

## ***Interactive comment on “Efficient bulk mass accommodation of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> into neutral aqueous aerosol” by Goran Gržinić et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 2 January 2017

Review of Grzinic et al., Efficient bulk mass accommodation of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> into neutral aqueous aerosol

Summary and General Comments: Grzinic et al presents a timely analysis of the reactive uptake of <sup>13</sup>N labelled N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> to neutral aqueous nitrate and sulfate aerosol. The analysis permits assessment of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> mass accommodation and the validity of the N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> disproportionation mechanism. The authors find high values for N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> mass accommodation (> 0.4) and the best evidence to date for the concerted N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ionization mechanism, involving the nitronium ion intermediate. The results are a welcome addition to the field and should be published following the authors attention to the following general comments:

1) Most of the discussion centers on the uptake of N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> to nitrate aerosol. The con-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



clusions drawn suggest large values for alpha and supports N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ionization at the particle interface. What is less clear is if this is a general result for all aerosol at the same water activity. In the case of sulfate particles, labelled N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> likely evaporates from the interfacial region w/o the opportunity for exchange with unlabeled nitrate. The upper limit of 0.03 is achieved that is likely a combination of alpha, KH, and the reaction rates described. If KH and the hydrolysis rates are the same for sulfate and nitrate aerosol, is it correct to generalize the mass accommodation results derived from the nitrate aerosol experiments to all aqueous aerosol of comparable interfacial water activity? It would be helpful for the authors to provide some discussion on these points and the generality of the derived mass accommodation coefficient. I would find it very helpful if there was a second panel to Figure 3, which showed the processes for the sulfate particles.

2) Most of the aerosol flow reactor community is familiar with the kinetic equations shown, for unlabeled reactants. Are there any special considerations that need to be accounted for regarding single, vs multiple collisions of the labelled N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> with aerosol and the walls? Or rather, in Fig. 3, how many times would you expect a labelled N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> to cycle through a particle or the wall of the flow tube over the time constant of the flow reactor? Is this important to the analysis or derivation of the equations presented?

3) What is the effect of labelled HNO<sub>3</sub> that is generated in the source region? How would this be interpreted in the experiment. It is not uncommon for N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> sources to be 10:1 HNO<sub>3</sub> to N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>. What is the expected ratio in this experiment?

4) Like reviewer #1, I am also confused by the notation of [N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>]<sub>p</sub>. It would be helpful if equation 3 and Figure 2 were consistent in notation. It would also be helpful to denote between labelled and unlabeled here, as the unlabeled N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> uptake coefficient to nitrate aerosol could be pretty small even at high labeled N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> uptake coefficients, correct?

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2016-1118, 2016.