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S1  Explanations for multi-annual trends in OM

S1.1  Decline in COOH, oxOCO and aCH concentrations: Plausibility of aqueous contribution

It is possible that the oxidation leading to this declining portion of OM occurred partially in the atmospheric aqueous phase, as hypothesized previously (Marais et al., 2015). While abundant in-cloud production of OM is not supported by model and satellite results for the SE US (Kim et al., 2015; Mao et al., 2018), wet aerosol can be an important venue for aqueous OM formation (McNeill, 2015; Tan et al., 2009), and these wet oxidation processes are likely to be regionally important (e.g., Xu et al., 2015).

S1.2  Increase in aCOH and naCO concentrations: sample stability considerations

SEARCH samples from 2011 and 2016 were re-analyzed via FT-IR spectrometry 1-2 years after the original analysis date (performed in Part One of this paper series, Boris et al., 2019). These re-analyzed samples demonstrated some apparent loss of naCO, aCOH, and aCH after one-two years storage for 2016 samples (e.g., a bias in aCOH was demonstrated of -7 % after year one and -19 % after year two of storage). However, 2011 samples were observed to have gained some naCO, aCOH, and aCH mass (e.g., a bias in aCOH was demonstrated of +13 % after two years of storage). Although the atmospheric trends observed in the multi-annual FG fractions of OM could have been explained by the 2016 loss of naCO and aCOH during storage, these conflicting results from 2011 precluded our finding that the trend was due to such losses. In addition, 2018 OM composition demonstrated a continuation of the trends in naCO and aCOH, and, despite a lack of positive trend in naCO and aCOH fractions of OM in all seasons 2011-2015 (with 2016 excluded), the trends during springs 2011-2015 were still positive (aCOH: 0.030±0.007 % of OM and naCO: 0.018±0.003 % of OM; main text Table 2).

S1.3  Increase in aCOH and naCO Concentrations: Alternative Smoke Hypothesis

While summertime OM in the SE U.S. includes little or no indication of biomass burning contribution (Liu et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2015), prescribed burning is common in the region in the spring, but also autumn and winter, and contributes substantially to OM (Zeng et al., 2008). Indicators of fires, including total burned area in the SE U.S. and concentrations of biomass burning chemical markers, are greatest during the springs and autumns, while lowest in the summers (Larkin et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2010).
Between 2011 and 2017, the prescribed burn acreage decreased from approximately 10,297,223 to 7,576,760 acres in the SE U.S. (Coalition of Prescribed Fire Councils, 2012, 2015, 2018), and wildland acreage burned decreased, but was variable (980,000 acres in 2009 versus 720,000 acres in 2016; based on summed totals over AL, FL, GA, NC, SC, TN, and TX values published by the National Interagency Fire Center; https://www.nifc.gov/fireInfo/fireInfo_statistics.html).

FT-IR spectrometry studies have demonstrated that biomass burning can contribute naCO and aCOH material, especially when the OM is not aged for long periods of time (Corrigan et al., 2013; Hawkins et al., 2010; Takahama et al., 2011, 2013). This is consistent with a source of regional smoke, although transport of smoke could be substantial, especially in the colder months when Santa Ana winds exacerbate wildfires in CA (Bytnerowicz et al., 2010). The steep spring and autumn aCOH and naCO concentration enhancements paralleled fire seasonality (main text Table 2) as well as O₃ concentration seasonality; these increasing O₃ concentrations could also be a result of biomass burning activities (Jaffe and Wigder, 2012), especially considering that other anthropogenic VOC emissions declined and O₃ formation potentials of some fire-emitted VOCs are substantial (Akagi et al., 2011; Derwent et al., 2007). Despite these observations, considerations that make smoke an unlikely cause of the aCOH and naCO enhancement over time are listed in Section 3.3.2 (in the main text).
In an effort to demonstrate a causal relationship of aCOH/OM or naCO/OM to fire activities in the SE U.S., satellite observations were used to distinguish “fire” from “no fire” days in the 2011-2016 dataset (see Main Text Section 2.3). The median concentrations of predominant aerosol species, possible fire markers, and median FG/OM ratios were calculated for “fire” and “no fire” days (Figure S1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FG/OM ratio</th>
<th>Median Concentration (μg m⁻³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aCOH/OM</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naCO/OM</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aCH/OM</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOH/OM</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXOCO/OM</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaK</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure S1. Box-and-whisker plots categorizing relevant concentrations and FG/OM ratios as “fire” and “no fire” days. Subplots are as follows: (a) is over the 2011-2016 time period and (b) is the same, but with FG/aCH ratios, while (c) is for only the 2016 daily dataset. FG/OM ratios are indicated as “fFG” (for example, “fCOOH”). Red circles indicate median values in each category, while bars extend to the bootstrapped 5th and 95th percent confidence limits. “nsK” is an abbreviation for non-soil potassium.

The fractions of oxOCO and COOH, with respect to OM or aCH, and for both 2011-2016 and 2016 daily datasets, were lower in “fire” samples than on “no fire” samples. The aCH/OM fraction was oppositely greater on “fire” samples than on “no fire” samples. In corroboration with the distinction of “fire” and “no fire” categories, the non-soil potassium was greater in “fire” than “no fire” samples 2011-2016. However, while the naCO/OM fraction was greater for “fire” samples in 2016 all days dataset, that trend was not observed for aCOH/OM, nor was it observed for the 2011-2016 dataset. Both of these FGs found to increase in fraction of OM over the 2011-2016 study period, however, demonstrated a distinctly different “fire” versus “no fire” sample pattern than the FGs found to decrease in fraction of OM (COOH and oxOCO). Overall, a “fingerprint” for smoke relating to aCOH and naCO was not observable, given...
the variation between these datasets, although the aCH/OM fraction was clearly higher in “fire” than “no fire” samples. The lack of “fingerprint” may, in part, be due to obfuscating factors such as aging of the smoke plume, type of burn (flaming, smoldering, crop type, etc.), distance from sampling location, and the environmental conditions.

5 S2 OM/OC Calculation

The measured decline in FG OM concentrations between 2011 and 2016 was steeper than that observed for FG OC concentrations (Main body Section 3.1). To further contrast FG OM/OC with other estimates, OC concentration trends were compared between TOR and FT-IR measurements. A somewhat greater slope was observed in TOR OC concentrations than FT-IR spectrometry, highlighting potential causes of differences between FT-IR spectrometry estimates of OM/OC and those using TOR OC-based regression methods (Table S1; although the difference between OC measurements did not significantly vary 2011-2016, 0.04±0.04 μg m⁻³ yr⁻¹ due to high method uncertainties).

S2.1 OM/OC Calculation using Regression Techniques

Two candidate multiple linear regression techniques, ordinary least squares (OLS) and error in variables (e-in-v; Simon et al., 2011), were applied for calculating OM/OC ratios with subcategories of the SEARCH functional group dataset. However, the resulting coefficients were not presented because they were often not meaningful within the understood range of possible values. In both techniques, various PM species concentrations measured in the SEARCH network (Edgerton et al., 2005) were used to calculate OM/OC ratios from a regression technique approximating the reconstructed fine mass (Hand et al., 2019; Simon et al., 2011). The methods approximate the OM/OC by assigning all PM2.5 mass as OM in each sample if it is not attributed to other measured species (ammonium sulfate, ammonium nitrate, soil/dust, elemental carbon, and sea salt).

Although the OLS method resulted in values of OM/OC within the range of those expected overall (Turpin and Lim, 2001), other coefficients that were not within logical bounds (Simon et al., 2011). OM/OC results of the OLS regressions are summarized in Table S1, and demonstrate that values are not significantly different for any category of the data. In addition, the OM/OC values (calculated as the
coefficients of TOR OC) do not match expected relationships: PM at rural sites is expected to be more aged and therefore oxidized than at urban sites; likewise, summertime PM is expected to be more oxidized than wintertime PM. These insignificant results might be attributable to analytical measurement uncertainties of contributing network data, insufficient sample size, and/or high sampling uncertainties (Boris et al., 2019).

Table S1. Regression coefficients calculated using OLS regression from SEARCH network data components, as described by (Simon et al., 2011). Lower and upper bounds were calculated using bootstrapping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>OC Coefficient (OM/OC)</th>
<th>Lower Bound (2.5th Percentile)</th>
<th>Upper Bound (97.5th Percentile)</th>
<th>Number of Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter (DJF)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring (MAM)</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer (JJA)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn (SON)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The e-in-v regression coefficients are not reported; values were not within logical bounds (Simon et al., 2011), confidence intervals were large in comparison to the regression coefficient values, in response to large uncertainty values inputted to the regressions. Uncertainties for each chemical species concentrations were required inputs to the e-in-v regression; these values were calculated as the root of the sum of squares of the precision of collocated samples between the Jefferson St., Atlanta, GA (JST) and collocated JST (cJST) sampling site concentrations (Boris et al., 2019; Hyslop and White, 2009), as well as the method detection limits (MDLs) reported for each relevant species by (Edgerton et al., 2005) (the average relative uncertainties for other ions was used for Cl since an MDL was not available). Confidence intervals about the ordinary least squares and e-in-v method OM/OC ratios were calculated using bootstrapping (n=100 with a two-tailed p=0.05). e-in-v results demonstrated that these uncertainties
(MDLs and co-located sampling uncertainties) as well as the number of samples (per season, site type) were insufficient to produce meaningful results at the concentrations in the SEARCH network. The residual between FG OC and TOR OC has not changed significantly between 2009 and 2016 (nor between 2011 and 2016, during which the trend was $0.04 \pm 0.04 \mu g \, m^{-3} \, yr^{-1}$), and there was no seasonality in the residual (Figure S2).

![Figure S2. Residual between concentrations of FG OC and TOR OC over the entire SEARCH 2009-2016 dataset. Dashed black lines are included at January 1\textsuperscript{st} of each year, and a red line is included at a residual of 0 \mu g m$^{-3}$. This demonstrates that the conclusions regarding long-term trend in OM would be similar with respect to OM derived from TOR OC, and furthermore that FT-IR spectrometry and TOR measurements were interchangeable over this long-term dataset. In contrast, the comparison of FT-IR spectrometry and residual OM trends demonstrated that there was an increasing difference between the two over time, with a trend of -0.08±0.07 \mu g m$^{-3} \, yr^{-1}$ (FG OM – residual OM; Figure S3).
Mean Oxidation State of Carbon

Although both describe the degree of oxidation, the OSC and OM/OC differ in calculation. The OSC metric up-weights the influence of O atoms (oxidation state of -2) versus H atoms (oxidation state of +1), with respect to the OM/OC (Kroll et al., 2011). While the OSC is evaluated in terms of the contributions of the numbers of atoms, the OM/OC approximates the degree of oxidation for OM by mass. In general, the trends in OM/OC ratios and OSC values over the 2009-2016 time period (Figure S4) were similar. The median OSC values between -1 and +1 indicate that the sample-integrated composition of the aerosol was within the range of semi-volatile or low-volatility oxygenated OM, but more oxidized than aerosol from urban sources or biomass burning (Kroll et al., 2011). As expected, OSC was lower (negative) for urban sites in the winter for all years than for rural sites in the summer (values were positive), although values varied between positive and negative over this time period. The overall trend in (all sites, all years) was not statistically significant (-0.001±0.003 yr⁻¹). Trends at particular sites and seasons were only significant for YRK and during winters, in which the OSC decreased minimally (-0.008±0.005 yr⁻¹ and -0.009±0.007 yr⁻¹, respectively).
Figure S4. Trends in median carbon oxidation state (data categorized by urban/rural site category and season).

**S4 Additional 2018 January and February Dataset**

Additional PM$_{2.5}$ samples were collected at JST January-February 2018 at the Georgia Institute of Technology. Data are summarized in Figure S5. The 2018 January and February median organic matter composition (left subplot) represents a continuation of the declining COOH contribution to OM, alongside an increasing aCOH contribution. This is also represented by the median absolute concentrations of COOH and aCOH relative to other years (center subplot). The contribution of COOH to median OM/OC ratio (right subplot) has declined sufficiently by 2018 to apparently cause an overall decrease in median OM/OC from that in 2016.
Figure S5. Medians in January and February, including 2018 extended dataset. Left: OM composition is represented as percent contribution of each functional group to total OM concentrations (see main text figures for legend). Center: absolute functional group concentrations are summed in each bar to the total OM concentration. Right: OM/OC contributions of each functional group are summed in each bar to the total OM/OC.

5 Annual Median Sample Spectra

As discussed in the main text, FT-IR spectra of samples confirmed that the functional group composition was changing over time. This was observed in all sampling sites, with the exception of the 2008-2009 economic recession period. Baseline correction was carried out using a smoothing splines method (Kuzmiakova et al., 2016) from sample spectra between 400 and 4000 cm⁻¹. Blank spectra (including lab and field blanks; see Methods Section) were used to subtract the blank PTFE absorption and scattering (including an overlapping absorption peak at ~1790 cm⁻¹) so that the variations between median sample spectra were visible. Median spectra were calculated over the baseline corrected spectra for each year and site (Figure S6).
Figure S6. Annual median spectra of samples collected at each site. Colored lines, as indicated in legends, demonstrate progression of absorbance over time. Subplots show (a) YRK, (b) BHM, and (c) CTR annual median spectra. Note that peak at ~2350 cm⁻¹ corresponds to Teflon filter substrate.
S6  Relationship with Wind Direction

The relationships between the wind direction (mean 24-hour direction at 10 m, measured using an RM Young 81000 sonic anemometer) and the concentrations of FT-IR OM and various other particle-phase chemical species were probed. Wind rose diagrams for each set of parameters of interested were generated using the function wind_rose function in Matlab 2016a (by M Ma; https://www.mathworks.com/matlabcentral/fileexchange/17748-wind_rose). Site and season combinations were examined to decipher whether any particular sources or meteorology might be responsible for contributions of particulate matter species (Figure S7).

It was discovered that Birmingham sources of high OM sources were variable in direction, perhaps due to regional dispersed small fires, with summer (June/July/August) high OM concentrations mainly coming from the ENE, perhaps related to emissions from a pipe foundry or coking oven (Hansen et al., 2003).

Despite Birmingham being to the NE of the Centreville site, the largest portion of springtime (March/April/May) OM originated from WNW of CTR, while the originating directions of OM during other seasons were mostly variable, with the greatest portion of samples during the autumn (September/October/November) originating from the ESE.

At Atlanta, urban sources to the SE of the site contributed to the majority of samples, but some or most higher OM samples generally originated from other directions in the winter (December/January/February). During the summer, high OM samples as well as the majority of OM in general at JST originated from the SSW, although many sources are possible from that direction.

The Yorkville site OM originated in part from Atlanta sources to the SE in the majority of samples, but higher concentrations were observed to come from areas to the west of the site, and in particular to the NW, perhaps from fires in the surrounding areas, or from industry or trees in nearby communities and rural area. During the summer, Yorkville high OM samples originated from nearly all directions, consistent with regional biogenic emissions.
Figure S7. Wind roses for each season and site, all years.
Trends in Monthly OM and Functional Groups

The monthly median OM compositions of each urban/rural site category for each site for each year 2009-2016 were plotted (Figure S8). In each case, the median absolute concentrations of OM were plotted on top of the functional group composition (right axes).
The statistical significance of the trend in monthly concentrations of each functional group was evaluated by plotting the monthly medians and bootstrapped confidence intervals (5th and 95th percentiles) for each urban/rural and year grouping (Figure S9; Figure S10). These were additionally contrasted with the same plots for median fractional contributions of each functional group to OM concentrations. The two different perspectives on functional group quantities gave different views on the OM: while absolute concentrations of the functional groups consistently peaked in the summers, monthly patterns of the fractional contributions of the functional groups to OM varied.
Figure S9. Monthly median concentrations of functional groups. Plots are shown for data categorized by urban/rural site location as well as subcategories of years (early = 2009-2012 and late = 2013-2016).
Figure S10. Monthly median contributions of functional groups to OM. Plots are shown for data categorized by urban/rural site location as well as subcategories of years (early = 2009-2012 and late = 2013-2016).
S9  Urban/Rural Ratios

Although monthly aCH concentration trends unsurprisingly mirror those of OM, the aCH monthly median urban/rural ratios were elevated compared to OM (some exceeded 1.5, especially in Alabama), indicating that the aCH was overall more attributable to urban emissions than was OM by mass. COOH trends demonstrated a distinction between the Alabama and Georgia site pairs: COOH concentrations were typically enhanced in urban Birmingham during the summer (but near one during the winter), while instead slightly enhanced in urban Atlanta during the winter. For the Alabama sites, the ratios were greater throughout the year than in the Georgia site pair, highlighting differences between the atmospheric chemical regime at the Alabama versus Georgia locations, as observed in Edgerton et al., (Edgerton et al., 2005) The monthly contrast between urban and rural site functional groups and OM (Figure S11), as well as the lack in sulfate urban/rural trends (Figure S12) overall emphasizes the importance of biogenic sources to OM in the region, but also that there is variation between chemical regimes within the region.
Figure S11. Monthly median urban/rural ratios of OM concentrations for Alabama (top) and Georgia (bottom) for each time period (earlier and later years).
Figure S12. Monthly median urban/rural ratios of sulfate concentrations at Georgia (top) and Alabama (bottom) for each time period (earlier and later years).
S10  SEARCH network aerosol chemical speciation data

Chemical variables measured by the SEARCH network are summarized in the following plots of median data for each site (shown for all data 2009-2012 in Figure S13 and Figure S14, then 2013-2016 in Figure S15 and Figure S16). Seasonality as well as inter-site differences are captured by the data, including differences in the enhancement of NO\textsubscript{x} (as well as particle NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-}) and elemental carbon (EC) in colder months, whereas most other variables peaked in the warmer months.

Figure S13. 2009-2012 median concentrations of SEARCH network gas particle speciation data.
Figure S14. 2009-2012 median concentrations of SEARCH network gas particle speciation data.
Figure S15. 2013-2016 median concentrations of SEARCH network gas speciation data.
Figure S16. 2013-2016 median concentrations of SEARCH network particle speciation data.

S11 Additional 2016 Data: Alabama Sites

2016 functional group composition and OM concentrations for Alabama sites are summarized in Figure S17 (only Georgia sites were shown in the body of the paper). While similar overall seasonal observations were made for the Alabama sites, Centreville and Birmingham were perhaps more different in chemical character than were Yorkville and Atlanta. The Centreville site was expected to be more rural than the Yorkville site, and urban sources of Birmingham were distinct from those in Atlanta (Hansen et al., 2003).
Figure S17. Organic matter concentrations, summed from the individual absolute concentrations of functional groups, are plotted for the two sites in Alabama (data for Georgia sites are shown in main paper). Precipitation and fire events are demonstrated as blue and orange markers, respectively, in the bottom subplot (from Atlanta dataset).

5 S12 2016 data: plots of data as normalized contributions to OM

The contributions of functional groups relative to the total OM concentrations, measured for each day in 2016 that was available and of sufficient quality (see Methods section of main paper) are plotted in Figure S18. The functional group variation during the year can be visualized more readily in this type of plot. Degree of oxidation, expressed as OM/OC and median carbon oxidation state, were also plotted.

Figure S18. 2016 datasets as normalized functional group contributions to total OM concentration.
S13  Evaluation of differences between samples with and without fire impact

The median concentrations of various species within the SEARCH dataset and the FG measurements were greater in 2016 where fire was observed in the region (Figure S19; based on positive visual identification of smoke; see Methods Section). Significant greater values were observed (evaluated at the bootstrapped 95th percent confidence limits) for all FG concentrations (not shown), and potassium concentrations in suspected fire-impacted samples. The FG fractions of OM demonstrated differing trends, which matched the long-term trends in OM: in suspected fire-impacted samples, the aCH fraction of OM was significantly greater, the naCO and aCOH fractions of OM were not significantly different, and the COOH and oxOCO fractions of OM were significantly lower. While some of these observed differences may be caused by the seasonality of fire days, this overall suggests that the OM from aged anthropogenic and/or biogenic sources (attributed to declining COOH and oxOCO in the multi-annual trends discussion) may be obscuring a fire fingerprint.

Figure S19. Concentrations and ratios of various aerosol metrics observed during periods with obvious regional smoke (“fire”) and without (“no fire”) in 2016 data. Potassium observations (K) are from x-ray fluorescence data. Median values are indicated by center red markers, 5th and 95th percent confidence intervals calculated using bootstrapping (n=1000).

S14  Meteorological observations from the SEARCH network sites

Measurements of various meteorological parameters were made at the SEARCH network sites and are summarized for all days in 2016 in temporal scatter plots by site here (Figure S20, Figure S21, Figure S22, and Figure S23). The values are each 24-hour averages of the parameters, as measured by an RM Young 81000 Sonic Anemometer (wind speed and direction), ParoScientific Model 3A or 4A measurement system (temperature, RH, and barometric pressure).

As in the observations made for OM concentration and composition, more variability in meteorological parameters was observed during the shoulder and colder months, while periods of stagnation were clearly
visible in data for the summer months (June, July, and August). The average RH was above 50 %, and average temperature above 20 °C for nearly all days during the summer at all sites. Even throughout the year, the average RH exceeded 30 % for most days. The average wind speed was typically lower throughout the same period, and average barometric pressure nearly constant as compared to colder months.

Figure S20. Meteorological parameters measured by the SEARCH network at YRK in support of the chemical speciation. Data are for all days in 2016.
Figure S21. Meteorological parameters measured by the SEARCH network at JST in support of the chemical speciation. Data are for all days in 2016.

Figure S22. Meteorological parameters measured by the SEARCH network at BHM in support of the chemical speciation. Data are for all days in 2016.
Figure S23. Meteorological parameters measured by the SEARCH network at CTR in support of the chemical speciation. Data are for all days in 2016.

S15  Weekly trends in composition: possible feedbacks of southeast U.S. aerosol on meteorology

Although a mid-week maximum in VOC concentrations has been observed previously in the SEARCH network (Blanchard et al., 2014), the median OM concentration trends observed in the present work were instead consistently lowest midweek (on Tuesdays) for 2013-2016 summers and winters at urban and rural sites (Figure S24). The same trend was observed for all FG concentrations during most seasons/sites (Table S2). The trend was less obvious during shoulder seasons (spring and autumn; not pictured for brevity) and was not observed in earlier years (2009-2012).
These low mid-week OM concentrations in the SE U.S. coincided with high median rainfall rates (Bell et al., 2008). Bell et al. hypothesized that this greater early-week rainfall was caused by the presence of small diameter aerosol: more, smaller raindrops were formed, which delayed the formation of large droplets needed for storm invigoration. This is a well-documented phenomenon in the presence of fine aerosol, as in Andreae et al., 2004. Similarly low values on a mid-week day were observed for other chemical variables and most seasons/sites, including PM$_{2.5}$, TOR OC, TOR EC, CO, and potassium (from XRF analysis), suggesting that the trend was related to anthropogenic/combustion emissions.
Table S2. Day of week on which lowest median value was observed, for chemical and meteorological variables listed in the first column, and sample sub-categories listed in the first row. Tuesday minima are indicated in bold font. Units of each chemical/meteorological variable are listed with the variable, when relevant; “XRF” indicates that the chemical variable was measured using x-ray fluorescence spectrometry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Urban Winter</th>
<th>Urban Summer</th>
<th>Rural Summer</th>
<th>Rural Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OM (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aCH (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOH (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxOCO (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naCO (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aCOH (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aCOH/OM</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOH/OM</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oxOCO/OM</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naCO/OM</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aCOH/OM</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Thu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$ (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM/PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Thu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfate (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Wed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium (XRF; μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Wed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon (XRF; μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Wed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium (XRF; μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Metal Oxides (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Mon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR OC (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR EC (μg m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Speed (m s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Wed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Direction (°)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Mon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°C)</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Thu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Humidity (%)</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (ppb)</td>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Sat</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO (ppb)</td>
<td>Thu</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Tue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO (ppb)</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO$_2$ (ppb)</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Tue</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO$_y$ (ppb)</td>
<td>Fri</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>Sun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References


