

Aerosol Optical Properties in the Southeastern United States in Summer-Part 1: Hygroscopic Growth

C. A. Brock¹, N. L. Wagner^{1,2}, B. E. Anderson³, A. R. Attwood^{1,2,4}, A. Beyersdorf³, P. Campuzano-Jost^{2,5}, A. G. Carlton⁶, D. A. Day^{2,5}, G. S. Diskin³, T. D. Gordon^{1,2}, J. L. Jimenez^{2,5}, D. A. Lack^{1,2,7}, J. Liao^{1,2}, M. Z. Markovic^{1,2,8}, A. M. Middlebrook¹, N. L. Ng^{9,10}, A. E. Perring^{1,2}, M. S. Richardson^{1,2}, J. P. Schwarz¹, R. A. Washenfelder^{1,2}, A. Welti^{1,2,11}, L. Xu¹⁰, L. D. Ziemba³, and D. M. Murphy¹

[1] {NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, Boulder, Colorado, USA}

[2] {Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, USA}

[3] {NASA Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, USA}

[4] {Now at: Horiba Scientific, Edison, New Jersey, USA}

[5] {Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, USA}

[6] {Department of Environmental Sciences, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA}

[7] {Now at: TEAC Consulting, Brisbane, Australia}

[8] {Now at: Air Quality Research Division, Environment Canada, Toronto, Ontario, Canada}

[9] {School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA}

[10] {School of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA}

[11] {Now at: Leibniz Institute for Tropospheric Research, Department of Physics, Leipzig, Germany}

Correspondence to: C. A. Brock (charles.a.brock@noaa.gov)

Abstract. Aircraft observations of meteorological, trace gas, and aerosol properties were made during May-September 2013 in the southeastern United States (US) under fair-weather, afternoon conditions with well-defined planetary boundary layer structure. Optical extinction at 532nm was directly measured at relative humidities (RHs) of ~15%, ~70%, and ~90% and compared with extinction calculated from measurements of aerosol composition and size distribution using the κ -Köhler approximation for hygroscopic growth. The calculated enhancement in hydrated aerosol extinction with relative humidity, $f(RH)$, calculated by this method agreed well with the observed $f(RH)$ at ~90% RH. The dominance of organic aerosol, which comprised 65±10% of PM1 in the planetary boundary layer, resulted in relatively low $f(RH)$ values of 1.43±0.67 at 70% RH and 2.28±1.05 at 90% RH. The subsaturated κ -Köhler hygroscopicity parameter κ for the organic fraction of the aerosol must have been <0.10 to be consistent with 75% of the observations within uncertainties, with a best estimate of $\kappa=0.05$. This subsaturated κ value for the organic aerosol in the southeastern US is broadly consistent with field studies in rural environments. A new, physically based, single-parameter representation was developed that better described $f(RH)$ than did the widely used gamma power-law approximation.

1 Introduction

Particles in the atmosphere scatter and absorb solar radiation. Atmospheric aerosol extinction (=scattering+absorption) reduces visibility and usually cools the earth, especially over dark surfaces such as

1 oceans and forests. Uncertainty in the direct radiative forcing due to anthropogenic aerosols is the second largest
2 contributor to total uncertainty in climate forcing (IPCC, 2013; Bond et al., 2013).

3 One of the most important factors affecting ambient aerosol optical extinction—hence visibility, aerosol optical
4 depth (AOD), and direct radiative effects—is the particulate water mass, which depends on both the hydrophilic
5 properties of the aerosol components and the relative humidity (RH). Hygroscopic water uptake changes particle
6 size and refractive index and can lead to dramatic changes in the extinction as a function of RH due to changes
7 in the amount of aerosol liquid water, even when dry mass is constant. Atmospheric RH is highly variable
8 temporally, horizontally, and especially vertically, so aerosol water modulates the relationship between ambient
9 extinction and dry aerosol mass.

10 The relationship between atmospheric extinction and humidity has long been recognized (e.g., Wright, 1939).
11 The coupling between particle hygroscopicity and composition and optical extinction has been evaluated
12 experimentally and quantitatively since the work of Pilat and Charlson (1966), Covert and Charlson (1972) and
13 Hänel (1972a; 1972b). Understanding the factors controlling the change in extinction or scattering as a function
14 of RH, known as $f(RH)$, is important for evaluating remote sensing measurements (e.g., Brock et al., 2015;
15 Crumeyrolle et al., 2014; Esteve et al., 2012; Ferrare et al., 1998; Hegg et al., 1993; Kotchenruther et al., 1999;
16 van Donkelaar et al., 2015; Voss et al., 2001; Zieger et al., 2011, 2012; Ziemba et al., 2012), aerosol direct
17 radiative forcing calculations (e.g., Attwood et al., 2014; IPCC, 2013; Kahn, 2011; Koloutsou-Vakakis et al.,
18 1998; Nemesure et al., 1995), and atmospheric visibility estimates (e.g., Charlson et al., 1967; Malm et al.,
19 2000). In general, particles composed primarily of organic material and dust are less hygroscopic (Duplissy et
20 al., 2011; Petters and Kreidenweis, 2007; Zieger et al., 2015), while those that are predominantly inorganic take
21 up water more readily (e.g., Petters and Kreidenweis, 2007; Quinn et al., 2005). Particles may exhibit sharp
22 phase transitions as they deliquesce, as well as hysteresis as they effloresce, especially for inorganic
23 compositions (e.g., Santarpià et al., 2005; Tang, 1996; Zieger et al., 2014). Particles dominated by organic
24 compounds are more likely to present more gradual hygroscopic growth with increasing RH without evident
25 phase transition behavior (e.g., Carrico et al., 2005; Zieger et al., 2015).

26 Because of the chemical complexity of particles and the difficulty in measuring precise molecular composition
27 and relating that to water uptake with increasing RH, it is common to use simplified parameterizations to
28 describe the change in extinction (or scattering) with atmospheric RH relative to a dry or low-RH state. The most
29 frequently used of these parameterizations is a power-law function known as the "gamma" parameterization,
30 which was first used by Kasten et al. (1969). This empirically derived, single parameter equation is often written
31 as

$$32 \frac{\sigma(RH)}{\sigma(RH_0)} \equiv f(RH) = \left[\frac{(100-RH_0)}{(100-RH)} \right]^\gamma, \quad (1)$$

33 where $\sigma(RH)$ is the bulk aerosol extinction at the ambient RH condition, $\sigma(RH_0)$ the extinction at the dry (low
34 RH) condition RH_0 , and γ is a parameter fitted to the observed data. The γ parameterization has been widely used
35 to describe aerosol hygroscopicity (e.g., Attwood et al., 2014; Doherty et al., 2005; Kasten, 1969; Massoli et al.,
36 2009; Quinn et al., 2005). Doherty et al. (2005) and Quinn et al. (2005) showed that in many environments the
37 value of γ varies systematically with composition, and especially with the ratio of submicron organic aerosol

1 (OA) mass to the mass of submicron sulfate plus OA. Thus one can approximately predict $f(RH)$ at arbitrary RH
2 given information on bulk submicron particle composition.

3 In this paper we examine the change in aerosol extinction at 532 nm wavelength as a function of RH based on
4 measurements from two airborne field projects in the southeastern US in the summer. This analysis focuses on
5 mid-day and afternoon data collected when the planetary boundary layer was fully developed because 1) prior to
6 daytime atmospheric mixing, aerosols may be chemically diverse and externally mixed, leading to complex
7 hygroscopic growth patterns that are hard to characterize (Santarpia, 2005); 2) we wish to develop an
8 understanding of aerosol hygroscopicity that is regionally representative, and the well-developed, cloud-topped
9 boundary layer structure examined here is typical of the southeastern US in summertime (Warren et al., 1986);
10 and 3) most of the airborne data were taken in the late morning and afternoon in fair weather. We describe the
11 observed variability in aerosol composition, size distribution, and hygroscopicity characteristics in this
12 environment and evaluate the suitability of κ -Köhler and Mie theories to represent $f(RH)$. We develop and use a
13 new single-parameter equation that better describe $f(RH)$ in this environment than does the γ parameterization
14 (Eq. 1).

15 This paper is the second of three that analyze in detail the same airborne measurements of aerosol optical
16 properties in the southeastern US. In the first paper (Wagner et al., 2015) we described in detail the flights, the
17 instruments and the observations associated with vertical profiles conducted in this region. In the final paper
18 (Brock et al., 2015), the understanding of aerosol hygroscopicity developed here and the vertical profiles
19 analyzed in Wagner et al. (2015) are used to evaluate the sensitivity of AOD to a range of aerosol and
20 meteorological parameters.

21 **2 Methods**

22 **2.1 Aircraft instrumentation**

23 We analyze airborne, in situ data measured during the May-July 2013 Southeastern Nexus of Air Quality and
24 Climate (SENEX) and the portions of the August-September 2013 Study of Emissions and Atmospheric
25 Composition, Clouds, and Climate Coupling by Regional Surveys (SEAC⁴RS) projects that were made in the
26 southeastern US. The SENEX project used the NOAA WP-3D aircraft (typical airspeed ~ 100 m s⁻¹), while the
27 SEAC⁴RS project used the NASA DC-8 aircraft (~ 160 m s⁻¹) Details of the instruments, measurements, and
28 methodology for generating regionally representative vertical profiles of aerosol, gas-phase, and meteorological
29 parameters are given by Wagner et al. (2015). Briefly, measurements of the composition of sub-1 μm vacuum
30 aerodynamic diameter (approximately <0.7 μm physical diameter) non-refractory particles were made by aerosol
31 mass spectrometers (AMS, Aerodyne, Billerica, Massachusetts, US; Canagaratna et al., 2007; DeCarlo et al.,
32 2006) each with extensive customization for aircraft use (Bahreini et al., 2008; Dunlea et al., 2009; Middlebrook
33 et al., 2012). The AMS used during SENEX employed a compact time-of-flight mass spectrometer (C-ToF)
34 while that used during SEAC⁴RS employed a high-resolution time-of-flight mass spectrometer with greater
35 resolving power (HR-ToF, DeCarlo et al., 2006). The mass of black carbon (BC) particles was measured on both
36 projects with the same humidified tandem single-particle soot photometer (SP2; Droplet Measurement
37 Technologies, Boulder, CO, US; Schwarz et al., 2015). Dry particle size distributions from ~ 0.07 to 1.0 μm were

1 measured with two separate ultra-high sensitivity aerosol size spectrometers (UHSAS, Particle Metrics, Inc.,
2 Boulder, Colorado, US; Brock et al., 2011; Cai et al., 2008), one on each project. Aerosol extinction at 532nm
3 wavelength and three relative humidities (~15%, ~70%, and ~90%) was measured simultaneously with a custom
4 built multichannel cavity ringdown spectrometer (CRDS; Langridge et al., 2011) on both projects.

5 Air entering the CRDS passed through a 40cm long carbon monolith denuder (210cpi/30mm OD, MAST
6 Carbon, Basingstoke, United Kingdom) to remove semivolatile inorganic and organic gases. The flow was then
7 was dried to a low RH (~15%, range 8-24%), below the efflorescence point of atmospherically relevant salts,
8 using multitube Nafion dryers (PD-200T-12MSS, Permapure Inc., Toms River, New Jersey, US) with a sample
9 residence time of 0.25 s. For measurement by the two elevated RH channels, the sample was humidified to
10 >90% RH by cooling the sample flow inside Nafion humidifiers (MH-110-12-S-4, Permapure Inc., Toms River,
11 New Jersey, US), causing deliquescence. The sample flow was then reheated to the temperatures of the
12 measurement cells in the instrument, which were controlled using RH sensors (Model HMP110, Vaisala Inc.,
13 Helsinki, Finland) to achieve the desired measurement RH. Typically, one elevated-RH channel measured at
14 ~70% RH (actual range 70-73%) and the other measured at ~90% RH (actual range 86-94%). Data were
15 excluded from analysis when the RH of high-RH channel was <85%.

16 Histograms of measured RH values for each CRDS channel are given in the Supplemental Materials. The
17 cooling in the humidifiers was 10-15K and 1-3K below the cell temperatures of the medium- and high-RH
18 channels respectively. Total time of exposure to elevated humidities was ~4s, of which 0.4 s was in the cooled
19 section and 3.6 s was in the warmed section. Calculated and measured $f(RH)$ for 300nm ammonium sulfate
20 particles are in agreement within uncertainties (Langridge et al., 2011), indicating that the humidified residence
21 time is sufficient to allow hygroscopic particles to grow to equilibrium. However, the instrument has not been
22 tested with less hygroscopic organic particles that might exhibit kinetic limitations to water uptake. This remains
23 an uncharacterized uncertainty.

24 The changes in sample temperature in the inlet, sample line, humidifiers, and CRDS cells may lead to loss of
25 semi-volatile species. Submicron ammonium nitrate was $<0.04 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ in the daytime during contemporaneous
26 measurements at a ground site in Centreville, Alabama in June 2013 (Attwood et al., 2014; Guo et al., 2015).
27 The upstream denuder excludes condensation of semi-volatile compounds. Because of the initial high level of
28 humidification prior to reheating, the CRDS measurements at elevated RH were made on the metastable
29 (humidified) branch of any deliquescence/efflorescence hysteresis curve. This better represents the likely state of
30 the aged atmospheric aerosol in the cloud-topped planetary boundary layer than would measurements made on
31 the deliquescence branch of the curve. We did not attempt to measure aerosol extinction at ambient humidity
32 because it is difficult to regulate instrument humidity rapidly enough to respond to ambient RH changes in flight.

33 A low-turbulence inlet and sampling system (Brock et al., 2011) was used during SENEX. During this project
34 the AMS, CRDS, SP2, and UHSAS sampled downstream of an impactor with 50% efficiency at $1.0 \mu\text{m}$
35 aerodynamic diameter (PM₁). Accounting for particle and air density, typical 50% impactor efficiency was ~0.7
36 μm physical diameter at the inlet RH, which was measured at <50% due to dynamic heating during sampling.
37 Particle losses in the CRDS system were characterized experimentally by Langridge et al. (2011) using particles
38 size-selected with a custom-built differential mobility analyzer (DMA) of the design now available

1 commercially (Brechtel Manufacturing, Inc., Hayward, CA, US). Losses within the instrument were <1.25% for
2 submicron particles at RH values up to 92%. Transmission of 0.1-0.7 μm particles in the turbulent transmission
3 line (inner diameter 0.95 cm, length 3 m, flowrate 20 l min^{-1}) between the impactor and the AMS, CRDS, SP2,
4 and UHSAS was calculated for inertial, gravitational, and diffusive losses using the aerocalc.xls spreadsheet
5 (Baron, 2001) and was >0.992 for the range of flight conditions encountered. Based on the known particle
6 transmission characteristics of the AMS focusing lens inlet and the measured size distribution, the AMS was
7 estimated to sample >97% of PM1 particle volume (Wagner et al., 2015). During SEAC⁴RS, the aerosol
8 instruments sampled ambient air using a shrouded conical diffusing inlet that transmitted particles smaller than
9 2.8 μm aerodynamic diameter with efficiency >95% (McNaughton et al., 2007). The CRDS and UHSAS
10 sampled downstream of the same 1.0 μm impactor used in SENEX. Calculated particle transmission through the
11 tubing between the inlet and the CRDS and UHSAS instruments was >0.99. The AMS, CRDS, SP2, and
12 UHSAS all comparably and quantitatively sampled PM1 aerosol during both SENEX and SEAC⁴RS.

13 The accuracy of the $f(RH)$ measurement made by the CRDS instrument was reported in Langridge et al. (2011)
14 using ammonium sulfate particles size selected with a differential mobility analyzer (DMA) as an
15 atmospherically relevant model hygroscopic aerosol and PSL as a model hydrophobic aerosol. The accuracy of
16 $f(RH)$ determined by this approach was within $\pm 2\%$ (at RH=76%) and $\pm 14\%$ (at RH=95%) of values calculated
17 by κ -Köhler theory, well within experimental uncertainty. The optical power in the sample cells of the CRDS is
18 much less than the 40-100 mW lasers that illuminate the optical cavities, and the aerosol is not measurably
19 heated. The humidity is controlled by direct measurement of RH within each ringdown cell. Because the CRDS
20 provides a fundamental measurement of extinction, repeated extinction calibrations are not necessary. The gas-
21 phase extinction measurement was periodically checked with an ozone source measured by an independent
22 ozone sensor (Thermo Environmental Instruments, Model 49i Ozone Analyzer) and showed no systematic biases
23 in the CRDS extinction during SENEX or SEAC⁴RS. The probes measuring the RH of the sample cells (Vaisala
24 HMP110) were calibrated before and after the SENEX and SEAC⁴RS missions using the equilibrium water
25 vapor pressure over salt solutions (Vaisala HMK15) providing nominal RH values of 33% (MgCl_2), 75%
26 (NaCl), and 97% (K_2SO_4). The RH values reported by probes were within the manufacturer's stated uncertainty
27 of $\pm 2\%$ for RH<90% and $\pm 3\%$ for RH \geq 90% for these salt solutions. The total accuracy in the 1-s humidified
28 extinction measurement is estimated to be $\pm 5\%$, $\pm 10\%$, and $\pm 15\%$ at $\sim 15\%$, $\sim 70\%$, and $\sim 90\%$ RH, respectively. Thus
29 the uncertainty in $f(RH)$ is estimated to be $\pm 11\%$ and $\pm 16\%$ for the medium and high RH channels, respectively.
30 This uncertainty estimate does not account for possible residual water present in particles in the $\sim 15\%$ RH
31 channel, which could bias the $f(RH)$ values low.

32 2.2 Corrections to UHSAS size distributions for refractive index

33 The size distribution reported by the UHSAS is a function of the amount of light scattered onto the instrument's
34 photodetectors, and the quantity of scattered light is itself a function of the composition-dependent aerosol
35 refractive index. Hence, it is necessary to correct the measured UHSAS size distributions for changing aerosol
36 composition during flight. This correction was accomplished by first calibrating the instrument to an aerosol of
37 known refractive index to relate scattering amplitude to discrete pulse height channels. Next, the Mie scattering
38 over the optical geometry of the instrument was calculated to determine how each channel was related to particle

1 diameter for an atmospherically relevant range of real refractive index. Finally, a look-up table of this
2 relationship was used to determine the actual diameter represented by each channel as refractive index,
3 calculated from the AMS measurements as described in Section 2.3, varied. The UHSAS exhibits a monotonic
4 response function for submicron particles (Cai et al., 2008).

5 The UHSAS operated during SENEX was calibrated using atomized, dried ammonium sulfate particles sized
6 with the DMA previously described. The sizing accuracy of the DMA was better than 2% as determined using
7 NIST-traceable PSL microspheres in eight sizes from 0.1 to 1.2 μm (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Inc., Waltham,
8 MA, US). The UHSAS was calibrated on five days with >36 separate ammonium sulfate particle sizes during the
9 SENEX mission, in addition to pre-flight daily calibration checks using four PSL microsphere sizes. The
10 UHSAS that was operated by the NASA Langley group during SEAC⁴RS was calibrated using PSL
11 microspheres and the calibration was checked twice during each flight by generating an aerosol containing four
12 microsphere sizes and introducing it into the inlet sample flow as the aircraft was flying.

13 The response of the UHSAS was simulated using numerical Mie calculations (Bohren and Huffman, 1983) of
14 the light scattered over the solid angle that is imaged onto the instrument's photodetectors. Assumptions include
15 spherical, homogeneous particles with composition that is invariant with particle diameter. The geometry of the
16 detection optics was determined from a review of technical drawings with the manufacturer. Light is scattered
17 perpendicularly to the beam from a neodymium-doped yttrium lithium fluoride laser (1053 nm) and is imaged
18 onto solid state photodetectors on each side of the scattering cell using pairs of Mangin mirrors in clamshell
19 configurations. The signal from each detector is amplified through two gain stages, for a total of four
20 independent gain stages. Each detector samples the light scattered by particles over a circularly symmetric angle
21 from 33-147°. The center region of the angle, between 75.2 and 104.8° is not sampled because of the hole cut in
22 the outer of the Mangin mirrors (the detector area is a negligible fraction of this hole area). Thus the imaged
23 solid angle is a conical annulus. This geometry is consistent with that reported by Petzold et al. (2013), but
24 contrasts with that reported for the UHSAS by Cai et al., (2008), who appear to have incorrectly used a 22-158°
25 scattering angle to simulate UHSAS instrument response..

26 Using the calibrations, the relationship between the 99 size channels and the amount of light scattered onto the
27 detectors was determined. Knowing that each channel represents a certain amount of scattered light, the Mie
28 model was used to calculate the particle diameter corresponding to each channel for a range of particle real
29 refractive indices from 1.40 to 1.60, in increments of 0.01, producing a look-up table relating channel number to
30 particle diameter as a function of real refractive index. Using the AMS data and the composition model
31 described in Section 2.3, the real refractive index was determined by volume-weighted averaging for each AMS
32 data point using the values in Table 1. The mean and standard deviation of the real part of the calculated
33 refractive index was 1.547 ± 0.004 for the data analyzed here. Using the real refractive index for each point, the
34 look-up table was then applied to determine the physical diameter for each UHSAS channel for each
35 measurement interval. Residual water content in the dry (~15% RH) aerosol was not considered. The variation in
36 instrument response due to the imaginary component of the refractive index, k , also was not considered. Because
37 BC concentrations measured by the SP2 were very low (averaging $<0.05 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ for the data analyzed here), k
38 was calculated to be 0.006 ± 0.004 , and thus was ignored in the generation of the UHSAS look-up table.

1 However, the BC component was included in the calculation of κ_{chem} , refractive index, and extinction as
2 described in Section 2.3 below.

3 **2.3 Method to calculate ambient extinction**

4 To determine ambient extinction, measurements of extinction made at three discrete RH values of ~15%, ~70%,
5 and ~90% may be interpolated or extrapolated to ambient conditions at arbitrary RH based on a parametric
6 model such as the γ function. However, because the measurements analyzed here include submicron aerosol size
7 distributions and composition, a more explicit method to determine ambient extinction can also be used (Fig.
8 1a). Petters and Kreidenweis (2007) proposed the κ -Köhler parameterization that describes the water activity of
9 an aqueous solution without considering explicitly the effect of individual ionic components. The κ -Köhler
10 approach has been used widely to predict subsaturated particle growth as well as the activation of cloud
11 condensation nuclei (CCN). Ignoring curvature effects for particles diameters >100 nm, the hygroscopic growth
12 of a water-soluble aerosol can be approximated as

$$13 \quad gf_{diam} \cong \left(1 + \kappa_{chem} \frac{RH}{100-RH}\right)^{1/3}, \quad (2)$$

14 where gf_{diam} is the diameter growth factor, the ratio of the particle's wet diameter to its dry diameter. An equation
15 of this form was first used by Rissler et al. (2006) to describe observed hygroscopic growth factors. **The value of**
16 **κ_{chem} for a mixed particle composition may be calculated from the volume weighted average of the κ_{chem} of each**
17 **species i , κ_i , which contributes to the aerosol composition:**

$$18 \quad \kappa_{chem} = \frac{\sum_i(\kappa_i X_i / \rho_i)}{\sum_i(X_i / \rho_i)}, \quad (3)$$

19 where X_i is the mass concentration and ρ_i the dry density of species i . The κ_i are determined from
20 thermodynamic model calculations or by experimentally determining the growth factors for individual
21 compounds. This volume-weighted approach follows the Zdanovskii-Stokes-Robinson (Stokes and Robinson,
22 1966) mixing rule, which states that each component of the mixture acts independently and that the optical
23 properties are linearly additive. The accuracy of the particle diameter growth factor calculated using κ_{chem}
24 determined from Eq. (3) varies depending on the specifics of the aerosol composition and mixing state and on
25 the accuracy of the κ_i , but is generally observed to be better than 30% (Petters and Kreidenweis, 2007).

26 Using the methodology shown schematically in Fig. 1a, the measurements of aerosol composition and size
27 distribution were used to calculate the extinction expected at the dry, medium, and high RH values measured in
28 the CRDS. This calculation serves two purposes: it evaluates the closure of the optical, chemical, and size
29 distribution measurements, and it helps determine how well the γ parameterization, Eq. (1), describes $f(RH)$ in
30 the southeastern US. The AMS measured the mass concentrations of sulfate, nitrate, chloride, ammonium, and
31 OA. From these measurements, an electrolyte composition model (Zaveri, 2005) was used to calculate the
32 concentrations of ammonium sulfate, ammonium bisulfate, letovicite, sulfuric acid, ammonium nitrate,
33 ammonium chloride, nitric acid, and hydrochloric acid. Contributions from ions associated with electrolytes of
34 magnesium and sodium are likely to be insignificant contributors to the submicron aerosol mass in the
35 continental boundary layer (Washenfelder et al., 2015). Organosulfates were estimated to contribute <4% to the
36 submicron aerosol mass and therefore are not considered (Liao et al., 2015). The contribution of particulate

1 organic nitrates (pON) to measured nitrate has been estimated using the method described in Fry et al (2009) for
 2 the SEAC⁴RS flights on which the HR-ToF-AMS was operated (Day et al., 2015). The pON, likely in the form
 3 of oxidized monoterpene nitrates (Boyd et al., 2015; Draper et al., 2015; Xu et al., 2015a,b) is estimated to be
 4 between 15 and 40% of the total measured nitrate above the surface in the well-mixed and transition layers, and
 5 more than 63% across the southeastern US at the surface (Xu et al., 2015a). However, nitrate represented <5% of
 6 fine aerosol mass in the data analyzed here. Lacking specific information on pON density or hygroscopicity, and
 7 given its relatively small contribution to aerosol mass in summer (<12% of OA and <8% of submicron mass; Xu
 8 et al., 2015b), all measured nitrate is treated as ammonium nitrate. Finally, potential phase separation phenomena
 9 that have been found in laboratory studies of OA/inorganic mixtures (e.g., Hodas et al., 2015), insoluble
 10 inclusions that might influence hygroscopicity (Pringle et al., 2010), and the diameter dependence of κ_{chem}
 11 discussed by Good et al. (2010a) are ignored.

12 The bulk aerosol κ_{chem} was determined from the volume-weighted κ_i values (Table 1) using Eq. (3). Aerosol
 13 extinction at the measured low, medium and high humidities was then calculated as follows (Fig. 1a). First, as
 14 detailed in Section 2.2., the optically equivalent dry diameters measured by the UHSAS were converted into
 15 physical dry diameters, accounting for the effects of varying composition on the real refractive index, which
 16 varied only slightly (interdecile range 1.54-1.56). Next, the particle diameter at the ambient RH, D_{RH} , was
 17 calculated using κ -Köhler theory (including the Kelvin effect) by numerically solving

$$18 \frac{RH}{100} = \frac{D_{RH}^3 - D_d^3}{D_{RH}^3 - D_d^3(1 - \kappa_{chem})} \exp\left(\frac{4\sigma_s M_w}{RT\rho_w D_{RH}}\right) \quad (4)$$

19 where D_d is the dry diameter, σ_s the surface tension of water at the particle/air interface, and M_w and ρ_w the
 20 molecular weight and density of water, respectively (Petters and Kreidenweis, 2007). Finally, Mie theory
 21 (Bohren and Huffman, 1983) was used to calculate the expected extinction coefficient, σ_{ext} , at the ambient RH
 22 using the water-swelled D_{RH} and water-corrected, volume-weighted refractive index n , as

$$23 \sigma_{ext} = \int_{4 \text{ nm}}^{700 \text{ nm}} \frac{\pi}{4} D_{RH}^2 \alpha(D_{RH}, n) N(D_{RH}) dD_{RH}, \quad (5)$$

24 where α is the extinction efficiency and N the number concentration of particles in diameter interval dD_{RH} .

25 In calculating ambient extinction using Eq. (5) it is assumed that there is no size dependence to κ_{chem} ; instead it is
 26 assumed that all optically active particles are spherical, internally mixed and have the same composition
 27 regardless of size. This assumption is supported qualitatively by inspection of the size-dependent composition
 28 periodically measured by the AMS instruments. The differences in the real refractive index between the UHSAS
 29 sensing laser (1053 nm) and the humidified CRDS (532 nm) wavelengths of about 0.02 (Toon et al., 1976) are
 30 not considered. We also ignore the contribution of submicron soil components, which were not separately
 31 measured but whose concentrations measured at a surface site nearby were negligible (Washenfelder et al.,
 32 2015), and of sea-salt, which has low concentrations in the southeastern US in summer (Guo et al., 2015).

33 2.4 Uncertainty in calculated and measured extinction

34 Extinctions were calculated from the measured composition and the UHSAS size distributions for the low
 35 (~15% RH) medium (~70% RH) and high (~90% RH) conditions of measurement in the CRDS instrument. The

1 uncertainties in these extinctions are difficult to estimate because of the multiple steps of processing (Fig. 1a),
2 including modeling the UHSAS instrument response, and the assumptions inherent in the calculation (e.g.,
3 internally mixed, homogeneous, spherical particles). We assume that κ_{chem} for inorganic electrolytes can be
4 estimated to within ~20%, based on ranges found in the cited literature. This uncertainty includes the uncertainty
5 in the composition determined by the AMS. This uncertainty may appear low, since AMS accuracy for absolute
6 concentrations is ~35%, driven in large part by uncertainties in particle collection efficiency (Middlebrook et al.,
7 2012). However, only the mass fractions of the individual aerosol constituents are used when calculating κ_{chem} ,
8 so the collection efficiency does not contribute to the uncertainty assuming that all components of a particle are
9 collected with the same efficiency. Instead, the uncertainty is dominated by other factors such as relative
10 ionization efficiency for different compounds, and is taken to be ~20%; this uncertainty is an area of current
11 research (Murphy et al., 2016). For OA, the uncertainty in the κ_{chem} is much larger because the OA composition
12 is largely unknown. Values of κ_{chem} for various OA compositions measured in the laboratory vary from 0 to 0.5
13 (e.g., Petters and Kreidenweis, 2007; Rickards et al., 2013). To achieve consistency with the observed $f(RH)$, we
14 have chosen a κ_{chem} for OA, $\kappa_{chem,org}$, of 0.050. The range of $\kappa_{chem,org}$ values that are consistent with our
15 observations within uncertainties is discussed further in Section 3.3.

16 The uncertainty in the size distribution measured by the UHSAS has been examined in detail elsewhere (Cai et
17 al., 2008; Brock et al., 2011). For particle diameters $<0.5 \mu\text{m}$, and an assumed a range in real refractive index of
18 1.43-1.56 with negligible absorption, the actual diameter may deviate by up to 8% from the reported diameter,
19 which is based on ammonium sulfate calibration. However, because we correct the size distribution for refractive
20 index effects as described in Section 2.2, the error in the diameters used to calculate extinction is estimated to be
21 $<3\%$ based on calibration precision. Concentration uncertainty due to counting statistics is $<4\%$ for the cases
22 analyzed here, and that due to the sample flow measurement is $<1.6\%$.

23 The uncertainties described above propagate to extinction nonlinearly through the κ -Köhler equation (Eq. (4))
24 and through the Mie calculation (Eq. (5)). We use a Monte Carlo approach to simulate the expected uncertainty
25 in the extinction determined at the three relative humidities. Three values each of geometric mean diameter,
26 geometric standard deviation, and κ_{chem} were chosen spanning the interdecile range of observed values, creating a
27 total of 27 cases. For each case, the extinction at the three RH values was calculated, as described in Section 2.3
28 (Fig. 1a), 1000 times while median diameter, standard deviation, κ_{chem} , and RH each was simultaneously varied
29 by a normally-distributed random error corresponding to the uncertainty in that parameter. In addition, a
30 normally-distributed random uncertainty was added to represent counting statistics and flow uncertainty. The
31 resulting total relative errors for calculated extinction varied only slightly as function of extinction, with a mean
32 relative error of $\pm 34\%$. This value is used as the best estimate of total uncertainty in calculated ambient
33 extinction.

34 The calibration accuracy in directly-measured CRDS extinction varies with measurement RH, and is $\pm 2\%$ at
35 $\sim 15\%$ RH, $\pm 5\%$ at $\sim 70\%$ RH, and $\pm 15\%$ at $\sim 90\%$ RH for extinction values exceeding 20 Mm^{-1} . Instrument
36 precision for 1-s data is $\pm 5\%$ at 50 Mm^{-1} .

37 For the seven flights analyzed for this study, the extinction calculated from the AMS and size distribution data
38 (Section 2.3) and the extinction measured by the CRDS agreed within the combined experimental uncertainty at

1 all three measurement humidities (Table 2). During the SEAC⁴RS flight of 6 September 2013, the UHSAS did
2 not function, so for this flight extinction was not calculated from the composition and size distribution
3 measurements, although the extinction values measured directly by CRDS are used.

4 All aerosol data used in this analysis have been corrected to conditions of 1013 hPa and 273.15 K. All aerosol
5 data were measured at 1 s intervals, with the exception of the C-ToF-AMS measurements during SENEX, which
6 were made over 10 s intervals. When calculating extinction from the AMS and size distributions (Fig. 1a), the
7 SENEX data were averaged to match the C-ToF-AMS measurement frequency. The SEAC⁴RS data, including
8 that from the HR-ToF-AMS, were averaged to 10s to maintain statistical consistency with the SENEX data.

9 **3. Results and analysis**

10 In this section we describe the observed aerosol properties and their vertical structure, explore the relationship
11 between particle composition and hygroscopicity, place constraints on the hygroscopicity of the OA component
12 of the submicron aerosol, and present a new parameterization to describe the $f(RH)$ curve.

13 **3.1 Selection of data**

14 This analysis focuses on in situ measurements obtained during vertical profiles from the SENEX and SEAC⁴RS
15 flights made in the southeastern states of Louisiana, Mississippi, and Georgia (Fig. 2). These data were selected
16 because they were the focus of analysis by Wagner et al. (2015) of particle vertical mixing and mass production,
17 and because the results of this analysis and these profiles are used in a companion paper evaluating the
18 sensitivity of AOD to several aerosol parameters and to RH (Brock et al., 2015). Wagner et al. (2015) describe in
19 detail the selection criteria for the profiles. Briefly, profiles were included in the analysis if they were in the
20 afternoon during fair-weather cumulus conditions, exhibited a well-mixed layer between the surface and cloud
21 base, and contained a distinct transition (cloud) layer between the well-mixed layer and the free troposphere
22 above. The well-mixed and transition layers were defined on the basis of the oxidation lifetime of the gas-phase
23 species CO and isoprene. Air within the well-mixed layer was in immediate (<1 hr) contact with surface
24 isoprene emission, while the transition layer was evidently a result of mixing between the well-mixed layer and
25 the free troposphere over time scales of hours.

26 Of the 74 profiles made in the geographic area of interest, 37 met the criteria of Wagner et al. (2015) and 25 met
27 both the meteorological criterion and the criterion that the high RH channel be at $RH < 85\%$. The aircraft flight
28 tracks and locations of these profiles are shown in Fig. 2. Brock et al. (2015) show that the AOD values
29 calculated by vertically integrating the ambient extinction derived from the in situ measurements in the profiles
30 are regionally representative and are consistent with ground-based climatologies of AOD determined from
31 sunphotometer measurements. Thus the measurements presented here are typical of the daytime, summertime
32 background and moderately polluted rural aerosol of this region.

33 **3.2 Observed aerosol composition and hygroscopicity**

34 Data from a single example profile measured in east central Alabama on 20130622 are shown in Fig. 3. The
35 measured extinction at the low, medium, and high RH values (Fig. 3a), along with the RH values measured in

1 the CRD cells and ambient air (Fig. 3b) are the fundamental measurements. The $f(RH)$ values from the medium
2 and high RH channels are shown in Fig 3c. Within the well-mixed layer the dry extinction was nearly constant
3 (Fig. 3a). The ambient RH reached a maximum at the top of the well-mixed layer (Fig. 3b), where the bases of
4 the fair-weather cumulus clouds were typically found. The fraction of PM1 dry mass that was measured by the
5 AMS to be inorganic was ~ 0.3 in the well-mixed and transition layers, and increased to ~ 0.55 in the free
6 troposphere. Because inorganic compounds are generally more hygroscopic than organic species (e.g., Petters
7 and Kreidenweis, 2007), the $f(RH)$ at $\sim 90\%$ RH increased from < 1.7 in the well-mixed and transition layers to
8 > 2.5 in the free troposphere. For comparison, the $f(RH)$ for pure 300 nm ammonium sulfate particles at 532nm
9 wavelength is expected to be ~ 2 at 70% RH and ~ 4 at 90% RH (Langridge et al., 2011). Because the extinction
10 and mass of the aerosol within the free troposphere was only $\sim 15\%$ of that within the well-mixed layer, the well-
11 mixed layer aerosol dominated aerosol composition and hygroscopicity within the transition layer.

12 Wagner et al. (2015) present a method to generate a composite profile while maintaining distinction between the
13 mixed, transition, and free tropospheric layers. Composite profiles of the subset of 25 profiles that contained
14 valid $f(RH)$ data were generated by this technique (Fig. 4). As in the individual profile shown in Fig. 3, the
15 median dry extinction was a maximum in the well-mixed layer, declined through the transition layer, and was a
16 minimum in the free troposphere (Fig. 4a). The values of $f(RH)$, on the other hand, slightly increased with
17 altitude in the well-mixed and transition layers, and were a maximum in the free troposphere (Fig. 4b,c). Values
18 of $f(RH)$ were highly variable in the free troposphere, primarily because extinction values were low and signal
19 levels were noisy. The median inorganic fraction of PM1 increased from 0.35 ± 0.10 averaged over the well
20 mixed and transition layers to ~ 0.45 in the free troposphere. The organic aerosol in the well-mixed layer in
21 daytime was composed of aged secondary organic matter, primarily from biogenic sources (Kim et al., 2015; Xu
22 et al, 2015a,b). The measured mean values of $f(RH)$ for all layers was 1.43 ± 0.67 at $\sim 70\%$ RH and 2.28 ± 1.05 at
23 $\sim 90\%$ RH.

24 Using the method described in Fig. 1a and Sect. 2.3, the expected extinction at the dry, $\sim 70\%$, and $\sim 90\%$ RH
25 conditions was calculated. The $f(RH)$ values from these calculated extinctions are compared with the $f(RH)$
26 values from the CRDS measurements in Fig. 5. The calculated and measured $f(RH)$ are in excellent agreement
27 (slope=1.13, $r^2=0.81$) for the $\sim 90\%$ RH condition, but are less well correlated ($r^2=0.29$) for the $\sim 70\%$ RH
28 condition. This poorer correlation at the medium RH value may be associated with variability in organic
29 hygroscopicity, which dominates aerosol hygroscopicity at $RH < 80\%$. In section 3.3 we examine the range of
30 organic hygroscopicity that is consistent with our measurements within experimental uncertainty.

31 3.3 Constraints on the hygroscopicity of OA

32 Organic matter dominated the composition of the submicron particles during both SENEX and SEAC⁴RS,
33 averaging $65 \pm 10\%$ of the fine aerosol mass in the data analyzed here (Section 3.1). Published values for the
34 hygroscopic growth parameter of OA, $\kappa_{chem,OA}$, vary widely between ~ 0 and 0.4 (e.g., Petters and Kreidenweis,
35 2007; Rickards et al., 2013; Suda et al., 2012). A parameterization linking $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ to the ratio of the oxidized OA
36 fragment m/z 44 to total OA mass (f_{44}) as measured in the AMS has been developed (Duplissy et al., 2011).
37 However, Rickards et al., (2013) find that this parameterization does not fit many available data, and that
38 significant variations in aerosol chemical functionality, composition, and oxidation history affect $\kappa_{chem,OA}$.

1 Cerully et al. (2015) show that, in the southeastern U. S., $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ is not simply related to oxidation level, but to
2 additional parameters including OA volatility. Values of κ_{chem} for atmospheric aerosols are commonly
3 determined experimentally using measurements of droplet activation diameter in the supersaturated regime (e.g.,
4 Cerully et al., 2015; Chang et al. 2010; Dusek et al., 2010; Gunthe et al., 2009; Levin et al. 2012; Sihto et al.,
5 2011) or using hygroscopic growth measurements in the subsaturated regime (Cappa et al., 2011; Cheung et al.
6 2015; Hersey et al., 2013; Malm et al., 2000; Mikhailov 2013; Nguyen et al., 2014; Sihto et al., 2011).
7 Atmospheric variability in these measurements is compounded by potential measurement artifacts (Good et al.,
8 2010b). Although not always explicitly calculated, the value of $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ often can be inferred from these studies.
9 A review of results from the publications cited above suggests a range of mass-weighted total $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ from 0 to
10 0.2 well represents the organic hygroscopicity of the ambient aerosol in a variety of environments, with best
11 estimates of <0.1 for subsaturated (hygroscopic growth) measurements and >0.1 for supersaturated (CCN)
12 measurements.

13 Given the high organic fraction of the aerosol, the value of $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ is an important factor determining observed
14 $f(RH)$. We can examine which values of $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ are consistent with our measurements within experimental
15 uncertainty to place constraints on this parameter. Some of the errors in the calculated extinction–UHSAS sizing
16 bias, UHSAS counting statistics, and UHSAS and AMS flow uncertainties (Sect. 2.4)—are not independent and
17 should cancel when calculating $f(RH)$. Ignoring these error terms, relative errors in calculated $f(RH)_{70}$ of $\pm 7\%$
18 and in $f(RH)_{90}$ of $\pm 24\%$ were determined using the Monte Carlo method described in Section 2.4. To calculate
19 the range in $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ that was consistent with the observed $f(RH)_{70}$ and $f(RH)_{90}$, the following approach was used:
20 1) For each measurement point, the inorganic κ_{chem} determined from the AMS measurements was held constant.
21 2) A Monte Carlo simulation assigned a random $\kappa_{chem,org}$ between 0.0 and 0.5, and the values of $f(RH)_{70}$ and
22 $f(RH)_{90}$ were calculated. 3) When the calculated $f(RH)_{70}$ and $f(RH)_{90}$ both agreed with the measured values
23 within their uncertainties, the value of $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ was recorded; otherwise step (2) was repeated. This process was
24 repeated 50 times for each data point, and the mean value of each $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ that was consistent with the data was
25 recorded. Thus statistics were built for the values of $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ that were consistent with observed hygroscopic
26 growth at both the high and medium RH conditions.

27 A histogram of the values of mean $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ that were consistent with the $f(RH)$ observations within uncertainty
28 (Fig. 6) is heavily skewed toward zero, with the 50th, 75th, and 90th percentile values being 0.05, 0.10, and 0.17.
29 This outcome demonstrates that a low value of $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ is necessary to match the observed $f(RH)$ values, with a
30 best estimate of 0.05. Only values of $\kappa_{chem,OA} < 0.10$ can be consistent with the relatively small increase in $f(RH)$ at
31 the medium RH value of $\sim 70\%$ (Fig. 7a) in most (75%) of our data. Our analysis assumes a homogeneous, size-
32 independent internal mixture of the aerosol components, and does not account for the possible presence of
33 sparingly soluble OA compounds (Wex et al., 2009) or for the diameter dependence of κ_{chem} (Good et al., 2010a).
34 Nguyen et al. (2014) suggest that κ_{chem} itself is a function of RH due to an increasing osmotic coefficient with
35 decreasing RH. We find that a single, constant κ_{chem} explains the $f(RH)$ at 90% RH, but only if $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ is < 0.10
36 for $> 75\%$ of our data.

1 3.4 Parameterizing $f(RH)$

2 The hygroscopic growth of particles and $f(RH)$ can be calculated using the technique shown in Fig. 1a and Table
3 2 if discrete phase transitions can be ignored. However, a simplified parameterization based on optical
4 measurements alone (Fig. 1b) is useful when compositional or size distribution observations are not available, as
5 is often the case for in situ data from monitoring networks or measurements from mobile platforms. The often-
6 used γ parameterization (Eq. (1)) has the desired simplicity. In Fig. 7a we plot the observed $f(RH)$ found within
7 the well mixed layer in the single profile in Fig. 3. The γ parameterization with $RH_0=0$ did not match within
8 uncertainties the $f(RH)$ directly observed by the medium RH channel of the CRDS. This bias at $\sim 70\%$ RH
9 occurred frequently, as shown in the composite profiles (Fig. 4b) and in histogram form (Fig. 7c). The planetary
10 boundary layer in the southeastern US is often at humidities between 50 and 90% where the γ parameterization
11 could lead to overprediction of the ambient extinction by 20% or more. Because of these biases we have sought
12 a different single-parameter representation of the $f(RH)$ curve.

13 In the Appendix, we use κ -Köhler and Mie theories to develop an alternative parameterization for $f(RH)$. This
14 parameterization is given by

$$15 \quad f(RH) \cong 1 + \kappa_{ext} \frac{RH}{100 - RH}, \quad (6)$$

16 where κ_{ext} is the fitted parameter. When fitted to the three-point $f(RH)$ measurements in SENEX and SEAC⁴RS,
17 both the κ_{ext} and γ parameterizations fit the high RH condition well (Figs. 4c, 7a). However, the κ_{ext}
18 parameterization predicts the medium-RH extinction values better than does the γ parameterization for most of
19 the data (Figs. 4b, 7a). In 17 of the 25 profiles for which valid hygroscopicity measurements were made, the κ_{ext}
20 parameterization described the observed hygroscopic growth better than did the γ parameterization, as
21 determined by a χ^2 statistic. This improved performance is shown Fig. 7c, where the fitted and measured $f(RH)$
22 values at the medium (70%) RH condition for the two parameterizations are compared. The ratio of fitted to
23 measured $f(RH)$ values at 70% RH for κ_{ext} is centered near 1 and is symmetric, while that for γ is >1 for most of
24 the data. Further, there are distinct differences in the fitted $f(RH)$ curves for the two approaches for $RH > 90\%$,
25 with the κ_{ext} parameterization showing a more rapid increase in $f(RH)$ with increasing RH for these high
26 humidity conditions (Fig. 7a). Preliminary evaluation of ambient atmospheric data acquired in February 2015 in
27 Boulder, Colorado, US (Appendix) provides an example where the κ_{ext} curve more closely follows the observed
28 $f(RH)$ for ambient particles at $RH > 90\%$ than does the γ parameterization. In the Supplemental Materials we also
29 present additional analysis of data from the work of Zieger et al. (2013) that support the use of the κ_{ext}
30 parameterization (Eq. (6)) in polluted and background continental cases where organic aerosol matter is likely to
31 be a dominant component.

32 The γ parameterization (Eq. 1) is sometimes used with RH_0 set to some value other than 0, which is used here. In
33 this application, $f(RH)$ is assumed to be zero for $RH \leq RH_0$, then increases sharply for $RH > RH_0$. That approach
34 may produce a better fit to the measured $f(RH)$ values (e.g., Fig. 3a), but is probably most suitable for aerosols
35 dominated by inorganic constituents which exhibit sharp deliquescence features. This approach is not
36 appropriate for the continuous hygroscopic growth expected for the organic-dominated aerosols found in the
37 southeastern US, and in particular for the deliquesced $f(RH)$ curve measured by the CRDS system.

1 In the Appendix we examine the relationship between κ_{ext} determined from fitting the $f(RH)$ values (Eq. (6)) and
2 κ_{chem} calculated from particle composition measurements (Eq. (3)). These parameters are related but not
3 identical.

4 3.5 Comparison of airborne and ground-based data

5 The airborne data can be compared with contemporaneous measurements at the SOAS ground site in Centreville
6 of the change in σ_{ext} at wavelengths of 360-420 nm at two RH values (Attwood et al., 2014). Wagner et al.
7 (2015) show that the airborne data measured in the well-mixed afternoon boundary layer near the Centreville site
8 agree well with the surface measurements. Attwood et al. (2014) fit the ground site data using the γ
9 parameterization (Eq. (1)) and find a decrease in hygroscopicity with increasing OA mass fraction that is
10 consistent with earlier studies in different aerosol types. Using the $f(RH)$ measurements by Attwood et al. and
11 solving Eq. (6), κ_{ext} can be calculated and compared with the airborne data. These values are plotted in Fig. 8
12 against the fraction of the total submicron non-refractory OA mass (note that this differs slightly from the F_{oa}
13 parameter reported by Attwood et al., 2014), as measured by a HR-ToF-AMS at the Centreville site (Xu et al.,
14 2015a,b). Also plotted are the values from the airborne data used in this analysis, restricted to AMS mass
15 concentrations $>8 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ to compare boundary layer air only. The airborne and ground data are similar, with
16 slopes of -0.24 ± 0.01 and -0.24 ± 0.04 , respectively (95% confidence intervals). The κ_{ext} values from the ground
17 site are higher; however, the κ_{ext} determined from a two-point $f(RH)$ measurement is particularly sensitive to the
18 accuracy of the RH measurements in the extinction cell, as shown by the dashed lines in Fig. 8, which represent
19 the variation in κ_{ext} due to the stated absolute uncertainty in the RH measurement at the ground site of $\pm 3\%$.
20 Extrapolating the central fits to an OA fraction of 1 yields a κ_{ext} of 0.030 for the airborne data and 0.067 for the
21 data from the ground site. The ratio of κ_{ext} to κ_{chem} is expected to be ~ 0.5 to 1 for typical accumulation-mode size
22 distributions (Appendix), so a value of $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ of ~ 0.07 - 0.14 would be expected at the SOAS ground site. These
23 values are generally consistent with the airborne results showing a relatively low value of $\kappa_{chem,OA}$ (< 0.10 for
24 75% of the data).

25 4 Discussion and Conclusions

26 The submicron aerosol observed in typical summertime, fair-weather, afternoon conditions in the southeastern
27 US displayed a vertical structure of a well-mixed layer between the surface and ~ 1100 m above the surface, a
28 transition layer from ~ 1100 to ~ 2100 m, and the free troposphere above ~ 2100 m. Wagner et al. (2015) more
29 fully describe this vertical structure and the gas-phase and aerosol characteristics of each layer, and show that
30 ammonium and sulfate were the dominant inorganic aerosol constituents in all the layers. Within the well-mixed
31 layer, the aerosol was $\sim 65\%$ OA, and declined to $\sim 50\%$ OA in the free troposphere. As a result of this
32 composition, the aerosol on average was modestly hygroscopic, with $f(RH) = 1.43 \pm 0.67$ at $\sim 70\%$ RH and
33 2.28 ± 1.05 at $\sim 90\%$ RH. Ammonium sulfate exhibits an $f(RH)$ of ~ 2 at $\sim 70\%$ RH (Langridge et al., 2011),
34 attesting to the low hygroscopicity of the OA component.

35 The hygroscopicity of OA varies with level of oxidation (O:C ratio), oxidation state, and solubility, among other
36 parameters (e.g., Cappa et al., 2011; Cerully et al., 2015; Duplissy et al., 2011; Rickards et al., 2013). The large

1 number of possible OA sources, oxidation histories, and compositions suggest a broad range of OA
2 hygroscopicities. While the slope of the least-squares fit between the calculated and measured $f(RH)$ values at
3 ~70% RH is 0.35, the r^2 value is only 0.43 and most of the data cluster near the 1:1 line; the low slope and poor
4 correlation is driven by a small number of points. At ~90% RH, the calculated and measured $f(RH)$ are in
5 excellent agreement and are well correlated (Fig. 5b), probably because the well-characterized hygroscopicity of
6 the inorganic components is dominating the extinction at this higher RH level. This agreement at ~90% RH
7 precludes a high value of $\kappa_{chem,OA}$. For >75% of the data, a value of $\kappa_{chem,OA} < 0.1$ represents a reasonable upper
8 bound on subsaturated OA hygroscopicity in this environment.

9 The value of $\kappa_{chem,OA} < 0.1$ is broadly consistent most previous work measuring atmospheric aerosol
10 hygroscopicity in the subsaturated regime (Cheung et al. 2015; Hersey et al., 2013; Mikhailov 2013; Nguyen et
11 al., 2014; Sihto et al., 2011). Many chemistry-climate models use κ -Köhler theory to predict the hygroscopic
12 growth and ambient radiative properties of the aerosol (e.g., Liu et al., 2012). Because OA is a substantial
13 component of the aerosol in many environments (Zhang et al., 2007), it should be a priority to use atmospheric
14 measurements to continue to improve understanding of the factors that control OA hygroscopicity and to
15 evaluate the extent to which the findings reported here apply to other organic-rich environments.

16 Finally, the γ power-law parameterization, which is widely used to describe $f(RH)$ for atmospheric aerosols, did
17 not effectively replicate many of the observations of $f(RH)$ in this environment, primarily because actual
18 hygroscopic growth was lower than parameterized growth at 70% RH. An alternative parameterization based on
19 κ -Köhler theory was developed and found to better describe the observed $f(RH)$ in the southeastern US in
20 summer. This κ_{ext} parameterization may be applicable to background and moderately polluted cases where the
21 extinction is dominated by organic particles with diameters $< 0.7 \mu\text{m}$.

22 Appendix

23 A.1 Derivation of the κ_{ext} parameterization

24 The cube of the diameter growth factor gf_{diam} (Eq. (2)) is the volume growth factor. Relating the volume growth
25 factor to bulk $f(RH)$ however, involves the complicated variation of aerosol extinction efficiency as a function of
26 particle diameter, often described using Mie theory. As particles grow due to water uptake as RH increases, the
27 extinction cross section can change non-linearly, and can even decrease (e.g., Bohren and Huffman, 1983).
28 However, as pointed out earlier (Chylek, 1978; Pinnick et al., 1980), for a physically realistic, polydisperse
29 aerosol composed of particles predominantly smaller than the wavelength of light (but larger than Rayleigh
30 scatterers), σ_{ext} is roughly proportional to integrated particle volume or mass. This proportionality results because
31 the extinction efficiency $a(D_p, n)$ for visible light can be approximated as a linear function of particle diameter
32 over the relatively broad size range of a polydisperse accumulation mode atmospheric aerosol (i.e., a is
33 proportional to D_p , Fig. A1). It then follows from Eq. (5) that $\sigma_{ext} \propto D_p^3$: extinction is proportional to volume.
34 Thus the relative change in extinction, $f(RH)$, is roughly proportional to the relative change in volume, which for
35 the case of a deliquescing aerosol is the volume growth factor gf_{vol} . The approximate proportionality between
36 extinction and volume is valid for particles smaller than the wavelength of light, which for these measurements
37 is 532 nm. The 10th to 90th percentile range for the geometric median diameters considered here was 120-170

1 nm, so this approximation is valid, even for particles at high RH. The approximate (no Kelvin effect) diameter
2 growth factor from κ -Köhler theory is given in Eq. (2). The cube of this this is then roughly proportional to gf_{vol}
3 and $f(RH)$:

$$4 \quad gf_{vol} \propto f(RH) \cong 1 + \kappa_{ext} \frac{RH}{100-RH}, \quad (A1)$$

5 where κ_{ext} is a dimensionless parameter fitted to observed $f(RH)$.

6 The volume-extinction approximate proportionality in Eq. (A1) applies for an aerosol of constant refractive
7 index, which is not the case for an atmospheric aerosol particle growing by addition of water with increasing RH
8 (Hänel, 1976; Hegg et al., 1993). The methodology to calculate ambient extinction (Section 2.3), which
9 incorporates the aerosol composition and size distribution measurements, can be used to estimate the effect of
10 aerosol water on the refractive index and its impact on extinction. Using this approach, the calculated mean
11 decrease in refractive index caused by condensed water reduces extinction by a factor of 0.81 ± 0.03 for the $\sim 70\%$
12 RH channel and by 0.71 ± 0.03 for the $\sim 90\%$ RH channel. Because of this effect and the rough proportionality
13 between particle volume and extinction, Eq. A1 is only an approximation that should be used parametrically to
14 interpolate and extrapolate from discrete measurements on the $f(RH)$ curve. However, it is a physically based
15 representation of the expected functional form of $f(RH)$, unlike alternative parameterizations.

16 We caution that, like the γ parameterization, the κ_{ext} parameterization may not accurately describe $f(RH)$ in many
17 circumstances. For example, the abrupt phase transitions of inorganic salts sometimes observed in the
18 atmosphere (e.g., Santarpia et al, 2005) clearly cannot be described by this smooth function (nor by the γ
19 parameterization). More complex, multi-parameter descriptions of aerosol deliquescence and efflorescence (e.g.,
20 Kotchenruther et al., 1999; Mikhailov et al., 2013; Zieger et al., 2011) are underconstrained by our three-point
21 $f(RH)$ deliquescence measurement. Further, the hygroscopic growth of aerosols dominated by larger particles,
22 such as sea-salt, dust, and primary plant materials is unlikely to follow the κ_{ext} parameterization because the mid-
23 visible extinction efficiency for particles larger than $0.6 \mu\text{m}$ does not monotonically increase (Fig. A1).
24 However, for a broad range of typical aged continental aerosol size distributions and organic-rich compositions
25 ranging from background to moderately polluted, from the boundary layer to the free troposphere, the κ_{ext}
26 parameterization may effectively describe the $f(RH)$ curve for the deliquesced aerosol. Further examples from
27 the literature are presented in the Supplemental Materials, and Section A.3 provides additional data from
28 wintertime rooftop measurements supporting the use of the the κ_{ext} parameterization.

29 **A.2 Relationship between κ_{chem} and κ_{ext}**

30 Equations (2) and (A1), which define κ_{chem} and κ_{ext} , are of similar form, but the $f(RH)$ term in Eq. (A1)
31 incorporates aerosol extinction, which is a complex function of the particle size distribution and refractive index
32 (Fig. A1). We use a size distribution and Mie scattering model to examine the relationship between κ_{chem} and κ_{ext} .
33 The aerosol was represented as a single-mode lognormal size distribution with a fixed geometric standard
34 deviation of 1.5; the observed interdecile range for the data analyzed here was 1.42-1.60. The geometric mean
35 diameter was varied from 0.04 to $0.5 \mu\text{m}$ and the κ_{chem} value was varied from 0 to 1. The dry refractive index
36 was fixed at $1.53 + 0i$. At each geometric mean diameter and each value of κ_{chem} , the water uptake was determined
37 at 10, 70, and 90% RH, which approximately matched the measurement RH values for the low, medium and

1 high CRDS channels, and the extinction from the deliquesced size distribution was calculated. After determining
2 the extinction at all three RH levels, Eq. (A1) was fitted to the calculated $f(RH)$ values to determine κ_{ext} . Thus the
3 chemically derived κ_{chem} could be compared with the optically derived κ_{ext} over a range of median particle
4 diameters and κ_{chem} values. As shown in Fig. A2, the ratio of $\kappa_{ext}/\kappa_{chem}$ varied from <0.4 to >2.0 over this range of
5 modal diameters and κ_{chem} values. However, for the range of κ_{chem} values of ~ 0.1 to ~ 0.4 and the geometric mean
6 diameter range from ~ 0.1 to ~ 0.2 , approximately matching the ranges observed in the southeastern US (Cerully
7 et al., 2015), the $\kappa_{ext}/\kappa_{chem}$ ratio generally lies between 0.6 and 1.0. Thus κ_{ext} and κ_{chem} are expected to be roughly
8 equivalent in magnitude, with κ_{ext} tending toward smaller values, and to vary approximately proportionally (i.e.,
9 the value of $\kappa_{ext}/\kappa_{chem}$ does not change much with changing κ_{chem}).

10 The $\kappa_{ext}/\kappa_{chem}$ ratio from the simulation described above can be compared with the same ratio determined from
11 the airborne extinction and aerosol composition measurements, also shown in Fig. A2. The measured mean
12 $\kappa_{ext}/\kappa_{chem}$ was 0.52, with considerable dispersion. This ratio is lower than that expected from the simple single-
13 mode lognormal model. This difference may arise because the atmospheric size distribution is not purely
14 lognormal, and the magnitude of the modeled $\kappa_{ext}/\kappa_{chem}$ shown in Fig. A2 (i.e., the color scale) is sensitive to the
15 assumed geometric standard deviation (although the overall shape of the pattern is not). Over the course of the
16 measurements, κ_{ext} and κ_{chem} were correlated (Fig. A3). The relationships were more linear and with less
17 dispersion for individual flights than for the dataset as a whole, suggesting day-to-day variability in mean size
18 distribution, composition, and/or instrument performance. These data emphasize that κ_{ext} and κ_{chem} are related but
19 substantially different parameters, coupled nonlinearly by Mie theory and the particle size distribution function,
20 and cannot be substituted directly for one another.

21 A.3. Additional data supporting use of the κ_{ext} parameterization

22 The data presented in this manuscript show $f(RH)$ at only three RH values in the summertime, background
23 aerosol of the southeastern US. To provide evidence of the broader applicability of the κ_{ext} parameterization, in
24 this section we present additional measurements of $f(RH)$ obtained over a wide range of ambient RH values in a
25 different environment. Data were obtained from an open-path cavity ringdown spectrometer (OP-CRDS; Gordon
26 et al., 2015), which measured extinction at ambient conditions at a suburban rooftop site, the NOAA Earth
27 System Research Laboratory in Boulder, Colorado. The aircraft CRDS system was used to provide a dry
28 extinction value at $RH < 10\%$ for calculating $f(RH)$. An $f(RH)$ curve was obtained as the ambient RH varied due
29 to changing meteorological conditions. The same cTOF-AMS flown during SENEX measured simultaneously
30 and reported an aerosol that was $57 \pm 14\%$ organic, with ammonium nitrate and ammonium sulfate the dominant
31 inorganic species. Figure A3 shows $f(RH)$ for all periods when $\kappa_{chem} < 0.4$ during nearly continuous operation
32 from 2015/03/05 to 2015/06/04. These data are well fit by the κ_{ext} parameterization and less well by the γ
33 parameterization (Fig. A3). This $f(RH)$ curve extends from 11-97% RH and shows a sharp increase in $f(RH)$
34 above 80% RH that is well captured by the κ_{ext} functional form.

35

1 **Author contribution**

2 All authors contributed measurements and/or analyses for this manuscript. CB prepared the manuscript with
3 substantial contributions from NLW, TDG, JLJ, PC-J, RAW, AMM, and DMM.

4 **Acknowledgements**

5 This work was supported in part by NOAA's Health of the Atmosphere and Atmospheric Chemistry, Carbon
6 Cycle, and Climate Programs. PC-J, DAD, and JLJ were supported by NASA award
7 NNX12AC03G/NNX15AH33A and NSF award AGS-1243354. AGC was supported by NSF award AGS-
8 1242155. LX and NLN were supported by EPA award R834799 and NSF award AGS-1242258. This
9 publication's contents do not necessarily represent the official views of the respective granting agencies. The use
10 or mention of commercial products or services does not represent an endorsement by the authors or by any
11 agency.

12 **References**

1 Attwood, A. R., Washenfelder, R. A., Brock, C. A., Hu, W., Baumann, K., Campuzano-Jost, P., Day, D. A.,
2 Edgerton, E. S., Murphy, D. M., Palm, B. B., McComiskey, A., Wagner, N. L., Sá, S. S., Ortega, A., Martin, S.
3 T., Jimenez, J. L. and Brown, S. S.: Trends in sulfate and organic aerosol mass in the Southeast U.S.: Impact on
4 aerosol optical depth and radiative forcing, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 7701-7709, doi:10.1002/2014GL061669,
5 2014.

6 Bahreini, R., Dunlea, E. J., Matthew, B. M., Simons, C., Docherty, K. S., DeCarlo, P. F., Jimenez, J. L., Brock,
7 C. A. and Middlebrook, A. M.: Design and operation of a pressure-controlled inlet for airborne sampling with an
8 aerodynamic aerosol lens. *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*, 42, 465–471, <http://doi.org/10.1080/02786820802178514>,
9 2008.

10 Baron, P.: Aerosol Calculator Spreadsheet for Excel. Accessed 7 Dec. 2013 at
11 <http://aerosols.wustl.edu/AAARworkshop08/software/AEROCALC-11-3-03.xls>, 2001.

12 Bohren, C. F. and Huffman, D. R.: *Absorption and Scattering of Light by Small Particles*, John Wiley & Sons,
13 1983.

14 Boyd, C. M., Sanchez, J., Xu, L., Eugene, A. J., Nah, T., Tuet, W. Y., Guzman, M. I., and Ng, N. L.: Secondary
15 organic aerosol formation from the β -pinene+NO₃ system: effect of humidity and peroxy radical fate, *Atmos.*
16 *Chem. Phys.*, 15, 7497-7522, doi:10.5194/acp-15-7497-2015, 2015.

17 Brock, C. A., Cozic, J., Bahreini, R., Froyd, K. D., Middlebrook, A. M., McComiskey, A., Brioude, J., Cooper,
18 O. R., Stohl, A., Aikin, K. C., de Gouw, J. A., Fahey, D. W., Ferrare, R. A., Gao, R. S., Gore, W., Holloway, J.
19 S., Hübler, G., Jefferson, A., Lack, D. A., Lance, S., Moore, R. H., Murphy, D. M., Nenes, A., Novelli, P. C.,
20 Nowak, J. B., Ogren, J. A., Peischl, J., Pierce, R. B., Pilewskie, P., Quinn, P. K., Ryerson, T. B., Schmidt, K. S.,
21 Schwarz, J. P., Sodemann, H., Spackman, J. R., Stark, H., Thomson, D. S., Thornberry, T., Veres, P., Watts, L.
22 A., Warneke, C. and Wollny, A. G.: Characteristics, sources, and transport of aerosols measured in spring 2008
23 during the aerosol, radiation, and cloud processes affecting Arctic Climate (ARCPAC) Project, *Atmos. Chem.*
24 *Phys.*, 11, 2423–2453, doi:10.5194/acp-11-2423-2011, 2011.

25 Brock, C. A., Wagner, N. L., Anderson, B. E., Beyersdorf, A., Campuzano-Jost, P., Day, D. A., Diskin, G. S.,
26 Gordon, T. D., Jimenez, J. L., Lack, D. L., Liao, J., Middlebrook, A. M.¹, Richardson, M. S., Welti, A., Ziemba,
27 L. D., and Murphy, D. M.: Aerosol optical properties in the southeastern United States in summer--Part 2:
28 Sensitivity of aerosol optical depth to meteorological and aerosol parameters, submitted to *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*
29 *Disc.*, 2015.

30 Cai, Y., Montague, D. and Mooiweer-Bryan, W.: Performance characteristics of the ultra high sensitivity aerosol
31 spectrometer for particles between 55 and 800 nm: Laboratory and field studies, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 39, 759-769,
32 doi:10.1016/j.jaerosci.2008.04.007, 2008.

33 Canagaratna, M., Jayne, J., Jimenez, J., Allan, J., Alfarra, M., Zhang, Q., Onasch, T. B., Drewnick, F., Coe, H.,
34 Middlebrook, A. M., Delia, A., Williams, L. R., Trimborn, A. M., Northway, M. J., DeCarlo, P. F., Kolb, C. E.,
35 Davidovits, P., Worsnop, D. R.: Chemical and microphysical characterization of ambient aerosols with the
36 aerodyne aerosol mass spectrometer, *Mass Spec. Rev.*, 26, 185–222, 2007.

- 1 Cappa, C. D., Che, D. L., Kessler, S. H., Kroll, J. H. and Wilson, K. L.: Variations in organic aerosol optical and
2 hygroscopic properties upon heterogeneous OH oxidation, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D15204,
3 doi:10.1029/2011JD015918, 2011.
- 4 Carrico, C. M., Kreidenweis, S. M., Malm, W. C., Day, D. E., Lee, T., Carrillo, J., McMeeking, G. R. and
5 Collett Jr., J. L.: Hygroscopic growth behavior of a carbon-dominated aerosol in Yosemite National Park,
6 *Atmos. Environ.*, 39, 1393–1404, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2004.11.029, 2005.
- 7 Cerully, K. M., Bougiatioti, A., Hite Jr., J. R., Guo, H., Xu, L., Ng, N. L., Weber, R., and Nenes, A.: On the link
8 between hygroscopicity, volatility, and oxidation state of ambient and water-soluble aerosols in the southeastern
9 United States, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 8679–8694, doi:10.5194/acp-15-8679-2015, 2015.
- 10 Chang, R. Y.-W., Slowik, J. G., Shantz, N. C., Vlasenko, A., Liggio, J., Sjostedt, S. J., Leaitch, W. R. and
11 Abbatt, J. P. D.: The hygroscopicity parameter (κ) of ambient organic aerosol at a field site subject to biogenic
12 and anthropogenic influences: relationship to degree of aerosol oxidation, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 5047–5064,
13 doi:10.5194/acp-10-5047-2010, 2010.
- 14 Charlson, R. J., Horvath, H. and Pueschel, R. F.: The direct measurement of atmospheric light scattering
15 coefficient for studies of visibility and pollution, *Atmos. Environ.* 1, 469-478, 1967.
- 16 Cheung, H. H. Y., Yeung, M. C., Li, Y. J., Lee, B. P. and Chan, C. K.: Relative humidity-dependent HTDMA
17 measurements of ambient aerosols at the HKUST supersite in Hong Kong, China, *Aerosol. Sci. Technol.*, 49,
18 643–654, doi:10.1080/02786826.2015.1058482, 2015.
- 19 Chylek, P.: Extinction and liquid water content of fogs and clouds, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 35, 296–300, 1978.
- 20 Covert, D. S. and Charlson, R. J.: A study of the relationship of chemical composition and humidity to light
21 scattering by aerosols, *J. Appl. Meteor.*, 11, 968-976, 1972.
- 22 Crumeyrolle, S., Chen, G., Ziemba, L., Beyersdorf, A., Thornhill, L., Winstead, E., Moore, R. H., Shook, M. A.,
23 Hudgins, C. and Anderson, B. E.: Factors that influence surface PM_{2.5} values inferred from satellite
24 observations: perspective gained for the U.S. Baltimore–Washington metropolitan area during DISCOVER-AQ,
25 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 2139–2153, doi:10.5194/acp-14-2139-2014, 2014.
- 26 Day, D. A., Campuzano-Jost, P., Palm, B. B.,^{1,2} Hu, W., Nault, B. A., Wooldridge, P. J., Cohen, R. C.,
27 Docherty, K. S., Wagner, N. L., Jimenez, J. L.: Observations of particle organic nitrate from airborne and ground
28 platforms in North America: Insights into vertical and geographical distributions, gas/particle partitioning,
29 losses, and contributions to total particle nitrate, manuscript in preparation, 2015.
- 30 DeCarlo, P. F., Kimmel, J. R., Trimborn, A., Northway, M. J., Jayne, J. T., Aiken, A. C., Gonin, M., Fuhrer, K.,
31 Horvath, T., Docherty, K. S., Worsnop, D. R. and Jimenez, J. L.: Field-deployable, high-resolution, time-of-
32 flight aerosol mass spectrometer, *Anal. Chem.*, 78, 8281–8289, doi:10.1021/ac061249n, 2006.
- 33 Doherty, S. J. P. K. Quinn, A. Jefferson, C. M. Carrico, T. L. Anderson, and D. Hegg.: A comparison and
34 summary of aerosol optical properties as observed in situ from aircraft, ship, and land during ACE-Asia, *J.*
35 *Geophys. Res.*, 110, D04201, doi:10.1029/2004JD004964, 2005.

1 Draper, D. C., Farmer, D. K., Desyaterik, Y. and Fry, J. L.: A comparison of secondary organic aerosol (SOA)
2 yields and composition from ozonolysis of monoterpenes at varying concentrations of NO₂, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*
3 *Disc.*, 15, 14923–14960, doi:10.5194/acpd-15-14923-2015, 2015.

4 Dunlea, E. J., DeCarlo, P. F., Aiken, A. C., Kimmel, J. R., Peltier, R. E., Weber, R. J., Tomlinson, J.,
5 Collins, D. R., Shinozuka, Y., McNaughton, C. S., Howell, S. G., Clarke, A. D., Emmons, L. K., Apel, E. C.,
6 Pfister, G. G., van Donkelaar, A., Martin, R. V., Millet, D. B., Heald, C. L., and Jimenez, J. L.: Evolution of
7 Asian aerosols during transpacific transport in INTEX-B, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 7257-7287, doi:10.5194/acp-
8 9-7257-2009, 2009.

9 Duplissy, J., DeCarlo, P. F., Dommen, J., Alfarra, M. R., Metzger, A., Barmpadimos, I., Prevot, A. S. H.,
10 Weingartner, E., Tritscher, T., Gysel, M., Aiken, A. C., Jimenez, J. L., Canagaratna, M. R., Worsnop, D. R.,
11 Collins, D. R., Tomlinson, J. and Baltensperger, U.: Relating hygroscopicity and composition of organic aerosol
12 particulate matter, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 1155–1165, doi:10.5194/acp-11-1155-2011, 2011.

13 Dusek, U., Frank, G. P., Curtius, J., Drewnick, F., Schneider, J., Kürten, A., Rose, D., Andreae, M. O.,
14 Borrmann, S. and Pöschl, U.: Enhanced organic mass fraction and decreased hygroscopicity of cloud
15 condensation nuclei (CCN) during new particle formation events, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 37, L03804,
16 doi:10.1029/2009GL040930, 2010.

17 Esteve, A. R., Ogren, J. A., Sheridan, P. J., Andrews, E., Holben, B. N., and Utrillas, M. P.: Sources of
18 discrepancy between aerosol optical depth obtained from AERONET and in-situ aircraft profiles, *Atmos. Chem.*
19 *Phys.*, 12, 2987-3003, doi:10.5194/acp-12-2987-2012, 2012.

20 Ferrare, R., Melfi, S., Whiteman, D., Evans, K. and Leifer, R.: Raman lidar measurements of aerosol extinction
21 and backscattering 1. Methods and comparisons, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, 19663-19672, doi:10.1029/98JD01646,
22 1998.

23 Fry, J. L., Kiendler-Scharr, A., Rollins, A. W., Wooldridge, P. J., Brown, S. S., Fuchs, H., Dubé, W., Mensah,
24 A., dal Maso, M., Tillmann, R., Dorn, H.-P., Brauers, T., and Cohen, R. C.: Organic nitrate and secondary
25 organic aerosol yield from NO₃ oxidation of α -pinene evaluated using a gas-phase kinetics/aerosol partitioning
26 model, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 1431–1449, doi:10.5194/acp-9-1431-2009, 2009.

27 Good, N., Topping, D. O., Allan, J. D., Flynn, M., Fuentes, E., Irwin, M., Williams, P. I., Coe, H. and
28 McFiggans, G.: Consistency between parameterisations of aerosol hygroscopicity and CCN activity during the
29 RHaMBLe discovery cruise, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 3189–3203, 2010a.

30 Good, N., Topping, D. O., Duplissy, J., Gysel, M., Meyer, N. K., Metzger, A., Turner, S. F., Baltensperger, U.,
31 Ristovski, Z., Weingartner, E., Coe, H., and McFiggans, G.: Widening the gap between measurement and
32 modelling of secondary organic aerosol properties? *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 2577–2593, 2010b.

33 Gordon, T. D., Wagner, N. L., Richardson, M. S., Law, D. C., Wolfe, D., Eloranta, E. W., Brock, C. A., Erdesz,
34 F. and Murphy, D. M.: Design of a novel open-path aerosol extinction cavity ringdown spectrometer, *Aerosol*
35 *Science and Technology*, 49, 717-726, doi:10.1080/02786826.2015.1066753, 2015.

1 Gunthe, S. S., King, S. M., Rose, D., Chen, Q., Roldin, P., Farmer, D. K., Jimenez, J. L., Artaxo, P., Andreae, M.
2 O., Martin, S. T. and Pöschl, U.: Cloud condensation nuclei in pristine tropical rainforest air of Amazonia: size-
3 resolved measurements and modeling of atmospheric aerosol composition and CCN activity, *Atmos. Chem.*
4 *Phys.*, 9, 7551–7575, doi:10.5194/acp-9-7551-2009, 2009.

5 Guo, H., Xu, L., Bougiatioti, A., Cerully, K. M., Capps, S. L., Hite Jr., J. R., Carlton, A. G., Lee, S.-H., Bergin,
6 M. H., Ng, N. L., Nenes, A., and Weber, R. J.: Fine-particle water and pH in the southeastern United States,
7 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 5211–5228, doi:10.5194/acp-15-5211-2015, 2015.

8 Hale, G. M. and Querry, M. R.: Optical constants of water in the 200-nm to 200- μ m wavelength region, *Appl.*
9 *Opt.*, 12, 555–563, 1973.

10 Hand, J. L. and Kreidenweis, S. M.: A new method for retrieving particle refractive index and effective density
11 from aerosol size distribution data, *Aerosol. Sci. Tech.*, 36, 1012-1026, doi:10.1080/02786820290092276, 2002.

12 Hänel, G.: Computation of the extinction of visible radiation by atmospheric aerosol particles as a function of the
13 relative humidity, based upon measured properties, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 3, 377-386, doi:
14 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0021-8502\(72\)90092-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0021-8502(72)90092-4), 1972a.

15 Hänel, G.: The ratio of the extinction coefficient to the mass of atmospheric aerosol particles as a function of the
16 relative humidity, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 3, 455-460, doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0021-8502\(72\)90075-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0021-8502(72)90075-4), 1972b.

17 Hänel, G.: Single-scattering albedo of atmospheric aerosol particles as a function of relative humidity, *J. Atmos.*
18 *Sci.*, 33, 1120-1124, 1976.

19 Haynes, W. M., Lide, D. R. and Bruno, T. J.: *CRC handbook of chemistry and physics : a ready-reference book*
20 *of chemical and physical data*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2014.

21 Hegg, D., Larson, T. and Yuen, P. F.: A theoretical study of the effect of relative humidity on light scattering by
22 tropospheric aerosols, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 98, 18435–18439, 1993.

23 Hersey, S. P., Craven, J. S., Metcalf, A. R., Lin, J., Latham, T., Suski, K. J., Cahill, J. F., Duong, H. T.,
24 Sorooshian, A., Jonsson, H. H., Shiraiwa, M., Zuend, A., Nenes, A., Prather, K. A., Flagan, R. C. and Seinfeld,
25 J. H.: Composition and hygroscopicity of the Los Angeles Aerosol: CalNex, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 118, 3016–3036,
26 doi:10.1002/jgrd.50307, 2013.

27 Hodas, N., Zuend, A., Mui, W., Flagan, R. C. and Seinfeld, J. H.: Influence of particle phase state on the
28 hygroscopic behavior of mixed organic–inorganic aerosols, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 5027-5045,
29 doi:10.5194/acp-15-5027-2015, 2015.

30 IPCC [Stocker, T. F., Qin, D., Plattner, G.-K., Tignor, M., Allen, S. K., Boschung, J., Nauels, A., Xia, Y., Bex,
31 V. and Midgley, P. M. (Eds.)]: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working*
32 *Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge
33 University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324,
34 2013.

- 1 Kahn, R. A.: Reducing the uncertainties in direct aerosol radiative forcing, *Surv. Geophys*, 33, 701–721,
2 doi:10.1007/s10712-011-9153-z, 2011.
- 3 Kasten, F.: Visibility forecast in the phase of pre-condensation, *Tellus*, 21, 631–635, 1969.
- 4 Kim, P. S., Jacob, D. J., Fisher, J. A., Travis, K., Yu, K., Zhu, L., Yantosca, R. M., Sulprizio, M. P., Jimenez, J.
5 L., Campuzano-Jost, P., Froyd, K. D., Liao, J., Hair, J. W., Fenn, M. A., Butler, C. F., Wagner, N. L., Gordon, T.
6 D., Welti, A., Wennberg, P. O., Crouse, J. D., St. Clair, J. M., Teng, A. P., Millet, D. B., Schwarz, J. P.,
7 Markovic, M. Z., and Perring, A. E.: Sources, seasonality, and trends of southeast US aerosol: an integrated
8 analysis of surface, aircraft, and satellite observations with the GEOS-Chem chemical transport model, *Atmos.*
9 *Chem. Phys.*, 15, 10411-10433, doi:10.5194/acp-15-10411-2015, 2015.
- 10 Koloutsou-Vakakis, S., Rood, M. J., Nenes, A. and Pilinis, C.: Modeling of aerosol properties related to direct
11 climate forcing, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, 17009–17032, 1998.
- 12 Kotchenruther, R. A., Hobbs, P. V. and Hegg, D. A.: Humidification factors for atmospheric aerosols off the
13 mid-Atlantic coast of the United States, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, 2239–2251, 1999.
- 14 Langridge, J. M., Richardson, M. S., Lack, D., Law, D. and Murphy, D. M.: Aircraft instrument for
15 comprehensive characterization of aerosol optical properties, Part I: Wavelength-dependent optical extinction
16 and its relative humidity dependence measured using cavity ringdown spectroscopy, *Aerosol Sci. Tech.*, 45,
17 1305–1318, doi:10.1080/02786826.2011.592745, 2011.
- 18 Levin, E. J. T., Prenni, A. J., Petters, M. D., Kreidenweis, S. M., Sullivan, R. C., Atwood, S. A., Ortega, J.,
19 DeMott, P. J. and Smith, J. N.: An annual cycle of size-resolved aerosol hygroscopicity at a forested site in
20 Colorado, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D06201, doi:10.1029/2011JD016854, 2012.
- 21 Liao, J., Froyd, K. D., Murphy, D. M., Keutsch, F. N., Yu, G., Wennberg, P. O., St. Clair, J. M., Crouse, J. D.,
22 Wisthaler, A., Mikoviny, T., Jimenez, J. L., Campuzano-Jost, P., Day, D. A., Hu, W., Ryerson, T. B., Pollack, I.
23 B., Peischl, J., Anderson, B. E., Ziemba, L. D., Blake, D. R., Meinardi, S. and Diskin, G.: Airborne
24 measurements of organosulfates over the continental U.S., *J. Geophys. Res.*, 120, 2990–3005,
25 doi:10.1002/2014JD022378, 2015.
- 26 Liu, X., Easter, R. C., Ghan, S. J., Zaveri, R., Rasch, P., Shi, X., Lamarque, J. F., Gettelman, A., Morrison, H.,
27 Vitt, F., Conley, A., Park, S., Neale, R., Hannay, C., Ekman, A. M. L., Hess, P., Mahowald, N., Collins, W.,
28 Iacono, M. J., Bretherton, C. S., Flanner, M. G. and Mitchell, D.: Toward a minimal representation of aerosols in
29 climate models: description and evaluation in the Community Atmosphere Model CAM5, *Geosci. Model Dev.*,
30 5, 709–739, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-709-2012, 2012.
- 31 Malm, W. C., Day, D. E. and Kreidenweis, S. M.: Light scattering characteristics of aerosols as a function of
32 relative humidity: Part I—A comparison of measured scattering and aerosol concentrations using the theoretical
33 models, *J. Air Waste Mgmt. Assoc.*, 50, 686-700, doi: 10.1080/10473289.2000.10464117, 2000.

1 Massoli, P., Bates, T., Quinn, P. and Lack, D.: Aerosol optical and hygroscopic properties during TexAQS-
2 GoMACCS 2006 and their impact on aerosol direct radiative forcing, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114,
3 D00F07,doi:10.1029/2008JD011604, 2009.

4 McNaughton, C. S., Clarke, A. D., Howell, S. G., Pinkerton, M., Anderson, B., Thornhill, L., Hudgins, C.,
5 Winstead, E., Dibb, J. E., Scheuer, E. and Maring, H.: Results from the DC-8 Inlet Characterization Experiment
6 (DICE): Airborne versus surface sampling of mineral dust and sea salt aerosols, *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*, 41, 136-
7 159, doi: 10.1080/02786820601118406, 2007.

8 Middlebrook, A. M., Bahreini, R., Jimenez, J. L. and Canagaratna, M. R.: Evaluation of composition-dependent
9 collection efficiencies for the Aerodyne aerosol mass spectrometer using field data, *Aerosol Sci. Tech.*, 46, 258-
10 271, doi:10.1080/02786826.2011.620041, 2012.

11 Mikhailov, E., Vlasenko, S., Rose, D. and Pöschl, U.: Mass-based hygroscopicity parameter interaction model
12 and measurement of atmospheric aerosol water uptake, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 717–740, doi:10.5194/acp-13-
13 717-2013, 2013.

14 Murphy, D. M.: The effects of molecular weight and thermal decomposition on the sensitivity of a thermal
15 desorption aerosol mass spectrometer, *Aerosol Sci. Technol.*, 50, 118-125,
16 doi:10.1080/02786826.2015.1136403, 2016.

17 Nemesure, S., Wagener, R. and Schwartz, S. E.: Direct shortwave forcing of climate by the anthropogenic
18 sulfate aerosol: Sensitivity to particle size, composition, and relative humidity, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100,
19 26105,26116, 1995.

20 Nguyen, T. K. V., Petters, M. D., Suda, S. R., Guo, H., Weber, R. J. and Carlton, A. G.: Trends in particle-phase
21 liquid water during the Southern Oxidant and Aerosol Study, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 10911–10930,
22 doi:10.5194/acp-14-10911-2014, 2014.

23 Petters, M. D. and Kreidenweis, S. M.: A single parameter representation of hygroscopic growth and cloud
24 condensation nucleus activity, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 7, 1961-1971, 2007.

25 Petzold, A., Formenti, P., Baumgardner, D., Bundke, U., Coe, H., Curtius, J., DeMott, P. J., Flagan, R. C.,
26 Fiebig, M., Hudson, J. G., McQuaid, J., Minikin, A., Roberts, G. C., and Wang, J.: In situ measurements of
27 aerosol particles, in: *Airborne Measurements for Environmental Research: Methods and Instruments*, J. Wiley &
28 Sons, ISBN: 978-3-527-40996-9, 157-224, 2013.

29 Pilat, M. J. and Charlson, R. J.: Theoretical and optical studies of humidity effects on the size distribution of a
30 hygroscopic aerosol, *J. Rech. Atmos.*, 165-170, 1966.

31 Pinnick, R. G., Jennings, S. G. and Chýlek, P.: Relationships between extinction, absorption, backscattering, and
32 mass content of sulfuric acid aerosols, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 85, 4059–4066, 1980.

33 Pringle, K. J., Tost, H., Pozzer, A., Pöschl, U. and Lelieveld, J.: Global distribution of the effective aerosol
34 hygroscopicity parameter for CCN activation, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 5241–5255, doi:10.5194/acp-10-5241-
35 2010, 2010.

- 1 Quinn, P. K., Bates, T. S., Baynard, T., Clarke, A. D., Onasch, T. B., Wang, W., Rood, M. J., Andrews, E.,
2 Allan, J., Carrico, C. M., Coffman, D. and Worsnop, D.: Impact of particulate organic matter on the relative
3 humidity dependence of light scattering: A simplified parameterization, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L22809,
4 doi:10.1029/2005GL024322, 2005.
- 5 Rickards, A. M. J., Miles, R. E. H., Davies, J. F., Marshall, F. H. and Reid, J. P.: Measurements of the sensitivity
6 of aerosol hygroscopicity and the κ parameter to the O/C ratio, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 117, 14120–14131,
7 doi:10.1021/jp407991n, 2013.
- 8 Rissler, J., Vestin, A., Swietlicki, E., Fisch, G., Zhou, J., Artaxo, P. and Andreae, M. O.: Size distribution and
9 hygroscopic properties of aerosol particles from dry-season biomass burning in Amazonia, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*,
10 6, 471–491, 2006.
- 11 Santarpià, J. L., R. Gasparini, R. Li, and D. R. Collins: Diurnal variations in the hygroscopic growth cycles of
12 ambient aerosol populations, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D03206, doi:10.1029/2004JD005279, 2005.
- 13 Schwarz, J. P., Perring, A. E., Markovic, M. Z., Gao, R. S., Ohata, S., Langridge, J., Law, D., McLaughlin, R.
14 and Fahey, D. W.: Technique and theoretical approach for quantifying the hygroscopicity of black-carbon-
15 containing aerosol using a single particle soot photometer *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 81., 110–126,
16 doi:10.1016/j.jaerosci.2014.11.009, 2015.
- 17 Sihto, S. L., Mikkilä, J., Vanhanen, J., Ehn, M., Liao, L., Lehtipalo, K., Aalto, P. P., Duplissy, J., Petäjä, T.,
18 Kerminen, V. M., Boy, M. and Kulmala, M.: Seasonal variation of CCN concentrations and aerosol activation
19 properties in boreal forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 13269–13285, doi:10.5194/acp-11-13269-2011, 2011.
- 20 Stokes, R. H. and Robinson, R. A.: Interactions in aqueous nonelectrolyte solutions. I. Solute-solvent equilibria,
21 *J. Phys. Chem.*, 70, 2126–2131, doi:10.1021/j100879a010, 1966.
- 22 Suda, S. R., Petters, M. D., Matsunaga, A., Sullivan, R. C., Ziemann, P. J. and Kreidenweis, S. M.:
23 Hygroscopicity frequency distributions of secondary organic aerosols, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, D04207,
24 doi:10.1029/2011JD016823, 2012.
- 25 Tang, I. N.: Chemical and size effects of hygroscopic aerosols on light scattering coefficients, *J. Geophys. Res.*,
26 101, 19245–19250, 1996.
- 27 Toon, O. B., Pollack, J. B., and Khare, B. N., The optical constants of several atmospheric aerosol species:
28 Ammonium sulfate, aluminum oxide, and sodium chloride, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 81, 5733-
29 5748,doi:10.1029/JC081i033p05733, 1976.
- 30 van Donkelaar A., Martin, R. V., Brauer, M., and Boys B. L.: Use of satellite observations for long-term
31 exposure assessment of global concentrations of fine particulate matter, *Environ. Health Perspect.* 123, 135–143,
32 doi:10.1289/ehp.1408646, 2015.
- 33 Varma, R. M., Ball, S. M., Brauers, T., Dorn, H. P., Heitmann, U., Jones, R. L., Platt, U., Pöhler, D., Ruth, A.
34 A., Shillings, A. J. L., Thieser, J., Wahner, A. and Venables, D. S.: Light extinction by secondary organic

1 aerosol: an intercomparison of three broadband cavity spectrometers, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 6, 3115–3130,
2 doi:10.5194/amt-6-3115-2013, 2013.

3 Voss, K., Welton, E., Quinn, P., Frouin, R., Miller, M. and Reynolds, R.: Aerosol optical depth measurements
4 during the Aerosols99 experiment, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 20821–20831, doi:10.1029/2000JD900783, 2001.

5 Wagner, N. L., Brock, C. A., Angevine, W. M., Beyersdorf, A., Campuzano-Jost, P., Day, D. A., de Gouw, J. A.,
6 Diskin, G. S., Gordon, T. D., Graus, M. G., Huey, G., Jimenez, J. L., Lack, D. A., Liao, J., Liu, X., Markovic, M.
7 Z., Middlebrook, A. M., Mikoviny, T., Peischl, J., Perring, A. E., Richardson, M. S., Ryerson, T. B., Schwarz, J.
8 P., Warneke, C., Welti, A., Wisthaler, A., Ziemba, L. D. and Murphy, D. M.: In situ vertical profiles of aerosol
9 extinction, mass, and composition over the southeast United States during SENEX and SEAC⁴RS: observations
10 of a modest aerosol enhancement aloft, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 7085–7102, doi:10.5194/acp-15-7085-2015,
11 2015.

12 Warren, S. G., Hahn, C. J., London, J., Chervin, R. M., and Jenne, R. L.: Global Distribution of Total Cloud
13 Cover and Cloud Type Amounts over Land., NCAR Tech. Note TN-273_STR, 1–232,
14 <http://www.atmos.washington.edu/CloudMap/Publications/index.html>, 1986.

15 Washenfelder, R. A., Attwood, A. R., Brock, C. A., Guo, H., Xu, L., Weber, R. J., Ng, N. L., Allen, H. M.,
16 Ayres, B. R., Baumann, K., Cohen, R. C., Draper, D. C., Duffey, K. C., Edgerton, E., Fry, J. L., Hu, W. W.,
17 Jimenez, J. L., Palm, B. B., Romer, P., Stone, E. A., Wooldridge, P. J. and Brown, S. S.: Biomass burning
18 dominates brown carbon absorption in the rural southeastern United States, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 42,
19 10.1002/2014GL062444, 2015.

20 Wex, H., Petters, M. D. and Carrico, C. M.: Towards closing the gap between hygroscopic growth and activation
21 for secondary organic aerosol: Part 1-Evidence from measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 3987–3997, 2009.

22 Wright, H. L.: Atmospheric opacity: a study of visibility observations in the British Isles, *Q. J. R. Meteor. Soc.*,
23 65, 411–442, 1939.

24 Xu, L., Guo, H., Boyd, C. M., Klein, M., Bougiatioti, A., Cerully, K. M., Hite, J. R., Isaacman-VanWertz, G.,
25 Kreisberg, N. M., Knote, C., Olson, K., Koss, A., Goldstein, A. H., Hering, S. V., de Gouw, J., Baumann, K.,
26 Lee, S.-H., Nenes, A., Weber, R. J., and Ng, N. L.: Effects of anthropogenic emissions on aerosol formation
27 from isoprene and monoterpenes in the southeastern United States, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 112, 37–42, 2015a.

28 Xu, L., Suresh, S., Guo, H., Weber, R. J. and Ng, N. L.: Aerosol characterization over the southeastern United
29 States using high-resolution aerosol mass spectrometry: spatial and seasonal variation of aerosol composition
30 and sources with a focus on organic nitrates, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 7307–7336, doi:10.5194/acp-15-7307-
31 2015, 2015b.

32 Zaveri, R. A.: A new method for multicomponent activity coefficients of electrolytes in aqueous atmospheric
33 aerosols, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 110, D02201, doi:10.1029/2004JD004681, 2005.

34 Zhang, Q., Jimenez, J. L., Canagaratna, M. R., Allan, J. D., Coe, H., Ulbrich, I., Alfarra, M. R., Takami, A.,
35 Middlebrook, A. M., Sun, Y. L., Dzepina, K., Dunlea, E., Docherty, K., DeCarlo, P. F., Salcedo, D., Onasch, T.,

1 Jayne, J. T., Miyoshi, T., Shimono, A., Hatakeyama, S., Takegawa, N., Kondo, Y., Schneider, J., Drewnick, F.,
2 Borrmann, S., Weimer, S., Demerjian, K., Williams, P., Bower, K., Bahreini, R., Cottrell, L., Griffin, R. J.,
3 Rautiainen, J., Sun, J. Y., Zhang, Y. M. and Worsnop, D. R.: Ubiquity and dominance of oxygenated species in
4 organic aerosols in anthropogenically-influenced Northern Hemisphere midlatitudes, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34,
5 L13801, doi:10.1029/2007GL029979, 2007.

6 Zieger, P., Weingartner, E., Henzing, J., Moerman, M., de Leeuw, G., Mikkilä, J., Ehn, M., Petäjä, T., Clémer,
7 K., van Roozendaal, M., Yilmaz, S., Frieß, U., Irie, H., Wagner, T., Shaiganfar, R., Beirle, S., Apituley, A.,
8 Wilson, K., and Baltensperger, U.: Comparison of ambient aerosol extinction coefficients obtained from in-situ,
9 MAX-DOAS and LIDAR measurements at Cabauw, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 2603–2624, doi:10.5194/acp-11-
10 2603-2011, 2011.

11 Zieger, P., Kienast-Sjögren, E., Starace, M., von Bismarck, J., Bukowiecki, N., Baltensperger, U., Wienhold, F.,
12 G., Peter, T., Ruhtz, T., Collaud Coen, M., Vuilleumier, L., Maier, O., Emili, E., Popp, C. and Weingartner, E.:
13 Spatial variation of aerosol optical properties around the high-alpine site Jungfraujoch (3580m a.s.l.), *Atmos.*
14 *Chem. Phys.*, 12, 7231–7249, doi:10.5194/acp-12-7231-2012, 2012.

15 Zieger, P., Fierz-Schmidhauser, R., Weingartner, E. and Baltensperger, U.: Effects of relative humidity on
16 aerosol light scattering: results from different European sites, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 10609–10631,
17 doi:10.5194/acp-13-10609-2013, 2013.

18 Zieger, P., Fierz-Schmidhauser, R., Poulain, L., Müller, T., Birmili, W., Spindler, G., Wiedensohler, A.,
19 Baltensperger, U. and Weingartner, E.: Influence of water uptake on the aerosol particle lightscattering
20 coefficients of the Central European aerosol, *Tellus B*, 66, 22716, doi:10.3402/tellusb.v66.22716, 2014.

21 Zieger, P., Aalto, P. P., Aaltonen, V., Äijälä, M., Backman, J., Hong, J., Komppula, M., Krejci, R., Laborde, M.,
22 Lampilahti, J., de Leeuw, G., Pfüller, A., Rosati, B., Tesche, M., Tunved, P., Väänänen, R. and Petäjä, T.: Low
23 hygroscopic scattering enhancement of boreal aerosol and the implications for a columnar optical closure study,
24 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 7247-7267, doi:10.5194/acp-15-7247-2015, 2015.

25 Ziemba, L. D., Hudgins, C. H., Obland, M. D., Rogers, R. R., Scarino, A. J., Winstead, E. L., Anderson, B. E.,
26 Thornhill, K. L., Ferrare, R., Barrick, J., Beyersdorf, A. J., Chen, G., Crumeyrolle, S., Hair, J. and Hostetler, C.
27 A.: Airborne observations of aerosol extinction by in-situ and remote-sensing techniques: Evaluation of particle
28 hygroscopicity, *Geophys Res Lett*, doi:10.1029/2012GL054428, 2012.

29
30

1 Table 1. Parameters used to calculate ambient extinction.

Species	Refractive Index	reference	κ_{chem}	reference	Density (g cm ⁻³)	reference
H ₂ O	1.33	(Hale and Querry, 1973)	N/A	N/A	1.00	N/A
OA	1.48	(Varma et al., 2013)	0.050	¹	1.4	(Hand and Kreidenweis, 2002)
H ₂ SO ₄	1.408	(Hand and Kreidenweis, 2002;)	0.870	(Good et al., 2010a; Petters and Kreidenweis, 2007)	1.8	(Hand and Kreidenweis, 2002)
(NH ₄)HSO ₄	1.479	(Hand and Kreidenweis, 2002)	0.543	(Good et al., 2010a)	1.78	(Hand and Kreidenweis, 2002)
(NH ₄) ₃ H(SO ₄) ₂	1.53	(Hand and Kreidenweis, 2002)	0.579	(Good et al., 2010a;)	1.83	(Hand and Kreidenweis, 2002)
(NH ₄) ₂ SO ₄	1.527	(Hand and Kreidenweis, 2002)	0.483	(Good et al., 2010a)	1.76	(Hand and Kreidenweis, 2002; Nguyen et al., 2014)
HNO ₃	1.393	(Haynes et al., 2014)	0.999	(Good et al., 2010a)	1.5129	(Good et al., 2010; Haynes et al., 2014)
NH ₄ NO ₃	1.553	(Tang, 1996))	0.597	(Good et al., 2010a)	1.725	(Tang, 1996)
HCl	1.329	(Haynes et al., 2014)	0.5	² assumed	1.49	(Haynes et al., 2014)
NH ₄ Cl	1.64	(Haynes et al., 2014)	0.5	² assumed	1.519	(Haynes et al., 2014)

2 ¹ $\kappa_{\text{org}}=0.05$ is estimated as described in Sect. 3.3.

3 ²No literature values found. These species contributed negligibly to aerosol mass and hygroscopicity.

4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

Table 2. Linear regression parameters between calculated extinction and measured extinction at 532nm and 3 relative humidities for each flight analyzed in this work.

Date	Low RH (~15%)			Medium RH (~70%)			High RH (~90%)		
	r ²	slope	intercept	r ²	slope	intercept	r ²	slope	intercept
20130603	0.87 ^a	1.02 ^b	-3.7	0.96	0.87	-3.6	0.97	1.12	-9.5
20130611	0.95 ^c	0.89	-3.9						
20130612	0.98	0.87	-0.85	0.98	0.87	-2.4	0.97	1.13	-10.5
20130616	0.95	0.74	2.0	0.93	0.81	0.87	0.95	0.88	1.5
20130622	0.95	0.74	-4.5	0.95	0.87	-6.4	0.97	0.96	-12.5
20130629	0.97	0.73	-0.59	0.92	0.92	-1.7	0.96	0.87	-1.2
20130830	0.94	1.04	-3.0	0.93	1.05	-2.6	0.93	1.04	1.2
20130906 ^d									

^ar² values calculated from single-sided linear least squares

^bSlope and intercept values calculated from orthogonal distance regression

^cNo humidified CRDS data available

^dNo UHSAS data available.




Figure 1. Schematics showing the process of calculating ambient extinction from a) measurements of composition, size distribution, and ambient RH and b) measurements of ambient RH and of extinction at three instrument RH values.




Figure 2. Map of the southeastern U.S. showing state borders and tracks of the flights during SENEX and SEAC4RS. Triangles show the locations of the 37 vertical profiles that are used in this analysis; 25 of these had valid $f(RH)$ measurements. The location of the groundsite in Centreville, Alabama is indicated. The inset shows the eastern portion of the U.S.; the dashed box indicates the sample region.




Figure 3. A vertical profile measured from 18:29 to 18:35 UTC on 22 June 2013 over east-central Alabama. a) Extinction measured in the dry, medium, and high RH channels of the CRDS, extinction calculated using the fitting method described in Section 3.4, and extinction at ambient RH calculated using this method. The dashed horizontal lines show the boundaries between the well-mixed and transition layers and between the transition layer and free troposphere, as defined by Wagner et al. (2015). b) Measured RH values within the dry, medium, and high RH channels of the CRDS, and ambient RH. c) $f(\text{RH})$ measured at the medium and high RH conditions, and calculated from fitted values as in (a). Circles show the $f(\text{RH})$ values from fitting Eq. 6 to the $f(\text{RH})$ data. Triangles show the fraction of sub- $0.7 \mu\text{m}$ aerosol mass measured by the AMS that is inorganic (top axis).




Figure 4. Composite vertical profiles of a) dry extinction, b) $f(RH)$ at $\sim 70\% RH$, and c) $f(RH)$ at $\sim 90\% RH$. Shaded areas represent the interdecile and interquartile ranges. The dashed horizontal lines in (a) show the boundary between the well-mixed and transition layers and between the transition layer and free troposphere, as defined by Wagner et al. (2015). The circles and dashed lines in (b) and (c) show the mean $f(RH)$ values determined by fitting the κ_{ext} and γ parameterizations, respectively, to the raw data before altitude binning and averaging. The triangles in (c) show the fraction of sub- $0.7 \mu m$ aerosol mass measured by the AMS that is inorganic (top axis); error bars show the interquartile range.




Figure 5. a) Calculated $f(RH)$ compared with observed $f(RH)$ at $\sim 70\%$ RH using the methodology in Fig. 1a for all analyzed data. Lines are 2-sided least squares (orthogonal distance regression) fits to the data. The dashed line is calculated assuming the line passes through (1,1). b) As in (a), but for $\sim 90\%$ RH. Organic hygroscopicity ($\kappa_{chem,OA}$) is assumed to be 0.05.




Figure 6. Histogram of results from a Monte Carlo analysis showing values of the organic κ_{chem} that, given the observed inorganic composition and size distribution, are consistent within experimental uncertainty with the measured $f(RH)$. Vertical lines indicate the 50th, 75th, and 90th percentile values of the histogram.




Figure 7. a) Mean values of $f(RH)$ determined profile data in the well-mixed and transition layers (below 2000 m altitude) on 22 June 2013 over central Alabama from Fig. 3c (symbols), and curves from the γ power-law parameterization (dashed line, Eq. (1)) and the κ_{ext} parameterization (solid line, Eq. (6)) fitted to the three data points. The green hashed line shows a fit to the γ parameterization assuming $RH_0=35\%$ (see Sect. 3.4). Error bars show the propagated measurement uncertainties and measurement standard deviation. b) Histograms of values of $f(RH)$ measured at medium RH (70 \pm 3%) and at high RH (86-94%) for all of the data selected for this study. c) Ratio of calculated to measured $f(RH)$ at ~70% RH for the γ and κ_{ext} parameterizations for all of the data selected for this study.




Figure 8. Comparison of κ_{ext} as function of the fraction of sub- $0.7\mu\text{m}$ non-refractory OA for the data analyzed in this paper (crosses) and similar measurements at the SOAS ground site in Centreville, Alabama, U.S. (Washenfelder et al., 2014) between the hours of 11:00 and 17:00 local time (circles).




Figure A1. Calculated extinction efficiency for a particle with a refractive index of $1.52+0i$ (solid line) and linear least-squares fit for $0.1 < D_p < 0.6$ (dashed line). The extinction efficiency averaged across the size range of hygroscopic growth of a typical accumulation mode aerosol is approximately linear. Extinction efficiency curves for $1.58+0i$ and $1.40+0i$ are also shown.






Figure A2. Ratio of optically determined κ_{ext} to chemically determined κ_{chem} as a function of particle geometric median diameter and κ_{chem} . Values of κ_{ext} were calculated for a lognormal particle size distribution with a geometric standard deviation of 1.5 and a geometric median diameter given by the abscissa. Points are instantaneous values of $\kappa_{ext}/\kappa_{chem}$ determined from the in situ $f(RH)$ and composition measurements.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8



9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Figure A3. Values of κ_{ext} determined from fitting Eq. (6) to the $f(RH)$ data plotted as a function of κ_{chem} calculated from aerosol composition measurements using κ -Köhler theory (Eq. 3).



1
2
3
4
5
6
7

Figure A4. Values of $f(RH)$ from rooftop measurements of ambient and dry extinction made at Boulder, Colorado, US, from 2015/03/05 to 2015/06/04. Curves are two-sided least-squares fits to the data using the κ_{ext} and γ parameterizations. Data are selected for periods when κ_{chem} determined from measurements made with the C-TOF-AMS were < 0.4 .