

1 **Compilation and evaluation of gas-phase diffusion coefficients of**  
2 **reactive trace gases in the atmosphere: Volume 2. Diffusivities of**  
3 **organic compounds, pressure-normalized mean free paths, and average**  
4 **Knudsen numbers for gas uptake calculations**

5 M. J. Tang<sup>1</sup>, M. Shiraiwa<sup>2</sup>, U. Pöschl<sup>2</sup>, R. A. Cox<sup>1</sup>, M. Kalberer<sup>1</sup>,

6 <sup>1</sup> Department of Chemistry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 1EW, UK

7 <sup>2</sup> Multiphase Chemistry Department, Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, 55128, Mainz,  
8 Germany

9 Correspondence to: M. J. Tang (mingjintang@gmail.com), M. Kalberer  
10 (markus.kalberer@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk)

11  
12 **Abstract:**

13 Diffusion of organic vapours to the surface of aerosol or cloud particles is an important  
14 step for the formation and transformation of atmospheric particles. So far, however, a  
15 database of gas phase diffusion coefficients for organic compounds of atmospheric  
16 interest has not been available. In this work we have compiled and evaluated gas phase  
17 diffusivities (pressure-independent diffusion coefficients) of organic compounds reported  
18 by previous experimental studies, and we compare the measurement data to estimates  
19 obtained with Fuller's semi-empirical method. The difference between measured and  
20 estimated diffusivities are mostly <10%. With regard to gas-particle interactions,  
21 different gas molecules, including both organic and inorganic compounds, exhibit similar  
22 Knudsen numbers ( $Kn$ ) although their gas phase diffusivities may vary over a wide range.  
23 **This is because different trace gas molecules have similar mean free paths in air at a**  
24 **given pressure. Thus, we introduce the pressure-normalized mean free path,  $\lambda_P \approx 100$**   
25 **nm atm, as a near-constant generic parameter that can be used for approximate**  
26 **calculation of Knudsen numbers** as a simple function of gas pressure and particle  
27 diameter to characterize the influence of gas phase diffusion on the uptake of gases by  
28 aerosol or cloud particles. We use a kinetic multi-layer model of gas-particle interaction  
29 to illustrate the effects of gas phase diffusion on the condensation of organic compounds  
30 with different volatilities. The results show that gas-phase diffusion can play a major role

1 in determining the growth of secondary organic aerosol particles by condensation of  
2 low-volatility organic vapours.

### 3 **1 Introduction**

4 Organic aerosols are ubiquitous in the atmosphere and can account for a dominant  
5 fraction of submicron aerosol particles (Jimenez et al., 2009). Organic aerosols affect  
6 climate by scattering and adsorbing solar and terrestrial radiation and serving as cloud  
7 condensation nuclei and ice nuclei (Kanakidou et al., 2005; Hallquist et al., 2009). Some  
8 organic aerosol components are toxic and hazardous, causing oxidative stress upon  
9 deposition into the lung (Platt et al., 2014). For better evaluation of impacts of organic  
10 aerosols on climate and public health, it is critical to know the number concentration,  
11 particle size distribution and chemical composition of organic aerosols.

12 Organic aerosol particles can be directly emitted into the atmosphere, and they can also  
13 be produced by condensation of semi- and low-volatility organic vapours which are  
14 directly emitted or formed by gas-phase reactions between atmospheric oxidants like OH,  
15 O<sub>3</sub>, and NO<sub>3</sub> with volatile organic compounds (VOCs) of biogenic and anthropogenic  
16 precursors (Robinson et al., 2007; Kroll and Seinfeld, 2008). Photo-oxidation of parent  
17 VOCs and subsequent multi-generation gas-phase chemistry produce an array of  
18 semi- and low-volatility oxidation products that can partition onto pre-existing particles  
19 (Baltensperger et al., 2005; Sax et al., 2005; Donahue et al., 2014). In addition, oxidation  
20 products partitioned into the particle phase may undergo particle-phase reactions (George  
21 and Abbatt, 2010; Shiraiwa et al., 2013), forming low volatility products such as  
22 oligomers and other high molecular mass products (Kalberer et al., 2004; Ziemann and  
23 Atkinson, 2012). Recently the uptake of organic compounds (e.g., CHOCHO) onto cloud  
24 droplets followed by aqueous reactions is suggested to be an important pathway for  
25 organic aerosol formation (Volkamer et al., 2009; Lim et al., 2010; Sareen et al., 2010).

26 The formation and transformation of atmospheric aerosol particles occurs via multiple  
27 physical and chemical steps in and between different phases (Pöschl, 2005; Rudich et al.,  
28 2007; Pöschl, 2011; Pöschl and Shiraiwa et al., 2015). The combination of diffusion in  
29 gas and liquid phases, surface adsorption and reaction, bulk dissolution and reactions

1 makes aerosol chemistry complicated and typically nonlinear (Kolb et al., 2010; Pöschl,  
2 2011; Berkemeier et al., 2013; Shiraiwa et al., 2014).

3 Over the last few decades a large number of heterogeneous and multiphase reactions have  
4 been investigated (Crowley et al., 2010; Sander et al., 2011; Ammann et al., 2013),  
5 significantly improving our understanding of many important atmospheric phenomena,  
6 e.g., stratospheric ozone depletion, acid deposition, and air quality. However, many  
7 important heterogeneous processes, such as the formation and transformation of organic  
8 aerosols, are still not well quantified, and our current knowledge is not sufficient enough  
9 to develop process-based modules to be included in air quality, cloud, or climate models.  
10 Process-based multiphase modules have been developed to address these challenges  
11 (Pöschl et al., 2007), and reliable thermodynamic and kinetic parameters are  
12 indispensable (Kolb et al., 2010; Abbatt et al., 2014). Therefore, it is very important to  
13 develop, disseminate and maintain evaluated databases for all the parameters which may  
14 be involved in atmospheric heterogeneous and multiphase processes.

15 Gas-phase diffusion is the first step for the condensation of organic vapours of low- and  
16 semi-volatility to existing particles (Pierce et al., 2011; Riipinen et al., 2011; Shiraiwa et  
17 al., 2014). Therefore, the gas-phase diffusion coefficient is an important parameter in  
18 kinetic models of SOA formation and growth (Riipinen et al., 2011; Roldin et al., 2014;  
19 Shiraiwa et al., 2014). A few previous studies have compiled gas phase diffusion  
20 coefficients of some organic compounds to evaluate the performance of different  
21 theoretical methods used to estimate diffusion coefficients (Marrero and Mason, 1972;  
22 Reid et al., 1987; Berezhnoi and Semenov, 1997). However, most of the compounds  
23 compiled previously are of limited interest to heterogeneous and multiphase chemistry in  
24 the atmosphere. We critically reviewed the gas phase diffusion coefficients of inorganic  
25 reactive trace gases in the atmosphere in our previous work (Tang et al., 2014a), and in  
26 the present work we have compiled and evaluated the gas phase diffusion coefficients of  
27 organic species. We find that different gas molecules, including both organic and  
28 inorganic compounds, have very similar Knudsen numbers, and propose a simple  
29 equation (only as a function of particle diameter and pressure) to calculate Knudsen  
30 numbers for all gas molecules. In addition, to illustrate the effects of gas-phase diffusion  
31 on organic aerosol formation, the condensation of two organic compounds with

1 distinctive volatility onto seed aerosol particles is simulated using a kinetic multi-layer  
2 model for gas-particle interactions in aerosols and clouds (Shiraiwa et al., 2012; Shiraiwa  
3 and Seinfeld, 2012).

## 4 **2 Gas phase diffusion coefficients**

### 5 **2.1 Gas-particle interaction and gas phase diffusion**

6 The overall kinetics of a heterogeneous or multiphase reaction, is usually described by  
7 the uptake coefficient,  $\gamma$ , defined as the net probability that a molecule X which collides  
8 with the surface is taken up by the surface (Crowley et al., 2010). The uptake coefficient  
9 links all the chemical and physical processes on and beyond the surface with an apparent  
10 pseudo-first order loss rate of X in the gas phase (Ammann et al., 2013; Crowley et al.,  
11 2010):

$$12 \frac{d[X]_g}{dt} = -k_I[X]_g = -0.25 \cdot \gamma_{eff} \cdot c(X) \cdot [SS] \cdot [X]_g \quad (1)$$

13 where  $[X]_g$  is the concentration of X in the gas phase (molecule  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ),  $k_I$  is the pseudo  
14 first order loss rate of X ( $\text{s}^{-1}$ ) in the gas phase, and  $\gamma_{eff}$  is the effective uptake coefficient  
15 of X by the surface.  $[SS]$  is the surface area concentration ( $\text{cm}^2 \text{cm}^{-3}$ ). For airborne  
16 aerosol particles,  $[SS]$  is usually derived from size distribution measured by instruments  
17 such as Aerodynamic Particle Sizer and Scanning Mobility Particle Sizer (e.g., McNeill  
18 et al., 2006; Vlasenko et al., 2009; Matthews et al., 2014; Tang et al., 2014c).  $c(X)$  is the  
19 average molecular speed of X ( $\text{cm s}^{-1}$ ) in the gas phase, given by

$$20 c(X) = \sqrt{\frac{8RT}{\pi M}} \quad (2)$$

21 where  $R$  is the gas constant ( $8.314 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \text{ K}^{-1}$ ),  $T$  is the temperature (K), and  $M$  is the  
22 molar mass of X ( $\text{kg mol}^{-1}$ ).

23 Significant net uptake can lead to local reduction of X in the near-surface gas phase (the  
24 distance of which from the surface is comparable to the mean free path of X) compared to  
25 the average gas phase concentration of X far from the particle, and therefore the effective  
26 uptake coefficient,  $\gamma_{eff}$ , is smaller than the true uptake coefficient,  $\gamma$ . Under steady state  
27 assumptions (Schwartz, 1986), a resistance formulation can be used to describe the  
28 relation between  $\gamma_{eff}$  and  $\gamma$  (Davidovits et al., 1995; Davidovits et al., 2006):

$$1 \quad \frac{1}{\gamma_{eff}} = \frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\Gamma_{diff}} \quad (3a)$$

2 where  $\Gamma_{diff}$  (sometimes called the gas transport coefficient) represents the effect of gas  
 3 phase diffusion and depends on the shape and dimension of the surface and the gas phase  
 4 diffusion coefficient of X (Crowley et al., 2010; Tang et al., 2014a). Alternatively, a  
 5 gas-phase diffusion correction factor,  $C_{g,diff}$ , can be used to describe the influence of gas  
 6 phase diffusion (Pöschl et al., 2007):

$$7 \quad C_{g,diff} = \frac{\gamma_{eff}}{\gamma} = \frac{1}{1+\gamma/\Gamma_{diff}} \quad (3b)$$

8 Several methods have been developed to calculate  $\Gamma_{diff}$  for the uptake onto a spherical  
 9 particle (Pöschl et al., 2007), such as the Fuchs-Sutugin equation (Wagner et al., 2008):

$$10 \quad \frac{1}{\Gamma_{diff}} = \frac{0.75+0.286Kn}{Kn \cdot (Kn+1)} \quad (4)$$

11 where  $Kn$  is the Knudsen number, calculated by

$$12 \quad Kn = \frac{2\lambda(X)}{d_p} \quad (5a)$$

$$13 \quad \lambda(X) = \frac{3D_P(X)}{c(X)} \quad (5b)$$

14 where  $\lambda(X)$  is the mean free path of X (cm),  $d_p$  is the diameter of the spherical particle  
 15 (cm),  $D_P$  is the gas-phase diffusion coefficient of X ( $\text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ ) at pressure of  $P$ , and  $d_p$  is  
 16 the diameter of the spherical particle (cm). The effect of gas phase diffusion largely  
 17 depends on the particle size and the uptake coefficient, as discussed in our previous work  
 18 (Tang et al., 2014a). A method to calculate  $Kn$  for poly-disperse spherical particles has  
 19 also been developed (Tang et al., 2012; Tang et al., 2014b). In addition, equations are  
 20 available to calculate  $\Gamma_{diff}$  for the uptake by the inner wall of cylindrical tubes (Hanson et  
 21 al., 1992; Wagner et al., 2008; Tang et al., 2014a; Knopf et al., 2015).

22 The effect of gas phase diffusion on the overall rate of a heterogeneous reaction, as  
 23 shown in Eqs. (3-5), depends on the gas phase diffusion coefficient of X, which is a  
 24 function of pressure of the bath gas (Reid et al., 1987):

$$25 \quad D(X) = D_P(X) \cdot P \quad (6)$$

1 where  $D_P(X)$  is the diffusion coefficient ( $\text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ ) of X at the pressure  $P$  (Torr), and  $D(X)$   
2 is the diffusivity ( $\text{Torr cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ ), sometimes also called pressure-independent diffusion  
3 coefficient of X.

## 4 **2.2 Estimation of gas phase diffusivities**

5 In theory the gas-phase diffusivity can be predicted based on molecular parameters  
6 (mainly molecular masses and collisional cross sections). However, molecular collisional  
7 cross sections are not readily available for many important trace gases in the atmosphere.  
8 Several empirical and semi-empirical methods have been developed to estimate the gas  
9 phase diffusivities. A large body of experimental diffusivities have been compared to  
10 estimated values using different modelling methods (Reid et al., 1987), and it is found  
11 that on average estimated diffusivities using Fuller's semi-empirical method (Fuller et al.,  
12 1966; Fuller et al., 1969) show best agreement with experimental data. Fuller's method  
13 was used our previous work (Tang et al., 2014a) to estimate the diffusivities of inorganic  
14 compounds, and is used here to estimate the diffusivities of organic compounds.

15 Fuller's method (Fuller et al., 1966) suggests that the diffusivity ( $\text{Torr cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ ) of a trace  
16 gas A in a bath gas B at the temperature  $T$  (K), can be estimated by

$$17 \quad D(A, B) = \frac{1.0868 \cdot T^{1.75}}{\sqrt{m(A, B) (\sqrt[3]{V_A} + \sqrt[3]{V_B})^2}} \quad (7)$$

18 where  $V_A$  and  $V_B$  are the dimensionless diffusion volumes of A and B, and  $m(A, B)$  is the  
19 reduced mass of the molecular pair A-B, given by

$$20 \quad m(A, B) = \frac{2}{(1/m_A + 1/m_B)} \quad (8)$$

21 where  $m_A$  and  $m_B$  are the molar masses ( $\text{g mol}^{-1}$ ) of A and B, respectively. The diffusion  
22 volume of a molecule can be calculated by summing the diffusion volumes of all the  
23 atoms it contains:

$$24 \quad V = \sum n_i V_i \quad (9)$$

25 where  $n_i$  is the number of atoms (contained by the molecule) with a diffusion volume of  
26  $V_i$ . The atomic diffusion volume is 15.9 for C, 2.31 for H, 6.11 for O, and 4.54 for N,  
27 respectively (Reid et al., 1987). In addition, the diffusion volume should be subtracted

1 by -18.3 if the molecule contains an aromatic or heterocyclic ring. However, alicyclic  
2 rings (e.g., cyclohexane and cyclohexene) do not have effects on diffusion volumes. For  
3 example, the diffusion volume of benzene ( $C_6H_6$ ) is 90.96, but it would be 109.26 if the  
4 effect of the aromatic ring (-18.3) was not taken into account. It has not been clearly  
5 stated (Reid et al., 1987) how to calculate the diffusion volumes for compounds  
6 containing more than one aromatic rings (e.g., polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, PAHs).  
7 Our work presented here suggests that the estimated diffusivities agree better with  
8 experimental values when only independent aromatic rings which do not share carbon  
9 atoms with other aromatic rings are accounted. However, experimental data are only  
10 available for two PAHs (naphthalene and anthracene), and naphthalene has one  
11 independent aromatic ring while anthracene has two.

12 Diffusion volumes calculated using Eq. (9) do not take into account the effects of  
13 different structures of isomers, which may have different collisional cross sections and  
14 thus different diffusion volumes. The measured (Cummings and Ubbelohde, 1953;  
15 Cummings et al., 1955; Hudson et al., 1960; Altshuller and Cohen, 1960; Nagata and  
16 Hasegawa, 1970) and estimated diffusivities of four isomers (cyclohexane, methyl  
17 cyclopentane, 1-hexene, and 2,3-dimethyl-2-butene) of  $C_6H_{12}$  are listed in Table A1 in  
18 the Appendix, showing good agreement between measured and estimated values. This  
19 suggests that the effect of different isomers may be of minor importance.

20 The diffusion volumes for a small number of molecules (mainly used as bath gases in  
21 atmospheric chemistry research) are directly given (Reid et al., 1987). For example, the  
22 diffusion volume is 18.5 for  $N_2$ , 16.3 for  $O_2$ , 19.7 for air, and 13.1 for water vapour. A  
23 complete list of atomic and molecular diffusion volumes are given by Reid et al. (1987)  
24 in Table 11-1, Page 588. It should be pointed out that atomic and molecular diffusion  
25 volumes are determined by regression analysis of experimental gas phase diffusivities of  
26 a larger number of molecules using Fuller's method, and thus differences between  
27 measured and estimated diffusivities using Fuller's method may vary with molecules.

### 28 **3 Evaluation guidelines**

29 In this work we compiled and evaluated the diffusivities of organic compounds in air,  $N_2$ ,  
30 and/or  $O_2$ , and the preferred diffusivities at 298 K are recommended. We do not

1 differentiate measurements carried out in air, N<sub>2</sub>, or O<sub>2</sub>, because the difference is  
2 expected to be very small. For example, the estimated diffusivities of benzene at 298 K,  
3 using Fuller's method, are 69, 71, and 70 Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> in air, N<sub>2</sub>, and O<sub>2</sub>, respectively.

4 An excellent indexed collection of references which reported experimental gas phase  
5 diffusivities was published by Gordon (1977), though no data were compiled. A similar  
6 collection of references of experimental diffusivities was provided by Marrero and  
7 Mason (1972), who also evaluated the gas phase diffusivities for binary mixtures mainly  
8 consisting of small gas molecules (e.g., noble gases, N<sub>2</sub>, H<sub>2</sub>, CO, H<sub>2</sub>O, CO<sub>2</sub>, etc.). Some  
9 experimental data were also compiled by Reid et al. (1987) to test the performance of  
10 different methods used to estimate diffusivities. A limited body of experimental data  
11 were collected by Berezhnoi and Semenov (1997) to compare with the estimated values  
12 using the method they developed. We have checked these three monographs (Marrero  
13 and Mason, 1972; Reid et al., 1987; Berezhnoi and Semenov, 1997) to include studies  
14 which were not indexed by Gordon (1977). Our data compilation is limited to literature in  
15 English.

16 The uncertainties of experimental diffusivities reported in the literature were often not  
17 clearly stated, and if reported, the stated uncertainties (typically 1-2 Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) are  
18 typically smaller than the difference between different studies on the same compounds.  
19 As a result, we do not specifically provide the uncertainties of experimental diffusivities  
20 reported by individual studies. Pressure dependent diffusion coefficients were usually  
21 reported together with the pressure under which the measurements were performed. In  
22 present work they have been converted to pressure independent diffusivities using Eq. (6),  
23 consistent with our previous evaluation of diffusivities of inorganic compounds (Tang et  
24 al., 2014a).

25 The guidelines used in our evaluation of diffusivities of inorganic compounds (Tang et al.,  
26 2014a) are also adopted here. If the diffusivity of one compound was measured by  
27 several studies, the preferred diffusivity is given as the average of the measured values at  
28 298 K and the given uncertainty is the corresponding standard deviation. Studies whose  
29 results appear significantly different from others are not included in the average. If the



1 measurement was not carried out at 298 K, the measured diffusivity was extrapolated to  
2 298 K, using the temperature dependence suggested by Fuller's method, i.e.:

$$3 \quad D(298) = D(T) \cdot \left(\frac{298}{T}\right)^{1.75} \quad (10)$$

4 where  $D(T)$  is the measured diffusivities at  $T$  and  $D(298)$  is the extrapolated diffusivity at  
5 298 K. The temperature dependence of diffusivities and rationality of using Eq. (10) for  
6 extrapolation are further discussed in Section 4.1.

7 A few examples, shown in Table A2 in the Appendix, are provided here to illustrate how  
8 the data are evaluated. The diffusivities of 1-propanol were measured by four different  
9 studies (Gilliland, 1934; Lugg, 1968; Arnikar and Ghule, 1969; Nagata and Hasegawa,  
10 1970). The measurement at 298 K by Lugg (1968) agrees well with those extrapolated to  
11 298 K from the measurements at 299 K by Gilliland (1934), at 358 K by Arnikar and  
12 Ghule (1969), and at 363 K by Nagata and Hasegawa (1970). The preferred diffusivity at  
13 298 K,  $(79 \pm 5)$  Torr  $\text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ , is the average of those measured at or extrapolated to this  
14 temperature, and the estimated value  $(75 \text{ Torr cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1})$  using Fuller's method agree with  
15 the preferred value within the given uncertainty.

16 If the standard deviation of the measurements is smaller than the difference between  
17 preferred and estimated diffusivities **using Fuller's method**, then the given uncertainty  
18 reflects the difference between the preferred and estimated diffusivities. For example, the  
19 diffusivity of 2-pentanol was measured by two studies (Gilliland, 1934; Lugg, 1968), and  
20 the preferred diffusivity at 298 K  $(54 \text{ Torr cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1})$  is the average of the measurement at  
21 298 K by Lugg (1968) and that extrapolated to 298 K from the measurement at 299 K by  
22 Gilliland (1934). Since the standard deviation of two measurements ( $\sim 1 \text{ Torr cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) is  
23 smaller than the difference  $(8 \text{ Torr cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1})$  between the preferred  **$(54 \text{ Torr cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1})$**  and  
24 estimated  **$(62 \text{ Torr cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1})$**  diffusivities at 298 K, an uncertainty of  $\pm 8 \text{ Torr cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  is  
25 given to the preferred value, i.e.  $(54 \pm 8) \text{ Torr cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ .

26 The diffusivities of many species included in this work were only measured once. If the  
27 only measurement was carried out at 298 K, the measured value is temporarily preferred,  
28 and the given uncertainty is equal to the difference between the measured and estimated  
29 values. For example, the diffusivity of 1,3-butadiene at 298 K was measured to be

1 88 Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, which is 10 Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> smaller than the estimated value. Therefore, the  
2 preferred diffusivity of 1,3-butadiene, is recommended to be (88±10) Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. If the  
3 only measurement was not performed at 298 K, the preferred value (as well as its  
4 uncertainty) is given as that extrapolated to 298 K from the measured value, using  
5 Eq. (10). For example, the diffusivity of isoprene (Table A2) at 288 K was measured to  
6 be (69±5) Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> at 288 K (Altshuller and Cohen, 1960), and this gives a preferred  
7 value of (73±6) Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> at 298 K. In addition, if the difference between the measured  
8 and estimated diffusivities is larger than a factor of 2, the compound is still listed in  
9 Tables 1-3 but without a preferred diffusivity.

10 Experimental methods used to measure diffusivities were reviewed by Marrero and  
11 Mason (1972), with critical discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of these  
12 methods. The two methods (i.e. coated wall flow tubes and denuders) used to measure  
13 diffusivities of inorganic compounds in the atmospheric chemistry community (Tang et  
14 al., 2014a) have not been applied to organic species yet. It is recommended for future  
15 work to use one or both of these two methods to measure the diffusivities of organic  
16 reactive trace gases important for atmospheric heterogeneous and multiphase chemistry.

## 17 **4 Summary of preferred diffusivities**

18 The preferred diffusivities at 298 K in air (or N<sub>2</sub>/O<sub>2</sub>) are summarized in Tables 1-3 to  
19 provide a quick overview. Table 1 lists the preferred diffusivities of 21 alkanes, 4  
20 cycloalkanes, 15 alkenes (including 5 dienes), 3 alkynes, and 16 aromatic hydrocarbons.  
21 Preferred diffusivities of 16 alcohols, 2 glycols, 4 ethers, 5 ketones, 8 carboxylic acids,  
22 and 9 multifunctional species (only containing C, H, and O) are provided in Table 2.  
23 Table 3 summarizes the preferred diffusivities of 39 esters and 15 nitrogen-containing  
24 species. The diffusivity of CH<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>3</sub>H has been reviewed in our previous work (Tang et al.,  
25 2014a). The diffusivities of organic halogens are not included because their interactions  
26 with surfaces are expected to be unimportant in the troposphere and stratosphere,  
27 although some experimental data are available (Gordon, 1977).

28 A comprehensive and detailed compilation/evaluation, which largely follows the format  
29 of online reports prepared by the IUPAC Task Group on Atmospheric Chemical Kinetic  
30 Data Evaluation (<http://iupac.pole-ether.fr/>), is provided as supplement. **The supplement**

1 contains comparisons between the measured and estimated diffusivities for each  
2 measurements. It is also available online  
3 (<https://sites.google.com/site/mingjintang/home/diffusion>), and will be updated when  
4 new data become available. Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> is always used as the unit of diffusivities in this  
5 paper and the supplement. The differences between the measured and estimated  
6 diffusivities are typically <10% for most of the compounds included in this work,  
7 suggesting that Fuller's method can be used to estimate the diffusivities (in air, N<sub>2</sub>, and/or  
8 O<sub>2</sub>) of organic species if experimental data are not available.

9 However, larger discrepancies also occur. For example, the diffusivities of carboxylic  
10 acids were only measured once at 298 K (Lugg, 1968). The estimated diffusivities are ~5%  
11 smaller than measured values for formic acid and acetic acid, 5% larger than measured  
12 values for propionic acid, ~13% larger than measured values for acids containing 4  
13 carbon atoms (n-butyric acid and 2-methyl propionic acid), and ~20% larger than  
14 measured values for acids containing 5 or 6 carbon atoms (3-methyl butanoic acid,  
15 hexanoic acid, and 4-methyl pentanoic acid). The discrepancies appear to increase with  
16 the number of carbon atoms these organic acids contain. It is not clear whether this is due  
17 to 1) that the measurement errors increase with carbon atoms; 2) that the estimation errors  
18 increase with carbon atoms, or 3) the combination of both.

19 The diffusivities of many (if not most of) species included in this work, especially for O  
20 and N containing compounds with >4 carbon atoms which are of more interest for  
21 heterogeneous and multiphase reactions in the atmosphere, have only been measured  
22 once, and further measurements in future will help reduce the uncertainties. The  
23 estimated diffusivities of glyoxal (CHOCHO, Liggio et al., 2005; Lim et al., 2013),  
24 methyl vinyl ketone (C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>6</sub>O, Liu et al., 2013), trans-β-isoprene epoxydiols (C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>8</sub>O<sub>3</sub>,  
25 Surratt et al., 2010; Nguyen et al., 2014), pinonic acid (C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>16</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, Capouet et al., 2004),  
26 and two low volatility compounds formed in the oxidation of α-pinene (C<sub>10</sub>H<sub>16</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and  
27 C<sub>20</sub>H<sub>32</sub>O<sub>12</sub>, Ehn et al., 2014), which all contribute significantly to SOA formation, are 93,  
28 73, 64, 44, 42, and 19 Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> respectively, using Fuller's method.

## 1 **4.1 Temperature dependence**

2 Temperatures of tropospheric and stratospheric interest range from ~200 to ~300 K.  
3 However, most of the diffusivity measurements were only carried out at around room  
4 temperature. For those studies in which the effect of temperature was investigated, they  
5 were usually performed at temperatures >300 K. The measured diffusivities of  
6 2-propanol (Gilliland, 1934; Lugg, 1968; Arnikar and Ghule, 1969; Nagata and  
7 Hasegawa, 1970), benzene (Lee and Wilke, 1954; Hudson et al., 1960; Altshuller and  
8 Cohen, 1960; Getzinger and Wilke, 1967; Lugg, 1968; Katan, 1969; Arnikar and Ghule,  
9 1969; Nagata and Hasegawa, 1970), n-pentane (Lugg, 1968; Barr and Watts, 1972;  
10 Nagasaka, 1973), and ethyl formate (Lugg, 1968; Nagata and Hasegawa, 1970) are  
11 plotted as a function of temperature in Fig. 1, together with the estimated diffusivities  
12 (black curves) using Fuller's method. All the measurements show good agreement with  
13 estimations from ~290 K to ~400 K for 2-propanol, benzene, and ethyl format. The  
14 diffusivities of n-pentane were measured from <260 K to ~300 K (Lugg, 1968; Barr and  
15 Watts, 1972; Nagata and Hasegawa, 1970), which are of direct relevance for atmospheric  
16 chemistry, and the measured diffusivities agree very well with the estimated values.  
17 Therefore, we conclude that Fuller's method, i.e. Eqs. (7, 10), can also be used to  
18 estimate the diffusivities at different temperatures when experimental data are  
19 unavailable.

## 20 **5 Mean free paths and Knudsen numbers**

21 Figure 2 shows the **calculated** Knudsen number ( $Kn$ ) at 298 K and 1 atm air for **the**  
22 **uptake of** four select organic compounds **onto spheric particles** as a function of particle  
23 diameter using Eqs. (5a, 5b), with gas phase diffusivities estimated using Fuller's method  
24 (Eqs. 7-9). The four organic compounds, glyoxal (Lim et al., 2013), methyl vinyl ketone  
25 (MVK) (Liu et al., 2013), and two highly oxidized and extremely low volatility volatile  
26 organic compounds, i.e.  $C_{10}H_{16}O_5$  and  $C_{20}H_{32}O_{12}$  (Ehn et al., 2014) were chosen because  
27 their uptake onto aerosol particles and/or cloud droplets may significantly contribute to  
28 organic aerosol formation. For a given particle diameter,  $Kn$  depends on the average mean  
29 free path (Eq. 5a), which is determined by the ratio of the diffusion coefficient to the  
30 average molecular speed (Eq. 5b). The average molecular speed is proportional to the  
31 reciprocal of the square root of the molecular mass, as shown in Eq. (2). On the other

1 hand, the diffusion coefficient also decreases with increasing molecular mass as bigger  
2 molecules move more slowly and have larger collisional cross sections (Eqs. 7-9). As a  
3 result, the effect of molecular masses largely cancels out for the mean free paths ( $\lambda$ ) and  
4  $Kn$ , and consequently these molecules exhibit very similar  $\lambda$  and  $Kn$  values (relative  
5 deviations <20%) although their molecular masses vary by an order of magnitude.

6 As illustrated in Figure 2, the similarity of  $Kn$  values for different trace gas species does  
7 not only apply to organic compounds. It also extends to inorganic species like OH, NO<sub>2</sub>,  
8 NO<sub>3</sub>, or N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, which are important for atmospheric heterogeneous and multiphase  
9 chemistry. At any given particle diameter, the relative deviation between the  $Kn$  values  
10 for both organic and inorganic trace gases considered in Figure 2 are less than 20%. Note  
11 that we used measured diffusivities to calculate  $Kn$  for these inorganic species because  
12 Fuller's method is primarily based on and aimed at organic compounds and tends to  
13 overestimate the diffusivities of small inorganic molecules (Tang et al., 2014a). Using  
14 diffusivities estimates from Fuller's method, the  $Kn$  values of the inorganic species would  
15 be 35-50% higher. The reason why the performance of Fuller's method is better for  
16 organic compounds than for inorganic compounds is that the atomic diffusion volumes  
17 used in Eqs. (7-9) to estimate the molecular gas phase diffusivities, have been generated  
18 by regression analysis of measured diffusion coefficients of many molecules, most of  
19 which are organic compounds.

20 We can then derive a simplified equation to calculate  $Kn$  as a function of particle  
21 diameter and pressure for all gas molecules. As we discussed, different gas molecules  
22 have very similar mean free paths,  $\lambda$ . We calculate  $\lambda$  for a variety of inorganic and  
23 organic molecules. As shown in Figure 3, the mean free paths are approximately equal to  
24 100 nm (with deviations <20%) at 1 atm air for all these molecules considered. As a  
25 result, we introduce the pressure-normalized mean free path,  $\lambda_P$ , which is equal to 100 nm  
26 atm<sup>-1</sup>, as a near-constant generic parameter. Eq. (5a) can then simplified to

$$27 \quad Kn = \frac{2}{d_p} \cdot \frac{\lambda_P}{P} \quad (\text{E11})$$

28 where  $P$  is pressure of air in atm. As shown in Figure 3, the errors in  $\lambda_P$  (and thus  $Kn$ ) are  
29 estimated to be <20%. When the true uptake coefficient is 1, the uncertainty in the  
30 calculated effective uptake coefficient (caused by the uncertainty in  $Kn$ ) is <10% for

1 200 nm particles, increases to ~16% for 1  $\mu\text{m}$  particles and ~19% for 10  $\mu\text{m}$  particles.  
2 The reason is that the role of gas phase diffusion increases with particle diameters. The  
3 uncertainty in the derived effective uptake coefficients will decrease if the true uptake  
4 coefficients are smaller than 1. The simplified method we propose here to take into  
5 account the effect of gas phase diffusion has the potential to reduce computational  
6 expenses in atmospheric models, especially in regional or global models including  
7 process based gas-particle interactions.

## 8 **6 Atmospheric implications**

9 To demonstrate the effects of gas-phase diffusion on organic aerosol formation, the  
10 condensation of two organic compounds onto seed aerosol particles is simulated using the  
11 kinetic multi-layer model for gas-particle interaction in aerosols and clouds (KM-GAP)  
12 (Shiraiwa et al., 2012; Shiraiwa and Seinfeld, 2012). It is assumed in the simulations that  
13 the parent VOC with an initial concentration of  $1 \times 10^{10}$  molecule  $\text{cm}^{-3}$  (~0.4 ppbv) is  
14 converted to a first-generation semi-volatile product (in this study, MVK or  $\text{C}_{20}\text{H}_{32}\text{O}_{12}$ )  
15 with a lifetime of 10 min. The first-generation product then partitions into the seed  
16 particles, leading to particle growth. Conversion of the first-generation product to higher  
17 generation products, particle-phase reactions and non-ideal mixing are not considered  
18 here for simplicity. The initial seed aerosols are assumed to consist of mono-disperse  
19 particles with a diameter of 300 nm and a number concentration of  $1 \times 10^4$   $\text{cm}^{-3}$ . Kinetic  
20 parameters used in the simulations include surface accommodation coefficient ( $\alpha_{s,0}$ : 1.0),  
21 desorption lifetime ( $\tau_d$ :  $1 \times 10^{-6}$  s), and bulk diffusion coefficient ( $D_b$ :  $1 \times 10^{-5}$   $\text{cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ )  
22 assuming that particle phase state is liquid. The volatility is estimated to be  $2 \times 10^8$   $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$   
23 for MVK using the EVAPORATION model (Compernelle et al., 2011). Volatility of  
24  $\text{C}_{20}\text{H}_{32}\text{O}_{12}$  is highly uncertain and it is assumed to be  $1 \times 10^{-3}$   $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ .

25 Figures 3a and 3b show the results of such simulation for MVK as oxidation products.  
26 The temporal evolution of mass concentration of the parent VOC ( $C^{\text{VOC}}$ , black), and the  
27 oxidation product in the gas phase ( $C^{\text{g}}$ , solid blue), in the near-surface gas phase ( $C^{\text{gs}}$ ,  
28 dotted blue) and in the particle phase ( $C^{\text{PM}}$ , red, i.e. SOA mass) are displayed. Mass  
29 concentrations ( $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ ) are typically used for species contained in the particle phase. In  
30 this section we use mass concentrations ( $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ ) instead of molecular number

1 concentrations (molecule  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ ) for species in the gas phase so that the concentrations of  
2 oxidation products in both phases have the same unit and thus are directly comparable.  
3 As the parent VOC is converted to MVK,  $C^g$  and  $C^{gs}$  increase simultaneously and  $C^{PM}$   
4 increases due to condensation.  $C^g \approx C^{gs}$  translates into  $C_{g,diff} = \gamma_{eff}/\gamma \approx 1$ , as shown in  
5 Figure 3b, indicating that there is no kinetic limitation by gas-phase diffusion. It results  
6 from the low value of the uptake coefficient ( $\gamma < 1 \times 10^{-5}$ ), as the desorption (or  
7 evaporation) flux is almost as large as the adsorption (or condensation) flux due to the  
8 high volatility of MVK.

9 The results for  $\text{C}_{20}\text{H}_{32}\text{O}_{12}$  are shown in Figures 3c and 3d. Due to low volatility of  
10  $\text{C}_{20}\text{H}_{32}\text{O}_{12}$ , the uptake coefficient stays at 1 during the course of SOA growth.  
11 Consequently, near-surface gas phase is depleted due to rapid uptake ( $C^{gs} < C^g$ ) by ~40%  
12 (i.e.,  $C_{g,diff} = \sim 0.6$ ) during initial growth up to ~100 s. Afterwards the particle diameter  
13 increases gradually to ~440 nm, resulting in lower  $C_{g,diff}$  value of ~0.45. **Additional**  
14 **model simulations with different seed particle size revealed that larger particle size leads**  
15 **to lower  $C_{g,diff}$  value.** Relatively low value of  $C_{g,diff}$  suggests that gas phase diffusion  
16 plays a major role in determining the overall rate of condensation of organic vapours onto  
17 seed particles, thus emphasizing the importance of gas-phase diffusion in the growth of  
18 organic aerosol particles.

19 **As discussed in our previous work (Tang et al., 2014a), the effect of gas phase diffusion**  
20 **increases with particle size and uptake coefficients. In our simulation the uptake of**  
21 **compounds in the gas phase by aerosol particles is driven by their condensation onto**  
22 **particles. Therefore, compounds with lower volatilities exhibit larger uptake coefficients**  
23 **and thus the effect of gas phase diffusion becomes more important. If the uptake**  
24 **coefficients for high volatility compounds (e.g., glyoxal, methylglyoxal, and aldehydes in**  
25 **general) are large due to reactions in the particle phase (for example, Liggió et al., 2005;**  
26 **Volkamer et al., 2009; Ziemann and Atkinson, 2012), gas phase diffusion may**  
27 **significantly influence their removal from the gas phase and the formation of secondary**  
28 **organic matters in the particle phase.**

## 1 7 Conclusions

2 Gas phase diffusion coefficients of organic compounds reported in previous literature  
3 have been compiled and evaluated. The reviewed organic compounds include 21 alkanes,  
4 4 cycloalkanes, 15 alkenes (including 5 dienes), 3 alkynes, 16 aromatic hydrocarbons, 16  
5 alcohols, 2 glycols, 4 ethers, 5 ketones, 8 carboxylic acids, 9 multifunctional species, 39  
6 esters, and 15 nitrogen-containing species. The experimental values are then compared  
7 with estimated ones using Fuller's semi-empirical method (Fuller et al., 1966). In general  
8 Fuller's method can predict the diffusion coefficients with errors of <10%. The  
9 temperature dependence of diffusion coefficients have also been discussed, and it is  
10 found that Fuller's method can reproduce the measured diffusion coefficients very well  
11 across a wide range of temperature.

12 We **suggest** that all the compounds have very similar mean free paths and thus exhibit  
13 very similar Knudsen numbers ( $Kn$ ) for the uptake onto particles, though they may have  
14 very different gas phase diffusion coefficients. **We have introduced a new near-constant**  
15 **generic parameter, pressure normalized mean free path ( $\lambda_p$ ) to derive a simple equation,**  
16 **Eq. (11), which calculates  $Kn$  only as a function of particle diameter and pressure for all**  
17 **different gas molecules.** This simplification could reduce the computational expense,  
18 especially for regional and global models with process-based gas-particle interactions.

19 We **have** also simulated the condensation of two organic compounds (MVK and  
20  $C_{20}H_{32}O_{12}$ ) with very different gas phase diffusion coefficients and volatilities onto seed  
21 aerosol particles, using the KM-GAP model. The results suggest that gas phase diffusion  
22 largely controls the condensation of low-volatility compounds like  $C_{20}H_{32}O_{12}$  and thus  
23 the growth of secondary organic aerosol particles, highlighting the importance of taking  
24 into account gas phase diffusion for reliable prediction of organic aerosol formation and  
25 transformation.

26 It should be noted that most of the compounds for which the experimental diffusion  
27 coefficient data are available are relatively small molecules. However, the uptake of  
28 multifunctional (and thus big) organic molecules onto aerosol particles and cloud droplets  
29 is of more significance for organic aerosol formation and transformation, due to their low  
30 volatilities. Further measurements of gas phase diffusion coefficients of compounds



1 which may directly contribute to organic aerosol formation in the troposphere is  
2 undoubtedly needed to further assess whether the simple equation we developed here to  
3 calculate  $Kn$  also applies to such complex organic compounds.

4 The preferred gas phase diffusivities (pressure-independent diffusion coefficients) at  
5 298 K in air (or  $N_2/O_2$ ) are summarized in Tables 1-3. A comprehensive  
6 compilation/evaluation, which largely follows the format of online reports prepared by  
7 the IUPAC Task Group on Atmospheric Chemical Kinetic Data Evaluation  
8 (<http://iupac.pole-ether.fr/>), is provided as supplement. It is available online  
9 (<https://sites.google.com/site/mingjintang/home/diffusion>) and will be updated when new  
10 experimental data become available.

### 11 **Acknowledgement**

12 M. J. T. and M. K. would like to thank the Isaac Newton Trust (Trinity College,  
13 University of Cambridge, UK) for financial support.

## 1 **References**

- 2 Abbatt, J., George, C., Melamed, M., Monks, P., Pandis, S., and Rudich, Y.: New  
3 Directions: Fundamentals of atmospheric chemistry: Keeping a three-legged stool  
4 balanced, *Atmos. Environ.*, 84, 390-391, 2014.
- 5 Altshuler, A. P., and Cohen, I. R.: Application of Diffusion Cells to Production of  
6 Known Concentration of Gaseous Hydrocarbons, *Anal. Chem.*, 32, 802-810, 1960.
- 7 Ammann, M., Cox, R. A., Crowley, J. N., Jenkin, M. E., Mellouki, A., Rossi, M. J., Troe,  
8 J., and Wallington, T. J.: Evaluated kinetic and photochemical data for atmospheric  
9 chemistry: Volume VI - heterogeneous reactions with liquid substrates, *Atmos. Chem.*  
10 *Phys.*, 12, 8045-8228, 2013.
- 11 Arnikar, H. J., and Ghule, H. M.: Electrodeless discharge as detector in the rapid  
12 determination of binary diffusion coefficient of gases, *Int. J. Electronics*, 26, 159-162,  
13 1969.
- 14 Baltensperger, U., Kalberer, M., Dommen, J., Paulsen, D., Alfarra, M. R., Coe, H.,  
15 Fisseha, R., Gascho, A., Gysel, M., Nyeki, S., Sax, M., Steinbacher, M., Prevot, A. S. H.,  
16 Sjogren, S., Weingartner, E., and Zenobi, R.: Secondary organic aerosols from  
17 anthropogenic and biogenic precursors, *Faraday Discuss.*, 130, 265-278, 2005.
- 18 Barr, R. F., and Watts, H.: Diffusion of some organic and inorganic compounds in air, *J.*  
19 *Chem. Eng. Data*, 17, 45-46, 1972.
- 20 Berezhnoi, A. N., and Semenov, A. V.: Binary Diffusion Coefficients of Liquid Vapors  
21 in Gases, Begell House, Inc., New York, 1997.
- 22 Berkemeier, T., Huisman, A. J., Ammann, M., Shiraiwa, M., Koop, T., and Pöschl, U.:  
23 Kinetic regimes and limiting cases of gas uptake and heterogeneous reactions in  
24 atmospheric aerosols and clouds: a general classification scheme, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*,  
25 13, 6663-6686, 2013.
- 26 **Capouet, M., Peeters, J., Noziere, B., and Müller, J. F.: Alpha-pinene oxidation by OH:  
27 simulations of laboratory experiments, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 4, 2285-2311, 2004.**
- 28 Compernelle, S., Ceulemans, K., and Müller, J. F.: EVAPORATION: a new vapour  
29 pressure estimation method for organic molecules including non-additivity and  
30 intramolecular interactions, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 9431-9450, 2011.
- 31 Crowley, J. N., Ammann, M., Cox, R. A., Hynes, R. G., Jenkin, M. E., Mellouki, A.,  
32 Rossi, M. J., Troe, J., and Wallington, T. J.: Evaluated kinetic and photochemical data for  
33 atmospheric chemistry: Volume V - heterogeneous reactions on solid substrates, *Atmos.*  
34 *Chem. Phys.*, 10, 9059-9223, 2010.
- 35 Cummings, G. A. M., and Ubbelohde, A. R.: Collision diameters of flexible hydrocarbon  
36 molecules in the vapour phase : the "hydrogen effect.", *J. Chem. Soc.*, 3751-3755, 1953.
- 37 Cummings, G. A. M., McLaughlin, E., and Ubbelohde, A. R.: Collision parameters of  
38 C6-C9 hydrocarbons in the vapour phase: the hydrogen effect, *J. Chem. Soc.*, 1141-1144,  
39 1955.
- 40 Davidovits, P., Hu, J. H., Worsnop, D. R., Zahniser, M. S., and Kolb, C. E.: Entry of gas  
41 molecules into liquids, *Faraday Discuss.*, 100, 65-81, 1995.
- 42 Davidovits, P., Kolb, C. E., Williams, L. R., Jayne, J. T., and Worsnop, D. R.: Mass  
43 accommodation and chemical reactions at gas-liquid interfaces, *Chem. Rev.*, 106, 1323-  
44 1354, 2006.
- 45 Donahue, N., Robinson, A., Trump, E., Riipinen, I., and Kroll, J.: Volatility and Aging of  
46 Atmospheric Organic Aerosol, in: *Atmospheric and Aerosol Chemistry*, edited by:

1 McNeill, V. F., and Ariya, P. A., Topics in Current Chemistry, Springer Berlin  
2 Heidelberg, 97-143, 2014.

3 Ehn, M., Thornton, J. A., Kleist, E., Sipila, M., Junninen, H., Pullinen, I., Springer, M.,  
4 Rubach, F., Tillmann, R., Lee, B., Lopez-Hilfiker, F., Andres, S., Acir, I.-H., Rissanen,  
5 M., Jokinen, T., Schobesberger, S., Kangasluoma, J., Kontkanen, J., Nieminen, T.,  
6 Kurten, T., Nielsen, L. B., Jorgensen, S., Kjaergaard, H. G., Canagaratna, M., Maso, M.  
7 D., Berndt, T., Petaja, T., Wahner, A., Kerminen, V.-M., Kulmala, M., Worsnop, D. R.,  
8 Wildt, J., and Mentel, T. F.: A large source of low-volatility secondary organic aerosol,  
9 Nature, 506, 476-479, 2014.

10 Fuller, E. N., Schettler, P. D., and Giddings, J. C.: New method for prediction of binary  
11 gas-phase diffusion coefficients, Ind. Eng. Chem., 58, 18-27, 1966.

12 Fuller, E. N., Ensley, K., and Giddings, J. C.: Diffusion of halogenated hydrocarbons in  
13 helium. The effect of structure on collision cross sections, J. Phys. Chem., 73, 3679-3685,  
14 1969.

15 George, I. J., and Abbatt, J. P. D.: Heterogeneous oxidation of atmospheric aerosol  
16 particles by gas-phase radicals, Nature Chem., 2, 713-722, 2010.

17 Getzinger, R. W., and Wilke, C. R.: An experimental study of nonequimolar diffusion in  
18 ternary gas mixtures, Aiche J., 13, 577-580, 1967.

19 Gilliland, E. R.: Diffusion Coefficients in Gaseous Systems, Ind. Eng. Chem., 26, 681-  
20 685, 1934.

21 Gordon, M.: References to experimental data on diffusion coefficients of binary gas  
22 mixtures, National Engineering Laboratory, Glasgow, UK, 1977.

23 Hallquist, M., Wenger, J. C., Baltensperger, U., Rudich, Y., Simpson, D., Claeys, M.,  
24 Dommen, J., Donahue, N. M., George, C., Goldstein, A. H., Hamilton, J. F., Herrmann,  
25 H., Hoffmann, T., Iinuma, Y., Jang, M., Jenkin, M. E., Jimenez, J. L., Kiendler-Scharr,  
26 A., Maenhaut, W., McFiggans, G., Mentel, T. F., Monod, A., Prévôt, A. S. H., Seinfeld, J.  
27 H., Surratt, J. D., Szmigielski, R., and Wildt, J.: The formation, properties and impact of  
28 secondary organic aerosol: current and emerging issues, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 9, 5155-  
29 5235, 2009.

30 Hanson, D. R., Burkholder, J. B., Howard, C. J., and Ravishankara, A. R.: Measurement  
31 of OH and HO<sub>2</sub> Radical Uptake Coefficients on Water and Sulfuric-Acid Surfaces, J.  
32 Phys. Chem., 96, 4979-4985, 1992.

33 Hudson, G. H., McCoubrey, J. C., and Ubbelohde, A. R.: Vapour diffusion coefficients  
34 and collision parameters for cyclic molecules, Trans. Faraday Soc., 56, 1144-1151, 1960.

35 Jimenez, J. L., Canagaratna, M. R., Donahue, N. M., Prevot, A. S. H., Zhang, Q., Kroll, J.  
36 H., DeCarlo, P. F., Allan, J. D., Coe, H., Ng, N. L., Aiken, A. C., Docherty, K. S.,  
37 Ulbrich, I. M., Grieshop, A. P., Robinson, A. L., Duplissy, J., Smith, J. D., Wilson, K. R.,  
38 Lanz, V. A., Hueglin, C., Sun, Y. L., Tian, J., Laaksonen, A., Raatikainen, T., Rautiainen,  
39 J., Vaattovaara, P., Ehn, M., Kulmala, M., Tomlinson, J. M., Collins, D. R., Cubison, M.  
40 J., Dunlea, E. J., Huffman, J. A., Onasch, T. B., Alfarra, M. R., Williams, P. I., Bower, K.,  
41 Kondo, Y., Schneider, J., Drewnick, F., Borrmann, S., Weimer, S., Demerjian, K.,  
42 Salcedo, D., Cottrell, L., Griffin, R., Takami, A., Miyoshi, T., Hatakeyama, S., Shimojo,  
43 A., Sun, J. Y., Zhang, Y. M., Dzepina, K., Kimmel, J. R., Sueper, D., Jayne, J. T.,  
44 Herndon, S. C., Trimborn, A. M., Williams, L. R., Wood, E. C., Middlebrook, A. M.,  
45 Kolb, C. E., Baltensperger, U., and Worsnop, D. R.: Evolution of Organic Aerosols in the  
46 Atmosphere, Science, 326, 1525-1529, 2009.

1 Kalberer, M., Paulsen, D., Sax, M., Steinbacher, M., Dommen, J., Prevot, A. S. H.,  
2 Fisseha, R., Weingartner, E., Frankevich, V., Zenobi, R., and Baltensperger, U.:  
3 Identification of polymers as major components of atmospheric organic aerosols, *Science*,  
4 303, 1659-1662, 2004.

5 Kanakidou, M., Seinfeld, J. H., Pandis, S. N., Barnes, I., Dentener, F. J., Facchini, M. C.,  
6 Van Dingenen, R., Ervens, B., Nenes, A., Nielsen, C. J., Swietlicki, E., Putaud, J. P.,  
7 Balkanski, Y., Fuzzi, S., Horth, J., Moortgat, G. K., Winterhalter, R., Myhre, C. E. L.,  
8 Tsigaridis, K., Vignati, E., Stephanou, E. G., and Wilson, J.: Organic aerosol and global  
9 climate modelling: a review, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 1053-1123, 2005.

10 Katan, T.: Diffusion Coefficients of Vapors Measured with a Moving Boundary, *J. Chem.*  
11 *Phys.*, 50, 233-238, 1969.

12 Knopf, D. A., Pöschl, U., and Shiraiwa, M.: Radial Diffusion and Penetration of Gas  
13 Molecules and Aerosol Particles through Laminar Flow Reactors, Denuders, and  
14 Sampling Tubes, *Anal. Chem.*, 87, 3746-3754, 2015.

15 Kolb, C. E., Cox, R. A., Abbatt, J. P. D., Ammann, M., Davis, E. J., Donaldson, D. J.,  
16 Garrett, B. C., George, C., Griffiths, P. T., Hanson, D. R., Kulmala, M., McFiggans, G.,  
17 Pöschl, U., Riipinen, I., Rossi, M. J., Rudich, Y., Wagner, P. E., Winkler, P. M., Worsnop,  
18 D. R., and O' Dowd, C. D.: An overview of current issues in the uptake of atmospheric  
19 trace gases by aerosols and clouds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 10561-10605, 2010.

20 Kroll, J. H., and Seinfeld, J. H.: Chemistry of secondary organic aerosol: Formation and  
21 evolution of low-volatility organics in the atmosphere, *Atmos. Environ.*, 42, 3593-3624,  
22 2008.

23 Lee, C. Y., and Wilke, C. R.: Measurements of vapor diffusion coefficient, *Ind. Eng.*  
24 *Chem.*, 46, 2381-2387, 1954.

25 Liggio, J., Li, S.-M., and McLaren, R.: Reactive uptake of glyoxal by particulate matter, *J.*  
26 *Geophys. Res.-Atmos*, 110, D10304, 10.1029/2004JD005113, 2005.

27 Lim, Y. B., Tan, Y., Perri, M. J., Seitzinger, S. P., and Turpin, B. J.: Aqueous chemistry  
28 and its role in secondary organic aerosol (SOA) formation, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10,  
29 10521-10539, 2010.

30 Lim, Y. B., Tan, Y., and Turpin, B. J.: Chemical insights, explicit chemistry, and yields  
31 of secondary organic aerosol from OH radical oxidation of methylglyoxal and glyoxal in  
32 the aqueous phase, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 8651-8667, 2013.

33 Liu, Y. J., Herdinger-Blatt, I., McKinney, K. A., and Martin, S. T.: Production of methyl  
34 vinyl ketone and methacrolein via the hydroperoxyl pathway of isoprene oxidation,  
35 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 5715-5730, 2013.

36 Lugg, G. A.: Diffusion coefficients of some organic and other vapors in air, *Anal. Chem.*,  
37 40, 1072-1077, 1968.

38 Marrero, T. R., and Mason, E. A.: Gaseous Diffusion Coefficients, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref.*  
39 *Data*, 1, 3-118, 1972.

40 Matthews, P. S. J., Baeza-Romero, M. T., Whalley, L. K., and Heard, D. E.: Uptake of  
41 HO<sub>2</sub> radicals onto Arizona test dust particles using an aerosol flow tube, *Atmos. Chem.*  
42 *Phys.*, 14, 7397-7408, 2014.

43 McNeill, V. F., Patterson, J., Wolfe, G. M., and Thornton, J. A.: The effect of varying  
44 levels of surfactant on the reactive uptake of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> to aqueous aerosol, *Atmos. Chem.*  
45 *Phys.*, 6, 1635-1644, 2006.

1 Nagasaka, M.: Binary diffusion coefficients of n-pentane in gases, *J. Chem. Eng. Data.*,  
2 18, 388-390, 1973.

3 Nagata, I., and Hasegawa, T.: Gaseous interdiffusion coefficients, *J. Chem. Eng. Japan*, 3,  
4 143-145, 1970.

5 Nguyen, T. B., Coggon, M. M., Bates, K. H., Zhang, X., Schwantes, R. H., Schilling, K.  
6 A., Loza, C. L., Flagan, R. C., Wennberg, P. O., and Seinfeld, J. H.: Organic aerosol  
7 formation from the reactive uptake of isoprene epoxydiols (IEPOX) onto non-acidified  
8 inorganic seeds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 3497-3510, 2014.

9 Pierce, J. R., Riipinen, I., Kulmala, M., Ehn, M., Petaja, T., Junninen, H., Worsnop, D. R.,  
10 and Donahue, N. M.: Quantification of the volatility of secondary organic compounds in  
11 ultrafine particles during nucleation events, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 9019-9036, 2011.

12 Platt, S. M., El Haddad, I., Pieber, S. M., Huang, R. J., Zardini, A. A., Clairotte, M.,  
13 Suarez-Bertoa, R., Barmet, P., Pfaffenberger, L., Wolf, R., Slowik, J. G., Fuller, S. J.,  
14 Kalberer, M., Chirico, R., Dommen, J., Astorga, C., Zimmermann, R., Marchand, N.,  
15 Hellebust, S., Temime-Roussel, B., Baltensperger, U., and Prevot, A. S. H.: Two-stroke  
16 scooters are a dominant source of air pollution in many cities, *Nature Communications*, 5,  
17 3749, 10.1038/ncomms4749, 2014.

18 Pöschl, U.: Atmospheric aerosols: Composition, transformation, climate and health  
19 effects, *Angew. Chem.-Int. Edit.*, 44, 7520-7540, 2005.

20 Pöschl, U., Rudich, Y., and Ammann, M.: Kinetic model framework for aerosol and  
21 cloud surface chemistry and gas-phase interaction-Part 1: General equation, parameters,  
22 and terminology, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 5989-6023, 2007.

23 Pöschl, U.: Gas-particle interactions of tropospheric aerosols: Kinetic and  
24 thermodynamic perspectives of multiphase chemical reactions, amorphous organic  
25 substances, and the activation of cloud condensation nuclei, *Atmos. Res.*, 101, 562-573,  
26 2011.

27 Pöschl, U., and Shiraiwa, M.: Multiphase Chemistry at the Atmosphere-Biosphere  
28 Interface Influencing Climate and Public Health in the Anthropocene, *Chem. Rev.*,  
29 10.1021/cr500487s, 2015.

30 Reid, R. C., Prausnitz, J. M., and Poling, B. E.: *The Properties of Gases and Liquids*,  
31 McGraw-Hill, Inc. , New York, 1987.

32 Riipinen, I., Pierce, J. R., Yli-Juuti, T., Nieminen, T., Häkkinen, S., Ehn, M., Junninen,  
33 H., Lehtipalo, K., Petäjä, T., Slowik, J., Chang, R., Shantz, N. C., Abbatt, J., Leaitch, W.  
34 R., Kerminen, V. M., Worsnop, D. R., Pandis, S. N., Donahue, N. M., and Kulmala, M.:  
35 Organic condensation: a vital link connecting aerosol formation to cloud condensation  
36 nuclei (CCN) concentrations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3865-3878, 2011.

37 Robinson, A. L., Donahue, N. M., Shrivastava, M. K., Weitkamp, E. A., Sage, A. M.,  
38 Grieshop, A. P., Lane, T. E., Pierce, J. R., and Pandis, S. N.: Rethinking organic aerosols:  
39 Semivolatile emissions and photochemical aging, *Science*, 315, 1259-1262, 2007.

40 Roldin, P., Eriksson, A. C., Nordin, E. Z., Hermansson, E., Mogensen, D., Rusanen, A.,  
41 Boy, M., Swietlicki, E., Svenningsson, B., Zelenyuk, A., and Pagels, J.: Modelling non-  
42 equilibrium secondary organic aerosol formation and evaporation with the aerosol  
43 dynamics, gas- and particle-phase chemistry kinetic multilayer model ADCHAM, *Atmos.*  
44 *Chem. Phys.*, 14, 7953-7993, 2014.

45 Rudich, Y., Donahue, N. M., and Mentel, T. F.: Aging of organic aerosol: Bridging the  
46 gap between laboratory and field studies, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 58, 321-352, 2007.

1 Sander, S. P., Abbatt, J. P. D., Barker, J. R., Burkholder, J. B., Friedl, R. R., Golden, D.  
2 M., Huie, R. E., Kolb, C. E., Kurylo, M. J., Moortgat, G. K., Orkin, V. L., and Wine, P.  
3 H.: Chemical Kinetics and Photochemical Data for Use in Atmospheric Studies,  
4 Evaluation No. 17, JPL Publication 10-6, Jet Propulsion Lab., Pasadena, CA, 2011.  
5 Sareen, N., Schwier, A. N., Shapiro, E. L., Mitroo, D., and McNeill, V. F.: Secondary  
6 organic material formed by methylglyoxal in aqueous aerosol mimics, *Atmos. Chem.*  
7 *Phys.*, 10, 997-1016, 2010.  
8 Sax, M., Zenobi, R., Baltensperger, U., and Kalberer, M.: Time resolved infrared  
9 spectroscopic analysis of aerosol formed by photo-oxidation of 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene  
10 and alpha-pinene, *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*, 39, 822-830, 2005.  
11 Schwartz, S. E.: Mass-transport considerations pertinent to aqueous phase reactions of  
12 gases in liquid-water clouds, in: *Chemistry of Multiphase Atmospheric Systems*, NATO  
13 ASI Series, edited by: Jaeschke, W., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 415-471, 1986.  
14 Shiraiwa, M., Pfrang, C., Koop, T., and Poschl, U.: Kinetic multi-layer model of gas-  
15 particle interactions in aerosols and clouds (KM-GAP): linking condensation, evaporation  
16 and chemical reactions of organics, oxidants and water, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 2777-  
17 2794, 2012.  
18 Shiraiwa, M., and Seinfeld, J. H.: Equilibration timescale of atmospheric secondary  
19 organic aerosol partitioning, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 39, L24801, 10.1029/2012gl054008,  
20 2012.  
21 Shiraiwa, M., Yee, L. D., Schilling, K. A., Loza, C. L., Craven, J. S., Zuend, A., Ziemann,  
22 P. J., and Seinfeld, J. H.: Size distribution dynamics reveal particle-phase chemistry in  
23 organic aerosol formation, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 110, 11746-11750, 2013.  
24 Shiraiwa, M., Berkemeier, T., Schilling-Fahnestock, K. A., Seinfeld, J. H., and Pöschl, U.:  
25 Molecular corridors and kinetic regimes in the multiphase chemical evolution of  
26 secondary organic aerosol, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 8323-8341, 2014.  
27 Surratt, J. D., Chan, A. W. H., Eddingsaas, N. C., Chan, M. N., Loza, C. L., Kwan, A. J.,  
28 Hersey, S. P., Flagan, R. C., Wennberg, P. O., and Seinfeld, J. H.: Reactive intermediates  
29 revealed in secondary organic aerosol formation from isoprene, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.*  
30 *S. A.*, 107, 6640-6645, 2010.  
31 Tang, M. J., Thieser, J., Schuster, G., and Crowley, J. N.: Kinetics and mechanism of the  
32 heterogeneous reaction of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> with mineral dust particles, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*,  
33 14, 8551-8561, 2012.  
34 Tang, M. J., Cox, R. A., and Kalberer, M.: Compilation and evaluation of gas phase  
35 diffusion coefficients of reactive trace gases in the atmosphere: volume 1. Inorganic  
36 compounds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 9233-9247, 2014a.  
37 Tang, M. J., Schuster, G., and Crowley, J. N.: Heterogeneous reaction of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> with illite  
38 and Arizona test dust particles, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 245-254, 2014b.  
39 Tang, M. J., Telford, P. J., Pope, F. D., Rkiouak, L., Abraham, N. L., Archibald, A. T.,  
40 Braesicke, P., Pyle, J. A., McGregor, J., Watson, I. M., Cox, R. A., and Kalberer, M.:  
41 Heterogeneous reaction of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> with airborne TiO<sub>2</sub> particles and its implication for  
42 stratospheric particle injection, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 6035-6048, 2014c.  
43 Vlasenko, A., Huthwelker, T., Gaggeler, H. W., and Ammann, M.: Kinetics of the  
44 heterogeneous reaction of nitric acid with mineral dust particles: an aerosol flow tube  
45 study, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 7921-7930, 2009.

1 Volkamer, R., Ziemann, P. J., and Molina, M. J.: Secondary Organic Aerosol Formation  
2 from Acetylene (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>2</sub>): seed effect on SOA yields due to organic photochemistry in the  
3 aerosol aqueous phase, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 1907-1928, 2009.  
4 Wagner, C., Hanisch, F., Holmes, N., de Coninck, H., Schuster, G., and Crowley, J. N.:  
5 The interaction of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> with mineral dust: aerosol flow tube and Knudsen reactor studies,  
6 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8, 91-109, 2008.  
7 Ziemann, P. J., and Atkinson, R.: Kinetics, products, and mechanisms of secondary  
8 organic aerosol formation, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 41, 6582-6605, 2012.  
9  
10  
11

# 1 Tables & Figures

2 **Table 1.** Summary of preferred diffusivities ( $D$ , Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) at 298 K: alkanes,  
 3 cycloalkanes, alkenes, alkynes, and aromatic hydrocarbons. The uncertainties given to  
 4 preferred values are explained in Section 3.

Species	$D$	Species	$D$	Species	$D$
alkanes and cycloalkanes					
methane	168±5	ethane	114±5	propane	87±5
n-butane	75±3	methyl propane	71±3	n-pentane	65±2
2-methyl pentane	71±6	2,2-dimethyl propane	67±2	n-hexane	59±3
2,3-dimethyl butane	60±2	n-heptane	55±2	2,4-dimethyl pentane	55±2
n-octane	50±4	2,2,4-trimethyl pentane	53±2	n-nonane	44±4
n-decane	44±2	2,3,3-trimethyl heptane	52±8	n-dodecane	37±4
n-hexadecane	31±5	n-heptadecane	32±5	n-octadecane	32±5
cyclopropane	97±7	cyclopentane	70±8	cyclohexane	63±4
methylcyclopentane	62±2				
alkenes and alkynes					
ethene	124±5	propene	100±10	1-butene	83±10
cis-2-butene	83±10	trans-2-butene	83±10	2-methyl propene	83±10
1-pentene	73±6	1-hexene	61±2	2,3-dimethyl-2-butene	61±2
1-octene	49±2	propadiene	106±13	1,3-butadiene	88±10
isoprene	73±6	1,5-hexadiene	61±2	2,3-dimethyl-1,3-butadiene	61±2
ethyne	111±12	propyne	100±7	1-butyne	88±10
aromatic hydrocarbons					
benzene	72±3	toluene	67±4	ethyl benzene	57±1
o-xylene	55±2	m-xylene	52±5	p-xylene	51±6
n-propyl benzene	51±2	iso-propyl benzene	51±2	1,2,4-trimethyl benzene	49±4
1,3,5-trimethyl benzene	50±3	p-cymene	48±1	p-tert-butyltoluene	43±6
styrene	53±5	naphthalene	46±5	diphenyl	52±7
anthracene	40±4				

5  
6



1 **Table 2.** Summary of preferred diffusivities ( $D$ , Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) at 298 K: alcohols, glycols,  
 2 ethers, ketones, acids, and multifunctional species. The uncertainties given to preferred  
 3 values are explained in Section 3.

Species	$D$	Species	$D$	Species	$D$
alcohols and glycols					
methanol	126±11	ethanol	98±7	1-propanol	75±4
2-propanol	79±5	1-butanol	66±1	2-butanol	67±1
methyl 1-propanol	67±2	methyl-2-propanol	66±3	1-pentanol	54±8
2-pentanol	54±8	1-hexanol	47±10	2-ethyl-1-butanol	50±7
1-methyl-2-pentanol	47±10	1-heptanol	42±10	1-octanol	38±11
prop-2-en-1-ol	78±3	ethylene glycol	76±10	propylene glycol	67±7
ethers					
diethyl ether	70±1	di-iso-propyl ether	52±5	di-n-butylether	41±8
1,4-dioxane	70±3				
ketones					
acetone	81±5	methyl ethyl ketone	69±2	methyl n-propyl ketone	60±3
4-methyl pent-3-en-2-one	58±1	isophorone	46±3		
acids					
formic acid	116±4	acetic acid	94±5	propanoic acid	72±4
n-butyric acid	59±8	2-methyl propanoic acid	60±7	3-methyl butanoic acid	50±10
hexanoic acid	46±10	4-methyl pentanoic acid	45±11		
multifunctional species					
2-methoxy ethanol	67±7	2-ethoxy ethanol	60±5	diethylene glycol	55±8
triethylglycol	45±10	2-(2-ethoxy ethoxy) ethanol	46±7	furfural	66±4
4-hydroxyl-4-methyl-2-pentanone	49±7	2-ethoxy ethyl acetate	46±8	methyl salicylate	62±10


4

1 **Table 3.** Summary of preferred diffusivities ( $D$ , Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) at 298 K: esters and  
 2 N-containing species. The uncertainties given to preferred values are explained in  
 3 Section 3.


Species	$D$	Species	$D$	Species	$D$
esters					
methyl formate	83±6	ethyl formate	76±2	methyl acetate	85±10
propyl formate	63±4	ethyl acetate	67±6	methyl propionate	66±1
2-methylpropyl formate	60±1	propyl acetate	58±2	2-methylethyl acetate	59±1
ethyl propionate	61±3	methyl n-butyrate	57±3	methyl isobutyrate	57±3
n-pentyl formate	50±6	iso-pentyl formate	51±5	n-butyl acetate	51±5
2-methylpropyl acetate	52±4	ethyl n-butyrate	51±5	ethyl isobutyrate	51±5
methyl n-pentanoate	51±5	n-pentyl acetate	46±6	n-butyl propionate	46±6
iso-butyl propionate	46±6	n-propyl-n-butyrate	46±6	n-propyl-iso-butyrate	47±5
iso-propyl-iso-butyrate	48±4	ethyl n-pentanoate	46±6	methyl hexanoate	46±6
n-pentyl propionate	42±6	iso-butyl n-butyrate	42±6	iso-butyl iso-butyrate	42±6
iso-propyl n-pentanoate	42±6	n-pentyl n-butyrate	37±9	n-pentyl iso-butyrate	38±8
iso-butyl n-pentanoate	38±8	benzyl acetate	46±4	dipentyl sebacate	n. p. r
diethyl phthalate	38±4	di-n-butyl phthalate	26±3	di-2-ethylhexyl phthalate	32±4
N-containing species					
n-butylamine	66±3	iso-butylamine	68±1	diethylamine	75±6
triethylamine	57±1	aniline	56±6	ethyl diamine	77±8
benzidine	n. p. r.	dimethyl formamide	74±2	ethyl cyanoacrylate	54±2
nitrobenzene	60±5	HCN	153±14	acrylonitrile	80±7
benzotrile	54±8	pyridine	72±1	piperidine	66±3

4

5 n. p. r.: no preferred value is recommended because the difference between the measured and  
 6 estimated diffusivity is larger than a factor of 2.




1  
 2 **Figure 1.** Comparison of measured diffusivities with estimated values (black curves) as a  
 3 function of temperature using Fuller's semi-empirical method. (a) 2-propanol; (b)  
 4 benzene; (c) n-pentane; and (d) ethyl formate.



1  
2


3 **Figure 2.** Knudsen numbers ( $Kn$ ) for the uptake of four organic compounds (glyoxal,  
 4 MVK,  $C_{10}H_{16}O_5$ ,  $C_{20}H_{32}O_{12}$ ) and four inorganic compounds (OH,  $NO_2$ ,  $NO_3$ , and  $N_2O_5$ )  
 5 onto aerosol particles as a function of particle diameter in 760 Torr air. Knudsen numbers  
 6 calculated using the empirical equation (Eq. 11) we propose in this work are also plotted.



1  
2

3 **Figure 3.** Mean free paths for different inorganic and organic species in 1 atm air. Three  
4 types of organic compounds (alkanes, carboxylic acids and dicarboxylic acids) containing  
5 different numbers of carbon atoms are plotted.

1

2  
3

4 **Figure 4.** Temporal evolution of mass concentrations of the parent VOC in the gas phase  
5 ( $C^{g,\text{VOC}}$ , black), the hypothesized VOC oxidation product as in the gas phase ( $C^g$ , solid  
6 blue), in the near-surface gas phase ( $C^{\text{gs}}$ , dashed blue), and in the particle phase ( $C^{\text{PM}}$ , red)  
7 for MVK (Panel a) and  $\text{C}_{20}\text{H}_{32}\text{O}_{12}$  (Panel c). Temporal evolution of gas-phase diffusion  
8 correction factor ( $C_{g,\text{diff}}$ ,  $\gamma_{\text{eff}}/\gamma$ , red curve) and uptake coefficient ( $\gamma$ , black curve) for MVK  
9 (Panel b) and  $\text{C}_{20}\text{H}_{32}\text{O}_{12}$  (Panel d).

## 1 Appendix

2 **Table A1.** Measured and estimated diffusivities of four isomers with a formula of  $C_6H_{12}$ :  
 3 cyclohexane, methyl cyclopentane, 1-hexene, and 2,3-dimethyl-2-butene. The unit for  
 4 diffusivities is  $\text{Torr cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ .

Species	Reference	$T$ (K)	$D_m(T)$	$D_m(298)$	$D_e(T)$	$D_e/D_m-1$ (%)
cyclohexane	Cummings and Ubbelohde, 1953	289	58	61	57	-1
	Hudson et al., 1960	289	57	60	57	1
	Nagata and Hasegawa, 1970	363	94	67	85	-10
		383	102	66	93	-9
		403	113	67	102	-10
methyl cyclopentane	Cummings and Ubbelohde, 1953	286	58	62	56	-3
1-hexene	Altshuller and Cohen, 1960	293	60	62	58	-3
2,3-dimethyl- 2-butene	Cummings et al., 1955	288	57	60	57	0

5  $T$ : temperature (in K) under which the measurement was performed;

6  $D_m(T)$ : measured diffusivity at  $T$ ;

7  $D_m(298)$ : measured diffusivity at 298 K, or extrapolated to 298 K using Eq. (10) from the  
 8 measurement carried out at  $T$ ;

9  $D_e(T)$ : estimated diffusivity at  $T$  using Fuller's semi-empirical method;

10  $D_e/D_m-1$ : relative difference (in %) between the measured and estimated diffusivities at  $T$ .

1 **Table A2.** Measured and estimated diffusivities of 2-propanol, 2-pentanol, 1,3-butadiene,  
 2 and isoprene, and comparison with estimated values. The unit for diffusivities is  
 3 Torr cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>.

Species	Reference	<i>T</i> (K)	<i>D<sub>m</sub></i> ( <i>T</i> )	<i>D<sub>m</sub></i> (298)	<i>D<sub>e</sub></i> ( <i>T</i> )	<i>D<sub>e</sub></i> / <i>D<sub>m</sub></i> -1 (%)
2-propanol	Gilliland, 1934	299	75	75	79	5
		312	81	75	85	5
		332	92	76	95	3
	Lugg, 1968	298	77	77	79	3
	Arnimar and Ghule, 1969	358	111	80	109	-2
	Nagata and Hasegawa, 1970	363	121	86	111	-8
2-pentanol	Gilliland, 1934	383	128		122	-4
		299	54	54	62	15
		312	58	53	67	16
	Lugg, 1968	298	55	55	62	12
1,3-butadiene	Elliott and Watts, 1972	298	88	88	78	-11
isoprene	Altshuller and Cohen, 1960	288	69	73	64	-7

4

5 *T*: temperature (in K) under which the measurement was performed;

6 *D<sub>m</sub>*(*T*): measured diffusivity at *T*;

7 *D<sub>m</sub>*(298): measured diffusivity at 298 K, or extrapolated to 298 K using Eq. (10) from the  
 8 measurement carried out at *T*;

9 *D<sub>e</sub>*(*T*): estimated diffusivity at *T* using Fuller's semi-empirical method;

10 *D<sub>e</sub>*/*D<sub>m</sub>*-1: relative difference (in %) between the measured and estimated diffusivities at *T*.