

Detection of HO₂ by laser-induced fluorescence: calibration and interferences from RO₂ radicals

H. Fuchs, B. Bohn, A. Hofzumahaus, F. Holland, K. D. Lu, S. Nehr, F. Rohrer, and A. Wahner

Institute of Energy and Climate Research: Troposphere (IEK-8), Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Jülich, Germany

Received: 9 February 2011 – Published in Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss.: 25 February 2011

Revised: 20 June 2011 – Accepted: 20 June 2011 – Published: 28 June 2011

Abstract. HO₂ concentration measurements are widely accomplished by chemical conversion of HO₂ to OH including reaction with NO and subsequent detection of OH by laser-induced fluorescence. RO₂ radicals can be converted to OH via a similar radical reaction sequence including reaction with NO, so that they are potential interferences for HO₂ measurements. Here, the conversion efficiency of various RO₂ species to HO₂ is investigated. Experiments were conducted with a radical source that produces OH and HO₂ by water photolysis at 185 nm, which is frequently used for calibration of LIF instruments. The ratio of HO₂ and the sum of OH and HO₂ concentrations provided by the radical source was investigated and was found to be 0.50 ± 0.02 . RO₂ radicals are produced by the reaction of various organic compounds with OH in the radical source. Interferences via chemical conversion from RO₂ radicals produced by the reaction of OH with methane and ethane (H-atom abstraction) are negligible consistent with measurements in the past. However, RO₂ radicals from OH plus alkene- and aromatic-precursors including isoprene (mainly OH-addition) are detected with a relative sensitivity larger than 80 % with respect to that for HO₂ for the configuration of the instrument with which it was operated during field campaigns. Also RO₂ from OH plus methyl vinyl ketone and methacrolein exhibit a relative detection sensitivity of 60 %. Thus, previous measurements of HO₂ radical concentrations with this instrument were biased in the presence of high RO₂ radical concentrations from isoprene, alkenes or aromatics, but were not affected by interferences in remote clean environment with no significant emissions of biogenic VOCs, when the OH reactivity was dominated by small alkanes. By reducing the NO concentration and/or the transport time between

NO addition and OH detection, interference from these RO₂ species are suppressed to values below 20 % relative to the HO₂ detection sensitivity. The HO₂ conversion efficiency is also smaller by a factor of four, but this is still sufficient for atmospheric HO₂ concentration measurements for a wide range of conditions.

1 Introduction

The measurement of hydroperoxy radical (HO₂) concentrations is important for the understanding of the photochemical degradation of atmospheric trace gases and the formation of secondary air pollutants such as ozone (e.g., Finlayson-Pitts and Pitts Jr., 2000). HO₂ is mainly produced by radical chain reactions, starting with the reaction of CO or volatile organic compounds (VOC) with photochemically produced hydroxyl radicals (OH). It is also formed by the photolysis of carbonyl compounds, ozonolysis and the reaction of the nitrate radical (NO₃) with organic compounds (e.g., Geyer et al., 2003; Kanaya et al., 2007).



Because of the small radical concentrations in the atmosphere within the range of some ten parts per trillion per volume (pptv) (e.g. Monks, 2005; Kanaya et al., 2007; Lelieveld et al., 2008; Hofzumahaus et al., 2009) high instrument sensitivities are required for the detection of HO₂. Matrix Isolation Electron Spin Resonance Spectroscopy (MIESR) is the only known technique being capable of specific HO₂ measurements in the atmosphere, but requires relatively long integration times (30 min) (Mihelcic et al., 1985, 1990).

Laser induced fluorescence (LIF) allows a more sensitive HO₂ detection, at integration times of about 1 min. It applies chemical conversion of HO₂ to OH at reduced pressure and detects OH by LIF (see review, Heard and Pilling, 2003). Chemical conversion combined with radical amplification




Correspondence to: H. Fuchs
(h.fuchs@fz-juelich.de)

is used by Peroxy Radical Chemical Amplifier (PERCA) (Cantrell et al., 1984; Hastie et al., 1991; Clemitshaw et al., 1997; Burkert et al., 2001; Sadanaga et al., 2004; Mihele and Hastie, 2000; Green et al., 2006; Andrés-Hernández et al., 2010) and Peroxy Radical Chemical-Ionization Mass Spectrometry (ROxMas, PerCIMS) (Hanke et al., 2002; Edwards et al., 2003; Hornbrook et al., 2011), in order to achieve high measurement sensitivities for HO₂. All indirect techniques (LIF, PERCA and ROxMas/PerCIMS) make use of the conversion reaction between HO₂ and NO, in order to produce OH. Possible loss of OH by formation of nitrous acid (HONO) can be suppressed by lowering the pressure in the measurement systems.



M is any collision partner, mostly oxygen and nitrogen.

Organic peroxy radicals (RO₂) are present in the atmosphere at similar concentrations as HO₂. RO₂ is mainly produced in the reactions of OH, O₃ and NO₃ with organic compounds. Reactions of VOCs with OH take place either via H-atom abstraction or addition of OH leading to two different types of RO₂ radicals (Atkinson and Arey, 2003). RO₂ radicals react with NO at nearly the same rate as HO₂.



In HO₂ detection systems that apply chemical conversion HO₂ produced by Reaction (R4) can undergo further conversion to OH (Reaction R1). This is utilized by PERCA and ROxMas/PerCIMS instruments, and one specialized LIF instrument, ROxLIF (Fuchs et al., 2008), in order to measure the sum of HO₂ and RO₂ (= RO_x). PERCA instruments cannot distinguish between HO₂ and RO₂. ROxMas/PerCIMS instruments, however, modulate the chemical conditions in their instruments, in order to measure either RO_x, or HO₂ only. The HO₂ measurement mode requires good suppression of the RO₂ to HO₂ conversion. Edwards et al. (2003), for example, achieved a suppression to less than 15 % in their PerCIMS instrument for RO₂ species that were produced by the reaction of Cl with various hydrocarbons. However, this required large changes in concentrations of reactants, so that the modulation between HO₂ and RO_x measurement mode took 30 min. In order to achieve a faster switching of the measurement modes within 1 min, Hornbrook et al. (2011) lowered the reactant concentrations in the HO₂-mode. The new method that improves temporal resolution offers good discrimination between HO₂ and various alkyl peroxy radicals, but RO₂ from the reaction of OH with large alkanes, alkenes (including isoprene) and aromatics are partially or

fully detected in the HO₂-mode of this instrument. RO₂ radicals were produced by the reaction of OH in Hornbrook et al. (2011), so that radical species from the same organic precursor were not necessarily the same as in Edwards et al. (2003).

It is generally believed that RO₂ radical conversion via Reactions (R3), (R4) and (R1) in the detection cell of LIF instruments for HO₂ measurements is negligible (Heard and Pilling, 2003). Experimental investigations in the laboratory for C₁–C₄ alkyl peroxy radicals and results from field campaigns (Stevens et al., 1994; Mather et al., 1997; Kanaya et al., 2001; Creasey et al., 2002; Ren et al., 2004; Fuchs et al., 2010) did not hint towards a significant interference. For example, for the instrument characterized here, it was shown that the upper limit for an interference from methyl peroxy radicals (CH₃O₂) is 5 % (Weber, 1998; Holland et al., 2003). The reason for the suppression of OH formation from CH₃O₂ radicals is the slow rate of Reaction (R4) at the low-pressure condition in the instrument. Only a small fraction of CH₃O is eventually converted to OH within the reaction time of a few milliseconds between the injection of NO and detection by the laser beam. Moreover, Reaction (R4) competes with the formation of nitrite in the presence of high NO concentrations (Reaction R5). However, the potential for an interference from organic peroxy radicals from alkenes, aromatics and OVOCs was not experimentally studied assuming that these RO₂ radicals would behave like small alkyl peroxy radicals.

So far, only few intercomparisons of HO₂ concentration measurements from different instruments have been performed at atmospheric conditions. The HO₂ comparisons in ambient air between LIF and MIESR (Platt et al., 2002) and between LIF and PerCIMS (Ren et al., 2003) exhibited high correlations and good absolute agreement without hints towards significant interferences. Recently, however, Ren et al. (2008) reported a change of the calibration factor of the LIF instrument. This may possibly require revision of the comparison results. Good agreement was also found for measurements from ROxLIF and MIESR in chamber measurements, during which HO₂, CH₃O₂ and C₂H₅O₂ were specifically measured (Fuchs et al., 2009). However, unexplained differences were observed between three LIF instruments in the international comparison campaign HOx-Comp (Fuchs et al., 2010), when measurements were taken in ambient air and in chamber experiments. Although the data from different instruments were well-correlated, the linear regressions showed sometimes differences that exceeded the combined estimated measurement errors and exhibited an unexplained water vapor dependence. The results from this campaign point to potential interferences in the calibration or measurement techniques.

Therefore, we investigated (1) the yield of radicals in the calibration source that produces OH and HO₂ radicals by water photolysis at 185 nm and (2) the potential for an interference from various RO₂ radical species in HO₂ concentration measurements. RO₂ radicals are produced by the reaction of




Fig. 1. Schematic drawing of the experimental setup. Peroxy radicals are converted to OH in their reaction with NO, which is injected into the gas expansion downstream of the inlet nozzle, in the low pressure detection cell. The air is exposed to pulsed laser radiation at 308 nm and the resulting fluorescence from OH is detected in the direction perpendicular to the laser and gas beam. For experiments done here, air is sampled from a calibration source, which provides either OH and HO₂, exclusive HO₂ or HO₂ and RO₂ radicals.

organic compounds with OH in the calibration source. An interference from RO₂ radicals would impact HO₂ concentration measurements in the past, when high loads of VOCs including isoprene were present such as during the field campaigns ECHO (Kleffmann et al., 2005; Dlugi et al., 2010) and PRIDE-PRD2006 (Hofzumahaus et al., 2009; Lu et al., 2011).

2 Detection of HO₂ radicals

HO₂ radicals cannot be detected directly by LIF. However, they can be chemically converted to OH, so that the detected OH concentration represents the sum of HO₂ and OH (=HO_x) in the sampled air (Hard et al., 1984; Heard and Pilling, 2003). A description of our LIF instrument has been given by Holland et al. (2003). The main instrument parameters are summarized in Table 1 and a schematic drawing of the detection cell is given in Fig. 1. The instrument performed measurements in two configurations: In the first configuration, 0.28 slpm (liter per minute at 1 atm and 20 °C) of air is drawn into a detection cell at low pressure of 3.5 hPa through a conically shaped inlet nozzle (Beam Dynamics) with an orifice of 0.2 mm. Configuration 2 differs in the orifice size of the inlet nozzle (0.4 mm), so that 1.1 slpm is drawn into the detection cell. The latter instrument configuration was used in past field campaigns and for experiments in the simulation chamber SAPHIR in Jülich.

The air stream in the detection cell is crossed by a short laser pulse at 308 nm (25 ns duration, 8 mm diameter, 8.5 kHz repetition rate, 25 mW average power at 308 nm), which is provided by a Nd:YAG pumped dye laser system (Navigator Spectraphysics and Intradye Laser Analytical

Table 1. Properties of the instrument regarding the HO₂ detection.

	Config. 1	Config. 2 ^a
Inlet orifice/mm	0.2	0.4
Sample flow rate/srpm	0.28	1.1
[NO]/10 ¹² cm ⁻³	1–40	5–100
Distance nozzle – detection/cm		10
Distance NO addition – detection/cm		5.5
Conversion reaction time/ms	0.18 ^b	2.7 ^b
Cell pressure/hPa		3.5
Laser rep. rate/kHz		8.5
Laser power/mW		35–40
Laser beam diameter/mm		8
1 σ accuracy of the calibration/%		±10

^a Configuration during previous field campaigns. ^b Determined from experiments here.

Systems), approximately 10 cm downstream of the tip of the inlet nozzle (Fig. 1). OH is excited on a single rovibronic transition ($Q_{11}(3)$ line of the A²Σ – X²Π(0,0) transition). The resonance fluorescence is measured by gated photon counting using a time delay, in order to discriminate the OH fluorescence from the instantaneous laser stray light.


Chemical conversion of HO₂ to OH is accomplished by its reaction with NO (Reaction R1). Different flows of NO were injected into the sampled gas. During the ECHO and HO_x-Comp campaigns, 4 sccm (1 sccm = 1 cm³ min⁻¹ at 298 K and 1 atm) of pure NO were added through a ring made of glass tubing with small holes, surrounding the gas expansion. During the PRIDE-PRD2006 campaign, 1 sccm of NO was injected by a glass tube with a small orifice that reached into the gas expansion. The concentration of NO was chosen that

the HO₂ conversion efficiency is larger than 90 % within the travel time of the sampled gas between NO addition and laser excitation (distance here: 5.5 cm). No significant difference was found in this work between using the glass ring or glass tube for NO addition. The NO was always purified in a cartridge that was filled with Ascarite (sodium hydroxide-coated silica) prior to addition. Ascarite removes gaseous nitrous acid (HONO), which can be photolyzed to OH by the 308 nm laser radiation and leads to an artificial laser-generated OH signal. With purification of NO the interference can be neglected.


3 Calibration of the detection sensitivity

3.1 The radical source

In order to calibrate the sensitivity of the LIF instrument, a radical source provides accurately known radical concentrations. This is accomplished by the photolysis of water in air at 1 atm using 185 nm radiation of a low-pressure discharge mercury lamp (Aschmutat et al., 1994; Schultz et al., 1995; Heard and Pilling, 2003):



Characterization measurements reported here are done with the calibration source described in detail by Holland et al. (2003). Typical radical concentrations are $7 \times 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, but can be lowered by a factor of 100 by reducing the intensity of the radiation, when the light passes an absorption cuvette filled with N₂O (not done here). Humidified synthetic air of highest purity (99.9999 %) flows through a 60 cm long glass tube (inner diameter 1.9 cm) at a high flow rate of 20 L min⁻¹ (laminar flow). The radiation of a mercury lamp crosses the air approximately 6 cm upstream of the inlet nozzle of the instrument, which sticks into the glass tube. The transport time of the radicals produced by photolysis (Reaction R6) is approximately 20 ms, before the gas flow reaches the tip of the inlet nozzle. Radical loss inside the radical source does not play a role, since only a small part of the entire flow is sampled from the center of laminar flow. The absolute radical concentration provided by the calibration source can be related to the amount of ozone that is simultaneously formed by the photolysis of oxygen at 185 nm in the air flow (Aschmutat et al., 1994; Schultz et al., 1995):



Here, this is accomplished indirectly by observing the light intensity measured by a CS-I-phototube, which was calibrated against ozone production. Spectral characteristics of the phototube and an interference filter (185 nm, FWHM = 27.5 nm) in front of the phototube ensure that only radiation which is relevant for the photolysis is detected by

the phototube. The concentration of OH radicals produced by the calibration source can be calculated as:

$$[\text{OH}]_0 = [\text{O}_3] \frac{\Phi_{\text{OH}} [\text{H}_2\text{O}] \sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}}{\Phi_{\text{O}_3} [\text{O}_2] \sigma_{\text{O}_2}} \quad (1)$$

Φ_{OH} and Φ_{O_3} are the quantum yields for OH and O₃. The absorption spectrum of oxygen is highly structured in the Schumann-Runge bands around 185 nm. Therefore, the value of the absorption cross section, σ_{O_2} , is specific for every mercury lamp and depends on the special design of the radical source (Hofzumahaus et al., 1996; Cantrell et al., 1997; Creasey et al., 2000). The absorption cross section of water, $\sigma_{\text{H}_2\text{O}}$, does not show distinctive structures and is well-known (Hofzumahaus et al., 1996; Cantrell et al., 1997; Creasey et al., 2003). The quantum yield of ozone in 1 atm of air is assumed to be $\Phi_{\text{O}_3} = 2$, supported by the experimental study by Washida et al. (1971). For OH, the quantum yield is generally assumed to be one based on spectroscopic considerations.


3.2 OH and HO₂ yields in the radical source

Photolysis of water molecules at 185 nm has only one energetically and spin-allowed dissociation channel, leading to OH(²Π) + H(²S) with both fragments in their electronic ground states (Reaction R6). The photo-dissociation process occurs in the first absorption band of water and is experimentally and theoretically one of the best understood polyatomic photo-dissociation processes (Engel et al., 1992). Upon photon absorption, the excited H₂O molecule decomposes rapidly in less than an internal vibrational period. Unity quantum yield is therefore expected for OH from Reaction (R6). OH radicals are produced almost exclusively in their vibrational ground state and most of the excess energy ($\approx 1.58 \text{ eV}$) from the photo-dissociation is transferred into translation of the H-atoms. The highly energetic H-atoms can undergo several chemical reactions or lose their energy by collisions with other molecules:




Because Reaction (R11) quickly removes excess energy, it is generally assumed that the H-atoms from water photolysis are completely converted to HO₂ (Reaction R12). However, Reactions (R9) and (R10) are energetically possible, if the H-atoms carry translational energy greater than 0.7 eV (Bajeh et al., 2001; Zhang et al., 2000), which is the case at 185 nm. In order to investigate the relevance of OH formation from Reactions (R9) and (R10), the HO_x partitioning in the calibration gas is measured, when humidified synthetic

air is irradiated by 185 nm at 1 atm, room temperature and 30 % relative humidity. The experiment is performed in two steps. First, an amount of 60 ppmv CO is added as an OH scavenger, in order to convert all OH to HO₂ within the residence time (≈ 20 ms) between photolytical generation and intake into the detection cell.



In this mode, the sum of OH and HO₂ is measured. OH that is produced by water photolysis (Reaction R6) and Reactions (R9) and (R10) is converted to HO₂ and is measured in the detection cell together with HO₂ produced by Reactions (R11) and (R12). Overall, this calibration mode has an HO₂ yield of 2 independent of Reactions (R9) and (R10). Second, 0.1 % deuterated methane (CD₄) is used as a scavenger, which ultimately removes OH in the calibration gas.



In this mode, HO₂ is formed by Reactions (R11) and (R12), only. If the competing Reactions (R9) and (R10) play a role, H atoms are converted to OH and the yield of HO₂ from Reaction (R12) is diminished, accordingly. Products of the OH-scavenging Reaction (R14) will not interfere, because the deuterated CD₃O₂ radicals cannot be converted to hydrogen-containing HO_x radicals, which would be detectable at the probing laser wavelength. Overall, the calibration mode with CD₄ has an expected HO₂ yield of one, if Reactions (R9) and (R10) are negligible, or less than one, if H-atoms are removed by Reactions (R9) or (R10).

Figure 2 shows an example of signals from one experiment, when either CO or CD₄ is added to the humidified air in the calibration source. The ratio of the signals gives the ratio of HO₂ to HO_x radicals produced in the radical source. The experiment was repeated four times on different days. The mean of the ratio is 0.50 ± 0.02 , meaning a ratio of quantum yields for OH and HO₂ of one in the photolysis of water in air. This result proves that the assumption of equal OH and HO₂ production in the photolysis of water at 185 nm is justified.

3.3 HO₂ and RO₂ yields of the radical source

The radical source can be operated to provide only HO₂ radicals by adding 60 ppmv CO to the synthetic air, in order to convert OH to HO₂ quantitatively (Reaction R13). This way the source provides HO₂ radicals with a quantum yield of two (HO₂-mode) in contrast to a yield of one without the addition of an OH scavenger (HO_x-mode). Therefore, the HO₂ concentration in the HO₂-mode is twice as large as the OH concentration defined in Eq. (1).

In a similar way, specific RO₂ radicals can be generated by scavenging all OH radicals with a hydrocarbon (Fuchs et al., 2008; Qi et al., 2006; Hornbrook et al., 2011). This is called the RO_x-mode of the calibration source. Again, the




Fig. 2. Relative HO₂ signals if either CO or CD₄ is used as an OH scavenger in the calibration source. Symbols show individual measurement points, solid lines denote average values and dashed lines represent 1σ standard deviations of measurements.

concentration of organic compounds is chosen, so that all OH is consumed within the time between production of OH in the radical source and sampling by the instrument (OH reactivity approximately 300 s^{-1}). Since hydrocarbons were added upstream of the photolysis region of the radical source, photolysis of these hydrocarbons at 185 nm may occur (Demers et al., 1978; Giroux et al., 1989). In order to test for effects of photolysis on experiments conducted here, the fluorescence signal was measured, when hydrocarbons were mixed in dry air, so that radicals are only produced by photolysis of the hydrocarbon. No significant radical production from hydrocarbon photolysis could be detected by LIF.

Different types of reactions can occur: (1) RO₂ radicals can be produced via H abstraction in the case of alkanes leading to alkyl peroxy radicals. (2) For other organic compounds like alkenes OH addition leads to the formation of β -hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals (Atkinson and Arey, 2003). If RO₂ radicals are the only radical product, the source yields equal concentrations of RO₂ and HO₂. However, the yield of RO₂ radicals can differ from unity, if other product channels compete with RO₂ formation in the reaction of OH and the hydrocarbon. For example, it is known that part of the products of benzene with OH is HO₂ (prompt HO₂) and only 35 % is RO₂ (Nehr et al., 2011).

3.4 Calibration of detection sensitivities

For calibration of OH, HO₂ and RO₂ sensitivities, C_i , the radical source is operated either in the HO_x-, HO₂- or RO_x-mode. Sensitivities defined here and throughout this report always refer to sensitivities of the HO₂-cell, when NO is

added into the detection cell. The fluorescence signal measured by the LIF instrument in the three operational modes of the radical source are:

$$S_{\text{HO}_x} = C_{\text{HO}_2} \phi_{\text{HO}_2} [\text{OH}]_0 + C_{\text{OH}} \phi_{\text{OH}} [\text{OH}]_0 \quad (2)$$

$$= (C_{\text{HO}_2} + C_{\text{OH}}) [\text{OH}]_0$$

$$S_{\text{HO}_2} = C_{\text{HO}_2} \phi'_{\text{HO}_2} [\text{OH}]_0 = 2 C_{\text{HO}_2} [\text{OH}]_0 \quad (3)$$

$$S_{\text{RO}_x} = C_{\text{HO}_2} \phi''_{\text{HO}_2} [\text{OH}]_0 + C_{\text{RO}_2} \phi_{\text{RO}_2} [\text{OH}]_0 \quad (4)$$

$$= (C_{\text{HO}_2} (1 + \delta) + C_{\text{RO}_2} (1 - \delta)) [\text{OH}]_0$$

ϕ_{HO_2} , ϕ'_{HO_2} and ϕ''_{HO_2} are the HO₂ yields in the three modes of the radical source and ϕ_{OH} and ϕ_{RO_2} the yields of OH and RO₂ in the HO_x- and RO_x-mode, respectively, as discussed in the previous section. The concentration $[\text{OH}]_0$ is calculated from Eq. (1). δ is the yield of prompt HO₂ in the reaction of organic compounds with OH without the formation of RO₂ on the time scale of the transport time in the radical source (20 ms).

In order to calculate the HO₂ detection sensitivity, only one measurement with the radical source in the HO₂-mode is required. In contrast, the OH sensitivity of the HO₂ detection cell can be calculated from the difference between measurements with the radical source in the HO₂- and HO_x-mode and the RO₂ sensitivity from the difference between measurements in the HO₂- and RO_x-mode:

$$C_{\text{OH}} = \frac{2 S_{\text{HO}_x} - S_{\text{HO}_2}}{2 [\text{OH}]_0} \quad (5)$$

$$C_{\text{HO}_2} = \frac{S_{\text{HO}_2}}{2 [\text{OH}]_0} \quad (6)$$

$$C_{\text{RO}_2} = \frac{2 S_{\text{RO}_x} - S_{\text{HO}_2} (1 + \delta)}{2 [\text{OH}]_0 (1 - \delta)} \quad (7)$$

In a simple model, the sensitivities C_i can be expressed as a product of three generic parameters:

$$C_i = \gamma_i \epsilon_i \beta_{\text{OH}} \quad \text{with } i = \text{OH, HO}_2, \text{RO}_2 \quad (8)$$

γ_i represents the fraction of radical species i that are transmitted through the instrument inlet. ϵ_i denotes the yield of OH after the sampled radical species i has passed the distance from the gas inlet (nozzle) to the detection volume, and β_{OH} is the internal detection efficiency of OH in the detection volume. Among these parameters, ϵ_i and β_{OH} are influenced by the injected NO. More specifically, ϵ_i accounts for NO-dependent Reactions (R1) to (R5), which determine the fraction of OH that reaches the detection volume. ϵ_i represents the loss of OH by HONO formation for sampled OH (Reaction R2), while it represents the efficiency of chemical conversion to OH for sampled peroxy radicals. In principle, β_{OH} is influenced by NO-dependent quenching of the OH fluorescence, but this effect is small for the NO concentrations used in this work.

4 Experimental results for detection sensitivities

4.1 OH and HO₂ detection sensitivities

In order to investigate the HO₂ and OH detection sensitivities, the instrument sampled from the calibration source in the HO₂- and HO_x-mode of the radical source. We define the relative HO₂ detection sensitivity of the instrument, α_{HO_2} , as the ratio of the calibration factors for HO₂ and OH (Eq. 8) that can be calculated from measurements using Eqs. (5) and (6). This gives the HO₂ conversion efficiency weighted by the ratio of the inlet transmission efficiencies for HO₂ and OH:

$$\alpha_{\text{HO}_2} = \frac{C_{\text{HO}_2}}{C_{\text{OH}}} = \frac{\gamma_{\text{HO}_2}}{\gamma_{\text{OH}}} \frac{\epsilon_{\text{HO}_2}}{\epsilon_{\text{OH}}} \quad (9)$$

Furthermore, we determine the influence of NO on the OH detection sensitivity as:

$$\epsilon_{\text{OH}} = \frac{C_{\text{OH}}(\text{NO})}{C_{\text{OH}}(\text{NO} = 0)} \quad (10)$$

Figure 3 shows α_{HO_2} (upper panel) and ϵ_{OH} (lower panel) depending on the NO concentration for the two different inlet nozzles (reaction times) tested here. For high NO concentrations relative detection sensitivities are approximately constant at a value larger than one. The dashed vertical line in Fig. 3 indicates the NO concentration, at which the LIF instrument (with the 0.4 mm nozzle) was operated during field campaigns in the past. Measurements show that the HO₂ conversion in the detection is nearly complete for this NO concentration.

The OH sensitivity, which is shown in the lower panel of Fig. 3, is nearly independent of the NO concentration within the range tested here and decreases only slightly for large NO concentrations.

4.2 RO₂ detection sensitivities

The potential for an OH signal caused by the conversion of RO₂ to HO₂ via Reactions (R3) and (R4) and subsequent conversion to OH is investigated for various RO₂ radicals. Like for HO₂ we define the relative RO₂ detection sensitivity as the ratio of calibration factors for RO₂ and HO₂ (Eq. 8), which can be calculated from measurements using Eqs. (7) and (6):

$$\alpha_{\text{RO}_2} = \frac{C_{\text{RO}_2}}{C_{\text{HO}_2}} = \frac{\gamma_{\text{RO}_2}}{\gamma_{\text{HO}_2}} \frac{\epsilon_{\text{RO}_2}}{\epsilon_{\text{HO}_2}} \quad (11)$$

The experimental determination of the relative RO₂ detection sensitivity is only possible, if the yield of prompt HO₂ is known (δ in Eq. 7). α_{RO_2} represents the value of the interference from RO₂ radicals. It always refers to the HO₂ detection sensitivity of the instrument that is achieved for the same operational conditions.




Fig. 3. Relative OH sensitivity (lower panel) and HO₂ (upper panel) conversion efficiency to OH depending on the NO concentration in the detection cell. Measurements (symbols) are compared to calculations using MCMv3.1 (lines). Two inlet nozzles with different orifices (0.2 and 0.4 mm) were used, in order to vary the reaction time for the conversion in the cell (0.18 and 2.7 ms). Dotted lines give results from sensitivity runs of the model varying the reaction time by ± 0.025 and ± 0.5 ms, respectively. The vertical dashed line indicates the working point for the instrument with the 0.4 mm nozzle in the past.

In this work, values for the relative detection sensitivity for various peroxy radicals were determined. Results are summarized in Table 2 and examples of the measurements are shown in Fig. 4 for methane, Fig. 5 for isoprene and Fig. 6 for benzene.

Alkyl peroxy radicals are produced by the reaction of an alkane with OH in the radical source. Initial H-atom abstraction is followed by the reaction of the alkyl radical with O₂ (Atkinson and Arey, 2003) producing alkyl peroxy radicals. The relative detection sensitivity for methyl peroxy radicals, which are produced in the reaction of methane with OH, is below the limit of detection of the instrument for the configuration of the instrument with the 0.2 mm nozzle for the range of NO concentration tested here (open circles in Fig. 4). For the larger orifice, however, a small interference of 0.04 ± 0.04 is measured for the NO concentration, at which the cell was operated in the field (filled circle at dashed vertical line). Measurements exhibit a maximum of nearly 0.1 at smaller NO concentrations. This behavior was reproduced in several experiments.




Fig. 4. Relative detection sensitivity for RO₂ radicals produced by methane and OH depending on the NO concentration in the detection cell. Measurements (symbols) are compared to calculations using MCMv3.1 (solid line) with non-zero initial RO₂ and zero HO₂ concentration. Two inlet nozzles with different orifices (0.2 and 0.4 mm) were used, in order to vary the reaction time for the conversion in the cell. Reaction times determined from the HO₂ conversion efficiency were used for model calculations and were varied according to the uncertainty of the reaction time, ± 0.025 and ± 0.5 ms (dotted lines). The vertical dashed line indicates the working point for the instrument with 0.4 mm nozzle in the past.




Fig. 5. Same as Fig. 4, but for RO₂ radicals produced by isoprene and OH.

Relative detection sensitivities are investigated for two other alkyl peroxy radicals, ethyl peroxy and cyclohexyl peroxy radicals, from the reaction of OH with ethane and cyclohexane, respectively, for two configurations of the detection cell (Table 2). For the configuration using the 0.4 mm orifice, the relative detection sensitivity of 0.07 ± 0.03 is small for ethyl peroxy radicals, but it is significantly larger for cyclohexyl peroxy radicals (0.48 ± 0.14). It is reduced to values

Table 2. Measured and calculated relative detection sensitivities of different RO₂ species in the HO₂ detection cell for two inlet configurations. Modeled values are calculated from the ratio of conversion efficiencies that are achieved for RO₂ and HO₂ ($\alpha'_{\text{RO}_2} = \frac{\epsilon_{\text{RO}_2}}{\epsilon_{\text{HO}_2}}$) assuming $\gamma_{\text{RO}_2} = \gamma_{\text{HO}_2}$ (Eq. 11). The sensitivity applies for RO₂ that is produced in the reaction of organic precursors with OH and O₂.

Precursor	Orifice 0.4 mm [NO] = $1.3 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$		Orifice 0.2 mm [NO] = $1.2 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$	
	α_{RO_2} (exp.)	α'_{RO_2} (model)	α_{RO_2} (exp.)	α'_{RO_2} (model)
Methane	0.04 ± 0.04	0.04	-0.01 ± 0.02	0.00
Ethane	0.07 ± 0.03	0.18	0.01 ± 0.02	0.00
Cyclohexane	0.48 ± 0.14	10.14 ^a	0.03 ± 0.00	10.00 ^a
Ethene	0.85 ± 0.05	0.85	0.17 ± 0.03	0.08
Propene	0.95 ± 0.03	0.83	0.15 ± 0.03	0.08
Isoprene	0.79 ± 0.05	0.67	0.12 ± 0.02	0.07
MVK	0.60 ± 0.06	20.26 ^b	0.24 ± 0.11	20.03 ^b
MACR	0.58 ± 0.04	0.38	0.14 ± 0.02	0.00
Benzene	0.86 ± 0.11^c	0.78	0.17 ± 0.17^c	0.08

^a MCMv3.1 does not include decomposition of the cyclohexoxy radical. ^b MCMv3.1 does not include all reaction paths of the RO₂ radical from MVK.

^c Value does not include 65 % prompt HO₂ formation in the radical source.




Fig. 6. Same as Fig. 4, but for RO₂ radicals produced by benzene and OH. Measurements take 65 % of prompt HO₂ formation in the radical source into account.

within the range of the limit of detection of the instrument for the configuration with the 0.2 mm orifice for both radical species.

The major pathway of the reaction of OH with alkenes is its addition to the carbon atoms of the double-bond forming a β -hydroxyalkyl radical, which then reacts with O₂ to form the corresponding β -hydroxyalkyl peroxy radical (Atkinson and Arey, 2003). Relative detection sensitivities were measured for radicals for the peroxy radicals from the OH reaction with ethene, propene and isoprene. All of them show a high relative detection sensitivity (Table 2) for the configuration with the 0.4 mm nozzle with 0.85 ± 0.05 , 0.95 ± 0.03 and 0.79 ± 0.05 for radicals

from ethene, propene and isoprene, respectively. The values are significantly reduced (0.17 ± 0.03 , 0.15 ± 0.03 and 0.12 ± 0.02) for the configuration with the 0.2 mm nozzle. Figure 5 shows the dependence of the relative detection sensitivity on the NO concentration in the detection cell for RO₂ radicals from isoprene plus OH, emphasizing the NO dependence of the relative detection sensitivity. The high relative detection sensitivities suggest a fast conversion of β -hydroxyalkoxy radicals to HO₂. This means that RO₂ radicals from isoprene produced a strong interference signal for HO₂ measurements by the LIF-instrument in the past.

Relative detection sensitivities for RO₂ radicals from MVK and MACR are shown in Table 2. They are smaller than that measured for ethene and propene for the configuration used in field campaigns (0.4 mm nozzle), but are still significant (MVK: 0.60 ± 0.06 , MACR: 0.58 ± 0.04). They are reduced to values within the range of values for other alkenes (MVK: 0.24 ± 0.11 , MACR: 0.14 ± 0.02), if the smaller orifice (shorter reaction time) is used.

The reaction of benzene with OH is an example for prompt formation of HO₂ within the transport time of the calibration gas in the radical source ($\delta > 0$ in Eq. 7). The formation of HO₂ in air is fast (2.2 ms) (Bohn and Zetzsch, 1999), much shorter than the travel time of air between photolysis and sampling by the instrument. A yield of 65 % recommended in literature based on product studies in the EU-PHORE chamber (Bloss et al., 2005a,b) is taken for calculations using Eq. (7). We investigated recently the yield of prompt HO₂ formation by directly observing the HO₂ formation and found good agreement (Nehr et al., 2011). Here, the relative detection sensitivity for RO₂ radicals from benzene plus OH was found to be approximately 0.9 for high NO concentrations for the two configurations with the different inlet

nozzles (Fig. 6). It is approximately 0.85 at the working point of the 0.4 mm nozzle used in previous field campaigns. The relative detection sensitivity decreases with decreasing NO concentration and is smaller than 0.1 for the 0.2 mm nozzle at the lowest NO concentration tested here.

4.3 Water dependence of HO₂ and RO₂ detection sensitivities

The measurement intercomparison for HO₂ by different LIF instruments during HOxCOMP revealed discrepancies that were apparently correlated with the atmospheric water vapor (Fuchs et al., 2010). This result was surprising, because all instruments had corrected their measurements for the known influence of OH fluorescence quenching by water vapor. Results from this campaign must therefore be considered as a hint to a so far unknown water-related interference. For this reason, the water vapor dependence of our LIF detection sensitivity for HO₂ was reinvestigated (Fig. 7).

In the upper panels, the calibration factors for HO₂ and RO₂ are shown, both of which decrease with increasing water vapor concentration in the same way. The trend is compared to calculations that give the reduction of the sensitivity due to fluorescence quenching by water vapor using quenching constants from literature (Heard and Henderson, 2000). Calculations and measurements are in good agreement. This proves once more that the correction factor that was applied to measurements from this LIF instrument during HOxCOMP accounts for a dependence of the instrument sensitivity correctly. The relative detection sensitivity for the isoprene peroxy radicals does not show any significant trend with the water vapor mixing ratio for both inlet nozzles. This suggests that water vapor does not influence the overall RO₂ to OH conversion at the conditions in our measurement instrument.

5 Discussion of detection sensitivities

5.1 OH and HO₂ detection sensitivities of the LIF instrument

The relative detection sensitivities for HO₂ increases with NO and is approximately constant for high NO. In this case, the HO₂ conversion to OH is complete ($\frac{\epsilon_{\text{HO}_2}}{\epsilon_{\text{OH}}} \rightarrow 1$ in Eq. 9). The plateau value has a value of greater than one (Fig. 3, upper panel), which can be explained by different transmission efficiencies for HO₂ and OH (Eq. 9). The HO₂ inlet transmission efficiency is approximately 45 % larger than that for OH for the 0.2 mm nozzle and 15 % larger for the 0.4 mm nozzle. A larger inlet transmission efficiency for HO₂ than for OH is expected because of the generally smaller reactivity of HO₂ towards surfaces (Mihele and Hastie, 1998; Fuchs et al., 2008).

Measured α_{RO_2} values are compared to calculated values using the framework of the Master Chemical Mechanism




Fig. 7. Dependence of the interference from RO₂ radicals produced by isoprene and OH on water vapor (lower panel) at high NO concentrations (0.2 mm nozzle: $3 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, 0.4 mm nozzle: $4 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$). Experiments were carried out for two combinations of reaction times (orifice diameters) and NO concentrations. Symbols show individual measurement points and lines are average values (solid, dashed) and 1σ standard deviations (dotted) of measurements. In the upper two panels the water vapor dependence of measured detection sensitivities for HO₂, C_{HO₂}, and RO₂ from isoprene, C_{RO₂}, (scaled to one dry conditions) is compared to calculations that give the reduction of the instrument sensitivity due to fluorescence quenching by water vapor (black lines).

version 3.1 (MCMv3.1, Saunders et al., 2003; Jenkin et al., 2003), in order to simulate the radical conversion. The initial concentration of HO₂ is set to $1 \times 10^8 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ for model calculations. The results of the model are independent of the initial concentration, because the much larger concentrations of the major reactants (NO, O₂) are virtually constant and radical-radical reactions play no role at the given concentrations and time scale. The ratio of the calculated OH concentration after the reaction time, which is determined as described below, and the initial HO₂ concentration gives the HO₂ conversion efficiency ϵ_{HO_2} in Eqs. (8) and (9). The ratio of inlet transmission efficiencies determined for measurements at high NO concentrations is used to scale the results of model calculations, since the model does not include inlet loss reactions.

The reaction time for radical conversion in the detection cell is determined by fitting the modeled HO₂ curve to the measured data in Fig. 3, upper panel. This reaction time is used as model input for all other model calculations. A reaction time of 0.18 ± 0.025 ms for the 0.2 mm nozzle and a reaction time of 2.7 ± 0.5 ms for the 0.4 mm nozzle is determined (errors are estimated from sensitivity runs). The value for the 0.2 mm nozzle is similar to previous results (Weber, 1998), but the reaction time for the 0.4 mm nozzle is much longer. Air is sampled by supersonic expansion in both cases, so that similar travel times in the detection cell may be expected.

Model calculations reproduce the NO dependence of the measured relative HO₂ detection sensitivities (Fig. 3). Also the NO dependence of the OH detection efficiency (Fig. 3, lower panel) is well-described. The small decrease at high NO concentrations can be explained by OH loss in its reaction with NO forming HONO (Reaction R2).

The sampled air cools down significantly when it is expanded from ambient pressure to the low pressure in the measurement instrument. Previous experiments with a nozzle orifice of 0.75 mm showed a large reduction of the rotational temperature of OH in the probing laser beam to $T = 207$ K (Holland et al., 1995). When an orifice diameter of 0.2 mm or 0.4 mm is used, the rotational temperature is found to be equal to room temperature indicating that the expanded gas has come into thermal equilibrium with the surrounding sheath gas, when it reaches the laser beam. This was also shown for another LIF instrument 40–50 mm downstream of a flat inlet nozzle with a 0.2 mm orifice (Creasey et al., 1997). In order to estimate the influence of a temperature gradient on the peroxy radical conversion along the line from the NO injection point to the detection volume, we have also performed model calculations at a reduced temperature of 230 K. The difference to model results for 295 K is small (<20%). This is also the case for all other model calculations that are performed, in order to calculate RO₂ conversion efficiencies below, indicating a negligible effect of temperature on the conversion reaction schemes (as far as they are known and included in MCMv3.1).

5.2 Interference from alkyl peroxy radicals

The high NO concentration in the detection cell ensures that alkyl peroxy radicals react exclusively with NO forming alkoxy radicals (Reaction R3). The rate constant of this reaction is similar for different RO₂ (typically 9×10^{-12} cm³ s⁻¹ at 298 K) (Atkinson and Arey, 2003). In addition to alkoxy radicals alkyl nitrates can be formed, but their yield is not well-known (Atkinson and Arey, 2003). Studies show that the yield is increasing with increasing number of C-atoms in the peroxy radical and with increasing pressure (Atkinson and Arey, 2003; Zhang et al., 2004). The lifetime of peroxy radicals is approximately 1 ms for conditions, at which the detection cell was operated in the

field (0.4 mm nozzle, [NO] = 1.3×10^{14} cm⁻³). Therefore, a substantial part of the alkyl peroxy radicals can be converted to alkoxy radicals within the reaction time determined from investigations of the HO₂ conversion efficiency (2.7 ms). Alkoxy radicals react via one or more pathways (Atkinson, 1997b; Orlando et al., 2003): (1) reaction with oxygen, (2) decomposition, (3) isomerization, (4) reaction with NO.

Model calculations (Fig. 4) that were performed to calculate the RO₂ conversion efficiency for methyl peroxy radicals agree with measurements for the short reaction time of the 0.2 mm nozzle showing that RO₂ conversion is negligible. For the longer reaction time with the 0.4 mm nozzle model calculations predict an increase of the RO₂ conversion efficiency with increasing NO concentrations, because of the faster conversion to HO₂. The small maximum in the measured RO₂ detection sensitivities at lower NO cannot be reproduced by model calculations using one reaction time. The reason for the discrepancy between measurements and model calculation is not clear. One may speculate that part of the sampled gas has a much longer residence time than determined from measurements of the HO₂ conversion efficiency due to e.g. recirculation in the background volume of the detection cell, so that a description of measurements with a single reaction time may not be sufficient. However, since CH₃O₂ is the most prominent radical for a wide range of atmospheric conditions, the important point is that there is no significant interference from methyl peroxy radicals for conditions at which the instrument was operated in the past.

The relative detection sensitivity for larger alkyl peroxy radicals may be greater than that for methyl peroxy radicals, since the reaction of alkoxy radicals, formed in the reaction of alkyl peroxy radicals with NO, with O₂ is faster by a factor of 4 to 6 (Atkinson and Arey, 2003; Orlando et al., 2003). Again, neither reaction rate constants nor the importance of decomposition and isomerization are well-known. Model calculations of the conversion efficiency for ethyl peroxy and cyclohexyl peroxy radicals approximately agree with measurements (Table 2). A larger discrepancy is only observed for cyclohexyl peroxy radicals, when the 0.4 mm nozzle is used. A large relative detection sensitivity of 0.48 ± 0.14 is measured, but model calculations predict only a small conversion efficiency of 0.14. This may be due to fast production of HO₂ from decomposition of the cyclohexoxy radical that competes with the ring maintaining reaction with O₂ (Aschmann et al., 1997; Orlando et al., 2000), but HO₂ production from this reaction has not been investigated so far. The yield of other ring-opening decomposition products was estimated to be nearly 0.50 for atmospheric conditions (Aschmann et al., 1997) similar to the relative conversion efficiency measured here. MCMv3.1 lacks any decomposition of the cyclohexoxy radical, so that it is not expected that the calculated conversion efficiency of the cyclohexyl radical agrees with measurements.

Results obtained here agree with previous investigations for our LIF instrument (Weber, 1998; Holland et al., 2003). An upper limit for an interference from methyl peroxy radicals of 0.05 was measured using the 0.2 mm nozzle. Potential interferences from small alkyl peroxy radicals in the HO₂ detection were also investigated for other LIF instruments and found to be negligible in agreement with results obtained here. Kanaya et al. (2001) investigated the detection sensitivity of an LIF instrument for ethyl peroxy radicals. A relative detection sensitivity of 0.05 was found. The potential for interferences from C₁–C₄ alkyl peroxy radicals were also experimentally investigated for another LIF instrument by Ren et al. (2004) and found to be negligible.

5.3 Interference from β-hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals

Similar to alkyl peroxy radicals, β-hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals can undergo conversion reactions leading finally to the formation of HO₂ in the detection cell. As an example, Fig. 8 shows the reaction sequence for β-hydroxyalkyl peroxy radical from ethene plus OH. They react with NO forming β-hydroxyalkoxy radicals with a reaction rate constant that is similar to those of alkyl peroxy radicals (Atkinson and Arey, 2003). β-hydroxyalkoxy radicals can react with O₂ or can decompose or isomerize. However, in contrast to alkoxy peroxy radicals, decomposition and isomerization appear to be the dominant pathways, except for the HOCH₂CH₂O radical (from ethene plus OH), for which decomposition and reaction with O₂ can be competitive (Atkinson, 1997a). Decomposition rate constants were determined to be on the order of 10⁴ to 10⁶ s⁻¹ (Atkinson, 1997a,b; Orlando et al., 1998; Vereecken et al., 1999). Decomposition leads to the formation of a hydroxyalkyl radical, which then reacts rapidly and solely with O₂ forming a carbonyl compound plus HO₂ (Atkinson, 1997b; Orlando et al., 2003). Compared to the slow alkoxy + O₂ reaction (e.g., for CH₃O), which inhibits the overall RO₂ to OH conversion for simple alkyl peroxy radicals in our detection cell, decomposition of β-hydroxyalkoxy radicals is extremely fast. Therefore, the lifetime of the β-hydroxyalkoxy radical is much shorter than the reaction time in the detection cell for the 0.4 mm nozzle, so that they are efficiently converted to HO₂. As a consequence, the reaction with NO limits the conversion efficiency, so that a strong interference is observed for high NO concentrations that decreases with decreasing NO in contrast to assumption made in the past.

In the MCMv3.1 decomposition of the β-hydroxyalkoxy radical is lumped with the subsequent reaction of the hydroxyalkyl radical with O₂. Due to the reduced density of O₂ in the detection cell, calculations using MCMv3.1 may not accurately describe the conversion efficiency. In addition, inlet transmission efficiencies for β-hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals may be different from that for HO₂. Despite these limitations calculated conversion efficiencies approximately match relative detection sensitivities as shown in Table 2.




Fig. 8. Reaction scheme of the radical sequence of the β-hydroxyalkyl peroxy radical produced by the reaction of OH with ethene. The β-hydroxyalkoxy radical formed in the reaction with NO either decomposes or reacts with O₂ in contrast to other β-hydroxyalkoxy species which exclusively decompose.

5.4 Interference from RO₂ produced by isoprene + OH and its oxidation products + OH

The fate of peroxy radicals from isoprene and OH is subject of recent theoretical and experimental investigations (Peeters et al., 2009; da Silva et al., 2010). If NO is present, the reaction pathway is similar to that of an alkene, but four different hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals can be formed (Fan and Zhang, 2004; Ghosh et al., 2010; Greenwald et al., 2010), two of which are favored (yield: 0.97). They can be converted to HO₂ in a radical reaction sequence. Peeters et al. (2009) suggest that the hydroxyalkyl peroxy radical may also undergo a 1,6-H-shift with subsequent decomposition and formation of HO₂ instead of reaction with NO. This prompt HO₂ formation may be of importance under low NO conditions. Another theoretical study by da Silva et al. (2010) suggests a high yield of HO₂ from unimolecular decomposition of the hydroxyalkyl peroxy radical to HO₂ in the absence of NO. No NO is present in the radical source, so that these reaction pathways would change the ratio of RO₂ to HO₂ towards HO₂ (Eq. 7 with δ > 0).

Lines in Fig. 5 show relative conversion efficiencies of RO₂ radicals from isoprene to HO₂ from model calculations using MCMv3.1, which does not include the recently suggested prompt HO₂ formation from the hydroxyalkyl peroxy radical. Conversion efficiencies of the four peroxy radicals that are formed in the reaction of isoprene with OH are weighted averages with weights accounting for the formation yields of the peroxy radical species assumed in MCMv3.1. Although the reaction mechanism neglects details of the

conversion of the hydroxyalkoxy radicals to HO₂, calculations reproduce roughly the observations. The agreement is better for the 0.2 mm nozzle, whereas measurements seem to be shifted towards smaller NO concentrations for the 0.4 mm nozzle. However, one has to keep in mind that calculated conversion efficiencies need to be weighted by the ratio of the inlet transmission efficiencies for RO₂ and HO₂ to be compared to measured relative detection sensitivities (Eq. 11). They are approximately 10 % larger for the 0.4 mm nozzle at high NO concentrations than calculated conversion efficiencies. This indicates that inlet transmission efficiency for peroxy radicals from isoprene may be slightly larger than that for HO₂ for this nozzle. Moreover, results for methyl peroxy radicals indicates (see above) that the description of the RO₂ conversion with one reaction time may not be sufficient.

Measured relative detection sensitivities are larger than calculated conversion efficiencies at low NO concentrations for both inlet nozzles. The difference of 0.08 can be regarded as an upper limit for potential prompt HO₂ formation (Eq. 11) in the radical source as suggested by Peeters et al. (2009) and da Silva et al. (2010) within the time between formation and detection of RO₂ radicals (20 ms). This upper limit would be consistent with the limit of the rate constant for the 1,6-H-shift given by Peeters et al. (2009), which converts to a lifetime of 120 ms, but does not fit to results obtained by Nehr et al. (2011), who investigated prompt HO₂ formation on a time scale of one second. However, the same authors lowered recently the estimate for the rate constant to 0.1 s⁻¹ (Peeters and Muller, 2010). In this case, the 1,6-H-shift would be too slow to be observed in experiments conducted here. The decomposition rate given by da Silva et al. (2010) for direct decomposition of the hydroxyalkyl peroxy radical (lifetime of several minutes) is too small to play a role in these experiments.

The two major atmospheric oxidation products from the degradation of isoprene with OH are MVK and MACR, both of which can be further oxidized by OH. The fate of RO₂ radicals from MVK and MACR plus OH are not well-known. Like for alkenes OH can add to the C=C double bond at two positions for MVK, so that two hydroxyalkyl peroxy radical species are formed. Both react with NO forming hydroxyalkoxy radicals, which further decompose. The hydroxyalkoxy radical that is formed, if OH adds to the terminal CH₂ group of MVK (yield: 0.64), decomposes via two channels (Tuazon and Atkinson, 1989), so that three conversion paths are possible. Two of them are similar to the reaction chain that follows the path described above for alkenes, so that a fast conversion to HO₂ is possible. However, decomposition products of the third channel do not lead to a fast HO₂ production. For this reaction path Tuazon and Atkinson (1989) measured a yield of 0.64 (referred to the entire reaction of MVK from product studies). Consequently, only the remaining part (36 %) can lead to a fast conversion of RO₂ to HO₂ in the detection cell via the other two reaction channels. The relative detection sensitivity for RO₂ radicals

is significantly larger (0.60) inconsistent with this reaction scheme. Calculations using MCMv3.1 (Table 2) give even smaller conversion efficiencies, since the mechanism does not include all of the conversion paths that lead to fast formation of HO₂.

In contrast to MVK, OH can add to MACR (yield: 0.43) or can abstract an H-atom (yield: 0.57) (Tuazon and Atkinson, 1990; Orlando et al., 1999). H-abstraction leads to the formation of an acyl peroxy radical that reacts with NO to the 1-methylvinyl radical and cannot be converted to HO₂ within the reaction time in the HO₂ detection cell. The hydroxyalkyl peroxy radical that is formed, if OH adds to MACR, follows the reaction path of other hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals, so that HO₂ is formed quickly. Therefore, it is reasonable that the relative detection sensitivity for peroxy radicals (0.58 ± 0.04, Table 2) from the reaction of MACR with OH for the configuration with the 0.4 mm nozzle is within the range of the yield of hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals (0.43) (Tuazon and Atkinson, 1990; Orlando et al., 1999). Also calculations of the conversion efficiency using MCMv3.1 (Table 2) give a relative RO₂ conversion efficiency that is similar to the yield of hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals for this configuration.

5.5 Interference from RO₂ produced by benzene + OH

Measured detection sensitivities for RO₂ from benzene plus OH agrees approximately with calculated conversion efficiencies using MCMv3.1. Equations (7) and (11) with $\delta = 0.65$ are used to determine the relative detection sensitivity, so that prompt HO₂ formation in the radical source does not add to the relative detection sensitivity of the peroxy radical. Error bars of data are relatively large (Fig. 6), because of the small RO₂ concentration compared to HO₂ from prompt HO₂ formation in the radical source.

OH adds to benzene forming the hydroxycyclohexadienyl radical, which reacts predominantly with O₂ in air (Nehr et al., 2011). Products are phenol plus HO₂ (yield: 0.53, Volkamer et al., 2002) and RO₂ radicals, part of which most likely decomposes to epoxides and HO₂ (yield: 0.12, Bloss et al., 2005b). Only 0.35 of the products in the reaction of benzene with OH is a bicyclic peroxy radical which behaves similar to hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals. After reaction with NO products decompose and react with O₂ yielding HO₂ very fast, so that the first reaction step becomes limiting to the conversion efficiency in the HO₂ detection cell. Therefore, the RO₂ radical species from benzene plus OH can be an interference for HO₂ measurements for conditions at which RO₂ radicals from alkene plus OH interfere.

6 Implication for atmospheric HO₂ concentration measurements by LIF

Investigation of relative detection sensitivities of the LIF instrument described in the previous section show that RO₂ can be a significant interference for HO₂ concentration measurements. Experiments indicate that a large fraction of RO₂ radicals from alkene plus OH reactions including isoprene and from aromatics plus OH reactions are detected for conditions, at which the instrument was operated during field campaigns in the past. Interferences from RO₂ radicals identified here (mostly β -hydroxyalkyl peroxy radicals), can be significantly reduced, if the NO concentration and/or the reaction time in the detection cell is decreased. Although the HO₂ detection sensitivity becomes smaller at the same time, operation of the instrument at lower NO concentration and with shorter reaction time is feasible. In this case, the HO₂ sensitivity is only reduced by a factor of four (Fig. 3), but the relative RO₂ sensitivity is smaller than 0.2 for most of RO₂ species studied here (Table 2). This value for the HO₂ sensitivity will be still sufficient for detecting HO₂ for a wide range of conditions in the atmosphere.

HO₂ measurements that we performed with our LIF instrument in past field campaigns and in simulation chamber experiments need to be revised, depending on the abundance and mix of RO₂ species present during the distinct campaigns. The interference by RO₂ is generally expected to be negligible for remote and marine environments, where methyl peroxy radicals are the dominant RO₂ species. However, significant interferences in HO₂ measurements are expected in the presence of high concentrations of alkenes and aromatics, as is typically found in urban and forested environments. In principle, speciated RO₂ measurements are required to correct for the interference, but such measurements do not exist. A detailed analysis of the consequences for past field measurements is beyond the scope of this paper and will be discussed elsewhere. For example, a significant impact of the interference is expected for the recently published HO_x measurements performed during the PRIDE-PRD2006 campaign in the Pearl River Delta, China (Hofzumahaus et al., 2009). Model calculations suggest that the measured HO₂ concentrations contain an interference by RO₂ of at least 30 % during daytime, depending on the chemical mechanism used for the calculation of the RO₂ species (Lu et al., 2011). This also suggests that the unknown radical recycling, proposed by Hofzumahaus et al. (2009) to explain the observed OH, must be even larger, if the HO₂ concentrations are smaller than assumed before (Lu et al., 2011).

An LIF instrument similar to the one for HO₂ detection was recently developed for alternating measurement of HO_x and RO_x radicals (Fuchs et al., 2008). This instrument utilizes the conversion of RO₂ radicals to HO₂ as described above (Reactions R3, R4) in an additional conversion reactor that is mounted on top of a detection cell that is similar to the HO₂ detection cell characterized here. The sum of OH, HO₂

and RO₂ is converted to HO₂ in the conversion reactor in the RO_x-mode of the system. The RO₂ conversion efficiency in the reactor is mainly determined by the rate constant of the reaction of RO₂ with NO, so that effects described here, do not impact RO_x measurements. However, since conditions were chosen for a high HO₂ conversion efficiency in the HO₂ detection cell downstream of the conversion reactor, HO₂ concentration measurements in the HO_x-mode of the instrument are affected by similar RO₂ interferences as described above. In the HO₂ measurement mode RO₂ radicals are not converted in the conversion reactor, but can be converted to OH in the HO₂ detection cell as shown above. Therefore, the instrument is not sufficiently capable of separating between HO₂ and RO₂ radicals from alkenes and aromatics. In the future, it is planned to install a separate HO₂ detection cell, which will be operated at optimized conditions (low NO concentration and shorter reaction time). This will allow separating HO₂ and RO₂ radical concentrations by subtracting the signals of the RO_x- and HO_x-channel of the instrument. HO₂ comparison measurements of RO_xLIF with measurements by MIESR in the past (Fuchs et al., 2009) is expected to be unaffected by interferences from RO₂, because only methyl peroxy radicals and ethyl peroxy radicals, which are not efficiently converted in the HO₂ detection cell, were involved. This expectation is consistent with the good correlation and absolute agreement between HO₂ and RO₂ concentration measurements of both instruments observed for the two techniques.

Although NO concentrations and reaction times in the detection cell are different for other LIF instruments, it is likely that these instruments also suffer from the interferences discovered here. All LIF-instruments make use of the conversion of HO₂ via reaction with NO reach HO₂ conversion efficiencies that are greater than 0.9 (Heard and Pilling, 2003). As shown above, the HO₂ conversion efficiency is closely connected to the RO₂ conversion efficiency for RO₂ species from alkene- and aromatic-precursors and can reach similar values for large NO concentrations. After publication of the discussion paper of this study two groups (Max Planck Institute for Chemistry, MPIC, and University of Leeds) reported in Interactive Comments to the paper that their LIF instruments suffer from the same interference observed here, if instruments are operated at conditions with a high HO₂ conversion efficiency. They also investigated RO₂ radicals from larger alkanes (>C₃) that were not investigated here and found an interference.

HO₂ concentration measurements of three LIF instruments were compared during the HO_xCOMP campaign in 2005 (Fuchs et al., 2010). Measurements were partly conducted in ambient air and partly at the atmosphere simulation chamber SAPHIR. Since the measurement place was influenced by biogenic emissions, most likely RO₂ radicals from isoprene and its reaction products were present during ambient air sampling and may have corrupted HO₂ concentrations that were reported for the three instruments. However, the

interference would likely appear in a difference in the slope from unity in the correlation plot rather than in an offset for two reasons: (1) HO₂ and RO₂ concentrations are often highly correlated (Mihelcic et al., 2003), (2) measurements of all instruments were most likely affected in a similar way. Thus, the interference would not be distinguishable from calibration errors. This is also the case for those experiments in SAPHIR during which RO₂ radicals were produced. It is possible that some of the day-to-day variability observed in the slope of the correlation may have been caused by interferences from RO₂ radicals. However, half of the experiments in SAPHIR were conducted without the addition of organic compounds. Therefore, it is likely that major results of this campaign are not related to an interference from RO₂ radicals.

7 Summary and conclusions

HO₂ concentration measurements are widely accomplished by chemical conversion of HO₂ to OH including reaction with NO and subsequent detection of OH by laser-induced fluorescence. RO₂ radicals can be converted to OH via a similar radical reaction sequence including reaction with NO, so that they are potential interferences for HO₂ measurements. It was believed that this reaction path does not play a role for LIF instruments. Here, RO₂ detection sensitivities relative to that for HO₂ were measured for RO₂ radicals from various organic precursors such as alkanes, alkenes including isoprene and aromatics. They were produced by the reaction of VOCs with OH in a radical source that produces OH and HO₂ by water photolysis. The ratio of OH and HO₂ concentrations in the radical source were determined in a separate experiment, in order to avoid uncertainties from potential discrepancies of the ratio from unity. Major results of these investigations are:

- The ratio of HO₂ to the sum of HO₂ and OH concentrations produced by water photolysis at 185 nm in air is 0.50 ± 0.02 .
- The interference of HO₂ measurements from RO₂ produced by the reaction of OH with small alkanes via H-atom abstraction tested here (methane and ethane) is within the range of a few percent for the LIF instrument operated at conditions used in field campaigns in the past in agreement with results reported from other groups.
- The interference from RO₂ from OH plus alkenes or aromatics (OH-addition) is larger than 0.8 for the LIF instrument operated with these conditions.
- Interferences from RO₂ radicals produced by the reaction of isoprene and its oxidation products, MVK and MACR, with OH are 0.8 and 0.6, respectively, for the LIF instrument operated with these conditions.

- The reaction of RO₂ with NO limits the conversion efficiency for interfering RO₂ radical species in contrast to assumptions made in the past that the reaction of alkoxy radicals with O₂ suppresses the conversion (Holland et al., 2003). This is due to the fast reaction of β -hydroxyalkoxy radicals with O₂.
- Interferences from these RO₂ species can be significantly reduced (<0.2), if the reaction time and/or the NO concentration in the detection cell is reduced at the expense of a reduced HO₂ detection sensitivity.

Consequently, HO₂ concentration measurements from previous field campaigns during which this LIF instrument was deployed give rather the sum of HO₂ and some fraction of RO₂ than HO₂ alone. Generally, the interference by RO₂ radicals would be small in clean remote environments, when small alkanes dominate the OH reactivity, but would be most likely larger in polluted environments. This is also the case for areas that have large biogenic emissions, because RO₂ radicals from isoprene and its oxidation products are efficiently converted in the detection cell. The impact of interferences from RO₂ is highest, if the oxidation rate of pollutants such as alkenes including isoprene is high (high VOC and OH concentrations) but NO concentrations are small as found e.g. during the PRIDE-PRD2006 campaign (Lu et al., 2011). For this campaign, model calculations suggest that the measured HO₂ concentrations contain an interference by RO₂ of at least 30 % during daytime. The unknown radical recycling, proposed by Hofzumahaus et al. (2009) to explain the observed OH, however, must be even larger, if the OH source from HO₂ is smaller than assumed before.

Results of investigations done here implicate that the detection of HO₂ via chemical conversion with NO and subsequent detection of OH needs to be revisited. Running the LIF instrument at much lower NO concentration and/or shorter reaction time for HO₂ to OH conversion will provide a significantly improved suppression of interferences from RO₂ (less than 0.2). Although the HO₂ sensitivity of the instrument will be reduced at the same time, this should allow useful studies of the atmospheric chemistry at most tropospheric conditions. Further characterization of interferences for a wider range of RO₂ species and redesign of the instrument may be required, in order to minimize interferences from RO₂ radicals.

Edited by: M. D. Andrés Hernández

References

- Andrés-Hernández, M. D., Stone, D., Brookes, D. M., Commane, R., Reeves, C. E., Huntrieser, H., Heard, D. E., Monks, P. S., Burrows, J. P., Schlager, H., Kartal, D., Evans, M. J., Floquet, C. F. A., Ingham, T., Methven, J., and Parker, A. E.: Peroxy radical partitioning during the AMMA radical intercomparison exercise, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 10621–10638, doi:10.5194/acp-10-10621-2010, 2010.
- Aschmann, S. M., Chew, A. A., Arey, J., and Atkinson, R.: Products of the gas-phase reaction of OH radicals with cyclohexane: reactions of the cyclohexoxy radical, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 101, 8042–8048, doi:10.1021/jp971869f, 1997.
- Aschmutat, U., Hessling, M., Holland, F., and Hofzumahaus, A.: A tunable source of hydroxyl (OH) and hydroperoxy (HO₂) radicals: in the range between 10⁶ and 10⁹ cm⁻³, Physico-chemical behaviour of atmospheric pollutants, European Commission, Brussels, 1994.
- Atkinson, R.: Gas-phase tropospheric chemistry of volatile organic compounds: 1. Alkanes and alkenes, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data*, 26, 217–290, 1997a.
- Atkinson, R.: Atmospheric reactions of alkoxy and β-hydroxyalkoxy radicals, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 29, 99–111, 1997b.
- Atkinson, R. and Arey, J.: Atmospheric degradation of volatile organic compounds, *Chem. Rev.*, 103, 4605–4638, doi:10.1021/cr0206420, 2003.
- Bajeh, M. A., Goldfield, E. M., Hanf, A., Kappel, C., Meijer, A. J. H. M., Volpp, H.-R., and Wolfrum, J.: Dynamics of the H + O₂ → O + OH chain-branching reaction: accurate quantum mechanical and experimental absolute reaction cross sections, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 105, 3359–3364, doi:10.1021/jp0036137, 2001.
- Bloss, C., Wagner, V., Bonzanini, A., Jenkin, M. E., Wirtz, K., Martin-Reviejo, M., and Pilling, M. J.: Evaluation of detailed aromatic mechanisms (MCMv3 and MCMv3.1) against environmental chamber data, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 623–639, doi:10.5194/acp-5-623-2005, 2005a.
- Bloss, C., Wagner, V., Jenkin, M. E., Volkamer, R., Bloss, W. J., Lee, J. D., Heard, D. E., Wirtz, K., Martin-Reviejo, M., Rea, G., Wenger, J. C., and Pilling, M. J.: Development of a detailed chemical mechanism (MCMv3.1) for the atmospheric oxidation of aromatic hydrocarbons, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 5, 641–664, doi:10.5194/acp-5-641-2005, 2005b.
- Bohn, B. and Zetzsch, C.: Gas-phase reaction of the OH-benzene adduct with O₂: reversibility and secondary formation of HO₂, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 1, 5097–5107, 1999.
- Burkert, J., Hernández, M. D. A., Stöbener, D., Weissenmayer, M., and Kraus, A.: Peroxy radical and related trace gas measurements in the boundary layer above the Atlantic Ocean, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, 5457–5477, 2001.
- Cantrell, C. A., Stedman, D. H., and Wendel, G. J.: Measurement of atmospheric peroxy radicals by chemical amplification, *Anal. Chem.*, 56, 1496–1502, 1984.
- Cantrell, C. A., Zimmer, A., and Tyndall, G. S.: Absorption cross sections for water vapor from 183 to 193 nm, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 24, 2195–2198, 1997.
- Clemmshaw, K. C., Carpenter, L. J., and St. A. P.: A calibrated peroxy radical chemical amplifier for ground-based tropospheric measurements, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 25405–25416, 1997.
- Creasey, D. J., Heard, D. E., Pilling, M. J., Whitaker, B. J., Berzins, M., and Fairlie, R.: Visualisation of a supersonic free-jet expansion using laser-induced fluorescence spectroscopy: Application of measurement of rate constants at ultralow temperatures, *Appl. Phys. B*, 65, 375–391, 1997.
- Creasey, D. J., Heard, D. E., and Lee, J. D.: Absorption cross section measurements of water vapour and oxygen at 185 nm, Implications for the calibration of field instruments to measure OH, HO₂ and RO₂ radicals, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 27, 1651–1654, doi:10.1029/1999GL011014, 2000.
- Creasey, D. J., Heard, D. E., and Lee, J. D.: Eastern Atlantic Spring Experiment 1997 (EASE97) 1. Measurements of OH and HO₂ concentrations at Mace Head, Ireland, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, 4091, doi:10.1029/2001jd000892, 2002.
- Creasey, D. J., Evans, G. E., Heard, D. E., and Lee, J. D.: Measurements of OH and HO₂ concentrations in the Southern Ocean marine boundary layer, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 4475, doi:10.1029/2002JD003206, 2003.
- da Silva, G., Graham, C., and Wang, Z.-F.: Unimolecular β-hydroxyperoxy radical decomposition with OH recycling in the photochemical oxidation of isoprene, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 44, 250–256, doi:10.1021/es900924d, 2010.
- Demers, R., Collin, G. J., and Gagnon-Deslauriers, H.: Photolyse de l'isoprène gazeux entre son seuil d'absorption (ca. 255 nm) et 147.0 nm, *Can. J. Chem.*, 56, 1864–1870, doi:10.1139/v78-303, 1978.
- Gluglietti, R., Berger, M., Zelger, M., Hofzumahaus, A., Siese, M., Holland, F., Wisthaler, A., Grabmer, W., Hansel, A., Koppmann, R., Kramm, G., Möllmann-Coers, M., and Knaps, A.: Turbulent exchange and segregation of HO_x radicals and volatile organic compounds above a deciduous forest, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 6215–6235, doi:10.5194/acp-10-6215-2010, 2010.
- Edwards, G. D., Cantrell, C. A., Stephens, S., Hil, B., Goyea, O., Shetter, R. E., Mauldin, R. L., Kosciuch, E., Tanner, D. J., and Eisele, F. L.: Chemical ionization mass spectrometer instrument for the measurement of tropospheric HO₂ and RO₂, *Anal. Chem.*, 75, 5318–5327, doi:10.1021/ac034402b, 2003.
- Engel, V., Staemmler, V., Vander Wal, R. L., Crim, F. F., Senion, R. J., Hudson, B., Andresen, P., Hennig, S., Weide, K., and Schinke, R.: Photodissociation of water in the first absorption band: a prototype for dissociation on a repulsive potential energy surface, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 96, 3201–3213, doi:10.1021/j100187a007, 1992.
- Fan, J. and Zhang, R.: Atmospheric oxidation mechanism of isoprene, *Environ. Chem.*, 1, 140–149, doi:10.1071/EN04045, 2004.
- Finlayson-Pitts, B. J. and Pitts Jr., J. N.: Chemistry of the Upper and Lower Atmosphere, Academic Press, San Diego, 2000.
- Fuchs, H., Hofzumahaus, A., and Holland, F.: Measurement of tropospheric RO₂ and HO₂ radicals by a laser-induced fluorescence instrument, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 79, 084104, doi:10.1063/1.2968712, 2008.
- Fuchs, H., Brauers, T., Häsel, R., Holland, F., Mihelcic, D., Müsgen, P., Rohrer, F., Wegener, R., and Hofzumahaus, A.: Intercomparison of peroxy radical measurements obtained at atmospheric conditions by laser-induced fluorescence and electron spin resonance spectroscopy, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 2, 55–64, doi:10.5194/amt-2-55-2009, 2009.

- Fuchs, H., Brauers, T., Dorn, H.-P., Harder, H., Häsel, R., Hofzumahaus, A., Holland, F., Kanaya, Y., Kajii, Y., Kubistin, D., Lou, S., Martinez, M., Miyamoto, K., Nishida, S., Rudolf, M., Schlosser, E., Wahner, A., Yoshino, A., and Schurath, U.: Technical Note: Formal blind intercomparison of HO₂ measurements in the atmosphere simulation chamber SAPHIR during the HOxComp campaign, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 12233–12250, doi:10.5194/acp-10-12233-2010, 2010.
- Geyer, A., Bächmann, K., Hofzumahaus, A., Holland, F., Konrad, S., Klüpfel, T., Pätz, H. W., Schäfer, J., and Platt, U.: Nighttime formation of peroxy and hydroxyl radicals during the BERLIOZ campaign: observations and modeling studies, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 8249, doi:10.1029/2001JD000656, 2003.
- Ghosh, B., Bugarin, A., Connell, B. T., and North, S. W.: Isomer-selective study of the OH-initiated oxidation of isoprene in the presence of O₂ and NO: 2. The major OH addition channel, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 114, 2553–2560, doi:10.1021/jp909052t, 2010.
- Giroux, L., Back, M. H., and Back, R. A.: The photolysis of ethylene at 193 nm, *Can. J. Chem.*, 67, 1166–1173, doi:10.1139/v89-176, 1989.
- Green, T. J., Reeves, C. E., Fleming, Z. L., Brough, N., Rickard, A. R., Bandy, B. J., Monks, P. S., and Penkett, S. A.: An improved dual channel PERCA instrument for atmospheric measurements of peroxy radicals, *J. Environ. Monitor.*, 8, 530–536, 2006.
- Greenwald, E. E., Ghosh, B., Anderson, K. C., Dooley, K. S., Zou, P., Selby, T., Osborn, D. L., Meloni, G., Taatjes, C. A., Goulay, F., and North, S. W.: Isomer-selective study of the OH initiated oxidation of isoprene in the presence of O₂ and NO, I. The minor inner OH-addition channel, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 114, 904–912, doi:10.1021/jp908543a, 2010.
- Hanke, M., Uecker, J., Reiner, T., and Arnold, F.: Atmospheric peroxy radicals: ROXMAS, a new mass-spectrometric methodology for the speciated measurements of HO₂ and ΣRO₂ and first results, *Int. J. Mass. Spectrom.*, 213, 91–99, 2002.
- Hard, T. M., O'Brian, R. J., Chan, C. Y., and Mehrabzadeh, A. A.: Tropospheric free radical determination by FAGE, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 18, 768–777, 1984.
- Hastie, D. R., Weissenmayer, M., Burrows, J. P., and Harris, G. W.: Calibrated chemical amplifier for atmospheric RO_x measurements, *Anal. Chem.*, 63, 2048–2057, 1991.
- Heard, D. E. and Pilling, M. J.: Measurement of OH and HO₂ in the troposphere, *Chem. Rev.*, 103, 5163–5198, doi:10.1021/cr020522s, 2003.
- Heard, D. E. and Henderson, D. A.: Quenching of OH(A²Σ⁺, v' = 0) several collision partners between 200 and 344 K. Cross-section measurements and model comparisons, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2, 67–72, 2000.
- Hofzumahaus, A., Aschmutat, U., Heßling, M., Holland, F., and Ehhalt, D. H.: The measurement of tropospheric OH radicals by laser-induced fluorescence spectroscopy during POPCORN field campaign, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 23, 2541–2544, 1996.
- Hofzumahaus, A., Rohrer, F., Lu, K., Bohn, B., Brauers, T., Chang, C.-C., Fuchs, H., Holland, F., Kita, K., Kondo, Y., Li, X., Lou, S., Shao, M., Zeng, L., Wahner, A., and Zhang, Y.: Amplified trace gas removal in the troposphere, *Science*, 324, 1702–1704, doi:10.1126/science.1164566, 2009.
- Holland, F., Heßling, M., and Hofzumahaus, A.: In situ measurement of tropospheric OH radicals by laser-induced fluorescence – a description of the KFA instrument, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 52, 3393–3401, 1995.
- Holland, F., Hofzumahaus, A., Schäfer, J., Kraus, A., and Pätz, H. W.: Measurements of OH and HO₂ radical concentrations and photolysis frequencies during BERLIOZ, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 8246, doi:10.1029/2001JD001393, 2003.
- Hornbrook, R. S., Crawford, J. H., Edwards, G. D., Goyea, O., Mauldin III, R. L., Olson, J. S., and Cantrell, C. A.: Measurements of tropospheric HO₂ and RO₂ by oxygen dilution modulation and chemical ionization mass spectrometry, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 4, 735–756, doi:10.5194/amt-4-735-2011, 2011.
- Jenkin, M. E., Saunders, S. M., Wagner, V., and Pilling, M. J.: Protocol for the development of the Master Chemical Mechanism, MCM v3 (Part B): tropospheric degradation of aromatic volatile organic compounds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 3, 181–193, doi:10.5194/acp-3-181-2003, 2003.
- Kanaya, Y., Sadanaga, Y., Nakamura, K., and Akimoto, H.: Development of a ground-based LIF instrument for measuring HO_x radicals: instrumentation and calibration, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 38, 73–110, 2001.
- Kanaya, Y., Cao, R., Akimoto, H., Fukuda, M., Komazaki, Y., Yokouchi, Y., Koike, M., Tanimoto, H., Takegawa, N., and Kondo, Y.: Urban photochemistry in central Tokyo: 1. observed and modeled OH and HO₂ radical concentrations during the winter and summer 2004, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D21312, doi:10.1029/2007JD008670, 2007.
- Kleffmann, J., Gavriloaiei, T., Hofzumahaus, A., Holland, F., Koppmann, R., Rupp, L., Schlosser, E., Siese, M., and Wahner, A.: Daytime formation of nitrous acid: a major source of OH radicals in a forest, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L05818, doi:10.1029/2005GL022524, 2005.
- Lelieveld, J., Butler, T. M., Crowley, J. N., Dillon, T. J., Fischer, H., Ganzeveld, L., Harder, H., Lawrence, M. G., Martinez, M., Taraborrelli, D., and Williams, J.: Atmospheric oxidation capacity sustained by a tropical forest, *Nature*, 452, 737–740, doi:10.1038/nature06870, 2008.
- Lu, K. D., Rohrer, F., Holland, F., Fuchs, H., Bohn, B., Brauers, T., Chang, C. C., Häsel, R., Hu, M., Kita, K., Kondo, Y., Li, X., Lou, S. R., Nehr, S., Shao, M., Zeng, L. M., Wahner, A., Zhang, Y. H., and Hofzumahaus, A.: Observation and modelling of OH and HO₂ concentrations in the Pearl River Delta 2006: a missing OH source in a VOC rich atmosphere, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 11, 11311–11378, doi:10.5194/acpd-11-11311-2011, 2011.
- Mather, J. H., Stevens, P. S., and Brune, W. H.: OH and HO₂ measurements using laser-induced fluorescence, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 102, 6427–6436, 1997.
- Mihelcic, D., Müsgen, P., and Ehhalt, D. H.: An improved method of measuring tropospheric NO₂ and RO₂ by matrix isolation and electron spin resonance, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 3, 341–361, 1985.
- Mihelcic, D., Volz-Thomas, A., Pätz, H. W., Kley, D., and Mihelcic, M.: Numerical analysis of ESR spectra from atmospheric samples, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 11, 271–297, 1990.
- Mihelcic, D., Holland, F., Hofzumahaus, A., Hoppe, L., Müsgen, P., Pätz, H. W., and Moortgat, G. K.: Peroxy radicals during BERLIOZ at Pabstthum: measurements, radical budgets and ozone production, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 9–1,

- doi:10.1029/2001JD001014, 2003.
- Mihele, C. M. and Hastie, D. R.: The sensitivity of the radical amplifier to ambient water vapor, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 25, 1911–1913, 1998.
- Mihele, C. M. and Hastie, D. R.: Optimized operation and calibration procedures for radical amplifier-type detectors, *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.*, 17, 788–794, 2000.
- Monks, P. S.: Gas-phase radical chemistry in the troposphere, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 34, 376–395, doi:10.1039/b307982c, 2005.
- Nehr, S., Bohn, B., Fuchs, H., Hofzumahaus, A., and Wahner, A.: HO₂ formation from the OH+benzene reaction in the presence of O₂, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 10699–10708, doi:10.1039/C1CP20334G, 2011.
- Orlando, J. J., Tyndall, G. S., Bilde, M., Ferronato, C., Wallington, T. J., Vereecken, L., and Peeters, J.: Laboratory and theoretical study of the oxy radicals in the OH- and Cl-initiated oxidation of ethene, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 102, 8116–8123, doi:10.1021/jp981937d, 1998.
- Orlando, J. J., Tyndall, G. S., and Paulson, S. E.: Mechanism of the OH-initiated oxidation of methacrolein, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 26, 2191–2194, doi:10.1029/1999gl900453, 1999.
- Orlando, J. J., Iraci, L. T., and Tyndall, G. S.: Chemistry of the cyclopentoxy and cyclohexoxy radicals at sub-ambient temperatures, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 104, 5072–5079, doi:10.1021/jp0002648, 2000.
- Orlando, J. J., Tyndall, G. S., and Wallington, T. J.: The atmospheric chemistry of alkoxy radicals, *Chem. Rev.*, 103, 4657–4689, doi:10.1021/cr020527p, 2003.
- Peeters, J. and Muller, J.-F.: HO_x radical regeneration in isoprene oxidation via peroxy radical isomerisations, II: experimental evidence and global impact, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 14227–14235, doi:10.1039/C0CP00811G, 2010.
- Peeters, J., Nguyen, T. L., and Vereecken, L.: HO_x radical regeneration in the oxidation of isoprene, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 5935–5939, doi:10.1039/b908511d, 2009.
- Platt, U., Alicke, B., Dubois, R., Geyer, A., Hofzumahaus, A., Holland, F., Martinez, M., and Stutz, J.: Free radicals and fast photochemistry during BERLIOZ, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 42, 359–394, 2002.
- Qi, B., Takami, A., and Hatakeyama, S.: A calibration method for measurement of small alkyl organic peroxy radicals by chemical amplifier, *Anal. Sci.*, 22, 1091–1093, 2006.
- Ren, X., Edwards, G. D., Cantrell, C. A., Leshner, R. L., Metcalf, A. R., Shirley, T., and Brune, W. H.: Intercomparison of peroxy radical measurements at a rural site using laser-induced fluorescence and peroxy radical chemical ionization mass spectrometer (PerCIMS) techniques, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 4605, doi:10.1029/2003JD003644, 2003.
- Ren, X., Harder, H., Martinez, M., Falona, I. C., Tan, D., Leshner, R. L., Carlo, P. D., Simpas, J. B., and Brune, W. H.: Interference testing for atmospheric HO_x measurements by laser-induced fluorescence, *J. Atmos. Chem.*, 47, 169–190, 2004.
- Ren, X., Olson, J. R., Crawford, J. H., Brune, W. H., Mao, J., Long, R. B., Chen, Z., Chen, G., Avery, M. A., Sachse, G. W., Barrick, J. D., Diskin, G. S., Huey, L. G., Fried, A., Cohen, R. C., Heikes, B., Wennberg, P. O., Singh, H. B., Blake, D. R., and Shetter, R. E.: HO_x chemistry during INTEX-A 2004: observation, model calculation, and comparison with previous studies, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D05310, doi:10.1029/2007JD009166, 2008.
- Sadanaga, Y., Yoshino, A., Watanaba, K., Yoshioka, A., Wakazono, Y., Kanaya, Y., and Kajii, Y.: Development of a measurement system of peroxy radicals using a chemical amplification/laser-induced fluorescence technique, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.*, 75, 864–872, doi:10.1063/1.1666985, 2004.
- Saunders, S. M., Jenkin, M. E., Derwent, R. G., and Pilling, M. J.: Protocol for the development of the Master Chemical Mechanism, MCM v3 (Part A): tropospheric degradation of non-aromatic volatile organic compounds, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 3, 161–180, doi:10.5194/acp-3-161-2003, 2003.
- Schultz, M., Heitlinger, M., Mihelcic, D., and Volz-Thomas, A.: Calibration source for peroxy radicals with built-in actinometry using H₂O and O₂ photolysis at 185 nm, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 100, 18811–18816, 1995.
- Stevens, P. S., Mather, J. H., and Brune, W. H.: Measurement of tropospheric OH and HO₂ by laser-induced fluorescence at low pressure, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 99, 3543–3557, 1994.
- Tuazon, E. C. and Atkinson, R.: A product study of the gas-phase reaction of methyl vinyl ketone with the OH radical in the presence of NO_x, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 21, 1141–1152, doi:10.1002/kin.550211207, 1989.
- Tuazon, E. C. and Atkinson, R.: A product study of the gas-phase reaction of methacrolein with the OH radical in the presence of NO_x, *Int. J. Chem. Kinet.*, 22, 591–602, doi:10.1002/kin.550220604, 1990.
- Vereecken, L., Peeters, J., Orlando, J. J., Tyndall, G. S., and Ferronato, C.: Decomposition of β-hydroxypropoxy radicals in the OH-initiated oxidation of propene, A theoretical and experimental study, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 103, 4693–4702, doi:10.1021/jp990046i, 1999.
- Volkamer, R., Klotz, B., Barnes, I., Imamura, T., Wirtz, K., Washida, N., Becker, K. H., and Platt, U.: OH-initiated oxidation of benzene Part I, Phenol formation under atmospheric conditions, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 4, 1598–1610, doi:10.1039/b108747a, 2002.
- Washida, N., Mori, Y., and Tanaka, I.: Quantum yield of ozone formation from photolysis of the oxygen molecule at 1849 and 1931 Å, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 54, 1119–1122, doi:10.1063/1.1674946, 1971.
- Weber, M.: Entwicklung und Einsatz eines Instrumentes zur Bestimmung der Konzentration von HO₂-Radikalen in der Troposphäre, Ph.D. thesis, Universität Köln, Köln, 1998.
- Zhang, D. H., Collins, M. A., and Lee, S.-Y.: First-principle theory for the H+H₂O, D₂O reactions, *Science*, 290, 961–963, 2000.
- Zhang, J., Dransfield, T., and Donahue, N. M.: On the mechanism for nitrate formation via the peroxy radical+NO reaction, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 108, 9082–9095, doi:10.1021/jp048096x, 2004.