Kinetic modelling of formation and evaporation of SOA from NO$_3$ oxidation of pure and mixed monoterpenes
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Abstract.

Organic aerosol constitutes a major fraction of the global aerosol burden and is predominantly formed as secondary organic aerosol (SOA). Environmental chambers have been used extensively to study aerosol formation and evolution under controlled conditions similar to the atmosphere, but quantitative prediction of the outcome of these experiments is generally not achieved, which signifies our lack in understanding of these results and limits their portability to large scale models. In general, kinetic models employing state-of-the-art explicit chemical mechanisms fail to describe the mass concentration and composition of SOA obtained from chamber experiments. Specifically, chemical reactions involving nitrate radical (NO$_3$) oxidation of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are a source of major uncertainty for assessing the chemical and physical properties of oxidation products. Here, we introduce a kinetic model that treats gas-phase chemistry, gas-particle partitioning, particle-phase oligomerization, and chamber wall loss and use it to describe the oxidation of the monoterpenes $\alpha$-pinene and limonene with NO$_3$. The model can reproduce aerosol mass and nitration degrees in experiments using either pure precursors or their mixtures and infers volatility distributions of products, branching ratios of reactive intermediates as well as particle-phase reaction rates. The gas-phase chemistry in the model is based on the Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM), but trades speciation of single compounds for the overall ability of quantitatively describing SOA formation by using a lumped chemical mechanism. The complex branching into a multitude of individual products in MCM is replaced in this model with product volatility distributions, detailed peroxy (RO$_2$) and alkoxy (RO) radical chemistry and amended by a particle-phase oligomerization scheme. The kinetic parameters obtained in this study are constrained by a set of SOA formation and evaporation experiments conducted in the Georgia Tech Environmental Chamber (GTEC) facility. For both precursors, we present volatility distributions of nitrated and non-nitrated reaction products that are obtained by fitting the kinetic model systematically to the experimental data using a global optimization method, the Monte Carlo Genetic Algorithm (MCGA). The results presented here provide new mechanistic insight into the processes leading to formation and evaporation of SOA. Most notably, much of the non-linear behavior of precursor mixtures can be understood by RO$_2$ fate and reversible oligomerization reactions in the particle phase, but some effects could be accredited to kinetic limitations of mass transport in the particle phase. The methodologies described in this work provide a basis for quantitative analysis of multi-source data from environmental chamber experiments with manageable computational effort.
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1 Introduction

Atmospheric aerosol particles play an important role in the Earth system by influencing weather and climate, enabling long-range transport of chemical compounds, and negatively affecting public health (Pöschl, 2005; Fuzzi et al., 2006). A major contributor to the global aerosol burden is the oxidation of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) to condensable organic species, which leads to formation of secondary organic aerosol (SOA; Kanakidou et al., 2005). Important classes of SOA precursors include alkanes and aromatic compounds, which are often emitted from anthropogenic sources, as well as alkenes such as isoprene, monoterpenes, and sesquiterpenes, which are predominantly emitted by trees (Hallquist et al., 2009). The monoterpenes α-pinene and limonene are among the most abundant and well-studied SOA precursors (Seinfeld and Pandis, 2016). Atmospheric oxidation of alkenes occurs mainly through three oxidants: the hydroxyl radical (OH), which is produced in daylight and is short-lived; the abundant, but comparatively slow reacting ozone (O$_3$); and the nitrate radical (NO$_3$), which is the major source of SOA at nighttime, but also contributes to SOA formation during daytime, despite its quick photolysis (Liebmann et al., 2019). The oxidation of VOCs by NO$_3$ results in the formation of high yields of nitrated organic compounds, alkyl nitrates and peroxy acyl nitrates, which are produced in lower quantities through other atmospheric oxidation channels such as reaction of organic peroxy radicals (RO$_2$) with nitric oxide (NO) (Perring et al., 2013; Ng et al., 2017). These organic nitrates (ON) play an important role in the atmospheric nitrogen budget by serving as temporary or permanent sink for highly reactive nitrogen oxides (NO, NO$_2$ = NOx). Reactive nitrogen oxides constitute an integral part of oxidation cycles in the atmosphere and are made significantly less reactive through reaction to ON.

Due to their sufficiently low volatility, ON can be taken up into atmospheric aerosol particles, where they are shielded from gas-phase chemical decomposition, causing NO$_x$ to be temporarily removed from atmospheric oxidation cycling. While NO$_x$ can be recycled back into the atmosphere via photolysis (Müller et al., 2014), photooxidation (Nah et al., 2016), and thermal decomposition of ON, permanent removal can occur through ON hydrolysis (Takeuchi and Ng, 2019) and deposition processes (Nguyen et al., 2015).

Furthermore, the presence of ON affects the formation and persistence of organic aerosol (OA) (Ng et al., 2017). The contribution of particulate ON mass (pON) to total organic aerosol has been investigated previously in laboratory studies by mass-spectrometric methods (Fry et al., 2009, 2011, 2014; Boyd et al., 2015; Nah et al., 2016; Boyd et al., 2017; Faxon et al., 2018; Takeuchi and Ng, 2019) and a radioactive tracer method (Berkemeier et al., 2016), revealing that organic nitrate mass fractions can reach up to 0.8 in the particle phase under certain conditions. Although ambient measurements varied strongly temporally and regionally, the ratio of ON mass to the total organic mass has been shown to reach up to 0.77 (Ng et al., 2017, and references therein).

Despite the importance of ON to the dynamics of SOA formation, the chemical mechanism for their formation in the gas and particle phases is still under discussion (Kurtén et al., 2017; Claflin and Ziemann, 2018; Draper et al., 2019). The Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM) provides a resource of the gas phase degradation chemistry of typical SOA precursors with atmospheric oxidants (Saunders et al., 2003; Jenkin et al., 2003). However, application of MCM to the oxidation of
monoterpenes with NO$_3$ leads to a significant underestimation of particle mass and pON/OA (Boyd et al., 2017; Faxon et al., 2018).

It has been hypothesized and shown recently that a majority of SOA might exist in oligomerized form (Kalberer et al., 2004; Gao et al., 2010), which might alter their evaporation behavior (Baltensperger et al., 2005; D’Ambro et al., 2018). In that case, the evaporation time scale is determined by chemical decomposition instead of equilibrium partitioning due to volatility (Pankow, 1994). Additionally, organic aerosol particles can exhibit a highly viscous phase state (Virtanen et al., 2010; Koop et al., 2011; Reid et al., 2018), which leads to kinetic limitations in evaporation (Vaden et al., 2011), reduced particle-phase chemistry (Gatzsche et al., 2017), and non-equilibrium partitioning (Cappa and Wilson, 2011).

To describe kinetic limitations in mass transport, a number of kinetic multi-layer models have been developed recently to describe aerosol particles and cloud droplets, including KM-SUB (Shiraiwa et al., 2010), KM-GAP (Shiraiwa et al., 2012), ADCHAM (Roldin et al., 2014), and MOSAIC (Zaveri et al., 2008, 2014). These models are capable of explicitly resolving mass transport and chemical reactions within aerosol particles. Using these models, Shiraiwa et al. (2013) and Zaveri et al. (2018) were able to find evidence for diffusion limitation affecting SOA formation dynamics by inspection of the evolution of particle size distributions. Yli-Juuti et al. (2017) and Tikkanen et al. (2019) used an evaporation model based on KM-GAP to describe the interaction of volatility and viscosity during isothermal dilution as a function of different environmental conditions. However, to our best knowledge, no model has been presented that describes all aspects of gas-phase chemistry, particle-phase chemistry, gas-particle partitioning and bulk diffusion of SOA.

A model capable of describing all these aspects of SOA formation must rely on a large set of kinetic parameters, which are often not readily accessible. However, model parameters can be systematically altered so the model matches experimental data, an approach often referred to as inverse modelling. Simultaneously optimizing multiple model parameters can often be unfeasible via manual optimization and prompts the use of global optimization methods (Berkemeier et al., 2013, 2017). As opposed to local optimization methods, global optimization algorithms are not as easily stuck in local minima and are able to reliably find solutions of difficult optimization problems. In conjunction with a kinetic model, global optimization algorithms represent a powerful tool that allows to infer molecular level information from macroscopic data. Thus, global optimization algorithms based on differential evolution, such as the Monte Carlo Genetic Algorithm (MCGA), have become increasingly popular in the modelling of complex multiphase chemical systems (Berkemeier et al., 2017; Marshall et al., 2018; Tikkanen et al., 2019).

In a previous study, Boyd et al. (2017) showed that the retained aerosol mass from oxidation of limonene with NO$_3$ after heating from 25 °C to 40 °C is significantly different than the mass obtained from oxidizing limonene at 40 °C. They further showed that the evaporation behavior of mixtures of limonene SOA and β-pinene SOA crucially depends on the order in which oxidation occurred. Limonene SOA evaporated less in the experiment where oxidation of limonene was followed by oxidation of β-pinene, compared to the experiment where both precursors were oxidized simultaneously. At the time, it was only postulated that diffusion limitations and/or oligomerization reactions could have led to these observations. In this work, we conduct new environmental chamber experiments and apply a novel kinetic modelling framework to investigate whether gas-phase chemistry, equilibrium partitioning, and particle-phase chemistry can describe the formation and evaporation of...
monoterpene SOA from oxidation of α-pinene, limonene, and mixtures of both precursors with NO3. α-pinene is chosen over β-pinene since it shows a more distinct evaporation behavior to limonene SOA and is the overall better-understood SOA precursor. We perform experiments at a lower initial temperature compared to Boyd et al. (2017) to include a second heating stage in the experiments. We focus the modelling efforts on the experimental observables aerosol mass and organic nitrogen content (contribution of particulate ON mass to total organic aerosol, pON/OA) as a function of time in the reaction chamber. We apply a kinetic model that uses a simplified, lumped kinetic mechanism based on MCM (Berkemeier et al., 2016), but modifies some of the branching ratios in RO2 chemistry and adds chemical reactivity in the particle phase. Building on the observations of Boyd et al. (2017) in their mixed precursor experiments, we investigate the linearity of these two observables by quantitative comparison of formation and evaporation of SOA from pure and mixed monoterpene precursors. Lastly, we use the kinetic model to perform a sensitivity analysis on the potential effect of retarded bulk diffusion due to a viscous phase state. The kinetic modelling framework consisting of a kinetic multi-layer model based on KM-GAP and the MCGA algorithm is used as analysis tool to unravel the mechanistic interactions between reactive intermediates and oxidation products that can lead to non-additivity of the investigated reaction systems.

2 Experimental and theoretical methods

2.1 Georgia Tech Environmental Chamber (GTEC)

The aerosol formation and evaporation experiments are performed as batch reactions in the GTEC facility, which consists of two separate 12 m³ Teflon chambers in a temperature- and humidity-controlled enclosure (Boyd et al., 2015). A consistent experimental routine is maintained for all experiments presented in this study and resembles the method used by Boyd et al. (2017) with small updates. Concentrations of O₃ and NOₓ are determined with a UV absorption O₃ analyzer (Teledyne T400) and a chemiluminescence NOₓ monitor (Teledyne 200 EU), respectively. Aerosol particle number and volume concentrations are measured using a scanning mobility particle sizer (SMPS, TSI), which consists of a differential mobility analyzer (DMA, TSI 3040) and a condensation particle counter (CPC, TSI 3775). Bulk aerosol composition is measured using a High Resolution Time-of-Flight Aerosol Mass Spectrometer (HR-ToF-AMS, DeCarlo et al., 2006).

The Teflon chamber is flushed with zero air for at least 24 h and the chamber enclosure is cooled to 5 °C several hours prior to each experiment, to ensure full equilibration with regard to temperature, pressure, and humidity. Monoterpene oxidation is initiated at 5 °C and under dry conditions (RH < 5 %). All experiments are conducted using ammonium sulfate seed particles. Seed particles are generated by atomizing a 15 mM ammonium sulfate solution into the chamber for 20 minutes, which typically results in particle number concentrations around 20 000 cm⁻³ and mass concentrations of 28 – 41 µg/m³. Simultaneously, monoterpene precursors are injected into the chamber. Injection volumes of the precursors are chosen to achieve consistent total aerosol mass concentrations around 100 µg/m³ in all experiments, based on knowledge about aerosol yields in trial experiments for this study. For α-pinene, we use a micro syringe to inject a known volume of liquid into a mildly heated glass bulb from which a 5 L/min zero air flow carries the evaporating fumes into the chamber. For limonene, the required liquid volume is so low that the use of micro syringes is a source of non-negligible uncertainty and hence a gas cylinder filled
with 0.85 ppm limonene, calibrated and confirmed using gas chromatography with flame ionization detection (GC-FID), is used to inject a known volume of gas into the chamber over the course of several minutes. NO$_3$ is produced by oxidation of NO$_2$ with O$_3$ (generated by passing zero air through a photochemical ozone generator) in a 1.5 L flow tube (0.9 L/min flow, 100 s residence time). The reaction mixture is optimized so NO$_3$ and N$_2$O$_5$ are produced in high yields, with no significant amount of O$_3$ entering the chamber. This is achieved by using a 2:1 ratio of NO$_2$ and O$_3$. N$_2$O$_5$ decomposes in the chamber to release NO$_3$ over time. Injection of NO$_3$/N$_2$O$_5$ marks the beginning of the reaction.

When peak SOA growth is reached, which is typically achieved in under 4 hours of the experiment, the chamber enclosure temperature is raised to 25 °C and, after another waiting period, to 42 °C. The temperature changes take approximately 90 minutes in both cases. Temperature profiles are reported alongside the experimental results in Fig. 2.

In total, four experiments are conducted, either with a single monoterpenic precursor, pure α-pinene (APN) and pure limonene (LIM), or with a mixture of both precursors. In the case where both precursors are used, the oxidation occurred in one of two variants: simultaneous (MIX) or sequential oxidation (SEQ). In case of the MIX experiment, both precursors are injected simultaneously into the chamber prior to NO$_3$/N$_2$O$_5$ injection. In case of the SEQ experiment, peak growth of the first precursor oxidation is first awaited. The first oxidation is followed by a second NO$_3$/N$_2$O$_5$ injection and injection of the second VOC precursor shortly thereafter. An 8-fold excess of N$_2$O$_5$ is used for pure limonene experiments, and a 4-fold excess used for pure α-pinene experiments. In the mixed precursor experiments, the amount of injected NO$_3$/N$_2$O$_5$ is determined using the same ratios proportionately. A summary of all experimental conditions, including injected precursor amounts, aerosol mass, organic aerosol mass excluding seed, and SOA yields can be found in Table 1. It is noted that we refer to the total aerosol mass concentration (sum of inorganic seed mass concentration and organic aerosol mass concentration) in the chamber simply as “aerosol mass” in our discussions. “SOA yield” refers to the ratio of produced organic aerosol mass to the reacted VOC mass (Odum et al., 1996).

### 2.2 Kinetic model

The kinetic model calculations in this study are performed with a multi-compartmental model akin to the KM-SUB/KM-GAP model family (Shiraiwa et al., 2010, 2012). The model code is set up as a generator script that uses an input chemical mechanism to generate a system of differential equations that is able to describe the key physical and chemical processes in the GTEC chamber. The model compartments include the chamber wall, the chamber gas phase, the particle near-surface gas phase, the particle surface and the particle bulk. The processes explicitly described in the model include injection of chemical compounds, wall loss of gas phase species, temperature change, gas diffusion to particles, condensation and evaporation at the particle surface, as well as chemical reaction in the gas and particle phases. Wall loss of particles is implicitly accounted for in this study by using wall loss-corrected SMPS data (Keywood et al., 2004; Nah et al., 2017).

All product molecules with volatility lower than 10$^{-5}$ Pa are allowed to partition into the topmost layer of the particles. Gas-particle partitioning is explicitly treated in the model and equilibration between the particle near-surface gas phase and the particle surface is achieved by balancing surface adsorption and desorption rates. This way, evaporation and condensation kinetics are treated more realistically than in a model assuming instantaneous equilibrium partitioning. The adsorption flux
$J_{ads,X}$ of a molecule $X$ is calculated from the collision flux from the particle near-surface gas phase to the particle surface, which in turn is calculated from the mean thermal velocity $\omega_X$ and the accommodation coefficient $\alpha_{s,X}$. $\alpha_{s,X}$ is assumed to be 0.1 for all organic species in this study, in line with previous investigations (Julin et al., 2013).

$$J_{ads,X} = \alpha_{s,X} \cdot \frac{\omega_X}{4} \cdot [X]_{gs} \quad (1)$$

The desorption flux from the particle surface to the gas phase $J_{des,X}$ is dependent on the vapor pressure $p_{vap,X}$ and the ratio of the concentration of $X$ in the particle near-surface bulk layer $[X]_{b1}$, and the sum of all other species $Y_j$ in that layer.

$$J_{des,X} = \frac{\alpha_{s,X} \cdot \omega_X \cdot p_{vap,X} \cdot N_A \cdot [X]_{b1}}{4 \cdot R \cdot T \cdot \sum [Y_j]_{b1}} \quad (2)$$

Here, $R$ is the universal gas constant, $T$ the temperature in K, and $N_A$ is Avogadro’s number. The vapor pressure of product compounds is assumed to be temperature dependent with a precursor-dependent effective enthalpy of volatilization, $\Delta H_{vap,Z}$ in kJ/mol, where $Z$ is the precursor of $X$. We assume this single effective enthalpy to be temperature independent and representative for the entire product spectrum.

$$p_{vap,X}(T) = p_{vap,X}(298 \text{ K}) \cdot \exp \left( -\frac{\Delta H_{vap,Z}}{R \cdot (T - 298)} \right) \quad (3)$$

Note that in this study only a single well-mixed layer is used to describe the aerosol phase. New particle formation from low-volatility vapors is not treated in this model, so seed particles have to be pre-defined. Seed particles are initialized as covered with a very small amount of non-volatile organics ($5 \times 10^{-3}$ ppb gas-phase mixing ratio) to aid in computation of gas-particle partitioning. The model can be run in two modes: lumped mode, in which only vapor pressure bins are defined, and explicit mode, in which vapor pressures must be pre-supplied for all participating species. In the following, we will describe the specific lumped mode used in this study.

### 2.3 Lumped chemical mechanism

The gas-phase chemical mechanism, summarized in Fig. 1a, is modeled after the initial reaction steps in the MCM, but does not assume specific sum or structural formulas of product molecules. The validity of this approach has been shown in previous work (Berkemeier et al., 2016). For limonene SOA, we apply the same general chemistry, but consider the oxidation of both double bonds individually, which leads to the more complex reaction scheme shown in Fig. S1. Note that oxidation of the second double bond of limonene with NO$_3$ is not considered in MCM, which makes the reaction mechanism distinctly different to the MCM template. However, we have shown previously that including oxidation of the second double bond leads to a significantly improved correlation between a kinetic model and chamber experiments (Boyd et al., 2017).

To account for chemical identity, the major product classes, nitrated and non-nitrated organic molecules, are subdivided into volatility bins (Fig. 1b) following the concept of a volatility basis set (VBS; Donahue et al., 2011). The six volatility bins employed in this study are chosen to have increased resolution and hence achieve maximum sensitivity around the experimental range of $10 - 100 \mu g/m^3$, but still cover a wider range of volatilities: (1) $1.32 \times 10^{-12}$ Pa ($C^* = 0.01 \mu g/m^3$), (2) $1.32 \times 10^{-10}$ Pa ($C^* = 1 \mu g/m^3$), (3) $1.32 \times 10^{-9}$ Pa ($C^* = 10 \mu g/m^3$), (4) $1.32 \times 10^{-8}$ Pa ($C^* = 100 \mu g/m^3$), (5)
1.32 × 10\(^{-7}\) Pa (\(C^* = 1000 \, \mu g/m^3\)) and (6) 1.32 × 10\(^{-5}\) Pa (\(C^* = 100,000 \, \mu g/m^3\)) at 298 K. \(C^*\) is the saturation mass concentration, which indicates the organic aerosol mass at which a semi-volatile organic substance would be in the gas and particle phase in equal parts. Note that while \(C^*\) is temperature dependent, we refer to the moving volatility bins in this manuscript by their \(C^*\) at 298 K.

Oligomeric species are chosen to be fully non-volatile and hence technically form a seventh volatility bin. The average molar mass of molecules in the organic aerosol phase is assumed to be 250 g/mol, which is similar to assumptions in previous publications (Berkemeier et al., 2016) and consistent with our measurements using chemical ionization high-resolution time-of-flight mass spectrometry with a special filter inlet that samples both the aerosol and gas phase (FIGAERO-HRToF-CIMS Lopez-Hilfiker et al., 2014) that were conducted alongside this study (Takeuchi and Ng, 2019).

A specific aim of this study is the mechanistic analysis of ON formation. Therefore, the gas-phase formation of ON is treated in detail and has been expanded from the MCM template, which is detailed in Fig. S2. We assume that chemical reaction of NO\(_3\) with the terpenic precursor yields a nitrated peroxy radical (R\(^N\)O\(_2\)). The fate of the nitrate group (-ONO\(_2\)) in this radical is dependent on its radical branching ratios. Following MCM, we assume that the reaction of R\(^N\)O\(_2\) with HO\(_2\) yields a stable organic nitrate product, whereas reaction with NO, NO\(_3\), RO\(_2\), or unimolecular decay leads to formation of a nitrated alkoxy radical (R\(^N\)O), which can further stabilize under elimination of the nitrate group. Reaction of two RO\(_2\) may also yield dimers.
Another channel of ON formation is the reaction of a non-nitrated peroxy radical (RO\textsuperscript{\textit{II}}\textsubscript{2}) with NO. Following MCM, we assume that only RO\textsuperscript{\textit{II}}\textsubscript{2}, which is the main intermediate in monoterpene OH oxidation and a secondary intermediate of monoterpene ozonolysis, can undergo this reaction. It is hence distinct from RO\textsuperscript{\textit{I}}\textsubscript{2}, which is the main intermediate in monoterpene ozonolysis. However, this RO\textsuperscript{\textit{II}}\textsubscript{2} + NO reaction channel has only minor implications in this study due to the low prevalence of NO under the employed reaction conditions, i.e., injection of NO\textsubscript{3}/N\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} as well as no irradiance with UV lights.

Particle-phase chemistry is included as formation and decomposition of oligomers from monoterpene oxidation products. Possible reaction pathways for oligomerization include the formation of esters, aldols, hemiacetals, acetals, peroxyhemiacetals, and peroxycetals from alcohol, aldehyde, hydroperoxide, and carboxylic acid moieties in the monoterpene oxidation products (Ziemann and Atkinson, 2012), but are lumped into a single reaction for simplicity. These oligomers are assumed to be non-volatile, but can re-partition back to the gas phase after decomposition into the monomeric building blocks. Oligomer decomposition is treated as temperature dependent with a precursor-specific activation energy $E_{\text{A, decom, } Z}$ to be used in an Arrhenius equation. The information about volatility and nitration degree of monomers is retained during oligomerization and reinstated after their decomposition. This process is outlined in Fig. 1c. A detailed discussion of the oligomerization scheme is provided in the Supplement, Sect. S1 and Fig. S3. An overview of all reactions of the lumped model in the gas and particle phases is given in Table S1.

**2.4 Global optimization**

The Monte Carlo Genetic Algorithm (MCGA; Berkemeier et al., 2017) is applied for inverse fitting of the kinetic model to the experimental data and determining the non-prescribed kinetic parameters listed in Table 1. The MCGA method consists of two steps: a Monte Carlo step and a genetic algorithm step. During the Monte Carlo step, kinetic parameter sets are randomly sampled from a defined parameter range and the residue between the model result and the experimental data is determined for each parameter set through evaluation of the kinetic model. During the genetic algorithm step, the parameter sets are optimized mimicking processes known from natural evolution: a survival mechanism retains best-fitting parameter sets, the recombination mechanic generates new parameter sets by combing parameters of high scoring sets, and the mutation step prevents early homogenization of the sample of parameter sets. To determine the model-experiment correlation, we use a weighted mean squared error (wMSE) approach that minimizes the sum of the squares of the residuals, Eq. 4. The estimator is normalized to the magnitude of the largest data point in a given sample, $\max(Y_{\text{data}, i})$, and the number of data points $n_i$ of data set $i$. Additionally, optional weighting factors $w_i$ can be used to guide the optimization process.

$$wMSE_i = w_i \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_i} \sum \left( \frac{Y_{\text{model}} - Y_{\text{data}, i}}{\max(Y_{\text{data}, i})} \right)^2}$$

After an optimization result is returned, a 1-dimensional golden-section search (Press et al., 2007, Sect. 10.2) is used to ensure conversion into a minimum of the optimization hypersurface. The simplex method (Press et al., 2007, Sect. 10.5) is used to find other combinations of parameters that lead to equivalent model results (test of uniqueness). Weighting factors $w_i$ can be used to assign a lower importance to data sets that e.g., exhibit large scatter due to experimental noise, represent experimental artifacts or are deemed only supplementary for the purpose of the optimization.
Table 1. Fit parameters of the kinetic model. Error estimates for the volatility distribution (parameters \( f_{\text{apin}} \) and \( f_{\text{lim}} \)) can be found in Fig. S5 in the supplement, error estimates for all other parameters are ranges in which a parameter can be varied until the model-experiment correlation decreases by 10%. For a full list of kinetic parameters, see Table S1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value of best fit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( f_{\text{apin,org,b1}} - f_{\text{apin,org,b6}} )</td>
<td>see Fig. S5</td>
<td>Volatility distribution of non-nitrated ( \alpha )-pinene oxidation products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{\text{apin,nitr,b1}} - f_{\text{apin,nitr,b6}} )</td>
<td>see Fig. S5</td>
<td>Volatility distribution of nitrated ( \alpha )-pinene oxidation products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{\text{lim,org,b1}} - f_{\text{lim,org,b6}} )</td>
<td>see Fig. S5</td>
<td>Volatility distribution of non-nitrated limonene oxidation products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( f_{\text{lim,nitr,b1}} - f_{\text{lim,nitr,b6}} )</td>
<td>see Fig. S5</td>
<td>Volatility distribution of nitrated limonene oxidation products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{gpwl} )</td>
<td>2.80 ((2.31 - 3.34) \times 10^{-7})</td>
<td>Gas-phase wall loss rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta H_{\text{vap,apin}} )</td>
<td>76.7 ((62.9 - 88.5))</td>
<td>Effective enthalpy of vaporization of ( \alpha )-pinene SOA products ((\text{kJ/mol}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta H_{\text{vap,lim}} )</td>
<td>69.2 ((66.0 - 72.2))</td>
<td>Effective enthalpy of vaporization of limonene SOA products ((\text{kJ/mol}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_{\text{vap,IM1}} )</td>
<td>2.06 ((1.38 - 4.70) \times 10^{-7})</td>
<td>Vapor pressure, non-nitrated limonene SOA intermediate ((\text{Pa}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p_{\text{vap,IM2}} )</td>
<td>3.86 ((3.16 - 4.48) \times 10^{-8})</td>
<td>Vapor pressure, nitrated limonene SOA intermediate ((\text{Pa}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_1 )</td>
<td>1.39 ((1.06 - 1.68) \times 10^{-2})</td>
<td>Branching ratio, gas-phase dimer yield from ( \text{RO}_2 + \text{RO}_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_2 )</td>
<td>0.141 ((0.102 - 0.171))</td>
<td>Branching ratio, ( \text{RO} ) yield from ( \text{RO}_2 + \text{RO}_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_{3,\text{apin}} )</td>
<td>6.91 ((6.30 - 7.46) \times 10^{-2})</td>
<td>Branching ratio, product yield from ( \text{RO} + \alpha )-pinene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_{3,\text{lim}} )</td>
<td>0.774 ((0.578 - 0.972))</td>
<td>Branching ratio, product yield from ( \text{RO} ), limonene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_{4,\text{apin}} )</td>
<td>0 ((0 - 9.65) \times 10^{-2})</td>
<td>Product ratio of non-nitrated to nitrate ratio species from ( \text{RO} ), ( \alpha )-pinene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_{4,\text{lim}} )</td>
<td>0.230 ((0.190 - 0.272))</td>
<td>Product ratio of non-nitrated to nitrate ratio species from ( \text{RO} ), limonene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{\text{form,apin}} )</td>
<td>17.4 ((9.5 - 27.0))</td>
<td>Oligomerization rate coefficient, ( \alpha )-pinene ((\text{h}^{-1}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{\text{form,lim}} )</td>
<td>1.11 ((1.01 - 1.22))</td>
<td>Oligomerization rate coefficient, limonene ((\text{h}^{-1}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{\text{decom,apin}} )</td>
<td>3.28 ((2.13 - 6.04))</td>
<td>Oligomer decomposition rate coefficient, ( \alpha )-pinene ((\text{h}^{-1}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{\text{decom,lim}} )</td>
<td>3.92 ((3.56 - 4.28) \times 10^{-2})</td>
<td>Oligomer decomposition rate coefficient, limonene ((\text{h}^{-1}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_{A,\text{decom,apin}} )</td>
<td>620 ((492 - 801))</td>
<td>Activation energy of oligomer decomposition, ( \alpha )-pinene ((\text{kJ/mol}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_{A,\text{decom,lim}} )</td>
<td>244 ((214 - 269))</td>
<td>Activation energy of oligomer decomposition, limonene ((\text{kJ/mol}))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that for the experiments discussed in this manuscript, multiple model solutions can be obtained, dependent not only on the choice of data sets that is optimized to, but also on the choice of weighting factors. In the following sections, only one fit of the model to experimental data will be discussed as de-facto fit as it scored best in our choice of the model-experiment correlation estimator. The fit is obtained by fitting to total aerosol mass and aerosol organic nitrate fraction \((\text{pON/OA})\) data of three experimental data sets (LIM, APN, and SEQ). The fourth experiment (MIX) is intentionally left out from the fitting process for cross-validation. We will discuss the dependence of the best fit on weighting factors and the uniqueness of the obtained model solution in a separate section, Sects. 3.4 and 4.
Table 2. Experimental conditions for environmental chamber experiments presented in this study alongside aerosol masses and SOA yields during peak growth at 5 °C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>VOC 1 (ppb)</th>
<th>VOC 2 (ppb)</th>
<th>Experiment variant</th>
<th>Seed mass † (µg/m³)</th>
<th>Peak aerosol mass † (µg/m³)</th>
<th>Peak OA mass † (µg/m³)</th>
<th>SOA yield (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>limonene</td>
<td></td>
<td>pure limonene</td>
<td>28.8 ± 1.4</td>
<td>110.1 ± 5.5</td>
<td>81.3 ± 5.7</td>
<td>129.6 ± 15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.5 ± 1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APN</td>
<td>α-pinene</td>
<td></td>
<td>pure α-pinene</td>
<td>37.3 ± 1.9</td>
<td>108.7 ± 5.4</td>
<td>71.4 ± 5.7</td>
<td>25.2 ± 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47.5 ± 4.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>α-pinene</td>
<td></td>
<td>limonene</td>
<td>33.4 ± 1.7</td>
<td>100.1 ± 5.0</td>
<td>66.7 ± 5.3</td>
<td>38.5 ± 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24 ± 2.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>sequential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIX</td>
<td>α-pinene</td>
<td></td>
<td>limonene</td>
<td>40.9 ± 2.0</td>
<td>93.8 ± 4.7</td>
<td>52.9 ± 5.1</td>
<td>32.2 ± 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.5 ± 2.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>simultaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†: Aerosol masses are calculated from aerosol volume concentrations using a density of the organic phase of 1.64 g/cm³ for limonene SOA (Boyd et al., 2017), 1.46 g/cm³ for α-pinene SOA (Nah et al., 2016), and 1.55 g/cm³ for the mixtures. All reported masses are particle wall-loss corrected.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Pure limonene oxidation (LIM)

3.1.1 Experimental observations (LIM)

Fig. 2a shows the total aerosol mass concentration (denoted as “aerosol mass”) during an experiment of limonene oxidation with NO₃ in the presence of ammonium sulfate seed particles, and subsequent evaporation in the GTEC chamber, here referred to as “LIM” experiment. Oxidation at 5 °C initially causes a fast increase in aerosol mass (black open markers, left axis) from 29 µg/m³ of seed mass to about 70 µg/m³ of aerosol mass within the first 20 minutes of the experiment. Afterwards, aerosol growth slows down considerably, so that the peak aerosol mass of 110 µg/m³ is reached only after 5 hours. The slow increase in aerosol mass in the beginning of the experiment is likely an important feature of the experimental data for determination of mass transfer and chemical reaction rates.

The produced aerosol mass corresponds to a SOA yield of 130 % (Table 2) and is observed to be constant in the chamber for several hours at 5 °C. Note that this observation is different from previous experiments conducted at 25 °C and 40 °C (Boyd et al., 2017), where peak aerosol mass was achieved swiftly and SOA yields at aerosol mass loading similar to this study were determined to be 174 % (yield constant with mass loading) and 124 %, respectively. While the lower SOA yield at 40 °C compared to 25 °C can be explained with equilibrium partitioning theory, the lower mass yield observed at 5 °C in this study cannot.

After 7 hours of total experiment time, the temperature set point of the chamber enclosure is increased to 25 °C. The new temperature plateau is reached inside the Teflon chamber 90 minutes later (grey dashed line, right axis). The temperature
change causes a slight reduction in aerosol mass from 110 to about 104 µg/m³. At the new temperature set point, aerosol mass is not constant, but rather decays at a constant rate. After about 19 hours, the temperature set point is increased to 42 °C, which again causes an immediate slight reduction in aerosol mass from 90 to about 83 µg/m³. At the new temperature plateau of 42 °C, aerosol mass once again decays at a constant rate that is comparable to the one previously observed.
In the following, kinetic modelling results are discussed in terms of a best fit that is obtained using the Monte Carlo Genetic Algorithm (MCGA). The uniqueness of this fit and potential pitfalls of the optimization process are discussed in Sects. 3.4 and 4. The kinetic model (red solid line in Fig. 2a) is able to reproduce the observed aerosol formation and evaporation behavior. In the model run at hand, the initial quick increase in aerosol mass is due to condensation of dimers formed in the gas phase through the \( \text{RO}_2 + \text{RO}_2 \) channel (from now on referred to as “gas-phase dimers”), making up about 50% of condensing material in the initial seconds and minutes. Subsequent growth is due to condensation of monomeric oxidation products (from now on referred to as “monomers”) of sufficiently low volatility. After 20 minutes, half of the aerosol mass at peak growth is reached and the particle phase is mostly comprised of monomers, cf. Fig. 2b, panel (i), about one third of which still contain an C-C double bond (Fig. S4). These mono-unsaturated oxidation products either partition back into the gas phase where they can be oxidized further, or co-oligomerize in the particle phase with other products. The vapor pressure of the non-nitrated and nitrated mono-unsaturated oxidation products were fitted during the MCGA optimization and determined to have saturation mass concentrations \( C^* \) of 1560 and 292 \( \mu g/m^3 \) at 298 K, respectively. During peak growth, 27% of oxidation products still contain a double bond in this model run, almost all of which are nitrated and present in the oligomer phase. Note that this is possible because we do not consider the oxidation of unsaturated compounds in the particle phase.

The volatility distributions determined by global optimization can be found in Fig. S5a. The majority of limonene oxidation products in this model run occupies the 4th and 5th volatility bins \( (C^* = 100, 1000 \mu g/m^3 \text{ at } 298 \text{ K}) \), which are mostly present in the gas phase under these reaction conditions. In the model, the slow increase in aerosol mass from 20 minutes to 5 hours of oxidation is due to oligomerization of monomers forming higher molecular weight structures through accretion reactions in the particle phase (from now on referred to as “oligomers”). According to the model fit, oligomerization occurs at a rate of 1 \( h^{-1} \), hereby slowly removing semi-volatile species in the particle phase from partitioning equilibrium and causing a slow drift of semi-volatiles from the gas phase into the particle phase. At peak growth, most of the organic material in the particle phase exists in an oligomeric state, cf. Fig. 2b, panel (ii), which explains the lack of initial evaporation caused by an increase in chamber temperature.

Surprisingly, the SOA yield observed at 5 °C in this study is lower than in experiments performed at 25 °C previously (Boyd et al., 2017). A potential justification could be temperature dependence of the oligomerization rate constant. In chamber experiments, condensation of vapors onto the particles stands in competition with irreversible loss to the chamber walls, which we assume to be temperature independent. When oligomerization occurs more slowly, oxidation products from the \( C^* = 100 \) and 1000 \( \mu g/m^3 \) volatility bins are increasingly lost to the walls instead of being incorporated into the particle oligomer phase. Furthermore, Boyd et al. (2017) observed a lower aerosol mass when forming limonene SOA at 40 °C compared to first forming limonene SOA at 25 °C and then heating to 40 °C. Also here, a possible explanation is the formation of oligomers of semi-volatile vapors: the fractional amount of chemical species from the 100 and 1000 \( \mu g/m^3 \) volatility bins that partitions into the particle phase is much smaller at 40 °C and hence prevents mass accumulation through oligomerization.
The slow decay of aerosol mass between 6 and 24 hours of the experiment is attributed in the model to a slow unimolecular decay of oligomeric material with a rate constant of $0.04 \text{ h}^{-1}$, followed by evaporation of monomers at elevated temperatures, and subsequent irreversible deposition of vapors onto the chamber walls. The observed decomposition rate is slightly slower than the rate of $0.06 - 0.2 \text{ h}^{-1}$ reported by D’Ambro et al. (2018) for SOA formed from ozonolysis of $\alpha$-pinene. Following Le Chatelier’s principle, removal of monomers from the equilibrium causes a constant drift of organic matter from oligomeric to monomeric state. Since the volatility of the monomeric subunit is retained in the model (for details see oligomerization mechanism in Fig. S3), this process is faster for monomers that have higher volatilities because they partition into the gas phase more quickly and readily, causing an enrichment of low-volatility monomeric subunits in the particle phase. The (meta-)stability of organic material in the particle phase can hence be attributed not only to the stability of the oligomer bond, but also the volatility of the monomeric building blocks at this temperature.

Monomers and dimers are removed from the system by loss to the chamber walls, which is the main driver of loss of organic mass. The loss coefficient of gas-phase molecules to the chamber wall is determined to be $3.3 \times 10^{-7}$. This number is interpreted as a gas-wall accommodation coefficient of molecules colliding with the chamber wall and is used for all organic molecules independent of their chemical structure. In this study, it is assumed that molecules adsorbed to the chamber walls are irreversibly lost for the time scale of the experiment. This can be explained by slow diffusion of molecules into the inner layer of the Teflon wall (Huang et al., 2018). In the geometry of the GTEC and for 250 g/mol molecules at 298 K, a loss coefficient of $2.8 \times 10^{-7}$ corresponds to a loss rate of 0.12 h$^{-1}$ or a gas-wall equilibration timescale $\tau_{\text{gwe}}$ of $3.0 \times 10^4$ s, respectively. This number falls in-between values previously reported in the literature. Krechmer et al. (2016) as well as Yeh and Ziemann (2015) reported a $\tau_{\text{gwe}}$ around $1 \times 10^3$ s in their Teflon chamber, whereas gas-wall equilibration timescales measured in the CalTech chamber typically range from $3 \times 10^4$ s and $5 \times 10^5$ s, depending on the chemical identity of the investigated substance (Loza et al., 2010; Shiraiwa et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2015a).

3.2 Pure $\alpha$-pinene oxidation (APN)

3.2.1 Experimental observations (APN)

Fig. 3a shows the aerosol mass during the corresponding experiment of $\alpha$-pinene oxidation with NO$_3$, here referred to as “APN” experiment. Similar to the LIM experiment described above, oxidation at 5 °C initially causes a fast increase in aerosol mass (black open markers), however, peak aerosol mass is reached already after 3 hours of oxidation at 109 µg/m$^3$. Due to the larger amount of injected precursor, SOA yield is at 25.2 % significantly lower than observed in the limonene oxidation experiment (Table 2). However, this yield appears to be larger than previously reported for the oxidation of $\alpha$-pinene with NO$_3$: Hallquist et al. (1999) measured a 7 % yield (corresponding to 52.9 µg/m$^3$ organic aerosol) at 15 °C. Nah et al. (2016) measured a yield of 3.6 % (corresponding to 2.4 µg/m$^3$ organic aerosol) at room temperature. Fry et al. (2014) reported no significant aerosol growth at room temperature. This is indicative of the low temperature employed in the experiments having a significant impact on SOA yield.
Figure 3. (a) Comparison of experimental and modelling results of aerosol mass for oxidation of α-pinene with NO$_3$. Open black markers are experimental aerosol masses obtained using an SMPS. The blue solid line represents a model result and the grey dashed line corresponds to the experimental temperature profile. (b) Analysis of the occupation of volatility bins of all products (bar plot) and oligomerization state of particle-phase products (pie chart) in the model (i) 3 hours and (ii) 12 hours after the beginning of the experiment. Shadings in the bar plot denote where molecules of a certain volatility bin reside: gas phase (grey) or particle phase (colored). Products in the particle phase are further distinguished as ON (green) and non-nitrated organics (orange).

After about 4 hours of total experiment time, the temperature set point of the chamber enclosure is increased to 25 °C, leading to a sharp and significant evaporation of organic material from aerosol particles. When the new temperature plateau is reached after 7 hours, aerosol mass has decreased to 80 µg/m$^3$. Since evaporation has hardly slowed down by that time, heating to the new temperature set point of 42 °C is initiated after 8 hours of experiment time (i.e., without long waiting time at the 25 °C temperature plateau) to avoid losing too much volatile aerosol mass from evaporation. After a chamber temperature of 42 °C is reached after 10 hours, evaporation slows down considerably and continues at a slow rate until the end of the
experiment, where a minimum aerosol mass of 57 µg/m³ is observed. With a seed mass of 37.3 µg/m³, this corresponds to a retained organic aerosol mass of about 20 µg/m³ (cf. Table 2).

3.2.2 Kinetic modelling results (APN)

The kinetic model (blue solid line in Fig. 3a) shows a reasonable correlation to the experimental data. The detailed model analysis in Fig. 3b reveals that at peak growth, the aerosol is composed of about 57 % of monomers and an aggregate 43 % of higher molecular weight structures, i.e., 33 % oligomers and 11 % gas-phase dimers (Fig. 3b (i)). Upon increase in chamber temperature, the gas-phase dimer content increases considerably from 11 % to 31 % (panel ii) due to evaporation of monomers in volatility bins \( C^* = 1 - 100 \mu g/m^3 \) and decomposition of oligomers. Hence, the slower evaporation of organic material toward the end of the experiment can be attributed to the fact that the remaining organic aerosol is only comprised of gas-phase dimers \( (C^* = 0.01 \mu g/m^3) \), low-volatile monomers \( (C^* = 0.01 - 1 \mu g/m^3) \) volatility bins) and oligomers composed of low-volatile monomer building blocks (Fig. 3b (ii)). The volatility distributions of the monomers produced from gas-phase chemistry (Fig. S5b) reveal that a large fraction of nitrated monomers occupy the highest volatility bin and does not partition into the particle phase. Since the majority of the oxidation products of the reaction of \( \alpha \)-pinene with NO\(_3\) are nitrated organics, this could explain the lower SOA yield compared to the reaction of \( \alpha \)-pinene with O\(_3\) or OH (Hoffmann et al., 1997; Griffin et al., 1999; Ng et al., 2007; Eddingsaas et al., 2012; Nah et al., 2017) since non-nitrated monomers also occupy lower volatility bins in this specific global optimization result.

Compared to the LIM experiment, peak aerosol mass is reached more quickly in the APN experiment. In the model solution, this is due to the determined oligomer formation rate being comparatively high at 17.4 h\(^{-1}\), which is an order of magnitude faster than determined for the LIM experiment. On the other hand, the oligomer decomposition rate is determined to be 3.3 h\(^{-1}\), which is two orders of magnitude quicker than that determined for the LIM experiment and one order of magnitude quicker than the rates reported by D’Ambro et al. (2018) for \( \alpha \)-pinene ozonolysis. This leads to an overall lower, more quickly formed, but labile oligomer content for the APN experiment. The higher gas-phase dimer concentration can be explained by the higher initial precursor concentration used in the APN experiment that leads to a more pronounced \( RO_2 + RO_2 \) gas-phase chemistry.

Evaporation in the model slows down once the 25 °C temperature plateau is reached and picks up again after temperature is raised. This behavior is not observed in the experiment, where the evaporation rate remains almost constant, irrespective of chamber temperature between hours 5 and 9 of the experiment. The behavior cannot be reproduced in any model run and the implications of these findings will be discussed in Sect. 3.4.3.

3.3 Simultaneous and sequential oxidation experiments (MIX and SEQ)

In addition to oxidation experiments with single precursors, experiments are performed where \( \alpha \)-pinene and limonene are oxidized simultaneously (MIX) or in sequence (SEQ) to investigate whether their co-existence affects growth or evaporation of SOA. In Figs. 4a (MIX) and 4b (SEQ), aerosol mass is displayed for these two scenarios alongside kinetic modelling results. The experiments are set up in a way that the produced aerosol mass is comparable in magnitude to the pure precursor
Figure 4. Overview of experimental and modelling results of aerosol mass for experiments with mixed monoterpene precursors. The experiments in the two panels differ in the way the precursors were added: (a) simultaneous oxidation of a mixture of α-pinene and limonene, (b) sequential oxidation of firstly α-pinene and secondly limonene with NO$_3$. Open black markers are experimental aerosol mass obtained using an SMPS. The colored solid and dashed lines represent model results from two different fits to the experimental data. The grey dashed line indicates the experimental temperature profile.

experiments and both precursors contribute to the produced mass in equal parts. Table 2 lists the experimental SOA yields along with injected precursor amounts.

3.3.1 Experimental observations (MIX and SEQ)

In the MIX experiment (Fig. 4a), most of the initial increase in aerosol mass (black open markers) is rapid and peak growth is reached after about 3 hours, comparable to the pure α-pinene oxidation experiment. The evaporation pattern upon chamber heating shows a less pronounced decrease in particle mass compared to the APN experiment, but is more pronounced than observed in the LIM experiment. Overall, the mass loss during the 5 °C to 25 °C evaporation step is more pronounced than mass loss during the 25 °C to 42 °C step.

In the SEQ experiment (Fig. 4b), initial growth of α-pinene SOA onto the inorganic seed particles is rapid. After subsequent injection of limonene precursor, the second increase in aerosol mass is more gradual, as would be expected from the pure LIM experiment. The evaporation pattern in the SEQ experiment is less pronounced than the one of the MIX experiment during the 5 °C to 25 °C temperature increase and equally marginal from 25 °C to 42 °C.

3.3.2 Kinetic modelling results (MIX and SEQ)

The model result of the best fit modelling scenario (solid green and purple lines) lacks in correlation to the experimental data for both, MIX, and SEQ experiments. Strikingly, the mass at peak aerosol growth is overestimated by the model in both scenarios. Furthermore, initial evaporation is overestimated such that aerosol mass in the middle and late stages of the experiments...
agrees between model and experiment. Towards the end of the experiment, evaporation is further overestimated in the SEQ experiment, such that predicted aerosol mass becomes lower than the experimentally observed mass.

The best fit modelling result is generated from optimization to aerosol mass and pON/OA data from experimental data sets LIM, APN, and SEQ; experiment MIX is left out for cross-validation. Furthermore, pure precursor experiments are each weighted twice as high as the SEQ experiment. pON/OA data are weighted by a factor of 4 less than aerosol mass data. The model optimization is hence intentionally biased towards aerosol mass of the pure precursor experiments. The premise of this decision is to investigate the potentially non-linear effects of mixing precursors, which cannot be accomplished if the pure precursor experiments are not accurately represented in the first place. We note that fitting to all four data sets with equal weighting coefficients does not yield a subjectively better optimization result and only shifts insufficient model-experiment correlation to the pure precursor experiments APN and LIM.

Figs. 4a and 4b also show a different modelling scenario that is obtained by only optimizing to the APN and LIM experiments (dashed green and purple lines), with experiments MIX and SEQ left out for cross-validation. This scenario shows agreement between model and mixed precursor experiments during peak growth, but significantly underestimates aerosol mass after the first increase in chamber temperature. If applied to all data sets, this fit scores worse in the least-squares residue between model and experiment (Eq. 4) than the best fit scenario described above, however, overestimation of evaporation in the mixed precursor experiment is a common theme between modelling scenarios that were able to reproduce both the growth and evaporation of the pure precursor experiments. Of note, evaporation is generally more strongly overestimated in the SEQ experiment, where limonene SOA is deposited onto α-pinene SOA that has already formed.

These results are similar to the findings of Boyd et al. (2017), who showed less evaporation of limonene SOA and more evaporation of β-pinene SOA in a SEQ-type experiment (β-pinene SOA condensing on preformed limonene SOA) compared to their MIX-type experiment. The study postulated a core-shell morphology of a limonene SOA core and a β-pinene SOA shell that is sustained due to incomplete mixing, though oligomerization between limonene and β-pinene oxidation products could also play a role. Here, we show in a proof of concept that oligomerization mechanics alone cannot explain the evaporation of monoterpene SOA mixtures. In the following, we will take a closer look at further possible explanations.

### 3.4 Deviation between model and experiment

We can conclude that while peak aerosol mass can be reconciled between the four simulated experiments with the kinetic model, the evaporation pattern in experiments MIX and SEQ cannot be brought fully into agreement with the pure precursor experiments LIM and APN. Hence, the kinetic model must lack a process that leads to resistance in evaporation in the mixed precursor scenarios compared to the pure precursor experiments. Possible mechanisms introducing such non-linearity include:

1. Non-linear gas-phase chemistry
2. Augmented particle-phase oligomerization chemistry
3. Mass transfer limitations
In general, none of these points can be fully excluded based on the results presented in this manuscript. However, in the following, we will go through the obtained evidence and evaluate these points to make an informed guess on how likely they are to affect aerosol formation and evaporation.

### 3.4.1 Gas-phase chemistry

Non-linear effects in gas-phase chemistry branching ratios could lead to a mixture of oxidation products that is more readily oxidized or dimerized and hence would show a reduced evaporation rate upon increase in chamber temperature. One possible mechanism for this is an increased yield of gas-phase dimers due to bimolecular reaction of two RO\textsubscript{2} radicals from different precursors, forming hetero-dimers of oxidation products. Formation of hetero-dimers is considered in the model, however, the branching ratio is assumed to be similar for limonene- and \(\alpha\)-pinene-derived molecules and hence self-reactions are of the same speed as cross-reactions. Berndt et al. (2018) showed that cross-reactions of two different \(\alpha\)-pinene-derived RO\textsubscript{2} radicals can be faster than the respective self-reaction rates. Such an effect would cause a higher dimer fraction in the product spectrum, which in turn would lead to reduced evaporation of SOA from precursor mixtures due to overall lower volatility. Since in precursor mixtures the number of RO\textsubscript{2} radicals is diversified, more cross-reactions will occur naturally, which would lead to more gas-phase dimers and in turn explain the slower evaporation in the MIX experiment. The SEQ experiment, however, also shows slow evaporation compared to the pure precursor experiment. Since oxidation occurred separately and cross-reactions are not enhanced by diversification of RO\textsubscript{2} radicals, formation of hetero-dimers in the gas phase cannot be the cause for reduced product volatility in the SEQ experiment.

### 3.4.2 Oligomerization

Augmented oligomerization in the particle phase is a possible explanation of reduced evaporation rates in case mixtures of oxidation products from different precursors oligomerize more readily together than the pure components in isolation. Unlike the gas-phase chemistry scenarios described above, these effects could be observed in both MIX and SEQ experiments since particle-phase oligomerization may occur retroactively after the second oxidation step in the sequential oxidation experiment. Moreover, oligomerization of already low-volatile products would not alter SOA yields as strongly as gas-phase chemical effects would, but could have a pronounced influence on evaporation rates.

In general, an augmentation effect leading to a higher oligomerization degree in mixtures could be achieved if the hetero-oligomers were formed more efficiently than a linear combination of formation rates of both homo-oligomers. A similar effect would be achieved when oxidation products of one of the two precursors were such efficient oligomer-formers that they would cause the oxidation products of the other precursors to oligomerize more readily and pull them into the oligomer phase. Therefore, during development of the model, we tested an implementation of the oligomerization scheme where formation of hetero-oligomers occurs at a combined rate using their logarithmic mean value, but first-order decomposition rates remain unaffected by the precursor type. The model solution exhibited a large discrepancy in oligomerization rates of a few orders of magnitudes, with limonene oxidation products oligomerizing quickly and readily and \(\alpha\)-pinene oxidation products hardly oligomerizing in isolation. As a result, mixtures of oxidation products still oligomerized significantly, driven by the high individual oligomer
formation rate of limonene oxidation products. Equilibrium oligomerization degree is governed by both oligomer formation and decomposition rates, but is also naturally capped to a value of 100 %. Hence, in conclusion, mixing a strong oligomer former that reaches this cap in isolation with a weak oligomer former can lead to a higher combined oligomerization degree of the mixture. However, this pure theoretical result seems unphysical as it requires a very high oligomerization degree of pure limonene SOA and a very small degree of oligomerization in pure α-pinene SOA, which has not been observed in experimental studies (Faxon et al., 2018; Takeuchi and Ng, 2019).

### 3.4.3 Mass transfer limitations

Increased mass transfer limitations caused by high viscosity can cause a reduction of volatilization. This is due to surface concentrations of the evaporating components being depleted when the mixing time scale in the particle is longer than the evaporation time scale. Mass transfer limitation is not treated in the model runs previously shown in this study. Instead, a well-mixed bulk phase is assumed and any resistance in evaporation is explained with oligomerization reactions. The slow evaporation of limonene SOA is hence solely caused by significant oligomerization in the model runs previously presented, but could also be caused by mass transfer limitations induced by a high bulk-phase viscosity, especially if a high fraction of particle-phase oligomers would have formed that depresses mobility of molecules in the condensed phase (Baltensperger et al., 2005; D’Ambro et al., 2018). Hence, limonene SOA might exhibit a more viscous phase state than α-pinene SOA. The high viscosity caused by limonene oxidation products might in turn affect evaporation in the mixed precursor experiments and cause the observed non-linear effects. In a first approximation, viscosities of mixtures can be assumed to be a linear combination of the individual viscosities and follow a logarithmic mixing rule (Gervasi et al., 2019). This entails that the change in the rate of mass transport between pure compounds and their mixtures can reach orders of magnitudes. This would be in line with volatilization rates observed in the mixed precursor experiments being more similar to the pure LIM experiment, which was observed in this and a previous study (Boyd et al., 2017). Notably, while evaporation steps immediately following a change in chamber temperature are overall similar between the MIX and SEQ experiments, the slope of the aerosol mass versus time curve is steeper in the MIX experiments. This might suggest that in the SEQ experiment, limonene SOA might be covering the preformed α-pinene oxidation products in a core-shell morphology and thus hampering their volatilization.

To test the effect of impeded bulk diffusivity on the evaporation of SOA, we perform a sensitivity study in which we increase viscosity in the model to evaluate whether the evaporation rates in the MIX experiment can be brought into agreement with observations. We use the alternative fitting scenario shown in Fig. 4 (dashed lines) and raise the viscosity in the simulation to $2 \times 10^6$, $2 \times 10^7$, and $2 \times 10^8$ Pas, respectively, in three separate model runs (Fig. 5). These viscosities are in the typical range for SOA under dry conditions and fall into the semi-solid phase state region (Koop et al., 2011; Shiraiwa et al., 2011; Abramson et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2015b; Grayson et al., 2016; Gervasi et al., 2019). Using the Stokes-Einstein relation (Einstein, 1905) and an effective molecular radius of 2 nm, these viscosities correspond to bulk diffusion coefficients of $5 \times 10^{-16}$ to $5 \times 10^{-18}$ cm$^2$/s at 298 K. The effective radius is approximated from geometric considerations assuming spherical molecular shape, a molar mass of 250 g/mol and density of 1.55 g/cm$^3$. The temperature dependence of this diffusion coefficient is
approximated with a constant activation enthalpy of diffusion $\Delta H_{\text{dif}} = 50 \text{ kJ/mol}$ according to Eq. 5.

$$D_b(T) = D_b(298 \text{ K}) \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{\Delta H_{\text{dif}}}{R \left( \frac{1}{T} - \frac{1}{298} \right)} \right) \tag{5}$$

Fig. 5 shows that in the selected viscosity range, the model output is quite sensitive to changes in bulk diffusivity. Evaporation is almost unimpeded in the highest diffusion case, but considerably slowed at the lowest simulated diffusivity. At a bulk diffusion coefficient of $5 \times 10^{-17} \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$, the correlation with the evaporation pattern in the MIX experiment is much improved.

This model result insinuates that the co-presence of limonene SOA and $\alpha$-pinene SOA might strongly reduce the mobility of $\alpha$-pinene oxidation products so that the fast evaporation of $\alpha$-pinene oxidation products observed in the pure $\alpha$-pinene oxidation experiment does not take place. The outcome of this sensitivity study has to be treated with caution since slow diffusion of limonene oxidation products also causes a change in the simulation outcome for the pure limonene experiment, which the employed parameter set is based on. With this parameter set, the slow evaporation of limonene SOA in the model is purely attributed to oligomer formation. The sensitivity study hence suggests that the high oligomerization degree observed for limonene SOA in the previous best fit solutions might be overestimated. In fact, a particularly high oligomer content was not observed for limonene SOA from oxidation with NO$_3$ in measurements using FIGAERO-CIMS (Faxon et al., 2018). Distinction of these two effects (oligomerization vs. mass transfer limitation) could be possible with the model and the MCGA, but is not attempted in this study due to the prohibitive computational cost of model calculations at low diffusivities and will be subject of future studies.

Taken together, it is possible that increased mass transfer limitation led to the observed reduced evaporation rates of the SOA mixtures as postulated in Boyd et al. (2017). However, there are still large uncertainties and a high computational expense associated with a model treatment of highly viscous SOA systems. While frameworks for the determination of viscosity of
mixtures have recently been developed (Gervasi et al., 2019), these rely on structural information about individual compounds. Furthermore, while the Stokes-Einstein relation seems to hold for similar systems at viscosities of up to $10^4$ Pas (Ullmann et al., 2019), it is not clear whether it also holds for viscosities of $10^7$ Pas derived in this study (Evoy et al., 2019).

Additionally, treatment of slow particle-phase diffusion requires many model layers to describe the steep concentrations gradients arising at the particle surface upon evaporation. In combination with the multitude of tracked species in the particle phase, computational costs quickly reach unfeasible ranges. Ideally, the spatial resolution model layers would have to be generated upon model runtime by an algorithm that detects steep concentration gradients. This detailed description will be presented in a forthcoming publication.

### 3.5 Organic nitrate fractions

In this study, the organic nitrate fraction (pON/OA) is presented as ratio of the total mass concentration of particulate ON (which includes the organic part and nitrate part of the ON compounds) to the total mass concentration of organic aerosol (which includes both ON and non-nitrated organics) (Takeuchi and Ng, 2019). It can be inferred from AMS data using Eq. 6.

In this formula, it is assumed that all organic aerosol mass is found in the organic and nitrate signal of the AMS (AMS$_{ORG}$ and AMS$_{NO_3}$) and all AMS nitrate is ON. When $MW_{pON}$ is the average molar mass of the ON (i.e., 250 g/mol in this study) and $MW_{NO_3}$ the molar mass of the nitrate group (i.e., 62 g/mol), the pON mass can be determined by scaling the AMS signal with the ratio of these molar masses.

$$\frac{pON}{OA} = \frac{AMS_{NO_3} MW_{pON}}{AMS_{NO_3} MW_{NO_3} + AMS_{ORG}} \approx \frac{4.03}{1 + \frac{AMS_{ORG}}{AMS_{NO_3}}} \quad (6)$$

Fig. 6 depicts measured and modelled values for pON/OA for all four experiments. Panel a shows that in the LIM experiment, pON/OA is high, with a mass ratio of about 0.8 in the particle phase, and only slightly increases over time, which is reproduced in the model. Note that the average molar mass of ON might change during the experiment, e.g., by evaporation of lower molecular weight components, which is not considered in our calculation. In the model, the slow evaporation of limonene SOA is caused by oligomer decomposition followed by evaporation of volatile monomers. The fact that nitrate groups are rather evenly distributed across monomers from the predominantly evaporating volatility bins is reflected in the constant pON/OA returned by the model. We note that this result gives no evidence that decomposition rates of oligomers consisting of nitrated or non-nitrated monomeric building blocks might differ and we use the same oligomer decomposition rate irrespective of nitration state of the respective product bin. Panel b shows pON/OA in the APN experiment. The initial nitrate content is lower than in the LIM experiment with a value of about 0.45. During the first temperature increase in the APN experiment, ON content increases with the reduction in organic mass, indicating predominant evaporation of non-nitrated oxidation products. During the second evaporation step, ON content decreases, indicating predominant evaporation of nitrated oxidation product. The best fit model run (solid blue line) captures the overall magnitude of the ON content, but lacks the time dependence of a reduction followed by an increase in pON/OA. This is probably due to the model parameter optimization being stuck in a local minimum and the relatively low weighting coefficients assigned to the pON/OA data sets in this study. pON/OA data were weighted by a factor of 4 less than aerosol mass data in this study.
Figure 6. Experimental and modelling results of particulate organic nitrate content (pON/OA) for four different types of chamber-generated SOA. (a) only limonene, (b) only α-pinene, (c) a mixture of α-pinene and limonene and (d) sequential oxidation of firstly α-pinene and secondly limonene. Cross markers are experimental nitration degrees inferred using a High Resolution Time-of-Flight Aerosol Mass Spectrometer (HR-ToF-AMS). The colored solid lines represent results of the kinetic model. The grey dashed line indicates the experimental temperature profile.

The measured and simulated ON contents for the experiments with multiple precursors are shown in panels c and d of Fig. 6 for the MIX and SEQ experiment, respectively. While both experiments use approximately the same concentrations of α-pinene and limonene, the measured pON/OA are slightly different. Simultaneous oxidation (MIX) leads to an initial pON/OA of 0.53, which is surprisingly low and closer to the value measured for pure α-pinene SOA. Sequential oxidation (SEQ) leads to an initial pON/OA of 0.52 after α-pinene oxidation, and increases to 0.6 after oxidation of limonene has concluded. This value in the SEQ experiment is closer to the expected value when assuming linear additivity of ON content. The unexpectedly low ON content in the MIX experiment points towards non-linear effects in chemistry that are not captured by the model. The time and temperature dependence of the ON fraction is qualitatively similar for both experiments and overall captured by the
model. Predominant evaporation of α-pinene oxidation products, which are the more-volatile and less-nitrated components of the mixture, leads to an overall increase of pON/OA.

A notable observation from modelling is that dimers from the gas-phase reaction of RO₂ + RO₂ are mainly ON because most RO₂ radicals originate from the reaction of alkene with NO₃ and are hence nitrated. This is especially significant for the α-pinene + NO₃ reaction system since the high momentary RO₂ radical concentrations in these experiments lead to a high estimated contribution of gas-phase dimers to aerosol mass of 11 % at peak growth and close to 31 % after heating to 42 °C (cf. Fig. 3).

In summary, the experimental and modelling results in this study confirm previous studies and report a high efficiency of nitration in the reaction of monoterpenes with NO₃, with a nitrated SOA fraction larger than 50 % under most experimental conditions studies (Ng et al., 2017, and references therein). Limonene SOA shows overall higher nitration degrees than α-pinene SOA, which can be understood by the higher number of double bonds of the VOC precursor compound itself and hence more possibilities to introduce a nitrate group during oxidation. An increase in temperature from 5 °C to 25 °C leads to an increase in ON content of the SOA in all observed systems, which can be explained by the slightly elevated nitration degree in the dimer fraction and hence less volatile fraction of the organic aerosol. By heating above 25 °C, pON/OA is in general slightly reduced. A potential reason for this might be accelerated thermal decomposition of ON.

4 Conclusions and Outlook

In this study, an inverse modelling approach is utilized alongside laboratory chamber experiments to gain insights into the molecular-level processes which occur during the formation and evaporation of SOA from the oxidation of α-pinene, limonene, and mixtures of both precursors with NO₃. We find α-pinene SOA to form and evaporate rather quickly and limonene SOA to form and evaporate more slowly. Both SOA types, however, show retardation in evaporation compared to instantaneous equilibration, which can be explained by the presence of particle-phase oligomers. The oxidation products of both SOA types are found to be heavily nitrated. A mixed and a sequential oxidation of both precursors shows the expected linear additivity of SOA yields, but a non-linear reduction in evaporation behavior, which could not be explained without diffusion limitations in the particle phase. These results highlight the significance of NO₃ as oxidant in SOA formation and the importance of ON as products of monoterpene oxidation. This study finds evidence for non-equilibrium partitioning caused by slow particle-phase chemistry and slow diffusion, which is currently not considered in global models and may lead to underestimation of SOA persistence and hence underestimated global SOA burdens in these models.

The modelling approach applied in this study comprises a combination of the kinetic multi-layer model based on KM-GAP (Shiraiwa et al., 2012) with the automated global optimization suite MCGA (Berkemeier et al., 2017) and details the full chemistry and physics of SOA particle growth and shrinkage. The underlying SOA formation and evaporation mechanism uses a simplified and lumped version of the Master Chemical Mechanism (MCM; Jenkin et al., 2003; Saunders et al., 2003; Berkemeier et al., 2016), extends it with a reversible particle-phase oligomerization and gas-phase dimerization scheme, and treats gas-particle partitioning with a volatility basis set approach (Donahue et al., 2006, 2011) for each product bin. This
study focuses on NO\textsubscript{3} oxidation of monoterpenes and their mixtures, but the model framework can be ported to other chemical systems. The depth resolution capabilities of the multi-layer model allow for a sensitivity study of the influence of particle phase state on the evaporation of these particles. A full treatment of composition-dependent, depth-resolved viscosity as global optimization parameter is ultimately needed to disentangle the interactions of particle-phase diffusion and particle-phase chemistry. Due to the computational expense of finely-resolved computational layers and the general uncertainty in the physical and chemical parameters, this will be subject of follow-up studies. In such studies, offline analysis of the oligomerization degree of SOA material can help to constrain oligomerization and oligomer decomposition rates and thermodynamic models can be used to provide estimates for composition dependence of viscosities and diffusivities (DeRieux et al., 2018; Gervasi et al., 2019).

In general, the model parameters that are returned by the inverse modelling approach applied in this work must be evaluated in the context of the model and experimental data that are employed. With a simplified multi-parameter model and experimental data sets that are aggregate observables and subject to uncertainty, the concept of a single global minimum and multiple local minima on the optimization hypersurface can become blurred and several extended areas on the optimization hypersurface can exhibit a minimal function value. This effect is enhanced when model parameters behave non-orthogonally, i.e., one parameter can by expressed to some extent by another one (or combinations of others). The existence of numerous and extended minima on the optimization hypersurface makes the process of finding an optimal parameter set computationally expensive. For example, repeated execution of an automated fitting algorithm can help to assess the flexibility of an underdetermined system. Fig. S5 includes an estimation of the uncertainty in volatility distributions obtained in this study. The error bars in Fig. S5 are standard deviations of individual re-fits of volatility distributions and hence quantify the uniqueness (or lack thereof) of the fitted volatility distributions. Beyond the technical intricacies of the parameter optimization process, the uniqueness of the obtained parameter set can be enhanced by inclusion of more experimental data at different conditions or by a priori determination of model parameters such as measurements of volatility distributions, oligomerization degrees or particle viscosities.

The modelling suite presented here constitutes a step forward in the computational, data-driven evaluation of SOA formation with kinetic models. In this work, only a small set of laboratory chamber data is utilized for optimization as proof of concept. We postulate that, by reconciling and cross-comparing large sets of experimental data, we will be able to significantly enhance our understanding of SOA and close the gap between our expanding theoretical knowledge about the detailed gas-phase chemistry, gas-particle partitioning, particle phase state of SOA, and the application of this knowledge in chemical transport models.
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