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Experimental and modeling studies of secondary organic aerosol formation and some applications to the marine boundary layer

Song Gao,^1 Dean A. Hegg,^1 Glendon Frick,^2 Peter F. Caffrey,^2 Louise Pasternack,^2 Chris Cantrell,^3 William Sullivan,^4 John Ambrusko,^4 Thomas Albrechcinski,^4 and Thomas W. Kirchstetter^5

Abstract. A series of controlled experiments were carried out in the Calspan Corporation’s 600 m³ environmental chamber to study some secondary organic aerosol formation processes. Three precursor-ozone systems were studied: cyclopentene-ozone, cyclohexene-ozone, and α-pinene-ozone. Additionally, SO₂ was added to the initial gas mixture in several instances and was likely present at trace levels in the ostensibly organic-only experiments. It was found that all three systems readily formed new submicron aerosols at very low reactant levels. The chemical composition of formed aerosols was consistent with some previous studies, but the yields of organic products were found to be lower in the Calspan experiments. A three-step procedure is proposed to explain the observed particle nucleation behavior: HO₂ production → H₂SO₄ formation → H₂SO₄·H₂O (perhaps together with NH₃) homogeneous nucleation. It is also proposed that some soluble organic products would partition into the newly formed H₂SO₄·H₂O nuclei, enhance water condensation, and quickly grow these nuclei into a larger size range. While the observations in the two cycloolefin-ozone systems could be well explained by these proposed mechanisms, the exact nature of the nucleation process in the α-pinene-ozone system remains rather opaque and could be the result of nucleation involving certain organics. The results from three simple modeling studies further support these proposals. Their applicability to the marine boundary layer (MBL) is also discussed in some detail. Particularly, such a particle nucleation and growth process could play an important role in secondary aerosol formation and, quite likely, CCN formation as well in certain MBL regions.

1. Introduction

Organic aerosols have recently received immense attention as organic compounds have been found to be important constituents of atmospheric aerosols. It has been reported that total organic carbon can comprise 25-65% of the fine aerosol (diameter <2.5 micron) mass in local regions [Wolff et al., 1991; Chow et al., 1994; Novakov et al., 1997]. In the marine boundary layer (MBL), according to the results from the First Aerosol Characterization Experiment (ACE 1), at least 10% of the marine aerosol mass is organic matter. In fact, organics and sulfate have been found to be often present in a single aerosol particle [Murphy et al., 1998]. There have also been measurements showing that in both the polluted and background marine atmosphere, organic aerosols can play as important a role in cloud condensation nucleus (CCN) formation as sulfate aerosols [Novakov and Penner, 1993; Matsumoto et al., 1997]. In addition, some laboratory studies have pointed out that aerosols composed of certain organic species as well as inorganic/organic mixtures have the ability to become CCN at typical atmospheric supersaturations [Cruz and Pandis, 1997, 1998; Corrigan and Novakov, 1999]. Because these organic compounds have quite different chemical, physical, hygroscopic, and optical properties from their inorganic counterparts, they could play significant and distinctive roles in aerosol and cloud-related processes, for example, affecting the direct and indirect aerosol climate forcing. However, despite their potential importance, there is still no complete inventory of organic compounds comprising fine aerosols due to their chemical complexity and the lack of appropriate analytical methods.

Among the known species, dicarboxylic acids (C₂ - C₁₀) are now recognized as ubiquitous components in the water-soluble portion of marine aerosols as well as polar and urban aerosols [Grosjean et al., 1978; Kawamura et al., 1996; Kawamura and Sakaguchi, 1999]. On average, these dicarboxylic acids can account for up to 16% of total organic aerosol mass in remote marine environments [Kawamura and Sakaguchi, 1999]. Some of the soluble dicarboxylic acids have been proven to be able to act as CCN at typical supersaturations in the MBL [e.g., Corrigan and Novakov, 1999]. Yet, not surprisingly, a lot of uncertainties still remain as to the atmospheric roles of these homologous compounds. One immediate concern is related to their secondary aerosol formation potential. It has long been postulated that dicarboxylic acids in the aerosols
could be produced by in situ chemical oxidation of precursor compounds (anthropogenic and/or natural) followed by partitioning of the gaseous diacid products into the particulate phase [Grosjean et al., 1978; Satsumabayashi et al., 1990]. Reaction pathways of cycloolefins and ozone to produce diacids have been proposed in some detail through laboratory studies [Hatakeyama et al., 1985, 1987; Kalberer et al., 2000]. These smog chamber experiments showed particulate dicarboxylic acids were indeed formed from cycloolefin precursors. However, the concentrations of olefins and ozone that were used were often at least 4 to 5 orders of magnitude higher than the expected values in the MBL. In some other cases there were already seed particles present before the reactants were introduced into the chamber. Thus there is a need to explore if particulate diacids can be produced from precursors at ambient levels with no preexisting particles, and if so, how are these acids incorporated into the particulate phase (via homogeneous nucleation or other mechanisms)? Could sulfate and its formation be related to the organic aerosol formation process in some way? Additionally, what are the effects of such a process on aerosol and perhaps CCN formation in certain MBL regions where preexisting aerosols are at low concentrations (100-300 cm$^{-3}$) and cycloolefins could be present due to transport from the continent or other sources? These uncertainties also apply to many biogenic hydrocarbons which are emitted globally in large quantities and have considerable reactivity toward atmospheric oxidants [Simpson et al., 1995; Hoffmann et al., 1997]. For example, monoterpens (α-pinene and analogous compounds), which are estimated to comprise 11% of volatile organic compounds emitted by vegetation [Guenther et al., 1995], can be easily oxidized to produce condensable products exhibiting high aerosol yields. A number of smog chamber experiments and modeling efforts have been carried out to study monoterpene oxidation systems [Odum et al., 1996; Hoffmann et al., 1997, 1998; Koch et al., 2000]. However, many results, while certainly of importance, are still highly speculative due to the complexity of the problem.

This work attempts to address the above specific uncertainties via controlled laboratory studies. We designed and carried out a series of experiments in the Calspan Corporation’s environmental chamber to simulate some secondary organic aerosol formation processes and investigate the roles of organic products in particle formation, including comparisons with the better studied sulfates. Diagnostic modeling calculations were performed, prompted by some interesting experimental results. The applicability of these results to certain MBL regions is also discussed in this work.

2. Experimental Procedure

The Calspan Corporation’s 600 m$^3$ chamber was carefully characterized in May 1998, when both physical and chemical measurements were made to test its functioning for chemical reaction and particle formation experiments. In addition, the concentration of background contaminants and wall loss of gases and particles in the clean chamber were determined. A more detailed description is given in a report on the characterization of the chamber [Hoppel et al., 1999].

The main experiments were carried out in the characterized chamber in October and November of 1998. Three hydrocarbon precursor-ozone systems were studied: cyclopentene-ozone, cyclohexene-ozone, and α-pinene-ozone. These three systems have been studied extensively but in most cases, either at precursor concentrations that are much higher than plausible values or in the presence of seed aerosol in the chamber [e.g., Hatakeyama et al., 1985, 1987; Hoffmann et al., 1997]. The fact that all these experiments have reported some sort of particle formation and the potential presence of these specific precursors (or related compounds) in certain regions of the atmosphere warrant another carefully designed laboratory study for our earlier-stated purposes. The experimental procedure was similar for all three systems, and is described as follows.

The chamber air was routinely filtered through charcoal and aerosol filters overnight to get a “clean” chamber. After such filtering, the mixing ratios of SO$_2$, NO$_x$, and O$_3$ were below detection limits of 0.1 ppbv, 0.5 ppbv, and 1 ppbv, respectively. The particle number concentration was always below 0.1 cm$^{-3}$. Then, for example, about 50 ppbv cyclopentene and 100 ppbv ozone were sequentially injected into this clean chamber and quickly mixed by a mixing fan. An air sample was drawn from the chamber at 15-min intervals and subsequently analyzed by a GC-MS to obtain the hydrocarbon precursor concentrations. The ozone concentration was continuously measured with a Dasibi Model 1008 ozone analyzer. The concentration of SO$_2$ was measured by a pulsed fluorescence SO$_2$ analyzer (Thermo Environmental Corp. Model 43S) continuously. A tunable diode laser absorption system (TDLAS) was employed to monitor the concentrations of NH$_3$ and H$_2$O$_2$ in the chamber. The NH$_3$ concentration was also monitored by a thermo oxidation NH$_3$ to NO$_x$ converter (Dasibi Model 2109) coupled with a NO$_x$ analyzer (Thermo Environmental Corp. Model 42) and compared with the measurements by TDLAS. The hydroxyl and peroxy radical concentrations were monitored by NCAR’s chemical ionization mass spectrometer (CIMS). The particle number concentration in the chamber was measured by a TSI 3025A (r > 3 nm) and a TSI 3022 (r > 10 nm) particle counter simultaneously (at 90% counting efficiency). A differential mobility analyzer (DMA) from Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) was used to obtain the particle size distribution (threshold r > 5 nm), from which calculated values of the particle volume density and surface area were derived. The chamber temperature, pressure, and relative humidity were monitored by respective NRL instruments. Such an experiment was repeated and/or carried out under slightly different conditions, for example, at a different RH or with a different amount of added SO$_2$ or NH$_3$, to examine their effects on particle formation. It is worth noting that since the DMA actually measures dry aerosol properties, the measured aerosol size and volume should be corrected to obtain the actual values in the more humid chamber. However, since most of our discussions in the next section are based on comparisons of a set of measurements at a similar RH, such a correction can be ignored in these cases. We will, on the other hand, perform such hygroscopic corrections in the “Partitioning of glutaric acid into the fresh H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O nuclei” modeling calculations.

The aerosols produced, if any, were collected onto a dual tandem filter arrangement (Teflon filter followed by quartz filter in one path, tandem quartz filters in another parallel path) connected to the chamber through the wall [Turpin et al., 1994]. Each Teflon filter was then dissolved in 10 mL deionized water, and the extract was analyzed by a DIONEX DX500
ion chromatography system to identify water-soluble compounds in the aerosols. The quartz filters were analyzed with an evolved gas analysis (EGA) method at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory for total carbon (TC) mass. This method has been described in detail in several recent publications [e.g., Novakov et al., 1997]. The dual tandem filter arrangement was used to correct the estimates of aerosol carbon mass for the possible adsorption of organic vapors onto the quartz filters.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. Particle Nucleation in the Hydrocarbon-Ozone Systems

In all three hydrocarbon-ozone systems, new submicron particles were formed at low precursor levels, as is shown in Table 1. In the case of November 10 the particle number concentration in the chamber was below 10 particles/cm³ before 50 ppb of cyclopentene and 100 ppb of ozone were injected into the chamber. Within 3 min after injections, ultrafine particles started to be detected by the TSI 3025A particle counter (r > 1.5 nm, at 50% counting efficiency). The DMA started to detect particles (r > 5 nm) and measure their size distribution within 10 min after the nucleation onset. The particle number concentration increased steadily and reached a maximum of 2600 cm⁻³ (Nₚ₁) in about 30 min. In the meantime the mean radius of the formed particles reached a maximum of 32 nm (Rₚ₃), while the volume density (Vₚ₃) reached 0.40 μm³/cm³. Qualitatively, similar behaviors were observed in the cyclohexene-ozone system and α-pinene-ozone system (Table 1) where new submicron particles were formed.

In contrast, when 100 ppb ozone alone was injected into the clean chamber on October 10, almost no new particles were formed in the next hour of observation. The measured particle concentration was always below 20 cm⁻³. During the 30 min from the nucleation onset, the mean radius of particles never exceeded 5 nm (not detected by the DMA), and the particle volume density was always below 0.02 μm³/cm³. The much smaller Rₚ₃ and Vₚ₃ here are in sharp contrast with those in the hydrocarbon-ozone experiments as shown in Table 1. Clearly, the oxidation products of these organic precursors significantly contributed to the new submicron particle production in the chamber. While such a particle formation behavior in the cycloolefin-ozone and monoterpeno-ozone systems has been reported in some earlier smog chamber studies [Hatakeyama et al., 1985, 1987, 1989], the concentrations of the hydrocarbon precursors they used were much higher (up to 3 orders of magnitude). Our results show that at mixing ratios of tens of ppbv, much closer to the possible values in the MBL [Grosjean et al., 1978; Bonsang et al., 1991], these cycloolefins and monoterpenes can readily form new submicron particles in the presence of ozone.

We note the average concentrations of cycloolefins in the MBL are possibly even lower than in this study. However, in some MBL regions such as those near urban centers, cycloolefins could potentially reach ppbv levels due to offshore transport under certain conditions. Therefore our results in this study can be directly applicable to such MBL regions where hydrocarbon precursor concentrations are somewhat elevated.

3.2. Chemical Analyses of Formed Aerosol

It is important to know what chemical species in these precursor-ozone reaction systems were produced and incorporated into the particulate phase. The initial conditions as well as the mass concentrations and molar yields of particulate products identified by ion chromatography (IC) are listed in Table 2. The carbon-based molar yield of a product (in the aerosol), which indicates the percentage of the reactant converted into this product, is defined by \( \Delta \text{product (mol) x carbon number of the product} \) / (Ahydrocarbon (mol) x carbon number of the hydrocarbon). The molecular structures of the three hydrocarbon precursors, selected oxidation products, and possible reaction intermediate (Criegee intermediate) are listed in Table 3.

The three cyclopentene (CP)-ozone cases show that glutaric acid was the most abundant particulate product identified by IC, followed by succinic acid. The ratio of C5 to C4 diacid yield was about 6 in all three CP-O₃ cases, which implies a stable reaction mechanism for dicarboxylic acid productions with distinct branching ratios could exist. However, this awaits further investigation. Comparing the total diacid mass concentration (from IC) with the aerosol volume concentration measured by DMA, if we assume an aerosol mass density of 1 g/cm³, dicarboxylic acids constitute about 15% of the total aerosol mass, which is consistent with earlier findings [Hatakeyama et al., 1987]. This also consistently shows secondary aerosol components in the CP-O₃ system could include other oxidation products, predominantly dialdehydes and ω-oxo carboxylic acids. The most abundant aerosol components in the cyclohexene-ozone case, identified by IC,
Table 2. Initial Conditions, Chemical Composition, and Molar Yields of Products in Selected Hydrocarbon-Ozone Experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrocarbon</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>[HC]₀, ppb</th>
<th>[O₃]₀, ppb</th>
<th>T, °C/RH, %</th>
<th>∆[HC]₀ Molar Yield of Identified Species, µg m⁻³</th>
<th>Carbon-Based Molar Yield, %</th>
<th>Molar Yield (% of Total Dicarboxylic Acids)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclopentene</td>
<td>Oct. 10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27/66</td>
<td>glutarate 0.41</td>
<td>GA 0.17</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 14 before noon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24/68</td>
<td>glutarate 0.27</td>
<td>GA 0.13</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 14 after noon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24/70</td>
<td>glutarate 0.57</td>
<td>SA 0.02</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclohexene</td>
<td>Oct. 16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>25/43</td>
<td>glutarate 0.30</td>
<td>GA 0.14</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>26/48</td>
<td>glutarate 0.30</td>
<td>SA 0.01</td>
<td>3.7 (carbon) N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25/29</td>
<td>glutarate 0.30</td>
<td>AA 0.14</td>
<td>3.8 (carbon) N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* [HC]₀ is the initial mixing ratio of hydrocarbon, [O₃]₀ is the initial mixing ratio of ozone, T (°C) is the temperature in the chamber, RH (%) is the relative humidity in the chamber, ∆[HC]₀ is the hydrocarbon consumed during the 40-min period; mass concentration is that of each organic product identified by the IC. GA, glutaric acid; SA, succinic acid; AA, adipic acid; SF, sulfuric acid; TC, total carbon; N/A, not available.

CTentatively identified as AA. It could also be one of its isomers, e.g., a hydroxy-ketoacid.

Table 3. Molecular Structures of Hydrocarbon (HC) Precursors, a Possible Reaction Intermediate, and Selected Oxidation Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HC Precursor (and a Possible Reaction Intermediate)</th>
<th>Molecular Structure</th>
<th>Selected Oxidation Product</th>
<th>Molecular Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cyclopentene</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Cyclopentene Structure" /></td>
<td>succinic acid</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="succinic acid Structure" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclohexene</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Cyclohexene Structure" /></td>
<td>glutaric acid</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="glutaric acid Structure" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α-pinene</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="α-pinene Structure" /></td>
<td>adipic acid</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="adipic acid Structure" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criegee intermediate (in cyclopentene-ozone system)*</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Criegee intermediate Structure" /></td>
<td>pinonic acid⁶</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="pinonic acid Structure" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A possible reaction intermediate in the cyclopentene-ozone reaction system. Criegee intermediates in other precursor-ozone systems are analogous to this one in structure.

⁶One of the identified ozonolysis products of α-pinene.
typical sampling volume of 4 m\(^3\)). The overall uncertainty for measured diacid concentrations was about ±20%. With NaOH as the eluent and a gradient elution method, each diacid eluted at a specific elution time that was determined by running a standard compound under the same IC condition. The separation of those consecutively eluted diacids was reasonably good. For example, the resolution between the adjacent glutarate and succinate peaks was, on average, 80%.

It is interesting to note that the carbon-based molar yields of total diacids in aerosols are quite a bit lower in our experiments (-0.2% in CP-O\(_3\) case; -0.3% in CH-O\(_3\) case) than in those carried out by Hatakeyama et al. [1985, 1987] (-0.6% in CP-O\(_3\) case; -6%, in CH-O\(_3\) case). Such comparisons are made with regard to the yields after about the same reaction time. As discussed in more detail later, this yield difference could be due to the fact that the initial ozone (and cycloolefin) concentrations in those earlier experiments were at least 3 orders of magnitude higher than in the experiments reported here. The lower initial concentrations led to smaller amounts of organic products in the gas phase which, due to the resultant lower driving force, partitioned into the particulate phase at much smaller amounts.

It is also worth noting that the above mass concentrations and yields, in most cases, are based upon the measurements of aerosol samples collected during a 40-min interval, usually starting \(\frac{1}{2}\) hour from the nucleation onset. However, previous studies suggest that if the formed aerosols were given enough time to evolve in the chamber (e.g., 24 hours), dicarboxylic acids could actually comprise more than 50% (mass) of the total secondary aerosol products [e.g., Hatakeyama et al., 1987]. Earlier experimental data strongly suggest a sequential oxidation mechanism, in which further oxidations of some intermediate products to diacids could slowly take place on the aerosol surface or in the gas phase. Because of the shortage of time, we were not able to collect aerosols after such a long time (24 hours). However, it should be kept in mind that in the ambient atmosphere, where enough time is often available, the dicarboxylic acids can have much higher aerosol yields than those shown in Table 2. These diacids can therefore comprise a major mass fraction of the secondary aerosols formed in similar cycloolefin-ozone systems. This provides an important basis for our later modeling calculations.

The mass concentrations of total organic carbon in the collected aerosols in the October 10, October 16, and November 14 after noon cases were 6 \(\mu\)gC/m\(^3\), 1.01 \(\mu\)gC/m\(^3\), and 1.26 \(\mu\)gC/m\(^3\), respectively, according to the EGA results. The total aerosol mass concentrations, derived from the DMA measurements, were 5.3 \(\mu\)g/m\(^3\), 3.62 \(\mu\)g/m\(^3\), and 4.82 \(\mu\)g/m\(^3\), respectively, in the above three cases, assuming a unit density of the aerosol. However, it is quite difficult to compare these two sets of measurements in a straightforward manner due to at least two uncertainties: the uncertainty of the aerosol density and the uncertainty of the average molecular weight of aerosol organic matter. The sampling artifacts of the EGA method could further add to the difficulty of any direct comparison [Huebert and Charlson, 2000]. Nevertheless, these measured organic carbon concentrations and total aerosol mass concentrations support our contention that secondary aerosols are indeed formed in the cycloolefin-ozone systems under atmospheric conditions and they contain a large fraction of organic matter.

In several previous studies, secondary aerosol formation from reaction of \(\alpha\)-pinene with O\(_3\) has been observed and a series of oxidation products have been identified, some of which are suspected to play important roles in new particle formation [Hatakeyama et al., 1989; Hoffmann et al., 1998]. However, no organic product was detected by the IC in the aerosol samples collected in the \(\alpha\)-pinene-ozone experiments in the Calspan chamber. In contrast, the EGA results showed high yields of particulate carbon (-4% yield), as shown in Table 2. These results strongly suggest at the low reactant levels used in the Calspan chamber, low-volatility, rather insoluble and/or nonpolar products were produced and incorporated into the particulate phase. However, the chemical nature of these oxidation products still awaits further elucidation despite some recent attempts [e.g., Yu et al., 1999].

### Table 4. Nucleation and Growth Behaviors of H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) and Cyclopentene-Ozone Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 ppbv Ozone</td>
<td>10 ppbv SO(_2)</td>
<td>50 ppbv Cyclopentene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T), øC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R)H, %</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J_n) (\text{cm}^{-3}\text{s}^{-1})</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R_n) (\text{nm})</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>over 100 K</td>
<td>2.6 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V_p) (\text{b} \text{cm}^{-3})</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(J_n\) is particle nucleation rate derived from particle counter measurements.

These notations are identical to those used in Table 1.

In Table 4 the average time derivative of particle number concentrations, measured by TSI 3025A particle counter, is calculated as an indication of the particle nucleation rate \(J_n\). When only ozone was in the chamber (October 10, 1998), the particle nucleation rate was negligible (-0). When SO\(_2\) or cyclopentene was added into the chamber, \(J_n\) was enhanced. However, at similar \(T\) and RH, the enhancement of \(J_n\) in the SO\(_2\)-O\(_3\) case was 2 orders of magnitude greater than in the cyclopentene-ozone case. Also, far higher maximum particle concentration was observed in the SO\(_2\)-O\(_3\) case as seen from the differences of \(N_p\). These particles were very small (mean radius \(R_p \sim 5 \text{ nm}\)) during the 40-min observation period and had a very low volume density \((V_p \sim 0.003 \ \mu\text{g/m}^3\)) in contrast to the much larger particles (but less in number concentration) eventually formed in the cyclopentene-ozone system. Such a contrast was also observed in other SO\(_2\)-O\(_3\) and cyclopentene-ozone cases. In addition, cyclohexene-ozone exhibited a similar behavior to the cyclopentene-ozone system. These results clearly indicate SO\(_2\)-O\(_3\) system has a much greater particle nucleation potential than cycloolefin-ozone system whereas the latter produced much larger particles. The \(\alpha\)-pinene-ozone system is somewhat different than the two cycloolefin-ozone systems: while particles also grew to a similarly large size eventually \((R_p \sim 30 \text{ nm}, \text{Table 1})\), far more particles were formed in the meantime. In fact, the particle number concentration in the \(\alpha\)-pinene-ozone case was found to be usually higher than the cycloolefin-ozone case, but lower...
than the SO$_2$-O$_3$ case, when the precursor concentrations were comparable (e.g., see Tables 1 and 4).

Perhaps the most interesting fact here is that in the October 13 case, a huge number of tiny particles were produced in the SO$_2$-O$_3$ system. Such a behavior agrees with the much studied behavior of H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O homogeneous nucleation. Indeed, H$_2$SO$_4$ is the only common species that has a low enough vapor pressure to nucleate new particles at such a high rate. On the other hand, it is well known that, in the gas phase (dark condition, no ozone photolysis), SO$_2$ and O$_3$ would react to produce H$_2$SO$_4$ only at an extremely slow rate. Reaction with HO$_2$ is the dominant oxidation process of SO$_2$ [Stockwell and Calvert, 1983]. Hence the following pathway is proposed to interpret the observed particle formation in SO$_2$-O$_3$ cases:

In the dark chamber, particle production was in fact due to H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O homogeneous nucleation. Hydroxyl, the needed oxidant for SO$_2$, was produced from the oxidation of background hydrocarbons rather than ozone photolysis. The characterization of the "clean" chamber showed that low though significant amounts of hydrocarbons were in the overnight filtered chamber. For example, a few ppbv halokanes and aromatic compounds were detected by a GC-MS [Hoppel et al., 1999]. This suggests that more reactive hydrocarbons such as alkenes (for which no specific analysis was made, i.e., no standards were run) could also have been present. These hydrocarbons could have reacted with the injected O$_3$ to produce Criegee intermediates and HO$_2$, the latter often being produced with a high yield [Atkinson, 1994]. Then either the Criegee intermediate or HO$_2$ could easily oxidize the injected SO$_2$ to produce H$_2$SO$_4$, followed by particle nucleation. Calculations indicate the Criegee intermediates would react quickly with water vapor in the chamber or go through other oxidation processes, leaving HO$_2$ as the most possible oxidant for SO$_2$ oxidation. The validity of such a pathway is further supported by the observed HO$_2$ production detected by the CIMS after ozone was injected into the "clean" chamber. In all the cases where 30 ppbv or more of ozone was injected, CIMS immediately detected the production of HO$_2$ at up to 20 pptv in mixing ratio. The recent hypothesis of stable sulfate clusters (1-3 nm in diameter) serving as a source of new atmospheric particles [Kulmala et al., 2000], based on theoretical calculations and model simulations, is quite consistent with our proposal stated above. To better understand the particle formation process in the cyclopentene-ozone case, and in hydrocarbon-ozone cases in general, we carried out two further experiments as described below.

### 3.4. Impact of SO$_2$ on Particle Formation in Hydrocarbon-Ozone Systems

In the four cases listed in Table 5, similar amounts of \( \alpha \)-pinene and O$_3$ were added into the chamber. In fact, \([O_3] \times [\alpha \text{-pinene}]\) varied by less than 10%, which means the production rate and amount of organic compounds would vary within 10%. Different amounts of SO$_2$ were added into the chamber between \( \alpha \)-pinene and ozone injections. The small amounts of added SO$_2$ should not affect the ozone amount (thus the oxidation of \( \alpha \)-pinene) in the four cases by more than 6%. However, we see significant variations in the particle formation behavior (e.g., at least by a factor of 2 for \( J_n \)), presumably attributable to the added SO$_2$. When more SO$_2$ was in the chamber before the nucleation onset, the nucleation rate \( J_n \) turned out to be faster; more particles (larger \( N_m \)) were formed, and the mean size of the particles \( R_m \) showed a decreasing trend. Such an impact of SO$_2$ on particle formation was also observed in the cyclopentene-ozone system and cyclohexene-ozone system. These results show that in these hydrocarbon-ozone systems, even a few ppbv of SO$_2$, if present, would play a crucial role in nucleating new particles. Furthermore, our model calculations, described in detail in section 4.1, suggest the gaseous organic products in these two cycloolefin-ozone systems do not readily form new particles through homogeneous nucleation. Therefore it is reasonable to believe that trace amounts of H$_2$SO$_4$ (from SO$_2$ oxidation) initiated particle nucleation in the cycloolefin-ozone cases where SO$_2$ could certainly have been present at trace levels (<0.1 ppbv). In the \( \alpha \)-pinene-ozone cases (e.g., November 9, Table 5), more particles were formed than in the cycloolefin-ozone cases (e.g., November 10, Table 4) under similar \( T \) and RH. We have shown earlier that high yields of organic products (carbon) were found in the aerosols in the \( \alpha \)-pinene-ozone system (Table 2). The possibility then exists that some organic products in this particular system contributed to new particle formation through homogeneous nucleation. However, the huge particle nucleation potential of H$_2$SO$_4$ as shown in Tables 5 and 4 also suggests that sulfuric acid could still be the major nucleating species even in the \( \alpha \)-pinene-ozone system. On the other hand, it is again evident \( R_m \) in Tables 5, 4, and 1) that oxidation products of hydrocarbon precursors grew the fresh nuclei into a much larger size range than in the SO$_2$-O$_3$ system.

### 3.5. Impact of Water Vapor Partial Pressure on Hydrocarbon-Ozone Particle Formation

In the case of the cyclopentene-ozone system the relative humidity was changed to study the impact of water vapor partial pressure \( P_{w,v} \) on particle formation. The results, listed in Table 6, indicate that a higher \( P_{w,v} \) produced more particles (larger \( N_m \)) and increased the nucleation rate \( J_n \). When we consider the binary nucleation rate equation: \( J = 4 \pi n_i n_f \beta_i \exp(-\Delta G_i/kT) \), where \( n_i \) is water molecule (component 1) concentration and \( \beta_i \) is the impingement rate of another nucleating species (component 2), it is conceivable that the nucleation we observed was quite possibly a binary (or even ternary) nucleation system with water as one nucleating species. As we have mentioned in section 3.4 and will further show with some modeling calculations, such a nucleating system is most
likely \(H_2SO_4\cdotH_2O\) in the ostensibly cycloolefin-ozone case. Analogous to the pathway we proposed earlier in section 3.3, the following (a)-(b)-(c) three-step procedure would produce fresh \(H_2SO_4\cdotH_2O\) nuclei:

\[
CP + O_3 \rightarrow \text{Criegee intermediate} + \cdot OH \rightarrow SO_2 (\text{trace}) \rightarrow H_2SO_4
\]

\[\text{Further } [O] \]

\[H_2O (NH_3)\]

\[\text{GA, SA, other products, and water vapor } \rightarrow \text{partitioning} \rightarrow \text{fresh nuclei} \rightarrow \text{[nucleation]} \]

Even though SO\(_2\) was below the detection limit of the SO\(_2\) analyzer, trace amounts (i.e., lower than 0.1 ppbv) were very likely present that could be quickly oxidized to produce \(H_2SO_4\). In fact, in the case of November 14 before noon (Table 6), 1-2 ppt of \(H_2SO_4\) vapor was detected by the CIMS during the 20-min period after cyclopentene and ozone were injected into the chamber. Considering also the likely presence of NH\(_3\) (a few pptv at least) as a contaminant, such a \(H_2SO_4\cdotH_2O\)-NH\(_3\) ternary chamber. Considering also the likely presence of NH\(_3\) (a few pptv at least) as a contaminant, such a \(H_2SO_4\cdotH_2O\)-NH\(_3\) ternary system constitutes one of the best known systems exhibiting a high nucleation potential [Coffinan and Hegg, 1995]. Additionally, as we can see from Table 2, glutaric acid (GA), succinic acid (SA), and other organic products were produced in much larger quantities than if no cyclopentene was injected. A possible reaction pathway from cyclopentene to its oxidation products is through the formation of a Criegee intermediate and its further oxidation, as depicted above. Considering their low volatility (compared with other gaseous products, e.g., formic acid) and appreciable water solubility, these diacids are expected to partition into the fresh \(H_2SO_4\cdotH_2O\) nuclei, initiate substantial water condensation and quickly grow the particles into a larger size range (-30 nm). Such a scheme could well explain many of our observations, for example:

1. In the \(SO_2\cdotO_3\) case (Table 4, October 13) the oxidation products from background hydrocarbons alone did not provide enough mass (to initiate substantial water condensation), thus never grew the nuclei big enough to be detected by the DMA \((R_a \text{ always below } 5 \text{ nm during the 40-min observation period})\).

2. In the \(O_3\)-only case (Table 4, October 10) the lack of hydrocarbon precursors yielded very little hydroxyl so that, with possibly only a trace amount of \(SO_2\) in the chamber, very little \(H_2SO_4\) was produced, and essentially no particle production was observed.

3. In the cases listed in Table 5, with similar amounts of organic species (and water) for partitioning, the mean particle size decreased as the initial \(SO_2\) mixing ratio increased, since more \(H_2SO_4\cdotH_2O\) fresh nuclei would be formed at the higher \(SO_2\) levels and share the available partitioning species.

4. When \(SO_2\) was deliberately added into the chamber with hydrocarbon and ozone (e.g., November 14 after noon case in Table 2), sulfate was detected in the collected aerosol samples due to the relatively large mass of produced \(H_2SO_4\). When no \(SO_2\) was injected (so that its concentration was below the detection limit of 0.1 ppbv), the mass of \(H_2SO_4\) produced was so low that no particulate sulfate was detected by the IC (e.g., October 10, November 14 before noon, and October 16 cases in Table 2). On the other hand, the organic species detected in the latter three cases indicated they, rather than sulfate, were the major contributors to the particle growth.

5. It is worth noting that the \(\alpha\)-pinene system could be an exception to this proposed scheme. The ozone oxidation products of \(\alpha\)-pinene could have very low volatility due to the rigid ring structure and large carbon numbers in the molecule. Therefore some of these products could directly participate in the homogeneous nucleation to from new particles [Hoffmann et al., 1998; Koch et al., 2000]. However, as indicated by the same authors, this hypothesis is still highly speculative both experimentally and theoretically. As we have shown in Table 5, just a few ppbv \(SO_2\) would dramatically increase the nucleation rate and new particle number concentration. It seems for many moderately polluted conditions (particularly the MBL), where \(SO_2\) is ubiquitous and terpenes rather rare (except when there are sufficient biogenic emissions), nucleation of \(H_2SO_4\cdotH_2O\) is more likely.

**3.6. Impact of Ammonia on Hydrocarbon-Ozone Particle Formation**

It has been suggested [Coffinan and Hegg, 1995; Korhonen et al., 1999] that ammonia could greatly enhance the binary nucleation rate \(J\) of the \(H_2SO_4\cdotH_2O\) system. For example, the modeling results of Coffinan and Hegg [1995] show when the \(H_2SO_4\) mixing ratio is 2 ppbv, just 1 to 5 ppbv of NH\(_3\) would enhance the \(J\) by 5 to 11 orders of magnitude, respectively. It

| \([\text{Cyclopentene}],^a \text{ ppbv}\) | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| \([\text{Ozone}],^b \text{ ppbv}\) | 100 | 90 | 100 |
| \(T, {^\circ}\text{C}, R_{\text{CRH}}, \%\) | 27/66 | 23/64 | 26/29 |
| \(P_{w^o}, \text{ Pa}\) | 2400 | 1800 | 980 |
| \(J,^c \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}\) | 81.5 | 37.2 | 3.0 |
| \(N,^d \text{ cm}^{-3}\) | 24 K | 14 K | 2.6 K |
| \(R_a,^e \text{ nm}\) | 37 | 40 | 32 |
| \(V,^f \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}\) | 5.3 | 3.7 | 0.54 |
| \(\text{Mass concentration of products, } \mu g \text{ m}^{-3}\) | | | |
| glutarate 0.41; succinate 0.09; | | | |
| glutarate 0.27; succinate 0.05; | | | |
| below detection limit of IC | | | |

---

\(^a\)\([\text{Cyclopentene}]\) is cyclopentene mixing ratio.
\(^b\)\([\text{Ozone}]\) is ozone mixing ratio.
\(^c\)\(P_{w^o}\) is water vapor partial pressure.
\(^d\)These notations are identical to those used in Table 4.

Table 6. Impact of Water Vapor Partial Pressure on Cyclopentene-O\(_3\) Particle Formation
therefore seems necessary to explore whether ammonia has any such effect on particle formation in the hydrocarbon-
ozone systems studied in the Calspan chamber. In the follow-
ing two cases listed in Table 7, different amounts of NH3 were
initially present in the chamber, with α-pinene and ozone,
before the nucleation onset.

Clearly, the change of ammonia mixing ratio had only a
very minor effect (less than a factor of 2) on either particle
nucleation rate $J_n$, maximum particle number concentration
$N_m$, mean particle size at the end of growth $R_m$, or particle
growth, were neither significantly affected by ammonia. The
values of $AG$ defined by

$$
AG = -n_1 kT \ln \left( \frac{S_1}{a_1} \right) - n_2 kT \ln \left( \frac{S_2}{a_2} \right) + 4\pi r^2 \sigma,
$$

where $k$ is the Boltzmann constant, $T$ is the temperature, $S_i$ is
the saturation ratio of component $i$ in the gas phase, $a_i$ is
the activity of component $i$ in cluster solution, $r$ is the radius of a
cluster containing $n_i$ molecules of $H_2O$ and $n_3$ molecules of
GA, and $\sigma$ is the surface tension of the cluster. By definition, we have

![Table 7. Effect of Ammonia on α-Pinene-Ozone Particle Formation](image-url)

4. Modeling Studies of Particle Nucleation and Growth

We have proposed that when cycloolefin and ozone were
present in the chamber, and their reaction products were incor-
porated into secondary aerosols, the actual particle formation
process was homogeneous nucleation of $H_2SO_4$ and $H_2O$ (and
perhaps NH$_3$), followed by partitioning of the organic prod-
ucts and water into the fresh nuclei. The $H_2SO_4$ was produced
by the oxidation of trace amounts of SO$_2$ likely present in the
chamber, whereas the partitioning of organic compounds into
the nuclei was essentially due to their water solubility. Three
simple modeling studies will further show why we believe
these proposals are valid and also lead to some applications of
these findings to secondary aerosol formation in the MBL.

4.1. Feasibility of Glutaric Acid-Water Binary
Nucleation in Forming New Particles

As is shown in Table 2, glutaric acid (GA) is one of the
major water-soluble species in the aerosol produced in the
cyclopentene-ozone system, constituting more than 80%
(mass) of aerosol components detected by ion chromatog-
rphy. Meanwhile, GA is expected to have the highest
particle nucleation potential considering its vapor pressure is
the lowest among the known products (Hatakeyama et al.,
1987). Known reaction mechanisms (e.g., Koch et al., 2000)
actually suggest that GA, with two carboxyl groups in its
molecular structure (and thus a high potential to form hydro-
gen bonds), is presumably the least volatile among the possible
ozonolysis products of cyclopentene. It thus becomes
important to evaluate if GA could indeed be the major nucleat-
ing species. We will study the feasibility of GA-H$_2$O nuclea-
tion by applying the classical binary nucleation theory (e.g.,
Kiang et al., 1973). For our purpose, both hydrate formation
and the Zeldovich nonequilibrium factor are neglected.

The model maps out a free energy surface based on the
values of $AG$ defined by
\[ S_i = \frac{P_i}{P_{i,\text{eqm}}}, \quad a_i = \frac{P_{i,\text{eqm}}}{P_{i,\text{eqm}}}, \]  
\[ \text{where } P_i \text{ is the ambient vapor pressure of component } i, P_{i,\text{eqm}} \text{ is the equilibrium vapor pressure of pure component } i, \text{ and } P_{i,\text{eqm}}^* \text{ is the equilibrium vapor pressure of component } i \text{ over a flat surface of the binary solution with the same composition as the cluster.} \]

\[ \Delta G \text{ in (1) is the free energy required to form a cluster of composition } (n_1 + n_2). \text{ At the saddle point of this free energy surface, the system is minimized. The nucleation rate can then be calculated by multiplying the steady state population of critical clusters by an "impingement rate" of the GA molecules (assumed far less than H}_2\text{O molecules in number concentration):} \]

\[ J = 4\pi r^2 \beta_{ij} N_1 \exp \left( \frac{-\Delta G^*}{kT} \right), \]  
\[ \text{where } N_1 \text{ is the number concentration of water vapor molecules, } \beta_{ij} \text{ is the impingement rate of GA molecules onto critical clusters, } \beta_{ij} = N_1 (kT/(2\pi M_j))^\alpha, M_j \text{ is the mass of one GA molecule, and } \Delta G^* \text{ is the free energy at the saddle point.} \]

The saddle point can be determined by solving

\[ \left( \frac{\partial \Delta G}{\partial n_i} \right) = 0, \quad (i,j=1,2,i \neq j), \]  
\[ \text{which can also be written as} \]

\[ \ln \left( \frac{S_i}{a_i} \right) = \frac{2}{kT} \frac{M_i \sigma}{\rho r} \left[ 1 - \frac{100 - X_i}{\rho} \frac{dp}{dx_i} \right], \]  
\[ \text{where } \rho \text{ is the density of the cluster at the binary composition, } M_i \text{ is the mass of one molecule of component } i, \text{ and } X_i \text{ is the weight percentage of component } i \text{ in the cluster which is defined as} \]

\[ X_i = \frac{100n_i M_i}{n_1 M_1 + n_2 M_2}. \]  
\[ \text{Equation (5) omits the surface tension derivative term } \left( d\rho /dx_i \right), \text{ as in the work of} \text{ Renninger et al. [1981]} \text{ and Wilemski [1984].} \]

At this point, we introduce the following expressions:

\[ \rho = \frac{n_1 M_1 + n_2 M_2}{n_1 M_1 + n_2 M_2} = \frac{X_1}{100} \frac{d\rho_1}{100}, \frac{X_2}{100} \frac{d\rho_2}{100}. \]  
\[ \sigma = \frac{\sigma_1 M_1 + \sigma_2 M_2}{n_1 M_1 + n_2 M_2} = \frac{X_1}{100} \sigma_1 + \frac{X_2}{100} \sigma_2. \]  
\[ \text{where } \rho_1 \text{ and } \rho_2 \text{ are the densities of pure water and glutaric acid, and } \sigma_1 \text{ and } \sigma_2 \text{ are the surface tensions of pure water and glutaric acid. Hence the density } \rho \text{ and surface tension } \sigma \text{ of the cluster are related to those of the pure components 1 and 2 through weight percentages. Thus} \]

\[ \frac{d\rho}{dx_1} = \frac{\rho_1 - \rho_2}{100}, \frac{d\rho}{dx_2} = \frac{\rho_2 - \rho_1}{100}. \]  

We also make the approximation that

\[ \frac{3}{4} \pi r^3 = n_1 V_1 + n_2 V_2, \]  
\[ \text{where } V_i \text{ is the volume of one molecule of component } i, \quad V_i = \frac{M_i}{\rho_i}. \]

Plugging (2), (6)-(10) into (5), we get the following two simultaneous equations:

\[ \ln \left( \frac{P_2}{P_2^*} \right) = \frac{2}{kT} \frac{M_2}{M_2} \left[ \frac{M_1 n_1 \sigma_1 + M_2 n_2 \sigma_2}{M_1 n_1 \rho_1 + M_2 n_2 \rho_2} \right] \left( \frac{3}{4\pi} (V_1 n_1 + V_2 n_2) \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \]  
\[ \left[ 1 - \frac{(\rho_1 - \rho_2) M_2 n_2}{M_1 n_1 \rho_1 + M_2 n_2 \rho_2} \right] \]  
\[ \ln \left( \frac{P_1}{P_1^*} \right) = \frac{2}{kT} \frac{M_1}{M_1} \left[ \frac{M_1 n_1 \sigma_1 + M_2 n_2 \sigma_2}{M_1 n_1 \rho_1 + M_2 n_2 \rho_2} \right] \left( \frac{3}{4\pi} (V_1 n_1 + V_2 n_2) \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \left[ 1 - \frac{(\rho_1 - \rho_2) M_1 n_1}{M_1 n_1 \rho_1 + M_2 n_2 \rho_2} \right]. \]

Since the interfacial mass transfer of GA and its aqueous-phase diffusion are expected to be sufficiently rapid, it is reasonable to assume that the concentration of GA inside the droplet is uniform and satisfies at any moment the Henry's law equilibrium; in mathematical terms, we have

\[ \rho \sigma K_s = \sigma_2', \]  
\[ \text{where } K_s \text{ is the Henry's law constant for glutaric acid. We use } K_s = 2E+8 \text{ M/atm (R. Sander, Compilation of Henry's law constants for inorganic and organic species of potential importance in environmental chemistry, 1999, available at http://www.mpch-mainz.mpg.de/-sander/res/henry.html#2).} \]

The parameter \( \sigma_2' \) is the activity of GA (in molarity) in the binary solution.

At this point, as long as \( a_i \) and \( a_2' \) in equations (11) and (13) can be expressed by \( n_i \) and \( n_2 \), we can numerically solve these two equations simultaneously for \( (n_1, n_2) \) at any given temperature \( T \), relative humidity \( \text{RH} \), and ambient GA vapor pressure \( P_2^* \). It will then be straightforward to calculate the rate of nucleation of the GA-H}_2\text{O binary system using equation (3).} \]  

Davies and Thomas [1956] did some isopiestic studies of aqueous dicarboxylic acid solutions. Using sulfuric acid as standards, the solvent vapor pressure lowering and activities of both solvent (water) and solute (dicarboxylic acids) are determined, as shown in Table 8. From the experimental data \( m, \Delta P, \) and \( a_2'm \) provided by Davies and Thomas, it is easy to calculate the activities of water and GA in binary solutions of different concentrations (in the first column). We can then write \( a_i \) and \( a_2' \) as a function of GA concentration from these data:

\[ a_i = -0.0097 m + 0.994; \]
\[ a_2' = 0.8107 \ln(m) + 1.0419. \]

Since we have \( m = (1000 n_f / (N_w n_1 M_1)) \) where \( N_w \) is the Avogadro constant and, in the range of concentrations studied,
Table 8. Determining Activities of Water and GA in Glutaric Acid-Water Solution (25°C)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( m ), mol kg(^{-1} )</th>
<th>( \Delta P ), mm Hg(^{-1} )</th>
<th>( P_1 ), mm Hg(^{-1} )</th>
<th>( a_2'/m )</th>
<th>( a_1 ) (H(_2)O, in Mole Fraction)</th>
<th>( a_2' ) (GA, in Molality)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>23.581</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.092</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>23.358</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.416</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>23.300</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>1.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.186</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>23.100</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>1.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.403</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>23.055</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>1.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>22.974</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>1.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.789</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>22.784</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>2.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.114</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>22.700</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>2.271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Here \( m \) is molality of GA in water solution; \( \Delta P \) is lowering of water vapor pressure due to GA in the solution; \( P_1 \) is water vapor pressure over the surface of GA-H\(_2\)O solution; \( a_1 \) is activity of water in GA-H\(_2\)O binary solution; \( a_2' \) is activity of GA in GA-H\(_2\)O binary solution; \( a_2' \) here (in molality) is different from but related to the GA activity (in mole fraction) defined by equation (2).

Table 9. Calculating Particle Nucleation Rate as a Function of the Glutaric Acid (GA) Vapor Mixing Ratio in the GA-H\(_2\)O Binary System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>([\text{GA}]_{\text{g}}) in the Chamber, ppbv</th>
<th>( n_1 )</th>
<th>( n_2 )</th>
<th>( r_c ) m</th>
<th>( \Delta G^* ) J</th>
<th>( J_{\text{c}} ) cm(^{-3}) s(^{-1} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2.3E09</td>
<td>1.1E-18</td>
<td>1.32E-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.83E-09</td>
<td>6.92E-19</td>
<td>1.26E-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.6E-09</td>
<td>5.22E-19</td>
<td>8.84E-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.35E-09</td>
<td>3.77E-19</td>
<td>1.51E-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.22E-09</td>
<td>3E-19</td>
<td>1.88E-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.14E-09</td>
<td>2.64E-19</td>
<td>1.17E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.06E-09</td>
<td>2.33E-19</td>
<td>2.12E-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.02E-09</td>
<td>2.12E-19</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.79E-10</td>
<td>1.94E-19</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.5E-10</td>
<td>1.89E-19</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.31E-10</td>
<td>1.78E-19</td>
<td>1.345E+04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.41E-10</td>
<td>1.42E-19</td>
<td>1.43E+07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.73E-10</td>
<td>1.18E-19</td>
<td>4.63E+09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.48E-10</td>
<td>1.05E-19</td>
<td>1.37E+11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\([\text{GA}]_{\text{g}}\) is glutaric acid vapor mixing ratio.

\( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) are the number densities of H\(_2\)O and GA molecules, respectively.

\( \Delta G^* \) is the free energy required to form a cluster (radius \( r_c \) containing \( n_1 \) molecules of H\(_2\)O and \( n_2 \) molecules of GA.

This notation is identical to that used in Table 4.

Read 2.3E-09 as 2.3 \times 10^{-9}.
The model output of nucleation rate does not change much (within 20% for each GA vapor pressure). This is contrary to what we observed from particle counters (Table 6). It is, on the other hand, well known that the H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O nucleation rate is strongly affected by water vapor partial pressure. This again supports our contention that the nucleation observed in the chamber was not GA-H$_2$O, but H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O.

Because of the lack of some thermodynamic data (mainly activity, surface tension) for the products in cyclohexene-ozone and o-pinene-ozone systems, we have not been able to calculate other (organic product-water) nucleation rates with our model. However, considering the saturation vapor pressure (1.46E-10 atm) and Henry’s law constant (2E8 M/atm) for adipic acid, a major product of the cyclohexene-ozone system, it is unlikely that (adipic acid-water) binary nucleation would have been fast enough to account for the observed new particle formation. Other aerosol components, including dialdehydes and α-oxo carboxylic acids, have even higher saturation vapor pressures which makes them even less likely to participate in homogeneous nucleation. Two points are worth reiterating here. First, even though we have only identified a fraction of the aerosol organic matter in these hydrocarbon-ozone systems, mechanistic considerations suggest diacids should be the least volatile among all the products [Seinfeld and Pandis, 1998; Koch et al., 2000]. Second, as we mentioned earlier in section 3.6, NH$_3$ is not expected to enhance the nucleating abilities of these oxidation products due to their weak acidity.

4.2. H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O Particle Nucleation in the Cycloolefin-Ozone System

We use an integral nucleation model [Hegg et al., 1992; Kreidenweis and Seinfeld, 1988] to simulate the H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O particle nucleation and growth under the conditions in our cycloolefin-ozone experiments and compare with the observed particle production. In such a model the extent of nucleation can be predicted on the basis of a handful of simple equations: a parameterized nucleation rate as a function of RH, T, and H$_2$SO$_4$ partial pressure, a H$_2$SO$_4$ source term (via SO$_2$ oxidation), a condensational sink term for H$_2$SO$_4$ condensing onto preexisting particle surface, and conservation equations for particle number and mass, and H$_2$SO$_4$ and SO$_2$ concentrations. Considering NH$_3$ was likely present in the chamber that could enhance the homogeneous nucleation rate $J_n$, we use a ternary nucleation model for the H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O-NH$_3$ system to calculate $J_n$ [Coffman and Hegg, 1995]. For this model to be applicable we set [NH$_3$] = 1.3 pptv which is probably at the lower end of the concentration range in the chamber. The integral model requires specifications of initial values of SO$_2$, -OH, H$_2$O, T, and particle number concentration. In the case of October 10 the number concentration of preexisting particles was about 80 cm$^{-3}$, given by the TSI 3025A counter. We take [SO$_2$]$_0$ = 100 pptv as the initial value for our calculation, according to the SO$_2$ analyzer. Both H$_2$SO$_4$ and hydroxyl were detected by the chemical ionization mass spectrometer. We also take the lower-end values, [H$_2$SO$_4$]$_0$ = 2 pptv and [OH]$_0$ = 5E+6 molecules/cm$^3$, as the model inputs. Our model results have proven rather insensitive to the initial H$_2$SO$_4$ vapor concentration. Figure 1 shows the model output of particle number concentration as a function of time compared with that observed by the TSI3025A particle counter.

The model output simulates the new particle production very well until about 5 min after the onset of nucleation (1327 LT), when the actual particle concentration started to level off, whereas the model still predicted a rapid “burst” of new particles. When we ran the model to simulate another case of cyclopentene-ozone particle production but with 1 ppbv SO$_2$ initially in the chamber, we saw similar results: The model output could well simulate the particle production in the first 5 min or so, but soon after that, the actual particle number concentration leveled off, while the model predicted more particle production. Furthermore, the particle sizes predicted by the integral model alone were too small to explain the sizes observed by the DMA in the chamber experiments.

These “inconsistencies” between the model outputs and the observations can actually be easily interpreted by our earlier
proposals. As soon as the H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O nuclei were formed, organic products continuously produced in the reaction system would partition into these nuclei, initiate substantial water condensation and quickly increase the nuclei surface area. At some point (about 5 min after nucleation onset in the October 10 case), H$_2$SO$_4$ vapor molecules would start to primarily condense on these large surfaces rather than nuclete new particles, therefore effectively killing off further nucleation.

As a result, far fewer particles than the model's prediction would be formed, and they would grow into much larger sizes. In comparison, on October 13 when only SO$_2$ and ozone were initially present in the chamber (Table 4), the particle number concentration grew up to over 100,000 cm$^{-3}$ within 10 min. Since there were not enough organic species produced, neither partitioning of organics nor water condensation occurred substantially to grow the newly formed H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O nuclei, resulting in only very small particles (R$_m$ = 5 nm) even after 40 min of observation.

### 4.3. Partitioning of Glutaric Acid Into the Fresh H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O Nuclei

It is well known that besides glutaric acid (GA), other oxidation products in the cyclopentene-ozone system will also partition into the aerosol phase, for example, glutaraldehyde and 5-oxo-pentanoic acid [Hatakeyama et al., 1987]. However, as we have mentioned earlier, GA is expected to be one of the major aerosol products under ambient conditions. Therefore, instead of trying to model the partitioning processes for all the products, we choose to develop a simple diagnostic model to study the partitioning of the major product, GA, into the H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O nuclei. Another reason for doing this is that GA has the highest solubility among all the known particulate products from cyclopentene ozonolysis. Our model results can then be compared with the mass concentration of particulate GA obtained from filter sampling of aerosol and subsequent IC calculations. Other oxidation products can be incorporated into this model later if found necessary.

It is worth noting that our approach throughout this exercise is at least semi-empirical, i.e., wherever possible we utilize the observational data to constrain and simplify our calculations. For example, the most straightforward methodology for calculating the amount of GA in the aerosol would simply be to assume that all of the GA was instantaneously produced in the gas phase through ozonolysis of cyclopentene. The GA then partitioned into the aerosol droplets with the observed asymptotic volume (~9.8 µm$^3$/cm$^3$ in the October 10 case, after the hygroscopic correction for the DMA measurement), assuming Henry's law equilibrium. In this scenario one gets a GA mass concentration in the condensed phase of 0.59 µg/m$^3$, somewhat higher than the measured value of 0.41 µg/m$^3$ from the IC analyses (uncertainty: ±20%). However, one should realize this scenario assumes no kinetic limitations to the interphase transfer and further assumes that the GA Henry's law constant for the bulk solution is exactly applicable to the actual aerosol droplets in the chamber. While the latter assumption is difficult to completely avoid in even diagnostic studies, the former can be tested with the following diagnostic box model.

As in other time-dependent box models [e.g., Chameides, 1984], our model treats the gas-phase chemistry as well as the partitioning of GA vapor into the aqueous-phase aerosol. The aqueous-phase chemistry is worth exploring in the future but neglected here as, in this study, we assume all the oxidation processes take place in the gas phase. Our purpose is to evaluate whether such an assumption could be viable to explain our observations. In the gas phase,

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = k[	ext{cyclopentene}][\text{ozone}] - \Phi_c,$$

where $k$ is the reaction rate constant (6.3E-16 cm$^3$ molecule$^{-1}$ s$^{-1}$), $X$ is the gas-phase concentration of GA (cm$^3$), $\Phi_c$ is the interphase flux rate of GA vapor into aerosols (cm$^3$ s$^{-1}$). The coagulation and wall loss can be to the first order ignored according to our calculations.

Using the Fuchs and Sutugin [1970] equation, we have

$$\Phi_c = 4\pi R_p \alpha D_g \beta N_p (X - X_i),$$

where $\alpha$ corrects for using the mean radius $R_p$ in the condensation rate equation [Okuyama et al., 1988], $D_g$ is the diffusivity of GA molecules (taken as 0.078 cm$^2$ s$^{-1}$), $\beta$ is a correction factor which extends the condensation equation through the transition and kinetic regimes [Dahneke, 1983]. $N_p$ is the aerosol number concentration (cm$^{-3}$), and $X_i$ is the GA vapor concentration at the particle surface (cm$^{-3}$).

Assuming the molar concentration of GA in the aerosol droplets is $Y$ (mol/L), we can apply Henry's law:

$$\left(\frac{X_i}{N_\text{av}}\right)RTK'_h = Y,$$

where $N_\text{av}$ is Avogadro's constant and $K'_h$ is the effective Henry's law constant.

In the aqueous phase we assume the flux of GA vapor is fully scavenged by these aerosol droplets with a mean volume density $V_p$ (µm$^3$/cm$^3$ air). We then have the mass balance equation for GA in the aqueous phase

$$\frac{dY}{dt} = \Phi_c (N_\text{av} V_p).$$

Here we assume all droplets are homogeneously mixed. Since the mixing time in a micron-sized droplet is about 0.01 s [Schwartz and Freiberg, 1981] and we are interested in temporal variations on the timescale of minutes, this approximation is appropriate. At this point, by combining (18), (19), (20), and (21), we shall be able to solve these coupled equations numerically for $X$ and $Y$ as long as $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\gamma$, $K'_h$, $N_p$, $R_p$, $R_m$, $\Phi_c$ are known.

The values of $\alpha$, $\beta$ are readily available or calculable from Okuyama et al. [1988], Lide [1991], and Seinfeld and Pandis [1998]. Hatakeyama et al. [1984] determined nicely that the collisionally stabilized Criegee intermediate from the cyclopentene-ozone reaction has a yield of 5.2%. Such a stabilized intermediate would mechanistically only lead to 5-oxo-pentanoic acid and glutaric acid. The yield of 5-oxo-pentanoic acid is estimated to be 1% [Hatakeyama et al., 1987]. Therefore we take 4.2% as the yield of gas-phase GA (Y). In the droplets composed of H$_2$SO$_4$ and H$_2$O as a result of homogeneous nucleation, the pH value is found to be lower than 1.0. At such a low pH the effective Henry's law constant $K'_h$ of GA is essentially the same as the Henry's law constant.
be very insensitive to the different sets of (N_s, V_s, R_s) values being used. Particularly, the GA molar concentration in the chamber, rather than the actual molar concentration in the aerosol droplets. One can recover the mass concentration by multiplying the given concentration by the corresponding V_r.

\( K_s \, (2E+8 \, \text{M/atm}) \). We note it is uncertain whether the Henry’s law constant in the bulk solution is exactly applicable to tiny aerosol droplets, and this uncertainty is further compounded by the chemical complexities of these droplets that could include H_2SO_4 and other organic species. Since these uncertainties are currently intractable, we here simply adopt the bulk data for our diagnostic purpose.

A key facet of this assessment is the GA vapor concentration above the aerosol droplets (Y) that will largely determine the rate of GA interphase transfer. This is estimated from Henry’s law and the instantaneous GA concentration in the aerosol droplets (Y), as implied by equation (20). Estimation of the aqueous concentration of GA itself, calculated by equation (21), utilizes observed value of the aerosol volume density V_r. This utilization of observed V_r avoids the difficult problem of calculating the water condensation onto the complex H_2O-H_2SO_4-GA (and likely other organic species) solution drops in which their activities are largely unknown. Indeed, our calculations suggest this approach can lead to even further simplifications as described below.

While N_r, V_r, R_s are all evolving during this process, the model results for the asymptotic values of X and Y turn out to be very insensitive to the different sets of (N_r, V_r, R_s) values being used. Particularly, the GA molar concentration in the aerosol (Y) near the end of phase partitioning is found to have little dependence upon (N_r, V_r, R_s) values, consistent with theoretical predictions that will be seen from equation (22). Thus, rather than writing out detailed time-dependent equations for these variables (essentially parameterizations based on observed values), we input a certain set of (R_s, N_r, V_r) values (e.g., at t = 5 min) for which the model should yield good enough results for our purpose (comparing with filter/IC results). However, because of this, one must be careful in interpreting the results. For example, the time dependence of Y, which ostensibly shows the time variance of the GA molar concentration in the aerosol droplets (mol/L), actually rather represents the time variance of the GA mass concentration in the chamber (\( \mu g/m^3 \)).

In the case of October 10, 1998, the measurements show the cyclopentene and ozone mixing ratios as a function of time as follows: [cyclopentene] = 56.6 exp[-0.001 t] ppbv; [ozone] = 93.0 exp[-0.0005 t] ppbv; plus, we take \( N_r = 7520 \, \text{cm}^3, R_s = 0.02 \, \mu \text{m}, V_r = 0.55 \, \mu \text{m}^3/\text{cm}^2 \) at t = 5 min as input values. Plug these into (18)-(21) and solve for Y. We plot Y as a function of time in Figure 2.

When other sets of (N_r, R_s, V_r) values (e.g., t = 0, 10 min, 20 min) are used as model inputs, the results of GA molar concentration in the aerosol (Y) and vapor concentration (X) show little variation from Figure 2. Such insensitivity to (N_r, R_s, V_r) values is rather surprising at first sight. However, we see the final molar concentration of GA in the aerosol is about 0.46 M, equivalent to 6 g GA/100 g water. This is far lower than the concentration in a saturated GA solution (solubility of GA equal to 116 g/100 g water) [Saxena and Hildemann, 1996]. Thus the partitioning process here is essentially a process of continuously produced GA quickly dissolving into the aerosol droplets. Water vapor would then also continuously condense onto the droplets to compensate for the lowering of water activity (and thus water vapor concentration at the surface), due to the dissolution of GA and likely other organic products. Since the GA solution was never saturated, the final GA concentration in the aerosol turned out to be mainly modulated by its gas-phase production, which was well measured and modeled. The chemically produced GA vapor would continuously dissolve into the aerosol droplets until the equilibrium between the gas and aqueous phase was established (i.e., when the gas-to-particle flux became zero).

Our model outputs show the GA molar concentration (Y) in the aerosol increases asymptotically (Figure 2), although the slope at the beginning should in fact be steeper due to the use of a constant volume V_r. However, once again, for the reasons we have just stated, the uncertainty of the model outputs of [GA] near the end of phase partitioning (the asymptotic value in Figure 2), caused by using a constant set of (N_r, R_s, V_r), is expected to be small. At least such an uncertainty should be smaller than the measurement uncertainties of N_r, R_s, V_r, and gas concentrations.

An aerosol sample was collected between t_1 = 1020 s and t_2 = 3420 s in the above case. Figure 2 shows the molar concentrations of GA in the aerosol (Y) at t_1 and t_2 are 0.36 and 0.46 mol/L, respectively. The DMA-derived aerosol volume densities V_r, after hygroscopic corrections, are 4.30 and 5.34 \( \mu \text{m}^3/\text{cm}^2 \), respectively. Calculations then show the mass concentration of GA in the chamber, during this time interval, has an average value of 0.48 \( \mu g/\text{m}^3 \). This is in quite good agreement with that identified by IC (0.41 \( \mu g/\text{m}^3 \)), considering the overall uncertainty of the IC analyses is about 20%. However, both values are somewhat lower than that predicted by calculations simply using partitioning equilibrium (0.59 \( \mu g/\text{m}^3 \)), as shown earlier. This implies that there could be some kinetic limitations to the interphase mass transfer during such an aerosol growth process, where chemical reaction and phase partitioning of certain products take place simultaneously. It should be pointed out that, under some circumstances, the actual gas/aerosol partitioning mechanism can be much more complicated than what is described here, as it is determined by both the partitioning species and the phases they can partition into. For example, a widely proposed mechanism is based upon the partitioning of organic species between the gas phase and the organic material phase.
in the aerosol [Pankow, 1994a, 1994b; Odum et al., 1996]. In our model the partitioning is between the gas phase and the aerosol aqueous phase. It seems reasonable to adopt the latter mechanism for a compound as soluble as glutaric acid, while for less polar (thus perhaps more hydrophobic) products such as those from the oxidation of aromatics and α-pinene [Odum et al., 1996], the first mechanism could be more suitable. Indeed, secondary organic compounds may exist in all three phases: the gas, the organic aerosol material, and the aqueous phase, at least for high relative humidities [Saxena et al., 1995]. It is our view that the mechanism suggested by Pankow (and others) and that suggested here by ourselves constitute two rather extreme cases in a "continuous" spectrum of the actual phase partitioning mechanism.

In several other cases the model outputs of GA mass in aerosol are also in good agreement with those from the filters. In fact, if we solve the above equations (18)-(21) in symbolic terms, the final GA molar concentration in the aerosol, [GA]-, can be written as follows:

\[
[GA]^- = \frac{A_{[ozone]}_{\text{aq}} [\text{cyclopentene}]_{\text{aq}} \gamma}{N_{\text{exp}} 0.1013 \frac{K'_{h} R T}{K_h' K_a K_a^2}}.
\]

where A is related to the ozone and cyclopentene reaction constant and decay rate, [ozone], and [cyclopentene], are initial gas-phase concentrations, and K'\_h is the effective Henry's law constant for GA. While the approximations utilized in its derivation render this an approximate and by no means general solution, we feel it will have considerable prognostic power for scenarios similar to that treated here. On the basis of (22) we present two theoretical predictions and their experimental support:

1. When the initial concentrations of O\_3 and cyclopentene are elevated, the equilibrium molar concentration of GA in the aerosol should also rise. The molar yield of GA in the aerosol, as seen from [GA]^-/[cyclopentene], is also expected to increase as the initial ozone level increases. This could quantitatively explain why the molar yields reported by Hatakeyama et al. [1985, 1987] are higher than in ours, as has been qualitatively suggested in some earlier work [e.g., Satsumabayashi et al., 1990].

2. The pH of the fresh nuclei could play an important role in affecting the partitioning of organic compounds into them. For a diprotic acid like a dicarboxylic acid the effective Henry's law constant K'\_h is

\[
K'_{h} = K_{h} \left(1 + \frac{K_{a1}^{-1}}{[H^+]^1} + \frac{K_{a1} K_{a2}^{-1}}{[H^+]^2}\right),
\]

where K\_h is the Henry's law constant, and K\_a\_1 and K\_a\_2 are the first and second step dissociation constants of the acid. When the [H\_+] of the fresh nuclei is high (such as in the H\_2SO\_4-H\_2O nuclei), strong acids with high K\_a\_1 and K\_a\_2 would increase the K'\_h effectively according to (23). Then equation (22), which should be applicable to other secondary aerosol components, predicts that the concentrations of these acids in the aerosol at the end of phase partitioning would become higher. Under conditions in the MBL where the NH\_3 mixing ratio is sufficiently low thus rendering H\_2SO\_4-H\_2O binary nucleation the dominant nucleation process, the pH of the freshly formed nuclei could be as low as 1. Then, as shown above, the acids with pK\_a\_1 close to 1 are expected to be the major partitioning species, for example, oxalic acid (pK\_a\_1 = 1.23) and malonic acid (pK\_a\_1 = 2.83). In comparison, succinic acid (pK\_a\_1 = 4.16), glutaric acid (pK\_a\_1 = 4.31), or adipic acid (pK\_a\_1 = 4.43) should contribute much less to the aerosol mass, provided all of these acids are present in comparable amounts. Such a theoretical prediction finds support from several field measurements of dicarboxylic acids in remote marine and urban aerosols [e.g., Kawamura and Sakaguchi, 1999; Kawamura and Ikushima, 1993]. Since C2 and C3 diacids could be final oxidation products from longer-chain acids, such a preferential partitioning into the condensed phase would further enhance their concentrations in the submicron aerosols.

5. Conclusions and Some Applications to the MBL

A series of controlled experiments were carried out in the Calspan Corporation's 600 m\(^3\) environmental chamber where some secondary organic aerosol formation processes were simulated and studied. Since the concentrations of the precursors and oxidants used, and the chamber conditions (T, P, RH, etc.), were much closer to the values expected in certain MBL regions than have previously been examined, many results in these experiments could be more plausibly applied to the MBL.

1. The three precursor-ozone systems studied, with no seed aerosol present, readily formed new submicron aerosols at very low reactant levels.

2. Identification of water-soluble compounds in the formed aerosols showed agreement with some previous studies. However, the yields of organic products in the Calspan experiments were lower, probably due to the lower concentrations of initial reactants.

3. A three-step procedure is proposed to explain the observed particle nucleation: hydroxyl production \(\rightarrow H_2SO_4\) formation \(\rightarrow H_2SO_4.H_2O\) (perhaps together with NH\_3) homogeneous nucleation. We also propose that certain secondary organic products would not make an important contribution to new particle nucleation but, rather, they would partition into the H\_2SO\_4.H\_2O fresh nuclei, enhance water condensation, and help grow these nuclei into a larger size range. Such a scheme is plausible in the MBL where trace amounts of SO\_2, NH\_3, O\_3, and background hydrocarbons are ubiquitous and preexisting particles are relatively few. It also provides a viable mechanism to explain why sulfate and organics have often been found present in a single aerosol particle.

4. The well-known source of cyclopentene or cyclohexene is from urban pollution, e.g., automobile exhaust. Assuming an ozone level of 20 ppb, the lifetime of cyclopentene due to ozone oxidation is about 1 hour. Therefore the cycloolefins, emitted in many urban coastal regions, can be transported into the marine atmosphere under certain meteorological conditions. During such transport, oxidation to dicarboxylic acids and other products could take place, and they could partition into preexisting particles through the mechanism proposed above. However, if the ozone level were higher or the wind speed were significantly slower, the above chemical and particle formation processes would mostly take place within the coastal region. Dicarboxylic acids could then still be transported to the MBL in the aerosols they have partitioned into.
On the other hand, if cycloolefins have a significant marine source and their oxidation products can provide sufficient mass flux, then our proposed mechanism could be a more widespread pathway to form secondary organic aerosols in the MBL. We further note that such a pathway can be applicable to primary hydrocarbon precursors of dicarboxylic acids other than cycloolefins (as much as 50% of the carbon mass emitted from the ocean surface could be in the form of olefins [cf. Bonsang et al., 1991]), as well as secondary organic species produced in the marine atmosphere which have similar properties as the ones studied here.

5. H$_2$SO$_4$ is a superb nucleating species, while secondary organic compounds (certainly with possible exceptions, e.g., certain α-pinene oxidation products) play a role more confined to growing newly formed particles. In the MBL such a scheme of particle nucleation (H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O-NH$_3$) followed by particle growth (through dissolution of organic compounds and condensation of water vapor) would allow particles to grow into the CCN size range reasonably fast and therefore help reconcile calculated nucleation and growth rates with the observed CCN budget. Different proposals have emerged as to the detailed mechanism of particle growth within such a scheme (e.g., Kreidenweis and Seinfeld, 1988; Kulmala et al., 2000). Indeed, this variety might very well be necessary to adequately treat the different suites of organic and inorganic species that range widely in their solubilities, volatilities, and other properties. Nevertheless, it appears that the traditional treatment of only H$_2$SO$_4$ particle nucleation and growth should be revisited to include selected organic compounds as important factors in the particle growth process [Lin et al., 1992; Raes and Dingenen, 1992]. Finally, it is to be kept in mind that the one discussed above, there is another potential route of nucleation (via H$_2$SO$_4$-H$_2$O nucleation) in the free troposphere followed by growth and subsidence into the MBL [e.g., Raes, 1995]. A number of field measurements seem to support such an aerosol entrainment process [Clarke et al., 1996, 1998]. However, further discussion on which of the two schemes contributes most to the aerosol and CCN concentrations in the MBL, or how the two processes compete, is beyond the scope of this work.

Acknowledgments. S.G. would like to express his gratitude to Marcia Baker for her help with computer modeling. Thanks also go to Tica Novakov for his help in total carbon analyses and Richard Leaitch for his important comments. We also wish to thank two anonymous reviewers for useful comments. The research reported here was supported by ONR grants N00014-97-1-1023 and N00014-97-1-0132. This work constitutes a contribution to the International Global Atmospheric Chemistry (IGAC) core project of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP).

References


Kawamura, K., and F. Sakaguchi, Molecular distributions of water-


