Supplement of

Chemical Characterization of Secondary Organic Aerosol at a Rural Site in the Southeastern U.S.: Insights from Simultaneous HR-ToF-AMS and FIGAERO-CIMS Measurements

5 Yunle Chen et al.

Correspondence to: Nga Lee Ng (ng@chbe.gatech.edu)



Figure S1 Correlation between FIGAERO total OA signals and AMS total OA mass concentration.



Figure S2 Normalized mass spectra of pOC ions measured by FIGAERO-CIMS, grouped by carbon atom number.



Figure S3 Normalized mass spectra of pON ions measured by FIGAERO-CIMS, grouped by carbon atom number.





Figure S4 (a) Time series, (b) mass fraction, (c) normalized mass spectra, and (d) diurnal profiles of AMS OA factors resolved by PMF.



Figure S5 (a) comparison of Isoprene-OA profile resolved by PMF and ME-2 (a-value 0), (b) average mass concentration for the three factors for the model runs, and (c) correlations R (Pearson) between the time series of selected factors and the time series of external data as a function of the model runs.



Figure S6 Time series (daily averaged) of the mass fraction of Isoprene-OA in total OA (fisoprene-OA) and temperature.



5 Figure S7 Diagnostic plots of PMF analysis on FIGAERO-CIMS measurements.



Figure S8 Scatter plots of pairs of highly-correlated ions, error bars representing estimated errors by simple Poisson statistics (left column) and after scaling by a factor of 10 (right column).



Figure S9 Diagnostic plots of PMF analysis on FIGAERO-CIMS measurements. Note that the input errors estimated from Poisson estimates were increased by a factor of 10 when performing PMF analysis.



Figure S10 Thermograms of (a) C5H9NO7, (b) C3H4O5, and (c) C3H4O4 ions measured by FIGAERO-CIMS.