

Supplementary material to :

Field measurements of methylglyoxal using Proton Transfer Reaction-Time of Flight Mass Spectrometry and comparison to the DNPH/HPLC-UV method

Vincent Michoud^{1,2}, Stéphane Sauvage¹, Thierry Léonardis¹, Isabelle Fronval¹, Alexandre Kukui³, Nadine Locoge¹, Sébastien Dusanter¹

[1] IMT Lille Douai, Univ. Lille, SAGE - Département Sciences de l'Atmosphère et Génie de l'Environnement, 59000 Lille, France

[2] LISA/IPSL, Laboratoire Interuniversitaire des Systèmes Atmosphériques, UMR CNRS 7583, Université Paris Est Créteil (UPEC) et Université Paris Diderot (UPD), Créteil, France

[3] Laboratoire de Physique et Chimie de l'Environnement et de l'Espace (LPC2E), UMR6115 CNRS-Université d'Orléans, 45071 Orléans CEDEX 2, France

Supplementary material 1: Example of peak fitting for MEK+butanal and methylglyoxal during the ChArMEx SOP2 field campaign




Figure S1: Example of signal recorded at m/z 73 (red line) and of Gaussian peak fitting analysis for MEK+butanal (green line) at m/z 73.065 and methylglyoxal (blue line) at m/z 73.029.

Supplementary material 2: Scatter plot of the PTR-ToFMS sensitivity for MGLY and the m/z 37-to-m/z 19 ratio




Figure S2: Scatter plot of the PTR-ToFMS sensitivity calculated at each tested MGLY concentration during calibration experiments and the m/z 37-to-m/z 19 ratio as a proxy for humidity.

Supplementary material 3: Scatter plots of the difference observed between the 2 techniques and various gaseous species




Figure S3: Scatter plots of the difference observed between the two techniques and various atmospheric species (red and black circles for night-time and daytime, respectively). (a) butanal measured by active sampling on DNP cartridges, (b) O_3 , (c) acetaldehyde measured by PTR-ToFMS, (d) nopinone measured by PTR-ToFMS, (e) MGLY measured by PTR-ToFMS and (f) MGLY measured by active sampling on DNP cartridges.

Supplementary material 4: Scatter plots of the difference observed between the 2 techniques and the concentrations of various high m/z compounds




Figure S4: Scatter plots of the difference observed between the two techniques and (a) m/z 137 (monoterpenes), (b) m/z 139 (Nopinone), (c) m/z 151 (Pinonaldehyde), and (d) m/z 155 (unidentified oxidation product of monoterpenes).

Supplementary material 5: Scatter plot of coefficients of determination (R^2) for linear regressions between blank signals and ambient signals recorded at m/z 73 and daily averaged relative humidity values (RH)




Figure S5: Scatter plot between coefficients of determination for the linear correlations observed between blank signals and ambient signals recorded at m/z 73 and daily averaged relative humidity values (RH).