

Interactive comment on “The $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ values of simultaneously collected atmospheric nitrates from anthropogenic sources – Implications for polluted air masses” by Martine M. Savard et al.

Martine M. Savard et al.

martinem.savard@canada.ca

Received and published: 19 February 2018

Comment 1: Title: I find the title to be somewhat misleading specifically “from anthropogenic sources – Implications for polluted air masses” As written this title implies direct plume emissions were sampled rather than air mass originating from anthropogenic emission regions. Due to the numerous sampling sites, I think the authors should instead highlight that this work is spatially-resolved.

REP – We can modify the title to: “The D17O and d18O values of simultaneously collected atmospheric nitrates from anthropogenic air masses”

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Comment 2: Intro: I think the introduction could use a better framework. If speciating $\text{HNO}_3(\text{g})$ and p-NO_3^- is a main motivation of this study (however likely not achieved), then I think the introduction needs to have a better critical analysis of $\text{HNO}_3(\text{g})$ and p-NO_3^- dynamics in the atmosphere. What might $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ of speciated nitrate tell the atmospheric community that isn't already known? Will this speciated work shed light into their separate formation pathways or will the phase separation reflect the inorganic thermodynamics of trace gases and PM driven by RH, temperature, [sulfate], [ammonia], etc.

REP – We can do that in the final version.

Comment 3: Sampling Methodology: I think it would be useful to quantitatively demonstrate that the collected nitrate truly originated from the targeted upwind region. Specifically, the lifetimes both for NO_x oxidation to nitrate and nitrate lifetime should be considered. Based on these lifetimes, how much of the sampled nitrate reasonable originated from NO_x oxidized from the upwind region? Was the emitted NO_x converted to nitrate from these emission regions are is the sampled nitrate a mixture of “background” nitrate originated from NO_x emitted further upwind that the targeted region due to a relatively long nitrate lifetime (3-5 days). I think this is incredible important especially considered the sampling distance from the targeted sources (1 to 125 km).

REP – We aimed at isolating emissions from sources at their respective location, with the emissions subject to some atmospheric processing (i.e., not stack sampling). By necessity, it is clear that background contributed to the sampled load, but not in significant proportions. For comparison, background particle nitrate and nitric acid concentrations at Wood Buffalo National Park in northern Alberta, where CAPMoN began sampling in 2014, averaged 0.071 and $0.089 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$, respectively, for >2 years of monitoring. Concentrations from the conditional sampling at the sampling sites studied here were 4-40 times higher, suggesting that the collected samples have greater p-NO_3^- and HNO_3 concentrations than background. Moreover, back trajectory runs using the HYSPLIT model for every hour of sampling served to rule out significant air mass transfer

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

from other potential emission sources outside of the targeted wind sector, as discussed in section 2.2 of the original article.

Comment 4 (MAJOR): Sampling Protocols: I'm not convinced that nitrate speciation (HNO_3 and p-NO_3^-) was actually achieved with the sampling filter pack method. The problem, as the authors have pointed out, that the collected p-NO_3^- can easily volatilize as HNO_3 that is collected on the filter designated for $\text{HNO}_3(\text{g})$ collection. Additionally, there is the possibility of gaseous reactions on the PM filter especially as the filter accumulates PM. The authors point out that they don't expect volatilization of p-NO_3^- to play a major role on their results because p-NO_3^- isotope ratios are higher during winter than during summer and that the difference between p-NO_3^- and HNO_3 is opposite than expected, but this is not proper justification. First, I wonder what the expected p-NO_3^- and HNO_3 isotope difference is? This process is likely driven by an equilibrium effect rather than a kinetic effect since the volatilization of p-NO_3^- as HNO_3 is due to the system being at non-equilibrium. I think this would change the authors expectation that the difference p-NO_3^- and HNO_3 is driven by a kinetic effect (I assumed this was the authors assumption). Additionally, which "isotopic ratios" did the authors use to evaluate the p-NO_3^- and HNO_3 difference? I'm assuming mass-dependent $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ but this information is not provided in text. Also, suggesting that this filter pack method has previously been used for isotopic analysis of p-NO_3^- and HNO_3 (Elliot et al., 2009) does not mean the sampling method is correct and optimal for this isotopic analysis. Elliot et al., 2009 did not quantify this method for phase separation for isotopic analysis; thus, this argument should not be used to justify the work in this manuscript. Also, there is a general lack of information regarding the authors sampling protocols. What types of filters were used (and size)? How were these filters prepared and processed? Were field and laboratory blanks taken? At what flow rates was sampling conducted? How was the requirement that sample air volumes be within 15% quantitatively determined and could the authors elaborate on the experienced flow problems, specifically was this related to mechanical malfunctions or filter build-up? If samplers were placed out for an extended period of time, how might potential for passive $\text{HNO}_3(\text{g})$ absorption on

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



the Nylon filter play a role in their results?

REP - A potential complication from the air sampling method could arise if there was significant dissociation of ammonium nitrate on the particle filter into nitric acid and ammonia, with subsequent collection on the downstream nitric acid and ammonia filters. This may result in isotopic fractionation between the particle and gaseous components (Heaton et al., 1997; Kundu et al., 2010). For instance, ammonium nitrate formed on the Teflon particle filters may dissociate and release NH_3 and HNO_3 , particularly with changes in the ambient temperature and humidity. In that equilibrium process, the p- NH_4^+ and p- NO_3^- remaining on the Teflon filters would preferentially retain ^{15}N , and ^{15}N -depleted HNO_3 and NH_3 would accumulate on the downstream nylon and citrated Whatman filters. This phenomenon could generate artificially low $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in HNO_3 and NH_3 and high values in the particulate ions. At higher temperature, the effect should increase due to enhanced volatilization, assuming that the effect of temperature on the solid/gas or solution/gas equilibrium is larger than the effect of temperature on the fractionation factor of the atmospheric reactions (typically smaller as the temperature increases; Savard et al., 2017; Atm Env). In the present study, when all source types are considered, or when several data from a single source are examined, the opposite relationship is observed; NH_4 $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values are low at higher temperature (10 to 20 C), and high at low temperature (-10 to 0 C). In contrast, the NH_3 values are slightly higher or practically unchanged at high temperature. In addition, there is no observed systematic change of HNO_3 $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values with temperature. We therefore conclude that any dissociation of ammonium nitrate from the Teflon filter did not significantly alter the isotopic values in the samples. While we acknowledge that small part of the HNO_3 is may derive from volatilized p- NO_3 , as discussed in the last paragraph of section 3.1 of the submitted article, fractionation during this process would be negligible during winter sampling and bias the HNO_3 $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ values low relative to p- NO_3 in summer, while the observations showed the opposite seasonal pattern (Figure 3 of submitted article). In addition, this would be a mass-dependent process and therefore have no effect on the $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ signals.

C4

To wrap up, both $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ values suggest that the data set is valid: dissociation of ammonium nitrate and volatilization are reduced to a minimum during winter (below 0°C), and these processes cannot create the $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ trends observed during summer.

Comment 5: Analytical procedures: I also mind a general lack of information in the analytical procedures. First, how were concentrations measured? Importantly, was nitrite detected and removed from the samples? Even if NO_2^- was minor say 5% relative to NO_3^- , due to its rapid exchange with water below pH of 10, this could have artificially lowered the measured $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ of the interpreted $\text{HNO}_3(\text{g})$ or p- NO_3^- . As an example, a 5% NO_2^- contribution would have lowered the $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ of the targeted nitrate (assuming $\delta^{17}\text{O} \sim 30\text{‰}$ by 1.5‰ and could be the primary driver behind the $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ difference in the “speciated” nitrate. Additionally, which chemical conversion method was used? Azide/Acetic Acid Buffer? If so, please cite the appropriate references (i.e. McIlvin and Altabet, 2005). How might using the long-form $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ definition ($\ln(1+d^{17}\text{O}/1000) - 0.516 \cdot \ln(1+d^{18}\text{O}/1000)$) impact the authors comparison to data using the more commonly used linear $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ definition ($d^{17}\text{O} - 0.52 \cdot d^{18}\text{O}$) (i.e. Table 4)?

REP – We can expand the analytical description as follows: We characterized the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ratios of NH_3 , w- NH_4 , p- NH_4 and NO_x , and the triple isotopic ratios ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{17}\text{O}$, $\delta^{18}\text{O}$) of w- NO_3 , HNO_3 and p- NO_3^- . The present article deals solely with the $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ values obtained for oxidized species. We treated the samples with the chemical conversion and thermal decomposition of N_2O protocols, providing the ability to simultaneously analyze low-concentration N- and O-containing species (Smirnov et al., 2012). The different preparation steps involved conversion of ammonium-containing and nitrate-containing samples into nitrite (NO_2^-), using sodium bromate and bromide, and a cadmium column, respectively. The final preparation step involved using sodium azide to ultimately produce N_2O (Smirnov et al., 2012). In addition to these procedures, which prepared samples for the NH_3 , NH_4 , NO_x , p- NO_3^- , and precipitation NO_3 isotopic analyses, HNO_3 samples collected on nylon filters were treated as well. They were reduced to NO_2^- using the Cd-column before being converted into N_2O .

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

NO₂ resin cartridges and NO filters were sealed and shipped to Maxxam, along with field blanks, for extraction by a proprietary method. The resulting solutions of NO₂- were converted into N₂O using sodium azide (for details consult Smirnov et al., 2012). All extracted N₂O was analyzed with the pre-concentration/gold furnace-IRMS system developed at the Geological Survey of Canada (Smirnov et al., 2012). This approach allows the spectrum of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ ratios from O-bearing N-species to be determined in samples containing as little as 37.5 nmol of N (15 mL final solution). The USGS-34, USGS-35, USGS-32 nitrate reference materials were used and processed exactly the same way as the samples, i.e., converted from nitrate to nitrite, then to N₂O. The laboratory analytical precision (average of replicates) determined during the present study using the described analytical procedures was 0.6 ‰ for $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ values in gaseous (n=12) and solid nitrates (n=20). For w-NO₃, analytical duplicates gave 0.6 and 0.5 ‰ for $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ (n=3) and $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ (n=4) values, respectively. The $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ values are defined as $\ln(1+\delta^{17}\text{O}/1000) - 0.516 \times \ln(1+\delta^{18}\text{O}/1000)$, relative to Vienna Standard Mean Ocean (VSMOW).

Comment 6: Sections 3.2-3.3: I'm a little unsure as to why the authors are spending so much time on the $\delta^{18}\text{O} + \delta^{17}\text{O}$ "source effect". Their collections were from polluted air masses not direct stack emissions, such that $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ should effectively be wiped of any "source effect" due to the rapid equilibration of NO_x and its oxidants. The authors suggest in 3.2, that due to elevated $\delta^{18}\text{O} + \delta^{17}\text{O}$ there isn't a source effect (this is not surprising or a novel finding but expected), but extend the discussion of source effects in 3.3 despite ruling them out in 3.2. This seems a bit odd to me, and I think it would serve this manuscript better to simplify these sections into 1, removing source effect discussions. Instead the authors should focus on the unique oxidation chemistries of the polluted air masses to understand how differences in NO_x oxidation cycling and post NO₂ reactions would have altered $\delta^{18}\text{O} + \delta^{17}\text{O}$ rather than a source derived $\delta^{18}\text{O} + \delta^{17}\text{O}$ effect, but again this is complicated as previously mentioned because of the nitrate lifetime problem. We don't know that the nitrate sampled is from the targeted source area.

REP – The final version of the article will show former Figure 1 in supplementary information (replaced in article by a location map), remove the emphasis previously put on the individual sources, and merge together sections 3.2 and former section 3.3 (for which the length is now much reduced).

Comment 7 (MAJOR): (a) Section 4.1: The Alberta nitrate NO_3^- and NO_2^- relationships appear linear despite the author's claim to the contrary. Can the authors include regression statistics so that their argument is supported quantitatively rather than qualitatively?

REP – If the reviewer refers to Figure 2, data per seasons are not numerous enough to play with statistics. However this is a very minor point and the sentence can be erased without consequences.

(b) Much of the authors NO_3^- range calculations and justifications are ad hoc. Can the authors properly justify their assumptions made in this calculation, specifically “50% contribution from each pathway for summer”?

REP – This assumption is just meant to help present alternatives. We do not claim that 50% is the proportion applicable for the collected samples.

(c) Additionally, can the authors propagate the error made in the suggested NO_3^- ranges? The authors indicate that the NO_3^- range “shrinks” during winter but their calculations indicate a larger range during the winter (winter: 26 to 37‰ summer: 20 to 29‰).

REP – The “shrinks” referred to the wider range estimated from the extreme cases discussed earlier in the paragraph (100% from the OH pathway or 100% for the N_2O_5 pathway; 25-45‰ for winter samples). This can be clarified.

(d) The authors conclusion that NO_3^- of NO_2 is not equal to the asymmetrical O_3 is not new but rather expected, due to VOC oxidation contributions that have an NO oxidation branching ratio of 70 to 80%. Perhaps the authors should retry their calculations

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

utilizing a more realistic approximated $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ of NO_2 . Also, could the authors compare their $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ in this region with the global $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ model?

REP – The goal of the calculation was to constrain the source NO_2 $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ values based on those of nitrate, and it is not clear what the reviewer is suggesting. Use an approximate value of NO_2 $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ to calculate the contributions from the different NO_2 oxidation pathways in different samples? That would require assuming the NO_2 $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ value was constant, which would also be unrealistic. The contribution of RO_2 oxidation of NO is discussed in the paragraph following the calculation. The nitrate $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ are compared with the global model in section 4.4; NO_2 $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ was not explicitly mapped in Alexander et al. (2009) for comparison.

(e) Again, the calculated transit times of 9 minutes to 4 hours, indicates that not all of the sampled nitrate is derived from the targeted upwind region due to the chemical lifetimes of NO_x and atmospheric lifetime of nitrate. I find it hard to believe any of the interpretation on $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ differences between p-NO_3^- and $\text{HNO}_3(\text{g})$ because this speciation was likely not truly achieved given the method concerns already raised in this review and others. I recommend that this speciation discussion should be removed and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ interpretation should focus on total nitrate relative to wet-nitrate (which was hardly discussed in this manuscript!)

REP – See reply to comment 4.

Comment 8: In general, I find the figures and tables difficult to read and interrupt (especially Figs. 3 and 4)

REP - We are planning to remove Figure 4 (see reply I to reviewer II) and willing to make the necessary changes to Figure 3 so it becomes easy to read.

Comment 9: The authors findings that meteorological parameters often correlate with HNO_3 , p-NO_3^- and their isotopic compositions isn't surprising (particularly phase separation) due to the well-established thermodynamic equilibrium of HNO_3 and p-NO_3^-

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

that determines this phase separation. This point however, directly contradicts that authors claim that reaction pathways (i.e. $\text{NO}_2 + \text{OH}$ vs N_2O_5 heterogenous rxn) had a significant role on the observed speciation and isotopic composition in Section 4.1.

REP – Thermodynamic equilibrium will contribute to change the $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ values, but not the $\Delta^{17}\text{O}$ signals.

Comment 10: Overall, I'm not convinced that during the summer, source effects lowered the anthropogenic originating nitrate $\delta^{17}\text{O}$ values. The simplest explanation for this observation should be NO oxidation contributions from RO_2 . Until the authors can explicitly rule out the "oxidation chemistry effect" by modeling or empirical evidence, I don't think the authors suggested conclusion should be drawn.

REP – The RO_2 oxidation contribution is not ruled out, but we believe it is valuable to raise an alternative hypothesis in order to spur further testing

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2017-1103>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)