Interactive comment on "Trends and variability of atmospheric PM$_{2.5}$ and PM10−2.5 concentration in the Po Valley, Italy" *by* A. Bigi and G. Ghermandi

A. Bigi and G. Ghermandi

alessandro.bigi@unimore.it

Dear Referee#3

we fear that the comment you sent us was meant for another manuscript: "Atmospheric aerosols in Rome, Italy: Sources, dynamics and spatial variations during two seasons" (doi:10.5194/acp-2016-664). You actually sent this same comment to that manuscript...

Regards,

Alessandro

Interactive comment on "Trends and variability of atmospheric PM$_{2.5}$ and PM10−2.5 concentration in the Po Valley, Italy" *by* A. Bigi and G. Ghermandi

A. Bigi and G. Ghermandi

alessandro.bigi@unimore.it

We want to thank the referee for his/her detailed corrections: all of them are now included in the revised manuscript. Replies to specific comments/corrections follow.

2. It should be indicated in the abstract that the current study deals with data sets, which range from 7 to 10 years.

The revised manuscript (page 1, line 7) now reads: [. . .] we analysed daily gravimetric equivalent concentration of PM$_{2.5}$ and of PM$_{10-2.5}$ at 44 and 15 sites respectively across the Po valley. The length of the investigated time series ranges between 7 and 10 years. For both PM sizes, [. . .]

3. Page 9, lines 3-4: If I understand the text correctly, the authors state that biomass

burning is a large source of both primary and secondary OC and to make this point they provide Perrone et al (2012) as reference. However, I failed to see in this reference that it is claimed that biomass burning is a large source of secondary OC. Clarification is needed here, e.g., by providing one or more appropriate references, or otherwise the statement about secondary OC should be removed.

In the revised manuscript we changed the reference to Perrone et al (2012) with 3 references: two describing biomass impact on carbonaceous aerosol in Lombardy (Piazzalunga et al., 2011; Gilardoni et al., 2011) and one on experimental measurements of emissions by commercially available Italian wood and pellet stoves (Ozgen et al., 2014).

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS:

page 7, line 21: "resulted three or two depending" is unclear; rephrasing is needed.
Revised manuscript, page 7, line 22: [. . .] position instead of their classification within the air-quality network. Nonetheless, some differences between the outcome of cluster analysis applied to PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ exist: three or two clusters resulted for $PM_{2.5}$ depending on the algorithm used (Fig. 1 and Fig. S3), i.e. fewer than for PM_{10} (as expected spatial variability for finer particles is smaller).

page 7, line 23: "resulted more internally homogeneous" is unclear; rephrasing is needed.
Revised manuscript, page 7, line 24: The influence of the metropolitan areas, evident for PM_{10} , is not shown by $PM_{2.5}$. Eastern and Western part of the valley were split in fewer groups when analysed for $PM_{2.5}$, compared to PM_{10}, i.e. a difference in $PM_{2.5}$ between Eastern and Western Po valley exists, however within each side of the valley $PM_{2.5}$ levels result more correlated than PM_{10} levels.

page 8, line 14: "resulted steepest for" is unclear; rephrasing is needed.
Revised manuscript, page 8, line 19: [. . .] Decrease was largest (in absolute and relative terms) at traffic urban sites and became lower from urban towards rural sites (see

Figure 4), [. . .]

page 9, line 26: "resulted highest in" is unclear; rephrasing is needed.
Revised manuscript, page 9, line 32: $PM_{2.5}$ concentration was largest in the N-NW sector of the valley (i.e. at the foothill of the Alps) and decreased towards S-SE.

References

Gilardoni, S., Vignati, E., Cavalli, F., Putaud, J. P., Larsen, B. R., Karl, M., Stenström, K., Genberg, J., Henne, S., and Dentener, F.: Better constraints on sources of carbonaceous aerosols using a combined ^{14}C – macro tracer analysis in a European rural background site, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 5685–5700, doi:10.5194/acp-11-5685-2011, 2011.

Ozgen, S., Caserini, S., Galante, S., Giugliano, M., Angelino, E., Marongiu, A., Hugony, F., Migliavacca, G., and Morreale, C.: Emission factors from small scale appliances burning wood and pellets, Atmos. Environ., 94, 144 – 153, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.05.032, 2014.

Piazzalunga, A., Belis, C., Bernardoni, V., Cazzuli, O., Fermo, P., Valli, G., and Vecchi, R.: Estimates of wood burning contribution to PM by the macro-tracer method using tailored emission factors, Atmos. Environ., 45, 6642 – 6649, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.09.008, 2011.

Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/acp-2016-441-AC3, 2016

Interactive comment on "Trends and variability of atmospheric PM$_{2.5}$ and PM10−2.5 concentration in the Po Valley, Italy" *by* A. Bigi and G. Ghermandi

A. Bigi and G. Ghermandi

alessandro.bigi@unimore.it

Firstly we want to thank the referee for his/her positive comments and his help in improving the study.

General comment: It is not completely stated what the added-value of the new manuscript is, compared to the complementary one of Bigi and Ghermandi (2014). Is it the fact that the present one focuses more on the fine fraction? If this is the case, it should be highlighted more and maybe even present a comparison between findings for PM$_{10}$ vs PM$_{2.5}$.

In the revised manuscript in the Introduction we added this two sentences (line 16 page 2):

[. . .] make air quality of this region one of the worst in Europe (EEA, 2010; Bigi et al., 2012). In a companion study Bigi and Ghermandi (2014) performed a detailed analysis of the long term trend and variability of PM_{10} across the Po valley. The study found a large and valley-wide decline in PM_{10} atmospheric levels and partly ascribed it to the regulatory forced renewal of the vehicular fleet, leaving undetermined the role of SIA and of primary emissions. Main aim of the present study is to complete the previous analysis of PM_{10} over the Po valley by investigating in detail a dataset comprising 44 $PM_{2.5}$ and 15 $PM_{10-2.5}$ monitoring sites, with $PM_{10-2.5}$ being the mass of coarse particles i.e. with aerodynamic diameter between 2.5 μm and 10 μm. The present study allows a better understanding of the role of emissions in the previously observed PM_{10} trends, and, together with the companion study, will provide an up-to-date and comprehensive representation of the trend and the variability of PM in the Po Valley. Most of the methods used in the present study follow the [. . .]

We did our best to compare findings for $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} throughout the text: comparison for weekly pattern results is in page 7 (lines 1-3). Comparison for cluster analysis results is in page 7 (lines 20-25). Comparison for trends in concentration and emissions is in page 9 (lines 13-22). We actually believe to have compared and discussed the results from the two studies as much as possible.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS: we included all corrections suggested by the referee, but one: in page 9 line 29 original manuscript with "[. . .] the several fog precipitation events [. . .]" we really meant precipitation of fog and not precipitation of rain (WMO, 2008).

References

WMO, Guide to Meteorological Instruments and Methods of Observation. 2008. url: https://www.wmo.int/pages/prog/gcos/documents/gruanmanuals/CIMO/CIMO_Guide-

7th_Edition-2008.pdf

Trends and variability of atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ concentration in the Po Valley, Italy

A. Bigi and G. Ghermandi

Department of Engineering "Enzo Ferrari", Università degli studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy

Correspondence to: A. Bigi (alessandro.bigi@unimore.it)

Abstract. The Po Valley is one of the largest European regions with remarkably high concentration level of atmospheric pollutants, both for particulate and gaseous compounds. In the last decade stringent regulations on air quality standards and on anthropogenic emissions have been set by the European Commission, including also for $PM_{2.5}$ and its main components since 2008. These regulations lead to an overall improvement ~~on~~ in air quality across Europe, including the Po valley and specifically
5   PM_{10}, as shown in a previous study by Bigi and Ghermandi (2014). In order to assess the trend and variability in $PM_{2.5}$ in the Po valley and its role in the decrease in PM_{10}, we analysed daily gravimetric equivalent concentration of $PM_{2.5}$ and of $PM_{10-2.5}$ at 44 and 15 sites respectively across the Po valley. The length of the investigated time series ranges between 7 and 10 years. For both PM sizes, the trend in deseasonalized monthly means, annual quantiles and in monthly frequency distribution was estimated: ~~these~~ this showed a significant decreasing trend at several sites for both size fractions and mostly occurring
10 in winter. All series ~~have been~~ were tested for a significant weekly periodicity (a proxy to estimate the impact of primary anthropogenic emissions), yielding positive results for summer $PM_{2.5}$ and for summer and winter $PM_{10-2.5}$. Hierarchical cluster analysis showed moderate variability in $PM_{2.5}$ across the valley, with 2 to 3 main clusters, dividing the area in Western, Eastern and Southern / Apennines foothill sectors. The trend in atmospheric concentration was compared with the time series of local emissions, vehicular fleet details and fuel sales, suggesting that the decrease in $PM_{2.5}$ and in PM_{10} originates from
15 a drop both in primary and in precursors of Secondary Inorganic Aerosols emissions, largely ascribed to vehicular traffic. Potentially, the increase in biomass burning emissions in winter and the modest decrease in NH_3 weaken an otherwise even larger drop in atmospheric concentrations.

1 Introduction

Airborne particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter equal or smaller than $2.5\,\mu m$ ~~have~~ has been regularly monitored in
20 Europe since over a decade, with an increasing number of sampling sites following the requirements of 2008/50/EC. Notwithstanding an occasional improper use of ambient $PM_{2.5}$ in epidemiological studies, leading to biased results, was acknowledged (Avery et al., 2010), several health–effects studies on bulk $PM_{2.5}$ assessed its harmfulness both in Europe (Boldo et al., 2006) and in the US (Franklin et al., 2006), with this latter study estimating $PM_{2.5}$ 3 times more dangerous than PM_{10}. Some studies included $PM_{2.5}$ composition to better infer its morbidity, highlighting the role of Black Carbon (Sørensen et al., 2003)

and of sulphate (Strand et al., 2006), while recently also the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) classified 'particulate matter from outdoor air pollution as carcinogenic' (Loomis et al., 2013).

European regulatory limits on atmospheric concentration and atmospheric emissions for several pollutants ~~lead~~ led to a direct decrease for some species: e.g. the SO_2 emission drop in Europe and in the US (Vestreng et al., 2007; Klimont et al., 2013) resulted in a continental scale decrease in atmospheric SO_2 (for Europe see Denby et al., 2010) and in the content of sulfur in rainwater (for the U.S. see Hicks et al., 2002). More spatial and seasonal variability was observed for the trends in atmospheric concentration of photochemically produced compounds, as Ozone (Jonson et al., 2006; Simon et al., 2015; Wilson et al., 2012), and finally site-dependent trends ~~resulted~~ were obtained for PM_{10} (Anttila and Tuovinen, 2010; Barmpadimos et al., 2011a). Cusack et al. (2012) found a decreasing trend in $PM_{2.5}$ at most EMEP sites across Europe, and observed that in the Western Mediterranean the trend was due to a drop in in Secondary Inorganic Aerosol (SIA) and organic matter.

The $\sim 42\,000\,\text{km}^2$ of the Po valley host wide urban areas, with an overall population of almost 15 millions inhabitants, large industrial manufacturing districts (including oil refineries and large power plants) sensibly impacting ~~on~~ local air quality (Bigi et al., accepted) and intensive agricultural and animal breeding activities. During colder months the Alps and Apennines surrounding the valley strongly limit maximum mixing layer height and prevent the development of moderate or strong winds, leading to recurrent thermal inversion both at daytime and at nighttime. These conditions cause the buildup and ageing of the intense atmospheric emissions of the valley and make air quality of this region one of the worst in Europe (EEA, 2010; Bigi et al., 2012).

In a companion study Bigi and Ghermandi (2014) performed a detailed analysis of the long term trend and variability of PM_{10} across the Po valley. The study found a large and valley-wide decline in PM_{10} atmospheric levels and partly ascribed it to the regulatory forced renewal of the vehicular fleet, leaving undetermined the role of SIA and of primary emissions. ~~In order to provide a representative study on the trend and the variability of in the Po Valley over the last decade and to possibly shed more light on the role of emissions in the previously observed~~ Main aim of the present study is to complete the previous analysis of PM_{10} ~~trends,~~ over the Po valley by investigating in detail a dataset comprising 44 $PM_{2.5}$ and 15 $PM_{10-2.5}$ monitoring sites~~was analysed~~, with $PM_{10-2.5}$ being the mass of coarse particles i.e. with aerodynamic diameter between 2.5 μm and 10 μm. The present study allows a better understanding of the role of emissions in the previously observed PM_{10} trends, and, together with the companion study, will provide an up-to-date and comprehensive representation of the trend and the variability of PM in the Po Valley. Most of the methods used in the present study ~~follows~~ follow the rationale of the companion study, to enhance the comparability between the two.

2 Materials and methods

The analysis involved daily $PM_{2.5}$ data ~~sampled at~~ obtained from 44 air quality monitoring stations within the Regional Environmental Protection Agencies (ARPA) operating over the Po Valley. Data proceed from low volume samplers (mainly EN compliant SKYPOST, by TECORA, Fontenay sous Bois, France) and gravimetric equivalent beta attenuators (mostly SWAM, by FAI Instruments, Rome, Italy). ~~Sites~~ The sites are listed in Table 1 and mapped in Figure 1. All sampling equipment

follows a quality management system which is certified to ISO 9001:2008. All analysed data have been automatically and manually validated by respective ARPA, i.e. the data are obtained by calibrated instruments, undergo a daily, seasonal and annual comparison with nearby sites as well as with previous data. ~~Authors~~ The authors have double-checked the data by analysing annual, monthly, weekly and daily patterns for all sites and by removing any occasional biased value (e.g. peaks from festival bonfires). 15 out of these 44 sites included daily gravimetric equivalent measurements of PM_{10}. At these 15 sites the mass concentration of coarse particles ($PM_{10-2.5}$) was computed and analysed equivalently to $PM_{2.5}$.

The variability in atmospheric particle concentration was compared to provincial emission estimates of PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, CH_4, CO and other main particle precursors (SO_2, NO_x, non-methane volatile organic carbon ($NM-VOC$) and NH_3). Emissions were provided by the National Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA) for the years 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005 and 2010 (inventory version 22_05_2015). Provincial emissions are estimated by attribution of the National Emissions to each Italian province by a top down procedure. Further details on the inventory used can be found in the companion paper and references therein. Similarly to the companion study, only provinces with a significant part of their land within the Po Valley were considered, assuming that most of the emissions occur in the valley part of the province, where most of the activities and population resides, instead of the mountainous parts. It is worth noting that there are some large differences between the inventory version used in this study and the one used in the companion paper, mostly related to emissions for SNAP sector 2 (i.e. Commercial, institutional and residential combustion plants), where SNAP is the Standardized Nomenclature for Air Pollutants. In this study we also included the emission inventory for the Lombardy region: this is built with a bottom-up procedure, based on emission source databases at a municipality level, and it is available for the years 2005, 2007, 2008, 2010 and 2012. The building procedure for this latter inventory was improved through the years by changing emission factors for few specific sources, e.g. biomass burning, biomass-fuelled power plants and air traffic. Nonetheless the homogeneity over time of both inventories was considered sufficient for the aim of the present study.

Also data on vehicular fleet composition and fleet age for each province were used. These were provided by the Italian Automobile Club (ACI). Data on fuel sales used in this study, also provided by ACI, were available at a regional scale and not at a provincial scale.

All statistical data analyses ~~have been~~ were performed within the software environment R 3.2 (R Core Team, 2015).

2.1 Trend estimate

The analysis for the presence of a trend involved a subset of 24 $PM_{2.5}$ series out of 44, i.e. the ones having a record between 7 and 10 years long, and all 15 $PM_{10-2.5}$ series, with a length ranging between 7 and 9 years. The limit of 7 years for the sampling duration for a trend analysis results from the compromise between the spatial and temporal representativeness of the valley by the analysed dataset. Similarly to the previous analysis for PM_{10}, slopes were estimated for monthly mean and annual quantiles of daily data, where these statistics were computed if at least 75 % of the daily data were available for the respective month or year.

Monthly average concentrations were decomposed in trend, seasonal and remainder components by the Seasonal Trend Decomposition procedure based on LOESS (STL) (Cleveland et al., 1990). For a good performance, STL requires a clear

seasonality in the analysed time series: this feature was shown by all $PM_{2.5}$ series and by only two $PM_{10-2.5}$ series (see section 3.1). All time series were log-transformed prior to STL decomposition in order to achieve normally distributed residuals and to control heteroscedasticity, and the analysis of monthly trend time series was performed on back-transformed logarithmic trend data. Generalized Least Squares (GLS) (Brockwell and Davis, 2002) and model-based resampling (Davison and Hinkley, 1997)

5   methods were used to estimate the presence of a significant slope in trend components. Details on these methods can be found in Bigi and Ghermandi (2014). All resulting slopes and two sample graphs are shown in Table 2 and in Fig. 2 respectively.

Similarly to in the companion study, the trends of monthly data were compared to non-parametric trends of annual quantiles: the slope of the 5th, 50th and 95th annual quantiles was estimated by the Theil–Sen method (hereafter TS); significance test for slope on annual data was performed by non-parametric resampling as in Yue and Pilon (2004). Finally each month was tested

10   for the presence of a trend: $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ daily concentration for each month was binned in $10\,\mu g\,m^{-3}$ increments, and the frequency of each bin in each month over the sampling period was computed. The trend in these frequencies for each month was estimated by the TS method and its significance was tested by a non-parametric bootstrap, similarly ~~to~~ as for the annual quantiles. For each site, months with a significant trend are listed in the rightmost column of Table 2 and two sample graphs are in Figure 3. Contrarily to deseasonalized monthly means, these two latter trend estimates were performed on all 24

15    $PM_{2.5}$ + 15 $PM_{10-2.5}$ sites.

The TS method was used to estimate also trends in the emission inventory data, along with non–parametric resampling to asses the slope significance.

2.2 Weekly pattern

In order to investigate the presence of a weekly cycle in daily $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ (i.e. a significantly different concentration

20   on a single weekday), three tests were used for all 44+15 series. Two tests involved both the complete and seasonal series (i.e. winter (January, February, March) and summer (June, July, August)) and focussed on PM anomalies, similarly to Bigi and Ghermandi (2014): the Kruskal–Wallis test on weekly cycle of mean anomalies (WCY) and the Wilcoxon test on weekend effect magnitude (WEM). Their significance was double-checked by repeating WCY and WEM tests on anomalies grouped into 6- and 8-day weeks (Barmet et al., 2009).

25   The third test involved the analysis of the smoothed periodogram for each time series of anomalies and verified the presence of a significant signal with a 7–day periodicity above background noise. The periodogram estimates the spectral density of a continuous time series, showing the contribution by all frequential components (eventually associated to a specific process/source) to the variance of the series. The periodogram, in order to be estimated, needs a continuous series: in each time-series one-day gaps were filled by linear interpolation of neighbouring data and the periodogram was computed from the

30   resulting longest continuous record within the series. Following Mann and Lees (1996), periodogram smoothing was achieved by the multiple-taper method (MTM), and background noise was estimated as an AR(1) red noise process, whose lag-1 autocorrelation coefficient proceeds from a robust estimate. The statistical significance of peaks in the periodogram was verified assuming a χ^2 distribution for spectral estimates. Therefore a peak in the smoothed periodogram at the frequency $1/7\,day^{-1}$ is significant when exceeding the 95% confidence bands for red noise at that same frequency (suggesting the presence of a

periodic emission source inducing a similar periodicity in atmospheric pollutant concentration). The astrochron package in R (Meyers, 2012) was used to follow the approach by Mann and Lees (1996). Results for the weekly cycle analysis are presented in Table S1 and anomalies for $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ are shown in Figure S1 and S2.

2.3 Cluster analysis

5   Cluster analysis was performed only on $PM_{2.5}$ daily data and included all 44 sites. Several distance metrics and clustering algorithms were tested. Best results were chosen depending on the cluster silhouette and the overall performance index, which led to two slightly different outcomes: one generated by divisive hierarchical clustering algorithm and one by partition around medoids (Kaufman and Rousseeuw, 1990). In the former an outlying site (Biella, ID 28) was removed from the dataset to prevent classification fouling (Kaufman and Rousseeuw, 1990). For both algorithms the dissimilarity matrix was based on

10   a Pearson's–correlation–coefficient metric (see Bigi and Ghermandi, 2014), highlighting linear correlation structures among sites. Spatial representation of the two resulting set of clusters is found in Fig. 1 and Fig. S3.

3   Results and discussion

General comments on the pre-processing procedures and trends used in the companion paper apply to this study: we exploited the STL performance on extracting the trend component from the monthly data, featured by wide seasonality, and we took

15   advantage of the robustness of both quantiles and resampling techniques, to minimize the influence of uncommon weather conditions on the estimated trends. Finally, the influence of a possible long-term trend in meteorological variables as temperature or precipitation was estimated negligible over the comparatively short length of these PM series.

    A main assumption in the discussion of trends and patterns is that, notwithstanding the occasional influence of long range transport on PM in the Po valley (e.g. Masiol et al., 2015), we considered local emission sources to have the largest influence

20   on particulates in the Po valley, i.e. throughout the analysis we assumed trends in continental emissions to have a minor effect on the estimated PM trends. A reasonable assumption, particularly in winter when valley emissions are confined for long periods within the (often shallow) mixing layer.

3.1   Results from trend analysis

All estimated trends are assumed linear. This was mostly true for all trend components extracted by STL on monthly $PM_{2.5}$,

25   while only in Lodi and Merate monthly–mean $PM_{10-2.5}$ showed a sufficiently wide seasonal pattern to allow a reliable extraction of a seasonal and a trend component by STL, with the latter being linear. Not surprisingly, these two sites are urban traffic stations and recorded the largest PM coarse concentration among all investigated sites (their overall mean is $16.2\,\mu g\,m^{-3}$ and $12.7\,\mu g\,m^{-3}$ respectively).

    ~~Trend~~ The trend component for monthly $PM_{2.5}$ showed a significant decline at most sites, ranging from 0.5 to $2\,\mu g\,m^{-3}\,yr^{-1}$

30   (Table 2). $PM_{2.5}$ annual quantiles exhibited a decline at several sites, indicating a decrease both for large, median and low concentration levels. Significant decrease rate for annual median was highly similar to the GLS trend of monthly mean at the

corresponding site (e.g. Borgofranco, Cornale, Parma); missing data or outliers in the annual series led the significance test for slope to fail at several sites, although the data showed a clear trend.

In order to detect months with a concentration change over the analysed period, TS trends in frequency of monthly bins were computed (see Figure 3 for the results at 2 sites). In the rightmost column of Table 2, a $-$ sign next to a specific month indicates a decrease in frequency of higher concentration bins towards lower bins, a $+$ sign indicates a shift from lower to higher concentration bins and a $\pm$ sign indicates a shift in lower and higher concentration bins towards median concentrations. The analysis of binned concentration levels indicates that at most sites higher concentrations decreased, mostly during winter months with January and February being the most frequent (see the rightmost column in Table 2). Occasional decrease of higher concentrations was observed also in summer months, while an increase in lower concentrations was found in Spring at few sites. These results are partly consistent with slopes in 5th annual quantile, representative of spring/summer trends. As a matter of comparison, estimate of trends for $PM_{2.5}$ annual mean at several EMEP (European Monitoring and Evaluation Programme) sites, i.e. rural background, over 2002–2010 by Cusack et al. (2012) resulted between $\sim -3.8/-5.4\,\%\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$, similar to significant trends ~~occurred~~ occurring in the Po valley for annual median at background sites (e.g. Borgofranco, Chivasso or Parma).

The trend component of monthly $PM_{10-2.5}$ at Lodi and Merate showed a drop of $2\,\%\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ and $6\,\%\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ respectively; in Lodi only winter months significantly contributed to this drop, whereas in Merate this drop occurred throughout the year. At Merate also annual quantiles exhibit a significant trend, while at Lodi the nonlinearity and a missing data lead to a non–significant slope. Both these are traffic sites and directly affected by primary sources of coarse particles, i.e. motor exhausts and road, tire and break wear (either directly emitted or resuspended) (e.g. see Perrone et al., 2012, for a PM source apportionment in Milan). This outcome suggests that the previously observed decrease in PM_{10} (Bigi and Ghermandi, 2014) is partly due to a drop in exhaust traffic emission following the renewal of the vehicular fleet, at least at traffic sites. Indeed the trend in $PM_{10-2.5}$ annual quantiles shows some site-dependency along with several cases of nonlinearity, suggesting occasional changes in active sources over time (e.g. construction works) and leading non–parametric bootstrap to negate slope significance notwithstanding a clear slope is present, as in the case of Rimini 95th quantile (see Figure S4 for $PM_{10-2.5}$ annual trends).

Trends in $PM_{10-2.5}$ found by Barmpadimos et al. (2012) at 5 EMEP sites are largely smaller than the ones observed in this study, supporting the hypothesis of the influence by primary sources on Po valley sites. Very few other studies investigated trends for $PM_{10-2.5}$ in Europe. Amato et al. (2014) found a trend of $-1.5/-2\,\mu\mathrm{g\,m}^{-3}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ in road dust in Southern Spain (meteorologically very different from the Po valley) and ascribed it to the decrease in construction works due to the severe financial crisis: from the data available for this study a similar explanation does not apply to the $PM_{10-2.5}$ trends observed in the Po valley.

3.2 Results for weekly pattern

Three different tests were used to assess whether a significant weekly pattern was present. Results presented in Table S1 show how, to some extent, the tests confirm each other, with WCY and WEM outperforming MTM. Almost all $PM_{2.5}$ sites exhibit a significant weekly pattern in summer, whereas almost none in winter. A weekly periodicity is observed in $PM_{10-2.5}$ at almost

all sites both in winter and in summer, as expected given the most common sources of coarse particles. For both PM fractions, significance in weekly periodicity was supported by the negative result of tests on 6– and 8–days weeks. This is consistent with the findings in Bigi and Ghermandi (2014), where a significant weekly pattern in PM_{10} was found in winter only at older sites (i.e. activated before 2002): this was ascribed to a larger contribution by the coarse fraction to PM_{10} in late 1990s early 2000s,

5   as confirmed by the decrease in $PM_{10-2.5}$ here reported. Similar results are in the study by Barmpadimos et al. (2011b), where for 7 different sites in Switzerland a significant weekly cycle was found, both in $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$, including the rural background site of Payerne.

One among the most recent source apportionment studies of $PM_{2.5}$ in the Po valley, by Perrone et al. (2012), based on samples over 2006–2009 in urban background Milan, estimates the contribution of Secondary Inorganic Aerosol (SIA) and

10   Biomass Burning (BB) to be larger in $PM_{2.5}$ than in PM_{10}, and higher in winter than in summer (up to 53% in winter $PM_{2.5}$). These results are consistent with the scientific literature (Finlayson-Pitts and Pitts, 2000) and are confirmed by the findings of other recent PM source apportionment studies in the Po valley (e.g. Larsen et al., 2012), i.e. supporting the hypothesis of a buffering role by SIA+BB over sources having a weekly periodicity (e.g. traffic, industry, resuspension), whose relative contribution is estimated lowest in winter $PM_{2.5}$ and highest in summer $PM_{10-2.5}$. Interesting enough, for both PM fractions

15   the significance in weekly periodicity is not dependent on station classification according to the air-quality network: this also supports the assumption on the minor influence of continental emission trends.

3.3   Results from cluster analysis

Similarly to Po valley PM_{10}, also $PM_{2.5}$ exhibited a strong seasonality, a significant trend and changes in frequency distribution across the valley (note that the $PM_{2.5}/PM_{10}$ ratio in the Po valley is approaching 1 over the years, particularly at urban sites

20   and in winter). Similarly to the companion paper, cluster analysis allowed to highlight the presence of groups having large internal correlation, and showed how the spatial distribution of most similar sites derives mainly ~~upon~~ from their geographical position instead of their classification within the air-quality network. Nonetheless, some differences ~~compared~~ between the outcome of cluster analysis applied to PM_{10} ~~exist: clusters for resulted~~ and $PM_{2.5}$ exist: three or two clusters resulted for $PM_{2.5}$ depending on the algorithm used (Fig. 1 and Fig. S3), i.e. fewer than for PM_{10} (as expected spatial variability for finer

25   particles is smaller)~~; the~~. The influence of the metropolitan areas, evident for PM_{10}, is ~~now lost;~~ not shown by $PM_{2.5}$. Eastern and Western part of the valley ~~resulted more internally homogeneous~~ were split in fewer groups when analysed for $PM_{2.5}$~~than for~~, compared to PM_{10}, i.e. a difference in $PM_{2.5}$ between Eastern and Western Po valley exists, however within each side of the valley $PM_{2.5}$ levels result more correlated than PM_{10} levels. Resulting clusters have to be understood as flexible, with sites on the 'geographical boundary' between two groups having a weaker membership.

3.4   Results from emission trend analysis and discussion

$PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ investigated in this study refer to the period 2005–2014, while valley-wide emission data are available every 5 years over the period 1990–2010, preventing any tentative comparison between the trends of the two datasets, but only a qualitative assessment. Moreover, as shown by Finardi et al. (2014) with an Eulerian chemical transport model, change in

emissions in the Po valley leads to highly non-linear change in atmospheric pollutants levels (e.g. O_3, $OH\cdot$ and NO_3^-) and in PM in general: this would make trends in emissions and PM even harder to compare.

SNAP sector 1 (best represented by power plants) showed a large decrease in SO_2, NO_x and PM emissions and its contribution to Po valley emissions is minor, particularly since 2005 (see Figure S5). A significant reduction occurred in NO_x, NM$-$VOC and PM emissions by road transport SNAP 7, one of largest ~~source~~ sources in the valley. The modest contribution of emissions by industrial combustion (SNAP 3) furtherly decreased for SO_2, NO_x and PM, both by technological improvements and recent national economy slowdown. On the contrary, heating (SNAP 2) exhibits an increase in emission of several species (e.g. NO_x, NM$-$VOC and $PM_{2.5}$), most likely due to an increase in the use of biomass, notwithstanding this is a seasonal source. These trends were observed in both analysed inventories.

Over the period 2005–2014 the total number of passenger cars and Light Duty Vehicles (LDV) in the Po valley was almost constant ($\sim -0.02\%$), with mean age of gasoline and diesel passenger cars increasing of ~ 3 years. Note that diesel cars are in average 6 years younger than gasoline ones, consistently with the dieselisation of the fleet observed in most of Europe (EEA, 2015a). Over the same period, fuel sales showed a significant linear trend for unleaded gasoline (-6.2 % yr^{-1}), a mild decline for diesel (-0.8 % yr^{-1}) and an increase for LPG (6.9 % yr^{-1}). This drop in fuel sales is ascribed to both the renewal of the fleet, i.e. the increased number of vehicles with a more efficient engine, and to a recent level off (decrease) of the mean distance travelled by car according to EEA (2015b) (ACI, 2012).

The observed trends in atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ occurred at several sites, including the rural background stations of Cornale and Schivenoglia; the drop occurred more often in winter, when no site exhibits a weekly cycle (i.e. a significant impact of primary anthropogenic emissions), and ranged from $\sim -1\%$ to $\sim -8\%$ yr^{-1}. ~~Absolute and relative slopes resulted steepest for~~ Decrease was largest (in absolute and relative terms) at traffic urban sites ~~, becoming milder~~ and became lower from urban towards rural sites (see Figure 4), although the small dataset did not allow to robustly test for a significant difference in trends among station types. From an overview of some recent source apportionment and chemical composition studies of $PM_{2.5}$ in the Po valley (Carbone et al., 2010; Khan et al., 2016; Larsen et al., 2012; Masiol et al., 2015; Matta et al., 2003; Perrino et al., 2013; Perrone et al., 2012; Pietrogrande et al., 2016) primary traffic emissions (including exhaust and non–exhaust) result highest at traffic sites in absolute and relative terms, decreasing towards rural background sites, suggesting that the decrease in $PM_{2.5}$ emissions by traffic had a significant role in the observed trends in atmospheric composition.

This possibility is supported by chemical transport model simulations of de Meij et al. (2009). ~~These latter~~ The latter authors estimated that a single drop in total $PM_{2.5}$ emissions of only ~ 200 Mg for SNAP 7 across Lombardy would lead to a variation of $-2.3\,\mu g\,m^{-3}$ in primary $PM_{2.5}$ in the Milan metropolitan area. According to the Lombardy inventory, primary $PM_{2.5}$ emissions by SNAP 7 actually drop of $\sim 2\,000$ Mg over 2005–2012, while the ISPRA provincial inventory estimated a drop of $\sim 2\,500$ Mg over 2005–2010. Over the same period, the observed mean absolute drop in monthly $PM_{2.5}$ for Lombardy resulted in $\sim 10\,\mu g\,m^{-3}$. Given the increase in PM emissions by heating in winter counterbalancing the drop in SNAP 7 (and in SNAP 3), the observed downward trend in atmospheric levels ~~are~~ is potentially consistent with the outcome by de Meij et al. (2009) and partly generated by a drop in primary traffic emissions (potentially exhaust and non–exhaust).

A drop in atmospheric SIA is also expected due to the large decrease in NO_x emissions and the (relatively modest) drop in NH_3 ($\sim 17\,000\,\mathrm{Mg}$ according to ISPRA provincial inventory); this would be consistent with the decrease of nitrate, ammonium and sulphate ions concentration in fog at the rural background station San Pietro C. over the period 1990–2011 (Giulianelli et al., 2014). In agreement, simulation results by de Meij et al. (2009) showed a significant drop in SIA only with a concurrent
5 decrease in NO_x and ~~ammonia~~ NH_3 emissions.

Available data do not allow to assess whether also a variation in secondary organic aerosol (SOA) occurred: $NM-VOC$ and NO_x, whose emissions drop over the investigated period, have a competing effect on SOA formation (Andreani-Aksoyoglu et al., 2004), and meanwhile biomass burning emissions increased. This latter is a large source of both primary and secondary OC ~~(e.g. Perrone et al., 2012)~~(e.g. Piazzalunga et al., 2011; Gilardoni et al., 2011; Ozgen et al., 2014), contributing to
10 the large levels of SOA found in winter PM in the Po valley (e.g. Khan et al., 2016; Larsen et al., 2012; Perrino et al., 2013; Pietrogrande et al., 2016). Indeed Putaud et al. (2014) found a significant trend in $PM_{2.5}$ mass and optical properties at the Ispra EMEP site over 2004–2010. This trend was explained ~~with~~ by an increment in brown carbon, i.e. in OC content, most likely ~~originated by~~ originating from an increase in biomass burning emissions. The slower decrease in PM at rural sites compared to urban ones might be eventually due also to the wider use of biomass for heating in rural areas, consistently with the spatial
15 results of the simulations by de Meij et al. (2009).

Finally, the results from the present study hint to a rationale to explain the decreasing trends previously found for PM_{10} in the Po valley (Bigi and Ghermandi, 2014) over 1998–2012: these seem to originate from a drop in the fraction of both primary particles and SIA, with their respective role in the observed trends being site–dependent. This rationale is supported by the decrease in $PM_{10-2.5}$ at Lodi and Merate (traffic sites) and at several UB sites, partly because of the still on-going technology
20 renewal, a process started around the year 2000. Rimini experienced a decrease in PM_{10} of $\sim 1\,\mu\mathrm{g\,m^{-3}\,yr^{-1}}$, while $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ decreased ~~of~~ by $\sim 0.5\,\mu\mathrm{g\,m^{-3}\,yr^{-1}}$ each, suggesting that both primary and SIA significantly contributed to the change in PM_{10} atmospheric concentration. Similar changes occurred in Parma, where the trends were significant for both PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$; at this latter site it is ~~worthnoting~~ worth noting that the increase observed in the 5th quantile of PM_{10} is present (although not significant) for this same quantile of $PM_{10-2.5}$. Finally, similar results apply to Reggio Emilia, i.e. to the
25 other site included both in the present study and in the companion paper.

3.5 Analysis of valley-wide episodes

Two consecutive and ~~worthnoting~~ worth noting $PM_{2.5}$ pollution episodes occurred in 2012: the ~~former~~ first from the 16th to the 23th of January 2012 and the ~~latter~~ second from the 15th to the 19th of February 2012. These episodes are briefly presented as representative, although extreme, examples of valley–wide PM events.
30 The episode in January was generated by a persistent inversion layer confining surface emissions; 1200UTC radiosoundings at Milan Linate airport showed thermal inversions up to $10\,^\circ\mathrm{C}$, at a height between $\sim 200\,\mathrm{m}$ and $\sim 500\,\mathrm{m}$ throughout the event. $PM_{2.5}$ ~~levels resulted highest~~ concentration was largest in the N-NW sector of the valley (i.e. at the foothill of the Alps) and ~~lowest in the~~ decreased towards S-SE~~sector~~. The peak in daily $PM_{2.5}$ during this event represented the maximum record ever for several sites (e.g. Bergamo, Turin C.) and equal or above the respective 94th quantile for all other sites (see Figure S6). The

severity of the event was locally mitigated thanks to aerosol deposition by the several fog precipitation events which occurred across the valley, triggered by the high relative humidity (similarly to the process shown by Gilardoni et al., 2014, during the fog scavenging events of winter 2011).

The second episode occurred during the European cold wave in February 2012, when in most of the valley the coldest temperature over the last ~ 60 years was observed. In the first days of February large snowfalls occurred over the valley (leading to a 100–year peak in snow height across the E sector), followed by several days of clear sky conditions, i.e. when the episode occurred. This event featured extremely cold temperatures and thermal inversions at night, confining the intense emissions by heating, and warm dry conditions at daytime, with a diurnal temperature variation up to $15\,^\circ$C and with either a minor inversion or an isothermal profile at noon (by radiosounding profile at Milan). The episode was ended by precipitation which occurred on the 20th of February. This second $PM_{2.5}$ episode was more severe than the former, with $PM_{2.5}$ concentration peaking at $186\,\mu g\,m^{-3}$ (see Figure S7).

For both events we computed 36–hours long backtrajectories by HYSPLIT (Draxler and Rolph, 2013) using 0.5° GDAS meteorological data and the results refute the possibility of a transboundary pollution episode.

4   Conclusions

The analysis of the trend, of the weekly periodicity and of the similarity in $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ concentration time series in the Po Valley was performed. The trend was estimated by Generalized Least Squares (GLS) on monthly deseasonalized time series, by the Theil–Sen (TS) method on annual quantiles and by the TS method on frequency of daily binned concentration for each month. The slopes estimated by TS and GLS on the same time series show good agreement. A significant and widespread decrease in monthly $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ occurred at the investigated monitoring sites, most often during colder months for the finest particle fraction, with slope getting steeper from rural background towards urban traffic sites. Fewer cases of significant slopes occurred for annual quantiles due to non-linearities, missing data and limited length of annual series. A significant weekly cycle (i.e. possibly forced by anthropogenic emissions) was found for several $PM_{2.5}$ series. This periodicity occurred more often in summer, probably because of the lower contribution to PM by secondary inorganic aerosol (SIA) and by biomass burning emission compounds during warmer months, along with an increase of the primary particle fraction. For all $PM_{10-2.5}$ series a significant weekly cycle was found throughout the year. Notwithstanding the investigated sites show similar trends and patterns, a hierarchical cluster analysis of daily $PM_{2.5}$ concentration showed some differences between Western, Eastern and Southern areas of the valley.

Finally, the trends in atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$ concentration, in emissions, in the vehicular fleet composition and in fuel sales were compared: the results suggest that the observed drop in $PM_{2.5}$ was generated by the renewal in vehicular fleet over the Po Valley, i.e. the introduction of vehicles having more efficient engines and improved emission control systems, leading to a drop in the fraction of primary particles and of SIA (triggered by the reduced NO_x emissions). Regarding $PM_{10-2.5}$, results suggest that a significant decrease in primary coarse particulate emissions occurred up to recently, again due to a technology renewal in the vehicular fleet: most likely this latter is partly responsible for the drop in atmospheric PM_{10}

previously observed in the Po valley in the companion paper. Study outlooks include the assessment of the role of Secondary Organic Aerosol (SOA) and of emissions in neighbouring regions on the observed trends.

Acknowledgements. Authors acknowledge ARPA Emilia-Romagna, ARPA Lombardia, ARPA Piemonte and ARPA Veneto for providing the concentration data of atmospheric pollutants.

References

ACI: Where is the car gone? XX report ACI-CENSIS (in Italian), Tech. Rep. 20, Italian Automobile Club, Rome, Italy, http://www.aci.it/fileadmin/documenti/studi_e_ricerche/monografie_ricerche/RAPPORTI_ACI_CENSIS/ACI-CENSIS_2012.pdf, 2012.

Amato, F., Alastuey, A., de la Rosa, J., Gonzalez Castanedo, Y., Sánchez de la Campa, A. M., Pandolfi, M., Lozano, A., Contreras González, J., and Querol, X.: Trends of road dust emissions contributions on ambient air particulate levels at rural, urban and industrial sites in southern Spain, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 3533–3544, doi:10.5194/acp-14-3533-2014, 2014.

Andreani-Aksoyoglu, S., Prévôt, A. S. H., Baltensperger, U., Keller, J., and Dommen, J.: Modeling of formation and distribution of secondary aerosols in the Milan area (Italy), J. Geophys. Res., 109, doi:10.1029/2003JD004231, 2004.

Anttila, P. and Tuovinen, J.: Trends of primary and secondary pollutant concentrations in Finland in 1994 - 2007, Atmos. Environ., 44, 30 – 41, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.09.041, 2010.

Avery, C. L., Mills, K. T., Williams, R., McGraw, K. A., Poole, C., Smith, R. L., and Whitsel, E. A.: Estimating error in using ambient PM2.5 concentrations as proxies for personal exposures: a review, Epidemiology, 21, 215–223, doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181cb41f7, 2010.

Barmet, P., Kuster, T., Muhlbauer, A., and Lohmann, U.: Weekly cycle in particulate matter versus weekly cycle in precipitation over Switzerland, J. Geophys. Res., 114, D05 206, doi:10.1029/2008JD011192, 2009.

Barmpadimos, I., Hueglin, C., Keller, J., Henne, S., and Prévôt, A. S. H.: Influence of meteorology on PM_{10} trends and variability in Switzerland from 1991 to 2008, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 1813–1835, doi:10.5194/acp-11-1813-2011, 2011a.

Barmpadimos, I., Nufer, M., Oderbolz, D., Keller, J., Aksoyoglu, S., Hueglin, C., Baltensperger, U., and Prévôt, A.: The weekly cycle of ambient concentrations and traffic emissions of coarse (PM10–PM2.5) atmospheric particles, Atmos. Environ., 45, 4580 – 4590, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.05.068, 2011b.

Barmpadimos, I., Keller, J., Oderbolz, D., Hueglin, C., and Prévôt, A. S. H.: One decade of parallel fine ($PM_{2.5}$) and coarse (PM_{10}–$PM_{2.5}$) particulate matter measurements in Europe: trends and variability, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 3189–3203, doi:10.5194/acp-12-3189-2012, 2012.

Bigi, A. and Ghermandi, G.: Long-term trend and variability of atmospheric PM_{10} concentration in the Po Valley, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 4895–4907, doi:10.5194/acp-14-4895-2014, 2014.

Bigi, A., Ghermandi, G., and Harrison, R. M.: Analysis of the air pollution climate at a background site in the Po valley, J. Environ. Monitor., 14, 552–563, 2012.

Bigi, A., Bianchi, F., De Gennaro, G., Di Gilio, A., Fermo, P., Ghermandi, G., Prévôt, A. S. H., Urbani, M., Valli, G., Vecchi, R., and Piazzalunga, A.: Hourly composition of gas and particle phase pollutants at a central urban background site in Milan, Italy, Atmos. Res., accepted.

Boldo, E., Medina, S., Le Tertre, A., Hurley, F., Mücke, H.-G., Ballester, F., and Aguilera, I.: Apheis: Health Impact Assessment of Long-term Exposure to $PM_{2.5}$ in 23 European Cities, Eur. J. Epidemiol., 21, 449–458, doi:10.1007/s10654-006-9014-0, 2006.

Brockwell, P. J. and Davis, R. A.: Introduction to Time Series and Forecasting, Springer-Verlag, New York, USA, 2nd edn., 2002.

Carbone, C., Decesari, S., Mircea, M., Giulianelli, L., Finessi, E., Rinaldi, M., Fuzzi, S., Marinoni, A., Duchi, R., Perrino, C., Sargolini, T., Vardé, M., Sprovieri, F., Gobbi, G., Angelini, F., and Facchini, M.: Size-resolved aerosol chemical composition over the Italian Peninsula during typical summer and winter conditions, Atmos. Environ., 44, 5269 – 5278, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.08.008, 2010.

Cleveland, R. B., Cleveland, W. S., McRae, J., and Terpenning, I.: STL: a seasonal-trend decomposition procedure based on Loess, J. Off. Stat., 6, 3–33, 1990.

Cusack, M., Alastuey, A., Pérez, N., Pey, J., and Querol, X.: Trends of particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) and chemical composition at a regional background site in the Western Mediterranean over the last nine years (2002–2010), Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 8341–8357, doi:10.5194/acp-12-8341-2012, 2012.

Davison, A. and Hinkley, D.: Bootstrap Methods and Their Application, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 1997.

de Meij, A., Thunis, P., Bessagnet, B., and Cuvelier, C.: The sensitivity of the CHIMERE model to emissions reduction scenarios on air quality in Northern Italy, Atmos. Environ., 43, 1897 – 1907, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.12.036, 2009.

Denby, B., Sundvor, I., Cassiani, M., de Smet, P., de Leeuw, F., and Horálek, J.: Spatial mapping of Ozone and SO_2 trends in Europe, Sci. Total Environ., 408, 4795 – 4806, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.06.021, 2010.

Draxler, R. and Rolph, G.: HYSPLIT (HYbrid Single-Particle Lagrangian Integrated Trajectory), Model access via NOAA ARL READY Website (http://www.arl.noaa.gov/HYSPLIT.php), 2013.

EEA: Impact of selected policy measures on Europe's air quality, Tech. Rep. 8, EEA, 2010.

EEA: Dieselisation in the EEA, http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/figures/dieselisation-in-the-eea, 2015a.

EEA: Developments in fuel efficiency of an average car alongside trends in private car ownership and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/daviz/developments-in-fuel-efficiency-of-1/#parent-fieldname-title, 2015b.

Finardi, S., Silibello, C., D'Allura, A., and Radice, P.: Analysis of pollutants exchange between the Po Valley and the surrounding European region, Urban Clim., 10, Part 4, 682 – 702, doi:10.1016/j.uclim.2014.02.002, 2014.

Finlayson-Pitts, B. J. and Pitts, J. N.: Chemistry of the Upper and Lower Atmosphere, Academic Press, San Diego, USA, 2000.

Franklin, M., Zeka, A., and Schwartz, J.: Association between PM2. 5 and all-cause and specific-cause mortality in 27 US communities, J. Expo. Sci. Env. Epid., 17, 279–287, 2006.

Gilardoni, S., Vignati, E., Cavalli, F., Putaud, J. P., Larsen, B. R., Karl, M., Stenström, K., Genberg, J., Henne, S., and Dentener, F.: Better constraints on sources of carbonaceous aerosols using a combined [14]C – macro tracer analysis in a European rural background site, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 5685–5700, doi:10.5194/acp-11-5685-2011, 2011.

Gilardoni, S., Massoli, P., Giulianelli, L., Rinaldi, M., Paglione, M., Pollini, F., Lanconelli, C., Poluzzi, V., Carbone, S., Hillamo, R., Russell, L. M., Facchini, M. C., and Fuzzi, S.: Fog scavenging of organic and inorganic aerosol in the Po Valley, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 6967–6981, doi:10.5194/acp-14-6967-2014, 2014.

Giulianelli, L., Gilardoni, S., Tarozzi, L., Rinaldi, M., Decesari, S., Carbone, C., Facchini, M., and Fuzzi, S.: Fog occurrence and chemical composition in the Po valley over the last twenty years, Atmos. Environ., 98, 394 – 401, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.08.080, 2014.

Hicks, B., Artz, R., Meyers, T., and Hosker Jr., R.: Trends in eastern U.S. sulfur air quality from the Atmospheric Integrated Research Monitoring Network, J. Geophys. Res., 107, ACH 6–1 – ACH 6–12, 2002.

Jonson, J. E., Simpson, D., Fagerli, H., and Solberg, S.: Can we explain the trends in European ozone levels?, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 51–66, doi:10.5194/acp-6-51-2006, 2006.

Kaufman, L. and Rousseeuw, P. J.: Finding Groups in Data: an Introduction to Cluster Analysis, Wiley, New York, 1990.

Khan, M. B., Masiol, M., Formenton, G., Gilio, A. D., de Gennaro, G., Agostinelli, C., and Pavoni, B.: Carbonaceous $PM_{2.5}$ and secondary organic aerosol across the Veneto region (NE Italy), Sci. Total Environ., 542, Part A, 172 – 181, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.10.103, 2016.

Klimont, Z., Smith, S., and Cofala, J.: The last decade of global anthropogenic sulfur dioxide: 2000-2011 emissions, Environ. Res. Lett., 8, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/014003, 2013.

Larsen, B., Gilardoni, S., Stenström, K., Niedzialek, J., Jimenez, J., and Belis, C.: Sources for PM air pollution in the Po Plain, Italy: II. Probabilistic uncertainty characterization and sensitivity analysis of secondary and primary sources, Atmos. Environ., 50, 203 – 213, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.12.038, 2012.

Loomis, D., Grosse, Y., Lauby-Secretan, B., Ghissassi, F. E., Bouvard, V., Benbrahim-Tallaa, L., Guha, N., Baan, R., Mattock, H., and Straif, K.: The carcinogenicity of outdoor air pollution, Lancet Oncol., 13, 1262–1263, doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(13)70487-X, 2013.

Mann, M. E. and Lees, J. M.: Robust estimation of background noise and signal detection in climatic time series, Clim. Change, 33, 409–445, doi:10.1007/BF00142586, 1996.

Masiol, M., Benetello, F., Harrison, R. M., Formenton, G., Gaspari, F. D., and Pavoni, B.: Spatial, seasonal trends and transboundary transport of PM2.5 inorganic ions in the Veneto region (Northeastern Italy), Atmos. Environ., 117, 19 – 31, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.06.044, 2015.

Matta, E., Facchini, M. C., Decesari, S., Mircea, M., Cavalli, F., Fuzzi, S., Putaud, J.-P., and Dell'Acqua, A.: Mass closure on the chemical species in size-segregated atmospheric aerosol collected in an urban area of the Po Valley, Italy, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 3, 623–637, doi:10.5194/acp-3-623-2003, 2003.

Meyers, S. R.: Seeing red in cyclic stratigraphy: Spectral noise estimation for astrochronology, Paleoceanography, 27, PA3228, doi:10.1029/2012PA002307, 2012.

Ozgen, S., Caserini, S., Galante, S., Giugliano, M., Angelino, E., Marongiu, A., Hugony, F., Migliavacca, G., and Morreale, C.: Emission factors from small scale appliances burning wood and pellets, Atmos. Environ., 94, 144 – 153, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.05.032, 2014.

Perrino, C., Catrambone, M., Dalla Torre, S., Rantica, E., Sargolini, T., and Canepari, S.: Seasonal variations in the chemical composition of particulate matter: a case study in the Po Valley. Part I: macro-components and mass closure, Environ. Sci. Pollut. R., 21, 3999–4009, doi:10.1007/s11356-013-2067-1, 2013.

Perrone, M., Larsen, B., Ferrero, L., Sangiorgi, G., Gennaro, G. D., Udisti, R., Zangrando, R., Gambaro, A., and Bolzacchini, E.: Sources of high PM2.5 concentrations in Milan, Northern Italy: Molecular marker data and CMB modelling, Sci. Total Environ., 414, 343 – 355, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.11.026, 2012.

Piazzalunga, A., Belis, C., Bernardoni, V., Cazzuli, O., Fermo, P., Valli, G., and Vecchi, R.: Estimates of wood burning contribution to {PM} by the macro-tracer method using tailored emission factors, Atmos. Environ., 45, 6642 – 6649, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.09.008, 2011.

Pietrogrande, M. C., Bacco, D., Ferrari, S., Ricciardelli, I., Scotto, F., Trentini, A., and Visentin, M.: Characteristics and major sources of carbonaceous aerosols in PM2.5 in Emilia Romagna Region (Northern Italy) from four-year observations, Sci. Total Environ., 553, 172 – 183, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.02.074, 2016.

Putaud, J. P., Cavalli, F., Martins dos Santos, S., and Dell'Acqua, A.: Long-term trends in aerosol optical characteristics in the Po Valley, Italy, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 14, 9129–9136, doi:10.5194/acp-14-9129-2014, 2014.

R Core Team: R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, https://www.R-project.org/, 2015.

Simon, H., Reff, A., Wells, B., Xing, J., and Frank, N.: Ozone trends across the United States over a period of decreasing NO_x and VOC emissions, Environ Sci. Technol, 49, 186–195, doi:10.1021/es504514z, 2015.

Sørensen, M., Daneshvar, B., Hansen, M., Dragsted, L. O., Hertel, O., Knudsen, L., and Loft, S.: Personal PM2.5 exposure and markers of oxidative stress in blood, Environ. Health Persp., 111, 161–166, 2003.

Strand, M., Vedal, S., Rodes, C., Dutton, S. J., Gelfand, E. W., and Rabinovitch, N.: Estimating effects of ambient PM2.5 exposure on health using PM2.5 component measurements and regression calibration, J. Expo. Sci. Env. Epid., 16, 30–38, doi:10.1038/sj.jea.7500434, 2006.

Vestreng, V., Myhre, G., Fagerli, H., Reis, S., and Tarrasón, L.: Twenty-five years of continuous sulphur dioxide emission reduction in Europe, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 3663–3681, doi:10.5194/acp-7-3663-2007, 2007.

5   Wilson, R. C., Fleming, Z. L., Monks, P. S., Clain, G., Henne, S., Konovalov, I. B., Szopa, S., and Menut, L.: Have primary emission reduction measures reduced ozone across Europe? An analysis of European rural background ozone trends 1996–2005, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 437–454, doi:10.5194/acp-12-437-2012, 2012.

Yue, S. and Pilon, P.: A comparison of the power of the t test, Mann-Kendall and bootstrap tests for trend detection, Hydrol. Sci. J., 49, 21–37, doi:10.1623/hysj.49.1.21.53996, 2004.

Table 1. Analysed $PM_{2.5}$ sampling sites for trend and for extended statistical analysis. All sites have been active up to January 2015. At boldfaced stations also PM_{10} data were available. Station type lookup: UT – urban traffic, UI – urban industrial, UB – urban background, SuB – suburban background, RB – rural background. [*] This UB station is different from the UB station analysed in Bigi and Ghermandi (2014) for the same city. [§] This station was relocated in January 2014.

ID	Station name	Station type	Activation date
	Trend analyis data set		
1	Besenzone	RB	Jan 2008
2	**Borgofranco**	SuB	Dec 2006
3	**Brescia V. Sereno**	UB	Jun 2006
4	**Calusco d'Adda**	SuB	Jun 2006
5	**Casirate d'Adda**	RB	Nov 2005
6	Castano Primo	UB	Mar 2007
7	Chivasso	SuB	Jan 2005
8	Cornale	RB	Feb 2006
9	Leinì	SuB	Aug 2006
10	**Lodi**	UT	Jul 2006
11	**Mantua S. Agnese**	UB	Dec 2007
12	**Merate**	UT	Sep 2006
13	**Milan**	UB	Jun 2007
14	Modena*	UB	Oct 2007
15	Mortara	UI	Dec 2007
16	Padua Mandria§	UB	Jan 2005
17	**Parma**	UB	Jan 2008
18	**Ponti sul Mincio**	SuB	Jan 2007
19	**Reggio Emilia**	UB	Oct 2007
20	**Rimini**	UB	Jan 2006
21	**Saronno**	UB	Dec 2005
22	**Schivenoglia**	RB	Dec 2006
23	Seriate	UB	Nov 2005
24	**Turin Lingotto**	UB	Jul 2005
	Extended analysis data set		
25	Alessandria Volta	UB	Feb 2011
26	Ballirana	RB	Jul 2008
27	Bergamo Meucci	UB	Dec 2008
28	Biella Sturzo	UB	Jun 2010
29	Bologna G.M.	UB	May 2008
30	Bologna P.S.F.	UT	Jan 2009
31	Faenza	UB	Apr 2009
32	Ferrara	UB	Nov 2008
33	Forlì	UB	May 2008
34	Gavello	RB	Jun 2008
35	Guastalla	RB	May 2008
36	Jolanda di Savoia	RB	Mar 2009
37	Langhirano	RB	Mar 2008
38	Novara	UB	Apr 2010
39	Piacenza	UB	Sep 2009
40	San Clemente	RB	May 2008
41	San Pietro C.	RB	Jan 2009
42	Turin Caduti	SuB	May 2010
43	Vercelli	SuB	May 2010
44	Vinchio	RB	Jan 2009

Table 2. Analysis of trend for monthly mean and for monthly frequency of $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$. Slope ($\pm$ standard error) for monthly mean is computed by Generalized Least Squares (GLS) on deseasonalized monthly mean time series of daily $PM_{2.5}$ or $PM_{10-2.5}$ concentration. Boldfaced values indicate slope significantly different from zero at a 95 % confidence level. Variation in monthly frequency distribution was estimated by Theil-Sen method.

Station	Slope $\mu g\,m^{-3}\,yr^{-1}$	Change $\%\,yr^{-1}$	Months with significant trend
		PM2.5	
Besenzone	-0.008 ± 0.121	$0.0\% \pm 0.5\%$	5–6 (–), 12 (–)
Borgofranco	$\mathbf{-1.007 \pm 0.139}$	$\mathbf{-3.7\% \pm 0.5\%}$	1–2 (–), 4 (–), 10 (–)
Brescia	$\mathbf{-1.323 \pm 0.249}$	$\mathbf{-4.3\% \pm 0.8\%}$	1–2 (–), 3 (+), 5–6 (–), 12 (–)
Calusco d'Adda	$\mathbf{-1.428 \pm 0.183}$	$\mathbf{-5.4\% \pm 0.7\%}$	1–2 (–), 4–5 (–), 7 (–), 9 (–), 11–12 (–)
Casirate d'Adda	$\mathbf{-1.035 \pm 0.395}$	$\mathbf{-3.2\% \pm 1.2\%}$	1 (–), 11 (–)
Castano Primo	$\mathbf{-2.217 \pm 0.177}$	$\mathbf{-8.1\% \pm 0.7\%}$	1–2 (–), 4 (–), 10 (–), 12 (–)
Chivasso	$\mathbf{-0.411 \pm 0.174}$	$\mathbf{-1.3\% \pm 0.6\%}$	1–3 (–), 6 ($\pm$), 9–11 (–)
Cornale	$\mathbf{-0.953 \pm 0.262}$	$\mathbf{-4.5\% \pm 1.3\%}$	1–2 (–), 4 (–), 9–10 (–)
Leinì	-1.899 ± 0.969	$-6.7\% \pm 3.4\%$	1–5 (–), 7 (–), 11–12 (–)
Lodi	$\mathbf{-1.605 \pm 0.124}$	$\mathbf{-6.4\% \pm 0.5\%}$	2–12 (–)
Mantua	$\mathbf{-1.090 \pm 0.269}$	$\mathbf{-3.7\% \pm 0.9\%}$	2 (–), 3 ($\pm$), 4–5 (–), 9–12 (–)
Merate	$\mathbf{-1.322 \pm 0.427}$	$\mathbf{-4.6\% \pm 1.5\%}$	1 (–), 4–5 (–), 9–10 (–)
Milan	-0.186 ± 0.154	$-0.6\% \pm 0.5\%$	1–2 (–), 3–4 (+), 9 (–), 10 ($\pm$), 12 (–)
Modena	$\mathbf{-1.007 \pm 0.402}$	$\mathbf{-4.8\% \pm 1.9\%}$	1 (–), 5–6 (–), 8–11 (–)
Mortara	$\mathbf{-1.439 \pm 0.214}$	$\mathbf{-5.5\% \pm 0.8\%}$	1–2 (–), 4–5 (–), 8 (–), 10 (–)
Padua	$\mathbf{-1.271 \pm 0.155}$	$\mathbf{-3.9\% \pm 0.5\%}$	1 (–), 3 (–), 11 (–)
Parma	$\mathbf{-0.648 \pm 0.176}$	$\mathbf{-3.2\% \pm 0.9\%}$	1 (–), 3 (+), 5 (–), 12 (–)
Ponti sul Mincio	-0.103 ± 0.212	$-0.4\% \pm 0.8\%$	2 (–), 3 (+), 4 (+), 9 (+), 10 (–), 12 (–)
Reggio Emilia	$\mathbf{-0.819 \pm 0.153}$	$\mathbf{-3.8\% \pm 0.7\%}$	1–2 (–), 3 (+), 5 (–), 12 (–)
Rimini	-0.486 ± 0.245	$-2.2\% \pm 1.1\%$	2 (–), 3 (+)
Saronno	$\mathbf{-0.844 \pm 0.156}$	$\mathbf{-3.0\% \pm 0.5\%}$	1–2 (–), 5 (–), 12 (–)
Schivenoglia	$\mathbf{-0.496 \pm 0.224}$	$\mathbf{-1.9\% \pm 0.8\%}$	1–2 (–), 4 (–), 8 (+), 10–11 (–)
Seriate	$\mathbf{-0.935 \pm 0.075}$	$\mathbf{-3.5\% \pm 0.3\%}$	1 (–), 5 (–), 7 (–), 10 (–), 12 (–)
Turin L.	$\mathbf{-1.717 \pm 0.270}$	$\mathbf{-5.2\% \pm 0.8\%}$	1–2 (–), 4–5 (–), 7 (–), 9–11 (–)
		$PM_{10-2.5}$	
Lodi	-0.362 ± 0.248	$-2.2\% \pm 1.5\%$	1–2 (–), 4($\pm$), 10(–)
Merate	-0.806 ± 0.280	$-6.3\% \pm 2.2\%$	1–12 (–)

Table 3. Analysis of trend for annual quantiles of $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{10-2.5}$. Slope for annual quantiles is computed by the Theil–Sen method: boldface values indicate slope significantly different from zero at the 95 % confidence level.

Station	5th annual quantile		50th annual quantile		95th annual quantile	
	Slope	Change	Slope	Change	Slope	Change
	$\mu g\,m^{-3}\,yr^{-1}$	$\%\,yr^{-1}$	$\mu g\,m^{-3}\,yr^{-1}$	$\%\,yr^{-1}$	$\mu g\,m^{-3}\,yr^{-1}$	$\%\,yr^{-1}$
	$PM_{2.5}$					
Besenzone	0.000	0.0	0.000	0.0	0.608	1.1
Borgofranco	-0.667	-8.3	**−1.000**	**−4.8**	-1.087	-1.8
Brescia	-0.250	-4.1	-0.367	-1.5	**−2.272**	**−3.0**
Calusco d'Adda	**−0.792**	**−13.1**	**−1.333**	**−7.0**	**−4.179**	**−6.1**
Casirate d'Adda	-0.225	-2.7	-0.225	-1.0	**−3.917**	**−4.9**
Castano Primo	-0.286	-4.9	-0.857	-4.6	-3.421	-5.4
Chivasso	0.200	3.7	**−0.817**	**−3.2**	-1.531	-2.0
Cornale	**−0.500**	**−8.5**	**−1.000**	**−6.5**	**−4.383**	**−9.4**
Leinì	-0.100	-2.4	-2.333	-13.2	-10.800	-17.9
Lodi	**−0.929**	**−12.2**	**−2.000**	**−10.3**	-1.875	-3.2
Mantua	-0.412	-6.4	-2.000	-8.1	-4.225	-6.0
Merate	-0.081	-1.0	-0.667	-3.0	-1.646	-2.3
Milan	0.000	0.0	0.200	0.9	-3.260	-4.3
Modena	-0.333	-5.4	-1.200	-7.7	-4.000	-7.6
Mortara	**−0.930**	**−12.9**	-1.000	-5.2	-2.988	-4.7
Padua	**−0.380**	**−4.4**	**−1.583**	**−6.6**	**−2.556**	**−3.0**
Parma	**−0.500**	**−10.0**	**−0.667**	**−4.5**	-1.000	-2.0
Ponti sul Mincio	0.071	1.3	0.000	0.0	-1.037	-1.7
Reggio Emilia	**−0.400**	**−6.7**	-0.500	-3.0	-1.850	-3.7
Rimini	-0.025	-0.5	0.000	0.0	-0.787	-1.4
Saronno	**−0.950**	**−23.8**	-0.414	-2.1	**−3.587**	**−4.7**
Schivenoglia	0.000	0.0	0.500	2.3	-1.450	-2.5
Seriate	-0.208	-3.7	-0.500	-2.5	**−2.875**	**−4.1**
Turin L.	-0.134	-2.2	**−1.083**	**−4.8**	**−3.568**	**−4.1**
	$PM_{10-2.5}$					
Borgofranco	**−0.500**	**−60.0**	0.000	0.0	1.060	5.4
Brescia	-0.025	-5.4	**−0.775**	**−8.2**	**−1.619**	**−6.7**
Calusco d'Adda	0.000	0.0	0.000	0.0	0.000	0.0
Casirate d'Adda	-0.250	-16.7	-0.375	-3.8	-1.900	-6.8
Lodi	-0.100	-2.7	-0.200	-1.6	-0.180	-0.5
Mantua	0.000	0.0	-0.550	-8.7	-1.667	-9.2
Merate	**−0.500**	**−12.1**	**−0.917**	**−8.4**	**−2.417**	**−9.2**
Milan	**−0.333**	**−23.3**	-0.750	-6.4	-1.167	-4.3
Parma	0.738	23.4	0.000	0.0	0.217	0.9
Ponti sul Mincio	**−0.667**	**−29.9**	**−1.400**	**−14.4**	**−2.310**	**−9.6**
Reggio Emilia	0.000	0.0	-0.333	-3.7	**−1.367**	**−6.6**
Rimini	**−0.500**	**−14.2**	**−0.750**	**−7.6**	-1.538	-7.9
Saronno	**−0.250**	**−25.0**	**−0.536**	**−5.8**	-1.434	-6.1
Schivenoglia	-0.492	-55.2	-0.292	-4.4	1.673	8.9
Turin L	0.000	0.0	-0.600	-6.5	-1.000	-4.3

Figure 1. Location of $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring stations included in the analysis. The key for ID number is found in Table 1. Colour coding refers to the result of the cluster analysis performed using a divisive algorithm, i.e. sites within the same cluster have the same colour. Site 28 (Biella) resulted in an outlier and was not included in this classification. Results of the cluster analysis with partition around medoids algorithm are in Figure S3. More details are in sections 2.3 and 3.3.

Figure 2. STL decomposition for monthly mean $PM_{2.5}$ along with Generalized Least Squares (GLS) fitted slope for two selected sites.

Figure 3. Significant changes in monthly frequency distribution of $PM_{2.5}$ at Milan **(a)** and Mortara **(b)**.

Figure 4. Boxplot of absolute and percentage significant slope of deseasonalized monthly mean $PM_{2.5}$ by station type.