

## Supplementary Information to

# What do we learn from long-term cloud condensation nuclei number concentration, particle number size distribution, and chemical composition measurements at regionally representative observatories?

10 Julia Schmale<sup>1</sup>, Silvia Henning<sup>2</sup>, Stefano Decesari<sup>3</sup>, Bas Henzing<sup>4</sup>, Helmi Keskinen<sup>5,6</sup>, Mikhail Paramonov<sup>5,7</sup>, Karine Sellegri<sup>8</sup>, Jurgita Ovadnevaite<sup>9</sup>, Mira L. Pöhlker<sup>10</sup>, Joel Brito<sup>11,8</sup>, Aikaterini Bougiatioti<sup>12</sup>, Adam Kristensson<sup>13</sup>, Nikos Kalivitis<sup>12</sup>, Iasonas Stavroulas<sup>12</sup>, Samara Carbone<sup>11</sup>, Anne Jefferson<sup>14</sup>, Minsu Park<sup>15</sup>, Patrick Schlag<sup>16,17</sup>, Yoko Iwamoto<sup>18,19</sup>, Pasi Aalto<sup>5</sup>, Mikko Äijälä<sup>5</sup>, Nicolas Bukowiecki<sup>1</sup>, Mikael Ehn<sup>5</sup>, Göran Frank<sup>13</sup>, Roman Fröhlich<sup>1</sup>, Arnoud Frumau<sup>20</sup>, Erik Herrmann<sup>1</sup>, Hartmut Herrmann<sup>2</sup>, Rupert Holzinger<sup>16</sup>, Gerard Kos<sup>20</sup>, Markku Kulmala<sup>5</sup>, Nikolaos Mihalopoulos<sup>12,21</sup>, Athanasios Nenes<sup>22,21,23</sup>, Colin O'Dowd<sup>9</sup>, Tuukka Petäjä<sup>5</sup>, David Picard<sup>8</sup>, Christopher Pöhlker<sup>10</sup>, Ulrich Pöschl<sup>10</sup>, Laurent Poulain<sup>2</sup>, André Stephan Henry Prévôt<sup>1</sup>, Erik Swietlicki<sup>13</sup>, Meinrat O. Andreae<sup>10</sup>, Paulo Artaxo<sup>11</sup>, Alfred Wiedensohler<sup>2</sup>, John Ogren<sup>14</sup>, Atsushi Matsuki<sup>18</sup>, Seong Soo Yum<sup>15</sup>, Frank Stratmann<sup>2</sup>, Urs Baltensperger<sup>1</sup>, and Martin Gysel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Laboratory of Atmospheric Chemistry, Paul Scherrer Institute, 5232 Villigen, Switzerland

20 <sup>2</sup> Leibniz Institute for Tropospheric Research, Permoserstrasse 15, 04318 Leipzig, Germany

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Atmospheric Sciences and Climate, National Research Council of Italy, Via Piero Gobetti, 101, 40129 Bologna, Italy

<sup>4</sup> Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research, Princetonlaan 6, 3584 Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>5</sup> Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Gustaf Hällströmin katu 2, 00014, Helsinki, Finland

25 <sup>6</sup> Hyytiälä Forestry Field Station, Hyytiäläntie 124, Korkeakoski, Finland

<sup>7</sup> Institute for Atmospheric and Climate Science, ETH Zurich, Universitätsstrasse 16, 8092 Zurich, Switzerland

<sup>8</sup> Laboratory for Meteorological Physics (LaMP), Université Clermont Auvergne, F-63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France

<sup>9</sup> School of Physics and CCAPS, National University of Ireland Galway, University Road, Galway, Ireland

<sup>10</sup> Multiphase Chemistry and Biogeochemistry Departments, Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, Mainz, Germany

30 <sup>11</sup> Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, Rua do Matão 1371, CEP 05508-090, São Paulo, SP, Brazil

<sup>12</sup> Department of Chemistry, University of Crete, Voutes, 71003 Heraklion, Greece

<sup>13</sup> Department of Physics, Lund University, 221 00 Lund, Sweden

<sup>14</sup> Earth System Research Laboratory, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 325 Broadway, Boulder, CO 80305, USA

35 <sup>15</sup> Department of Atmospheric Science, Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea

<sup>16</sup> Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research, University of Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>17</sup> Institute for Energy and Climate Research (IEK-8): Troposphere, Forschungszentrum Jülich, Jülich, Germany

<sup>18</sup> Institute of Nature and Environmental Technology, Kanazawa University, Kakuma-machi, Kanazawa 920-1192, Japan

<sup>19</sup> Graduate School of Biosphere Science, Hiroshima University, 1-4-4, Kagamiyama, Higashi-Hiroshima 739-8528, Japan

40 <sup>20</sup> Energy Research Center of the Netherlands, Petten, The Netherlands

<sup>21</sup>National Observatory of Athens, P. Penteli 15236, Athens, Greece

<sup>22</sup>School of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering and School of Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332-0340, USA

<sup>23</sup>Foundation for Research and Technology – Hellas, Greece

5

*Correspondence to:* Julia Schmale ([julia.schmale@gmail.com](mailto:julia.schmale@gmail.com)) and Martin Gysel ([martin.gysel@psi.ch](mailto:martin.gysel@psi.ch))

## 1 Data corrections


### Jungfraujoch (JFJ) CCN data

5

The operation and data analyses procedures for the SMPS at JFJ are described in detail in Jurányi et al. (2011) and Herrmann et al. (2015). Routinely, the integrated SMPS particle number concentration is compared to a reference CPC. Discrepancies of greater than 20 % in concentrations are removed from any further data analysis.

At a supersaturation of 1.0 % it is expected that all particles activate if the number fraction of particles with a diameter lower than 30 nm is small (e.g., Schmale et al., 2017). We calculate the total number concentrations of particles > 30 nm ( $CN_{30}$ ) from the SMPS data and compare them to the  $CCN_{1,0}$  number concentration for the years 2012 through 2014, see Fig. S1. Discrepancies in 2012 and 2013 are beyond the 10 % counting uncertainty of both the SMPS and CCNC (compare the black solid and dashed lines with the color coded data points). In 2012 the CCNC significantly underestimated the CCN number concentration while in 2013 it overestimated it. This is likely due to the malfunctioning of the humidifying membrane in the CCNC which was replaced at the end of 2012 due to underreporting. The new membrane did not operate properly until late in 2013, hence the discrepancy in 2013. In 2014 the CCNC operated correctly as can be seen in the figure. Based on closure attempts following the  $\kappa$ -Köhler theory as described in Section 2.3.2 in the manuscript the concentration biases in 2012 and 2013 were found to be independent of the applied supersaturation. For the data analysis presented in the manuscript, the CCN number concentrations were corrected accordingly.

20




**Fig. S1:** Untreated JFJ data from 2012, 2013 and 2014. The left panels show the ratio of the total particle number > 30 nm and the CCN number concentration at SS = 1.0 % as a box and whiskers plot. The box indicates the interquartile range, the whiskers the 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles, the middle horizontal bar the median and the marker the geometric mean whose value is also given. The right panels show the relationship between  $CN_{30}$  and  $CCN_{1,0}$  within logarithmic bins. The color code indicates the number of particles falling within one bin space. The solid black line is the 1:1 line while the dashed lines mark the 10 % particle uncertainty range.

5

## **Cabauw (CES) CCN data**

At CES the CCN number concentration is strongly underestimated, and the underestimation increases with increasing supersaturation. Fig. S2 shows examples of the closure attempt based on the  $\kappa$ -Köhler theory as described in Section 2.3.2 in the manuscript for SS = 1.0, 0.5 and 0.2 %. The results suggest that small particles, activating at higher supersaturation, were not sufficiently accounted for by the CCNC while they were measured by the SMPS. SMPS data have been quality controlled (Schlag et al., 2016). As this was not due to insufficient droplet growth to the detection limit of 1  $\mu\text{m}$  of the optical particle counter in the CCNC, the bias most likely originated from particle losses in the sampling line to the CCNC. These size dependent losses could not be corrected for in retrospect. Hence, the dataset has not been corrected.




**Fig. S2:** Performance of closure study for the CES data set at SS = 1.0, 0.5 and 0.2 %. The left panels show the ratio of the predicted CCN number concentration based on the  $\kappa$ -Köhler theory and the measured CCN number concentration as a box and whiskers plot. The box indicates the interquartile range, the whiskers the 10<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentiles, the middle horizontal bar the median and the marker the geometric mean whose value is also given. The right panels show the relationship between the predicted and measured CCN number concentrations within logarithmic bins. The color code indicates the number of particles falling within one bin space. The solid black line is the 1:1 line while the dashed lines mark the 10 % particle uncertainty range.

## 2 Sensitivity study

Figure S3 demonstrates how the prediction skill of the CCN number concentration changes across a range of supersaturations when varying a number of parameters based on the corrected JFJ data. Panels a) and b) show in detail how the slope and correlation coefficient of the closure based on the  $\kappa$ -Köhler theory change assuming internally mixed particles. Changing the  $\kappa$ -value by a factor of two would introduce a bias of 15 % on average, panel d). If the supersaturation were calibrated incorrectly for the CCNC, for example by an exaggerated overestimation of 50 %, the predicted CCN number concentration would be roughly 20 % too high. Accounting for a potential, but again exaggerated, error in the size distribution measurements by shifting it by 20 % of the measurement range, i.e. overestimating the diameter by roughly 120 nm, 30 % more CCN would be predicted. If the surface tension were significantly lower, an assumed 50 %, the overprediction of the CCN number concentration would be around 40 %. A particle number counting error, evenly distributed across the whole size range, is directly proportional to the over- or underprediction of the CCN number concentration. Here an example for 10 % overcounting is provided.

15 Given that only exaggerated deviations of all parameters, but the particle counting, lead to moderate over- or underestimations of the CCN number concentration, these results suggest that precise counting of particles by both the SMPS and CCNC is most important. A 10 % deviation is within the expected uncertainty. Higher deviations will, however, be reflected proportionally in the results, as was the case at JFJ as shown in Fig. S1.




**Fig. S3:** Sensitivity analysis of a  $\kappa$ -Köhler closure study based on the uncorrected JFJ data. Panel (a) shows how the agreement between the predicted and measured CCN number concentration changes with supersaturation in form of the slope of the linear regression. Panel (b) shows the same for the correlation coefficient. The legend is given in panel (c), while (d) summarizes the top panels by showing how the prediction skill changes when varying specific variables by extreme values.




### 3 Seasonal total particle number concentration and activation ratios

Figure S4 shows the total particle number seasonal cycle for all stations.



**Fig. S4:** Seasonal cycle of the total number concentration. The thick colored lines indicate the median value, while the shaded colored areas show the interquartile range. The black vertical bars indicate 1000 particles  $\text{cm}^{-3}$ .

Figure S5 shows the monthly variation of the fraction of activated particles (activation ratio “AR”). Note, based on the discussion in SI Sec.1 the AR for CES is underestimated and should be referred to with caution.



5

**Fig. S5:** Annual cycle of the CCN activation ratio at SS = 0.2 %. The basis for the total particle number is  $N_{20}$ . The thick colored lines indicate the median activation ratio, while the shaded colored areas show the interquartile range. The black vertical bars indicate 50 % activation. Due to higher data coverage in SEO results for SS = 0.4 % are shown additionally.

10

## References

- Herrmann, E., Weingartner, E., Henne, S., Vuilleumier, L., Bukowiecki, N., Steinbacher, M., Conen, F., Collaud Coen, M., Hammer, E., Jurányi, Z., Baltensperger, U., and Gysel, M.: Analysis of long-term aerosol size distribution data from Jungfraujoch with emphasis on free tropospheric conditions, cloud influence, and air mass transport, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 120, 9459-9480, 2015.
- Jurányi, Z., Gysel, M., Weingartner, E., Bukowiecki, N., Kammermann, L., and Baltensperger, U.: A 17 month climatology of the cloud condensation nuclei number concentration at the high alpine site Jungfraujoch, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116, n/a-n/a, 2011.
- Schlag, P., Kiendler-Scharr, A., Blom, M. J., Canonaco, F., Henzing, J. S., Moerman, M. M., Prévôt, A. S. H., and Holzinger, R.: Aerosol source apportionment from 1 year measurements at the CESAR tower at Cabauw, the Netherlands, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 8831-8847, 2016.
- Schmale, J., Henning, S., Henzing, B., Keskinen, H., Sellegri, K., Ovadnevaite, J., Bougiatioti, A., Kalivitis, N., Stavroulas, I., Jefferson, A., Park, M., Schlag, P., Kristensson, A., Iwamoto, Y., Pringle, K., Reddington, C., Aalto, P., Äijälä, M., Baltensperger, U., Bialek, J., Birmili, W., Bukowiecki, N., Ehn, M., Fjæraa, A. M., Fiebig, M., Frank, G., Fröhlich, R., Frumau, A., Furuya, M., Hammer, E., Heikkinen, L., Herrmann, E., Holzinger, R., Hyono, H., Kanakidou, M., Kiendler-Scharr, A., Kinouchi, K., Kos, G., Kulmala, M., Mihalopoulos, N., Motos, G., Nenes, A., O'Dowd, C., Paramonov, M., Petäjä, T., Picard, D., Poulain, L., Prévôt, A. S. H., Slowik, J., Sonntag, A., Swietlicki, E., Svenningsson, B., Tsurumaru, H., Wiedensohler, A., Wittbom, C., Ogren, J. A., Matsuki, A., Yum, S. S., Myhre, C. L., Carslaw, K., Stratmann, F., and Gysel, M.: Collocated observations of cloud condensation nuclei, particle size distributions, and chemical composition, *Scientific Data*, 4, 170003, 2017.