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ABSTRACT: To reduce the quantification uncertainty of commercial aerosol mass spectrometers (AMS) and aerosol chemical speciation monitors (ACSM), a new capture vaporizer (CV) was recently built to replace the standard vaporizer (SV). A collection efficiency (CE) ∼ 1 in the CV AMS/ACSM has been demonstrated for ambient aerosols, but the CV also leads to increased thermal decomposition of the analytes because of longer residence time and vaporizer surface contact. This study reports on the performance of the CV for analyzing organic aerosol (OA) elemental composition and source apportionment, using both HR-ToF-AMS and ACSM for the first time. The methodology for obtaining elemental ratios from AMS spectra is updated to account for differences in OA fragmentation between the CV and SV. An artifact CO+ signal is observed for some chemically reduced laboratory compounds. If that signal is included in elemental analysis, the O:C is substantial overestimated, while accurate results are observed if the anomalous CO+ is ignored. The estimated uncertainty of O:C (H:C) of standard organic species with the CV-AMS is 23% (18%). Consistent time series of positive matrix factorization (PMF) factors and their fractions of total OA were found across the CV and SV in the three very different ambient data sets ranging from biogenic- to anthropogenic-dominated, indicating limited loss of source determination information despite the increased fragmentation. In some cases, bootstrap analysis of CV data sets shows higher uncertainty for the apportionment of total oxygenated OA (OOA) into different subtypes than that of the SV data set, which is potentially due to lower signal-to-noise at larger m/z from the increased thermal decomposition in the CV.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Aerosol mass spectrometer (AMS) or aerosol chemical speciation monitor (ACSM) instruments, which have been commercialized by Aerodyne Research Inc. (ARI), are widely used to quantify organic aerosols (OA) with a time resolution of seconds to minutes.1−5 Analysis of the time variation of AMS/ACSM OA mass spectra with factor analysis methods (e.g., positive matrix factorization, PMF) has been widely used to investigate various sources and aging of OA and to help improve our understanding of primary emissions and secondary formation of OA.5−10 The AMS is also capable of quantifying the elemental composition of OA, including atomic O:C and H:C.11,12 Elemental analysis results have been used to investigate the chemical evolution of OA13−16 to quantify the conversion between organic carbon (OC) and OA,17,18 and to constrain and improve model results.18−22

Almost all the currently operating AMS instruments use the standard vaporizer (SV), which has an open inverted cone structure and porous tungsten surface (Figure S1a). Some fraction of the solid particles impacting the SV can bounce, requiring the use of a collection efficiency (CE) correction (e.g., ∼0.2−0.5 for (NH4)2SO4).23,24 Typically ambient aerosol CE values vary between 0.5 and 1 depending on the chemical composition and phase of the aerosol.25 CE is a major contributor to quantification uncertainty of aerosols in the AMS, as addressed in the Supporting Information (file jgrd15378-sup-0003-txts01.pdf)
of Bahreini et al.\textsuperscript{25} Because of this limitation, a capture vaporizer (CV), with a narrow entrance and a trapping "cage" (Figure S1),\textsuperscript{26} has recently been demonstrated to reduce particle bounce.

Recently, experimental results showed CE $\sim 1$ for CV-AMS analysis with ambient total and inorganic aerosols,\textsuperscript{27} and improved CE for laboratory aerosols.\textsuperscript{28,29} Increased mass spectral fragmentation was also observed for both inorganic and organic aerosols with the CV.\textsuperscript{26–30} This shift in fragmentation pattern is thought to be due to increased thermal decomposition of neutral and/or increased fragmentation of ions with more internal energy, due to the additional residence time and hot surface collisions experienced by vaporized molecules in the CV. The increased decomposition has been found for all types of OA regardless of varied oxidation level or composition complexity in the CV, although its relative impact is smallest for ambient aerosols.\textsuperscript{30} Given these changes in OA detection, it is important in the CV, although its relative impact is smallest for ambient aerosols.\textsuperscript{30} Given these changes in OA detection, it is important to evaluate whether the calibration parameters for elemental composition from SV OA mass spectra need to be updated for the CV. There is also a need to evaluate whether factor analysis capabilities routinely used for aerosol source apportionment are maintained with the CV. This manuscript describes multiple laboratory and field studies that use parallel deployments of SV- and CV-AMS instruments to address these questions. For reference, all the abbreviations and acronyms used in this study are explained in the "ABBREVIATION/GLOSSARY/NOMENCLATURE" section of this paper.

2. EXPERIMENT AND INSTRUMENTATION

2.1. Laboratory and Field Experiments. Laboratory Studies. Particles of pure organic compound standards were generated with three methods:

(1) Atomization, where analytes are dissolved into a suitable solvent based on their polarity and corresponding particles are generated with an atomizer (model: 3076, TSI); Hexane (purity $>95\%$, Sigma-Aldrich), isopropanol ($>99.5\%$, Sigma-Aldrich), and water (Milli-Q) were used as solvent;

(2) Laser ablation method, where a solution or OA liquid was dropped on a glass or thin-layer chromatography (TLC) plate and dried, then particles were generated using the focused output of a Nd: YAG laser (212.8 nm) through irradiation of the solid material on the plates;\textsuperscript{31–33} Argon (Ar) was used as the carrier gas instead of air in these experiments in order to reduce interference from the large N$_2$+$^+$ signal for CO$^+$ and tight RH control was used to reduce the interference of particle water on molecular water fragments. The "Aiken ambient (A-A) method" was applied to the ambient aerosol measurements, where CO$^+$ and H$_2$O$^+$ from OA are very difficult to quantify directly due to interferences from ambient air that produce N$_2$+$^+$ and other sources of H$_2$O$^+$. In this method, CO$^+$ ions are estimated based on the measured CO$_2$+$^+$(assuming CO$^+$/CO$_2$+$^+ =1$), and similarly for H$_2$O$^+$(H$_2$O$^+/CO$_2$+$^+ =0.225$), HO$^+$(HO$^+/H$_2$O$^+ =0.25$), and O$^+$(O$^+/H$_2$O$^+ =0.04$) ions.\textsuperscript{34} The A-A method uses the same calibration parameters of O:C and H:C as A-E method. Canagaratna et al.\textsuperscript{11} showed that the elemental ratios of multifunctional oxidized standards estimated from the A-A method were biased low, while A-E method still performed well. Thus, Canagaratna et al.\textsuperscript{11} introduced the C-IA method to reduce the errors when analyzing such compounds.

(3) Evaporation–condensation method,\textsuperscript{35} where particles were generated on the basis of vapor recondensation by mixing of cooler air after being evaporated in a heated glass flask. In this study, particles from 21 different pure organic compounds were analyzed. Detailed information on each compound, such as name, formula, aerosol generation method, and carrier gas, is listed in Table S1.

Field Studies. Data from three field studies were used. (1) The Southern Oxidation Aerosol Study (SOAS) was carried out at a ground site in a pollution-influenced forest area in the Southeast US during the summer of 2013.\textsuperscript{35} OA was strongly influenced by biogenic emissions.\textsuperscript{36,37} (2) The KOREan–United States Air Quality mission (KORUS-AQ, May-June, 2016) was an aircraft-based field campaign to investigate the factors controlling air quality in and around the Seoul Metropolitan Area; anthropogenic (vehicular and industrial) sources are important for this data set. Significant contribution from aged long-range transport sources was also expected. OA data from several flights (Research Flights, RF 05, 12, 18), which are representative of the range of conditions encountered during KORUS-AQ, are used in this study. (3) The Billerica study (September, 2012) was conducted on the campus of ARI, located in a suburb of Boston, MA (U.S.A.), and, hence, is expected to be affected by urban pollution and regional aged aerosols.

2.2. AMS/ACSM. Two high-resolution time-of-flight AMSs (HR-ToF-AMSSs), equipped with a SV and CV, respectively, were deployed in all the laboratory studies. In the SOAS study, an HR-ToF-AMS with the CV was used for the entire campaign, while a second AMS equipped the CV was used with a compact time-of-flight AMS (C-ToF-AMS, m/Δm: $\sim 750$)\textsuperscript{38} for most of the campaign, and with an HR-ToF MS for a few days (June 7–10). In the KORUS-AQ study, two HR-ToF-AMSSs, outfitted with a CV (Hankuk University AMS) and SV (University of Colorado aircraft AMS), respectively, were run alongside on the aircraft platform (NASA DC8) with different sampling lines for most of time (occasionally, two AMSSs both sampled from the sample inlet). For the Billerica study, two ACSMSs, equipped with a SV and CV, were used. This study allows investigating the performance of OA analysis with the CV in the ACSM, which uses a different measurement protocol (e.g., different aerosol/background subtraction method and sequence), which could affect OA analysis.\textsuperscript{40}

AMS calibrations of ionization efficiency (IE) were conducted before each set of experiments in the laboratory or every few days in the case of the field studies. Particle velocity/sizing calibration was determined before the experiment or in the middle of the campaign when necessary. Details on the setup of the instruments are shown in Figure S1, and the detailed calibration protocol of the AMS was reported in Hu et al.\textsuperscript{27,28} AMS/ACSM.

2.3. Elemental Analysis Methods. Two elemental analysis methods were applied for the SV-AMS: the Aiken method\textsuperscript{12,39} and the Canagaratna Improved-Ambient (C-IA) method.\textsuperscript{11} Two different variants of the Aiken method were used. In the "Aiken explicit (A-E) method", calibration parameters were applied to the elemental ratios determined by fitting all the major organic peaks of pure standard species when CO$^+$ and H$_2$O$^+$ ions (arising from OA) could be clearly resolved in the spectrum, and no residual particulate water was present.\textsuperscript{39} Argon (Ar) was used as the carrier gas instead of air in these experiments in order to reduce interference from the large N$_2$+$^+$ signal for CO$^+$ and tight RH control was used to reduce the interference of particle water on molecular water fragments. The "Aiken ambient (A-A) method" was applied to the ambient aerosol measurements, where CO$^+$ and H$_2$O$^+$ from OA are very difficult to quantify directly due to interferences from ambient air that produce N$_2$+$^+$ and other sources of H$_2$O$^+$. In this method, CO$^+$ ions are estimated based on the measured CO$_2$+$^+$ ion (assuming CO$^+$/CO$_2$+$^+ =1$), and similarly for H$_2$O$^+$(H$_2$O$^+/CO$_2$+$^+ =0.225$), HO$^+$(HO$^+/H$_2$O$^+ =0.25$), and O$^+$(O$^+/H$_2$O$^+ =0.04$) ions.\textsuperscript{34} The A-A method uses the same calibration parameters of O:C and H:C as A-E method. Canagaratna et al.\textsuperscript{11} showed that the elemental ratios of multifunctional oxidized standards estimated from the A-A method were biased low, while A-E method still performed well. Thus, Canagaratna et al.\textsuperscript{11} introduced the C-IA method to reduce the errors when analyzing such compounds.

2.4. PMF Source Apportionment. Unconstrained PMF analysis was performed on the time series of the OA spectral matrix measured by the SV and CV from the SOAS, KORUS-AQ and Billerica studies.\textsuperscript{3} For the SOAS and Billerica field studies, PMF (PET, PMF Evaluation Tool, which is PMF analysis interface software, version 2.04–2.08 in Igor 6.37) was performed on unit mass resolution OA matrices (UMR, m/z 12–120...
Figure 1. Scatter plots of elemental ratios from HR-ToF-AMS spectra of atomized standards vs the nominal atomic ratios in the CV. In the upper panel (a–c), the reported raw elemental ratios use the explicit formulation. The CO\(^+\) and H\(_2\)O\(^+\) ions are directly measured and included in the reported ratios. In the lower panel (d–f), Aiken ambient (A-A) fragmentation table, which constrains CO\(^+\) and H\(_2\)O\(^+\) abundance based on CO\(_2\)^\(^+\) ions (CO\(^+\)/CO\(_2\)^\(^+\) = 1; H\(_2\)O\(^+\)/CO\(_2\)^\(^+\) = 0.225), was applied. In Figure 1a,b and d,e, the direct measurements are shown; that is, no calibration parameters are applied to the measured O:C and H:C ratios. For OA:OC ratios in panels c and f, they were reconstructed on the basis of the calibrated O:C and H:C ratio (= 16\(^{\text{O}}\)O + 1\(^{\text{H}}\)H + 14\(^{\text{N}}\)N + 12\(^{\text{C}}\)C)/12). In this equation, the calibrated O:C and H:C for each species were obtained based on raw O:C dividing by the regression slope in Figure 1a (and Figure 1d) and Figure 1b (and Figure 1e), respectively. The elemental ratio values of several species for the SV (in blue) with explicit formulation are also shown, and the calibration slopes obtained from Aiken method\(^{12}\) have also been included (green lines). The uncertainty of regression ratio of OA:OC is 9%. The detailed information on the name of those compounds and estimation method can be found in Tables S1, S2.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Determination of Elemental Composition with the CV. 3.1.1. O:C and H:C Ratios: Explicit Method. Elemental composition, often measured by AMS, i.e., O:C, H:C, and OA:OC (OA:OC = organic aerosol-to-organic carbon mass ratio, sometimes referred to as OM:OC), has been widely used to investigate the chemical evolution of OA (e.g., Jimenez et al.,\(^{13}\) Kroll et al.,\(^{14}\) and Heald et al.\(^{15}\)). The elemental ratios measured with the CV are evaluated in this study for the first time with pure standard species. Detailed information on those standard species, such as name and formula, is given in Table S1, S2.

Figure 1 shows the comparison between measured elemental ratios in the CV and nominal molecular/atomic ratios. Because the organic-derived CO\(^+\) and H\(_2\)O\(^+\) contributions from the organic species can be explicitly measured for pure standards under an Ar carrier gas (or N\(_2\) and air under high OA concentration), the measured values are used directly (without calibration factors) to calculate the elemental ratios measured by the CV. Good correlation between measured O:C (slope = 0.75; \(r^2 = 0.88\)) and nominal values is observed, as well as for H:C (slope = 0.92; \(r^2 = 0.71\)), as shown in Figure 1a,b.

The measured elemental ratios from squalene, oleic acid, octacosane, and nicotinic acid fall out of the regression line, which is mainly caused by artificially high CO\(^+\) and H\(_2\)O\(^+\) fractions of total OA signal (10–40\%) in their spectra, which might be produced through chemical reactions between the sampled OA and residues on the vaporizer surfaces.\(^{30}\) When the CO\(^+\) and H\(_2\)O\(^+\) of these four species are estimated on the basis of the A-A fragmentation table (CO\(^+\)/CO\(_2\)^\(^+\) = 1; H\(_2\)O\(^+\)/CO\(_2\)^\(^+\) = 0.225), the resulting elemental ratios are much closer to the expected values (Figure 1d,e). These four species are not taken into account for the final regression. Except for these four species, there are no obvious high biases for CO\(^+\) and H\(_2\)O\(^+\) for other species. A comparison of organic CO\(^+\)/CO\(_2\)^\(^+\) and organic H\(_2\)O\(^+\)/CO\(_2\)^\(^+\) ratios for different standard OA species between the CV and SV are listed in Table S3.

The CV elemental ratios obtained from the direct measurements (without calibration factors) are similar to those obtained for the SV cosampled in this study, which indicates that the increased fragmentation in the CV does not result in a loss of information about elemental composition. The regression slopes (i.e., calibration factors) in the CV (0.75 for O:C and 0.92 for H:C) are also similar to the original SV estimates for the A-E method (0.75 for O:C and 0.91 for H:C) in previous calibrations.\(^{12}\) The uncertainty, defined as the average absolute value of the relative error of each data point with respect to the
regression line is 23% for O:C and 18% for H:C, which is also similar to the values (31% and 10%, respectively) from Aiken et al.\textsuperscript{12,39} We propose to use the regression slope of 0.75 for O:C ratio and 0.92 for H:C as calibration factors for the elemental ratios measured in the CV for the explicit method (i.e., when the organic contribution to H$_2$O$^+$ and CO$^+$ can be directly and accurately quantified). However, the appearance of artifact signal at CO$^+$ especially for chemically reduced species needs to be evaluated, for example, with the beam alternation experiments discussed by Hu et al.\textsuperscript{30}

3.1.2. O:C and H:C Ratios: Ambient Method. CO$^+$ and the organic contribution to H$_2$O$^+$ are very difficult to quantify directly in most ambient studies even with HR data, and especially at high time resolution. They are nearly impossible to quantify for ambient UMR data from the ACSM. Thus, an “ambient” quantification method for OA elemental composition is needed for situations in which the “explicit” method just described above cannot be applied, by estimating CO$^+$ and H$_2$O$^+$ using a fragmentation table.\textsuperscript{11,12}

In the SV, A-A fragmentation table (CO$^+/CO_2^+ = 1$; H$_2$O$^+/CO_2^+ = 0.225$) was used. In the following, CO$^+/CO_2^+$ and H$_2$O$^+/CO_2^+$ ratio in the ambient aerosols between the SV and CV are examined to evaluate if A-A fragmentation table is also suitable for the CV. An artifact CO$^+$ enhancement in the CV has not been observed for ambient aerosols so far, probably due to the prompt thermal decomposition process of ambient aerosols, and possibly the fact that the campaigns analyzed here do not include very high contributions from chemically reduced components such as hydrocarbon-like OA (HOA).\textsuperscript{30} It indicates the O:C and H:C ratio for ambient aerosols should not be biased due to this vaporizer artifact. In addition, elemental ratios of several standard species between Ar and air systems were compared in this study (Figure S2). We did not find systematic differences of elemental ratios between Air and Ar in either the SV or CV, suggesting oxygen in the carrier gas does not introduce bias in the CV elemental ratios.

During the SOAS and KORUS-AQ study, an average CO$^+/CO_2^+$ ratio of 1.30 $\pm$ 0.24 was obtained by averaging the measured CO$^+$ vs CO$_2^+$,\textsuperscript{30} which is similar to CO$^+/CO_2^+$ of 1.20 $\pm$ 0.21 for the SV, and within the range of values observed for the SV in past studies.\textsuperscript{11,12} We also compared the measured H$_2$O$^+$ vs CO$_2^+$ in the SOAS study. After subtracting background H$_2$O$^+$ (calculated on the basis of filter data) and sulfate H$_2$O$^+$ (calculated on the basis of the measured ambient sulfate multiplying measured H$_2$O$^+$/sulfate mass ratio when pure sulfate was sampled during calibrations) from measured H$_2$O$^+$ signal in AMS, H$_2$O$^+/CO_2^+$ showed similar ratios in the SV and CV ($\sim$1). We cannot exclude that some particulate H$_2$O$^+$ remains in ambient aerosols in this calculation because the RH was only dried below 30–40%, and a fraction of the particulate water is tightly bound to particles. The measured closed signal ratio of O$^+/H_2$O$^+$ and H$^+/H_2$O$^+$ in the CV are $\sim$0.22–0.23 and $\sim$0.03 during the SOAS and KORUS-AQ field studies, respectively, which are similar to the values detected in the SV ($\sim$0.22 and $\sim$0.04). The similarity of CO$^+/CO_2^+$ and H$_2$O$^+/CO_2^+$ ratios in difference mode (open minus closed signal), as well as H$^+/H_2$O$^+$ and O$^+/H_2$O$^+$ in closed mode (beam closed signal), in the SV and CV when the same ambient particles were sampled suggests that using the default SV ambient fragmentation table for the CV may be appropriate.

We compared the elemental ratios for the standards using the traditional A-A fragmentation table (H$_2$O$^+/CO_2^+ = 0.225$ and CO$^+/CO_2^+ = 1$) in Figure 1d,e. Lower regression slope (0.58 for O:C and 0.83 for H:C) and coefficient of determination ($r^2 = 0.52$ and 0.56, respectively) than the values for the explicit method (slope = 0.75 of O:C and 0.92 of H:C; $r^2 = 0.88$ and 0.71, respectively) were found. This is not surprising because there is variability of CO$^+/CO_2^+$ (also H$_2$O$^+/CO_2^+$) ratios across different compounds (Table S3). In fact, the lower regression slopes when A-A fragmentation table (Figure 1d,e) applied (Figure 1a,b) are also found for the SV.\textsuperscript{11}

It is possible that different CO$^+/CO_2^+$ and H$_2$O$^+/CO_2^+$ ratios other than those used in the A-A fragmentation table could produce better results for CV data. This is explored in Figure S3. In summary, no clear improvement is found for other values, and the results with the A-A default setting are within the optimum solution region, suggesting it should be reasonable to use A-A fragmentation table values in the CV.

3.1.3. O:C and H:C Ratios: Application to Ambient Data. Next, we check if the calibration parameters derived with standard OA above are suitable for ambient measurements. O:C and H:C ratios for the SV quantified using the C-IA method and calibration parameters,\textsuperscript{30} were used as the standard reference to which results for measured O:C and H:C ratios for the CV can be compared to. We first apply the A-A fragmentation table (CO$^+/CO_2^+ = 1$ and H$_2$O$^+/CO_2^+ = 0.225$) and the calibration slopes derived from OA standards (0.58 for O:C and 0.83 for H:C). After applying these calibration parameters to the ambient OA, we found an overestimation for O:C (slope = 1.24–1.27) and underestimation for H:C (0.82–0.88) compared to the SV results, as shown in Figure S4a,b. This inconsistency suggests that the calibration parameters derived for OA standards here are not suitable for ambient OA. This may be caused by the limitations of the standard OA data set used, which may not be sufficient to capture the variability of ambient OA. To address this question, we recommend a further calibration study with a greatly expanded standard OA data set including more different types of OA (e.g., acids, peroxides, polyols).

Alternative calibration parameters can be derived by comparing the raw O:C and H:C ratios measured from the CV directly with the values from the SV for ambient data. The comparisons of ambient O:C and H:C between the CV and SV during the SOAS and KORUS-AQ studies are shown in Figure 2 and Figure 3, respectively. Using the A-A fragmentation table with CV data set, good correlation of O:C and H:C ratio between the CV and SV are observed, for both the biogenic emission dominated SOAS study ($R \sim 0.5–0.9$, Figure 2) and anthropogenic emission dominated KORUS-AQ study ($R \sim 0.8–0.9$, Figure 3). The obtained regression slopes from SOAS study (O:C slope = 0.72; H:C slope = 0.74) are similar to these from the KORUS-AQ studies (O:C slope = 0.74; H:C slope = 0.69). Average slopes of O:C (0.73) and H:C (0.72) for the SOAS and KORUS-AQ studies can be used as initial calibration parameters for ambient data in the CV, until more detailed laboratory calibrations can be conducted. After applying those calibration parameters, consistent variation of O:C and H:C vs corresponding elemental ratios from SV were observed (Figure 2e and Figure 3e) with regression slopes of 0.98–1.01 and 0.95–1.03, respectively (Figure S4c,d). Positive relationship between O:C vs f$_{44}$ ($= m/z$ 44/OA) and H:C vs f$_{43}$ ($= m/z$ 43/OA) ions in the SV has been reported in previous studies.\textsuperscript{3,14} We also explored the relationships between O:C vs f$_{44}$ and H:C vs f$_{43}$ ions in the CV, as shown in Figure S5. Both field studies show consistent variations of elemental ratios versus their tracer fractions in OA in the CV. The fitting parameters in the CV, which is slightly different than the results in the SV, can be used to
estimate rough elemental ratios based on \( f_{\text{CV}} \) and \( f_{\text{SV}} \) for example, when only unit-resolution data is available. We explored the impact of particle beam position on the CV (center vs edges) on OA parameters, because this experiment
was useful for inorganic species. When the particle beam is aimed at the edge of the CV, the citric acid spectra recorded are more similar to the spectra from the SV because of the short residence time of particle with vaporizer surfaces (Figure S6). Lower $f_{A4}$ and higher H:C were observed at the edges of the vaporizer, which is consistent with the lower thermal decomposition shown in previous studies. The O:C ratios are stable between the edge and center, suggesting that enhanced thermal decomposition might not lead to extra O loss in the CV.

In summary, we propose to use the parameters listed in Table 1 to calibrate the O:C and H:C ratios measured in the CV. We recommend the use of explicit formulation with calibration parameters of 0.75 for O:C and 0.92 for H:C for pure organic compounds measured in environments with negligible or quantifiable contributions from gas phase H$_2$O and CO$_2$. The presence of artifact CO$^+$ should be evaluated further for reduced compounds. The ambient fragmentation table (CO$^+/CO_2^+$ = 1; H$_2$O$^+/CO_2^+$ = 0.225) is recommended for ambient OA measurement with calibration parameters of 0.73 for O:C and 0.72 for H:C being used. An expanded effort with a larger data set to assess the CV calibration parameters for both ambient and laboratory studies is recommended.

### 3.1.4. N:C Ratios

For N:C ratios, the current data set is not large enough to obtain quantitative calibration parameters, but some trends become clear nevertheless. Nicotinic acid (C$_6$H$_5$NO$_2$, N:C = 0.17) and 1,2-bis(4-pyridyl)ethylene (C$_{12}$H$_{10}$N$_2$, N:C = 0.17) particles were sampled simultaneously in the SV and CV. Comparable N:C ratios were observed (0.12 and 0.08, respectively, in the SV versus 0.09 and 0.08, respectively, in the CV); both are lower than the nominal species values (0.17). For ambient aerosols, since V-mode ($m/\Delta m = \sim2000−3000$) was used for the CV in both field studies discussed here, the AMS resolution was not high enough to obtain an accurate separation of C$_6$H$_5$NO$_2^+$ and C$_{12}$H$_{10}$N$_2^+$ ions vs other organic ions (C$_6$H$_4^+$, C$_5$H$_6$O$_2^+$),$^{40}$ especially accounting for their low abundance in both ambient studies reported here (atomic N:C usually <0.05). Thus, a thorough investigation with a greater data set of nitrogen-containing standard compounds, ideally taking advantage of the new higher resolution LToF-AMS in both the SV and CV is recommended for evaluating the quantification of N:C ratios.$^{11,12,39}$

### 3.1.5. OA:OC and OSC

After calibrating O:C and H:C ratios for the A-E and A-A formulation, the OA:OC ratios from the SV show good agreement with their nominal values for pure chemical compounds (slope = 0.99, Figure 1c,f), and with estimated ambient OA:OC from the SV (slope = 0.97–0.99, Figure 1c and Figure 3c), respectively. The regression slopes for ambient aerosols are also well within the 6% uncertainty estimated in Aiken method$^{12,39}$ and 9% for the C-IA method.$^{11}$ Consistent

## Table 1. Recommended Calibration Parameters for O:C and H:C Ratios Measured by the CV with Calibration Parameters from the Aiken Method for the SV$^{12}$ Shown as a Reference$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragmentation Table</th>
<th>Standard OA</th>
<th>Ambient Aerosols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SV: Aiken explicit method</td>
<td>fitted CO$^+$ and H$_2$O$^+$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV: explicit method</td>
<td>fitted CO$^+$ and H$_2$O$^+$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV: A-A fragmentation table</td>
<td>CO$^+/CO_2^+$ = 1</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$For the explicit method, those parameters were obtained by comparing the directly measured O:C and H:C of standard organic compounds with their nominal values. For the ambient aerosols, those values are estimated on the basis of comparing the directly measured O:C and H:C in the CV with C-IA method calibrated elemental ratios measured in the SV.
for the CV-AMS is still very limited (e.g., lacking examples of ambient and chamber BBOA spectra). Thus, comparisons based on constrained PMF for both vaporizers are not yet possible. A spectral database for AMS measurements with the CV has been recently established at http://cires1.colorado.edu/jimenez-group/AMSSd_CV/.

Figure 4. Comparisons of time series, scatter plot, and spectra of PMF factors: (a) IEPOX-SOA, (b) MO-OOA, (c) LO-OOAI (biogenic origins) and (d) LO-OOAII (anthropogenic origins), from the CV and SV during the SOAS study. In SOAS, the linear regression slope of total OA concentration between the SV and CV is around 0.9. For a fair comparison of PMF source apportionment ability, the regression slope of total OA between the SV and CV is forced to be 1 by multiplying the OA matrix of the SV by a factor of 1.1.

Figure 5. Comparisons of time series, scatter plots, and spectra of PMF factors: (a) HOA; (b) LO-OOA and (c) MO-OOA, for the SV and CV from the KORUS-AQ (RF05) study. Elemental ratio comparisons are also included. The regression slope of total OA between the SV and CV for this KORUS-AQ flight (RF-05) is ~1.
Figure 6. Comparisons of time series, scatter plots, and spectra of PMF factors: (a) HOA, (b) LO-OOA, and (c) MO-OOA, for the CV and SV during the Billerica study. The regression slope of total OA between the SV and CV in the Billerica study is ~1.

Good comparisons for the factor time series between the SV and CV is found (with R between 0.80 and 0.90 for UMR vs UMR; R between 0.61 and 0.97 for HR vs UMR), as shown in Figure 4. An improved regression slope and R of LO-OOAI and LO-OOAII in the comparison of UMR vs UMR (LO-OOAI: slope = 1.16; R = 0.80; LO-OOAII: slope = 0.88; R = 0.86) compared to HR vs UMR (slope = 1.32; R = 0.61; slope = 0.70, R = 0.90) is observed. For all factors, m/z 44 and its related ions (e.g., CO∗ and H2O∗) show higher abundances in the CV than the SV, consistent with the enhanced f44 in CV during SOAS.30 In all CV PMF factors is still positively correlated with f44 in the SV factor. This suggests that the variation of f44 in different PMF factors from the CV is still distinct, despite the larger values (Figure S9). Characteristic tracer ions (e.g., m/z 82 and m/z 53 for IEPOX-SOA and m/z 91 for LO-OOAII and I) also appear in their respective CV PMF factor spectra similar to the corresponding PMF factors from the SV. Meanwhile, the MO-OOA factor is the most oxidized factor for both the CV and SV.

For the KORUS-AQ study, three PMF factors, including hydrocarbon-like OA (HOA, correlated with black carbon, R ≈ 0.8), less-oxidized OA (LO-OOA, correlated well with aerosol nitrate and formaldehyde, R > 0.84) and more-oxidized OA (MO-OOA, correlated with sulfate, R > 0.7) are resolved, as shown in Figure 5. Good correlation coefficients of all the time series of PMF factors between the SV and CV (R > 0.87) are found in the KORUS-AQ study. For the Billerica study, three PMF factors were resolved. Good correlation of LO-OOA (R = 0.84) and moderate correlation of MO-OOA (R = 0.44) and HOA (R = 0.53) between the CV and SV are found (Figure 6). The slightly poorer correlation of HOA and MO-OOA in the Billerica study is mainly caused by some differences in the time series in the early comparison period (light blue background in Figure 6) and may be influenced by the very short time period and thus limited number of data points available for PMF comparison (3.5 days with ~180 points, while a week or longer period with more points, e.g., > 1000, is preferred) and limited signal-to-noise of the ACSM. Consistent with SOAS, prominent peaks at m/z 44 and m/z 28 are observed in the spectra of almost all PMF factors from the CV in both the Billerica and KORUS-AQ studies (except for HOA in KORUS-AQ), while ions above m/z 44 are less abundant in the CV compared to the SV. Similar to the SV, the HOA factor from the CV in KORUS-AQ and Billerica also shows much higher f44 at m/z > 50 than the other OOA factors. Positive correlation of the O:C and H:C ratios of the respective PMF factors are also observed in KORUS-AQ study (Figure S9).

The average fractions of total OA for each PMF factor of the total OA are shown in Figure 7. In all three studies, the fraction of each factor for the SV vs CV are reasonably consistent with each other. The only significant difference observed is the higher MO-OOA (37%) for the CV vs SV in KORUS-AQ. However, a consistent overestimation of MO-OOA is not observed across the different studies because the values are more similar for SOAS and actually lower MO-OOA for the CV than SV in the Billerica study. It is well-known that the separation of different types of OOA is the most difficult and uncertain aspect of PMF of AMS data (e.g., Ulbrich et al.), so these observations are not surprising. The factors that are more chemically and spectrally distinct (e.g., HOA and IEPOX-SOA) compare well across CV and SV. The reasons causing the slight differences of PMF factor separation between the CV and SV are unclear and may be influenced by different signal-to-noise (S/N) ratios due to different relative instrument sensitivities (not related to the vaporizers), as shown in Figure S10. The bootstrap calculation shows lower uncertainty of PMF deconvolution in the CV than the SV for the SOAS study, higher uncertainties for PMF deconvolution in the CV than the SV for the KORUS-AQ and Billerica studies (especially for the separation
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high O:C ratios largely due to unusually high CO+ and H2O+.

Figure 7. Fraction of each PMF factor in total OA during the SOAS, Billerica, and KORUS-AQ studies. Pie charts of PMF factor contributions for the CV and SV are also shown. The uncertainty bar of each PMF factor is calculated based on bootstrapping analysis (Table S4).

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we have examined the performance of the CV in the AMS for OA elemental analysis and source/component apportionment using multiple pure OA standard compounds and ambient OA. Calibration parameters for O:C and H:C ratio in A-E (O:C of 0.75 and H:C of 0.92) and A-A formulations are derived on the basis of comparing the measured elemental ratio of pure organic species in the CV vs their theoretical values. Calibration parameters for ambient OA (O:C of 0.73 and H:C of 0.72) are also recommended based on comparing the measured elemental ratios of ambient aerosols vs those estimated from C-IA method in the SV. We recommend the use O:C of 0.75 and H:C of 0.92 to calibrate elemental ratios from the CV when H2O+ and CO2+ can be accurately assessed, and to apply O:C of 0.73 and H:C of 0.72 as calibration parameters for ambient OA measured with the CV. A few outliers (specifically oleic acid, squalene, and nicotine acid) were found to have artificially high O:C ratios largely due to unusually high CO+ and H2O+ ion intensity. After calibration, good agreement of the measured OA:OC and OSC between the CV and SV was obtained. No effect of oxygen from the carrier gas was observed. Evaluating the CV calibration and CO+/CO2+ and H2O+/CO2+ ratios with additional standard compounds and other types of ambient aerosols (e.g., biomass burning OA) in future studies is recommended.

PMF results from the CV data sets show good agreement with those from the SV in three field studies in very different environments, including an aircraft study (SOAS, Billerica, and KORUS-AQ), indicating that PMF analysis of CV-AMS is similarly useful as for SV-AMS. In some cases (e.g., same type AMSs equipped with the CV and SV being compared), the chosen solutions and the bootstrap analysis shows higher uncertainty for the apportionment of OOA subtypes in the CV than the SV, which might be due to the low signal-to-noise at larger m/z from the increased thermal decomposition in the CV. With wider use of CV in the future, a larger database of representative spectra from different types of OA can be obtained, which will help guide other source apportionment analyses (e.g., chemical mass balance (CMB) and constrained PMF analysis (ME-2)) using the CV, of particular importance for ACSM measurements where the PMF rotational ambiguity is typically larger.
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**ABBREVIATION/GLOSSARY/NOMENCLATURE**

- **ACSM**: Aerosol chemical speciation monitor
- **A-A method**: Aiken ambient method
- **A-E method**: Aiken explicit method
- **AMS**: Aerosol mass spectrometer
- **ARI**: Aerodyne research incorporated.
- **BB**: Biomass burning
- **BBOA**: Biomass burning organic aerosol
- **CE**: Collection efficiency
- **C-IA method**: Canagaratna Improved-Ambient method
- **CPC**: Condensation particle counter
- **C-ToF-MS**: Compact time-of-flight mass spectrometer
- **CMB**: Chemical mass balance
- **CV**: Capture vaporizer
- **CV-AMS**: Aerosol mass spectrometer equipped with a capture vaporizer
- **DMA**: Differential mobility analyzer
- **f_{CO2}**: The ratio of the organic CO_{2}\^+ signal to the total OA signal
- **f_{44}**: The ratio of the m/z 44 signal to the total OA signal
- **f_{43}**: The ratio of the m/z 43 signal to the total OA signal
- **f_{m/z}**: The ratio of the organic signal at a given m/z to the total OA signal
- **FPEAK**: A parameter used to explore the rotational freedom of solution in positive matrix factorization analysis.
- **H:C**: Hydrogen-to-carbon atomic ratio of OA
- **HR**: High resolution
- **HR-ToF-MS**: High-resolution time-of-flight mass spectrometer
- **HR-ToF-AMS**: High-resolution time-of-flight aerosol mass spectrometer
- **HOA**: Hydrocarbon-like organic aerosol
- **IE**: Ionization efficiency
- **IEPOX-SOA**: Isoprene derived epoxydiols secondary organic aerosol, which is SOA mainly formed from isoprene oxidation under low NO condition.
- **IGOR pro**: An interactive software environment for analysis of scientific and engineering data and the production of publication-quality graphs.
- **KORUS-AQ**: KOREan-United States Air Quality mission, a aircraft study carried out in and around South Korea.
- **LO-OOA**: Less-oxidized oxygenated organic aerosol
- **LToF-AMS**: Long time-of-flight aerosol mass spectrometer, which has a resolution approaching 8000 m/Δm
- **MS**: Multilinear engine, a software tool that can perform constrained PMF analysis
- **MO-OOA**: More-oxidized oxygenated organic aerosol
- **N:C**: Nitrogen-to-carbon atomic ratio of OA
- **Nd: YAG**: Neodymium-doped yttrium aluminum garnet; Nd:Y\textsubscript{3}Al\textsubscript{5}O\textsubscript{12}, which is a crystal that is used as a lasing medium for solid-state lasers.
- **NH\textsubscript{4}NO\textsubscript{3}**: Ammonium nitrate
- **(NH\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{2}SO\textsubscript{4}**: Ammonium sulfate
- **NO\textsubscript{3}^{-}**: Nitrate radical
- **NOx**: Nitrogen oxides (=NO + NO\textsubscript{2})
- **O\textsubscript{3}**: Ozone
- **OA**: Organic aerosol
- **OOA**: Oxygenated organic aerosol
- **OA:OC**: Organic aerosol to organic carbon ratio
- **OC**: Organic carbon
- **O:C**: Oxygen-to-carbon atomic ratio of OA
- **OM:OC**: Organic matter to organic carbon ratio, which is equal to OA:OC
- **OSc**: Average carbon oxidation state
- **PET**: PMF Evolution Tool, an interface using IGOR pro software for unconstrained PMF analysis (developed by the Jimenez group at the university of Colorado)
- **PMF**: Positive matrix factorization,
- **PCI**: Pressure controlled inlet
- **Q/Q_{exp}**: Ratio of the weighted squared residual ("Q") to the expected value, if the PMF model applied and the error are correctly specified. This parameter is used to evaluate PMF results.
- **RH**: Relative humidity
- **SMPS**: Scanning mobility particle sizer
- **SOA**: Secondary organic aerosol
- **SOAS**: Southern oxidant and aerosol study, a field study carried out in the southeastern US in summer 2013.
- **SoFi**: A interface IGOR software developed by Paul Scherrer Institute for constrained PMF (ME-2) analysis
- **S/N**: Signal-to-noise
- **SV**: Standard vaporizer
- **SV-AMS**: Aerosol mass spectrometer equipped with a standard vaporizer
- **TLC**: Thin-layer chromatography
- **UMR**: Unit mass resolution
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