



Supplement of

High-time-resolution chemical composition and source apportionment of PM_{2.5} in northern Chinese cities: implications for policy

Yong Zhang et al.

Correspondence to: Qiyuan Wang (wangqy@ieecas.cn) and Junji Cao (jjcao@mail.iap.ac.cn)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

16 **Text S1. Selction of inputted HERM chemical species and its uncertainty calculation**

17 Considering the validity and credibility of monitoring data, chemical species including OA, NO₃⁻, SO₄²⁻, NH₄⁺,
18 Cl⁻, and BC were all selected to input HERM model for three pilot cities. For inorganic elements, Si, K, Ca, Cr, Mn,
19 Fe, Ni, Cu, Zn, As, Se, Ba, and Pb in Xi'an and Beijing, and Si, K, Ca, Ti, Cr, Mn, Fe, Ni, Cu, Zn, As, Se, Ba, and
20 Pb in Shijiazhuang were selected for source apportionment, respectively.

21 The uncertainty data of chemical species inputting HERM was calculated according to the recommendation in
22 the PMF5.0 user guideline. If the measured chemical species concentration is greater than the minimum detection
23 limit (MDL) provided, the uncertainty (Unc) calculation is based following equation:

$$24 \text{Unc}_i = \sqrt{(C_i \times E_i)^2 + (0.5 \times \text{MDL}_i)^2} \quad (1)$$

25 where C_i represents measured concertation for species i , E_i represents error fraction of species i . For online
26 measured data, the error fraction was recommended to use 10% (Rai et al., 2020). If the measured concentration is
27 less than or equal to the MDL provided, the Unc is calculated as the following equation:

$$28 \text{Unc} = \frac{5}{6} \times \text{MDL} \quad (2)$$

29

30 **Text S2 Diagnostics of HERM solutions**

31 In this study, factors numbering from two to ten were selected and run in the HERM software. Each factor
32 solution was run thirty times with completely unconstrained profiles to explore the possible sources. The optimal
33 factor number solution was determined by examining the ratio of Q and expected Q (Q_{exp}). The Q_{exp} in HERM was
34 equal to (samples × species – factors × (samples + species) + the number of constrained source profiles). As shown
35 in Fig. S5, the value of Q/Q_{exp} decreased with the increase of the factor number, which suggests increasing the factor
36 number could lead to a better explanation of the variance by HERM. However, the utility of increasing factors
37 declined with the number of factors. Too many factors could cause splitting profiles, although the Q/Q_{exp} may be
38 desirable (Liu et al., 2021; Salameh et al., 2018, 2016). Thus, the drops of Q/Q_{exp} ($\Delta Q/Q_{\text{exp}}$) were subsequently
39 evaluated to choose the optimal solution factor number. As shown in Table S2, when the number of factors increases
40 to more than six in Xi'an, the value of $\Delta Q/Q_{\text{exp}}$ shows a relatively stable change trend. A six-factor solution is
41 preferable because $\Delta Q/Q_{\text{exp}}$ between the five-solution and six-solution is smaller than that between the six-solution
42 and seven-solution (Liu et al., 2021). In addition, secondary formation source and biomass burning were mixed when
43 the factor number was five, and vehicle emission was split into two profiles when the factor number was seven (Table

44 S3). Therefore, the six-factor solution was determined as the optimal HERM solution for Xi'an. Similar criterias were
45 used for Shijiazhuang and Beijing, six-factor and eight-factor solutions were determined as optimal HERM solutions,
46 respectively.

47

48 **Text S3 Estimation of secondary organic aerosol (SOA).**

49 Due to lack of critical tracers of SOA, the sources of SOA cannot be individually resolved by receptor model.
50 In this study, In this study, the secondary sources were mainly characterized by high EV values for inorganic
51 aerosols such as SO_4^{2-} , NO_3^- , NH_4^+ , but the medium EV values for OA (16~29%) were also presented on
52 secondary sources in three pilot cities. This means that the SOA maybe mixed in with the factors of secondary
53 sources. To verify this, the SOA concentrations we estimated by using a BC-tracer method (Wang et al., 2019)
54 and then compared the results with those based on source apportionment. The SOA calculation by BC-tracer
55 method was calculated as follow:

$$56 \quad [\text{SOA}]_{\text{BC-tracer}} = [\text{OA}] - (\text{OA/BC})_{\text{pri}} \times [\text{BC}] \quad (3)$$

57 where [] means mass concentration, $(\text{OA/BC})_{\text{pri}}$ is the ratio of [OA] to [BC] in primary emission. The
58 $(\text{OA/BC})_{\text{pri}}$ ratios vary among sources, therefore, a minimum R squared (MRS) method was used to derive
59 appropriate $(\text{OA/BC})_{\text{pri}}$ values for three pilot cities. In previous studies (Srivastava et al., 2018; Wang et al.,
60 2019), MRS method has been used to calculated the concertation of secondary organic carbon and brown carbon.
61 More detailed information on the method and a validation of this approach can be found in Wang et al. (2019).

62 In addition, according to results of receptor model, SOA concentration can also be estimated as follow
63 based on EV values of OA from secondary source factors.


$$64 \quad [\text{SOA}]_{\text{source apportionment}} = [\text{OA}] \times \text{EV}_{\text{OA}} \quad (4)$$

65 where EV_{OA} represents the EV values of OA in secondary sources factors resolved by HERM model.

66 As shown in Fig. S9, the $(\text{OA/BC})_{\text{pri}}$ ratios were determined as 4.73 for Xi'an, 3.12 for Shijiazhuang and
67 7.6 for Beijing, respectively. Furthermore, the concentrations of SOA from three pilot cities were shown in
68 Table R1 based two different methods. As we can see, the SOA concentrations estimated by EV values of OA
69 are close to that by BC-tracer method for three pilot cities. This indicated SOA was mixed in secondary sources
70 factors.


71

72




73
74
75
76
77
78

Figure S1. Annual average concentration of PM_{2.5} from 2013 to 2021 in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang, and Beijing. (The data are from the website of the local Ecological Environment Bureau, Xi'an: <http://xaepb.xa.gov.cn/>, Shijiazhuang: <https://sthjj.sjz.gov.cn/>, Beijing: <http://sthjj.beijing.gov.cn/>). The red dotted line represents the second level of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (GB3095-2012, 35 µg m⁻³)




79

Figure S2. Correction of chemical components measured by Q-ACSM in different cities. During the campaigns, offline filter samples were simultaneously sampled for the correction. In summary, 29 offline samples in Xi'an, 83 offline samples in Shijiazhuang, and 10 offline samples in Beijing were sampled respectively.




83

84 **Figure S3.** Concentration of the internal standard element (Pd) of Xact625 during sampling periods in (a) Xi'an,
 85 (b) Shijiazhuang, and (c) Beijing.




86

87 **Figure S4.** Correlation of online and reconstructed PM_{2.5} concentration in (a) Xi'an, (b) Shijiazhuang, and (c) Beijing
 88 during the campaigns. The online PM_{2.5} mass data in the X axis from national monitor stations near sampling sites.




89

90 **Figure S5.** Values of Q/Q_{exp} for the unconstrained profile solutions with two to ten factors based on thirty runs in (a)
 91 Xi'an, (b) Shijiazhuang, and (c) Beijing, respectively.




92

93 **Figure S6.** (a) Sources profiles obtained from HERM with a six-factor solution in Xi'an, the columns in each factor
 94 are the profile that displays the relative relation of the absolute values of variables. The red dot represents the
 95 explained variation (EV) in species for different factors. (b) Time series plots of sources concentration, including
 96 biomass burning, fugitive dust, industrial emission, coal combustion, vehicle emission, and secondary formation
 97 source. The corresponding time trends of chemical tracers are also shown.



98


99 **Figure S7.** (a) Sources profiles obtained from HERM with a six-factor solution in Shijiazhuang, the columns in each
 100 factor are the profile that displays the relative relation of the absolute values of variables. The red dot represents the
 101 explained variation (EV) in species for different factors. (b) Time series plots of sources concentration, including
 102 biomass burning, fugitive dust, industrial emission, coal combustion, vehicle emission, and secondary formation
 103 source. The corresponding time trends of chemical tracers are also shown.




104

105 **Figure S8.** (a) Sources profiles obtained from HERM with an eight-factor solution in Beijing, the columns in each
 106 factor are the profile that displays the relative relation of the absolute values of variables. The red dot represents the
 107 explained variation (EV) in species for different factors. (b) Time series plots of sources concentration, including
 108 biomass burning, fugitive dust, industrial emission, coal combustion, vehicle emission, secondary nitrate plus OA,
 109 secondary sulfate plus OA, and firework. The corresponding time trends of chemical tracers are also shown.


110




111
 112 **Figure S9.** Coefficients of determination (R^2) for SOA versus BC mass concentration plotted against assumed
 113 ratios for OA to BC in primary emissions ($(OA/BC)_{pri}$) in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang and Beijing.



114
 115 **Figure S10.** Correlation between reconstructed $PM_{2.5}$ and modeled $PM_{2.5}$ mass concentrations derived by HERM in
 116 Xi'an, Shijiazhuang, and Beijing with optimal solutions



118
 119 **Figure S11.** Source contribution of $PM_{2.5}$ during Chinese Spring Festival (from New Year's Eve to January 3rd of
 120 the Lunar Calendar) in Beijing




121

122 **Figure S12.** Time series plots of secondary formation source/ ΔCO in (a) Xi'an, (b) Shijiazhuang, and (c) Beijing.

123 The red and black lines represent daytime (08:00-17:00 LST) and nighttime (18:00 - 07:00 the next day LST),

124 respectively.


125



126


127 **Figure S13.** Source contribution of PM_{2.5} in three pilot cities during daytime and nighttime, respectively.

128



129


130 **Figure S14.** Correlation of secondary formation source/ΔCO and ALWC during daytime (08:00–17:00 LST, a–c)
 131 and nighttime (18:00–7:00 the next day LST, d–f) in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang, and Beijing, respectively. The points and
 132 error bar represent the mean values and standard deviation values of secondary formation source /ΔCO and ALWC
 133 in each bin. In Xi'an, each bin is 5 μg m⁻³ (ΔALWC = 5 μg m⁻³). In Shijiazhuang, each bin is 5 μg m⁻³ (ΔALWC = 5
 134 μg m⁻³) when ALWC ranged from 0 to 75 μg m⁻³, but 25 μg m⁻³ (ΔALWC = 25 μg m⁻³) for ALWC ranged from 75 to
 135 200 μg m⁻³ due to limitations in data. In Beijing, during daytime, each bin is 5 μg m⁻³ (ΔALWC = 5 μg m⁻³) when
 136 ALWC ranged from 0 to 40 μg m⁻³, but 100 μg m⁻³ (ΔALWC = 100 μg m⁻³) for ALWC ranged from 40 to 450 μm⁻³
 137 due to limitations in data. During nighttime, each bin is 5 μg m⁻³ (ΔALWC = 5 μg m⁻³) when ALWC ranged from 0
 138 to 50 μg m⁻³, but 100 μg m⁻³ (ΔALWC = 100 μg m⁻³) for ALWC ranged from 50 to 900 μg m⁻³ due to limitations in
 139 data.



140

141 **Figure S15.** The pollution episodes selection according to temporal variation of PM_{2.5} chemical components (a-c)
 142 and source contribution (d-f) during the campaigns in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang, and Beijing, respectively. The gray shape
 143 parts were lack of MD values due to the out-of-order Xact625, and missing values in the time series owing to the out-
 144 of-order ACSM, AE33, and Xact625 at the same time.

145




146

147 **Figure S16.** Time series of T and RH (a), WS and WD (b), O_x and ALWC (c), NO₂ and SO₂ (d), chemical components
 148 (e,f), and source contribution (g, h) of PM_{2.5} during EP4 in Shijiazhuang.

149

150




151

152

153 **Figure S17.** Time series of T and RH (a), WS and WD (b), O_x and ALWC (c), NO₂ and SO₂ (d), chemical components
 154 (e, f), and source contribution (g, h) of PM_{2.5} during EP7 in Beijing


155




156

157 **Figure S18.** Time series of T and RH (a), WS and WD (b), O_x and ALWC (c), NO₂ and SO₂ (d), chemical
 158 components (e, f), and source contribution (g, h) of PM_{2.5} during EP2 in Xi'an.


(a) The first round
Period: 2012/6-2013/12
 $PM_{2.5}$: $90 \mu g cm^{-3}$



(b) The second round
Period: 2017/1-2018/5
 $PM_{2.5}$: $58 \mu g cm^{-3}$



(c) The third round
Period: 2020/1-2021/6
 $PM_{2.5}$: $38 \mu g cm^{-3}$



159

160

Figure S19. $PM_{2.5}$ sources apportionment in Beijing released by Beijing Municipal Ecology and Environment Bureau in the last decade (<http://sthjj.beijing.gov.cn/so/s?tab=all&sourceCode=1100000122>, in Chinese).

161

162

163 **Table S1.** Detailed information on complementary data for sampling sites

Sampling site	National Air Quality Monitoring Station	National Meteorological Station	complementary data
Xi'an	Gaoxinqiqu station, 1.1km from the sampling site	Haidian station, 7.6 km from the sampling site	hourly PM _{2.5} , NO _x , NO ₂ , CO, SO ₂ , O ₃ , WS, WD, T, RH
Shijiazhuang	Gaoxinqu station, 4.2 km from the sampling site	Shijiazhuang station, 23.8 km from the sampling site	hourly PM _{2.5} , NO ₂ , CO, SO ₂ , O ₃ , WS, WD, T, RH
Beijing	ChaoyangAotizhongxin station, 1.2 km from the sampling site	Jinghe station, 21.2 km from the sampling site	hourly PM _{2.5} , NO ₂ , CO, SO ₂ , O ₃ , WS, WD, T, RH

164 Note: WS: wind speed, WD: wind direction, T: temperature, RH: relative humidity.

165

166 **Table S2.** The $\Delta Q/Q_{\text{exp}}$ ^a value with increasing factor number from two to ten of the runs in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang, and
167 Beijing.

Parameter ^b	$\Delta Q/Q_{\text{exp}}$		
	Xi'an	Shijiazhuang	Beijing
F2-F3	1.3	1.8	5.7
F3-F4	0.9	2.2	2.3
F4-F5	1.1	1.2	1.9
F5-F6	0.4	0.3	1.5
F6-F7	0.3	0.3	1.5
F7-F8	0.2	0.2	0.3
F8-F9			0.4
F9-F10			0.3

168 ^a $\Delta Q/Q_{\text{exp}}$ means the difference of Q/Q_{exp} of two sequent factor numbers.

169 ^b Parameters represent the factor numbers (F) – (F+1).

170

171 **Table S3.** Sources diagnostics with increasing factor numbers from four to ten of the runs in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang,
 172 and Beijing.

Factor number	Sources identification		
	Xi'an	Shijiazhuang	Beijing
4	Secondary formation source mixed with biomass burning and coal burning mixed with industrial emission	i) Secondary formation source mixed with primary sources including biomass burning and coal combustion ii) Biomass burning, coal combustion, and vehicle emission was also mixed	i) Secondary sources mixed with primary sources including biomass burning, coal combustion, and vehicle emission ii) Biomass burning and coal combustion was mixed
5	Secondary formation source mixed with biomass burning	Biomass burning, coal combustion, and vehicle emissions were mixed	Secondary sulfate plus OA mixed with coal combustion and industrial emission; secondary nitrate plus OA mixed with biomass burning
6	Six individual sources were identified	Six individual sources were identified	Secondary sulfate plus OA mixed with coal combustion and secondary nitrate plus OA mixed with industrial emission
7	Vehicle emission was split into two profiles	Coal combustion was split into two profiles	Secondary sulfate plus OA mixed with coal combustion
8	Vehicle emission and industrial emission was split into two profiles, respectively.	Vehicle emission and coal combustion were split into two profiles, respectively.	Eight individual sources were identified
9			Coal combustion was split into two profiles
10			Coal combustion and biomass burning were split into two profiles, respectively.

173

174 **Table S4.** Average concentrations of reconstructed PM_{2.5} and its chemical species in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang, and Beijing
 175 during the campaign* ($\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$)

Chemical Species	Xi'an	Shijiazhuang	Beijing
Reconstructed PM _{2.5}	77 ± 47	60 ± 39	64 ± 57
OA	25.9 ± 18.0	16.0 ± 9.7	22.1 ± 18.1
SO ₄ ²⁻	5.2 ± 3.4	7.0 ± 7.6	9.6 ± 11.3
NO ₃ ⁻	18.5 ± 14.5	15.8 ± 12.5	15.2 ± 16.7
NH ₄ ⁺	6.2 ± 4.5	7.0 ± 5.5	9.2 ± 10.3
Cl ⁻	1.9 ± 1.5	2.8 ± 2.2	0.7 ± 0.8
BC	4.5 ± 3.2	3.9 ± 2.5	1.9 ± 1.8
MD ^a	13.2 ± 7.0	6.0 ± 4.0	4.8 ± 3.8
TE ^b	1.1 ± 0.7	1.0 ± 0.6	0.9 ± 1.5

176 * Data during Xact625 failure shown in Figure S2 was excluded to calculate average concentration of campaign

177 ^a MD means mineral dust, which is equal to 2.20Al + 2.49Si + 1.63Ca + 2.42Fe + 1.94Ti

178 ^b TE means trace elements which is equal to K + Cr + Mn + Ni + Cu + Zn + As + Se + Ba + Pb

179

180 **Table S5.** The nitrogen oxidation ratio (NOR) and sulfur oxidation ratio (SOR) in Xi'an, Beijing, and Shijiazhuang
 181 during the campaigns^a

Parameters	Xi'an	Shijiazhuang	Beijing
NOR	0.15 ± 0.08	0.20 ± 0.11	0.16 ± 0.12
SOR	0.18 ± 0.08	0.36 ± 0.25	0.48 ± 0.23

182 ^a NOR = $n(\text{NO}_3^-) / (n(\text{NO}_3^-) + n(\text{NO}_2))$; SOR = $n(\text{SO}_4^{2-}) / (n(\text{SO}_4^{2-}) + n(\text{SO}_2))$. where $n(\text{NO}_3^-)$, $n(\text{NO}_2)$, $n(\text{SO}_4^{2-})$, and $n(\text{SO}_2)$ are the molar
 183 concentrations of NO₃⁻, NO₂, SO₄²⁻, and SO₂, respectively.

184

185

186 **Table S6.** Average concentrations of SOA in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang, and Beijing during sampling periods estimated by BC-
 187 tracer method and source apportionment results ($\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$)

SOA	Xi'an	Shijiazhuang	Beijing
SOA_BC-tracer	5.1 ± 5.8	4.2 ± 4.4	8.0 ± 9.0
SOA_source apportionment	6.0 ± 4.1	4.6 ± 2.8	8.2 ± 6.7

188

189

190 **Table S7.** The concentration of PM_{2.5} and its main chemical components during wintertime in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang,
 191 and Beijing in the last decades.

City	Year	PM _{2.5}	OA ^a	EC	SO ₄ ²⁻	NO ₃ ⁻	NH ₄ ⁺	Others	References
		μg m ⁻³	μg m ⁻³	μg m ⁻³	μg m ⁻³	μg m ⁻³	μg m ⁻³	μg m ⁻³	
Xi'an	2003	356	153.3	21.5	53.8	29.2	29.6	68.9	Cao et al., 2012
	2006	230	57.4	11.4	45.9	20.6	14.2	80.0	Xu et al., 2016
	2008	199	48.3	9.9	42.5	20.8	11.0	66.9	Xu et al., 2016
	2010	233	60.0	14.7	30.6	22.9	12.3	92.8	Xu et al., 2016
	2012	196	56.3	8.2	27.0	19.2	13.3	71.9	Zhang et al., 2015
	2013	263	45.8	7.1	31.7	29.2	17.1	132.5	Niu et al., 2016
	2014	156	57.4	2.5	16.2	20.6	9.4	49.7	Dai et al., 2018
	2018	189	42.1	4.9	9.7	14.5	6.6	111.0	Wang et al., 2022
2020*	77	25.9	4.5	5.2	18.5	6.2	16.2	This study	
Shijiazhuang	2010	227	75.6	12.2	33.2	25.3	10.5	70.2	Zhao et al., 2013
	2015	232	82.0	16.3	26.6	27.4	19.8	59.7	Huang et al., 2017
	2016	193	63.2	13.5	29.5	24.0	17.0	45.8	Liu et al., 2019
	2017	97	31.2	6.5	12.5	16.5	12.5	17.8	Liu et al., 2019
	2018	96	35.8	10.1	10.5	15.3	6.3	18.0	Zhang et al., 2020
	2022*	60	16.0	3.9	7.0	15.8	7.0	9.8	This study
Beijing	2001	122	51.5	11.3	9.9	10.7	7.1	31.5	Duan et al., 2006
	2003	116	38.2	6.2	20.0	13.1	9.4	29.1	Cao et al., 2012
	2004	107	53.8	8.3	12.7	8.3	6.0	17.9	Song et al., 2007
	2010	127	42.9	7.1	14.2	17.1	5.2	40.5	Zhao et al., 2013
	2013	132	38.5	6.4	21.9	18.5	15.1	31.6	Tao et al., 2015
	2014	138	46.4	5.2	21.0	26.0	14.1	25.3	Ma et al., 2017
	2016	130	75.7	20.2	12.3	5.5	10.5	5.3	Xu et al., 2018
	2021*	64	22.1	1.9	9.6	15.2	9.2	6.4	This study

192 * study was conducted on online monitoring equipment, and the rest studies were researched on filter sampling experiments.

193 ^a Assumption of OA = 1.6 × OC for the filter-based sampling experiments

194 **Table S8.** The concentration of PM_{2.5} and its source contribution during wintertime in Xi'an, Shijiazhuang, and
 195 Beijing in the last decades.

City	Year	PM _{2.5}	Vehicle	Coal	Secondary	Fugitive	Industrial	Biomass	Others	References
		μg m ⁻³	emission μg m ⁻³	combustion μg m ⁻³	formation source μg m ⁻³	dust μg m ⁻³	emission μg m ⁻³	burning μg m ⁻³	μg m ⁻³	
Xi'an	2006	392	74.5	121.5	82.3	51.0	39.2	23.5		Xu et al., 2016
	2008	199	41.8	55.7	45.8	23.9	21.9	10.0		Xu et al., 2016
	2010	233	48.9	55.9	41.9	44.3	30.3	11.7		Xu et al., 2016
	2014	169	20.3	47.3	71.0	8.5	6.8	15.2		Dai et al., 2020
	2018	189	26.5	28.4		15.1	22.7	58.6	37.8	Wang et al., 2022
	2020*	77	10.0	11.6	24.6	6.2	6.2	19.3		This study
Shijiazhuang	2015	232	46.4	62.6	30.2	20.9	16.2	7.0	48.7	Huang et al., 2017
	2016	181	23.5	54.3	54.3	30.8	9.1		7.2	Liu et al., 2018
	2019	119	21.4	21.4	42.8	21.4	6.0	6.0		Diao et al., 2021
	2022*	60	7.2	9.6	22.8	2.4	3.0	14.4		This study
Beijing	2004	107	8.6	40.7	19.3	7.5		16.1	15.0	Song et al., 2007
	2010	139		79.2	8.3	22.2	16.7	9.7	2.8	Zhang et al., 2013
	2013	159	9.5	41.3	79.5	15.9		9.5	3.2	Huang et al., 2014
	2015	125	48.8	15.0	23.8	8.8	2.5	6.3	18.8	Huang et al., 2017
	2021*	64	7.0	5.8	33.3	2.6	2.6	11.5	1.3	This study

196 * study was conducted on online monitoring equipment, and the rest studies were researched on filter sampling experiments.

197

198

References:

- 199 Cao, J.-J., Shen, Z.-X., Chow, J. C., Watson, J. G., Lee, S.-C., Tie, X.-X., Ho, K.-F., Wang, G.-H., and Han, Y.-M.: Winter
200 and summer PM_{2.5} chemical compositions in fourteen Chinese cities, *J. Air Waste Manage.*, 62, 1214–1226,
201 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10962247.2012.701193>, 2012.
- 202 Chen, L., Lowenthal, D., Watson, J., Koracin, D., Kumar, N., Knipping, E., Wheeler, N., Craig, K., Reid, S.: Toward
203 effective source apportionment using positive matrix factorization: experiments with simulated PM_{2.5} data. *J. Air
204 Waste Manage.*, 60(1), 43–54, <https://doi.org/10.3155/1047-3289.60.1.43>, 2010.
- 205 Dai, Q., Bi, X., Liu, B., Li, L., Ding, J., Song, W., Bi, S., Schulze, B. C., Song, C., Wu, J., Zhang, Y., Feng, Y., and Hopke,
206 P. K.: Chemical nature of PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ in Xi'an, China: Insights into primary emissions and secondary particle
207 formation, *Environ. Pollut.*, 240, 155–166, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2018.04.111>, 2018.
- 208 Dai, Q., Hopke, P. K., Bi, X., and Feng, Y.: Improving apportionment of PM_{2.5} using multisite PMF by constraining G-
209 values with a priori information, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 736, 139657, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139657>,
210 2020.
- 211 Diao, L., Zhang, H., Liu, B., Dai, C., Zhang, Y., Dai, Q., Bi, X., Zhang, L., Song, C., and Feng, Y.: Health risks of inhaled
212 selected toxic elements during the haze episodes in Shijiazhuang, China: Insight into critical risk sources, *Environ.
213 Pollut.*, 276, 116664, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2021.116664>, 2021.
- 214 Duan, F., He, K., Ma, Y., Yang, F., Yu, X., Cadle, S., Chan, T., and Mulawa, P.: Concentration and chemical characteristics
215 of PM_{2.5} in Beijing, China: 2001–2002, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 355, 264–275,
216 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2005.03.001>, 2006.
- 217 Huang, R.-J., Zhang, Y., Bozzetti, C., Ho, K.-F., Cao, J.-J., Han, Y., Daellenbach, K. R., Slowik, J. G., Platt, S. M., Canonaco,
218 F., Zotter, P., Wolf, R., Pieber, S. M., Brun, E. A., Crippa, M., Ciarelli, G., Piazzalunga, A., Schwikowski, M.,
219 Abbaszade, G., Schnelle-Kreis, J., Zimmermann, R., An, Z., Szidat, S., Baltensperger, U., Haddad, I. E., and Prévôt,
220 A. S. H.: High secondary aerosol contribution to particulate pollution during haze events in China, *Nature*, 514, 218–
221 222, <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13774>, 2014.
- 222 Huang, X., Liu, Z., Liu, J., Hu, B., Wen, T., Tang, G., Zhang, J., Wu, F., Ji, D., Wang, L., and Wang, Y.: Chemical
223 characterization and source identification of PM_{2.5} at multiple sites in the Beijing–Tianjin–Hebei region, China, *Atmos.
224 Chem. Phys.*, 17, 12941–12962, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-17-12941-2017>, 2017.
- 225 Liu, B., Cheng, Y., Zhou, M., Liang, D., Dai, Q., Wang, L., Jin, W., Zhang, L., Ren, Y., Zhou, J., Dai, C., Xu, J., Wang, J.,
226 Feng, Y., and Zhang, Y.: Effectiveness evaluation of temporary emission control action in 2016 in winter in
227 Shijiazhuang, China, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 7019–7039, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-7019-2018>, 2018.
- 228 Liu, G., Xin, J., Wang, X., Si, R., Ma, Y., Wen, T., Zhao, L., Zhao, D., Wang, Y., and Gao, W.: Impact of the coal banning
229 zone on visibility in the Beijing–Tianjin–Hebei region, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 692, 402–410,
230 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.07.006>, 2019.

- 231 Liu, H., Wang, Q., Ye, J., Su, X. li, Zhang, T., Zhang, Y., Tian, J., Dong, Y., Chen, Y., Zhu, C., Han, Y., and Cao, J.: Changes
232 in Source-Specific Black Carbon Aerosol and the Induced Radiative Effects Due to the COVID-19 Lockdown,
233 *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 48, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL092987>, 2021.
- 234 Ma, Q., Wu, Y., Tao, J., Xia, Y., Liu, X., Zhang, D., Han, Z., Zhang, X., and Zhang, R.: Variations of Chemical Composition
235 and Source Apportionment of PM_{2.5} during Winter Haze Episodes in Beijing, *Aerosol Air Qual. Res.*, 17, 2791–2803,
236 <https://doi.org/10.4209/aaqr.2017.10.0366>, 2017.
- 237 Niu, X., Cao, J., Shen, Z., Ho, S. S. H., Tie, X., Zhao, S., Xu, H., Zhang, T., and Huang, R.: PM_{2.5} from the Guanzhong
238 Plain: Chemical composition and implications for emission reductions, *Atmos. Environ.*, 147, 458–469,
239 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.10.029>, 2016.
- 240 Rai, P., Furger, M., Slowik, J. G., Canonaco, F., Fröhlich, R., Hüglin, C., Minguillón, M. C., Petterson, K., Baltensperger,
241 U., and Prévôt, A. S. H.: Source apportionment of highly time-resolved elements during a firework episode from a
242 rural freeway site in Switzerland, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 20, 1657–1674, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-20-1657-2020>,
243 2020.
- 244 Salameh, D., Pey, J., Bozzetti, C., El Haddad, I., Detournay, A., Sylvestre, A., Canonaco, F., Armengaud, A., Piga, D.,
245 Robin, D., Prevot, A. S. H., Jaffrezo, J.-L., Wortham, H., and Marchand, N.: Sources of PM_{2.5} at an urban-industrial
246 Mediterranean city, Marseille (France): Application of the ME-2 solver to inorganic and organic markers, *Atmos. Res.*,
247 214, 263–274, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2018.08.005>, 2018.
- 248 Salameh, T., Sauvage, S., Afif, C., Borbon, A., and Locoge, N.: Source apportionment vs. emission inventories of non-
249 methane hydrocarbons (NMHC) in an urban area of the Middle East: local and global perspectives, *Atmos. Chem.*
250 *Phys.*, 16, 3595–3607, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-3595-2016>, 2016.
- 251 Shrivastava, M., Cappa, C., Fan, J., Goldstein, A., Guenther, A., Jimenez, J., Kuang, C., Laskin, A., Martin S., Ng, N.,
252 Petaja, T., Pierce, J., Rasch, P., Roldin, P., Senfeld, J., Shilling, J., Smith, J., Thornton, J., Volkamer, R., Wang, J.,
253 Worsnop, D., Zaveri, R., Zelenyuk, A., Zhang, Q.: secondary organic aerosol: Implications for global climate forcing.
254 *Rev. Geophys.*, 55, 509–559. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016RG000540>, 2017.
- 255 Song, Y., Tang, X., Xie, S., Zhang, Y., Wei, Y., Zhang, M., Zeng, L., and Lu, S.: Source apportionment of PM_{2.5} in Beijing
256 in 2004, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, 146, 124–130, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2006.11.058>, 2007.
- 257 Tao, J., Zhang, L., Gao, J., Wang, H., Chai, F., and Wang, S.: Aerosol chemical composition and light scattering during a
258 winter season in Beijing, *Atmos. Environ.*, 110, 36–44, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.03.037>, 2015.
- 259 Wang, Q.; Han, Y.; Ye, J.; Liu, S.; Pongpiachan, S.; Zhang, N.; Han, Y.; Tian, J.; Wu, C.; Long, X.; Zhang, Q.; Zhang, W.;
260 Zhao, Z.; Cao, J.: High Contribution of secondary brown carbon to aerosol light absorption in the southeastern margin
261 of Tibetan Plateau. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 46, 4962–4970, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL082731>, 2019.
- 262 Wang, Z., Wang, R., Wang, J., Wang, Y., McPherson Donahue, N., Tang, R., Dong, Z., Li, X., Wang, L., Han, Y., and Cao,
263 J.: The seasonal variation, characteristics and secondary generation of PM_{2.5} in Xi'an, China, especially during
264 pollution events, *Environ. Res.*, 212, 113388, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2022.113388>, 2022.

- 265 Xu, H., Cao, J., Chow, J. C., Huang, R.-J., Shen, Z., Chen, L. W. A., Ho, K. F., and Watson, J. G.: Inter-annual variability
266 of wintertime PM_{2.5} chemical composition in Xi'an, China: Evidences of changing source emissions, *Sci. Total*
267 *Environ.*, 545–546, 546–555, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.12.070>, 2016.
- 268 Xu, X., Zhang, H., Chen, J., Li, Q., Wang, X., Wang, W., Zhang, Q., Xue, L., Ding, A., and Mellouki, A.: Six sources
269 mainly contributing to the haze episodes and health risk assessment of PM_{2.5} at Beijing suburb in winter 2016,
270 *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.*, 166, 146–156, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2018.09.069>, 2018.
- 271 Zhang, Q., Shen, Z., Cao, J., Zhang, R., Zhang, L., Huang, R.-J., Zheng, C., Wang, L., Liu, S., Xu, H., Zheng, C., and Liu,
272 P.: Variations in PM_{2.5}, TSP, BC, and trace gases (NO₂, SO₂, and O₃) between haze and non-haze episodes in winter
273 over Xi'an, China, *Atmos. Environ.*, 112, 64–71, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.04.033>, 2015.
- 274 Zhang, R., Jing, J., Tao, J., Hsu, S.-C., Wang, G., Cao, J., Lee, C. S. L., Zhu, L., Chen, Z., Zhao, Y., and Shen, Z.: Chemical
275 characterization and source apportionment of PM_{2.5} in Beijing: seasonal perspective, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 7053–
276 7074, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-7053-2013>, 2013.
- 277 Zhang, W., Liu, B., Zhang, Y., Li, Y., Sun, X., Gu, Y., Dai, C., Li, N., Song, C., Dai, Q., Han, Y., and Feng, Y.: A refined
278 source apportionment study of atmospheric PM_{2.5} during winter heating period in Shijiazhuang, China, using a
279 receptor model coupled with a source-oriented model, *Atmos. Environ.*, 222, 117157,
280 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.117157>, 2020.
- 281 Zhao, P. S., Dong, F., He, D., Zhao, X. J., Zhang, X. L., Zhang, W. Z., Yao, Q., and Liu, H. Y.: Characteristics of
282 concentrations and chemical compositions for PM_{2.5} in the region of Beijing, Tianjin, and Hebei, China, *Atmos. Chem.*
283 *Phys.*, 13, 4631–4644, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-13-4631-2013>, 2013.