An inter-laboratory comparison of aerosol inorganic ion measurements by Ion Chromatography: implications for aerosol pH estimate

Jingsha Xu[1], Shaojie Song[2], Roy M. Harrison[1], Congbo Song[1], Lianfang Wei[3], Qiang Zhang[4], Yele Sun[3], Lu Lei[3], Chao Zhang[5], Xiaohong Yao[5, 6], Dihui Chen[5], Weijun Li[7], Miaomiao Wu[7], Hezhong Tian[8], Lining Luo[8], Shengrui Tong[9], Weiran Li[9], Junling Wang[10], Guoliang Shi[11], Yanqi Huangfu[11], Yingze Tian[11], Baozhu Ge[3], Shaoli Su[12], Chao Peng[12], Yang Chen[12], Fumo Yang[13], Aleksandra Mihajlidi-Zelić[14], Dragana Đorđević[14], Stefan J. Swift[15], Imogen Andrews[15], Jacqueline F. Hamilton[15], Ye Sun[16], Agung Kramawijaya[1], Jinxiu Han[1], Supattarachai Saksakulkrai[1], Clarissa Baldo[1], Siqi Hou[1], Feixue Zheng[17], Kaspar R. Daellenbach[17], Chao Yan[17], Yongchun Liu[17], Markku Kulmala[17], Pingqing Fu[4], Zongbo Shi*[1]

1 School of Geography Earth and Environmental Science, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK

2 School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

3 State Key Laboratory of Atmospheric Boundary Layer Physics and Atmospheric Chemistry, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100029, China

4 Institute of Surface-Earth System Science, Tianjin University, Tianjin, 300072, China

5 Frontiers Science Center for Deep Ocean Multispheres and Earth System, and Key Laboratory of Marine Environment and Ecology, Ministry of Education of China, Ocean University of China, Qingdao 266100, China

6 Laboratory for Marine Ecology and Environmental Sciences, Qingdao National Laboratory for Marine Science and Technology, Qingdao 266071, China

7 Department of Atmospheric Sciences, School of Earth Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, China

8 Center for Atmospheric Environmental Studies, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, 100875, China

9 State Key Laboratory of Structural Chemistry of Unstable and Stable Species, Institute of Chemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100190, China

10 School of Environment, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China

11 State Environmental Protection Key Laboratory of Urban Ambient Air Particulate Matter Pollution Prevention and Control, Center for Urban Transport Emission Research, College of Environmental Science and Engineering, Nankai University, Tianjin, 300350, China

12 Research Center for Atmospheric Environment, Chongqing Institute of Green and Intelligent Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chongqing, 400714, China

13 Department of Environmental Science and Engineering, Sichuan University, Chengdu, 610065, China

14 Centre of Excellence in Environmental Chemistry and Engineering – ICTM, University of Belgrade, Njegoševa 12 (Studentski trg 14–16), Belgrade, Serbia

15 Department of Chemistry, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, UK

16 School of Space and Environment, Beihang University, Beijing, 100191, China

17 Beijing Advanced Innovation Center for Soft Matter Science and Engineering, Beijing University of Chemical Technology, Beijing, 100029, China

Correspondence: Zongbo Shi (Z.Shi@bham.ac.uk)

ABSTRACT

Water soluble inorganic ions such as ammonium, nitrate, and sulfate are major components of fine aerosols in the atmosphere and are widely used in the estimation of aerosol acidity. However, different experimental practices and instrumentation may lead to uncertainties in ion concentrations. Here, an inter-comparison experiment was conducted in 10 different laboratories (labs) to investigate the consistency of inorganic ion concentrations and resultant aerosol acidity estimates using the same set of aerosol filter samples. The results mostly exhibited good agreement for major ions Cl^-, SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^-, NH_4^+ and K^+. However, F^-, Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} were observed with more variations across the different labs. The Aerosol Chemical Speciation Monitor (ACSM) data of non-refractory SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^-, NH_4^+ generally correlated very well with the filter analysis based data in our study, but the absolute concentrations differ by up to 42%. Cl^- from the two methods are correlated but the concentration differ by more than a factor of three. The analyses of certified reference materials (CRMs) generally showed good detection accuracy (DA) of all ions in all the labs, the majority of which ranged between 90% and 110%. The DA was also used to correct the ion concentrations to showcase the importance of using CRM for calibration check and quality control. Better agreements were found for Cl^-, SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^-, NH_4^+ and K^+ across the labs after their concentrations were corrected with DA; the coefficient of variation (CV) of Cl^-, SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^-, NH_4^+ and K^+ decreased 1.7%, 3.4%, 3.4%, 1.2% and 2.6%, respectively, after DA correction. We found that the ratio of anion to cation equivalent concentrations (AE/CE) and Ion balance (anions − cations) are not a good indicator for aerosol acidity estimates, as the results in different labs did not agree well with each other. In situ aerosol pH calculated from the ISORROPIA-II thermodynamic equilibrium model with measured ion and ammonia concentrations showed a similar trend and good agreement across the 10 labs. Our results indicate that although there are important uncertainties in aerosol ion concentration measurements, the estimated aerosol pH from the ISORROPIA-II model is more consistent.

Keywords: PM$_{2.5}$, inorganic ions, aerosol acidity, ion balance, thermodynamic model

62

1.   INTRODUCTION

Water-soluble inorganic ions (WSII), consisting of F^-, Cl^-, NO_2^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-}, NH_4^+, Na^+, K^+, Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+}, are a major component of atmospheric aerosols and can contribute up to 77% of $PM_{2.5}$ (particulate matter with aerodynamic diameter ≤ 2.5 μm) mass (Xu et al., 2019a). Secondary inorganic aerosols (SIA) including sulfate, nitrate and ammonium (SNA) often dominate water-soluble ionic species in $PM_{2.5}$, and were reported to account for more than 90% of WSII in Sichuan, China (Tian et al., 2017). In Beijing, the average SNA concentrations can range from 4.2 ± 2.9 μg/m^3 in non-haze days to 85.9 ± 22.4 μg/m^3 in heavily polluted days, and contribute 15%-49% of $PM_{2.5}$ (Li et al., 2016). SNA can greatly influence air pollution, visibility, aerosol acidity and hygroscopicity, which are driving factors affecting aerosol-phase pH and chemistry and the uptake of gaseous species by particles (Shon et al., 2012; Xue et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2019). Hence, the study of WSII is of great interest due to their adverse impacts.

WSII in aerosols were reported to be analyzed by multiple techniques such as Cl^- by spectrophotometry, and Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+} by flame atomic absorption in the early 1980s (Harrison and Pio, 1983). However, previous methods were time-consuming as WSII were analyzed by different techniques separately. Ion chromatography (IC), which was first introduced in 1975 (Buchberger, 2001), was applied in many studies for routine measurement of atmospheric WSII due to its fast, accurate and sensitive determination in a single run (Heckenberg and Haddad, 1984; Baltensperger and Hertz, 1985). IC can be coupled with diverse detection techniques for ion analysis, such as suppressed conductivity, UV-VIS absorbance, amperometry, potentiometry, mass spectrometry, etc. (Buchberger, 2001). It has been used in various atmospheric studies for many years and is still widely applied at present, such as in the investigation of WSII in size-segregated aerosols (Li et al., 2013; Zhao et al., 2011; Đorđević et al., 2012), fine aerosols (Fan et al., 2017; He et al., 2017; Liu et al.,

2017a) and coarse aerosols (Li et al., 2014; Guo et al., 2011; Mkoma et al., 2009). IC can also be used for the determination of both water soluble organic and inorganic ions (Yu et al., 2004; Karthikeyan and Balasubramanian, 2006).

Aerosol ion concentrations can also be measured by online methods such as the Aerosol Chemical Speciation Monitor (ACSM) or Aerosol Mass Spectrometer (AMS) (Ng et al., 2011; Sun et al., 2012). During the recent Atmospheric Pollution and Human Health in a Chinese Megacity (APHH-China) campaigns (Shi et al., 2019), we observed important discrepancies between offline aerosol IC observations from different labs and between online AMS and offline IC methods. This prompted us to carry out this intercomparison exercise.

The IC method had been validated by a common reference standard - NIST SRM 1648 (urban particulate matter) and the results for Na, K, S and NH_4^+ were compared with those from other suitable alternative analytical techniques such as AAS, UV-VIS and PIXE in previous studies (Karthikeyan and Balasubramanian, 2006). However, to the best of our knowledge, no investigation has been conducted to compare the results of different laboratories (labs) for such an important and widely used simple technique.

The aim of this work is to 1) examine the consistency of ion concentrations measured by various labs and by ACSM, 2) explore the impact of the inter-lab variability in ion concentration measurements on aerosol acidity estimates, and 3) provide recommendations for improving future WSII analysis by IC.

2.   EXPERIMENTAL

2.1   Participating Laboratories

Ten laboratories from China, United Kingdom and Serbia were invited to take part in the inter-laboratory comparison of atmospheric inorganic ions, which are listed as follows: University of Birmingham; University of York; University of Belgrade; Zhejiang University; Nankai University;

112 Ocean University of China; Beijing Normal University; Chongqing Institute of Green and Intelligent

113 Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences; Institute of Chemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences;

114 Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences. The participating laboratories were

115 randomly coded from Lab-1 to Lab-10 and not related to the above order.

116

2.2 Sample and Data Collection

118 Eight daily PM$_{2.5}$ samples were collected on quartz filters (total area: 406.5cm^2) from 16th-23rd

119 January 2019 by a high-volume air sampler (1.13 m^3 min^{-1}; Tisch Environmental Inc., USA) at an

120 urban site, located at the Institute of Atmospheric Physics (IAP) of the Chinese Academy of Sciences

121 in Beijing, China. The sampling site (116.39E, 39.98N) is located between the North Third Ring Road

122 and North Fourth Ring Road, and approximately 200 m from the G6 Highway. It is 8 m above the

123 ground and surrounded by high-density roads and buildings; detailed information regarding the

124 sampling site can be found elsewhere (Shi et al., 2019). Apart from the aerosol samples, 5 field blank

125 filters were also collected in the same manner with the pump off. All ion concentrations in this study

126 were corrected by the values obtained from field blanks. Hourly PM$_{2.5}$ mass concentrations were

127 obtained from a nearby Olympic Park station, the China National Environmental Monitoring Network

128 (CNEM) website. Shi et al. (2019) showed that the PM$_{2.5}$ data at this station are close to those

129 observed at IAP during the APHH-China campaigns. The close observed PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations at

130 different air quality stations in Beijing provide further reassurance of the representability of the

131 observed concentration at Olympic Park. The original hourly data was averaged to 24 h for better

132 comparison.

133

134 An Aerodyne Time-of-Flight Aerosol Chemical Speciation Monitor (ToF-ACSM) with a PM$_{2.5}$

135 aerodynamic lens was also deployed on the same roof of the building at IAP for real-time

136 measurements of non-refractory (NR) chemical species (Organics, Cl$^-$, NO$_3^-$, SO$_4^{2-}$ and NH$_4^+$) in

137 PM$_{2.5}$ (NR-PM$_{2.5}$) with 2 min time resolution (Sun et al., 2020). Another ToF-ACSM was also used

138 to measure the PM$_{2.5}$-associated non-refractory chemical species at the Beijing University of

139 Chemical Technology (BUCT), which is located at the west third-Ring Road of Beijing and

140 approximately 10 km away from the sampling location of IAP. The collection efficiencies (CE)

141 applied for the ACSM at IAP and BUCT were different. For IAP, a capture vaporizer was used, and

142 the CE was assumed to be close to 1 (Sun et al., 2020). For BUCT, a standard vaporizer was applied

143 with a composition- and acidity-dependent CE calculated according to Middlebrook et al. (2012).

144 Details regarding quality control of the ACSM at IAP and BUCT can be found elsewhere (Sun et al.,

145 2020; Liu et al., 2020). The concentrations of non-refractory species were calculated from mass

146 spectra using a fragmentation table (Allan et al., 2004). The ToF-ACSM data were then averaged to

147 24h for a comparison with those from filter analysis in our study. Note that the ToF-ACSM data at

148 IAP on 19th and 20th and data at BUCT on 17th and 18th are excluded from the comparison due to the

149 maintenance of the instrument. An ammonia analyzer (DLT‐100, Los Gatos Research LGR, USA)

150 which applies a unique laser absorption technology called off-axis integrated cavity output

151 spectroscopy was used for the ambient NH$_3$ measurements. It has a precision of 0.2 ppb and the

152 original data with 5 min intervals were averaged to 24 h for the calculation of aerosol pH. More

153 information on NH$_3$ measurement can be found elsewhere (Ge et al., 2019).

154

155 **2.3   Sample Analysis**

156 Filter cuts of 5cm^2 and 6cm^2 from the same set of samples were used for extraction in 10 labs. Filters

157 were extracted ultrasonically for 30 minutes with 10 ml ultrapure water in all laboratories and then

158 filtered before IC analysis. The instrument details are given in Table 1 and the extraction details

159 including purity of ultrapure water, model/power of ultrasonicator, type of syringe filter and vials that

160 used for analysis are provided in Table S1. In total, 9 ionic species were reported: F$^-$, Cl$^-$, SO$_4^{2-}$, NO$_3^-$,

161 Na$^+$, NH$_4^+$, K$^+$, Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+}. Other ions including Br$^-$, NO$_2^-$, PO$_4^{3-}$ and Li$^+$ were not included due

162 to their relatively low concentrations in aerosol samples. The calibration detail and QA/QC

163 procedures are provided in Table S2.

164

165 Certified reference materials (CRM) were also determined for quality control. CRM for cations

166 (CRM-C, Multi Cation Standard 1 for IC, Sigma-Aldrich) contains 200mg/L Na^+, 200mg/L K^+,

167 50mg/L Li^+, 200mg/L Mg^{2+}, 1000mg/L Ca^{2+} and 400mg/L NH_4^+. CRM for anion (CRM-A, Multi

168 Anion Standard 1 for IC, Sigma-Aldrich) contains 3mg/L F^-, 10mg/L Cl^-, 20mg/L Br^-, 20mg/L NO_3^-,

169 20mg/L SO_4^{2-} and 30mg/L PO_4^{3-}. CRM-C and CRM-A were diluted 180 and 6 times, respectively.

170 20mL of the diluted CRM solutions were marked as unknown solutions and sent along with the

171 aerosol samples to each lab for analysis. All CRM solutions were measured by each lab as unknown

172 samples. All filters and solutions were kept frozen during transportation to prevent any loss due to

173 volatilization.

174 **Table 1.** Summary of instrument and method details in 10 laboratories.

Lab No.	Instrument model (Ion Chromatograph)		Columns & suppressor		Eluent	
	Anions	Cations	Anions	Cations	Anions	Cations
1	Dionex AQUNION-1100	Dionex AQUNION-1100	IonPac™ AS11-HC separation column; IonPac™ AG11-HC guard column; suppressor ASRS 300	IonPac™ CS12A separation column; IonPac™ CG12A guard column; suppressor CSRS 300;	30 mM KOH; 1.0 ml/min.	20 mM methansulfonic acid; 1.0 ml/min.
2	Dionex ICS-1100	Dionex ICS-1100	IonPac™ AS11-HC separation column; IonPac™ AG11-HC guard column; suppressor ASRS 500	IonPac™ CS12A separation column; IonPac™ CG12A guard column; suppressor CSRS 500	KOH with gradient variation from 0 to 30 mM; 0.38 ml/min.	15 mM methansulfonic acid; 0.25 ml/min
3	Dionex ICS-600	Dionex ICS-600	IonPac™ AS11-HC separation column; IonPac™ AG11-HC guard column; suppressor ASRS 300	IonPac™ CS12A separation column; IonPac™ CG12A guard column; suppressor CSRS 300	20 mM KOH; 1.0 ml/min.	20 mM methansulfonic acid; 1.0 ml/min
4	Dionex 600	Dionex ICS 2100	IonPac™ AS11 separation column; IonPac™ AG11 guard column; suppressor ASRS 300	IonPac™ CS12A separation column; IonPac™ CG12A guard column; suppressor CSRS 300	30 mM KOH; 1.0 ml/min	20 mM methansulfonic acid; 1.0 ml/min
5	Ion Chromotragraph (ECO)	Ion Chromotragraph (ECO)	Metrosep A5-150 separation column; Metrosep A SUPP 4/5 Guard/4.0 guard column; suppressor MSM	Metrosep C4-150 separation column	3.2 mM Na_2CO_3-1.0mM $NaHCO_3$; 0.7 ml/min	1.7 mM nitric acid - 0.7mM dipicolinic acid; 0.9 ml/min
6	Metrohm (940 Professional IC Vario)	Metrohm (940 Professional IC Vario)	Metrohm A SUPP 5-250 separation column; Metrohm A SUPP 10-250 guard column; suppressor MSM-A Rotor	METROSEP C6-150 separation column; Metrohm C4 guard column	3.2 mM Na_2CO_3-1.0mM $NaHCO_3$; 0.7 ml/min	1.7 mM nitric acid - 1.7mM dipicolinic acid; 0.9 ml/min

7	Dionex ICS600	Dionex ICS600	IonPac^{TM} AS11-HC separation column; IonPac^{TM} AG11-HC guard column; suppressor ASRS	IonPac^{TM} CS12A separation column; IonPac^{TM} CG12A guard column; suppressor CSRS	30 mM KOH; 1ml/min	20 mM methansulfonic acid; 1.0 ml/min
8	Dionex ICS-900	Dionex ICS-900	IonPac^{TM} AS14 separation column; IonPac^{TM} AG14 guard column; suppressor Dionex CCRS 500	IonPac^{TM} CS12A separation column; IonPac^{TM} CG12A guard column; suppressor Dionex CCRS 500	3.5 mM Na_2CO_3-1.0mM $NaHCO_3$; 1.2 ml/min	20 mM methansulfonic acid; 1.0 ml/min
9	Dionex ICS-1100	Dionex ICS-1100	IonPac^{TM} RFICTM AS14A separation column; IonPac^{TM} RFICTM AG14A Guard column	IonPac^{TM} RFICTM CS12A separation column; IonPac^{TM} RFICTM CG12A Guard column	8.0 mM Na_2CO_3-1.0mM $NaHCO_3$; 1.0 ml/min	20 mM methansulfonic acid; 1.0 ml/min
10	Dionex ICS-2100	Dionex INTEGRION HPIC	IonPac^{TM} AS15 separation column; IonPac^{TM} AG15 guard column; suppressor ADRS 600	IonPac^{TM} CS12A separation column; IonPac^{TM} CG12A guard column; suppressor CERS 500;	38mM KOH; 0.3 ml/min.	20 mM methansulfonic acid; 1.0 ml/min.

175

2.4   Coefficient of Divergence Analysis

In order to investigate the differences of ionic concentrations measured by different labs, the Pearson's correlation coefficient (R) and the coefficient of divergence (COD) were applied. COD is a parameter to evaluate the degree of uniformity or divergence of two datasets. COD and R were computed for Lab_j/Lab-Median pairs, of which Lab_j indicates the results of each lab and Lab-Median represents the median values of 10 labs. Median values are chosen here to better represent the theoretical true concentrations of the ions, as there are some outliers in some labs, and the averages may be less representative. The results of COD and R were also computed for Lab_j/Lab-Mean, Lab_j/Lab-Upper and Lab_j/Lab-Lower pairs (Supplemental Information Fig. S1-S3), where Lab-Mean, Lab-Upper and Lab-Lower represent the mean value, upper values (84% percentile) and lower values (16% percentile) of ion concentrations measured by 10 labs. COD of ionic concentrations of two datasets is determined as follows:

$$COD_{jk} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{P}\sum_{i=1}^{P}\left(\frac{X_{ij}-X_{ik}}{X_{ij}+X_{ik}}\right)^2} \tag{1}$$

where j represents the ion concentrations measured by an individual lab-j, k stands for the median ion concentrations of 10 labs, P is the number of samples. X_{ij} and X_{ik} represent the concentration of ion i measured by lab-j and the median concentration of ion i measured by 10 labs, respectively. COD value equal to 0 implies no difference between two datasets, while a COD of 1 means absolute heterogeneity and maximum difference between two datasets (Liu et al., 2017c). A COD value of 0.2 is applied as an indicator for similarity and variability (Krudysz et al., 2008). A higher COD (>0.2) implies variability between two datasets, while lower COD (<0.2) indicates similarity between them. Overall, lower COD (<0.2) and higher R (>0.8) of the lab suggest the similar variation pattern and similar ion concentrations of this lab with the median values of 10 labs.

2.5 ISORROPIA-II

ISORROPIA-II is a thermodynamic equilibrium model for predicting the composition and physical state of atmospheric inorganic aerosols (available at http://isorropia.eas.gatech.edu) (Fountoukis and Nenes, 2007). It was applied in this study to calculate the aerosol water content (AWC) and pH. Aerosol pH in this study (pH$_i$) was defined as the molality-based hydrogen ion activity on a logarithmic scale, calculated applying the following equation (Jia et al., 2018; Song et al., 2019):

$$pH_i = -\log_{10}\left(a_{H^+_{(aq)}}\right) = -\log_{10}\left(m_{H^+_{(aq)}} \gamma_{H^+_{(aq)}} / m^\Theta\right) \qquad (2)$$

where $a_{H^+_{(aq)}}$ represents hydrogen ion activity in aqueous solution, $H^+_{(aq)}$. $m_{H^+_{(aq)}}$ and $\gamma_{H^+_{(aq)}}$ represent the molality and the molality-based activity coefficient of $H^+_{(aq)}$, respectively. m^Θ is the standard molality (1 mol kg^{-1}). Model inputs include aerosol-phase Cl$^-$, SO$_4^{2-}$, NO$_3^-$, Na$^+$, NH$_4^+$, K$^+$, Mg^{2+}, Ca^{2+} and gas-phase NH$_3$ concentrations, along with daily averaged temperature and relative humidity (Table S3). In this study, the model was run only in forward mode (with gas + aerosol inputs) in the thermodynamically metastable phase state, assuming salts do not precipitate under supersaturated conditions. More information regarding applications of ISORROPIA-II can be found in other studies (Guo et al., 2016; Weber et al., 2016; Song et al., 2018).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA & QC)

3.1.1 Certified reference materials (CRM) – detection accuracy and repeatability

Certified reference materials for both cations and anions were investigated for quality control. CRM-C and CRM-A were analyzed three consecutive times in each lab. The detection

223 accuracy (DA) of each ion was determined as the ratio of measured concentration divided by

224 its certified concentration in percentage. The results of DA of all ions are listed in Table 2.

225 **Table 2.** Detection accuracy (%) of water-soluble inorganic ions in certified reference materials
226 measured by 10 laboratories.

Lab NO.	F^-	Cl^-	SO_4^{2-}	NO_3^-	Na^+	NH_4^+	K^+	Mg^{2+}	Ca^{2+}
1	111.8 ± 0.2	107.6 ± 0.1	108.5 ± 2.4	110 ± 0.5	98.2 ± 0.0	108.7 ± 0.3	99.4 ± 0.2	95.6 ± 0.3	99.6 ± 0.6
2	89.1 ± 0.4	95.1 ± 0.2	94.0 ± 1.0	94.5 ± 0.5	102.2 ± 1.0	135.0 ± 6.0	94.9 ± 4.6	95.9 ± 0.2	92.8 ± 0.5
3	101 ± 1.4	95.9 ± 0.3	132.4 ± 31.4	97.1 ± 1.0	91.4 ± 0.1	93.5 ± 0.2	92.4 ± 0.2	105.5 ± 0.3	98.7 ± 0.4
4	94.1 ± 4.0	90.4 ± 0.2	91.9 ± 1.2	91.7 ± 1.4	93.3 ± 1.7	112.2 ± 0.6	92.0 ± 2.8	98.9 ± 2.0	100.4 ± 1.1
5	94.0 ± 3.1	99.0 ± 0.0	92.4 ± 0.9	97.7 ± 0.0	85.9 ± 3.2	89.3 ± 0.5	92.1 ± 4.9	96.1 ± 0.6	101.7 ± 3.0
6	93.3 ± 0.3	110.8 ± 0.5	89.2 ± 0.1	91.4 ± 0.2	98.2 ± 1.1	88.4 ± 1.1	92.2 ± 4.9	102.0 ± 2.1	102.6 ± 1.2
7	89.4 ± 2.7	114.5 ± 21.3	100.8 ± 0.0	105.2 ± 0.2	97.0 ± 1.3	107.5 ± 0.8	72.1 ± 0.8	93.5 ± 0.4	91.9 ± 1.1
8	92.0 ± 0.0	96.6 ± 0.7	97.4 ± 1.1	96.2 ± 1.2	97.3 ± 0.0	93.8 ± 0.3	97.3 ± 0.9	94.0 ± 2.1	89.3 ± 0.6
9	102.6 ± 1.5	105.9 ± 1.0	101.9 ± 4.5	99.1 ± 3.5	101.2 ± 0.1	110.6 ± 0.2	103.0 ± 0.0	99.7 ± 0.2	102.2 ± 0.3
10	103.4 ± 1.6	103.5 ± 0.7	99.0 ± 9.3	114.2 ± 2.5	95.3 ± 4.1	91.0 ± 4.1	91.5 ± 4.7	94.8 ± 3.8	96.3 ± 2.1

227

228 As reported in Table 2, most ions were observed with DA in the range 90% - 110% among 10

229 laboratories. However, SO_4^{2-} in Lab-3 and NH_4^+ in Lab-2 were overestimated, the DA of which

230 were 132.4%±31.4% and 135.0%±6.0%, respectively. The standard deviation of SO_4^{2-}

231 measured by Lab-3 was the largest (31.4%), followed by Cl^- measured by Lab-7 (21.3%),

232 which indicated their poor repeatability. Even though NH_4^+ in Lab-2 was observed with high

233 value of DA, its deviation of three repeats was relatively small, which may be attributable to

234 the evaporation of ammonium in calibration standards in Lab-2; hence, the level it represented

235 was higher than its real concentration. K^+ in Lab-7 was underestimated, and was observed with

236 a DA of only 72.1%±0.8%. This may be due to contamination in the water blanks or the IC

237 system, as the average concentration of K^+ in 3 water blanks of Lab-7 was 8.0 ng/L, much

238 higher than the median value of 10 labs (3.4 ng/L).

239

240 **3.1.2 Detection limits**

241 The detection limits (DLs) in this study were calculated as:

242    $DL = 3 \times SD_i$ (3)

243   where SD_i is the standard deviation of the blank filters. The mean concentrations of the ions in

244   blanks and DLs (3SD) of all ions are provided in Table 3.

245   **Table 3.** Mean filter blank concentrations and detection limits (3SD) (ng/m^3) of ions measured by 10
246   laboratories.

Lab	F$^-$		Cl$^-$		SO$_4^{2-}$		NO$_3^-$		Na$^+$		NH$_4^+$		K$^+$		Mg^{2+}		Ca^{2+}	
	mean	3SD	mean	3SD	mean	3SD	mean	3SD	mean	3SD	mean	3SD	mean	3SD	mean	3SD	mean	3SD
1	2.3	4.0	33.2	31.5	74.2	12.7	64.2	7.1	78.3	31.3	37.2	16.6	7.9	19.6.	3.4	3.9.	50.0	18.2.
2	0.2	0.4	10.9	11.3	15.6	2.5	35.3	14.7	11.5	8.0	20.8	5.0	3.4	1.2	3.2	6.8	38.1	54.6
3	2.8	2.0	6.3	2.7	8.7	11.7	15.3	10.5	0.5	3.4	9.6	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	18.8
4	59.6	195.2	103.6	229.3	85.3	25.9	50.3	159.6	22.8	29.4	59.6	123.2	19.1	26.5	10.1	1.9	376.4	90.4
5	4.2	2.7	50.9	98.6	33.4	40.8	25.7	116.5	51.6.	57.7.	46.3	54.7	22.6	9.4	45.4	9.4	268.2	49.8
6	n.a.	n.a.	251.6	7.4	55.1	53.6	24.5	0.0	56.6	35.9	35.0	46.1	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
7	2.1	3.9	11.4	11.8	37.9	32.7	14.5	40.3	6.1	0.0	5.8	0.0	4.9	12.4	1.4	4.5	7.6	17.3
8	n.a.	n.a.	29.0	32.8	17.4	26.1	n.a.	n.a.	8.7	22.6	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	20.3	27.1
9	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	34.8	32.8	39.5	22.7	47.4	12.1	21.2	8.3	10.1	5.4	1.6	0.2	7.1	32.4
10	29.4	1.3	19.5	21.1	59.4	21.3	78.8	102.2	24.6	53.3	33.5	34.2	31.3	82.1	4.3	0.0	10.2	14.6

247   *Note: The detection limits were calculated based on large-volume sampling (total filter size: 406.5 cm^2; total*
248   *sampling volume: 1560 m^3); n.a.: not available due to no relevant peaks being identified in the chromatography.*

249 ## 3.2 Mass Concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ and Inorganic Ions

250 ### 3.2.1 PM$_{2.5}$ and ion concentrations

251 The results for PM$_{2.5}$ and all inorganic ion concentrations measured by 10 labs are presented in

252 Fig. 1. During January 16th – 23rd 2019, the daily mean PM$_{2.5}$ ranged from 8.4 to 53.8 µg/m^3,

253 with an average of 31.4 µg/m^3. Among them, January 16th, 17th and 18th were deemed

254 moderately polluted days with PM$_{2.5}$ concentration > 35 µg/m^3, while the rest were non-haze

255 days with PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations falling in the range of 8.4-27.9 µg/m^3.

256

257

Fig. 1 The time series of mass concentrations of PM$_{2.5}$ and ions

259

260   The time series of all inorganic ions are also shown in Fig. 1 to demonstrate the consistency

261   among different laboratories. In Fig. 1, Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ showed a similar trend to

262    $PM_{2.5}$ and good correlations among the 10 labs, suggesting the consistency and reliability of

263   using Ion Chromatography for analysing these ions, despite various instruments and analysing

264   methods. Larger variations of Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ concentrations between different

265   laboratories were observed in moderately polluted days, whereas results for the non-haze days,

266   especially for 19th and 20th, were observed with good agreement in 10 labs. Good agreement

267   was also observed for the mass ratios of NO_3^-/SO_4^{2-} in most of the labs during the study period

268   (Fig. S4), which basically followed a similar trend as $PM_{2.5}$. On more polluted days,

269   NO_3^-/SO_4^{2-} ratios were obviously higher than less polluted days, suggesting the dominance of

270   mobile source contributions over stationary sources during heavily polluted days.

271

272   The average SNA concentrations of 8 samples varied from 6.3±3.3 (Lab-4) to 9.1±5.0 (Lab-1)

273    $\mu g/m^3$ in 10 labs, accounting for 20.6±4.8 % to 29.0±6.7 % of the $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentrations.

274   However, their contributions to total ions measured by each lab were not significantly different,

275   which ranged between 83.6±2.7% and 86.3±2.3%. The total ions summed to 24.3±4.9% (Lab-

276   4) to 33.8±7.1% (Lab-1) of $PM_{2.5}$. These results are comparable with those in another study in

277   Beijing which found that SNA accounted for 88% of total ions and 9-70% of $PM_{2.5}$

278   concentrations (Xu et al., 2019b). As shown in Table 2, the DA of most ions measured by Lab-

279   4 were < 100%, while those of Lab-1 were much higher, especially for major ions (>100%).

280   Corresponding to this, the ion concentrations in Lab-4 were mostly lower than other labs, while

281   those of Lab-1 were mostly higher than other labs. For Lab-6 which was also observed to have

282   lower DA of ions such as SO_4^{2-} (89.2%) and NH_4^+ (88.4%) in 10 labs; its SNA concentrations

283   and total ions accounted for 24.5±5.6 % and 28.7±6.0% of $PM_{2.5}$, respectively, the second

284 lowest among all labs. Hence, it is very important to run certified reference materials before

285 any sample analysis to ensure accuracy and good quality of data.

286

287 K^+ concentrations analysed by 10 labs followed a similar trend to $PM_{2.5}$ mass, except the

288 sample measured on a moderately polluted day (19th) by Lab-6, which is 2-3 times higher than

289 that measured by other labs. F^- concentrations varied across 10 labs, but most of them shared

290 a similar trend. Some labs like Lab-8 did not follow the same trend due to reporting

291 undetectable F^- concentrations. The Na^+ concentration on the least polluted day (20th) was

292 abnormally high in Lab-9, while its concentrations measured by other labs were generally low.

293 This could be due to Na^+ contamination during preparation or measurement of this sample, as

294 Na^+ concentrations in the rest of the samples measured by Lab-9 followed a similar trend as

295 that of other labs. The alkaline ions Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} are mostly originated from crustal dust and

296 mainly exist in coarse particles (Zou et al., 2018). Their mass concentrations varied

297 considerably due to their relatively low concentrations in aerosol samples and being sometimes

298 below the detection limits in some labs, such as Lab-6. Nevertheless, some labs like Lab-2, 3,

299 and 10 still followed a similar trend.

300

301 **3.2.2   Comparison with ToF-ACSM data**

302 As shown in Fig. 1, Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-}, NH_4^+ generally exhibited similar patterns, but due to

303 some outliers, such as NO_3^- concentration measured by Lab-8 on the 16th , the median values

304 were selected to better represent the general levels and theoretical actual concentrations of ions

305 measured by different labs. The scatter plots of the median mass concentrations of Cl^-, NO_3^-,

306 SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ in 10 labs (IC- Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+) *versus* the non-refractory (NR)

307 species measured by the ToF-ACSM (ACSM- Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+) are shown in Fig. 2.

308 The time series of IC and ACSM data at IAP and BUCT are plotted in Fig. S5.

309   Chloride is reported to arise mainly from biomass burning and coal combustion in China

310   (Zhang et al., 2016). Its average concentration in 10 labs correlated very well with $ACSM\text{-}Cl^-$

311   (R^2=0.82 for IAP). However, $IC\text{-}Cl^-$ in IAP is 2-3 times higher than $ACSM\text{-}Cl^-$; this may be

312   due to the small contribution of Cl^- to the overall mass spectrum which made it difficult to

313   quantify by ToF-ACSM (Allan et al., 2004). Additionally, the ACSM is incapable of measuring

314   Cl^- in the form of KCl, as the ACSM only measures non-refractory Cl^-. Poor correlation of

315   chloride (R^2=0.21) was also discovered between two collocated ACSMs with a much larger set

316   of data points, while other NR species were observed with strong correlation (R^2>0.8) in

317   another study (Budisulistiorini et al., 2014), suggesting the quantification of chloride by ACSM

318   has large uncertainties.

319   Sulfate, as another important component of atmospheric secondary inorganic aerosols, plays

320   an important role in the formation of haze (Wang et al., 2014; Yue et al., 2019). The correlation

321   coefficient (R^2) between the measured $IC\text{-}SO_4^{2-}$ and $ACSM\text{-}SO_4^{2-}$ was only 0.26 for IAP with

322   a slope of 0.54. The correlation of $IC\text{-}SO_4^{2-}$ and $ACSM\text{-}SO_4^{2-}$ from BUCT was 0.84 (R^2) with

323   a slope of 0.56. Judging from the slopes, $ACSM\text{-}SO_4^{2-}$ and $ACSM\text{-} NH_4^+$ were similarly higher

324   than the median values of measured SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ concentrations in this study. The NR

325   species followed the same trend as $NR\text{-}PM_{2.5}$, and chemical species measured through filter

326   analysis also shared the same trend as $PM_{2.5}$ measured in our study.

327   Very good correlation between measured IC and ACSM data was found for NO_3^- and NH_4^+

328   with R^2>0.9. The lab median value of NO_3^- was very close to the $ACSM\text{-}NO_3^-$ from the same

329   sampling site- IAP, with a slope of 0.88 for $IC\text{-}NO_3^-$/ $ACSM\text{-}NO_3^-$, while that of BUCT was

330   only 0.57. The slopes of $IC\text{-}NH_4^+$/ $ACSM\text{-}NH_4^+$ were 0.58 and 0.60 for IAP and BUCT,

331   respectively. Comparing $IC\text{-}NH_4^+$ to $ACSM\text{-}NH_4^+$, the absolute concentration of $IC\text{-}NH_4^+$

332   differed the most among all ions (42%), except Cl^-. Generally, $ACSM\text{-}NO_3^-$ and $ACSM\text{-}NH_4^+$

333   were higher than the median values of measured NO_3^- and NH_4^+ concentrations in the 10 labs.

334 Higher concentrations in the online ACSM observations compared to the daily filter sample

335 measurements may be partially due to differences in the performance of the two $PM_{2.5}$ cut-

336 point selectors, which lead to different transmission efficiency of particles. Other reasons could

337 be: 1) the uncertainties in ACSM observations themselves. Crenn et al. (2015) reported the

338 uncertainties of NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-}, and NH_4^+ in ACSM analysis were 15%, 28%, and 36%,

339 respectively; 2) negative filter artefacts, such as volatilization of semi-volatile ions (Kim et al.,

340 2015), although that the latter would not be expected to affect sulfate. Sun et al. (2020) also

341 compared ACSM and filter based IC results and showed that the concentrations of NO_3^-, NH_4^+

342 and SO_4^{2-} in the ACSM measurement were also higher than those of filter-based, although the

343 slopes were smaller than in our study. It is also possible that the representative ions of ACSM-

344 NO_3^- and $-NH_4^+$ could have significant interferences from other species in the mass spectrum,

345 causing large uncertainties even after correction for those interferences.

346 To summarize, SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^-, NH_4^+ from lab analysis generally correlated very well with the

347 ACSM data, but the absolute concentrations differ by up to 42%. Cl^- from the two methods is

348 correlated but the concentration differ by more than a factor of three. It appears that Cl^- is less

349 accurate in online ACSM observations. NO_3^- was comparable for the online data and filter-

350 based data, while SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ in online data may be generally overestimated by a similar

351 factor. It should be noted that higher SO_4^{2-} concentrations in online ACSM data could

352 potentially be due to ACSM not being able to separate organosulfate from sulfate. ACSM-NO_3^-,

353 $-SO_4^{2-}$ and $-NH_4^+$ were also reported to be higher (approximately 10-20%) than filter analysis

354 based NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ in another study (Sun et al., 2020). Although the comparison

355 between IC and ACSM provided important information about the data from the two methods,

356 we recognize that we only have 8 data points here. Future studies should be carried out and

357 include more data points in order to comprehensively study the relationship between the online

358   ACSM data and filter-based data. We emphasize that it is essential that both ACSM and filter-

359   based observations are robustly quality controlled before any ACSM and IC intercomparison.

360

361

362   **Fig. 2** Scatter plots of the median mass concentrations of Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+ measured
363   by 10 labs (IC- Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+) *versus* the non-refractory (NR) chemical species
364   from ACSM (ACSM- Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-} and NH_4^+) from BUCT and IAP.

365

3.3   Divergence and Correlation Analysis

367   As shown above, some ions like Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-}, NH_4^+ generally exhibited similar patterns,

368   but some of the ions varied significantly in different laboratories. Therefore, the Pearson's

369   correlation coefficient (R) and the coefficient of divergence (COD) were both calculated to

370   identify the uniformity and divergence of ionic concentrations measured by different labs. The

371   COD and R values of all ions for Lab_j/Lab-Median pairs are presented in Fig. 3. Cl^-, NO_3^-,

372   SO_4^{2-}, NH_4^+ and K^+ clearly showed high R values (>0.8) and low COD values (<0.2) in all

373   labs, suggesting the reliability of the measurement of these ions in different labs. However, F^-

374   and Ca^{2+} in most labs was observed with higher COD values, and Ca^{2+} was also found with

lower R, suggesting heterogeneity of Ca^{2+} detection in different labs, which made this ion less

reliable. Mg^{2+} was observed with good correlation (>0.7) between each lab and the Lab-Median,

but a higher COD was found between Lab-3, 5, 6 with the Lab-Median. Similarly, Na^+ was

also observed with good correlation (>0.7) between each lab and the Lab-Median, except Lab-

9, and a higher COD was found between Lab-5, 8 with the Lab-Median.

Fig. 3 Coefficient of divergence (COD) plotted against correlation coefficient (R) for all ions
in each lab with the median ionic concentrations of 10 labs. (Note: vertical line indicates an R
value of 0.8, and horizontal lines indicate COD values of 0.2).

3.4 Ion Concentrations calculated by Detection Accuracy of CRM

The detection accuracy of the certified reference materials was used to correct the ion

concentrations in this study to show the importance of using CRM for calibration check and

388   quality control. The correction was conducted by dividing the measured ion concentrations by

389   their corresponding DA value. The coefficient of variation (CV) which can indicate the

390   variance of data, was applied here to compare the variation of uncorrected/corrected ion

391   concentrations among 10 labs. It was calculated as the standard deviation of ion concentrations

392   measured by 10 labs divided by the mean and expressed in a percentage. A lower CV value

393   indicates the closeness of data measured by 10 labs and reflects more precise results, while

394   higher CV value reflects the opposite. As F^-, Na^+, Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} were undetectable in some

395   labs, only Cl^-, SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^-, NH_4^+ and K^+ were investigated and the results are shown in Table

396   4.

397

398   In Table 4, Lab-7 was excluded from the calculation of CV of both uncorrected and corrected

399   chloride, due to its poor repeatability. The CV of uncorrected chloride concentration in 8

400   samples varied between 11.7-19.3%, with an average of 14.3%. CV of corrected chloride

401   concentration in 8 samples varied between 10.4-17.0%, with an average of 12.6%. The

402   averaged CV decreased 1.7% for corrected chloride concentration. Small changes of CV were

403   observed during moderately polluted days (16th, 17th, 18th), but more obvious changes occurred

404   during non-haze days.

405

406   The average CV of SO_4^{2-} surprisingly increased from 9.8% for uncorrected to 10.9% for

407   corrected SO_4^{2-} (Supplemental Table S4). However, when excluding Lab-3 from the

408   calculation, the averaged CV of uncorrected sulfate concentration was 10.3% and it

409   significantly decreased to 6.9% once corrected. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that

410   excessive DA (>110%) with large variation should be avoided for the correction of SO_4^{2-}

411   concentrations. Better agreements of NO_3^- and K^+ concentrations among 10 labs were also

observed after correction, as indicated by lower CV values for corrected samples. Similar to

other ions, the mean concentration of NH_4^+ of the 10 labs remained almost the same after

correction, but the CV of corrected samples increased from 12.5% to 13.2% after correction

(Table S4). Nevertheless, it decreased 1.2% after correction when excluding Lab-2 (the DA of

NH_4^+ was 135.0±6.0 %) from the calculation. The small change of coefficient of variation here

could be due to the high volatility of ammonia which leads to differing results measured by

different analytical procedures in labs.

To sum up, certified reference materials should be applied for the quality control. If the values

of DA are highly deviated from 100% (e.g., >110% or <90%) or there is large inter-CRM

variations, then the measurement procedures have to be checked, including repeating the

analysis or re-preparing the calibration standard solutions.

Table 4. Uncorrected and CRM-corrected ion concentrations ($\mu g/m^3$) and their corresponding coefficient of variations (CV/ %).

	Uncorrected Mean (min-max)	CV/%	Corrected Mean (min-max)	CV/%	Uncorrected Mean (min-max)	CV/%	Corrected Mean (min-max)	CV/%
	Chloride				Sulfate			
2019/1/16	1.5 (1.2-1.8)	11.7	1.5 (1.2-1.7)	10.4	1.5 (1.1-1.7)	11.3	1.6 (1.2-1.7)	8.8
2019/1/17	2.2 (1.8-2.6)	12.4	2.2 (1.7-2.6)	11.3	2.0 (1.6-2.3)	9.7	2.0 (1.7-2.2)	6.0
2019/1/18	1.5 (1.2-1.8)	11.9	1.5 (1.2-1.8)	11.2	2.0 (1.6-2.4)	10.2	2.1 (1.7-2.3)	7.3
2019/1/19	0.2 (0.1-0.3)	19.3	0.2 (0.2-0.2)	16.8	1.0 (0.9-1.1)	7.9	1.0 (1.0-1.1)	4.5
2019/1/20	0.3 (0.2-0.4)	19.0	0.3 (0.3-0.4)	17.0	0.9 (0.8-1.1)	10.7	0.9 (0.8-1.0)	6.7
2019/1/21	0.6 (0.5-0.8)	12.6	0.6 (0.5-0.7)	11.0	1.2 (1.1-1.4)	8.7	1.2 (1.1-1.3)	4.7
2019/1/22	0.5 (0.4-0.7)	13.4	0.5 (0.4-0.6)	11.3	1.4 (1.0-1.6)	12.5	1.4 (1.1-1.6)	8.8
2019/1/23	0.8 (0.5-0.9)	13.9	0.8 (0.6-0.8)	12.0	2.2 (1.7-2.5)	11.6	2.3 (1.8-2.4)	8.5
Average		14.3		12.6		10.3		6.9
	Nitrate				Ammonium			
2019/1/16	6.1 (4.1-8.0)	16.5	6.1 (4.5-8.3)	15.2	2.7 (2.1-3.2)	12.7	2.7 (2.1-3.2)	12.8
2019/1/17	8.0 (6.1-9.8)	13.1	8.0 (6.7-8.9)	7.8	3.6 (2.6-4.5)	14.9	3.6 (2.9-4.2)	12.1
2019/1/18	7.1 (5.3-8.3)	12.1	7.1 (5.7-7.9)	8.4	3.1 (2.7-3.8)	10.8	3.2 (2.6-3.8)	10.2
2019/1/19	0.9 (0.7-0.9)	8.9	0.9 (0.8-1.0)	7.3	0.6 (0.5-0.8)	11.7	0.6 (0.6-0.7)	9.4
2019/1/20	1.5 (1.2-1.7)	9.8	1.5 (1.3-1.6)	7.0	0.8 (0.6-1.0)	13.1	0.8 (0.7-1.1)	13.3
2019/1/21	3.0 (2.4-3.4)	9.4	3.0 (2.7-3.3)	5.9	1.5 (1.1-1.7)	12.1	1.5 (1.3-1.7)	9.7

2019/1/22	2.4 (1.8-2.9)	12.3	2.5 (2.0-2.6)	7.9	1.3 (1.0-1.5)	12.3	1.3 (1.1-1.6)	11.8
2019/1/23	5.7 (4.0-6.8)	13.6	5.7 (4.4-6.4)	9.6	2.5 (2.0-3.0)	13.7	2.6 (2.1-3.0)	12.6
Average		12.0		8.6		12.7		11.5

	Potassium			
2019/1/16	0.3 (0.2-0.5)	19.8	0.4 (0.3-0.5)	16.2
2019/1/17	0.5 (0.3-0.6)	15.6	0.5 (0.4-0.7)	14.9
2019/1/18	0.3 (0.3-0.4)	14.1	0.4 (0.3-0.5)	10.8
2019/1/19	0.1 (0.1-0.3)	48.5	0.1 (0.1-0.3)	47.7
2019/1/20	0.1 (0.1-0.2)	31.4	0.2 (0.1-0.3)	29.7
2019/1/21	0.2 (0.1-0.3)	20.9	0.2 (0.2-0.3)	17.0
2019/1/22	0.2 (0.1-0.3)	20.6	0.2 (0.1-0.3)	17.8
2019/1/23	0.3 (0.2-0.3)	25.3	0.3 (0.2-0.4)	21.3
Average		24.5		21.9

Lab-2, 3 and 7 were excluded for calculating CV% of ammonium, sulfate and chloride, respectively.

3.5 Aerosol Acidity

In this study, aerosol acidity was evaluated applying three different parameters: Anion and Cation Equivalence Ratio, ion-balance and in situ acidity. Ion-balance was calculated by subtracting equivalent cations from anions (Zhang et al., 2007), while in-situ aerosol acidity was represented by pH or the concentration of free H^+ in the deliquesced particles under ambient conditions. In situ aerosol pH can be estimated from various thermodynamic models, for example, SCAPE, GFEMN, E-AIM and ISORROPIA (He et al., 2012; Pathak et al., 2009; Yao et al., 2006). In situ aerosol acidity is most likely to influence the chemical behavior of aerosols (He et al., 2012). Ion-balance is widely used to indicate the neutralization status of aerosols with the equivalent ratios of anions/cations in a relative way (Sun et al., 2010; Takami et al., 2007; Chou et al., 2008). It is noteworthy that ion-balance and in-situ aerosol acidity estimations are empirical approaches which are strongly dependent on the selection of ion species.

3.5.1 Anion and Cation Equivalence Ratio

The ratio of the anion molar equivalent concentrations to the cation molar equivalent concentrations (AE/CE) can be applied to reflect the potential aerosol acidity (Meng et al., 2016; Zou et al., 2018). In this study, AE and CE were calculated as:

$$AE = [SO_4^{2-}/96] \times 2 + [NO_3^-/62] + [Cl^-/35.5] + [F^-/19] \tag{4}$$

$$CE = [NH_4^+/18] + [Na^+/23] + [K^+/39] + [Mg^{2+}/24] \times 2 + [Ca^{2+}/40] \times 2 \tag{5}$$

AE represents the equivalent concentrations of all anions; and CE denotes all cations equivalent concentrations.

Table 5. Anion and cation equivalent ratios (AE/CE) among 10 laboratories.

	Lab-1	Lab-2	Lab-3	Lab-4	Lab-5	Lab-6	Lab-7	Lab-8	Lab-9	Lab-10
2019/1/16	1.02	1.01	1.02	0.81	1.26	0.93	1.03	1.18	0.93	1.43
2019/1/17	1.00	1.02	1.01	0.85	1.25	0.93	0.87	1.07	0.96	1.59
2019/1/18	1.03	1.03	1.04	0.84	1.26	0.96	1.03	1.14	0.95	1.28
2019/1/19	0.99	0.79	0.97	0.85	1.11	0.65	0.99	0.90	0.98	1.15
2019/1/20	1.00	0.80	0.96	0.85	1.14	0.82	1.00	0.98	0.83	1.08
2019/1/21	1.03	0.78	1.03	0.80	1.14	0.85	1.04	1.02	0.90	1.12
2019/1/22	1.04	0.79	1.04	0.80	1.16	0.90	0.97	0.91	0.93	1.09
2019/1/23	1.02	0.98	1.05	0.80	1.15	0.95	0.84	1.00	0.94	1.48

As presented in Table 5, the AE/CE ratio of all samples were compared among 10 labs. The ratios in Lab-1 and Lab-3 were close to unity. The ratios in Lab-5 and Lab-10 were above 1, indicating the deficiency of cations to neutralize all anions, while that was the contrary of Lab-4, 6 and 9. In Table 2, the detection accuracies of major cations (Na^+, NH_4^+, K^+) were <100% and much lower than those of the major anions (Cl^-, NO_3^-, SO_4^{2-}) in Lab-5 and 10, which may have caused lower cation concentrations than their real concentrations and a constant higher ratio of AE/CE. For Lab-9, the detection accuracies of all ions were very close to 100%, except

462   NH_4^+ which was found with a detection accuracy of >110%. Therefore, AE/CE < 1 of all

463   samples measured by Lab-9 could be the result of overestimation of ammonium. Similarly, in

464   addition to ammonium detection accuracy of >110%, generally lower anion detection

465   accuracies than cations were reported by Lab-4, which may explain AE/CE < 1 in all samples

466   measured by this lab as well. The other three labs (Lab-2, 7 and 8) were found with various

467   AE/CE ratios with both >1 and <1 values; moderately polluted days were generally observed

468   with a higher ratio of AE/CE. These results indicate that AE/CE ratios bear large uncertainties

469   from different labs. Stricter quality control measures should be adopted if applying AE/CE

470   ratios to evaluate aerosol acidity.

471

472   **3.5.2   Ion Balance**

473   The calculation of ion balance is an alternative way to evaluate the aerosol acidity (Han et al.,

474   2016; He et al., 2012). Three methods were listed below for the calculation of ion balance in

475   this study:

476   Method 1: $IB = 2[SO_4^{2-}] + [NO_3^-] - [NH_4^+]$ (6)

477   Method 2: $IB = 2[SO_4^{2-}] + [NO_3^-] + [Cl^-] - [NH_4^+] - [Na^+] - [K^+]$ (7)

478   Method 3: $IB = 2[SO_4^{2-}] + [NO_3^-] + [Cl^-] - [NH_4^+] - [Na^+] - [K^+] - 2[Mg^{2+}] - 2[Ca^{2+}]$

479   (8)

480   In Method 1, only SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^- and NH_4^+ were applied for the calculation (Tian et al., 2017),

481   assuming that these three ions and H^+ alone control $PM_{2.5}$ acidity (Ziemba et al., 2007). SO_4^{2-},

482   NO_3^- and NH_4^+ were also used in other studies to assess aerosol acidity. For example, the mole

483   charge ratio of NH_4^+ to the sum of SO_4^{2-} and NO_3^- was applied to represent aerosol acidity

484   (Chandra Mouli et al., 2003; Wang et al., 2019). SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^- and NH_4^+ were selected because

485   they contributed approximately 90% of the total ionic species in fine aerosols and play

486   predominant roles in controlling aerosol acidity (Zhou et al., 2012). Salt ions Na^+, K^+ and Cl^-

487   were added for the calculation in Method 2. Based on this calculation, Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} were

488   added in Method 3 to include the effects of crustal dust on aerosol acidity (Huang et al., 2014).

489   The ion balance of all labs varied applying different methods, especially for the first three

490   heavily polluted days, as shown in Fig. 4. Positive ion balance values indicated a deficiency of

491   cations to neutralize anions, while negative values implied an excess of cations to neutralize

492   anions. Lab-10 showed the highest variation among all labs; when excluding Lab-10, the results

493   of the other 9 labs agreed very well, with most of the values below 0, suggesting sufficient

494   ammonium to neutralize sulfate and nitrate. By applying Method 1, comparable results were

495   found. The average ion balance values in all samples were consistent in Lab-1, 2, 6, 7, 9 (0.02

496     $\mu mol/m^3$). When adding more ions in the calculation by adopting Methods 2 and 3, poorer

497   agreement among all labs was exhibited. Therefore, it seems more consistent to indicate the

498   relative ion-balanced aerosol acidity among different samples by Method 1, as SNA were the

499   most abundant ions in atmospheric aerosols and their concentrations measured by different labs

500   showed good agreement (Fig. 1). This method could reduce the large discrepancy of ion

501   balance results calculated by adding other ions from the different labs, as their concentrations

502   varied largely in different labs due to varying detection limits.

503

504

Fig. 4 Ion balance in all labs applying different methods (negative values reflect the excessive cations to neutralize anions)

507

3.5.3 Aerosol pH using ISORROPIA-II

A thermodynamic equilibrium model- ISORROPIA-II was applied to estimate the in-situ aerosol acidity. This was run only in forward mode, as the results from the use of reverse mode (using only particle phase composition) are reported to be unreliable (Song et al., 2018) . The only gas phase data were for ammonia, but this introduces little error as concentrations of HNO_3 and HCl are likely to be very low in this high ammonia environment (Song et al., 2018) .

The inputs include aerosol-phase Cl^-, SO_4^{2-}, NO_3^-, Na^+, NH_4^+, K^+, Mg^{2+}, Ca^{2+} and gas-phase NH_3 concentrations. The daily ammonia concentrations during the study period ranged from 13.9 ± 0.6 to 20.1 ± 0.7 ppb with an average of 17.2 ± 2.2 ppb. Mean NH_3 concentrations during moderately polluted and non-haze days were 19.6 ± 0.6 and 15.9 ± 1.5 ppb, respectively. Daily temperature ranged between -4.4°C to 4.3°C with an average of 1.0°C and RH ranged from

519   13.8% to 40.1% with a mean value of 22.4%. The aerosol pH was calculated for all samples

520   by the model, as well as aerosol water content (AWC. Table S5), details of the calculation of

521   pH and AWC can be found elsewhere (Liu et al., 2017b; Masiol et al., 2020). The calculated

522   aerosol pH results of 10 labs are presented in Fig. 5. The predicted gas-phase NH_3 by

523   ISORROPIA-II was well correlated with the measured NH_3 with slope of 1.02 and R^2 of 0.95

524   (Fig. S6), which demonstrated the accuracy of thermodynamic calculations by the model (Song

525   et al., 2018).

527 **Fig. 5** Aerosol pH estimated by ISORROPIA-II using ions and ammonia in 10 labs from 16th to 23rd
528 January 2019.

529

530   The computed aerosol pH during the study period generally exhibited good agreement among

531   10 labs. Lab-6 was observed with higher pH and lower ion balance than other labs on the 19th,

532   which could be mainly due to the 2-3 times higher K^+ concentration measured by Lab-6 on that

533   day (Fig. 1), while other ions measured by this lab were more comparable with other labs. The

534   aerosol pH on 3 moderately polluted days was above 7, indicating an alkaline nature of aerosols

535   during these days. This result is consistent with the discussion mentioned above that ion

536   balance estimated by Method 1 was below 0 as more NH_4^+ neutralizes NO_3^- and SO_4^{2-}. It should

537   be noted that higher pH (>7) of those samples could be due to the lower temperature (-

538   4.4~4.3 °C) during the sampling period (Table S3), in addition to their relatively alkalic nature.

539   The equilibrium of water (H_2O) with OH^-(aq) + H^+(aq) is temperature-dependent. For highly

540   dilute aqueous systems, the values of pK_w (= $-\log_{10}[K_w]$; K_w is the temperature-dependent

541   equilibrium constant on molality basis) at 25 °C (13.99) and 0 °C (14.95) can result in

542   corresponding pH values of 6.995 and 7.475, respectively, both of which are considered neutral

543   (Bandura and Lvova, 2006; Pye et al., 2020). In addition, the low RH in these samples (Table

544   S3) may have also contributed to the high pH values we calculated. Different RH values were

545   tested for aerosol pH among 10 labs. The results (Fig. S7) showed that at different RH (40%,

546   50%, 60%, 70%, 80%), the pH values in 10 labs were consistent; and the pH values were mostly

547   lower than 6 in all samples. Hence, higher pH (>7) of some samples could be resulted from the

548   combination of lower temperature, RH, and the nature of the aerosols. Excellent agreement

549   among the 10 labs for the aerosol pH during these moderately polluted days was also found.

550   Non-haze days, especially the least polluted day on 20th, showed higher variation among the

551   different labs. The calculated pH of 9 labs mostly fall on the same side of the neutralization

552   line (pH=7), and only lab-9 on 20th falls onto a different side of the pH=7 line from the other

553   labs. Sensitivity test of Na^+, K^+, Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} showed that this abnormal pH value was mainly

554   due to the significant higher Na^+ concentration of Lab-9 on 20th.

555   Our results suggest AE/CE and Ion Balance are flawed representations of particle acidity,

556   which are not recommended for the evaluation of aerosol acidity. This is also consistent with

557   the conclusions from previous studies (Hennigan et al., 2015; Guo et al., 2015; Pye et al., 2020).

558   ISORROPIA-II gives more consistent aerosol pH values among different laboratories. But

559   there are uncertainties within this calculation: 1) RH during some periods in this study was

560   relatively low (around 20%), and as a result, aerosol water content is very low. Under such

561   conditions, ions are mostly existed in solid phase. Hence, pH of aerosols with very low RH

562   may not be reliable; 2) the calculation of AWC only considered for inorganics in this study.

563   Water associated with organics also contribute to AWC. For example, Guo et al. (2015)

564   indicated that it accounts for 29-39% of total $PM_{2.5}$ water in southeastern United States. NH_3

565   is the main driving factor affecting aerosol pH and leads to the more alkaline nature of aerosols.

566   Wang et. al (2020) also reported that the high concentration of total ammonium (gas+aerosol)

567   was likely an important factor causing lower aerosol acidity of fine particles during a severe

568   haze period in Henan province, China. It is also confirmed in another study that ammonia

569   played an important role in influencing aerosol pH during winter haze period in northern China

570   (Song et al., 2018).

571

4.   SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

573   Despite use of variable methods and instruments for measuring ion concentrations, data from

574   all the participating labs show a reasonably good agreement in the overall trend for major ions

575   like chloride, sulfate, nitrate, and ammonium. The coefficients of divergence of these ions

576   across 10 labs were lower than 0.2 and the correlation coefficients were higher than 0.8,

577   suggesting a reasonably high reliability of measuring major ions by IC in different labs.

578   However, the inter-lab difference can be as high as 30% if excluding the two extreme values

579   for each day, and reached up to 100% in extreme cases if including all data. Furthermore, ions

580   like F^-, Mg^{2+}, K^+ and Ca^{2+} were observed with large variations in different labs, which may be

581   due to their relatively low concentrations in the samples. Good correlations were found for

582   non-refractory ion species measured by ACSM with those in our study. However, the absolute

583   mass levels were quite different, which may be due to the differences in the performance of the

584   two $PM_{2.5}$ cut-point selectors, the uncertainties in ACSM observations themselves, and

585   negative filter artefacts. Certified reference materials were applied to show the detection

586   accuracy of IC measurement in the 10 laboratories. By comparing the coefficient of variation

587   of samples among 10 labs before and after correction by the detection accuracy of CRM, we

588   emphasize the importance of using certified reference materials for quality control for future

589   ionic species analysis.

590

591   Aerosol acidity was studied through the investigation of ion-balance based acidity and in-situ

592   acidity. Firstly, the ratios of anion equivalent concentrations to cation equivalent concentrations

593   (AE/CE) varied significantly in different labs, which could be attributed to measurement errors,

594   as supported by the different detection accuracies of ions in CRM. Secondly, by calculating the

595   ion balance, Method 1 which only applied SNA for the calculation, was more consistent in

596   most labs. Poor agreement of acidity estimation was observed in all labs when adding other

597   ions like Ca^{2+} and Mg^{2+}. Finally, ISORROPIA-II was applied for estimating in-situ aerosol

598   acidity by calculating aerosol pH in forward (gas+aerosol phases as input) mode. The results

599   showed a similar trend between labs and exhibited a good agreement. This indicates that, if

600   including gaseous pollutant equilibrium in the ISORPIA II model, the estimated aerosol pH is

601   more consistent even if there are relatively large differences in the measured concentrations of

602   ions.

603

604   Based on this analysis and our experience, we recommend that:

605   1. Literature aerosol ion data based on online and offline methods should be treated with a

606   degree of uncertainty in mind. The uncertainties are particularly large for minor ions like

607   Ca^{2+} from the aerosol filters-based ion chromatography analysis.

608   2. The ion-balance approach is not recommended for estimating aerosol acidity due to its

609   large uncertainty. Instead, in situ aerosol pH may be used to represent acidity, and can be

610   calculated from thermodynamic model considering gas-aerosol equilibrium (e.g., NH_4^+

611   and NH_3). This requires the measurements of aerosol composition as well as NH_3.

3. Certified reference materials should be used on a regular basis to assess the accuracy and reliability of the measurement method. Calibration standards should be re-prepared and the IC performance should be checked when the detection accuracy is largely deviated from 100% (e.g., > 110% or < 90%).

4. The detection accuracy of ammonium varied significantly among 10 labs (88.4-135.0%) with median value close to 100%. Stock NH_4^+ solutions that are used for the preparation of calibration standards should be freshly prepared to ensure good detection accuracy.

5. Robust quality control processes should be put in place to avoid contamination, particularly for those ions with low concentrations, such as K^+ and Na^+. For example, water blanks should be run before any standard or sample analyses to ensure no contamination from water blanks or the IC system.

6. Some batches of commercial quartz filters may be contaminated with Na^+ and PO_4^{3-}, and thus testing each batch of blank filters is necessary before any field sampling (data not shown here). Filter washing may be needed in some cases.

7. Ionic concentration from ACSM observations should be calibrated although the observed trend is robust. Future research should be carried out to compare the offline ASCM and IC using the same filters to clearly identify the discrepancies between the two methods.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by the Natural Environment Research Council (Grant Nos. NE/S00579X/1, NE/N007190/1, NE/R005281/1). We would like to thank all researchers for carrying out the technical work and providing the relevant data. We appreciate the support from all participating laboratories.

Data availability. The data in this article are available from the corresponding author upon request.

Author contributions. ZS conceived the study after discovering large inter-lab variability in water-soluble inorganic ions from offline and online methods. JX prepared the paper with the help of ZS, RMH and all co-authors. JX, LW, QZ, CZ, XY, DC, WJL, MW, HT, LiL, ST, WRL, JW, GS, YH, SS, CP, YC, FY, AM, DD, SJS, IA, and JFH conducted the laboratory analysis. SS supported the aerosol pH calculation. CS supported the calculation of coefficient of divergence. YLS, LuL, FZ, KRD, CY, YL, MK provided the ACSM data and YLS supported the interpretation of the ACSM data. BG provided the NH_3 data.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Allan, J. D., Delia, A. E., Coe, H., Bower, K. N., Alfarra, M. R., Jimenez, J. L., Middlebrook, A. M., Drewnick, F., Onasch, T. B., Canagaratna, M. R., Jayne, J. T., and Worsnop, D. R.: A generalised method for the extraction of chemically resolved mass spectra from Aerodyne aerosol mass spectrometer data, Journal of Aerosol Science, 35, 909-922, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2004.02.007, 2004.

Baltensperger, U., and Hertz, J.: Determination of anions and cations in atmospheric aerosols by single column ion chromatography, Journal of Chromatography A, 324, 153-161, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673(01)81314-5, 1985.

Bandura, A., and Lvova, S.: The Ionization Constant of Water over Wide Ranges of Temperature and Density, Journal of Physical and Chemical Reference Data - J PHYS CHEM REF DATA, 35, 10.1063/1.1928231, 2006.

Buchberger, W. W.: Detection techniques in ion chromatography of inorganic ions, TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry, 20, 296-303, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-9936(01)00068-1, 2001.

Budisulistiorini, S. H., Canagaratna, M. R., Croteau, P. L., Baumann, K., Edgerton, E. S., Kollman, M. S., Ng, N. L., Verma, V., Shaw, S. L., Knipping, E. M., Worsnop, D. R., Jayne, J. T., Weber, R. J., and Surratt, J. D.: Intercomparison of an Aerosol Chemical Speciation Monitor (ACSM) with ambient fine aerosol measurements in downtown Atlanta, Georgia, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 7, 1929-1941, 10.5194/amt-7-1929-2014, 2014.

Chandra Mouli, P., Venkata Mohan, S., and Jayarama Reddy, S.: A study on major inorganic ion composition of atmospheric aerosols at Tirupati, Journal of Hazardous Materials, 96, 217-228, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3894(02)00214-5, 2003.

Chou, C. C. K., Lee, C. T., Yuan, C. S., Hsu, W. C., Lin, C. Y., Hsu, S. C., and Liu, S. C.: Implications of the chemical transformation of Asian outflow aerosols for the long-range transport of inorganic nitrogen species, Atmospheric Environment, 42, 7508-7519, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.05.049, 2008.

Crenn, V., Sciare, J., Croteau, P. L., Verlhac, S., Fröhlich, R., Belis, C. A., Aas, W., Äijälä, M., Alastuey, A., Artiñano, B., Baisnée, D., Bonnaire, N., Bressi, M., Canagaratna, M., Canonaco, F., Carbone, C., Cavalli, F., Coz, E., Cubison, M. J., Esser-Gietl, J. K., Green, D. C., Gros, V., Heikkinen, L., Herrmann, H., Lunder, C., Minguillón, M. C., Močnik, G., O'Dowd, C. D., Ovadnevaite, J., Petit, J. E., Petralia, E., Poulain, L., Priestman, M., Riffault, V., Ripoll, A., Sarda-Estève, R., Slowik, J. G., Setyan, A., Wiedensohler, A., Baltensperger, U., Prévôt, A. S. H., Jayne, J. T., and Favez, O.: ACTRIS ACSM intercomparison − Part 1: Reproducibility of concentration and fragment results from 13 individual

Quadrupole Aerosol Chemical Speciation Monitors (Q-ACSM) and consistency with co-located instruments, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 8, 5063-5087, 10.5194/amt-8-5063-2015, 2015.

Đorđević, D., Mihajlidi-Zelić, A., Relić, D., Ignjatović, L., Huremović, J., Stortini, A. M., and Gambaro, A.: Size-segregated mass concentration and water soluble inorganic ions in an urban aerosol of the Central Balkans (Belgrade), Atmospheric Environment, 46, 309-317, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.09.057, 2012.

Fan, M.-Y., Cao, F., Zhang, Y.-Y., Bao, M.-Y., Liu, X.-Y., Zhang, W.-Q., Gao, S., and Zhang, Y.-L.: Characteristics and Sources of Water Soluble Inorganic Ions in Fine Particulate Matter During Winter in Xuzhou (In Chinese), Huan jing ke xue= Huanjing kexue, 38, 4478-4485, 10.13227/j.hjkx.201703178, 2017.

Fountoukis, C., and Nenes, A.: ISORROPIA II: a computationally efficient thermodynamic equilibrium model for K+–Ca2+–Mg2+–NH4+–Na+–SO42-–NO3-–Cl-–H2O aerosols, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 7, 4639-4659, 10.5194/acp-7-4639-2007, 2007.

Ge, B. Z., Xu, X. B., Ma, Z. Q., Pan, X. L., Wang, Z., Lin, W. L., Ouyang, B., Xu, D. H., Lee, J., Zheng, M., Ji, D. S., Sun, Y. L., Dong, H. B., Squires, F. A., Fu, P. Q., and Wang, Z. F.: Role of Ammonia on the Feedback Between AWC and Inorganic Aerosol Formation During Heavy Pollution in the North China Plain, Earth And Space Science, 6, 1675-1693, 10.1029/2019ea000799, 2019.

Guo, H., Xu, L., Bougiatioti, A., Cerully, K., Capps, S., Hite, J., Carlton, A. M., Lee, S.-H., Bergin, M., Ng, N., Nenes, A., and Weber, R.: Fine-particle water and pH in the southeastern United States, ATMOSPHERIC CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS, 15, 5211-5228, 10.5194/acp-15-5211-2015, 2015.

Guo, H., Sullivan, A. P., Campuzano-Jost, P., Schroder, J. C., Lopez-Hilfiker, F. D., Dibb, J. E., Jimenez, J. L., Thornton, J. A., Brown, S. S., Nenes, A., and Weber, R. J.: Fine particle pH and the partitioning of nitric acid during winter in the northeastern United States, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 121, 10,355-310,376, 10.1002/2016jd025311, 2016.

Guo, Y.-t., Zhang, J., Wang, S.-g., She, F., and Li, X.: Long-term characterization of major water-soluble inorganic ions in PM10 in coastal site on the Japan Sea, Journal of Atmospheric Chemistry, 68, 299-316, 10.1007/s10874-012-9223-8, 2011.

Han, B., Zhang, R., Yang, W., Bai, Z., Ma, Z., and Zhang, W.: Heavy haze episodes in Beijing during January 2013: Inorganic ion chemistry and source analysis using highly time-resolved measurements from an urban site, Science of the Total Environment, 544, 319-329, 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.10.053, 2016.

Harrison, R. M., and Pio, C. A.: MAJOR ION COMPOSITION AND CHEMICAL ASSOCIATIONS OF INORGANIC ATMOSPHERIC AEROSOLS, Environ. Sci. Technol., 17, 169-174, 10.1021/es00109a009, 1983.

He, K., Zhao, Q., Ma, Y., Duan, F., Yang, F., Shi, Z., and Chen, G.: Spatial and seasonal variability of PM2.5 acidity at two Chinese megacities: insights into the formation of secondary inorganic aerosols, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 12, 1377-1395, 10.5194/acp-12-1377-2012, 2012.

He, Q., Yan, Y., Guo, L., Zhang, Y., Zhang, G., and Wang, X.: Characterization and source analysis of water-soluble inorganic ionic species in PM2.5 in Taiyuan city, China, Atmos. Res., 184, 48-55, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2016.10.008, 2017.

Heckenberg, A. L., and Haddad, P. R.: Determination of inorganic anions at parts per billion levels using single-column ion chromatography without sample preconcentration, Journal of Chromatography A, 299, 301-305, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9673(01)97845-8, 1984.

Hennigan, C. J., Izumi, J., Sullivan, A. P., Weber, R. J., and Nenes, A.: A critical evaluation of proxy methods used to estimate the acidity of atmospheric particles, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 15, 2775-2790, 10.5194/acp-15-2775-2015, 2015.

Huang, K., Zhuang, G., Wang, Q., Fu, J. S., Lin, Y., Liu, T., Han, L., and Deng, C.: Extreme haze pollution in Beijing during January 2013: chemical characteristics, formation mechanism and role of fog processing, Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 2014, 7517-7556, 10.5194/acpd-14-7517-2014, 2014.

Jia, S., Wang, X., Zhang, Q., Sarkar, S., Wu, L., Huang, M., Zhang, J., and Yang, L.: Technical note: Comparison and interconversion of pH based on different standard states for aerosol acidity characterization, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 18, 11125-11133, 10.5194/acp-18-11125-2018, 2018.

735 Kamal, A., Syed, J. H., Li, J., Zhang, G., Mahmood, A., and Malik, R. N.: Profile of Atmospheric PAHs
736 in Rawalpindi, Lahore and Gujranwala Districts of Punjab Province (Pakistan), Aerosol Air Qual. Res.,
737 16, 1010-1021, 10.4209/aaqr.2015.01.0016, 2016.
738 Karthikeyan, S., and Balasubramanian, R.: Determination of water-soluble inorganic and organic
739 species in atmospheric fine particulate matter, Microchemical Journal, 82, 49-55,
740 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2005.07.003, 2006.
741 Kim, C. H., Choi, Y., and Ghim, Y. S.: Characterization of Volatilization of Filter-Sampled PM2.5
742 Semi-Volatile Inorganic Ions Using a Backup Filter and Denuders, Aerosol Air Qual. Res., 15, 814-
743 820, 10.4209/aaqr.2014.09.0213, 2015.
744 Krudysz, M. A., Froines, J. R., Fine, P. M., and Sioutas, C.: Intra-community spatial variation of size-
745 fractionated PM mass, OC, EC, and trace elements in the Long Beach, CA area, Atmospheric
746 Environment, 42, 5374-5389, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.02.060, 2008.
747 Li, L., Yin, Y., Kong, S., Wen, B., Chen, K., Yuan, L., and Li, Q.: Altitudinal effect to the size
748 distribution of water soluble inorganic ions in PM at Huangshan, China, Atmospheric Environment, 98,
749 242-252, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.08.077, 2014.
750 Li, X., Wang, L., Ji, D., Wen, T., Pan, Y., Sun, Y., and Wang, Y.: Characterization of the size-
751 segregated water-soluble inorganic ions in the Jing-Jin-Ji urban agglomeration: Spatial/temporal
752 variability, size distribution and sources, Atmospheric Environment, 77, 250-259,
753 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.03.042, 2013.
754 Li, Y., Tao, J., Zhang, L., Jia, X., and Wu, Y.: High Contributions of Secondary Inorganic Aerosols to
755 PM(2.5) under Polluted Levels at a Regional Station in Northern China, Int J Environ Res Public Health,
756 13, 1202, 10.3390/ijerph13121202, 2016.
757 Liu, B., Wu, J., Zhang, J., Wang, L., Yang, J., Liang, D., Dai, Q., Bi, X., Feng, Y., Zhang, Y., and
758 Zhang, Q.: Characterization and source apportionment of PM2.5 based on error estimation from EPA
759 PMF 5.0 model at a medium city in China, Environmental Pollution, 222, 10-22,
760 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.01.005, 2017a.
761 Liu, M., Song, Y., Zhou, T., Xu, Z., Yan, C., Zheng, M., Wu, Z., Hu, M., Wu, Y., and Zhu, T.: Fine
762 particle pH during severe haze episodes in northern China, Geophysical Research Letters, 44, 5213-
763 5221, 10.1002/2017gl073210, 2017b.
764 Liu, Y., Yan, C., Ding, X., Wang, X., Fu, Q., Zhao, Q., Zhang, Y., Duan, Y., Qiu, X., and Zheng, M.:
765 Sources and spatial distribution of particulate polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in Shanghai, China,
766 Science of The Total Environment, 584, 307-317, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.12.134,
767 2017c.
768 Liu, Y., Yan, C., Feng, Z., Zheng, F., Fan, X., Zhang, Y., Li, C., Zhou, Y., Lin, Z., Guo, Y., Zhang, Y.,
769 Ma, L., Zhou, W., Liu, Z., Wei, Z., Dada, L., Dallenbach, K. R., Kontkanen, J., Cai, R., Chan, T., Chu,
770 B., Du, W., Yao, L., Wang, Y., Cai, J., Kangasluoma, J., Kokkonen, T., Kujansuu, J., Rusanen, A.,
771 Deng, C., Fu, Y., Yin, R., Li, X., Lu, Y., Liu, Y., Lian, C., Yang, D., Wang, W., Ge, M., Wang, Y.,
772 Worsnop , D., Junninen, H., He, H., Kerminen, V. M., Zheng, J., Wang, L., Jiang, J., Petäjä, T., Bianchi,
773 F., and Kulmala, M.: Continuous and Comprehensive Atmospheric Observations in Beijing: A Station
774 to Understand the Complex Urban Atmospheric Environment, Big Earth Data (under review),
775 10.1080/20964471.2020.1798707, 2020.
776 Masiol, M., Squizzato, S., Formenton, G., Khan, M. B., Hopke, P. K., Nenes, A., Pandis, S. N., Tositti,
777 L., Benetello, F., Visin, F., and Pavoni, B.: Hybrid multiple-site mass closure and source apportionment
778 of PM2.5 and aerosol acidity at major cities in the Po Valley, Science of The Total Environment, 704,
779 135287, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135287, 2020.
780 Meng, C. C., Wang, L. T., Zhang, F. F., Wei, Z., Ma, S. M., Ma, X., and Yang, J.: Characteristics of
781 concentrations and water-soluble inorganic ions in PM2.5 in Handan City, Hebei province, China,
782 Atmos. Res., 171, 133-146, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2015.12.013, 2016.
783 Middlebrook, A. M., Bahreini, R., Jimenez, J. L., and Canagaratna, M. R.: Evaluation of Composition-
784 Dependent Collection Efficiencies for the Aerodyne Aerosol Mass Spectrometer using Field Data,
785 Aerosol Sci. Technol., 46, 258-271, 10.1080/02786826.2011.620041, 2012.
786 Mkoma, S. L., Wang, W., and Maenhaut, W.: Seasonal variation of water-soluble inorganic species in
787 the coarse and fine atmospheric aerosols at Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Nuclear Instruments and Methods
788 in Physics Research Section B: Beam Interactions with Materials and Atoms, 267, 2897-2902,
789 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nimb.2009.06.099, 2009.

Ng, N. L., Herndon, S. C., Trimborn, A., Canagaratna, M. R., Croteau, P. L., Onasch, T. B., Sueper, D., Worsnop, D. R., Zhang, Q., Sun, Y. L., and Jayne, J. T.: An Aerosol Chemical Speciation Monitor (ACSM) for Routine Monitoring of the Composition and Mass Concentrations of Ambient Aerosol, Aerosol Sci. Technol., 45, 780-794, 10.1080/02786826.2011.560211, 2011.

Pathak, R. K., Wu, W. S., and Wang, T.: Summertime PM2.5 ionic species in four major cities of China: nitrate formation in an ammonia-deficient atmosphere, Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, 9, 1711-1722, 2009.

Pye, H. O. T., Nenes, A., Alexander, B., Ault, A. P., Barth, M. C., Clegg, S. L., Collett Jr, J. L., Fahey, K. M., Hennigan, C. J., Herrmann, H., Kanakidou, M., Kelly, J. T., Ku, I. T., McNeill, V. F., Riemer, N., Schaefer, T., Shi, G., Tilgner, A., Walker, J. T., Wang, T., Weber, R., Xing, J., Zaveri, R. A., and Zuend, A.: The acidity of atmospheric particles and clouds, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 20, 4809-4888, 10.5194/acp-20-4809-2020, 2020.

Shi, Z., Vu, T., Kotthaus, S., Harrison, R. M., Grimmond, S., Yue, S., Zhu, T., Lee, J., Han, Y., Demuzere, M., Dunmore, R. E., Ren, L., Liu, D., Wang, Y., Wild, O., Allan, J., Acton, W. J., Barlow, J., Barratt, B., Beddows, D., Bloss, W. J., Calzolai, G., Carruthers, D., Carslaw, D. C., Chan, Q., Chatzidiakou, L., Chen, Y., Crilley, L., Coe, H., Dai, T., Doherty, R., Duan, F., Fu, P., Ge, B., Ge, M., Guan, D., Hamilton, J. F., He, K., Heal, M., Heard, D., Hewitt, C. N., Hollaway, M., Hu, M., Ji, D., Jiang, X., Jones, R., Kalberer, M., Kelly, F. J., Kramer, L., Langford, B., Lin, C., Lewis, A. C., Li, J., Li, W., Liu, H., Liu, J., Loh, M., Lu, K., Lucarelli, F., Mann, G., McFiggans, G., Miller, M. R., Mills, G., Monk, P., Nemitz, E., O'Connor, F., Ouyang, B., Palmer, P. I., Percival, C., Popoola, O., Reeves, C., Rickard, A. R., Shao, L., Shi, G., Spracklen, D., Stevenson, D., Sun, Y., Sun, Z., Tao, S., Tong, S., Wang, Q., Wang, W., Wang, X., Wang, X., Wang, Z., Wei, L., Whalley, L., Wu, X., Wu, Z., Xie, P., Yang, F., Zhang, Q., Zhang, Y., Zhang, Y., and Zheng, M.: Introduction to the special issue "In-depth study of air pollution sources and processes within Beijing and its surrounding region (APHH-Beijing)", Atmos. Chem. Phys., 19, 7519-7546, 10.5194/acp-19-7519-2019, 2019.

Shon, Z.-H., Kim, K.-H., Song, S.-K., Jung, K., Kim, N.-J., and Lee, J.-B.: Relationship between water-soluble ions in PM2.5 and their precursor gases in Seoul megacity, Atmospheric Environment, 59, 540-550, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.04.033, 2012.

Song, S., Gao, M., Xu, W., Shao, J., Shi, G., Wang, S., Wang, Y., Sun, Y., and McElroy, M. B.: Fine-particle pH for Beijing winter haze as inferred from different thermodynamic equilibrium models, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 18, 7423-7438, 10.5194/acp-18-7423-2018, 2018.

Song, S., Nenes, A., Gao, M., Zhang, Y., Liu, P., Shao, J., Ye, D., Xu, W., Lei, L., Sun, Y., Liu, B., Wang, S., and McElroy, M. B.: Thermodynamic Modeling Suggests Declines in Water Uptake and Acidity of Inorganic Aerosols in Beijing Winter Haze Events during 2014/2015–2018/2019, Environmental Science & Technology Letters, 6, 752-760, 10.1021/acs.estlett.9b00621, 2019.

Sun, J., Zhang, Q., Canagaratna, M. R., Zhang, Y., Ng, N. L., Sun, Y., Jayne, J. T., Zhang, X., Zhang, X., and Worsnop, D. R.: Highly time- and size-resolved characterization of submicron aerosol particles in Beijing using an Aerodyne Aerosol Mass Spectrometer, Atmospheric Environment, 44, 131-140, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2009.03.020, 2010.

Sun, Y., Wang, Z., Dong, H., Yang, T., Li, J., Pan, X., Chen, P., and Jayne, J. T.: Characterization of summer organic and inorganic aerosols in Beijing, China with an Aerosol Chemical Speciation Monitor, Atmospheric Environment, 51, 250-259, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.01.013, 2012.

Sun, Y., He, Y., Kuang, Y., Xu, W., Song, S., Ma, N., Tao, J., Cheng, P., Wu, C., Su, H., Cheng, Y., Xie, C., Chen, C., Lei, L., Qiu, Y., Fu, P., Croteau, P., and Worsnop, D. R.: Chemical Differences Between PM1 and PM2.5 in Highly Polluted Environment and Implications in Air Pollution Studies, Geophysical Research Letters, 47, e2019GL086288, 10.1029/2019gl086288, 2020.

Takami, A., Miyoshi, T., Shimono, A., Kaneyasu, N., Kato, S., Kajii, Y., and Hatakeyama, S.: Transport of anthropogenic aerosols from Asia and subsequent chemical transformation, Journal of Geophysical Research, 112, 10.1029/2006JD008120, 2007.

Tian, M., Wang, H., Chen, Y., Zhang, L., Shi, G., Liu, Y., Yu, J., Zhai, C., Wang, J., and Yang, F.: Highly time-resolved characterization of water-soluble inorganic ions in PM2.5 in a humid and acidic mega city in Sichuan Basin, China, Science of The Total Environment, 580, 224-234, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.12.048, 2017.

Wang, S., Yin, S., Zhang, R., Yang, L., Zhao, Q., Zhang, L., Yan, Q., Jiang, N., and Tang, X.: Insight into the formation of secondary inorganic aerosol based on high-time-resolution data during haze

episodes and snowfall periods in Zhengzhou, China, Science of The Total Environment, 660, 47-56, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.12.465, 2019.

Wang, S., Wang, L., Li, Y., Wang, C., Wang, W., Yin, S., and Zhang, R.: Effect of ammonia on fine-particle pH in agricultural regions of China: comparison between urban and rural sites, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 20, 2719-2734, 10.5194/acp-20-2719-2020, 2020.

Wang, Y., Zhang, Q., Jiang, J., Zhou, W., Wang, B., He, K., Duan, F., Zhang, Q., Philip, S., and Xie, Y.: Enhanced sulfate formation during China's severe winter haze episode in Jan 2013 missing from current models, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 119, 10.1002/2013JD021426, 2014.

Weber, R. J., Guo, H., Russell, A. G., and Nenes, A.: High aerosol acidity despite declining atmospheric sulfate concentrations over the past 15 years, Nature Geoscience, 9, 282-285, 10.1038/ngeo2665, 2016.

Wongphatarakul, V., Friedlander, S. K., and Pinto, J. P.: A comparative study of PM2.5 ambient aerosol chemical databases, Environmental Science and Technology, 32, 3926-3934, 10.1021/es9800582, 1998.

Xu, Q., Wang, S., Jiang, J., Bhattarai, N., Li, X., Chang, X., Qiu, X., Zheng, M., Hua, Y., and Hao, J.: Nitrate dominates the chemical composition of PM2.5 during haze event in Beijing, China, Science of The Total Environment, 689, 1293-1303, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.06.294, 2019a.

Xu, W., Liu, X., Liu, L., Dore, A. J., Tang, A., Lu, L., Wu, Q., Zhang, Y., Hao, T., Pan, Y., Chen, J., and Zhang, F.: Impact of emission controls on air quality in Beijing during APEC 2014: Implications from water-soluble ions and carbonaceous aerosol in PM2.5 and their precursors, Atmospheric Environment, 210, 241-252, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.04.050, 2019b.

Xue, J., Lau, A. K. H., and Yu, J. Z.: A study of acidity on PM2.5 in Hong Kong using online ionic chemical composition measurements, Atmospheric Environment, 45, 7081-7088, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.09.040, 2011.

Yao, X., Yan Ling, T., Fang, M., and Chan, C. K.: Comparison of thermodynamic predictions for in situ pH in PM2.5, Atmospheric Environment, 40, 2835-2844, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2006.01.006, 2006.

Yu, X.-C., He, K.-B., Yang, F., Yang, F.-M., Duan, F.-K., Zheng, A.-H., and Zhao, C.-Y.: Application of ion chromatography to the determination of water-soluble inorganic and organic ions in atmospheric aerosols, Journal of environmental sciences (China), 16, 813-815, 2004.

Yue, F., Xie, Z., Zhang, P., Song, S., He, P., Liu, C., Wang, L., Yu, X., and Kang, H.: The role of sulfate and its corresponding S(IV)+NO2 formation pathway during the evolution of haze in Beijing, Science of The Total Environment, 687, 741-751, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.06.096, 2019.

Zhang, B., Zhou, T., Liu, Y., Yan, C., Li, X., Yu, J., Wang, S., Liu, B., and Zheng, M.: Comparison of water-soluble inorganic ions and trace metals in PM2.5 between online and offline measurements in Beijing during winter, Atmospheric Pollution Research, 10, 1755-1765, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apr.2019.07.007, 2019.

Zhang, J. K., Cheng, M. T., Ji, D. S., Liu, Z. R., Hu, B., Sun, Y., and Wang, Y. S.: Characterization of submicron particles during biomass burning and coal combustion periods in Beijing, China, Science of The Total Environment, 562, 812-821, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.04.015, 2016.

Zhang, Q., Jimenez, J. L., Worsnop, D. R., and Canagaratna, M.: A Case Study of Urban Particle Acidity and Its Influence on Secondary Organic Aerosol, Environ. Sci. Technol., 41, 3213-3219, 10.1021/es061812j, 2007.

Zhao, J., Zhang, F., Xu, Y., and Chen, J.: Characterization of water-soluble inorganic ions in size-segregated aerosols in coastal city, Xiamen, Atmos. Res., 99, 546-562, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2010.12.017, 2011.

Zhou, Y., Xue, L., Wang, T., Gao, X., Wang, Z., Wang, X., Zhang, J., Zhang, Q., and Wang, W.: Characterization of aerosol acidity at a high mountain site in central eastern China, Atmospheric Environment, 51, 11-20, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.01.061, 2012.

Ziemba, L. D., Fischer, E., Griffin, R. J., and Talbot, R. W.: Aerosol acidity in rural New England: Temporal trends and source region analysis, Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 112, 10.1029/2006jd007605, 2007.

Zou, J., Liu, Z., Hu, B., Huang, X., Wen, T., Ji, D., Liu, J., Yang, Y., Yao, Q., and Wang, Y.: Aerosol chemical compositions in the North China Plain and the impact on the visibility in Beijing and Tianjin, Atmos. Res., 201, 235-246, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2017.09.014, 2018.