- 710

- Karl, T., Guenther, A., Yokelson, R. J., Greenberg, J., Potosnak, M., Blake, D. R., and Artaxo, P.: The tropical forest and fire emissions experiment: Emission, chemistry, and transport of biogenic volatile organic compounds in the lower atmosphere over Amazonia, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 112, doi:10.1029/2007JD008539, 2007.
- 715 Karl, T., Misztal, P. K., Jonsson, H. H., Shertz, S., Goldstein, A. H., and Guenther, A. B.: Airborne Flux Measurements of BVOCs above Californian Oak Forests: Experimental Investigation of Surface and Entrainment Fluxes, OH Densities, and Damkohler Numbers, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 70, 3277–3287, doi:10.1175/Jas-D-13-054.1, 2013.
- Kim, P. S., Jacob, D. J., Fisher, J. A., Travis, K., Yu, K., Zhu, L., Yantosca, R. M., Sulprizio, M. P., Jimenez, J. L.,  
 720 Campuzano-Jost, P., Froyd, K. D., Liao, J., Hair, J. W., Fenn, M. A., Butler, C. F., Wagner, N. L., Gordon, T. D., Welti, A., Wennberg, P. O., Crounse, J. D., St. Clair, J. M., Teng, A. P., Millet, D. B., Schwarz, J. P., Markovic, M. Z., and Perring, A. E.: Sources, seasonality, and trends of Southeast US aerosol: an integrated analysis of surface, aircraft, and satellite observations with the GEOS-Chem chemical transport model, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 15, 17 651–17 709, doi:10.5194/acpd-15-17651-2015, 2015.
- 725 Kim, S., Karl, T., Guenther, A., Tyndall, G., Orlando, J., Harley, P., Rasmussen, R., and Apel, E.: Emissions and ambient distributions of Biogenic Volatile Organic Compounds (BVOC) in a ponderosa pine ecosystem: interpretation of PTR-MS mass spectra, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 1759–1771, 2010.
- Kristensen, L., Lenschow, D. H., Gurarie, D., and Jensen, N. O.: A Simple Model for the Vertical Transport of Reactive Species in the Convective Atmospheric Boundary Layer, *Bound.-Lay. Meteorol.*, 134, 195–221,  
 730 doi:10.1007/s10546-009-9443-x, 2010.
- Lee, L., Teng, A. P., Wennberg, P. O., Crounse, J. D., and Cohen, R. C.: On Rates and Mechanisms of OH and O<sub>3</sub> Reactions with Isoprene-Derived Hydroxy Nitrates, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry A*, 118, 1622–1637, doi:10.1021/jp4107603, 2014.
- Lelieveld, J., Butler, T. M., Crowley, J. N., Dillon, T. J., Fischer, H., Ganzeveld, L., Harder, H., Lawrence, M. G.,  
 735 Martinez, M., Taraborrelli, D., and Williams, J.: Atmospheric oxidation capacity sustained by a tropical forest, *Nature*, 452, 737–740, 2008.
- Liu, Y. J., Herdinger-Blatt, I., McKinney, K. A., and Martin, S. T.: Production of methyl vinyl ketone and methacrolein via the hydroperoxyl pathway of isoprene oxidation, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 5715–5730, doi:10.5194/acp-13-5715-2013, 2013.
- 740 Lu, K. D., Rohrer, F., Holland, F., Fuchs, H., Bohn, B., Brauers, T., Chang, C. C., Haseler, R., Hu, M., Kita, K., Kondo, Y., Li, X., Lou, S. R., Nehr, S., Shao, M., Zeng, L. M., Wahner, A., Zhang, Y. H., and Hofzumahaus, A.: Observation and modelling of OH and HO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the Pearl River Delta 2006: a missing OH source in a VOC rich atmosphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 1541–1569, 2012.
- Mak, J. E., Su, L., Guenther, A., and Karl, T.: A novel Whole Air Sample Profiler (WASP) for the quantification  
 745 of volatile organic compounds in the boundary layer, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6, 2703–2712, doi:10.5194/amt-6-2703-2013, 2013.
- Mao, J. Q., Paulot, F., Jacob, D. J., Cohen, R. C., Crounse, J. D., Wennberg, P. O., Keller, C. A., Hudman, R. C., Barkley, M. P., and Horowitz, L. W.: Ozone and organic nitrates over the eastern United States: Sensitivity to isoprene chemistry, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 118, 11 256–11 268, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50817, 2013.


- 750 Min, K. E., Pusede, S. E., Browne, E. C., LaFranchi, B. W., Wooldridge, P. J., and Cohen, R. C.: Eddy covariance fluxes and vertical concentration gradient measurements of NO and NO<sub>2</sub> over a ponderosa pine ecosystem: observational evidence for within-canopy chemical removal of NO<sub>x</sub>, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 5495–5512, doi:10.5194/acp-14-5495-2014, 2014.
- Muller, J. F., Peeters, J., and Stavrou, T.: Fast photolysis of carbonyl nitrates from isoprene, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 2497–2508, doi:10.5194/acp-14-2497-2014, 2014.
- 755 Nguyen, T. B., Crounse, J. D., Teng, A. P., Clair, J. M. S., Paulot, F., Wolfe, G. M., and Wennberg, P. O.: Rapid deposition of oxidized biogenic compounds to a temperate forest, *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. Usa.*, 112, E392–E401, doi:10.1073/pnas.1418702112, 2015.
- Orlando, J. J. and Tyndall, G. S.: Laboratory studies of organic peroxy radical chemistry: an overview with emphasis on recent issues of atmospheric significance, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 41, 6294–6317, 2012.
- 760 Ouwersloot, H. G., de Arellano, J. V. G., van Heerwaarden, C. C., Ganzeveld, L. N., Krol, M. C., and Lelieveld, J.: On the segregation of chemical species in a clear boundary layer over heterogeneous land surfaces, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 10 681–10 704, 2011.
- Park, J. H., Goldstein, A. H., Timkovsky, J., Fares, S., Weber, R., Karlik, J., and Holzinger, R.: Eddy covariance emission and deposition flux measurements using proton transfer reaction - time of flight - mass spectrometry (PTR-TOF-MS): comparison with PTR-MS measured vertical gradients and fluxes, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 1439–1456, doi:10.5194/acp-13-1439-2013, 2013.
- 765 Patton, E. G., Davis, K. J., Barth, M. C., and Sullivan, P. P.: Decaying scalars emitted by a forest canopy: A numerical study, *Bound.-Lay. Meteorol.*, 100, 91–129, 2001.
- 770 Paulot, F., Crounse, J. D., Kjaergaard, H. G., Kurten, A., St Clair, J. M., Seinfeld, J. H., and Wennberg, P. O.: Unexpected Epoxide Formation in the Gas-Phase Photooxidation of Isoprene, *Science*, 325, 730–733, 2009.
- Peeters, J. and Muller, J. F.: HO<sub>x</sub> radical regeneration in isoprene oxidation via peroxy radical isomerisations. II: experimental evidence and global impact, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 14 227–14 235, 2010.
- Peeters, J., Nguyen, T. L., and Vereecken, L.: HO<sub>x</sub> radical regeneration in the oxidation of isoprene, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 5935–5939, 2009.
- 775 Rivera-Rios, J. C., Nguyen, T. B., Crounse, J. D., Jud, W., St Clair, J. M., Mikoviny, T., Gilman, J. B., Lerner, B. M., Kaiser, J. B., de Gouw, J., Wisthaler, A., Hansel, A., Wennberg, P. O., Seinfeld, J. H., and Keutsch, F. N.: Conversion of hydroperoxides to carbonyls in field and laboratory instrumentation: Observational bias in diagnosing pristine versus anthropogenically controlled atmospheric chemistry, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 8645–8651, doi:10.1002/2014gl061919, 2014.
- 780 Shirley, T. R., Brune, W. H., Ren, X., Mao, J., Leshner, R., Cardenas, B., Volkamer, R., Molina, L. T., Molina, M. J., Lamb, B., Velasco, E., Jobson, T., and Alexander, M.: Atmospheric oxidation in the Mexico City Metropolitan Area (MCMA) during April 2003, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 2753–2765, 2006.
- Thornton, F. C., Pier, P. A., and Valente, R. J.: NO emissions from soils in the southeastern United States, *J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos.*, 102, 21 189–21 195, doi:10.1029/97jd01567, 1997.
- 785 van Stratum, B. J. H., de Arellano, J. V. G., Ouwersloot, H. G., van den Dries, K., van Laar, T. W., Martinez, M., Lelieveld, J., Diesch, J. M., Drewnick, F., Fischer, H., Beygi, Z. H., Harder, H., Regelin, E., Sinha, V., Adame, J. A., Sorgel, M., Sander, R., Bozem, H., Song, W., Williams, J., and Yassaa, N.: Case study of the

- diurnal variability of chemically active species with respect to boundary layer dynamics during DOMINO,  
790 Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 5329–5341, 2012.
- Wennberg, P. O.: Let's abandon the "high NOX" and "low NOX" terminology, IGAC News, pp. 3–4, 2013.
- Whalley, L. K., Furneaux, K. L., Goddard, A., Lee, J. D., Mahajan, A., Oetjen, H., Read, K. A., Kaaden, N.,  
Carpenter, L. J., Lewis, A. C., Plane, J. M. C., Saltzman, E. S., Wiedensohler, A., and Heard, D. E.: The  
chemistry of OH and HO<sub>2</sub> radicals in the boundary layer over the tropical Atlantic Ocean, Atmos. Chem.  
795 Phys., 10, 1555–1576, doi:10.5194/acp-10-1555-2010, 2010.
- Whalley, L. K., Edwards, P. M., Furneaux, K. L., Goddard, A., Ingham, T., Evans, M. J., Stone, D., Hopkins,  
J. R., Jones, C. E., Karunaharan, A., Lee, J. D., Lewis, A. C., Monks, P. S., Moller, S. J., and Heard, D. E.:  
Quantifying the magnitude of a missing hydroxyl radical source in a tropical rainforest, Atmos. Chem. Phys.,  
11, 7223–7233, doi:10.5194/acp-11-7223-2011, 2011.
- 800 Xie, Y., Paulot, F., Carter, W. P. L., Nolte, C. G., Luecken, D. J., Hutzell, W. T., Wennberg, P. O., Cohen, R. C.,  
and Pinder, R. W.: Understanding the impact of recent advances in isoprene photooxidation on simulations  
of regional air quality, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 13, 8439–8455, doi:10.5194/acp-13-8439-2013, 2013.
- Xiong, F., McAvey, K. M., Pratt, K. A., Groff, C. J., Hostetler, M. A., Lipton, M. A., Starn, T. K., Seeley, J. V.,  
Bertman, S. B., Teng, A. P., Crounse, J. D., Nguyen, T. B., Wennberg, P. O., Misztal, P. K., Goldstein, A. H.,  
805 Guenther, A. B., Koss, A. R., Olson, K. F., de Gouw, J. A., Baumann, K., Edgerton, E. S., Feiner, P. A.,  
Zhang, L., Miller, D. O., Brune, W. H., and Shepson, P. B.: Observation of isoprene hydroxynitrates in the  
Southeastern United States and implications for the fate of NO<sub>x</sub>, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 11 257–11 272,  
doi:10.5194/acp-15-11257-2015, 2015.







**Figure 1.** Schematic of the observations and various processes simulated in the mixed-layer model in this study.




**Figure 2.** Location of the two ground-based sampling sites and typical flight tracks of Long-EZ aircraft. The left panel shows the locations of the SEARCH site (upper red rectangular area) and the AABC site (lower red rectangular area). The two panels on the right side show the typical flight tracks carried out on June 12 over the two sites. The solid red square and solid red triangle indicate the location of the sampling towers at the SEARCH site and the AABC site, respectively. The GPS altitude of both flight tracks are color coded and indicated by the legend on the right. The maps were obtained from Google Earth.




**Figure 3.** Vertical profiles of VOC species collected using the WASP system. The blue and red colors indicate data collected on 2013-06-01 (at 06:55 CST, over the AABC site) and on 2013-06-11 (at 10:06 CST, over the SEARCH site), respectively. The dots represent original data points from the WASP system. The solid lines represent averaged data from the corresponding original data points within each 50 m altitude intervals. The dashed lines represent the estimated boundary layer height from ceilometer measurements (cf. Figure 4c). The y axis represents GPS altitude in unit of meters above mean sea level (m.a.s.l.). The elevation of the sampling sites is  $\sim 67$  m.a.s.l.




**Figure 4.** Diurnal evolution of (a) mixed layer potential temperature ( $\langle \theta \rangle$ ), (b) mixed layer specific humidity ( $\langle q \rangle$ ), and (c) boundary layer height ( $h$ ). The solid blue lines indicate ground-based observations which are averaged over the low cloud cover days. The shaded areas and error bars indicate 1 standard deviation of the corresponding observations. The solid red lines indicate data from MXLCH outputs.




**Figure 5.** Diurnal variation of (a)  $O_3$ , (b)  $NO$ , (c)  $NO_2$ , (d)  $OH$ , (e)  $HO_2$ , (f)  $ISOPN$ , (g) isoprene, (h)  $MVK+MACR$ , and (i) monoterpenes, and (j)  $HCHO$ . The solid blue-black line and corresponding shaded light blue-gray area indicate the averaged value and 1 standard deviation from the observation-observations at the SEARCH site. The solid blue circle and corresponding error bar indicate averaged value and 1 standard deviation of VOC mixing ratios within the boundary layer from each RF of the WASP system. The solid black square and corresponding error bar indicate averaged value and 1 standard deviation of chemical species within the boundary layer from RF of the NCAR C-130 aircraft. The solid black and red lines indicate the output from MXLCH model simulation with reduced and complex chemistry schemes, respectively. Data from the WASP system are from different days and RFs, see text for details.



**Figure 6.** Contribution of dynamics and chemistry to the budgets of (a) isoprene, (b) ozone.



**Figure 7.** Relative contributions of different reaction pathways to the fate of ISOPROO radicals under different NO:HO<sub>2</sub>. ISOM indicates isomerization. Data are from the MXLCH complex scheme with  $F_{NO_x} = \pm 30$  pptv ms<sup>-1</sup> and  $Yield_{ISOPN} = 6\%$ . ISOM indicates isomerization.



**Figure 8.** Diurnal evolutions of isoprene nitrates (ISOPN), isoprene hydroxy hydroperoxides (ISOPOOH), isoprene (ISOP), and NO:HO<sub>2</sub> from the MXLCH complex scheme with  $F_{NO_x} = \pm 30$  pptv m s<sup>-1</sup> and  $Yield_{ISOPN} = 6\%$ .



**Table 1.** Summary of the WASP research flights (RFs). The first four digits in RF no. before the underscore indicate the month and day of the flight, the digit after the underscore indicates the flight number carried out on the specific single day.

RF no.	Site	Latitude (°)	Longitude (°)	Sampling time (CST)	Temperature (°C)	RH
0601_2	AABC	32.69 <del>-32.71</del> to 32.71	-87.26 <del>-to</del> -87.24	06:55–06:57	18.9–22.2	0.8–0.9
0605_1	SEARCH	32.90 <del>-32.91</del> to 32.91	-87.26 <del>-to</del> -87.24	10:05–10:07	21.2–26.2	0.7–0.9
0605_4	AABC	32.69 <del>-32.71</del> to 32.71	-87.26 <del>-to</del> -87.23	14:23–14:25	22.6–28.2	0.6–0.7
0606_1	SEARCH	32.90 <del>-32.91</del> to 32.91	-87.26 <del>-to</del> -87.24	10:47–10:49	19.1–24.1	0.7–0.8
0606_3	AABC	32.69 <del>-32.70</del> to 32.70	-87.25 <del>-to</del> -87.24	14:17–14:19	21.7–25.7	0.7–0.8
0606_5	AABC	32.69 <del>-32.71</del> to 32.71	-87.26 <del>-to</del> -87.24	16:06–16:09	21.5–27.2	0.7–0.8
0608_3	AABC	32.69 <del>-32.71</del> to 32.71	-87.26 <del>-to</del> -87.23	12:42–12:44	20.3–25.8	0.6–0.8
0611_1	SEARCH	32.90 <del>-32.91</del> to 32.91	-87.26 <del>-to</del> -87.24	10:06–10:08	22.6–27.8	0.6–0.8
0611_3	AABC	32.69 <del>-32.70</del> to 32.70	-87.25 <del>-to</del> -87.24	12:34–12:36	23.2–29.1	0.6–0.7
0611_5	AABC	32.69 <del>-32.70</del> to 32.70	-87.25 <del>-to</del> -87.23	16:09–16:11	24.2–31.1	0.5–0.7
0612_1	SEARCH	32.90 <del>-32.91</del> to 32.91	-87.26 <del>-to</del> -87.24	09:51–09:53	22.2–28.5	0.7–0.8
0612_4	SEARCH	32.90 <del>-32.91</del> to 32.91	-87.26 <del>-to</del> -87.24	15:01–15:03	25.1–31.0	0.5–0.6
0613_2	AABC	32.69 <del>-32.70</del> to 32.70	-87.25 <del>-to</del> -87.23	11:23–11:25	23.2–29.8	0.6–0.7
0613_4	AABC	32.68 <del>-32.70</del> to 32.70	-87.25 <del>-to</del> -87.22	14:13–14:15	24.3–31.0	0.5–0.7

**Table 2.** The initial and boundary conditions used in MXLCH.

Parameter	Symbol	Value	Units
Initial BL height	$h$	500 <sup>a</sup>	m
Subsidence rate	$w$	$9.0 \times 10^{-6}$	s <sup>-1</sup>
Surface sensible heat flux	$\overline{w'\theta'_s}$	$0.10\sin(\pi t/t_d)^b$	K m s <sup>-1</sup>
Surface latent heat flux	$\overline{w'q'_s}$	$0.15\sin(\pi t/t_d)^b$	g kg <sup>-1</sup> m s <sup>-1</sup>
Entrainment/surface heat flux ratio	$\beta = -\overline{w'\theta'_e}/\overline{w'\theta'_s}$	0.2	1
Initial BL potential temperature	$\langle\theta\rangle$	296.6 <sup>c</sup>	K
Initial FT potential temperature	$\theta_{FT}$	298.1	K
Potential temperature lapse rate FT	$\gamma_\theta$	0.003	K m <sup>-1</sup>
Advection of potential temperature	$A_\theta$	$6.40 \times 10^{-4}$	K s <sup>-1</sup>
Initial BL specific humidity	$\langle q \rangle$	16.8 <sup>c</sup>	g kg <sup>-1</sup>
Initial FT specific humidity	$q_{FT}$	12.8	g kg <sup>-1</sup>
Specific humidity lapse rate FT	$\gamma_q$	-0.004	g kg <sup>-1</sup> m <sup>-1</sup>
Advection of specific humidity	$A_q$	$1.50 \times 10^{-4}$	g kg <sup>-1</sup> s <sup>-1</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Data from ceilometer measurement at the SEARCH site.

<sup>b</sup>The peak values of the heat fluxes are obtained from the AABC tower.  $t$  is the elapsed time since the start of the simulation and  $t_d$  is the time difference between the start and end of the simulation period (06:00–16:30 CST).

<sup>c</sup>Data from the AABC flux tower.

**Table 3.** The initial mixing ratios of important chemical species in the CBL and FT used in MXLCH.

Species	Mixing ratio in CBL (ppbv)	Mixing ratio in FT (ppbv)	Emission or deposition
O <sub>3</sub>	12.9 <sup>a</sup>	51.0 <sup>c</sup>	2.3 <sup>d</sup>
NO	0.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.05 <sup>c</sup>	<sup>e</sup>
NO <sub>2</sub>	0.8 <sup>a</sup>	0.06 <sup>c</sup>	<sup>f</sup>
OH	0	0	—
HO <sub>2</sub>	0	0	—
HCHO	2.0 <sup>a</sup>	1.1 <sup>c</sup>	—
C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>8</sub>	0.6 <sup>b</sup>	0.0	1.0sin( $\pi t/t_d$ ) <sup>g</sup>
MVK	0.3 <sup>b</sup>	0.3 <sup>b</sup>	2.4 <sup>d</sup>
MACR	0.3 <sup>b</sup>	0.3 <sup>b</sup>	2.4 <sup>d</sup>
ISOPND	0.01 <sup>a</sup>	0	1.5 <sup>h</sup>
ISOPNB	0.01 <sup>a</sup>	0	1.5 <sup>h</sup>
ISOPOOH	0	0	2.5 <sup>h</sup>
Monoterpenes	1.1 <sup>b</sup>	0.0	0.070sin( $\pi t/t_d$ ) <sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Data are obtained from the SEARCH site.

<sup>b</sup>Data are obtained from the WASP system.

<sup>c</sup>Data are obtained from NCAR C-130.

<sup>d</sup>Dry deposition velocity (unit, cm s<sup>-1</sup>), values taken from Karl et al. (2010).

<sup>e</sup>  $-5\sin(\pi t/t_d)$  pptv m s<sup>-1</sup> in reduced scheme;  $-5\sin(\pi t/t_d)$ ,  $-10\sin(\pi t/t_d)$ , or  $-30\sin(\pi t/t_d)$  pptv m s<sup>-1</sup> in complex scheme.  $t$  is the elapsed time since the start of the simulation and  $t_d$  is the time difference between the start and end of the flux period (06:00–08:00 CST).

<sup>f</sup>  $5\sin(\pi t/t_d)$  pptv m s<sup>-1</sup> in reduced scheme;  $5\sin(\pi t/t_d)$ ,  $10\sin(\pi t/t_d)$ , or  $30\sin(\pi t/t_d)$  pptv m s<sup>-1</sup> in complex scheme.  $t$  and  $t_d$  are the same as above.

<sup>g</sup>The peak values of the BVOCs fluxes are obtained from the AABC tower.  $t$  and  $t_d$  are the same as above.

<sup>h</sup>Dry deposition velocity (unit, cm s<sup>-1</sup>), values taken from Nguyen et al. (2015).

**Table 4.** The reduced chemistry scheme used in MXLCH. Product compounds shown in parenthesis (e.g., (O<sub>2</sub>)) indicate not included in the model solution.

Number	Reaction	Reaction rate
R01	O <sub>3</sub> + hν → O( <sup>1</sup> D) + (O <sub>2</sub> )	$3.03 \times 10^{-4} \exp(-1.96/\cos(x))$
R02	O( <sup>1</sup> D) + H <sub>2</sub> O → 2OH	$1.63 \times 10^{-10} \exp(60/T)$
R03	O( <sup>1</sup> D) + N <sub>2</sub> → O <sub>3</sub>	$2.15 \times 10^{-11} \exp(110/T)$
R04	O( <sup>1</sup> D) + O <sub>2</sub> → O <sub>3</sub>	$3.30 \times 10^{-11} \exp(55/T)$
R05	NO <sub>2</sub> + hν → NO + O <sub>3</sub>	$1.71 \times 10^{-2} \exp(-0.55/\cos(x))$
R06	CH <sub>2</sub> O + hν → HO <sub>2</sub>	$1.94 \times 10^{-4} \exp(-0.82/\cos(x))$
R07	OH + CO → HO <sub>2</sub> + (CO <sub>2</sub> )	$2.40 \times 10^{-13}$
R08	OH + CH <sub>4</sub> → CH <sub>3</sub> O <sub>2</sub>	$2.45 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-1775/T)$
R09	OH + C <sub>5</sub> H <sub>8</sub> → HOC <sub>5</sub> H <sub>8</sub> OO	$3.10 \times 10^{-11} \exp(350/T)$
R10	OH + [MVK+MACR] → HO <sub>2</sub> + CH <sub>2</sub> O	$2.40 \times 10^{-11}$
R11	OH + HO <sub>2</sub> → H <sub>2</sub> O + (O <sub>2</sub> )	$4.80 \times 10^{-11} \exp(250/T)$
R12	OH + H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> → H <sub>2</sub> O + HO <sub>2</sub>	$2.90 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-160/T)$
R13	HO <sub>2</sub> + NO → OH + NO <sub>2</sub>	$3.50 \times 10^{-12} \exp(250/T)$
R14	CH <sub>3</sub> O <sub>2</sub> + NO → HO <sub>2</sub> + NO <sub>2</sub> + CH <sub>2</sub> O	$2.80 \times 10^{-12} \exp(300/T)$
R15	HOC <sub>5</sub> H <sub>8</sub> OO + NO → HO <sub>2</sub> + NO <sub>2</sub> + 0.7[MVK+MACR] + CH <sub>2</sub> O	$1.00 \times 10^{-11}$
R16	OH + CH <sub>2</sub> O → HO <sub>2</sub>	$5.50 \times 10^{-12} \exp(125/T)$
R17	2HO <sub>2</sub> → H <sub>2</sub> O <sub>2</sub> + (O <sub>2</sub> )	<sup>a</sup>
R18	CH <sub>3</sub> O <sub>2</sub> + HO <sub>2</sub> → PRODUCT	$4.10 \times 10^{-13} \exp(750/T)$
R19	HOC <sub>5</sub> H <sub>8</sub> OO + HO <sub>2</sub> → 0.8OH + PRODUCT	<del><math>1.50 \times 10^{-11} \exp(750/T)</math></del> $1.50 \times 10^{-11}$
R20	OH + NO <sub>2</sub> → HNO <sub>3</sub>	$3.50 \times 10^{-12} \exp(340/T)$
R21	NO + O <sub>3</sub> → NO <sub>2</sub> + (O <sub>2</sub> )	$3.00 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-1500/T)$
R22	NO + NO <sub>3</sub> → 2NO <sub>2</sub>	$1.80 \times 10^{-11} \exp(110/T)$
R23	NO <sub>2</sub> + O <sub>3</sub> → NO <sub>3</sub> + (O <sub>2</sub> )	<sup>b</sup>
R24	NO <sub>2</sub> + NO <sub>3</sub> → N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	<sup>c</sup>
R25	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> → NO <sub>3</sub> + NO <sub>2</sub>	$1.30 \times 10^{-2} \exp(-3.5/T)$
R26	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> + H <sub>2</sub> O → 2HNO <sub>3</sub>	$2.50 \times 10^{-22}$
R27	N <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> + 2H <sub>2</sub> O → 2HNO <sub>3</sub> + H <sub>2</sub> O	$1.80 \times 10^{-39}$
R28	HO <sub>2</sub> + O <sub>3</sub> → OH + 2(O <sub>2</sub> )	$2.03 \times 10^{-16} (T/300)^{4.57} \exp(693/T)$
R29	C <sub>10</sub> H <sub>16</sub> + O <sub>3</sub> → PRODUCT	$5.00 \times 10^{-16} \exp(-530/T)$
R30	C <sub>10</sub> H <sub>16</sub> + OH → PRODUCT	$1.21 \times 10^{-11} \exp(436/T)$
R31	OH + O <sub>3</sub> → HO <sub>2</sub> + (O <sub>2</sub> )	$1.30 \times 10^{-12} \exp(-956/T)$

<sup>a</sup>  $k = (k_1 + k_2)/k_3$ ;  $k_1 = 2.21 \times 10^{-13} \exp(600/T)$ ;  $k_2 = 1.91 \times 10^{-33} \exp(980/T) c_{air}$ ;  $k_3 = 1 + 1.4 \times 10^{-21} \exp(2200/T) c_{H_2O}$ .

<sup>b</sup>  $k = 0.35 \times (k_0 \times k_{inf}) / (k_0 + k_{inf})$ ;  $k_0 = 3.61 \times 10^{-30} (T/300)^{-4.1} c_{N_2}$ ;  $k_{inf} = 1.91 \times 10^{-12} (T/300)^{0.2}$ .

<sup>c</sup>  $k = 0.35 \times (k_0 \times k_{inf}) / (k_0 + k_{inf})$ ;  $k_0 = 1.31 \times 10^{-3} (T/300)^{-3.5} \exp(-1100/T)$ ;  $k_{inf} = 9.71 \times 10^{14} (T/300) \times \exp(-11080/T)$ .