

***Interactive comment on* “Design and Characterization of a new OFR: The Particle Formation Accelerator (PFA)” by Ningjin Xu and Don R. Collins**

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 24 November 2020

Reviewer comments on manuscript amt-2020-373, "Design and Characterization of a new OFR: The Particle Formation Accelerator (PFA)"

The authors present here a description and investigation of a new oxidation flow reactor that is made entirely from Teflon. A variety of OFRs have been developed over the past decade from a range of materials, but few have been previously designed from Teflon despite its high inertness and low vapor wall losses. The specific geometry and design of each has important implications for interpreting the data they produce. It is consequently valuable and important to conduct (and submit for peer-review) the detailed sorts of testing described here, and this is a fitting journal for this work. This manuscript

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



presents a detailed description of the design and examination of its residence times, wall losses, and results, and it should be published. My concern, however, is not so much with the science (though there are some specific comments below), but in the presentation. Overall, I think many of the Figures could be made more clear, and many of them (and some of their discussion) does not need to be included in the main body and could be moved to an SI.

General comment:

(1) In the descriptions of the operation of the PFA, the authors spend a lot of time discussed operating modes that are not necessarily pertinent to the final operational approach. For instance, in some figures they show the impacts of operating with the side purge flow off, or without the reflective ePTFE. These feel to me like advancements the authors figured out along the way that don't describe the actual recommended operation of the system (i.e., the authors do not seem to recommend ever operating with the side purge flow off). Consequently, they seem better suited to a brief mention in the main text and deeper discussion in a Supplementary Information for the more interested reader. The discussion of the static removal is similar, though I think may warrant a discussion in the main text as the static losses might be expected to be the main issue with a non-conductive OFR. Figures (and associated discussions) that I think are more detail than are maybe relevant to the main text are: Figure 3 - This figure is illustrative of the detailed description of the text, I don't think it really adds much Figure 5 - shows the importance of the the reflective sheath, but since the reflective sheath is used throughout the manuscript and is "part" of the instrument, this mostly shows work done along the way, and is not of central importance to the rest of the work. One option would be to show the gradient by pairing Fig. 5a and Fig 6a as one figure, as Fig 5b (which is just the ratios shown in 5a) and 6b (which doesn't have much information) don't seem critical. Figure 9 - again, as with Figure 5, this mostly shows work done along the way, and is not really germane to the final instrument. The interested reader might want to dig into this, but since the average reader is probably

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



more interested in the final configuration, this could go to the SI

This is a general issue, not just related to these specific figures. Overall, I think discussions of some of the methods are perhaps a bit too detailed, and then interpretation of the demonstration and scientific data at the end is a bit sparse.

Specific comments:

(2) Line 89-90: I am not sure, but I thought there was also a teflon film OFR in use by the Jimenez group at some point? Bill Brune also published one in 2007: <https://acp.copernicus.org/articles/7/5727/2007/acp-7-5727-2007.pdf> . Given that one of the big values/advances of the present work is the all-Teflon construction, some discussion of Teflon OFRs should be included.

(3) Line 107: It is confusing to call it the PFA. I get that it is a play on the fact that it is made of PFA, but it muddies the discussion somewhat.

(4) Line 124: In Figure 1 the annulus and pinholes are not really clear, so it took a little bit of re-reading and examining to understand exactly how it is designed and works, and I'm still not totally sure I have it figured out.

(5) Line 280: Not really a 36% increase in transmission efficiency, more accurately a 36 percentage point increase, maybe state as "36% of particles that are no longer lost"

(6) Line 284: Not clear, is the data in Figure 7 directly from the referenced work?

(7) Line 309: I'm not a statistician, so I'm not sure whether or not this is the right metric or approach - why adjust residence times by the average? Why not normalized to the nominal residence time (V/Q)? Isn't that the metric that is used for the laminar flow case? For example, in Figure 8b, SO₂ comes out sooner than expected from laminar flow or than CO₂, which the authors attribute to reversible uptake - but that should delay the SO₂ response, not speed it up. By delaying response, the average RT is shifted later, and the apparent speed of the early eluting SO₂ is faster. I think all of this would be easier to interpret (and perhaps more meaningful) if the nominal RT were

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



used instead of the average.

(8) Lines 342-361: How should the scientific community be dealing with or thinking about these yields? Looking at Figure 11, OFRs seem to be saying that the yield for α -pinene at a give Coa and OHexp could easily vary by a factor of many (e.g. ~ 5 -50% for Coa = $\sim 100\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and OH in the range of 3 - 10×10^{11}). This is, of course, not a problem the authors are solely responsible for, but it makes me wonder about the utility of using yield comparisons to validate or understand the OFR. It is reassuring, I suppose, that the PFA is in the middle of all this noise (as opposed to outlying), but are we (the reader and/or the authors) really learning anything from this intercomparison? Is there some way to make sense of this spread other than the broad "uncertainty in OHexp"? Maybe the points in Figure 11 could at least indicate different OFR modes, or something that might explain some of these differences?

(9) Line 366: In Figure 12 it looks like the seed is multi-modal but the test refers to a narrow mode at 200 nm - is this due to multiple charging in the DMA?

(10) Line 374-376: Adding a panel to Figure 12 showing the trend in yield as a function of pinene:AS would aid this discussion

(11) Line 384: Both of these citations refer to specific conditions and locations in the early 2000's. How are the author's using these to estimate the stated OHR?

Figure comments:

(12) Figure 2 is missing "(a)"

(13) Figure 3 labels are confusing because the arrows could refer to "that point onward" or to the region they are coming from. It would be clearer to indicate with colored regions or a binary on/off trace when UV was on or off.

(14) Figure 6 could be made more clear - too much going on in the legend with lots of repetition. Also not clear if 6a is with or without the ePTFE. I gather it is without? Why are only two points from 6a reproduced on 6b? Why not just include the one point w/

ePTFE shown in 6b into 6a and make all the labeling more clear?

(15) Figure 9 - why not also include the modeled with the side flow on?

(16) Figure 10 legends are similarly busy and repetitive requires a lot of looking back and forth. Some estimate of OH exposure on these plots might help.

(17) Figure 11 - make the legend markers darker so they can be seen more easily

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., doi:10.5194/amt-2020-373, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

