

Dear editor

Please find the enclosed revision of our manuscript “Significant formation of sulfate aerosols contributed by the heterogeneous drivers of dust surface” (Manuscript Number: ACP-2022-227). We thank the valuable comments from the reviewers, which have greatly improved the manuscript. The point-by-point replies to the comments are attached on the following pages.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Liwu Zhang

Shanghai Key Laboratory of Atmospheric Particle Pollution and Prevention, Department of Environmental Science and Engineering
Fudan University
Shanghai, 200433, P. R. China
E: zhanglw@fudan.edu.cn

Comments by referees are in black

Our replies are in red.

Changes to the manuscript are highlighted in blue both here (*italic*) and in the revised manuscript.

Referee #2

This paper discusses the correlation of atmospheric mineral dust, and heterogeneous chemistry with the lifetime of SO₂ and would give a closer prediction of the formation of sulfate aerosols. Therefore this will be a good addition to our current knowledge in this field of atmospheric chemistry. I have a few comments and suggestions.

1. Abstract: I think we shouldn't say accurately predict - This is because it is still a prediction. Maybe with near accuracy, some rewording would be good.

Reply:

Thanks for your comments.

We have rewritten the sentence in the revised manuscript (line 13-14).

“Regression models were then developed to make a reliable prediction for the heterogeneous reactivity based on the particle chemical compositions.”

2. Authors discuss at several points that the differences of dust surfaces can affect their heterogeneous reactivities. (Under driving factors of dust surface, line 265). Another addition to this section: TiO₂ and other titanium-bearing minerals such as ilmenite showed night-time thermal reactions that involve redox cycling with nitrates, as well as pH dependency.

Reply:

We have reconsidered the different heterogeneous performances of Ti-bearing constituent under the dark and light conditions. The following explanation has been added into the revised manuscript (line 279-281).

“In addition, the heterogeneous reaction on the surface of TiO₂ or Ti-bearing mineral is thermodynamically favored during nighttime but largely dependent on photocatalysis under solar irradiation (Chen et al., 2012).”

3. Figure 2: why do some minerals have lower sulfates in the daytime while the others have lower sulfates in the nighttime? Can this be explained with the change of particle pH? What is the pH of each sample before the reaction? Fig 2b shows only the pH after reactions.

Reply:

Each of the studied clay minerals, with the exception of NAu, presents greater sulfate production during daytime than nighttime, which can be explained by its photocatalytic property (mainly attributed to the Al- and Ti-bearing components as discussed by Section 3.1). The opposite situation of NAu can be explained by its rich abundance of iron oxides that would undergo photoreductive dissolution in acidic media. We have emphasized this point in the manuscript (line 331-335).

“The diurnal uptake coefficients of CCa, SWy, KGa, IMt are respectively 1.52, 1.01, 2.94, 2.30 times greater than the corresponding nocturnal ones, reflecting the distinct photocatalytic performances of the clay minerals. Conversely, NAu presents the decreased heterogeneous uptake capacity under light irradiation than dark condition due to its rich abundance of Fe, whose oxide species may occur photoreductive dissolution in acidic media (Fu et al., 2010; Shi et al., 2012).”

In addition, the association between the uptake coefficient for sulfate formation and the corresponding particle acidity has been discussed in the revised manuscript (line 355-359).

“For one clay mineral, its different acidities after dark and light reactions correspond to the distinct heterogeneous kinetics. All of the studied clays, with the exception of NAu, become more acidic after the photoreaction than the dark reaction, which can be explained by the photoinduced SO₂ adsorption and sulfate production on these samples. The opposite situation of NAu coincides to the decreased heterogeneous kinetics over its surface by the presence of solar irradiation.”

The current methodology cannot estimate the acidity of the unreacted sample. The acidity of the reacted sample was derived from the relative abundance of SO₂-H₂O and SO₃²⁻, as assumed to be equivalent to the relative integral areas of their characteristic peaks. By contrast, the particle sample before reaction was scanned by infrared as a background spectrum, and therefore no infrared signals can be obtained for the unreacted particles.

4. Is chemistries a real word?

Reply:

As a real word, it was widely utilized in the research papers of this field (e.g. doi.org/10.1021/cr500501m; doi.org/10.1021/cr5003485).

5. Figure 3: why does the reactive uptake coefficient drastically increases after particle acidity reached ~4.5/ 5?

Reply:

Figure 3 displays the particle-acidity-dependent reactive uptake coefficients (γ) for the dust-mediated heterogeneous chemistry. We have discussed the dramatically increased γ when pH exceeds 4.5 or 5.0, in the revised manuscript (line 367-369).

“The γ of NO_2 , O_3 , HOCl , HOBr and CH_3COOOH presents positive dependence toward pH, in accordance with the evolution of the effective Henry’s law constant for the studied sulfur species, as theoretically illustrated by Eq. (5).”

6. For daytime chemistry, did you consider the possibility of the formation of sulfate radicals on surfaces with high Ti content?

Reply:

We have considered the impact of sulfate radical on the heterogeneous formation of sulfate. Necessary discussions are added into the revised manuscript (line 266-267).

“Sulfate radical ($\text{SO}_4^{\cdot-}$) is generated by the presence of abundant $\cdot\text{OH}$ and participates into the oxidation events (Antoniou et al., 2018; Kim et al., 2019; Li et al., 2020b).”

7. Figure 5: Why the kinetics has increased drastically after pH 5? Within the statistical error, do you see any difference between the aq phase and heterogeneous chemistry?

Reply:

We have explained the pH dependences of the aqueous-phase and dust-mediated heterogeneous kinetics in the revised manuscript (line 449-452).

“In more detail, the significant sulfate formation in the acidic environment is primarily contributed by the TMI- O_2 pathway where the concentrations of TMIs and H^+ keep increasing as the aerosol water becomes more acidic. When $\text{pH}>5.0$, the formation rate of sulfate increases with the elevated pH, in step with the evolution of the concentration of dissolved sulfur species.”

Moreover, we have explained the kinetic difference between the aqueous-phase and dust-mediated chemistries. The addition to the revised manuscript (line 452-453) is shown as follows.

“Within the entire pH range, the aqueous-phase chemistry is more efficient than the dust-mediated heterogeneous chemistry in contributing to secondary sulfate.”

8. Figure 7: Can you better label the y-axes to explain what % contribution? Panel b: why does the heterogeneous sulfate contribution for a daytime peak at a certain dust concentration and lowers, whereas it reaches a plateau at night time?

Reply:

We have re-labelled the y-axes of Fig. 7 as *“Secondary sulfate contribution (%)”*.

In the revised manuscript (line 518-525), we have additionally explained the different responses to the concentration of dust, as shown follows.

“The increased dust concentration facilitates the aqueous-phase TMI-O₂ pathway and the dust-mediated and dust-driven heterogeneous reactions, whereas presents negative impacts on the others by the removal of gaseous oxidants over dust surface. The unsusceptible response to dust concentration, as shown by Fig. 7b, can be related to the increased sulfate contributions from the TMI-O₂ pathway. Unlike the TMI-O₂ pathway and dust-driven chemistry receiving constant positive feedbacks from the increased dust concentration, the dust-mediated chemistry is somewhat affected by the decreased oxidants adsorbed on dust surface. Since the importance of dust-mediated chemistry is more significant during daytime than nighttime, there is a negative correlation between the high dust concentration and heterogeneous contribution proportion under solar irradiation.”

9. Why is more SSA formed during nighttime, but more sulfate is formed during the daytime?

Reply:

We have noticed that the observed sulfate concentration during nighttime may be comparable to or even exceed that measured during daytime, in contrast to the calculated results derived from this work. Such phenomenon can be explained by the different meteorological conditions during nighttime and daytime in the real atmosphere. In the revised manuscript (line 396-401), we have discussed these uncertainties and emphasized the current comparisons through kinetic regime. The added discussion is shown as follows.

“It is worthwhile to mention that, in the real atmosphere, the observed sulfate concentration during nighttime may be comparable to or exceed that during daytime, which can be explained by the higher nocturnal humidity facilitating the liquid oxidations or the lower boundary layer causing the adverse diffusion conditions (Liu et al., 2017c; Tutsak and Koçak, 2019; Li et al., 2020c). The relevant meteorological factors were not considered by this comparison model, and the current results emphasized the different sulfate formation potentials through kinetic regime.”

Referee #3

I have reviewed the manuscript “Significant formation of sulfate aerosols contributed by the heterogeneous drivers of dust surface” by Wang et al. Authors investigated the different metals and ions of the dust surface are associated with the heterogeneous formation of sulfate and used models to predict the heterogeneous reactivity. This study found that a significant amount of secondary sulfate aerosol was formed during nighttime and the heterogeneous drivers on the dust surface are more efficient to convert SO₂ to secondary sulfate. Given the importance of atmospheric secondary sulfate formation and heterogeneous chemistry of aerosols, this work is both significant and appropriate for this journal. However, there are some issues in this work that needs to be addressed before it can be published, as detailed below.

Introduction: authors should add some broad impacts of secondary sulfate aerosol as the motivation, such as the climate and health.

Reply:

Thanks for your comments.

We have discussed the relevant information at the start of Introduction section (line 25-27).

“As an important component of atmospheric particulate matters, sulfate exerts profound impacts on the Earth’s climate system, air quality, and public health (Seinfeld and Pandis, 2016; Wang et al., 2021a). The rapid formation of sulfate was proven as largely responsible for London Fog and Beijing Haze (Wang et al., 2016; Cheng et al., 2016).”

Line 45: authors need to add relevant references “... mentioned in the previous works” and be more specific.

Reply:

We have rewritten the sentences to make the declaration more specific (line 47-49), as shown follows.

“However, the “aerosol surface” mentioned in the previous works was not distinguished by its physical or chemical properties (Wang et al., 2014; Zheng et al., 2015; Xue et al., 2016), thereby making it difficult to compare the atmospheric importance of the diverse airborne surfaces.”

The following references are added.

Wang, Y., Zhang, Q., Jiang, J., Zhou, W., Wang, B., He, K., Duan, F., Zhang, Q., Philip, S., and Xie, Y.: Enhanced sulfate formation during China’s severe winter haze episode in January 2013 missing from current models, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 119, 10425-10440, <http://doi.org/10.1002/2013jd021426>, 2014.

Zheng, B., Zhang, Q., Zhang, Y., He, K. B., Wang, K., Zheng, G. J., Duan, F. K., Ma, Y. L., and Kimoto, T.: Heterogeneous chemistry: a mechanism missing in current models to explain secondary inorganic aerosol formation during the January 2013 haze episode in North China, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 15, 2031-2049, <http://doi.org/10.5194/acp->

15-2031-2015, 2015.

Xue, J., Yuan, Z., Griffith, S. M., Yu, X., Lau, A. K. H., and Yu, J. Z.: Sulfate formation enhanced by a cocktail of high NO_x, SO₂, particulate matter, and droplet pH during haze-fog events in megacities in China: an observation-based modeling investigation, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 50, 7325-7334, <http://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.6b00768>, 2016.

Method Line 118: Can authors briefly describe the “documented methodologies” and add references.

Reply:

In the revised manuscript (line 122-124), we have briefly described the utilized methodologies and parameterizations.

“The gas- and aqueous-phase pathways were assessed by the documented methodologies and parameterizations (Cheng et al., 2016; Seinfeld and Pandis, 2016; Shao et al., 2019; Song et al., 2021), as briefly introduced by Section 2.2 (more details in Supporting Information).”

The following references are added.

Cheng, Y., Zheng, G., Wei, C., Mu, Q., Zheng, B., Wang, Z., Gao, M., Zhang, Q., He, K., Carmichael, G., Pöschl, U., and Su, H.: Reactive nitrogen chemistry in aerosol water as a source of sulfate during haze events in China, *Sci. Adv.*, 2, e1601530, <http://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1601530>, 2016.

Seinfeld, J. H., and Pandis, S. N.: *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, From Air Pollution to Climate Change*, 3rd Edition, Wiley, New Jersey, USA, 2016.

Shao, J., Chen, Q., Wang, Y., Lu, X., He, P., Sun, Y., Shah, V., Martin, R. V., Philip, S., Song, S., Zhao, Y., Xie, Z., Zhang, L., and Alexander, B.: Heterogeneous sulfate aerosol formation mechanisms during wintertime Chinese haze events: air quality model assessment using observations of sulfate oxygen isotopes in Beijing, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 19, 6107-6123, <http://doi.org/10.5194/acp-19-6107-2019>, 2019.

Song, H., Lu, K., Ye, C., Dong, H., Li, S., Chen, S., Wu, Z., Zheng, M., Zeng, L., Hu, M., and Zhang, Y.: A comprehensive observation-based multiphase chemical model analysis of sulfur dioxide oxidations in both summer and winter, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 21, 13713-13727, <http://doi.org/10.5194/acp-21-13713-2021>, 2021.

Line 339-340: Can author provide more explanation about why the different clay minerals can affect the significant change of particle acidity?

Reply:

Firstly, the absolute acidity level varies with the type of clay mineral. The relevant discussions in the revised manuscript (line 350-355) is shown as follows.

“After the exposure to SO₂, CCa is the most acidic, followed by IMt and KGa, leaving SWy and NAu being more neutral.

Because no significant correlations can be found between γ and pH, the absolute acidity level is largely dependent on the basic nature of dust. The lowest pH assigned to CCa can be explained by its highest content of elemental Mg relative to the other clays (see Table S6). The Mg-bearing constituents dissolve to be Mg^{2+} that can be further hydrolyzed by water to produce H^+ , thus accelerating the acidification of particle (Park et al., 2008; Huang et al., 2015)."

In addition, we discussed the different particle acidities after the dark and light reactions (line 355-359).

"For one clay mineral, its different acidities after dark and light reactions reflect the distinct heterogeneous kinetics. All of the studied clays, with the exception of NAu, become more acidic after the photoreaction than the dark reaction, which can be explained by the photoinduced SO_2 adsorption and sulfate production on these samples. The opposite situation of NAu coincides to the decreased heterogeneous kinetics over its surface by the presence of solar irradiation."

Line 343-343: It is very interesting to see the difference in particle acidity between dark reaction and photoreaction, are they statistically different? Can author discuss why the CCa has the lowest pH among all the different types of clay minerals?

Reply:

For a certain clay mineral, the particle acidity after dark reaction is statistically different from that after photoreaction, as reflected by the Mean \pm SD data presented in Fig.2b. We have added more details in the data processing section (line 187-188).

"The consistent deconvolution procedure was performed for the infrared spectra derived from the repeated experiments."

We have provided an explanation for the lowest pH of CCa. The added text in the revised manuscript (line 352-355) is shown as follows.

"The lowest pH assigned to CCa can be explained by its highest content of elemental Mg relative to the other clays (see Table S6). The Mg-bearing constituents dissolve to be Mg^{2+} that can be further hydrolyzed by water to produce H^+ , thus accelerating the acidification of particle (Park et al., 2008; Huang et al., 2015)."

Line 373-374: Earlier authors assert that the sulfate formation is more during nighttime and less during the daytime, but this statement is opposite and confusing. Can the author clarify this?

Reply:

In the real atmosphere, the sulfate concentration during nighttime could be comparable to or even exceed that during daytime, as normally explained by the different meteorological conditions. We have explained the relevant details in the revised manuscript (line 396-401) to make our calculation results more reasonable.

“It is worthwhile to mention that, in the real atmosphere, the observed sulfate concentration during nighttime may be comparable to or exceed that during daytime, which can be explained by the higher nocturnal humidity facilitating the liquid oxidations or the lower boundary layer causing the adverse diffusion conditions (Liu et al., 2017c; Tutsak and Koçak, 2019; Li et al., 2020c). The relevant meteorological factors were not considered by this comparison model, and the current results emphasized the different sulfate formation potentials through kinetic regime.”

Line 380-390: In addition to the temperature dependence, did the authors consider the change of relative humidity during the day and night can also contribute to the heterogeneous chemistry reaction with sulfate?

Reply:

We attempted to carry out the heterogeneous laboratory experiments under the higher relative humidity (RH) relative to the current setting. However, the presence of surface adsorbed water makes the Gaussian/Lorentzian deconvolution difficult to be performed, as reflected by the large uncertainties in determining the relative abundance of $\text{SO}_2 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$ and SO_3^{2-} . Accordingly, the RH of 50% was utilized for the experiments. In the revised manuscript (line 654-656), we have emphasized the importance of various meteorological factors when discussing the atmospheric relevance of heterogeneous chemistry, as shown follows.

“In addition, the influence of meteorological factors, like temperature, humidity and irradiance, on the atmospheric relevance of heterogeneous chemistry warrants further research.”

Line 391-393: This sentence “Relative to ... heterogeneous chemistries by ...” does not make sense, please rephrase/refine the sentence.

Reply:

We have rewritten the sentences to make the relevant content more readable (line 417-420).

“The sulfate formation rates of gas-phase, aqueous-phase and heterogeneous chemistries under solar irradiation are respectively 9.4, 6.8 and 3.0 times greater than the corresponding nocturnal results, indicating that the oxidations in gaseous and liquid media could be more kinetically susceptible to the occurrence of sunlight than those relevant to the gas-solid interface.”

Figure 5: Can author provide some discussion about the trend shown in Figure 5? Why would it show a dip in sulfate formation rate at pH 5 and more sulfate at higher pH?

Reply:

The dip in sulfate formation rate around the pH of 5.0 is attributed to the significant sulfate formations under the

extremely acidic and near-alkaline conditions. We have discussed the pH-dependent kinetics of the aqueous-phase and dust-mediated heterogeneous chemistries (line 449-452), as shown follows.

“In more detail, the significant sulfate formation in the acidic environment is primarily contributed by the TMI-O₂ pathway where the concentrations of TMIs and H⁺ keep increasing as the aerosol water becomes more acidic. When pH>5.0, the formation rate of sulfate increases with the elevated pH, in step with the evolution of the concentration of dissolved sulfur species.”

Figure 10 Line 558-559: Can author explain why the O₂ affects SO₂ oxidation over pH <4 and why is it starting to decrease after pH 4?

Reply:

We have explained the pH-dependent kinetics of the interfacial O₂ at acidic aerosol interface (line 592-594).

“As reported by Hung et al. (2015, 2018), acidic droplet interface favors the noncatalyzed oxidation by the presence of sufficient SO₃⁻ and SO₄⁻ when pH<4.0, which can be further explained by the structure differences of water at the interface versus the characteristic water structure in bulk-phase water.”

Comments in the quick report

Can author provide more information about the particle acidity calculation and standard calibration? Rindelaub et al developed the direct pH measurement for single-particle using the ratio of bisulfate and sulfate peak.

Reply:

The calculation of particle acidity by the relative abundance of bisulfate and sulfate may not be applied for this study because the characteristic bisulfate signals cannot be determined in some of the recorded infrared spectra. We have discussed the report from Rindelaub et al. (2016) and provided more information on the calculation of particle acidity (line 195-197).

“The relative abundance of SO₂·H₂O and SO₃²⁻, as assumed to be equivalent to the relative integral area of their characteristic peaks, is utilized to calculate the particle acidity (more details in Text S3-2 of Supporting Information). The relative abundance of HSO₄⁻ and SO₄²⁻, which can be used to calculate the aerosol acidity (Rindelaub et al., 2016; Ault, 2020), was not considered by the present study because the characteristic signals of bisulfate cannot be observed in some of the recorded infrared spectra.”

Line 336: Author mentioned that the more sulfate formation during the daytime than the nighttime, but later author suggests more secondary sulfate aerosol formation during nighttime than daytime, can author clarify this?

Reply:

As discussed in Section 3.2, the dust surface drivers are responsible for the atmospheric sulfate formation rate of $0.195 \mu\text{g m}^{-3} \text{h}^{-1}$ during nighttime and $0.365 \mu\text{g m}^{-3} \text{h}^{-1}$ during daytime. As discussed in Section 3.3, the dust heterogeneous chemistry is responsible for 28.6% and 13.1% of the secondary sulfate during nighttime and daytime, respectively. We have clarified the different dependences of absolute sulfate yield and relative sulfate contribution in the revised manuscript (line 411-413).

“In other words, although the heterogeneous sulfate production during nighttime is quantitatively lower than that during daytime (see Section 3.2), the nocturnal heterogeneous chemistry accounts for the higher proportion of secondary sulfate.”

In figure 5, it is interesting to see the formation rate of sulfate increase after pH5, can author provide some discussion about this trend and the increasing sulfate formation with increasing pH?

Reply:

In the revised manuscript (line 450-452), we have explained the positive pH dependence when $\text{pH} > 5.0$.

“When $\text{pH} > 5.0$, the formation rate of sulfate increases with the elevated pH, in step with the evolution of the concentration of dissolved sulfur species.”