# Measurement report: Seasonal, distribution and sources of organophosphate esters in $PM_{2.5}$ from an inland urban city in southwest China

Hongling Yin, ~~Jiangfeng~~ Jinfeng Liang, Di Wu, Shiping Li, Yi Luo, Xu Deng

College of Resources and Environment, Chengdu University of Information Technology, Chengdu, Sichuan, 610025, China

*Correspondence: Hongling Yin (yhl@cuit.edu.cn)*

**Abstract.** Organophosphate esters (OPEs) are contaminants of emerging concern~~emerging contaminants in recent years~~ and studies concluded that urban areas~~centers~~ were a significant source of OPEs. Samples were collected from six ground-based sites located in Chengdu, a typical fast developing metropolitan of southwest China and were analyzed for seven OPEs in atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$. The concentrations of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ ranged from 5.83 to 6.91 ng $m^{-3}$, with a mean of 6.6 ± 3.3 ng $m^{-3}$, and the primary pollutants were TBEP, TnBP, TCEP and TCPP which together made up more than 80% in the $\Sigma_7$ OPEs. The concentrations of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs were higher in autumn/winter than that in summer. Nonparametric test showed that there was no significant difference in $\Sigma_7$ OPEs concentrations among the six sampling sites, but the occurrence of unexpected high level of individual OPEs at different sites in autumn might indicate that there was a noteworthy emission. Very strong correlation ($R^2$ = 0.98, $p$<0.01) between the OPEs in soil and in $PM_{2.5}$ was observed~~suggested the atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ settlement is an important source of OPEs in soil~~. The backward trajectory analysis displayed that OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ were mainly affected by local sources. The principal component analysis (PCA) identified the OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ were largely sourced from the plastic industry / interior decoration / traffic emission (34.5%) and chemical, mechanical and electrical industry (27.8%), while PMF model found the main sources were the plastics industry / indoor source emissions, the food / cosmetics industry, and industrial emissions. Differed from the coastal cities, the sustained and stable high local emissions in the inland city were identified which were particularly noteworthy. The chlorinated phosphate, especially TCPP and TCEP have a high content, whose usage and source emissions should be controlled.

## 1. Introduction

With the prohibition of brominated flame retardants, the production and the demand of organophosphate esters (OPEs) have rapidly increased in recent years (Wang et al., ~~2012~~2013). To date, OPEs are widely distributed in the environment and have been detected in air (Guo et al., 2016; Li et al., 2017~~Bacaloni, A. et al., 2008~~), water (Bacaloni et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2013; Li et al., 2014), soil (Yin et al., 2016), sediment (Cristale J. et al., 2013; Celano R, et al., 2014) and organisms (~~Araki et al., 2014;~~ Kim et al., 2011). However, many scholars found that the residues of OPEs in the environment

could cause toxic effects on organisms (WHO, 1991, 1998, 2000; Van der Veen and de Boer, 2012; Du et al., 2015)~~OPEs have negative effects on the human body with the characteristics of water resistance, weather resistance, heat resistance and good polymer substrates compatibility (Matthews, et al., 1990; 1993)~~. Some countries have legislated to restrict the usage of OPEs (Blum et al., 2019; Exponent, 2018; State of California, 2020). Nevertheless, the production and usage of OPEs in China is still on the rise.

As synthetic substances, the only source of OPEs in the environment is anthropogenic emissions. The detection of OPEs in Arctic and Antarctic snow samples and atmospheric particulate matter samples demonstrated that OPEs can be transported over long distances (Möller et al., 2012; Li et al., 2017). Studies on OPEs in oceans were carried out a lot, and the concentrations of particle-bound OPEs ranged from tens to thousands of ng $m^{-3}$ (Möller et al., 2011; 2012; ~~Covaci et al., 2007; Cristale J & Lacorte S., 2013;~~ Li et al., 2017; McDonough et al., 2018). Researchers noted that the contribution of air flow originated from the mainland when high concentrations of OPEs (thousands of ng $m^{-3}$) appeared (Möller et al., 2012; Lai et al., 2015). In addition, studies proved the urban area was the highest pollution area of OPEs. However, until now, only a few papers reported the concentration and distribution of OPEs in urban atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$. Concentrations of atmospheric OPEs in most cities were lower than 10 ng $m^{-3}$, higher concentrations of 19.2 ng $m^{-3}$ were observed at a suburban site in Shanghai, and 49.1 ng $m^{-3}$ were observed in Hongkong (Ohura et al., 2006; Salamova et al., 2014b; ~~Marklund et al., 2005;~~ Shoeib et al., 2014; Yin et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2016; Ren et al., 2016; Guo et al., 2016; Wong et al., 2018). To date, most of studies in China focus on the OPEs in the Yangtze River Delta and Pearl River Delta, especially eastern coastal cities while little attention was paid to the western inland cities.

Chengdu is a typical inland city located in the southwest of China. It is the capital and megacity of Sichuan Province, which covers an area of 14,335 square kilometers and has a permanent population of 16.33 million. As the important national high-tech industrial base, commercial logistics centere and comprehensive transportation hub determined by the State Council, Chengdu is the important central city in the western region (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chengdu). Liu et al. (2016) reported an investigation of three chlorinated OPEs in the atmosphere at 10 urban sites in China during 2013–2014 and found that the highest annual mean concentrations were observed in Chengdu (1,300 ± 2,800 ng $m^{-3}$). However, there is still a lack of information regarding the levels, sources, and fate of OPEs in the southwest China which may obviously differed from the coastal cities or over the sea. Our previous

study has investigated the OPEs concentrations in $PM_{2.5}$ at two sites (urban and suburban sites) in Chengdu (an economically fast growing city in southwest of China), and found that OPEs concentrations and profile were similar at two sites (Yin et al., 2015). But the influence factors and potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu are still unclear. Therefore, in this study, $PM_{2.5}$ was collected over one year (October 2014 to September 2015) at six sites~~In this study, we investigated the atmospheric OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ through intensive sampling in an economically fast growing city Chengdu. Sampling was carried out over one year (October 2014 to September 2015) which was a continuous and further project of our previous study from December 2013 to October 2014. The aims of the study~~ in Chengdu ~~were~~ to: a) report the levels and composition profiles of OPEs in urban air in the typical inland city; (b) obtain the seasonal and spatial variation of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$; (c) investigate the relationships and correlations among the target compounds or with influence factors; (d) illustrate the potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$.

## 2. Materials and Methods

### 2.1. Chemicals

The main reagents, such as ethyl acetate, acetone, hexane and acetonitrile, were High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) grade (Kelon Chemical Corp., China). The standard solution~~s (Sigma Aldrich Corp., USA) included~~ including tri-n-butyl phosphate (TnBP), tris-(2-ethylhexyl)phosphate (TEHP), tris-(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate (TBEP), triphenyl phosphate (TPhP), tris-(2-chloroethyl)-phosphate (TCEP), tris-(2-chloroisopropyl)phosphate (TCPP), and tris-(2.3-dichloropropyl)-phosphate (TDCIPP) and internal standard (TDCPP-$d_{15}$ and TPhP-$d_{15}$) were all purchased from Sigma-aldrich Corp., USA. Copper, aluminium oxide, silica gel, $Na_2SO_4$ and other chemicals were purchased from Kelon Chemical Corp., China.~~.~~ Deionized water was supplied from a Milli-Q equipment.

### 2.2. Sample collection

The atmospheric sampling sites were located in the main city area (site B: downtown; site C: south; site D: east; site E: north; site F: west) and suburban area (site A) of Chengdu, as shown in Fig. S1. The atmospheric samples were collected by KC - 6120 medium flow atmospheric comprehensive sampler with quartz film. The speed was set at 100 L $min^{-1}$, and each collection campaign lasted 23 h. The

sampling campaign was carried out between October 2014 and September 2015. In each season, continuous sampling was carried out for about one week, except for rainy days. In autumn, the sampling duration was from October 23 to October 29, 2014 (no sample was obtained due to the rain on October 26 and 27); in winter, the sampling duration was from December 22 to December 30, 2014 (no sample was obtained due to the rain on October 25 and 26); in spring, the sampling duration was from March 25 to March 30, 2015; in summer, the sampling duration was from July 16 to July 24, 2015 (no sample was obtained due to the rain on July 21). A total of 149 samples were obtained. Most of the weather conditions were cloudy days, with south / north wind whose speed was ~~at~~ lower ≤ than 5.5 m / s. Temperature ranged from 0 to 35 ℃. Weather conditions could represent typical weather conditions of the season.

## 2.3. Sample preparation and analysis

The shredded $PM_{2.5}$ sample film was placed in a test tube and incubated in 20 mL ethyl acetate/acetone (v: v, 3: 2) for 12 hours. After ultrasonic extraction for 30 minutes, the liquid was separated, and the residue was further extracted with 10 mL ethyl acetate/acetone (v: v, 3: 2) by ultrasonic extraction for 15 minutes. The extracts were combined and concentrated by vacuum-condensing equipment (Buchi Syncore Q-101, Switzerland) to approximately 1 mL, then loaded onto an activated aluminium oxide / silica gel (v: v, 3: 1) column. The column was first eluted with 20 mL hexane to remove impurities, then with 20 mL ethyl acetate/acetone (v: v, 3: 2) and the latter eluate (ethyl acetate / acetone) was collected. The ~~eluate was~~ ~~solvent extracts were~~ concentrated to near~~ly~~ dryness by vacuum-condensing equipment and then fixed volume to 200 $\mu$L with hexane ~~diluted to 200 $\mu$L~~ for gas chromatography - mass spectrometry (GC - MS) (Shimadzu 2010 plus, Japan) analysis.

The GC is equipped with a capillary column ~~Rti~~SH-Rxi-5Sil MS (30 m × 0.25 μm × 0.25 mm, Shimadzu, Japan~~, Kelong~~)~~, with a 280 ℃ inlet temperature using splitless injection~~ Splitless injection was applied and the inlet temperature was 280 ℃. The MS source was electron impact (EI) and the MS was operated in selected ion monitoring (SIM) mode. Helium was used as ~~a~~ carrier gas with a flow rate of 1.00 mL $min^{-1}$. The GC oven temperature was held at 50 ℃ for 1 minute, increased to 200 ℃ at 15 ℃ $min^{-1}$ and held for 1 minute, ~~increased~~then to 250 ℃ at 4.00 ℃ $min^{-1}$, and ~~then increased~~ to 300 ℃ at 20 ℃ $min^{-1}$ ~~and~~ , held for 4 minutes. The interface temperature was 280 ℃, and the ion source temperature was 200 ℃. The respective characteristic ion and reference ions (m / z) of the 7

target compounds were: 155 / 99, 211, 125 (TnBP), 249 / 63, 143, 251 (TCEP), 125 / 99, 201, 277, 157 (TCPP), 75 / 99, 191, 209, 381 (TDCPP), 326 / 325, 77, 215 (TPhP), 85 / 100, 199, 299 (TBEP), 99 / 113 and 211 (TEHP).

## 2.4. QA / QC

Thorough QA / QC procedures for OPEs analysis were conducted to ensure data quality. To evaluate the recovery efficiencies of analytical procedures, all samples were added with internal standard (TDCPP-$d_{15}$ and TPhP-$d_{15}$), and the accuracy was evaluated by their recoveries. The concentrations of the 7 OPEs were determined by an external standard method. The correlation coefficients of the standard curves of the seven OPE monomers were all greater than 0.990. The recoveries of the 7 OPEs and the internal standard were between 78.9% and 122.5%~~ranged from 83.9% to 121.2%~~. A matrix blank was analysed with each batch of samples. Only TnBP was detected in the blanks, and the level of TnBP found in the blanks was <5% of the concentrations measured in all samples, which ~~means~~ meant it was negligible. Field blanks were done at each site to evaluate the background contamination in the field. TBEP, TnBP and TEHP were detected in it. The level of them found in the blank were <15% of the concentrations measured in all samples. The instrument precision was in the range of 1.9%-8.3%.

## 2.5 Statistical analysis

Data analysis was done through IBM SPSS 22.0. Parameter test and nonparametric test were used to analyze the difference between data. Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the linear relationship between the two variables, while Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the monotonic relationship between the two variables.

# 3. Results and Discussion

## 3.1. Levels of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$

OPEs were present in $PM_{2.5}$ samples collected across the study area (Fig. S1). Seven OPEs were detected in 96.7% - 100% of the samples ~~Four OPEs (TCPP, TDCPP, TCEP and TnBP) were detected in all samples~~ (n=149)~~, while TBEP was detected in all but one sample. Additionally, TEHP was~~

~~detected in 96.7% of samples overall and TPhP was detected in 98% of samples~~. The high detection frequencies of most OPEs indicated OPE contamination was ubiquitous in the air of Chengdu city. Concentrations of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ across the six sites were in the range of 3.5 - 11.5 ng $m^{-3}$, and the annual median concentration of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs was 6.5 ± 3.3 ng $m^{-3}$ (Fig. 1). The seasonal average value of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ at each site ~~in four seasons~~ was almost at the same level (5.8 ± 1.3 ng $m^{-3}$ - 6.9 ± 2.5 ng $m^{-3}$). Nonparametric test showed that there was no significant difference in $\Sigma_7$ OPEs concentrations among the six sampling sites, indicating that the atmosphere mixed evenly, and there was no particularly heavy or light ~~pollution~~ polluted area in Chengdu city. These data were ~~are~~ quite consistent with our previous study which reported ~~that showed~~ the annual median concentration of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ from December 2013 to October 2014 (Yin et al., 2015). Interestingly, the concentration of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs at the suburban site was ~~the annual median of total OPEs at the suburban site was not the lowest as might be expected and is instead likewise~~ similar to, or even higher than some urban sites, which indicated more local sources of these compounds in the suburban area.




**Figure 1.** Levels and seasonal variation of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ at six sampling sites. A: autumn, W: winter, Sp: spring, Su: summer, Sub: suburbs, Dow: dowtown, S: south, E: east, N: north, W: west.

The concentrations of OPEs in the particles of Chengdu were comparable to that reported from Beijing ($\Sigma_9$ OPEs: ~~0.257 - 8.36~~1.4 ng $m^{-3}$) (Wang et al., ~~2018~~2019), 6.6 ng $m^{-3}$ ($\Sigma_6$ OPEs) for Shanghai urban site (Ren et al., 2016), 6.5 ng $m^{-3}$ ($\Sigma_6$ OPEs) for Bursa, but higher than that in Houston, US ($\Sigma_{12}$ OPEs, 0.16 - 2.4 ng $m^{-3}$) (Clark et al., 2017), Dalian ($\Sigma_9$ OPEs, 0.32-3.46 ng $m^{-3}$,1.21 ± 0.67 ng $m^{-3}$) (Wang et al., 2019), European Arctic (0.033 - 1.45 ng $m^{-3}$) (Salamova et al., 2014b), Northern Pacific and Indian Ocean (0.23 - 2.9 ng $m^{-3}$) (M~~o~~öller et al., 2012), the Yellow Sea and Bohai Sea (0.044 - 0.52 ng $m^{-3}$) (Li et al., ~~2017~~2018), South China Sea (0.047 - 0.161 ng $m^{-3}$) (Lai et al., 2015), North Atlantic and

Arctic Oceans (0.035 - 0.343 ng $m^{-3}$) (Li et al., 2017). And they were lower than that in Guangzhou and Taiyuan ($\Sigma_{11}$ OPEs, 3.10 - 544ng $m^{-3}$) (Chen et al., 2020), in Bursa, Turkey ($\Sigma_6$ OPEs~~,~~ , 0.53 - 19.14 ng $m^{-3}$) (Kurtkarakus et al., ~~2018~~2017), 20 industrial sites in an urban region ($\Sigma_{12}$ OPEs, 0.52 - 62.75 ng $m^{-3}$) in Guangzhou, China (Wang~~,~~ ~~T. T.~~ et al., 2018).

### 3.2. The composition profiles of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$

~~There was clear dominant n~~Non-chlorinated OPEs were the predominant OPEs across Chengdu city (Fig. 2). The annual median concentrations of total OPEs were fairly uniform at six sites and influenced mainly by the alkylated OPEs. As listed in Table 1, the general trend was found that TBEP was the most abundant OPE (annual media concentration: 2.3 ng $m^{-3}$, 35.3% of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs), followed by TCEP (1.1 ng $m^{-3}$, 16.3%) ≈ TnBP (1.0 ng $m^{-3}$, 15.6%) ≈ TCPP (1.0 ng $m^{-3}$, 15.0%) > TPhP (0.5 ng $m^{-3}$, 8.4%) > TEHP (0.3 ng $m^{-3}$, 5.1%) > TDCPP (0.3 ng $m^{-3}$, 4.3%), with the concentrations of TBEP being approximately 7 - 10 times higher than those of TDCPP and TEHP. The composition profile of OPEs was similar at all sites except for that the east site which has a higher contribution of TnBP. But TBEP, TCEP, TCPP and TnBP were dominant OPEs across the city who contributed more than 80% to $\Sigma_7$ OPEs. This profile was similar to that in Longyearbyen, Norway, with primary pollutants being TnBP and TBEP (Möller et al., 2012), as well as the OPEs in outdoor urban air being TBEP > TCPP > TCEP > TnBP > TPhP in Stockholm, Sweden (Wong et al., 2018) and TBEP > TCPP > TPhP > TEHP > TCEP in Turkey (Kurtkarakus et al., 2018). However, these results substantially differed from the report of an urban site in Shanghai that showed TCEP (0.1 - 10.1 ng $m^{-3}$, 1.8 ng $m^{-3}$) > TCPP (0.1 - 9.7 ng $m^{-3}$, 1.0 ng $m^{-3}$) > TPhP (0.06 - 14.0 ng $m^{-3}$, 0.5 ng $m^{-3}$) > TBP (0.06 - 2.1 ng $m^{-3}$, 0.4 ng $m^{-3}$) > TDCPP (Nd. - 23.9 ng $m^{-3}$, 0.3 ng $m^{-3}$), whereas TBEP was only detected in 3 out of 116 samples (Nd. - 0.7 ng $m^{-3}$, Nd.) (Ren et al., 2016), and the reported data over the Bohai and Yellow Seas showed TCPP (43 - 530 ng $m^{-3}$; 100 ng $m^{-3}$, 50 ± 11%)> TCEP (27 - 150 ng $m^{-3}$; 71 ng $m^{-3}$, 25 ± 7%) > TiBP (19 - 210 ng $m^{-3}$; 57 ng $m^{-3}$, 14 ± 12%) > TnBP (3.0 - 37 ng $m^{-3}$; 13 ng $m^{-3}$). Li et al. (2014) determined the primary pollutant of outdoor air in Nanjing was TCEP, and TBEP was not detected. These differences reflected that there were significant differences in OPE production and usage in different regions, even in the same country. It should be noted that concentrations of TCPP and TCEP were in the same level in this study, suggesting the industrial replacement of TCEP by TCPP wasn't identified in the southwest China which differed from that the higher concentration of TCPP in comparison with

TCEP was observed due to the industrial replacement of TCEP by TCPP in Europe (Quednow and Püttmann, 2009). This was confirmed by the fact that there are manufacturers and sellers of TCEP and TCPP in Chengdu (https://show.guidechem.com/hainuowei, http://www.sinostandards.net/index.php), indicating that there is production and demand both for TCPP and TCEP in this region.




**Figure 2.** Percentages of individual OPEs contributing to the $\Sigma_7$ OPEs at each sampling site.

**Table 1.** The annual median concentrations of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ from Chengdu (ng $m^{-3}$).

| ~~Orientation~~ Sampling sites | TnBP | TCEP | TCPP | TDCPP | TPhP | TBEP | TEHP | $\Sigma_7$ OPEs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| suburb | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 6.7 |
| downtown | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 5.8 |
| south | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 5.9 |
| east | 2.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 6.6 |
| north | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 6.7 |
| west | 0.8 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 6.9 |
| median | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 6.4 |

Combined with the data of 2013 - 2014 year (Yin et al., 2015), TBEP was always the dominant OPEs during the two sampling periods (2013 - 2014 and 2014 - 2015). Kruskal Wallis test was used and found that TnBP and TCPP had no significant difference between the two sampling periods, but there were significant differences in other kinds of OPEs between the two sampling periods. This indicated

that the production and usage of individual OPEs have certain change suggesting that OPEs should be better investigated and governed for individual compounds.

OPEs can be categorized by whether they are halogenated, alkylated or aryl OPEs. Of the OPEs measured in this study, TCEP, TCPP and TDCPP are halogenated, TBEP, TnBP and TEHP are alkylated, and TPhP is aryl OPEs. The OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ at all sites were dominated by the alkylated compounds (55.9 ± 10.1%), followed by halogenated OPEs (35.8 ± 9.9%) and aryl OPEs (8.3 ± 4.1%). Our results are similar to those observed in Bursa, Turkey (Kurtkarakus et al., ~~2018~~2017), whose alkylated OPEs covered 68% ~~-~~ 95% of total OPEs, while halogenated OPEs covered 3.1% ~ 29%, and aryl OPEs covered 1.4% ~~-~~ 3.7% of total OPEs. Wu et al. (2020) also reported that alkyl OPEs dominated OPE compositional profiles of urban air collected from Chicago and Cleveland. At Longyearbyen, the non-chlorinated OPE concentrations comprised 75% of the $\Sigma_8$OPEs concentrations (Salamova et al., 2014a). However, our results are obviously different from many studies with the atmospheric samples collected in urban areas being dominated by chlorinated OPEs (50 ~~-~~ 80%) (Salamova et al., 2014b; Liu et al., 2016; Guo et al., 2016). In our study, non-chlorinated OPEs were dominant in urban and suburban area across the city.

### 3.3. Seasonal and spatial variation of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$

The mean seasonal concentrations were plotted for six sampling sites in Fig. ~~2~~1. The data were quite consistent with our previous study from December 2013 to October 2014 (Yin et al., 2015). The concentrations of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ have been fairly uniform in the past three years. As shown in Fig. ~~2~~1, the general order of the decreasing average $\Sigma_7$OPEs concentrations in suburban area was autumn (8.4 ± 4.3 ng $m^{-3}$) ≈ winter (8.4 ± 4.5 ng $m^{-3}$) > spring (7.6 ± 2.2 ng $m^{-3}$) > summer (3.5 ± 1.1 ng $m^{-3}$), while in urban area was autumn (9.30 ± 3.89 ng $m^{-3}$) > winter (6.63 ± 3.65 ng $m^{-3}$) > spring (6.36 ± 1.72 ng $m^{-3}$) > summer (4.60 ± 1.91 ng $m^{-3}$). The average concentration of $\Sigma_7$OPEs in autumn / winter was approximately 2 times that in summer. In summer, the turbulent flow accelerated the diffusion of pollutants, leading to the lowest concentration, while the higher concentrations of OPEs appeared in autumn and winter because the inversion layer appeared more frequently in autumn and winter, resulting in the pollutants being more difficult to diffuse and dilute. This seasonal variation was mostly in line with that at the Shanghai urban site of autumn (8.4 ng $m^{-3}$) > winter (7.6 ng $m^{-3}$) > spring (5.5 ng $m^{-3}$) > summer (4.4 ng $m^{-3}$), of which the maximum value was also approximately twice the minimum

(Ren et al., 2016). In addition, this finding was similar to that in Xinxiang that no significant seasonal changes and only exhibited individual high values in winter. On the contrary, Wang et al. (2019) found the $PM_{2.5}$-bound fractions of OPEs varied significantly between seasons in Dalian, China, with their concentrations higher in hot seasons, which may due to the temperature-driven emission or gas-particle partitioning. Wong et al. (2018) reported that most of OPEs in outdoor urban air showed seasonality, with increased concentrations during the warm period in Stockholm, Sweden. Sühring et al. (2016) reported temperature dependence of chlorinated OPEs and EHDPP in Arctic air. Wu et al. (2020) reported that median concentrations of $\Sigma_6$ OPEs for summer samples were up to 5 times greater than those for winter samples. The similar seasonal patterns were reported by Salamova et al. (2014a) for the atmospheric particle - phase OPE concentrations in samples collected from the Great Lakes in 2012. A reasonable explanation is that OPEs are not chemically bound to the materials in which they are used and higher temperatures may facilitate their emission from buildings and vehicles. However, Shoeib~~Liu~~ et al. (2014) did not observe any temperature dependence for the OPEs in urban air in Toronto, Canada. Thus previous reports of temperature dependence of OPEs are not consistent. In our study, the correlation analysis between the temperature, wind speed, wind direction and $\Sigma_7$ OPEs concentrations has been done. The results showed statistically significant negative correlations between temperature and $\Sigma_7$ OPEs ($R= -0.355$, $p<0.01$). T~~In this study, t~~he lowest concentrations of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs and individual compound were observed in summer suggesting the OPEs level was not driven by the temperature-driven emission. Gas-particle partitioning and local emission sources may contribute to the variation.

Compared to the coastal cities, the most obvious difference was that concentrations of almost all OPEs monomers in this study (Fig. 3) were highest in autumn / winter and lowest and concentrated in summer suggesting the sustained and stable high local emissions in the inland city which were particularly noteworthy. No point source was identified in summer and the OPEs level was diluted and diffused in summer due to the higher wind speed than in winter in the inland city. This was different from the coastal cities: Liu et al. (2016) reported that the highest TCPP and TCEP concentrations were observed in the summer in Guangzhou and Javier et al. (2018) found the OPEs in spring generally exhibited the lowest concentrations in Bizerte, Tunisia, probably linked to the influence of local meteorological conditions and air mass trajectories to a lesser extent.




TnBP




TCEP




TCPP




TDCPP




TPhP




TBEP




TEHP

**Figure 3.** The seasonal variation of monomer individual OPEss in $PM_{2.5}$ from Chengdu city. A:Autumn, W:Winter, Sp:Spring, Su:Summer, Sub:Suburbs, Dow:Dowtown, S:South, E:East,N:North, W:West.

Though Kruskal Wallis test showed that there was no significant variation of $\Sigma_7$OPEs concentrations across the city, the spatial differences were identified in the study. For example, TnBP and TCPP had significant difference among six sites. In addition, the higher concentrations and more dispersed pattern of most OPEs were observed in autumn and winter than in summer (Fig. 3). The concentrations of TEHP in autumn at the eastern and northern sampling site were more dispersed than others. The same dispersion pattern was observed for TBEP in winter at the western sampling site, TPhP in autumn at the suburban sampling site, TnBP in autumn at the eastern sampling site, suggesting that there existed ~~the~~ extra emission sources in autumn or winter. ~~Considered~~ Considering the layout of Chengdu which develops from the central area with the loop line (the first ring road, the second ring road and the third ~~Ring~~ ring ~~Road~~road), the uniform patterns of OPEs levels and distribution across the city is understandable. Differen~~we could understand the OPEs levels and distribution were quite uniform across the city. But differen~~t types of industrial parks in different directions in Chengdu may be the reason for the spatial differences of OPEs. For example, in the east of Chengdu, there are automobile industrial parks and other large industrial parks while logistics and shoemaking industrial parks are located in the suburbs. The occurrence of unexpected high levels of individual OPEs at different sites in autumn might indicate that there was a noteworthy emission. The spatial and seasonal variation of

individual OPE suggest that the control and management of OPEs should be taken ~~to the individual OPE~~. Interestingly, in this study, alkyl OPEs dominated both urban and suburban sites. This was extremely different from the results reported by Wu et al. (2020) that alkyl OPEs dominated at urban sites, chlorinated OPEs were prevalent at rural sites, and aryl OPEs were most abundant at remote locations.

~~OPEs can be categorized as halogenated, alkylated and aryl OPEs. Of the OPEs measured in this study, TCEP, TCPP and TDCPP are halogenated, TBEP, TnBP and TEHP are alkylated, and TPhP are aryl OPEs.~~ Many studies focused on the halogenated OPEs due to their persistence, bio-accumulation, and potential human health effects, and they dominated the OPEs profile in the air of many cities and other areas (~~Zhang et al., 2016,~~ Li et al., 2017). Liu et al. (2016) reported that the sum of the concentrations of the three halogenated OPEs at 10 urban sites ranged from 0.05 to 12 ng $m^{-3}$ suggesting the highest production volume and widest applications of OPEs leading to large emissions of OPEs in China in recent years. However, in our study, the mean concentrations of halogenated, alkylated and aryl OPEs were 2.4 ± 1.4 ng $m^{-3}$, 3.7 ± 2.1 ng $m^{-3}$, 0.5 ± 0.4 ng $m^{-3}$, respectively, which showed the alkylated OPEs dominated the profile of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu. In different seasons, the most notable seasonal variation was observed for alkyl phosphate, followed by halogenated OPEs and aryl OPEs. These results were significantly different from those in other studies which reported that the halogenated OPEs had the maximum seasonal variability (Guo et al., 2016; Shoeib et al., 2014).

## 3.4. Correlation analysis of OPEs

### 3.4.1 Linkage to environmental factors

Most of OPE monomers concentrations in $PM_{2.5}$ have a strong linear correlation ($R^2$ = 0.79) with their vapor pressure (Fig. 4), suggesting that the vapor pressure is an important factor controlling the levels of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ except for TBEP. Generally speaking, the greater the vapor pressure of OPEs, the easier it is to be released into the environment. Therefore, the sources of most OPEs in Chengdu atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ are mainly both from the production process containing OPEs and the phase transition process before they enter into the atmosphere. The boiling points of OPEs are relatively high, so they tend to be adsorbed in $PM_{2.5}$ after being released to the environment (Wang et al., 2019), and their gas-particle distributions determine~~s~~ their concentration in $PM_{2.5}$. Interestingly, the vapor pressure

of TBEP is lower than other OPEs, but its concentration in $PM_{2.5}$ was higher which indicated that there were sustained and stable high emission sources to keep its concentration at a high level which may include the traffic emission source (Chen et al., 2020). Sühring et al. (2016) reported non-halogenated OPE concentrations in Canadian Arctic air appeared to have diffuse sources or local sources close to the land-based sampling stations.




**Figure 4.** Relationship of individual OPEs concentration in $PM_{2.5}$ and its vapor pressure.

### 3.4.2 Correlation between target analytes

Spearman's ranks correlation coefficients were used to investigate the potential emission sources for OPEs by the relationship between individual OPE in $PM_{2.5}$ (Fig.5, Table 2). Fig. 4–5 showed no statistically significant positive correlations between OPE monomers ($r<0.50$, $p<0.01$). However, $\Sigma_7$ OPEs concentrations were closely related to TBEP, TCEP and TnBP ($r=0.53$ - 0.61, $p<0.01$) which further identified the OPEs levels were influenced mainly by the dominated OPEs compounds. Comparatively, weak correlations between most of OPEs were observed in urban regions (Wang et al., 2018) and Turkey (KurtKarakus et al., 2018). However, strong correlations between individual OPEs were found in Guangzhou and Taiyuan (Chen et al., 2020).




**Figure 5.** Spearman's rank correlation coefficients between the concentrations of individual OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ samples.

**Table 2.** The correlation analysis of individual OPEs in downtown and suburb sampling sites.

| | | TnBP | TCEP | TCPP | TDCPP | TPhP | TBEP | TEHP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Downtown | TnBP | 1 | .408* | 0.319 | 0.15 | .455* | 0.187 | 0.105 |
| | TCEP | .408* | 1 | .818** | 0.165 | 0.342 | .447* | .449* |
| | TCPP | 0.319 | .818** | 1 | 0.184 | 0.392 | .447* | .500* |
| | TDCPP | 0.15 | 0.165 | 0.184 | 1 | 0.053 | 0.216 | 0.175 |
| | TPhP | .455* | 0.342 | 0.392 | 0.053 | 1 | 0.104 | -0.081 |
| | TBEP | 0.187 | .447* | .447* | 0.216 | 0.104 | 1 | 0.338 |
| | TEHP | 0.105 | .449* | .500* | 0.175 | -0.081 | 0.338 | 1 |
| Suburb | TnBP | 1 | .566** | .476* | .650** | 0.269 | .417* | 0.141 |
| | TCEP | .566** | 1 | .852** | .683** | 0.368 | .784** | .423* |
| | TCPP | .476* | .852** | 1 | .686** | 0.304 | .701** | 0.297 |
| | TDCPP | .650** | .683** | .686** | 1 | 0.175 | .708** | 0.158 |
| | TPhP | 0.269 | 0.368 | 0.304 | 0.175 | 1 | .512** | .629** |
| | TBEP | .417* | .784** | .701** | .708** | .512** | 1 | .434* |
| | TEHP | 0.141 | .423* | 0.297 | 0.158 | .629** | .434* | 1 |

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Further analysis results were shown in Table 2. Only significant correlation between TCPP and TCEP both at downtown (r=0.82, $p$<0.01) and suburban sites (r=0.85, $p$<0.01) were observed indicating the high homology between these two compounds. ~~So t~~The inland city in China is still using a large number of products containing chlorinated flame retardants, which was confirmed by our previous study of house dust (Liu et al. 2017; Yin et al., 2019). At downtown site, another significant correlation existed between TEHP and TCEP (r=0.50, $p$<0.01) while others have weak to moderate correlations (r<0.46, $p$<0.01). The downtown area mainly focuses on the light industry and software development, and TCPP, TCEP, TnBP, TBEP and TPhP are used in textile, leather, electronic products and other fields. However, the correlation of each OPE monomer at site A (suburb) was stronger than that in the urban area. The correlations between TnBP and TCEP, TnBP and TDCPP, TCEP and TCPP, TCEP and TDCPP, TCEP and TBEP, TCPP and TDCPP and TBEP were all extremely significant. This result indicated that the pollution in the suburb was commixed and ~~was~~ influenced by many kinds of pollution sources.

### 3.4.3 Correlation analysis of OPEs and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations

The SPSS software scatter diagram was used to analyse the relationship between the concentrations of OPE monomers and $PM_{2.5}$. As displayed in Fig. S2, only weak to moderate correlation were observed between most of OPEs and $PM_{2.5}$ except significant correlation was found between TDCPP and $PM_{2.5}$ (r=0.53, $p$<0.01) which suggest the continuous and relative constant local sources were the main sources. This result was found similar with that reported from Taiyuan (Guo et al., 2016), where no correlation was between the concentrations of OPEs and the concentration of particulate matter. However, this result differed from that in Xinxiang (Shen et al., 2016), which showed that the concentrations of OPEs and $PM_{2.5}$ had significant correlation (r=0.85~~e~~), and a high value of OPEs / $PM_{2.5}$ was related to the contribution of the air mass from the heavily polluted area (Henan and Jiangsu province), while low OPEs / $PM_{2.5}$ was due to the air mass from Shanxi-Gansu and Neimenggu Province. Chen et al. (2020) found there was a significant correlation (p–<–0.05) between the concentrations of $\Sigma_{11}$OPEs and $PM_{2.5}$ in some sampling sites but not a site located in the urban region in Guangzhou with potential additional pollution sources.

### 3.4.4 Correlation analysis of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ and soil

Due to the low detection frequency of TCPP and TDCPP in the soil (Yin et al., 2016), the relationship of other five OPE monomers in the soil and in atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ were presented in Fig. 6. A very strong linear relationship was obtained between the OPEs in soil and in $PM_{2.5}$ ($R^2$ = 0.98, $p$<0.01–), indicating that the atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ settlement is an important source of OPEs in the soil, so does the soil be a source for OPEs in the air.




**Figure 6.** Relationship between OPEs in atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ and in soil.

### 3.4.5 Correlation analysis of OPEs indoor and outdoor air

The OPEs profile in outdoor air in this study were: TBEP> TCEP > TnBP> TCPP > TPhP> TEHP> TDCPP, which was different with indoor dust reported from our previous study (Liu et al., 2017): TPhP>TCPP>TnBP> TDCPP >TBEP> TCEP > TEHP. TPhP is used as one of important alternatives for technical decabrominated diphenyl ether (deca - BDE) product, which is typically used as a flame retardant in electrical and electronic products. In addition, the use of plastic film and rubber may be an important source of TPhP. Thus OPEs in indoor dust mainly comes from indoor environment and related to human activities, not from outdoor air. Except for the different usage of OPEs, many factors may also lead to differences between indoor and outdoor OPEs. For example, TBEP has the shortest atmospheric half-lives, which may explain why its dominance in indoor samples was not observed for

the outdoor counterparts. Studies in Swedish (Wong et al., 2018) reported the concentrations of OPEs in indoor air were TCPP > TCEP > TBEP > TnBP> TPhP, and in outdoor urban air were TBEP > TCPP > TCEP > TnBP > TPhP ~~(Wong, 2018)~~ which also indicated the differences of OPEs profile in indoor and outdoor air. They found that activities in the building, e.g. floor cleaning, polishing, construction, introduction of new electronics and changes in ventilation rate could be key factors in controlling the concentration of indoor air pollutants, while the observed seasonality for OPEs in outdoor air was due to changes in primary emission.~~emission sources in indoor and outdoor air due to the different use of OPEs.~~

## 3.5 Source apportionment of OPEs

### 3.5.1 Analysis of backward trajectory model

The backward trajectory cluster analysis (HYSPLIT4) combines the horizontal and vertical motion of the atmosphere, which can analyse the transport, migration and diffusion of atmospheric pollutants, were used in this study. The height of AGL500m can better represent the characteristics of the process wind field, and HYSPLIT4 was used to obtain the 24 hours backward trajectory of AGL500m during the sampling period of Chengdu. During the sampling period, the air mass was mainly from the northeastern and southern parts of Sichuan Province, including Mianyang, Deyang, Renshou and Chengdu, and a few of the trajectories came from Chongqing and other places in Gansu Province. Therefore, during the sampling period, Chengdu was mainly affected by the air mass of the eastern Sichuan.

In different seasons, the air sources always came from the southern or the northern regions of Chengdu. In spring, Chengdu was influenced by air mass from the southern region, which could be divided into three paths: (a) from Ya'an through Renshou to Chengdu; (b) from Leshan and Yibin; and (c) from Chongqing through Ziyang to Chengdu. The concentrations of OPEs at the northern and suburban site were relatively high in spring. During the summer period, Chengdu was mainly influenced by air masses from both the southern areas (Yibin, Zigong and others) and the northern areas (Gansu Province, Guangyuan and Mianyang), but there was no significant difference in OPE concentrations at each sampling site, nor in autumn and winter. Combined with the backward trajectory cluster analysis and the concentrations of OPEs at each sampling site, the concentrations of OPEs had no obvious change. This result suggested that OPEs were not affected by exogenous pollution but were mainly

affected by the local sources of Chengdu. These results are consistent with the meteorological and topographic conditions. Chengdu's wind has always been breezy with much smaller strength than coastal cities or other inland cities (https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E6%88%90%E9%83%BD/128473?fr=aladdin). The wind direction is relatively constant, mainly from the south and the north. In addition, Chengdu is a city located in the interior of China, which was ~~located in the basin,~~ surrounded by the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau, the Qinling Mountains, etc. These topographic and meteorological conditions block the influence of foreign sources on Chengdu's atmosphere, which further explained that the pollution of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ was controlled by endogenous pollution, not by exogenous pollution.

### 3.5.2 Principal Component Analysis

The principal component analysis (PCA) of OPEs was carried out by SPSS. The normalized correlation coefficient matrix of the original data of each sampling site showed that there was a strong correlation between TCPP and TCEP, TCEP and TBEP, and TnBP and TPhP, which satisfied the condition of dimensionality reduction of PCA. Two principal component factors were obtained in this study. The cumulative contribution of the two principal component factors was 62.3%, which can basically reflect the data information. The results were shown in Table S1. For factor 1, there was a large load on TCEP~~、~~,TCPP~~、~~,TBEP and a moderate load on TDCPP. Factor 1 can represent the sources of OPEs from the plastic industry, interior decoration and traffic emission, with the contribution ratio of 34.5% (Marklund et al., 2007; Regnery et al., 2011; CEFIC, 2002). Factor 2 has higher load on TnBP, TEHP and TPhP. The highest load was on TnBP, which is often used as a high-carbon alcohol defoamer, mostly in industries that do not come in contact with food and cosmetics, as well as in antistatic agents and extractants of rare earth elements. TEHP can be used as an antifoaming agent, hydraulic fluid and so on. TPhP is typically used in electrical and electronic products, or plastic film and rubber (Esch, 2000; Stevens et al., 2006; Wei et al., 2015). Factor 2 can be considered the chemical, mechanical and electrical industry, and its contribution ratio was 27.8%.

### 3.5.3 PMF model analysis

The basic principle of the PMF method is to decompose the sample matrix into a factor contribution matrix and factor component spectrum. The source type of the factor is judged according to the factor

component spectrum, and then the contribution ratio of source is determined. The uncertainty is estimated by three methods: BS, disp and bs-disp. From 149 samples collected in Chengdu, 132 valid samples were selected to participate in the model calculation and three factors were determined. TPhP was the only chemical with residual (4.0) greater than 3. Concentrations of OPEs satisfied the normal distribution. The components of factor 1 were complex. Factor 1 contributes 71.0%, 70.7% and 70.9% to TCEP, TCPP and TEHP, respectively, and 58.3% to TPhP. Factor 1 was deduced to be the plastics/electrical industry and indoor source emissions (Esch, 2000; Stevens et al., 2006). Factor 2 contributed the most to TBEP (78.0%), followed by TDCPP (44.7%), while it did not contribute to TnBP. Therefore, factor 2 was deduced as the food / cosmetics industry and traffic emissions (Marklund et al., 2007). Factor 3 contributes 71.7% of the total TnBP, which can be deduced as chemical industrial source (Regnery et al., 2011).

## 4. Conclusions and Implications

Compared to the levels of OPEs in other cities, the levels of OPEs measured in this study were comparable or even higher than most of other studies. This suggests that during the shift of labour-intensive manufacturing from the coastal developed areas to inland regions, OPEs were widely used in industrial and manufacturing processes in southwest China which needs concern.

This intensive sampling campaign of urban and suburban area found no significant spatial variability of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs across Chengdu, China, but the most notable seasonal variation was observed for alkyl phosphate, followed by halogenated OPEs and aryl OPEs. Higher concentrations and more dispersed pattern of OPEs in autumn / winter than that in summer, with TBEP, TCEP, TCPP and TnBP being the dominant compounds. The occurrence of unexpected high level of individual OPEs at different sites in autumn might indicate that there was a noteworthy emission. PCA analysis showed the main sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ include plastic industry / interior decoration / traffic emission (34.5%) and chemical, mechanical and electrical industry (27.8%). PMF showed the main sources were the plastics / electrical industry and indoor source emissions. OPEs have a wide range of physical and chemical properties, combined with differences in its behavior identified in this study, the management of OPEs as individual compounds instead of a single chemical class should be considered. In addition, due to the special topography and meteorological conditions of the inland city, the distribution and seasonal

variation of OPEs in the air in this study were significantly different from that of most coastal cities and over the sea. The sustained and stable high local emissions are particularly noteworthy. The chlorinated phosphate, especially TCPP and TCEP, which are highly toxic and persistent~~not easy to degrade~~ in the environment, have high concentrations in this study~~have a high content~~. Their usage and source emissions should be controlled.

*Data availability.* Some or all data, models, or code generated or used during the study are available in a repository or online in accordance with funder data retention policies (Provide full citations that include URLs or DOIs.)

*Team list.* Hongling Yin, Jinfeng Liang, Di Wu, Shiping Li, Yi Luo, Xu Deng.

*Author contribution.* Hongling Yin designed the experiments and Jinfeng Liang and Shiping Li carried them out. Shiping Li visualized the data and Di Wu wrote the original Draft. Hongling Yin prepared the manuscript with contributions from all co-authors.

*Competing interests.* The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## Acknowledgments

We acknowledge financial support from National Natural Science Fund (41773072, 21407014, 41831285).

## References

~~Araki, A., Saito, I., Kanazawa, A., Morimoto, K., Nakayama, K., Shibata, E., Tanaka, M., Takigawa, T., Yoshimura, T., Chikara, H.: Phosphorus flame retardants in indoor dust and their relation to asthma and allergies of inhabitants, Indoor Air., 24, 3-15, https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12054, 2013.~~

Bacaloni, A., Cucci, F., Guarino, C., Nazzari, M., Samperi, R., Lagan à, A.: Occurrence of organophosphorus flame retardant and plasticizers in three volcanic lakes of central Italy, Environ. Sci. Technol., 42, 1898-1903, https://doi.org/10.1021/es702549g, 2008.

Blum, A., Behl, M., Birnbaum, L. S., Diamond, M. L., Phillips, A., Singla, V., Sipes, N. S., Stapleton, H. M., Venier, M.: Organophosphate ester flame retardants: Are they a regrettable substitution for

polybrominated diphenyl ethers? Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett., 6, 638-649, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.estlett.9b00582, 2019.

Celano, R., Rodr ́guez, I., Cela, R., Rastrelli, L., Piccinelli, A. L.: Liquid chromatography quadrupole time-of-flight mass spectrometry quantification and screening of organophosphate compounds in sludge, Talanta., 118, 312-320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2013.10.024, 2014.

Chen, Y. Y., Song, Y. Y., Chen, Y. J., Zhang, Y. H., Li, R. J., Wang, Y. J., Qi, Z. H., Chen, F. H., Cai, Z. W.: Contamination profiles and potential health risks of organophosphate flame retardants in $PM_{2.5}$ from Guangzhou and Taiyuan, China, Environ. Int., 134, 105343, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.105343, 2020.

Clark, A. E., Yoon, S., Sheesley, R.J., Usenko, S.: Spatial and temporal distributions of organophosphate ester concentrations from atmospheric particulate matter samples collected across Houston, TX., Environ. Sci. Technol., 51, 4239-4247, https://doi.org/ 10.1021/acs.est.7b00115, 2017.

~~Cristale, J., Katsoyiannis, A., Sweetman, A. J., Jones, K. C., Lacorte, S.: 2013. Occurrence and risk assessment of organophosphorus and brominated flame retardants in the River Aire (UK), Environ. Pollut., 179, 194-200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2013.04.001, 2013.~~

Cristale, J., Lacorte, S.: Development and validation of a multiresidue method for the analysis of polybrominated diphenyl ethers, new brominated and organophosphorus flame retardants in sediment, sludge and dust, J. Chromatogr. A., 1305, 267-275, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2013.07.028, 2013.

~~Covaci, A., Voorspoels, S., Ramos, L., Neels, H., Blust, R.: Recent developments in the analysis of brominated flame retardants and brominated natural compounds, J. Chromatogr. A., 1153, 145-171, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2006.11.060, 2007.~~

~~Chen, Y. Y., Song, Y. Y., Chen, Y. J., Zhang, Y. H., Li, R. J., Wang, Y. J., Qi, Z. H., Chen, F. H., Cai, Z. W.: Contamination profiles and potential health risks of organophosphate flame retardants in PM2.5 from Guangzhou and Taiyuan, China, Environ. Int., 134, 105343, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2019.105343, 2020.~~

~~Celano, R., Rodr ́guez, I., Cela, R., Rastrelli, L., Piccinelli, A. L.: Liquid chromatography quadrupole time-of-flight mass spectrometry quantification and screening of organophosphate compounds in sludge, Talanta., 118, 312-320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2013.10.024, 2014.~~

Du, Z., Wang, G., Gao, S., Wang, Z.: Aryl organophosphate flame retardants induced cardiotoxicity during zebrafish embryogenesis: by disturbing expression of the transcriptional regulators. Aquat. Toxicol., 161, 25-32, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2015.01.027, 2015.

Esch, G. J. V.: Flame retardants: tris (2-butoxyethyl) phosphate, tris (2-ethylhexyl) phosphate and tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salts. In: Environmental Health Criteria 218, World Health Organization, Geneva, https://doi.org/4058, 130,2000.

Exponent. California bans flame retardants in certain consumer products. 2018, Available at: https://www.exponent.com/knowledge/alerts/2018/09/california-bans-flame-retardants/?pageSize=NaN&pageNum=0&loadAllByPageSize=true (accessed February 15, 2020).

Guo, Z. M., Liu, D., Shen, K.J., Li, J. Yu, Z.Q. Zhang, G.: Concentration and seasonal variation of organophosphorus flame retardants in $PM_{2.5}$ of Taiyuan City, China, Earth and environment (in chinese), 44, 600-604. https://doi.org/10.14050/j.cnki.1672-9250.2016.06.002, 2016.

Javier, C.J., Richard, S.: Atmospheric particle-bound organophosphate ester flame retardants and plasticizers in a North African Mediterranean coastal city (Bizerte, Tunisia), Sci. Total Environ., 642, 383-393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.06.010, 2018.

Kim, J. W., Isobe, T., Chang, K. H., Amano, A., Maneja, R. H., Zamora, P. B., Siringan, F.P., Tanabe, S.: Levels and distribution of organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in fishes from Manila Bay, the Philippines. Environ. Pollut., 159, 3653-3659. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.07.020, 2011.

Kurtkarakus, P., Alegria, H., Birgul, A., Gungormus, E., Jantunen, L.: Organophosphate ester (opes) flame retardants and plasticizers in air and soil from a highly industrialized city in Turkey, Sci. Total. Environ., 625, 555-565, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.12.307, 2017.

Lai, S., Xie, Z., Song, T., Tang, J., Zhang, Y., Mi, W.: Occurrence and dry deposition of organophosphate esters in atmospheric particles over the Northern South China Sea, Chemosphere, 127, 195-200, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.02.015, 2015.

Li, J., Tang, J., Mi, W., Tian, C. G., Emeis, K. C., Ebinghaus, R., Xie, Z. Y.: Spatial distribution and seasonal variation of organophosphate esters in air above the Bohai and Yellow Seas, China, Environ. Sci. Technol., 52, 89-97. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b03807, 2018.

~~Li, J.: Occurrence and health risk assessment of organophosphate flame retardants in drinking water and air. Nanjing University, 2014.~~

Li, J., Xie, Z., Mi, W., Lai, S., Tian, C., Emeis, K.C.: Organophosphate esters in air, snow and seawater in the north atlantic and the arctic, Environ. Sci. Technol., 51, 6887-6896. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b01289, 2017.

Liu, D., Lin, T., Shen, K. J., Li, J., Yu, Z. Q., Zhang, G.: Occurrence and concentrations of halogenated flame retardants in the atmospheric fine particles in Chinese cities, Environ. Sci. Technol., 50, 9846-9854, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b01685, 2016.

Liu, Q., Yin, H.L., Li, D., Deng, X., Fang, S.H., Sun, J.: Distribution characteristic of OPEs in indoor dust and its health risk, China. Environ. Sci., 37, 2831-2839. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1000-6923.2017.08.004, 2017.

Liu, R., Lin, Y., Liu, R., Hu, F., Ruan, T., Jiang, G.: Evaluation of two passive samplers for the analysis of organophosphate esters in the ambient air, Talanta., 147, 69-75, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2015.09.034, 2016.

~~Li, J., Xie, Z., Mi, W., Lai, S., Tian, C., Emeis, K.C.: Organophosphate esters in air, snow and seawater in the north atlantic and the arctic, Environ. Sci. Technol., 51, 6887-6896. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b01289, 2017.~~

~~Lai, S., Xie, Z., Song, T., Tang, J., Zhang, Y., Mi, W.: Occurrence and dry deposition of organophosphate esters in atmospheric particles over the Northern South China Sea, Chemosphere 127, 195-200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.02.015, 2015.~~

~~Möller, A., Sturm, R., Xie, Z., Cai, M., He, J., Ebinghaus, R.: Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in airborne particles over the northern pacific and Indian Ocean toward the polar regions: evidence for global occurrence, Environ. Sci. Technol., 46, 3127-3134. 2012~~

Marklund, A., Andersson, B., Haglund, P.: Traffic as a source of organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in snow, Environ. Sci. Technol., 39, 3555-3562, https://doi.org/10.1021/es0482177, 2007.

~~Marklund, A., Barbro Andersson, A., Haglund, P.: Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in Swedish sewage treatment plants, Environ. Sci. Technol., 39, 7423-7429. https://doi.org/10.1021/es051013l, 2005.~~

McDonough, C. A., De Silva, A. O., Sun, C., Cabrerizo, A., Adelman, D., Soltwedel, T., Bauerfeind, E., Muir, D. C. G., Lohmann, R.: Dissolved organophosphate esters and polybrominated diphenyl

ethers in remote marine environments: Arctic surface water distributions and net transport through Fram Strait, Environ. Sci. Technol., 52, 6208-6216, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b01127, 2018.

Möller, A., Sturm, R., Xie, Z., Cai, M., He, J., Ebinghaus, R.: Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in airborne particles over the northern pacific and Indian Ocean toward the polar regions: evidence for global occurrence, Environ. Sci. Technol., 46, 3127-3134. 2012

Möller, A., Xie, Z., Caba, A., Sturm, R., Ebinghaus, R.: Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in the atmosphere of the North Sea, Environ. Pollut., 159, 3660-3665, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.07.022, 2011.

~~Matthews, H. B., Eustis, S. L., Haseman, J.: Toxicity and carcinogenicity of chronic exposure to tris(2-chloroethyl) phosphate, Fundam. Appl. Toxicol., 20, 477-485, https://doi.org/10.1006/faat.1993.1058, 1993.~~

~~Matthews, H. B., Dixon, D., Herr, D. W.: Sub-chronic toxicity studies indicate that tris (2-chloroethyl) phosphate administration results in lesions in the rat hippocampus, Toxicol. Ind. Health., 6, 1-15, https://doi.org/10.1177/074823379000600101, 1990.~~

~~Ma, Y., Cui, K., Zeng, F., Wen, J., Liu, H., Zhu, F.: Microwave-assisted extraction combined with gel permeation chromatography and silica gel cleanup followed by gas chromatography-mass spectrometry for the determination of organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in biological samples, Analytica. Chimica. Acta., 786, 47-53, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2013.04.062, 2013.~~

Ohura, T., Amagai, T., Senga, Y., Fusaya, M.: Organic air pollutants inside and outside residences in Shimizu, Japan: levels, sources and risks, Sci. Total. Environ., 366, 485-499, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2005.10.005, 2006.

Quednow, K., Püttmann, W.: Temporal concentration changes of DEET, TCEP, terbutryn, and nonylphenols in freshwater streams of Hesse, Germany: possible influence of mandatory regulations and voluntary environmental agreements, Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 16, 630-640, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-009-0169-6, 2009.

Regnery, J., W. Püttmann, Merz, C., Berthold, G.: Occurrence and distribution of organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in anthropogenically affected groundwater, Journal of Environmental Monitoring, 13, 347-354, https://doi.org/10.1039/C0EM00419G, 2011.

Ren, G., Chen, Z., Feng, J., Ji, W., Zhang, J., Zheng, K.: Organophosphate esters in total suspended particulates of an urban city in East China, Chemosphere., 164, 75-83, https://doi.org/0.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.08.090, 2016.

Salamova, A., Ma, Y., Venier, M., Hites, R.A.: High levels of organophosphate flame retardants in the great lakes atmosphere, Environ. Sci. Technol., 46, 8653-8660, https://doi.org/10.1021/ez400034n, 2014a.

Salamova, A., Hermanson, M.H., Hites, R.A.: Organophosphate and halogenated flame retardants in atmospheric particles from a European Arctic site, Environ. Sci. Technol., 48, 6133-40, https://doi.org/10.1021/es500911d, 2014b.

Shen, K. J., Zhang, X. Y., Liu, D. Geng, X. F., Sun, J. H., Li, J.: Characterization and seasonal variation of carbonaceous aerosol in urban atmosphere of a typical city in North China, Ecology. Environ. Sci. (in Chinese), 25, 458-463, https://doi.org/10.16258/j.cnki.1674-5906.2016.03.013, 2016.

Shoeib, M., Ahrens, L., Jantunen, L., Harner, T.: Concentrations in air of organobromine, organochlorine and organophosphate flame retardants in Toronto, Canada, Atmos. Environ., 99, 140-147, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.09.040, 2014.

State of California. Safer consumer products (SCP) information management system. 2020. Available at: https://calsafer.dtsc.ca.gov/cms/search/?type=Chemical (accessed February 21, 2020).

Stevens, R., van Es, D. S., Bezemer, R., Kranenbarg, A.: The structure-activity relationship of fire retardant phosphorus compounds in wood, Polymer Degradation and Stability, 91, 832-841. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2005.06.014, 2006.

~~Shoeib, M., Ahrens, L., Jantunen, L., Harner, T.: Concentrations in air of organobromine, organochlorine and organophosphate flame retardants in Toronto, Canada, Atmos. Environ., 99, 140-147, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.09.040, 2014.~~

Sühring, R., Diamond M. L., Scheringer, M., Fiona, Wong., Monika, Pu#ko., Gary. S., Alexis. B., Hayley. H., Philip. F., Henrik. L., Liisa. M.: Jantunen et al. Organophosphate Esters in Canadian Arctic Air: Occurrence, Levels and Trends, Enviro. Sci. Technol., acs.est.6b00365, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b00365, 2016.

Shen, K.J., Zhang, X.Y., Liu, D. Geng, X.F., Sun, J.H. Li, J.: Characterization and seasonal variation of carbonaceous aerosol in urban atmosphere of a typical city in North China, Ecology. Environ. Sci. (in chinese), 25, 458-463, https://doi.org/10.16258/j.cnki.1674-5906.2016.03.013, 2016.

Tang, R., Keming, M.A., Zhang, Y., Mao, Q.: Health risk assessment of heavy metals of street dust in Beijing, Acta. Scientiae. Circumstantiae., 32, 2006-2015, https://doi.org/10.13671/j.hjkxxb.2012.08.029, 2012.

Wang, X., He, Y., Li, L., Feng, Z., Luan, T.: Application of fully automatic hollow fiber liquid phase microextraction to assess the distribution of organophosphate esters in the Pearl River Estuaries. Sci. Total. Environ., 470-471C, 263-269, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.09.069, 2013.

Wang Y., Sun H., Zhu H., Yao Y.M., Chen H., Ren Chao., Wu F.C., Kannan Kurunthachalam.: Occurrence and distribution of organophosphate flame retardants (OPFRs) in soil and outdoor settled dust from a multi-waste recycling area in China, Sci. Total. Environ., 625:1056, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.01.013, 2018.

Wang, D., Wang, P., Wang, Y. W., Zhang, W. W., Zhu, C. F., Sun, H. Z., Matsiko, J., Zhua, Y., Li, Y. M., Meng, W. Y., Zhang, Q. H., Jiang, G. B.: Temporal variations of $PM_{2.5}$-bound organophosphate flame retardant in different microenvironments in Beijing, China, and implications for human exposure, Science of the Total Environment, 666, 226-234, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.02.076, 2019.

Wang, Y., Bao. M. J., Tan. F., Qu. Z. P., Zhang. Y. W., Chen. J. W.: Distribution of organophosphate esters between the gas phase and PM $_{2.5}$ in urban Dalian, China, Environ. Pollut., https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113882, 2019.

Wang, T., Ding. N., Wang. T., Chen. S. J., Luo. X. J., Mai. B. X.: Organophosphorus esters (OPEs) in $PM_{2.5}$ in urban and e-waste recycling regions in southern China: concentrations, sources, and emissions, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2018.08.015, 2018.

Wang, X., He, Y., Li, L., Feng, Z., Luan, T.: Application of fully automatic hollow fiber liquid phase microextraction to assess the distribution of organophosphate esters in the Pearl River Estuaries. Sci. Total. Environ., 470 - 471C, 263 - 269, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.09.069, 2013.

Wang, Y., Bao. M. J., Tan. F., Qu. Z. P., Zhang. Y. W., Chen. J. W.: Distribution of organophosphate esters between the gas phase and PM 2.5 in urban Dalian, China, Environ. Pollut., https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113882, 2019.

669 Wang, Y., Sun, H., Zhu, H., Yao, Y. M., Chen, H., Ren, C., Wu, F. C., Kannan, K.: Occurrence and
670 distribution of organophosphate flame retardants (OPFRs) in soil and outdoor settled dust from a multi-
671 waste recycling area in China, Sci. Total. Environ., 625, 1056-1064,
672 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.01.013, 2018.
673 WHO (World Health Organization): Triphenyl phosphate, Environmental Health Criteria, 111, 1991.
674 WHO (World Health Organization): Flame retardants: tris (Chloropropyl) phosphate and tris (2-
675 chlorethyl) phosphate, Environmental Health Criteria, 209,
676 https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470986738.refs, 1998.
677 WHO (World Health Organization): Flame retardants: tris (2-butoxyethyl) phosphate, tris (2-ethylhexyl)
678 phosphate and tetrakis (hydroxymethyl) phosphonium salts, Environmental Health Criteria, 218, 2000.
679 Wong, F., Wit, C. A. D, Newton, S. R.: Concentrations and variability of organophosphate esters,
680 halogenated flame retardants, and polybrominated diphenyl ethers in indoor and outdoor air in
681 Stockholm, Sweden, Environ. Pollut., 240, 514-522, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.04.086,
682 2018.
683 Wu, Y., Venier, M., & Salamova, A.: Spatioseasonal variations and partitioning behavior of
684 organophosphate esters in the great lakes atmosphere, Environ. Sci. Technol., 54,
685 https://10.1021/acs.est.9b07755, 2020.
686 Yin, H. L., Wu, D., You, J. J., Li, S. P., Deng, X., Luo, Y., Zheng, W. Q.: Occurrence, distribution, and
687 exposure risk of organophosphate esters in street dust from Chengdu, China, Arch. Environ. Con. Tox.,
688 76, 617-629, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-019-00602-3, 2019.
689 Yin, H. L., Wu, D., You, J. J., Li, S.P., Deng, X., Luo, Y., Zheng, W. Q.: Occurrence, distribution, and
690 exposure risk of organophosphate esters in street dust from Chengdu, China, Arch. Environ. Con. Tox.,
691 76(04), 617-629, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00244-019-00602-3, 2019.
692 Yin, H. L., Li, S. P., Ye, Z. X., Liang, J. F., You, J. J.: Pollution characteristics and sources of OPEs in
693 the soil of Chengdu City, Acta. Scientiae. Circumstantiae., 36, 606-613,
694 https://doi.org/10.13671/j.hjkxxb.2015.0489, 2016.
695 Yin, H. L., Li, S. P., Ye, Z. X., Yang, Y. C., Liang, J. F., You, J. J.: Pollution level and sources of
696 organic phosphorus esters in airborne $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu City, Environ. Sci. (in Chinese), 36, 3566-
697 3572, https://doi.org/10.13227/j.hjkx.2015.10.003, 2015.

Zhang, Q. H., Yang, W. N., Ngo, H. H., Guo, W. S., Jin, P. K., Dzakpasu, M.: Current status of urban wastewater treatment plants in China, Environ. Int., 92-93, 11-22, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.03.024, 2016.

Figure Captions:

Fig.1. Levels and seasonal variation of $\Sigma_7$OPEs at each sampling site. A:autumn, W:winter, Sp:spring, Su:summer, Sub:suburbs, Dow:dowtown, S:south, E:east, N:north, W:west.

Fig. 2 Seasonal variation of $\Sigma_7$OPEs at each sampling site.

Fig.3 The seasonal variation of monomer OPEs in Chengdu city. A:Autumn, W:Winter, Sp:Spring, Su:Summer, Sub:Suburbs, Dow:Dowtown, S:South, E:East,N:North, W:West

Fig.4 Relationship of OPE monomer concentration in $PM_{2.5}$ and its vapor pressure

Fig. 5 Spearman's ranks correlation coefficients between the concentrations of individual OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ samples

Fig. 6 Relationship between OPEs in atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ and in soil.

Table Captions:

Table 1 Table 1 The annual median concentrations of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ form Chengdu (ng $m^{-3}$).

Table 2 The correlation analysis of monomer OPEs in downtown and suburb sampling sites.

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).




717

718 ~~Fig.1 Levels and seasonal variation of Σ7OPEs at each sampling site. A:autumn, W:winter, Sp:spring,~~

719 ~~Su:summer, Sub:suburbs, Dow:dowtown, S:south, E:east, N:north, W:west.~~




720

721 ~~Fig.2 Seasonal variation of Σ7OPEs at each sampling site.~~

722




~~TnBP~~




~~TCEP~~




TCPP




TDCPP




TPhP




TBEP




TEHP

~~Fig.3 The seasonal variation of monomer OPEs in Chengdu city. A:Autumn, W:Winter, Sp:Spring, Su:Summer, Sub:Suburbs, Dow:Dowtown, S:South, E:East,N:North, W:West.~~




~~Fig.4 Relationship of OPE monomer concentration in PM2.5 and its vapor pressure~~



**Fig.5 Spearman's ranks correlation coefficients between the concentrations of individual OPEs in PM2.5 samples**




**Fig.6 Relationship between OPEs in atmospheric PM2.5 and in soil.**

**Table 1 The annual median concentrations of OPEs in PM2.5 form Chengdu (ng m$^{-3}$).**

| Orientation | TnBP | TCEP | TCPP | TDCPP | TPhP | TBEP | TEHP | ΣOPEs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| suburb | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 6.7 |
| downtown | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 5.8 |
| south | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 5.9 |
| east | 2.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 6.6 |
| north | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 6.7 |
| west | 0.8 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 6.9 |
| median | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 6.4 |

**Table 2 The correlation analysis of monomer OPEs in downtown and suburb sampling sites.**

| | | TnBP | TCEP | TCPP | TDCPP | TPhP | TBEP | TEHP |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Downtown | TnBP | 1 | .408* | 0.319 | 0.15 | .455* | 0.187 | 0.105 |
| | TCEP | .408* | 1 | .818** | 0.165 | 0.342 | .447* | .449* |
| | TCPP | 0.319 | .818** | 1 | 0.184 | 0.392 | .447* | .500* |
| | TDCPP | 0.15 | 0.165 | 0.184 | 1 | 0.053 | 0.216 | 0.175 |
| | TPhP | .455* | 0.342 | 0.392 | 0.053 | 1 | 0.104 | -0.081 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | TBEP | 0.187 | .447* | .447* | 0.216 | 0.104 | 1 | 0.338 |
| | | TEHP | 0.105 | .449* | .500* | 0.175 | -0.081 | 0.338 | 1 |
| Suburb | | TnBP | 1 | .566** | .476* | .650** | 0.269 | .417* | 0.141 |
| | | TCEP | .566** | 1 | .852** | .683** | 0.368 | .784** | .423* |
| | | TCPP | .476* | .852** | 1 | .686** | 0.304 | .701** | 0.297 |
| | | TDCPP | .650** | .683** | .686** | 1 | 0.175 | .708** | 0.158 |
| | | TPhP | 0.269 | 0.368 | 0.304 | 0.175 | 1 | .512** | .629** |
| | | TBEP | .417* | .784** | .701** | .708** | .512** | 1 | .434* |
| | | TEHP | 0.141 | .423* | 0.297 | 0.158 | .629** | .434* | 1 |

737 *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

738 **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

739 ## Author's Response

740

| **Response to reviewer 1#:** | |
|---|---|
| Questions: | Response: |
| The manuscript reported the measurement of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu, China and presented the seasonal and spatial distributions, and the potential sources of the OPEs by using multiple correlation tests. The analysis and reported data were consistent with the conclusions. The measurements and findings are critical to fill in the knowledge gap of OPEs levels in inland cities. However, several issues need to be addressed before acceptance for publication. Besides some typos and wording changes, Figure 2 seems not matching the context since no seasonal variations can be seen. Since different statistical tests were used, e.g. Pearson correlation test, spearC1 ACPD Interactive comment Printer-friendly version Discussion paper man's rank correlation test, and nonparametric test, a clearer statement of conditions (e.g. normality check) to use | Thank you for your valuable comments and good advice on improving our manuscript. We are so sorry that the manuscript has some mistakes. The typos and wording of the manuscript, as well as the specific contents and references of the manuscript, have been revised as follows according to your comments. |

| | |
|---|---|
| those tests is needed. Lastly, the references need to be checked carefully since some of them are either not matched or not cited appropriately. | |
| 1. Introduction: line 30, the reference "Bacoloni, A. et al. 2008" was wrongly matched, since the referenced study measured water samples instead of air. | 1. Lines 33- 34, the reference "Bacoloni, A. et al. 2008" has been replaced by "Guo et al., 2016" and "Li et al., 2017".<br>Lines 535-537: Guo, Z. M., Liu, D., Shen, K.J., Li, J. Yu, Z.Q. Zhang, G.: Concentration and seasonal variation of organophosphorus flame retardants in $PM_{2.5}$ of Taiyuan City, China, Earth and environment (in chinese)., 44, 600-604. https://doi.org/10.14050/j.cnki.1672-9250.2016.06.002, 2016.<br>Lines 556-558: Li, J., Xie, Z., Mi, W., Lai, S., Tian, C., Emeis, K. C.: Organophosphate esters in air, snow and seawater in the north atlantic and the arctic, Environ. Sci. Technol., 51, 6887-6896. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b01289, 2017. |
| 2. Introduction: line 32, the reference "Araki et al. 2014" didn't measured organisms, instead, they measured dust. | 2. Line 35, the reference "Araki et al. 2014" was deleted. |
| 3. Introduction: line 34, the reference "Matthews, et al., 1990, 1993". Both references are animal studies. Thus, stating "many scholars found that OPEs have negative effects on the human body. . ." is not appropriate. | 3. Lines 37-40, the reference "Matthews, et al., 1990, 1993" has been revised to "WHO, 1991, 1998, 2000; Kanazawa et al., 2010; Van der Veen and de Boer, 2012; Du et al., 2015". In addition, "human body" has been revised to "organisms". |
| 4. Introduction: line 41, the reference "Covaci et al. 2007" focused on analytical method development instead of measurement reports, not sure if it is a good reference here. | 4. Line 46-47, the reference "Covaci et al. 2007" has been replaced by "(Möller et al., 2011; 2012; McDonough et al., 2018)". |
| 5. Introduction: line 53, change "14335" to "14,335". | 5. Thank you very much for your advice in such a detail. Line 59, "14335" has been revised to "14,335". |
| 6. Materials and Methods: line 72, (Sigma Aldrich,? location? country?); Be consistent in the text in terms of listing instrument/chemical manufacturing info. | 6. Sigma Aldrich is the reagent production company. The manufacturing information of instruments and reagents has been indicated in Lines 82-88, ("Kelon Chemical Corp., China"; "Sigma |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Aldrich Corp., USA"), and the full text has been checked. |
| 7. Results: line 124, "heavy or light polluted area" may be better. | 7. Line 155, "pollution" has been revised to "polluted". |
| 8. Results: line 126-128, rephrase the sentence to make it more precise. | 8. Lines 155-160, the sentence has been revised to: "These data were quite consistent with our previous study which reported the annual median concentration of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ from December 2013 to October 2014 (Yin et al., 2015). Interestingly, the concentration of $\Sigma_7$OPEs at the suburban site was similar to, or even higher than some urban sites, which indicated more local sources of these compounds in the suburban area." |
| 9. Results: line 136, "And they were lower than". | 9. Line 171, it has been revised to: "And they were lower than". |
| 10. Results: line 138, add a space before (Wang, T. et al.), Double check other places in the text to make the format consistent. | 10. Line 174, a space has been add before (Wang, et al.). The typos of the manuscript have been proofread. |
| 11. Results: section 3.3. "Seasonal and spatial variations of OPEs in PM2.5", starting line 186, there is a mis-match in Fig.2 with the context. Where are the seasonal variations presented in Fig.2? Only site variations were presented here. | 11. We are so sorry for this mistake. Because the version we uploaded to the website is different from the first draft, the sequence numbers of figures have been adjusted. We forgot to change it here. Figure 1 refers to "levels and seasonal variation of $\Sigma_7$OPEs at each sampling site". Line 228, "Figure 2" has been revised to "Figure 1". |
| 12. Results: line 227, delete first "the". "Considering" instead of "Considered". | 12. Line 280, first "the" has been deleted. "Considered" has been changed to "Considering". |
| 13. Results: line 228, 229, lowercase "the third ring road". | 13. Line 282, the "third Ring Road" has been revised to "the third ring road". |
| 14. Results: line 229, maybe "the uniform patterns of OPEs levels and distribution across the city is understandable"? | 14. Lines 282-283, this sentence has been revised to "the uniform patterns of OPEs levels and distribution across the city is understandable". |
| 15. Results: line 229, delete "But". | 15. Line 284, "But" has been deleted. |
| 16. Results: line 232, "shoemaking industrial parks are located in the suburbs". | 16. Lines 286-287, this sentence has been revised to "…shoemaking industrial parks are located in the suburbs". |
| 17. Results: line 233, "high levels". | 17. Line 287, "high level" has been revised to "high levels". |

| | |
|---|---|
| 18. Results: line 235, delete “to the individual OPE”. | 18. Lines 289-290, "to the individual OPE" has been deleted. |
| 19. Results: line 257, 258, “their gas-particle distributions determine their concentrations in $PM_{2.5}$”. | 19. Line 317, “…distributions determines” has been revised to “distributions determine”. |
| 20. Results: line 266, is it “Fig.4 showed” or “Fig.5 showed”? | 20. Line 328, “Fig.4 showed” has been revised to “Figure 5 showed". |
| 21. Results: line 275, delete “so”. | 21. Line 344, “So” has been deleted. |
| 22. Results: line 282, add “The correlations between” before actually listing pairs of OPE monomers. | 22. Line 351, “The correlations between” has been added. |
| 23. Results: line 284, delete second “was”. | 23. Line 353, the second “was” has been deleted. |
| 24. Results: section 3.4.3 “Correlation analysis of OPEs and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations”, you mentioned Fig. S2, in which you used Pearson correlation tests. Why not spearman’s rank correlation tests as you used in Figure 5? | 24. As we know, Pearson evaluates the linear relationship between the two variables, while Spearman evaluates the monotonic relationship between the two variables. According to the results of other literature (Wong et al., 2018) and our hypothesis, we think that $PM_{2.5}$ concentration is linearly related to the content of OPEs. So we carried out Pearson correlation tests in Fig. S2 according to the hypothesis. The results showed that the correlation was very poor, which was totally different from what we expected. In order to emphasize the difference of correlation between OPEs/other pollutants and $PM_{2.5}$ concentration, Pearson correlation test result was used.<br>Lines 138-142, “2.5 Statistical analysis<br>Data analysis was done through IBM SPSS 22.0. Parameter test and nonparametric test were used to analyze the difference between data. Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the linear relationship between the two variables, while Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the monotonic relationship between the two variables. ” has been added. |
| 25. Results: line 291, add “found” after “was”. | 25. Line 360, "found" has been added. |
| 26. Results: line 315, “different uses”. | 26. Lines 390-391, the sentence has been |

| | |
|---|---|
| | revised to "which also indicated the differences of OPEs profile in indoor and outdoor air." |
| 27. Results: line 338,339, add a reference to the statement “Chengdu’s wind has always been. . .”. | 27. Line 420, a website was added. “(https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E6%88%90%E9%83%BD/128473?fr=aladdin)”. "Chengdu is a city located in the interior of China" has been added to illustrate that its wind intensity is smaller than coastal cities. |
| 28. Conclusions and Implications: line 372, “compared to the levels of OPEs in other cities”. | 28. Line 457, it has been changed to "Compared to the levels of OPEs in other cities". |
| 29. Conclusions and Implications, line 390, maybe change “not easy to degrade” to “persistent”? What do you mean by “have a high content”?, change the wording to clarify. | 29. Lines 475-476, the sentence has been changed to "The chlorinated phosphate, especially TCPP and TCEP, which are highly toxic and persistent in the environment, have high concentrations in this study." |
| 30. Reference: line 486-488, where the reference was cited? Cannot locate it in the text “Tang, R., Keming, M.A., Zhang, Y., Mao, Q.: Health risk assessment of heavy metals of street dust in Beijing, Acta. Scientiae. Circumstantiae., 32, 2006-2015, https://doi.org/10.13671/j.hjkxxb.2012.08.029, 2012.” | 30. Lines 643-645, this reference has been deleted. |
| 31. Reference: what is the novelty in this paper compared with your reference paper in Chinese (Line 512-514) "Yin, H.L., Li, S.P., Ye, Z.X., Yang, Y.C., Liang, J.F., You, J.J.: Pollution Level and Sources of 513 Organic Phosphorus Esters in Airborne PM2.5 in Chengdu City, Environ. Sci. (in chinese), 36, 3566-3572, https://doi.org/10.13227/j.hjkx.2015.10.003, 2015." | 31. The article we published earlier is a report of our experiment results from only two sampling sites. The purpose of that paper was to report the pollution level and distribution of the atmospheric OPEs at urban and suburban sites. Interestingly, we found the seasonal variations of OPEs were significantly different from $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and $PM_{2.5}$-bound PAHs, etc.. So we carried out a more detailed experiment with six sampling sites in the second year. In this paper, except for reporting the level and seasonal variations of OPEs at six sites, we paid more attention to investigate the relationships and correlations among the target compounds or with influence factors and illustrate the potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$. For example, whether different functional areas affect the distributions of |

| | |
|---|---|
| | atmospheric OPEs, correlations of OPEs with environmental factors (temperature, wind, vapor pressure, boiling points, etc.), correlations of OPEs with $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations, correlations of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ and soil, correlations of OPEs in indoor and outdoor air were all discussed. These differences are the innovation of this paper.<br>Lines 66-78: in the revised manuscript, the novelty has been added: "Our previous study has investigated the OPEs concentrations in $PM_{2.5}$ at two sites (urban and suburban sites) in Chengdu (an economically fast growing city in southwest of China), and found that OPEs concentrations and profile were similar at two sites (Yin et al., 2015). But the influence factors and potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu are still unclear. Therefore, in this study, $PM_{2.5}$ was collected over one year (October 2014 to September 2015) at six sites in Chengdu to: a) report the levels and composition profiles of OPEs in urban air in the typical inland city; (b) obtain the seasonal and spatial variation of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$; (c) investigate the relationships and correlations among the target compounds or with influence factors; (d) illustrate the potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$." |
| 32. Reference: line 515-517, reference "Zhang, Q. H., Yang, W. N., Ngo, H. H., Guo, W. S., Jin, P. K., Dzakpasu, M.: Current status of urban wastewater treatment plants in China, Environ. Int., 92-93, 11-22, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.03.024, 2016" might not be a good reference to be used here. | 32. Lines 707-709, this reference has been deleted. |
| 33. Figure 2: where is the seasonal variations? As only site variation is presented here. | 33. There are some errors in the arrangement of the sequence number of the figure. Figure 1 refers to "Levels and seasonal variation of $\Sigma_7$OPEs at each sampling site", and line 205, figure 2 refers to "Percentages of individual OPEs contributing to the $\Sigma_7$OPEs at each sampling site ". Line 228, Figure 2 should actually be Figure 1. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 34. Figure 4: line 542, be consistent with your notations/subscripts in the manuscript, $PM_{2.5}$ or PM2.5. Same issue in line 544 etc. | 34. Thanks for your advice. Line 685, "PM2.5" has been revised to "$PM_{2.5}$". All "PM2.5" appearing in the manuscript has been replaced by "$PM_{2.5}$". |
| 35. Figure 5: Line 544, Should be "Spearman's rank correlation coefficients". Double check other places to be consistent. | 35. Line 336, it has been revised to "Spearman's rank correlation coefficients". We have checked other places throughout the manuscript. |
| 36. Table 1: line 549, "orientation" of what? wind direction? If so, may want to use a different term since suburb and downtown probably do not quite fit. | 36. "Orientation" refers to the direction of the city, not the wind direction.<br>Line 206, it has been replaced with "Sampling sites". |
| 37. In Figure 5 "Spearman's ranks correlation coefficients between the concentrations of individual OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ samples" and Figure S2 "Scatter plot of OPEs and $PM_{2.5}$", spearman's rank tests and Pearson's correlation coefficients were used. Could you explain more about the selection of two different correlation tests? | 37. Pearson evaluates the linear relationship between the two variables, while Spearman evaluates the monotonic relationship between the two variables. According to the results of other literatures and our hypothesis, we selected the different test method. In addition, when choosing which of the two test methods to use, firstly the data distribution map was obtained. If it's a normal distribution, Pearson's correlation coefficients were used. If not, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were used. In the revised manuscript,<br>Lines 138-142, "2.5 Statistical analysis<br>Data analysis was done through IBM SPSS 22.0. Parameter test and nonparametric test were used to analyze the difference between data. Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the linear relationship between the two variables, while Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the monotonic relationship between the two variables." was added. |

741

742

| **Response to reviewer 2:** | |
|---|---|
| Questions: | Response: |
| Thanks for the invitation to review. I read the manuscript by Yin et al. with interest. The authors | Dear sir, we are thankful for the reviewer's constructive comments and totally understand the reviewer's concern. The pre-experiment was carried out before the experiment. We conducted the thorough experiment for the quality control and |

| | |
|---|---|
| reported concentrations of seven OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ from Chengdu, China, tracked their possible sources, and conducted source apportionment using PCA andthe PMF receptor model. My utmost concern is the data accuracy as some requiredQA/QC procedures were missing. Additionally, the manuscript is a little hard to readas it has a number of grammatical issues, and several statements lacked referencesupports. Though this study provided a few useful information (e.g., difference in OPEprofiles between inland and costal cities), its novelty and quality at current version may not be sufficient enough for the Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. My specific comments are as follows: | quality assurance including the blank experiment, recoveries of internal standard (TDCPP-$d_{15}$ and TPhP-$d_{15}$) in samples for evaluating the accuracy, blank experiment (field blanks, solvent blanks, matrix blanks), precision experiment, etc.. Due to the limited space of the paper, and the focus of this paper is not on the establishment of analytical methods, it is simplified a lot in the QA/QC part. But we have done all the related experiments for QA/QC, and the results were good. In the revised manuscript, we have added them in QA/QC part. Therefore, there is no need to worry about the accuracy of the data. But it's a pity that there were many grammatical problems and reference problems in the manuscript. We all corrected them and sincerely hope that the manuscript can meet the requirements of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics after modification. According to your constructive comments, the revisions of the manuscript are as follows: |
| 1. Major concern:<br>Novelty: There is a similar study previously conducted by the leading author here. What makes this manuscript distinct from that previous one? Authors should elaborate more the novelty of this study. | The article we published earlier is a report of our experiment results from only two sampling sites. The purpose of that paper was to report the pollution level and distribution of the atmospheric OPEs at urban and suburban sites. Interestingly, we found the seasonal variations of OPEs were significantly different from $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and $PM_{2.5}$-bound PAHs, etc.. So we carried out a more detailed experiment with six sampling sites in the second year. In this paper, except for reporting the level and seasonal variations of OPEs at six sites, we paid more attention to investigate the relationships and correlations among the target compounds or with influence factors and illustrate the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$. For example, whether different functional areas affect the distributions of atmospheric OPEs, correlations of OPEs with environmental factors (temperature, wind, vapor pressure, boiling points, etc.), correlations of OPEs with $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations, correlations of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ and soil, correlations of OPEs in indoor and outdoor air were all discussed. These differences are the innovation of this paper.<br>In the revised manuscript, the novelty has been added in lines 66-78: "Our previous study has investigated the OPEs concentrations in $PM_{2.5}$ at two sites (urban and suburban sites) in Chengdu (an economically fast growing city in southwest of China), and found that OPEs concentrations and profile were similar at two sites (Yin et al., 2015). But the influence factors and potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu are still unclear. Therefore, in this study, $PM_{2.5}$ was collected over one year (October 2014 to September 2015) at six sites in Chengdu to: a) report the levels and composition profiles of OPEs in urban air in the typical inland city; (b) obtain the seasonal and spatial variation of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$; (c) investigate the relationships and correlations among the target compounds or with influence factors; (d) illustrate the potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$." |
| QA/QC: 1) As no surrogate standards were spiked prior to sample treatment, how did authors evaluate OPE recoveries from the analytical procedures? | Lines 127-132, "Thorough QA/QC procedures for OPE analysis were conducted to ensure data quality. To evaluate the recovery efficiencies of analytical procedures, all samples were added with internal standard (TDCPP-$d_{15}$ and TPhP-$d_{15}$), and the accuracy was evaluated by their recoveries. The concentrations of the 7 OPEs were determined by an external standard method. The correlation coefficients of the standard curves of the seven OPE monomers were all greater than 0.990. The recoveries of 7 OPEs and the internal standard were between 78.9% and 122.5%." was added.<br>Lines 135-137, "Field blanks were done at each site to evaluate the background contamination in the field. TBEP, TnBP and TEHP were detected in it. The level of them found in the blank were <15% of the concentrations measured in all samples." was added.<br>There are only two internal standards, so we use them to ensure the recovery, but use external standard method to quantify the target compounds. In addition, a matrix blank was run in |

| | |
|---|---|
| | parallel with every batch of samples for the analysis of OPEs. Only TnBP was detected in the blanks, and the level of TnBP found in the blanks was <5% of the concentrations measured in all samples, which meant it was negligible. The correlation coefficients of the standard curves of the seven OPE profiles were all greater than 0.990. These all could ensure the accuracy of the data. |
| 2) How was the matrix effect assessed and compensated? | The matrix effect was assessed by the matrix blank experiment. The blank quartz membrane was added with the internal standard (TDCPP-$d_{15}$ and TPhP-$d_{15}$) and OPEs standard. After the whole pretreatment process, the recoveries of 7 OPEs and the internal standard were all between 70% and 120%. So the data was not corrected and the matrix effect was not compensated. |
| 3) The data from field blanks were missing. PMF model: How were the uncertainties determined? Which references were referred to for identification of sources associated with each factor? I also want to see the source profile of each factor. | The field blanks were done which were prepared and installed in the same manner as the regular samples but without turning on the sampler motor. Due to the limited space of the paper, and the focus of this paper is not on the establishment of analytical methods, so it is simplified a lot in the QA/QC part. But we have done all the related experiments for QA/QC, and the results were good.<br>Lines 135-137, "Field blanks were done at each site to evaluate the background contamination in the field." TBEP, TnBP and TEHP were detected in it. The level of them found in the blank were <15% of the concentrations measured in all samples." was added.<br>Lines 445-446, "The uncertainty is estimated by three methods: BS, disp and bs-disp" was added for PMF. The results are shown in the table below:<br>DISP results showed that the solution was stable because no swaps were present.<br>BS results showed that mapping over 80% of the factors indicated that the BS uncertainties could be interpreted and the number of factors may be appropriate.<br>All of the "Strong" species were selected for the BS-DISP error estimation. The number of DISP and BS-DISP swaps was zero. BS-DISP highlight that the solution may be reliable due to there was no swaps across two factors.<br>Error estimation summary results |

| **BS-DISP Diagnostics:** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| # of Cases Accepted: | 100 | | | |
| % of Cases Accepted: | 100% | | | |
| Largest Decrease in Q: | -0.150999993 | | | |
| %dQ: | -0.067824623 | | | |
| # of Decreases in Q: | 0 | | | |
| # of Swaps in Best Fit: | 0 | | | |
| # of Swaps in DISP: | 0 | | | |
| Swaps by Factor: | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| **DISP Diagnostics:** | | | | |
| Error Code: | 0 | | | |
| Largest Decrease in Q: | -0.005 | | | |
| %dQ: | -0.002245848 | | | |
| Swaps by Factor: | 0 | | 0 | 0 |

| **BS Mapping:** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Unmapped |
| Boot Factor 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Boot Factor 2 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Boot Factor 3 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |

The source profile of each factor:

| Factor Profiles (% of species sum) from Base Run (Convergent Run) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TnBP | TCEP | TCPP | TDCPP | TPhP | TBEP | TEHP |
| Factor 1 | 28.69 | 70.95 | 70.72 | 31.01 | 58.34 | 0.00 | 70.93 |
| Factor 2 | 0.00 | 20.31 | 25.47 | 44.72 | 13.97 | 77.95 | 26.41 |
| Factor 3 | 71.31 | 8.73 | 3.81 | 24.27 | 27.69 | 22.05 | 2.66 |

Lines 450-455, the references were referred to for identification of sources associated with each factor. “Factor 1 was deduced to be the plastics/electrical industry and indoor source emissions (Esch, 2000; Stevens et al., 2006). Factor 2 contributed the most to TBEP (78.0%), followed by TDCPP (44.7%), while it did not contribute to TnBP. Therefore, factor 2 was deduced as the food/cosmetics industry and traffic emissions (Marklund et al., 2005). Factor 3 contributes 71.7% of the total TnBP, which can be deduced as chemical industrial source (Regnery et al., 2011).”

| | |
|---|---|
| Minor concern:<br>Line 8: "emerging contaminants"→"contaminant of emerging concern". OPEs have been produced for decades. | Line 10, "emerging contaminants" has been revised to "OPEs are contaminants of emerging concern". |

| | |
|---|---|
| Line 9: "centers"→ "areas" | Line 11, "Centers" has been replaced by "areas". |
| Line 13... which TOGETHER made up..." | Line 15, “which made up” has been revised to "which together made up". |
| Line 18: OPEs can transfer from soil to air particles via suspension and volatilization as well. Actually, authors mentioned this at Lines 303-304. | Line 20, “suggested the atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ settlement is an important source of OPEs in soil” has been deleted. The sentence has been revised to “Very strong correlation ($R^2$ = 0.98, $p<0.01$) between the OPEs in soil and in $PM_{2.5}$ was observed.” |
| Lines 32-35: A weird sentence, please rephrase it. | Lines 36-38, the sentence has been revised to "However, many scholars found that the residues of OPEs in the environment could cause toxic effects on organisms (WHO, 1991, 1998, 2000; Kanazawa et al., 2010; Van der Veen and de Boer, 2012; Du et al., 2015)". |
| Line 35: Reference is needed for the "OPE restrictions". | Lines 40-41, three references were added “Some countries have legislated to restrict the usage of OPEs (Blum et al., 2019; Exponent, 2018; State of California, 2020)”.<br>Lines 495-498, “Blum, A.; Behl, M.; Birnbaum, L. S.; Diamond, M. L.; Phillips, A.; Singla, V.; Sipes, N. S.; Stapleton, H. M.; Venier, M. Organophosphate ester flame retardants: Are they a regrettable substitution for polybrominated diphenyl ethers? Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett. 2019, 6, 638-649. ” was added.<br>Lines 532-534, “Exponent. California bans flame retardants in certain consumer products. 2018, Available at: https://www.exponent.com/knowledge/alerts/2018/09/california-bans-flame-retardants/?pageSize=NaN&pageNum=0&loadAllByPageSize=true (accessed February 15, 2020).<br>State of California. Safer consumer products (SCP) information management system. 2020. Available at: https://calsafer.dtsc.ca.gov/cms/search/?type=Chemical (accessed February 21, 2020).” were added. |
| Lines 38-39: Reference is needed. | Lines 44-47, references have been added: “The detection of OPEs in Arctic and Antarctic snow samples and atmospheric particulate matter samples demonstrated that OPEs can be transported over long distances (Möller et al., 2012; Li et al., 2017). Studies on OPEs in oceans were carried out a lot, and the concentrations of particle-bound OPEs ranged from tens to |

| | |
|---|---|
| | thousands of ng $m^{-3}$ (Möller et al., 2011; 2012; Cristale J & Lacorte S., 2013; Li et al., 2017; McDonough et al., 2018)".<br>Lines 583-592, "McDonough, C. A., De Silva, A. O., Sun, C., Cabrerizo, A., Adelman, D., Soltwedel, T., Bauerfeind, E., Muir, D. C. G., Lohmann, R.: Dissolved organophosphate esters and polybrominated diphenyl ethers in remote marine environments: Arctic surface water distributions and net transport through Fram Strait, Environ. Sci. Technol., 52, 6208-6216, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b01127, 2018.<br>Möller, A.; Sturm, R.; Xie, Z.; Cai, M.; He, J.; Ebinghaus, R. Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in airborne particles over the Northern Pacific and Indian Ocean toward the polar regions: Evidence for global occurrence. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2012, 46, 3127-3134.<br>Möller, A.; Xie, Z.; Caba, A.; Sturm, R.; Ebinghaus, R. Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in the atmosphere of the North Sea. Environ. Pollut. 2011, 159, 3660-3665. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.07.022, 2011." have been added. |
| Line 45: Which type of matrix is referred to for "Concentrations of OPEs in most cities..."I looked at the references cited, but not all of them talked about $PM_{2.5}$. | This matrix is only for outdoor atmospheric environment.<br>Line 51, "Concentrations of OPEs in most cities..." has been revised to "Concentrations of atmospheric OPEs in most cities". Not all of the references we cited talked about $PM_{2.5}$, but they were all about OPEs in atmospheric particles. |
| Lines 54-56: How about "Chengdu is an important city in Southwest China due to its role as a national high-tech industrial base, a commercial logistics center, and a comprehensive transportation hub"? | Line 62, a website has been added: "(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chengdu)." |
| Line82: Sampling intervals? | Lines 94-100, "In each season, continuous sampling was carried out for about one week, except for rainy days. In autumn, the sampling duration was from October 23 to October 29, 2014 (no sample was obtained due to the rain on October 26 and 27); in winter, the sampling duration was from December 22 to December 30, 2014 (no sample was obtained due to the rain on October 25 and 26); in spring, the sampling duration was from March 25 to March 30, 2015; in summer, the sampling duration |

| | |
|---|---|
| | was from July 16 to July 24, 2015 (no sample was obtained due to the rain on July 21)" has been added. Each collection campaign lasted 23 h. The interval of each sample was 1h. |
| Line 86: Was the analytical method used here applied in any previous studies? | Based on the references of Möller et al. (2012), we established the quantitative analysis method in the laboratory. The analytical method has been applied in our previous studies.<br>Li, S. P., Yin, H. L., Ye, Z. X., Liang, J. F., Hao, Y. F.: GC-MS determination of 7 organic phosphate ester flame retardants in atmospheric particulates with chromatography purification: PTCA (Part B: Chem Anal). 2015, 051(005), 581-585, https://doi.org/10.13227/j.hjkx.2015.10.003, 2015.<br>Yin, H.L., Li, S.P., Ye, Z.X., Yang, Y.C., Liang, J.F., You, J.J.: Pollution level and sources of organic phosphorus esters in airborne $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu City, Environ. Sci. (in chinese), 36, 3566-3572, https://doi.org/10.13227/j.hjkx.2015.10.003, 2015.<br>Möller, A.; Sturm, R.; Xie, Z.; Cai, M.; He, J.; Ebinghaus, R. Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in airborne particles over the Northern Pacific and Indian Ocean toward the polar regions: Evidence for global occurrence. Environ. Sci. Technol. 2012, 46, 3127-3134. |
| Lines 93-94: How about "The latter eluate was collected and con-centrated by vacuum-condensing..."? | The latter eluate was collected in a centrifugal tube and then concentrated to nearly dry by vacuum condensing equipment and then fixed volume to 200 μL with hexane. Then it was placed in a sample bottle to wait for the injection of gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS).<br>Lines 111-113, it has been revised to "…the latter eluate (ethyl acetate/acetone) was collected. The eluate was concentrated to nearly dry by vacuum-condensing equipment and then fixed volume to 200 $\mu$L with hexane for gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) (Shimadzu 2010plus, Japan) analysis." in the manuscript. |
| Lines 114-118: Could concisely say "detected in virtually all the samples". | Lines 145-148, "Four OPEs (TCPP, TDCPP, TCEP and TnBP) were detected in all samples (n=149), while TBEP was detected in all but one sample. Additionally, TEHP was detected in 96.7% of samples overall and TPhP was detected in 98% of samples." has been revised to "Seven OPEs were detected in 96.7% - 100% of the samples (n=149)". |
| Lines 120-121: Did "The average value... four seasons mean "annual average level"? | It means "seasonal average concentration", not "annual average level". Lines 151-153, it has been revised to "The seasonal average value of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ at each site was almost |

| | |
|---|---|
| | at the same level (5.8 ± 1.3 ng $m^{-3}$-6.9 ± 2.5 ng $m^{-3}$)". We have checked other places throughout the manuscript. |
| Line 141: Rephrase the first sentence. | Line 176, it has been revised to "Non-chlorinated OPEs were the predominant OPEs across Chengdu city". |
| Lines 143-145: Explain the meaning of values in the parentheses. | Line 179, it has been revised to "(annual media concentration: 2.3 ng $m^{-3}$, 35.3% of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs)". |
| Lines: 165-167: References? | Line 202, two company websites for producing and selling OPEs have been added: "https://show.guidechem.com/hainuowei, http://www.sinostandards.net/index.php". |
| Lines182-184: A recent study measuring an extended list of OPEs in the Great Lakes atmosphere also found that alkyl OPEs dominated OPE compositional profiles of urban air collected from Chicago and Cleveland (Wu et al. 2020; 10.1021/acs. est.9b07755). | Thank you for your reminder. We have referred to the results of this study. For example, (1) lines 220-221, "Wu et al. (2020) also reported that alkyl OPEs dominated OPE compositional profiles of urban air collected from Chicago and Cleveland." (2) Lines 247-252, "Wu et al. (2020) reported that median concentrations of Σ OPEs for summer samples were up to 5 times greater than those for winter samples. The similar seasonal patterns were reported by Salamova et al. (2014) for the atmospheric particle-phase OPE concentrations in samples collected from the Great Lakes in 2012. A reasonable explanation is that OPEs are not chemically bound to the materials in which they are used and higher temperatures may facilitate their emission from buildings and vehicles." has been added. (3) Lines 290-293, "Interestingly, in this study, alkyl OPEs dominated both urban and suburban sites. This was extremely different from the results reported by Wu et al. (2020) that alkyl OPEs dominated at urban sites, chlorinated OPEs were prevalent at rural sites, and aryl OPEs were most abundant at remote locations." has been added in the revised manuscript. |
| Line 208-210: OPE levels can be surely affected by temperature, so I suppose the authors would like to say "seasonal variations in OPE levels". Additionally, would meteorological parameters other than temperature result in the seasonal variations found in the present study? | Based on our experience, we also strongly agree that temperature and other meteorological factors will affect the level of pollutants in $PM_{2.5}$. However, the concentration of OPEs found in this study did not varied much in the four seasons, which was significantly different from other pollutants. Some literatures showed that the seasonal variations of OPEs in some coastal cities were significantly affected by temperature (Liu et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2019). For example, Wang et al. (2019) reported seasonality was discovered for OPEs in both gas phase and $PM_{2.5}$ with their concentrations higher in hot seasons in |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Dalian, which may due to the temperature-driven emission or gas-particle partitioning.<br>Lines 254-259, it has been revised to "In our study, the correlation analysis between the temperature, wind speed, wind direction and $\Sigma_7$OPEs concentrations has been done. The results showed statistically significant negative correlations between temperature and $\Sigma_7$ OPEs ($R= -0.355$, $p<0.01$). The lowest concentrations of $\Sigma_7$OPEs and individual compound were observed in summer suggesting the OPEs level was not driven by the temperature-driven emission. Gas-particle partitioning and local emission sources may contribute to the variation." In addition, other meteorological parameters with high contributions to the seasonal variations were not found in the present study. |
| Lines 236-238: Has been mentioned before. Lines 238-248: Out of place here. Could be moved to section 3.1. | Lines 295-297 have been deleted. |
| Line 257: Need reference to support "they tend to be adsorbed in $PM_{2.5}$". | Line 316, reference has been added: " (Wang et al., 2019)".<br>Lines 675-677, "Wang, Y., Bao. M. J., Tan. F., Qu. Z. P., Zhang. Y. W., Chen. J. W.: Distribution of organophosphate esters between the gas phase and $PM_{2.5}$ in urban Dalian, China, Environ. Pollut., https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113882, 2019." |
| Line 315: Other factors may lead to such difference between indoor and outdoor OPEs. For example, TBEP has the shortest atmospheric half-lives, which may explain why its dominance in indoor samples was not observed for the outdoor counterparts. | Of course, other factors may also cause differences in the content of indoor and outdoor OPEs. Lines 385-395 have been revised to "Except for the different usage of OPEs, many factors may also lead to differences between indoor and outdoor OPEs. For example, TBEP has the shortest atmospheric half-lives, which may explain why its dominance in indoor samples was not observed for the outdoor counterparts. Studies in Swedish (Wong et al., 2018) reported the concentrations of OPEs in indoor air were TCPP > TCEP > TBEP > TnBP> TPhP, and in outdoor urban air were TBEP > TCPP > TCEP > TnBP > TPhP which also indicated the differences of OPEs profile in indoor and outdoor air. They found that activities in the building, e.g. floor cleaning, polishing, construction, introduction of new electronics and changes in ventilation rate could be key factors in controlling the concentration of indoor air pollutants, while the observed seasonality for OPEs in outdoor air was due to changes in |

| | |
|---|---|
| | primary emission.” |
| Lines 350-356: References are required for identification of possible sources associated with each factor. | Thanks for your advice. Lines 433-440, references have been added: “Factor 1 can represent the sources of OPEs from the plastic industry, interior decoration and traffic emission, with the contribution ratio of 34.5% (Marklund et al., 2005; Regnery et al., 2011; CEFIC, 2002). Factor 2 has higher load on TnBP, TEHP and TPhP. The highest load was on TnBP, which is often used as a high-carbon alcohol defoamer, mostly in industries that do not come in contact with food and cosmetics, as well as in antistatic agents and extractants of rare earth elements. TEHP can be used as an antifoaming agent, hydraulic fluid and so on. TPhP is typically used in electrical and electronic products, or plastic film and rubber (Esch, 2000; Stevens et al., 2006; Wei et al., 2015).” |

743

744

## Response to Anonymous Referee #1

Interactive comment on "Measurement report: Seasonal, distribution and sources of organophosphate esters in $PM_{2.5}$ from an inland urban city in southwest China" by Hongling Yin et al.

Anonymous Referee #1 Received and published: 3 June 2020

Reviews: The manuscript reported the measurement of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu, China and presented the seasonal and spatial distributions, and the potential sources of the OPEs by using multiple correlation tests. The analysis and reported data were consistent with the conclusions. The measurements and findings are critical to fill in the knowledge gap of OPEs levels in inland cities. However, several issues need to be addressed before acceptance for publication. Besides some typos and wording changes, Figure 2 seems not matching the context since no seasonal variations can be seen. Since different statistical tests were used, e.g. Pearson correlation test, spearC1 ACPD Interactive comment Printer-friendly version Discussion paper man's rank correlation test, and nonparametric test, a clearer statement of conditions (e.g. normality check) to use those tests is needed. Lastly, the references need to be checked carefully since some of them are either not matched or not cited appropriately.

**Response:** Thank you for your valuable comments and good advice on improving our manuscript. We are so sorry that the manuscript has some mistakes. The typos and wording of the manuscript, as well as the specific contents and references of the manuscript, have been revised as follows according to your comments.

Specific comments on the manuscript

1. Introduction: line 30, the reference "Bacoloni, A. et al. 2008" was wrongly matched, since the referenced study measured water samples instead of air.

**Response:** Lines 33- 34, the reference "Bacoloni, A. et al. 2008" has been replaced by "Guo et al., 2016" and "Li et al., 2017".

Lines 535-537: Guo, Z. M., Liu, D., Shen, K.J., Li, J. Yu, Z.Q. Zhang, G.: Concentration and seasonal variation of organophosphorus flame retardants in $PM_{2.5}$ of Taiyuan City, China, Earth and environment (in chinese)., 44, 600-604. https://doi.org/10.14050/j.cnki.1672-9250.2016.06.002, 2016.

Lines 556-558: Li, J., Xie, Z., Mi, W., Lai, S., Tian, C., Emeis, K. C.: Organophosphate esters in air, snow and seawater in the north atlantic and the arctic, Environ. Sci. Technol., 51, 6887-6896. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.7b01289, 2017.

2. Introduction: line 32, the reference "Araki et al. 2014" didn't measured organisms, instead, they measured dust.

**Response:** Line 35, the reference "Araki et al. 2014" was deleted.

3. Introduction: line 34, the reference "Matthews, et al., 1990, 1993". Both references are animal studies. Thus, stating "many scholars found that OPEs have negative effects on the human body. . ." is not appropriate.

**Response:** Lines 37-40, the reference "Matthews, et al., 1990, 1993" has been revised to "WHO, 1991, 1998, 2000; Kanazawa et al., 2010; Van der Veen and de Boer, 2012; Du et al., 2015". In addition, "human body" has been revised to "organisms".

4. Introduction: line 41, the reference "Covaci et al. 2007" focused on analytical method development instead of measurement reports, not sure if it is a good reference here.

**Response:** Line 46-47, the reference "Covaci et al. 2007" has been replaced by "(Möller et al., 2011; 2012; McDonough et al., 2018)".

5. Introduction: line 53, change "14335" to "14,335".

**Response:** Thank you very much for your advice in such a detail. Line 59, "14335" has been revised to "14,335".

6. Materials and Methods: line 72, (Sigma Aldrich,? location? country?); Be consistent in the text in terms of listing instrument/chemical manufacturing info.

**Response:** Sigma Aldrich is the reagent production company. The manufacturing information of instruments and reagents has been indicated in Lines 82-88, ("Kelon Chemical Corp., China"; "Sigma Aldrich Corp., USA"), and the full text has been checked.

7. Results: line 124, "heavy or light polluted area" may be better.

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Line 155, "pollution" has been revised to "polluted".

8. Results: line 126-128, rephrase the sentence to make it more precise.

**Response:** Lines 155-160, **t**he sentence has been revised to: "These data were quite consistent with our previous study which reported the annual median concentration of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ from December 2013 to October 2014 (Yin et al., 2015). Interestingly, the concentration of $\Sigma_7$OPEs at the

suburban site was similar to, or even higher than some urban sites, which indicated more local sources of these compounds in the suburban area."

9. Results: line 136, "And they were lower than".

**Response:** line 171, it has been revised to: "And they were lower than". The grammatical problems in this manuscript have been carefully corrected.

10. Results: line 138, add a space before (Wang, T. et al.), Double check other places in the text to make the format consistent.

**Response:** Line 174, a space has been add before (Wang, et al.). The typos of the manuscript have been proofread.

11. Results: section 3.3. "Seasonal and spatial variations of OPEs in PM2.5", starting line 186, there is a mis-match in Fig.2 with the context. Where are the seasonal variations presented in Fig.2? Only site variations were presented here.

**Response:** We are so sorry for this mistake. Because the version we uploaded to the website is different from the first draft, the sequence numbers of figures have been adjusted. We forgot to change it here. Figure 1 refers to "levels and seasonal variation of $\Sigma_7$OPEs at each sampling site". Line 228, "Figure 2" has been revised to "Figure 1".

12. Results: line 227, delete first "the". "Considering" instead of "Considered".

**Response:** Line 280, first "the" has been deleted. "Considered" has been changed to "Considering".

13. Results: line 228, 229, lowercase "the third ring road".

**Response:** Line 282, the "third Ring Road" has been revised to "the third ring road".

14. Results: line 229, maybe "the uniform patterns of OPEs levels and distribution across the city is understandable"?

**Response:** Thanks a lot. Lines 282-283, this sentence has been revised to "the uniform patterns of OPEs levels and distribution across the city is understandable".

15. Results: line 229, delete "But".

**Response:** Line 284, "But" has been deleted.

16. Results: line 232, "shoemaking industrial parks are located in the suburbs".

**Response:** Lines 286-287, this sentence has been revised to "…shoemaking industrial parks are located in the suburbs". Thank you for your advice.

17. Results: line 233, “high levels”.

**Response:** Line 287, “high level” has been revised to “high levels”.

18. Results: line 235, delete “to the individual OPE”.

**Response:** Lines 289-290, "to the individual OPE" has been deleted.

19. Results: line 257, 258, “their gas-particle distributions determine their concentrations in $PM_{2.5}$”.

**Response:** Line 317, “…distributions determines” has been revised to “distributions determine”.

20. Results: line 266, is it “Fig.4 showed” or “Fig.5 showed”?

**Response:** Line 328, “Fig.4 showed” has been revised to “Figure 5 showed".

21. Results: line 275, delete “so”.

**Response:** Line 344, “So” has been deleted. Thanks for your advice.

22. Results: line 282, add “The correlations between” before actually listing pairs of OPE monomers.

**Response:** Line 351, “The correlations between” has been added.

23. Results: line 284, delete second “was”.

**Response:** Line 353, the second “was” has been deleted.

24. Results: section 3.4.3 “Correlation analysis of OPEs and $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations”, you mentioned Fig. S2, in which you used Pearson correlation tests. Why not spearman’s rank correlation tests as you used in Figure 5?

**Response:** As we know, Pearson evaluates the linear relationship between the two variables, while Spearman evaluates the monotonic relationship between the two variables. According to the results of other literature (Wong et al., 2018) and our hypothesis, we think that $PM_{2.5}$ concentration is linearly related to the content of OPEs. So we carried out Pearson correlation tests in Fig. S2 according to the hypothesis. The results showed that the correlation was very poor, which was totally different from what we expected. In order to emphasize the difference of correlation between OPEs/other pollutants and $PM_{2.5}$ concentration, Pearson correlation test result was used.

Line 138-142, “2.5 Statistical analysis

Data analysis was done through IBM SPSS 22.0. Parameter test and nonparametric test were used to analyze the difference between data. Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the

linear relationship between the two variables, while Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the monotonic relationship between the two variables. " has been added.

25. Results: line 291, add "found" after "was".

**Response:** Line 360, "found" has been added.

26. Results: line 315, "different uses".

**Response:** Lines 390-391, the sentence has been revised to "which also indicated the differences of OPEs profile in indoor and outdoor air."

27. Results: line 338,339, add a reference to the statement "Chengdu's wind has always been. . .".

**Response:** Line 420, a website was added. "(https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E6%88%90%E9%83%BD/128473?fr=aladdin)". "Chengdu is a city located in the interior of China" has been added to illustrate that its wind intensity is smaller than coastal cities.

28. Conclusions and Implications: line 372, "compared to the levels of OPEs in other cities".

**Response:** Line 457, it has been changed to "Compared to the levels of OPEs in other cities".

29. Conclusions and Implications, line 390, maybe change "not easy to degrade" to "persistent"? What do you mean by "have a high content"?, change the wording to clarify.

**Response:** Lines 475-476, the sentence has been changed to "The chlorinated phosphate, especially TCPP and TCEP, which are highly toxic and persistent in the environment, have high concentrations in this study."

30. Reference: line 486-488, where the reference was cited? Cannot locate it in the text "Tang, R., Keming, M.A., Zhang, Y., Mao, Q.: Health risk assessment of heavy metals of street dust in Beijing, Acta. Scientiae. Circumstantiae., 32, 2006-2015, https://doi.org/10.13671/j.hjkxxb.2012.08.029, 2012."

**Response:** Lines 643-645, this reference has been deleted.

31. Reference: what is the novelty in this paper compared with your reference paper in Chinese (Line 512-514) "Yin, H.L., Li, S.P., Ye, Z.X., Yang, Y.C., Liang, J.F., You, J.J.: Pollution Level and Sources of 513 Organic Phosphorus Esters in Airborne PM2.5 in Chengdu City, Environ. Sci. (in chinese), 36, 3566-3572, https://doi.org/10.13227/j.hjkx.2015.10.003, 2015."

**Response:** The article we published earlier is a report of our experiment results from only two sampling sites. The purpose of that paper was to report the pollution level and distribution of the

atmospheric OPEs at urban and suburban sites. Interestingly, we found the seasonal variations of OPEs were significantly different from $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and $PM_{2.5}$-bound PAHs, etc.. So we carried out a more detailed experiment with six sampling sites in the second year. In this paper, except for reporting the level and seasonal variations of OPEs at six sites, we paid more attention to investigate the relationships and correlations among the target compounds or with influence factors and illustrate the potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$. For example, whether different functional areas affect the distributions of atmospheric OPEs, correlations of OPEs with environmental factors (temperature, wind, vapor pressure, boiling points, etc.), correlations of OPEs with $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations, correlations of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ and soil, correlations of OPEs in indoor and outdoor air were all discussed. These differences are the innovation of this paper.

Lines 66-78: in the revised manuscript, the novelty has been added: "Our previous study has investigated the OPEs concentrations in $PM_{2.5}$ at two sites (urban and suburban sites) in Chengdu (an economically fast growing city in southwest of China), and found that OPEs concentrations and profile were similar at two sites (Yin et al., 2015). But the influence factors and potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu are still unclear. Therefore, in this study, $PM_{2.5}$ was collected over one year (October 2014 to September 2015) at six sites in Chengdu to: a) report the levels and composition profiles of OPEs in urban air in the typical inland city; (b) obtain the seasonal and spatial variation of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$; (c) investigate the relationships and correlations among the target compounds or with influence factors; (d) illustrate the potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$."

32. Reference: line 515-517, reference "Zhang, Q. H., Yang, W. N., Ngo, H. H., Guo, W. S., Jin, P. K., Dzakpasu, M.: Current status of urban wastewater treatment plants in China, Environ. Int., 92-93, 11-22, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.03.024, 2016" might not be a good reference to be used here.

**Response:** Lines 707-709, this reference has been deleted.

33. Figure 2: where is the seasonal variations? As only site variation is presented here.

**Response:** There are some errors in the arrangement of the sequence number of the figure. Figure 1 refers to "Levels and seasonal variation of $\Sigma_7$OPEs at each sampling site", and line 205, figure 2 refers to "Percentages of individual OPEs contributing to the $\Sigma_7$OPEs at each sampling site ". Line 228, Figure 2 should actually be Figure 1.

34. Figure 4: line 542, be consistent with your notations/subscripts in the manuscript, $PM_{2.5}$ or PM2.5. Same issue in line 544 etc.

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Line 685, "PM2.5" has been revised to "$PM_{2.5}$". All "PM2.5" appearing in the manuscript has been replaced by "$PM_{2.5}$".

35. Figure 5: Line 544, Should be "Spearman's rank correlation coefficients". Double check other places to be consistent.

**Response:** Line 336, it has been revised to "Spearman's rank correlation coefficients". We have checked other places throughout the manuscript.

36. Table 1: line 549, "orientation" of what? wind direction? If so, may want to use a different term since suburb and downtown probably do not quite fit.

**Response:** "Orientation" refers to the direction of the city, not the wind direction.

Line 206, it has been replaced with "Sampling sites".

37. In Figure 5 "Spearman's ranks correlation coefficients between the concentrations of individual OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ samples" and Figure S2 "Scatter plot of OPEs and $PM_{2.5}$", spearman's rank tests and Pearson's correlation coefficients were used. Could you explain more about the selection of two different correlation tests?

**Response:** Pearson evaluates the linear relationship between the two variables, while Spearman evaluates the monotonic relationship between the two variables. According to the results of other literatures and our hypothesis, we selected the different test method. In addition, when choosing which of the two test methods to use, firstly the data distribution map was obtained. If it's a normal distribution, Pearson's correlation coefficients were used. If not, Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were used. In the revised manuscript,

Lines 138-142, "2.5 Statistical analysis

Data analysis was done through IBM SPSS 22.0. Parameter test and nonparametric test were used to analyze the difference between data. Pearson's correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the linear relationship between the two variables, while Spearman's rank correlation coefficients were used to evaluate the monotonic relationship between the two variables." was added.

## Response to Anonymous Referee #2

Thanks for the invitation to review. I read the manuscript by Yin et al. with interest. The authors reported concentrations of seven OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ from Chengdu, China,tracked their possible sources, and conducted source apportionment using PCA andthe PMF receptor model. My utmost concern is the data accuracy as some requiredQA/QC procedures were missing. Additionally, the manuscript is a little hard to readas it has a number of grammatical issues, and several statements lacked referencesupports. Though this study provided a few useful information (e.g., difference in OPEprofiles between inland and costal cities), its novelty and quality at current version may not be sufficient enough for the Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. My specific comments are as follows:

**Response:** Dear sir, we are thankful for the reviewer's constructive comments and totally understand the reviewer's concern. The pre-experiment was carried out before the experiment. We conducted the thorough experiment for the quality control and quality assurance including the blank experiment, recoveries of internal standard (TDCPP-$d_{15}$ and TPhP-$d_{15}$) in samples for evaluating the accuracy, blank experiment (field blanks, solvent blanks, matrix blanks), precision experiment, etc.. Due to the limited space of the paper, and the focus of this paper is not on the establishment of analytical methods, it is simplified a lot in the QA/QC part. But we have done all the related experiments for QA/QC, and the results were good. In the revised manuscript, we have added them in QA/QC part. Therefore, there is no need to worry about the accuracy of the data. But it's a pity that there were many grammatical problems and reference problems in the manuscript. We all corrected them and sincerely hope that the manuscript can meet the requirements of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics after modification. According to your constructive comments, the revisions of the manuscript are as follows:

Major concern:

Novelty: There is a similar study previously conducted by the leading author here. What makes this manuscript distinct from that previous one? Authors should elaborate more the novelty of this study.

**Response:** The article we published earlier is a report of our experiment results from only two sampling sites. The purpose of that paper was to report the pollution level and distribution of the

978 atmospheric OPEs at urban and suburban sites. Interestingly, we found the seasonal variations of OPEs
979 were significantly different from $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations and $PM_{2.5}$-bound PAHs, etc.. So we carried out a
980 more detailed experiment with six sampling sites in the second year. In this paper, except for reporting
981 the level and seasonal variations of OPEs at six sites, we paid more attention to investigate the
982 relationships and correlations among the target compounds or with influence factors and illustrate the
983 potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$. For example, whether different functional areas affect the
984 distributions of atmospheric OPEs, correlations of OPEs with environmental factors (temperature, wind,
985 vapor pressure, boiling points, etc.), correlations of OPEs with $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations, correlations of
986 OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ and soil, correlations of OPEs in indoor and outdoor air were all discussed. These
987 differences are the innovation of this paper.

988 In the revised manuscript, the novelty has been added in lines 66-78: "Our previous study has
989 investigated the OPEs concentrations in $PM_{2.5}$ at two sites (urban and suburban sites) in Chengdu (an
990 economically fast growing city in southwest of China), and found that OPEs concentrations and profile
991 were similar at two sites (Yin et al., 2015). But the influence factors and potential sources of OPEs in
992 $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu are still unclear. Therefore, in this study, $PM_{2.5}$ was collected over one year (October
993 2014 to September 2015) at six sites in Chengdu to: a) report the levels and composition profiles of
994 OPEs in urban air in the typical inland city; (b) obtain the seasonal and spatial variation of OPEs in
995 $PM_{2.5}$; (c) investigate the relationships and correlations among the target compounds or with influence
996 factors; (d) illustrate the potential sources of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$."

997 QA/QC: 1) As no surrogate standards were spiked prior to sample treatment, how did authors
998 evaluate OPE recoveries from the analytical procedures?

999 **Response:** Lines 127-132, "Thorough QA/QC procedures for OPE analysis were conducted to
1000 ensure data quality. To evaluate the recovery efficiencies of analytical procedures, all samples were
1001 added with internal standard (TDCPP-$d_{15}$ and TPhP-$d_{15}$), and the accuracy was evaluated by their
1002 recoveries. The concentrations of the 7 OPEs were determined by an external standard method. The
1003 correlation coefficients of the standard curves of the seven OPE monomers were all greater than 0.990.
1004 The recoveries of 7 OPEs and the internal standard were between 78.9% and 122.5%." was added.

1005 Lines 135-137, "Field blanks were done at each site to evaluate the background contamination in
1006 the field. TBEP, TnBP and TEHP were detected in it. The level of them found in the blank were <15%
1007 of the concentrations measured in all samples." was added.

There are only two internal standards, so we use them to ensure the recovery, but use external standard method to quantify the target compounds. In addition, a matrix blank was run in parallel with every batch of samples for the analysis of OPEs. Only TnBP was detected in the blanks, and the level of TnBP found in the blanks was <5% of the concentrations measured in all samples, which meant it was negligible. The correlation coefficients of the standard curves of the seven OPE profiles were all greater than 0.990. These all could ensure the accuracy of the data.

2) How was the matrix effect assessed and compensated?

**Response:** The matrix effect was assessed by the matrix blank experiment. The blank quartz membrane was added with the internal standard (TDCPP-$d_{15}$ and TPhP-$d_{15}$) and OPEs standard. After the whole pretreatment process, the recoveries of 7 OPEs and the internal standard were all between 70% and 120%. So the data was not corrected and the matrix effect was not compensated.

3) The data from field blanks were missing. PMF model: How were the uncertainties determined? Which references were referred to for identification of sources associated with each factor? I also want to see the source profile of each factor.

**Response:** The field blanks were done which were prepared and installed in the same manner as the regular samples but without turning on the sampler motor. Due to the limited space of the paper, and the focus of this paper is not on the establishment of analytical methods, so it is simplified a lot in the QA/QC part. But we have done all the related experiments for QA/QC, and the results were good.

Lines 135-137, "Field blanks were done at each site to evaluate the background contamination in the field." TBEP, TnBP and TEHP were detected in it. The level of them found in the blank were <15% of the concentrations measured in all samples." was added.

Lines 445-446, "The uncertainty is estimated by three methods: BS, disp and bs-disp" was added for PMF. The results are shown in the table below:

DISP results showed that the solution was stable because no swaps were present.

BS results showed that mapping over 80% of the factors indicated that the BS uncertainties could be interpreted and the number of factors may be appropriate.

All of the "Strong" species were selected for the BS-DISP error estimation. The number of DISP and BS-DISP swaps was zero. BS-DISP highlight that the solution may be reliable due to there was no swaps across two factors.

Error estimation summary results

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **BS-DISP Diagnostics:** | | | |
| # of Cases Accepted: | 100 | | |
| % of Cases Accepted: | 100% | | |
| Largest Decrease in Q: | -0.150999993 | | |
| %dQ: | -0.067824623 | | |
| # of Decreases in Q: | 0 | | |
| # of Swaps in Best Fit: | 0 | | |
| # of Swaps in DISP: | 0 | | |
| Swaps by Factor: | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **DISP Diagnostics:** | | | |
| Error Code: | 0 | | |
| Largest Decrease in Q: | -0.005 | | |
| %dQ: | -0.002245848 | | |
| Swaps by Factor: | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| **BS Mapping:** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Unmapped |
| Boot Factor 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Boot Factor 2 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Boot Factor 3 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |

The source profile of each factor:

| Factor Profiles (% of species sum) from Base Run (Convergent Run) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TnBP | TCEP | TCPP | TDCPP | TPhP | TBEP | TEHP |
| Factor 1 | 28.69 | 70.95 | 70.72 | 31.01 | 58.34 | 0.00 | 70.93 |
| Factor 2 | 0.00 | 20.31 | 25.47 | 44.72 | 13.97 | 77.95 | 26.41 |
| Factor 3 | 71.31 | 8.73 | 3.81 | 24.27 | 27.69 | 22.05 | 2.66 |

Lines 450-455, the references were referred to for identification of sources associated with each factor. “Factor 1 was deduced to be the plastics/electrical industry and indoor source emissions (Esch, 2000; Stevens et al., 2006). Factor 2 contributed the most to TBEP (78.0%), followed by TDCPP (44.7%), while it did not contribute to TnBP. Therefore, factor 2 was deduced as the food/cosmetics industry and traffic emissions (Marklund et al., 2005). Factor 3 contributes 71.7% of the total TnBP, which can be deduced as chemical industrial source (Regnery et al., 2011).”

Minor concern:

Line 8: "emerging contaminants"→"contaminant of emerging concern". OPEs have been produced for decades.

**Response:** We're sorry for the improper expression. Line 10, "emerging contaminants" has been revised to "OPEs are contaminants of emerging concern".

Line 9: "centers"→ "areas"

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Line 11, "Centers" has been replaced by "areas".

Line 13... which TOGETHER made up..."

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Line 15, “which made up” has been revised to "which together made up".

Line 18: OPEs can transfer from soil to air particles via suspension and volatilization as well. Actually, authors mentioned this at Lines 303-304.

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Line 20, “suggested the atmospheric $PM_{2.5}$ settlement is an important source of OPEs in soil” has been deleted. The sentence has been revised to “Very strong correlation ($R^2 = 0.98$, $p<0.01$) between the OPEs in soil and in $PM_{2.5}$ was observed.”

Lines 32-35: A weird sentence, please rephrase it.

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Lines 36-38, the sentence has been revised to "However, many scholars found that the residues of OPEs in the environment could cause toxic effects on organisms (WHO, 1991, 1998, 2000; Kanazawa et al., 2010; Van der Veen and de Boer, 2012; Du et al., 2015)".

Line 35: Reference is needed for the "OPE restrictions".

**Response:** Lines 40-41, three references were added “Some countries have legislated to restrict the usage of OPEs (Blum et al., 2019; Exponent, 2018; State of California, 2020)”.

Lines 495-498, “Blum, A.; Behl, M.; Birnbaum, L. S.; Diamond, M. L.; Phillips, A.; Singla, V.; Sipes, N. S.; Stapleton, H. M.; Venier, M. Organophosphate ester flame retardants: Are they a regrettable substitution for polybrominated diphenyl ethers? Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett. 2019, 6, 638-649. ” was added.

Lines 532-534, “Exponent. California bans flame retardants in certain consumer products. 2018, Available at: https://www.exponent.com/knowledge/alerts/2018/09/california-bans-flame-retardants/?pageSize=NaN&pageNum=0&loadAllByPageSize=true (accessed February 15, 2020).

State of California. Safer consumer products (SCP) information management system. 2020. Available at: https://calsafer.dtsc.ca.gov/cms/search/?type=Chemical (accessed February 21, 2020).” were added.

Lines 38-39: Reference is needed.

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Lines 44-47, references have been added: “The detection of OPEs in Arctic and Antarctic snow samples and atmospheric particulate matter samples demonstrated that OPEs can be transported over long distances (Möller et al., 2012; Li et al., 2017). Studies on OPEs

in oceans were carried out a lot, and the concentrations of particle-bound OPEs ranged from tens to thousands of ng $m^{-3}$ (Möller et al., 2011; 2012; Cristale J & Lacorte S., 2013; Li et al., 2017; McDonough et al., 2018)".

Lines 583-592, "McDonough, C. A., De Silva, A. O., Sun, C., Cabrerizo, A., Adelman, D., Soltwedel, T., Bauerfeind, E., Muir, D. C. G., Lohmann, R.: Dissolved organophosphate esters and polybrominated diphenyl ethers in remote marine environments: Arctic surface water distributions and net transport through Fram Strait, Environ. Sci. Technol., 52, 6208-6216, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b01127, 2018.

Möller, A., Sturm, R., Xie, Z., Cai, M., He, J., Ebinghaus, R.: Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in airborne particles over the northern pacific and Indian Ocean toward the polar regions: evidence for global occurrence, Environ. Sci. Technol., 46, 3127-3134. 2012

Möller, A., Xie, Z., Caba, A., Sturm, R., Ebinghaus, R.: Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in the atmosphere of the North Sea, Environ. Pollut., 159, 3660-3665, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.07.022, 2011." have been added.

Line 45: Which type of matrix is referred to for "Concentrations of OPEs in most cities..."I looked at the references cited, but not all of them talked about $PM_{2.5}$.

**Response:** This matrix is only for outdoor atmospheric environment.

Line 51, "Concentrations of OPEs in most cities..." has been revised to "Concentrations of atmospheric OPEs in most cities". Not all of the references we cited talked about $PM_{2.5}$, but they were all about OPEs in atmospheric particles.

Lines 54-56: How about "Chengdu is an important city in Southwest China due to its role as a national high-tech industrial base, a commercial logistics center, and a comprehensive transportation hub"?

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Line 62, a website has been added: "(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chengdu)."

Line82: Sampling intervals?

**Response:** Lines 94-100, "In each season, continuous sampling was carried out for about one week, except for rainy days. In autumn, the sampling duration was from October 23 to October 29,

2014 (no sample was obtained due to the rain on October 26 and 27); in winter, the sampling duration was from December 22 to December 30, 2014 (no sample was obtained due to the rain on October 25 and 26); in spring, the sampling duration was from March 25 to March 30, 2015; in summer, the sampling duration was from July 16 to July 24, 2015 (no sample was obtained due to the rain on July 21)" has been added. Each collection campaign lasted 23 h. The interval of each sample was 1h.

Line 86: Was the analytical method used here applied in any previous studies?

**Response:** Based on the references of Möller et al. (2012), we established the quantitative analysis method in the laboratory. The analytical method has been applied in our previous studies.

Li, S. P., Yin, H. L., YE, Z. X., Liang, J. F., Hao, Y. F.: GC-MS determination of 7 organic phosphate ester flame retardants in atmospheric particulates with chromatography purification: PTCA (Part B: Chem Anal). 2015, 051(005), 581-585, https://doi.org/10.13227/j.hjkx.2015.10.003, 2015.

Yin, H. L., Li, S. P., Ye, Z. X., Yang, Y. C., Liang, J. F., You, J. J.: Pollution level and sources of organic phosphorus esters in airborne $PM_{2.5}$ in Chengdu City, Environ. Sci. (in chinese), 36, 3566-3572, https://doi.org/10.13227/j.hjkx.2015.10.003, 2015.

Möller, A., Sturm, R., Xie, Z., Cai, M., He, J., Ebinghaus, R.: Organophosphorus flame retardants and plasticizers in airborne particles over the northern pacific and Indian Ocean toward the polar regions: evidence for global occurrence, Environ. Sci. Technol., 46, 3127-3134. 2012

Lines 93-94: How about "The latter eluate was collected and con-centrated by vacuum-condensing..."?

**Response:** The latter eluate was collected in a centrifugal tube and then concentrated to nearly dry by vacuum condensing equipment and then fixed volume to 200 μL with hexane. Then it was placed in a sample bottle to wait for the injection of gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS).

Lines 111-113, it has been revised to "…the latter eluate (ethyl acetate/acetone) was collected. The eluate was concentrated to nearly dry by vacuum-condensing equipment and then fixed volume to 200 $\mu$L with hexane for gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) (Shimadzu 2010plus, Japan) analysis." in the manuscript.

Lines 114-118: Could concisely say "detected in virtually all the samples".

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Lines 145-148, “Four OPEs (TCPP, TDCPP, TCEP and TnBP) were detected in all samples (n=149), while TBEP was detected in all but one sample. Additionally, TEHP was detected in 96.7% of samples overall and TPhP was detected in 98% of samples.” has been revised to "Seven OPEs were detected in 96.7% - 100% of the samples (n=149)".

Lines 120-121: Did "The average value... four seasons mean "annual average level"?

**Response:** It means "seasonal average concentration", not “annual average level”. Lines 151-153, it has been revised to “The seasonal average value of OPEs in $PM_{2.5}$ at each site was almost at the same level (5.8 $\pm$1.3 ng $m^{-3}$-6.9 $\pm$2.5 ng $m^{-3}$)”. We have checked other places throughout the manuscript.

Line 141: Rephrase the first sentence.

**Response:** Line 176, it has been revised to "Non-chlorinated OPEs were the predominant OPEs across Chengdu city”.

Lines 143-145: Explain the meaning of values in the parentheses.

**Response:** Line 179, it has been revised to "(annual media concentration: 2.3 ng $m^{-3}$, 35.3% of $\Sigma_7$ OPEs)".

Lines: 165-167: References?

**Response:** Line 202, two company websites for producing and selling OPEs have been added: "https://show.guidechem.com/hainuowei, http://www.sinostandards.net/index.php".

Lines182-184: A recent study measuring an extended list of OPEs in the Great Lakes atmosphere also found that alkyl OPEs dominated OPE compositional profiles of urban air collected from Chicago and Cleveland (Wu et al. 2020; 10.1021/acs. est.9b07755).

**Response:** Thank you for your reminder. We have referred to the results of this study. For example, (1) lines 220-221, “Wu et al. (2020) also reported that alkyl OPEs dominated OPE compositional profiles of urban air collected from Chicago and Cleveland.” (2) Lines 247-252, “Wu et al. (2020) reported that median concentrations of Σ OPEs for summer samples were up to 5 times greater than those for winter samples. The similar seasonal patterns were reported by Salamova et al. (2014) for the atmospheric particle-phase OPE concentrations in samples collected from the Great Lakes in 2012. A reasonable explanation is that OPEs are not chemically bound to the materials in which they are used and higher temperatures may facilitate their emission from buildings and vehicles.” has been added. (3) Lines 290-293, “Interestingly, in this study, alkyl OPEs dominated both

urban and suburban sites. This was extremely different from the results reported by Wu et al. (2020) that alkyl OPEs dominated at urban sites, chlorinated OPEs were prevalent at rural sites, and aryl OPEs were most abundant at remote locations." has been added in the revised manuscript.

Line 208-210: OPE levels can be surely affected by temperature, so I suppose the authors would like to say "seasonal variations in OPE levels". Additionally, would meteorological parameters other than temperature result in the seasonal variations found in the present study?

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Based on our experience, we also strongly agree that temperature and other meteorological factors will affect the level of pollutants in $PM_{2.5}$. However, the concentration of OPEs found in this study did not varied much in the four seasons, which was significantly different from other pollutants. Some literatures showed that the seasonal variations of OPEs in some coastal cities were significantly affected by temperature (Liu et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2019). For example, Wang et al. (2019) reported seasonality was discovered for OPEs in both gas phase and $PM_{2.5}$ with their concentrations higher in hot seasons in Dalian, which may due to the temperature-driven emission or gas-particle partitioning.

Lines 254-259, it has been revised to "In our study, the correlation analysis between the temperature, wind speed, wind direction and $\Sigma_7$OPEs concentrations has been done. The results showed statistically significant negative correlations between temperature and $\Sigma_7$ OPEs ($R= -0.355$, $p<0.01$). The lowest concentrations of $\Sigma_7$OPEs and individual compound were observed in summer suggesting the OPEs level was not driven by the temperature-driven emission. Gas-particle partitioning and local emission sources may contribute to the variation." In addition, other meteorological parameters with high contributions to the seasonal variations were not found in the present study.

Lines 236-238: Has been mentioned before. Lines 238-248: Out of place here. Could be moved to section 3.1.

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Lines 295-297 have been deleted.

Line 257: Need reference to support "they tend to be adsorbed in PM $_{2.5}$".

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Line 316, reference has been added: " (Wang et al., 2019)".

Lines 675-677, "Wang, Y., Bao. M. J., Tan. F., Qu. Z. P., Zhang. Y. W., Chen. J. W.: Distribution of organophosphate esters between the gas phase and $PM_{2.5}$ in urban Dalian, China, Environ. Pollut., https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113882, 2019."

Line 315: Other factors may lead to such difference between indoor and outdoor OPEs. For example, TBEP has the shortest atmospheric half-lives, which may explain why its dominance in indoor samples was not observed for the outdoor counterparts.

**Response:** Of course, other factors may also cause differences in the content of indoor and outdoor OPEs. Lines 385-395 have been revised to "Except for the different usage of OPEs, many factors may also lead to differences between indoor and outdoor OPEs. For example, TBEP has the shortest atmospheric half-lives, which may explain why its dominance in indoor samples was not observed for the outdoor counterparts. Studies in Swedish (Wong et al., 2018) reported the concentrations of OPEs in indoor air were TCPP > TCEP > TBEP > TnBP> TPhP, and in outdoor urban air were TBEP > TCPP > TCEP > TnBP > TPhP which also indicated the differences of OPEs profile in indoor and outdoor air. They found that activities in the building, e.g. floor cleaning, polishing, construction, introduction of new electronics and changes in ventilation rate could be key factors in controlling the concentration of indoor air pollutants, while the observed seasonality for OPEs in outdoor air was due to changes in primary emission."

Lines 350-356: References are required for identification of possible sources associated with each factor.

**Response:** Thanks for your advice. Lines 433-440, references have been added: "Factor 1 can represent the sources of OPEs from the plastic industry, interior decoration and traffic emission, with the contribution ratio of 34.5% (Marklund et al., 2005; Regnery et al., 2011; CEFIC, 2002). Factor 2 has higher load on TnBP, TEHP and TPhP. The highest load was on TnBP, which is often used as a high-carbon alcohol defoamer, mostly in industries that do not come in contact with food and cosmetics, as well as in antistatic agents and extractants of rare earth elements. TEHP can be used as an antifoaming agent, hydraulic fluid and so on. TPhP is typically used in electrical and electronic products, or plastic film and rubber (Esch, 2000; Stevens et al., 2006; Wei et al., 2015)."