

Authors' response

We thank again the referee for his critical review of our work. We also thank the editor for coordinating the peer-review process. We provide here answers to the referee's and editor's comments. (Referee comments are in italics.)

Anonymous referee #2

I acknowledge the efforts put in by the authors in revising the paper. However I still have very major concerns that have arisen with some of the revised plots made in the new version to address concerns raised in the original review. These concerns cast serious doubt on the quality and comparability of the OH reactivity measurements during the different seasons. I have listed these below:

1) Fig 2: Although the authors claim that the GC-PID detector has no dependence on humidity, the calibration plots they provide in Fig 2 are not at all convincing. There are several major issues with it.

Looking at the right panel, one would surmise that the detector signal in June at 25 ppb of pyrrole was close to zero. The fits were arrived at using just three points and making the lines pass through zero, not even allowing for the fact there could be different residual noise in the detector under wet and dry conditions....the wet and dry calibration points were not even done at the same introduced pyrrole mixing ratios, which could have been helpful if the information were to be inferred using just 2-3 points to get a fit!

Coming to the left hand figure, it does have many more points but the lowest point even for 10 ppb pyrrole when the instrument was more sensitive in April at the start of their seasonal measurements for the long term deployment, shows a detector signal close to zero. The delta C3 (that is C3-C2) values would be typically less than 10 ppb for the ambient OH reactivity values measured during their study. How then can one distinguish the signal from noise beyond reasonable doubt and just trust the values blindly by applying statistics on the measured signals ?

We regret the poor quality of Figure 2 in the revised manuscript. Following the referee's concern, we had a closer look at the underlying raw data and realized a mistake in the way the script that we used calculated pyrrole mixing ratios and corrected it (Fig. A1) for the second revision of the manuscript.




Figure A1. Left: GC-PID sensitivity for pyrrole used in the present study. Right: Same day test (30 June 2015) for GC-PID sensitivity to pyrrole under dry and humid conditions.

In the right panel, the wet and dry calibrations were indeed both derived introducing the same amount of pyrrole. The fits (with only 3 points) are now within 2.8 %, which corresponds to the measurement uncertainty with the GC-PID. In the left panel, the calibration of 30 July remains unchanged, while the calibration of 5 April was corrected. The slope of the fit is now 1797 a.u./ppbv (about 9% higher than the value in the revised manuscript). We revised all our calculations based on this revised sensitivity value in the second revision of the manuscript.

2) *The NO₂ correction is still beyond my comprehension...first of all the plot in Fig3 shows change in C₃ signal to be appreciable only starting at 20 ppb in the reactor. Considering there is large dilution of ambient air before it enters the reactor this would imply that much higher ambient NO₂ of even 30 ppb would not change C₃ by much. In this relatively clean forest site how much of the time period that the authors measured was characterized by 20-30 ppb NO₂? How many data points? Even the reasoning they give for NO₂ interference being important is not unclear. They assert NO₂ photolysis produces NO which reacts with HO₂ to give OH. But why wouldn't the reaction of NO also occur with O₃ which is more abundant in the reactor and competitive reaction wise, not give back NO₂ and compensate this effect?*

It does not seem as though they quantified reaction rates of both reactions for the range of conditions inside their reactor... I cannot understand why the authors wish to pursue with such experiments and analysis in the present work, and try to draw conclusion attributing corrections to a single factors despite the occurrence of several possible confounders during these experiments?

This is a very legitimate concern from the referee. While the decrease of C₃ due to the introduction of NO₂ has been reported previously (Michoud et al., 2015; Praplan et al., 2017), we lost sight of its relevance to the present study. The referee is right to ask how much of the data points were corrected for this and after verification it appears to be only less than 4%. For this reason, we have removed this correction from the data analysis. We accordingly removed its description and any associated discussion and updated all the results in the second revision of the manuscript.

I am regret very much that this version is still lacking as this is a very good research group which is well known for its VOC measurement expertise in the world. Just this work in my opinion has serious shortcomings for me to have confidence in the results and conclusions of the study.

We hope that this second revision addresses adequately the referee's main concerns and we appreciate founded criticism, regardless of the reputation of our research group.

Editor

On the revised manuscript, Reviewer #2 shows a big concern, particularly about Figure 2 (small number of data and points largely deviated from linearity) and thus the quantitiveness of the

determined reactivity from the measurements. The present editor also suspects that the measurements suffer from large uncertainties (not well specified), affecting solidity of the conclusion.

We regret that Fig. 2 of the revised manuscript was of such poor quality, due to a mistake in a script used in our data analysis. We have redone the figure and do hope that correcting our mistake answers the referee's concerns (as described above). We also detail the uncertainties better in the main text and with additional plots in the Appendix of the second revision of the manuscript.

The authors also need to address the issue that the present editor originally requested at the timing of resubmission, to verify if the concentrations of secondary organic species are adequately modeled. Independent measurements of aldehydes or peroxides should be used to test the adequacy of the model. Otherwise the modeled levels of the secondary species could become very arbitrary and the conclusion about the presence of missing reactivity is weak.

Our options to validate the model in the way that the editor suggests are very limited, which is why we referred to previous work by (Zhou et al., 2017a, 2017b) regarding the validation of the model. The main reason is the lack of measurements for specific secondary compounds during the measurement period of this study. No PTR-MS was operating at the SMEAR II station during that period. This is now mentioned in the main text of our manuscript. Also no measurements of any peroxide or specific aldehydes (such as pinonaldehyde, for instance) are available during that time either. Comparing non-specific oxidation products might be misleading as not all the precursors are included in the model and these compounds could have been transported. Nevertheless, nopinone, a reaction product of β -pinene was measured by GC-MS. To provide the reader a verification of the secondary organic species produced in the model, we have added a plot in the Appendix to compare measured and modelled nopinone (Fig. A2) and added information related to earlier model validations for organic species with SOSAA at SMEAR II. As it is the most we can do with the measurements available, we hope that this and the previous studies suffice to convince the editor that the modelled secondary species agree reasonably well with measurements.




Figure A2. Mixing ratio of nopinone measured (red line and shaded area for 50% uncertainty) and modelled (blue line) for the three modelled periods in April, May, and July (from left to right).

We modified the text at the end of section 2.6 which now reads: “The latter describes the explicit simulation of the loss of every compound in the model by dry deposition inside the canopy for all height levels and provides a detailed comparison of measured and modelled fluxes of certain selected VOCs including some secondary organic species at SMEAR II.”

In addition we added the following text to improve the third paragraph of section 3.4: “To check the model performance for the concentrations of the secondary organic species, we compared nopinone measured by GC-MS with the model output. The plots for all three selected periods (Fig. C1 in the Appendix) show that the trend and of the model concentrations for nopinone are comparable to the measured values and the absolute values are mostly inside estimated 50% uncertainties of the

measurements.

The only exceptions are the difference during daytimes in May where the measurements show a very strong decrease in the morning but the model follows these behavior much weaker. No other specific secondary species is available for such comparison due to the lack of measurements.”

Only when the authors could provide appropriate reply to the points above and other important points that the reviewer raised, further consideration will be made.

We hope that we could reply appropriately to the points raised in the second revision of our manuscript.

References

Michoud, V., Hansen, R. F., Locoge, N., Stevens, P. S. and Dusanter, S.: Detailed characterizations of the new Mines Douai comparative reactivity method instrument via laboratory experiments and modeling, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8(8), 3537–3553, doi:10.5194/amt-8-3537-2015, 2015.

Praplan, A. P., Pfannerstill, E. Y., Williams, J. and Hellén, H.: OH reactivity of the urban air in Helsinki, Finland, during winter, *Atmos. Env.*, 169, 150–161, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.09.013, 2017.

Zhou, P., Ganzeveld, L., Rannik, Ü., Zhou, L., Gierens, R., Taipale, D., Mammarella, I. and Boy, M.: Simulating ozone dry deposition at a boreal forest with a multi-layer canopy deposition model, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(2), 1361–1379, doi:10.5194/acp-17-1361-2017, 2017a.

Zhou, P., Ganzeveld, L., Taipale, D., Rannik, Ü., Rantala, P., Rissanen, M. P., Chen, D. and Boy, M.: Boreal forest BVOC exchange: emissions versus in-canopy sinks, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17(23), 14309–14332, doi:10.5194/acp-17-14309-2017, 2017b.

Long-term total OH reactivity measurements in a boreal forest

Arnaud P. Praplan¹, Toni Tykkä¹, Dean Chen², Michael Boy², Ditte Taipale², Ville Vakkari^{1,3}, Putian Zhou², Tuukka Petäjä², and Heidi Hellén¹

¹Finnish Meteorological Institute, P.O. Box 503, 00101 Helsinki, Finland

²Institute for Atmospheric and Earth System Research/Physics, Faculty of Science, P.O. Box 64, 00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

³Unit for Environmental Sciences and Management, North-West University, ZA-2520 Potchefstroom, South Africa

Correspondence: A. P. Praplan (arnaud.praplan@fmi.fi)

Abstract.

Total hydroxyl radical (OH) reactivity measurements were conducted at the second Station for Measuring Ecosystem-Atmosphere Relations (SMEAR II), a boreal forest site located in Hyytiälä, Finland, from April to July 2016. The measured values were compared with OH reactivity calculated from a combination of data from the routine trace gas measurements (station mast) as well as online and offline analysis with gas chromatography coupled to mass spectrometry (GC-MS) and offline liquid chromatography. Up to 104 compounds, mostly Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and oxidised VOCs, but also inorganic compounds, were included in the analysis, even though the data availability for each compound varied with time. The monthly averaged experimental total OH reactivity was found to be higher in April and May (ca. $17\text{--}20\text{ s}^{-1}$) than in June and July ($7.4\text{--}12.3\text{--}7.6\text{ and }15.4\text{ s}^{-1}$, respectively). The measured values varied much more in spring with high reactivity peaks in late afternoon, with values higher than in the summer, in particular when the soil was thawing. Total OH reactivity values generally followed the pattern of mixing ratios due to change of the boundary layer height. The missing reactivity fraction (defined as the different between measured and calculated OH reactivity) was found to be high. Several reasons that can explain the missing reactivity are discussed in detail such as 1) missing measurements due to technical issues, 2) not measuring oxidation compounds of detected biogenic VOCs, 3) missing important reactive compounds or classes of compounds with the available measurements. In order to test the second hypothesis, a one-dimensional chemical transport model (SOSAA) has been used to estimate the amount of unmeasured oxidation products and their expected contribution to the reactivity for three different short periods in April, May, and July. However, only a small fraction ($3.1\text{--}7.3\text{--}4.5\%$) of the missing reactivity can be explained by modelled secondary compounds (mostly oxidised VOCs). These findings indicate that compounds measured but not included in the model as well as unmeasured primary emissions contribute the missing reactivity. In the future, non-hydrocarbon compounds from other sources than vegetation (e.g. soil) should be included in OH reactivity studies.

1 Introduction

Terrestrial vegetation is responsible for about 90 % of the emissions of Biogenic Volatile Organic Compounds (BVOCs) into the atmosphere (Guenther et al., 1995). Isoprene and monoterpenes are the most abundant BVOCs globally (44 and 17 %, respectively; Guenther et al., 2012). These compounds are very reactive and their lifetimes range from minutes to hours, thus influencing tropospheric chemistry.

Total hydroxyl radical (OH) reactivity measurements can be used as a method to assess our understanding of tropospheric chemistry (Kovacs and Brune, 2001; Williams and Brune, 2015). Many observations of total OH reactivity have been performed in the past few decades and compared to calculated OH reactivity derived from known chemical composition of the atmosphere. While for urban environment the unexplained (or *missing*) reactivity fraction remains low, it is often more than 50 % in forested environments (see the review by Yang et al., 2016). Based on these observations, Ferracci et al. (2018) modelled the global OH reactivity, as well as hypothetical missing chemical sink, which was found to be mostly localized above forested areas and in a few areas with large anthropogenic emissions.

Large fractions of missing reactivity were first observed in a forest in northern Michigan (Di Carlo et al., 2004) and later observed as well in other forested environments (e.g. Hansen et al., 2014; Nakashima et al., 2014; Ramasamy et al., 2016; Zannoni et al., 2016). Also in the tropical forest of Borneo up to 70 % of the measured total OH reactivity remained unexplained (Edwards et al., 2013). In addition, Nölscher et al. (2016) identified a large difference of missing OH reactivity between the dry and wet seasons in the Amazon rainforest, with 79 % on average and between 5 to 15 %, respectively. They identified then the forest floor as an important but poorly characterized source of OH reactivity and Bourtsoukidis et al. (2018) recently identified strong sesquiterpene emissions from soil micro-organisms at the same site.

Also in the boreal forest, which represents approximately one third of the Earth's forested surface (Keenan et al., 2015), a large discrepancy was observed between the total measured OH reactivity and the reactivity calculated from individual compounds present in the forest air (Sinha et al., 2010; Nölscher et al., 2012). Up to 89 % of the measured total OH reactivity could not be explained for periods in which the forest experienced stress conditions (elevated temperature).

The two main assumptions for the missing reactivity are 1) missing primary emissions and 2) missing oxidation products from the emissions. Several studies have been conducted to investigate these hypotheses. Nölscher et al. (2013), for instance, found an increasing missing fraction of Norway spruce (*Picea abies*) emissions from about 15–27 % in spring and early summer and up to 70–84 % in late summer and autumn. In contrast, Kim et al. (2011) found no significant unknown primary BVOC contributing to OH reactivity (for red oak, white pine, beech, and red maple) during their study period in July 2009 in a forest in Michigan. They also found that the missing reactivity from ambient measurement at this site could be explained by oxidation products from isoprene. Kaiser et al. (2016) found in an isoprene-dominated forest in Alabama that emissions and their modelled oxidation products reduced the unexplained reactivity to 5–20 % during the day and 20–32 % at night and attribute the missing reactivity to unmeasured primary emissions. Mao et al. (2012) also demonstrated that including modelled oxidation products in OH reactivity calculations reduce the difference with measurements significantly.

55 Sinha et al. (2010) and Nölscher et al. (2012) conducted their studies at the second Station for Measuring Ecosystem-
Atmosphere Relation (SMEAR II; Hari and Kulmala, 2005) in Hyytiälä, Finland, for about three weeks in August 2008 and
for about three and a half weeks in July-August 2010, respectively, with the Comparative Reactivity Method (CRM, Sinha
et al., 2008). Mogensen et al. (2011) modelled the full year of OH reactivity at SMEAR II for 2008, based on modelled
60 emissions, known chemistry, and environmental conditions. A comparison with results from Sinha et al. (2010) showed that
compounds other than monoterpenes, isoprene, and methane contribute to only about 8 % of the measured OH reactivity. Taking
all compounds into account, about 61 % of the OH reactivity remained unexplained on average during that period. Mogensen
et al. (2015) also compared modelled reactivity at SMEAR II with OH reactivity measurements from Nölscher et al. (2012),
using measured trace gases as input but found on average about 65 % of unexplained reactivity, similarly to the previous study.

In order to investigate OH reactivity at SMEAR II in more details, in particular its missing fraction and the seasonal variations
65 which are often neglected for summer intensive campaigns, a new implementation of the CRM was developed at the Finnish
Meteorological Institute (Praplan et al., 2017). It was installed at SMEAR II along with instrumentation to measure VOCs in
spring and summer 2016.

2 Methods

2.1 Measurement site

70 Measurements were conducted at the boreal forest site SMEAR II (Hari and Kulmala, 2005; Ilvesniemi et al., 2009) in Hyytiälä,
Finland (61°51' N, 24°17' E, 181 m above sea level). The site is located in a ca. 60-year old managed conifer forest with modest
height variation of the terrain. The stand is dominated by Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) homogeneously for about 200 m in
all directions, extending to the north for about 1.2 km. Tampere is the largest city near the station about 60 km S-SW.

The instruments were located inside a container in an opening about 115 m from the site mast, from which meteorological
75 data as well as ozone (O₃), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), methane (CH₄), carbon monoxide (CO) and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) concen-
trations were retrieved to be included in the analysis. Proton-transfer-reaction mass spectrometer (PTR-MS) measurements of
VOCs usually operated at the station mast were not operational during the measurement period and could not be used in this
study.

In situ measurements of the total OH reactivity (section [2.5](#)) and of VOC concentrations (section 2.2) were done at the
80 container, sampling outside air at a height of about 1.5 m (Fig. 1). Station data (from the mast, measurement towers and soil)
are open data under Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution licence (CC BY 4.0) and were retrieved from the online SmartSMEAR
interface (<https://avaa.tdata.fi/web/smart/smear>, Junninen et al., 2009).

Temperature and relative humidity (RH) are taken at 4.2 m above ground on the mast; soil properties are an average of five
locations throughout the site; and radiation and precipitation data are collected at 18 m height on a nearby tower.



Figure 1. Orthophotograph of the SMEAR II station in Hyytiälä and its surroundings with the marked location of the station mast and the container where the measurements were performed. (Source: Land Survey of Finland Topographic Database 09/2018, CC BY 4.0).

85 2.2 In-situ measurements of volatile organic compounds

VOCs were measured with two in situ GC-MS. The first GC-MS was used for the measurements of mono- and sesquiterpenes, isoprene, 2-methyl-3-butenol (MBO) and C_{5-10} aldehydes. With this GC-MS air was drawn at the flow rate of 11 min^{-1} through a meter-long fluorinated ethylene propylene (FEP) inlet (i.d. 1/8 inch) and for O_3 removal (Hellén et al., 2012) through a meter-long heated (120°C) stainless steel tube (o.d. 1/8 inch). VOCs were collected from a 40 ml min^{-1} subsample flow in
90 the cold trap (Carbopack B/Tenax TA) of the thermal desorption unit (TurboMatrix, 650, Perkin-Elmer) connected to a gas chromatograph (Clarus 680, Perkin-Elmer) coupled to a mass spectrometer (Clarus SQ 8 T, Perkin-Elmer). A HP-5 column (60m, i.d. 0.25 mm, film thickness $1 \mu\text{m}$) was used for separation. The second GC-MS was used for the measurements of
95 C_{4-8} alcohols and C_{2-7} volatile organic acids (VOAs). Samples were taken every other hour. The sampling time was 60 min. Samples were analysed in situ with a thermal desorption unit (Unity 2 + Air Server 2, Markes International LTD, Llantrisant, UK) connected to a gas chromatograph (Agilent 7890A, Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA) and a mass spectrometer (Agilent 5975C, Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA). A polyethylene glycol column DB-WAXetr (30-m, i.d. 0.25 mm, a film thickness $0.25 \mu\text{m}$) was used for the separation. These methods and measurements have been described in more detail by Hellén et al. (2017, 2018).

2.3 Offline measurements of volatile organic compounds

100 Additional sampling took place between 27 April to 3 May in canisters and through adsorption cartridges (24-hour time resolution) to be analysed by GC-FID (C_{2-6} hydrocarbons) and LC-UV (carbonyls), respectively. During this period, Tenax tube samples were also taken (4-hour time resolution) and analysed later in the laboratory with GC-MS. These results were used as backup to fill in data during interruptions of the online GC-MS measurements. Between 20 and 29 July, additional sampling through adsorption cartridges for offline analysis with LC-UV was performed.

105 2.4 Mixing Layer Height measurements

The Mixing Layer Height (MLH) was estimated from measurements with a 1.5 m pulsed Doppler lidar (Halo Photonics Stream Line; Pearson et al., 2009) similar to Hellén et al. (2018). MLH was determined from a combination of turbulent kinetic energy dissipation rate profiles and conical scanning at 30° elevation angle according to the method described in Vakkari et al. (2015). With this method MLH could be determined from 60 m above ground level (a.g.l.) to more than 2000 m a.g.l. at SMEAR II.

110 Periods when MLH was <60 m a.g.l. could be identified although the actual MLH was not determined due to minimum range limitations. MLH was not determined for rainy periods. For more detailed specifications of the lidar system and the applied MLH determination method see Hellén et al. (2018).

2.5 Total OH reactivity measurements: the Comparative Reactivity Method (CRM)

The OH reactivity, R_{OH} , is defined as the sum of the concentration of individual compounds X_i multiplied by their respective reaction rate coefficient with respect to OH (k_{OH+X_i}). This can be summarised by the following equation:

115

$$R_{OH} = \sum_i [X_i] k_{OH+X_i} \quad (1)$$

The OH reactivity of a compound is the inverse of the OH chemical lifetime due to its reaction with that compound. High OH reactivity values correspond to short lifetimes and long-lived species (such as methane) have a low reactivity.

Our analysis includes up to over 100 individual species from two GC-MS, GC-FID and LC-UV measurements (see sections 2.2 and 2.3). However, not all compounds have been measured at all times (see Fig. 6c). In addition NO_x , O_3 , SO_2 and, and CO concentrations were retrieved from the mast of the SMEAR II station, about 115 m away from the sampling position of total OH reactivity and VOCs.

120

Measurements of total OH reactivity (R_{exp}) have been conducted using the Comparative Reactivity Method (CRM, Sinha et al., 2008; Michoud et al., 2015). Our particular implementation of the method is described in Praplan et al. (2017).

125 The CRM is based on the monitoring of pyrrole (C_4H_5N) mixed in a 100 ml-reactor with zero air and ambient air, alternatively. The total flow through the reactor is about 465 ml min^{-1} and the residence time in the reactor estimated about 12–15 s.

Pyrrole detection is performed with a gas chromatograph (GC) equipped with a photon ionization detector (PID) every two minutes (Synthec Spectras GC955, Synspec BV, Groningen, The Netherlands). The sensitivity of this detector is independent




Figure 2. Left: Sensitivity of the GC-PID for pyrrole used in the present study. Right: Same day (30 June 2015) sensitivity test for sensitivity of GC-PID for pyrrole in humid and dry conditions.

from the RH of the sample (Fig. 2), but decreased from ~~1645~~ 1797 a.u./ppb_v (data from April to June) to 1290 a.u./ppb_v (July data). In both cases, the uncertainty of the sensitivity (U_s) is 2.5%. In addition we consider the uncertainty of the pyrrole levels (U_p) based on the uncertainty of the pyrrole standard ($U_{pyr, std} = 10\%$) and of the uncertainty of the dilution ($U_{dil} = 8\%$), so $U_p = \sqrt{U_{pyr, std}^2 + U_{dil}^2} = 12.8\%$ (Praplan et al., 2017).

Based on earlier tests, the sensitivity of the GC-PID does not depend on RH in the reactor (Fig. 2, right). The sensitivity differs by only 2.8% between humid and dry conditions, which is roughly the uncertainty of the sensitivity.

OH is produced by the photolysis of water (H_2O) in a nitrogen flow (99.9999% N_2) using ultraviolet (UV) radiation and introduced into the CRM instrument reactor. Note that hydroperoxyl radicals (HO_2) are concurrently produced from the reaction of hydrogen (H) with molecular oxygen (O_2). In the zero air mixture, all OH are consumed by pyrrole (C_2 level), while ambient air contains other reactive compounds that compete for OH leading to a higher pyrrole concentration (C_3 level). The instrument switches between measurement of zero air and ambient air every 8 minutes. Stabilization of the conditions takes a couple of minutes and the first data point after each switch is discarded. From the difference between C_2 and C_3 pyrrole levels and taking into account the amount of pyrrole in the reactor in the absence of OH (C_1 , typically between 26 and 43 ppb_v), the total OH reactivity R_{eqn} can be derived from the following equation:

$$R_{eqn} = \frac{C_3 - C_2}{C_1 - C_3} \cdot k_p \cdot C_1 \quad (2)$$

with k_p the reaction rate of pyrrole with OH ($1.2 \cdot 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$, Atkinson et al., 1985). C_1 is measured by introducing a large concentration of 0.6% propane (C_3H_8) in nitrogen (N_2) to act as an OH scavenger (Zannoni et al., 2015). Therefore, C_1 takes into account the photolysis of pyrrole due to the UV radiation entering the reactor (8–13%), which decreases the pyrrole concentration from the total amount of pyrrole injected in the reactor (C_0 level).

Equation (2) assumes that OH levels are identical during C₂ and C₃ measurements. Therefore, variations of RH within the reactor, but also the presence of ~~NO_x and~~ O₃ needs to be taken into account. Therefore C₃ in Eq. (2) results from the following:

$$150 \quad C_3 = C_{3,\text{exp}} + \Delta C_{3,\text{H}_2\text{O}} + \underline{\Delta C_{3,\text{NO}_2}} + \Delta C_{3,\text{O}_3} \quad (3)$$

with C_{3,exp} the measured level of pyrrole in C₃ mode, ΔC_{3,H₂O} the correction due to different RH in C₂ and C₃ (the difference in RH is 4 % or less 99 % of the time, which corresponds to a change of no more than 5 % for R_{eqn}), and ~~ΔC_{3,NO₂}~~ and ΔC_{3,O₃ the ~~corrections~~ correction due to the presence in the reactor of ~~nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) and~~ additional O₃ ~~, respectively.~~}

155 ~~The corrections due to the presence of NO₂ and O₃ are~~ from sampled air. This last correction is discussed in detail in sections ~~?? and 2.5.1~~ Due to the low NO levels at the measurement site, this correction described in earlier publications (e.g. Michoud et al., 2015; Praplan et al., 2017) is not applied nor discussed in the present study 2.5.1.

In addition, because of the dilution of the sampled air with humid nitrogen, the experimental total OH reactivity (R_{exp}) is derived from the following equation:

$$160 \quad R_{\text{exp}} = D \cdot R_{\text{measured}} \quad (4)$$

with *D* the dilution factor (ratio of sampling flow over total flow through the reactor) and R_{measured} the reactivity inside the reactor after applying corrections to R_{CRM} (see section 2.5.2).

Finally, the missing fraction of the total OH reactivity is obtained by comparing R_{exp} with R_{OH}:

$$R_{\text{missing, fraction}} = \frac{R_{\text{exp}} - R_{\text{OH}}}{R_{\text{exp}}} \quad (5)$$

165 **2.5.1 Nitrogen dioxide correction factor**

~~Praplan et al. (2017) describe the derivation of this correction in more details. Briefly, the introduction from NO₂ from ambient air in the reactor causes an increase of OH in C₃ mode compared to C₂ (there NO_x is removed by the catalytic converter). This is possibly due to the photolysis of NO₂ to NO and the reaction of NO with HO₂ yielding NO₂ and OH. To derive this correction factor, the change in reactivity due to the injection of NO₂ has been taken into account.~~

170 ~~The correction for C₃ (ΔC_{3,NO₂}~~) for the presence of NO₂ derived experimentally for this study is plotted in Fig. ~~??~~ along with the correction from Praplan et al. (2017) for comparison. The correction ΔC_{3,NO₂ has been applied when it is larger than the standard deviation of C₃.}

~~Correction of C₃ (ΔC_{3,NO₂}~~) as a function of nitrogen dioxide in the reactor (NO_{2,reactor}). Error bars represent standard deviations and the black line the overall fit to derive the correction factor ΔC_{3,NO₂. For comparison, the correction from}

175 ~~Praplan et al. (2017) is depicted as a gray dashed line.~~

2.5.1 Ozone correction factor

As discussed in Praplan et al. (2017) and by Fuchs et al. (2017) for the CRM system of the Max Planck Institute, the pyrrole signal obtained during analysis of ambient air must be corrected for the presence of O₃. ~~In the reactor~~ Even though, O₃ is present in the reactor due to the UV lamp used to produce OH (about 170 ppbv in the instrument used in the present study),
180 additional O₃ most probably gets photolysed sampled from ambient air (up to a 30% increase) affects the OH concentration in the reactor, most probably by getting photolysed and producing O(¹D), which reacts further with H₂O, yielding two OH.

Praplan et al. (2017) used a correction ($\Delta C_{3,O_3}$) independent of pyr:OH as the experimental pyr:OH for the measurements was in a narrow range close to 2. However as pyr:OH varied from 1.0 to 5.3 in this study, a pyr:OH-dependent correction has been derived.

185 The corrections $\Delta C_{3,O_3}$ were derived experimentally for various pyr:OH by injecting a known amount of O₃ in the CRM's reactor (Fig. 3, left panel) and then the slope of the linear fit (through the origin) for each pyr:OH (F_{O_3}) was plotted against pyr:OH (Fig. 3, right panel). Based on these data, a linear fit has been derived to calculate F_{O_3} according to pyr:OH and the uncertainty of this correction ($U_{F_{O_3}}$) is ~~33-73~~ 30.8%. When correcting ambient data in this study, the correction for a pyr:OH of 3 ($F_{O_3} = 0.079$) has been applied when pyr:OH was higher than 3 due to the lack of experimental data at higher pyr:OH
190 values. Note that a couple of experiments (with pyr:OH 1.27 and 1.05) were performed with additional injection of propane (C₃H₈) as the pyrrole signal would have decreased to zero otherwise and no $\Delta C_{3,O_3}$ could have been determined.

The correction $\Delta C_{3,O_3}$ is then derived from the following equation:

$$\Delta C_{3,O_3} = F_{O_3}[O_3] = (0.022 \cdot (\text{pyr} : \text{OH}) + 0.013) \cdot [O_3] \quad (6)$$

As observed in Praplan et al. (2017), inhomogeneity of the air composition at the sampling site can affect the comparison
195 between experimental total OH reactivity and calculated reactivity from known composition. It can for instance be directly affected by meteorology or changes in concentrations between the various sampling locations due to local emissions during low mixing periods (see Liebmann et al., 2018). As VOCs in this study were sampled at the same location than the total OH reactivity, the effect of inhomogeneity of the air composition is minimized. However, the ozone mixing ratio used to derive the ozone correction (described in section 2.5.1) is retrieved from the station mast (115 m away) and at a height of 4.2 m. It is very
200 likely that emissions from soil and understorey vegetation (or from standing water close to the OH reactivity sampling location) would further deplete the ozone close to the ground, leading to an overestimation of the correction. Under some circumstances, such as when there is a strong O₃ gradient below canopy (Chen et al., 2018), the correction might be overestimated.

For instance, on 29 and 30 April total OH reactivity ~~peaks close to 100~~ around 125 to 150 s⁻¹ in the afternoon are followed by O₃ concentration drops below canopy (Fig. 4, see also Chen et al. (2018)). While the high reactivity peaks themselves are likely
205 not affected by an overestimation of the correction, the period following them (night-time) might be slightly overestimated due to the sampling of O₃ further away and higher above ground. This effect is difficult to take into account in retrospect. The concentration of O₃ should have been measured immediately next to the CRM system. Similar conditions were observed during nights between 11 and 16 May and to some extent in July (without reaching such high total OH reactivity values as in




Figure 3. Left: Correction of C_3 ($\Delta C_{3,O_3}$) as a function of ozone in the reactor ($O_{3,reactor}$). Right: O_3 correction factor (F_{O_3}) as a function of pyr:OH.

spring). This effect on the inhomogeneity of the forest air composition might affect total OH reactivity measurements and in turn partly explain some of the missing fraction.




Figure 4. One-hour averages of total measured OH reactivity, R_{exp} and ozone mixing ratios at 4.2 and 125.0 m above ground. Mixing Layer Height (MLH) is shown as a gray shadow. Note that the detection limit for MLH is 60 m and values below this limit are displayed at 30 m (and zeros denote gaps in the data).

2.5.2 First order correction factor

Sinha et al. (2008) used a two-equation model to correct for the deviation from pseudo-first-order kinetics ($[\text{Pyr}] \gg [\text{OH}]$). Michoud et al. (2015) used more detailed modelling taking into account OH recycling reactions, but could not match the model results with their experimental data. For this reason, Michoud et al. (2015) favoured the experimental approach to correct
215 the reactivity data. Nevertheless, the experimental approach also has drawbacks. For instance, impurities from standards and changes over time (ageing) might alter its reactivity. Also it is based on calibrations using one compound at the time, which do not represent complex ambient mixtures of reactive gases.

Nevertheless, reactivity calibrations were performed for the present study with a 10 ppm_v C₃H₈ standard as well as with an in-house made gas mixture containing α -pinene with small impurities from aromatic compounds. The concentrations of the
220 C₃H₈ and in-house α -pinene standards were checked periodically by taking adsorbent tube samples and analysing them by GC-MS. At the same time impurities (4.7–17 % of the reactivity) could be measured and taken into account.

The comparison between OH reactivity expected from the standard (R_{std}) and the measured OH reactivity (R_{measured}) is presented in Fig. 5. Note that the data has been corrected for deviation from pseudo-first-order kinetics similarly to the work of Sinha et al. (2008) by using numerical simulations and fitting the relationship between R_{eqn} and R_{true} for various pyr:OH ratios
225 with equations of the form $R_{\text{true}} = F_1 \cdot R_{\text{eqn}}^{F_2} + F_3$, so that F_1 , F_2 , and F_3 are pyr:OH-dependent coefficients (see Appendix A for additional details).

The calibration for C₃H₈ is consistent with the one from Sinha et al. (2008). Due to the high reactivity of α -pinene, the calibration consistently underestimate the expected reactivity and because monoterpenes constitute the most important class of compounds in the boreal forest, this needs to be taken into account by applying the overall correction for α -pinene to the
230 ambient data in this study, which has an uncertainty (U_F) of 6.3% based on the uncertainty of the fit. The reactivity measured in the reactor R_{measured} then is derived from the following equation:

$$R_{\text{measured}} = (R_{\text{CRM}} + 0.449)/0.497 \quad (7)$$

Based on these reactivity calibrations the precision of the measurements (U_{prec}) is derived. R_{eqn} and its standard deviation ($\sigma_{R_{\text{eqn}}}$) are calculated for every C3 value measured. Dividing $\sigma_{R_{\text{eqn}}}$ by the mean of R_{eqn} ($\overline{R_{\text{eqn}}}$) for stable conditions yields
235 U_{prec} , which varies with R_{eqn} values and is described by the following function:

$$U_{\text{prec}} = 0.15 + 5.35 \cdot 10^5 \cdot e^{-5.53 \cdot \overline{R_{\text{eqn}}}} \quad (8)$$

This derivation is shown in Figure AB1 of the Appendix.

2.5.3 Uncertainty of the measured total OH reactivity

The total uncertainty for the measured total OH reactivity is derived from the following equations:




Figure 5. Comparison between measured OH reactivity for C_3H_8 and α -pinene standards with the expected OH reactivity.

$$240 \quad U_{R_{exp}} = \sqrt{U_p^2 + U_s^2 + U_\sigma^2 + U_{\Delta C_3}^2 + U_{k_{OH,pyr}}^2 + U_D^2 + U_F^2 + U_{prec}^2} \quad (9)$$

$$U_{\Delta C_3} = \sqrt{U_{fit,O_3}^2 + U_{[O_3]}^2} \quad (10)$$

with $U_{k_{OH,pyr}}$ is 15% (Keßel, 2016), and U_D is 2.8% ($U_D^2 = U_{totalflow}^2 + U_{samplingflow}^2$, with $U_{totalflow} = U_{samplingflow} = 2\%$), and other uncertainties mentioned previously.

2.6 The model to Simulate the concentrations of Organic vapours, Sulphuric Acid and Aerosols (SOSAA)

245 In this study we applied the model to Simulate the concentrations of Organic vapours, Sulphuric Acid and Aerosols (SOSAA) to simulate the OH reactivity at the SMEAR II station for selected days in April, May, and July 2016. SOSAA is a one-dimensional chemical transport model comprised of boundary layer meteorology, biogenic emission of VOCs, gas-phase chemistry, aerosol dynamics and gas dry deposition (e.g. Boy et al., 2011; Zhou et al., 2014) and has been previously used to simulate OH reactivity at this site (Mogensen et al., 2011, 2015).

250 The boundary layer meteorology was derived from SCAlar DIStribution (SCADIS; Sogachev et al., 2002), as described in Boy et al. (2011). The biogenic emission module was deactivated because in situ measurements were used to provide input concentrations. Biogenic compounds were set to the measured values up to 18 m (canopy height), while aromatic compounds were set to the measured values at all heights. Measured inorganic gas concentrations at SMEAR II were used as input. The gas-phase chemistry was created using the Kinetic PreProcessor (KPP; Damian et al., 2002). The chemical reaction equations
255 used in this study were selected from the Master Chemical Mechanism v3.3.1 (MCMv3.3.1 Jenkin et al., 1997; Saunders et al., 2003; Bloss et al., 2005; Jenkin et al., 2012, 2015). The chemistry scheme included more than 15000 reactions, and a total of 3525 chemical species representing the complete reaction paths for isoprene, α -pinene, β -pinene, limonene, β -caryophyllene, methane, 2-methyl-3-buten-2-ol (MBO), benzene, toluene, styrene, ethylbenzene, 1,2-dimethylbenzene, 1,3-dimethylbenzene, 1,4-dimethylbenzene, 1,2,3-trimethylbenzene, 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, 1-ethyl-2-methylbenzene, 1-
260 ethyl-3-methylbenzene, 1-ethyl-4-methylbenzene, heptane, octane, nonane, butanal, pentanal, methacrolein and relevant inorganic reactions. First order reactions between OH, O₃, and NO₃ with the following monoterpenes were also included in the chemistry: Δ^3 -carene, myrcene, camphene and 1,8-cineole. Likewise, first order reactions between OH, O₃, NO₃ and β -farnesene were included. The photochemistry has been improved by calculating the photodissociation constants more precisely using data from Atkinson et al. (1992), as described in Mogensen et al. (2011). The OH reactivity has been calculated similarly
265 as in Mogensen et al. (2011, 2015). The condensation sinks for sulfuric acid and nitric acid, based on Differential Mobility Particle Sizer (DMPS) and Aerodynamic Particle Sizer (APS) data from SMEAR II, were included (Boy et al., 2003). Since sulfuric acid and nitric acid make up most of the condensation sinks, sinks of VOCs into the particle phase are not taken into account, thereby the aerosol module is turned off.

The model runs in the present study include the dry deposition module implemented in SOSAA by Zhou et al. (2017a)
270 and extended in Zhou et al. (2017b). The latter describes the explicit simulation of the loss of every compound in the model by dry deposition inside the canopy for all height levels and ~~shows that the sink by dry deposition inside the canopy is comparable to the chemical production for several oxidised VOCs (e.g. pinic acid or BCSOZOH, a reaction product of β -caryophyllene)~~provides a detailed comparison of measured and modelled fluxes of certain selected VOCs including some secondary organic species at SMEAR II.

3.1 Overview

An overview of the measured total OH reactivity together with the calculated OH reactivity from up to 104 compounds, depending on data availability, as well as selected ancillary data, such as environmental conditions (air and surface soil temperatures as well as surface soil water content), and contributions from different compounds and groups of compounds are presented in Fig. 6. The following sections are discussing in details various aspects of the results such as a) seasonality, b) diurnal variations, and c) missing reactivity. Nevertheless, from this overview, the following observations can be made:

- The range of measured total OH reactivity values is similar to previous studies at the same site in August 2008 and July-August 2010 (Sinha et al., 2010; Nölscher et al., 2012), with notably higher values in the spring.
- These high total OH reactivity peaks in the spring (with values higher than at the end of July) seems to be associated with changes in the soil water content resulting from soil thawing.
- The calculated OH reactivity from measured compounds is in general lower than the measured total OH reactivity (also for periods with a large number of compounds included in the analysis), leading to a large fraction of *missing* reactivity (see section 3.4).
- Inorganic compounds (CH_4 , CO , O_3 , and NO_2) form an important fraction of the calculated OH reactivity.




Figure 6. a) Experimental total OH reactivity R_{exp} (1-h average) and calculated OH reactivity R_{OH} , b) environmental conditions (air and surface soil temperatures, as well as surface soil water content), c) Pyr:OH in the CRM reactor, d) data availability from the different instrumentation/sources, e) fraction of experimental total OH reactivity, and f) fraction of calculated OH reactivity. The periods shaded in gray in panels (a) to (d) represent the periods investigated with SOSAA (see sect 3.4).

Table 1. Monthly means and standard deviations (std.) of experimental total OH reactivity (R_{exp}), the missing OH reactivity fraction ($R_{\text{missing, fraction}}$), monoterpene and sesquiterpene mixing ratios ([MT] and [SQT], respectively), Photosynthetically Active Radiation (PAR), precipitation (Precip), relative humidity (RH), air temperature (T), surface soil temperature ($T_{\text{soil, humus}}$), surface soil water content ($w_{\text{soil, humus}}$), and Mixing Layer Height (MLH). Coefficients a and b from linear regressions between the weekly means of these variables and weekly averaged R_{exp} and the corresponding coefficients of determination (r^2). n_{days} indicates the number of days with measurements. n denotes the amount of R_{exp} observations. Note that all other means (except MLH) have been derived for the same measurement period as R_{exp} . n_{MLH} indicates the amount of observations with overlapping R_{exp} and MLH measurements.

	April mean (std.)	May mean (std.)	June mean (std.)	July mean (std.)	Linear a
n_{days}	17	26	16	12	
n	1032 <u>1095</u>	1854 <u>1910</u>	1416	952 <u>957</u>	
R_{exp} (s^{-1})	17.1 <u>(20.4)</u> 20.6 <u>(26.5)</u>	17.5 <u>(12.2)</u> 20.4 <u>(15.2)</u>	7.4 <u>(2.6)</u> 7.6 <u>(2.8)</u>	12.3 <u>(5.9)</u> 15.4 <u>(7.5)</u>	
$R_{\text{missing, fraction}}$	0.80 <u>0.82</u> (0.15)	0.85 <u>(0.15)</u> 0.86 <u>(0.14)</u>	0.85 <u>0.86</u> (0.05)	0.74 <u>(0.16)</u> 0.79 <u>(0.14)</u>	0.004 <u>0.003</u>
[MT] (ppt _v)	99.6 <u>(186.5)</u> 94.3 <u>(182.3)</u>	233.8 <u>(493.4)</u> 229.1 <u>(487.6)</u>	83.6 (408.2)	564.5 <u>(508.6)</u> 564.0 <u>(508.1)</u>	8.5 <u>7.2</u>
[SQT] (ppt _v)	0.092 <u>(0.31)</u> 0.088 <u>(0.311)</u>	2.15 <u>(2.92)</u> 2.11 <u>(2.89)</u>	1.12 (3.78)	23.1 (23.7)	-0.04 <u>0.01</u>
PAR ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)	177.3 <u>(277.1)</u> 184.3 <u>(284.4)</u>	313.0 <u>(420.0)</u> 324.1 <u>(425.0)</u>	490.9 (521.2)	359.0 <u>(422.1)</u> 359.8 <u>(422.3)</u>	-4.8 <u>-4.0</u>
Precip (mm)	0.13 <u>0.12</u> (0.10)	0.12 (0.14)	0.12 (0.18)	0.10 (0.00)	0.0002 <u>0.0001</u>
RH (%)	83.4 <u>(17.8)</u> 82.9 <u>(18.2)</u>	67.8 <u>(22.4)</u> 66.9 <u>(22.8)</u>	58.0 (21.1)	79.0 (16.0)	0.6 <u>0.5</u>
T ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	3.7 (3.9)	11.8 <u>(4.6)</u> 12.0 <u>(4.7)</u>	12.2 (5.6)	18.0 (3.5)	-0.02 <u>-0.01</u>
$T_{\text{soil, humus}}$ ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)	1.6 (1.2)	8.2 (2.4)	9.9 (2.1)	15.2 (1.4)	-0.06 <u>-0.05</u>
$w_{\text{soil, humus}}$ ($\text{m}^3 \text{m}^{-3}$)	0.38 (0.05)	0.32 (0.03)	0.24 (0.03)	0.28 (0.03)	0.004
n_{MLH}	1016 <u>1079</u>	1833 <u>1889</u>	1291	945 <u>950</u>	
MLH (m)	196.5 <u>(296.0)</u> 206.5 <u>(312.3)</u>	335.9 <u>(553.6)</u> 360.8 <u>(581.2)</u>	573.0 (679.3)	309.3 <u>(443.5)</u> 310.6 <u>(444.3)</u>	-8.0 <u>-6.8</u>

Keeping in mind that the experimental data have not always been acquired continuously, the total experimental OH reactivity (R_{exp}) monthly mean was high in April and May (about ~~17.2~~17.2 s^{-1}) compared to June (~~7.4~~7.6 s^{-1}) and July (~~12.3~~15.4 s^{-1}), due to few very high values at night time (Table 1). Consequently, no strong correlation could be found between R_{exp} and other variables looking at weekly means. The highest coefficient of determination (r^2) was obtained for the correlation with $w_{\text{soil, humus}}$ (~~0.33~~ $r^2 = 0.35$), which indicates that soil moisture might be an important driver for the high reactivity values measured in spring. The highest reactivity peaks happened when the surface soil water content was the highest as the surface soil temperature started to increase above 1.5 $^{\circ}\text{C}$, indicating thawing of the soil, a possible source of OH reactive compounds. Forest floor emissions of monoterpenes are known to be high in spring after snow has melted (Hellén et al., 2006; Aaltonen et al., 2011; Mäki et al., 2017) and VOC emission bursts have been observed after wetting events (e.g. Rossabi et al., 2018). There has also been some indication that thawing snow/soil could be a source of volatile organic amines (Hemmilä et al.,

2018). In the present study, the soil was snow-free already on 8 April, but a short snowfall episode happened later with 5 cm of snow measured on the morning of 25 April (which were gone on the next day). This episode happens just before the first OH reaction peak (at about 4756 s^{-1}), but this single occurrence is too little information to conclude of the role of snow in the large OH reactivity values observed and it might well be due to a combination of factors (including snowfall and immediate melting). These results deviate however from the conclusions of Nölscher et al. (2016), which suggested that a wet (and cold) soil in the Amazon rainforest acts as sinks for reactive compounds.

The data for July cover days that were cloudier and more humid (both air and soil) but warmer than the period covered by the data in June leading to higher total OH reactivity. Monthly means of ambient concentrations of locally emitted terpenoids had a weak correlation ($r^2 = 0.43$) with temperature (see also Hellén et al., 2018), which is not reflected in the correlation of total measured OH reactivity with temperature, as observed earlier (e.g. Nakashima et al., 2014; Ramasamy et al., 2016). However, these studies were performed during summer, which highlights the different regimes governing OH reactivity in various seasons and how most likely other (unknown) compounds in addition to terpenes contribute to OH reactivity during spring. In other words, while conditions that favour high OH reactivity values seem to favor BVOC (terpene) emissions in the summer as well, OH reactivity is driven by other parameters in spring.

It should be noted, though, that the use of a correction factor based on α -pinene throughout the measurement period even though the air composition varied might lead to an overestimation of the measured total OH reactivity. However, average mixing ratios of monoterpenes were similar in April and June ($99.694.0 \text{ pptv}_v$ and 83.6 pptv_v , respectively), so that relative differences in measured total OH reactivity cannot be explained this way. This further indicates that non-terpene compounds that were not measured in the spring might have contributed to the total OH reactivity.

3.3 Diurnal variations

The calculated OH reactivity of various groups of compounds shows different diurnal patterns, which vary with the season as well. Their normalized values are depicted in Fig. 7 (second to fourth row), separated by month (April to July in columns), together with the normalized diurnal patterns of R_{exp} and its missing fraction and temperature difference between measurements at 4.2 m and 125.0 m above ground as a proxy for mixing layer height (top row). Compounds that had a 24-hour sampling time were removed from this analysis. Sinha et al. (2010) did not measure a clear OH reactivity diurnal pattern during their two-week measurement period and the modelling of the OH reactivity also showed no diurnal pattern (Mogensen et al., 2011). However, Mogensen et al. (2015) modelled a weak diurnal pattern with a maximum at night, mostly due to improvements in the meteorological scheme. The observations in the present study, even though at higher OH reactivity levels show this pattern from May to July. Nölscher et al. (2012), for measurements roughly at the same time of the year, identified a similar diurnal pattern with maximum at night during the identified stress period. For normal boreal forest conditions, they measured large variations in the afternoon reactivity, sometimes leading to a maximum, which they associated with long-range transport. In the present study, afternoon reactivity maxima were dominating April's diurnal pattern.

When the total measured OH reactivity hourly average is at a minimum during the day and a maximum at night (May to July), it follows the pattern of BVOCs concentrations (and calculated OH reactivity) due to the low mixing layer height and




Figure 7. Normalized monthly averaged diurnal variations of experimental OH reactivity R_{exp} and the missing fraction as well as temperature gradient between 4.2 and 125.0 m above ground as a proxy for mixing layer height (top row), and calculated OH reactivity separated by group of compounds (second to fourth row).

335 despite slightly lower emissions due to the lower temperatures at night (Hellén et al., 2018). The hourly average of missing reactivity fraction remained consistently high (between 65% and 92%), similar to values from Nölscher et al. (2012) and despite the inclusion of more compounds in our analysis (see section 3.4 for a detailed discussion).

While the OH reactivity daily patterns from monoterpenoids and MBO had a minimum during the day for all months, other groups of compounds showed this reactivity pattern only for some periods. Isoprene showed this pattern except in July, where the light-induced emissions during the day were dominating. Sesquiterpenes, other carbonyls and NO_2 showed a similar pattern with daytime minima from May to July, while C_{7-10} alkenes, aromatics, C_{3-10} aldehydes, and methacrolein showed a pattern with daytime minimum only in May and June. Alcohols exhibit an OH reactivity pattern with a maximum in the morning (9-11 a.m.). The absolute OH reactivity of alcohols is low and dominated by 1-butanol, which is used in aerosol measuring devices at the site. It is not clear what causes the diurnal pattern, but SO_2 reactivity had a similar pattern in April and May, and NO_x had such a pattern in April, when the photochemistry is not yet very strong.

Overall, from May to July the total OH reactivity exhibits a minimum during the day and a maximum at night, following the OH reactivity pattern for biogenic compounds (except for isoprene in July, which is present in low concentrations in this pine forest, and has a maximum in the afternoon then). In April, the total OH reactivity has a maximum in the afternoon, and sesquiterpenes, even though present in low concentrations show a similar reactivity pattern. Mäki et al. (2019) found high

350 levels of sesquiterpenes from soil emissions at the same site in spring. This is an additional indication that unknown primary emissions (in particular from soil) could drive the reactivity during that time of the year.

3.4 Missing OH reactivity

The comparison between the calculated and measured OH reactivity is challenging as the calculated values are derived from a number of compounds that varies because of the availability of the measurements (Fig. 6d). Some periods include only a few
355 inorganic compounds from the station mast while other periods include a large amount of (O)VOCs analysed by the GC-MSs. The contribution to the known reactivity is shown in Fig. 6f. It is also good to keep in mind that part of the missing reactivity can be explained by measurement uncertainties and potential overestimation due to applied correction factors. As the data in this study has been uniformly corrected based on α -pinene calibrations, it is likely that the obtained values are an upper limit for the reactivity considering that α -pinene (and monoterpenes in general) are not dominating the air composition and reactivity at the
360 site for the whole measurement period. It should also be remembered that because of technical problems, PTR-MS data (VOC data) from the station mast is unavailable for our measurement period. Some compounds such as acetaldehyde were measured during two short periods with offline 24-hour sampling methods. In late July, acetaldehyde contributed on average 0.13 s^{-1} to the OH reactivity, which can be a small but significant fraction for low OH reactivity values. This is likely the case for other compounds that were not measured at all in the present study such as formaldehyde, acetonitrile, or methanol, to name a few.
365 In addition, this also makes the comparison with previous studies difficult. Despite the higher number of compounds included in the present work, the impossibility to include aforementioned compounds in the analysis explain partly why missing OH reactivity fractions remain high. Therefore, even with the maximum number of compounds used to calculate OH reactivity (late April/early May) a large fraction of the measured total OH reactivity remain unexplained (*missing* reactivity, Fig. 6e).

However, this period coincided also with high reactivity peaks observed likely due to soil thawing as mentioned previously.
370 Only sesquiterpenes peaked at the same time as the total OH reactivity, but their concentrations are still low, which is why we mentioned amines and non-terpene BVOCs as potential classes of compounds contributing to the observed total OH reactivity. Kumar et al. (2018) identified various non-hydrocarbon classes of compounds associated with biomass burning that potentially contribute to OH reactivity. However, even if long-range transported biomass burning emissions are observed occasionally at the measurement site of this study Leino et al. (2014), no significant increase of CO concentrations (above 250 ppb_v ~~as
375 in Leino et al. (2014))~~ were observed during the measurement period as in Leino et al. (2014). Only between 23 and 26 July, concentrations of 150 ppb_v (slightly above the average background levels of 100 ppb_v) were detected. Nevertheless, these classes of compounds could potentially be emitted by local sources of a different kind.

As it has been shown for forests dominated by isoprene emitters (Kim et al., 2011; Kaiser et al., 2016), oxidation products from BVOCs might contribute significantly to the missing OH reactivity. As oxidation products of monoterpenes and
380 sesquiterpenes are neither measured routinely nor were they monitored for this study, the SOSAA model was used (see Section 2.6) using measured trace gases and meteorological conditions as inputs in order to calculate the potential contribution of terpenes oxidation products to missing OH reactivity. Three periods of two to three days for the months of April, May and July were simulated. The results for the inclusion of modelled oxidation compounds in the analysis are presented in Fig. 8. These

385 compounds labelled modelled OVOCs are mostly peroxides, alcohols, and carbonyl compounds due to the generally low NO_x
levels at the site. Modelled inorganics, whose contributions is negligible, regroup molecular hydrogen (H_2), hydrogen peroxide
(H_2O_2), nitrous acid (HONO), peroxyntic acid (HO_2NO_2), nitric acid (HNO_3), and the nitrate radical (NO_3). To check the
model performance for the concentrations of the secondary organic species, we compared nopinone measured by GC-MS with
the model output. The plots for all three selected periods (Fig. C1 in the Appendix) show that the trend and of the model
concentrations for nopinone are comparable to the measured values and the absolute values are mostly inside estimated 50 %
uncertainties of the measurements. The only exceptions are the difference during daytimes in May where the measurements
show a very strong decrease in the morning but the model follows these behavior much weaker. No other specific secondary
species is available for such comparison due to the lack of measurements.

While the trend of $R_{\text{OH,model}}$ follows qualitatively the general trend of R_{exp} , $R_{\text{OH,model}}$ underestimates R_{exp} , especially
at night. Total OH reactivity values are in general lower during the day and they are closer to $R_{\text{OH,model}}$ values. In April
395 April and early May, the high peaks in the late afternoon of 29 and 30 April indicate missing primary emissions, which also
contribute (or their oxidation products) to the missing reactivity in the following nights.

Retrieving the additional reactivity from these modelled compounds that were not included in R_{OH} reduced the missing
reactivity by only a small fraction (about 7.34.5 % for the studied period in July and less for the other periods) as seen in Fig. 9.
A detailed breakdown of the individual compounds contributing to the reactivity and their mixing ratios can be found in the
400 Appendix D.

Most of the missing reactivity could be then due to oxidation products that are not included in the model from measured
precursors such as Δ^3 -carene, myrcene, camphene, 1,8-cineol, β -farnesene, or unidentified sesquiterpenes (in contrast with
the well-studied isoprene chemistry scheme), but the contribution to the OH reactivity from these precursors is small due to
their low atmospheric concentrations, so that the contribution from their oxidation products is also expected to be small (Hellén
405 et al., 2018). As mentioned earlier, missing primary emissions also contribute to the missing reactivity, more so in spring than
in summer.

Amines released from soil, as mentioned previously, are a potential class of compounds that could contribute to OH reactivity.
Kumar et al. (2018) identified various non-hydrocarbon classes of compounds associated with biomass burning that potentially
contribute to OH reactivity. However, even if long-range transported biomass burning emissions are observed occasionally at
410 the measurement site of this study Leino et al. (2014), no significant increase of CO concentrations (above 250 ppb_v as in
Leino et al. (2014)) were observed during the measurement period. Only between 23 and 26 July, concentrations of 150 ppb_v
(slightly above the average background levels of 100 ppb_v) were detected.

It is also good to keep in mind that part of the missing reactivity can be explained by measurement uncertainties and
potential overestimation due to applied correction factors. As the data in this study has been uniformly corrected based on
415 α -pinene calibrations, it is likely that the obtained values are an upper limit for the reactivity considering that α -pinene (and
monoterpenes in general) are not dominating the air composition and reactivity at the site all the time.

A previous study by Mogensen et al. (2011) modelled the OH reactivity at the SMEAR II site for the year 2008, using
modelled emissions, and estimated the OH reactivity to be about $2\text{--}3\text{ s}^{-1}$ between April and July. This is lower than the

measured averages from the present and previous studies and lower than the night-time modelled values in July from the
420 present study. Mogensen et al. (2011) report that secondary organics, β -caryophyllene, farnesene, and MBO represent 8 % of
the total OH reactivity, which represent the same magnitude as the results from this study. Mogensen et al. (2015) modelled the
OH reactivity at the same site for July and August 2010 with the same methodology (including minor model improvements)
and obtained values between 2.7 and 3.2 s⁻¹. The higher modelled values in our study indicates that modelled emissions lead
to lower monoterpene concentrations than measured concentrations.

425 Our results are not entirely in line with other studies that showed reductions of the missing reactivity by constraining VOC
concentrations to model their oxidation products (e.g. Mao et al., 2012; Edwards et al., 2013; Kaiser et al., 2016), as the
reduction observed remains small in this study. This approach still leaves a large unexplained fraction of OH reactivity. This is
a strong indication that on one hand non-terpenoid compounds contribute to the total OH reactivity and that on the other hand
more compounds have to be included in the chemical model.

430 Finally, heterogeneous loss of OH to particles might be a contribution to missing OH reactivity, but this process is poorly
quantified (Donahue et al., 2012). Due to the low sampling flow and long FEP sampling line to the CRM instrument, it is
unlikely that particles will reach the reactor. Additionally, we could not find any correlation between ambient particle numbers
and either total measured OH reactivity or its missing fraction.

As a side note, total OH reactivity measurements were unfortunately not available in the autumn, but Liebmann et al. (2018)
435 who measured nitrate radical (NO₃) reactivity at the same site made found about 30 % of unexplained NO₃ reactivity at night
and about 60 % during daytime. Mogensen et al. (2015) modelled NO₃ reactivity at the site and found a maximum in the early
morning, while the measurements from Liebmann et al. (2018) showed a maximum at night. The modelled NO₃ reactivity
values were similar to the measured ones without strong temperature inversion at night, while higher measured values were
recorded for nights with strong temperature inversion.

440 Hellén et al. (2018) showed that the balance between the emissions of VOCs and the production of oxidation compounds
and the sinks vary with the season, leading to different diurnal profiles for compounds such as isoprene, C₇₋₁₀ aldehydes, and
nopinone. This can also be observed in terms of OH reactivity in the present study (see section 3.3).

4 Conclusions

Total OH reactivity is not a simple function of a few variables. It includes many complex processes involving sources and
445 sinks that can change dramatically depending on the environmental conditions and the time of the year. Measurement uncer-
tainties and data availability for comparison between measured total OH reactivity values and calculated values also represent
a challenge when interpreting results.

In the present study total OH reactivity measurements were performed at a Finnish boreal forest research site (SMEAR II).
The monthly averaged experimental total OH reactivity were high in April and May (about ~~17~~20 s⁻¹) due to some very large
450 afternoon reactivity peaks captured when the soil was thawing. The low sampling height and the peaking of sesquiterpene
emissions at the same time than OH reactivity in April, which are known to be emitted from soil, indicate that the forest floor




Figure 8. Measured total OH reactivity (R_{exp}), calculated OH reactivity from measured compounds (R_{OH}), calculated OH reactivity including measured and modelled compounds ($R_{OH,model}$) (1 hour averages, top panels) and normalized contributions to R_{exp} for various compounds and group of compounds (bottom panels) for the three periods investigated with SOSAA (see main text for details).

is a potential important but overlooked source of reactive compounds. The total OH reactivity diurnal pattern from May to July follows the one of biogenic compounds with high values during the night due to the low mixing height, even though emissions are lower at night.

455 A suite of online and offline (O)VOCs measurements was used to calculate the known fraction of OH reactivity to compare it to the total OH reactivity measured. The missing fraction of the OH reactivity remained high for the measurement period. This can be due to various reasons. As the data availability of (O)VOCs varies, the comparison between experimental and calculated OH reactivity is difficult but three different explanations can lead to high missing (unexplained) OH reactivity: 1) simply the lack of measurements, 2) not measuring oxidation products (only their precursors), and 3) not measuring the right class of compounds. We showed that compounds not included (or only partially included) in the analysis due to the unavailability of measurements (e.g. due to technical problems), such as acetaldehyde, might contribute a small but significant fraction to the total OH reactivity, in particular for low reactivity values. Using one-dimensional transport model to estimate oxidation products concentrations from measured precursor concentrations for three short periods of two to three days in various months (with most (O)VOC data availability) it is demonstrated that only a small fraction (up to ca. 7.345 %) of the missing reactivity
460
465 can be explained by these oxidation products. On one hand, this is due to the absence in the model of degradation scheme




Figure 9. Contributions of various compounds and groups of compounds to the measured total OH reactivity (R_{exp}). For clarity, labels for fractions smaller than 2.0 % have been omitted.

for detected compounds in the ambient air (e.g. Δ^3 -carene, β -farnesene), but on the other hand it is also possible that non-hydrocarbon compounds contribute to the OH reactivity as well.

More measurements of oxidised compounds and identification of non-terpene reactive compounds from emissions also from other sources than vegetation (e.g. soil) are required to better understand the reactivity and local atmospheric chemistry in the forest air in general, in particular during winter, spring, and autumn, when the forest air chemistry is not dominated by emissions from the vegetation.

Author contributions.

A. P. Praplan conducted total OH reactivity measurements, offline sampling, LC-UV analysis, performed data analysis, and led the writing of the manuscript. H. Hellén designed the measurement campaign, conducted GC-MS measurements and data analysis, and commented the manuscript. T. Tykkä assisted GC-MS measurements and data analysis and commented on the manuscript. V. Vakkari provided mixing layer height data, their description in the method part and commented the manuscript. D. Chen, M. Boy and P. Zhou performed model runs with the help of D. Taipale and all commented the manuscript.

Acknowledgements. The presented research has been funded by the Academy of Finland (Academy Research Fellowship, project no. 275608, Postdoctoral Research project no. 307957, and Centre of Excellence in Atmospheric Science, grant no. 272041). The authors thank Hannele Hakola for the continuous support. They also thank the staff at the SMEAR II station for their help, Dr. Petri Keronen for providing the data

that we retrieved from SmartSMEAR, Dr. Jari Waldén for lending calibration standards and gas analyzers, and Anne-Mari Mäkelä for the analysis of the canister samples. The authors also wish to acknowledge CSC IT Center for Science, Finland, for computational resources.

References

- Aaltonen, H., Pumpanen, J., Pihlatie, M., Hakola, H., Hellén, H., Kulmala, L., Vesala, T., and Bäck, J.: Boreal pine forest
485 floor biogenic volatile organic compound emissions peak in early summer and autumn, *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 151, 682–691, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2010.12.010>, 2011.
- Atkinson, R., Aschmann, S. M., Winer, A. M., and Carter, W. P. L.: Rate constants for the gas-phase reactions of nitrate radicals with furan, thiophene, and pyrrole at 295 ± 1 K and atmospheric pressure, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 19, 87–90, <https://doi.org/10.1021/es00131a010>, 1985.
- 490 Atkinson, R., Baulch, D. L., Cox, R. A., Hampson, R. F., Kerr, J. A., and Troe, J.: Evaluated Kinetic and Photochemical Data for Atmospheric Chemistry: Supplement IV. IUPAC Subcommittee on Gas Kinetic Data Evaluation for Atmospheric Chemistry, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data*, 21, 1125–1568, <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.555918>, 1992.
- Bloss, C., Wagner, V., Jenkin, M. E., Volkamer, R., Bloss, W. J., Lee, J. D., Heard, D. E., Wirtz, K., Martin-Reviejo, M., Rea, G., Wenger, J. C., and Pilling, M. J.: Development of a detailed chemical mechanism (MCMv3.1) for the atmospheric oxidation of aromatic hydrocarbons,
495 *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 641–664, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-5-641-2005>, 2005.
- Bourtsoukidis, E., Behrendt, T., Yañez-Serrano, A. M., Hellén, H., Diamantopoulos, E., Catão, E., Ashworth, K., Pozzer, A., Quesada, C. A., Martins, D. L., Sá, M., Araujo, A., Brito, J., Artaxo, P., Kesselmeier, J., Lelieveld, J., and Williams, J.: Strong sesquiterpene emissions from Amazonian soils, *Nat. Commun.*, 9, 2226, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04658-y>, 2018.
- Boy, M., Rannik, U., Lehtinen, K. E. J., Tarvainen, V., Hakola, H., and Kulmala, M.: Nucleation events in the continental boundary layer:
500 Long-term statistical analyses of aerosol relevant characteristics, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 108, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JD003838>, 2003.
- Boy, M., Sogachev, A., Lauros, J., Zhou, L., Guenther, A., and Smolander, S.: SOSA — a new model to simulate the concentrations of organic vapours and sulphuric acid inside the ABL — Part 1: Model description and initial evaluation, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 43–51, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-43-2011>, 2011.
- 505 Chen, X., Quéléver, L. L. J., Fung, P. L., Kesti, J., Rissanen, M. P., Bäck, J., Keronen, P., Junninen, H., Petäjä, T., Kerminen, V.-M., and Kulmala, M.: Observations of ozone depletion events in a Finnish boreal forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 49–63, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-49-2018>, 2018.
- Damian, V., Sandu, A., Damian, M., Potra, F., and Carmichael, G. R.: The kinetic preprocessor KPP—a software environment for solving chemical kinetics, *Comput. Chem. Eng.*, 26, 1567–1579, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-1354\(02\)00128-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0098-1354(02)00128-X), 2002.
- 510 Di Carlo, P., Brune, W. H., Martinez, M., Harder, H., Leshner, R., Ren, X., Thornberry, T., Carroll, M. A., Young, V., Shepson, P. B., Riemer, D., Apel, E., and Campbell, C.: Missing OH Reactivity in a Forest: Evidence for Unknown Reactive Biogenic VOCs, *Science*, 304, 722–725, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1094392>, 2004.
- Donahue, N. M., Henry, K. M., Mentel, T. F., Kiendler-Scharr, A., Spindler, C., Bohn, B., Brauers, T., Dorn, H. P., Fuchs, H., Tillmann, R., Wahner, A., Saathoff, H., Naumann, K.-H., Möhler, O., Leisner, T., Müller, L., Reinnig, M.-C., Hoffmann, T., Salo, K., Hallquist, M., Frosch, M., Bilde, M., Tritscher, T., Barmet, P., Praplan, A. P., DeCarlo, P. F., Dommen, J., Prévôt, A. S. H., and Baltensperger, U.: Aging of biogenic secondary organic aerosol via gas-phase OH radical reactions, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 109, 13 503–13 508, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1115186109>, 2012.

- Edwards, P. M., Evans, M. J., Furneaux, K. L., Hopkins, J., Ingham, T., Jones, C., Lee, J. D., Lewis, A. C., Moller, S. J., Stone, D., Whalley, L. K., and Heard, D. E.: OH reactivity in a South East Asian tropical rainforest during the Oxidant and Particle Photochemical Processes (OP3) project, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 9497–9514, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-9497-2013>, 2013.
- 520 Ferracci, V., Heimann, I., Abraham, N. L., Pyle, J. A., and Archibald, A. T.: Global modelling of the total OH reactivity: investigations on the "missing" OH sink and its atmospheric implications, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 7109–7129, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-7109-2018>, 2018.
- Fuchs, H., Novelli, A., Rolletter, M., Hofzumahaus, A., Pfannerstill, E. Y., Kessel, S., Edtbauer, A., Williams, J., Michoud, V., Dusanter, S., Locoge, N., Zannoni, N., Gros, V., Truong, F., Sarda-Esteve, R., Cryer, D. R., Brumby, C. A., Whalley, L. K., Stone, D., Seakins, P. W., Heard, D. E., Schoemaeker, C., Blocquet, M., Coudert, S., Batut, S., Fittschen, C., Thames, A. B., Brune, W. H., Ernest, C., Harder, H., Muller, J. B. A., Elste, T., Kubistin, D., Andres, S., Bohn, B., Hohaus, T., Holland, F., Li, X., Rohrer, F., Kiendler-Scharr, A., Tillmann, R., Wegener, R., Yu, Z., Zou, Q., and Wahner, A.: Comparison of OH reactivity measurements in the atmospheric simulation chamber SAPHIR, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 10, 4023–4053, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-10-4023-2017>, 2017.
- 525 Guenther, A., Hewitt, C. N., Erickson, D., Fall, R., Geron, C., Graedel, T., Harley, P., Klinger, L., Lerdau, M., McKay, W. A., Pierce, T., Scholes, B., Steinbrecher, R., Tallamraju, R., Taylor, J., and Zimmerman, P.: A global model of natural volatile organic compound emissions, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100, 8873–8892, <https://doi.org/10.1029/94JD02950>, 1995.
- Guenther, A. B., Jiang, X., Heald, C. L., Sakulyanontvittaya, T., Duhl, T., Emmons, L. K., and Wang, X.: The Model of Emissions of Gases and Aerosols from Nature version 2.1 (MEGAN2.1): an extended and updated framework for modeling biogenic emissions, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 5, 1471–1492, <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-5-1471-2012>, 2012.
- 535 Hansen, R. F., Griffith, S. M., Dusanter, S., Rickly, P. S., Stevens, P. S., Bertman, S. B., Carroll, M. A., Erickson, M. H., Flynn, J. H., Grossberg, N., Jobson, B. T., Lefer, B. L., and Wallace, H. W.: Measurements of total hydroxyl radical reactivity during CABINEX 2009 – Part I: field measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 2923–2937, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-14-2923-2014>, 2014.
- Hari, P. and Kulmala, M.: Station for Measuring Ecosystem-Atmosphere Relations (SMEAR II), *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 10, 315–322, 2005.
- 540 Hellén, H., Hakola, H., Pystynen, K.-H., Rinne, J., and Haapanala, S.: C₂-C₁₀ hydrocarbon emissions from a boreal wetland and forest floor, *Biogeosciences*, 3, 167–174, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-3-167-2006>, 2006.
- Hellén, H., Kuronen, P., and Hakola, H.: Heated stainless steel tube for ozone removal in the ambient air measurements of mono- and sesquiterpenes, *Atmos. Environ.*, 57, 35–40, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.04.019>, 2012.
- Hellén, H., Schallhart, S., Praplan, A. P., Petäjä, T., and Hakola, H.: Using in situ GC-MS for analysis of C₂–C₇ volatile organic acids in ambient air of a boreal forest site, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 10, 281–289, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-10-281-2017>, 2017.
- 545 Hellén, H., Praplan, A. P., Tykkä, T., Ylivinkka, I., Vakkari, V., Bäck, J., Petäjä, T., Kulmala, M., and Hakola, H.: Long-term measurements of volatile organic compounds highlight the importance of sesquiterpenes for the atmospheric chemistry of a boreal forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 13 839–13 863, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-13839-2018>, 2018.
- Hemmilä, M., Hellén, H., Virkkula, A., Makkonen, U., Praplan, A. P., Kontkanen, J., Ahonen, L., Kulmala, M., and Hakola, H.: Amines in boreal forest air at SMEAR II station in Finland, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 6367–6380, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-6367-2018>, 2018.
- 550 Ilvesniemi, H., Levula, J., Ojansuu, R., Kolari, P., Kulmala, L., Pumpanen, J., Launiainen, S., Vesala, T., and Nikinmaa, E.: Long-term measurements of the carbon balance of a boreal Scots pine dominated forest ecosystem, *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 14, 23, 2009.
- Jenkin, M. E., Saunders, S. M., and Pilling, M. J.: The tropospheric degradation of volatile organic compounds: a protocol for mechanism development, *Atmos. Environ.*, 31, 81–104, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310\(96\)00105-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1352-2310(96)00105-7), 1997.

- 555 Jenkin, M. E., Wyche, K. P., Evans, C. J., Carr, T., Monks, P. S., Alfarra, M. R., Barley, M. H., McFiggans, G. B., Young, J. C., and Rickard, A. R.: Development and chamber evaluation of the MCM v3.2 degradation scheme for β -caryophyllene, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 5275–5308, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-5275-2012>, 2012.
- Jenkin, M. E., Young, J. C., and Rickard, A. R.: The MCM v3.3.1 degradation scheme for isoprene, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 11 433–11 459, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-11433-2015>, 2015.
- 560 Junninen, H., Lauri, A., Keronen, P., Aalto, P., Hiltunen, V., Hari, P., and Kulmala, M.: Smart-SMEAR: on-line data exploration and visualization tool for SMEAR stations, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 14, 11, 2009.
- Kaiser, J., Skog, K. M., Baumann, K., Bertman, S. B., Brown, S. B., Brune, W. H., Crounse, J. D., Gouw, J. A. d., Edgerton, E. S., Feiner, P. A., Goldstein, A. H., Koss, A., Misztal, P. K., Nguyen, T. B., Olson, K. F., Clair, J. M. S., Teng, A. P., Toma, S., Wennberg, P. O., Wild, R. J., Zhang, L., and Keutsch, F. N.: Speciation of OH reactivity above the canopy of an isoprene-dominated forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 9349–9359, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-9349-2016>, 2016.
- 565 Keenan, R. J., Reams, G. A., Achard, F., de Freitas, J. V., Grainger, A., and Lindquist, E.: Dynamics of global forest area: Results from the FAO Global Forest Resources Assessment 2015, *For. Ecol. Manage.*, 352, 9–20, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2015.06.014>, 2015.
- Keßel, S.: Entwicklung und Charakterisierung der Comparative Reactivity Method zur Messung von Hydroxylradikal- und Chlorradikal-Reaktivitäten : troposphärische Oxidationschemie in drei unterschiedlich stark anthropogen beeinflussten Gebieten, 2016.
- 570 Kim, S., Guenther, A., Karl, T., and Greenberg, J.: Contributions of primary and secondary biogenic VOC to total OH reactivity during the CABINEX (Community Atmosphere-Biosphere INteractions Experiments)-09 field campaign, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 8613–8623, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-8613-2011>, 2011.
- Kovacs, T. A. and Brune, W. H.: Total OH Loss Rate Measurement, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 39, 105–122, <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010614113786>, 2001.
- 575 Kumar, V., Chandra, B. P., and Sinha, V.: Large unexplained suite of chemically reactive compounds present in ambient air due to biomass fires, *Sci. Rep.*, 8, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-19139-3>, 2018.
- Leino, K., Riuttanen, L., Nieminen, T., Maso, M. D., Väänänen, R., Pohja, T., Keronen, P., Järvi, L., Aalto, P. P., Virkkula, A., Kerminen, V.-M., Petäjä, T., and Kulmala, M.: Biomass-burning smoke episodes in Finland from eastern European wildfires, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 19 (suppl. B), 275–292, 2014.
- 580 Liebmann, J., Karu, E., Sobanski, N., Schuladen, J., Ehn, M., Schallhart, S., Quéléver, L. L. J., Hellen, H., Hakola, H., Hoffmann, T., Williams, J., Fischer, H., Lelieveld, J., and Crowley, J. N.: Direct measurement of NO₃ radical reactivity in a boreal forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 3799–3815, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-3799-2018>, 2018.
- Mao, J., Ren, X., Zhang, L., Duin, D. M. V., Cohen, R. C., Park, J.-H., Goldstein, A. H., Paulot, F., Beaver, M. R., Crounse, J. D., Wennberg, P. O., DiGangi, J. P., Henry, S. B., Keutsch, F. N., Park, C., Schade, G. W., Wolfe, G. M., Thornton, J. A., and Brune, W. H.: Insights into hydroxyl measurements and atmospheric oxidation in a California forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 8009–8020, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-8009-2012>, 2012.
- 585 Michoud, V., Hansen, R. F., Locoge, N., Stevens, P. S., and Dusanter, S.: Detailed characterizations of the new Mines Douai comparative reactivity method instrument via laboratory experiments and modeling, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8, 3537–3553, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-8-3537-2015>, 2015.
- 590 Mogensen, D., Smolander, S., Sogachev, A., Zhou, L., Sinha, V., Guenther, A., Williams, J., Nieminen, T., Kajos, M. K., Rinne, J., Kulmala, M., and Boy, M.: Modelling atmospheric OH-reactivity in a boreal forest ecosystem, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 9709–9719, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-9709-2011>, 2011.

- Mogensen, D., Gierens, R., Crowley, J. N., Keronen, P., Smolander, S., Sogachev, A., Nölscher, A. C., Zhou, L., Kulmala, M., Tang, M. J., Williams, J., and Boy, M.: Simulations of atmospheric OH, O₃ and NO₃ reactivities within and above the boreal forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 3909–3932, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-3909-2015>, 2015.
- Mäki, M., Heinonsalo, J., Hellén, H., and Bäck, J.: Contribution of understory vegetation and soil processes to boreal forest isoprenoid exchange, *Biogeosciences*, 14, 1055–1073, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-14-1055-2017>, 2017.
- Mäki, M., Aaltonen, H., Heinonsalo, J., Hellén, H., Pumpanen, J., and Bäck, J.: Boreal forest soil is a significant and diverse source of volatile organic compounds, *Plant Soil*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-019-04092-z>, 2019.
- Nakashima, Y., Kato, S., Greenberg, J., Harley, P., Karl, T., Turnipseed, A., Apel, E., Guenther, A., Smith, J., and Kajii, Y.: Total OH reactivity measurements in ambient air in a southern Rocky mountain ponderosa pine forest during BEACHON-SRM08 summer campaign, *Atmos. Env.*, 85, 1–8, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.11.042>, 2014.
- Nölscher, A. C., Williams, J., Sinha, V., Custer, T., Song, W., Johnson, A. M., Axinte, R., Bozem, H., Fischer, H., Pouvesle, N., Phillips, G., Crowley, J. N., Rantala, P., Rinne, J., Kulmala, M., Gonzales, D., Valverde-Canossa, J., Vogel, A., Hoffmann, T., Ouwersloot, H. G., Vilà-Guerau de Arellano, J., and Lelieveld, J.: Summertime total OH reactivity measurements from boreal forest during HUMPPA-COPEC 2010, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 8257–8270, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-12-8257-2012>, 2012.
- Nölscher, A. C., Bourtsoukidis, E., Bonn, B., Kesselmeier, J., Lelieveld, J., and Williams, J.: Seasonal measurements of total OH reactivity emission rates from Norway spruce in 2011, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 4241–4257, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-4241-2013>, 2013.
- Nölscher, A. C., Yáñez-Serrano, A. M., Wolff, S., de Araujo, A. C., Lavrič, J. V., Kesselmeier, J., and Williams, J.: Unexpected seasonality in quantity and composition of Amazon rainforest air reactivity, *Nature Comm.*, 7, 10383, <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms10383>, 2016.
- Pearson, G., Davies, F., and Collier, C.: An Analysis of the Performance of the UFAM Pulsed Doppler Lidar for Observing the Boundary Layer, *J. Atmos. Oceanic Technol.*, 26, 240–250, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JTECHA1128.1>, 2009.
- Praplan, A. P., Pfannerstill, E. Y., Williams, J., and Hellén, H.: OH reactivity of the urban air in Helsinki, Finland, during winter, *Atmos. Environ.*, 169, 150 – 161, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.09.013>, 2017.
- Ramasamy, S., Ida, A., Jones, C., Kato, S., Tsurumaru, H., Kishimoto, I., Kawasaki, S., Sadanaga, Y., Nakashima, Y., Nakayama, T., Matsumi, Y., Mochida, M., Kagami, S., Deng, Y., Ogawa, S., Kawana, K., and Kajii, Y.: Total OH reactivity measurement in a BVOC dominated temperate forest during a summer campaign, 2014, *Atmos. Environ.*, 131, 41–54, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.01.039>, 2016.
- Rossabi, S., Choudoir, M., Helmig, D., Hueber, J., and Fierer, N.: Volatile Organic Compound Emissions From Soil Following Wetting Events, *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeophys.*, 123, 1988–2001, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JG004514>, 2018.
- Saunders, S. M., Jenkin, M. E., Derwent, R. G., and Pilling, M. J.: Protocol for the development of the Master Chemical Mechanism, MCM v3 (Part A): tropospheric degradation of non-aromatic volatile organic compounds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 3, 161–180, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-3-161-2003>, 2003.
- Sinha, V., Williams, J., Crowley, J. N., and Lelieveld, J.: The Comparative Reactivity Method – a new tool to measure total OH Reactivity in ambient air, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 8, 2213–2227, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-8-2213-2008>, 2008.
- Sinha, V., Williams, J., Lelieveld, J., Ruuskanen, T., Kajos, M., Patokoski, J., Hellen, H., Hakola, H., Mogensen, D., Boy, M., Rinne, J., and Kulmala, M.: OH Reactivity Measurements within a Boreal Forest: Evidence for Unknown Reactive Emissions, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 44, 6614–6620, <https://doi.org/10.1021/es101780b>, 2010.
- Sogachev, A., Menzhulin, G. V., Heimann, M., and Lloyd, J.: A simple three-dimensional canopy — planetary boundary layer simulation model for scalar concentrations and fluxes, *Tellus B: Chemical and Physical Meteorology*, 54, 784–819, <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusb.v54i5.16729>, 2002.

- Vakkari, V., O'Connor, E. J., Nisantzi, A., Mamouri, R. E., and Hadjimitsis, D. G.: Low-level mixing height detection in coastal locations with a scanning Doppler lidar, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8, 1875–1885, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-8-1875-2015>, 2015.
- Williams, J. and Brune, W.: A roadmap for OH reactivity research, *Atmos. Environ.*, 106, 371–372, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.02.017>, 2015.
- 635 Yang, Y., Shao, M., Wang, X., Nölscher, A. C., Kessel, S., Guenther, A., and Williams, J.: Towards a quantitative understanding of total OH reactivity: A review, *Atmos. Environ.*, 134, 147–161, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.03.010>, 2016.
- Zannoni, N., Dusanter, S., Gros, V., Sarda Esteve, R., Michoud, V., Sinha, V., Locoge, N., and Bonsang, B.: Intercomparison of two comparative reactivity method instruments in the Mediterranean basin during summer 2013, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8, 3851–3865, <https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-8-3851-2015>, 2015.
- 640 Zannoni, N., Gros, V., Lanza, M., Sarda, R., Bonsang, B., Kalogridis, C., Preunkert, S., Legrand, M., Jambert, C., Boissard, C., and Lathiere, J.: OH reactivity and concentrations of biogenic volatile organic compounds in a Mediterranean forest of downy oak trees, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 1619–1636, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-1619-2016>, 2016.
- Zhou, L., Nieminen, T., Mogensen, D., Smolander, S., Rusanen, A., Kulmala, M., and Boy, M.: SOSAA—A new model to simulate the concentrations of organic vapours, sulphuric acid and aerosols inside the ABL—Part 2: Aerosol dynamics and one case study at a boreal forest site, *Boreal Env. Res.*, 19 (suppl. B), 237–256, 2014.
- 645 Zhou, P., Ganzeveld, L., Rannik, U., Zhou, L., Gierens, R., Taipale, D., Mammarella, I., and Boy, M.: Simulating ozone dry deposition at a boreal forest with a multi-layer canopy deposition model, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 1361–1379, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-1361-2017>, 2017a.
- Zhou, P., Ganzeveld, L., Taipale, D., Rannik, U., Rantala, P., Rissanen, M. P., Chen, D., and Boy, M.: Boreal forest BVOC exchange: emissions versus in-canopy sinks, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 14 309–14 332, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-14309-2017>, 2017b.
- 650

Appendix A: Pseudo first-order-kinetics correction




Figure A1. Numerical simulations of R_{true} as a function of R_{eqn} for various pyr:OH values and their corresponding fit curves of the form $R_{\text{true}} = F_1 \cdot R_{\text{eqn}}^{F_2} + F_3$ (upper plot). Fit coefficients F_1 , F_2 , and F_3 as function of pyr:OH and corresponding exponential fit curves (lower panels).

Appendix B: Precision of the measurements




Figure B1. Uncertainty of R_{eqn} ($U_{R_{eqn}}$) as a function of $\overline{R_{eqn}}$. The solid line is the fit function for the precision of the measurements (U_{REG}).

Appendix C: Comparison of measured and modelled nopinone




Figure C1. Mixing ratio of nopinone measured (red line and shaded area for 50 % uncertainty) and modelled (blue line) for the three modelled periods in April, May, and July (from left to right).

Appendix D: Details for the modelled periods

Table D1 (continued).

		29 – 30 April			22 – 25 May		
		Mixing ratio [ppt _v]		R_{OH} [s ⁻¹]	Mixing ratio [ppt _v]		R_{OH} [s ⁻¹]
		mean	(std)	mean	mean	(std)	mean
				(std)			(std)
1,2,3-trimethylbenzene		2.2	(0.8)	0.0019	2.4	(2.4)	0.0019
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene		3.3	(1.0)	0.0028	0.56	(0.52)	0.00028
1,3,5-trimethylbenzene		1.3	(0.7)	0.0021	0.37	(0.21)	0.00018
isoprene		3.9	(3.0)	0.010	8.0	(6.4)	0.020
<i>Monoterpenoids</i>							
α -pinene		223 221	(142 143)	0.33	120	(134)	0.16
β -pinene		28 27	(26)	0.066 0.059	24	(27)	0.047
camphene		22	(16)	0.030	29	(29)	0.037
Δ^3 -carene		44	(35)	0.10	72	(82)	0.16
<i>p</i> -cymene		5.5	(2.3)	0.0021	23	(24)	0.0080
limonene		1.8	(1.4)	0.0037 0.0038	12	(14)	0.050
terpinolene		n.d.	(-)	-	0.53	(0.37)	0.00068
myrcene		0.25	(0.26)	1.6e-12	4.2	(3.0)	1.8e-11
1,8-cineol		2.6	(2.4)	0.00076	12	(9)	0.0033
bornylacetate		0.31	(0.20)	0.00011	1.7	(0.9)	0.00033
<i>Sequiterpenes</i>							
longicyclene		0.32	(0.27)	0.000079 0.00078	0.81	(0.27)	0.000009 0.00089
iso-longifolene		0.0600	(0.0003)	0.000042	0.28	(0.13)	0.000036
β -farnesene		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
β -caryophyllene		0.94	(0.6 0.60)	0.0013	7.3	(3.7)	0.020
α -humulene		0.0514	(0.0001)	0.000071	0.21	(0.15)	0.0014
SQT1*		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
SQT2*		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
SQT3*		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
SQT4*		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
<i>GLVs</i>							
1-hexanol		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
<i>cis</i> -2-hexen-1-ol		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
<i>trans</i> -2-hexen-1-ol		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
<i>cis</i> -3-hexen-1-ol		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
<i>trans</i> -3-hexen-1-ol		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
<i>trans</i> -2-hexenal		n.d.	(-)	-	2.4	(1.8)	0.0021
hexylacetate		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
<i>cis</i> -3-hexenylacetate		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-
n.d.		(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)
<i>trans</i> -2-hexenyl-acetate		n.d.	(-)	-	n.d.	(-)	-

Table D1 (continued).

29 – 30 April			22 – 25 May					
	Mixing ratio [ppt _v]		R_{OH} [s^{-1}]		Mixing ratio [ppt _v]		R_{OH} [s^{-1}]	
	mean	(std)	mean	(std)	mean	(std)	mean	(std)
<i>Aldehydes</i>			0.10	(0.07)	0.075	(0.051)		
formaldehyde	42 122	(40 11)	0.028	(0.025)	n.m.	(-)	-	(90)
acetaldehyde	16.5	(0.1)	0.0019 0.0018	(0.0030)	n.m.	(-)	-	(62)
propanal	86	(32)	0.046	(0.017)	93	(49)	0.040	(36)
butanal	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	4.7	(1.5)	0.00039	(26)
pentanal	19	(6)	0.015	(0.005)	24	(20)	0.011	(16)
hexanal	8.03	(0.04)	0.0018 0.0017	(0.0029)	7.3	(3.3)	0.0052	(8)
heptanal	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	5.9	(1.5)	0.0043	(0.08)
octanal	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	4.2	(1.0)	0.0032	(1.7)
nonanal	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	2.8	(1.0)	0.0024	(4.1)
decanal	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	3.1	(0.8)	0.0026	(3.0)
methacrolein	8 8.0	(1.4)	0.0030	(0.0033)	8.0	(3.3)	0.0058	(6.5)
crotonaldehyde	1.6	(0.1)	0.0000 0.00079	(0.00071)	n.m.	(-)	-	(-)
benzaldehyde	26	(2)	0.0016	(0.0035)	n.m.	(-)	-	(-)
tolualdehyde	75	(7)	0.0058 0.0060	(0.0128 0.0129)	n.m.	(-)	-	(-)
<i>Alcohols</i>			0.082 0.086	(0.080)	0.21	(0.56)		
isopropanol	26	(6)	0.0035	(0.0008)	37	(29)	0.0041	(95)
1-butanol	367 3.66	(350 349)	0.083	(0.079)	1122	(2704)	0.21	(745)
1-pentanol	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	3.7	(1.4)	0.000065	(3.3)
1-penten-3-ol	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	1.9	(0.7)	0.00041	(2.3)
3-methyl-2-buten-1-ol	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)
1-octen-3-ol	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	n.d.	(-)	-	(0.4)
2-methyl-3-buten-2-ol (MBO)	5.4	(4.6)	0.021	(0.018)	15	(16)	0.054	(28)
<i>Other carbonyls</i>			0.014	(0.018)	0.0012	(0.0019)		
acetone (and acrolein)	3073 3060	(4151 4141)	0.013 0.012	(0.017)	n.m.	(-)	-	(1632)
6-methyl-2-hepten-3-one	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	n.d.	(-)	-	(0.6)
methyl ethyl ketone (MEK)	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	n.d.	(-)	-	(0.3)
butylacetate	2.9	(1.3)	0.000052 0.000051	(0.000143)	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)
4-acetyl-1-methylcyclohexene	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	1.3	(0.6)	0.00022	(4.0)
nopinone	4.8	(3.2)	0.0018	(0.0012)	2.9	(2.5)	0.0010	(4)
<i>Organic acids</i>			0.071	(0.013)	0.024	(0.018)		
acetic acid	2800	(447 446)	0.060	(0.008)	1507	(430)	0.020	(283)
propanoic acid	142	(25)	0.0044	(0.0008)	84	(26)	0.0018	(53 52)
butanoic acid	98	(38 37)	0.0046	(0.0018 0.0017)	58	(33)	0.0018 0.0019	(26)
isobutanoic acid	n.d.	(-)	-	(-)	n.d.	(-)	-	(14)
pentanoic acid	20	(13)	0.0016	(0.0015)	21	(11)	0.00055	(36)

Table D1 (continued).

29 – 30 April			22 – 25 May		
	Mixing ratio [ppt _v]	R_{OH} [s ⁻¹]	Mixing ratio [ppt _v]	R_{OH} [s ⁻¹]	Mixing ratio [ppt _v]
	mean (std)	mean (std)	mean (std)	mean (std)	mean (std)
isopentanoic acid	1.0 (0.2)	0.0000014 0.0000013	2.0 (0.5)	0.0000025	8.5 (5.2)
4-methylpentanoic hexanoic acid	n.d. 5.9 (2.1)	-0.000052	n.d. 9.7 (2.8)	-0.000035	n.d. 35 (-1.1)
hexanoic 4-methylpentanoic acid	5.9 n.d. (2.1)	0.000052	9.7 n.d. (2.8)	0.000055	35 n.d. (1.1)
heptanoic acid	n.d. (-)	- (-)	n.d. (-)	- (-)	13 (3)
<i>Inorganics</i>		1.2 (0.2)		1.0 (0.2)	
NO	77 (41)	0.013 0.012	89 (52)	0.013 (0.013)	69 (42 43)
NO ₂	450 449 (377 374)	0.14 (0.12)	418 (295)	0.11 (0.08)	149 (94)
O ₃	4.28 4.3e4 (9.0e3 9e3)	0.066 (0.015)	4.2e4 (7.4e3)	0.69 (0.014)	2.7e4 (8.9e3)
SO ₂	53 (60)	0.00091 0.00090	37 (25 24)	0.00058 (0.00054)	74 (114)
CO	1.29e5 (9.4e3 9e3)	0.72 (0.06)	1.1 1.0e5 (6.1e3 6e3)	0.58 (0.03)	1.4e5 (2.1e4 2e4)
CH ₄	1.9 1.938e6 (2.2e3 2e3)	0.23 (0.01)	1.9 1.923e6 (5.1e3 5e3)	0.26 (0.02)	1.9e6 (2.2e-16)
<i>Model OVOCs</i>		0.120 0.19 (0.06)		0.25 0.20 (0.120, 0.09)	
<i>Model inorganics</i>		0.057 (0.004 0.008)		0.07 0.084 (0.007, 0.026)	
<i>Missing</i>		466 1 (29, 40)		46 13 (7, 8)	
<i>Total</i>		49 664 (29, 341)		42 715 (7, 210)	

655 * quantified with β -caryophyllene calibration and an estimated reaction coefficient (1e-10 cm³ s⁻¹)