Aerosol Surface Area Concentration: a Governing Factor for New Particle Formation in Beijing

Runlong Cai[1,#], Dongsen Yang[2,#], Yueyun Fu[1], Xing Wang[2], Xiaoxiao Li[1], Yan Ma[2], Jiming Hao[1], Jun Zheng[2*] and Jingkun Jiang[1*]

[1]State Key Joint Laboratory of Environment Simulation and Pollution Control, School of Environment, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China

[2]Collaborative Innovation Center of Atmospheric Environment and Equipment Technology, Nanjing University of Information Science & Technology, Nanjing 210044, China

#: Runlong Cai and Dongsen Yang contribute equally to this work

*: *Correspondence to*: J. Jiang (jiangjk@tsinghua.edu.cn) and J. Zheng (zheng.jun@nuist.edu.cn)

Abstract. The predominating role of aerosol Fuchs surface area, A_{Fuchs}, in determining the occurrence of new particle formation (NPF) events in Beijing was elucidated in this study. The analysis was based on a field campaign from March 12th to April 6th, 2016, in Beijing, during which aerosol size distributions down to ~1 nm and sulfuric acid concentrations were simultaneously monitored. The 26 days were classified into 11 typical NPF days, 2 undefined days, and 13 non-event days. A dimensionless factor, L_Γ, characterized by the relative ratio of the coagulation scavenging rate over the condensational growth rate (Kuang et al., 2010), was applied in this work to reveal the governing factors for NPF events in Beijing. The three parameters determining L_Γ are sulfuric acid concentration, the growth enhancement factor characterized by contribution of other gaseous precursors to particle growth, Γ, and A_{Fuchs}. Different from other atmospheric environments such as in Boulder and Hyytiälä, daily maximum sulfuric acid concentration and Γ in Beijing varied in a narrow range with geometric standard deviations of 1.40 and 1.31, respectively. A positive correlation between the estimated new particle formation rate, $J_{1.5}$, and sulfuric acid concentration was found with a mean fitted exponent of 2.4. However, the maximum sulfuric acid concentrations on NPF days were not significantly higher (even lower, sometime) than those on non-event days, indicating that the abundance of sulfuric acid in Beijing was high enough to initiate nucleation, but may not necessarily lead into NPF events. Instead, A_{Fuchs} in Beijing varied greatly among days with a geometric standard deviation of 2.56, while that in Tecamac, Atlanta, and Boulder were reported to be much less variable. In addition, there was a good correlation between A_{Fuchs} and L_Γ in Beijing ($R^2 = 0.88$). Therefore, it was A_{Fuchs} that fundamentally determined the occurrence of NPF events. Among 11 observed NPF events, 10 events occurred when A_{Fuchs} was smaller than 200 $\mu m^2/cm^3$. NPF events were suppressed due to the coagulation scavenging when A_{Fuchs} was greater than 200 $\mu m^2/cm^3$. Measured A_{Fuchs} in Beijing was in good correlation with its PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration ($R^2 = 0.85$) since A_{Fuchs} in Beijing was mainly determined by particles in the size range of 50 – 500 nm that also contribute to the PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration.

1 Introduction

New particle formation (NPF) is closely related to atmospheric environment. It is a common atmospheric phenomenon, which has been observed all over the world (Kulmala et al., 2004). High concentrations of ultrafine particles are formed intensively during NPF events. It has been illustrated through both theoretical modelling and field observations that these ultrafine particles can grow and serve as cloud condensation nuclei (Kuang et al., 2009; Spracklen et al., 2008), and thus affect climate (IPCC, 2013). The increased number concentration of ultrafine particles also raises concerns on human health (HEI, 2013).

New particles are formed by nucleation from gaseous precursors such as sulfuric acid, ammonia, and organics. Newly formed particles either grow by condensation or are lost by coagulation with other particles (McMurry, 1983). Aerosol Fuchs surface area, A_{Fuchs}, is a parameter that describes the coagulation scavenging effect quantitatively. In addition to gaseous precursors participating in nucleation and subsequent condensational growth, it has been a consensus that the occurrence of a NPF event is also limited by A_{Fuchs}, because the survival possibility of nucleated particles is suppressed when the coagulation scavenging effect is significant (Weber et al., 1997; Kerminen et al., 2001; Kuang et al., 2012). Reported average A_{Fuchs} (or in the form of condensation sink) on NPF days was found to be lower than that on non-event days at several locations (Dal Maso et al., 2005; Gong et al., 2010; Qi et al., 2015).

A dimensionless criterion, L_Γ, was proposed to characterize the ratio of particle scavenging loss rate over condensational growth rate, and to predict the occurrence of NPF events in diverse atmospheric environments (Kuang et al., 2010). By definition, L_Γ is determined by three factors, i.e., sulfuric acid concentration, the growth enhancement factor representing contribution of other gaseous precursors in addition to sulfuric acid, Γ, and A_{Fuchs}. Diurnal sulfuric acid can vary drastically diurnal variation due to the substantial change in radiation (e.g., from several thousand to ~1.5×10^6 #/cm^3 in this campaign) and the increase in sulfuric acid concentration after the sunrise can potentially lead to nucleation. The values of A_{Fuchs}, however, were usually reported within a narrow range at locations such as Tecamac, Atlanta and Boulder (Kuang et al., 2010). Sulfuric acid concentration in Atlanta and Hyytiälä can differ significantly among days (Eisele et al., 2006; Petäjä et al., 2009). Therefore, sulfuric acid often governs nucleation and subsequent growth in the sulfur-rich atmosphere such as in Atlanta (McMurry et al., 2005). The growth enhancement factor, Γ, at Hyytiälä varied in a wide range while those at Tecamac and Boulder were found in a relatively narrow range.

Aerosol concentrations in Beijing are usually much higher than those in clean environments. The annual average PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration in 2016 was 73 µg/m^3 (reported by Beijing Municipal Environmental Protection Bureau), and the average A_{Fuchs} measured in Beijing by this campaign was 381.5 µm^2/cm^3, which is approximately a magnitude higher than those measured in clean environments such as in Hyytiälä (Dal Maso et al., 2002). Different from comparatively slow

2

accumulation and depletion process of aerosol concentrations in clean environments, A_{Fuchs} in Beijing may change rapidly because of changes in air mass origins (Wehner et al., 2008) or accumulation of pollutants.

Sulfuric acid concentration is needed to estimate L_Γ and direct measurement of particle size distribution down to ~1 nm will help to better quantify NPF events. Although sulfuric acid has been measured around the world (Erupe et al., 2010) and the analysis based on sub-3 nm size distributions have been conducted sporadically since the development of diethylene glycol scanning mobility particle spectrometer (DEG-SMPS, Jiang et al., 2011a; Jiang et al., 2011b; Kuang et al., 2012) and particle size magnifier (PSM, Vanhanen et al., 2011; Kulmala et al., 2013), there are limited data on atmospheric sulfuric acid concentrations and directly measured sub-3 nm particle size distributions in China. A campaign in Beijing during 2008 Olympic Games (Yue et al., 2010; Zheng et al., 2011) characterized atmospheric sulfuric acid concentration and its correlation with new particle formation rate. The exponent in the correlation of formation rate, J_3, with sulfuric acid was found to be 2.3. The exponent for correlating derived $J_{1.5}$ with sulfuric acid was 2.7 (Wang et al., 2011). They were different from the exponents between 1 and 2 often reported in other places around the world (Riipinen et al., 2007; Sihto et al., 2006; Kuang et al., 2008). The same instrument used in the Beijing campaign was also deployed in Kaiping to measure sulfuric acid concentration during a one-month campaign in 2008 (Wang et al., 2013a). Sub-3 nm particle size distributions have not been reported previously in China, except for 1-3 nm particle number concentration in Shanghai in Winter 2013 inferred by a PSM (Xiao et al., 2015). Due to the limitation of observation data, although good correlation between new particle formation rate and sulfuric acid concentration in Beijing was found and the ratio of sulfuric acid concentration over A_{Fuchs} was reported to positively correlate with number concentration of 3-6 nm particles (Wang et al., 2011), the roles of sulfuric acid concentration and A_{Fuchs} in determining the occurrence of NPF events have not been quantitatively illustrated.

In this study, we aimed to examine the roles of A_{Fuchs} and sulfuric acid in determining whether a NPF event will occur on a particular day in Beijing. The data analysis was based on simultaneous measurement of particle size distributions down to ~1 nm and sulfuric acid. The correlation between particle formation rate, $J_{1.5}$, and sulfuric acid concentration was examined. L_Γ was used to predict the occurrence of NPF events. Daily variations of the three parameters determining L_Γ, i.e., sulfuric acid concentration, Γ, and A_{Fuchs}, were compared. A nominal value of A_{Fuchs} was suggested to predict the occurrence of NPF events in Beijing. The relationship between the $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentration and NPF events was also examined.

2 Experiments

A field campaign studying NPF in Beijing was carried out from Mar. 7th to Apr. 7th, 2016. The campaign site was located on the campus of Tsinghua University. Details of this site can be found elsewhere (Cai & Jiang, 2017; He et al., 2001).

3

A home-made DEG SMPS was used to measure sub-5 nm particle size distributions and a particle size distribution system (including a TSI aerodynamic particle sizer and two parallel SMPSs, equipped with a TSI nanoDMA and a TSI long DMA, respectively) was used to measure size distributions of particles from 3 nm to 10 μm (Liu et al., 2016). A specially designed miniature cylindrical differential mobility analyzer (mini- cyDMA) for effective classification of sub-3 nm aerosol was equipped with the DEG-SMPS (Cai et al., 2017). A cyclone was used at the sampling inlet to remove particles larger than 10 μm. The sampled aerosol was subsequently dried by a silica-gel diffusion drier. The diameter change due to drying was neglected when calculating A_{Fuchs} since the mean daytime relative humidity during the campaign period was ~25%. Diffusion losses, charging efficiency, penetration efficiencies through the DMAs, detection efficiencies of particle counters, and multi-charging effect were considered during data inversion. Particle density was assumed to be 1.6 g/cm^3 according to local observation results (Hu et al., 2012).

Sulfuric acid was measured by a modified high-resolution time-of-flight chemical ionization mass spectrometer (HR-ToF-CIMS, Aerodyne Research Inc.). Instead of using radioactive ion source, a home-made corona discharge (CD) ion source was utilized with the HR-TOF-CIMS. The CD ion source was designed to be able to operate from a few Torr up to near atmospheric pressure and has been successfully implemented in measuring ambient amine (Zheng et al., 2015a) and formaldehyde (Ma et al., 2016). In this study, nitrate reagent ions were used to measure gaseous sulfuric acid (Zheng et al., 2010). The detailed ion chemistry to generate nitrate ions and the calibration procedure for sulfuric acid measurement have been reported in Zheng et al. (2015b). Ambient sulfuric acid concentration in Beijing has been reported only once in a field campaign conducted in 2008 (Zheng et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2011). Compared to that campaign, sulfuric acid concentration measured in this study displayed similar diurnal variations, but with lower daily maximum values. This might be caused by the relatively weak solar radiation intensity encountered in this springtime observation compared with the previous summertime campaign. To verify the precision of sulfuric acid measurement, the instrument was calibrated daily at night and background checks were performed for ~3 minutes each hour during daytime.

A meteorological station (Davis 6250) measuring temperature, relative humidity, wind speed, wind direction, and precipitation was located at ~10 m away from the sampling inlet. The PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration measured in the nearest national monitoring station (Wanliu station, ~5 km away on the southwest of our campaign site) was also used for analysis. Backward trajectories were obtained from online HYSPLIT server of national oceanic and atmospheric administration (NOAA).

3 Theory

Nucleation is only the first step of new particle formation. Gaseous precursors form clusters by random collisions and bound together by Van der Waals force and/or chemical bond. These clusters become particles if they are more likely to

4

grow by condensation rather than evaporate. However, particles formed by nucleation may be scavenged through coagulation with larger particles before they grow large enough to be detected. Nucleation only refers to the process that stable molecular clusters formed spontaneously from gaseous precursors. New particle formation also requires subsequent

125 condensational growth of freshly nucleated particles. That is, the occurrence of nucleation is mainly determined by gaseous precursors (e.g., sulfuric acid and organics) in atmospheric environment while new particle formation is also influenced by the coagulation scavenging effect of pre-existing aerosols. A possibility exists that nucleation occurs while NPF events are not observed because of the short lifetime of nucleated particles due to a strong coagulation scavenging. In fact, nucleation can also be suppressed when the aerosol concentration is high since vapours and clusters may also be

130 scavenged by aerosol surface.

Aerosol Fuchs surface area, A_{Fuchs}, is a representative parameter of coagulation scavenging based on kinetic theory. It is corrected for particles whose size falls in the transition regime (Davis et al., 1980; McMurry, 1983). The formula assuming unity mass accommodation coefficient (sticking probability) is shown in Eq. (1),

$$A_{Fuchs} = \frac{4\pi}{3} \int_{d_{min}}^{\infty} d_p^{\,2} \cdot \left(\frac{Kn + Kn^2}{1 + 1.71Kn + 1.33Kn^2} \right) \cdot n \cdot dd_p \,, \tag{1}$$

135 where d_p is particle diameter, d_{min} is the smallest particle diameter in theory and the smallest detected one in practice, Kn is Knudsen number and n is particle size distribution function, dN/dd_p. The condensation sink and coagulation sink can also describe how rapidly gaseous precursors and particles are scavenged by pre-existing aerosols, respectively (Kerminen et al., 2001; Kulmala et al., 2001). Since the condensation sink is proportional to A_{Fuchs} (McMurry et al., 2005) and the coagulation sink can be approximately converted to the condensation sink using a simple formula (Lehtinen et al., 2007),

140 only A_{Fuchs} is used in this study to describe the coagulation scavenging effect. Condensation sink values reported in previous studies are referred in the form of A_{Fuchs}. The diffusion coefficient of sulfuric acid was assumed to be 0.117 cm^{-2}s^{-1} (Gong et al., 2010) when converting the condensation sink into A_{Fuchs}.

A dimensionless criterion, L_Γ, was proposed to predict the occurrence of NPF events (Kuang et al., 2010). It is defined as,

145
$$L_\Gamma = \frac{\bar{c} \cdot A_{Fuchs}}{4\beta_{11} N_1} \cdot \frac{1}{\Gamma} \,, \tag{2}$$

where $\bar{c}$ is the mean thermal speed of sulfuric acid that can be calculated from molecular kinetic theory; β_{11} is the coagulation coefficient between sulfuric acid monomers that can be calculated using Eq. 13.56 in Seinfeld & Pandis (2006); N_1 is the number concentration of sulfuric acid; Γ is a growth enhancement factor and is defined as,

$$\Gamma = \frac{2GR}{v_1 N_m \bar{c}} \,, \tag{3}$$

150   where *GR* is the observed mean growth rate; v_1 is the corresponding volume of sulfuric acid monomer and was estimated

to be 1.7×10^{-28} m^3 (the volume of a hydrated sulfuric acid molecule, Kuang et al., 2010); N_m is the maximum number

concentration of sulfuric acid during a whole NPF event period. Since other gaseous precursors in addition to sulfuric

acid might also contribute to the condensational growth of particles formed by nucleation (O'Dowd et al., 2002; Ristovski

et al., 2010) and only concentration of sulfuric acid is used in Eq. (2), the ratio of measured growth rate over the sulfuric

155   acid condensational growth rate (Weber et al., 1997), i.e., Γ, was used for correction. It should be clarified that L_Γ in Eq.

(2) is defined similar to that in McMurry et al (2005) but slightly different from that in Kuang et al (2010), since L_Γ in

this study are time-resolved values rather than event specific ones. Theoretically, Γ can also be time and size-resolved if

using time and size-resolved GR and time-resolved sulfuric acid (Kuang et al., 2012). However, Γ during each NPF event

is assumed to be constant in Eq. (3) because further evaluations are needed for this time and size-resolved model. Note

160   that in Eq.(2) the absolute sulfuric acid concentrations were effectively normalized by the corresponding daily sulfuric

acid maximum concentrations and thus has no influence on L_Γ values and conclusions based on L_Γ reported in this study.

A new balance formula to estimate new particle formation rate was proposed recently (Cai & Jiang, 2017) and is given

below,

$$J_k = \frac{dN_{[d_k, d_u)}}{dt} + \sum_{d_g = d_k}^{d_{u-1}} \sum_{d_i = d_{\min}}^{+\infty} \beta_{(i,g)} N_{[d_i, d_{i+1})} N_{[d_g, d_{g+1})} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d_g = d_k}^{d_{u-1}} \sum_{\substack{d_i^3 + d_{j+1}^3 = d_g^3 \\ d_{i+1}^3 + d_j^3 = d_g^3 \\ d_i, d_j \geq d_{\min}}} \beta_{(i,j)} N_{[d_i, d_{i+1})} N_{[d_j, d_{j+1})} + n_u \cdot GR_u, \qquad (4)$$

165   where J_k is the formation rate of particles at the size of d_k, $N_{[d_k, d_u)}$ is the total number concentration of particles from d_k

to d_u (not included), d_u is the upper bound of the size range for calculation (25 nm in this study), $d_{\min}$ is the size of the

smallest cluster in theory and the smallest detected size in practice (1.3 nm in this study). The second and third terms in

the right hand side of Eq. (4) are the coagulation sink term (*CoagSnk*) and the coagulation source term (*CoagSrc*),

respectively. The difference between *CoagSnk* and *CoagSrc* is the net *CoagSnk* representing the net rate of particles from

170   d_k to d_u, i.e., lost by coagulation scavenging. The last term is often negligible according to the determination criterions

for d_u. dN/dt is the balance result of J_k and net *CoagSnk*.

4 Results and Discussion

A total of 26 days from Mar. 12th to Apr. 6th was classified by the occurrence of daytime NPF event. A typical NPF day

is featured with distinct and persisting increases in sub-3 nm particle number concentration and subsequent growth of

175   these nucleated particles. A non-event day means that neither of these two features was observed. As shown in Fig. 1,

there are 11 typical NPF days and 13 non-event days. The rest 2 days, i.e., Mar. 19th and Mar. 30th, were classified as

undefined days. On these days, the increase in sub-3 nm particle number concentration and subsequent growth were both

observed. However, sub-3 nm particle number concentration was relatively low and the evolution of particle size distributions was not continuous. NPF events mainly occurred when wind came from northwest of Beijing and non-event days were associated with air masses from southwest (as summarized in Table 1). Air masses coming from north usually experience less influence from urban pollution (Wehner et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2013b), i.e., A_{Fuchs} is likely to be lower than that on days dominated by southwest wind.

The occurrence of NPF events in most days can be predicted by L_Γ if unity was empirically chosen as the threshold value. Greater L_Γ indicates higher possibilities of nucleated particles to be scavenged by coagulation before they can continue to grow. Growth rates on non-event days were assumed to 2.4 nm/h, the mean value of observed growth rates on NPF days (the range is 1.2 nm/h to 3.3 nm/h). A threshold value of L_Γ can not be theoretically predicted but can be empirically estimated. 0.7 was suggested as the threshold value by Kuang et al. (2010). However, unity suggested by McMurry et al. (2005) appeared to work better for results from this campaign in Beijing. As shown in Table 1, the median and mean values of L_Γ on NPF days observed in this campaign were 0.55 and 0.71 (with a standard deviation of 0.40), respectively, comparing to 3.05 and 3.45 on non-event days (with a standard deviation of 1.79), respectively. However, some exceptions were also observed. On the two undefined days, L_Γ were 1.40 and 0.64, respectively, and weak nucleation was observed. Although the estimated L_Γ value on Mar. 18th was 1.75, a comparatively weak but still distinct NPF event was observed. Despite these few exceptions, L_Γ works well in most days in this campaign and were verified in other places (Kuang et al., 2010). Following discussion is focused on the contribution of different factors, i.e., sulfuric acid concentration, Γ, and A_{Fuchs}.

4.1 The Role of Gaseous Precursors

There was a positive correlation between the estimated new particle formation rate, $J_{1.5}$, and sulfuric acid concentration during most NPF periods (typically 8:00-16:00 when the estimated $J_{1.5}$ was greater than zero). On NPF days, an increase in sub-3 nm particle number concentration was often accompanied with an increase in sulfuric acid concentration (as shown in Fig. 2). Considering the possible sensitivity of the fitted parameters to the fitting time period (Kuang et al., 2008), the correlation between $J_{1.5}$ and sulfuric acid concentration was only examined for NPF periods. We found that the mean coefficient of determination (R^2) in this campaign was 0.53. The exponents for correlating the $J_{1.5}$ and sulfuric acid concentration ranged from 1.5 to 4.0 in the 10 days with a mean value of 2.4 (Mar. 29th was not included because of insignificant correlation). This is in consensus with previously reported mean exponent of 2.3 using J_3 in Beijing (Wang et al., 2011). However, it is quite different from those exponents no greater than 2 observed in North America and Europe (Kuang et al., 2008; Riipinen et al., 2007; Sihto et al., 2006) indicating activation or kinetic nucleation alone can not explain all NPF events observed in this campaign.

Although the correlation between sulfuric acid concentration and the particle formation rate was significant, sulfuric acid appeared not to be the determining factor for whether a NPF event would occur in Beijing. As illustrated by the temporal trend of sulfuric acid concentration in Fig. 2, a significant diurnal variation was observed every day. However, the differences among daily maximum sulfuric acid concentrations were small. The variations of daily maximum sulfuric acid concentration were significantly less than those of A_{Fuchs}. The geometrical standard deviation and relative standard deviation of maximum sulfuric acid concentration on each day were 1.40 and 0.34, respectively, while those of daily averaged A_{Fuchs} values were 2.56 and 0.82, respectively. Sulfuric acid concentrations during NPF periods were not significantly higher than those between 8:00 - 16:00 on non-event days (p=1). In addition, comparatively high concentrations of sulfuric acid, e.g., on Apr. 4th - 6th, did not necessarily lead to NPF events.

The influence of growth enhancement factor, Γ, on the occurrence of NPF events also needs to be addressed because sulfuric acid alone may not explain the observed growth rates. Estimated Γ value for each event was normalized by the geometric mean Γ value for the whole campaign to make it comparable with those obtained from previous studies (Kuang et al., 2010): MILAGRO in Tecamac (Iida et al., 2008); ANARChE (McMurry et al., 2005) in Atlanta; Boulder (Iida et al., 2006); QUEST II (Sihto et al., 2006), QUEST IV (Riipinen, et al., 2007), and EUCAARI (Manninen et al., 2009) at the SMEAR II station in Hyytiälä. It should be clarified that the relative value of Γ can improve the comparability by overcoming some uncertainties in measuring sulfuric acid concentration in different studies. Fig. 4 indicates that Γ values observed in this study distribute in a relatively narrow range, similar to those observed in Tecamac, Atlanta, and Boulder, while different from the wide-spreading characteristics of Γ values in Hyytiälä. Geometric standard deviations of Γ values were 1.31, 1.75, 2.23, 1.87, 1.62, 2.77, and 2.87 in this campaign, MILAGRO, ANARChE, Boulder, QUEST II, QUEST IV, and EUCAARI, respectively. The daily variations of Γ values in Beijing were less than those observed in other places. They were also less than the daily variations of A_{Fuchs} values measured in this campaign. Considering the small daily variations of both sulfuric acid concentration and Γ values, it is reasonable to conclude that the abundance of gaseous precursors such as sulfuric acid in Beijing during the campaign period was sufficiently high for nucleation to occur but the occurrence of NPF events appeared to be governed by A_{Fuchs}.

4.2 Relationship between A_{Fuchs} and NPF Events

Comparatively lower A_{Fuchs} values were found during most of the NPF days while sulfuric acid concentrations on NPF days were not significantly higher than those on non-event days. NPF events mainly occurred when A_{Fuchs} was smaller than 200 μm^2/cm^3. Non-event days mainly corresponded to a real-time A_{Fuchs} value greater than 200 μm^2/cm^3 and an average A_{Fuchs} value greater than 350 μm^2/cm^3 (Fig. 5). The value of 200 μm^2/cm^3 appeared to be an empirical division between NPF days and non-event days. If A_{Fuchs} was lower than this value, a NPF event tended to occur. Otherwise, the occurrence of NPF events was suppressed because of the predominant coagulation scavenging effect.

The variation of L_Γ in Beijing was governed by A_{Fuchs}. The measured L_Γ and A_{Fuchs} values were in good correlation with a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 0.88. The mean relative error of fitted L_Γ using A_{Fuchs} was 11.4% compared to the measured ones (Fig. 6(a)). It should be clarified that GR on non-event days in this campaign was assumed to be the same (2.4 nm/h, an average of the fitted values on NPF days). The correlation between L_Γ and A_{Fuchs} on NPF days alone had the R^2 of 0.89. The A_{Fuchs} of 200 $\mu m^2/cm^3$ corresponds to an L_Γ of approximate unity in this campaign. Since L_Γ has been verified as a proper nucleation criterion in diverse atmospheric environments, it is reasonable to conclude that A_{Fuchs} was the governing factor of the occurrence of NPF events observed in this campaign.

The characteristics of A_{Fuchs} dominated NPF events in Beijing are different from those at other locations. As shown in Fig. 6(b), L_Γ and A_{Fuchs} in most other places do not correlate well, indicating that A_{Fuchs} alone can not predict the occurrence of NPF events at these locations. The variations of these parameters at various locations are illustrated in Fig. 7. In Atlanta and Boulder, A_{Fuchs} values fluctuated within relatively narrow ranges while the concentrations of gaseous precursors participating in nucleation differed significantly. The variations of L_Γ at these locations were mainly caused by the relatively large variations in the concentrations of gaseous precursors. However, the contribution of gaseous precursors to L_Γ in Beijing was relatively stable and the variations of L_Γ were mainly caused by the variations in A_{Fuchs} values.

The predominant role of A_{Fuchs} in Beijing can also be explained using the balance formula shown as Eq. (4). It is dN/dt rather than the formation rate, J, that directly reflects whether a NPF event has occurred or not. dN/dt is the balanced result of the formation rate and the net $CoagSnk$. Different from L_Γ that is the ratio of the particle loss rate over the growth rate, the ratio of the net $CoagSnk$ over J represents how many nucleated particles are lost due to the coagulation scavenging. The surviving particles are accounted for by the increment in number concentration of particles in the nucleation mode (1-25 nm). The nucleation mode was used in this study to estimate dN/dt caused by nucleation because newly formed particles seldom grew beyond 25 nm in the evaluated time period. Surviving possibilities of nucleated particles can also be inferred using the growth rate and A_{Fuchs} (Weber et al., 1997; Kerminen & Kulmala, 2002; Kuang et al., 2012). However, the ratio of the net $CoagSnk$ over J was used because it is based on measured particle size distributions. Note that theoretically the ratio of the net $CoagSnk$ over J can be greater than unity. This would correspond to a negative dN/dt value. For better description of the occurrence of NPF events rather than the whole process including termination, only NPF periods when dN/dt was positive were considered here. On average, 70% of particles formed by nucleation were lost due to coagulation scavenging on NPF days (as shown in Fig. 8) indicating high coagulation loss in Beijing even on NPF days. When the A_{Fuchs} value was much greater, most nucleated particles were lost due to the coagulation scavenging rather than grew into to larger sizes such that NPF events were less likely to be observed.

It should be clarified that although with much less possibility, NPF events may also occur in Beijing when A_{Fuchs} was greater than 200 $\mu m^2/cm^3$. In this campaign, a distinct NPF event was observed with a comparatively high A_{Fuchs} value of

329 $\mu m^2/cm^3$ (on Mar. 18th). It was significantly higher than the suggested threshold value of 200 $\mu m^2/cm^3$. As indicated by Table 1, this exception was caused by the failure of L_Γ rather than A_{Fuchs} alone, i.e., NPF events occurred when estimated L_Γ was greater than unity (the empirical threshold value). The comparatively low number concentration of sub-3 nm particles together with the moderate particle formation rate indicated that the NPF event was suppressed. In addition, previous studies in Beijing also observed some NPF events when A_{Fuchs} values were relatively high (Wu et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2013c; Wang et al., 2017), e.g., an A_{Fuchs} value of ~555 $\mu m^2/cm^3$ (Kulmala et al., 2016). These reported A_{Fuchs} values might be overestimated since the daily average rather than the average only over NPF event periods was used. A_{Fuchs} in Beijing during non-event periods can be significantly higher. Nevertheless, A_{Fuchs} can be considered as the major determining factor of the occurrence of NPF events in Beijing while admitting that exceptions can occasionally occur at a medium L_Γ value greater than unity (corresponding to the A_{Fuchs} value of 200 $\mu m^2/cm^3$).

4.3 A case Study of 3 Days

Three continuous days including two NPF days and one non-event day are shown in Fig. 9 to further illustrate the roles of A_{Fuchs} and sulfuric acid (together with other gaseous precursors) in affecting the occurrence of NPF events in Beijing. On Apr. 2nd, A_{Fuchs} remained at a relatively low level. A NPF event occurred after sunrise (together with an increase in sulfuric acid concentration) and ended in the afternoon when sulfuric acid concentration decreased to a low level. The whole NPF event began at approximately 7:30 and ended at approximately 14:30 that was also the typical time period for other NPF events observed in this campaign. However, when wind direction changed from northwest to southwest at the noon of on Apr. 3rd, sulfuric acid concentration decreased and A_{Fuchs} increased rapidly because of particles transported from south. This leads to an increase in L_Γ. The ongoing NPF event was interrupted and no newly nucleated particles was detected even when sulfuric acid concentration increased again later. On Apr. 4th, A_{Fuchs} stayed at a high level. L_Γ was always greater than unity. Maximum sulfuric acid concentrations on Apr. 4th were even higher than those on Apr. 2nd and 3rd. However, no NPF event was observed. It supports the argument that the abundance of gaseous precursors in Beijing are often high enough for nucleation to happen, however, whether or not a NPF event occurs is mainly governed by A_{Fuchs}.

4.4 Predicting NPF Days Using PM$_{2.5}$ Mass Concentration

The PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration in Beijing serves as a rough but simple parameter to predict whether a NPF event can happen. The value of A_{Fuchs} is affected by particle size distributions. Accumulation mode particles ranging from 50 nm to 500 nm in Beijing were the major contribution to A_{Fuchs}. Normalized size distributions of accumulation mode particles were relative stable at various A_{Fuchs} levels (as shown in Fig. 10). On NPF days when A_{Fuchs} were relatively low, nucleation mode particles formed by nucleation and subsequent growth also contributed to A_{Fuchs}, although A_{Fuchs} was still governed by accumulation mode particles. Thus, A_{Fuchs} should show better correlation with the particle mass concentration rather

10

than the particle number concentration. Figure 11 indicates that there was a good correlation between A_{Fuchs} and the $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentration in Beijing with a R^2 of 0.85, although the correlation at high A_{Fuchs} level was generally better than that at low A_{Fuchs} level because particles formed by nucleation significantly changed the shape of particle size distribution functions on NPF days. Measured $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentrations in the 26 days ranged from 3 to 420 μg/m^3, wide enough to represent both relative clean days and severe polluted days in Beijing. The $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentrations during NPF event periods were mostly lower than 30 μg/m^3 except for the event on Mar. 18th. On non-event days, the $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentrations between 8:00 and 16:00 were typically greater than 30 μg/m^3. Note that this threshold $PM_{2.5}$ value of 30 μg/m^3 may not be valid for the whole year. This campaign was in March and early April. Emissions and radiation intensity are different in different seasons such that the concentrations of gaseous precursors can vary with seasons as well.

The criterion of $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentration was applied to predict NPF events measured at the same site in Beijing in April and May, 2014. Among 38 days in that campaign, 11 typical NPF events were identified. For 9 NPF events, average $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentrations during event periods were lower than 30 μg/m^3. For the other 2 events, it was 49.8 and 40.5 μg/m^3, respectively. In another campaign in Beijing during January 2016 (Jayaratne et al., 2017), 14 NPF events were observed. Among them, 12 events occurred when daily average $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentration was lower than 30 μg/m^3. Daily average $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentrations on 16 non-event days were all greater than 40 μg/m^3.

5 Conclusions

Factors governing the occurrence of NPF events in Beijing were examined using data from a field campaign during Mar. 12th to Apr. 6th, 2016. In these 26 days, 11 typical NPF events were observed. The rest were 2 undefined days and 13 non-event days. The new particle formation rate, $J_{1.5}$, was in positive correlation with sulfuric acid concentration with a fitted mean exponent of 2.4. However, sulfuric acid concentrations on NPF days were not significantly higher than those on non-event days. A dimensionless criterion proposed by Kuang et al. (2010), L_Γ, was found to be applicable to predict NPF events in most days. Theoretically, L_Γ was determined by sulfuric acid concentration, the enhancement factor, Γ, and aerosol Fuchs surface area, A_{Fuchs}, together. In Beijing, however, A_{Fuchs} alone was found to be in good correlation with L_Γ ($R^2 = 0.88$). Different from NPF events observed at other locations such as Hyytiälä, daily maximum sulfuric acid concentration and the enhancement factor in Beijing only varied in a narrow range with geometric standard deviations of 1.40 and 1.31, respectively, while A_{Fuchs} varied significantly among days with a geometric standard deviation of 2.56. It was inferred that the concentrations of gaseous precursors such as sulfuric acid in Beijing were high enough to initiate nucleation while it was A_{Fuchs} that determined whether a NPF event would occur or not. An A_{Fuchs} value of 200 μm^2/cm^3 was proposed as the empirical threshold in Beijing below which NPF events are highly likely to occur. NPF events will be suppressed when A_{Fuchs} is higher than this threshold value. The A_{Fuchs} dominated characteristics in Beijing are different

from those at other locations such as Atlanta, Boulder, and Hyytiälä. Since A_{Fuchs} in Beijing was mainly governed by accumulation mode particles (50 to 500 nm) and the normalized $dA_{Fuchs}/dlog d_p$ in this size range was relatively stable at different A_{Fuchs} levels in Beijing, measured A_{Fuchs} was in good correlation with the PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration ($R^2 = 0.85$). Accordingly, the PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration may also serve as a rough and simple parameter to predict the occurrence of NPF events in Beijing. An empirical PM$_{2.5}$ threshold value of 30 μg/m^3 was proposed based on data from this field campaign and was found to also work well for other field campaigns in Beijing.

Acknowledgement

References

Cai, R., Chen, D.-R., Hao, J., & Jiang, J.: A Miniature Cylindrical Differential Mobility Analyzer for sub-3 nm Particle Sizing. Journal of Aerosol Science, 106, 111-119, doi:10.1016/j.jaerosci.2017.01.004, 2017.

Cai, R., & Jiang, J.: A new balance formula to estimate particle formation rate: reevaluating effect of coagulation scavenging, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussion, doi:10.5194/acp-2017-199, in review, 2017.

Dal Maso, M., Kulmala, M., Lehtinen, K.E., Mäkelä, J.M., Aalto, J., & O'Dowd, C.D.: Condensation and coagulation sinks and formation of nucleation mode particles in coastal and boreal forest boundary layers. Journal of Geophysical Research, 107, doi:10.1029/2001jd001053, 2002.

Dal Maso, M., Kulmala, M., Riipinen, I., Wagner, R., Hussein, T., Aalto, P., & Lehtinen, K.E.: Formation and growth of fresh atmospheric aerosols: eight years of aerosol size distribution data from SMEAR II, Hyytiälä, Finland. Boreal Environment Research, 10, 323-336, 2005.

Davis, E.J., P., R., & K., R.A.: A Review of Theory and Experiments on Diffusion from Submicroscopic Particles. Chemical Engineering Communications, 5, 251-268, 1980.

Eisele, F.L., Lovejoy, E.R., Kosciuch, E., Moore, K.F., Mauldin, R.L., Smith, J.N., McMurry, P.H., & Iida, K.: Negative atmospheric ions and their potential role in ion-induced nucleation. Journal of Geophysical Research, 111, doi:10.1029/2005jd006568, 2006.

Erupe, M.E., Benson, D.R., Li, J., Young, L.-H., Verheggen, B., Al-Refai, M., Tahboub, O., Cunningham, V., Frimpong, F., Viggiano, A.A., & Lee, S.-H.: Correlation of aerosol nucleation rate with sulfuric acid and ammonia in Kent, Ohio: An atmospheric observation. Journal of Geophysical Research, 115, doi:10.1029/2010jd013942, 2010.

Gong, Y., Hu, M., Cheng, Y., Su, H., Yue, D., Liu, F., Wiedensohler, A., Wang, Z., Kalesse, H., & Liu, S.: Competition of coagulation sink and source rate: New particle formation in the Pearl River Delta of China. Atmospheric Environment, 44, 3278-3285, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.05.049, 2010.

He, K., Yang, F., Ma, Y., Zhang, Q., Yao, X., Chan, C.K., Cadel, S., Chan, T., & Mulawa, P.: The characteristics of PM$_{2.5}$ in Beijing, China. Atmospheric Environment, 35, 4959–4970, 2001.

HEI Review Panel on Ultrafine Particles: Understanding the Health Effects of Ambient Ultrafine Particles. HEI Perspectives 3. Health Effects Institute, Boston, MA, 2013.

Hu, M., Peng, J., Sun, K., Yue, D., Guo, S., Wiedensohler, A., & Wu, Z.: Estimation of size-resolved ambient particle density based on the measurement of aerosol number, mass, and chemical size distributions in the winter in Beijing. Environmental science & technology, 46, 9941-9947, doi:10.1021/es204073t, 2012.

Iida, K., Stolzenburg, M., McMurry, P., Dunn, M.J., Smith, J.N., Eisele, F., & Keady, P.: Contribution of ion-induced nucleation to new particle formation: Methodology and its application to atmospheric observations in Boulder, Colorado. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 111, doi:10.1029/2006jd007167, 2006.

Iida, K., Stolzenburg, M.R., McMurry, P.H., & Smith, J.N.: Estimating nanoparticle growth rates from size-dependent charged fractions: Analysis of new particle formation events in Mexico City. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 113, doi:10.1029/2007jd009260, 2008.

IPCC.: Climate Change 2013: IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5). Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Jayaratne, R., Pushpawela, B., He, C., Gao. J., Hui, L., Morawska, L.: Observations of Particles at their Formation Sizes in Beijing, China. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics Discussions, doi:10.5194/acp-2017-156, in review, 2017.

Jiang, J., Chen, M., Kuang, C., Attoui, M., & McMurry, P.H.: Electrical Mobility Spectrometer Using a Diethylene Glycol Condensation Particle Counter for Measurement of Aerosol Size Distributions Down to 1 nm. Aerosol Science and Technology, 45, 510-521, doi:10.1080/02786826.2010.547538, 2011.

Jiang, J., Zhao, J., Chen, M., Eisele, F.L., Scheckman, J., Williams, B.J., Kuang, C., & McMurry, P.H.: First Measurements of Neutral Atmospheric Cluster and 1–2 nm Particle Number Size Distributions During Nucleation Events. Aerosol Science and Technology, 45, ii-v, doi:10.1080/02786826.2010.546817, 2011.

Kerminen, V.M., & Kulmala, M.: Analytical formulae connecting the "real" and the "apparent" nucleation rate and the nuclei number concentration for atmospheric nucleation events. Journal of Aerosol Science, 33, 609-622, 2002.

Kerminen, V.-M., Pirjola, L., & Kulmala, M.: How significantly does coagulational scavenging limit atmospheric particle production? Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 106, 24119-24125, doi:10.1029/2001jd000322, 2001.

Kuang, C., Chen, M., Zhao, J., Smith, J., McMurry, P.H., & Wang, J.: Size and time-resolved growth rate measurements of 1 to 5 nm freshly formed atmospheric nuclei. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 12, 3573-3589, doi:10.5194/acp-12-3573-2012, 2012.

Kuang, C., McMurry, P. H., & McCormick, A.V.: Determination of cloud condensation nuclei production from measured new particle formation events, Geophysical Research Letters, 36, doi:10.1029/2009gl037584, 2009.

Kuang, C., McMurry, P.H., McCormick, A.V., & Eisele, F.L.: Dependence of nucleation rates on sulfuric acid vapor concentration in diverse atmospheric locations. Journal of Geophysical Research, 113, doi:10.1029/2007jd009253, 2008.

Kuang, C., Riipinen, I., Sihto, S.L., Kulmala, M., McCormick, A.V., & McMurry, P.H.: An improved criterion for new particle formation in diverse atmospheric environments. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 10, 8469-8480, doi:10.5194/acp-10-8469-2010, 2010.

Kulmala, M., Dal Maso, M., Mäkelä, J. M., Pirjola, L., Väkevä, M., Aalto, P., Miikkulainen, P., Hämeri, K., and O'Dowd, C. D.: On the formation, growth and composition of nucleation mode particles, Tellus, 53, 479-490, 2001.

Kulmala, M., Kontkanen, J., Junninen, H., Lehtipalo, K., Manninen, H.E., Nieminen, T., Petäjä, T., Sipilä, M., Schobesberger, S., Rantala, P., Franchin, A., Jokinen, T., Jarvinen, E., Äijälä, M., Kangasluoma, J., Hakala, J., Aalto, P.P., Paasonen, P., Mikkilä, J., Vanhanen, J., Aalto, J., Hakola, H., Makkonen, U., Ruuskanen, T., Mauldin, R.L., 3rd, Duplissy, J., Vehkamäki, H., Bäck, J., Kortelainen, A., Riipinen, I., Kurtén, T., Johnston, M.V., Smith, J.N., Ehn, M., Mentel, T.F., Lehtinen, K.E., Laaksonen, A., Kerminen, V.-M., & Worsnop, D.R.: Direct observations of atmospheric aerosol nucleation. Science, 339, 943-946, doi:10.1126/science.1227385, 2013.

Kulmala, M., Petäjä, T., Kerminen, V.-M., Kujansuu, J., Ruuskanen, T., Ding, A., Nie, W., Hu, M., Wang, Z., Wu, Z., Wang, L., & Worsnop, D.R.: On secondary new particle formation in China. Frontiers of Environmental Science & Engineering, 10, doi:10.1007/s11783-016-0850-1, 2016.

13

Kulmala, M., Vehkamäki, H., Petäjä, T., Dal Maso, M., Lauri, A., Kerminen, V.M., Birmili, W., & McMurry, P.H.: Formation and growth rates of ultrafine atmospheric particles: a review of observations. Journal of Aerosol Science, 35, 143-176, doi:10.1016/j.jaerosci.2003.10.003, 2004.

415 Lehtinen, K.E.J., Dal Maso, M., Kulmala, M., & Kerminen, V.-M.: Estimating nucleation rates from apparent particle formation rates and vice versa: Revised formulation of the Kerminen–Kulmala equation. Journal of Aerosol Science, 38, 988-994, doi:10.1016/j.jaerosci.2007.06.009, 2007.

Liu, J., Jiang, J., Zhang, Q., Deng, J., & Hao, J.: A spectrometer for measuring particle size distributions in the range of 3 nm to 10 μm. Frontiers of Environmental Science & Engineering, 10, 63-72, doi:10.1007/s11783-014-0754-

420 x, 2016.

Ma, Y., Diao, Y., Zhang, B., Wang, W., Ren, X., Yang, D., Wang, M., Shi, X., and Zheng, J.: Detection of formaldehyde emissions from an industrial zone in the Yangtze River Delta region of China using a proton transfer reaction ion-drift chemical ionization mass spectrometer. Atmospheric Measurement Techniques, 9, 6101-6116, 2016.

Manninen, E.H., Petäjä, T., Asmi, E., Riipinen, I., Nieminen, T., Mikkilä, J., Hõrrak, U., Mirme, A., Mirme, S., Laakso,

425 L., Kerminen, V.-M., & Kulmala, M.: Long-term field measurements of charged and neutral clusters using Neutral cluster and Air Ion Spectrometer (NAIS). Boreal Environment Research, 2009, 591-605, 2009.

McMurry, P.H. New particle formation in the presence of an aerosol: rates, time scales, and sub-0.01 μm size distributions Journal of Colloid and Interface Science, 95, 72-80, 1983.

McMurry, P.H., Fink, M., Sakurai, H., Stolzenburg, M.R., Mauldin, R.L., Smith, J., Eisele, F., Moore, K., Sjostedt, S.,

430 Tanner, D., Huey, L.G., Nowak, J.B., Edgerton, E., & Voisin, D.: A criterion for new particle formation in the sulfur-rich Atlanta atmosphere. Journal of Geophysical Research, 110, doi:10.1029/2005jd005901, 2005.

O'Dowd, C.D., Aalto, P., Hmeri, K., Kulmala, M., & Hoffmann, T.: Aerosol formation: atmospheric particles from organic vapours. Nature, 416, 497-498, doi:10.1038/416497a, 2002.

Petäjä, T., Mauldin, R.L., Kosciuch, E., McGrath, J., Nieminen, T., Paasonen, P., Boy, M., Adamov, A., Kotiaho, T., &

435 Kulmala, M.: Sulfuric acid and OH concentrations in a boreal forest site. Journal of Aerosol Science, 9, 7435-7448, 2009.

Qi, X.M., Ding, A.J., Nie, W., Petäjä, T., Kerminen, V.-M., Herrmann, E., Xie, Y.N., Zheng, L.F., Manninen, H., Aalto, P., Sun, J.N., Xu, Z.N., Chi, X.G., Huang, X., Boy, M., Virkkula, A., Yang, X.-Q., Fu, C.B., & Kulmala, M.: Aerosol size distribution and new particle formation in the western Yangtze River Delta of China: 2 years of

440 measurements at the SORPES station. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 15, 12445-12464, doi:10.5194/acp-15-12445-2015, 2015.

Riipinen, I., Sihto, S.-L., Kulmala, M., Arnold, F., Dal Maso, M., Birmili, W., Saarnio, K., Teinilä, K., Kerminen, V.-M., Laaksonen, A., & Lehtinen, K.E.J.: Connections between atmospheric sulphuric acid and new particle formation during QUEST III-IV campaigns in Heidelberg and Hyytiälä. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 7, 1899-

445 1914, doi:10.5194/acp-7-1899-2007, 2007.

Ristovski, Z.D., Suni, T., Kulmala, M., Boy, M., Meyer, N., K., Duplissy, J., Turnipseed, A., Morawska, L., & Baltensperger, U.: The role of sulphates and organic vapours in growth of newly formed particles in a eucalypt forest. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 10, 2919-2926, 2010.

Seinfeld, J.H., & Pandis, S.N.: Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New Jersey,

450 2006.

Sihto, S.L., Kulmala, M., Kerminen, V.M., Dal Maso, M., Petäjä, T., Riipinen, I., Korhonen, H., Arnold, F., Janson, R., Boy, M., Laaksonen, A., & Lehtinen, K.E.: Atmospheric sulphuric acid and aerosol formation: implications from atmospheric measurements for nucleation and early growth mechanisms. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 6, 4079-4091, 2006.

455 Spracklen, D.V., Carslaw, K.S., Kulmala, M., Kerminen, V.-M., Sihto, S.-L., Riipinen, I., Merikanto, J., Mann, G.W., Chipperfield, M.P., Wiedensohler, A., Birmili, W., & Lihavainen, H.: Contribution of particle formation to global cloud condensation nuclei concentrations. Geophysical Research Letters, 35, doi:10.1029/2007gl033038, 2008.

14

460 Vanhanen, J., Mikkilä, J., Lehtipalo, K., Sipilä, M., Manninen, H.E., Siivola, E., Petäjä, T., & Kulmala, M.: Particle Size Magnifier for Nano-CN Detection. Aerosol Science and Technology, 45, 533-542, doi:10.1080/02786826.2010.547889, 2011.

Wehner, B., Birmili, W., Ditas, F., Wu, Z., Hu, M., Liu, X., Mao, J., Sugimoto, N., and Wiedensohler, A.: Relationships between submicrometer particulate air pollution and air mass history in Beijing, China, 2004 - 2006, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 8, 6155–6168, 2008.

465 Wang, Z., Wu, Z., Yue, D., Shang, D., Guo, S., Sun, J., Ding, A., Wang, L., Jiang, J., Guo, H., Gao, J., Cheung, H.C., Morawska, L., Keywood, M., & Hu, M.: New particle formation in China: Current knowledge and further directions. The Science of the total environment, 577, 258-266, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.10.177, 2017.

Wang, Z. B., Hu, M., Yue, D. L., He, L. Y., Huang, X. F., Yang, Q., Zheng, J., Zhang, R. Y., and Zhang, Y. H.: New particle formation in the presence of a strong biomass burning episode at a downwind rural site in PRD, China, 470 Tellus B, 65, 10.3402/tellusb.v65i0.19965, 2013a.

Wang, Z. B., Hu, M., Wu, Z. J., Yue, D. L., He, L. Y., Huang, X. F., Liu, X. G., and Wiedensohler, A.: Long-term measurements of particle number size distributions and the relationships with air mass history and source apportionment in the summer of Beijing, Atmos Chem Phys, 13, 10159-10170, 10.5194/acp-13-10159-2013, 2013b.

475 Wang, Z.B., Hu, M., Sun, J.Y., Wu, Z.J., Yue, D.L., Shen, X.J., Zhang, Y.M., Pei, X.Y., Cheng, Y.F., & Wiedensohler, A.: Characteristics of regional new particle formation in urban and regional background environments in the North China Plain. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 13, 12495-12506, doi:10.5194/acp-13-12495-2013, 2013c.

Wang, Z.B., Hu, M., Yue, D.L., Zheng, J., Zhang, R.Y., Wiedensohler, A., Wu, Z.J., Nieminen, T., & Boy, M.: Evaluation 480 on the role of sulfuric acid in the mechanisms of new particle formation for Beijing case. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 12663-12671, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12663-2011, 2011.

Weber, R.J., Marti, J.J., McMurry, P.H., Eisele, F.L., Tanner, D.J., & Jefferson, A.: Measurements of new particle formation and ultrafine particle growth rates at a clean continental site. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 102, 4375-4385, doi:10.1029/96jd03656, 1997.

485 Wu, Z., Hu, M., Liu, S., Wehner, B., Bauer, S., Ma ßling, A., Wiedensohler, A., Petäjä, T., Dal Maso, M., & Kulmala, M.: New particle formation in Beijing, China: Statistical analysis of a 1-year data set. Journal of Geophysical Research, 112, 2007.

Xiao, S., Wang, M.Y., Yao, L., Kulmala, M., Zhou, B., Yang, X., Chen, J.M., Wang, D.F., Fu, Q.Y., Worsnop, D.R., & Wang, L.: Strong atmospheric new particle formation in winter in urban Shanghai, China. Atmospheric 490 Chemistry and Physics, 15, 1769-1781, 10, doi:1029/2006jd007406, 2015.

Yue, D. L., Hu, M., Zhang, R. Y., Wang, Z. B., Zheng, J., Wu, Z. J., Wiedensohler, A., He, L. Y., Huang, X. F., and Zhu, T.: The roles of sulfuric acid in new particle formation and growth in the mega-city of Beijing. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 10, 4953-4960, doi:10.5194/acp-10-4953-2010, 2010.

Zheng, J., Khalizov, A., Wang, L., and Zhang, R.: Atmospheric pressure-ion drift chemical ionization mass spectrometry 495 for detection of trace gas species. Analytical Chemistry, 82, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.05.024, 7302-7308, 2010.

Zheng, J., Hu, M., Zhang, R., Yue, D., Wang, Z., Guo, S., Li, X., Bohn, B., Shao, M., He, L., Huang, X., Wiedensohler, A., and Zhu, T.: Measurements of gaseous H_2SO_4 by AP-ID-CIMS during CAREBeijing 2008 Campaign. Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 11, 7755-7765, doi:10.5194/acp-11-7755-2011, 2011.

500 Zheng, J., Ma, Y., Chen, M., Zhang, Q., Wang, L., Khalizov, A. F., Yao, L., Wang, Z., Wang, X., and Chen, L.: Measurement of atmospheric amines and ammonia using the high resolution time-of-flight chemical ionization mass spectrometry. Atmospheric Environment, 102, 249-259, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.12.002, 2015a.

Zheng, J., Yang, D., Ma, Y., Chen, M., Cheng, J., Li, S., and Wang, M.: Development of a new corona discharge based ion source for high resolution time-of-flight chemical ionization mass spectrometer to measure gaseous H_2SO_4 505 and aerosol sulfate. Atmospheric Environment, 119, 167-173, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.08.028, 2015b.

15

Table 1: <mark>Characteristics of</mark> each campaign day.

Date (mm/dd)	Classification	Max $J_{1.5}$ ($cm^{-3} s^{-1}$)	N_{1-3} (#/cm^3)	A_{Fuchs} (μm^2/cm^3)	L_T	Wind direction [*]
03/12	Non-event	–	0	919.5	3.63	SW
03/13	NPF	156.0	26347.5	119.7	0.71	NW
03/14	Non-event	–	0	632.7	3.05	NW
03/15	Non-event	–	0	733.9	3.73	SW
03/16	Non-event	–	0	796.2	4.15	WSW
03/17	Non-event	–	0	1140.1	9.04	WSW
03/18	NPF	33.8	741.2	329.0	1.75	WNW
03/19	Undefined	Weak[**]	1643.67	240.8	1.40	SE
03/20	Non-event	–	137.9	348.8	1.74	NNW
03/21	Non-event	–	0	512.0	2.76	SSW
03/22	Non-event	–	0	457.6	2.58	E
03/23	NPF	30.1	3846.3	76.1	0.57	NNW
03/24	NPF	46.8	5576.7	145.2	0.76	NNW
03/25	NPF	57.0	4637.7	126.7	0.52	NNE
03/26	NPF	41.5	9640.9	100.4	0.71	N
03/27	NPF	31.2	2806.2	90.6	0.44	NW
03/28	Non-event	–	0	508.1	2.86	W
03/29	NPF	32.3	2449.8	121.0	0.69	NW
03/30	Undefined	17.7	2885.7	88.8	0.64	NW
03/31	Non-event	–	0	767.0	4.21	SW
04/01	NPF	50.9	5477	51.7	0.22	WNW
04/02	NPF	46.9	10002	63.1	0.31	NW
04/03	NPF	21.6	10962.9	105.7	0.24	NW
04/04	Non-event	–	442	398.2	3.09	SW
04/05	Non-event	–	185	391.2	2.33	NW
04/06	Non-event	–	0	365.5	1.71	SW

*: Indicated by 12-hour backward trajectory (starting at noon, 500 m in altitude).

**: Difficult to estimate.

510

Figure 1 Contour of measured particle size distributions during Mar. 12th to Apr. 6th. <mark>Identified thirteen non-event days and two undefined days are shadowed by grey and yellow background, respectively.</mark>


515

Figure 2: Time series for Fuchs surface area (A_{Fuchs}), sulfuric acid concentration, and number concentration of 1-3 nm particles. Typical NPF days and undefined days are shadowed by light blue and light green background, respectively.

Figure 3: The correlations between the estimated new particle formation rate, $J_{1.5}$, and sulfuric acid concentration during NPF event period on each NPF day. The regression line of $J_{1.5}$ versus sulfuric acid concentration was exponentially fitted. n is the exponent. Data on Mar. 29th was not included because the correlation was not significant (p = 0.34).

525 **Figure 4: Normalized growth enhancement factor, Γ, in this campaign in comparison to those reported for other campaigns. Γ was normalized by the geometric mean value in each campaign.**

Figure 5: (a) The relationship between Fuchs surface area and number concentration of 1-3 nm particles, N_{1-3}. The relative concentration of measured sulfuric acid is represented by symbol size, i.e., the higher the relative concentration, the bigger the symbol size. Data points are 5-minute-resolved. (b) Frequencies of observed NPF days, undefined days and non-event days in comparison to daily averaged Fuchs surface area. On typical NPF days and undefined days, A_{Fuchs} was averaged during NPF event periods. On non-event days, it was averaged between 8:00 and 16:00. A_{Fuchs} values were binned in logarithmic scale ranging from 45 to 1150.

**Figure 6: (a)** The correlation between L_Γ and A_{Fuchs} (data from Table 1) in this campaign. NPF days, non-event days, and undefined days are shown as different symbols. The regression was based on all campaign days. **(b)** The correlation between L_Γ and A_{Fuchs} estimated for this study in comparison to other campaigns.

540

Figure 7: The schematic of governing factors for L_Γ at different locations. Concentration of growth relevant gaseous precursors is represented by $\Gamma \cdot N_1$, where Γ is the growth enhancement factor and N_1 is sulfuric acid number concentration. Background colour represents the magnitude of L_Γ. Data for each location are shown as different symbols (circle: Beijing; square: Atlanta; diamond: Boulder; triangle: Hyytiälä). The ellipse and the boxes were artificially drawn to illustrate the variations. Tecamac was not included due to the lack of data on non-event days. Both axes are in log scale.

Figure 8: Average contribution of the net CoagSnk, dN/dt, and the condensational growth term (GR term) to the estimated new particle formation rate, $J_{1.5}$, on identified typical NPF days. The percentage presented in each column is the relative ratio of the net CoagSnk compared to $J_{1.5}$ of that NPF event. Note that only the time period when dN/dt was positive during a NPF event was taken in to account when calculating average contribution.

Figure 9: (a) Contour of measured particle size distributions on Apr. 2nd, 3rd, and 4th. (b) Representative parameters on these three NPF days. Time periods when L_Γ was lower than 1.0 are shadowed by light blue background. When wind speed was close to zero, the corresponding wind direction data were not included in the plot.

$$\overline{A_{\text{Fuchs}}}\left(d_p\right) = \frac{4\pi}{3}\int_{d_{\min}}^{d_p} d^2 \cdot \left(\frac{Kn + Kn^2}{1 + 1.71Kn + 1.33Kn^2}\right) \cdot n \cdot \mathrm{d}d$$

○ 10:00, Apr. 1$^{\text{st}}$, $A_{\text{Fuchs}} = 58\ \mu\text{m}^2/\text{cm}^3$

● 10:00, Mar. 13$^{\text{th}}$, $A_{\text{Fuchs}} = 99\ \mu\text{m}^2/\text{cm}^3$

◇ 10:00, Apr. 4$^{\text{th}}$, $A_{\text{Fuchs}} = 454\ \mu\text{m}^2/\text{cm}^3$

◆ 10:00, Mar. 14$^{\text{th}}$, $A_{\text{Fuchs}} = 808\ \mu\text{m}^2/\text{cm}^3$

560   **Figure 10: Normalized distribution of cumulative Fuchs surface area, $\overline{A_{\text{Fuchs}}}$, as a function of the particle diameter, d_p, on two**

NPF days (red circle) and two non-event days (blue diamond). $\overline{A_{\text{Fuchs}}}$ is equal to A_{Fuchs} when d_p is approaching positive infinity.

$\mathrm{d}\overline{A_{\text{Fuchs}}}\big/\mathrm{d}\log d_p$ is normalized by A_{Fuchs}.

Figure 11: Relationship between hourly averaged A_{Fuchs} and the PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration in Beijing. Data when A_{Fuchs} changed rapidly was not included to avoid potential influence caused by the distance between Wanliu station and our campaign site. NPF period, daytime (8:00-16:00) on non-event days and undefined days, and other time are shown as different symbols. The regression of A_{Fuchs} versus the PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration was based on all the data. The proposed criterion for the occurrence of NPF events, i.e., A_{Fuchs} is lower than 200 μm^2/cm^3 (the PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentration is lower than 30 μg/cm^3), is shadowed by light green background.