
Anonymous Referee #1

1.0. This study deploys an AMS and a FIGAERO-CIMS to investigate the sources and formation mechanisms of oxidized organic nitrogen (OON) species in an urban site in Guangzhou, China. By applying a tracer based method to FIGAERO-CIMS measurement, the contributions from biomass burning and secondary production to OON have been quantified. Further, the production rate of secondary OON is estimated based on the measured VOCs concentrations and literature values of ON yields. Overall, this study presents an interesting dataset and conducts comprehensive analysis. It improves our understanding of the concentration and speciation of OON in diverse environments. However, the conclusions on the source apportionment and formation mechanisms of OON are speculative as outlined below. I recommend accept with major revisions noted.

A1.0: We greatly appreciate the reviewer providing the valuable comments and constructive suggestions which help us tremendously in improving the quality of our work. All the responses to the specific comments are shown below. To facilitate the review process, we have copied the reviewer comments in black text. Our responses are in regular blue font. We have responded to all the referee comments and made alterations to our paper (in bold text).

Major Comments

1.1. The mass closure analysis on particle OON measured by CIMS and by AMS is valuable. It is shown that pOrgNO3,CIMS only accounts for ~30% of pOrgNO3,AMS (Line 228). In other words, CIMS only captures a small fraction of total pON, if the AMS measurement is reliable. Thus, the majority of the analysis in this study only focuses on a small fraction of total ON. A more important question is what the rest 70% of particle OON are. The reviewer understands this question is beyond the scope of this study, but this measurement limitation should be stressed more throughout the manuscript, to avoid the fallacy that the OON measured by I- CIMS, such as figure 7, represents the composition of all OON in the atmosphere. Similarly, the conclusions like half of particle OON originates from
biomass burning and the rest from secondary production should be discussed under the frame that the OON measured by I- CIMS are considered in the calculation, not total OON in the atmosphere.

A1.1: We agree with the reviewer’s comment that the source apportionment results from CIMS cannot represent all the particle- and gas-phase OON in the ambient air. We stressed the measurement limitation of the CIMS throughout the revised main manuscript by emphasizing the OON reported here was mainly applicable to CIMS measurement and the OON mass detected by CIMS only accounted for 30% of values by AMS. For examples:

Line 375-377: “On average, biomass burning emissions accounted for 49 ± 23% of total pOON measured by the CIMS, while the contribution was much lower (24 ± 25%) for gOON (Figs. 2b and 2d), indicating that biomass burning is one of the major sources for pOON measured by the CIMS, and gOON is predominately from secondary formation (76 ± 25%) (Huang et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2016).”

Line 496-497: “In this section, the molecular components of the gOON and pOON measured by the CIMS categorized with different oxygen and carbon atom numbers are briefly discussed.”

Line 534-535: “Note that the sources of the undetected pOON from CIMS are still unknown, which shall be further investigated.”

Please also note that although the pOON measured by the CIMS only accounts for ~30% of the mass loading measured from AMS, we found that the measured pOON from two techniques correlated well, suggesting the rest of ~70% of mass from CIMS may have similar variation. Per reviewer #2’s comments, we also calculated the potential uncertainty of measured pOON between CIMS and AMS. We found that the pOrgNO3,CIMS accounted for 28 ± 18% of pOrgNO3,AMS combined with uncertainty analysis in the revised Text S3 in supporting in formation. The detailed calculation can be found in A2.5.

1.2. Using C6H10O5I- as a tracer for biomass burning is not adequately justified. A major piece of evidence that biomass burning contributes to OON is figure 2a and 2c, which show the relationship between OON and C6H10O5I- is bifurcated. However, the same relationship is not observed between OON and other BB tracers including AMS mz60, methoxyphenol, and vanillic acid. The contrasting observations are suspicious. The manuscript claims that BB tracers other than levoglucosan have all sorts of issues, such as non-biomass burning emissions, low concentration, or larger background. These issues could certainly be true. However, an obvious issue with C6H10O5I- is that it is not solely levoglucosan, but has interference from other isomers! Thus, it can be easily argued that C6H10O5I- is not a perfect tracer either. One should not rely the analysis solely on this single chemical formula. Let’s imagine, among all the
CIMS ions, one ion, which is a tracer for VCP for example, exhibits similar correlation relationship with OON as C6H10O5 does (i.e., bifurcation as in Figure 2a). Then, the conclusion will easily become that VCP is a large contributor to OON. In conclusion, more evidence is required to support the contribution of biomass burning to OON. The authors mentioned that there are some episodes when pOON and levoglucosan peak coincidently (Figures S11a and S12a). Again, the figures only show pOON has some relationship with C6H10O5I-, not with levoglucosan, because the C6H10O5I- could be some other isomers.

A1.2: As the reviewer mentioned that the formula C6H10O5 consisted of isomers in ambient atmosphere, which are levoglucosan, mannosan, and galactosan. In the same campaign, we also measured the isomer of levoglucosan based on filter sampling analyzed by high performance anion exchange chromatography with pulsed amperometric detection (HPAEC-PAD) (Zhang et al. 2015). The detailed information about this measurement can be found in recently published paper of Jiang et al. (2023) in the Science of Total Environment journal. The isomer measurement showed that the levoglucosan contributed 90 ± 2% of the total mass loading from three isomers of C6H10O5 (Fig. A1) through the campaign, which was consistent with the previously reported results across China (80−95%) (Mao et al., 2018; Ho et al., 2014; Müller et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2018; Zhu et al., 2020).

Furthermore, we added measured results of potassium (K+) to verify the source of C6H10O5. K+ can be treated as a tracer for biomass burning (Wang et al., 2017; Andreae, 1983) and is detected using IC based on filter sampling. The consistent variation of potassium (K+) and levoglucosan supported that the enhancement of C6H10O5 at high mass concentration shall mainly come from biomass burning (Wang et al., 2017), as shown in the reproduced Fig. S11a below.

To clarify this, we added corresponding information and revised the description in line 179-183 in the maintext as below. To be more precise and avoid confusion, we also updated all the compound name “levoglucosan” to be “C6H10O5” or “C6H10O5 (levoglucosan and its isomers)” when CIMS measurement was referred to in the manuscript. The uncertainty of using C6H10O5 as tracer for biomass burning source apportionment of OON was also added, the detailed information can be found in A2.10.

“In the ambient air, the C6H10O5 measured in the particle phase using the CIMS was probably composed by levoglucosan and its isomers (mannosan and galactosan) (Ye et al., 2021). The isomer measurement of C6H10O5 in this campaign have revealed that the levoglucosan contributed 90 ± 2% mass loading of the three isomers of C6H10O5 (Jiang et al., 2023), thus the C6H10O5 signal in this study can be used as a tracer for biomass burning
emission (Bhattarai et al., 2019). The good correlation (R = 0.78) between C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{10}O\textsubscript{5} and another biomass burning tracer potassium (K\textsuperscript{+}) (Wang et al., 2017; Andreae, 1983), also supports this statement (Fig. S11a).

Figure A1. The mass concentration of C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{10}O\textsubscript{5} isomers, i.e., levoglucosan, mannosan, and galactosan in this campaign. The mass fraction of levoglucosan to total C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{10}O\textsubscript{5} isomer mass loading is also shown.

Figure S11. (a) Time series of m/z 60 from the AMS, particulate C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{10}O\textsubscript{5} (levoglucosan and its isomers), water-soluble potassium (K\textsuperscript{+}), (b) C\textsubscript{7}H\textsubscript{8}O\textsubscript{2} (methoxyphenol and its isomers) and C\textsubscript{7}H\textsubscript{8}O\textsubscript{2} (methoxyphenol and its isomers) from CIMS. The m/z 60 was found to be a fragment from levoglucosan-like species and supposed to
be a tracer of biomass burning (Cubison et al., 2011). Scatter plots of (c) C7H8O2 (methoxyphenol and its isomers), (d) C8H8O4 (vanillic acid and its isomers), and (e) m/z 60 versus levoglucosan. Moderate agreement between them and C6H10O5 also demonstrates the existence of biomass burning emissions (Urban et al., 2012).

(f) Diurnal variation of the four species.

1.3. The production rate of secondary OON is estimated based on measured VOCs, but the usefulness of this analysis is limited. First, as the OON concentration depends on both production and loss, which is clearly pointed out in Line 369-371, the correlation between OON concentration and product rate is not very meaningful. As a result, there is no clear correlation between two terms as shown in this study. Second, the calculated production rate is not tied to the I CIMS measurement, which degrades the importance of such analysis. In other words, both methods do not validate each other. But it is at the authors’ discretion regarding whether to keep this analysis.

A1.3: The production rate of OON was widely applied to investigate the formation pathway and potential contribution of VOCs to OON (Rollins et al., 2012; Liebmann et al., 2019; Sobanski et al., 2017; Ayres et al., 2015; Perring et al., 2013; Hamilton et al., 2021; Pye et al., 2015). It is true that the production rate did not account for the loss of OON results, however, to properly simulate the ambient OON concentration need modeling work with detailed mechanism account for the extra loss pathways including oxidation, photolysis, hydrolysis and deposition. The model simulation on mass concentration of OON in urban areas is still a challenge due to the complex formation and loss way of anthropogenic-derived OON (Li et al., 2023), which is beyond the scope of this manuscript. Under such background, the production rate calculation itself would be very meaningful to explore the formation mechanism of OON in urban areas in preliminary. In this study, we estimated the ambient mass concentration of NO3 radicals based direct measurement of N2O5 by CIMS and obtained the time series of OH mass concentration using MCM model constrained by real J-value measurement. The detection of VOCs was also validated with multiple techniques. Overall, the dataset used for production rate estimation here is in high quality. Considering the uncertainty in both measurement of secondary gOON by CIMS and estimation of OON production rate, their similar diurnal variations show good agreement, which also supports the reasonability of the production rate calculated here. The rate production results give a summarized overview for the OON formation pathways and help us to better understand the future focus of OON studies. E.g., through OON production rate calculation, we found important OON formation through NO3 pathways during the daytime, which highlight the potential contribution of NO3 oxidation to other secondary products, e.g., SOA. The important contribution from monoterpene oxidation to OON was also revealed. Thus, we would like to keep these results and believe it is a very important part of our study. Finally, we revised the sentences in line 414-417 to remind the readers the potential uncertainty of production rate calculation in the maintext.
“To further elucidate the secondary formation mechanism of gOON, the diurnal patterns of gOON production rates from the three pathways following the procedure mentioned in section 2.3 are calculated and shown in Fig. 4a and Fig. S21. Although the production rate did not consider the loss of OON, the calculation of production rate still serves as a useful tool to assess the formation pathway and precursor contribution to OON (Liebmann et al., 2019; Sobanski et al., 2017; Hamilton et al., 2021).”

We also remind the readers that the life of pOON accounting for the loss of pOON shall be further investigated in the future in line 493-494:

“For the lifetime of pOON, a modeling study including explicit formation mechanism as conducted by Lee et al. (2016) is required for systematic explorations in the future.”

1.4. Even though some analysis methods have been used in the literature, they still should be briefly explained to guide the readers who are not familiar with the methods. For example, Line 155 – 158 mentioned that three methods are applied to estimate the ON concentration based on AMS measurements. The basic principles behind each method should be briefly discussed (i.e., one or two sentences). For example, the NO2+/NO+ ratio method is based on the fact that inorganic and organic nitrates have different fragmentation patterns. Another examples include Line 232 and seasonal decomposed analysis (Line 348). Please briefly discuss the methods. Lastly, Line 431, please explain how the lifetime of gON is estimated.

A1.4: The detailed description of the three methods that were applied to estimate the ON concentration was already presented in detail in section 1 of the supporting information, where the principle of three ON estimation methods based on AMS measurement and the calculation process were fully addressed. Per the reviewer’s comment, we also added brief description of each method in the revised main text in line 195-201:

“In addition to the total organic aerosol (OA), the mass concentration of –ONO2 group from pON (pOrgNO3,AMS) was also estimated by NO2+/ NO+ ratio method (Farmer et al., 2010; Fry et al., 2013; Day et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2015), positive matrix factorization (PMF) method (Hao et al., 2014), and thermodenuder (TD) method (Xu et al., 2021b) based on the AMS data. The NO2+/ NO+ ratio method was based on the different ratios of NO2+ to NO+ fragmented from pOrgNO3,AMS and inorganic nitrate. The PMF method was performed by including the NO+ and NO2+ ions into the PMF analysis combined with spectral matrix of organic ions. The TD method was conducted based on the difference of volatility between pOrgNO3,AMS and inorganic nitrates in particles.”
The revised explanation of seasonal decomposed analysis can refer to Text S4 in supporting information manuscript. We also added brief description of the method and revised the sentence in the revised main text in line 400-403:

“To elucidate this large uncertainty, a seasonal decomposition method (Hilas et al., 2006), which was performed by locally weighted linear regression to decompose the time series into three components, i.e., trend component, seasonal component and remainder, was applied (detailed process can be found in Text S4). By replacing seasonal variation with hour variation, the method can down weight the impact of daily peak intensity variation.”

We revised the estimation method of the lifetime of gOON in the last paragraph of section 3.3 (line 487-489):

“Furthermore, the lifetime of gOON in this study can be approximately estimated by a steady-state approach (gOON mixing ratio versus total production rate) as shown in Liebmann et al. (2019). A scatterplot of the secondary gOON versus the secondary gOON production rate at 1 hour time resolution is shown in Fig. S24b.”

1.5. Issues regarding CIMS quantification. Does the calibration account for the temperature-dependence? A recent study shows that the I- CIMS sensitivity has a strong dependence on temperature\(^1\). This issue could be significant for particle-phase measurements, which have a higher IMR temperature. Line 134 mentioned that a voltage scanning procedure was used to estimate the sensitivity. However, neither detailed procedures nor calibration results are shown. Please describe the procedure, show the calibration curves, and show the accuracy of this method to the 39 compounds calibrated with authentic standards. Please discuss how the calibration curve is applied to estimate the sensitivity of individual compounds. Also, two recent studies have quantified the uncertainty of the voltage scanning method\(^2, 3\), which should be cited and discussed in the manuscript.

A1.5: We thank the reviewer for his/her comments and suggestions. We maintained the IMR temperature in a stable condition by keeping heater strip and room temperature constant, as well as adding an insulation layer outside of the gas sampling line. The temperature of the IMR during measurement was kept almost constant (80 °C) to minimize the effect of temperature on sensitivity throughout the experiment set up. Thus, we think the temperature-dependent sensitivity shall be minor in this study. To clarify this, we added relative description in line 127-131 in the revised main text:

“The temperature of the IMR was kept almost constant by setting the temperature constant (80 °C) of the heater strip in the IMR. Meanwhile, the room temperature, which was maintained by an air-conditioner, was
relatively stable ($23.7 \pm 2.9 \, ^\circ C$). The gas sampling line inside the room was covered by heat insulation associated with a heating cable to hold the temperature of sampling gas steady. These protocols reduce the effect of the temperature dependence of IMR, as indicated by Robinson et al. (2022) that $\Gamma$ CIMS sensitivity may be influenced by the temperature of IMR.”

The detail description of the calibration experiments and data processing in this campaign, e.g., voltage scanning, was already shown in a previous paper of Ye et al. (2021) (copied as Fig. A2 below). We added a brief description on the calibration method about voltage scanning method and how the calibration curve was applied to estimate the sensitivity of individual compound in line 148-160 in the maintext:

“ Lopez-Hilfiker et al. (2016) and Iyer et al. (2016) have verified the connections among the binding energy of the iodide-adduct bond, the voltage dissociating iodide adducts and the sensitivity of corresponding species. The relationship between the voltage difference ($dV$) and signal fraction remaining of an iodide-molecule adduct is established by scanning the $dV$ between the skimmer of the first quadrupole and the entrance to the second quadrupole ion guide of the mass spectrometer. This relationship curve of an individual iodide adduct can be fitted by a sigmoid function and yields two parameters: $S_0$, the relative signal at the weakest $dV$ compared to the signal under operational $dV$; $dV_{50}$, the voltage at which half of the maximum signal is removed (i.e., half the adducts that could be formed are de-clustered). A sigmoidal fit was then applied to the results of all the iodide adducts. An empirical relationship between relative sensitivity ($1/S_0$) and $dV_{50}$ of each ion (includes levoglucosan) based on average values of the entire campaign was obtained. By linking the relative sensitivity of levoglucosan with its absolute sensitivity based on the authentic standard, the absolute sensitivity of all the uncalibrated OON species was determined, after taking into account the relative transmission efficient of all the ions. The detailed data of these response factors can be found in the supporting information of Ye et al. (2021).”
“Figure A2. The original Figure S7 in the supporting information of Ye et al. 2021. (a) Fitting the voltage scanning results as a sigmoidal function of sensitivity relative to maximum sensitivity versus $dV_{50}$ (i.e., the voltage where half of an iodide adducts dissociate). (b) Fitting relative transmission efficiency as a gaussian curve of m/z. (c) The sensitivity derived from voltage scanning procedure. The transmission correction has been applied. The bottom line in Figure A2c that has a shape exactly the same as the transmission curve represents the points with a cutoff of 0.23 for the relative sensitivity.”

The uncertainty of voltage scanning method was quantified in previous studies including two studies mentioned by the reviewer and Isaacman-Vanwertz et al. (2018). This approach was found to carry high uncertainties for individual analytes (0.5 to 1 order of magnitude) but represent a central tendency that can be used to estimate the sum of analytes with reasonable error (∼30% differences between predicted and measured moles) (Bi et al., 2021b). Based on the analysis of the uncertainties of three nitrogen-containing compounds (in the list of calibrated species) derived both from the voltage scanning method and the method using the standard compounds, we approximately obtained 32–56% underestimation of sensitivity for the voltage scanning method. Through the comparison of the sensitivity factors derived from the two methods is added in Figure S3 (also shown as below), an average value of 47% was regarded as the uncertainty of the voltage scanning method and the total mass loading of uncalibrated species. To clarify this, we added the description of uncertainty analysis of the voltage scanning method in line 160-168:

“Three OON species which are 4-nitrophenol (C$_6$H$_5$NO$_3$), 2,4-dinitrophenol (C$_6$H$_4$N$_2$O$_5$), and 4-nitrocatechol (C$_6$H$_5$NO$_4$) were calibrated in both authentic standards and voltage scanning methods. By comparing their sensitivity (Fig. S3), the uncertainty of the voltage scanning method can be roughly estimated. Detailed description of the calibration curves and the application of the calibration curve to estimate the sensitivity can
be referred to the supporting information text of Ye et al. (2021). In general, the voltage scanning method underestimates (32–56%) the sensitivity of OON in this study compared to the values using the standard compounds as real. This uncertainty was comparable with 30% uncertainty of all analytes in Bi et al. (2021b) and 60% uncertainty of total carbon in Isaacman-Vanwertz et al. (2018) measured by the Iodide-CIMS. Finally, an average underestimation of 47% on sensitivity was taken as the uncertainty of the whole OON mass loading in this study.”

Minor Comments

1.6. Lines 50 and 78. Please cite Xu et al. 2015 ACP4 which also extensively discussed the NO2+/NO+ ratio method.

A1.6: In fact, the paper Xu et al. 2015 ACP was already cited in line 204 in the original main text and also in Text S1 in the supporting information. After checking through the manuscript, we also added the citation of Xu et al. 2015 ACP in Line 50, line 78 and line 194 in the revised main text:

In line 50: “(II) by using aerosol mass spectrometer (AMS) (Decarlo et al., 2006) based on NO2+/NO+ apportionment (Farmer et al., 2010; Fry et al., 2013; Hao et al., 2014; Day et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2015) and/or thermodenuder (Xu et al., 2021b);”

In line 78: “Previous studies indicated that the oxidation of biogenic VOCs by NO3 dominanted gOON formation at a forest-urban site in Germany (56% of average gOON production rate) (Sobanski et al., 2017), as well as at a boreal forest site in the Finland (70% of total gOON production rate) (Liebmann et al., 2019) and the southeast US (84% of monoterpene organic nitrate mass) (Ayres et al., 2015; Pye et al., 2015; Xu et al., 2015).”
In line 197: “In addition to the total organic aerosol (OA), the mass concentration of –ONO\textsubscript{2} group from pON (p\text{OrgNO}_3,\text{AMS}) was also estimated by NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript+/ NO\textsuperscript{+} ratio method (Farmer et al., 2010; Fry et al., 2013; Day et al., 2022; Xu et al., 2015),”

1.7. Line 60. Please cite Chen et al. 2020 ACP5 which also deployed FIGAERO-CIMS to measure organic nitrates. Please also discuss Chen et al. in related analysis, such as the comparison between AMS and FIGAERO-CIMS.

A1.7: We thank the reviewer for the reminding. We have read attentively through the paper of Chen et al. 2020 ACP, then added the citation of Chen et al. (2020) in the corresponding sentence in line 61 and in the overview of pON/OA in Fig. S7 as shown below.

“So far, g\text{OON} and p\text{OON} (containing 4–12 oxygen atoms) formed from multiple oxidation process of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) have been quantified by a high-resolution time-of-flight CIMS installed with a Filter Inlet for Gases and AEROsols (FIGAERO-CIMS) in the forests (Lee et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2016) and at rural sites (Huang et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2020).”

Figure S7. (a) Mass concentration pON and (b) its fraction to OA at sites around the world (Ayres et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2020; Day et al., 2010; Farmer et al., 2010; Fisher et al., 2016; Fry et al., 2013; Kiendler-Scharr et al., 2016; Lanz et al., 2010; Lee et al., 2019; Rollins et al., 2012; Salvador et al., 2020; Singla et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2015; Yu et al., 2019) classified into urban sites, downwind sites (lied downwind of the cities where were influenced by the emissions from the cities), forest or remote sites with different seasons. The average molecular weight of ON used for all sites is assumed to be 200 g mol\textsuperscript{-1}. The inset pies indicate the average fraction of pON
(pink) to OA at each type of site. The yellow indicates the data are measured by thermal dissociation laser-induced fluorescence instrument (TD-LIF). The method of the pON\textsubscript{AMS}/TD-LIF/OA calculation was referred to Takeuchi and Ng (2019).

1.8. Line 125. Do all 339 compounds have signal significantly higher than the background? Or 339 refers to the number compounds that are fitted in the HR analysis?

A1.8: Yes, the 339 compounds were selected due to that they can be fitted in the HR analysis after subtracting the background. To clarify this, we revised the sentence in line 138-140.

“Based on the CIMS measurement, speciated OON (nitrogen-containing oxygenated hydrocarbons, 339 closed-shell compounds with oxygen versus carbon atom ratio no less than 3, C\textsubscript{2n}H\textsubscript{2n}O\textsubscript{3}N\textsubscript{1-2}) in both gas and particle phases were quantified. These OON compounds can be fitted well in the HR analysis after the background signals have been removed.”

1.9. Line 200. The underlying assumption of this statement is unclear. Does the fraction of organic nitrate in total nitrate increases with decreasing OA concentration?

A1.9: We are sorry that we do not quite understand what the assumption that the reviewer refers to here. For the second question, the fraction of organic nitrate in total nitrate as a function of OA concentration was displayed in Fig. A3. The faction of ON in total nitrates decreases as a function of OA mass concentrations above 10 µg m\textsuperscript{-3}.

![Figure A3](image_url)

**Figure A3.** Mass fraction of pOrgNO\textsubscript{3,AMS} (NO\textsubscript{2}/NO\textsuperscript{+} ratio method) to total nitrates as a function of total OA derived from the AMS. The points are color-coded with total nitrates.

1.10. Line 225-228. There are many acronyms in this paragraph, including pOON\textsubscript{CIMS}, pOON\textsubscript{AMS}, pOrgNO\textsubscript{3,CIMS}, pOrgNO\textsubscript{3,AMS}. Please better explain the difference between these terms.
A1.10: To provide a comprehensive explanation of the acronyms, we added Table A1 in the appendix to explain all nomenclature mentioned in this manuscript:

“Appendices A: Summary of the acronym

Table A1. The summary of the acronym and corresponding full name in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full name</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWC</td>
<td>aerosol liquid water content</td>
<td>ONs</td>
<td>organic nitrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_{11-20N}</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen molecules with 11−20 carbon atoms</td>
<td>OON</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_{4-5N}</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen molecules with 4−5 carbon atoms</td>
<td>OON_{bb}</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen from biomass burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_{6-9 AroN}</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen molecules with 6−9 carbon atoms and benzene ring</td>
<td>OON_{sec}</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen from secondary formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_{8-10N}</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen molecules with 8−10 carbon atoms</td>
<td>O_x</td>
<td>odd oxygen, sum of O_3 and NO_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHON</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen with only one nitrogen atom</td>
<td>pC_xN</td>
<td>particle-phase C_xN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHON_2</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen with two nitrogen atoms</td>
<td>PMF</td>
<td>positive matrix factorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIMS</td>
<td>chemical ionization mass spectrometer</td>
<td>pON</td>
<td>particle-phase organic nitrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_{othersN}</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen molecules not in other four group</td>
<td>pOON</td>
<td>particle-phase oxidized organic nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_xN</td>
<td>oxidized organic nitrogen molecules with x carbon atoms</td>
<td>pOON_{AMS}</td>
<td>particle-phase oxidized organic nitrogen derived from aerosol mass spectrometer measurement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dV</td>
<td>voltage difference</td>
<td>pOON_{CIMS}</td>
<td>particle-phase oxidized organic nitrogen measured by chemical ionization mass spectrometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dV_{50}</td>
<td>the voltage at which half the signal is removed (i.e., half of iodide adducts dissociate)</td>
<td>pOrgNO_{3,AMS}</td>
<td>Nitrate functional group from particle-phase ON measured by aerosol mass spectrometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGAERO-I-CIMS</td>
<td>an iodide-adduct chemical ionization mass spectrometer equipped with a Filter Inlet for Gases and AERosols gas chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry and flame ionization detector</td>
<td>pOrgNO_{3,CIMS}</td>
<td>Nitrate functional group in particle-phase ON based on the data by chemical ionization mass spectrometer Particles, Radicals, and Intermediates from oxidation of primary Emissions over the Great Bay Area proton transfer reaction time-of-flight mass spectrometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC-MS/FID</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRIDE-GBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gON</td>
<td>gas-phase organic nitrates</td>
<td>PTR-ToF-MS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gOON</td>
<td>gas-phase oxidized organic nitrogen</td>
<td>RH</td>
<td>relative humidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gOON_{CIMS}</td>
<td>measured by chemical ionization mass spectrometer</td>
<td>S_0</td>
<td>the relative signal at weakest dV compared to the signal under operational dV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR-ToF-AMS</td>
<td>high-resolution time-of-flight aerosol mass spectrometer</td>
<td>TD</td>
<td>thermodenuder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMR</td>
<td>ion-molecule reaction region</td>
<td>TD-LIF</td>
<td>thermal dissociation laser induced fluorescence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>molecular weight</td>
<td>VCP</td>
<td>volatile chemical product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO_x</td>
<td>Sum of NO and NO_2</td>
<td>VOCs</td>
<td>volatile organic compounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.11. Line 247-248. Please explain “high susceptibility influenced by temperature”.

**A1.11:** We revised this sentence in line 293-295:

“The slightly poor correlation of C_{4-5}N groups between gas and aerosol phase was probably caused by less partitioning of substantial formed isoprene-oxidized gOON in the daytime to the pOON compared to other long-chain compounds.”

1.12. Line 253. “photolysis rate” in this sentence is confusing, because reader may think it refers to the photolysis rate of OON. Replace “photolysis rate” with jNO2 or solar radiation.

**A1.12:** “Photolysis rate” was replaced with “jNO2” in line 300.

1.13. Line 258. It should be figure 1d, instead of figure 1f.

**A1.13:** Corrected (in line 305).

1.14. Line 282. replace “NO/NOx concentration” with “NO and NOx concentrations”.

**A1.14:** Corrected (in line 330).

1.15. Line 312 and Text S4. If the reviewer understands correctly, the “seasonal decompose analysis” removes the seasonal variation from the diurnal variation. However, the data only include one-month measurement and it is not clear why this analysis is necessary. Also, text S4 does not clearly describe the method at all. This method section should be expanded.

**A1.15:** The “seasonal decompose analysis” is the original name of the method, which is always used to resolve long-term and repeated variation in term of years and seasonal variation. The two variation trends are similar to a combination of two filters with large and small bandwidth, which can be adjusted. Here we changed the “bandwidth” of the method by replacing seasonal variation with hour variation and replacing long-term variation in term of years with days. We reserved this expression of “seasonal decompose analysis” in the manuscript for its original application. To clarify this, we revised the sentence in line 400-403 of the main text:

“To elucidate this large uncertainty, a seasonal decomposition method (Hilas et al., 2006), which was performed by locally weighted linear regression to decompose the time series into three components, i.e., trend component, seasonal component and remainder, was applied (detailed process can be found in Text S4). By replacing
seasonal variation with hour variation, the method can down weight the impact of daily peak intensity variation.”

In addition, we expanded the method section Text S4 in the supporting information to introduce more details about this method:

“A time series usually comprises three components: a long-term trend, seasonal fluctuation, and a remainder component (containing anything else in the time series). A long-term trend is a tendency or state of affairs in which a phenomenon develops and changes continuously over a longer period of time. Seasonal fluctuation is the regular variation caused by seasonal change. The time series decomposition can distill the component of repeatability from complex data. This method is similar to the combination of two filters with large and small bandwidth. The bandwidth can be adjusted for different time resolution. If an additive decomposition was assumed, the Eq. is:

\[ y_t = S_t + T_t + R_t \]  \hspace{1cm} (S10)

where \( y_t \) is the data, \( S_t \) is the seasonal fluctuation, \( T_t \) is the long-term trend, and \( R_t \) is the remainder component, all at period \( t \). Taking 24 hours as the “season” in the calculation, i.e., adjusting the “bandwidth”, we can get a clearer diurnal variation preventing the trend blurred by the varies intensity between days. The detailed process of the calculation applied in this paper can refer to Hilas et al. (2006).”

1.16. Line 340. For the strong BB emission period, are VOCs from BB considered in the calculation of OON production rate?

A1.16: The VOCs considered in the calculation of OON production rate are the same during the whole campaign, including the strong BB emission period here. VOCs from biomass burning emissions include alkanes, alkenes, aromatics (e.g., phenol and cresol), and terpenes (e.g., isoprene and monoterpenes) (Gilman et al. 2015; Liu et al. 2017). Thus, the calculation of OON production rate during the strong BB emission period shall include VOCs from biomass burning. To clarify this, we added brief discussion in line 370-372 of the main text:

“The precursors, e.g., alkanes, alkenes, aromatics (phenol and cresol), and terpenes (isoprene and monoterpenes), considered in the calculation were also contributed by biomass burning (Liu et al., 2017; Gilman et al., 2015), especially during the strong biomass burning emission period.”

1.17. Line 413. Please rewrite this sentence because RO2+NO produces either RONO2 or O3.
The sentence was revised in line 468-470:

“Fig. 6a shows a strong correlation between secondary gOON and O₃ (R = 0.83, slope = 0.02 µg m⁻³/ppb), which is within expectation as the major channel of gOON formation between peroxy radicals (RO₂) and NO can lead to the formation of ONs and O₃ by continual radical propagation and photolysis of NO₂ (Perring et al., 2013; Xu et al., 2021a).”

1.18. Figure S21. Please explain why ALWC (RH and others) is correlated with pOON/Ox, instead of pOON?

The ALWC is correlated with “secondary pOON/Ox” (pOONₘₐₚ/Ox) as shown in Fig. S23 (original Fig. S21) in the revised supporting information. Using pOONₘₐₚ/Ox instead of pOONₘₐₚ was originated from Herndon et al. (2008) and Wood et al. (2010). Both studies showed that the observed [OOA]/[Ox] roughly serves as a useful tool to represent the calculated production of SOA vs production of Ox (P[SOA]/P[Ox]). As cited equation shown below:

\[ \frac{\Delta [\text{SOA}]}{\Delta [\text{Ox}]} \approx \frac{P[\text{SOA}]}{P[\text{Ox}]} \] (Wood et al., 2010)

In the recent studies, the variation of OOA/Ox ratios have been attributed to several factor including photochemical oxidation, heterogenous/aqueous reaction, and mixing with air aloft that contains residual SOA and Oₓ during boundary layer growth (Hu et al., 2016; Hayes et al., 2013; Nault et al., 2021). Nault et al. (2021) found the ratio of [OOA]/[Ox] is highly correlated with the BTEX fraction (Benzene, Toluene, Ethylbenzene and Xylene) in total measured VOCs among different urban areas across the world. Compared with short chain VOCs, the BTEX VOCs are more efficient to form SOA than Oₓ, resulting a higher OOA/Ox ratio. Multiple studies also found the OOA/Ox ratio also increases when there are heterogeneous/aqueous reactions which can lead to extra SOA formation but not Oₓ (Zhang et al., 2018; Zhan et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2017; Dai et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2016). In this study, we applied a similar concept of OOA/Ox to pOONₘₐₚ/Ox, since pOONₘₐₚ is part of SOA.

The pOONₘₐₚ/Ox ratios that positively correlated with ALWC and wet aerosol surface area suggested that the pOONₘₐₚ formed by heterogenous/aqueous reaction partially account for the increasing ratio compared to gas-phase photochemistry (together with Oₓ formation). If absolute pOONₘₐₚ instead of pOONₘₐₚ/Ox was used, the correlation between RH (ALWC) and pOONₘₐₚ would probably be influenced by meteorological factors (e.g., boundary layer height), introducing more ambiguity of the conclusion. Thus, the pOONₘₐₚ/Ox instead of pOONₘₐₚ was applied here.

To clarify this, we added relative description and revised the caption of Figure S23:
“Figure S23. The ratio of Secondary (Sec.) pOON to Ox versus the (a) RH, (b) aerosol liquid water content (ALWC), (c) wet aerosol surface area, and (d) ambient temperature color-coded using the RH during the campaign. Regression slopes between pOON and Ox in photochemically processed urban emissions provide a metric to investigate the relative efficiency of pOON versus O3 formation during photochemical oxidation (Wood et al., 2010; Hayes et al., 2013). The different values of secondary pOON/Ox ratio can be attributed to photochemical oxidation from different VOC constituent (Nault et al., 2021), heterogenous/aqueous reaction (Zhang et al., 2018; Zhan et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2017; Dai et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2016), and mixing with air aloft that contains residual pOON and O3 during boundary layer growth (Wood et al., 2010). The secondary pOON/Ox ratios that positive correlated with ALWC and wet aerosol surface area suggested that partial pOON might be formed by heterogenous/aqueous reaction, which can efficiently produce secondary pOON but inefficiently on Ox.”
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